UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 90—PART 3

MARCH 22, 1944, TO MAY 11, 1944
(PAGES 2871 TO 4368)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1944

LAW LIBRARY
GENERAL WORKS SECTION

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of our spirits, Thou hast ordained that not in cushioned seats of safety but in danger and stern conflict shall we find our strength and our triumph. Steel our hearts to endure hardness as soldiers of the common good. As with enraptured eyes we watch once more springtime touch barren wastes to loveliness and bushes bloom in flame, may the stirrings of a spiritual springtime bring refreshment and renewal, beauty for ashes, oil of joy for sadness, faith for fear, and hope for despair. Peering into the uncertain tomorrows we see as but through a glass darkly, but where sight fails faith walks unafraid, even through the valley of the shadows, knowing that in that future goodness, justice, and truth will abide, and that in them is the wealth of our life and the spring of all existence.

In these desperate days we pray that Thou wilt meet us each where lies our deepest and most personal need. Send us forth to our work today saying of Thee, as Thy servants have said across all the changing centuries, "He restoreth my soul." We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 21, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 20, 1944:

S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis; and

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.

On March 21, 1944:

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 250) to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1232. An act for the relief of Roscoe McKinley Meadows; and

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York;

S. 1410. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940;

S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy;

S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 324. An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; and

H. R. 2836. An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

CENTENNIAL OF FIRST TELEGRAPH MESSAGE

The VICE PRESIDENT, under the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 72, appointed Mr. WHEELER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. AUSTIN members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee to Commemorate the Centennial of the Telegraph on May 24, 1944.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ORDINANCES OF PUERTO RICAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION: MANUFACTURE AND PROCESSING OF RAW SUGAR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certified copy of each of the various ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico, granting to the sugar companies and mills listed therein the right to engage in the manufacture and processing of raw sugar (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, the Administrator of the National Gallery of Art, and the Secretary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION ACT

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, recommending that legislation be enacted to amend section 3 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, so as to further amend said section 3 by inserting at the end thereof a subsection reading as follows: "In subdividing any grade into classes of positions, as provided in the foregoing subsection, the Civil Service Commission, whenever it deems such action warranted by the nature of the duties and responsibilities of a class of positions in comparison with other classes in the same grade, and in the interests of good administration, is authorized to establish for any such subdivision or class a minimum or a maximum pay rate, or both, each of which shall be one of the pay rates of that grade as set forth in section 13 of this act, as amended. In no event shall any rate for a class of positions fall below the minimum rate or above the maximum rate of the grade in which the class falls. Such rates shall be duly published by regulation and may be revised from time to time by the Commission. The Commission shall make a report of such actions or revisions with the reasons therefor to Congress at the end of each fiscal year."; to the Committee on Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of Virginia, which were referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Education and Labor:

House Joint Resolution 46

Resolution memorializing Congress to pass a law requiring certain able-bodied persons to work

Be it resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact a law requiring every sane and able-bodied male person between the ages of 17 and 60 years, with certain exceptions, to work at least 40 hours in each calendar week for the duration of the present war emergency, at some gainful occupation when any such work is available at a fair and reasonable wage, regardless of whether such person is or is not financially able to support himself and his dependents without working, excepting, however, all persons serving any branch of military service of the United States, and such other persons as the Congress may deem proper; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted, by the clerk of the house of delegates, to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and to each member of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

House Joint Resolution 45

Resolution requesting the National Congress to enact permanent legislation providing for reasonable compulsory military service by citizens of the United States

Whereas the state of military unpreparedness which existed in the United States at the outbreak of World War No. 2, and its consequences, have demonstrated the necessity for providing against a recurrence of such conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and it is hereby respectfully petitioned to enact legislation making permanent provision for reasonable compulsory military training and service by citizens of the United States of suitable age and physical condition; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the clerk of the house of delegates to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, and to each member of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition sent to me by citizens of Delaware praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States. I ask that the petition be noted and referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FLOOD-CONTROL LAW—RESOLUTION BY VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the secretary of state of Vermont, together with an accompanying joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, endorsing the provisions of House bill 4179, pending in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and urging the endorsement thereof by other States. This relates to the protection of the domain of the several States from invasion by the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the letter and joint resolution were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,
Montpelier, March 18, 1944.

To Vermont Members of Congress, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Attorney General:

DEAR SIRS: I am glad to send you herewith a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 3, entitled "Joint resolution endorsing the provisions of H. R. 4179 pending in the Seventy-eighth Congress and urging the endorsement thereof by the other States," approved March 18, 1944.

Yours very truly,

RAWSON C. MYRICK,
Secretary of State.

Senate Joint Resolution 3

Joint resolution endorsing the provisions of H. R. 4719 pending in the Seventy-eighth Congress and urging the endorsement thereof by the other States

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress a measure designed to recapture for the States certain rights, privileges, and prerogatives that by right belong to them; and

Whereas H. R. 4179 introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress by the Representative from Vermont, the Honorable CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, has as its objective the amendment of Federal flood-control law so that such a result may be accomplished; and

Whereas this measure, if enacted, would reestablish the right of an individual State to have a dominant voice in the construction of flood-control projects within its borders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont not only hereby endorses wholeheartedly the principles embodied in this particular legislation but as well urge the legislative bodies of Vermont's sister States to take similar action; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is instructed to send copies of this resolution to Vermont's congressional delegation, to the presiding officers of the legislatures and to the attorneys general of our sister States.

MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
President of the Senate.
ASA S. BLOOMER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved March 18, 1944.

WM. H. WILLS,
Governor.

ABSORPTION OF EXCHANGE OR COLLECTION CHARGES BY MEMBER BANKS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Fred M. Bowman, secretary of the Kansas Bankers Association, an important resolution adopted by that organization expressing their opposition to the passage of the so-called Maybank bill, being the bill (S. 1642) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits. I am advised that this is practically the unanimous opinion of the bankers of Kansas. I ask consent that the statement and resolution sent to me by the Kansas Bankers Association be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A group of States, both par and otherwise, believing that the Maybank bill in the Senate, which is a companion bill to the Brown measure passed by the House, would constitute a long step toward breaking down the par collection system established by the Federal Reserve bank and approved by the great majority of banks in the United States, the advisory committee felt that action should be taken at once to inform the Senators from Kansas and members of the Banking and Currency Committee in the Senate of the position of this association. Since the matter is coming before the Senate committee within 10 days, it is felt that there is not time to call a meeting of the committee on Federal legislation; and since the banks of Kansas have long demonstrated their approval of the par collection system the following resolution was unanimously passed and the secretary instructed to forward a copy of the same to each of the Senators from Kansas, the members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the five members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency who submitted a minority report to that of the full committee reporting out the bill, and to the office of the American Bankers Association with advices to the latter that our advisory committee believes that the A. B. A. should have taken an open position in opposition to the passage of this legislation, and to such other groups or committees as he feels might effectively aid in the defeat of the Maybank bill. The resolution follows:

"RESOLUTION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, KANSAS BANKERS ASSOCIATION, MARCH 16, 1944

"*Be it resolved*, That whereas the Kansas Bankers Association, consisting of 624 members, being all but 1 of the banks in Kansas, both State and National, has throughout its long history worked diligently in the interests of establishing in our State and our Nation sound and conservative banking practices; and

"Whereas we believe that the perpetuation of privately chartered banks and that the maintenance of independent banking require that all banks pay checks drawn upon them at their face value without deduction of exchange or other charges (our belief in this banking principle being illustrated by the fact that, with the exception of two small banks in our State, all banking institutions maintain this par system); and

"Whereas there is before the Senate of the United States the Maybank bill (S. 1642), being a companion of the Brown bill (H. R. 3965), which has passed in the House of Representatives, which bill by its terms would defeat the very sound provision of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and regulation Q based thereon: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Kansas Bankers Association, through its advisory committee, declare itself to be strongly opposed to the passage of this Maybank bill; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of this association be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators from the State of Kansas, urging that they, on behalf of the 623 banks of Kansas now maintaining and supporting the par collection of checks, do everything within their power to defeat the passage of this bill."

THE BOUNDARIES OF POLAND

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Dr. F. C. Tyburski, secretary of the Polish American Council, district No. 2, State of Connecticut, Bridgeport, Conn., and a resolution adopted by that council concerning the boundaries of Poland.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH AMERICAN COUNCIL,
DISTRICT NO. 2, STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
March 9, 1944.

The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: It is my privilege to forward to you a copy of the resolution adopted by the Polish American Council, District No. 2, of the State of Connecticut.

The problem voiced in this resolution, Mr. Senator, is of vital concern and interest to us Americans of Polish descent, and I trust that you will give it your utmost consideration and attention.

Respectfully yours,
Dr. F. C. TYBURSKI, *Secretary.*

We, the delegates to the annual meeting of the Second District of the Polish American Council, assembled at New Haven, Conn., on February 27, 1944, representing 350,000 Americans of Polish descent in the State of Connecticut, do hereby unanimously

Resolve, That we reaffirm our allegiance and loyalty to the United States of America and our trust in the leadership of our great President and Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We subscribe without reservation to all the principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter, that Magna Carta of human liberty, and we do particularly affirm our belief that all nations, both large and small, have an unqualified right to exist free from fear of aggression by other nations and free to pursue their national existence by forms of government of their own choosing.

We believe that these principles should be adhered to without qualifications in the present dispute between Russia and Poland and that the future peace of the world is to a large extent dependent upon a proper solution of this question, entailing as it does the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

We most earnestly urge the State Department to continue to refuse to recognize any conquests of territory made by force and any changes of government which are not made with the consent of the governed.

We believe that the Polish Government-in-exile in London is the sole legitimate authority empowered to speak for the people of Poland and that any attempts by Soviet Russia to discredit the Polish Government by setting up ex parte puppet regimes are in cynical disregard of the principles of self-government set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

We are firmly convinced that upon historical, moral, ethnological, and economic grounds, the eastern part of Poland, which is the basis of the present Russo-Polish dispute, belongs and should belong to the Republic of Poland and that any pretensions to this territory by Russia lack factual basis on any of the grounds enumerated.

We believe that any arguments advanced to the effect that the acquisition of this territory by Russia is necessary to her national defense against future aggression are without validity in these days of mechanized warfare and particularly in view of the major part played by air forces in present day combat; and we therefore believe that these arguments in effect would protect large nations at the expense of smaller ones.

We believe that Poland's contribution to the cause of democracy and freedom merits the appreciation of the entire civilized world, embodying as it did the first armed resistance against Nazi aggression in the face of overwhelming odds and continuing to the present day both by the activities of the armed forces of Poland and of the vast network of underground resistance. We do, therefore, hereby unanimously

Resolve, That we believe it to be the solemn duty of the United States to stand fast by the principles of the Atlantic Charter and to do everything in its power and influence to further the just claims of Poland in the present dispute with Russia; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Connecticut.

Dr. B. L. SMYKOWSKI, *President.*
Mrs. W. DUCH, *Vice President.*
RICHARD T. MOKRZYNSKI, *Financial Secretary.*
Rev. A. MAZURKIEWICZ, *Treasurer.*
Dr. F. C. TYBURSKI, *Secretary.*

CROP INSURANCE—RESOLUTIONS FROM WARD COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present five resolutions adopted by the county committee and district committees of Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association in annual meeting assembled in the city of Minot, N. Dak., on February 4, 1944; the Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association, at Gasman Township Hall, February 17, 1944; Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association, at Berthold, February 19, 1944; Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association, at Minot, N. Dak., February 21, 1944, and Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association, at Kenmare, February 22, 1944, and I ask that they may be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the county committee and district committees of Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association in annual meeting assembled in the city of Minot, N. Dak., this 4th day of February 1944, That

Whereas farming is a very hazardous industry conventionally undertaken by individuals and individual families, consequently where unavoidable disaster overtakes the individual farm, the loss falls extremely heavy on the individual farmer; and

Whereas no private insurance company writes an "all risk" policy which a farmer may buy and be protected in his investment in his attempt to raise a crop; and

Whereas where private enterprise fails to provide the accommodation a people need for their welfare, then it devolves on Federal and State Governments to sponsor and put into operation the institution which private enterprise has failed to provide.

Therefore, we do petition Congress to sponsor, set up, and put into operation a Nation-wide insurance corporation that will sell farmers a policy that assures him that if what he salvages of his crop, when he has practiced good husbandry, is not worth an amount equal to his expenses, he may draw on the insurance corporation to cover the deficiency, the farmer to pay for the policy a premium based on the volume salvaged of the insured crop, the premium rate to be adjusted to districts established by the insurance corporation.

C. O. LAWSON,
Chairman, Minot, N. Dak.

Be it resolved by members of Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association, assembled at Gasman Township Hall this 17th day of February 1944, That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America to sponsor, set up, and put into operation a Nation-wide insurance corporation that will sell us a policy that provides that, when we have practised good husbandry, the resultant crop when salvaged is not worth an amount equal to the expense incurred we may draw on the insurance corporation to cover the deficiency.

For such a policy we would pay a premium based on the volume salvaged of the insured crop, the premium rate to be adjusted to districts established by the insurance corporation.

E. P. NICOLAISEN,
Chairman, Max, N. Dak.

Be it resolved by members of Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association, assembled at Berthold this 19th day of February 1944, That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America to sponsor, set up, and put into operation a Nation-wide insurance corporation that will sell us a policy that provides that, when we have practiced good husbandry, the resultant crop when salvaged is not worth an amount equal to the expense incurred we may draw on the insurance corporation to cover the deficiency.

For such a policy we would pay a premium based on the volume salvaged of the insured crop, the premium rate to be adjusted to districts established by the insurance corporation.

VICTOR HAUGEN,
Chairman, Berthold, N. Dak.

Be it resolved by members of Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association, assembled at Minot, N. Dak., this 21st day of February 1944, That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America to sponsor, set up, and put into operation a Nation-wide insurance corporation that will sell us a policy that provides that, when we have practiced good husbandry, the resultant crop when salvaged is not worth an amount equal to the expense incurred we may draw on the insurance corporation to cover the deficiency.

For such a policy we would pay a premium based on the volume salvaged of the insured crop, the premium rate to be adjusted to districts established by the insurance corporation.

GEORGE REINHOLDT,
Chairman, Sawyer, N. Dak.

Be it resolved by members of Ward County (N. Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Association, assembled at Kenmare this 22d day of February 1944, That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America to sponsor, set up, and put into operation a Nation-wide insurance corporation that will sell us a policy that provides that, when we have practiced good husbandry, the resultant crop when salvaged is not worth an amount equal to the expense incurred, we may draw on the insurance corporation to cover the deficiency.

For such a policy we would pay a premium based on the volume salvaged of the insured crop, the premium rate to be adjusted to

districts established by the insurance corporation.

J. B. SCHOU,
Chairman, Kenmare, N. Dak.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask consent to present two identical petitions with different signatures sent to me by Mrs. E. G. Ranum, president of Valley City Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Valley City, N. Dak. I ask unanimous consent to have the petitions themselves printed in the RECORD, without the names attached thereto. I wish to state for the RECORD that the petitions are signed by 220 men and women, outstanding, patriotic citizens of North Dakota, most of whom I know.

There being no objection, the petitions were received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, residents and voters of the United States, respectfully request that you give the most serious consideration to the enactment of laws for the protection of our boys and girls and for the best interest of our Nation and to speed the war effort in every manner possible. Therefore we urge—

1. The passage of laws to restrict and prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor.

2. That no grain be used for making beverage alcohol and that all the facilities of the distilleries be used for making alcohol to be used for making explosives for munitions of war.

3. That the shipment of beer, wine, and other intoxicating liquor be absolutely prohibited.

Respectfully submitted.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty; with an amendment (Rept. No. 765).

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. BILBO):

S. 1802. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1803. A bill to provide for the sale of surplus Army general purpose automobiles to rural mail carriers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr MEAD:

S. 1804. A bill to extend to the custodial-service employees of the Post Office Department certain benefits applicable to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1805. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for recalculating the benefits payable to individuals who receive wages after they have become entitled to old-age-insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. BILBO):

S. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a Minimum Wage Board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1232. An act for the relief of Roscoe McKinley Meadows; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

FEDERAL AID FOR READJUSTMENT OF VETERANS IN CIVIL LIFE—AMENDMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BUCK to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, viz: On page 5, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

"OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

"COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

"Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to carry out the functions vested in it by Executive Orders 8802 and 9346, including salary of a chairman at not to exceed $10,000 per annum and 6 other members at not to exceed $25 per diem when actually engaged; travel expenses (not to exceed $16,000); expenses of witnesses in attendance at committee hearings, when necessary; printing and binding (not to exceed $12,000); purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed $125); and the temporary employment of persons, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws (not to exceed $2,250), $150,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and shall be immediately available."

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF MONOGRAPH 31, TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: PATENTS AND FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. BONE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 274), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Patents of the Senate is hereby empowered to have printed for its use 700 additional copies of Monograph 31 of the Temporary National Economic Committee relative to patents and free enterprise.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Is Going on in Washington," delivered by him before the Eagles, at Milwaukee, Wis., March 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT WILL OUR BOYS COME HOME TO?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What Will Our Boys Come Home To?", written by Senator THOMAS of Utah, and published in the February 1944 issue of the magazine Spotlight, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT HAS THE R. F. C. DONE FOR SMALL BUSINESS?—ADDRESS BY CHARLES B. HENDERSON

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Has the R. F. C. Done for Small Business?", delivered by former Senator Charles B. Henderson at the dinner of the American Business Congress, at the Waldorf Astoria, New York City, March 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALES OF SURPLUS ARMY GOODS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was very much interested in a letter I received from the Chamber of Commerce of La Crosse, Wis., which contains notice of a sale, from which I read as follows:

AUCTION SALE—BRAND NEW ARMY GOODS

Approximately $450,000 valuation. Surplus warehouse stock acquired from Army post exchange; removed for convenience of sale and will be sold at our showrooms, 420 East Eighth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., Monday, March 20, at 10 a. m.

Then, Mr. President, it lists numerous articles of Army goods, as follows:

Two thousand shirts; 7,000 trousers, 100-percent wool, elastique, O. D. wool, serge, China pink, green, O. D., natural; 15,000 officer's caps; 15,000 undershirts; 5,000 Cooper jockey shorts; 16,000 pair socks; 200 trench coats; 600 field jackets; 600 sweaters; 60 two- and three-suiter bags; 4,500 sewing kits; 2,000 sleeping bags, 100 percent wool, zipper and button; 20,000 pairs sun glasses, goggles; 1,500 bike supporters; 1,000 furlough bags; 4,500 billfolds and wallets; 2,000 ties; 500 utility kits; 1,000 cribbage sets; 2,700 buddy and apron kits; 13,000 2-gallon water bags; 2,500 12-quart buckets; 3,500 4-quart basins; 4,500 belts.

Then in small type it says:

Money belts, tobacco pouches, shower clogs, laundry bags, toilet kits, photo folios, suitcases, duffle bags, pennants, pillow tops, post cards, etc.

Then the advertisement says:

In addition, we will offer for sale 10,000 G. I. field jackets, wool lined, zippers and buttons. Army tents, cots, pads, blankets, sheets.

The advertisement concludes as follows:

For further particulars and descriptive circular, communicate with J. J. Sugarman-Rudolph Co., commercial auctioneers and

liquidators, 415 East Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; telephone TUcker 3131.

Mr. President, the small-business man of this Nation is concerned with how the Government is going to handle its surplus goods when the war is over. But the war is not over, and already the old game that went on after the last war seems to be starting.

Mr. President, the small-business man is concerned with not only what is going to take place after the war but, when such advertisements as this appear, he is concerned with what is going on now.

This advertisement appeared in the Chicago Tribune of recent date. It was called to my attention by the Chamber of Commerce of La Crosse, Wis. The letter states—and I think the statement is very significant—

> This is a good illustration of what we fear is going to happen to the merchandising business in this country if the Army is allowed to dump its surplus merchandise whenever the Procurement Division decides to liquidate any one or more projects.

Mr. President, you and I remember what happened after the last World War. The small-business men in all the communities of this country found all at once, each one of them, that they had competitors who were not in business during the war. Some group, which had bought up vast quantities of surplus Army merchandise, had rushed into all the communities of this Nation, established "army" stores, and paralyzed the business of men who had paid the taxes and borne the burden of the war. This must not happen again.

Who are the small-business men, Mr. President? We have not the figures recently, but in 1939 there were establishments of manufacturers, rated as small-business men employing a hundred or less, 168,814; wholesaling 71,681; retailing 1,614,310; service establishments 637,585; hotels 25,224; construction 200,307; places of amusement 40,351.

There were 2,758,272 small businesses, employing a personnel of 8,364,071, that did a business in 1939 of $43,600,000,000. Yet, Mr. President, since this war started, literally thousands of them have been liquidated because they could not obtain merchandise and, therefore, could not supply the wants of the citizens.

What do we find now? We find an example of blindness on the part of some one in Government who is starting the whole process over again by failing to make plans to enable these surplus Army goods to be siphoned through the worthy small-business men, but, instead, offering them at auction, so that some one can get a clutch hold and repeat the paralyzing process.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows, of course, that under the law as it is now the Department has to sell the surplus goods at auction. It is required to do it. It is required to advertise them.

Mr. WILEY. I am not questioning that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand; but the Senator is saying that the War Department should see that small business gets the surplus goods. I agree with that theory, but Congress would have to take action so that some other method of sale could be inaugurated before the War Department could guarantee who would get the surplus materials.

Mr. WILEY. I do not question that conclusion; it indicates the very purpose of my remarks, as the distinguished Senator will find if he listens to the few concluding sentences I am about to utter. I am not talking about any individual; I am talking about an inadequacy which exists and which may grow to such an extent that it will have a paralytic effect upon this great part of our economy.

I said that after the last World War the small-business man found that an outlander, an outsider, would come into his town and set himself up in business. I remember the condition in my own town. I remember outsiders opening stores, people who never paid a cent of taxes in my town, people who never sustained the schools or the churches, who had never put one dollar into paving or any other improvement in the community. They opened up stores, they bought merchandise from the Government for a song, and made 100, 200, 300, up to 500-percent profit. We saw the businessmen who had been the backbone of the community further impacted on account of the lack of vision on the part of our leadership.

I say that must not happen again. If the Army and the Navy have not brains enough to handle this matter properly, it is up to the Congress to demonstrate that it has the capacity to do so. Already, because of lack of merchandise, thousands upon thousands of small businesses have been compelled to liquidate. There are many more thousands, as we know, on the ragged edge. We know they are in that condition because they cannot obtain merchandise. If the administrative branch of Government cannot devise a plan, we should not wait; it is our function to devise a plan. I know that both Houses are considering this problem, but we must see to it that the Army and the Navy, or the procurement divisions, do not repeat past history.

There should be some way by which this much-needed merchandise could be placed in the hands of small-business men. I cannot understand why the Army is selling it now, when we are about to open a second front, the western front in Europe. I cannot comprehend why they are doing it. Why is it? I think that is a question which should be answered, and I think the appropriate committee of the Senate should get the answer. There should be some way by which this much-needed merchandise—and I repeat, I do not know why the Army is selling it now—could be siphoned into the channel of the small-business man who still has life, who is not paralyzed yet by the inadequacy of the Government in making provision to enable him to get merchandise. That is the purpose of my remarks.

It has never been my idea that the way to argue a proposition is to pick out an individual and criticize him. I am talking of principles. I am saying that it is the obligation of this distinguished body to see to it, and see to it as quickly as possible, that the thing which the Senator from Kentucky just brought to our attention does not carry us into the abyss into which we fell after the last World War.

There should be some way of getting this merchandise into the channels of the small-business man. There is a hunger for it. I remind the Senate that the notice says that the value of the merchandise to be sold is only approximately $450,000. Of course, the sale of this small amount of stock in Los Angeles might not affect the people seriously throughout the whole Nation, but if this is a symptom of what is going to follow, then we had better provide the antidote to the disease, for it is a disease, and we should provide the antidote as quickly as possible.

It might be well for the appropriate committee to ascertain why at this time, when we are about to experience a test on the western front in Europe, there is this surplus. The committee could ascertain definitely what plans are in contemplation for the period during and after the war for handling this problem, that is, what plans the executive branch of the Government has, and then the committee should devise a plan. They are studying the subject; I am glad they are, and I find no fault in that regard. I merely say that sometimes we move too slowly.

The morale of a great segment of our economy in this country is at stake. Already in one State of the Union more than 7,000 small businesses have been liquidated because they could not obtain the merchandise with which to carry on. Are we going to permit merchandise not required by the Army and the Navy during the war to be siphoned off into hands which ordinarily pay little or nothing for it? It was brought out on the floor of the Senate a week or so ago, by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that more than $1,000,000 worth of tools was sold for about $40,000. I do not know the facts of that case, but I say that that, too, is another indication of a disease. In this instance the merchandise which is to be auctioned off cost the taxpayers of this country a great deal of money. It is merchandise which the taxpayers themselves want. They would like to see it sold through the channels of the ordinary small-business man, and I say it is our function to see to it that adequate legislative steps are taken to provide that such goods shall go through the ordinary channels, in order to maintain the economic health of the community.

Many communities are sick economically. Many merchants are on the ragged edge. If the Army and the Navy have merchandise to sell, the local merchants, who have been buying bonds and paying taxes and maintaining the economic health of their communities, should be given the chance, and not some smart buyers.

Mr. President, I repeat, the morale of the small-business men of this country is at stake in this matter. If they are pushed around much more—and a great

number of them have been paralyzed—then we who fail to take action to correct the situation should be held responsible. There has been too much fumbling by incompetent brains. The Congress of the United States, which is now in the process of recapturing its constitutional position as an independent and coordinate branch of Government, must not delegate the solution of this problem to the executive branch of Government. It is our job.

THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last fall I introduced Senate bill 1385, which provides for the development of the world's greatest natural resource, the St. Lawrence River. The bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce. On March 3 of this year I received a letter from the President reading as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 3, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I am convinced that the time has come for a nonpartisan effort to secure congressional authorization for the St. Lawrence development in order that the project may be available for early post-war construction.

The undertaking will offer such important benefits to many States that I am sure it will provide a desirable stimulus to industrial and business activity which will assist the entire country in its reconversion to a stable peacetime economy on a continued high-production level. Many competent studies have shown that it will not hurt the railroads or ports through which foreign commerce now flows but will ultimately increase their business.

I am advising interested Federal agencies that your bill (S. 1385), modified to provide for construction as a post-war project, has my approval.

I have appreciated your consistent support of this great undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. President, the President's desire for a nonpartisan effort to secure Congressional authorization for the St. Lawrence development met a very prompt response from the forthright young Republican Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, and the New York State Assembly, which unanimously, in both houses, endorsed this project. I have here a statement which has been sent to me by Senator Rhoda Fox Graves and Assemblyman Grant F. Daniels of the New York Legislature, setting forth the accomplishments of the 1944 session of the New York State Legislature with respect to the St. Lawrence project. The statement would probably require 10 minutes to read. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unanimous adoption of the concurrent resolution by the senate March 15, and by the assembly March 16, strongly urging the immediate development of the St. Lawrence River as a post-war measure, helps to place the State of New York squarely on record in favor of this great public improvement.

The full weight and significance of the unanimous action taken by the legislature are best understood when it is considered that this resolution also had the vigorous backing and support of Governor Thomas E. Dewey, and the majority and minority leaders in both branches of the legislature.

By its decisive action, the legislature disposed once and for all of the propaganda widely circulated by selfish, special interests to the effect that the State of New York is indifferent to the continued waste of its rich water-power resources and to the relatively high costs for electric service from steam-power plants imposed as a burden upon millions of commercial, rural, and domestic consumers in this area.

The legislature took its unanimous action, moreover, in the light of the fact that the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941 signed an agreement to provide for full development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, including New York's power development, as an integral part of a multiple-purpose project for the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway This agreement is based on negotiations which were initiated by Presidents Coolidge and Hoover, Secretaries of State Hughes and Kellogg, and have continued under President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull.

The Agreement of 1941 and the six identical bills introduced in the present and the preceding Congress to confirm it, including New York's power project in the authorization, were specifically directed to the attention of the legislature before the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

On February 5, 1944, the undersigned authors of the concurrent resolution, Senator Rhoda Fox Graves and Assemblyman Grant F. Daniels, joined with Trustee George S. Reed of the power authority in a public statement warning that failure to provide for development of New York's power resources would result in serious economic dislocation and "a tremendous unemployment problem following this war." This statement, made public at Albany, continued:

"We believe that the Congress should pass the Aiken bill providing for the development of these power resources. * * * There are those in the State of New York who have joined with outsiders in objecting to the development of the St. Lawrence River for hydroelectric purposes on the ground that such hydroelectric development would actually be contrary to the best interest of the people of the State. If this argument is good, no hydroelectric development should ever be made anywhere and there should be no cheap power in the hands of the people of any State for disposition for sale. * * *

"It is high time that the State of New York take care of its own interests and immediately take steps which will result in the development of the international section of the St. Lawrence River and the completion of the seaway."

The undersigned members of the legislature, Senator Graves and Assemblyman Daniels, accordingly on February 14, 1944, introduced companion resolutions in the senate and assembly which had the full support of the friends of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in both branches.

In the form in which they were introduced February 14, the Graves-Daniels resolutions made specific reference to the legislation pending in Congress and memorialized Congress to take prompt and favorable action. When it was called to the attention of the authors of the resolutions that an agreement had been entered into among the leaders in the legislature not to report the numerous measures then pending, memorializing Congress, they revised the resolution to omit this feature.

The time having expired under the rules for introducing a companion measure in the assembly the revised resolution was offered in the senate March 13, 1944, by Senator Graves. It was favorably reported by the committee on finance and upon the motion of Senator Graves, who recited the above facts in an address in the senate, was unanimously adopted by the senate March 15. Upon the motion of Assemblyman Daniels, who elected not to have his original measure reported with amendments from committee, the identical resolution was unanimously adopted by the assembly March 16.

The text of the resolution, as adopted by the legislature, emphasizes the urgent need for cheap power and for the development of the St. Lawrence River on behalf of more than 4,000,000 commercial, rural, and domestic consumers in this area. While the resolution does not deal directly with the navigation phase of this multiple-purpose project, it was well understood that the authors of the resolution are on record in favor of the Aiken-Pittenger bill and sought this means to advance New York's power project as provided for under the terms of the pending congressional legislation.

That this is the true intent and effect of the adoption of the resolution is further confirmed by the fact that less than half a dozen members in both branches saw fit to voice their opposition to the navigation improvement when the resolution was open to debate. Moreover, the Quinn resolution, offered in the assembly February 28, which violently attacked the St. Lawrence seaway and the pending agreement and legislation, evoked no support in either branch of the legislature and was left buried in committee.

As stated on the floor of the senate by the joint author of the concurrent resolution adopted by the legislature:

"There is another urgent reason why the Legislature of the State of New York should at this time go on record in unmistakable terms in favor of the development of our great water power resources.

"A bill (S. 1385) has been introduced in the United States Senate by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, providing for the development of the St. Lawrence River in cooperation with our neighbor and ally, the Dominion of Canada. This bill provides for construction of the power development in New York in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, as a State project under State ownership and control. * * *

"The adoption of the pending resolution will serve notice that New York desires, and is determined to obtain, the full benefit of the development of its water-power resources, as a State project, under State ownership and control. In 1940, again in 1942, and in subsequent public statements, Governor Dewey has consistently gone on record in favor of the St. Lawrence project. In 1942 the completion of the project was pledged in the Democratic and American Labor Party State platforms. We should act, and act now, consistent with the redemption of these pledges, to give New York State parity in cheap power supply with other areas, to insure a place for our great water-power resources in the Nation-wide programs for post-war development now in the making, in the interest of our agriculture, our manufactures, our servicemen, and all our people."

In a public statement March 16, 1944 the author of the resolution in the assembly said:

"Passage of the resolution by both houses of the legislature means that we have successfully answered the charge of St. Lawrence project opponents that the State of New York is opposed to this great development.

"It is my belief that this action of the legislature, taken with the support and approval of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, is the first

step toward actual construction of the project. Those of us who have fought for many years to see the day when these great undeveloped resources will be utilized for the benefit of the people are naturally enthusiastic over our success in passing this resolution. * * * At least we are on the way toward realization of our efforts to bring cheap hydroelectric power and its countless benefits to the people of the State of New York."

The authors of the concurrent resolution join in the above statement on the legislative history of this measure, for submission to Senator AIKEN, Representative PITTENGER, the National Grange, the National Seaway Council, and other supporters of the St. Lawrence project, as well as to Members of the New York delegation in Congress.

RHODA FOX GRAVES,
GRANT F. DANIELS.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the concurrent resolution adopted by the legislature of the State of New York.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is an ever-increasing need in the State of New York for cheap hydroelectric power not only to attract new industries to the State but also to retain those which are already established; and

Whereas the State of New York has no cheap hydroelectric power to offer to any new industry and already the lack of this cheap power has sent countless industries elsewhere; and

Whereas the development of the water powers of the St. Lawrence River will directly benefit more than 4,000,000 small commercial users, farm homes and domestic consumers of electricity in this State, comprising the greatest potential market for low-cost electricity in the world; and

Whereas unless the State of New York indicates its willingness and desire to bring to the people the untold benefits of cheap hydroelectric power and takes effective steps to this end, this New York State power will remain the only important hydroelectric power undeveloped in the entire United States; and

Whereas the Province of Ontario, through the Chairman of the Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission, has expressed a desire to proceed at once with the development of this power resource in cooperation with the State of New York: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That it is the sense of the legislature of the State of New York that prompt measures should be taken to provide for development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence River with adequate provisions to safeguard the rights and interests of the people of the State of New York in these resources under the inalienable ownership of the people.

WAR PROFITS AND RESERVES—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of March 20, 1944, entitled "War Profits and Reserves."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR PROFITS AND RESERVES

The question of wartime profits of corporations continues to be of interest. The latest Truman committee report estimates undivided profits, after taxes, have reached a cumulative total of $10,000,000,000. The Department of Commerce, in February, placed the figure at upwards of $8,000,000,000.

Noting that 70 percent of the total war orders are held by 100 large corporations, the Truman committee finds only 9 of the 100 "wholly free of excessive profits in 1942."

However, Secretary of the Navy Knox, testifying before another Senate committee, said that for the big firms the rate of profit, after taxes, was only 4 percent.

The reconciliation of Secretary Knox's views with those of the Truman committee is not so difficult as might at first appear. The Secretary is talking about rates, the committee is reporting on volume. A 4-percent rate on a $200,000,000,000 2-year volume would equal the Department of Commerce's figure.

Naturally, the application of a general statement to specific instances that vary as widely as does the pattern of American war production brings up points of conflict. The Truman committee mentions a New York aircraft corporation which had average profits in its 1936–39 base period of $32,483 after taxes. In 1942 its profits before taxes had multiplied 528 times to $23,153,583, and its profits after taxes were $5,403,583, or 168 times the pre-war average. Renegotiation then entered the picture and reduced the before-tax figure by $8,000,000 and the after-tax figure by $1,600,000.

This was cited by the committee as an extreme example, and of course it is an extreme example, because it is doubtful whether this firm before the war was very much more than a research and experimental plant, whereas today it is a mass producer, its scope completely altered.

Even so, the figures tend to support the administration's contention—in which business does not wholly disagree—that excess-profits taxes and renegotiation are the only effective implements available for keeping war profits under some semblance of control.

The question next arises whether it is desirable to cut even more deeply into war profits. And that is a question involving congressional intentions toward the reserves which business seeks to accumulate for the post-war conversion.

General Motors has said it will need $150,000,000 to return it to automobile manufacture; General Electric sees need for $50,000,000; Ford, $70,000,000; Douglas Aircraft, $63,000,000, and so on.

As the problems of renegotiation become problems also of termination, this question of post-war reserves will inevitably become of the sharpest importance to many concerns. It is decidedly not too early for Congress and the administration to formulate some clear policies.

CHARGES MADE TO SOLDIERS FOR FOOD IN RAILROAD DINERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from Pvt. Clinton R. Davies, from Camp Kohler, Calif., under date of March 13. Private Davies is a brother of Capt. Ron Davies. The letter deals with the charges made on the railroad dining cars for food furnished to men in the armed forces.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMP KOHLER, CALIF., *March 13.*

DEAR SENATOR: First I want to identify myself. I am Capt. Ron Davies' brother, but recently inducted into the Army. One of those pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, and a former Grand Forks resident.

I would like to acquaint you with a tremendous graft that the railroads generally are indulging in.

Thousands upon thousands upon thousands of meals are being served United States Army men being transferred or being shipped all over the country every day by railroad diners.

They charge the Government $1, and the enlisted man takes just what is given him. The officers, I understand, make a choice. Enlisted men are herded in (I am not talking about troop trains), fed what the diners offer, then the man in charge signs an order authorizing the Government to pay them at the rate of $1 per meal per person.

Now, I am the first to admit that a dollar is not an exorbitant price for a meal on a railroad diner.

Here is the menu served my contingent of 16 men coming from Fort Snelling to Sacramento. This meal is typical and was served on the Southern Pacific. It was prepared for hundreds of soldiers using Government meal tickets. Imagine the profits.

Mush; one roll; one muffin—no butter—a small portion of egg and potatoes; coffee.

Each soldier was handed an orange on the way out. No soldier had enough to eat. The Government paid $1 a plate for that. They serve three much better meals than that for 58 cents a day in the Army.

These enlisted men are herded in by the military police and take what they get in the diners. With the volume of traffic dining-car profits must be enormous.

Remember, the big railroads segregate the soldiers. They are so often crowded they run their trains in sections. They have two diners—one for the soldier and a first-class one for the civilian.

This is large-scale graft, Senator, practiced by railroads owned by Averill Harriman and his cohorts. It should be stopped immediately.

Either the soldier should get a decent meal, or the Government should pay less. It is rank graft.

Incidentally, I was with the Immigration and Naturalization Service in civilian life. I see you are on that committee.

At your earliest convenience check this matter. I would appreciate knowing your reaction. It is a source of great discomfort and irritation to we enlisted men.

Sincerely,

PVT. CLINTON R. DAVIES.

THE URGENT DEMAND FOR FARM MACHINERY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Allen Dowling is the editor of the Beatrice Times, of Beatrice, Nebr. Beatrice is located in Gage County, one of the finest agricultural counties in my State. I am sure the President of the Senate has visited in that town and knows something about the qualities of the products raised in Gage County, in southeast Nebraska. In the issue of the newspaper, the Beatrice Times, of day before yesterday—and the Times is one of the leading newspapers of Nebraska—Mr. Dowling states that he believes recent "farm auction lust" offers a beautiful illustration of the law of supply and demand. The article states:

A tractor was offered for sale in Gage County. Each prospective purchaser was required to put up a check for $800 to show good faith, and there were 170 of them. It meant a total offering of $136,000 for 1 tractor. The demand in money terms—

Dowling points out—

was ridiculously in excess of the supply in material terms.

That is all I want to quote from the article, but I wish to say that this incident affords a beautiful illustration of how short is the supply of farm machinery in the Middle West, which is known as the bread basket of the world. One tractor was offered for sale at auction. One hundred and seventy farmers put up $800 apiece, or a total of $136,000, to buy that tractor. Is there any doubt that in the further deliberations of the Senate we should see to it that the farmers of America obtain the machinery they require in order to produce the food which is needed not only for our own civilian population and our military but also for lease-lend purposes?

OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Reverend Harry L. Bowlby, general secretary of Lord's Day Alliance of the United States, setting forth the plan approved by his organization for securing a better observance of Sunday throughout the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVE SUNDAY

The return of the Lenten season each year emphasizes the fact that Christianity is the religion of the Republic of the United States and so declared to be by its highest judiciary, the United States Supreme Court, having on February 29, 1892, handed down an obiter dicta opinion that this country "is a Christian Nation." *The Church of the Holy Trinity* v. *The United States* (145 U. S. 227).

It is likewise an interesting fact that the Constitution of the United States, article 1, section 7, paragraph 2, has incorporated the first day of the week, Sunday, and so recognized it as a civil institution.

In view of these facts recognition of Sunday by the Postal Service of the United States would be most appropriate and eminently in order would be the stamping on all pieces of mail the words "observe Sunday" for a period of 2 weeks previous to and including Easter Sunday, to remind the people of the United States that Sunday is the national weekly rest day, the friend of the toiler, a principle embedded in the Constitution of the United States and that Christianity is the friend of every person within the Nation who believes that it is his duty to this country "to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

The President of the United States has expressed himself in favor of such a purpose. It is hoped the Congress of the United States will favor and enact legislation to that desired end and do so promptly in this critical period of our Nation's history.

The Lord's Day Alliance of the United States, New York 10, N. Y., representing 22 religious bodies whose communicant membership is above 20,000,000 with upward of 10,000,000 adherents, makes this earnest appeal, and for the introduction of a bill embracing the said purpose of the movement.

HARRY L. BOWLBY,
General Secretary,
Lord's Day Alliance of the United States.

AMMUNITION HELD AS SOUVENIRS

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in several million American homes there is ammunition which has been taken there as souvenirs by members of our armed forces. That ammunition undoubtedly constitutes a threat and a danger in those homes. I have written a letter to the Secretary of War concerning that problem. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 21, 1944.

The Honorable SECRETARY OF WAR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There has recently been brought to my attention a condition which I believe should be presented to you for your consideration and proper action.

Almost all men in our armed forces have access to ammunition in some form and many have presented to their families and friends shells and various types of explosives small enough to slip, undetected, past the search of guards and sentries, which have apparently become the favorite home-front souvenir. There is undoubtedly today an enormous quantity of just such ammunition lying about the homes of the Nation. These explosives carry a potential danger for any family possessing them, particularly for the younger children.

There recently appeared an article in one of the California newspapers concerning a half-dozen youngsters and a 20-mm. shell which an older member of the family had brought home. The children undertook to unload the shell, using nails and hammers for tools. One was killed outright and four, I believe, hospitalized with serious injuries. This is only one example of what might happen in any of countless homes throughout the Nation.

However, after being apprised of the dangers in harboring such matériel, obviously, the first impulse would be to dispose of it as speedily as possible. Unfortunately, as you know, there are few safe ways to dispose of ammunition. Few people would return this Government property to the military authorities because of possible questioning and unhappy consequences for the boy who took home a souvenir because his buddies had already made it the thing to do. The probable result, then, of this reaction would be that vacant lots, canyons, and roadsides would become most dangerous for youthful explorers.

It is my thought, therefore, that simultaneously with informing the people of the dangers of keeping such ammunition they be afforded an easy and safe method whereby they can dispose of it. May I suggest that the police and sheriff offices be employed as receiving stations for this ammunition. These law-enforcement agencies have trained personnel who could handle and transmit the ammunition to the military authorities with safety.

I believe this problem merits wide publicity, and I trust expeditious and proper action will be taken toward the elimination of this existent dangerous situation.

Sincerely,

SHERIDAN DOWNEY.

POST-WAR PROBLEMS OF MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—STATEMENT BY HAROLD HOPPER

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, on February 28 Harold Hopper resigned his post as Chief of the Motion Picture Section of the War Production Board, and called upon the American film industry to organize a special committee to draft plans for presenting the problems of the industry at the coming Allied peace conference. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a news release dated February 28, 1944, containing this statement by Mr. Hopper. I think the suggestion of Mr. Hopper is most valuable, and I hope it will be acted upon. There is little I can add to Mr. Hopper's statement. I agree wholly with him in his measure of the importance of the film industry and the advisability of creating a proper industrial policy for the post-war era, so that this great American business can operate most widely and successfully both here and abroad. Mr. President, I hope the Senators will find time to read the release which I am placing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Declaring that 90 percent of the problems of the motion-picture and film industries related to the war have now been solved, Harold Hopper today announced his retirement as chief of the motion-picture section of the War Production Board.

In giving up the dollar-a-year post to which he was named more than a year and a half ago, Mr. Hopper said he felt free now to resume direction of his private business in Los Angeles, where he is connected with the cinema industry. Although his resignation is effective immediately, he will continue to serve the War Production Board in an advisory capacity.

The California man in relinquishing his official duties took occasion to urge upon the motion-picture industry the necessity of setting up a special committee for the purpose of presenting to the coming Allied peace table problems of the industry with respect to free access to world markets after the war.

"The film industry," he said, "should take steps now toward setting up some permanent organization to function in drafting a program for presentation at the peace conference, as well as in aiding the various Government agencies in their efforts to assist the industry through reciprocal trade agreements with Latin-American countries.

"Much valuable preliminary work can be done by the industry in both directions. Upon returning to Washington recently I was gratified to learn that certain arrangements have already been made by the State Department in furtherance of the free and unhampered distribution of American films through the operations of reciprocal trade agreements.

"But this is only one phase of the program which the industry should press for the removal of embargoes and other barriers to the free distribution of our films. The need exists for a permanent, well-organized industry committee, capable of dealing with national and international problems, particularly in relation to the peace conference and post-war conditions.

"Unless the industry lays the groundwork in advance for presenting its case it will miss a golden opportunity. The proper committee or agency should be set up now to begin preparing a program."

Mr. Hopper said the motion-picture industry is probably the greatest salesman of American goods and the democratic way of life that could possibly be devised.

"If results could be tabulated," he declared, "they would unquestionably show that the modern motion picture is not only the greatest salesman of the American way of life, but that it is daily selling everything from hairpins to steam locomotives, kitchen cabinets, bathroom fixtures, and motorcars, to say nothing of women's and men's fash-

ions, nationally and in every corner of the earth.

"Without a properly organized committee to keep the United States Government and all its agencies, as well as foreign nations, thoroughly conversant with the needs and requirements and problems of the industry, there is little hope that the motion-picture producers of the country will be given proper consideration at the peace table or in the domestic affairs of foreign nations with regard to consumer goods produced in the United States.

"It seems to me," he added, "that it is elementary that any such sales agency as this industry should take every step possible to see that its voice and influence are properly and adequately heard, both here and abroad."

In announcing that 90 percent of the war problems in film and motion-picture regulation have now been adjusted by the War Production Board, Mr. Hopper said that all of the essential needs of film by the Army and Navy and amusement had been met, and that he anticipated that sometime in 1944 there would be sufficient film production in the United States to permit unlimited sales even to amateurs and the general public. The latter point, he feels, is particularly desirable because of the urgent and insistent demand of our soldiers and sailors overseas and elsewhere for photographs of loved ones at home and familiar scenes. Such demands are growing stronger every day, he said.

Mr. Hopper said the latest evidence of the need for organization of an industry committee to function in connection with foreign problems was found in dispatches carried by the American press last week telling of an attack made on Hollywood films by Lord Brabazon in the British House of Lords.

"Lord Brabazon," he said, "was quoted as objecting to the policy which ended the freezing of the earnings of United States films in Britain, going on to say that, while such earnings were frozen, English films were allowed to be shown in the United States. He added that the moment the funds were unfrozen 'not another English film was shown in the States.'

"This statement is simply not in keeping with the facts. If allowed to go unchallenged, it might result in a revival of the freezing policy. The American industry needs some group to watch its interests in foreign developments of the kind. It is far easier to correct misunderstandings of the kind than to undo the damage after it is done."

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry indepndent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, line 17.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] asked about some rubber gloves. I told him I would have the matter looked up, and I have done so.

The Securities and Exchange Commission purchases about 30 pairs of rubber gloves per year, spending therefor between $15 and $20. The fluids used in the photostat work and the multilith work contain acids injurious to hands and it is, therefore, necessary that employees engaged on this work be provided with rubber gloves. The Comptroller General has ruled that for an agency to purchase rubber gloves there must be specific statutory authority therefor, and for this reason the appropriating language of the Securities and Exchange Commission contains the words "and purchase of rubber gloves."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the information he has just given the Senate.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Robertson
Andrews	Gerry	Russell
Austin	Gillette	Shipstead
Ball	Green	Smith
Bankhead	Guffey	Stewart
Barkley	Hawkes	Taft
Bone	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Holman	Tunnell
Brooks	La Follette	Tydings
Buck	Langer	Vandenberg
Burton	McCarran	Wagner
Bushfield	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Butler	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Byrd	McKellar	Weeks
Capper	Maloney	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wherry
Connally	Mead	White
Danaher	Millikin	Wiley
Davis	O'Mahoney	Willis
Downey	Overton	Wilson
Eastland	Radcliffe	
Ellender	Revercomb	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, since 1916 I have been a very diligent worker in behalf of the building of the dams on the Tennessee River. In my own estimation my work in the Congress, during the time I have been a Member of Congress, in furthering the building of the dams on the Tennessee River has been the most important work of my life. In importance to Tennessee, of course, it far surpasses anything else I have ever done; and in building up the country it has been of great value.

Mr. President, I am somewhat embarrassed by many things which have been said in this debate. During the entire time that we have been working in behalf of these dams, there has been more or less embarrassment. Naturally that is so. It is a very large project. On it the Government has expended between $750,000,000 and $800,000,000. That is quite a large sum of money. It is estimated that the receipts this year from those dams will amount approximately to $68,000,000. That is quite an item so far as the present state of our country in this war is concerned.

The committee has reported a change in the T. V. A. appropriation as passed by the House. The principal change is that instead of appropriating, as the House did, the unexpended balances of the present year's appropriation and appropriating the receipts of the T. V. A. for the coming year, and providing for a reserve of more than $8,000,000, as the House did, the Senate committee has amended the bill so as to appropriate out of the Treasury of the United States the sum of $76,000,000, and has inserted the usual clause applicable to other agencies, requiring them to pay into the Treasury their unexpended balances and their receipts, and doing away with the reserve fund of some $8,000,000 requested by Lilienthal. For several years now Lilienthal has been getting, in addition to his appropriation, a clause like the one in the House bill authorizing him to use the income of the T. V. A. in his operations. Those are the principal changes involved in the amendments affecting the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to ask whether there are other amendments which affect this question or whether it is all involved in one amendment, and will be determined by one vote?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not, because the amendments can be divided. The principal amendment is that providing for payment into the Treasury of the receipts. The others are all subordinate to that amendment. As the Senator will see, they are all related.

Mr. President, how could it in any way cripple the Tennessee Valley Authority if we should appropriate substantially the same amount that the Authority claims it would receive under the House provision? This matter has been exaggerated far beyond its real status. The committee proposes what Congress provided in the original law, namely, that the receipts shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, and that the Authority shall come to the Congress for its money. Is there anything unusual about that? That is what we require in the case of nearly every other similar activity. Every other business of this kind is conducted on that basis. That is what the T. V. A. has done heretofore, until its receipts amounted to as much as its expenditures.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's speech, but the Senator knows, and I tried to make plain yesterday, that I do not agree with his interpretation, or his statement with reference to the basic law. I think the language of the basic law is very clear. If the Senator will yield, I should like to read it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was read several times yesterday. I hope the Senator will wait until I conclude before reading the law again. I think we all understand what the law is. I hope the Senator will not read it again at this time.

Mr. HILL. I shall not do so, but I wish to make it clear that I do not agree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that. The Senator said so several times yesterday, and I am quite sure the Senator does not agree with what we propose to do.

Mr. HILL. Not only do I not agree with what is proposed, but I wish to emphasize that I do not agree with what the Senator says about the basic law.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand. I think it is well understood that the Senator does not agree with me on that point.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Whatever may have been the original act, and whatever interpretations may have been placed upon it in the past, is it not true at this time that the principal question which is raised is whether the receipts from the Tennessee Valley Authority shall go into a special fund in the Treasury, always at the disposal of the T. V. A., amounting, in practical effect, to the building up of a revolving fund in the Treasury? Is not that the question?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has stated it very accurately.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to take the Senator's time, but I do not believe the Senator from Maine has correctly stated the proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator be good enough to have it out with the Senator from Maine a little later? I shall greatly appreciate it.

Mr. HILL. I shall do so. However, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that when I was speaking yesterday there was not a single time when he asked me to yield that I did not yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator yielded; but before I could ask a question, or even begin to ask a question, the Senator would answer it, and therefore the yielding did not amount to anything.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will further yield, I believe that if the Senator will look at yesterday's proceedings he will find that I yielded very liberally and freely to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator yielded; but he did not wait until I asked a question before he answered it.

Mr. President, practically all the principal dams on the Tennessee River have been completed. The notable exceptions are the dam at Gilbertsville, Ky., and the Fontana Dam. The Congress authorized the construction of the Watauga Dam and the South Holston Dam in upper east Tennessee. However, Mr. Lilienthal and his associate in the work, Mr. Krug, who had been loaned or transferred to the W. P. B., "cooked up" an arrangement by which it was to appear that the W. P. B. did not have the materials to permit these two dams to be constructed. However, in some remarkable way, it was found that the construction of the Fontana Dam, which was preferred by Mr. Lilienthal, could continue.

Mr. President, provision is made in the bill for the continuance of the work on all these dams except the two which I have named, the construction of which has been stopped by the W. P. B.

Mr. President, as I have stated, it is estimated that the income from the sale of power and fertilizer during the coming year will be nearly $70,000,000. I need not repeat that the undertaking is a large one and that the Government has more than three-quarters of a billion dollars invested in it. In my judgment, it is time for the Government to reap some of the benefits. At present the project is under the absolute domination and control of one single man, whose name is David Eli Lilienthal. At the present time Hitler has no more complete control over Germany than has Mr. Lilienthal over the dams of Tennessee.

That can hardly be better illustrated than by a letter I received Friday from a constituent, which I shall now read:

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I see where you have stated that Mr. Lilienthal had absolute power over the T. V. A.

I recall last February, a year ago, there were negotiations at Johnson City, Tenn., between Mr. Lilienthal and the East Tennessee Light & Power Co. looking toward the sale of the light and power company to the T. V. A. I was interested in getting T. V. A. power for Johnson City and in that connection we held an intercity meeting at the John Sevier Hotel in Johnson City to talk it over with Mr. Lilienthal. I asked him the plain question if he had the authority and money to buy the plant and pay the amount agreed upon. A price of $11,000,000 had been discussed. He said "Yes"; he had absolute right and power to make the purchase if and when the price was agreed upon. I also asked him if he had to consult anyone else, and he said "No."

That shows the way the T. V. A. is operated. It is operated by this one man.

Yesterday several questions arose for which I was sorry. I wish to show the Senate—and I think I can do so very quickly—the real and substantial reasons why Mr. Lilienthal should not have the power to establish a revolving fund, taking in money and pay it out as he pleases. As I have said, it is not done in other cases. Why should it be done in the case of the T. V. A.? Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to what has happened heretofore.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How large a bond is this man under?

Mr. McKELLAR. He is under no bond whatever. He is an appointee.

Mr. LANGER. I know that he is an appointee, but has he put up a bond?

Mr. McKELLAR. He has put up no bond whatever. He has under his control more than three-quarters of a billion dollars of the American people's money. He is receiving $75,000,000 a year from power and from the manufacture of fertilizer, and he has control of the money without let or hindrance.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not also true that while he holds this office without any bond, there is no accounting or auditing by the Comptroller General's Office?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is auditing and accounting by the Comptroller General's Office. However, I wish to say that the T. V. A. officials pay very little attention to the recommendations made by the Comptroller General's Office. I had an investigation made of that matter, and I found that the last report of the General Accounting Office included a number of suggestions which were rejected by Mr. Lilienthal, who controls the T. V. A. He does not want any interference of any kind, or anyone to say him nay about anything.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the T. V. A. is audited by the General Accounting Office. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if, to his knowledge, the General Accounting Office has ever reported to the Congress, as required by law, any irregularities, shortages, or misspending of funds if such conditions exist.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it has not done so insofar as I know.

Mr. President, I shall give reasons why we should ask that these funds be not paid to Mr. Lilienthal, and that the Congress itself hold its hand on this activity.

At this point I desire to let the Senate know more particularly who this man Lilienthal is. I have an idea that Lilienthal when first appointed 8 years ago, was from Wisconsin. I had never

heard of him before, and I do not now know anything about his early history. I only know concerning his history since he has been on the T. V. A. The Authority was established in 1933. One of the first dams built by the Authority, as the older Members of the Senate will recall, was the so-called Norris Dam. In buying the property for that dam, Dr. A. E. Morgan, the then chairman of the T. V. A., made very specific charges of fraud against Lilienthal.

On March 4, 1938, Dr. Morgan gave out an interview to the New York Times in which he said it was his responsibility "to fight for certain decencies and proprieties in public life which are more important to good government than any particular Government program. The * * * marble case presents an instance of this difficulty."

In reference to the so-called marble cases there are some Senators now present who were here when the marble cases were very prominently before the country. Several gentlemen had bought up the mineral rights under the lands taken for the Norris Dam. They bought those rights for a few hundred dollars, and then, as I remember, undertook to sell them to the Authority for five or six million dollars, claiming that marble was under the whole Valley, and that they were being deprived of their right to quarry it. There was a terrible furor about the matter, as Senators will recall, and finally there was quite a division of opinion in the Authority itself. Two members of the Authority wanted to compromise and settle with the claimants. One of them was Mr. Lilienthal, and the other was Dr. H. A. Morgan. Dr. A. E. Morgan, the then chairman of the Authority, felt differently, and considerable feeling concerning the matter arose between Dr. A. E. Morgan and Mr. Lilienthal. I wish to read what Dr. Morgan and others said. By the way, I shall include in my statement a number of excerpts which I think Senators will find interesting. One is from a statement by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. Dr. Morgan said:

To a steadily increasing degree I have contended with an attitude of conspiracy, secretiveness, and bureaucratic manipulation * * * the public has been steadily, and I believe, purposely, led to believe that the difficulties within the Tennessee Valley Authority have been due primarily to differences as to power policy or to just another "family quarrel."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask to which Dr. Morgan the Senator refers?

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer to Dr. Arthur E. Morgan. He continued:

The real difficulty has been in the effort to secure honesty, openness, decency, and fairness in government.

The New York Times printed an article quoting Dr. Morgan:

There is a practice of evasion, intrigue, and sharp strategy, with remarkable skill in alibi, and the habit of avoiding direct responsibility, which makes Machiavelli seem open and candid, * * * and man to man directness was a mask for hard-boiled, selfish intrigue.

And again:

The marble claims, in my opinion, were an effort at deliberate bare-faced steal.

Deliberate, bare-faced—a steal!

Here is a man's associate on a commission, on a governmental authority stating that his colleague was engaged in a conspiracy, in a bare-faced steal. Has that statement ever been denied by the man to whom it was directed? If there is a Member of the Senate who has ever heard of a denial of that statement by Mr. Lilienthal, I should like to hear from him.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Tennessee is now talking about the old marble deal?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and what is needed is honesty, whether in reference to marble or anything else.

Mr. HILL. Exactly; I agree with that; honesty is first and foremost, but the Senator ought to tell the Senate that the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives set up a joint committee, the chairman of which was the then Senator from Ohio, Senator Donahey.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. HILL. And on that committee were some of the most distinguished Members of the Senate and House of Representatives. They investigated T. V. A.; they investigated the marble case to which the Senator refers, and after weeks and months of investigation, of testimony, of hearings, and of consideration that committee gave the T. V. A. a clean bill of health in the marble case. As the Senator well knows there was a feud between Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, who made all these charges against Mr. Lilienthal, but, after making these charges Dr. Morgan could not substantiate them before the special committee of the Senate and the House.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, may I interject a statement?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York was a member of that committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment; I desire first to answer what the Senator from Alabama has said. He talks about a feud. Every friend of Mr. Lilienthal and all the newspapers talk about his feud with me. Heaven knows, I have no feud with Mr. Lilienthal. The only thing I require of Mr. Lilienthal is common honesty in the administration of the affairs of his office, and as, in great degree, I caused the Congress of the United States to erect the dams in my State and in the neighboring State of Alabama, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not bring to the attention of the Senate what I know and what I will prove before I conclude concerning these matters. This is the first one of the items, but I have several others, showing exactly what this man's conduct has been all the time. He does not deny anything. He did not deny anything in the hearings before the Donahey committee, of which the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] was a member. Did he come onto the stand and deny these statements?

Mr. MEAD. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator answer that question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. He did not while I was in attendance on the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. He did not testify at all. He merely let the charges go off as best they could, but he did not answer his colleague, and he never has answered him. It is not his method of doing business to answer charges made against him, and he has not done it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. As a member of the committee that investigated T. V. A., I merely wanted to say, as indicated by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], that we visited the area of operations and went completely into all the charges. I recall very distinctly—and I should say this first—the splendid work done by the senior Senator from Tennessee in the matter of securing appropriations for the construction of the dams in the early period of the T. V. A. history. I also remember that with meticulous penetration we went into the marble deal and other deals, and in the final report, which is available to Members of the Senate, we gave the Tennessee Valley Authority a clean bill of health.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to show it to anybody who wants to read it, and I will guarantee that any Senator who has not already made up his mind who will take the report and study it will be obliged to come to the conclusion that this man was guilty.

The Senator from New York, my good friend who serves with me on the Committee on Appropriations, knows how this thing has been managed for years. He says that this man was given a clean bill of health. He did not even appear before the committee. Here is a man charged with stealing, charged with fraud, charged with the highest wrong, and he did not have the manhood to appear before the committee and say that he was not guilty. He did not come. He was given a clean bill of health without ever appearing.

Now, let me read further:

Arthur E. Morgan made extensive and unequivocal charges of dishonesty and lack of integrity in public office.

Of course, if this man had gone into any claims and had paid to the claimants for a claim of a few hundred dollars a few million dollars, we all realize that there was something unusual about it.

Senator VANDENBERG said:

It is impossible to turn aside * * * the charges of * * * Dr. Arthur E. Morgan * * * about lack of honesty in the expenditure of half a billion dollars.

I quoted Senator Norris the other day, but my attention has been called to the fact that I did not quote him sufficiently, and I shall now quote further what Senator Norris said about this matter. I do that in justice to Senator Norris, who is no longer a Member of this body. On March 8, 1938, which was about 6 years ago, Senator Norris said:

Mr. President, Dr. Arthur Morgan has spread this story all over the United States. People generally have an idea, and perhaps many Senators have an idea, that when these claimants, and Mr. Lilienthal, and the other Morgan, were about to rob the Government of millions of dollars—

This is Senator Norris speaking—

were about to rob the Government of millions of dollars, Dr. Morgan stepped in and called a halt, and saved the day.

That is what I read the other day. I have been asked to read a little farther from the same place, and I do so, as follows:

He did not do anything of that kind. I suppose he was suspicious. I think he has reached such a stage in his mentality that if he saw Lilienthal going to church he would charge him with being treasonable, because he would say, "He is trying to fool God Almighty."

Now I have read it all.

At that time the newspapers seemed to take the view that a case of fraud was involved. The Chicago Journal of Commerce, for example, stated:

Bluntly, Dr. Morgan charged that only his intervention had prevented the consummation of an agreement whereby his two colleagues would have permited * * * (the marble interest) to exploit, hold up, and defraud the Government.

Mr. President, I believe this is as far as I care to go into that phase of the matter.

I feel I should say here that Dr. H. A. Morgan, a Canadian by birth who moved to Knoxville, Tenn., many years ago and was for a time president of the State university at Knoxville; is a kindly and good man. These charges were not aimed at him primarily. They were aimed at Lilienthal. The only charge made against Dr. H. A. Morgan was that he was being misled by Lilienthal. Since that time and prior to 1939 there was an investigation made by a Senate committee and all of these matters were gone into. It does not appear that Lilienthal ever denied the charges or affirmed them but just left them where they were. The Senate committee stated the facts but apparently did not have Lilienthal before the committee. At all events, in the record that I received there was no evidence given by Lilienthal. It was not shown whether he was guilty of the charges or not, but so far as this record shows he did not deny the charges that his colleague A. E. Morgan made against him. The Senate committee simply said the charges had not been proved and let it go at that. Dr. A. E. Morgan was asked to resign for other reasons and Lilienthal was put in his place and has been in his place ever since. Lilienthal has been before our committee a great many times. Every word that Dr. Morgan said about his secretiveness, willness, lack of frankness, and lack of openness, is absolutely true. That he is a scheming, designing, and falsifying official of the Government there can be no doubt. That is the kind of a man we are dealing with. That is the kind of a man we have given $750,000,000, at the lowest estimate, of the Government's money, or property worth that, which brings in an income of at least $68,000,000 a year, and without requiring anything of him, just letting him take the receipts and run the matter to suit himself.

By the way, I have received two letters in the last day or so which show that Mr. Lilienthal recently bought a tract of land in Williamson County, Tenn., not very far from Muscle Shoals, containing phosphate rock, which can be extracted from the ground and made into fertilizer. I suppose he had an idea that the fertilizer plant at Muscle Shoals would be used for that purpose. I forget the number of acres involved, but, as I recall, it was about 800 or a thousand. Without ever saying a word to Congress, without ever asking "By your leave," without ever mentioning it or reporting it to Congress—it has not been reported yet, but came to light since this matter arose—he bought for $678,459.80 a tract of land supposed to be phosphate land, which cost the phosphate concern from which he bought it about $139,000. In other words, he bought it for over $500,000 more than the concern had paid for it. That is not a matter of policy, such as my distinguished friend from Alabama was discussing yesterday; it is a matter of just everyday action. The same is true of another tract of land, not so large, which he has recently bought in Maury County.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is talking about the phosphate lands.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I have here before me the report of the joint committee investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and at this point, if the Senator will yield, I think I shall read into the RECORD the names of the men who constitute this committee.

Mr. WILEY. What is the date of the report?

Mr. HILL. This report was made during the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, by the joint committee which made the investigation in 1938. The membership of that committee was:

Vic Donahey, Senator from Ohio, chairman.

H. H. Schwartz, Senator from Wyoming.

JAMES M. MEAD, Senator from New York.

Lynn J. Frazier, Senator from North Dakota.

JAMES J. DAVIS, Senator from Pennsylvania.

Graham A. Barden, Representative from North Carolina.

R. E. THOMASON, Representative from Texas.

THOMAS A. JENKINS, Representative from Ohio.

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Representative from New Jersey.

Mr. President, that was the membership of the committee which made this investigation. They investigated the purchase of these phosphate lands, and let us see what they said about it, if the Senator will yield for a moment. I read from page 216 of the report of this joint committee of the two Houses of Congress. It says:

Tennessee Valley Authority phosphate land purchases.

That is the headline.

The Authority's fertilizer production requires a continuous available supply of phosphate rock or matrix. In the beginning the Authority obtained rock by contracts with individual landowners and by leasing small tracts of phosphate land. Some ore was purchased from commercial companies. These methods proved unsatisfactory. The average cost of rock having a 52 percent content of b. p. l. (bone phosphate of lime) was about $2 a ton at the mine, and an adequate tonnage could not be secured. The Authority therefore set out in 1936 to acquire phosphate lands of its own. A total of 2,986 acres have been acquired, containing estimated phosphate rock deposits of 15,065,800 tons. Purchases were made under the supervision of Dr. Harry A. Curtis, formerly head of the Authority's Department of Chemical Engineering and at present dean of the school of engineering at the University of Missouri.

I shall not read all the details, but I think this is germane——

Mr. WILEY. I understood the Senator from Tennessee referred to recent purchases.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Alabama is referring to 1938.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am referring to recent purchases. I shall read the letter.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The letter reads:

On the registry books of Williamson County, Tenn., there is no evidence that the Tennessee Valley sold any properties to the Monsanto Chemical Co. There is evidence that the International Agricultural Corporation, incorporated in the State of New York, through their branch office at Columbia, Tenn., sold and transferred mineral rights in Williamson County, Tenn., to the Tennessee Valley Authority, in the name of the United States of America, for the sum of $678,459.80, which transfer is recorded in book 71, pages 319 and 324, on August 7, 1937. These properties were purchased in 1934 by the International Agricultural Corporation for the sum of $139,597.50. In this transaction you will see that the Government paid $538,862.30 more than the original amount paid by the International Agricultural Corporation.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I will say the transactions to which the Senator refers are the identical transactions which the joint committee investigated.

Mr. McKELLAR. How in the name of heaven——

Mr. HILL. I can tell the Senator how in the name of heaven——

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait a moment. I hope the Senator will not follow the method he pursued yesterday. Yesterday whenever I would seek to interrupt the Senator would say "Yes; I yield," and then would proceed to interrupt me, so

I did not get any satisfaction in my attempt to ask questions of my friend. I hope he will let me make this statement.

It does appear that this purchase was made in 1937, and the joint committee may have passed on the matter, but no committee could explain how this corporation bought from a phosphate company lands for which the phosphate company had a year or two before paid $139,000, at the enormous price of $780,000, in excess of a half a million dollars more than the phosphate company itself paid.

Mr. HILL and Mr. WILEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama, but I hope the Senator will not read long excerpts.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator, if I may—and I do not wish to impose upon him—that he brings up this question of phosphates as if there were something terribly wrong about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it is terribly wrong, I think it is damnably wrong, and committed by Lilienthal against this Government.

Mr. HILL. This is the point to which I wish to call the Senator's attention. Whatever may be the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee—and of course he has a right to his opinion—the committee which was created to make the investigation certainly did not find it "damnably wrong," and they went into it thoroughly.

Mr. McKELLAR. They did not excuse it.

Mr. HILL. Just a moment. I am going to read from the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I object to the Senator reading in my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am unwilling to have the Senator stand here and read the report of a committee which whitewashed this man Lilienthal several years ago.

Mr. HILL. Then the Senator's colleagues in the Senate and the House were guilty of a whitewashing job?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. HILL. That is what the Senator said. Of course, if the Senator thinks these splendid Senators and Members of the House who were members of this committee merely went to work to whitewash and did whitewash the T. V. A., I do not suppose he wants to know the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a very unfair statement, but I will let it stand just as it is, if the Senator will permit me to proceed for a few moments. The Senator addressed this body yesterday afternoon for 2 or 3 hours. Will not the Senator permit me to say a word or two? Will the Senator be gracious enough, kindly enough to permit me to submit the facts in this case without undertaking to read some balderdash from some committee report of 20 years ago?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee indicates that he does not desire to yield further at this time.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama is not asking the Senator to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When the Senator has a question I shall be delighted to yield to him at any time, but I do not yield to him so he may read a book.

I now come to the second matter, and I want to read from a book, but it will not be long. I read from the Annual Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority. In other words, I am reading Mr. Lilienthal's own language. It appears on the second page of the report. He is telling what the Tennessee Valley Authority has done:

Returned——

I am reading his own language now——

Returned $13,148,000 of net income to the United States Treasury.

What would anyone reading that language infer? To anyone on earth who reads it it would mean that Lilienthal had, out of the net income, paid over into the Treasury as general receipts $13,148,000. Did he do it? He appeared before our committee and I asked him if he had paid it in. He said "yes." I said "When did you pay it in?" Well, he could not tell when. But, boiled down, he finally said that he had a private account and when I say "he" I mean the T. V. A., because he is the T. V. A. He said the T. V. A. had a special account in which it had put all its money. I asked him, "Was this paid to the Government?" "Oh, yes; this $13,148,000 was paid to the Government." "Well," I said, "I happen to have a statement from the Treasury saying they have received no money at all from you as general receipts."

When he was thus confronted, he said, "Well, I put that in my own account."

Mr. President, is that paying it into the Treasury? Is there any one Senator present who would for a moment contend that that was paying a part of the net receipts in to the Government of the United States? It was a blind. It is what bankers call window dressing, but it is what I call plain falsification. Mr. Lilienthal wanted to curry favor with the Congress, and he made a false statement about it, and when confronted with it he had to admit it.

I telephoned the Treasury Department and asked if they had received any such sum from the T. V. A. and I was told over the phone that they had not. I asked the Treasury to write me a letter showing that fact as they stated it. In writing the letters the Treasury got it mixed up with an account that the T. V. A. has with the Treasury. In other words, the T. V. A. uses the Treasury as a bank and has its funds put in a specific account. Of course, that fund is a special fund and is subject only to a check of the T. V. A. The two letters tried to explain this account. I thereupon summoned Mr. Daniel W. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, to appear before the committee and I asked him the direct question as follows:

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Bell, last year the T. V. A. reported that it had paid into the Treasury of the United States $13,148,353. I want to ask you this question: Has the T. V. A. paid into the Treasury of the United States as a part of the general receipts of the Treasury $13,148,353 or any other sum during the year 1943? What I wish you to do, Mr. Bell, is to answer "yes" or "no," then you may make any explanation you wish about it.

Mr. BELL. The T. V. A. did not deposit into the Treasury during the fiscal year 1943 any money that became a part of the general revenue of the Government.

It is thus seen that in making a report to the Congress of the United States Lilienthal was specifically falsifying about paying any money into the Treasury. No one on earth could read that testimony and think that Mr. Lilienthal was telling about making deposits in the T. V. A.'s special account with the Treasury. Anyone in reading it would have, of course, concluded that Lilienthal had paid into the general fund of the Treasury $13,148,353 when he had done nothing of the kind.

Is that the kind of man to whom we want to turn over the Tennessee Valley Authority? Is that the kind of a man to whom we want to turn over, without let or hindrance, an income amounting to between $68,000,000 and $70,000,000 a year? Is that what we want to do?

Mr. President, I was instrumental in having the Government put its money in the T. V. A. project. I wish to say, right here and now, at this point, that most of it was done over the lobbying of this man Lilienthal. That brings me to another point in this matter.

In 1934, after the Norris Dam had been started, and after the Wheeler Dam had been started, Dr. A. E. Morgan and Lilienthal seemed to have been together at that time—it was before Dr. Morgan called him a thief and said he was defrauding the Government—and they fixed a policy. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] says that the Congress fixes the policy. They did not allow the Congress to fix this policy. They fixed the policy of a yardstick. They said that they were not in competition with private industry, that they were not in competition with the private power companies; that all they wanted to do was to furnish a yardstick by which the power companies would know how much it would cost to make water power, and therefore fix their rates based on the cost. Senators know how many power companies would pay any attention to such a yardstick thus established by the Government. Yet they wanted to fix a yardstick, and they did not want any other dams to be built. So when the matter of the next dam came up they did not make any recommendation to the President. The President did not make any recommendation to the Congress. The House did not provide in the bill of that year for any dams.

But when the bill came to the Senate, as my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], will recall, for he was on the committee at the time, I offered an amendment providing for the Pickwick Landing Dam. That was the first dam provided for. We paid no attention to the yardstick. We paid

no attention to the question of recommendation. That provision was adopted by the Senate and was adopted in the House, and that dam was built. That is how the dam came to be built.

Next year they still were fighting for their yardstick, and they came to Congress. They did not recommend that any more dams be built. The President did not recommend that any more dams be built. The House did not recommend that any more dams be built. But when the matter came over to the Senate I was one of those unfortunate ones who offered an amendment to provide for building the Guntersville (Ala.) Dam, in my friend's own State, the Chickamauga Dam near Chattanooga, the Hiwassee Dam not far from Chattanooga, and the Gilbertsville Dam in the State of my distinguished friend here the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Lilienthal and Dr. Morgan came up and lobbied against those amendments. They went around and buttonholed the various members of the Appropriations Committee and urged them not to vote for the amendments, stating that they had another policy, and they did not want those dams built; that the President had not recommended them, and the House had not recommended them and, therefore, they did not want them built. I remember that I had to say to them that they were lobbying here with the members of the committee who were passing on the matter, and they would have to get out of town or I would denounce them on the floor of the Senate for being here lobbying against the building of those dams.

We began to build three of the dams that year. We obtained oppropriations for them. The next year the Gilbertsville Dam, located in the State of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Kentucky, who is now opposing me, who is standing with Lilienthal in this matter, was begun. I got that dam built the next year. I am looking into the face of my friend, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who was on the committee at the time, and I am sure he will vouch for everything I say about the matter.

At any rate, the next year I got the Watts Bar Dam built, in the same way—over their protest. And the next year I got the Fort Loudoun Dam built, in the same way—over their protest. And the next year I got the Cherokee Dam, in Tennessee, built, in the same way—over their protest.

The only dam Lilienthal ever favored, so far as I have ever heard, was the one known as the Douglas Dam. The water backed up by it covered one of the most beautiful valleys in the State of Tennessee. That is the only dam Lilienthal ever favored, so far as I know.

I got the Congress of the United States, beginning in the Senate, to build those dams at great cost; and I would be untrue to every principle of right and justice if I were willing to turn the Tennessee Valley Authority over to a man who opposed those dams, who worked against them, who lobbied against them, who fought against them in every way in the world. Yet he has circulated all over Tennessee the statement that I am opposed to the Tennessee Valley Authority and to the Tennessee dams—a statement as false as the falsest statement ever made by any human being. A man who has such a small idea of truth undertakes to show to the people of my State in my absence that I am opposed to the T. V. A. when I have used the best years of my life in the building of these dams over the active lobbying of Lilienthal and his cohorts.

Dr. Morgan called him a Machiavelli. I say that he is simply a common, sneaking, infamous falsifier. I would use a harsher word if I were not here in the Senate.

I first worked for the building of those dams when I sat as a Member of the House of Representatives, in 1916.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I merely wish to bear witness, as a member of the Commerce Committee, to the fact that not only did the Senator from Tennessee sponsor and stand for the Tennessee Valley Authority, but he came before the Commerce Committee and tried to strong-arm us into setting up a Cumberland Valley Authority, too.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I applied for that, but I was not so successful in that case as I was in the other cases.

However, having been successful in my efforts to have the dams built in the Tennessee Valley, I certainly do not like to be charged with being opposed to the dams by the very man who was in Washington fighting against their construction. I have fought for something affecting those dams almost every hour of the day since way back yonder in 1916.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Let me suggest, in view of the experience the Senator from Missouri has had in his own State with the Union Electric Co., in St. Louis, that it might have been a good idea to have had a Cumberland Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, since the able Senator from Washington has interrupted, I should like to say to him that the late Senator McNary, God bless his memory, came to me during one of those fights and told me he was interested in the construction of some dams in Oregon, and that he wished to have my help. If ever one man helped another, I helped the late Senator McNary in connection with those dams, both in the adjoining State and in the Senator's own State; because the Grand Coulee Dam is located in the State of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Bonneville Dam is in the late Senator McNary's State.

So, Mr. President, I wish to say that the statements which have been made about me in Tennessee—as to my being opposed to those dams—are malicious falsifications made by the oily, eely, designing, corrupt man who is now in charge of them.

By the way, Mr. President, someone said he was to be appointed Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. God save the railroads if Lilienthal is ever appointed Chairman of that Commission.

I have been working for dams along the Tennessee River for 30 years. During that time I have had the opposition of nearly all the newspapers, all the power companies, and many of the big interests. In addition to that, whenever anything good arises concerning those dams, the credit for it is immediately claimed by others. It has been so during the entire 30 years.

I wish to give as succinctly as I can the history of the building of those dams. It will take me only a moment or two to do so. In 1915 and 1916 I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I recall distinctly that the whole world seemed to be going topsy-turvy. On every side one could hear rumblings of war. The *Lusitania* had gone down, and the whole world was talking about it. During the time when those rumblings became greater, the Honorable James Hay was chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs. S. Hubert Dent, of Alabama, was second in seniority among the members of the committee, and I was third. E. B. Almon was a new Member of the House of Representatives from the Muscle Shoals district of Alabama, and was a fine old gentleman. The elder John H. Bankhead and Oscar W. Underwood were the two Senators from Alabama. In 1916, when President Woodrow Wilson sent for our committee and told us that the country was in grave danger and that it was absolutely necessary for us to prepare the Army for the defense of our country, we, of course, knew that the *Lusitania* had been sunk and that Germany was on the rampage. We fully entered into the matter with the President. At that time in the House the Committee on Military Affairs, presided over by Mr. Hay, of Virginia, and of which I was a member, made the appropriations for the War Department. By the way, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that that is no longer the practice. The rule was changed in 1920. However, at that time the House Committee on Military Affairs prepared the appropriation bills for the War Department, insofar as the House was concerned, after having heard the testimony. It was then that I became a vigorous, earnest, and active advocate of having the Government build a dam at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. President, the situation in respect to the building of public dams at that time was very different from what it now is. At that time the power companies reigned supreme in this country. They did not brook any interference; and a man was regarded as extreme in his views, indeed, if he believed in public ownership. If it had not been for the First World War, we could never have built the dam at Muscle Shoals.

At that time it was deemed necessary to have a full supply of nitrates, and it was believed that the best way to obtain nitrates was by the use of water power. Naturally, there were many undeveloped water-power sites in our Nation at that time. The most notable ones, except for

Muscle Shoals, were in Oregon and Washington, as I stated a moment ago to the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE]. Senator George E. Chamberlain was a United States Senator from Oregon. When I proposed the measure in the House of Representatives, we wanted to locate the dam at Muscle Shoals; and, if I remember correctly, we provided that it be located at Muscle Shoals. Then the bill went to the Senate. When the bill went to conference, it was found that there was such a difference of view between the conferees of the two Houses as to where the dam for the manufacture of explosives in time of war should be located that it became necessary to agree to strike out of the bill all reference to location, and to have the bill provide for delegation to the President of the task of selection of the site. The President was to select whatever site he might deem most appropriate.

The bill became law on June 3, 1916. At this point I shall read section 124 of the law, which gives its full terms, and shows that our committee not only authorized the dam, but that Congress appropriated the money in the same bill for the purpose of building the dam. Section 124 reads as follows:

SEC. 124. Nitrate supply: The President of the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to make, or cause to be made, such investigation as in his judgment is necessary to determine the best, cheapest, and most available means for the production of nitrates and other products for munitions of war and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers and other useful products by water power or any other power as in his judgment is the best and cheapest to use; and is also hereby authorized and empowered to designate for the exclusive use of the United States, if in his judgment such means is best and cheapest, such site or sites, upon any navigable or nonnavigable river or rivers or upon the public lands, as in his opinion will be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act; and is further authorized to construct, maintain, and operate, at or on any site or sites so designated, dams, locks, improvements to navigation, power houses, and other plants and equipment or other means than water power as in his judgment is the best and cheapest, necessary or convenient for the generation of electrical or other power for the production of nitrates or other products needed for munitions of war and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers and other useful products.

The President is authorized to lease, purchase, or acquire, by condemnation, gift, grant, or devise, such lands and rights-of-way as may be necessary for the construction and operation of such plants, and to take from any lands of the United States, or to purchase or acquire by condemnation materials, minerals, and processes, patented or otherwise, necessary for the construction and operation of such plants and for the manufacture of such products.

The product of such plants shall be used by the President for military and naval purposes to the extent that he may deem necessary, and any surplus which he shall determine is not required shall be sold and disposed of by him under such regulations as he may prescribe.

The President is hereby authorized and empowered to employ such officers, agents, or agencies as may in his discretion be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes herein specified, and to authorize and require such officers, agents, or agencies to perform any and all of the duties imposed upon him by the provisions hereof.

The sum of $20,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, available until expended, to enable the President of the United States to carry out the purposes herein provided for.

The plant or plants provided for under this act shall be constructed and operated solely by the Government and not in conjunction with any other industry or enterprise carried on by private capital.

In order to raise the money appropriated by the act and necessary to carry its provisions into effect, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the President of the United States, may issue and sell, or use for such purpose or construction hereinabove authorized, any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed $20,000,000: *Provided*, That any Panama Canal bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section may be made payable at such time after issue as the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deem advisable, and fix, instead of 50 years after date of issue, as in said act of August 5, 1909, not exceeding 50 years.

That language was incorporated in an amendment which was agreed to and became a part of the bill. After the bill had been passed, Representative Hay, our chairman, and I went to see the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, and pled with him to choose Muscle Shoals as the site of the dam. Senator George E. Chamberlain earnestly pled with him to choose a site in Oregon. During the talk I had with President Wilson in favor of Muscle Shoals, he agreed that the dam should be built at Muscle Shoals; and it was built there.

Of course, while I was most active and vigilant in securing the location of that dam at Muscle Shoals, because I knew or hoped I knew what it would mean for the entire river, it was the action of President Wilson that started the first improvement on that river, just as I have related.

My recollection is that at that time both Senators BANKHEAD and Underwood were opposed to what was known as public ownership of power.

Mr. President, that dam was not completed when the war ended, although it was about completed. After the war, and after President Harding was elected, efforts were made by Senator Smoot, of Utah, and others, to scrap the Wilson Dam. There ensued a fight, which lasted from 1921 until 1933, over what was to be done with Muscle Shoals, as it was then called. Henry Ford made an offer for it, and his offer for it galvanized the dam as a living thing, again; and it was finally completed.

So, Mr. President, I say that when men talk about my opposition to the T. V. A., their statements to that effect are absolutely untrue. I am not opposed to the T. V. A. Heaven knows I think it is one of the greatest institutions in the world today. I am in favor of running it in the interest of the Government; I am in favor of everything connected with it, except the devious, eellike, oily machinations of this man Lilienthal. I think he ought to be dismissed. More than a year ago I told the President of the United States that he ought to be dismissed, and I thought he was going to be, but he has not been. The purpose of thi bill is to make him do the right thing with the proceeds as he collects them.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Is the dam at Muscle Shoals the same as the Norris Dam?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. The Norris Dam is on the Tennessee River at Cove Creek, not far from Knoxville. Wilson Dam was the first dam that was built. It was not built under the T. V. A. at all. It was built under the original law, which I have just read, the one which I initiated in the House of Representatives 28 years ago.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Wilson Dam is at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. Wheeler Dam is just above it, in Alabama.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senate about another remarkable thing. I have already said that the Treasury stated that Lilienthal had never paid in a thin dime to the Government of the United States. He is talking about what he does for the Government of the United States. With the expenditure of all this money, and with an income of $70,000,000 for the T. V. A., he has not paid a thin dime to the United States. He admits that his receipts are $8,000,000 more than his expenditures, but he puts that in a reserve fund for the use of Lilienthal, not for the use of the Government. We need this money as never before. Eight million dollars would help to some extent, but Mr. Lilienthal has never paid in a red cent.

Let me call attention to another matter. There is no income tax from this privately owned property. Mr. Lilienthal does not pay any income tax to the Government from this property. The Government receives nothing from it. If it were a private company it would have to pay an income tax, but Mr. Lilienthal operates it as a private company. He has written a learned article, which I will place in the RECORD, in which he states that he is in favor of a grass-roots administration of this activity, away from Washington, away from the center of everything. It must be operated down there, he writes. It must not be operated from Washington at all. Politicians might disturb it or distress it. He says that it must be given over to his tender mercies, and he has never paid a dime to the Government of the United States.

When the T. V. A. bill was under consideration I secured an amendment requiring the T. V. A. to pay 5 percent of the gross receipts from the dams in Tennessee to the State of Tennessee in lieu of taxes, and 5 percent of the receipts from the dams in Alabama to the treasury of the State of Alabama in lieu of taxes. The State of Tennessee is today

receiving between $250,000 and $300,000 a year from that tax fund, but the United States Government is not receiving a red cent. Mr. Lilienthal is placing it to his private credit in the Treasury of the United States. Is that fair? Is that just?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator says that Mr. Lilienthal is placing the receipts from the T. V. A. to his private credit. Does the Senator contend that that money is not going into the special fund established by Congress, in which the T. V. A. is ordered by Congress to deposit that money?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. What I mean to say is that Lilienthal is the T. V. A. That money is not paid into the special fund by direction of Congress, but by reason of a recent agreement between certain Members of the House, I believe, and Lilienthal, it is required to be placed to the credit of the T. V. A., a special credit in the Treasury. The Treasury is used as a bank, in place of other banks, but Lilienthal has absolute control of the fund. Not a dime of it can be used by the Government of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator says that Mr. Lilienthal has control of it. There are three members of the Board. Any two of them, of course, could control the actions of the Board. When the Senator says that Mr. Lilienthal controls it, he means that Mr. Lilienthal controls the other two members of the Board. At least two of them must vote in order to adopt any kind of policy.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. We established the special T. V. A. fund in the Treasury. The money does not go into the general fund of the Treasury, and never has gone into the general fund of the Treasury. That is what the Senator meant when he said that the T. V. A. had not paid anything to the Government of the United States. Of course it has not. It has paid it into the special fund created by Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Lilienthal stated that it had been paid into the general fund. He was not telling the truth.

Mr. BARKLEY. It went into the Treasury, but it went into a special fund in the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. It went to the credit of his organization in the Treasury.

I do not intend to talk about the other members of the Board. One was formerly a Senator. He is a very estimable gentleman. The other is Dr. H. A. Morgan, a very fine gentleman. However, they permit Lilienthal to control the Board, and do as he pleases. He is just as much in control of that Board, and everything that pertains to the T. V. A., the dams, and the funds, as Hitler is in control of Germany.

There is another transaction concerning which Lilienthal falsified, namely, as to the rates at which he sold electricity to two aluminum companies. One was the rate that he sold to the Aluminum Co. of America, commonly known as Alcoa, and the other was the rate at which he sold to the Reynolds Metals Co., also an aluminum company. It seems that he made the contract with Alcoa first and sold the power to that company at a very reasonable rate. I have no complaint whatsoever to make about his sale of the power to Alcoa at that rate. I am not criticizing Alcoa in the least, but I am criticizing Lilienthal about these rates. Afterward he made a 20-year contract with Alcoa on these rates, and later on he made a 20-year contract with the Reynolds Metals Co. Both aluminum companies were doing war work, both of them were reputable concerns, and yet Lilienthal, acting for the Government or claiming to act for the Government, sold electricity to the Aluminum Co. of America at a much less figure than he sold it to the Reynolds Metals Co. The evidence shows the difference in price was $7,000,000 on the 20-year contract in favor of the Aluminum Co. of America. It is true that he undertakes to dispute some of the figures. Indeed, when I asked him which company he sold to at a less price he turned me over to Mr. Wessenauer, his expert, sitting by him, and said he would answer the question, and Mr. Wessenauer promptly answered that he sold it at a less price to the Reynolds Metals Co. Fortunately for the truth, we had a letter from Lilienthal to Mr. McIntyre, of the White House, in which he admitted that he was selling it at a higher price to the Aluminum Co. of America and tried to justify it by saying, among other things, he had sold to the Reynolds Metals at a subsequent period Thus it is seen that again Lilienthal was engaging in his pastime of falsifying.

Again, Mr. Lilienthal was asked if the T. V. A. had not gone in partnership with the Aluminum Co. of America in the management and control of the Aluminum Co.'s four dams and other properties. He denied it; but, finally, on cross-examination, after weaving in and weaving out, he admitted that he had made a contract with the Aluminum Co. which constituted a working agreement between them in which mutual benefits were given and received. If that is not a partnership, I do not know what it is. Even with as broad powers as the T. V. A. has, there is no authority whatsoever for the T. V. A. to enter into a partnership with the Aluminum Co. of America.

Again, all of us old-timers remember how Senator Norris, of Nebraska, used to inveigh against the private power companies. He denounced them probably thousands of times as being in a power trust. Indeed, the only reason Senator Norris ever took an interest in the T. V. A. that I ever knew of was his opposition to the Power Trusts, and he thought there was also a good opportunity of breaking the hold that the Power Trust had on the power users of that part of our country.

Again, the record shows that I asked Lilienthal if he had not taken his place with the private Power Trusts. He answered "No," but finally admitted that he had a working agreement with various private power companies, and those mentioned were the Kentucky Power Co.; the Duke Power Co. of North Carolina; the South Carolina Power Co.; the Georgia Power Co.; the Alabama Power Co.; the Mississippi Power Co.; and the Commonwealth & Southern, which used to be presided over by the Honorable Wendell L. Willkie. In a facetious manner I asked him if he had not taken the place of Mr. Willkie in the Power Trusts.

What their agreement is can only be understood by the technical power people, and I have not had time to have the technical people tell me what sort of trust agreement Lilienthal has with the power companies.

Again the evidence discloses other practices of Mr. Lilienthal that are most reprehensible. Referring again to the reserve fund, a peculiar thing about the appropriation as it passed the House is that it not only gave Lilienthal the unexpended balance and current income of the Authority amounting to nearly $70,000,000 but it also set up a reserve fund of $8,656,298. Why should the T. V. A. have a reserve fund? If we are going to build up a reserve in each of the departments we would have to build up a reserve with the Mississippi River Commission, the various reclamation projects in the West, the various Indian Bureaus, and manifold other Government agencies of similar kinds owned by the Government; and yet, Lilienthal, having absolute control of the T. V. A., recommended it, and our good friends in the House agreed to it, no doubt, after blandishments and cajoleries and pleading of this slick, scheming rascal who is in charge of the T. V. A. at this time.

Again, Lilienthal was asked about newspaper advertising. I asked him why the T. V. A. had to advertise in the newspapers. The amount of advertising they had done in the 3½ years from July 1, 1940, until December 31, 1943, had cost $42,258.74. When he was asked about this advertising he said there was expense for legal advertising, and that is true, but it is not included in the above. He was then asked if the principal amount was not spent in 1940, and he said it was, and he said it was because of some drought that it was spent. As a matter of fact, it was spent in political advertising. At that time he was trying to defeat me for the Senate, and when he was asked about it he denied it, but, as Dr. Morgan said, he would say anything and do anything in his own interest.

I call the attention of the Senate especially to pages 384, 385, and 386 of the record. I asked him if instead of using it for the drought he had not used this money to curry favor with the newspapers in the State trying to defeat my reelection. As he always does, he denied it, and, as he always does, he tells falsehoods whenever he thinks it is necessary. He went all over my State denouncing me when my election was before the people and he spent this money perhaps at that time, and he admits he spent it at that time. There is one thing about a man, and that is that he knows when another man is against him, and he knows when another man is using improper means against him. Lilienthal had no purpose in mind other than to defeat me as Senator. It was not his money; it was the Government's money, and he ought to be

made to pay back every dollar of the $42 000 that he spent in that behalf.

Mr. President, Lilienthal claims that he is complying with the law under which he is operating. Section 26 of that law reads as follows:

Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. A continuing fund of $1,000,000 is also excepted from the requirements of this section and may be withheld by the Board to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation.

That is the law. The provision in the House bill changes the law, and I want to leave the law as it is. Lilienthal has no right to violate the law. He asks the Congress to repeal a portion of this law. The Senate committee is standing by the law as originally enacted by the Congress. Lilienthal pays no attention to the law under which he is operating. If a provision suits him he stands by it, but if a provision does not suit him he ignores it and does as he pleases, as he has done in the case of the General Accounting Office of the Government. The law provides that the head office shall be at Muscle Shoals. He has violated that law and moved the head office to Knoxville, Tenn. Knoxville is the proper place for the Tennessee Valley Authority. It ought to have been there in the beginning, but at that time Muscle Shoals was the head of such power development as we had, and later, instead of coming to the Congress and asking that the Congress amend the law so that he could have his office in Knoxville, Lilienthal ignored the Congress and moved his office to Knoxville. He is now reaping the whirlwind after having sowed the wind at that time. It is a great pity, Mr. President, that the Tennessee Valley Authority has at the head of it a man who in effect actually despises the Congress. He ignores the Congress. He has contempt for it, and for every Member of it. When he thinks it will benefit him he tells a falsehood more easily than he can tell the truth. I have no doubt that he is raising the question about the general office of the Tennessee Valley Authority being moved back to Muscle Shoals for the purpose of undertaking to embarrass me. I offered an amendment in the committee to move the office to Knoxville, Tenn., so it would be legal, but his friends insisted upon voting it down.

Furthermore, Mr. Lilienthal has entered into a partnership with the Aluminum Co. of America. The evidence is as follows:

Senator McKELLAR. You are in partnership with the Aluminum Co. of America, are you not? Do you not control the power dams of the Aluminum Co. of America in the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not control those dams?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. After the Fontana Dam has reached operating elevation the T. V. A. has received the right under a contract to direct the release and discharge of the waters in the Aluminum Co. dams on the Little Tennessee River for the purpose of increasing the total amount of power and flood control available from the whole river, if that is a partnership.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you not know that is a partnership agreement? Here is the Aluminum Co. which owns several small dams, and you own quite a number of large ones and you enter into a contract with the Aluminum Co. that you are going to control, manage, and sell the power of those smaller dams?

Do you not know that is a partnership?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I would call it cooperation between Government and business.

Senator McKELLAR. Cooperation. All right, go ahead.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. And as a result of this cooperation more water is usefully available for the production of electricity than if the Government operated dams on one part of the river and the company on two tributaries operated theirs separately.

It seems to me that is a great accomplishment. The views of these two agencies—T. V. A. and Alcoa—are hardly the same. But physical facts show, after years of study, that if dams of the T. V. A. and the Aluminum Co. were operated jointly more power could be developed than if they were separately operated and more flood control obtained, to the benefit of both the Aluminum Co. and the public.

The contract is published in our annual report for 1942 and I am very proud of it, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. It is a partnership.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. It is beneficial to both parties, and that is an accomplishment.

Senator McKELLAR. I know the act under which you operate is very broad and includes a great many things. Will you ascertain the provision of your act which authorizes you to go into a partnership with another and private power company?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Well, reserving the objection to the word "partnership," I am sure——

Senator McKELLAR (interposing). Cooperative working arrangement mutually of benefit to both parties.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Cooperation is authorized expressly by the language of this original act which contemplates the interchange of power and of water so we can get the best utilization of it.

Mr. President, the idea of a Government agency, without the consent of Congress, going into a partnership with the Aluminum Co. of America. I have nothing against the Aluminum Co. of America. Its officers and agents in Tennessee are fine men, but they know quite as well as does Lilienthal how to conduct their business. There is no provision for them to go into a partnership with the T. V. A., and Lilienthal ought to be dismissed from the employ of the Government, not only because he has falsified in regard to the amount of money paid into the Treasury of the United States but about the rates he charged the Aluminum Co. of America and the Reynolds Metal Co. and about putting in discriminatory rates. He should be dismissed, not only because he has joined in a partnership with the private power companies heretofore mentioned but as well because he has entered into a partnership with the Aluminum Co. of America.

I quote from the hearings concerning the so-called interchange of power:

Senator McKELLAR. How many private companies have you got partnership agreements with to furnish power and for them to furnish you power? You have a number.

Mr. WESSENAUER. We have this sort of agreement with all companies interconnected with our system——

Senator McKELLAR. How many, the Commonwealth & Southern?

Mr. WESSENAUER. The Commonwealth & Southern.

Senator McKELLAR. The Alabama Power Co.?

Mr. WESSENAUER. The Alabama Power Co.

Senator McKELLAR. The Georgia Power Co. and the Louisville Power Co.?

Mr. WESSENAUER. That is right.

Senator McKELLAR. You are just one of the large organizations of power, are you not?

Mr. WESSENAUER. May I explain that?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; but that is true, is it not?

Mr. WESSENAUER. We also have interconnections.

Senator McKELLAR. You have a working arrangement.

Mr. WESSENAUER. We have a working arrangement of this kind. If we have a plant which cost us 4 mills to operate and produce power, say a steam plant, let me take 5 mills, the steam plant at Nashville cost 5 mills, if one of our neighbors has power that is idle that will produce power for 3 mills, we have a plan where we can cut down our generating and save the 2 mills.

Senator McKELLAR. That is a partnership arrangement?

Mr. WESSENAUER. It is an arrangement. We have not anything to say about their business and they say nothing about ours.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you not organized a great power trust down there that makes Mr. Willkie's trust look like a "thingumajig"?

Mr. WESSENAUER. No.

Senator McKELLAR. How much power is generated in Mr. Willkie's outfit?

Mr. WESSENAUER. If the question is whether we produce more power than Commonwealth & Southern, the answer is "Yes."

Senator McKELLAR. You are joined up with the Alabama Power, the Louisville Power, the Commonwealth and Southern, the Georgia Power Co., the South Carolina Power Co., and the Duke Power Co.

Do you believe you could put all the power companies you have in the record? I wish you would get the names of all of them and put them in the record.

Mr. WESSENAUER. Yes. The schedule of interchange agreements with private power companies is presented on page 449. Such interchange agreements are expressly authorized by the following language of section 12 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act (48 Stat. 65–66): *"And provided further,* That the Board is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with other power systems for the mutual exchange of unused excess power upon suitable terms, for the conservation of stored water, and as an emergency or breakdown relief.

I did not name all the companies, but all of them are named on page 449. There are sixteen of them.

Under the section of the law authorizing surplus power the Tennessee Valley Authority enters into a trust agreement as is shown on page 453 to page 547.

To show they are using implied authority granted in this act to exchange power with private companies the following question and answer are cited:

Senator McKELLAR. Your lines are constantly connected and the power is all in one great reservoir and you transmit it where you like to the private companies or to the public

in accordance with the contracts you make. Is that not so?

Mr. WESSENAUER. Yes, sir.

Lilienthal agreed that he was here lobbying against the dams as shown by the following testimony:

Senator MCKELLAR. But it does seem to me that after I fought here, when you were fighting against any other dam in this Tennessee Valley except three, wanting to use it as a yardstick, and when you were lobbying here against these dams, I think your attitude and your going over the State making speeches reflecting upon me, is contemptible, Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, you know I have not made any speeches attacking you. I have differed with you in respect to a piece of legislation. I continue to differ. I think it is an unsound piece of legislation. I tried to explain it to the people of the Valley, but what I have said concerning you has been respectful.

I would like to remind the Senator that immediately I had the first information from him that he disagreed very violently with us in respect to our stand, I wrote him a personal note in which I acknowledged his great contribution to the Tennessee Valley.

Now, Mr. President, he says he wrote me a letter acknowledging my great contribution to the Tennessee Valley Authority. That is a miserable, deliberate, premeditated, scheming, double-dealing falsehood. I do not recall the letter. He may have written such a letter. The only kind of letter Lilienthal can write is a double-dealing, scheming letter full of trickery. He may have attempted to write such a letter, but such a letter meant nothing to me. He talks about my having contributed to the Tennessee Valley Authority, when, as a matter of fact, I succeeded in getting these dams against his vigorous opposition, his visiting the members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and trying to prevent the building of these dams, against his falsehoods, against his dishonesty and corrupt methods at that time. Yet he condescendingly talks about my having "contributed" to the Tennessee Valley Authority. He is dishonest, corrupt, self-effacing, when he thinks it is to his advantage to be so; vigorous and determined when he thinks he has an advantage; a sneaking, lying, miserable, impudent squirt of a man. He has put some good men around him who are running this plant, but Lilienthal is just as capable of running a great enterprise of this kind as "Lefty Louie" was capable of running a church of God.

Again, his gift to the people of Dandridge, Tenn., for planning assistance, was approximately $1,300, and his gift to the people of Guntersville, Ala., for the same purpose was $20,000.

Again, for a long time there was a feud between him and the General Accounting Office about the examination of his books. He objected very seriously to it, as I was informed. He has spent for examining his books, as I recall, the sum of $190,000, all told, and he wants $30,000 to have some agency subscribe to his accounts for the next year. This was denied. He says, on page 300, that he is for the General Accounting Office 100 percent, but he wants his books examined by private auditors.

Mr. President, in 1932 President Roosevelt was first elected to the Presidency and in January of that year he invited the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], former Senator Black, Senator Bachman, and me, Representatives Almon and Hill, and former Senator Norris to go down to Muscle Shoals and look at the Wilson Dam. It seems that President Roosevelt when he was Governor of New York had recommended, and the legislature had passed, one or more acts creating what he called authorities, and if I recall rightly on his way down there he suggested that a bill be passed by the Congress to create the Tennessee Valley Authority patterned after one of his New York statutes. My recollection is also that he had the bill prepared afterward. Naturally I supposed that either Senator Bachman or I or Senator Black or the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] would be invited to introduce the bill, but after the President took office to my great surprise he selected Senator Norris, of Nebraska, to introduce the bill which it was understood he had had prepared.

I secured, my recollection is with the help of Senator Bachman and Senator Black and perhaps the Senator from Alabama, an amendment which is found as section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. Section 13 is as follows:

SEC. 13. Five percent of the gross proceeds received by the board for the sale of power generated at dam No. 2, or from any other hydro-power plant hereafter constructed in the State of Alabama, shall be paid to the State of Alabama; and 5 percent of the gross proceeds from the sale of power generated at Cove Creek Dam, hereinafter provided for, or any other dam located in the State of Tennessee, shall be paid to the State of Tennessee. Upon the completion of said Cove Creek Dam the board shall ascertain how much additional power is thereby generated at dam No. 2 and at any other dam hereafter constructed by the Government of the United States on the Tennessee River, in the State of Alabama or in the State of Tennessee, and from the gross proceeds of the sale of such additional power 2½ percent shall be paid to the State of Alabama and 2½ percent to the State of Tennessee. These percentages shall apply to any other dam that may hereafter be constructed and controlled and operated by the board on the Tennessee River or any of its tributaries, the main purpose of which is to control floodwaters and where the development of electric power is incidental to the operation of such flood-control dam. In ascertaining the gross proceeds from the sale of such power upon which a percentage is paid to the States of Alabama and Tennessee, the board shall not take into consideration the proceeds of any power sold or delivered to the Government of the United States, or any department or agency of the Government of the United States, used in the operation of any locks on the Tennessee River or for any experimental purpose, or for the manufacture of fertilizer or any of the ingredients thereof, or for any other governmental purpose: *Provided*, That the percentages to be paid to the States of Alabama and Tennessee, as provided in this section, shall be subject to revision and change by the board, and any new percentages established by the board, when approved by the President, shall remain in effect until and unless again changed by the board with the approval of the President. No change of said percentages shall be made more often than once in 5 years, and no change shall be made without giving to the States of Alabama and Tennessee an opportunity to be heard.

It will be seen from this act that 5 percent of the gross proceeds received by the Board from the sale of power generated at dam No. 2 or from any other hydropower plants thereafter constructed in the State of Alabama shall be paid to the State of Alabama.

Two other dams have been built in Alabama—the Wheeler and Guntersville Dams—and Alabama receives 5 percent of the gross proceeds from those dams.

In like manner, Tennessee was to receive 5 percent of the gross proceeds of the sale of power generated at Cove Creek Dam or any other dam located in Tennessee. Now there are a number of dams that have been built in Tennessee. The Pickwick, Chickamauga, Watts Barr, Fort Loudon, Cherokee, and Douglas Dams have already been built, and as to what will be done about the Gilbertsville Dam is yet to be determined.

There was a further provision about the addition of power at dams located lower down on the river and the 5 percent figure should be equally divided between Alabama and Tennessee on such additional power. I am advised that the State of Tennessee for the last 3 years has received certain sums under section 13 of that act.

These payments are made in lieu of taxes and were put there at my very earnest insistence. We had been discussing this feature of the case for years.

Of course, Mr. President, the greatest credit is due Franklin Roosevelt, President of the United States, for the development of the Tennessee Valley. He appointed the three members of the Authority with Dr. A. E. Morgan as chairman, and under Dr. Morgan the Norris and Wheeler Dams were built—one in Tennesseee and one in Alabama.

Dr. A. E. Morgan was a professor at Antioch College in Ohio. Dr. H. A. Morgan was president of the University of Tennessee; and Mr. Lilienthal was a young lawyer in partnership with Donald Richberg.

There was no trouble about the passage of the bill; there was no trouble about the appointment and confirmation of the three members of the Authority. All of this went along as a matter of course.

I wish to refer to one further matter, and then I shall be through.

Mr. Lilienthal is not an engineer. He is a lawyer. That is, he was educated as a lawyer. I do not think he has ever practiced law. I have no doubt that there are some fine engineers under him. I do not know any of them, except as they have appeared before the committee. I have never been in the confidence of Mr. Lilienthal. He has never come to my office. I do not know whether he goes to the office of the Senator from Alabama, but he never comes to mine. Judging from his newspaper statements, he does not think much of Senators and Representatives anyway. He thinks that this money ought to be left at the "grassroots."

Yesterday the question was raised as to Mr. Lilienthal going into politics in Tennessee. Everyone in Tennessee

knows that he is up to his neck in politics. For years he has been urging, not only that I be not returned to the Senate, but that my colleague [Mr. STEWART] be not returned to the Senate. My colleague so stated yesterday. I know that Mr. Lilienthal fought him in east Tennessee.

I do not know whether Mr. Lilienthal is a voter in my State. I doubt if he is. I presume he votes in some other State. I do not know that he has ever voted in my State. However that may be, he has taken a very active part in politics in Tennessee. Remember, this is a man who never says anything directly. His closest associates say that he never speaks directly. He never acts directly. He acts indirectly. He is eely and oily in his actions. Let me read what he said. I read from a newspaper article:

Lilienthal warns against political invasion of T. V. A.

Ordinarily that might be good. Aside from the gentlemen who appear before our committee once a year, I do not believe I know anyone in the T. V. A. I have never tried to meet anyone connected with the T. V. A. I do not know anything about them. I presume most of them vote for me. If we do not know Lilienthal well enough, they certainly know him well enough not to follow his lead in the matter of voting. Lilienthal tried in every possible way to defeat me in 1940, but he could not get up any steam, and had to give it up.

While he was making speeches, this is what he said. I am sorry the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is not present. He ought to hear this:

Mr. Lilienthal concluded by urging citizens to find out how candidates for political office stand on the issue of continued businesslike management of public power agencies.

The war is absorbing every last bit of your attention and energy. At times like these the average citizen is preoccupied and is therefore less likely to pay attention to things that are going on in his community.

But the future of public ownership here in the Valley depends upon a continuation of business principles in all the hundreds of communities receiving and distributing T. V. A. power.

Your eternal vigilance is the price of low-cost electricity.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is what the Senator has been reading a quotation from a speech?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is from a speech made 2 years ago when Mr. Lilienthal was canvassing the State against the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Was the speech made at a time when a campaign was under way?

Mr. McKELLAR. The campaign was in full blast. It was a campaign which was close, and in which Mr. Lilienthal made it so hot for the Senator from Tennessee that the Senator denounced Mr. Lilienthal in Chattanooga, charged him with being actively against him, and making speeches against him, and dared him to deny it. However, Mr. Lilienthal never denied anything.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the implication, which is carried in the quotation which the Senator has read, have reference to the issue now pending before the Senate with respect to continuing Lilienthal's business management?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I think Lilienthal wanted to get rid of the two Senators from Tennessee, and he was undertaking to do that. I do not know whether the Hatch Act applied to it or not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I am asking whether anything contained in the quotation read by the Senator has reference to the issue now before the Senate relative to continuing the business management as it has been.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; exactly. There are several other statements which I shall put in the RECORD, all showing that Lilienthal was vigilant and active during the campaign. There is one article to which I shall call attention. It is from one of the newspapers, and states that Lilienthal was in the gallery 2 years ago when I made a speech on a similar bill in which I made similar charges. I never heard of any comment being made by him with reference to my charges. He never answered them. He never answers anybody. He just goes along and lets time answer charges of fraud and stealing which have been made by his colleagues. His colleagues have charged him with stealing, and they have charged him with attempting to combine and confederate with others to pay millions of dollars to a marble company which had some little interest in leases. The company bought leases on the underground rights of Norris Lake. Because of that, Lilienthal was denounced by his colleagues for wrong-doing. Now, why should we continue that man in control? We cannot help continuing him in office, but we certainly should pass a law which will hold him down to doing the right thing by paying his receipts into the Treasury of the United States. That is what this particular amendment asks for.

Mr. President, at this point I shall ask that the Senate vote on the amendment as soon as it can do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the Senator's opinion is the amendment divisible in any way?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; it can be divided. I shall be very glad to have it divided.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to have separated from it the question relating to employees receiving $4,500 and more.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to divide the amendment in any way. I merely want the Senate to vote on it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Robertson
Andrews	Gerry	Russell
Austin	Gillette	Shipstead
Ball	Green	Smith
Bankhead	Guffey	Stewart
Barkley	Hawkes	Taft
Bone	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Holman	Tunnell
Brooks	La Follette	Tydings
Buck	Langer	Vandenberg
Burton	McCarran	Wagner
Bushfield	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Butler	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Byrd	McKellar	Weeks
Capper	Maloney	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wherry
Connally	Mead	White
Danaher	Millikin	Wiley
Davis	O'Mahoney	Willis
Downey	Overton	Wilson
Eastland	Radcliffe	
Ellender	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

IMPORTATION OF LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY FEED FREE OF DUTY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4410, and I desire to say a word by way of explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4410) to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have conferred with the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, and there is no objection on their part to the consideration of this bill. It simply extends for an additional period of 90 days public law approved December 22, 1943, which suspended the tariff duty on certain grains imported for poultry and cattle feed. The present law expires today, and it is highly important if the supply of poultry and cattle feed is to be maintained in the country that the time be extended. Therefore I have asked that the bill be considered at this time, without prejudice of course, to the pending unfinished business.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I shall make no controversy about this bill, of course, but I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if the bill would include grain screenings as well as grains?

Mr. GEORGE. I myself would have no doubt, because the language of the bill, which is the same as that of the present law, reads:

Wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, cottonseed, corn, or hay, or products in chief value of one or more of the foregoing or derivatives thereof, any of the foregoing if to be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock and poultry.

Flaxseed is included, and I should think there would be no doubt about grain screenings, because I do not understand that grain screenings constitute a separate dutiable item under the Tariff Act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator from Georgia has considered whether the bill includes also oat scalpings, which are broken pieces of the kernel of oats?

Mr. GEORGE. I should think so, because I do not think that either screenings or scalpings are separate dutiable items, and I think they are covered by the language which reads:

or products in chief value of one or more of the foregoing or derivatives thereof, any of the foregoing if to be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock or poultry.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Georgia I think is the only interpretation that those who handle the items at the import points could make; but I was anxious that the statement be made by the chairman of the committee on the floor. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment reported by the Committee on Finance will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

(3) Oats to be used for purposes of human consumption, if entry or withdrawal is after the date this paragraph takes effect.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I request that the action taken by the Senate on House bill 4410 be immediately messaged to the House, so that the House may concur in the single amendment made to the bill by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order requested by the Senator from Georgia will be made.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask for a division of the pending question and a separate vote on the language of the amendment starting in line 9, page 55, and ending with the word "Senate" in line 13. In other words, it is the clause identified as No. 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Michigan that the better way to handle the vote upon the committee amendment would be by a motion to strike out clause 13 rather than voting on it separately. There are so many subdivisions that the Chair thinks that will be the better procedure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I realize that the same result would be accomplished, but at the same time I assume that it is correct parliamentary procedure to ask for a division of the question. Is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The difficulty is that they are all governed by the sentence with which the proviso on page 53, line 13 begins.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. Is a motion to strike out the amendment in order at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; for the reason that the Senate has not reached that committee amendment. There are a number of other amendments ahead of it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am perfectly willing, and I am sure that no other Senator will have any objection, to having a separate vote on that amendment or any other subdivision or amendment of the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I hope to be able to present the statements I care to make on this subject in a very short time. Of course, the subject is a broad one, and if it had not been discussed it would require considerable time for presentation of the issues involved. We have had an able speech from my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], leaving very little to be said on our side of the case. We have had a very able speech from my friend and old college mate from across the line of my State, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], in which he has presented in a masterly way the reasons which actuate him in his position on this subject.

I would not for anything say anything personally objectionable to my friend from Tennessee, for whom I have real affection, and if I say anything which encroaches upon that sentiment, I hope he will call my attention to it, because nothing I say will be intended as offensive.

I think it might be well in the beginning to have a little better understanding of what is involved in this controversy. I have found Senators who look on it solely as a personal issue of the Senator from Tennessee. They seem to think that if his amendments shall be agreed to the result will be favorable to the Senator from Tennessee, and unfavorable to Mr. Lilienthal, and I feel sure we will find, as we did 2 years ago, a number of Senators casting their votes upon this important issue because of their friendship for the senior Senator from Tennessee.

If every Member of the Senate thought that was the issue, I am sure the amendments of the Senator from Tennessee would receive practically a unanimous vote; but, of course, there is a fundamental difference in viewpoint about what is involved. Unfortunately, many Senators have not been present during the discussion. They merely know it is a fight by the Senator from Tennessee on this man Lilienthal. I assume that is the scope of the information of some Senators, because I know a number who have not heard a word of the discussion.

Mr. President, what is the fundamental issue? It is whether we are going to change the law dealing with the operation of this growing and already gigantic plant which is under the control and administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and which is confessedly an experiment in the field of government. I shall not discuss who sponsored it. I know that the Senator from Tennessee has been devoted to it, and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations for years, and as a Member of the Senate, and as a participant in the passage of the T. V. A. bill, which came from a committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Appropriations, I have been in full accord with the Senator from Tennessee and have in large measure recognized his leadership. But we reached the dividing point upon this issue 2 years ago, when, for some reason—I do not know what it was and I do not care—the Senator from Tennessee decided that the management of the T. V. A. should be changed. Those who have heard his argument recognize that it has been addressed almost exclusively to the question of whether we can trust Mr. Lilienthal.

It is rather significant that from the beginning of this great organization, which has been growing in strength and power and income by leaps and bounds, there have been no real, supported charges or complaints against the integrity or against the good management of the vast affairs of this corporation. It has grown every day in the confidence and respect of the people of the great Tennessee Valley, from one end of it to the other, so far as I have ever heard. The Tennessee River extends across the entire width of the State of Alabama, from Georgia to Mississippi, and on into Tennessee, and the people of Alabama are as one man, so far as I have been able to ascertain, opposed to the amendments offered here by the Senator from Tennessee.

I shall not undertake to speak for the people of Georgia, or Tennessee, or Kentucky, or those of Mississippi, but I feel sure that no Member of the Senate has received any protests or complaints from anyone along the entire Tennessee River against the philosophy, against the method of administration, against the great program as carried on by the men who are now in charge of it.

In the case of this organization, whose activities extend into nearly 100 cities, including nearly every city in the State of Tennessee, furnishing them with the power they use, and extending into all the cities and towns in north Alabama, into parts of Georgia, and on into Mississippi, and soon to extend into the State of Kentucky, with such widespread diversification of operation, I submit it is remarkable that there has been no complaint against the management, no complaint against the Authority, or the Board of T. V. A., and no request to change the power and authority and basic law of the T. V. A. Do Senators think a private corporation, with such

widespread operations as those of the T. V. A., could ever get along without numerous complaints and criticism and applications for change? It is especially remarkable that a political corporation should not be the subject of all kinds of criticism during these days of general political criticism. But we do not find that there is such criticism. The people in the areas affected are holding mass meetings, they are sending letters and telegrams, and the newspapers all the way down to Birmingham are in accord in the movement to defeat the McKellar amendments on the ground that they think the amendments would hamstring the T. V. A. in its efficient management of the affairs of this great corporation and organization.

Mr. President, I submit that the Members of the Senate in making up their minds on this matter, should take into careful consideration that public attitude of friendship and support, and that it should supersede the criticism of my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, however fine and great a man he is—and he is fine and great. This expression of public opinion and sentiment on the part of the people in that section of the country which is concerned in this issue should have very great weight with the Members of the Senate.

The question has been asked, What reason is there to change the law that controls the administration of the T. V. A.? I have heard no reason advanced, except objection to Mr. Lilienthal. The T. V. A. legislation was worked out carefully. It has stood the test. It went through Congress at a time when the creation of the proposed organization meant entering into a new field of governmental activity. The legislation was deliberately passed to try this great experiment, and, so far as the people it has served are concerned, it has been a great success. I now ask the question, Why change the legislation with respect to the organization, and why change it in the manner here proposed? The amendments would totally change the fundamental law adopted by the Congress, although with appropriations being made from time to time under the law there has been no effort until recently to make any change in it.

Measures have come before the Senate and the House of Representatives in which increased appropriations were asked for the building of additional dams and transmission lines and generating machinery, but not until this controversy between my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, and Mr. Lilienthal came to the surface 2 years ago has there been any serious complaint, and until 1 or 2 years ago there has been in all these appropriations no effort made to change the basic law for the government and control of the T. V. A.

The Government has more than $750,000,000 invested in that great plant. It is a proper investment. It is making money every year. It will make more and more as new dams are added. Some have just been finished and others are under construction. It will make more and more money as they come into use and operation. Is it the part of wisdom, however much we may think of a Member of the Senate, on an appropriation bill to change the method of operating and administering this great plant which has proved so successful?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that the House changed the law in this very appropriation bill, and it is because the House changed the law on this particular appropriation bill that the Senate has a right to vote to change it a little more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not questioning the right, though I doubt very much the right to inject all this machinery into the appropriation bill simply because the House made a change.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think the House has a superior right with respect to making a change in an appropriation bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It depends upon the nature of the case. But I said I raised no point against that, though I doubt it very seriously. I take the word, as I would take it at any time, of my good friend that he has consulted the Parliamentarian and has been advised that a point of order would not lie against it. So I am not discussing the technical question. I am talking about the wisdom of the proposal, assuming that there was no sort of question about whether it could properly be added to the bill. But here is a great change proposed to be made in a plan which has worked to the satisfaction of nearly everyone. I admit that the attitude of Mr. Lilienthal has not been satisfactory to my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, but evidently it has been satisfactory to the great mass of the people who are chiefly concerned. But now it is proposed to bring about a change, and how is it proposed to do it? Not by sending to a committee a bill changing the law, having hearings on it, giving due consideration to a measure dealing with this vast sum advanced by the taxpayers of the United States to carry out a program which is of paramount interest and importance to that great area of country from Virginia on through Kentucky and reaching into Indiana and Illinois.

No hearings of any consequence were held upon this program. Mr. Lilienthal was brought before the committee and asked about what money he put into the Treasury of the United States. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] believed that he had found him to be misrepresenting with respect to it. I do not think he did. I will show the Senate in a moment the difference between the two points of view. But we had no hearings on the matter. We had no complaint about the management, unless my friend the Senator from Tennessee made some complaint in his own way in his argument relating to the character of Mr. Lilienthal. We had no complaint about the law. No contention was made that it ought to be changed except as it would limit the power of Mr. Lilienthal while he is at the head of the corporation. Mr. Lilienthal will not be there always. His term of office expires, I think, next year; does it not, I ask the Senator from Tennessee? When does Mr. Lilienthal's term of office expire?

Mr. McKELLAR. In May of next year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In just about a year. That leads to two thoughts. In the first place, is the way now being proposed the proper way to put a crimp in the activities of Mr. Lilienthal? Is it necessary to change the entire procedure with respect to the corporation and the law on this subject as it has been on the books since the T. V. A. legislation was originally passed? Is that the way to do it? There are two other ways. One is when Mr. Lilienthal's appointment comes before the Senate, if it does, to act upon the matter of confirmation, which will be before the Senate within the next year at about the time the next appropriation bill comes up. The other is, of course, to institute impeachment charges against Mr. Lilienthal. But no statement has been made here which, according to my understanding of the law on that subject, would justify impeachment charges. They are the two legal remedies, one of which is available immediately, and the other one a year from now. But my friend is a little impatient to get at Mr. Lilienthal.

I know he does not want to injure the T. V. A. No man on earth could make me believe that. His heart is in that organization. He has probably done more to advance its cause by the construction of dams and the enlargement of its power than has any other Member of the Senate. I know that to be so. He would not injure the T. V. A. But in my humble judgment he will injure it if the basic law is changed for a temporary purpose, and to get rid of a certain individual. I do not see how it will even have that effect. Will it get rid of Lilienthal? How is the proposed change going to accomplish that purpose? Will limiting the power of the T. V. A. tend to eliminate Lilienthal from control of its operation? Not at all, unless he should resign because he could not operate it successfully and efficiently. But the more likely and normal effect will be to punish the T. V. A., not Lilienthal. These amendments are not directed at Lilienthal in their effect. They are directed at the T. V. A. So, Mr. President, I submit that from that standpoint the amendments ought not be adopted.

Let us see what the basic law is. I am sure many Members of the Senate do not understand it. Let me call attention to section 26 of the T. V. A. Act, under which this great program has been so successfully administered. I will read it:

> Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation and from

any other activities of the Corporation, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year—

The T. V. A. keeps the money throughout the year, until the end of the calendar year—

save and except such part—

They are not even required to pay it all in—

of the proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. A continuing fund of $1,000,000 is also excepted from the requirements of this section—

That much, in addition to all the receipts—

and may be held by the Board to defer emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation.

There is another proviso, but I think it has no application to what I have been reading.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. BURTON. Under that provision as to the disposal of the funds, would the Senator say the fund is or is not a revolving fund?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is not a continuing revolving fund. The revolving fund is there, and we call it a revolving fund or a reserve. They have the right to use, as the statute provides, all their receipts from operations and income from other sources until the end of the year.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore during the year they would have an opportunity to act just as any business corporation would act; but when the end of the year arrives, at which time the ordinary business corporation either declares a dividend or does not declare a dividend, the Congress comes in and determines whether they should have the money for the next year; is that correct?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly correct.

Mr. President, my friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] says the T. V. A. has never turned any money into the Treasury. He puts a technical construction on the situation. But what he has said is not the situation in substance, in fact, or in law. They have complied with this section of the basic law all the time. At the end of the fiscal year they have accounted for the net income, after having spent out of the receipts, as they came along, for the administration and for any other purpose for which Congress authorized them to spend the money. Otherwise the funds have been in the Treasury of the United States all the time. I doubt whether Mr. Lilienthal ever personally handled a dime of the income. That is handled in accordance with the mechanical procedure and administrative regulations, through their treasury and their subordinate accountants and officials. But Congress has heretofore disposed, before the end of the year arrives, of the accumulated receipts—the profits which otherwise would have gone into the general fund of the Treasury.

I submit to the Members of the Senate that the only reason why the money has not gone into the general fund which is lying in the Treasury for that purpose—I ask Senators to observe this point—is the fact that the Congress directed that it go elsewhere. When the Congress passes the appropriation bill covering the T. V. A. about this time each year, the Congress appropriates for certain purposes and uses the money which is in the T. V. A. fund. We all know that the T. V. A. was engaged in an extended program of construction. If, under the congressional appropriations and under the basic law authorizing such expenditures, the T. V. A. needed $10,000,000 in addition, it used the $10,000,000 or whatever amount it had in the special fund. The Congress appropriated it. That reduced the amount of the appropriation coming out of the Treasury; the amount of the appropriation coming out of the Treasury was thus reduced to the extent of the money in the special fund.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is similar to having a corporation plow back its earnings into improvements and betterments, is it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly correct. It is handled just as any corporation would handle its own affairs.

That plan was worked out, not by Mr. Lilienthal, but by Congress. Under the law, the T. V. A. was authorized to hold every dollar of receipts until the end of the year. But rather than put them into banks and handle them in some risky way, the procedure which is now being followed was worked out and written into the law. That procedure has been approved by the House, and has been included in the appropriation bills passed in previous years. Who worked it out, Mr. President? Who worked out the system now used? It was worked out by Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, and by Mr. Lilienthal, with the approval of the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The plan was to keep the money in the Treasury. Up to that time it could have been kept elsewhere. The plan was to keep the money in the Treasury until the Congress decided whether it wished to appropriate additional sums of money for these purposes. If it did, there was the net balance available in this fund. That is what Congress has done from year to year. That was done with the approval of disinterested and high officials of the Government. I refer to the Comptroller General, the Director of the Budget, and the chairman of the House committee.

There is no complaint that that plan has not been carried out in letter as well as in spirit. I submit that it is a dangerous thing, without consideration, to adopt a new plan, necessarily against the judgment of these great officials of our Government, although there is no evidence on that score. The plan which is now being followed is the plan which they recommended and agreed to for the operation of the T. V. A. Certainly, if any change is to be made in the plan, it ought to be done in the regular way, after full consideration.

I wish to invite attention to a statement made by a recently departed great friend of every Member of this body, when the same subject was under consideration 2 years ago. A similar bill, which did not go as far as the pending bill, but almost as far, was introduced and sponsored by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. He secured the passage of that bill because of his great ability and his well-deserved popularity with Members of the Senate, and the confidence they have in him. The Senate did not have time to go into the details of the bill. Look at the attendance in the Senate at this moment. Do Senators think that the Senate is now capable of passing upon a great question such as this, with less than a dozen Senators present? We are about to decide one of the most important problems involved in our national economy, and to place under criticism one of the great experimental programs, which has gone far beyond the experimental stage, and is on the right side from the standpoint of the people. Would that be right? Would it be good judgment to abandon what was done after due consideration and deliberation?

Let me read what our friend Senator McNary said in discussing a similar bill 2 years ago. As we all know, Senator McNary was a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has jurisdiction of this subject, and at one time was chairman of the committee. The original bill was thoroughly discussed and fully considered before that committee. Senator McNary was one of its active supporters. Two years ago the question of a change arose, in connection with an appropriation bill. I think it is fair to have the benefit of his judgment upon a similar program in recent times. Listen to what Senator McNary, the late leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, said. We all admired him, regardless of the dividing line in the Senate. While that bill was under consideration in the Senate, Senator McNary said:

Mr. President, I appreciate the generous attitude of the Senator from Kentucky, and I shall confine my remarks to narrow limits. I shall limit what I say particularly to the procedural aspects of the case. I shall not enter into a discussion of the substance of the question involved, because that has been gone into by other Senators who are probably more familiar with the subject than am I.

That was his usual modest way of speaking.

Mr. President, I have known the project under discussion from its infancy. I refer now not to the T. V. A. but to the parent project, which was the Muscle Shoals undertaking, a matter before the Senate a great many years ago. If I can trust my memory it was in 1916 that the National Defense Act was passed, which contained a provision

for the construction of the dam at Muscle Shoals, afterward named Wilson Dam. In that act there was a provision that the dam should be used for the making of propellants in time of war and fertilizer in time of peace. I became a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when I came to the Senate, and that committee has had jurisdiction over the subject matter since that time. For a number of years I was chairman of the committee, and various bills affecting the Muscle Shoals project, and later bills affecting what is now known as the Tennessee Valley Authority, came before the Senate.

I recall most graphically that when I was chairman of the committee much of the legislation revolved about processes for the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen. We studied the arc process, the cyanimid process, the Haber process, and finally the synthtic process. That is all a matter of history, but it all ripened into the present organization known as the T. V. A.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and as its chairman at one time, I served on conferences, and always exercised my interest in behalf of this project. I hope I have been helpful in the development of that great undertaking.

I think we generally accord the able senior Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, the distinction of being the father of the T. V. A., and from the able speech made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], it appears he was the father of the Muscle Shoals project, and, as the latter begat the former project, this would seem to make him a kind of foster grandfather of the T. V. A. I think I might be called a remote cousin by a line of consanguinity, because my affiliations with this project, and the legislation affecting it, have been very much in my life. I am glad, however, to know the genealogy of this whole undertaking as manifested by the speeches of these two able Senators.

I concede that there is much to contemplate and that serious study should be given to the proposal made by the Senator from Tennessee. I do not like the procedure under which this matter comes before the Senate in the pending bill. For years I have tried to conform to the Senate rules, and as ex officio member of the Appropriations Committee, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Committee on Commerce I have repeatedly opposed proposals of legislation on appropriation bills. The function of an appropriation bill is to appropriate money, and the members of the Committee on Appropriations become familiar with the various projects which come before that committee. In connection with matters of independent legislation, or legislative bills in general, we have committees having jurisdiction of the various subject matters, who have the duty and the right and the jurisdiction to handle legislative matters. This indicates the objection I am now interposing to the matter before us as it is presented today, and my vote will be against the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

I have in mind rule XVI of the Senate Rules, subdivision 4, with which all Senators are conversant, I am sure. It provides:

"No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received."

I think the amendment now before the Senate violates two of those provisions. I am sure it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is no defense to say that it is legislation coming from the House of Representatives on the pending appropriation bill.

I shall not read any more of Senator McNary's statement. I wished to develop the judgment of that great man upon the danger of legislating in this way, in an appropriation bill, on a great and important issue.

There are a great many things, Mr. President, which I should like to say, but I shall not take any more time of the Senate. I know that Senators are tired of the discussion, and there are yet other Senators who wish to speak.

In my judgment, we are asked to set a bad precedent. It would be a bad thing to do at this time what is proposed. As I conceive it, if Mr. Lilienthal deserves punishment, he should not be punished by the Congress in the manner suggested.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may make the point of no quorum?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Robertson
Andrews	Gerry	Russell
Austin	Gillette	Shipstead
Ball	Green	Smith
Bankhead	Guffey	Stewart
Barkley	Hawkes	Taft
Bone	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Holman	Tunnell
Brooks	La Follette	Tydings
Buck	Langer	Vandenberg
Burton	McCarran	Wagner
Bushfield	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Butler	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Byrd	McKellar	Weeks
Capper	Maloney	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wherry
Connally	Mead	White
Danaher	Millikin	Wiley
Davis	O'Mahoney	Willis
Downey	Overton	Wilson
Eastland	Radcliffe	
Ellender	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PROMOTION OF SUSTAINED-YIELD FOREST MANAGEMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 250) to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife", which were on page 3, line 14, after "conditions" to insert ", but not the price,"; on page 5, line 21, after "given" to insert "by registered mail to each landowner whose land is proposed to be included and"; on page 6, line 16, after "publication" to insert "once weekly for four consecutive weeks"; on page 7, line 14, to strike out "without further hearing thereon"; on page 8, line 24, to strike out "the timber and other forest products on"; on page 9, line 1, to strike out "sold" and insert "included"; and on page 9, to strike out lines 17, 18, and 19 and insert:

SEC. 10. Funds available for the protection or management of federally owned or administered forest land within the unit concerned may also be expended in carrying out the purposes of this act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums for the purposes of this act as the Congress may from time to time deem necessary, but such additional sums shall not exceed $150,000 for the Department of Agriculture and $50,000 for the Department of the Interior, for any fiscal year.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am authorized by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to move the acceptance of the amendments, which are agreeable to the proponents of the bill. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to take the time of the Senate on the amendments reported by the committee and sponsored by the Senator from Tennessee. I would not do so were it not for the fact that I have a profound conviction that it would be a serious mistake to adopt them.

The history of the Tennessee Valley Authority is very interesting. It had many vicissitudes on the way. It has not been a one-way street, and there is no Member of Congress, either now or heretofore, who is or was wholly responsible for the enactment of the law creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. I happened to have been a Member of the House of Representatives in 1916 during the First World War during the administration of Mr. Woodrow Wilson, referred to by the Senator from Tennessee today. I supported the legislation creating the dam and power plant at Muscle Shoals for the manufacture of nitrates out of which explosives were to be made for war purposes and fertilizer for agricultural purposes.

Following the war the enterprise lay dormant for a number of years. The most active and insistent protagonist of the development of Muscle Shoals, particularly, was the late Representative Almon, of Alabama, in whose district Muscle Shoals was located. From that time until now I have been as active as I knew how to be in developing the Tennessee Valley, which I long ago believed offered one of the great opportunities for the development of a natural resource in a section of the country where it would be propitious to undertake such development, either for the benefit of those who might come within its radius, or as an example of what might be done to other great natural resources in the United States.

I was not and have never been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, nor of the Committee on Agriculture, so

that I was not in position originally to vote in the committee for the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. But we all know that legislation was primarily sponsored by the former Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris. It came out of the Committee on Agriculture, and one of its great friends in the committee and on the floor was the late Senator from Oregon, Mr. McNary.

The Senator from Tennessee, in the House of Representatives, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and in the Senate, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, has had the opportunity to render and has been in a position where he could render invaluable service, and he has rendered invaluable service in the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority and in its completion. He had much help in critical moments here in the Senate. I was one of those who were glad to join with him, with whatever influence and ability and activity I might have, to bring about the development of the Tennessee Valley, and it was developed to a very large degree in Alabama and in Tennessee, and even on some of the stretches of the tributaries of the Tennessee into western North Carolina before it became definitely known that there would ever be built a dam in the State of Kentucky under the Tennessee Valley Authority. When it shall have been completed there will be but one dam in the State of Kentucky; that is the one at Gilbertsville, now known as the Kentucky Dam. The Senator from Tennessee cooperated with me very effectively, and I may say indispensably, in the establishment of the Gilbertsville Dam, but I have likewise cooperated with him to the best of my ability in the establishment of all the dams in Tennessee and Alabama before the Kentucky Dam was ever reached for development.

I regret, Mr. President, that there should have been injected into this fundamental proposition, as I see it, any disagreement on account of personalities as between the Senator from Tennessee and any member of the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I know Mr. Lilienthal only slightly. I have never seen him or talked with him about politics. I do not know how he votes or whether he votes or where he votes. My contacts with him have been very infrequent. While Dr. A. E. Morgan was chairman of the board I had many contacts with him, as did the Senator from Tennessee, and sometimes the two of us together contacted him, very frequently unsatisfactorily, I may say.

It is not necessary to go into the disagreements between Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, the first chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and Mr. Lilienthal, or between Dr. Morgan and the Senator from Tennessee—and there were differences—or between Dr. Morgan and me, for there were very acute differences between Dr. Morgan, the first chairman of the Tennessee Valley board, and me, and I know there were between him and the Senator from Tennessee, because I participated in some of those differences.

Finally such a situation developed that Dr. Morgan was not in harmony with the policy of the board. The thing dragged along for months, until finally it became necessary for the President of the United States to take action in order to clear the atmosphere. That was done by the elimination of Dr. Morgan as chairman of the board and as member of the board. What was said by Dr. Morgan about Mr. Lilienthal and what Mr. Lilienthal may have said or thought about Dr. Morgan grew out of the differences between them in the administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I do not think they are pertinent here in deciding this question.

I think it is also unfortunate that this legislation comes here as an amendment on a general appropriation bill. My own opinion is that it is not in order under rule XVI. I shall not argue that point now, but rule XVI referred to by the Senator from Alabama as having been discussed by the late Senator from Oregon, Mr. McNary, prohibits on appropriation bills amendments providing for general legislation. The Senator from Oregon pointed out that the mere fact that the House may include a legislative provision in an appropriation bill does not abrogate the rule of the Senate. This is a proposal of new legislation; it changes the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It requires it to put into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States all the moneys it receives from all sources as they are received, day by day, or week by week, and it certainly changes the law as it now exists, either under the original Tennessee Valley Authority Act, or under the amendment of 1935, or under the appropriation bills, and particularly the current appropriation law, which did not change the law as to that particular. Under the appropriation bill as sent to us by the House there is no attempt to change the law as it was amended in 1935, and as the law was prescribed in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944. But that is another matter.

Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority is a great public utility. The fact that it is a corporation created by Congress does not take away from it its character as a utility. It is furnishing power to a vast number of people within the radius of its ability. It is furnishing power to war plants which are now manufacturing essential materials for the winning of the war. It has purchased and now owns the properties of other utilities existing in the same territory, including the Commonwealth & Southern Co., for whose property it paid, as I recall, in the neighborhood of seventy-eight million and some hundreds of thousands of dollars. So that it is a utility, it has all the characteristics of a utility, and as such it must adopt the methods of a utility in its operations. That means that from day to day, it may be every day in the year, every week in the year, and every month in the year, the Tennessee Valley utility is required to be ready at any call, on any occasion, to do things within its power in order to maintain its operations as any other utility would do. That means it must send men out over its entire stretches to repair lines, or to build lines, or to do other things necessary in order to create the power which it is to distribute among its customers.

Mr. President, it has been given some flexibility, some leeway, under the law as first enacted and as amended in 1935, and in every appropriation bill that has been passed since then. It has been given the flexibility of being able, in the discretion of its board, to do the things necessary in order to create and distribute power, and at the end of the year, after deducting all its operating expenses from its entire revenues, it is required to turn the balance back into the Treasury of the United States. In 1935 Congress itself created the special Tennessee Valley Authority fund, so that even at the end of the year instead of turning the net balance back into the general fund of the Treasury, Congress itself authorized the creation and the earmarking of the Tennessee Valley Authority fund and its moneys have gone into that fund, and they have been operated in that fund from that time until now.

Mr. WILEY. Where is the fund kept?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is kept in the Treasury of the United States, just as the social-security fund is kept in the Treasury, earmarked for that purpose, the difference being, of course, that the law requires the Treasury Department to borrow the funds created by the social-security payments, but the Tennessee Valley funds are earmarked as a separate fund for the use of the Tennessee Valley Authority. That has been its practice and that has been its method of doing business.

In providing this flexibility, this leeway, Congress has not been negligent in protecting the public interest. The Tennessee Valley Authority is not only audited by a private auditing concern, the Tennessee Valley Authority is audited by the General Accounting Office of the United States Government, an agency set up as a representative of Congress to go over, item by item, all its receipts and all its expenditures, and every year the books of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been audited, and they are now being audited by the General Accounting Office. So that the General Accounting Office, a representative of Congress, with expert bookkeepers and accountants and auditors, determines by audit the amount of net balance that is left at the end of each year to be turned back into the fund created by Congress as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund.

There has never been any complaint that there has been any misappropriation of funds available for the Tennessee Valley Authority, there has never been any complaint that anyone stole any money from them. Some 3 or 4 years ago Congress authorized an investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and former Senator Donahey of Ohio was appointed chairman of the joint committee. The committee spent months investigating the affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and it made a comprehensive and exhaustive report

to the Congress of the United States, in which, to use the vernacular, the committee gave it a clean bill of health.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Tennessee Valley Authority is not only audited by the Comptroller General, but, as my distinguished colleague knows, the Tennessee Valley Authority goes before the Bureau of the Budget and submits its estimates, where an examination of all its receipts and expenditures is made, just as in the case of other agencies.

I hold in my hand the Budget estimates of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and I shall be glad to have any Senator examine the document containing these Budget estimates. It shows in what detail the Tennessee Valley Authority submits the picture of its estimates and its receipts and expenditures. After that the Tennessee Valley Authority goes before the House Committee on Appropriations, submitting all these estimates, and for any question or investigation the committee may care to make, and it also comes before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, just as any other agency of the Government must do each year.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator in more detail calling my attention, and the attention of the Senate, to the practices with regard to auditing. The Tennessee Valley Authority is required to justify every dollar of its expenditures before the House Committee on Appropriations, and before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, just as the War and Navy Departments or the Maritime Commission, or any other agencies of the Government are required to justify their expenditures before appropriations are made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Under the basic law, the Tennessee Valley Authority makes an annual report to the Congress. That annual report contains a full story of all the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the details of its operations, and all its financial dealings. I hold in my hand a copy of the report for the fiscal year 1943. The report contains altogether 323 pages. It goes into every detail of the operations of the Authority, every detail with respect to all moneys collected and all moneys paid out. It gives an account of all the operations and management of the Authority and its many different ramifications. It gives a financial account.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. And, I may say, including the following statement: "Returned $13,148,000 of net income to the United States Treasury," which it never returned. But that is not the question I want to ask the Senator. The House bill contains a provision not only to appropriate all the money necessary for carrying on all the business of the organization, but $8,000,000 plus as a reserve fund for anything which may happen. The Senator said that this appropriation was like any other appropriation. I do not know of a single appropriation in which a reserve fund is provided for any department of government, not even for military affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course that does not change the law. The bill as it was sent to the Senate by the House carries the appropriation as authorized by the law enacted in 1933, and amended in 1935, and by legislation enacted since that time. They could divide and earmark the fund they appropriated as they might see fit so long as they complied with the statute; that would not be legislation, and that was the point I attempted to make.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a statement with respect to the $8,000,000 referred to?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. There are two dams, one known as the Watauga Dam and the other known as the South Holston Dam, on which certain work has been done and certain expenditures made. The construction of these dams has been temporarily held up on account of shortage of critical materials, but the $8,000,000 was put in the measure so that if the critical materials become available and the War Production Board thinks it advisable, the Authority can proceed with the construction of the two dams, and also with the construction of the phosphate plant at Mobile, Ala.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Lilienthal testified before the committee that he did not know when anything would be done on the other projects, but that he wanted to get to the Mobile plant as soon as possible, and as the cost of the Mobile plant will be about as much as he has placed in the reserve fund it may be that the Mobile plant is to be built out of the reserve fund. He did not testify to that, however. He did mention the possibility of the two dams in east Tennessee, the Watauga and the South Holston. But as everyone must be aware who knows anything about the T. V. A., Mr. Lilienthal is wholly opposed to the building of those dams, and stopped the building of them through the instrumentality of one of his former agents, a man by the name of J. A. Krug, who is with the W. P. B., and who engineered the scheme of having the W. P. B. object to the building of the Watauga and the South Holston Dams.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if Mr. Krug has all the power and influence with the War Production Board the distinguished Senator from Tennessee ascribes to him?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed he has. Not only has he as much as I ascribe to him, but more.

Mr. HILL. It seems to me that the provision for the $8,000,000 for the construction of the two dams on which money has previously been expended, and which, of course, must be completed, was brought about through the order of the War Production Board, headed by Mr. Donald Nelson.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, so far as the $8,000,000 is concerned, if the facilities for which the sum is set aside are not built, the money will not be expended.

Mr. HILL. Of course not.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that does not change the character of the appropriation. It simply sets aside that fund for the completion of facilities which have already been begun, if it is found possible to complete them, as I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. I beg the Senator's pardon, if he will allow me to interrupt. There is no limitation whatsoever on that fund. They can use it for any purpose they want to. They can buy farm lands with it, or they can buy more phosphate lands.

Mr. BARKLEY. If that is true I am surprised that the Senator from Tennessee has not placed some limitation on it, because he has done so with respect to everything else that the Tennessee Valley Authority does.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have done it with respect to all the matters that are necessary to keep the man honest.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator glibly says that he has put on restrictions necessary to keep the man honest. If the man is not honest, certainly some audit would reveal that fact, and if he is not honest there is a way to prove that he is not honest, and he can be punished for his dishonesty. The entire Tennessee Valley and the utilities dependent on the Authority, as well as plants engaged in war work, should not be hampered simply to punish Mr. Lilienthal for something imputed to him, but which has not been proved or charged in any formal way.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Lilienthal has been a director of the Authority for 11 years, and certainly no one that I know of has ever been able to submit any evidence that he was dishonest, and he has twice been confirmed by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee quoted something that Dr. Arthur E. Morgan wrote about Lilienthal in the midst of his heated personal dispute with him—about his being slick and oily and devious, I believe, and evasive. My experience and the experience of the Senator from Tennessee with Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, I think, was of a character that at least would convince me that Dr. Morgan fitted the description he gave to Lilienthal better than Lilienthal fitted into it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances we have a very happy pair to do this great work, do we not?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator had anything to do with the appointment of either of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; I did not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not even the appointment of Dr. H. A. Morgan?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I did not know of it until after it was made.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Kentucky, first, what amendments we are discussing. I have gathered from the debate that we were discussing the amendments on pages 52, 53, 54, and 55 of the bill. They involve the propositions which were discussed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. They clearly appear to be legislation.

I wanted to suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that from the date the T. V. A. bill was introduced and passed in this body to the present moment I have upon occasions, as have other Senators, introduced legislation and attempted to attach it to appropriation bills, and without a single exception a point of order has been made and upheld. I am going to suggest to the Senator that I shall make a point of order against all these amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say in this connection that I have already expressed my view that the pending amendment is not in order under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. BONE. I have had the rules of the Senate invoked against me from time to time, and I am merely desirous of knowing whether we are going to throw the rules of the Senate into the wastebasket or enforce them.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that the rules require the Appropriations Committee to make a point of order, or require the Senator in charge of the appropriation measure to make a point of order against an amendment offered from the floor which constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. I do not know why the same rule should not be invoked against the action of the committee itself if it presents legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in answer to what the Senator from Kentucky has just said, I wish to say that before reporting these amendments I consulted the Parliamentarian of this body, and the Parliamentarian told me they were in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have consulted the Parliamentarian also about that matter, and I am not going to quote what the Parliamentarian had to say about it. The Parliamentarian, however, I will say, when I consulted him about it, was in doubt whether the amendment was in order, and indicated that the Chair might rule either way with the possibility that he was right. So it is up to the Chair after all to determine parliamentary questions. Of course, he seeks the advice of our very competent Parliamentarian, but after all the responsibility is on the Chair to rule on points of order.

Personally, I have no doubt whatever that this amendment changes the law. It provides a different method by which the T. V. A. shall turn its money into the Treasury. It provides that the T. V. A. must do so every time it receives $5 in revenue, as and when collected; and the T. V. A. would be given no discretion whatsoever to use any of that money for ordinary running expenses or for working capital, unless it first came to Congress and received an appropriation. Thereby, we would make the Congress of the United States the board of directors to manage the Tennessee Valley Authority. I, myself, do not want, much as I honor and respect the Congress of the United States, to have the Congress act as the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I do not believe that 531 Members of Congress can efficiently and effectively act as a board of directors to determine whether the Tennessee Valley Authority shall repair a transmission line which is down or whether it shall build a new transmission line or whether it shall rent a building in order that it may house its employees, or to make any other determination in connection with anything which it is necessary for the T. V. A. to do in order to operate that great utility.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I quite agree with the Senator from Kentucky that the amendment would change the mechanics of operation, and certainly that clearly invades the field of legislation. If the Senate wishes to pass legislation of that sort, that is all right; I will not say the Senate has no right to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am doing my level best to keep the Senate from passing it.

Mr. BONE. I understand that, and I appreciate what the Senator is doing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] complained that Mr. Lilienthal made speeches at Rotary clubs, Kiwanis clubs, and luncheon clubs of various kinds. Of course, we all know that everyone in public life is frequently invited to make speeches before luncheon clubs. I myself have punished many a luncheon club with a speech. [Laughter.] In spite of that, I receive repeated invitations to punish them again. I am sure the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has received many invitations, not to punish luncheon clubs, but to enlighten them. We accept such invitations. Of course, it should be natural for us to wish to talk about a matter about which we know something; and I presume Mr. Lilienthal knows more about the T. V. A. than anyone else does, and knows more about it than he knows about anything else. Therefore, it would be natural for him, when talking before a luncheon club, to talk about the T. V. A. It would not only be natural but it would be proper for him to enjoin against injecting politics into the T. V. A.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Alabama desire that I yield to him?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall wait for a minute or two.

Mr. BARKLEY. While the Senator is waiting, I will say that of all the organizations set up in the United States, the T. V. A. is the one organization which has gone beyond what are ordinary and reasonable bounds to keep from injecting politics into its activities; so much so, that early in its history, when many men out of employment came to me, as they came, no doubt, to the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Alabama, and other Senators, asking for letters of recommendation to the Tennessee Valley Authority in order to help them get a job as a blacksmith or as a carpenter or as a ditch digger, those letters were a handicap, rather than a benefit, in connection with securing the positions they were seeking; because Congress itself in the law provided that the Tennessee Valley Authority should give no consideration to political recommendations or political affiliations in the employment of persons working under it; and in order that they might not even be accused of allowing a United States Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives to influence them by political pressure or by a political recommendation, they uniformly turned them all down. I think they were properly acting within the law and in the proper spirit in doing so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In view of the statement made earlier in the day by the Senator from Tennessee that Mr. Lilienthal had been engaging in political activities, I desire to read a letter which came to me from Mr. Lilienthal. The letter is dated March 9, more than 10 days ago. I think it is my duty to read this letter to the Senate, in view of the statements which have been put in the RECORD about Mr. Lilienthal's conduct and his characteristic of never denying anything, especially never denying statements that he had engaged in political activities.

As I said, the letter was written on March 9. Today is the 22d of March. I believe it is fair to Mr. Lilienthal, in view of the statements made here today that he never made any correction or denial of charges relating to him, that his letter, written more than 10 days ago, be read into the RECORD at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: In the hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on the Independent Offices the other day you will recall that Senator McKELLAR charged me with engaging in political activities directed against him. This accusation he repeated in the press this morning. The amendments to the T. V. A. appropriation bill he has sponsored include what constitutes a direct charge that the T. V. A. has been engaging in political activity for and against the candidates for political office.

Your own observation of the T. V. A. and of my conduct, I believe, leaves no doubt in your mind that we have scrupulously avoided any and all activity of a partisan, political character, whether involving Presidential, Senatorial, or State and local offices. So far as Alabama is concerned, I am sure you have never had word from your constituents that would sustain in any degree Senator McKELLAR's serious charge of illegality on our part.

I want to say to you, as a friend and supporter of the program entrusted to T. V. A., that:

(1) The Board of Directors of the T. V. A., from the very outset has had a formal policy forbidding any of its officials or employees from engaging in any form of political activity whatsoever. That policy was promulgated before the national policy on the subject in the Hatch Act, and is more extensive in its application than is the Hatch Act. It has been severely observed by our Board, in letter and in spirit.

(2) The writer of this letter, in the almost 11 years as a Director of T. V. A., has not once, by any act or suggestion, or otherwise, promoted the candidacy of anyone for any political office—local, State, or Federal—nor has he opposed any candidacy in anyway, directly or indirectly. Any statement to the contrary is wholly without basis in fact. Any inquiry you may make of any disinterested citizens of Tennessee or anywhere in the Tennessee Valley will confirm this statement, without qualification. This fact is well known.

We are thus writing you, as a member of the Senate subcommittee on Independent Offices and as a friend of the Tennessee Valley development, because this charge of political activity, contrary to existing law and sound policy, attacks the integrity of the T. V. A. and my integrity; for it is the heart and spirit of the T. V. A., in accordance with congressional policy written in the law, that it must never be used for political purposes. And it has never been so used.

Faithfully yours,

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
Chairman.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. WILEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to what was said on the floor of the Senate yesterday by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. He said he denounced Lilienthal for making a speech against him, and that Lilienthal never denied doing so. The junior Senator from Tennessee called on Lilienthal to deny it.

I wish again to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama and the attention of all other Senators to the following statement made on July 9, 1942, during a political campaign, when Mr. Lilienthal was abusing the junior Senator from Tennessee:

Mr. Lilienthal concluded by urging citizens to find out how candidates for political office stand on the issue of continued business-like management of public power agencies.

"Your eternal vigilance is the price of low-cost electricity."

He was fighting the junior Senator from Tennessee because the junior Senator from Tennessee had voted for a bill of this kind. He was out on the stump denouncing the two Senators from Tennesee, as was clearly shown here yesterday.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator does not insist that that article properly has that meaning, does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course it has. What else could he be referring to? Why was he making a speech? He is not ordinarily a speechmaker.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He did not denounce anybody.

Mr. McKELLAR. He visits luncheon clubs and other organizations, making speeches. He was making them in that campaign for the purpose of defeating the junior Senator from Tennessee. Time and again he tried to defeat him, not only in this speech, but in other speeches in that campaign. He was an active fighter. Everyone in Tennessee knew that he was an active fighter in that campaign. For him to attempt to deny it at this late date, when he was called upon to deny it at the time, is a confession that he was guilty or he would have denied it then.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if this contest in the Senate were a political contest between the Senators from Tennessee and David Lilienthal, I would be voting for McKELLAR and STEWART. I do not know anything about what has happened in Tennessee in regard to this matter from a political standpoint; but if all that the Senator from Tennessee says is true, if Lilienthal actually made political speeches against him and called him by name and said to the people that they ought not to reelect him—which I do not understand he ever did—I still do not see why the entire Tennessee Valley Authority in Tennessee, North Carolina, Alabama, Kentucky, Indiana, Missouri, and Illinois should be punished in order to punish Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I entirely agree with the Senator that the T. V. A. ought not be punished. It is not being punished. We are proposing to furnish the money to operate the T. V. A. through appropriations by Congress, instead of allowing Lilienthal to have an ever-continuing revolving fund, from which he can withdraw money whenever he wants it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That revolving fund is audited. We would be punishing the people who are customers and patrons of this enterprise if every time something were needed the T. V. A. had to come to Washington and appear before the Committee on Appropriations, and then wait until a bill could be considered by the Senate and the House, acting as a board of directors.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator surely does not mean that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say that today the Army must do the same thing. We appropriate all the money for the Army. The Army does not have to come to Congress every time it wishes to make an expenditure. It has its appropriations. The same is true of the Navy, and of every other activity of Government. It is idle to talk that way about appropriations by Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Even the Army and the Navy must come to Congress every month or so for increased sums by way of deficiency appropriation bills. Does the Senator want the Tennessee Valley Authority to be required to come to Congress every time it needs to expend a small additional amount of money on a facility which it is charged with the duty of operating, and obtain the additional amount through a deficiency appropriation bill before it can be expended?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not what this amendment proposes. It simply proposes that expenditures be made from the appropriations. We propose to appropriate $66,000,000 for the T. V. A. It will be some time before the T. V. A. can have an opportunity to spend all the $66,000,000. We all know that if and when the T. V. A. comes to Congress with a good reason for the expenditure of money, the money will be provided. If I did not think so, I would not be in favor of the amendment. In my judgment the T. V. A. should be treated just as every other activity of the Government is treated. It should come to Congress for its appropriations, and should pay its receipts into the Treasury of the United States. That is what we said in the first law, with the one limitation, and that is what we should say today.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been in existence for 11 years, and for 11 years it has been doing what it is now doing. There has been only one attempt to change the procedure. That was in 1942, and it was a failure. Now, after 11 years, we are asked to say to the Tennessee Valley Authority, "You shall not pursue business methods which are meticulously audited and examined by private and governmental auditors, because there is a controversy, personal in some respects, between certain Senators and someone on the board of directors."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think for the sake of the RECORD it should be said that the speech to which the Senator from Tennessee repeatedly refers was delivered by Mr. Lilienthal before the Knoxville Kiwanis Club.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, let me ask the Senator whether Mr. Lilienthal barged in on the Knoxville Kiwanis Club and broke down the doors in order to get in, or was he invited to appear before that organization?

Mr. HILL. I am quite certain that he was invited to appear. I have never heard of his barging in anywhere. I am sure that he was invited to come before the organization and deliver an address on July 9, 1942.

The fact is that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] felt that some things which Mr. Lilienthal said in that speech were against the interest of his candidacy. It is not for me to pass judgment on whether the junior Senator from Tennessee is correct. The fact remains that in that speech neither the name of the senior Senator from Tennessee nor that of the junior Senator from Tennessee was mentioned. But even if Mr. Lilienthal did say something in that speech which could be construed as against the candidacy of the junior Senator from Tennessee, it is the only speech and the only statement of any kind or character that the senior Senator from Tennessee has been able to submit to

the Senate as being a political speech from Mr. Lilienthal. The Senator has said that not only did Mr. Lilienthal make this speech, but time and again he spoke against the candidacy of the junior Senator from Tennessee. This is the only speech that the Senator from Tennessee has been able to submit to the Senate. The senior Senator from Tennessee stated yesterday that for years Mr. Lilienthal had been making speeches fighting him. Where are all those speeches? Where are all those statements? Where will we find, aside from this one speech, anything that Mr. Lilienthal has said against the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Kentucky will yield, I shall be very happy to answer that question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Here is another statement. This is from the Chattanooga Daily Times of May 8, 1942, during the same campaign.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before what Kiwanis Club was that statement made?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. We shall see. I read from the Chattanooga Daily Times of May 8, 1942:

"The Tennessee Valley Authority, throughout its 9 years of existence, has been governed by the 'rule of merit' and not 'rule of political reliability' in the selection of its personnel," Chairman David E. Lilienthal, of the T. V. A. Board of Directors, declared here last night in a speech which, in part, at least, was directed at the fight that United States Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR conducted successfully in the Senate against the Authority. While the T. V. A. Board's Chairman did not use Senator MCKELLAR'S name at any time during his remarks—

As I pointed out the other day—

it was obvious that they were directed at him. He was here to address a mass meeting of T. V. A. workers.

He was addressing a mass meeting of T. V. A. workers and denouncing one of the Senators from Tennessee because he did not do as the great director of the T. V. A. wanted him to do.

I have referred to two occasions. There were many others. The truth is that all during that campaign this man Lilienthal went all over the State denouncing me and denouncing the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is easy for the Senator from Tennessee to say that Lilienthal went all over the State denouncing him; but the language which he quoted contains no reference to the Senator from Tennessee. It speaks of the fact that we wrote into the fundamental, basic act of the T. V. A. the provision that there should be no politics, but that there should be a merit system. We even provided that if any T. V. A. employee in any way engaged in politics with reference to the personnel, he should be peremptorily fired. One of the greatest contributions the T. V. A. has made has been to prove that it is possible under our system of government to have a great governmental agency free from politics. It was not unnatural for Mr. Lilienthal, speaking to the personnel of the T. V. A., to mention the fact that they were under a merit system, free from politics.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no way of knowing whether Mr. Lilienthal had in mind the senior or the junior Senator from Tennessee when he was urging that the T. V. A. be kept out of politics. However, I certainly feel that in urging that that be done not only was he on solid ground, but he was complying with the law itself, which went further than any other law of which I know to keep this activity out of politics, to such an extent that no one may be employed or dismissed by the T. V. A. because of his politics.

I recall that early in the proceedings I wrote a letter to Dr. Morgan, as chairman of the T. V. A. Board, recommending a man from my State who wanted to obtain a job. It is hard to refuse to write letters of recommendation when one's friends ask for such letters. Dr. Morgan replied to me, calling attention to the provision of the law which prevented political considerations. I did not write him any more letters in behalf of anyone, but I did not interpret his letter to me as an attack upon me because he was insisting that the law be observed by keeping politics out of appointments.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to make an observation. A discussion of the 1942 campaign has been resumed here today. Again Mr. Lilienthal has been quoted. Yesterday I made a statement as to my recollection with respect to the speech made by Mr. Lilienthal at Knoxville. The speech was certainly aimed at me. Everyone with whom I talked at that time so construed it. It was during the heat of the campaign. The vote which I had cast on a certain amendment relating to the T. V. A. was an issue in the campaign. That was the picture. There could be no question about that part of it. However, as I stated yesterday, I shall not support all the amendments which are being presented here at this time. I am sorry that I cannot go along with my colleague on all of them. As I have already said, I wish to make a statement, not a speech, explaining my vote.

There can be no question about Mr. Lilienthal's political activity. I know. I have been prodded and punched by that thing once, and I carried my campaign all over the State of Tennessee feeling the effects of it. Unless I cannot understand the English language, there is no question that that man was acting politically. I believe that, in the interest of efficient operation of the T. V. A., he should be removed. I have said so, heretofore. However, so far as that is concerned, it probably has nothing to do with the handling of the money of the T. V. A., paying it into the Treasury, or handling it in one way or another. As pointed out by the Senator from Alabama yesterday, that is a different proposition. But Lilienthal was active politically in 1942. I do not believe there can be any doubt about it. And if he was, certainly the law was violated. As the junior Senator from Alabama has pointed out, persons who are employed by the T. V. A. are not supposed to take any active part in political campaigns. They are restricted, as are other Government employees, and their activities are circumscribed by certain provisions of the law which forbid active participation in political campaigns. My honest belief is that Mr. Lilienthal violated both the spirit and the letter of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and he knows that I would not, by any word, gesture, or thought of mine, approve of Mr. Lilienthal, or anyone else holding a Government position, opposing the Senator from Tennessee in a campaign, although we all recognize that everyone has a right to vote as he pleases. I certainly would not condone any surreptitious attack, or covert or open attack, on the Senator from Tennessee in a political campaign. But my point is that, even if we admit that to be true, there is a way by which to deal with an activity of that kind. If Mr. Lilienthal is to continue as a director, he must be reappointed, and the Senate will have to confirm him. We can deal with that subject when the proper time comes. The point is that we should not, in the midst of consideration of an appropriation bill, enact legislation, which was not considered for a moment by the committee which framed the T. V. A. legislation, as a punitive expedient against Mr. Lilienthal or anyone else.

Mr. President, I have taken more time than I had intended, and I shall bring my remarks to a conclusion.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the remarks of the Senator in which he gave us a picture of the financial operations of the T. V. A. I was not in the Chamber when the statement was made. As I understand, he has stated that under the present law, and the amendments now in operation, the T. V. A. operates as a business concern; it takes in receipts, makes expenditures, and at the end of the year the balance of the funds remaining is placed in an account in the United States Treasury. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct. Technically, the money does not go into the Treasury general fund.

Mr. WILEY. Does it go into a special account?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but the money is under the guardianship of the Treasury, in a special T. V. A. fund.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And subject to appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Subject to appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. Does the Senator state that the T. V. A. money is subject to appropriation?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is subject to the checking authority of the Board, and is in no way subject to appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is subject to appropriation after the T. V. A. turns the balance in.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, well; the balances have not been turned in.

Mr. BARKLEY. Last year the T. V. A. turned in $13,000,000. In the technical sense it did not go into the Treasury. It was turned into the fund, earmarked, and set aside by Congress for that purpose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And it was appropriated for Government uses under the T. V. A. program.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. Each appropriation bill dealing with this agency has provided for appropriating the money turned back into the fund by the T. V. A.

Mr. WILEY. Be that as it may, I think we understand the general operations at the present time.

With respect to page 52 of the bill, I understand the objection of the Senator is to the effect that the language there provides that all the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1945 and subsequent fiscal years shall be covered, as and when collected, into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States. That language means that no longer could the Authority receive money and make normal payments in the course of business, but that every payment which had to be made would have to be paid out of the Treasury. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have to be paid out of the Treasury under an appropriation of Congress, just as any other money is appropriated and paid out of the Treasury.

Mr. WILEY. Then, am I correct in my understanding that the very crux of the issue here is whether the Authority should continue to operate in the usual way in which a private business concern would operate, or whether the funds should go into the Treasury and then be reappropriated, and payments made from that fund after the appropriations had been made?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the sole issue.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in a colloquy with me a moment ago, the Senator from Washington announced that he would make a point of order against this amendment. I do not see the Senator on the floor. I am reminded by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that the amendment to which the point of order is to be made is the Watts Bar steam-plant amendment, and not the pending amendment. The real crux of this whole thing is the amendment on page 52. The amendments on page 51 with reference to Watts Bar steam plant, Fort Loudon Dam, and the Sheffield steam plant are not in the amendment to which the point of order is directed.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are all included in the one amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are separate amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they are not separate; they are all a part of one amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Are not the amendments appearing on page 51 and page 52 separable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. From a parliamentary point of view, they are separable.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They would be considered as separable. They are separate amendments. For instance, the amendment on page 51 begins in line 17 and strikes out certain words but does not propose to insert anything. That must be the first amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment now under consideration is in line 14, page 51 to insert the word "of", which has not heretofore been agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the words "Watts Bar steam plant; Fort Loudon Dam (including an extension to bring the waters of the Little Tennessee River within the pool of this project)" are a part of the sentence that ends on page 53 with the words "the general fund of the Treasury of the United States." I will read it to the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator does not have to read it. If the Senator from Kentucky will pardon me——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Obviously, whether it is one sentence or whether it is not it proposes to affect very different subject matters, and obviously, under all parliamentary law and procedure and the rules and precedents of the Senate, these amendments should be considered separately.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to their being considered separately, but they are a part of one sentence.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That has nothing to do with whether or not the amendments are separable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if we were voting on these amendments in the ordinary course we would vote on them separately, whether they are a part of one long sentence or whether they are a part of four or five different short sentences.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why not let us vote on them?

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment on page 51 striking out Watts Bar steam plant. Fort Loudon Dam and the Little Tennessee River extension have no connection whatever with the language at the bottom of page 52 which deals with the handling of the funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it will help any to obtain a vote, I am perfectly willing to have them considered separately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in line 14, page 51.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee withhold his point of no quorum?

Mr. McKELLAR. I withhold it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Kentucky had concluded his remarks.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I had not quite concluded.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] wishes to be heard, and when it comes to considering the specific amendments I myself want to be heard briefly. The amendments will have to be taken up in the usual parliamentary manner and be considered in their order. I do not want any confusion to exist that, because the Senator from Tennessee is willing to have them considered separately, when they have to be considered that way, it is going to have any effect on the debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had about concluded. I had intended to read a number of telegrams and letters from people in Kentucky and Tennessee and Alabama in opposition to this amendment and attempting to state what the effect of it would be upon their communities and their public utilities; but I shall not take the time of the Senate to do that. I may say, however, that I have scores of such communications, including resolutions adopted by organizations in Tennessee and Alabama and in the State of Kentucky, opposing this amendment. I shall not encumber the RECORD with them, but simply wish to state, in conclusion, that I think it would be really a tragedy for this amendment, that is the crux of these amendments, to be adopted. There are a number of amendments, some of them limiting the number of automobiles which may be bought, and all that sort of thing, the wisdom or folly of which I am not now discussing. I am talking about the fundamental question of changing the law relative to the handling of the funds, the receipts and disbursements, and especially the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority. So I hope that the amendments in that particular at least will not be agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is right about that being the crux of the matter. I am perfectly willing, if the Senator is, to vote on that amendment now, and to vote on the others later.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not imagine it will take long to dispose of these technical amendments.

ASSAULTS ON CONSTITUTIONAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, for 12 years the American people have been witnessing assault after assault upon their traditional constitutional form of government. These assaults have been made not only in disregard of, but sometimes in apparent contempt for, the constitutional safeguards protecting the liberties of our people and limiting the powers of Federal governmental officials over them.

These assaults have been made always behind the smoke screen of propaganda poured out to confuse the people and portraying imaginary necessities during depression, emergencies, and now war.

The present assault is a demand for a national service law under which all of our people would truly be subjected to the rules and regulations of a "commander in chief."

We still live in a free country under a Constitution guaranteeing a representative republican form of government. Under our system, both labor and private enterprise are producing the greatest supply of war materials ever known in the history of the world. They have brought about the production miracle of the ages—one which has astounded not only our enemies, but our allies as well. Now, to say that any individual shall be conscripted under Government direction to work for any private employer smacks of that involuntary servitude to rid ourselves of which our Nation once engaged in a bitter civil war.

While 10,000,000 men are away from home in the armed services fighting for American freedom, we, above all others, should defend their wives, sisters, daughters, and families from involuntary servitude and serfdom. Conscription of labor in America would destroy rather than implement our miracle of production, and might well destroy our free country.

No program to conscript labor fits into the fabric of our free Government. Labor slavery might properly fit into the communistic theories of some New Deal bureaucrats. The "fellow travelers" who map out New Deal policies and want to determine in detail each individual life find that they can do so only when they can completely dictate those lives.

Under a national service law, bureaucrats could tell each free American when to work, where to work, how much to work for, and how long. The Constitution provides:

> The President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States.

That, and nothing more. There is nothing in the Constitution that says he shall be the Commander in Chief of the Nation or of the people—not yet.

A draft-labor scheme fits perfectly into the general program of aggressive "power grabbing," which has been the distinguishing characteristic of the New Deal. Each pretended crisis in government has been marked by new evidences of this underlying mania for power—power over the States; power over private enterprise; power over resources; and now power over the rights of all our people.

This determined effort to control the lives of American people is evidenced constantly by the mass of directives, edicts, and Executive orders flowing constantly from the heads of the bureaus. The present unpardonable confusion prevalent throughout the country has been caused by conflicting rules and estimates constantly being issued by the War Manpower Commission, the Selective Service, and the War Production Board.

Mr. President, compulsion born of this constant confusion can never be made a substitute for the unity of purpose of a free people.

The American people have shown a willingness to go to any extreme in sacrifice to preserve their liberty, their form of government, their security, and their opportunity to contribute to the welfare of mankind. What they want now is a well-considered, permanent, and orderly plan to meet the real problems of this global war and the perplexing problems that will inevitably follow. That can only be given them by a leader surrounded by competent liberty-loving Americans dedicated to maintain the freedom of our people at home—the freedom for which our men are fighting abroad.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have always been interested in the great American experiment known as the Tennessee Valley Authority, although I have not always agreed with all its policies. I knew Dr. Arthur Morgan when he was Director of the Authority. I had a great deal of respect for him, and considered him one of the most honest and courageous of Government servants at that time. I felt that he was unjustly treated and unjustly removed from office, and I still entertain that belief.

Mr. President, I feel that we are not voting on Dr. Arthur Morgan or Mr. David Lilienthal today. We are going to vote as to whether we will take any steps to restrict the work of the great Tennessee Valley Authority at this time.

I think we might do well to consider what work the T. V. A. is doing today. It is doing work which affects the life of practically every person in the United States, and particularly the work being carried on and the production being made on every farm.

Besides producing 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, most of which has been going into war production, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been producing large quantities of ammonia, ammonium nitrate, and phosphorus, for munitions; and calcium carbide for synthetic rubber.

It has been aiding farmers in producing more food without additional manpower, through improved farming methods based on T. V. A. phosphate fertilizers distributed in 29 States. If I read the amendments correctly, they would put a stop to the distribution of any of this fertilizer for experimental work in these 29 States, unless the consent of the county agent of the county had previously been obtained.

T. V. A. has supplied thousands of tons of concentrated phosphatic fertilizers for the food-production program of Great Britain.

It has constructed new electric-generating plants at a rate which kept power supply ahead of expanding war needs, and all of us should be familiar with the part the T. V. A. has played in the production of aluminum during our greatest need for aluminum.

T. V. A. has trained Army medical officers in malaria-control methods. It has developed equipment and techniques for preserving foods by quick freezing and by dehydration. I know of some of this work, because for several days I presided over subcommittee hearings at which representatives of the T. V. A. testified, and demonstrated the dehydrating outfit which had been perfected by the T. V. A.

The T. V. A. has made available to industry surveys of new sources of critical raw materials urgently needed in the war effort.

It has developed new methods of producing aluminum from common clays, and magnesium from native olivine.

Mr. President, the part of the work of T. V. A. in which our people in the Northeast have been particularly interested has been that having to do with the fertilizer situation. About 2 years ago we began to experience a critical shortage of nitrates, and the T. V. A. went to work on the production of ammonium nitrate. At first the product would gather moisture so that it would not go through the fertilizer spreader, and it did not work out so well. A year ago they started experimenting with ammonium nitrate, and finally perfected a process by which it can be manufactured and kept dry and made available for use months afterward.

A few nights ago I was talking with the manager of the largest farm cooperative in New England, the Eastern States Farmers' Exchange. He told me that ammonium nitrate which has been developed by this new process, partly through the efforts of the T. V. A., is now keeping perfectly, and they are using all of it they can get.

Ammonium nitrate, incidentally, will provide American farmers with nitrogen at two-thirds the cost of imported nitrate of soda. I do not give T. V. A. all the credit, because private concerns have also been doing experimental work, but I dare say that if it had not been for the work which has been done on fertilizer by the T. V. A. we would today be paying at least twice as much for nitrates and phosphates as we are paying. If we were paying twice as much, we would not be producing nearly what is being produced on the farms today.

We are now experiencing a serious labor shortage, and we all know that heavier applications of fertilizer will go part way in making up the labor shortage, through producing greater amounts on smaller areas.

Only last month, or the month before, a delegation representing the farmers from the northeastern section of the United States called on me and asked me to do what I could to help T. V. A. secure a new phosphate plant, because they were desperately in need of more

superphosphate, and this seemed to be the only way by which they could get it.

I say, therefore, Mr. President, that I shall not vote today on Mr. Lilienthal or Dr. Morgan, or any other personalities. I think we spend too much time legislating around personalities anyway. But I wish to say, in conclusion, that any crippling of the Tennessee Valley Authority, or any unnecessary restrictions on its work at this time, would produce an unfavorable effect, which would be felt on every farm in the United States.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I know there are a number of amendments to be considered, and I understand they will be considered separately. I shall not attempt to make a speech, but merely a brief statement explaining my vote on the most controversial amendment, that is, as to the proposal to cover into the Treasury the Tennessee Valley Authority funds.

About 2 years ago I voted for a measure which, among other things, would have made the Tennessee Valley Authority cover into the Treasury of the United States all its receipts. The measure failed of congressional approval at that time.

Essentially the same measure, along with others, is again before us. I believed 2 years ago, and I still believe, it is sound policy to require all agencies of the Government to be responsible to Congress for the money they get, and accountable to it for what they spend. I believed that so strongly then that I felt the measure offered should be passed, even though we were entering into a great war. There were hypothetical reasons advanced why such a change in the manner of operating T. V. A. affairs should not be undertaken during wartime.

Two years have elapsed, and we are now deeply engrossed in that war. Indeed, we are now perhaps at a critical juncture in our prosecution of it. Our productive facilities and our manpower are now taxed to their limit. Our armed forces in the European theater are at the moment probably poised for a full-fledged invasion attack. The exigencies and demands of such an engagement are virtually unpredictable. The present need for unhampered agricultural and industrial production in the Tennessee Valley is of paramount importance. I do not think anyone here would gainsay the great stress of our situation.

If there were no other consideration involved save the mere changing of the manner in which T. V. A. accounts for its expenditures and secures money with which to operate, I would insist that the law even now could be changed without injury to the great work of T. V. A., or of the many enterprises and industries dependent upon it for electric power. But such is not the case.

Since this issue has been revived recently I have received reports from numerous men engaged in various enterprises which are dependent on T. V. A. for power—from members of rural electric cooperatives, farm organizations, from manufacturers, from public and business leaders throughout the valley, and from users of T. V. A. power generally. I have made considerable inquiry of my own and I have pondered the reports that have come to me.

On the basis of the claims made and of the common state of mind manifested among those engaged in wartime production in the valley, I have concluded that, regardless of the soundness of the idea involved, a change-over at this time might produce harmful results. There is no rule but has its exception; there is no principle infallible. The question involved has ceased to be one of a sound, or unsound, idea of fiscal government, but of the state of mind of the people in the valley and of the enterprises vital to this war that are contingent upon their concentrated and undisturbed effort.

It is manifest that the people of the valley in overwhelming number believe the proposed amendment will prove hurtful to T. V. A.

Any diversion of their attention from their wartime tasks, any dissipation of their energies in uncertainties and confusion growing out of the problematic effect of the proposed change might result in a loss of graver consequences than the good to be gained. I am so impressed with the dangers involved in making any change in a situation now operating with apparent smoothness that I must vote against a measure which under other circumstances I might support.

It is provided in the original Tennessee Valley Authority Act that the principal offices of the corporation shall be at Muscle Shoals, Ala. This provision was placed in the law for the simple reason that all corporations must have a principal office or situs for the purpose of the service of civil process, etc. This is not a provision that would require the actual active working office to be located there, but, as a matter of fact and as a matter of law, the Authority can maintain operating offices anywhere in the valley and, in the interest of efficient operation, such flexibility is both desirable and essential because of the widespread area now covered by the Authority, which is, in fact, operating in seven or eight States.

Of course, I vigorously oppose the provisions proposed to be placed in the act as committee amendments prohibiting the expenditure of money for principal offices anywhere except at Muscle Shoals. The present set-up should be left undisturbed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall not take any considerable time in discussing the background and the history of this great enterprise on the Tennessee River. When I first came to the Senate in 1925, and as a secretary to my father for the 6 years preceding, I witnessed the struggle to prevent the great Muscle Shoals Dam and the power plants and nitrate plants which had been constructed there from being turned over to private bidders for a song. After I became a Member of the Senate I joined as best I could in my humble way in helping the then great senior Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris, in that fight. I did all in my power to further the enactment of the Tennessee Valley Authority legislation. And since that time, whenever opportunity has offered here in the Senate, I have given my wholehearted and vigorous support to the enterprises. I have done so, Mr. President, because from early youth I have been impressed with the great wastage of our natural resources which has occurred in the development of this great Nation which is a slice of a continent.

In the Tennessee Valley Authority experiment we have for the first time in any great river valley in the world attempted to develop all of its natural resources, to conserve them, and insofar as possible to restore them in order that they may be maintained for oncoming generations in such magnitude and plenitude that they may afford a sound and an adequate basis for a continued civilization in this Nation.

It seems tragic to me, Mr. President, that after this experiment has gone through its initial stages of development and has attained the great success which it has achieved, that it should now be subjected to proposals contained in a series of amendments which inevitably would cripple and greatly impair the operations of the enterprise. It seems passing strange to me, Mr. President, that support for these amendments should come in many instances from those who are often critical of the lack of business principle and practice in governmental operations. And yet these proposals taken as a whole will have the effect of preventing this gigantic enterprise, in which more than $750,000,000 of the taxpayers' money has been invested, from operating on sound business principles, principles and practices which are followed by every corporation in the United States that is properly and prudently managed.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I merely want to call the Senator's attention to one provision on page 53, line 17, which forbids paying for advertisements in newspapers. I want to suggest in that connection that every private power company in the United States is at this moment and day by day putting full page ads in the newspapers telling about their contributions to war work, and in my own State of Washington they are getting ready now to put on a national campaign of advertising which will be paid for by the light and power users of my State.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate the Senator calling attention to that matter. It is perhaps one of the more minor amendments of the character which I have been attempting to describe in general language, but it shows the danger of a committee of Congress, or the Senate or the House, or the Congress as a whole, attempting to sit in and participate in the management of a giant enterprise of this character.

The facts are, so far as newspaper advertisements are concerned, that the Tennessee Valley Authority has never indulged in any newspaper advertising such as the Senator from Washington

has indicated the private power companies undertake. It has never indulged in any general advertising of a self-laudatory character pointing out its service to the people who live in this great river valley and who are served by this giant utility enterprise. The only advertising that they have ever engaged in, Mr. President, was when they joined in the campaign of advertising as a part of the utility system of southeastern United States at a time of a drought, appealing to people not to waste electrical energy. The only other types of advertising they have indulged in is help-wanted advertising when they are short of manpower in this critical manpower situation.

Yet, Mr. President, we have here a proposal solemnly presented by a great committee of the Senate prohibiting this $750,000,000 enterprise from utilizing newspaper advertisements in an effort to find replacement for employees who are drafted into the armed services of the United States. Is that the kind of business policy that the Senate of the United States is going to inject when it first indulges in interference with the management of this corporation?

Mr. President, that is just a flyspeck so far as these amendments are concerned. As I said before, the general character of these amendments can have no other effect than to cripple the operation of this giant enterprise, to cripple it in the midst of the most serious war this Nation or any other nation has ever been engaged in, and to cripple it at a time when products manufactured with the power developed by this giant system are critically needed by the men on the battle fronts all over the world and by the men who are on the high seas in the Navy of the United States, scattered around the entire globe.

Mr. President, I wish to say that in my humble opinion it is a vital mistake even for those who have never subscribed to the principles or the objectives of the T. V. A. to join in responsibility for adopting these amendments, for the moment Senators do so, they must assume responsibility for the management of the project, inasmuch as they will then have relieved the Board of Directors of the T. V. A. of its sole responsibility for management, which it now must fully assume and discharge. By adopting the amendments, the Senate would give the Board of Directors a sound alibi for any future mistake or failure which it might make. I venture to say that if these amendments become law, they will be thrown back into Senators' teeth again and again in the future.

Now I wish to discuss briefly the first amendment. I cannot believe any person who has given consideration to this matter could be in favor of it. The first amendment of substance—I am skipping the pending amendment, which provides for the injection of the word "of" in line 14—appears on page 51, line 17, and proposes to strike out the following words: "Watts Bar steam plant."

Mr. President, the Watts Bar steam plant was specifically authorized by Congress, just as every other dam, power unit, and waterway this great enterprise has constructed has been authorized. It is complete misrepresentation to say that the Congress of the United States has not definitely and specifically authorized by statute every unit of this great system. In the course of that authorization the Congress authorized the construction of the Watts Bar steam plant. Ninety percent of the work on that project will be completed by the end of this fiscal year. Four million dollars of money will have been invested in it. The Watts Bar steam plant has a capacity of 60,000 kilowatts. It is a part of the integral power-development program in connection with the war effort. It has been relied upon by war industries in the Tennessee Valley to provide additional power for the fulfillment of their war contracts. If the majority of the Senate follows the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee and strikes out the provision for the Watts Bar steam plant, it will have to assume responsibility for denying electrical energy needed, necessary, and essential to the war effort in the Tennessee Valley. If in the future on the battle fronts of the world, during the present war effort, there are shortages of materials which could have been manufactured by use of the electrical energy this 60,000-kilowatt plant could have furnished, the responsibility will rest upon the majority of the Senate which votes to adopt the amendment, and to do so after Congress has already authorized construction of the plant, which will be within 90 percent of completion on June 30, 1944. Mr. President, if the Senate adopts this amendment, and fails to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to complete the project, the Senate will have sunk $4,000,000 of the taxpayers' money into a steam-power electric plant which will not be able to turn a wheel or develop a single kilowatt of energy at a time when this Nation is short of electrical energy.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask the Senator how much money is involved in the completion of the Watts Bar steam plant.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot say exactly. If it is within 10 percent of completion, it would be a very rough guess, inasmuch as $4,000,000 has already gone into it——

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. On page 427 of the hearings, Mr. Lilienthal said that the total amount will be approximately $18,000,000 for the entire plant.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, this unit is 90 percent complete, and can well be completed during the next fiscal year.

One other point I wish to make about it is——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. To complete the Watts Bar steam plant, $525,000 will be needed. But the trouble is that the War Production Board has stopped the completion of those steam plants. So it is not necessary for the Congress to appropriate the money for the plant, inasmuch as action toward completion of the plant could not be secured even after the Congress had appropriated the money.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I dislike to differ with the Senator from Tennessee, but my information is that this project was not one of the projects stopped by the War Production Board. It was one of the projects the War Production Board recommended in view of the necessity for the 60,000 additional kilowatts of electrical energy. As a matter of fact, it is only with the approval of the War Production Board that the necessary priorities could have been issued. Otherwise, the necessary materials could not have been obtained. Without the authorization of the War Production Board, construction of the plant would have had to be stopped.

It is true that the War Production Board did stop the construction of the Watauga Dam and some of the other dams which Congress had authorized; but the addition of this 60,000-kilowatt steam plant was specifically recommended by the War Production Board. If the Senate agrees to this amendment, the Senate will be flying in the face of its own authorization, will be flying in the face of the expenditure of $4,000,000 which has already been made thereunder, and will be flying in the face of the recommendation of the War Production Board that this steam unit be completed. Mr. President, I simply cannot believe that the majority of the Senate will indulge in such an action at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the able senior Senator from Wisconsin clarify the figures which have been cited? The Senator said $4,000,000 has already been expended, and we are advised that $18,000,000 will be necessary to be spent in order to complete the plant.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] took the total figure for the projected total units in the future.

Mr. DANAHER. For four units.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But the Watts Bar steam plant is merely one unit which was recommended by the War Production Board, because the War Production Board found, after a careful survey, that it needed this 60,000-kilowatt-capacity plant in order that there should be energy available for war production work in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Can we not be advised with some definiteness as to what amount of money would be necessary to be expended in order to complete this unit?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. According to the Senator from Tennessee, it would cost about $525,000 to complete this single

unit. The figures of the Senator from Connecticut apply to three additional units which have been projected as a part of this project in the future.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin is interested only in this one particular unit at this time?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not interested in it at all personally. I am interested in it only because I feel that it would be a tragic mistake, merely because there may be some feeling against the T. V. A. or some member of its Board, or because there may be Senators who, had they been here in the first place, would not have approved a government enterprise of this character, to take a step at this time which I think the bare facts prove would interfere with the war effort. I wish to emphasize to the able Senator from West Virginia that no alternative power is available.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I did not mean to indicate for a moment any personal interest on the part of the Senator from Wisconsin other than his interest as a Senator and a member of the National Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator arguing for the completion of this one unit, or for the completion of the four units at this time?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am arguing only for the completion of this one unit. That is all that would be involved if the committee amendment were rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, line 14.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as I understand, the pending amendment is to strike out the Watts Bar steam plant.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is on page 51, line 14, after the word "provisions" to insert the word "of."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 51, line 17, after the word "Kentucky" it is proposed to strike out "Watts Bar steam plant; Fort Loudon Dam (including an extension to bring the waters of the Little Tennessee River within the pool of this project)."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, these are separate projects, and should be separately considered. There is a semicolon after the word "plant" in line 18.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate so desires, the items will be divided.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that it is considered desirable by the Senator from Tennessee and others to take a recess at this time until tomorrow. Is there any objection to meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope not, because I am very anxious to get through with this bill. I hope we can meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I presume to answer for myself the inquiry of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. I think it is highly desirable that we proceed with all reasonable expedition in the consideration of this measure and its final disposition. So far as I am concerned, if we take a recess now, which I think is altogether appropriate, I have no objection to meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we should do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, can we not vote on some of these amendments?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there will be some discussion of the other amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have just had discussion of the Watts Bar steam plant. Let us vote on that amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there will be a discussion on each of these amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is nearly 5 o'clock. We cannot conclude consideration of the bill today, and we cannot conclude consideration of the controversial amendments. In view of the fact that we have practically agreed to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow, we might as well take a recess at this time.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4410) to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4410) to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty, and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating Rear Admiral Robert C. Giffen, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Commander of the Caribbean Sea Frontier, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ernest Gruening to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

REGULATION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on February 16 the Senate passed Senate bill 1029, a bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. This measure came to the floor of the Senate from the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was chairman at that time. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] was a member of the subcommittee which had charge of this bill. It had been my intention when the bill came before the Senate to offer certain amendments.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Has the Senator from Wyoming submitted those amendments to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have.

Mr. WHITE. And have they his approval?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They have. I was about to say that while I have not undertaken to present all the amendments which it was my original intention to

present, I recognize that this measure is a substantial contribution to the improvement of the insurance law of the District of Columbia. I have submitted three amendments to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered, in order that these three amendments may be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed are reconsidered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, at the end of line 11, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal existing law prohibiting discrimination in individual risks or classes of risks."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, at this point let me say that I concur in the statement just made by the Senator from Wyoming. He has submitted to me and to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] the three amendments which he has just offered. I believe there is no substantial objection to any one of them, and I am glad to give approval to them. Personally, as the one who reported the bill in the first instance, I believe that the amendment just agreed to is clearly in order, as it preserves the present regulation against discrimination in individual risks or classes of risks, which it was intended to preserve in the first instance. This amendment clarifies the situation.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. This morning I read in the Washington Post that a Member of the House from New Mexico, as I recall, had yesterday brought before the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee in the House a bill dealing with insurance rates in the District of Columbia; that it was the purpose of Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH to call a meeting of the full District Committee in the House to act upon the report of the subcommittee; and that some effort had been made yesterday in the subcommittee in the House to bring up the so-called McCarran bill, which is the bill now under consideration, but that such effort had been blocked.

Is it the purpose of the Senator from Wyoming, by the amendments which he now offers, to render the so-called McCarran bill, Senate bill 1029, in consonance with the bill which is being brought up by the Representative from New Mexico?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not an exactly accurate statement of the facts. The bill brought up by the Representative from New Mexico varies in considerable detail from the bill which was approved by the District of Columbia Committee.

Mr. DANAHER. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not offered any of the changes which were made by the Representative from New Mexico in the House; but unless the bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and approved by the District of Columbia Committee is passed tonight, so that it may be considered in the House, there is grave danger that the valuable work which has been done by the District of Columbia Committee, by the Senator from Nevada and by the Senator from Ohio will go for naught. I desire to offer these perfecting amendments tonight and have the bill passed so that it will be before the District of Columbia Committee of the House tomorrow when it meets.

Mr. DANAHER. So that the Senator's real purpose may be stated thus, as I understand, that the McCarran bill, Senate bill 1029, as amended, will then receive consideration with the bill which is being reported by the subcommittee to the full House Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The next amendment is on page 5, line 15, to strike out the period after the word "proceedings", and insert a comma and the words "and shall file a copy thereof with the superintendent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 19, after the word "District" and the period, to insert "Each member company of the rating bureau shall have one vote in all matters affecting the operation or affairs of the bureau."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in keeping with the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, let me say that these amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming have been considered by both the Senator from Ohio and myself, and we believe they may properly become a part of the bill that is before the Senate at this time, and we hope that the bill may be enacted so that the legislation may become effective as soon as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in this act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"District" means the District of Columbia;

"Superintendent" means the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia;

"Company" means any insurer, whether stock, mutual, reciprocal, interinsurer, Lloyd's, or any other form or group of insurers;

"Agent" means and shall include any individual, copartnership, or corporation acting in the capacity of or licensed as a "policy-writing agent," "soliciting agent," or "salaried company employee," as defined under section 3, chapter I, of the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1064; D. C. Code, 1940 edition, title 35, sec. 1303); and

"Broker" means any person who for a consideration acts or aids in any manner in the solicitation or negotiation on behalf of the assured of contracts of insurance.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall apply to insurance in the District of Columbia against loss of or damage to property or any valuable interest therein by or as a consequence of fire, lightning, tornado, and windstorm, or any one or more of such hazards, including all supplemental, additional, or extended forms of coverage written in connection with fire insurance, and including any policy which insures property, while it is at a permanent location, against the hazard of fire, lightning, tornado, or windstorm; but this act shall not apply to ocean marine, transportation, or motor vehicle insurance, nor to insurance covering the property of interstate common carriers, nor to any form of insurance designated by the superintendent as inland marine insurance.

SEC. 3. The superintendent is empowered to investigate the necessity for an adjustment of the rates on any or all insurance risks within the scope of this act, and to order an adjustment of such rates whenever he determines, after investigation, that the profit derived therefrom for a period of time not less than 5 years immediately preceding such investigation is excessive, inadequate, unjust, or unreasonable. In determining the necessity for an adjustment of rates, the superintendent shall give consideration to the conflagration hazard, both within and without the District. The superintendent is also empowered, after investigation, to order removed, at such time and in such manner as he shall specify, any discrimination existing between individual risks or classes of risks: *Provided,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal existing law prohibiting discrimination in individual risks or classes of risks.

Any person, firm, or corporation aggrieved by any order, ruling, proceeding, or action of the superintendent, or any person acting in his behalf and at his instance, may appeal to the Commissioners of the District, or contest the validity of such order, ruling, proceeding, or action in any court of competent jurisdiction by appeal or through any other appropriate proceedings, as provided under sections 44 and 45 chapter II, Public, No. 824, Seventy-sixth Congress, known as the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1082; D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 35, secs. 1348 and 1349).

SEC. 4. Within 120 days after the approval of this act and under the supervision of the superintendent, the insurance companies authorized to effect insurance in the District against the risk of loss or damage by hazards within the scope of this act shall organize a rating bureau for the purpose of administering rates for such insurance, and all such companies now or hereafter authorized to transact such business in the District shall be members of such bureau. The government of the rating bureau shall be vested in its members and it shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other bureau, association, corporation, company, individual, or group of individuals. The rating bureau shall have power to establish reasonable agreements and bylaws for

its governance, and shall be permitted to adopt reasonable rules and regulations necessary to carry out its functions, but such agreements, bylaws, rules, and regulations shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of this act, and the same and amendments thereto shall be approved by the superintendent before becoming effective. The rating bureau, subject to the approval of the superintendent, shall apportion the expenses of its operation among its members in proportion to the premium income on risks in the District. Each member company of the rating bureau shall have one vote in all matters affecting the operation or affairs of the bureau.

SEC. 5. No company, agent, or broker shall issue or deliver, or offer to issue or deliver, or knowingly permit the issuance or delivery of, any policy of insurance in the District which does not conform to the requirements approved by the superintendent: *Provided, however,* That a company may deviate from such requirements if the company has filed with the rating bureau and with the superintendent the deviation to be applied, and provided such deviation is approved by the superintendent. If approved, the deviation shall remain in force for a period of 1 year from the date of approval by the superintendent, unless such approval is withdrawn by the superintendent, for cause after notice to the insurer, or withdrawn by the insurer with the approval of the superintendent.

It is further provided that a rate in excess of that promulgated by the rating bureau may be charged, provided such higher rate is charged with the knowledge and written consent of the insured and the superintendent.

SEC. 6. The rating bureau shall keep a record of all rates, schedules, and proceedings, and shall file a copy thereof with the superintendent. Every agent shall keep a record of every policy contract issued by or through his agency.

SEC. 7. The superintendent, his deputy, or duly authorized examiner, is authorized and empowered to examine all records of the rating bureau, companies, and agents, and to require every company to furnish promptly accurate written information from such records as will disclose their loss or profit from any class of risk in the district.

SEC. 8. No rate, premium, schedule, rating method, rule, bylaw, agreement, or regulation shall become effective or be charged, applied, or enforced in the district by the rating bureau, or by any company, agent, or broker governed by the provisions of this act, until it shall have been first filed with and approved by the superintendent: *Provided,* That a rate or premium used or charged in accordance with a schedule, rating method, or rule previously approved by the superintendent need not be specifically approved by the superintendent. No company, agent, or broker shall issue any form of policy, clause, warranty, rider, or endorsement until such form shall have been filed with and approved by the superintendent.

SEC. 9. Any company or any agent or broker guilty of violating any of the provisions of this act shall be subject to the provisions of sections 3 and 36, respectively, and as may be amended, of chapter II, Public, No. 824, Seventy-sixth Congress, known as the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1066 and 1079; D. C. Code 1940 ed., title 35, secs. 1306 and 1340).

SEC. 10. All laws or parts of laws, insofar as they relate to business affected hereby and in conflict with any of the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. Should any section or provision of this act be decided by the courts to be unconstitutional or invalid, the validity of the act as a whole, or of any part thereof, other than the part decided to be unconstitutional, shall not be affected.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, after conferring with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] I have decided to move a recess until 11 o'clock Friday next. I, therefore, move that the Senate take a recess until Friday at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, March 24, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

An executive nomination received by the Senate March 22 (legislative day of February 7, 1944):

PROMOTION, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Robert C. Giffen, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 22 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

Ernest Gruening to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be passed assistant surgeon

Harry F. White, Jr.

To be passed assistant sanitary engineer

John S. Wiley

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons

H. Charles Franklin
Robert S. McClintock

To be temporary senior surgeon

Erwin W. Blatter

To be temporary surgeon

William H. Stimson

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Thomas L. Sprague
Allan E. Smith
Robert W. Hayler

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

To be lieutenants, to rank from January 14, 1944

Del L. Young	Wilfred E. Fleshman
Lee J. Delworth	Saleem D. Frey
Jesse L. Holloway	Walter W. Jones, Jr.
Elof W. Hermanson	John E. King
Homer K. Davidson	Clyde C. Sapp
Percy D. Generous	Elmer L. Prescott
Theodore R. Cooley	John D. Fuller, Jr.
Elmo D. Runyan	Westley L. Larson
Clyde B. Lee	Marion C. Kelly
David R. Sword	William F. Gadberry
Hubert W. Fisher	Kenneth F. Shiffer
James Dyer	William W. Gribble
Grant E. Horsley	Forrest A. Lees
Thomas E. Russell	Milford G. Kendall
Richard K. Margetts	Orville L. Beck

To be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from January 14, 1944

John W. Perdue	Joseph B. Simpson
John H. Newcomb	Laurence F. Seaman
Bernard M. Kassell	Joseph C. Lawrence

To be ensigns, to rank from January 14, 1944

Floyd X. Passmore
Raymond E. Dillon

To be passed assistant paymasters with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from January 14, 1944

William C. Humphrey	Arthur W. Shawkey
Edgar M. Brown	Adam P. Mastio
Goff E. Manuel	Creo Baldwin

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from January 14, 1944

Edward J. Hagen	Michael J. Knapp
James E. Corcoran	John L. Warden
Francesco M. Barbero	John A. Keefer
Walter Barsz	Donald F. Kent
Joseph R. Shirley	Lester F. Bevil
Frank S. Bird	John T. Barham
Henry C. Krueger	

To be ensigns, to rank from the date stated opposite their respective names

Harold R. Kellar, Jr., June 3, 1941.
Francis H. McClanan, June 21, 1941.
Forest H. McClanan, June 21, 1941.
Robert J. Beaudine, October 10, 1941.
William B. Troendle, October 16, 1941.

To be assistant surgeon, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from September 8, 1939

Delphos O. Coffman

To be assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their respective names

George T. McCoy, Jr., March 17, 1941.
Clark O. Martin, March 19, 1941.
Francis I. Lundquist, June 16, 1941.
Bryant W. Russell, September 24, 1941.
Edgar R. Bryant, September 24, 1941.
Robert O. Dodd, Jr., February 13, 1943.
Calvin A. Vobroucek, March 15, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Joshua T. Wilkinson, Charlton City.

NORTH DAKOTA

Forrest C. Cowles, Ellendale.

WASHINGTON

Edmond Paul Hennessey, Everett.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Throne of grace and mystery, about which are clouds and darkness, we bring our strivings and yearnings, seeking help and mercy in our need. Touch our immortal souls with seraphic fire and make manifest unto us the innermost depths of the divine. Bring Thy hallowed presence most clearly to our apprehension that we may know that there is in Thy heart a place and a refuge for every human soul in every time of storm.

Our Father, we seek understanding and vision; lead us through these hard days, braving every ignoble act and temper. Let the sentiments of love and confidence spring up along our way, rejoicing that Thy word is as strong as the hand which built the skies. We would not resign ourselves to sadness and gloom, but rather vanish these moods of the night and walk in the day. Thou who dost ask

for the glorified realities of true character and sincere deeds of virtue, help us to stand distinct as the star from the firmament and as a rainbow from the cloud. Make us mindful of those silent forces—the example that has no voice; the common deed that eludes, weighs, and measures; and that precious influence that is as telling and mysterious as the being of man; thus we shall serve our country and bless our generation. In Thy holy name and for Thy sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to provide for appropriate commemoration of the Centennial of the Telegraph on May 24, 1944.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH B. EASTMAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a short statement from the Herald Tribune, of New York, and that it may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KENNEDY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the regular business of the day and any previous special orders heretofore granted, my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] may address the House for 30 minutes on March 30 next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FARM PLAN FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the farmers who resides in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent has sent to me a card which he received from the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, in which it states:

Your Government is calling on you to produce the most necessary crops in 1944.

Then the card gives the time and place of a proposed meeting which is to be held in that locality for the purpose, as stated, of completing your "1944 farm plan."

Then this card recites the following:

Remember the Axis is watching whether we farmers are working in unity to produce the foods that will win the war.

A recent ruling provides that future nonhighway gasoline allotments will be based on your completing this farm plan.

I understand similar cards have been sent to farmers throughout that section.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Department of our Government is not going to penalize our people by taking their gasoline allotment away if they fail to join the farm plan which the A. A. A. is promoting. A threat of this kind is unnecessary, and it is not in accord with our policy of government, either in time of war or in peace. Under this policy if a farmer asserts his independence he is to be penalized by having his gasoline allotment revoked. This policy must cease. This is the United States of America!

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include three letters concerning the mint industry in my district and southern Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. L. Metcalfe Walling, of the Wage, Hour, and Contracts Division of the Department of Labor, out of fairness to Mr. Walling. On December 14, 1943, I placed in the RECORD a letter from a department store calling attention to the efforts of the Wage and Hour Division to bring such stores under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a joint resolution of the Vermont Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very interesting article from the Boston Herald of March 7.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VASSEURE H. WYNN

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, a boy, who a short time ago was a page in the House of Representatives, has established a wonderful record as a flying ace in the Air Forces of Canada, Great Britain, and of the United States in Malta, England, and over Germany. I think it would be interesting to the membership of the House, and especially to the pages who are now serving in the House, to read the record of this boy's accomplishments.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Atlanta Journal of March 19, 1944, giving an account of the distinguished achievements of this young man, V. H. Wynn, who happens to hail from my home city of Dalton, Ga.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

DALTON LIEUTENANT IS ONLY GEORGIA ACE IN BRITAIN—VASSEURE H. WYNN NOW FLYING FIGHTERS IN ESCORTED-BOMBER RAIDS ON GERMANY

(By Wright Bryan)

AMERICAN FIGHTER BASE SOMEWHERE IN ENGLAND, March 17.—"Now, tell this thing straight," said First Lt. Vasseure H. (Georgia) Wynn, of Dalton, Ga. "One fellow talked to me and then wrote a story so flowery I couldn't recognize myself or anything I'd done. I sure hope none of my friends in the Air Corps ever get hold of that story. They would never give me another minute's peace."

So I will tell it straight. And that's all right, too. It is good enough not to need embellishment. Here it is:

Lieutenant Wynn is the only Georgian among the list of more than 60 fighter aces in the European theater of operations.

His record shows six German planes definitely destroyed, three probably destroyed, and two damaged.

He enlisted in the Royal Canadian Air Force in March 1941 and flew at Malta with the British and Canadians.

His outfit took off from a carrier and flew from somewhere in the Mediterranean to Malta when that island was partly isolated and being constantly pounded by Nazis.

Three of his definitely destroyed Jerries, and the three probables and two damaged, he got while helping defend Malta.

He returned from Malta to England in December of 1942, served 5 months as instructor in an R. A. F. operational training unit, and transferred to the American Eighth Air Force June 1943.

NOW AN ESCORT FLYER

Now he is helping escort American Flying Fortresses and Liberators on their deepest penetrations into Germany.

Since transferring to our own Air Force he has downed three more Jerries.

His group got 13 Thursday, and Wynn is fussing because he did not get to go along on that show.

Many pilots in his group were members of Eagle Squadron of the R. A. F. before their transfer to the United States Army Air Forces. Like himself, they wear the R. A. F. wings on the right side of their blouses and American wings on the left side.

Early in his service with the R. C. A. F. he won the nickname "Georgia." Today he wears the name Georgia Wynn in big letters on his leather jacket, and nobody calls him anything but Georgia.

He has fought in British Spitfires and American Thunderbolts, but now his group uses P-5 Mustangs, long-range fighters which combine the best thought of British and American designers and the best efforts of American manufacturers to produce a plane capable of escorting heavy bombers all the way to Berlin.

Georgia considers the Mustang the best plane he ever flew.

His group is stationed at one of the permanent bases which the R. A. F. turned over to Americans. By comparison with the Nissen-hutted bases, it is luxurious, and Georgia calls it the country club of ETO.

ONCE SHOT DOWN

Georgia was shot down once in Malta. There were 15 machine-gun holes in his plane. One through the cockpit got him in the leg. He crash-landed and soon was fighting again.

He wears no Purple Heart, because that was when he was in British service, but he wears the American Air Medal with three clusters and the Distinguished Flying Cross.

Thirty-two pilots went with him to Malta, and nine came back.

He attended Dalton High School and went to Washington with Congressman MALCOLM TARVER as a page in the House of Representatives, later working 2 years in the F. B. I. and 2 years in the United States Department of Agriculture. He learned to fly in Washington and had 150 hours in light planes before joining the Canadians.

His mother is Mrs. Willie Loy Wynn, 2 McAfee Street, Dalton.

And that, without embellishment—as he would wish—is the story of Georgia Wynn.

RESTORATION OF THE TWO-THIRDS RULE IN THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, while I know that the vast majority of our colleagues regard the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] on the floor of the House yesterday in my absence in which he took me to task for advocating the restoration of the two-thirds rule governing the nomination of the Democratic nominations for the Presidency and Vice Presidency to be too inconsequential to merit attention, still I must not let the gentleman's words pass without saying to him that in setting himself up as a censor of the conduct of his fellows he hazards the risk of having the bladder upon which he swims punctured; besides he might be called upon to furnish some of his own hair for his own bite. The gentleman perhaps seized the incident in order to advertise the fact that accidents continue to happen. He tells us that he is a delegate to the next Democratic National Convention. I should like to say to the gentleman that when the Democratic Party is driven to the extremity, if it is ever driven to such extremity, of looking to him for guidance that it will then be so completely bankrupt as to be beyond all hope of repair. The gentleman includes me in an honorable company and derisively calls us Pharisees. Obviously, the gentleman is not a Pharisee. He is exclusive—for the time being. I shall not deflate the gentleman's bloated conceit, for it is probably his sole source of happiness as well as the cause for his delusions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of including a statement by Thomas B. Freeman, president of Butler Bros., of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 4219.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a letter sent to the Office of Price Administration by the Laundry Board of Trade of Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESTORATION OF THE TWO-THIRDS RULE IN THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not set myself up as a censor for the Democratic Party, but I do lose patience when a gentleman states he wants to have the Democratic Party go forward and make progress by going backward and restoring the two-thirds rule. I assure the gentleman that he is simply affording good grist for the mill of a lot of disgruntled, frustrated, crotchety, "old-maidenlike" men such as Harry Woodring, former Congressman John J. O'Connor, and former Senator Reed, when he advocates the restoration of the two-thirds rule. In common parlance it is merely a stop-Roosevelt movement, and Roosevelt will not be stopped because he will be elected a fourth-term President of the United States.

Under extension of my remarks, I wish to state:

As to bankruptcy, the men mentioned, to whom the gentleman from Georgia gives great comfort, assuredly would bring our glorious party to the low ebb of bankruptcy. The gentleman from Georgia seems exercised over my adverse comments. That is proof positive that they have merit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Wall Street Journal dealing with O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LLOYD L. JOHNSON AND P. B. HUME

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3157) for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,000."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE GEILER

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2743) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,577.75" and insert "$5,000."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES J. GOFF

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Charles J. Goff, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "Idaho", insert "as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff, as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE WAVERLY MORGAN

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read (H. Res. 480) as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 166 Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Indian Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation or any part

thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include an editorial by Hon. Chester H. Rowell, editor in chief of the San Francisco Examiner; and in the second to include an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee, the Fresno Bee, and the Modesto Bee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds of his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the Tri-County News, of South Bend., Ind., circulated in Michigan and Indiana, in the issue of January 27, 1944, there was printed the following:

Resolved, That the St. Joseph County Industrial Union Council of the C. I. O., hereby goes on record denouncing CLARE HOFFMAN as a traitor to our Nation, and that the council demands of the Department of Justice to place CLARE HOFFMAN under indictment as a violator of the Espionage Act of our Government.

The statement reflects upon the integrity and the patriotism in his official capacity of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and raises the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states a question of personal privilege and is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The resolution adopted by the St. Joseph County Industrial Council of the C. I. O. is so absurd, so venomous, but so characteristic of the methods of the Communists, who apparently rule the C. I. O.'s political activities, that it needs no answer.

Similar false charges were circulated throughout the district prior to the November 1942 election by the C. I. O. organization in a 12-page pamphlet.

The people of the district, many of whom have known me intimately for years, gave the C. I. O. its answer when 69 percent of the voters cast ballots for my reelection.

Let me turn now for a moment to one of the political allies of the C. I. O., the commentator Walter Winchell, and answer his charge and the charge of PM, Marshall Field's smear publication, that I would suppress free speech.

OH, HOW HE CRIES!

Yesterday, March 21, an article appeared in Marshall Field's PM captioned, "Unfair attack on Winchell threatens freedom of press."

Many of us long have known that Winchell and PM were yellow and both reach the height of absurdity when they squawk about unfair attacks upon either.

For years, Winchell has been smirching decent, law-abiding, patriotic citizens and his sponsors, the Jergens Co., have paid him for doing it. He has pried into the private lives of inoffensive people; he has spread scandal and gossip—much of it false—over the radio and through his column, until the name of Walter Winchell and the name of his sponsor, the Jergens Co., have become known throughout the land as synonyms for dirty, malicious, and usually false charges.

While Winchell was wearing the uniform of the United States Navy, his conduct became so offensive to so many Americans that the administration was forced to strip him of his uniform, of his pay, of his duties; but to the disgrace of the Navy be it said, it retained him as a Reserve officer.

Over the air, sponsored by the Jergens Co., Winchell made many statements which, either directly or by innuendo, charged Members of Congress with disloyalty. He has repeatedly attempted to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives.

The article in PM contains this statement:

The concerted attack on Walter Winchell by a few Congressmen, notably CLARE HOFFMAN, has reached incredible depths of infamy. The significance of this attack is deeply disturbing to those who cherish democratic institutions. It tends to degrade the dignity of Congress, which should stand as the foremost symbol of representative democracy. It is a direct threat to freedom of speech and of the press.

The article also contains the following statement, and I quote:

The second anti-Winchell speech of March 16 was made by CLARE HOFFMAN. It not only attacks Winchell but his sponsor, the Jergens Co. It is a dirty, despicable effort to drive Winchell off the air by subjecting his sponsor to congressional pressure.

"Why," HOFFMAN asks, "does Jergens keep Winchell on his pay roll? Has Jergens something to hide? Winchell once made the statement, in substance, 'orchids to Jergens for his exposure of Nazi spies.'

"I would like to have Winchell come before a committee of Congress and explain just what he meant by that statement, a statement apparently simple on its face—what is there hiding behind it?"

It's a fine pass we've come to, when a Congressman recommends an investigation against a firm "accused" of anti-Nazi activity and which dares sponsor an anti-Nazi broadcaster.

What an absurdity for Winchell, who over the years has made thousands of statements which tended to disgrace and humiliate good citizens, to, when the falsity of his statements, the harmful effect of his utterances is pointed out, complain about a denial of free speech.

Perhaps no one has ever more extensively used and abused a free press, the freedom of speech, than has Walter Winchell.

Those who would smirch Members of Congress, destroy the people's confidence in their chosen representatives, intimidate and silence all opponents of the New Deal and the Communists, are now the first to cry, whimper, and whine when their hypocrisy is exposed; when their own words and actions are given the acid test of publicity, when their true purpose and character stand revealed.

Winchell and PM charge that some Members of Congress—and my own name is one of those mentioned—are attempting to suppress free speech, demanding that Winchell be taken off the air.

It is not my desire to limit free speech or a free press. My only demand has been that Winchell, in his public utterances, confine himself, when he makes statements purporting to be fact, to statements of fact; that he cease to falsely accuse not only Members of Congress but all citizens of disloyalty; that he avoid false accusations, which tend to create race prejudice, disunity, discourage our men in the service and lower their morale.

And let the Blue Network and Winchell quit changing his scripts. Not long ago, referring to me, he made a vile, indecent and false statement over the radio; but, in the written transcript of that broadcast, that statement was omitted. But the transcription of the spoken word shows that he uttered that vile and indecent slander.

What must be the state of mind of a man who will pollute the air of our country with that kind of a statement? I know it may please the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY], who is laughing, and it may please the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS], who is also laughing, but let me tell you, the decent, respectable citizens of our country condemn that kind of a statement. They are horrified by it and they are resentful that such statements are made.

Let me repeat the last sentence of the article in PM. It is this:

It's a fine pass we've come to when a Congressman recommends an investigation against a firm "accused" of anti-Nazi activity and which dares to sponsor an anti-Nazi broadcaster.

There is a fair sample of how Winchell and PM twist words, attempt to create an impression which is untrue.

That paragraph is a charge that a Congressman has demanded an investigation of a firm, namely, the Jergens Co., which has been engaged in anti-Nazi activity and which sponsors Winchell, an anti-Nazi broadcaster.

What are the facts?

Winchell, who claims to be the Nation's No. 1 reporter, who on Sunday night addresses "Mr. and Mrs. North America and South America and our men overseas," ought to know a few of the facts about his sponsor and his sponsor's activities.

Time and again, Winchell has intimated that he is a buddy of J. Edgar Hoover; that he has access to the confidential files of the Department of Justice, of the F. B. I.

Yesterday came a letter from J. Edgar Hoover, which reads as follows:

My attention has been directed to your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 16 and I received a specific inquiry regarding the following statement appearing on page A1342:

"Perhaps Jergens, if he took the stand, might disclose that the F. B. I., under J. E. Hoover, has in its files information to which Winchell has access, and might show that Jergens associated with individuals who were much closer to the Nazis than any of those who have been indicted for sedition."

I note, of course, that your statement was made in a conjectural manner, yet I wanted you to know the facts, and the facts are that no one outside of the official staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has access to its files. Any statement to the effect that a commentator has access to the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is wholly unjustified and is not based on fact.

Mr. Hoover, however, failed to state that there was not in the F. B. I. files information which might show that Jergens associated with individuals who were much closer to the Nazis than any of those who have been indicted for sedition.

Nor did he write that Winchell does not have access to information which would show that Jergens associated with such individuals.

In view of the fact that Winchell time and again has by innuendo, if not directly, created the impression that he was a buddy of Hoover, that he did have access to information in the F. B. I. files or in the files of the Department of Justice, would it not be in the public interest for Hoover and for Biddle to state, emphatically and without equivocation, that, so far as they know, Winchell has no opportunity to get confidential information or information of any kind from the files of either organization or from any agent or representative of either?

That letter should dispose of Winchell's oft-repeated claim that he has a pipe line into the F. B. I. offices.

Winchell has claimed credit for the indictment of the thirty-odd so-called seditionists. He, apparently acting in conjunction with William Power Maloney, who was later branded as a pettifogging shyster by the United States Supreme Court, made to the country many statements which intimated that those who had been three times arrested but not yet tried were guilty of sedition. He falsely charged that Members of Congress were guilty of sedition.

Winchell has falsely charged that Members of Congress delayed the trial of those indicted. He has falsely charged that Members of Congress claimed that those who were so indicted were innocent.

It is undoubtedly true that some of those who have been indicted are guilty of some criminal offense, for some of them have been tried and convicted.

Winchell, Sunday night, complained bitterly because the head of the Dies committee had not, before exposing his activities on the floor of the House, given him an opportunity to be heard.

The right to be confronted with witnesses, the right to cross-examine, is given to every individual when tried before any court. That right is not given to people who are under investigation.

And who is Winchell and what has been his conduct that he should complain because he was not first given a hearing, confronted by the witnesses? When did Winchell ever, during his long course of vilification and scandalmongering, ever give any of his victims an opportunity to state their side of the case before he went on the air slandering or libeling them or printed his column in the public press?

Winchell should be the last to complain that he has not been given a fair trial. Winchell is yellow. And when he sees exposure coming he hides behind the Constitution, the protection of which he had denied to hundreds of citizens.

Oh, yes; Winchell claims that he is an anti-Nazi broadcaster. Like a hound pup on the trail of a rabbit, Winchell has been pounding those arrested and charged with sedition day after day, week after week, and month after month, but of the activity and conviction of some real Nazi agents, of some Nazi sponsors, he has been as silent as the grave.

Is he blackmailing someone? Or is he in sympathy with the methods of these Nazis?

Here are a few questions which the people of this country would be glad to have Walter Winchell and PM answer, and, may I add, Andrew Jergens can add his answer:

Did Andrew Jergens have in his employ one or two or more persons who were charged with aiding, abetting, or conspiring with Nazi agents?

Was not one of the employees, a confidential employee of Andrew Jergens, president of the Jergens Co., the sponsor of Walter Winchell, charged with and convicted of a Federal offense, the gist of which was either sedition, espionage, or misprision of treason?

Was not a confidential employee of Andrew Jergens convicted of a Federal offense and sentenced to prison?

Was not another confidential employee of the said Andrew Jergens guilty of conduct which required and resulted in her internment or incarceration in a Federal prison?

Is not Andrew Jergens at the present time engaged in an effort to have one of the individuals referred to above released from Federal or Army custody?

Has not Walter Winchell for months known that two of the confidential employees of Andrew Jergens, president of his sponsor, the Jergens Co., or employees of that company, have been charged with disloyalty—one convicted and one interned?

And while questions are being asked, for good measure let me ask the Department of Justice as well as Winchell and Andrew Jergens if it is not true that at least one of Jergens' confidential employees did either give aid to or conspire with some or all of the six saboteurs who were executed?

When will the Department of Justice or the F. B. I., if it has knowledge thereof, bring the files with reference to the two individuals referred to above before the Dies committee and let "Mr. and Mrs. North and South America and our men overseas" know the facts?

When next Winchell starts a broadcast with "Good evening, Mr. and Mrs. North and South America and our men overseas," let him tell the overseas men whether or not he covered up these two Nazi agents.

Has "your grateful New York correspondent," as he terms himself, been ignorant of the apprehension, arrest, and confinement of two of Jergens' confidential employees?

Or am I just dreaming that something of that kind happened?

Has the great sedition hunter, Walter Winchell, been covering up a real Nazi agent?

Come now, Walter, you are being asked, not for a suppression of free speech; you are being asked to talk, and for once in your life to tell the truth. What, if anything, do you know about the incidents referred to above?

Inasmuch as Winchell is at times rather evasive, apt to stray from the point at issue, and as PM has characterized Winchell as an "anti-Nazi broadcaster" and Jergens as a firm engaged in "anti-Nazi activity," perhaps a few memory-refreshing suggestions may help Mr. Jergens and Mr. Winchell in their efforts to give the public some information.

One Elfrieda Margaret Siddell was Jergens' personal secretary, or an employee graduating to that position from an upstairs maid post in his home. As his secretary, she accompanied Jergens on various trips about the country and to his homes in Florida and California.

In 1942 she was arrested by agents of the F. B. I. as a German enemy alien. Jergens is not a German, but of Danish descent.

It was learned that she had hired as a maid in the Miami Beach home of Jergens one Hedwig Engemann, 34 years of age, formerly of 238 East Eighty-sixth Street, New York City.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that hotel the gentleman mentioned there in Miami the one that Walter Winchell occupies when he is down in Miami? Does the gentleman have any information on that fact?

Mr. HOFFMAN. My relation with Mr. Winchell is not of a personal nature.

Miss Engemann was arrested about the time of the capture of the eight Nazi saboteurs who landed here from a submarine in the summer of 1942, and six of whom were afterward executed for sabotage.

Miss Engemann was shown to have aided Edward John Kerling, one of the eight. He was executed and Miss Engemann pleaded guilty in a New York court to a charge of misprision of treason.

Have you heard Winchell saying anything about that? He is after these folks down town here, and I hold no brief for them. I do not say they are guilty or innocent; I do not know anything about

that. But here is a woman who was convicted. She was employed by Winchell's sponsor. Why did he not mention it? Is he blackmailing Jergens? Is he exposing the Nazis? Is he telling about what they are doing, or is he just covering up?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. This lady, Miss Engemann, the gentleman spoke about and the address he gave happens to be in my congressional district. As I remember, when that young lady was arrested, her brother, who was about to be drafted, came to see me. He operated a delicatessen store in the neighborhood for many years, and seemed deeply concerned about the activities of his sister.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech. If the gentleman wants to ask a question, all right.

Mr. KENNEDY. This girl had been employed in her brother's delicatessen store for many years, and her brother seemed and claimed he knew nothing about her activities outside the store. Whether or not she worked for Jergens in addition to working for her brother, I do not know. But, as a matter of fact, I know she lived and worked right in that neighborhood and in the delicatessen store for several years. I do not think she could have been in the employ of Jergens during those years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All that does not prove that she was not employed by Jergens. The committee can bring Mr. Jergens down here, and he can testify under oath, and we will find out all about it. The gentleman does not deny that she was employed by Jergens?

Treason is defined to be—

Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason.

Misprision of treason is defined to be—

Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and make known the same to the President or to some judge of the United States, or to the Governor or to some judge or justice of a particular State, is guilty of misprision of treason.

After a somewhat lengthy hearing in Cincinnati, Miss Siddell was ordered interned and has ever since been so confined.

Jergens made strenuous efforts to prevent her detention, describing her at one time as "the finest woman I have ever known." He sent her clothing while she was confined in jail and at times called her over the long-distance phone.

It has been charged that Jergens offered money to an individual in the Department of Justice, not to help exonerate Miss Siddell, but to have her held in a hotel suite during her hearing, instead of being held in jail.

It is now reported that Jergens has started action to have Miss Siddell released from the internment camp.

I have been advised by reliable sources that the records which prove this story have been withheld from Congress on the ground that to make disclosure of their contents would be "contrary to the public interest." Later, it was said that the files had been loaned to Jergens' attorney.

It has also been charged that, while the hearing was in progress in Cincinnati, Jergens was greatly concerned about what Winchell, his employee, would say, and in substance, stated, "I wonder what Winchell will say about this."

At that time Winchell was away on a South American "mission" for the Navy. Upon his return his only mention of this incident, so far as I have been able to learn, was to congratulate his sponsor for helping to apprehend an alien enemy.

As to whether Jergens appealed to Winchell for this so-called cover-up, probably only Winchell or Jergens can give the true answer. In any event, Winchell has been silent about Jergens' connection with his two employees, one of whom, as stated, entered a plea of guilty of misprision of treason and the other was found guilty of conduct which required her internment.

It is quite true that the story about Miss Engemann and her associations with Kerling, one of the executed Nazis, has been published in connection with their trial, but her employment in the Jergens home has, so far as I know, not been mentioned.

Suppose Mrs. Dilling or any one of the others accused of sedition had employed a person who was convicted of misprision of treason. How Winchell would have torn the air with his denunciations.

Can it be that his retention on the air at a fee of $5,000 for approximately 15 minutes is the price of his silence? And why is it that in his broadcasts Winchell has never, so far as I have been able to learn, mentioned the name of Miss Siddell? Why is it that his column has not carried a reference to her pro-Nazi activities?

No; Winchell confines his abuse, his vilification, to those who have been accused of sedition, to Members of Congress, to the denunciation of Congress as the "House of Reprehensibles." He characterized twenty-odd million citizens as being "damned fools."

Yet Winchell is carried on the Navy lists as a Reserve officer. Is it not about time that the Navy purge its organization of this man?

Is it not time that Winchell and Jergens be called before some committee of the House; that the publishers of PM be called and be made to tell what is back of their smear campaign, their efforts to discredit the people's representatives, and to disclose as well the source from which they derive the funds to carry on their campaign of dissension?

The record seems to show that Winchell's sponsor, Jergens, was the employer of at least one Nazi agent who entered a plea of guilty to a charge of misprision of treason.

If Winchell will confine himself to the washing of his own and Jergens' dirty linen, he will be busy for some time. He might ask the aid of J. Edgar Hoover, of the Department of Justice.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

MARCH 22, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees of the House: Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Labor, Public Buildings and Grounds, the Public Lands, and the Territories.

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE E. OUTLAND.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMEMORATION OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE TELEGRAPH

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 72, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee to Provide for Appropriate Commemoration of the Centennial of the Telegraph the following Members of the House: Mr. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; Mr. LEA, of California; Mr. MYERS, of Pennsylvania; Miss STANLEY, of New York; Mr. ROHRBOUGH, of West Virginia.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 469), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4381, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "exceed", strike out the words "one hour" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two hours."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

ELK HILLS NAVAL OIL RESERVE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3961, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Yesterday, at the conclusion of the session of the Committee, debate on the pending amendment was limited to 20 minutes. At that time a number of Members were on their feet asking recognition. The Chair will read the names of the Members who will be recognized on the pending amendment: Mr. WICKERSHAM, Mr. HARE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana, Mr. HILL, Mr. CASE, Mr. LEMKE, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. DWORSHAK, and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the 20 minutes to which debate has been limited on this amendment, divided among the Members whose names the Chair has just read, would not give over 2 or 3 minutes to each Member, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the pending amendment be extended so that each Member listed may have 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the Members who were on their feet yesterday and whose names the Chair has just read be given 5 minutes each to speak on the pending amendment. This would extend the time to 60 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. This is an issue that was debated fully on the floor yesterday, and it appears that every argument that might be advanced was advanced, and there has been considerable time already spent on this bill, on this particular issue.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman states that this has been fully debated. The gentleman means probably by only the proponents of the amendment. Only one Member spoke of that, and I do not think the gentleman ought to contend that that is so; and if he will reflect, I think he will not do so.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will remember, an amendment similar to this amendment was debated at length, and was voted down by this House. There was full discussion. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move that Committee of the Whole allow 5 minutes to each Member named by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The House has already determined that by unanimous consent, and that can only be changed by unanimous consent of the House. The motion is not in order.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet yesterday, although my name does not appear there.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name is on the list.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HILL. I was on my feet yesterday at the time the Chair says that this was done by unanimous consent. I suggest that it was not done by unanimous consent and as far as my memory is concerned it was done by motion, and I think that motion should be amended now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. It was agreed to yesterday by a motion, but the motion can only be amended by unanimous consent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] for a minute and a half.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this is such an important amendment, to all the people of the United States, because, after all, food is our most important product, that debate upon it ought not to be limited to a minute and a half. I am in favor of the amendment. We have in Idaho, and in all of these Western States, a demand for water and need for water for reclamation. This use is paramount. I am in full support of the provisions of our State constitution which establishes a priority to premises for use of water in Idaho streams and lakes, and following that, first comes domestic use, and I don't think any Member of this House would consent to take water away from domestic use in cities and towns, and when it comes to production of food, I don't think any Member would take water off the land for the purpose of navigation. This amendment will not disturb navigation. Navigation improvements simply deepen the flow of water by deepening the channel and retarding the flow of the stream.

The use of the waters of the streams of Idaho, in fact of all the Western States, is vital to our farming industry—an industry that provides the eastern manufacturers with one of their best markets.

If navigation of our western streams would take one drop of water away from our irrigated farms or give preference over the future use of water for the irrigation of new lands in any of our Western States, I should be against this bill.

The proposed navigation projects on the Snake River in Idaho are fortunately located. All the water of the Snake River upstream tributary to the irrigable lands can be used for irrigation without being needed for navigation below Lewiston. The two larger tributaries flowing into the Snake River frame the rugged mountainous section of central Idaho. The Clearwater and Salmon Rivers, which can in no way be used for irrigation, will supply more than enough water to provide for river navigation below Lewiston, as confirmed in a telegram just received from the district Army engineer, which telegram is inserted herewith:

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 17, 1944.*

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference is made to your request for further data on stream flow on lower Snake River. Records at Weiser for the period 1930 to 1940, inclusive, show low flow to be approximately 6,600 cubic feet per second: Ninety percent of the time flow exceeds 8,500 cubic feet per second, and 75 percent of the time it exceeds 10,000 cubic feet per second. At Riparia low flow is 11,000 cubic feet per second; 90 percent of the time flow exceeds 15,200 cubic feet per second, and 75 percent of the time it exceeds 18,300 cubic feet per second. Flow required to provide slack-water navigation, when all dams are built, will be less than 1,000 cubic feet per second. Either the Clearwater or Salmon River provides, at all times, flow in excess of this minimum amount.

TUDOR, *District Engineer.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] for a minute and a half.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, it was suggested a moment ago that a similar amendment to this bill had been acted upon and voted down in the House. I call attention to the fact that this amendment is dissimilar in a fundamental respect to every amendment acted on yesterday. The last few words of this amendment refer to control of water under the laws of the State, and that is what I want to emphasize. This amendment classifies beneficial uses in the order they are classified by State law and makes State law on water prevail in that region.

Out in the West, water is of great importance. In the arid and semiarid regions our streams are not actually navigable, and we feel that there State law should prevail. In fact our own State constitution provides, in the fundamental law for water usage, and that recognition is contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah. I feel that this amendment should be incorporated for our protection, and I ask that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, there is no use trying to say anything about this subject in a minute and a half. I am very sorry that the House saw fit to cut off this debate, because a good many

from the irrigated sections have had no chance to discuss the idea that this water belongs to the State where it rises, regardless of what the folks downstream think about it. Let me read what was said yesterday by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL]:

So, if you have any respect or consideration for the common law of your country, you are bound to agree with me when I say that if there is a dispute as to whether there is enough water, you know it must go to those cities which have their rights long established by custom and usage.

And that simply means that all this irrigated territory that we have developed, all these farms, whose title includes title to water, must permit this water to go down to Mr. BELL'S folks, while our folks can see their crops destroyed by dry weather, and there will be little food for people down the river.

The rivers and harbors authorization bill (H. R. 3961), which is before the House of Representatives for consideration, sets a pattern of future development for some of the major rivers of the Nation. It accomplishes even more, if passed and approved without amendment, for it would enact into law principles which seriously jeopardize the control under State laws of a limited water supply needed in arid regions for continued irrigated agricultural development. It dedicates for all time to come the waters of certain great river basins for a particular use without just and reasonable recognition of other uses. It invokes congressional approval for such development without adequate coordination of studies and investigations designed to present a plan which would preserve in fair balance and in the highest possible degree all uses of water. It shapes the future economy which is related to a great natural resource.

In the consideration of such legislation there is no place for partisanship. It is too important to indulge in measures of expediency. And, surely, in such matters there is no place to spar for advantage.

Everyone supports the desirability of improving the highways of water traffic; but there is real objection to legislation which assures improved navigation through drastic curtailment of other uses of the waters of a river system. Any legislation which authorizes navigation projects commanding the entire water supplies of a river system for the one purpose, establishes a yardstick of control which rules out for all time any future irrigation development.

The great rivers west of the Mississippi have their sources and flow through areas where irrigation is essential to agriculture. Irrigation is the basis, the measure, and the limit of economic development of that inland region.

To demonstrate the inherent dangers to present and future irrigation found in H. R. 3961, reference is made to the authorization of the development of navigation on the Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth; House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress. The import of this authorization cannot be understood without reference to the House document mentioned. An examination of this document leads to other House documents which become part of the law when referred to in a bill passed by Congress.

Page 199, paragraph 495, House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, referring to navigation development on the Missouri River, reads thus:

The results of the study contained in Appendix XI indicate that a channel of between 8 and 9 feet can be obtained, by the present method of open channel regulation, in the section from Kansas City to Hermann, with a discharge of 35,000 second-feet at Kansas City.

Page 242, paragraph 673, House Document No. 238. Seventy-third Congress, states:

Several methods for the provision of a greater depth than 6 feet for future navigation have been given consideration. A navigable channel of between 8 and 9 feet in depth could be obtained by the method of open channel regulation described in paragraph 666, with a discharge of 30,000 second-feet at Yankton. This discharge could be maintained by enlarging the Fort Peck Reservoir to a capacity of 17,000,000 acre-feet which would involve a total cost of $84,155,000.

The meaning of this harmless-appearing authorization language is further supported by the committee report on H. R. 3961, which construes this language in the bill as embracing improvements for a channel of 9-foot depth and a width of not less than 300 feet between Sioux City and the mouth of the river.

To appraise the effect of such a navigation development on other uses or proposed uses of Missouri River water, it is only necessary to examine the figures on the annual water supply of this river. The records of the United States Geological Survey disclose that the average annual flow of the river at Kansas City during the last 14 years is 32,520 cubic feet.

Thus with proper regulation of flood flows, it is proposed by H. R. 3961 to construct public works for navigation which will command and substantially utilize all of the Missouri River flow for this one purpose. Such a program would not only thwart future irrigation development in the upper basin but would seriously threaten present consumptive uses of water which have been built up under State laws over many years.

Congress exercises its control over navigation and makes authorizations for navigation improvements under the provisions of the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution. In the absence of congressional enactment to the contrary, the authorization for navigation improvement imposes a Federal control of the water resource involved which transcends State laws governing the appropriation and distribution of water for irrigation, domestic, and industrial purposes. Although the power of Congress is plenary in fixing the conditions for water use for navigation, H. R. 3961 contains no language which protects the present and future uses for beneficial and consumptive purposes in the upper basin. Therefore, the navigation improvement proposed by this bill dedicates the waters of the Missouri to navigation to the exclusion of other uses, not only by virtue of the physical works planned but by the imposition of Federal jurisdiction over these waters.

The interests of navigation and irrigation and other uses of waters of a river system may be coordinated and often such uses may be mutual in a large degree; but H. R. 3961 neither coordinates nor paves the way for an orderly evaluation and protection in the highest degree possible of these various water uses.

Therefore, to protect the domestic irrigation and industrial water users of the Nation in the river basins affected by this proposed legislation, appropriate amendments should be inserted for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin said as I was getting up, "We are dealing here with the case of minority rights."

Mr. KEEFE. Riparian rights.

Mr. CASE. Very well, riparian rights, but I will change it to minority rights. We are dealing with the rights of the Western States, which have a minority as far as population is concerned. I hold in my hand a compilation of a report and recommendations made by a committee of the National Reclamation Association. This committee had representatives from 15 Western States. Recommendation No. 1 is, and I am reading from the text, that the control and regulation and utilization of water in the arid and semiarid area of the United States be in accordance with the principle that the highest use shall be for domestic consumption and for growing crops, and that the multiple-use or power projects shall be so designed and operated that domestic or irrigation use at all times be paramount to the requirements of hydroelectric-energy production, and that the imposition of Federal jurisdiction under the commerce clause to maintain navigable capacity and regulate floods in lower reaches of rivers having their source in the arid and semiarid regions, should recognize the maximum use of water for irrigation purposes.

I urge the House to recognize this petition of the Western States. The power of Congress, the power of the Federal Government to regulate commerce between the States is admitted. The pending amendment simply proposes that in regulating the use of interstate streams west of the ninety-seventh meridian, the provisions of State laws be recognized in certain particulars. It is not an attempt to amend the Constitution by a simple act of Congress; it is merely an exercise of the constitutional power over commerce. The Robinson amendment merely proposes that we regulate the commerce on certain waters in a certain way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, no one respects the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee more than I do. No one has a higher regard for the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] than I have. But that respect and admiration ends when it becomes a question that affects the Nation. Then I reserve the right not only to disagree with them but to oppose a scheme or policy that would deprive the people of a great portion of this Nation of the necessary water for irrigation and domestic uses.

These genial gentlemen tell us that that is not their design or purpose, and I shall agree with them on that. But I think they were taken in, or rather taken for a ride down the river, by that other genial gentleman [Mr. BELL] from Kansas City.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], in his unguarded moment, frankly admitted that what they wanted was the water from the upper Missouri River States so that he, at Kansas City, could float an empty boat down the Missouri into the Mississippi and down to visit our friend RANKIN, in the State of Mississippi, and join hands with other friends at New Orleans in Louisiana. I said an empty boat because, if he had his way, then the great American desert would soon be on its way and there would be nothing to float down the river.

Human selfishness at times knows no limits. Sectionalism still seems to be strong in this Congress. The time has come that we look at the United States as a whole as our country and not get lost in the local atmosphere of Kansas City.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] need not worry. We will let him have plenty of water for drinking purposes. That is if he has not anything better to drink in Kansas City, but, we are not going to permit him to wreck a great part of our Nation, to turn it into a desert because he wants to float a boat.

Of course, the gentleman from Kansas City is very much mistaken when he tells of the great benefit that navigation on the Missouri River has been to the Dakotas and Montana. This because he says it gives a road to markets. No more erroneous statement was ever made on the floor of this Chamber. The Missouri River, as far as furnishing markets for North Dakota products, has been a dead issue for years. As far as being an avenue for transportation for the upper States it never did exist to any great extent and to what little extent it was used has been so long ago that it no longer remains in the memory of the present generation.

I believe at one time a few barges were pulled up the river by tugboats and canoes. The present civilization has surpassed this slow method of transportation except for some heavy and bulky commodities and even these are now being hauled largely by train and practically all of it above Kansas City is hauled by truck and train. And when the war is over some will be taken care of by plane.

I am not opposed to permitting the gentleman from Missouri and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to dig a ditch if they want it. I am perfectly willing that they should be allowed to play around in the mud of the Missouri River, but, I am more interested in giving the first right of the water of the Missouri River and of other rivers to the State through which these rivers pass for irrigation and domestic uses.

Irrigation and flood control go hand in hand. If the water is used at its source it can create no floods. After that it can be used to develop power and for navigation. Let us forget sectionalism. We are 1 Nation and just 48 States.

I submit the following basic facts to show that with a 6-foot channel there is only enough water left to irrigate approximately 2,778,000 acres and that with a 9-foot channel there would be no water at all left for irrigation:

Out of 15,768,000 acre-feet mean annual yield at Yankton:	
Requirement with 6-foot channel and reservoirs to regulate 20,000[1] x 2 x 240 (navigation period)	9,600,000
Evaporation from reservoirs	1,000,000
Waste to coordinate flood control with navigation	500,000
Release during nonnavigation period for various uses	500,000
Total	11,600,000
15,768,000−11,600,000=4,168,000 acre-feet for upstream domestic, industrial, and irrigation use (for 2,778,000 acres).	
Requirements with 9-foot channel and reservoirs to regulate 30,000 x 2 x 240 (navigation period)	14,800,000
Evaporation	1,000,000
Waste	500,000
Winter release	500,000
Total	16,800,000

This permits no irrigation development at all.

[1] 20,000 cubic second-feet converted to acre-feet for the navigation period of 240 days per year.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, the half of the United States west of the ninety-seventh meridian has an annual rainfall that varies from 3 to 15 inches, not sufficient to grow crops without irrigation. Unless we can preserve our present use of water as now decreed by our States we shall lose our economic security so far as agricultural production, mining, and domestic use is concerned. I cannot too strongly urge your support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we in Colorado appreciate the need and value of post-war work to help care for the men returning from the armed services. This is especially true in public works done for the proper control and use of water and waterways. We wish to cooperate and assist in the control of floods, the development of new power and navigation as outlined in this bill, which in turn reduces the cost of transportation, perhaps the greatest liability of our Mountain States. However, we cannot do this unless our water rights in the upper States are properly guaranteed and protected. That is the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah, Representative ROBINSON, and it must be adopted or we cannot afford to approve this measure no matter how beneficial it otherwise might be.

In our Colorado mountains, four great rivers rise, two flowing east to the Atlantic, one south to the Gulf of Mexico, and one draining the area west of the Rockies and emptying into the Pacific. One of these rivers, the Platte, becomes the Missouri after it leaves our State and is affected by this law. Another, the Arkansas, runs into the Mississippi farther downstream. Are not we entitled to the prior use of this water for irrigation and domestic use?

Our rainfall is insufficient for crop production without the aid of irrigation, and consequently, the whole future of agriculture in Colorado depends upon the retention by our people and our State of our present and future water rights. The use of water for irrigation means that dams and reservoirs must be built on the headwaters of those streams to hold the melting snows before they rush down to the great rivers below. Later the water is taken from these reservoirs and run through ditches and laterals to produce the moisture so necessary for our hay, sugar beets, potatoes, grain, and other products. Much of the irrigation water is returned to the streams farther down. Take from us the use of this water and our State would again return to the arid region it once was.

The Supreme Court has said that a river "offers a necessity of life that must be rationed among those who have power over it." The rights or decrees for water arising in Colorado have been filed in the courts of our State and are as important—almost more important—than the land itself. It is imperative that these State water decrees and rights be protected from future demands on the lower streams. In 1901, President Theodore Roosevelt stated in his message to Congress:

> The distribution of the water, the diversion of the streams among irrigators, should be left to the settlers themselves in conformity with State laws, and without interference with these State laws or with vested rights.

This statement received the approval of Congress in the 1902 Reclamation Act, and we propose to fight any encroachment on this principle as stated in that act.

Colorado is a State larger than the States of New York and the New England States together, with a total population of 1,000,000 people, about the size of 1 large city. Our mining, agriculture, and power development is limited to the proper use of our water resources. To impair these water rights would be unfair to us and would ruin the future of our State.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we ask support for this amendment. It carries out the message to Congress of President Theodore Roosevelt, and without it we cannot support this bill, much as we appreciate its value and wish to cooperate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, next to the winning of the war and the profound hope that we have of a just and lasting peace, I should say the next most important concern to the people living in the semiarid region west of the ninety-seventh meridian would be the assurance of an adequate and secure supply of water for irrigation. I should say their greatest fear next to the losing of the war and the losing of the freedoms that we cherish most would be their justified fear of losing their right to use the irrigation water they have and of being prohibited from its further use and developments.

These are strong statements, but I believe they are true; and I say to the members of this Committee it is not a question that has just now, as was indicated in the discussion yesterday, caught our fancy, but has been a question of great concern from the time that it was discovered that food could be raised by the process of irrigation.

When it comes to a question of irrigation, to those of us who live in this region, knowing as we do that irrigation water is the lifeblood of our economy, we forget party and partisanship and close our ranks for the purpose of defending for us and those that come after us our inalienable right to pursue our way of economic life.

I do not believe, if those who are opposing this amendment really understood its importance to us, that they would oppose this amendment. As has been so well said by previous speakers in support of this amendment, we have no quarrel with navigation or flood-control projects whenever they are useful and necessary, but we do contend that we should have the right in our own way and to our own satisfaction to determine by our own State laws the use of its waters within its boundaries. My own State has done this. Next in importance to the use of water for culinary purposes and that used for the watering of livestock comes water for irrigation. Actually water is owned by the State and can only be acquired if it is put to beneficial use. Any time a user of irrigation water fails to make use of this water for a beneficial purpose the water reverts back to the State and can be allocated to some other person who will use it for a useful purpose.

I repeat again that irrigation is the lifeblood of our western country. It acts as an Aladdin's lamp to our land. For years the Government had an established price of $2.50 an acre for its land in our section. In many cases this was an exorbitant price but when water was applied through the science of irrigation this same land immediately increased in value to $100, $200, $300 per acre, and in some cases more. Indeed the basic and permanent civilization of the West has come as a result of benefits derived from the use of its streams for the production of food. Furthermore, its growth is and will be determined by the amount of irrigation water that will be available. One only has to travel through the whole western section and observe that every city, town, and hamlet is built on some stream from whose banks flow the water that makes it possible for the people to live. This is the reason, gentlemen, that our fears are aroused when we see the danger of Federal encroachment. We do not contend for a minute that so far as the Potomac, the Ohio, and the Mississippi River are concerned, their most important use is anything but navigation. Irrigation is not a consideration. Rather than being in many cases an economic blessing, their waters are a menace and we have expended hundreds of millions of dollars to build dikes, dams, and levees to control them and lessen the danger to loss of life and property. So it seems to us that the division line of the ninety-seventh meridian certainly will not in any way injure any part of the country east of that meridian where the rivers are useful for navigation and the best interest of the country is thereby served. Likewise, we contend that no injury will come to any part of the country if the States in the arid section be permitted, by their past experience, to determine the use of their water as defined in the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], namely, for livestock purposes, irrigation, mining and industrial uses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, those of us who represent the districts which are west of the ninety-seventh meridian are a relatively small minority in this House. On the other hand, we represent half of the United States in area. That half, of course, has its own problems, which are different from the problems of the rest of the United States. We ask your consideration at this time in our interests because of this very special problem of irrigation and reclamation so necessary to our life there. I know it is difficult for those who think of streams and lakes as means of transportation to reorient their minds to think of water as the precious fluid of life. To those of us who live in the arid and semiarid half of our great country water means life itself not only for our own living but for our crops and animals. Water law in the West is based on a different premise than water law in the East. In the West it is based on beneficial use and consumption. In the East it is based on the right of access for such purposes as transportation, fisheries, and so forth.

We from the West ask your indulgence and your support of our needs—your support of this amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, this issue may be of no concern to the eastern part of the United States, but I want to impress particularly upon my colleagues on this side of the House that this is of transcendant importance to all of the arid States of the West. Yesterday it was said by a member of the committee that there have been no abuses of authority in the construction of river and harbor projects by the Army Engineer Corps. If that be true—and I have all the confidence in the world in the Army engineers—I think it is an additional safeguard and a precautionary safeguard to provide that the water priorities of the western streams, involving the very lifeblood of the irrigated and arid sections of our country, be given precedence under State laws. I particularly appeal to the Members on my side of the House to support this amendment, which gives preference to the use of waters for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

IRRIGATION OR NAVIGATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am naturally disappointed that the chairman of the committee did not see fit to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]. The amendment makes crystal clear that water within the States shall first be used for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes before it can be earmarked for navigation.

I wish it were possible to draw a picture for you folks living in the nonarid country showing how much water really means to a growing crop and the prosperity of a community. Nebraska, I believe, has more miles of running water than any other State in the Union. We have many excellent irrigation projects. If water was not available little or no crops could be raised.

Food has assumed a most important place in the affairs of the world. If we cannot protect the water within our State for domestic and irrigation purposes ahead of navigation then I am fearful that irrigation projects will not continue to develop and indeed some projects already in operation may suffer unless this type of an amendment is accepted in this bill.

I feel that flood control is most important and certainly the Missouri River should be kept within its bounds by dikes and levees and whatever other means may be available to prevent the disastrous floods which so frequently occur outside its channel. I believe that by putting up the dikes, floods can be controlled which have done untold damage to property and at the same time a 9-foot channel might be available for navigation. However, if it is a choice between having water for irrigation or navigation then certainly irrigation should have first place. It does little good to have satisfactory navigation unless you have some crops that can be sent down the river by navigation.

Certainly water is the lifeblood of our semi-arid regions. I urge the House to accept this amendment which will protect the water rights, the domestic and irrigation rights of the people west of the 97th meridian.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am sympathetic with the people of the West, and there is nothing in this bill that will interfere with any rights of appropriation that they enjoy. If I may characterize the pending amendment, I would say that under the commerce clause of the Constitution Congress has the authority for navigation work such as is embraced in this bill, and for flood control. The purport of the amendment

would be to undermine the legislation for navigation and irrigation that has been passed for the Columbia River, the Sacramento River, the Missouri River, the Willamette River, and other western rivers. Under the guise of water uses and prior water appropriations we would undertake by statute, if the amendment is adopted, to repeal the Constitution of the United States which vests in Congress the supervision of navigable waters. In my judgment the apprehensions advanced by my friends from the West, are not involved, because there is nothing in the bill which would interfere with their vested or statutory rights. These rights have been safeguarded in the bill. The Western States are protected in the continued utilization of the water resources under existing law. We would undertake to amend the Constitution by statute and render void legislation for navigation and irrigation, if the amendment were approved.

I extend by saying that under the commerce clause of the Constitution it was early held that the power to regulate commerce necessarily included power over navigation.

Congress has absolute power over navigation in rivers. At the same time the States possess control of the waters within their borders, but this possession under the Constitution is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States with respect to commerce and navigation of rivers.

Inasmuch as Congress has the power to improve for navigation, any statute that subordinated this power to domestic uses or industrial purposes would be ineffective inasmuch as the commerce clause of the Constitution cannot be amended by statute. Federal, and not State, laws control on navigable streams.

The people of the arid States are unduly apprehensive. I want to protect the States in the utilization of the waters within the States for domestic use and for irrigation. I want to protect the citizens of other parts of the country in their riparian privileges and in the enjoyment of their riparian rights. All such rights, however, whether in the West or elsewhere along navigable rivers, are subordinate to improvements in the discretion of Congress for navigation and flood control.

The pending amendment means the same as a similar amendment that has been circulated among the Members of the House. The words "for the maintenance of a navigable channel" have been omitted in the pending amendment, but the meaning of the amendment without words quoted is substantially as if the words were included. The words "heretofore or hereafter" in the amendment as generally circulated have been omitted and the word "wherever" inserted. The meaning again is the same.

It is said that the amendment is necessary to protect the arid West in view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the *United States* v. *Appalachian Electric Power Co.* (311 U. S. Reports, 377). The decision is criticized because it held that improvements for navigation may be made not only on a navigable river but on its tributaries. The criticism is without merit. There could be no navigation of a river unless the waters were contributed by its tributaries. The tributaries are the source of waters for navigation. They are also sources of waters for floods. There could be no regulation for navigation without regulation of the tributaries.

If the pending amendment is adopted, it would make the use of water for navigation subordinate to other uses, including mining and industrial uses, that would be inconsistent with the constitutional provision giving Congress the power to provide for navigation, for flood control, for power, irrigation, and conservation, as the said case, page 426, holds that flood control or protection, watershed development, and power are parts of commerce control.

Congress has been appropriating money for navigable rivers in the West for navigation for years. No conflict with respect to the domestic use of water or the use of water for irrigation has ever arisen.

Again, as I have stated, the power of Congress to authorize dams and other works for flood control on navigable streams and their tributaries is based upon the commerce clause of the Constitution. The Court has held that this power is vested in the Federal Government because these works preserve and protect navigable waterways. Such preservation and protection is a proper function of the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court has held that in the improvement of navigation and in the protection of navigable waterways, Congress may provide for other beneficial uses of water such as irrigation, recreation, and power development. Multiple-purpose reservoirs provide for flood control and for irrigation. Penstocks are installed wherever there are power probabilities.

But if the other uses than navigation were declared to be superior to navigation, as is provided in the pending amendment, Congress by such declaration would be undertaking to destroy the constitutional basis upon which these works can be built by the United States. The adoption of the amendment would undertake to repeal the commerce clause of the Constitution with respect to the power of Congress to improve rivers for navigation west of the ninety-seventh meridian. Navigable waters west of the said meridian, as well as navigable waters east of the said meridian under the commerce clause of the Constitution are under Federal control.

The proposed amendment if adopted would be unconstitutional. Certainly if the proposed amendment were adopted, navigation and flood-control projects located west of the ninety-seventh meridian would be unconstitutional.

There is no real conflict between navigation, flood control, and irrigation. Those who undertake to promote discord among the advocates of reclamation on the one hand and flood control on the other are rendering a disservice.

The Supreme Court has held on navigable rivers that navigation is the supreme and not the subordinate or incidental question. The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Arizona* (295 U. S. 174), held that Congress could authorize a dam across the Colorado River without regard to the jurisdiction of an adjoining State in respect of the appropriation, use, and distribution of its equitable share of water. The decision is based upon the commerce clause of the Constitution. Navigation under the Constitution is superior and not subordinate to the use, appropriation, or distribution of water.

I repeat therefore that the pending amendment to make navigation subordinate under State law is in violation of the Constitution and would render void much beneficial legislation for the arid West, including legislation to provide not only for navigation but for flood control and reclamation. The amendment should be rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a person cannot make much of a speech on the Constitution within a minute and a half. But this amendment prohibits the use of the water for war purposes, while the war is on. It is for no purpose on earth which would benefit them. They are getting all the water they can use. They have 15,000,000 acre-feet in Fort Peck Dam now that they are not using. They could use it. Why do they not use it? The amendment would interfere with the effort of the War Department in the present war. The Secretary of War has put in the machinery there free of cost to the Reclamation Bureau, not only to pay for the cost of installing the machinery, but for its operation, all free of cost to the Reclamation Bureau. The water that is being released there now is for war purposes, to help take the ships down over the chain of rocks in the Mississippi River. It is appealed for by both the War Department and the Navy Department for that purpose. If you pass this amendment and put it in the statute then it will be left to the State law out there, which has already declared that the water cannot be used for navigation when they need it for irrigation.

The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] requests me to state that he is in thorough accord on the opposition to this amendment. I see no reason on earth for it. They cannot benefit by it. They are getting all the water they can use and more too; and they are not using it. Why do they not use it if they are so anxious for it? There is no reason in this amendment. There is none whatever. It is unnecessary, and on the other hand, it will work a great harm, perhaps, upon the Nation in time of war.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HILL. May I inquire as to the statement of the gentleman about having all the water they need? The gentleman does not refer to Colorado, does he?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. No.

Mr. HILL. We do not have all the water we need.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. No, sir; you do not get water from Fort Peck Dam in Colorado, and you have no way of getting access to it.

Mr. HILL. We are now building a tunnel under the Rocky Mountains to bring water over from the west side to supply our dry lands, so we are not getting the amount of water we need.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Inasmuch as this bill is not effective until 6 months after the war, how can this amendment affect the war effort?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It will be effective from the day of its approval if you pass this amendment. The only thing to be postponed until after the war will be the appropriation for the expenditures.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. If this amendment is passed, is it not true that the States up the river can cut off the water supply of the cities downstream, the great cities of Sioux City, Omaha, St. Joseph, and Kansas City, by storing up water, and we would have no recourse, and we would be cut off from the water?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That would be possible, and before our committee some of them claimed the right to do that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the water that we are now getting in the Missouri River and Mississippi River is diverted, it would mean there would not be a 6-foot channel in the Missouri and a 9-foot channel in the Mississippi? We will not have sufficient water. Right now ships built for the Navy come down the Mississippi. Without a 9-foot channel they could not be delivered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Does the gentleman contend that if this water is needed for the irrigation of crops, for culinary purposes in the upper regions of the Missouri River and in these other States, that those people should be deprived of that water in order to make navigation available?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I say that if it stops every farm in America, if it closes every port in my State, for war purposes, I am for it if it is necessary for the war. I am opposed to putting anything in the statute that would prevent this Government from exercising every power necessary to win this war.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does not the gentleman believe that the production of essential food is highly important?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It is all important; yes, sir. It is also important for you to market that.

Mr. DWORSHAK. We have got to produce it before we can market it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Absolutely, and if you produce it and cannot market it you might as well not produce it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. We will produce it all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] has expired.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment to this bill (H. R. 3691) offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]. As a Member at Large from Nevada, a typical arid-land State west of the ninety-seventh meridian, I feel that this Congress, by express inhibition incorporated into this bill, should terminate the executive and judicial legislation which is aimed at the destruction of the rights of the people to the use of flowing waters for irrigation and reclamation.

The only title the Federal Government has to control flowing waters springs from clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, giving to Congress the power—

> To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

That power has been exercised in the improvement of navigable streams in the interest of interstate commerce and the public safety. It has never been expressly extended in any statute to the control of any unnavigable stream. An unnavigable stream, by the force of the term itself, cannot serve commerce, whether interstate or local.

Under the riparian doctrine or the appropriation doctrine and under both doctrines combined, from the time of the Louisiana cession in 1803 and the Guadalupe-Hidalgo cession in 1848, and the admission of Nevada in 1864, governments never claimed the corpus of the water at all or the right to the use of water, except as subordinate to the right of the people to use it for agricultural, domestic, and power purposes. When Congress passed the Reclamation Act it provided that the Interior Department should conform to State laws in acquiring water rights to be held in trust for the use of settlers.

The abuse sought to be checked here is of modern origin. In the beginning navigability was defined as navigability in fact. But now it has been stretched to cover streams potentially navigable or formerly navigable, or to cover all the miscellaneous tributaries, headwaters, and creeks that might conceivably augment the firm or seasonal flow of a river capable of carrying commerce. Under recent decisions the definition of navigability has been so whittled away as to constitute a menace to all the rest of the public who make use of flowing waters for agricultural purposes. If this goes on farms may be dried up and farmers wiped out in aid of a mythical river-steamboat trade so remote that its smoke will never come within a hundred miles of the farmers' homes.

Mr. Chairman, we are in the arid-land States and do not oppose commerce, although, outside of the railways, the highways, and the air transport, we see very little of it west of the ninety-seventh meridian. What we ask is protection of irrigation and reclamation which has built up the West under rights and customs, enjoyed and followed under the riparian and appropriation doctrines. We want protection through a positive statutory inhibition, against a definition of navigable waters that has no basis in any statute thus far enacted. It seems to me that when it comes to definitions Congress should be the fountainhead—not the victim.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah) there were—ayes 45, noes 70.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah and Mr. DWORSHAK demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. ROBINSON of Utah and Mr. PETERSON of Georgia to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 48, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT: On page 21, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13, and the semicolon at the end of line 13.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be brief about this matter. The House has been very patient.

The amendment that I have offered is to strike lines 11, 12, and 13 on page 21. The purpose of the amendment is to strike out all reference to the Missouri River. The reason I offer that amendment is this: The Bureau of Reclamation will submit a report within 60 days, which will deal primarily with the Missouri River Basin. I think that before the House takes any action on this bill, certainly on this section of the bill, we should have before us the report of the Bureau of Reclamation. Only when that report is submitted can we intelligently discuss a comprehensive plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand that that report will amount to something like $500,000,000?

Mr. BARRETT. As to the Missouri River Basin, I think it will amount to considerably less than the amount that is considered necessary to carry out the purposes of this particular section, which I understand is $125,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. But the section the gentleman intends to strike out by his amendment amounts to only a few million dollars.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to my distinguished colleague from Michigan that my understanding is that in order to

carry out effectively this particular section of the bill the committee is considering the advisability of asking for an appropriation of $125,000,000, which will include several dams on the main stem of the Missouri River.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. Certainly, I yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The purpose of the gentleman from Wyoming is to let the Bureau of Reclamation get in its report before May 1.

Mr. BARRETT. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. And on that basis perhaps some sort of reasonable agreement can be worked out between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation which will work to the interest of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. BARRETT. That is right. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, the over-all development of the Missouri River Basin comes before this House only after consideration by three separate and distinct committees of the House. In addition to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the Flood Control and the Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation will submit reports on various phases of the entire problem. Certainly common sense and good business should dictate that the reports of each of these committees should be considered at the same time and with relation to each other. Accordingly it seems to me that this section should be stricken from the bill until the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the development of the Missouri River Basin is completed.

Mr. Chairman, from February 22 to date I have endeavored to obtain from the Office of the Chief of Engineers a definite statement of the amount of water presently authorized for navigation purposes between Sioux City and the mouth of the Missouri River. Although I have repeatedly requested a specific statement as to the exact amount of water necessary to fulfill the demands of a 9-foot channel 300 feet wide, as authorized by this bill, I must confess that I am as much in the dark now as before I commenced this inquiry.

Because of the fact that the people of my State are afraid that the construction of this channel, having a capacity from 32,000 to 35,000 cubic feet per second at Kansas City, notwithstanding the fact that the average annual water supply of the Missouri River at that point over a 14-year period is only about 32,250 cubic feet per second, is a dangerous threat to the future development of the State of Wyoming, and we are fearful that if this legislation is passed that by use a priority will be built up whereby that amount of water will be required and that it will thereby prevent the complete development of the irrigable areas in the upper reaches of the Missouri in my State.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the correspondence in question:

XC——165

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1944.

Maj. Gen. THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Acting Chief of Engineers, Office of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL ROBINS: In connection with H. R. 3961 and particularly in connection with the amendment voted by the committee, on line 13, page 21, of the bill reading as follows:

"*Provided*, That such improvements when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri Basin over that now authorized by existing law."

I shall appreciate it very much if you will let me know how much water is presently authorized for navigation purposes at Sioux City.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. BARRETT.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, February 28, 1944.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARRETT: Reference is made to your letter of February 22, 1944, referring to the item in H. R. 3961 relating to the 9-foot navigation channel in the Missouri River below Sioux City, Iowa, and the amendment thereto providing that such improvements when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri River basin over that now authorized by existing law. You ask to be informed as to how much water is presently authorized for navigation purposes at Sioux City.

The physical control of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin for navigation purposes presently authorized by Congress is limited to that effected by the creation of the Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir in Montana, some 1,100 miles upstream from Sioux City. The completion of channel improvements from the mouth to Sioux City and the construction of the Fort Peck Dam were authorized in the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935, in accordance with the plans recommended in House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

In House Document No. 238, the Chief of Engineers recommended that "* * * the reservoir at the site of Fort Peck be built to the maximum practicable capacity; and be operated primarily for navigation, with such arrangement for future installation of power as will permit the maximum production of hydroelectric power consistent with the primary demands of navigation * * *." The act of Congress approved May 18, 1938, providing for the installation of facilities for the generation of electric power, recognized the navigation improvement to be the primary purpose of this reservoir. The dam proper has been completed, forming a reservoir with a maximum storage capacity of 19,412,000 acre-feet and a normal operating storage capacity of 18,400,000 acre-feet. In general, the water impounded by the dam is released systematically during low water periods to augment the natural stream flow as may be required in the interest of commerce and navigation.

As indicated in the above-cited authorizations, there is no fixed amount of water authorized by statute for navigation purposes other than the capacity of the reservoir itself. The Department merely impounds a portion of whatever stream flow actually reaches the Fort Peck Reservoir and releases the stored waters in a manner consistent with the primary demands of navigation.

Sincerely yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1944.

Mr. GLEN PARKER,
United States Geological Survey, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PARKER: I would like very much to know the average annual yield of the waters above Fort Peck for the past 20 years.

I shall appreciate it if you will get this information for me as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,

FRANK A. BARRETT.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1944.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BARRETT: In reply to your letter of March 3 to Mr. Parker requesting information on the flow of Missouri River above Fort Peck:

The principal inflow to the Fort Peck Reservoir is measured at the gaging station known as Missouri River at power-plant ferry, about 30 miles southeast of Zortman. The Musselshell River enters the reservoir below the station at the power-plant ferry, and records of its flow are obtained at Mosby. Records at the power-plant ferry were started in February 1934, and supplementary records have been obtained at the Mosby station.

A summary of the records for Missouri River and tributaries in Montana collected by the Geological Survey and cooperating State and Federal agencies up to September 30, 1938, was published last year as Water Supply Paper 917. I believe this paper will be useful to you and I am enclosing a copy. The records in the form of monthly and annual figures for the station on Missouri River at power-plant ferry will be found on pages 128–129, and those for the Mosby station on Musselshell River on pages 324 to 326. The available annual figures in acre-feet for the years after 1938 are as follows:

Water year	Power-plant ferry (acre-feet)	Mosby (acre-feet)
1938–39	4,718,000	121,800
1939–40	3,761,000	16,330
1940–41	3,502,000	49,010
1941–42	7,149,000	443,300

You will note that these records cover only 8 complete years. Records have been obtained, however, on the Missouri River at Fort Benton since 1882, and these afford a good indication of the supply available for the reservoir over a long period of years. The annual figures for the Fort Benton station will be found on pages 126–127 of Water-Supply Paper 917. The figures for the years following 1938 for this station are as follows:

Water year:	*Fort Benton*
1938–39	3,954,000
1939–40	3,136,000
1940–41	2,962,000
1941–42	5,776,000

The average annual flow for the Fort Benton station for the 61 years of record has been computed as 5,940,000 acre-feet, and the concurrent records indicate that the flow at Fort Benton is about 80 percent of the flow at the station at power-plant ferry.

The figures of annual flow for the years 1939 to 1942 have been inserted in the copy of Water-Supply Paper 917, which is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. WRATHER,
Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1944.

Maj. Gen. E. REYBOLD,
Chief of Engineers, War Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL REYBOLD: I wrote your office on February 22 asking for information in connection with the amendment to H. R. 3961, agreed to by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, providing that the 9-foot navigation channel on the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri River Basin over that now authorized by existing law. I acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 28, and I appreciate your prompt and frank statement contained therein.

I might state that the people of Wyoming and other States in the upper Missouri River Basin are very much concerned that if a channel 300 feet wide and 9 feet deep, having a capacity of 32,000 cubic feet per second is constructed from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River, that by use, a priority may be built up whereby that amount of water will be required for navigation purposes, and consequently will prevent the complete development of the irrigable areas in the upper reaches of the Missouri and its tributaries.

It seems, therefore, highly desirable that we determine very definitely the exact amount of water that is presently authorized for navigation purposes from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri, in the event H. R. 3961, with the amendment referred to above, is enacted into law. In your letter of February 28, you state that "The physical control of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin for navigation purposes presently authorized by Congress is limited to that effected by the creation of the Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir in Montana * * *." In order to know the average annual yield and inflow to Fort Peck Reservoir, I wrote the United States Geological Survey on March 3 and requested that information. I am enclosing herewith a copy of the letter of Mr. W. E. Wrather, Director of the United States Geological Survey, under date of March 8.

From this letter it appears that the average annual flow, as recorded at the Fort Benton station for the 61 years on record, is 5,940,000 acre-feet. From the records as supplied in Mr. Wrather's letter, and from Water-Supply Paper 917, I have computed the inflow to the Fort Peck Reservoir as measured at the gaging station known as Missouri River at power-plant ferry and the Musselshell River at Mosby station for the 8-year period from 1934 to 1942, inclusive, a copy of which I am herewith enclosing. Over that 8-year period, it appears that the average inflow into Fort Peck is 4,589,277 acre-feet. It appears that the computations as taken over this 8-year period should be more reliable than those taken over the 61-year period at Fort Benton.

If the average annual yield at Fort Peck is 4,589,277 acre-feet, I assume that this is the entire amount of water presently authorized for navigation purposes at Sioux City. Of course, there will be a certain amount of loss before the water reaches Sioux City, and so the exact amount available will be somewhat less than that figure. I assume also that more water could be released in one year than another, although over a period of years navigation would be compelled to restrict its use to the average inflow at Fort Peck.

I will appreciate it if you will advise as soon as possible if I am correct in my assumption.

Yours very truly,

FRANK A. BARRETT.

[Enclosures.]

Summary of the records for Missouri River and tributaries in Montana collected by the United States Geological Survey and cooperating State and Federal agencies from 1934 to 1942, showing the inflow to the Fort Peck Reservoir as measured at the gaging station known as the Missouri River at power-plant ferry, about 30 miles southeast of Zortman as well as at Mosby station:

Water year	Power-plant ferry (acre-feet)	Mosby (acre-feet)
1934-35	4,027,000	18,420
1935-36	3,851,200	96,500
1936-37	3,213,000	77,760
1937-38	5,397,000	272,200
1938-39	4,718,000	121,800
1939-40	3,761,000	16,330
1940-41	3,502,000	49,010
1941-42	7,149,000	443,300
Total	35,618,900	1,095,320

Totals for 8-year period

	Acre-feet
Power-plant ferry	35,618,900
Mosby station	1,095,320
Total	36,714,220
Average for 8-year period, both stations	4,589,277

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1944.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: I have your letter of March 2, with the accompanying enclosures, in which you requested any comments regarding the probability of Fort Peck storage, if used wholly for navigation purposes, being sufficient to provide flow for a 6-foot channel at Sioux City.

Fort Peck Reservoir has a capacity of 19,400,000 acre-feet. The flow of the Missouri River at Wolf Point, Mont., according to the reports of the United States Geological Survey, has averaged for the period 1929-42, inclusive, 6,652 cubic feet per second or 4,816,000 acre-feet per year. Wolf Point, Mont., is about 40 miles below Fort Peck and also below the mouth of Milk River.

I do not have available the storage yield of the Milk River but perhaps 1,000,000 acre-feet a year would be a fair assumption and this would have to be deducted from the 4,816,000 acre-feet at Wolf Point to determine the amount which would enter Fort Peck Reservoir. Fort Pack Reservoir, therefore, has capacity to store about five times the mean yearly flow entering it.

With 3,816,000 acre-feet entering and being released from Fort Peck for a navigation season of 240 days, a flow of 7,950 c. f. s. could be maintained. This is not enough by itself to supply a 6-foot channel at Yankton. According to the Army engineers' report, House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, 20,000 c. f. s. is the requirement at Yankton for the 6-foot channel.

I assume therefore that it is expected to draw on other tributaries of the Missouri to furnish the additional over that made available by Fort Peck Reservoir to meet the requirements of the 6-foot channel. How the law might be construed as to the right to use such water for navigation is something which I cannot answer.

The situation appears quite complicated when one remembers that legislation for the Army engineers' work usually says that it is in accordance with plans and reports of the Chief of Engineers.

Very truly yours,

H. W. BASHORE, *Commissioner.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, March 13, 1944.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: I have received your letter of March 10, with which you enclosed copies of recent correspondence on H. R. 3961.

With particular reference to the data which you enclosed from the United States Geological Survey, I note that the Survey record shows that the average annual inflow into Fort Peck Reservoir amounted to 4,589,277 acre-feet. This was for the period 1934 to 1942, inclusive. This is an average annual amount of 773,277 acre-feet in excess of the 3,816,000 acre-feet which I estimated in my letter to you of March 11, and would maintain a flow of 9,561 cubic feet per second at Yankton during the navigation period of 240 days. However, the comments which I made in my letter of March 11, regarding the sufficiency of the supply of 7,950 cubic feet per second apply as well to this amount.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. BASHORE,
Commissioner.

MARCH 14, 1944.

Maj. Gen. E. REYBOLD,
Chief of Engineers, War Department, Washington, D. C.:

The Big Horn River flows from Wyoming into Montana; the North Platte River flows from Wyoming into Nebraska; both are tributaries of the Missouri River. Part of the stream flow of each of these rivers is presently used for irrigation of high-priced agriculture lands in Wyoming; the balance of the stream flow of each of these rivers must be conserved by storage and used for additional irrigation in Wyoming; naturally we in Wyoming are vitally concerned and accordingly I shall appreciate it very much if you will advise by wire if the present authorization for navigation on the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth or the proposed channel changes as provided in H. R. 3961 will hold static the present flow of the Big Horn and North Platte Rivers at the points where these rivers cross the State line of Wyoming.

FRANK A. BARRETT,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 15, 1944.*

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel dated March 14 I am pleased to inform you that maintenance of existing 6-foot channel or construction and maintenance of proposed 9-foot channel between Sioux City and mouth of the Missouri River will have no natural physical effect on the present flow of Big Horn and North Platte Rivers at the points where these rivers cross the State line of Wyoming. Spewr 262.

ROBINS, *Acting Chief of Engineers.*

MARCH 16, 1944.

Maj. Gen. E. REYBOLD,
Chief of Engineers, War Department, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your wire of March 15. However am still seriously concerned as to effect of amendment to H. R. 3961 that improvements contemplated shall not create any demands on Wyoming and other waters over that now authorized by existing law. House Document 238, Seventy-third Congress, sec-

ond session, states that the operation of a 6-foot channel requires 20,000 cubic feet per second at Yankton. Do you consider that this amount of water must be supplied at Ynkton? If your reply is yes, how much is to be supplied from Fort Peck now and in the future and how much, if any, is to be supplied by the tributaries below Fort Peck? In supplying the 20,000 feet at Yankton, must developments in Wyoming for irrigation consumptive use be restricted in order to meet the requirements of the channel? Under the proposed 9-foot channel which H. R. 3961 authorizes, what additional demands on upstream water would be made? Appreciate answer to this and my letter of March 9 today by wire.

FRANK A. BARRETT,
Member of Congress.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, March 17, 1944.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARRETT: Reference is made to your letter of March 9, 1944, relating to the amendment to the authorization item in H. R. 3961 for the 9-foot navigation channel in the Missouri River below Sioux City, providing that such improvements when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri River Basin over that now authorized by existing law. In referring to the Department's letter of February 28, 1944, in reply to your inquiry as to the amount of water presently authorized for navigation, you state that it seems desirable that you determine very definitely the exact amount of water presently authorized for navigation purposes below Sioux City. Your letter presents a figure, based on certain stream-flow records, reported to be the average annual inflow of water into the Fort Peck Reservoir, and states that you assume the figure is the entire amount of water presently authorized for navigation. You state that you assume more water could be released in 1 year than in another and that the amount available at Sioux City will be somewhat less than the figure mentioned in your letter as the average annual yield at Fort Peck due to losses before the water reaches Sioux City. You ask to be advised if you are correct in the assumption.

Since there is no fixed amount of water authorized by statute for navigation purposes on the Missouri River other than the capacity of the Fort Peck Reservoir, it cannot be assumed that the average annual inflow into that reservoir cited in your letter is the amount of water authorized for navigation between Sioux City and the mouth of the river. The stream-flow records for the past 50 years indicate that the period between 1934 and 1942, which was used as the basis for the average annual inflow into the reservoir cited in your letter, was embraced within a dry cycle. By interpolating discharges as recorded by the Fort Benton gaging station during the period prior to 1933, the average annual flow of the river at Fort Peck since 1890 is about 65 percent greater than that during the 8-year period ending 1942. As the flow may fluctuate considerably from year to year, the amount of inflow into the reservoir is unpredictable. Accordingly, it would appear that no equitable figure could be chosen as the definite amount of water available for navigation purposes.

It is true that more water can be released from the reservoir in 1 year than in another provided such regulation of the impounded water is consistent with the demands of navigation. During a dry period the amount and duration of the releases would necessarily be greater than during a wet year when it is possible no releases would be required for navigation. The water, instead of going to waste, is stored in the Fort Peck Reservoir for future use in the interest of navigation and other beneficial uses as now authorized by law. With respect to the volume for the releases from the Fort Peck Reservoir that actually reaches Sioux City, it may be stated that the run-off from the watershed between the dam and Sioux City, not otherwise appropriated for irrigation and related purposes, augments the reservoir releases to the extent that the average stream flow at the head of the recommended 9-foot channel is several times the amount of inflow into the reservoir.

You may be assured that the importance of conserving the water resources of the Missouri River Basin is recognized and that operation of the Fort Peck Reservoir is being so scheduled as to conserve all possible water consistent with providing for the requirements of navigation in accordance with the act of Congress authorizing its construction. In my opinion there is sufficient water supply available in the Missouri River Basin to meet all existent requirements. In order to meet the future requirements for irrigation additional reservoirs will be required. Any action in that direction, instead of restricting the use of water for navigation purposes, would advance the development of the Missouri Basin.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, March 17, 1944.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARRETT: Reference is made to your letter of March 9, 1944, relating to the amendment to the authorization item in H. R. 3961 for the 9-foot navigation channel in the Missouri River below Sioux City providing that such improvements when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri River Basin over that now authorized by existing law. In referring to the Department's letter of February 28, 1944, in reply to your inquiry as to the amount of water presently authorized for navigation, you state that it seems desirable that you determine very definitely the exact amount of water presently authorized for navigation purposes below Sioux City. Your letter presents a figure, based on certain stream-flow records, reported to be the average annual in-flow of water into the Fort Peck Reservoir and states that you assume the figure is the entire amount of water presently authorized for navigation. You state that you assume more water could be released in one year than in another and that the amount available at Sioux City will be somewhat less than the figure mentioned in your letter as the average annual yield at Fort Peck due to losses before the water reaches Sioux City. You ask to be advised if you are correct in the assumption.

Since there is no fixed amount of water authorized by statute for navigation purposes on the Missouri River other than the capacity of the Fort Peck Reservoir, it cannot be assumed that the average annual inflow into that reservoir cited in your letter is the amount of water authorized for navigation between Sioux City and the mouth of the river. The stream-flow records for the past 50 years indicate that the period between 1934 and 1942, which was used as the basis for the average annual in-flow into the reservoir cited in your letter, was embraced within a dry cycle. By interpolating discharges as recorded by the Fort Benton gaging station during the period prior to 1933, the average annual flow of the river at Fort Peck since 1890 is about 65 percent greater than that during the 8-year period ending 1942. As the flow may fluctuate considerably from year to year, the amount of in-flow into the reservoir is unpredictable. Accordingly, it would appear that no equitable figure could be chosen as the definite amount of water available for navigation purposes.

It is true that more water can be released from the reservoir in one year than in another provided such regulation of the impounded water is consistent with the demands of navigation. During a dry period the amount and duration of the releases would necessarily be greater than during a wet year when it is possible no releases would be required for navigation. The water, instead of going to waste, is stored in the Fort Peck Reservoir for future use in the interest of navigation and other beneficial uses as now authorized by law. With respect to the volume for the releases from the Fort Peck Reservoir that actually reaches Sioux City, it may be stated that the run-off from the watershed between the dam and Sioux City, not otherwise appropriated for irrigation and related purposes, augments the reservoir releases to the extent that the average stream flow at the head of the recommended 9-foot channel is several times the amount of in-flow into the reservoir.

You may be assured that the importance of conserving the water resources of the Missouri River Basin is recognized and that operation of the Fort Peck Reservoir is being so scheduled as to conserve all possible water consistent with providing for the requirements of navigation in accordance with the act of Congress authorizing its construction. In my opinion there is sufficient water supply available in the Missouri River Basin to meet all existent requirements. In order to meet the future requirements for irrigation additional reservoirs will be required. Any action in that direction, instead of restricting the use of water for navigation purposes, would advance the development of the Missouri Basin.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

MARCH 18, 1944.

Maj. Gen. E. REYBOLD,
Chief of Engineers, War Department,
Washington, D. C.:

Re your wire March 17, 1944, navigation proposals for Missouri River. You express opinion these proposals will not adversely affect irrigation uses in Wyoming and I assume you mean also in other upper States. It would appear that in view of this opinion on your part you would have no objection to protective language in H. R. 3961 to insure such upper uses against possible adverse effects. Shall appreciate answer by wire today.

FRANK A. BARRETT,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
March 20, 1944.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel 18 March under departmental regulations and practice of long standing official expressions of opinion of merits of proposed legislation are made only through established channels and in response to formal request from congressional committee having such legislation under consideration. Compliance with your request would therefore not be appropriate spewr 280.

ROBINS,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed expenditure between Sioux City and Kansas City on the Missouri River is to complete work now in process. The work on this section, according to Colonel Freeman, the district engineer, is 91 percent completed. The total Missouri River project is a $200,000,000 development and is approximately 95 percent completed.

The appropriation involved is $6,000,000 on a small segment of the Missouri River. It is supplemental with the larger project of flood control throughout the entire basin.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. The Army engineers have carefully gone into this Missouri River project, have issued their report, and have recommended that the project be authorized. As the gentleman from Nebraska just said, the project is 91 percent completed at this time. It seems to me that in considering this bill we should do so from the viewpoint that it is an over-all development of a particular program, and we should not let these sectional interests enter in. In my judgment, no section along the Missouri River, or any river, as far as that is concerned, has any priority on the rainfall which ultimately gets into the channels of the river.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I may state, in regard to the amount of wheat and flour shipped in 1 year down the Missouri River, it has already saved over $400,000 to the farmers there.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Judging from the official reports, it seems to me that there is going to be enough water in the Missouri River Valley to take care of all the needs for reclamation, irrigation, navigation, and whatever is involved in this particular program.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to point out in that connection that an amendment which was adopted yesterday, the so-called committee amendment to the Missouri project, states that the accomplishment of this project shall be done without increasing the water demanded beyond the projects previously authorized by law. Those projects previously authorized by law as far as the Missouri River is concerned are a 6-foot channel and the Fort Peck Reservoir.

With that amendment in the bill this project does not change the water demands on the Missouri River one iota, and with that limiting amendment it should not be involved in any further consideration of the Missouri River; that is whatever the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers may agree upon for new uses of the river above Sioux City is not going to be affected by this project in view of the amendment which has been adopted, and I think the chairman of the committee will confirm that that was the interpretation of the amendment at the time it was discussed with the committee, and it has been the interpretation accepted here in the House during all the debate.

Mr. HOEVEN. In the light of all the amendments which have been introduced here it seems that there is some organized attempt to hamper the proposed Missouri River program.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the point where I interrogated the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] I may extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to call the attention of the House to what is perhaps the smallest item in this bill, but which in a way, nevertheless, is one of the most significant items.

You will find on page 25 of the bill a little item for the improvement of the Salmon River in Oregon. It is the smallest of the many projects in the State of Oregon which are authorized in this bill, and which range in cost from a few thousand dollars to several million dollars. It involves an expenditure of only $5,000 for the purpose of removing a large rock from the entrance of a very small coastal river in Oregon.

A few small fishing vessels, having a draft of 2 or 3 feet use the estuary of this little stream as a home port and sometimes as a harbor of refuge. Some of them have been wrecked in bad weather on this rock. There was no seaborne commerce, of course, on this little stream, and nobody had ventured a suggestion that there ever would or could be any. Likewise, on account of its small volume of water nobody ever suggested that it contained any hydro-electric power possibilities. Such a suggestion would have been ridiculous. We simply wanted that rock removed so that it would not wreck the fishing boats and that was the entire purpose and scope of the project.

This little project was first proposed by me in 1938, when I introduced a resolution authorizing a survey by the Army engineers with a view to improving the entrance to this stream by removing the rock. This resolution was approved and the survey was authorized by H. R. 10298, Public Law No. 685, Seventy-fifth Congress. The survey was made and the project was recommended by the district engineer, the division engineer and the Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and was duly transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of War, as provided by law, in 1940.

Now why, Mr. Chairman, do I say this simple little project is significant. It is significant because it was the first piece of legislation, so far as I can learn, with which an executive agency of the Government, unauthorized by any act of Congress, openly tried to interfere. That agency was the National Resources Planning Board, which the Congress has since abolished because of its unauthorized, pernicious interference with the orderly processes of legislation.

In the debate on the 1940 appropriation bill, in which I endeavored to prevent the appropriation of any further funds for this agency, I took occasion to cite this little Salmon River project as an example of the methods used by the National Resources Planning Board to interfere with and to undermine constitutional and orderly processes of Congressional legislation. The speech will be found on pages 4455–56 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1940.

That was a long time ago. We have not had a general river and harbor bill since that time. And so I am going to briefly recite the facts here in connection with the pending bill, which again revives and authorizes this little project.

When the Secretary of War on January 8, 1940, transmitted to the Congress, through the Speaker of the House, the favorable report of the Army engineers on the Salmon River project (H. Doc. No. 551, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), his letter of transmittal contained this statement:

> In forwarding this report your attention is invited to the accompanying memorandum from the President in which he indicates his disapproval of the project on the ground that it is not justified by the population or water-borne commerce affected, and because it is a part of a larger comprehensive project on the Columbia and Salmon Rivers.

Knowing, of course, no comprehensive project either of power or navigation on this very small stream was involved in the engineers' report, and that all that was intended was to remove a rock so that small fishing boats could enter and leave the entrance without being destroyed, I undertook to find out, if I could, why the President should go out of his way, before the report even reached the Congress, to put in an objection to it. The memorandum to which the Secretary of War referred was printed at the very beginning of the engineers' report, and was boldly initialed, "F. D. R." This is what the memorandum said:

> I cannot approve this project for the entrance of the Salmon River. The population of less than 200 does not warrant it; existing water-borne commerce does not justify it, and this is essentially a part of a larger project which will undoubtedly be undertaken by the Government in connection with the development of navigation and power on the Columbia and Salmon Rivers. It should wait until then.

I found out that the President, of course, knew nothing about the Salmon River, and it was obvious that he could not have read the Army engineers' report to which he had attached this memorandum, and which was simple, plain, and unambiguous, and which comprehended only the removal of this rock. The President had undertaken, nevertheless, to veto this little item prior to the time it

was considered by the Congress. I learned he had done this upon the recommendation of the National Resources Planning Board, to whom the engineers' report had been submitted without any authority of law whatever. The law requires that these reports be submitted by the Secretary of War directly to the Congress. Not even the President is entitled to receive them, or in any way to interfere with their direct transmission to Congress. Yet here was the National Resources Planning Board, which had never been even authorized by Congress, holding up this report and recommending to the Congress what it ought to do about it.

I found also, upon further investigation, that this National Resources Planning Board had undertaken to interfere with other legislation in the same way, in connection with a half-dozen other similar bills, but, as I said in the beginning, it was in my speech of April 12, 1940, that this pernicious and illegal interference of the Board in legislation was first brought directly to the attention of the Congress and the country.

From that time to this I have overlooked no opportunity to make known the unauthorized and harmful activities of the National Resources Planning Board, one of the main objectives of which has been to interfere with the ordinary processes of legislation in this Congress, and I have never ceased in demanding that this agency be abolished.

I am glad to say that the Congress of the United States since that time has decided that this agency, which it never authorized in the first place, should no longer exist, and that in the last session of Congress we finally took away the appropriations from the National Resources Planning Board so that it could no longer operate.

I am particularly happy, Mr. Chairman, now that the National Resources Planning Board is a thing of the past, that this little Salmon River project is included in the pending bill. Its history, as I have said, is significant for the reason I have stated, but only for that reason. It is not, as the President's memorandum stated, an essential part of a larger and more comprehensive project involving navigation and power. It is just a project to remove a rock in a very small stream so that little fishing boats may safely use it; and yet I think it has played its part in contributing to the abolishment by Congress of one of the most harmful executive agencies the Congress has ever dealt with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to allot not to exceed $300,000 from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for improvement of rivers and harbors, for removing accumulated snags and other debris, and for protecting, clearing, and straightening channels in navigable harbors and navigable streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of navigation or flood control.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: On page 29, after line 21, insert new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. That (a) the consent, permission, and authority granted to the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois to exercise jurisdiction over the navigable waters of Lake Michigan which lie within the following-described boundaries:

"Beginning at a point at the intersection of the existing bulkhead along Lake Shore Drive in Chicago, Ill., with the existing pier which is parallel to and north of Ohio Street extended and south of Ontario Street extended; thence easterly along said pier to a point in a line parallel to and 350 feet easterly of said bulkhead along the Lake Shore Drive; thence northwesterly along said last-described line to a point in a curve of 200 feet radius and tangent both to said last-described line and to a line 350 feet southerly from the southerly side of and parallel to the shore arm extension breakwater extending into Lake Michigan from a point near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive; thence along said curve to a point in said line last described; thence easterly along said line to a point in a line at right angles with said shore arm extension breakwater at the eastern extremity thereof; thence northward along said last-described line to said shore arm extension breakwater; thence westward along said shore arm extension breakwater to the shore line; and (b) the right granted to said The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, to destroy the navigability of the above-described waters altogether, and (c) the right granted to said The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, to erect an additional breakwater to connect the said shore arm extension breakwater near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive with the shore line, and (d) the transfer of possession of said shore arm extension breakwater to said The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, and the obligation for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore arm extension breakwater by The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, all as provided for by the act entitled "An act granting to The Commissioners of Lincoln Park the right to erect a breakwater in the navigable waters of Lake Michigan, and transferring jurisdiction over certain navigable waters of Lake Michigan to The Commissioners of Lincoln Park", approved March 3, 1931, be rescinded.

"The United States of America hereby resumes jurisdiction over the above-described waters and above-described shore arm extension breakwater, and hereby discharges the Chicago Park District, successor to the superseded The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, from its liability for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore arm extension breakwater.

"Said Chicago Park District shall signify its acceptance of this act by written notice to the Secretary of War within 60 days after the passage of this act, and this section shall become effective immediately upon its acceptance by said Chicago Park District. In the event of nonacceptance within 60 days this section shall become null and void."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this merely involves property that was turned over to a local concern out there for certain purposes. The property belonged to the Government. This concern no longer wants to use it for that purpose and wants to return it to the Government free of cost.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to rescind the act approved March 3, 1931, and to provide for resumption of jurisdiction by the United States over the waters and shore-arm extension breakwater, and for the discharge of the Chicago Park District from its liability for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore-arm extension breakwater. It requires acceptance by the said Chicago Park District, to be signified by written notice to the Secretary of War within 60 days after passage, and provides that upon failure of said Chicago Park District to so signify its acceptance this section shall become null and void.

The shore-arm extension breakwater was built by the United States in 1914–17 as part of the project authorized by Congress to provide an anchorage basin and protect the Navy pier. The maintenance of this breakwater is still necessary for the protection of the harbor, but is no longer required or being maintained by the Chicago Park District.

The item was originally included in H. R. 6264, river and harbor bill, which passed the Congress in April 1940, but was vetoed by the President on May 1, 1940. It was again included in the river and harbor bill introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress. However, the bill died with the adjournment of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The War Department and the Bureau of the Budget have approved the proposed legislation—see letter from the War Department to the Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, dated May 15, 1939, printed in House Report 1431, Seventy-seventh Congress.

It is believed the proposed legislation is essential at this time, and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 29, after line 21, insert the following section:

"SEC. 4. The excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to lands which will receive a water supply from the Central Valley project, California, reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment just offered on the ground that it modifies the fundamental reclamation laws, therefore is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] desire to be heard?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] to reply.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the point of order made by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], permit me to say that the Central Valley project as stated in the amendment was reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; therefore this amendment is germane to the pending bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It is an amendment to that act.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COSTELLO). The Chair is ready to rule.

In view of the fact that the amendment is directed to an amendment of the River and Harbor Act of 1937, the Chair believes the subject matter of the pending amendment is in keeping with the rules of the House regarding germaneness. For that reason the Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California as a substitute for the committee amendment: Page 29, after line 21, insert the following section:

"SEC. 4. The excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation lands shall not be applicable to any tract of land that may receive water from the Central Valley project, California, reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937, which is held by any one landowner having equitable or legal title on August 26, 1937, or by the heir or devisee of such owner, and which has been farmed by irrigation each crop season since and including 1937: *Provided*, That veterans shall, under suitable regulation, have preference in obtaining, under applicable legislation, the family-sized farms that will be made available on the Central Valley project."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very important and serious proposition. First of all, I would like to say that I understand the purpose of its having been offered. It will be said by people who disagree with me, and with some justification, that there are already holdings in excess of 160 acres, some of them very, very much in excess of that amount, whose owners now are irrigating them, and that an application of this limitation would work a hardship on those holdings.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment, I want to point out clearly, will not affect any land that was already being irrigated on the date that the Central Valley Project Act was passed, but it will affect the possibility of thousands upon thousands of acres of undeveloped land belonging, in many instances, to large commercial land companies, being tremendously appreciated in value, because those companies will be able to take advantage of this reclamation water, made possible by expenditure of public money, in the first instance, at least, to enhance the value of those lands and sell to the working farmers at that greatly increased price.

It seems to me if we are looking forward to making it possible for the veterans of this war to settle on the lands of America, if we want to have family-sized farms be the rule under the reclamation projects, the committee amendment is vastly too broad and my substitute should be adopted instead.

In addition, the Reclamation Bureau is at the present time making a study of this whole question, and substantial legislation will, in the near future, be considered by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, where this matter really belongs, and not as an amendment to a river and harbor bill. I agree there are problems. But they need mature and careful consideration, which cannot be given here.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Is the gentleman aware that a similar provision has been enacted into law in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson and other reclamation projects where the land was held in private ownership that was within the reclamation district?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know it was done in the case of the Colorado-Big Thompson. I do not know about the facts in that situation. I do believe, however, wherever that limitation is lifted and it is allowed to affect undeveloped land, that we are doing something that will cost the working farmer money—sometimes a lot of money—and that is what I want to prevent. I think the purpose of a reclamation project is to make it possible for this water to be used on family-sized farms and not for the purpose of enabling land companies to speculate as a result of the reclamation project.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know that the very thing he advocates has been done by this House in passing a bill to prevent speculation in the great Columbia River district?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, and it seems to me that this committee amendment is a backward step from the action the House took in that connection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will yield to the gentleman, and then I hope I will not be asked to yield again. I do not have much time and other people are going to get time after I am through.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Since he has mentioned it, will the gentleman name some of the large companies that will be benefited, as he says?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think it important to do that, but if the gentleman insists, the Kern County Land Co. is one of them, which would, I believe, be affected.

Mr. ELLIOTT. What other companies?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not believe it makes any difference about the names of companies.

Mr. ELLIOTT. All right; that one company.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That one company and others own a very considerable amount of land much of which is still undeveloped. If we are interested in our returning veterans, if we are interested in the small farmers, if we really want this reclamation project to be a benefit to the family-farm type of American agriculture, in which I believe, at any rate, my substitute ought to be put in instead of the committee amendment.

There has been a good deal of money expended on the Central Valley project, and irrigation is perhaps the most important single part of the whole project.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Would not the effect of the gentleman's amendment be to make this project conform to the general reclamation law?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It would come a lot closer. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. My substitute would bring the thing into conformity with the reclamation law, with the exception that anyone who did have under irrigation lands in excess of 160 acres on the date when the Central Valley Act was first passed, and therefore when people were put on notice that the reclamation laws would in the future apply, could continue to get water on a larger acreage, but otherwise they could not go against the basic reclamation law.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Do I understand the committee amendment to mean that it raises the limitation of 160 acres that anyone can take under the irrigation and reclamation law?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. The committee amendment is wide open. There would be absolutely no limit on the amount of land that any one owner could have and get reclamation water for, which means, of course, that the small man would be shut out; and not only that, if he did buy land he would pay the appreciated, higher value, due to the fact that the big holder had the water already.

Mr. IZAC. Does the gentleman think it will help the speculators who are out to sell land to the returning soldiers?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is exactly what it would do.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Would the gentleman's amendment tend to bring the existing law into conformity with what we did in the Columbia River Basin situation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. That is precisely what it would do.

Mr. Chairman, there has not been very much time since I learned about the adoption of this amendment to work on the matter. My amendment is an attempt to see if we cannot do something within reason here in the House in order that the whole matter may be threshed out in some fundamental fashion, with due consideration being given to it. I realize there is a problem in certain instances here, but I certainly do not want to see the House in a moment of time "chuck" the whole basic reclamation law in regard to the Central Valley project, without raising my voice in protest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 5 additional minutes in opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes, the 10 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the one Member in Congress whose people the committee amendment would benefit and whose people the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] would affect.

In the first place, the Central Valley project was authorized to give water to the south San Joaquin Valley. All of that territory, with the exception of a few acres, lies in my congressional district.

To date the Federal Government has spent $150,000,000 for an irrigation project to give the people water to produce food upon their land, yet to date not one gallon of water has been given to the farmer.

To show you that the gentleman from southern California [Mr. VOORHIS] does not know anything about this at all, he named one big company, the Kern County Land Co. The Kern County Land Co. will not need any of the water from the Central Valley project, I would like to inform the gentleman from southern California. I cannot conceive of any Member of Congress coming up out of his own congressional district to interfere with people whom he does not represent.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He ought to yield to me.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am not going to yield to the gentleman because he does not know anything about it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman has mentioned my name. I yielded to him in my time. If the gentleman does not want to yield, it is all right with me.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is not true that a very considerable amount of the land that will be affected is owned in large holdings and undeveloped at the present time by various land owners?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is not a true statement. There are about a million and a half acres of land that this project was set up to assist with a supplemental supply of water. The new acreage that the gentleman talks about amounts to 285,000 to 300,000 acres of land in the San Joaquin Valley. This project was set up to take care of all farmers that are already farming, and whose water tables are being depleted. Lord help this country if we have farmers today sacrificing all holdings more than 160 acres of land.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. When this came before our committee it was shown that 60 percent of the land was owned by people owning more than 160 acres of land.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. And that 40 percent of the little owners were asking for this particular amendment in order to relieve them.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes. I hold in my hand telegrams and resolutions that represent practically every farmer in the San Joaquin Valley, asking that this provision be taken out, little and big all alike, and I have not one asking the opposite. My people, not the gentleman's people of Los Angeles—my people have been paying the bill, and paying it most dearly. We have been endeavoring to get water to help produce food, and it is this kind of propaganda being put out in the State of California that has today stopped the Central Valley project from going ahead—false propaganda, misrepresentations; and I hold in my hand again the plea of my people, and the time has come when we must listen to the people who will pay the bill. My people are going to pay for this water, not the gentleman's people in southern California, and when we had a fight on this issue in the State of California at the time one of the finest Governors we ever had was in office—his brother is now a Member in this House—Governor Rolph, he pleaded with the people of southern California to assist, and the southern California group voted against the project, but we were able to defeat them at that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yielded to the gentleman once, and I do not believe that he can enlighten me on this project any more.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wanted to say that I supported that project strongly and was for it from the beginning.

Mr. ELLIOTT. And I point out to the House that 60 percent of our farmers own more than 160 acres. All of those farmers should have more than 160 acres of land to make a decent living. This project should not be held down to 40 percent of the small farmers, because the cost would be too great. Let us be sensible. Would I be in the well of this House pleading with you if I did not have the full support of my people who are going to pay for this project in the San Joaquin Valley? I certainly would not. I hold telegrams and resolutions from every water district, and you must have those water districts formed in order to purchase this water when the project is complete. But this project has been set up, so far, not to provide water for the farmers.

As recently as this week, before the Committee on Appropriations, members of the Interior Department Reclamation Division admitted that they had spent all the money for power and nothing for water. A group of five committee members visited that locality last summer. They saw the Friant Dam complete. It has been complete for practically 2 years, except for the gates, and they are available. Nine hundred thousand acre-feet of water wastes through the gates going to the sea. Twenty million dollars of your money has been spent, and not 1 dollar spent to open up the canal so that the farmers can get the water. It is imperative that we form these water districts. My people are not going to form them to be strangled by not being allowed to have more than 160 acres of land. I know the gentleman's program, but I do not go along on that sort of line—socialistic. If we would listen to some people in the United States, each farmer would be farming 5 and 10 and 15 acres, and we would be paying subsidies and asking the taxpayers to make up the difference. We have to get away from that. Let us give a man enough to make a living. Let us give a man enough to make a living, I say, so that he does not have to have a subsidy from the Government. I have been watching this project. I am a farmer, I own my own land, and I know what it is to till the land. The average man who can rear a family today in California in certain types of farming, dairying, needs more than 160 acres to operate a decent kind of a dairy. Anybody knows that. This is not anything new. All we ask is to take this limitation off, so that the small farmer can afford to pay for the water, and so that the large farmer will not have part of his land destroyed. He has been paying taxes and owns water rights. Let us give them all proper protection and pass the committee amendment and defeat the amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] offered as a substitute. I say to the House again, and I speak in all earnestness, that the Central Valley project is what I came

to Washington for and nothing else. It was to try to get water for the people of the San Joaquin Valley. In my congressional district last year, the richest in all the United States, we produced over $200,000,000 worth of food and fiber. We are helping to win the war. We have been strangled and sold down the river. We have been driven into a power project, from a water project supposed to be given to the farmers. There are Members sitting on the floor here who can stand up, members of the Committee on Appropriations, who will tell you that I am speaking the truth. I am not for large holding companies to make easy money out of this project, but, gentlemen, these companies have been farming out there for years. I have not seen anybody getting rich. People are trying to leave the farms, instead of coming to them. I saw a piece of property just after the first of the year, and we are talking about the big farmer, where they are operating today and where one man takes the place of 23 in their operation, and we could not feed the Nation if it were not for the large farmer and his operations. If we are going to limit the farmer, we might as well say to Henry Ford that he can only make 20 automobiles in a year, because Charlie across the road only wants to make that many.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand it a committee amendment is before the House, and the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has offered an amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has offered a substitute for the committee amendment. The question before the House is, Shall the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California be agreed to?

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important duties of our Government and especially this Congress is to plan and prepare now for the afterwar program of providing work and employment for the millions of boys who are today sacrificing everything to preserve free government in America.

I have the honor of representing one of the greatest industrial areas in the United States, located on the shores of Lake Michigan and immediately adjacent to the southern borders of the city of Chicago. At no spot in America are there greater possibilities for manufacturing expansion than the Calumet region of Indiana, with its present railroad and water transportation on Lake Michigan to the north, and its river and canal connections with the Mississippi to the southwest.

The provisions in H. R. 3961 calling for an authorization to develop the natural water transportation opportunities in the Illinois-Indiana Calumet area is of prime importance, and its construction would bring to this district hundreds of industries and the giving of employment to thousands of workers and returning war veterans. We hear a great deal of lip service, conversation, and resolutions about post-war planning and the necessity of giving employment to the millions of boys who in a short time will return from the battle front. The only practical way to provide jobs is to lay the foundation for industry and manufacturing. The authorization by Congress of this Indiana-Illinois river and canal project would be a major step in post-war planning in the Middle West.

This district is the center of steel manufacturing, and on the Indiana side we have East Chicago with fifty-odd important industries, the city of Hammond with approximately 80, and Whiting with its large oil refineries and other industries. Immediately to the southeast we have Gary with the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries which produce millions of tons of steel per year. This corporation owns and maintains its own harbor, known as the Gary Harbor, on Lake Michigan and receives at this port many tons of iron, coal, and stone by deep-draft vessels on the Great Lakes.

The Universal Atlas Cement Co. is also located between Gary and Indiana Harbor with its Buffington Lake Harbor where it receives many tons of material by deep-draft vessel.

In addition to the above, the city of Gary has the American Bridge Co., the Tubular Alloy Steel Corporation, the Union Drawn Steel Corporation, the Standard Steel Spring Corporation, and the Gary Screw & Bolt Co. and other smaller industries shipping many thousands of tons annually out of this area. I am mentioning the above regarding the city of Gary because with a very small comparative expense the Army engineers could extend the barge canal along the Grand Calumet River from the juncture of the Indiana Harbor Canal in East Chicago to Clark Road at the city limits of Gary and afford these industries inland waterway transportation to points south.

I might say that the State of Indiana, the administrative and the State planning board, along with the municipalities of all the industrial cities in the Calumet area, their chambers of commerce, all civic organizations, and various labor groups have been advocating for years the development of the Calumet region's natural inland-waterway possibilities. Organized labor in my district can see the unlimited possibilities if this great Government improvement is made; it might prove to be the barrier which would protect us from another unemployment depression similar to 1930, 1931, and 1932.

If this additional transportation facility becomes a reality, grouped with our railroad and lake transportation, we would in 20 years see an industrial development along the south shore of Lake Michigan which will give employment to hundreds of thousands of American citizens. This development, based on its phenomenal growth in the last 25 years, undoubtedly will come. Heavy industry throughout the State of Indiana is confined greatly to the Calumet district, and this rapid growth has taken place in spite of only a limited, one-way water transportation.

The freight transportation problems of this region are common to both Indiana and Illinois, and the Army engineers who have given this area so much of their time and constructive thought are deserving of the thanks and gratitude of all our citizens.

This bill, as far as it pertains to the Illinois-Indiana Waterway and Canal, calls for the widening of the Calumet Sag Channel from 60 to 160 feet and keeping it at the present depth of 9 feet; the Grand Calumet River would be widened from 100 feet and depth to 6 feet, to 160 and 9 feet. It also calls for the replacement of an inadequate lock in the Little Calumet River and providing for railroad bridges. Local interests pay for the highway bridges and also provide for all adjacent land.

If this project receives the final approval of the Army engineers, within a short time after its completion there will be hundreds of new industries demanding perfect rail and water transportation move in to this Indiana Calumet district. In a short time the freight transportation of this area would be more than tripled. This great influx of industries will extend to our railroads a greater volume of business in freight transportation, far more than they enjoy in and out of this area at the present time. It was water transportation down Lake Michigan to Gary and East Chicago that provided the iron ore for the mammoth steel mills which produce the finished products for the railroads to transport in all directions. In numerous areas throughout our Nation railway and water transportation are interdependable. The growth of one assures the progress of the other and vice versa.

I am not familiar with all the proposed projects set out in this legislation, H. R. 3961, but I am thoroughly acquainted with the project referred to as the Illinois Waterway, Illinois, and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Indiana, House Document Number 145, in this bill. This project has been certified as economically sound after long study by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

We have found that the future of the democratic world depends upon ships and shipping; let us not retard commercial progress, as we would be in a deplorable condition today if it were not for our present Federal waterway system. When initiated, other waterway projects, vital to us now, were criticized or condemned by selfish interest and short-sighted groups.

I have every confidence that if there are any projects in this legislation not meritorious and economically sound, they will be refused by the War Department and Army engineers if Congress makes this authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the next section in the bill is section No. 3 for surveys. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of section 3 be dispensed with and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Section 3 reads as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to direct to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made at the following-named localities, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That no preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate for new works other than those designated in this or some prior act or joint resolution shall be made: *Provided further*, That after the regular or formal reports made as required by law on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law: *Provided further*, That reports of surveys on beach erosion and shore protection shall include an estimate of the public interests involved, and such plan of improvement as is found justified, together with the equitable distribution of costs in each case: *And provided further*, That this section shall not be construed to interfere with the performance of any duties vested in the Federal Power Commission under existing law:

Beals Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Macks Point, Searsport, Maine, with a view to the construction of a harbor.

Scarboro River, Maine, between Prouts Neck and Pine Point.

Bunganuc Creek, Maquoite Bay, Maine.

Cathance River, Maine.

Winterport Harbor, Maine.

Cundys Harbor, Maine.

Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the pool at Biddeford.

For a continuous waterway between Portland, Maine, and Boston, Mass., inland where possible.

Waterway from Plum Island Sound to the Annisquam River, Essex County, Mass.

Ipswich River, Plum Island Sound and Fox Creek, Mass.

Fall River Harbor, Mass.

Channel to Hog Island, Hingham Bay, Mass.

Eightmile River, Conn.

Moriches Inlet, N. Y.

Centerport Harbor, Long Island, N. Y.

Shinnecock Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.

Fire Island Inlet, N. Y.

Saw Mill River, N. Y.

Bronx River, N. Y.

Westchester Creek, N. Y.

Hutchinson River, N. Y.

Steinway Creek, Astoria, N. Y.

Champlain Canal, N. Y., with a view to its improvement without taking title to said canal and its appurtenances.

Hudson River, at or near North Germantown, Columbia County, N. Y.

Hudson River at the mouth of Endikill Creek, N. Y., with a view to constructing a small boat anchorage basin.

Mohawk River, N. Y.

Hackensack River, N. J.

Salem River, Salem County, N. J.

Fishing Creek, Cumberland County, N. J.

Cheesequake Creek, N. J.

Schuylkill River, Pa., to determine whether navigation conditions may be improved, and if the increasing cost of maintenance due to silting in the channels of the Schuylkill and Delaware Rivers may be lessened, and flood heights controlled, by the construction of impounding and settling reservoirs to prevent the encroachment of mining wastes.

Waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehobeth Bay, Del.

Marumsco Creek, lower Somerset County, Md.

Websters Cove, Somerset County, Md., with a view to constructing a jetty in the project channel.

Taylors Landing, Worcester County, Md.

Channel from Charlestown, Northeast River, Md., to Havre de Grace.

Channel from Havre de Grace, Md., to Red Point, via Stump Point and Carpenter Point.

Honga River and Tar Bay, including channel into and harbor in Back Creek, Hooper Island, Md.

Channel in Honga River, to the plant of White and Nelson, Hoopersville, Md.

Harbor at Public Landing, Worcester County, Md.

Cambridge Harbor, Md.

Rockhall Harbor, Md.

Ross Cove (Magothy River), Md.

Cambridge Harbor, Md.

Coxes Creek, tributary of Stony Creek, Md.

Channels to Lake Ogleton and Walnut Lake, Anne Arundel County, Md.

Channel from Kent Island Narrows to Well Cove, Chester River, Md.

Port Tobacco Creek, Md.

Hellens Creek, Calvert County, Md.

Channel from Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md.

St. Patricks Creek, Md.

Big Kingston Creek, St. Marys County, Md.

Tanners Creek, St. Marys County, Md.

Parkers Creek, Calvert County, Md.

Chester River Channel, Md.

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers and adjacent waters in and near the District of Columbia, with a view to attaining a comprehensive and coordinated improvement and development of such waters and their shores. In determining the recommendations to be made with respect to such improvement and development, consultations shall be had with, and consideration given to the recommendations of, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Potomac River and tributaries at and below Washington, D. C., with a view to elimination of the waterchestnut.

Potomac River at and near Washington, D. C.

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers at and near Washington, D. C., with a view to providing a municipal sailing base.

Farnham Creek, Richmond County, Va.

Southwest side of Rappahannock River, in vicinity of Bowlers Wharf, Essex County, Va., to secure harbor of refuge and connecting channels.

Finneys Creek, Accomac County, Va., and the channel connecting said creek with Wachapreague Inlet and the Atlantic Ocean.

Jackson Creek, Westmoreland County, Va.

Bonum Creek, Westmoreland County, Va.

Kings Creek, Northampton County, Va.

Bransons Cove, lower Machodoc River, Va.

Taskmers Creek, Northumberland County, Va.

Davis Creek, Mathews County, Va.

Dyer Creek, Mathews County, Va.

Deep Creek, Accomac County, Va.

Browns Bay, Gloucester County, Va., and the channel connecting said bay with Mobjack Bay.

Parrotts Creek, Middlesex County, Va.

The Hague (Smith Creek), Va.

Southern Branch of Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor, Va.

Chuckatuck Creek, Nansemond and Isle of Wight Counties, Va.

Little Creek, Princess Anne County, Va.

Channel from the Thoroughfare to Albemarle Sound, N. C., either by way of lower Cashie River, Middle River, and Bachelors Bay, or by way of any other route.

Purviance Creek, New Hanover County, N. C.

Little Pee Dee River, S. C., from junction of the Lumber River to the Great Pee Dee River, with a view to removing logs, debris, and other obstructions.

Jefferys Creek, Florence County, S. C.

Murrells Inlet, S. C.

North River, Ga.

St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.

Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, Fla., with a view to providing an auxiliary side channel from the Intracoastal Waterway near Titusville through, and easterly of, Merritt Island via Banana Creek and River, to, or near, Eau Gallie, Fla.

Side channels, or spur channels, leading from the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, Fla., to, and turning basins or harbors at, the various communities on or near the banks of said waterway, having particular reference to providing such improvements to and at Titusville, Flagler Beach, New Smyrna, Fort Pierce, and to the Lighthouse Service Depot at Taylor Creek, adjacent to Fort Pierce Harbor.

St. Augustine Harbor, and vicinity, Fla.

Kissimmee River, Fla.

Jupiter Inlet, Fla.

Oklawaha River, Fla., from Lake Apopka through Lake Dora to Lake Eustis and adjoining waterways.

Oklawaha River, Fla., from Lake Eustis to Lake Griffin, and thence from Lake Griffin to Silver Springs Run.

Oklawaha River and its tributaries, Fla., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

Orange Lake Basin, Fla.

Wacasassa River and its tributaries, Fla., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

Channel and harbor at Everglades, Collier County, Fla.

Bakers Haulover Inlet, Fla.

Waterway from packing house and railroad terminal at Belle Glade, Fla., to Lake Okeechobee and to the Intracoastal Waterway through the Hillsboro and West Palm Beach Canals.

Peace River, Fla.

Channel to Pahokee, on Lake Okeechobee, Fla.

Lake Okeechobee and its tributary streams, Fla., with a view to removing the waterhyacinth.

Fisheating Creek, Fla.

Channel from bridge at Bradenton, Fla., to deep water in Gulf of Mexico (Tampa Bay).

Channel from Tampa Bay to Safety Harbor, Fla.

Channel from Old Tampa Bay to Oldsmar, Fla.

Channel leading from Tampa Bay Channel directly north to the vicinity of Maximo Point near St. Petersburg, Fla.

St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla., to provide for a channel up to the depth of 30 feet from the main Tampa Bay ship channel past the port of St. Petersburg in front of the recreation pier.

Channels through Big Pass and Little Pass, from Clearwater Bay, Fla., to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico.

Sarasota Bay, Fla.: Channel from Caseys Pass (Venice Inlet), through Dona Bay to the bridge on the United States Highway No. 41, including a turning basin at the eastern terminus of the channel.

Hudson River, Fla.

Channel from the deep water in St. Joseph Sound to, and turning basin at, Ozona, Fla.

Chassahowitska River, Fla.

Channel, turning basin, and improvements at Horseshoe, Dixie County, Fla.

Sante Fe River, from bridge on Federal Highway No. 41, near High Springs, to the Suwannee River, and from this bridge upstream to Camp Blanding, Kingsley Lake, Fla.

Waterways from Camp Blanding, Kingsley Lake, Fla., via Black Creek to St. Johns River, and (or) via Black Creek and Doctors Inlet to St. Johns River.

Canal from Saint Marks to Tallahassee, Fla.

Chipola River, Ala. and Fla., with a view to its improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, power, and other related purposes.

Waterway from the Intracoastal Waterway south across Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to a point at or near Deer Point Light.

La Grange Bayou, Fla.

St. Josephs Bay, Fla.

Entrance to Perdido Bay, Ala. and Fla., from the Gulf of Mexico to deep water in Perdido Bay, via the most practicable route.

Waterway from the Escambia River to the Alabama River, Fla., and Ala.

Tennessee, Tombigbee, and Mobile Rivers, with a view to securing a through waterway of 12 feet depth and suitable width between the Ohio River and the Gulf of Mexico.

Fly Creek, Fairhope, Ala.

Grand Bayou Pass, La., from the Gulf of Mexico to Buras and Empire.

Bayou Schofield, La., from the Gulf of Mexico to Buras and Empire.

Ship canal to extend from the Mississippi River at a point at or near the city of New Orleans, La., to the Gulf of Mexico, by way of the best available route or routes.

Grand Bayou, connecting Bayou Boeuf and Bayou Chevreuil, La.

Barataria Bay and connecting channels, La., to provide a continuous waterway from the Gulf of Mexico to the intracoastal waterway.

Bayou Boeuf, La Fourche Parish, La.

Lake Pontchartrain, La., with a view to the construction of a seaplane base in the vicinity of New Orleans.

Mermentau River, La., from Grand Chenier to the Gulf.

Bell City Drainage Canal, La.

Bayou La Fourche, La., from the Gulf of Mexico to Leeville or to Golden Meadow.

Bayou La Fourche, La., from Donaldsonville to the Intracoastal Waterway, via Bayou Boeuf, Assumption Parish.

The shore of Galveston Bay, Tex., with a view to preventing its erosion.

Pine Island Bayou, Tex.

Cedar Bayou Pass, Corpus Christi Pass, and Pass at Murdocks Landing, Tex.

Little Bay, Tex.

Sabine River, Tex.

Neches River, Tex.

Big Sandy Creek, Tex.

Cypress Creek, Tex.

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., with a view to further improvements in the interest of navigation and the prevention of damage by floods.

Waterway from the Neches River, by way of Pine Island Bayou and extension, to Trinity River, Tex.

Colorado River, Tex.

Waterway from Alvin, Tex., to the Intracoastal Waterway.

Ouachita River, with a view to the construction of a dam at or near Rockport, Ark., in the interest of navigation, flood control, and the development of hydroelectric power.

Loosahatchie River, Tenn., from its mouth to the O. K. Robertson Road and including the area west of the Illinois Central Railroad and north of Wolf River, with a view to extending the navigation facilities of Memphis Harbor.

Mississippi River: Davenport (Iowa) harbor of refuge.

Mississippi River at Cassville, Wis.

Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis.

Mississippi River at Alma, Wis.

Mississippi River at Maiden Rock, Wis.

Illinois and Mississippi Canal, Ill.

St. Croix River Basin, Minnesota and Wisconsin, including consideration of the construction of dam below the mouth of Kettle River.

Red River of the North Drainage Basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

Missouri River in South Dakota.

Tofte Harbor, Minn.

Lake Kabetogama, Minn.

Waterway connecting Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, from Au Train Lake to Little Bay de Noc, Mich.

Harbor at mouth of Au Train River, Mich.

Shelldrake Harbor, Mich.

St. Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., with a view to providing facilities for light-draft navigation.

Algoma Harbor, Mich.

Galien River, Berrien County, Mich.

Pine River, Mich.

Pinconning River, Mich.

Waterway from Lake Erie, at or near Toledo, Ohio, to the southerly end of Lake Michigan by way of the Maumee River and the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., or other practicable route.

St. Marys River, Ohio and Ind.

Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio.

Harbor at Ballast Island, Ohio.

Vermilion Harbor, Ohio, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and related purposes.

Rocky River, Ohio.

At or near North East, Pa., with a view to constructing a harbor of refuge.

Harbor at Hamburg Township, N. Y.

Little River (branch of Niagara River), at Cavuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Port Bay, N. Y.

Chaumont River, N. Y.

At and in the vicinity of Henderson, N. Y., with a view to constructing a harbor.

At and in the vicinity of Sacketts Harbor, N. Y., with a view to providing additional harbor facilities.

Point Dume, Calif.

Santa Monica Harbor, Calif.

The coast of southern California, with a view to the establishment of harbors for light-draft vessels.

Pillar Point, Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, Calif.

Nelscott, Oreg., with a view to protection of the beach.

Harbor at Empire, Oreg.

Alsea Bay, Oreg., with a view to the construction of a harbor of refuge.

Channel at Charleston, South Slough, Oreg.

Grays Harbor, Wash., with a view to constructing a channel into Bay City.

Grays Harbor, Wash., with a view to providing a breakwater and other improvements at and near Westport.

Friday Harbor, Wash.

Sitka Harbor, Alaska.

Cordova Harbor, Alaska.

Kodiak Harbor, Alaska.

Neva Strait and Olga Strait, Alaska.

Upper Kvichak River, Alaska.

Skagway Harbor, Alaska.

Kalaupapa Landing, Island of Molokai, Hawaii.

Kalepolepa Boat Harbor, Island of Maui, Hawaii.

Aguadillo Harbor, P. R.

Humacao Playa, Punta Santiago, P. R.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will state there are 28 amendments to be offered to section 3. I ask unanimous consent they may be considered en bloc and printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments are as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 29, line 22, strike out "3", and insert in lieu thereof "5."

Committee amendment offered to the preliminary examination and survey section of the pending bill by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Insert the following items on the pages and places hereinafter designated:

Page 31, after line 13:

"New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbors, Mass.; particularly with a view to providing greater depth in the eastern portion of the anchorage basin."

Page 31, after line 17:

"The southern coast of Long Island, from the New York City line to Montauk Point, N. Y., with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along said coast, such examination and survey to be made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and the act entitled 'An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States,' approved June 26, 1936."

Page 32, after line 6:

"Arthur Kill, N. Y. and N. J., between a point 1,000 feet north of the mouth of Smiths Creek and a point 1,000 feet south of Buckwheat Island."

Page 32, after line 7:

"Coast of New Jersey, from Sandy Hook to Cape May, with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along said coast, such examination and survey to be made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and the act entitled 'An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States,' approved June 26, 1936."

Page 32, after line 17:

"Mispillion River, Del., up to Milford."

Page 32, after line 22:

"Pocomoke River, Md., from Old Rock Buoy to Williams Point."

Page 33, after line 14, insert:

"Walnut Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., lying between Bay Ridge and Arundel-on-the-Bay."

Page 36, after line 25:

"For a system of interlocking open-river and canalized channels having a depth of 12 feet, and of suitable width, to be constructed through rivers and lakes, and by land cuts, as follows: From Palatka, Fla., to the Indian River at Sebastian, Melbourne, Eau Gallie, Cocoa, or such other locality as may be found most suitable; from Titusville westerly to the St. Johns River, thence to Lake Tohopekaliga; from Lake Tohopekaliga to Leesburg, on Lake Harris; from Lake Harris to the St. Johns River near Dexter Lake, or alternately from Lake Harris to the Wekiwa River, thence to the St. Johns River; and from Lake Tohopekaliga via the Kissimmee River and Lake Okeechobee to a connection with the Okeechobee Cross-Florida Channel; all with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and water conservation."

Page 38, after line 2:

"Hillsboro Inlet, Fla., in the vicinity of Pompano."

Page 39, after line 5:

"Aucilla River, Fla.

"Bayou Texar, Fla."

Page 40, after line 13:
"Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and connecting streams, lakes, and bays in Louisiana between Bayou Sale ridge and the Calcasieu River in the interest of navigation, flood control, irrigation, and drainage."
Page 41, after line 2:
"Dickinson Bayou, Tex.
"Jones Creek, Tex., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and flood control."
Page 42, after line 3:
"Allegheny River, up to Warren, Pa."
Page 42, after line 4:
"Grand Portage Harbor, Minn."
Page 42, after line 11:
"Harbor at St. Ignace, Mich.
"Mackinac Harbor, Mich."
Page 42, line 12: Strike out "Algoma Harbor, Mich."
Page 42, after line 15:
"Clinton River, Mich."
Page 42, after line 21:
"The coast of Lake Erie, with a view to the establishment of harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels for commercial and, or, recreational purposes."
Page 42, after line 24:
"Minnesota River, Minn., up to a point 10 miles above New Ulm, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and related purposes.
Page 43, after line 6:
"Oswego Harbor, N. Y."
Page 43, after line 17:
"Monterey Harbor, Calif.
"Carquinez Strait and Alhambra Creek, Calif., with a view to providing harbor improvements at, and in the vicinity of, Martinez."
Page 43, after line 22:
"Willapa Harbor, Wash., with a view to providing a channel to, and turning basin at, Tokeland dock; also with a view to providing a mooring basin and breakwater at and near Nahcotta dock, Nahcotta."
Page 44, after line 9:
"Valdez Harbor, Alaska, with a view to its improvement, and particularly with respect to the expansion of facilities for harborage of small boats.
"Cook Inlet, Alaska, with a view to improvement for navigation, providing harbor facilities for the city of Anchorage, and the development of hydroelectric power.
"Anchorage Harbor, Alaska, with a view to its improvement, and with the view of determining the advisability of providing additional harbor facilities for small boats."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York: On page 43, line 4, change the letter "v" in the last word to the letter "y", so that it will read:
"Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 3? The Chair hears none. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration H. R. 3961, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes, and pursuant to House Resolution 464, reported the same back to the House, with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Tombigbee Inland Waterway amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendments? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Allen, Ill.	Gale	Monroney
Andresen, August H.	Gamble	Morrison, La.
Baldwin, Md.	Gibson	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gifford	O'Connor
Barry	Green	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Bonner	Harless, Ariz.	Plumley
Buckley	Hendricks	Price
Bulwinkle	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Burgin	Kee	Rizley
Busbey	Kelley	Scanlon
Celler	Lambertson	Short
Chenoweth	Lane	Smith, Maine
Disney	Larcade	Stearns, N. H.
Feighan	LeFevre	Sullivan
Fernandez	Luce	Taylor
Fogarty	McGehee	Thomas, N. J.
Fuller	McLane	Vorys, Ohio
Fulmer	Manasco	Vursell
Furlong	Merrow	Winter

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 17 strike out all of lines 10 to 14, inclusive.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. A vote to sustain the amendment would be a vote "aye," and a vote against the amendment would be a vote "no"; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is always the case.

Mr. RANKIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. A vote "aye" would be against the committee; a vote "no" would be to sustain the committee.

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry, but it is undoubtedly true.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONDERO) there were—ayes 113, noes 122.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 195, nays 157, answered "present" 1, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—195

Andersen, H. Carl.	Gossett	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	OBrien, Ill.
Arends	Griffiths	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arnold	Gross	O'Hara
Auchincloss	Gwynne	O'Konski
Beall	Hale	Plumley
Beckworth	Hall, Leonard W.	Poage
Bender	Halleck	Poulson
Bishop	Hancock	Powers
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Pracht, C. Frederick
Bolton	Herter	Pratt, Joseph M.
Boren	Hess	Ramey
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Randolph
Bradley, Pa.	Hoch	Reece, Tenn.
Brehm	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Holmes, Mass.	Rizley
Buffett	Howell	Robertson
Burch, Va.	Hull	Robsion, Ky.
Butler	Jeffrey	Rockwell
Carrier	Jenkins	Rodgers, Pa.
Carson, Ohio	Jennings	Rogers, Mass.
Carter	Jensen	Rohrbough
Celler	Johnson, Anton J.	Rolph
Chapman	Johnson, Ind	Russell
Chiperfield	Johnson, J. Leroy	Sauthoff
Church	Johnson, Ward	Schiffler
Clevenger	Jones	Schwabe
Cochran	Jonkman	Scott
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Sheppard
Compton	Kearney	Simpson, Ill.
Costello	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Crosser	Kinzer	Smith, W. Va.
Cunningham	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Landis	Snyder
Day	LeCompte	Springer
Dewey	Lesinski	Stanley
Dickstein	Lewis	Stefan
Dingell	Ludlow	Stevenson
Dirksen	McConnell	Sumner, Ill.
Dondero	McCowen	Sundstrom
Douglas	McGregor	Taber
Durham	McWilliams	Talbot
Dworshak	Maas	Talle
Eaton	Madden	Tibbott
Eberharter	Mahon	Towe
Elliott	Maloney	Treadway
Ellis	Martin, Iowa	Troutman
Ellison, Md.	Martin, Mass.	Vincent, Ky.
Elston, Ohio	Mason	Wadsworth
Fellows	May	Ward
Fenton	Michener	Wasielewski
Fish	Miller, Conn.	Weiss
Fisher	Miller, Mo.	Wigglesworth
Flannagan	Miller, Nebr.	Willey
Gavin	Miller, Pa.	Wilson
Gerlach	Monkiewicz	Wolcott
Gilchrist	Mruk	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillette	Mundt	Wolverton, N. J.
Gillie	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff, Mich.
Goodwin	Myers	Woodrum, Va.
Gordon		Worley
Gorski		

NAYS—157

Abernethy	Barry	Boykin
Allen, La.	Bates, Ky.	Brooks
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bell	Brown, Ga.
Andrews, Ala.	Bennett, Mich.	Bryson
Angell	Bennett, Mo.	Burchill, N. Y.
Barrett	Bland	Burdick
	Bloom	Byrne

Camp	Holifield	Peterson, Fla.
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Wash.	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Mo.	Hope	Pfeifer
Capozzoli	Horan	Philbin
Carlson, Kans.	Izac	Pittenger
Clark	Jackson	Ploeser
Clason	Jarman	Priest
Coffee	Johnson,	Ramspeck
Colmer	Luther A.	Rankin
Cooley	Johnson,	Rees, Kans.
Cooper	Lyndon B.	Rivers
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Robinson, Utah
Cox	Kefauver	Rogers, Calif.
Cravens	Kennedy	Rowan
Curley	Keogh	Sasscer
D'Alesandro	Kerr	Satterfield
Davis	Kilburn	Scrivner
Delaney	King	Sikes
Dies	Kirwan	Slaughter
Domengeaux	Kleberg	Sparkman
Doughton	LaFollette	Spence
Drewry	Lanham	Starnes, Ala.
Ellsworth	Lea	Stewart
Elmer	Lemke	Stockman
Fay	Lynch	Sullivan
Fitzpatrick	McCord	Sumners, Tex.
Folger	McCormack	Tarver
Forand	McKenzie	Thomas, Tex.
Ford	McMillan	Thomason
Fulbright	McMurray	Tolan
Gathings	Magnuson	Torrens
Gearhart	Mansfield,	Vinson, Ga.
Gore	Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Granger	Mansfield, Tex.	Walter
Grant, Ala.	Marcantonio	Weaver
Gregory	Mills	Welchel, Ohio
Hagen	Mott	Welch
Hare	Murdock	Wene
Harris, Ark.	Murphy	West
Harris, Va.	Murray, Tenn.	White
Hart	Newsome	Whitten
Hays	Norman	Whittington
Hébert	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Heffernan	Outland	Winstead
Heidinger	Pace	Wright
Hinshaw	Patman	Zimmerman
Hobbs	Patton	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rowe

NOT VOTING—75

Allen, Ill.	Gale	Merrow
Andresen,	Gallagher	Monroney
August H.	Gamble	Morrison, La.
Baldwin, Md.	Gibson	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gifford	O'Connor
Barden	Green	O'Neal
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	O'Toole
Bonner	Edwin Arthur	Phillips.
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Price
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Rabaut
Burgin	Hendricks	Richards
Busbey	Johnson,	Sabath
Canfield	Calvin D.	Sadowski
Case	Kee	Scanlon
Chenoweth	Kelley	Sheridan
Dawson	Klein	Short
Dilweg	Knutson	Simpson, Pa.
Disney	Lambertson	Smith, Maine
Engel, Mich.	Lane	Somers, N. Y.
Engle, Calif.	Larcade	Stearns, N. H.
Feighan	LeFevre	Taylor
Fernandez	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Fogarty	McGehee	Vorys, Ohio
Fuller	McLean	Vursell
Fulmer	Manasco	Whelchel, Ga.
Furlong	Merritt	Winter

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Manasco against.

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Baldwin of Maryland against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Gibson against.

Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Fernandez against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Green with Mr. Short.

Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Feighan with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Busbey.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Price with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Furlong with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. Barden with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Dilweg with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Case.

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. McLean.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Bates of Massasetts.

Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. KING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ROGERS of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KEOGH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLE of Missouri changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. PLUMLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, how is the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is recorded as voting "nay."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain there is an error, inasmuch as Mr. MCLEAN, as I understand, is not present and is not in the city.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the roll call will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 213, noes 46.

So the bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the Savannah River project, better known as the Clark Hill Dam project, carried in the bill we have just passed upon, was considered by my predecessors in Congress from the standpoint of navigation and flood control for many years, but no definite action was taken looking to a final solution of the problems until 1927, 2 years after I first came to Congress, when the River and Harbor Act carried a provision for a survey and study of these problems as they related to rivers in the southeastern United States. The report was to be prepared and submitted to Congress under the direction of the Secretary of War and the Chief of the Board of Engineers.

The survey and report on the Savannah River were not completed and submitted to Congress until November 1934. The feasibility of flood control, navigation, and power development by one or more reservoir dams above Augusta was recommended, the reasons therefor being set out at considerable length and detail in the report.

On August 15, 1935, the President of the United States addressed a communication to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, directing that a three-member board be created, consisting of one representative from the Board of Engineers, one from the National Resources Committee, and one from the Federal Power Commission, to make further study and prepare a report on the advisability of proceeding the following year with the Savannah River improvement by erecting a dam at a point approximately 21 miles above the city of Augusta. On February 29, 1936, this Board submitted its report and filed same with the Rivers and Harbors Committee for consideration. In November following, the National Resources Committee, in a report entitled "Comprehensive Report on the Savannah River Drainage Basin," made further reference and suggestions relative to this proposal in cooperation with a report of the Eastern Georgia Planning Council.

In April 1937, the Federal Power Commission submitted a report entitled "Power Market" showing that approximately 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours of primary electric current annually and 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary power could be generated and fully disposed of on the local market and still not satisfy the demands. That is, the National Resources Committee and the Federal Power Commission, after careful study and consideration, have concluded that the industrial possibilities of the Savannah River Valley and adjacent territory are practically in their infancy and insist there is ample and suitable markets for all the power to be generated at this plant when completed.

Mr. Speaker, this is a project in which I have been interested for approximately 20 years, and my interest has been based on the grounds that the proposal was fully justified from the standpoint of flood control and navigation, and when we add to that the tremendous economic value of electric power to be furnished, coupled with the extraordinary necessity for such power, in the section of the country to be accommodated, I am convinced the proposal is not only justified from every standpoint but well commanded the favorable consideration just shown by the Congress.

The record will show that surveys have been made by engineers of the War Department time and time again for the

past 15 or 20 years and without exception favorable reports have been submitted in each instance. In addition the proposal has been considered on several occasions by the National Resources Planning Board, the United States Federal Power Commission, and representatives of the War Department, all of which have concluded without exception that it is a worthy project and well justified by facts and evidence submitted by the different disinterested investigators.

The initial cost will approximate $28,000,000 but the undisputed evidence is that it will be a self-liquidating and self-supporting project and the Government will be fully repaid for all expenditures made, and that the added income from industrial developments and contributions otherwise will add greatly to our national wealth and national economy.

I am very grateful for the interest manifested in this project and the highly valued services rendered by my friend and neighbor, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, who represents the district adjoining me across the Savannah River since he came to Congress 10 years ago, including a number of others who have manifested a great deal of interest in this proposal. I am also grateful to members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee for the patient and fair consideration given to the justifications submitted, and I am deeply grateful for the favorable consideration taken by the House of Representatives in authorizing an appropriation for the development of this project.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, and 8; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the beginning of said amendment insert "Sec. 5."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the section number "5" and insert in lieu thereof "6"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 7. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

"That it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of resolution numbered 12 adopted at the first session of the council, referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution and reading "The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief", contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 8. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

"That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made under this authorization and by other countries and receipts from other sources."

And the Senate agree to the same.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill provided that in expressing its approval of this joint resolution it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This amendment excepts from the application of this recommendation areas "within enemy territory and while occupied by the enemy." The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment provides that no amendment under article VIII (a) of the agreement involving any new obligation for the United States shall be binding upon the United States without approval by joint resolution of Congress. The House recedes with an amendment inserting a section number.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment provides that in adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with a reservation that in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States. The House recedes with an amendment changing the section number.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment provides that in adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the reservation that it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of resolution numbered 12 adopted at the first session of the Council, referred to in section 3 of the joint resolution and reading "The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief," contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined to relief only. The House recedes with an amendment providing that the provision in question contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief, in lieu of "relief only".

Amendment No. 5: This amendment provides that in adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with a reservation that the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made therefor. The House recedes with an amendment to the effect that such authority shall not extend beyond the limits of appropriations made under this authorization and by other countries and receipts from other sources.

Amendment No. 6: This amendment provides that none of the funds appropriated in pursuance of the authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 7: This amendment changes a section number; and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: The House bill provided that the authorization contained in this joint resolution shall expire at the conclusion of 2 years following the termination of hostilities on all fronts unless specifically extended by an act of Congress. This amendment provides that this authority shall expire on June 30, 1946. The House recedes.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I think there should be no difficulty in the House adopting the conference report on this U. N. R. R. A. resolution. The only changes that have been made in the resolution will serve to satisfy rather than displease those who were not in favor of the resolution before. I do not believe that in any substantial respect there has been any

change made except to make clearer the meaning of Congress with reference to our participation therein.

The Senate adopted several amendments, none of which materially changed the resolution as it passed the House, but they were limitations which were designed to clarify, somewhat, and to check upon the power of U. N. R. R. A. insofar as our participation in it is concerned. I think the amendments do not change its meaning. I think the resolution as it passed the House has not been materially changed, or in fact changed at all insofar as its intent is concerned, by the Senate amendments that have been agreed to by the conferees.

Amendment No. 1, which was adopted by the Senate, was with reference to an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. The amendment as we passed it said:

That in expressing its approval of this joint resolution it is the recommendation of Congress that, insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The Senate amendment left that amendment intact except it added this limitation:

Except within enemy territory and while occupied by the enemy.

In other words, U. N. R. R. A. cannot operate in any country while it is occupied by the enemy, and while our military forces are there.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the gentleman agree with me that the Senate amendment, while it can in no way interfere with my amendment, seems to be unnecessary?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think so. I think the meaning of the amendment as it passed the House is clearly expressed. I think the Senate amendment is surplusage, but to satisfy the Senate, we agreed. I see no objection to it.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman propose to discuss the amendment that limits rehabilitation and reconstruction?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; that is one of the amendments that will be reached in just a moment.

Amendment No. 2 was a new amendment placed by the Senate, which says "that no amendment under article VIII (a) of the agreement involving any new obligation for the United States shall be binding upon the United States without approval by joint resolution of Congress." The language of the resolution as it passed the House referred to "constitutional authorities" rather than by Congress. We placed that in there in language which I think anyone could understand. That limitation was already applied. We said "constitutional authorities." Everyone familiar with our Government knows that the constitutional authority of the United States is vested in the Congress of the United States, but we had no objection to the resolution specifically naming the Congress. So that amendment was accepted with the understanding that the amendment, instead of being a subsection, should be a different numbered section. That is the only change made with reference to that.

Amendment No. 3 was a Senate amendment which reads:

In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with a reservation that in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

What I have said with reference to the preceding amendment applies to this one also.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. In the Senate there was some discussion in regard to the use of these funds for educational purposes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is one of the amendments I will reach in a moment, if my time permits.

The next amendment is amendment No. 4, in which the Senate said in section 6:

In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the reservation that it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of resolution No. 12 adopted at the first session of the Council, referred to in section 3 of the joint resolution and reading "The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief," contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined to relief only.

The language of this amendment does not in the slightest degree change the meaning of the resolution as it passed the House, but merely reemphasizes that the funds and activities of U. N. R. R. A. are to be used for relief, and the only rehabilitation involved would be that confined to relief only. This is what U. N. R. R. A. proposes to do and the resolution in no respect changes the proposed and declared intention of U. N. R. R. A. in its Atlantic City meeting.

Mr. BLOOM. And it further states, "that such activities as are necessary to relief."

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes. That is all there is to it. "Only such activities." That means just what it says, that this is not a rehabilitation measure. We are not going to rehabilitate Europe. These funds are to be used for relief in the distressed areas for temporary relief, and anything else that is so spent must grow out of relief. There is no permanent rehabilitation as such.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. With reference to rehabilitation, just what is that limited to? Is that understood as we use the term in rehabilitation of injured human beings?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It would be primarily with reference to human beings. That is, food, medicine, clothing; and it might be for a temporary shelter where they had to be taken care of.

Mr. REED of New York. Would it include rehabilitation as we know it?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; it does not. The only rehabilitation would be that incident and necessary in administering relief to those in stricken areas.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. To be a little more specific, does this mean that any reconstruction can be made at the expense of this $1,350,000,000?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No.

Mr. FISH. No reconstruction at all?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No. Relief only, or expense incidental to granting relief. No reconstruction.

Mr. FISH. That means there can be no building of factories?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Oh, no. That is absolutely clear both in the resolution and also in the meeting at Atlantic City, which set forth this meaning.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. It may be perfectly clear, but I would like to have the record show whether this is so broad that it would require the shipment of farm machinery and things of that kind for the rehabilitation of the farms.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Well, it might include some small amount of farm machinery, but in limited quantities only. U. N. R. R. A. is designed to help these people help themselves, and funds will be used to supply and equip them with farm implements, but only in such small quantities as might be necessary for a temporary emergency, and such quantities will be infinitesimally small.

Mr. REED of New York. Then there has been some talk and plans along that line.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; there has been some talk, and speeches made in the House that are erroneous and not based upon facts. I think there has been a misunderstanding about the question of farm machinery, because there was a speech made by one Member a short time back, in which he talked about our already having spent and contracted for large sums for farm machinery under U. N. R. R. A. The truth is there have been no commitments, no allocations made. There has been nothing done with reference to that. I can give the gentleman the facts fully about that.

Mr. REED of New York. I think they should be in the RECORD.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I will be glad to do that. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] recently made a statement in which he said that already there had been allocated to certain countries——

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. If the gentleman will permit, I have a photo-

static copy, a complete record, which I intend to present concerning my statements as soon as I am given time.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. On which subject?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Farm machinery.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I have here a letter from Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, of this date in which he states that there has been no allocation to U. N. R. R. A. with reference to any farm machinery. The War Production Board does this; it plans ahead with reference to the allocation of steel for the ensuing year and there was an allocation made which might be used if called upon. Nothing has been done so far, but it could be used with reference to farm machinery abroad if it became necessary so to do. That amounted to about 30,000 tons of steel to cover the period from July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas 8 additional minutes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That 30,000 tons of steel would be used by the countries that wanted to buy machinery for cash, that is, foreign countries. It also would include any supplies that might be sent to our armed forces in the occupied countries if that occasion should arise. It would also include any demands that should come from U. N. R. R. A. That allocation to foreign countries represents less than 2 percent of the allocation for the same period for steel for farm implements to be used in the United States; in other words the War Production Board has already allocated 1,799,573 tons of steel for the production of farm machinery for American farmers for the period from July 1, 1944, to July 1, 1945, and if, therefore, this 30,000 tons which has been only tentatively allocated for abroad should be used it would be less than 2 percent—about 1½ percent—of that allocation, but none of it may be used. It is simply planning ahead if the occasion should arise.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Can the gentleman give the House and the farmers of the Nation the assurance that as long as they are in such crying need for farm machinery no greater allotment than this 30,000 tons will be made to foreign nations?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am in thorough sympathy with his position because I have a farming district myself and I know the shortage and the great need of farm implements at this time. I have gone into this question very thoroughly with Mr. Nelson and Mr. Crowley. I believe the gentleman need have no fear but what that is the maximum amount that will be allocated for the next year; and it may not be used. The reason I say that is because U. N. R. R. A. will not use anything until an occupied country has been evacuated by the military. When that time comes demands for steel will grow less for military needs in this country, and there will be plenty of steel for farm implements everywhere when the fighting stops.

Mr. PACE. On the basis of conferences the gentleman has had he gives us the assurance that this 30,000 tons is the maximum?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is the assurance given us as to the year July 1, 1944, to July 1, 1945.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. If I understand correctly, this farm machinery is of the type that could also be used here.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. And, first, U. N. R. R. A. must come before the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations must approve the appropriation. There is no pending commitment made until that time, but the steel is ready.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The resolution we are now considering is an authorization measure; and when it becomes the law, Congress will then appropriate funds for participation in U. N. R. R. A., and until Congress appropriates the money U. N. R. R. A. will make no contracts or commitments for the expenditure of money which is to be secured from the United States Government.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What has the gentleman to say as to the definite statement that has been made in responsible circles that orders have already been placed for so many yards of cloth or woolens to be made from foreign wools?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. There is no commitment made by U. N. R. R. A. There has been no money spent by U. N. R. R. A. in any way, shape, or form up to the present time. That is positive. U. N. R. R. A. has not spent one penny of the money they are supposed to get under this authorization, and they have not made any commitments.

Mr. CASE. I may say that Dean Ackerman, who is secretary of the Wool Association, has made that positive statement.

Mr. BLOOM. That is in error. I wish the gentleman from Texas would read the letter from Mr. Donald Nelson so we can get that clear.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This relates to steel. I will read the letter if the gentleman wishes, but I was trying to save time. I will read it anyway. It reads as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1944.

Mr. SOL BLOOM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: This will refer to your inquiry concerning the recent allocation made by the War Production Board to the Foreign Economic Administration of 30,000 tons of carbon steel to meet a portion of the farm machinery requirements of the liberated areas.

I understand that in the course of making this allocation we came to refer to it as a U. N. R. R. A. program and I would like to make clear to you just what we had in mind in using this phrase.

As you can well appreciate, the War Production Board must, if it is adequately to meet the essential demands placed upon it, plan a long way in advance the production of such complicated items as farm equipment and machinery. In establishing recently a farm-machinery program for the coming fiscal year, we found that no provision whatsoever had been made for the needs of the liberated areas, en during the initial period of military responsibility. Although the U. N. R. R. A. had not submitted any such requirements to us, it seemed clear that they might later on develop in considerable proportions. Accordingly, we arranged to allocate to F. E. A. for this purpose some 30,000 tons of steel, this being an amount which we could make available during the farm-machinery program year starting on July 1, 1944, without interfering with essential programs.

Strictly speaking, therefore, the phrase "U. N. R. R. A. program" was a misnomer, since no farm-machinery program was or has yet been submitted to us by U. N. R. R. A. I hope this will clarify the matter for you, but if you wish further details, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

While I am discussing farm machinery, I want to read a letter of this date to me from Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of Foreign Economic Administration, which is as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1944.

Hon. LUTHER JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: You have inquired as to the production of farm machinery in the current year particularly in comparison with the years preceding the war.

The current farm-machinery-program year ends on June 30, 1944, and it is now estimated that the production of farm machinery for this year will be something in excess of $500,000,000. This means that production of farm machinery in the current year is at a level as high as that of any year immediately preceding the war. Current farm-machinery production, in fact, is substantially higher than production in the pre-war years with the possible exception of 1937 when about $514,000,000 of farm machinery was produced domestically.

Notwithstanding the high level of current farm-machinery production there have been domestic shortages of certain types of farm machinery. These shortages are accounted for to a considerable extent by the increased need for mechanization resulting both from shortages of manpower and from the increased production of food.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY.

With reference to the inquiry in regard to cloth I will say that no commitments whatever have been made by U. N. R. R. A. Until an appropriation is made by Congress and the funds are authorized to be spent there will be no obligation, no commitments of any kind for any material whatever. We are assured of that.

Mr. CASE. But according to what Jesse Jones, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and others at this meeting said, whereas we have some 900,000,000 pounds of wool in this country, a great portion of which has come from abroad and which we bought up to keep out of the hands of the enemy, that all attempts to get U. N. R. R. A. to agree that when they place orders they will use this wool have been refused, yet at the same time orders have been placed for some 8,000,000 pounds of wool elsewhere.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Some tentative plans may have been drawn up, but I feel sure there has been no contract made and no commitments made.

Mr. CASE. There may have been some secret understanding.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I might say to my colleague from Texas that it is my understanding that the Procurement Division of the Treasury the first of this month asked for bids or commitments for something over 4,000,000 yards of part-wool textiles on behalf of U. N. R. R. A.

I am advised that the specifications require only 20 percent of new wool of 58's grade or lower; 30-percent reused wool or shoddy; and 50 percent cotton or rayon.

Furthermore, during January and February of this year U. N. R. R. A. asked for bids on about 8,000,000 additional yards of part-wool fabrics, which makes 12,000,000 yards over a period of 3 months, or at the rate of 50,000,000 yards a year. As may be seen the quality of goods being ordered is of the lowest grade. The clothing made from these goods will be unhealthful and generally unsatisfactory and with the American trade-mark will give us a bad name all over the world. We have a tremendous surplus of wool in this country. With the new clip coming on it is estimated that the United States will own over 1,500,000,000 pounds of wool. By just a little increase in the cost of garments the U. N. R. R. A. could use some of our surplus wool and at the same time get a fabric that will wear 50 percent longer and give us good instead of bad advertising.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman's understanding that the Procurement Division of the Treasury has asked for bids for cloth for U. N. R. R. A. is not correct. The Treasury has not asked for bids for cloth for U. N. R. R. A., so I am informed. The Treasury, I understand, has asked for bids for some cloth within the general Army requirement for use in the liberated areas during the period of military responsibility, and it will be distributed under the direction of the commanding generals. U. N. R. R. A. will not operate in any of the countries until after the evacuation of the military authorities, and U. N. R. R. A. at this time has not made any commitments or attempted to buy cloth or any other commodities, so I am reliably informed by the authorities of that organization. And the statement by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] about wool is incorrect, insofar as U. N. R. R. A. is concerned.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. My understanding is that the United States has not put any money in U. N. R. R. A. at all. Is that right?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not a cent.

Mr. WRIGHT. There has not been any appropriation by the United States, but some other nations have put money in.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I do not know what other countries may have contributed to U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. WRIGHT. It might be possible that some of the money that has been put in by other nations might have been used to place orders for some of these things.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That may be true; there may have been some other funds from other countries, of this I am not advised, but we are not concerned with funds coming from other countries. We are concerned only with what comes from our own country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON]; and I want to say that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], a member of the committee, asked for time but very courteously allowed the gentleman from Illinois to proceed first.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 I disclosed to the Congress the farm machinery program of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and charged that it was the intention of the crystal gazers heading that organization to send hundreds of thousands of pieces of farm machinery to Europe, although every item demanded was needed by American farmers. At that time I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of approximately one-half million pieces of farm equipment which these world planners had marked for export to 15 nations—every one of which is now wholly or in part occupied by the Axis.

I disclosed that their program called for 30,000 tractors to be sent to all parts of Europe where, in many instances, the intended recipient had never seen one; 30,000 plows were to be scattered all over Europe and paid for with American dollars; 30,000 separators; 50,000 mowers; 17,000 reapers; 22,900 horse-drawn hay rakes; 40,000 harrows and harrow sections; and 12,000 binders—every item of which Members of Congress have endeavored to obtain for needy American farmers.

Thirty thousand pieces of machinery were to be sent to the Netherlands, 15,000 pieces of equipment to Belgium and Luxemburg, 14,000 to Czechoslovakia, 21,000 to Denmark, 212,000 to France, 8,900 to Greece, 12,000 to Norway, 115,000 to Poland, 36,000 to Yugoslavia, 20,000 to the Baltic states, and 10,000 to Italy. In addition they had listed 13,000 tons of spare parts to repair machinery in Europe although our American farmers are using baling wire to hold their equipment together.

I further stated that despite the critical shortage of farm machinery in this country that these Utopian dreamers were demanding delivery of portions of this machinery by August 1, 1944.

Subsequent to my charges, Mr. Leo Crowley, Director of Lend-Lease and head of the Foreign Economic Administration, appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and stated:

> I am surprised that there is a list made available at all, because I imagine that what has appeared is merely this, that those people are just listing items that might be helpful for these people to help themselves.

Mr. Crowley further stated:

> I read this Congressman's statement but I did not think it had anything in it of what we are doing.

On March 22, in a statement addressed to Congressman SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Crowley further disclaimed any knowledge of an U. N. R. R. A. program.

Mr. Speaker, such statements appear to be a clear-cut case in which the right hand knoweth not what the left hand doeth.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that through an oversight, Mr. Crowley's member on the Foreign Machinery and Equipment Division Requirements Committee, Mr. H. Swanburg, has neglected to keep Mr. Crowley informed as to what was happening in his own agency. It is very apparent from Mr. Crowley's statement that Mr. Swanburg neglected to notify him that a meeting was held by the Division Requirements Committee, under date of January 22, 1944. He further neglected to inform him that under decision No. 8, which was unanimously approved by the committee, farm machinery was to be built for U. N. R. R. A. He neglected to inform him that this machinery was to be built from a 15,000-ton allotment made to O. F. R. R. A. for the first quarter of 1944. He further neglected to inform him that it was the decision of the committee to stock-pile this machinery, if necessary, because of the shortage of crating materials.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to embarrass any one in this matter. My desire is to save this machinery for American farms and American farmers. Al-

though the fathers of this program have denied its paternity, it was prepared by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, United States Department of Agriculture, for Liberated Areas Branch, Bureau of Areas, Foreign Economic Administration, as is attested by the photostatic copy which I submit for the RECORD. I also submit for the RECORD a copy of the official order placing this program into operation, and charge that manufacturers were called before the committee and inquiry was made as to what portion of this machinery they could produce.

I also charge that certain portions of this machinery are being produced at the present time. It is my hope that this machinery, since this exposure, will be diverted into regular American channels.

The material I submit for the RECORD contains the date upon which the committee met, it contains their decision, and its number. It contains a list of machinery that was slated for delivery by August 1 and the program determination number by which the steel was allotted O. F. R. R. A., and the order that stated it should be used for U. N. R. R. A. It also contains a list of 7,500 tractors that were to be taken from an allotment to War Foods Administration to supplement this program.

From the statements of Mr. Crowley and of various other officials of Government, namely, Mr. Cox, attorney for F. E. A., and Mr. Acheson, Assistant Director of U. N. R. R. A., it is apparent that the administration is rapidly getting out from under this farm machinery program. I feel that my mission has been accomplished.

I shall, however, Mr. Speaker, continue to oppose this program and try to prevent its adoption until safeguards protecting the American public are adopted, for, as it is now constituted, these globe-girdling globats can spread our wealth as a lush green carpet over the entire earth.

I submit my proof.

At the bottom of this photostat which I hold in my hand, and which I submit as proof that there was a definite U. N. R. R. A. program that had been placed in operation, appears this statement:

Total number of machines equals the number agreed upon by the Combined Supply Committee. Does not include items not classified as farm machinery by W. P. B. One part of this machinery, at the most corresponding to 30,000 tons of steel, may be delivered from the 1944 United States production. Another part may be delivered from Canadian and British factories. The size of these countries' contribution is to be determined by the Combined Production and Resources Board. The major part of the machinery is to be scheduled for production by United States manufacturers during the first part of the 1945 production year—July 1, 1944–June 30, 1945. This machinery will be needed in Europe in the fall of 1944 and early spring of 1945.

The total tonnage of machinery listed is about 186,000 tons, including approximately 100,000 tons of carbon steel.

Prepared by Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, United States Department of Agriculture, for Liberated Areas Branch, Bureau of Areas, Foreign Economic Administration.

The order that placed this program in effect reads thus:

Agricultural machinery rehabilitation requirements for European countries [1]

[Number of machines and tons of spare parts]

Item No.		Belgium and Luxemburg	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	France	Greece	Netherlands	Norway	Poland	Yugoslavia	Albania	Baltic states	Italy	Total [2]
	Grain drill:													
24	3-7 disk					150								150
25	Fertilizer						50							50
26	Plain	100		250	4,900		250	200	11,575	200	25		100	17,600
30	Planters, hand	250												250
32	Fertilizer distributors	500					1,250							1,750
42 43	Plows, moldboard, walking				5,000	2,500	2,300		5,000	10,000	200			25,000
	Plows, moldboard, tractor (total)													30,000
48	2-bottom, drawn	250	550	800	7,395	25	870	600	2,300	200		850	265	14,105
53	2-bottom, mounted	30	100	100	1,200	50	130	50	700	50		150	175	2,735
49	3-bottom, drawn	70	350	300	5,020	25	500		3,700	250		750	195	11,160
50	4-bottom, drawn				500				1,500					2,000
	Extra shares, 2 per bottom	1,540	4,700	5,400	68,500	450	7,000	2,600	46,200	2,500		8,500	2,930	150,320
63	1-way disk plow with seeding attachment				3,600								100	3,700
	Harrow sections:													
78	Spike	180	1,200	200	6,000	300	530	100	4,100	2,300		300		15,210
79	Spring	170		1,000	8,600		970	800	4,100		50	1,450		17,140
80	Harrow, disk with tandem	100	200	400	2,475		715	325	3,000	50		250	635	8,150
82	Rollers								1,200					1,200
91	Cultivators, 1-horse								2,000					2,000
96	Field cultivators	200	350	800	5,102		300	250	1,048	50				8,100
99	Mounted toolbar		150		800	75		75		100		250		1,450
108	Power sprayers						1,000							1,000
111	Hand sprayers	2,300				4,500	2,500			13,500	200			23,000
	Reapers								6,500					6,500
	Binders:													
129	Ground-drive	965		3,500	4,445	150	550	200		500			315	10,625
130	Power take-off	70		250	400		150		415					1,285
139	Potato diggers	50			400		50	50	175					725
141	Beet lifter	150			500		150		350					1,150
146	Mowers, ground-drive	5,000	1,965	4,000	26,400	200	4,000	2,000	2,000	800		3,000	635	50,000
	Rakes:													
148	Sulky dump	1,000	485	800	12,000		1,000	1,000		200		1,500	315	18,300
149	Combination, side-delivery	200			3,900		500							4,600
157	Reaping attachments—mowers	1,000		535	2,300	50	100	200	450	50			315	5,000
	Threshers:													
158	Power	120				50		100	250	100		50	100	770
	Hand									3,000				3,000
	Tractors:													
194	Under 30 horsepower	280	650	900	8,280	75	1,000	650	3,000	250		1,000	500	16,585
195	30-horsepower and over	70	350	300	5,520	25	500		5,200	250		750	450	13,415
209	Trailers, farm, 2-wheel	350	1,000	1,200	13,800	100	1,500	650	8,200	500		1,750	950	30,000
	Separators:													
238	Under 250 pounds		2,000	800	13,800	200	1,500	1,500	2,500	1,000			1,800	25,100
239	Over 250 pounds			200	2,000		1,500	500	500				200	4,900
274	Incubators							150		300				450
	Parts for—													
	New machinery (tons)	230	253	492	4,063	49	540	219	2,597	289	1	430	258	9,421
	Present machinery (tons)	297		45	3,331		230	7					45	3,955

[1] Total number of machines equals the number agreed upon by the Combined Supply Committee. Does not include items not classified as farm machinery by the War Production Board. 1 part of this machinery, at the most corresponding to 30,000 tons of steel, may be delivered from the 1944 United States production. Another part may be delivered from Canadian and British factories. The size of these countries' contribution is to be determined by the Combined Production and Resources Board. The major part of the machinery is to be scheduled for production by United States manufacturers during the first part of the 1945 production year (July 1, 1944–June 30, 1945). This machinery will be needed in Europe in the fall of 1944 and early spring of 1945.

[2] The total tonnage of machinery listed is about 186,000 tons, including approximately 100,000 tons of carbon steel.

Prepared by Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U. S. Department of Agriculture, for Liberated Areas Branch, Bureau of Areas, Foreign Economic Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I also submit for the RECORD a copy of the order that placed this program into effect. This copy contains a list of machinery to be delivered by August 1 and is self-explanatory. It also contains the directives and order numbers and I contend it proves my statement completely. It refutes the contention of Mr. Crowley and various other persons that no U. N. R. R. A. farm machinery program existed, and nails to the cross various and sundry statements made on this floor to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit as evidence a copy of the order which reads as follows:

To program implementation officer, War Production Board.

From Farm Machinery and Equipment Division Requirements Committee.

Subject: Divisional Requirements Decision No. 8, U. N. R. R. A. program, to be built in the third quarter of 1944 from a 15,000-ton first-quarter steel allotment to O. F. R. R. O.

I. This decision relates to an application from the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Organizations to have built for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, certain items of farm machinery and equipment and repair parts therefor, to be exported to liberated European countries for farm use. This program is hereinafter referred to as the U. N. R. R. A. program. The subject program was approved unanimously at the Divisional Requirements Committee meeting held January 22, 1944.

The U. N. R. R. A. program, described in detail, hereinafter, provides for delivery of the products during the third quarter of 1944 or prior thereto, if possible. It further provides that the allotments of controlled materials to producers shall be made from the allotment of 15,000 tons of carbon steel and complementary quantities of other controlled materials made to O. F. R. R. O. by the W. P. B. Requirements Committee by Program Determination No. 494, for the first quarter of 1944.

II. An allotment of 15,000 tons of steel to O. F. R. R. O. in the fourth quarter has not yet been implemented. The allocation was combined with the War Food Administration program subject to later adjustment depending upon U. N. R. R. A.'s needs. The implementation of this portion of the rehabilitation program has been presented to the Program Bureau for recommendation and decision.

III. *Controlled materials required first quarter, 1944*

	Code 450	Code 471	Code 813	Total
Carbon steel (tons) 2001-2061	6,801	4,356	1,529	12,686
Alloy steel (tons) 2501-2561	123	1,533	73	1,729
Copper (pounds) 3011	3,041	27,151	3,930	34,122
Copper (pounds) 3021	5,617	1,529	4,677	11,823
Copper (pounds) 3041	6,472	659	9,124	16,255
Copper (pounds) 3051-71	26	8,018	1,299	9,343
Copper (pounds) 3101	19	5,902	1,080	7,001
Copper (pounds) 3201-3211	12,090	14,102	25,923	52,115
Aluminum (pounds) 4021-4151	6	----------	11	17
Aluminum (pounds) 4202-4218	340	1,220	77	1,637
Aluminum (pounds) 4251-4311	----------	----------	20	20
Aluminum (pounds) 4351-4601	----------	9	7	16

III. *Statement of approved production schedule of farm machinery and equipment for U. N. R. R. A. for delivery in the third and fourth quarters of 1944, or prior thereto, if possible*

L-257 items	Equipment	Total units	Delivery date
	TILLAGE AND PLANTING EQUIPMENT		
24	Grain drill, 3-7 disk	150	Aug. 1
26	Grain drill, plain, 14-run and under	2,175	Do.
42	Plow, moldboard, horse walking, steel bottom	2,000	Do.
48	Plow, moldboard, tractor-drawn, 2-bottom	3,225	Do.
49	Plow, moldboard, tractor-drawn, 3-bottom	1,675	Do.
63a	1-way disk plow	900	Do.
63b	1-way disk plow, seeding attachments for 1-way plow	900	Do.
79	Harrow section, spring tooth	5,900	Do.
80e	Harrow, disk	1,000	Do.
80d	Harrow, disk—tandem attachment for disk harrow	1,000	Do.
96	Field cultivator	1,200	Do.
96a	Do	700	Do.
194	Tractors, wheel, all-purpose under 30 belt horsepower	[1] 3,300	Do.
195	Tractors, wheel, all purpose over 30 belt horsepower	[1] 2,200	Do.
	Parts (tons)	1,425	Do.
	HARVESTING AND MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		
111	Sprayers, knapsack	4,000	Dec. 30
129	Binder, ground-drive	2,250	Do.
146	Mower, ground-drive	4,700	Do.
148	Rakes, dump	2,000	Do.
149	Rakes, combination, side delivery and tedder	1,700	Do.

[1] As indicated in par. I (a), the tractors will be supplied from the production under the War Food Administration program.

IV. Controlled materials required for first and subsequent quarters of 1944

	Code 450	Code 451	Code 813	Total
Carbon steel (tons), 2001-2061	5,339	3,175	1,360	9,874
Alloy steel (tons), 2501-2561	97	24	65	186
Copper (pounds), 3011	2,387	4,527	3,496	10,410
Copper (pounds), 3021	4,932	304	4,160	9,396
Copper (pounds), 3041	5,081	574	8,116	13,771
Copper (pounds), 3071	20	454	1,156	1,630
Copper (pounds), 3101	15	582	960	1,557
Copper (pounds), 3201-3211	9,491	1,798	23,058	34,347
Aluminum (pounds), 4021-4121-4151	5	0	10	15
Aluminum (pounds), 4202-4218	267	10	69	346
Aluminum (pounds), 4251-4301-4311	0	0	18	18
Aluminum (pounds), 4351-4361-4601	0	1	6	7
Aluminum (pounds), 4401-4411	0	15	0	15

IV. *Statement of approved production schedule of farm machinery and equipment for U. N. R. R. A. for delivery in the third quarter of 1944 or prior thereto if possible*

L-257a item	Description	Units
26a	Grain drills, plain, over 14-run	2,148
48	2-bottom, 12-inch, tractor-drawn plows	4,697
49	3-bottom, 12-inch, tractor-drawn plows	2,025
50	4-bottom, 12-inch, tractor-drawn plows	300
53	2-bottom, 12-inch, tractor-mounted plows.	478
63a	One-way disk plows, 5 feet and under 8 feet.	250
63b	One-way disk plows, 8 feet and over	250
78	Spike-tooth harrow sections, tractor-drawn.	6,830
79	Spring-tooth harrows, tractor-drawn	2,448
80d	Disk harrows, single and tandem, 6 feet and under.	387
80e	Disk harrows, single and tandem, over 6 feet and under 11 feet.	2,090
96	Field cultivators, spring tooth, 7 feet and under.	1,076
96a	Field cultivators, spring tooth, over 7 feet.	280
96b	Field cultivators, stiff tooth, 7 feet and under.	1,612
96c	Field cultivators, stiff tooth, over 7 feet.	420
194	Tractors, under 30 horsepower	5,100
195	Tractors, over 30 horsepower	2,400
	Repair parts (total tons of steel)	1,602

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing is the actual record. It is taken from the files of the departments who have denied its very existence.

I have listened to the statements made by the gentlemen of the committee that such procedure will not continue, and I sincerely hope they are right. I ask the Congress to join with me in opposing this measure and serve notice that I will not, as an individual, approve such programs for these crystal-gazing Pied Pipers who lead us onward toward bankruptcy.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in answer to what the gentleman has just stated, I want to call your attention to a statement that was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which sets forth fully and in detail a letter with accompanying statement from Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, found on page A1527. This goes thoroughly into the question.

I will just read the first paragraph:

1. No farm machinery has yet been procured for U. N. R. R. A. and no United States funds will be used for that purpose until money is appropriated for U. N. R. R. A. by the Congress.

2. The so-called U. N. R. R. A. program for which the War Production Board made an allocation to F. E. A. of 30,000 tons of steel is a misnomer. This allocation, when put into production, is primarily intended to meet the farm-machinery requirements of the liberated areas during the period of military responsibility, when the equipment will be distributed under the authority of the theater commander.

This bears out what I have said that that amount will be used only for three different purposes, if foreign countries should buy or have the money to buy, or the areas under military domination should require it, or U. N. R. R. A. should have need of it.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that no commitments have been made and I believe the House understands that, but do we also understand that the gentleman and his committee understand at least from those in authority and who will have the disposition of this matter that it will be a breach of faith on their part as to what they have told you if they authorize the use of more than 30,000 tons of steel during the next year for the manufacture of farm machinery to be shipped or sold to U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is our understanding, and I may say the Appropriations Committee can safeguard that when they go to appropriating the money. They may make any limitations they desire.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I believe the statement of Mr. Crowley and the statement I made agree in this, that the fathers of this particular legislation are denying its paternity in the very fact this letter has come through.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. There is no question about the statement. It was labeled for U. N. R. R. A. and it was not so intended for U. N. R. R. A. It was 30,000 tons for military areas and U. N. R. R. A., only if they used any. The chances are there will be none used by U. N. R. R. A. in the coming year because it looks now as if it will be some time before we get into those countries and U. N. R. R. A. cannot begin to operate until our military authorities evacuate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can shed any further light after my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has spoken. My understanding from the testimony we have had is that we have a certain amount of steel production in the country. We plan and program that steel production. We allocate it to the various essential uses. It is necessary to plan in advance to give this 30,000 tons of steel either to lend-lease or U. N. R. R. A., either one or the other, depending upon whether the military still occupies the territory. There is no commitment, there is nothing binding, there is no procurement, there is no obligation until there is an appropriation agreed to by Congress, and there cannot be. There is no money in U. N. R. R. A. for the appropriation.

Another question arose as to whether the Lend-Lease Administration might be buying this equipment and turning it over to U. N. R. R. A. We were given to understand very definitely and very clearly by Mr. Crowley and by Mr. Cox that no such thing had been done; that no business has been done by U. N. R. R. A. up to the present time, and will not be until Congress has acted.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Would the gentleman be interested in obtaining the names of manufacturers that were called in and asked how much U. N. R. R. A. machinery they could produce in addition to the regular allotment of American machinery?

Mr. WRIGHT. That does not disprove my point unless there is an obligation and a definite order—of course, they call in manufacturers, otherwise how could they find out what the potentialities of the plants are? Possibly they want to increase their production. That does not mean to say there is any order binding on the United States Treasury.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the testimony before us on lend-lease it was stated that in Australia today men are diverted from certain work and, reading between the lines, I can see that they were diverted from the Army, many thousands of them, to raise agricultural products. If that is true at the present time, you can imagine what will happen when they are asked to raise agricultural products for U. N. R. R. A.

The House knows, Mr. Speaker, that I voted against U. N. R. R. A. in committee, although it was stated repeatedly that the bill came out reported unanimously. I appeared before the Rules Committee against it, not that I did not want to cooperate and help other nations that are starving, for that is only decent. After all, it is rather to our self-interest to do that. But today relief and even reconstruction are being administered and administered well by the military, who know what pestilence and famine mean. They know how to administer relief wisely.

The military will never for one instant give away a military secret. Today there are many persons in U. N. R. R. A. who have never had any experience in any foreign country and know nothing about international relations. Think of the possibilities of what could happen in the way of giving information to the enemy.

I would like to have the House think for a minute just what the grocery bill will be that this country will pay under U. N. R. R. A., the military, lend-lease, and the bill that has already come out of the Foreign Affairs Committee and passed the Senate, to feed the starving and hungry of many nations. We are going to have quadruple groups administering relief.

Under U. N. R. R. A., no relief agency can operate without the permission of U. N. R. R. A. The International Red Cross even cannot function without their permission.

I pointed out in the House when the bill came up that the military should continue to administer relief and then turn it over to the Red Cross, to persons who are used to handling relief, persons who want every religion to have its chance and the people to have the sort of education they want. The Red Cross administers impartially.

Mr. Speaker, the House remembers that I offered an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds for the control of education or religion. That would be the thing that should be done under the Atlantic Charter, and the way things are done in our own country. It failed. Senator WILLIS, of Indiana, secured the adoption of a somewhat similar amendment to the bill when it passed the Senate. Unfortunately that was thrown out in conference. Many of you have read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the proceedings of yesterday in the Senate, and all through it the debate is upon this very amendment by Senator WILLIS as to control of religion and education. If they do not intend to try to control religion and education, why did they refuse to put it in? Senator after Senator said there is nothing in U. N. R. R. A. that provides for control of religion or education, and yet, if that were true, why did they not accept that amendment? The Senate accepted it once. What is the mysterious something that prevents it? Senator CONNALLY states, if you will refer to page 2803, that it could be done in the Appropriations Committee. I am awfully tired of having the Appropriations Committee legislate for the House. Why does not the House legislate for itself?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Did I correctly understand that the Senate said this fund would not be used for control of education or religion in foreign countries?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. Is the gentlewoman aware that a survey is being made to see how many refugee students can be taken by the universities of this country that will be financed by U. N. R. R. A.?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct. At the present time I understand that U. N. R. R. A. is operating by means of the War Refugee Board. U. N. R. R. A. has already taken a good many of our doctors that we need so much for the care of our men. There is and will be a greater shortage in the Veterans' Administration of many doctors.

Mr. REED of New York. In many of our universities we educated Japanese, who have been fighting and killing our boys ever since.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true. I repeatedly warned the House when the neutrality legislation was under consideration, and I warned against cash-and-carry, that Japan would do the very thing she did, get our scrap iron and get our war commodities very likely to use against us. There are many boys

from my own district that were killed in the South Pacific and at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentlewoman mean to state that she understands that some of this money is going to be used to bring boys from foreign countries over here and educate them?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is my understanding of the plan.

I called up two persons in the State Department and spoke about my amendment, and said I would like to put it in, and I was asked not to, because we might want to reeducate the people, we might want to give them a different form of religion. After all, we may not like the religions in other countries but we certainly do not want to control them, neither do we want their ideologies to be be given to our own people. Think of the power of the purse and the tremendous influence U. N. R. R. A. can exercise.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that none of this money can be spent in any country unless it has been an occupied country or an occupied territory of that country?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Unless it is a liberated area.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentlewoman does not want to convey the idea that any of this money can be spent over here in this country?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They can be exchanged with students of this country. That is my understanding.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I was very much interested in the gentlewoman's amendment regarding education and religion. Has the gentlewoman looked at page 17 of the bill, as amended by the Senate, section 8, amendment No. 6? Was that stricken out in conference?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was stricken out in conference.

Mr. STEFAN. I feel that this amendment ought to remain in the bill. It reads:

> That none of the funds appropriated in pursuance of this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

Do I understand that the Senate debated that amendment, and that it was stricken out in conference?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was debated carefully and adopted by a vote of 45 to 18, but it seems the Senate was apologetic about throwing out that amendment in conference, because they repeatedly said there was nothing in the bill that provided for it. However, in our own national W. P. A., we know that both religious and educational philosophies and other types were attempted and somewhat promulgated under the W. P. A. I leave it to the membership of the House to decide exactly what will happen in the countries abroad when any such thing is attempted under this international W. P. A., and this is a huge international W. P. A. By the way, Governor Lehman, the Administrator of U. N. R. R. A., is not a representative of the United States, but he is a representative of U. N. R. R. A. In the hearings I asked him if he was asked to go out and get supplies, natural resources in the United States, if there was a shortage in this country, if he would do so, and his reply was, "Yes." Then I said to him, "You are a creature of U. N. R. R. A.?" and he replied, "Yes."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Take items 1 and 2, dealing with relief supplies and relief services, rehabilitation supplies and services; materials such as seeds, fertilizers, raw materials, and so forth, and the money can be used in procuring such material.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is not in order to refer to statements or speeches or arguments made in the Senate.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am referring to hearings on U. N. R. R. A. Is that out of order?

The SPEAKER. Statements from the hearings in the Senate are out of order.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Hearings before the Senate committees?

The SPEAKER. Certainly, if the hearings were used in the proceedings of the Senate.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Very well. That is in our own hearings, about rehabilitation of public utilities and services. Some of the money can be used in securing material and equipment for the rehabilitation of educational institutions. That is in our own hearings. Also, I would call attention to the fact that the Director General in charge of the Bureau of Areas is a Russian, Mr. Menshikov.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentlewoman is correct, and I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert information that I have as to U. N. R. R. A. regarding the personnel and the background of the personnel already engaged.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the information requested:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1944.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am transmitting herewith a list of the employees of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, recently requested by your office.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. PHILLIPS,
Acting Chief, Division of Public Information.

Employees of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration

Name	American—legal residence	Non-American, national of—
Abbot, Adeline	New Jersey	
Abbott, Lucy	New York	
Adams, Wayne W	New Mexico	
Alband, William C	New York	
Alcorn, Virginia N	North Dakota	
Alden, Frances Burke	Maine	
Alt, Freda H	Kansas	
Anderson, Dewey H	California	
Applebee, Francis B	New York	
Archer, Laird	(In field)	
Aquino, Virginia	Illinois	
Arnstein, Margaret	New York	
Bacot, Dixie	South Carolina	
Bagby, Jessie Bell	Arkansas	
Baron, Anna	New York	
Bass, Gertrude	Ohio	
Bates, Victoria J	Washington, D. C.	
Beall, Jane A	Arkansas	
Beckelman, Moses	Washington, D. C.	
Bell, Edwina Mary	Florida	
Bell, Hazel M	New York	
Bellows, Fredrick M	do	
Benjamin, Jessie P	Maryland	
Bennett, Mary J	Mississippi	
Berger, Marie	Illinois	
Berry, Bessie	Maryland	
Bettman, Carol Helen	Ohio	
Bewley, Thomas	California	
Blaisdell, Catharine M	Washington, D. C.	
Blinn, Robert K	California	
Bonk, Stella N	Massachusetts	
Boorady, Edna A	New York	
Booz, Paul	Kansas	
Borders, Karl	Illinois	
Borne, Dorothy M	Louisiana	
Bornne, Ethel	(Not shown)	
Brennan, Mary Virginia	Washington, D. C.	
Bridges, Marion	Pennsylvania	
Brock, Myron R	Nebraska	
Brookbank, Richard	Washington State.	
Brown, Aldean	Michigan	
Brown, Emerson M	do	
Brownbridge, Albert E	New York	
Brunkard, Thomas V	do	
Buffmire, Dorothy E	Wisconsin	
Burd, Treva M. E	Virginia	
Burton, Mortimer	Florida	
Byron, Gertrude	New York	
Caustin, H. E		England.
Caldwell, Elsie M	North Carolina	
Campbell, Ned	Arizona	
Campbell, Stuart	Virginia	
Cantrell, Catherine	Arkansas	
Chace, Mary G	Virginia	
Chamberland, N. C	Massachusetts	
Chamoud, Simone	New York	
Chau, Yau-Pik		China.
Cheplak, Mitzi F	Washington, D. C.	
Childress, William C	Virginia	
Chubbuck, Kathryn	New York	
Chudson, Walter A	do	
Church, Irene	Kansas	
Cissna, Elsie D	Mississippi	
Clark, Carnzu	Massachusetts	
Clark, Virginia	Georgia	
Coddington, Edna	New York	
Cohen, Myer	California	
Cohn, Emma	New York	
Cole, Mary C	Alabama	
Compton, Carl C	Massachusetts	
Condliffe, John B		Australia.
Conley, L. Ann	Massachusetts	
Conhaim, Herbert J	New York	
Connel, Howard Joseph	Pennsylvania	
Conroy, Abagail	Massachusetts	
Cover, John	Illinois	
Cowell, Charles C	Ohio	
Crawford, Vera	Virginia	
Dalton, Margaret	Massachusetts	
Darling, George S	New York	
Davies, Dilys Mary		England.
Dayton, Kenneth	New York	
Dean, Vera M	do	
Decatur, Anne	New Jersey	
Dees, Lola	Alabama	
Delgado, Frank	Florida	
Denbo, Beatrice Shirley	New York	
Dennis, Madison	Ohio	
Diamond, Lillian	New York	
Dickens, Elizabeth J	Washington State.	
Dickinson, Edwin Dewit		
Donovan, Lucile	Indiana	
Dorr, Laurie D	New York	
Douglass, Bette M	Iowa	

Employees of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—Con.

Name	American—legal residence	Non-American, national of—
Doull, James A.	Ohio	
Dula, John Edmond	New York	
Dunkleberger, Mildred L.	California	
Dykstra, Walling		Netherlands.
Edwards, Marguerite M	Maryland	
Ekings, Mary C.	(Not shown)	
Eiklebery, Helen B.	South Dakota	
Eliot, Lois A. J.	Massachusetts	
Elkinton, Charles M.	Virginia	
Elliott, John E.	Maryland	
Elwin, Atha C.	do	
Emrich, Marion Vallat	New York	
Erickson, Florence	Pennsylvania	
Fackt, Elizabeth	Colorado	
Factor, Norma	New York	
Feonov, Nicolai		Russia.
Falck, James	New York	
Feller, Abraham H.	Connecticut	
Filbert, Robert B.	(Not shown)	
Fillman, Gwendolyn	Nebraska	
Fingeroth, Elizabeth	New York	
Finley, Alice	(Not shown)	
Fisher, Dorcas	Maryland	
Flexner, Carolin	New York	
Flynn, Jane Mary	do	
Fox, Grace E.	Washington, D.C.	
Franc, Helen M.	New York	
Franklin, Gladys J.	Washington, D.C.	
Franklin, Harry Lee	Kentucky	
Frazier, Frances	Virginia	
Fried, Anthony		Czechoslovakia.
Fritch, Jessie	Illinois	
Funkhouser, Richard L.	New Hampshire	
Garrett, Doris Yvonne	Ohio	
Gaumnitz, Richard K.	Minnesota	
Gaus, John M.	Wisconsin	
Gerstenzang, Leo	New York	
Gill, Olive A.	Texas	
Girard, Stephan	Illinois	
Glassey, Helena	New York	
Gold, Estelle	Washington, D. C.	
Goldberger, Leo Julius	New York	
Goodloe, Jane	Tennessee	
Gordon, Alexander	New York	
Graham, Helen V.	do	
Grantham, Josephine K.	Alabama	
Greene, James D.	Washington, D. C.	
Greene, Katrine	(Not shown)	
Greenestein, Harry	Maryland	
Gregg, Florence	Tennessee	
Grosvenor, Gordon	Pennsylvania	
Gubin, Justice F.	Indiana	
Gulick, Luther	District of Columbia.	
Gumpper, Ada L.	Pennsylvania	
Gumpper, Evelynita	do	
Gunn, Selskar M.	Connecticut	
Hackman, Abe	New York	
Hammer, Phillip G.	Virginia	
Handy, Martin A.	Maryland	
Harakas, James T.	(In field)	
Harrell, Elizebeth	North Carolina	
Harris, Joseph P.	California	
Harrison, Leslie H.	Washington, D. C.	
Hartlove, Emacita	Hawaii	
Huang, Robert T.		China.
Harvey, Frances H.	Illinois	
Helmers, Gladys	North Dakota	
Hendrickson, Roy F.	Iowa	
Hedquist, Enid	(Not shown)	
Henson, Edwin R.	Texas	
Herwitz, Harry K.	Illinois	
Higgins, Doris M.	(Not shown)	
Hill, Edna Margaret	Indiana	
Hobson, Gertrude	New York	
Hoehler, Fred Kenneth	(In field)	
Holland, Amy C.	Massachusetts	
Holzmann, Margaret	New York	
Hooper, Patricia	Illinois	
Howard, Donald S.	New Jersey	
Hyde, Alice	Washington, D. C.	
Iberg, Lowell	New York	
Isikoff, Harry L.	do	
Jackson, Hugh	do	
Jacobs, Samuel	do	
Janus, C. George	Illinois	
Jerchower, Ottilie	New York	
Johnson, James G. Jr	Maryland	
Johnson, Warren J.	Washington, D. C.	
Johnston, Lillian Jane	New York	
Jonisch, Sylvia	Washington, D. C.	
Jones, Mary Bagot		England.
Kalichstein, Rita E.	Washington, D. C.	
Kay, Hildred	(Not shown)	

Employees of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—Con.

Name	American—legal residence	Non-American, national of—
Keenan, Harold E.	Massachusetts	
Keene, Mabel L.	Maryland	
Keeny, Spurgeon M.	New York	
Keller, Eugenia	Indiana	
Kelsey, Lincoln D.	New York	
Kent, Martin	do	
Kenworthy, Jane C.	Indiana	
Kerr, Peyton	California	
Kerr, Sybil P.	Georgia	
Kerze, Therese	New York	
Kettle, Fletcher	Illinois	
Kiernan, C. Jean	(Not shown)	
King, Viola	Washington, D. C.	
Kirkbride, Mary E.	Colorado	
Kolodny, Leo	New Jersey	
Krane, Jay B.	(In the field, England).	
Krause, Mary	Washington, D. C.	
Kugaczewska, Wanda	Maryland	
Lancaster, James B.	Washington, D. C.	
Lapin, Raye	New York	
Lariviere, Frances	Iowa	
Lawford, Geoffrey	(Not shown)	
Lay, Elizabeth	Washington State.	
Lazarus, Theodore	New York	
Leff, David	California	
Lehman, Herbert H.	New York	
Leibovitz, Roberta	Rhode Island	
Leslie, Grey	New York	
Levin, Mable Foy	Maryland	
Lewis, Virginia B.	do	
Line, Myrtle	Iowa	
Longley, Elizabeth	Maryland	
Lott, Eleanor	Illinois	
Leonard, Larry	New York	
Loucheim, Kathleen	Washington, D. C.	
Loewy, Harris	New York	
Luloff, Elaine	Connecticut	
Luria, Dorothy	do	
Lynch, Eleanor	Massachusetts	
MacMonnies, Wallace	New Jersey	
McMillen, Frederick	Washington State.	
Manley, Claudine	North Carolina	
Manley, Odell	do	
Manusuaki, Antigone	New Jersey	
Marburg, Jean	West Virginia	
Marclay, Elsie	Arkansas	
Mattern, Edith	South Dakota	
Matthews, John B.	Massachusetts	
Mattox, F. Annabella	Alabama	
May, Arthur	Michigan	
Mayo, Sara H.	(Not shown)	
McAllister, Pauline	Florida	
McCandlish, George E.	Washington	
McCann, Grace E.	West Virginia	
McCloskey, Janet	New York	
McDonald, Norma		Canada.
McGeachy, Craig		Do.
McKeever, Bernard	Pennsylvania	
McMakin, Edythe	Maryland	
Mellett, Jeane	(Not shown)	
Menshikov, Michail		Russia.
Merryman, Nina	Maryland	
Metropol, Bannia	South Carolina	
Meyer, John L.	Virginia	
Miles, Helen	Iowa	
Miller, Alice	New York	
Moller, Eleanor M.	do	
Montgomery, Katherine	Pennsylvania	
Moore, Marjorie	Minnesota	
Moore, William C.	New Jersey	
Morris, Annie	Washington, D. C.	
Morris, Pearl	(In field, England).	
Morrison, Bessie E.	(Not shown)	
Moy, Thelma		China.
Munder, Mabel	Washington, D. C.	
Murphy, Aura Lee	do	
Nadzo, Guido	New York	
Nash, Mary L.	Texas	
Neil, Helen N.	New York	
Netzorg, Elizabeth W.	Michigan	
Newcomb, Annabelle	Massachusetts	
Nickas, Mary	Ohio	
Norelli, Benson	Washington, D. C.	
Norris, Corinne	Pennsylvania	
Nugent, Rolf	New York	
Olinger, Lucienne	do	
Osborne, Lithgow	do	
Otto, Elma	(Not shown)	
Owens, Esther	Massachusetts	
Page, Irene	(Not shown)	
Patterson, James	Connecticut	
Peck, Millard	Iowa	
Powell, Annie	Washington, D. C.	

Employees of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—Con.

Name	American—legal residence	Non-American, national of—
Preston, Gene Isobel	Maine	
Peck, Naida	Kansas	
Pecot, Rebecca	Washington, D. C.	
Penery, Anne H.	California	
Perazich, George	New Jersey	
Perry, Agnes		
Peters, Lenita D.	Maryland	
Peterson, George L.	Minnesota	
Phillips, Bozie C. J.	Georgia	
Phillips, William B.	Illinois	
Pierce, Clarence	New York	
Plimpton, Jane F.	Massachusetts	
Plummer, Alma	Washington, D. C.	
Porter, Doris	Mississippi	
Purvis, Frances M.	Montana	
Racich, Ann	California	
Railey, Battaille	Alabama	
Rathje, Elnora	Nebraska	
Reed, Layle	South Dakota	
Rezak, Nicholas	New York	
Rhatigan, Edward	do	
Richards, Catherine	Massachusetts	
Richards, Gordon S.	do	
Rifkin, Ruth S.	New York	
Roberts, Dorothy F.	Missouri	
Robinson, Horace	Washington, D. C.	
Rodger, Mary		England.
Rogers, Clifton Paul	New York	
Rohrbach, Dorothy	Indiana	
Rooby, George	New York	
Roseman, Alvin	Ohio	
Rosenberg, Samuel	Virginia	
Rosenstein, Abraham	Connecticut	
Rosner, Alice	(Not shown)	
Rubin, Mary	New York	
Rubins, William	Pennsylvania	
Ruda, Frances	New York	
Rusk, Minnie	South Carolina	
Russell, Johnie Mae	do	
Ryshpan, Cicely	New York	
Ryther, Willie	North Carolina	
Sadow, Sue	Massachusetts	
Salter, Arthur (Sir)		Do.
Sayre, Francis B.	Washington, D. C.	
Seasf, Carl Hart	Virginia	
Schachter, Oscar	do	
Schaefer, Lorainne	Montana	
Schenker, Herbert	Pennsylvania	
Schmitter, Lyle L.	Illinois	
Scranton, Laurell	Nebraska	
Semaske, Gertrude	South Carolina	
Semelisky, Ruth	New York	
Sender, Tony	do	
Servison, Gertrude	Washington, D. C.	
Sevareid, Lois	Maryland	
Sexton, Mary Ellen	Tennessee	
Shack, Mildred	New York	
Shafer, Marian	Washington, D. C.	
Shannon, Wilma	New York	
Sheriff, Alice	Maryland	
Shiamanna, Dena	Wyoming	
Shurcliff, Alice	Massachusetts	
Sibley, Hiram	New York	
Simmons, Charles	Washington, D. C.	
Singerman, Sylvia	Pennsylvania	
Slagsvold, Peter	Montana	
Sluchan, Miram	New York	
Smith, Jane Horbart	Pennsylvania	
Smith, Leonidas R. Jr	Washington, D. C.	
Smith, Lorenzo	do	
Smith, Linton	California	
Sorieri, Antonio	New York	
Spellacy, Bette	do	
Spinks, Francis	California	
Staley, A. Eugene	Massachusetts	
Stanski, Mary	New Jersey	
Steckel, Grace P.	Kansas	
Steel, Herbert	Missouri	
Stillwell, Ray	Texas	
Strogonova, Nadejda		Russia.
Sulzberger, David	New York	
Swisher, Janice	Texas	
Synhorst, Alice	Iowa	
Taris, Frances	New York	
Tellier, Grace W.	Arkansas	
Thompson, Doris	New York	
Thomas, Thalia	Maryland	
Tolley, Grant	California	
Tull, Ray Ashbrook	Colorado	
Tyson, Winifred	New York	
Uhlmann, Martin S.	Michigan	
Underhill, Louise	New York	
Valentine, John	Illinois	
VanGelder, H. P.		Canada.
Vassardaki, Lucille	New York	
Veatch, Ray	Oregon	

Employees of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—Con.

Name	American—legal residence	Non-American, national of—
VonThurn, Elizabeth	Washington, D. C.	
Wadsworth, Lisa	New York	
Warren, George	Connecticut	
Washburn, Eleanor	Washington, D. C.	
Watson, Louise	(Not shown)	
Weber, Milton	New York	
Weigel, John	Illinois	
Weintraub, David	New York	
Welk, William	Washington, D. C.	
Whipple, Francis M. (Mrs).	(Not shown)	
Whitaker, Margaret	do	
Whitman, Mary	do	
Wickland, Eleanore	do	
Wilbur, Virginia	Pennsylvania	
Williams, Edward	(Not shown)	
Williams, Elizabeth M.	North Carolina	
Williams, Rita	(Not shown)	
Williams, Ruth	New York	
Wilson, Theodore	Illinois	
Wilson, Wayne	do	
Wingert, A. Leonella	(Not shown)	
Wolff, F. Richard	New York	
Wyant, Nina	West Virginia	
Xanthaky, George	New York	
Yalch, Margaret J.	Pennsylvania	
Youdin, Richard	(In field, Egypt).	
Young, Dora	Massachusetts	
Zamoyska, Morag		Poland.
Zimmerman, Opal	Illinois	
Zorich, Mayre	South Dakota	

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made and include material I used in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, taking up this point that has been discussed in respect to U. N. R. R. A. interfering with educational activities, or attempting to control religious and educational teachings, let me call attention to one or two matters in that connection. A debate was held in another body and one of the participants in that debate is a member of the committee of that body that passed upon the terms of the agreement before that agreement was submitted to the several nations, and he has a very excellent conception of the meaning of that agreement and its objectives. In that debate in the other body, and I use that phrase "the other body" lest somebody may make the point of order that I am referring to the Senate.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's remarks directed to the other body are out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York should be cognizant of the rules governing references to the other body.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In any event, here is a statement from the Secretary of State of the United States, and I think I can mention the title of that office at this time. He wrote to that other body, direct from the State Department, to this effect:

The U. N. R. R. A. has no power whatever to enter into educational, religious, or political activities.

That is the conception of the Government of the United States, as represented by the State Department.

Now, with respect to the omission of this amendment from the conference report, it is admitted that some difficulty was encountered in a special instance, and that difficulty, if resolved, would not in my judgment indicate that U. N. R. R. A. is going to try to run the schools and teach political philosophy or religious concepts. I quote from a memorandum in connection with this particular section B:

> The only connection that U. N. R. R. A.'s work may have with education is by virtue of paragraph 4, section II, of resolution 1 of the U. N. R. R. A. Council, which provides that one of the U. N. R. R. A.'s functions may be "assistance in procuring material equipment for the rehabilitation of educational institutions." This provision was inserted at the instance of the Chinese delegation, who referred to the systematic effort of the Japanese armies to destroy Chinese schools and institutions. For your confidential information the following is an excerpt from the résumé of the meeting of the subcommittee of the Council at Atlantic City at which this provision was adopted:
>
> "During the course of the discussion on this amendment, the member for China indicated that under this provision U. N. R. R. A. would not itself procure materials but that it would assist in such procurement. Moreover, the use of the word 'material' would limit the assistance to the procurement of books, laboratory equipment, and other similar items, without requiring the Director General to interfere in anyway with the educational system of the particular liberated area. Under this provision, the Director General might serve as a middleman in obtaining, on the one hand, information as to material available in the countries that have not been occupied, and on the other, information as to the material needed for the rehabilitation of educational institutions within the various liberated areas. In this way the Director General could be of great assistance without placing any large burden on the resources of the U. N. R. R. A."

So, as a matter of fact, the omission of that amendment from this conference report was decided upon because, had it been stated as written, it might have been construed to forbid U. N. R. R. A. to repair broken glass windows in a half-wrecked school, on the ground that that was interfering with educational institutions. I can assure the Members of the House that U. N. R. R. A. has not the slightest intention of controlling education, much less religion. We have been assured of that over and over again, and I think we can dispel that fear from our minds.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 68, noes 31.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 287, nays 57, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—287

Abernethy	Gossett	Mruk
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	Mundt
Anderson, Calif.	Granger	Murdock
Anderson, N. Mex.	Grant, Ala	Murphy
Andrews, Ala.	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gregory	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Gross	Myers
Arends	Gwynne	Newsome
Auchincloss	Hagen	Norman
Barrett	Hale	Norton
Barry	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Halleck	O'Brien, N. Y.
Beall	Hancock	O'Neal
Beckworth	Hare	Outland
Bell	Harris, Ark.	Patman
Bender	Harris, Va.	Patton
Bennett, Mich.	Hart	Peterson, Fla.
Bennett, Mo.	Hartley	Peterson, Ga.
Blackney	Hays	Pfeifer
Bland	Heffernan	Pittenger
Bloom	Herter	Ploeser
Bolton	Hess	Plumley
Boykin	Hill	Poage
Bradley, Pa.	Hinshaw	Poulson
Brehm	Hobbs	Powers
Brown, Ga.	Hoch	Pracht, C. Frederick
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Priest
Bryson	Holifield	Ramey
Burch, Va.	Holmes, Mass.	Ramspeck
Burchill, N. Y.	Holmes, Wash.	Randolph
Burdick	Horan	Rankin
Butler	Howell	Reece, Tenn.
Byrne	Hull	Rees, Kans.
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Richards
Cannon, Mo.	Jarman	Rivers
Capozzoli	Jeffrey	Robertson
Carson, Ohio	Jenkins	Rockwell
Chapman	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Church	Jensen	Rogers, Calif.
Clark	Johnson, Ind.	Rohrbough
Clason	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rolph
Cochran	Johnson, Luther A.	Rowan
Coffee	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rowe
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Russell
Colmer	Jonkman	Sasscer
Compton	Judd	Sauthoff
Cooley	Kean	Schwabe
Cooper	Kearney	Scott
Costello	Keefe	Sheppard
Courtney	Kefauver	Simpson, Pa.
Crosser	Kennedy	Slaughter
Cunningham	Keogh	Smith, Va.
D'Alesandro	Kerr	Smith, W. Va.
Davis	Kilburn	Snyder
Delaney	Kilday	Somers, N. Y.
Dewey	King	Sparkman
Dickstein	Kinzer	Spence
Dies	Kirwan	Springer
Dilweg	Kleberg	Stanley
Dingell	Kunkel	Stevenson
Dirksen	LaFollette	Stewart
Domengeaux	Landis	Sullivan
Dondero	Lanham	Sundstrom
Doughton	Lea	Taber
Douglas	LeCompte	Talbot
Drewry	Lesinski	Talle
Durham	Lewis	Tarver
Eaton	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Eberharter	Lynch	Thomason
Elliott	McConnell	Tibbott
Ellison, Md.	McCord	Tolan
Ellsworth	McCormack	Torrens
Elston, Ohio	McCowen	Towe
Engle, Calif.	McGregor	Treadway
Fay	McKenzie	Troutman
Fellows	McMillan	Vincent, Ky.
Fenton	McMurray	Voorhis, Calif.
Fish	McWilliams	Wadsworth
Fisher	Madden	Walter
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Ward
Flannagan	Mahon	Wasielewski
Folger	Maloney	Weaver
Forand	Mansfield, Tex.	Weichel, Ohio
Ford	Marcantonio	Weiss
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Welch
Gale	Martin, Mass.	Wene
Gathings	Michener	Whitten
Gavin	Miller, Conn.	Whittington
Gerlach	Miller, Mo.	Wigglesworth
Gilchrist	Miller, Pa.	Willey
Gillette	Mills	Winstead
Gillie	Monkiewicz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Goodwin	Morrison, La.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gordon	Mott	Woodrum, Va.
Gore		Worley
Gorski		Wright
		Zimmerman

NAYS—57

Allen, La.	Griffiths	Reed, Ill.
Arnold	Harness, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Heidinger	Rizley
Boren	Hoffman	Robsion, Ky.
Bradley, Mich.	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Brooks	Johnson,	Scrivner
Brumbaugh	Anton J.	Shafer
Buffett	Johnson,	Simpson, Ill.
Camp	Calvin D.	Smith, Ohio
Carrier	Jones	Smith, Wis.
Case	Lemke	Stefan
Clevenger	Maas	Stockman
Cole, Mo.	Mason	Sumner, Ill.
Cravens	Miller, Nebr.	West
Crawford	Norrell	White
Curtis	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Day	O'Hara	Wilson
Dworshak	O'Konski	Wolcott
Ellis	Pace	Woodruff, Mich.
Gearhart	Philbin	

NOT VOTING—84

Allen, Ill.	Furlong	Monroney
Andresen,	Gallagher	Morrison, N. C.
August H.	Gamble	O'Connor
Baldwin, Md.	Gibson	O'Toole
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gifford	Phillips
Barden	Green	Pratt,
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Joseph M.
Bonner	Edwin Arthur	Price
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Rabaut
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Robinson, Utah
Burgin	Hendricks	Sabath
Busbey	Izac	Sadowski
Canfield	Johnson, Ward	Satterfield
Carlson, Kans.	Kee	Scanlon
Carter	Kelley	Schiffler
Celler	Klein	Sheridan
Chenoweth	Knutson	Short
Chiperfield	Lambertson	Sikes
Cox	Lane	Smith, Maine
Curley	Larcade	Starnes, Ala.
D'Alesandro	LeFevre	Stearns, N. H.
Dawson	Luce	Sumners, Tex.
Disney	McGehee	Taylor
Elmer	McLean	Thomas, N. J.
Engel, Mich.	Manasco	Vinson, Ga.
Feighan	Mansfield,	Vorys, Ohio
Fernandez	Mont.	Vursell
Fogarty	May	Whelchel, Ga.
Fuller	Merritt	Winter
Fulmer	Merrow	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Satterfield for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Lambertson against.
Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Gibson against.
Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Vursell against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Whelchel of Georgia against.
Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Disney against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kelley with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Joseph M. Pratt.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. May with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Taylor.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME DURING WHICH CERTAIN GRAINS AND OTHER PRODUCTS TO BE USED FOR LIVESTOCK MAY BE IMPORTED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES FREE OF DUTY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4410) to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from countries free of duty, with Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, after line 15, insert "(3) Oats to be used for purposes of human consumption if the entry or withdrawal is after the date this paragraph takes effect."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled bill, H. R. 4410.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the bill H. R. 3961, and to have them placed following the remarks of the gentleman from California in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an editorial which appeared in the Binghamton Sun, March 18, concerning the St. Patrick's Day speech delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, and I ask unanimous consent to include this speech in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BURCHILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a resolution and in the other to include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein copy of the Minnesota law on the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the bill, H. R. 3961.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD at that point in the RECORD where I spoke today on H. R. 3961, and to include therein some correspondence between myself and the Corps of Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a certain exhibit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, first, in reference to international currency. I have an estimate on this of $195 from the Public Printer. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by B. M. Anderson. On that I have an estimate of $495. I desire to combine these two in one article and I ask unanimous consent that these articles may be included, notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and pending that

motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue throughout the day and close not later than 3 p. m. on tomorrow, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, I hope as many members of the Committee of the Whole as can do so remain during the attempt on my part to present as briefly as I may the facts about this bill.

The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations began its hearings on the 7th day of February and since that time has been engaged almost continuously in morning and afternoon sessions in the completion of hearings on the bill which, as you will observe from examining them, are of a rather voluminous character, and in the work of writing up the bill we are anxious to have you understand as clearly as possible the reasons which have actuated us in taking certain actions in connection with the formulation of the bill, especially those which have been taken either in reduction or in the increase of Budget estimates. The bill, in our judgment, will prove a less fruitful source of controversy than has any agricultural appropriation bill presented to this House during the last several years.

The subcommittee is practically in unanimous agreement. Of course, there are some items in the bill concerning which we were not able to reach entire agreement on the part of all members of the subcommittee, but the subcommittee is more nearly in unanimous agreement regarding the provisions of this bill than it has been in regard to any agricultural appropriation bill presented to this House since I have served as a member of the subcommittee.

I desire at this time to express the very deep appreciation which I feel for the fine spirit shown by all members of the subcommittee, including the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is also a member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WENE], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], who have been so cooperative in connection with the preparation of the bill and for the very large amount of work faithfully performed, which has been necessary on the part of all of them in its preparation.

We have, of course, had the assistance of one of the most able employees of the House Committee on Appropriations who, throughout many years of service, has demonstrated his extraordinary efficiency and who has perhaps had more to do with the preparation of the bill than has any individual member of the subcommittee. I refer, of course, to our genial clerk, Mr. Arthur Orr.

I wish to point out in the beginning of my remarks, as shown by the summary contained on pages 3 and 4 of the committee report, that this bill has been more drastically reduced below the level of the appropriation act for the Department for which it provides for the current fiscal year than has been any supply bill presented so far during this session of the Congress for any of the departments of the Government. That statement was made also last year in comparing the bill for this fiscal year with that for the fiscal year 1943. It was true then, as it is now.

We have here, therefore, a bill which, when all of its provisions are taken into accoount, carries about 45 percent less in the way of actual money than was carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year 1944. In making that statement I am taking into consideration the appropriations and reappropriations and loan funds authorized for use in the bills for the 2 fiscal years.

If we take into consideration only appropriations and reappropriations, the amount of the reduction below the funds made available for these items for the present fiscal year is approximately 41 percent, but when consideration of the loan provisions is added the amount of the reduction is 45 percent.

The bill as presented to you here is $93,500,000-plus below budget estimates. It is approximately $404,000,000 below the amount carried in the bill for the present fiscal year for appropriations and for reappropriations, which amount was approximately $972,000,000. When, as I have said, you take into account the reduction of loan authorizations carried in the bill, in addition to this tremendous reduction in appropriations and reappropriations, you have a still further reduction in the amount made available of $82,500,000, which brings the present bill to only 55 percent of the bill for the current fiscal year, involving a reduction of 45 percent.

You may think it strange that I, as one who is deeply interested in agriculture and in contributing to the solution of the problems of agriculture, insofar as it can be done by the appropriation of money for the support of the Department of Agriculture, am thus stressing the fact that by action of the subcommittee on which I serve as chairman there has been such a tremendous reduction in the amount of Federal funds made available for agricultural purposes. I want to assure you that not only myself, but every member of the subcommittee, while we have been interested in bringing about all reasonable economies, have at the same time endeavored to have the bill, insofar as we could under the limitations under which we labored, provide as fully as possible for the reasonable needs of agriculture insofar as those needs could be supplied through the agricultural appropriation bill.

Perhaps the farmer has been requested, through the submission of this bill in its drastically curtailed form, to assume more than a fair share of the reduction in national expenditures, and to be deprived of services which, in many instances, are of a type which are desirable, if not essential, in the making of proper provision for the needs of agriculture in this time of emergency.

We have not thought, however, to so severely reduce appropriations for the Department of Agriculture as to bring about the reduction or elimination of any absolutely essential activity. We have believed that the farmers of the country generally would approve our efforts to effect all reasonable economies and in that position we have been supported by the evidence of officials of the American Farm Bureau who appeared before our subcommittee, this having been the only farm organization which requested the opportunity to appear and be heard. Of course, there are certain subject matters we could not consider. We have no power to include anything in the bill for the school-lunch program, for which provision was made in the bill for the present fiscal year in the amount of $50,000,000, which was transferred from section 32 funds intended to be used in facilitating the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities. That provision was legislative. Under the rules of the House we are prohibited from bringing in any provision in this bill which would be subject to a point of order as being legislative in character. The same statement applies to the appropriations and loan authorizations which were proposed by the Budget for the Farm Security Administration, amounting to $126,000,000.

There are at least some members on the subcommittee, including myself, who would like to have seen adequate provision made for the continuance of the work of the Farm Security Administration. Certainly there must be provision made for conserving the huge investment of Government funds, amounting to over $400,000,000, which have already been invested in this program. It is absolutely inconceivable that the Congress should fail to make any provision for Farm Security Administration activities and simply leave the matter of the collection and conservation of those funds up in the air, with the Government's interests unattended to. So, I apprehend that before this bill is finally enacted by the Congress some provision will be found in the bill to take care of this situation, certainly for the conservation of these funds, and I trust for the carrying on in a reasonable way of the activities of the Farm Security Administration for another fiscal year.

We are all familiar with the fact that there has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture a bill that seeks to revise this program and to authorize it, and to combine it with the program of

the Emergency Crop Loan and of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Of course, I do not know what action will be taken by the Congress on that proposed legislation.

If the Congress desires to enact a law under which these activities are taken care of, then I trust that it will do so before this bill is finally enacted, so that an appropriation under the terms of whatever law it may enact may be included in the bill. If it does not enact such a law, then I certainly trust that the Senate in its consideration of the bill, not being bound by the same rules which obtain in the House, will insert adequate provision for the Farm Security Administration activities.

I wish also to point out in connection with the remarks I have made concerning the drastic reduction in the appropriations carried in the bill the fact that $170,000,000-plus of this reduction is accounted for by the omission from this bill of any provision for parity payments. We carried, of course, in the bill for the current fiscal year a provision for parity payments on the 1942 crops to carry out an obligation which had been assumed by the Congress in connection with the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943. At this time it appears that all of the major crops to which parity payments would be applicable are selling at or above parity according to parity standards fixed by law, with perhaps one or two exceptions where the prices are almost to parity. Therefore, no provision has been made in this bill for parity payments, and that accounts for a considerable part of the reduction in the over-all appropriations carried in the bill.

There is also the reduction in loan funds for the farm-tenant program of $15,000,000.

Even with these last-mentioned items, which were included in the Agricultural Appropriations Act for 1944—and have not been included in the present bill—not taken into account, there is still a tremendous reduction in the funds carried in this bill for direct appropriations, reappropriations, and loans as compared with the act for the present fiscal year, amounting to $152,921,695.

In addition to appropriations, reappropriations, and loan authorizations, there are, of course, available to the Department of Agriculture certain trust funds estimated to amount, for the next fiscal year, to $10,144,950 and certain funds derived from permanent appropriations, amounting in the aggregate to $125,309,615, making a total of funds for the Department of Agriculture for the 1945 fiscal year of $843,759,959, if the recommendations of this subcommittee, as outlined in the pending bill, are approved by the Congress, as against a total of all similar items for the present year of $1,089,624,558.

I shall not have the time, nor would you have the patience to listen to me for the time that might be necessary, to discuss all of the provisions of this bill. I do ask you to turn with me to the tabular statement which is set out on page 20 of the committee report and the following pages, and I shall make some brief reference to the outstanding items in regard to which the committee has undertaken to effect some changes, either to increase or to decrease Budget estimates.

SECRETARY'S OFFICE AND OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Certain items for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor were increased by small amounts, in the one case $29,200 and in the other case $125,200, largely because of the fact that with the reduction in the working funds of the Department, contemplated by the appropriations made later on in the bill, the work of the Office of the Secretary and of the Solicitor's office ought to be materially decreased. In addition to that, as far as the Office of the Secretary is concerned, there has been set up in the Department, as you know, the Office of the War Food Administrator, which has charge of most of the organizations of the Department, and administrative supervision over them, and that fact should bring about a reduction in the work of the Secretary's office.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

While the committee has approved the Budget estimates for the Office of Information, they represent a reduction of $284,524 below funds available for the present fiscal year. The services of that Office, its publications, and the information it is able to furnish the farmers of the country are of inestimable value at this time when the American farmer is exerting himself to the utmost to meet the requirements of the food-for-victory program. The committee has reluctantly approved the contemplated economies in this Office but hopes that the funds carried in the bill will enable it to function with reasonable efficiency.

LIBRARY

The bill carries for the library of the Department $543,233 which is identical with the amount provided in the 1944 act.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

There is some difference of opinion among the members of the subcommittee as to whether it is wise at this time to make further reductions in the funds appropriated for this Bureau. Its economic investigations, if properly conducted, are of vital importance to American agriculture. Speaking for myself alone, I feel that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, while the information it furnishes should, of course, be accurate, is supposed primarily to be working for the benefit of agriculture and of the farmer and that too much of its effort has been devoted to an attempt to prove that the condition of the farmer is satisfactory, and that he is being accorded a fair deal in comparison with other classes of our people in the pending emergency. I do not believe that such findings and contentions accurately or fairly present the farmers' case. While prices of agricultural commodities have increased, their increase has been by no means proportionate to the increases in the values of manufactured goods or in the value of services either in war industry or in other civilian employment. While labor in war industry is receiving approximately 200 percent of what it received in World War No. 1, the farmers' prices are very substantially less in value than they were during that war and his labor machinery and fertilizer costs are largely in excess of those which then prevailed. Profits in industry, which are so tremendous as to be in large part responsible for a national income exceeding anything of which anyone ever dreamed in our national history, have not been accompanied by anything like proportionate profits in agriculture.

The farmer is, therefore, justified in feeling that he is not receiving the consideration which is the lot of many classes of our citizenry. If this be the fact, and I think it is, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, supposed to be working for the farmer, has not adequately developed it, and I, therefore, feel that it has not been wholeheartedly the servant of agriculture as it should have been. Perhaps the committee would feel justified in increasing rather than decreasing the amount of its appropriation for economic investigations if it were able to feel that in this field the Bureau is accomplishing to the full and with wholehearted sincerity the type of work which it was set up to do.

The appropriation for its crop and livestock estimates has been approved as submitted by the Budget.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The appropriation carried for the activities of this Office is identical with that for the present fiscal year and with the Budget estimate.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Budget estimates for the Office of the Administrator have been approved without change, including the appropriation of $1,226,364 for the special research fund.

EXTENSION SERVICE AND OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

We have been carrying, as you know, in every bill for the last several years a lump-sum appropriation for the Extension Service, $255,000, and for the Office of Experiment Stations, $63,708, for the purpose of preventing any States from receiving a smaller allotment of funds than they had received prior to the 1940 farm census. These supplemental appropriations have not been authorized by law, and heretofore we could not include them in the bill, under the rules of the House, but this year we are proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement, reached yesterday, by which the House may consider as in order any items carried in the bill which are proposed for authorization under the Pace bill, which passed the House March 7, 1944, just as if that bill had finally been enacted into law, and the making of these two supplemental appropriations is proposed for authorization by the terms of the Pace bill. Therefore, under the rules and the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are proceeding, these two items are in order, and since the House has on several other occasions

manifested its purpose to continue the appropriation of these funds, the subcommittee has included provision for them in the pending bill. Other estimates for these organizations have been approved without change.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY (A. R. A.)

A very controversial subject matter is involved in the reduction which has been made in the estimates for the Bureau of Animal Industry, and there has been, as I presume all of you know, an organized campaign upon the part of friends of the field service in the Bureau of Animal Industry to have approval given to the proposed reclassification of 2,472 of these field employees, the effect of which would be to bring about a salary increase of an average of $289 for each of these employees.

I say to you frankly that many arguments which in my judgment have merit were presented to the subcommittee in favor of the proposed increase in salaries, which is what it amounts to, in fact. Except for the circumstances under which the matter came to the attention of the committee, the committee might have felt inclined to have gone along with the suggestion, but we find ourselves confronted with these facts. All Federal employees have had increases in pay under the provisions of the Overtime Pay Act of 1943, amounting for these particular employees to an average of $452 per employee. We felt that if the Congress should at this time provide for an additional increase through the reclassification method, for all of these field employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, we would start a movement on the part of many organizations of Federal employees to secure for themselves similar consideration. In fact there was proposed in connection with the legislative appropriation bill passed by the House a few days ago by the subcommittee reporting the bill, an increase of $330,000 to provide for an increase in the salaries of the law clerks in the district and circuit court judges' offices, and in the full committee that proposed increase was stricken because the committee did not want to embark on an increase in salaries beyond the 21.6 percent carried by the Overtime Pay Act. So this subcommittee handling the present bill, in an effort to be consistent with the action of the committee on the legislative appropriation bill, has eliminated from the estimates here approximately $996,000, which would have been necessary for the next fiscal year to have paid these increases in salaries, and in addition has found it possible to reappropriate $343,000 which had been appropriated for the present fiscal year for the work of eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease, and which it had been proposed to use to increase these salaries for the remainder of the present fiscal year.

That money will not be expended during the present fiscal year, unless the Congress should express its approval of this reclassification plan. In the event it should do that, it would be spent, and that would mean an increase in this appropriation of not $996,000 in all but of $966,000 plus $343,000, which would have to be added to the figures contained in the bill since we would not have that money to reappropriate for the next fiscal year and could not by that process reduce the estimate for the Bureau of Animal Industry.

I trust this may satisfactorily explain the present status of this proposed plan. I apprehend that the matter will be brought to your attention in reading the bill under the 5-minute rule. A motion was made in the whole Committee on Appropriations to restore these cuts that we had made from the Budget estimates for this particular purpose, and that motion was rejected by the full committee by a vote of 19 to 4. It is the hope, at least of a majority of the subcommittee, that the House may approve the action of the subcommittee with regard to this item.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY (A. R. A.)

The estimates for this Bureau which are identical with the appropriations for the present fiscal year have been approved without change.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING (A. R. A.)

The estimates for this Bureau, with its manifold activities, including agricultural engineering investigations, cereal crops and diseases, cotton and other fiber crops and diseases, dry-land agriculture, forage crops and diseases, forest pathology, fruit and vegetable crops and diseases, irrigation agriculture, plant exploration, soil and fertilizer investigations, the plant industry experiment farm, soil surveys, sugar-plant investigation, and tobacco investigations, represent in almost every instance small reductions below the amounts carried in the act for the present fiscal year.

We have approved the Budget estimates with two exceptions, having made a small additional appropriation of $3,110 in connection with the investigation of fruit and vegetable crops and diseases, and a reduction of soil-survey item of $12,000, feeling that additional soil surveys at this time are unlikely to prove beneficial in the war effort and especially that these should not be undertaken until it is possible to make available for the use of farmers the information which has already been collected by previous surveys, a great deal of which has not yet been published.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE (A. R. A.)

The estimates for this very important Bureau include provisions for research in fruit insects, Japanese beetle control, sweetpotato weevil control, Mexican fruitfly control, citrus canker eradication, gypsy and brown-tailed moth control, Dutch elm disease eradication, phony peach and peach mosaic eradication, forest insects, truck crop and garden insects, cereal and forage insects, barberry eradication, cotton insects, pink bollworm and thurberia control, bee culture, insects affecting man and animals, insect pest survey and identification, and foreign parasites.

Numerous budgetary reductions in this multitude of items have been approved, although we feel that sufficient funds are now carried in the bill for these worthy purposes to insure the efficient continuance of proper research and investigation. In only one instance have we exceeded Budget estimate. We have restored a proposed budgetary cut of $6,950 in the item for bee culture.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY (A. R. A.)

The committee examined with a great deal of care witnesses having knowledge of the types of investigations being carried on by this Bureau and were particularly interested in the work of the four regional research laboratories. Many substantial accomplishments were reported in connection with that work and the attention of interested Members is respectfully invited to the hearings regarding these subject matters.

In the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry there has been an increase of $18,536 for the purpose of carrying on some very essential work at Winter Haven laboratory in Florida in connection with the experimentation on processes for the preservation of citrus fruit juices so as to aid in shipment abroad for the use of our armed forces and our allies without damage in shipment. We were given advices as to considerable losses which have been sustained by reason of the spoilage of such products in shipment heretofore. The laboratory at Winter Haven has been doing some very important, and to some extent at least, successful work in undertaking to solve these particular problems.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

I am sure all the Members of the House are deeply interested in the work of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, which heretofore has been known as the Bureau of Home Economics. It is the women's organization of the Department of Agriculture. Frequently we have letters from women throughout the country complaining that whereas we appropriate $17,000,000 or $18,000,000 for the Bureau of Animal Industry, yet for this organization which has to do with the problems of the American home and homemaking we appropriate what seems to them to be a miserly sum, estimated by the Budget for the next fiscal year at $606,000. I hope you will find time to read the hearings on this bill, and particularly the evidence of the outstanding women from all over the United States who came before our committee to testify in behalf of increases in the Budget estimates for this Bureau. They asked for $675,000 more, which would have more than doubled the amount of the appropriation. The committee was very sympathetic with their request, but felt that under the present conditions we were not justified in granting it to the full extent that was desired. But we have provided here in this bill for an increase in appropriations for this Bureau above the estimates for the next fiscal year of $200,000 for certain very desirable types of research activities which you will find outlined in the committee report and in the hearings.

BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER (A. R. A.)

The Budget estimate for administrative expenses of the Beltsville Research Center has been approved without change. Most of the moneys expended at Beltsville, as Members of the Congress know, are appropriated to the several bureaus of the Department doing work there, and the comparatively small item of $130,760 carried in the bill represents only over-all administrative expenses.

WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

The Budget estimate for this very important work has been approved as submitted in the amount of $2,264,026.

FOREST SERVICE

Despite the fact that two small increases were made in items of appropriations for the Forest Service above Budget estimates, the bill represents a reduction of $2,422,324 below Budget estimates for this Service. This is occasioned by the fact that estimates for forest fire cooperation were in the amount of $5,000,000, whereas the limit of authorization of existing law is $2,500,000, to which we have added $29,062 authorized under the Overtime Pay Act of 1943. This action does not represent the viewpoint of the committee as to what funds should be appropriated for this purpose, but represents the limit of our authority under the law, and the committee leaves open the question of further consideration should the additional amount of the Budget estimate be added to the bill by Senate amendment. We have made an addition under the item for Forest Management of $45,000 which includes $35,000 for use in investigation of Naval Stores Production at the Olustee, Fla., laboratory, and $10,000 for studies looking to the control of the spruce budworm.

The bill includes no money for the acquisition of lands for national forests excepting small amount to carry out existing obligations of the Government under contracts heretofore executed. The available funds for farm and other private forestry cooperation is continued, $781,466, as estimated for by the Budget.

The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has been provided for in the amount of the Budget estimate plus $15,000 for investigations at the Southern Forest Experimental Station at New Orleans, La., in connection with the utilization of southern hardwoods.

EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

We have provided in the bill for the liquidation of the emergency rubber project. That, I know, is a subject matter which is bound to arouse considerable discussion and considerable controversy. Before the Members of the House reach the conclusion that the committee has improvidently made provision for the liquidation of this project, I respectfully request that they read the hearings had before the committee with reference to the matter. The Government has expended so far approximately $45,000,000 in connection with this emergency rubber project, most of it in experimentations in guayule, in which so far there have resulted approximately 400 tons of rubber produced from stock which had matured prior to the purchase of the lands comprising the original project by the Government. The golden rod and Russian dandelion and cryptostegia investigations have produced some findings which appear to be of interest, but at the same time there has not been developed from them or from the guayule experimentations any hope that as the result of the carrying on of this project any material relief will be secured in our rubber situation during the period of this emergency unless it should last much longer than most of us hope will be the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

According to the evidence of some of the witnesses who have appeared in past hearings in connection with this emergency rubber project, the cost of the production of this guayule rubber would run about $3 a pound, whereas some of the more recent evidence and that delivered in connection with our hearing this year, would indicate the possibility of its production at 52 cents per pound, or even, according to the most optimistic estimates, at lower prices than that. However that may be, the evidence is undisputed that in 1933 and 1934 natural rubber imported into this country from the East Indies was selling at 3 cents per pound. Of course, that was the lowest price ever reached. But there is no hope in the minds of anyone so far as I have been able to ascertain, that is, anyone who is in position to know or to express an intelligent opinion regarding this subject matter, that we will be able to develop in this country an industry for the production of natural rubber, either from guayule, golden rod, Russian dandelion, or cryptostegia, which will be able to compete with the importation of natural rubber from foreign sources after this war is over and since it is very apparent that the carrying on of this emergency rubber project during the period of the war will not contribute substantially to the solution of our rubber problem, and since it involves and has involved such a tremendous sum of money, the committee has thought proper to provide for its liquidation. However, an ample sum amounting to $3,900,000-plus has been provided in the bill for the purpose of liquidation which would include money for the processing of whatever guayule or other plants they may have which are available for processing during the next fiscal year and the reclamation of whatever rubber can be secured by this processing, which they estimate will be, however, only about 325 tons.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman know of any expenditure for any other agricultural program such as hemp? I do not believe it has been included in the agricultural appropriation, but has there been a wartime experiment on the production of such fibers?

Mr. TARVER. There has been, of course, such a program, but it is not provided for in this bill, and I have not given the study to that particular subject matter that would be required in order to intelligently advise the gentleman concerning it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I note in the table under "Farm tenancy, title I," that there is provided $750,000 for personnel.

Mr. TARVER. I am going to discuss that later. Would the gentleman wait until I reach that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I would like to have that cleared up.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TARVER. The Budget estimates for the War Food Administration contemplate a substantial increase, amounting to more than $3,000,000 above amounts available for the present fiscal year. It has been pointed out, however, by officials of the War Food Administration that many of its activities began long after the beginning of this fiscal year, such as the promulgation and enforcement of food distribution orders, and that more money will be required to carry them on for an entire fiscal year than was sufficient for only a portion of a year. It has been felt, however, by a majority of the subcommittee that the $800,000 projected for expenditure in the wage-stabilization project of War Food Administration should not be expended and that this project should be abandoned. It is believed it should be abandoned now rather than to await the beginning of the next fiscal year, when, if this bill is approved, its funds will not be available for that purpose.

The committee has inserted a proviso which would prevent the expenditure of administrative funds to promulgate or enforce any food-distribution order which undertakes to assess the cost of administering such orders against the handlers, distributors, or producers of the product with which they deal. In the cases of dairymen the War Food Administration has begun a practice of making a small assessment of 1½ cents per hundred pounds of milk against handlers or distributors of dairy products for administrative expenses in carrying out these food-distribution orders, which assessment is eventually borne by the producer, whether he is a producer only or a producer-distributor. While the assessment is small we believe it is distinctly unfair that any part of administrative expense of the War Food Administration should be assessed against the agricultural producers with whose products it has occasion to deal. We were advised by administrative officials that a considerable additional amount of administrative money should be appropriated for the use of War Food Administration if these assessments are made impossible. Estimates as to the exact

amount of increase thought necessary were in the nature of guesswork and varied from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000. We believe that the increased funds made available for War Food Administration for the next fiscal year, if this bill is approved, should be amply sufficient to take care of any additional costs which may be incurred in this connection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A reduction of $302,000 is proposed in the committee bill in the amount of money appropriated from Corporation funds for administrative purposes. This represents the judgment of a majority of the subcommittee as to economies that it should be possible to effect in the administration of the affairs of the Corporation. It cannot be said that the subcommittee has been in unanimous agreement on this proposed reduction. Further, I as one member of the subcommittee believe that an appropriation should be made by Congress to restore the capital stock of the Corporation as contemplated by law. According to the information we have, the capital stock of $100,000,000 has now suffered almost 100 percent impairment. A Budget estimate for approximately $39,000,000, intended to replace a portion of this impairment, was recently disapproved by the Deficiency Subcommittee and the House passed the deficiency bill which might have contained the appropriation without amendment in this particular. There was no Budget estimate before our subcommittee for this purpose, and we did not feel justified in including in this bill any provision with relation to this subject matter. The proviso carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of the present year prohibiting the sale of Government-owned or controlled agricultural commodities at less than parity prices is carried in the pending bill in substantially the same form in which it appears in the present law and with the same exceptions.

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

The bill carries provision for the direct appropriation of $290,000,000 as contemplated in the Budget estimates, although the Budget estimates provided for the use of $40,000,000 of this amount from section 32 funds. For this use, however, we were unable to provide since it is not authorized by law. We, therefore, appropriate in the bill the $40,000,000 directly, or a total of $290,000,000, which, added to funds which will be available from previous appropriations, will make a total of $300,000,000 available for the program for the present calendar year, which is the amount of the limitation contained in the 1944 Agricultural Appropriation Act. The money is provided entirely for soil-conservation and water-conservation practices. Language in the Budget which would have required that the 1944 appropriation suffice for the program until June 30, 1944, instead of the calendar year 1943 as appropriated has been deleted by the deficiency committee in its submission of the deficiency bill considered a few days ago and similar language proposed by the Budget for the pending bill with regard to extending the availability of the appropriation carried in this bill for a program to end June 30, 1945, instead of for a program to end December 31, 1944, has been disapproved by this committee since we feel that the effect of these proposed changes would be to reduce the appropriation for soil- and water-conservation practices by having the same funds suffice for the needs of the program for a 6-month period after the expiration of the period for which they were pledged.

PARITY PAYMENTS

As previously pointed out, no provision is carried in the bill for parity payments.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Despite the action of the Congress last year in directing the liquidation of the Federal crop insurance program, the Budget has sent over an estimate in the amount of $5,997,433 for the reinstallation of this program and carrying it on for another fiscal year. Of course, there has been no insurance on wheat or on cotton, the only two agricultural products involved for the present crop year. The committee is of the opinion that the Congress considered very carefully all of the facts, both for and against this program, in taking the action it did last year and does not believe that it contemplates now reversing its position, and immediately after directing the liquidation of the program, providing for its reinstatement.

I might say to you that the evidence regarding last year's program, what was done after the hearings last year, shows a more unsatisfactory condition with reference to the Federal crop insurance program even than was shown at last year's hearings. The losses on wheat have been $6,000,000 as compared with $3,000,000 the year before. The losses in cotton, while not so considerable, yet have been substantial, and the entire losses for the 5-year period of operation of the Corporation aggregate in excess of $63,000,000. They are divided about half in the amount of indemnities paid by the Government over and above the amount of premiums paid by the farmers, and about half in administrative expenses. I think there is no member of the committee but who is sympathetically interested in the objective sought by the establishment of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. I think all of them without exception would have been delighted if that experiment had been successful.

But 5 years' operation with huge losses to the Government seems to have demonstrated conclusively that the plan, as devised by Congress, will not work out, and the farmers themselves are not participating in it to the extent which had been anticipated. Last year only one-fourth of the wheat farmers participated, whereas one-third had participated the year before. The same is true of cotton, where 10 percent or less have participated. So under those circumstances we thought it would be unwise to provide, and we did not think that Congress would be willing to provide, for the reinstallation of the program for the next fiscal year. For that reason we omitted this Budget estimate, but have provided for an appropriation of $100,000 from the unexpended balance heretofore appropriated for this Corporation, to be used in the final and complete liquidation of the Corporation during the early part of the next fiscal year. We feel that that amount of money should be amply sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I cannot understand why the Budget would make that recommendation after the action of the Congress.

Mr. TARVER. I am not able to inform the gentleman on that point.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service, in my judgment, is performing a more useful service for agriculture than any other organization of the Department of Agriculture.

I have had the opportunity to examine its work in connection with soil conservation districts set up in my own State, to which, as to other districts throughout the country, it furnishes technical assistance and assistance in the making of farm plans and otherwise. The result of its work, to one who will take the trouble to examine it, is astounding. It has contributed not only to the restoration of the soil where it has been depleted, but it has contributed, in substantial ways, to the material prosperity of the farmers who have undertaken to cooperate with the Soil Conservation Service in this work, and I feel amply justified in the statement I made a few moments ago to the effect that the Soil Conservation Service is performing a work of more benefit to agriculture than is any other organization in the Department of Agriculture.

Since I feel that way about it, you may wonder why I am in accord with the action of the committee in reducing the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service as estimated for by the Budget, by $2,935,000. $2,900,000 of that was intended for use in connection with the proposed taking over of certain drainage and irrigation districts set up by State laws, in which cases the draining or irrigating in the districts in question, as the case might be, was assessable against the land in those districts. Those districts have proven unsuccessful ventures. Now it is proposed by the Soil Conservation Service to take over these unsuccessful districts and spend several hundred thousand dollars for heavy machinery and equipment, to proceed at Government expense, with some undetermined amount of cooperation on the part of the local owners, to endeavor to carry out the programs which were originally undertaken and with regard to which there was failure.

We thought that suggestion unwise. Despite our love for the Conservation Service, we provided for the elimination of this portion of its estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In regard to that $3,000,000 for drainage in connection with the Soil Conservation Service, was there any evidence presented to the committee that might justify, not the projects but the effort that might be made on individual farms, to do the drainage work in connection with increasing food production?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. There was evidence submitted to the committee that some of this land lying on the Mississippi River, I think part of it in Illinois, and in some of the Middle Western States would, if reclaimed, be extremely valuable land, perhaps worth two or three hundred dollars an acre. In the opinion of the officials of the Soil Conservation Service there is a need for the development of additional land for agricultural production at this time. The committee was of the opinion, however, that the trouble about agricultural production today is not that we have insufficient land upon which adequate production might be obtained, but that we do not have the necessary farm machinery and labor and other facilities which would bring about adequate production. We thought that instead of using several hundred thousand dollars—I think it approximates a million dollars for heavy machinery and equipment, and with other funds it would amount to $2,900,000, in trying to reclaim this land which other authorities had tried to reclaim without success, we ought to husband our resources for use in trying to do what we could to aid in the agricultural program on lands already available, and which should be sufficient for our purposes if properly handled, and with proper equipment and labor.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What the gentleman says may be true of particular lands that may be along the river, but I am sure the gentleman from Georgia would not want to say that applied to all the land. There is no contemplation of using money to buy equipment. As I understand, practically all of these funds are used for personnel.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no. The gentleman is mistaken. If he will examine the justifications he will find that a tremendous amount of the reduction made here was estimated for, for the purpose of purchasing heavy equipment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. For the drainage part.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But practically all of their appropriation goes to personnel, does it not?

Mr. TARVER. No; I would say that the major portion of it goes to personnel, but this particular item has included in it a tremendous amount of money, well over half a million dollars, for heavy equipment.

Now, may I pass on briefly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I find nothing in here that would provide money for the control of chinch bugs and grasshoppers unless it be in this paragraph for the control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases. Does that cover it?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I intend to discuss that further on, but I may as well dispose of it now.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Would the gentleman tell us whether corn borers would be included, too?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; they are included, too; all destructive pests. We have not carried in this bill heretofore the pest-control provision. It has been provided for in the deficiency bill, but $2,700,000 is carried for it in this bill with the understanding that, if there develops need for more money, the money will be supplied through a deficiency appropriation. This was not intended to be the limit of what is to be available for the purpose of combating these outbreaks, if they occur, of pests of these types.

The school-lunch program: I have already referred to this. I am one of those who feel that the school-lunch program in some form ought to be continued. I regret very much that the committee has been unable to make provisions for funds in this bill to provide for the continuance of this program, but we are without authority to do so, for the program is not authorized by law. Had we inserted such provision in the bill, it would have been stricken on a point of order in the House. Further than that, the House on March 7 voted down an amendment to the Pace bill which would have authorized the program, and as I recall, the vote was about 3 to 1. So, the committee being the servant of the House, and feeling on this occasion that the action on the Pace bill was indicative of its opinion regarding the program, its composite opinion, and also because the program is not authorized by law, could not insert the provision in the bill.

EMERGENCY EROSION CONTROL, EVERGLADES REGION, FLORIDA

The budget of $72,248 for this project, which is to be matched by State and local funds, has been approved.

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

The Budget estimate of $1,250,000, representing a decrease of $58,875 below the current appropriation, has been approved. It does not involve the purchase of any additional land but only the caretaking, maintenance, and operation for demonstration purposes of lands already owned by the Government.

SUGAR ACT

The Budget estimate for administration of the Sugar Act has been approved without change.

MARKETING SERVICE

No change has been effected in estimates for the Marketing Service except by the addition of $25,915 intended to restore marketing-news service for Cleveland, Detroit, and Seattle. Small items of increase proposed by the Budget for the various branches of this service are almost in their entirety related to increased cost brought about by the Overtime Pay Act of 1943 and this statement is also true with regard to other increases of a similar character appearing at other points in the bill.

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

These estimates, as I have already stated, have been disapproved since appropriation is not authorized by law. They amount to $126,000,000. When the pending Cooley bill to provide for the consolidation of this activity with the Emergency Crop Production Loan activity and that of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations comes before the House we will be able to ascertain the legislative will as to the type of program of this sort which it is desired to maintain and under what limitations. It is to be hoped that that legislation will have been enacted prior to the final disposition of the pending bill so that provision can then be made in this bill for such appropriations as Congress may see fit to authorize.

FARM TENANT LAND PURCHASE PROGRAM

The Budget estimate for loans for this program in the amount of $15,000,000 has been approved. The program, in my judgment, has amply justified itself and should be expanded after the war. At the present time its activities have necessarily diminished owing to high land values and the apparent unwisdom of permitting tenants to assume long-term obligations to pay for farms at high prices, which obligations they would probably be unable to discharge under post-war conditions. The appropriation of $750,000, or half the Budget estimate, for the administration of this program is, in my judgment, manifestly insufficient, and yet we are prohibited by law from appropriating more than 5 percent of the amount of funds made available, the law having apparently failed to take into account the tremendous amount of money the Government has invested in the loans made in previous years and which must be serviced and collected. I sincerely hope that the Senate may, under its rules, which are more liberal than those of the House, make provision for the additional administrative funds necessary.

LIQUIDATION AND MANAGEMENT OF RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS

No appropriation was proposed by the Budget and none has been made for this purpose. It is proposed that necessary liquidation expenses in 1945 for these projects shall be financed from trust funds received for such purposes from

such projects. Their complete liquidation and that of all other cooperative or collective farming activities has been twice directed by Congress, and we are still hopeful that it may be eventually achieved.

WATER FACILITIES—ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

This appropriation was estimated for by the Budget in connection with the estimate for loans, grants, and rehabilitation which has heretofore been discussed.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The Budget estimates for the Rural Electrification Administration have been approved without change. The work of this organization during the present fiscal year has substantially improved and with the relaxation of restrictions upon the use of materials in line construction greater steps have been made toward completing the job of rural electrification than were possible in the 1943 fiscal year. It is believed, however, that the amount of funds estimated for by the budget will be amply sufficient for the needs of R. E. A. for fiscal 1945.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Except for $626,321 directly appropriated, which represents a reduction of $62,938 below the appropriation for the present fiscal year, no funds are directly appropriated to the Farm Credit Administration for administrative expenses. The larger portion of these expenses is paid by amounts chargeable against activities administered by it and by transfer from farmers' crop production and harvesting loan funds. Adequate provision for this last-mentioned activity is made through reappropriation of unexpended balances.

FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Provision is made in the bill for the use of corporation funds for its administrative expenses in the amount of Budget estimates.

The record of the Farm Credit Administration in its several branches and of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is one which must bring gratification to all of those who are interested in the development of a more stable agriculture and the removal as time goes on of the heavy debt burden with which our farmers generally have been afflicted. An examination of the hearings will disclose the repayment of these loans has exceeded all previous records and, while the loan activities of the Federal land banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are being materially reduced, that circumstance in itself very greatly adds to our feeling of satisfaction with the success of these activities.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, I have substantially covered the major items in the bill. The hour is growing late, and unless some Member desires to ask me a question I shall relinquish the floor.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I have some curiosity to know whether a worm is an insect.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, undoubtedly it is. An insect is not necessarily a worm, but a worm, of course, is an insect.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I spoke about corn borers. That would be covered by the provision at the bottom of page 40 and the top of page 41 of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. One further inquiry, if the gentleman will permit, about farm loans upon grain that is stored upon the farms. That is taken care of by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TARVER. If it is taken care of at all it is taken care of there. I want to say this to the gentleman with regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation: I think it was a mistake when the House in the deficiency bill made no provision for a restoration of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation which has now been depleted by at least 95 percent of the original $100,000,000. Whether the Commodity Credit Corporation will continue to be able to make as extensive loans during the coming fiscal year as it has in the past is very questionable because of this depletion in its working capital. Certainly I think the Congress ought to provide sufficient funds, but all we can do in this bill is to make an appropriation for its administrative expenses from corporate funds.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I think there has been nothing so satisfactory as the right to the farmer to store his grain on his own farm and borrow money on it. It has been universally approved. I think it ought to be covered in the bill.

Mr. TARVER. There is nothing we can do here except to appropriate funds from the corporate funds for its administrative expenses. The Budget estimate providing for restoration of the capital stock of the Corporation was referred to the deficiency subcommittee, not our subcommittee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the chairman in regard to several items here, especially in regard to farm homes and with regard to forest management. Can the gentleman give me a little more assurance about taking proper care of the great Government investment in the Farm Security Administration so that what we have there will be protected?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I will take another minute.

Let me say to the gentleman that it is beyond the power of this committee to include provisions in this bill for taking care of the investments or for carrying on in any degree the activities of the Farm Security Administration. It has never been authorized by law, but certainly I cannot conceive that Congress will fail to make some provision for the protection of the Government's interest in Farm Security Administration loans before the end of the present fiscal year, either through this bill or through some other legislative action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, not long ago I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 418, which provided for the reaffirmance of the action of the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1922, when it placed itself on record as favoring the establishment of a national home in Palestine for the Jews. This original action was in substantiation of the Balfour Declaration, wherein Britain committed itself to the identical policy, and the later mandate of the League of Nations, signed by 72 nations, which entrusted Britain with the encouragement of Jewish immigration into Palestine, their close settlement of its lands, and the establishment there of a Jewish national home. Implicit in the Balfour Declaration and the mandate was the plan that the Jews should eventually form in Palestine a nation or commonwealth. The resolution which I presented provided expressly for a Jewish commonwealth. This policy was at that time likewise agreeable to the Arabs in their first gratitude at being themselves freed from Turkish rule. The resolution of the Sixty-seventh Congress was later fortified by a convention or treaty between the United States and Britain wherein the United States agreed to the mandate, and Britain pledged itself not to change its terms without our consent.

In 1939 the white paper was published by Britain without the consent of the League or of our country, the effect of which was the cutting off of immigration into Palestine and the prohibition of the further purchase by the Jews of Palestine lands. This action was assailed in Britain by many of its most prominent leaders, and was condemned by the mandates commission of the League of Nations. In the meantime, the persecutions of Hitler had grown steadily more brutal and murderous, both in Germany and the conquered countries, until it is doubtful today whether any considerable number of European Jews will survive. It became imperative that a haven be found for those who can now escape, the hope be afforded the others of a post-war asylum. This Palestine resolution sought to fill this desperate need.

We are impelled to the salvation of the Jews by many motives. The first, of course, is common humanity. We cannot be so callus as to be indifferent to the suffering of these unfortunate people. The second is that our treaty rights be respected, and that the judgment of the civilized world at the expiration of the last war be now affirmed. The third is our concern for the world's stability and peace. For centuries the Jewish minority has been mistreated by Christian

Europe. Anti-Semitism has been repeatedly used as a weapon by ambitious and demagogic tyrants. Palestine is the answer to these grave, recurring problems of the world.

Our President has stated but recently that America has never agreed to the white paper, but favors immigration of Jews into Palestine. He pledged eventual justice to the downtrodden Jews of the world.

At a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House last week a letter from Secretary of War Stimson was received, stating that further action on the Palestine resolution at the present time would be prejudicial to the successful prosecution of the war. A representative of the War Department stated in the committee's executive session matters of a military nature which concerned themselves with the possible unfortunate results of the present passage of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, we are not soldiers but civilians. We are not military strategists. We must in the absence of superior knowledge respect our selected military chiefs in their decisions on military matters. The progress of the war and its successful conclusion is never absent from our minds. Our thoughts are grave when they turn upon the safety of our own American boys in the armed services. We cannot lightly disregard the warning we have received.

On the other hand, we have not abandoned this fight. We have agreed in committee, and have so stated, that we will postpone action on this resolution. We have not tabled it nor buried it. The Jews are entitled by all considerations of humanity and right to their home. We must press for action whenever the military situation is alleviated.

It is my intention so to do as quickly as I have reason to believe that I am not endangering our soldiers nor hampering our military in so doing.

This is my pledge to the House and to the millions who cling to this hope of Palestine as the last chance of salvation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I assent generally to the statements made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on which it is my privilege to have served some time.

Mr. Chairman, the agricultural interests of this country are more fortunate than they perhaps know or appreciate to have as the chairman of this subcommittee so energetic, so able, so fair an advocate, or such a man as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. He is a hard man to "lick" when he has made up his mind he is right; but overwhelmed as he is sometimes by the votes of those whom he still thinks are wrong, he is the best sport in the world. He will report the committee's action and defend it—and I would not do it as such, but he will, and he will reserve the right to express his own opinion on the floor. That is what I call sportsmanship, and I hand it to him. If we "lick" him then and there I will say we are good. It is a pleasure and a great honor to serve with him and with the other members of the committee, none of whom are less distinguished or able than he.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not in the brief period of time that has been allotted to me undertake to cover all the ramifications of the activities of or appropriations for this great Department. I take it for granted that my colleagues on the committee will, if they have not already done so, tell you in detail of the status of the many vast programs that have been launched through the Department of Agriculture at some time during the past 10 or 12 years—such programs as the emergency rubber project, the work of the War Food Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the prosecution of the agricultural program under which vast benefits ranging from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000 have been paid annually to the American farmer, and other programs and activities of the like nature.

FOOD WILL WIN THE WAR

These are subjects of primary importance, of course, and it is proper that the House and the country should be advised of them. However, it shall be my pleasure to devote the few remarks which I intend to make on this bill to the subject of agricultural research, that activity to which the Department of Agriculture was born almost 100 years ago and to which it has been dedicated in the act often referred to as the basic act establishing the Department and dedicating it to the acquisition and dissemination of information useful to agriculture in the broadest sense of that term.

That was the work which the Department had been carrying on for almost three-quarters of a century when these great, modern programs involving the control of agricultural production, the payment of benefits to agriculture, and so forth, first appeared on the scene. In fact, it was upon the foundation of knowledge that agricultural research had laid that these programs were established and have been carried on.

I do not hope to be able to cover the entire field of agricultural research in my remarks today. That is a subject upon which one could dwell with profit for many hours. It is a subject shot through and through with romance—the story of the plodding work of thousands upon thousands of scientific men, each working in his little cubicle and in his own generation and each contributing to the sum total of the vast store of scientific knowledge on agricultural subjects which is now the precious heritage of this generation.

There are three men of whose work I know in particular and whom I have come to esteem for their admirable qualities, their ability in research, and for the great contributions which they are making to this great store of knowledge. In naming them I do not wish to detract from the similarly admirable qualities which I know are possessed by the other bureau chiefs, but whom it has not been my good fortune to know as intimately or to observe their work as in the case of these three men.

I am referring to Dr. E. C. Auchter, formerly the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry but now the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration; to Dr. O. E. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Dairy Industry; and to Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service.

In praising them let it be understood that I include, as they would insist, within that praise all of the worthy individuals who labor with them and under their supervision. Also let it be understood that the work which they are doing and to which I am calling special attention merely exemplifies the splendid work being performed by all the scientific men in this great Department under the guidance of their great bureau chiefs.

The war has placed a man killing and most solemn responsibility upon the shoulders of Dr. Auchter, the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration. It has been his duty to redirect and coordinate the research of the several bureaus under his administration with a view to rendering maximum support to the war effort. Dr. Auchter reports that a thorough review of all research projects has resulted in placing about 90 percent of them in the category of being directed toward the solution of problems pertinent to war food, feed, fiber, medicinal, and other requirements. The remaining projects, he tells us, are on a curtailed basis, directed principally to the maintenance of valuable breeding stocks, experimental orchards, groves, and certain physical facilities the complete abandonment of which would entail a loss too great to be justified even by the war.

Let me cite just a few of the recent accomplishments by the men working under Dr. Auchter's supervision:

They have developed methods for preparing and utilizing crude adhesive materials from natural sources for meeting emergency camouflage needs where base supplies are unavailable. The results of these studies have been incorporated into instructions issued by the military services.

They have developed soybean varieties of high yield and high content of oil and of improved drying quality especially valuable for industrial war uses.

Through the application of breeding methods in the improvement of sheep on the western ranges, they have made definite progress in increasing the length of staple and amount of clean wool. During the past 3 years the staple length of the fleeces in the breeding line under the project has increased from 2.17 inches to 2.41 inches, or a little better than 10 percent.

They have discovered that the lack of honeybees and other pollinating insects in Utah is partly responsible for the steady decline in alfalfa seed production. Since the practice of devoting lands to

the growing of alfalfa as a part of crop rotation is regarded as of major importance in the soil-conservation program, the value of this discovery becomes obvious.

Experiments on a laboratory scale in the application of certain chemicals to turpentine woods have demonstrated the possibility of stimulating and increasing the flow of rosin-bearing saps by this means, and the present bill contains an increase of $35,000 for the purpose of enlarging these experiments to the pilot-plant scale with a view to the early introduction of this process into the industry and with a view to its availability to increase the production of vitally needed naval stores in connection with the war.

These constitute but a few examples of what has been recently accomplished. They could be multiplied many hundred times.

I wish now to speak briefly of the interesting and important work being done by the Bureau of Dairy Industry under the immediate supervision of Dr. Reed, the Chief of that Bureau. Here again the improvements are too numerous to be enumerated in their entirety.

Recent accomplishments have been along the line of producing a dehydrated form of cheese which not only enhances the keeping quality of the product but which greatly reduces the bulk and therefore the amount of shipping space required to transport this product which is of such great importance to our allies as well as to our soldiers overseas.

In compiling a roster of the great shipbuilders of this period, the names of Dr. Reed and his associates should not be omitted, for when one has devised a process by which products which once required two ships to carry may now be carried in one, has he not, in effect, constructed a ship?

One of the most interesting pieces of work performed by the Bureau of Dairy Industry has been the direction of the work of the herd-improvement associations. These associations had, in 1927, 327,000 cows only 15 percent of which produced more than 375 pounds of butterfat per cow per year, while in 1942, with 816,000 cows on test, 34 percent produced over 375 pounds, and the average last year of all cows in these associations was 339 pounds of fat as compared to an average of 188 pounds for the entire dairy-cow population.

Here indeed is a foundation upon which a dairy industry can be erected in this country far greater than man has ever dreamed of.

The work of Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, is known far and wide not only in this country but throughout the entire world. The Soil Conservation Service had its very humble start in the form of a very small appropriation for soil-erosion investigation reported out in this very bill some 15 years ago through the initiative of the Honorable James P. Buchanan, of Texas, then a minority member of the committee but who later became its chairman. This appropriation was continued from year to year with some increases in amount as time went on, and the movement finally blossomed forth in the establishment of a great bureau in this great Department of the Government.

Under the guidance of Dr. Bennett and his inspirational leadership, soil conservation demonstration projects to the number of approximately 150 were established throughout the length and breadth of this great land. Wherever a region had problems common to the great number of farm areas within its boundaries there would be set up a great farm demonstration project of sometimes as many as 25,000 acres. Every farmer in this project agreed to conduct his farm operations under the direction of the Soil Conservation scientists assigned to the project. Crops that had formerly been planted in rows up and down hill, as a result of which heavy rains would wash away great quantities of topsoil, were now planted in rows which followed the contour of the land. The contour rows, instead of facilitating rapid run-off of the rains, tended to hold the precipitation until it sank into the ground where it was stored up for the use of the crops in drier seasons and whereby the precious topsoil was not washed away to the streams and to the rivers and down into the sea where it was beyond recovery.

Farmers for miles around would visit these demonstration projects and would learn of the improved methods and of the increased production resulting from the application of the principles of soil conservation which had been worked out by the men under Dr. Bennett's supervision.

Long after this generation has passed from the scene of action, long after the programs of control of agricultural production have been supplanted by a more satisfactory and a more intelligent regime, the work of the vast army of scientific men who generation after generation have labored upon the problems confronting agriculture and have made of agriculture the greatest and noblest of all the sciences, will go on and each succeeding generation will reap dividend at compound interest on the labors and the efforts which they have so patiently put forth throughout the years.

Recognizing the almost incalculable value of the research work that has been done and is being done this very moment in the fields offered by the sulfa drugs and penicillin, your committee, while reducing the appropriation sought in some respects, has been concerned not to cripple nor to retard unduly the work of those who are giving their lives and effort to the advancement of science for the safety, security, rehabilitation, and prosperity of us all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

CONGRESS MUST ASSUME THE RESPONSIBILITY IF THEY CONTINUE THESE EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, when the New Deal was verbally buried its follies were not interred with its bones. I am including in my remarks the official table showing the payees that received in 1942 up to $185,000 as Government payments.

Before discussing the import of this information at this time, I wish to bring out certain facts and my own personal observations. First of all, we should consider that when this subsidy program was adopted and up until 1940, farm prices were low, and these Government payments could be accepted and construed as part of the market price rightly belonging to the producer.

Second, from remarks made when this same subject was under consideration in previous years, I wish to emphatically state that I am not necessarily opposing big farms, nor have I any personal feelings against any insurance company or any large land owner or owners. I will say I do not believe in a system that subsidizes one man $20 and another $100,000. I oppose these payments because it does not appear to me to be a desirable expenditure of public funds.

Third, I say right here and now that no Member of Congress who supports the present method of distributing these funds can fairly criticize the A. A. A. I have discussed this question of Government payments with many township, county, and State A. A. A. committeemen. They all have had constructive suggestions as to how to improve the A. A. A. The leadership and plans may or may not have been right when the A. A. A. was inaugurated, but that is no excuse for continuously following the methods of distribution that were then put into effect.

In other words, let us not blame the administration of the A. A. A. for something that is a provision of law that we each year sanction by legislation. The agency has had little criticism for not following the mandates of Congress, so I say frankly that Congress must accept the responsibility if it does not change the legislation.

The A. A. A. has gradually changed its program as much, no doubt, as was permissible under the provisions of the law.

With the foregoing statements I hereby include the table showing the 1942 payments of over $1,000 each by States. It is as follows:

Payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1942 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs—United States

State	Number of payees	Payments			
		Agricultural conservation program	Parity	Naval stores	Total
Alabama	138	$190,525.53		$57,201.07	$247,726.60
Arizona	390	883,947.59	$34,575.12		918,521.71
Arkansas	763	1,574,831.29	2,625.72		1,577,457.01
California	1,315	2,652,323.53	699,561.93		3,351,885.46
Colorado	418	523,019.36	212,505.10		735,524.46

Payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1942 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs—United States—Continued

State	Number of payees	Payments			
		Agricultural conservation program	Parity	Naval stores	Total
Connecticut	19	$46,054.87	$150,478.30		$196,533.17
Delaware	25	22,626.80	13,528.67		36,155.47
Florida	251	301,073.41		$259,060.83	560,134.24
Georgia	370	303,501.72	5,518.63	428,755.98	737,776.33
Idaho	656	624,996.42	567,661.74		1,192,658.16
Illinois	4,479	2,847,354.34	4,162,991.75		7,010,846.09
Indiana	1,040	705,122.22	971,091.78		1,676,214.00
Iowa	3,892	1,793,915.26	2,804,142.40		4,601,057.66
Kansas	3,225	2,942,989.49	2,436,484.78		5,379,474.27
Kentucky	95	109,188.78	52,243.49		161,432.27
Louisiana	207	412,700.52		2,703.68	415,404.20
Maine	141	82,071.00			82,071.00
Maryland	79	65,500.05	58,087.80		123,587.85
Massachusetts	8	17,543.05	84,859.68		102,402.73
Michigan	26	19,789.17	18,134.95		37,924.12
Minnesota	532	423,940.22	494,656.12		923,596.34
Mississippi	992	2,147,970.97		20,041.26	2,168,012.23
Missouri	894	839,370.29	716,896.35		1,556,266.64
Montana	1,579	1,505,686.55	1,029,186.63		2,534,873.18
Nebraska	1,552	1,211,134.94	1,361,629.23		2,572,764.17
Nevada	16	30,014.25	3,614.88		33,629.13
New Hampshire					
New Jersey	15	45,182.04	300,006.90		345,188.94
New Mexico	340	572,126.19	99,802.82		671,929.01
New York	18	37,961.74	265,472.95		303,434.69
North Carolina	79	154,454.66	4,508.02		158,962.68
North Dakota	1,121	977,907.28	768,475.55		1,746,382.83
Ohio	688	485,607.89	731,606.72		1,217,214.61
Oklahoma	485	405,378.25	297,490.21		702,868.46
Oregon	926	1,009,210.54	997,657.32		2,003,867.86
Pennsylvania	71	88,454.68	78,937.72		167,392.40
Rhode Island	1	1,074.13			1,074.13
South Carolina	249	387,603.53	6,606.57	12,510.68	403,720.78
South Dakota	658	654,343.66	341,947.50		996,291.16
Tennessee	64	122,385.36	3,975.66		126,361.02
Texas	3,302	4,941,299.45	1,336,846.16		6,278,145.61
Utah	132	148,894.44	96,118.59		245,013.03
Vermont	2	10,494.47	23,656.55		34,151.02
Virginia	21	39,720.41	3,328.37		43,048.78
Washington	1,768	1,570,470.74	1,919,967.36		3,490,438.10
West Virginia	4	4,306.00	366.86		4,672.98
Wisconsin	57	59,224.61	83,581.96		142,806.57
Wyoming	200	299,852.09	49,971.09		349,823.18
Alaska					
Hawaii	18	52,989.23			52,989.23
Puerto Rico	3	4,353.45	918.10		5,271.55
Total	33,324	34,358,986.58	23,291,717.03	780,273.50	58,430,977.11

You will note that one State—Texas—has 10 percent of these large payments and over 10 percent of the total funds. This same year—1942—the Texas cotton farmer on the black waxy land of that State received 19 cents per hour labor return and received 2 cents per hour as Government payment. In 1939, in Dr. Goodsell's study in the United States Department of Agriculture, we find the cotton farmer on this black land received 10 cents per hour labor return and 5 cents, or half of this hourly income, came to him in the form of Government payments. In 1942 there were 178,000 Texas farmers that received less than $20 per farm, or about three millions for soil conservation, while in 1942 there were 3,300 large operations in that State that received $4,941,000 or over $1,400 each for soil conservation alone.

The complete list of these large payments is on file in the office of the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable HAMPTON D. FULMER, chairman of the Agricultural Committee, and includes all payments above $1,000, filed according to law by the Secretary of Agriculture with the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. A partial list of the larger payments is as follows:

Alabama:
- E. D. Fennel, Leighton — $10,000
- Stallworth Pine Co., Stapleton — 6,496
- Leonard Premit, Leighton — 4,784

Arizona:
- Arizona Land Co., Waddell — $9,690
- Arizona Farm Products, Casa Grande — 6,381
- Bartlett, Heard Land & Cattle Co., 303 Phoenix Building, Phoenix — 5,830
- Allen Belluzzi, Avondale — 5,238
- V. D. Brown, Sanders — 4,727
- Casa Grande Valley, Casa Grande — 6,176
- Cataract Livestock Co., Flagstaff — 4,956
- Chandler Implement Co., Chandler — 5,227
- Chinle district, Chinle — 8,632
- Dougherty, M. J., 516 Heard Building, Phoenix — 6,204
- Fort Defiance district, Fort Defense — 9,165
- Peter Ethrington & Sons, Casa Grande — 9,531
- Green Gold Ranchos, Tucson — 9,130
- A. G. King, Buckeye — 8,247
- Klag-E-Toh District, Klagstoh — 9,190
- Leupp District, Leupp — 9,190
- Lukachukai District, Lukachukia — 8,919
- Maricopa Reservoir & Power Co., Phoenix — 9,690
- S. Carl Miller, Buckeye — 5,248
- T. G. Rhodes, Avondale — 7,165

Arkansas:
- Twist Leasing Cooperative Association, Twist — 8,415
- Wilson Lee Co., Wilson — 7,380
- Tillar Mercantile Co., Tiller — 9,760
- R. A. Pickens & Son Co., Pickens — 7,566
- Miller Lumber Co., Marianna — 9,742
- W. P. McGeorge, Pine Bluff — 7,538

Arkansas—Continued.
- Lowrance Bros., Driver — $9,810
- Lesser-Goldman Co., Walnut Ridge — 8,293
- Mary K. Kuhn, Marion — 11,717
- Howe Lumber Co., Wabash — 8,481
- Cromer Bros., Osceola — 7,599
- Chapman & Dewey Farms Co., Marked Tree — 8,253
- J. O. E. Buck, Jr., Hughes — 7,686

California:
- J. G. Boswell, Corcoran — 11,309
- J. G. Boswell Co., Corcoran — 11,970
- Capital Co., San Francisco — 11,320
- Frank C. Driver, Riverdale — 10,308
- Russell Giffin Co., Mendota — 11,409
- Ralph and Margaret Gilkey, Corcoran — 13,797
- A. W. Goodfellow, Fresno — 14,408
- Grayson-Owen Co., Oakland — 15,417
- J. W. Guiberson Co., Corcoran — 10,798
- Heck Bros., Stratford — 11,119
- Hotchkiss Estate Co., Firebaugh — 14,080
- C. E. Hanchin, Bakersfield — 12,200
- James Irvine, San Francisco — 12,788
- Kern County Land Co., Bakersfield — 11,666
- Natomas Co., Sacramento — 14,831
- J. E. O'Neill, Fresno — 11,009
- J. C. Phillips, Paso Robles — 11,319
- F. E. Redfern, Dos Palos — 10,950
- Forest Ripley, Corcoran — 11,639
- Sutter Basin Corporation, Ltd., Robbins — 15,960
- Elmer C. Von Glahn, Corcoran — 24,916

Colorado:
- Western Boca County Soil Erosion District, Springfield — 3,101
- C. E. Tupps, Watkins — 4,159
- Ira J. Taylor, Pasoli — 4,074
- Soil Erosion District, Walsh — 4,181
- Reicholt & Beal, Julesburg — 4,201
- R. R. Rutherford, Vilas — 6,911
- San Luis Valley Land & Cattle Co., Crestone — 7,200
- Carl Nielson, Ruggin — 5,094
- A. S. Miller, Watkins — 4,157
- T. P. Klausner, Roggen — 6,800
- Alvin Hobbs, Milliken — 5,060
- Hatchet Cattle Co., Pueblo — 9,178
- B. V. Hanna, Springfield — 5,712
- Frank L. Forristall, Hugo — 4,322
- James A. and Lyle Cocksey, Roggen — 4,477
- Arnold-Harriman Co., Inc., Fowler — 3,465
- Arkansas Valley Sugar Beet & Irrigated Land Co., Holly — 3,619
- American Crystal Sugar Co., Denver — 4,513

Connecticut:
- Aetna Life Insurance Co., Hartford — 52,092
- Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford — 25,046
- Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co., Hartford — 23,172
- Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford — 59,298
- Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co., Hartford — 6,888

Delaware:
- 25 payees—only one over $2,500.
- Lillian Price, Middletown — 2,506
- John S. Isaacs, Ellendale — 2,346
- Julius N. Kirk, Middletown — 2,083
- Townsends Inc., Millsboro — 1,909

Florida:
- American Sumatra Tobacco Corporation, Quincy — 6,814
- Avon Florida Citrus Corporation, Avon Park — 6,549
- Aycock-Lindsey Corporation, Shamrock — 9,400
- Dixie Cattlemen's Association, Okeechobee — 5,674
- Hugh Turpentine Co., Maxville — 5,451

Florida—Continued.	
Ideal Holding Co., Perrine	$4,277
A. B. & D. B. Kibler, Inc., Lakeland	8,376
Lykes Bros., Inc., Tampa	9,740
Mayo Rosin Co., Shamrock	7,296
Palm and Pine Land Co., New York, N. Y.	6,216
Seminole Cattle Co., Inc., Orlando	8,986
Southern Resin & Chemical Co., Mary	7,702
Swainsboro Rosin Corporation, Jacksonville	6,144
Welles' Fruit and Livestock Co., Arcadia	4,296
Georgia:	
Bateman Fruit Farm, Inc., Macon	7,052
Brunswick Peninsula Corporation, Brunswick	9,400
Butler Naval Stores, Inc., Butler	5,179
J. B. Davis & Co., Camilla	7,176
W. M. Jackson, Est., Donovan	6,980
Langdale & Bennett, Nashville	6,514
Meadows Turpentine Co., Vidalia	5,325
Mitchell Naval Stores, Homerville	6,008
The Newton Co., Cogdell	8,664
Onyx Turpentine Co., Cordele	6,554
Tarver Turpentine Co., Valdosta	9,400
Idaho:	
J. W. Harp, Idaho Falls	11,951
Kootenai Valley Farms, Inc., Bonners Ferry	11,241
D. H. Linderman, Tetonia	7,716
McIntosh & Grover, Lewiston	7,560
Joe Rosenkranz, Reubens	8,217
Wagner & Co., Clarkston, Wash.	6,197
W. T. Wagner, Clarkston, Wash.	6,556
Herndon & Harris, Lapwai	5,397
Leslie Herndon, Culesac	5,296
Joe Lux, Nez Perce	5,929
McDonald Bros., Fenn	4,467
F. S. Parkinson, Rexburg	5,456
Carl Rudeen, Pocatello	6,404
Thomas Bros., Downey	4,231
Turner Bros., partnership, Nez Perce	4,515
Illinois:	
Robert Allerton, Monticello	13,382
Babson Farms, Inc., DeKalb	12,813
Cook Valley Farms, Eldred	9,075
M. L. Evans, Sr., Emerson	12,988
First Trust Joint Stock Land Bank of Chicago, Chicago	54,781
Franklin Life Insurance Co., Springfield	14,588
Illinois Bankers Life Assurance Co., Monmouth	10,509
Rebecca Lowrie, Galesburg	13,801
Mutual Trust Life Insurance Co., Chicago	11,439
John C. Proctor, endowment, Peoria	11,354
Valley Farms Co., Carrollton	11,321
Indiana:	
Robert Graham, Washington	11,655
Mitchell Partnership, Windfall	8,071
New Harmony Realty Corporation, New Harmony	8,685
Princeton Farms, Princeton	10,273
L. A. Waugh, Brookston	8,850
John Brevoort, Vincennes	7,130
Deshes Farms, Inc., Vincennes	6,127
Fair Oaks Farms, Inc., Chicago	9,130
Earl Goodwine, West Lebanon	7,423
Frances M. Hanson, Connersville	6,879
Iowa:	
Adams Bros. & Co., Odebolt	18,758
Amana Society, Amana	23,716
American Mutual Life Insurance Co., Des Moines	10,753
Bankers Life Co., Des Moines	24,954
Iowa—Continued.	
Brenton Bros., Inc., Dallas Center	$14,002
Central Life Assurance Society (mutual), Des Moines	12,047
The Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa, Des Moines	55,269
Litchfield Realty Co., Des Moines	11,151
W. G. Lodwick, Sedan	10,301
Martha P. Cresap, Hamburg	9,983
Iowa State College, Ames	5,672
George Kellogg, Missouri Valley	8,786
G. H. Moorhead, Moorhead	5,965
National Life Co. (Home Office), Des Moines	6,638
Henry K. and Raymond G. Peterson, Council Bluffs	8,702
Kansas:	
Herbert J. Barr, Leoti	9,920
J. W. Baughman, Liberal	13,321
R. B. Christy, Scott City	12,845
Collingwood Grain and Land Co., Johnson	19,957
G. K. Kriss and John Farms, Colby	13,225
George E. Gano, Hutchinson	12,638
Federal Land Bank, Wichita	31,558
Prudential Investment Co., Topeka	10,344
Ed. Richardson, Plains	10,871
Sledd Farm Corporation, Lyons	11,267
Victory Life Insurance Co., Topeka	17,362
Kentucky:	
Beaumont Farm, Lexington	2,486
Bower Bros., a partnership, Evansville, Ind	4,950
Henry P. Barrett, Henderson	5,075
James C. Ellis, Owensboro	3,789
S. R. Ewing Est., Owensboro	2,777
A. G. & S. B. Pritchett, a partnership, Corydon	2,493
Charles B. Smith, Reed	3,667
Helen Tyler, Hickman	3,472
Brent and Co., Inc., Paris	2,793
Clarence LeBus and Co., Lexington	4,668
Weil Land and Livestock Co., Lexington	2,880
Louisiana:	
John H. Baker, Delhi	7,850
Beene Planting Corporation, Bossier	5,890
Burnside and McDonald, Newellton	6,688
Canal Bank and Trust Co., New Orleans	4,207
T. B. Gilbert and Co., Inc., Wisner	5,743
J. W. Lyon, Gilliam	5,640
W. H. North, Dixie	6,320
W. H. Robinson, Shreveport	5,859
A. B. Learned, Natchez, Miss.	4,067
A. F. McDade, Sr., McDade	4,524
R. R. Rhymes, Rayville	4,978
Maine:	
W. R. Christie, Presque Isle	4,196
Kroemer Farm, Inc., Lagrange	3,969
Ben Marks Co., Inc., Presque Isle	3,991
Reed Bros., Fort Fairfield	5,157
Woodman Potato Co., Presque Isle	6,930
Maryland:	
J. H. and W. G. Baker, partnership, Buckeystown	5,096
Frank S. Dudley, Baltimore	4,221
Thomas W. Eliason, Chestertown	2,448
Edison Groh, Lime Kiln	2,337
Charles Jarrell, estate, Hillsboro	3,733
John McKinney, Millington	2,259
Oldfields Farm, Galena	2,182
Harry H. Rieck, Preston	2,642
B. F. Shriver Co., Westminster	3,902
A. Lee Towson, Jr., Chestertown	3,346
Nathaniel J. Williams, Middletown	2,513
Massachusetts:	
Columbian National Life Insurance Co., Boston	4,143
Massachusetts—Continued.	
John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston	$90,031
Michigan:	
G. Elwood Bonine, Vandalia	2,589
L. E. Casey and Edward Brooks, Marshall	2,697
A. B. Chapman & Sons, South Rockwood	2,238
William H. Mathews, Niles	2,731
Upjohn, W. E. U. T. C., Richland	2,464
Minnesota:	
Agricultural Credit Corporation, Minneapolis	4,297
Ruth T. Cathcart, Windom	5,221
Concordia College Corporation	3,609
Farmers & Merchants Savings Bank, Minneapolis	5,931
Federal Land Bank, St. Paul	55,882
First Minneapolis Co., Minneapolis	4,559
N. J. Florence, Hallock	7,409
A. J. Kaufman, Appleton	6,524
Frank Kiene, Kennedy	9,791
Maple Island Farms Co. Hollandale	6,790
E. G. Melo, Stephen	5,973
Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul	5,544
Northwestern Improvement Co., St. Paul	4,031
Northwestern National Life Insurance Co., Minneapolis	9,022
The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, Minneapolis	9,409
St. Olaf College, Northfield	4,392
Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank, Minneapolis	23,239
James S. Thompson, Windom	7,976
Tilney Farm Co., St. James	6,828
A. R. Voss, St. James	5,006
Winona National & Savings Bank, Winona	5,110
Mississippi:	
Abbay & Leatherman, Robinsonville	7,266
C. B. Box Estate, Midnight	9,184
W. P. Brown, Drew	8,610
J. P. Cole, Highlandale	7,331
Dixie Farms, Vance	9,069
J. R. Dockery, Cleveland	9,249
J. T. Fargason & Son, Lyon	8,808
J. L. Gaddis, Bolton	8,113
B. F. Harbert & Co., Robinsonville	7,006
Hopson Planting Co., Clarksdale	8,069
King & Anderson, Clarksdale	9,910
McKee Bros., Friars Point	9,910
Mississippi State Penitentiary, Parchman	9,950
Newton Naval Stores, Inc., Wiggins	9,400
R. W. Owen & Son, Evansville	9,212
Panther Burn Co., Leland	7,549
Robertshaw Co., Heathman	7,981
Lamont Rowlands, Picayune	10,000
Missouri:	
Acom, O. H.; Smith, Emerson; Peterson, Glenn, Wardell	11,729
American Union Life Insurance Co., St. Joseph	7,062
E. P. Coleman, Jr., Sikeston	12,170
Columbia Hog & Cattle Powder Co., Kansas City	6,417
Federal Land Bank of St. Louis, St. Louis	6,598
General American Life Insurance Co., St. Louis	11,556
Kansas City Life Insurance Co., Kansas City	16,759
Gabe Rendleman, Mesler	7,502
W. T. Riley, New Madrid	7,190
Montana:	
Antler Livestock Co., Wyola	7,922
Campbell Farming Corporation, Hardin	12,174
Cort Livestock Co., Big Timber	6,757

Montana—Continued.
- R. E. Davis, Willow Creek $7,012
- Ed. Kopac, Hardin 7,515
- A. J. Rasmussen, Harlem 8,009
- Scheffels Bros., Great Falls 12,836
- Schmityler Corporation, Froid 10,941
- Wismeyer & Shawhan, Billings 6,653

Nebraska:
- Bankers Life Insurance Co. of Nebraska, Omaha 40,912
- Brown Land Co., Omaha 18,101
- Conservative Savings & Loan Association, Omaha 4,926
- D. W. Evans, Watson 9,702
- Federal Land Bank of Omaha, Omaha 62,483
- Fremont Joint-Stock Land Bank, Lincoln 11,528
- Grinnell College, Omaha 5,901
- Hamilton County Farms Co., Aurora 4,626
- Kilpatrick Bros. Co, Beatrice 11,441
- Lincoln Joint-Stock Land Bank of Lincoln, Nebr., Lincoln 24,471

Nevada:
- Lester C. Munk, Lovelock 3,153
- C. A. Sewell, Elko 3,317
- Utah Construction Co., Montello 4,448

New Hampshire: None over $1,000.

New Jersey:
- The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., Newark 185,869
- The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark 132,248
- Seabrook and Baitinger, Bridgeton 8,245

New Mexico:
- Hal Bogle, Dexter 6,597
- Del Cerro Co-op Association, Las Cruces 8,370
- The Diamond A Cattle Co., Roswell 6,059
- John Garrett, Jr., Clovis 9,141
- Bun Lewis, Grady 6,658
- Cecil Porter, Clovis 6,730
- H. F. Prewitt, Coolidge 9,000
- D. F. and Joyce H. Stahmann, Las Cruces 8,370
- J. P. White Co., Roswell 9,078

New York:
- Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York City 115,031
- Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York City 148,691
- New York Life Insurance Co., New York City 14,392
- Security Mutual Life Insurance Co., Binghamton 2,810

North Carolina:
- M. C. Braswell Farms, Battleboro 4,977
- Caledonia State Prison Farm, Halifax 6,223
- Duke Power Co., Charlotte 7,213
- McNair Investment Co., Laurinburg 6,178
- John F. McNair, Inc., Laurinburg 4,335
- Z. V. Pate, Inc., Laurinburg 7,446

North Dakota:
- John J. Deschenes and Henry M. Baldwin, Cando 9,886
- Equitable Reserve Association, Neenah 5,424
- E. J. Lander Co., Grand Forks 4,316
- McCanna Farming Co., McCanna 5,620
- McKensie County, Watford City 4,197
- Murphy & Murray, Grand Forks 4,661
- State of North Dakota, Bismarck 49,682
- Olaf Pierson, York 8,531
- J. Scott, Gilby 6,299

Ohio:
- Agricultural Lands, Inc., London 12,611
- Brady Bros., Payne 22,155
- Ohio National Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati 10,076
- Orleton Farms, London 14,137

Ohio—Continued.
- Union Central Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati $73,432

Oklahoma:
- Jacob Q. Bacon, Elkhart 4,356
- Big V Ranch, Ponca City 6,288
- O. J. Gales, Tonkawa 3,101
- R. C. Drummond, Hominy 3,757
- G. E. Irvin, Gage 3,384
- Sid Jones, Duncan 3,457
- Rolla Lathrop, Keyes 3,014
- Emery L. Metcalf, Helena 3,924
- E. C. Mullendore, Hulah 9,640
- Protho Perkins Co., Wichita Falls, Tex 3,545
- Owen W. and W. H. Temple, Buffalo 3,863

(All others under $3,000.)

Oregon:
- F. H. Banfield, Portland 8,134
- Cunningham Sheep Co., Pendleton 12,107
- Dixon & McQuiston, Klamath 9,103
- Eastern Oregon Land Co., Ontario 10,023
- John H. Hales, Adams 12,910
- James K. Hill, Pendleton 9,660
- H. A. Miller, Bond 9,066
- Pendleton Ranches, Inc., Pendleton 14,640
- M. E. Weatherford, Arlington 8,767

Pennsylvania:
- Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia 6,478
- Penn. Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia 18,208
- Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia 30,750
- Trexler Farms, Allentown 6,550
- Lauxmont Farms, Wrightsville 4,534

(All others under $4,000)

Rhode Island (only one): Harold B. Tarbox, Slocum 1,074

South Carolina:
- Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville 6,563
- J. A. Fletcher, McColl 4,020
- R. J. Moyes, Jr., Mayesville 5,292
- D. K. McColl, Bennettsville 6,729
- Jerry Richardson, Barnwell 4,223
- C. W. Stone, Clinton 4,516
- P. A. Wallace, Bennettsville 5,044

(All others under $4,000.)

South Dakota:
- Wm. J. Asmussen, Agar 4,620
- R. P. England, Stamford 4,872
- The Grand Lodge of the Ancient Order of United Workmen of North Dakota, Aberdeen, S. Dak 4,734
- H. F. Hansmeier, Bristol 4,503
- Rural Credit Board of South Dakota, Pierre 6,283
- T. R. Walker Estate, Vermillion 5,549

(All others under $4,500.)

Tennessee:
- Dillard & Coffin Co., Memphis 5,302
- John C. Jackson, Jr., Tiptonville 5,463
- G. F. Parker, Tiptonville 4,014
- Tennessee Farm Corporation, Clarksville 5,302
- J. E. Vaughn, Tiptonville 4,107

(Balance under $4,000.)

Texas:
- Mrs. C. Adair Estate, Floyd Bennett Field, Long Island, N. Y. 9,948
- Ollie P. Anderson, Pecos 9,900
- O. V. Beck, Amarillo 9,405
- Grover C. Brillhart, Spearman 11,687
- Richard C. Buckles, Stratford 11,938
- S. B. Burnett Estate, Fort Worth 9,684
- Geo. F. Buzzard, Spearman 9,454
- Callaghan Land & Pastoral Co., Encinal 9,900
- Capitol Freehold Land & Trust, Farwell 17,582
- J. R. Durrett, Amarillo 11,074
- Fred S. Fegel, Amarillo 10,273

Texas—Continued.
- A. S. Gage Ranches, Marathon 9,800
- Haden B. Hart, Gruver 10,311
- Hueco Cattle Co., El Paso 9,900
- Chas. L. Killgore, Amarillo 16,194
- H. L. Kokernot & Son, Alpine 9,800
- Martin & Zimmerman, Floydada 10,359
- Matador Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., Denver, Colo 9,863
- Clyde Merryman, Plainview 10,541
- L. M. Price Co., Stratford 9,455
- Malcolm J. Shelton, Amarillo 9,340
- Malcolm Stewart, Dalhart 9,967
- The Sugarland Industries, Sugarland 9,800
- Texas Land & Development Co., Plainview 12,011
- W. T. Waggoner Estate, Vernon 10,160
- Asa Willis, Hatley 10,104

(Too many to enumerate.)

Utah:
- John Adams, Brigham City 4,864
- Perry Land & Livestock Co., Salt Lake City 4,200

(Balance under $4,000.)

Vermont (only 2):
- Burlington Savings Bank, Burlington 1,677
- National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier 32,473

Virginia:
- Eastern Shore Canning Co., Machipongo 8,625
- Stuart Land and Cattle Co., Cedar Bluff 3,965
- G. L. Webster Co., Inc., Cheriton 9,510

(Balance under $3,000.)

Washington:
- C. J. Broughton, Dayton 20,170
- Don Damon, Cunningham 10,788
- Win C. Estes, Prescott 11,221
- Fred W. Hair, Prescott 10,549
- Hugh Huntley, Colfax 7,262
- Fred Lasater, Prescott 8,227
- W. A. Longmeier, Lind 9,022
- McGregor Land & Livestock Co., Hooper 16,071
- Sheffels Bros., Govan 9,299
- Ed Tucker, Walla Walla 10,409
- Nettie E. Woodward, Walla Walla 10,866

West Virginia: (Only 4 loans, all under $2,000.)

Wisconsin:
- Better Farms, Inc., Fond du Lac 6,197
- George W. Borg, Delavan 3,365
- H. W. Burmeister, Gratiot 2,046
- Larsen Canning Co., Green Bay 1,227
- Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee 51,651
- Old Line Life Insurance Co. of America, Milwaukee 9,538

Wyoming:
- Cow Creek Sheep and Pioneer Sheep Co., Rawlins 4,330
- Lee Sheep Co., Rawlins 4,034
- Miller Land & Livestock Co., Parkman 12,025
- Leroy Moore, Ross 4,019
- Mortons, Inc., Douglas 6,071

(Balance under $4,000.)

Alaska: None.

Hawaii:
- Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd., Honolulu 10,000
- Hutchinson Sugar Plantation Co., Naalehu Kau 2,956
- Annie T. K. Parker (trust), Honolulu 4,057
- Ulupalakua Ranch, Ltd., Waiakoa, Maui 6,360

Puerto Rico (only 3):
- Luis Rivera, Comerio 2,284
- Adolfo San Feliz, Comerio 1,772
- Rafael Aponte Sanchez, San Lorenzo 1,214

LAW LIBRARY

Mr. Chairman, now let us review some of these payments. Let us review them in the light of the fact that we are now engaged in a world-wide war; in the light of the fact of a national debt of $300,000,000,000; in the light of the fact that we have a tax bill that reaches down to the low-income brackets; in the light of legislation for the few at the expense of the many; in the light of the fact that in past years some Members have justified these large subsidies to insurance companies and large operators on the basis that it was necessary to have the large operators cooperate in order to control and reduce food and fiber production; in the light of the fact that this argument is worthless now as no one would contend, you need to make these enormous payments for reducing production at this time; in the light of the fact that no appropriation whatever has been included in the agricultural bill for the use of the farmers in the low-income brackets that are serviced by the Farm Security Administration; and lastly in the light of the fact that most of us have assured our constituents that we would oppose all nonwar expenditures.

Who can say that the reduction of these payments to $200 would decrease food production?

Let us ask ourselves a few questions.

First. The school-lunch program was defeated on the grounds of the purchasing power of the people and on the grounds of economy. Do you feel that if this abolition of school lunches which was to cost $50,000,000 was advisable, that we should provide 33,000 large land owners—whether insurance companies or individuals—a gratuity of $58,000,000 for doing something they should be doing anyway for their own welfare?

Second. Take a look at the Arizona list of checks for from $5,000 to $9,000 to big cattle ranches.

Third. Look at the California list receiving $10,000 to $24,000. Do you suppose they are subsidizing labor from other countries for these same big operators?

Fourth. In Colorado they send one sugar company $3,600 and another $4,500.

Fifth. You will note that $166,000 of the $196,000 that went in large checks to Connecticut went to five life-insurance companies. Do you really believe that the $166,000 is needed to make their policies good?

Sixth. Florida is interesting. One sumatra tobacco company received over $6,000. Some types of tobacco are 200 to 300 percent of parity. Does this make sense?

Seventh. Do you realize that according to Dr. Goodsell's studies the two-mule Georgia cotton farmers received in 1942 but 22 cents labor income per hour, and that of this 22 cents per hour labor income only 2 cents per hour was from Government payment. However, in Georgia in 1942, 370 large operators received on the average over $2,000 each. This subsidy would be a down payment on quite a farm in that State. If all the farmers in the United States had the same subsidy 370 large operators received, it would take an appropriation of $1,200,000,000. This indicates how futile this approach is in solving the farm soil or price problem.

Eighth. To look at the Illinois list one would never realize the great areas of rich produce fertile land within the confines of that State, would one? The first trust joint stock land banks of Chicago receive a $54,000 subsidy.

Ninth. Kansas has had recipients receiving subsidies of from $10,000 to $31,000.

Tenth. In the Kentucky blue-grass area only one received a $5,000 subsidy.

Eleventh. In Maine one potato company, the Woodman Co., received $6,900. Floor or support prices are supplemented with a large additional subsidy.

Twelfth. Maryland—close to the best markets in America—had several subsidies but mostly under $5,000. Do you suppose the same ones get the $14-per-ton hay subsidy, too?

Thirteenth. Massachusetts has one life-insurance company that received $90,000 out of the total of $102,000 that went for the large checks in that State.

Fourteenth. Fifty-five thousand dollars was paid to the Federal land bank in Minnesota.

Fifteenth. Big operations in Mississippi did pretty well. The State penitentiary is much below former years and before the $10,000 State limit was put into effect.

Sixteenth. Montana. The Campbell Farming Corporation is down to $12,000. This is much reduced.

Seventeenth. New Jersey is worth the time to examine. Two insurance companies received $318,000 of our grandchildren's money.

Eighteenth. New Mexico can surely obtain many large subsidies for the amount of the Nation's food it produces.

Nineteenth. Two insurance companies in New York received $263,000. Does this make sense to you? According to Dr. Goodsell's studies the dairymen in central New York received less than 1 cent per hour as Government payments in 1942.

Twentieth. Three thousand three hundred big operators in Texas receive over $6,000,000. In Dr. Goodsell's official report farmers on family sized selected farms on the black waxy land in Texas the same year received 19 cents per hour. Three cents per hour was in Government payments. Is it any wonder that Texas has exhibited the attitude it has?

Our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EDWARD REES of Kansas, assisted by the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN of Minnesota, have led the fight to reduce these payments to $1,000 and also to $500. Last year the House fixed the maximum payment at $500, but it was removed in the other body.

In the letter of transmittal which is furnished according to law by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Speaker of the House, there is one paragraph that should be of interest to every Member of the House.

The letter of transmittal is from Mr. Grover Hill. This paragraph is:

> The great majority of farmers participating in the 1942 program earned payments of less than $200. Approximately 95 percent were in this classification.

If 95 percent of the farmers participating in the program received less than $200 each, do you not agree that a $200 maximum would be fair for all the participants?

Congress, and every Member of both bodies must answer for taxation or the method of taking money from the people for public needs. Is not here an opportunity to more fairly distribute public funds, and would not a wider distribution be used for an increased food supply? I feel that if the Members would obtain the long list of farmers that receive a $20 check, they would not hesitate to put a $200 ceiling on these subsidy payments. This should be ample for any family sized farm and why subsidize more generously the above family sized farms?

The importance of this rural financing is and should most assuredly be of interest to every Member since Dr. A. G. Black, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration writes me on March 11, 1944, as follows:

> We believe that 4 percent per annum is a fair and reasonable rate on long-term mortgage loans of the type made by the Federal land banks through national farm loan associations and with their endorsement. Similarly we believe that a 5-percent interest rate is reasonable for the type of first- and second-mortgage loan made by the Land Bank Commissioner, which carries no endorsement liability, and which, in general, is a more hazardous credit risk than the land-bank loan.

Our Government would receive—3½ to 4 percent—½ percent more interest on Federal land bank and—3½ to 5 percent—1½ percent more interest on the Land Bank Commissioner loans. On January 1, 1944, there were 482,779 Federal land-bank loans with a total of $1,357,937,417. An increase in interest rate would provide $6,789,687 in additional revenue.

On January 1, 1944, there were 318,282 Land Bank Commissioner loans with a total indebtedness of $406,190,206. The increased interest rate from 3½ to 5 percent would provide $6,092,853 in additional revenue.

In the United States this would extract $12,882,540 in additional interest directly from the rural people of America. This increase in interest will be reflected in higher interest rates by private loaning agencies that make farm loans.

In Wisconsin alone this increase in interest rate will amount to $274,436 from Federal land-bank loans, and $367,702 from Land Bank Commissioner loans, or a total of $642,138 for the State. There were 18,723 Federal land-bank loans, and 15,312 Commissioner loans in Wisconsin on January 1, 1944.

If we are forced to accept Dr. Black's position and increase the interest rate to obtain $12,000,000, and take it from the producers that owe money, do you

feel we are justified at this time in doling out $58,000,000 to 3,300 big land owners and insurance companies? You and I have the responsibility of making this decision. I have made mine as a result of careful study. Are you ready to make yours? This might be an appropriate time to have one of those "stand up and be counted" procedures we have been hearing about.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the more I see of the illogical, indefensible waste of public funds the more I feel like paraphrasing Scott and saying: "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said "This is the bunk.'"

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman that we should not criticize the A. A. A. for something and then by appropriation or otherwise insist on them doing certain things. So far as the gentleman knows, is there anything in the A. A. A. program, or that we gave to the A. A. A., to set itself up as a board to determine who is entitled to deferment by reason of being an essential agriculturist, or has the Congress ever authorized the A. A. A. to act as a board or an agency to determine who is entitled to farm machinery, or has the Congress ever authorized the A. A. A. to determine under the A. A. A. program which farmers are entitled to gasoline to be used not in their tractors but on the highways? If the gentleman can answer those questions and say that those of us who have criticized the A. A. A. for sending out information to farmers now that these things I have just mentioned will be used in considering whether they are going to permit a farmer to have machinery or whether they are going to permit him to be deferred, that is another thing entirely. I have criticized the A. A. A. for that and I still criticize it. I do not know where the Congress has ever authorized them to do anything of that kind.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he has not asked one question, but several questions. If I were to answer the questions from the knowledge I have at this moment, I would say: I presume what the gentleman refers to are the activities of the War Food Administration which do not necessarily come under the A. A. A. In most, if not all the States, the Chairman of the A. A. A. happens to be the head of the War Food Board. I presume that those things that the gentleman complains of are done under the War Food Boards rather than by the A. A. A. set-up. That would be my understanding of the organization at the present time. In most cases they are the same individuals. If there is any law it comes under the powers that have been delegated to the War Food Administrator by Executive order and is not part of any law passed by the Congress.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman say that by Executive order the War Food Administration has now been given authority to determine who is entitled to a draft deferment as an essential farmer?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would say it may have been so construed. There is a rather broader interpretating of many laws and orders.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman say further that the War Food Administration, by Executive decree, has been authorized to determine who shall be entitled to a quota of farm machinery?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will look up the law under which this power has been delegated, I am sure he will find it is quite broad, and he will find that the interpretation of it is very, very broad. It will include most anything, as I found out last summer when a certain employee of the War Meat Board was telling all the farmer butchers in my particular district that, if they did not have a new slaughterhouse within 10 days, he would cancel their permit to slaughter. That is what I ran into last summer. I later found the writer of the letter did not have permission to write the letter from any superior officeholder. I did find out that he must have been a political appointee, as his service record showed no experience whatsoever in regard to meats, or much of anything else. I did, however, find that I could not get the War Food Administrator, my friend, Mr. Marvin Jones, to write me that the employee had exceeded his legal authority. One of Mr. Jones' underemployees wrote me quoting the provisions of the Executive order, where this authority was supposed to come from. This is where these small people in big places can harm any program. They should be replaced by people who have the right attitude in regard to the public. I imagine that is part of the directive under which these other things you complain about operate, though I do not want to be too sure on that point.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What will the situation be in 1944 in regard to the farmers being able to get more machinery?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is going to be the same problem as to whether the farmer will get more overalls or not. There is plenty of steel for farm machinery. It is simply a matter of manpower. As far as the overalls are concerned, there is plenty of cotton, because we are pretty nearly giving it away to make insulating material. It is a matter of manpower and getting it into the cheaper garments. Those are problems we have to meet.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4443, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1945, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the conclusion of the debate on the rivers and harbors bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include therein a letter from Mr. Leo Crowley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE KEYNES-MORGENTHAU SCHEME

A FURTHER STUDY OF THE BRITISH SCHEME TO SECURE CONTROL OF UNITED STATES GOLD, COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS THE KEYNES-MORGENTHAU PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the present study should be considered in connection with a paper I presented on this subject to the House November 1, 1943. In that paper I established what I believe to be conclusive proof that there are not two plans, a British plan for an international clearing union and an American plan for a united and associated nations stabilization fund, but that there is in reality only one plan; namely the British plan. Benjamin M. Anderson has asserted as much.

[Anderson, Benjamin M., Post-War Stabilization of Foreign Exchange; the Keynes-Morgenthau Plan Condemned; Outline of a Fundamental Solution, in the Economic Bulletin, Capital Research Co., Los Angeles, Calif., May 11, 1943. For many years economic adviser to the Chase National Bank in New York, Dr. Anderson is now professor of economics, University of California at Los Angeles.]

Dr. Melchior Palyi states that the two plans "deal practically only with the problem of Great Britain."

[Palyi, Dr. Melchior, Some Implications of the Keynes-Morgenthau International Clearing Pool, an address delivered at Union League Club, Chicago, April 28, 1943, and reprinted from the Great Lakes Banker, July 1943.]

Indeed, I think the proof is clear in that paper that the officials of the administration who are responsible for having drawn up the draft for a "United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund" did practically nothing but copy from and reword and rephrase the text of the British proposal for an international clearing union as outlined in the British white paper.

Several other points contained in the November 1 paper should be kept in mind in considering the present study. The scheme would involve the complete abandonment of the international gold standard as this term has been used and understood since gold has been used in international trade and commerce down to the present time—all protests by the promoters of the scheme to the contrary notwithstanding. It would substitute for the gold standard a fictitious international monetary unit called "unitas" which would not be gold but whose value would be fixed by politicians in terms of gold, but not unalterably. The currency of each country belonging to the scheme would in turn be arbitrarily fixed by politicians in terms of unitas, but also not unalterably. The main characteristic of this device would be its high degree of political variability which would give it the desired political manipulability aimed at by Lord Keynes and his coworkers. Along with the destruction of the international gold standard, this artifice would, of course, also destroy the supremacy which the United States dollar now holds in international trade, which is no doubt one of the objectives of the scheme.

The scheme would also involve the assumption by the United States of perhaps $5,000,000,000 or more of British debts which Britain owes South American countries, Belgium, Scandinavian countries, and her colonies and dominions. This would be accomplished substantially with United States gold. Although the United States would furnish the vast bulk of the capital in the form of gold, yet our country would be hopelessly in the minority in respect to control. The present study will show this picture to be even more unfavorable to the United States than was shown in my previous paper.

The control of our money, which is vested in Congress by the Constitution, would be given over to an international monetary authority which would also have far-reaching and dictatorial powers over our domestic economy. Great Britain would be the dominating power in the scheme.

The computations in the November 1 paper relating to contributions were based on a total capitalization of $5,000,000,000. Since then, as stated in a letter to me by the Treasury, the administration has changed this figure to $8,000,000,000. Accordingly the computations will in the present study be based on the latter figure.

It will be noted in referring to column 2 in the table which is to follow that the aggregate of contributions listed does not come to $8,000,000,000 but only $6,560,000,000. The aggregate of the contributions of the countries not shown on the table would apparently not be sufficient to make up this difference. However, Treasury officials inform me that the percentage figures given me for computing contributions are tentative and subject to change. Further, that "before computing individual quotas there shall be reserved an amount equal to 10 percent of aggregate quotas to be used as a special allotment for equitable adjustment of quotas," as provided in II–4 of the administration's revised draft. The irreconcilability of these figures would seem to be of no particular importance to the results of this study.

In my November 1 paper I raised the question of the availability of free or unpledged gold in the countries that would belong to the scheme for their allegedly assigned contributions to the fund. By free or unpledged gold is meant gold in excess of that pledged as cover for demand liabilities. The primary purpose of the present study is to show which countries have and which countries do not have free gold to meet their proposed gold quotas.

The accompanying table (see p. 1669) shows the pertinent data relating to this problem for 31 of the 43 so-called United and Associated Nations which we are told would become members of the scheme.

Data relating to the amount of circulating notes and "other demand liabilities" and gold holdings were furnished me by the Federal Reserve. Data relating to contributions to the scheme were furnished me by the Treasury.

Four sources showing the legal requirements for gold reserves against demand liabilities have been made available to me, namely, the Federal Reserve Bulletin for July 1936; Treasury data for about 13 Latin-American countries; the Law Library of the Library of Congress; and Moody's Manual of Investments for 1943.

A footnote will be appended to the name of each country on the table showing the legal reserve requirements as furnished me by one or more of the above-mentioned sources. As will be noted the data for some countries are incomplete, uncertain, and apparently conflicting. Where doubt or uncertainty exists I have sought to use the data which provide the least amount of reserves and to apply the statute of the most recent date.

I have quoted the several sources showing legal reserve requirements for the purpose of presenting the apparent uncertainties, lack of uniformity and generally unsatisfactory conditions in this part of the monetary field. However, I have done this more expressly to indicate something of the progressive deterioration of the standard unit of value and the gravity of the monetary pathology that now afflicts nearly if not all of the countries we are to believe would become participants in the scheme.

The 31 countries represented on the table are divided into 3 categories, namely, (a) those countries having no free gold, which number 14; (b) those countries having free gold, which number 16; (c) the United States.

With respect to the remaining countries that would become members of the scheme, I have been unable to obtain any data that are of value to this study. Those countries are Iceland, the Philippines, Panama, Luxemburg, Iraq, Honduras, Haiti, Ethiopia, Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Iran. According to Federal Reserve and Treasury data, though sometimes conflicting with each other, Panama, Iraq, Ethiopia, and Dominican Republic make no reports of their gold holdings, while in the case of some of the others no figures respecting gold holdings are at present available. Paraguay and Nicaragua require no gold reserves against their demand liabilities. From such data as are "available" to me it would appear that all of these countries together must possess such a very small amount of gold that leaving them out of consideration could not possibly make any material difference in the results of this study.

In further explanation of the figure (2) which precedes the percentage figures in column 2, it should be stated that gold exchange, as defined on page 541 in the July 1936 Federal Reserve Bulletin, means exchange convertible into gold.

The percentage figure shown in column 2 does not always correspond with the figure actually used in computing reserve requirements because of certain qualifying factors. This apparent discrepancy is clarified in the footnote relating to the country concerned.

Observe that although both the circulating notes and other demand liabilities are shown for each country in columns 4 and 5 that the percentage figure in column 2 has not always been applied to both of the above two figures. Some countries require gold reserves against circulating notes only and others against both circulating notes and other demand liabilities. Furthermore, the requirement for notes may be different than the one for other demand liabilities. The footnote for each country will clarify these points.

It should be understood that the computations showing the amount of gold reserve requirements against demand liabilities as well as the amount of free or unpledged gold or lack of same are of necessity quite inexact. This is true because in most cases up-to-date data and in many complete figures are unavailable. Figures showing gold holdings and circulating notes and other demand liabilities are frequently of different dates. Numerous other qualifying factors are involved. In several cases I could not be certain as to the correct percentage figure to be applied for computing the amount of required gold reserves and accordingly some errors are likely to be

found in those computations. The best I have been able to do with the material at hand is to give a rough approximation of the true picture. But whatever inexactness and error may be involved in the figures which would show conditions to be worse than they really are, this would be more than offset by the fact that they are now much worse than the table shows and are continually growing worse at an accelerated rate of speed.

Neither in this nor my paper of last November has the administration's formula for determining gold quotas for member countries been strictly adhered to. Section II–3 of the administration's revised draft of the Keynes scheme provides in most cases that the amount of free foreign exchange held by a country is to be given a certain amount of weight in determining the gold quotas. Both the Treasury and Federal Reserve informed me that they had no data relating to this item. This, however, could not materially affect the results of the study.

With respect to several countries, because of incomplete and unsatisfactory data, principally in Latin America, no attempt has been made to compute the amount of required gold reserves.

By referring to columns 4 and 5 on the table it will be seen that the grand total of circulating notes and other demand liabilities of the 13 non-free gold holding countries [China not included] is $28,000,000,000. By referring to column 6 it will be noted that the amount of gold reserves required against their total demand liabilities [omitting gold reserves required by United Kingdom] would be $7,300,000,000. By now referring to column 8 it will be seen that the total amount of gold holdings of those 13 non-free gold holding countries is only $3,800,000,000. Thus it will be seen that those 13 non-free gold holding countries have a shortage of $3,500,000,000 for meeting their statutory reserve requirements.

Looking now at column 13 we see that the total amount of gold contributions of the 13 non-free gold holding countries would come to roundly $894,000,000. Since, however, those countries are deficient in gold to the amount of $3,500,000,000 for their demand liability coverage as shown in column 9 [taking into consideration that no figure for China is possible for this column] those countries would, of course, have no available gold for international use in the form of such contributions.

Let us now look at column 14 and compare the amount of gold the United States would be called on to contribute with that which the other 30 non-free and free gold holding countries combined would have available to meet their gold quotas, leaving out of consideration for the moment the paper portion of the contributions that would be made by the United States as well as that of all the other countries.

The United States would contribute in gold $1,172,000,000. The 30 other countries would have available for international use only approximately $420,000,000 in gold to meet their quotas. On this basis the United States would contribute 73-plus percent of the gold capital of the scheme while all the other countries combined would contribute only 26-plus percent. Yet the United States would be given a voting strength of only 20 percent while the other countries would have 80 percent! But this by no means shows the picture to be as bad as it really it.

In my paper of last November, before I had completed the present study, I stated:

> The gold liability of the United States would be nearly four times that of the whole British Empire, yet the United States would have only 20 percent of the votes while the Empire would have 19 percent.

I now find the United States would be in a much more unfavorable position than was indicated at that time. The Union of South Africa is the only component of the entire British Empire which possesses any free gold. She is given a gold quota of $72,000,000. The gold quota of the United States would be $1,172,000,000. Thus it is seen that, on the basis of available free gold the United States would contribute more than 16 times as much gold as the entire British Empire, yet the United States would be given only approximately the same percentage of basic votes as the Empire, 20 and 19 percent, respectively!

Since United States paper dollars from an international standpoint are convertible into gold on demand, the United States would actually contribute in gold $2,344,000,000. Her total gold liability would be the same as her total contribution. The non-free gold holding countries, numbering 14, would have no gold liability whatever. We stated the total gold that would be available for contributions by the 16 free gold holding countries would be $420,000,000. Now what would be the total gold liability of the 16 free gold-holding countries? Would it be any more than the aggregate of their gold contributions? Conceivably it might be more. But here we run into some questions which show this whole proposal to be positively preposterous.

Let us consider the case of Russia. Her paper and gold contributions are set at $432,000,000 and $184,000,000, respectively. The Treasury informed me that Russia makes no reports of her gold holdings. November 22, 1943, the Federal Reserve gave me the figure of $839,000,000 as the amount of gold Russia held September 1935.

The Soviet Union is an absolutist state. It is conceivable that she might pool a portion of her gold on paper, or even by delivering it into the physical possession of some other country. That would depend on the benefits she could see accruing to her by doing so. Lend-lease and United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation gifts and "loans" for reconstruction and development, which latter might be available to her in case the proposed international bank should be created, would no doubt be deciding factors. But it is unthinkable that the Soviet Union would consent to giving over to an international body any power whatsoever over her money, or any other part of her economy.

The basis of the whole Soviet economy is the political ownership and control of her gold and paper currency, just as this is the basis of all dictatorship. Lewis Haney, professor of economics, New York University, in an article in the Washington Times-Herald December 11, 1943, in commenting on a certain press dispatch from Moscow relating to "world banks and such things" gives the impression that Russian participation in the Keynes scheme is impossible. "Russia Balks" is the caption of an article by Ralph Hendershot in the New York World-Telegram December 7, 1943, of which he is financial editor. He then goes on to say of Russia:

> And, she wants nothing to do with schemes for an international bank, preferring to do business on a gold basis. The chances are this will put a crimp in Britain's plans to stabilize international currencies by placing various and varied assets into an international bank and issuing a new currency against these assets, to be used in the settlement of trade balances between participating nations. And it may very well give our Treasury officials reason to stop, look and listen before throwing in with the British idea.

Furthermore, it would seem another complication may have arisen in connection with Russian participation in this British scheme. I refer to the announcement that recently came from Russia to the effect that the Russian state is to be divided up into 16 "republics," each of which is to have power to separately enter into "direct relations with foreign states and conclude agreements with them."

[See full text of Molotov Plan Enlarging Autonomy of 16 of the Soviet Republics, New York Times, February 2, 1944.]

What the purpose of this new arrangement may be is as yet not clear but it could be used to somehow match the control of other nations, particularly that of Great Britain and the United States, in order to secure greater advantage to herself in any international financial arrangements that might be created. But whatever may be the object of this move, it is safe to say the Soviet Union could not in any event give her consent to any proposal which would involve outside interference with the price at which she might be willing to buy or sell gold outside of her borders, or with her domestic currency or any part of her internal economy. Since the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme would definitely involve control by an international body over all of those things in Russia, we can safely conclude that she would not become a full-fledged participant in it. Hence the gold contribution assigned to her becomes more of a fiction than a reality.

Having eliminated Russia as anything but a possible limited partner in the plan, let us look for a moment at the other countries in the free gold holding category with a view of determining the extent to which they could be expected to actually make their gold available to the scheme. The extent to which this could be expected would of course, as in the

case of Russia, depend upon the amount of concrete benefits they could see in it for themselves. We may be sure that the other countries that would join this proposed scheme would be realistic, that they would do so understandingly and with their eyes glued to their material interests. The United States seems to be the only country in the world that not only has lost much of its mechanism for protecting its own material interests against foreign exploitation, but whose trusted government officials willfully assist foreign interests to insinuate themselves into our economy and government and intrude themselves upon our rights as a sovereign power.

Section V–8 of the administration's revised draft holds out a promise of considerable benefit to at least some of the free gold holding countries. This is particularly true with respect to those Latin-American countries which have large sterling balances in London. The assumption by the scheme of the British debts which comprise those sterling balances would place those Latin-American countries in a position of being able to collect them from the United States.

Like Russia, lend-lease, Export-Import Bank loans, and loans which might be made available to them through the creation of an international bank for reconstruction and development would undoubtedly be further inducements to the Latin-American countries to contribute some of their gold to the scheme. The extent to which the United States would indirectly, through these means, furnish to the Latin-American countries the very assets they would contribute to the scheme could not help but be substantial. If we can believe certain news items, the Treasury is even now giving away gold to certain countries which would be used in making up their gold quotas to the scheme. [See Reader's Digest, February 1944, pp. 12–14.]

In my November 1, 1943, paper, I also raised the question of whether the scheme would actually have physical possession of all of the gold assets contributed to it, or whether each country would keep its gold quota in its central bank and government vaults, and the whole operation of the plan, except the gold contributed by the United States, be one of bookkeeping.

It is important to know the answer to this question, for unless the international body would actually have in its physical possession the gold contributions of the so-called member countries, it is difficult to see how they could serve either as a true credit base or be of any value in maintaining the liquidity of its assets. The soundness—that is, the liquidity—of the plan would always be dependent upon the availability to it of its gold assets. There is no such thing as absentee liquidity any more than there is liquidity in futurity.

The paper contributions that would be made to the scheme constitute in reality nothing but overdrafts, except those made by the United States and other countries whose currencies are internationally convertible into gold. Lord Keynes, in expounding his scheme to the House of Lords, touched upon this point, but apparently was very careful to refrain from distinguishing between the paper which would be contributed by countries whose position is such as to make it fully redeemable in gold at all times and those countries whose gold position is not such as to make their paper fully redeemable in gold at all times. He said:

> The American plan requires the member States to provide so-called security against their overdrafts, a requirement which could certainly be met if it is thought useful; but the security in question only to a very small extent consists in an outside security in the shape of gold. It consists mainly of an I O U engraved on superior notepaper, better than would be the case, perhaps, under our own scheme. I have said that, if that is thought useful and worth while, it does not involve any particular problem. [P. 81, Parliamentary Debates on an International Clearing Union, British Information services.]

The paper portion that would be contributed by the United States would not "consist mainly of an I O U engraved on superior notepaper" but would be a bond underwritten by the Government of the United States for the delivery of gold on demand, backed by the actual possession of said gold. But the paper portion that would be contributed by the United Kingdom would not be possessed of this liquid quality. It would be a political I O U in the truest sense, with no gold back of it to assure its redemption, and without recourse to any other means or source of payment.

To what extent would the gold "contributions" made by countries other than the United States actually be made available to the scheme? Would any gold except that supplied by the United States be made available for use in the operation of the scheme in the sense in which the term "use" is applied to the capital of a bank or any other financial institution? The capital and assets of any financial institution must either be in its actual physical possession or in some manner subject to physical possession by it. This proposition holds with respect to international financial institutions as well as domestic ones. If the scheme does not comprehend actual physical possession of all its capital assets, if the shares of some are represented by paid-in gold and of others by political promissory notes only then it becomes a sham and a fraud of the worst sort.

On November 10, 1943, I addressed the following letter to Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury:

> Some days ago Mr. E. M. Bernstein, in company with Mr. Brenner [Mr. Edward M. Bernstein is an assistant director, Division of Monetary Research, Treasury Department; Mr. Richard B. Brenner is an attorney in the Treasury Department], in my office gave me to understand, in answer to a direct question, that the operation of the United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund would be only a matter of bookkeeping, that the assets of the fund would remain in the central banks and government institutions of the member countries.

Wishing to have this statement confirmed in writing by the Secretary of the Treasury, I wrote him in that letter as follows:

> I desire from you, the Secretary of the Treasury, a direct answer to the following:
>
> Does the "Preliminary Draft Outline of a Proposal for a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund, United States Treasury Department, Revised Draft, July 10, 1943," provide for the physical delivery of the gold assets of the fund at some central point within the geographic boundary of one of the United and Associated Nations? Or, is it contemplated that the gold assets of the fund will remain in the physical possession of the member countries of the fund within their territorial boundaries?

On November 13, 1943, Mr. Morgenthau replied to the above as follows:

> It is my understanding that the discussions among the technical experts of other countries did not touch on the point of the manner in which the gold contributed by a member country would be physically delivered to the fund. I presume, however, it is likely, with respect to the larger countries at least, that their respective gold contributions would be kept available on earmark for the fund at the central banks of those countries.

This is of course an attempt to evade answering my question. In the first place how could there be any question about the "manner" in which the gold should be physically delivered to the scheme? Is there any other way this could be done except by the simple act of shipping? Surely it would not require the services of any "technical experts" to figure that out.

If we are to infer from Mr. Morgenthau's answer that these technical experts have not discussed with the other countries the question of whether they would be willing to ship their gold quotas to one or possibly even several of the other member countries, it should be interesting to know what they have discussed. Do administration officials who are lending their support in the promotion of this scheme believe we are either so naive as to simply take it for granted that the member countries would be willing to ship their gold to some central depository, or so completely uninformed and unconcerned about the matter as to ask no questions?

One thing certain, however, does emerge from Mr. Morgenthau's answer, namely, that each one of the "larger countries" would retain physical possession of its gold contribution. Furthermore, the phrase "with respect to the larger countries at least," would certainly imply that the smaller countries might be given the choice to do likewise.

It should be interesting to have Mr. Morgenthau's formula which he used to classify the United and Associated Nations in two categories, the larger countries on the one hand and the smaller ones on the other, but it would be more interesting still to know how and why he arrived at determining that the larger nations would keep their gold contributions at home in their own vaults, yet seemed undecided or unwilling to say whether or not the smaller countries would be permitted to keep their gold contributions at home, too.

We wonder also which countries have been selected as the elect. The United States, Great Britain, China, and Russia have been officially designated as the "big four" powers so it is reasonable to suppose none of these countries would be called on to let loose of its "gold contribution" to be shipped off to any of the other member countries, though neither Great Britain nor China has any gold to let loose of.

If it is proposed that the smaller countries should hand their gold contributions over to the scheme, to which of the self-chosen few would they be expected to deliver them, to one or more of them, and, if so, which one or ones? Since the Soviet Union would be no more than a limited partner in the scheme, it is hardly likely that country would be selected as the gold depository for the smaller nations. China being so far away from the financial and industrial center of the world and for obvious various and sundry other reasons would hardly do as a depository of the gold assets of the smaller countries. That would leave only England and the United States to be considered as suitable places for holding and guarding those gold assets. To which of these two would the gold contributions from the smaller countries be made to flow, or would they be made to gravitate toward both?

These would not be idle questions if the scheme really contemplated that the proposed gold subscriptions of the smaller countries would actually have to be delivered at some central point within the geographic boundary of one of the so-called member countries. Indeed, these questions would then become vital as they would go to the very root of the matter.

These questions, of course, answer themselves, and they are not asked so much for the purpose of determining whether or not the smaller countries would actually deliver their gold quotas to some central depository within one of the member countries, but are asked more particularly to show both the deception and bizarreness of this scheme. With respect to the countries having no free or unpledged gold, the scheme would have nothing more than a second mortgage on any gold contributions that might be promised and with no recourse at that. Is it not likely that the free gold holding countries, nearly all of which come within the category of smaller countries, would prefer to keep their gold quotas in their own pockets when the nonfree gold holding countries had nothing more to offer than a second mortgage on their gold quotas without recourse, and when the so-called larger countries preferred to retain their gold contributions at their homes in their own vaults? Is it possible to draw any other conclusion than that the operation of the scheme would be one of bookkeeping, and the allegedly assigned gold contributions for both the nonfree and free gold holding countries, except with respect to the United States, would consist almost, if not entirely, of political promises, not to even pay in any part of such gold contributions, but simply to agree to earmark them in their own countries for the account of the scheme?

Up to the present we have considered only the initial amount of gold liability the scheme would impose upon the United States. In the paper heretofore referred to of last November, I mentioned that the initial subscription of gold by the United States would likely be no more than a starter, that once the program were put in operation we should expect to be called upon to pour additional amounts into it. In that paper I said of the scheme:

> We are to believe it is something that could be started and stopped like a watch; tried out and if found ineffective abandoned to its own fate. But it just would not work that way. Once the scheme were in operation it would quickly generate forces that would make for self-perpetuation and expansion, as is the nature of all political machinery * * *. A whole congeries of "vested" international interests would quickly spring up and concurrently the protective mechanisms for maintaining them.

In this connection we should read some of the provisions of the administration's draft under section V, Powers and Operations, wherein are provided the following powers:

> To buy, sell, and hold gold, currencies, and government securities of member countries; to earmark and transfer gold; to issue its own obligations, and to offer them for discount or sale in member countries.
>
> To buy from the governments of member countries, blocked foreign balances held in other member countries.
>
> To sell member country obligations owned by the fund.
>
> To use its holdings to obtain rediscounts or advances from the central bank of any country whose currency the fund needs.
>
> With the approval of the representative of the government of the country concerned, sell its own securities, or securities it holds, directly to the public or to institutions of member countries.

With these far-reaching powers the scheme could be greatly expanded beyond its initial functions and organization. J. H. Riddle, economic adviser to the Bankers Trust Co. in New York, says of the administration's draft of the scheme that:

> It could lend and borrow money, and deal in securities. The fact that it could borrow money and issue its own obligations might bring the fund's activities nearer the scope of the Keynes Union.

Of the Keynes Union he says:

> Under the Keynes plan foreign countries could in theory accumulate debits of nearly $26,000,000,000. That is a theoretical limit based on the assumption that the United States would be the only creditor country and all others would be debtor countries, and further than none of the safeguards provided for worked. That would not occur, of course, but it might be possible after a period of years for debit balances to reach half that figure, or even more, if creditor countries should continue to supply the funds without making any use of their credit balances.

That is, the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme could in time involve the United States in a liability to the extent of upward of perhaps $15,000,000,000. Many conditions must be taken into consideration in determining the probable extent to which the scheme would be expanded. It would be in control of the debtor countries who would determine its operations and formulate its lending policies. Keynesian monetary and financial thinking, with its fiat credit and currency, its pyramiding of credits, its unlimited government deficit financing, its totalitarian approach, and, in this instance at least, its lack of integrity, would give direction to all of its procedures.

Then we must keep in mind that this proposed plan is only a part of a larger and more grandiose scheme that is envisioned by its promoters. Indeed, this is frankly stated by its prime mover and spearhead, Lord Keynes, when he says:

> It is possible that taken together—
>
> 1. The mechanism of currency and exchange.
>
> 2. The framework of a commercial policy regulating conditions for exchange of goods, tariffs, preferences, subsidies, import regulations, and the like.
>
> 3. Orderly conduct of production, distribution, and price of primary products * * *.
>
> 4. Investment aid, both medium and long term, for countries whose economic development needs assistance from outside.
>
> * * * may help the world to control the ebb and flow of the tides of economic activity which have, in the past, destroyed security of livelihood and endangered international peace.

Lord Keynes looks upon his international stabilization scheme as the nucleus for the construction of a universal and all-pervasive centralized international power to regulate the economies, governments, and individual lives of the people of the whole earth. To the foregoing he adds that it "might become the instrument and the support of international policies in addition to those which it is its primary purpose to promote," that it "might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world," that "without it, other more desirable developments will find themselves impeded and unsupported," that "with it, they will fall into their place as parts of an ordered scheme," that it "might set up a clearing account in favour of international bodies charged with post-war relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction," which segment of his scheme is already in operation in the form of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Further, that his stabilization scheme "might set up an account in favour of any supernational policing body which may be charged with the duty of preserving the peace and maintaining international order," that "this would provide an excellent machinery for enforcing a financial blockade," that it "might set up an account in favour of international bodies charged with the management of a commodity control, and might finance stocks of commodities held by such bodies, allowing them overdraft facilities on their accounts up to an agreed maximum."

Also that it "might be linked up with a board for international investment," that

"there are various methods by which the clearing union could use its influence and its powers to maintain stability of prices and to control the trade cycle," that "if an international economic board is established this board and the clearing union might be expected to work in close collaboration to their mutual advantage," that "if an international investment or development corporation is also set up together with a scheme of commodity controls for the control of stocks of the staple primary products, we might come to possess in these three institutions a powerful means of combating the evils of the trade cycle, by exercising contractionist or expansionist influence on the system as a whole or on particular sections," and, finally, "the facility of applying the clearing union plan"—that is, the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme which we are here considering—"to these several purposes arises out of a fundamental characteristic which is worth pointing out, since it distinguishes the plan from those proposals which try to develop the same basic principle along bilateral lines and is one of the grounds on which the plan can claim superior merit," which he clinches with this sophistry: "This might be described as its 'anonymous' or 'impersonal' quality."

What else could it possibly be that is envisioned here but a "supernational brain trust with authority," as Benjamin M. Anderson has designated it?

As just mentioned, one of the parts of this all-embracing scheme has already been perfected, namely, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which, according to resolutions adopted at the Atlantic City conference, is to undertake everything from the furnishing of soup kitchens to the construction of railroads in all the war-stricken areas of the world; further, still another part of this global program, an "international bank for reconstruction and development" with an initial capitalization of $10,000,000,000, is now in the process of concoction by the Administration.

Then there is a vast assemblage of related forces and conditions which are giving impetus or allowing freedom to this movement, though perhaps not so directly or manifestly connected with it, such as the totalitarian planning cult which in conjunction with the Federal bureaucracy all but completely dominates our economy and government, the disordered and corrupt currency and the long way our Nation has already gone in substituting a society of status for that of contract.

There is one more point which is of great importance to the consideration of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme and which is very pertinent to this study. Seldom if ever are the expectations or promises of legislators in setting up political agencies fulfilled. It is an almost unbroken law that such bodies are, when once established and put in operation, never limited to their original size and functions, but tend always to enlarge and expand the scope of their activities.

This is so universally true and so self-evident that it should require no substantiating proof, though a thousand illustrations are ready at hand to support this contention, if that should be deemed necesary. But look at the growth of bureaucracy that has taken place in the Federal Government in recent years.

Who in 1887 would have thought that the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was created at that time, would develop to its present size, complexity, and power, and that the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution would be construed by the Supreme Court so as to make the growing of wheat interstate commerce and empower a Federal bureau to dictate to the farmer how much wheat he can grow?

The Congress devotes nine-tenths of its time trying to restrain the political machinery which it has created and to confine its functions within the bounds of the laws it has itself written. Now especially, it scolds the O. P. A., C. C. C., A. A. A., and the other political alphabetical agencies for using their powers to change the economy, for taking on functions that were not intended and for disobeying the laws which brought them into existence.

The Keynes-Morgenthau scheme would be no exception to the law of endogenous growth of political machinery. That it would go the way of all bureaucracy, take on new functions and expand in directions not now thought of or intended, most likely even by Lord Keynes and some of his coworkers, should be a foregone conclusion. Indeed, the nature of this scheme is such as to make it particularly liable to anarchic growth.

It is plainly seen that the meat of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, stripped of its pretense and window dressing, is, perhaps along with other highly important objectives, an attempt to inveigle the United States into handing over to Great Britain the control and use of the United States stock pile of gold; to finance $5,000,000,000 or more of debts Britain owes to a large number of countries; to restore London as the world's banker and financial center; to finance her world trade and pay for her Beveridge plan.

The scheme seeks to accomplish these objectives by destroying the dollar as the leading international standard unit of value and settler of accounts and what is left of the orthodox international gold standard by substituting therefor a fictitious and political paper unit of account called unitas, in terms of which international pecuniary contracts would have to be made. It is sheer nonsense for Lord Keynes to say:

> The existence of the clearing union does not deprive a member state of any of the facilities which it now possesses for receiving payment for its exports. In the absence of the clearing union, a creditor country can employ the proceeds of its exports to buy goods or to buy investments, or to make temporary advances and to hold temporary overseas balances, or to buy gold in the market. All these facilities will remain at its disposal. [Proposals for an international clearing union, British Information Services, April 8, 1943, p. 11.]

And for the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, to chime in with Lord Keynes by saying:

> The fund would deal only with treasuries and central banks. It would not compete with private banks or existing agencies. Its operations would be maintained only to supplement the efforts made by each member government to maintain monetary stability. The established channels of international trade and international banking would be retained in full for all international transactions. [Statement of Secretary Morgenthau before the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Banking and Currency and the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, April 5, 1943, p. 3.]

If these gentlemen mean that gold could still be used in the settlement of international trade balances in the orthodox way. That view postulates the impossible, namely, the existence simutaneously of two kinds of international units of value and media for settling trade balances, a definable weight of gold on the one hand and an indefinable paper "unitas" of account on the other. Would not Gresham's law operate the same in the international field as it always has in domestic economies? Would not the bad unitas money drive out the good gold money? What earthly chance would gold have to remain in circulation internationally and compete with the cheap money, the politically manipulable paper unitas? None, of course.

It is of the utmost importance to a full comprehension of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme to grasp the fact that it would involve not merely the amount of gold the United States would contribute to it but our entire stock pile of gold. It envisions the complete demonetization of our total gold reserves for international use just as they have been demonetized for domestic use within our own economy and the economies of other countries. It would do exactly what Lord Keynes formally denies it would do when he says:

> Nor is it reasonable to ask the United States to demonetize the stock of gold which is the basis of its impregnable liquidity.

This would in one single stroke destroy in large measure if not entirely the superb international gold position the United States now holds, in international trade and commerce. It would at the same time yield to the debtor countries and, of course, to Great Britain in particular an unearned, precious, and vital national resource.

The alleged capital formation of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme is a fraud. The dishonesty and deception which underlie it condemn it utterly. This is not a proposal for international cooperation if the word "cooperation" still means what the dictionary up to now has always said it meant—"collective action in the pursuit of common well-being." On the contrary, this is a proposal by Great Britain, supported by other countries and aided by our present administration, not only to bleed the United States white but to destroy her very blood-making organs.

Table showing the countries which would have no free or unpledged gold and the countries which would have free or unpledged gold for gold contributions to the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, and other pertinent data relating thereto

POSITION OF 14 COUNTRIES HAVING NO FREE GOLD

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Country	Percent of gold (1) or gold and gold exchange (2) legally required against circulating notes or circulating notes and other demand liabilities in central banks	Date of circulating notes and other demand liabilities in central banks as shown in columns 4 and 5	Amount of circulating notes (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Amount of other demand liabilities in central banks (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Amount of gold, or gold and gold exchange required against circulating notes, or circulating notes and other demand liabilities in central banks (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Date of gold holding as shown in column 8	Amount of gold holding (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Amount of free gold (+) or gold deficiency (−) for circulating notes, or circulating notes and other demand liabilities in central banks (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Alleged percent of aggregate contribution ($8,000,000,000 gold and paper) assigned by scheme	Alleged share of aggregate contribution ($8,000,000,000 gold and paper) allotted by scheme (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Alleged percent of gold contribution of total contribution of each country alloted by scheme	Alleged amount of gold contribution allotted by scheme (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Free gold (+) or deficiency of free gold (−) for gold contribution to fund (in dollars, 000 omitted)
Australia	(2) 25	Sept. 27, 1943	484, 239	557, 266	121, 059	April 1940	5, 000	−116, 059	1.5	120, 000	1.2	1, 500	−1, 500
Belgium	(2) 40	Aug. 26, 1943	2, 512, 595	372, 111	865, 411	August 1943	734, 000	−131, 411	2.4	192, 000	37.5	72, 000	−72, 000
Bolivia	(2) 45	Sept. 30, 1943	24, 204	19, 211	13, 024	September 1943	13, 000	−24	.1	8, 000	40.0	3, 200	−3, 200
Canada	(1) 25	Oct. 30, 1943	760, 552	403, 354	290, 976	October 1943	5, 000	−285, 976	2.8	224, 000	40.0	89, 600	−89, 600
China						March 1939	21, 000		4.0	320, 000	22.5	72, 000	−72, 000
Czechoslovakia	(1) 25	Aug. 31, 1943	863, 446	142, 798	251, 561	August 1943	61, 000	−190, 561	1.2	96, 000	14.0	13, 725	−13, 725
Egypt	(1) 50	do	356, 294	484, 840	178, 147	do	52, 000	−126, 147	.6	48, 000	32.0	15, 600	−15, 600
France	(1) 35	Oct. 28, 1943	9, 517, 353	1, 022, 606	3, 688, 985	April 1940	2, 000, 000	−1, 688, 985	5.5	440, 000	37.5	165, 000	−165, 000
Greece	(2) 40	Mar. 31, 1941	129, 789	140, 085	107, 709	Mar 1941	28, 000	−79, 709	.4	32, 000	22.5	7, 200	−7, 200
India	(2) 40	Aug. 27, 1943	2, 272, 964	315, 690	909, 185	August 1943	274, 000	−635, 185	3.2	256, 000	32.0	82, 200	−82, 200
Netherlands	(1) 40	Aug. 30, 1943	1, 542, 053	422, 047	616, 821	August 1943	522, 000	−94, 821	2.1	168, 000	30.0	50, 400	−50, 400
New Zealand	(2) 25	Sept. 27, 1943	109, 122	139, 241	62, 090	July 1943	23, 000	−39, 090	.5	40, 000	17.0	6, 900	−6, 900
United Kingdom	(1) 100	Oct. 27, 1943	4, 028, 794	1, 003, 827		August 1943	1, 000		12.8	1, 024, 000	30.0	307, 200	−307, 200
Yugoslavia	(1) 20	July —, 1943	713, 840	91, 340	201, 295	February 1941	83, 000	−118, 295	.3	24, 000	30.0	7, 200	−7, 200
Total			23, 315, 245	5, 114, 416	7, 306, 263		3, 801, 000	−3, 506, 263		2, 992, 000		893, 725	−893, 725

POSITION OF 16 COUNTRIES HAVING FREE GOLD

Brazil		Apr. 30, 1943	516, 643	473, 209		September 1943	223, 000		1.2	96, 000	40.0	38, 400	+38, 400
Chile	(2) 50	Aug. 31, 1943	107, 229	30, 306	60, 579	August 1943	54, 000	+6, 579	.4	32, 000	40.0	12, 800	+6, 579
Colombia		Oct. 30, 1943	63, 748	65, 915		September 1943	55, 000		.3	24, 000	40.0	9, 600	+9, 600
Costa Rica		July 31, 1943	12, 005	7, 219		do	6, 000		.04	3, 200	50.0	1, 600	+1, 600
Cuba						July 1943	31, 000		.4	32, 000	28.0	9, 300	+9, 300
Ecuador	(2) 30	July 29, 1943	14, 459	13, 697	6, 757	April 1943	10, 000	+3, 243	.05	4, 000	40.0	1, 600	+1, 600
El Salvador	(1) 25	Aug. 31, 1943	12, 972	8, 819		September 1943	11, 000		.05	4, 000	50.0	2, 000	+2, 000
Guatemala		May 31, 1942	12, 436	13, 415		December 1942	19, 000		.07	5, 600	50.0	2, 800	+2, 800
Mexico		Aug. 31, 1943	205, 620	126, 505		October 1943	200, 000		.8	64, 000	50.0	32, 000	+32, 000
Norway	(1) 100	Mar. 30, 1940	136, 088	25, 468	39, 528	February 1940	84, 000	+44, 471	.7	56, 000	30.0	16, 800	+16, 800
Peru		July 31, 1943	49, 585	21, 681		October 1943	26, 000		.2	16, 000	30.0	4, 800	+4, 800
Poland	(1) 40	Aug. 20, 1939	385, 705	17, 934	65, 456	July 1939	84, 000	+18, 544	1.1	88, 000	21.0	18, 900	+18, 544
South Africa	(1) 30	Aug. 27, 1943	181, 902	494, 061	202, 788	August 1943	628, 000	+425, 212	1.8	144, 000	50.0	72, 000	+72, 000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics						September 1935	839, 000		7.7	616, 000	30.0	184, 800	+184, 800
Uruguay	(1) 100	June 30, 1943	78, 808	102, 534	31, 410	June 1943	101, 000	+69, 590	.2	16, 000	50.0	8, 000	+8, 000
Venezuela	(2) 50	Oct. 31, 1943	75, 233	23, 966	44, 639	October 1943	84, 000	+39, 361	.3	24, 000	50.0	12, 000	+12, 000
Total			1, 852, 433	1, 424, 729			2, 455, 000			1, 224, 800		427, 400	+420, 823

GOLD POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

United States	[1] 40-35	Oct. —, 1943	15, 550, 000	14, 193, 804	11, 187, 000	October 27, 1943	[2] 19, 851, 000	+8, 514, 000	29.3	2, 344, 000	50.0	1, 172, 000	+1, 172, 000

[1] The United States statute provides that: Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates or lawful money of not less than 35 per centum against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 40 per centum against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation.

[2] Represents gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve banks. They are truly representative of gold only to the extent to which they are actually convertible into gold, that is, to the extent to which gold may be exported.

FOOTNOTE ANALYSIS OF COLUMN 2 IN PRECEDING TABLE

AUSTRALIA

Requires a 25-percent gold and gold exchange reserve against notes.

Exchange included limited to English sterling. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

The bank is obligated by law to maintain a 25-percent gold reserve against notes in circulation. By the Commonwealth Bank Act of 1932 [assented to May 21, 1932], it was provided that the reserve may be held in gold coin or in English sterling or partly in gold and partly in English sterling. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1652.]

The maintenance of reserves in the Commonwealth of Australia, provided for in the Commonwealth Bank Act, 1911–32, is as follows:

"SEC. 60K. (1) The Board shall hold in gold or in English sterling or partly in gold and partly in English sterling a reserve of an amount not less than 15 percent of the amount of Australian notes on issue during the 2 years ending on the 30th day of June 1933, not less than 18 percent of such notes on issue during the year ending on the 30th day of June 1934; not less than 21½ percent of such notes on issue during the year ending on the 30th day of June 1935; and not less than 25 percent of such notes on issue after the 30th day of June 1935." [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 15, 1943.]

Only gold held by Australia can be considered as reserve against notes since English sterling exchange owned by Australia cannot be considered as gold exchange.

BELGIUM

Thirty percent gold or 40 percent of gold and gold exchange against demand liabilities. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 193, p. 542.]

Prior to the occupation of the country by the German Army in May 1940, the National Bank of Belgium had the sole right to issue bank notes; its reserves, in gold or gold foreign exchange had to equal 40 percent of its sight engagements and 75 percent of the reserve had to be in gold. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1682.]

Moody's Manual of Investments data used for computing amount of gold reserve required.

BOLIVIA

Requires a 50 percent of gold and gold exchange reserve against notes and deposits.

May legally include silver. Silver included limited to one-fifth of required reserve. Exchange included limited to deposits payable in gold on demand or on 3 days' notice in

New York or London, except that since September 6, 1932, domestic and foreign prime commercial bills may, with the consent of the superintendent of banks, be included up to one-tenth of required reserve. Bank includes drafts payable, dividends, and other obligations with deposits against which reserves are required. [Federal Reherve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

Decree of June 21, 1941, requires 45 percent reserve in gold or foreign exchange against notes and deposits, all foreign exchange may be counted, but gold itself must equal 30 percent of notes and deposits. [Computation of required reserves in chart based on this 30-percent requirement.] The bank however, follows its organic law of July 20, 1928, and counts only gold, dollars and sterling [plus a small amount of silver]. [Treasury data as of June 30 1943.]

CANADA

Canada requires 25 percent gold reserve against notes and deposits.

Government at bank's request may suspend reserve requirement for maximum period of 1 year. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

In connection with the Exchange Fund order of May 1, 1940, the bank's gold reserves were sold to the Foreign Exchange Control Board, and at the same time the bank's minimum gold reserve requirement was temporarily discontinued. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1512.]

Excludes gold held by Foreign Exchange Control Board which on May 1, 1940, took over all the gold reserves of the Bank of Canada, amounting to $206,000,000. [Federal Reserve data.]

CHINA

According to information supplied me by the Federal Reserve Board, China held in March 1939, only $21,000,000 in gold. Yet, according to data furnished me by the Treasury, China's gold contribution is set at $72,000,000.

No attempt has been made to show the gold reserve requirements of China. The Law Library of Congress furnished me with almost seven pages of single-spaced typewritten data relating to this subject, which shows it to be impossible to determine much of value in respect to her reserve requirements.

China has no gold to contribute to the scheme. In this connection should be read the agreement made by the Treasury Department with China relating to the $500,000,000 of financial aid extended to China. Under that agreement the United States has assumed a potential gold liability to the full amount of $500,000,000. It is also necessary here to keep in mind the great inflation which is now raging in China. She needs all the gold she can possibly acquire to meet that situation, and for that reason alone would have none to spare for the Keynes scheme.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

A 25-percent gold reserve is required against demand liabilities.

Reserve may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject * * * to the payment of a tax. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

When Czechoslovakia became divided into a protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia and the state of Slovakia, a separate Slovakian bank—Slovenska Narodna Banka—was established. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 16, 1943.]

The demand liabilities of Slovakia were included with those of Bohemia and Moravia, but they amount to only about 10 percent of those of the latter, and would, for the purpose of this study, not materially affect any of the figures shown for Czechoslovakia.

EGYPT

Requires a 50-percent gold and gold-exchange reserve against notes.

Gold included must be held at home. Exchange included limited to British Treasury bills. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

The statutes of the National Bank of Egypt, approved by the decree of June 25, 1898, were amended several times, the last amendments being dated May 29, 1920, June 20, 1927, and August 10, 1940. This last decree was promulgated August 12, 1940 [Journal Officiel, p. 108]. Section 4 of the statute grants the National Bank of Egypt the privilege of issuing bank notes. Section 5 states that the issue of bank notes is a separate service distinct from the other operations of the bank. It states further:

"The amount of bank notes in circulation payable either to bearer or on sight must be always represented by (1) at least one-half in gold; (2) one-half in such securities owned by the bank and calculated at a rate not exceeding the daily quotations but with maximum at par, the choice of which is by law reserved to the government alone without any responsibility whatsoever on the part of the government. In default, either complete or partial, of such securities the reserve in gold held by the special issue service of the bank notes, must be increased proportionately in such a way that the amount of the bank notes in circulation shall always be covered completely."

This text is quoted from Pace, Repertoire Permanent de Legislation Egyptienne, which is a loose-leaf service of Egyptian legislation in force brought up to date to August 1940. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 18, 1943.]

Required gold reserve computed in accordance with Library of Congress, Law Library, November 18, 1943, data. English exchange being not gold exchange, the result would be the same if Federal Reserve data had been used.

FRANCE

Requires a 35-percent gold reserve against demand liabilities. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

This 35-percent gold reserve requirement was suspended under the emergency decree of September 2, 1939. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1777.]

The amount of gold holding shown does not include the gold transferred to the Exchange Stabilization Fund—about $700,000,000. [See p. 1003, September 1940 Federal Reserve Bulletin.]

GREECE

A 40-percent gold and gold-exchange reserve is required against "demand liabilities, minus holdings of national silver coin up to 150,000,000 drachmas."

Reserve net, i. e., minus gold exchange liabilities. Reserve may include certain gold bonds of the Greek state up to 650,000,000 drachmas. Reserve requirements suspended since April 26, 1932. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

Under section 61 of the Statute of the Bank of Greece of 1927, the bank had to maintain "a reserve of not less than 40 percent of the notes in circulation and other demand liabilities." The reserve may have consisted not only of gold bullion and coin, but also of "net foreign gold exchange." However, section 61, above quoted, was expressly suspended by section 1 of the law, No. 5422 of April 26, 1932 [Ephemeris, 1932, p. 917]. This law seems to be still in force down to 1939 as it is stated in the monograph, Tsamis, L'Evolution Monetaire en Grece, 1928–38, a Doctor's dissertation presented at the University of Nancy on October 19, 1939. The same work gives the following tabulation of the amount of coverage actually held by the bank [p. 96]. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 17, 1943.]

No consideration was given to the silver allowed as reserve by Greece because of the very small amount permitted to be used, nor to her foreign exchange which might be used by her as reserve because of the comparatively small amount held—$103,000, March 31, 1941, Federal Reserve figure.

INDIA

A gold and gold-exchange reserve of 40 percent is required against notes.

Reserves may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject * * * to the payment of a tax. Government consent is necessary in * * * India. Gold must not be less than 400,000,000 rupees; at least 85 percent of gold included must be held at home. Exchange included limited to deposits at Bank of England, sterling bills, or British Government securities maturing within 5 years. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

India held on August 27, 1943, $2,155,071,000 of English sterling. [Federal Reserve data.]

Since English sterling exchange cannot be considered as gold exchange in the true sense, India's English sterling cannot be applied as reserve against her notes.

NETHERLANDS

A 40-percent gold reserve is required against demand liabilities.

May legally include silver. Eighty percent of required reserve must be held at home. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

The Netherlands Bank is required to maintain against outstanding notes and other demand liabilities a revenue of 40 percent in gold and silver coin and bullion, and other legal tender coin. The law does not specify a fixed proportion of gold or silver. Foreign exchange is not permitted as reserve. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1851.]

The latest comprehensive regulation concerning the bank is contained in the law of February 2, 1937 [Staatsblad, 1937, No. 400], and the royal decree of March 1, 1937 [Staatsblad, 1937, No. 401], by which the provision for issuing bank notes was prolonged for 5 years, beginning with March 31, 1937—that is, up to March 31, 1942. The last-named law also contained the following provison:

"SEC. 23. The proportion of bank notes, bank drafts, and balances of accounts current which must be covered by coin or bullion shall be established by royal decree and passed on recommendation of the management of the bank. This decree shall be promulgated in Staatsblad and changed as necessary from time to time."

The only royal decree disclosed in this respect is that of January 4, 1939 [Staatsblad, 1929, No. 3], which set the minimum proportion of the gold reserve in bullion and coin at

40 percent. Staatsblad, from 1929 to 1940, inclusive, does not contain any laws changing these provisions, so it seems that it was still in force by the end of 1940. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 17, 1943.]

The amount of silver held in the Netherlands Bank in June 1943 was $4,000,000. [Federal Reserve Bulletin for October 1943, p. 1040.]

NEW ZEALAND

A 25-percent gold and gold exchange reserve is required against demand liabilities.

Exchange may include sterling; liabilities in exchange must be deducted from gold exchange. Government at bank's request may suspend reserve requirements. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 548.]

The Reserve Bank of New Zealand is the sole bank-note issuing authority. In October 1939 it was announced that the minimum reserve of 25 percent of the Reserve bank's note circulation and other demand liabilities may be varied or suspended, and authority was given to revalue the gold reserve up to market value. As of September 1, 1942, no action had been taken in either respect. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1664.]

As of February 1943, New Zealand owned English sterling exchange to the amount of £31,000,000. [London Economist, April 7, 1943, p. 180.] But English sterling exchange cannot be considered as gold exchange, since it is not convertible into gold.

UNITED KINGDOM

A 100-percent gold reserve is required against notes in excess of fiduciary issue of £260,000,000.

At bank's request treasury may decrease fiduciary issue or may, for a period up to 2 years, increase fiduciary issue. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

The principle of formula controlling the Bank of England's reserve is to be found in the Currency and Bank Note Act, 1928 (18 and 19 George V, ch. 13), section 2 (1):

"SEC. 2 (1). Subject to the provisions of this act the bank shall issue bank notes up to the amount representing the gold coin and gold bullion for the time being in the issue department, and shall in addition issue bank notes to the amount of £260,000,000 in excess of the amount first mentioned in this section, and the issue of notes which the bank is by or under this act required or authorized to make in excess of the said first-mentioned amount is in this act referred to as 'the fiduciary note issue.'

"(2) The treasury may at any time on being requested by the bank, direct that the amount of the fiduciary note issue shall for such period as may be determined by the treasury, after consultation with the bank, be reduced by such amount as may be so determined."

Section 3 (1) provides for the covering of the fiduciary note issue by securities as follows:

"SEC. 3 (1). In addition to the gold coin and bullion for the time being in the issue department, the bank shall from time to time appropriate to and hold in the issue department securities of an amount in value sufficient to cover the fiduciary note issue for the time being.

"(2) The securities to be held as aforesaid may include silver coin to an amount not exceeding five and one-half million pounds.

"(3) The bank shall from time to time give to the treasury such information as the treasury may require with respect to the securities held in the issue department, but shall not be required to include any of the said securities in the account to be taken pursuant to section 5 of the Bank of England Act, 1819." [Library of Congress, Law Library, No. 15, 1943.]

Gold held by England excludes gold held by exchange equalization account which on September 1, 1941, the last date reported, amounted to $151,000,000. [Federal Reserve data.]

The figure of 100 in column 2 showing the percentage of gold reserves required by the United Kingdom against her circulating notes was taken from the July 1936, Federal Reserve Bulletin, page 543. It should be noted, however, that this figure was not applied to the circulating notes, as will be seen in column 6 for the reason that the data here are too uncertain to be of any value.

Unless it could be shown that England considers that she no longer requires any gold in the exchange equalization account as well as any gold backing for her notes, she would have no free gold to contribute to the fund. It has been suggested by one of the leading English financial journals that England might sell goods for gold to meet her gold contribution, but that such action would be objectionable. [See London Economist, August 28, 1943, pp. 261–262.]

YUGOSLAVIA

Requires a 25-percent gold reserve, or 35 percent of gold and gold-exchange reserve against demand liabilities.

Gold included must be held at home. Provisionally since January 21, 1935, reserve requirements are reduced from 25 and 35 percent to 20 and 25 percent, respectively, and bank is authorized, in computing these ratios, to value reserves at 28.5 percent above legal rate. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

The monetary law of May 11, 1931, provided with regard to the reserve as follows:

"SEC. 5. The bank must maintain a reserve in gold or foreign values legally or actually convertible into freely exportable gold. The amount of the reserve to be not less than 35 percent of the bank's sight obligations of which at least 25 percent must be covered by gold in the vaults of the bank."

By section 63 of the financial law [Budget] for 1934–35 [Sluzhbene Novine, 1934, item 168, p. 330] the Council of Ministers was granted the power to issue decrees with the force of law for the regulation of economic situation in the country. On the basis of this authority, the Council of Ministers issued on January 15, 1935, a decree which being printed in No. 15 Sluzhbene Novine of January 21, 1935, took effect on that date.

The decree reads:

"Decree concerning liquidation of the revolving credit of the national bank.

"Section 1. The National Bank of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, may provisionally, in defiance of section 5 of the law on currency of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and for the purpose of a complete liquidation of its revolving credits abroad, maintain reserve in gold and foreign exchange which was accounted at the legal rate plus a 'prim' of 28.5 percent, so that the total reserve must cover 25 percent of the sight liabilities and at least 20 percent of sight liabilities of the bank must be covered in gold in the vaults of the bank."

No further change of this provision was disclosed by perusal of the Collection of Yugoslavian Laws [Sluzhbene Novine] down to the 2d of April 1941, the date of the last number of Sluzhbene Novine. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 18, 1943.]

Computation of required gold reserves made on the basis that at least 20 percent of sight liabilities of the bank must be covered with gold in the vaults of the bank. [Library of Congress, Law Library, data used for computing reserve requirements.]

BRAZIL

A 25-percent reserve of Government funds in gold or foreign exchange is required against cruzeiro notes. No gold or foreign exchange reserve is required against deposits. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

The above being the only data available to me respecting the reserve requirements of Brazil, no effort has been made to supply all of the figures here. For the purpose of this study we shall assume that Brazil would have enough free gold to meet her gold contribution to the fund.

CHILE

A 50-percent gold and gold exchange reserve is required against notes and deposits.

Reserve may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject * * * to the payment of a tax. Exchange net; limited to demand deposits payable in gold in New York or London. Exchange purchased under laws of April 19, 1932 (No. 5107) and February 13, 1935 (No. 5594), regarding official exchange control, and an equivalent amount of notes and deposits are excluded in computing ratio. While bank holds Treasury notes issued under law of January 7, 1932 (No. 5028) and later consolidated in a long-term Government debt, reserve requirements are reduced to 25 percent. Bank includes cashiers' checks and dividends payable with deposits against which reserves are required. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

Article 83: The Central Bank of Chile must maintain a gold reserve equal to 50 percent of the total of its notes in circulation and of its deposits. This may be in gold bars or coins deposited in the safes of the bank, or gold [bars or coins] deposited in the custody of first-class foreign banks; or in deposits payable on demand, and in gold in first-class banks in London and New York. The 50 percent guarantees also Treasury notes and bonds in circulation which the bank is obliged to exchange, cancel, or withdraw in accordance with law. [Library of Congress, Law Library, Nov. 15, 1943.]

Reserve requirements are "in suspense." [Treasury data as of June 30, 1943.]

Chile employs a system of multiple exchange rates in its current trade, but at present the prevailing rate is P/31–$1. P/317,400,357 of the outstanding notes are technically not subject to reserve requirements. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

These factors were taken into consideration in determining the reserves required. Chile owned on August 31, 1943, $18,331,000 of foreign exchange [Federal Reserve data] which was added to her gold holding in computing the amount of reserve required against her notes and deposits. However, no data are available to show the distribution of Chile's foreign exchange holdings according to the currency involved. To the extent Chile's foreign exchange holdings may not consist of gold exchange the amount of free gold shown in column 14 would be reduced.

COLOMBIA

A gold and gold exchange reserve of 40 percent is required against notes.

Reserve may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject * * * to the payment of a tax. Exchange limited to demand deposits but not to gold exchange. During present emergency reserve requirements are reduced to 30 percent or, so long as gold content of peso is not reduced, to 25 percent. An additional reserve of 25 percent of deposits plus outstanding Treasury notes is required in gold or other cash [silver not to exceed one-half]. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

In January 1942 the minimum legal gold reserve of the Bank of the Republic was fixed at 30 percent [reduced from 40 percent] of its bills in circulation.]Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1741.]

A 25 percent reserve is required against deposits. No more than one-half may be in silver. A 50 percent reserve in gold or foreign exchange is required against notes. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

No attempt has been made to determine the amount of gold reserve that is required against notes or notes and deposits. It is assumed Colombia would have sufficient free gold to meet her gold contribution.

COSTA RICA

No specific gold or exchange requirements. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

CUBA

Since May 2, 1942, 98 percent gold or dollar reserve has been required against new note issues. Earlier issued backed 1 to 1 by silver pesos. United States currency circulates freely. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

Decree of August 2, 1938 [Norma de reserva metalica en los Bancos]: Article 1 provides that all banking institutions operating within the territory of the Republic shall have in metallic currency of national coinage a reserve of at least 75 percent of the amount to which article 180 of the Commercial Code refers [infra]. Article 180 of the Commercial Code [as amended through 1941] provides that banks shall conserve in metal at least one-fourth of the total of their deposits, current accounts in currency and of their bills in circulation. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 15, 1943.]

ECUADOR

Requires a 40-percent gold and gold-exchange reserve against notes and deposits.

Exchange included limited to deposits payable in gold. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

A 30-percent reserve is required against notes and sight obligations. This reserve may consists of gold and [up to 20 percent of the required reserve] of foreign exchange. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

A minimum reserve of 30 percent [reduced from 40 percent effective Jan. 1, 1938] in gold against notes in circulation and sight deposits is required. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1765.]

Treasury data used in computing amount of required gold reserve.

EL SALVADOR

A gold reserve of 25 percent is required against demand liabilities.

After definitive stabilization of currency, net exchange may count as reserve. Such exchange is not limited to gold exchange, but must be held in central banks. If reserve falls below 30 percent on 3 of the 24 report dates a year, no dividend shall be paid to shareholding banks. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

Twenty-five percent reserve in gold or foreign exchange is required against notes and other sight liabilities. If, however, the reserve ratio falls below 30 percent, no dividends can be paid. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

Amount of reserve not computed. Assumed El Salvador would have sufficient free gold to meet her gold quota.

GUATEMALA

Thirteen and one-third percent gold is required against notes. A gold reserve of 8⅓ percent is required against deposits, due in 30 days or less, including unutilized credits.

Gold in required reserves must be in bank's vaults. Silver may replace gold up to one-tenth of requirement shown in gold column. Reserve against deposits payable in a foreign currency may be held entirely in that currency. Note issue may not exceed five times bank's paid-up capital and surplus or 12,500,000 quetzals, whichever is larger. Deposits due in 30 days or less may not exceed five times bank's capital and surplus. May legally include silver in each category. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

The bank must maintain a reserve in gold and silver in its vaults or in sight deposits abroad payable in gold equivalent at least to 40 percent of its notes in circulation. Not less than one-third of the 40 percent reserve must be kept in its own vaults, but this may include Guatemalan silver coins in an amount not exceeding 3.33 percent of the reserve. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1817.]

Forty percent reserve required against notes; 25 percent against other sight liabilities. Reserves may consist of gold, deposits abroad, United States currency, and silver in a limited amount. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

Amount of required gold reserve not calculated. Assumed Guatemala would have sufficient gold to meet her gold quota.

MEXICO

On December 23, 1938, the Chamber of Deputies approved a new law providing for the revaluation of the bank's gold, and foreign exchange reserves at market value. In addition, the law removed the limitation on the amount of paper currency which the bank may issue. Under the original organic law, the bank was required to back its note issue with at least 50 percent of metallic reserves. Early in 1938, however, that restriction was removed by decree, and a bill passed authorizing the treasury to issue interest-bearing treasury certificates which are acceptable for tax payments. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1845.]

Ley organica del Banco de Mexico y Estatutos—as amended February 21, 1939:

"Article 99: The bank shall maintain at all times a reserve to uphold the value of the peso. The total of this reserve * * * shall not in any instance be lower than 100,000 pesos, nor less than 25 percent of the total of notes issued on the bank and its obligations to pay on sight in national currency.

"Article 100: The reserve to which the article above refers will consist of gold and silver, coined or in bars, of shares of foreign exchange, etc." [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 15, 1943.]

Twenty-five percent reserve required against both notes and deposits, of which at least 80 percent must be in gold or foreign exchange. As much as 20 percent may be in silver. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

No attempt has been made from the above data to calculate the amount of required gold reserves. It is assumed Mexico would have sufficient free gold to meet her gold quota.

NORWAY

Requires a 100-percent gold reserve against notes in excess of fiduciary issue of 250,000,000 kroner. Gold included must be held at home. Fiduciary issue may be increased, subject to a tax, by authority of King and Storting. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

A legal minimum reserve of 100 percent gold against notes in excess of a fiduciary issue of 425,000,000 kroner must be maintained. This issue may be increased, subject to tax, by authority of the King and Storting. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1860.]

Gold reserve requirements computed from Moody's Manual of Investments, that is, on the basis of 100 percent against notes in excess of 425,000,000 kroner, which qualifies the percentage figure as shown in column 2 accordingly.

PERU

A gold and gold exchange reserve of 50 percent is required against notes, deposits, and net foreign items in process of collection.

May legally include silver. Silver included must not exceed one-fifth. Exchange included may consist only of deposits payable on demand in gold, or its equivalent, in New York or London, and up to one-half of reserve, bankers' acceptances payable in gold currencies. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, January 1936, p. 543.]

The original statutes of the bank [Banco Central de Reserva del Peru] provided for a tax on the note circulation whenever the reserve ratio fell below 50 percent, but this provision was suspended by Law 7760 of June 9, 1933. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1869.]

A 50-percent reserve is required against notes and deposits. Reserve may consist of gold or exchange, bank acceptances or silver coins [up to one-fifth]. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

No attempt has been made from the above data to determine the amount of gold reserve that is required for cover of demand liabilities. It is assumed Peru would have sufficient free gold to meet her gold quota.

POLAND

Requires 30 percent gold reserve against demand liabilities in excess of 100,000,000 zlotys. Reserve may be permitted to fall below the stated reserve requirements subject to the payment of a tax. Gold net, after deduction of pledged gold and of liabilities in exchange. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

The law of March 24, 1939, introduced some amendments to the charter of the Bank Polski of 1936. In particular, the law changed section 52 of the charter dealing with the gold reserve [Dziennik Ustaw, 1939, item 142, p. 417]. Then the charter with all the amendments was re-promulgated in toto by the proclamation of the Minister of Finance of May 2, 1939 [Dziennik Ustaw, 1939, item 296], and the amended text to section 52 is given there as follows:

"SEC. 52. The bank must possess a gold reserve to the amount equivalent to 40 percent of the sum by which the total of the

banknotes in circulation plus sight liabilities exceeds the sum of 800,000,000 zlotys.

"Depending upon the situation on the gold market, the council of the bank may, with the consent of the Minister of Finance, raise the limit of 800,000,000 zlotys established in the first paragraph of this section to a sum not exceeding 1,200,000,000 zlotys however.

"The liabilities based upon loans secured by gold of the bank are deducted from the gold reserve" [Dziennik Ustaw, 1939, p. 585].

These are the latest available provisions for the period before the German occupation. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 19, 1943.]

Gold-reserve requirement computed from data supplied by Law Library of Congress, second paragraph, under section 52.

If the figure 800,000,000 zlotys were taken as representing the amount of notes and sight liabilities to be exempted from reserve requirements, as provided in the first paragraph of section 52 above, instead of the figure 1,200,000,000 zlotys—the figure used in the chart—there would be a deficiency of gold to the amount of $13,455,000 for note and sight liability coverage.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Requires a gold reserve of 30 percent against notes, deposits, and bills payable. May legally include silver.

Reserve may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject, except in South Africa * * * to the payment of a tax. Government consent is necessary in * * * South Africa. One-half of gold included must be held at home. Silver included limited to 6 percent of deposits and bills payable [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543].

U. S. S. R.

She makes no report of her gold holdings. [Treasury data.] There are indications that Russia does not intend to bind herself to the United and Associated Nations' stabilization fund scheme.

[See New York World-Telegram, December 7, 1943; Lewis W. Haney in the Washington Times-Herald, December 11, 1943; Russia's Intentions About Gold, in the January 1944 Economic Conditions, Government Finance, United States Securities, p. 6.]

URUGUAY

Requires 45⅗ percent of gold reserve against major notes of 10 pesos or more issued in excess of (a) bank's paid-up capital, less fiduciary issue of minor notes, and (b) rediscounted bank documents up to 10,000,000 pesos.

Fiduciary issue of minor notes is permitted in place of major notes, against paid-up capital. Against minor notes in excess of fiduciary issue minimum reserve requirement is 45.6 percent in silver. Minor notes are limited to 20,000,000 pesos. Bank must hold notes equivalent to 20 percent of deposits. Gold coin may be held abroad only if 55,000,000 pesos of gold coin is held in Uruguay, unless specifically authorized otherwise. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

Notes of the issue department of the Banco de la Republica in excess of 60,000,000 pesos may be backed by silver up to 12,000,000 pesos [actually 9,000,000 pesos are so backed]; additional notes require a backing of 100 percent in gold. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

Ley No. 9496, August 14, 1935. Article 11.—The Bank of the Republic of Uruguay shall always maintain a reserve of bank notes equal to 20 percent of the total of its deposits, no matter of what type. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 15, 1943.]

Treasury data used for computing gold reserve requirements. The percentage figure shown in column 2 must therefore be qualified accordingly.

Sixty million pesos, plus 12,000,000 pesos subtracted from 119,715,000 pesos. [Federal Reserve figure as of June 30, 1943, of outstanding peso notes] times 65.83 cents to peso [same source and data as above] equals $31,410,000.

VENEZULA

A 50-percent reserve is required against note and deposit liabilities. No more than 10 percent of the reserve may be in the form of foreign exchange, and at least 60 percent must be gold on hand. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the international stabilization fund project which we have heard criticized so sharply is not by any stretch of the imagination far enough along to warrant such detailed discussion. Moreover, the criticism is based chiefly upon a preliminary draft, which, I understand, has been worked over and changed materially by the technical people of thirty-odd countries since its publication 4 months ago.

It seems to me, however, there is a far larger issue at stake than whether or not a stabilization plan which might conceivably be adopted by this or any other government looks good or bad at this highly premature point.

The issue is whether or not the Government of this country should attempt to be forehanded about problems which are certain to arise in the future; whether or not Government departments should make preliminary investigations and studies with the full knowledge and consent of Congress, leading to possible solutions for unavoidable difficulties which lie ahead. I think they should, and I believe that we in Congress should cooperate, not carp.

The alternative, of course, is to have the Government operate as it did in late Republican years, and spend its time running around locking barn doors after horses are stolen. My Republican colleague from Ohio may prefer this.

Now, before we go any farther, let us set the record straight on some of the more obvious accusations:

The gentleman from Ohio says that the monetary proposal, drafted by American technicians, is nothing but a rewording of the text of the British proposal. Nothing could be further from the truth. In the first place the proposal of the American technicians was drawn up in the winter of 1941 fully 15 months before the British plan, and was presented in principle to the Rio Conference of foreign ministers in January 1942. Anyone with the slightest understanding of international exchange and monetary questions would say that the plans have only one thing in common and that is they both attempt to deal with the international monetary problems. The two proposals are completely different in their approach and suggested solution.

The gentleman from Ohio says that the draft proposal seeks to replace gold with a fictitious standard. The fact is that the proposal of the American technicians provides for defining the currencies of all member countries in terms of gold and tieing their currencies to gold. Instead of weakening the possibility of a return to the gold standard, it would do the very opposite. It attempts to strengthen the ties between all currencies and gold. To say that the plan aims to destroy the supremacy which the dollar holds in international trade and finance is an obvious falsehood.

The gentleman from Ohio says that the scheme would involve the assumption by the United States of $5,000,000,000 or more of British debts. This is complete nonsense. An early draft of the fund proposal provided for the purchase by the fund of very limited amounts of blocked balances on those occasions on which the fund finds it desirable to do so, and only under terms and conditions which make it actually impossible for the fund to incur a loss. This provision, I believe, has already been dropped. Strangely enough, in view of my colleague's inferences, I understand it was dropped because of the opposition of the British experts.

The gentleman from Ohio says that the control of our money would be given over to an international money authority. Again I wonder whether he has read the proposal. There is nothing in it which reduces the authority of the United States over its monetary system or over the dollar. The fund can make no change in the value of the dollar and the proposal specifically reserves to each country the complete control of its money policies.

My esteemed colleague has placed before you a chart which purports to show you the figures on the gold holdings and gold contributions of some of the United Nations. The figures shown are completely erroneous. They are based largely upon data published years ago, some going back as far as 1935, and I am surprised that anyone should assume that data of this character can at all represent the actual situation. I am told, incidentally, that this table overlooks half the gold holdings of the other United Nations. The true information, I might point out, is secret and cannot be given out by any country. The publication of a completely unfounded table by the gentleman from Ohio serves no purpose other than to confuse and mislead the interested public.

I do not know what the gentleman from Ohio means when he says that the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme—and by the way, there is no such thing; the British,

French, Canadians, and Americans all had preliminary drafts, all published, all different—he says the scheme could involve the United States to the extent of upward of $15,000,000,000. The tentative proposal by the American technicians specifically states that our participation shall be limited in the neighborhood of $2,000,000,000. This is a small error of 700 percent on the part of the gentleman and involves some $13,000,000,000.

Finally the gentleman from Ohio seems to be disturbed by the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission was different in 1887 from what it is now. This perhaps is the key to the understanding of his entire speech. This Republican gentleman is complaining because we cannot meet the complex problems of the 1940's with the facilities of the years when as a free, sun-kissed barefoot boy he first graced Shanesville, Ohio, in the 1880's. He was born there, I understand in 1884, and like the Interstate Commerce Commission, has altered his earlier limits and become increasingly complex in the intervening years.

The preliminary work on stabilization—and all the work that has been done to date is preliminary—is an effort by an alert Government department to prepare a remedy beforehand for a difficulty that seems certain to strike when the war is over, or before.

When the economies of various countries began to shudder under the strain of approaching war, Secretary Morgenthau and his technical experts anticipated that world reconstruction would be very difficult indeed if all the moneys of the world had no common denominator and if there were no basis for international cooperation. If we were to come out of the war with a sound dollar and all other nations were bankrupt and their exchange were fluctuating in a disruptive manner, the Secretary recognized that the soundness of our dollar would be a virtue in a vacuum.

The war is likely to aggravate a situation which will make it extremely difficult to avoid a break-down of international economic relations.

In an effort to find a solution to this problem—and unless a solution is found, the reconstruction, restoration of a prosperous level of world trade and the establishment of sound monetary systems will be delayed indefinitely—in an effort to find a solution, Secretary Morgenthau's technicians began exploratory conversations with technical representatives of other nations.

Now, in spite of those who, through lack of understanding or for political purposes, choose to distort the facts in the case, these early conversations were not launched with the idea of letting the United States rescue or support the other nations of the world—any of them. Mr. Morgenthau is no economic Santa Claus. Anyone who has watched the handling of Treasury matters over the past 10 years knows that. The present Secretary of the Treasury has worked hard and long to make and keep Washington the financial center of the world. He has been diligent in keeping foreign debts in hand, and he invented reverse lend-lease to help keep dollar balances down. So you may rest assured that our country's economic wherewithal will not be dissipated across the oceans by the watchdog of the Treasury Department.

But let me repeat, the point at issue is really whether or not, having seen the necessity for stabilizing foreign exchange, our Secretary of the Treasury would have served the public interest better by pretending no problem exists, and accordingly done nothing about it. By inference, at least, the gentleman from Ohio and others who criticize a plan which still is in its formative stage are, apparently, suggesting that we go back to those good old do-nothing days—those days that reached their pinnacle in 1929—when the administration in power realized full well that calamity lay just over the horizon, but chose to make no effort whatever to stop it. They felt that it was none of the Government's business to keep people from starving, to keep businesses from closing their doors, to keep the wheels of commerce from slowly grinding to a stop.

I do not believe that we should return to those unrealistic days of "let us pretend it is not so." I believe that we should continue to anticipate problems and try to find solutions before they have an opportunity to send the international economy into a tailspin. And further I believe that this viewpoint is representative of a large majority of the American people. Most Americans would rather see us on the ball than behind it.

Some people have a tendency to view with alarm anything going on that they do not quite understand. Certainly there is no crime in being alert, but it seems to me aimless for anyone to take up time to discuss, as though it were a fait accompli, a plan which in the first place is in its preliminary stages and in the second place he has confused with at least one other plan. And especially since he has not revealed the pertinent fact that this thing which he views with such alarm is nothing more than a logical, conservative development which has evolved out of proved practices of this Government. It would appear that my colleague is so concerned about motives that he is losing sight completely of the facts in the case.

I should like to take a few minutes to tell you how this proposal for monetary cooperation, aimed at the protection of the American economy, came about. Its evolution is as important as the project itself, for it demonstrates its basic simplicity.

The story of this stabilization fund really began back in the twenties, when a surprisingly large and substantial group of people suddenly awakened to the fact that fortunes could be made by trading in foreign exchange; and nations believed that, by manipulating exchange rates, they could avoid payment of war debts to this country.

All this was going on during the Coolidge administration, and it continued through the Hoover administration. There was no mystery about it. The Republican administration which then had the responsibility of safeguarding the welfare of the American people knew all about it.

In the record of the Hoover administration written by William Starr Myers and Walter H. Newton, much is said about—

> The deliberate credit inflation policy undertaken by the Federal Reserve System and the important central banking systems of Europe in the year 1927.

Then the authors review the growth of that inflation policy. They say, and I quote:

> In late 1925 the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, through its governor, Benjamin Strong, entered into the discussion of a program of joint action with Montagu Norman, governor of the Bank of England. This was joined in by the officials of various central banks of continental Europe. The objectives were the expansion of credit, "easy money policies" by "open market" operations, and the manipulation of discount rates. The purpose of the arrangements was to strengthen the situation in Europe.

The book then points out that Mr. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, protested vigorously, and is reported to have said:

> As to the effects of these Reserve policies upon the United States, it means inflation with inevitable collapse which will bring the greatest calamities upon our farmers, our workers, and legitimate business.

As Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover seems to have had some influence, for this inflationary program was apparently sidetracked for the time being.

But in July 1927, Mr. Norman, of the Bank of England, Dr. Schacht, president of the Reichsbank, and Prof. Charles Rist, deputy governor of the Bank of France, visited the United States, and in spite of Mr. Hoover, who was soon to become President and certainly in a position to protest if he wanted to, these redoubtable gentlemen apparently got the plot started all over again, and this time they went through with it. Now, mind you, Mr. Hoover made no move to stop it, though he was on record as knowing what the consequences would be. Perhaps he had been won over by those Republican leaders who seem so fond of inflationary policies that they have maintained a startling record of supporting inflation up to the present day.

In the final analysis, there could be only one cure for this disease which had been started so deliberately in the Coolidge administration. That cure was administered on March 6, 1933, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt closed the banks for 4 days "because of unwarranted withdrawals of gold and currency from banking institutions for the purpose of hoarding, and undue speculative activity abroad in foreign exchange."

That was a medicine swiftly and courageously administered. Less than a year later, concrete steps were planned to make it impossible for such calamity as we knew in 1929–30 and 31 to befall us again. These steps were planned under the same Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., who has just been criticized for trying to get things done, and consisted of setting up a stabiliza-

tion fund in the United States to protect the value of the dollar abroad, and to make it difficult for foreign currencies to be manipulated to the great detriment of the American economy.

This stabilization fund, which has been functioning for 9 years with complete success, was the real foundation of the present International Stabilization Fund idea.

Through the use of this fund, the American Government, on many occasions, has invested temporarily in foreign currencies for stabilization purposes.

In all of the 9 years that this fund has been in operation, the United States Government has not lost a cent.

To those who say a stabilization fund will not work, here is pretty strong evidence that it will work. Ours has been working in this limited field for 9 years.

In 1936, Secretary Morgenthau took another step to reinforce international stabilization. He established the tripartite arrangement with the Governments of England and France. The Governments of Belgium, the Netherlands, and Switzerland also held to this agreement. This, too, was successful until the outbreak of war made it impossible to continue for obvious reasons.

The present international stabilization plan which we have heard so bitterly denounced as impractical, is a combination and extension of these two tried and proved methods of stabilization.

In January of 1942 the ministers of foreign affairs of the American republics, meeting in Rio de Janeiro, recognized the need for a greater degree of cooperation in the stabilization of currencies. Accordingly, they adopted a resolution recommending—

First, that the governments of the American republics participate in a special conference of ministers of finance or their representatives to be called for the purpose of considering the establishment of an international stabilization fund;

Second, that the conference in considering the establishment of such a fund shall formulate the plan of organization, powers, and resources necessary to the proper functioning of the fund, shall determine the conditions requisite to participation in the fund, and shall propose principles to guide the fund in its operation.

Following this conference, an American technical committee was set up to pursue the subject further. Represented on that committee were the Treasury Department, the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Board of Economic Warfare. This group prepared a tentative proposal which, in March 1943, the Secretary of the Treasury sent to the ministers of finance of the United Nations for study by their technicians.

On April 5, Secretary Morgenthau reported to seven committees of the House and Senate on the progress of this study, even though it was then in its infancy, so to speak. I think it is important that the Secretary asked permission to keep us advised, a program which he has maintained consistently on this and other projects falling within the scope of the Treasury Department. On April 5 he said, in part:

> For some time we in the Treasury have been deeply concerned with the threat of international monetary chaos at the end of this war.
>
> We feel that international currency stability is essential to reconstruction in the post-war period and to the resumption of private trade and finance. It is generally held that this formidable task can be successfully handled only through international cooperation.
>
> I think further that most of us would agree that the establishment of a program adequate to deal with the inevitable post-war monetary problems should not be postponed until the end of hostilities. It would be ill-advised, if not dangerous, to be unprepared for the difficult task of international monetary cooperation when the war ends. No one knows how long or how short the war will be. We therefore believe it is desirable to begin now to devise an international monetary agency adequate to cope with the problems with which we shall be confronted when the war does end.
>
> The completion of such a task is certain to take many months at the least. Specific and practical proposals must be formulated and must be carefully considered by the policy-shaping officials of the various countries.

And then the Secretary said very clearly, so that we could not fail to understand:

> In each country acceptance of a definitive plan can follow only upon legislative or executive action.

After explaining the nature of the preliminary proposal which was sent to the other nations to start them thinking, the Secretary said, upon leaving:

> I have been anxious to discuss this matter with you and to keep you informed of developments. Obviously, we are still in the early stages of our thinking and discussions. However, I did want you to know what we are doing and I do want to feel free to come back from time to time and discuss the subject with you and obtain your views and advice.

Here I should like to point out that the gentleman from Ohio has taken advantage of this offer on numerous occasions. He has written many letters to the Treasury and each has been answered, although the answers to many of them seem for the most part to have been misinterpreted.

One of these letters I must comment upon here. He wrote to the Secretary, asking the Secretary for a direct answer as to whether or not contributions to the fund will be physically delivered to one central point in one of the United Nations.

In answer, Mr. Morgenthau told him that it was generally assumed that at least the major contributions to the fund would simply be earmarked and kept in the contributors' central banks. In other words, our gold would be kept right here if that is what interests the gentleman from Ohio.

Whereupon the esteemed gentleman from Ohio, apparently misinterpreting what "earmarked" means, throws his hands in the air and says, "See what I told you. How could there be any question about the manner in which the gold should be delivered? How could it be done except by shipping?"

But let me continue with the progress of the stabilization fund.

Following the April 5 report, there were many meetings of the technical experts of various countries. By fall the technicians had made enough progress so that a revised proposal could be prepared, and the Secretary again reported to the committees in the House and the Senate. He said at that time:

> I want to emphasize that the International Stabilization Fund, tentatively proposed by the technical experts of this Government, is fundamentally an adaptation of the methods we have successfully used on a more limited scale with our own Exchange Stabilization Fund. We have tried to adapt that experience to the broader and more difficult currency problems confronting the world during the post-war years. The International Stabilization Fund is an extension of the principle of the tripartite agreement that the responsibility for maintaining stability of exchange rates is international and that countries must cooperate to maintain stability of exchange.
>
> The obligations a country assumes under this proposal are no more than a country voluntarily imposes on itself when it pursues a policy of exchange stability and refrains from resorting to discriminatory exchange practices. Beyond that, there is only the duty of consulting and agreeing before altering exchange rates, an extension of the principle that we have embodied for years in our own stabilization agreements.
>
> We have held technical conversations with the experts of more than 30 countries and we are continuing these discussions with the experts of some of the countries. These exploratory conversations have been unofficial and confined to the technical level. No government, including the United States, is committed to any of the tentative proposals for international monetary cooperation that have been presented by the experts.

The Secretary then explained some of the changes which had been made in the proposal previously described to the committees and presented a summary of a tentative proposal for a United Nations Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the principal function of which would be to "guarantee loans made by private capital for sound and constructive purposes, when such loans are also guaranteed by a member government."

Upon leaving the committees, the Secretary said:

> I want to assure you again that I shall always be available for discussion of both the bank and fund proposals. I know that some members of your committees are desirous of cooperating with us in studying these problems. Speaking for the Treasury, we would be very happy if an informal committee were formed which would consult with our technical men as frequently as feasible.

That is the story of the international stabilization fund to date. It is the whole story.

On the basis of a rumor circulating in a foreign capital, some sections of the House of Representatives seem to have become excited about possible infractions of the rights of Congress by the Treasury Department. Statements have been made that the executive department of the Government is making

agreements with foreign nations, which is wholly and absolutely absurd. There have been inferences that the Treasury Department, behind the backs of Congress, has been making arrangements to give away our money and our credit. This, of course, is even more absurd than the first charge.

Secretary Morgenthau assured the gentleman from New York, Representative BLOOM, only last week that sufficient progress had not yet been made to warrant taking the time of House and Senate committeemen to listen to a further report.

The entire project is still at the level of various Government technicians. A group of technical men from Russia is at present discussing the matter with the American technicians at the Treasury. When progress has been made, when a recommendation has been agreed upon by the technicians, a formal meeting will be held by accredited representatives of the various governments and following that, the various legislative bodies will decide upon what action to take.

I think Congress should commend Secretary Morgenthau for keeping us abreast of developments concerning the stabilization fund project, rather than criticize him for having made agreements which we all know very well he has not and could not make, and which he himself described on April 5 of last year as being out of his province.

All this is a tempest in the teapot.

It is an effort to create a political issue where no political issue could possibly exist. I suppose we can expect more and more of this as we come closer to election.

But I sincerely hope that the administration will not find it necessary to curtail its investigations and forehanded projects, because some groups want to make it politically inexpedient to do anything but sit.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CANFIELD, for Wednesday, March 22, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio, for March 23 and 24, on account of official business.

To Mr. WARD, for March 23, 24, and 27, on account of official business.

To Mr. BULWINKLE, for 9 legislative days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R 324. An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; and

H. R 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York;

S. 1410. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940;

S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy; and

S. 1653. An act to provide title for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 23, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 23, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold an executive meeting on Thursday, March 23, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2994.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 23, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 1565, relating to the appointment of postmasters; and H. R. 3688, to change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard." Hearings will be had.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1322. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of $80,000,000, for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year 1945, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 508); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1323. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the navigation provisions of the project for the improvement of the Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended, with a view to determining the advisability in the interest of navigation and flood control of increasing the depth of the navigable channel from 9 to 12 feet between Cairo, Ill., and Baton Rouge, La. This report was requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 8, 1943, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on March 9, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 509), to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1324. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a copy of estimate of personnel requirements, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1325. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting the tenth report on the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1326. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to remove the limitation on the right to command of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army which limits such officers to command in that corps, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1327. A letter from the Archvist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1328. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 31, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Detroit River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 20, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1329. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 11, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Detroit River, Mich., with a view to improvement along the easterly shore of Grosse Ile, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 8, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 480. Resolution authorizing the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 166, Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 469. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4381, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2850. A bill to authorize the rezoning of certain property in the District of Columbia as a residential area; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276); to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4219. A bill to provide for the appointment of female pilots and aviation cadets in the Air Forces of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 4455. A bill to provide duplicate posthumous awards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4456. A bill to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4457. A bill to provide that, in disposing of lands which have been acquired by the United States for national defense or war purposes, a preference shall be given to the former owners of such lands or their successors in interest; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of J. G. Power and L. D. Power; to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania introduced bill (H. R. 4459) for the relief of Dominik Tyczkowski, which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5315. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church, of Beaver Falls, Pa., representing approximately 120 persons urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5316. By Mr. HART: Petition of the New Jersey State Bar Association board of trustees, presenting a resolution which they adopted favoring passage of Senate bill 1559 for the appointment of an additional judge for the Third Circuit Court of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5317. By Mr. HORAN: Memorial of both houses of the Washington State Legislature, urging revision of foreign policies to permit return of Jews to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5318. Also, memorial of the Washington State Legislature (lower house), urging postwar road construction; to the Committee on Roads.

5319. Also, memorial of the Washington State House of Representatives, urging constitutional amendment to permit voting at 18; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5320. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of Arthur Brady and 63 others of Harrisburg, Pa., protesting against passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5321. Also, petition of Kenneth J. Condon and 298 others of Harrisburg, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5322. Also, petition of Carl Weisenford and 75 others of Steelton, Pa., sponsored by the Fifth Ward Republican Club, against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5323. Also, petition of Frank English and 54 others of Swatara Station, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5324. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, urging the enactment of omnibus bills H. R. 3917 and S. 1617; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5325. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5326. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of James N. Marshall and nine other residents of Ridgefield, N. J., supporting the American Legion's omnibus bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O patient Father, we pray Thee to ever hold us to the endless truth that he who is willing to lose his life for the sake of some good cause, some duty, some benevolence, shall find it in everlasting remembrance; the workman dies but the work goes on forever. We would register in our hearts the example of the poor widow with her mite and Mary at Bethany. Let us do cheerfully that for which we cannot be paid; Thy recompense transcends all gains of earthly rewards.

In this mistaken world, O God, men have fallen into wrong and wicked paths; teach us self-forgetfulness that we may turn aside from the outward things that perish and reach for that which is an eternal reality. Blessed Lord, let us not allow the millions of Thy children be caught by the undertow of the wild seas of hate and revenge, and those whose homes are devastated by the mad torrents of destruction. Oh, may America glorify our Saviour's name by her sacrificial toil and pity for the nations that are living in dismay and terror, in hunger and darkness, deep and thick. Bring all to that glorious day of prediction when peace shall reign and the earth shall see Thy salvation. In the name of Jesus Christ, St. Mary's Holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1029. An act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 250. An act to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

CHARLES P. KEYSER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, today there is a vacant chair in the press gallery. Charles Phillip Keyser, who has been a familiar figure among Washington newspapermen since the turn of the century, died at his home in Washington Tuesday evening and is being buried this afternoon.

Charlie Keyser as we knew him entered the newspaper field at Mount Sterling, Ill., where he was born, became city editor of a Peoria, Ill., paper, and then joined the staff of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. He was political reporter and covered the Legislatures of Missouri and Illinois for this outstanding newspaper, and then was transferred to Washington. He started his career here during the term of President McKinley in charge of the Washington bureau of the Globe-Democrat. He was known throughout the Nation among the leaders of both parties and was always on duty at the press table at national conventions. Mr. Keyser was a very active member of the Gridiron Club, the White House Correspondents' Association, and was one of the organizers of the National Press Club. While he was rather inactive for the last 2 years, he remained a contributing editor to the newspaper that he had served so long. It was my privilege to be able to call him my close personal friend. He was devoted to his country and was a writer of the old school. An outstanding journalist has passed away. He was a credit to his profession. He was known for his fairness and possessed a personality that made him friends with all he came in contact with. I think some of the happiest days of his life were when he was preparing for the annual Gridiron dinners. He helped to write the skits as well as take an active part with other members of the club during those famous dinners. He leaves a devoted wife and two children. Mrs. Keyser, ever since she came to Washington, has been extremely active among civic organizations, especially those that assist unfortunate people. They have lost a devoted husband and father, and I a close personal friend, and I am sure all his friends join me in extending sympathy to his family in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

[Mr. CANNON of Missouri addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LIGHTERAGE AT PORT OF NEWARK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday I made complaint concerning conditions in New York Harbor with reference to the monopoly of the lighterage business out of the port of

Newark that had been set up by the administrative office of the port of Newark. Major General Farthing, officer in charge at the port of Newark, apparently as a result of my admonition, has advised that the situation is now remedied. I am informed that the work of lighterage in New York Harbor emanating from the port of Newark will now be divided, so that we shall no longer have a monopoly of that business. This indicates the value of Members of Congress pointing out irregularities when they meet with them and having courage enough to come into the well of the House and point them out and give publicity thereto. I am sure Major General Farthing, who is an exemplary officer, for whom I have the highest respect, has seen wisdom in this regard and will make—what I said the other day—a good record of administration in the port of Newark an even better one.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Worcester Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENCE OF SMALL NATIONS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PAPER SHORTAGE

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I note the shrinking size of newspapers from time to time and have heard much concerning the shortage of paper.

I would like to call to the attention of the House an item appearing in a bulletin issued on March 15, 1944, entitled "Sale of Surplus Stocks and Salvage," as follows:

The Jersey City Quartermaster Repair Subdepot, 125 West End Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Paper items—Bid S-55, March 28: Sale of waste materials: Obsolete printed forms, 57 tons white ledger and manila paper, in cartons, located in New York City.

STEPHEN RAUSHENBUSH

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DONDERO addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HOSPITALS AND NURSING

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, gratitude is expressed from the Ninth District of Ohio through its representative in Congress to the departments who have been unusually kind in regard to the hospital housing for the nurses. For a number of weeks and months St. Vincent and Mercy Hospital have been without the proper room for the nurses and we have just been accommodated by the departments. I wish to express my gratitude to Miss De Shetler, who came from Toledo and has spent several days here in field work, as well as to the Sisters of Mercy, to Sister Farley and to Dr. Wagner. When folks cooperate I think we should express our gratitude.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Friday, after the completion of the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article entitled "When Johnnie Comes Marching Home."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therewith certain letters and other data.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. H. Earl Propst, of the United States Department of Agriculture, on farm problems.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on future peace.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the completion of the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HUNGRY HORSE DAM

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 481, Rept. No. 1278) on the bill (H. R. 3570) to provide as an emergency war project, for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3570) to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXPATRIATING PERSONS EVADING MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 482, Rept. No. 1279) on the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House who may be interested, I am happy to advise that the Committee on Petroleum of the House, this week agreed that hearings will soon be held by that committee on the distribution and rationing of oil and gasoline. These hearings are scheduled to begin just as soon as the present hearings on oil production are concluded, probably in about 10 days, and will cover all of the ramifications of the distribution and rationing of gasoline, including the recent order reducing the A rations in the West and Midwest, the black-market angle, and the distribution system, that will be of interest to the Members.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

A TRIBUTE

Mr. Chairman, it is always a privilege in the consideration of an appropriation bill to pay testimony to those who have done so much in the preparation of the measure. First I want to pay my annual tribute to the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER. I have a real affection for him, and I have a great admiration for his intimate knowledge of the measure that is before us. The Members of Congress do not always appreciate the immense amount of painstaking labor and attention to detail that goes into the preparation of this bill. They do not always have a full appreciation of what it means to pilot a measure of such magnitude across the floor. Yet the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, has been so profoundly familiar with all the details and has such a capacity for handling the little controversies that are bound to arise, that he has evoked my admiration over a long period of time. So I feel that it is a privilege to pay public testimony to his diligence and capacity as a public servant. That is equally true of our diligent and devoted committee clerk.

Over and over again I have paid testimony to Arthur Orr who has been in the service of the Government for more than 20 years, and who labors so diligently, early and late, on matters of this kind. The House does not generally know that the committee clerks so often labor until midnight and 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning in order to straighten out that wealth of detail that is necessary before a measure is ready for the floor.

So, to my good chairman and all the members of the committee and to our committee clerk, I once more pay humble testimony for the great work they have done and for the privilege of enjoying their fellowship in the preparation of a bill of this kind.

CONTROVERSY IN OTHER YEARS

On previous bills we have had a great deal of controversy. On one occasion we kept the measure on the floor of the House for 11 days when the Secretary of Agriculture was in Mexico. It caused him no end of difficulty. It ran beyond the end of the fiscal year and he could not even use the travel money provided in the bill and had to come back out of his own pocket. There was a belief, perhaps in some quarters, that it was a sumptuary and arbitrary attitude. With me, however, it was a matter of deep conviction as I belabored the various items in the bill, because I have been so thoroughly wedded to agriculture as a faith, to agriculture as a way of life, to agriculture as the very essence of this rather amorphous thing that we call freedom. It is because I had that intense conviction that I was willing to keep that bill on the floor insofar as my humble talents and my physical energies permitted, indefinitely if necessary, to fight out some of these controversies.

FOOD AND FREEDOM

After all, freedom makes agriculture; freedom makes production. The great problem now, as ever, is to produce sufficient subsistence, not only for ourselves but for the countries with whom we are engaged in this great war effort. You can go back into history and find that we have conquered our food problems in proportion as we have been devoted to freedom of the men who till the soil. Prior to 1800 it was the common thing for people to go to bed hungry. Hunger was accepted as a matter of course. That was only 150 years ago. People thought nothing of it. They thought probably it was one of the providential punishments for the sins of the earth. In that 400-year period just ahead of that, the world experienced seven famines each century, each of which were nearly 10 years in duration. Think of 70 years of famine in a century, for four continuous centuries. Then something happened. We began to get away from the feudal system. Through our own rebellion, men got the right to own land. There was a striving and a stirring in the souls of people who were seeking for this indefinable thing that we call freedom.

FREEDOM AND LAND OWNERSHIP

With the right to till the soil as freemen, with the right to own a portion of the earth's surface, there was stimulated also the inventive genius of people, particularly in this country. The evidence is eloquent on that point. The foundation for our real inventions for farm machinery came in 1820, 1830, and 1840. That is when the real pattern of the reaper, the drill, and mower, and all those instrumentalities of the land were first contrived. So, freedom, plus machinery, plus the right to own land were the great forces that drove back the spectral hand of famine. We have not yet conquered famine in all corners of the earth, but at least in most of the regions of the earth today people do not accept hunger as a matter of course, and go to bed hungry almost every night in the week. That is a testimony to freemen tilling the soil that they own, who receive a fair reward for arduous labor, and are equipped with the machinery that makes the lush soil produce in abundance.

FREEDOM AND MACHINERY

Not even war has stifled the genius for better machinery and greater production. That was true in the Civil War. I think it was Secretary Stanton who said the reaper won the Civil War. In 1861, we produced only 20,000 reapers. It runs in my mind that in 1864 we produced 70,000. It was the reaper that made it possible to subsist our own people notwithstanding the fact that a million people had been taken from the farms to serve in uniform. It was the reaper that made it possible to keep sending food to other sections of the world. That was true of the World War. In 1914 we produced 10,000 tractors, but we continued to progress, and in 1919 we produced 165,000.

Freedom and machinery and the right to own a piece of the world's surface have been the great motivating forces for production. There were no W. P. B.'s in that day. There were not many farm labor problems in that day. There was no undue and restrictive interference by Government.

GOVERNMENT AND PRODUCTION

In proportion as government tinkers with that force there develops trouble and dislocation. The law of compensation and balance always works. Be there scarcity of machinery, then of course, you do not get tillage and you develop black markets. Are taxes too high, it serves as a deterrent on those who devote themselves diligently to the soil. Do we reach in and take the young farmers from the soil and put them in uniform? After a while your production begins to feel the effect of the hand of Selective Service. Always the law of balance and compensation manifests itself. So when we have agricultural problems today they spring, I think, in large measure, from the fact that government too often abitrarily intervenes. Was that not always true?

GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE IN OTHER DAYS

Go back to the days of Diocletian. That is 1,700 years ago. I have stated on this floor before that he was the gentleman who guided the destinies of Rome, and was the progenitor of the O. P. A. He felt it was permanent. He had price ceilings engraved on stones. There are 800 of them that still stand as mute testimony to the mistakes of government more than 1,700 years ago.

What happened? When he interfered with tillage, when he went so far as to set a price ceiling and restrictions upon

all forms of business and agricultural activities from the price of barley to the use of a donkey to carry a given number of pounds 1 mile, then, of course, tillage and production began to fall off. That is when famine and hunger began. It was ever thus.

So I go back to the original premise. One reason why I fought so diligently on some of these agricultural appropriation bills and kept them here so long was because I had a deep and abiding conviction on what I think is the essence of agriculture as a way of life. It becomes a matter of abiding principle.

We go back then to the premise that food is tied up with freedom in agriculture and it must become something more than an academic thing.

We have gone quite far in this bill, I think, in preserving the essential freedom. The committee is virtually unanimous on this bill and I have but a single amendment that does not affect major policy. I am very happy over that fact that we can come here with a bill that we can report unanimously. We are preserving for the man who tills the soil that kind of freedom that is not dominated by bureaus and personnel of Government. That will make real production.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman be kind enough to yield for one short observation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. People who love art always delight in listening to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, whose speech is art in its finest form.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my good friend; I feel truly complimented.

HUMBLE APOSTLE OF FREEDOM

In this connection I want to tell you about a witness who came before our committee. He intrigued me a great deal, first because he was a real farmer; secondly, because he paid his own way to come before the committee; and third, because he was a very humble man who had lived intimately with the soil and who saw the problems and who saw what America required in the days to come. I want to inscribe his name by my words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I think he is so eminently worthy of it. His name is F. W. Boswell, of Wilson, N. C. I think you ought to read his testimony because it is so refreshing. You will find it on page 1420 of the hearings. I want to give you just one or two items therefrom. He said:

> I am a farmer and came right off of my farm, and I left a sweet wife and daughter there when I left. I have plenty of sheep and hogs, and plenty of feed. I paid for a round-trip ticket here to appear before this committee.

He is devoted to soil conservation. He says here he bought a farm for $20 an acre and today he can sell it for $200 an acre. He is truly a farmer. He has made two blades of grass grow where one grew before. He says this about soil conservation:

> Not long ago a man from another county came down to our county and wanted to rent a farm. They asked him if he knew anything about farming and he said: "Of course I do. Why, hell, I have worn out three farms already." This is the reason for so much land that must be reclaimed.

That is so essentially right. The most professorial scholar in the Department could not phrase the problem any better than this humble farmer. Then he said this:

> There are 150 farms in my county that are not rented and are not cultivated.

I wanted to know why they were not cultivated. He said the former occupants had taken work in industrial plants where they could get a dollar and a dollar and a quarter an hour. Then he said:

> But some day they will come back.

Yes; they will come back to the sweet and the lush soil, and so we must find the answer to that challenge when men once more turn their attention to the problem of subsistence and production in the piping times of peace that will follow this global conflict. But is it not refreshing to have a man whose hands are hard with toil pay his own way to the Nation's Capital to appear before a committee and there to tell a humble, persuasive, and convincing story? That is the essence of freedom, that is the essence of our republican form of government where men are so interested in what we do here at the seat of government that at their own expense they come and make their representations before those who are the stewards of the public weal. It revitalizes one's faith in the people of this country.

And so, Mr. Boswell, wherever you may be this morning, God bless you, and all power to you because you are the essence, you are the substance of this great thing we call the Republic of America; you are a worthy testimony to these interesting articles on the Republic by Dr. Beard that have been appearing in Life magazine for the last 5 or 6 weeks.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. May I not add also that the self-sufficiency exemplified by this Mr. Boswell is stimulating?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

There are some things in the bill to which I wish to call attention though in a rather general way. To me, however, they are interesting. One thing to which I wish to call the attention of the membership is the fact that the bill is made up of four kinds of appropriations; they become very confusing even for members of the committee: There are direct appropriations, there are permanent appropriations, there are reappropriations, and there are trust accounts. We make it so hard for ourselves and we develop so much confusion. I do not see why we do not abolish all permanent appropriations. When we set up a permanent appropriation we have also divested Congress of control. We have in a way impaired our own power over the public purse. Some day I think a special committee ought to give some attention to it, ought to explore this great labyrinth of permanent appropriations, and abolish every one of them. Then we could deal with them individually as direct appropriations and revest the control in its entirety over the public purse in this body where it constitutionally belongs.

DISTRIBUTION BY FUNCTIONS

In the aggregate this bill contains about $10,000,000 for administrative purposes, $15,000,000 for extension, $48,000,000 for research. That research item carries out the original purposes of the bill that was signed by Lincoln in 1862 which created the agency of agriculture. I believe the language of that provision is:

> To diffuse useful knowledge among those who till the soil.

So here is $48,000,000 for research, $28,000,000 for forestry, $29,000,000 for war food, $320,000,000 for soil conservation and domestic allotments, and for the Soil Conservation Service.

At this point let me make a confession. I have belabored the soil conservation item a good deal in other years, but since then I have had the privilege of going into many States of the Union and seeing what they are doing. Frankly, I changed my mind, and so I was rather happy about the increase here because I think the farmers and the country are getting their money's worth in the work that Dr. Bennett and the Soil Conservation Service are doing. An open confession is good for the soul. I say very frankly that in other years, perhaps through provincial knowledge or lack of knowledge maybe, I was enlisted on the wrong side. So I am glad to add my voice to this item because I think it is a very worthy service.

There is a little over $7,000,000 for food distribution, and about $60,000,000 for the credit agency.

PERSONNEL IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Let me call your attention to the matter of employment in the Department of Agriculture, for I think you will be interested. In total number there are now 60,858 full-time employees and 15,607 part-time employees. The total therefore is 80,433. This is a rather substantial personnel for one department of the Government.

DISTRIBUTION BY PURPOSES

Let me call your attention to the distribution of the expenditures by purposes, for grants, subsidies, and contributions. Fifty-five percent of this money will be allocated. Nineteen percent goes to investment and loans, 20 percent goes to personal services. Stated in another way $20 out of every $100 we appropriate go to Federal pay roll. It is an indication that in that field there is much to be done in the development of efficiency, economy, and, shall I say, a better bureaucracy? There will always be bureaus of course. Congress must delegate to some ministerial agency certain authority that Congress itself can-

not very well administer; but perhaps we can have better administrators, more efficient administrators, and fewer people to do a better job. This of course redounds to the benefit of the taxpayers of the country.

PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS ARE POSSIBLE

Let me call your attention to the number of employees in the Farm Security Administration, a portion of which has been stricken from this bill, to prove contentions I made in other years. You will remember when I edified you—I hope—with the fact that in 1942 Farm Security had over 19,000 employees. I insisted then that it could operate with a lesser number. In 1943 it had dropped to 14,682, from 19,000. In the fiscal year 1944 it dropped from 14,000 to 11,000. In the fiscal year 1945 our esteemed former colleague, Mr. Hancock, in whom I have an abiding and resolute faith, indicated that he could do his job with 9,514. That is a far cry from 19,000; that is 10,000 fewer people in that agency, and yet if that agency continues it would have more work to do, more loans to administer than it had in 1942. That, I think, is rather eloquent proof that it can be done. Here is a fruitful field for our efforts.

CROP INSURANCE

Mr. Chairman, a word now about crop insurance. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] has introduced a new bill to establish crop insurance, and has varied indemnities and the premium policy therein so as to more nearly approximate the hope that we can get away from losses. You may notice on page 875 of the hearings what crop insurance has cost us on two commodities, namely, wheat and cotton. It is their own testimony that up to June 30, 1944, for administrative expenses and for the excess indemnities over premiums it will have cost us $63,113,040. That is a rather expensive experiment. I felt last year and still feel it should be discontinued, and I sincerely hope the House will sustain the committee. If a bill is reported to revive the Crop Insurance Corporation, I trust that the House will reaffirm the action it took last year and bring this activity to an end. After all, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go if we are going to be the proper husbands of the public purse. The taxpayers, too, in general, are entitled to a break from this Congress.

WAGE STABILIZATION

A word about wage stabilization. You will remember the first word that went out from the War Food Administration that they were going to stabilize farm wages. This is an enormous job. For instance, here is a man working as a laborer on a farm or as a farm helper. In determining the ceiling on his wage, what will you include? Does it include the rent for the house in which he lives and how much rent will you determine for that house? Will you determine as much for that as you would for a piece of property in Northeast Washington or in my home town? Somebody has to determine that. Suppose the owner of that farm gives him a couple of pigs to raise for his subsistence; will those be counted as a part of his emoluments? Suppose he uses the landlord's car to make a weekly trip or a daily trip to the city, will you attach a rent to that car and include it? There are many difficulties that arise. It requires people to resolve all those problems. Then growing bureaucracy, growing control, new orders and regulations start on the march.

At the outset they said that in January this year they had only 9 people working in connection with the function of wage stabilization, but for the fiscal year 1945 they wanted 38 departmental employees and 176 field employees, making a total of 214. So, they had 9 in January of this year and for the next fiscal year they want 214 to stabilize farm wages at a total expenditure of something over $800,000. The committee in its wisdom felt that we should not permit that, and the committee quite unanimously agreed to delete those funds from the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I am in hearty accord with what the gentleman has said with reference to the agricultural wage stabilization matter, but I think it might be interesting to the Committee of the Whole to call attention to the fact that statistics which we have had inserted in the RECORD show that of approximately 2,200,000 farm laborers in the United States 1,900,000 plus receive less than $600 per year and that this project is intended to have to do not with placing any floor under farm wages but with placing a ceiling on farm wages and it could not, therefore, be of any benefit to the vast majority of those who are farm laborers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] expresses my conviction on the subject and I think the consensus of opinion of the entire committee.

GUAYULE

Let me say a word now about rubber. The action that we took disturbed me a little, particularly in light of the testimony given by Colonel Dewey before the Committee on Agriculture only yesterday. Here in a small package is the sum and substance of our guayule activity. When the bill was passed to authorize this venture several years ago we provided $19,000,000 plus in 1943. In 1944 we provided $11,000,000 plus. That is substantially $30,000,000 for the guayule experiment. In 1945 we have an estimate of $5,338,000. Out of that thus far we can show that guayule shrubs from 550 acres have been milled and sold to the Rubber Reserve Company at 27 cents a pound or a total of $236,000 plus; also 200 tons were milled from the wild shrub in Texas.

In starting this experiment they leased 60,000 acres of land. The War Food Administration then became just a little apprehensive about the problem of food and the separation of this acreage from our food domain. They thought, therefore, that some of it ought to be returned, so 28,000 acres was either subleased or returned, leaving 32,000 acres, 70 percent of which is irrigated and 30 percent of which is not irrigated.

If you will consider all of the testimony it was not too impressive. The committee thought perhaps this project should be liquidated. I presume there are some who disagree with that. There are some, no doubt, who feel that this is something in the nature of an insurance investment; on the other hand, I think we are making progress in the field of synthetic rubber.

The last report from the War Production Board given by Colonel Dewey indicates for 1944 it is anticipated that the production of synthetic rubber from Buna S, from butyl, and from Buna N will be 868,900 tons. For 1943 it was 124,000 tons and in the first quarter of 1944 it was 166,000 tons. We therefore produced more synthetic in the first quarter of 1944 than we have in the entire year of 1943. I have confidence that the men who go into the darknesses of the laboratory and who look so keenly on those strange agitations in the test tubes will finally find the answer to this rubber problem.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does the gentleman realize that the deleting of the rubber program, as contemplated in this bill, will in the long run mean the absolute destruction of 30,000 potential tons of real rubber?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether that is true or not. I was not persuaded with the point. I confessed at the outset when I came to this subject matter that I was a little disturbed about it. The committee, however, felt that it had not made the showing that it should for one reason or another and that perhaps it ought to be liquidated now, since it is a long-range program which will be of meager value to the war effort and will always be a costly venture.

Mr. OUTLAND. Is it not true that the experiments that have been taking place in reference to guayule practically started from scratch, that it was originally supposed that it would take at least 7 years to bring guayule into full production? Now it has been grown for only 3 or 4 years of that time and it is being cut down. Therefore, have we any evidence thus far to base an assumption that the guayule program should be discontinued?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We know, of course, that it was an emergency program, we know it was designed to bring some relief if this war lasted too long; so we may say it is not going to be very productive in the course of the present conflict.

Mr. OUTLAND. What has been the recommendation of the Rubber Director upon this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not recall that we had that. I will ask the gentleman

from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to refresh my memory. I do not know whether we had any direct recommendation from Colonel Dewey himself or not. You see, this part of the program was handled by the Forest Service, so the testimony came from Mr Granger of that agency

Mr. TARVER. I think the evidence disclosed that the Rubber Director thought it should be continued for a period of 7 years, the liquidation not to be attempted prior to the expiration of this 7-year period; however, I feel that if the membership of the House will examine all of the facts detailed in the hearings they will arrive at the conclusion that was the result of the committee's deliberations, that is, that there is no reason to anticipate the production of any substantial amount of rubber for use during the period of this emergency by continuing a program upon which we have already spent approximately $45,000,000. These people in charge of the emergency rubber program are interested in the matter, of course, and they want it continued.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. OUTLAND. May I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is brief.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the fact that this House has only recently authorized a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture to make a complete study of the guayule project, that it might have been wiser to suspend this particular part of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, I would have to answer that by saying it is a matter of opinion. I recognize that there is sentiment on both sides of the question.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

I want to raise one question with the House. We carry a provision here for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation, as you know, is a Delaware corporation. It was created by Executive order. The statutory authority for that order is the National Industrial Recovery Act. It has always seemed strange to me that a corporation chartered under the laws of the State could be given the power to pledge and to hypothecate the credit of the Government of the United States.

We have a good many corporations today of all kinds. They have a variety of authority. It becomes so bewildering that probably no man in Government can spell them out. They employ nearly 100,000 people today. They have pledged the credit of this Government contingently for nearly seventeen thousand million dollars. It is a fiscal wilderness, and one of the things that either the Committee on Appropriations could do or this House could do would be to authorize an exploration of that governmental corporate wilderness to see where we are, how deeply we are contingently indebted today and whether or not some order can be brought out of confusion and, so that we get a better and crystal-clear picture of what we do when we pass these amendments that go across the floor frequently to basic law that does something for or to these corporations in the form of extended authority and more money. I think it would be a very fruitful field of investigation.

AGRICULTURAL YEARBOOKS

You may know that we have authorized the printing of additional agricultural yearbooks titled "Keeping Livestock Healthy." There has been a tremendous demand for it. It is not one of these books that lasts today or tomorrow. It will be just as good, just as authoritative, just as useful 50 years from now as it will be today.

I notice that one of the young gentlemen of the press dealt with the matter recently and indicated that we were authorizing the use of a lot of paper for this purpose at a time when there was a paper shortage. If I remember correctly, he expressed it in terms of how much paper this would supply to the newspaper in my home town, the Pekin Daily Times, which, incidentally, is a very great newspaper, under the leadership of a very fine editor. He had it translated into those terms and figured that the yearbook paper would supply that daily newspaper for 2 years. There is an answer to it, and I think you should have it.

I asked the Government Printing Office to give me some idea of the amount of money expended by the agencies of the Government for paper. Congress spends $410,000. Keep that figure in mind. The Department of Commerce spends $1,447,000. That is 3½ times as much. The Navy Department spends $4,479,000 for paper. That is 10 times as much. The War Department spends $9,810,000. That is 23 times as much. The Department of Agriculture spends $642,000 for paper. The National Housing Agency spends $196,000 for paper. The Office of War Information spends $261,000 for paper.

Every morning, after I go through all these gaudy releases that come to my desk, printed in two or three colors, lovely booklets that are so eloquent of the typographical handicraft, mimeographs by the ton, they go into the wastebasket, after a suitable examination to see that the grains of wheat are culled from the chaff. It eases my conscience a good deal to be one of those who has approved the issuance of additional yearbooks for the men who are the stewards of millions of head of livestock in the country, to subsist not only the civilian population but the Army and the Navy as well; men who can look in that book, an authoritative book, and so often find the answer for a slight malady that gets into the herd or in his flock of chickens or sheep, or that may affect some other farm animal and fowl. I think it is one of the good investments that the Congress has made, because the work is scientific, useful, and durable, I can think of many other ways of saving paper which are far more constructive.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Last year the bill carried the same language, that "Keeping Livestock Alive" should be furnished during 1943. It was not done. Consequently, many of us had promised our good constituents that we would get that book and send it to them. Now, how am I going to transfer the blame from me to somebody else in that regard?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Being one of charitable impulse, I suggest that the gentleman fasten the blame partly on the Public Printer, partly on me, and partly on the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I would not place any blame on the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The explanation is simple indeed.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Tell the truth about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They did not have sufficient capacity in the Government Printing Office, so they were going to contract for the yearbook. When they got the bids they found some difficulty in remaining within the authorized amount, so the Public Printer came before us very recently, and then, after examining into the statement and looking into the bids, we authorized him to go ahead.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Can I keep on making this false promise now henceforth?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will not be a false promise. It will be a deferred promise, because it will probably eventuate in October or November.

Mr. GILCHRIST. There is a difference between a false promise and a prevarication you know.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I think it should appear in the RECORD that the bid which is being accepted by the Public Printer at this time is within the limits of the appropriation provided in the bill for the current fiscal year, and it is anticipated that deliveries of the yearbook will begin about October of the present year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr ANDERSON of California. I thoroughly enjoyed the gentleman's remarks about the claptrap coming to our office every morning. Could not Congress cut down the amount of paper used for that purpose by reducing very materially the amount of money appropriated for printing and binding in these appropriation bills?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I will say that the committee has labored diligently with this matter. We had it up with the Budget any number of times. It is pretty difficult when a department says, "We need so much for printing and binding,"

to say, "Well you can cut that just half in two." Then the invariable answer is that you cripple their functions. So, until we have more investigators to investigate into it and get the story at the other end, there will be some measure of guesswork in it.

PUBLIC LAND ACQUISITIONS

One other item I want to bring to your attention. It impressed itself on me when I was privileged to revel in the great open spaces of the western region of the country. People were talking about the vast amount of land that is acquired by the Federal Government. I think you ought to have the story.

Uncle Sam, as of January 30, 1943, owned 383,600,000 acres of land. That is the equivalent of the entire area of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Ohio, Alabama, Kentucky, and Indiana.

The Federal Government owns 20 percent of the whole land area of this country. Three agencies are at the top. The Department of Agriculture owns and administers 162,752,000 acres. The Department of the Interior owns and administers 205,000,000 acres. The War Department owns and administers 6,316,000 acres. The Tennessee Valley Authority embraces 626,000 acres. Now, look what it means to some of these States.

Forty-two percent of the State of Arizona belongs to Uncle Sam. This means that 42 out of every 100 acres in the State are federally owned. Forty-one percent of the State of California is owned by the Federal Government, 34 percent of the State of Colorado, and 78 percent of the whole domain of Nevada belongs to Uncle Sam.

I could recite the rest of the States, but that is sufficient to indicate that this question of land acquisition is, in my judgment, deserving of scrutiny and attention. I have watched this bill pretty closely. If I thought there was a single acre to be acquired, I lifted my voice in protest. We are permitting some of the agencies in this bill to perfect some of the land condemnations that were made before 1942 and to perfect the title. I notice that the people in the Western States are getting vocal on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

They are particularly vocal since Mr. O'MAHONEY's article appeared in Readers Digest, stating that Uncle Sam was going to take over Jackson Hole, in Wyoming, that the country was being remade, and that the people will not like it. No; they will not like it. They do not like it. They are beginning to say so already. That is why you see a resurgence of fundamental thinking in the country today. They are becoming afraid of a centralized and overweening government that may some day imperil their freedom.

A summarization of our Federal land holdings as of June 30, 1940, may be of interest to the Members if it has not already come to your attention and I therefore include it for all of the States:

TABLE III.—*Record of Federal real estate, by States*[1] *(as of June 30, 1940)*

State	Number of projects	Number of counties	Number of— Counties having Federal projects	Number of— Cities having Federal projects	Acreage of Federal real estate: Public domain	Otherwise acquired (purchase, condemnation, donation, etc.): Rural	Otherwise acquired (purchase, condemnation, donation, etc.): Urban	Total	Acreage of State: Total	Acreage of State: Federal	Cost of Federal real estate: Land	Improvements	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
										Percent			
Alabama	370	67	66	73	44, 516	884, 253	1, 771	930, 540	32, 818, 560	2. 84	$29, 590, 781	$142, 168, 947	$171, 759, 728
Arizona	189	14	14	16	30, 585, 679	356, 432	46	30, 942, 157	72, 838, 400	42. 48	1, 476, 241	131, 387, 502	132, 863, 743
Arkansas	227	75	72	59	1, 123, 215	1, 390, 690	1, 231	2, 515, 136	33, 616, 000	7. 48	6, 248, 533	32, 109, 381	38, 357, 914
California	800	58	58	150	39, 946, 071	1, 004, 885	8, 538	40, 959, 494	99, 617, 280	41. 12	28, 342, 167	319, 956, 791	348, 298, 958
Colorado	326	63	62	55	22, 073, 138	744, 574	76	22, 817, 788	66, 341, 120	34. 39	5, 308, 187	65, 352, 680	70, 660, 867
Connecticut	138	8	8	48	----------	429	305	734	3, 084, 800	. 02	3, 524, 035	18, 127, 635	21, 651, 670
Delaware	70	3	3	14	----------	27, 137	9	27, 146	1, 257, 600	2. 16	3, 620, 136	15, 158, 466	18, 778, 602
District of Columbia	972	----------	----------	1	----------	----------	11, 146	11, 146	44, 320	25. 15	101, 461, 058	436, 784, 457	538, 245, 515
Florida	315	67	66	55	216, 609	1, 556, 135	1, 549	1, 774, 293	35, 111, 040	5. 05	6, 123, 571	67, 888, 603	74, 012, 174
Georgia	317	159	121	95	----------	1, 160, 350	537	1, 160, 887	37, 584, 000	3. 09	12, 947, 934	64, 075, 274	77, 023, 208
Idaho	299	44	44	46	31, 307, 132	1, 099, 084	822	32, 407, 038	53, 346, 560	60. 75	4, 130, 881	56, 327, 525	60, 458, 406
Illinois	415	102	97	181	----------	288, 406	3, 395	291, 801	35, 867, 520	. 81	22, 694, 632	191, 140, 873	213, 835, 505
Indiana	229	92	88	108	----------	62, 901	355	63, 256	23, 068, 800	. 27	5, 190, 977	39, 465, 424	44, 656, 401
Iowa	189	99	90	103	----------	58, 121	848	58, 969	35, 575, 040	. 17	4, 321, 557	29, 772, 352	34, 093, 909
Kansas	143	105	71	70	25, 618	69, 046	98	94, 762	52, 335, 360	. 18	1, 740, 674	40, 468, 927	42, 209, 601
Kentucky	226	120	95	75	----------	583, 545	1, 118	584, 663	25, 715, 840	2. 27	10, 149, 324	55, 957, 078	66, 106, 402
Louisiana	227	64	56	52	14, 566	1, 037, 738	473	1, 052, 777	29, 961, 760	3. 62	13, 860, 495	115, 643, 948	129, 504, 443
Maine	220	16	16	66	----------	98, 432	1, 062	99, 494	19, 132, 800	. 52	2, 624, 853	34, 136, 019	36, 760, 872
Maryland	143	24	22	30	----------	124, 107	711	124, 818	6, 362, 240	1. 96	13, 349, 269	135, 578, 180	148, 927, 449
Massachusetts	281	14	14	108	----------	13, 106	2, 513	15, 619	5, 144, 960	. 03	31, 190, 233	135, 859, 379	167, 049, 612
Michigan	470	83	81	115	122, 185	2, 169, 728	774	2, 292, 687	36, 787, 200	. 62	13, 985, 698	68, 447, 626	82, 433, 324
Minnesota	246	87	70	79	1, 431, 377	1, 670, 143	1, 985	3, 103, 505	51, 749, 120	6. 00	9, 975, 193	43, 901, 154	53, 876, 347
Mississippi	321	82	79	76	9, 671	1, 234, 250	904	1, 244, 825	29, 671, 680	4. 20	8, 906, 477	29, 373, 802	38, 280, 279
Missouri	289	114	96	93	----------	1, 351, 233	385	1, 351, 618	43, 985, 280	3. 07	19, 539, 941	63, 914, 048	83, 453, 989
Montana	381	56	56	35	24, 927, 361	1, 760, 697	53	26, 688, 111	93, 523, 840	28. 54	7, 040, 929	119, 395, 653	126, 436, 582
Nebraska	148	93	68	48	259, 216	197, 827	182	457, 225	49, 157, 120	. 93	2, 782, 747	22, 178, 813	24, 961, 560
Nevada	158	17	17	13	54, 960, 302	119, 685	28	55, 080, 015	70, 285, 440	78. 37	948, 179	72, 998, 687	73, 946, 866
New Hampshire	56	10	10	27	----------	668, 233	69	668, 302	5, 779, 840	11. 56	6, 111, 857	5, 941, 514	12, 053, 371
New Jersey	270	21	20	100	----------	26, 693	604	27, 297	4, 808, 960	. 57	11, 237, 652	84, 003, 663	95, 241, 315
New Mexico	231	31	31	17	24, 970, 692	1, 388, 399	35	26, 359, 126	78, 401, 920	33. 62	3, 191, 170	53, 493, 280	56, 684, 450
New York	638	62	61	198	----------	87, 240	5, 435	92, 675	30, 498, 560	. 30	80, 110, 844	302, 549, 301	382, 660, 145
North Carolina	275	100	89	89	----------	1, 469, 302	366	1, 469, 668	31, 193, 600	4. 71	19, 380, 121	62, 919, 283	82, 299, 404
North Dakota	179	53	48	30	194, 564	769, 119	304	963, 987	44, 917, 120	2. 15	4, 287, 716	9, 202, 109	13, 489, 825
Ohio	393	88	88	160	----------	91, 463	1, 199	92, 662	26, 073, 600	. 36	18, 206, 648	109, 971, 645	128, 178, 293
Oklahoma	239	77	73	69	171, 240	245, 850	136	417, 226	44, 424, 960	. 94	4, 661, 057	32, 086, 011	36, 747, 068
Oregon	384	36	36	44	26, 629, 080	795, 965	168	27, 425, 213	61, 188, 480	44. 82	7, 649, 130	113, 811, 909	121, 461, 039
Pennsylvania	429	67	63	208	----------	520, 075	2, 406	522, 481	28, 692, 480	1. 82	27, 790, 998	153, 833, 611	181, 624, 609
Rhode Island	69	5	5	16	----------	10, 039	56	10, 095	682, 880	1. 48	2, 245, 034	18, 324, 540	20, 569, 574
South Carolina	177	46	44	46	----------	719, 069	98	719, 167	19, 516, 800	3. 68	6, 835, 336	37, 214, 166	44, 049, 502
South Dakota	127	69	53	29	1, 762, 786	545, 728	20	2, 308, 534	49, 195, 520	4. 69	3, 127, 759	18, 710, 580	21, 838, 339
Tennessee	468	95	92	120	----------	1, 095, 131	2, 814	1, 097, 945	26, 679, 680	4. 12	43, 838, 607	164, 245, 991	208, 084, 598
Texas	514	254	167	171	----------	910, 416	3, 495	913, 911	167, 934, 720	. 54	15, 528, 953	116, 292, 830	131, 821, 783
Utah	249	29	29	30	35, 565, 121	200, 123	120	35, 765, 364	52, 597, 760	68. 00	2, 443, 281	33, 808, 811	36, 252, 092
Vermont	73	14	12	28	----------	168, 671	33	168, 704	5, 839, 360	2. 89	2, 245, 826	7, 673, 317	9, 919, 143
Virginia	366	100	85	72	----------	1, 612, 365	2, 762	1, 615, 127	25, 767, 680	6. 27	34, 770, 505	209, 180, 370	243, 950, 875
Washington	418	39	39	67	10, 413, 076	669. 324	3, 469	11, 085, 869	42, 775, 040	25. 92	8, 627, 433	163, 999, 367	172, 626, 800
West Virginia	152	55	45	63	----------	905, 223	556	905, 779	15, 374, 080	5. 89	7, 337, 234	63, 159, 033	70, 496, 267
Wisconsin	320	71	67	103	14, 960	1, 479, 518	2, 581	1, 497, 059	35, 363, 840	4. 23	9, 060, 711	46, 775, 683	55, 836, 394
Wyoming	202	23	23	35	28, 219, 256	319, 226	1, 112	28, 539, 594	62, 430, 720	45. 71	1, 761, 657	55, 005, 491	56, 767, 148
Total	14, 338	3, 071	---------	---------	334, 987, 431	33, 760, 106	68, 752	368, 816, 289	1, 903, 221, 280	19. 38[2]	691, 524, 231	[2]4, 409, 771, 729	[2]5, 101, 295. 96

[1] Federal Works Agency computations.

[2] Does not include cost of public domain.

FREEDOM

Let me close my observations on the same note with which they began—the note of freedom which is the very essence of a sound, stable, sturdy, prosperous agriculture. It is quite in point to direct your attention to a notice which reached my desk this morning, signed by five Members of the House. They announce a meeting this afternoon at 3 o'clock in the Agricultural Committee room.

The subjects for discussion will be (1) the threat that farmers' sons will be recommended for draft unless they sign up for the triple A; (2) the threat to deny them gasoline unless they sign up for the triple A; and (3) the suing of farmers in the United States district courts in connection with the unconstitutional penalty tax.

It is no great tribute by Government to the patriot farmers of the country, who work long, hard hours, who buy bonds, who surrender their sons for military service, who carry on that you and I, the men in the services in all the far-flung corners of the earth may have subsistence, that those who are engaged with us in this gigantic war effort may have subsistence, that some officer of Government should say, "Unless you sign up for a program, we will take your boy, or we will not give you gasoline." That is not a happy testimony to freedom. Something must be done about it. That is the responsibility of us in the legislative branch. May we not fail in our responsibility to the freedom-loving people of the country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In connection with the letter the gentleman has just read, may I say that I have in my files in my office a copy of a letter written by a draft board which says to a farmer, "You must report and join the triple A within 5 days or we will classify you I–A for military service."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope the gentleman will make some comment to the House on that, because it is vital.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I add a word to what I have already said, that Paderewski never played upon the piano with greater skill than this gentleman from Illinois plays upon the heart strings and the imagination of the people who hear him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I fortunately came into this Committee just as my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] began his speech. I enjoyed very much the splendid presentation he has made in respect to the bill which is now before the Committee. I always enjoy hearing our distinguished colleague make a speech. I often find myself ready to agree with his viewpoint about many matters.

I have been a Member of this House for 20 years and I have heard a great many able debates here. I recognize that during my service here there have been many outstanding students in this body and I always listen with great pleasure to their scholarly addresses. I make no mistake when I assert that our distinguished colleague from Illinois who has just addressed the Committee is one of the outstanding debaters who have been here in the 20 years in which I have been in Congress. He is one of the best students, in my opinion, who has adorned this House at any time, and certainly one of the most intellectual men we have had here in a number of years. This is what I think of him and this is how I apprise the statements he makes in this body. His fellow Members are always glad to hear him because he is an outstanding Member of our great body.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague for the compliment he has just paid one of my constituents on this floor. I have made it the purpose of my life to say nice things about people. I often look back over my life and enjoy the nice things I have said about my friends. I never intend to breach this habit. The gentleman from Illinois has just spoken of a constituent of mine, Mr. F. W. Boswell, of Wilson County, N. C., who came here a modest, genuine farmer, and appeared before this committee recently. Mr. Boswell came into my office, and I did not realize what he was doing in Washington. He is a busy man at home and has always been a busy man. He is a man who has had the respect and the confidence of the people in his county and throughout the whole State of North Carolina. Several times the able people in the county in which he resides have sent him to the Legislature of North Carolina because of his practical sense, his fine characteristics, and his successful career in life.

I was glad that he had come here to speak to our subcommittee in respect to this important soil conservation program, which he says, and which I believe, is one of the outstanding and most wonderful things we have done here in the last 50 years. Mr. Boswell deserves the compliment paid him by my distinguished colleague from Illinois. I want this House to know that he is an intimate friend of mine and has been for many years and I consider him one of the best citizens and one of the outstanding men in my great State.

I deeply appreciate the splendid reception given Mr. Boswell by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, when he appeared before this committee, and the comments of the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, made and other members of the committee in respect to Mr. Boswell's appearance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I always dislike to disagree with my friends of the subcommittee for agricultural appropriations, but I do take exception to their action this year in suggesting the immediate liquidation of the guayule emergency rubber project. I am glad to note that my friend from Illinois, the distinguished gentleman, Mr. DIRKSEN, is a little bit disturbed over the action that has been taken. I hope that other members of the subcommittee will find that their conscience also bothers them just a little bit, because I think the action recommended in this bill is a long step backward in what might have proved to be a very forward-looking program. As soon as I learned of the action that had been suggested by the committee, I called the office of the Rubber Director, Mr. Bradley Dewey. Mr. Dewey said to me that he was horrified. I said, "Don't you think they have taken the uneconomic way out of this question?" He said, "I do not see that economics enters into it so much," but he added, "Does not someone believe in a rubber insurance program?"

Yesterday morning in testifying before the Poage subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, Mr. Dewey submitted a memorandum in connection with the present status of the emergency rubber program and he closed with this warning note, which I should like to read into the RECORD. He said:

I do not take any position on guayule as a commercial post-war crop, but as Rubber Director I believe I would be derelict in my duty if I were to allow to pass without protest a decision that at this time would liquidate any supplies of crude rubber, whether growing in American fields or stored in warehouses.

I was interested to hear the distinguished gentleman from Illinois state that in this bill is contained $48,000,000 for research. Well, if the domestic production of rubber from guayule is not an important research activity, what would you call it?

I think most of the Members of the House will recall that only a short time ago, we authorized the appropriation of $30,000,000 to develop fuel oil from coal and shale and other sources. I wonder how many hundreds of millions of dollars we have appropriated for the development of synthetic rubber. It seems to me particularly short-sighted at this time to do away entirely with the program which consists of approximately 30,000 tons of potential rubber now growing in the United States.

Let us look briefly at the history of the entire guayule program. The bill was signed by the President on March 5, 1942, just a little over 2 years ago. That authorization contained a provision for the planting of 75,000 acres in the United States. That was later amended to 500,000 acres following the favorable report of the Baruch committee, which recommended the expansion of the project. The Forest Service started taking

over some valuable food-crop land in our Western States and ran squarely into our emergency food program. The Rubber Director and the Secretary of Agriculture curtailed the program, and we now have growing in the United States approximately 33,000 acres of guayule shrub.

Now it was carefully explained to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and it was most thoroughly explained to the House of Representatives when the bill was first presented, that we could not expect an immediate supply of rubber from guayule, that it takes a period of time to grow, that the most economic time for harvesting it is after 4 or 5 years in the field. But why at this particular time, with rubber as short as it is and with our crude rubber inventory falling annually, we should destroy the potential 30,000 tons of rubber now growing is utterly incomprehensible to me.

In this connection I would like to quote from a letter which I just received from the Director of this program, Mr. C. M. Granger, of the United States Forest Service. He submits several plans for liquidating the project over varying periods of years, and I shall insert his letter at this point.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 21, 1944.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: In response to your letter of March 20 concerning the guayule project, I am glad to provide you the following information.

The estimate of $5,420,000 for fiscal year 1945 submitted to Congress by the Budget Bureau provided for erection of one new mill in the Bakersfield area; operating that mill and the Salinas mill during the harvest season of 1944–45 to produce an estimated 700 tons of rubber; maintenance of the remaining approximately 29,000 acres of existing plantations for future harvesting; and continuance of research on producing guayule shrub and processing it into rubber, with a view to probable completion of research in fiscal year 1945. Since Congress last December denied funds for an expansion of the project, the Rubber Director informally asked the Department to prepare a program of liquidation of existing plantations which would produce the maximum quantity of rubber at the lowest net cost per pound. This was done, as follows:

Fiscal year	Harvest, acres	Rubber production, long tons	Estimated cost
1945	2,587	720	$5,470,000
1946	3,915	3,067	4,857,000
1947	4,880	4,468	3,410,000
1948	4,585	5,009	2,996,000
1949	4,311	5,280	2,663,000
1950	6,113	5,569	2,528,000
1951	5,549	4,825	2,178,000
Estimated total rubber production		28,938	
Estimated total cost, fiscal years 1945–51			24,104,000
Estimated cost, fiscal years 1942–44			33,049,331
Total			57,153,331

Under this plan it is estimated there would be an approximate salvage value of $5,000,000 in improvements and equipment, and a realization from the sale of 64,822,000 pounds of rubber at 27 cents per pound of $17,501,940, which combined would provide a credit of $22,501,940 against the estimated total outlay for the project, including liquidation, of $57,153,331, making net cost of 53 cents per pound of rubber.

If it were decided to harvest all shrub in the next 2 years, as a means of quick liquidation instead of plowing up the shrub, it is estimated that it would require nine large new mills to be designed at once and erected as rapidly as possible. The additional cost of liquidation under this plan during the 2-year period is estimated at approximately $22,000,000. About 10,000 long tons of rubber might be produced. Allowing for a salvage of $5,000,000 and receipts from the sale of rubber of $6,048,000, the net estimated expenditures not recoverable for the entire guayule project would be approximately $43,892,700, or $1.96 per pound for the rubber produced.

The project has already produced about 613 tons of rubber from old shrub at Salinas, and Texas wild shrub which has been sold to Rubber Reserve Company.

The estimated total amount of rubber which would be produced by the project if the liquidation plan favored by the Rubber Director were adopted would be equivalent to the quantity used in making 5,400,000 ordinary (600 by 16) passenger-car tires.

Very sincerely yours,

LYLE F. WATTS,
Chief.
By C. M. GRANGER.

Now, let me quote one paragraph:

Under this plan it is estimated there would be an approximate salvage value of $5,000,000 in improvements and equipment and a realization from the sale of 64,822,000 pounds of rubber at 27 cents per pound of $17,501,940, which combined would provide a credit of $22,501,940 against the estimated total outlay for the project, including liquidation, of $57,153,331, making the net cost 53 cents a pound for rubber.

May I respectfully invite your attention to the fact that today we are paying 63 cents a pound for rubber imported from South America.

So far we have spent approximately $33,000,000 during the fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944. The Forest Service requests $22,000,000 additional for the 7-year liquidation program. If the project is to be liquidated let us do it in a manner that will bring some sort of a return on our investment. We should not plow these 33,000 acres under. Let us produce it. Let us go through an orderly process of liquidation and find out whether or not it is possible for our farmers to produce this in the post-war world. Why liquidate a research program that has been so well established up to the present date? As the chairman of the committee stated yesterday, we have already refined 613 tons of rubber from approximately 500 acres of old shrub in California and some wild shrub in Texas.

Now, who endorsed this program? What Government agencies were interested in the emergency rubber program? The House did not have to accept my statement in connection with this, but they did accept the statements of interested Federal agencies. The Department of Commerce endorsed it. The United States Tariff Commission endorsed it. The Navy Department endorsed it. The Big Four—General Rubber Co., Goodrich Rubber Co., Goodyear Rubber Co. and the Firestone Rubber Co. endorsed it. The Bureau of the Budget gave it its approval. The Department of Agriculture endorsed it. The Committee on Agriculture endorsed it and reported it to the House and it was passed and signed by the President.

There is one more report which I should like to call to the attention of the House, because I do not want them to accept my statements on this as a rubber expert. I do not claim to be a rubber expert.

Back in 1930, when this country was beginning to worry a little bit about the fact that it was entirely dependent for rubber on sources far removed in the western Pacific, then Maj. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Maj. Gilbert Van B. Willkes, of the United States Army, conducted a thorough investigation of guayule production in Mexico, Texas, and California. Following the report that they filed, nothing was done. That was unfortunate as time and experience have shown. I would like to quote briefly several paragraphs from the recommendations made by General Eisenhower, who is now leading our forces in England. He said, in part, as follows:

The Government might be interested in encouraging the guayule industry in the United States in view of:

The opportunity to build up a domestic source of supply for rubber so that in a grave emergency we would not be wholly dependent on southeast Asia and the adjoining islands for this important raw material.

The opportunity to build up a domestic source of supply of rubber so that American consumers would have some protection against possible commercial combines between the great rubber producing companies of the Far East.

The possibility of building up an industry in the United States that would give profitable employment to some thousands of American farmers, mechanics, and laborers. We send some two to three hundred million dollars annually to foreign countries to pay for rubber which we import.

And, I might add, we pay the price they set because we have no lever here at home to pry with when it comes to negotiating.

Another point raised by General Eisenhower is as follows:

The precarious position of the United States in depending entirely on the continued health of hevea trees in the Middle East now producing 96 percent of the world's supply of rubber.

Adding even 10 percent to the total annual supply of rubber by means of cultivated guayule would mean much lower prices for the remaining 90 percent, with the United States, as a consuming country, greatly benefited.

Mr. Chairman, when the original bill authorizing this project was before the House, I made the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position on this subject absolutely clear to every Member of the House. I would still be urging the adoption of this legislation if there was no war on and if our supply of rubber from the East Indies had not been threatened. In my opinion it is extremely unwise for the United States to continue to ignore the possibility of producing a certain percentage of the rubber it needs within its own

borders. We are completely at the mercy of an international rubber cartel, a rubber monopoly, and in spite of the cost of production of imported rubber this monopoly sets the price and we pay it.

In spite of all reports to the contrary, I cannot share the beautiful optimism of those who say that we are not going to be kicked out of the southwest Pacific, and our rubber is going to continue to arrive. There is no Member of the House that I give way to in my desire to settle this issue in the southwest Pacific just as soon as possible and get back our natural supply of rubber as soon as possible, but at the same time I think that as long as this guayule plan presents an avenue of securing an additional supply of natural rubber, we should take advantage of it.

I still think that was pretty good logic.

One last point in General Eisenhower's report which I hope you will all listen to carefully. This was in 1930:

> At present no one believes that the United States will, in this or the next generation, produce annually the major part of the rubber we consume. But if the guayule industry could develop to the point where approximately 400,000 acres were devoted to the growth of guayule we would produce annually almost 160,000,000 pounds of rubber and have in reserve at all times not less than 250,000,000 pounds. The existence of these conditions would in the event of a war where our overseas communications were interrupted be of inestimable value to the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The recommendations I have quoted are not my personal opinions. They are the opinions of men who have gone into this subject thoroughly and carefully over a period of many years. It seems to me to be a particularly short-sighted policy for us at this time to eliminate this splendid research program. I do not intend to offer an amendment to this bill. The responsibility for discontinuing the emergency rubber project rests with the committee. However, I do hope that at the other end of the Capitol, at a later date, and as a result of investigations now under way, this very vital program will be reinstated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

CABINET MEMBERS IN CONGRESS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, St. Paul tells us that the Athenians congregated daily at the Areopagus on Mars' Hill "to hear and to tell some new thing." That interest, that passion for something new has continued down through the ages to the present day. It is fortunate that it has, for without it progress would have been slow if not impossible. That is particularly true of systems of government. No day is complete without suggestions of some new thing in governmental structure or procedure. In every Congress—from the First to the Seventy-eighth—resolutions have been introduced, and propositions submitted orally, for amendment or revision of the Rules of the House. And all improvements in the rules, and in House procedure, have resulted from such resolutions and suggestions.

The latest—and the most important proposed in recent years—is the resolution introduced by Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, establishing procedure under which invitations would be extended to Cabinet members and heads of Government agencies to appear before the House of Representatives for questioning.

In brief, the plan provides for a question period at least once every fortnight, but not oftener than once a week, at which heads of departments and independent agencies would be invited to attend and answer questions propounded by Members of the House. The date and duration of the periods would be determined by the Committee on Rules and the time would be equally divided between written and oral questions. The written questions would be reviewed and submitted by the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter and issuing the invitation and would be printed in advance in two daily editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The oral questions would be submitted from the floor by Members of the House in time controlled equally by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee extending the invitation.

The purpose of this rather drastic—and to some extent iconoclastic—innovation, and the benefits sought to be secured, are the establishment of a closer relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, the diffusion of more accurate and authoritative information on governmental affairs, both in the Congress and the country at large, the conservation of the time of executives and legislators and the better administration and control of departmental activity and expenditure.

It is argued that perhaps while the plan may not be considered a sovereign remedy for all governmental and parliamentary ills, it will at least be productive of no particularly disqualifying evils, and that it may embody possibilities of great potential advantage.

The resolution is painstakingly prepared and admirably framed, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is to be commended on his constructive proposal and its scholarly presentation. He has rendered a distinct service in bringing it to an issue.

The proposal has aroused widespread interest. It has been editorially reviewed by practically every metropolitan newspaper and radio commentator in the country. It has been sympathetically debated in the House and numerous magazine articles and newspaper editorials have been reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In a Gallup-poll survey 72 percent of the representative citizens questioned favored the proposal, and an inconsequential number opposed it. Few proposals in recent years have met with such general and generous consideration and approval by students of government and the political writers of the day. In all the Nation-wide editorial comment on the resolution there is not a single sentence of criticism or dissent. In the debate on the floor of the House, although the resolution might well be considered a highly mooted question, no opposition has been expressed and no controversial issues have been raised. It has met everywhere with universal acquiescence and acclaim.

The experience and practice of the British House of Commons, however, so frequently cited in support of the proposition, is not in point. There are fundamental and organic differences between the American and English systems of government which render many of the practices of one inapplicable to the other. The question period is one of them. In England the Cabinet is wholly independent of the Crown, whereas under our Government the Cabinet is a mere appendage of the Presidency, appointed by the Executive, subject to direction or dismissal at any time, and without authority to speak for the administration. The members of the British Cabinet are members of Parliament and exercise both legislative and administrative authority. The American Cabinet is per se without either. There the Cabinet, while the creature of the House of Commons, and holding office at the pleasure of that body, dominates the Parliament, acts as a steering committee, lays out the agenda, appoints the standing committees, controls all major legislation, and rules the nation. Under such a system, the right to question on the floor and, by vote of lack of confidence, to dismiss the ministry is a vital and indispensable part of governmental machinery.

On the contrary, under our own form of government, the question period does not conform to parliamentary requirements and is not only unneeded but would be disruptive and dangerous.

Congress already has authority and machinery with which to secure any needed information from the departments and has other and better adapted methods and more efficient agencies at hand than any which would be afforded by the proposed question period.

First. The resolution of inquiry, in use since the beginning of the Republic and codified in 1820 is specifically designed to serve precisely the purpose for which the question period is proposed. Under this rule—section 5 of rule XXII—any Member of the House may submit a resolution requesting information from the head of any of the executive departments and the committee having jurisdiction is required to report it within 1 week—less time than would be required to bring a Cabinet member to the floor under the pending resolution. If the committee refuses or neglects to report it within the 7 days or reports it adversely, a motion to discharge the committee is privileged. Such resolutions invariably elicit the information requested. Even the President himself, although exempted where the information requested is "incompatible with the public welfare" has usually complied with the request even to the transmittal of minutes of Cabinet meetings, data which could not be obtained under any circumstances during the proposed question period.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In just a moment.

The resolution of inquiry is a drastic instrument and is effective under conditions to which the question period would not apply. It is the equivalent of the question hour under the English system.

The right to request information from the executive departments is one of the important prerogatives of the House. This carefully preserved right of the House to interrogate the executive branch of the Government obviates the necessity of Cabinet members appearing on the floor to give information as in the House of Commons (III, 1879–83; VI, 432). (Procedure in the House of Representatives, p. 205.)

I now yield to my good friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am deeply interested in what my colleague from Missouri says. According to his statement, information is immediately forthcoming under the system he outlines. As far as I am concerned, I have been ever since last October trying to find out what the hay subsidy is in two States. While I get all kinds of information I do not get the information I asked for.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman would take advantage of the means at his command and introduce a resolution of inquiry requesting the information today they could not deny him the data requested 1 week from today. If the gentleman asks the information and it is information we should have I shall be glad to cooperate with him in securing the passage of the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thought the gentleman, being chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—and since this bill has an appropriation in it for that department—I thought it would be an easier matter just to take it up with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that possibly he would be glad to get it for me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman should take advantage of the facilities at hand. He is one of the leading Members of the House and will have no difficulty. I shall be glad to cooperate.

Mr. Chairman, by way of recapitulation, the instrumentalities of inquiry and investigation are:

First. Resolutions of inquiry, which I have just discussed.

Second. The standing committees, in which the real work of the Congress is done, offer every facility for securing information. They regularly and habitually call the Cabinet officers, and other officers of the Government, before them for inquiry and interrogation. They have the advantage, over any inquiry which might be instituted through a question period, of eliciting information on military and other secret and confidential subjects which could not be divulged on the floor. Whereas the proposed question period is limited to 2 hours and the questions to subjects approved by the committee having jurisdiction, the standing and select committees of the House and Senate are subject to no limitation either as to time or material. It is only necessary to consult the printed hearings of the committees of the House and Senate to read in detail the testimony of any member of the Cabinet on practically any question with which his department is concerned. It is impossible to imagine any more thorough or searching inquiries than those conducted by the Kilgore, Tolan, Dies, or Truman committees, or by the House Committee on Appropriations with its indefectible and unerring staff of investigators to supplement and verify any testimony adduced. In answer to the singularly unconvincing suggestion that executives are required to spend too much of their valuable time before committees and are called before more than one committee on the same subject, the truth is that they frequently welcome a second invitation as affording them an opportunity for rebuttal. And if there should be grounds for such complaint, it would apply with equal force to those called before the House for question periods, as witness the protest by Prime Minister Churchill to Parliament:

I must ask the House to realize the enormous burdens falling upon me, not by my work as Minister of Defense, but by repeated and constant attendance on this House, which I never expected I should have to face, but which I will face.

So onerous were these demands upon Mr. Churchill's time that eventually Secretary Cripps was drafted to relieve the Prime Minister of this task.

Third. Insofar as the general public, so frequently referred to in debate and editorial comment in this connection, are concerned, the regular press conferences of the President, and of the heads of departments, comprise an American substitute for the British parliamentary question period and are a much more effective medium for disseminating information. The average American reporter has no peer as an interlocutor and can be depended upon to extract information where many a ponderous parliamentary potentate would fail ingloriously.

Fourth. A peculiarly American instrumentality is the freedom of intimate personal contact with American officialdom. Any Member of Congress may see the President at will and heads of departments and other agencies welcome such visitors or are available by telephone or will call at the office of Congressmen on request. The House and Senate leaders hold weekly conferences at the White House and any information which any department is in position to supply is at the command of any Member in the discharge of his official duties.

Fifth. And last, but comprehensive and authoritative, each governmental department and agency issues periodical and special reports carrying voluminous information on its work and will, if occasion requires, issue supplemental reports which are available to all sincere searchers after legislative and administrative knowledge.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of the transfer of legislation or investigation from one committee to another. Did the gentleman ever try to get a piece of legislation once referred to a committee transferred to another committee that had more appropriate jurisdiction?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Perhaps I fail to understand the question of my colleague from Idaho. Apparently it does not relate to a question of inquiry. But if it does, we have a score of special committees investigating almost every question subject to investigation. And if none of them are considering the particular matter in which my friend is interested further committees can be authorized to make inquiries.

If anybody can think of anything that has not been investigated, we will investigate it. As a matter of fact, I sometimes think it is about time for somebody to investigate the investigators.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield further to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Let me tell the gentleman what has been happening. In the House within the last 2 days a bill dealing with about $50,000,000 worth of forest land under the Department of Agriculture, was placed before the Committee on Agriculture, it was bypassed around the Committee on Public Lands, that has made a study of this matter and knows something about it. It was passed out of the Agricultural Committee, where the members are worked to death. It comes in here and is passed through the House without anybody knowing a great deal about it. What kind of legislation is that? I am talking about S. 150.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentleman has slept on his rights.

Mr. Chairman, the institution of a question hour in House procedure would be of no value. It could not supply even a modicum of the information already available through the facilities now at the command of any Member of Congress. On the other hand, it would involve disadvantages of the most serious nature.

It is unnecessary to discuss here the grave implications in the changed constitutional relations between the executive and legislative branches of the Government resulting, or calculated to result, from the tentative abandonment of the traditional doctrine of the separation of powers laid down in the Constitution and the proposed fusion of legislative and executive direction provided in this radical innovation in our system of government. But it should be noted that while the members of the Cabinet could not be summoned without consent of the President, the pressure of public sentiment would be such as to override any objections he might feel justified in interposing and the invitations of the House to the members of the President's official family would, in effect, amount to an arbitrary direction to the executive branch to attend upon the wishes of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Aside from such complications, the forced attendance of Cabinet officers on

the will of the House—for that is what it would amount to—could not fail to result in strained relations between the two branches of government. Such a question hour would degenerate immediately and inevitably into a political fencing match. Nothing would be so calculated to arouse bitter controversy as the selection of the questions to be asked, and when in the last half of the period the inquiry was thrown open to a round table in which all Members were free to participate, the Sergeant at Arms would have to recruit a special force to preserve order. While the resolution apparently takes every possible precaution to keep the inquiry on a high plane of statesmanship, and committees of the House are required to sanction the formal questions to be submitted in the first half of the period, anyone even casually acquainted with the House and its membership knows that from the first hour the device would be used for partisan political advantage. Would the questions submitted from the floor relate to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the administration of Indian Affairs or the extent of the victory in the South Pacific or the advantages of social security? Well, hardly. They would probe excruciatingly into the depths of the rawest nerve centers of current campaign issues. It requires no effort of the imagination to visualize certain Members—readily brought to mind—inquiring about prominent characters featured in the political cartoons of the day and their personal and private foibles. On the only occasion on which he appeared on the floor of the Senate, President Washington was so deliberately, gratuitously, and cavalierly insulted that he left in high dudgeon and never returned. If august Members of the upper body so flagrantly offended the Father of his Country at the close of the War for Independence, and in his first administration, could each of the 435 Members of the House be expected to treat Cabinet envoys with special and indulgent consideration? If Members said personally to Cabinet members when they appeared here the same things they say about them daily on the floor, it would probably be necessary to call out the guard. Always there are members of every party and every parliamentary body who cannot be restrained. Controversies would be engendered which would bring friends to the defense and foes to the attack and the result would be bedlam and pandemonium. It would give rise to bad taste, bad manners, and bad blood. Such a plan would disturb the warm spirit of amity existing across the aisle of the House. Instead of bringing about better teamwork between the Congress and the executive departments, it would drive a wedge of discord between the legislative and executive branches of the Government and controversies kindled in the question hour would spread through the Nation until they involved the remotest cross-road hamlet in the country.

Furthermore, the mechanical difficulties of such a plan are insuperable. The question period would fill the galleries, feature the newspapers and radio broadcasts, and precipitate field days in Congress. No Member would feel that he was discharging his duties as a leading Member of the House in the eyes of his constituency unless he was participating prominently in the proceedings. It would be a poor Member indeed who could not think up a $64 question to woo the limelight of publicity—especially in campaign years. The result would be traffic jams on the floor unprecedented in the history of the Congress.

It naturally follows that the committees would be required to devote a large amount of time to the consideration of the flood of questions which would pour in upon them for review. The Committee on Rules in addition to its already onerous duties would be swamped with the necessity of making allotments of time, determining priorities, setting dates and durations of periods. The routine of the Cabinet itself would be materially disturbed. There would be constant communications relative to invitations, negotiating acceptances, and preparing for the ordeal of the floor. The President would be reduced to the necessity of selecting his Cabinet officers on a basis of controversial repartee rather than statesmanship and would have to choose between executives and exhorters. Thomas Jefferson himself could not have qualified. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be further burdened in carrying approved questions for two issues in advance and voluminous reports of proceedings transpiring during the question period. The periods would necessarily monopolize time on the most crowded days of the week and further complicate the already congested program of the House.

But the most significant commentary on the widely advertised proposal is its antiquity. It is as old as the House itself. It has risen to challenge the attention of statesmen in every generation since the founding of the Republic. It was considered by the framers of the Constitution and rejected. It has been proposed either orally or by resolution in practically every Congress since Washington. The fact that all through the years it has been repeatedly and consistently rejected, is in itself conclusive evidence of its failure to conform to the needs of our parliamentary system. It would solve no problems. It would question appointive officers who cannot commit anybody to anything. It would divert the attention of legislators and executives from important work. It would invite interparty and intraparty dissension, provoke endless annoyance, involve fruitless complications and would be accompanied by a huge wastage of time. It is impracticable, obstructive, and unworkable and should be buried, once for all, so deeply in the limbo of the past that columnists and commentators will never again be able to disinter its moldering bones to parade them as trappings of a vehicle in which to criticize the legislative branch of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, in his speech at the Food Forum on March 15 the gentleman from Kansas, Representative HOPE, paid just tribute to the war efforts of the American farmer. As one who grew up on a small farm and whose parents now live alone on one, I take just pride in what American farmers have done and are doing. No class of civilians has done more with less or under greater difficulties.

During 1942, 13.6 percent of our food production went for military purposes and for lend-lease. During 1943, 25 percent of our food production went for this purpose. Yet during both of these years our civilian population on the whole was better fed than ever before in their lives. The farmer has received little publicity or acclaim because his activities are of the less spectacular sort. Each year since the beginning of the war program the farmer has increased his total output. He has done this notwithstanding the increasing cost and scarcity of farm machinery and of farm labor. Between the years 1939 and 1943 total farm production increased 21 percent and food production increased 24 percent. In a 3-year period from 1940 to 1943 2,600,000 actual or potential farm workers left the farm and more than a million others took nonfarm jobs while continuing to live on the farm. These persons who left the farms for military service or skilled employment were, on the whole, the younger and more able-bodied members of the farm community. Yet those remaining have carried on, meeting food-production quotas, increasing acreage, planting crops in many cases for which they had poor equipment and with which they had little experience, simply because they were requested to do so.

From 1939 to 1943 we increased our oilseed crops 145 percent. Production of beef cattle increased 27 percent. The production of pork increased 68 percent. During 1943 the allotment of material for farm machinery was only 40 percent of the production of 1940, yet the farmer received only a fractional part of that allotment. During the year 1944 the allotment of material for farm machinery is 80 percent of the 1940 output, but already we know the farmer will receive only a fractional part of the machinery contemplated. Notwithstanding his lack of priority in the procurement of suitable machinery, notwithstanding his transportation and labor shortages, the farmer will in 1944 break our crop record of 364,000,000 acres by many additional millions, and if Providence is kind in the matter of weather he will break the already all-time high record of food production set during these war years. This cannot be kept up indefinitely without better cooperation from the Government.

Many of these farms have no one remaining on them except unemployable persons, the very old and the very young. Many of these farms are cultivated by aged persons whose shoulders are stooped from years of toil, whose eyes are

dim, who suffer from rheumatism and other diseases of declining years. Yet, through patriotism and a sense of duty they carry on. Instead of 8 hours per day they work from 10 to 16 hours a day. Instead of a 40-hour week they work from 60 to 75 hours a week.

Mr. Chairman, many times during my brief service in this Congress I have contended that farmers should be assured not only parity prices for their products, but parity income with industry and labor. During the parity period, 1909–14, the per capita farm income averaged $134, compared with nonfarm income of $483 per capita. In 1941 the per capita income of farmers was $237 as compared with $825 for nonfarmers. This unfavorable income ratio has continued. There is no just basis for such great disparity.

Mr. Chairman, within the next few days we are going to pass through this Congress two bills of great importance to the American farmer and to our entire food-production program. One is the agriculture appropriation bill we are today debating, the other is a bill continuing the Office of Price Administration. I opposed the last O. P. A. bill because, among other ways in which it discriminated against farmers, it refused to permit labor costs to be figured into the parity formula and restricted the floor under farm products to 90 percent of the old parity formula.

Mr. Chairman, fairness and self-interest demand for the American farmer better legislation and better administration in his efforts to sustain himself and meet food-production goals.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I am always pleased to listen to the distinguished young man from Illinois who is on this subcommittee and who made his statement about a half hour ago. I am certainly pleased also with all the positions he takes on agricultural legislation.

There is going to be a meeting of Republicans in Chicago on the 26th of June. This gentleman lives down at Pekin, which is only 156 miles away. I think the folks who will meet in Chicago might go farther and fare worse than travel down that 156 miles, pick up this distinguished statesman from Pekin and name him for the highest place in the councils of this Nation.

I am also much pleased and thankful to this committee and the chairman of it who has been so diligent and who makes his case so plain to us that there remains with us scarcely any criticism of the bill. The gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, has done great things for agriculture.

I am also pleased this year to find that the bill and the report upon it was ready to put into our hands several days before we had to commence to discuss it on the floor and vote upon it. It was not so 1 year ago, and I complained somewhat at that time. It is not done with the other appropriation bills, or at least some of them, and it certainly is right that the bill should be before us in sufficient time that we can read it before we commence to discuss it on the floor and vote upon it.

On yesterday I interrogated the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, about the Commodity Credit Corporation, especially as to the making of loans upon grain and crops stored upon the farms. He informed me that the Commodity Credit Corporation had run behind about 95 percent of its capital, and I want to say that it also has the right to borrow money from the R. F. C., some $3,000,000,000 worth, and that it can make loans upon the grain, wheat, corn, cotton, and so on, out of what it borrows from the R. F. C., and it will lose nothing. Its losses are almost wholly attributable to the fact that they are allowed to buy wheat, paying the full price for wheat over in Kansas where they raise it and then bring it over and sell it at a loss to feeders, or sell it to the East to feeders. They do the same thing with the wheat that comes up from the Argentine.

The told me this morning that they had bought wheat down in the Argentine at a cost of $225,000 and the freight was $125,000, and that they lost a great deal of money in bringing it up here and selling it to the feeders, the eastern feeders, the chicken feeders, and all that.

I do not know that I am objecting so much to that, but I do object to attributing this loss to the farmers of the wheat and corn country. It is not their fault that Commodity Credit is losing money. It is because they go down in other places, and into the Argentine, and buy wheat and then sell it at a loss. Oh, how we ought to love the Argentine that has little sympathy for the United States of America and its allies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Soybeans is a thing I want to talk about for a moment. We cannot get a price for soybeans so that the farmers of our State can afford to raise them. They have asked the farmers in my part of the country to raise soybeans, and state that this is necessary to the war effort. I suppose our farmers will do it, even though they lose money by it. Two of them told me they would, because of their patriotism and because they have boys in the Army. Do you not know that for every acre upon which they raise these soybeans they lose about $20, because they can make that much more by the raising of corn. We ought to raise, and the Commodity Credit Corporation ought to raise, the floor on soybeans up to $2.50 anyway in order to make it comparable with the price we can get for our corn.

There are many things in this bill that I would like to talk about. I do not find affirmative fault with the bill itself. If there is any fault to be found, it is a fault of omission and not of commission, because everything in the bill appears to be very good, although you might put some things in it that would add to it and improve its quality.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, on March 7 the House eliminated the school-lunch program from the Pace bill, authorizing certain projects heretofore carried in the agricultural bill. I confess that I am quite in accord with the arguments against a broad spread of school lunches just because there are schools and there are school children, but I cannot subscribe to this wholesale elimination of the school-lunch program.

The school-lunch program was inaugurated in 1939 in connection with the surplus disposal of foods and was financed under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Until 1943 the program consisted of the distribution of these surpluses to schools qualifying for assistance. In 1943, because of the disappearance of any substantial surpluses, the program was changed to be largely a reimbursement program. Projects qualifying for Federal assistance during the past year purchased essential supplies in the local market and were reimbursed by the Federal Government. But note that they do have to qualify. Eligible schools and child-care centers make application for the program to the field office of the War Food Administration or to the appropriate State agency. Upon verification of the applicant's eligibility, only nonprofit organizations certifying that they cannot serve an adequate lunch without Federal assistance are really eligible. There may be some schools that might appear to lack essential need as a qualification, but the great majority of them are schools that cannot afford to give the children lunches. So many children come from homes where the mother is working. Before she goes to work in the morning she has little time to give the children a satisfying hot breakfast and to fill their lunch boxes. The result is that those children are pretty hungry children who seldom get any hot meal at all.

About 70 percent of the lunches include milk. Sixty-seven percent of the children participating are getting what they call a type A meal that costs about 5.8 cents a meal.

To many people this may seem just another one of those things where the Federal Government is reaching into the local communities and doing things that the local communities should be doing for themselves. Perhaps that is partly true. But I am a woman, a mother, and a very proud grandmother; I am troubled that we eliminate this program before we know what provisions can be made for those schools where there cannot be school lunches unless there is some Federal help. Unless we can be assured that the children will not suffer, surely we should not take away all Federal help.

When I was a very little girl I was given a bit of advice and I have found it exceedingly useful and exceedingly steadying. I am sometimes inclined to feel that my way is perhaps the best way and that all other ways must go. Then

I am reminded of what I was told long ago. "Never take away something that is serving a constructive, useful, or necessary purpose unless or until you have something better to put in its place."

What have you to put in the place of the school-lunch program?

I cannot but hope that once again the Senate will put the school-lunch program back into the bill, which, I understand, would not make it subject to a point of order. That would give us time to see to it that there is proper enabling legislation to set up methods of control throughout the country to cover the real needs of this very large group of our children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady has definitely painted the picture as far as the House is concerned. It should be understood by everybody that insofar as this subcommittee is concerned, it was powerless to appropriate a cent for this purpose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago I received a number of complaints from the farmers of my district objecting to the fact that they were being compelled to go to the A. A. A. in order to obtain the gasoline necessary to operate their farms. At that time I took the matter up with the Office of Price Administration, and just a few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Richard C. Harrison, Chief of the Gasoline Rationing Branch to which he attached a memorandum which was sent out by Mr. Charles F. Phillips, Director of the Automotive Supply Rationing Division, to all regional offices. The letter and the memorandum are as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE AMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1944.

The Honorable J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MCGREGOR: Per our telephone conversation today I am enclosing herewith six copies of memorandum which we sent to our regional offices yesterday regarding A. A. A. certification of farmers' gasoline rations.

If I may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD C. HARRISON,
Chief, Gasoline Rationing Branch.

MEMORANDUM

MARCH 15, 1944.

To all regional offices.

From Charles F. Phillips, Director, Automotive Supply Rationing Division.

Subject: A. A. A. certification of farmers' rations.

Recently we have had a good many complaints from farmers and farm groups over A. A. A. certification. The purpose of the tie-up with agriculture was, of course, to provide our boards with information and expert assistance concerning proper gasoline consumption by farmers. But we should not be drawn into any quarrel over A. A. A. If cases arise in which individuals or groups object to A. A. A. certification this objection should be heeded so long as it will not lead to bad rationing. We doubt that objection should arise in many cases since applicants, according to our annotations, are allowed to file with our local boards, and then boards are instructed to refer farmer nonhighway applications to the A. A. A. In any case the annotations will be promptly revised with the above instructions in mind.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the United States has now been at war for nearly 2½ years. During that time we have shown a remarkable ability to produce. We have produced food and war materials for virtually every group of people fighting for the cause of freedom and liberty. Our great production success has been partly due to our ability to get things done quickly and partly to our vast supply of natural resources. It has often been said that wars are caused by the intense desire of nations to acquire the natural resources which they lack. Be that as it may, we know that natural resources are essential in our national economy. Three of our important natural resources are forests, range lands for grazing of livestock, and water supplies. We in the West fully appreciate how vital it is to conserve and efficiently utilize these resources.

Millions of feet of lumber have been used in the prosecution of this war for thousands of different things. Nearly half has been used for creating our vast war supplies for shipment throughout the world. A large amount, too, has gone for constructing cantonments, supply depots, and other establishments, not only in this country but in all parts of the globe. Paper and paper products, too, made from pulpwood, are now listed as critical materials. Many millions more board feet of lumber and cords of pulpwood will be used before this war is over, causing a tremendous drain on the merchantable supply of growing timber. This all emphasizes the necessity of so cutting our forests that a future supply will be assured.

Our capacity to fill the demands of meat, hides, and wool has also been severely taxed but a grand job is being done by our farmers and stockmen. Much of the slaughter has been of grass-fat cattle and lambs coming directly from the ranges of the West. Other animals grown on the western ranges have been fattened in feed lots on our farms before becoming beefsteaks and lamb chops. Continued high livestock production from our range lands is going to be essential during the rest of the war and in the immediate post-war period. When this period of maximum war production has passed, we want to be sure that our range resources are in shape to continue to support the important part of our western population which makes up the western livestock industry.

Food production of all sorts has been at record levels. Vast amounts of this food are produced under irrigation. To irrigation farmers the amount and character of water available and the period of availability are of the first importance. This irrigation water comes chiefly from our forested mountains. Accordingly, the use made of these forests directly affects the irrigation farmer.

Research is the basis for efficient management and use of these resources. The Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, through its series of regional forest and range experiment stations and the forest-products laboratory, is conducting the necessary research to furnish principles and practices underlying efficient production, harvesting, and utilization of the wood, forage, and water produced on forest lands.

At Fort Collins, Colo., in my district, the headquarters of one of these research centers, the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station is located. For the past 10 years this station has been studying some of the more important forest, range, and water problems. These studies are handled in cooperation with the Colorado State Agricultural Experiment Station. I have personally been on the ground and have seen some of the work being done; I have talked to the men conducting these investigations; and I have talked to many of the folks for whom the work is being done. The projects under way are, in my opinion, sound, they are being capably handled, and the results are being accepted and used by farmers, stockmen, and timberland owners.

Through its forest management studies this station is developing the most desirable methods of harvesting the timber from our mountain regions, and of reestablishing stands of timber on cut-over lands. While we all want these lands to make their full contribution in the war, the continued production of timber is essential to supply home needs after the war. Methods of harvesting spruce-fir forests is a particularly pressing problem at this time.

In a cooperative study on the Central Plains Experimental Range in Weld County, Colo., the Rocky Mountain Station has been studying range management practices which will give greater cattle production and aid in stabilizing the livestock industry on the plains. Practical stockmen, who are cooperating in this endeavor, make their cattle available for the studies.

One of the most important problems in which work has been done is that of determining the proper rate of stocking to produce the maximum amount of meat and yet assure maintained high production of range forage. Yearling Hereford cattle gained an average of 251 pounds per animal under heavy stocking, but comparable cattle gained 283 and 317 pounds, respectively, under moderate and light stocking. Considering costs of production, which, of course, every livestock operator must do, the greatest net income was realized from moderate stocking, rather than from either heavy or light. This emphasizes that if an effort is made to carry too many cattle they will not produce as much meat as a somewhat smaller number, and the meat cannot be produced as economically.

Other valuable results of these range investigations could be cited. These results are being accepted and used by progressive stockmen throughout the plains and mountain country. Numerous prominent stockmen of both Colorado and Wyoming have expressed their keen

interest in these investigations and the results which they are bringing forth for the livestock industry. Representatives of the agricultural experiment stations, who are familiar with the work, also have praised it highly. There is no question but what the direct benefits to the livestock industry and in turn to our war effort and consumers will be many times greater than the cost of the research to the Federal Government.

Directly related to these forest and range problems are many concerned with watershed management. Water is the lifeblood of the West. It provides for successful agriculture through irrigation and the power and municipal supplies essential to maintain our war-swollen cities. The Rocky Mountain Station is finding that we can increase the amount of water available for use by preventing certain losses. It has found, for example, that by the right kind of logging practices in the forests at high elevations, it can reduce evaporation losses and thereby increase streamflow approximately 30 percent. Such an increase, if from a widespread area, could mean still greater development of our water supplies.

Personally I consider this research program of the Forest Service one of the most important lines of work being carried on in the country. There are many problems yet to be solved, but if given the opportunity, I feel sure that the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station and its companion stations in other regions will find ways to solve them. I believe that the Forest Service deserves considerable praise for its conduct of these important investigations.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The lumber dealers in my State of Nebraska are very much disturbed over the fact that they cannot get enough lumber to supply the need of the farmers for lumber to build essential barns, sheds, and so forth. Can the gentleman tell us about the supply of lumber which we buy from the people out in his part of the country?

Mr. HILL. One of the troubles with the lumber situation has been the demands of the armed services in connection with crating and boxing the supplies we have to ship abroad. The type of lumber we produce in our particular territory is especially valuable for that kind of crates, with the result that the people of the gentleman's part of the country have been short of that kind of lumber. I think you will continue to be short for some time, until this great demand for shipping can be somewhat lessened.

Mr. STEFAN. While I was in Neraska a number of the retail lumber dealers had a small meeting and asked me to come in and see what relief we could get them with reference to lumber supplies, because the demands of the farmers for lumber are very large. We were told that the War Production Board had loosened the restrictions on lumber needed on the farm. I told them they would perhaps get some relief in the near future, but the gentleman indicates that that will not be the case.

Mr. HILL. I doubt it.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that my State of Oregon is one of the great lumber-producing States of the country. The difficulty we are experiencing there is in getting trained workmen, men accustomed to the woods, to get the logs out and then to manufacture the logs into lumber. We could produce much more lumber than we are producing at the present time if manpower were available. What the gentleman has said is true, that a large portion of the lumber that is being produced is being used by the Government in war operations, particularly for boxing and crating the vast amount of material that is being sent overseas and all over the world.

Mr. HILL. And until that supply is properly filled there will not be an increase in farm lumber.

Mr. ANGELL. There will not be any increase in lumber until the manpower situation is taken care of?

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The lumber dealers have this to say and they put this question to us. There is going to be a tremendous amount of lumber which the Surplus Material Administrator is going to have on hand to let loose into private channels. There are a lot of these temporary houses being torn down and they are wondering whether or not that surplus lumber is going to be put back into regular channels and dealt out into industry through the regular lumber dealer channels so that they can put it where it is needed most.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman from Nebraska is well aware that the House right at this moment is working on a bill that will give us the proper type of organization to take care of the sale of these commodities that we are going to have in surplus. I think that bill should soon be brought to the floor of this House and enacted into law.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman. Does the gentleman agree if there is surplus lumber that these farmers can get through their dealers at this time that they should have it?

Mr. HILL. If not at this particular time then in a very short while.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I just want to make the observation that the War Production Board advised me last week the lumber production of this country today is the greatest ever in the history of the country. Yet it is more critical now than steel.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. NORRELL. They are expecting to begin to allocate steel to civilian projects to take the place of lumber.

Mr. HILL. I might say before I conclude, one of the things in this article which I am putting in the RECORD as part of my remarks, is the fact that we must begin now to build up our forests so that these supplies which you and I are talking about can be increased in a way to give us this production of lumber.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention this afternoon to the situation that has existed in one of the departments of our Government for a long time. I respectfully call your attention to the wage situation as it appears in the Bureau of Animal Industry. For a long time now the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and particularly veterinarians, have labored under this situation as regards their salaries, and I want to talk to you about this salary problem. It appears to me, in view of the fact that we expect the finest talent we can get in all branches of our Government, and it is certainly true in the Bureau of Animal Industry, one sure way to get the highest type of veterinarians is to pay a better wage. Up to this time it is very evident that the wage scale is far too low in the Bureau of Animal Industry. I would like to see this House change the classification in this Department. I think everyone, all the taxpayers in the United States, especially the livestock interests and the pure-bred livestock interests, are all very much in favor of having the Bureau of Animal Industry one of the best departments in the Government. Up to this time the Bureau of Animal Industry is losing a great share of its good men and scientists. I know of several who have already left and I know of some more who are going unless their classification and the question of salary can be remedied. Up to this time 97 veterinarians have left the Service because of the fact that they cannot make a living on the salary they are receiving. I have several cases here showing that men who have come into the Service way back in 1917, 1920–23, and entered at a salary of $2,000, are now receiving $2,400. That is a good many years to serve in order to get a $400 raise.

I would like to see the Bureau in such a position that they can demand the highest type of veterinarians that our country can produce. Why should not we have the best veterinarians that the country can produce in the Bureau of Animal Industry? That is where they belong and that is where they ought to be. Down through the years since the Bureau was organized back in 1884, the B. A. I. had to combat a good many very serious and dangerous diseases, diseases such as foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, anthrax, hog cholera, glanders, dourine, and scabies, and many others. These are dangerous diseases to the livestock. Thousands of herds would be lost

to the country had it not been for the efficient Bureau of Animal Industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman appreciates the effect upon the health and welfare of this country of the work which the gentleman has outlined as being done by these men engaged in this occupation and profession as being of tremendous worth to the public generally?

Mr. GILLIE. That is right. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I know the gentleman from Indiana is an authority on this subject. I have some knowledge of it, being very closely associated with veterinarians in the State of Nebraska who have done so much work in hog cholera and other diseases among animals. In the gentleman's opinion is there some danger to the health of the United States as a result of the lack of proper meat inspection and the work of veterinarians, if some relief is not given to these people?

Mr. GILLIE. I will say to the gentleman that during the last war they had an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease which cost the Government millions of dollars to suppress. That was during the last war and we might have another scourge again in this war, by sabotage, perhaps, or some other way, in which this disease might be brought into this country. Rinderpest is one of the worst diseases that Japan has to deal with. They have always had it. They have it there in a virulent form and if it ever gets into this country we would lose many of our fine herds.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very sympathetic to the appeal of the gentleman to the Congress to reclassify these employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry, but as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I am somewhat worried about the reclassification of employees in one department setting a precedent in that particular department, because in my opinion it would be followed by requests for reclassification in other departments, in spite of my deep sympathy and my concern for the health of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, our independent cheese factories are slowly but surely being liquidated, and the Office of Price Administration is contributing to this liquidation.

In analyzing certain provisions of the cheese order—order 2891—it is necessary to take into consideration the claim that since the Federal Government is confronted with the task of large-scale buying, it must use those existing facilities which lend themselves to this type of purchasing operations.

Large-scale buying presupposes a concentration of distribution facilities combined with the possibility of an easy and ready handling of a product. This explains two things in the Government's cheese-buying activities:

(a) That it uses the large dairy corporations for the simple reason that the independent assembler has practically disappeared and that the distribution of over 70 percent of the cheese of the Nation is concentrated in the hands of four large concerns, while the marketing of the rest of the cheese is to a large extent indirectly influenced by the large corporations; and

(b) It explains the fact that the distribution of process cheese is looked upon with more favor than that of natural cheese because of the high degree of standardization and possibility of preservation which has been developed with respect to process cheese.

The recently issued order on cheese seems to substantiate this view. It contains, among other things, two sections, one concerning price differentials between large and small styles of cheese and the other relating to maximum prices in connection with moisture content.

The section relating to the styles of cheese provides for the establishment of a maximum price for Cheddar cheese delivered at all places in the State of Wisconsin regardless of point of origin. This maximum price is set forth in the table below—table A, page 5 of the order:

TABLE A

Maximum price (cents per pound)	Styles	Approximate weight (pounds)
23¼	Cheddars, twins and larger	[1]
23½	Flats	35
23¾	Double daisies	44
23¾	Triple daisies	66
24¼	Single daisies	22
24¼	Longhorns	12
24¼	Young Americas	12
24½	Picnics and midgets	12
24¼	Square prints	10
24½	Natural loaf and smaller styles	[2]

[1] 70 or more. [2] 5 or less.

A glance at the above table reveals one outstanding feature, namely the low differential between the price established for the larger styles and that established for the smaller styles. This low differential places the smaller styles of cheese at a disadvantage and will result in eliminating these styles from the market in favor of the larger styles.

The reason for criticizing these low differentials is that the smaller styles of cheese involve a higher proportional cost than the larger styles due principally to the following reasons.

First. The shrinkage on the smaller styles is greater.

Second. More labor is involved in the manufacture of smaller styles.

Third. The cost of bandages on the smaller styles is higher.

Fourth. The cost of boxes is higher.

Fifth. More money is invested in hoops and presses and more room and plant facilities are necessary.

The disadvantageous position in which the factories making small styles of cheese are placed presents to them one way out—to change from the making of the smaller to the larger styles. This, however, will be very difficult not only because of the cost involved, but particularly because of the difficulty of obtaining hoops.

The important thing with regard to the smaller styles of cheese is that it will be of considerable disadvantage to the retailer in the marketing of natural cheese. It is obvious that retailing presupposes sales in small quantities. If obstacles are placed in the way of the retailer in handling small styles, the convenient process cheese packages will completely eliminate the natural cheese from the retailers' counters.

Another factor which will work powerfully toward the elimination of natural in favor of process cheese is the determination of prices for twins and cheddars when sold for processing or to Government agencies in relation to moisture as set forth in the table below taken from the O. P. A. order—table B, page 5 of the order:

TABLE B

Moisture content	Maximum price, cents per pound	
	For Cheddars, twins, and larger styles	For flats
33.2 percent	25.54	25.79
Over 33.2 percent but not over 33.7 percent	25.35	25.60
Over 33.7 percent but not over 34.2 percent	25.16	25.41
Over 34.2 percent but not over 34.7 percent	24.97	25.22
Over 34.7 percent but not over 35.2 percent	24.77	25.02
Over 35.2 percent but not over 35.7 percent	24.58	24.83
Over 35.7 percent but not over 36.2 percent	24.39	24.64
Over 36.2 percent but not over 36.7 percent	24.20	24.45
Over 36.7 percent but not over 37.2 percent	24.01	24.26
Over 37.2 percent but not over 37.7 percent	23.82	24.07

The definite consequence of this order will be that no cheese under 37½ percent moisture content will be put into storage. But under present conditions it is practically impossible to keep in storage even for a period of 6 months, cheese with a moisture content of more than 37½ percent moisture because of quicker deterioration.

It should be noted that cheese is exempted from the maximum price regulation as cured cheese only if it is 6 months old or more. But on the other hand, this precludes anyone from buying and keeping cheese for storage and sale as cured cheese. Therefore, it is evident that the effect of this order will be the

practical elimination of cured cheese and a tremendous increase in the volume of processed cheese. This is the more tragic, since we have been spending so much effort toward building up the sale of cured cheese as one of Wisconsin's finest products.

It was stated above that it is claimed that the Federal Government is confronted with the task of large-scale distribution which logically favors the services of large dairy concerns. The use of a product such as process cheese is claimed to be particularly adapted to such distribution. It should be pointed out that in the long run this will have the consequence of a tremendous increase in the production of process cheese and the practical elimination of natural cheese. The development of a package for natural cheese has been neglected for many years by private concerns in favor of packaged process cheese, because of the higher profits involved in the production and distribution of the latter type of cheese. However, during the past few years due principally to the efforts of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and the Dairy Improvement Association, so much progress has been made in the development of a package for natural cheese that this type of cheese became a serious threat to the process cheese industry. The O. P. A. order, however, threatens to nullify the progress made by natural cheese consumption.

This is connected with another development which constitutes a threat to the soundness of the cheese industry, namely the disregard of the problem of quality. This was brought out very clearly by a statement of an O. P. A. official at a recent conference in the offices of the department to the effect that in view of a tight market little attention is being paid to quality.

The interesting thing is that we are now repeating the experience of the First World War. Up to the beginning of that war, the quality of the cheese produced in the Nation, particularly in the States of Wisconsin and New York, was very high. During the war it had deteriorated to such an extent that strenuous efforts have been made by this State and by the Federal Government to improve the quality during the years immediately preceding the present war. If we allow a repetition during this war of what happened during the last war, all our past efforts in trying to improve quality will be nullified with the additional result that a more favorable situation will be developed for the process cheese to dominate completely the cheese industry.

It is our belief that despite the problem of large-scale distribution during war which confronts the Government, it is possible to arrange conditions under which the work of quality development will go on unhindered. In order to arrive at this solution it is imperative that those Federal agencies which are concerned with the buying of cheese be willing to meet with the official representatives of the cheese-producing States to devise a plan for the continuation of conditions which favor the production of a quality product.

The above facts and material were obtained for me by Mr. William Kirsch, chief statistician of the department of agriculture of my State of Wisconsin. Mr. Kirsch is a very capable State official who is painstakingly devoted to the agricultural interests of Wisconsin and has devoted years of study and research to our problems, particularly the problems of dairy products. His work can be accepted without question.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, before I start on the soil-conservation question I would like to supplement what my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] has said about the harassing that our cheese industry is getting in the great State of Wisconsin. They have a price fixed of 27 cents to the farmer on good American cheese that has 30-percent fats and 39-percent moisture, yet right here in Washington today they are allowing cottage cheese, which has 72 percent moisture and 4 or 5 percent fat, to be sold for 29 cents. The O. P. A. ceiling on American cheese is supposed to be 36 cents. That just does not make sense, and it is going to wreck the industry, not only the American cheese but also the Italian cheese and the Swiss cheese and all the cheese industry. It is all unnecessary. It is all happening just because there does not seem to be enough people to have enough interest to take enough time to find out what the problems are in connection with that.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Let me point out that among the fine grades of cheese made in my district, and perhaps some in your district, is the famous Wisconsin blue, which is the same as Roquefort. Their price at the factory is limited to 39 cents. My wife bought some in a store the other day. She could not get our type and was told to take another type by the grocer. It was Argentine blue and sold at $1.25 a pound.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

OUR LEGISLATIVE APPROACH TO SOIL FERTILITY AND SOIL CONSERVATION

There are five routes through which Federal funds have been and are being appropriated for the improvements and conservation of our soil.

First. Three appropriations to the land-grant colleges and experiment stations. This appropriation has been in existence for over 50 years and valuable soil information has resulted from these studies and experiments during this time.

Second. For over 25 years the Extension Service has devoted considerable time and effort in its attempt to carry the messages discovered by the experiment stations to the farms of the various States.

Third. We have had the soil-conservation and fertility program of the Farm Security Administration which has been largely conducted through the lower income farm groups.

Fourth. We have the soil programs of the A. A. A. This is the only agency up to this time wherein large appropriations were provided for their soil work. Their work has included not only the soil fertility problems in the distribution of lime and mineral fertilizers but also the problem of improving the physical condition of the soil. The A. A. A. has distributed a total of 63,000,000 tons of lime, 85,000 tons of muriate of potash, and over 4,000,000 tons of phosphate up to January 1, 1943. The A. A. A. program has gradually increased its soil work and in 1942 a total of $167,000,000 was spent for soil fertility alone. In addition to the soil-fertility program the A. A. A. in 1942 carried on a program of strip cropping, tree planting, grass and legume seeding, cover crop plans, contour listing pasture or range land, and other soil-conserving practices.

Fifth. We have the Soil Conservation Service. This Service is largely one of personnel wherein the agency cooperates with the agricultural colleges and States in the establishment of soil districts in many States. The State of Wisconsin has cooperated with this Service. The projects include strip farming, prevention of soil erosion, and other soil-conservation practices.

It appears that some three million of the requested appropriation for 1944 was to be allocated to drainage projects, but that this money was not provided for in the 1944 agricultural bill now under consideration.

The following official information from the Soil Conservation Service shows the personnel in the United States, in Wisconsin, and in the Seventh Wisconsin District, which I have the honor to represent:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
SOIL-CONSERVATION SERVICE

Number of employees in the entire Service as of Jan. 1, 1944

Departmental (Washington, D. C.):	
Regular	291
Temporary	1
W. A. E. (while actually employed)	[1]2
Total departmental	295
Field (other than Washington, D. C.):	
Regular	6,443
Temporary	125
W. A. E. (while actually employed)	[1]2,489
Without compensation	[2]85
Total field	9,142

[1] Temporary or seasonal aids employed to assist farmers in speeding up the application of the conservation plans prepared by the technicians.

[2] Primarily college or experiment-station officials listed as collaborators, but not on our pay roll.

The above figures do not include employees on military furlough.

Outside continental United States:	
Puerto Rico	43
Virgin Islands	3
Total outside continental United States	46
Total (entire Service—permanent and temporary)	9,483
Temporary	2,597
Total permanent employees	6,906
Number of employees in State of Wisconsin:	
State office	10
Research (cooperating with State experiment stations)	18
Nursery	1
Number of employees in State of Wisconsin—Continued.	
Field offices	129
Total employees, State of Wisconsin	158

Number of employees in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin

County and location:	Number
Adams, Friendship	2
Marathon, Stratford	2
Marathon, Wausau	6
Waushara, Wautoma	5
Wood, Wisconsin Rapids	2
Total (Seventh Congressional District)	17

The following table shows the allocation of funds as a whole for the United States:

Funds expended by the Soil Conservation Service by program during the fiscal year 1943

	Personal services	Materials, equipment, etc.	Total
Regular funds, the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act:			
Soil Conservation Service regular program (Public 46, 74th Cong.)	$19,687,021	$3,130,724	$22,817,745
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	1,151,864	680,575	1,832,439
Cooperative farm forestry	175,536	22,417	197,953
Development of water facilities		31,309	31,309
Miscellaneous allotments and working funds:			
Emergency Relief	711		711
Public Works Administration	53,848	42,968	96,816
Funds advanced from the War Department for making and reproducing maps	440,765	131,356	572,121
Funds, transfer from the War Department for the flood-control program	76,073	19,926	95,999
Funds advanced from the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs for expenses of Latin-American trainees		51,261	51,261
Funds advanced from the Public Roads Administration for water run-offs and infiltration studies on roadside strips		3,413	3,413
Funds advanced from the State Department for salary of technician assigned to China	5,205		5,205
Special and technical investigations, international joint commission, United States and Great Britain, funds advanced from the State Department	1,261	276	1,537
Expenses in connection with the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps camps assigned to the Soil Conservation Service	441,185	24,984	466,169
Selective Service System funds allotted to the Soil Conservation Service in connection with camps for conscientious objectors assigned to work of the Soil Conservation Service	125,172	58,389	183,561
Total	22,158,641	4,197,598	26,356,239

There are two conclusions in connection with this soil problem that appear to be of merit. The first one is that many people familiar with the soil problems for 50 years feel that there should be a coordination of programs; and, second, that if this coordination was put into operation a large saving in expenditure of public funds could be attained. This economy angle will evidently become of more importance.

Since Prof. C. J. Chapman and Soils and Men estimate that we are losing twice as much phosphate as is being applied, and losing nine times as much potash as is being applied, it is apparent that considerable educational work must still be done. In addition, the physical soil problem, including humus improvement and erosion control, demands our constant attention and consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, as far as this side is concerned we have no other speakers.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago our colleague from California [Mr. ANDERSON], gave us a very clear picture of what this bill was going to do to the guayule project in the State of California, and elsewhere. He gave us a good picture of the background of that project and of its present status. He told about its endorsement by the various departments of Government and he read portions of a report published in 1930 by the man who is now Commander in Chief of the American armed forces in Europe, urging, back in that year, that we establish a guayule project in this country in order to build up a reserve rubber supply. It seems to me that we are being very short-sighted now in making such an abrupt curtailment of the program.

There are several reasons why I am disposed to say this. In the first place we have a very large investment, over $30,000,000 in the guayule project, and the work which it is now taking place not the amount of rubber produced to date, seems to be the criterion upon which we should make our judgment. We should protect our investment. All types of experimental work are now being carried on at the guayule station at Salinas, Calif.; experiments as to the type of soil which can best produce the shrub; experiments as to the type of weather conditions under which the plant can best be grown. The type of planting, that is, whether by direct planting or by transplanting of the shrub, is another point that has not yet been established. The improvement of the type of shrub is still another phase of the experimental work that is being carried on. The method of extracting the latex from the shrub itself is another important phase of the experimental program. The type of cultivation; the type of spacing; the type of harvesting of the plant—all those things are important phases of guayule production that we need to know in case we have to have this source as a possible insurance ir the future for an adequate rubber supply. However, I should not list simply the experimental work as a reason for justifying a continuance of the project. The Office of Rubber Director has said that we need every single pound of rubber we can get in this emergency, and if we liquidate the project, as called for in this particular bill, we are going to be plowing under, in effect, some 30,000 tons of rubber supply, every single pound of which we would be needing in the country at the present time.

Finally I should say it is short-sighted to curtail the project as we are doing, because this House has recently authorized a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture to make a complete investigation into the entire guayule problem to find the facts and to bring back a report to this Congress and tell us whether or not such a project is justified. This committee, under the very able chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is planning a trip to the west coast in the near future to make a thorough investigation into every phase of our guayule program. Hearings by this subcommittee have already started here in Washington. Certainly it would seem to me to be a wise course to wait until this subcommittee has had the opportunity to make its investigation and give its report to this House before taking such drastic and final action as is contemplated in this bill. I am confident that the findings of such a subcommittee would give us a much more rational basis for intelligent action than anything that has yet been presented to us.

It seems to me it would be much better, in view of our present rubber needs and as possible insurance for the future, if we would liquidate the program on the 7-year basis advocated by the Department of Agriculture rather than by curtailing it as sharply as would be done under this bill. Such a gradual program would permit several additional years of essential experimental work, would give us thousands of tons of badly needed natural rubber, and would be the most efficient and most economical way of disposing of our Government investment in this project. I join my colleague from California in hoping that when the bill reaches the other body a substantial appropriation for continuing the guayule project will be reinserted.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there are no further requests for time, I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Adminis-

trator, and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $136,656.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks are not directed to any particular section of the bill but certainly are important to any consideration of the agricultural program, although it relates more definitely to the operations of the War Manpower Commission. If men who should be in the armed forces or on our farms are kept in factories and not fully employed we certainly are not contributing the utmost to either the actual fighting effort or the food program.

From time to time recently I have called the attention of the House to the operations of the War Manpower Commission, particularly in the Hartford, Conn., area with which I am most familiar. I have charged that the regulations of the War Manpower Commission are hampering the war-production program instead of helping it; that their regulations are hampering the Government's food-raising program. I believe there is absolutely no justification for continuing the central Connecticut area in the so-called group 1 labor-shortage classification. I have received the reply I expected. The director of war manpower, Mr. William J. Fitzgerald, charges that information I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and turned over to the appropriate committees of the House is not helping the war effort a "damned bit," and he calls it "poison propaganda." Further he states: "BILL MILLER has made false statements." I have absolute proof in writing to back up every statement made by me. Use of the short, ugly word is no answer to a difficult problem.

I cannot for the life of me understand why it is that a man who has had the reputation of being a "regular fellow" so quickly acquires the attitude of the typical bureaucrat when clothed with an assumed authority over the lives of his fellow citizens. The Connecticut State director of the War Manpower Commission is a former Member of this House. While serving as a Member here he showed due regard for the complaints he received from his constituents; but now it is "poison propaganda" when I turn over to an appropriate congressional committee information coming to me from responsible citizens, some of whom are manufacturers, some of whom are representatives of organized labor, and some of whom are farmers.

A few weeks ago the mayor of the city of Hartford appointed a committee known as the war manpower committee, the chairman being Mr. Francis S. Murphy, business manager of the Hartford Times. The mayor's committee has recently completed a study of the manpower needs of that area. For the information of the House, I desire to quote briefly from the replies to a survey made by that committee. I present this information to the House at this time for the reason that I am informed this morning that the President is requesting additional funds for the War Manpower Commission. I now quote from the replies to the mayor's committee:

The heads of local industries accompanied their answers to Mr. Murphy's inquiry into the labor situation with words of praise and hope that the committee would be able to lift the critical labor-shortage designation, which has hampered war production instead of helping it, according to some claims.

General Manager Earl H. Hodge, of the Champlin Box Co., wrote: "Congratulations on your excellent approach to the very difficult manpower problem with which we have all been faced for the past few months. We believe that you are on the right track, and we are very happy to cooperate."

"It is our conviction that Hartford never should have been included in the critical area," wrote O. J. Grandahl, of the Grandahl Tool & Machine Co.

Mr. Murphy also reported a different picture at Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co., where the company indicated its working force may be decreased by about 2,000 by May 1 of this year.

Still it is a "critical labor area," and still the farmers in that area do not know where they are going to get help to plant this year's crops.

The replies from other large plants showed Niles-Bement-Pond and Underwood-Elliott-Fisher as needing no additional workers, while Royal Typewriter Co. officials said they desired to hire 150 more workers if permitted by present ceiling regulations.

And 150 employees is just a drop in the bucket to a firm of that size:

From the replies received from a majority of the 57 firms queried, Mr. Murphy was able to present the following picture of the labor situation in Hartford to the committee:

(In every case, the companies were asked to anticipate not only the number of extra workers needed by May 1, 1944, but the number of separations, military or otherwise).

M. H. Rhodes, Inc., military separations, 16; other, 3; total labor needed, 23, or increase of 4.

The Wiremold Co., military, 8; other, 8, total labor need, 10; decrease of 6 which the company expects to offset by additional part-time workers.

C. H. Dresser & Son, Inc., military, 2; other, 2; total labor need, 4; total unchanged.

Bush Manufacturing Co., no change.

Allen Manufacturing Co., military, 25; other, 40; need, 65; total unchanged.

Hartford Steel Ball Co., military, 3; other, 12; need, 26; increase of 11.

Maxim Silencer Co., military, 23; other, 15; need, 45; increase of 7.

ROYAL TYPEWRITER

Royal Typewriter Co., military, 10; other, 50; need, 210; increase of 150 desired by company if permitted under present ceiling.

Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co., military, 667; other, 1,356; need, 50, or decrease of 1,973.

Taylor & Fenn Co., military, 3; other, 0; need, 10; increase of 7.

Fenn Manufacturing Co., military, 5; other, 20; need, 45; increase of 20.

Hartford Gas Co., military, 4; other, 0; need, 4; no change.

United Tool & Die Co., military, 29; other, 8, need, 37; no change.

Grandahl Tool & Machine Co. expects to need 5 additional full-time workers and 5 part time with a net drop of 10 in its working force.

Southern New England Telephone Co., military separations, 12; other, 0; need 12, no change.

Hartford Electric Light Co. anticipates decrease of 16 workers during period.

Gray Manufacturing Co., military, 3; other, 15; need, 30; gain of 12.

M. S. Little Manufacturing Co., military, 2; other, 5; need, 5; decrease of 24 indicated due to other lay-offs.

NILES-BEMENT-POND

Niles-Bement-Pond Co., military, 100; other, 200; need, 300; no change.

Matson Mills, Inc., reports it is running 40 workers short and expects to lose 5 due to the draft.

Billings & Spencer, military, 12; other, 70; need, 114; gain of 32.

Whitney Chain & Manufacturing Co., military, 10; other, 75; need, 100; gain of 15.

Cushman Chuck Co., military, 52; other, 23; need, 75; no change.

Union Drawn Steel, military, 2; other, 20; need, 41; gain of 19.

Arrow-Hart & Hegeman Electric Co., military, 6; other, 74; need, 96. The company explained it will need to replace 60 separations by May 1.

Kolodney & Myers, Inc., military, 0; other, 40; need, 86; gain of 46.

Fuller Brush Co., military, 20; other, 30; need, 67; increase of 17.

Henry & Wright Manufacturing Co., military, 6; other, 10; need, 23; increase of 7.

HARTFORD MACHINE SCREW

Hartford Machine Screw Co., military, 22; other, 100; need, 204; gain of 82.

Terry Steam Turbine Co., military, 5; other, 2; need, 0; decrease of 7.

Champlin Box Co., military, 3; other, 20; need, 23; no change.

Capewell Manufacturing Co., military, 4; other, 6; need, 31; gain of 21.

Connecticut Foundry Co., military, 0; other, 6; need, 15; gain of 9.

The Collins Co., military, 20; other, 3; need, 31; gain of 8.

Merrow Machine Co., military, 4; other, 2; need, 16; gain of 10.

Underwood-Elliott-Fisher Co., military, 15; other, 56; need, 0. Company anticipates drop of 240 in working force.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's disease of cattle, $5,240,355, together with not to exceed $343,959 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1944: *Provided*, That in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Secretary it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy tuberculous or paratuberculous cattle, or cattle reacting to the test for Bang's disease, and if such animals have been destroyed, condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his discretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary for the payment of indemnities to owners of such animals but, except as hereinafter provided, no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State,

Territory, county, and municipality where the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 22, line 10, strike out "$5,240,355" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,433,232."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I understand the gentleman has several amendments connected with the same subject matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. TARVER. I wonder if he would not be willing to submit them all at this time and have them voted on en bloc.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to ask that they might all be considered together inasmuch as they relate to the same subject matter and in the aggregate provide an increase of $996,000 in different items under animal husbandry, the money to be used for the reclassification of veterinarians so that more veterinarians can be induced to enter the Service.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my other amendments to this item may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his amendments to this item may be considered en bloc. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 22, strike out "$114,288" and insert in lieu thereof "$115,440."

Page 24, line 8, strike out "$951,253" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,003,160."

Page 24, line 13, strike out "$8,616,759" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,359,124."

Page 24, line 20, strike out "$272,115" and insert in lieu thereof "$279,228."

Page 25, line 22, strike out "$37,007" and insert "$38,444."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for use of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, this matter is not very involved. When the committee print came to the subcommittee, the Bureau of the Budget by including $996,000 for this purpose virtually recommended that that money be appropriated to take care of the reclassification of veterinarians who are a large professional group in the Department of Agriculture and the most underpaid professional group probably in the entire Government. I submitted these amendments to the full committee, but I must confess that my feeble powers of persuasion were not equal to the task and the full committee therefore rejected the proposal. It does, however, in my opinion, merit consideration. There is involved here something more than reclassification for pay increases.

Mr. Chairman, this money would be used to increase the pay of virtually 2,472 veterinarians and lay inspectors whose business it is to carry on meat inspection, and the inspection of tubercular cattle, inspection for Bang's disease, check up on serums, hog cholera, and similar functions. It involves, therefore, the health of the livestock population of the country and particularly at a time when we are standing on the threshold of probably the greatest slaughter of beef animals in the history of our country. The Department needs these inspectors and it needs more than it has at the present time.

I am informed that from February to December 1943 more than 288 veterinarians, inspectors, and lay assistants have left the Service and the reason they left the Service was that the remuneration for the amount of education that you have to have in order to carry on this kind of work is wholly inadequate and is disproportionate to the wages and salaries that are being paid to people in other lines of endeavor. There are 591 of these folks who have a P–1 rating today under our Classification Act. Three hundred and fifty-six of them have served for 5 years or more and 65 have served for 10 years or more. There, I think, you have some testimony as to the fidelity of their service at a time when they could make infinitely more money outside the Government.

There are 294 of them with a P–2 classification, 237 having served for more than 10 years, 165 for more than 20 years, and 26 for more than 30 years.

The difficulty is that the salaries that they receive are disproportionately so small that there is no incentive for people to come into this line of endeavor today. The State veterinarian of the State of Illinois called me the other day. I think we have 81 in the State service and about 17 Federal inspectors out there. He said, "This thing is absolutely imperative because there is no inducement for young men who come out of a veterinarian course that takes 5 years to go into the Government service when he can do infinitely better elsewhere."

The Department is asking for it; the Bureau of the Budget said it was all right and recommended the funds; the livestock people of the country have been here in Washington representing the cause not only to Members of the Congress but to the Department officials as well; so they are insisting that this be done to, in part at least, alleviate a condition under which they cannot get enough inspectors and veterinarians to come into the Service. In view of the slaughter that will take place very soon, the necessity for careful inspection of our livestock, the fact that there is involved here the health of the civilian population and the soldiers, I think dictates the adoption of this amendment.

It will be argued, no doubt, that this will set a precedent for other classifications in the Government, but I do not believe so. There is something more involved here than the question of a precedent and the question of whether or not other groups in the governmental service will come here to ask for $200 or $300 or $400 a year.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The particular service rendered by the members of this profession is preceded by a long course of study.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Just the same as for a man to qualify himself to practice medicine or to practice dentistry?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. They must know animal husbandry and be able to stop the spread of contagious disease which otherwise would destroy millions of our livestock.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Bureau of Animal Husbandry contacted the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has given an examination for the grade of junior veterinarian. There were 53 on the register. They contacted 47 of the 53 and they did not get a single one to come into the service because the answer was, "Why go into the Federal service for meat inspection and quarantine? We can do infinitely better elsewhere."

Mr. Chairman, this is not only a question of keeping what we have but of getting additional inspectors that are so sorely needed for livestock and quarantine inspection today. They have even persuaded the Civil Service Commission to change the age limit and to change some of the qualifications in order to make it easier, but notwithstanding the very frantic, desperate efforts that have been made, the Bureau of Animal Husbandry is still in difficulty. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that evidently they sold the Bureau of the Budget on the idea, because the Bureau of the Budget proposes that the money be provided in this bill. The livestock people are interested through their associations and otherwise. I think this has merit from the standpoint of health, from the standpoint of sanitation, from the standpoint of adequate inspection of that vast amount of beef and hogs that are going to be slaughtered within the next 60 or 90 days.

Mr. Chairman, one other thing. There are 3,300 plants in the country today that are nonfederally inspected. Of that number about 300 have applied for and will have Federal inspection. That simply enlarges the job. If you are going to mandate these people to come in for inspection, you have got to have the inspectors. The question is, Where are you going to get them? The money represented in these amendments is a step in

that direction and has the approval of the Budget Bureau and of all the livestock people.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I want to compliment the gentleman for making his fight for this worthy cause. Is it not a fact also that even in peacetimes, because of salary differential, there has been a shortage of veterinarians throughout the country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may observe that we had the same condition in 1928 and Congress then provided $200,000 in order that they might get an additional $200 a year. So there is some precedent for this kind of action.

Mr. GRANGER. In view of the further fact of the tremendous necessity we have for this at the present time, as the gentleman has indicated, even if it set a precedent it would be justified from the standpoint of health alone?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. That is the important question.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois on so ably presenting the case for the veterinarians, and also the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] who brought out the fact that they are a skilled technical group. I have received many communications from individuals and organizations in my State and from the State livestock and State wool associations that if we do not give these people this added money, we are going to pay for it in the way of a tremendous loss so far as our food program is concerned. We cannot afford to do that at this or at any other time. I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment not only because it is necessary but because it will give justice to an extremely worthy group.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. So, there is involved here the health of the people and those in the armed services.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman state what the present salary range is and how much he intends to increase it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. One grade, for instance, will start in at $2,000. Some grades, I think, start in at $1,620. As I recall, this would give them about $400. I believe the House is sufficiently familiar with my own efforts to bring about economy in Government to appreciate that I would not sponsor a proposal to spend this sum of public funds unless there was ample, sound, and convincing reasons for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that out in Fort Collins, Colo., we have one of the finest veterinary departments of any school in the entire world, and our boys have found employment in practically every nation under the sun. They are doing a wonderfully fine piece of work. That is important.

When a boy out of college, with 5 years' work, can go into practice and earn twice as much as these experts in the Department—if you do not raise these salaries—there is not much inclination on the part of these fine experts down here in the Department to stay on with the Federal Government. That is an important point in this discussion. If we are to keep these experts in the Department of Agriculture, not only in veterinarian work but in other lines of activity, we have got to provide a pay schedule that will keep these men interested in their work and in the advancement and improvement of their line of endeavor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am in sympathy with the amendment, but there is a problem that arises in connection with it about which I am disturbed, and perhaps the gentleman can throw some light on it. Our Nebraska delegation discussed it this morning at their weekly meeting. It is this: There are practically no veterinarians left in the country to take care of the farmers' needs. In the case of one veterinarian it was brought out that he is covering five counties, vaccinating hogs and cattle and caring for the sick livestock and everything else. Will the adoption of this amendment make it more acute for the farmers or the stock raisers? I hesitate to raise the question because I am in sympathy with the amendment.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I cannot see how this would affect the ordinary practice of veterinary students who are just coming into the field.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it take those veterinarians away from the farmer if they go to the Government?

Mr. HILL. This would affect only those now in the service of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment does not give a raise to those who come in at this time?

Mr. HILL. I am not positive of that.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. One reason we are short of veterinarians, as is indicated by the Nebraska experience, is due to the fact that this differential working against your veterinarians has existed for a long while. They, historically, have received subpar pay, particularly in the fields of State and Federal employment. It has not been an attractive profession to get into. I know at one time the secretary of our State department of highways was getting more than the man who headed our State veterinary department. That has existed for a long while. The case is cited of a man who went to work for the Government in 1919 in veterinary work at $2,000, who today, after 24 years, is getting only $2,400. Probably the Department itself has not rewarded their own men properly.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that the idea of this increase is to assist in keeping the men who are already in the Federal service.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. As far as the veterinarians employed out of the Federal Government service are concerned, they are making a pretty fair living, because they are not regulated by the wage scale in the service. If we do not do something to help these people in the service, they are going out in private practice, and where will we be?

Mr. HILL. The very question that our friend from Nebraska asked shows that when veterinarians are serving as high as five counties, it simply means that their income is three to five times more than men with years of experience in the Department of Agriculture are receiving at this time for their work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There has been the customary number of graduates from veterinary schools and the deans of those schools have been contacted, but there is no incentive for them to get into Government service. This would be helpful all the way around.

Mr. HILL. I might add when a man enters this service he enters a technical service that requires years of training to become expert in this line of endeavor.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I think our friends need not be apprehensive that it will take veterinarians out of private practice for the reason people now know what good they are doing, and they are making good money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I am very heartily in favor of the amendments which have been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I am sorry that perhaps some of the Members were not here when the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] spoke upon the importance of this work which is done by the various meat-inspection and food-inspection departments. I think it has been an unhappy situation that we have faced in the picture today, the need of reclassification of the salaried lay-inspectors, and it is indeed intriguing to find a group of Republicans in here fighting to increase governmental salaries, which but emphasizes the need of these amendments.

I have had a great many wires, telegrams, and letters from people in my State. We have very large stockyards and packing industries at South St. Paul.

These men in this work, some of them having been lay inspectors for as long as 16 years, wire me that they are getting less than common laborers in the work which they are doing of that type.

I would like to say further that I have a communication from Dr. Boyd, the distinguished head of the University of Minnesota, division of veterinary medicine, calling to my attention the importance of this work in a public-health way.

These inspectors are either veterinarians or they are lay inspectors with many, many years of experience. They do not get this experience in a few days or a few months, but it takes a course of years, and through professional training. I think the great importance here is that we have to keep these inspectors. It is a matter of public health. Here we are preparing this tremendous amount of livestock which goes not only to the public but to our armed forces, and it must have the type of inspection of that product which is so necessary for our welfare.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It might be well to point out, too, that while the livestock population of the country is increasing, the veterinarians who are looking after all this livestock are in effect decreasing in number, proportionately, and they cannot give enough attention to the needs of the people.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the course of the next 6 months we will probably have the greatest amount of meat preparation that has ever taken place in the history of this country. If ever we have need of that skilled inspection we need it today, not a year from now, but we need it today, and I certainly hope that the several amendments of the gentleman from Illinois will be treated favorably by the Congress in passing upon this.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. I would like to say that many are going to say that this is not an economy measure, but I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think it is correct that if we are going to have a Bureau of Animal Husbandry at the highest point of efficiency, we are going to have to get the kind of men we need to handle it.

Mr. O'HARA. I will say to the gentleman that I do not believe in talking about economy when we are dealing with the health and safety of our armed forces or the public generally in this country. I do not think there is any wisdom in preaching economy and playing with possible serious disastrous results.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to say to the gentleman I am heartily in accord with what he says. In my State, as the gentleman knows, we have a large amount of stock and it is absolutely necessary that we have trained, skilled men in a veterinary capacity, not only to inspect the stock but to be present when it is killed in order to protect the lives of our citizens.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree with the gentleman. I have been talking about the inspection of food, but it includes the raising and production of the stock itself, and that also is of the greatest importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This is an item that raises the pay of one particular group of Federal employees?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. If we attempt in one bill to raise the pay of one group of employees does it not naturally follow that we have to go all the way down the line and raise the pay of everybody else?

Mr. TARVER. In answer to the gentleman's question, I think I am justified in saying that the effect of the adoption of these amendments would be to bring about demands for increases in compensation for Federal employees quite generally in all branches of the Federal Government. There will also be repercussions in private industry, where employees who have so far abided by the restrictions of the Little Steel formula would, if we set an example here of raising Federal employees beyond the limitations provided in the formula, immediately begin demands to be accorded the same kind of treatment in their employment in private industry. I think this is one of the most dangerous amendments proposed to any appropriation bill within recent months.

Mr. TABER Is it not a fact that these people have already received the same increase that other Federal employees have received under Public Law 49?

Mr. TARVER. Twenty-one and six-tenths percent, under the Overtime Pay Act of 1943, amounting in the average to $452 per individual employee of these 2,472 employees who are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I am always regretful when I find myself in disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for whose ability, for whose intellectual honesty, and for whose sincerity of purpose I have the highest regard; but I do not believe the gentleman from Illinois will be very deeply disappointed if the amendments offered by him are not adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The subject matter is one which had the attention of the deficiency subcommittee and also the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. The whole Committee on Appropriations also considered the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and rejected them by a vote of 19 to 4. The opportunity for intelligent consideration of this subject matter on the part of these two subcommittees and on the part of the full Committee on Appropriations was much better than the opportunity is today for the Members of the Committee of the Whole to consider them. I sincerely hope that the Committee of the Whole will not reverse the judgment of the two subcommittees in question and of the full Committee on Appropriations.

I think all of us approach the consideration of this problem in the most sympathetic frame of mind as far as the reclassification of these field employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry is concerned. This is a problem which has been pending for more than 10 years and it is only at a time of acute national emergency that it is brought before the House of Representatives for consideration. The only effect of the approval of this reclassification plan is to bring about an increase above the average increase of $452 a year accorded by the Overtime Pay Act of 1943, for each of these 2,472 employees, of $289.

We had the legislative appropriation bill before the House the other day. When it came into the full Committee on Appropriations it contained a provision appropriating $330,000 to increase the salaries of the law clerks of the Federal district and circuit judges. The full Committee on Appropriations struck out that provision for substantially the same reasons that are being urged here today against the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois, that is, that we did not feel that at this time, regardless of the merits of the case, we could afford to enter upon the policy of increasing the annual compensation of any particular type of employees of the Federal Government, realizing that if we do that there will be numerous other organizations of employees of the Federal Government who will come before the Congress and insist upon the same type of consideration.

I was talking a few moments ago with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who is chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, and he has given me permission to quote what he said to me, that is, that there are many types of positions in the Federal Government at this time for which available personnel cannot be secured but for which that personnel could be secured if increases in compensation should be granted. So let no one linger under the delusion that if we provide for this increase in compensation for the field employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry we have ended the question, because it would be only the beginning. We will have started a spiral the end of which it would be impossible to foresee.

As I said a while ago in response to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] there will also be repercussions in private industry. You will

be going before the employees of private industry in this country, who are being held down by what is known as the Little Steel formula, and saying: "You must continue to observe the limitations of that formula, and not ask wage increases in excess of it, yet at the same time we have in the Federal Government granted an increase not only of 21.6 percent to all Federal employees but in addition we have within 1 year raised the salaries of other employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry, 2,472 of them, by an additional average of $289 per employee."

So I think this is something you ought to consider very carefully and which I hope you will not do.

The amount involved is more than $936,000—$996,000 is the amount of these amendments. But we have provided in the bill the reappropriation of $343,000 from funds heretofore appropriated for the eradication of tuberculosis and Bang's disease, which will not be used during this fiscal year unless this reclassification plan is put into effect. If it is put into effect, and it will be if you approve these amendments, that money will be used during the present fiscal year, it will not be available for reappropriation, and we must add to the amounts in the bill not only the $996,000 plus but $343,000 in addition which will be necessary for that purpose, making a total of approximately $1,340,000. You may not be very much concerned with $1,340,000, but it is a considerable sum.

I am not very much in sympathy with the arguments which have been advanced about these employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry quitting the service if their salaries are not increased. They had what is regarded as good jobs during the lean years when there were millions of men in this country who did not have any employment. When war conditions come about their services are absolutely essential to the Government's program since they are engaged in this work of meat inspection; yet men come and say in their behalf—they have not said it, but men have said it in their behalf—that if they do not get this raise in salaries they are going to quit this important service of the Government and go into a service where they are able to earn more money. Farm employees in my part of the country cannot leave the farm and go to work in war industries where they can make from three to four times what they used to make, unless they get a certificate of availability from the United States Employment Service.

But now we are told that these men who get as high as $3,200 a year will quit the service of the Government and go into something where they can get better compensation unless we raise their salaries. Now, I do not believe that those who advance those arguments correctly represent the viewpoints of those men. I think those employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry are just as patriotic as anybody else, and I do not believe that when our boys who are fighting and dying on the battlefields all over the world and on the seven seas for $50 a month in the great majority of cases, these men who are engaged in this important work behind the lines are going to say, "We are going to strike on the job and we are going to seek other employment unless you give us an increase beyond what we are now receiving, notwithstanding we have had a 21.6 percent increase within the last 12 months."

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. The gentleman spoke about this 21.6 percent increase of all the Government employees. What about this, here in P–3, P–4, and P–5, for instance, the attorneys in the Office of Price Administration who are in grade P–4 and P–5 are raised in a range of $3,200 to $4,600 in less than a period of 3 years?

Mr. TARVER. We are not dealing with the Office of Price Administration and I cannot answer the gentleman's question in regard to the salaries of that Office.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, in 1923 Congress held out to all of its professional and subprofessional civilian employees the prospect that all of them would receive equal pay for equal work and outlined the principles to be followed first by the Director of the Budget and later by the Civil Service Commission in the classification of positions by grades with pay for the different grades varying in accord with the skill required and the responsibilities attached to each position. Reclassification requires investigation and progress has been slow, particularly with the reclassification of positions in the older organizations, but in 1943 investigations of the field services of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Meat Inspection Division, now a part of the Office of Distribution, War Food Administration, were completed and a reclassification of the positions filled by the veterinarians and the lay assistants in these services was established by the Civil Service Commission. This reclassification, set up by the agency, directed by Congress to make it, provides for increased pay of 977 veterinarians and 2,165 lay assistants.

To put this classification into effect, increased appropriations amounting in all to about $750,000, including $152,301 war overtime pay, are included in the estimate submitted by the War Food Administration for the fiscal year 1945.

The request for these increased appropriations comes to Congress with the approval of the War Food Administration and the Director of the Budget after a full and complete investigation and study, and the question is now squarely presented to Congress whether to approve this request or, by disapproving it, to deny to the veterinarians and their lay assistants the benefits of the assurance offered to them by Congress in the Federal Classification Act that the positions held by them would be reclassified so as to provide equal pay for equal work.

The survey conducted preliminary to the proposed reclassification shows unmistakably that the veterinarians in the field services are now and for several years have been grossly underpaid. The total number of these professional employees at the beginning of the year was 1,579. Of this total 299 have been in grade No. 1—$2,000 to $2,600—from 5 to 10 years; 82 have been in the same grade from 3 to 5 years, and 150 have been in that grade up to 3 years. In grade No. 2—$2,600 to $3,200—74 doctors have been employed from 20 to 30 years and 65 have been employed from 15 to 20 years. Of the total number of veterinarians now employed, 6.5 percent are in grade No. 3—$3,200 to $3,800; 1.5 percent are in grade No. 4—$3,800 to $4,600; and 2 percent are in grades Nos. 5 to 8—$4,600 to $9,000. The salary steps within the present grades are limited to $100 each, and the full year changes in basic salaries of the doctors as reclassified amount to $367,000. Out of a total of 2,472 lay assistants, 95 have been in grade No. 4—$1,620—from 5 to 10 years and 950 have been in that grade up to 3 years; 46 have been in grade No. 5—$1,800—from 5 to 10 years with 96 in the same grade up to 3 years; 148 have been in grade No. 6—$2,000—from 10 to 15 years, with 111 in that grade up to 3 years, and 266 in this same grade from 15 to 20 years; 46 have been in grade No. 8—$2,600—up to 3 years. The full year changes in basic salaries for lay assistants as reclassified amounts to $477,520.

On comparing veterinarians with other professional groups in the Department, it appears that veterinarians in the field services are poorly paid.

The percentages of professional groups in the Department by grades are:

Grade	Doctors of veterinary medicine	All other professional groups
P–1	61.5	21.2
P–2	28.5	35.0
P–3	6.5	22.0
P–4	1.5	10.0
P–5 to P–8	2.0	11.8

Notwithstanding the slow rate of promotion and the preponderance of these professional employees in the lower grades, a high rate of efficiency has been maintained both by the B. A. I. and the Meat Inspection Service. Veterinarians are a highly skilled group and they are devoting their skill wholeheartedly to the fulfillment of the war-food program. Their contribution is of first importance to the meat supply. Now that the reclassification has been worked out by the Civil Service Commission, I urge, as a matter of fairness and good faith, that Congress should now appropriate the requested funds to provide compensation for the field services of the B. A. I. and the Meat Inspection Service and thus give effect to the policy declared by Congress in the Classification Act. Otherwise, as to them, the reclassification by the agency authorized to prepare it becomes merely an idle gesture and the Classification Act becomes a nullity.

The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is an important one, and I trust that it will pass and return the Bureau of Animal Industry to the high position it has held down through the years.

In my request to extend my remarks I include therein some "pertinent facts" signed by several livestock associations:

RECLASSIFICATION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY AND OF THE MEAT INSPECTION SERVICE OF THE OFFICE OF DISTRIBUTION OF WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, BUDGET FOR 1944–45

PERTINENT FACTS

1. The persons affected by these recommendations have been underpaid for many years. At present they are the lowest-paid large professional group in the Department of Agriculture. The requests will not give them a preferred position in the Department. It will only place them on an equal status with others in the Department. Without the reclassification, there is great danger that the meat-inspection service and disease control will break down. The deterioration of the animal disease-control service cannot be looked upon with complacency by the livestock interests of the country, neither is it believed to be good policy to allow the fine meat-inspection service which has been built up in this country to disintegrate. Both require well-trained, intelligent personnel which cannot be maintained without establishing more satisfactory salaries than now obtain.

2. According to the testimony offered by the Department in the hearing before the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations last fall (1943), 61.5 percent of the professional employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry were in the P–1 classification, the beginner's grade, whereas no other large group of professional employees of the Department of Agriculture contained more than 21.2 percent.

3. Under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, it is provided that employees be advanced to higher grades after they have acquired experience. For many years, because of lack of funds, these promotions have not been made in this group. At present, of the 591 veterinarians in the P–1 grade, 356 have served more than 5 years and 65 more than 10 years. Of the 294 veterinarians in the P–2 classification, 237 have served more than 10 years, 165 more than 20 years, and 26 more than 30 years.

4. These veterinarians and their lay assistants receive benefits of the overtime pay bill of last year, the same as all other civil-service employees, but their relative position is no better than before. In fact, the relative position is poorer because overtime pay is calculated on the base pay, and therefore the increments received by these employees are smaller.

5. The poor salary situation of this group is well known to veterinary students and schools and for years the Department has not been able to recruit sufficient good personnel. Also the turn-over has been large and in recent years separations have far exceeded the number that could be recruited. Both disease-control groups and the meat-inspection service are at present far understaffed.

On behalf of our respective organizations, we, the undersigned, respectfully urge favorable consideration of this requested reclassification of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry to the end that the livestock and meat industries may continue to be assured of adequate disease control and inspection facilities, and the public of a plentiful supply of clean, wholesome, and disease-free meat.

American National Livestock Association, Denver, A. D. Brownfield, president, F. E. Mollin, executive secretary and treasurer; American Pork Producers Association, Peoria, Ill., Ted Anderson, president, Eugene Harsh, secretary; National Livestock Producers Association, Chicago, Ill., B. B. Brumley, president, P. O. Wilson, secretary; National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, G. N. Winder, president, J. M. Jones, secretary; Texas and Southwestern Cattlemens Association, Fort Worth, Tex., Holman Cartwright, president, Henry Bell, secretary and general manager; Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association, Fort Stockton, Tex., Marsh Lea, president; Kansas Livestock Association, Topeka, Kans., W. J. Brown, president, Will J. Miller, executive secretary and treasurer; New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association, Albuquerque, N. Mex., E. G. Hayward, president, Horace H. Henning, secretary; Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Cheyenne, Wyo., Charles A. Myers, president, Russell Thorp, secretary; American Stock Yards Association, A. Z. Baker, president, C. B. Heinemann, secretary; National Association of Livestock Exchanges, East St. Louis, Ill., John Saunders, president, Henry Park, secretary; National Livestock Loss Prevention Board, Chicago, J. C. Cash, president, H. R. Smith, secretary; American Veterinary Medical Association, Chicago, Ill, Charles W. Bower, president, John G. Hardenbergh, secretary; United States Live Stock Sanitary Association, Trenton, N. J., J. M. Sutton, president, R. A. Hendershott, secretary-treasurer; National Assembly State Livestock Sanitary Officials, Chicago, Ill., C. P. Bishop, president, C. C. Franks, secretary-treasurer.

ALLEGED SEDITIONISTS AND PRO-NAZI EMPLOYEE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it may be that Winchell, as an employee of the Jergens Co. and perhaps interested in a former employee of that company or of Andrew Jergens and who—the employee—entered a plea of guilty to misprision of treason came to town yesterday to ascertain the present place of residence of such employee, to bring up to date his—Jergens'—information on the subject.

If that was his purpose and he has now ascertained that one of the two former employees of Jergens is in jail and the other is interned, perhaps he will go on and explain in some of his future broadcasts what he meant when he said, in connection with the arrest of one of them, "orchids to Jergens." Did he mean that Jergens was to be congratulated in having in its employ such an individual? Did he mean that Jergens actually did something to unearth the subversive activities of such employee? If he meant the latter, why is it that he has never given us the details?

He has devoted plenty of time and space to lambasting a Congressman who gave employment to a shell-shocked World War veteran, who was subsequently led into a trap; and Winchell has given plenty of space and time to all of those who were indicted here in Washington for sedition. But he has been as quiet as a clam for many months about the subversive, the Nazi-connected activities of two of the former employees of his own boss.

Now it is quite true that Winchell referred to the arrest of a Mrs. Siddell when he spoke over the air on January 17, 1943. From a transcript of Winchell's broadcast on January 17, 1943, the following appears:

CINCINNATI.—On January 16 the Associated Press reported that the F. B. I. was holding Mrs. Margaret F. Seidel (sic), 36 years old. Mrs. Seidel, ladies and gentlemen, was in the trusted employ of Andrew Jergens, my sponsor. She is being held for investigation of violating the Enemy Alien Act. "Mr. Jergens," said the Associated Press, "aided the F. B. I. in the investigation." This is to further report that Mr. Jergens cooperated fully with the F. B. I. many months ago when complaints about Mrs. Seidel were turned over to John Edgar Hoover and Mr. Jergens by this newsboy.

Apparently, the inference which Winchell wishes to be drawn from this broadcast is that Jergens and Winchell were responsible for the arrest of Mrs. Siddell.

As stated the other day, Winchell, in connection with this matter, stated, "orchids to Jergens." Winchell, in effect, created the impression that he was congratulating his sponsor and sought to claim credit for him for the disclosure of the pro-Nazi activities of Mrs. Siddell.

Unfortunately, the record of the hearing before the alien board in Cincinnati shows that Jergens continually sought to obtain his employee's freedom and is now reported to have renewed his efforts to secure her release from an internment camp.

The Winchell broadcast, as quoted above, has all the earmarks of a clever cover-up. Winchell's subsequent conduct, his comparative silence as to the actions of this Nazi agent; his loquacity, his vociferousness in connection with the indictment of alleged seditionists all tend to show that the principal difference between the so-called seditionists and the convicted Nazi propagandist was the sum of $5,000 per broadcast paid him by Jergens.

It would seem expedient that the Dies committee, when it makes its inquiry into Winchell's smear methods, ask not only Mr. Jergens and Mr. Winchell what they know about the situation, but that they ask J. Edgar Hoover to disclose whatever facts there may be in connection with the so-called full cooperation by Jergens, and whether or not the first information as to Miss or Mrs. Siddell's alien connection came from Winchell.

In brief, let the Department of Justice, let the F. B. I., give the public as much information about these two former employees of Jergens, Winchell's sponsor, as has been given to the public time and again in connection with the charges against those indicted here in Washington for sedition.

From the press this morning it appears that Winchell has again been endeavoring to attract to himself some degree of respectability by attempting to associate his name, his activities, with the names of outstanding, decent, loyal citizens who have passed on.

The attempt to which I refer is an article by Ed Sullivan in this morning's

Washington Times-Herald. It reads as follows:

LITTLE OLD NEW YORK

(By Ed Sullivan)

THE BROADWAY MADHOUSE

In an excess of modesty, Winchell compares himself with great Thomas Paine, Horace Greeley, James Gordon Bennett, William Allen White, Jacob Riis, Lincoln Steffens, and Heywood Broun, and throws in Joseph Pulitzer for good measure. Always belitting himself. Winchell, self-styled apostle of free speech, had New Yorker Editor Harold Ross barred from the Stork Club because Ross exercised free speech and razzed him in print. Because Earl Carroll exercised the right of free speech and told him to his face what he thought of him, Winchell taunted Carroll for years in print as a convict. Because I once asked Barbara Hutton to stage a Christmas party for the poor children of New York, and because she gave $5,000 for Christmas baskets for the poor, infuriating him, Winchell vilified me as a "journalistic blackmailer." Shades of Thomas Paine, Pulitzer, Steffens, Broun.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the proposed amendment for increase in the salaries of veterinarians and meat inspectors. A number of persons employed in the Union Stock Yards in Chicago in these capacities have written me and presented very cogent arguments for the adjustment of wages paid those who are doing such a splendid service to protect the people of America and her armed men and women in this great national crisis.

I beg leave to present here the straightforward statements of two meat inspectors and a woman who has been employed for some time in the Meat Inspection Division:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 22, 1944.*

HON. W. A. ROWAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to present for your consideration a few facts that may perhaps induce you to take favorable action on that part of the Department of Agriculture appropriation that provides for reclassification of the lay inspectors and veterinarians employed by the Meat Inspection Division, Office of Distribution, W. F. A.

Primarily, meat inspection is police work; that is, constant supervision of all operations connected with the production of meat and meat food products. This supervision takes the form of enforcing absolute compliance with the Meat Inspection Act, its amendments, and all regulations pertaining thereto.

Obviously, in order to enforce proper compliance, the men must maintain a high standard of technical information regarding the innumerable practices and processes involved in operating the edible departments of the meat-packing industry.

We believe that, in all honesty, we can say that in the aggregate we know the meat-packing industry as well as the packers themselves. As a matter of fact, a number of our men have resigned from the service to accept high salaried positions with the packers.

As nearly as we can ascertain, we are the lowest salaried enforcement unit in the Federal service. We feel that, in all fairness, our salaries should be comparable to others in the Federal service who carry on similar lines of work.

The quality of our work is high, and of inestimable value to the country. Through our efforts, every consumer of meat and meat food products is given protection the value of which cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Moreover, the meat packers of the country have built up a tremendous export business, in peacetime particularly, that would disappear overnight without our services.

You have our assurance that whether we get reclassified or not, the high level of our efforts will be maintained. However, we hope that you can see the justice in our desire for reclassification at a higher rate of salary.

Respectfully yours,

NATHAN OSTROWSKY,
Assistant Lay Inspector.

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 14, 1944.*

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am employed in the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture, so I am vitally interested in the reclassification measure which is to be considered by the agriculture appropriations subcommittee.

This reclassification is of vital importance to me, due to the fact that present salary paid is low and insufficient to adequately support my family according to the present-day standards of living.

The regular deductions from my salary checks tend to reduce the actual amount of cash in hand to a great extent, and the payroll bond purchase plan, now amounting to 15 percent in my case, is in grave danger unless relief is obtained in the near future.

Meat inspection, as you know, is one of the most important branches of service, inasmuch as the public health depends solely upon the efficiency of this branch for the protection of the health of the entire Nation.

Believing that this reclassification is of the utmost importance in maintaining the required high standard of efficiency, I am respectfully soliciting whatever support you may be able to lend to this measure.

Respectfully yours,

H. D. THOMPSON.

FEBRUARY 28, 1944.

Representative WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A measure for the reclassification of employees in the Meat Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture will soon require the attention of the agricultural appropriation subcommittee. This measure has already been considered and approved by the United States Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission.

This measure is one of utmost importance to the Nation. Meat-inspection employees are responsible for the protection of the health of the people, and they are also instrumental in protecting the public from being fraudulently deceived regarding meat and meat-food products. A high degree of efficiency is required of these employees, and the reclassification measure will serve not only to maintain this efficiency, but also to attract persons of high caliber to undertake this type of work.

The present standard has been in force for many decades and has long been outmoded. Such restricted recognition of special ability and opportunity for deserved advancement has often served to lose the best employees to other more attractive services and has dulled the ambition of many who remained as meat inspectors. Monetary remuneration lags far behind that offered to employees in other closely related services.

Being a member of the Meat Inspection Service, I am naturally very much interested in seeing it brought up to date. To this end I am, therefore, requesting your wholehearted support and cooperation in contributing to the passage of the reclassification measure.

Most respectfully yours,

MRS. CLEO V. BOBST.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, in the efforts to foster livestock production and safeguard animal products for food the following steps are indispensable:

First. Research in the laboratory and in the field to discover the causes of disease and effective safeguards, remedies, and preventives.

Second. Federal and State quarantines to confine any dangerous and infectious diseases to the smallest possible area until it can be eradicated.

Third. Cattle, sheep, and swine feeding and breeding investigations.

Fourth. Campaigns for control and eradication of widespread diseases, State by State and county by county. In some campaigns insects causing diseases such as scabies and cattle fever are eradicated. In others, such as dourine and bovine tuberculosis, the infected animals are destroyed. In hog-cholera campaigns large numbers of swine are immunized. In foot-and-mouth disease all affected and exposed animals, as well as all exposed materials, are quickly destroyed.

Fifth. Stockyards inspection: Stockyards are potential sources of inspection for serious diseases. Each year millions of animals are inspected in the yards by doctors of veterinary medicine able to detect by overlooking large numbers of animals visible symptoms of such diseases as anthrax, cattle and sheep scabies, fever ticks, shipping fever, hog cholera, swine erysipelas, and foot-and-mouth disease. Diseases found on this inspection are traced back to source, and measures are taken to prevent the spread of disease by animals to be shipped out of the yards to other points.

Sixth. Meat inspection: Ante mortem and post mortem inspection are made of each animal immediately before and at the time of slaughter, and inspection and reinspection, are required of meats and meat products and of processing. The number of animals receiving this inspection rose to 95,000,000 during the fiscal year 1943 and the number is increasing. All carcasses and parts thereof found unfit for food are condemned and destroyed, and sanitary conditions of inspected establishments are closely supervised at all times.

Seventh. International border inspection and quarantine prevent importation of diseased animals.

Eighth. Regulation of biological products eliminates all offered as remedies that are worthless, contaminated, harmful, or otherwise dangerous.

The work done by Federal doctors of veterinary medicine and their assistants in my judgment is of first importance, and unless Congress now wishes to repeal or modify the laws of long standing under which consumers receive protection against unwholesome meats and meat products and the livestock industry is aided to keep animals healthy by the control and eradication of animal diseases, I urge approval of the request of the War Food Administration for sufficient appropriations to finance the reclassification of these field services as set up by the agency authorized by Congress to establish it.

Due regard for the public interest demands that these services shall not be curtailed through failure to appropriate sufficient funds to sustain them. I urge the House to accept the amendment, so that justice will be given to the veterinarians of the country.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the great State of Wyoming, which I have the high honor to represent, is vitally interested in the Bureau of Animal Industry. This bureau was established 60 years ago, and has an enviable record for efficient service. The livestock industry is subject to a constant menace of diseases that can destroy herds and endanger the health and lives of consumers. Many diseases can be fought only by Federal and State control with the aid of veterinary science. One of the duties of the Bureau of Animal Industry is to keep livestock healthy. The fight against animal diseases must be waged all the time and requires the continued exercise of brains and skill supplied by doctors of veterinary medicine. The number of these doctors as compared with the number of livestock in this country is small, but they have made a notable record in controlling livestock diseases and parasites, and while our losses each year from these sources are large, every livestock man knows that abandoning the efforts to eradicate and prevent animal diseases would stifle the production of livestock in this country.

The inspection before and after slaughter by the Bureau and the Meat Inspection Service resulting in the elimination of carcasses or parts thereof being found unfit for food, is a distinct and vital service to the Nation. The stamp of Federal inspection is a safeguard for the protection of the consumers. All animals received at federally inspected slaughterhouses must pass two thorough veterinary inspections, one before slaughter and one at the time of slaughter, because it is only by such antemortem and postmortem inspection it can be determined whether meat is fit for food and because animals and animal products are intimately associated with human health and disease. Under the leadership of the Bureau of Animal Industry, some very devastating and dangerous animal diseases such as rinderpest have been kept out of this country.

The Bureau of Animal Industry has succeeded in eradicating foot-and-mouth disease every time it has appeared in this country. There have been 7 outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States since the turn of the century. The most serious one occurred during the year 1914, and covered 22 States. During 1924 and 1925 California and Texas experienced difficulties with this disease. On January 1, 1927, the Bureau of Animal Industry in establishing a rigid embargo declared in the order "that there exists in most of the countries throughout the world the contagious and infectious diseases of animals known as rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease," and prohibited imports of meat products from any region in which either of said diseases exist. Since then a minor outbreak occurred in the State of California in 1929, and it is significant to know that this was caused by violation of the existing sanitary regulations from a ship returning from Argentina.

In dealing with diseases of this character, a tight quarantine on animals and products likely to carry infection is the only effective control. I should like to call your attention to a resolution passed by the American National Livestock Association at their annual meeting at Denver, during January of this year:

Whereas the war condition which exists in our country and the world today has brought the realization of the need for an increased meat supply and other necessary foods for the United States; and

Whereas in order that we may maintain the production of these increased meat supplies, it is of vital importance that we protect and safeguard the health of our herds: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our opposition to any modification of the existing sanitary embargo applying to countries where foot-and-mouth disease and/or rinderpest exists.

Bang's disease is under better control and it is hoped that with sustained efforts by Federal and State veterinary services it may also be eradicated. I desire also to call attention to a resolution of the same association adopted at the same time on this disease:

Whereas there now exist much confusion and lack of uniformity in State sanitary regulations against Bang's disease: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Bureau of Animal Industry to adopt regulations recognizing calfhood vaccination for the movement of cattle interstate; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge all States to adopt standard regulations in conformity with the standards established by the B. A. I.

Congress at this session has before it a request to appropriate about $750,000—war overtime pay included—to pay for the long-delayed reclassification of doctors of veterinary medicine and their lay assistants with promotions proposed for 977 doctors and 2,165 lay assistants. The increase requested is less than 9 percent of the current annual appropriations for the activities in which these field employees are engaged. In addition to promotions it is expected the reclassification, by making feasible deserved promotions within a reasonable time, will make possible the employment of the more competent recent graduates of colleges of veterinary medicine who have been avoiding the Federal veterinary service because it offers less compensation and less prospect of advancement than is open to them in other fields.

The efficiency of any organization will decrease unless service in it is sufficiently attractive to permit replacement of those who resign or retire with new employees, and it is inevitable that in organizations as old as the B. A. I. and Federal Meat Inspection, resignations and retirements will increase rather than diminish. These services suffered a net loss of 93 doctors during 1943, including 35 who entered the armed forces, and 19 who transferred to other Government units.

The decision which Congress is now called upon to make is whether it wants the efforts of these field services to keep animals healthy and their products fit for food to continue at its present high rate of efficiency or to deteriorate eventually because of lack of skilled manpower. Five years' study are required to acquire a degree of doctor of veterinary medicine and there never have been enough of them to implement their services to the fullest extent. Lay assistants require training for varying periods depending upon their assignment and prior experience.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendments, to be considered en bloc, offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 32, noes 50.

So the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dutch elm disease control: For determining and applying methods of control and prevention of spread of the disease of elm trees known as Dutch elm disease and of a virus disease of elm trees prevalent in the Ohio Valley, $300,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this appropriation shall be made for applying methods of control of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force, provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential or appropriate for the carrying on of the control program, nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations concerned: *Provided further*, That expenditures incurred for removal of trees from non-Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, or on property included within local experimental control areas: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] if he would make an explanation briefly of the effect of the change of language in the section relating to Dutch elm disease control. I notice quite a few changes in that and a quick reading of it leads me to believe it is restricted to elm trees on Federal land. Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. TARVER. I might point out to the gentleman from Connecticut that in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year there was carried language which prohibited the use of any of the funds carried in this item of the bill for the purpose of removing trees from privately owned land, that is, infected trees, and had the effect also, although I am not quoting exactly, of

requiring that the States in which this disease exists should enact legislation under which the owners of lands on which infected trees should be located should be required to remove the trees at their own expense. There was objection on the part of some State authorities because, according to their insistence, in some States the State itself or some subdivision of the State might be willing to pay the expense of the removal of the trees and they thought we ought not to require that legislation to be enacted which would require in every case the property owner to pay the expense of removing the trees. We accorded with that objection by making changes in the language which would simply require that the trees be removed without expense to the Federal Government, leaving to the States the determination as to the method of removal, whether it should be at State expense, local expense, or at the expense of the property owners. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think that answers the question. I know that in my own State we are concerned about that, and we try to regulate our program in accordance with the language just read. I just wanted to be sure that no further change was going to be brought about by this language. I think this meets the situation and I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $290,400 for personal services in the District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics for conducting either independently or in cooperation with other agencies, investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this subject, $806,630.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 43, line 24, strike out "$806,630" and insert in lieu thereof "$606,630."

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. TARVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment may close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be used by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity to save $200,000. The committee has brought in this bill with this particular item, $200,000, above the Budget estimate. They are seeking to have this $200,000, as I understand it, for the purpose of experimenting and teaching people how to can fruit.

You are all familiar with the fact that women in the country districts are brought up to can fruit.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I am sure the gentleman would not want to represent the matter incorrectly. The purpose for which the addition was asked was for food processing and storage in the home; housing needs; adjustments families are making to changes in incomes; child-feeding programs as they affect the health of children; practical helps for homemakers.

Mr. TABER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield any further, because I think that proves just exactly what I said. Here we are in this situation, with the Commodity Credit Corporation having on hand an inventory of 500,000,000 pounds of canned fruit and vegetables, mostly canned fruits, canned and dried fruits, and nearly 200,000 more of contracts right at this time, at a time when the stores have taken the points off of most of these things and made them available to the public, and when the canners have been obliged to sell these things more or less at a discount because the people have done so much canning at home. There is no occasion for our turning loose a lot of experimental work on this sort of thing at this time. They already have $606,000, which is nearly $100,000 more than was given them in the bill last year. They were already given by the Budget nearly $100,000 increase and then the committee throws on $200,000 more. Frankly I cannot go along with that because I do not believe it is economy.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is not the gentleman familiar with the fact that virtually every woman and schoolgirl more than 10 years of age on the farms of this country, or wherever they raise anything, know how to can vegetables and fruit?

Mr. TABER. They are brought up to do that. They know how to do that, and they are doing it. To have a lot of professors going into this kind of business will not improve the situation. It will not do anything to contribute to the welfare, except to put more people on the Federal pay roll.

Sometime we have got to come to the end of that sort of thing. I cannot go along with it. I hope the House of Representatives will not be in favor of increasing appropriations at this time.

I think this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe a subcommittee which has reduced an appropriation bill by 45 percent below the figures for the present fiscal year can be justly accused of extravagance. We have added in one of a few instances in the bill, an amount in excess of the Budget estimates. We were asked to add $675,000 and we added $200,000, not for the purpose of teaching canning in the home only, as indicated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] but for the several purposes which I read in connection with the question I asked of him.

We had before our subcommittee some of the leading women in this country interested in problems of the home and in home economics. I wish I had time to read the list of them to you. Their statements appear on page 1300 and the following pages of our hearings and I hope you may, before voting on this amendment, have an opportunity to refer briefly to them.

They take the position that a Congress which appropriates $17,000,000 plus, for the Bureau of Animal Industry, ought not to become parsimonious and appropriate only a very small amount for that organization of the Department of Agriculture which has to do with the problems of the home. Only $806,000 is asked here for the purpose of undertaking to deal with these problems and make certain additional research studies.

The committee unanimously approved of this after hearing the evidence. Of course, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has not heard the evidence and I judge from his remarks that he has not had an opportunity to read the evidence. We had statements from Miss Jessie W. Harris, president of the Home Economics Association, and many others.

Mr. TABER. I did look this stuff over. I found out by checking up that this woman was an employee of the Department of Agriculture. I presume that is news to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no; she is director of the school of home economics, at the University of Tennessee.

Mr. TABER. I know what she said she was, but I am telling you what the fact of the situation is, that she is an employee of the Department of Agriculture. I will prove it to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. And I can assure the gentleman that he is mistaken just as he was mistaken a moment ago when he said what he did about this $200,000. The gentleman just has not read the report. Or if he has read it, has not digested it. Apparently the matter was called to the gentleman's attention only a moment ago.

Then we have the statement of Miss Lita Bane, chairman advisory committee, American Home Economics Association, and head of home economics department, University of Illinois; the statement of Dr. Margaret Justin, dean of the division of home economics, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.; the statement of Mrs. Thalia Woods, executive secretary, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C.; the statement of Mrs. Bernice Finn, a homemaker from Iowa; the statement of Mrs. Edgar B. Chiswell, Jr., homemaker from California; the statement of Mrs. Waldo E. Caven, rural homemaker from New Jersey; and many others who appeared in defense of these items, whose evidence, in my judgment,

is entitled to full faith and credit by this House. My only regret is that we could not have granted the increase of $675,000 instead of $200,000. If this House should cut out this small increase for this worthy Bureau and its activities in my judgment it would be a penny-wise and pound-foolish thing to do.

I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 49, noes 50.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. TARVER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 57, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note in reading the items on forestry in this bill that the amounts for forest-fire cooperation have been reduced from the Budget appropriations for 1944 of $6,334,917 to $2,529,062, a reduction of $3,805,855. I have discussed this with a member of the committee who has informed me that he believes the existing authorization bill allows only $2,500,000 to be provided for forest-fire cooperation. I should like to know the truth of this matter from a member of the committee.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this matter in the committee. I undertook to discuss it in my presentation to the House yesterday. The limit of the authorization, as the gentleman knows, is $2,500,000 to which we can add only the amount necessary to meet the overtime pay requirements of the Overtime Pay Act of 1943. It would, therefore, be beyond the power of the committee to insert any amount in the bill in excess of the authorization. As the result of this fact, it was necessary to reduce the Budget estimate by approximately $2,470,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. As my memory now serves me the appropriation bill of last year carried an authorization to the Department to incur expenditures beyond the appropriation in the event a fire occurred that required such expenditures.

Mr. TARVER. The appropriation the gentleman refers to is an item of $100,000 for fighting fires on Government lands. That is only a token appropriation. Nobody knows how much might be required. The Department goes ahead and spends whatever money is necessary, then asks for a deficiency appropriation, but that is not this item which is for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and owners of private land in the matter of fire prevention and forest-fire protection.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that the language is missing from this bill that was carried in previous bills which enabled the Forestry Department to spend whatever sums were necessary for combating forest fires under the forest-lands item.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is mistaken. That has not been in the bill. It is simply done as a matter of routine every year, it is put in as a token appropriation, which is supplemented by whatever funds may be necessary in a deficiency bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it not true that in previous bills there has been such language which enabled the Department to expend whatever was necessary to control fires?

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no. That authority is outlined in the report and in the policy this Congress has uniformly followed of making good whatever amount may be necessary to expend in fighting forest fires on Government-owned land. The gentleman has two different subject matters in mind. One of them is the item to which he first referred, dealing with forest-fire cooperation where an appropriation is made for expenditures in cooperation with the States and the owners of private land. The other is the item having to do with fighting forest fires on Government-owned land. There has never been any question so far as I know in the mind of anyone as to the procedure followed in connection with the last-mentioned item.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have sent to the document room for a copy of last year's bill, but I find there is not a copy of that bill available. However, my memory is there was such language in that bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the language of the 1944 Appropriation Act before me, and there has been no change.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In the deficiency bill that we had in here last month there was an item for quite a considerable amount—I have forgotten exactly the amount but it was in the neighborhood of a million and a half to two million dollars—as a deficiency that had been incurred. The sum varies so from year to year according to circumstances that it is absolutely impossible to figure the thing out in advance.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what I am saying, and that is why I want to make certain it is possible to go ahead and expend whatever money is necessary for forest-fire fighting, under the law.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is true, is it?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,092,519.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, within my own State of Ohio, and close to home, are striking examples of Nation-wide forest conditions calling for intelligent, statesmanlike action for correction. In the hill counties of southern Ohio the mineral deposits of coal and oil are rapidly being depleted. The forests of the area have been heavily used and exploited to the point where they contribute little to the welfare and support of the population. . The rugged terrain and the kinds of soil existing over much of the area prevent sustained, productive agriculture. With our non-renewable resources gone, my people will be forced by necessity to depend heavily upon the one resource capable of sustained production under the circumstances, namely, the forest cover.

Yet neither they, nor the professional foresters of the region know specifically how the forest can be brought quickly to maximum sustained productivity, nor even the level of productivity possible to attain either in terms of money or of population and industry. Nor can the professional foresters tell with exactitude the effect of the present and improved forest cover outside the area, as in terms of flood control and water yield.

Similar conditions prevail over vast areas of the United States, and this situation reflects the inadequacy of the forest research in the past. Only by painstaking study and analysis can foresters devise effective corrective measures and bring the forests of the country to full fruition.

You are, or should be, aware that Nation-wide research in forestry is a national function; and that its effective prosecution is dependent almost entirely on funds made available in appropriations.

I will touch a little later on the returns to be expected from the research investment, but at this point I want to call attention to the magnitude of the task confronting research foresters. The 630,000,000 acres of forest land in the continental United States bears nearly a thousand kinds of trees occurring in well over a hundred recognized combinations called forest types, all sufficiently different to require individual study. Climatically, geologically, and topographically they cover almost the full range of conditions found in the country. But the problem of how to bring the forests to, and maintain them, at a high level of production cannot be solved by study of measurable physical elements alone. The solution depends also on an understanding of the relation of people and their economic affairs to the use and care of the forests and their products. As long ago as 1926 the Congress, recognizing the importance, magnitude, and complexity of a realistically adequate program of research in forestry, authorized annual appropriations

of $2,575,000 for such work, exclusive of studies on forest products. As I will point out later, the largest appropriation made was only about half this amount.

As an example of the magnitude of the job I might cite the Nation-wide forest survey. For the past 10 or 12 years, region by region, we have sought to determine the existing amount of timber by kinds and the rate at which it is being used or destroyed and regrown. Despite the use of the lightest sampling consistent with reasonable accuracy, and the most energetic prosecution of the work possible with the finances available, less than half the forested area of the country has been covered by the survey to date.

The importance of the forest resource is fully commensurate with its extent and complexity. Over half a million of our wage-earning citizens in all sections of the country are directly dependent on the forest for a livelihood. In times of peace, as in 1939, the primary products of the forest were worth more than $2,500,000,000. Now their strategic importance in the prosecution of the war is inestimable and their monetary value has increased to nearly three and one-half billions of dollars. This wealth is largely harvested, moreover, not by a few gigantic industrial plants but by a host of small and moderate sized plants widely scattered. These thousands of small businesses and enterprises, and the farmers and owners of the timber areas supplying them raw materials are, perhaps, most in need of practical guidance based upon research results.

Forest Research is not a new activity in the United States, yet it has never been adequately financed. As early as 1881 a tiny appropriation was made for investigations in forestry. Further appropriations, increasing at a snail's pace, were made for the next 24 years. From 1905 to 1939 a more or less regular increase occurred, stimulated from time to time by legislation such as the McSweeny-McNary Act. In 1939 some $1,430,000 was available for research on the problems of protecting, regenerating, improving, and cutting of forests, the management of forest ranges, the effects of forest cover on run-off and streamflow, and the economic interdependence of people, forest industries, and forests. It seems appropriate here to call attention to the fact that even at the peak in 1939 appropriations were only about half of the amounts authorized by the McSweeny-McNary Act.

Since 1939, despite the fact that the war and progressive exploitation of our forests have brought them and their dependent industries to the threshold of their most critical period, this Congress has stifled the research essential to the healthy continuation of an essential, Nation-wide industry by repeatedly reducing appropriations. These reductions—savings some may call them—although inconsequential in the National Budget have had a deplorable effect on the research organization of the Forest Service. The total reduction, amounting to some 33 percent has required the closing of all research in one important forested region, and the release of some 60 highly trained professional research men. It has required abandonment of scores of small experimental forests, and indefinite suspension of record taking on hundreds of studies where continuity of records is essential to successful solution of pressing problems. In this effect it is no exaggeration to say that the reductions have led directly to the waste of previous work costing at least five times as much as the savings. In the words of a proverb of my home State—we have saved at the spigot and let it run out at the bung.

These ill effects have come right at a time when we should be bending every effort to determine how to minimize the effects of excessive cutting for war needs, how to repair the damage that inevitably has resulted over large areas, and how in the post-war period to so manage, rehabilitate, and protect our forests and range lands that they will furnish a decent American living for a large segment of our population. Without an adequate and aggressive program of research now on these broad problems many other areas and regions will, like southern Ohio, the Ozarks, and the Appalachians, be faced with a steadily diminishing base of natural resources on which to build. Moreover, it is fallacious to assume that the time lost now can be made up later. An experiment, once started, yields no results unless brought to completion, and in forestry—far more than in other sciences—time is an integral part of every study.

There is scarcely a field of human interest or endeavor in which research has not paid handsome dividends, and forest research is no exception. Yet, as in other industries, the solution of one problem begets hope for the solution of others previously considered insoluble, and the need and opportunities for continued and expanded research unfold and develop with each step of progress.

I might cite a few of these steps in the progress of forest research that point the way to what may be expected elsewhere if this activity receives the support it deserves from a body charged with responsibility for the welfare of the Nation.

In California, by careful studies, the research men learned to recognize and describe the individual ponderosa pine trees most susceptible to attack by the pine beetle. This information, translated into cutting instructions, has made it possible to harvest as healthy live timber some 85 percent of the trees that would have been killed by beetles and left to rot in the woods. The new cutting practices are being applied on large operations with consequent savings of thousands of dollars yearly.

Naval stores, turpentine and rosin, are essential components of many military items. The demands of war exceed production, and stocks were being steadily depleted; and labor and timber to step up production were not available. Research men of the Forest Service were able, however, to devise a treatment of the trees tapped so as to increase by as much as 50 percent the yield of gum from individual trees without material increase in labor. The studies, moreover, gave evidence that further increases might be possible.

In Utah, California, and the Southwest studies on the relation of forest and range-land cover to stream flow disclosed the reasons for destructive floods and the corrective measures needed on the watersheds to supplement engineering protective structures. The savings in flood damage alone promise to pay far more than the cost of the research.

Perpetuation of the forest and of its dependent industries and populations in two important regions is given greater assurance by the solution of the problems of regenerating Douglas fir and jack pine following cutting. Years of the most meticulous research were required to discover and test the treatments and conditions that will assure prompt and adequate restocking of cut-over stands of these two species. As a result, it is no longer necessary for landowners, industries, and communities to look with apprehension on the cutting of merchantable timber in the Lake States and Pacific Northwest where they grow.

Perhaps the outstanding achievement of forest research, however, is the recognition and evaluation of the critical elements governing forest fires and the development of a scientific basis for determining the degree of danger daily and planning adequate control measures. The application of these results has spread to every forest region having organized fire control. The value of timber saved, of increased resource security, and of time required to grow new forest crops, translated into dollars, will total millions.

These results, and others equally important, are taken by people in all parts of the country as assurance that their own problems will yield to study. Increasingly they are demanding that something be done in that direction. This Congress can, and should, meet its responsibility by making the investment in forest research needed to do so.

The Clerk read as follows:

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570), $2,500,000, and in addition thereto $29,062 to carry out the provisions of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943; in all, $2,529,062, of which not to exceed $64,226 and $5,000 shall be available for personal services and for the purchase of supplies and equipment, respectively, in the District of Columbia.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 23), and for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, including not to exceed $70,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $4,161,496 for forest development roads and

trails, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $7,500.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to direct my remarks to the item on page 54, line 5, entitled "Farm and other private forestry cooperation."

I do so because I want to call attention to the fact that the Plains States forestry project as now being operated by the Soil Conservation Service has been very successful in the Plains States.

I want to report to you that I have recently returned from my State, where we have a great many of these shelterbelt projects, and the trees which we planted under the old shelterbelt project are growing in an excellent manner, and the percentage of loss is negligible.

This has been one of the finest pieces of work the Government has ever undertaken. It is popular with the farmers. It is popular with the businessmen. The farms upon which these shelterbelts have been planted bring more money in the open market than farms which do not have these shelterbelt projects upon them. Therefore I want to report to you that the money that is spent in planting trees in the Plains States was wisely expended. I am happy to note that the Soil Conservation people are going to continue planting these trees on these farms. They are already bringing back into our plains wildlife and song birds. We can even cut fence posts from many of these shelterbelts. They are a wind protection. In many places they are so valuable that we no longer have to build snow fences.

I hope the Soil Conservation organization will continue planting these trees in the Plains States where we really appreciate vegetation and trees. You who have trees and vegetation cannot realize what we in Nebraska mean when we say we are a tree-planting State.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. What is so wonderful as a tree? I have not visited that part of the country, but do I understand that these trees are growing on treeless plains? Where they have not grown before?

Mr. STEFAN. Where trees have never been planted before these shelterbelts are growing with a negligible loss. The Forestry Service has learned where they can plant trees and under what conditions and in what soil, and our farmers have learned through the Soil Conservation Service and the Forestry Service what kind of trees will grow on their individual farms.

Some of these trees are now 30 to 40 feet high. They are bringing us an unusual amount of happiness.

We, in Nebraska, are the followers of the spirit of the late J. Sterling Morton who was Secretary of Agriculture under the late President Grover Cleveland. At that time the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture was approximately $14,000,000. The father of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], our colleague, who was chairman of the committee, expressed horror that perhaps this bill would sometime reach $15,000,000. At one time our appropriation bill for agriculture reached over $1,000,000,000. In 1944 it was over $900,000,000. This bill comes to you with a cut of about $405,000,000 in it. While we have to save money, I hope we will continue to plant trees and do something constructive. I am glad that this particular item is left in the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. I may say that the gentleman's State, with Federal aid, is probably setting an example for others, my own included. I hope the example is copied.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Nebraska make this statement, because I recall some years ago the fight the gentleman from Nebraska put up to get this amount for his State and to institute this program.

May I make the observation in the face of that fact that many of the gentleman's colleagues on the other side of the aisle labeled this as one of those fantastic New Deal experiments. I am glad the gentleman admits it has been very satisfactory.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank my colleague from Washington. May I say to the gentleman that there were not only some on our side of the House who did not believe in it, but there were some distinguished Members on the other side of the aisle who had control of these appropriations who did not believe in it either.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and individuals, other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, of persons serving while away from their permanent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by the War Food Administration, without other compensation from the United States, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $200,000; printing and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and not to exceed $800 for newspapers; and the purchase, operation, and maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia) of passenger-carrying vehicles; $29,200,000: *Provided*, That the applicable appropriations available to the War Food Administration, current at the time services are rendered or payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or estimated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration, incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products for administration of such orders: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the main purpose in taking this time is to get an explanation of the proviso on page 59, which reads as follows:

Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products for administration of such orders.

I want to briefly explain, if I may, Mr. Chairman, the situation that we have in my district in California. We have a number of cooperatives handling, for example, apricots, cherries, grapes, walnuts, plums, peaches, and pears. These are groups of growers who have organized to market their own products. They tell me that they are afraid that this provision would interfere with their normal operation and with the cooperation that they get from the Department of Agriculture.

The general mechanical means of the marketing scheme is something like this: If the War Food Administrator wants to make a change in the allocation of the use of these products—for instance, pears is one of them—then he issues an order to that effect, and that order is carried out by the marketing agreement group. We have a cooperative marketing group that we call the Tree Fruit Agreement. It is allowed to assist its members to handle that work of reallocations occasioned by an order of the W. F. A. They are afraid if this proviso is retained in the bill, unless we have some assurance to the contrary, that it will not allow them to cooperate with the Department or the W. F. A., and it will not allow the Department of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator to help them, to work with them to carry out what must be done under the orders for the reallocation of these foods.

I would like to have an explanation of it by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman and some other Members of the House brought this question to my attention today. It was not the purpose of the subcommittee to in any way interfere with the carrying out of marketing agreements of the kind to which the gentleman refers where a group of farmers or producers of their own voluntary action enter into agreements under the terms of which they assist themselves in the cost of carrying out the operations of the agreement.

I felt sure that the language contained in the proviso could not be construed to

interfere with such organizations and with their operations, but after the gentleman and other Members of the House had called the matter to my attention, I requested the clerk of the committee to communicate with the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture and to secure his opinion on the subject. The clerk advises me that he has stated that my conclusion was correct and that this proviso will not in any way interfere with the carrying out of the agreements of the kind in which the gentleman is concerned.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question. Would this provision prevent a man from the Department of Agriculture from going out there at Government expense and arranging with one of these cooperatives to handle the situation that the War Food Administrator wants carried on?

Mr. TARVER. The provision will prevent the War Food Administrator from issuing orders such as it has recently issued in connection with the distribution of milk, under which he undertook in various areas of the country to impose quotas on the producers and handlers of dairy products, requiring that they should not exceed in their distribution of dairy products the quota of such products distributed by them in June or December of 1943, and assessing against the distributor or handler 1½ cents per 100 pounds of milk to defray the administrative expenses for carrying out the F. B. O. order.

That is to pay a part of the administrative expenses of the War Food Administration, as we conceive it to be, and since those orders have been made effective without the consent of the producers concerned, not as the result of any marketing agreement, but simply in the exercise of an assumed power by the War Food Administration, which we do not believe it can legally use, we have inserted this proviso which will not prohibit the making of such orders, but will prohibit the assessment of the administrative expenses of the War Food Administration in administering those orders against the producers or distributors of food.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. In other words, if the producers agree to it, then this provision will not prevent them from carrying it out?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of California: On page 59, line 9, change the colon to a period and strike out all of lines 10 and 11.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call careful attention to this provision in the bill. It is of immediate and immense importance to Representatives from districts where agricultural wages are paid by the hour, or from districts where fruits and vegetables are produced. If this proviso remains in the bill, it absolutely removes all the authority the War Food Administrator now has to stabilize or equalize agricultural wages. We have a stabilization of industrial wages, and we are trying to hold the line. Last year there were very few ceilings placed on fresh food commodities, that is, fruits and vegetables. This year those ceilings are being imposed at an ever-increasing rate. If those ceilings are going to be imposed and no authority is given to the War Food Administrator to place a ceiling on agricultural wages, the farmer is going to be caught in an ever-tightening squeeze that will gradually eliminate him from the picture.

Let me give you an example of exactly what I mean. Last year when this matter was first called to the attention of Marvin Jones it was during the asparagus harvesting season out in the district of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. Asparagus grows fast and has to be cut every day. There is no "do it yesterday" or "do it tomorrow" about it. It has to be cut the day it is ready. The agricultural workers who were cutting that asparagus knew it. They were able to pyramid their wages to the point where they were receiving as high as $35 per day for cutting asparagus.

This utterly unjust and inequitable situation was called to the attention of the War Food Administrator. He came out for the first time in history with a wage ceiling on agricultural wages. It effectively stopped the practice of pyramiding wages in that section, and it had a stabilizing effect on other agricultural wages throughout the entire State of California.

I am informed by the War Food Administrator, with whom I communicated only a few minutes ago, that if this proviso stays in the bill all the authority given to him under Executive Order 9322, to regulate agricultural wages, is removed and agricultural wages can go sky high. Ceilings will be placed on agricultural commodities, and the farmer will be left in the middle. I do hope the Committee will agree to accept my amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, to be used by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the item to which the gentleman from California refers and which he would want to delete from the bill had very careful consideration by the subcommittee. If I remember correctly, there was a complete unanimity of opinion on the part of every member of the subcommittee that we should not go further in the field of farm labor stabilization. This is dictated by a number of considerations.

Assuming there are some benefits in some States, yet it is aimed to apply to every State in the Union. I notice in the break-down that was supplied in connection with the justification that it would affect not only the Western States but every other State in the Union, and every commodity, where the Administrator felt there was some need for wage stabilization.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I say in that regard that in discussing this with Administrator Jones I was informed that it was applied only in two States last year, California and Florida, and that they have no intention of going into other States unless it is urgently needed in just such instances as I cited to the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I can say is that I have the justification before me, and the Administrator lists a great many States here that he believes will be in the orbit of these operations in the fiscal year 1945 for which this money will be used.

I pointed out earlier in the day the difficulties when you venture into this field, the difficulty of making an administrative determination as to what are wages, what is the entire emolument of a farm hand. Then it becomes necessary to determine the value of a rented house on the farm, the value of pigs and sheep and chickens that may be set over to the account of the man who works on the farm, the value of an automobile that is loaned to him to make trips to town. All of those questions are not academic. They have already been raised in a great many localities, including my own. In consequence, while they had only 9 persons in January 1944, they propose here to employ a total of 241 persons in fiscal 1945 for all manner of purposes in enforcing directives by the War Food Administrator. What you are going to have is a complete domination, a complete control of all the farm labor in the country, and then you will get the usual repercussions that arise when you set one over against another. The ultimate result is going to be infinitely worse than anything I can think of if the matter were left without this type of regulation.

Those are the considerations, in the main, that have moved the committee, in addition to which we have had no testimony from any groups of farmers, any organizations of farmers, or individual farmers, in behalf of this activity, yet they are the people who would be affected by this endeavor.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I join in the statement of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is true with beans the same as with the asparagus that he mentioned. The ceiling was set on the beans, and then along came labor increases. The farmer was caught in the squeeze. Today the farmers are not planting beans in my State for the simple reason that the proper protection was not given to them. I

think the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be most helpful if we hope to cooperate with the farmer and have more beans to eat. If the gentleman wants fewer beans to eat, his statement will produce fewer beans. The statement of the gentleman from California will produce more beans.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a very beany controversy.

May I conclude with this one observation, that we try to measure the disadvantages or inconveniences for the country as a whole against some inequities that may arise in some localities, and that has persuaded the subcommittee that this function of wage stabilization should be deleted.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Will not the gentleman agree with me that we ought to give the War Food Administrator some authority to correct those inequities if they are correctible?

Mr. DIRKSEN. How are you going to give him authority to correct those unless you give him authority at the same time to engage in wage stabilization for everyone in the 48 States of the Union?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. They used it very wisely and judiciously last year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In some spots that is probably true, but I am speaking of the dislocations and difficulties that might arise in many sections of the country that are only going to produce a headache for the Congress with which it is going to have to deal at some later time. In my judgment, it is far better from the standpoint of our whole farm economy that this proviso remain in the bill and that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I read with a great deal of interest the testimony of the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. Hutson, before the hearing conducted by this committee. I was particularly intrigued by his remarks regarding the potato situation which confronts our country at the present time. I quote as follows from the testimony of Mr. Hutson on page 1287 of the hearings:

> However, there were about 75,000,000 bushels of potatoes more than is normally grown, and to keep from purchasing potatoes we extended our price support throughout the season. There remains in the country at the present time about 70,000,000 bushels of these potatoes. That is probably more than we will be able to move unless we have perfect distribution from now until the new crop comes in, but we are trying to move some 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 bushels more than is normally used from now until the end of the late potato season.

Mr. Hutson informed the committee that the subsidy program involving potatoes would probably cost $20,000,000, or rather, involve a loss of $20,000,000. But I want to take these few minutes to direct your attention to another activity of the Commodity Credit Corporation which affects the potato industry. We recall that last spring we faced a potato shortage and so, notwithstanding the program of the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the prices of potatoes at 92 percent of parity, a program was announced whereby incentive payments would be paid to stimulate expansion of the 1943 crop of potatoes. That incentive payment was based on 50 cents a bushel on the normal yield in excess of 90 percent up to 110 percent of the goal. On January 24 I got some figures from the Commodity Credit Corporation. I found that that one activity—not the support-price program, but the incentive payments for potatoes—would cost the Federal Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation in excess of $30,000,000. That also involved a commercial-loan program.

As the result of that incentive payment program, we had an overproduction of 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes as compared with the 10-year average of 363,332,000 bushels. The 1942 production of Irish potatoes was approximately 370,000,000 bushels, and the 1943 potato production amounted to 465,000,000 bushels.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is now confronted with an emergency which it created through the expenditure of this $30,000,000, and we find that more than 10,000 carloads of potatoes have been diverted for relief, for dehydration, for starch, and for other purposes. I am calling your attention to this fact primarily because that shows how some of these Federal agencies operate to create an emergency and then seek to justify the expenditure of additional funds out of the Federal Treasury to overcome the situation caused by their own inept policies.

In the West and throughout the country this year, we have had a dislocation of our farm program. We find that 26 of the 80 sugar-beet factories in the United States were closed during the past operating season because there was a reduction of approximately 40 percent in the production of sugar beets. This was largely caused by the incentive payments to potato growers.

We find today that we are facing a serious shortage of legume and grass seed. Why? Because when this incentive program was announced by the Commodity Credit Corporation last year, when this $30,000,000 was spent unnecessarily to induce farmers to produce potatoes—notwithstanding the fact that we had a support price which would insure the production of all the potatoes we needed—they caused this inevitable emergency. This critical situation involves the serious shortage of seeds in this country; particularly when it is desired, through various agencies, to provide some seed to help in the rehabilitation of devastated countries in other parts of the world.

It is unfortunate that Federal agencies persist in formulating unsound policies which not only defeat the intended objectives, but cause confusion. The agricultural industry could operate far more efficiently if producers were permitted to use their own judgment, based upon economic factors, instead of being subjected constantly to the whims and caprices of armchair advocates of planned economy. It is deplorable that Federal funds are used first to create emergencies, and then to overcome the effects of these same emergencies. Such practices do not contribute to the effective prosecution of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I notice the liquidation of the guayule project that the Government, through the Department of Agriculture and the Forestry people, has been handling.

I have in my congressional district about 9,000 acres of guayule rubber plants, and at the end of this year, as I understand it, they estimate the yield per acre will be about 850 pounds of rubber. Instead of liquidation of the program completely I would like to see assistance and encouragement given to the farmers. Instead of the Federal Government being in business in the agricultural field, the farmers themselves could actually produce the guayule rubber and sell the rubber at so much a pound, like they do in any other agricultural commodity. I have gone into this situation quite thoroughly and I find that the need for guayule rubber today is far greater than it was a year ago or even 2 years ago. The synthetic rubber needs the live rubber to make good tires. So I want to point out here today my experience in my own district with the guayule rubber plant up to date, and the visits I have made with my local people whose farms have been leased by our Federal Government. Now the Congress should encourage the Department of Agriculture to work out a proper price by the time this liquidation is complete and offer to our farmers so much per pound for guayule rubber. If there is a market for it our farmers can produce it much better, I think, than it can be bought at the present time from some of the foreign countries. So, Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to bring this to the attention of the House. I think we should all encourage the Department of Agriculture to do what they can to work out a proper price per pound now, and not wait until the liquidation date comes around, so that the farmers can actually plant more of an acreage than they have today, because I think the need is greater for the guayule plant today, as I said a while ago, than it was a year ago or even 2 years ago.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, $290,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1945, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1944 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1943, to December 31, 1944, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the "1944 Agricultural Conservation Program" bulletin, dated February 9, 1944: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $24,250,000 of said amount shall be available until June 30, 1945, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs; but not more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Agency," shall be so transferred: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1945 programs of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, and like programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000, including the value of seeds, fertilizers, and other conservation materials remaining on hand at the close of the 1944 program and to be used as grants under the 1945 program; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil-and-water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States: *Provided further*, That no part of such amounts shall be available after June 30, 1945, for salaries and other administrative expenses except for payment of obligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1945: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of the General Accounting Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1944 and 1945 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local Government agency for such materials, or services, and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1944 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of said act of February 29, 1936, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or contributions for the distribution of publications and other literature designed to influence or aid in the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in activities designed to influence the action of Congress with respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except that employees may furnish to Congress any information authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by Congress, or by any of its committees or members).

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 65, line 18, after the end of the bracket, strike out the period and insert "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out for the salary, per diem allowance or expenses of any person who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire first to raise the question of whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is in order. I conceive that the amendment requires the performance of additional duties on the part of employees of the Department, in that, if I understand the amendment correctly, it would require in the case of all of the thousands of employees, administrative investigation and determination to be made as to whether any of those employees had written a letter or a postal card or done anything in violation of the requirement of the gentleman's amendment before the salary check of such employee could be issued for the month for which he was being compensated. Now it may be that the language of the proviso is technically correct, but if it is not then I desire that the point of order which I raise may be considered by the Chair. It certainly seems to me, while it is in the form of a limitation so as to be in order under the Holman rule, the effect of this is to require performance of additional duties on the part of the employees of the Department. For that reason it is legislative in character and should not be considered in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman further on the point of order if he desires to be heard.

Mr. TARVER. I do not desire to be heard further, Mr. Chairman. I have expressed my view with regard to the matter and I am willing to abide by the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] on the point of order.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I submit that the argument of the gentleman does not point out anything except that this is a limitation. It does not require any duty on the part of any of the A. A. A. officials. It simply prohibits payment when this thing has been done. It simply acts as a safeguard so that the A. A. A. officials who want to enforce this act, who do not want these things to be done, could withhold payment when it has been done.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. How are those authorized to pay the salaries of these employees to ascertain whether these employees have written a letter or a postal card as prohibited in the gentleman's amendment? Will it not be necessary to make an investigation in each case every month?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; of course it would not. If this amendment is adopted it will stop this practice. These people will not do it.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is just figuring on everybody being good because he tells them to be?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Well, that is true. If your argument is sound, any limitation will require the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The Chair is prepared to rule. The proviso offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] in the opinion of the Chair is a limitation and the point of order is overruled.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we are endeavoring to finish consideration of the bill this afternoon if that is possible.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman insists on his objection I will have to make a point of no quorum.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman has a right to do that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have the same right to make that point that you have.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. I said the gentleman has a right to do that. I have not objected. I was simply reserving the right to object. I trust the gentleman will wait until the conclusion of my statement before he becomes aroused.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Why waste time?

Mr. TARVER. Oh, I think not. The gentleman is more expert at wasting time than I.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But not as often.

Mr. TARVER. I would not object to the gentleman having 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that he may proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object to that. If the gentleman requests 3 additional minutes, I shall not object.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-three Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think all the Members are familiar with this amendment and with the bureaucratic abuses which this proposal is designed to correct. Its purpose is to outlaw what appears to be the common practice of A. A. A. officials in the field of coercing our farmers to join the triple A program in order to get gasoline, farm machinery and implements, and other essential commodities; and to qualify for draft deferments as essential farm workers.

If there is a shred of doubt in the mind of any Member that such shameless abuses are occurring, I think I shall convince you with the few bits of evidence selected from my current mail from victims among my constituency that these coercive practices actually do prevail.

To those of you who may argue against my amendment in the mistaken belief that to do so is to defend officials and official policies of this administration, let me say that the Selective Service System, the Department of Agriculture, and the Office of Price Administration all agree that the emergency powers of the executive agencies should not be, and must not be, used as weapons to force compliance with the philosophy and policies of the triple A. They all agree that triple A compliance, at least in theory, is purely voluntary. They all point out that no agent of the Executive, by any stretch of the imagination, may penalize any individual who declines to participate in triple A, or to embrace its doctrines and policies.

If the spokesmen for these agencies mean what they have said in informal reports to me, then there should be utterly no objection to the amendment I have proposed. They do not authorize these practices. They do not condone them. They even assure me, in fact, that they are anxious to prevent them.

The officials of Selective Service have investigated the obvious violations which have occurred in cases which I brought to their attention. They have been quick to correct the mistakes which have occurred, and I believe they are entirely sincere in their assurances that they do not want the Selective Service Act prostituted for the promotion of some particular New Deal ideology. I think that Selective Service should be given a clean bill of health in this matter, for I am convinced that these abuses occur through no fault of draft headquarters. I would like to say that the local draft board, in the case which I have exposed, is not primarily at fault. I think its members have simply been the unwitting victims of ardent new dealers on the local triple A committee, who sold them a sorry bill of goods. It should also be said in credit to this draft board that it was quick to correct its original mistake when it was called to attention.

The fact remains, however, that these glaring violations have occurred, and are occurring, not only in my own State and district, but all over the country.

I want to read you a letter sent to me by a number of farmers residing in Grant County, Ind., which is in my district. This letter, I understand, was mailed to all draft-age men in that county holding agricultural deferments, or who had applications for deferments pending before the board. Please listen to this carefully, because I know you will find it interesting and significant:

GRANT COUNTY LOCAL BOARD NO. 2,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Marion, Ind.

I have been reading the heading of the letter—

DEAR SIR: You are hereby directed to report to the U. S. D. A. War Board at the office of the A. A. A. in Marion, Ind., within 5 days—

This next line is emphasized because it is capitalized and underscored—

after you have signed up at your township A. A. A. meeting and obtain a certified copy of your 1944 production.

Bring this certified copy to this office.

It is very important that you obtain this certificate as directed, since in its absence you may be placed in class I-A and held for military service.

This is signed "Grant County Local Board No. 2, 228 Post Office Building, Marion, Ind."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Briefly.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman's amendment would not correct that.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think it will correct it, because it is perfectly obvious——

Mr. PACE. That is from the Selective Service.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I know it is, but remember I have said this is not really a draft-board creation. I think the draft board has in this instance been victimized by the local A. A. A.

Mr. PACE. That is not in this bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think it is perfectly obvious that there was a mutual understanding, a working agreement between triple A authorities and this local draft board. Otherwise, I am sure that local board would never have sent out such a letter. Those men on that local board are good, patriotic Americans who are, I assure you, doing a good job. They have been working under terrific pressure, and they have simply been hoodwinked when they turned to triple A for help. Had they seen the matter in true perspective, I feel sure they never would have sent out such a letter.

Let me read you now a letter from another Grant County farmer, a resident of the same county:

DEAR MR. HARNESS: You have our utmost support in your fight against bureaucratic methods used by the Government to force joining the triple A, by leaving no alternative by which they, the farmer could have his points counted.

And it is very true that they did this thing. Back 2 years ago, my two sons and myself were farming almost 600 acres of Grant County, Ind., land in Liberty township. The draft board came along and took Clyde, so not being able to get help we were forced to let 260 acres go. So my other son is running his land and I am running my farm land with no outside land. We have been unable to get permission to buy new tools. The son at home has been called up and questioned time after time by the draft board, yet his operations show 54 points. I saw and talked to Glenn Smith, a member of the triple A board. I asked him, "Is it true that a farmer has to be a member of the triple A to have his points count?" He answered, "Yes, as the program was in danger of failure because no one, that is, few cared for it no longer."

I then asked this gentleman: "Is that democratic?" He answered, "Why democratic. This is war and the President must rule." I then asked, "Are you going to force the farmers in line?" He answered, "We must, as they will not go along with the administration any other way; they will raise too many hogs and no tomatoes. The hogs we do not want but the tomatoes we must have." I then asked, "Don't you think the farmer has sense enough to run his own business?" His answer was a short, "No." My son was forced to sign up the triple A program or go to war."

I have had many, many other complaints. The special draft deferment committee, of which I am a member, will meet Monday morning with triple A and

selective-service officials in the hope that we can stop this nefarious practice. I do not know why any draft official or any triple A official should say to a farmer, "Before you can obtain a deferment you have got to join this program and farm as we want you to farm or else we will railroad you into the military service." Nor is there any reason why any triple A agent should require as a condition that a farmer should join the triple A before he could get a new tractor or a new plow or get gasoline to operate his farm machinery.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Who selected this draft board in the gentleman's district that he complains of? How was it selected?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think the gentleman knows who selected the draft board and how it was selected. I say that the vast majority of the draft boards have done a fine, patriotic job and I bring no charges against this particular board.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. What in the world has this administration, in the sense the gentleman seems to use when he wrote that letter, to do with the draft board when it was selected the way it was?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think the letter from the draft board and what is happening in these various counties through triple A groups speak for themselves.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Supplementing what the gentleman has said, on yesterday I put into the RECORD a card which had been received by another farmer in the State of Indiana. After the writer of the card had discussed the 1944 farm plan he used this language—and remember the card came from the Department of Agriculture—

> A recent ruling provides that future nonhighway gasoline allotments will be based on your completing this farm plan.

Those cards are being sent promiscuously to the farmers throughout my district of Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. During the course of the last year I have had numerous complaints from farmers in Indiana and elsewhere that these triple A agents in our farming States were forcing men to come in and sign up with the A. A. A. program before they could get rationed articles and commodities. I submit, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason under God's heaven for such a thing in this terrible time of war. We must ration many commodities, of course, and they should be rationed fairly and justly; but to use this war and the draft to coerce and compel men to go along with a program with which they are not in favor is, to say the least, reprehensible. I hope you will support this amendment.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. CAMP. This program was formulated by the War Food Administration. No war food program has been made by the triple A. I think the writer of the letter read by the gentleman from Indiana was referring to something other than the triple A.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Oh, no! No, indeed! We all understand that W. F. A. is proposing a quite comprehensive farm production program. No one that I know of objects to that, and I think American farmers almost universally have cooperated 100 percent. I am not talking about national food production planning, nor about the willingness of farmers to produce tremendously for war. I am simply talking about triple A, which we all know is entirely another matter. Triple A is that old, old hangover from days when we were trying to kill pigs, plow under corn and cotton, and restrict farm production. And triple A and this whole old New Deal philosophy of keeping the iron heel on the neck of the farmer is the sole source of trouble in this present instance. I could submit evidence from my own files for a week to show you that this is purely New Deal dictatorship at work in the field. I expect the Members representing every other farming district in the country could do the same. I hope the gentleman will help me correct this glaring intrusion of New Deal ideology. I hope the House will help me correct these unforgivable abuses.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure; and I fear the gentleman from Indiana is not quite sure as to whether he is complaining of alleged maladministration in the triple A, the War Food Administration, the Selective Service System, or the War Manpower Commission. All that he is satisfied about is that somebody is doing something that he ought not to undertake in the way of trying to coerce farmers to enter the triple-A program by threatening them with the loss of their gasoline or the induction of their sons into service if they do not do so-and-so in accordance with administrative orders.

This matter has not been called to my attention until a day or so ago, when one or two Members of the House commenced reading postal cards and letters they claimed had been sent out by some employees of the Department of Agriculture in the field. I think this House would be taking a remarkable step to undertake to legislate upon the basis of this scattered information if indeed it be information at all until witnesses are called before a committee of this House and have established by their evidence what the truth of this may be. I remember that last year I was concerned because an employee of the War Manpower Commission in my district had sent out notices to farmers in that area which in my judgment threatened them with induction into military service unless they reported and went to Florida to perform agricultural labor.

I thought that conduct on the part of that employee was outrageous and had the facts placed in the hearings of the committee which was considering the appropriation for agricultural labor; but I did not offer an amendment to hamper the handling of all the administrative funds of the War Manpower Commission on that account. I think there ought to be some way to correct administrative abuses on the part of minor employees in the field without undertaking to hamper the payment of salaries of thousands of employees of the Department of Agriculture. If you will read the language of this amendment it applies to every appropriation carried in this bill, not merely to the appropriation for conservation and use of agricultural resources.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not believe the gentleman meant to say just what he did. Certainly there is nothing in this amendment that will hamper this program in any way. If the triple A officials in Washington are sincere when they tell us they do not approve of this method being used by some of their committeemen they should stop it. This is one means they can use to stop it. When the gentleman argues to this House that this is going to injure the program he is going too far.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. The gentleman wants us to place in this bill a provision which applies to every employee of the Department of Agriculture, because it is a restriction on all of the funds in this bill; and he wants us to do that on the basis of two or three letters and postal cards that in themselves have never been brought to the attention of any committee of this House. I feel that before we do anything of this kind some committee ought to consider the matter carefully and take evidence with regard to it both from those who complain and from the officials of the Department.

If an amendment of the kind the gentleman proposes should be adopted it can be done in the Senate. The Senate will have an opportunity to hear the evidence and to do what it thinks is wise. Our committee would have been glad to have heard the evidence if it had been presented. You will note from the bill that we have included here a very stringent provision against the carrying on of political activities by any of the employees of this organization. We are not averse to the making of reasonable restrictions based upon evidence which justifies them, but we are averse to the insertion here of a provision which, as I have said, restricts the Department with reference to every dollar carried in its bill for personnel by a requirement which may or may not be necessary but which certainly has not been established so far as being

necessary by evidence submitted to any congressional committee.

I hope we will not act hastily in this matter. There is plenty of time for the insertion of such a proviso in the bill, and a carefully worded provision if one be necessary at all in the further consideration of the bill in the Senate. We should not now hastily and upon the basis of some two or three complaints undertake to make a legislative provision of this importance a part of this appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how late does the gentleman contemplate running this evening?

Mr. TARVER. I think after we conclude this amendment it will be my purpose to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's request applies only to this particular amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The request was as to this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House and for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia, I would like to advise that in Ohio in the last 2 or 3 weeks there have been many instances in which farmers have been called upon to join the A. A. A. and they have been told that it is necessary to sign up for the A. A. A. program in order to obtain needed gasoline for farm production and use.

I am thinking of one particular instance in Seneca County, Ohio, where nearly 100 farmers met in protest, and a riot almost developed. I personally took up the matter with Mr. Harrison, Chief of the Gasoline Rationing Division of the National Office of Price Administration, and he told me that many similar complaints had reached the O. P. A., that he was fearful the practice had been followed, which, of course, was contrary to the O. P. A. regulations and that a check-up would be made.

The next day I received a communication from Mr. Harrison containing a number of copies of a new order or regulation issued by Mr. Phillips, I believe his name was, Chief of the Fuels Division of O. P. A., to all district and division officers of the Office of Price Administration, warning them that it was unnecessary and illegal for any requirement to be placed upon farmers or other individuals obtaining extra allotments of gasoline, and that the practice should be stopped if at all possible. That is from the angle of the Office of Price Administration. That Office seemingly admits this practice of which the gentleman from Indiana complains has been followed.

In order to support that order of the Office of Price Administration and to assist them in carrying it out and making it effective. I believe that we must follow this other approach suggested by the gentleman from Indiana and adopt the pending amendment so as to prohibit from the agricultural side the members of the A. A. A. organizations in the various States and counties from following this practice. If we take action through this amendment against O. P. A. and A. A. A., then perhaps we will have it stopped.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. When I was at home last summer in California I was informed by certain farmers in the San Fernando Valley that they were being practically required to join A. A. A. in order to obtain orders from the War Production Board for repair parts to farm equipment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think that is true also. Let me say that in my own home county, the local ration board has issued a public statement saying that they were not following the practice that had been complained of in other counties in Ohio and that they would not put that requirement upon the farmers of that county that they could not get gasoline without joining the A. A. A. Of course, that is an admission on their part that that practice is being followed in other countries. Therefore I think the amendment is necessary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The practice is not new by any means. Several years ago the Federal loan agency making loans to farmers had printed in the application for loan the statement that the borrower must agree, as long as the principal or any interest on it was unpaid, not to say anything against the A. A. A.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Regardless of how long the practice has been followed, it is a reprehensible thing and should be stopped. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I want to add that I am receiving letters from farmers in my district complaining of this practice that is now being discussed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My purpose was simply to show that this is not an accident. It is an old, definite, well established policy to use Government funds to force the farmers into the A. A. A.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, it is premeditated, it is done knowingly and purposely and should be stopped by action of this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, if there are those in this House who believe that some sort of compulsory program for farmers is necessary either in peacetime or during war in order to obtain production from our farmers then they should vote against this amendment; but if you believe that all of these farm programs should be a voluntary matter with the individual farmer and that he should have the right and privilege of exercising his own free will and discretion as to whether he signs up with the A. A. A. as they express it, or any other farm program promulgated by the Department of Agriculture or any other governmental agency, then certainly you should vote for the pending amendment.

For several months I have been receiving letters at various intervals from different sections of my district to the effect that practices were being put into effect that before a farmer would be considered eligible for gasoline or before his request for draft deferment would be considered either for himself or laborers on his farm or before his requests would be considered for farm machinery or be eligible for soil-conservation payments he must sign up with the A. A. A. or subject himself to some agricultural Government agency to ascertain the facts in respect thereto. I wrote a good many people in order to get some concrete evidence. I had no reason to disbelieve these statements because men whose reputation was above reproach told me that these things were actually going on in some counties in Oklahoma.

I took the matter up several times with the A. A. A. officials here in Washington and they assured me there was no foundation for those statements, but that if such practices did exist, of course, they ought to be corrected. Day before yesterday I received from a merchant in my district a letter, and for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia who doubted whether these requests were coming from the A. A. A., he sent me the card that was sent out by the regular A. A. A. committee. I have the card in my office, not with me presently. I put a part of the card in the RECORD on Tuesday of this week. The card in itself does not say that they must sign the work sheet to which it refers, in order to receive draft deferments or in order to receive farm machinery; but the card does contain certain language which is being construed not only by the farmers who are getting the cards but by many of the committees such as the local O. P. A. and others, and in some instances the local draft boards, that it does mean that very thing.

That card says:

> Your community committeeman will be in Hawley on March 17 to assist you in executing your 1944 farm plan sheet and to explain 1944 practice payments that can be earned on your farm.

It follows with this language:

> These plan sheets will be used to secure information for draft deferments and securing farm machinery.

Now let us be fair. What construction would you or anyone else put upon that sort of language when contained in a card coming from the local A. A. A. committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman, if that is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask, in all fairness, what other construction could be put upon it? Why put this in the farm plan sheet about farm machinery or about gasoline or about farm deferments? I called the head of the southern division of triple A in my State, when I got this card, and he said that this language about draft deferment or farm machinery had no business being in there and that he would immediately take it up with the State director. He called me this morning and told me that he had taken it up with the State director and that the State director said it had no place on the card and that the State committee would give proper publicity to this erroneous implication and make it crystal clear that farmers who did not or had not been members of the A. A. A. should not be discriminated against in respect to securing fair consideration for farm machinery, draft deferments, or gasoline.

This amendment will help to correct the situation if it is adopted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If it is true that the officials of the triple A, the officials of Selective Service, and the officials of the Office of Price Administration contend that this is a wrong practice, then what can be wrong by adopting this amendment to try to stop it?

Mr. RIZLEY. Certainly there cannot be anything wrong. As I said in the beginning, if we want a free program in America for the farmers, and let the farmers use their own discretion about these matters, then certainly this amendment should be adopted. Of course, if there are those who believe we must have a compulsory program of some kind, then vote against the amendment. Personally I cannot subscribe to governmental compulsion for the farmers or any other group of our citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have received letters from farmers in my district complaining that they are being coerced to sign up with the triple A before they are allowed to have any gasoline. I do not know why anybody should doubt that this practice is being carried on. From the time the Triple A Act was passed this agency has continuously resorted to coercive measures to force all farmers into its program. Could there be any worse coercion than the procedure of levying a penalty on farmers for growing more wheat than suits the Washington bureaucracy? Who would have thought in 1887 that the time would ever come when the commerce clause of the Constitution would be construed so as to allow a bureau here in Washington to tell a farmer how much wheat he could plant?

This is a good amendment. As has been stated here before, there is no reason in the world why it should not be adopted. This practice should be stopped. The people of this country are arriving at a stage where they are beginning to resent in no uncertain terms the coercion and regimentation that this administration has forced upon them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Accounts Committee, for the courtesy extended me in allotting me his time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. What I wanted to talk about was the entire proviso. If the Members of this House will read that proviso, I venture the assertion that no one will say that he ever saw a proviso of that character tacked onto an appropriation bill before.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the mail I received a letter sent out by the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 222 Mercantile Building, Berkeley, Calif., signed by Walter R. Goldschmidt, associate social science analyst. I should like to read this letter:

Miss Vera Christie of the bureau of occupations of the University of California submitted the names of several recent graduates dwelling in the upper San Joaquin Valley who she felt might be interested in taking short-term employment. Your name was among the list. I am writing you to ask you if you would be interested to work for approximately 6 to 8 weeks under the conditions to be set forth below and to ask that you respond to this request at your very earliest.

The work I have in mind is taking schedules or questionnaires from residents in the communities of Arvin (Kern County) and Dinuba (Tulare County). The schedule is designed to get information on the standard of living and the social participation of a cross section of the total population in each of these towns. The work is to begin the latter part of this month, preferably around the 23d. It will last approximately 6 weeks to 2 months. The pay rate will be $202.76 per month; in addition to this you will receive $5.60 per diem for each day you are away from home. During wartime all Government employees work 48 hours a week. If you have a car at your disposal it would be advantageous to use it. You will receive compensation for the use of the car at the rate of 5 cents a mile, and we will arrange through your local ration board for the gasoline.

If you are interested in this employment please respond at once and indicate the following facts: (1) your age; (2) the courses you have taken in the social sciences while at the university; (3) any pertinent occupation experience you have had; (4) the date on which you will be available for work; (5) whether or not you have a car which you can use. I will be in the neighborhood of your community on or about the 21st of March and if you are interested in this employment I will interview you at that time.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER R. GOLDSCHMIDT,
Associate Social Science Analyst.

Here we are telling the farmers that they cannot have gasoline, and we have another group spending the same farmers' money running around digging into everybody's business, trying to find out how some people live. I am wondering at this particular time just where we are heading. Here are the taxpayers of the Nation, and you are asking them to produce food in great quantities. You are asking their cooperation, and then we turn around with the Department of Agriculture, right out of our own Federal bureau here, setting up one of the silliest things I ever heard of.

In my State we do not have to have somebody running around asking people how they can live. We are living all right out there. If some of these bureau heads would just tend to their own business and let the farmers operate their own business once in a while, we would get along a whole lot better. Some silly professor, some dreamer, some man who knows nothing about agriculture, knows nothing about the living conditions of the farmers and the people who work there, is doing this. I venture to say there is not a State in the Union that has better facilities for the farmers than they have in the State of California or for the laborers who work on the farm. But here we are going to take the taxpayer's money, gasoline we do not have, tires we do not have, and money that we do not have to support some childish dream.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, there is little that I can add to this debate. Like many other Members from agricultural districts I have received numerous protests and complaints from farmers about the procedure used by the A. A. A. county committees in inducing, or compelling, nonconformist farmers to sign up for the A. A. A. program in order to be assured of adequate gas to operate farm machinery during the coming crop year. These letters make it clear that the A. A. A. committeemen and investigators have stated absolutely that farm gas would be available only to those who sign up for the program.

One farmer sent me a mimeographed letter which was delivered to him stating the exact position of the local A. A. A. committee of his county. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, and in justice to the committee, I am inserting here a copy of that letter which is as follows:

JACKSON COUNTY AGRICULTURAL
CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Jackson, Mich.

DEAR FARMER: As a front-line soldier of production you are being requested this year to produce even more food than your record

production last year. Necessarily you must have the facilities to do your job efficiently.

One of the foremost of these is gasoline and fuel oil to operate your tractors and engines. The supply will not be sufficient to meet all civilian demands. But there will be enough for you to use in carrying on your farming activities.

Your local A. A. A. committee is cooperating with your local war price and rationing board in working out a program to assure you enough gasoline and fuel oil for the year.

This is what you will be asked to do. Your community A. A. A. committeeman will soon contact you to discuss with you plans for meeting the goals on your farm. He will ask you to sign the 1944 farm plan. At the same time he will get your estimate of the amount of gasoline and fuel oil you will need for the period April 1, 1944, to April 1, 1945. Before he calls you should get together the following information:

1. Number of gallons of gasoline used in 1943.

2. Number of gallons of other tractor fuels used in 1943.

3. Your estimate of the number of gallons of gasoline and tractor fuel you will use in 1944.

4. The estimated amount available from unused coupons expected to be on hand as of April 1.

5. The estimated amount to be in storage on April 1.

6. The additional amount required (compute this by subtracting the sum of 4 and 5 from 3).

The form you fill out when the committeeman calls will be your application for gasoline and fuel oil for the year, based on your farming operations for 1944. It must be approved by the county A. A. A. committee before any action is taken by the local rationing board. It will be to your advantage to have the above-mentioned information ready when the committeeman calls.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM S. NORTON,
Chairman.

From the same county a farmer writes:

I have never been a member of the A. A. A., as I do not consider it right nor proper to accept money for work not performed, but now I am informed by our local A. A. A. committee, that I will not be allowed to receive any gasoline ration for my tractors unless I sign up, and become a member of the A. A. A.

This is a typical excerpt from one of many letters.

Upon receipt of these protests, I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture and received an immediate reply which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1944.

Hon. EARL C. MICHENER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MICHENER: This is in reply to your telephone conversation with Mr. William W. Chandler of this office.

At the request of the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration agreed to assist in the allocation of off-the-highway fuel. The War Food Administrator assigned the administration in the field to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. This assignment was made largely because of the ability of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency to contact all farmers quickly through their elected county and community committeemen.

Under the plan in operation, county and community committeemen recommend the amount of fuel needed for each farmer to carry on his farming operations. This determination is based on the number of acres of cropland and the uses made of these acres. In most States a formula was used based on so many gallons of gasoline for each acre of corn, soybeans, etc. Variations from this formula were made according to the amount of power machinery each farmer will use in 1944; therefore, some farmers were granted more than the formula had given them, and others were granted less.

In most States in the north central region the county and township committeemen received requests and made recommendations as to the amount of nonhighway fuel each farmer should receive at the same time the war-food program sign-up campaign was conducted. This procedure was adopted in order to save administrative expense and to avoid the requirement that farmers make numerous trips to meetings or that community committeemen make extra visits to farms.

We would like to point out that the Agricultural Adjustment Agency undertook this job as a service to farmers and to assist the Office of Price Administration in administering their off-the-highway fuel program. In all cases the final authority for issuing the fuel coupons rests with the local price rationing board. We would also like to point out that it is not our policy or intention to require farmers to participate in Agricultural Adjustment Agency programs in order to receive their fair share of off-the-highway fuel.

We trust that this answers any questions you may have with regard to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency's participation in the rationing of off-the-highway fuels.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY K. SMITH,
Director, North Central Division.

When I sent a copy of Mr. Smith's letter to one of the protesting farmers, he wrote me as follows:

On March 7, 8, 9, and 10 in Fairfield Township the crop committee of the U. S. D. A. sat at the I. O. O. F. Hall in Jasper and Weston to write up nonhighway gasoline applications. First they took our 1942 production figures then asked for our 1944 figures. While doing so they did not explain to many of us that this was for the 1944 crop program which we have fought. However, I asked them why I should be required to make such an estimate when the week before I had done the same thing for the selective-service draft board at the same hall. I was told that this is for the 1944 crop program and you will receive $44 if you will sign. I did not. I asked for the gas applications and was given one, which I filled out. Now many farmers signed the crop program not knowing as I did that it was the same old A. A. A. One farmer told me he signed because he was told he'd go to war if he did not. Is this free America? Just what can we expect? Another farmer threw his papers on the table and left without any farm gas. He appealed to the ration board but has been refused his farm gas. * * * Does Congress approve of such tricks that deceive the people?

In short, Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that in many instances the local A. A. A. committees have either definitely or indirectly informed the farmers that the securing of gas for the operation of tractors and other farm machinery was dependent upon the farmer complying with the A. A. A. program.

In the last few days the Washington authorities have given publicity to statements repudiating any such attempt on their part. However, the word has gone out. This type of thing does not help the A. A. A. program. The American farmer does not like to be pushed around. He is willing to accept whatever is necessary to win the war but he will not willingly permit, in the name of the war effort, any subterfuge to make him a party to a crop-control program to which is diametrically opposed. The war effort suffers whenever any group attempts to perpetuate a program which originated before and has nothing to do with the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is now before the House provides:

That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out of the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple-A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity.

Mr. Chairman, possibly this amendment goes a little far at this time. However, if the amendment prevails, the bill will go to the Senate and will return to the House at a later date for further consideration. If the amendment does nothing else, this publicity will stop a practice which should not be permitted on the part of A. A. A. committees, and which the Washington office now condemns.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, certainly I do not approve wrongdoing on the part of any official of the Department of Agriculture, but I think it might be helpful if we have a better understanding of what these funds are to be used for.

It was mentioned here that somebody is trying to make somebody else join the triple A. There is no such thing as a triple A program today except in tobacco. There are no controls of production on any crop except tobacco, and that control remains only because we now need food more than we need smoking and chewing tobacco.

It is also presented here as if there were some compulsion if a farmer signs a work sheet. I think you understand that we have two acts. We have the Soil Conservation and the Domestic Allotment Acts, and this language that you now have before you confines this money to soil conservation and water conservation payments. So if a farmer signs a work sheet, there is no penalty attached to it, there are no taxes involved, there is no control involved. All he does is say, "I think at this time I will be able to plant so many acres of wheat, so many acres of corn, and so many acres of soybeans." If he does not plant these crops there is no penalty, there is no tax. The most he could possibly lose would be the payments he would have earned if he had carried out the practices. If he decides he does not want to carry out the practices, that ends the matter.

You speak of making a man join the triple A as you would of making him join the Army, subject to somebody's orders. There are no orders or penalties today in agriculture except in tobacco, where there is a penalty if there is excess production, because most all of the tobacco producers asked for it. But get it clear that there is no compulsion in the farm program today, with this one exception.

What I think these notices mean—and whatever you do I shall make no complaint—is that if the draft board wants to know if you have 16 units, they go to that record to find it out. If you do not want to supply the information there, you can show them and make your proof in some other way.

However, I intended to use my time to correct the impression that seems to exist here that we now have an enormous triple A program when we do not; that we have an enormous compulsory program when you do not. Now, if you want to throw up some terraces, you can earn five or ten dollars. If you want to plant some cover crops and turn them under and build up your soil, you can earn five or ten dollars. If you want to apply some lime or some phosphate, you can earn five or ten dollars. That is what this money is for, but you do not have to do it, and there is no compulsion about it.

Some of you gentlemen seem to think that the mere act of asking a farmer to make out and file his intention or work sheet, merely to indicate what crops he intends to plant and the acreage of each, is a terrible thing to do. Maybe it is, but it seems to me that such cooperation is not too much to ask when our Nation is at war, when our national existence is at stake, when millions of our boys are out on the battle lines of the world offering and giving their lives in order that these same farmers may keep their farms and enjoy the safety and comfort of their homes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this really is not new except as it applies to the draft. Last summer one of my constituents came to me all excited. He was very much agitated about the O. P. A. When the second and third one came along, I asked if they would not bring me the letter they had received from the O. P. A. so I would know what their troubles were. I will not read the entire letter, but the last sentence says:

> You are hereby notified that unless you take immediate steps to remedy the situation your permit will be suspended within 10 days.

For as many years as I can remember everyone in my county has butchered their hogs or their cattle for the local butchers when they so desired. Here this man comes along and sends them this letter saying they have to have a new slaughterhouse within 10 days or he will take their permit away from them—even at a time when one could not find any lumber to build with and no one available to erect a building. I found out that he was merely a meat-marketing supervisor under the Food Distribution Administration. I later found he was receiving $3,800 per year, the best job he ever held and over twice as much as he formerly received before entering Government service. I said that the only thing to do first was to have a meeting and find out what it is about. I said that I did not know of any authority of law that gave him any right to send them that letter.

I arranged a meeting that week and some 50 small butchers and farm butchers were there, and the gentleman himself was there. He said that his superior officer told him that he guessed he should not have written that letter. That is what we always find when we get small men in big places. He had to write the letter to show his authority. At that meeting he kind of wrapped the flag around himself two or three times and got himself all heated up, but when it was over with he decided not to insist on that 10 days' time limit for building.

At that time I told these people that it happened that the War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, and I had served together 2 years in the House, and I said that I knew Marvin Jones too well to know that he would want to follow this kind of procedure.

When I came back here I took it up with the Department and wrote Mr. Hendrickson, who was head of the F. D. A. at that time. I ended the letter by saying this:

> The way the farm butchers and the local butchers have been harassed by the Food Distribution Administration is rendering a disservice to the war-food program. If a "small fry" like this has any authority to write the kind of letters he does, I want to be so advised, and if he does not, I want him to immediately cease. I recommend that he put on a pair of overalls and help produce the food instead of continuing in a useless position hindering the people who are producing the food to win the war.

After many weeks of correspondence with Mr. Hendrickson in which I had insisted on having him state the law that gave his man any authority to write the letter in the first place—you should be interested in this reply, since it would also apply to gas and machinery:

> In reply to the specific questions raised in your letters, the authority of the Food Distribution Administration to establish regulations with respect to the slaughtering of livestock is based upon title III of the Second War Powers Act which specifies that, upon a finding by the President that war requirements will result in a shortage in the supply of any material, he shall allocate or distribute such material in a manner deemed appropriate or necessary in the public interest and to promote the national defense.

Here then is the Executive order that has been interpreted to cover most everything, or it so appears. This is one more example of what happens when Executive orders are used instead of laws passed by the Congress. These actions harm the war-food program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—Ayes 58, noes 96.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 65, noes 88.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 89, noes 69.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order after the direction for the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous ruling of the Chair, the point of order is overruled.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 70, noes 88.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 65, noes 90.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. Tellers have been ordered.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 93, noes 65.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4443, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech I had intended to present during discussion of an amendment now pending on the desk.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader with reference to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, the O'Hara bill, H. R. 3592, a bill to prevent multiple taxes on salaries of the Federal employees. Two hours general debate has been provided.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, H. R. 4381, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, on which 2 hours debate has been allowed.

H. R. 4257, a bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service.

Then if the Rules Committee reports out a resolution creating a post-war military committee, that bill will be taken up also. I have no knowledge now of any other bill for next week.

I ask the gentleman from Michigan to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Several requests have been made of the Committee on Rules for hearings on several resolutions and bills. The committee will meet tomorrow morning. What action the committee will take I do not of course know. I believe the Committee on Naval Affairs is anxious for a rule on a bill to take care of some adjustment of promotions.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot put that on the program for next week. What is the other bill the gentleman mentioned?

Mr. MICHENER. The other bill is the admirals bill. A similar bill is pending in the Committee on Military Affairs as I recall for the generals. I think it is a most controversial matter.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know.

Mr. MICHENER. I feel that it should not come up until after recess.

Mr. SABATH. I promised them all I would give them a hearing tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I have announced now will be the program for the coming week. Any other bills that are disposed of will have to be handled by unanimous consent.

Mr. MICHENER. Then it is the purpose to recess about the 30th until after Easter?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the purpose then to recess—Thursday or Friday, Friday at the latest, but the strong hope is Thursday—until a week from the following Tuesday, which I think will be April 11. There will be no legislation scheduled for the 11th or 12th but it is the purpose to bring up the naval appropriations bill on the 13th.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Hon. Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my own remarks and insert therein several speeches I have heretofore made and some resolutions I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next I may address the House for 20 minutes after completion of the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 19, entitled "Duggan Logical Choice."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE MYRON SELZNICK

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, a great American and one of the most distinguished residents of my district passed away today. Myron Selznick is a name known wherever American films have been shown, and that is all over the world.

Associated with the industry since its earliest days, Myron Selznick has been responsible, in no small measure, for the phenomenal success, for the incredibly wide acceptance, of American motion pictures. He had an uncanny judgment as to what the public wanted. His skill was his ability to understand the American taste.

The art of motion pictures is one of the most democratic art forms yet devised. Paintings and sculpture have historically been what the king liked, or what a small group of experts liked. Motion pictures are what the mass likes.

The strength of Myron Selznick was that he never lost touch with the American people. He was one with 130,000,000. The entertainment industry is the less because Myron Selznick is no longer with us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include certain communications.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the point where the Dirksen amendment was under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter and a memorandum from the Director of the Automotive Supply Rationing Division.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made this afternoon in the Committee of the Whole excerpts from the report from which I quoted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain correspondence in reference to the subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] may extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein pertinent excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE FAIR GOVERNMENT PRACTICES ACT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time, today, in order that I may express my views and make some observations respecting H. R. 4314, which was recently introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. While this proposed measure, as presented, may not be in the specific form finally desired by the House, I am constrained to believe that as a general policy the basic principles set forth in H. R. 4314 are sound, very desirable, and highly essential.

During this war, and the hysteria which follows by reason of the eagerness to win an early victory, we have been lulled into a state of lethargy with respect to our own home front. We have been struggling with the problems of war; we are confronted with the hysteria of war; we think, live and dream of this war—the most frightful of all wars—the war which we must win, and the war which our Army and Navy are slowly, but surely, winning. We realize that we must win this war as quickly as possible in order to save the lives of our men and boys who are engaged in it, and we recognize that as quickly as the war is ended we must begin the process of rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to speak upon this subject, today, because it relates to our own domestic and economic policy. Our own affairs on the home front are too often overshadowed by those of the many battle fronts, and we are led astray from our own situation on the homeland by reason of the exigencies developing on the battle fronts. However, we must mark well our own progress at home. This is the arsenal of production for the war. We must not yield to any policy which will, in any measure, retard or slow down that production. We must ever reflect upon the necessity of maintaining production and the morale and courage of our people—of our businessmen, our farmers, our workers in the factories and mills, in fact every American citizen on the home front, in order to lend aid to the prosecution of this war on every battle front.

Mr. Speaker, it has been reported, quite recently, that during the last 10 years the Congress has enacted 4,553 laws, and during that same period of time President Roosevelt has issued and put into effect 3,703 Executive orders and directives. This is startling information. While this is a Government by law and not by men, yet we find that the President has, by his own Executive orders, almost equalled the stride of the Congress. He is a very close second to this great legislative body in the issuance of orders which take the force and effect of law, yet the Congress has had no part in the declaration of the policy pronounced in those Executive orders, and, in fact, the Congress did not know anything about them until they were announced from the Executive Office. The regulations and rules which are issued and promulgated by the boards, bureaus, and agencies, largely created by Executive order, are myriad and some of those rules and regulations clothe the issuing board, bureaus, or agency with the power, or, at least, the power is assumed, to impose penalties of both fine and imprisonment upon the people of this country, many of whom did not know of the regulation, misunderstood it, or had been misinformed regarding it. Such a ridiculous condition should not have been countenanced in the beginning, and, certainly, it should not be permitted to continue longer. Ours is a Government by law, duly enacted by the representatives of the people, and not by Executive orders and directives, and not by rules and regulations issued by some board, bureau, or agency of Government.

Mr. Speaker, when we come to realize that the Executive orders and directives issued by the President during the past 10 years are almost equal in number to the laws which were passed by the Congress in that same period of time we are appalled by that unparalleled situation. If that unprecedented practice is continued, and increases, it can result in practically all of the governing power, under the guise of law by Executive orders and directives, coming from the pen of one man—the President of the United States—and without the Congress, the representatives of the people, having either knowledge or voice in legislation. Such a policy amounts to one-man government. Under that plan the representatives of the people have had no part in making the laws by which they are governed. In many instances our people have found themselves confronted with charges for violations of rules and regulations with which they were entirely unfamiliar, and they were tried before the board, bureau, or agency through which the same were issued, where the prosecutor acted also as judge and from which decision there was no appeal. This is a theory which is far afield from our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss briefly some of the merits contained in the pending measure, H. R. 4314. May I say, at the outset, I am in full accord with the underlying principles contained in the measure, which is called the Fair Government Practices Act. This measure is intended to establish and improve the relations between our people—every private citizen—and the Government authorities, to facilitate the administration of justice, to protect civil rights, and to preserve the form of government which is guaranteed by and under the Constitution of the United States of America. The pending measure to which I have referred will operate to curb and to compel the discontinuance of many of the unwarranted practices which have developed during the past few years; it will make uniform administrative practice and procedure, which is regarded as generally fair and equitable to the people and highly essential to the orderly processes of efficient and effective government.

Mr. Speaker, if this measure is finally enacted into law, it will, in my humble opinion, be highly beneficial. Briefly, it will do the following things:

First. Cause to be made available to the public full and complete information regarding Government rules and regulations, all to the end that every citizen affected thereby may be fully advised respecting their rights, duties, and obligations under the same.

Second. Protect the public against the excessive cost, expense and time entailed under the growing wave of investigations, reports, and questionnaires; to prevent those only as the minimum requirement under the law and for the maintenance of efficient and effective Government.

Third. To preclude Government agencies from establishing new or special penalties or restrictions which are not authorized by the Congress.

Fourth. To forbid the Government, or any agency thereof, from penalizing any citizen because of the fault of the Government, whether arising from delayed rulings on acts requiring Government approval or from changes of rules which are applicable.

Fifth. It provides for the judicial review of any administrative action, rule or order, within the purview of the measure—

(a) As an incident to proceedings for any form of criminal or civil enforcement;

(b) Through any statutory review proceeding relevant to the subject matter; or

(c) Through any applicable form of legal action, including actions for declaratory judgments or for writs of injunction, mandamus, or habeas corpus.

Every person should be extended the opportunity of having his "day in court", and that policy does not prevail at the present in many of the administrative agencies of Government.

Sixth. It provides a good-faith effort to guarantee fair, impartial, and unbiased decisions by the Government agencies by requiring a separation of the functions of the "prosecutor" and the "judge." Quite often, under the present administration of affairs in this country, the same Government official acts in the capacity of both prosecutor and judge.

Seventh. This measure undertakes to create a fairer and better understanding between the Government and the people by giving the people a voice in the rules and regulations which are vital to their welfare as citizens.

Eighth. This measure, if enacted, will prevent any decision from being rendered against our people until they have received due notice of the time and place of the hearing and they have been given a full opportunity to be heard and to meet any evidence which may be produced against the citizen charged. No judgment can be rendered until this opportunity has been extended to the people.

Ninth. The measure further requires that all the administrative decisions shall be reached only on the basis of the

weight of the evidence and that no decision shall be rendered which is based upon surmise or conjecture. This is merely a fair and just provision for both the Government and the people.

Tenth. This proposed legislation will allow a more intelligent judicial review of administrative action by distinguishing between those practices on the part of our Government which are compatible with due process of law and good government from those abuses which can only undermine and destroy the public confidence and respect and jeopardize our constitutional system.

Mr. Speaker, this is a brief outline of the basic objectives of this measure. However, may I state that this proposed legislation will be helpful, in my opinion, in many ways. It will not hamper, in any way, the full and complete prosecution of the war—but it will be helpful to our war effort. It will be very helpful to every class of our people, from the man who uses gasoline to the officials of the plants; the farmer, the merchant, and the laboring man and woman will be benefited by this proposal. Those things which are helpful on the home front are, without doubt, helpful in the prosecution of this war. Under the provisions of the pending bill all military, naval, and diplomatic functions, which are essential in time of war, are expressly excluded. This exclusion extends to the requirement of publication of rules, regulations, and orders, and to the requirement of minimum standards of notice, hearing, and public participation in the formulation of rules and regulations.

However, on the other hand, in case of emergency agencies performing military, naval, or diplomatic functions, where they are also exercising judicial functions under statutes which provide for public hearings, this measure does not relax any of the requirements of due process which Congress has imposed under existing law.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are entitled to fair, just, and equitable treatment by the many and various agencies of government. This measure will, in my opinion, aid materially in granting to the people those rights to which they are justly entitled—and those rights which our own Government should desire the people to have.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPUBLICANS IN LAST 2 YEARS HAVE CONCENTRATED THEIR HEAVY ARTILLERY ON ADMINISTRATION OF HOME FRONT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years the Republicans in and out of Congress have concentrated their heavy political artillery on the administration of the home front, particularly on the stabilization program.

They have denounced price control and rationing as unsound and unworkable; they have denounced their administration as an attempt to impose bureaucratic regimentation and alien fascism upon the American people. They have stirred up the fears and selfishness of each and every economic group. They have told business that it was being destroyed by price control. They have encouraged the farmers to seek higher prices on the ground that labor and the urban consumers were getting rich out of the war. And they have told labor and the urban consumers that they were being ruined by the high cost of living. They have told the whole Nation that bureaucratic bungling on the home front was impeding our war production and our production of essential civilian supplies. They have even predicted a food famine during the winter month of February.

In Congress the Republicans sought by every legislative device to destroy the stabilization program. They have attempted to transfer the essential function of the Office of Price Administration to this agency and that agency, thereby to break it up and destroy its usefulness. They have backed bills to raise this price and that price. At appropriation time they voted to slash necessary appropriations, and to impose crippling riders on the sums that they consented to appropriate.

SOME IRRITATIONS INEVITABLE—MERE CAMPAIGN ORATORY

The Republicans have done all these things and many more in an effort to make political capital out of the inevitable irritations that a home-front program imposes on the people. And today—and today they have to admit that they have failed. They have failed to destroy the successful administration of the stabilization program, and they have failed to make permanent political capital out of their attacks upon that program. Their attacks on the home-front program have fizzled out just as miserably as did Willkie's attacks upon the President's foreign policy and upon the national defense program in 1940. Willkie frankly admitted later that his attacks had just been "mere campaign oratory." That description fits the Republican attacks on the home-front program just as well. They were just campaign oratory in preparation for the elections of 1944.

MOST SUCCESSFUL ACCOMPLISHMENT OF WAR EFFORT

After 2 years, the stabilization program stands out as one of the most successful accomplishments in the whole war effort.

REPUBLICANS MADE HOME FRONT POLITICAL ISSUE—LET THEM LIE ON IT

I am very sorry that the stabilization program, the home-front program, has been made a party issue. We Democrats in Congress never wanted to regard it as a party issue. We regarded it as a national undertaking. Because we regarded it as a nonpartisan national undertaking, we freely criticized the administrative mistakes which were made when the program was started. We criticized these mistakes with the constructive purpose of having them corrected as quickly as possible. And most of these initial mistakes have been corrected. But the Republican attacks were not confined to constructive criticism. The Republicans set out to make a political issue out of the home-front program. They bet on its failure. Or to use a stock-market term, they bearishly sold short on the home-front program—they forgot that in so doing they were also selling the American people short. Well, today all the Republican maneuvers having failed, they have forced us Democrats to claim credit for the success of the stabilization program, a success achieved despite all the Republican opposition and obstruction. The Republicans made the home front a political issue—now let them lie on it.

STEPS NECESSARY TO PREVENT INFLATION

I have said that the stabilization program constitutes one of the most outstanding successes of the war effort. To appreciate the truth of this statement, let us keep in mind that inflation is the dread disease that manifests itself in every large-scale war, and that the greater the war effort, the greater is the tendency toward inflation. There is nothing very mysterious about the tendency to wartime inflation. In wartime we pay the civilian population at home for producing both war goods and civilian goods, but when the civilian population comes to spend their money income they find only a limited supply of civilian goods available. The excess of the money income over available goods has to be in part drained off by war taxation and savings, and for the rest it has to be controlled by price-control dams. If these steps are not taken or are not taken effectively, the excess money or purchasing power starts a spiral of price rises, wage rises, further price rises and further wage rises, until we get galloping inflation, which can destroy both our productive power and our economic structure.

ONE HUNDRED BILLIONS A YEAR BEING SPENT

The tremendous magnitude of the inflationary pressures of this war is indicated by the figures of Treasury payments for war costs. The other day it was stated that during the month of February we were spending at the rate of $330,000,000 a day. That adds up to well over $100,000,000,000 a year. World War No. 1 was a pygmy in comparison. The whole cost of World War No. 1 was only $32,000,000,000, and should have been far less if prices during that war had been properly controlled—as, of course, they were not.

AGRICULTURAL PRICES PERMITTED TO RISE BEFORE CONTROLLING THEM

Well, with the underlying inflationary pressures many times greater in this war than in the last war, what are the comparative facts on price rises? After 53 months of World War No. 2, wholesale prices are 38 percent above the level of August 1939. During the same period in World War No. 1, wholesale prices had risen 103 percent. And let us bear in mind here that the wholesale price index includes food and farm products, the prices of which were abnormally low in 1939. As we all recall, it was our national policy to permit agricultural prices to rise to fair levels before undertaking to control them.

If we exclude agricultural prices from the comparison, the contrast in achieve-

ment is even more remarkable. Industrial prices have risen only 22 percent during 53 months of World War No. 2 as against 95 percent during the same period of World War No. 1. In short, despite pressures that were many times as great, we were able in this war to hold industrial prices—the prices of war materials—to less than a quarter of the rise which took place in the last war.

COST OF LIVING—THIS WAR COMPARED WITH LAST

Let us turn to the cost of living. The cost of living has gone up 26 percent since the war began in September 1939—less than half of the rise that took place in the same period in the last war. What is most significant, however, is not the fact that the rise over the whole period has been of moderate proportions, but the steady progress that has been achieved in halting price rises. We started out quite late in controlling retail prices and rents—the items that make up the cost of living. The Price Control Act was not passed until January 30, 1942, and by that time three-fifths of the total rise in the cost of living had already taken place. Retail price and rent control was instituted in May 1942, and since then the cost-of-living index has risen only 7 percent. And most remarkable of all, since last April the cost of living—that is to say, the national average—has remained unchanged. In the case of wholesale prices, the record is slightly better—for the index of wholesale prices is today one-half percent lower than it was in April of 1943.

NO NATION HAS BETTER PRICE-CONTROL RECORD

I discussed these figures with some officials of the O. P. A., and I was amazed to learn from them that the record of the last 11 months is better than that of any country in the world. Neither Canada, England, nor Germany has been able to show a stable cost of living over the past 11 months.

If we can hold to the stabilization that has now been achieved—if we can hold to present prices for the rest of the war and for the immediate period after the war—why, we will be able to show a rise in the cost of living only one-fourth as great as that which was reached during the peak of World War No. 1 inflation, and a rise in industrial prices of only one-fifth of the World War No. 1 peak.

As a Democrat, I am proud that a Democratic administration has been able to achieve such a record in the control of inflation. Let me repeat that I would not be boasting of my party's achievement in this field had not the Republicans for the past 2 years chosen to make a political issue out of the home-front program.

AN AVERAGE OF OVER $500 FOR EACH MAN, WOMAN, AND CHILD ALREADY SAVED ON COST OF WAR

Thanks to this achievement, this country has already saved $67,000,000,000 in the gross cost of the war—$65,000,000,000 being saved the first 52 months of the war. That is the amount we have saved by paying for our war effort in the controlled prices of this war, instead of the skyrocketing prices of the last war. Similarly, our housewives saved about $22,000,000,000—or $700 per family unit—by buying their goods under the controlled prices of this war, instead of under the spiralling prices of the last war.

SUBSIDIES HELPED

Yes; this record has been achieved by the use of Government subsidies on a few foods and other items. But the whole subsidy program costs only a billion and a half a year. Compare that with the $89,000,000,000 of savings in war costs and in prices to the consumers.

MONEY AND PRODUCTION USED TO SAVE LIVES

There is an even more important angle to this inflation control. This war, as no other war in history, has been a mechanized war, a war of production. Our leadership has taken advantage of this crucial fact, and has built our strategy upon it. We have been prodigal in the expenditure of American material, so that we could be stingy, very stingy, in the expenditure of American lives. We have had the vision to distribute vast quantities of American matériel—planes, tanks, guns, and everything else—to places where they could do the most good in killing Germans and Japs. We all recall the toast of Stalin at Teheran, expressing his gratitude at American lend-lease, "Without American production, the war could not have been won."

STABILIZATION PROGRAM HAS HELPED PRODUCTION

But if the doom of the Axis has been sealed by American war production, it is because we have been able to produce, and produce abundantly. Our stabilization program has not only not held back production, but has definitely and demonstratably facilitated the breaking of production records. Here is the demonstration. In World War No. 1, prices skyrocketed, and industrial production increased only 25 percent during the whole length of the war. During the period of American participation in the war, production actually declined.

During World War No. 2, when industrial prices were kept under good control, our industrial production has more than doubled. Of course, the chief credit for our production records belongs to the hard work put in by our workers and by our businessmen, but without conditions of price stability—conditions that make possible the orderly scheduling of production and the making of advance commitments—the hard work would have been in vain. With materials hoarded in anticipation of further and further price rises, as happened during the last war, the production goals which were set by the needs of the armed forces just could not have been met. We just would not have been able to produce the 90,000 planes we produced in 1943, nor the 20,000,000 tons of shipping, nor any of the other stupendous goals we set for ourselves—and actually achieved.

FARMERS ACHIEVE REMARKABLE RECORD

In the field of farm production—where increases are always much more difficult to achieve than in industry—we have also been able to achieve remarkable records, thanks in large part to the success of the stabilization program. Farm production in 1943 was 21 percent higher than in 1939—and 32 percent higher than the average of the 5 pre-war years, 1935–39. In the last war farm production increased by only 5 percent, and did not increase at all during the years we were in the war. In World War No. 1 the farmer did not help the Nation nor himself as much as he was able to do in this war when both his prices and his costs were fairly controlled.

HAVE BUREAUCRATS OF O. P. A. RUINED FARMERS?

But have not the terrible bureaucrats of the O. P. A. ruined American business and the American farmer? The production records are in themselves a sufficient answer to these wild charges of ruin. Obviously American industry did not achieve its phenomenal production records by producing at a loss. If it had, it would have been completely dead and buried long since. American industry produced its record production at a profit, and the financial results are indicated in the official figures on corporation profits. Corporation profits before taxes in 1943 were 436 percent of their 1939 level. Corporation profits after taxes were 210 percent of their 1939 level. Despite the deservedly heavy excess-profits taxes, net corporate profits stand today at an all-time high of close to $9,000,000,000.

SMALL BUSINESS NOT CRUSHED BY O. P. A.

Many people have believed—and I myself for a while believed it too—that O. P. A. reglations bear down on small business with excessive severity and are pushing small concerns to the wall. These beliefs do not stand up to the test of facts. The facts show that business failures are today at an all-time low. They show, also, that in the field of distribution, where so much of small business is concentrated, small business concerns are increasing their volume at the expense of the chain stores.

I am not going to deny that O. P. A. regulations have not created some hardship for some firms here and some firms there. You cannot undertake to control 8,000,000 prices without incidental hardships. But most of the stories of hardship are grossly exaggerated. Often they turn out to be the possible hardships of the future, not the actual hardships of the present. At other times the hardships may consist in the inability to make as much profit as the next fellow.

BOYS IN ARMED SERVICES BEARING REAL HARDSHIPS OF THE WAR

In all this talk of hardships, let us remember two things: First, let us remember that the real hardships of this war are being borne, not by civilians, but by the boys in the armed forces. Some of the Republicans, like Mr. Willkie, have now taken to complaining that we are running the home front with too little hardship. This, incidentally, shows how hard it is to satisfy the Republicans. First, they complain that bureaucracy is ruining American business and the American economy, and then when you show them that the hardships have been very much exaggerated, they turn right around and denounce you for not inflicting enough hardships—for conducting a "soft" war instead of a "hard" war.

In the second place, let us remember that it is a settled principle of law—adopted by both our State and Federal

courts—that a law passed for the general welfare is not invalidated by the incidental hardships it inflicts on individuals. If this is true in peacetime, how much more should it be true in wartime when the Nation is fighting for survival and the laws in question are necessary for the safety of the Nation?

STABILIZATION PROGRAM FAIR TO ALL MAJOR GROUPS

Our stabilization program has not only been basically fair to business. It has been fair to all major groups of the population. Our farmers have improved their economic situation remarkably, and no one begrudges this improvement. The net income of farm operators in 1943 was more than $8,000,000,000 higher than in 1939—and about $4,000,000,000 higher than the 1919 figure, which for more than 20 years had stood out as the record high.

In the case of labor, too, despite the incidental hardships that have been inflicted on some groups by wage stabilization, there can be no doubt that by and large our anti-inflation program has redounded to its benefit.

RATIONING PROGRAM QUICKLY ORGANIZED

Let us turn to another aspect of the stabilization program which a year or two ago was receiving an avalanche of criticism—the rationing programs. The fact which most people forgot in their criticisms of rationing was that all our rationing programs had to be instituted in a hurry. The tire-rationing program, for example, was organized in just 29 days after the attack on Pearl Harbor suddenly deprived us of our access to far eastern rubber. The various food-rationing programs similarly had to be instituted in a hurry; since such programs had to be discussed with the trade, long preliminaries would have resulted in consumer runs on our supplies. In the hurry and bustle of instituting rationing programs for 132,000,000 Americans mistakes were inevitable. In the course of the past 2 years they have been corrected. Today American housewives are satisfied with the conduct of the rationing programs. A recent poll showed that 95 percent of the housewives interviewed regarded the rationing system as both fair and equitable. Another indication of the success of the rationing programs is the absence of partisan attacks. Political capital can no longer be made by criticizing the rationing programs. But I notice that the Republicans, who were lavish in their criticisms, are now dumb in several languages when it comes to giving commendation where commendation is due.

RATIONING PROGRAM OF GREAT HELP—CONSIDER INFLATIONARY PERIOD AFTER LAST WAR

Thus we see that in all respects the stabilization program has turned out to be a solid support for the war effort. Unless it is deliberately ruined by partisan malice, it will continue to serve the war effort for the duration. And we can even look forward, when the war is terminated, to its providing the foundation for an orderly transition from the war economy to the economy of peacetime production. It is not to be forgotten that 40 percent of the inflationary prices of the World War No. 1 period took place after the armistice. These price rises served to lift prices to dizzy heights, with the result that the crash, when it came, was all the greater and all the more disastrous. Business profits were wiped out; the farmers were engulfed in a load of debt from which it took them 20 years to recover; industrial employment fell off by a third.

We are reasonably certain of averting such a disastrous aftermath of war if our stabilization program, which has stood the test of war, is continued with the necessary modifications during the transition years of reconversion and demobilization.

FACTUAL DATA ON PRICE CONTROL

War is an economic cloudburst. It requires great quantities of goods, and rains great quantities of dollars down upon the land.

The extra goods produced, however, go off to war, leaving the extra dollars with no place to go.

So a wartime cloudburst of buying power inundates the countryside with flood-stage prices.

When war ends and the flood recedes, it leaves tragedy in its wake. At least that is what always has happened until the present war.

NO PRICE CONTROL DURING THREE PREVIOUS MAJOR WARS

To illustrate this, let us take a look at what happened in the three previous major wars in which the United States engaged.

In the War of the Revolution, the purchasing power of the dollar shrank to 33 cents. In the War between the States, it shrank to 44 cents. In World War No. 1, it shrank to 40 cents.

PRICES THIS WAR AND LAST WAR

To get an idea of what might have happened in this war, save for the establishment of price control by congressional enactment, one need only look at what happened in the last war. Over a 6-year period, from 1914 to 1920, wholesale prices rose 131 percent. The living cost index rose 108 percent—the worst inflation coming after the war. As a result the purchasing power of a fixed income of $2,000 dropped to $960, before the inflationary forces got through. As a result, too, the prices of goods entering largely into the cost of the war were greatly inflated, as is indicated by the following figures:

Steel plates up 187 percent.
Zinc up 73 percent.
Lumber up 67 percent.
Cement up 80 percent.
Pig iron up 154 percent.
Anthracite coal up 65 percent.
Tin up 156 percent.
Petroleum up 200 percent.
Copper up 93 percent.
Bituminous coal up 135 percent.
Coke up 171 percent.
Lead up 106 percent.

COST OF FIRST WAR ALMOST DOUBLED

Because of these and other price increases, the war which had a necessary cost of $17,000,000,000 actually cost $32,000,000,000, $15,000,000,000 being added by inflationary price increases.

DEFLATION

Whatever goes up, however, must come down. It took 6 years for prices to rise; 2 years for them to decline. In the drop they went down 42 percent. The result was disastrous for millions of people throughout the Nation.

In the first place, the profits of corporations engaged in manufacturing and trade shrank from $6,419,000,000 in 1919, the first year after the war, to $4,468,000,000 in 1920. In 1921 they incurred a loss of $255,000,000. In the 5 years following collapse 105,996 businesses failed, 40 percent more than in the last 5 prewar years. Most of them, of course, were small businesses.

Factory unemployment dropped 31 percent. Over 5,600,000 persons lost their jobs. Total factory pay rolls shrank 44 percent, from $244,000,000 weekly in 1920, to $136,000,000 weekly in 1922. The weekly take-home pay of those who kept their jobs dropped 25 percent—from an average of $27.50 to $20.70.

The farmers were hit hardest of all. Following were declines in the prices of leading farm crops:

Wheat dropped 65 percent.
Corn dropped 78 percent.
Oats dropped 71 percent.
Cotton dropped 76 percent.
Potatoes dropped 85 percent.
Rice dropped 79 percent.
Peanuts dropped 70 percent.
Lambs dropped 61 percent.
Hogs dropped 66 percent.
Beef cattle dropped 57 percent.
Butter dropped 53 percent.
Milk, wholesale, dropped 32 percent.
Eggs dropped 73 percent.
Hens dropped 39 percent.
Oranges dropped 76 percent.

As a result of this, net farm-operator income shrank from $1,360 to $460. Total net farm income dropped from $8,799,000,000 in 1919 to $2,990,000,000 in 1921. In the next 5 years 453,000 farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosures.

MUST PREVENT RECURRENCE

Certainly no one can review these figures without the conviction that everything possible should be done during the present war to prevent a recurrence of these tragic events.

It is impossible, of course, to predict with certainty what would have happened to prices during the present war had the price-control program not been put into effect. We can, however, measure inflationary pressures, and if we do this we inevitably reach the conviction that without control prices would have risen far higher than they did in the last war.

COST OF THIS WAR COMPARED WITH LAST

Take a look, for example, at comparative pressures. The last war cost $32,000,000,000. The present war has cost $156,000,000,000 to date and its cost is increasing at the rate of $7,500,000,000 per month.

In the fourth year of the First World War the purchasing power of the public, after taxes, totaled $58,000,000,000. In the fourth year of this war it is estimated that it will total $128,000,000,000. This

is $38,000,000,000 more than goods available for civilian purchase.

INFLATIONARY PRESSURES GREATER IN THIS WAR

In the last war money in circulation increased from $3,400,000,000 at the start to $5,900,000,000 after 51 months. In the present war money in circulation has increased from $7,200,000,000 to $19,900,000,000, and is increasing many millions of dollars every month.

On June 30, 1914, demand deposits in banks subject to check withdrawals totaled $10,082,000,000. By June 30, 1918, these had increased to $14,843,000,000.

On June 30, 1939, demand deposits in banks subject to check withdrawals totaled $27,355,000,000. By June 30, 1943, demand deposits in banks subject to check withdrawals totaled $56,039,000,000. They are today many billions of dollars above the latter figure, although recent official figures are not available.

In the last war 25 percent of all goods produced went to war, 75 percent remaining for civilian use. In 1944 it is estimated that 46 percent of all goods produced will go to war, 54 percent remaining for civilian use.

No one can view the far greater inflationary pressures of the present war without concluding that, save for price control, we should have had price increases far in excess of those which took place in the last war.

FIRST TIME EFFORT MADE TO STOP INFLATION IN WARTIME

This time, however, for the first time Congress and the President decided to protect the Nation from the disaster of wartime inflation. By enactment of the Price Control Act on January 30, 1942, Congress established the Office of Price Administration and erected a price-control dam.

There are two ways to deal with the inflationary pressures of war. The first way is to drain off as much as possible of the deluge of buying power created by war, by raising taxes and by the sale of War bonds to the public. The second way is to erect a price-control dam to hold inflationary pressures in check and prevent them from inundating the land with flood-stage prices.

We have, during the present war, largely increased taxes, and billions of dollars' worth of bonds have been sold to the public. In spite of this, however, inflationary pressures have increased month by month, and there is every reason to believe that prices would have risen far higher than they did in the last war, save for the price-control dam.

Fifty-three months after the last war broke out in Europe living costs had risen in the United States 64.6 percent. In a like period in the present war, living costs have risen 25.9 percent, much less than half as much as they did in the last war, in spite of the far greater inflationary pressures. This 25.9 percent is, of course, a very considerable increase; but 13.6 percent of it occurred before the Price Control Act was passed; 19.5 percent took place before the Stabilization Act was passed.

When the hold-the-line order was issued last April (1943) living costs were 25.9 percent above the level of September, 1939, when war broke out in Europe. Since then for 10 difficult months, with pressures rising month by month behind the price-control dam, living costs have been held practically level. The index figure for January 1943 is exactly what it was for last April. This is unquestionably the most remarkable economic accomplishment in the Nation's history.

Control of the prices of goods entering largely into the cost of the war also has been remarkable. The following table shows the relative increase in the cost of such materials in the last war and in the present war:

Commodity	World War No. 1 (52 months)	World War No. 1 (inflation peak)	World War No. 2 (52 months)
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Steel plates	187	696	0
Pig iron	154	304	15
Copper	93	165	15
Zinc	73	346	70
Anthracite coal	65	82	32
Bituminous coal	135	675	24
Lumber	67	296	60
Tin	156	132	7
Cement	80	276	3
Coke	171	268	20
Glass (plate)	81	81	0
Petroleum	200	367	25
Lead	106	195	29
Wool (wholesale)	195	236	63
Cotton (wholesale)	126	211	105

WITHOUT PRICE CONTROL WAR DEBT WOULD BE $65,000,000,000 HIGHER

No one can view these figures and consider the far greater inflationary pressures of the present war without coming to the conclusion that the accomplishments of price control have been extraordinary. They have been so extraordinary that these facts are true. In its first 52 months the war cost $136,000,000,000. Had prices risen as they did in the last war it would have cost $201,000,000,000. The difference is $65,000,000,000, a direct saving achieved by price control, for, considering the dangers of inflationary pressures, the probability is that without controls the prices of war goods would have increased far greater than they did last time.

One year's interest on $65,000,000,000, at the rates which the Government pays, is $1,260,000,000. The cost of administering this program is $155,000,000 a year—that is the budget of the Office of Price Administration for the year ending June 30, 1944. Based on direct savings on war costs, the Government never made a better investment than its investment in O. P. A.

BENEFITS GREAT

The benefits of the price-control program have been very great. Some people maintain, however, that price control has interfered with production. Let us look at the facts:

In the last war farm production increased 5 percent. During the present war it has increased, in a like period, 21 percent. Food production in 1943 topped all previous records. It probably is true that here and there price control has been discouraging to a limited number of farmers, but it certainly is not true that price control has had any important effect in crippling farm production. Otherwise it would not be at an all-time peak.

Facts as to industrial production are even more extraordinary. In the last war, after 52 months, the prices of industrial goods had risen 77.8 percent. Production of such goods had risen only 25 percent. There was an actual decline in production from the third to the fourth year of the war. In the present war prices of industrial goods have risen 21.8 percent, but production has gained 131 percent.

The truth is that the largely fluctuating prices of the last war interfered with production, while the stable prices of the present war have benefited production. At any rate, no one can claim that price control has interfered with industrial production during the present war.

Still other people maintain that price control hurts profits, small business, landlords, wages, or farmers. Is this true? Let us look at the record.

CORPORATION PROFITS

The following table shows corporation profits before and after taxes for 1929, 1939, and the years since war broke out in Europe:

Corporation profits

[In millions of dollars]

	1929	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Before taxes	9,153	5,320	7,390	14,443	19,037	22,800
After taxes	7,972	4,088	4,847	7,277	7,376	8,200

SMALL BUSINESS NOT HURT

It will be noted that under price control corporation profits, both gross and net, have reached an unprecedented all-time high. The charge that price control has hurt small business is also untrue, as the following figures from the Commerce Department indicate:

Percent of business done by small independent stores

Type of business	1939	1943
	Percent	*Percent*
Food stores	63.3	67.2
Eating and drinking establishments	91.4	93.7
Apparel stores	69.6	71.0
General merchandise	58.4	60.2

LANDLORDS

Some people maintain that rent control has hurt landlords. The truth is, however, that we have controlled rents only in areas where the population has been congested as a result of the war. Before the war vacancies in rented quarters in these areas averaged about 3 percent. At the present time they average only about 1½ percent. Landlords, moreover, do far less decorating and spend less for upkeep than they did previously. The result is that although rents have been held without increase since rent control went into effect, the earnings of landlords have substantially increased.

WEEKLY EARNINGS

Figures on weekly earnings of industrial workers indicate that price control has not hurt labor. The average take-home pay of industrial workers was $26.95 in 1929; $23.86 in 1939; $25.20 in

1940; $29.58 in 1941; and $36.65 in 1942. In 1943 it reached an all-time high of $43.15. Certainly there is no foundation for any claim that price control has hurt labor.

FARM INCOME

Look next at the farmers. Since the beginning of the war net farm-operator income has increased 182 percent. This compares with a net increase in the wages and salaries of nonfarm employees of 58 percent; with wages and salaries of factory employees of 84 percent; with wages and salaries of nonfactory employees of 40 percent. It compares with an increase of 336 percent in corporation profits before taxes, but with an increase of 110 percent in corporation profits after taxes.

Total net farm income of the Nation has increased from $4,537,000,000 in 1939 to $12,775,000,000 in 1943. It is clear from these figures that although individual farmers may have had difficulty in making ends meet, farmers generally have enjoyed a greater degree of prosperity in price-control years than ever before in the Nation's history.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY BILLION DOLLARS WILL BE SAVED BY END OF 1944

The only conclusion one can come to, after a review of the facts, is that price control has hurt no group, but has been extraordinarily beneficial to the people of this Nation. In spite of the far greater inflationary pressures it has held the cost of living 58 percent below the increase of the last war. For the last 10 difficult months it has held the cost of living to no increase. It has an extraordinary record in holding down the cost of materials entering into the cost of the war, saving at least $65,000,000,000 on war costs up to January 1, 1944. If war expenses continue according to present estimates during the remainder of 1944, price control, by the end of this year, will have saved $120,000,000,000 over what would have been the cost had prices increased as they did in the last war.

SPECULATION IN FARM LANDS

Finally, if we continue to "hold the line," price control will save us from very serious economic readjustments after this war. Food prices already have risen so high it will be exceedingly difficult to prevent a decline creating difficult problems for farmers. Governmental agencies are doing what they can to discourage speculation in farm lands. If these efforts are successful they will cushion the blow on the farm population. Nonfarm prices, on the whole, have been so well controlled that post-war readjustments should not be too extreme to be dealt with.

SUBSIDIES

Subsidies are a vital stone in the price-control dam. Some people claim that they are inflationary because the money to pay for them has to be borrowed. It is true, of course, that the $1,500,000,000 a year required to finance subsidies has to be borrowed and so will increase inflationary pressures. Added to the billions of dollars of pressure already above the price-control dam, however, they will have no effect, so long as the dam holds, and will not be reflected in higher prices.

Removed from the dam, however, this $1,500,000,000 stone can have a disastrous effect. For if the inflationary pressures now impounded are let loose upon the country, the price we shall pay in increased war costs will not be $1,500,000,000; but many times that.

Some people say that subsidies are inflationary because, since they hold prices down, they increase the excess of consumer purchasing power over available goods. The people who make this statement confuse inflationary pressures and price increases and as a result offer one of the most absurd arguments ever presented to the American people. In effect, they say if we want to be sure to keep prices down the thing to do is to let them go up.

Subsidies hold prices down. To hold them down is the sole purpose of the price-control program.

Some people complain that through subsidies the soldier boys now fighting at the front will have to come back and help pay the grocery bills of those who stay home and earn big incomes. The truth is that what subsidies pay for really is not groceries, but a stable cost of living, or an essential stone in the price-control dam. Remove that stone, let the inflationary pressures piled up behind the dam loose upon the country and the sum the soldier boys will have to pay when they come back will not be $1,500,000,000, but many times that sum. It is no exaggeration to say that the war can easily cost $50,000,000,000 more in 1944, should we fail to keep living costs and other prices under control.

JOBS AFTER WAR

Eleven million men in our military forces will return at the end of the war to be reabsorbed into jobs. It will be tragic for them and for us if we have to face the task of reestablishing them with prices collapsing about our ears. For the sake of these men, and for the sake of all the rest of us, we must continue to hold the line.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks in all sections of the land, I have belabored the issue of free enterprise. It receives so much lip service and so little action. It is our last best hope in the post-war era. The Government's attitude on free enterprise is all-important. It will determine the mass attitude of the future. This is the time for action in strengthening free enterprise. It must be made strong and healthy to do the task of providing jobs in the days ahead. It can be done by removing the irritants, the burdens, the barriers, the deterrents on business. It is one reason why I have pursued the liquidation of H. O. L. C. with vigor. Its continuance beyond a reasonable time is but an invitation for other emergency agencies to continue beyond their purpose and for the establishment of a pattern which is a menace to the free enterprise system of the future.

THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

How long does an emergency last? It is a pertinent question. It is proposed that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which was created in 1933, shall continue until 1952 and as long thereafter as it would take to liquidate the $271,000,000 in accounts that would then remain. That is 19 years plus. It might become 25 or 30 years. That is truly a long emergency. It reminds one of the grandfather in the play called Adam and Eva who came to spend a week end and remained for 17 years.

A CAUSE CÉLÈBRE

H. O. L. C. is about to become a cause célèbre. In recent days there has been much controversy over its liquidation. It is, of course, a matter of regret that so much of what appears in print is intemperate, pontificial and shot through with opinion and misstatement. A résumé of the whole case and some comment on the efforts to bring about the liquidation of this agency might therefore be appropriate.

THE EFFORT IS NOT NEW

First efforts looking toward H. O. L. C.'s liquidation began in 1940 as evidenced by the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill on page 166. At that time, Chairman John H. Fahey of the H. O. L. C. had this to say to the subcommittee when the question of liquidation was discussed:

Mr. DIRKSEN referred to a program of liquidation here. We have always had in mind that when the great bulk of these accounts have been placed on a sound basis, they can be cleaned up and turned over to private institutions. Within the next couple of years or so that problem ought to be close to a solution. By that time practically all of these accounts should be on a sound basis or else they will become foreclosure cases and we will have to acquire the property. When we reach this point, private institutions will be in a position to take over the active loans.

Note that that testimony was given on December 19, 1940. This would indicate that the matter is not new.

SOME REASONS FOR LIQUIDATION

There were many sound reasons for liquidation. H. O. L. C. had served its purpose. The basic act which created H. O. L. C. provided for its liquidation when its purposes were served. It was a case of taking Government out of business. There was a good mortgage market. There was growing confidence in real-estate values. The unpaid balances on H. O. L. C. accounts were attractive to investment funds. The average life of H. O. L. C. properties was becoming longer and longer and it was a good time for Government to retire from this business. It is well known that, as interest income decreases, losses are certain to be larger. H. O. L. C. was suffering losses on property acquired and incurring abnormal expenses on properties acquired. There was the ever-present danger that H. O. L. C. would undertake to become a permanent agency. It has always been the general policy of Government to liquidate accounts and assets which it acquires such as banks, bonds, and property and that policy should be applied to a Federal emergency agency.

There was its substantial and continuous pay roll. These and other reasons dictated its early liquidation.

A START IS MADE

A start was made in the fiscal year 1944. In the spring of 1943 when the independent offices appropriation bill was under consideration on the floor of the House, I offered an amendment to limit the administrative expenses of H. O. L. C. in such fashion as to compel its liquidation. The amendment also provided unlimited nonadministrative funds for liquidation purposes. By this method it could be liquidated over a reasonable period of time. That amendment carried by a vote of 224 to 159. The bill then went to the Senate. Long hearings were held. Commissioner Fahey testified. I also testified. At long last, the Senate adopted language which expedited the sale of H. O. L. C. properties and mandated H. O. L. C. to prepare and file a report for its liquidation at the earliest practicable date and that such a plan together with its terms and other information should be filed with Congress by February 1, 1944.

MR. FAHEY COMES TO CAPITOL HILL

In November of 1943, Mr. Fahey came to the office for a leisurely, extended, and pleasant chat. We talked of many things including the liquidation of H. O. L. C. The burden of his contention was that private financing institutions were not interested in the H. O. L. C. mortgage accounts, that the balances were too small, that they did not have the financial capacity to take such accounts over. In general, his thesis was the private lending agencies of the land would not and could not take over H. O. L. C. accounts and properties. I disagreed with Mr. Fahey. I was persuaded that H. O. L. C. as an emergency agency should be liquidated. It had served its purpose. The country was full of investment funds. If as the Treasury and the President contended, these investment funds had inflationary potentialities, then why not kill two birds with one stone by reducing these explosive funds, and liquidating a Federal emergency agency whose bonds could be retired and the Nation's contingent debt thus be reduced? I therefore pondered a method of determining whether private enterprise could take over the H. O. L. C. accounts of all kinds. Obviously the thing to do was to ask them.

A LETTER SURVEY

On January 7, 1944, I sent out a letter of inquiry to savings banks, commercial banks, mortgage companies, insurance companies, and savings and loan associations. That letters speaks for itself and reads as follows:

JANUARY 7, 1944.

Re H. O. L. C. liquidation.

DEAR SIRS: As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, I have advocated the retirement of the Government from nonwar business activities. The Congress, in the independent offices appropriation bill, last year required the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to submit by next February 1, 1944, a plan for its prompt liquidation. However, Mr. John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, which has jurisdiction over the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, has made statements which indicate that he thinks he would have a great deal of difficulty in selling all the H. O. L. C. mortgages at this time.

The H. O. L. C. has about 725,000 mortgages and contracts, with an aggregate unpaid balance of about $1,400,000,000. The average unpaid balance is $1,809. These are loans which were made from June 13, 1933, to June 12, 1936, all on a monthly amortized basis and secured by owner-occupied homes. Approximately 97 percent of them are current in their payments or paid to within 90 days. The present rate is 4½ percent.

In order that the committees of Congress may know whether these loans can be sold to local private-enterprise institutions or not, will you kindly write me whether you would be interested in the purchase of some of them? Such purchase, if consummated, should be at par, preserving for the borrowers their 4½ percent rate and all other rights under their contracts. Would you be interested in some or all of these loans in your community, your county, or your State?

In replying, please be as specific as possible as to the amount you would wish to purchase, and also state what information or inspections you would consider necessary on any noncurrent accounts. Though the results of this survey are wanted for the guidance of Congress, your reply will be treated confidentially.

You may wish to send a copy of your reply to your own Senators and to your own Congressman.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Member of Congress.

You will note in paragraph 3 this phrase, "Such purchase, if consummated, should be at par, preserving for the borrowers their 4½-percent rate and all other rights under their contracts." Manifestly there would be no misunderstanding that the purpose was to liquidate the H. O. L. C. and to preserve every right which the borrower had as to terms, maturities, interest rates, and so forth. It would, therefore, be nothing more than a substitution of private financing institutions for a governmental agency.

THE REPLIES ARRIVE

I was frankly astonished as to the number and character of the replies. To date a little more than 4,200 replies have been received, of which 4,129 were willing and able to take over these mortgage accounts.

Broken down as to types, there were 125 from mortgage companies, 110 from life insurance companies, 239 from savings banks, 2,421 from commercial banks, and 1,234 from savings and loan associations.

As to geographical dispersion, the replies came from all of the 48 States, the Territory of Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

A tabulation of these replies indicates that 1,919 institutions indicated their desire to purchase $846,384,566 of such loans, 996 institutions replied that they were desirous of purchasing all of such loans in their areas, 1,033 replied that they would be interested in purchasing indefinite amounts, 181 were uncertain as to what amount they could take.

There are no duplications in these results and it must be quite evident that here is a showing as to the capacity and willingness of the financial institutions of the country which are today filled with idle funds having inflationary potentialities to purchase the H. O. L. C. accounts.

A FEW COMPARISONS

The total H. O. L. C. loans outstanding will run about $1,300,000,000. A reexamination of the replies indicates that 1,919 institutions would take 65 percent of that amount. When you add the 996 who will take all the loans in their area and the 1,033 who would take indefinite amounts you have here a very persuasive indication of the willingness and the capacity of financial institutions to absorb these accounts at a time when it would be advantageous to the Federal Government and to the taxpayers.

THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

An analysis of the replies from the State of Illinois indicates that of the mortgage companies, I asked for $1,500,000; 4 stated they would take all in their area; and 2 indicated indefinite amounts. Of the life-insurance companies, 3 indicated $1,200,000 each and 2 manifested their interest in indefinite amounts. One savings bank stated it could, and would, handle $300,000 of these loans. Of the commercial banks, 83 asked for a total of $23,057,000; 27 said they would take everything in their area; 27 were interested in an indefinite amount, and 3 were uncertain. Of the savings and loan associations, 58 would take $17,562,500; 17 said they would take every loan in their area; 15 named an indefinite amount, and 3 were uncertain. A recapitulation of the State of Illinois, therefore, shows 146 institutions who would take over $4[illegible],620,000; 48 would take everything in their area; 46 were interested in indefinite amounts; and 7 were uncertain. Compare this, then, with the H. O. L. C. figures of the outstanding loans in Illinois.

DOES THIS ANSWER THE QUESTION?

After an examination of the foregoing replies, there is a pertinent query as to whether or not this showing answers the questions which have been raised concerning the capacity and the willingness of the financial institutions of the country to take over these loan accounts and take the Government out of business.

SOME STRAW MEN

Ever since the controversy began, the real issues have been obscured by setting up fictitious straw men so that they could be knocked down.

It was alleged that buyers would be interested only in the current loans. An examination of the testimony taken on this matter on February 3, 1944, page 20, discloses the following colloquy:

Mr. DIRKSEN. Have these accounts either on the basis of cities, counties, districts, States, or regions been formally offered to any thrift institution for sale?

Mr. FAHEY. No; certainly not.

Since no effort has been made to offer these accounts to private enterprise, it is obvious that H. O. L. C. does not know whether prospective buyers will take over

all of its loans—good, bad, and indifferent. It has been alleged that prospective buyers would want a Government guaranty. From no responsible source have I ever heard that allegation because the very purpose of liquidation was to bail the Government out of business.

It has been alleged that prospective purchasers would not maintain the terms such as interest rates and maturity which they now enjoy from H. O. L. C. The answer will be found in the letter which I addressed to such institutions which states in part:

Such purchase, if consummated, should be at par, preserving for the borrowers their 4½-percent rate and all other rights under their contracts.

H. O. L. C. REPORT IS FILED

Meanwhile the H. O. L. C. liquidation report as required by the provisions of the independent offices appropriation bill for 1944 was filed. On February 3, 1944, Commissioner Fahey appeared before the subcommittee to testify. Those hearings are in print. They cover 45 pages. The report in full is printed in those hearings together with explanatory tables and testimony. A few days thereafter, articles and editorials began to appear. It was evident that someone was doing a good job at salesmanship. Government agencies are not easily liquidated. They will hang on so long as there is a single shred of hope and employ every device to that end.

SOME OF THE CURRENT LITERATURE ON H. O. L. C.

It is only fair that all sides be presented—the good and the bad—and I submit at this point some of the articles and editorials referred to. I have no comment to add other than that where they are intemperate, pontifical, inaccurate, and slanted. They speak for themselves.

An article from the Nation for February 1944:

THE ATTACK ON H. O. L. C.

As hypocritical and greedy a campaign as any being waged in Washington is that led by Representative DIRKSEN against the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Although the slogans used are to "reduce nonwar expenditures" and "safeguard private enterprise," the purpose is to permit a few leading institutions to grab the H. O. L. C.'s profitable mortgages and leave the Government holding the bag with the rest. A powerful lobby headed by H. Morton Bodfish, $20,000-a-year president of the United States Savings and Loan League, was behind DIRKSEN's bill to force hurried liquidation of the H. O. L. C. last year. This bogged down in the Senate after the H. O. L. C. testified that such a move would cost the Government about $373,000,000 in mortgage losses. Another legislative measure of this kind is expected to be introduced within a few weeks in the wake of the report just made to Congress by John H. Fahey, the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner.

Mr. Fahey cannot be accused of speaking as a New Dealer without practical business experience. He is a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. He reports that the H. O. L. C. is already 58 percent liquidated and pleads that liquidation can be completed without loss to the Government if it is permitted to continue on the orderly lines laid down in the original Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act in 1933. It is not irrelevant to recall that the H. O. L. C. not only saved thousands of home owners from foreclosure in the early days of the New Deal but also rescued the banks and other lending institutions which had been holding wobbly mortgages. Some of these lenders, says the Fahey report, "seem to believe that the only purpose of the H. O. L. C. was to bail them out of their poor mortgages, enabling them to put the cash received into good loans and then to take back their relinquished mortgages after the Government had spent millions in making them safe. They seek easy profits regardless of the public interest."

However framed, each of the proposals for quick liquidation of the H. O. L. C. would, in effect, hand over the sound H. O. L. C. mortgages to private institutions and leave the Government with the bad ones. This is hardly a way to "reduce nonwar expenditures." Until now, the H. O. L. C. has been able to use earnings on its good mortgages as an offset against losses on the bad. As a result its net realized loss today is little more than $65,000,000, as compared with the eventual losses of a half billion to a billion dollars which were predicted when the H. O. L. C. was established. A loss of $65,000,000 on a "rescue" investment of $3,484,000,000 is less than 2 percent, and Fahey indicates that even this can be wiped out if the H. O. L. C. is allowed to liquidate the holdings in slow and orderly fashion.

The case for the H. O. L. C. is not merely the case for businesslike procedure in handling a Government investment. There are thousands of home owners, most of them good risks, whose homes would be endangered by sudden liquidation of the H. O. L. C. "A great number of H. O. L. C. mortgages," Fahey points out, "are not attractive to lending institutions because of their small balances, extended terms, and scattered location in remote communities, which increases the cost of servicing." These mortgagors would suffer if forced to find commercial lenders to replace their H. O. L. C. loans. As it is, some thousands of H. O. L. C. borrowers have already been misled into arranging new loans by false reports that the H. O. L. C. was soon to be liquidated.

In most of these cases, refinancing has been harmful. The interest rate has been higher, the terms less favorable. Study of a large number of H. O. L. C. loans transferred to private lending institutions showed that the debts had been increased by an average of $1,500, or 78 percent more than the balance the borrowers had owed the H. O. L. C. at the time of transfer. The houses on which these loans were made averaged over 22 years in age. Transfers under such conditions load borrowers with additional debt and add to wartime inflationary pressure. We hope Congress this year will not only resist the mortgage hogs again but slap them down so resoundingly as to discourage any further campaign against the H. O. L. C. and leave its officers and its borrowers free to continue in the path of orderly liquidation.

Now follows an editorial from the Chicago Sun dated February 15, 1944, which evidences little real grasp of the problem:

DIRKSEN AND THE H. O. L. C.

Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN, with the aid of Senator BYRD, has launched his annual attempt to force immediate liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. A year ago misleading statements about the proposed liquidation caused some H. O. L. C. borrowers to arrange new loans with private agencies, often at less advantageous terms. This year neither the home owners nor Congress should be stampeded. Both must recognize the DIRKSEN attack for what it is—an attempt to transfer H. O. L. C.'s good loans to private lenders, while Government and taxpayers are left holding the bag with the bad loans.

The current drive to close up H. O. L. C. is made in the name of economy. But these false whiskers cannot conceal the fact that some private interests have been trying to wipe out H. O. L. C. for 7 years. Had they succeeded before, they would have increased the agency's losses.

H. O. L. C. has made no new loans since 1936. It is now in process of liquidation under the plan adopted by Congress in the beginning—a gradual process, which has kept losses down to less than 2 percent of the original investment. Liquidation is 58 percent completed, and on the present schedule will be wound up entirely by 1952. To compel a speed up would mean a forced sale of any loans which private interests wished to buy, thus depriving H. O. L. C. of earnings which offset losses on the less desirable loans. These having no immediate market value, but capable of improvement with time, would have to be foreclosed and the losses borne by the Government.

Representative DIRKSEN and Senator BYRD may call this economy, but to others it looks like a disgraceful attempt to benefit private interests at public expense.

Next let me submit an editorial from the Washington Post dated February 16, 1944, which is long on opinion and short on fact:

PLUNDER LEAGUE

In the dark days of the depression millions of American families were in danger of losing even the homes in which they lived. The stock market and banking collapse of 1929 was followed by an unprecedented mortgage panic. From 1930 to 1932, mortgages were foreclosed on more than half a million urban homes, housing approximately 2,000,000 Americans. By the spring of 1933 foreclosures were being effected at the rate of 1,000 a day. To meet this situation, the administration and Congress acted with imagination and courage. They established the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, authorizing it to grant loans on generous terms to distressed home owners and to arrange for amortization over a 15-year period. More than a million such loans were made in an aggregate amount of close to $3,500,000,000. It is no overstatement to say that this action, more than any other single measure taken to meet the depression, preserved the stability and the savings of the average American family.

The operations of H. O. L. C. had a collateral benefit of no small consequence. They saved a great number of private lending institutions from financial disaster by taking over their wobbly mortgages and the unsalable properties which they had captured through foreclosure. But now, ironically, the banks and mortgage companies and loan associations rescued by H. O. L. C. are clamoring for the agency's liquidation. Their potent Washington lobby, the United States Savings and Loan League, working through Representative DIRKSEN in the House and through Senator BYRD in the Senate, has sought to compel H. O. L. C. to dispose hastily and prematurely of the mortgages and properties it now holds. The purpose, of course, is to enable the private bankers to pick up the desirable items in the H. O. L. C. portfolio at cut rates.

The hypocritical pretexts on which this raid is based are shamefully transparent. The mortgage bankers, suddenly wrapping themselves in the banner of "free enterprise," have come to the horrified conclusion that the Government is in competition with them. No such qualms assailed them in the days of their despair when they pleaded piteously for governmental aid. Now, with the danger apparently passed, not content with having fed at the public trough, they seek to bite the hand that fed them. There is something even more ludicrous about their second pre-

text, especially from the lips of that arch apostle of economy, Senator BYRD. He wants to abolish H. O. L. C. to reduce nonwar expenditures. A glance at the record should reduce this argument to absurdity.

When H. O. L. C. undertook to save the home owners of America and to bail out the private lenders it was naturally expected to incur huge losses. These were commonly forecast at anywhere from half a billion to a billion dollars. But by rehabilitating the families it assisted, H. O. L. C. has put most of them in a position to pay their own way. More than half of its loans have already been liquidated. More than 90 percent of the properties it was forced to take over have been sold. Earnings from its sound mortgages have offset losses from the shaky ones. As a result, the total loss sustained by H. O. L. C. to date amounts to scarcely more than $65,000,000, less than 2 percent of its three and one-half billion dollar investment. There is every reason to believe, moreover, that, given time to liquidate its holdings in the patient, orderly fashion originally prescribed by Congress, H. O. L. C. will be able to wind up its affairs without a single penny's cost to the American taxpayer.

Senator BYRD's "economy" course would cost the taxpayer, on the other hand, about $373,000,000 in mortgage losses. It would give the mortgage companies a rich, quick profit on the sound loans and leave the Government holding the bag with the unsound ones. Even in a period when public plunder seems to be the vogue, this looks like a monumental piece of effrontery. The families scattered all over the United States who hold their homes today by virtue of H. O. L. C. mortgages have no organization with which to counter the pressure of the United States Savings and Loan League. But they are entitled to expect their Government to save them from a return to such greedy hands. They are entitled to expect their Government to abide by its contracts with them.

Now let me submit an article from the Washington Times-Herald under the title "Time to Bail Out":

TIME TO BAIL OUT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

An interesting demonstration of the truth that the Government never voluntarily gets out of any business, once let in, is now being given by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, have introduced a bill to liquidate the H. O. L. C. because it is no longer necessary, and H. O. L. C. is resisting with might and main because it is living out the rule of all bureaucracies: "Never give up anything, never admit the job is done."

The H. O. L. C. was very useful once. It was created in 1933 to bail out citizens who had got too far behind in their mortgage payments, and refinance them on a very low rate, very long-term basis beyond the means of private capital at that time.

It was a popular idea and on the whole the early work was well organized and well conducted. The H. O. L. C. took over more than 1,000,000 small mortgages after an average write-off of 7 percent of the face value of each one. It advanced money for necessary repairs and taxes, and set up new loans for the householders at 5 percent.

The amendment of 1935 changed the period of H. O. L. C. mortgages from 15 to 25 years and 250,000 mortgagors took advantage of the new provision, so that some mortgages will run to 1957–60. Last reports showed $1,600,000,000 in mortgages, of which three hundred million have been sold (foreclosed).

Only a nation as rich as the United States of America could have offered such soft, easy terms.

In theory the H. O. L. C. was to be "self-liquidating." That is, the owners of mortgaged homes would meet the cost of administration out of their interest payment while the capital indebtedness was being paid off in fixed installments.

Of course, it has not all gone off as planned, 100 percent.

There were some people unable even to meet the Government-refinanced installments of debt due, and so H. O. L. C. has had to foreclose and sell their houses at market prices.

These foreclosures, according to a recent estimate, have run about 1 in 5 on all H. O. L. C. loans. But there are very few today.

People have plenty of cash lying around, and just about everybody prudent enough to get into a house of his own has sense enough to pitch his surplus cash into installments on his mortgage.

The market for mortgage securities is as good, therefore, as it has ever been in American history.

Obviously, this is exactly the right moment for the H. O. L. C. to sell all its holdings to private agencies capable of absorbing them, and get the Government out of the mortgage business.

The liquidation of H. O. L. C. can be accomplished in the next 2 years with comparatively nominal losses and with a record that on the whole is excellent.

On the other hand, if the Government keeps this agency alive its interest income will decline as the mortgages and contracts are paid down to small balances, and expense of operation will eventually exceed income. The total loss to the Government will far exceed any loss that would result from a sale of the assets in the present favorable market.

The mortgages and contracts of H. O. L. C. now average between $1,500 and $2,000 each and are salable on a favorable basis.

To make collections and administer these mortgages alone over a long period of time will be expensive and wasteful.

It is feasible to sell them now to mortgage institutions able to make collections and administer them along with other mortgages producing a normal return.

A good illustration of the cost and the losses to Government arising from the liquidation over 25 or 30 years of a business such as H. O. L. C. is found in the United States Housing Corporation, established during World War No. 1, and still in existence.

U. S. H. C. could have been liquidated to the Government's advantage in the favorable markets of 1919–25.

Failure to liquidate it has cost the taxpayers dearly, yet the same course for H. O. L. C. is now proposed by certain administration officials.

The H. O. L. C. borrower secured his relief in 1933–36, when his loan was refinanced, and he is now protected by a definite contract. He will continue to be protected by that contract after its sale to a private lending institution.

The rapidity with which H. O. L. C. borrowers are already refinancing their loans with private lending institutions without waiting on the Government to act on its own accord indicates that they prefer to have their loans held by some other banker beside Uncle Sam.

The statute creating H. O. L. C. provides that it shall proceed to liquidate the Corporation when its purposes have been accomplished.

In pursuance of the provision of the original act, the Congress last year after full discussion and debate required the submission by February 1, 1944, of a plan for the prompt liquidation of H. O. L. C.

Instead, the Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration has just submitted a report which does not provide for early liquidation.

H. O. L. C.'s survival is being sought by certain persons in government who profess to believe that government can and will do a better home-financing job than private business can and will do. This is unsound, Senator BYRD declares, and he quotes figures.

Almost every mortgage in the H. O. L. C. portfolio can be sold at 100 percent of its face value, according to John Scott, president of the United States Savings and Loan League, and the savings and loan agencies around the country are clamoring for chances to buy.

There is no real excuse for keeping H. O. L. C. in existence, obviously except to keep plenty of cushion under plenty of bureaucrats' seats.

If Congress really means to whittle down the Government wherever it is practicable to do so, here's an excellent place to begin. Liquidate the H. O. L. C. now.

Now follows an editorial from the Baltimore Sun, dated March 13:

H. O. L. C. IN NEW YORK

We are not as yet prepared to say whether the H. O. L. C. should be immediately liquidated, as Senator BYRD proposes, or whether it should be allowed to work itself free of its commitments by the gradual processes which have been followed up to this time. But we are convinced that the H. O. L. C. still constitutes a problem and that many of its difficulties stem from the manner in which the agency was launched. The recently publicized record of H. O. L. C. in the State of New York illustrates both the difficulties and their cause.

Of the original 80,000 refinanced mortgages in New York State, only 8,000, or 10 percent, have been paid in full.

Of all the unpaid principal of $825,034,484 in loans foreclosed by the Corporation, over one-fourth is represented by New York holdings.

Of the Corporation's 15,313 foreclosed homes still unsold and held by the Corporation, nearly one-half are in New York State.

So many New York houses have been taken over by the Corporation and resales are proving so difficult that H. O. L. C. losses in that State are running several times those in other parts of the Nation.

Such, in New York State, has been the Government's sad experience in its well-intentioned desire to come to the help of the small-home owner. The final gloss on this unhappy record is that during the loan-making period H. O. L. C. was directed in New York State by Vincent Dailey, known in State Democratic circles as Jim Farley's right-hand man, who employed 1,200 full-time workers and 2,000 part-time fee workers and admitted that they all were taken from the ranks of the Democratic Party.

A second editorial on February 18, 1944, from the Washington Post which displays the same weakness:

H. O. L. C.

Senator BYRD's proposal to hasten the winding up of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation grew out of hearings conducted by his Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Economy has been the Senator's watchword, and it cannot be doubted that economy was his motive in seeking to bring H. O. L. C.'s activities to a close. But, as we have previously declared, we believe the economy effected would be a false and illusory one. H. O. L. C. has had, as Senator BYRD himself acknowledges, a superb record of accomplishment. Through patience and forbearance it has enabled a large proportion of its borrowers to get on a current basis and meet their regular interest and amortization charges. There is a reasonable prospect that, if the loans are allowed to run to their termination in 1952 and are liquidated in the orderly fashion originally devised by Congress, the H. O. L. C. will be able to wind up its affairs without

any loss whatsoever. Mr. John Fahey, Administrator of H. O. L. C., estimates, however, that if liquidation is forced in 1946, as is proposed under the Byrd bill, his agency will sustain a net loss of $285,046,000.

Most of the banking profession has no desire to force H. O. L. C. into a disadvantageous liquidation. On this score, Mr. Fahey had the following observation to make in his report to Congress: "While there are a few mortgage lending institutions who apparently are entirely forgetful of the imperatively necessary aid extended to them during the depression period and who seek only easy profits on H. O. L. C. sound loans regardless of the public interest, this attitude is not shared by the vast majority of the bankers, savings and loan association and insurance company executives. These officials declare emphatically that they have no wish to participate in any plan to purchase H. O. L. C. good loans and leave the Corporation with the slow accounts and the losses which the Government would have to absorb under such a transaction. They decline to campaign for profits for their institutions at the expense of the taxpayer."

There is another important consideration which argues for the retention of H. O. L. C. The transition from war to peace may be attended by serious economic dislocations. H. O. L. C., as Mr. Fahey put it, "represents a valuable safeguard against a recurrence of the mortgage panic conditions which existed from 1930 to 1934 because of the authority which Congress has provided to deal with uncertain conditions and prevent foreclosures. The private lending institutions are in no position to render effective aid in the event of trouble and their possession of H. O. L. C. loans would necessarily aggravate unfavorable developments."

In our judgment, however, the most compelling reason for continuance of H. O. L. C.'s activities lies in the fact that they entail an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to some 700,000 borrowers. These home owners entered into 15-year contracts with H. O. L. C. Even if private lenders took over the contracts without change, they could not deal with their borrowers in times of stress as leniently and generously as could the Government. The loans made by H. O. L. C. were not ordinary business transactions. They were offered to people in need as a means of rehabilitation. They should be carried to conclusion in that spirit, we believe, by the Government which made them.

Let me also include Dave Boone's column from the New York Sun, dated March 9, which speaks for itself:

DAVE BOONE SAYS

It seems that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is being left holding the bag by many of the folks to whose rescue it went with billions of Government dollars. Uncle Sam now finds himself left with tens of thousands of houses on his hands. And he's stuck with 'em.

New York makes the worst showing. The New York H. O. L. C. owns between thirty and forty thousand homes now, or nearly half the property on which it extended help.

Of course, those valuations put on thousands of homes when Uncle Sam stepped in were away out of line and now he can't unload 'em except as bargain specials. The motto of a good many beneficiaries of Government aid seems to be: "Never give a sucker an even break."

Well, I guess the H. O. L. C. is going to get stuck more rather than less as time goes on. A lot of those new little houses which have been springing up all over the country on Government money, the dweller chipping in a few white chips with a yawn and a grin, are going to be back in its lap, I'm afraid.

From the Chicago Daily News dated February 19, 1944:

THE H. O. L. C. HANGS ON

The annual report of John H. Fahey, head of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, reveals some interesting—and disturbing—facts. Perhaps the most interesting fact is that Mr. Fahey says the H. O. L. C. cannot be liquidated before 1952 without serious loss to the Government. This is interesting, rather than disturbing, because it is just what one could expect any bureaucrat to say about any bureau. If the H. O. L. C. is still in existence, come 1952, we may expect whoever is then its head to contend that it should not be abolished before 1978.

The most disturbing item in the report is Mr. Fahey's statement that of the 736,694 mortgages held by the H. O. L. C., 174,330, or 23 percent, are currently in arrears. This is pretty bad mortgage banking, judged by the standards of private enterprise. It appears much worse when one considers that the H. O. L. C. was organized and began its operations at a time when real-estate values were at the lowest point in our recent history, and that, throughout its 10 years of existence, the H. O. L. C. has been riding on a rising real-estate market. For the past several years the Nation has been suffering from a housing shortage, and residential properties in most localities have been at a premium. If the H. O. L. C. can't achieve a better record than this on a rising market, what can we expect in the event of a post-war depression?

The time to liquidate, it would seem, is in a period while the market is still firm. Each year the H. O. L. C. continues to operate, its assets—the homes on which it holds mortgages—decline in value. They not only will depreciate with age, a factor for which all sound mortgage practice makes allowance, but they will be further depreciated by comparison with newer homes built from new materials, by new methods and incorporating new ideas and devices that will be available as American industry switches to a peacetime economy.

Aside from the fact that a large number of Government employees would be separated from the public pay roll, there seems no good reason to delay liquidation of the H. O. L. C. If liquidation in the immediate future while the real-estate market is still firm would mean a loss, as Mr. Fahey contends, it is obvious that liquidation in a falling market would involve a greater loss. And it should be obvious to anyone that, regardless of general real-estate conditions, the market for the H. O. L. C. properties cannot be as favorable 8 years from now, when they are 8 years older, as it is today.

From the Chicago Sunday Tribune dated December 5, 1943:

MORE ON THE H. O. L. C.

Mr. John H. Fahey, the efficient gentleman who operates the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, replies at some length today in the Voice of the People to objections that we voiced last month against the prolongation of the life of his agency through its undertaking a program for conversion of dwelling units to provide homes for the war workers.

Mr. Fahey has caught us in one outright error, for which we can only plead the fallibility of the editorial mind. We said that Congress had ordered the H. O. L. C. to be liquidated by 1945. Such a provision was incorporated in the bill up to the final stage of passage. The vigorous assertions of the H. O. L. C. that the Government would lose money in the process caused Congress to relax the requirement to one of a report on the progress of liquidation by next February 1. However, it was the unmistakable wish of Congress, as shown by the discussions on this matter, that the H. O. L. C. should wind up its affairs as quickly as possible, and no Congressman, we are sure, had any idea that it was going to undertake a new activity.

As to the other misapprehensions that Mr. Fahey attributes to us, we still are not sure that they are misapprehensions. He contends that the H. O. L. C. is not embarking on a new activity and its rehabilitation program is acting merely as an agent for the National Housing Authority. The editorial noted that the work is being done on the authority of the latter agency, and a distinction of the H. O. L. C.'s activities as between those of an agent and those of a principal seems to us to be mere playing with words. Mr. Fahey says his agency was assigned this task of contracting for the remodeling work and supervising the expenditures of the National Housing Administration funds because of its wide experience in this field. We contended that, regardless of the reputation the H. O. L. C. has for efficiency, the projects could have been done better by private enterprise had it been given the same priorities that have been available to H. O. L. C.

That, however, is immaterial to Mr. Fahey's letter. What is material is this: He says the H. O. L. C. was given the task because it was experienced. Is it his contention that that superior experience will make it necessary for the H. O. L. C. to stay in business another 7 years, the period for which the leases as made will run, in order to manage them?

Next let me submit an article from the New York Times by Mr. Lee Cooper, dated March 8, which is a real analysis and which sets forth the H. O. L. C. situation which has prevailed, and still does prevail, in New York.

H. O. L. C. FORCED TO TAKE BACK 34,233 DWELLINGS IN STATE—UNPAID PRINCIPAL IS $217,641,000 IN NEW YORK, 50 PERCENT OF ORIGINAL LOAN TOTAL, LOSSES HERE HIGHEST IN UNITED STATES

(By Lee Cooper)

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, created 11 years ago to save hundreds of thousands of distressed families from the threat of foreclosure on their homes, has taken over so many New York properties and has found resales on the basis of the original valuations so difficult here that its losses in the State are running several times those in other parts of the Nation, a study of the Federal agency's records showed yesterday.

As an aftermath of the vast refinancing program under which more than $3,000,000,000 was poured out in 3 years to help more than a million small owners, the latest figures show that well over one-fourth of all the unpaid principal of $825,034,484 in loans that have been foreclosed by the Corporation are represented by New York holdings.

They show also that, excepting foreclosures, only about 10 percent of the original 80,115 refinanced mortgages in this State have been paid in full; that nearly half of the 15,313 foreclosed homes still unsold and held by the Corporation are in New York, and that nearly one-fifth of the money still owed to the H. O. L. C. throughout the country is involved in outstanding loans in this State.

In the face of this poor showing in New York, officials of the agency, of the Federal Home Loan Bank and Administration and of the National Housing Agency of which the H. O. L. C. is a part, are wrestling with the problem of improving the status of many delinquent accounts here to make unnecessary the taking over of many more houses under the very procedure it originally sought to avoid.

Already it has become the owner of 34,233 dwellings in the State, or 40 percent of the

properties on which it carried out refinancing operations. The unpaid principal alone on these foreclosed loans was $217,641,869, or more than half of the amount originally borrowed from the agency in New York, and well over 25 percent of the unpaid foreclosed principal of $825,034,484 in the Nation. No other State or region approaches this one in the dollar volume of its foreclosures, number of foreclosures, or in losses thus far, although New Jersey and Massachusetts also were listed as making unusually poor showings in comparison with the national record.

In a further determined effort to find buyers for many of the 7,565 homes listed late in 1943 as still unsold in this State, the H. O. L. C. began yesterday a new sales drive through which it hopes within 3 months to dispose of most of these and several thousand other dwellings held in the New York region, which embraces the section from Maine to Virginia.

It will take a substantial loss in many cases, however, despite the fact that it will have the advantage of a rising wartime market. It must pay brokers' commissions, the foreclosure costs, and figure in tax arrears and interest defaults. The unpaid interest alone on the 34,233 properties taken in the State up to December 1, 1943, was $14,535,608. Also to be added to the "investment" of the Corporation are the funds previously advanced or now necessary to put the residences in good condition.

LOSSES IN STATE INCREASED

All of these factors will increase the losses in the State, which will be offset only partly by the agency's income from interest charges on outstanding loans.

The extent of these losses, led by New York, may be realized from a study of the books as of November 30, 1943, when cumulative losses chiefly from resale of foreclosed houses, aggregated $255,080,000 compared with a total of $189,838,000 received in interest income.

For the Nation, the average loss on resales, including brokers' commissions, has been about 31 percent of the original loans, but in some New England States, and particularly in New York, the average loss is running higher, due in part to higher foreclosure expenses.

The troublesome situation in the New York loans is emphasized by an analysis of outstanding mortgages as of November 30. At that time total "debtor balances" had been reduced by 58 percent in the Nation to $1,354,392,000, from the original figure of $3,093,451,000, but in the Empire State the balance still was $22,015,143 in 64,368 loans out of the original $411,276,352 on 80,115 loans.

To these 64,368 outstanding mortgages must be added the 7,565 homes still held as the result of mortgage foreclosures, giving 71,933 unsettled accounts out of the original list of slightly more than 80,000, and indicating that only about 8,000 loans had been paid off here. Nationally, only 699,773 accounts and 15,313 houses remained on the books of the H. O. L. C., indicating final settlement of about 30 percent of its original accounts, which numbered 1,017,821.

The New York refinancing program was carried out under the direction of Vincent Dailey, long known as James M. Farley's right hand man in New York State Democratic Party activities, who was State manager of the H. O. L. C. during its lending period from August 15, 1933, to December 28, 1936, about 6 months after the last loan was made.

Mr. Dailey kept up his interest in politics during that period, continuing to serve as State campaign manager for his party. In the fall of 1936 he received a 90-day leave from the H. O. L. C. to manage the New York campaigns of President Roosevelt and Governor Lehman for reelection. He admitted in 1935 that his H. O. L. C. employees—numbering about 1,200 full-time workers and about 2,000 part-time or fee employees—were taken from the ranks of the Democratic Party.

FORECLOSURES APPARENT

While loans still were being made in the State, it became evident that many foreclosures would occur, and some employees were kept busy drawing up papers to take back quite a few houses on early refinancing eve.. while others were arranging the details of further loans.

In some cases no payment ever was made on the refinanced mortgage, and early in 1935 Mr. Dailey found it necessary to warn chiselers and willful defaulters that the Government was not making them a present of the money, that they must pay up or lose their homes.

THE FAHEY REPORT

Let me now insert the report which Commissioner Fahey filed with the Subcommittee on Independent Offices on February 3:

A REPORT TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES PURSUANT TO THE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1944, PUBLIC LAW 90, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, BY THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

JOHN H. FAHEY, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK COMMISSIONER

JANUARY 31, 1944.

The Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, Public Law 90, Seventy-eighth Congress, includes the following provision:

"*Provided further*, That the Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall prepare a plan for its liquidation at the earliest practicable date and shall, by February 1, 1944, submit a report of such plan to the Congress, setting forth the terms of liquidation and such other information as may be necessary to inform the Congress of the disposition of the property of such Corporation while in the process of liquidation."

The meaning of this provision is not altogether clear, inasmuch as the original Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, Public Law 43, Seventy-third Congress, provided that the Corporation should cease making loans on June 12, 1936, and, in accordance with its terms, the Corporation has been engaged in liquidation operations since that date.

It is assumed that what Congress desires is:

(1) Full information concerning the results of Home Owners' Loan Corporation liquidation thus far;

(2) Whether the plan adopted by Congress in 1933 should now be displaced by a new plan; and

(3) Whether the Corporation's loans can now be sold without serious loss or injustice to the Government or to the home owners the Corporation was organized to help, as suggested by some mortgage lenders and brokers.

The answers to these questions are—

First. The $3,484,047,906 total investment of Home Owners' Loan Corporation at the end of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1943, had been reduced to $1,632,451,939, representing a total liquidation of 53.1 percent.

As of the fiscal year ending June 30, last, of 196,750 properties acquired, 170,652, or 86.7 percent, had been sold. As of November 30, the total number sold was 181,910, or 92.2 percent.

The 1,017,821 loans made by Home Owners' Loan Corporation, on June 30, last, had been reduced 28 percent to 736,694. As of November 30, the number was 699,773, a reduction of 31 percent.

The peak of administrative expenses of the Corporation was $37,679,998. This had been reduced to $10,711,749 for the fiscal year 1943, or 72 percent.

The number of employees of the Corporation at the height of its operation was 20,811. As of June 30, 1943, this number had been reduced to 3,810, a reduction of 81.7 percent. The number provided for the 1945 fiscal year is 2,904.

As of June 30, last, the outstanding bonds of the Corporation had been reduced from $3,489,453,550 to $1,729,481,800.

As of June 30, 1943, the net earnings of the Corporation before losses were $189,838,205, as compared with $157,728,773 at the end of the preceding fiscal year.

The Corporation's loss resulting from the sale of foreclosed properties and minor losses from fire, casualty, etc., as of June 30, 1943, was $255,080,636 which, being offset by the $189,838,205 of interest income on loans and rentals, resulted in a realized net loss as of that date of $65,242,431.

Second. Many proposals for a forced liquidation of Home Owners' Loan Corporation have been advanced for several years and examined thoroughly. None has been devised which compares in economy and effectiveness with that which Congress incorporated in the Home Owners' Loan Act, and no scheme has been suggested which would not increase greatly the Government loss.

A plan which, instead of causing a loss of a half billion to a billion dollars, will lose but a small fraction of what was expected and may lose nothing whatever can hardly be regarded as an unsuccessful plan which should be discarded for some proposal which makes large losses certain.

Third. Generally speaking, private lending institutions legally and under the limitations fixed by their directors, can purchase only those loans which although representing great risks when granted have now been made entirely safe. The sale of such loans would leave the Corporation with the slow accounts, the small and widely scattered loans, and those on which borrowers have not yet reduced their debts to the point where they have acquired safe equities. Private lending institutions ordinarily cannot buy Home Owners' Loan Corporation foreclosed properties, and those remaining in the possession of the Corporation would have to be sold at substantial losses with little net return from the loans to offset such losses. As a result, the Government would be deprived of the regular income on sound assets and would still be obliged to maintain a Nation-wide organization to manage the slow and doubtful accounts and the Treasury would have to make up the difference. Such a sale of the Corporation's loans would simply make certain large and unnecessary losses to the Government which must inevitably increase the war debt and the burdens of the Nation's taxpayers with no public advantage whatever. Some of the country's most experienced mortgage-lending executives who have studied the matter carefully agree as to this result.

It is, moreover, difficult to see how private lending institutions can enter into binding agreements to carry Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans on the same terms as those which Congress granted under the act or extend the same leniency to borrowers as that now possible in the event of the development of unforeseen difficulties.

State laws do not permit the latitude in such matters which is authorized by the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.

Any proper consideration of proposals to sell the loans of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation obviously calls for a review of the circumstances under which the Congress passed the Home Owners' Loan Act, what it was expected to accomplish, the extent to which these hopes have been realized, and the present prospects of the Corporation.

It will be recalled that the stock market and banking collapse of 1929 was accompanied by the greatest mortgage panic in the history

of this or any other country. From 1930 to 1932, mortgages had been foreclosed on more than a half million urban homes, which provided housing for approximately 2,000,000 people in the United States. Hundreds of thousands of additional foreclosures were being initiated and many thousands of mortgage-lending institutions were not only impaired but steadily developing more serious insolvencies while the fair values of many more homes were being undermined.

In the spring of 1932 the Congress established the Federal Home Loan Bank System. It provided $124,741,000 of Government capital to open 12 regional home loan banks. While these banks were intended chiefly to make loans to mortgage-lending institutions, Congress took cognizance of the dangerous mortgage situation and authorized the banks, under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which was appointed in July 1932, to make direct loans to home owners who were in distress. The banks were not opened until October 1932. Meanwhile, the foreclosure tide was rising and by the spring of 1933 had reached the record height of 1,000 a day. Conditions as affecting the lending institutions were so serious that, as of January 1, 1933, the bank system had enlisted but 118 institutions in its membership.

The records of the Board show that, notwithstanding the grave difficulties affecting home owners in every part of the country, it not only failed to take adequate steps to meet the crisis, but it also neglected to make any report to Congress on the basis of which prompt remedies could be applied. The regulations adopted by the Board providing for the making of direct loans by the banks were so restrictive as to prove wholly ineffective.

They authorized loans up to 30 percent of the current appraised value of the homes in some cases, or 40 percent in others, if the owners proved inability to obtain loans elsewhere, at a time when there was no market value. The futility of these measures is demonstrated by the fact that, while over 42,000 applications for relief were considered, and over $136,000 was spent by the Board, only three loans, amounting to a total of $9,000, were made in the entire country.

The Senate of the United States refused to confirm the Board which had been appointed, their interim terms expired in March 1933, and on the recommendation of the President of the United States, Congress promptly passed the Home Owners' Loan Act.

This law created a corporation with a capital stock of $200,000,000 subscribed by the United States Treasury with the right to issue $2,000,000,000 of bonds bearing an interest rate of 4 percent, with provisions for exemption from Federal, State, and local taxes, except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes. In spite of the 4-percent rate, the tax-exempt features of these bonds, and the fact that the Government guaranteed the payment of interest on the bonds, many lending institutions declined to exchange them for defaulted mortgages they had foreclosed or were about to foreclose. It was not until the act was amended to provide for a Government guaranty of principal as well as interest that the bonds were freely accepted by large numbers of institutions.

The new Federal Home Loan Bank Board which had been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate was named as the board of directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and charged with the responsibility of carrying out the purposes of the act. Applications for loans were received in every State in the Union and in Puerto Rico, the Hawaiian Islands, and Alaska; 458 offices were opened to provide for the prompt handling of these applications. The entire operation was likewise decentralized by the organization of a series of regional offices to prevent the delays in action which would have ensued if decisions on details of loan operations and other necessary procedures had been concentrated in Washington.

Special staffs were quickly organized to process and take over eligible mortgages in the closed banks and other closed financial institutions of the country and, in cooperation with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, several hundred millions of cash was quickly released for the relief of business and public needs.

Under the provisions of the act approved by Congress, the Corporation was authorized to make monthly, quarterly, or semiannual amortized loans, and home-owner borrowers were granted a period of 15 years in which to repay their loans. This was the longest term for which such loans had ever been made in the United States and it resulted in a general change in lending practices throughout the country in favor of long-term, amortized loans. The act provided that no payment of principal should be required during the period of 3 years after the act took effect if the home owner was not in default as to any other condition or covenant of the mortgage. In accordance with the limitations of the act, final principal payments on the last loans made in 1936 would accrue in 1951 but, believing that a year thereafter would be required to clear up the Corporation's affairs, the Congress, in 1935, amended the act and fixed 1952 as the final maturity date on its bonds. The rate of interest on the loans was fixed at not more than 5 percent, the lowest rate for loans of this kind which had thus far been made in the country. The Corporation later provided for acceptance of interest at 4½ percent. The Corporation was also authorized to make extensions of payments from time to time in worthy cases. All costs of examining applications and closing loans, amounting to a total of more than $58,500,000 were absorbed by the Corporation and charged off completely to its operating expense when the loans were made.

Immediately upon the opening of its offices, the Corporation was overwhelmed with applications for loans from people in dire distress. Such was the anxiety of home owners that, in several of our large cities, long queues of applicants formed and waited overnight under the impression that the funds available might be exhausted quickly. The applications filed accumulated to the point where, in June 1934, Congress felt it was necessary to increase the bond authorization to $3,000,000,000 and, as such applications continued to rise, in May 1935 this authorization was further extended to a maximum of $4,750,000,000. The total of applications filed was 1,886,491, representing a total of $6,173,355,652. Of these applications, the Corporation granted by June 12, 1936, 1,017,821 loans, representing a total of loans and advances, which included delinquent taxes, insurance, and necessary repairs, amounting to $3,484,047,906 at June 30, 1943.

Aside from increasing the lending authority of the Corporation in order to stop the mortgage panic, and save homes from foreclosure, the Congress felt obliged to extend financial help to lending institutions in order to permit many which were frozen to make payments to investors and depositors, to make mortgages and help revive employment in the building industries, and to assist in the merging and rehabilitation of lending institutions which were in trouble in all parts of the country. For these purposes, it authorized the Corporation to sell bonds and advance cash up to a total of $300,000,000 to make deposits in savings banks and purchase shares in savings and loan associations. The savings and loan associations were granted a moratorium of 5 years on repayments to retire these shares, thereafter they were callable over a period of 10 years at 10 percent a year.

To restore public confidence in the institutions which were sound and bring back into service vast sums of money which were in hoarding, the Congress, following the organization of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to insure deposits in commercial banks, directed the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to provide $100,000,000 of capital for the establishment of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. This Corporation was authorized to insure savings in these institutions up to a maximum of $5,000 for each investor in each insured institution, and the members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board were made the trustees of the Corporation.

It will be observed that, when established, and as a result of subsequent amendments, while Home Owners' Loan Corporation was created primarily for the direct relief to home owners, it was also regarded as a financing device for the effective rehabilitation of a dangerously undermined mortgage structure. The results which have accrued from this farsighted legislation have far exceeded anticipations. When the Corporation was organized and during the lending period, it was generally believed that its losses would run to over five hundred millions and probably to a billion dollars. Executives of leading mortgage-lending institutions of the country freely predicted such losses in view of the fact that, on the average, the loans were nearly 2 years in default and 3 years behind on taxes when taken over by the Corporation, and the houses averaged 15 years old. The sound character of the plan formulated by Congress, which gave home owners the opportunity to pay off their mortgage indebtedness in small amounts, at low-interest rates, over a long period of time, the Mead-Barry amendment which provided for extensions in justifiable cases, and the leniency extended to harassed borrowers as contemplated by the act has, however, resulted in keeping losses down to less than 2 percent on the cumulative investment to June 30, 1943, but a fraction of what was expected.

The gratitude of self-respecting American citizens, who recognize their obligations to their Government and willingly make sacrifices to discharge them and to save their homes, has made a conspicuous success of an extraordinary lending adventure. It is also fair to say that a loyal staff of employees of the Corporation who realized the responsibilities the public service imposed upon them and, regardless of hours and inadequate compensation, worked indefatigably, have also contributed in a very large way to the results secured.

These results may be summarized as follows:

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION LIQUIDATION PROGRESS AT JUNE 30, 1943

The Corporation made 1,017,821 loans totaling $3,093,451,021. Up to June 30, 1943, this amount had been increased by $390,596,585 for advances for taxes, insurance, maintenance, foreclosure costs, reconditioning on property acquired, unpaid interest, etc., making a total capitalization of $3,484,047,906.

Of this amount, there had been realized $1,597,047,551, or 45.8 percent, while losses had amounted to $254,548,416, or 7.3 percent. This represented a total liquidation of $1,851,595,967, or 53.1 percent of the cumulative investment.

The remaining balance of $1,632,451,939, or 46.9 percent, was made up of $1,441,153,111, or 41.4 percent of cutstanding balances of debtor accounts, and $191,298,828, or 5.4 percent, capital value of properties on hand.

Of the original 1,017,821 loans made, there were on hand 736,694 original loans and vendee accounts, and 26,041 properties at June 30, 1943, making a total of 762,735 accounts, or 74.9 percent of the original loans made.

Summary of Home Owners' Loan Corporation capitalization and liquidation

Original amount of loans	$3,093,451,321
Total additions	390,596,585
Total capitalization	3,484,047,906
Net realization	1,597,047,551
Capital losses	254,548,416
Total liquidation	1,851,595,967
Debtor accounts (736,693)	1,441,153,111
Properties on hand (26,041)	191,298,828
Balance outstanding (762,734)	1,632,451,939

As of November 30, 1943, the latest verified figures show: Total balances, $1,464,967,813, representing a total liquidation of 58 percent; total properties acquired, 197,281; properties sold, 181,910, or 92.2 percent; total outstanding active accounts, 699,733.

There are attached the following:

Exhibit A. Condensed summary of income and expenses and losses, by fiscal years 1942–43, and cumulative.

Exhibit B. Condensed summary of income, expenses, and losses, cumulative to June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943.

Exhibit C. Status of debtor accounts as of June 30, 1943, delinquencies.

Exhibit D. Status of all accounts by percent of loan reduction, United States total.

Exhibit E. Estimate of properties acquired, sold, and on hand, fiscal years 1944–52.

Exhibit F. Estimated income and expense, normal liquidation, fiscal years 1944–52.

As of June 30, 1943, the total cumulative investment in the shares of savings and loan associations was $223,856,700. Of this amount, $115,453,300 has been repaid to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

Accounts in 2,428 savings and loan associations were insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation up to $5,000 on June 30, 1943. These institutions now have total assets of more than $4,000,000,000. In the years since the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was organized (1934) the institutions in its membership have shown greater gains in savings than any other class of savings institutions in the country. In the past 9½ years it has been necessary to place but 33 associations in liquidation. Final losses in these cases, it is estimated, will amount to $5,940,771.85, representing 30.13 percent of premium income, 11.95 percent of gross income, and 0.19 percent of insured liability. As of June 30, 1943, the Corporation had reserves of $41,406,963.44 including a special reserve for contingencies amounting to $24,000,000, representing cumulative dividends on the capital stock of the Insurance Corporation which is owned by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and, it is expected, will finally be paid to Home Owners' Loan Corporation. As of May 1, next, the earliest callable date of the 3-percent bonds which Home Owners' Loan Corporation transferred to the Insurance Corporation in return for its stock, the accumulated dividends will be $26,500,000.

The Insurance Corporation is most economically operated, the estimated costs for personal services for the fiscal 1945 being but 2.34 percent of estimated gross income.

As the reports of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the exhibits listed above indicate, the nearly three-quarters of a million borrowers whose mortgages the Corporation held at the end of the last fiscal year (June 30, 1943) have made most encouraging progress in reducing the amount of their loans. At the end of last June, of 736,694 active accounts only 174,330, or a little over 23 percent, were in arrears on their payments, and of these 27,464 were behind less than one installment. (See exhibit C.) The 120,920 borrowers who were delinquent from 1 to 3 installments occasion little concern from the standpoint of delayed payments, since the amount in arrears was but slightly more than $4,000,000. These accounts, however, represent an indebtedness to the Corporation of $269,278,189 and do call for energetic servicing.

The loans more seriously in default, that is, more than three payments, involve 25,942 borrowers. Their delinquent payments total a little more than $3,500,000, but these cases involve over seventy millions of debt to the Corporation and are a somewhat more difficult problem. This group, however, has been reduced to but 4 percent of the entire number of borrowers.

It has been suggested that, since only a small percentage of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers are in default for three installments or for periods ranging from 3½ months up to a little over a year, all of the loans of the Corporation are now on such a basis that they can be sold for cash at par to private lending institutions. This proposal, however, ignores many factors which private lenders must or should take into consideration in making loans under the laws which govern their operations. They represent the tests which obviously would be applied by well-managed mortgage-lending institutions which would buy Home Owners' Loan Corporation or any other urban home mortgages.

These tests may be summarized briefly as follows:

(a) In all of our States the provisions of State laws or good business practice limit the amount lending institutions may advance on mortgage based upon a sound appraisal of the value of the property. Such appraisals, if made, properly must consider not only a readily obtainable market price, the age of equipment, physical characteristics, and maintenance of the property, but its location, neighborhood trend, and community prospects. Only by such appraisals can the borrowers' safe equity in the property be determined.

(b) The dependable income and credit record of the borrower must be ascertained.

(c) The size of the loan as an earning asset, cost of servicing, and its distance from the offices of the lending institution must be taken into consideration.

There are other facts of importance relative to the borrower and the value of the collateral behind the loan which many lending institutions examine but the fundamentals mentioned cannot be disregarded without taking risks which most lenders are unwilling or legally unable to assume under the established mortgage lending limitations generally prevailing.

Any careful examination of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation experience and its present portfolio will disclose the obstacles which make it impractical for the lending institutions of the country to take over any except the soundest and most remunerative loans the Corporation owns—the very assets which provide most of the income to pay the Corporation's operating expenses and limits its losses.

It is to be remembered that the loans which the Corporation took over from 1933 to 1936 were the most seriously distressed urban mortgage loans in the country. On the average, the loans taken were in default nearly 2 years on principal and interest payments and 3 years on taxes. The homes on which these mortgages are liens were on the average over 15 years old when the loans were made. They are now 22 to 25 years old. There being practically no market value for these houses at the time the loans were made, appraisals had to be based on estimates of reproduction costs over a period of years, probable market values under more normal conditions, etc. Today's appraisals must of necessity be more critical and because of the history of these loan cases, most private institutions would unquestionably insist upon careful examination of the properties which are collateral for Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans, irrespective of the Corporation's judgment as to their worth. If its loans were to be divided into groups and sold in that fashion, the Corporation would be obliged to incur large appraisal costs in order to fix fair sales prices and protect the interests of the Government.

The income of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrower, his record of payment with Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the extent to which he has developed an undoubted equity in his property by the reduction of his debt would have to be taken into consideration. Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers have shown unexpected tenacity in making the sacrifices necessary to pay off the mortgages on their homes and have surprisingly reduced these liens as they were able to do so. The fact must nevertheless be recognized that many whose total indebtedness to the Corporation is still very large, have not yet been able to pay off to the point where the average private lending institution would consider their loans as safe.

As of June 30, 1942, 21,134 Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers had been unable to reduce their principal indebtedness to the Corporation, although meeting interest charges. They owed $79,199,395. During the last fiscal year, however, this number dropped to 10,976, and the balance due to $41,175,008.

At the end of June 1942, there were 44,377 borrowers who had not yet reduced their principal indebtedness as much as 10 percent. They owed $162,780,335.

In the following 12 months, however, the number in this group declined to 27,028 and their indebtedness to $96,758,279. It must be recognized, however, that these loans in which private institutions would have no interest, still represented a balance of $137,933,287

The Corporation also has 141,375 borrowers who a year ago had developed valuable equities in their homes by the reduction of principal indebtedness in amounts ranging from 10 to 20 percent. They owed $424,405,125 on June 30, 1942. A year later, the number of accounts in this category was 93,782 and the total indebtedness $293,615,325. These loans have made an excellent record, but their complete safety would undoubtedly be challenged by many private lending institutions and a considerable number could not be taken by State or national banks or other classes of lending institutions under existing State laws.

Exhibit D discloses the status of Home Owners Loan Corporation accounts by percentage of loan reduction up to 30 percent and over, indicative of the equities which have been established by the Corporation's borrowers as of June 30, 1943, compared with the previous year.

In considering the credit record of Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers, private lending institutions necessarily must give weight to the fact that over 200,000 Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers were badly delinquent in 1939, and a large proportion of them faced foreclosure when Congress provided for extensions of these loans over periods as long as 25 years from the date of execution of the Corporation's mortgage. This proved to be a wise and wholly constructive measure, although it was at the time regarded by most mortgage-lending institutions as an extremely risky undertaking.

The result of this change in the Home Owners' Loan Corporation plan, the reduction in monthly payments which it made possible, and the additional time granted borrowers to pay off their obligations has yielded remarkable returns. The number of

borrowers who were in arrears from 3 to 12 months and almost constantly in difficulties, dropped from 205,582 at the end of June of 1939 to 25,942 on June 30, 1943, and the amount of delinquent payments owed by those who were seriously behind declined from $75,829,206 in June 1939 to $3,590,187 on June 30, 1943.

Private lending institutions generally would be neither equipped nor able to extend to these borrowers the opportunity to save their homes which was made possible by the action of Congress.

Private lending institutions ordinarily are not disposed to make mortgage loans of small amounts. It costs as much to place such loans on the books as those of larger amounts which yield a profitable income. Most of such loans are on low-cost properties and a large proportion of them in small communities. It is usually more expensive to service them than nearby loans and in the event of serious difficulties the costs of handling are often high. The rates charged on small distant loans by private lenders, when made at all, take into consideration the greater risks, higher costs involved, and the smaller returns and are invariably much greater than on mortgages in city and suburban areas. The limit on interest rates which Congress fixed on Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans applied without discrimination in every section and every town in the country, and the rate of 4½ percent on small loans is, of course, a deterrent to their acquisition by private lending institutions. Home Owners' Loan Corporation made loans in every county in the United States except 64, and practically every community of 2,500 inhabitants or more. These mortgages are on all kinds of houses from modest bungalows in the mining regions to the cabins of workers in the remote sections of many of our States. The smaller loans have now been paid down to the point where the Corporation now holds over 220,000 mortgages of less than $1,000. Nearly 30,000 of them are less than $250. Over 52,000 of them are in amounts from $250 to $500, and over 138,000 of them range from $500 up to $1,000. By energetic servicing, the Corporation has been able to keep these mortgages in good shape, and this group of borrowers is responding well to the suggestions of the Corporation that they undertake regularly to pay more than the principal amounts due each month. Irrespective of their condition, there are many doubts as to the interest of private lending institutions in this class of loans.

The Corporation's mortgages are also widely scattered. The active accounts as of June 30 last were distributed in 19,070 cities, towns, and villages. In 14,295 of these communities there were less than 10 loans; a total of 4,813 communities had but 1 loan; and 2,637 had but 2 loans; 58 percent, or 8,450 communities, had 2 loans or less. A large proportion of the smaller loans are located in these communities. In the more densely populated sections of the country are cities in which there are enterprising mortgage-lending institutions not far distant from these smaller communities, but in the more sparsely settled areas of the country the distances between many Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans are formidable.

Exhibit A, a comparison of income and expense, discloses that during the fiscal year 1943 the Corporation absorbed all losses on the sale of foreclosed property in an amount nearly a million dollars greater than in 1942 and yet was able, despite a decline in receipts of nearly $13,500,000, to show a net income applicable to a reduction of accumulated losses of $4,461,249, a net improvement over the previous year of $8,677,276. It will be noted from an examination of this exhibit that although the total income during 1943 of $92,861,703 represented a decrease of nearly $13,500,000, or 12.7 percent, the total expenses of $60,752,270, including bond interest and all other charges, represented a decrease of $23,123,204, or 27.6 percent, or more than twice the percentage decline in income.

The losses of the Corporation are, of course, due almost entirely to the sale of foreclosed properties, and these losses include all charges which have accrued against the properties, including the balance of unpaid principal and interest, unpaid taxes, advances, costs of foreclosures, and all commissions and costs of sale. The accumulated charges of this character, influenced largely by the Corporation's unwillingness to resort to foreclosure until every reasonable possibility of saving the borrower's home had been exhausted, represented on June 30, 1943, a total of $214,340,459 out of the gross loss of $225,080,636 at that date.

Property losses began to accumulate substantially in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, when for the first time the Corporation was able to dispose of a considerable amount of property. In the first year of these sales the losses on property sales amounted to $45,164,726, which was offset by earned income before losses of $16,252,319, leaving a net loss for the year of $29,158,003, including other minor losses.

In 1939 the Corporation had on hand the largest number of properties carried at any one time. In the following year it was possible to greatly increase the sale of properties, and the losses as a result increased correspondingly for that fiscal year to a total of $82,285,894. This was offset by a net earned income of $23,176,713 which reduced the net loss for the year to $59,250,655 including other minor losses.

In the 1941 fiscal year it was possible to sell 34,745 additional properties with losses amounting to $61,398,402. This loss was, however, offset by net income before losses of $24,451,077 which in turn cut the year's net loss to $37,153,357.

In 1942, as a result of 3 years of steady decline in the number of the more readily marketable properties which the Corporation had on hand, the sales that year dropped to 16,822, representing a loss of $26,504,083. Net income before losses reduced the net loss for that year to $4,226,027. With the long-delayed improvement in the market in the northeastern group of States it became possible in 1943 to dispose of 14,066 properties at a loss of $27,479,757. The steady improvement of the loans in the portfolio and progressive reductions in expense increased the net income before losses to $32,109,432 and resulted in the final income of $4,461,249 after deducting other minor losses.

The entire problem of the Corporation is, of course, concentrated in the losses sustained in the sale of properties. The advantage of disposing of these properties as rapidly as the market will absorb them without "dumping" or unjustifiable losses, is obvious. Although pending sale, most of the Corporation's properties have been rented. The advantage of disposing of the properties and taking into the Corporation's portfolio "good" mortgages resulting from sales which yield a dependable 4½ percent income is apparent. It is also apparent from the figures reviewed above that without the income from the loans which were made good as the result of careful and persistent servicing, the losses of the Corporation would be very heavy.

Without such earnings the realized loss of the Corporation as of June 30 last would have been $255,030,636 instead of $65,242,431, to which it was reduced by earnings before losses amounting to $189,838,205.

By June 30 next the Corporation expects to reduce still further the number of properties on hand. This policy will temporarily increase net losses of the Corporation, but the advantage of replacing nonremunerative properties with income-producing loans is apparent. With property losses declining after next year, net income in excess of current losses for 1945 and thereafter will result in progressive and substantial reductions in the net losses of the Corporation. By 1949 these losses should be completely offset by the payment to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation of the dividends on the capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

The estimates made in exhibit F are conservative. They are based upon the Corporation's experience. Invariably in the past results have exceeded such estimates and there is every reason to believe that by the continuation of orderly liquidation as contemplated by the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Corporation will have a surplus ranging from $6,830,000 to over $30,000,000 on June 30, 1952, as accumulated dividends on the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation stock are transferred to Home Owners' Loan Corporation. In other words, instead of being a source of loss to the taxpayers, as was expected, the Corporation will not only have carried out its purpose of saving hundreds of thousands of homes from foreclosure but has excellent prospects of returning its capital and a comfortable surplus to the Government and its taxpayers.

It is estimated that at June 30, 1952, there will be a remaining balance of outstanding accounts amounting to $270,925,000, representing extended original accounts and vendee accounts with maturities up to 1961. The extended loans mature as late as 1961 as a result of the Mead-Barry Act providing for extensions on loans up to 25 years from the original date of the loan. The vendee accounts maturing between 1952 and 1962, are the mortgages resulting from the sale of acquired properties. By 1952 practically all of these accounts will be seasoned mortgages, easily salable at no loss to the Government. If improvement in the status of these loans places them in such a position that all but a comparatively small number would be readily salable at no loss to the Government, their disposition might be considered at a much earlier date than 1952. It is certain, however, that the Government will be called upon to carry on liquidation activities involving homes as well as other types of real estate for many years after the present war, and it would be entirely logical before 1952 to combine Home Owners' Loan Corporation with the appropriate agency of the Government conducting similar operations for final liquidation.

Without adequate knowledge of Home Owners' Loan Corporation operations, the difficulties to be overcome, and which are still encountered in servicing some of its loans or the losses which would be imposed upon the Government if their demands were acceded to proposals have been advanced by some private lenders ever since 1935, for the sale of the Corporation's loans as fast as they were placed on a sound basis. A small group of mortgage lenders seem to believe that the only purpose for which Congress established the Corporation was to take over their poor loans, enable them to put the cash received into profitable mortgages and, after the Government had spent millions in making some of these defaulted obligations safe again, to turn them back to those who were foreclosing them from 1933 to 1936, and leave all the losses to the Government.

While there are a few mortgage lending institutions who apparently are entirely forgetful of the imperatively necessary aid extended to them during the depression period and who seek only easy profits on the Home Owners' Loan Corporation sound loans regardless of the public interest, this attitude is not shared by the vast majority of the bankers, savings and loan association, and insurance company executives. These officials declare emphatically that they have no wish to participate in any plan to purchase the Home Owners' Loan Corporation good loans and leave the Corporation with the slow accounts and the losses which the Government would have to absorb under such a transaction. They decline to campaign for profits for their institutions at the expense of the taxpayer.

It must be recognized that in most cases the institutions could no longer continue to carry the defaulted loans when they were taken over by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation during the depression but unfortunately it is also a fact that in numerous cases borrowers were not granted the consideration which should have been extended at a difficult time.

The first of the proposals was made even before the Corporation stopped lending, when more than 600,000 of its loans were delinquent. Several times thereafter resolutions were adopted at conventions of one of the organizations of lending institutions asking that the Government turn over the "good" loans of the Corporation to such institutions.

In July of 1941 leading officials of a national trade association presented to the Corporation a plan for selling its assets to the 12 Federal home loan banks. It was presented as "not representing a liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation but actually the setting up of 12 regional Home Owners' Loan Corporations operating under about the same plan and supervision." It provided for passing the assets of the Corporation on "to the members of the banks for their ownership and administration." It was proposed that the Corporation be not dissolved and that its bonds be left outstanding since "by letting these bonds remain outstanding whatever loss there may be ultimately will fall on the Government without requiring any additional guaranties from the Government." Each Federal home loan bank was to purchase from Home Owners' Loan Corporation the assets in its district and issue in payment therefor debentures of the bank system at a rate of interest not in excess of 2¼ percent. The "acceptable assets of the Corporation" would be purchased at par and the properties at an agreed-upon price.

The bank system debentures would not be issued in full to Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the "nonacceptable assets including real estate." A part of the obligation for such assets would be in the form of a contingent liability and final payment to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would depend upon what was realized on the assets after the deduction of losses and all costs incurred.

The 12 banks would distribute the loans and properties to member institutions and accept in payment therefor the "shares of insured members." These shares would be retired over a period of 10 years at the rate of one-tenth a year. Noninsured bank members would be permitted to buy the Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans and properties upon payment of cash or through credit facilities arranged for them. The debentures to be issued by the banks to acquire the loans and properties would be guaranteed by the Government as to principal and interest. The memorandum outlining the plan frankly stated that "the above-suggested plan places the losses upon the Government where it justly belongs."

It is, of course, clear that since the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would have no control whatever over foreclosures on the loans transferred, or losses in connection with the sale of properties, under such a plan there would be no safeguards whatever against losses. Home Owners' Loan Corporation could not close up its affairs until the last of its bonds were retired and, since ultimate payment to the Corporation would depend upon the realization of the assets by the Federal home-loan banks, no date of final liquidation of the Corporation could be fixed.

Under such a proposal, the Government would surrender all control over the administration of its assets worth billions of dollars and guarantee those taking over such assets against any possible loss.

The executive vice president of the United States Savings and Loan League last year, through the press, advanced a somewhat different plan for the immediate liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. It proposed that lending institutions should be allowed to purchase the good loans, those which may now be regarded as safe, for cash, and that the loans which would be considered as slow because of delinquency or an insufficient reduction of principal indebtedness should be marked down to an acceptable figure and also sold to them. This plan contemplated the offering of the good and the slow loans in packages by cities, States, and areas. Full information concerning the loans would be provided by Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the institutions would be expected to bid on them. Just who would take the good loans and who would be content with the slow loans or how the packages would be distributed without endless controversies was not explained. If such a plan were undertaken, Home Owners' Loan Corporation would first be obliged to incur large expenditures to prepare information of the sort suggested with no assurance whatever that the assets offered would be purchased on any basis. It is apparent that if this information were prepared and circulated, there would be no obligation on any institution obtaining it to buy any of the loans from the Corporation. There would be a strong inclination by some, at least, to canvass the borrowers, secure the transfer of as many safe loans as possible, and leave the Corporation with the smaller and slow accounts.

The misleading publicity stimulated last year by the discussion of possible immediate liquidation of Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the Congress, and publicity issued by one of the trade associations resulted in a flood of letters and inquiries from Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers as to whether the Corporation was to be closed up and if they were obliged to borrow money to pay off their obligations. As a result, some thousands of Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers were misled into arranging new loans, in most cases on decidedly disadvantageous terms.

Borrowers whose accounts were delinquent or otherwise unsatisfactory, noting the suggestion that such accounts would be marked down and sold promptly, asked if their accounts could not be marked down now and continued with the Corporation. Others wished to know if their loans were to be sold at a discount whether they would receive the benefit of the discount or if some mortgage-lending institution would get that much extra profit.

Borrowers who had long met their obligations on schedule, assuming from the statements printed that delinquent and defaulted accounts were to be marked down, raised questions as to why their accounts, which had been kept current constantly should not be treated with equal generosity.

The unsoundness of any plans for packaging or piecemeal sales of Home Owners' Loan Corporation assets is well demonstrated by these incidents.

There are other important considerations which would seem to preclude serious consideration of such a scheme. Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers are faithfully keeping their contracts and meeting their obligations. It is true that there are some who fall behind from time to time but practically all of them will pay out and it is wholly unnecessary for the Government to cancel any part of these borrowers' obligations when there is every prospect of full payment. If the Home Owners' Loan Corporation were directed to compile lists of borrowers with full information concerning their loans and circulate this information widely over the country, it is easy to anticipate the confusion, resentment, and anxiety which would be generated in nearly every city and town of any size in the United States when representatives of lending institutions began calling upon the more than 700,000 families whose homes are mortgaged to Home Owners' Loan Corporation, to question them and inspect their homes.

Several suggestions have been advanced that a corporation might be formed by private interests which would buy all the loans and properties owned by Home Owners' Loan Corporation, issue securities to the public and pay off the Corporation. Some who have discussed the possibilities of this plan were confident that all the cash necessary could be raised at once and paid over to the Corporation. They contended that all the loans could be taken at par while the properties would be bought at an agreed-upon price but no responsible financial interests have yet shown any evidence of willingness to provide the cash for such purchases. I am certain that none will unless protected from risk and guaranteed a sure profit by the Government.

A variation of the corporate purchase idea is the suggestion that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation be paid in part in cash and final payments deferred until the losses resulting from the transfer to private hands could be determined and deducted. Numerous brokers and speculators have from time to time sought full information concerning Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans and properties for some sections of the country, or for all the country, with the idea that by shopping around they would be able to interest persons or institutions with capital to join in a scheme for Home Owners' Loan Corporation purchasers. It is obvious that the Corporation should not provide the information demanded or engage in the discussion of indefinite speculative schemes of this character.

A few proposals have been advanced that the Corporation could sell out its loans for a particular city or State. These proposals have always been carefully hedged about with a reference to the acceptable loans and properties. Not one of these proposals has ever been advanced, or can be developed, which would not transfer profits to a private operator and additional losses to the Government.

It has also been suggested on various occasions that all the loans, good and slow, could be taken over by private institutions if the Government would guarantee the purchasers against losses. Such a plan, of course, would mean sure profits to those who acquired the loans and the certainty of increased losses to the Government. It would also raise the important question of public policy involved in any Government assurance to purchasers of Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans of a return on their investment greater than that of Government War bonds.

It is claimed by some who wish to see the Corporation's good loans sold at once that now is the best time to dispose of these assets, because of the possibility that a recession in the post-war period will affect payments by the Corporation's borrowers, and it would then be difficult to sell the loans. This theory, of course, assumes that experienced lending institutions would buy Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans that were being sold because they were expected to get into trouble and become less valuable.

The experience of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation furnishes no support for the theory that the Corporation's borrowers whose accounts are now in better shape than ever will not continue to keep up their loan payments to the Corporation. During some of the worst periods of the depression, as a result of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation plan of monthly payments, the lowest they were ever called upon to make, in order to acquire or retain their homes, nearly 400,000 Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers were meeting their payments on schedule. Another 200,000 were less than 90 days behind. Every month now the security of the Corporation's position on these loans is strengthened not only on the so-called good loans but all the others as well. The borrowers are steadily reducing their indebtedness and building up stronger equities in their properties. This process has the effect

of making the collateral behind the loan of constantly increasing value and the borrower has every interest in keeping up his payments.

Moreover, these monthly payments usually are less than rent for comparable homes, an important incentive to the borrower to maintain his payments. Conclusive evidence of the desire of Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers to meet their payments and reduce their indebtedness lies in the fact that whereas at the peak of delinquency they owed over $120,000,000 and one hundred and thirteen millions of this was badly in default, at the end of the last fiscal year the total delinquency was but $7,965,582. Of this $3,590,187 was the amount represented by seriously defaulted cases, a reduction in this worrisome item alone of nearly $110,000,000.

During the 1943 fiscal year, over 77,000 of the Corporation's borrowers succeeded in moving from a lower group to a higher category in reducing indebtedness and substantially increasing equities.

The possibility of repercussions and dislocations which may be incidental to transition to peacetime conditions should not be disregarded. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, however, represents a valuable safeguard against a recurrence of the mortgage-panic conditions which existed from 1930 to 1934 because of the authority which Congress has provided to deal with uncertain conditions and prevent foreclosures. The private lending institutions are in no position to render effective aid in the event of trouble and their possession of Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans would necessarily aggravate unfavorable developments.

I have discussed the numerous ideas which have been advanced for quick liquidation of Home Owners' Loan Corporation by the sale of its loans with outstanding and experienced executives of the Nation's savings and loan associations, the insurance companies, the commercial and savings banks, and the mortgage bankers. I have met with groups of leaders active in all these mortgage-lending institutions who have studied the Home Owners' Loan Corporation figures and given serious thought to the proposals that its loans should be sold forthwith on some basis or other. While all agree that it would be helpful to private enterprise, if the opportunity were presented to acquire loans that were safe, these leaders have no wish to suggest any plan which would impose increased losses on the Government. They are in agreement that no scheme could prevent serious losses that did not provide for taking less desirable mortgages with those that could be regarded as absolutely sound. They agree that the sale of good loans, while leaving Home Owners' Loan Corporation with doubtful mortgages, would inevitably result in increased losses.

In the opinion of gentlemen of the character to whom I refer, most mortgage-lending institutions in the country would not have legal authority to acquire the Corporation's real estate or any loans which could not be regarded as sound. It was recognized that, if the mortgage portfolio were sold on any basis, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, deprived of the income on the loans, would have to absorb entirely the losses which would accrue from foreclosed real estate.

Most of the gentlemen skilled in mortgage lending with whom I have had the privilege of discussing the matter during the past year see no feasible method at present of selling all the Corporation's loans except in connection with Government guaranties against loss. The objections to the adoption of such a policy are recognized and I know of no responsible bankers or mortgage-lending executives who would advocate such a plan or any other plan which would assure them of attractive profits at the expense of their Government.

EXHIBIT A.—*Home Owners' Loan Corporation condensed summary of income, expense, and losses, by fiscal years 1942, 1943, and cumulative*

	Fiscal year 1942	Fiscal year 1943	Increase, decrease	June 13, 1933, to June 30, 1943
Operating and other income:				
Interest	$80,181,329	$70,569,491	−$9,611,838	$966,539,714
Property income	19,528,529	16,768,486	−2,760,043	130,011,165
Dividends	5,588,941	4,729,649	−859,292	43,099,737
Miscellaneous	1,060,414	794,077	−266,337	4,356,528
Total	106,359,213	92,861,703	−13,497,510	1,144,007,144
Operating and other expense:				
Interest on bonds	53,202,757	38,365,159	−14,837,598	591,987,838
Property expense	14,586,897	11,550,908	−3,035,989	105,436,987
Administrative and general expenses	16,085,820	10,836,203	−5,249,617	256,744,114
Total	83,875,474	60,752,270	−23,123,204	954,168,939
Net income before losses	22,483,739	32,109,432	9,625,694	189,838,205
Losses:				
Mortgage loans and vendee accounts	33,261	35,511	2,250	265,643
Property	26,504,083	27,479,757	975,674	254,041,276
Other property losses	3,573	13,340	9,767	241,497
Fidelity and casualties	83,753	42,944	−40,809	247,671
Fire and other hazards	85,774	76,289	−9,485	277,453
Miscellaneous	−678	342	1,020	7,096
Total	26,709,766	27,648,183	938,417	255,080,636
Net income		4,461,249	8,687,276	
Net loss	4,226,027			65,242,431

EXHIBIT B.—*Home Owners' Loan Corporation condensed summary of income, expense, and losses cumulative to June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943*

	June 30, 1942	June 30, 1943	Increase
Operating and other income:			
Interest	$895,970,223	$966,539,714	$70,569,491
Property income	113,242,679	130,011,165	16,768,486
Dividends	38,370,088	43,099,737	4,729,649
Miscellaneous	3,562,451	4,356,528	794,077
Total	1,051,145,441	1,144,007,144	92,861,703
Operating and other expense:			
Interest on bonds	553,622,679	591,987,838	38,365,159
Property expense	93,886,079	105,436,987	11,550,908
Administrative and general expenses	245,907,911	256,744,114	10,836,203
Total	893,416,669	954,168,939	60,752,270
Net income before losses	157,728,773	189,838,205	32,109,432
Losses:			
Mortgage loans and vendee accounts	230,132	265,643	35,511
Property	226,561,519	254,041,276	27,479,757
Other property losses	228,157	241,497	13,340
Fidelity and casualties	204,727	247,671	42,944
Fire and other hazards	201,164	277,453	76,289
Miscellaneous	6,754	7,096	342
Total	227,432,453	255,080,636	27,648,183
Net loss	−69,703,680	−65,242,431	
Net income			4,461,249

EXHIBIT C.—*Home Owners' Loan Corporation status of debtor accounts as of June 30, 1943, delinquencies*

	Number	Percent to number of accounts		Arrearage	Balances
		In arrears	Outstanding		
Less than 1 installment	27,468	15.7	3.7	$313,172	$60,255,951
1 to 3 installments	120,920	69.4	16.3	4,061,922	269,278,189
3 installments and over	25,942	14.9	3.5	3,590,187	70,872,524
Total	174,330	100.0	23.5	7,965,282	400,406,664

EXHIBIT D.—*Home Owners' Loan Corporation—Status of all accounts by percent of loan reduction, United States total*

	June 30, 1942	June 30, 1943		June 30, 1942	June 30, 1943
No reduction:			20 to 30 percent:		
Number	21,134	10,976	Number	129,200	130,714
Balance	$79,199,395	$41,175,008	Balance	$324,657,144	$345,553,169
Less than 10 percent:			30 percent and over:		
Number	44,377	27,028	Number	472,488	474,194
Balance	$162,780,335	$96,758,279	Balance	$684,803,290	$664,051,330
10 to 20 percent:					
Number	144,375	93,782	Total:		
Balance	$424,405,124	$293,615,325	Number	808,574	736,694
			Balance	$1,675,845,288	$1,441,153,111

EXHIBIT E.—*Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimate of properties acquired, sold, and on hand*

[Fiscal years 1944-48]

	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948
Beginning of year:					
1. Total properties on hand	26,041	7,500	3,400	1,900	1,150
2. Capital value	$191,298,828	$54,000,000	$22,000,000	$11,500,000	$6,500,000
3. Net transfers	1,359	500	750	600	400
4. Capital value	$10,956,172	$5,300,000	$4,000,000	$3,000,000	$2,000,000
5. Property sales	19,900	5,000	2,250	1,350	900
6. Capital value	$148,255,000	$37,300,000	$14,500,000	$8,000,000	$5,250,000
End of year:					
7. Total properties on hand	7,500	3,400	1,900	1,150	650
8. Capital value	$54,000,000	$22,000,000	$11,500,000	$6,500,000	$3,300,000
9. Sales price	$97,350,000	$24,000,000	$9,330,000	$6,100,000	$3,380,000
10. Capital loss	$50,905,000	$13,300,000	$5,170,000	$3,400,000	$1,870,000
11. Commission and sales expense	$6,595,000	$1,700,000	$630,000	$400,000	$230,000
12. Total loss	$57,500,000	$15,000,000	$5,800,000	$3,800,000	$2,100,000
13. Total cash proceeds	$22,300,000	$5,500,000	$2,130,000	$1,400,000	$780,000
14. Net vendee accounts	$75,050,000	$18,500,000	$7,200,000	$4,700,000	$2,600,000
15. Principal balance transferred	$6,000,000	$4,800,000	$4,000,000	$3,400,000	$2,240,000

Estimated properties acquired, sold, and on hand

[Fiscal years 1949-52]

	1949	1950	1951	1952
Beginning of year:				
1. Total properties on hand	650	300	100	50
2. Capital value	$3,300,000	$1,500,000	$500,000	$250,000
3. Net transfers	250	100		
4. Capital value	$1,200,000	$500,000		
5. Property sales	600	300	50	50
6. Capital value	$3,000,000	$1,500,000	$250,000	$250,000
End of year:				
7. Total properties on hand	300	100	50	
8. Capital value	$1,500,000	$500,000	$250,000	
9. Sales price	$1,930,000	$965,000	$160,000	$160,000
10. Capital loss	$1,070,000	$535,000	$90,000	$90,000
11. Commission and sales expense	$130,000	$65,000	$10,000	$10,000
12. Total loss	$1,200,000	$600,000	$100,000	$100,000
13. Total cash proceeds	$450,000	$220,000	$35,000	$35,000
14. Net vendee accounts	$1,480,000	$715,000	$125,000	$125,000
15. Principal balance transferred	$1,350,000	$550,000		

EXHIBIT F.—*Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimated income and expense, normal liquidation*

[Fiscal years 1944-48]

INCOME

	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948
1. Interest on accounts	$60,000,000	$50,790,000	$41,940,000	$34,160,000	$27,690,000
2. Dividends, savings and loan associations	2,200,000	400,000	60,000		
3. Property income from rents	8,200,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000	500,000
4. Miscellaneous income	1,100,000	600,000	500,000	400,000	300,000
5. Gross income	71,500,000	54,790,000	44,500,000	35,560,000	28,490,000

EXPENSE

6. Interest on outstanding bonds	$32,000,000	$15,180,000	$9,270,000	$7,230,000	$5,620,000
7. Administrative expenses	9,580,000	9,275,000	8,300,000	7,400,000	6,000,000
8. Property expense	5,650,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	800,000	400,000
9. Miscellaneous expenses	270,000	225,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
10. Gross expenses	47,500,000	26,680,000	19,270,000	15,630,000	12,220,000
11. Net income	24,000,000	28,110,000	25,230,000	19,930,000	16,270,000
12. Losses	57,558,000	15,020,000	5,820,000	3,810,000	2,110,000
13. Net profit or loss	33,558,000	[2] 13,090,000	[1] 19,410,000	[1] 16,120,000	[1] 14,160,000
14. Net losses at beginning of year	65,242,000	98,800,000	85,710,000	66,300,000	50,180,000
15. Net losses, end of year [2]	98,800,000	85,710,000	66,300,000	50,180,000	36,020,000

[1] Indicates net profit.

[2] Net losses and corresponding profits would be improved by the payment to Home Owners' Loan Corporation of the cumulative dividends on the stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which, on May 1, 1944, will amount to $26,500,000.

EXHIBIT F.—*Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimated income and expense normal liquidation*—Continued

[Fiscal years 1949–52]

INCOME

	1949	1950	1951	1952
1. Interest on accounts	$22,700,000	$18,950,000	$15,980,000	$13,410,000
2. Dividends, saving and loan associations				
3. Property income from rents				
4. Miscellaneous income	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
5. Gross income	22,900,000	19,150,000	16,180,000	13,610,000

EXPENSE

	1949	1950	1951	1952
6. Interest on outstanding bonds	$4,340,000	$3,430,000	$2,640,000	$1,980,000
7. Administrative expenses	4,800,000	3,800,000	2,800,000	2,400,000
8. Property expense				
9. Miscellaneous expenses	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
10. Gross expenses	9,340,000	7,430,000	5,640,000	4,580,000
11. Net income	13,560,000	11,720,000	10,540,000	9,030,000
12. Losses	1,200,000	600,000	100,000	100,000
13. Net profit or loss	[1] 12,360,000	[1] 11,120,000	[1] 10,440,000	[1] 8,930,000
14. Net losses at beginning of year	36,020,000	23,660,000	12,540,000	2,100,000
15. Net losses, end of year	23,660,000	12,540,000	2,100,000	[1] 6,830,000

[1] Indicates net profit.

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL REPORT TO CONGRESS BY JOHN H. FAHEY, COMMISSIONER OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION, ON OPERATIONS OF THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

(This report is called for by a provision of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1944, directing that Home Owners' Loan Corporation "shall prepare a plan for its liquidation at the earliest practicable date and shall by February 1, 1944, submit a report of such a plan to the Congress.)

FEBRUARY 1, 1944.

The logical course to follow in the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation's 700,000 loans is that charted by the Congress when the Corporation was established in 1933. As of November 30, 1943, it already had resulted in a liquidation of 58 percent, and holds the chance of complete liquidation without cost by 1952—whereas any forced liquidation through sale of mortgages before they are sufficiently matured means an unnecessary loss to the Government.

The arguments which have been pressed for forced liquidation in the past year were used as early as 1936, when sale of Home Owners' Loan Corporation assets would have cost the Government and taxpayers at least $1,000,000,000. The loss would be less now, but it still would be very heavy. The most common proposal has been to take over only the "good" loans at par, leaving the slow and doubtful loans and all future losses to the Government as a result of its success in saving hundreds of thousands of homes and bailing out hundreds of mortgage institutions in the depression.

An alternative proposal has been to take over all loans, with the Government giving a complete guaranty against losses. A third has been to take the sound loans at par and transfer the others to lending institutions at a discount. All of these plans would inflict heavy losses on the Government and taxpayers, while the buyers of the loans would take sure profits.

During the fiscal year 1943 the Home Owners' Loan Corporation absorbed all losses on sales of foreclosed property in an amount nearly $1,000,000 greater than in 1942. Nevertheless, despite a large decline in gross income because of more rapid liquidation, the Corporation was able to show a net income of $4,461,000 to apply against previous losses, an improvement over the year before of $8,677,000.

In brief the facts are:

The $3,484,000,000 total investment of the Corporation had been reduced to $1,632,000,000 on June 30, 1943, the end of the past fiscal year, or by 53.1 percent. By last November 30, liquidation of Home Owners' Loan Corporation had reached 58 percent. On the same date 31 percent of its 1,000,000 loans had been completely retired and the Corporation had sold 92 percent of the properties it was forced to acquire.

At the end of the fiscal year the Corporation's cumulative losses, chiefly from the sale of foreclosed properties, totaled $255,080,000. These were offset by $189,838,000 of interest income on loans, plus rentals, resulting in a net realized loss of $65,242,000.

Most private lending institutions, legally and in the exercise of prudence, can buy only "safe" loans. The sale of Home Owners' Loan Corporation mortgages which have been brought to an "acceptable" rating, after years of servicing at Government expense, would leave this agency only with the slow accounts and the small and widely scattered loans. Home Owners' Loan Corporation would be deprived of regular income on sound assets, but would still be obliged to maintain a Nation-wide organization to manage the slow and doubtful accounts—and the Treasury and taxpayers would have to make up the difference.

Of vital importance to Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers who have not yet attained financial stability is the fact that State laws prevent most private lending institutions from extending them the leniency the Home Owners' Loan Corporation can allow in case of further trouble. It can be taken almost for granted that if all the Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans were sold many foreclosures would result which can be averted under the present Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers are making encouraging progress in reducing their loans. Of the 736,694 active accounts at the end of last June, only 174,330, or about 23 percent, were in arrears, and 27,464 of these were behind less than one installment. However, the 120,920 borrowers delinquent only from 1 to 3 months still require vigilant servicing because they have not yet succeeded in substantially reducing their balances. The 25,942 loans over 3 months in default constitute, of course, a still more difficult problem for the Corporation, and they represent an indebtedness of over $70,800,000.

It has been suggested that since only a small percentage of Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans are very far in default, all of the Corporation's loans can now be sold for cash at par. This proposal ignores the tests which obviously would be applied by well-managed mortgage institutions in buying any home loans, including thorough appraisals and a scrutiny of the amount of the borrower's equity, the amount of the balance due, his earnings and credit record, and the cost of servicing.

Despite the faithful performance of Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers as a whole, many have not yet paid off to the point where the average lending institution would consider their loans as safe.

No lending institutions want to buy for par the 39,000 loans that have been paid down less than 10 percent, and which still represent a balance of $138,000,000.

Other large numbers of borrowers have made an excellent record in recent years but the margin of safety on their accounts would look dubious to many lending institutions, and many of the loans could not be taken over by lending institutions under present State laws.

About 220,000 of the Corporation's mortgages represent balances of less than $1,000; some 30,000 are less than $250; 138,000 range from $500 to $1,000. Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans are distributed in about 19,000 cities, towns, and villages. In over 14,000 of these communities there is a concentration of fewer than 10 loans; 4,800 communities had but 1 loan each on the reporting date.

The losses of Home Owners' Loan Corporation are incurred almost entirely in the sale of foreclosed properties, against which are charged unpaid principal and interest, tax advances, and costs of foreclosure and sale. These added charges arise from the Corporation's long forbearance before resorting to foreclosure.

Clearly, it is of advantage to Home Owners' Loan Corporation to sell these properties as rapidly as possible, without sacrificing them, and then take over purchase money mortgages yielding the Corporation's interest rate of 4½ percent. Without the earnings from its loans the loss of the Corporation up to last June 30 would have been nearly $255,000,000, instead of $65,242,000.

It is estimated that by June 30, 1952, the balance of Home Owners' Loan Corporation accounts will have declined to $271,000,000.

Practically all of the mortgages will have become well seasoned by then, easily salable at no loss to the Government, and legally eligible for purchase by all classes of lending institutions. If improvement places them in such a condition that they can be marketed at no loss to the Government or injustice to the borrowers, there should be no difficulty in effecting their sale at an earlier date if Congress should decide it is in the public interest.

Small groups of mortgage lenders repeatedly have asked to be allowed to take over the Corporation's loans as rapidly as they were placed on a sound basis. They seem to believe that the only purpose of Home Owners' Loan Corporation was to bail them out of their poor mortgages, enabling them to put the cash received into good loans and then to take back their relinquished mortgages after the Government had spent millions in making them safe. They seek easy profits regardless of the public interest.

Misleading publicity on the subject was stimulated last year by discussion of possible immediate liquidation of Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Erroneous publicity issued by one of the trade organizations resulted in a flood of letters to Home Owners' Loan Corporation from borrowers asking whether the Corporation was to be dissolved and if they were obliged to borrow money elsewhere to pay off their obligations. In consequence of this publicity, some thousands of Home Owners' Loan Corporation borrowers were misled into arranging new loans, usually at higher interest rates and decidedly unfavorable terms.

While there are a few mortgage-lending institutions who apparently are entirely forgetful of the aid extended to them during the depression and who seek only easy profits regardless of the public interest, this attitude is not shared by the vast majority of the bankers and savings and loan association and insurance-company executives. These officials declare emphatically that they have no wish to participate in any plan to purchase the Home Owners' Loan Corporation's good loans and leave the Corporation with the slow accounts and the losses which the Government would have to absorb under such a transaction. They decline to campaign for profits for their institutions at the expense of taxpayers.

Any forced liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation certainly would have just that result.

Mr. Speaker, you will note in the paragraph which is fifth from the end that it is anticipated that by June 30, 1952, the balances of H. O. L. C. will have declined to $271,000,000. The report, therefore, proposes liquidation some time after 1952 but nobody knows how much longer thereafter. This will mean that an emergency agency which began operations in 1933 will have been doing business for 19 years plus such additional time as may be required for its final liquidation. If our experience with H. O. L. C. should prove similar to that of the liquidation of the United States Housing Corporation which was created in 1917 and which is still in process of liquidation in 1944 after 27 years of existence, it may be long after 1952 before this emergency agency is liquidated unless Congress gets busy.

A FEW PERTINENT QUESTIONS

This is a good time to raise a few pertinent questions.

First. Will there be any better mortgage market than there is today in which to liquidate the H. O. L. C.?

Second. If, as has been alleged, there is such grave inflation danger in the funds which now lie idle in the credit and thrift institutions of the country, why should not some of these funds be siphoned off and invested in mortgage loans now held by the Federal Government?

Third. If our concern over the public and contingent debt is genuine, why not begin the reduction of the debt by bailing the H. O. L. C. out of business and retiring its outstanding bonds?

Fourth. Is there a more advantageous time than now to liquidate H. O. L. C., reduce its indebtedness, and thereby reduce the amount of interest paid on our contingent debt?

Fifth. If, as Mr. Fahey indicates in his report to the committee, his loan account is in good shape, why should he be concerned as to whether or not these loans can be sold to private institutions?

Sixth. Since the basic act under which H. O. L. C. was created provides for its liquidation when its purposes have been served and, inasmuch as no new loans have been made since 1936, why does the Home Owners' Loan Corporation fail or refuse to carry out liquidation as provided by Congress by offering these loans for sale?

Seventh. What caused Mr. Fahey to change his mind as indicated by his testimony in 1940 that within a few years these accounts could be turned over to private institutions, and who now submits a report that it will be 1952 plus before the Corporation is reduced to 20 percent of its present loan accounts?

Eighth. What explanation does Mr. Fahey have for the condition which presently prevails in New York as evidenced by the analysis made by Mr. Cooper in the New York Times?

Ninth. How does H. O. L. C. propose to avoid losses on aging properties on which the original loan was in excess of that dictated by prudence and sound loan practices?

THE TECHNIQUE FOR KEEPING AN AGENCY ALIVE

I believe the following exhibits furnish sufficient proof that H. O. L. C. loses no opportunity to sell itself in the hope of avoiding liquidation. Examine the text of the following letters from the various regional offices and the principal office of H. O. L. C. Note the indisposition in every case to close its accounts wherever possible. Note how it suggests that where an abstract is being requested which would indicate that the borrower is refinancing elsewhere, H. O. L. C. is only too glad to compete with private lenders where improvements and repairs may be involved. Note how earnestly it resists every effort on the part of the borrower to transfer his loan account. Note the all-pervading paternalism of H. O. L. C.:

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION,
Detroit, Mich., February 19, 1942.

DEAR MR. ———: We notice that you are asking that the abstract be forwarded to Anderson, Ind., and that you plan on refinancing this loan.

If you are planning on improving your property or making necessary repairs, and that is the reason for the refinancing, I would like to suggest that you take this matter up with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, inasmuch as they will accept your application for such work, and there is no finance charge, and our interest rate is only 4½ percent.

If you are interested, please let us know, and we will send our service representative to call on you immediately.

Your very truly,

H. G. CHAPMAN,
Control Supervisor.

Let me call particular attention to the following letter which went out of the Washington office of H. O. L. C. on August 16, 1943. Read paragraph 3. It says:

You do not benefit the war effort by paying off your loan to the Government with money you have to borrow.

That goes pretty far for a Government agency. First, it is something of a reflection on the borrower's patriotism. It is more than that. It is a pretty sorry statement.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 16, 1943.

DEAR H. O. L. C. BORROWER: Letters are coming to us from borrowers in all parts of the country, asking whether Congress has voted to dissolve the H. O. L. C. and ordered it to sell all its loans to the highest bidder. This is not true.

Many borrowers are worried by letters they are receiving urging them to transfer their H. O. L. C. loans before it is too late. Some have hurried to transfer their loans to individuals or lending institutions at higher interest rates. As a result they have lost the liberal terms and protection granted them by the H. O. L. C. So many troubles have resulted that I feel it is my duty to reassure each and every one of you and let you know the facts.

First. Congress has not voted to close up the H. O. L. C., and Congress has not voted to have your loan or any other borrower's loan sold.

Second. You do not need to borrow money and get a new loan somewhere to pay off your H. O. L. C. loan. Under the H. O. L. C. law our borrowers had up to 15 years to pay back the money which the Government advanced. That time has not been reduced and no other rights granted you have been taken away.

Third. You do not benefit the war effort by paying off your loan to the Government with money you have to borrow.

Fourth. Certain mortgage lending institutions, wishing to get H. O. L. C. loans, did try to have Congress pass a law this year which would have forced the H. O. L. C. to sell out all its loans at once. This would have caused heavy losses to the Government and serious hardships to hundreds of thousands of home owners. Congress, after full consideration did not approve this legislation.

Fifth. You can rely on us to let you know promptly if any new laws are passed which affect your loan. However, Congress, which passed the H. O. L. C. law in 1933 to save homes all over the country, is not likely to take any action which would bring new dangers to your home.

If you have any questions as a result of being asked to transfer your loan somewhere else, please write to the manager of your regional office with whom you have done business right along.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

Here are additional letters addressed to borrowers which have gone out from H. O. L. C.'s regional offices in San Francisco, Chicago, and New York. It is the same old story. It is Government diligently competing with private enterprise. It is the technique of a Federal agency trying to prolong its life and resist liquidation.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION,
San Francisco, Calif., September 13, 1943.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. ———: We have a letter from a source other than you asking what the balance is on your loan account with us. Such a matter we deem to be your business only, and we will not give the requested information unless you write us that we may do so.

Perhaps you have been invited to transfer your loan account due to incorrect reports that Congress has voted to put an end immediately to the operations of Home Owners' Loan Corporation and to possible statements that you should borrow money to pay off your indebtedness to us. Because of their desire to acquire certain H. O. L. C. loans, some mortgage interests did recently try to have Congress act to compel this Corporation to sell its loans at once. Had Congress so acted, there would have been great money losses to the Government and many disadvantages to persons now enjoying the benefits of the liberal lending policy of Home Owners' Loan Corporation. After full consideration Congress did not grant the wishes of these mortgage interests. You are not required either to transfer your indebtedness or to borrow money to pay it off; and this Corporation is not forced to sell your loan or any other loan.

If your personal circumstances are such that out of your own money you can now pay your H. O. L. C. loan in full, or are able to make monthly payments on it in a greater amount than your note calls for, then we advise you to do either the one or the other so that you may clear your home of all debt at as early a date as possible. Please remember that you are not helping either yourself or the war program by borrowing new money for the sole purpose of paying off your H. O. L. C. loan.

It is of the utmost importance that you tell us by letter bearing your signature whether you wish, or do not wish, us to give the information which has been requested concerning your account. Your reply may be written either at the bottom or on the back of this sheet, and for your convenience in answering we enclose an addressed envelope which requires no postage. In view of the importance of this matter, we urge you to reply as soon as you receive this communication.

Very truly yours,

R. R. RENNIE,
Regional Manager.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION,
Chicago, Ill., September 29, 1943.

We have received a letter from the Liberty Savings & Loan Association, 5812 West Burnham Street, West Allis, Wis., asking for the amount of your loan with us.

This inquiry may be due to the fact that you have been approached to transfer your loan, because of reports circulating to the effect that Congress has voted to close the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. If this is the reason, your attention is called to the enclosed letter from the head of our institution, Mr. John H. Fahey, under date of August 16, denying these rumors and explaining the true facts.

If, out of your own savings, you are now able to pay this loan in full, or to increase your regular monthly payments, we urge you to do so in order that you may own your own home free of all debt as soon as possible. The record of your loan with us is a commendable one, and we would like to continue to help you in reaching the goal of debt-free home ownership.

However, there may be other reasons why you are seeking to refinance your loan. If so, please let us know the reasons and, at the same time, confirm your written authority to furnish the Liberty Savings & Loan Association the information requested.

We will take no action on the request of the bank until we hear from you.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES W. COLLINS,
Regional Manager.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION,
New York, N. Y., September 1943.

DEAR H. O. L. C. BORROWER: You have received recently a letter from John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, concerning the various false rumors that the H. O. L. C. was to go out of business soon. As stated in Mr. Fahey's letter, Congress has passed no law to wind up the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and you do not have to borrow money to pay us or to transfer your loan to some other institution.

As you know, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was created by Congress to help you in every reasonable way in saving your home. You were granted very easy terms when H. O. L. C. took over your mortgage. You were allowed to make monthly payments over a long period of years at the very low interest rate of 5 percent, without extra charges of any kind. Later, the interest rate was reduced to 4½ percent, the lowest ever paid in this country for the kind of loan you have.

If you are called upon by someone who seeks to have you transfer your mortgage from the H. O. L. C., be sure that you have all the facts before making a decision. As General Manager of this Corporation, I would like to invite you to write to the regional manager who has charge of your loan, if you have any questions or problems in connection with your loan. Let him advise you, so that you will not give up any of the advantages you now have with your H. O. L. C. loan.

If you are in a position to pay your loan in full from your own savings, or to increase the amount of your monthly payments, I urge you to do so. You do not have to do this but it will be greatly to your advantage since you will then have your home entirely free from debt in a shorter time. This is what Congress wanted to help you do when your H. O. L. C. loan was made. All of us in this Corporation are anxious to assist you in any way we can.

CHARLES F. COTTER,
General Manager.

THE OMAHA OFFICE DOES EVEN BETTER

Now note the following letter from H. O. L. C.'s regional office at Omaha. It is convincing. It is a type of polite pressure of which H. O. L. C. is truly a master.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION,
Omaha, Nebr., April 23, 1943.

Loan 21-10-D-2912.
Mr. JOHN SWENSON,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. SWENSON: We are in receipt of a letter from the Twin City Federal Savings and Loan Association, of St. Paul, dated April 20, in which they request a statement of your account in order that they may pay it in full.

We are not giving this information to them, as it is not the policy of the Corporation to divulge such information to third parties without the borrower's written request.

We do not know what is prompting you to retire your loan with the Corporation at this time. Before you make a final decision we would suggest that you take into consideration the liberal terms you are now receiving. Interest is being charged at the rate of 4½ percent annually and is computed only on the unpaid principal balance each month. It is also possible, if you desire, to make provisions to include payments for taxes and insurance with your monthly remittance.

If you have surplus funds available to retire this loan, it is good business that you do so. It may be possible that certain newspaper articles pertaining to legislation now pending before Congress advocating liquidation of this Corporation is prompting you to refinance. You have a 15-year mortgage agreement, which cannot be terminated at the option of the mortgagee. Therefore you or any other satisfactory borrower cannot be forced to refinance your loan with its attendant inconvenience and sometimes large costs and fees.

Very truly yours,

H. D. BENSON,
Control Supervisor.

HOW THE OMAHA REGIONAL OFFICE DOES IT

The following letter from the H. O. L. C. regional office at Omaha is worthy of some emphasis. Just read paragraph 2. It is a persuasive piece of salesmanship. H. O. L. C. does not propose to surrender. It does not propose to liquidate. It now contemplates staying in business until 1952 plus, which means 19 years and maybe much longer. A 19-year emergency is really something:

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION,
Omaha, Nebr., May 28, 1942.

5-16-A-3741
ELEANOR T. ACHESON,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MADAM: We have your letter requesting the abstract of title and a statement of your account. This request has been referred to our regional treasurer for appropriate handling.

If you have the funds with which to pay off your loan in full, naturally it would be to your advantage to do so. However, if this requires refinancing you should be positive that you are not surrendering any of the loan advantages or additional means of assistance available to our borrowers. Interest, as you know is now charged at the rate of 4½ percent computed monthly on the unpaid principal balance only. The principal may be reduced without penalty by excess payments and if the excess principal reduction is substantial, the monthly loan installments may be reduced proportionately.

No doubt the notice of payment due which is issued in advance of the due date each month has rendered a valuable service to you, inasmuch as it provides a remittance coupon and a statement showing all entries to the account. Facilities are also offered for the establishment of a tax and insurance account to assist in budgeting income to provide for the systematic accumulation of funds with which to pay taxes and insurance as these items become due. A record of this separate tax and insurance account becomes a part of the regular statement issued each month.

Usually the cost of refinancing involves commissions, attorney fees, abstracting costs, recording fees, and other incidental expense. If you have any particular reason for paying off the obligation and are confronted with other financial problems not mentioned herein, we shall be glad to discuss the matter further before you incur any unnecessary expense.

The Corporation is primarily interested in seeing that our borrowers eventually own their homes free of debt, and if we can be of further service to you, we should like to hear from you immediately.

Yours very truly,

R. C. LUSH,
Control Supervisor.

To complete the story, I am setting out in full, a copy of the bill which I introduced for the liquidation of this agency. The time has come to terminate its ac-

tivities within a reasonable period and to give private enterprise a chance:

H. R. 4149

A bill to facilitate the liquidation of Home Owners' Loan Corporation through the transfer and cash sale of its assets to individuals and to local banks, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, cooperative banks, trust companies, insurance companies, and other mortgage institutions

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Home Owners' Loan Corporation Liquidation Act."

SEC. 2. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, hereinafter referred to as the Corporation, was created by the Congress in 1933 to provide a necessary fiscal agency of the United States to assist in a financial emergency and to serve the general welfare. It has accomplished its principal objectives and is now slowly liquidating, collecting home mortgage loans and real estate purchase contracts and administering real estate and other assets which, consistent with the financial policy of the United States, should be promptly sold and transferred to local private persons and business corporations. Early liquidation will rapidly reduce the obligations of the United States, will reduce by several thousands the number of employees of the Government, and will reduce nonwar expenditures and Government activities.

SEC. 3. Upon the date of enactment of this act all assets, liabilities, investments, records, contracts, and property, including office equipment of the Corporation, shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of complete and final liquidation of the Corporation, in accordance with the provisions of this act. In addition, the outstanding appropriation authorizations for the present fiscal year for the administrative expenses of the Corporation shall remain available, and all personnel of the Corporation whose services are required to carry out the provisions of this act shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 4. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed as rapidly as is practicable to sell and transfer to private parties, mortgage institutions, or others, the mortgages, home-purchase contracts, repossessed real estate, and other assets of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

SEC. 5. Such assets shall be sold for cash, or exchanged for obligations of the United States or obligations fully guaranteed as to interest and principal by the United States. Such sales may be made upon any terms and conditions that may be determined by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. All loan accounts of the Corporation shall be promptly listed, with a short description of each loan and its present status, and offered for sale by places and counties and in blocks so as to encourage bidding by individuals and the smaller home financing or mortgage-lending institutions, as well as by the larger home financing or mortgage-lending institutions. All bids equal to present balances or better shall be promptly accepted and all bidders shall contract to continue the 4½ percent interest rate prevailing at the time of purchase, and to continue all other terms in the present mortgages and contracts for the benefit and protection of the borrowers.

SEC. 7. Property owned and property the title to which the Corporation is in process of acquiring shall be sold, giving present occupants the first opportunity to purchase at current appraised values. Down payments as low as 10 percent are hereby authorized, with such monthly payments as may be determined by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but with terms not exceeding 15 years. Sales contracts and mortgages originating under this section shall be sold to private enterprise institutions if possible, but if not sold within the time limit provided in section 11 they shall be transferred to the Federal Housing Administration for collection and administration under subsection (g) of section 204 of the National Housing Act, as amended. Funds so collected shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 8. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with the aid of the Secretary of the Treasury, is directed to apply all receipts collected by it under this act, as rapidly as practicable, to the retirement of the Corporation's bonds at maturity and excess funds shall be paid into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided, however*, That through an annual authorization and appropriation by the Congress the Corporation shall have made available to it sufficient funds for expenses of liquidation within the time limit provided for in section 11.

SEC. 9. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed to make regulations and arrangements to expedite as rapidly as practicable the sale or retirement for cash of the obligations and shares of savings and loan associations. Upon final liquidation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall transfer the stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation held by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be held by him for the Government until the Congress makes provision for the repayment of such capital and the reimbursement of the Government by the retirement or by the sale of such capital stock to the insured institutions.

SEC. 10. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to utilize the personnel and facilities of other Government agencies to assist in the sale and transfer of loan accounts and property, including the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal home-loan banks, the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, Farm Credit Administration, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, insofar as these agencies have experienced personnel and facilities available to assist in the prompt consideration of bids for loan accounts and sale of properties.

SEC. 11. The assets of the Corporation shall be liquidated as herein provided by June 30, 1946, and the corporate existence of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall thereupon be terminated, at which time the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to transfer to other departments or agencies those employees released through the liquidation of the Corporation, whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments and agencies.

SEC. 12. On or before June 30, 1946, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed to sell to the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, the building and grounds owned by the Corporation at the corner of First Street and Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

SEC. 13. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any corporation, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other corporations, persons, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an assorted quantity of excerpts, editorials, articles, and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FULBRIGHT, for March 27 to 31, inclusive, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1029. An act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 22, 1944:

H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

On March 23, 1944:

H. R. 324. An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; and

H. R. 2836. An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 24, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Friday, March 24, 1944.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1330. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a recommendation for the enactment of legislation to amend section 3 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1331. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and the Annual Report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period; to the Committee on the Library.

1332. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of fiscal affairs of Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; in duplicate; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1333. A letter from the secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the Annual Report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1334. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1945 in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 510); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1335. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the War Manpower Commission of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945 containing estimates of appropriations amounting to $84,948,200 and proposed provisions affecting said estimates (H. Doc. No. 511); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 481. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3570, a bill to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 482. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4257, a bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3974. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4347. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on Labor. H. R. 4371. A bill to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McKENZIE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 1565. A bill relating to the appointment of postmasters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MERRITT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4460. A bill to temporarily increase salaries of certain Postal Service employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4461. A bill to authorize revision of the tribal roll of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4462. A bill to provide for restoring real property acquired by the United States for military purposes to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 4463. A bill to authorize Federal Reserve banks to make advances to States secured by direct obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 4464. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4465. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Virginian Railway Co., a corporation, for railroad yard enlargement purposes, a parcel of land of the Camp Allen Reservation at Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 4466. A bill to place glider units of the Army and Navy on the same parity as to pay allowances and privileges as now given to the air forces of the Army and Navy and paratroops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4467. A bill to provide that members of the armed forces during World War No. 2 shall, upon retirement, be advanced in rank on the retired list to the highest commissioned, warrant, or enlisted grade held during said war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4468. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the War Department from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4469. A bill to facilitate the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4470. A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before the courts, departments, and offices of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4471. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4472 (by request). A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed. title 26, ch. 4), relating to building and loan associations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4473. A bill to validate certain applications for national service life insurance where deductions of premiums from service pay were authorized, but the applicant died prior to the effective date of such insurance and prior to February 11, 1942; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution relating to 3-year wheat insurance contracts with the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MRUK:

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to provide for presentation of certificates of honor to those persons contributing eight blood donations to the Red Cross blood banks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution authorizing the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to have printed for its use additional copies of part 1 of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee on House Resolution 262 (78th Cong., 1st sess.), for the utilization of the Columbia River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution creating a special joint committee to investigate the conduct of the war; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass and enact into law a bill enabling the ceiling prices on fluorspar to be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. McGREGOR introduced a bill (H. R. 4474) granting an increase of pension to Missouri E. McCrum, which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5327. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress and the Agricultural Committees of the Senate and House in the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for and continuing Federal assistance for the community-lunch program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5328. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Concord Methodist Church of North Sewickley Township, Beaver County, Pa., representing approximately 86 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5329. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Walter Hamblin and 30 other citizens of Haddam, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 4357 and Senate bill 1767, cited as the Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5330. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. M. H. Corey and 109 other citizens of Fairfield, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5331. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of Federal Post, No. 315, American Legion, of San Francisco, endorsing opposition of Samuel Gompers Union Labor Post, No. 578, to Government employing persons inducted into the land and naval forces of the United States for

any purpose other than that outlined in Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5332. Also, petition of Federal Post, No. 315, American Legion, of San Francisco, endorsing opposition of Samuel Gompers Union Labor Post, No. 578, of Oakland, Calif., against legislation covering national service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5333. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Steel Workers of America, Local 1299, River Rouge, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Green-Lucas soldier vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5334. Also, petition of the secretary, Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Georgia, Savannah, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Independence Hall as a national shrine; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5335. Also, petition of the president, Light in Shadows, Old Age Pension Associations, Inc., Gadsden, Ala., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, through the lowly gateway of penitence we would enter the inner chamber of peace where the harsh noises of the clamorous world are hushed and in quietness of spirit we face ourselves and Thee.

Across these holy days grant us to follow the wounded footprints of that One who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many; who turned the world's mocking robe of derision into the crimson garments of sacrifice and the white vestments of love. In His comradeship may we know the joy that has walked with sorrow, the heavenly music which trembles on the chords of earthly pain, and the triumph which mounts to its throne on trials. In these days of heartache and yet of measureless challenge, e'en though it be a cross that lifts us to our place of power, may we fail not our best consciences, our fellows who trust us, or Thee our God. Save us at last from the remorse of a solitude where regret sits with nought but ashes in her hand and from shame with the mark of Cain on her brow and memory with bitter tears in her eyes. We ask it in the name of that Holy One who for the joy set before Him endured the cross and despised the shame. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 22, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROVISION PERTAINING TO AN APPROPRIATION FOR THE PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR (S. DOC. NO. 176)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Petroleum Administration for War (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROVISION RELATING TO AN APPROPRIATION FOR FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 177)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Federal Security Agency contained in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Banking and Currency;

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to pass a law enabling the ceiling prices on fluor spar to be increased

"Whereas fluor spar is a vital and necessary ore, highly essential in the war effort, and whereas the present ceiling prices on fluor spar are entirely too low to encourage the proper production of this necessary material: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"1. That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky memorializes the Congress of the United States that it, at the earliest possible date, take such action as may be necessary to increase by 10 percent the ceiling price of fluor spar, and to take such additional action as may be necessary to authorize and require the approval of such increase, in order to insure a sufficient supply of fluor spar to meet the war requirements.

"2. Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President and Chief Clerk of the Senate of the United States, the United States Senators from Kentucky, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Representatives in Congress from Kentucky."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution, adopted by Snyder-Farmer Post No. 3, American Legion, of Hyattsville, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation to permit the retirement of veterans at their option, who have 25 years (military service to count double) in the Government service, regardless of age, at full retirement annuity as of 30 years service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Mothers of Men in Service of America, Baltimore, Md., favoring the commemoration of April 9 (marking the surrender of the lost battalion of America's armed forces at Bataan), and the sending greater assistance and supplies to General MacArthur in the southwest Pacific area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF CLAIMS COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1216. A bill for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin; without amendment (Rept. No. 766);

H. R. 1421. A bill for the relief of Paul B. Lingle; without amendment (Rept No. 767); and

H. R. 2273. A bill for the relief of E. C. Fudge; without amendment (Rept. No. 768).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1416. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judith H. Sedler; with amendments (Rept. No. 771);

H. R. 3538. A bill for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 769); and

H. R. 3661. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 770).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. McCLELLAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On March 22, 1944:

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York;

S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy; and

S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

On March 23, 1944:

S. 1410. A bill to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1806. A bill for the relief of Norbert J. Sero; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1807. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1808. A bill to authorize temporary appointment as officers in the Army of the United States of members of the Army Nurse Corps, female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such corps, female dietetic and physical-therapy personnel of the Medical Department of the Army (exclusive of students and apprentices), and female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such department as female dietetic or physical-therapy personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. 1809. A bill to remove the limitation on the right to command of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army which limits such officers to command in that corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. BURTON):

S. 1810. A bill to provide for the appointment of female pilots and aviation cadets in the Air Forces of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1811. A bill for the relief of Margaret Redmond; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. CLARK of Missouri also introduced Senate bill 1812, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill providing for amendment of the Social Security Act, and I ask to have it appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I had originally introduced the bill as a part of the veterans' legislation. The bill deals with the Federal old-age and survivors' provision relative to persons in the military service. It is introduced on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and myself.

By Mr. WAGNER (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri):

S. 1813. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of that act for military service by providing for adjustment of benefits received under such title in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

RIVER AND HARBOR WORKS, FLOOD CONTROL, ETC.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and so forth.

Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere with the presentation by the Senator from Tennessee of the amendments in the bill under consideration, but I give notice that as soon as I can obtain the floor without necessarily interfering with the business of the Senate I shall desire to make some remarks in explanation of the bill which I have asked to introduce.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1812) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors; authorizing investigations and measures for flood and sediment reduction on watersheds, through run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention; providing for supervision by the Chief of Engineers of dams across navigable waters; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3361) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Senate bill 1738, to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, and for other purposes, which has to do with the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, was inadvertently, as I believe, referred to the Finance Committee. It should have been referred to the Military Affairs Committee, the committee which has handled all the allowance legislation. I therefore ask that the Finance Committee be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1738, and that it be re-referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask what the bill is?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] further to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended.

Mr. WHITE. Did not the original act come from the committee to which the Senator is now proposing to send this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, the Military Affairs Committee handled the original allowance act, and handled the amendments to the allowance act, and I propose now that the committee handle this further amendment to the allowance act.

Mr. WHITE. Where has the bill recently been pending? Before the Senate Finance Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It was inadvertently referred to the Finance Committee the other day after it was introduced by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. WHITE. Can the Senator say whether the Finance Committee chairman is agreeable to the change in reference proposed to be made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill belongs to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and I am trying to have it sent to the committee where it should be considered.

Mr. WHITE. If it has been before the Finance Committee I assume the Finance Committee has assumed some jurisdiction over it. I wonder if the change of reference is agreeable to the Finance Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I spoke to the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and he told me the change was agreeable.

Mr. GEORGE. The jurisdiction of the bill is in the Military Affairs Committee, and it is agreeable that this particular bill be referred to that committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no possible objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Finance Committee will be discharged from further consideration of the measure, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INVESTIGATION OF THE NEW YORK COTTON EXCHANGE

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 275), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the New York Cotton Exchange with a view to ascertaining whether its rules and regulations permit speculative activities or other abuses which tend to hamper trade or depress the price of cotton. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of the study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable with respect to the prevention of such abuses as may be found to exist.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself and Mr. GILLETTE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 276), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the present production, means and facilities of production, and plans for future facilities of production for the manufacture of all types of machinery used in the farming industry, including horse- and motor-drawn implements, together with the manufacture of repairs and spare parts for such implements and machinery, and to make inquiry as to resources of supply of materials for such manufacture, and to specifically make investigation of the past, present, and future plans for distribution of farm machinery and the component parts thereof and secure facts as to what portion of the supply of farm machinery has been diverted to uses in areas outside of the United States and its Territories and what policies and plans have been adopted for future foreign distribution of this type of machinery and its parts, and such other inquiries as shall be germane to and pertinent to the development of the facts in the farm-machinery production and distribution industry.

The committee is directed to secure this information for the purpose of use in the preparation and consideration of legislative action to aid the agricultural industry in the Nation.

The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its studies and investigations, together with its recommendation for such legislative action as is indicated.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable. the committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL AND PHYSICAL FITNESS OF CIVILIANS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 277), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 copies of part I, and each subsequent part, of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee during the current Congress, pursuant to Senate Resolution 74 (78th Cong., 1st sess.), authorizing an investigation of the educational and physical fitness of the civilian population as related to national defense.

MARYLAND TRADITION OF TOLERANCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the State of Maryland we have been exceedingly proud during our entire history from the time the colony was originally founded in 1634 of the high degree of religious toleration which has ever characterized the activities of our State and our people. Indeed, Maryland was the first place in all history, I believe, where a government was set up guaranteeing to mankind the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. We have lived together for a good many years in that State, and, while sometimes there has been some intolerance manifested, yet, on the whole, we have adhered pretty closely to our traditions and heritage, and it is one of the things that is in the philosophy of every Marylander and one of the things in our history of which, as I have said, we are extremely proud.

I have learned that at the recent session of the Maryland Legislature a resolution was passed, I believe unanimously, the title of which is as follows:

A resolution expressing the hope that Gerald L. K. Smith, national director of the so-called America First Party, will imbibe some of the spirit of tolerance practiced in Maryland during his visit to Baltimore.

We hope that he will imbibe some of that tolerance because we do not look with favor upon activities which divide Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Gentiles, whites and blacks. We may have our disagreements, groups may be formed advocating or opposing various measures, but we have always attempted to reconcile whatever disagreements we might have without resort to a base appeal either to religious or racial prejudices.

The resolution concludes with the following words:

Be it resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That we hereby express the hope that when Gerald L. K. Smith, national director of the so-called America First Party, visits the State of Maryland that he will be so impressed with the tolerance practiced here that he will recant his profession of faith in fascism and cease to be opposed to democracy, as practiced in the United States.

I have been requested to present this resolution and ask that it be printed in the RECORD of the United States Senate. I therefore send it to the desk and hope that the tolerance of Maryland will not be lost sight of in whatever campaign may lie ahead.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolution expressing the hope that Gerald L. K. Smith, national director of the so-called America First Party, will imbibe some of the spirit of tolerance as practiced in Maryland during his visit to Baltimore

Whereas newspaper articles contain reports that Gerald L. K. Smith, national director of the so-called America First Party will establish a branch of this party, with nine key officers, in Maryland and will call a meeting in Baltimore on or about April 15; and

Whereas the said Gerald L. K. Smith represents by his own admission the Fascist, reactionary, antiwar, and anti-United Nations elements in this country; and

Whereas the said Gerald L. K. Smith and his cohorts preach anti-Semitism and all kinds of undemocratic doctrines; and

Whereas the spirit of tolerance, as taught and practiced in Maryland, is well known throughout the entire country; and

Whereas the people of Maryland are almost unanimous in their opposition to the teachings and practices of the so-called America First Party and have wholeheartedly supported all demands made on them in connection with war drives for the Red Cross, buying War bonds, and production of supplies of war materials; and

Whereas from the time of the Calverts, Maryland has stood for religious liberty and the tolerance of views of all shades of opinion; and

Whereas it may be possible that after the said Gerald L. K. Smith and his associates spend sufficient time in Maryland, they may feel impelled to recant their present views and undemocratic conduct: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That we hereby express the hope that when Gerald L. K. Smith, national director of the so-called America First Party, visits the State of Maryland that he will be so impressed with the tolerance practiced here that he will recant his professions of faith in fascism and cease to be opposed to democracy, as practiced in the United States.

THE SECRET OF SENATOR McNARY'S CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post and which is entitled, "Not Out of the Statesman's Manual."

This editorial describes the secret of the even, statesmanlike conduct of the revered and recently departed minority leader of the Senate, Charles L. McNary.

I cannot help but feel, Mr. President, that perhaps the agenda and the accomplishments of the Congress would be much more creditable if all its membership resorted to the technique used by "Charlie Mac" whenever he was tempted to rise to his feet to participate in some acrimonious yet inproductive argument.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT OUT OF THE STATESMAN'S MANUAL

The late Senator Charles L. McNary used to explain how he became known for suavity, sweet reasonableness, and reluctance to take part in Senate brawls on the floor. Senator McNary was actually a man of positive views and a sharp temper. Sometimes it took all the self-control he had to refrain from rising to his feet and pulverizing an opponent. "When I thought I couldn't stand it any longer," Charlie McNary said once, "I used to pinch my leg. I would keep on pinching until the impulse was over. After a good many debates in the past few years, I would get home and find I'd pinched myself black and blue."

There must be some Members of Congress who, as they look over their remarks in an accumulation of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, would give a good deal to have learned Charlie McNary's secret. Certainly, the great American audience would appreciate it if some of our gabbiest solons would try pinching their thighs instead of wearing out their larynxes. This method might make some of them as effective in politics as was the affable, unwillingly silent Charlie McNary.

P. S.: Maybe some self-pinching would do no harm in the Executive branch, too.

IF I WERE PRESIDENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "If I Were President," delivered by him at North Park College, Chicago, Ill., March 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DANAHER AT REPUBLICAN FOUNDERS' DAY ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION, OMAHA, NEBR.

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator DANAHER at the Republican Founders' Day anniversay celebration, Omaha, Nebr., March 7, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SUPERHIGHWAY PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY A. Q. MILLER, SR.

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The President's Superhighway Program," by A. Q. Miller, Sr., from the Belleville (Kans.) Telescope of March 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTES FOR SOLDIERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE KANSAS CITY TIMES

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Politics or the Law," from the Kansas City Times of March 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION—ARTICLE FROM WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with judicial review of administrative action, published in the Wall Street Journal of March 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS OF THE PUBLIC ON THE SOLDIER-VOTE SITUATION

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis News of March 20, 1944, entitled "That Federal Ballot"; an editorial from the Indianapolis Star of March 21, 1944, entitled "Let the States Act"; and an editorial from the South Bend Tribune of March 7, 1944, entitled "Soldier Vote," which appear in the Appendix.]

SCIENCE AND A LASTING PEACE—ARTICLE BY WALDEMAR KAEMPFFERT

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Science and a Lasting Peace," by Waldemar Kaempffert, appearing as an advertisement in the New York Herald Tribune of March 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLORADO RIVER WATER—PROPOSED TREATY WITH MEXICO

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate a proposed treaty with Mexico which attempts to allocate the waters of the Colorado River between that country and our own.

That treaty is now pending before this body only because Congress in 1928 authorized the building of Boulder Dam to conserve the waters of the Colorado River.

A careful examination of the treaty and of the conditions leading to its proposal having convinced me that it is wholly unfair to citizens and communities of western America, it is with some hope that the terms of the compact may be further considered by our Chief Executive and the State Department that I am making this statement. I hope, therefore, what I am about to say will receive the attention not only of the Members of this body, but likewise of the President and the Secretary of State.

In spite of the facts—

That Boulder Dam was built entirely on American ground, by American initiative, engineering genius, and money;

That the Boulder Canyon Project Act authorized the building of Boulder Dam for storage of water for use "exclusively within the United States";

That, as authorized by the Project Act, the United States has solemnly contracted with American communities and States to deliver them quantities of Boulder water and power, which are indispensable to their development;

That American citizens have, in reliance on the Project Act and those contracts, committed themselves to pay hundreds of millions of dollars for construction of works with which to use their Boulder water and power;

That the American communities, not the United States, are, under their contracts, standing the entire cost of Boulder Dam;

That the United States does not ask and will not gain anything from Mexico in respect of the Colorado River.

It is now proposed—

To "guarantee" to Mexico, for all time, 1,500,000 acre-feet per annum of Colorado River water—twice what Mexico ever had used prior to the construction of Boulder Dam—twice what Mexico could ever have gotten from the river without Boulder Dam;

To store, regulate, and deliver this water, as ordered by Mexico, free of charge to Mexico;

To extend to Mexico the benefits of Boulder Dam, in flat contravention of the Project Act;

To create in Mexico a first right on the Colorado River, to which all American rights must yield in event of conflict;

To deny water to American communities, in cycles of dry years, such as have occurred and will recur, in order to supply Mexican lands;

To impair the ability of the United States to perform its outstanding contracts with its own citizens;

To deprive American citizens of vested rights without compensation and without due process;

To deprive American communities of the benefits of works built and owned by them, for the advantage of Mexico;

To authorize construction of works in Mexico which would endanger and damage lands within the United States.

Mr. President, the following statement outlines, in brief, the physical and legal facts. It is submitted in the belief that, if these facts are known, the Senate of the United States will preserve the good faith of the United States, and will protect the vested contract rights of American citizens, by declining to ratify the proposed treaty.

I. PHYSICAL FACTS

First. The Colorado River is a major continental stream draining one-thirteenth of the land area of the United States.

Second. Its basin in the United States comprises 242,000 square miles; in Mexico, 2,000 square miles.

Third. Its basin is divided into an upper basin—Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah—and a lower basin—Arizona, Nevada, and California.

Fourth. All of its water comes from the United States; none from Mexico.

Fifth. Its water supply, available in the future to satisfy all uses in the United States and Mexico below Boulder Dam during extended dry cycles, is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation at not over 8,500,000 acre-feet per annum.

Sixth. Its unregulated flow was extremely irregular from year to year and was characterized by an early summer flood season of 2 to 3 months, followed by 9 to 10 months of low flow.

Seventh. There are, in the United States, many natural sites where storage reservoirs have been or can be constructed to capture and conserve floodwaters of the river. Mexico has none.

Eighth. There are needs and opportunities for use, within the United States, of all of the water of the Colorado River. Accordingly, any gift of water to Mexico, as a matter of comity, will pro tanto curtail the development of communities in the United States.

II. HISTORICAL USE AND DEVELOPMENT

First. In the United States, prior to construction of Boulder Dam, development of irrigation and domestic projects, using water from the main stream and many tributaries, proceeded independently in each of the seven States and chiefly under local public or private agencies. Such uses, before Boulder Dam was built, reached such a great extent that they, together with Mexican uses, consumed the entire low-season flow, and indeed were, in dry years, subject to severe shortages.

Second. Mexican uses, prior to Boulder, reached a maximum of 750,000 acre-feet per annum; averaged 600,000 acre-feet over a 10-year period; and in 1932 amounted to only 228,000 acre-feet. All such uses were made possible by irrigation works and protective levees provided by American initiative and capital. The water was even diverted in the United States, through structures built and owned by Americans.

III. COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

In order to protect existing development in the United States and permit expansion by conservation of floodwaters, Boulder Dam was proposed. The Upper Basin States objected, fearing that, by early development, the lower basin would appropriate so much water that the upper basin would be foreclosed from development. A solution was found in the formulation of the Colorado River compact, an agreement among the States, in 1922, which apportioned certain water to each basin.

IV. BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ACT

In 1928 Congress adopted the act for construction of Boulder Dam and the All-American Canal. The act approved the Colorado River compact. However, section 1 provides that the waters conserved by Boulder Dam shall be for "beneficial use exclusively within the United States." The extension of the benefits of Boulder storage to Mexico would flatly violate the principle of the act, namely, that the only permissible grant of water to Mexico must be measured by Mexico's use from natural flow.

Section 1 of the act also authorized construction of a power plant at Boulder Dam. Section 5 of the project act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to contract for the delivery of stored water and prohibited use of stored water without such contract. Section 4 (b) prohibited construction of the dam until the Secretary should have procured executed water and power contracts which would assure repayment to the United States of the cost of the dam and the power plant.

V. BOULDER DAM CONTRACTS

First. California contracts. The Secretary of the Interior executed, with pub-

lic and private agencies in southern California, contracts for water and power which the Attorney General of the United States held sufficient to guarantee repayment of the cost of the dam and power plant. Without these contracts, the dam could not have been built—act, section 4 (b).

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am somewhat surprised that the Senator should be discussing this matter at this time. He appealed to the Committee on Foreign Relations to postpone the hearings on account of his own situation, and that of his colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is absent, and who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee has been disposed to accommodate the two Senators from California. Now we are presented with the issue being aggressively presented and pushed by the junior Senator from California, when I thought the matter was to be held in abeyance. I do not quite appreciate his position.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, Mr. President, I am unhappy if in any way I have done anything which the senior Senator from Texas considers improper. I may say to the distinguished Senator that it is my desire to place in the RECORD by this statement the facts and the position of California as we see them to be, and to ask the distinguished Senator, the State Department, and the President of the United States, for a further review of the pending compact. I believe that this statement will be helpful, I might say to the distinguished Senator, in working out a fair solution of the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas wishes to be considerate of other Senators, but in the posture this matter has now assumed I do not feel disposed to withhold it any further, and I am ready to proceed with hearings immediately. Those of us who are proposing the treaty cannot lie down and let the California view be urged and pushed in the absence of any hearings on the other side of the question.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I might say that of course I am unhappy to hear the distinguished Senator say that. The senior Senator from California, who was one of the joint sponsors of the Boulder Project Act, is not present. He is at Miami, and cannot be here until later, in April. As the distinguished Senator knows, the senatorial primary date in California is set for May 16. All my arrangements are made to campaign in California for the next 6 weeks. However, if the distinguished Senator from Texas thinks it is necessary to begin hearings immediately because, for a perfectly proper purpose, I am making this statement of the facts on the floor of the Senate, I shall have to submit to his decision. He undoubtedly has the power to force the hearings whenever he desires to do so, and of course, if that is his intention, there is nothing I can do except cheerfully to abide by that decision.

The California contracts were made by the California agencies in good faith, and in reliance upon the good faith of the United States in observing the requirement of section 1 of the Project Act that the stored water be used exclusively in the United States. These agencies, and others, in reliance upon their contracts, have expended and obligated themselves to expend, for construction of works and facilities for the use of Boulder Dam water and power, more than half a billion dollars. The California contract obligates the United States to deliver for domestic and irrigation uses, 5,362,000 acre-feet per annum.

Second. Arizona and Nevada contracts: The Secretary of the Interior has also executed contracts with the State of Nevada for 300,000 acre-feet per annum and with the State of Arizona for 2,800,000 acre-feet per annum.

VI. THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL

First. Besides authorizing Boulder Dam, section 1 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act authorized construction of a diversion dam across the Colorado River, now known as Imperial Dam, and a main canal "located entirely within the United States," to carry water to an area of 1,000,000 acres in the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California. This All-America Canal was, by the terms of the act, dedicated to the beneficial use of the waters conserved by Boulder Dam "exclusively within the United States."

Second. Section 4 (b) of the act required that before construction of the canal should commence, the Secretary of the Interior must procure executed contracts which would insure repayment of the entire cost of the canal.

Third. Section 7 of the act grants to the agencies which contract to pay for the canal the power privileges on the canal. There are a number of important power drops on the canal. One of the largest, known as Pilot Knob, is located on the bank of the Colorado and so situated that water may be discharged from the power plant directly back into the river.

Fourth. The Secretary of the Interior has executed, with Imperial irrigation district, Coachella Valley County water district and the city of San Diego, contracts wherein the United States agreed to construct Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal. The three public agencies agreed to pay to the Government the entire construction cost. The contracts provide that on completion of the works Imperial irrigation district shall assume operation and maintenance of them. They also provide that all of the power possibilities on the canal shall belong to the three agencies and that the net proceeds from power development shall be theirs, to be paid on contractual debt to the United States until it is retired and thereafter to belong to the agencies. The Imperial irrigation district contract provides, specially, that there shall be built for that agency, and it shall pay for, additional canal capacity for 3,000 second-feet of water from the dam to Pilot Knob, for power generation by the district at the Pilot Knob plant. The three agencies agreed to pay for 2,000 second-feet of capacity in the canal from the dam to Syphon Drop, to carry water, free of cost, for the Yuma project of the Bureau of Reclamation in Arizona. The three agencies also agreed to pay a sum of $1,600,000 to the United States on account of the cost of Laguna Dam, originally built in 1908 for the Yuma project, but now considered a necessary appurtenance of Imperial Dam.

VII. THE MEXICAN TREATY

By the proposed treaty the United States is obligated with reference to the Colorado River:

First. To allot to Mexico a guaranteed annual minimum of 1,500,000 acre-feet of the surface flow of the river, to be increased, when water is available unused in the United States, to 1,700,000.

Second. To deliver until 1980, 500,000—and thereafter 375,000—acre-feet of the guaranteed 1,500,000 through the All-American Canal, and the remaining 1,000,000—or 1,250,000, after 1980—in the bed of the river, at the boundary. This water is all to be delivered according to certain schedules, but practically as and when ordered by Mexico.

Third. To give Mexico a share of the net revenues of the Pilot Knob power plant on the All-American Canal.

Fourth. To construct, operate, and maintain, at its own cost, the Davis Dam, which will be used in part to regulate the comparatively equal monthly discharges from the Boulder power plant so as to meet the unequal monthly needs of Mexico.

Fifth. To permit Mexico to build a permanent diversion dam at any point below the California-Mexico boundary—upper boundary. This Mexico is forbidden by present treaties to do.

Sixth. To construct or acquire, and operate and maintain, all works needed to deliver water to Mexico.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Am I correct in saying that the proposed treaty would require the Republic of Mexico to construct the diversion works for the canal, and that in turn the United States Government agrees, within 5 years, which is the same period of time agreed to by the Mexican Government, to construct the Davis Dam? Is that not true?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think that statement is true, but not wholly explanatory. In the treaty, I might say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada, the United States agrees that there shall be turned over to the Government of Mexico a proportionate part of the revenue from the hydroelectric plant to be developed at Pilot Knob, and I think undoubtedly the plan is so worked out that Mexico will receive sufficient revenue from the Pilot Knob power-plant site, which now belongs to the California agencies, totally to defray all the expenses provided for Mexico for any work in the United States.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the Senator give the location of the Pilot Knob site?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Pilot Knob site is perhaps 20 miles north of the Mexican border in the United States, and within a very short distance of the Colorado River itself.

Mr. President, I might say a word in relation to that. The California agencies, when they sold their bonds, and when they worked out their plans, expected they would have the net revenues which would accrue from that hydroelectric development.

Under the treaty as proposed, the United States would take over that particular site. With respect to the power plant that would then be constructed by the International Boundary Commission and operated by that Commission, after amortization of the building of the plant the revenues would be divided between Mexico and the United States in the same proportion as the expense of building the works commonly to be used in the United States. So a method has been worked out by which Mexico will be relieved of all financial responsibility, and a very valuable asset that the Imperial irrigation district had counted on having is taken away from its members.

In this connection I might say that if we assume that the United States can by treaty properly agree with Mexico to take over certain property within the United States through the International Boundary Commission, and operate it for the joint benefit of both countries, I believe, following out that principle, we could have the International Boundary Commission take over the works at Boulder Dam in connection with all the works operated by the two countries, and allow Mexico her proportionate part of the revenues that would come from Boulder Dam.

I might say it is a matter which is involved and complicated, and I know it will receive the very serious attention of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee when it is before them.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Does the Mexican Government contemplate using the waters of the Colorado River in some reclamation project?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Colorado River, after it passed out of the United States, flows for about 75 miles through Mexico, when it empties into the Gulf of California. For a long time Mexico has been irrigating a large body of land in Lower California, using an average of 600,000 acre-feet of water. She has used that water for a great number of years, and there is no disposition on the part of anyone to prevent Mexico from freely and equitably using the water she has been using. This treaty would grant to her two and a half times as much water as she ever was using before Boulder Dam, or that she could use without Boulder Dam. Of that additional water 900,000 acre-feet will have to be taken from contracts already made by the Secretary of the Interior with American communities.

Mr. BONE. Has there been previously some commitment by treaty with Mexico regarding the waters of the Colorado?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; there never has been any treaty either with respect to the waters of the Rio Grande or the waters of the Colorado. I might say this treaty embraces a settlement of controversies between both countries with respect to both the Rio Grande and the Colorado. It is supposed to be a final settlement.

Mr. BONE. Is there any limit that can be clearly defined indicating the amount of land that would be brought under reclamation to Mexico? Is the area of land capable of being brought under reclamation limited?

Mr. DOWNEY. No. There are several million acres of land in Lower California that can be irrigated only with the waters of Boulder Dam, just as in the United States there are vast areas which are always destined to remain arid because the water is not there.

Mr. BONE. That is down on the peninsula.

Mr. DOWNEY. Well, north of the peninsula, some in Sonora and some in Baja California.

Mr. BONE. I am thinking of the country around Ensenada.

Mr. DOWNEY. There is no expectation of taking any of this water there.

Mr. BONE. That is toward the northern end of Baja.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is on the seacoast. The Colorado empties into the Gulf of California, perhaps 75 or 100 miles from the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. BONE. What does the treaty propose to do in the way of allocating water?

Mr. DOWNEY. The treaty will guarantee to Mexico and give her a first right on the entire river of 1,500,000 acre-feet, which is two and a half times the average amount that she was using, two and one-half the amount she could have used without Boulder Dam being built.

I might say to the distinguished Senator from Washington, the reason for that is that the Colorado has a great flow for 2 or 3 months, and for 9 or 10 months has a very low flow. The reason Boulder Dam was built was to prevent floods, develop power, and for irrigation. Boulder Dam will make it possible to give 900,000 acre-feet more to Mexico than she could have used without Boulder Dam. But when this body passed the Boulder Dam Project Act the word "exclusively" was added to the language which came over from the House. The language as it came from the House provided that the waters from Boulder Dam should be used within the United States, and here on the Senate floor the word "exclusively" was added, so as to provide that it should be used exclusively within the United States. This treaty attempts to give to Mexico an average of 900,000 acre-feet more water than she was using or ever could use, and to that extent will deprive California and Arizona and perhaps some of the Upper Basin States of water that they had confidently relied upon and will vitally need.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Please understand that the Senator from Nevada is taking no issue on this matter at this time. My purpose in rising is merely to clarify the situation as much as I can as the Senator from California proceeds. This is a controversial matter, and has been for a great many years, as to how much water Mexico was entitled to from the Colorado River. The doctrine of relation, as it is known in arid and semiarid regions, has been claimed by the Republic of Mexico. We recognize that doctrine, and it may be a part of the thought which is fundamental to the treaty now before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The question of how much water the Republic of Mexico is entitled to has never been really determined. This treaty would be the first step toward determining how much water should be guaranteed to Mexico. The question of the right to use the waters of the Colorado River was raised during the days when the construction of Boulder Dam was under consideration. Whatever may be the outcome of this treaty, regardless of whether it be correct in its terminology, the matter is one which this Government and the Government of Mexico some day must settle. The effect on California interests, as well as on interests in New Mexico, Arizona, and Nevada, is exceedingly vital. There are many things connected with the California interests with which, of course, the Senator is familiar. In other words, in California there are many private concerns which have land in Mexico; and they, too, may be vitally concerned in this matter; and they may be behind or before, to use a homely expression, any movement to allow water in excess of the amount of water to which Mexico may be entitled to go over the line.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I appreciate that statement on the part of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada. He has a far greater familiarity with the entire question that I have, because his experience goes back much further than does mine. It happens that when I was practicing law in California I had a practice revolving largely around irrigation and reclamation law. From what I knew as a lawyer in those days, I may say to the distinguished Senator, I think it is clearly the law of the Western States, under our system of irrigation law, that when a public agency builds a dam or a reservoir, it must protect all users of water below that dam in respect to the amount of water they have been beneficially applying. But above and beyond that, the public agency has the right to adverse any user of the water which is to be stored in the dam, and has the right to take whatever time the public agency may desire to appropriate it to beneficial use. I think that is the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the law; I think the Senator has correctly stated it, with the exception that in carrying out the principles to which the Senator has

referred, what is known as the doctrine of relation enters the picture. In other words, it has been quite definitely established, as the Senator will recall, that in the case of land which is under irrigation or is capable or susceptible of being irrigated by the natural flow of a stream, and in connection with which the landowner has taken steps with reasonable diligence from time to time to apply water to progressive acreages of the land, the courts have applied what is known as the doctrine of relation. In other words, they give to the owner of the land the beneficial use of the water in futurity.

So, under the doctrine of relation, if I have a piece of dry land to which I have not yet applied water, I may have that water right protected in respect to anyone who seeks to impound the upper flow of the stream. He must take into consideration the use of that water for the protection of my land to which I have not yet applied the water, but for which use I may have taken preparatory steps.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, Mr. President; I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada is correct in that respect. In most of the irrigation codes in the West there is a provision entitling a person intending in the future to appropriate water to file application in the State engineer's office or in the office of some other governmental agency, and he may thus be protected.

However, I desire to point out to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada that I believe it will be undenied that the maximum amount of water Mexico ever used before Boulder Dam was constructed, and the maximum amount she could have used without the construction of Boulder Dam, was 750,000 acre-feet.

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as I have been able to ascertain I believe the Senator is practically correct in making that statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate that contribution from the distinguished Senator.

I think that under the law, as we would apply it to citizens of the United States, the most our Government would have to provide for in order to protect our own citizens, if they stood in the place of Mexico, would be to the extent of the average use which had been made, which in this case was 600,000 acre-feet. The people of California desire to be just, liberal, and fair with the people of Mexico; and they make no objection to having our Government set apart for Mexico 750,000 acre-feet, which was the maximum use in 1 year which Mexico had been able to apply.

When this matter was previously before the Senate, the distinguished former Senator Pittman, of Nevada, served notice upon the world and upon Mexico that Boulder Dam was being constructed on American land, by American capital, and to make use of American water, and that while Mexico would be fully protected in respect to all the water she was beneficially applying, which was all the water she could apply, she should not be entitled to any beneficial use from this dam.

Mr. President, I dislike longer to intrude upon the time of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I have on my desk some prepared matter which I have largely covered in my extemporaneous remarks. If I may obtain unanimous consent that this matter, as I have it written in order to maintain a logical sequence, may be printed in the RECORD, I shall merely read the last few paragraphs, and then shall conclude.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am very sorry, but I cannot give my consent for the Senator to have portions of his remarks, which he does not read, printed in the RECORD in the same type as the type in which the remarks he actually has delivered will be printed. If he desires to have the unread portions of his remarks printed in small tiype, so as to show they were not read in the Senate, I shall have no objection.

Mr. DOWNEY. I regret that I shall have to continue then.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will consent. We met today at 11 o'clock in order to consider the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall endeavor to conclude my remarks as rapidly as possible. Again I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that I am preparing to place in the RECORD certain data which I wish to submit to the interested authorities in Washington, because we believe international relations will be better served and time will be saved if our viewpoint can be placed before the interested governmental officials before the hearing is held. I cheerfully accede to the suggestion of my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and I will read the matter just as rapidly as I am able to do so. If I am not interrupted, it will not take me long to read it. I may say that, unfortunately, I have already covered a good deal of the material in connection with the interrogatories which have been propounded. If the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] could secure unanimous consent for me to have this matter embodied in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, I should read only the concluding paragraphs, and then should subside.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent again. I hope what the Senator requests can be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am forced to object to the unanimous-consent request to have printed in the RECORD a speech which was not delivered. That has been done only once before since I have been in the Senate, and that was at the request of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] on another occasion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would allow it to be printed in small type, as suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin. It could be read just as well. Most persons have better eyes than I have. I hope that can be done. We met early today to consider the pending appropriation bill, and I hope very much that it can be done. Will not the Senator be willing to print it as an addendum to his speech?

Mr. DOWNEY. I might say to the distinguished Senator that if it is to be done that way, I shall want the whole speech to appear in the same place.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no reason why that cannot be done, is there?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me state my only purpose in objecting. It is in conformity with a notice which I gave at the last session when the practice began to develop of inserting manuscripts in the RECORD and having them appear in RECORD type, as though they had been delivered on the floor of the Senate. That privilege has never been accorded to Members of the Senate, and I think it is a bad practice, because it leaves the impression that the remarks were delivered in the hearing of those present. Senators may remember that there was considerable controversy when the price control bill was before us and certain matters were inserted in the RECORD. As I recall, it was then, after that happened, that I gave this notice. It is not directed against my friend from California in any way, but I want the RECORD to show, by the type which is utilized, whether the remarks were actually delivered on the floor or whether they were printed by unanimous consent. I understood the Senator's original request to be that, regardless of whether he read portions of his speech or not, it should appear in the RECORD as though it had been delivered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appeal to the Senator from California to insert it in the RECORD, as an addendum to his speech, in the type suggested.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say that I am keenly sympathetic with the position of the Senator from Tennessee. I have always endeavored to avoid the presentation of extraneous matter when important legislation is pending. I would favor a Senate rule against such a practice. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I have intruded at this time only because I must leave the city tomorrow morning, and I wished to complete the record. I will read the concluding paragraphs and then ask to have the entire speech placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I know the very heavy burden which Senators carry, and I have no desire to add to them.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to interrupt the Senator once more, and I shall not do it again.

The Senator knows of the conferences which have been held by representatives of the Southwestern States—Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, California, Colorado, Utah, and other States. He knows that this subject has been under consideration at those conferences. The

State which I have the honor in part to represent has taken a neutral position and has not joined with either side of the controversy. Nevertheless, we are very much interested. I am very sorry that the Senator is yielding to the suggestion which has been made, because in my judgment his speech should go into the RECORD as his speech, in the regular type, so that all of us may be fully advised as to the position which the State of California, speaking through its very worthy and able representative, the Senator from California, takes in this matter. The treaty which is under consideration is one of the most vital things to the West at this time.

Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. CONNALLY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOWNEY. First, Mr. President, let me thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his remarks. I have already acceded to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee.

I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I have just entered the Chamber. I presume the Senator is discussing the proposed treaty between the United States and Mexico concerning the allocation of water from the Colorado River. My State has a very vital interest in that matter. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator at this time whether, in connection with his remarks in the main part of the RECORD, or that part which is to go in the Appendix of the RECORD, his full remarks will be available?

Mr. DOWNEY. They will be available in their entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield next to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Senator concludes, I shall ask to be recognized.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator from Louisiana was first on his feet.

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to defer to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that when he puts his speech in the Appendix, it must appear that what he did not say was not read on the floor of the Senate, if he wishes to insert it in the RECORD in the form of a memorandum. I shall object if he puts the entire speech in the Appendix of the RECORD as though he had delivered it on the floor of the Senate when, as a matter of fact, he did not.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I shall cheerfully abide by the rules of the Senate, whatever they are.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I rise to make the suggestion that the Senator from California now surrender the floor, and that when we conclude consideration of the bill later in the afternoon, he can resume his remarks with the request that what he says be inserted in the RECORD immediately following what he has already said. Then the entire speech will be in the RECORD.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate that advice; and if we conclude consideration of the bill early enough, I may consider it.

I should like to read three or four concluding paragraphs, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. President, on this floor I have often contended that our foreign policy should be guided by honor and justice and that, to the fullest reasonable extent, we should give aid to the nations of the New World, but I deny that the National Government should sacrifice domestic rights upon the altar of foreign good will. How can we condone liberality to another country that would violate Federal contracts already made with American citizens, that would injure or entirely destroy American investments believed to be firmly founded on the pledge of the National Government? World honor, peace, commerce, and progress will, it seems to me, never be conserved by a reckless international utopianism that does internal injustice to gain external good will. In the long pull will not internationalism itself be fatally stricken if our Government attemps to build its structure upon broken domestic pledges and the disappointment, ruin, and resentment of its own citizens?

In this chaotic period I regret the necessity of opposing any treaty, and if the views I am expressing were prompted by a selfish regard for my own State, or by political opportunism then I would deserve censure.

I, therefore, hasten to assert that in resisting the pending proposal I am not suggesting the sacrifice of any Mexican right. California people desire only what is fairly theirs, nothing more, but certainly nothing less. We do not want injustice done Mexico, but we do not intend that injustice shall be done ourselves—if we can help it.

Nevertheless, I deem it unfortunate that disputes, destructive of international good will, may develop before this treaty is settled, and it is with some slight hope that controversy may be avoided that I have made this statement—first to express California's opposition to the treaty and then to appeal to our President and the State Department that the present compact shall be withdrawn and a fairer agreement substituted in its place.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I very much regret having intruded for so long.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the suggestions which have been made, I now ask that the speech on this subject as prepared by me, without the interruptions, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[Mr. DOWNEY's speech, as prepared by him, without the interruptions, appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASE IN ACREAGE ALLOTMENT FOR BURLEY TOBACCO

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report favorably, with an amendment, House Joint Resolution 234, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration without displacing the unfinished business. It is an emergency measure, and I do not think it calls for any debate. The joint resolution has to do with burley tobacco. There has been some confusion as to the number of years involved, and also as to the amount of acreage. It has been unanimously agreed to by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is emergent because the planting time has arrived.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, with the understanding that it will not displace the appropriation bill which is under consideration, and that it will take only a short time, I have no objection.

Mr. SMITH. The joint resolution has been amended by the committee. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] can explain better than I the object of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 234) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONEY and Mr. WHITE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, has unanimous consent been given to proceed to consider the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; not as yet. The Chair understands that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] wishes to speak on the matter.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to be sure that I understand the nature of the resolution. Did I correctly understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that the resolution had been unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. SMITH. It was.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was one of those who voted to report the resolution, but I reserved the right to object to its passage if it should appear that the cigar-leaf growers of the northeastern section of the United States objected to it. I do not know whether they object to it or not. I ask the Senator from Connecticut if he knows whether there is any objection on their part.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the situation, and I wish to be informed. I am very reluctant to oppose the request of the Senator from South Carolina, but I feel compelled to do so. I wish to make inquiry of the tobacco growers in my section.

Mr. BARKLEY. Allow me to say to the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Connecticut, and all other Senators, that the joint resolution applies only to burley tobacco, and would make it possible to increase the minimum acreage from a half acre to one acre in the quota

which may be grown. It would have no effect whatever on cigar makers.

The preamble to the resolution sets forth the fact that there is a shortage only in burley tobacco.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, in view of the explanation, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. SMITH. No tobacco growers except growers of burley tobacco would be affected by the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (H. J. Res. 234) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 11, to insert the following:

Resolved, That Public Law 118, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 7, 1943, is amended by striking out the words "marketing year 1944–45" and inserting in lieu thereof "marketing years 1944–45, 1945–46, and 1946–47."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed; and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 234) was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, by the direction of the Committee on Appropriations I withdraw certain of the committee amendments to the provisions of House bill 4070 relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and propose modifications in some of the remaining committee amendments to such provisions, as were reported from the committee.

I withdraw the following amendments:

First. Beginning on page 51, line 17, all of the amendments on the remainder of that page and on page 52 down to and including line 4.

Second. On page 52, line 6, the amendment which would insert the words "more than seven hundred."

Third. On page 52, the amendment beginning in line 7 and ending in line 11.

Fourth. On page 52, the amendment in lines 14 and 15.

Fifth. On page 53, the amendment which would strike out the proviso beginning in line 5 and ending in line 12.

Sixth. On page 53, the amendment which would insert in lines 12 and 13 the words "the general fund of the Treasury of the United States."

Seventh. The amendment which would insert the proviso beginning in line 13 on page 53 and ending with line 24 on page 55.

Also, at the direction of the committee, I recommend that the following action be taken with respect to the other amendments reported by the committee:

First. On page 52, line 5, in lieu of striking out the words proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment, strike out the word "purchase."

Second. On page 52, line 6, that the committee amendment inserting the word "repair" be agreed to.

Third. On page 52, that the committee amendment, beginning in line 16 and ending in line 20, be agreed to with an amendment as follows: In line 16, in lieu of the figure proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment as reported insert "$79,134,882."

Fourth. On page 52, line 22, that the committee amendment be agreed to.

Fifth. On page 52, lines 23 to 25, inclusive, that the committee amendments be agreed to.

Sixth. On page 52, line 26, in lieu of the words "as and when collected", insert the word "quarterly"; and after the word "into" insert "the general fund of the Treasury of the United States."

Seventh. That the committee amendment striking out the language beginning with the word "and", in line 26, on page 52, and ending on page 53, line 5, with the quotation marks, be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the committee amendments proposed to be withdrawn.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 51, beginning in line 17, it is proposed to withdraw all the amendments on the remainder of that page, and on page 52, down to and including line 4.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The changes in the committee amendments which have been described by the Senator from Tennessee were presented in a fashion a little too complicated for me to follow because he described portions of the text to be stricken out. I wish to ask if the new committee print dated March 24, 1944, is a complete substitute for all the language in the bill under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority", starting on page 51 and ending at the bottom of page 55.

Mr. McKELLAR. It constitutes an amendment.

Mr. BONE. That is what I wished to ascertain. As I understand, it is a complete substitute for the language to which I have referred.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a complete substitute.

I ask that the clerk state the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments in the new committee print will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the word "periodical", it is proposed to strike out "purchase."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I do not know what portion of the suggested amendments of the committee has been reached, but in order that we may clarify the picture without unnecessary delay, if I am within the rules at this time in making the point of order, I desire to make a point of order against the proposed amendment which I have described and which is printed and now lies on our desks. I make the point that it is general legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that we are now on line 3 on page 2 of the committee print. The point which the Senator has in mind begins on line 9, page 2, of the committee print. Will the Senator withhold his point of order until that place is reached?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington if he would be willing——

Mr. BONE. I am not objecting to the construction of the plants referred to on page 1, but my point of order goes to the amendment on page 2.

Mr. McKELLAR. What I was going to suggest to the Senator was this: Let us complete the amendments, and have that settled, and then he can make the point of order to the completed amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments as they appear in the original bill will be withdrawn, and the committee print is now under consideration. The clerk has stated the first amendment on page 2. Without objection, that amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the word "maintenance", it is proposed to insert the word "repair."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 9, after the word "field", to insert "$79,134,882, to be accounted for as one fund known as the 'Tennessee Valley Authority Fund, 1945,' to remain available until June 3, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the 'Tennessee Valley Authority Fund, 1944'; and."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I make the point of order at this place that the amendment is general legislation sought to be attached to an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, paragraph 4 of rule XVI dealing with amendments to general appropriation bills provides:

Nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

The provisions of the House text and the committee amendment provide for the disposition of the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Therefore, I raise the question that the committee amendments are germane and relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority and relate directly to the item concerning the disposition of the receipts

of the Corporation. The question of relevancy being raised, it therefore, as I understand, becomes the duty of the Chair to submit that question to the Senate without debate. I ask that the question of relevancy be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is aware of the fact that on April 1, 1941, when the agricultural appropriation bill was under consideration, the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, said:

Mr. President, no question of germaneness has been raised. The point is that the amendment is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER—

Who was the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—

The Chair understood the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to make the argument that the proviso beginning in line 17 is germane to the language written in the bill by the House of Representatives.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] then said:

It pertains to that part of the language and clarifies it.

The question was then referred to the Senate, and the Senate on a division held the amendment was in order.

The Chair, however, believes that the ruling at that time was out of order. The Chair calls attention now to section 4 of rule XVI and urges Senators to read it with great care:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill; nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received—

At that point there is a semicolon—

nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

The Senator from Washington has not raised the question of relevancy, but the question of the amendment being general legislation on a general appropriation bill. It is the view of the Chair that action on the question raised by the Senator from Washington should not be estopped because of the question of germaneness being subsequently raised.

The Chair is not aware of the full situation that confronted the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] when he was in the chair on April 1, 1941. The Chair is somewhat familiar with the present situation.

The Chair therefore calls attention to the language in the committee print and the language in the House text. The pertinent language in the committee print is as follows:

$79,134,882, to be accounted for as one fund known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945, to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944, and the unexpended balance on June 30, 1944, in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944, and all the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1945.

That appears from lines 9 to 17 on page 2 of the present committee print. The corresponding language on page 51 of the bill as it came from the House, extending from line 5 to line 14, reads as follows:

The unexpended balance on June 30, 1944, in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944, and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1945 (subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended), shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945, to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944.

Of course, the Chair will not undertake to rule with any ultimate decisiveness on whether that which the House did in this language is in conformity with the original T. V. A. Act as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does, however, call attention to the fact that the T. V. A. Act, as amended by section 26, reads as follows:

Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. A continuing fund of $1,000,000 is also excepted from the requirements of this section and may be withheld by the Board to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the use by the Board, after June 30, 1936, of proceeds accruing prior to July 1, 1936, for the payment of obligations lawfully incurred prior to such latter date.

The Chair would call attention to the fact that the language on page 51 of the bill as it came from the House, lines 5 to 14, inclusive, is in conformity with the basic legislation, with the exception that in the one case "calendar year" is specified, and in the other "fiscal year" is specified.

The Chair therefore holds——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. That the point of order of the Senator from Washington is sustained.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is not this debatable? I was on my feet asking for the privilege of saying a word or two before the Chair ruled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well; the Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I merely wish to suggest that I find nothing in rule XVI which provides any priority in the matter of consideration. I raised my point in view of the suggestion of the able Senator from Tennessee that some priority is suggested. I did not raise the point of relevancy, but urged that the amendment proposed general legislation. I think that point should be disposed of.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, first I desire to quote a distinguished Senator who is opposed to the amendment now suggested, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I read from the RECORD of March 21, page 2856.

Mr. TYDINGS. This year?

Mr. McKELLAR. This year, just a day or two ago. This is the junior Senator from Alabama speaking:

Let me say to the Senator that that is not the present law, for this reason—

"That is not the present law"—that what appears in the House bill is not the present law—

In the various appropriation bills which have been enacted during the past 7 years, we have changed section 26, so that—

"We have changed section 26," which the Chair has just read:

We have changed section 26, so that today the T. V. A. is really not operating under section 26 as amended. Under the language of section 26 originally, and section 26 as amended, the T. V. A. could deposit its receipts anywhere it saw fit, withholding the receipts under the powers granted in section 26. In appropriation bills we provided that the T. V. A. should pay its receipts into a special fund in the Treasury.

And that is what is proposed for the next year, just as it was proposed last year for the present year.

The T. V. A. receipts have gone into a special fund in the Treasury, and each year Congress has reappropriated the funds which have accumulated in the special T. V. A. fund, together with any other moneys which the T. V. A. needed for the operation of its projects.

I wish to say that when this matter came before the committee the first thing the committee did was to ask the parliamentarian of this body if the amendments under consideration were in order, and the parliamentarian came before the committee, and held, in accordance with the opinion which the Chair has just overruled, that these amendments were in order, and we proceeded along that line. Section 26 is quite different from the provision in the House text. The House amended section 26; I believe the bill as it passed the House actually amends it by words, but I shall have to look that up and verify it. At any rate, it amends it; there can be no question about that. The House having amended it, it is surely within the power of the Senate to amend it.

I do not think the opinion of the Chair is correct. It is not in conformity with preceding opinions of this body. The Chair is changing the rule of the Senate, and for that reason, when the Chair shall finally make his ruling, I shall appeal from the decision of the Chair, and I hope that the decision of the Chair will be overruled.

In order that Senators may be present I shall make a point of no quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator desires to discuss the matter, I shall not make the point of no quorum until later.

Mr. BARKLEY. I trust the Presiding Officer, Senators, and also our able parliamentarian, will give consideration to one or two points I desire to raise, which

I think have not been properly considered.

In the first place, no point of order has been made against the proposed language on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are not discussing that. The Chair has ruled that out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand, but it may be a matter which will have to be discussed. In order for the Chair or for the Senate to pass upon the question of germaneness under rule XVI someone must make the point that the matter in question is not germane. Germaneness does not necessarily relate itself to new legislation in a bill. It may relate itself to other things besides new legislation. The Senate wrote rule XVI, paragraph 2 of which prohibits a committee—the Committee on Appropriations especially—from bringing in amendments which constitute new legislation. It does not make any particular difference whether the point of order is made under section 2 or section 4, but section 2 prohibits the Committee on Appropriations from offering or bringing in an amendment which constitutes new legislation.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. That is precisely the point I raised. I relied on paragraph 2 of rule XVI. I take it that under our rules any Member of the Senate may make the objection. The prohibition in the rule runs against the Appropriations Committee reporting a bill containing objectionable matter, and here before us is the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee containing matter which I conceive to be objectionable. I base my objection on paragraph 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. Paragraph 2 prohibits the Appropriations Committee from reporting on an appropriation bill an amendment proposing new or general legislation. That is one thing. That is with respect to the committee making a report of an appropriation bill containing new legislation. Paragraph 4 relates I think more forcefully to the offering from the floor by Members of the Senate of amendments that would do the same thing that the Committee on Appropriations is prohibited from doing in paragraph 2 of the rule. The question of germaneness and the question of being new legislation are entirely separate matters. As I said a moment ago, a matter might not contain new legislation, but if it is not germane to an appropriation it is not in order to be offered by a Member of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. What would be the effect of the decision by the Chair in the event the final decision is that the committee has reported a legislative provision? Would that have the effect of sending the bill back to the committee, or striking the matter out of the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. Paragraph 2 provides that if a point of order is sustained against an amendment which contains new legislation, the bill shall be returned to the committee. But there has been, as I understand, a modification of that; I am not absolutely certain that I am correct about it, but I understand that there has been a modification so that the measure would not go back to the committee automatically.

Evidently the Senate in writing this rule had in view protecting itself against a committee doing what Members of the Senate themselves could not do, and if the automatic effect of sustaining the point of order is to send the bill back to committee, evidently the Senate had that possibility in mind when it wrote the rule. It is in my judgment more important to protect the integrity of the rules of the Senate than it is to determine whether a bill shall go back to a committee for further consideration.

But I want to emphasize the point, Mr. President, that the germaneness of an amendment is one thing, and whether it is new legislation is entirely another thing. The House of Representatives, in my judgment, as said by the late Senator from Oregon, Mr. McNary, in the speech he made on the same proposition 2 years ago, cannot write into an appropriation bill a provision which automatically abrogates the rules of the Senate, so that the Senate cannot invoke its own rules against amendments which offer new legislation on an appropriation bill.

As a matter of fact, the House language does not substantially change the present law in any way. Under the present law, section 26, as amended, it is provided that once a year, at the end of the calendar or fiscal year—first it was the calendar year, and then I think the fiscal year—the net, after all expenses, shall be turned into the Treasury of the United States. Under a subsequent appropriation bill this special fund was set up which was to receive the net proceeds. But that does not substantially change the running provisions of the appropriation bills, all of which have required that this be done in compliance with section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended. Therefore I think that on both grounds, under section 2 and under the first phrase of paragraph 4 of rule II, this amendment beyond any doubt constitutes new legislation because it changes the fiscal relationship of the Government, and that the point of order ought to be sustained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he made the point of order that the germaneness should now be voted on—if that is the specific point of order the Senator is now making?

Mr. McKELLAR. I made the point of order that the question of germaneness should be disposed of first, and I asked that that be submitted to the Senate, as the rules of the Senate require.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask this preliminary question, and I should like the Senator from Tennessee to give an answer to it. The question of germaneness can only be submitted to the Senate if someone has made a point of order that the matter is not germane. The Senator from Tennessee is not going to make the point of order that his own amendment is not germane?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the matter is not submitted to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. The rule of the Senate does not provide that a motion either way has to be made. All a Senator has to do is to submit the question of germaneness.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. Read the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me read paragraph 4.

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill—

That is that.

> Nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received.

We all recognize that a point of order cannot be passed upon, either by the Chair or by the Senate, unless it is made. Frequently in appropriation bills points of order would lie but no one makes them, and therefore the matter is voted upon like other propositions in the bill. But if anyone makes the point of order, then of course it is subject to be ruled upon by the Chair. But the Chair is not required to take note of any violation of the Senate's rules by an amendment to an appropriation bill unless some Senator makes the point of order that it violates the rule. No one has made the point of order that this amendment is not germane.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; if I have the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say that the Senator from Kentucky did not read the point which is relevant to the controversy. Listen to it. There is a semicolon just before this language:

> Nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

I submitted that question to the Senate, and the Chair held that he did not have to submit it to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The question of relevancy "when raised" is the language. How is the question raised? The question of relevancy is raised just as a question of new legislation is raised, by a point of order made by some Senator directed at the language. I insist that the question of germaneness or relevancy must be raised under the rule itself.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order to save time, I make the point of order of germaneness.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. Which point is now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to observe that, in his opinion, the point of order with regard to germaneness cannot be raised in such a way as to exclude a point of order raised with regard to whether or not there is general legislation proposed to an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, pending that, will the Chair indulge me long enough to cite a precedent on that question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not cite any precedent except the precedent of common sense.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I desire to cite a precedent on that subject. On one occasion last year, when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] was in the chair, he made a decision on the same subject. I thought his decision was wrong, but his decision was sustained by the Senate.

During consideration by the Senate of the last agricultural appropriation bill, when the question of the farm-security appropriation was before the Senate, a point of order was made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as I recall, that the matter constituted legislation on an appropriation bill. It then was urged by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]——

The VICE PRESIDENT. No doubt the Senator has in mind the precedent which the Chair read into the RECORD earlier.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Chair has already referred to it, very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say a word, I should like to point out that the precedent referred to was subsequent to another one. On two occasions the Chair sustained the identical point of order. It happened that I was involved in the parliamentary situation on both occasions. As I recall, one related to the appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration, and the other related to the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration, now being discussed by the Senator from Missouri. On both occasions the Chair ruled that in cases in which there was any legislation whatever on the part of the House in an appropriation bill, such action on the part of the House opened the door to the Senate to place legislation in the appropriation bill.

Mr. President, if we take any other position, the Senate will tie its hands against ever dealing with any question in an appropriation bill on which the House has legislated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, on both occasions it was held, and the ruling of the Chair was sustained by the Senate, that the question of germaneness could be raised by the proponents of the amendment, but that if the amendment was germane, it obviated the question of new legislation on the appropriation bil.

As I have said, I opposed that ruling, in the case of the ruling made when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] was in the chair. I opposed it, to the point that we almost came to blows on the subject. But the Senate sustained the position of the Senator from Kentucky, and that is unquestionably the practice of the Senate at the present time.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I have the floor, I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to call attention to the question raised a while ago by the Senator from Louisiana. I am not certain that it was satisfactorily answered. The Senator from Washington has raised this question under paragraph 2 of rule XVI. If his point of order is sustained, I have not the slightest doubt that the bill must be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations; because paragraph 2 of rule XVI reads as follows:

> A point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Under that rule we have no choice.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The bill would automatically be recommitted.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; as the Senator from Missouri has said, the bill would automatically be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations, if the point of order were sustained.

If the point of order now raised relates to the matter of relevancy or germaneness, no such situation arises. But if a point of order under paragraph 2 of rule XVI is sustained, the Senate has no choice. The bill then must be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to observe, if the Senator will indulge me, that without regard to the merits of the question, in my judgment it would be the most unfortunate precedent the Senate could establish, to hold that when the House has violated this rule and has attached legislation to an appropriation bill, the Senate is powerless to change the position of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate is not powerless because the Senate can strike out the legislative provisions added by the House to the appropriation bill; so the Senate is not bound by the fact that the House has added legislation to an appropriation bill. It would be in conformity with our own rule if the Senate should do that, and it would be recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. So we are not actually bound.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows it is possible to draw a legislative item to an appropriation bill in such manner that if only the legislative provision is stricken out, and if the matter which is not legislation is allowed to remain, the provision will not make sense; and in that case, in the subsequent necessary conference some one of the conferees would have the right to add legislation to the appropriation bill. Why should the House of Representatives or a conference committee have more power in dealing with an appropriation bill than has the Senate of the United States?

Mr. President, this question has been raised in the Senate on a number of previous occasions; and, so far as I know, the Senate has uniformly held, and under the advice of the Parliamentarian of the Senate any Member of the Senate who happened to be presiding has ruled that if the House of Representatives has added a legislation item to an appropriation bill, the Senate certainly has a right to legislate on the same item when the bill comes before the Senate. If any other position should be taken, the Senate would not be a body of equal dignity with the House of Representatives in connection with the handling of appropriation matters.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the case of action taken by the House of Representatives in the nature of legislation on an appropriation bill, is it not fundamental that the Senate has a right to pass on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate is to be of equal power with the House, it is fundamental.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the House desires to add legislation to an appropriation bill, it does so. Does anyone mean to say that when such a bill comes to the Senate, the Senate must accept it as written by the House or must reject it, but that the Senate cannot modify or change the items referred to? It seems to me the issue goes beyond the matter of a point of order, and goes to the very question of the legislative power of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is the very point I was undertaking to make. If the Senator from Kentucky is correct, the only power the Senate has in connection with a matter which is legislation on an appropriation bill is to strike out the legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Every Member of the Senate who has studied an appropriation bill has found that in such bills legislative matter has been so interwoven with appropriation items that the striking out of the legislative matter would leave the bill in such shape that it would not make good sense.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If, as the Senator mentioned, the Senate simply struck out the legislative items which the House attached to the appropriations bill, the bill would subsequently have to go to conference; and, according to the undisputed practice relating to committees of conference, any matter germane to the bill would be before the conference. Under those circumstances, the Senate would simply be prevented from participating in legislation on an appropriation bill, but the House conferees and the Senate conferees would be enabled to indulge in legislation on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have just stated that if the ruling should be sustained, a conference committee would be granted powers which would be forbidden to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, the implications of such a ruling go far beyond the merits of the instant issue before the Senate. I regret very much that it has been raised; because if the Senate were to sustain a ruling by the Chair which would tie the hands of the Senate from legislating on

a matter in an appropriation bill on which the House had already legislated, the result would be to say that the Senate of the United States is not a coequal body with the House of Representatives in connection with the handling of legislation on appropriation bills, and, in addition, that the Senate of the United States does not have a power which a creature of the Senate—a conference committee—would have because certainly a conference committee would have a right to modify or to change or to yield as to legislative provisions on an appropriation bill which might come to the Senate from the House of Representatives. It is as fundamental as the creation and constitutional establishment of the Senate of the United States as a coequal legislative body that the Senate has a right to legislate on any matter on which the House of Representatives has legislated.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator feel that the question of germaneness or relevancy should be decided first by the Senate before a decision is made under a rule which would automatically force the bill to be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate is to adhere to the unbroken precedents of this body, so far as I know, that would be the procedure which would be followed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we should have to do so, because the Chair has just ruled that he does not have to submit to the Senate the question of relevancy, as raised by both the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and myself. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] raised it directly, and I raised it indirectly. The Chair has so held, and I have appealed from the Chair's ruling. That is the pending question.

Mr. BONE obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to inquire whether two points of order, both relating to two different provisions of the rule, can be pending at the same time. Regardless of what may be done with respect to the point of order relative to the general legislative theory of the amendment, certainly, in my judgment, the two points of order constitute different grounds for rejection. If the point of order made by the Senator from Maryland had been submitted first—namely, the point of order that the language was not germane under the rule—of course, it would have to be submitted to the Senate. But, the point of order having been first made that the matter constitutes new legislation, it seems to me we cannot entertain two points of order at the same time. We must dispose of them one at a time. The point of order raised against the matter as general legislation was made first, and it seems to me it should be disposed of first.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I am not sure that I have the floor. I wish to make a statement. If I have the floor, I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In response to what the Senator from Kentucky has said, let me say that the Senator evidently misconceives the theory upon which the question of germaneness enters into the equation. The theory is that while the amendment standing alone might be subject to the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, it is taken out of the general rule if it appears that there is legislation on the subject in the bill as it comes from the House, and that the amendment proposed is germane to the House provision. That is the principle. Therefore, it is not a question of having two points of order on different subjects. The second point of order is designed to obviate the effect of the first point of order.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, let me suggest that there is not a line or a syllable in the rule itself which fortifies the position of my able friend from Missouri. I sought to find something to enlighten me on that particular point, and found nothing.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that this question seems to have profoundly disturbed my brethren and may, in the normal course of events, constitute a Senate precedent of some moment, the Vice President having ruled on it, I now ask that as a part of my remarks at this point there be printed in the RECORD all the provisions in the pending bill beginning on page 51, under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority," and including all the language down to the bottom of page 55, with all the italics, diacritical marks, interlineations, and everything else which appears in that language.

There being no objection, the language referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

[Omit the part in black brackets and insert the part printed in italic]

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions *of* "The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933", as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including the continued construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Kentucky; [Watts Bar steam plant; Fort Loudoun Dam (including an extension to bring the waters of the Little Tennessee River within the pool of this project);] Fontana Dam; South Holston Dam; Watauga Dam; [an additional unit at the Sheffield steam plant;] and a fertilizer and elemental phosphorus manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Alabama; and the acquisition of necessary land, the clearing of such land, *and* relocation of highways, *within authorized projects*, and the construction or purchase (*not exceeding $600,000*) of transmission lines and other facilities *authorized by the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended*, [and all other necessary works authorized by such Act,] and for printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, [newspapers, periodicals, purchase,] maintenance, *repair*, and operation of *not more than seven hundred* passenger-carrying vehicles *not exceeding $225,000* (*and all passenger-carrying motor vehicles owned by the Authority in excess of seven hundred and all aircraft other than those used for mosquito control work shall be declared surplus and shall be sold to the highest bidder or bidders*), rents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and all necessary salaries and expenses connected with the organization, operation, and investigations of the Tennessee Valley Authority[, and for examination of estimates of appropriations and activities in the field,] *$76,981,873, to be accounted for as one fund known as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945", to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944"; and* the unexpended balance on June 30, 1944, in the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944", and *all* the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1945 [(subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended)] *and subsequent fiscal years*, shall be covered *as and when collected* into [and accounted for as one fund to be known as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1945", to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944": *Provided*, That purchases may be made by the Authority during the fiscal year 1945 without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, when in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Authority such a procedure will expedite the completion of projects determined by the President to be essential for defense purposes] *the general fund of the Treasury of the United States: Provided, That no part of any appropriation or fund made available to the Tennessee Valley Authority by this Act or otherwise for the fiscal year 1945 or any subsequent fiscal year shall be used (1) for paying for advertisements in newspapers, by radio, or otherwise (except publication of notices required by statute and except in cases of emergency shortage of power); (2) for paying for any expenses in connection with explorations for sources of alumina or other minerals (except such as are necessary for the construction, completion, or operation of any authorized projects); (3) for buying lands or buildings or building steam plants or building new dams or additions to dams, not authorized by law; (4) for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles; (5) for the maintenance, repair, or operation of any passenger-carrying vehicle, unless such vehicle is (a) used only upon official business of the Authority and (b) has painted on each side in white letters not less than two inches high "TVA On Official Business"; (6) for the payment of any claim for damages, or any contested claim, involving a sum of $10,000 or more, except in pursuance of an order, decree, or judgment made by a court of competent jurisdiction after a hearing in such court as to the facts relating to such claim; (7) for any political purpose whatsoever, directly or indirectly, or for the purpose of seeking to influence public opinion, by means of lectures, advertisements, publications, public statements, radio, or otherwise for or against (a) any candidate for public office or (b) any legislation or legislative proposal; (8) for paying any compensation to or expenses of any member or other officer or employee of the Authority who takes an active part in political management or political campaigns or who seeks to influence public opinion, by means of lectures, advertisements, publications, public statements, radio, or otherwise, for or against (a) any candidate for public office or (b) any legislation or legislative proposal; (9) for furnishing fertilizer or any components thereof to any person free of charge, or at less than cost, unless such person be selected*

and approved by the county agent of the county of such person's residence; (10) for paying for any audit or examination of the books or accounts of the Authority by any nongovernmental accountant or firm, the Comptroller General of the United States being authorized by law to make such audits; (11) for paying any administrative or other expenses in connection with the making of any contract which discriminates unjustly between consumers of the same character of current under similar circumstances; (12) for the establishment of or additions to any reserve fund; (13) for paying the salary or compensation at a rate of $4,500 or more per annum of any officer or employee who shall not be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; (14) for the maintenance, repair, or operation of any aircraft other than those used for mosquito-control work; (15) for the maintaining the principal office, principal place of business, or general headquarters of the Authority at any place other than in the immediate vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Alabama; or (16) for paying the compensation of any member of the board of directors of the Authority, or any officer or employee of the Authority having general supervisory powers over any phase of its activities throughout its area of operations, who does not maintain his principal place of business and office in the immediate vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Alabama.

Mr. BONE. Following that, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed the committee print which appeared on our desks today, dated March 24, 1944.

There being no objection, the committee print was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Committee print]

March 24, 1944

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT AS AGREED TO BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS ON MARCH 23, 1944

[Omit the part in black brackets and insert the part printed in italic]

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of "The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933", as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including the continued construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Kentucky; Watts Bar steam plant; Fort Loudoun Dam (including an extension to bring the waters of the Little Tennessee River within the pool of this project); Fontana Dam; South Holston Dam; Watauga Dam; an additional unit at the Sheffield steam plant; and a fertilizer and elemental phosphorus manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Alabama; and the acquisition of necessary land, the clearing of such land, relocation of highways, and the construction or purchase of transmission lines and other facilities, and all other necessary works authorized by such Act, and for printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, periodicals, [purchase,] maintenance, *repair*, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles, rents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and all necessary salaries and expenses connected with the organization, operation, and investigations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for examination of estimates of appropriations and activities in the field, *$79,134,882, to be accounted for as one fund known as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945", to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944"; and* the unexpended balance on June 30, 1944, in the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944", and *all* receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1945 [(subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended)] *and subsequent fiscal years*, shall be covered *quarterly* into [and accounted for as one fund to be known as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1945", to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944"] *the general fund of the Treasury of the United States: Provided*, That purchases may be made by the Authority during the fiscal year 1945 without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, when in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Authority such a procedure will expedite the completion of projects determined by the President to be essential for defense purposes.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I was really depressed to learn that my able friend the Senator from Missouri and my able and very learned friend from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] once nearly engaged in fisticuffs over this particular rule, because any problem that could excite those two able and very amiable gentlemen to that sort of attitude toward each other is something which assuredly should be laid at rest as an issue in the Senate. Over the years I have been privileged to know these gentlemen in a very delightful intimacy. I have always found them bearing themselves in the brunt of battle with the true courtesy of Arthurian knights. It is something of a shock to learn that in the mind or the heart or the attitude of either there was an impish impulse for fisticuffs over this tremendous and important issue which we have just been discussing. So, for posterity and history, and for those who shall follow through the numberless cycles of time while the Senate shall last, in order utterly to put at rest the issue which has been raised here today, I want the RECORD to show everything that appears in the bill and the amendments before us, so that we may once and for all time settle the question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will include in his remarks the remarks made by the Senator from Missouri in connection with another bill, in which he took the opposite position, it might show some reason for the excited attitude on the part of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have that done, provided the RECORD also includes the vote by which I was defeated on that proposition.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, my love for the Senator from Missouri is something worthy of note, but at times I may be filled with what to him may seem an impish desire to irritate him. I should like nothing better than to insert at this point in the RECORD the remarks of my able friend from Missouri dealing with this particular question, but they are not available.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator also insert the vote by which I was defeated, and by which the precedent of the Senate was established?

Mr. BONE. My remarks probably creep into his drab life like a gleam of supernal sunshine. I merely want to elevate him to higher planes of thought. I think his parliamentary foot slipped today. I am sorry to learn from my friend from Kentucky that the Senator from Missouri has ever reversed himself. I have always considered him one of the stanchest pillars of righteousness in the matter of loyalty to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not reverse myself. I take the law as I find it. I made this contention in perfect good faith. The Senate, by a decided vote, overruled me. I have not reversed myself. I take the law as I find it. I do not think the Senate should follow one rule when it wishes to sustain an amendment and another rule when it wishes to defeat it. I think there should be some uniformity. I think it is more important to have uniformity than to be right.

Mr. BONE. I know that the Senator from Tennessee wishes to vote on this question immediately, and I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, when the Senator is inserting a few remarks by me on the agricultural appropriation bill last year, he also ought to insert the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who was very urgently, strenuously, and ably contending for exactly the position which I take today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, ever since I was a boy in knee pants in the House of Representatives I have tried to follow the Senator from Missouri. I am now following in his footsteps when I exercise the same right to change my view that he has exercised.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I should like to make the observation that under paragraph 4 of rule XVI objection can be made by a point of order raised on the floor against an amendment because of its lack of germaneness or relevancy. That is not fatal to the bill from the standpoint of having the bill withdrawn from the consideration of the Senate. If the amendment were found to be not germane, or to be irrelevant, it could be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill.

If a ruling is made and sustained on the point of order, made by my good friend from Washington, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI, the bill automatically must leave the Senate and go back to the Committee on Appropriations. Why do we not first decide the question of relevancy and germaneness? After we have passed that point we can come to the next point, as to whether the committee has made a mistake in reporting a bill to the Senate in violation of the Senate rule. If that decision is in the affirmative, under the rule the bill must automatically go back to the Committee on Appropriations. That is the plea I am making in order that we may have a clear ruling and a just decision on the whole question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the Chair has already held that this question should not be submitted to the Senate, and I have appealed from that ruling. The Chair has ruled on the point of order made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], that the question of relevancy should not be submitted to the Senate. I have appealed from the ruling. So the same result would be attained by voting to overrule the decision of the Chair.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, what is the ruling?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee requested that the Chair withhold decision until all the arguments had been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was as to the first ruling of the Chair; but since that time the Chair has held that the point of order raised by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was not to be submitted to the Senate, and I have appealed from the ruling of the Chair. The RECORD will sustain what I have said.

Mr. CHANDLER. My understanding was that the Chair had withheld his ruling. I thought the whole question was still before the Senate. Let us see if we cannot adjust it without having to vote on an appeal from a ruling by the Chair. I think the Chair is in error. I should have to vote against the ruling of the Chair, which I do not wish to do, but I am not afraid to do so if it should become necessary. I think we ought first to determine the question of germaneness and relevancy. If that fails, the bill does not have to go back automatically to the committee. If we vote on the point raised by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and he is successful, the bill will automatically disappear from the consideration of the Senate and go back to the committee. There is no choice. The rule provides that it shall go back.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What effect does my colleague give to the first part of paragraph 4 of rule XVI, which provides as follows:

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

That is not hooked up with anything else. If the Chair should rule, under paragraph 4, that the amendment does contain legislation, it would not go back to the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. I construe that to mean that no amendment containing general legislation, if objected to, shall be received from the floor, after the bill is before us. If the Senator were to offer from the floor an amendment containing general legislation, and it were objected to, under paragraph 4 of rule XVI it would have to be submitted to the Senate without debate. However, my plea now is that we decide whether or not this amendment is germane, or relevant, or both. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has raised the question of germaneness. The Senator from Washington would not lose anything if we should decide that it was germane. For the time being it would be germane. If we should decide that it was not, the amendment could be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill.

Mr. OVERTON and Mr. BONE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I thoroughly concur in the interpretation of the two rules stated by the Senator from Kentucky. There are two rules. There would not be two rules unless we were dealing with two different phases of the question. The first phase of it is covered by paragraph 2 of the rule. That is, when the committee reports an appropriation bill containing general legislation, there is only one remedy, and that is to make a point of order. If the point of order is sustained, the bill must then go back to the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. That question was raised by my friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. That is the only point which can be made when the committee itself reports an appropriation bill containing general legislation.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is what I understand.

Mr. OVERTON. If some Member from the floor offers an amendment which proposes general legislation, and the point of order, under paragraph 4 is made and sustained, the amendment cannot be received; but, of course, the bill does not go back to the committee. Therefore it is necessary to have both rules. They deal with entirely distinct phases of the question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will my colleague the Senator from Kentucky yield in order that I may ask for some information from the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it be true that paragraph 2 deals only with amendments offered from the floor, is it the contention of the Senator that if the Committee on Appropriations should bring in some amendments which were not germane, no Senator could raise a point of order against them?

Mr. OVERTON. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then paragraph 4 is limited only to amendments offered from the floor of the Senate, and paragraph 2 has nothing to do with germaneness.

Mr. OVERTON. Paragraph 2 has nothing to do with germaneness. Paragraph 4 has to do with germaneness.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the Committee on Appropriations could bring in an amendment not germane, and no Senator in the Senate could raise a point of order.

Mr. OVERTON. Any Senator may raise a point of order with respect to germaneness, but if the question of germaneness is raised and sustained, the amendment does not go back to the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; not under paragraph 2.

Mr. OVERTON. As I have said, paragraph 2 deals with general legislation reported by the committee to an appropriation bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. And it deals only with general legislation.

Mr. OVERTON. It deals only with general legislation; that is all. That is separate and apart. When the committee makes a report of a bill containing general legislation, and a point of order is sustained, the bill goes back to the committee. Paragraph 2 is very clear on that point. However, paragraph 4 deals with another phase of general legislation, and applies when a Senator offers to an appropriation bill an amendment containing general legislation. It also deals with another question entirely diverse from general legislation, namely, the question of germaneness.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. My sunny friend from Kentucky surrounds himself with an aura of gloom. He refers to the fact that the bill would have to go back to the committee. Let me lift him from the bog of despair in which he seems to be, and point out that the bill could go back to the committee and emerge in 1 hour. Probably the chief delay would be in printing. The committee could meet and in 3 minutes it could bring the bill back. There is no crisis involved here. I have been in the Senate many years, and I never heard a rule announced on this floor with any aspect of finality that would apply to a question affecting germaneness as against general legislation. I may be in error.

Mr. CHANDLER. My friend the Senator from Washington has been here a long time but in all the time he has been here he has not had as much trouble with this rule as I have had. I am very anxious to have this rule cleared up, and I think we can make more headway if we follow the method which I have suggested. I do not wish to vote, as I have heretofore said, on an appeal against the ruling of the President of the Senate. However, if that rough way is the only way to handle it, then we shall have to handle it in that way.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think this situation is rather unique. It seems to me that technically this bill has not been in the possession of the committee since it was reported. It was the unfinished business of the Senate when we recessed day before yesterday. It is true that the committee held a meeting, and authorized the acting chairman of the committee to come to the Senate and withdraw certain amendments, and to retain certain of the amendments which had been reported from the committee. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] himself, when he made a statement with respect to the amendments earlier today, stated that he did so by the direction of the committee. So it would seem that the point of order which has been raised is directed against the amendment which the Senator from Tennessee has offered, rather than against the bill. The point

of order therefore would have to be brought under paragraph 4 of the rule instead of under paragraph 2. I may be in error about that because there was some confusion in the Chamber when the Senator from Tennessee was reading his statement concerning the amendments. I understood the effect of his statement to be the withdrawal of certain amendments, and to offer other amendments. He did that as an individual Senator, although, it is true, at the direction of the committee. Insofar as the committee could influence the decision of the Senate, it would be a committee action. But in reality, as it stands here today, it is the action of the Senator from Tennessee in his capacity as Senator, although he takes such action as the result of instruction by his committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I agree with the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin that any such amendment offered by any Senator from the floor could be disposed of by the Senate without prejudice to the bill. However, this other matter definitely prejudices the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in the discussion of paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI it has been suggested that there is some confusion between the two paragraphs. It seems to me that there is language contained in paragraph 2 which distinguishes it clearly from paragraph 4 and would help clear up some of the present controversy. Paragraph 2 relates to the Committee on Appropriations reporting an appropriation bill, and if it contains an amendment proposing new and general legislation, then a point of order may be made against the bill as coming from the Appropriations Committee with such an amendment in it. If objection is raised to the bill and is sustained, then the bill goes back to the committee.

As I understand, the Senator from Washington, in this instance, is not raising a point of order to the bill, but is raising a point of order to an amendment to the bill. That comes under paragraph 4, and does not involve the return of the instrument to the committee. That question must be raised under paragraph 4, however.

Mr. CHANDLER. It does come under section 4, and its germaneness or relevancy must be submitted by the Chair to the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The primary purpose of the Senate of the United States is to pass on legislation. We have legislation before us containing a particular provision which some Members of the Senate favor and others oppose. It seems to me that at a time such as this the question on its merits should be submitted to the Senate without points of order being made by any Member. It also seems to me that if a majority of the Senators wish to favor the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee, they should be permitted to do so. If they do not favor it, of course, we should not adopt it as a national policy.

I therefore make the sincere request to those who have spoken for and against this measure that all points of order against the proposal be withdrawn, and that the Senate vote on it on its merits. If we think it is good for the country, let us adopt it. If it is not good for the country, let us strike it down. All this debate over parliamentary procedure on such a small point, when such a tremendous issue is involved, seems to me to be an evasion of our duty in formulating plans and policies for the country. I myself made one of the points of order in order to try to clarify the situation. I shall be very glad to join with the Senator from Washington, or with any other Senator, in withdrawing the point of order and allowing the Senate to vote on the question of whether the proposal in itself has merit, or should be voted down.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I did not wish to offend the Senator from Kentucky. I merely wished to express the hope that when my friend, the Senator from Washington, was putting in insertions from me during the debate on the point of order relating to the Farm Security Administration provision in the last agricultural appropriation bill, he would also include the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, who at that time was urging the position which I am now taking.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am ready to conclude. But I want to ask the Chair this question: Has the Chair made a final ruling or is the situation still so that a ruling can now be made?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point at issue is the objection of the Senator from Tennessee to the point made by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I have made no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland made the point that the amendment was not relevant or germane—as the Chair recalls he included both, that it was neither relevant nor germane—and the Senator from Tennessee can state what he said.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is already in the RECORD, but I am perfectly willing to withdraw any motion that I made so that the motion of the Senator from Maryland may be put.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator does not, I presume, withdraw his appeal?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I am not withdrawing the appeal. I understood the Chair to overrule the motion of the Senator from Maryland. I understood it that way, and I took an appeal on that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator appealed from that decision.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is now the question before the United States Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the United States Senate is on the appeal of the Senator from Tennessee to the ruling the Chair made in regard to the point raised by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. So that if we have a vote, the vote will be on the question whether the point of order made by the Senator from Maryland shall be sustained or shall not be sustained?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On whether the decision of the Chair shall stand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, just a moment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I am not trying to formulate the exact language of how the motion should be put, but only the substance of it. After listening to the debate and to the Chair explain the parliamentary situation, I take it the first vote will come on whether or not the position of the Chair on my point of order shall be sustained or shall not be sustained.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote will be on the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the point made by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is not this the situation: On the point of order of the Senator from Maryland the Chair has ruled he was not required by the rules to submit it to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. From that decision the Senator from Tennessee has appealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, if the decision of the Chair stands, the Chair is not required to submit the question of germaneness to the Senate, and if the decision of the Chair is overruled, the Chair will be compelled to submit the question of germaneness to the Senate, and then the question of germaneness will be determined by the Senate.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is not quite the situation.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Kentucky has the floor. Does he yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not yield at the moment. What the Senator from Missouri suggests is what I have been trying to avoid. I want now to ask my friend from Tennessee and my friend from Maryland to withdraw their motions if we are going to make any headway, so that we will not have to vote on the appeal from the decision of the Chair, and then let us start all over again. Then I want the Chair to take back what he said, so that we can vote on the question of germaneness and relevancy. When I first got on my feet I especially asked the Chair not to make a final ruling until we could discuss the matter. There would be no excuse for discussing it if we were not going to have a chance to arrive at a fair and just conclusion, without appealing from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Chair is willing to submit the question of relevancy to the Senate, of course I am willing to withdraw the appeal, and let the question be submitted to the Senate according to the Rules of the Senate.

I hope the Chair will, and I think the Chair should, submit to the Senate the question of relevancy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to state that, in his opinion, it certainly is not common sense to use the question of germaneness or relevancy to obviate completely the consideration of whether or not general legislation has been introduced into an appropriation bill. That appeals to the Chair as being nothing more nor less than a parliamentary trick.

Mr. McKELLAR. I indulged in no parliamentary trick.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say that I have not undertaken to trick the Chair about anything. The Chair has made a ruling that he does not have to submit the question of relevancy to the Senate. Under the circumstances, I honestly believe—I never believed anything more honestly—that, in accordance with all the authorities, when the point of relevancy is raised, as it was raised by the Senator from Maryland, beyond the question of doubt it is the duty of the Chair, and his first duty, to submit the question to the Senate. It is not a trick. I denounce the statement of the Chair that I have undertaken to trick anybody. I am not that kind of a man, Mr. President. I do not believe in tricking anybody. I am not offering any trick measures or motions here, nor am I asking for any trick rulings. I think it is damnable for anybody to make the suggestion that any statement I made was a trick, and I state to the Chair that I think he should withdraw his remark.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be very happy, indeed, to do so. The Chair did not entertain for a moment the idea that the Senator from Tennessee would indulge in a trick; that was the farthest thing from his mind. But the Chair does feel, in view of the fact that the Senator from Washington first made a request for a ruling on the point of order, that general legislation was proposed to the appropriation bill, that the Chair does have a right to make a ruling on that point under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, we are operating under rule XVI. Rule XVI is a rule that contains several sections. The objection made by my friend the Senator from Washington to the amendment was not to the bill, but to an amendment on the ground that it proposes general legislation to an appropriation bill. Under the articles and sections of rule XVI, there is a place where the question of germaneness and relevancy ought to be decided, and the decision on the question would not be fatal to the bill; that is, it would not be fatal in the sense that the bill would have to leave the Senate floor and go back to the committee. It may come back again; it may come back in half an hour or an hour or it may come back in a day or a week, although I have seen bills go to the committee and never come back; I have seen bills disappear when they were recommitted and never return. Of course, that would not happen in this instance.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. In just a moment. I asked the Chair to withhold his ruling so that we could avoid a vote on his ruling that the Senate did not have the right to decide the relevancy and germaneness of an amendment offered to a bill that contains general legislation, or is alleged to contain general legislation. There is an easy way to do it; there is a nice way to do it and a rough way to do it. I am prepared to follow either way if we have to. I think the Chair was mistaken; I think we have a right in the Senate to say whether or not this amendment is relevant and germane. If we do so and say it is irrelevant, or say it is not germane, it will not be fatal to the bill. The amendment can be laid on the table without danger to the bill, and then we can take up the next amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Suppose it were held, either by the Chair or by the Senate, that it was germane, but it was decided, on the contrary, to hold that it was new legislation, and therefore not admissible in the bill? It is contended that a ruling by a vote of the Senate that the amendment was germane would prevent the Senate acting on whether it was a violation of the rule as adding general and new legislation to the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. The objection is not to an amendment. The objection called for in paragraph 2 is to a bill, it is not to an amendment. I am talking about an objection to an amendment, not to the bill. An objection to a bill should be made to a bill as a whole, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI. An objection to an amendment should be made under paragraph 4, and the amendment, if the objection is sustained, can be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill, and the Senate can proceed in an orderly manner.

I wish to ask the Chair again whether the Chair has made his final decision. Notwithstanding what the Senate has done or what the Senator from Maryland has urged, has the Chair made his final decision, or does he now wish to submit his final decision?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to make the statement that he feels that it was not the intent of the original formulators of the Rules of the Senate that a ruling on germaneness should obviate a point of order with regard to general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. We all agree to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is also informed that if the subject of germaneness is determined, and an amendment is held to be germane, then it is impossible to pass on the question of whether or not it is general legislation. The Chair feels that is wrong, that the Senate should have opportunity to pass on the point whether a proposal is to add legislation to an appropriation bill. In view of the fact that the Senator from Washington in the first place made the latter point, the Chair took the position he has taken, because the point of germaneness was made secondly.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair has not ruled that if a point of order is made against language on the ground that it is not germane or not relevant he does not have to submit that to the Senate. The Chair does have to submit it to the Senate. The Chair's ruling is that a point of order having been previously made on the question of the amendment being general legislation, which is a different matter, that cannot be superseded by a subsequent point of order as to germaneness, the effect of which would be to deny any Senator the right to make the point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has stated more accurately than did the Chair the intent of the Chair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry. As a matter of fact, the Chair has ruled that he is not required by rule XVI to submit the particular point of order made by the Senator from Maryland. Leaving out any generalizations about it, what the Chair has ruled is that he does not have to submit under rule XVI the particular point of order made by the Senator from Maryland. Is not that what the Chair ruled?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to change his ruling to the position as stated by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A further parliamentary inquiry. Is it not a fact that the Chair has actually ruled that he will not submit the question of the point of order raised by the Senator from Maryland, and from that ruling the Senator from Tennessee has taken an appeal?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Chair's ruling meant simply that the point of order made by the Senator from Maryland was not in order to be made at the time it was made because another point was pending. That is the effect of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Kentucky may rationalize and attempt to justify this remarkable decision of the Chair as much as he pleases, but the fact is that what the Chair has ruled is that he is not required by rule XVI to submit the point of order on germaneness raised by the Senator from Maryland. No matter how much the Senator from Kentucky may wish to rationalize that ruling the fact is that that is the effect of the language.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not have to rationalize the ruling; it rationalizes itself.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, unless my ears deceive me, after I had made the point the Chair ruled on it, and held that it was well taken. As I recall—and I assert this on the theory that my ears did not deceive me—thereupon the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] appealed from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the Chair withheld his ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee had been asking to be recognized, and he asked the Chair to withhold his ruling until he was recognized.

Mr. BONE. I have no objection to the matter being submitted to the Senate, but just for the purpose of the RECORD, and perhaps in aid of the new Senators who have come into the Senate in the last 2 years, and have not been through one of these rather heated debates, let us examine this picture for a moment, and see what will happen if the question of relevancy is raised, whether I may not avail myself of a rule of the Senate by raising the point that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. That presents a rather peculiar picture, to say the least. Certainly, the right of any Senator to present the question of relevancy is no more sacred than the right under rule XVI to have presented, as I asked in the first instance, the question whether or not the amendment is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have not yielded, and in view of the character of this debate, and the fact that it has touched a matter which has caused no end of discussion throughout the years, I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the question. We should all be willing to have a yea-and-nay vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry. Did the senior Senator from Tennessee, on behalf of the committee, withdraw all the amendments pertaining to T. V. A. which were in the bill day before yesterday when the Senate adjourned, on the submission of the new amendments this morning?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator did not withdraw all the amendments.

Mr. STEWART. In the committee print of the bill we still have amendments in addition to the ones which lie on the desks of Senators this morning. I had understood that all the amendments in the committee print of the bill as it lay on our desks day before yesterday were withdrawn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They were first withdrawn.

Mr. STEWART. I do not understand how many amendments were withdrawn. I have been informed that there was only one T. V. A. amendment pending, that is, the one relating to covering into the Treasury the funds or receipts of the T. V. A.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is all that is left now.

Mr. STEWART. If that is all that is left, what became of the others?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and yesterday the committee authorized the acting chairman, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], to modify the committee amendment. The modification is in the form in which it now appears in the print, and the new print was made solely for the purpose of apprising Senators as to what is now the issue.

Mr. STEWART. Then the amendments which appear in the bill as reported have been or will be withdrawn, and the new committee print will be substituted for all the original amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee amendment as modified by the committee reads in accordance with the print which has been prepared for the convenience of Senators. All other portions of the amendments were withdrawn, and the Senator from Tennessee was instructed to offer a modified amendment from the committee.

Mr. STEWART. Before the matter is voted upon, would it not be necessary to clarify the situation with respect to the pending amendment, the T. V. A. amendment? I had understood the Chair to say the amendments were not withdrawn. I am now told by one or two Senators around me that the amendments in the bill as reported by the committee were withdrawn this morning, and this new suggestion was offered by the committee as a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, but the new print does include some of the amendments which were formerly in the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the Chair understands they were all withdrawn, and this new print substituted.

Mr. STEWART. So the only T. V. A. amendments which are pending at all are the amendments which are in the committee print which was laid upon the desks of Senators this morning?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, let me make a further inquiry. The print which lies upon the desks of Senators is called a committee print, with the T. V. A. amendment, which was reported by my colleague, the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. My parliamentary inquiry is, How can this amendment be reported as a committee print when the record of the Senate shows that the bill was not recommitted to the committee, but that it has been pending in the Senate all the time, and when the Senate recessed day before yesterday it was the pending business for today?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The committee print is not a report of the committee at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. OVERTON. It is simply on the desks of Senators.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; for the information of the Senate, so the Senate can understand what was done.

Mr. STEWART. It is not actually a committee report then?

Mr. OVERTON. What the committee did was to modify its own amendment; that is all.

Mr. STEWART. The committee modified its own amendment. So this is not, then, actually a committee report?

Mr. OVERTON. It is not a committee report. The acting chairman of the committee, acting under the authority of the whole committee, has modified the committee amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Then, I submit to the Chair that the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is entirely out of order under paragraph 2 of rule XVI, because that paragraph refers to reports of the Committee on Appropriations. What we are discussing is not a report of the Committee on Appropriations. It is something which has been brought up from the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would not make it impossible to make a point against general legislation under paragraph 4.

Mr. STEWART. I want to know whether we are proceeding under paragraph 4 or paragraph 2 of rule XVI. Under paragraph 2 the whole bill should be recommitted to the committee if the Chair were to be sustained in his ruling. Is not what we have before us something which was offered on the floor of the Senate by an individual Senator, and not by way of a committee report?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] made the point in the first instance under paragraph 2.

Mr. STEWART. Under paragraph 2, as I understood.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And the point of the Senator from Tennessee is that he appropriately should have made the objection under paragraph 4. Is that correct?

Mr. STEWART. There are very decided differences between matters covered by the two paragraphs. The RECORD will show what the Senator from Washington stated, but I understood him to say that he made his point under paragraph 2, and the question was whether the bill would automatically go back to the committee.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I am not at all concerned with any principle wrapped up in this debate except that this proposition contains legislation which it is sought to tack onto an appropriation bill. I find language of prohibition in both paragraphs.

Mr. STEWART. But, if the Senator from Washington please, under paragraph 2 the whole bill would have to go back to the committee.

Mr. BONE. I am not concerned except with fitting the shoe to the right foot. I am objecting to legislation being tacked onto an appropriation bill. The Senate certainly can iron that question out without great difficulty.

Mr. STEWART. If objection is made under paragraph 2, objection lies to the whole bill.

Mr. BONE. I am objecting to the proposal brought in by the committee. I assumed the committee brought it in. It is marked "committee print."

Mr. STEWART. That is my understanding, and I did not see how the committee could do that.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BONE. No ruling has as yet been made.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Iowa desires to submit a parliamentary inquiry. He is desirous of knowing what is the question before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair overruling the point of order of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that the question of germaneness of the amendment should be submitted to the Senate stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington raised a point of order which the Chair sustained, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair made no decision on that point of order.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Chair has not ruled on the point of order made by the Senator from Washington?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair has not ruled on that point.

Mr. GILLETTE. While that question was pending the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] made a point of order bringing up the question of relevancy. Has the Chair ruled on that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the Chair has ruled on that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Chair has ruled on that, and there has been an appeal taken, I will say to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. If the question of relevancy is raised, it has, under the rule, to be submitted without debate; yet we have been debating here for an hour.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to make a point of order to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair ruled on that point on the basis, as stated repeatedly, that it was not the intent of the formulators of the rule to have the point of germaneness obviate bringing up the question of whether an amendment proposes general legislation to an appropriation measure, especially in the case where the point relating to general legislation on an appropriation measure was brought up first.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Chair refused to entertain the point of order raised by the Senator from Maryland?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair overruled the point of order made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. GILLETTE. The Chair overruled the point of order made by the Senator from Maryland?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the Chair overruled the point of order made by the Senator from Maryland, and then the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] appealed from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not want to delay the vote, but I think one of the wisest observations made in this discussion was that made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], when he called attention to paragraph 2 of rule XVI, and stated that if the point of order were made against an amendment, and that point of order were sustained, it would not automatically, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI, result in sending the bill back to the Appropriations Committee, because, as the Senator from Ohio called attention to, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI it is provided:

> The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill—

Mr. President, note that, "against the bill"—

> and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

In other words, if an amendment is brought to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Appropriations a point of order can be made against the whole bill. If the point of order is made against the whole bill and the point is sustained, then the whole bill goes back to the Committee on Appropriations. But under paragraph 4 a point of order can be made against the amendment, not against the bill, simply against the amendment, just as in the House of Representatives, if an amendment is offered and a part of it is out of order, a point of order can be made against the whole amendment, and if the point of order is sustained the whole amendment goes out; or a point of order can be made against only that part of the amendment which is out of order. In that case, if the point of order is sustained, only that part of the amendment which is out of order goes out.

All this discussion about paragraph 2 applying only to the Committee on Appropriations is true where the point of order is made against the whole bill, but where the point of order is made only to an amendment, it applies to an amendment whether it comes from the Committee on Appropriations or comes from an individual Senator on the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. HILL. That is the way the rule reads. It reads exactly as the Senator from Ohio stated it. So I do not think the Senate ought to have the idea, and I do not think it is the intent of the rule, that if an amendment is held to be out of order the whole bill must go back to the committee. If the point of order is made against the bill, and that point of order is sustained, then the bill, under paragraph 2 of the rule, would go back to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I correctly understood the Chair a moment ago, he said he entertained the question of germaneness raised by the Senator from Maryland. If the Chair did so, was he not bound under paragraph 4 of rule XVI to submit the matter to the Senate? The Chair has just said that he overruled that point, and that an appeal was taken from his ruling. Under the rules of the Senate is the Chair not bound to submit that question to the Senate?

Mr. HILL. Yes; but I think the Chair is absolutely right in holding that the first question to be determined is whether or not the matter in question is legislation. Then if it is found that the matter in question is in order, the question rises as to whether it is germane. When the question of germaneness is raised, under the rule that is a question not for the Chair to decide but for the Senate to decide.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my friend hear me for just a moment?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Chair entertains the motion of the Senator from Maryland, under the rule he must submit the question to the Senate. The Chair has entertained it, and then he has not entertained it, because he did not submit it to the Senate as the rule requires. The Chair is apparently acting with respect to the attack made by my friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], which is not addressed to the bill but to a committee amendment.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. So you are getting the advantage of it in both ways, without giving the Senate the right to pass on it in either case.

Mr. HILL. No. If a point of order is made against the amendment on the ground that it is general legislation, without regard to how the Chair might rule on that point of order, any Senator would have a right to appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and that would give the Senate the right to pass on the point of order. The Senate cannot be denied its right to pass on any point of order if a Senator wishes to appeal from the decision of the Chair. On any decision the Senate has a right to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the Senator's understanding of the point of order raised by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HILL. The point of order raised by the Senator from Washington was that the amendment was legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, under the rule was not in order.

Mr. CHANDLER. What was the procedure in connection with the point of order? First the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] made the point of order that the amendment was general legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of paragraph 2 of rule XVI. Before the Chair ruled on that point of order, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] made the point of order that, under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, the amendment was germane. Subsequently, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] made the point of order that the amendment was germane, and stated that it was the duty of the Chair to submit the question to the Senate, to be decided without debate. The Chair then overruled the point of order raised by the Senator from Maryland, and from that ruling the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] appealed. Then the Chair went a little further, and said he entertained a point of order under paragraph 4 of rule XVI. But the Chair did not submit the question on the point of order to the Senate. The Chair overruled it.

Mr. HILL. The Chair did not submit it to the Senate because it had not

reached that stage. As I understand the matter, the first question is whether the amendment is legislation. If the decision is that the amendment is in order, as legislation, the next question is whether it is germane.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If I understood the most recent statement by the President of the Senate, it seems clear to me that the ruling is erroneous, because obviously the Chair has no right, under the specific injunction of the rule, to overrule a point of order with regard to germaneness. The rule is specific and mandatory and requires the Chair to submit that question to the Senate. I would not question the right of the Chair—I do not wish to take much of the time of the Senator from Alabama——

Mr. HILL. I am glad to have the Senator proceed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would not question the right of the Chair to determine whether he would entertain a point of order when another is pending. That raises an entirely different issue.

But if, as the Chair most recently stated, the Chair had overruled the point of order of germaneness, as made by the Senator from Maryland, and if the Senator from Tennessee had appealed from that decision, if question then should arise as to whether the decision of the Chair should stand as the decision of the Senate, it seems to me the rule is clear that the Chair has no power to overrule a point of order on germaneness or relevancy.

I understood, in all the confusion and discussion, that the position of the Chair, as stated, other than in the Chair's ruling, was that the Chair felt that the point of order made by the Senator from Washington could not be or should not be displaced by a subsequent point of order concerning germaneness. That question is entirely different from the one most recently stated by the Chair, namely, that the Chair had overruled the point of order relative to germaneness made by the Senator from Maryland, and that the appeal would come on that basis, because it seems to me the rule is clear that the Chair has no right to rule on the question of germaneness or relevancy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems to me that the question presented by the appeal is the very simple one of whether the Chair, even the Vice President of the United States, the constitutional Presiding Officer of the Senate, has a right to disregard the rules of the Senate. The question presented, as I understand it, by the appeal is the question whether the Chair is required by the rules of the Senate to submit the question of germaneness to a vote of the Senate. The latest decision of the Chair is, not that the Chair was not required to submit it at this time because of the pendency of a point of order made by the Senator from Washington, but that the Chair had entertained the point of order of the Senator from Maryland, and had overruled it.

Mr. President, I insist that under the plain language of paragraph 4 of rule XVI, the Chair is prohibited from undertaking to pass on the question of germaneness, either to overrule or to sustain the point of order on the question of germaneness. I insist, Mr. President, that the question on appeal should be the question whether the Chair is required to submit a point of order on the question of germaneness, under rule XVI, and that if the Chair is overruled on that contention, the question of germaneness then should be submitted to the Senate. Because there are some Senators, probably many Senators, who certainly do not desire to sustain such an arbitrary decision on the part of the Chair, namely, a decision by which the Chair assumed to overrule a point of order on the question of germaneness, who might, on the vote on the question on the merits of the matter of germaneness, consider that the amendment was not germane, and that therefore the point of order of the Senator from Maryland was well taken.

But it seems to me that the Senate is entitled to vote first on the question whether the Chair is required to submit the question to the Senate; and that if the Chair is overruled on that question, the next question is that of germaneness.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that sufficient Senators will be present when a vote is taken on this question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Reed
Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gerry	Robertson
Bailey	Gillette	Russell
Ball	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bankhead	Hayden	Smith
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Bridges	La Follette	Tydings
Buck	Langer	Vandenberg
Burton	McCarran	Wagner
Bushfield	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Butler	McFarland	Weeks
Byrd	McKellar	Wheeler
Capper	Maloney	Wherry
Chandler	Maybank	White
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wiley
Connally	Millikin	Willis
Danaher	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Davis	Overton	
Downey	Radcliffe	

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Chair wishes to state, because some Senators who were not previously in the Chamber may now have entered——

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Chair state the effect of a yea-and-nay vote on the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Because this is a matter which may have some importance for the future of the Senate, and because the question may arise on many occasions in the future, the Chair feels that the Senate should have the full background of the point at issue.

There have been several precedents with regard to the matter. The Chair has been disturbed as to the precedents. The one which the Chair read earlier had to do with an amendment relating to the Rural Electrification Administration. The Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, said:

> Mr. President, no question of germaneness has been raised. The point is that the amendment is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Presiding Officer then proceeded, at the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and stated that the proviso was germane, and the point was never passed upon as to whether or not the amendment was general legislation.

The Chair felt that that was incorrect. He felt that that was not the intent of those who originally wrote rule XVI in its entirety.

The point was then made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that the section was not germane. The Chair ruled on that point. The Chair did not intend to rule that the Senate did not have a right to pass on the germaneness in general, but intended to rule that the Senate did not have the right to pass upon the question of germaneness at that time, because of the fact that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] had already raised the issue that the amendment was general legislation in a general appropriation bill. The Chair definitely felt that the Senate should not be estopped from a decision on that point, because of the question of germaneness having subsequently been raised.

The Chair should have ruled—though in the haste of the moment he did not so rule—that the objection made by the Senator from Maryland at that time was out of order. That was the intention of the Chair. At that time the objection was out of order. In view of the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the question previously stated, the Chair does not know whether the Senate would entertain a change in the ruling to that effect—that at that time the motion was out of order. It will be shown by the statements surrounding the issue that that definitely was the intention of the Chair. However, the statement, as boiled down by the Parliamentarian, did not have that in it. It should have been in it.

The Chair will now state the intent of the ruling of the Chair:

It is the ruling of the Chair that the point of order of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that the question of germaneness of the amendment should be submitted to the Senate was out of order at that time.

The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk has already started the calling of the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is a vote "yea" a vote to sustain the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote "yea" is a vote to sustain the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understood that once before the calling of the roll was interrupted, or almost interrupted. I think we should adhere to the rule, and not permit interruptions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I desire information to advise me how to vote on this question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will give the Senator advice. Vote "nay."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Maine to withdraw his objection?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine accede to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WHITE. I thought the matter was disposed of.

Mr. STEWART. I merely wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry for my own information, for the purpose of aiding me in casting my vote.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who if present would vote "nay," and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending a funeral.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Utah.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—17

Aiken	Burton	Langer
Austin	Butler	Mead
Ball	Danaher	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Downey	Tunnell
Barkley	Gillette	Wagner
Bone	Hill	

NAYS—46

Andrews	Holman	Shipstead
Bailey	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brewster	La Follette	Stewart
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	McClellan	Tydings
Bushfield	McFarland	Vandenberg
Byrd	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	Maloney	Weeks
Chandler	Maybank	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wherry
Connally	Overton	White
Davis	Radcliffe	Wiley
Eastland	Reed	Willis
George	Revercomb	Wilson
Gerry	Robertson	
Hawkes	Russell	

NOT VOTING—33

Bilbo	Gurney	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hatch	Pepper
Caraway	Hayden	Reynolds
Chavez	Jackson	Scrugham
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Cordon	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Moore	Tobey
Glass	Murdock	Truman
Green	Murray	Wallgren
Guffey	Nye	Walsh, N. J.

So the Senate refused to sustain the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair submits to the Senate the question, Is the amendment germane? (Putting the question:) The ayes have it, and the amendment is ruled to be germane.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment, which as the Senate knows, requires the Tennessee Valley Authority to turn all its receipts quarterly into the Treasury, and then an appropriation has to be made to provide money for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, the language in the bill as it passed the House, as well as the language which has appeared in appropriation bills for the past 9 years making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, sets up a special T. V. A. fund in the Treasury Department. Under that language, for the past 9 years all receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been paid into the special fund in the Treasury. Not one dollar has been drawn out of that fund by the Tennessee Valley Authority except as the money has been appropriated out of that fund by the Congress of the United States for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Under language carried in the bill today, as well as the language carried in the bills during the last 9 years, Congress has specifically appropriated the receipts turned by the Authority into the Tennessee Valley Authority fund for the fiscal year, so that having turned all its receipts into the Treasury, it had a right to draw on and pay out those funds. However, I wish to emphasize that not one dollar can be drawn out except when it has been expressly appropriated by the Congress.

What Congress has done in the past has been to provide that the receipts for a particular fiscal year could be drawn out of that fund. That is the way the language carried in the bill as it passed the House reads. It gives to the Tennessee Valley Authority the right to make use of the receipts which it takes in during a given fiscal year. In fact, in the bill providing funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the last fiscal year, and for the coming fiscal year, as carried in the House language, no new funds have been provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority. What the Congress did was to make these funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and also make available to the Authority any unexpended balance which might be left in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund at the end of the fiscal year, June 30.

Under such procedure the Tennessee Valley Authority for the past 9 years has gone before the Bureau of the Budget and submitted its estimates, just as all other departments of the Government go before the Bureau of the Budget and submit their estimates.

I have before me the estimates of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the coming fiscal year, ending June 30, 1945. An examination of the estimates shows that the Tennessee Valley Authority has submitted its estimates in the same detailed manner as was done by other agencies and departments of the Government.

Under the law the Tennessee Valley Authority each year makes its annual report. I have before me the last annual

report, for 1943. The report contains some 323 pages, and an examination of it shows how detailed it is. The report goes into detail concerning all the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and gives all details concerning the expenditure of its funds.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has to go before the House Committee on Appropriations in exactly the same way as all other Government agencies which expend Government funds go before that committee. The T. V. A. submits to that committee in detail its estimates, and its break-down of the money which it needs and expects to expend. The Tennessee Valley Authority is subjected to examination and investigation by the House Appropriations Committee, just as all other agencies of the Government are subjected to similar examination and investigation.

When the appropriation bill comes to the Senate, the Tennessee Valley Authority goes before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. There, before that committee, it is subjected to the same examination and to the same investigation, so far as its funds are concerned, and so far as its receipts and expenditures are concerned, to which every other agency of the Government is subjected.

In other words, the Tennessee Valley Authority by Budget estimates, by its annual report, by its appearance before both the House committee and the Senate committee makes the same statement to the Congress with reference to its expenditures that every other agency of the Government has to make.

Mr. President, the money comes out of the Treasury only through appropriations by the Congress. What, then, is the issue in dispute here? The question is whether the Tennessee Valley Authority should put its funds into the Treasury and have the Congress appropriate those funds as they are received, so that the Tennessee Valley Authority may use them when they come in, or whether the Tennessee Valley Authority shall have all its funds deposited in the Treasury, to remain there and then come to the Congress and have the Congress appropriate money out of the Treasury for the expenses and the needs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. By being allowed, as the Authority has been allowed to do for the past 10 years, to use these funds through the appropriation by the Congress the Tennessee Valley Authority has more flexibility, has greater leeway to meet emergencies and meet unexpected situations which may arise during a fiscal year than if specific and definite appropriations were made by the Congress months ahead of the time when the emergencies or the unexpected needs might arise.

During the period from September 1939 to December 1941, that very critical period in the life of our country, when it became so imperative for us to build up our defenses, to increase our war production and when it became so necessary to develop as much electric power as possible, the Tennessee Valley Authority was able to produce 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power in excess of its contract commitments. It was able to produce that much needed additional power because of efficient management, but more particularly because it was not tied down too tightly to specific amounts that had been appropriated months before the need for the additional power arose, and because it was allowed to use its receipts, which provided the Authority with sufficient money to enable it to go ahead and produce the additional power to meet this urgent need.

Mr. President, on January 13 last Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, wrote a letter to the Hon. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as follows:

As you know, the War Production Board has recently found it necessary to stop work on certain electric-generating projects of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the War Department.

That work was stopped on account of the need for critical materials on more urgent projects.

All of these projects—

Mr. Nelson continues:

All of these projects had been authorized by the Congress and appropriations had been made for them.

Major new electric projects are among the chief competitors with our most urgent and important war program, such as rubber, aviation, gasoline, heavy bombers, warships, merchant ships, ammunition, and lend-lease. Because of the exceedingly tight situation as to critical materials, manufacturing facilities, and manpower for such programs, it has been necessary for us to operate and plan on the basis of close margins in the electric field.

In consequence, if changing conditions at any time during the next 6 months should dictate expansion of our existing power program, it would be necessary to reinstate some of the halted Federal projects on very short notice. In that event, any delay in resuming work might prevent completion of the project in time to meet power requirements in the area affected. We have planned our power program with a high degree of flexibility so that we shall be able to meet all contingencies, provided only that the operating Government agencies which we count upon to provide expansion will themselves be in a position to act with promptness.

In order that we may be prepared for quick action, as circumstances may require, I should like to enlist the cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget in measures to make funds available to the Government power agencies so that the moment the War Production Board decides that any particular project must be reinstated the money for that purpose will be immediately available. Until just before the decision to reinstate any project it is impossible to specify the projects or the total capacity which it might be necessary to have. However, on the basis of present outlook, there is a possibility that at some time prior to the end of this fiscal year we should want to reinstate as much as several hundred thousand kilowatts of capacity for the Department of the Interior, several hundred thousand for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and a substantial although lesser amount for the War Department, all to be selected from among the projects recently halted.

I shall greatly appreciate your advice as to what steps are necessary to be prepared, from the budgetary standpoint, for such a program. We shall, of course, be glad to go over this matter with you in detail, and, if desirable, I shall be glad to present to the appropriate committees of the Congress the urgent necessity for the measures I am recommending.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. NELSON.

In other words, Mr. Donald Nelson, who is responsible for the war production of this country, who is responsible for getting the guns, the ships, the planes, and the equipment to our boys in all the many different theaters of the battle line, told Mr. Smith, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, that additional power might be needed from the Tennessee Valley Authority, and advised Mr. Smith to make sure that there was sufficient flexibility so far as the funds of the Tennessee Valley Authority were concerned so that they could when and if needed step up their power production.

In that connection let me read a telegram which I received only this morning from Decatur, Ala., which is in the Tennessee Valley Authority area. The telegram, which is addressed to me, reads:

Let me give you an illustration of the danger to war industry in the six States served by T. V. A. if the Congress must pass on all expenditures. At the present time Goodyear Decatur Mills has called for 7,000 horsepower needed to produce rayon tire fabric, No. 1 on the critical material list of the armed forces. This means T. V. A. must spend $40,000 immediately to make that power available within a month or two. Further, war plants at Decatur have increased power requirements so rapidly and so heavily that our central substation transformers must be changed to larger ones before hot weather. If they are not changed the present transformers will burn up this summer and cause interruption to power for the entire city for at least 2 days at the minimum. These transformers may not be on hand and will have to be purchased. They will cost approximately $50,000. All these things cannot always be foreseen.

Multiply this illustration in hundreds of communities and cities in the six States depending upon T. V. A. for power and you will understand readily why T. V. A. must have flexibility in handling of funds.

The telegram is signed by Mr. Barrett C. Shelton, representing the people of the 13 north Alabama counties in the T. V. A. area.

Mr. President, those are merely small illustrations of the fact that months in advance neither Congress nor anyone else can determine exactly what the need will be for expenditures in the operation of a great power system such as the Tennessee Valley Authority.

If the Tennessee Valley Authority is to be operated on an efficient, businesslike basis, and if it is to be allowed to meet the changing and compelling needs of war, it must have flexibility with reference to the expenditure of its funds, it must be able to make expenditures the need for which no person could foresee months in advance. There could be no better illustration than that provided by the telegram of what the situation will be if the Congress undertakes ahead of time to say in detail just what these expenditures shall be.

The very history of the bill now before the Senate shows how impossible it is even for the Senate Committee on Appropriations to know about the details of

the management and operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The distinguished acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], first offered a number of amendments to the bill in the subcommittee. Under those amendments, the fertilizer program of the Tennessee Valley Authority would have been absolutely destroyed, the power program of the Tennessee Valley Authority would have been seriously impaired. The Tennessee Valley Authority in its operations would have been literally gutted.

Then the Senator from Tennessee, realizing that many of those amendments were not practical, that the Tennessee Valley Authority could not operate efficiently, on a businesslike basis, with such amendments in the law, himself agreed to the withdrawal of some of them.

The bill as reported to the Senate contained other amendments, limitations on expenditures, fixed expenditures, where the expenditures would have to be made months ahead of time. After the bill was reported with those amendments, the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee, who was the author of the amendments, on his own motion took the amendments back to the Committee on Appropriations, and asked for authority to withdraw some 16 of them, showing that he realized how impractical were the amendments, how harmful they would be to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and that the Congress of the United States could not under any circumstances be justified in adopting them.

Even now, Mr. President, as we find the bill before us, it does not make sufficient appropriations to carry on even the work and the projects which the committee itself has approved. If the bill shall pass appropriating what it now provides, the Tennessee Valley Authority will lack some $30,000,000 necessary to meet obligations and commitments now outstanding against the Authority, and to carry out the program as approved by the committee for the next fiscal year.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RADCLIFFE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I should like very much to secure from the Vice President, as Presiding Officer, a decision on the status of my point of order, which did not go to the question of relevancy but to the question of the amendment being legislation on an appropriation bill. It is conceivable, I suspect, even as a question of pure law, that a proposal in a bill might be relevant, and still constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

I do not seek to prolong the discussion; I should merely like to have a decision of the Chair on that matter, and then I can let it rest. I should like to know the status of the point I submitted. It is smothered up now and forgotten, and no one knows anything about it. I confess I do not know its status, and I think that in order to bring to repose the issues which were threshed out today, the question should be decided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was not in the chair when the point was made by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I raise the question now, while the Vice President is in the Chamber, and I think we can bring this matter to repose here promptly, if the Vice President will take the chair and decide that my point no longer exists. I raised the point of order that the amendment was legislation on an appropriation bill, and that matter has not yet been disposed of. I should like to know whether it is still pending, because I intend to present it again, if it is within the rules for me to do so.

The question was raised in the discussion here this morning that, by the process we employed here today, the Senate would not be permitted to pass on the point of order I raised. That does not outrage my feelings; I am merely curious to know the status of a suggestion of that kind from a Member of the Senate, if it is raised against an amendment in an appropriation bill, that it is general legislation. I want the point decided.

I suggest the matter to the Chair, and ask the Vice President, as Presiding Officer, to decide the status of my point of order against the pending amendment.

I am sorry if I have interrupted the Senator from Alabama. I hope he will forgive me, but I was fearful that I would not be able to reach this matter while the Vice President was present if I did not do so at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair observes that, under the precedents, whenever the Senate has ruled that a particular amendment is germane, the Senate thereupon has concluded, either directly or indirectly, that the question of whether or not it is general legislation in an appropriation bill does not arise.

The Chair is not aware of the basis on which that conclusion was arrived at, but that does happen to be the precedent, and in view of the tendency of the Senate always to rule on the merits of the instant case rather than on the merits of the Senate rules, the Chair, in view of the recent happenings, does not care to open the matter again and have the Senate operate upon him again in the same way. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the committee amendment shall be adopted and the T. V. A. denied the use of its receipts, and if it has to depend upon the sum of $79,134,882, carried in the bill, then the T. V. A. will find itself in the position of having obligations outstanding as of June 30, 1944, estimated to total approximately $30,000,000, and with no funds with which to meet those obligations. The T. V. A. will begin the fiscal year with $30,000,000 of obligations without a dollar with which to meet them. It will find itself without a reserve fund of some $8,500,000 to be used to complete construction of the Watauga and the Holston Dams and for the construction of the phosphorus plant at Mobile, Ala., if the War Production Board shall say that its construction should go forward for war purposes.

It will also find itself without any funds, so far as possible expansion of power facilities for war purposes requiring additional expenditures beyond estimates for operations of steam plants, and purchase of energy from neighboring systems. Under the language now in the bill, without the committee amendments, we know that such expenditures would be met by increased revenues. If we are to meet the obligations which the Tennessee Valley Authority will owe on the 1st of July, obligations to private citizens, to taxpayers of the United States, we will be $30,000,000 short of the funds necessary to carry out the program of operations for the Tennessee Valley Authority as approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

What I am wondering is what the Senate Committee on Appropriations has in mind? Does the committee mean that the Tennessee Valley Authority shall not meet its obligations, that it shall not pay its debts? Does it mean that it shall not construct the necessary transmission lines, so that the new power which will come into being at the great Fontana Dam and at the great Kentucky Dam may not flow into the Tennessee Valley power system? Does it mean that the other construction now going on which will develop more power for war production, and produce increased returns to the T. V. A., and to the Treasury, shall be stopped? Does it mean that the fertilizer program shall be discontinued so that there may be a saving in that respect of some $4,000,000 to be paid on these commitments? I am wondering just what the Senate Committee on Appropriations has in mind in not making provision for at least these obligations involving some $30,000,000. If those obligations are not met, if the money is not provided to meet them, it would make it impossible to pay vendors and constructors for materials and supplies such as cement, coal, coke, lumber, steel transmission towers, services rendered under war relocation contracts, or bridge construction contracts, or to meet unpaid bills for freight, express and passenger fares.

Furthermore, Mr. President, contractors would presumably be asked to forego refundable deposits in the nature of performance bonds which they have placed with the T. V. A. These unpaid obligations will amount to some $10,000,000 alone on June 30, 1944. The contractors who have put up money as performance bonds, when they have carried out their contracts, are entitled to have their money returned to them; and yet under the appropriations provided by the Committee on Appropriations, no money will be available to refund this money, that is, unless certain operations which the committee has approved for the next fiscal year are not to be carried out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is perfectly justified in showing his concern for the proper functioning and, I may say, the proper development and proper

financing of all the T. V. A. activities, and it is to that phase of the matter I understand he is directing his remarks?

Mr. HILL. I am.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe the Senator would be well advised if he would assume that whenever the T. V. A. comes before the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and shows that it needs funds for any particular purpose the Congress will appropriate the funds so that there will be no hiatus between performance of work, or the proper development, and the payment for it. I can appreciate that the Senator wants to make that as certain as possible, but the committee, by taking this action, does not intend that there shall be no money on which the T. V. A. may operate. What the committee wants to be certain of, however, is that when money is needed the Congress shall authorize it so that some check may be kept on the operations.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that the money is needed now, and yet the committee has failed to provide the money. I wish to say to the Senator that I believe he does not have any more faith in the committees of the House and the Senate than I have, but the committees of the House and the Senate simply cannot operate a great power system 500 miles away from their committee rooms.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct, and the committees are not going to attempt to operate the system. What the Senate committee wants is to have the T. V. A. make known to the committee how much it needs for current operations each year, how much it needs for developments so that we, who are the parent of it all, may help develop whatever there is to be developed there in unison, and not have an unchecked operation. If that organization is entitled to or needs money now in addition to any money it may have available, all it has to do is to come before the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Senate and make out a case. It can do that in 30 days; it can do it in 60 days; and if the proposition has merit I shall be glad to help the Senator to see that sufficient funds are provided.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the trouble is that the Tennessee Valley Authority has just been before the committee and has just made out its case, and yet it has not been given the funds needed to meet the obligations and carry out the program as approved by the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will allow me, I should venture this interpretation: As I understand, the law gives authority to the T. V. A. to take out of revenues such sums as necessary to maintain the plants, and make replacements, and so forth.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that all I am fighting for is that right which the law gives the T. V. A., but under the committee amendment that right is taken away from it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not so interpret it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Maryland say why he does not so interpret it?

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say before we leave that point that I have talked with other Senators whose States are directly affected by the proposed action, Senators from States in which some of the operations of the T. V. A. are now taking place, and certainly those Senators would not want to favor legislation which would cripple the proper functioning of the plant, and they assure me—and they have studied the law well—that there is ample authority in the existing law for repairs and replacements of transformers, lines, and general operations, without coming back to Congress.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct, that that right exists in existing law. That is why I oppose the suggested amendment. The Senator is a good lawyer, and if he will read the amendment, he will see that under it the Tennessee Valley Authority cannot spend one red copper cent out of its receipts, no matter how urgent the need may be. No matter how great the emergency may be, how compelling it may be, they cannot use their receipts. The Senator is a good lawyer. I am glad he raised the question. I read from the committee amendment, page 2, line 15:

> And all the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1945 and subsequent fiscal years, shall be covered quarterly into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

So the T. V. A. would be required to put all its funds into the Treasury and would not be allowed to expend any of them.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not interpret the provision in that way at all.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is a far better lawyer than is the Senator from Alabama. If that is not what the language of the proposed amendment states I want the Senator to tell me what it states.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us narrow the issue first of all to see what is in dispute. Does the Senator mean to say that the Tennessee Valley Authority must instantly turn over to the United States Government every cent it takes in?

Mr. HILL. No; I do not mean that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then we have eliminated that part of it. Then under the Senator's interpretation how much can the T. V. A. retain of its receipts?

Mr. HILL. Not a single penny. The language says that all receipts must be turned in quarterly. That means at the end of 90 days every dollar that is coming in must go into the Treasury. So that if every dollar and every penny must go into the Treasury at the end of 90 days, the T. V. A. cannot spend the money, because if it spent it it would be violating the law which says it must turn it in to the Treasury.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, the Senator's position is that, of all the money which comes into the T. V. A., not a single penny at any time can be kept by the T. V. A. to pay its expenses; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. So far as receipts are concerned.

Mr. TYDINGS. I say, of all the money.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. But I wish to be frank. I say to the Senator that from all the receipts which come in from the sale of power, fertilizer, or from any other source, if the proposed amendment is agreed to by the Senate and by the House, and becomes the law of the land, the T. V. A. will not be able to spend a single penny out of its receipts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Why not?

Mr. TYDINGS. To confine it a little further, let us suppose that the amendment becomes part of the law, and let us assume that the employees of the T. V. A. are paid twice a month. Does the Senator believe that after the law is signed, no one working for the T. V. A. will receive any pay——

Mr. HILL. No; I would not say that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why not?

Mr. HILL. Because if Congress had appropriated the money with which the T. V. A. was to pay salaries, it could pay them, but the employees of the T. V. A. could not receive any pay out of the receipts.

Mr. TYDINGS. In this very bill, the appropriation figure is "$79,134,882."

Mr. HILL. That is an appropriation which, I say, is, at a minimum, $30,000,000 short of meeting the commitments of the T. V. A. and of meeting the program which the Senate Committee on Appropriations has approved for the next fiscal year.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the point I make is, Will not the T. V. A. have $79,134,882 in its treasury, to use for its expenses?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct as to that. The T. V. A. would have the $79,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and that $79,000,000 is nothing more than a reappropriation of the receipts turned in and handed back to the T. V. A. for a specific purpose.

Mr. HILL. Of course. But there is a vast difference, I say to the Senator. That makes the T. V. A. absolutely dependent, in respect to the expenditure of every penny, on a direct, specific appropriation. That is where the issue arises, and that is what I am opposed to. I think the T. V. A. should have a certain amount of flexibility in order to meet emergencies, to meet unexpected situations brought about either by war or weather or other causes, by using its receipts. Under the amendment, although its transactions will be checked by the Comptroller General, and will also be subject to a private commercial audit, yet it will have to go before the Bureau of the Budget, it will have to make its annual report to Congress, it will have to go before the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and then the appropriation bills will have to be threshed out on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to say I am not quarreling with the Senator's general position——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator is not quarreling with my position, I hope he will vote with me.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will permit me to complete my statement, I was saying that I am not quarreling with

the Senator's general position, but with his specific position. If the Senator will permit me to explain, I shall do so.

We are coming to the time when we shall have a national debt of $300,000,000,000, which is $8,500 for every family in America, rich or poor, black or white. However, that is only the national debt. There are the State, city, and county debts, and there are also the private debts. Already the burden of taxation is far inadequate to supply the funds necessary to keep the debt down.

Here is an agency for which Congress has appropriated nearly $800,000,000. Does not the Senator feel that the time has now come when the Congress should look into the operations of that agency, and should take back into the Treasury such part of its receipts as the Congress may deem wise to take back, leaving the remaining part of its receipts to be spent by the T. V. A., under congressional approval? That is my specific objection.

I do not feel that in time of war we can afford to drive up still higher a $300,000,000,000 debt, without saving out of the T. V. A. and all other agencies in America every reasonable dollar which present wartime conditions will permit us to save.

Mr. HILL. I say to the Senator that I share his concern for economy; but when we fail to give to the T. V. A. the necessary flexibility so that it can meet the wartime production needs, and so that it can take care of unexpected and emergency situations, we do not practice economy. We reduce the revenues; we waste power which is available; and, instead of running the power system on an efficient, economical, businesslike basis, we run it on a wasteful, inefficient, unbusinesslike basis.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree that it would be idle to cut the T. V. A.'s funds to the point where the T. V. A could not operate, with the result of diminishing returns, rather than full returns. But I do not believe that will be the case in this matter. Let me say to the Senator that if one is to be in favor of economy, he must be in favor of economy, and the "but" must be there with a small "b," not a capital "B." Otherwise, all the talk is just so much chatter, and produces no economy at all.

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. But we reach the point of diminishing returns, where the so-called economy is not economy at all, but is a matter of waste.

By way of illustration, let me say that if the T. V. A. does not have sufficient money to enable it to buy or install the necessary transmission lines to bring the new power which will come from the Fontana Dam into the power system, where that power can be sold to customers, where the T. V. A. cannot only get back the cost of generating the power but also a reasonable profit which will pay the interest on the investment and will help amortize the cost—in other words, if we put the T. V. A. in a position where it will have to waste that power, rather than obtain a return on it—that is not economy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, I do not think we are in that position.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that no one has more faith in the Congress than have I. But the Senator from Maryland, who has been in the Congress a long time—I think he and I entered the Congress together; he was elected to the Senate long before I was, but we entered the House of Representatives together—knows that, with all the conscientiousness of Congress, there are many delays incident to congressional action. Right on this floor, at times, matters have come up which have provoked long debate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not interrupt him further. I simply wish to make this rejoinder: If, during the conduct of this war, with so many lives dependent on congressional appropriations, the Army and the Navy, with their long-range program, can obtain sufficient funds in advance to give the men in the service everything in the world they need in the way of weapons, equipment, and munitions, I fail to see how the peacetime activity of the T. V. A., with its smaller problem, cannot do what the Army and the Navy have been doing ever since the present war started.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the distinguished and amiable Senator——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to describe me as being amiable. I do not think that is a compliment. I do not want to be too amiable. [Laughter.] I have my hand on my knife right now.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator if he will distinguish between the T. V. A. and the Post Office Department.

Mr. TYDINGS. Or between the T. V. A. and the Army and the Navy.

Mr. REED. The Post Office Department is a business institution which is transacting business all over the country and all over the world, with its foreign mail. It makes payments for service by airplanes, railroads, and steamers. It pays several hundred thousand employees. It does many times the annual business the T. V. A. does. The Post Office Department turns into the Treasury every cent it collects, and in turn it receives appropriations from the Congress, and gets along with them. Will the Senator from Alabama distinguish between the Post Office Department and the T. V. A. and tell us why the T. V. A. should be accorded an exemption from certain rules of governmental and legislative business which the Post Office Department has always been able to follow, and now follows?

Mr. HILL. There are many differences, in my opinion, between the Post Office Department and the T. V. A. In the first place, the Post Office Department in many respects is more or less static. It is about the same today as it was 10 or 15 or 20 years ago. It has grown very slowly through the years from the beginning of our country.

The T. V. A. is a great power system which has come into being in only a few years. It has many different business operations. It has many construction projects involving dams, transmission lines, relocation of roads, and so forth. It has a great fertilizer program. The T. V. A. is operated as it must be operated, as a business corporation. It must be operated as a business corporation, and must have that flexibility in the use of its funds and in the making of its expenditures that a private business corporation has.

In asking flexibility for the T. V. A. we are not asking for something which has not been granted to other Government agencies. A much greater flexibility than has been granted for the T. V. A., or than is asked today for T. V. A., has been granted the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Inland Waterways Corporation, the War Shipping Administration under the Maritime Commission, and other Government corporations. We must bear in mind that when we have a Government corporation which must operate as a private business, that corporation, if it is to be operated on a businesslike and efficient basis, must have a certain flexibility with reference to its funds, akin to the flexibility that a private corporation enjoys. If a private corporation needs money it can borrow it from a bank. It can issue bonds, and sell them. Under certain circumstances it can issue new stock to get money. But the Tennessee Valley Authority cannot borrow money. It has only one way of getting money, and that is either from the receipts it takes in, or from money directly appropriated for it out of the Treasury by the Congress.

My distinguished colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] has called my attention to a telegram which he and I received this morning from the Tennessee Valley, in north Alabama. I read this telegram earlier in my remarks, and I will not read it again, but Mr. Barrett Shelton, the sender of the telegram, speaking for the people of the Tennessee Valley in north Alabama, calls attention to the fact that at the present time the great Goodyear Decatur Mills, which are producing rayon tire fabric, one of the bottlenecks in this war, needs immediately additional power. To get that additional power the T. V. A. must spend something like $40,000. When the estimates were made for this fiscal year, some 18 months ago, there was no way in the world for any one to visualize that $40,000 would be needed for additional power to produce rubber for the war effort of the United States.

Earlier in my remarks I read a letter which Mr. Donald Nelson wrote to Harold Smith, Director of the Budget, emphasizing the need for flexibility with reference to the funds of the T. V. A. and emphasizing the fact that the War Production Board would likely have to call upon the T. V. A. for additional power for war production, and stating that if the T. V. A. were to be able to meet these compelling needs for additional power it would have to have the

funds with which to meet the needs, with which to install new transformers and additional units, or to run extra transmission lines which might be required.

Whenever we tie the T. V. A. down to estimates made 18 months ahead of time, we hamstring it. We throttle it. We make impossible its efficient and businesslike operation. As I stated a few minutes ago, we know the delays incident to obtaining appropriations from Congress. We are familiar with the long, continuous route. First an estimate must go to the Budget Bureau for approval. Testimony and evidence must be submitted to the Budget Bureau. Then the request goes to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, which holds hearings and takes the testimony of witnesses. Perhaps there are weeks of delay in the subcommittee. Then there is action by the full committee. Perhaps there is further delay before the bill can be considered by the House of Representatives. Then, when the bill is passed by the House, it must go to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. There may be further delay before the bill can even be taken up for hearings by the subcommittee. There is delay in the subcommittee and delay in the full committee. Then, perhaps, the bill is reported to the Senate. The Senate may be engaged in a long and protracted debate, which is not an unusual situation, when no appropriation bill can be taken up. Therefore there is further delay. So, no matter what may be the good will of the Congress toward the T. V. A., no matter how well the Congress may wish the T. V. A. in its operations, the fact remains that the procedure is such that there is inevitably delay in obtaining appropriations from the Congress.

Earlier in my remarks, when some Senators now present were not in the Chamber, I called attention to the fact that from September 1939, until about March 1941, in that crucial period of our history when it was so necessary to obtain all the power we could, to build all the guns, tanks, ships, and airplanes possible, the T. V. A., because it had the money, was able to increase its power over and above its estimates and its contractual commitments, to the extent of 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate too long by indulging in a twice-told tale, but I wish to reiterate what I said in the beginning. Under the language carried in the bill as it passed the House, without the proposed amendment, every dollar of the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority would go into the Treasury, and not a single dollar would be taken out except through appropriations by the Congress. In the past the Congress has appropriated the receipts at the beginning of the fiscal year, so that as the receipts came in during the fiscal year they were subject to expenditure by the Tennessee Valley Authority. We could have no more perfect illustration of the reason why this committee amendment ought not to be adopted, and why we ought not to put the Tennessee Valley Authority absolutely at the mercy of Congress for every penny it expends than what has happened in connection with this very bill. Amendments were withdrawn by their author in the subcommittee, because, after they were offered, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the author, realized that they were not practical and that they could not possibly be justified. Yesterday the Senator from Tennessee, acting chairman of the committee, and author of additional amendments, called his committee together to obtain the consent of the committee to withdraw 16 of the amendments which the committee had reported.

It was brought out in the debate on this floor during 2 preceding days that there would be no way in the world by which to justify the amendments. They would have seriously hamstrung and hampered the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority. For 9 years the Tennessee Valley Authority has gone forward with a great development under a provision of law identical with that in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives. There is not a single Senator who will rise on this floor and say that the management of the T. V. A., on the whole, has not been efficient, capable, or businesslike. Most of us who know it intimately feel that its management has been magnificent. Why now change it? Why now destroy its flexibility? Why now hamstring and hamper the Tennessee Valley Authority when we know that under the committee amendment an appropriation is asked for which would be at a minimum $30,000,000 short of what the Tennessee Valley Authority must have in order to meet outstanding obligations, and to carry out the program of operations as approved by the committee itself for the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, a moment ago I spoke of the efficient operation of this great Authority. I think that at this point I should read a telegram which came to me this morning, entirely unsolicited on my part, signed by men who I believe my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] will join me in saying are as outstanding and as authoritative as spokesmen as could be found in the Tennessee Valley in the State of Alabama. The telegram reads:

DECATUR, ALA., *March 22, 1944.*

Senator LISTER HILL,
Washington, D. C.:

We have read what Senator MCKELLAR has said of Chairman Lilienthal. Our dealings with T. V. A. have been satisfactory, pleasant, and in keeping with honest business practice. Lilienthal, in our experience, is an honest, sincere, and faithful public servant. He is directing T. V. A. in the public interest as inteded by Congress.

T. R. Harrison, mayor, Decatur, Morgan County; R. H. Richardson, Jr., mayor, Athens, Limestone; Isaac Johnson, probate judge, Moulton, Lawrence; Senator John Benson, Scottsboro, Jackson; A. W. McAllister, mayor, Huntsville, Madison; Dr. E. H. Couch, mayor, Guntersville, Marshall; Dr. J. A. Keller, president, State Teachers College, Florence, Lauderdale; Andrew Johnson, probate judge, Fort Payne, De Kalb; J. L. Andrews, Sheffield, Colbert; A. A. Griffith, circuit judge, Cullman; Edgar Underwood, probate judge, Franklin; Senator Lem Cobb, Center, Cherokee; Julian Harris, circuit judge, Decatur; Jap Bryant, mayor, Bessemer, Jefferson; A. N. Cameron, mayor, Tarrant City, Jefferson.

Judge Cullman presides over our circuit court, which is the highest nisi prius court, next only to our supreme court, which is our high court of appeals.

Knowing those gentlemen as I do, knowing the positions of responsibility and leadership which they occupy, and knowing that they have all been chosen to their positions by the people themselves, being elected to be public servants in all the counties of Alabama served by the T. V. A., I do not believe it would be possible for Mr. Lilienthal, or his work as Chairman, to receive a finer testimonial than is conveyed in this telegram

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I take it from what the Senator has said that he thinks the amendment is simply put into the bill to hamstring the administration of the T. V. A. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. HILL. I think the amendment would very seriously hamstring the administration of the T. V. A. I do not in any way question the motive or the sincerity of the author of the amendment, I may say to the Senator, but it is certain that the amendment would very seriously hamper the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I can see no justification or reason for it. I do not wish to keep going over the subject, but the Comptroller General checks into the management of the T. V. A. We have the Budget Bureau, the committees of Congress and Congress itself, and all of them have proclaimed the efficient, sound, and businesslike management, and when people journey from various parts of the world to the Tennessee Valley Authority because they have heard of what a magnificent job is being done by it, after 9 years of operation of the T. V. A., why should we change it now? Why hamstring it now? The amendment of the committee would hamstring it, because if the appropriation remains as it has been reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, it would give the T. V. A. a very minimum of $30,000,000 less than the record shows the Tennessee Valley Authority will need.

As I said before the Senator came upon the floor, if this amendment shall be adopted and the appropriation shall be carried as recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, either the T. V. A. will have to refuse to meet some $30,000,000 of outstanding obligations, debts owed to citizens of the United States who are taxpayers, or it will have to cut down, reduce, and impair the program for the next fiscal year which the committee itself has approved, by that minimum of $30,000,000.

In addition, as I have already said, there is no provision made to take care of any emergency. Suppose there

should be a storm or a great drought in that section, and instead of using the hydroelectric power generated by the T. V. A. it were necessary for the T. V. A. to buy a great deal of coal and employ many persons to operate its steam plants, and materially increase the cost of operation. The cost does not, in the final analysis, fall on the T. V. A., because under the contracts the purchasers pay more when the Authority supplies power from coal, and in that way the T. V. A. gets the money back; but it has to have the money with which to buy the coal and pay the people to operate the steam plants. Suppose there should be a hurricane in that section, or a storm, and a great transmission line were blown down. It would be necessary to have money with which to rebuild and repair the transmission line. More than two and one-half million people served by this great power system have a right, as customers of the system, to have the T. V. A. so fortified and circumstanced financially that they may know that its service will be carried on efficiently, and without interruption.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Alabama that I took a trip to Alabama about a year ago to investigate the T. V. A. I must have talked to perhaps 200 persons. I found that T. V. A. had done a magnificent job, and any time the people of Alabama and the other States affected do not want it they can give it to us in North Dakota. We should certainly like to have it there. I think the Senator is exactly right, and that he is to be commended for the fine job he has done upon this floor in bringing the true facts concerning this splendid institution to the attention not only of the Senate but to the attention of the country. I shall support the Senator in his fight against any amendments which, if adopted, would hamper the effort and work of the T. V. A.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and thank him for his words and for his support.

Mr. President, I have in a rather haphazard way said the things which I thought perhaps I might say when I arose to address the Senate. I may add that of all the amendments which were originally recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, this amendment is the worst; it is the most harmful amendment; it will do more to strangle and to paralyze if not to gut the T. V. A. than any of the other amendments. There was no justification for the other amendments, and that is why they have been withdrawn. This amendment should be withdrawn, but, since it is not going to be withdrawn, the Senate of the United States should vote it down.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan;

H. R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geller; and

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Charles J. Goff.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 250) to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife, and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize that the Senate is very anxious to vote on this question, and I am likewise aware of the fact that, in all probability, Senators have determined how they will vote on the amendment, and that I could not hope to affect the result. However, because of my deep conviction that this amendment would constitute a staggering blow to the successful operations of this enterprise, in which upward of $725,000,000 of the taxpayers' money has been invested, and because of my long interest in the project, I cannot let the vote come upon this amendment without registering some of the reasons for my violent opposition to it.

Mr. President, I hope no Senator will vote in favor of this amendment on the theory that the committee has withdrawn 16 other amendments and that something should be left for the committee to accomplish in its efforts in regard to the T. V. A. But, Mr. President, this is the heart of the series of amendments which were first presented by the committee; this is the crux of the whole issue, and the adoption of this amendment would do more to prevent a businesslike operation and the rendering of adequate service to the great war industries and to the industrial and commercial and residential consumers of this great river valley, which sweeps across the southeastern portion of the United States, than all the other 16 amendments combined.

Mr. President, as this bill came from the House of Representatives it did not appropriate any new money out of the Treasury for the Tennessee Valley Authority and its operations for the fiscal year 1945. It followed the practice which has been pursued ever since this enterprise was launched. First of all, an estimate was made of the cost of the program for the fiscal year 1945. When that had been ascertained, the receipts for 1945 were estimated; and the amount of the estimate was $68,523,882.

In addition to that, the unobligated balance which would exist on July 1, 1945, namely, $19,262,298, was made available for the operations of this giant enterprise during the coming fiscal year.

In my opinion, the committee erroneously confused the unexpended balance and the unobligated balances, and, because of that confusion, the T. V. A. will find itself short $30,000,000 of a sum sufficient to meet obligations which will become due after the 1st of next July, and it will be forced to take that $30,000,000 out of this appropriation of $79,134,182. So, as a result of the attempt of the Senate Appropriations Committee to gaze into the crystal ball and estimate how much this giant enterprise will need for 1945, the T. V. A. will be short $30,000,000, even on the committee's estimate as to the cost of operations and construction, replacement, repair, and betterment.

But waiving aside for the moment the precarious financial position in which the Authority will find itself on the 1st of July due to this confusion on the part of the Senate Appropriations Committee as between unexpended and unobligated funds, a more serious aspect is that the proposal now pending before the Senate provides that all the receipts for the fiscal year 1945 shall go into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, this proposal is analogous to a board of directors of a giant corporation, such as General Motors or the du Pont de Nemours Co., or any great power company in the United States, meeting prior to the end of the corporation's fiscal year and deciding, assuming that they had such power, that for the coming fiscal year the president and the management of the corporation could not utilize one penny of the corporation's receipts with which to meet its operating expenses. The board of directors, each member of it being provided with a crystal ball, would go into a trance, look into the crystal ball, and come up with a number which they estimate would represent the operating

expenses and the amount needed for betterment, improvement, and replacement which the corporation would have to utilize in the coming fiscal year, and then say to the management, "Now, of course, if you find that our gaze into the crystal ball has not resulted in an accurate figure, if you find that our estimation is out of line, you can come back to us some time when you run into a financial jam, or a plant burns down, or a whole turbine is blown out, or your transmission lines are swept down by a tornado, and let us know, and we will have a meeting later on and appropriate some more money out of the surplus." I submit Mr. President, that if any board of directors could ever take any such action with regard to a corporation, a stockholder should have the right, if he does not possess it under the law, to bring a proceeding to remove the board of directors for being incapable and incompetent to manage the affairs of the corporation; and although I am not a lawyer, I think they should have a right to have them examined by a board of alienists.

Mr. President, every time the Government engages in any kind of enterprise such as the T. V. A., a hue and cry is raised that the Government cannot do business on a businesslike basis. One of the favorite slogans is, "More business in government and less government in business." But here is a bold, naked proposal to adopt a policy so unbusinesslike that any Member of the Senate, if he were a member of the board of directors of a corporation, would be ashamed to propose it if he ever thought of it.

Mr. President, there has never been a dollar of money spent by the Tennessee Valley Authority since it was created that was not specifically authorized by statute. There is no showing that there has ever been any diversion of money for projects or for operations not authorized by law, either in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as amended or in appropriation acts which have been passed. Yet, in the midst of the most serious war in which any nation has ever been involved, it is now proposed to run the risk that the able and estimable gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, overworked, every one of them, have been able to guess what is going to happen to a $725,000,000 corporation during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do we not have to tell what is going to happen with a hundred-billion-dollar corporation during the coming year?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not know to what corporation the Senator refers.

Mr. BREWSTER. I refer to the United States Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have tried to make it clear, and I think it should be clear, that the Tennessee Valley Authority is not analogous to any operation of the War Department or the Navy Department. This is a great, giant power system, as well as a great construction corporation. It is selling power, it is selling fertilizer, it has an enormous income. It is estimated that its receipts will be $68,528,000 in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Which does the Senator think has had more unexpected and more unanticipated items in the last 2 or 3 years, the corporation of which he speaks, or the United States Government?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, I would say that, obviously, the Federal Government as a whole has; but the point I am trying to make is that the War Department is not operating a business. We appropriate billions of dollars for the use of the War Department, and their job is to spend that money in order to carry on the war effort. But here is a great public utility enterprise, and it is proposed that the management of that enterprise shall not have one penny of the huge receipts which it takes in as part of its business operation, but, instead, it must rely on the "guesstimation" of the estimable gentlemen sitting on the Committee on Appropriations. I say there is not a business corporation in the world which could operate on such a basis as is proposed here.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I correct in understanding that actual appropriation is made in any event?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly an appropriation is made.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that the items are ultimately considered, in any event?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; when the bill came to the Senate from the House there was not a dollar of new money appropriated out of the Treasury. All that was done was to make the receipts available, which was to be the bulk of the operating fund, as has been done every year since T. V. A. was created, namely, the $68,528,000 of which I have spoken; and to take the unobligated balance which would exist on July 1 and make that available.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was that done without any consideration of the necessity or applicability of those revenues?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; of course not. That was done after a most careful estimate, insofar as it is humanly possible to make one, and one can be made so far as certain specific items are concerned. For example, we know now that the cost of completing the Watts Bar steam plant is to be $532,000. That is an item that can be put down.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean that that determination was made by the Authority, or by the committee?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I presume that in the first place the Authority made its estimates, then submitted them to the Bureau of the Budget, and then, through the Bureau of the Budget, they were submitted to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that in the final analysis, the committee did consider and determine the question of the necessity of those expenditures?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly; and I stated before that so far as I know not a dollar of money—and no showing has been made here that a single dime of the receipts of the corporation has ever been expended for any purpose except purposes which had been authorized by Congress. That is true, and in addition to that, the accounts of the Authority are audited by the Comptroller General, and the Authority pays $30,000 a year to one of the outstanding firms of public accountants in the United States to make a corporate audit of its operations. So there has been no showing that there is any justification for assuming that there has been any misappropriation or misuse of the receipts during all the lifetime of this corporation.

I submit to anyone who has ever had any business experience that it is absolutely impossible for the Senate or for the board of directors of a private corporation to sit down in advance of a full year's operations and write a figure which will cover the operations for that year. That is why we never know what dividends may be paid, except as we come to the end of a quarter. Any corporation which was paying its dividends out of earnings, and paying them in advance of the period in which the earnings were being made, would soon be insolvent. Yet that is what is proposed to be done in this case.

Mr. President, I stated before, and I wish to repeat, I feel strongly that every Senator has an absolute right to his opinion as to whether or not this enterprise should have been launched in the first place. I concede the right of Congress—although if I should chance to be here I would oppose it with all the vigor at my command—at any time a majority of both Houses desire to do so, to sell this great public-utility system back into the hands of private ownership. My opinion is, Mr. President, that having invested $750,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in this enterprise in the first place, and in the second place because it is now the only available source of power in this very important war-producing area, we should not hamstring it by indirection, and that we should not do so by adopting methods and policies which could not successfully be carried out by any private corporation. If it is desired to change the basic policy it should be done when sufficient votes can be obtained to do so. But I plead with the Senate not to take action of an oblique nature, which will hamper and hamstring and prevent the functioning of this great enterprise, and not to force upon it policies which would ruin any corporation in America if it had to live under them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 9 on page 2 of the committee print.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Reed
Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gerry	Robertson
Bailey	Gillette	Russell
Ball	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bankhead	Hayden	Smith
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	La Follette	Tunnell
Buck	Langer	Tydings
Burton	McCarran	Vandenberg
Bushfield	McClellan	Wagner
Butler	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Byrd	McKellar	Weeks
Capper	Maloney	Wheeler
Chandler	Maybank	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Mead	White
Connally	Millikin	Wiley
Danaher	O'Mahoney	Willis
Davis	Overton	Wilson
Downey	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 9, on page 2.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. If the Senator from North Dakota were present, he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending a funeral.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business.

I also announce the following pairs: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]; and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and that the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea." He is paired on this question with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—39

Bailey	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	McClellan	Tydings
Byrd	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Maloney	Weeks
Eastland	Maybank	Wherry
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Overton	Wiley
Gillette	Reed	Willis
Hawkes	Revercomb	Wilson

NAYS—26

Aiken	Capper	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Chandler	Radcliffe
Austin	Danaher	Shipstead
Ball	Davis	Stewart
Bankhead	Downey	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Hill	Tunnell
Bone	La Follette	Wagner
Burton	Langer	Wheeler
Butler	Mead	

NOT VOTING—31

Bilbo	Gurney	Pepper
Brooks	Hatch	Reynolds
Caraway	Jackson	Scrugham
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Tobey
Ellender	Moore	Truman
Ferguson	Murdock	Wallgren
Glass	Murray	Walsh, N. J.
Green	Nye	
Guffey	O'Daniel	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 56, line 18——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is a second amendment in the committee print which has not been disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the second amendment in the committee print.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2 of the committee print, line 15, after the word "and" it is proposed to insert "all."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that that amendment is hooked in with the one in lines 18 and 19, and also all the amendment in italics, and the striking out of lines 19 to 24, together with the inclusion of new language in lines 24 and 25 in the committee print, and in view of the fact that they are all linked together, I suggest that we vote on those amendments en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. They have already been voted on en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not so understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. The then occupant of the chair held that they were all one amendment. As I understand, the clerk read them all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is misinformed on that particular point.

Mr. BARKLEY. All these amendments involve the same question, and I think we might as well vote on them together.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to voting on the amendments en bloc? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the roll call begins, I should like to say to Senators that I hope—and I am sure I speak for the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]—that we may dispose of this bill with as little delay as possible. It is desirable that we dispose of it, if possible, in time to take up the bill reported from the Finance Committee known as the "G. I. Bill of Rights." It is desirable that we recess until next Tuesday.

I might say for the benefit of Senators that the suggestion has been made by the Speaker of the House that beginning next Thursday, March 30, the Senate and House take a formal recess until the 12th of April. It is very necessary that the bill known as the "G. I. Bill of Rights" be passed by the Senate before any recess is taken. For that reason I hope Senators will facilitate the prompt disposition of the pending bill and all the amendments without unnecessary delay or debate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not only necessary that the bill be passed by the Senate but that we give sufficient opportunity for the House to act on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I meant to say.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I wish to be sure that I understood correctly. Did the majority leader say something about a recess beginning next Thursday?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the proposal.

Mr. MALONEY. That is from the 30th of March.

Mr. BARKLEY. From the 30th of March to the 12th of April.

If I may supplement what I stated a moment ago, I hope the Senate will be willing, if necessary, to sit a little later tonight in order to accomplish this legislative program if possible.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, may the pending amendment be stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 15, of the committee print, after the word "and", it is proposed to insert "all"; in line 17, after the numerals "1945", it is proposed to strike out "(subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended)" and insert "and subsequent fiscal years"; in line 19, after the word "covered", it is proposed to insert "quarterly"; and in the same line, after the word "into", it is proposed to strike out "and accounted for as one fund to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority Fund, 1945, to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944", and insert "the general fund of the Treasury of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be voted upon en bloc. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as I made previously, I shall vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is absent, attending a funeral.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business.

I also announce the following pairs: The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]; and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and that the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea." He is paired on this question with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—39

Bailey	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	McClellan	Tydings
Byrd	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Maloney	Weeks
Eastland	Maybank	Wherry
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Overton	Wiley
Gillette	Reed	Willis
Hawkes	Revercomb	Wilson

NAYS—26

Aiken	Capper	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Chandler	Radcliffe
Austin	Danaher	Shipstead
Ball	Davis	Stewart
Bankhead	Downey	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Hill	Tunnell
Bone	La Follette	Wagner
Burton	Langer	Wheeler
Butler	Mead	

NOT VOTING—31

Bilbo	Gurney	Pepper
Brooks	Hatch	Reynolds
Caraway	Jackson	Scrugham
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Tobey
Ellender	Moore	Truman
Ferguson	Murdock	Wallgren
Glass	Murray	Walsh, N. J.
Green	Nye	
Guffey	O'Daniel	

So the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendments were agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. TYDINGS. I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND BEQUESTS FOR THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1640) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, to strike out lines 6 to 8, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 3. For the purpose of Federal income, estate and gift taxes, gifts and bequests accepted by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of this act shall be deemed to be a gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1895

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1647) to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended, which was, in line 8, to strike out all after "following:" down to and including "Guard." " and insert: "officers and employees of other civilian agencies of the United States and bonded officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan;

H. R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff, as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume; and

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee beginning on page 56 will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission," on page 56, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$39,983,725"; and on page 57, line 1, after the word "services" and the semicolon, to strike out "purchase (not to exceed $16,275)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 58, line 1, after the word "administering", to strike out "$164,000,000" and insert "$163,977,740, of which $44,940 shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Federal Board of Hospitalization"; and in line 18, after the word "including", to strike out "purchase."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 1, after the name "Veterans' Administration", to strike out "$1,259,310,500" and insert "$1,259,288,240."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—General provisions," on page 68, line 10, after the word "vehicle", to insert "(1)"; in line 18, after the word "concerned", to insert a semicolon and "(2) unless there shall be painted in white letters not less than 2 inches high on both sides of each motor vehicle and trailer owned or leased by the United States Government the words 'On official business,' and (3) unless there shall also be displayed at all times in a conspicuous place a sign designating the particular department, independent establishment, or other Federal agency which operates said vehicle. Any officer or employee of the Government who uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, or of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle leased by the Government, for other than official purposes or otherwise violates the provisions of this subsection shall be summarily removed from office, and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both"; and on page 69, line 12, after the word "officials", to insert "and clauses (2) and (3) shall not apply to motor vehicles operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and the Secret Service of the Treasury Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 210. No part of any appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 contained in this or any other act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of the nomination of said person.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 210. No part of any appropriation available for the executive departments and independent establishments (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) for the fiscal year 1945 or any subsequent fiscal year contained in this or any other act shall be (1) paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of the nomination of said person, or (2) available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 18, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 213. No part of any appropriation or fund made available by this or any other act shall be allotted or made available to, or used to pay the expenses of, any agency or instrumentality established by Executive order after such agency or instrumentality has been in existence for more than 1 year, if the Congress has not appropriated any money specifically for such agency or instrumentality or specifically authorized the expenditure of funds by it. For the purposes of this section, any agency or instrumentality established by Executive order shall be deemed to have been in existence during the existence of any other agency or instrumentality, established by a prior Executive order, if the principal functions of both of such agencies or instrumentalities are substantially the same or similar. When any agency or instrumentality is or has been prevented from using appropriations by reason of this section, no part of any appropriation or fund made available by this or any other act shall be used to pay the expenses of the performance by any other agency or instrumentality of functions which are substantially the same as or similar to the principal functions of the agency or instrumentality so prevented from using appropriations, unless the Congress has specifically authorized the expenditure of funds for performing such functions.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in the pending amendment on page 74, after line 18, I move to amend by inserting after "Sec. 213" and the period, in line 19, the words "After July 1, 1944."

I believe it to be the intent of the sponsor of the amendment, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that it shall not apply until July 1, 1944, but I am not certain in my own mind that it might not become effective immediately after the enactment of the measure, and I think the President should have an opportunity to present Budget estimates for these agencies.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 74, line 19, after "Sec. 213", it is proposed to insert "After July 1, 1944", so as to read:

SEC. 213. After July 1, 1944, no part of any appropriation or fund made available by this or any other act shall be allotted or made available to, or used to pay the expenses of, any agency"—

And so forth.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the purpose of the committee amendment, which is apparent from a reading thereof, is to retain in the Congress the power of legislating and creating bureaus and departments of the Government, and of giving to Congress the right to know what the bureaus and departments of the Government which have been created by Executive order are doing.

Under the provisions of the amendment no bureau, agency, or instrumentality of the Government which has been in existence for a longer period than 12 months shall have any funds allotted to it for its maintenance which are appropriated for any other purpose whatsoever. I realize, Mr. President, that in time of war, emergencies may arise which might dictate that the executive branch of the Government should immediately create some agency to deal with an immediate difficulty, but certainly there is no excuse for the continuance of an agency which has been in existence for longer than 12 months for which the Congress has not appropriated, or for which the Congress has not had any opportunity to appropriate. This amendment follows the provision which was inserted in the appropriation bill for the current year, and which denied funds to any agency when a budget estimate had been submitted to the Congress, and Congress had refused to appropriate for that purpose.

Secondly, Mr. President, no agency which has power to issue orders affecting the lives and business of the American people should stay in existence for more than 12 months unless the Congress has passed upon an appropriation for such agency. I have made an effort to ascertain the number of agencies which would be affected by this provision. According to a report which was filed by the Bureau of the Budget in response to a request which I made of the director of that agency, about 13 agencies would be affected. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] very kindly furnished me with a list of agencies which had been compiled by the committee of which he is chairman, and according to that list approximately 17 or 18 such agencies would be affected.

From the Legislative Reference Bureau I secured another list which shows that still other agencies would be involved.

Regardless of what agencies might be affected, the purpose of this amendment is to require them all to come to Congress for their appropriations after they have been in existence for more than a year.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that any lengthy discussion of this amendment is necessary. Its purpose is clear. Certainly those who have been complaining about bureaucrats and bureaucracy in this country, and who have heretofore complained because the Congress had not created or passed upon such agencies, should support this amendment and thereby give Congress the right at least

to keep advised as to what all the different agencies of the Government are doing.

I understood that the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota is to insure that this provision shall not take effect until the first of July of this year. Of course, I should like to see the agencies to which I have referred be compelled to come before Congress immediately, but my understanding is that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would not be necessary because it is an amendment to an appropriation bill which would not take effect until the 1st day of July, 1944. I have no particular objection to the amendment but I do not think it is at all necessary.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It seems to me that section 213 of the legislative provision might be interpreted as taking effect immediately. In order to remove any doubt, I think we ought to give the agencies time to come to Congress to ask for funds. My amendment would give them until July 1.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection particularly to the amendment. I apprehend that it may cause some of the agencies to come to Congress for deficiency appropriations, but I would not make any particular point on the amendment offered by the Senator. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and, if he thinks the provision is wise, I shall not object to the amendment.

Mr. BALL. It seems to me to be only fair to give the agencies time to present their cases to the proper committees. I am entirely in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not impressed with the argument as to an opportunity to come to Congress for funds because some of them have been in existence 2 or 3 years and have had ample time to come before Congress and ask for funds.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Senator where his amendment comes in and what it does.

Mr. BALL. The amendment proposes to insert before the word "No" in line 19, the words "After July 1, 1944," which would give them to the end of this fiscal year to come to Congress for funds.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the committee amendment which I desire to propose. I send it to the desk and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is not in order at the moment. There is an amendment to the amendment pending. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is now in order.

Mr. BUTLER. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 75, line 1, before the period, it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the following:

nor shall any of the funds or personnel made available by this or any other act to any specific governmental department or agency thereof be allotted or assigned to any other governmental agency or department to permit it to engage in any activity for which funds have not been granted to it directly, unless such allotment or assignment is expressly so authorized in the Appropriation Act.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I only have a very few words to say in reference to the proposed amendment.

In my opinion, the amendment would make a little bit tighter the provisions of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia. To illustrate exactly what I am aiming at, I should like to refer Senators to an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of March 6 by Representative PLOESER, of Missouri, covering a memorandum given him by the famous writer, John T. Flynn.

Some programs are being attempted by various departments or agencies that, if successful, would make over the entire American society—our entire economic system. When they are stopped in one place they break out in another.

The memorandum given Representative PLOESER, of Missouri, by John T. Flynn, covers the details of just such an incident in the United States Office of Education. I quote from it, as follows:

Last summer * * * an Austrian was brought into the Office of Education by its head, Commissioner Studebaker, and, without any official status whatever, given the run of the place and complete access to its files. In a few weeks he emerged with a 32-page report severely criticizing the department of comparative education in the Commissioner's office and ending with a proposal for a department of international education, which, of course, is the idea he had in mind before he began his "investigation."

I believe that by the amendment I have proposed the committee amendment would be improved to a considerable extent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not press his amendment. It deals with an entirely different question from the subject matter of the pending amendment. The pending amendment is designed for one purpose, and that is to prevent the executive department of the Government from legislating by creating agencies, by Executive order. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska would prevent any flexibility whatever in the transfer of personnel from one department or agency of the Government to another. Under normal conditions, I should be disposed to support the amendment proposed by my friend from Nebraska but in this time of war and stress it might be possible and desirable for the Navy Department to lend the War Department certain personnel or for the War Department to lend the War Production Board certain personnel; and the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska would have the effect of defeating such transfers of personnel.

Under ordinary circumstances, the proposition is sound, but I wish to point out that the amendment proposed by the Senator would also affect the Congress of the United States. We have personnel now who have been loaned to various committees of the Congress by some of the agencies of the Government for which appropriations have been made. We have already passed two or three of the appropriation bills. The Treasury Department bill has already been enacted; the Post Office Department appropriation bill has already been enacted; and the Senate is on the eve of adopting the appropriation bill that relates to all the independent agencies of the Government, and we have not therein provided any elasticity, even to the extent of 1 percent, in the personnel that might be transferred.

In the abstract, I favor the proposition of the Senator, but I hope he will not press it as an amendment to this provision which deals with a different question altogether, and prevents the creation of agencies by any authority other than the Congress. The amendment proposed by the Senator deals with transfers of personnel from one agency already created by the Congress to another agency already created by the Congress. It relates to an entirely different proposition, and I hope my friend will not press his amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is not my intention to press the matter unduly at all, but I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia, inasmuch as he seems to agree with the idea in a general way, if he can suggest a more opportune time for enacting such a provision?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to have the Senator at least offer it as an independent proposal, and not inject an entirely new proposition into the heart and body of my amendment, which has only one purpose and which submits only one issue to Congress. If the Senator will offer it as an independent proposition I shall certainly be the last Member of this body to object to it; but we will have to go to conference on this amendment, and I should not like to have to carry two issues, including this collateral issue, to the House and the conference.

Mr. BUTLER. In view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly thank my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I have an amendment I should like to submit. I ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, line 24, after the word "year", it is proposed to insert "except the Fair Employment Practice Committee."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is self-evident. It would retain the agency to which it refers which under the Senate committee amendment would be done away with. The colored folks are citizens of the country, and are particularly interested in retaining this agency. It is one that prevents and eliminates racial discrimination in war plants. There are nearly a million colored boys in the armed forces and more than 3,000,000

colored persons in the war plants of the country. I hope that this agency may be retained and that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the interest of consistency, I would probably have to——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before the Senator starts on consistency will he permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it not a fact that the F. E. P. C. has been removed from the purview of the committee amendment by the President sending in a Budget recommendation for it, thus taking it out of the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would not be if Congress refused to appropriate. A Budget estimate has been submitted and the House Appropriations Committee has been conducting hearings on it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A Budget estimate has been held, under the rules of the Senate, to be an authorization, to all intents and purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Undoubtedly, there is authority to provide for the agency in the bill, yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then it has been removed from the purview of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because the pending amendment says if Congress has not made appropriations for an agency it shall cease to function. But I am rather astonished, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Delaware, a member of a party that has been complaining a great deal about bureaucracy, about the issuance of orders which affect the people, about bureaucratic agencies of the executive department exercising too great powers, and about the executive department usurping the powers of Congress, should come here and seek exemption for any agency of the Government that depended for its life and for its existence solely upon the action of the President of the United States.

Of course, everyone has his pet agencies, everyone has departments which he wants preserved, and if we start action like that proposed, if we are to say that the President of the United States can legislate by Executive order when we favor the objective which he is seeking, we should say that we favor the President of the United States taking to himself the power that is vested by the Constitution in the Congress of the United States, and legislating and creating departments of government which issue orders that bring the people of the United States before them, and pass orders which direct people how they shall proceed in their daily business.

The amendment proposed by the committee should stand or fall as an entire proposition. There is no reason on earth for exempting any agency, and if we start exempting any of them, we might as well defeat the entire amendment.

As the Senator from Missouri has stated, the President of the United States has moved to eliminate this Fair Employment Practice Committee from the operation of the committee amendment. Three days after this amendment was approved by the full Committee on Appropriations he sent a Budget estimate to the House of Representatives, and hearings have already been held before the House committee which is dealing with the war agencies bill to determine whether or not the Congress shall appropriate funds for this Committee.

We should not undertake in this shotgun fashion to pass upon the merits of appropriations. Of course, I could go into the merits of the Committee the Senator from Delaware seeks to save and preserve, but I shall not discuss it at length. In the information that was furnished the Committee on Appropriations by the Bureau of the Budget, it developed that this Committee has around a hundred employees, and that the average compensation of those employees was around $3,500 per annum. The average compensation of $3,500 paid employees of this Committee compares with an average of around $1,700 paid all civil-service employees, and around $2,000 for all the employees of the Government of every kind, class, and category. So certainly, of all the agencies which should be dealt with in separate items of appropriations, the one which the Senator from Delaware seeks to preserve stands in the very forefront.

We should not here undertake to differentiate if we are dealing with a matter of policy. We either should stand or fall on this proposition as one requiring the executive department to submit these legislative questions to the Congress, or we should forever hold our peace, and not complain against executive agencies which have been created without the knowledge or consent of the Congress of the United States.

The amendment already agreed to, which was offered by the Senator from Minnesota, has allowed until the first of the fiscal year before the pending committee amendment shall be in operation, and I see no reason why we should undertake to exempt any one of the various agencies which have been created by Executive order. All should stand or fall together.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, there is a difference of opinion between the distinguished Senator from Georgia and myself on this question. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bone	Byrd
Andrews	Brewster	Capper
Austin	Bridges	Chandler
Bailey	Buck	Clark, Mo.
Ball	Burton	Connally
Bankhead	Bushfield	Danaher
Barkley	Butler	Davis
Downey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Maloney	Tunnell
George	Maybank	Tydings
Gerry	Millikin	Vandenberg
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Hawkes	Overton	Walsh, Mass.
Hayden	Radcliffe	Weeks
Hill	Reed	Wheeler
Holman	Revercomb	Wherry
Johnson, Colo.	Robertson	White
La Follette	Russell	Wiley
Langer	Shipstead	Willis
McCarran	Smith	Wilson
McClellan	Stewart	
McFarland	Thomas, Idaho	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BUCK. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the Chair had ruled that not a sufficient number had seconded the demand for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum call has ensued since the ruling.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Chair rule that a request for the yeas and nays may be made a number of times?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been the practice, the Chair is advised, that the request may thus be made.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] to the amendment of the committee. The yeas and nays are demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment of the committee, on page 74, line 24, after the word "year", it is proposed to insert "except the Fair Employment Practice Committee."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this amendment to the appropriation bill I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who is also a member of the Committee on Appropriations. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay" on the amendment. I supported the Russell amendment in the committee. If the junior Senator from New York were at liberty to vote he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending a funeral. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are

absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would vote "nay," and that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Montana.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—36

Aiken	Downey	Shipstead
Austin	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Ball	Holman	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Brewster	La Follette	Vandenberg
Bridges	Langer	Wagner
Buck	McCarran	Weeks
Burton	McFarland	Wherry
Butler	Maloney	White
Capper	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Danaher	Radcliffe	Willis
Davis	Robertson	Wilson

NAYS—22

Andrews	George	Reed
Bailey	Gerry	Russell
Bankhead	Gillette	Smith
Byrd	Hill	Stewart
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Millikin	
Eastland	Overton	

NOT VOTING—38

Bilbo	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bone	Hatch	Pepper
Brooks	Hayden	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jackson	Reynolds
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Maybank	Tobey
Ellender	Mead	Truman
Ferguson	Moore	Wallgren
Glass	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Green	Murray	Wheeler
Guffey	Nye	

So Mr. Buck's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, so far as I know, no one has written me either for or against this amendment. I am heartily in favor of the Russell amendment providing that bureaus shall not be created by Executive fiat. Therefore I shall support the Russell amendment. I was detained in my office, and when I came on the floor I did not understand the purport of the proposal then pending before the Senate. Had I known what the purport of it was, as a matter of principle, and regardless of the merits of this particular institution, I should have voted "nay" and I am a candidate for reelection in that State where all the colored people who wish to vote may do so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my vote of "yea" be changed to "nay." It will not affect the result, but I am particular about keeping my position with regard to Executive-inspired bureaucracy consistent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, beginning in line 19, on page 74, as amended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope that the American people will take due note of the action just taken by the Senate. They will observe that many Senators who have gone up and down the country protesting and inveighing against bureaucracy and denouncing the usurpation of the constitutional powers of the Congress by the executive branch of the Government have proven that they did not mean what they said by voting to sustain the right and power of the Executive to create agencies of Government by fiat and proclamation. It is amazing to see Senators who have been the loudest in protesting that the executive department was taking over the powers and functions of this body to the discredit of Congress now voting against the way they have talked for so long by declaring themselves in favor of executive agencies. It is an amazing abandonment of principle. In this case principle means nothing. But the desire to appeal to certain groups of voters seems to mean everything.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, if the Senate is to make fish of one agency and fowl of another, if I, as the author of this amendment in committee, have the right, I should like to withdraw it. Do I have the right or power to withdraw the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the Senator does not have that right after an amendment to it has been adopted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I then ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say, Mr. President, that before I should be a party to any such proceeding as this, that I am now placed in the position where I shall vote against my own amendment. If the amendment shall be so distorted, and if those who have heretofore been most insistent in inveighing against executive action shall undertake to approve executive action in creating agencies of Government, I shall vote against the entire proposal.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words to what has been said about the amendment. Not only are those Senators who claim to be opposed to bureaucracy in a wholly inconsistent position, but the one agency which has been excepted here has no legal status whatsoever. It has no foundation on which to stand. It is purportedly based upon the Second War Powers Act, but there is not a line or a syllable or any mark of punctuation in the Second War Powers Act which is authority for it, which authorizes the creation of the single agency which is retained by the amendment to the committee amendment just agreed to. This agency has no power to enforce its orders. Its orders are already challenged, and they will be consistently challenged, and unquestionably they will be upset. I doubt if there is anyone, even in the Department of Justice, who believes that this agency has any legal foundation in fact.

Some Senators have pledged to their people that they would recapture the powers of the Congress and revest in the Congress the power to legislate. Some Senators will be heard making a loud noise in November in repetition and repeated repetition of that particular program and of that declaration. Here is the acid test. Here is the proposal that agencies created by Executive order and which have been in existence for more than a year, and which have received no congressional approval, should no longer receive part of the public money appropriated under this measure. That is all.

Senators have selected the one agency whose single order in any important matter stands stopped almost by the confession of the Department of Justice that the agency has no legal status.

So far as I am concerned, I have said to my people, and I repeat it now, that when this war ends, and long before it ends, I shall vote to restore to the American Congress or to the American people every power which should be rightfully exercised by the American Congress or the people. I meant that. I do not challenge the sincerity of any other Member of this body. But if I had had any part in permitting the existence of a single agency in the Government, created under Executive order, and which for more than a year has stood without even congressional approval by the making of a single appropriation for its support, I could not justify the position I expect to take, and which I ex-

pect to take consistently, with my own people. I am up for election this year. But I am going to face my people on one issue, at least, and that is that every power which was not intended to be granted by the Congress, although there may be a technical foundation for its exercise, should be restored to the people themselves.

Human liberty cannot exist in any democratic country anywhere, any time, when the people fall under the rule of bureaucracies created by Executive order. Where is there in America a lawyer of any responsibility who will assert that the single agency which Senators have excepted from the operations of the amendment stands upon any legal foundation whatsoever?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I rise in defense of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who voted for the last amendment which was adopted, because they had reason to do so. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] was the brain child of a man by the name of Edgar Brown, who held a very good job under the Democratic administration for 5 or 6 years. When he was finally separated from the public pay roll, he used the appointment of Mr. Justice Byrnes as Stabilization Director as an excuse for announcing his departure from the Democratic fold, although he did not deny that the Roosevelt administration had done more in many ways for the preservation of the rights of colored people and the upbuilding of their morale than had any other administration or any combination of administrations in the history of the country.

Recently I read in a Missouri newspaper an article by Edgar Brown in which he stated that, irrespective of what the President might have done or irrespective of the record of any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, everyone who was nominated on the Democratic ticket, from the President down to constable, should be defeated. It is easy to understand the pull of a persuasion like that on some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I saw Mr. Brown outside the Senate Chamber the other night, as I was getting on the elevator. He rushed up to me, and said that the provisions which were later incorporated in the Buck amendment should be included in the bill. I said to him, "As a matter of fact, has not the question of the F. E. P. C. been taken out of the controversy as to executive agencies without any authority of Congress, by the action of the President in sending up a Budget estimate for it?" I recall that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] happened to be with me at the moment, and I am sure he will verify my statement of the conversation. I said to Brown, "Has not the action of the President in sending up a Budget estimate for the F. E. P. C. taken it out of the controversy as to executive agencies without any congressional authority?" I personally was in favor of the maintenance of the F. E. P. C.; I would have voted for this amendment, with great reluctance, if the F. E. P. C. had been included in it. But Brown rushed up to me and said, "We have got to have this amendment," the amendment specifically exempting the F. E. P. C. I said, "Why do you say that? The President himself has removed the F. E. P. C. from the operation of the amendment by sending up a Budget estimate." Brown said, "Well, because we want it."

About that time the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] came along. Brown repeated that to him.

Mr. President, by agreeing to the amendment I do not think the Senate of the United States puts itself in a very good position on a great constitutional question, when the President of the United States has shown his disposition to remove this agency from the controversy by sending in a Budget estimate for it. The effect of agreeing to the amendment is to have the Senate act in accordance with the whim of a lobbyist, who would thus control the action of the Senate of the United States. So far as I am concerned, I intend to join the Senator from Georgia in voting against the amendment as amended.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BUCK. The Senator is exactly correct, in that this man Brown approached me, as I think he did other Senators. Let me say that many of my constituents in Delaware are very much interested in this matter. It is largely at their request that I was persuaded to present the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I meant no reflection whatever on him. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of the maintenance of the F. E. P. C. As I have said, I might have voted against the Russell amendment against the action of the President of the United States. But I say that when the President of the United States has, by sending in a Budget estimate, acted in accordance with the effect of the Russell amendment, for the Senate of the United States finally to yield to the whim of a lobbyist like this man Brown is a disgraceful thing.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to confirm everything the Senator from Missouri has said. Mr. Brown said, "This is the heart of everything the colored people want."

But I desire to announce that that had no effect on my consideration of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say that the Senator from Indiana gave him no encouragement whatsoever.

Mr. WILLIS. Yes. Mr. President, in casting my vote on the amendment I will be acting out of my regard for a great group of colored people in the State of Indiana who I think are deserving of every possible consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say further that the great group of colored people in the State of Indiana or the great group of colored people in the State of Illinois or the great group of colored people in the State of Missouri or the great group of colored people in any other State are fully protected by the action of the President of the United States in submitting a Budget estimate on this matter. I repeat that the action the Senate has just taken is in response to the whim of this lobbyist.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is quite evident that the interest and votes of the great body of colored folks in many States has had considerable to do with the action the Senate has just taken. It appears that the influence of that great body of voters is such that in a case in which a constitutional principle is involved, principle can fall and be crushed into the earth, so long as the votes of Senators are cast in accordance with the wishes of that great body of colored voters, for whom they have such respect.

However, Mr. President, that question is not the only one involved in the amendment. This agency, without any legislative authority whatever, without the slightest basis of statutory power, without having had one dime of appropriation ever made for it, is one of the most arrogant of all bureaucracies. Because, Mr. President, when there is an agency which is not answerable to the Congress, an agency which does not even have to submit an annual request for an appropriation, an agency which has no power on earth over it except the Chief Executive of the United States, we always find that agency to be the most arrogant of all the bureaucracies.

Mr. President, I have received a great many letters in regard to this amendment that did not come from the South and do not involve the Negro issue. I know the situation of a Senator from the South who introduces an amendment under any circumstances whatever which remotely affects one Negro in the United States. Edgar Brown comes to see Senators, and the amendment is looked upon with suspicion even if the author did not know at the time the amendment was introduced that it affected a single Negro.

Many letters have been received from people who care nothing about the Negro issue—as illustrative of those who are in business and complain of the activities of these agencies, I read from a letter from a man whom I never saw, and of whom I never heard. His name is John S. Greer, of Cambridge, Mass. He wrote me a letter with respect to this amendment. He said:

> I have read with considerable interest of a bill which would limit the transfer of funds to Government agencies that have not been authorized by Congress. I heartily commend your action and hope that your amendment will have widespread support in Congress. I see in your action perhaps the beginning of a movement to restore to Congress some control over the unending stream of regulations that have been pouring out of Washington of late years.

Of course this businessman could not know that Republican Senators, almost in a body, would vote to keep this unending stream of regulations pouring out of Washington, and to keep inviolate in

the hands of the bureaus of the Government the powers which they have always had. They go up and down the land making political speeches denouncing bureaus and agencies, and excess Executive power, but when it comes to the test in the Senate, and the roll is called on a vote, where are all their words? They are as empty as the winds that have gone in the years that are past. They speak one way on the stump and vote another way when the test is put to them in the Congress. They try to catch votes by attacking the bureaus which are harassing business in the country, but when it comes to voting, they vote to keep them in power, to get other votes, even if the Congress of the United States has never appropriated one dime for the maintenance of such agencies and they have never received any legislative sanction. If there has ever been any demonstration of politics at its worst, we have just seen it here. Men who spend their time denouncing bureaus and bureaucracy, now vote to uphold and sustain them.

To return to the letter:

I do not believe that any regulations imposed by Congress can be unduly biased or unfair.

I know nothing about this gentleman or his political affiliations. He had no idea that the Republicans were going to vote almost solidly to sustain these regulations, whether they were unbiased or unfair, or whatever they might be.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will yield as soon as I have concluded reading the letter. The writer continues:

Unfortunately, this cannot be said of most of the rules, regulations, etc., imposed upon us by the administrative agencies. I sincerely hope that Congress will now recover for itself the power and authority it formerly used in order that we may have more balanced government from Washington.

I hope Senators will listen to this. Talk about the colored issue. Here is a letter from Massachusetts about the Fair Employment Practice Committee. The writer brought this subject up himself:

By all means, do what you can to eliminate the Fair Employment Practice Committee. We, like most other industrial firms, have been annoyed on many occasions by the stupidity of this committee; for example, such inexcusable things as demanding that we explain to them why our newspaper advertisement for help specified that the applicants for positions should bring their birth certificates with them, when the United States Employment Service recommended that we use this phrase in our advertisement in order to expedite the hiring of war workers. Your action is most encouraging. More power to you.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Can the distinguished Senator tell us how many bureaus have been created by executive action?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I stated at the outset of my remarks that I have not been able to obtain a complete list of them; but I desire to put the responsibility on the Comptroller General for seeing that all of them, without exception, come before the Congress of the United States to ask for their appropriations.

Mr. WILEY. Would the Senator say there are 500?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there are that many.

Mr. WILEY. One hundred?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator is probably getting a little warm. The number might be less than 100.

Mr. WILEY. Seventy-five?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know how many there are. I said that I found 18 which would come within the purview of this amendment, in my judgment.

Mr. WILEY. Eighteen?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. President, we are living in a strange age. We hear of a great many combinations in political life. We see queer happenings in some of the party councils. Last time our friends across the aisle nominated a man who had been a Democrat on their ticket for President of the United States. I do not know all the ramifications of the national political picture at present. I do know that I have received letters from a great many organizations, both pro and con, on this amendment. I do not know all the powers which were at work, which might have caused it to be so overwhelmingly adopted, but I do find that the Communist Party of the District of Columbia, in a letter addressed to me under date of March 8, has denounced this amendment and demanded that the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices be eliminated from the purview of this amendment. I ask that the letter from the Communist Party demanding that this agency be specifically removed from the provisions of this amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST PARTY,
District of Columbia, March 8, 1944.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was adopted unanimously at the last meeting of the Stanton Park Communist Club on March 2, 1944:

"Whereas the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices has done a great deal to eliminate discrimination in the vital war industries of our country, and has proved to be one of the most valuable agencies to the entire war effort; and

"Whereas the Senate Appropriations Committee is considering favorably an amendment preventing the transfer of funds by the President to any agency which has been in existence for a year or more; and

"Whereas the local newspapers have reported that Senator RUSSELL admitted that the purpose of this amendment was to smash the F. E. P. C.: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Stanton Park Communist Club, join with millions of our fellow-citizens in protesting against this vicious amendment and in demanding of the Senate Appropriations Committee that it be permanently shelved."

Respectfully,

JAMES P. BRANCA,
City Chairman.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us who signed the letter——

Mr. RUSSELL. The letter is signed by James P. Branca, city chairman of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia, with headquarters at 527 Ninth Street NW.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was interested in the name of the writer of the letter from Cambridge.

Mr. RUSSELL. His name is Mr. Don S. Greer, treasurer of J. W. Greer Co., manufacturers of confectioners' and bakers' machinery. I know nothing about the concern.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is a large business establishment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is at least one issue which, so far as most of the campaign oratory this fall is concerned, should in all good faith be eliminated. After the vote which has just been had I do not see how any Republican can, with any degree of good faith, go before the country and denounce the Democratic Party for creating bureaucracy when by their votes they are insisting that bureaus created by Executive order shall continue to harass the people of the United States. This vote is a challenge to the good faith of all of those who have been resorting to attacks on bureaus and bureaucracy. More will be heard of it in the days to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the vote just taken be reconsidered. I was called out of the Chamber by a constituent, Mr. Harry G. Worsham, who desired to speak to me, and when I left the Chamber the Russell amendment was under consideration. When I returned to the Chamber, while the yea and nay vote was being taken, I supposed that we were voting on the Russell amendment. I inadvertently voted "yea," and I therefore move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] to the committee amendment on page 74, line 22, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement concerning my pair that I made heretofore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. If he were present and at liberty to vote he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending a funeral. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from

Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Washington.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—30

Andrews	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Hill	Reed
Ball	Holman	Russell
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Byrd	McClellan	Smith
Chandler	McFarland	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	Maloney	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
George	O'Mahoney	Wheeler

NAYS—28

Aiken	Burton	Downey
Austin	Bushfield	Hawkes
Barkley	Butler	La Follette
Brewster	Capper	Langer
Bridges	Danaher	McCarran
Buck	Davis	Radcliffe
Robertson	Wagner	Wiley
Thomas, Utah	Weeks	Wilson
Tunnell	Wherry	
Vandenberg	White	

NOT VOTING—38

Bilbo	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bone	Hatch	Pepper
Brooks	Hayden	Revercomb
Caraway	Jackson	Reynolds
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Maybank	Tobey
Ferguson	Mead	Truman
Gerry	Moore	Wallgren
Glass	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Green	Murray	Willis
Guffey	Nye	

So the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIS subsequently said: Mr. President, when the vote was taken to reconsider the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] I was absent from the Chamber on official business. I should like to have the RECORD show, in the proper place, that had I been present I should have voted against the motion to reconsider, and should have voted in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, which would be in accord with my former record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] to the committee amendment on page 74, line 22.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote I should vote "nay," and if present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending a funeral. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Washington.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would vote "nay," and that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—26

Aiken	Davis	Tunnell
Austin	Downey	Vandenberg
Barkley	Hawkes	Wagner
Brewster	La Follette	Weeks
Buck	Langer	Wherry
Burton	McCarran	White
Butler	Maloney	Wiley
Capper	Radcliffe	Wilson
Danaher	Thomas, Utah	

NAYS—33

Andrews	George	Overton
Bailey	Gerry	Reed
Ball	Gillette	Robertson
Bankhead	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	McClellan	Stewart
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Tydings
Connally	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—37

Bilbo	Hatch	Pepper
Bone	Hayden	Revercomb
Brooks	Jackson	Reynolds
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Tobey
Ellender	Mead	Truman
Ferguson	Moore	Wallgren
Glass	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Green	Murray	Willis
Guffey	Nye	
Gurney	O'Daniel	

So Mr. BUCK's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, on the amendment offered by

the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], I was present in the Chamber and voted "yea" both times. I did not notice the fact that my name was omitted in the recapitulation of the vote the second time. I should like to have the RECORD show that I voted "yea."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the RECORD will show that the Senator from Nebraska voted "yea" on both occasions.

The question is on agreeing on the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move to amend in line 22, page 74, by striking out the words "established by Executive order", and on line 25 to strike out the word "or" and insert the word "and."

This amendment would make the so-called Russell amendment all-inclusive, and inasmuch as we have done some reconsidering and are going to include every agency created by Executive order, let us go all the way and include all organizations and corporations under Government control.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated? It was difficult, because of the noise in the Senate Chamber, to follow the words when the Senator read the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope it may be stated. I did not hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, line 22, it is proposed to strike out the words "established by Executive order", and on line 25 to strike out "or" and insert "and."

Mr. TYDINGS. There are two "ors" in line 25. Which one is the Senator eliminating, the first one or the last one?

Mr. BRIDGES. The last one, after the word "instrumentality."

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand where the last insertion was to be.

Mr. BRIDGES. On line 25, after the word "instrumentality", to strike out the word "or" and insert the word "and."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I know the difficulties we encounter when we attempt to get information in regard to these governmental agencies, and I make bold to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he can give us some illustrations of the type of agency to which he would attempt to apply the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator will refer to the House hearings, at page 807, he will find there has been inserted a list of Government corporations as of December 15, 1943, and there is an analysis showing whether or not they are subject to control by Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator name some of them so that we may get a line on what the agencies are?

Mr. BRIDGES. The American President Lines, Ltd. Congress has no control over its administrative expenditures.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it is said that organization is not audited by the Comptroller General's Office because it is owned by the Maritime Commission. About 90 percent of the stock is so owned.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator says it is not audited by the General Accounting Office?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. According to the House hearings, the official testimony, that does not appear to be so.

Mr. AIKEN. The notation says:

> No accounts submitted to the General Accounting Office, but books and records examined in connection with Maritime Commission audit.

Incidentally, the Maritime Commission audit simply proved that they could not tell anything by the books and balance sheets. So perhaps we might say it was not audited effectively and efficiently; but it was audited the best the General Accounting Office could audit it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I read from the list:

> Banks for cooperatives, Central Bank for Cooperatives, District banks for cooperatives; Cargoes, Inc.; Colonial Mica; Copper Recovery Corporation; Defense Homes Corporation; Defense Plant Corporation; Defense Supplies Corporation; Disaster Loan Corporation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not well advised as to this matter, being taken more or less by surprise by the recital of all these agencies, but my impression is that some of those the Senator is naming are authorized under act of Congress, not directly, but the activities themselves are authorized, and appropriations are made for the agencies. These agencies are entities, as I understand, carrying out specific grants of power by Congress. If I am wrong in that, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think most of these organizations are subsidiary corporations of the R. F. C. which are created pursuant to authority granted by Congress; but I do not think Congress ever specifically authorized their creation. For instance, there is the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. The R. F. C. has authority to create such a corporation, but I do not think Congress ever provided for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it correct to state what I understand to be the case, that authority was given by Congress to the R. F. C. to do certain specific things, that Congress did not of course name the agencies by which those things should be translated into action, but the R. F. C. has set them up itself? What I am concerned about is whether Congress did give the R. F. C. the general power to administer the functions which these agencies are administering.

Mr. BALL. I think most of them are authorized in the act. I rather question whether some of the functions they have carried on are authorized, such as paying food subsidies.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it might be that for what the Senator from New Hampshire desires to accomplish he could obtain support, but at the moment it appears to me that to take a broadsword and go into this matter without a little clearer definition, or knowing what in general Congress has done in the war effort, might wreck the whole thing.

Mr. BRIDGES. It seems to me to be very clear that Congress should have supervision over the administrative expenditures of these various corporations which are authorized and controlled by the Government. We have heard the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and others who have made very impassioned speeches here today. The amendment of the junior Senator from Georgia is sound, it is in the right direction, but let us go all the way and take in these additional corporations and let Congress have control all along the line.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire except that portion which changes the word "or" to "and" in line 25 on page 74. If the Congress has specifically authorized the expenditure of funds I believe we ought not to undertake to repeal the act of Congress. I am perfectly willing to let the provision apply to all agencies which have to come before Congress to obtain appropriations, but where the Congress has specifically authorized the expenditure of funds by a corporation, such as the T. V. A., I do not think we ought to change the law. I am willing to accept the Senator's amendment, to take in all agencies, whether created by Executive order or otherwise, but where the Congress has specifically authorized the expenditure of funds I do not think we should undertake to repeal such authorization in this haphazard fashion. I am perfectly willing, however, to include all the other agencies the Senator has suggested.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator please explain what he is willing to accept, and what he is not willing to accept?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to eliminating the words "established by Executive order." I think that will accomplish what the Senator has indicated he desires to do because what we want to do is to make all these agencies accountable to Congress. If the words "established by Executive order" are eliminated, it will bring all these agencies to the point where we will either appropriate specifically for them or specifically authorize expenditures. I think that is going far enough.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. To reach the purpose the Senator from Georgia has in mind, and which obviously is in accordance with the views expressed by the Senator from New Hampshire, if, in line 22, instead of striking out the words "established by Executive order" there were inserted after the word "instrumentality" the words "including those", so as to read "instrumentality including those established by Executive order", the change in line 25 to which the Senator from Georgia objects would not be needed, and everything as to which both Senators are now in accord would be effectuated. Is that not so?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the quick mind of the Senator from Connecticut has sug-

gested an amendment that will solve the whole matter.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will modify my amendment accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. BRIDGES' amendment, as modified, is on page 74, line 22, after the word "instrumentality," to insert the words "including those."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I am seeking information. Will that make all the subsidary corporations which R. F. C. has created come annually before the Appropriations Committee or some other committee to receive specific authorization?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is what I desire to have them do.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. It would be my expectation that it would not do any such thing, I hasten to say. If the Senator from New Hampshire thinks that by modifying the amendment by adopting my language, it would force R. F. C. to come before Congress for an appropriation, I wish to say to him that it will not. Those corporate agencies are in a different status, and they ought to be, and if in fact the Senator wishes to define a policy which will reach Government corporations which are authorized specifically to borrow from the Treasury, neither the language as it was reported by the committee, nor the language suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, nor the language which I offered by way of a modification, would reach such corporate agencies.

On the other hand, all those that are set up as agencies are instrumentalities, and all those that are set up under existing law or by Executive order would come squarely within the intendment of the committee amendment if it be modified as I suggested to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Let me say, Mr. President, that it seems to me to be wise that the Senator from New Hampshire accept the modification. I will say further that I am in accord with him that some of these days we ought to take affirmative action with reference to the definition of a policy or at least a review of the authorization in execution of the policy which we have hitherto entrusted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all of its class 5-d subsidiaries. But that is not involved in an appropriation bill. It clearly is not involved in this bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I respectfully appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire to go as far as he properly can in this amendment, and let the matter of corporation authorizations be reviewed in subsequent action.

I will conclude with one further observation. We do have such corporations as the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has been specifically set up by the Congress with a list of purposes and objectives clearly stated in the enabling or the creating act. We have another class of corporations, however, which are the 5-d corporations which R. F. C. can set up in its own office, and those are the ones against which the Senator from New Hampshire no doubt would inveigh and which he hopes to reach. But this language would not do that.

I also think that in due course we ought to review the entire set-up with reference to these corporate creatures. I was simply trying by way of explanation of my own thought on this subject to assist other Senators who do not understand what I had in mind when I suggested to the Senator from New Hampshire a modification of his language.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it seems to me the weakness in congressional control over these created agencies, the children and the grandchildren of agencies that have been authorized, is due to the fact that we have never authorized an official audit of any of them, and if the Senator will look on his desk he will find that I have submitted an amendment which I expect to call up shortly which will provide for an official audit of all these agencies, whether authorized directly by the Congress or created by another agency that has been authorized by the Congress.

I agree with the Senator from Connecticut. His suggestion is about as far as it seems to me it would be safe to go. I am in full sympathy with the intent of the Senator from New Hampshire as to controlling these agencies which have been created, it might be said, promiscuously, but we do not want to take a chance on going too far. Therefore it appears to me that the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut is a good one.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am frank to say that I cannot agree entirely with the Senator from Connecticut. The language of the proposed section 213 is—

> No part of any appropriation or fund made available by this or any other act shall be allotted or made available to, or used to pay the expenses of, any agency or instrumentality.

A corporation set up by one of these agencies is certainly an instrumentality. If they have set up corporations I think they would come within the meaning of the term "instrumentality." What else is a corporation which is set up by the R. F. C. but an instrumentality to carry out some purpose of the R. F. C.?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me so I may reply to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I fully agree with the Senator from Montana that a corporation is an instrumentality. I further state that it is an instrumentality of government when it is set up under an authorization which Congress has granted. But the language in line 19 on page 74 is—

> No part of any appropriation or fund made available by this or any other act.

That means no part of any appropriation or fund for such instrumentalities as those which would be affected.

Consequently corporations which we have authorized to be created and to be capitalized by borrowing from the Treasury are in no way involved within the meaning of that language. Moreover, I will say to the Senator from Montana, if I may do so, I do not think they should be.

Mr. WHEELER. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator, Mr. President. I say that a corporation set up by the R. F. C. is an instrumentality of the R. F. C.

Mr. DANAHER. I agree. It is an instrumentality of the Government.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I agree to that.

Mr. WHEELER. If such a corporation is borrowing money from the R. F. C. without coming to the Congress for authority for that purpose, I say the language is broad enough to cover it. If the Congress authorizes the setting up of a separate corporation, that may be different. But I certainly cannot follow the construction placed upon the language by the Senator from Connecticut. I think the language is broad enough to cover such corporations, and I think it should cover them. I do not think the R. F. C. should be permitted to set up a corporation, and then give it money, without coming to the Congress and saying what the money is for. I think we should put a stop to such a practice. If there is any question about it, I think that should be done, and words to do it should be written into the bill at this time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me further reply by saying that I agree there should be an overhauling of the powers which have hitherto been granted to corporations. I am even willing to agree that some corporations which have been created have thereafter exceeded any authorization or purposes the Congress had in mind. But this bill is not the place on which to provide for an overhauling of all the corporate powers of corporations Congress has authorized.

In the Committee on Banking and Currency we very often deal with such matters, and on many occasions we have had opportunity to review requests by the R. F. C. or other agencies for increases in the authorizations as to their borrowing power. But, Mr. President, if it is borrowing power, clearly an appropriation is not involved. Clearly, if we are dealing with appropriations, and if we intend to place a limit on the appropriations in the pending bill, we may and we should limit the circumscription of this particular section to appropriations, not to corporations. That is the way I look at it, in any case; and I believe that is as far as we should go at this time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, perhaps I misunderstood the Senator. I understand that his idea is that the language is limited to corporations referred to in this particular bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Or in any other bill or act. In line 20 the words "or any other act" appear. It obviously applies to the agencies or instrumentalities over which Congress does have power, which it has authorized, and for which an appropriation has been provided. Consequently, we simply say we wish to have a chance to review the policy involved, so far as corporations created by Executive order are concerned, in addition to

those for which we appropriate directly. That is all the amendment does. It may not go as far as the Senator from Montana would like to have it go, but I say that is as far as it goes.

Mr. WHEELER. I still say, with regret, that I am unable to follow the logic of the Senator from Connecticut with reference to the matter. In connection with the interpretation of the language, if the words "established by Executive order" were included, I think that would cover the matter. I may be wrong, but that is my own interpretation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as I understand the pending issue, I accepted the amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, which provided that, after the word "instrumentality," the words "including those" be inserted, so that the language would read, "including those established by Executive order."

Mr. RUSSELL. And the same amendment would be made on page 75, in line 2.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

FEDERAL AID FOR READJUSTMENT OF VETERANS IN CIVIL LIFE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I must leave the Chamber in just a moment. Following the conclusion of the consideration of the bill now before the Senate, I am advised that Senate bill 1767 is to come up for consideration. That is the ex-servicemen's bill, or the veterans' bill, in charge of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I had intended, when the bill was before the Senate, to offer three amendments to it. I do not intend to hold up, even to the extent of having the Senate consider the amendments at this time, action on the pending bill. Inasmuch as I must leave the Chamber now, I wish to obtain unanimous consent that the three amendments may be printed in the RECORD, with the understanding that I may at a later time offer the amendments as separate amendments to the bill. I wish the RECORD to show that if I were present during the consideration of the bill, I would vote for it in its present form.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCARRAN to the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, viz: On page 5 after line 10, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 106. The Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by adding six new sections to title I thereof to be numbered 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, and 127, to read as follows:

"'SEC. 122. Upon receipt of an official report of the death of a member of the active military or naval forces as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by such service, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall notify the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the Administrator) thereof, and shall certify to the Administrator, (1) the date of death of such member, (2) the fact that the death was the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, (3) the names, addresses, and relationship of any dependents of such member, who, at the time of his or her death, were being paid monthly family allowances under this act, (4) the amount or amounts of any such monthly allowances being paid to each of such dependents, (5) the date on which any such allowances will terminate as provided in section 123, and (6) any other information necessary for the Administrator to perform the duties required of him by this act.

"'SEC. 123. The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, are hereby authorized and directed to continue the payment of any monthly family allowances to the dependents of such deceased member for a period of 1 month following the termination of such allowances as provided in section 107 (b).

"'SEC. 124. Upon receipt of the notification and certificate provided for in section 122, the Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to determine, automatically and without application therefor, whether any of such dependents are entitled to any pension or compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and the exact amount or amounts thereof, if any. Pending such determination the Administrator is hereby authorized and directed (commencing with the month following the payments provided for in sec. 123) to pay to such of the dependents of the deceased member having such relationship to him or her as might entitle them to a pension or compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the full amount or amounts of such monthly family allowances as certified to the Administrator by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy under section 122, until he shall have made the determinations provided for in this section as to any pension, compensation, and the amount or amounts thereof. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, any pension or compensation awarded such dependents under this section shall become effective after the termination of the payment of any monthly family allowances provided for in this section: *Provided*, That section 112 of this title shall apply to payments of monthly family allowances made by the Administrator under the provisions of this section.

"'SEC. 125. Nothing in this act shall be construed to (1) curtail any right of any such dependent (after any award of pension or compensation is made) to appeal from the determination and finding of the Administrator made as directed in section 124; (2) prevent the Administrator from subsequently reopening the case and making any other determination or finding with respect thereto; or (3) prevent any such dependent from waiving any pension or compensation or other benefit after such determination and finding has been made by the Administrator.

"'SEC. 126. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator are authorized jointly and severally to prescribe such regulations as they may deem necessary to enable them to carry out the provisions of sections 122, 123, 124, 125, and 127 and to delegate to such officers and employees of their respective departments as they may designate any of their functions.

"'SEC. 127. Appropriations heretofore made for the Veterans' Administration "Salaries and expenses, medical and hospital, and compensation and pensions," shall be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the purposes of section 124; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of that section.'"

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCARRAN to the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, viz: At the end of title II, page 19, insert the following new sections:

"SEC. 404. Every veteran, excepting commissioned officers whose base pay exceeds $200 per month, shall be credited with mustering-out pay as provided in section 402. Such credit shall be made as of the time of discharge or relief from active duty of such veteran.

"SEC. 405. Mustering-out pay shall be determined according to length of service prior to discharge or relief from active duty, as follows: For service less than 3 months, $150; for service more than 3 months but less than 6 months, $300; for service more than 6 months but less than 9 months, $450; for service 9 months or more, $600.

"SEC. 406. One-sixth of the amount of mustering-out pay credited to any veteran, or $50, whichever is greater, shall be paid at the time of discharge or relief from active duty of such veteran, or on the first day of the second calendar month next following approval of this act, whichever shall last occur; similar payments shall be made at consecutive monthly intervals thereafter, until the full amount of mustering-out pay credited to such veteran shall have been paid.

"SEC. 407. Payments as provided in section 403 shall be made to the veteran, if living. In the case of a veteran who shall die before receiving the full amount of mustering-out pay credited to him, any payment due under section 403, subsequent to his death, shall be made to his surviving widow, if any; and if he shall leave no surviving widow, then in equal shares to his surviving minor children, if any; and if he shall leave no surviving widow or minor children, then in equal shares to his surviving parents, if any; and if he shall leave no surviving widow, minor children, or parents, then to his executor or administrator for the benefit of his estate.

"SEC. 408. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall administer this title within their respective services."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr McCARRAN to the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans viz: At the end of title III, page 26, insert the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER VI—VETERANS' LOANS

"SEC. 600. That as used in this title—

"(a) The term 'veteran' means any person who was in the military service of the United States, as defined in section 101 (1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940, at any time during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, and who shall have been honorably discharged from such service; or any person who served in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and who shall have been honorably discharged for disability incident to such service.

"(b) The term 'veterans' loan' means a loan made by a lending agency to a veteran pursuant to the provisions of this act for the purpose of enabling such veteran to retire indebtedness owed by him on the date of his discharge from the service.

"(c) The term 'lending agency' means any banking institution the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, any Federal savings and loan association organized pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, and any building and loan association which is a member of a Federal home-loan bank.

"(d) Masculine pronouns shall be taken to include the feminine, the singular to include the plural and the plural to include the singular.

"SEC. 601. (a) Upon receipt of an application in such form as may be prescribed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation') pursuant to section 604 (a) of this act, filed by a veteran within 6 months after the date of his discharge from the service, or within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, and upon execution by such veteran of a veteran's note in such form as may be prescribed by the Corporation pursuant to such section 604 (a), a lending agency is authorized to make a veteran's loan to such veteran in an amount not to exceed the amount of indebtedness and accrued interest thereon owed by such veteran on the date of his discharge as evidenced in the manner prescribed in subsection (c) of this section; but in no case shall the amount of such loan exceed $1,000.

"(b) Such veteran's loan shall be on the monthly installment plan, repayment to begin 6 months after the date of execution of the loan. Veterans' loans shall bear interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the unpaid portion of the obligation. No veteran's loan shall be made for a period longer than 3 years; but if made for a shorter period, any veteran's loan may be refinanced, in the discretion of the lending agency, by extension of payments, without impairing the obligation of the Corporation under section 604 (a) of this act: *Provided*, That under any refinancing plan agreed to, equal monthly installments shall be required, and provision shall be made for complete discharge of the entire obligation, including interest, not later than 3 years from the date of the veteran's loan. Acceleration of installments on a veteran's loan shall not be permitted by the lending agency unless the loan is more than 3 months in arrears, except that the lending agency may accept whole or partial settlement of any veteran's loan, without regard to prescribed installments, in any case where the lending agency has good reason to believe that the veteran's loan was procured wholly or in part by fraud.

"(c) Any application for a veteran's loan shall be accompanied by satisfactory evidence of the honorable discharge of the applicant by a list of present and certain future benefits due the applicant from the Government of the United States, or from any of its departments or agencies, at the time of the application, and by a certified list of creditors showing the amounts owed by such applicant as of the date of such discharge; and shall comply with such other requirements as may be provided in accordance with section 604 (a) of this act. No security, endorsers, or comakers shall be required with respect to any such loan. The obligation of the Corporation to purchase, as provided in section 602, shall not be created in the case of any borrower who is not in fact a veteran.

"(d) Within 5 days after making any veteran's loan, the lending agency shall give notice thereof, in such form as shall be provided in accordance with section 604 (a) of this act, to the Corporation and to all Government departments and agencies from which benefits are due or to become due the applicant, according to the list filed by the applicant with his application, as provided in subsection 601 (c) of this act.

"SEC. 602. The Corporation shall agree to purchase from the lending agency any note legally executed by a veteran for the purpose of securing a veteran's loan, in full compliance with the provisions of section 601 and subsection 605 (a) of this act, which remains unpaid for 30 days after the date of maturity thereof, or on which installments are more than 3 months in arrears, at a price equal to the unpaid portion of such note and any interest accrued and unpaid thereon: *Provided*, That in any case in connection with which the lending agency is guilty of fraud or gross negligence, the Corporation shall not be obligated under this section. As consideration for such agreement by the Corporation, the lending agency shall agree to pay to the Corporation an amount equal to 1½ percent per annum of the unpaid portion of such loan, to be payable at such time and in such manner as the Corporation may prescribe.

"SEC. 603. (a) Upon notice by the Corporation or by a lending agency that it is the holder of a note given by a veteran for the purpose of securing a veteran's loan under this act, any Government department or agency of the United States shall consider the amount of unpaid principal and interest thereon as a preferred lien on any pension, compensation, insurance, or other financial benefit accrued or thereafter accruing, under any of the laws administered by such department or agency, to such veteran or to his dependents or beneficiaries, and shall withhold from such accrued or accruing benefits, and remit to the Corporation upon demand, such amounts as will fully discharge such indebtedness: *Provided*, That the official having charge of the payment of any such benefits may, with the approval of the Corporation, release all or part of such benefits from the Corporation's lien, in any case where he determines such release is advisable because of the needs of the veteran, or his dependents or beneficiaries.

"(b) The special remedy provided by this section shall not be deemed exclusive.

"SEC. 604. (a) The Corporation is authorized and directed to prescribe and furnish to lending agencies forms of applications for veterans' loans under this act and of notes to be executed by veterans for the purpose of securing such loans, and to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to enable it to carry out the provisions of this act, and such forms, rules, and regulations shall be uniform with regard to all veterans' loans.

"(b) The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations which the Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to enable the Corporation to carry out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 605. (a) Not more than one veteran's loan shall be made under the provisions of this act to any veteran, regardless of the amount of such loan, except that a veteran who has received a veteran's loan in a lesser amount than the maximum amount of the loan to which he is entitled under subsection 601 (a) of this act, but who is otherwise eligible for a veteran's loan, may apply for and receive a second veteran's loan: *Provided*, That the existence of the first veteran's loan shall be disclosed by the applicant to the lending agency to which application for a second veteran's loan is made, and that such lending agency shall make certain such first loan is paid in full, both as to principal and interest, from the proceeds of such second veteran's loan.

"(b) Any person who, having obtained a veteran's loan under this act, solicits, applies for, or accepts another such loan, except as provided in subsection 605 (a) of this act, and any person who knowingly and willfully furnishes any false or misleading information for the purpose of obtaining a veteran's loan, or of enabling another to obtain a veteran's loan, under this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended on page 74, beginning in line 19.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, line 3, after the sum, and before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Comptroller General shall designate an employee of the General Accounting Office to act as Comptroller General during the absence or incapacity of the Comptroller General and the Assistant Comptroller General, or during a vacancy in both of such offices."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 11, 1944.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Acting Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the honor to submit for your consideration for inclusion in a pending appropriation bill carrying appropriations for the General Accounting Office the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That the Comptroller General shall designate an employee of the General Accounting Office to act as Comptroller General during the absence or incapacity of the Comptroller General and the Assistant Comptroller General, or during a vacancy in both of such offices."

Section 302 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, provides for an Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, who shall act as Comptroller General during the absence or incapacity of the Comptroller General, or during a vacancy in that office. Also, section 311 (e) of said act provides that all official acts performed by such officers or employees specially designated therefor by the Comptroller General shall have the same force and effect as though performed by the Comptroller General in person. Under authority of the latter provision, the Comptroller General from time to time has designated certain officers or employees of the General Accounting Office specially to perform certain duties imposed upon him by law. However, there is no clear authority for the designation by the Comptroller General of an employee to act as Comptroller General during the absence or incapacity of both himself and the Assistant Comptroller General, or during a vacancy in both offices.

The need for legislation of the character here proposed is apparent in the recent history of the General Accounting Office. During the period for July 1, 1936, to April 10, 1939, and for a considerable period in 1940, the office of Comptroller General was vacant. The then Assistant Comptroller General acted as Comptroller General, pursuant to law, but there was no other officer specifically authorized by law so to act in the event of his absence or incapacity or in the event he had resigned or retired or his term had ended. Individuals previously designated under section 311 (e) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, could have continued to perform, in the name of the Comptroller General, the acts specified in their respective designations, but there would have been no one empowered to make new or additional delegations of authority or to perform the full duties of the office of Comptroller General.

General statutory provisions for temporary succession in emergencies have been made in the case of the heads of the executive departments of the Government and the bureaus and offices thereof. (See title 5, U. S. C., secs. 1 to 9.)

I am proposing enactment of this legislation as a part of a pending appropriation bill carrying appropriations for the General Accounting Office because it has seemed to me that the legislation requested herein is so clearly devoid of any objectionable features and so clearly and urgently needed to assure the continuous and complete operation of the General Accounting Office through any future emergency of the character sought to be guarded against that you and your committee might agree with me that it would be more economical and prompter if the authority sought can be obtained in that way rather than through the medium of a separate bill for the purpose.

I shall be glad to appear before your committee for the purpose of explaining this proposal further if you should desire me to do so.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BURTON. What disposition was made of the amendment to section 210, on page 73?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was agreed to, without debate.

Mr. BURTON. I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered. I should like to state the nature of the amendment, because I think a brief statement will enable the Senate to realize the reason why the vote by which the amendment was agreed to should be reconsidered.

The amendment is the one which involves the abolition of the civil service as it would affect positions with salaries of $4,500 or more a year. The amendment would make all such positions subject to having the salaries paid only when the persons holding such positions were appointed by the President and confirmed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I believe the amendment should have consideration before the vote upon it is taken.

Therefore I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am sure all Members of the Senate understood the amendment at the time when it was agreed to. Consequently I see no reason for having the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the vote by which the amendment to section 210, on page 73, was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BURTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as I previously made, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. If he were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending a funeral.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Washington.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Utah.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—31

Andrews	Holman	Russell
Bailey	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bankhead	McClellan	Stewart
Bushfield	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Chand'er	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Maybank	Weeks
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Overton	Wherry
George	Reed	
Gerry	Robertson	

NAYS—23

Aiken	Capper	Shipstead
Austin	Davis	Tunnell
Ball	Downey	Vandenberg
Barkley	Hill	White
Bridges	La Follette	Wiley
Buck	Langer	Willis
Burton	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Butler	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—42

Bilbo	Guffey	Nye
Bone	Gurney	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hatch	Pepper
Brooks	Hawkes	Revercomb
Byrd	Hayden	Reynolds
Caraway	Jackson	Scrugham
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	Mead	Truman
Gillette	Moore	Wagner
Glass	Murdock	Wallgren
Green	Murray	Walsh, N. J.

So Mr. MCKELLAR's motion to lay on the table Mr. BURTON's motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 20, after the figures "$1,978,707", it is proposed to insert "of which not less than $172,410 shall be available for the enforcement of the Wool Products Labeling Act."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is a repetition of the provision which was in the bill last year, and I think it ought to be contained in the bill this year. It is an earmarking of the amount of money which may be expended for the Truth in Fabrics Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on page 34, line 3, after the word "expenses", I move to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$655,000."

The budget of the Bureau of Valuation of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the fiscal year 1943 and 1944 amounted to slightly less than $700,000, including the overtime pay of employees. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $655,000 for the fiscal year 1944–45, a

reduction below the current year of approximately $40,000. The House Appropriations Committee cut $155,000 from the Budget figure, which resulted in the bill passing the House with a figure of $500,000, and the Senate committee did not alter that amount.

It would appear from a perusal of the House report that this action was taken because the work of valuation in connection with the war activities of the Government was on a reimbursable basis. Further consideration of the matter would seem to indicate that this money was not utilized for the purpose of expanding the number of employees, but on the contrary was utilized to pay overtime, or was returned to the Treasury.

The Bureau of Valuation has conducted some very important valuation work for the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Navy Department, for the Maritime Commission, and for some of the other agencies of government, in connection with a report. I am offering this amendment in order that the matter may have further consideration in conference. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will be willing to take it to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the circumstances stated by the Senator from Wisconsin, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I greatly appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. President, I shall conclude by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, sundry letters from various agencies involved, by which the Valuation Division of the Interstate Commerce Commission has done this special war evaluation work.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1943.

HON. CAROL MILLER,
Commissioner in Charge of Valuation, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: I have learned informally that there is a possibility of curtailing the personnel in your Bureau of Valuation. This information coming at this time is of great concern to me and which I personally feel would cripple the Navy's war effort or at least force such a radical change and departure in our methods of doing business that our costs would be greatly increased and we would be forced to augment our personnel.

As I presume you are aware, in its land program the Navy Department has refrained from building up a large appraisal organization. It has been able to do so because of the fact that it has had the resources of the Interstate Commerce Commission's Bureau of Valuation at its command. We have been able to limit our field force to 19 men only because we can have and have had recourse to the facilities and information in the some twenty-odd offices of your Bureau spread throughout this country. If those offices are not staffed we have to replace them. Of course, with the tempo with which this war has of necessity to be conducted we are under the urgent need of speed in the ascertainment of values, first, in justification of programs calling for the expenditure of public funds and, second, though not less important, the public duty of making prompt and just payment for properties expropriated.

I feel very strongly on this subject. All of the men who are associated with me feel very much of the same mind—that to dry up this source of valuation information would be a wasteful and dangerous thing to do.

While I have no wish to intrude myself nor again to burden you with a long letter on the subject, I would be very glad to explain to you our valuation problem in terms of volume and amounts involved, and I believe that you would be quite convinced that any change in the relatively small number of people in your Bureau's Valuation Section would be a serious handicap to us in our land-acquisition work.

I would like to call attention further to the fact that under the new Naval Appropriation Acts all proposals for land acquisition since the 1st of March or for leasehold interests must have the prior approval of the two Naval Affairs Committees of the Congress. In the past 3 weeks, therefore, we have monopolized the time of three of your men obtaining information required by the Congress.

With this short statement and your knowledge of the complexity of naval operations throughout the country, I think you have some idea of what would be involved if your offices would be curtailed or closed. We would have to duplicate the information and duplicate the men. Neither seems advisable and either one or both would involve delays and expense to the United States.

Not the least important part of the present set-up is the independence of your appraisers and appraisal data from any suggestion of control or influence by any other Department. Our experience in court has been that by reason of their independent set-up, I. C. C. appraisers are highly respected and their opinions exceedingly valuable for the guidance of both courts and juries in determination of valuation.

Before any changes are made, in the public interest and for the good of us all in this war effort, I hope you will give me a chance to more fully explain and elaborate upon our part of this whole picture and demonstrate the effect it will have upon this organization.

Respectfully,

JOHN J. COURTNEY,
Head of Real Estate Division.

EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, December 18, 1943.

HON. CARROLL MILLER,
Member, Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: It has come to the attention of the Maritime Commission that there is a possibility that the working force of the Bureau of Valuation of the Interstate Commerce Commission may be reduced. The Maritime Commission sincerely hopes that this will not come about. If this force should be reduced, we fear that it may not be possible for us during the remainder of the war period to secure from your Commission services which have been made available to us in the past and which have expedited the Maritime Commission's war effort, and have in addition been responsible for saving the Government substantial sums of money.

It is difficult in this letter to develop in detail the advantages which the Maritime Commission and the Government have secured by utilizing the specialized services of your personnel. I will, however, cite one or two instances.

In 1942 the Maritime Commission found it necessary, in order to expedite ship production and cut down production expenses, to construct a spur line of railroad at Portland, Maine. We did not have available on our staff a practical railroad engineer. The Interstate Commerce Commission made available to us the services of Mr. John Hansbury, who laid out the line of railway and advised us constantly and effectively in our negotiations for the construction of and operation over the spur track. Without Mr. Hansbury's help, construction of this important line of track (which is an integral part of our ship-production system at Portland) would have taken a much longer time than was actually consumed, and the resulting loss of time would have prevented ships from the two shipyards involved from being delivered at the rate they have been delivered since operation over the spur track began.

Recently it became necessary in connection with this spur track to have constructed certain switching facilities and to enter into service contracts. In connection with these matters, Mr. Hansbury's help has again expedited our work and resulted in a substantial saving of Government money.

Recently an appraisal of railroad land in California by a representative of the Bureau of Valuation of the Interstate Commerce Commission (Mr. Geisler) has enabled the Maritime Commission to secure a material reduction in rentals upon the lands in question which are utilized for ship-construction purposes.

In connection with requisition by the Maritime Commission of railroad equipment for transporting shipyard workers to and from the yards, valuation reports by Interstate Commerce Commission employees have been of particular value in determining just compensation for the property requisitioned.

The services of representatives of the Bureau of Valuation in appraising real property and machinery, in some cases leased and in others involved in condemnation cases, have been invaluable to us. In one of these cases, the property in question was an old railroad property, and it is doubtful if any private appraiser could have made as accurate an appraisal as was made by the Interstate Commerce Commission personnel.

In at least one other case, appraisals by representatives of the Bureau of Valuation (Mr. Sandford in particular) have enabled the Maritime Commission to effect substantial cuts in rentals of shipyard property.

Even more valuable perhaps than the specialized knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commission personnel has been the fact that because your representatives are not employees of the Maritime Commission, their opinions and advices have been peculiarly effective in connection with our negotiations, and generally regarded by the private interests with which the Commission deals as emanating from a disinterested and neutral source. It is in our opinion of importance to preserve this third-party position of your employees, particularly as a number of them will doubtless be utilized during 1944 as witnesses in condemnation cases. If it becomes necessary for them to take the stand not as employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission but as Maritime Commission men, this fact will unquestionably be brought out on cross-examination, and may to a certain extent render their opinions as to values less persuasive to court or jury.

Summed up, it is the feeling of the Maritime Commission that the cutting of the personnel of your Bureau of Valuation, with the attending loss to this Commission of the services recounted, would be contrary to the best interests of that portion of the war effort being carried on by the Maritime Commission We hope that this reduction will not come about. If it does, we feel that the Government over-all will lose money by it. The services which we have been securing from you on a most economical

basis will have to be secured elsewhere at equal or greater cost, and we believe will be less effective, with a resulting increase expense to us in certain of our activities.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. WOODWARD,
Commissioner.

EXHIBIT 3

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, February 24, 1944.

Mr. W. P. BARTEL,
Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. BARTEL: Your letter of February 22, 1944, requests me to furnish the Interstate Commerce Commission with such factual data as the Maritime Commission may have with respect to the cost of appraisals made by the Bureau of Valuation of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the Maritime Commission; savings, if any, effected by the use of such appraisals; and in general the value of the work done by the Bureau of Valuation for the Maritime Commission. The information available to us is as follows:

For work done for the Maritime Commission by representatives of the Bureau of Valuation from April 21, 1942, to June 17, 1943, we have reimbursed the Interstate Commerce Commission in the amount of $30,707.08. I am advised that we have incurred an additional cost of a few thousand dollars for further work on a project wherein the cost of full appraisals was $7,670.34. As opposed to this cost, savings have been effected in the amount of $36,684 by readjustment of one lease, $4,172 on settlement for requisitioned transportation equipment, and not less than $177,893 representing the difference between the jury verdict in a condemnation case and the lowest evidence of value submitted to the landowner, a saving of $218,749. Further readjustment of certain leases already agreed to by lessors will reflect an annual saving of $49,872. Readjustments of various lease obligations already agreed to by lessors should save not less than $1,442,476. There remain pending seven cases of requisitioned equipment as to the value of which representatives of your Bureau of Valuation are particularly competent to form an opinion, wherein the claims aggregate $1,229,922.74, and relying upon appraisals by representatives of your Bureau of Valuation, we hope to save in excess of $528,000.

It follows from the above that these appraisals secured from you at a cost of between $30,000 and $40,000 reflect actual and potential savings well in excess of $2,000,000, plus annual savings on leases of approximately $50,000.

We have pending several important condemnation cases wherein the value of the land to be taken unquestionably exceeds in the aggregate $1,000,000. The value of the testimony of your employees in these cases should be great, particularly in view of the fact that in every instance you have attempted to assign to our appraisal work, men well-qualified to form sound opinions as to the value of property in the particular locality involved and to support their opinions upon the witness stand.

In addition to the above, the advice of representatives of your Bureau of Valuation on technical problems of railway construction and operation has enabled us to meet our problems on an equal footing with the representatives of the railroads themselves.

I trust that the foregoing facts and figures taken from the records of the Maritime Commission are what you require, and, of course, I have no objection to the Interstate Commerce Commission placing this letter in the record if it so desires.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT 4

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
New Orleans, La., October 9, 1942.

Mr. A. B. MANLY,
Head Land Appraiser, Bureau of Valuation, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. MANLY: The trial of the condemnation suit against the second floor of the Audubon Building ended yesterday afternoon at 2:30 with a verdict in favor of the Government.

I cannot refrain from writing this letter to tell you how helpful the testimony of Mr. R. Tyler Price, of the Land Section, and Mr. George Douglass, of the Engineering Section, was to the Government's case. Both of these gentlemen were most cooperative and made splendid expert witnesses.

The jury verdict, which was for $17,500 for the term taken, gives a per annum rental of $13,278. The appraisal by Mr. Price was $13,360 per annum. We have computed that the jury verdict varied from Mr. Price's appraisal only to the extent of 1 cent per square foot.

I consider this a remarkable testimonial to Mr. Price's ability. This case makes the third I have had with Mr. Price as a Government expert, and in each, his poise and presence as a witness was impressive, his research exhaustive and accurate.

I thought it would be gratifying to you to hear how highly I regard the two gentlemen who are in your department.

Very truly yours,

NORTON L. WISDON,
Special Attorney, Department of Justice.

EXHIBIT 5

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1944.

Mr. R. A. LACEY,
Director, Bureau of Valuation, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Recent negotiations conducted by the Navy in the leasehold acquisitions of State pier, New London, Conn., and pier 37, North River, N. Y., have directed our attention to the excellent appraisals of these properties submitted by your Bureau and prepared by your senior land appraiser, David W. Sweet.

The factual data contained in the reports were such that they reflected conditions affecting the property in a manner so clear that the negotiations were greatly facilitated. The principal strength, however, was the clear, concise discussion of the data and the logical reasoning of the appraiser in assignment of and support to his values. Mr. Sweet's work in these and the many other appraisals which he has prepared for the Navy Department has been of such character as to deserve particular notice and commendation. The wealth of his experience and knowledge of his subjects have at all times been clearly portrayed in such a manner that our negotiary activities have been materially aided.

Considerable comment has been made to personnel of this agency by members of the legal and real estate fraternity concerning Mr. Sweet's testimony before the commissioners in the Bayonne, N. J., acquisition by the Navy. These comments may be summarized by the statement of one of the commissioners hearing the case which was to the effect that Mr. Sweet's testimony evidenced complete and thorough knowledge of the property, absolute honesty in appraisal, and a reasonable and logical summation of factors, so that his valuation conclusions were considered by this commissioner as the outstanding and most worth-while evidence which tended toward this commissioner's valuation verdict.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. COURTNEY,
By direction of Chief of Bureau.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which has been printed, and copies of which lie on the desks of Senators. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) The financial transactions of every agency or corporation of the Government of the United States, or created under its authority, either directly or indirectly (including any agency or corporation the majority of the capital stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States), except as provided in subdivision (d), for which an appropriation has been or shall be hereafter made by the Congress, shall, beginning with the fiscal year 1945, be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. A report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable.

(b) The expenses of such audit shall be paid from moneys advanced therefor by each such respective agency or corporation, or from any appropriation for the General Accounting Office; and any such appropriation so used shall be reimbursed promptly by such agency or corporation as billed by the Comptroller. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, and property belonging to or under the control of any such agency or corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided*, That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of any such agency or corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of any such agency or corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

(c) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where the records of such agency or corporation are normally kept in the transaction of its business.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any agency or corporation of the Government the financial transactions of which are otherwise required to be audited under authority of Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this amendment clearly proposes legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of rule XVI, and I therefore make the point of order that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I concede that the amendment proposes legislation which I hope will be added to an appropriation bill. The purpose of the proposed legislation, which should be very clear to everyone, is to bring under the Comptroller General's Office, and thereby somewhat more nearly under the control of Congress, those agencies of Government which thus far have escaped being required to make to the Congress proper accounting of their funds.

I will read the names of those Corporations which now escape being audited, and therefore do not have to let Congress or the people know what they are doing with the money appropriated or given to them by a higher agency.

Allow me first to say that there are several agencies which are not required by law to be audited by the Comptroller General's Office, but many of them have voluntarily asked the Comptroller General to audit their accounts. I shall not read their names. There are approximately 30 agencies which will come in the category to which I first referred.

Banks for Cooperatives: Central Bank for Cooperatives, District Banks for Cooperatives (12); Defense Homes Corporation; Defense Plant Corporation; Defense Supplies Corporation; Disaster Loan Corporation; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Federal home-loan banks (12); Federal Intermediate Credit Banks (12); Federal land banks (12); Federal National Mortgage Association; Inland Waterways Corporation; Metals Reserve Company; Panama Railroad Company; Petroleum Reserves Corporation; Production Credit Corporations (12); Reconstruction Finance Corporation; RFC Mortgage Company; regional agricultural credit corporations (2), Washington and Minneapolis; Rubber Development Corporation; Rubber Reserve Company; Steel Recovery Corporation; Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.—

I do not know what that is—

Textile Foundation, Inc.; United States Commercial Company; United States Spruce Production Corporation.

This Corporation has been in process of liquidation for some time, and it seems as though it were time for the Corporation to be audited.

The list continues:

Virgin Islands Co.; War Damage Corporation; War Emergency Pipe Lines, Inc.; War Materials, Inc.; Warrior River Terminal Co.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. AIKEN. I am reading from a list which is shown on page 807 of the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1945, before the committee of the other House. The Senator from New Hampshire was reading from the same page only a short time ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the fact that the Senator from Vermont has been unable to erect any screen of germaneness behind which he is hiding his proposed legislation, the Chair rules that the point of order of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is sustained.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that Senate Rule XVI be suspended in order that the Senate may vote and act upon the proposed amendment at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the rule requires that a motion to suspend the rule be made in writing 24 hours before being presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont gave notice in writing on March 20.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, the notice was given, because I expected, knowing some of the operators of the departments downtown, objection would be made to any move to bring them under the Office of the Comptroller General.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to make clear, in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont, that no one downtown or uptown, or anywhere else, has suggested such a thing to me. I am seeking to preserve the rules of the Senate, and the Senator has conceded that I have the right to make the point of order. I do not see why he should attribute my action here to someone downtown. Every now and then I do something on my own accord.

Mr. AIKEN. After his wonderful display of courage a few days ago, I would not accuse the Senator from Kentucky of anything.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Vermont has implied that I made the point of order because of some operator downtown. I do not object to the auditing of any governmental agency in the United States, but I think measures affecting these agencies which have been created under various laws ought to be considered as matters of substantive legislation and not brought in under an appropriation bill in order to change the law without committee consideration.

Take, for example, the Federal Reserve banks. I do not know whether they should be audited by the General Accounting Office. The various agencies loaning money out of funds which they receive in the way of interest from farmers who borrow money and pay interest into the Treasury are audited by the Farm Credit Administration under which they are created. I think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would like to consider whether they ought to be audited by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we have added a good deal of essential legislation to the independent offices appropriation bill today, but if we do not provide for auditing these different agencies, what good is it all going to do unless we know what they do with the money? This amendment would not handicap them in any way.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. AIKEN. Just a moment. The amendment does not provide for a preaudit; it provides for an annual audit, and if the Comptroller General shall find they are misspending their money in some way, he can report to Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator could long ago have introduced bills and had them referred to the committees which had jurisdiction over these agencies, instead of waiting until the last 5 or 10 minutes in the consideration of an appropriation bill, and now bringing the matter up and asking the Senate to vote. I am quite satisfied that if the Senator will offer bills and have them referred to the proper committees which have jurisdiction over these agencies, they will receive the consideration to which they are entitled.

Mr. AIKEN. I have not waited until the last 5 or 10 minutes. This amendment was offered last Monday, it was printed, and was on the desks of Senators Tuesday morning. I have no more waited until the last 5 or 10 minutes than has the Senator from Georgia, or the other Senators who proposed amendments which have rightfully been agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator brought the amendment up as soon as he could, but the point is that at the last minute, with this important appropriation bill before us, he is asking the Senate to adopt an amendment which affects the procedure of what he calls 38 different agencies, the names of some of which he has read, and as to some of which I have grave doubt in my own mind whether there is not already sufficient audit and control over them by those responsible. But I think it should be done in an orderly way, by legislation, and not by an amendment on an appropriation bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Kentucky must know that any amendment adopted by the Senate would go to conference, and if any very great injustice would be committed that it would be corrected there. This is the time—right now—for putting these various agencies—most of them under the R. F. C.—under the control of the Comptroller General's Office, or at least in such a position that they will have to give a proper account of their funds, which will be reported to the Congress. This is the time to do that.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Vermont if, in the course of his study and preparation for this very excellent amendment, he went into the subject of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at all.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been observing the work of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a long time, and I came to the conclusion a long time ago that they should be under the control of Congress to a greater degree than they are now. I have seen hundreds of millions of dollars which I have considered just thrown down rat holes.

Mr. DANAHER. With a contingent total liability of somewhere in the neighborhood of $14,000,000,000 for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation alone, does the Senator recall that in November 1942 the R. F. C. was here asking us for an additional authorization of $5,000,000,000 of borrowing power?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; and the Senator will recall that it is very difficult to find out from the head of the R. F. C. where that money goes, and why it goes there, or anything about it.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out to the Senator that we did not give the R. F. C. that additional $5,000,000,000 borrowing power, although the testimony was, and the representation to the Senate was, by the leadership in favor of the bill, that if we did not give the $5,000,000,000 by that afternoon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would fold up, and the war effort would be retarded, and everything else. But from that day to this they have not had an increase in their borrowing power. What are they doing for money, and where are they getting it, under what

circumstances are they expending it, subject to whose audit, let me ask the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies hire auditing concerns to audit claims against the Government, which audit the books of the corporations making claims against the Government. The auditing concerns say they do it honestly, but they never put the same man on the books of the Corporation that they put on auditing claims the Corporation makes against the Government.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator know what obligations the R. F. C. has incurred all through 1942 and down to this 24th day of March 1944?

Mr. AIKEN. Nobody knows, because they get other departments of Government to bail them out. They were bailed out in a shipbuilding company case, and Mr. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, said, when he appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, in answer to a question of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that they had arrangements with defense plants to bail them out and take over their property. That is going on day after day in this Government. Then we hear it said that they should not be audited.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, as I understand the Senator's contention, the Comptroller General is not permitted, under existing law, to audit the R. F. C. accounts and the accounts of its subsidiary corporations. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is corect.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. I am hoping he can get the two-thirds vote to suspend the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont to suspend the rule.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wondered how long the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had not been audited by the Comptroller General.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, it has never been audited. It has not been audited since I have been in Washington.

Mr. MAYBANK. When was it created?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not recall.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was created about 1930.

Mr. MAYBANK. If my memory serves me correctly, long, long ago, in the Hoover administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was created in 1930 or 1931.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was quite active in distributing relief money, was it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, it was quite active at that time. The R. F. C. is audited by auditors. It is not audited by the Comptroller General, and Congress has never required that it should be, because the activities of the R. F. C. are such that when they pass upon a loan, especially loans such as those they have been making to business for 12 or 14 years, the loans have to go through their board of directors, and if they had to delay their activities in coming to the relief of business by having the General Accounting Office pass upon their loans, they could not afford the relief required.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was just wondering why, after 14 years——

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know when they were organized or authorized, and I do not care what administration was in power when they were organized. They should have been required to be audited when they were created. As the Senator from Kentucky says, they are audited, but they are audited by concerns which they hire and pay themselves, and the results of the audits are not submitted to the Congress, so far as I know.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as previously, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending a funeral.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 33, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Davis	Thomas, Idaho
Austin	Holman	Tunnell
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Brewster	La Follette	Walsh, Mass.
Bridges	Langer	Weeks
Buck	McKellar	Wheeler
Burton	Maloney	Wherry
Bushfield	Millikin	White
Butler	Reed	Wiley
Capper	Robertson	Willis
Danaher	Shipstead	Wilson

NAYS—19

Andrews	Eastland	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	George	Radcliffe
Barkley	Gerry	Smith
Chandler	Hill	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	
Downey	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—44

Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Bilbo	Hatch	Pepper
Bone	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brooks	Hayden	Reynolds
Byrd	Jackson	Russell
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Mead	Tobey
Ferguson	Moore	Truman
Gillette	Murdock	Tydings
Glass	Murray	Wallgren
Green	Nye	Walsh, N. J.
Guffey	O'Daniel	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 33, the nays 19. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative——

At this point Mr. REVERCOMB entered the Chamber and voted "yea."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that according to senatorial custom, after the announcement has been made it is impossible to——

Mr. BRIDGES. The Chair had not finished the announcement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Chair had undoubtedly made the announcement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair had not completed his statement, however.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Chair had announced the vote, though.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair had announced the number, but had not completed the statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not affect the result anyway. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia be permitted to vote inasmuch as it does not change the result.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On this vote the yeas are 34, the nays are 19. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, the motion to suspend rule XVI is not agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there are no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill H. R. 4070 was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

FEDERAL AID FOR READJUSTMENT OF VETERANS IN CIVIL LIFE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1767 to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Finance.

The first committee amendment was, in title I, under the heading "Chapter 1—hospitalization, claims, and procedures," in section 100, page 2, line 5, after the words "to be an", to strike out "agency of the United States vital and essential to the successful prosecution of the present war, and as such agency the Veterans' Administration shall be" and to insert "essential war agency and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 104, on page 4, line 16, after the word "no", to strike out "wounded, diseased, or handicapped"; in line 18, after the word "service", to insert "on account of disability"; and in line 24, after the word "care", to insert "nor preclude the discharge of any person who refuses to sign such claim or statement."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 105, on page 5, line 1, after the word "forces", to strike out "suffering from disease or injury"; in line 4, after the word "of", to strike out "such" and insert "any"; in the same line, after the word "injury", to insert "he may have"; and in line 5, after the word "against", to strike out "the interest of such person" and insert "his own interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 200, on page 6, line 6, after the word "Navy", to strike out "in conjunction" and insert "jointly."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 300, on page 7, line 8, after the word "That", to strike out "in any case to which this section applies the surrender value, if any, of" and insert "this section shall not apply to"; and in line 11, after the word "policy" to strike out "at the time of forfeiture shall be payable to the insured if living, or, if the insured die before such payment, to the designated beneficiary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 301, on page 7, line 23, after the words "court martial", to strike out the comma and the words "and except, in the case of officers, denial of retirement with pay"; and on page 8, line 14, after the words "court martial" to strike out "and except, in the case of officers, denial of retirement with pay."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in title II, under the heading "Chapter IV—Education of Veterans," in section 400, on page 9, line 7, after the word "under", to strike out "honorable"; in line 8, after the word "conditions", to insert "other than dishonorable"; and in line 13, after the word "disability", to strike out the colon and the following: *"And provided further,* That the education or training of such person was interrupted or prevented by such service, or such person requires a refresher or retraining course in no event to exceed 1 year, to fit him for employment or profession."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 13, after the word "Navy", to insert "the Secretary of Agriculture"; in line 16, after the word "and", to strike out "six" and insert "eight"; in line 18, after the word "Affairs", to strike out "at least four of whom shall be recognized leaders in the field of education," and insert "who shall be recognized leaders in the fields of education, labor, agriculture, and industry."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 23, after the numeral "6", to strike out "A" and insert "Except as to a refresher or retraining course, a," and on page 12, line 14, after the word "obtained", to insert "Subject to the above limitations, any person who has not completed his course of education or training but has satisfactorily completed his first year, shall be eligible and entitled to continue his course of education or training until he has completed the same, provided his work continues satisfactorily throughout the remaining period."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 5, after the word "thereof", to strike out "(a) for the purpose of advising and assisting in selecting those persons who shall be entitled to receive a further period of education or training as provided for in this part or (b)"; and on page 16, line 7, after the word "part", to add the following proviso: *"Provided,* That wherever there are established State apprenticeship agencies expressly charged by State laws to administer apprentice training, the Administrator shall, whenever possible, utilize such existing facilities and services in training on the job when such training is of 1 year's duration or more."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 4, after the word "education", to insert "or any State apprenticeship agency"; in line 6, after the words "council", to strike out "of" and insert "or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 2, after the numerals "VII", to strike out "All payments under the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 received by any person during the time that such person is receiving education or training under the provisions of this part shall be offset by suspension of equal amounts of subsistence allowance, which suspended amounts may be paid after completion of education or training hereunder."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 12, after the word "agency", to strike out "or State apprenticeship agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 17, in section 403, after "403", to strike out "Paragraph" and insert "Subsection (f) of section 1, title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and paragraph"; in line 21, after "1943", to strike out "is" and insert "are"; in line 22, after the word "the", to strike out "date" and insert "dates 'December 7, 1941' and"; and in line 23, after "1941", to strike out "in the first sentence thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in title III, under the heading "Loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property" in section 501, on page 22, line 21, after the word "paid", to strike out "and" and insert "or"; on page 23, line 2, after the words "purpose of", to insert "making repairs, alterations, or improvements in, or"; in line 4, after the word "special", to strike out "assessments, on" and insert "assessments on"; in line 5, after the word "purchased", to strike out "for a home" and insert "or owned"; in the same line after

the word "veteran", to insert "and used by him as a home," and in line 7, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(d)" and insert "(d),".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 502, on page 24, line 1, after the word "implements", to insert "or in repairing, altering, or improving any buildings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in title IV, under the heading "Chapter VI—Employment of veterans," in section 601, on page 27, line 15, after the word "Board", to insert "in accordance with the civil-service laws, and whose compensation shall be fixed"; and in line 16, after the words "with the", to strike out "civil service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 604, on page 29, line 12, after the word "functions", to insert "the Federal agency administering the United States Employment Service shall maintain that service as an operating entity, and, during the period of its administration, shall effectuate the provisions of this title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 605, on page 30, line 6, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in title V, under the heading "Chapter VII—Readjustment allowances for former members of the armed forces who are unemployed," in section 800, on page 33, line 15, after the word "or", to strike out "indirectly" and insert "directly"; in line 24, after the words "branches of", to strike out "work" and insert "work, which"; in line 25, after the word "separate", to strike out "premises or" and insert "premises"; on page 34, line 6, after the word "provisions" to strike out "of paragraph (1)"; in line 10, after the word "weeks", to strike out:

In addition, the 24-month period within which he might otherwise be eligible to receive readjustment allowances shall be reduced by the number of weeks for which the claimant shall have been disqualified.

(2) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions of paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) of this section, he shall be disqualified to receive any readjustment allowance for the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and for all subsequent weeks until he has had substantially full-time employment for wages for a period of 2 weeks, or in the event of any subsequent disqualification, the Administrator may prescribe a longer period of such employment, not to exceed 4 weeks.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"; in line 25, after the words "provisions of", to strike out "paragraph (1) of"; on page 35, line 1, after the word "section", to strike out "impose the disqualification provided in paragraph (2) above, when in the estimate of the Administrator such additional disqualification is in furtherance of the purposes of this act" and insert "extend the period of disqualification for such additional period as the Administrator may prescribe, but not to exceed 8 additional weeks in the case of any one disqualification."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 21, after "(2)", to strike out "No" and insert "In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work, no"; and in line 23, after the word "suitable", to insert "for an individual."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1102, on page 42, line 10, after the word "agency", to insert "or other such agency as may be designated by the Administrator."; in line 12, after the word "Administrator", to strike out "located in each State participating in the administration of this title"; in line 14, after the word "final", to strike out "appellate"; in line 14, after the word "contested", to strike out "claims arising in such State. The decision of the representative shall be subject to review by" and to insert "claims, subject to appeal."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in title VI, under "Chapter XVI—General Administrative and Penal Provisions", in section 1602, on page 45, line 16, after the word "Act", to insert "unless the context otherwise requires", and in line 18, after the word "feminine", to insert "and the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 1603. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable shall be a prerequisite to entitlement to veterans' benefits provided by this act or Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a short time ago I gave the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] a letter which I received from Admiral Jacobs, head of the Bureau of Personnel of the Navy. In his letter the admiral called attention to the fact that the language in this bill permits the benefits under it to be extended to persons in the Army and the Navy and the Coast Guard who have been given bad conduct discharges and undesirable discharges, and he objects to that class of dischargees being given the benefit of this proposed legislation. Will the Senator from Missouri explain why these groups are included in the provisions of this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say that I am very familiar with the objections raised by Admiral Jacobs. In my opinion, they are some of the most stupid, short-sighted objections which could possibly be raised. They were objections which were considered very carefully both in the subcommittee on veterans' affairs of the Finance Committee and in the full committee itself. The issue revolves around the question whether we should say, as Admiral Jacobs recommends, that a man must have received an honorable discharge or whether we should say, as the Senate bill provides, "under conditions other than dishonorable conditions."

The point to the whole matter is that in the Army there are what are known as blue discharges, discharges without honor. Such a discharge is not an honorable discharge. It may be issued to men who have had no particular fault other than except, for instance, misstatements about age. A boy may have lied a little about his age, in order to get into the Army. He may have said he was 18 years old, when as a matter of fact he was only 16 or 17 years old. If his father or mother come to the Army, and say, "You cannot keep this boy; he lied about his age, in order to get into the Army," the commanding officer has no recourse other than to discharge him. If he discharges him, he cannot give him an honorable discharge. Under the regulations, he is bound to give him what is called a blue discharge, a discharge without honor.

In the present war, contrary to what occurred during the last war, I understand that in many cases the Army is giving blue discharges, namely, discharges without honor, to those who have had no fault other than that they have not shown sufficient aptitude toward military service. I say that when the Government drafts a man from civil life and puts him in the military service—most of the cases we are now discussing as to aptitude involve older men—and thereafter, because the man does not show sufficient aptitude, gives him a blue discharge, or a discharge without honor, that fact should not be permitted to prevent the man from receiving the benefits which soldiers generally are entitled to.

Mr. President, in the last war I knew a boy who was my own orderly. He had lied about his age in order to get into the Army. He was only 16 years old when he enlisted. He had sworn he was 18 years old. His parents came to the camp and said they were going to take him out. The boy came to me and said, "Colonel, don't let them take me out. I would never be able to hold up my head again in this world." I told the boy's father and mother, "Of course, I am bound to discharge this boy if you say so. But I would have to give him a blue discharge."

The father, who was a very prominent man in northern Missouri, said, "What is that?"

I said, "That is a discharge without honor, a very different thing from an honorable discharge."

He said, "Let me talk to my wife about it."

In a couple of hours they came back, crying, and said they wanted the boy to stay in.

If they had taken that boy out of the Army, I do not think he should have been penalized. He had been in the Army a year and had been an excellent soldier. I do not think he should have been penalized because he had been so eager to serve his country that he was willing to do a little fabricating about his age in order to get into the Army.

Mr. President, in the committee we amended this provision in order to give the Veterans' Administration some dis-

cretion in the matter. The Veterans' Administration pointed out that as the bill was originally drafted, in the use of the words "other than dishonorable discharge," we opened up the opportunity to such persons as fellows "going over the hill," and those who had been absent without leave, and those who possibly had been guilty of desertion, or who might have committed larceny or murder or some other crime, and who had been picked up by the civilian authorities and subsequently convicted of some crime, or possibly sent to jail or to the penitentiary, or who did not receive an honorable discharge for other reasons but were given a blue discharge merely because the Army wanted to get rid of them and did not want to take the trouble to court martial them and give them what they deserved—a dishonorable discharge.

I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that what we did was to amend that provision by using the words "under other than dishonorable conditions." That does not say "with a dishonorable discharge." That means that under this provision the Veterans' Bureau, if a man's service has been dishonorable, if he has been convicted of larceny or any other crime or has been convicted of chronic drunkenness or anything else one might think of, the Veterans' Administration will have some discretion with respect to regarding the discharge from the service as dishonorable, and that therefore the man involved will be entitled to the benefit of that discretion.

I do not think anyone wants to penalize boys who lied about their age in order to enlist, or who did something else of that sort, or, certainly, men who were discharged because of lack of aptitude for military service.

I may say further, Mr. President, that the people who drew this act, and particularly the people who worked on this provision, are almost without exception fellows who have actually had the experience of going up against the guns themselves. We are more interested than anyone else could possibly be in keeping the gold-brickers, the coffee-coolers, the skulkers, and the criminals, the bad soldiers and bad sailors and bad marines, off the benefit rolls.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I think all of us are agreed as to that point. I should like to have the Senator state for the RECORD whether in the case of persons who have received bad-conduct discharges, as mentioned by Admiral Jacobs, the Veterans' Bureau would have discretion as to whether they would be entitled to receive the benefits provided under the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Veterans' Bureau would have such discretion; and I believe that, under the spirit and letter of the act, the Veterans' Bureau would be required to reject such claims.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If that is the opinion of the Senator, and if the language can be so interpreted, I think the objections of the Navy Department would be greatly minimized.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the Navy Department misunderstands the purport of the amendment adopted by the committee at its last meeting.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The sentiments expressed in the letter of Admiral Jacobs I understand were concurred in by the Army and the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that representatives of the Army and the Navy were present when the matter was discussed, and they seemed to agree totally with the terms of the amendment. I think probably the higher authorities have not consulted their representatives who were present at the committee meeting, in order to find out exactly what the language means. We certainly have no desire to have any gold-brickers or any habitual dead beats or anyone who is guilty of a crime come under the benefits of the act.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the Senator's explanation of the change or modification of the language contained in the bill as originally drawn clarifies the matter considerably for the benefit of the Navy, the Army, and the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter written to me by Admiral Jacobs may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I should like to invite your attention to S. 1767, providing Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, known as the G. I. bill of rights.

Report No. 755, dated March 18, 1944, from the Committee on Finance, indicates an amendment by the committee in executive session which does not meet with my approval. Title II of the bill provides for the education of veterans, and paragraph 1 of section 400 thereof sets forth eligibility for educational benefits. The original bill made eligible those persons discharged under honorable conditions, but the committee amendment changes eligibility to those persons discharged under other than dishonorable conditions.

In the Navy, dishonorable discharges are given only by sentence of a general court martial and are reserved for crimes involving moral turpitude or the serious military crimes. However, during the war in an effort to expedite punishment without tying up several officers who would constitute the general court martial, we resort to a smaller court—the summary court martial—which has the power to give a sentence of bad-conduct discharge in cases where it has been clearly shown that the individual is not fit to be retained in the service—habitual drunkenness, theft, repeated absence over leave, etc. There is also an administrative discharge known as the undesirable discharge. In this category is a man who repeatedly commits petty offenses not necessitating trial by court martial, a habitual shirker, or a man of unclean habits.

It is my considered opinion that persons with dishonorable discharge, bad-conduct discharge, or undesirable discharge should be excluded from the benefits for veterans. S. 1767, as introduced, would have provided so, but as amended by the committee the benefits will be extended to those persons who will have been given bad-conduct discharges and undesirable discharges. This might have a detrimental effect on morale by removing the incentive to maintain a good service record. The desirable precedent has already commenced in that mustering-out pay by law is available only to those discharged under honorable conditions.

It is recommended that consideration be given to a floor amendment to restore the original wording in paragraph 1 of section 400 so that a discharge under honorable conditions would constitute eligibility. Similar wording also applies to section 1603 which should be amended in like manner.

I have communicated with officials in the War Department and Veterans' Administration relative to this proposal and have obtained their concurrence.

Sincerely yours,

RANDALL JACOBS.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an interruption?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to go on record as thoroughly in favor of the action of the Senator from Missouri in this respect. As he knows, we very carefully went over this whole matter. This particular section relates primarily to the education of soldiers. That is one place where we can do something for the boys who probably have "jumped the track" in some minor instances, and yet have not done anything which would require a dishonorable discharge. We might save some of those men. They need education more than anything else.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not think there can be any question on earth about that. Many boys who do not receive honorable discharges have capabilities of being very excellent citizens. They receive discharges other than honorable discharges. I differentiate them from dishonorable discharges for many reasons. Some of them are no fault of the men themselves.

Mr. CONNALLY. We may reclaim those men, but if we blackball them and say that they cannot have it we will but confirm them in their evil purposes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, before we leave this point, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. I wonder if the Senator would not desire to have in the RECORD at this point the statement that the language "conditions other than dishonorable" is not strange language in such legislation? We have used it in some other bills during the present session of Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. These are practically the same provisions as the provisions with respect to eligibility in the mustering-out-pay legislation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The language was drafted by the General Counsel for the Veterans' Administration, and the Veterans' Administration advised the committee that that language had been used in several bills which had been reported from the Military Affairs Committee. It is a well-understood term, and a term which they regard as the most desirable term to use in this situation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I understand that the committee amendments have been concluded. I desire to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 14, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by other provisions of law to exercise over any educational or training institution, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this part in any institution over which such supervision or control is exercised under authority of other provisions of law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to make doubly certain that the interdiction against any department, agency, or officer of the United States in carrying out the provisions of this part of the bill exercising any supervision or control over any State educational agency, and so forth, shall not affect existing law. For example, there are Indian schools which are operated directly by the Government. There are relationships between the Government and other institutions under other statutes. After the bill was reported from the committee it was brought to my attention that there was some apprehension that section 14 might have the effect of changing existing law and existing relationships. All the amendment I have offered would do would be to make certain that that shall not occur.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As the Senator has indicated, the amendment was not offered in the committee, and I have no authority to accept the amendment on behalf of the committee. So far as I am personally concerned, I think the Senator's amendment simply states and clarifies the intention of the bill. So far as I am individually concerned, I shall be glad to vote for the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the language on page 23, commencing in line 14? This matter was brought to my notice after we had finished consideration of the bill in the Senate Finance Committee. It will be noted that the language authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to designate the agency or agencies which are to service home loans for veterans. It has been suggested that this might authorize the creation of an entirely new set-up throughout the country, going back reminiscently to the H. O. L. C., and the establishment of an entirely independent system for this purpose. It was suggested to me that an amendment would be appropriate to require the functioning of home loans through existing banks and savings and loan associations, approved mortgage corporations, and so forth. I am wondering whether that phase of the matter has come to the attention of the able Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I explain?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

That matter was suggested during the consideration of the bill in the committee. It came to my attention by reason of a committee which was formed in the city of Chicago by some loan agencies, nearly all the counsel of which had at one time or another been connected with Government agencies. I could not escape the conclusion that their anxiety about it was perhaps caused by their desire to earn a fee by advising their clients. All the testimony before the Finance Committee and the subcommittee was to the effect that what is stated in the amendment to which the Senator has just referred is really included in the bill as it now stands. The proponents of the amendment desire to go further and negative every possible presumption. So far as I am concerned, it seems to me that if we undertake to negative every monstrous presumption anyone might think of, we shall have an interminable bill. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was asked about that matter and he stated his view, which is in accordance with the amendment to which the Senator has referred. It is a question whether we are to negative every possibility which some lawyer might be able to think of. If so, I think we shall be engaged in an interminable wrestle.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know nothing about the group to whom the Senator refers, and I have no interest in their point of view. I do see how this language might invite the creation of an entirely independent, and perhaps needless and duplicating system of home loans under the authority here created. On the other hand, since the pending bill places the entire responsibility with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to designate any agency he pleases, my own opinion of the high administrative responsibility of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is such that I would expect him to use any existing agencies which he might find available.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. While the Senator is a member of the subcommittee, it is possible that he was not present at that particular session of the subcommittee. It was stated to the subcommittee by General Hines, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, that that was his specific intention, under this language, as to the course he would follow. I believe it is better to give the Administrator the most general authority possible, with that understanding. I certainly do not wish to have the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs establishing some new governmental agency. Neither did the committee. General Hines was in entire accord with the committee's views on that question, and I was entirely satisfied with General Hines' statement. The gentlemen who talked to me about this proposal, some of whom I have known for some time, and who are good friends of mine, apparently have never taken the trouble to read General Hines' testimony before the committe.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the basis of the Senator's statement, I am satisfied. I think we agree in our interpretation of the objective.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question that the Senator from Michigan and I, as well as the whole committee, are unanimous in not wishing to have a new governmental agency established.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to say, particularly for the benefit of the Senator from Michigan, that the educational features of this bill, and particularly the loan features, almost adopt the amendment which was submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and I to the original bill. We went over this particular section many times in trying to find the proper agency to handle these loans. It was our desire, and it was the desire of the veterans' organizations—both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—that no new agencies be created, but that existing agencies be used wherever possible.

Originally, in drafting this particular section I put in it the authority to create a new agency, for the reason that previously, in our original bill, we had placed that authority in the Federal Housing Administration. We found that the Federal Housing Administration did not reach all parts of the United States, and for that reason we adopted this language, and the language which would grant authority to create a new agency was stricken out.

I will ask the Senator from Missouri if that is not his interpretation of the intent. It was the intent to permit the Administrator to designate any Federal agency, any State agency, or any municipal agency, or even a private agency which he might find capable of handling them, to handle these loans.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is entirely correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In that connection, let me say that the bill is very comprehensive in character, and of necessity we had to lodge a measure of discretionary authority in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to work out the necessary administrative machinery to execute the broad purposes and provisions of the bill. We might as well recognize that frankly at the outset. If we had sat down and tried to draft definitive statutory provisions creating instrumentalities for all the broad aspects of this program, ranging all the way from hospitalization through education, including placing veterans who desire to go there on farms and giving them loans for business and home purposes, this measure would have taken 2 or 3 years of consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In addition, it would have been so voluminous that no one would have been able to understand it or even read it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We probably would not have been able to frame such

a bill. Frankly, the Senate and the country might as well recognize that there must be some experience under the proposed act before we can possibly hope to work out all the minute details.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to return to page 10 and ask a question. In lines 4, 5, and 6 it is provided that—

> The Administrator may utilize the services of any legally designated Federal or State educational or vocational agency in the execution of this part subject to agreements with the responsible heads of such agencies.

Why should not the word "may" be "shall"? I understand that it is intended that such agencies shall be used.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think there is no controversy as to the purpose of the bill or as to the intention of the Administrator. The reason the word "shall" was not used—and that was considered both in the subcommittee and the full committee—is that there are certain States which have no agency to which reference might be made.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, is it clearly the intention of the bill and of the Administrator to utilize State agencies where available?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no dispute whatever about that. The great difficulty is that there are certain States which have no equivalent to what in my State is the superintendent of schools. Equivalent agencies go by different names in different States, but some States do not have any such agency as this at all. Some of them are not adequate, and some discretion has to be left in the Administrator as to whom he shall use in carrying out the program.

Mr. WEEKS. Then I understand it to be the intention to utilize such agencies where they are adequate and available.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question about it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the fact that in order to take care of the situation in those States which have not heretofore created a suitable agency, if he will look on page 14, line 25, section 11, he will see that we have provided that the President, upon recommendation of the Administrator, may request the Governor of any State to designate a suitable agency. In order further to reassure the Senator, let me say that, if my recollection serves me correctly, General Hines stated on numerous occasions that he intended to use the State agencies wherever they were truly representative of all the institutions in the State.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to have a little information about title IV on page 26. The Senator will recall that 2 years ago an attempt was made to pass a bill through Congress to take the employment service away from the various States and federalize it. After a very bitter fight in the Congress the Governors of various States were able to persuade the Congress not to enact the bill. Then when the war started the President requested each of the Governors to turn over the employment service of his State to the Federal Government. As a Governor at that time, I did so, and I am sure that every other Governor in the country turned the employment service of his State over to the Federal Government with the reservation that it should be turned back to the State as soon as the war was over.

I find on page 26, in lines 12 and 13, the language:

> For the purpose there is hereby created within the United States Employment Service—

And so forth. Again on page 27 the United States Employment Service is referred to twice, and on page 29 it is referred to again. I should like an explanation. In view of the fact Congress refused to federalize the employment service, would not the language in the bill have the effect of federalizing the service which the States refused to turn over?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not think so at all. The United States Employment Service is in existence. There is no question about its present status. What the language under title IV of the bill is designed to do is to make provision for veterans. In times past for the veterans of the First World War we had a veterans' placement service. I think I can say without fear of successful contradiction that the service has been the red-headed stepchild of all the Government services. It has been pushed around from pillar to post, from the Labor Department over to the Social Security Department. We intend to make the Veterans' Placement Service effective so far as we can. We will employ the existing governmental agency.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I agree completely with the Senator about the Veterans' Employment Service. In fact, I am one of the sponsors of this bill, but I know that the States are tremendously concerned over whether or not the Federal service will take away the employment service which existed in all the States before the President asked them to surrender.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not think that will occur. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is familiar with that question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, perhaps I could make a brief statement which might help to reassure the Senator from South Dakota.

In drafting both the compensation title and the employment title great care was exercised in order to assure that this bill should not be made the vehicle for any controversy as to the federalization of either the unemployment compensation or employment service. As the Senator has said, the Wagner-Peyser set-up was lifted to the Federal level as a part of the war effort, but I feel certain that this has no bearing on any permanent recognition of such federalization, and I may say to the Senator that representatives of State agencies have collaborated in the drafting of this bill with the very fear that the Senator has in mind. So far as I know, they are entirely satisfied that, granting the fact that there will be Federal participation because the veterans are to be paid out of the Treasury, so far as it is humanly possible we have safeguarded the State systems.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is it the feeling and position of the committee itself with respect to this bill that there will be no federalization?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think I am safe in saying that it was our desire and determination that the bill should not become the vehicle for any federalization tion beyond the point that is inherent in the fact that the Federal Government will be paying unemployment compensation to veterans without State participation, and from Federal money.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Will the Senator explain the necessity of the language on page 5, under chapter II, referring to representatives of veterans' organizations being certified to the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The language "accredited representatives of the veterans' organizations specified in section 200 of the act of June 29, 1936" is followed by the language, "and other such organizations recognized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs thereunder in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

On page 8, where the word "counsel" is used in connection with review proceedings, the same language is not used. In other words, the phrase "and other such organizations" is not there.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course the language referred to on page 5 refers to a specific act of Congress which enumerates certain organizations and authorizes the Veterans' Administration to recognize and designate certain other organizations. On page 8 the term used is "recognized." I take it that that is all-inclusive. If the Senator wishes to be meticulous about the matter I will accept an amendment.

Mr. BALL. I merely wish to find out if the language means the same thing in both places.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly it is intended to mean the same thing. The term "recognized" includes every organization recognized under the act.

Mr. BALL. It not only recognizes, but authorizes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It authorizes the Veterans' Administration to recognize other organizations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On page 5, line 14, the language is, "veterans' organizations specified in section 200." On page 8 the language is simply "recognized by the Veterans' Administration under section 200." So there is no real lack of harmony between the two.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In other words, if additional organizations other than those specified in Public Law 844, should subsequently be added, the language on page 8 would include them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the soldiers in this war do not wish to join the American Legion, or the Veterans of Foreign Wars, or any other veterans' organization in existence, they can form a veterans' organization of their own which will probably be larger than all the rest of them put together, they can qualify with the Veterans' Administration, and be recognized and come in on the same status with the others.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I wish to compliment the Senator from Missouri for his devotion to the public service in helping to have this bill prepared and brought before the Senate. Thousands of boys, perhaps nearly a million, are out of the Army now. Many of them need hospitalization, and facilities additional to those they now have; many of them need education which is not provided; many of them need homes; and this bill will go a long way toward giving these men a chance to get another start. I desire to express my personal appreciation of the hard work the Senator from Missouri has done to secure the passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BRIDGES and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before a decision is taken on the yeas and nays, I feel that I should make a statement.

This bill was introduced and sponsored by 81 Senators. So far as I am informed and know, every Senator was given opportunity to be one of the sponsors of the bill. There are some Senators for whom it has been impossible to be here today, and I have taken the responsibility of saying that, if they were not here, so far as I was concerned, as the Senator in charge of the bill, who has lived with the bill for nearly 3 months, who has worked with it, who has conducted the hearings, I would not ask for the yeas and nays, because I thought it would be unfair to some Senators who would be unavoidably detained. I can mention the case of one Senator who had specifically telegraphed me that she desired to return here and vote on this bill, although she has been at home for some time, and her business requires her to remain at home. I refer to the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY]. I advised her that in my opinion there would not be a record vote on the measure, particularly in view of the fact that I did not know of any opposition to the bill, and the fact that 81 Senators had indicated their support by joining as sponsors.

If any Senator desires to demand the yeas and nays, I have no wish to oppose it, but I feel it incumbent on me at this time to make the statement that certain Senators are absent who would have been present if they had been advised there would be a record vote on the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, my name does not appear on this bill, not because I am opposed to the bill, not because I ever was opposed to it; on the contrary, I have great interest in the bill, as I think every Senator here knows. For a long time I have been working closely with the American Legion in various causes. Some of them appear in bills of which I have been sponsor without getting a large number of subscribers to the bills.

I need not state my reason for not becoming a sponsor of the bill. I have very good reasons, which are well understood by members of the American Legion who are interested in the bill now before the Senate. I think my colleagues may understand what those reasons are. They have nothing to do with this particular bill. They have to do with what I regard as good practice in legislation. They are my own views; I do not impose them on anyone else. I do not even say what they are. But if there is no vote taken, I want it distinctly understood that I am for this proposed legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Maine and the Senator from New Hampshire that it is generally understood there is no one opposed to the bill. I doubt if there is a Senator who would vote against the bill if there should be a roll call. Circumstances have made it necessary for us to bring the bill up at this late hour, and unless there is some Senator who is opposed to the bill and will so state, there might be some way to have it understood that the bill has the unanimous support of the Members of the Senate, so as not to do an injustice to anyone who is unavoidably absent, and who, if he had been told or advised that a yea-and-nay vote might be had, would have attempted to be here. It seems to me we might obviate the necessity of a yea-and-nay vote, because I do not believe there would be a vote against the bill, either on roll call or vive voce vote.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, after telling the majority leader that I intended to vote for the bill, it does not make any difference to me whether we have a yea-and-nay vote or not.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I happen to be in a situation in part like that of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. My name is not attached as one of the sponsors of the bill, because I happen to think it is poor, unsound legislative practice to undertake to sign up a large number of Senators as sponsors for a bill. Personally, I am for the legislation, but I felt there might be some other Senators whose names do not appear on the list who would want the opportunity to vote either for it or against it. So far as I am concerned, in view of what the Senator from Kentucky has said, I am perfectly willing to withdraw my request for the yeas and nays and leave the responsibility with others.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have never signed with the eighty-odd Members of the Senate this bill known as S. 1767. I am a member of the veterans' subcommittee of the Committee on Finance. I knew very well that many conflicting provisions were presented to us by various organizations. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] had an amendment which we considered, which markedly improved the bill, in my judgment. Indeed, Mr. President, there were many sections of the bill, in the form in which it came before us, which no 80 Senators, no 8 Senators, should have approved, in my opinion.

There came from the Committee on Education and Labor Senate bill 1509, which is on the calendar this very minute as order No. 697. That bill undertakes to provide a complete method of education for those who served in the armed forces. The bill received the careful attention of the Committee on Education and Labor. In fact, I talked the matter over with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who had given it very great attention, and who told me what he felt were the very definite merits of that particular bill.

I have said enough to indicate that there can be very valid and very substantial reasons why some should not appear to foreclose themselves with reference to a particular measure, either for or against, either in its entirety or in part. On that account I was not one of the sponsors of the bill. However, I think that if there are Senators who never have had a chance to be recorded either for or against the bill, a yea-and-nay vote is the only way by which they can be recorded.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I am in much the same position as the Senator from Maine. I do not think it good practice to sign a bill until it has been before my committee, and I have had a chance to study it. Under those circumstances I did not have my name placed on the bill. Unfortunately I had to be away the day the committee met, but I have studied the bill and am in favor of it. I simply wish it to appear in the RECORD that I am in favor of the bill. But I do think it is unfair to Senators who are in favor of the bill and who are here not to be given an opportunity to state their position with respect to the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am in the same position to some extent as are the Senators who have spoken heretofore. I do not want to say that I had no chance to put my name on the bill. I did have that chance. I was away from the Senate, and expected to be away from the Senate for 2 or 3 weeks at the time the bill was introduced. One of my friends from Kansas called me up from Washington and told me the bill was to come before the Senate, and asked if I wanted my name placed on the bill. My answer was that I hesitated very much to put my name on a bill concerning which I did not know anything. I had not seen

it and did not know what it contained. I knew there was more or less controversy as to some of its provisions.

Of course, I am for the bill. I expect to vote for it. I am not particular about whether a yea-and-nay vote is had on the bill. If any Senators desire a yea-and-nay vote I will join them in the request. If they do not desire a yea-and-nay vote it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at the request of various veterans' organizations of North Dakota, I desire to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] for the splendid job he has done in piloting the bill through the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, my name appears as one of the sponsors of the bill. I should like my vote to be recorded on it. If we have a yea-and-nay vote I shall vote for the bill. If we do not have one I want the RECORD to show now that I vote for the passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I withdraw my opposition to the yeas and nays being ordered. I have a tally sheet in my hand, and will be able to take care of the sponsors of the bill who are not present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HILL (when Mr. BANKHEAD's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is not present. He is one of the sponsors of the bill. His name appears on it as one of the proposers of the bill. He is heartily in favor of it. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. McCLELLAN (when Mrs. CARAWAY's name was called). The Senator from Arkansas is unavoidably absent. She is one of the sponsors of the bill. I know that if present she would vote "yea."

Mr. OVERTON (when Mr. ELLENDER's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is unavoidably absent. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when Mr. FERGUSON's name was called). The junior Senator from Michigan is unavoidably absent on official business for the Senate. He is one of the sponsors of the bill, and if present would vote "yea."

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who is one of the coauthors of the bill. I know that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (when Mr. MEAD's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from New York is unavoidably absent on official business. He is one of the sponsors of the bill. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHEELER (when Mr. MURRAY's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is one of the cosponsors of the bill. He is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. NYE's name was called). The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is necessarily absent. He is one of the cosponsors of the bill. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BURTON (when Mr. TAFT's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY (when the name of Mr. THOMAS of Utah was called). I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], my colleague the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH], all sponsors and cointroducers of the bill, are unavoidably detained, but if present would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in order that there may be no mistake in the RECORD regarding the absence of Republican Senators who are necessarily absent, I desire to state that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on work of the Truman Committee. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—50

Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gerry	Robertson
Ball	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	La Follette	Tunnell
Burton	Langer	Vandenberg
Bushfield	McClellan	Wagner
Butler	McFarland	Weeks
Capper	McKellar	Wheeler
Chandler	Maloney	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	White
Connally	Millikin	Wiley
Danaher	O'Mahoney	Willis
Davis	Overton	Wilson
Eastland	Reed	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—46

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Scrugham
Bone	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Jackson	Taft
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lucas	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Truman
Cordon	Mead	Tydings
Downey	Moore	Wallgren
Ellender	Murdock	Walsh, Mass.
Ferguson	Murray	Walsh, N. J.
Gillette	Nye	
Glass	O'Daniel	

So the bill S. 1767 was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944."

TITLE I

CHAPTER I—HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 100. The Veterans' Administration is hereby declared to be an essential war agency and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities in personnel, equipment, supplies, and material under any laws, Executive orders, and regulations pertaining to priorities, and in appointments of personnel from civil-service registers the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby granted the same authority and discretion as the War and Navy Departments and the United States Public Health Service.

SEC. 101. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Federal Board of Hospitalization are hereby authorized and directed to expedite and complete the construction of additional hospital facilities for war veterans, and to enter into agreements and contracts for the use of suitable Army and Navy hospitals by the Veterans' Administration after cessation of hostilities and after such institutions are no longer needed by the armed services; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to establish regional offices, suboffices, branch offices, contact units, or other subordinate

offices in centers of population where there is no Veterans' Administration facility, or where such a facility is not readily available or accessible: *Provided*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 for the construction of additional hospital facilities.

SEC. 102. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy are hereby granted authority to enter into agreements and contracts for the mutual use or exchange of use of hospital and domiciliary facilities, and such supplies, equipment, and material as may be needed to operate properly such facilities, except that at no time shall the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs enter into any agreement which will result in a permanent reduction of Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary beds below the number now established or approved, plus the estimated number required to meet the load of eligibles under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or in any way subordinate or transfer the operation of the Veterans' Administration to any other agency of the Government.

Nothing in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or any other act, shall be construed to prevent the transfer or detail of any commissioned or enlisted personnel from the armed forces to the Veterans' Administration, subject to agreements between the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs: *Provided*, That no such detail shall be made or extend beyond 6 months after the termination of the war.

SEC. 103. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall have authority to place officials and employees designated by him in such Army and Navy installations as may be deemed advisable for the purpose of adjudicating disability claims of, and giving aid and advice to, members of the Army and Navy who are about to be discharged or released from active service.

SEC. 104. No person shall be discharged or released from active duty in the armed forces until his certificate of discharge or release from active duty and final pay, or a substantial portion thereof, are ready for delivery to him or to his next of kin or legal representative; and no person shall be discharged or released from active service on account of disability until and unless he has executed a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization, to be filed with the Veterans' Administration or has signed a statement that he presently does not desire to file such claim: *Provided*, That this section shall not preclude immediate transfer to a veterans' facility for necessary hospital care, nor preclude the discharge of any person who refuses to sign such claim or statement.

SEC. 105. No person in the armed forces shall be required to sign a statement of any nature relating to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease or injury he may have, or any other statement against his own interest. In the adjudication of any claim against the United States arising out of service in the armed forces, all Government agencies are hereby authorized and directed to disregard and to hold for naught any such statements heretofore signed by any such person.

CHAPTER II—AID BY VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 200. (a) That upon certification to the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of accredited representatives of the veterans' organizations specified in section 200 of the act of June 29, 1936 (Public Law No. 844, 74th Cong.), and other such organizations recognized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs thereunder in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized and directed to permit the functioning, in accordance with regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, of such accredited representatives in military or naval installations on shore from which persons are discharged or released from the active military or naval service: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall operate to affect measures of military security now in effect or which may hereafter be placed in effect.

(b) The necessary regulations shall be promulgated by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy jointly with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accomplish the purpose of this section, and in the preparation of such regulations the national officer of each of such veterans' organizations who is responsible for claims and rehabilitation activities shall be consulted. The commanding officer of each such military or naval installation shall cooperate fully with such authorized representatives in the providing of available space and equipment for such representatives.

CHAPTER III—REVIEWING AUTHORITY

SEC. 300. The discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a court martial of any person from the military or naval forces, or the discharge of any such person on the ground that he was a conscientious objector who refused to perform military duty or refused to wear the uniform or otherwise to comply with lawful orders of competent military authority, or as a deserter, or of an officer by the acceptance of his resignation for the good of the service, shall bar all rights of such person, based upon the period of service from which he is so discharged or dismissed, under any laws administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That in the case of any such person, if it be established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that at the time of the commission of the offense such person was insane, he shall not be precluded from benefits to which he is otherwise entitled under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration: *And provided further*, That this section shall not apply to any Government (converted) or national service life-insurance policy.

SEC. 301. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, after conference with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, are authorized and directed to establish in the War and Navy Departments, respectively, boards of review composed of five members each, whose duties shall be to review, upon the request of a former officer or enlisted man or woman, the type and nature of his discharge or dismissal, except a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a court martial. Such review shall be based upon all available records of the service department relating to the person requesting such review, and such other evidence as may be presented by such person. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony either in person or by affidavit and the person requesting review shall be allowed to appear before such board in person or by counsel: *Provided*, That the term "counsel" as used in this section shall be construed to include, among others, accredited representatives of veterans' organizations recognized by the Veterans' Administration under section 200 of the act of June 29, 1936 (Public Law No. 844, 74th Cong.). Such board shall have authority to change, correct, or modify any discharge or dismissal, except a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a court martial, in accord with the facts presented to the board. The Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy are hereby amended to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to establish such boards of review, the findings thereof to be subject to final approval of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

TITLE II

CHAPTER IV—EDUCATION OF VETERANS

SEC. 400. Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended by Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, March 24, 1943, is hereby further amended by adding part VIII, to read as follows:

"PART VIII

"1. That any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or relieved therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable shall be eligible for education and training under this part: *Provided*, That such person shall have been in active service not less than 6 months, or shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability.

"2. The President shall appoint in the Veterans' Administration upon the recommendation of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs a Director of Servicemen's Education and Training who, subject to the direction of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall administer the provisions of this part. The Administrator shall from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this part through the Director and such additional officers and employees as the Administrator may appoint, within appropriations made therefor by the Congress. The Administrator may utilize the services of any legally designated Federal or State educational or vocational agency in the execution of this part subject to agreements with the responsible heads of such agencies.

"3. There is hereby authorized to be established an advisory council to aid and advise the Administrator in the execution of his duties under this part. The council shall consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Security Administrator, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs who shall be chairman, the United States Commissioner of Education, and eight representatives of the public, to be appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be recognized leaders in the fields of education, labor, agriculture, and industry. The public representatives shall be selected as nearly as practicable on a regional basis. The members of the council shall not receive any compensation for their services on the council, but shall be reimbursed for all necessary travel expenses and members appointed shall receive a per-diem allowance of $15 in lieu of subsistence while away from their respective places of residence on the business of the council.

"4. Persons eligible for education and training under this part shall be entitled to receive education and training at any approved educational or training institution in which they wish to enroll, whether or not it is located in the State in which they reside: *Provided*, That they are accepted as students by such institution in any field or branch of knowledge for which they are found by such institution to be qualified.

"5. Persons eligible under this part shall be entitled to education and training at an approved educational or training institution for a period of 1 year (or the equivalent thereof in continuous part-time study), or for such lesser time as may be required to complete the course of instruction chosen by them, beginning not later than 2 years after the date of discharge or release from active duty or 2 years after the date of termination of the present war, whichever is later: *Provided*, That no education or training under this part shall be afforded beyond 7 years after termination of the present war.

"6. Except as to a refresher or retraining course, a further period of education or training not exceeding 3 additional years may be provided for persons who have satisfactorily completed the first year of education or training: *Provided*, That no person shall be eligible for a period of such additional education or training in excess of the total period he served in the active service during the present war, exclusive of (1) the 6 months' qualifying service and (2) any period of education or training which he may have received under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, or as a cadet at one of the service academies. Such persons shall be selected from those voluntarily apply for such further period of education or training. The further period of education or training shall be continuous instruction on a full-time basis as defined by the institution in which it is obtained. Subject to the above limitations, any person who has not completed his course of education or training but has satisfactorily completed his first year, shall be eligible and entitled to continue his course of education or training until he has completed the same, provided his work continues satisfactorily throughout the remaining period. The selection of persons for a further period of education or training under this part shall be made in accordance with rules, standards, and methods established by the Administrator.

"7. The Administrator shall provide for the payment by the United States of such customary tuition, laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees and charges, as may be approved by the Administrator, to the educational or training institutions furnishing education or training to persons under this part so long as such persons maintain regular attendance and are in good standing at such institutions, but in no event shall such payment with respect to any person exceed $500 for an ordinary school year: *Provided*, That such payments shall not include charges for board, lodging, or other living expenses, and no payments shall be made to business or other establishments furnishing apprentice or other training on the job. If any publicly supported institution has no established tuition fee or if the established tuition fee at any publicly supported institution (including the fee for nonresident students) shall be found by the Administrator to be inadequate compensation to such institution for furnishing education or training to persons eligible under this part, he is authorized to provide for the payment with respect to any such person of such compensation as he may find to be fair and reasonable, but not to exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

"8. Every person who attends on a full-time basis an approved educational or training institution in accordance with this part shall be entitled to receive a subsistence allowance of $50 per month while in attendance and in good standing at such institution, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding 30 days in a calendar year, in accordance with regulations issued by the Administrator. A person having a dependent or dependents shall be entitled to receive an additional sum of $25 per month. Persons attending on a part-time basis and persons receiving compensation for productive labor performed as part of their apprentice or other training on the job at business establishments shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependency allowances as may be determined by the Administrator.

"9. The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational guidance of the persons eligible for education and training under this part. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make information available respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various trades, crafts, and professions: *Provided*, That facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized.

"10. The Administrator shall transmit to the Congress annually a report of operations under this part. If the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session, such reports shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"11. The President upon recommendation of the Administrator may request the chief executive of any State to designate the legally constituted State educational agency or agencies, or, if no such State educational agency is available, may request the creation of a special board to act in lieu thereof for the purpose of furnishing lists of approved educational or training institutions in such State which are found, in accordance with standards established by the Administrator, to be qualified to provide education and training to persons eligible under this part: *Provided*, That in the event the Administrator is of the opinion that any institution should be included in, or excluded from, such lists from any State he shall make recommendations to that effect to the appropriate State agency or special board. Wherever the State educational agency is not representative of all the educational or training institutions eligible for approval in accordance with this part, the President upon the recommendation of the Administrator may request the chief executive of the State to appoint an advisory committee consisting of persons who shall represent the elementary, secondary, and vocational schools, the colleges, junior colleges, professional schools, universities, and other educational institutions, and business and other establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job in the State, to aid and advise the State educational agency in the execution of their functions under this part. Only such educational or training institutions as are included in such lists and approved by the Administrator shall be deemed approved educational or training institutions within the meaning of this part: *Provided*, That wherever there are established State apprenticeship agencies expressly charged by State laws to administer apprentice training, the Administrator shall, whenever possible, utilize such existing facilities and services in training on the job when such training is of 1 year's duration or more.

"12. As used in this part, the term 'State' shall include the States of the United States, the Territories and possessions, the District of Columbia, and the Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That until the termination of Japanese occupancy of the Philippine Islands and the restoration of orderly processes of government therein, the provisions of this part, to the extent that they require action within the territorial limits of the Philippine Islands, shall not apply; the term 'educational or training institution' shall include public or private elementary, secondary, and other schools furnishing education for adults, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, colleges, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers colleges, normal schools, professional schools, and universities, and shall also include business or other establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job under the supervision of an approved college or university, or any State department of education or any State apprenticeship agency or State board of vocational education, or any State apprenticeship council or the Federal Apprentice Training Service established in accordance with Public, No. 308, Seventy-fifth Congress, or any agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such training. No business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job to persons eligible for training under this part shall be approved for training under the provisions of this part unless such establishment compensates such persons at rates of pay required by applicable State or Federal laws and which are fair and reasonable for any productive labor performed as part of their training and unless such establishment meets all applicable State and Federal statutes and regulations relating to health, safety, and other conditions of labor.

"13. Any person eligible for the benefit of this part who is also eligible for the benefit of part VII may elect which benefit he desires: *Provided*, That subsistence allowance hereunder shall not, in the event of such election, exceed the amount of additional pension otherwise payable were the training under said part VII.

"14. No department, agency, or officer of the United States in carrying out the provisions of this part shall exercise any supervision or control over any State educational agency or State apprenticeship agency or any educational or training institution with respect to their personnel, curriculum, or methods or materials of instruction. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by other provisions of law to exercise over any educational or training institution, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this part in any institution over which such supervision or control is exercised under authority of other provisions of law."

SEC. 401. Section 3, Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, 'Salaries and expenses, medical and hospital, and compensation and pensions,' shall be available for necessary expenses under part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes thereof. Such expenses may include, subject to regulations issued by the Administrator, and in addition to medical care, treatment, hospitalization, and prosthesis, otherwise authorized, such care, treatment, and supplies as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a)."

SEC. 402. Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section 4 to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Any books or equipment furnished a trainee or student under part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), shall, unless waived by the Administrator, be returned or the reasonable value thereof accounted for if he, because of fault on his part, fails to complete satisfactorily a course of training or schooling afforded thereunder."

SEC. 403. Subsection (f) of section 1, title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended by Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, March 24, 1943, are hereby amended by deleting the dates "December 7, 1941" and "December 6, 1941", and substituting the date "September 16, 1940."

TITLE III—LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

CHAPTER V—GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOANS

SEC. 500. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination

of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more, or shall have been discharged or released therefrom after less than 90 days of service for disability incurred in line of duty, shall be deemed to be a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, except that no person shall be eligible for such benefits by reason of service from which he shall have been discharged or released on his own initiative to accept employment unless he had served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska. Any such veteran may apply to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for a loan for any of the purposes specified in sections 501, 502, and 503. If the Administrator finds that the veteran is eligible for the benefits of this title and is in need of such loan, the Administrator shall submit the veterans' application for approval of the loan as provided in sections 501, 502, and 503. When any such loan has been approved as provided in such sections, the loan shall be made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(b) The aggregate of all loans made to any one veteran under this title shall be for such amount not in excess of $1,000 as may be applied for by the veteran. Any such loan shall bear no interest for the first year after the loan is made, and thereafter shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum, compounded annually. No guarantor of any such loan shall be required and no security for the loan shall be required except for a lien, which shall be subject only to a lien covering the balance of the purchase price or construction cost and such ground rents as may arise from the purchase of a leasehold estate. No loan to be used in paying a part of the purchase price of any real property or a part of the construction cost of a dwelling to be erected upon unimproved real property owned by the veteran shall be denied or disapproved under this title because another loan is made or to be made to finance any part of the remainder of the purchase price or construction cost of such property, or because a lien upon the property is given or to be given as security for such other loan.

(c) Any loan made under this title shall be repayable to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and, except as otherwise provided in this title, shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed jointly by such Administrator and the head of the department or agency to whom the application is submitted for approval of the loan.

Purchase or construction of homes

SEC. 501. (a) Any application made under this title for a loan to be used in purchasing residential property or in constructing a dwelling on unimproved property owned by the veteran to be occupied as a home by the veteran applicant shall be submitted to an agency designated pursuant to subsection (d) for its approval. Such agency shall approve the loan if it finds—

(1) that such loan will be used for part payment for such property to be purchased or constructed by the veteran;

(2) that the contemplated terms of payment required in any mortgage to be given in part payment of the purchase price or the construction cost bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and that the nature and condition of the property is such as to be suitable for dwelling purposes; and

(3) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property or the construction cost, including the value of the unimproved lot, does not exceed the appraised value thereof as determined by such designated agency.

(b) Any application for a loan under this section for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, or improvements in, or paying delinquent indebtedness, taxes, or special assessments on, residential property previously purchased or owned by the veteran, and used by him as a home, shall be submitted to an agency designated pursuant to subsection (d), which shall approve such loan if it finds that such loan will be used for such purpose.

(c) No first mortgage shall be ineligible for insurance under the National Housing Act, as amended, by reason of any loan made under this title or by reason of any secondary lien upon the property involved securing such loan.

(d) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may designate such agency or agencies as he deems appropriate for determining whether or not loans should be approved under this section; and he may designate the agency to which any application shall be submitted for approval under this section, except that if the veteran so requests in his application for the loan the agency designated for such purpose with respect to such loan shall be the Federal Housing Administration.

Purchase of farms and farm equipment

SEC. 502. (a) Any application made under this title for a loan to be used in purchasing any land, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, or implements, or in repairing, altering, or improving any buildings, to be used in farming operations conducted by the applicant, shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture for his approval of the loan. Such Secretary shall approve the loan if he finds—

(1) that such loan will be used for part payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used in bona fide farming operations conducted by him;

(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

(3) that the ability and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed a reasonable appraised value therefor as determined by the Secretary.

(b) Any person who is found by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, as provided in section 500 hereof, and who is found by the Secretary of Agriculture, by reason of his ability and experience, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, shall be eligible for the benefits of such act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

Purchase of business property

SEC. 503. Any application made under this title for a loan to be used in purchasing any business, land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, or tools, to be used by the applicant in pursuing a gainful occupation (other than farming), shall be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce for his approval of the loan. Such Secretary shall approve the loan if he finds—

(1) that such loan will be used for part payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used by him in the bona finde pursuit of a gainful occupation (other than farming);

(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such occupation;

(3) that the ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such occupation; and

(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed a reasonable appraised value therefor as determined by the Secretary.

TITLE IV

CHAPTER VI—EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

SEC. 600. (a) In the enactment of the provisions of this title Congress declares as its intent and purpose that there shall be an effective job-counseling and employment placement service for veterans, and that, to this end, policies shall be promulgated and administered, so as to provide for them the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment. For the purpose there is hereby created within the United States Employment Service, as established by the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, a Veterans' Placement Service Board, which shall consist of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as chairman, the Director of the National Selective Service System, and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, or whoever may have the responsibility of administering the functions of the United States Employment Service. The members of the Board may be represented by alternates. The Board shall determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service.

(b) The Chairman of the Board, through an executive secretary, who shall be the Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service, shall have direct authority and responsibility for carrying out its policies through the veterans' employment representatives in the several States.

(c) The public records of the Veterans' Personnel Division, National Selective Service System, and the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service shall be available to the Board.

SEC. 601. The United States Employment Service shall assign to each of the States (the Territories and the District of Columbia) a veterans' employment representative, who shall be a veteran of the wars of the United States and who shall be appointed, subject to the approval of the Board, in accordance with the civil-service laws, and whose compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Each such veterans' employment representative shall be attached to the staff of the public employment service in the State (the Territory or the District of Columbia) to which he has been assigned. He shall be administratively responsible to the Board, through its executive secretary, for the execution of the Board's veterans' placement policies through the public employment service in the State (the Territory or the District of Columbia). In cooperation with the public employment service staff in the State, he shall—

(a) be functionally responsible for the supervision of the registration of veterans in local employment offices for suitable types of employment;

(b) assist in securing and maintaining current information as to the various types of available employment in public works and private industry or business;

(c) promote the interest of employers in employing veterans;

(d) maintain regular contact with employers and veterans' organizations with a view of keeping employers advised of veterans available for employment and veterans advised of opportunities for employment; and

(e) assist in every possible way in improving working conditions and the advancement of employment of veterans.

SEC. 602. Where deemed necessary by the Board, there shall be assigned by the administrative head of the employment service in the State one or more employees of the staffs of local employment service offices, whose

services shall be primarily devoted to discharging the duties prescribed to the veterans' employment representative.

SEC. 603. All Federal agencies shall furnish the Board such records, statistics, or information as may be deemed necessary or appropriate in administering provisions of this title, and shall otherwise cooperate with the Board in providing continuous employment opportunities for veterans.

SEC. 604. Failure of the employment service of a State to give preference to qualified registered veterans on job assignments and to cooperate in the execution of the policies of the Board shall be sufficient cause to withhold the funds made available to the State under the act of June 6, 1933, until such time as the employment service of the State complies with the laws and regulations governing the Board's administration of its veterans' placement functions. The Federal agency administering the United States Employment Service shall maintain that service as an operating entity and, during the period of its administration, shall effectuate the provisions of this title.

SEC. 605. (a) The Board through its executive secretary shall estimate the funds necessary for the proper and efficient administration of this title; such estimated sums shall include the annual amounts necessary for salaries, rents, printing and binding, travel, and communications. Sums thus estimated shall be included as a special item in the annual budget of the United States Employment Service. Any funds appropriated pursuant to this special item as contained in the budget of the United States Employment Service shall not be available for any purpose other than that for which they were appropriated, except with the approval of the Board.

(b) The War Manpower Commission shall from its current appropriation allocate and make available sufficient funds to carry out the provisions of this title during the current fiscal year.

SEC. 606. The term "United States Employment Service" as used in this title means that Bureau created by the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, or such successor agencies as from time to time shall perform its functions and duties, as now performed by the War Manpower Commission.

TITLE V

CHAPTER VII—READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

SEC. 700. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been separated from active service under other than dishonorable conditions after the date of enactment of this title or within the 52-week period preceding such date (except that no person shall be eligible for any benefit under this title by reason of any period of service from which he shall have been discharged or released on his own initiative to accept employment unless he had served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska), shall be entitled, in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe, to receive a readjustment allowance as provided herein for each week of unemployment, up to 52 weeks, which (1) begins after the effective date of this title, and (2) occurs during the 24-month period after final payment of mustering-out pay: *Provided*, That no such allowance shall be paid for any of the first 4 consecutive weeks following any payment of mustering-out pay, or for any period for which he receives increased pension under part VII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a) or a subsistence allowance under part VIII of such regulation: *Provided further*, That no readjustment allowance shall be payable for any week commencing more than 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war.

(b) Such person shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of unemployment if claim is made for such allowance and the Administrator finds with respect to such week that—

(1) the person is residing in the United States at the time of such claim;

(2) the person is completely unemployed, having performed no service and received no wages, or is partially unemployed in that services have been performed for less than a full workweek and the wages for the week are less than the allowance under this title plus $3;

(3) the person is registered with and continues to report to a public employment office, or such other agency as the Administrator may designate, in accordance with regulations of the Administrator;

(4) the person is able to work and available for suitable work: *Provided*, That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

CHAPTER VIII—DISQUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 800. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 700 a claimant shall be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

(1) he leaves suitable work voluntarily, without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct in the course of employment;

(2) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work in accordance with regulations of the Administrator or to accept suitable work when offered him; or

(3) he, without good cause, does not attend a free training course (not within the purview of part VIII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a)), in accordance with regulations of the Administrator.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 700, a claimant shall also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week with respect to which it is found that his unemployment is due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a labor dispute at the factory, establishment, or other premises at which he is or was last employed: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply if it is shown that—

(1) he is not participating in or directly interested in the labor dispute which causes the stoppage of work; and

(2) he does not belong to a grade or class of workers of which, immediately before the commencement of the stoppage there were members employed at the premises at which the stoppage occurs, any of whom are participating in or directly interested in the dispute: *Provided, however*, That if in any case separate branches interested in the labor dispute which causes the stoppage of work, which are commonly conducted as separate businesses in separate premises, are conducted in separate departments of the same premises, each such department shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be a separate factory, establishment, or other premises.

(c) (1) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, he shall be disqualified to receive any readjustment allowance for the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and for not more than 4 immediately following weeks.

(2) In addition to the disqualification prescribed in paragraph (1) above, the Administrator may, in cases of successive disqualifications under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, extend the period of disqualification for such additional period as the Administrator may prescribe, but not to exceed 8 additional weeks in the case of any one disqualification.

(d) (1) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work or the existence of good cause with respect to a claimant, there shall be considered, among other factors, the degree of risk involved to his health, safety, and morals, his physical fitness and prior training, his experience and prior or probable earnings in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the length of his unemployment, his prospects for obtaining work in the customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the distance of available work from his residence and prospects for obtaining local work. No work shall be deemed unsuitable for an individual solely because the wages are less than his readjustment allowance.

(2) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work, no work shall be deemed suitable for an individual if—

(A) the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute; or

(B) the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to him than those prevailing for similar work in the locality.

CHAPTER IX—AMOUNT OF ALLOWANCE AND PAYMENT

SEC. 900. (a) The allowance for a week shall be—

(1) $15, plus

(2) (A) $5 if the claimant has one dependent, or

(B) $8 if he has two dependents, or

(C) $10 if he has three or more dependents,

less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3: *Provided*, That where the allowance is not a multiple of $1, it shall be computed to the next highest multiple of $1.

(b) The number of weeks of allowances to which each eligible veteran shall be entitled shall be determined as follows: For each calendar month or fraction thereof of active service, the veteran shall be entitled to 8 weeks of allowances, but in no event to exceed the maximum provided in section 700.

(c) (1) As used in this section the term "dependent" includes only—

(A) the lawful wife of a claimant living with him or receiving regular support from him, or the lawful husband of a claimant if dependent upon his wife for support, who, in the week for which an allowance is claimed, has not received $5 or more either as wages, as an allowance under this title, or under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law; or

(B) an unmarried child either (1) under 18 years of age, or (2) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

(2) As used in this section the term "child" shall include only—

(A) a legitimate child;

(B) a child legally adopted;

(C) a stepchild, if a member of the claimant's household; or

(D) a child to whom the claimant stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of this claim on behalf of such child.

(d) The Administrator may find an individual to be a dependent of the claimant if the claimant has certified the facts required by the provisions of this subsection.

(e) Where a child is a dependent of more than one claimant, allowance for the child shall be made only on behalf of one claimant, as determined by the Administrator.

(f) Where a claimant seeks an allowance for a dependent who is separated from him under court order or written agreement, the allowance for the dependent shall not exceed

the amount fixed in the court order or in the written agreement. If such amount is not fixed at a weekly rate, the portion payable for each week shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Administrator.

SEC. 901. (a) Readjustment allowances shall be paid at reasonable intervals prescribed by the Administrator.

(b) Any allowances remaining unpaid upon the death of a claimant shall not be considered a part of the assets of the estate of the claimant, or liable for the payment of his debts, or subject to any administration of his estate, and the Administrator may make payment thereof to such person or persons he finds most equitably entitled thereto.

CHAPTER X—ADJUSTMENT OF DUPLICATE BENEFITS

SEC. 1000. Where an allowance is payable to a claimant for a week under this title and where, for the same week, either an allowance or benefit is received under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law, or a Federal or State noncontributory benefit is received, the amount received or accrued from such other source shall be subtracted from the allowance payable under this title (except that this section shall not apply to pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration); and the resulting allowances, if not a multiple of $1, shall be readjusted to the next higher multiple of $1.

CHAPTER XI—ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 1100. (a) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to administer this title and shall, insofar as possible, utilize existing facilities and services of Federal and State departments or agencies on the basis of mutual agreements with such departments or agencies. Such agreements shall provide for the filing of claims for readjustment allowances with the Administrator through established public employment offices and State unemployment compensation agencies. Such agencies, through agreement, shall also be utilized in the processing, adjustment, and determination of such claims and the payment of such allowances. To facilitate the carrying out of agreements with State departments or agencies and to assist in the discharge of the Administrator's duties under this title, a representative of the Administrator shall be located in each participating State department or agency.

(b) The Administrator shall prescribe such rules and regulations and require such records and reports as he may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this title: *Provided, however,* That prior to the adoption of any rules and regulations relating to the performances of Federal or State departments or agencies with which agreements have been made, the Administrator shall consult and advise with representatives of such departments or agencies as to the provisions of such rules and regulations.

(c) The Administrator may delegate to any officer or employee of his own or of any other department or agency of the Federal Government or of any State such of his powers and duties, except that of prescribing rules and regulations as the Administrator may consider necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. The Administrator may require any such officer or employee to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Administrator may deem necessary and the cost of such bond shall be paid out of sums appropriated for the administration of this title.

(d) Allowances shall be paid upon certification by the Administrator. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, and prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall pay, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, to the departments, agencies, or individuals designated, the amounts so certified.

(e) The Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in advance or otherwise such sums as he estimates to be necessary to compensate any Federal department or agency for its administrative expenses under this title. Such sums shall cover periods of no longer than 6 months.

The Administrator shall also from time to time certify to the Social Security Board such State departments or agencies as may be participating in the administration of this title. Upon such certification the Social Security Board shall, in addition to the amounts certified under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State such amounts as the Board determines to be necessary for the administrative expense of such State under this title.

(f) Any money paid to any cooperating agency, person, or institution which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement with such agency, person, or institution, be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current appropriation for carrying out the purpose of this title, or, if returned after the expiration of this title, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 1101. (a) No person designated by the Administrator as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any allowance certified by him under this title.

(b) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated by the Administrator.

SEC. 1102. Any claimant whose claim for an allowance has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal of the State agency or such other agency as may be designated by the Administrator. The representative of the Administrator shall be the final authority in regard to contested claims, subject to appeal to the Administrator.

CHAPTER XII—DECISIONS AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 1200. The authority to issue subpenas and provisions for invoking aid of the courts of the United States in case of disobedience thereto, to make investigations, and to administer oaths, as contained in title III of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat 2033-34; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 131-133), shall be applicable in the administration of this title.

CHAPTER XIII—REQUIREMENT OF REPORTING

SEC. 1300. Any claimant shall report the occurrence of any event which makes him ineligible for or reduces his allowance. Any claimant who fails to report any such event of which he has knowledge and who accepts an allowance to which he is not entitled because of such event shall be ineligible to receive any allowance for 4 weeks of unemployment thereafter.

CHAPTER XIV—PENALTIES

SEC. 1400. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any allowance authorized under this title, or for the purpose of causing any allowance to be paid where none is authorized under this title, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any allowance under this title, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such claim, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

CHAPTER XV—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 1500. As used in this title—

(a) The term "week" means such period or periods of 7 consecutive calendar days as may be prescribed in regulations by the Administrator.

(b) The term "United States" used geographically means the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(c) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(d) The term "wages" means all remuneration for services from whatever sources, including commissions and bonuses and the cash value of all remuneration in any medium other than cash.

(e) The term "noncontributory benefit" means a cash benefit, allowance, annuity, or compensation (including payments under any workmen's compensation law) payable by reason of the past employment or services of any individual, under any law or plan of the United States, any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, creating a system of such payments to individuals (including payments made under any such law or plan by private insurance carriers), if with respect to such individual the benefit system is supported without direct and substantial contributions by wage earners.

TITLE VI

CHAPTER XVI—GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1600. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the administrative, definitive, and penal provisions under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, shall be for application under this act.

SEC. 1601. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 1602. Wherever used in this act, unless the context otherwise requires, the singular includes the plural and the masculine includes the feminine, and the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 1603. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable shall be a prerequisite to entitlement to veterans' benefits provided by this act or Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended.

Mr. McFARLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I had intended to make a few remarks in regard to the bill just passed. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, where so many Senators have endorsed a bill, I do not deem an extended statement appropriate, but I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] for the splendid work he has done upon this G. I. bill of rights. As chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation, he has coordinated the views of various interests and has presented a workable bill. The ex-servicemen have no better friend in this Congress than the Senator from Missouri, who has for many years championed their cause.

I was accorded the privilege of attending all the hearings upon this legislation, including the executive sessions, for which I am very grateful, and I wish to commend the members of the subcommittee and of the whole Finance Committee for the careful study which they have given this legislation.

We all know that after the last war many ex-servicemen wandered over the United States without jobs or means of livelihood. Altogether too many boys found their way into penitentiaries because of their inability to adjust themselves to changed conditions. Many of these boys could have been rehabilitated by the proper assistance, and would have become just as good citizens as they had been soldiers. Had the money eventually paid these men been used for rehabilitation at the proper time, it is my opinion that the misery of many could have been avoided. I personally came in contact with many such cases as county attorney of my country, as assistant attorney general of my State, and as superior court judge.

With the purpose in mind of avoiding the mistakes of the past, the able junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and I, after giving careful consideration to this problem, introduced a bill (S. 1495) which provides adjusted pay for veterans of this war in the form of bonds, with provision for its immediate use for rehabilitation.

I personally felt that our bill was fair, but after attending the hearings of the committee, I observed that many members of the committee felt that the adjusted-pay question should be postponed until after the war. I recognize that the rehabilitation problem is the most important one confronting us at this time, and that it constituted the most important parts of our original bill. I, therefore, in conjunction with the American Legion, worked out an amendment to broaden and enlarge the provisions of S. 1617, both as to the educational benefits and as to loans for rehabilitation. After many conferences, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars approved the amendments which my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and I offered, with a few changes, and our amendments are now incorporated in the G. I. bill of rights.

There are two particularly important and, I think, commendable provisions in the educational features of this bill. First, it gives an equal right to each veteran to receive the educational benefits. It is most important that not only those whose education was interrupted be given this privilege but it is equally important that the boy whose means of livelihood was interrupted by the war and who, because of changed conditions would not be able to come back home and pick up just where he left off, be given an opportunity to prepare himself to meet the changed conditions, and as he is as much entitled to these benefits as the boy who was attending school at the time he entered the service. There will probably be many returning veterans who, for instance, have never had an opportunity to receive an education, but who have been trained in the service in the mechanics of an airplane. These men, with vocational training, can become expert mechanics. Then there is the other boy who may have finished high school and who was, at the time of entering the service, trying to earn sufficient money to complete his education. In a strict sense, he might not be classified as having had his education interrupted. There is also the professional man who, after several years in the service, will need to take a refresher course.

Second, it is important that the veteran be given the privilege of choosing his own school. This is in accordance with the American system, which has prevailed during all of these years and which has been found to be the best in the world. No man should be compelled to attend a school which is not his own choice.

The loans to veterans, not to exceed $1,000, for the purchase of or down payment upon farm implements and machinery, a home or small business, are very important for the rehabilitation of our boys on returning from the service.

I was especially proud to help work out these loan provisions and recommend them to the committee. Many of our boys have married while in service and will return to civilian life needing homes in which to live. This loan will serve a double purpose. It will give to these boys the home they need, and the building of it will help in post-war unemployment.

The provision in regard to buying farm implements and for the payment upon a farm is likewise important. I have talked with boys who were farming before they entered the service and who had to sell the equipment which they owned. Many of them will return without funds with which to purchase any new equipment, and will need help from their Government. Certainly they are entitled to this assistance.

The loan for business purposes is likewise very important. Many will return needing this assistance to adjust themselves in their chosen profession or business. Lawyers will find their law libraries out of date and will need to purchase new lawbooks. Dentists will have to buy dental equipment. Different examples could be multiplied indefinitely and each individual will have his own peculiar problem.

While I consider all phases of the G. I. bill of rights highly important, the education and loan features are absolutely necessary for the rehabilitation of our returning veterans.

I know that each Senator whose name appears on this bill is equally interested in the rehabilitation of our fighting men upon their return. We cannot afford to have our boys wandering over the country as they did after the last war. We must meet this problem now and prevent a recurrence of that unfortunate situation. The stark tragedy of the Anacostia Flats must not be reenacted. We must and are facing this problem today in this G. I. bill of rights.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess, which I understand is to be taken until Tuesday, the Appropriations Committee may be authorized to file a report on the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—AUTHORIZATION TO FILE NOTICES IN WRITING TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for authorization to submit notices in writing of motions to suspend the rule with respect to several amendments to be reported by the committee to the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS, AND TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate the Presiding Officer may be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives,

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to call attention for just a moment to an observation I made earlier in the day. I stated that the Speaker and other Members of the House of Representatives had brought to my attention the desire to take a recess over the Easter holidays, beginning next Thursday, until the 12th of April—practically 2 weeks. The 12th of April comes on Wednesday of the week after Easter Sunday. It had occurred to me that if we were to take a recess, we might as well take a recess until the following Monday. But the plans of the House of Representatives are to take up the naval appropriations bill on the 12th. Therefore, I think I can say with some degree of certainty that probably on next Wednesday a concurrent resolution will be introduced providing for a recess beginning on Thursday, the 30th day of this month, and ending on the 12th of April.

The fact that the Members of the House of Representatives must be back on April 12 in order to take care of a naval appropriation bill does not necessarily mean that the Senate will transact any business during that week. So, although we may take a recess officially only until the 12th of April, I think I can say to the Senate that no business of any importance will be transacted during the remainder of that week, so that in effect the Senate will be in recess until the 17th of April, which is on Monday following Easter Week.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the Senator's purpose to have the Senate adjourn until Tuesday?

Mr. BARKLEY. My purpose is to have the Senate take a recess until Tuesday.

Mr. WHITE. Can the Senator state what will be before the Senate on Tuesday?

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I know, there will be nothing of any importance.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, Mr. President, there will be the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes; I beg the Senator's pardon. The deficiency appropriation bill, if reported, as I understand will be, will be before the Senate.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this morning I introduced a comprehensive bill on the subject of flood control, a subject in which I am very deeply interested. The measure I introduced will, I believe, be the most comprehensive bill on this subject which has ever been introduced. It was my desire to address the Senate on that subject, and I had prepared a résumé on it. I had intended to deliver today, a speech incorporating the résumé. As a matter of fact, I have already released it to the newspapers. However, in view of the pressure in the Senate today in connection with consideration of the appropriation bill, I refrained from imposing the speech on the Senate. Rather than to impose the speech on the Senate at this

late hour, I now ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I have today introduced what I believe to be a comprehensive measure for meeting the tremendous problem of flood control in the United States. In the preparation of this measure I have had the benefit of the advice and assistance of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, of the Secretary of Agriculture, and of many State agencies, private associations, and individuals deeply interested in this problem. None of them, however, is responsible for the net result of these conferences and labors because for the final form of the bill and the ultimate combination of the many suggestions which I have received, I, alone, accept the responsibility.

This bill provides that Federal investigations and improvements of levees and other waterways for flood control and other allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers and that Federal investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention shall be under the supervision of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture except as otherwise provided for by act of Congress. In other words, the bill proposes to fix upon the Corps of Engineers the responsibility for handling the water after it gets into the streams and to give them sufficient authority to completely carry into effect the purpose of such a comprehensive plan.

In addition, in title III the bill gives to the Chief of Engineers authority to control the flow of water from all the dams in the area, private as well as public. Undoubtedly a major part of the responsibility for the first of the disastrous floods in the lower Missouri Valley and middle Mississippi Valley in 1943 was caused by the handling of water flow by certain privately owned dams in the area. By the very nature of the case, reservoirs and dams whether privately owned or publicly owned are affected by public interests and as a police measure of safety for the whole area, this use should be under the control of competent Federal authority which I believe to be the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. President, the season is again approaching in which we may expect with dread and with certainty recurrence in various portions of the United States the enormous and calamitous losses caused by disastrous floods. The appalling disaster of the destruction by floods of many lives and of hundreds of millions of dollars of our national wealth in the Missouri, Illinois, Arkansas, and Mississippi Valleys in 1943, then once again fixed for a brief time, the attention of the Nation upon the vital necessity for comprehensive and adequate measures for the permanent control of this great menace to our national life.

In a speech which I delivered over the Nation-wide net work of the National Broadcasting Co. on February 8, 1937, I said:

"The pity is that such disasters are always necessary in order to arouse national interest in what should be a subject of continuing preeminent national concern until it is successfully, completely, and permanently dealt with in all of its ramifications of reforestation, forest preservation, and soil-erosion prevention as well as the ultimate engineering accomplishment of flood control through reservoirs on the headwaters and adequate levees on the lower reaches of the stream."

The shocking catastrophe of recurrent floods in the Missouri, Illinois and Arkansas, Mississippi Valleys in 1943 made these words even more true and the situation more stringently urgent than they were when they were uttered in 1937.

To be sure, millions of dollars have been expended by the Federal Government on the problem of flood control, but until the most recent years these expenditures were confined to the main stem of the Mississippi, to one lake in Florida, and to the Sacramento River in California, except such works as were incidental to other purposes, such as navigation or power; there they sometimes do more harm than good so far as flood control and prevention are concerned. The great bulk of the vast expenditures which have been made for flood control have been by the States or by local subdivisions of the State such as counties, cities, townships, or levy districts. By reason of the essentially interstate and national character of the flood problem, such improvements have necessarily been piecemeal and incomplete in character, uncoordinated and completely lacking continuity. Moreover, the fact that when such local improvements are destroyed or impaired by flood, the local community which constructed them originally is likely to be so prostrated and impoverished by the disaster itself as to lack the means to repair the damage. The element makes such a system uncertain and ineffective, as has been many times demonstrated.

Not for many years, in fact, not until the terrific floods of 1927, with loss of hundreds of millions of dollars, was the principle that flood control on the main stem of the Mississippi is a national problem and a national responsibility established and then only after a terrific fight and over a most virulent opposition. And still it was denied that floods on the tributary streams of the Mississippi or upon any other great streams in the country such as the Columbia, the Connecticut, the Merrimack, and the Susquehanna, and many others afford a national problem. All efforts to have the subject dealt with in a comprehensive way were berated, ridiculed, abused, and thwarted. Shouts of "pork barrel" went up in the House and Senate and in the press and in magazines at any attempt to secure action to meet the situation. Only in very recent years have we secured national legislative recognition of the national responsibility for flood prevention on the tributaries as well as upon the main stem of the Mississippi. I am proud of the fact that during my service in the Senate as a member of the Commerce Committee I have been able to have an active part in the preparation and enactment of this salutary legislation.

Emergency appropriations following the 1943 floods merely serves to emphasize the vital necessity for a comprehensive, over-all plan for the prevention of floods and for the utilization of available water supply in the Mississippi Basin as a whole, including all of its tributaries, no matter how small and insignificant. Piecemeal efforts, which, while helpful to some degree, have in the analysis proved unavailing, should be abandoned as a permanent program and should be integrated into one system treating the whole Mississippi Valley as a comprehensive whole and the plan should then be enlarged to treat in the same way the other great basins of the United States. The so-called pork-barrel appropriation for local projects should be abandoned and integrated in such a comprehensive scheme, although of course those local projects must necessarily form the framework of the greater whole. Such a plan must of necessity not only include levees upon the lower reaches of the streams where they are and will always be necessary, but should also include sound provisions for dams and reservoirs upon the headwaters of the various tributaries to impound these floodwaters and control their flow in an orderly and beneficial manner. Fully as important, perhaps more important, in such a plan must be adequate and complete over-all provision for the retention, so far as possible, upon the land on farms and in the forested areas composing the watersheds of even the smallest tributaries. Water should not only be controlled after it gets into the rivers and their tributaries but to as great an extent as possible retained on the land where it fell.

To accomplish these purposes a comprehensive plan should be enacted by the Congress. Definite authorization for carrying it out should be made at the earliest possible time and authority and responsibility should be definitely fixed for carrying it into being. One of the great difficulties heretofore has been that too many governmental agencies have been mixed up in making recommendations and doing piecemeal work without any of them having definite over-all responsibility and authority.

It seems to me as I said a moment ago that the time has now arrived for such legislation.

The proposed bill provides for treating the whole Mississippi Basin as a unit. Not because, of course, that the Mississippi Basin has any greater rights to protection than other great basins in the country, but I propose this because the Mississippi Basin affects a much greater area than any other in this country and its area constitutes the greatest granary in the world; also because the Corps of Engineers have for many years been assembling data for dealing with this problem which I understand to be now practically complete. It is, of course, contemplated that the other great basins of the country will ultimately be included in this great work for the conservation of the Nation's resources.

I understand that the data on some other basins is also practically complete and of course, these basins should be added progressively to the national scheme.

This bill includes the first comprehensive over-all plan for the development of the great Missouri Valley as a whole. This is based upon the so-called Pick report prepared by Colonel Pick, one of the greatest of Army engineers who was lately division engineer for the Missouri Valley. In my judgment the monumental Pick report, if carried into effect will be calculated to be one of the most beneficial projects for the whole Missouri Valley that has ever been enjoyed by any great section and will pay for itself over and over as time goes on and will add tremendously to the production and resources of the Nation. It should also be noted that the bill sets up a Missouri River commission for the handling of the problems of flood control, and navigation on the Missouri River, modeled exactly upon the Mississippi Commission whose services have been of such inestimable value to the Basin of the Mississippi River from St. Louis to the mouth.

No matter what vast sums may be spent for structural works upon the main streams and tributaries of the rivers, and with what engineering skill the works may be constructed, these measures will prove ineffective in the long run unless adequate measures are taken for the retention for as much as possible of the water on the land before it even gets into the stream at all.

This brings me to title II of a bill which I have introduced today.

The whole flood situation should be a partnership between the people on the headwaters of the tributaries from whose land the waters must come to a large extent, and the people lower down whose lands are being constantly flooded. This partnership should be and can be mutually advantageous to both and of estimable advantage to the public welfare. Therefore the responsibility for an over-all plan for retaining as much as possible of the water on the land should be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture. The denuding of our forests, the putting of vast acres of land in cultivation, the absence of

vegetation, and certain wasteful practices of farming which have been in effect in many portions of the country have all contributed vastly to the flood situation as it exists in the country at the present time. Reforestation, erosion control, conservation farming practices, all will contribute immeasurably to the prevention of floods. Such practices would serve a twofold purpose, each of very great benefit to the national resources of the country. Not only would they tremendously diminish the rapidity and volume of floods in the lower reaches of the streams but by retaining the water upon the land which it falls, it would enormously increase the fertility and productiveness of the land where it is retained. Billions of tons of the best topsoil in the Missouri-Mississippi Valley have been carried off into the Gulf of Mexico.

This erosion with consequent loss of fertility and consequent increase of flood hazard can to a very material extent be prevented by sound conservation practices in farming and by farsighted reforestation of lands not now suited to agricultural cultivation. This is not a theory. It has been demonstrated on a widespread scale by thousands of experiences and projects already conducted by the Department of Agriculture. The data of these instances establishes the wisdom of such policy beyond the peradventure of a doubt, as the Department itself has said in a bulletin, "By slowing down the run-off of rain water in order to curb erosion the farmer automatically reduces the volume and velocity of water which might otherwise contribute to floods. The soil which is held on the land by erosion-control methods is thereby kept out of the streams where it would reduce the water-carrying capacity of the channels. Thus when a farmer applies erosion-control measures to his land he is actually contributing to flood control. When a considerable proportion of farmers of a watershed adopt effective soil- and water-conservation measures on their lands the effect will be beneficial not only from the standpoint of erosion control but in reducing the flood hazard downstream. The extent of those latter benefits will depend not only upon the physical character of the particular watershed in question but also on other factors such as the amount and intensity of rainfall and the character of the stream involved."

The Department further points out that such practices are simply adaptation of national conservation and flood-control methods to the conditions of advanced cultivation. The principle of all of them is simply to make rain and water walk or creep instead of run, to store a far greater portion of it in the soil and do this by making the soil and its crops provide impediments to run-off by supplying millions of natural little dams by the simple device of plowing and cultivating around the hills. For example, each harrow and each harrow scratch forms a small dam or terrace. On steeper slopes somewhat more elaborate methods may be needed such forestation, terracing, strip cropping, etc. Other segments of the national land-use program may be made to contribute to flood control.

Eroded submarginal farm-basin land that is contributing to floods may be retired from cultivation and disused forested lands may be acquired for flood control and the public purposes.

This erosion-control effort upon the part of the Department of Agriculture is not new. Its utilization in the flood-control program would not require a new program in the Department of Agriculture in the sense that new types of activities must be undertaken. As a matter of fact, the desirability as an aid to flood control was recognized in the Omnibus Flood Control Act of 1936 but the complete integration of the program for the retention of water on the land with a structural-engineering effort for flood control, has never been accomplished. It seems to be that in any comprehensive effort for real flood prevention these two great efforts must be provided for and completely integrated.

Of course, nothing in this plan contemplates any compulsion toward the farmers as to their methods of cultivation but does contemplate the utmost efforts of the Government in the line of encouragement, education, and assistance for a voluntary program.

The provision for soil conservation under title II of this act embodies not only an essential and fundamental means of flood control but also the means for increasing the productive power of farm land and thereby improving and stabilizing the economic position of agriculture. Both results would be vitally important to this Nation.

The relation of soil conservation to the control of floods is profoundly simple. A child can understand it and many children do. The steps are as plain and as logical as the A B C's and their sequence. Water must run downhill and gather in great volume in creeks and rivers before it can produce a flood. If you hold more of the water on the uplands, you reduce the volume which flows into the streams, and thereby you reduce the peaks of floods, or maybe you prevent some of the floods altogether. And when water from rain and snow is held on the uplands the surface soil also stays in place instead of being washed off into the creeks and rivers eventually to clog the channels and lodge in the flood-control structures downstream and impair their efficiency.

The measures of conserving and improving the soil provided under this title are among the best practices of good farming. Their efficiency in checking soil losses and reducing water run-off has been repeatedly provided by the United States Department of Agriculture and the agricultural experiment stations of the various States. In my own State, for example, similar measures in actual farm practice have held soil losses to a negligible minimum and have cut down water run-off by nearly 50 percent under normal rainfall on a highly erodible soil type.

Floods are rapidly increasing in frequency, size, violence, and damage. Unchecked floods could in time roll up a cost approaching that of war itself. Floods therefore must be stopped. They are costing too much, in money and in moral and social effects. They can no longer be afforded.

But costly as may be the losses from floods, they still do not equal the losses from soil erosion. It is estimated by Mr. Hugh Bennett, Soil Conservation Service, that the average annual cost of soil erosion to the whole country is four times greater than the average annual national damage from floods.

It is believed by the best technical authority, and it is the consensus of public judgment, that there is no one way of controlling floods. More than one means of control must be adopted. Let us therefore begin by reducing the run-off from the uplands through the sound and profitable practices of soil conservation, and supplement this by a wisely planned system of channels, levees, dams, and other structures downstream. Then we shall be going at the job with both hands.

I do not know what the final cost of such a comprehensive over-all attack on the flood problem will be, though I doubt it will equal the total sum already spent for flood control without satisfactory results. I believe it will be less than the national property damage from floods in the last 20 years.

But whatever the cost, I know it will be justified, for on the basis of soil improvements alone it will in our time be a highly profitable investment, without counting the saving which will result from diminished damage by floods themselves.

Soil conservation is not merely something good for the farmers. It is something good for everybody. There is scarcely an inland city in the United States whose business does not depend more or less upon the welfare of the land around them. The city in the long run will rise or fall as the fertility of the farms flourishes or decays. Broadly, then, it may be said that when you increase the productive power of farm land you rejuvenate and strengthen the principal natural force by which America lives and prospers. Every man, woman, and child, and all generations of the future have a vital interest—a necessary economic equity—in this question.

It is not to be overlooked that upon the conclusion of the war vast quantities of machinery will be released by our armed forces—bulldozers, tractors, trucks, dredges, and every other form of machinery necessary in public works will be available in the hands of the Government. It would be far better in the national interest that this machinery should be put to useful employment in the retention of water on the soil and in the construction of reservoirs, catch basins, and levees than that it should be given away or sold at sales for a nominal return.

This is not to intimate that I believe that the program for flood prevention should remain entirely as a post-war program. On the contrary I believe that the maintenance of maximum production on agricultural lands is a major war necessity and I believe that this work should be started as soon as possible and as much progress made as can be achieved within the limitations of our manpower and material situation. It does, however, hold forth almost unlimited possibility for usefulness in the public-works program which must inevitably follow the war.

I believe that there is no character of a public-works program which holds forth such certainty as a sound investment as a complete and definite plan for the control of the flood menace, first, by keeping the water on the land, and, second, by regulating its flow when it gets into the streams. It is my hope that Congress may see fit to enter upon the consideration of this vitally important question.

Through the years the Government has expended millions upon millions of public funds in the alleviation of suffering and the relief of those rendered homeless and destitute by the various flood catastrophes. And this is entirely proper and necessary. Very few Members of the House or Senate of the United States have opposed appropriation to meet these vital expenditures for purposes of mercy. But this necessity for such relief and the unanimity for sentiment with which it has been, and is being, extended should not becloud the essential fact that in the most accurate and most tragic sense we are, and have been, merely locking the stable after the horse has been stolen. We are pouring out from year to year, to soften the harder and more immediate effects of recurring disaster, money which if intelligently expended in years gone by for the support of sound measures for flood control would have gone far to prevent the occurrence of those very disasters. Such a policy can only be considered as an example of stupendous national folly.

A truly comprehensive national program for flood prevention and control involving reservoirs and catch basins on the headwaters of the tributaries, levees on the lower reaches of the streams, and progressive plans for retaining water on the soil where it falls and preventing its rapid run-off into the tributaries by reforestation, terracing, and conservation farming methods, as I have said, will involve the expenditure of a great deal of money. Its initial cost will amount to hundreds of millions of dollars, but the cost will be small in comparison with the billions

of dollars of damage which have been sustained through the years by the action of uncontrolled and preventable floods. It has been estimated by competent authority that the loss from the one disastrous flood in the Ohio Valley and other flooded areas in 1937, direct and indirect, was certainly not less than a billion dollars. The loss of life from privation and pestilence which inevitably follows floods will probably never be correctly estimated. Certain it is that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure has never been truer than in this instance.

Such a comprehensive plan will not only pay for itself dollar for dollar in a very short time, but during the years it will pay for itself over and over again by the preservation of fertility and the restoration of permanent productiveness to lands, both in the bottoms and in the uplands.

It seems to me that there has never been a time in all our history more suitable for the inauguration of over-all plans for the prevention of the stupendous waste from floods than is the present. Unquestionably, when this war is over a tremendous public works program will be necessary and inevitable in connection with the demobilization of our armed forces. A tremendous number of men and women will be discharged from the armed forces for whom temporary employment must be found until they can again be reintegrated in our civilian life in an ordinary manner. It is my hope that this great reservoir of manpower may be employed upon a public works program which will consist of works which will be a sound permanent investment, which will pay for themselves over and over rather than in spotted sporadic boondoggling projects merely to supply temporary employment without permanent benefit.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK REVOLUTION FOR INDEPENDENCE.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, tomorrow will be the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the Greek revolution for independence. This year, as during the 2 preceding years, the anniversary finds Greece depleted and exhausted after almost 3 years of Nazi tyranny and exploitation.

The people of Greece have suffered much and they will suffer more before the day of liberation. However, the Greek people have not lost hope. They have fought many times for their freedom, and they continue to fight even now, as the German soldiers trample their beloved country.

All friends of Greece remember "the golden age of Pericles" with its array of achievements in every field of endeavor. It was in ancient Greece that democracy was first born. All are familiar with the valiant stand of the Greeks at Thermopylae, their struggle agains the Persians, and how they saved Europe from invasion by the barbarians from the East.

In her long history Greece suffered vicissitudes as violent as those any other country has known. For long periods she has been eclipsed; she has vanished, almost, from the European nations; but whenever she has emerged she has been found holding fast to the same idea of liberty, and the noblest moments of her story have been those in which she fought not to lose it.

Greece was the first of the subject countries of Europe to rise against the Turks. The struggle began in 1821, when the Archbishop of Patras gave the signal to a crowd of people massed in the monastery of Agia Lavra. The struggle for independence lasted 10 long years. It was carried on by intellectual leaders from Constantinople, by sailors from the island trading communities of Hydra, Spetsai, Psara, and the Dodecanese, by Greek fighters from the mountains who never had submitted to the Turks. The people of Greece fought for their freedom.

Even women joined in the fight. They stood beside their men, and shared their dangers and hardships without complaint. They died with their men.

Slowly moral support from the outside world was translated into practical support. The British, French, and Russians joined together to help free Greece from Turkish suzerainty. It was during this period that Lord Byron gave his life for the freedom of Greece. America had a share in making Greek independence possible, through the efforts of Daniel Webster, President James Monroe, and other American leaders. Finally in 1830 the people of Greece gained their complete independence.

On October 28, 1940, Mussolini attacked Greece because Greece refused to play the part of an abject slave and yield to Italian demands for territorial bases. On November 23, less than a month later, the last remaining Italians on Greek soil were driven across the Albanian frontier.

For 6 months the ill-clad, poorly equipped Greek soldier, whose strongest armor was the undisputed righteousness of his cause, drove the invader out of Greece and deep into Albania, vanquished and humiliated him, exposed him as an inflated braggart, irretrievably shattered his prestige and the morale of his people, gave to the Allies their first victory in a long series of defeats, and to the occupied countries an encouraging token of future victories.

On April 6, 1941, Germany invaded both Greece and Yugoslavia. By overwhelming mechanical might, she conquered the two countries. But the Nazis have never been able to conquer the people.

Even now, the people of Greece continue their struggle to oust the invader. Starvation and exploitation by the Nazi overlords is reducing the population by thousands. The beautiful Greek historic and religious shrines are desecrated and dispoiled wantonly.

Yet Greece fights on. Many officers and soldiers in the former Greek Army, many professional people, and clergymen, joined the underground organizations. A woman's organization was formed; and again the women of Greece stood beside their men in the resistance movement.

Mr. President, the underground movement grew so strong that it fought pitched battles against the Germans, and by 1943 it was able to set up a regular civil administration in its territory. The large cities, coast, and main routes remain under the control of the Germans, but the countryside and the villages are in the hands of the Greek underground.

In this country Americans of Greek origin are in the forefront in supporting the United States war effort. This year Greek-Americans all over this Nation are buying an extra War bond to celebrate the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of the Greek Revolution for Independence. This campaign, launched by the Daily National Herald, is an effort to do something more for the war effort and express the appreciation of Americans of Greek descent for all that America has done and is doing for Greece and the cause of freedom. May our country continue to be worthy of their efforts. Americans of Greek origin feel that the most effective way to secure the liberation of their native land is to buy an extra War bond in their adopted homeland, the great United States of America. These Greek-Americans know the need for unity in support of the Commander in Chief. This country can be proud of the Americans of Greek origin who sacrifice so willingly for the cause of victory.

Mr. President, I wish to express the fervent hope that the great democracy that was Greece will live again. I know it is the desire of all democratic freedom-loving Americans that the people of Greece should be free to choose their own form of government and have their national rights fulfilled, when the hated German oppressor is driven out of their land. We can and must play our part to vouchsafe this to the Greek people.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

SURG. GEN. THOMAS PARRAN, UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report favorably the nomination of Dr. Thomas Parran to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. He was today nominated for reappointment by the President. In view of the fact that it is very undesirable to have a hiatus in his office, and because his present term will shortly expire, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination. I have conferred with the leaders on both sides, and it is agreeable to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Parran to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, March 28, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 24 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Thomas Parran, of New York, to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PEOPLE'S COUNSEL, PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

James W. Lauderdale, of the District of Columbia, to be people's counsel. Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward M. Curran, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia. (Mr. Curran is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 29, 1944.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Felix B. Stump, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1943.

Capt. Alfred M. Pride, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of July 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 24 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

SURGEON GENERAL

Thomas Parran to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

POSTMASTERS

WASHINGTON

Amelia K. Stalding, Grayland.
Robert L. Van Arsdall, Lakeview.
Bertha M. Simmons, Milton.

WISCONSIN

Robert R. Taylor, Brokaw.
Edgar Leissring, Butler.
Edward B. Morse, Mount Hope.
Carol P. Buehler, Nekoosa.
Herman H. Eberhardt, Newton.
Bernice P. Lampman, Plover.
Celia Stapleton, Ridgeway.
Ben A. Bittner, St. Cloud.
Jossie Loescher, Salem.
John A. Heinzen, Whitelaw.
Martin G. Tonn, Wilton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the life of mortal men, we would hear Thy word with the upward glance of faith: "The Lord God is a sun and a shield, the Lord will give grace and glory; no good thing will He withhold from them that walk uprightly"; we praise Thee that Thou art a shield to protect and a sun to provide. Across the years, Thou dost bring succor to the generations of troubled and tempted hearts and out of the empty heavens Thou dost light up the soul of earth.

O Saviour Divine, breathe upon us that spirit which sweetens the soul and gives power to its deepest elements in dealing with our fellow men. We beseech Thee to turn the thought of our land to Thy holy altar; ours is a sacred trust of human life and the gleaming jewel in the crown of freedom; for the sake of the truth which abides in us, let us never be overmastered by indifference or neglect, nor become the target of material schedules. Dear Lord, there is no work so important or so high in the scale of human endeavor as to follow Him whose cross is a symbol of hope across the eastern sky of humanity; He came giving the cup of water, clothing the naked, and feeding the hungry. Blessed Master, inspired by Thy holy example, help us to be radiant in spirit, tireless in service, and joyous in seeking to do Thy will. In the name of Him who is destined to bring peace and harmony to this wandering world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JARED YOUNG SANDERS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a very sad task that I am called upon to perform this morning. On last evening in Baton Rouge, the State capital of Louisiana, one of the most colorful and picturesque figures in the political history of that State crossed the Great Divide. Former Gov. Jared Young Sanders, who has been on the political scene of Louisiana for some 50 years, died at the age of 75 after a long illness.

Mr. Sanders served in this House in the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses. He lived to see the day that his son, J. Y. Sanders, Jr., served and represented the same district from Louisiana here with many of you Members. The devotion between that father and that son will always remain in my memory. J. Y. Sanders, Jr., was, indeed, a worthy son of a worthy sire.

J. Y. Sanders, Sr., was a native of Louisiana. He was born at Morgan City, St. Mary Parish, on January 29, 1869. He attended the public schools of the State of Louisiana and then entered Tulane University at New Orleans, where he was graduated in law in 1893. He was admitted to the bar the same year and commenced the practice of law in New Orleans. He entered the political arena of the State back in 1892 during the famous Louisiana lottery fight, when he was elected to the State house as a member of the Antilottery Party. He was then elected to the State constitutional convention in 1898 and elected speaker of the State house of representatives in 1900, where he served until 1904. He was then elected Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana in 1904 and served until 1908, when he was elevated to the governorship and served from 1908 to 1912. On July 6, 1910, he was elected to the United States Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Samuel D. McEnery, of Louisiana.

I pause here to call your attention to this fact, which is most characteristic of the life of J. Y. Sanders. Elected to the United States Senate on July 6, 1910, given the occasion to realize the greatest ambition of his life, he declined to qualify for the office and remained as Governor of Louisiana for the sole reason that he believed he owed a debt of loyalty to his friends within the State of Louisiana. He declined to come to the Senate and passed up that opportunity of realizing his life's ambition because he placed loyalty above self.

He was elected then to the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses of the United States and served in this House from March 4, 1917, until March 3, 1921.

He was again elected a member of the State constitutional convention in 1921. He then resumed the practice of his profession and later was twice a candidate for the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is also of interest to take cognizance of the fact that when J. Y. Sanders, Sr., was the Governor of Louisiana, the speaker of the House of

Representatives of Texas was the distinguished gentleman from Texas who is now the Speaker of this House. Our Speaker served with Mr. Sanders in two sessions and also served with his son.

Mr. Speaker, Louisiana has lost a great character, both politically and personally. Louisiana will miss the name of J. Y. Sanders, Sr., in the future. Governor Sanders experienced the rare experience which comes to few men in public life, the experience of becoming a legend during their lifetime. For a half century in Louisiana the name of Sanders has been injected into every Statewide campaign in a State which has contributed some of the most colorful political figures and campaigns in our national history. Governor Sanders has departed from among us, but he has left his imprint upon our memories forever.

The name of Jared Young Sanders will never be forgotten in Louisiana. He will not be forgotten by political friend or political foe. He was that kind of character—dynamic, tireless, resourceful, effective, able, commanding. It shall be a long time before Louisiana will look upon his like again.

JESSE S. COTTRELL

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply moved this morning when my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable ALBERT GORE, informed me of the sudden death of our mutual journalist friend, Jesse S. Cottrell.

Mr. Cottrell was the Washington correspondent for many newspapers in the United States, including the Green Bay Press-Gazette, a daily newspaper in Green Bay, Wis., and the Appleton Post-Crescent, a daily newspaper in Appleton, Wis., both of which are in the Eighth Congressional District. In my early contacts with Mr. Cottrell, I sensed a desire on his part to cut through the veneer of the formal contact and to reach the real individual personality. He reported my activities with the true individual touch of knowing me intimately. Time and again he gave me the benefit of his experience on the Hill and I grew very fond of Jesse. Words cannot express my true feelings in the loss of this friend.

Mrs. Cottrell assisted Jesse and was very devoted to him. Well shall I remember an incident happening but a few days ago when I saw the Cottrell team enter the House Building, embrace for a moment and then travel in different directions down the high marble corridors to gather material for distribution to the reading public. I am sure that my colleagues join me today in extending sympathy to his teammate and close companion in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Wisconsin in expressing deep regret and sincere sorrow at the death early today of one of the most faithful and beloved members of the Press Gallery.

Jesse S. Cottrell passed away suddenly this morning after a heart attack at his home in Arlington.

His death brought to an end a long and distinguished career as a soldier, a diplomat, and a journalist.

No greater tribute can be paid to any man in the newspaper profession than to say that he was a good reporter. Jesse Cottrell met that test in a very real and complete manner, and concerned himself with facts rather than fancy; with truth rather than rumor.

In times like these the Nation needs stalwart journalists even as it needs courageous statesmen.

The death of Jesse Cottrell is a serious loss to the country.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that I am voicing the profound sorrow of the United States Congress over the untimely death of Jesse Samuel Cottrell, newspaperman, diplomat, attorney, and above all, a friend of uncounted scores of men and women who have served at the Capitol.

In the passing of Jesse Cottrell we are reminded again of the great service men and women, truly dedicated to their profession of reporting and interpreting the news, give to their country and fellow citizens.

Some men must wait for an outpouring of appreciation until they die. Mitigating our grief at the death of Jesse Cottrell is the knowledge that he was appreciated and held in the highest esteem during his long career as a Washington editor and columnist. He brought to Washington not only fine skill as a newspaperman but long experience as an Ambassador to South American countries and the fruits of many years as an attorney and as on Army officer. His counsel was eagerly sought because of his varied experience and, perhaps, the finest tribute which could be paid to him is that he was a fair, a capable, and an understanding newspaperman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues who have preceded me in lamenting the passing early this morning of one of Washington's best known and most beloved newspapermen, Jesse S. Cottrell. His passing comes as a great shock to his many friends in the newspaper profession and in Congress.

Jesse Cottrell was a gentleman of the old school. He had a long and distinguished career of public service. As a gentleman of the press he was a "square shooter," an assiduous worker, and a man who never breached a confidence. He was born at Knoxville, Tenn., 65 years ago. He started his newspaper career with the Knoxville Sentinel as a messenger boy. Afterwards he was engaged in newspaper work at Chattanooga, Nashville, and in Tucson, Ariz. He came to Washington in 1910 as a secretary to Senator Newell Sanders. He was a captain in World War No. 1. Later he was named and served as Minister and Special Ambassador to Bolivia. After about 8 years of meritorious service in this capacity he returned to Washington to engage in his chosen profession. He was active to the last. He took a great interest in the National Press Club and at the time of his passing was serving as vice chairman of the board of directors. Jesse and his lovely and capable wife, Mary, have served as Washington correspondents for some of the country's leading newspapers for a number of years. He is also survived by one daughter, Betty Ann.

His passing will be greatly lamented by every Member of the House who knew him and by his friends and acquaintances throughout the country. Jesse Cottrell was truly "the gentleman to the manor born."

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the ouse for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the many friends of Jesse Cottrell in expressing my great sorrow at his recent death. Mr. Cottrell was a fine gentleman. He surrounded himself with the beautiful things of life. It has been well said that "what surrounds us, reflects more or less that which is within us." He was a sweet-spirited companion. He sought the truth, and he was always fair in his reports on the activities of Congress and on all public matters about which he undertook to write. The North Carolina delegation was very, very fond of this distinguished gentleman. We sincerely hope that his accomplished wife will continue the splendid work of our distinguished friend.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE MYSTERY OF THE ARABIAN PIPE LINE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. Oswald Wilson, of San Francisco. I am informed by the Government Printing Office that this will exceed the limit and will cost $112.50, but I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address recently delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] in his home State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter addressed to Hon. Thomas F. MacDonald, which is signed by a group of Congressmen from the States of Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas, relating to the construction of an air-line highway from Memphis, Tenn., to Houston, Tex. A copy of this letter was likewise sent to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], chairman of the House Committee on Roads. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include this letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an Associated Press dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of tax simplification.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by including therein an article entitled "The Indian in the United States."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILCHRIST addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, after the address by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 50]

Andresen, August H.	Ellison, Md.	Kee
Auchincloss	Ellsworth	Kelley
Baldwin, Md.	Elmer	Kennedy
Baldwin, N. Y.	Engel, Mich.	Kilburn
Barrett	Fay	Klein
Barry	Feighan	LaFollette
Blackney	Fernandez	Lambertson
Bonner	Fogarty	Lane
Bradley, Mich.	Fuller	LeFevre
Brooks	Fulmer	Luce
Brumbaugh	Furlong	Lynch
Buckley	Gallagher	McCormack
Bulwinkle	Gamble	McCowen
Burchill, N. Y.	Gifford	McGehee
Busbey	Goodwin	McWilliams
Butler	Gross	Maas
Byrne	Hale	Manasco
Capozzoli	Hall, Leonard W.	May
Celler	Harless, Ariz.	Merritt
Chenoweth	Harness, Ind.	Merrow
Coffee	Hart	Miller, Mo.
Compton	Heffernan	Miller, Nebr.
Dewey	Herter	Monroney
Dickstein	Holmes, Mass.	Morrison, N. C.
Dies	Holmes, Wash.	Myers
Dingell	Izac	O'Brien, N. Y.
Disney	Jeffrey	O'Connor
Domengeaux	Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Konski
Doughton	Kearney	O'Toole
Douglas		Pfeifer
Phillips	Sabath	Philbin
Plumley	Sadowski	Sundstrom
Poulson	Satterfield	Taylor
Pracht, C. Frederick	Scanlon	Thomas, N. J.
Pratt, Joseph M.	Scott	Torrens
Price	Shafer	Treadway
Rabaut	Sheridan	Vorys, Ohio
Randolph	Sikes	Vursell
Rankin	Snyder	Ward
Reed, Ill.	Stanley	Weichel, Ohio
	Sumner, Ill.	Weiss
		Winter
		Wright

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 298 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with Greek Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the 21st of March.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter which I have received from a soldier overseas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN: On page 64, line 25, after the word "producers", strike out the colon, add a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the membership of the House to read this proviso which, in my opinion, is the most vicious limitation I have ever seen placed on an appropriation bill. If we are justified in placing this limitation in the pending appropriation bill you will likewise be justified in placing it in every appropriation bill. This not only applies to the A. A. A. but it applies to every employee and every official of the Department of Agriculture from the Secretary down. The proviso deprives every employee and official of the Department the right of petition. They would even be prohibited from discussing matters with you unless you called upon them to do so.

Mr. Chairman, as far as political activity is concerned, we already have a law on the statute books that takes care of the situation; however, this goes further, for under the provisions of this limitation no official or employee of the Department could voluntarily contribute to any campaign, be it national or local. In my opinion, it would be a violation of the limitation if an official or an employee attended a Jackson Day or Lincoln Day dinner where they were required to pay for the dinner, part of which went to a political committee. I understand this grows out of some kind of a fight out in the field between certain groups of employees of the Department of Agriculture. This situation could be corrected without placing language of this character in the bill. I also understand certain employees have opposed Members of Congress. You can stop that under existing law.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that when we deny the right of petition to an individual, be he private citizen or Government employee, we are in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. Right of petition is something we have always tried to protect. As far as I am personally concerned I have no employees, or at least not more than 5 or 10, of the Department of Agriculture who live in my district. Most of them are meat inspectors. I am speaking from the standpoint of principle. The language is so broad that it is going to absolutely require employees and officials to refrain from any kind of activity in connection with any matters relating to the Department. As I said before, if you set a precedent by placing this language in the pending billl, then you would be justified in placing it in every appropriation bill. I would like to have some of the members of this subcommittee who are responsible for the language explain to the House why they think it is justified, especially when we have a law, the Hatch Act, now on the statute books.

Let me also ask what the Comptroller General will do. Will it be necessary to have an affidavit from every employee monthly showing the law has not been violated before he can pay them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the pending amendment be limited to 15 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be allotted to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], which would strike the last proviso of the bill and which in so doing would also strike out the Harness amendment which was adopted yesterday, will be defeated.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not possible to reoffer the Harness amendment by itself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am speaking of what would happen if the gentleman's amendment is adopted. I am not passing on subsequent procedure or parliamentary considerations that may develop. I think the gentleman from Missouri will agree that if his amendment is adopted the Harness amendment goes with it.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing wrong with this language in the bill. It applies first of all to full-time employees of the Department of Agriculture only who engage in political or lobby activities. Why should they receive the largess of the taxpayers of this country or receive funds out of the Federal Treasury, and at the same time be permitted to engage in lobby activities to subserve the purposes that must be paid for out of the Federal Treasury? There is one of those paradoxes in itself and should have been effectively cured long ago. We anticipated that the Hatch Act would cure it, but evidently it has not because there have been some of these activities in the field in the last year or two, and this is notably true in connection with lobby activities for larger funds for agriculture out of the Federal Treasury, for incentive payments.

We had the investigators go into these activities last year to examine a good many of the telegrams that had been sent by the officials of the Department in Washington. I have that whole file of photostats in my office at the present time. When the matter of incentive payments was up, wires went out from certain officials in the Department to people in the field who had an interest in the matter and at the bottom of the wire was the statement, "Wire your Senators and Congressmen." Oddly enough, it was scratched from the photostat copies in the file. That simply gives point then to the fact that the greatest, sometimes the most insidious, and certainly the most influential lobby activities in the Government are not pressure groups on the outside of the Government, but pressure groups on the inside who consist of those who are on the pay roll. We wanted to be very clear that this interdiction is meant to stop that kind of activity and that kind of pressure upon the National Legislature.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the expression "full-time employee" would cover a local member of the A. A. A. committee in any county?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. The community committeeman, for instance, will receive forty or fifty dollars a year. The county committeeman will receive something like $500 a year on the average, and that group are not full-time employees in the Department, so there is an exception for them, since this applies only to full-time employees.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman tell us whether the A. A. A. here in Washington has construed this limitation as affecting the local county committees?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have had no expression from the A. A. A., simply because the subcommittee has not asked them. The language in itself is sufficiently clear, in my judgment.

Mr. COLE of New York. For the gentleman's information, last fall I received a communication from a member of the A. A. A. committee in one of my counties criticizing the subsidy program. Within a month that entire committee was summarily dismissed by the headquarters of the A. A. A. here in Washington for violation of this particular section.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I think the language is explicit, it is clear, it is effective. It goes only to full-time employees. It goes to political activities that are designed to bring about the defeat or election of a person in public office simply because he takes one position or another on questions of agricultural policy or funds in which a Federal employee would have a personal interest. That is scarcely healthy.

It is time that a provision of this kind be inserted in the bill as a refresher to people who have forgotten the Hatch Act. They have forgotten also the antilobby statute that was adopted shortly after the First World War when there was so much pressure to obtain or maintain large appropriations for given groups in the country that Congress by way of defense of itself and its activities had to adopt the antilobby statute. People have forgotten. It ought to be reaffirmed from time to time to make sure we will not be overwhelmed by these lobby activities.

I trust, therefore, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] will be roundly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 62, line 5, after the colon following the word "inclusive", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no payment or payments hereunder to any one person or corporation shall be in excess of the total sum of $500: *And provided further*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter of payments not exceeding the amount to which he would otherwise be entitled."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because of the inclusion of the second proviso therein, which, in my judgment, constitutes legislation upon an appropriation bill. It is in effect a construction of the preceding proviso, and which legislatively provides that the preceding proviso in the case of tenants shall not be taken at its face value but that a different rule shall be applicable to them. Because that provision is included, I think the entire amendment is subject to a point of order because of its being legislative in character.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Kansas on the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia with respect to the second proviso of the amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. First, I believe the point of order comes too late. I had been recognized by the Chair. I think I am correct in that.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman had commenced debate.

Mr. TARVER. No, indeed. I got the attention of the Chair just as soon as I could after hearing the amendment read. Of course, I could not make a point of order until I heard the amendment read and determined whether I thought it was subject to a point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I will not press that point.

Mr. Chairman, an amendment identical with the one now before the Committee was presented in this House on April 17, 1943. There was a considerable amount of discussion with regard to it. A point of order was raised against it. We had exactly the same situation we have now. The gentleman from Georgia, I believe, raised the point of order. I believe I am correct in that.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In any event a point of order was raised against it by a member of the committee. We had the same chairman at that time that we have now. I assume that under the same circumstances there should be no necessity of going back and presenting the matter again. The whole matter with respect to the question of whether a point of order would lie against the amendment was presented on that occasion.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, I think he is mistaken. I did not make the point of order which may have been urged a year ago. I think the point of order was not raised on the ground I have submitted here, as an objection to the pending amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not have the RECORD before me, but the matter was pretty thoroughly discussed at that time. It may have been on a similar amendment presented earlier in the day. I do not believe the amendment in its present form is subject to a point of order. I am going to leave it to the decision of the Chair, but I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that an amendment was offered on April 17, 1943, and the Chair ruled that a point of order would lie against it. The gentleman from Kansas then submitted another amendment, identical with the one pending before the committee, and that amendment was accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. As the gentleman from Kansas said, after a point of order had been made and sustained for another purpose against the amendment, he did submit the amendment, as disclosed by the RECORD of April 17, 1943, in the form that he now submits it, but no point of order was made against it at that time.

The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from Georgia on the proposition of whether or not the second proviso would constitute an exception to the limitation contained in the first part of the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. No, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion, having heard the amendment read, although I have not had the opportunity to examine it carefully, that the second proviso does not constitute merely an exception to the limitation made in the first proviso, but it is legislative in character and constitutes a legislative construction of the language contained in the first proviso and is, therefore, clearly in itself legislation. I know no reason why the gentleman from Kansas should not offer or be permitted to offer the first proviso. But I think the second proviso which reads, "*And provided further*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter of payments not exceeding the amount to which he would otherwise be entitled," is clearly a legislative construction of the preceding proviso and, therefore, in itself constitutes legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Just one point. Let me observe that the so-called limitation is a limitation only on the first proviso of the amendment and does not constitute legislation on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the second proviso constitutes an exception to the provisions of the amendment as contained in the first proviso. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical with one I submitted and was adopted by the House last year. It went to another body and was eliminated by the members of the conference committee. The amendment simply limits the payment under this program to any one person, firm, or corporation to a maximum of $500. Share renters also participate up to $500.

Mr. Chairman, there is a considerable misunderstanding with regard to what is known as the soil-conservation program in the Department of Agriculture. The Soil Conservation Service has its own organization and has been in effect for many years. We appropriate approximately $30,000,000 per year for it. That agency employes hundreds of soil experts, and other trained men to render assistance with respect to soil conditions, crops, conservation, crop rotation, and any and all kinds of advice and information is furnished free to the farmers. This agency, although not so much publicized, has done a great amount of real constructive work.

This section of the legislation deals with payments that are allowed by the Government for following certain land programs and practices laid out by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. These payments are, as the legislation suggests, in compliance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1936 as amended in 1938. Now, Mr. Chairman, all I am asking is that since this money paid by taxpayers, from the Federal Treasury, that payments be limited to $500.

This item provides for an expenditure of a total of $300,000,000. That is, there is $290,000,000 in this section and then a carry-over of $10,000,000. Of the total amount you propose to spend $24,250,000 for salaries and expenses of those who administer this part of the act.

Now, take a look as to how this money from the Treasury is divided—I have only the approximate figures for 1943. They are practically in line with those of 1942. Here is the way the funds are distributed. There are approximately 6,000,000 farmers participating. Last year there were 5,860,000. Two-fifths of these farmers, or 1,815,000, got less than $20 each. Three million two hundred and sixty thousand, or more than 60 percent, did not get as much as $40 each. Four million nine hundred and seventy-five thousand, or 83 percent, of these farmers did not get as much as $100, and 95 percent got less than $200 each. As a matter of fact it took less than 20 percent of the money to pay more than half of the farmers. Then about $60,000,000 was sliced off to a few big operators. It seems to me that if the Government wants to assist farmers by paying money direct for following certain rules to build up the soil, good and well, but I feel there should be a limit in favor of the individual who looks after his land, whether he owns it or not. Seems to me that since this program does not provide for "laying out" any land, and since none is to be used for incentive payments, this House might see fit to save approximately $60,000,000 for the taxpayers of this country and at the same time not disturb any farmer unless, of course, some landowners should feel they are entitled to the extra cash, although the money

paid up to $500 is credited on work that improves his investment and his estate. Let me say again, you are not taking anything away from anyone. You are limiting the amount paid by your Government to anyone. The limit affects only about 2 or 3 percent, but it saves $60,000,000.

It seems rather strange that since this Government started out to assist the farmers when prices were low and crops poor that the big operators justify a demand at this time of payments from this fund in sums of thousands of dollars. I ask you to take a look at the figures and tables inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable REID MURRAY, showing to whom these payments were made in sums of thousands of dollars each, and then look at the 3,000,000 farmers who did not even get as much as $20. And yet you will say it is very inequitable to place a limit on these payments. Does it occur to you that this is Government money and not proceeds from the land?

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot think the operators of large tracts of land would want to withhold payments from their tenants just because their own payments for soil conservation on their own land is limited to $500. Incidentally, this Congress not so long ago just could not stand to see operators get payments ranging from $25,000 to $100,000 and more, so Congress did attempt to fix a limit of $10,000, subject to certain modifications.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct your attention to the fact that we have in this bill the present agency dealing with the subject Conservation and Use of Agricultural Resources. It provides for the expenditure of $24,250,000 to pay employees and agents in Washington and in every State and every county in the United States. Offices, equipment, and automobiles with gasoline and tires are furnished. I do not know the number of employees, but there are thousands of them. These individuals, according to the legislation, are concerned with "conservation and use of agricultural land resources."

Then, Mr. Chairman, right in this same agricultural bill, and on the next page of the bill, another and separate division is entitled "Soil Conservation Service."

This provides for expenditure of $29,637,248 to be used for salaries and expenses for soil-research investigations. To study soil character, cause, history, depletion, and so forth. It also provides for maintaining offices here in Washington, also in every State in the Union, also in districts and counties within the States.

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot understand why the Soil Conservation Service is not permitted and required to administer both of these agencies. Here are two agencies right in the Department of Agriculture dealing with the same subject matter, one costs about $25,000,000 for personal services and expenses, and the other costs approximately the same amount. Fifty million dollars for services that could be reduced as much as $20,000,000 I am sure, and not injure the farmer or the country in doing so. You might have to trim a little extra on personnel, but I do not think it would injure the services rendered to the farmer. There would also be a saving of manpower that is so much needed right now.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of this country have all they possibly can do to meet the requirements and demands of their Government. They are doing a magnificent job. They are willing to work from dawn to dark. They and their wives and children are doing everything possible to meet their goals in producing food for the armed forces and for civilian requirements. They are doing it in spite of a lot of handicaps, shortage of help, and adequate machinery and equipment, but, Mr. Chairman, with all this the farmer ought to be given a little more encouragement and more consideration. He is doing a war job. Let him have a little more machinery, more fertilizer. More necessary gas for farming, and, above all things, cut out a lot of red tape, rules and regulations that are imposed on him and are retarding his efforts. Give the farmer a little more "green light" for a change.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that discussion on this amendment be concluded in 45 minutes, the last 10 minutes of which may be for the use of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to help to keep the New Deal from committing agricultural suicide. That is not the reason I am supporting the amendment. I am supporting the amendment because the amendment is right. Last year there were $400,000,000 for soil conservation. This year there is $390,000,000, plus $10,000,000 carry-over, or $400,000,000. A $375 ceiling this year, which would be the same as $500 passed last year when the Rees amendment was passed.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will yield only for a correction.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman this question. The money will be distributed differently this year than it was last year in that it will be paid only for crops, whereas last year it was paid for other things than crops; is that not correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct, as he always is, but it is doubtful if it will disturb the relationship between the small payments and the big payments.

Do you wish to be in the position of supporting a program whereby in 1942 nearly a third of the cooperators received $20 or less, and 33,000 cooperators received $58,000,000?

Do you wish to provide $58,000,000 for one group of 33,000 when another agency right in the same United States Department of Agriculture is asking 840,000 United States farmers who have mortgages on their farms to pay in $12,000,000 more to the United States Treasury in the form of increased interest rates? They need more money. They are going to raise the interest rates on July 1 on 840,000 United States farmers who have mortgages on their farms. At the same time they are going to carry on a program of distributing $58,000,000 to 33,000 large operators in the country. You are asked to support a program where 370 large operators in Georgia, for example, receive over $300,000, and where 94,000 cooperators in 1942 received $20 or less.

Or, take the State of Texas, where 178,000 farmers received $20 or less, and still we have 3,300 large operators receiving $4,941,000. It does not make any difference what State you take. It all works out the same.

In Wisconsin we have 22,000 farmers getting less than $20.

The same United States Department of Agriculture through another agency, says we have to have $600,000 more from the people of our State of Wisconsin as a result of increased interest rates on farm loans. The same agency in the United States Department of Agriculture says we need $12,000,000 more interest from the 840,000 farm mortgages they hold in the United States.

In Kansas where our colleague the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE comes from, 3,000 cooperators received $3,000,000; yet there are 32,000 other operators who received $20 or less. These 32,000 operators received a total of less than $640,000; and yet 3,000 big operators got $3,000,000.

This is purely legislation for the few at the expense of the many. You can subscribe to such a program but it does not coincide with my convictions.

I will give you other States.

In Massachusetts we have 4,500 farmers who received $20 or less per cooperator. We have 8 big cooperators who received over $2,000 each.

In New York, 18 large cooperators received $7,000; and 5,900 cooperators in New York State received $20 or less.

Illinois—here is a combination that we have to beat on the floor—our distinguished colleague from Illinois, our good friend and my candidate for President [Mr. DIRKSEN], aided by the gentleman from Kansas, the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, and our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON. When you have to go up against them, together with the gentleman from Iowa, the Honorable FRED GILCHRIST, you have a hard row to hoe. I know that. However, take Illinois: 24,000 small operators received $20 or less; but 4,400 of the larger cooperators in the same State received $2,800,000, to say nothing about the $4,000,000 that they threw in as parity payments, which they did not have the conscience to put into the bill this year.

The following official table that I am reading from gives you each State in detail as to the amounts of payments:

TABLE No. 12.—*Estimated number of payees receiving payments in various size-of-payment groups, by States, 1942 agricultural conservation program*

Number of payees

State and region	$0 to $20	$20.01 to $40	$40.01 to $60	$60.01 to $100	$100.01 to $150	$150.01 to $200	$200.01 to $300	$300.01 to $400	$400.01 to $500	$500.01 to $1,000	$1,000.01 to $2,000	$2,000.01 to $3,000	$3,000.01 to $4,000	$4,000.01 to $5,000	$5,000.01 to $10,000	Total number of payees
Maine	5,380	7,149	2,739	2,493	1,373	707	416	159	54	86	29	7	2	1	2	20,597
New Hampshire	1,842	5,173	1,415	1,049	300	70	32	3	4	2						9,890
Vermont	2,758	5,622	3,760	3,021	822	169	56	13	3	5						16,229
Massachusetts	4,582	7,229	2,602	2,198	966	288	145	20	7	6	6					18,049
Rhode Island	159	1,169	200	131	47	17	8			7						1,738
Connecticut	1,840	5,124	1,651	1,426	528	195	93	28	13	32	7	4	1		1	10,943
New York	5,968	25,258	19,870	23,780	8,643	2,289	716	204	56	88	9	4	1			86,886
New Jersey	2,396	2,911	2,040	2,972	1,570	726	382	140	63	80	10	1		1	1	13,293
Pennsylvania	26,777	32,195	20,682	19,455	6,142	1,198	520	135	24	25	44	16	6		3	107,222
Northeast	51,702	91,830	54,959	56,525	20,391	5,659	2,368	702	224	331	105	32	10	2	7	284,847
Illinois	24,916	24,899	23,039	41,602	36,177	21,585	14,891	5,009	2,118	1,854	302	29	12	1	1	196,435
Indiana	27,587	29,694	24,271	34,797	20,550	9,707	5,639	1,693	669	576	78	9	5	4		155,279
Iowa	11,374	14,811	20,446	49,104	45,177	30,703	19,405	5,773	1,988	1,489	119	11	4	2	2	200,408
Michigan	37,967	40,702	27,697	26,570	8,741	2,376	814	177	56	33	8					145,141
Minnesota	35,740	32,940	23,234	34,541	23,580	11,658	5,912	1,494	460	396	69	9	2		2	170,037
Missouri	45,542	50,447	32,646	38,527	20,071	9,190	5,359	1,882	750	905	182	36	8	3	4	205,552
Nebraska	15,580	21,707	19,820	33,313	25,959	15,712	10,169	2,953	1,157	1,243	198	17	9	2	2	147,841
Ohio	38,179	37,727	33,816	43,559	22,339	9,312	4,687	1,319	452	420	62	7	1	1	2	191,883
South Dakota	21,823	11,100	9,022	15,753	12,698	8,635	6,284	2,540	1,188	1,358	224	27	6	2		90,660
Wisconsin	22,033	45,413	42,485	43,874	13,035	3,609	1,254	219	60	54	13					172,049
North Central	280,741	309,440	256,476	361,640	228,327	122,487	74,414	23,059	8,898	8,328	1,255	145	47	15	13	1,675,285
Delaware	2,000	3,214	1,800	1,601	590	185	55	15	4	5	1					9,470
Maryland	6,520	8,104	5,250	5,010	1,922	655	240	60	28	30	6	1				27,826
Virginia	64,847	37,418	14,127	9,642	3,366	1,274	498	171	94	106	8	3	3	1	1	131,499
West Virginia	25,570	21,503	4,882	2,643	725	233	83	27	22	20	3					55,711
North Carolina	145,780	120,563	54,115	33,600	7,900	2,575	1,270	492	210	300	64	12	6	3	3	366,893
Kentucky	99,159	62,883	25,740	24,800	8,075	3,520	1,595	590	250	260	36	7	2			226,917
Tennessee	136,080	72,700	24,100	21,302	6,318	2,140	1,031	430	198	214	46	5				264,564
East Central	479,956	326,385	130,014	98,598	28,836	10,582	4,772	1,785	806	935	164	28	11	4	4	1,082,880
Alabama	119,304	65,873	30,259	20,920	5,496	1,609	931	277	134	160	29	4			4	245,000
Arkansas	94,480	73,846	35,212	26,653	9,546	3,369	1,826	828	374	1,195	560	152	74	32	34	248,181
Florida	23,154	13,364	5,134	3,654	1,540	670	395	221	129	114	68	25	10	7	8	48,493
Georgia	94,993	71,735	32,249	24,203	7,218	2,408	1,080	474	253	322	36	10	14		5	235,000
Louisiana	74,377	56,891	22,746	12,489	3,464	1,499	773	319	222	367	115	21	2	6	8	173,299
Mississippi	113,838	113,184	44,325	27,165	8,092	3,123	1,956	872	625	1,102	621	167	83	35	19	315,207
Oklahoma	101,435	44,699	25,918	32,105	17,295	7,780	3,959	1,253	494	300	82					235,320
South Carolina	45,614	50,577	27,220	21,998	7,913	3,233	1,906	773	502	663	159	20	6	3	2	160,589
Texas	178,148	105,512	67,936	76,204	45,309	26,668	17,444	7,142	3,379	4,277	1,125	280	48	26	22	533,520
Southern	845,343	595,681	290,999	245,391	105,873	50,359	30,270	12,159	6,112	8,500	2,795	679	237	109	102	2,194,609
Arizona	647	652	386	621	513	394	372	264	170	358	226	80	26	21	25	4,755
California	29,252	21,313	10,096	9,923	5,005	3,193	2,589	1,294	863	1,553	777	173	100	59	99	86,289
Colorado	9,887	7,556	5,382	6,647	4,564	2,819	2,454	1,116	570	765	166	20	7	2	4	41,959
Idaho	4,738	6,251	5,143	7,165	4,341	2,534	1,876	806	525	699	140	15	4	1	2	34,240
Kansas	32,728	33,493	23,848	32,372	22,690	12,279	13,172	5,396	2,935	3,700	659	109	36	18	18	183,453
Montana	11,184	6,687	4,123	5,385	3,906	3,305	3,405	2,100	1,214	2,069	427	47	9	1	12	43,874
Nevada	408	414	259	265	188	101	69	23	13	21	10	3	1	1		1,776
New Mexico	8,358	3,341	1,752	2,511	1,946	1,659	1,090	538	312	530	164	43	14	5	10	22,273
North Dakota	31,319	16,025	11,084	14,342	11,668	7,848	8,057	4,733	1,946	2,078	188	19	6	2		109,315
Oregon	8,943	7,685	3,775	3,848	1,938	1,192	863	452	300	612	288	57	12	7	5	29,977
Utah	7,511	5,375	2,613	2,182	900	488	344	150	96	130	50	7	1	1		19,848
Washington	10,135	9,899	3,830	3,458	1,778	1,282	1,211	805	448	981	414	57	17	4	3	34,322
Wyoming	2,281	1,887	1,350	1,767	1,179	888	754	341	207	342	109	26	7	3	2	11,143
Western	157,391	120,578	73,641	90,486	60,616	37,982	36,256	18,018	9,599	13,838	3,618	656	240	125	180	623,224
Total	1,815,133	1,443,914	806,089	852,640	444,043	227,069	148,080	55,723	25,639	31,932	7,937	1,540	545	255	306	[1] 5,860,845

[1] Does not include 2,928 payees for naval stores and 98,592 payees in insular region.

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency Division of Special Programs, September 1943.

You will note that 1,815,000, or about one-third of the total number, received $20 or less as conservation payments. You will note that 3,259,069 cooperators, or about three-fifths of the cooperators, received less than $40 each. You will note that 4,917,818 cooperators of total of 5,860,845 cooperators received less than $100 each. You will note that 95 percent of the cooperators received less than $200 each. Would it be such a legislative sin to put a $500 ceiling on future payments?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am assailed with deep agitation of soul after these gracious avowals of my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] that I must be in opposition to his position and to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. The thesis which they have belabored here indicates that they mistake the concept of soil conservation and the husbanding of our agricultural land resources. They insist upon putting it on a personal basis. They discuss payments to farmers. That is not the purpose of this program. This program is to conserve the great national asset of our soil. This program deals with acres, not with individuals. This program deals with fertility and the conserving of that fertility.

I might best express it in the terms of the poem which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] gave us the other day, by this young man, who in the heat of battle said, "My friends, what have you done today?"

This program challenges the farmers of the country and says to them, "What have you done to conserve your soil today?" Then we say to them, "If you do a prescribed thing, we shall reimburse you for your effort. If you plant clover, if you plant vetch, if you put lime or superphosphate upon your soil we shall reimburse you, not as an individual, but for what you have done to conserve the soil of the country."

I am glad we have finally gotten bottomed up on this program. It was once shot through with acreage adjustment and other purposes, so that for raising less or raising more, we paid people out of the Federal Treasury. All of that is gone, at least, momentarily. We have put an interdiction in this bill that there shall be no funds for incentive payments. We have required that this program be approved by the State A. A. A. to make sure that the practices will conform to their knowledge of the soil in that State. We are seeking for the maximum benefit, for a national, natural asset. It is therefore not a question of whether he is a small farmer or a large farmer, or

whether he is a personal or a corporate entity, but whether or not, as a person, or as a corporate entity something has been done for the hundreds of millions of acres of land that we would conserve, because we realize so well what has befallen so many other countries, notably China, with all of its weak soil, made so because soil conservation was never practiced in the days when that rich alluvial topsoil was being washed away by many of the small streams.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Why is it that we have two separate organizations here? You have in one part of this bill an appropriation of something like $30,000,000 for the Soil Conservation Service rendered by the Government of the United States, whereby they assist the farmers, furnish technical advice, and help them to protect their soil as the gentleman suggests—a very fine, splendid program. Why is it then, that you do not emphasize that program and make it more important, rather than to go out here and offer these little payments to individuals for building fences across their pastures, for instance, or fixing terraces or for mowing weeds and things like that, and being paid for out of the Federal Treasury? If the Government is going to pay for these things, then why not put it on that basis?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer is twofold. First, as to building up Soil Conservation Service, which is a service agency, we have increased the appropriation in this bill, because we recognize its value. Its function is threefold. The first is to conduct researches in the field of moisture and soil practices, the types of plants and grasses that do best in enriching and conserving soil of different kinds in different areas. Third, to carry on practical demonstration field operations where the farmers can go and see the practical value and then be able to do it for themselves. Now, the farmer can do for himself under the pending program; but do not forget he could probably make more money by planting some kind of a crop that is a cash crop but which we do not need in quantity. So, here is an incentive for conserving the national asset, the great resource of soil.

I trust the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nothing new to this body. I have been a Member of this House for almost 6 years. Every year with the exception of one, that being 1941, an amendment similar to this has been offered to the agriculture appropriation measure when it came to the floor of the House. Every time such an amendment has been presented it has failed to be enacted into law. There are many reasons why this amendment should not be adopted: First, it is unsound and unjustifiable; second, it has no place in a sound soil-conservation program as I see it; and, third, it never has been presented to the Committee on Agriculture for hearings and consideration by that committee.

When this program was first inaugurated there was no limitation whatever on these payments. About 7 or 8 years ago the Committee on Agriculture held hearings and determined that a limitation of $10,000 was justified and should be written into the law, and that was done. Then in 1939 the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable Marvin Jones, presented the bill H. R. 3800 which put a limitation of $5,000 on these payments and carried a provision with respect to keeping share croppers on the forms. That bill passed this House. Since that time the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] offered an amendment cutting down these payments to $1,000; and since 1942, I believe, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has offered his amendment to reduce these payments to the farmers to $500. I do not see any reason why if we are going to have a soil-conservation program the same treatment should not apply to every type of farmer, whether he has 200 acres, 50 acres, or 1,000 acres. There should be no discrimination because a man has worked hard and saved his money and increased the size of his holdings. That is the American way.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he is making. Likewise at this point I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for the very logical and informative statement he made to this House. We no longer have any parity payments. This is a matter of paying men to take care of their soil.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is just as important to take care of a 10,000-acre farm as a 10-acre farm. When you start to discriminate you destroy the soil conservation program, yet we all know that our soil is the greatest asset this Nation has.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. Not at this point. I hope the gentleman will let me proceed just a little further.

Along that very line, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that these large farms are nothing in the world but the aggregation of several small farms. You are not going to have a soil-conservation program unless the large farmer signs and enters this program. When he does go in he carries with him his tenants and sharecroppers, and the only way they are going to get in is for the landlord to sign up for this program and by his doing so he carries with him his tenants and sharecropper who work from 20 to 40 acres of land in accordance with the size of their families.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Arkansas has fought for several years to keep the soil-conservation program intact. The statement that the gentleman has made in regard to the tenants not being able to join in unless the landlord goes in is the hub of the entire matter. If we accept the amendment offered by my good friend from Kansas, we take away from the tenant farmer the privilege of joining in this program.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct; if the landlord does not go in the tenant cannot. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who as a farmer himself has consistently supported the Triple-A program and for whose views I have the highest respect. It could just as well be argued that a manufacturer is not entitled to a tariff of more than $500. That is what you are saying by this amendment in principle. You may just as logically say that because a day laborer only earns $3 a day, every person, whoever he may be, and whatever his duties, cannot receive more than $3 a day. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas will be defeated.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to defend some of the large farm owners in my district, the insurance companies. I know it is very popular to attack Wall Street and to attack huge financial institutions, but in considering the effect of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] on insurance companies we must think of these same insurance companies simply as temporary owners of a large number of farms. I have not discussed this with a single representative of any insurance company. I am sure that the insurance companies referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] would much rather not own the farms they now own but, owning them and being expected to carry on this soil-conservation program, they have the right to expect that there will be no discrimination against a company because it owns a thousand farms instead of one.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that this soil-conservation program is a compliance program to build up the fertility of the soil of this country and that the man is only compensated when he complies and does the things that are necessary to build up the fertility of the soil? That leaves it an acreage proposition; and what difference does it make if a man spends the money to build up the fertility of the soil on a thousand acres? That is not going to make bigger payments to the fellow that is working only a 10-acre farm; his payments were not to be increased, as I see it, under that program.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Of course I will not. I cannot yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I cannot yield at this time. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] asked this question, Do you want to support a program that pays huge sums to 5 percent of the farmers and a much smaller sum to the remaining 95 percent of our farmers? I shall answer that question by saying, in all frankness, and I think I can speak for the insurance companies that own so many of these farms that they would favor legislation to eliminate this whole farm program, soil conservation, parity payments, and so forth. They would eliminate the paying of money to a farmer to reduce his crops 1 year and then pay the same farmer the next year for increasing his crops. I believe that the executives of the American insurance companies, like any other citizens, look forward to the day when there will not be any Government agents tramping across the farms of American farmers; when he will be able to raise his crops and get a reasonable price in the market place that will pay him for raising them. However, as long as soil-conservation payments are going to be made on an acreage basis and officials of the Federal Government feel it is necessary to pay farmers for conserving the soil then the benefits must, of necessity, be made as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] so clearly stated, on the basis of acreage owned. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to assure my colleague from Connecticut that I do not hold anything against the insurance companies. I have several policies in some of the insurance companies, but that does not change the picture. Let me call attention to this: If this is such a wonderful soil-conservation program no man who knows anything about the soil can stand there and say that the soil has been conserved as well today as it was 5 years ago, 10 years ago, or a hundred years ago.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Now, if I may interrupt the gentleman at that point, I am not discussing the merits of the soil-conservation program, I am discussing the cash benefits. If they are going to make payments to John Smith who has 10 acres on the basis of the work he does on those 10 acres, then it must be paid on the same basis to any company which may have even 10,000 acres on the same basis. The insurance company is only the trustee of their policyholders' funds. They are holding these farms against the time when they can dispose of them for the benefit of their policyholders, not for the benefit of their stockholders. Take the case particularly of a mutual company, they certainly are acting only for the benefit of their policyholders, they have no stockholders. They would be remiss in their duty to their policyholders if they did not make application for the soil-conservation payments that are available to them on the basis of what they have done for the land they temporarily hold.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not in accord with the Reece amendment. I think in its nature it is a socialistic idea. We might as well limit the amount of crops you can raise or the amount of land you can own and the taxes you can pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out already that this is a different program than the one to which this amendment has been offered in previous years, for the reason that this is simply a soil-conservation program and payments can be made only upon the performance of certain practices. The soil-conservation program is either right or it is wrong. It is either right to make these payments for these practices or it is wrong. If it is not right, and the gentleman from Kansas, my distinguished colleague, and my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, say it is not right, then their motion should be to strike out the provision altogether. Let us not make these payments to any farmer, large or small, if it is the wrong thing to do. But if soil conservation is a proper practice and if we are improving the soil of this country by carrying out those practices, then what difference does it make whether a large landowner having a number of tenants and large acreage in crops on his farm receives as much money as a half-dozen individual farmers operating the same acreage would receive?

There is no consistency at all in the position of the gentlemen who are saying that we should put a limit upon the amount of payments that may be made to any individual landowner. If this is just to be construed as a gratuity to be paid to farmers because they are farmers, and to be paid only to small farmers, then why do we have these provisions in here requiring that they perform any practices at all? Let us cut out the red tape, let us cut out the administrative cost, and just say that every farmer farming less than so many acres of land will get a payment out of the Federal Treasury. That is the logical way to proceed if the theory of the gentleman from Kansas is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman express himself on a concern which I have over the amendment offered by the gentleman's colleague from Kansas, to this effect: I am afraid that the restrictive operations of this amendment would operate against the tenants more than against the insurance company. Is it not true that under this amendment a tenant would almost be barred from cooperating, even if he might want to, because the insurance company would put something in the lease to the effect that he could not cooperate inasmuch as we cannot collect our share.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that undoubtedly would be the effect in many cases.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If this is a soil-conservation program, I would like to know if the gentleman does not think that someone might ask why it is necessary to unload the money pretty much in the sections that have the best land in the country—including, I would like to mention to my colleague from Kansas, $17,000,000, which is considerably more than 35 different States in the Union will receive—if it is going to conserve the soil. The gentleman from Kansas can put the figures in the RECORD showing that the phosphate content of the Kansas land is not anywhere near what it was 5 years ago.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not know how this money is going to be distributed because we have never distributed the money on this basis before. In previous years we have had other formulas for distributing the funds, and neither the gentleman from Wisconsin nor anyone else can say how it is going to be distributed this year as between States. It will be distributed according to participation in the program by the farmers of the various States and if the gentleman's State has a high participation in the program then his State will get more money than some other State where there is not such a high participation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from South Dakota is deeply concerned, he said, about the tenants. After all, whatever services the tenants render for the money they receive is for the improvement of the land of the operator of the land, as far as that is concerned, and the operator of the land gets the benefit of the payment.

Mr. HOPE. The question is whether there will be participation in the program at all. My judgment is the gentleman's amendment will very much limit participation in the program. I think that is the idea the gentleman from South Dakota had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield to permit me to reply to my friend from Kansas by saying that soil conservation is a long-term program, that all the benefits of conserving the soil do not accrue to the tenant in any one year in which he makes the conservation effort; consequently it does not apply to that particular time.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is anything more important in this Nation today than the conservation and the building up of its soil. Certainly it is important in this hour that we place every possible acre into production and every acre should produce to its capacity. I cannot give my consent to

adopting on this floor a new philosophy of government that would be comparable with saying to Mr. Henry Ford: "We will give you a Government contract to make so many trucks, but your profits cannot exceed those of the smaller plants in other cities. You may make a million trucks, the others may make only a hundred, but your profit must be confined to exactly the same amount as the smaller manufacturer."

It is difficult for me to believe that that is really the philosophy that the distinguished gentleman from Kansas is ready for his Government to adopt. This program is predicated on an acre basis. It is important, for example, that the acreage owned by the constituents of the gentleman from Connecticut, and his companies own acreage in my State, be conserved so that when the Georgia farmer is able to buy that land he will receive soil that is in good condition for cultivation and will not receive a washed-away, soil-depleted farm.

I wonder if anyone in this House has the idea that these payments amount to as much as the expense the farmer is put to in order to earn them. I will mention one case I am personally familiar with, as an example.

This farmer placed a small acreage under this program. He applied some phosphate and planted a cover crop. When he had finished on this very small acreage of about 25 acres, he had spent $340 carrying out the practices under this program. He then asked the agent to come out and tell him how much the payments would be. He was told they would total $75. He had spent $340 in order to comply with these practices. I do not know how general that is, but I think some of the Members have the idea that this is a gift; that you are getting something you are not paying for. The farmer is not only paying for it—it is costing him several times in excess of the payment he receives, and certainly it is important to him and to the Nation that he conserve and build up every acre of his land and not merely the few acres which this amendment would very probably restrict him to.

I have definitely come to this conclusion that to the farmer as well as to the Nation it is just as important to conserve and build up your soil as it is to get a good price. It does not make any difference where you fix the support price for wheat or corn or cotton or any other commodity, the farmer cannot make a living unless he can produce the crops, and he cannot produce them unless he has fertile soil to plant. Poor land, depleted soil, washed-away fields, is just about the most worthless investment there is.

We should encourage the farmer, we should cooperate with him, we should help him to conserve and build up his land, the greatest natural resource of the Nation, and try to bring it back to its original fertility. This is one of our greatest programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I will yield for a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Just simply to state what I have attempted to say concerning the gentleman from Georgia, that I am in full agreement with what he had to say upon this subject and I compliment him.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST], who is now addressing the House, is one of the best friends of agriculture in this great body. During my 5 years in Congress I have observed that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] has always worked hard for the welfare of his farmers and small-business men. This I see from the viewpoint of a man who is a farmer himself and one of the few in the House whose home today is on a farm.

Mr. GILCHRIST's high ranking on the important Committee on Agriculture has been gained by his long and faithful years of service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I thank the distinguished gentleman and Minnesota friend. I am embarrassed by such high praise. But I join with him in complimenting the gentleman from Georgia who is a safe and splendid guide in agriculture. I compliment the gentleman from Illinois, who we all agree would make a splendid President. I compliment the gentleman from Kansas who last spoke, who would make a splendid Secretary of Agriculture in the next administration. And I compliment the ideas advanced in the interrogatories of the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I should like to say something on my own motion, if I could.

Mr. CASE. I want to ask the gentleman if the gentleman from Georgia had fertilized twice as many acres, would it not have cost him twice $340?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes, certainly. It is plain that this soil-conservation program costs a lot of money. It costs a lot of money for anyone to put in these terraces out in my country, and then to farm the terraced fields and to conserve the fertility of the soil, and keep it from washing away and from blowing away, just as we are now trying to do in different parts of my State.

Mr. Chairman, saving soil and its fertility is something that must be done. You are derelict if you do not see that it is done, and you are not making anything in the long run by your failure, whether you are a tenant or whether you are a landlord. Soil conservation will save this country from disaster in the future. Look at Worn-out China! We are now having to protect her because she has never conserved soil in the past. She wore out her lands. We should have soil saving practices, and have them now in this country of ours, and have them on the farms, whether it be on a 20-acre farm or a 200-acre farm. These figures that have been given out this afternoon by some speakers here who favor the amendment do not relate to what we have before us today, because the thing today differs from what it formerly did in past bills under which such figures were collected. This is soil conservation. It is on an acreage basis and it makes no difference whether the man's name commences with A who owns that acreage, or whether it commences with Z who owns that acreage. It is something that we ought to do and must do, and the owner of the land in a great majority of cases cannot afford to do it alone. It costs more than he can get out of it for his present income.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I would like to go ahead with one other idea, but I will gladly yield to my very congenial friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would just like to have the record straight. If he is referring to the figures that I gave, they applied to soil conservation. I did not include parity.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I accept the gentleman's statement, but nevertheless it is true that this is a thing that must be done at a great cost to the landowner.

Something was said about the tenants. A landlord who owns much land will not go into this if he cannot get his share of the money, and the result is that he will say to the tenant, "Now, Bill, we cannot go into the thing this year," and then scarcely anybody will go into it. The big man will not go into it unless he gets a just share of the heavy expense returned to him. And then his tenant cannot go into it because he can be paid only if his landlord will allow him to go into it, and if the tenant and the landlord operate together.

Two years ago, before the same sort of an amendment was offered, I was met by a friend of mine in my home town who rented a splendid farm, and he told me, "Fred, why do you not fix it so that my landlord can go into the program, because unless he goes into the program I cannot, and we need the program?"

That is exactly the position in which the small man is. This is not a thing to help the big man or the small man. It helps everybody in the soil conservation program, and it helps the whole Nation, and it helps posterity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not have enough farmers in my district who would get over $500 under the provisions of this appropriation to rattle in a gourd. My district is largely an agricultural district but it is a district of small farms.

This proposed amendment does not interest me very much, therefore, so far as my district is concerned, but I hope I am broad encugh to envision the needs of a program of this sort for the entire Nation, and not favor something which would not be particularly injurious to my district but which would, in my judgment, be disastrous to the program for the Nation as a whole.

I do not desire to be repetitious. The arguments against the amendment by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] have been so logical and so well presented that it would be presumptuous on my part to undertake to stress them by repetition, and I shall not do so. There are, however, some facts concerning this matter that have not been called to your attention and I desire to refer to them briefly.

This is a calendar-year program. The authority for announcement of the program and the authority to obligate the Government to pay the benefits provided by the program are contained, first, in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and there the obligation is limited to $500,000,000. Last year in the passage of the Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1944 the Congress made a further limitation on the maximum amount of $300,000,000 and restricted the program purely to soil-conservation and water-conservation purposes. But by the provisions of those two acts, the Department of Agriculture was authorized to announce a soil- and water-conservation program and to bind the credit of the Government to a total amount of not to exceed $300,000,000 to the farmers of the country who might enter into agreements to carry out on their individual farms the provisions of that program. That announcement has been made. Farm programs for each of the 48 States of the Union have been formulated and submitted through State Tripe-A committees and have been approved, and the Department of Agriculture long ago announced that it would pay farmers in those several States certain stated amounts for carrying out certain soil-conservation and water-conservation practices which were provided for in their State program, and farm plans have been executed by those farmers under which they agreed to carry out these practices.

While, of course, those plans have not as yet been completely carried out, it is impossible to believe that any farmer would have agreed to make such improvements and to carry out such soil conservation or water-conservation practices and not have made plans and incurred expense long prior to this time to carry his promises into effect, so that if you now insert a provision here which will prevent the owners of large farms from receiving the pay which has been promised them by the Government for carrying out soil- and water-conservation practices on their farms, you are, in my judgment, violating the solemn obligation of the Government. If you want to adopt such an amendment, you ought to do it for the next year and not for the year for which the program has already been announced under your authority.

This amounts to an amendment of existing law on this subject, although it is presented in the form of a limitation under the Holman rule. On March 7 of this year we had up here in this House an act amending the organic act of the Department of Agriculture and authorizing a large number of different types of appropriations. Amendments to that bill, known as the Pace bill, would have been in order changing the statute law with reference to the program we are now discussing, but none was offered. I am advised that nobody appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and asked them to include in that bill any amendment of existing law such as is now proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REESE]. Certainly, the opportunity to legislate when Congress was legislating on the subject ought not to have been neglected and then an effort made in the agricultural appropriation bill to provide legislation on this important matter. I sincerely hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

To carry out the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and moisture conservation to be carried out directly and in cooperation with other agencies, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, but not to exceed $1,089,837 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, purchase of books and periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of one passenger-carrying automobile in the District of Columbia, furnishing of subsistence to employees, training of employees, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this act shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 67, line 23, after the word "equipment", insert ": *Provided further*, That in any case in which a State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil-conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil-conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I have conferred with the majority of this subcommittee—all of them I was able to contact—and we are willing to agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important activities administered by the Department of Agriculture is the Soil Conservation Service. It is belatedly conserving and protecting one of our most valuable national resources. It is annually saving and redeeming millions of acres of fertile soil which otherwise would be washing away into the rivers of the Nation leaving vast areas depleted, gullied, and eroded beyond hope of redemption.

The Soil Conservation Service is one of the few agencies for which the 1945 appropriation is increased over that provided for 1944, and received the largest increase of any item in the bill—an increase of $5,505,650 over last year—providing a total of $29,637,248 for the coming year.

Perhaps the most effective means yet devised by the Soil Conservation Service for combatting erosion is through technical cooperation with local soil-conservation districts organized and chartered under laws specifically enacted for the purpose by the various States. This system was organized about 1936 and has been so successful and has spread so rapidly that the legislatures of every State, with one possible exception, have now enacted legislation providing for this form of cooperation. My own State was one of the last, if not the last, to adopt the system. In four consecutive sessions of the General Assembly of Missouri soil districts bills were rejected. But at the last session of the State legislature a compromise bill was finally agreed on in collaboration between representatives of our local farm organizations and representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture. The principal feature of this compromise bill provided for approval of soil-conservation policies and programs by the Missouri State Districts Commission before submission to the local soil-conservation districts. The provision was approved by the Soil Conservation officials of the Department of Agriculture and was enacted only on assurance of Federal compliance and cooperation on those terms.

This amendment is in conformity with that agreement and with the provisions of the Missouri soils districts law enacted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri. I trust it will have the approval of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether any of the funds provided for research work on soil conservation and for experimental work can apply to Indian reservations?

Mr. TARVER. I do not recall that that subject matter was discussed in the hearings. There would appear to be no reason why research work on soil conservation should not be conducted in part on Indian reservations if the administrative authorities deem such work to be essential or of value. The question has never been raised before, as far as I know, in the deliberations of the committee, but I know of no reason why they could not conduct such work there.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the chairman. I refer particularly at this time to the Navajo Indian Reservation in northeastern Arizona, which is a part of the watershed of the Colorado River. That area has been terribly overgrazed and it is now being eroded rapidly. Lake Mead is being filled up at an unusually rapid rate, so that I think the matter requires immediate attention, inasmuch as great property investments are at hazard. No doubt the appropriation for such work should come in another bill for another department, but I do not want to be remiss in my duty by failing to call the attention of Congress to this imperative need on every possible occasion.

Some remarkable experiments are being carried on and other experiments should be conducted involving reseeding and revegetating such overgrazed and eroded areas. I have been trying to get one of the departments to try out Dr. Lytle Adams' airplane seeding device which, in my opinion, may prove to have a greater value in our Nation's well-being than has his air-mail pick-up invention. At the close of the war and immediately thereafter is the right time to be ready to use such a significant process. Airplanes and many skillful flyers will be available and other materials will be available after the war to make full use of any such feasible process which has been proven.

In regard to the need of and usefulness of soil conservation I am in agreement with the chairman the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], and I am also glad to see some leaders on the other side of the central aisle have changed their minds and now recognize the need of a soil-conservation program. Reseeding, revegetating, and reforesting our barren and worn-out lands wherever possible and feasible is a part of that rebuilding of resources which we have so often wasted.

It delighted me in general debate to hear my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] tell so enthusiastically of the successful growing of trees on the treeless plains in the shelterbelt projects. If man will quit destroying such valuable resources, nature alone through a long time can do wonders in restoring them, but if man will be as wise in helping to restore them as he has been foolish in depleting them, the restoration can be very quickly done.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I call to the attention of the House a news item in today's Washington Post which should be given the very careful scrutiny of every Member of this body:

KAISER SEEKS NOD TO BEGIN RECONVERSION—EAGER TO START WORK ON 30 CARGO SHIPS FOR INDIES GOVERNMENT

Henry J. Kaiser, west coast shipbuilder, yesterday laid down a challenge to the Government to permit him to convert his yards to commercial production as soon as materials, manpower, and facilities are available.

The challenge was laid down by his announcement that the Netherlands Indies Government had expressed its intent to enter into a contract with the Kaiser Co., Inc., to construct 30 coastwise cargo vessels in his No. 4 yard at Richmond, Calif., and that he would begin work on the contract some time this year as facilities are made available at the yard by the expiration of outstanding war contracts.

Kaiser said the deal would be on a cash—lump sum—basis, not covered by lend-lease. He did not disclose the amount involved or details of the ships' design other than to say that they will be shallow-draft vessels.

CONFIDENT HE CAN DELIVER

Kaiser acknowledged that he was still to receive an allocation of materials for the project from the War Production Board, but he predicted that sufficient steel to go ahead would be available later in the year.

Mr. Chairman, if these ships were needed for the war effort today there would be no objection on my part. Note, however, that these are for a foreign nation for use following the war. Note particularly the last paragraph, in which Mr. Kaiser predicts that sufficient steel will be available later in the year.

For the past 3 or more months I have been trying to obtain consideration for House Joint Resolution 201, which would direct W. P. B. to increase by 25 percent the production of farm implements over the 1940 schedule. I have urged early allocation of this additional 250,000 tons of steel so that the farmers of our Nation might have labor-saving machinery, such as corn pickers, tractors, and combines to help make up for the manpower necessarily stripped from the farms.

Mr. Chairman, what cooperation does W. P. B. accord those of us seeking to give the farmers this helping hand toward food production? Let me quote here a letter from Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of W. P. B., to Mr. FULMER, head of our Committee on Agriculture:

MARCH 13, 1944.

Hon. H. P. FULMER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your inquiry of January 20 asking for a report on House Joint Resolution 201, a joint resolution "relating to the allocation of steel for the manufacture of farm machinery and farm implements."

This resolution would make mandatory allocation of steel for the domestic manufacture of farm machinery and farm implements without any reference to the war production picture as a whole. Such a mandatory allocation and the resultant production would seriously disrupt the production of components for our highest rated military products such as landing craft, aircraft, and military trucks, which are vitally needed in the conduct of military operations in all theaters of war. I am opposed, therefore, to this joint resolution and strongly urge that it be not passed.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON, *Chairman.*

Surely, Mr. Chairman, if W. P. B. can even consider at this time the allocation of steel and critical materials to Mr. Kaiser for building ships for a foreign government to use after the war is over, surely he could also give more sympathetic consideration to my request for this farm-implement allocation for the production of food, not only for ourselves, but for our allies and starving people throughout the world.

There are those in our Government today who refuse to recognize that food itself is a critical material, both in winning the war and evolving a just and lasting peace.

We have had pointed out to us the past few days the potential demands of U. N. R. R. A. for our farm implements. I serve notice here today that it will be my intention, if possible, to place a prohibition in its appropriation bill against U. N. R. R. A. expending a cent of its appropriation to take farm machinery away from our farmers who desperately need it and export the estimated 186,000 tons out of our country to any foreign nation at this time.

Thank God, Congress still has the power of the purse strings and that seems to be the only form of persuasion this overstaffed, wasteful bureaucracy will listen to.

A year and one-half ago, in a speech to the House, I stated: "We have enough food today but how about tomorrow."

Today it is my firm conviction that unless more consideration is given to the farmers, both as to manpower and farm machinery, our beloved Nation may want for sufficient food, let alone have enough for the starving peoples of war-torn lands, much as we might wish to help them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, $1,267,290.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the item that has just been read is the item for market news service on which I want to say a few words. It was a few months ago that a market news service was instituted in the Los Angeles market, covering poultry products, and other things. But it is with poultry products that I am pri-

marily concerned here. I ask for this time in order to state that in my judgment this service to the farmers is one of the most important services performed by the Department of Agriculture. Without it the farmer who comes to market with his eggs, for example, is subject to having to sell these eggs under conditions where all he has to go by is the price quotation of the buyer. Sometimes markets are seriously under the control of a few buyers or an association of buyers. In order for the farmer to have the protection of a really free and open market this market news service is, in my judgment, of very great importance. The item which the committee has included under this heading is the budget estimate, plus a slight increase, as I understand it, in order to make it possible for a fruit and vegetable service to be instituted at three points where they were not in effect last year. I frankly wish that the item could have been increased by an additional $52,000 approximately, in order to make possible some expansion of the market news service for poultry and dairy products in some of the more important markets of the country, one of them being the Los Angeles market that affects the farmers of the district I represent.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks herewith a brief description of what that extra $52,000 would do in expanding this service and rounding it out in these other points. I realize that without further discussion and without the Members being more familiar with some of these matters than they are at present an amendment might not be adopted at this time to provide this $52,000 increase.

But I earnestly hope that if in the course of the next year there arises any difficulty about carrying on the market news services at any of these points, it can be taken care of by the deficiency appropriation committee, and to say that it is my earnest and honest hope that when another body considers this matter it may be possible for the dairy and poultry people who have an interest in this matter to be heard on the possibility of this additional fund.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. We recently had a very striking example of the need for a market-news service in the Northwest when there was a glut in the stockyards and the packing plants, due to the shortage of manpower, and when the producers of livestock loaded up their stock and came into a glutted stockyard and could not even be allowed to unload and had to carry the stock back, and they had no way of knowing the conditions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I am in full support of the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank my good friend from Idaho very much indeed. I would like to add that those who feel that the market news service is not important because we have price ceilings are entirely wrong. At this time eggs are selling on the Los Angeles market at low prices, considering the cost of production to the poultrymen. The market news service is quite as necessary now as it has ever been.

Mr. Chairman, listed below are markets where there is need for inaugurating or expanding market news:

First. Los Angeles: Additional funds should be provided in order to expand the local market-news program in line with the needs and demands of producer groups which for some time have been pressing the Federal and State departments of agriculture for more comprehensive information. Los Angeles has become an increasingly important market during recent years. Although located in a State with a tremendously large production of dairy and poultry products, the immediate territory may be classified as a deficit area. Eggs and poultry move south from the San Joaquin Valley to Los Angeles, or may move north to San Francisco. Producers' interests will be best served only when adequate reports are available at Los Angeles as well as at San Francisco. Dairy products move to Los Angeles regularly from as far north as eastern Washington and Idaho, and intermittent supplies from the Middle West. Market reports from Los Angeles are of particular significance to producers and shippers in the entire area west of the Rockies.

Second. New Orleans: The market news service at New Orleans was discontinued July 1, 1943, when Federal market news funds were reduced. Under the former arrangement, the service was on a Federal-State basis, under a cooperative agreement with the Louisiana State Market Commission, with funds provided by both agencies. This was the first service provided in a major southern market, and the information assembled regarding market receipts and supplies was of particular value during the spring of 1943 when maximum price-control programs were inaugurated by the O. P. A. The service should be reestablished in order to provide producers over a wide area in the South with bona fide information regarding market supplies, trends, and prices. If Federal funds were available, it is hoped that the working agreement with the State market commission might be resumed.

Third. Kansas City: Thus far funds have not permitted the establishment of an office in this market. Kansas City is a central point in a large producing area from which products move east, south, and west. It is also a key passing point. The nearest market now reported is Chicago, and because of distance, producers in the Kansas City area are not adequately served.

Fourth. Seattle: The service at Seattle has necessarily been limited in scope, through lack of funds, and is now further handicapped by lack of teletype service. Seattle is a key market from a national standpoint, and is the most important market in the Northwest. Large quantities of dairy and poultry products move south and east from this area, as the production of these products are major agricultural enterprises in the territory served by the Seattle office.

Fifth. Detroit: Detroit is a major consuming market, with an estimated consuming population of two and one-half million. It is less important than Seattle as a distributing market, although it, too, is located in the midst of a major producing area. No service has been established there, except a small project dealing with Government graded eggs only, handled in cooperation with the State department of agriculture in conjunction with other work. Information should be provided regarding supplies, market receipts, storage movements, consumption, and prices, in order to place producers and shippers in a position to properly compare this market with alternative outlets.

Sixth. Cincinnati: No service is now available on this market, which is an important outlet for a large producing area in the Ohio Valley, and also serves as an important shipping and distributing point. Local market reports on eggs and live poultry would be the type of work first emphasized.

Seventh. Fort Worth: No market news service is now provided at any point in the Southwest region. Fort Worth is the center of a major producing and shipping area. Considerable quantities of shell eggs from this area have been converted into dried eggs for sale on Government purchase contracts. Fort Worth is also important as a point for collecting shipping point information, and for disseminating terminal market information to producing and shipping interests.

Eighth. New York City: A major office is in operation at New York City, but an additional market reporter is needed to adequately cover all products reported. There should also be a man in training there to handle emergency situations, to relieve the live poultry market reporter who is employed jointly under the Federal-State cooperative agreement as occasions may arise, and to provide relief help as needed at Philadelphia and Boston.

Ninth. Chicago: A major office is maintained at Chicago, but an additional market reporter is needed to assist in covering all the products handled, and to be available for emergency relief.

Tenth. Washington, D. C.: The Washington office faces the danger of having to depend upon supplemental allotments to take care of present commitments, and has not been able to finance the cost of properly reporting the local egg and poultry market.

The estimated cost of developing the service as above outlined is indicated below. These amounts provide for full-time market reports, necessary clerical assistance, supplies, equipment, telephone, and rent where Federal space is not available.

Los Angeles	$6,000
New Orleans	4,000
Kansas City	7,000
Seattle	6,000
Detroit	7,000
Cincinnati	7,000
Fort Worth	6,500
New York City	5,200
Chicago	2,600
Washington, D. C	1,000
Total	52,300

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, no doubt the market news service is of some value to the farmers. I know the A. A. A. is of a great political value to the New Dealers. In the last few days we have been told how the A. A. A. sells itself by requiring the farmers to sign up if they want gasoline, if their sons want deferment from the draft.

My memory goes back 5 or 6 years——

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What has that got to do with the market news Service?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a part of the market news service that the A. A. A. was using; to sell itself to the farmers, not only furnishing the people news about crops, but furnishing them news about the desirability. Why does the gentleman walk away? He asks a question—I am trying to answer his question. The A. A. A. was trying recently to tell the people that they had better join up with the triple A if they want gas. The gentleman from Illinois and others told you about that yesterday. The farmers have been given to understand they had better join up with the A. A. A. if they wanted their sons to escape the draft or if they wanted gas from the rationing board. But my memory goes back 5 or 6 years. There goes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] again walking away without waiting for an answer to the question he asked—my memory goes back to the time when one of the farm agencies was loaning money to the farmers and it required every farmer who borrowed a dollar to sign a written agreement that he would not say a thing against the triple A as long as there was a dollar unpaid on the principal, as long as there was any interest unpaid on the loan. That was the way they then distributed news about the desirability of the triple A.

Down in my own home county they had 123 township committeemen. They were in the habit of calling some of them in in April for 10 days' instruction. They called them in every year, and they paid them $4.50 per day each. The farmers did not happen to be very busy at that time of the year. Then they would put on the bulletin board in some of the offices a sentiment like this: "If your Congressman"—and they named him, I will not name him—"if your Congressman had voted for more appropriations for the triple A, you would have received more money this year." That is the way they distributed news. That was news that was supposed to help a sale of the New Deal—not of farm products. So it was suggested that farmers vote against the sitting Congressman who had not voted for increases in appropriations for the A. A. A. Forty-five dollars for each of those farmers who came in there every year to the school of instruction, and its one purpose was to disseminate news which it was thought would sell the A. A. A. to the farmers. About what? About the desirability of becoming New Dealers, and getting their names on the pay roll. That is the way they did it at that time. If that is a part of farm news service, if the New Deal is getting so inefficient, so wasteful, so incompetent, so extravagant in its expenditure of public money that they have to pay fellows to come in and join up and accept those payments—if we must do that—the New Deal must be in a bad situation. The farmers in my district were objecting. They said, "If these administrators did not take all this money we would get more for our crops, more for conservation." Of course they would. But it is like so many of these New Deal agencies, the administrative expenses eat up the money that should be used for payments in working for the perpetuation of their big bosses in office down here, the money which should go to the dirt farmer goes to the politician who works the farmer. It makes it rather binding for a Congressman who is limited in his campaign expenditures to have to fight an opposition New Deal campaign financed by the taxpayers. Then on top of it comes this political action committee with several million dollars, and they dip their fingers into the union dues, which in the end come out of the taxpayer in the increased price of the product made or transported.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you have gotten over on this side of the aisle and I note you have and become converted, yes; I will yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of the market news service for farmers, giving them the benefit of that service in determining their sale price.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I think, perhaps, if there is anything good in the New Deal, that would be a good idea. I am for legislation which will aid the farmers as distinguished from the political farmer. I will ask the gentleman if he is in favor of keeping grafters in office who are using the taxpayers' money?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am in favor of putting out grafters of every sort, wherever they may be.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why do you not support some of these amendments when we try to do it? Answer that, will you? Why do you not support some of these amendments? The money should go to the farmers, not to the administrators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to refer to page 59 of the bill, and to the colloquy that took place yesterday between the chairman of the subcommittee and my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. This proviso appears on page 59 of the bill, and I would like to read it:

Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products or administration of such orders.

Mr. Chairman, I received a telegram from San Francisco, on yesterday, which reads as follows:

Agriculture Department appropriation bill now before House contains rider which would make operation of FDO 79 practically impossible. FDO 79 is operating satisfactorily under the circumstances and its elimination would doubtlessly necessitate undesirable methods of control of milk sale. This rider must be removed and we urgently request your active efforts to that end. Please keep me advised.

This is signed by Hanns Stratmann, 1325 Potrero Avenue, for San Francisco milk distributors.

I conferred with several members of the committee about this provision in the bill and wired Mr. Stratmann as follows:

Retel bill mentioned is being debated on floor today. I immediately personally contacted members of the committee and I am pleased to advise Mr. Shields, Solicitor for Department of Agriculture, advised committee on special inquiry today that those groups operating under marketing agreements or in case of cooperatives will not be affected.

Today I received a telegram, which reads as follows:

Nobody in California is operating under Federal marketing agreement. We are paying assessment for operation of FDO 79. If such assessments be outlawed FDO 79 may have to be discontinued. We fear rider will make dead letter of FDO 79.

Immediately on receipt of this telegram I telephoned the Department of Agriculture and Mr. Shields was not in. His assistant told me that if this provision is continued, unless it is amended in the Senate or in conference, probably a situation will develop as set forth in the telegram, because it develops that in California there are no marketing agreements covering milk.

I just want to bring this before the House so that when the bill goes to conference the members of the conference committee will be advised.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. There is no reason whatever for the apprehension expressed by the gentleman from California. F. D. O. orders which have been issued by the War Food Administration may continue to be kept in effect, and the administrative expenses necessary in connection therewith paid from the administrative funds appropriated for the War Food Administration by Congress.

We believe that an adequate amount of money is carried in this bill for their use to take care of that administrative expense. Of course, if they are able to convince the Senate that more money is necessary, there is a possibility of the Senate, in passing upon this bill, granting more funds, but there is no reason why this rider, as it is called, should be removed because of the fears expressed by the gentleman's constituent who has wired about this matter.

Mr. ROLPH. In other words, my constituents are protected?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly. If they desire the continued effectiveness of one of these orders which limits the quota of milk or dairy products which can be delivered and be distributed by a handler or producer in a certain area in California, if they think that order is necessary and is doing a good job for the producers in that area, they should be satisfied with its continuance at Government expense, because it can be continued notwithstanding this proviso.

The only difference would be that the administrative expense would be paid by the Government instead of being paid by the producer or by the producer-handler.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the chairman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, speaking of the United States marketing news service purely as a business proposition it is unfortunate, as I see it, that politics and political comment should be injected into these proceedings. We had a very striking example of the need of marketing information in the Northwest recently; and when I speak of the Northwest I am speaking of the States of Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. We have several large packing centers out there where the farmers market their livestock. Under the rules of the O. P. A. and the War Production Board all the livestock for market has been funneled into these big packing centers. The people who raise their cattle in the hills must take them to market as soon as the snow falls on the hills and the ground freezes. They store only enough hay to support and maintain the carry-over herd. We do not feed cattle in the Northwest by shipping them to feeders and graining them like they do in the eastern and central sections of the country; we grass-fatten our cattle, sheep, and things of that kind and move them into market as soon as the market season arrives. When this season arrived in the Northwest this year there was such an acute shortage of manpower in these big packing plants and the little packing plants have been put out of business by the rules and regulations of the O. P. A. and the War Production Board—so that the growers were entirely dependent upon these big packing plants for a market—these farmers would load their livestock into trucks or railway cars and take them 50 or 100 miles to a packing plant only to find the yards were glutted and they could not even unload. And in many cases they were forced to truck their livestock all the way back home. They had no news, no information concerning that condition. An appeal was made to the Members of Congress from those Western States to do something about it. It proved to be a very difficult problem. A certain wage structure was maintained by the big packing plants all over the country. Their wage rate in the Northwest was below the prevailing wage scale. The War Labor Board said we could not raise wages or authorize a wage unless employees and employers petitioned them to do so. I said to them that if they waited until the employees in the packing plants could go through the tedious, long delay of asking for a wage increase that way they were mistaken, for the men could step right across the street and get a better job and better pay; that they would have to wait a long time and that the people would go hungry, unless something was done and done promptly to relieve the packing-house situation. Nothing was done until we appealed finally to the Secretary of the Navy to furlough some of the experienced slaughterhouse employees from nearby Farragut Naval Training Station to let them go back into the packing plants and relieve the glut and get this food moving. We made the appeal and said to Mr. Knox that in the Civil War and in the Spanish-American War when the Army wanted beef it simply sent a detail out to bring in the meat and that he could just as well detail his sailors to go out and operate these packing plants so that the Army and Navy could have meat. That was done; but what these farmers need, what these livestock producers need up in these isolated sections of the country, is information as to the condition of the market and whether their stock would be received when they hauled them to the markets. I am in full support of this program and regret exceedingly that politics should enter a matter of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of books, lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals; not to exceed $300 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $2,550,000.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 13 in order to ask a question.

Mr. Chairman, this is the appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration, but under the general provisions of the bill on page 87 I find this language:

Employment by Rural Electrification Administration of not to exceed 20 junior engineers who are citizens of other American republics.

This is contained in a paragraph which exempts the employment of those residents of other American republics from the provisions of existing law.

Will the gentleman tell me why it is necessary to employ these junior engineers and pay them out of this appropriation when we have plenty such qualified men in this country?

Mr. TARVER. I believe the gentleman today has raised the very same point I raised last year in the hearings. We were assured then by authorities in the Government in whose views we had the utmost confidence that this program under which certain students from South American countries are permitted to come into the United States and receive training of this kind is of the utmost importance not only in the maintenance of amicable relations with our southern neighbors, but for the advantage of trade with those countries represented in that these students who come in and are trained as electrical engineers go back to South America friendly toward this country and will to some extent influence trade relations. In the development of electrical projects there they will naturally contact trade sources in this country from which the supplies will come which they will need in their activities. We were convinced that this program, while prima facie it might not have been justified, is in reality of very great value to this country and should be continued.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri yield that I may ask a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does not this practice constitute a breach of the contract labor law?

Mr. TARVER. No; not at all.

Mr. WHITE. It in effect is bringing these people into this country and allowing them to work for pay.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman for the information, and ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $20,000,000.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOREN: Page 78, line 5, add the following: "*Provided*, That the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Rural Electrification Administration') and expended or loaned under the authority conferred by section 4 of the act approved May 20, 1936, shall be used only to finance the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems, for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not now receiving central station service: *Provided further*, That none of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Rural Electrification Administration') shall be used to finance the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems in any area of the United States included within the boundaries of any city, village, or borough having a population in excess of 1,500 inhabitants."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that, rather than being a limitation on the appropriation,

this is a change in the substantive law that authorized the Rural Electrification Administration; and I call the attention of the Chair to a ruling that was handed down on April 19, 1943, when substantially the same amendment was offered, the only difference being that the word "exclusively" has now been changed to "only." I submit those words have exactly the same meaning and that the ruling applied at that time would be applicable at this time.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOREN. Is it the gentleman's point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands the point of order to be that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, that is right.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the proposed amendment merely reaffirms existing law. It does not change existing law. It does not change existing law or the substantive law that created the Rural Electrification Administration or that governs its organization and I submit that the proposals are limiting to the appropriation in that the sole purpose and object of the proposals are to prevent the use of this particular money outside the provisions of existing law. That is, that they cannot use the particular money involved in the appropriation in line 5, page 78, to buy out electrical systems in towns in excess of a population of 1,500.

Mr. Chairman, to support my contention that this is existing law I want to say that the language of the first proviso is lifted directly from section 4 of the R. E. A. Act approved May 20, 1936, section 4 of which reads as follows:

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized and empowered, from the sums hereinbefore authorized, to make loans to persons, corporations, States, Territories, and subdivisions and agencies thereof, municipalities, peoples, utility districts and cooperatives, nonprofit, or limited-dividend associations organized under the laws of any State or Territory of the United States, for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service.

That language is the language that is in the act of May 20, 1936, substantially word for word.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair may interrupt the gentleman, if it is existing law what is the necessity for it being in the amendment?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, the Chair anticipates the point of my discussion in justifying the amendment. The reason is that so far as appropriations are concerned, they have issued opinions down there by a circuitous route and have managed to go ahead and buy electrical systems in towns with a population in excess of 1,500. They have done it in connection with other appropriations. So I want to pick up this particular $20,000,000 and say that this $20,000,000 shall not be expended in that illegal fashion.

Mr. Chairman, the language of the second proviso is lifted directly from section 13 of the R. E. A. Act approved May 20, 1936. Section 13 reads as follows:

SEC. 13. As used in this act the term "rural area" shall be deemed to mean any area of the United States not included within the boundaries of any city, village, or borough having a population in excess of 1,500 inhabitants, and such term shall be deemed to include the farm and nonfarm population thereof.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I served on the committee which created the R. E. A. and I was a member of the subcommittee that created it. I have a thorough familiarity with the act and with the amendments that have been made to the act since its original creation. I know what was in the mind of the committee when this organization was created. But in spite of that, they are spending this money to buy electrical plants in towns with a population as high as 10,000 people. I want to limit the use of this appropriation so that they cannot buy out existing facilities in cities having populations of ten or twenty thousand.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the point of order is not substantiated by the facts in this case. First, this is a limitation and, second, the language used has been lifted verbatim from the substantive act creating this organization.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I understood the gentleman to say that the amendment was lifted word for word from the existing law. I have not seen the amendment, Mr. Chairman, in writing, I have only heard it read, but I understood from the reading of the amendment that the word "only" is in the amendment. The amendment states, as I understand it, that this money shall be used only for these purposes. When you refer to the existing law the word "only" is not in existing law. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us whether the word "only" has been inserted in the proposed amendment?

Mr. BOREN. In reply to the gentleman's question, I said that this language was lifted almost verbatim.

Mr. POAGE. I asked whether it was verbatim.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, let us take the word "only".

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman will answer my question as to whether he has inserted the word "only," whether the amendment is verbatim with the present law or whether it is not?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk can inform the gentleman about that. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be reread, and I point out that the word "only" is a limiting word.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Boren amendment.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, just one final word in explanation of my position. In the first instance, we inserted the word "only" which is a limiting word only. They have been doing it not for this purpose but for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the word "only" appear in the statute, in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

Mr. BOREN. The word "only" does not appear in the statute. That is in the second proviso. Neither do the words "shall not be used for other purposes" but I make the contention that is the thing that makes it limiting.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Would the gentleman's amendment expand the basic law and authorize expenditures for anything not authorized in the basic law?

Mr. BOREN. It does not. It is solely limiting.

Mr. CASE. In the use of the word "only," does that word "only" limit the appropriation to expenditures for only a particular purpose?

Mr. BOREN. It does not. It does not preclude any of the purposes in the substantive law.

Mr. CASE. I wonder if the gentleman would explain this. My understanding of a limitation is that it restricts the appropriation to a portion of the original purposes. You cannot expand an appropriation but you can restrict it. If the use of the word "only" limits to only a certain part of the basic appropriation, then it is a restriction and a limitation.

Mr. BOREN. My amendment does not in any iota expand or take in any new purposes. It limits the practice that is going on.

The reason I answered the gentleman as I did is, I am unwilling, in my own judgment, to hold that the other practices outside of this limitation are justified by law, but it does limit them in some of the practices they are carrying on that they are claiming come under the law.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the gentleman's interpretation of the word "only," it is synonymous to saying at that point in his amendment that "this money shall be used for no other purposes than."

Mr. BOREN. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The Chair is ready to rule.

Reference has been made to similar amendments that have been heretofore presented. It has also been stated that

the language of the amendment offered is identical with an amendment presented on April 19, 1943, but an examination of the amendment offered at that time will show that the language was considerably and materially different than the language of the proposed amendment. Aside from that, the Chair is more anxious to be correct than perhaps consistent.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want it to be understood that I said that the wording of these amendments were identical.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so state that the gentleman or any other Member said that. That was brought to the attention of the Chair a few minutes ago. As the Chair stated, he is more interested in being correct than consistent.

Inasmuch as it is conceded that the language of the first proviso is the language of the substantive law except for the word "only," the first proviso is a limitation, and in view of the fact the second proviso is also a limitaiton, the point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I wonder whether or not agreement can be reached as to limitation of time on this amendment.

Mr. BOREN. I do not know whether others wish to discuss this point or at what length, but I can assure the gentleman so far as I am concerned the 5 minutes allocated me will be adequate for my purpose.

Mr. TARVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate be limited to 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be used by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss this subject at any length at all. I only ask your careful attention for a couple of minutes.

I have presented to the Subcommittee on Appropriations a full case history of what is going on in R. E. A. management in violation of the intent of the law. I extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this summary of facts, and again yesterday I extended in the RECORD at some length an analysis of the so-called Comptroller General's opinion and other statements that have been made on this subject which the R. E. A. has laid claim to in their annual report and which are without foundation; and some of their allegations are absolutely false.

Here is the point at issue. I sat on the committee that helped pass this act at the time it was passed, and participated in most of the subsequent considerations that have been given to the subject. The committee specifically wrote into the law that they could not buy established electrical systems in the large cities. We had one purpose when we created R. E. A. We wanted electricity carried to the farmer in the rural area, to the fellow who is not now getting electricity. There was no thought that the R. E. A. would be used to go in and buy up electrical systems and operate like a private industry, doing business for profit. Every nickel that the R. E. A. has spent has been used for buying electrical facilities in cities.

We did recognize that there would be some small villages in a rural area, so we authorized and let them buy in towns up to 1,500 population.

In Missouri alone they bought out over 30 towns in excess of that population. In my State they bought out 2 and are negotiating for a third. More than 100 towns have been bought within the last 2 years, some of them with populations ranging as high as from 10,000 to 25,000 people.

I do not believe this Congress ever thought for a moment when it voted R. E. A. appropriations that that money was going to be loaned to somebody to buy electrical facilities in some towns ranging in population anywhere from the size of Richmond, Va., to Dallas or Houston, Tex., or what have you. Of course, these towns may not be that large, but they range from 10,000, my home town—we do not consider ourselves eligible at all to enter into a rural cooperative electrification program, within the city limits, I mean—a town of 10,000 people, but under this program they are buying out towns right and left like that.

The unfortunate thing about it is, in addition to taking this money and diverting it away from the farmer for other purposes, they are buying out the "cats and dogs" of the electrical utility systems. They are buying out the worthless ones. They will buy anything almost that is offered, and in many instances, as I pointed out in my full discussion, they have paid prices that have been in excess of any offers made by anybody else. They have even bought one system in excess of the price at which the system was first offered.

I do not mean to impeach their integrity in connection with these manipulations; I mean they are seeking a place to spend money. Why? Because in this temporary period the money that has been appropriated to them they have not been able to use for legitimate purposes. They are violating the act. They are buying cities and they are betraying the farmer, taking the money to the city that we intended for the farmer. If you want to buy cities, if you want us to appropriate money to buy electrical systems in the cities of this country, well and good; but let us decide that here, where that policy ought to be decided. Let us not by edict or arbitrary decisions circumvent the law. That is the problem we face in this country. If a man believes in government by law and believes that the law should be carried out by administrative agencies, then I do not believe it is possible to vote against the amendment I have offered.

I want to point out to you that the R. E. A. in these instances has definitely considered the law which the Congress wrote as of no more binding effect than a scrap of paper.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be used by the chairman of the subcommittee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I think we are in agreement that the purposes of the R. E. A. should be, and are, to provide cheaper electricity for rural homes. If it is necessary in order to provide that to operate the systems in some small rural communities it seems to me it will be necessary in some instances that we acquire the facilities which cover small towns as well as the rural areas that surround them. The R. E. A. has done that in 11 cases during its history. Two of those cases were in the district represented by the gentleman from Oklahoma, or at least were in the State of Oklahoma. They were Fairfax and Cleveland, Okla. In the history of the R. E. A. there have been only 11 acquisitions of property where towns of more than 1,500 population were involved. In the last 2 fiscal years there have been only 2 such acquisitions. I cite that to make it clear that there has been no tendency, as has been suggested, on the part of the R. E. A. to go into the utility business or to seek to secure for itself a hold upon city properties.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Do I understand the gentleman to say there have been only 11 towns in excess of 1,500 population purchased?

Mr. POAGE. I said there have been 11 acquisitions during the history of the R. E. A. There have been 16 towns involved. I will put the names of those towns in the RECORD, together with the population of the towns. Of those 16 towns, 10 were of less than 2,000 population, 5 from 2,000 to 3,000, and 1 had a population of 3,400. That is the tremendous record of the R. E. A. in trying to become a big public utility, as the gentleman would like to have us believe it is doing.

In buying these, the R. E. A. bought properties in every instance in which more than 50 percent of the money was spent to provide new rural service to rural subscribers. I have the list here. In every instance of acquisition where we have as much as 1 year's history, there has been a betterment of the fiscal conditions of the local cooperative that made the acquisition. In every single instance it has inured to the advantage of the R. E. A. and to the farmers who owned the local cooperative.

It is perfectly true that in Oklahoma, where this last acquisition took place, there was a competitive power company that wanted to buy that power and offered $20,000 more than the R. E. A. paid for it, but it did not offer it until after

the R. E. A. had made the trade and got it under a binding contract.

If you are interested in protecting these power companies simply so that they can hold a community without giving rural service, without serving anybody out in the rural areas, and simply say that they can sit there because, perchance, there happens to be some town of as much as 1,500 population in the area, then you vote for this amendment and keep a lot of people in the dark the rest of their lives. But if you are interested in seeing the R. E. A. extend its lines to all of those people in the rural areas, then you give them a chance to do so by allowing them to do just as the law allows them to do today.

I call your attention to the fact that of these 11 acquisitions, 6 of them were in the Tennessee Valley area, where there were already established operations that involved both town and rural areas before the R. E. A. was established, and it became desirable for those properties to be taken over by the R. E. A. and operated as local cooperatives rather than as agencies of the T. V. A. or the local agencies that existed there. Six of the 11 acquisitions in the United States have been of that nature.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma would not only seek to destroy, but the first part of his amendment would prevent any acquisitions, prevent the R. E. A. from taking anything that is now in existence, prevent it from taking over any of the old properties that could fit in nicely with its own operations but which do not fit in with existing operations. This amendment would prevent the R. E. A. from taking advantage of those properties that must go on the market as a result of the death-sentence clause of the Securities Act, which breaks up the holding companies. Every one of us knows that within the next few years there must be many of these properties come on the market.

If you want to vote simply to protect those properties, and keep them in the hands of the utility companies, with no opportunity for the farmers of this country to buy any of those properties for their own good, if you want to say that those properties are to remain for the benefit of the utilities and that no farmer in America can enjoy the advantages of the death-sentence clause, then you vote for this amendment, because it will dead sure guarantee that the utilities and not the farmers will get the benefit of that act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not unsympathetic with the general objective which my good friend from Oklahoma has in mind of conserving rural electrification funds for the farmers, but the situation is not quite so simple as it would appear, because there have been a great many rulings by the Comptroller General and a great deal of discussion about this very matter.

I share the belief, of course, that this money ought to be used for strictly farm purposes. That is the reason the interdiction was written into the law that it should be limited to localities of 1,500 people. But now here is a situation that arises. Imagine an area that may have the general conformity of this Chamber, in any State in the Union, that is made up largely of unserved rural electric customers. In order to do the job, it becomes necessary to get at this group of unserved customers to acquire a utility property that may be in a town somewhat larger than 1,500. Those very questions, and there have been a number of them, have been submitted to the Office of the Comptroller, and it is a matter of fact that the subcommittee submitted that very question last year and the year before. The Comptroller ruled in a very extensive decision that where the acquisition in a town of over 1,500 is incidental and contributory to the serving of people in a hitherto unserved area, he thought it was in conformity with existing law. In pursuance thereof, they have acquired some properties in towns of 2,000. I think the largest town was about 3,500, as I recall.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Is the gentleman familiar with the Sho-Me Cooperative in Missouri?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not too familiar with that particular one.

Mr. BOREN. This is a holding-company type of cooperative, and it has bought out some thirty-odd units, and in at least one instance the population was over 10,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That particular case has not come to my attention, but I am sure my good friend is familiar with the observations made by the general counsel of R. E. A. in connection with a memorandum which he filed with the committee.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to correct the gentleman from Oklahoma about the Sho-Me Cooperative.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The Public Service Commission of Missouri authorized and sanctioned the acquisition. It is merely the consolidation of these different units into a larger unit so that they can more effectively serve the people coming within the jurisdiction of these old cooperatives. It has been approved by the Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The general counsel makes this observation, and I read it for the benefit of the Committee of the Whole:

> With respect to such communities, a study of our records, made this week, indicates that there have been only a few towns or small cities having populations of more than 1,500—most of them under 2,000, and the largest approximately 3,500.

But in the language of the ruling of the Comptroller, it was incidental to and contributory to the basic function of R. E. A. to provide service for people in unserved areas.

In the light of that ruling, which was necessary in order that there be an interpretation of the authority contained in the basic statute, it would seem to me inadvisable to adopt this amendment. I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], that I think the real relief is to be found perhaps in a more meticulous refinement of the law wherever there have been abuses. If we want to say nothing over 1,500, then we should make it so specific that not even the Comptroller General in making an interpretation for the service of unserved areas can go beyond that 1,500. But in the light of that ruling, in the light of the fact that he seeks to interpret whether money is being taken out of the Federal Treasury for this purpose, and then approves it, the subcommittee had no choice in the matter. That is the reason I do not think the gentleman's amendment ought to prevail.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Do I correctly understand that the substantive law as passed by the Congress limited the use of these funds to villages of less than 1,500?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; except that there is the broad provision in the law for serving people in unserved areas; so the Comptroller takes the position of taking the language of the law in its entirety and then interpreting the limitation in the law that where it is incidental and contributory it can be done. So he has permitted and approved the withdrawal of funds from the Treasury for that purpose.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. To begin with I want to say I believe the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is slightly in error in the last statement made in his remarks, in that the Rural Electrification Act does not prohibit the erection of rural electric service lines in towns of 1,500 or more in population by definite provision to that effect. It does provide that the funds which are made available by Congress shall be used in the provision of electric service for unserved rural areas, and it further provides that rural areas shall include towns of 1,500 or less. Therefore, it might at a casual glance be assumed that the use of any of the funds in towns of 1,500 population or more would be prohibited by law. However, the Comptroller General has ruled that is not the case. I raised the question myself so far as the hearings before our subcommittee are concerned, upon the theory it was not possible to use any of these moneys elsewhere than in unserved rural areas. The Comptroller General ruled that while that was the primary purpose of the law, funds could be used for the purchase of existing lines when incidental to rural service extension and where the effect of such purchase was to enable a cooperative to be set up and to function efficiently, which would carry service to unserved rural areas. That is the situa-

tion in quite a number of areas in this country, where if you set up a rural electric plan for rural people and have in the middle of it a town of maybe 2,000 people, the distribution system in that town could not operate properly without the rural area and the rural area cannot carry on properly an electric distribution system without the town. So in such cases the Comptroller General says it is permissible under the law to consolidate the system of the small town with the cooperative in the unserved rural area and thereby bring service to the unserved rural persons. I can see no objection to it.

I think the Rural Electrification Administration has done a wonderful service for the agricultural population of this country, and I do not believe we ought to throw any monkey wrench into the machinery here which would interfere with the orderly operations of that organization. I realize it is under investigation now by a committee of the other body. Perhaps there may be some things about the way in which its business has been conducted which are subject to criticism. But if there are, they should be corrected legislatively and not through consideration of an amendment which none of us heard read until a few moments ago, an amendment to an appropriation bill. We had on March 7, in this House, H. R. 4278, which contains specific provisions with reference to rural electrification, and any Member who wanted to do so could have, at that time, risen on the floor and offered this amendment or any other amendment to the Rural Electrification Act. No amendment was offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma or anybody else.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BOREN. Did not the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] at that time say that committee had unanimously refused to insert into that law a provision to permit the purchase of urban areas?

Mr. TARVER. Whether they refused or not, you had the right to offer an amendment, even the same amendment which was offered today. Our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations refused, after your insistence before our committee, to insert this provision, yet you are coming and offering it today. If you think you could not have offered the amendment to the bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] because the committee had unanimously refused to insert it at that time, I wonder why the gentleman does not apply the same argument to offering it to this bill.

Mr BOREN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] misunderstands me.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry.

Mr. BOREN. They unanimously refused to put into the bill a proposal by the R. E. A. to permit the R. E. A. to buy in towns in excess of 1,500.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the R. E. A. has been following a practice under the construction of the law by the Comptroller General. The gentleman wants to change the law. If his amendment provided nothing but existing law there would be no necessity whatsoever for offering it. The Comptroller General has ruled under existing law it is permissible to make these incidental purchases where it is necessary in setting up rural electrification, and until the law as construed by him is changed it can go ahead and do that. The gentleman wants to change the law. But I say if he wants to change the law he should undertake to do it legislatively and not by an ill-considered provision to be attached to this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 65, line 18, after the end of the bracket, strike out the period and insert "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out for the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 70, noes 57.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 171, nays 135, not voting 122, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—171

Allen, Ill.	Griffiths	Miller, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gwynne	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Hagen	Miller, Pa.
Andrews, N. Y.	Hale	Monkiewicz
Angell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mott
Arends	Halleck	Mruk
Arnold	Hancock	Mundt
Auchincloss	Heidinger	Murray, Wis.
Barrett	Herter	Norman
Bates, Mass.	Hess	O'Brien, Mich.
Bender	Hill	O'Hara
Bennett, Mich.	Hinshaw	O'Konski
Bennett, Mo.	Hoeven	Pittenger
Bishop	Hoffman	Ploeser
Bolton	Holmes, Wash.	Plumley
Brehm	Hope	Poulson
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Powers
Buffett	Hull	Ramey
Burdick	Jeffrey	Reece, Tenn.
Canfield	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
Carlson, Kans.	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Carrier	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Anton J.	Ridley
Carter	Johnson, Calvin D.	Robsion, Ky.
Case	Johnson, Ind.	Rockwell
Chiperfield	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rodgers, Pa.
Church	Johnson, Ward	Rogers, Mass.
Clason	Jones	Rohrbough
Clevenger	Jonkman	Rolph
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Rowe
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Sauthoff
Costello	Kearney	Schwabe
Crawford	Keefe	Scrivner
Crosser	Kinzer	Shafer
Cunningham	Knutson	Simpson, Ill.
Curtis	Kunkel	Simpson, Pa.
Day	LaFollette	Smith, Maine
Dewey	Landis	Smith, Ohio
Dirksen	Lea	Smith Wis.
Dondero	LeCompte	Springer
Dworshak	Lemke	Stanley
Elliott	Lewis	Stearns, N. H.
Ellis	Luce	Stefan
Ellison, Md.	Ludlow	Stevenson
Elston, Ohio	McConnell	Stockman
Engle, Calif.	McGregor	Sumner, Ill.
Fellows	McLean	Taber
Fenton	McWilliams	Talbot
Fish	Mansfield, Mont.	Talle
Gale	Martin, Iowa	Tibbott
Gavin	Martin, Mass.	Tolan
Gearhart	Mason	Welch
Gilchrist	Michener	West
Gillette	Miller, Conn.	Wigglesworth
Gillie	Miller, Mo.	Willey
Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson
Graham	Miller, Pa.	Wolcott
Grant, Ind.	Monkiewicz	Wolverton, N. J.
	Mott	Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—135

Abernethy	Burch, Va.	Davis
Allen, La.	Burgin	Dawson
Anderson, N. Mex.	Camp	Delaney
Andrews, Ala.	Cannon, Fla.	Dies
Barden	Cannon, Mo.	Dilweg
Bates, Ky.	Chapman	Durham
Beckworth	Clark	Eberharter
Bell	Cochran	Fisher
Bland	Coffee	Fitzpatrick
Bonner	Colmer	Flannagan
Boren	Cooley	Folger
Boykin	Cooper	Forand
Brooks	Courtney	Ford
Brown, Ga.	Cox	Fulbright
Bryson	Cravens	Gathings
	D'Alesandro	Gibson

Gordon	McCord	Robinson, Utah
Gorski	McKenzie	Rowan
Gossett	McMillan	Sasscer
Granger	McMurray	Sheppard
Grant, Ala.	Magnuson	Slaughter
Gregory	Mahon	Smith, W. Va.
Hare	Maloney	Somers, N. Y.
Harris, Ark.	Mansfield, Tex.	Sparkman
Harris, Va.	Marcantonio	Spence
Hays	Mills	Stewart
Hébert	Morrison, La.	Sullivan
Hendricks	Murdock	Sumners, Tex.
Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.	Tarver
Hoch	Newsome	Thomas, Tex.
Holifield	Norrell	Thomason
Izac	Norton	Vincent, Ky.
Jackson	O'Brien, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Jarman	O'Neal	Walter
Johnson, Luther A.	Outland	Wasielewski
	Pace	Weaver
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Patman	Wene
	Patton	Whelchel, Ga.
Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Fla.	White
Kefauver	Peterson, Ga.	Whitten
Kerr	Poage	Whittington
Kilday	Priest	Wickersham
King	Ramspeck	Winstead
Kirwan	Richards	Woodrum, Va.
Lanham	Rivers	Worley
Lesinski	Robertson	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—122

Andresen, August H.	Gerlach	Pfeifer
	Gifford	Philbin
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Phillips
Baldwin, N. Y.	Green	Pracht, C. Frederick
Barry	Gross	
Beall	Hall, Leonard W.	Pratt, Joseph M.
Blackney	Harless, Ariz.	Price
Bloom	Harness, Ind.	Rabaut
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Randolph
Bradley, Pa.	Hartley	Rankin
Brumbaugh	Heffernan	Rogers, Calif.
Buckley	Holmes, Mass.	Russell
Bulwinkle	Howell	Sabath
Burchill, N. Y.	Kee	Sadowski
Busbey	Kelley	Satterfield
Butler	Kennedy	Scanlon
Byrne	Keogh	Schiffler
Capozzoli	Kilburn	Scott
Celler	Kleberg	Sheridan
Chenoweth	Klein	Short
Compton	Lambertson	Sikes
Curley	Lane	Smith, Va.
Dickstein	Larcade	Snyder
Dingell	LeFevre	Starnes, Ala.
Disney	Lynch	Sundstrom
Domengeaux	McCormack	Taylor
Doughton	McCowen	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	McGehee	Torrens
Drewry	Maas	Towe
Eaton	Madden	Treadway
Ellsworth	Manasco	Troutman
Elmer	May	Vinson, Ga.
Engel, Mich.	Merritt	Vorys, Ohio
Fay	Merrow	Vursell
Feighan	Monroney	Wadsworth
Fernandez	Morrison, N. C.	Ward
Fogarty	Murphy	Weichel, Ohio
Fuller	Myers	Weiss
Fulmer	O'Brien, N. Y.	Winter
Furlong	O'Connor	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gallagher	O'Toole	Wright
Gamble		

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Randolph against.

Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Feighan against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Byrne against.

Mr. Beall for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Baldwin of Maryland against.

Mr. Troutman for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Manasco against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Weichel of Ohio for, with Mr. Curley against.

Mr. C. Frederick Pracht for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Vorys of Ohio for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Joseph M. Pratt for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Lane against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Burchill of New York against.

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Gross for, with Mr. Dickstein against.

Mr. Compton for, with Mr. Furlong against.

Mr. Brumbaugh for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Easton for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Torrens against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Phillips for, with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Lambertson for, with Mr. Starnes of Alabama against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Wright against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. McCowen.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Ward with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Maas.

Mr. May with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Butler.

Mr. BOREN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

RETURN TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN GREAT LAKES VESSELS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs BLAND, RAMSPECK, MANSFIELD of Texas, WELCH, and O'BRIEN of New York.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, FOR THE PURPOSE OF FURTHER REGULATING INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN TOBACCO

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 234, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, after line 11, insert:

"*Resolved*, That Public Law 118, 78th Congress, approved July 7, 1943, is amended by striking out the words "marketing year 1944–45" and inserting in lieu thereof "marketing years 1944–45, 1945–46, and 1946–47'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Virginia explain just what this amendment does?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the only thing the Senate amendment will do is extend the quotas for 2 years. Last year we thought we had an amendment that took care of it but it developed that the amendment passed last year only provided for the current crop. The tobacco growers have already voted on a 3-year program.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman answer this question: The amendment adopted by the Senate does not extend the quota provision to any other types of tobacco than those which have previously been in the program?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right. It does not affect any other type of tobacco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief article from the Wall Street Journal on the subject of the British aviation policy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Hon. Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 465, Rept. No. 1286), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Military Policy to be composed of 21 Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker as follows: 7 members of the Committee on Military Affairs, 7 members of the committee on Naval Affairs, and 7 Representatives who are not members of either such committee. A vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to investigate all matters relating to the post-war military requirements of the United States; to gather information, plans, and suggestions from informed sources with respect to such military requirements; to study the plans and suggestions received; and to report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) from time to time during the present Congress the results of findings made and conclusions reached.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the committee (1) may employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, and (2) may request such information and assistance (including the services of personnel) from departments and independent agencies of the Government as it deems necessary.

(b) The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, in carrying out this resolution, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in regard to the Tule Lake investigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a soldier on post-war planning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM E. WIDBY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on the call of the Private Calendar on March 7 there was a bill objected to, H. R. 3674, for the relief of William E. Widby. That matter has been given further consideration and the majority and minority leaders have been consulted and they have no objection to its restoration to the calendar. I ask unanimous consent that that bill be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon quotations from a letter from Donald M. Nelson relative to House Joint Resolution 201, and also a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Dr. Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, together with a reprint of A Four-Plank Platform for War and Peace, appearing in the April issue of the Progressive Farmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, hundreds of thousands of people of Greek blood throughout the world will be celebrating the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of Greek independence. Like the Fourth of July, this date marks the beginning of a nation's struggle for freedom, rather than its achievement. After four centuries of slavery under their Turkish rulers, Bishop Germanos, on March 25, 1821, proclaimed at Patras the independence of Greece; and though it took 8 years of struggle before the final victory, this date is the one that is rightly held sacred, by every Greek and every friend of Greece.

Nowhere was the heroic effort of a small nation more quickly or more cordially welcomed than in the United States. President Monroe said in his annual message to Congress:

> It is natural that their contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States. We have already formed the opinion, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they will succeed in their contest and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world takes a deep interest in their welfare.

And statesmen like Webster and Clay echoed his sentiments on the floor of Congress. It is in accordance with the traditions of more than a century of friendship between our two nations that this House should pause for a moment in the midst of its many occupations, to recall the significance of this date, and to extend the right hand of friendship to the heroic Greek people, now again suffering under the heel of a new oppressor.

From their first appearance in history, the Greeks have never lost their love of liberty, or their hold on the Hellenic ideals. They were the first to express the principles of democracy—the word itself is Greek—"the rule of the people"; and if they were not always successful in their attempts to carry it into practice, they carried on experiments in that field that have been most enlightening to students of government ever since. The appeal of democracy to the minds and hearts of men is not based on the ease or simplicity with which it can be put into effect. The nineteenth century was acclaimed as the age of democracy; it was in fashion then, and all men spoke well of it. But the experience of democracy in the twentieth century shows that it calls for deep conviction and vigilant defense if it is to live. To the Greek people it has always been an ideal, and for it they have been willing to make every sacrifice.

It is not necessary to recall the services rendered by the Greek race to European civilization. Besides their great contributions to the development of human thought, the names of Thermopylae and Marathon will live forever as reminders that the Greeks could fight and die in defense of their way of life. It was Greek heroism that withstood the inroads of oriental despotism, and preserved a world in which Greek philosophy and Greek learning could survive and flourish. Only in the fifteenth century were they overwhelmed by a more barbaric conqueror, owing to the lethargy and indifference of western Europe; and 400 years of Turkish rule could not crush their spirit or dim the undying flame of Greek culture.

It was only a small part of the Greek world that finally won recognition in 1829 as an independent nation. During the nineteenth century, in spite of poverty and lack of natural resources, the Greek people with untold sacrifice rebuilt their national culture; while, bit by bit, new areas of the Greek homeland, on the

mainland and in the islands of the Aegean, came under the blue and white flag of the kingdom of the Hellenes. In the last war, despite dynastic difficulties, the Greek people ranged themselves on the side of the Allies, and Greek troops shared in the Balkan campaigns. After the enforced withdrawal of the Greek troops from Asia Minor in 1922, there followed one of the most remarkable exchanges of population in history, in which this little nation found itself faced with the problem of absorbing a million and a half of refugees from Turkey. Much help was needed, and freely given, chiefly from American sources; but the success of the undertaking was principally due to the able planning and generous sacrifices of the Greek people themselves. The coming of a new spirit in nationalist Turkey was welcomed by their Hellenic neighbors; and the beginnings of better times for the troubled Balkan regions seemed within sight.

And then, with the entry of Fascist Italy into the present war, a new and terrible blow fell upon Greece. On October 28, 1940, Italian troops crossed the Albanian frontier in an unprovoked and wanton attack. For a brief period the defenders fell back before the invaders; but with the completion of national mobilization the Greeks counterattacked, and by November 10 the Italians were in full retreat. Inadequately equipped for the rigors of a winter campaign, the heroic Greek Army maintained the offensive, and performed prodigies of valor worthy of the descendants of the men of Thermopylae and Marathon. The world looked on in amazement at the first defeat of an Axis army; and took new courage as it saw the myth of Axis invincibility forever ended. It was the triumph once again of the human spirit—the victory of brave men fighting for their freedom against superior equipment and armament. Then, in April 1941, came the more powerful forces of Hitler's armies. Greece's British allies sent what aid they could, as a matter of honor, and at the gravest risk to their own position in Africa; but it was not enough, and before the end of May the island of Crete, last stronghold of the Nation's independence, had fallen to the invaders, and Greek soil was again controlled by alien masters.

The Greek soil was captured; but the Greek spirit was not crushed. Though millions of her people are starving under the enemy yoke, Greek troops are still fighting beside their allies—now including their historic friends from across the Atlantic; the Greek Navy is active in the Mediterranean; and Greek merchantmen are carrying the stuff of victory in many seas; while in Greece itself guerrilla bands carry on unceasing harassment of the enemy.

From the days of Ulysses, the Greeks have been a race of seafarers. Greece is a poor and mountainous country, with the longest coast line in Europe. Her most profitable crops are in the luxury class—currants, tobacco, and olives; and always her seamen have borne these goods to other lands, bringing back the foodstuffs on which her people depended for subsistence. The little Greek sailing ships still dot the waters of the eastern Mediterranean as they have done for untold centuries; the building up of a steam merchant marine has been one of the principal achievements of her century of freedom. A little country of 8,000,000 people, she brought to the service of the Allies something like 460 oceangoing merchantmen of 1,800,000 gross tonnage. Most of these were carrying goods under charter between foreign ports; almost every capture of a European port by the Germans caught one or more Greek ships in harbor—even as far afield as the Polish port of Gdynia in the Baltic. They are transporting Allied supplies today, not only in the Mediterranean but across the Atlantic, and even in the Pacific. Over 1,000,000 tons of Greek shipping have been sunk by U-boats, and thousands of Greek sailors have lost their lives.

These men are carrying on in exile, hearing nothing from their homes and families save tales of almost unbelievable suffering and starvation; but there is no weakening of their spirit—the Greek Government and the Greek people in exile are doing without complaint and without stint whatever is still in their power to do to hasten the day of victory and of release for their beloved Hellas.

In the day of her declaration of independence, the sympathy and understanding of the American people went out to Greece; through her period of reconstruction they have watched with friendly eyes the rebuilding of her national life. More than half a million Greek immigrants have come to our shores, of whom something like 320,000 are today American citizens. They are good citizens, faithful to their national church and retentive of their national traditions, but taking a keen and intelligent interest in the duties of American citizenship. Hard working and industrious, they are forging ahead in many walks of life, and with increasing prosperity goes an increasing sense of civic responsibility. Many are the ties that bind the United States and Greece, many are the debts we owe her, from the epics of Homer to the war aid that she is rendering us today.

On this occasion of the anniversary of her independence, we will do well to pause for a moment, not merely to celebrate with her, not merely to pray for the renewal of that independence through the victory of Allied arms, but to see what we are doing now to repay our debt, and what Greece has a right to expect when her days of martyrdom are over.

Since the autumn of 1942, a neutral commission of Swedish and Swiss citizens, in close cooperation with the International Red Cross, has been supervising the distribution of 15,000 tons monthly of wheat or flour, brought from the United States and Canada in Swedish ships. This is not half what is needed to prevent widespread suffering and even starvation; but even this has greatly relieved the situation, and has served as a reminder to the imprisoned people that their friends outside do not forget them.

I have spoken of the fact that Greeks are still fighting beside the British and Americans. On July 10, 1942, their Government signed a lend-lease agreement with ours. Most of the munitions for their fighting men are coming from the British; but we have given them merchant ships to replace in part their losses, and are helping under lend-lease to supply and maintain this shipping.

When victory is won, and the time comes to rebuild a war-torn world, there is no nation that the American people will be more anxious to see reestablished than martyred Greece. I feel confident in predicting that her friends will see to it that all Greek lands are at last united under her flag. The Albanian frontier should be rectified to unite the Greek population of northern Epirus with their compatriots. And Rhodes and the other islands of the Dodecanese, siezed from Turkey by the Italians in 1911, and retained with no other excuse than Italian dreams of empire, should join their sister islands of the Aegean as part of the body as well as the soul of Greece.

Our contribution under war conditions suggests the chief step that can be taken to restore her shattered economy. Her reliance has been on her shipping, and we shall come out of the war with a great pool of merchantmen. The gift of enough of these vessels to restore Greek commerce to its pre-war strength would seem to be an obligation that will profit us as well as Greece. The grit and determination of Greek merchants and Greek seamen will do the rest.

In 1821, the declaration of Greek independence marked the dawn of a brighter day. And in this dark hour of her suffering and trial, her friends here in America join her in looking forward to the day when Greece, "under God, shall have a new birth of freedom," and when at last she can go forward to fulfill her destiny, and give to the world a new example of Greek democracy in action. May the day be sooner than we dare to think.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, 123 years ago the bishop of Old Patras blessed the revolution of the people of Greece against Turkish oppression, which had meant untold suffering and sacrifices to the Greeks. The ceremony took place at the monastery of St. Laura, near the town of Calabryta, in southern Greece, 368 years after the fall to the Turks of Constantinople, capital of the Greek or Byzantine Empire. After 7 years of bloody struggle a part of Greece was liberated from the Turks.

Following the success of the great efforts of the Greeks to free themselves from the Turks, the little country, again breathing the air of freedom and independence, forged ahead in matters of civilization and prosperity. It also increased in size, acquiring from the Turks, always at a high price in blood, other Provinces in the north and islands in the east and south, thus bringing freedom to more Greeks.

The present war could not but affect Greece, as it has done the rest of the world. While busily endeavoring to improve existing social conditions and at the same time to strengthen their de-

fenses, the Greeks were awakened early on the morning of October 28, 1940, to learn that Italy, through Mussolini, had demanded the complete surrender of Greece within 3 hours. King George and Prime Minister Metaxas, with the entire nation behind them, informed Mussolini that he would have to fight in order to acquire what he so brazenly demanded. We all know what ill luck and disgrace the brave Greeks heaped upon the Italians. It was the beginning of the end of the Italian Empire.

Incensed at the defeat of his fellow culprit, Adolf Hitler succeeded in proving that he was a more capable brigand by invading and conquering Greece in the spring of 1941, and was followed by the armies of Bulgaria, which had opened its doors to Hitler for an easier conquest of Greece. The King, the Government, and the people of Greece, despite Hitler's great might and invincibility at that time, defied the Germans with a determination akin to that wherewith they had defied the Italians, although certain that defiance would result in the total conquest of Greece. Since then the Italians and the Germans, as well as the Bulgarians, who also lost no time in declaring war against the United States immediately after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, vied with each other in acts of utter barbarism.

We all know of the town of Lidice, in Czechoslovakia. Few of us, however, know that more than 1,000 Greek villages have been completely razed and most of their inhabitants butchered. The campaign of barbarism increased in intensity when the Greek patriots began their quite effective guerrilla warfare against the Axis combine. Even the town of Calabryta and the historic monastery of St. Laura, where the revolution against the Turks formally began on March 25, 1821, were only recently razed by Hitler's Germans after the monks and the townspeople were lined up and shot in cold blood, in punishment for the activities of guerrilla patriots in that part of Greece.

Under the wise leadership of King George and Prime Minister Tsouderos, both of whom we had the good fortune to have as our guests in Washington not long ago, the Greek Navy, an army of several brigades, one of which fought with the British Eighth Army at El Alamein and earned General Montgomery's praise, as well as the Greek merchant marine and the Greek Air Force, have been rendering effective and vital service to the cause of the United Nations.

May I express my sincere wish, which no doubt is the wish of all of my colleagues in Congress, that Greece may soon be freed from the Germans and the Bulgarians, and that all islands and territories adjacent to Greece whose population is wholly or chiefly Grecian, but which are under foreign rule, may again become valued parts of the honor-loving and glorious country of the Greeks.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES FOR THE FOLDING ROOM

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read (H. J. Res. 260), as follows:

Resolved, etc. That notwithstanding the provisions of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended by the act of August 29, 1916, the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to employ, whenever necessary, the services of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets at the prevailing rates provided by law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

REHABILITATION OF WOUNDED SERVICEMEN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read to the House a letter I have received from Brig. Gen. Fred W. Rankin, of the United States Army, chief consultant in surgery:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
SERVICES OF SUPPLY,
Washington, March 17, 1944.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am writing you, as per our telephone conversation, to give you some data on amputees in the American Army in this war.

Not infrequently there appears a rumor that a large number of amputees have been received in this country and that many of them have had triple or quadruple loss of limbs. Actually, the facts are entirely the reverse. As you know, the Surgeon General's Office has set up five amputation centers geographically distributed throughout the United States. They are as follows: Lawson General Hospital, Walter Reed General Hospital, Percy Jones General Hospital, McCloskey General Hospital, Bushnell General Hospital. This program was initiated nearly 2 years ago and these centers are all staffed by men who are expert surgeons and who have had experience in handling this type of case. Every man who loses a limb is evacuated to one of these centers and kept there until the wound is healed. He is then fitted with a prosthesis and proper disposition of his case is made. At the end of 6 months, when the stump has shrunken and been molded to what will be its final conformation, he is fitted by the Veterans' Administration with a permanent prosthesis. Of course, while in hospital attempts are made at vocational rehabilitation at the same time that physical reconditioning is going on.

Yesterday over the telephone I obtained the following data on the number of amputation cases we have had in this war. I might say that this data is on the number of cases now in this country and that is practically complete, because amputees are evacuated from the combat zones as quickly as their physical condition permits. As of yesterday, we had in this country 1,194 patients who had major amputations. Of this number only 68 had had amputation of 2 limbs. There was not a single triple amputation nor was there a single quadruple, or so-called "basket type" of case. I am sure of the accuracy of these data.

I believe that the Surgeon General's Office has set up a program which takes care of amputation cases in a prompt and thoroughly efficient manner, and I believe that all possible steps are being taken to forward the reconditioning of these maimed soldiers.

I express to you on behalf of The Surgeon General sincere appreciation of your kindness in helping to suppress rumors to the effect that there had been enormous numbers of these unfortunate people evacuated back to the States, and I trust that the figures I have given you will prove useful in combatting such future rumors to that effect as may arise.

Very sincerely yours,
FRED W. RANKIN,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Chief Consultant in Surgery.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Missouri, because he has shown a great deal of interest in this problem and is doing so much for the men in that respect. He has always been extremely helpful to service men and women. Certainly no one has taken a keener or more constructive interest than he. He has introduced splendid bills for the disabled men and women and I hope they will become law.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentlewoman for her interest. I know she has been extremely active in connection with this matter. Did I correctly understand the gentlewoman to say that there were 700 and some amputees?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are 1,194 patients who have had major amputations.

Mr. COCHRAN. The reason I ask is that I understood the gentlewoman to say 700, but it is 1,194?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Two months ago I heard the Surgeon General personally say that they had over 1,000. Now, these men are coming in from both the Pacific and Atlantic areas. I think it will be interesting for the gentlewoman to know that there is a lack of proper instruction at the general hospitals. We have given this matter a great deal of attention and had some hearings on it. There is a necessity to train these men properly in the use of the appliances with which they are furnished. If they are not trained in the use of them, the appliances are absolutely valueless to the men.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very familiar with the situation and the gentleman from Missouri is entirely correct. Much more must be done in fitting and training the men in the use of artificial limbs. I was at the Forest Glen Reconditioning Hospital today and talked with a number of the amputees and also with the major in charge of the reconditioning and training. All were very much interested in the reconditioning and the training of the amputees with the prosthetic appliances. I visited an institute for the disabled on Friday in New York, and I know the gentleman is familiar with the institute there. The institute there for the disabled is doing a very magnificent piece of work in teaching persons to walk with artificial limbs and in the use of artificial arms. They are teaching them there to

stand, to walk, and to sit, and to cross the street and to get on streetcars. When they go out they are able to take care of themselves in the outside world. Some of them get along, it seems to me, faster than people who have had no disabilities. It is very important we should have provision for reconditioning and for this training of the handicapped in the hospitals, not only of the Army and Navy, but also the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has a bill in at the present time that would insure their receiving this training before they sever their connection with the Army. I do not mean that they must stay in uniform or in the service. They can go back to business. But one must make sure, that is, the Congress must make sure, the men receive by legislation this training somewhere in the use of these appliances. The Army and Navy and veterans assure me this will be done, but I want an act passed to make it obligatory.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. My observation in cases like that, not particularly, however, with reference to soldiers, is that the most important thing is mental therapy and the attitude they have in life. I wonder if they are taking steps and having people train them in the mental adjustment which is necessary for them to make when they have these disabilities?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentlewoman will agree with me that the most important thing is to see that they are trained to get about and trained to go back to their old business if they want to. We have passed legislation and will pass more legislation which will give them a chance to go back to college and continue their schooling and give them a chance to take out loans on houses, a chance for vocational training, and so forth. Servicemen fight bravely. They show courage in facing readjustment after the fighting. It is our lot to help in every way to make it easier.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am not disparaging what is being done. I think it is absolutely splendid. But I am just saying that mental therapy is often considered the most important part in the rehabilitation of disabled men. I mean, getting a new psychological attitude so that they will say, "Oh, well, we can do just as well," which they do not necessarily get in the physical therapy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is perfectly true. That is one of the reasons for the various places such as they have in Atlantic City for the Air Corps. They are rest hotels, so called. The Air Corps has taken over several hotels and the men there, the aviators, rest and sleep for a while until they can get back and see whether they want to continue with their aviation, and a great deal is being done in the hospitals for the men who are nervously worn out. A good deal is being done along that line, but not enough. We have a bill that provides an additional $500,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration to build hospitals. I have a fear that we will not have enough beds even in the hospitals to care for the men when the tremendous drive is made abroad and the least we can do is to give these men hospital care and training and adequate compensation and educational and vocational training.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is quite right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is a bill, the American Legion bill, which is in the Senate now, which takes care of a good many of these cases by legislation. It will come to the House, and I am sure it will pass unanimously within a week or 10 days anyway. But we must make sure. It must be written into law that the men are given everything with which to go out and go back into civil life and take up just as much as possible the life they had before. I find in talking with the men that that was one thing that was in their minds. They want to be sure they are given the opportunity to be trained in order that they may go back to their old places in civil life. I do not think there will be any objection in the House to any part of the bill that has been introduced. We should give the disabled men more while they are in training. Now it is only $80 a month for a single man, more for dependents. During the First World War we gave a single man $100 a month, and more for dependents. This new bill, the Legion bill, which will be taken up in the Senate first, and which is before our World War veterans, will provide $50 for a single man, and for a man with a dependent, $25 additional pay; and then his education will be taken care of and his training for a certain period of time.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

The Chair hopes by next Thursday a concurrent resolution will be passed recessing the Congress over until the 11th or 12th of April. It will be impossible for the present occupant of the chair to be in Washington next week, and therefore he has asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to offer a resolution.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 483) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan;

H. R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff, as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume; and

H. J. Res. 192. Joint Resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 250. An act to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, March 27, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1336. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Office of Strategic Services for the fiscal year 1945, containing estimates of appropriation amounting to $57,000,000 and proposed provisions affecting said estimates (H. Doc. No. 512); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1337. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 26, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Kern River, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 513); to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1028. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No.

1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 465. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER. Committee on Claims. H. R. 3674. A bill for the relief of William E. Widby; without amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4475. A bill to provide for the future status of certain functions and personnel transferred to the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 4476. A bill to provide for a more equitable basis for the granting of old-age assistance under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4477. A bill to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEIDINGER:

H. R. 4478. A bill to permit newspapers to be transmitted free of postage to certain members of the armed forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 4479. A bill to authorize the naturalization and the admission into the United States under a quota of Eastern Hemisphere Indians and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 4480. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 4481. A bill for the relief of William H. Crompton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4482. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4483. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harrison H. Bradford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 4484. A bill for the relief of F. V. Johnson, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5336. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition from the City Council of the City of Boston, relative to the misunderstanding of the differences between America and Eire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5337. Also, petition of the city of Cambridge, favoring House bill 3917 and Senate bill 1767, known as the American Legion bill of rights for World War No. 2 veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5338. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by F. F. McClure, of Newberg, Oreg., and 80 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5339. Also, petition signed by George C. Patterson, of Salem, Oreg., and 65 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5340. Also, petition signed by Rev. William J. Wiens, of Salem, Oreg., and 23 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 27, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our eternal God and Lord of life, Thou who art our portion and the strength of our hearts, we rejoice that we have often found Thy presence full of light, peace, and power. We would turn to Thee for refuge and pray to be delivered from the errors of unbelief and practice; magnify Thy words and deeds in us. Give us of the treasures of Thy wisdom, of patience and calm confidence; strengthen us for our labors, though often unwelcome and burdensome. Forgive the coolness of our devotion, our wavering faith, our irresolution, and speak to all who are hushed with fear.

Suffer not our people to abide in ignorance; open their eyes and direct their minds that they may be ready for the stress of their obligations. Grant that our loyalty may be set in motion by thanksgiving and praise for those institutions with all their blessings which we cherish and revere. As we move through this week of compassion, whose appointed path teaches us to live with spirits free, we pray that life and love, liberty and brotherhood may surge through all breasts. In labor and trial, in losses and disappointments, help us to bring our souls into union with Thy holy purpose. We commend unto Thy gracious care and mercy our Speaker and the Congress in its entirety. In the name of Him who has inscribed on His hands and heart the names of those who trust Him. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 24, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 1, 1944:

H. R. 480. An act for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939;

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Henry Angell; and

H. R. 2350. An act to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

On March 2, 1944:

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids.

On March 3, 1944:

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes;"

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis; and

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Fred Hunter.

On March 4, 1944:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

On March 7, 1944:

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of Frederick Lee Littlefield.

On March 11, 1944:

H. R. 1874. An act for the relief of Robert P. Sick; and

H. R. 4166. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

On March 14, 1944:

H. R. 2912. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge.

On March 20, 1944:

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2419. An act to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2880. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.; and

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson.

On March 21, 1944:

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1488. An act to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of Henry Grossi; and

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin.

On March 22, 1944:

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt;

H. R. 2956. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska; and

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes.

On March 24, 1944:

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2836. An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; and

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1767. An act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4070. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The Chair requests the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to administer the oath of office to the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. SABATH administered the oath of office to Mr. MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore.

INVITATION TO VISIT THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK) laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

WESTMINSTER,
March 14, 1944.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER RAYBURN: Each of the two Houses of Parliament, over which we respectively preside, today passed a resolution that the House, desiring to promote a closer association between the British Paliament and the Congress of the United States of America, requested us on its behalf to invite the Congress of the United States to send a delegation of its Members to visit Parliament at as early a date as may be convenient.

We have the honor to transmit this invitation accordingly, and to request you to communicate the invitation to the House over which you preside, in the hope that this proposal, which was adopted unanimously and with enthusiasm both by the House of Lords and by the House of Commons, will commend itself to both Houses of Congress.

Yours sincerely,
SIMON, *Lord Chancelor.*
D. CLIFTON BROWN. *Speaker.*

SOLDIERS' VOTE LEGISLATION

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place in the RECORD a telegram sent to Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the White House, Washington, D. C., by Hon. John W. Bricker, Governor of the State of Ohio, on March 18, 1944. It reads as follows:

MARCH 18, 1944.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

Replying to your telegram of March 15 with reference to soldiers' voting bill please be advised that the present Ohio laws do not authorize the supplementary Federal ballot mentioned in your telegram. I am calling the legislature in special session in order that the Ohio laws with respect to soldiers voting may be further liberalized so that ballots will be available for distribution under the provisions of the bill recently passed by the Congress in sufficient time that those in the service may vote without registration for Federal, State, and local officials. The bill now before you for signature will materially aid Ohio's citizens in the armed forces in exercising their franchise to the fullest extent.

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Governor, State of Ohio.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the other special orders already granted I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FAULTY DISTRIBUTION OF OILSEED MEALS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am extending in the Appendix of the RECORD today some tables with reference to the distribution of oilseed meals in the United States. This deals with the subject of food production, and I trust the Members will study these tables for if they do they will soon find out that the War Food Administration, charged with the responsibility of allocating these foods to the district where they do the most good, is not doing it that way and I call attention to the fact that last December I offered a House concurrent resolution which would take care of this situation.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION TO SIT DURING THE SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit during the sessions of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. During general debate?

Mr. RANKIN. During general debate.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, can the chairman tell us whether or not they are going to consider the bill which was sent over from the Senate relative to veterans?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Ohio let me say that we have a similar bill before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

I understand the bill that has been messaged over will be referred to that committee. We are holding hearings attempting to expedite the disposition of that measure as much as possible not to make wasteful haste.

Some representatives of veterans' organizations wanted to be heard, General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, wants to be heard, and there are a great many Members of Congress who have asked permission to be heard. We decided by a unanimous vote in the committee this morning that we would proceed as rapidly and as expeditiously as possible with the hearings, not, as I said, to make wasteful haste, but to try to bring out legislation we can all afford to support and that we can all defend.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman able to give the House information as to when this bill may be

called up for consideration? Some Members would like to make plans.

Mr. RANKIN. We had hoped to get the measure out and passed this week, but I understand that under the present parliamentary situation we would have to get a rule from the Committee on Rules or unanimous consent to take it up under a suspension of the rules or under the regular rules of the House. I am not sure, and no member of the committee can tell, just how long it is going to take on these hearings or how long it is going to take the committee in executive session, but we are going to do the best we can to expedite it as much as possible.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit during the session of the House this afternoon. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and include therein part of a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on American journalism from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other some letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the regular business of the House and other special orders already entered into I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today following the special orders granted the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] and the other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

L. S. M. F. T.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Connecticut addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION FIELD PERSONNEL

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Last week in connection with the passage of the agricultural appropriation bill the House considered what is known as the Harness amendment having to do with proposed restrictions of alleged activities of triple-A committees in connection with the deferment of men for military service, the rationing of farm machinery, and so forth. At that time I had not been advised of the position of the War Food Administration, of which the Agricultural Adjustment Agency is a constituent part, with regard to these alleged activities. I have here a statement from Judge Marvin Jones, Administrator of the War Food Administration, which gives the position of the War Food Administration with regard to this subject matter. I think in all fairness to him and to the War Food Administration it should be inserted in the RECORD.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington.

Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE: In response to your request I am sending the attached statement dealing with activities of War Food Administration field personnel with regard to gasoline rationing and selective-service deferment.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

An amendment to the agricultural appropriations bill approved by the House Thursday, March 23, provides: "That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out of the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple-A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity."

The discussions of this amendment indicate the need for a statement clarifying the relation of A. A. A. committees to these activities and how responsibilities of the War Food Administration in connection with selective-service deferment and rationing are handled.

The committees that make recommendations to local selective-service boards and the committees that handle farm machinery rationing are not A. A. A. committees. Hence, the A. A. A. could not use this means and does not use any other means of forcing anyone to take part in the A. A. A. program.

In connection with deferments, the Agricultural Extension Service is responsible, under a memorandum issued by the War Food Administration November 26, 1943, for "collecting and transmitting to county war boards such factual information as selective-service boards may request from county war boards regarding the deferment of individual farm operators and agricultural workers."

Eligibility of agricultural workers and farm operators for deferment pursuant to the provisions of the Tydings amendment is determined on the basis of the number of war units which they are producing. County agricultural agents are responsible for collecting information on the number of war units when requested to do so by the local draft board. This information is reported to the local draft board through the county war boards. Membership of the county war board includes representatives of offices of all Federal agricultural agencies operating in the county, including the county agent and the A. A. A. chairman. A. A. A. records are available to the county agent if he wishes to use them in the preparation of production information requested by the local draft board.

Because there is not enough farm machinery to go around, many items of machinery have to be rationed. The War Food Administration has established county farm rationing committees to handle the rationing of these items. These are not A. A. A. committees. They are five-man committees composed of three farmers and two farm machinery dealers. One of the farmer members is a member of the county A. A. A. committee.

A. A. A. community and county committees are authorized by the War Food Administration to provide information on farm operations as a basis for allotment of gasoline rations for nonhighway use when requested to do so by local war-price and rationing boards. The function of the A. A. A. committees is to act in behalf of the farmer in obtaining necessary gasoline for farming operations regardless of whether or not the farmer is a member of the county agricultural conservation association.

Last year when farmers in some parts of the country were experiencing difficulty in obtaining adequate gasoline to operate trucks, tractors, and other motorized farm equipment, Members of Congress asked that the local A. A. A. committees be requested to help determine the gasoline needs of farmers. Local ration boards do not have information on which to determine the needs of farmers.

A. A. A. committeemen are given the responsibility by the War Food Administration for informing individual farmers of the wartime needs for farm products and encouraging them to produce in accordance with these needs. In carrying out this responsibility A. A. A. committees have quite generally adopted a farm-plan work sheet on which the farmer and the committeeman record the operations and the intentions of the farmer. These farm-plan sheets are not designed to be used as a basis for deferment and the language objected to on the forms used last year is eliminated. However, they do provide a helpful source of information on which local draft boards could base action on selective-service deferment and on which local ration boards could determine nonhighway gasoline needs of the farmer. The farm-plan sheets are in no sense a contract and have nothing to do with membership in the county agricultural conservation association.

When farmers wish to qualify for agricultural conservation payments, they are asked to indicate on a form which they sign their desire and intention to take part in the program. If they wish to sign such a statement and carry out the necessary conservation practices on their farm, they become members of the county agricultural conservation association and qualify for payments under the provisions of the program.

Provisions of A. A. A. legislation providing for adjustment of production are not now in operation except in the case of tobacco. Congress last summer passed a joint resolution directing that a referendum among tobacco producers be held and that tobacco quotas be applied if the vote of growers showed that they desired it. The vote of growers favored tobacco quotas and acreage allotments were applied in accordance with the legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therein a radio speech I made last night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein correspondence that I recently had with Chairman Pogue, of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' REHABILITATION LEGISLATION

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, now that the coordinate body has unanimously approved the so-called veterans' rehabilitation measure, also variously referred to as the G. I. law and the veterans' bill of rights, I am sure that every Member of this House desires to bring this vital legislation to an immediate vote so we may also give it our unanimous approval.

The distinguished chairman of the Veterans Committee, the very able gentleman from Mississippi, whose life-long devotion to veteran problems marks him as a loyal and outstanding friend to all service men and women, will, I have no doubt, seek every opportunity to bring this measure to an early vote.

Sometime ago I brought to the attention of the House what is unquestionably the very great need for a fresh approach and a new attitude toward the treatment of veteran neuropsychiatric cases which modern science believes require, for successful results, in many instances relative seclusion, privacy, and freedom from the harassments, noise, confusion, and impersonality that too frequently typify the regular institutional veterans' hospital. At the time I proposed to the Veterans' Bureau that rest homes and smaller isolated units be established for the solicitous care of these mental and nervous cases, which will, I am informed, embrace well over half of all our casualties, very many psychiatrists, psychologists, neurologists, and other medical experts wrote me approving and urging the adoption of my suggestions. Without exception, these authorities, including several reputable professional organizations, favored the inauguration of such a policy to insure effective and best treatment for our patriotic battle-shocked veterans, many of whom can be cured, rehabilitated, and restored to civilian life if they receive proper scientific care and considerate treatment early in their affliction. Inasmuch as my proposal has received only perfunctory attention—and that is putting it mildly—from the Veterans' Bureau and related committees, I intended to offer an amendment to the G. I. bill, incorporating appropriate provisions to accomplish these ends and believe it would be adopted.

However, I suggest that when the bill is reported, if it appears that this amendment would threaten to obstruct or delay favorable speedy action, I will refrain from offering the provision—vital as I regard it to be—at this time and will seek other means later of effectuating my objectives. I urge the leadership of the House to act at once to give the Members the chance to pass this measure before the recess.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for 3 weeks Walter Winchell has been crying and whining and whimpering because, he says, someone is attempting to deprive him of free speech. I know of no one who wants to deprive him of free speech. Certainly he has plenty of it, and a free press and radio time as well. The only thing that the people are objecting to is a lack of decency and truthfulness in what he says and writes. Now Winchell objects because those who sell his column are censoring it, which is not the fault of anyone in the Congress.

In order to be helpful to the gentleman, and I speak advisedly, I want to inquire and I am inquiring this morning by privileged resolution, of the Department of Justice about his sponsor's employment of two women, one plead guilty of misprision of treason and the other was interned as an enemy alien. When I get that information, if I do get it from the Department of Justice, I will pass it along to Mr. Winchell so that he may explain to the public how it came about that his sponsor had in its or his employ these two women and to tell us something about the Nazi activities of the two employees of Jergens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the distinguished Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, last Friday night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Dr. T. W. Shoop, of the University of Chicago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address I recently made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr LUTHER A JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include a statement made recently by Secretary Hull as to the basis of our foreign policy, and in the second, to include an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Mr. Hull and His Critics."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Senate of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt from an address delivered by Sr. Lic. Carlos Sanchez Mejorada, president of the Inter-American Bar Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN PHYSICALLY OR MENTALLY HELPLESS CHILDREN

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 662) to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes, and I ask that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what is in the legislation?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this act, S. 662, is to remove in-

equalities in existing laws for the benefit of a very small number of mentally and physically helpless children of Civil War, Indian wars, and Spanish War veterans, including the Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion and the Regular Establishment, where service was prior to April 21, 1898.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this bill comes out of our committee with unanimous approval, and it also has the endorsement of the Veterans' Administration as well as the veterans.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter pension under the general and service pension laws pertaining to service prior to April 21, 1898, and under the laws reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, shall be allowed to or for any person otherwise entitled as a physically or mentally helpless child regardless of his or her age at the time of death of the veteran or date of filing claim: *Provided*, That such person was insane, idiotic, or otherwise physically or mentally helpless at the date of attaining the age of 16 years and the helpless condition exists at the date of filing claim. Payments of pension shall continue during the period of helplessness, except that payments shall be discontinued as of the date preceding the marriage of a helpless child, and when pension is properly discontinued by reason of marriage it shall not thereafter be recommenced. This act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS — PHILIPPINE UPRISINGS AND CAMPAIGNS FROM JULY 6, 1902, TO DECEMBER 31, 1913

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4099) to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913, and I ask that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and veterans regulations as amended, or laws reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as amended, the Philippine Insurrection shall be deemed to have extended from August 13, 1898, to July 4, 1902, both dates inclusive: *Provided*, That where there was active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in the hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, the dates herein stated shall extend to December 31, 1913.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "have", strike out the word "extended."

Page 1, strike out all of line 8.

Page 2, line 1, strike out "sive" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "ended July 4, 1902."

Page 2, line 4, after the second word "the", strike out the word "dates", and insert in lieu thereof the word "date."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point on the bill that was just passed and to include therein a letter I received from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN] relative to the bill H. R. 4099, and the report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1944.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Invalid Pensions, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The following is a suggestion which I have received from a Spanish War veteran, relative to your bill, H. R. 4099:

"It should state provinces not province. There are several provinces in those islands named in the bill. Also include both the Moro and Pulajane campaigns.

"I should include all the Philippine Islands, and not restrict this service to any designated territory, as there was lots of fighting, or some at least in most all islands. They seem to be determined to leave out the Pulajane campaigns, for some reason unknown to me."

Any consideration given this suggestion and amendment, if desirable and needed, will be appreciated.

Kindest regards.

Very cordially yours,
HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Member of Congress.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, March 16, 1944.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Invalid Pensions, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LESINSKI: Reference is made to your letter dated March 11, 1944, transmitting a letter dated March 8, 1944, received from Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN, recommending certain proposed changes in H. R. 4099, Seventy-eighth Congress, "A bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913," concerning which you desire the views of the Veterans' Administration.

Congressman HAGEN suggests that the word "provinces" be used in the bill in lieu of the word "province" as there are several provinces in the islands named in the bill and that the Moro and Pulajane campaigns should be included. He further suggests that all the Philippine Islands should be included in the bill as there was some fighting in most all of the islands. It appears to be his understanding that the Pulajane compaigns are excluded from the provisions of the bill.

The Philippine Archipelago, which was acquired by the United States under the treaty with the Kingdom of Spain concluded April 11, 1899, comprises numerous provinces lying within the following line:

"A line running from west to east along or near the twentieth parallel of north latitude, and through the middle of the navigable channel of Bachi, from the one hundred and eighteenth to the one hundred and twenty-seventh degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, thence along the one hundred and twenty-seventh degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich to the parallel of four degrees and forty-five minutes north latitude, thence along the parallel of four degrees and forty-five minutes north latitude to its intersection with the meridian of longitude one hundred and nineteen degrees and thirty-five minutes east of Greenwich, thence along the meridian of longitude one hundred and nineteen degrees and thirty-five minutes east of Greenwich to the parallel of latitude seven degrees and forty minutes north, thence along the parallel of latitude seven degrees and forty minutes north to its intersection with the one hundred and sixteenth degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, thence by a direct line to the intersection of the tenth degree parallel of north latitude with the one hundred and eighteenth degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, and thence along the one hundred and eighteenth degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich to the point of beginning."

As previously pointed out in the report on H. R. 4099, dated March 8, 1944, the Philippine Insurrection was declared to be at an end and peace to have been established in all parts of the Philippine Archipelago except in the territory occupied by the Moro Tribes, by the President's proclamation dated July 4, 1902 (32 Stat. 2014). The territory occupied by the Moro Tribes included a number of southern islands in the Philippine Archipelago and is specifically defined by metes and bounds in section 1 of Act No. 787 of the Philippine Commission, "An act providing for the organization and government of the Moro Province," approved June 1, 1903, which reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. All that part of the island of Mindanao and its adjacent islands lying west or south of a boundary line beginning at a point on the north coast of Mindanao at Point Balato, 1 mile west of the western boundary of the barrio of Naburos, thence running due south to the middle of the channel of the Mipangi River, thence along said river to its mouth in Panquil Bay, thence along the south shore of Panquil Bay in an easterly and northeasterly direction to the south shore of Iligan Bay, thence along the southern and southeastern shore of Iligan Bay in an easterly and northeasterly direction to Salinbal Point, about 7 miles north of the stone pier in Iligan, and thence from Salinbal Point due east to the crest of the watershed dividing the waters which flow into Iligan Bay from those flowing into Macajalar Bay, thence in a southerly direction along the crest of said watershed to the eighth parallel of north latitude, thence east along the eighth parallel of north latitude to the eastern shore of Mindanao, together with the Sulu Archipelago, including the islands known as the Jolo group, the Tawi Tawi

group, and all other islands pertaining to the Philippine Archipelago under the sovereignty of the United States of America south of the eighth parallel of north latitude, excepting therefrom the islands of Paragua and of Balabac, and the immediately adjacent islands, but including the island of Cagayan Sulu, shall constitute the Moro Province, and shall be governed as hereinafter provided."

In referring to the Moro Province, comprising the areas above defined, it would seem inaccurate to use the word "provinces," although several provinces of the Philippine Islands may be included within the Moro Province, such as Jolo, part of Mindanao, Sulu, etc.

The purpose of H. R. 1358 and H. R. 1512, and of similar bills introduced in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses, was to grant service pension and the same privileges of hospitalization and medical treatment accorded to honorably discharged veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, and World War No. 1 to persons and the dependents of persons who served a required number of days in any military or naval establishment of the United States and who were honorably discharged therefrom when such service or any part thereof was rendered in certain southern islands of the Philippines, viz., Samar, Leyte, Jolo, or Mindanao in those campaigns against the Pulajane or Moro natives or their allied tribesmen between July 16, 1903, and December 31, 1913, recognized by the War Department in the issue of the Philippine campaign medal.

In the report to the committee dated July 8, 1943 on H. R. 1358, Seventy-eighth Congress, the service recognized in the issue of the Philippine Campaign Medal is set forth at length. All such service is covered by existing law or H. R. 4099, except that designated in Army Regulations No. 600-65, section I, paragraph 6g (5) "In the field against an enemy in any action in which there were killed or wounded on the side of the United States troops participating." This general provision has no relation to any particular time or particular campaign or expedition in which troops of the United States may have been engaged in hostilities in the Philippine Islands.

Operations between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913, against hostile Moros, or their allied tribesmen in the Moro Province, or in that part of Mindanao not included in the Moro Province, and against the Pulajanes in the islands of Samar and Leyte, or against any hostile tribesmen in any of the areas mentioned are covered by H. R. 4099.

As the bill covers all of the area in the Philippine Archipelago in which military or naval forces of the United States are known to have been engaged in hostilities during the period July 5, 1902, to December 31, 1903, and includes both the Moro and Pulajane campaigns, no further modification of the bill in its present form is indicated.

The original letter of Congressman HAGEN is returned.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have inquired whether or not the pending veterans' legislation will be taken up for passage this week in case we conclude our hearings and our work on that bill in executive session. Therefore I would like to ask the Chair about the effect of this commitment which I find on page 3006 of the RECORD of March 23, at which time an inquiry was made whether or not there would be any legislation taken up this week which required a roll call and, as I understand it, the response was that there would not be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair was acting at that time in his capacity as majority leader, and because of the fact that he is occupying the Chair at the present time, I think the inquiry should be answered rather not as a parliamentary matter, but as an inquiry.

The present occupant of the chair calls attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Thursday, page 3006, in which, in response to a question by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], as to the program for next week, I announced the program. I stated at that time that the O'Hara bill would be taken up on Monday; that on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday we would take up the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works and the bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service.

I further stated:

Then if the Rules Committee reports out a resolution creating a post-war military committee, that bill will be taken up also. I have no knowledge now of any other bill for next week.

Then the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] entered the colloquy and referred to several requests made of the Committee on Rules for hearings on several resolutions and bills reported by various committees which his committee had original jurisdiction over.

I answered:

I cannot put that on the program before next week.

Then the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] inquired about the admirals' bill of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Then I made the statement:

What I have announced now will be the program for the coming week. Any other bills that are disposed of will have to be handled by unanimous consent.

Then the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] said:

Then it is the purpose to recess about the 30th until after Easter?

To which I replied:

It is the purpose then to recess—Thursday or Friday, Friday at the latest, but the strong hope is Thursday—until a week from the following Tuesday, which I think will be April 11. There will be no legislation scheduled for the 11th or 12th, but it is the purpose to bring up the naval appropriations bill on the 13th.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, if we get this bill out and get it to the floor of the House and get it taken up for consideration, it will have to be by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with that statement; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the reason I am asking is that there are so many Members away now and so many preparing to go, and they keep pressing me to know whether or not we can get this bill up this week in case we can get it reported out of the committee.

I just wanted to get the parliamentary situation explained for the Members of the House at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair will never knowingly take any action other than the statement that the present occupant of the chair, the majority leader, makes to the House.

In the light of the existing conditions, without going beyond what I have said, the Chair will state that as soon as the bill is reported out of committee—it being evident that the bill cannot be reported out of committee and acted upon before the recess—as soon as the bill is reported out of committee and as quickly as possible after the recess the present occupant of the chair will bring it up for consideration of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would much prefer that it be simply a further inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. A further inquiry. Would it be possible, if we were to get this bill out the latter part of the week, to take it up under a suspension of the rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A motion to suspend the rules would not be in order until the next Consent Calendar day anyway. Only by unanimous consent would it otherwise be in order for the Chair to recognize a Member for the purpose of moving to suspend the rules.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, no matter what course I take, I would have to get it up by unanimous consent, if at all?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the gentleman has asked permission for the committee to hold afternoon sessions.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A number of Members of Congress have asked to be heard, and the committee felt it was their right to be heard.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Many of them have some very fine amendments to suggest.

Mr. RANKIN. Not only Members of Congress have asked to be heard, but representatives of the accredited veterans' organizations. General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, has asked to be heard, as well as representatives of the War and Navy Departments.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is very important, I think, that the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy appear before the committee and tell us about their vocational training and what they are actually doing.

Mr. RANKIN. We members of the committee are willing to work morning and afternoon in order to get this meas-

ure through and get it to the floor of the House as quickly as possible.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And night, if necessary.

Mr. RANKIN. And night, if necessary. We certainly want to do it in a systematic way so that we will have legislation that the House can afford to pass.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I think I can ease the mind of the gentleman from Mississippi by saying that I am satisfied the Rules Committee will act upon the application for a special rule for this bill within a few hours after that committee has reported the bill. I got that assurance from the membership of the Rules Committee, and I shall call a meeting immediately, the moment I am informed that the gentleman's committee, or the committee having jurisdiction, has made a favorable report on the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I will address my inquiry a step further. If we should report the bill out and get a rule provided, would we then still have to have unanimous consent before it would be taken up for consideration?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes. The committee has voted, as the chairman has stated, unanimously to hold hearings on the bill. If a bill is reported out before the recess, in accordance with the statement made by the present occupant of the chair, acting as majority leader, the situation is such that it would, in my mind, have to be brought up by unanimous consent.

Does that answer the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

JOHN W. BOOTH III—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 517)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 2993, a bill for the relief of John W. Booth III.

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $5,000 to John W. Booth III, of Mansfield, La., in settlement of his claims against the United States by reason of personal injuries sustained when the automobile which he was driving was involved in a collision with an Army truck near Mansfield, La., on or about August 13, 1941.

The record shows that the claimant was hospitalized for about 45 days, that 1 month after having been discharged from the hospital he enlisted at Barksdale Field as an aviation cadet, that he was found physically disqualified for flying duty, that a medical examination on May 25, 1942, by the claimant's physician showed that the claimant's left eyeball was slightly recessed which caused dimness of vision or double vision under certain circumstances, but that such conditions frequently follow a traumatic injury and have a tendency to improve spontaneously and that such improvement was expected in this case, and that the claimant recovered from the injuries sufficiently to be accepted as an apprentice seaman in the United States Navy on July 2, 1942, where he is now serving.

The evidence of record indicates that while the Army driver may have been negligent to some extent in making a left turn in front of the privately owned vehicle, the driver of that vehicle was much more negligent in operating it at an excessive rate of speed, estimated by one witness at 85 miles per hour. But even if the Government were to assume liability for the accident, the fact of the claimant's early recovery and present service in the United States Navy would indicate that the amount of the proposed payment of $5,000 would be excessive.

I regret, therefore, that I find it necessary to return the bill without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 27, 1944.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

PREVENTING MULTIPLE STATE INCOME TAXES ON SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 451 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3592) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after I have concluded my remarks explaining what the rule aims to do, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

As you have heard, the rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, the bill thereafter to be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and the rule was unanimously granted by the Committee on Rules.

All this bill aims to do is to eliminate a double or, in some instances, a triple income tax on Government employees, those who for business or other reasons are obliged to change their domicile. I believe it to be legislation in the right direction. It has the approval of the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, of Mr. McNutt, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, and of Mr. John L. Sullivan, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, and, also, I think, of Mr. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General.

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Federal employees from multiple State income taxes on their salaries and to permit only the State in which such employee is domiciled to levy such tax.

It appears that many Federal employees who would normally be stationed in the District of Columbia, because of the abnormally crowded conditions in the District of Columbia have been required to work in other taxing jurisdictions. These conditions have accentuated the problem of multiple State income taxation. However, according to the advice of the Attorney General, since 1939, numerous cases have arisen in which a person employed by the United States and stationed in a State other than the State of his domicile has been subjected to an income tax by each of the States involved. It is recognized also that there are probably numerous individuals other than Federal officers and employees who may be temporarily sojourning for business reasons in a State other than that of their domicile and who are, therefore, subjected to a multiple taxation on their incomes.

Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in *Graves* v. *New York ex rel. O'Keefe* (306 U. S. 466 (1938)), salaries of Federal officers and employees were deemed immune from taxation under State income-tax laws. The O'Keefe case held, however, that such an implied immunity did not exist, although the Court indicated that the Congress could grant such an immunity in order to protect agents of the Federal Government from State burdens.

The bill under consideration would qualify the foregoing consent by adding a provision to the 1939 act to the effect that the compensation of an officer or employee of the United States shall be subject to State tax only in the State in which such officer or employee is domiciled.

Section 1 of the bill proposes to amend the Judicial Code by conferring on United States district courts jurisdiction of all actions involving the liability of any Federal officer or employee for State income taxes if the claim of domicile on the part of such officer or employee is disputed by the State.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman who introduced the bill, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], is thoroughly informed in the matter. He drafted the bill and succeeded in having it reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and therefore possesses more information and knowledge concerning the provisions of the bill which I feel he is in position to impart to the House in

a more understanding and concise manner than I possibly can. Therefore, I shall later yield to him to explain in detail the effect of the provisions of the bill and the need for the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has made a statement as to the general purpose of this bill. I quite concur in his view that the author of the bill is best qualified to explain the technicalities of the bill. Therefore, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this is an unselfish legislative attempt to the approach of the increasing problem of multiple taxation. I am informed the bill has been unanimously reported, as amended, from the Judiciary Committee, and unanimously reported by the Rules Committee to the House.

The practical situation in which the average Government employee finds herself is this: The average employee enters the Government service at a small salary. She comes from a State wherein there is a State income tax. It is her domicile. She intends to and does consider the State she has left as her home.

She finds herself a room in the District of Columbia. She may be sent to work either in the State of Virginia, for instance in the Pentagon Building, or to one of the Government establishments in Maryland, or some other location.

After a short time she receives a notice to pay the District of Columbia income tax. Then she receives notice to pay income taxes in either the State of Virginia or the State of Maryland. She also receives notice to pay her income taxes from the State of her domicile. She pays her home State tax. She disputes the tax of the District of Columbia; it is a small tax, maybe $25, maybe $50. She cannot afford to litigate. The same is true of the State of Virginia or Maryland. As a result she is or may be compelled to pay at least three State income taxes. She cannot afford to litigate it.

Let me call your attention to one further step in the matter of income tax, which is the situation that has been developed in the city of Philadelphia. In the year 1939, the city of Philadelphia passed an ordinance under the authority of the so-called Sterling Act of that State, to add a salary or wage tax to any person who works within the city of Philadelphia whether they are residents or nonresidents. There are literally thousands of people from the State of New Jersey and Delaware who travel back and forth between their State and the city of Philadelphia to work. Their tax is imposed upon them, although they have no use or benefit of the facilities of that city.

Now, it is perfectly right and proper that the Government employee should pay the income tax in her home State. It is rather shocking that she has to pay the District of Columbia and the Virginia or Maryland tax, in one of the examples I have cited.

The question is a Federal question. Without desiring in any way to offend anyone's feelings, the State courts have a tendency—and it is a psychological one—to support their own laws, and they have a tendency to support the taxing authorities of their own State.

The proponents of this measure feel that the general rule as to domicile is the proper rule.

This condition exists as to any other people who are not employed by the Federal Government, but the Federal Government saw fit to announce the rule that employees should be subject to taxation, and, of course, it can, if it desires, determine whether the salaries of these employees shall be subject altogether or in part or in certain circumstances to State income taxation.

It is suggested in the report of the Attorney General that there are many people besides the Federal employees who occupy the same unfortunate position. To me that is not an answer to the problem nor an objection to the bill. If there is an admitted wrong and admittted injustice to any group of people, it is no argument against the relief of a portion of that group that it is beyond your power to relieve all of them. It would be my personal desire to relieve all people who are victims of an admitted wrong. In this case there is a serious question in my mind whether the United States Government can interfere with the State income taxes to such an extent that it would take care of those individuals who are not officers or employees of the United States Government.

The Congress has seen fit by legislative act to make the income of its officers and employees subject to State income tax. The United States does have an interest in that the money being advanced to employees of the United States is being subjected to an additional tax burden. This is the constitutional basis for the act. If we get beyond that, then I think we get beyond the power of the Federal Government.

In considering the provisions of this bill we must first consider that if you provided a bill which simply gave a taxpayer his remedy in court, then the bill would not do any good, because the amounts involved are too small, with many of the taxpayers. There are a few exceptions, I suppose, where officers or employees get large salaries, but those with which I am concerned are the many Federal employees who get a small salary. If we simply relegate them to the courts for relief, then you have no relief; because in most instances the costs are too high.

The bill provides that the domicile of the employee shall be the State which he declares to be his domicile. Now of course that standing alone would open the door to people simply selecting a State with the lowest tax rate, or selecting a State which did not have an income tax at all, as their domicile, thereby defeating the States of Virginia and Maryland or the District of Columbia. This bill guards against that in two ways; in the first place, it provides that the employee shall not or may not select as his domicile any State except the State from which he came; that State must have been the one. On page 2 of the bill, if you will look at line 18, it reads:

> *Provided*, That he shall have acquired a domicile in such State, under the laws of such State, prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed.

It is not going to be a loophole for the evasive, for it is provided in the bill, as follows:

> Such declaration must be made in writing under oath to the authority whose duty it is to assess, levy, or collect such taxes and the time for filing such declaration shall not expire until 60 days after a written demand for payment of such tax shall have been received by such officer or employee.

The above provision requires the officer or employee of the Federal Government to make such declaration under oath. If such declaration is false, he is perjuring himself and subjecting himself to serious criminal prosecution for perjury. The provision also makes plain that he is entitled to and should receive some notice from the taxing authority claiming the tax, and fixes definitely the time in which such declaration must be filed with the taxing authority. It is customary for the taxing authority to give written notice to pay the tax.

While usually State laws do not require that each individual taxpayer be notified of the amount of his tax, some State statutes require such a notice and, even though not required by statute, a notice or bill for taxes is usually sent to the taxpayer as a part of the administrative procedure in collecting taxes. The procedure varies, of course, for each State.

The evil we seek to prevent is that a Federal employee might be foreclosed from filing a declaration of domicile without having been aware that a tax has been claimed on his Federal compensation. It is believed that this can be avoided without interfering with established State practice.

This would not require a State to alter its normal procedure, yet it would protect the Federal employee. He would not lose his right to declare his domicile solely through lack of knowledge that a tax had been levied against him. As a practical matter, at some time or other in the process of attempting to collect a tax a written demand, tax bill, or notice is almost universally given to the person against whom the tax is assessed, whether or not required by statute.

Under the common law there is a distinction between "domicile" and "residence." The domicile of a citizen may be in one State and his residence in an-

other, although they are generally in the same place.

"Domicile" originates from the Latin "domus," meaning "home."

It is customary to distinguish between residence and domicile on the ground that any place of abode or dwelling place constitutes a residence, however temporary it may be, while the term "domicile" relates rather to the legal residence of a person, or his home in contemplation of law.

As a result, one may be a resident of one jurisdiction although having a domicile in another.

It is generally considered under the common law that domicile is not synonymous with residence. It is not generally synonymous when considered by the courts of the various States. In some States for certain purposes domicile and residence are synonymous, but in treating domicile as considered in this bill domicile is intended to be the legal residence of the person, coupled with the intent to make that place his home.

The very problem of this triple taxation was considered and feared and vigorously protested in the Congress when the District income tax law was being enacted and expressions in the debates leave no doubt that Congress never intended such a result.

My colleague, Congressman BATES, one of the House conferees, said:

> We raised that particular point because we are much concerned about how those who come from our States would be affected by the income-tax provisions of the new law, and it was distinctly understood that in this bill there should be no triple taxation (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 8973).

THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO REMEDY THE WRONG

Insofar as the bill affects the District of Columbia, it is needless to point out that Congress has plenary control.

As to the authority of Congress with reference to State taxes, the theory of the bill is that triple taxation of employees of the United States is an indirect burden on the Government of the United States and that Congress may properly legislate to prohibit such a burden. It is well known that for physical, geographical, and other reasons all of the employees of the United States at the seat of government cannot find living quarters within the District of Columbia. It is also a recognized fact that scattered throughout the whole United States there are employees of the United States who are compelled to live for long or short periods of time in States other than their real homes. If these persons are to be protected in their right to retain citizenship in their States of domicile, they must assume the concomitant liability to pay income tax in their home States. It follows that if they are taxed also within the States of their temporary abode, they are in effect being subjected to an additional price for the enjoyment of their right to State citizenship.

It is apparent that the salaries of Government employees must be controlled by the economic necessities of such employees and that triple taxation of the income of employees must be reflected, however remotely, in the compensation to be paid them. The morale of employees is likewise affected and, as can be seen, public employment in many instances carries with it this penalty, making a Government job to that extent less attractive. Congress would be fully justified, therefore, in declaring that such triple taxation indirectly and ultimately is a burden on the Federal Government. If there is any doubt on the question at all, the doubt is whether Congress can permit taxation of Federal salaries by the States; not whether it can exempt them. At least, that is the question which most seriously troubled Congress when it passed the act of April 12, 1939—53 Statutes 574, the act which consented to State taxation of Federal salaries—see volume 84, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 1298 to 1332.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

SIGNIFICANCE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VERSUS MURPHY AND GRAVES VERSUS NEW YORK EX REL. O'KEEFE

Mr. O'HARA. There are two recent cases of some significance in connection with this bill. The case of *District of Columbia* v. *Murphy* (314 U. S. 441), decided December 15, 1941, concerned an employee of the Treasury Department who had come to the District of Columbia from Michigan. He contended he was domiciled in Michigan and, therefore, was not liable to tax on his income by the District of Columbia. The taxing authorities of the District of Columbia insisted that he was domiciled in the District within the meaning of the District of Columbia Income Tax Act—53 Statutes 1087. The Board of Tax Appeals received considerable evidence bearing upon the subject and found "as a fact" that the respondent had formed an intention to remain and make his home in the District for an indefinite period of time but held that "as a matter of law" he was not domiciled in the District.

The court of appeals affirmed the decision of the Board of Tax Appeals. The Supreme Court held that, although the act did not define the word "domicile," which was the basis of the tax liability, its congressional history made it clear that a man does not acquire a domicile in the District simply by coming here to live for an indefinite period of time while in the Government service. It held that his living here, however, may properly be taken to be his domicile until facts are adduced to establish the contrary and that the taxing authority is warranted in treating as prima facie taxable any person quartered in the District on the tax day, whose status the taxing authority deems doubtful.

The Court followed the general rule as to the necessity of intent and indicated a large number of circumstances which might reflect intent. It did not prescribe any formula by which these facts might be weighed or given value. On the contrary, it stated that its mention of these various items as being relevant must not be taken as any indication of the relative weight to be attached to them or as an effort to suggest a formula to handle all cases, or as an effort to suggest the possibility of devising a formula. But it did say significantly "in view of the legislative history showing that Congress was concerned lest there be triple taxation—Federal, State, and District—the Board should consider whether taxes similar in character to those laid by this act have been paid elsewhere."

The case was remanded with directions to the Board for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion.

It will be noted that the case more or less restates with elaboration the common law doctrines guiding the determination of domicile and, in some respects, suggests that removal to Washington, D. C., for employment in the Federal service is of less significance than would be a removal to other places where that purpose was not present. The case makes the problem of the Federal employee difficult, however, because it asserts that the taxing authority is warranted in treating as prima facie taxable any person quartered in the District on tax day whose status it deems doubtful. It is an inducement to the taxing authorities to rule against every person and to compel him to assume the expensive and usually prohibitive burden of upsetting the ruling.

A second case is *Graves* v. *New York ex rel. O'Keefe* (306 U. S. 466), decided March 27, 1939. In that case an employee of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation claimed immunity from the State income tax in New York upon the ground that such tax placed an unconstitutional burden upon the Federal Government. The Court very carefully avoided passing upon any question except the one which was vital. It assumed for the purpose of the case that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was such an instrumentality as would make its activities immune from State tax. It said that in that case it need not be determined whether the power of Congress to grant tax exemptions, as an incident to the exercise of its known powers, extends beyond the constitutional immunity of Federal agencies which courts have implied (p. 478). And it carefully limited its opinion to the assertion that Congress had given no intimation that it intended to grant or withhold immunity from State taxation of the salary of the Corporation's employees and that since Congress was silent on the matter, the congressional intention could not be gathered from the statute by implication. The Court said:

> Whatever scope this may give to the National Government to claim immunity from State taxation of all instrumentalities which it may constitutionally create, and whatever authority Congress may possess as incidental to the exercise of its delegated powers to grant or withhold immunity from State taxation, Congress has not sought in this case to exercise such power.

In a concurring opinion, Mr. Justice Frankfurter specifically states that the question whether or not Congress by express legislation may grant immunity is a matter to be determined when occasion arises.

The Court was dealing with an agency which itself had been expressly exempted from taxation and the question was whether or not, in the absence of an express declaration by Congress, the employees of the agency were likewise exempt. The case did not decide that employees of the United States itself were subject to State taxation and those circumstances presumably had something to do with the fact that Congress by the act of 1939 specifically made the salaries of employees of the United States subject to State taxation.

Moreover, the fact that Congress expressly made the salaries of Government employees subject to State taxation shows that Congress was of the opinion that it had the discretion to determine whether or not the salaries of employees of the United States might be subject to State taxation.

So far as the Graves case is concerned, it neither affirms nor denies the power of Congress to declare that salaries of Federal employees shall be immune from State taxation. It merely reserves that question for determination when it arises. On the other hand, there can be no question that the decision recognizes that, if a State tax is a burden on the Federal Government, the Congress has the right to proscribe it; and that, if Congress specifically determines that a given State tax is a burden upon the Federal Government, the Court will not make an independent effort to review the correctness of that determination. It seems more likely that such a determination would fall within the realm of political questions which the courts may not consider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. BECKWITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for the same purpose?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a portion of a column from the National Legionnaire of March 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PREVENTING MULTIPLE STATE INCOME TAXES ON SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is up to us as the Congress of the United States to declare by this act the limitation, which we as the Congress have a right to declare, upon the burden which may be necessarily or unnecessarily imposed upon employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Let me at the outset say that the purposes of the bill are both commendable and desirable.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. But does not the bill as drawn go beyond that by setting up two loopholes through which Federal employees can avoid the payment of an income tax? The first loophole would be created, I think, by the provision, on page 2, line 16, reading as follows:

> For the purpose of this act, the domicile of such officer or employee shall be in the State which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile.

This means that the employee can select as his domicile a State that has no income tax or a State which has a very low income tax. The gentleman from Minnesota stated in his remarks that that was offset by the following proviso:

> *Provided*, That he shall have acquired a domicile in such State, under the laws of such State, prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed.

Will the gentleman be kind enough to interpret this proviso which would indicate that an employee has to come from that State in order to declare that State as his domicile?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; the language specifically states:

> That he shall have acquired a domicile in that State under the laws of that State prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. But in order to acquire domicile under this he would not have to go through a formal action but just pick out a State in which he would like to be domiciled because of favorable tax laws.

Mr. O'HARA. I believe the gentleman misconstrues the effect of the language.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that different States have different requirements.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. As an example, if I accept service in the Government here in Washington, I might say I should like to have Connecticut as my domicile. I would not have to do anything else.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman from Maryland uses Connecticut as an example of a State in which to establish legal domicile. I believe we in Connecticut use the word "settlement" as synonymous with the word "domicile." In Connecticut we have a requirement that to acquire a legal settlement a person must reside there 4 years. The gentleman, therefore, would have to make long preparation in order to avoid a year's taxes by claiming that State.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman, of course, recognizes the evil to which this bill is directed.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Yes, unquestionably; and I am with the gentleman 100 percent.

Mr. O'HARA. I do not see how we can accomplish it in any other way; it is all part of the same sentence.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Why not say it in so many words?

Mr. O'HARA. We do. We go even further and provide that if a person claims the State which is not the State of his domicile he shall be subject to a charge of perjury, which is a very serious offense.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. This bill does not say that I must select as my domicile the State from which I happen to come to accept employment as a Federal employee.

Mr. O'HARA. I do not see how we can make it any more clear.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. I think it could be improved by indicating that it should be the State from which the employee came. That would be fine.

Now, as to the second loophole. In the original bill there was a provision on page 3, line 3, as follows:

> In the event the compensation of such officer or employee shall not be subject to tax in the State of his domicile as herein defined, such compensation shall not be immune from taxation in any other State in which, except for the immunity conferred by this act, it may be lawfully subject to a State tax.

Based on that premise, normally, the residence of an employee should be the taxing jurisdiction because while he resides there the employee receives all the benefits of Government service.

Mr. O'HARA. Not necessarily.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. We have 5,000 in Maryland in one department who live in Maryland.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the great number of employees in Bethesda and other nearby places who work there but live in the District. The Maryland authorities are taxing them there right along.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. No.

Mr. O'HARA. Oh, yes; they are.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. If they are a bill should be passed to prohibit that kind of tax.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me answer the gentleman. It is my understanding that the committee struck that out because they felt it was in contradiction to the fundamental purpose of the bill. Then we say, in other words when we strike that out, we do not recognize it if it is not an income tax by domicile.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. If the amendment striking through the provision just read would prevail, is it not true that the Federal employee would be the only class having the advantage over other citizens in not having to pay an income tax in the State of his residence, where he receives all the benefits of governmental services, schools, fire protection, police protection, and so forth?

Mr. O'HARA. Please do not take up all of my time.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman says that because there is an evil which affects one class only that that evil should go on.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. I say it should be rectified.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think this is timely legislation. I have had a number of inquiries from Wisconsin folks who are temporarily residents of the District of Columbia who complain about this double taxation. May I ask the gentleman how many people, in his opinion, are affected by the legislation?

Mr. O'HARA. I suppose there are many thousands of them. There are perhaps several millions of employees of the Federal Government from all over the country working here in various capacities.

Mr. McCONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. As I understand, there might be an amendment added regarding taxation by local subdivisions rather than just State taxes?

Mr. O'HARA. Someone spoke to me about that, but I do not intend to offer such an amendment.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman is not going to offer such an amendment?

Mr. O'HARA. No.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman mentioned the Philadelphia wage tax.

Mr. O'HARA. That is right.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is what I had in mind. That would be a political subdivision tax rather than a State tax.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes. That comes under the Sterling tax.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I was going to ask the same question the gentleman from Wisconsin asked, How many people would it affect within the District of Columbia?

Mr. O'HARA. That I cannot answer.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, we do not want double taxation imposed upon our constituents who happen to live here temporarily. I do not see anything in the hearings with reference to whether or not the gentleman's committee gave attention to how this is going to affect the District of Columbia treasury which has been collecting taxes from many of these Government employees. Would that in any way affect the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia—the contribution which we make every year amounting to about $6,000,000? Would it result in their requesting an increase in that Federal contribution?

Mr. O'HARA. I may say to the gentleman I think the situation is that if that contingency does arise it would be better to do it on a fair basis rather than try to impose a penalty upon somebody.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4163) to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes, Union Calendar No. 409, and which is also on the Consent Calendar, be recommitted to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I may say that I have spoken to some of the Members on the Republican side that I could contact and on my side, and we are agreed in this action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

PREVENTING MULTIPLE STATE INCOME TAXES ON SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I feel obliged to call attention and to earnestly urge that the gentlemen who have taken so much of the time of the House in discussing Mr. Walter Winchell should desist in doing so in the future. Just a few minutes ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] apprised the House that he would introduce resolutions directing the Department of Justice to furnish information concerning two employees of Mr. Winchell's sponsor, the Jergens Co. It would appear to me that instead of Winchell being criticized, he should be commended by reason of calling the attention of the employer to the questionable activities of the employees in question. Please understand, and I repeat what I stated several weeks ago, I hold no brief for Mr. Winchell, but on the occasion of the times that I have listened to his broadcasts I have not fully agreed to some of his statements, but I must admit that in nearly all instances he has sought to direct attention to those advocating un-American and subversive activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware, from statements made on this floor by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], that Mr. Winchell has frequently criticized the Congress. However with one exception I have never heard him attack the Congress collectively, but on occasions he has replied to individual Members of Congress who have attacked or assailed him on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday I listened to the broadcast of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and only a few minutes ago he asked permission to insert that broadcast, in which he assailed and attacked Mr. Winchell, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Among other things, the gentleman from Texas stated that Mr. Winchell is speaking for and representing an un-American group. On the basis of that statement by the gentleman from Texas, I feel that such charge by him should be investigated, and as chairman of the Committee to Investigate Un-American and Subversive Activities it is within his province to have such investigation made and to ascertain who, if anyone, is financing Mr. Winchell. Personally, I feel that there is nothing to that charge. Nevertheless, let us find out.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] also stated that Mr. Winchell is destroying the prestige of Congress. That to me, saying the least, is a farfetched statement. Congress has, is, and will be judged by its deliberations, whether it is legislating in the best interest of our country or whether it has failed to function, and it will not be judged by a single commentator's statement or statements.

Personally, I know of only one statement made by Mr. Winchell to which I called his attention as unfair and unfortunate. That was when he referred to Congress as the "House of Reprehensibles," and when I learned of it I immediately wrote him taking exception to it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Winchell is not the only commentator who at times has attacked and criticized Congress or its individual Members. I venture to say that there are very few of us that might not have been justified at times to rise to a question of personal privilege to answer unfair criticism and attacks not only by commentators but by columnists, magazine writers, and even newspaper correspondents. However, if we were to answer them so much time of the House would be taken up that little time would be left for legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it must be conceded by us that Mr. Winchell has been frequently assailed and attacked on this floor and he has been subject to vile and vicious name calling. Naturally, therefore, he feels that he has a right, not having the privilege of the floor, to answer and retaliate against those who assail and attack him.

This is my thirty-eighth year of service in Congress and I regret that I am obliged to say that in no prior Congress in my period of service has so much time been taken in discussing any person as given to Mr. Winchell. It behooves me that it would not only be in the interest of the Congress but in the interest of the Members whom Mr. Winchell has answered that both sides would cease in this diatribe. I feel that Mr. Winchell if left alone will in turn desist in replying to the attacks levelled against

him, but if the vile and vicious name calling continues on the floor he will, in justice, defend himself and by the resulting publicity you will make him the most advertised man in the United States.

Personally, though, Mr. Winchell may have gone far afield in his criticism, nevertheless, he has rendered actual, valuable service to the country. He has directed attention to many men who have been charged with sedition, some of whom have been convicted, some of whom have been indicted, and others who have not yet been reached by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In that connection, I doubt the statement to the effect that he obtained information from the Federal Bureau of Investigation bearing on seditious and subversive activities as anyone familiar with the practice and procedure of that organization knows that it is not within the province of that organization to divulge any information with respect to any of its investigations. It is quite possible that Mr. Winchell obtained information from some of the Dies' committee reports—evidence which Mr. DIES, himself, states has been in possession of his committee since 1939. An abundance of this evidence concerned Nazi and bund activities and the leaders of these organizations, but somehow or other was not given publicity as was the so-called communistic activities or, perhaps, was not reported to the Department of Justice. I know that Winchell has been charged with being connected with communistic activities, but this has not been borne out by facts as he on divers occasions has strongly assailed the Communists.

It has been stated frequently by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and, I believe, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] that the Navy has forced Mr. Winchell from the active list of that service. Viewing his picture from one of the newspapers, I would judge him to be at least 45 years of age and, surely, a man of that age cannot render real, active, or combat service. As to officers, God knows we have enough of them, and I feel that the Navy will manage to get along without Winchell.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, if Mr. Winchell is left alone I presume he will have nothing to talk about. Therefore I hope in the future that we will devote our time to legislation and to seeing how we can be helpful in aiding the administration in its war effort and to bringing about an early conclusion of the war so that we may begin legislating on the many, many matters that are pressing us so far as post-war activities are concerned.

As I stated, it is with reluctance that I have asked for these 5 minutes, but I feel that in the interest of the House and in the best interest of the country these things should be eliminated henceforth and that we should not have to listen continuously to these personal attacks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CHILE CELEBRATION OF THE DAY OF THE AMERICAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

SANTIAGO, CHILE, *January 25.*

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA:

I have the honor, in the name of the Chamber of Deputies, to invite your Excellency and a deputation from that body (the House) to attend on the 14th of April next a special meeting at which the Chamber will celebrate the Day of the Americas. The occasion will give opportunity to strengthen the ties of mutual understanding and fraternity of the American peoples.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that the Speaker, pursuant to the invitation extended by the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile, has appointed the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] as members of a committee to attend on the 14th day of April 1944 a solemn session in the Chamber of Deputies of Chile celebrating the Day of the Americas.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news article and an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONDUCT OF THE WAR

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I had 20 minutes reserved for me this afternoon for a special order. My subcommittee is in session, and I would like to vacate that order and ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 74, which calls for the creation of a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War. It is to be composed of 11 Members; 5 from the other body and 6 from the House.

The resolution proposes that it shall be the duty of the committee to counsel, advise, investigate, and cooperate with the President, the heads of departments, and agencies of the Government, military leaders, and other persons engaged in the war effort on all matters and subjects pertaining to the conduct of the war, and to the foreign policy of the United States. Its function, therefore, is to investigate and advise in all matters pertaining to the war and our national policy.

This committee will not engage in carping criticism, and it will not interfere in any degree with military campaigns. It is assumed that able men and women will be appointed to such a committee and it is presumed that it will conduct its business on a high plane and in the best interest of our country.

Mr. Speaker, our sons and daughters are in every part of the world, fighting and dying for us; this Nation is pouring out untold and unprecedented wealth for unknown and uncertain objectives. It is the absolute right, Mr. Speaker, of a free people to be fully informed at all times, and especially in time of war about matters pertaining to the war and national and foreign policy. Yet we know that a tight veil of secrecy surrounds the war activity and matters of national and international import. Conferences have been held by our leaders with those of other nations, in the course of which commitments have been made, but precious little information has leaked through to the people. And what is the result? From all parts of the country come reports that the people are becoming restive and suspicious; there are mutterings of distrust; they want to know the real facts about Pearl Harbor, about the Moscow Conference, the conference at Cairo, and Teheran. Yes, and they want to know about the size of our Army and Navy, and about that so-called second front. They also want to know just how far we are going to expand our own boundaries. Mr. Speaker, as matters stand today, these questions and many, many others are veiled in secrecy, a secrecy that is creating suspicion and distrust, and if continued will lead to national disunity. There must be an end to it; the responsibility rests with the Congress.

Is the proposal for a war committee something new? Indeed not, Mr. Speaker. It is almost as old as the Congress. We have ample historical precedent for it. I make no claim to originality for that would be untrue. But my attention was called to it, and in a search for precedent I found volumes have been written on the subject. Such a committee was set up as early as 1792 to investigate the expedition of General St. Clair against the Indians of the Northwest. Likewise, in 1813, a similar committee was established.

During the Civil War another such committee was appointed. At that time the question was raised: "To what extent, with due regard to the public welfare, may the unprofessional civilian control military policy and decide questions of strategy and tactics?" Now, my resolution does not propose that this special committee shall interfere in any manner with the conduct of a military campaign, but it would have the right to inquire into these matters. Mr. Speaker, it is of utmost importance to the Nation to know how this war is being conducted now, and how it is to be conducted in the future. The people are also entitled to know the import and purpose of all events connected with the waging of the war.

As in the case of the other war committees, this committee is chiefly an investigative body. It will seek to secure the facts in any given situation and report them to the country, consistent, of course, with public safety.

There will be those, in both bodies of Congress, who will doubt the advisability of the establishment of such a committee at this time. There was doubt in 1862 also, but Senator Fessenden, who

at first had serious doubts as to its advisability, finally concluded that such a committee could render a great service to the Nation. In the course of the debate he said:

Sir, I hold the very contrary of the doctrine that we are to leave everything without question, without the slightest complaint, without any inquiry even as to the conduct of this war by the public agents. We know that every day wrongs are perpetrated; we know that the people of this country, the soldiers of this country have, in some instances, been sacrificed without reason; and we do not know how it was done or by whom it was ordered.

But, sir, while there is this agitation in the public mind; while there are so many ideas afloat; so many accusations, unfounded, perhaps, in a very great degree; and no inquiry is made and no step taken to the public in relation to the matter—that public which carries on this war, and which furnishes the means for carrying it on—shall we, who are the agents of that public, be told that during its progress, be it longer or shorter, we know nothing, say nothing, and inquire nothing about it? I hold it to be our bounden duty, impressed upon us by our position here, to keep an anxious, watchful eye over all executive agents who are carrying on the war at the direction of the people, whom we represent and whom we are bound to protect in relation to this matter.

Fessenden was of the opinion that such a committee would redress the balance between the executive and legislative departments, which, because of vast power given to the President as a result of the war, was at that time sadly out of adjustment.

The language used by those men in the Civil War period to justify the creation of a joint committee on the conduct of the war might be used at this time to establish such a committee. Conditions and events are not greatly different, except that at this time they are on a global basis.

There is a rising tide of public resentment, Mr. Speaker, because of the withholding of vital information concerning the conduct of the war. If it continues its present tempo, there will be a resistance to the peace plans as visioned by our leaders and the peace may be in jeopardy and life and treasure gone for naught.

Perhaps the Congress is responsible for the situation that exists today, for we have vested more power in the President than in any other; we have voted huge sums to the Army and Navy without insisting upon a strict accounting; commitments and pledges are made at secret conference without any information about them being passed on to the people. In some strange way "off the record" statements float around Washington and the country, causing suspicion and distrust. One rumor reaches me to the effect that we are now planning to girdle the globe with Army and Navy Air Force stations and docks and that hundred-year leases are in contemplation on these projected sites. Harry Hopkins is reported to be the mastermind in this world development, which includes the perfection of the island of Formosa as a United Nations base for all time. The point, Mr. Speaker, in this connection is that this concerns a matter of national policy, and until the people speak the executive branch of this Government has no right to make any such commitments.

Every day Members of Congress and the press are expressing deep concern about matters connected with the war and our foreign policy. Every day constituents write us asking for information about these vital matters, yet we can give them no satisfactory answers. We must confess that the Congress does not know what is going on. A sorry spectacle, indeed, Mr. Speaker.

We are drifting into a difficult situation; we are building up a public suspicion which threatens the war effort and the peace. We are getting dangerously close to dictatorship, and the people are alarmed. Mr. Speaker, I have gathered many editorials in the past week and I have them here, all dealing with these important subjects and all support the point I make, that there is great concern about the war, about commitments, about our domestic economy, about our foreign policy, and about the peace that must follow victory. Can we, Mr. Speaker, the duly elected Representatives of the people, sit here dumb and inert and fail or refuse to act in this crisis? Are we not derelict in our duty if we leave everything without question, without the slightest complaint, without inquiry of the executive branch as to the conduct of this war? It was well said in 1862, by a Congress that preceded this one, "that it is our bounden duty to keep an anxious, watchful eye over those who carry on this war." We cannot, we must not fail to meet our responsibilities in this matter.

The time for candor is here. The "hush-hush" policy now being used is in disrepute—the public wants no more of it. "Military necessity" is no longer a term to be used to cover or conceal military or civil bungling. As one editor has said so well: "Straightforwardness is the secret of sound public relations."

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 74 will enable the Congress to meet its full responsibility to the Nation. I am confident that it will have a stimulating effect upon home-front morale. This is not a party matter, for the waging of war to final victory is a cooperative effort by all of the people.

House Concurrent Resolution 74

Whereas formulation of our national policy in war and peace is vested in the Congress; and

Whereas important conferences have been held with the leaders of other nations in the course of which commitments have been made as to the conduct of the war and the peace to follow; and

Whereas it is the right of a free people to be fully informed, at all times, about these matters with a minimum of secrecy in order to allay suspicion and distrust which is detrimental to a united war effort; and

Whereas our sons are fighting and dying on battle fronts all over the world, and this Nation is pouring out untold and unprecedented wealth for unknown and uncertain objectives, foreign and domestic: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War and to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to counsel, advise, and cooperate with the President, the heads of departments and agencies of the Government, military leaders, and other persons engaged in the war effort on all matters and subjects pertaining to the conduct of the war (except the conduct of military campaigns) and to the foreign policy of the United States.

SEC. 3. For purposes of the performance of its duties under this resolution, the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) may request from the President, the heads of departments and agencies of the Government, military leaders, and other persons engaged in the war effort, full and complete information with respect to the participation of the United States in the present global war, including such information as to military campaigns as may properly be divulged; and

(2) is authorized to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, from time to time, shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to its activities under this resolution. Such reports shall contain, among other things, (1) such data and information obtained in carrying out its duties as it deems advisable, and (2) such recommendations for legislation or other action as it deems advisable.

COMMITTEES INVESTIGATING THE CONDUCT OF WARS

INVASION AGAINST INDIANS

1. 1792: By a House resolution, passed on March 27, 1792, a committee was appointed to investigate the disaster suffered by General St. Clair in an Indian campaign of 1791.

WAR OF 1812

2. 1813: A House resolution establishing a committee to investigate the causes of recent American defeats was proposed by Mr. Bradley, of Vermont, July 9, 1813. The House refused to pass the measure at that time, asserting that the imminence of session adjournment precluded essential debate on the question. On December 31, 1813, shortly after the opening of the second session of the Thirteenth Congress, the resolution, modified so as to acknwledge the President's right to withhold information, was adopted and a committee was appointed.

CIVIL WAR

3. 1861: The Senate adopted on December 9, 1861, a concurrent resolution to establish a committee to investigate the conduct of the war. On December 10, 1861, the House concurred in the resolution. The committee was reconstituted and strengthened in January 1864.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

4. 1898: Congress relied on the report of the President's Commission, which met first on September 24, 1898, for information about the conduct of the War with Spain. This report, which was not made available until after the brief war's close, was entitled "Report of the Commission Appointed by the

President To Investigate the Conduct of the War Department in the War with Spain," Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900. Eight volumes. The membership of the Commission comprised essentially military figures and did not include Congressmen.

WORLD WAR NO. 1

5. 1919–21: Information of a detailed nature was again lacking until after the close of hostilities. From 1919 through 1921 hearings were held before the House of Representatives Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and before the subcommittees of that committee. Mr. William Johnson Graham, of Illinois, was chairman of the committee.

WORLD WAR NO. 2

6. July 25 to September 26, 1943: The Senate Committee Visiting the War Fronts. Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, was chairman of this committee of five Senators—BREWSTER, CHANDLER, LODGE, MEAD, and RUSSELL—which undertook to inspect the global war fronts.

7. November 1943: House Military Affairs subcommittee investigation of Army air bases in Central and South America and in the Caribbean. The committee, composed of seven men, was headed by Representative BROOKS, of Louisiana. The group spent 2½ weeks in November investigating.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Matthew Woll.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the regular order of business and following any other special orders on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes this afternoon on the political situation in Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a statement which reads:

> The advocacy of armed violence to overthrow our Government constitutes a clear violation of a Federal espionage act. Representative HOFFMAN's past collaboration with convicted Nazi agents and indicted fifth columnists and present close relations—

And so on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks the gentleman has presented a matter of personal privilege and is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr HOFFMAN Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take an hour. I think 10 minutes will be plenty. At no time have I advocated the overthrow of our Government either by force or any other means. I have advocated and I shall continue to urge the ousting of the New Dealers, of the Communists, because I think both are destroying our constitutional government.

I would not take this time were it not for the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has, if I understood him correctly—and if I did not he may correct me now—made an attempt here to condone what has been said over the radio by Walter Winchell.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do.

Mr. SABATH. I have not condoned anything. I have criticized the fact that we are taking altogether too much time with Winchell, and I think it would be for the best interests of Congress and the country if we would ignore anything that he might say if it is not really subversive or to the best interests of the country.

I will say this—I wanted to say this to the gentleman but I omitted it—that I am in favor of the resolution that the gentleman put in to get the information from the Department of State, and if there is anything contained therein that Winchell has said or done in violation of our laws or that in any way affects Congress, I will be more than pleased to cooperate with the gentleman to get action upon it, favorable action from the Department of Justice, to see that any evidence that they may have is submitted to the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman, but I am not asking for information or help from the Department of State. I am today asking the Department of Justice a few questions. I agree with the gentleman that no attention should be paid Mr. Winchell's broadcasts unless he says something which tends to affect the spirit, the courage, the determination of those in the fighting forces or unless he challenges the patriotism or loyalty of a Member of Congress. That is what he has been doing. When Winchell charges that Members of Congress are saboteurs he should be required to publicly prove his charges or action should be taken against him. I ask the gentleman now to listen to this and what I have to say about him.

On July 12, 1942, Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, after referring to the eight saboteurs who were apprehended, asked the radio audience the question: "How about the voters going after those other saboteurs who landed in Congress?" He made that statement. There is no dispute about it. I am reading here from the answer to House Resolution 108. Winchell has charged that after the last election saboteurs landed in Congress. Who were they? Why conceal their names? Winchell knew he was lying when he made the statement.

Mr. SABATH. That was in 1942, was it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. He said the saboteurs, following the election in 1942, landed in Congress. If the gentleman wants to sit quiet under that charge, pay no attention to it, he may do so. I will not, for I know it to be false. So does Winchell. So do his sponsors. So does the Blue Network. So does the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. SABATH. I do not approve of that statement; of course not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right.

Mr. SABATH. I resent it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is chairman of the Rules Committee. For more than a year I have had before that committee—and the gentleman has carried it around—a resolution asking for the investigation of those who were charging the Members of Congress with being saboteurs; with being seditious. If the gentleman wants to sit here and permit some fellow, with a national audience even though he be known nationally as an originator and circulator of malicious falsehoods, to say that the body to which the gentleman belongs has within its membership saboteurs, the gentleman may do it, but I do not propose to let it pass uncontradicted. I do not propose to quit asking that he be called down here and put under oath, or permit the untruthfulness of statement after statement that the man has been making to be left unexposed. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] believes in the integrity, in the loyalty, and in the sincerity of the Members of Congress, as I do, instead of covering up, attempting to condone by indirection what that man Winchell does, he would, I think, lend his influence to a full and fair examination of the facts.

Mr. SABATH. I will say this to the gentleman, no man has oftener stated to the people of this country, here and everywhere, that the membership of the Congress compares favorably with any group of men in the United States and exceeds in loyalty and patriotism any group in the United States, whether they are bankers, whether they are lawyers, or whatever they are.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. I do not contend we are more loyal than others. I do say we are average Americans—no better, no worse than the average man or woman citizen of this country. Did the gentleman ever write to Winchell? Did the gentleman ever write to his sponsors that they demand of him or the broadcasting company which affords him a forum that he quit making false statements? I have never asked that he be taken off the air. All I have asked at any time, all I ask now, is that when he talks about the patriotism of Members of Congress, that he be confined to the truth. Does not the gentleman want that?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I want the truth.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why does not the gentleman write the broadcasting com-

pany that gives him time? Why does the gentleman not ask Winchell, his sponsors, the Jergens Co., to tell the truth instead of falsehoods?

Mr. SABATH. We have many other broadcasters worse than he that are attacking Congress and have been attacking Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who are they? Let the gentleman name them. But Winchell's activities are taking the time of Congress, the gentleman complains. The way to end it is to have the man quit making false charges. Did the gentleman ever from the floor or any place challenge one of Winchell's statements when he charged the Members of Congress with being disloyal? I say, did the gentleman? If the gentleman did, will he tell me when and where?

Mr. SABATH. No, because he never applied that to Congress in general. He applied that to a few Members who have been attacking him. That is unfortunate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. He applied it to the body of which the gentleman is a Member, the body which represents the people of this country. He said there were saboteurs in Congress. If there are, then Congress is either dumb, has been deceived, or is itself disloyal.

Mr. SABATH. He applied it to Congress in general?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, and he said that those who voted for the successful candidates in 1942 were damn fools, and the gentleman has never, according to his own statement, denied the charge of disloyalty. The gentleman has never criticized him. The gentleman condoned that charge against Members of Congress by his silence.

Mr. SABATH. I do not listen to him very often, perhaps once in 6 months.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEFFE. It ought to be perfectly clear, even to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], that when Mr. Winchell makes statements over the air and in his column with reference to this body, the Congress of the United States, and refers to the House of Representatives as the "House of Reprehensibles," he is referring to every man in this Congress, and the gentleman ought to stand up and defend the body that he is a Member of.

Mr. SABATH. As to that very word I have written him and I informed him that he should not make such statements; that it is deplorable and that it will do more harm than good. He had no right to call the House or the Congress the "House of Reprehensibles."

Mr. KEEFE. Very obviously, then, he paid very little attention to the letter of the gentleman from Illinois or anyone else, because in his broadcast last night he reenunciated and reaffirmed every statement that he has ever made on the air, including that statement referring to this body as the "House of Reprehensibles."

The gentleman from Illinois can defend him by indirection if he wants to, but there are some Members of this House who do not intend to remain silent and allow that sort of thing to go on.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the statement the gentleman made here that he had written Winchell, if my ears did not deceive me, it has not been 3 minutes since the gentleman from Illinois said he had never challenged Winchell when he charged Members of Congress with being disloyal.

Mr. SABATH. I never said that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We will see what the stenographer's notes show when he transcribes them. I do not care whether the gentleman did or did not.

Mr. SABATH. I did not, but I have written him that letter. The moment I read it that time, or someone called my attention to it, that he used that as an expression, I felt that it was unfortunate on his part that he should make such a statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, that was unfortunate, was it? I call it dastardly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understood Mr. Winchell correctly last night, he reaffirmed everything he has said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is correct. Mr. Winchell did just that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He said he had no apology to make to anybody anywhere or any place for anything he had said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He stood by everything he has said. He did not take back anything. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the purport, the substance of his statement last night, as I got it. He reaffirmed every charge he had ever made against Congress, against the Members of Congress. So, as a matter of fact, the people who voted for the successful candidates in 1942, in his opinion, are still damn fools, there are still saboteurs in Congress, and Congress is still the "House of Reprehensibles." The gentleman on the Rules Committee can bring out that resolution and let it be adopted by the House, and we will get him down here. And if the committee will permit, I will prove, by his own statements, by his own words, that he is untruthful. As I said a moment ago, and as I have said many a time, let the man say what he will as long as he sticks to the truth. But the effect of his action is now, and has been in the months gone past, to raise in the minds of millions of Americans the thought that their Representatives here in Congress are disloyal. We know very well how that can be used by our enemies for propaganda purposes. His statements are propaganda for Hitler and Hirohito. His lies create discontent and discord among the armed forces as well as here at home. Winchell does not tell the truth; there is no question about it. I will give you just one instance now, and I can produce a dozen of them to show that the truth is not in him. But the Blue Network keeps him on the air to spread discontent; and the Jergens Co., among others, pay for it. Here is one example——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman from Michigan if he stated he wanted to be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I said I did not think I would use an hour. I said I thought I might finish in 10 minutes. I was recognized for an hour, I understand under the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that. The Chair wanted to inform the gentleman that he had consumed 10 minutes.

Mr HOFFMAN Permit me to thank the Speaker. The reason I have taken more than 10 minutes is because last night I was convinced by Mr. Winchell's statement that he thought there should be freedom of speech, at least for him if not for those he slandered, and I want to give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and any other Member of the House who wants to ask any questions, or who wants to add any remarks which would contribute to the truth and perhaps add something to the merits of the discussion, an opportunity to be heard, just as I would advocate the calling of Mr. Winchell and giving him an opportunity to be heard and to be examined. A week ago yesterday he cried and he whined and he whimpered because, he said, he had never been given an opportunity to be confronted by witnesses who made charges against him. He said he had been attacked by Members of Congress without being given a chance to defend himself. When did Winchell ever give anyone an opportunity to be heard before he went on the radio and blackened that man's name, destroyed his good name? Ever? No, never an instance so far as I know. He strikes in the dark. He stabs in the back. When his victims turn on him he squeals like a stuck pig. He is a coward. He is reported to be afraid to travel except with an armed bodyguard. He once, it is reported, paid $90,000 to gangsters he had double-crossed. Let him come down and deny the truth of the charges made against him and do it under oath.

Now to get back to the point where I said I would give you just one instance to prove that Winchell does not tell the truth.

In his column published in the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of September 9, 1943, Winchell wrote, and I quote:

> There was a squib in the paper the other day reporting that the U. S. A. had bought 5,000 copies of John Roy Carlson's exciting book, Under Cover. These were to be sent to spots where a reading of them could do the most good—and it can do plenty.

In writing that statement, Winchell followed his usual deceptive methods. He pretended that some other paper, some other time, had reported that the U. S. A. had bought 5,000 copies of Under Cover. Doubtless, if placed under oath, Winchell will be forced to admit that he originated and gave publicity to the statement that 5,000 copies of that book had been purchased by the U. S. A., and that it was false.

As a matter of fact, on September 1, 1943, in his column, Winchell himself wrote:

The best seller, Under Cover, was spurned by 28 publishers before E. P. Dutton's cleaned up with it. The Government bought 5,000 copies for distribution to camps.

Noting the above on September 14, 1943, I wrote the U. S. A. as follows, and I quote:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1943.

Maj. Gen. JAMES A. ULIO,
The Adjutant General,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL ULIO: Will you kindly advise me whether the War Department has purchased any copies of the book, Under Cover, by one who calls himself John Roy Carlson?

Have there been any negotiations looking toward the purchase of any copies of this book?

Thanking you in advance for your reply, I am

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Then, on October 29, 1943, in his column, Winchell wrote—and I quote:

Just as we suspected, no Army officer or official has any authority to "investigate" the sales or distribution of the book Under Cover to men in the Army. It now comes out that the Congressman who made such a request of a colonel (and said to keep his name quiet) is none other than Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, who is written up a lot in that best seller. This colonel is now "explaining" why he gave out such an order to various camps.

There are 83 words in that quotation and, by the use of the 83 words, Winchell tells 3 falsehoods.

The first one he put across by innuendo—when he made the statement that no Army officer or official has any authority to "investigate" the sales or distribution of the book Under Cover. By quoting the word "investigate," he implies that some officer was attempting to uncover some improper activity.

The officers of the Army had authority to inquire as to the number of books purchased by the Army, who purchased them, where the money came from and how they were distributed; in fact, it was the duty of the Army to furnish such information to any Congressman about any book or publication which it was alleged spread subversive doctrine, as does Under Cover.

The next sentence in the column reads,

It now comes out that the Congressman who made such a request of a colonel (and said to keep his name quiet) is none other than Representative CLARE HOFFMAN.

In that short sentence, there are two misstatements. I made no request of any Army officer to "investigate" the sales or distribution of the book, Under Cover, to men in the armed forces. The letter of September 14, 1943, shows beyond argument that I asked Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio whether the War Department had purchased copies of the book; whether there had been negotiations looking toward the purchase of copies of the book. Not a word was said in the letter about any investigation.

I was trying to learn whether Winchell told the truth when he said that the Army had purchased 5,000 copies of the book. You will note I did not even ask where the books had been distributed. Nor did I in that letter nor by any other method ask that my name be kept quiet. Why should I?

So it appears that twice, while using 29 words, Winchell told two falsehoods.

Not content to let the matter rest after, according to his own statement, he had learned the truth from the War Department, knew that he was not telling the truth in his column or over the radio, on October 31, 1943, in his broadcast—and I hold in my hand a transcript of his remarks made over the Blue Network—Winchell said:

WASHINGTON.—Recently the newspapers told of an Army colonel in the East, who had ordered all copies of the best-seller Under Cover taken from American soldiers. Your reporter, in an open letter, asked Secretary of War Stimson's office, under what law or Army regulation, could the Army deprive any soldier of that exposé of alleged seditionists in the United States. I was notified within 48 hours that Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, made that request to Col. James M. Roamer. Hm—Roamer.

Here again, by using the device of saying that "recently the newspapers told of an Army colonel," Winchell seeks to create the false impression that someone other than himself had circulated the story that some Army colonel had ordered all copies of Under Cover taken from American soldiers.

If Winchell has any authority for his statement that an Army colonel in the East or anywhere else had ordered copies of Under Cover taken from American soldiers, why does he not produce it?

Experience with Winchell and his methods leads one to the belief that he originated a false charge; then repeated the false charge which he had himself created.

Then, in that same paragraph, he makes this false statement, and I quote:

I was notified within 48 hours that Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, made that request to Col. James M. Roamer. Hm—Roamer.

Once more, by inference, he creates and circulates the falsehood that I had asked some official of the Army to deprive soldiers of copies of Under Cover.

Then he makes the direct false statement that he was notified within 48 hours that I had made that request to Colonel Roamer. I made no such request of Colonel Roamer. My letter was written to Major General Ulio, and, as you will note by again reading the letter, it not only did not ask—it did not even hint—that any soldier should be deprived of a copy of Under Cover.

On November 4, 1943, in answer to my letter of September 14, I received the following letter from the War Department:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
The Adjutant General's Office,
Washington, D. C., November 4, 1943.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: This is in further reply to your letter of 14 September, 1943, inquiring as to the accuracy of the allegation that the Army has purchased 5,000 copies of the book Under Cover for distribution to our soldiers.

Reports from the field just now available to me reveal that in response to requests emanating from among some 5,500,000 soldiers, a total of 363 copies of this book has been purchased for post libraries from appropriated and nonappropriated funds, and that 107 additional copies are on order.

I am indeed sorry for the delay in transmitting this information to you but know that you understand, since it had to be compiled by military agencies distributed over the entire Nation, some delay was unavoidable.

It is hoped this information will meet your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

From that letter you will note that, when Winchell gave the public to understand that the U. S. A. had purchased 5,000 copies of the book, Under Cover, he was guilty of a falsehood.

Beyond question, if Winchell, prior to October 31, inquired of Secretary of War Stimson's office, as he said he did in his broadcast of that date, he had learned the truth as to the number of copies of Under Cover which had been purchased by the Army.

But he was not satisfied with the truth. On November 7, 1943—and once more I quote from an official transcript of his broadcast—he said:

Last week I told you about an attempt to stop servicemen from reading the best seller, Under Cover. Over 400,000 copies sold to date, by the way, and how Congressman HOFFMAN, of Michigan, persuaded Col. James Rommer to issue a bulletin to Army bases and camps about that book. This is to add that a spokesman for the War Department has told me that such an order is illegal—that any Army officer who deprived any soldier of his personal property was violating the Articles of War and could be subjected to the severest military discipline.

Spelled "Rommer" in this transcript.

Analyze that statement. In the first sentence, he again utters an untruth in the statement:

Last week I told you about an attempt to stop servicemen from reading the best seller, Under Cover.

Winchell knew at the time he uttered that statement that no attempt to stop servicemen from reading Under Cover had been made.

In the next sentence, when he said:

Over 400,000 copies sold to date, by the way, and how Congressman HOFFMAN of Michigan persuaded Col. James Rommer to issue a bulletin to Army bases and camps about that book—

Did Winchell mean to imply that 400,000 copies had been sold to the Army for distribution by it to the servicemen? Or did he just mean that 400,000 copies of the book had been sold to the public generally? Give him the benefit of the doubt and say that it was the latter meaning that he intended to convey.

But the rest of the sentence is a deliberate falsehood. When he said "Congressman HOFFMAN, of Michigan, persuaded Col. James Rommer to issue a bulletin to Army bases and camps about that book," he departed from the truth.

I never asked Col. James Rommer to issue a bulletin to Army bases or camps, or anyone else about that book—Under Cover. So far as I know, neither Col. James Rommer nor anyone else connected with the Army issued an order that the book should not be read by men in the service.

Then Winchell, for good measure, added this half truth—and I quote again:

> This is to add that a spokesman for the War Department has told me that such an order is illegal—that any Army officer who deprived any soldier of his personal property was violating the Articles of War and could be subjected to the severest military discipline.

Here he implies that Colonel Rommer had issued an illegal order; that he was violating the Articles of War and could be subjected to the severest military discipline. Have any of you heard of any charges filed against Colonel Rommer? Does the War Department know of any order by any Army officer depriving any soldier of a copy of Under Cover?

In short, in that paragraph, Winchell, either directly or indirectly, uttered three falsehoods—

First, that I had attempted to stop servicemen from reading Under Cover;

Second, that I had asked and persuaded Colonel Rommer to issue a bulletin to Army bases and camps referring to that book;

Third, that an Army officer, presumably Colonel Rommer, had issued an order which would deprive a soldier of his copy of Under Cover.

And, for good measure, he added another statement creating the inference that some officer in the Army had attempted to stop a soldier from reading Under Cover, for he told his audience that no officer could do that and that, if anyone in his audience knew of any such officer who had taken away a soldier's book, to let him know—an implication that some officer had done that illegal act.

The foregoing citations from his tells falsehoods, complete falsehoods; falsehoods by way of half truths; falsehoods by innuendo, by insinuation, by inflection—not once in a while, not now and then, not inadvertently, but as a matter of habit; that falsehood is a part of his stock in trade; that he is untruthful because the truth is not in him.

The foregoing citations from his broadcasts and from his column show that he not only would make false charges against Members of Congress, but that he makes malicious, vicious charges against Army officers.

Why should he be permitted to make these false charges as he does? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] complained that we were wasting time by discussing Winchell's charges.

I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], if he is interested in conserving the time of this body, he can render the country a service by inducing that man's sponsors, the radio company which affords him facilities for talking, or Winchell himself, to tell the truth and nothing but the truth and to quit making false charges. As long as Winchell continues to make false charges that Congress or Members of Congress are disloyal or that Army officers are guilty of illegal acts, I shall continue to point out his untruthfulness.

Just as long as that man remains on the air, just as long as he claims, as he did last night, that he was ordered to stay here in this country by someone high in authority, as was pointed out last night by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]—where he said he would be stabbed in the back—just as long as he continues to stab patriotic, decent, loyal, and law-abiding American citizens in the back, I propose to show here at every opportunity that he is a creator of untruths, a peddler of falsehood, that the truth is not in him, that instead of being interested in exposing the enemies of our country, while he peddles some second-hand information about so-called seditionists, information first dug up by the Department of Justice, the Army or the Navy Intelligence forces, or the Dies Committee, claiming it falsely as his own—as long as he continues to do that and to shield, as he has shielded, Nazi agents like the two employees of his sponsor, Jergens, that man's record is going to be brought out on the floor. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] can pat him, figuratively speaking, on the back, he can hand him, as he would say, orchids, he can approve of him, he can sit silent and let the Members of Congress be accused of disloyalty, of being unpatriotic, if he wants to, but my voice is going to be raised to expose Winchell for what he is—a low, untruthful originator, disseminator of false, salacious, malicious, scandalous gossip and worse.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; if the gentleman wants to praise Winchell some more, if he wants to hand him some more flowers, go ahead.

Mr. SABATH. I wish that I would have the power not only to make Winchell speak the truth in all of his broadcasts, but all the other broadcasters as well. You know and I know that many of the other broadcasters have attacked Congressmen from time to time just as viciously, and perhaps, more so, than he.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whom have you in mind?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, I am not going to mention any name.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, you might offend some friend?

Mr. SABATH. Well, now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, why cover up? If they are enemies of our country why not expose them?

Mr. SABATH. I do not cover up anybody. But I do not want to take up the time of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, you can shorten up my time, save the time of the House by inducing Winchell to confine himself to the truth.

Mr. SABATH. I do not want to take up the time of the House by bringing up these things and articles in the newspapers from day to day that might be unfavorable to the Congress. Why, we would have nothing else to do but answer these attacks and articles that are appearing in the various weeklies and dailies. That is all we would be able to do here, just devote our time in answering those articles. I wish that I could bring about a condition that would force each and every man to tell the truth at all times. I would be a happy man.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman from Illinois would exercise the power which he possesses, the gentleman being the oldest Member in point of service, I think, in the House—he is chairman of the most powerful committee in the House—he could end all this. If your party would bring the gentleman down here and compel him to tell the truth about the situation and the charges which he makes it would help. He is either right or he is wrong. He is either untruthful or there are saboteurs in this House of Congress, and the people are entitled to know.

I will say this, the people are entitled to know who is this powerful figure that gave Winchell, who, so far as I know, is the only radio commentator who is an officer in the Navy, the order to remain behind to be stabbed in the back. Was Winchell told if he remained here he might be stabbed in the back or was he told to stab others in the back? In that connection I have introduced today, or dropped in the hamper here, a bill to amend the Federal law which governs the Navy. All that bill proposes to do is to lift from the code which governs the Army two sections and put them into the law which governs the Navy. Those sections make it an offense for officers in the Army to speak disrespectfully of the President of the United States. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois is in favor of that. And this law also makes it an offense for an Army officer to speak disrespectfully of Members of Congress. The other section says that an Army officer who is guilty of conduct unbecoming a gentleman can be disciplined. Those provisions are not in the statute that governs the Navy; so writes Secretary of the Navy Knox. We have the peculiar result that a man who is an officer in the Army cannot speak disrespectfully of certain officials in a coordinate branch, but if you are in the Navy, it is all right. To put it this way, if you are in the Army you must be a gentleman. If you are in the Navy, you need not be a gentleman. Well, I do not believe the rank and file of the Navy know that. I do not believe the officers of the Navy want any such distinction made between the two services. I think they are just as gentlemanly in their conduct as are the officers of the other branch of the service. But you have that peculiar difference in the statute law. Let me go on and say again, and then I am finished, that the people of this country are entitled to know who is this man; who is this man who ordered Winchell out of active duty, out of uniform, deprived him of opportunity to receive the pay of an officer—told him he would be stabbed in the back? Is it the President of the United States, by virtue of whose authority Winchell, without pay, without duty, and without uniform, is

still carried on the rolls of that honorable body, the Navy, as a Reserve officer? Is it because of the President's backing?

Mr. SABATH. I doubt very much whether the President of the United States knows every man who is a member of the Reserve Corps.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, well, I think the President has heard of Winchell. Is it because of the President's backing that Winchell was told that some men must be sent across to be shot, but some must stay here to be stabbed in the back?

Yes, if the gentleman from Illinois wants to get some help from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] that is all right. it matters not to me.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I submit that the gentleman is not in order; he is not in order when he referred to me as helping the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not say you were helping him. I said it was all right if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] wanted to get some help from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. And he is creating a wrong impression, trying to create a wrong impression on the Members of the House and the country at large. I submit the gentleman is not acting fairly at all and in accordance with the dignity of this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will apologize to the gentleman if his feelings are hurt, but listen——

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlemen will kindly suspend.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois does not need any help.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the three gentlemen kindly suspend?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, who has the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has the floor and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a point of order. The Chair feels, in debate, respect for each Member must at all times be had and also respect for the other branches of Government. The Chair does not and cannot, upon the statements made today, find that the gentleman from Michigan has violated the rules of the House. But the Chair feels that the gentleman from Michigan is very close to the line and recognizes the gentleman to proceed in order.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will tell you somebody else who is getting awfully close to penitentiary line and not the rules of order, and that is the gentleman, Mr. Winchell. I have all the respect in the world——

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a minute. Come around here where I can see you.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, sir; I will in just a second.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. I am asking the gentleman to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sit down. If you want the regular order, that is the regular order.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield? He refuses to yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In just a minute I will yield to you. Yes; I will yield right now if you want me to. Go ahead.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not see why the gentleman wants to take it upon himself to try to give the wrong impression, either to the Members of this House or to the country. I want to say that I am able to take care of myself. If I want to inject myself into this debate I will do so on my own time without any instigation or intimations from the gentleman from Michigan. I think if he wants to show the proper dignity that should be shown to the Members of this House he will conduct himself accordingly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now that the lecture is over and I have been properly instructed, let me call to your attention that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], although I had the floor, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] were exchanging remarks back there. If I am in error in thinking that the gentleman from Illinois wanted a little help from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, well then, it is just another mistake. Maybe they were talking about some social engagement. I do not know what you were talking about. I do not care, but they seemed to be in——

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. They seemed to be holding a little conference about something. You do not deny that he was talking to you, do you? You do not deny that he was talking to you, do you?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. He will not answer that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure, I will yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I categorically deny that the gentleman from Illinois was talking to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Were you talking to him?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that I made a remark to the gentleman from Illinois and I will also say——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Instead of seeking help, he volunteered, that's all.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will say this, if the gentleman will permit me, so that the RECORD is straight. I said to the gentleman——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not care what you said.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I said to him, "This is only a waste of time; we are wasting the time of all the Members of this House on the floor when important legislation is coming up, and why don't we get on with the business of the House, and why do you not let the gentleman from Michigan finish his tirade against Walter Winchell?" That is what I said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, now it is a so-called tirade.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not see where that is trying to defend anybody or trying to hurt anybody. I want to get on with the business of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I can only say——

Mr. EBERHARTER. I hope that the truth is known, now that the truth is known, without any exaggeration or any innuendoes or any intimations of any sort, that the gentleman from Michigan need not attempt to have adopted on the floor of the House a practice of calling out the names of individual Members of the House and trying to give the wrong impression to the country at large as to whether or not I want to defend Mr. Winchell or whether or not I want to catechize him. If the gentleman from Michigan wants the regular order and does not know the rules of the House, the regular order is being followed right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. EBERHARTER. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor. I ask unanimous consent that at this point the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] may be given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will handle that, may I state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The Chair objects himself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I have the utmost respect for the Chair, and the greatest admiration for him personally, although I hope some Republican replaces him at the next election.

I want to say I am surprised, and I hope the Chair will not insist upon that objection, because it might be what Mr. Winchell would call a deprivation of free speech and of the opportunity to be heard. I am not in favor of that. I will close now by saying to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we could get on with our business of the House if he will just muzzle—no; not muzzle—just induce the gentleman who is the Reserve officer without pay, without uniform, and without duty, Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, but who is under orders to stay here and be stabbed in the back, to confine himself, well, not to the truth, but to a little of the truth, and tell it once in a while.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not want to take up the time of the House. You know this is just a shame, to waste the time this way. But as long as you want to——

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to keep the record straight.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But as long as you want to save the time of the House, why does not the gentleman follow the advice he gave his colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] when he told him to keep still and not bother me, so that we could get through quicker. Why do you not follow your own advice?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Just in order to keep the record straight I want to say that I do not desire to revise or extend my remarks. Not a sentence, or a word, or a clause or a phrase will be changed or stricken out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you want to add to what you said?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not want to change anything I have said on the floor of the House this morning. I want the record to show just exactly what I said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield the balance of my time to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address which I delivered on Friday at the dedication of the Big Inch pipe line at Rockwood, Pa.; and also to include an address made on the same occasion by Mr. George Wilson, representing the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] rise?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have risen for the purpose of asking the words of the gentleman from Michigan to be taken down.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, that is too late, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. I was on my feet. You want to be fair now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will state the point of order.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman said that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said to me that I should keep still. He did not say any such thing. I think it is manifestly unfair——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am willing to accept the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] as to what he told you. If that suits you, it suits me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair trusts that clarifies the atmosphere.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is recognized.

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 75), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 30, 1944, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, April 12, 1944.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTING MULTIPLE STATE INCOME TAXES ON SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3592) to amend the judicial code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3592, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to ask a question or two of the members of the committee on the application of this proposed legislation.

If I may have the attention of the members of the committee, will someone who has worked on the bill kindly differentiate the interpretation that is intended for "domicile" from the general understanding of "residence" or "legal residence"? I raise the question because of a practical situation that has come to my attention. There is a party who is stationed in the District of Columbia. He is here with his wife. He does own some property here, but during the time when he was stationed in South Dakota he determined that that was where he wanted to make his permanent residence. He acquired some real estate there, in fact a ranch, on which he has a house and other buildings. He bought some cattle. He has stocked the ranch. He goes out there at periodical intervals to see how the property is being taken care of. He votes in the State. He buys a resident hunting license in the State.

We have had a State income tax in South Dakota, which he has been paying, but this year, the District of Columbia notified him that it expected him also to pay an income tax in the District of Columbia, contending that this was his residence and his domicile, which made him subject to the income-tax laws of the District of Columbia. He appealed and the case is pending before some court at present.

I would like to find out what the effect of this legislation would be on situations of that sort.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman that it is just such cases which the gentleman has mentioned that this bill is intended to correct. For instance, the gentleman to whom you have referred has his permanent domicile in South Dakota. He is temporarily residing in the District of Columbia by reason of his employment in the District. By reason of the fact that an income-tax law has been passed in the District of Columbia they are attempting to collect an income tax in the District of Columbia from the gentleman who is domiciled permanently in South Dakota, which would bring him within the provisions of the multiple tax-collection provision. That is the very thing this bill is intended to correct.

For instance, under section 5, page 2 of the bill, it provides that the person shall have acquired domicile in such State, under the laws of such State, prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed. That would bring the gentleman to whom you have referred in your remarks within the provisions of this bill. Then he must make a declaration. Such declaration must be in writing, under oath, to the authority whose duty it is to assess, levy, and collect such taxes. That is the declaration which he makes respecting his domicile. When he makes that written declaration under the provisions of this measure, if this measure becomes law, then that declaration of residence is respected, and his residence would then be determined to be in South Dakota and he would not be subject to the income tax in the jurisdiction of his employment.

Mr. CASE. I am very glad to have that statement from the gentleman as a part of the legislative consideration of this bill.

There are two further questions growing out of what the gentleman has said. The first of those is this: Will this statute be retroactive, so as to affect the case of this gentleman which is already in the courts on the tax proposed to be levied against last year's income?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

May I say to the gentleman from South Dakota that this bill would not be retroactive and in cases which have been begun, such as the case to which the gentleman has referred, this measure if adopted and become law, would not be retroactive and would not cure that situation. It would apply only to future cases.

Mr. CASE. So far therefore as this case is concerned it would depend upon the decision of the court as to whether or not in fact his domicile was in South Dakota at that time.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is entirely right.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman's statement makes the application of the bill clear where the party has property in South Dakota with acts that evidence his intent to have South Dakota as his legal residence and domicile. He belongs to lodges out there, he gets resident hunting licenses and car licenses in that State, and so forth.

Now, take the case of a single person who does not own property in either place, a young man or a young woman who may come to the District under a civil-service appointment who does not own any real property in either place; would such person be entitled to make a declaration under the terms of this act stating that his or her residence is in a certain State?

Mr. SPRINGER. I presume South Dakota has an income tax.

Mr. CASE. We have, but it has been repealed effective as of this year.

Mr. SPRINGER. But in the instance the gentleman cites of a single person who left South Dakota to come into the District of Columbia for employment under civil service, if that person makes his declaration as provided in this measure, which is now before the House, in writing and under oath declaring where that residence is, that will be respected if this becomes law.

Mr. CASE. And that declaration is sufficient of itself without going into the question of whether property may or may not be owned.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Indiana take a minute to answer a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. What if a person coming to the District of Columbia did not make a declaration? We have thousands of residents from Oregon here.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the person failed to make a declaration he would simply be subject to the laws of the jurisdiction where he found himself. The declaration of residence is, under this measure, essential before the Federal employee is entitled to the protection it affords.

Mr. ANGELL. Such persons would be subject to existing law.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; and the question of their residence would not be determined definitely as provided by this measure.

Mr. ANGELL. One further question, if the gentleman will permit, that under existing law a person who is a bona fide resident of and domiciled in a State, cannot be subject to income tax there and also in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SPRINGER. We had assumed that that was true. That was true until the decision in the *O'Keefe Case* (306 U. S., at p. 466) when the court left the matter open. Since that decision was rendered there has been some doubt about it. The tax collectors have been trying to collect such taxes, and in many instances have been collecting income taxes in two and three States on the same income.

Mr. ANGELL. This additional question if the gentleman please: The gentleman is a great lawyer and has had long experience on the bench; he is also a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that a person who is legally domiciled outside the District of Columbia cannot be subjected to an income tax in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SPRINGER. That has always been my opinion, that where a person is legally domiciled in one of the States he could not be called upon to pay an income tax in the District of Columbia or any other State in which he was temporarily residing in order to hold his employment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me in connection with the first question raised by the gentleman from Oregon that attention might be invited to the sentence in section 2 which reads:

> The time for filing such declarations shall not expire until 60 days after a written demand for payment of such tax shall have been received by such officer or employee. If therefore the officer or employee had never made a declaration he would have 60 days after he received notice of tax in which to make a declaration.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. The period of 60 days is granted for the filing of the declaration of residence after demand is made for payment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to discuss this bill any longer. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] gave a very clear explanation of the bill. I should like at this time, however, to make one statement that I think would be of interest to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who a moment ago was citing a type of case that I think is more prevalent than any others which this bill is designed to cure and to correct; and that is where Government employees here in the District of Columbia physically present are asked to pay an additional income tax to the District. Under the decisions physical presence can be taken as prima facie evidence of domicile, that is where the rub comes. These employees, when they are compelled to pay a tax here in the District of Columbia, which is the case he cited, incur the expense of appealing the case to get relief. The first step they take is to go to the Board of Tax Appeals. There they present their evidence and the Government presents its evidence.

Should the decision of the Board of Tax Appeals be against them and be taken to the courts by the taxpayer on a disputed question of fact concerning domicile, the rule seems to be that if there is any evidence on appeal to support the Tax Board in the controversy the petitioner has slight chance of any redress; that, together with the fact that the amounts involved are not more than $30, $40, or $50 on these low-bracket salaries, makes it an intolerable and unhappy experience for them to try to correct the inequity and injustice. Where this sort of thing occurs not in the District of Columbia but in a State the same situation arises. The litigants or the petitioners have the gamut of the courts to run. Attorneys' fees and necessary expenses incident to trying out this disputed question of fact makes it impossible for these people to find any relief.

This bill under section 1 gives jurisdiction in these cases to the United States district court where the issue can be decided one way or the other on the laws that already exist in the respective States of the Union regarding citizenship as established by domicile plus an intent. It is a very important thing to be corrected and I do not believe there is much argument on the part of any Member of the House against the relief this measure attempts to bring to these people who have no way of helping themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly impressed with the statement that was made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] in favor of this bill. It seemed to me that the basic reasons he urged in behalf of it were logical and sound. I believe there is little that can be added to what he has already said in justification of this bill. It is my purpose merely to make reference to a feature in connection with it that I think deserves consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration, H. R. 3592, is designed to correct a most unjust situation that has arisen as a result of the passage of the act of 1939 that gave reciprocal rights to the Federal and State Governments to tax income received by the respective employees of Federal and State Governments.

Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in *Graves* v. *New York ex rel. O'Keefe* (306 U. S. 466 (1938)), salaries of Federal officers and employees which were received from the United States were deemed immune from taxation under State income tax laws. The O'Keefe case held, however, that such an implied immunity did not exist, although the Court indicated that Congress could grant such an immunity in order to protect agents of the Federal Government from State burdens.

Subsequent to the above decision legislation was passed by Congress that created reciprocal rights of taxation in the

Federal and State Governments with respect to the employees of either. The only restriction laid down by such legislation with respect to the right of State governments, or the taxing units thereof, to tax Federal employees was that such taxation should not "discriminate against such officer or employee because of the source of such compensation." Therefore, so long as the tax levied under State authority did not affect Federal employees any different than other employees, it was declared legal.

The difficulty that has arisen, and which the pending act seeks to remedy, grows out of the fact that State taxing units have levied taxes upon Federal and other employees, working within said States or taxing districts, and yet not residents of said State or taxing district. In other words, advantage has been taken of the fact that such employees were working within said taxing district for the purpose of levying a local or State tax upon their earnings. Thus such employees are liable to double taxation. First, taxation by their State of legal residence, and, second, taxation by the State within which they are working. Certainly it was never intended that the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939 should permit such a condition to be created or to exist. A reading of the committee report submitted in connection with such legislation will justify this viewpoint. However, notwithstanding the intent of Congress, this system of double taxation does exist in many places throughout the United States, and creates an injustice to the employees affected thereby and justifies legislation of the character now under consideration.

It is regrettable that the proposed legislation does not include private employees as well as Federal employees, within its provisions. The basic reason for this legislation would justify its application to private employees equally as well as to Federal employees. It has been suggested that legal reasons of a jurisdictional character prevent the inclusion of employees of private employers in the proposed legislation. This may be true, but the fact remains that double taxation, as now practiced in some places, is just as unfair, unjustified, and inequitable when applied to employees of private employers as in the case of the employees of the Federal Government. Consequently they are equally entitled to relief.

Taxation of the kind which this bill seeks to prevent is not only wrong from the standpoint of double taxation, but also because it violates in a most obnoxious way the principle of representation. It is a clear case of taxation without representation. As an illustration of the injustice that has resulted, and is being practiced right now by the city of Philadelphia upon thousands of employees of the Federal Government who are working in the Philadelphia Navy Yard, the Quartermasters Depot, Frankford Arsenal, Internal Revenue, Securities Exchange Commission, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, Post Office, Civil Service, and all the varied and numerous bureaus, boards, commissions, and other activities incident to the Federal Government and its war agencies, as well as to employees of private employers in the city of Philadelphia, is the imposition of a wage tax. No matter what kind of employment the worker is engaged in, nor of what State or place he is a legal resident, the tax applies. Workers who live in New Jersey, workers who live in Pennsylvania outside of the city of Philadelphia, workers who live in the State of Delaware, in fact all workers notwithstanding their legal domicile is in any 1 of the 48 States, must pay tribute in the form of a wage tax to the city of Philadelphia for the privilege of working in that city. With no right to vote, and because they and their families live elsewhere they do not even have the use of the municipal facilities that are provided for those who live in the city. They are, however, required to help pay for the upkeep and the running expenses of that great city. Even the reasons that gave rise to the Boston Tea Party were not more irritating than those that now exist as a result of the Philadelphia wage tax. Already, practically every city, town, and village in southern New Jersey has held protest meetings and formed committees of citizens to fight this un-American wage tax that has been levied upon them by the authorities of the city of Philadelphia. This tax has been levied for upwards of 4 years. Threats of arrest have been utilized time and again by city authorities to collect this unfair tax from nonresidents. Some have paid. Others have defied the city. The situation has now grown to troublesome proportions. Those who have not paid now owe unpaid taxes to an amount of several hundred dollars. They are constantly being threatened with arrest. Some have left their employment to escape from this constant harassing by constables and other city officers.

It is time something is done to correct the situation. This bill will help in some places. However, it will not give adequate relief from the situation which I have just outlined unless it is amended to include taxing units acting under authority of State government. Such an amendment will be proposed. I hope the amendment as well as the bill will have the support of the Membership of this House.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. POWERS. I know it is unnecessary for me to say to my distinguished colleague that I am heartily in favor of the position he has taken on this particular bill. I want to compliment him and to say that this is one of the finest presentations I have ever listened to on any matter that has ever been brought before the House. The gentleman must have given it considerable study.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I am very grateful to the gentleman for his kind remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yeld 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, this bill has a very laudable purpose; however, there are two very serious objections to it. In the first place, it only proposes to give aid to a very limited group of people, whereas we all know that the evil of double taxation is widespread.

We have in this country 32 States which levy an income tax. Five of the States impose a tax solely on the principle of residence. Four States impose the tax only on the principle of the origin of revenue. Twenty-three States tax residents on all their income and tax nonresidents on all income originating in that particular State.

With that situation you can realize that there is a great deal of double taxation in the country. The solution of the problem, it seems to me, does not lie here in Congress. What we need is some cooperative action among the States aimed not just for the benefit of a small group of Government employees but for the benefit of all citizens.

The second objection to the bill is that I believe it is on an unsound constitutional basis. Back in 1939 we passed the Public Salary Tax Act in which the Congress consented to the levying by the States of an income tax upon Federal salaries. If all the authority that any State had to levy an income tax on a Federal salary were based on that statute, then it might be said that this statute would be constitutional because if a State gets its power to tax a Federal salary from Congress, then the latter can attach any condition to its grant of power to tax. That, however, is not the case.

For many years the States have been levying taxes on Federal salaries and the Federal Government in some cases has been levying taxes on certain State salaries. That has been upheld by the courts. The history of it is very interesting. It begins with the case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 315), in which the court held that the particular tax there sought to be levied by the State against the functioning of the Federal Bank was discriminatory and, therefore, unconstitutional. A misunderstanding of that case became very general in the country and led later on to the decision in *Collector* v. *Day* (11 Wall. 113), in which it was held that the Federal Government could not tax the income of a State judge. That case was much criticized and was whittled away little by little by the courts, the later cases being, as you will remember, *Helvering* v. *Gerhardt* (304 U. S. 405), in which it was held that the salary of an engineer of the New York Port Authority was subject to Federal tax, and *Graves* v. *State Tax Commission* (306 U. S. 466), in which it was held that the salary of an examiner for the H. O. L. C. was subject to a State income tax.

In other words, the test is this: We have a dual form of government, State and Federal. The courts, regardless of what legislation is passed by either the Congress or the States, will not allow any

action by one government which interferes with the functioning of the other government. That is what it is all based upon.

Congress cannot say to the State: "You can tax a Federal salary if you do it the way we say you should." The States have the right to levy taxes under the present holdings of our Supreme Court if they do not discriminate and if they do not in their levying of the tax interfere with the functionings of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the net result will be, if we pass this statute, that nothing will be accomplished by it. You will simply discourage the efforts now being made by the States in cooperation with each other to solve this great problem of double taxation and, furthermore, you will find that the attorneys general of many States are going to challenge this statute in the courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ELLISON].

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the purpose of this bill, which is to eliminate multiple taxation imposed upon income of Federal employees, but this bill goes beyond that.

Two of its provisions create loopholes through which Federal employees can avoid the payment of State income tax altogether.

The first provision I refer to is that beginning at line 16 on page 2 of the bill, which reads:

> For the purpose of this act, the domicile of such officer or employee shall be in the State which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile.

This enables a Federal employee to select a State which imposes no income tax upon its citizens or only a small tax, a result which the committee certainly did not intend to bring about.

It has been explained by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] that the provision which follows limits the selection by the Federal employee of the State of his domicile to the State from which he originally came before he entered Government service. The provision to which he refers reads:

> *Provided*, That he shall have acquired a domicile in such State, under the laws of such State, prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed.

I respectfully submit that I cannot interpret this provision to mean what the gentleman from Minnesota says it means. Moreover, this provision is so obscure that it needs clarification to carry out the intent of the committee, as expressed by the gentleman from Minnesota.

A simple provision could be inserted, such as the following:

> For the purposes of this act the domicile of this officer or employee shall be the State from which he originally came to enter upon Government employment.

That would be a limitation that would be simple to understand.

But the main objection I have to the bill is the proposed committee amendment which would strike from the bill the provision beginning on line 3 and ending on line 8 on page 3 of the bill, which reads:

> In the event the compensation of such officer or employee shall not be subject to tax in the State of his domicile as herein defined, such compensation shall not be immune from taxation in any other State in which, except for the immunity conferred by this act, it may be lawfully subject to a State tax.

If the committee amendment to strike this provision from the act prevails, then a Federal employee coming from a State which does not impose a tax upon the income of its citizens will neither have to pay a tax in the State of his domicile nor in the State of his residence. Such Federal employee would not only be immune from multiple taxation, but would be free of all State income taxes.

Suppose a Federal employee comes from a State that does not impose taxes on the income of its citizens, and lives in the District of Columbia, which has a District income tax. He enjoys all the rights and privileges of a resident of the District: He may send his children to school; he has fire and police protection; uses the city streets and enjoys all other governmental services which the District furnishes its citizens, without having to contribute anything toward the cost of such services. I do not believe that the committee intended to bring about such a condition.

Mr. Nagle, one of the leading proponents of the bill, who appeared before the committee, indicated that such was not the intention. On page 7 of the hearings before the subcommittee on a similar bill, Mr. Nagle said:

> Now, he might come from a State which does not have an income tax. In that case, it seemed to the authors of this bill, although there had been some dissent from it—it seemed to the authors of this bill if the State does not have an income tax then he does not have quite as strong a ground for claiming immunity from the District tax or some other State tax as he would have if he were paying an individual tax.

And then he cited the provision contained in lines 3 to 8, inclusive, on page 3 of this bill, heretofore quoted, as making such a situation impossible.

Now, the committee proposes to amend the bill by striking out this provision, making it possible for a Federal employee not to pay any income taxes into the State of his domicile, if such State has no income-tax law, or in the State of his residence. I hope that the committee amendment, when offered, will be defeated.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the statement just made by my friend from Maryland. When I first heard of his suggestion, it seemed to me that it was probably sound, but after a more thorough examination it does not seem to me to be sound.

Here is a person who comes from one State where he pays an income tax. He has the advantages of the facilities afforded him by the community just the same as the person whose State levies no income tax.

One State resorts to one sort of a tax to raise the money for its operations and another State resorts to another sort of a tax, but the children that come from each of those States attend the same schools. Why should the person who has paid all the tax his State requires be required to pay an additional tax merely because his State has not gone the income-tax route to get its money. If this committee amendment is not adopted the sojourner in a State would be taxed by that State, not to get a contribution from him to pay the cost of operating its government, but because the State had not levied a specific tax, an income tax, instead of getting all its necessary revenue by other sorts of taxes. I could say more but I would be just repeating myself over and over again.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. If we pursued the argument of the gentleman from Maryland, we would go back and defeat the very fundamental thing that we are driving at in this bill, and that is the question of domicile; is that not true?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; that is right. The whole proposition is so simple, it stands out so plainly, that to consume the 5 minutes alloted me I would just have to repeat myself; so I believe I will just leave it like it is.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. I was interested in the gentleman's remarks apropos of my first objection, but I should like to have his further opinion as to the proposed committee amendment which attempts to strike out all of line 3 to line 8, inclusive, on page 3. This will enable a Federal employee to escape taxation if he comes from a State that has no income tax.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I say to my distinguished friend from Maryland that that is the one thing I was talking about, that very amendment. If it had not been stricken out, you would have had a situation where, for instance, a man comes from a State where they have an income tax. His children go to school and they enjoy the use of the public roads, but he pays nothing to the State where he is living.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. That is fine if he pays it in the State of his domicile.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What difference does it make with your State if you are going to permit the children to go to school free from those States where they do collect a part of the taxes to maintain the States by an income tax, and another man must pay if he comes from a State which raises the income to

maintain the State without an income tax?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the measure now before the House has been brought here largely because of the passage of the income-tax law in the District of Columbia. When that tax law was passed, it made possible the fact that people would pay an income tax in their own State and then would be subjected to the payment of a second income tax in the District of Columbia, or in any State in which Federal employees are working temporarily. This amounts to multiple taxation, which is not approved by this body.

Instances have been cited, and they were given before our committee when we held the hearings on this measure, that in some cases people were subjected to the payment of as many as three income taxes by reason of the situation which now exists. This measure, which has been presented by the gentleman from Minnesota, is intended to correct that particular evil which now exists.

Mention was made just a little while ago by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], regarding the various cases and decisions which have been rendered on this subject. The one outstanding decision rendered, which has changed the general policy of collecting income taxes from Government employees, in the jurisdiction in which they are temporarily employed, is the case of *Graves v. New York, ex rel. Keefe* (306 U. S. 466). In the decision of that case, it was announced that Federal employees were not immune from the collection of the income tax. Prior to that decision it had been the custom followed, and the belief generally, that the Federal employees who were living in one State and were working temporarily in another State were not subject to the payment of the income tax in the State in which they were temporarily employed. That belief and custom was adhered to until the decision in the Graves case, supra, since that decision was rendered, which was in the year 1939, in which it was held that such immunity did not exist. Then much confusion has resulted. Many people have suffered by reason of having to respond to the payment of multiple income taxes.

Mr. Chairman, in the decision of the Graves case, the court went somewhat further, and announced in that decision that Congress could express itself on this very question, but it had not done so. This is the opportunity, for Congress to express itself on this very question. The House should express itself on this question of multiple taxation in no uncertain terms. Under the provisions of this measure, which refers to Government employees who are working within the District of Columbia, or who are working within any State which has an income tax to the payment of which they will be subjected, if this measure becomes law, their procedure will be to file a written declaration of their residence or domicile. If they came from the State of Iowa, they will file their written declaration with the taxing officials in the District of Columbia, setting forth in that declaration that their residence, their permanent domicile, is in the State of Iowa. That declaration, when filed, is under oath. It is filed with the taxing authority. When that declaration is made, then those persons are subject to the payment of the tax in the State of their residence and not to the payment of the tax in the District of Columbia, in Virginia, in Maryland, or in any other State where they may be employed which has an income tax. In other words, this compliance will eliminate entirely the question of the payment of multiple taxes under the State income tax laws of the various States in which the Federal employee is temporarily employed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. In line with the gentleman's statement that the bill is directed primarily to avoiding double or triple taxation, may I ask concerning the amendment on page 3 which it is intended to strike out, if it does not mean that if a man comes from a State in which he is not subject to tax he may be subject to tax in the State in which he is residing?

Mr. SPRINGER. That paragraph, on page 3, was not in conformance with and did not recognize the basic principles of this bill. For that reason, after the Committee on the Judiciary had held hearings upon it, and held an executive session in which the matter was fully discussed, that provision was struck out. The basic principle of this measure is the determination, by declaration of the domicile of a person, and that fixes the status with respect to taxation.

Mr. SASSCER. Under that section, if he were not taxed in his home State, this provision of the bill would apply, which would in itself get away from the idea of triple taxation.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman is correct. However, if that section remains in the bill it would probably have the effect of forcing many other States, which have no State income-tax law, to adopt such a measure.

Mr. SASSCER. Therefore, it seems to me that language should stay in the bill.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Does this bill now apply only to Federal employees?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; the gentleman is precisely correct. It refers only to Federal employees.

Mr. ANGELL. So it would not affect the case where a State attempts to impose an income tax on income in that State, although the party does not live there, or is not domiciled there.

Mr. SPRINGER. We would have no authority over the private employees, but this measure would apply, as I understand, entirely to Federal employees.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one or two questions?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. The original of the bill on page 1 seems to be a matter of jurisdiction, conferring jurisdiction on the district court of the United States in any suit or proceedings by a State attempting to collect income from the services or compensation of employees.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is entirely correct.

Mr. FOLGER. And you could not extend that to individuals who did not receive their compensation from the Government.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 24 of the Judicial Code (36 Stat. 1091; title 28 U. S. C., sec. 41), as amended, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto a new subsection immediately following subsection twenty-eighth, to be known as subsection twenty-ninth and to read as follows:

"Twenty-ninth. Of all actions, suits, or proceedings, involving the liability of any officer or employee of the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or of any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, for State tax on the compensation for personal services as such officer or employee, where the claim of domicile on the part of such officer or employee is disputed by the taxing authority of any State."

SEC. 2. That title I of the act of April 12, 1939 (ch. 59, 53 Stat. 574), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto a new section to read as follows:

"SEC 5. The compensation of an officer or employee of the United States, any Territory or possession thereof, the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, shall be subject to State tax only in the State in which such officer or employee is domiciled.

"For the purpose of this act, the domicile of such officer or employee shall be in the State which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile: *Provided*, That he shall have acquired a domicile in such State, under the laws of such State, prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed. Such declaration must be made in writing under oath to the authority whose duty it is to assess, levy, or collect such taxes and the time for filing such declaration shall not expire until 60 days after a written demand for payment of such tax shall have been received by such officer or employee.

"In the event the compensation of such officer or employee shall not be subject to tax in the State of his domicile as herein defined, such compensation shall not be immune from taxation in any other State in which, except for the immunity conferred by this act, it may be lawfully subject to a State tax."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, beginning at line 3, strike out down to and including line 8; and insert quotation marks after the word "employee" in line 2.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this paragraph which the committee wishes to strike out was

in the original bill when introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]. The adoption of this paragraph will, I am sure, prevent multiple taxation of Federal employees, which is causing serious hardship on them, particularly in this period of the rising cost of living. People who live and work in Maryland for years, and receive the benefits of its schools, roads, police and fire protection, should, as much as any other citizen, pay their share of the cost. If their income is not subject to tax in the State of their domicile it should be paid in the State where they work and live. I had hoped that this paragraph was acceptable to the sponsor of this bill and to most of the members of the committee. The passage of this bill with this amendment stricken from the bill will affect the financial structure of not only Maryland but of other States as well.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of February 25, 1944. It is as follows:

TAXING FEDERAL WORKERS

If Congress passes the O'Hara bill, which will exempt Federal jobholders living in Maryland from the Maryland income tax on condition that they maintain voting residences in other States, it will do so on an assumption of power that competent lawyers believe is open to question.

Such an assumption, however, would not be without precedent of a sort. In 1939 Congress passed an act "consenting" to the application of State income taxation to Federal officeholders, which implies the right not to consent. But that act placed no restriction on the exercise of taxing powers by the States, hence there was no occasion to challenge its constitutionality. If Congress attempts to interfere in local taxation, that will be another story.

The argument that taxing the income of a Government employee is tantamount to taxing the Government, since it might be compelled to increase salaries to compensate for it, can't be raised. The Supreme Court rejected this contention in 1938 when it decided that Federal officeholders were not immune to State taxation. The Court went so far as to declare that not even contractors working for the Government on a cost-plus basis were immune from State taxes on income, though in such case the tax went directly into the cost to the Government.

The avowed purpose of the O'Hara bill is to relieve Federal jobholders of the possibility of paying double income taxes, which is to say, taxes imposed by the State of actual residence as well as the State of legal residence. But this purpose is rendered meaningless by the Maryland statute which credits income taxes paid to another State against Maryland's income tax. Liability to Maryland occurs only when Maryland income taxes exceed those of the State of legal domicile, in which case the balance must be paid; or when the State in which legal residence is claimed is one of the few that do not tax incomes.

It would seem that if Congress is concerned about employees of the Federal Government paying double income taxes, it would move to exempt them from the taxes of a State in which they hold only an absentee's citizenship and not from the taxes of a State to which they look for the protection of their persons and property and from whose roads, other facilities and services, they benefit.

I urge the membership to vote against the committee amendment.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the bill was originally drawn, this section to which the amendment is directed, provided in substance that persons who were exempt from income taxes in their home States, would not receive the immunity of this act. In other words, if they did not pay income taxes in the State of their claimed domicile, then they would not receive the immunities and protections of this particular statute. In listening to the debate nearly every speaker who has addressed the House has directed his remarks to the evil of dual and triple taxation. If that is the purpose of the bill, then it is not necessary to have this amendment or to strike this provision from the bill, because the bill would only tax, as originally drawn, those who did not pay taxes in their home States. It would prevent a situation under which a person might reside possibly in the District of Columbia or its environs for 20 or 25 years, own his home, and enjoy all the State and municipal privileges that come from taxation, and pay no income tax at home, and still we would not be able to tax him by an income tax in the State in which he was enjoying these privileges. At the same time if this amendment is defeated and the bill stays as it is, he would not be subject to double taxation, because if he paid the tax at home, then he would not have to pay it in the State in which he had been residing for years, enjoying the privileges and pleasures of that State.

I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that most of the opposition to this bill apparently centers in connection with this amendment which has been proposed by the committee, which strikes out on page 3 all of the lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, I want to briefly call your attention to the effect this bill will have in its practical operation, not only in the State of Maryland or the State of Virginia, but in a great many other States where Federal employees may be employed, if that section is not stricken out.

Here is a situation that could very easily develop if these lines are not stricken out. Take a resident, for instance, of the State of Texas, where no State income tax is imposed at all. Assume that he is employed by the F. B. I. and is assigned to work in New York City. Another man from the State of Arkansas, for instance, which charges a fairly reasonable State income tax, is also working for the F. B. I. at the same job and receiving the same salary and is assigned to the same office in the State of New York. Another F. B. I. agent, say from the State of Georgia, is also working for the F. B. I. and making the same salary and assigned to the same office in the State of New York.

With this provision left in the bill, then the F. B. I. agent who works in the city of New York, from the State of Texas, because his own State had elected to charge no income tax, would have to pay the very high rate of tax imposed by the State of New York, while the employee working for the F. B. I. in the same office, at the same rate of pay, from the State of Arkansas, or from the State of Georgia, performing exactly the same duties as the man from Texas is performing, would escape taxation entirely in the State of New York because his particular State happens to levy an income tax.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman would impress the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], if he would take an example of a Government employee from the State of Maryland, and put him in the State of New York where they pay a 7-percent income tax. I wonder if the gentleman from Maryland would still think this amendment should be defeated?

Mr. CRAVENS. Apparently, the gentleman is willing to sacrifice a few Marylanders in New York in order to get more taxpayers in Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. If the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to answer that.

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. I think, if a man from Maryland went to New York and bought a home and took his children and lived there for 25 years or for 2 years or any period of time and did not pay any tax in Maryland, he should pay in New York, to help support these things that he has enjoyed.

Mr. CRAVENS. But under this bill, if the State of Maryland imposes a tax——

Mr. SASSCER. Maryland gives credit for taxes paid in another State.

Mr. CRAVENS. If he pays anything in the State of Maryland, he is doing it by reason of the fact that the State of Maryland has determined that he ought to pay taxes. It is left to the determination and the discretion of the State of Maryland whether he should pay it or not. What right has the State of Maryland to tell a citizen of Texas, who happened to temporarily live in Maryland and work for the Government, that because his State has not elected to charge him any income tax, that gives the State of Maryland the right to impose a tax upon him? Here would be the situation that would result: Every State that does not have any income tax now, in order to protect its citizens, would have to impose a nominal income-tax charge against all of its citizens, in order to prevent some other State from charging them an exorbitantly high rate, to which otherwise they would be subject. If a man is working in the District of Columbia, living in Maryland, but is temporarily sojourning here, and pays as much as $1 in his own State, then you could not charge him a cent, while the other man, who is not paying anything, could be subjected to the whole tax liability of some other State, and that would be the rankest sort of discrimination between citizens of the various States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS] has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Under our dual system of government, the matter of taxation comes to both the State and Federal Governments for

consideration and determination. The Federal Government imposes taxes to carry out its Federal functions. The State governments impose taxes to carry out the State functions. The purpose of taxation, whatever its form, is to raise sufficient revenue to meet the demands in the way of public expenditures.

Some of the States raise sufficient revenue for their purposes by other means than an income tax. Some raise a part of their revenue by resorting to the income tax; but whatever system may be adopted by a State, the fundamental purpose of the taxation is to raise sufficient revenue to carry on the ordinary governmental processes of that particular State. So when a man pays his taxes, for instance in Texas, he has paid his proportionate part of the necessary revenue to carry on the State functions. When a man who lives in Maryland, where a State income tax is imposed, has paid his income tax in addition to any other taxes, he has done no more than pay his proportionate part of State revenue. He has simply contributed his part toward the necessary expenditures to carry on the State government.

Consequently, when you seek to impose taxes of one State upon the residents of another State, you are violating a fundamental principle of our Government, because the States are left to themselves in the measures to which they shall resort to raise their own revenues, and the Federal Government has exactly the same function with reference to the raising of revenue to carry out its functions.

It seems to me it is absolutely unsound to seek to make a citizen of one State, who has paid his proportionate part of the necessary revenue to carry on the functions of that State by the methods which that State has adopted, then pay, in addition, taxes in another State. I think the philosophy of the committee amendment is absolutely correct and that the amendment should be adopted, and that the committee has acted wisely in striking this provision from the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to my distinguished fellow Texan, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I understand, this proposition does not propose to tax temporary residents because of the service rendered to their families or children in the State, but they are going to tax them because their States did not levy income tax?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct; yet in their States they have paid their proportionate parts of the revenues necessary to carry on the functions of their States, and when they have done that, why place upon them the burden of meeting the necessary expenses of another State and the revenue that must be had for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment to strike out this section, because to do otherwise would be to grant to other States, or to the Federal Government, the right to compel a State to an income-tax law.

Those States which do not have an income tax should be treated as well as all other States. The fact that the people of a State choose to deny themselves of the spending of public money should not be cause for a penalty. Neither should a State which raises its revenue by taxes other than an income tax be discriminated against.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. D'ALESANDRO) there were—ayes 35, noes 4.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act the term "State" shall include the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLEY: Page 3, after line 10, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 4. For the purpose of this act the term 'State tax' shall include in addition to a tax levied by a State, a tax levied by any duly constituted taxing authority in a State."

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, H. R. 3592, applies to State income taxes and is designed to prohibit the levying of such taxes upon the compensation of a taxable by two different States. It provides that where two States are concerned, such State income taxes can be levied only by the State in which the taxable has his domicile

Obviously, the bill will not reach a situation about which residents of some States complain. Their situation is that while they live in one State they are employed or do their work in a different State and are, in some instances, subjected there to a municipal wage tax. This situation applies to many residents of the State of Delaware who are officers or employees of the Federal Government and who are employed in Philadelphia, for example, in the navy yard or in the United States engineer's office. Some of these employees were directed to their new places of employment because of the removal of certain Federal offices to Philadelphia from the city of Wilmington and after they had established homes in Delaware.

These residents are, of course, liable, as other citizens are, to a Federal income tax, to their State income taxes, and to county and municipal taxes which may be imposed in the particular areas where they reside. They feel that the imposition of the Philadelphia wage tax upon them is taxation without representation because they have no voice in the municipal affairs of Philadelphia and thus they have no effective means of protest against the application to them of the Philadelphia wage tax.

In addition, should such taxes be increased, the nonresidents thus affected by multiple taxation, having no vote in the affairs of the city, feel that they would be without effective legal protection.

For the reasons given, this amendment is offered to afford relief to taxables who are domiciled in one State and are subject to a wage tax levied by a municipality in another State. It is designed to include in the term "State tax," as that term is defined in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], a tax levied by any duly constituted taxing authority in another State. This objective is sought by offering a new section to the bill under consideration, as follows:

SEC. 4. For the purpose of this act the term "State tax" shall include, in addition to a tax levied by a State, a tax levied by any duly constituted taxing authority in a State.

The bill as reported does not afford relief to these interested persons because Pennsylvania does not levy a State income tax. Hence an amendment such as is being offered here must be adopted if these persons are to be relieved of the municipal wage tax to which they are now liable.

The proposed amendment will affect only United States Government officers and employees and will not affect those who are otherwise employed in a State other than the one in which they have their domicile and where they are subjected to the operations of a municipal wage tax. This phase of the question no doubt affects many people, although I am unable to state the exact number in Delaware who are thus affected. Provision for their relief is not made herein because of the constitutional questions that might arise if an attempt were made to apply it to persons not in the employ of the Federal Government.

It is submitted that the present situation is more acute because of the increasing burden of Federal taxation. Unless some legislative action is taken, the situation mentioned here can become even more burdensome should the policy of levying municipal wage taxes be extended or if increases should be made in the rates of such taxation. More and more people would be affected should there be an extension of such form of municipal taxation.

It is, therefore, hoped that favorable consideration will be given to this amendment so that persons working in a city without the State of their domicile will not be subjected to a tax from which they and their families do not derive most of the benefits which a municipality provides for its residents, and which they seriously believe to constitute taxation without representation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLEY. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I may say to the gentleman from Delaware that at the time this bill was drawn I do not believe

any of us had any knowledge of this Philadelphia tax situation. As far as I, personally, am concerned I am willing to accept the amendment but I should like to offer a separability clause in the event there should be a separate attack made upon that feature included in the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WILLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIMOND: On page 3, line 10, strike out the period and add: "and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii."

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered pursuant to the policy and program of the Delegates for the two Territories to seek to have the Territories included within all general legislation of Congress unless there is some special reason arising out of their territorial status why they should not be so included.

I am not prepared to state that the people of the Territories are going to gain any advantage by having this amendment adopted, if it be adopted, but in any event this is a piece of general legislation which is considered by the Congress to be wise and expedient for the people of the United States. If it is such legislation, whether it be good, bad, or indifferent, I suggest it should apply equally to the Territories, for the residents of the Territories are as much citizens of the United States as the citizens of any of the States and are subject to the same income and other internal revenue taxes as the people of the States and those taxes go to the same place, the Treasury of the United States. These people should be given the benefit of general legislation. I therefore submit the question to you feeling confident that the position is fully justified.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Gladly.

Mr. HOBBS. What power of taxation has Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. Alaska has almost unlimited powers of taxation, and the same is true of the Territorial Government of Hawaii. I have just talked with my colleague the gentleman from the Territory of Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] and he tells me that the Territory of Hawaii levies an income tax. The Territory of Alaska at this time has no income tax but one was considered at length at a former session of the legislature and lost only by a vote or two. So in all probability at the next session or soon thereafter at any rate there will be a Territorial income tax in Alaska. I suspect that the inclusion of the Territories will not be of any benefit to the Territories in this particular legislation, but I do not like to see any general legislation enacted by Congress without including the Territories on the same standards and on the same basis as the States. I therefore hope this amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 3, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, this is what the legislative counsel refers to as the separability clause, in the event of any provision of this being held unconstitutional and the remaining provisions being held constitutional, and I merely offer it as a safeguard, particularly because of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware. I refer to his amendment to section 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MCCORMACK having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3592) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 451, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered at the Democratic convention at Bristol on March 18.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I was granted 20 minutes to address the House under special order this afternoon. I desire to withdraw that and ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the regular business on the Speaker's table and after any previous special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to speak for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time today for the purpose of discussing some points in connection with T. V. A. financing which may be of interest to the House because of action taken in another body.

From the beginning of this development the method used, and the method which will continue under the bill making provisions for this operation as it passed the House, has conformed to a definite policy and followed a fixed formula.

Each year the T. V. A. comes to Congress with a request for an appropriation and in making that request the Authority reports to the Congress three important facts.

First. The total amount of money required during the succeeding fiscal year for the statutory program.

Second. The estimated, unobligated balance in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, which is maintained in the Treasury under authority of law, and in which unappropriated funds and receipts from all sources are handled together.

Third. The estimated receipts from all sources that may be expected during the succeeding fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with these amounts and facts before it, Congress has not found it very difficult to determine what new funds if any are necessary to be appropriated. The practice has been to reappropriate the unexpended balance as of the end of the current fiscal year, add this figure to the receipts, and make up the difference of the total requirements with an additional appropriation.

This plan of combining receipts and appropriated funds has been very successful in the past operations of the Authority. And let me point out here, and emphasize if I may, that insofar as the Treasury of the United States is concerned the net result has been exactly the same as it would have been had all receipts been paid into the general fund of the Treasury and then the total amount necessary for operation appropriated out of the Treasury.

I want to emphasize that because I have found in a number of instances, as a result of questions that have been asked me, that there is some misunderstanding of that particular situation.

Now this procedure is not new, despite some opinion that it is a very new departure. Is has been in effect from the very beginning, and it is not based alone on language in appropriation bills. I think it is important for us to recognize that this method and procedure in financing T. V. A. is in every sense in full accord with the basic provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

I do not wish to take the time of the House to read all of section 26 of the basic act, but to refer in substance to some provisions which affect the subject under consideration.

Section 26 provides among other things that receipts from all sources shall be paid by T. V. A. into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, with some exceptions which are set forth in the act.

Under these exceptions the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority may use receipts currently for certain designated purposes.

Included among these purposes are:

First. The operation of dams and reservoirs.

Second. The carrying on of the business of generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy.

Third. Carrying on the business of manufacturing, selling and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients.

Now, let us keep in mind that the basic law authorizes the Board to use receipts currently for those purposes. The basic law, in other words, would not require the T. V. A. to turn in those funds at all, although, of course, the Authority would be required to give an accounting of the expenditure to Congress. But insofar as receipts to be spent for those designated purposes are concerned, except for an arrangement reached with reference to the Treasury fund, the Board could have selected any depository for those funds. I cite that, Mr. Speaker, as evidence that the T. V. A. Board did not even take advantage of the basic law in order to dodge any accountability with respect to its finances.

On the other hand, it was decided that the funds should be handled through the Treasury of the United States. In order to make the arrangement workable and practical, certain mechanics had to be worked out whereby these funds as needed could be disbursed.

Now, as this House well knows, the plan agreed upon came about as a result of the recommendations made by the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General. After concurrence by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, it was decided that there should be established in the Treasury a single fund to be designated as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is making a very excellent statement on this subject, and I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the present method which has worked so successfully is entirely satisfactory with the Comptroller General, with the Bureau of the Budget, and with the Treasury Department, and they, nor any one of them, are not asking for any change in the present procedure.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is exactly correct, Mr. Speaker. So far as I have been able to learn, no agency, no official of the Government concerned with this matter, has found any objection to the present system that has been in operation, as my colleague has said, so successfully since 1935. No request from anyone has come for a change.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I also ask the gentleman if it is not true that every amount that has been spent—for instance, for the purchase of coal in order to operate a steam plant or the building of a transmission line or the restoration of one in the event a line is blown down—all those items are checked by the Comptroller General, by the Bureau of the Budget, by the Appropriations Committee when they come in for their next appropriation, and by the General Accounting Office, and they are all shown in the annual report; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And is it not true, I ask the gentleman, that there has never been a charge that has been proven throughout the history of the Tennessee Valley Authority of 1 cent that has ever been embezzled or misused?

Mr. PRIEST. I will say to my colleague, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the record of the Tennessee Valley Authority will stand beside any record of any Federal agency in the history of the Nation for efficiency of operation and for a complete lack of any charge that could be substantiated of any mismanagement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask the gentleman if, when this matter was up last year, it was not pointed out that just a few weeks before the issue was raised they had a tornado in west Tennessee that blew down a good many power lines? People were without power. A good many war industries had to close for a day or two in order to give the T. V. A. time to restore the power lines which were, of course, blown down by an act of God, that could not be foreseen. Yet, under the Senate amendment, since that could not be foreseen, those plants would have had to remain closed until they had had time to come to Congress, go to the Bureau of the Budget, and pass an appropriation bill through both Houses of Congress in order to remedy the situation.

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. On April 6, 1936, the most devastating cyclone of the last 50 years struck Tupelo. It killed more than 200 people, injured 1,000, blew away 600 homes, and destroyed the water works and I believe every school building in town.

The next afternoon we got a telegram from a private power company, of which Wendell Willkie was the head, offering to assist us in getting hooked up so that we would have electricity. The mayor wired him, "Thank you, sir, but T. V. A. attended to that last night."

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, who has been such a stalwart friend of T. V. A. during the years.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman feel that this Senate amendment is so important that the conferees who will be appointed to confer on the independent offices appropriation bill should bring that amendment back to the House for a separate vote before any agreement is made with the Senate?

Mr. PRIEST. Certainly, before any agreement or concurrence is made. I feel that the gentleman from Missouri is eminently correct. I hope that if there is any inclination at all to agree in conference the conferees will, before making any such agreement, come back to the House with this question.

May I go just a little further now? This Tennessee Valley Authority fund was to include both current receipts and appropriated funds by establishing a single fund. In that manner a great deal of dual bookkeeping and accounting was avoided. It would have been possible, but not practicable, to have established two separate funds, one for receipts and another for appropriated moneys. So, after agreement of all parties that the single fund in the Treasury was preferable to any other plan, it was included in the appropriation bill of 1935. As the bill passed the House that year it contained this language, or language substantially as I am reading now. I think this is the exact language:

And the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal

year subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund.

That, Mr. Speaker, was in 1935, and every appropriation bill since that time, including the one that passed this House a few weeks ago, has contained that or similar language. I think it is important to note that this language carried in all appropriations for T. V. A. since 1935 in no way changes or expands the provisions of section 26 of the basic law. That is another point on which there has been considerable discussion. As a matter of fact, it has been tied in very closely with section 26 by reference to that section of the act each year as it has passed the House; in other words, by tying these receipts closely to the provisions of section 26, although they are placed in the same fund with appropriated moneys, they cannot be used for any purposes except those designated by law in section 26 of the basic law; that is, for carrying on the business of generating—the business, mind you, the day-by-day business—of generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy, for the operation of dams and reservoirs, and for carrying on the business of manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients.

These receipts have been used each year only for the purposes authorized under the law. There has never been to my knowledge a charge made anywhere that the basic law has been violated in the use of these funds. They have thereby served to reduce the amounts necessary each year to be appropriated by the Treasury.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that the Tennessee Valley Authority has been the most successful governmental operation I have ever known. I was, as the gentleman knows, the coauthor of the bill that created it. I think it would be a serious mistake to interfere with its program now. The only result I can see is to hamper the T. V. A. in carrying out its program that has been so successful up to this time. I am wondering, if the bill goes to conference, if we might not get an agreement out of the conferees to bring this provision back here for a vote. I believe when every Member of the House understands it, they will vote that provision down.

Mr. PRIEST. I certainly agree with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. I express again the hope that if there is any inclination to agree in conference they will certainly bring this one provision back and let the House decide it. It is a tremendously important matter.

Mr. RANKIN. It is especially so at this time when we are at war and there is so much necessary war activity taking place in the Tennessee Valley. To cripple the T. V. A. at this time would, in my opinion, be a terrible blunder from every standpoint.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, under this method of financing it is very clear that the ability of the Authority to use receipts to meet current obligations makes it possible for T. V. A. to meet the constantly changing requirements of business and to discharge its obligations and render efficient and uninterrupted service. I emphasize the "uninterrupted" as well as the "efficient" because, as the gentleman from Mississippi so well stated just now, any interruption of service at this time would be tremendously harmful to the Nation in its war program.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the Members of the House will appreciate the disastrous effect the passage of this amendment might have upon the war-production program. As the Members all know, a large part of the aluminum manufactured in the United States is manufactured by the use of Tennessee Valley Authority power. In order to meet all the requirements of the war industries in the valley, it has been necessary for the T. V. A. to operate all of its hydraulic dams at almost full capacity, and also many of its steam plants. When the river is down the T. V. A. has to buy more coal in order to operate the steam plants at greater capacity. When the river is up and they have lots of water, it does not have to buy so much coal. This amendment would place the T. V. A. in the position of having to anticipate 9 months or 16 months in advance whether there will be high water or a little water in the Tennessee River during a particular time. If they overestimated the amount of water and had to operate the steam plants more than they anticipated, that would mean that many war industries would have to be closed down while they were coming up to Congress to make out a case to buy some more coal to operate those war industries.

It would not only be disruptive of the peacetime operations in the valley but it would certainly impede and might greatly hinder the operation of many war plants in the valley.

The people of the United States have a great investment in the T. V. A., and it has made a record that is absolutely remarkable. I certainly think this House should have all the facts before it and have an opportunity for a separate vote before this crippling amendment is ever agreed to.

I think the gentleman is rendering a great service in bringing this matter to the attention of this House at this time.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much the contribution of my colleague. I know we can count on his very vigorous effort in seeing that this amendment, which in effect would place the Congress in the position of trying to run from Washington the day by day details of a great operation, is defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman know of any suspicion on the part of any Member of this body of any fraud or misappropriation of funds by the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. PRIEST. I do not know of any such suspicion on the part of any Member of this body.

Mr. GORE. In fact, has not the T. V. A. been rather exemplary in full disclosure of its operations and the handling of its funds—more completely even than required by law?

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is quite correct. The T. V. A. has come to Congress and justified every item of expenditure every year.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. In that connection I recall that a few years ago I was a member of a joint committee of the Senate and the House that investigated the T. V. A. on all kinds of charges, including fraud and crookedness, if I may use that term, from its very inception down to that date. I think the report of that committee will disclose that even at that time they had done a remarkably fine job. So it seems to me that if under the present law and regulations the financial set-up is working, not only successfully but with all honesty insofar as taxpayers are concerned, it is worthy of serious consideration whether we ought to be making any change here in the middle of a war, in view of the contribution the T. V. A. is making to the war effort.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I know of the very close study he has given to this subject.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly I want to give the House a few high lights of the T. V. A. contribution for war as shown in its report to the Congress for the year 1943.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I voted for the T. V. A. and have never regretted my vote. When I voted for it I had in mind bringing benefits to hundreds of thousands of people in the area served. That was even before we could see the war approaching. It has become of invaluable service during the war. I hope the gentleman in his remaining minutes will

not confine himself, however, to the war contribution but look into the future and speak of the contributions it will bring to that great area that it serves and, through bringing them to that area, to the entire country.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate the comment of the majority leader. I may not have the time to emphasize that, but I think we should recognize what the majority leader has said, that in bringing these benefits to this area T. V. A. is a national interest. It is not limited merely to the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Although I live 2,000 miles away from it, I am very much interested in T. V. A. I have always supported it in every way I could and I hope it will continue to be a shining example to the undeveloped portions of the West, which would like to duplicate it. More power to my colleagues in this empire-building endeavor.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, during the year 1943, T. V. A. provided 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, and more than 75 percent of that 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours was used for war purposes.

During that same year it produced large quantities of ammonia, ammonia nitrate, and phosphorus for munitions and calcium carbide, and for synthetic rubber. It made possible greatly increased water transportation of war materials over the improved Tennessee River channel. It aided farmers to produce without additional manpower, through improved farming methods and the use of T. V. A. phosphate fertilizer, a greatly increased amount of food. It supplied thousands of tons of concentrated phosphatic fertilizers for food production in Great Britain. That development of high-concentrate product resulted in substantial savings of shipping space. I do not have time here to give a complete listing of these contributions. I hope House conferees on the independent offices appropriation bill will stand by the position and policy previously approved by the House and reject the Senate amendment that would destroy the T. V. A. revolving fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the completion of the legislative program and other special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program and other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on tomorrow, after completion of business on the Speaker's table, I may be privileged to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the proposed amendment to the T. V. A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STOP THE COOK COUNTY DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION'S PENNY SNATCHING IN THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it is surely recognized that the enemies of democracy are not solely those with whom we are engaged in battle across the Atlantic and the Pacific, nor solely those misguided individuals within our borders who advocate nazi-ism, fascism, or communism. One of the greatest enemies of democracy is the type of political machine that has been built up by the Democrats in the city of Chicago. It is no secret that many individuals in high positions in government owe their appointment or election, and their allegiance, to the Kelly-Nash Democratic machine in Chicago. The operations of this despicable organization are not unlike the operations of the hated Gestapo of Germany, and we shall never enjoy true democracy in the United States until we have rid ourselves of these gangsters.

I rise at this time to call your attention to one of the most recent public robberies by the Cook County Democratic organization. It is almost unbelievable, but nevertheless a fact, that the Kelly-Nash machine, which controls the Chicago Board of Education, has been snatching pennies from school children. The Kelly-Nash crowd as penny snatchers. Destroy this vicious penny snatching practice now and thereby prevent its spread to other cities of the Nation.

A few weeks ago—March 7—we had before us a bill, H. R. 4278, reported by the Committee on Agriculture. During the consideration of that bill a committee amendment was offered by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] to authorize the expenditure of $50,000,000 by the Federal Government in connection with the school-lunch program. That amendment was defeated, and I do not propose to discuss it now. But I wish to explain the manner in which the Kelly-Nash politicians have been literally "snatching pennies" from the school children in connection with that program in the city of Chicago.

I recall that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] took the floor in favor of the amendment. He spoke of the great value of the program to undernourished children and how necessary it is for the needy families. I wonder if my colleague, who is so concerned about the poor school children, closes his eyes to the fact that the Democratic Party organization in Chicago, which city and which party he represents in Congress, has taken about $250,000 a year in pennies from the school children of Chicago in the form of overpayments on "penny milk." If my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is so concerned about the undernourished school children who cannot afford to purchase school lunches, he will join with me in an effort to stop the Kelly-Nash gangsters from snatching pennies from the school children in order to fill their political campaign coffers.

The facts are these:

The Federal Government subsidizes the "penny milk" program to the extent of paying 2 cents toward the cost of every half pint of milk sold to children under this program. The State of Illinois adds another cent, making a total subsidy of 3 cents. Wherever milk can be bought by the schools or welfare centers at 3 cents a half pint the child has to pay nothing, since the Federal-State subsidy covers the cost. If milk costs more than 3 cents a half pint, then the child must make up the difference.

In Chicago, various bodies which sponsor penny-milk programs buy milk for varying prices—ranging from 3 and 3½ cents per half pint of milk to 4 cents. Where milk is bought for 3 cents the children get it for nothing, and 100 percent of the children in these schools drink it. Where milk is bought for 3½ cents, the children pay 1 cent every other day, and most of the children in these schools drink it. Where milk is bought for 4 cents, the children pay 1 cent, and only about 60 percent of those children attending these schools drink it. In other words, the price of 1 cent to the child tends to discourage buying of penny milk and tends to defeat the purposes of this program.

What accounts for the disparity of prices among these Chicago penny-milk programs?

In Chicago there is a back-of-the-yards council, which is an organization composed of representatives from various church groups—predominantly Catholic—welfare organizations, and labor organizations. This council represents about 100,000 persons in the back-of-the-stockyards area. This council sponsors penny-milk and hot-lunch programs, and up to last September had 27 parochial schools and welfare centers under its wing as far as these penny-milk and lunch programs are concerned. These 27 parochial schools were able to purchase milk at 3 cents a half pint. The child got the milk free, and everybody was satisfied.

In September, when the new school year began, the dairy which furnishes this

milk—Lake Valley Dairy—informed the council that the price of milk had risen, that it would continue to furnish milk at 3 cents to the 27 schools in the program, but that new schools would have to pay 3½ cents a half pint. The council investigated and found this was fair enough, so today we find 27 parochial schools under council sponsorship getting milk at 3 cents a half pint, and 9 parochial schools—having joined the program since September 1943—paying 3½ cents a half pint. Children in these latter schools pay 1 cent every other day. All these schools together take 214,127 half pints of milk a month—January 1944 figures.

In contrast to the back-of-the-yards council which seems to be able to purchase half pints of milk at 3 and 3½ cents merely by calling for bids, we find the Chicago Board of Education "contracting" for half pints of milk at 4 cents—the children paying 1 cent every day. In my district, there are a good number of elementary and high schools —public schools—and the children in all these schools must pay 1 cent to get their "penny milk"—because the board of education has "contracted" for milk at 4 cents. I say "contracted" in quotes, because no one has ever been able to see these contracts. They may not even exist. But the board purchases milk at 4 cents a half pint, saying that it cannot get any milk for less, when at the same time, in the very same city and on the north side of Chicago, other schools under back-of-the-yards sponsorship, by asking for bids, can buy milk at one-half cent or a full cent cheaper.

The Chicago schools on the north side, most of which are in my district, which have 4-cent milk are: elementary: Gale, Armstrong, Field, Kilmer, Stone, Peirce, Trumbull, Chappel, Amundsen, Goudy, Steward, McPherson, Ravenswood, Coonley, Stockton, Blaine, Eell, Audibon, Burley, Jahn, Schneider, Prescott, Thomas, Headly, Mulligan; high schools: Sullivan, Senn, Lake View, Hamilton and Lake View Branch. The children in all Chicago public schools consume monthly—in January—2,291,-151 half-pints of milk.

Now it is not only the public schools which pay 4 cents for milk. The Archdiocese of Chicago sponsors penny-milk programs also, and its program covers 57 parochial schools. In getting dairies, it merely followed the lead of the board of education, not knowing the true situation, and it also pays 4 cents for milk. The children in these parochial schools therefore pay one cent for their milk. They take—in January—227,760 half pints of milk monthly.

We therefore have the curious situation in which children in 27 schools—parochial, with penny-milk programs under back of the yards sponsorship—paying nothing for their milk because it can be bought for 3 cents and the Federal-State subsidy covers that basic cost, while children in other schools—the public schools—pay 4 cents. That difference of 1 cent seems small enough, but multiplied by the amount of milk these public-school children consume over the 10-month school year, the 1-cent overpayment builds up to about $229,115 a year. The children in parochial schools where the penny-milk programs are under the sponsorship of the Archdiocese of Chicago also overpay 1 cent per half pint, and their monthly consumption, multiplied over the 10-month school year, means they overpay about $22,776. In all, the overpayments to dairies appear to be in the neighborhood of $250,-000 a school year, if the overpayments on milk are 1 cent on the half pint. If the overpayments are only one-half cent, then the total extracted from these children's pockets is about $175,000—which is no small sum.

These are the facts. What explanation is there for this curious state of affairs?

I have looked into all the details available and talked with people who are familiar with the mild situation in Chicago, and I find that the answer to the riddle is this: The major dairies in Chicago have an unwritten agreement to hold the price of milk up to 4 cents a half pint, and the Chicago Board of Education accepts this situation because it knows that these dairies contribute handsomely to the Cook County Democratic fund. In other words, the Cook County Democrats are perfectly willing to have the dairies sneak an extra cent or half cent out of the pockets of school children, just so long as the Cook County Democratic fund gets its cut.

What evidence is there that this situation prevails? Let us consider, first, the reasons given by the Chicago Board of Education for refusing to take milk from the Lake Valley Dairy which supplies 3- and 3½-cent milk to parochial schools with penny-milk programs under back-of-the-yards sponsorship. The board of education says that the milk of this dairy is, first, bad; and the dairy is, second, nonunion.

I might tell you that according to the Chicago Department of Health the milk of this dairy meets the requirements of the grade-A ordinance in all respects. That means not only sanitation and bacteria, but butterfat. That means it is as good as the milk of every other Chicago dairy. Second, as to the union status of the dairy, according to Thomas J. Haggerty, secretary-treasurer of Local 753 of the Milk Wagon Drivers Union, all the outside men of this dairy are unionized. According to Frank Gillespie, secretary-treasurer of Local 754 of the Dairy Employees Union, all the inside men of this dairy are unionized. In short, the dairy is 100-percent union. There we have the answer to the Chicago Board of Education explanation, and it is obvious that there is nothing to the story. The board of education is merely trying to hide its usual practice of skinning the taxpayers.

From evidence I have seen, and in my talks with dairymen since this story has broken out in the newspapers, I have come to the conclusion that the larger milk companies in Chicago have a gentlemen's agreement to hold the price of milk to 4 cents. The bids to the Chicago Board of Education this year were all 4 cents, all identical. Any other conscientious body would have thrown the bids out, but not the board of education. It plays the political game, right along with the Kelly-Nash machine. Mr. F. O. Washam, director of the lunchrooms for the Chicago Board of Education, has told various people that he advises all the dairies and other business concerns who have business with the board of education that they must kick in to the Cook County Democratic fund, and they do. Sometimes, he says, they even send the board of education their checks, and he has to reroute the checks to the Cook County party treasurer.

Of course, not all the dairies in Chicago are in cahoots on this 4-cent milk proposition, but enough of them are to make the price stick, and the board of education is so anxious for the contributions to continue to the Cook County Democratic fund that it will do nothing about it.

Let me illustrate something which has recently arisen. The Hawthorne-Mellody Farms Dairy, Inc., is one of the dairies selling milk to the Chicago Board of Education for 4 cents. It also sells milk to the Archdiocese of Chicago for 30 "penny milk" programs in 30 schools, also at 4 cents a half pint. Last September this dairy tried to get the milk business of the Back of the Yards Council. Since that council sponsored 27 schools then—36 now—supplying these schools with "penny milk," it is a sizable chunk of business.

The dairy in September at the beginning of the school year asked the council what it paid for milk. The council said it paid 3 cents a half pint, and if the Hawthorne-Mellody Dairy wanted any part of the business, it had only to send in a bid, along with all the other dairies bidding on the council's schools at the beginning of the school year. Hawthorne-Mellody, in the person of J. F. Gerrity, manager, as the letter is signed, bid "one-quarter of a cent lower than any other bid." In other words, the dairy was willing to supply milk at 2¾ cents a half pint, at the very same time it was getting 3¾ cents from the public schools. Just 4 months later—January 1, 1944—this dairy got 4 cents from the board of education for the very same milk.

While the letter has been published, I understand the dairy is now denying it ever sent the letter, or that J. F. Gerrity signed it. But that need not detain us. Joseph Meegen, secretary of the Back of the Yards Council, and Father Plawinski, pastor of St. John of God Church, 1234 West Fifty-second Street, Chicago, and president of the Back of the Yards Council last year—have stated that the letter was discussed by them with Mr. Gerrity over the phone, and Mr. Gerrity acted as if there actually was such a letter, and talked prices with these two gentlemen.

It is interesting to note that the dairy was forced to disown this letter because it broke the gentlemen's agreement the

dairy had with the other dairies to hold the price of milk fixed. Just so long as the letter was unpublished the dairy was all right. As soon as it got out, everything broke loose.

But what is more important, if the 2¾-cent bid by Hawthorne-Mellody Dairy illustrated what competition could do, then it is obvious that public money is being wasted. Milk at 2¾ cents per half pint, is under the 3-cent Federal-State subsidy in Illinois, which means that this subsidy could be spread further if the price of milk were permitted to reach its competitive level, instead of being pegged at 4 cents as at present. And the reason the major dairies an g·t away with their 4-cent peg is because the board of education is perfectly willing to let this high price ride—the dairies contribute to the Cook County Democratic fund and everybody is happy—except the taxpayers whose funds are being misused, except the children and parents who pay the extra cent, and except the farmers who would like to see as many children drink milk as possible. When milk is at 4 cents, only 60 percent of the school children drink it; when it is 3 cents; that is, free—100 percent of them drink it.

When my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], rose to urge the continuance of the school-lunch program, I do not know whether he was fully aware of how his party organization in Chicago was using the program to raise campaign funds. My colleague is dean of the House and he occupies a place of influence in the Cook County Democratic organization. He can, if he will, and I call upon him to use his place of influence in the Cook County Democratic organization, to stop such cheap, petty, despicable practices as this—the snatching of pennies from school children to fill the campaign coffers of the Kelly-Nash politicians.

If the Kelly-Nash machine has stooped so low as to rob the people through the pennies of school children, I wonder what must be the extent of their robberies in connection with the millions of dollars spent by the Federal Government and the State and the city on other programs. An investigation of their operations will show how millions of dollars of the people's money has been channeled into the pockets of cheap politicians. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the pressing need is a spring house cleaning of the penny-snatching termites.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore rise today to ask an investigation of the use of the Federal funds in connection with the school-lunch program in Chicago, and I believe an investigation should also be made by the Illinois State Legislature of the use of its funds.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield briefly.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate that the gentleman represents the richest district in Illinois, and naturally the people in his district may not be so much interested in aiding the children of the poorer people as I was when I tried to bring about the appropriation for the lunches. The gentleman makes certain charges against the so-called Nash-Kelly machine. I wonder whether he knows that Mr. Nash has been dead now for several months? I wonder whether he knows that we have in Cook County, and especially in Chicago, a combination of five or six of the largest dairy companies that are all Republican and do not contribute a single penny to the Democratic committee?

If the gentleman has any evidence on which I can cooperate with him to ascertain whether there is any such contribution I give him my word as a man that I will cooperate with him to find out if there is anything to the charges he makes. You know, of course, it is easy to make charges but it is hard to prove them.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield much further. My time is limited.

Mr. SABATH. I thought the gentleman had plenty of time.

I think as we grow older we ought to be a little fairer in this matter of making charges and accusations. I know the gentleman does not need to in his district for campaign purposes, for he has the strongest Republican district and there is no fear that he will be defeated. His reelection is nearly assured, so why make these charges unless you have positive evidence?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I know what the gentleman is commencing to feel, that we ought to be a little more careful.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

Mr. SABATH. But I will say this, I do not think the gentleman will find that there is a cent that has been given by the Republican combination and trust to the Democratic organization. But I know where the Republicans are going after many of these men demanding contributions for the next campaign. I have made no use of it yet, but someday I will when I have positive facts. I hate to listen to a statement unless I feel it can be substantiated, and I do not believe the gentleman can substantiate the charges that the Democratic Party has received any portion of funds or any contributions from these Republicans or Republican dairy combinations whom we indicted here a short time ago. They have not any great love for the Democratic Party. The men do because they appreciate what is being done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. All I am interested in is the gentleman's promise to help save our city from the penny snatchers. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. SABATH. No; there is nothing to it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] said about the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] not needing this material as campaign propaganda is true; we know that, but I am sorry the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] cannot grasp the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is doing this in the interest of the public, in the interest of the city of Chicago. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] wants proof about what the machine is doing there in Chicago, all he has to do is to read the court records showing——

Mr SABATH. The court records of Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All he has to do is to read the court records showing how the milk drivers' organization broke windows, destroyed stores, and prevented the delivery of milk to the children of Chicago; put even a widow out of business.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this exposure may help to stop this situation. Exposures have prevented the spread of many vicious practices. Exposure on the floor of the House a few years ago stopped instantly some H. O. L. C. officials from their practice of making unlawful and wasteful week-end holiday trips at the taxpayers' expense. Compare the General Accounting Office reports, before and after that exposure, and you will find this to be true.

Exposure of some of the practices encouraged and permitted by the then chairman of the Select Committee to Investigate Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganizations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] prevented further appropriations of the taxpayers' money to that committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Does not the gentleman feel that that committee rendered valuable service and saved thousands upon thousands of bondholders their holdings and investments?

Mr. CHURCH. That committee had a great opportunity but muffed it.

I hope this exposure may help to destroy "penny snatching" at its inception before it spreads to other cities of our great Nation.

I would be glad to join my colleague from Illinois in singing into the ears of the Chicago Kelly-Nash "penny snatchers":

"Lay that pistol down, Demos,
Lay that pistol down,
Penny-snatching Demos,
Lay that pistol down."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman said——

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman want to sing? Does he like this song:

"Lay that pistol down, Demos,
Lay that pistol down,
Penny-snatching Demos
Lay that pistol down."

Does not that have a lilting swing to it?

Mr. SABATH. I know; it is very catching. Will not the gentleman sing

a song to Governor Green who now has about $80,000,000 that he has collected and is collecting from the people but not expending in the interest of the people, rather using it for political purposes?

Mr. CHURCH. Let me say that Governor Green has no jurisdiction of the Chicago Board of Education.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman read about it; did he not?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield no more, because I must answer within my time.

Mr. SABATH. And he is a Republican, by the way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That fund was made up of voluntary contributions from people who want to get out from under this slavery.

Mr. SABATH. What slavery?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That incubus in Chicago, the corrupt vote-stealing machine.

Mr. SABATH. Ever since 1931 slavery has gone and we have prosperity now in this Nation under a Democratic administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. With one-third ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed; is that prosperity?

Mr. SABATH. But then it was about two-thirds.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; it was not. Now you have them over across the seas. That is prosperity too!

With men dying and the debt rolling up by the billions.

Mr. CHURCH. The Republicans do not control the School Board of Chicago. That control is under the administration of a Democratic mayor of Chicago dominated entirely by the Kelly-Nash organization. I merely plead with the gentleman from Illinois to help stop this penny snatching. I have sung this song to him today. I appreciated his friendly interest.

Mr. SABATH. If there is anything wrong that should be stopped and there is evidence to work upon I say it should be done.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WICKERSHAM, for the period beginning March 28 and ending April 17, on account of official business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the report that accompanied the bill (S. 1767), to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AID FOR READJUSTMENT IN CIVILIAN LIFE OF RETURNING WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I regret that it will be impossible to secure action on the bill S. 1767, or a somewhat similar bill before the House recesses this week. This legislation is very much needed, it is long overdue, and should have been passed months and months ago. I hope that this measure will come before the House and be passed on the day that Congress reconvenes. There is no possible excuse for any further delay. Canada in 1941 placed legislation similar to this on her statute books, and Canada is a smaller country and much less able to stand the financial strain than the United States. I deplore the fact that we have not enacted this legislation before now.

The report from the Senate committee on the above bill is as follows:

PROVIDING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AID FOR THE READJUSTMENT IN CIVILIAN LIFE OF RETURNING WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, report the bill back with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments, many of which are merely for the purposes of clarity, appear hereinafter in the reported bill, and their effect will be discussed in the analysis of the bill.

This measure is designed to be a comprehensive bill of rights for the returning veterans of the present titanic conflict. It aims to state comprehensively and clearly the rights and benefits to which these veterans will be entitled and to state clearly and simply the way in which these rights may be obtained.

The bill sets up an over-all control of these activities in the Veterans' Administration to the end that the veteran may have one central agency with whom he may qualify and one agency to whom he may look to insure the enjoyment of his rights. At the same time Congress will have one agency which may be held responsible for the proper carrying out of the will of Congress with regard to these benefits.

It is contemplated that under the general supervision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs all suitable governmental agencies, both Federal and State, will be employed. No one has any idea of putting the Administrator in the business of education or agriculture or housing, but it is designed to set up one central agency for the protection and benefit of the returning veterans.

The bill recognizes by law the Veterans' Administration not only as an important post-war agency but an exceedingly important war agency and it gives it necessary priorities to enable it to carry out its essential functions of hospitalization, rehabilitation, and other activities. It includes provision for the fullest protection of the rights of the veteran to the end that there shall be no interval between his release from the armed forces and the taking up of his interests by the Veterans' Administration. It includes provision for the further education of veterans, for unemployment benefits, for loans in aid of the purchase, construction, or repair of homes, farms, and business property, for the assistance to veterans in obtaining employment and for other benefits more particularly described later in this report.

Your committee recognizes that this bill authorizes a program which will be costly to the Nation. Yet we view it as true economy. None can deny that it is part of the bare bones necessary cost of the war. We regard it as the best money that can be spent for the future welfare of the Nation. The men and women who compose our armed forces and who will compose our armed forces before the end of the war not only now hold the destiny of this Republic firmly in their hands, they will so hold it for a generation to come. To the extent to which these men and women can be speedily reintegrated into the civilian population the consummation of all of our hopes and prayers for national security and advancement depend. At the conclusion of the last war all of the nations involved save only the United States and to a lesser extent Great Britain failed dismally in this task of reintegration of the civilian population, and thereby planted the seeds of the present war

If the trained and disciplined efficiency and valor of the men and women of our armed forces can be directed into the proper channels, we shall have a better country to live in than the world has ever seen. If we should fail in that task, disaster and chaos are inevitable.

This bill is admittedly more extensive and generous in its benefits to returning veterans than any bill previously introduced as to this or any other war. We believe that this is entirely justifiable in view of the character of service in this war.

The bill is presented as being a fundamental bill of rights to facilitate the return of service men and women to civilian life. The committee does not contend that it is or can be the last word on the subject. We do assert that it is a comprehensive statement of the measures presently necessary and that it represents the very least that should be done at this time both in justice to the veterans and in enlightened self-interest for the remainder of the country.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

Under Senate Resolution 225, introduced December 21, 1943, a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance held extensive hearings and conducted an intensive study of the problems relating to the readjustment in civil life of veterans of World War No. 2. The committee had for its consideration also, Senate Resolution 230, introduced January 11, 1944, concerning the administration of the laws conferring benefits upon disabled veterans of the present war, with a view to ascertaining whether there are unreasonable delays in determining eligibility for and making awards of such benefits. Through reports from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and testimony of the Administrator and of representatives of the War and Navy Departments, as well as of veterans' organizations, it appeared that every effort is being made to eliminate unnecessary delays in the administration of the present statutes, that much progress is being made in this respect, that the Mustering-Out Pay Act helps to bridge the gap, and that consideration should now be given to legislation necessary to afford improved procedures and to grant additional relief pertaining particularly to the immediate post-war adjustment period. Many bills, including S. 1545, a bill to amend the Social Security Act, to give insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of that act for military service, and to provide unemployment allowances for members of the armed forces after their demobilization; S. 1495, a bill to provide adjusted-service compensation and to provide a 3 months' furlough with pay prior to discharge for persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war, and S. 1617, a bill embodying recommendations of the two largest veterans' organizations, to which bill numerous amendments were offered by several Senators. Further hearings were held on the latter bill and the proposed amendments, and as a result of such further consideration, there was introduced on March 13, 1944, S. 1767, which bill was sponsored by more than 70 Senators. This bill was considered in executive session extending over sev-

eral days and the amendments as reported herein were agreed upon and the bill was reintroduced March 17, 1944.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The general purpose of the bill as amended is stated in the title, "to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans." It consists of six titles, covering the entire scope of the post-war veteran readjustment program not already enacted into law, excepting only the question of extension of social security (old-age and survivors insurance) provisions of the Social Security Act to persons in the armed forces of the United States or alternatively, the freezing of the status of such persons as were covered as of the date they entered active service. The laws now in effect pertaining to veterans' benefits include those for pensions, insurance, hospitalization and domiciliary care, medical care and treatment including prosthetic appliances, vocational training or rehabilitation, and mustering-out pay for all persons in the active service, subject to statutory exceptions and entitlement criteria. It is the view of the committee that the enactment of this bill will render unnecessary any consideration of adjusted compensation, and that the benefits provided by the bill, if enacted into law, will be of greater advantage to veterans, at a lesser expense to the Government, than could possibly be accomplished by an adjusted compensation act, at least under factors known or readily foreseeable at this time. The bill, as amended, was reported unanimously by the committee.

TITLE I

Title I of the bill relates to procedures and other matters pertaining to hospitalization and claims of veterans

Section 100, as amended, insures recognition of the Veterans' Administration as an essential war agency, entitled to priorities for personnel, equipment, supplies, and material second only to the War and Navy Departments

Section 101 authorizes and directs the establishment of additional hospital facilities and additional regional offices, suboffices, branch offices, contact units, or other subordinate offices in centers of population where required, and where not now available.

Section 102 authorizes the interchange of hospital and domiciliary facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the War or Navy Department as agreed upon by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of War, or Secretary of the Navy, respectively, subject to a limitation that such agreements shall not result in permanent reduction of Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary beds below the number required for eligible veterans, nor subordinate or transfer the operation of the Veterans' Administration to any other agency of the Government The section contains a further provision affording specific statutory authority for the detail or transfer of commissioned or enlisted personnel from the War or Navy Department to the Veterans' Administration.

Section 103 authorizes the Administrator to place designated officials and employees in Army and Navy installations for the purpose of giving aid and advice to members of the armed forces about to be discharged, or to adjudicate the disability claims of such persons.

Section 104 requires, preliminary to discharge or release from active duty, that a certificate of discharge and the soldier's final pay, or substantial portion thereof, be ready for delivery to him or to some person on his account, and that no person shall be discharged or released from active service on account of disability until he shall have executed a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization to be filed with the Veterans' Administration, or has signed a statement that he does not at the time desire to file any such claim. There are safeguarding provisos to insure possibility of immediate discharge of persons who refuse to cooperate in the signing of such claims or statements.

Section 105 provides that no person in the active service may be required to sign a statement of any nature relating to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease he may have, or any other statement against his own interest, and provides that in the adjudication of any claim any such statements heretofore signed shall be disregarded.

Section 200 authorizes the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to make provision for permitting accredited representatives of veterans' organizations, certified by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to aid and assist persons in the active service and who are about to be discharged or released therefrom in the preparation and presentation of their claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. This would be in addition to the American Red Cross which has statutory basis for, and is, affording similar service.

Section 300 authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to review certain cases wherein the veteran was separated from active service by a dishonorable discharge or a discharge for certain causes generally considered as constituting dishonorable conditions, and upon his determination that the person was insane at the time the offense was committed, he may authorize benefits otherwise payable under such laws. The proviso makes clear that section 300 applies only to benefits in the nature of a gratuity and does not apply to policies of Government (converted) or national service life insurance.

Section 301 authorizes the establishment by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy of boards of review, which boards are given authority upon the request of a former officer or enlisted person to consider the type and nature of discharge or dismissal except one by sentence of court martial, and upon the facts found, to change, correct, or modify such discharge or dismissal with the exception stated. The Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy are modified accordingly, and provision is made that the findings of the boards shall be subject to the final approval of the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy as the case may be.

TITLE II

Title II concerns the education of veterans other than those entitled to vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The purpose of this title is to afford education or training strictly as a veterans' benefit to be administered by the Veterans' Administration in a direct and simple manner as is done with respect to vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress; yet at the same time permitting the use of existing, or to be created, Federal or State machinery, agencies or facilities. The same authority exists under said Public Law 16, and it is desired to leave it within the wise discretion of the Administrator to make such use thereof as may be found desirable, and yet retain control and complete responsibility in the Veterans' Administration. It is the purpose not to set up the Veterans' Administration as an educational agency nor to establish any educational organization, but to provide education and training as a veterans' benefit to be administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 400 further amends section 1, title I, Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, by adding Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part VIII, providing for the education of veterans.

Paragraph 1 of part VIII establishes the criteria for eligibility providing in effect, that any person who served in the active service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war who shall have been released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable shall be eligible for education or training. There is a limitation that such person shall have served not less than 6 months, or otherwise shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual incurred service injury or disability. The purpose of this last provision is to afford an opportunity for education or training to one who is released from the active service of less than 6 months, caused by an injury actually received in or caused by service as distinguished from one service-connected by virtue of the liberal presumptions pertaining to service incurrence or aggravation of disabilities for pension purposes.

Paragraph 2 provides for the appointment by the President upon recommendation of the Administrator of a Director of Servicemen's Education and Training, who, subject to the direction of the Administrator, shall administer the provisions of part VIII Elsewhere the term "Administrator" is defined as meaning the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs unless context otherwise requires. Provision is made for the issuance of necessary rules and regulations, the appointment of additional necessary officers and employees within the limits of applicable appropriations, and for the use of Federal or State educational or vocational agencies subject to agreements with the responsible heads of such agencies.

Paragraph 3 authorizes the establishment of an advisory council to aid and advise in the administration of part VII. Such council shall consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Security Administrator, the United States Commissioner of Education, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as chairman, together with eight representatives of the public who are recognized leaders in the fields of education, labor, agriculture, and industry, and who are authorized to be appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Administrator. The provision is made for necessary travel expenses and per diem of members of the council, the latter confined to appointed members.

Paragraph 4 authorizes anyone eligible under paragraph 1 to receive education or training at any approved educational training institution in which the person desires to enroll, subject to acceptance by such institution and regardless of whether the institution is in the State of which the person is a resident.

Paragraph 5 authorizes a course of education or training not to exceed a period of 1 year, or for such lesser time as may be required to complete the course chosen, with the limitation that such course shall begin not later than 2 years after date of discharge or release from active duty or date of termination of the war, whichever is later, and that no education or training shall be afforded beyond 7 years after the termination of the war.

Paragraph 6 authorizes additional education or training, except as to a refresher or retraining course, which latter may not exceed 1 year as provided in paragraph 5, and provides that such additional or further period of education or training shall not exceed 3 additional years nor the total period of time the person served in the active service during the period of the war, in addition to the 6 months qualifying service, and exclusive of periods of education or training

received under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, or as a cadet at one of the service academies. The amendment authorizes, subject to the above limitations, the automatic continuation of education or training upon application by the veteran subject only to satisfactory completion of the first year's course and continued satisfactory progress to be determined under rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

Paragraph 7 authorizes the payment of tuition and other fees and charges customarily paid by other students, and as may be approved by the Administrator, subject to a limitation of not to exceed $500 for an ordinary school year. Provision is made that the Administrator may determine that such charges of a publicly supported institution are inadequate and that upon such determination he may provide for such compensation as he may find to be fair and reasonable, but not to exceed the $500 limitation prescribed.

Paragraph 8 authorizes the payment of subsistence allowance of $50 per month while the person is receiving education or training with an additional $25 per month if he has a dependent or dependents. It also authorizes a lesser amount, or no allowance, for persons who receive education or training on a part-time basis, or who receive compensation for productive labor performed as a part of their training. This would permit a veteran to receive part-time training at reduced or no subsistence allowance while he is employed on a remunerative job.

Paragraph 9 enables the Administrator to arrange for necessary education and vocational guidance to persons who are eligible for the benefits of part VIII and to make available certain information with respect to general education and training needs with the limitation that other Federal facilities engaged in collecting such information shall be utilized.

Paragraph 10 is the usual provision for annual report to the Congress.

Paragraph 11 as amended authorizes the President, upon recommendation of the Administrator, to request the chief executive of any State to designate the legally constituted State agency, or if none available, to create a special board for the purpose of furnishing lists of approved education or training institutions in the State which are found, in accordance with standards to be established by the Administrator, to be qualified to provide education or training to persons eligible therefor. The provisos are for the purpose of insuring that the determinations of the Administrator as to availability or propriety of any such institution for such purpose shall be final, but authorize the securing of advice from an advisory committee which may be appointed by the chief executive of the State upon the request of the President and the recommendation of the Administrator, which advisory committee consists of persons representing the elementary, secondary, and vocational schools, colleges, junior colleges, professional schools, universities, and other educational institutions, business and other establishments providing apprentice or job training. The amendment would provide for the utilization of the State agency having charge of apprenticeship training under prescribed conditions.

Paragraph 12 defines the term "State" and the terms "educational or training institution," as used in part VIII. The latter definition is sufficiently broad to encompass any approved institution. Those mentioned are not intended to be exclusive but rather illustrative. Restrictions are provided to insure compliance with State and Federal laws relating to fair wages as well as health, safety, and other conditions of labor.

Paragraph 13 is intended to preclude a person receiving vocational rehabilitation under part VII and education or training under part VIII, but authorizes any person eligible for both benefits to elect which he shall receive, with a limitation that he may not receive under part VIII more subsistence allowance than he would receive by way of increased pension under part VII. This is considered essential in order that the provisions pertaining to vocational rehabilitation and to education and training may be properly administered without duplication.

Paragraph 14 is to make clear that no Federal agency or officer shall exercise any supervision or control over any State agency.

Section 401 amends section 3, Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, so as to make the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration available for administration of part VIII as well as part VII.

Section 402 adds an additional new section applying to both part VII and part VIII authorizing a trainee or a student to retain books and equipment supplied him as such unless he, through his own fault, failed to complete satisfactorily a course of training or education provided under part VII or part VIII.

Section 403, consistent with the provisions of paragraph 1 of part VIII, changes the dates as prescribed in sections 1 and 2, Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, so as to include any service after September 16, 1940, rather than limit service to a period after December 6, 1941.

TITLE III

Title III contains the provisions respecting the authorizations of loans to eligible veterans for the purchase, construction, or improvement of homes, farms, and business property.

Section 500 (a) contains the general eligibility provisions which, with certain exceptions, are consistent with those required for the other benefits of the act and similar to those contained in the Mustering-Out Pay Act, 1944 (Public Law 225, 78th Cong.). There is a requirement of a minimum of 90 days' service unles prior discharge is required by reason of disability incurred in line of duty; and elimination, for eligibility purposes, of service from which a person shall have been discharged at his own request unless he had service outside the continental limits of the United States, in which event such service may be counted. Any person so eligible may apply to the Administrator for a loan subject to the latter provisions of the title.

Section 500 (b) limits the amount of loans made to one veteran to a sum or sums not exceeding $1,000, authorizes such loan to be made at no interest for the first year, and at the rate of 3 percent per annum, compounded annually thereafter. No guarantor is required and no security other than a lien which shall be subject to any lien covering the balance of the purchase price or cost of construction or improvement, or, in some jurisdictions, ground rents in connection with a leasehold estate. Loans for such purposes may not be denied to those eligible because of another loans made to finance any part of the remainder of the purchase price or cost of construction or improvement or because lien on the property is given security for such other loan.

Section 500 (c) provides that any loan made under this title shall be repayable to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, except as otherwise provided in the title, shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed jointly by the Administrator and the head of the department to whom the application is submitted for approval of the loan. The language of the section as a whole is construed also to permit loans to be made for the purposes stated therein, regardless of whether the loan for the balance of the purchase price or cost is made by a Federal agency or by a private lending agency.

Section 501 describes the conditions necessary to be met before such loan may be approved and authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to designate the agency or agencies which he deems appropriate for determining whether the loan applied for meets such conditions. He may also designate the agency to which any application shall be submitted for approval unless the veteran requests in his application that the loan be made by the Federal Housing Administration shall be designated.

Section 502 (a) contains similar conditions respecting loans for the purpose of purchasing land, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, or implements, or improvements thereon to be used in farming operations. The Secretary of Agriculture is required to advise as to the propriety of loans authorized in the said section. Subsection (b) makes veterans eligible for the benefits of this title eligible also for the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, subject to approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Section 503 provides similar conditions for loans to be used in the purchase of business, land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, or tools, or improvements thereon, to be used in pursuing a gainful occupation other than farming. The Secretary of Commerce shall pass on the propriety of such loans, subject to the conditions specified.

TITLE IV

Title IV, relating to the employment of veterans, provides no additional specific benefits as such but is intended to afford cooperative efforts to insure that veterans will receive full advantage of the United States Employment Service. As stated in section 600 (a), it is the intention of the Congress that there shall be an effective job-counseling and employment placement service for veterans, and that policies shall be promulgated and administered so as to provide for them the maximum opportunity in the field of gainful employment. Section 600 will create in the United States Employment Service a Veterans Placement Service Board, consisting of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as Chairman, the Director of the National Selective Service System, and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency or other official having the responsibility of administering the functions of the United States Employment Service. The Board shall determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service. The chairman of the Board, through an executive secretary who shall be also the Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service, shall have direct authority and responsibility for carrying out the policies established by the Board, which shall be effectuated through the veterans' employment representatives in the several States. Certain records of other specified services are made available to the Board.

Section 601 requires the United States Employment Service to assign to each State a veterans' employment representative who is required to be a war veteran and who will be appointed subject to civil-service laws and the approval of the Board. He will be administratively responsible to the Veterans' Placement Board created by section 600, and will carry out the Board policies, but will function with and through the public employment service in the State. In cooperation with the public employment service staff in the State, he will be responsible for the supervision of registration of veterans in local

employment offices; assist in securing and maintaining current information as to available employment; promote interest of employers in employing veterans; maintain regular contract with employers and veterans' organizations, and assist in every possible way in improving working conditions and the advancement of employment of veterans.

Section 602 authorizes, where deemed necessary by the Board, the assignment in each State of one or more employees of the staffs of local employment service offices to assist in the discharge of the duties prescribed in the preceding section.

Section 603 requires that all Federal agencies shall make available to the Board such records, statistics, or information as may be deemed necessary or appropriate in the administration of this title.

Section 604 prescribes that failure of the employment service of a State to give preference to qualified registered veterans on job assignments and to cooperate in the execution of the policies of the Board shall be sufficient cause to withhold funds otherwise available to the State under the act of June 6, 1933, until such time as the service complies with the laws and regulations governing the Board's administration of its duties under this title. The amendment is designed to insure the maintenance of the United States Employment Service as a distinct operating entity for the purpose of effectuating the provisions of this title.

Section 605 (a) places upon the Board the responsibility of estimating the appropriation necessary for the proper and efficient administration of this title by separate items, and provides that the sums so estimated shall be included in a special item in the annual budget of the United States Employment Service, and may not be used for any other purpose except upon the approval of the Board.

(b) Requires the War Manpower Commission to allocate from its current appropriation sufficient funds to carry out the provisions of the title during the current fiscal year.

Section 606 defines the term "United States Employment Service" as being the bureau created by the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, or its successor.

TITLE V

Title V covers the field of unemployment insurance or readjustment allowances for World War No. 2 veterans.

Section 700 (a) prescribes the basic eligibility criteria similar to those in existing statutes and in other titles of this act, and in addition, authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe, subject to the provisions of this title and regulations issued thereunder, a readjustment allowance for each week of unemployment not to exceed a total of 52 weeks, which period begins after the effective date of this act and occurs during the 24-month period after the final payment of mustering-out pay to the individual veteran. There are safeguarding provisions to prevent duplication of unemployment allowance, mustering-out pay, increased pension under part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or subsistence allowance under part VIII of such regulation as added by title II of this act. There is an over-all limitation that no such allowance shall be payable for any week commencing more than 5 years after termination of the present war.

(b) Contains additional limitations requiring that the person be a resident of the United States at the time of claim; that he is completely unemployed, or if partially unemployed, that the services have been performed for less than a full workweek, and wages for the week are less than the allowance of this title plus $3; that he is registered with and reports to a public employment office or other agency designated by the Administrator in accordance with regulations, and that he is able to work, and available for suitable work, with a saving proviso that ineligibility shall not be based upon failure to comply with such provisions if the failure be due to an illness or disability occurring after the commencement of the period in question.

Section 800 (a) provides further disqualifications as follows:

(1) If the claimant leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct in the course of employment;

(2) If he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work, or to accept suitable work;

(3) If he, without good cause, does not attend a free training course other than training provided under title II of this act.

(b) Provides additional disqualifications if it be found that the veteran's unemployment is due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a labor dispute at the place where he is or was last employed, with a proviso that this disqualification shall not apply if it be shown that the veteran—

(1) Is not participating in or directly interested in the labor dispute;

(2) Does not belong to a grade or class of workers participating in or directly interested in the dispute, or members of which were employed at the premises where the stoppage occurs, and immediately before such stoppage.

There is a further saving provision confining the application of those provisions to separate branches, businesses conducted in separate premises or departments, and requiring that they be deemed to be separate factory, establishment, or premises.

(c) (1) Any claimant disqualified under any of the three disqualifications provided in section 800 (a) shall be denied any readjustment allowance for the week in which the cause of disqualification occurred, and for not more than the 4 immediately following weeks. The amendments to this subsection (c) are intended to provide the same penalty for the three classes of disqualifying conditions prescribed in (a).

(2) Authorizes the Administrator to prescribe additional penalty not to exceed 8 weeks for each successive disqualification under the provisions of section 800 (a) when in the judgment of the Administrator such additional penalty would further the purposes of the title.

(d) (1) Defines the standards for determining suitability of work or the existence of good cause with respect to a claimant, and provides that there shall be considered, not to the exclusion of other factors, the degree of risk involved to his health, safety, and morals, his physical fitness and prior training, his experience and prior or probable earnings in his customary occupation or one for which he had been trained, the length of his unemployment, his prospects for obtaining work in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the distance of available work from his residence, and the prospects for obtaining local work. The fact that the wages are less than the unemployment allowance shall not be considered a factor.

(2) Declares that for the purposes of section 800 no work shall be deemed suitable if—

(A) the position offered is vacant due to a strike; or

(B) the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in the locality.

The amendment deleting a provision of the bill pertaining to nonsuitability of work if the veteran as a condition of labor be required to join, to refrain from joining, or to resign from a labor organization leaves this a matter for regulation.

Section 900 (a) specifies the unemployment allowances, providing that the weekly allowance shall be $15, plus $5 if the claimant has one dependent; $8 if he have two dependents, and $10 if he have three or more dependents, less that part of any wages paid him for such week which is in excess of $3, with a provision requiring that the allowance so computed be in the next highest multiple of $1.

(b) Prescribes the fundamental limitation that the sum total of allowances shall depend upon length of service. Specifically, it provides that for each calendar month or fraction thereof of active service the veteran shall be entitled to 8 weeks of allowances within the limitations provided in section 700.

(c) Prescribes the definitions for dependent, described as a lawful wife or dependent husband, unmarried child under 18 years of age or otherwise incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect and who is a legitimate child, child legally adopted, stepchild if a member of the claimant's household, or a child to whom the claimant stood in loco parentis and has borne such relationship for not less than 12 months prior to the date of claim on behalf of such child. Provision is made whereby the Administrator may determine dependency and if the child be dependent on more than one claimant, allowance shall be made only to one as determined by the Administrator. Further, where a claimant asks for an allowance for a dependent separated from him under court order or written agreement, the allowance shall be not in excess of the amount fixed in the court order or the agreement.

Section 901 provides that the allowances shall be paid at reasonable intervals as prescribed by the Administrator, and that any allowance remaining unpaid upon the death of the person entitled shall not be considered a part of the assets of his estate, liable for the payment of his debts, or subject to any administration of his estate, but that the Administrator may make payment thereof to such person or persons he finds most equitably entitled thereto.

Section 1000. Any allowance payable under this title shall be reduced by the amount received by the veteran for the same week under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law, or any Federal or State noncontributory benefit other than pension, compensation, or retirement pay paid by the Veterans' Administration.

Section 1100 (a) vests the responsibility of administration of title V in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and authorizes him so far as possible and subject to mutual agreements to utilize the existing facilities and services of Federal and State departments or agencies. Procedures for the filing of claims through established public employment offices and State unemployment compensation agencies, on the processing, determination, and paying such claims through such agencies, subject to mutual agreements, are authorized. Provision is made for the assignment of a representative of the Administrator with each participating State department or agency for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of the agreements made with such agencies and the accomplishment of the responsibilities placed upon the Administrator by this title.

(b) Authorizes the Administrator to prescribe necessary rules and regulations and require necessary records and reports to carry out the purposes of the title, but provides that prior to the adoption of any rules and regulations relating to the performance of Federal or State departments or agencies with which agreements have been made, consultation with such departments or agencies shall be had.

(c) Authorizes the Administrator to delegate to any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, or of any other department or agency of the Federal Government or of any State any powers and duties placed upon him by the title except that of prescribing rules and regulations. As a safeguard the Administrator may require such officer or employee to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Administrator may deem necessary, the cost thereof to be paid out of sums appropriated for administration of the title.

(d) The allowances are prescribed to be paid upon certification by the Administrator by the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office.

(e) The Administrator is authorized to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in advance or otherwise such sums as he estimates to be necessary to compensate any Federal department or agency for its administrative expenses under the title. Such sums shall cover periods not in excess of 6 months.

The Administrator is also authorized to certify to the Social Security Board such State departments or agencies as may be participating in the administration of the title. Upon such certification the Social Security Board shall, in addition to the amounts certified under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State such amounts as the Social Security Board determines to be necessary for the administrative expense of the State under this tile.

(f) Any money so paid to any cooperating agency, person, or institution which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement with such agency, person, or institution, be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current appropriation for carrying out the purpose of this title, or, if returned after the expiration of the time limited in the title shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Section 1101 protects designated certifying officers from liability except for gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, and likewise, with similar exceptions, any disbursing officer with respect to any payment made by him based upon a voucher signed by a designated certifying officer.

Section 1102. Any claimant whose claim has been denied is guaranteed a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal of the State agency, or any such other agency as may be designated by the Administrator. As to such contested claims the decision of the representative of the Administrator shall be final, subject only to appeal to the Administrator.

Section 1200 makes applicable to this title the authority under existing statute (Public Law 844, 78th Cong.) to make investigations, to administer oaths, and to issue subpenas, together with the authority granted by such statute to invoke the aid of the courts of the United States in case of disobedience to any subpena issued pursuant thereto.

Section 1300 requires any person to report the occurrence of any event making him ineligible for, or reducing his allowance, and prescribes a penalty of ineligibility of 4 weeks for employment benefits for failure so to report.

Section 1400 prescribes penalties for the making of false statements or representations as to any wages paid or received, for making or causing to be made any false statements of material fact in any claim for any allowance under this title, or the making or causing to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with any claim under the title, and provides that any person so offending shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. A similar penalty is provided for anyone who shall obtain or receive any money, check, or allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States.

Section 1500 prescribes definitions of the term "week" to mean period or periods of 7 consecutive calendar days as may be prescribed in regulations, the term "United States" to include the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, the term "State" to include, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, the term "wages" to mean all remuneration for services from whatever sources, including commissions and bonuses and the cash value of remuneration received in kind, and the term "noncontributory benefit" to mean a cash benefit, allowance, annuity, or compensation, to include payments under a workmen's compensation law, payable by reason of the past employment of any individual under any law or plan of the United States, or of any State, Territory, or possession, or of the District of Columbia, or of any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, creating a system of payments to individuals, if, with respect to the individual concerned, such benefit system is supported without direct and substantial contributions by him as a wage earner. The term would include benefits made under any law or plan by private insurance carriers.

TITLE VI

Title VI covers the general administrative provisions

Section 1600 makes applicable to all the titles of the act, except as otherwise provided therein, the administrative, definitive, or penal provisions of Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress. This integrates the entire act with the system of benefits initiated under and authorized by said Public Law 2, act of March 20, 1933, and the Veterans' Regulations issued thereunder as subsequently amended by statutory enactment. Among other things it makes applicable the definition of the term "person who served" as including any person, male or female, commissioned, enlisted, enrolled, or drafted, who served in any of the armed forces of the United States, including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or any of the components thereof. Likewise it will make applicable the provisions of section 5, Public Law 2, concerning the finality of decisions of the Administrator, except as otherwise provided, but it would not carry forfeiture for fraud under title V inasmuch as the penalties for fraud under said title are specifically provided in section 1400.

Section 1601 makes available the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this act except, by construction, as otherwise specifically provided in any of the separate titles of the act; and authorizes the appropriation of any such amount as may be necessary.

Section 1602, as amended, provides that as used in the act, unless the context otherwise requires, the singular includes the plural, the masculine includes the feminine, and the Administrator means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 1603. The purpose of this section is to provide a uniform basic entitlement contingent upon the type of release from the active military or naval service. It provides that in order to be entitled to any veterans' benefits provided by this act or by Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, with which this act is integrated, a veteran must have been discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable. These benefits are generally termed "gratuities" to distinguished them from contractual rights, as in insurance policies. The amendment would remove a discrepancy in existing law which has been found to be highly undesirable, that is, the provision of section 6, Public Law 2, as amended (Public law 312, 74th Cong., 38 U. S. C. A. 706), relating to hospitalization whereby a veteran not dishonorably discharged may be entitled to hospitalization benefits. In practice it has been found that this permits most unworthy cases to be hospitalized often to the detriment of persons honorably discharged or discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. It is believed that the hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration should be maintained for veterans whose service was honest and faithful or otherwise meritorious.

Further, the amendment will correct hardships under existing laws requiring honorable discharge as prerequisite to entitlement. Many persons who have served faithfully and even with distinction are released from the service for relatively minor offenses, receiving a so-called blue discharge if in the Army or a similar discharge without honor if in the Navy. It is the opinion of the committee that such discharge should not bar entitlement to benefits otherwise bestowed unless the offense was such as, for example, those mentioned in section 300 of the bill, as to constitute dishonorable conditions. A dishonorable discharge is effected only as a sentence of court martial, but in some cases offenders are released or permitted to resign without trial—particularly in the case of desertion without immediate apprehension. In such cases benefits should not be afforded as the conditions are no less serious than those giving occasion to dishonorable discharge by court martial.

The bill, as amended, is printed with the matter to be deleted in black brackets and the additional language printed in italics, as follows:

[S. 1767, 78th Cong., 2d Sess.]

"A bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War II veterans

"Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the 'Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944.'

"TITLE I

"CHAPTER I—HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

"SEC. 100. The Veterans' Administration is hereby declared to be an [agency of the United States vital and essential to the successful prosecution of the present war, and as such agency the Veterans' Administration shall be] *essential war agency and* entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities in personnel, equipment, supplies, and material under any laws, Executive orders, and regulations pertaining to priorities, and in appointments of personnel from civil-service registers the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby granted the same authority and discretion as the War and Navy Departments and the United States Public Health Service.

"SEC. 101. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Federal Board of Hospitalization are hereby authorized and directed to expedite and complete the construction of additional hospital facilities for war veterans, and to enter into agreements and contracts for the use of suitable Army and Navy hospitals by the Veterans' Administration after cessation of hostilities and after such institutions are no longer needed by the armed services; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to establish regional offices, suboffices, branch offices, contact units, or other subordinate offices in centers of population where there is no Vet-

erans' Administration facility, or where such a facility is not readily available or accessible: *Provided*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 for the construction of additional hospital facilities.

"SEC. 102. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy are hereby granted authority to enter into agreements and contracts for the mutual use or exchange of use of hospital and domiciliary facilities, and such supplies, equipment, and material as may be needed to operate properly such facilities, except that at no time shall the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs enter into any agreement which will result in a *permanent* reduction of Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary beds below the number now established or approved, plus the estimated number required to meet the load of eligibles under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or in any way subordinate or transfer the operation of the Veterans' Administration to any other agency of the Government.

"Nothing in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or any other act, shall be construed to prevent the transfer or detail of any commissioned or enlisted personnel from the armed forces to the Veterans' Administration subject to agreements between the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs: *Provided*, That no such detail shall be made or extended beyond six months after the termination of the war.

"SEC. 103. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall have authority to place officials and employees designated by him in such Army and Navy installations as may be deemed advisable for the purpose of adjudicating disability claims of, and giving aid and advice to, members of the Army and Navy who are about to be discharged or released from active service.

"SEC. 104. No person shall be discharged or released from active duty in the armed forces until his certificate of discharge or release from active duty and final pay, or a substantial portion thereof, are ready for delivery to him or to his next of kin or legal representative; and no [wounded, diseased, or handicapped] person shall be discharged or released from active service *on account of disability* until and unless he has executed a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization, to be filed with the Veterans' Administration or has signed a statement that he presently does not desire to file such claim: *Provided*, That this section shall not preclude immediate transfer to a veterans' facility for necessary hospital care, *nor preclude the discharge of any person who refuses to sign such claim or statement.*

"SEC. 105. No person in the armed forces [suffering from disease or injury] shall be required to sign a statement of any nature relating to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of [such] *any* disease or injury *he may have*, or any other statement against [the interest of such person] *his own interest*. In the adjudication of any claim against the United States arising out of service in the armed forces, all Government agencies are hereby authorized and directed to disregard and to hold for naught any such statements heretofore signed by any such person.

"CHAPTER II—AID BY VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 200. (a) That upon certification to the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of accredited representatives of the veterans' organizations specified in section 200 of the act of June 29, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 844, Seventy-fourth Congress), and other such organizations recognized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs thereunder in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized and directed to permit the functioning, in accordance with regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, of such accredited representatives in military or naval installations on shore from which persons are discharged or released from the active military or naval service: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall operate to affect measures of military security now in effect or which may hereafter be placed in effect.

"(b) The necessary regulations shall be promulgated by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy [in conjunction] *jointly* with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accomplish the purpose of this section, and in the preparation of such regulations the national officer of each of such veterans' organizations who is responsible for claims and rehabilitation activities shall be consulted. The commanding officer of each military or naval installation shall cooperate fully with such authorized representatives in the providing of available space and equipment for such representatives.

"CHAPTER III—REVIEWING AUTHORITY

"SEC. 300. The discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a court martial of any person from the military or naval forces, or the discharge of any such person on the ground that he was a conscientious objector who refused to perform military duty or refused to wear the uniform or otherwise to comply with lawful orders of competent military authority, or as a deserter, or of an officer by the acceptance of his resignation for the good of the service, shall bar all rights of such person, based upon the period of service from which he is so discharged or dismissed, under any laws administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That in the case of any such person, if it be established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that at the time of the commission of the offense such person was insane, he shall not be precluded from benefits to which he is otherwise entitled under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration: *And provided further*, That [in any case to which this section applies the surrender value, if any, of] *this section shall not apply to* any Government (converted) or national service life-insurance policy [at the time of forfeiture shall be payable to the insured if living or, if the insured die before such payment, to the designated beneficiary].

"SEC. 301. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, after conference with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, are authorized and directed to establish in the War and Navy Departments, respectively, boards of review composed of five members each, whose duties shall be to review, upon the request of a former officer or enlisted man or woman, the type and nature of his discharge or dismissal, except a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a court martial[, and except, in the case of officers, denial of retirement with pay]. Such review shall be based upon all available records of the service department relating to the person requesting such review, and such other evidence as may be presented by such person. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony either in person or by affidavit and the person requesting review shall be allowed to appear, before such board in person or by counsel: *Provided*, That the term 'counsel' as used in this section shall be construed to include, among others, accredited representatives of veterans' organizations recognized by the Veterans' Administration under section 200 of the act of June 29, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 844, Seventy-fourth Congress). Such board shall have authority to change, correct, or modify any discharge or dismissal, except a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a court martial, [and except, in the case of officers, denial of retirement with pay,] in accord with the facts presented to the board. The Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy are hereby amended to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to establish such boards of review, the findings thereof to be subject to final approval of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

"TITLE II

"CHAPTER IV—EDUCATION OF VETERANS

"SEC. 400. Veterans Regulations 1 (a), as amended by Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, March 24, 1943, is hereby further amended by adding part VIII, to read as follows:

"'PART VIII

"'1. That any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or relieved therefrom under [honorable] conditions *other than dishonorable* shall be eligible for education and training under this part: *Provided*, That such person shall have been in active service not less than 6 months, or shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability [: *And provided further*, That the education or training of such person was interrupted or prevented by such service, or such person requires a refresher or retraining course in no event to exceed one year, to fit him for employment or profession].

"'2. The President shall appoint in the Veterans' Administration upon the recommendation of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs a Director of Servicemen's Education and Training who, subject to the direction of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall administer the provisions of this part. The Administrator shall from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this part through the Director and such additional officers and employees as the Administrator may appoint, within appropriations made therefor by the Congress. The Administrator may utilize the services of any legally designated Federal or State educational or vocational agency in the execution of this part subject to agreements with the responsible heads of such agencies.

"'(3) There is hereby authorized to be established an advisory council to aid and advise the Administrator in the execution of his duties under this part. The council shall consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, *the Secretary of Agriculture*, the Federal Security Administrator, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be chairman, the United States Commissioner of Education, and [six] *eight* representatives of the public, to be appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, [at least four of whom shall be recognized leaders in the field of education] *who shall be recognized leaders in the fields of education, labor, agriculture, and industry*. The public representatives shall be selected as nearly as practicable on a regional basis. The members of the council shall not receive any compensation for their services on the council, but shall be reimbursed for all necessary travel expenses and members appointed shall receive a per diem allowance of $15 in lieu of subsistence while away from their respective places of residence on the business of the council.

"'4. Persons eligible for education and training under this part shall be entitled to receive education and training at any approved educational or training institution in which they wish to enroll, whether or not it is located in the State in which they reside: *Provided*, That they are accepted as students by such institution in any field or branch of knowledge for which they are found by such institution to be qualified.

"'5. Persons eligible under this part shall be entitled to education and training at an approved educational or training institution for a period of one year (or the equivalent thereof in continuous part-time study), or for such lesser time as may be required to complete the course of instruction chosen by them, beginning not later than two years after the date of discharge or release from active duty or two years after the date of termination of the present war, whichever is later: *Provided*, That no education or training under this part shall be afforded beyond [six] *seven* years after termination of the present war.

"'6. [A] *Except as to a refresher or retraining course, a* further period of education or training not exceeding three additional years may be provided for persons who have satisfactorily completed the first year of education or training: *Provided*, That no person shall be eligible for a period of such additional education or training in excess of the total period he served in the active service during the present war, exclusive of (1) the six months' qualifying service and (2) any period of education or training which he may have received under the Army Specialized Training Program or the Navy College Training Program, or as a cadet at one of the service academies. Such person shall be selected from those voluntarily applying for such further period of education or training. The further period of education or training shall be continuous instruction on a full-time basis as defined by the institution in which it is obtained. *Subject to the above limitations, any person who has not completed his course of education or training but has satisfactorily completed his first year, shall be eligible and entitled to continue his course of education or training until he has completed the same, provided his work continues satisfactorily throughout the remaining period.* The selection of persons for a further period of education or training under this part shall be made in accordance with rules, standards, and methods established by the Administrator.

"'7. The Administrator shall provide for the payment by the United States of such customary tuition, laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similiar fees and charges, as may be approved by the Administrator, to the educational or training institutions furnishing education or training to persons under this part so long as such persons maintain regular attendance and are in good standing at such institutions, but in no event shall such payment with respect to any person exceed $500 for an ordinary school year: *Provided*, That such payments shall not include charges for board, lodging, or other living expenses, and no payments shall be made to business or other establishments furnishing apprentice or other training on the job. If any publicly supported institution has no established tuition fee or if the established tuition fee at any publicly supported institution (including the fee for nonresident students) shall be found by the Administrator to be inadequate compensation to such institution for furnishing education or training to persons eligible under this part, he is authorized to provide for the payment with respect to any such person of such compensation as he may find to be fair and reasonable, but not to exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

"'8. Every person who attends on a full-time basis an approved educational or training institution in accordance with this part shall be entitled to receive a subsistence allowance of $50 per month while in attendance and in good standing at such institution, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding thirty days in a calendar year, in accordance with regulations issued by the Administrator. A person having a dependent or dependents shall be entitled to receive an additional sum of $25 per month. Persons attending on a part-time basis and persons receiving compensation for productive labor performed as part of their apprentice or other training on the job at business establishments shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependency allowances as may be determined by the Administrator.

"'9. The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational guidance to the persons eligible for education and training under this part. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make information available respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various trades, crafts, and professions: *Provided*, That facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized.

"'10. The Administrator shall transmit to the Congress annually a report of operations under this part. If the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session, such reports shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"'11. The President upon recommendation of the Administrator may request the chief executive of any State to designate the legally constituted State educational agency or agencies, or, if no such State educational agency is available, may request the creation of a special board to act in lieu thereof [(a) for the purpose of advising and assisting in selecting those persons who shall be entitled to receive a further period of education or training as provided for in this part of (b)] for the purpose of furnishing lists of approved educational or training institutions in such State which are found, in accordance with standards established by the Administrator, to be qualified to provide education and training to persons eligible under this part: *Provided*, That in the event the Administrator is of the opinion that any institution should be included in, or excluded from, such lists from any State he shall make recommendations to that effect to the appropriate State agency or special board. Wherever the State educational agency is not representative of all the educational or training institutions eligible for approval in accordance with this part, the President upon the recommendation of the Administrator may request the chief executive of the State to appoint an advisory committee consisting of persons who shall represent the elementary, secondary, and vocational schools, the colleges, junior colleges, professional schools, universities, and other educational institutions, and business and other establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job in the State, to aid and advise the State educational agency in the execution of their functions under this part. Only such educational or training institutions as are included in such lists and approved by the Administrator shall be deemed approved educational or training institutions within the meaning of this part: *Provided, That wherever there are established State apprenticeship agencies expressly charged by State laws to administer apprentice training, the Administrator shall, whenever possible, utilize such existing facilities and services in training on the job when such training is of one year's duration or more.*

"'12. As used in this part, the term "State" shall include the States of the United States, the Territories and possessions, the District of Columbia, and the Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That until the termination of Japanese occupancy of the Philippine Islands and the restoration of orderly processes of government therein, the provisions of this part, to the extent that they require action within the territorial limits of the Philippine Islands, shall not apply; the term "educational or training institution" shall include public or private elementary, secondary, and other schools furnishing education for adults, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, colleges, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers colleges, normal schools, professional schools, and universities, and shall also include business or other establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job under the supervision of an approved college or university, or any State department of education *or any State apprenticeship agency* or State board of vocational education, or any State apprenticeship council [of] *or* the Federal Apprentice Training Service established in accordance with Public Numbered 308, Seventy-fifth Congress, or any agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such training. No business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job to persons eligible for training under this part shall be approved for training under the provisions of this part unless such establishment compensates such persons at rates of pay required by applicable State or Federal laws and which are fair and reasonable for any productive labor performed as part of their training and unless such establishment meets all applicable State and Federal statutes and regulations relating to health, safety, and other conditions of labor.

"'13. Any person eligible for the benefit of this part who is also eligible for the benefit of part VII may elect which benefit he desires: *Provided*, That subsistence allowance hereunder shall not, in the event of such election, exceed the amount of additional pension otherwise payable were the training under said part VII. [All payments under the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 received by any person during the time that such person is receiving education or training under the provisions of this part shall be offset by suspension of equal amounts of subsistence allowance, which suspended amounts may be paid after completion of education or training hereunder.]

"'14. No department, agency, or officer of the United States in carrying out the provisions of this part shall exercise any supervision or control over any State educational agency *or State apprenticeship agency* or any educational or training institution with respect to their personnel, curriculum, or methods or materials of instruction.'

"SEC. 401. Section 3 Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. The appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, "Salaries and expenses, medical and hospital, and compensation and pensions," shall be available for necessary expenses under part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes thereof. Such expenses may include, subject to regulations issued by the Administrator, and in addition to medical care, treatment, hospitalization, and prosthesis, otherwise authorized, such care, treatment, and supplies as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a).'

"SEC. 402. Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section 4 to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 4. Any books or equipment furnished a trainee or student under part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), shall, unless waived by the Administrator, be returned or the reasonable value thereof accounted for if he, because of fault on his part, fails to complete satisfactorily a course of training or schooling afforded thereunder.'

"SEC. 403. [Paragraph] *Subsection (f) of section 1, title I, Public, Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, and paragraph* 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended by Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, March 24, 1943, [is] *are* hereby amended by deleting the [date] *dates 'December 7, 1941'* and December 6, 1941,' [in the first sentence thereof,] and substituting the date 'September 16, 1940.'

"TITLE III—LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

"CHAPTER V—GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOANS

"SEC. 500. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of ninety days or more, or shall have been discharged or released therefrom after less than ninety days of service for disability incurred in line of duty, shall be deemed to be a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, except that no person shall be eligible for such benefits by reason of service from which he shall have been discharged or released on his own initiative to accept employment unless he had served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska. Any such veteran may apply to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for a loan for any of the purposes specified in sections 501, 502, and 503. If the Administrator finds that the veteran is eligible for the benefits of this title and is in need of such loan, the Administrator shall submit the veteran's application for approval of the loan as provided in sections 501, 502, and 503. When any such loan has been approved as provided in such sections, the loan shall be made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"(b) The aggregate of all loans made to any one veteran under this title shall be for such amount not in excess of $1,000 as may be applied for by the veteran. Any such loan shall bear no interest for the first year after the loan is made, and thereafter shall bear interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum, compounded annually. No guarantor of any such loan shall be required and no security for the loan shall be required except for a lien, which shall be subject only to a lien covering the balance of the purchase price or construction cost and such ground rents as may arise from the purchase of a leasehold estate. No loan to be used in paying a part of the purchase price of any real property or a part of the construction cost of a dwelling to be erected upon unimproved real property owned by the veteran shall be denied or disapproved under this title because another loan is made or to be made to finance any part of the remainder of the purchase price or construction cost of such property, or because a lien upon the property is given or to be given as security for such other loan.

"(c) Any loan made under this title shall be repayable to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and, except as otherwise provided in this title, shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed jointly by such Administrator and the head of the department or agency to whom the application is submitted for approval of the loan.

"PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES

"SEC. 502. (a) Any application made under this title for a loan to be used in purchasing residential property or in constructing a dwelling on unimproved property owned by the veteran to be occupied as a home by the veteran applicant shall be submitted to an agency designated pursuant to subsection (d) for its approval. Such agency shall approve the loan if it finds—

"(1) that such loan will be used for part payment for such property to be purchased or constructed by the veteran;

"(2) that the contemplated terms of payment required in any mortgage to be given in part payment of the purchase price or the construction cost bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and that the nature and condition of the property is such as to be suitable for dwelling purposes; and

"(3) that the purchase price paid [and] *or* to be paid by the veteran for such property or the construction cost, including the value of the unimproved lot, does not exceed the appraised value thereof as determined by such designated agency.

"(b) Any application for a loan under this section for the purpose of *making repairs, alterations, or improvements in, or* paying delinquent indebtedness, taxes, or special [assessments, on] *assessments on,* residential property previously purchased [for a home] *or owned* by the veteran, *and used by him as a home,* shall be submitted to an agency designated pursuant to subsection [(d)] *(d)*, which shall approve such loan if it finds that such loan will be used for such purpose.

"(c) No first mortgage shall be ineligible for insurance under the National Housing Act, as amended, by reason of any loan made under this title, or by reason of any secondary lien upon the property involved securing such loan.

"(d) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may designate such agency or agencies as he deems appropriate for determining whether or not loans should be approved under this section, and he may designate the agency to which any application shall be submitted for approval under this section, except that if the veteran so requests in his application for the loan the agency designated for such purpose with respect to such loan shall be the Federal Housing Administration.

"PURCHASE OF FARMS AND FARM EQUIPMENT

"SEC. 502. (a) Any application made under this title for a loan to be used in purchasing any land, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, or implements, *or in repairing, altering, or improving any buildings,* to be used in farming operations conducted by the applicant, shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture for his approval of the loan. Such Secretary shall approve the loan if he finds—

"(1) that such loan will be used for part payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used in bona fide farming operations conducted by him;

"(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

"(3) that the ability and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

"(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed a reasonable appraised value therefor as determined by the Secretary.

"(b) Any person who is found by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, as provided in section 500 hereof, and who is found by the Secretary of Agriculture, by reason of his ability and experience, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, shall be eligible for the benefits of such act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

"PURCHASE OF BUSINESS PROPERTY

"SEC. 503. Any application made under this title for a loan to be used in purchasing any business, land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, or tools, to be used by the applicant in pursuing a gainful occupation (other than farming), shall be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce for his approval of the loan. Such Secretary shall approve the loan if he finds—

"(1) that such loan will be used for part payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used by him in the bona fide pursuit of a gainful occupation (other than farming);

"(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such occupation;

"(3) that the ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such occupation; and

"(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed a reasonable appraised value therefor as determined by the Secretary.

"TITLE IV

"CHAPTER VI—EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

"SEC. 600. (a) In the enactment of the provisions of this title Congress declares as its intent and purpose that there shall be an effective job-counseling and employment placement service for veterans, and that, to this end, policies shall be promulgated and administered, so as to provide for them the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment. For the purpose there is hereby created within the United States Employment Service, as established by the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, a Veterans' Placement Service Board, which shall consist of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as Chairman, the Director of the National Selective Service System, and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, or whoever may have the responsibility of administering the functions of the United States Employment Service. The members of the Board may be represented by alternates. The Board shall determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service.

"(b) The Chairman of the Board, through an executive secretary, who shall be the Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service, shall have direct authority and responsibility for carrying out its policies through the veterans' employment representatives in the several States.

"(c) The public records of the Veterans' Personnel Division, National Selective Service System, and the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service shall be available to the Board.

"SEC. 601. The United States Employment Service shall assign to each of the States (the Territories and the District of Columbia) a veterans' employment representative, who shall be a veteran of the wars of the United States and who shall be appointed, subject to the approval of the Board, *in accordance*

with the civil-service laws, and whose compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the [Civil Service] Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Each such veterans' employment representative shall be attached to the staff of the public employment service in the State (the Territory or the District of Columbia) to which he has been assigned. He shall be administratively responsible to the Board, through its executive secretary, for the execution of the Board's veterans' placement policies through the public employment service in the State (the Territory or the District of Columbia). In cooperation with the public employment service staff in the State, he shall—

"(a) be functionally responsible for the supervision of the registration of veterans in local employment offices for suitable types of employment;

"(b) assist in securing and maintaining current information as to the various types of available employment in public works and private industry or business;

"(c) promote the interest of employers in employing veterans;

"(d) maintain regular contact with employers and veterans' organizations with a view of keeping employers advised of veterans available for employment and veterans advised of opportunities for employment; and

"(e) assist in every possible way in improving working conditions and the advancement of employment of veterans.

"SEC. 602. Where deemed necessary by the Board, there shall be assigned by the administrative head of the employment service in the State one or more employees of the staffs of local employment service offices, whose services shall be primarily devoted to discharging the duties prescribed to the veterans' employment representative.

"SEC 603. All Federal agencies shall furnish the Board such records, statistics, or information as may be deemed necessary or appropriate in administering provisions of this title, and shall otherwise cooperate with the Board in providing continuous employment opportunities for veterans.

"SEC. 604. Failure of the employment service of a State to give preference to qualified registered veterans on job assignments and to cooperate in the execution of the policies of the Board shall be sufficient cause to withhold the funds made available to the State under the act of June 6, 1933, until such time as the employment service of the State complies with the laws and regulations governing the Board's administration of its veterans' placement functions. *The Federal agency administering the United States Employment Service shall maintain that service as an operating entity and, during the period of its administration, shall effectuate the provisions of this title.*

"SEC. 605. (a) The Board through its executive secretary shall estimate the funds necessary for the proper and efficient administration of this title; such estimated sums shall include the annual amounts necessary for salaries, rents, printing and binding, travel, and communications. Sums thus estimated shall be included as a special item in the annual budget of the United States Employment Service. Any funds appropriated pursuant to this special item as contained in the budget of the United States Employment Service shall not be available for any purpose other than that for which they were appropriated, except with the approval of the Board.

"(b) The War Manpower Commission shall from its current appropriation allocate and make available sufficient funds to carry out the provisions of this [Act] *title* during the current fiscal year.

"SEC. 606. The term 'United States Employment Service' as used in this title means that Bureau created by the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, or such successor agencies as from time to time shall perform its functions and duties, as now performed by the War Manpower Commission.

"TITLE V

"CHAPTER VII—READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

"SEC. 700. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been separated from active service under other than dishonorable conditions after the date of enactment of this title or within the fifty-two-week period preceding such date (except that no person shall be eligible for any benefit under this title by reason of any period of service from which he shall have been discharged or released on his own initiative to accept employment unless he had served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska), shall be entitled, in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe, to receive a readjustment allowance as provided herein for each week of unemployment, up to fifty-two weeks, which (1) begins after the effective date of this title, and (2) occurs during the twenty-four-month period after final payment of mustering-out pay: *Provided*, That no such allowance shall be paid for any of the first four consecutive weeks following any payment of mustering-out pay, or for any period for which he receives increased pension under part VII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a) or a subsistence allowance under part VIII of such Regulation: *Provided further*, That no readjustment allowance shall be payable for any week commencing more than five years after the termination of hostilities in the present war.

"(b) Such person shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of unemployment if claim is made for such allowance and the Administrator finds with respect to such week that—

"(1) the person is residing in the United States at the time of such claim;

"(2) the person is completely unemployed, having performed no service and received no wages, or is partially unemployed in that services have been performed for less than a full workweek and the wages for the week are less than the allowance under this title plus $3;

"(3) the person is registered with and continues to report to a public employment office, or such other agency as the Administrator may designate, in accordance with regulations of the Administrator;

"(4) the person is able to work and available for suitable work: *Provided*, That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

"CHAPTER VIII—DISQUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 800. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 700, a claimant shall be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

"(1) he leaves suitable work voluntarily, without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct in the course of employment;

"(2) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work in accordance with regulations of the Administrator or to accept suitable work when offered him; or

"(3) he, without good cause, does not attend a free training course (not within the purview of part VIII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), in accordance with regulations of the Administrator.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provision of section 700, a claimant shall also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week with respect to which it is found that his unemployment is due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a labor dispute at the factory, establishment, or other premises at which he is or was last employed: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply if it is shown that—

"(1) he is not participating in or [indirectly] *directly* interested in the labor dispute which causes the stoppage of work; and

"(2) he does not belong to a grade or class of workers of which, immediately before the commencement of the stoppage there were members employed at the premises at which the stoppage occurs, any of whom are participating in or directly interested in the dispute: *Provided, however*, That if in any case separate branches of [work] *work, which* are commonly conducted a separate businesses in separate [premises or] *premises*, are conducted in separate departments of the same premises, each such department shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be a separate factory, establishment, or other premises.

(c) (1) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions [of paragraph (1)] of subsection (a) of this section, he shall be disqualified to receive any readjustment allowance for the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and for not more than four immediately following weeks. [In addition, the twenty-four-month period within which he might otherwise be eligible to receive readjustment allowances shall be reduced by the number of weeks for which the claimant shall have been disqualified.

"[(2) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions of paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) of this section, he shall be disqualified to receive any readjustment allowance for the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and for all subsequent weeks until he has had substantially full-time employment for wages for a period of two weeks, or in the event of any subsequent disqualification the Administrator may prescribe a longer period of such employment, not to exceed four weeks.]

"[(3)] (2) In addition to the disqualification prescribed in paragraph (1) above, the Administrator may, in cases of successive disqualifications under the provisions of [paragraph (1) of] subsection (a) of this section, [impose the disqualification provided in paragraph (2) above, when in the estimate of the Administrator such additional disqualification is in furtherance of the purposes of this act] *extend the period of disqualification for such additional period as the Administrator may prescribe, but not to exceed eight additional weeks in the case of any one disqualification.*

"(d) (1) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work or the existence of good cause with respect to a claimant, there shall be considered, among other factors, the degree of risk involved to his health, safety, and morals, his physical fitness and prior training, his experience and prior or probable earnings in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the length of his unemployment, his prospects for obtaining work in the customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the distance of available work from his residence and prospects for obtaining local work. No work shall be deemed unsuitable for an individual solely because the wages are less than his readjustment allowance.

"(2) [No] *In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work, no* work shall be deemed suitable *for an individual* if—

"(A) the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute; or

"(B) the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less fa-

vorable to him than those prevailing for similar work in the locality.

"CHAPTER IX—AMOUNT OF ALLOWANCE AND PAYMENT

"SEC. 900. (a) The allowance for a week shall be—

"(1) $15, plus

"(2) (A) $5 if the claimant has one dependent, or

"(B) $8 if he has two dependents, or

"(C) $10 if he has three or more dependents,

less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3: *Provided*, That where the allowance is not a multiple of $1, it shall be computed to the next highest multiple of $1

"(b) The number of weeks of allowances to which each eligible veteran shall be entitled shall be determined as follows: For each calendar month or fraction thereof of active service the veteran shall be entitled to eight weeks of allowances, but in no event to exceed the maximum provided in section 700.

"(c) (1) As used in this section the term 'dependent' includes only—

"(A) the lawful wife of a claimant living with him or receiving regular support from him, or the lawful husband of a claimant if dependent upon his wife for support, who, in the week for which an allowance is claimed, has not received $5 or more either as wages, as an allowance under this title, or under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law; or

"(B) an unmarried child either (1) under eighteen years of age, or (2) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect

"(2) As used in this section the term 'child' shall include only—

"(A) a legitimate child;

"(B) a child legally adopted;

"(C) a stepchild, if a member of the claimant's household; or

"(D) a child to whom the claimant stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than twelve months prior to the date of this claim on behalf of such child.

"(d) The Administrator may find an individual to be a dependent of the claimant if the claimant has certified the facts required by the provisions of this subsection.

"(e) Where a child is a dependent of more than one claimant, allowance for the child shall be made only on behalf of one claimant, as determined by the Administrator.

"(f) Where a claimant seeks an allowance for a dependent who is separated from him under court order or written agreement, the allowance for the dependent shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or in the written agreement. If such amount is not fixed at a weekly rate, the portion payable for each week shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Administrator

"SEC. 901. (a) Readjustment allowances shall be paid at reasonable intervals prescribed by the Administrator.

"(b) Any allowances remaining unpaid upon the death of a claimant shall not be considered a part of the assets of the estate of the claimant, or liable for the payment of his debts, or subject to any administration of his estate, and the Administrator may make payment thereof to such person or persons he finds most equitably entitled thereto.

"CHAPTER X—ADJUSTMENT OF DUPLICATE BENEFITS

"SEC. 1000. Where an allowance is payable to a claimant for a week under this title and where, for the same week, either an allowance or benefit is received under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law, or a Federal or State noncontributory benefit is received, the amount received or accrued from such other source shall be subtracted from the allowance payable under this title (except that this section shall not apply to pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration); and the resulting allowances, if not a multiple of $1, shall be readjusted to the next higher multiple of $1.

"CHAPTER XI—ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 1100. (a) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to administer this title and shall, insofar as possible, utilize existing facilities and services of Federal and State departments or agencies on the basis of mutual agreements with such departments or agencies. Such agreements shall provide for the filing of claims for readjustment allowances with the Administrator through established public employment offices and State unemployment compensation agencies. Such agencies, through agreement, shall also be utilized in the processing, adjustment, and determination of such claims and the payment of such allowances. To facilitate the carrying out of agreements with State departments or agencies and to assist in the discharge of the Administrator's duties under this title, a representative of the Administrator shall be located in each participating State department or agency.

"(b) The Administrator shall prescribe such rules and regulations and require such records and reports as he may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this title: *Provided, however*, That prior to the adoption of any rules and regulations relating to the performances of Federal or State departments or agencies with which agreements have been made, the Administrator shall consult and advise with representatives of such departments or agencies as to the provisions of such rules and regulations.

"(c) The Administrator may delegate to any officer or employee of his own or of any other department or agency of the Federal Government or of any State such of his powers and duties, except that of prescribing rules and regulations, as the Administrator may consider necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. The Administrator may require any such officer or employee to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Administrator may deem necessary and the cost of such bond shall be paid out of sums appropriated for the administration of this title.

"(d) Allowances shall be paid upon certification by the Administrator. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, and prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall pay, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, to the departments, agencies, or individuals designated, the amounts so certified.

"(e) The Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in advance or otherwise such sums as he estimates to be necessary to compensate any Federal department or agency for its administrative expenses under this title. Such sums shall cover periods of no longer than six months.

"The Administrator shall also from time to time certify to the Social Security Board such State departments or agencies as may be participating in the administration of this title. Upon such certification the Social Security Board shall, in addition to the amounts certified under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State such amounts as the Board determines to be necessary for the administrative expense of such State under this title.

"(f) Any money paid to any cooperating agency, person, or institution which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement with such agency, person, or institution, be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current appropriation for carrying out the purpose of this title, or, if returned after the expiration of this title, shall be covered into the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 1101 (a) No person designated by the Administrator as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any allowance certified by him under this title.

"(b) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated by the Administrator.

"SEC. 1102. Any claimant whose claim for an allowance has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal of the State agency *or such other agency as may be designated by the Administrator*. The representative of the Administrator [located in each State participating in the administration of this title] shall be the final [appellate] authority in regard to contested [claims arising in such State. The decision of the representative shall be subject to review by] *claims, subject to appeal to* the Administrator

"CHAPTER XII—DECISIONS AND PROCEDURES

"SEC. 1200. The authority to issue subpenas and provisions for invoking aid of the courts of the United States in case of disobedience thereto, to make investigations, and to administer oaths, as contained in title III of the Act of June 29, 1936 (49 Statute 2033-34; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 131-133), shall be applicable in the administration of this title.

"CHAPTER XIII—REQUIREMENT OF REPORTING

"SEC. 1300. Any claimant shall report the occurrence of any event which makes him ineligible for or reduces his allowance. Any claimant who fails to report any such event of which he has knowledge and who accepts an allowance to which he is not entitled because of such event shall be ineligible to receive any allowance for four weeks of unemployment thereafter.

"CHAPTER XIV—PENALTIES

"SEC. 1400. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any allowance authorized under this title, or for the purpose of causing any allowance to be paid where none is authorized under this title, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any allowance under this title, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such claim, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"CHAPTER XV—DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1500. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'week' means such period or periods of seven consecutive calendar days as may be prescribed in regulations by the Administrator.

"(b) The term 'United States' used geographically means the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"(c) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"(d) The term 'wages' means all remuneration for services from whatever sources, including commissions and bonuses and the cash value of all remuneration in any medium other than cash.

"(e) The term 'noncontributory benefit' means a cash benefit, allowance, annuity, or compensation (including payments under any workmen's compensation law) payable by reason of the past employment or services of any individual, under any law or plan of the United States, any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, creating a system of such payments to individuals (including payments made under any such law or plan by private insurance carriers), if with respect to such individual the benefit system is supported without direct and substantial contributions by wage earners.

"TITLE VI

"CHAPTER XVI—GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1600. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the administrative, definitive, and penal provisions under Public, Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, shall be for application under this act.

"SEC. 1601. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 1602. Wherever used in this act, *unless the context otherwise requires*, the singular includes the plural and the masculine includes the feminine, *and the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.*

"Sec. 1603. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable shall be a prerequisite to entitlement to veterans' benefits provided by this act or Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended."

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1767. An act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on March 25, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan;

H. R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff, as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume; and

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 28, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 28, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will hold open hearings on S. 1767, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 28, 1944.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1338. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting consolidated forms 3257, "Report of Federal Civilian Employment," for the Federal Security Agency for the month of February 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1339. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to remove restrictions on establishing postoffice branches and stations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1340. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, a detailed report showing credit operations to July 1, 1943; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1341. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1943; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1342. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of report on the Yazoo River, with a view to determining whether improvements for flood control on the Big Sunflower, Little Sunflower, and Quiver Rivers and their tributaries, and on Deer Creek, Steele Bayou, and Bogue Phalia, Miss., are advisable at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on January 28, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 516); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 86. A bill to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4115. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; with amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4292. A bill to amend section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4320. A bill relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil-service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 242. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a Minimum Wage Board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1918, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SATTERFIELD: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3732. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddems; without amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3296. A bill for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3977. A bill for the relief of Harry Schultz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4361. A bill for the relief of Arch A. Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 4485. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4486. A bill to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4487. A bill to authorize the designation of retired justices for service on the Supreme Court of the United States when necessary to obtain a quorum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4488. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 4489. A bill to restore standard time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4490. A bill to amend article 8 of chapter 21 of title 34 (Navy) of the United States Code by adding three subsections to the first subdivision thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4491. A bill to facilitate the supplying of the war needs for beryllium and beryllium alloys and to further ensure a just and equitable relationship between the Alien Property Custodian, holder of certain German patents, and the Beryllium Corporation of Delaware, whose contract with Siemens and Halske and the Heraeus Vacuumschmelze, dated January 16, 1934, expiring on March 28, 1944, and which contract is now under the control of the Alien Property Custodian; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4492. A bill granting annual and sick leave with pay to war-service substitutes in the Postal Service for service performed from the date of appointment; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McMURRAY:

H. R. 4493. A bill to promote the trade and commerce of the United States and to promote trade and commerce among the nations of the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4494. A bill to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of flood-control and navigation improvements, including dams, reservoirs, and allied structures, in the basins of the Arkansas and White Rivers, and for the disposition of surplus electric energy generated by the Federal flood-control and navigation improvements in the basins of such rivers, and other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 484. Resolution requesting information from the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 485. Resolution requesting information from the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4495. A bill for the relief of H. Louis Tupper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4496. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Deo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5341. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 166 members of the Calvary Baptist Church of Rochester, N. Y. urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5342. Also, petition of Ella M. Butcher and 29 other citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5343. Also, petition of Mrs. K. Soreng and 113 other citizens of Grand Forks, N. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5344. Also, petition of Dora A. States and 57 other citizens of Spencerville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5345. Also, petition of Leona H. Evans and 75 other citizens of Durham, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5346. Also, petition of Anna I. Marshall and 108 other citizens of Magnolia, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5347. Also, petition of Mrs. James A. Walls and 62 other citizens of Bel Air, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5348. Also, petition of Anita E. Studebaker and 72 other citizens of Angwin, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5349. Also, petition of Mrs. William Landon and 69 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5350. Also, petition of Mrs. D. S. Hammond and 93 other citizens of National City, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5351. Also, petition of Rose M. Porter and 55 other citizens of Snow Hill, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5352. Also, petition of E. G. Green and 56 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5353. Also, petition of I. C. Isham and 55 other citizens of Houghton, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5354. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the board of directors of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., urging that the United States Congress take such action as may be necessary to eliminate interstate trade barriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5355. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petition of 360 citizens of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5356. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, at San Francisco, adopted March 21,

1944, urging enactment of House bill 4184; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5357. Also, resolution of the U. A. Steamfitters' Union, Local No. 590, at San Francisco, adopted March 17, 1944, urging enactment of House bills 2017 and 375, and Senate bills 65 and 910, regarding money grant to all blind persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5358. Also, resolution of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Local No. 10, at San Francisco, adopted March 15, 1944, regarding war prisoners; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5359. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Eduarda Griswold Keith, requesting an investigation of certain frauds and conspiracies in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5360. Also, petition of the secretary, American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to constitutional principles for world order; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5361. Also, petition of the mayor of Athens, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, under the all-embracing canopy of Thy goodness and mercy which have followed us all the days of our lives, we come as children in our Father's house. Beneath all diversities of gifts and of thought we seek the common unity which binds us together with the cords of Thy brooding love which faileth never. Away from all the divisive forces of the world about us, which tear and separate and push apart, we would kneel in penitence at the altar of the one God whose love shed abroad in our hearts alone can send us out on our differing and often difficult paths, hoping all things, believing all things, enduring all things.

Steel our hearts as we go on our way, with set and steadfast face, to be stabbed by thorny crowns, to bow in Gethsemane gardens, to climb our own Calvaries, in the trust and peace and joy of that Holy One who in the shadow of His cross sang a joyful hymn of faith and praise. With obedient hearts may we listen as that One who overcame the world whispers to ears that can hear:

"Every morning lean thine arms awhile
Upon the window sill of heaven
And gaze upon thy Lord;
Then, with the vision in thine heart,
Turn strong to meet the day."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 24, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 24, 1944, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; and

S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives during the absence of the Speaker.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 662) to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 234) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3231) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLAND, Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. O'BRIEN of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3592. An act to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4099. An act to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913;

H. R. 4443. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 75) providing for an adjournment of Congress from Thursday, March 30, 1944, to Wednesday, April 12, 1944, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4346, making appropriations to supply deficiences, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I now yield the floor for the presentation of routine and other matters, with the understanding that consideration of the appropriation bill will be resumed as soon as possible.

VIEWS OF EX-SENATOR NORRIS ON SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to read a letter which I received yesterday from a former distinguished Member of this body who served long and faithfully in both branches of Congress. The letter is as follows:

McCOOK, NEBR., *March 20, 1944.*

Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GUFFEY: I have just received a copy of your address delivered in the Senate on March 13, 1944, on the soldier-voting proposition.

I agree with every word you have said. It seems to me the Senate has taken an unwise and a very backward step in passing this so-called soldier-vote bill. As I see it, the result will be that our soldiers fighting in

every part of the world for the principles of freedom and justice will be practically disfranchised by the failure of Congress to give them a workable and practicable law so that they can cast their votes. I feel very deeply on this subject. I regret to say that the Republican Party in the Senate has lined up practically solid in favor of this bogus voting law. When this solid Republican vote is united with that fraction of the Democratic vote which apparently would rather strike at Roosevelt than to win a battle against our enemies, they constitute a majority of the Senate. I cannot understand how men, honest and patriotic, can square their position on this question by voting for such an ineffective law as this one is bound to be, as I see it.

If the soldier is entitled to a vote, it should be given him without asking him how or for whom he is going to vote. It is fundamentally wrong to withhold this vote from him on the ground that he might vote for President Roosevelt. I think the Senator from Oregon let the cat out of the bag when on the floor of the Senate he said the matter could all be ended in a few minutes if Roosevelt would take himself out of the contest.

Yours very truly,

G. W. NORRIS.

INVITATION TO CONGRESS TO VISIT THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate an invitation to visit Parliament from the presiding officers of the House of Lords and the House of Commons of Great Britain, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

WESTMINSTER, *March 14, 1944.*

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE: Each of the two Houses of Parliament, over which we respectively preside, today passed a resolution that the House, desiring to promote a closer association between the British Parliament and the Congress of the United States of America, requested us on its behalf to invite the Congress of the United States to send a delegation of its Members to visit Parliament at as early a date as may be convenient.

We have the honor to transmit this invitation accordingly, and to request you to communicate the invitation to the House over which you preside, in the hope that this proposal, which was adopted unanimously and with enthusiasm both by the House of Lords and by the House of Commons, will commend itself to both Houses of Congress.

Yours sincerely,

SIMON, *Lord Chancelor.*

D. CLIFTON BROWN, *Speaker.*

The Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE,
Vice President of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

POST OFFICE BRANCHES AND STATIONS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove restrictions on establishing post office branches and stations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

CREDIT OPERATIONS UNDER THE INDIAN OFFICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on certain credit operations transacted under the Office of Indian Affairs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FLOOD-CONTROL SURVEY, SANTA YNEZ RIVER, CALIF.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of a survey of the Santa Ynez River watershed in California (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS AND REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, together with the report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Library.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 178)

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth report of his operations under the act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War, Navy, and Commerce; Federal Security Agency, and Office for Emergency Management (2) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Vermont; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relating to acquirement of lands within this State by Federal instrumentalities

"Whereas the government of Vermont has strong reason to believe that the sovereignty and continued existence of this State is jeopardized by the proposal of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Federal Power Commission, acting under the amended flood-control law, to seize, in the name of the Central Government, a river and its valley in this State to provide, under the guise of flood control, a make-work project after the war; and

"Whereas the original Federal policy respecting flood control was established by the Congress in 1936 after extensive hearings before the Commerce Committee of the Senate; and

"Whereas this policy, as enunciated in the 1936 flood-control law, provided for a joint enterprise by the National Government and individual States, or a group of States joined by interstate compact; and this policy safeguarded the functions, duties, rights, and natural resources of the individual States; and

"Whereas in 1937, at the request of the Federal administration, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the States of Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont negotiated, and each ratified, an interstate compact for control of the Connecticut River by means of flood-control reservoirs as authorized by the Flood Control Act, which compact was approved by the Chief Counsel of the War Department and subsequently was extolled by the Secretary of War as a model for use on interstate streams; and

"Whereas as a part of the compact, the four States provided from their own funds all the moneys required for the acquisition of all lands and rights needed at the dams and reservoirs, and for discharging each and all of their other duties required by the flood-control law; and

"Whereas after the compact had been submitted to Congress for ratification, although the Governors of the four States in interest on numerous occasions pressed for congressional action, Congress was never permitted to vote on ratification, despite the fact that the committee of each House had reported favorably; and

"Whereas while the compact was still pending before the Congress in June 1938, the functions, duties, and rights of States in flood-control matters were taken from them and their natural right to their nonnavigable streams seized by an eleventh hour amendment passed as the Congress was about to adjourn; and

"Whereas this amendment directing the Secretary of War to acquire in the name of the United States, all lands and rights needed for flood-control projects consisting of dams and reservoirs despite any prohibition against such action in any other law, and without obtaining the consent of the State or States affected, was opposed by the Commerce Committee; and

"Whereas although this amendment seriously affects the interest of every State in the Union, and threatens the statehood of each by nationalizing one of its natural resources, and by robbing it of any voice in determining developments within its borders, no notice was given to the Governors or to other State officers that such an action was contemplated by the forces of the administration; and

"Whereas both the manner of introduction of the amendment and its timing precluded States from registering their protests; and

"Whereas until the passage of this amendment to the flood-control law there had never been any question of the authority in the individual States east of the Mississippi to control their intrastate nonnavigable streams and rivers, nor of like authority in the States west of the Mississippi except in areas of Federal ownership; and

"Whereas the flood-control law as now amended, if it be within the letter of the Constitution operates to destroy its spirit by violating the fundamental rights of the States, which, under its protection, joined together to make this Nation; and

"Whereas it was the studied intention of the framers of the Constitution to provide for the continued integrity of the States making up the Union; and

"Whereas it is true now as it was in the days of our fathers, that the continued sovereignty of the States, as a check against

overreaching central authority, is as necessary both to preserve the liberties of the people and to guarantee continuation of free government in the Republic, as is the continued separation of powers between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches in the National Government itself: And now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the dangers inherent in the flood-control law, as amended, be called to the attention of the Congress in the firm belief that the legislative branch of our Government, jealous to guard the basic principles of the Republic, upon reexamining this matter will replace the present law by an act removing this particular threat of destruction to the States; and in the hope that this will be only the first of a series of actions to quiet the conflicts—noticeably on the increase over all the area of State-Federal relations—because States are now being bypassed and their functions usurped by Federal agencies; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of the Congress of the United States, and to the Governor of each State of the Union.

"Approved March 17, 1944

"WM. H. WILLS,
"Governor."

A resolution adopted by Post No. 1 of Disabled American Veterans, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring the enactment of House bill 3356, relating to service-connected disabilities, and House bill 3776, relating to nonservice-connected permanent and total disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution by the Board of Aldermen (and approved by the mayor) of the City of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the naming of a naval vessel in honor of the late Lieut. Harold Arthur Kepnes, of Chelsea, Mass., who made the supreme sacrifice in the present war; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

RESOLUTION BY THE CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION OF GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Civic and Commerce Association of the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak., giving its full approval of House bill 4184, a bill to repeal land-grant deductions in favor of the Government.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the Civic and Commerce Association of the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak., gives its full approval to H. R. 4184, being a bill introduced in Congress to repeal land-grant-rate reductions in favor of the Government. In support of the approval of the passage of this bill the association respectfully directs attention to the following facts:

The land-grant railroads are largely those of the West and the South and primarily serve agriculture. Under the existing law the Government pays for the transportation of its personnel and property but 50 percent of full tariff fares and rates. The major portion of the freight transported by the railroads of the West and South is for the Government. The Government is just as able to pay reasonable fares and rates as any of its citizens.

If the Government moves its freight at less than a reasonable charge for the service it follows that the shipping public is required to pay higher rates for the transportation of its products. The railroads of the eastern section of the United States are paid full tariff fares and rates for the transportation of Government personnel and property because the eastern railroads are not land-grant railroads. It certainly is unfair to thus penalize the railroads serving the western and southern parts of the country.

We understand full well that the reduced rates paid by the Government are the result of provisions in the land grants made in the aid of the construction of these railroads, and are based upon contracts between the railroads and the Government. These grants of public lands were for the purpose of encouraging the building of railroads into the unsettled portion of the country, and this underlying purpose of settlement has been accomplished. Impartial investigation shows that the Government has been more than repaid by the land-grant railroads for the value of the lands conveyed to them. A cancelation of the land-grant rates will be beneficial to all the shippers in the territory in which such rates prevail. The Government should deal fairly with its citizens and this generation of shippers should not be penalized by the insistence of maintaining a contract that in fact and in good conscience has been fully complied with.

The land-grant contracts which require the railroads receiving such grants to transport Government personnel and property at less than tariff fares and charges were made in the light of the transportation needs and demands of the Government at the time the contracts were made. At that time the Government was transporting a very limited number of soldiers and limited freight to a few scattered Indian defense posts in the West. It is certainly inequitable to apply such a contract, made for the purposes already stated, to the movement of millions of soldiers, sailors, and other Government personnel, and vast quantities of freight much of which is only indirectly connected with the war effort.

It is not a fair argument to contend that the cost of the war to taxpayers may be increased if the Government is required to pay higher rates. If the Government does pay higher rates a large portion of the amount so paid to the railroads will be repaid by the railroads in the form of taxes. Further than this, the receipt of additional revenue from the Government, should the land-grant discount of rates be abolished, would make it possible, indeed probable, to have railroad rates reduced generally, thus relieving the inequitable rate burden now imposed upon the general shipping public by reason of the discrimination now enjoyed by the Government under the land-grant rates; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of the association to Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; and to Hon. LYLE H. BOREN, chairman of the subcommittee in charge of said bill, at the same address.

I, W. W. Blain, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the Civic and Commerce Association of the City of Grand Forks, N. Dak., on the 9th day of March 1944.

W. W. BLAIN,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS' UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, five resolutions adopted by the North Dakota Farmers' Union, one dealing with the Baruch plan and proposal for real post-war conversion; another being in the form of a statement on the Wagner-Murray-Dingle bill providing for extension of the social-security program to groups not now covered, including farmers and farm labor, and its broadening to include health services; another resolution by the same Farmers' Union opposing compulsory national service; another dealing with cooperative pooling of machinery and labor, and yet another dealing with manpower on North Dakota farms.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

COOPERATIVE POOLING OF MACHINERY AND LABOR

Since Pearl Harbor the Farmers Union has encouraged the development of cooperative use of farm machinery and the pooling of available help; the State board of the Farmers Union commends the activities of North Dakota Farmers Union locals in promoting the full use of machinery and manpower in neighborhood pools the past year.

Recognizing the need for superhuman efforts on the part of North Dakota farmers to meet 1944 food goals, despite increasing handicaps of lack of manpower and farm machinery, the North Dakota Farmers Union board of directors, meeting March 17, urges all farmers to secure maximum use of available machinery and manpower by cooperatively sharing implements and machines with their neighbors as well as trading work to a much greater extent in 1944.

We further recommend that Farmers Union locals take the initiative in setting up additional machinery and labor pools where needs and facilities of each farmer in the neighborhood, whether a member or not, may be listed and utilized.

To the Committee on Finance:

STATEMENT ON WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL BILL

The North Dakota Farmers Union State convention in 1943, as in previous years, called for the extension of the social-security program to groups not now covered, including farmers and farm labor, and its broadening to include health services.

The board of directors of the North Dakota Farmers Union, meeting at Jamestown March 16, 1944, find that S. 1161, known as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, fulfills, in general, this part of the Farmers Union program and therefore we endorse the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill in principle, reserving the right to advocate such changes and amendments that would, in our opinion, strengthen its provisions designed to give farmers and their families a minimum economic security aganst the hazards of death, disability, and old age, and to provde more adequate health care.

Farm families have more children, proportionate to the population as a whole, to support, and a larger proportion of aged persons; but they have access to fewer doctors, fewer nurses, fewer clinics, and fewer hospitals. The need for better health care is indicated by the fact that 40 percent of the boys classified as farmers were rejected for physical defects by the Army, as compared with 38 percent for those classified as emergency workers and unemployed, and 20 percent of those classified in the skilled occupations, professional, and semiprofessional services.

Any program of payment of medical and hospital expenses must be implemented by a program to provide adequate hospital and medical facilitates and personnel in rural areas. Provision for dental care should also be included.

In levying a tax upon self-employed farmers for social security, lowest income farmers (those with $200 income or less) should be exempt, since aid to them must be in the form of public assistance and the cost of administering the collection would very likely exceed the revenue derived. We recommend that the payment of social-security taxes by farmers be made through the same channels and at the same time as Federal income taxes.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

RESOLUTION ON BARUCH PLAN AND PROPOSAL FOR REAL POST-WAR CONVERSION

We, the board of directors of the North Dakota Farmers Union, meeting March 16, view with alarm and apprehension the inadequacies and dangers inherent in the Baruch recommendations to President Roosevelt for the reconversion of our war economy to a peacetime economy by turning over to private business, particularly monopolistic big businesses, the lion's share of the $15,000,000,000 worth of Government-financed war plants and the $50,000,000,000 worth of war materials without any restrictions as to their use or nonuse.

Such a program would be an invitation to return to scarcity, because monopolies, judging by their past records, would dismantle or close plants whose increased output of peacetime goods would result in disturbing the price structure, kept artificially high by limiting output. The Farmers Union maintains that to secure the most abundant production possible that the Government sell or lease plants only with the provision that they be operated at full capacity to produce civilian goods at reasonable prices and that the Government use some plants as yardsticks to determine such reasonable costs.

We are deeply resentful that the problems of farmers in post-war reconversion are totally ignored. We advocate, among other things, that farm cooperatives be given the first opportunity to secure surplus materials suitable for farmers and plants for the production of farm equipment.

We regret the hasty appointment of William L. Clayton and Frank W. Hines to administer the Baruch program, because their past records indicate that their primary concern will be the interest of business rather than of the masses of workers, farmers, and consumers.

We advocate that Congress immediately set up an adequate agency to deal with reconversion problems, including the maintenance of full employment and full production, and that such an agency be directed by a board composed of representatives of government, industry, labor, and agriculture.

RESOLUTION OPPOSING COMPULSORY NATIONAL SERVICE

We, the board of directors of the North Dakota Farmers' Union, meeting March 16, express the continued unalterable opposition of the North Dakota Farmers' Union to the enactment of a compulsory National Service Act as unnecessary, unsound, and injurious to the war effort. We base our opposition on the following reasons:

1. Over 1,300,000 farm families still remain underemployed because they have not received the technical assistance and equipment necessary for their full employment; in many instances Public Law 45 freezes employable members of these families to part-time agricultural work by preventing them from moving to other areas where their service is needed in agriculture or industry.

2. Voluntary recruitment and employment of women has not been adequately fostered because of the failure to provide nursery facilities for children or working mothers, proper housing, and other essential facilities to enable women to maintain their homes while working.

3. Employer discrimination still exists against full use of skills of minority groups among the population.

4. Hoarding of manpower, particularly by employers with cost-plus contracts, is still prevalent.

5. Enactment of compulsory national service was made conditional by the President upon heavier taxation, renegotiations of contracts to eliminate excessive war profits, stabilization of prices clear across the board. Since these other conditions have not, and will not be met, a compulsory national-service law would penalize part of the Nation for the benefit of another part.

6. It would be destructive of the morale of our fighting men, as well as of our workers on farms and in the factory to impose forced labor on the people for the pecuniary benefit of private owners.

MANPOWER ON NORTH DAKOTA FARMS

Nineteen hundred and forty-four food goals must be met if sufficient food essential to armed and civilian needs is to be supplied. While recognizing the needs of the armed services to secure more men, the board of directors of the North Dakota Farmers' Union, meeting March 17, urges local selective-service boards, the State appeal board and selective-service officials, the National Selective-Service and War Manpower Commission, the President, and the Congress to exercise extreme caution in reclassifying men now deferred for agricultural employment.

If North Dakota farms are to produce what is expected of them, few, if any, farmers or experienced farm workers can be taken from the farms of this State, because already the farms have been so depleted of able-bodied manpower, that under normal weather conditions it will be practically impossible to maintain production. We point out that the amazing production of 1943 was made possible only because providence granted an unusually dry and open fall that extended the normal harvest and threshing season many weeks longer than usual and because farmers and their families pooled their work and machinery, as proposed by the Farmers' Union.

Many farmers have indicated that if their last son or hired man is taken they will be forced to immediately sell out and quit farming. We urge that proper authorities at once give definite assurance that a policy of keeping essential and productive farmers on the farm will be maintained, so that no farmers will quit before spring work begins on the strength of rumors or newspaper accounts that may lead them to believe that occupational deferments will not continue to be granted.

REPORT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 24th instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, reported it on March 27, 1944, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 772) thereon.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE FILED DURING RECESS—AMENDMENTS

Under authority of the order of the 24th instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, on March 27, 1944, submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of the rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely: Page 7, after line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"The appropriation 'Training for nurses, Public Health Service (national defense),' in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby made available, for the entire fiscal year, for transfer to and consolidation with appropriations of St. Elizabeths and Freedmen's Hospitals in such amounts as may be deemed necessary by the Federal Security Administrator to cover the cost of items furnished to student nurses in training under plans approved for such hospitals in accordance with the act of June 15, 1943 (Public Law 74), as amended."

Page 8, line 22, after the words "outplant facilities" and before the period, insert the following proviso: ": *Provided further*, That the limitation of $40,000,000 contained in Public Law 150, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 15, 1943, on the total amount that may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, is hereby increased to $65,000,000."

Page 69, after line 15, and before the heading "Title III—Judgments and Authorized claims," insert the following new section:

"SEC. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay to regular, full-time civilian officers and employees, whose basic compensation is determined on a daily or hourly basis, overtime compensation, pursuant to the joint resolution of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1068), and the act of May 7, 1943 (Public, No. 49, 78th Cong.), on any basis other than at the rate of one and one-half times the basic rate of payment for work actually performed by such officers and employees in excess of 40 hours per week, without proration or the use of any formula which has been adopted to determine the daily compensation of per annum officers and employees; it being declared to be and to have been the true intent and meaning of the aforesaid enactments to provide for the payment of the overtime compensation of such employees only upon the basis herein described: *Provided*, That any overtime compensation in excess of the compensation so authorized under the above joint resolution and act which has been paid in reliance upon, and in accordance with, any decision or decisions of the Comptroller General is hereby approved and the Comptroller General shall allow credit therefor in the accounts of the officers accountable therefor, and shall make no charges against any certifying officer because of certification of such excess overtime compensation."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by

him to House bill 4346, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1944.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2778. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 773);

H. R. 3075. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker; without amendment (Rept. No. 774); and

H. R. 3362. A bill to fix the annual compensation of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 775).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

H. R. 2616. A bill to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 777).

By Mr. GUFFEY (for Mr. SCRUGHAM), from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. 1479. A bill providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites; with amendments (Rept. No. 778).

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1770. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 779).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 24, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 250) to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter J. LaBuy, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice William H. Holly, retired; and

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

REPORT OF NOMINATION OF CLAUDE P. STEPHENS

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably the nomination of Claude P. Stephens, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice John T. Metcalf, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be received as in executive session and placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1814. A bill to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. CLARK of Missouri introduced Senate bill 1815, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1816. A bill granting a pension to Teresa F. Boyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 1817. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1818. A bill providing for an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of certain governmental agencies and corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1819. A bill to repeal the acts of August 15, 1935, and January 29, 1940, relating to the establishment of the Patrick Henry National Monument and the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry, in Charlotte County, Va.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1820. A bill to provide for Federal assistance in the maintenance, expansion, and operation of school-lunch and school-milk programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to provide for the distribution of surplus war materials through domestic lend-lease to States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof.

Mr. President, in connection with the introduction of the bill, I desire to say that the United States has been more prodigal than any other nation in the history of the world in its lavish generosity to other nations. Both by lend-lease and by U. N. R. R. A. we are holding ourselves out as outfitters and providers for the world. I am introducing today a bill for what might be called domestic lend-lease in order that the hard-pressed American taxpayer may get some of the benefits of the lush expenditures which have been made from his funds. When this war is over we will have on hand a huge stock of material, particularly heavy machinery. I see no reason why the principle of lend-lease should not be applied to this material and why it should not be loaned or leased to counties, towns, road districts, levee districts, soil-conservation districts, or other public subdivisions where it would certainly be of value. In the same way hospital units which have been set up in so many camps and which are not suitable for use by the Veterans' Administration after the war might well be loaned or leased or given to some of the many counties or communities in the United States which are not only too poor to have a hospital but even a medical center.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1815) to provide for distribution of surplus war materials through domestic lend-lease to States and their political subdivisions, and instrumentalities thereof, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3592. An act to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4099. An act to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 4443. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BONE, and Mr. TYDINGS each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were severally referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Vice President of the United States on Greek independence day, at Boston, Mass., March 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OMNIBUS G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS FOR RETURNING VETERANS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLARK OF MISSOURI

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator CLARK of Missouri on the so-called Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

[Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GUFFEY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah on the occasion of the Greek independence day celebration, in Washington, D. C., on March 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

"BACK THE INVASION" RALLY ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a "Back the Invasion" rally address delivered by Senator TUNNELL at Baltimore, Md., March 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ONE-HOUSE LEGISLATURE—ARTICLE BY FORMER SENATOR NORRIS

[Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GUFFEY) asked and obtained leave to have reprinted in the RECORD an article entitled "The One-House Legislature," written by former Senator Norris of Nebraska and published in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science for September, 1935, and originally printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 13, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITY IN THE WAR EFFORT

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article, originally printed as an advertisement, under the heading "When duty whispers low 'thou must!'," which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS BY WENDELL WILLKIE—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What He Really Said," written by Frank C. Waldrop and published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Preventable Loss," written by Fred W. Perkins, and published in the Washington Daily News of March 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA ENQUIRER

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Light Is Needed," published in the March 25 issue of the Philadelphia Enquirer, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Does the United States Really Have a Foreign Policy?" from the New York Sun of March 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JESSE COTTRELL

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to the late Jesse Cottrell, published in the Greenville (S. C.) News, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALMOS W. GLASGOW

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 555) for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow, which were, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$2,800" and insert "$2,300"; and on the same page, line 10, to strike out "1942" and insert "1941."

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

OIL COMPANIES AND PIPE-LINE FACILITIES

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, during the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses the late lamented Senator Borah, of Idaho, and I introduced certain legislative proposals looking to the divorcement of the functions of integrated oil companies from the profits of the pipe-line owners. I did not renew the proposals in the present Congress, because I was led to believe that certain civil suits instituted by the Department of Justice had accomplished the end of denying the profits accruing by way of the operation of these facilities.

Under date of February 7, 1944, I addressed a letter to the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General, and received a reply from him under date of February 22, 1944, from which I shall read one paragraph.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will not the Senator please read it all? I am very much interested in the subject.

Mr. GILLETTE. I intend to put both letters in the RECORD.

Mr. LANGER. The matter is of such great importance that I should like to have the Senator read his letter and the reply.

Mr. GILLETTE. My letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1944.

The Honorable FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIDDLE: As you know, up through the Seventy-seventh Congress I sponsored legislation proposing a divorcement of the functions of the integrated oil companies with particular emphasis on divorcement of pipe lines from their shipper-owners.

I did not renew my proposals in the present Congress, because I was led to believe that certain civil suits instituted by your department had accomplished the end of denying profits in transportation of oil by pipe lines to their shipper-owners.

With a view to what may happen in the post-war era as to the established pipe lines and those built for war purposes, and to determine whether legislation supplemental to the Antitrust, Interstate Commerce, and the Elkins Acts, is necessary, will you be kind enough to advise me as to whether I have been correctly assured that the litigation removed the rebating practices? In other words has the consent decree been obeyed and has it brought about a reduction in pipe-line tariffs and the discontinuance of the payment of transportation profits to the integrated oil companies?

Also, can you advise me whether the steps taken thus far by your department have resulted in the use of pipe-line facilities by others than their integrated owners?

Sincerely.

The letter was signed by me. The reply of the Attorney General, dated February 22, 1944, is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1944.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: In further reply to your letter of February 7, 1944, inquiring as to the effect of oil pipe-line litigation upon the earnings, tariffs, and use of pipe lines, Assistant Attorney General Berge has informed me that litigation has been instituted under the Antitrust and Elkins Acts. The antitrust case, *United States* v. *American Petroleum Institute et al.*, has been continued until the termination of the war. The Elkins Act cases were consolidated and a consent judgment was entered on December 23, 1941, in *United States* v. *The Atlantic Refining Company et al.*

At this point I interpolate to say that the consent decree was in settlement of a suit filed for the recovery of a billion and a half dollars assessed as penalties for violation of a Federal statute, but a consent decree was filed.

Mr. LANGER. How much of the billion and a half dollars did the Government obtain?

Mr. GILLETTE. As I recall the consent decree, the Government waived its claim to approximately a billion and a half dollars in penalties, and obtained the assurance that the companies would go and sin no more.

Mr. LANGER. That is, the pipe-line companies kept a billion and a half dollars?

Mr. GILLETTE. They have it as yet. The Government did not get any of it.

Mr. LANGER. And the lawsuits are over?

Mr GILLETTE. That lawsuit is over. I read further from the letter of the Attorney General:

The consent judgment, *United States* v. *The Atlantic Refining Co.*, provides that a defendant pipe-line carrier shall not pay to its shipper-owner any part of earnings from transportation in excess of the owner's share of 7 percent of valuation which is defined in the judgment. All earnings in excess of the 7 percent are required to be held in a special surplus account which can be used for designated purposes only. Thus the defendant oil company may receive profits from its own pipe lines to the extent of 7 percent of valuation.

Again I interpolate, that is a provision of the consent decree, that from that time on they would be limited to 7 percent, and the balance would be paid into a special fund; but the Government waived its claim to the billion and a half dollars of penalties imposed for derelictions which had previously occurred.

I quote further from the letter:

The judgment requires each defendant carrier to file an annual report with the Department showing operations under the provisions of the judgment. Reports for the calendar year 1942 are the latest on file and they reflect a general compliance with the judgment except for approximately 10 companies who have used special surplus funds to make prohibitive payments to shipper-owners. Consideration is now being given to these exceptions so as to enforce compliance with the provisions of the decree.

The Department is not in a position to inform you with regard to reduction of pipe-line tariffs resulting from the entry of the judgment without making an exhaustive study of the tariff structure of 59 pipe-line companies. The fact that 22 of the carriers placed an aggregate of $15,500,000 in the special surplus fund during 1942 would indicate that those carriers had maintained tariffs at levels which resulted in their net profits being in excess of 7 percent of valuation. I might suggest that since the Interstate Commerce Commission has pending two dockets designed to reduce pipe-line tariffs additional information on the subject might be on file with the Commission.

As to the question of the use of pipe-line facilities by others than their integrated owners, we are of the opinion that there has been some such use during the present emergency since at the request of the Petroleum Administration for War and the Office of Defense Transportation, the Antitrust Division joined with the Interstate Commerce Commission to assure the oil companies that the question of common carrier status would be

determined without reference to acts of transportation which are performed exclusively in response to the request or direction of the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation or the Petroleum Administrator for War.

Without passing upon the merits of legislation, referred to in your letter, the Department, of course, never intended that litigation be considered as a substitute for legislation designed to divorce pipe lines from their shipper-owners.

I shall be pleased to furnish you with any additional information that you may require.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that I have read the correspondence into the RECORD as a part of my remarks, I shall not request that the letters be printed in the RECORD.

I might add, before I take my seat, that as soon as the war exigency shall be ended, if I happen to be in a position to do so, I shall reintroduce the proposed legislation, and, if I shall not be in a position to do so, I shall try to see that someone else introduces it.

SALES OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week I called attention to the imperative need of an appropriate committee going into action to see to it that small-business men, many of whom are already on the ragged edge, are not further liquidated by Government action or lack of action.

There was sent to me yesterday from Colorado a newspaper clipping with big headlines, "Army store." I shall be glad to show this to Senators. There follows this advertisement:

Civilians! Now you, too, can purchase merchandise made to the exacting specifications of the United States Army and Navy.

Then follows a list of the goods which are for sale—wool-lined regulation Army water-repellent field jackets, Army sweaters, undershirts, shorts, and other articles.

Then at the bottom of the ad, which covers most of a page of the paper, there is this statement:

We have a complete stock of regulation Army shirts and trousers for civilians and enlisted men. New shipments of Army and Navy surplus stocks are being received each week. Watch our windows and advertisements.

Mr. President, I repeat the statement which appears at the bottom of the advertisement:

New shipments of Army and Navy surplus stocks are being received each week. Watch our windows and advertisements.

Mr. President, the fear which I expressed last week is being realized. Army stores are coming into communities. What better evidence do Senators want of that statement than the advertisement I just read?

The distinguished majority leader said on the floor of the Senate the other day, when I was speaking on this subject, that the regulations require the sale of these goods by auction. That was not news to me, but, Mr. President, I do not want the Army or the Navy to auction off the small business of this country, and that is what will happen if they continue this practice. I want the appropriate committee to take action and see that constructive steps are taken so that, if the Army has merchandise to sell, it will be siphoned through legitimate channels and not through fly-by-night operators who only disrupt, but do not build, communities.

There are enough misdeeds in government already without creating more. There are enough misdirectives and bungling orders that would disrupt the morale of our citizens without creating more. Here is a subject that Congress should immediately take hold of and provide the remedy.

The small-business men who have survived, in spite of scarcity of consumers' goods, are hungry for goods to sell similar to those listed in this newspaper advertisement. The small-business men of the country constitute a large section of the backbone of the Nation. Give them the opportunity to distribute the goods. Let Congress provide the ways and means so that over their counters will go the merchandise, and do not further "termite" the legitimate rights and interests and businesses of the small-business men.

Everyone who has so far spoken on this subject has called the merchandise in question post-war surpluses. That, Mr. President, is something to think of—post-war surpluses. But we are not through the war yet, and apparently we have more surpluses which are threatening the economic life of the small-business man. If there is any question of proof, let me say that last week an advertisement of the sale of surplus material appeared in the Chicago Tribune and in San Francisco newspapers; but here is an advertisement which shows that Army stores are actually in being, coming into the little communities, the villages. As a result, what is happening to the small-business man? He cannot obtain these goods. The small-business man, who through the war period has taken the bumps and paid the taxes and who through previous years has been the sustaining economic force of each community, now finds the Government failing to protect his interests. As I said last week, that is a repetition of what took place after the last world war.

We know that the Army and the Navy since Pearl Harbor have bought literally tens of millions of shoes, sheets, shirts, flashlights, automobiles, underwear, and every conceivable consumer commodity. The north African invasion required 700,000 different items of equipment and supply. There were 390 different items of clothing. The total war activities expenditures for the fiscal years 1941 to 1944 are estimated at $172,000,000,000. Much of this money was used to purchase goods which may be surplus material at the end of the war. It does not take much vision to see what would happen to the value of the merchant's goods which he has on his counters if these surpluses were dumped on the market now or in the post-war period. Everyone must realize what the consequence would be. But the strange thing is that much of the Government surplus goods is being siphoned, not through legitimate, but through illegitimate channels, to the detriment of the surviving little-business man of this country.

As I have stated, Mr. President, the merchants can use this merchandise which the Army has now, and it must be siphoned into legitimate business channels and not be put in the hands of those who would dynamite small business. Not only small business but American business as a whole and American labor leaders are very much concerned about the possibility of the disposition of vast stores of surplus material in the post-war period. So long as the war continues, we know that home markets will be hungering for everything which civilians can use.

As everyone knows, there are great shortages in most civilian goods. The problem is to have those in authority use their brains so as to make certain that the goods as they become available are distributed through legitimate business channels. Speculators should not be the chosen people of America. The taxpayers' dollars which have gone into this merchandise must be adequately protected and the taxpayers economy must also be adequately protected, but such protection is not afforded when the goods are dumped into the hands of speculators.

When we think of the unsatisfied demands of the people of this country which the retail stores of the country, the plumbing concerns, and so forth, cannot supply, the statement makes sense that the Congress must see that whatever goods are distributed by Government shall pass through regularly established trade channels. I know that there are committees of the House and Senate which are concerning themselves with the general problem of post-war planning and that there are numerous committees of the House and Senate which are investigating problems which relate to our post-war economy, and I know, too, that the entire Senate and House are concerned with this problem; but the danger is that there will be so much concern and so much committee action that there will not be provided the specific remedy which would bring about channeling Government surplus merchandise to the public without disrupting our economy.

Mr. President, the teamwork in America has been magnificent since Pearl Harbor. With such teamwork I believe that we can handle these surpluses, which at present appear to be a great threat to our economy, in such a manner as to strengthen our economy and the general welfare. These surpluses can, if we use our heads, prove to be a blessing. The world needs them, and we need them. It is simply a question of wise administration. As was suggested by John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, they might even be used "effectively to control runaway prices and curb inflation." I repeat that statement, be-

cause it affects the attitude of a thinker, that these surpluses might be used "effectively to control runaway prices and curb inflation."

I have faith that we will find the answer, but I am hoping that soon that faith will be translated into reality by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, we cannot pass the buck in this instance. The problem is up to the Congress to solve. Already all indications are that the law is being utilized so that those is authority in the Army and the Navy and in the Procurement Division are literally starting a flood of surplus merchandise throughout the country. We can sit here and seem to be unconcerned about the matter, but the boomerang will strike back. It is our problem, and we cannot neglect it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

SECRETARY HULL'S LIAISON COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for a few brief moments I desire to discuss a subject which has been of great concern to me since December 1942. In the morning newspaper there is an article entitled "Teamwork for Peace," by Merlo Pusey. Then follows a subhead "Hull moves toward filling vacuum."

I heard over the radio, the other day, that Secretary Hull and the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] were now in favor of a liaison committee or committees between the Executive and the Congress. It makes me very happy to know that at long last there is a realization of the desirability of bringing into being an instrumentality which will work for closer collaboration between those two independent branches of our Government. Mr. President, in September 1942, I submitted a resolution providing that a foreign relations advisory council be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, certain technicians whom the Secretary of State might designate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chairman and the ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate. I am happy to note that at long last the Secretary of State has come around to the idea which I suggested in September 1942. If Mr. Hull's present plan coincides with the idea contained in my 1942 resolution and the explanation of it which I have repeatedly made on the floor of the Senate, I am very happy, indeed. This country will have one of the most efficient and constructive governmental agencies ever created, to handle the many intricate and oftentimes embarrassing problems arising from the international relations between the Allied nations, if the plan proposed in my resolution is put into effect. I trust that the Secretary of State and I are in agreement as to the fundamentals of the plan, and that such a plan will be effectuated without delay.

Our present international situation is precarious. We must have adequate, immediate discussion of all phases of the problems existing between our allies and ourselves, in order to insure sound and lasting agreements, when such agreements are ultimately made. I believe that a foreign relations advisory council, such as the one I suggested, would not only be a liaison committee between the Executive, the Senate, and the House, but would, as I said on a previous occasion, constitute a splendid example of democratic government at work, because it would embrace the concept of having the technicians, the Executive, and the representatives of the people working together.

As I stated earlier in my remarks, Mr. President, I was very much interested in reading in the morning newspaper the statement in the column written by Merlo Pusey that—

> The first major step toward harnessing this team—
>
> Congress and the Executive—
>
> together for one-way pulling has been taken by Secretary Hull. He has asked the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to designate a subcommittee to consult with the Department of State on problems connected with the establishment of an international peace organization.

Mr. Pusey further stated in his column:

> Mr. Hull's move is belated, but there is still time to bring about a meeting of minds between the treaty-negotiating and treaty-ratifying agencies if they find it possible to work together.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be kept straight on this subject, I desire to repeat that on September 17, 1942, I submitted the resolution which I read a few moments ago, although on September 16, 1942, I sent a copy of my remarks and the resolution to Secretary Hull. On November 25, 1942, I spoke on this subject, and submitted for the RECORD the correspondence between Secretary Hull and myself, in which Secretary Hull turned down flatly the plan we are now considering. It will be a healthy sign, Mr. President, in our Government if once in a while someone from the executive branch of government would say, "I have made a mistake. I am sorry; I should have done so and so." Such an attitude does not exist at the present time.

I again spoke on this subject on February 25, 1943. At that time the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said my resolution would receive the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations. On March 9, 1943, I spoke again on the subject of a foreign relations advisory committee or liaison committee; and while on the floor of the Senate I received the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Texas that he would give me an opportunity to be heard on my resolution, Senate Resolution 22. I was given an opportunity to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations, but Secretary Hull's definite position, as outlined in his letters which are a part of the record, apparently determined the action of the committee, because the committee took no action.

On January 7, 1944, I again submitted the resolution. It is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations. It invites the Chief Executive to join with the Senate in the creation of a foreign relations advisory council.

Mr. President, the reason why I am so much concerned about this matter is, first, that there has been no team play between the Senate of the United States and the Executive because the Executive does not know how to "play ball" with a coordinate branch of government. For some 11 years the matter of cooperation has been summarized by the words, "Do it my way." During that time we had an era of "yes" men.

Today, during a great world crisis, the Nation is demanding that these two great branches of government get together and "play ball." Can the Executive "play ball" after 10 or 11 years of telling Congress what to do? That question is a serious one. I sensed that situation in 1942. That is why I submitted the resolution. That is why I asked the Secretary of State to collaborate with us. But the Secretary of State flatly turned down the suggestion.

However, Mr. President, today, when Mr. Churchill, Mr. Stalin, and the President of the United States, according to all those who claim to know, are having troubles of their own, there is a slight indication that the two constitutional bodies of the United States which have to do with treaty-making and with foreign policy will get together. I am happy to know that is so. I have no pride of parentage in the resolution, but I desire to see that the record is kept straight. I wish to say to you, Mr. President, that Mr. Pusey also calls attention in his column to the following:

> Senator WILEY had introduced a resolution 10 months before, asking the Secretary of State to report on the danger of war in the Far East in an executive session of the Foreign Relations Committee, but nothing had come of it.

The Washington Post in February 1942, 1 month after the white paper was issued, in commenting on the resolution I introduced in February 1941, calling for Secretary Hull to report on conditions in the Far East, said that had that resolution been acted upon, it was barely possible we would have been a year ahead in the Pacific, and that Pearl Harbor might have occurred in reverse. Why? Because my resolution was submitted in February 1941. In January 1941, our Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Grew, had already reported to the President and to others that Japan was ready to strike,

and would strike. In February I submitted my resolution calling for an executive session of the Senate and requesting that the Secretary of State report to us the condition of our defenses, and so forth, in the Far East. On December 7, Pearl Harbor came. In January 1942, the white paper giving this information was issued. In February we had the comment in the Washington Post. I do not know any reason why this august body of 96 Members, representing 134,000,000 people, should not have consideration, especially when the fundamental law of the land makes it the primary right and duty of this body to be in the foreign-relations picture, to advise and consent to treaties. So, Mr. President, I am very happy that at long last there seems to be a trend in the direction of cooperation in order that this country may have the benefit of two coordinate branches of government in the war picture and the post-war picture.

EMPLOYMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN HOUSE AND SENATE FOLDING ROOMS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 260) providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended by the act of August 29, 1916, the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ, whenever necessary, the services of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets at the prevailing rates provided by law.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to take care of a situation in the folding room of the House of Representatives, which situation exists to an equal extent in the folding room of the Senate. There is great difficulty in obtaining help. The joint resolution would permit Government employees who have finished their work in the departments to receive overtime for work in the folding room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, to make the joint resolution effective so far as the Senate is concerned, I offer three amendments, as follows:

At the end of line 4, to insert "Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the"; in line 5, after "House of Representatives", to strike out "is" and insert "are"; and in line 5, after the word "hereby", to insert "respectively", so as to make the joint resolution read:

That notwithstanding the provision of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended by the act of August 29, 1916, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives are hereby respectively authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ, whenever necessary, the services of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets at the prevailing rates provided by law.

Senators will understand that this is piece work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Arizona. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 260) was read the third time, and passed.

RETURN TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF GREAT LAKES VESSELS AND CERTAIN OTHER VESSELS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BAILEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, and Mr. VANDENBERG conferees on the part of the Senate.

MEMORY MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, out of order, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate bill 1110, providing for the designation of each Monday during the present war as Memory Monday, and I submit a report (No. 776) thereon.

Mr. President, this bill, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Iowa [MR. GILLETTE] is a very commendable and appropriate measure. It has been approved by the President of the United States, by the War Department, and by the Navy Department. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. From what committee was the bill reported?

Mr. McFARLAND. From the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WHITE. Was there opposition to it in the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. There was no opposition. The bill was unanimously reported.

Because of the importance of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that this bill be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1110) providing for the designation of each Monday during the present war as Memory Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1110) providing for the designation of each Monday during the present war as Memory Monday, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "and", to strike out "each Monday" and insert "the first Monday of each month"; and in line 11, after the word "preceding", to strike out "week" and insert "month", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the first Monday in the month next following the date of enactment of this act, and the first Monday of each month thereafter until the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as Memory Monday in commemoration of the American men and women who have given their lives in the service of their country during the present war, particularly those who shall have fallen during the preceding month, and calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States at half mast on all Government buildings, property, and military and naval installations in the United States and its Territories and possessions on the days so designated.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the designation of certain Mondays during the present war as Memory Monday."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the President of the United States; a memorandum from the Secretary of State; a letter from Secretary Knox to the President; and a letter from the Acting Secretary of War to the President, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 8, 1944.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GUY: I asked Cordell what he thought of your proposal for a Memory Monday, and I am enclosing copy of his memorandum to me indicating that neither the War Department nor the State Department would make any opposition.

Neither would I. But personally I always have the fear in the back of my head that any increase in the number of memorial days tends, over a period of time, to have them forgotten or not observed.

Just between us, what would you think of carrying out your excellent thought, but doing it a little less often? How would it do, for example, to make the first day of every month as the Memory Day; or, if you think it is better, make it the first Monday in every month?

If something like that were done instead of having the Memory Day once a week, I think that we could better call attention to it over the radio and in the press.

This is just a thought for you to mull over. In any event, you can be sure that I would not oppose.

With every good wish for the New Year,

Always sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

P. S.—I am also enclosing herewith copies of letters from the Acting Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

JANUARY 6, 1944.

By reference of a memorandum under date of December 28 there was enclosed a letter from Senator GILLETTE under date of December 8, together with a copy of S. 1110.

The Senate bill would provide that each Monday be designated as Memory Monday and indicated by lowering the flags to half-mast on every public building in the United States.

The matter has been carefully considered in the Department. Informal conversation with the War Department indicated that that Department will probably offer no opposition.

It is my view that since foreign relations are not involved I do not care to recommend that the measure be opposed.

C. H.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

DECEMBER 29, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I acknowledge your memorandum of December 28 touching upon the bill introduced by Senator GILLETTE and enclosing a copy of the bill which Senator GILLETTE had introduced in the Senate providing for the designation of each Monday as "Memorial Monday."

As one means of bringing home to the people of the United States the realities of the war and its certain costs in life, this might be very useful. In my opinion, it would be preferable to designate the first Monday in each month as "Memorial Monday" rather than every Monday. If, in some way we could encourage, by press and radio, the practice of giving out the names in each community once a month of those who had made the supreme sacrifice and for whom the flag was half-masted, it would naturally heighten the effect. I believe that through the O. W. I. this custom could be established. The two together, I think, would be highly useful in producing the essential psychology among the people for the duration of the war.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK KNOX.

JANUARY 6, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In reply to your memorandum of December 28 concerning Senator GILLETTE's bill, S. 1110, providing for a weekly ceremony honoring the men who lose their lives in the war, I feel that the thought of regularly and vividly bringing to mind the brave men who have fallen in the battle for this Nation's survival cannot but meet with general approbation. There is the danger, however, that a standardized ceremonial, as frequently repeated as is proposed under S. 1110, may lose the significance for which it is conceived, a result which would be most unfortunate. Should the resolution be enacted, continuing affirmative effort would be necessary to keep alive the significance of the ceremonial. While this could probably be done at military posts, camps, and stations, it might not be feasible in other installations. The War Department therefore feels that a less frequent observance would be decidedly preferable.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCLOY,
Acting Secretary of War.

Mr. McFARLAND. The committee asked that I particularly call the attention of the Senate to a portion of the letter from the Secretary of the Navy, which reads as follows:

As one means of bringing home to the people of the United States the realities of the war and its certain costs in life this might be very useful. In my opinion it would be preferable to designate the first Monday in each month as "Memorial Monday" rather than every Monday. If, in some way, we could encourage, by press and radio, the practice of giving out the names in each community once a month of those who had made the supreme sacrifice and for whom the flag was half-masted, it would naturally heighten the effect. I believe that through the O. W. I. the custom could be established. The two together, I think, would be highly useful in producing the essential psychology among the people for the duration of the war

FIRST LT. CHARLES F. GUMM

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the trans-Atlantic edition of the London Daily Mail of March 22, 1944. This is the world's first trans-ocean newspaper, edited and made up in London, photographed on microfilm, flown by bomber over the Atlantic, then printed and published in New York. The grim necessity for thrift and space is evident as one contemplates the small size of this newspaper when contrasted with our great metropolitan dailies.

In all the vast panorama of war news presented by the immense field of operations, the editors of the Daily Mail still find space to record a story of valor of one of our American boys who went down in the red tide of war. This boy, who not only gave his last full measure of devotion to the cause of his country, but who did it in a way that will immortalize his name, was 23-year-old First Lt. Charles F. Gumm, of Spokane, Wash. He was flying over the village of Nayland, in Suffolk, England, in his Mustang plane. Something went wrong with the engine of the plane, and apparently his one hope of escaping with his life was to drop his plane into the street. Instead of giving himself this one last chance, he deliberately forced his plane over the roof tops of buildings in order to avoid crashing into the street where he knew such a landing would cause the death of pedestrians. As a capable pilot, he knew exactly what this deliberate act meant to him, and yet this boy instantly elected to rob himself of his last chance in order to save the lives of others.

St. John the apostle said:

Greater love than this hath no man, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

Charles F. Gumm went beyond this highest expression of love and courage, for he voluntarily laid down his life for strangers.

Probably no greater tribute to stark bravery has ever been penned by mortal man than is found in the beautiful language of Hugo describing the last stand of the Old Guard at Waterloo. And yet, when those brave Frenchmen perished to a man in the hail of English lead, they gave to the world no more sublime example of unselfish heroism than that revealed by this courageous lad from Spokane. So long as mankind admires the virtue of manly courage, the world will remember with a thrill the gallant exploit of Charles F. Gumm, who deliberately yielded up his young life to save the lives of others. Nobility of character could find no higher expression in this sad world.

SOUTHERN FREIGHT RATES

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the subject of Southern freight rates. It is one of the most vital problems of the South. Later I expect to go into this subject at greater length.

My State of Arkansas is unusually rich in natural resources, agricultural, forest, and mineral, but its production, population, income, and wealth are below the average for the United States because it lacks manufacturing industries.

While the population of Arkansas has shown a steady, but moderate increase—at the rate of less than 10,000 per annum for the past 20 years, as contrasted with more than 20,000 per annum before that time—the rate of growth for the past 20 years has been less than the natural increase from births, less deaths. This means that Arkansas has been exporting to other States people who were seeking better opportunities, although Arkansas has natural resources rich enough to support many times its present population.

One reason for this situation is decreasing employment. From 1920 to 1940, the total number of gainful workers in Arkansas decreased from 634,564 in 1920, to 583,944 in 1940. The decrease was proportionately greatest in the number of wage earners engaged in manufacturing industries, which went down from 49,954 in 1919 to 36,177 in 1939. The total wages paid industrial workers declined in even greater proportion, from $47,186,000 in 1919, to $24,547,000 in 1939. Correspondingly, the value of manufactured products declined from $200,313,000 in 1919 to $160,167,000 in 1939.

The disproportion of Arkansas' manufacturing industry to its production of raw materials is shown by the fact that its manufactured products in 1939, $160,000,000, were less than the value of raw materials produced, which was $227,000,000, the value of the manufactured products being only 41 percent of the value of the total production. In the United States, as a whole, the value of manufactured products in 1939 was $56,842,000,000 and of raw materials, $14,449,000,000, the value of manufactures being 80 percent of the whole. Arkansas has, per capita, more than its

share of the value of raw materials produced, but it has only 19 percent of its per capita share of the value of the manufactured products of the United States.

Because income depends on production, especially upon production of manufactured products, the relatively low production of manufactured products in Arkansas is reflected in a relatively low annual average income of $825 per employed person (1940), compared with an average of $1,688 for the United States as a whole.

Arkansas has the misfortune of being in the region of the highest freight rates on miscellaneous manufactured articles in the United States. There is no justification for this from the standpoint of transportation costs, as recent studies of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which have been published in Senate Document No. 63, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, June 1943, show that the cost of rail transportation in Arkansas is no higher than in the eastern territory, but the rates on manufactured products from Arkansas to the East are almost without exception much higher than the rates in the East on the same commodity, for the same length of haul.

For example, the rate on furniture in carloads, from Fort Smith, Ark., to Indianapolis, Ind., a distance of 656 miles, is $1 a hundred pounds, while the rate in eastern territory for the same mileage is 79 cents a hundred pounds. The rate on canned foodstuffs from Fayetteville, Ark., to Indianapolis, a distance of 594 miles, is 56 cents a hundred pounds, while the rate on canned goods for the same mileage in the eastern territory is 41 cents a hundred pounds. The rate on fiberboard boxes from Little Rock, Ark., to Indianapolis, a distance of 532 miles, is 52 cents a hundred pounds, while the rate for the same distance in the East is 35 cents per hundred pounds. Even the rate on lumber from Arkansas points to the East is on a higher level than the rate on lumber in the eastern territory. From Crossett, Ark., for example, to Indianapolis, a distance of 643 miles, the rate on lumber is 40 cents a hundred pounds, while the eastern lumber rate for the same distance is 32 cents a hundred pounds. Those rates are typical of the rates paid on Arkansas-manufactured products to the East, as compared with the rates charged on competitive articles moving from eastern manufacturers to eastern markets. It is no wonder that Arkansas manufacturing has made little progress in the face of these handicaps.

Bills are now pending in Congress which would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish within 3 years a uniform classification of freight and uniform class freight rates throughout the country, with only such exceptions as are justified by difference in transportation conditions. Those bills are intended to carry out the recommendations of the Transportation Board of Investigation and Research which reported to the President and Congress last year—House Documents 145 and 303, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session—that the existing differences in classification and class rates were harmful to the economic development of the South and West, and were not justified by differences in transportation or other conditions.

There is also an investigation now under way, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of freight classification and class rates throughout the area east of the Rocky Mountains, which was begun in 1939—I. C. C. Documents 28300 and 28310—upon earnest insistence of southern and western Members of Congress that the existing inequalities be investigated and corrected. The indications are that there may be a decision by the Commission in the next year or two. However, class rates apply on only a small proportion of the total freight which the railroads haul. The great majority of the traffic moves on individual commodity rates. While it is important that class rates which apply on miscellaneous commodities, particularly small-quantity shipments, be corrected as promptly as possible, this will by no means be the end of the fight which must be carried on until present discriminations against all the products of Arkansas and other Western and Southern States are wiped out.

Mr. President, we have heard much in recent years of the so-called southern economic national problems. There would be no southern problems if the South received the fair treatment accorded other areas. The discrimination against that section in the matter of freight rates is but an example of what I have in mind.

The South is one of the greatest areas of our great Nation. It has the resources, the climate, and the high type of American citizenship to forge to the front if it be given an even break in the operation of government.

Mr. President, I am proud to be an Arkansan and a southerner. No other section of the Nation has exceeded us in the war effort. From that area, and those contiguous thereto, there has come a remarkable number of those who have been prominent in leadership in the war. The area has many heroes. To my mind everyone who is serving in this great war for the liberty of our Nation and the world, whether he be the humblest private, or one who leads, is a hero.

I predict that when peace comes the South will have a new and brighter page in the history of the United States.

JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, on February 1, 1944, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] submitted Senate Resolution 247, resolving that the United States use its good offices in taking appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be open for free entry of Jews into that country and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. The resolution reaffirmed the action of the Congress on June 30, 1933, in which the Sixty-seventh Congress gave adherence to the Balfour Declaration for the reestablishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. Senate Resolution 247 was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. As a member of that committee I was an earnest supporter of that resolution, and, so far as I know, there was little or no opposition to its adoption in the committee. However, as a result of a letter from the Secretary of War transmitted by the Secretary of State vigorously protesting against the adoption of the resolution at this time, and as the result of the appearance before the committee of high military authorities ascertaining that the adoption of the resolution might be harmful to the war effort, the resolution has been held in abeyance in the committee, and on that state of fact even the most ardent supporters of the resolution were unable to protest seriously the action of the committee. However, a few days ago, after a conference at the White House between the President and Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Dr. Stephen S. Wise, the cochairmen of the American Zionist Emergency Council, Dr. Silver and Dr. Wise issued the following statement:

> The President authorized us to say that the American Government has never given its approval to the white paper of 1939. The President is happy that the doors of Palestine are today open to Jewish refugees, and that when future decisions are reached, full justice will be done to those who seek a Jewish national home for which our Government and the American people have always had the deepest sympathy and today more than ever, in view of the tragic plight of hundreds of thousands of homeless Jewish refugees.

Inasmuch as the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, as well as the head of our Diplomatic Service, it seems to me that the statement of the President necessarily supersedes and transcends the statements of other American officials, no matter how important they may be. I, therefore, feel justified in calling the matter to the attention of the Senate, particularly in view of the extreme urgency of the situation.

Mr. President, on March 31 there will become operative, unless this Government successfully intervenes, one of the most brutal and calamitous policies in the history of Christian civilization. I refer to the British white paper which for the past nearly 5 years has been the obstruction upon which the hopes of hundreds of thousands of homeless persecuted people have fallen in their efforts to escape the living hell which the bestial Hitler has inflicted upon the Jews of Europe.

Ironical as it may seem, tragic as it is, the Jewish homeland in Palestine, by the operation of this policy, has, insofar as the homeless Jews of Europe are concerned, ceased to be a homeland, and if this policy becomes fully effective, it will not only not be a homeland, but it may well become another place where the Jew will be unable to lay his head in peace. It may well become another concentra-

tion camp, with all the horrors of those camps.

The British white paper stands, in my mind and in the minds of hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of American citizens of all faiths, as probably the most tragic of all the unhappy experiences this unhappy people have had since a political mountebank threw the world into an uproar with the Jews as his first victims. The British Government closed the gates of Palestine back in 1939, when a misguided Prime Minister, Mr. Chamberlain, was seeking to appease the Hitler government. No peoples on earth denounced that policy more vigorously than did the rank and file Britishers, and no official was more critical of that policy than was the man who today is the Prime Minister of the British Empire, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill.

Almost 5 years have passed, however, since Mr. Churchill rose in Commons to denounce this violation of the solemn pledge of the British Government. Since he spoke from the benches of the opposition, Mr. Churchill has become the No. 1 spokesman of his Government, and although he so vigorously opposed the stoppage of Jewish immigration into Palestine when he was on the outside looking in, he has done nothing, insofar as I know, now that he sits in the seats of the mighty, to rectify that great wrong or to modify that policy.

In the meanwhile, time moves rapidly. Unhappily the British Government is not alone in responsibility for the tragic situation which now pertains to Palestine. Our Government also has a responsibility, and this responsibility will increase as the full effects of this policy become operative.

Let me explain. During the First World War the great President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, and the then head of the British Empire, Mr. Lloyd George, conducted negotiations in response to a world-wide demand that steps be taken to alleviate the plight of the suffering Jews of Europe by setting aside their centuries-old home, Palestine, as a national home for the Jews.

As a result of the negotiations between this Government and the British Government, there was promulgated on November 2, 1917, by the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the late Arthur James Balfour, that has since become known as the Balfour Declaration. This declaration, although issued in the name of the British Government, was, insofar as I am able to ascertain, a declaration also of policy on the part of the Government of the United States, because President Wilson and our own Department of State were party to its promulgation. Let me read to Senators what the Balfour Declaration says. I quote:

His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country.

The Balfour Declaration brought hope and happiness to millions of Jews throughout the world. To the homeless and oppressed it was the rainbow in the storm-covered sky of the Jewish world. Equally, it was hailed by Protestant and Catholic men and women of good will throughout the world. They were like you and me, Mr. President, in thinking that at long last the age-old crime of a Christian civilization against the Jewish people was about to be righted.

After the World War, first at the Versailles Peace Conference, and then at subsequent international gatherings, steps were taken by the Allied and Associated Nations to carry into practical effect the principles of the Balfour Declaration. It is well to note here that in all these conversations by the spokesmen of the British Government and the spokesmen of the American Government, and the other Allied Powers, it was intended that Palestine would be a homeland for the Jews in the fullest sense of the word.

It is well to note, too, that the spokesmen for the Arab world were apparently just as happy that this was coming to pass as were the spokesmen for the Jewish world. At the Versailles Conference there actually was entered into by the spokesmen for the Jews and spokesmen for the Arabs what can well be known as a treaty of peace and amity. There were exchanged letters by the then foremost champion of the Arab cause and a leading spokesman for the Zionist organization of America. In a personal letter the Emir Feisal, the late great recognized spokesman for the Arab people, had this to say:

I want to take this opportunity of my first contact with American Zionists to tell you what I have often been able to say to Dr. Weizmann in Arabia and Europe.

We feel that the Arabs and Jews are cousins in race, have suffered similar oppression at the hands of powers stronger than themselves, and by a happy coincidence have been able to take the first step toward the attainment of their national ideals together.

We Arabs, especially the educated among us, look with the deepest sympathy on the Zionist movement. Our deputation here in Paris is fully acquainted with the proposals submitted yesterday by the Zionist organization to the peace conference and we regard them as moderate and proper. We will do our best, insofar as we are concerned, to help them through; we will wish the Jews a most hearty welcome home.

With the chiefs of your movement, especially with Dr. Weizmann, we have had, and continue to have, the closest relations. He has been a great helper of our cause, and I hope the Arabs may soon be in a position to make the Jews some return for their kindness. We are working together for a reformed and revived Near East and our two movements complete one another. The Jewish movement is national and not imperialist. Our movement is national and not imperialist, and there is room in Syria for us both. Indeed, I think that neither can be a real success without the other.

People less informed and less responsible than our leaders and yours, ignoring the need for cooperation of the Arabs and Zionists, have been trying to exploit the official difficulties that must necessarily arise in Palestine in the early stages of our movements. Some of them have, I am afraid, misrepresented your aims to the Arab peasantry, and our aims to the Jewish peasantry, with the result that interested parties have been able to make capital out of what they call our differences.

I wish to give you my firm conviction that these differences are not on questions of principle, but on matters of detail such as must inevitably occur in every contact of neighboring peoples, and as are easily adjusted by mutual good will. Indeed, nearly all of them will disappear with fuller knowledge.

I look forward, and my people with me look forward, to a future in which we will help you and you will help us, so that the countries in which we are mutually interested may once again take their place in the community of civilized people of the world.

Now let me get back to the Versailles Conference. As a result of the Covenant of the League of Nations, a mandatory policy was agreed upon in which certain nations were to be given spheres of influence. England was given the mandate of Palestine, and although the United States Government did not become a participant in the League of Nations, it did reserve for itself the right to approve the mandate over Palestine, having first kept itself fully informed concerning the development of the mandate.

Let me say parenthetically, Mr. President, that a few days ago I read a very long and illuminating article in the Baltimore Sun, under a London date line, in which it was stated that the mere introduction of this resolution had caused a great deal of indignation in England, on the ground that we were interfering in British territory even by introducing such a resolution. Of course, the fact is that the British have no more rights in Palestine than we have, or than anyone else has, except in their fiduciary capacity, which comes about by their having been granted a mandate by the League of Nations. Palestine does not belong to the British. The British have no color of title whatever to Palestine. It is a piece of impudence on their part to assume that Palestine belongs to them.

Following the agreement on a mandatory policy a convention was negotiated by the then Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the British Secretary of State, whereby the United States approved the mandate for Palestine. This convention was approved by the Senate of the United States on February 20, 1925. It was ratified by the President of the United States on March 2, and by Great Britain on March 28. The ratifications were exchanged at London on December 3, and the convention was proclaimed by President Calvin Coolidge on December 5, 1925. It thus became the law of the land insofar as the United States Government is concerned.

Prior to ratification of the mandate by the United States and Great Britain, the Congress of the United States unanimously passed what has since become

known as the Lodge resolution which resolved:

> That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected.

Following the proclamation of the mandate, Jews from all parts of Europe began moving into Palestine. Their coming converted a barren land into a literal Biblical land of "milk and honey." In the span of a quarter of a century since the end of the first World War, the Jewish community in Palestine grew from approximately 50,000 to approximately 600,000 people.

A barren country, desolate and forsaken for centuries, Palestine has been transformed by Jewish idealism and labor into a thriving country, and it stands today as the world's most marvelous example of reclamation. The example is even more marvelous because the people who converted this soil had for centuries been forced to live away from the land and in crowded areas of industrial communities. It is fortunate that, prior to the promulgation of the British white paper policy, more than a quarter million Jews poured into Palestine in the early days of Hitler's reign of terror. These refugees from Germany and other Nazi-dominated countries of Europe became, in Palestine, aggressive and intelligent allies of the United Nations. Aside from the fact that were it not for Palestine, approximately half a million additional Jews would have been slaughtered by Hitler, the fact stands out that these people in Palestine were heroic allies of the British Eighth Army at a time when the British Empire was being driven back to its life line at the Suez.

These people were our friends in the hour of the United Nation's greatest need. Jews of Palestine volunteered as combat troops with General Montgomery, and more than 30,000 of them fought with magnificent courage at El Alamein, Tobruk, and in every other battle in north Africa through to Italy, where thousands of men are now fighting with the British. They were magnificent soldiers and no one has been more generous in his praise than General Montgomery himself. In addition, the men, women, and children in Palestine left their orange groves and their other agricultural pursuits to become industrial workers, first for the British Army and then later for the American troops. In Palestine, they manufactured everything from marmalade to munitions. It is noteworthy that Jewish technicians who were driven from Germany by Hitler, reestablished their trades and enterprises in Palestine. They began turning out in that country optical equipment, scientific and precision instruments, and other commodities which the British had theretofore imported from Germany. Had it not been for the presence of these people in Palestine, the British Eighth Army would have been deprived of much valuable material badly needed in helping to win the war in north Africa. These industries still are functioning at high speed and the entire economy of Palestine continues to be geared to the winning of the war.

So much for Palestine's contribution to the war which has been and is a magnificent contribution.

Now let us get back to the mandate. I have shown how the United States Government became a party to the mandate for Palestine. Article 7 of the convention between the United States and Great Britain, which convention includes all the provisions of the mandate, declares that no modification shall be made in the terms of the mandate unless such modifications had been assented to by the United States.

Note these words, that no change shall be made in the terms of the mandate unless such modifications shall have been assented to by the United States. This language is part of a treaty by the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain, signed by the late Ambassador Frank B. Kellogg, of the United States, and by the Right Honorable Austen Chamberlain, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on behalf of the King of England.

Despite this treaty which specified that no change should be made in the mandate, the British Government proceeded to destroy the mandate and to render it practically null and void insofar as its purpose was to make it a national home for the Jews. They, the British Government, made the mandate for Palestine a scrap of paper. They were apparently entirely indifferent to their solemn agreement.

Not once were the wishes of the American Government consulted, and not once in the nearly 5 years which have elapsed since this flagrant and tragic betrayal of its trust was perpetrated by Great Britain, so far as is known, has the American Government made any protest.

Not once has our Department of State said to the Government of Great Britain, "You cannot do this. You have a treaty with us which says that no change shall be made in the mandate without first receiving our assent."

To all intents and purposes, we of the United States Government, are equally a party to this nullification. By our silence for nearly 5 years we have to all practical purposes given our consent to this tragic violation of the pledged word of 51 nations.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator mean to say that neither the State Department nor the President has protested the actions of the British Government?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say they have never been protested so far as anyone knows.

Because Palestine might have saved the lives of tens of thousands of persecuted Jews during the past 5 years had they been permitted to go there, and were not permitted to go there because of the operation of this iniquitous white paper, we of this Nation are in effect a party to this crime, and for this I hang my head in shame.

The horrible effects of this mandate, Mr. President, will become fully operative on April 1, and in all this period the only word of protest uttered by a responsible official of the American Government was spoken a few days ago in the White House by the President to Dr. Abba Hillel Silver of Cleveland, Ohio, and Dr. Stephen S. Wise, the cochairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council, the organization of Jews and gentiles which has been formed to try, at this late date, to rectify this horrible wrong. Following that conference Dr. Silver and Dr. Wise, by authority of the President, gave out the statement I have quoted above.

This, Mr. President, I repeat was the first word of protest against the white paper policy by a responsible official of the American Government in these 4 years, 11 months, and 9 days of its operation.

You can imagine, Mr. President, the hope it brought to hundreds of thousands of people here and overseas.

At long last, a responsible official of this Government has spoken out.

I was a guest that evening at the dinner of the American Palestine committee at which more than 800 people were present, mostly Protestants and Catholics. To them the President's words were stimulating, even as they were to Jews in this country and to Jews overseas.

All of us felt that finally the Government of the United States was disassociating itself from that horrible and ironical policy which prevents homeless, persecuted Jews from migrating even to Palestine.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. To whom did the President protest?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The President authorized the statement. I believe the Senator stepped off the floor when I earlier referred to the statement. In an interview with Dr. Silver and Dr. Wise, the President authorized them to give out the statement which I read earlier. I am glad to repeat it:

> The President authorized us to say that the American Government has never given its approval to the white paper of 1939. The President is happy that the doors of Palestine are today opened to Jewish refugees, and that when future decisions are reached, full justice will be done to those who seek a Jewish national home for which our Government and the American people have always had the deepest sympathy, and today more than ever, in view of the tragic plight of hundreds of thousands of homeless Jewish refugees.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Was there no protest from our Government to the British Government?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is the only expression by any responsible Government official which has been made on the subject.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That statement was made by Dr. Silver; was it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was made by Dr. Silver and Dr. Wise, who were authorized to make the statement, so they said.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Was the statement made to the British Government?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; they gave it out to the public.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, since the announcement of the statement on behalf of the President by Dr. Silver and Dr. Wise, nearly 3 weeks have passed, and we have heard nothing further. I appreciate that the wheels of diplomacy turn slowly, but I also appreciate that the clock clicks away. In another 10 days the white-paper policy will become completely effective, and unless repudiated or modified, it will become a permanent prohibition against Jewish migration to Palestine.

If this comes to pass, Mr. President, the tragedy of the Jew of our time will be infinitely worse than the tragedy of the Jew throughout the ages. Where, then, Mr. President, will be our vaunted Christian civilization? Where, then, will be the long-time policy of this Government? Where then will be our national self-respect? Where, then, will be the principles of the Atlantic Charter?

I cannot believe, Mr. President, that this Government will stultify itself. Neither do I believe that a great humanitarian like Mr. Roosevelt will be content merely with an indirect statement to the effect that the "United States Government has never given its approval to the white paper of 1939."

The time has passed when mere words will halt continuation of this tragedy. Action is needed.

Mr. President, it has been said that Palestine is too small a country to accommodate all of the homeless Jews who might want to go there. Obviously, Mr. President, it is not planned to move all of them overnight; nor, insofar as I have ever heard, is it planned to move all of them at all at any time. What is anticipated is that when the war is over those unfortunate people, who cannot reconstruct their lives in the devastated areas of Europe, where people do not want them, will be permitted to go to Palestine and achieve homes for themselves. Also, the thousands of refugees who got away from Hitler, but did not get to Palestine because of the restrictive immigration policy resulting from the white paper, will be absorbed.

For the past few nights, I have been reading a very interesting book by a United States Government official, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, one of the foremost soil-conservation authorities of our Government and in the world, entitled "Palestine, Land of Promise." It would be to the advantage of any Member of this body to peruse the book.

Dr. Lowdermilk was first attracted to Palestine because of studies made there and in the course of a soil survey of other countries, directed by the Congress of the United States, which took him from Casablanca to Chungking. In all of his travels in Europe, Africa, and Asia, he found Palestine by all odds the most interesting place on earth where the soil is being reclaimed and an ancient land is being returned to the fruitfulness which the Creator intended.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Does the book the Senator has mentioned indicate the amount of water available for reclamation work in Palestine?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It not only indicates the amount of water available for reclamation work but it contains concrete suggestions as to certain very interesting projects which the author of the book believes entirely feasible both for power development and for reclamation work. I may say that one of the projects which Dr. Lowdermilk discusses in his book would involve taking the sweet water of the River Jordan and using it for irrigation purposes in the arid or semiarid land around it, and replacing that water in the River Jordan by sea water. The proposal is that the sea water be brought in by means of a tunnel which Dr. Lowdermilk says is entirely practical. It would bring from the Mediterranean sea water which could be used for power purposes. Dr. Lowdermilk states that the depression of the Sea of Galilee, the River Jordan, and the Dead Sea is the most interesting spot on the habitable globe from the standpoint of prospective power development. His book is one which I am certain every Senator could very profitably spend a few evenings in reading.

Mr. BONE. Of course, Mr. President, it would be a remarkable thing and would be tremendously advantageous for that area, if both functions could be blended in one operation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The project Dr. Lowdermilk suggests is unique, as I have said, because he proposes that the sweet water be taken from the River Jordan and used for irrigation and reclamation purposes, and that it be replaced with sea water from the Mediterranean, which would be used for power purposes. He says that is entirely feasible.

Mr. BONE. Would any pumping operations be necessary?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The topography is such that, by the construction of the tunnel, so Dr. Lowdermilk says, it is perfectly possible to divert water from the Mediterranean Sea, which is only a few miles away, and use it to replace the sweet water taken from the River Jordan and used for irrigation purposes. Of course, the surface of the Dead Sea is nearly 1,300 feet below sea level. The Sea of Galilee is more than 600 feet below sea level, as I recall.

Mr. BONE. We have nothing comparable to that in this country, unless it be portions of Death Valley.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Dr. Lowdermilk states there is nothing else in the entire world that is anything like the topography existing in the cleft generally represented by the Sea of Galilee, the River Jordan, and the Dead Sea.

Mr. BONE. Of course, with a 600-foot head of water there would be no trouble with power development.

Mr. President, it might be well at this point to say a few words about the country itself. Incidentally, let me say that the mandate of Transjordania, which logically should belong with Palestine in one country, because it is essentially the same country, was wrenched out of the Palestine mandate. While the British have a mandate over Transjordania, it was wrenched out of the Palestine mandate, which is proposed as the Jewish homeland.

Palestine, west of the Jordan, comprises an area of 10,400 square miles. It is characterized, despite its small size, by great diversity of climate, soils, altitude, and rainfall, and offers possibilities for many types of agriculture and varied economic development. Its population today is about 1,500,000.

Belgium, Holland, and Sicily are each of approximately the same size as Palestine. The population of Sicily, mountainous and without important industries, is 4,000,000; that of Belgium and Holland, each, over 8,000,000. It is clear that area alone does not determine the absorptive capacity of a country; its material resources and the energy, skill, and character of its inhabitants must also be taken into account.

Archeological and historical evidence indicates that in Greco-Roman times Palestine supported a population of 3,000,000 to 4,000,000, or more than twice the present total. It is reasonable to suppose that with the aid of modern technology that figure will not only be reached once more, but considerably exceeded.

After 8 months in which Dr. Lowdermilk was afforded every possible opportunity by all groups in Palestine to make a thorough and exhaustive study of the potentialities of the area, he says this in his book about the absorptive capacity of Palestine:

> I shall not attempt to estimate the final absorptive capacity of Palestine. That would be impossible, for the absorptive capacity of any country is a dynamic and expanding conception. It changes with the ability of the population to make the maximum use of its land, and to put its economy on a scientific and productive basis. It is clear, however, that there is ample proof of the assertion that full utilization of the Jordan Valley depression for reclamation and power will in time make possible the absorption of at least 4,000,000 Jewish refugees from Europe, in addition to the 1,800,000 Arabs and Jews already in Palestine and Trans-Jordania.

It has been also said that the Jews are driving the Arabs from the country. This is in no way in accordance with the facts. Actually, the contrary is true and actually the Arabs of Palestine are by far the most prosperous Arab peoples in the Middle

East, in contrast with the fact that at the time of the establishment of the Jewish homeland they were by far the poorest and most backward Arabs in the whole of the Middle East The Arab population has substantially increased since the Balfour Declaration. Certainly the Colonial Office of the British Government is not prejudiced in favor of the Jews. When Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, Secretary of State for the Colonies in the Chamberlain government, refutes the allegation that the Jews have imposed hardships on the Arabs, the allegation certainly is without foundation in fact. This is what Mr. MacDonald said in the House of Commons on November 24, 1938. Remember, he is said to be the author of the white paper.

> The Arabs cannot say that the Jews are driving them out of their country. If not a single Jew had come to Palestine after 1918, I believe that the Arab population of Palestine today would still have been around about the 600,000 figure—instead of over 1,000,000 as at present—at which it had been stable under the Turkish rule. It is because the Jews who have come to Palestine bring modern health services and other advantages that the Arab men and women who would have been dead are alive today, that Arab children who would never have drawn breath have been born and grow strong.

One further word, Mr. President, and I shall be through. The question of the termination of the horrible white-paper policy is not a problem of the Jew. It is a problem of the Christians of the world, and by force of circumstances it is chiefly a problem of the Christians who constitute the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain. As a humble member of the legislative branch of the Government of the United States I feel deeply on this subject. The self-respect of all of us has been challenged and the self-respect of our Government is equally at stake. I hope that other Members of the Congress and of the executive branch of the Government will feel as I do, so that every possible constructive step to alleviate the sufferings of the Jews of Europe will be taken at the earliest possible moment, and that the gates of Palestine will be reopened speedily and permanently in order that those people may find a welcome at the only place on God's green earth where at the moment the governments of the world apparently are willing for them to get a new start in life and live as decent, self-respecting, constructive, helpful citizens as they have always lived in those communities where the Jew is permitted to become a part of his community.

It seems to me that in view of the tragic urgency of the crisis and in view of the President's humanitarian expressions on the subject, the Wagner-Taft resolution should be passed without delay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for his very detailed and comprehensive statement of a situation which is rapidly becoming almost intolerable. Next Saturday may become one of the black days in the history of the English-speaking people. Next Saturday will become one of the black days of the history of England, Mr. President, unless in the remaining few days of this week the British Government rescinds its iniquitous white paper which halts Jewish immigration into Palestine.

After next Saturday a total of not more than 23,000 Jews will be permitted to go to Palestine, which will include only the men, women, and children who have heretofore obtained visas but have been unable to complete their pilgrimage to their "promised land" because of transportation difficulties. The British Colonial Office charged with the administration of Palestine has graciously consented to extend the validity of their admission certificates until they can be utilized. But after that the gates of Palestine will be closed.

For the past 5 years, Mr. President, or since the white-paper policy has been operative, the British Government has permitted only 10,000 Jewish refugees a year to enter a land which was set aside after the last war, under the initiative of the United States and other Allied Nations, as the haven where these oppressed and harassed people would have the opportunity to rebuild their lives, as was stated to the Senate by the Senator from Missouri.

In the meanwhile, Hitler the maniac, and his henchmen, have been exterminating Jews in Germany, in Poland, and in the occupied countries at an estimated rate of more than 10,000 per day. In other words, Hitler has killed more Jews a day—every day—than Britain has permitted to find refuge in Palestine in a year. Hitler has exterminated more Jews in 5 days in central Europe than the British Government has permitted to enter Palestine in 5 years.

Hitler and Himmler the hangman have now moved into Hungary and Rumania, and once more Jewish slaughter stands first on the agenda of hate in those unhappy lands.

Heretofore tens of thousands of Jews en route to Palestine, halted because of the white paper, have found some sort of asylum in the Balkans. Now Hitler has caught up with them and his Gestapo may be depended upon to do its work thoroughly. The reverses he is suffering in Russia will be expiated by the blood of these helpless people.

Our Government has not been unaware of their plight. Our Government has known that it was necessary to get them out of the Balkans. Brave words have been spoken about saving them; but apparently there was no real effort made to get them to Palestine, the only place where they were really wanted. Palestine could have absorbed an additional two or three million of them and made them helpful allies of our cause—just as it has absorbed the half-million Jews who did get there before 1939—but Palestine has been closed by the white paper. The white paper and its responsible authors have therefore been in effect an ally of Hitler in his diabolical conspiracy for the extermination of the Jewish people of Europe. This is an inescapable conclusion.

While the responsibility for this tragedy is primarily the responsibility of the British Government, we in the United States must also bear our share of blame. As stated by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], to the extent that we failed to voice a protest, the responsibility is also ours. Long ago we negotiated a treaty with Great Britain wherein we consented to British administration of the mandate for Palestine. That convention specifically states in article 7 that no modification shall be made in the terms of the mandate unless such modification has been assented to by the United States.

Curtailment of Jewish immigration during the past 5 years, and the proposed complete stoppage, is in violation of this mandate. Furthermore, any restriction whatsoever of Jewish immigration into Palestine is entirely contrary to the intent, purpose, and spirit of the Balfour Declaration which was the forerunner of the mandate. Has the United States Government ever protested this violation? Has the United States Government ever lifted its voice in behalf of the helpless victims of this unlawful violation of a sacred covenant? The answer is "No."

Just 2 weeks ago—mark you, just 2 weeks ago—President Roosevelt asserted that the American Government has never given its approval to the white paper. Of course, it has not, but neither has it voiced its disapproval. So in the absence of a protest by the United States, the British Government has continued this iniquitous and unlawful policy for 5 years. In those 5 years no one knows how many lives might have been saved. Certainly many tens of thousands would have found safety.

While the President's guarded statement that this Government "has never approved the white paper" does not constitute a formal protest by one government to another concerning the flagrant violation of a treaty, yet it is the only word which has been spoken by a responsible United States official on the subject.

I had hoped that Mr. Churchill in his speech last Sunday would announce a retreat from the white paper, for no one in Britain has been more critical of it than Mr. Churchill. He once described it as a "betrayal." But perhaps he too has become callous to Jewish suffering and travail. Perhaps he, too, is indifferent to the fate of those who still can be saved.

Well, I am not indifferent, Mr. President, and I know the Senate is not indifferent. The Senate ratified the treaty concerning the mandate for Palestine, and it approved by unanimous vote the Lodge resolution of 1922 approving the establishment of the Jewish national homeland. The time has come for the Senate to speak up. The overwhelming majority of American citizens are appalled at the premeditated extermination of the Jewish people. They want justice accorded the Jew. They know that a just settlement of this problem is a Christian problem. They know that in the inhospitable world of today the only place where the Jew of Europe can go is Palestine. I wish it were otherwise, but unfortunately it is not.

Under the circumstances, therefore, we should face realities in the Senate and do all in our power to keep the gates of Palestine open to the end that it shall become a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. It should become a Jewish national homeland, just as was contemplated when the Balfour Declaration was promulgated more than a quarter of a century ago with the full knowledge, consent, and cooperation of the United States Government. Anything less will be what the elcquent Churchill has termed a "betrayal."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish merely to take a moment of the Senate's time, in following the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], to add my protest against the British white paper, which will completely stop Jewish immigration into Palestine on and after next Sunday unless before then the policy be changed.

President Roosevelt, in a recent statement, said:

> The American Government has never given its approval to the white paper.

Which is an accurate statement.

The President further stated:

> When future decisions are reached, full justice will be done to those who seek a Jewish national home.

It would be a major tragedy if, literally on the eve of our winning World War No. 2, fought in the interest of freedom of all peoples and nations, tens of thousands of additional Jews should perish because of Hitler's fury on one hand and the inability of the Jews to find a place to go, on the other. If Palestine were open, there would be a place for them to go.

From London comes word, I hear, that some change may be made in the British position. I hope so, and I hope that it will mean some constructive action will be taken.

Unfortunately, Palestine is the only place on earth where most of these unfortunate people can go. There they will be given a genuine welcome and safety. There, like others before them, they will become useful, productive citizens.

Palestine, the Jewish national homeland, created by the great statesmen of the British Empire with the full cooperation of American statesmen, is denied to the Jews—the very people it was intended to help—at a time when they need it the most.

The white paper was part of an appeasement era which produced Munich, which, instead of preventing heartaches and bloodshed, produced greater heartaches, more bloodshed, and economic destruction.

Happily, more than 300,000 Jews escaped Hitler and went into Palestine. They became our valued and valiant allies. They have contributed directly to the war effort, both in productive capacity and fighting on the front.

Our Government failed to protest immediately and actively when the British Government took action which was not in accord with the treaty between the two Governments, which says that no change can be made in the mandate for Palestine without our consent.

The situation is now sufficiently clear so that I hope some change of policy may be worked out in the interest of fairness and justice to humanity.

The need today for a free Palestine is great, but the need will be infinitely greater when the task of rehabilitation begins in the post-war era.

OPERATIONS OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last week in the independent offices appropriation bill we appropriated $6,766,000,000 for the United States Maritime Commission. I did not oppose the appropriation because, as the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration are now operated, this amount is probably needed to attain the desired results. However, I have repeatedly called the attention of the Congress to the shortcomings and wastefulness of the United States Maritime Commission and wish to do so again at this time.

The very fact that the Comptroller General's office has repeatedly called the attention of the Congress to the misconduct of the affairs of the Maritime Commission and the fact that the Comptroller General has held up several hundred million dollars which in his opinion the Commission proposed to pay out wrongfully should have resulted in a complete investigation of this Commission a long time ago.

From time to time I have requested and received from the General Accounting Office information concerning Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration affairs.

A short time ago I requested certain information from the General Accounting Office, and, under date of March 8, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren wrote me giving such information as was available at that time. I asked for—

> The percent of total amount of the purchase contracts that carry recapture provisions as required under section 606 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

I was in error in that I referred to section 606, because it is section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which requires the insertion of recapture clauses in contracts placed by the Maritime Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

Section 505 (b) is as follows:

> SEC. 505 (b). No contract shall be made for the construction of any vessel under this act unless the shipbuilder shall agree (1) to make a report under oath to the Commission upon completion of the contract, setting forth in the form prescribed by the Commission the total contract price, the total cost of performing the contract, the amount of the shipbuilder's overhead charged to such cost, the net profits and the percentage such net profit bears to the contract price, and such other information as the Commission shall prescribe; (2) to pay to the Commission profit, as hereinafter provided shall be determined by the Commission, in excess of 10 percent of the total contract prices of such contracts within the scope of this section as are completed by the particular contracting party within the income taxable year, such amount to become the property of the United States, but the surety under such contracts shall not be liable for the payment of such excess profit: *Provided*, That if there is a net loss on all such contracts or subcontracts completed by the particular contractor or subcontractor within any income taxable year, such net loss shall be allowed as a credit in determining the excess profit, if any, for the next succeeding income taxable year: *Provided*, That, if such amount is not voluntarily paid, the Commission shall determine the amount of such excess profit and collect it in the same manner that other debts due the United States may be collected; (3) to make no subdivisions of any contract or subcontract for the same article or articles for the purpose of evading the provisions of this act, and any subdivision of any contract or subcontract involving an amount in excess of $10,000 shall be subject to the conditions herein prescribed; (4) that the books, files, and all other records of the shipbuilder, or any holding, subsidiary, affiliated, or associated company, shall at all times be subject to inspection and audit by any person designated by the Commission, and the premises, including ships under construction, of the shipbuilder, shall at all reasonable times be subject to inspection by the agents of the Commission; and (5) to make no subcontract unless the subcontractor agrees to the foregoing conditions: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to contracts or subcontracts for scientific equipment used for communication and navigation as may be so designated by the Commission, and the Commission shall report annually to the Congress the names of such contractors and subcontractors affected by this provision, together with the applicable contracts and the amounts thereof.

Mr. AIKEN. Under date of March 8, 1944, the Comptroller General wrote me a letter from which I quote the following:

> Item No. 2: Section 606 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relates to operating differential-subsidy contracts and, hence, it is presumed that you intended to refer to section 505 of the said act which relates to construction. A large number of the purchase contracts have been examined and, with the exception of one or two instances, the recapture provisions were omitted. It is understood that approximately 20,000 purchase contracts have been entered into and that recapture provisions were inserted in only about 25 or 30 of said contracts. In that connection, see my letter of October 7, 1943, B–32105, to you. There is transmitted herewith a copy of memorandum dated October 20, 1941, to the Commission from its Assistant General Counsel (Exhibit A), and of memorandum dated November 4, 1941 (Exhibit B), showing the action taken by the Commission in the matter.

Exhibit A referred to is dated October 30, 1941, and is a memorandum from Assistant General Counsel Wade H. Skinner to the United States Maritime Commission. The subject is "Recapture of profits in excess of 10 percent," and concludes with a recommendation. I ask leave to have the entire memorandum inserted in the RECORD at this point, including the recommendation which was made to the Commission by Wade H.

Skinner, assistant general counsel at that time, and which appears at the end of the memorandum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum is as follows:

EXHIBIT A

OCTOBER 30, 1941.

To: United States Maritime Commission.
From: Assistant general counsel.
Subject: Recapture of profits in excess of 10 percent.

By section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act 1936, as amended, it is provided that no contract shall be made for the construction of any vessel under said act unless the shipbuilder shall agree to pay the Commission profit in excess of 10 percent of the total contract prices of such contracts as are completed by the contracting party within the income taxable year and that such contracting party will not make any subcontract involving an amount in excess of $10,000 unless the subcontractor agrees to the same conditions. Prime contracts for materials, equipment, and supplies for use in connection with the construction of vessels under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, have been considered by the Commission to be subject to the same conditions as prime contracts made by the Commission for the construction of vessels, if such contracts are for amounts in excess of $10,000. By section 402 of the Second Revenue Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940, a subcontractor to whom the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1940 is applicable is exempt from the provisions of section 505 (b) if the prime contractor and the subcontractor are not affiliated and if both parties are corporations.

Contracts for the construction of vessels and for the purchase of materials, equipment, and supplies to be used in the construction of vessels pursuant to the authority in Public Law 5 and Public Law 23 (Lend-Lease Act) may be entered into without regard to the requirements of competitive bidding under section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and are not required to contain provisions with respect to recapture of profits. Under section 2 of Public Law 46 the Commission is granted authority to negotiate contracts for the construction of complete vessels or any portion thereof either under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, or section 4 of Public Law 5 "with or without advertising or competitive bidding upon determination that the price is fair and reasonable" and in connection with such authority to negotiate contracts, the Commission might use contracts providing for payment of cost plus a fixed fee or cost plus a fixed fee with such bonuses and penalties as the Commission may deem necessary to secure maximum performance under such contracts, if for each contract such fixed fee does not exceed 7 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee and any bonuses payable thereunder and the aggregate of such fixed fee plus any such bonuses payable thereunder does not exceed 10 percent of such estimated cost. By this provision, negotiated contracts, providing for payment of cost plus a fee, are excluded from consideration in the determination of profit of the contractor under section 505 (b) (2) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

Title III of Public Law 247, approved August 25, 1941, provides for an appropriation supplementing the Commission's construction fund established under the provision of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in addition to the other activities and functions authorized. This title further provides that the provisions of section 2 and 4 and the several proviso clauses contained in section 1 of the act of February 6, 1941 (Public Law 5), shall apply to all the activities and functions which the Commission is authorized to perform thereunder. Neither sections 2 or 4 nor the several proviso clauses of Public Law 5 make any reference to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, except section 207 of that act. It is not believed, therefore, that the recapture provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, are required by law to be made applicable to lump-sum contracts for the construction of vessels or portions thereof under the provisions of Public Law 247. The increase made in the Commission's construction fund by Public Law 247 at most only raises an inference that the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, shall be applicable to the activities and functions authorized under this law.

Recent contracts for the construction of vessels on a lump-sum basis, whether pursuant to the Lend-Lease Act or otherwise, have contained provisions for the recapture of profits in excess of 10 percent similar to the recapture provisions incorporated into contracts made pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Such provisions seem to be consistent with the intent of Congress so far as the Commission's activities are concerned, particularly in view of the 10-percent limitation of profit both under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and Public Law 46.

Inasmuch as the Commission is engaged in an extensive procurement program of machinery, equipment, parts, and supplies for use in connection with the construction of vessels, the question has arisen as to the necessity or desirability of recapture of profit provisions similar to those required under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in connection with prime contracts made by the Commission for the procurement of materials, machinery, equipment, and supplies in excess of $10,000 for use in the construction of vessels whether or not such vessels are or will be constructed pursuant to the authority of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Since such contracts will in many cases be for materials for vessels under the Merchant Marine Act as well as the Lend-Lease Act or other authority, it would seem necessary in the interest of consistency to make the recapture of profits provisions applicable to the entire quantity of materials purchased. Moreover, in view of the fact that practically all of the lump-sum contracts contain a rather liberal escalator clause, which eliminated most of the contractor's risk, and the limitations on profits imposed by the Merchant Marine Act and by Public Law 46 in connection with cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, it is believed that the Commission's policy should be to the effect that all construction and procurement contracts on a lump-sum basis made by the Commission should carry profit-limitation provisions.

Recommendation: It is recommended that in view of the foregoing, the Commission should determine, as a matter of policy, that all contracts made on a lump-sum basis for the construction of vessels and for materials, equipment, and supplies, whether for use in connection with the construction of vessels or otherwise, provided such contracts are in excess of $10,000, shall be subject to profit-limitation provisions substantially similar to those required by section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It is further recommended that the Commission authorize the proper officers to take any and all action necessary to effectuate the purposes of the recommendation herein set forth.

WADE H. SKINNER,
Assistant General Counsel.

Mr. AIKEN. This memorandum, Mr. President, is dated October 30, 1941. Exhibit B, referred to by Mr. Warren, is dated November 4, 1941, and shows the action taken by the Commission on the recommendation of its assistant general counsel, Mr. Skinner. I shall read it as follows:

EXHIBIT B

NOVEMBER 4, 1941.

To: Assistant general counsel.
From: Secretary.
Subject: Recapture of profits in excess of 10 percent.

At a meeting on November 4, 1941, the Commission considered your memorandum of October 30, 1941, on the above subject.

The Commission determined as a matter of policy that all prime contracts in excess of $10,000 made on a lump-sum basis for the construction of vessels and for materials, equipment, and supplies, whether for use in connection with the construction of vessels or otherwise, shall be subject to a 10-percent profit limitation in cases where such contracts contain an "escalator clause" with respect to material and labor costs.

The Commission further authorized the proper officers to take any and all action necessary to effectuate the purposes of this determination.

W. C. PEET, Jr.,
Secretary.

It would appear from this that the Commission at that time—November 4, 1941—had determined to restrict profits on its contracts in excess of $10,000 to 10 percent.

Inasmuch as the Comptroller General refers to a letter which he sent to me under date of October 7, 1943, I wish to say that in this letter he makes reference to a letter which was received by him from the Chairman of the Maritime Commission under date of May 29, 1943, reading as follows:

This will acknowledge your letter of May 15, 1943, relative to the noninclusion within the document designated General Provisions, Form No. 8026, and Form No. 8024 of the provisions of section 505 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

These forms were designed for use in connection with the purchase of materials, supplies, and equipment for vessels to be constructed under the provisions of Public Laws 5, 247, 474, and 630 (77th Cong.) and in the opinion of the Commission's general counsel, the inclusion of the provisions of section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is not required in contracts entered into pursuant to the authority of the afore-mentioned laws.

Thus it would appear from these exhibits that the Maritime Commission had determined on November 4, 1941, that all prime contracts in excess of $10,000 should be subject to a 10 percent profit limitation; that the Commission at some later date, which I do not know, had decided that it was not necessary or advisable to include a recapture clause in the contracts.

At any rate, according to the Comptroller General, the recapture clause has been inserted in only about 25 or 30 contracts out of 20,000 purchase contracts that have been entered into.

I am not sufficiently versed in law to state whether the Maritime Commission was within its rights in failing to insert a recapture clause in these contracts, as required by section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. There is such liberality in the interpretation of law by Government departments and so many

loopholes through which departments can technically escape the congressional intent of a law, that it is impossible for a layman, as well as most lawyers, to venture an opinion or interpretation without being promptly disagreed with.

However, whether the Maritime Commission violated the law or not in failing to include recapture clauses in its contracts, we are, every one of us, interested in the amount of profit allowed by the Commission to its contractors. I do not think there is the slighest doubt that Congress intended to limit profits to cost plus 10 percent.

Now, let us see what profit the Maritime Commission has actually allowed.

I requested the Comptroller General to advise me of the results of renegotiation both where the contracts carried the recapture provisions and where such provisions were not included in the contracts.

I now quote from Mr. Warren's letter in reply to my request:

Item No. 3. Enclosed herewith is a summary of the results of renegotiation by the Price Adjustment Board of the United States Maritime Commission, together with supporting schedules covering renegotiations from inception to December 31, 1943 (exhibit C). It will be noted that the profit allowed on "sales" amounting to $898,012,874.07 is $78,389,734.96, or 9.65 percent, which profit amounts to approximately 10.6 percent of costs.

Since section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, provides for recapture of profits in excess of 10 percent of the contract prices, it follows that the higher the contract price the higher the profit allowance, the elements of cost and capital invested not being for consideration. That is to say, the higher the bid price the higher the profit allowance.

Item No. 4. See summary of renegotiations (exhibit C) and statement under item No. 3. The summary shows that profits allowed under renegotiated contracts exceed 10 percent of cost and, in many instances, exceed 10 percent of "sales" (contract prices). Accordingly, it appears that the profits allowed under renegotiation settlements in those cases exceed the profits that would have been allowed had the recapture provisions of section 505 been incorporated in the contracts—since under the terms of that section profits are limited to 10 percent of the contract price (sales).

The exhibit C referred to is a summary of renegotiations of the United States Maritime Commission Price Adjustment Board from its inception to December 31, 1943, showing the schedule of renegotiations completed, renegotiations miscellaneous, where contracts are not yet executed, renegotiations cleared, and renegotiations resulting in forward price reductions.

It is significant that, of the $459,919,755.82 representing renegotiations completed, the Maritime Commission has allowed a profit of 10.78 percent on adjusted sales. While I have been furnished with photostat copies of these renegotiation schedules broken down to individual contractors, yet I will ask to have inserted in my remarks at this point only the summary of renegotiations to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of renegotiations, U. S. Maritime Commission Price Adjustment Board, from inception to Dec. 31, 1943—Restricted

Description	Total sales subject to renegotiation	Reported profits before Federal income and excess profits taxes	Percent reported profits on sales	Excessive profits recovered	Adjusted sales	Profits allowed on adjusted sales (before Federal taxes)	Percent allowed on adjusted sales	Forward price reductions	Total recovered and forward price reductions
Renegotiations completed (schedule 1)	$459, 919, 755. 82	$105, 605, 262. 16	22. 96	$62, 793, 792. 67	$397, 125, 963. 15	$42, 811, 469. 49	10. 78	----------	$62, 793, 792. 67
Renegotiations miscellaneous (schedule 2) (contracts not yet executed)	278, 887, 295. 35	47, 097, 162. 29	16. 89	22, 701, 071. 85	256, 186, 223. 50	24, 396, 090. 44	9. 52	----------	22, 701, 071. 85
Subtotal	738, 807, 051. 17	152. 702, 424. 45	20. 67	85, 494, 864. 52	653, 312, 186. 65	67, 207, 559. 93	10. 29	----------	85, 494, 864. 52
Renegotiations cleared (schedule 3)	159, 205, 822. 90	11, 182, 175. 03	7. 02	----------	159, 205, 822. 90	11, 182, 175. 03	7. 02	----------	----------
Subtotal	898, 012, 874. 07	163, 884, 599. 48	18. 25	85, 494, 864. 52	812, 518, 009. 55	78, 389, 734. 96	9. 65	----------	85, 494, 864. 52
Renegotiations resulting in forward price reductions (schedule 4)	451, 778, 711. 00	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	$57, 321, 608	57, 321, 608. 00
Grand total	1, 349, 791, 585. 07	163, 884, 599. 48	----------	85, 494, 864. 52	812, 518, 009. 55	78, 389, 734. 96	----------	57, 321, 608	142, 816, 472. 52

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, section 505 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provided that all profits in excess of 10 percent should be recovered by the Government. Not only did the framers of this act consider 10 percent an adequate peacetime profit, but we might as well assume that it was considered an adequate profit for the depression years which were then prevailing.

The contracts of the Maritime Commission have expanded from millions to billions of dollars, yet the Commission is allowing contractors a percentage of profit greater than that which was considered adequate during the years of the great depression. How can we lay any claim to maintaining good government in our country—even good wartime government—when we permit such things to continue?

I asked the Comptroller General for the latest balance sheet of the Maritime Commission, and this is what he said. I quote from his letter:

The latest balance sheet available is as of June 30, 1942. A recent examination thereof was made by representatives of this office who reported that the records were in such condition—supporting documents and papers being missing—that a proper verification of the balance sheets of the War Shipping Administration and the United States Maritime Commission as of June 30, 1942, was impossible.

Again, Mr. President, let me say that the facts I am presenting today concerning conditions prevailing in the operations of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration are the facts that have been determined by the General Accounting Office. The Comptroller General is required by law to report to the Congress transactions of any agency of government which is audited by his office and found to be wrongfully or wastefully expending public funds. The Comptroller General has reported many transactions of the Maritime Commission to this Congress. We have done nothing about it.

An investigation of the Maritime Commission would reveal that the Red Sea charter contracts, under which operators with very little capital investment obtained millions of dollars in profits, have never been renegotiated, in spite of the fact that counsel for the Maritime Commission and Lend-Lease have both ruled that these rates are subject to renegotiation.

In order to refresh our memory on the Red Sea charter contracts, I will say that in the year 1941 there were 81 vessels chartered to carry lend-lease goods to the Red Sea. These 81 vessels made 90 voyages. The value of these vessels, with 11 valuations missing, was $8,256,000. The charter hire amounted to $31,364,880.11, and the profit on these voyages amounted to $26,874,176.70, or about three times the value of the vessels themselves.

Considerable publicity was given to these seemingly excessive profits, and there was, naturally, a demand that these steamship companies be required to return part of the profits. It appears, with two exceptions, these being the Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co. and the American President Lines, the companies receiving these tremendous profits have refused to return any of them, I understand on the ground that the costs were paid out of lend-lease funds, and were claimed, therefore, not to be subject to renegotiation by the Maritime Commission.

I ask to insert in the RECORD a table which appears on page 303 of the report of hearings on the Red Sea space charter rates held before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in March 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of Red Sea voyages

Owner	Vessels	Voyages	Depreciated values	Dead-weight tons	Charter hire	Voyage profits	Profit per weight-ton per month
American Export Lines, Inc.	6	6	$232,350.57	49,145	$1,724,918.64	$1,572,144.52	$4.70
American Foreign Steamship Corporation	2	2	895,974.26	16,000	634,116.03	481,128.13	5.14
American Hawaiian Steamship Co.	10	10	478,532.54	97,369	3,565,674.79	3,096,749.85	5.65
American President Lines, Ltd.	2	3	307,828.59	39,150	1,181,643.00	814,242.06	3.89
Atlas Trading Corporation	1	1	----------	9,650	261,405.00	57,624.60	.59
Boyd, Weir & Sewell, Inc.	1	1	----------	7,200	374,812.92	385,588.52	9.13
Colmar Steamship Corporation	7	8	695,237.00	75,453	2,967,669.75	2,639,989.25	5.63
Isthmian Steamship Co.	6	7	1,589,581.60	65,940	2,554,540.30	2,529,292.68	6.80
Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.	10	12	1,426,857.72	128,428	4,608,456.74	3,879,729.77	5.42
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.	4	4	187,208.37	38,975	1,370,440.20	1,318,493.69	5.11
Matson Navigation Co.	4	4	238,779.23	37,440	1,301,901.75	995,390.62	4.12
McCormick Steamship Co.	2	3	146,065.99	26,807	942,641.55	743,516.59	4.87
Nicol, R. A., agent	6	6	----------	54,335	2,066,206.75	1,662,681.97	4.25
Norwegian Shipping & Trade Mission	1	1	----------	8,990	418,967.40	367,230.57	7.76
Shepard Steamship Co.	1	2	167,465.10	16,800	621,513.39	498,554.42	5.78
Sudden & Christenson	1	1	----------	8,565	374,664.75	270,835.20	3.27
The Union Sulphur Co.	1	2	----------	16,868	571,808.80	364,558.12	3.84
Waterman Steamship Corporation	12	12	[1] 855,800.46	107,736	4,004,987.30	3,733,193.31	5.17
Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co.	4	5	1,037,189.82	49,134	1,818,511.05	1,463,232.83	5.18
Total	81	90	8,256,000.00	853,985	31,364,880.11	26,874,176.70	5.13

[1] Value of 1 ship not available.

Charter hire per deadweight-ton	$36.73
Profit per deadweight-ton	$31.47
Average length of completed voyages (days)	186

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it has been claimed that the companies participating in these profits needed the profits, I ask that there be printed condensed balance sheets of these companies appearing on pages 328 to 349 of the report to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the balance sheets were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American Export Lines, Inc.

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Dec. 31, 1941		Dec. 31, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$2,060,735.77		$2,968,796.69		$6,767,220.01		$16,743,896.52		$15,360,235.53
Vessels	$10,407,235.74		$13,398,507.30		$17,807,247.43		$14,442,002.38		$11,037,430.15	
Less reserves	3,831,118.20		4,349,811.28		4,096,780.29		4,376,961.65		968,938.17	
		6,576,117.54		9,048,696.02		13,710,467.14		10,065,040.73		10,068,491.98
Securities of and receivables from subsidiaries		400,000.00		350,000.00		1,350,000.00		1,350,000.00		1,350,000.00
Special funds and deposits		4,811.12		10,188.65		6,269,260.88		10,276,320.79		15,760,477.59
Vessels under construction		107,548.72		475,902.96				1,779,186.94		
Other assets		517,865.39		509,408.84		582,694.28		436,720.17		898,246.58
Total assets		9,667,078.54		13,362,993.16		28,679,642.31		40,651,165.15		43,437,451.68
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	1,157,620.97		1,850,685.28		2,275,980.80		6,404,668.42		6,947,618.09	
Voyages in progress	167,528.35		741,284.68		1,956,363.65		2,819,206.50			
Recapture profits, U. S. Maritime Commission					4,086,711.84		5,084,642.73		5,267,684.03	
Other liabilities and reserves	4,282,392.50		5,878,336.60		10,271,510.47		3,335,542.76		103,001.81	
Total liabilities and reserves		5,607,541.82		8,470,306.56		18,590,566.76		17,644,060.41		12,318,303.93
CAPITAL										
Capital stock [1]	480,000.00		480,000.00		1,480,000.00		1,480,000.00		1,415,000.00	
Capital surplus	594,016.46		592,850.98		592,850.98		592,850.98		592,850.98	
Earned surplus	2,985,520.26		3,819,835.62		8,016,224.57		20,934,253.76		29,111,296.77	
Total		4,059,536.72		4,892,686.60		10,089,075.55		23,007,104.74		31,119,147.75

[1] 194,349 of a total of 480,000 shares of common stock are held by Lehman Bros., New York.

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit on shipping operations		$804,533.81		$1,656,148.33		$7,957,951.92		$14,348,552.43		$7,614,531.49
Operating differential subsidy		1,217,744.33		1,375,758.51		1,681,020.89		973,847.00		220,076.39
Other income		[1] 26,916.69		[1] 31,829.05		281,121.31		228,168.85		370,337.84
Total		1,995,361.45		3,000,077.79		9,920,094.12		15,550,568.28		8,204,945.72
Officers' salaries	$83,514.53		$91,105.83		$96,152.50		$102,439.97		$99,622.81	
Depreciation of vessels	487,163.37		519,617.48		912,046.57		710,179.16		506,076.89	
Other costs and expenses	804,281.79		898,600.26		1,041,137.80		759,649.79		482,918.47	
Total		1,374,959.69		1,509,323.57		2,049,336.87		1,572,268.92		1,088,618.17
Net profit before taxes		620,401.76		1,490,754.22		7,870,757.25		13,978,299.36		7,116,327.55
Provision for Federal income taxes		50,000.00		40,000.00		165,000.00		300,000.00		1,061,400.00
Net profit after taxes		570,401.76		1,450,754.22		7,705,757.25		13,678,299.36		6,054,927.55
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
Dividends declared, common	55	$232,000.00	90+	$462,000.00	100	$480,000.00	150	$720,000.00	200	$960,000.00
Dividends declared, preferred					5	18,687.50	5	50,000.00	5	48,156.25

[1] Loss.

American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Dec. 31, 1941		Dec. 31, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$3,104,625.99		$3,919,008.87		$11,497,480.57		$16,773,471.50		$13,573,533.31
Vessels	$21,604,816.73		$21,780,507.50		$15,047,710.98		$14,598,801.70		$9,017,144.27	
Less reserves	16,184,882.15		17,020,133.94		12,941,915.97		13,221,783.88		8,435,673.06	
		5,419,934.58		4,760,373.56		2,105,795.01		1,377,017.82		581,471.21
Securities of and receivables from subsidiaries		195,000.00		195,000.00		1,045,000.00		1,550,380.00		1,550,380.00
Other assets		3,775,121.68		4,067,292.27		1,637,178.07		2,491,561.55		8,915,617.72
Total assets		12,494,682.25		12,941,674.70		16,285,453.65		22,192,430.87		24,621,002.24
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	581,240.32		681,655.08		3,303,044.30		8,003,468.49		5,801,422.42	
Voyages in progress	429,573.56		406,610.34		862,993.20		1,058,167.95			
Other liabilities and reserves	3,253,514.54		3,319,025.78		1,150,000.00		1,850,000.00			
Total liabilities and reserves		4,264,328.42		4,407,291.20		5,316,037.50		10,911,636.44		5,801,422.42
CAPITAL										
Capital stock	4,370,000.00		4,370,000.00		4,358,000.00		4,338,000.00		4,257,000.00	
Capital surplus	716,592.98		605,423.36		268,237.72					
Earned surplus	3,143,760.85		3,558,960.14		6,343,178.43		6,942,794.43		[1]14,562,579.82	
Total capital		8,230,353.83		8,534,383.50		10,969,416.15		11,280,794.43		18,819,579.82

[1] Includes reserves for vessel replacements, insurance, and contingencies.

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit on shipping operations		$3,687,838.87		$3,851,941.51		$4,989,212.57		$12,603,724.15		$7,670,503.12
Other income		123,196.29		267,306.29		1,989,328.51		[1]500,188.68		753,047.31
Total		3,811,035.16		4,119,247.80		6,978,541.08		12,103,535.47		8,423,550.43
Officers' and directors' salaries	$181,371.24		$181,380.00		$300,549.84		$392,575.04		$240,300.21	
Depreciation of vessels	896,973.02		835,251.79		660,981.60		533,563.54		388,459.46	
Other costs and expenses	1,986,724.91		2,160,623.74		2,524,560.51		2,520,866.06		1,759,174.91	
Total		3,065,069.17		3,177,255.53		3,486,091.95		3,447,004.64		2,387,934.58
Net profit before taxes		745,965.99		941,992.27		3,492,449.13		8,656,530.83		6,035,615.85
Provision for Federal income taxes		155,000.00		169,000.00		2,570,000.00		5,900,000.00		4,316,300.00
Net profit after taxes		590,965.99		772,992.27		922,429.13		2,756,530.83		1,719,315.85
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
Dividends declared	10	$437,625.00	15	$655,500.00	35	$1,526,350.00	50	$2,177,000.00	30	$1,281,375.00

[1] Loss.

American President Lines, Ltd.

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Dec. 31, 1941		Dec. 31, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$3,822,948.31		$3,945,069.26		$5,415,308.39		$14,549,440.55		$8,833,380.87
Vessels	$24,784,238.65		$24,784,238.65		$26,356,382.59		$24,816,036.47		$9,886,365.71	
Less reserves	6,370,714.54		7,697,858.23		7,816,219.99		6,434,010.73		3,031,765.89	
		18,413,524.11		17,086,380.42		18,540,162.60		18,382,025.74		6,854,599.82
Securities of and receivables from subsidiaries		2,658,800.96		2,630,954.66		2,602,994.69		880,714.57		
Voyages in progress		293,673.23								
Vessels under construction						1,036,000.00				
Other assets		1,539,117.68		1,381,583.05		1,987,515.50		4,703,516.20		17,844,328.43
Total assets		26,728,064.29		25,043,987.39		29,581,981.18		38,515,697.06		33,532,309.12
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	3,875,100.91		3,508,077.97		4,610,402.36		6,192,395.12		6,205,653.26	
Voyages in progress			608,319.51		784,399.30		744,264.29			
Recapture of profits, U. S. Maritime Commission					1,321,696.45		5,975,237.03		7,525,871.54	
Long-term debt	13,430,790.00		11,566,703.10		11,107,788.65		10,681,606.45		5,552,992.34	
Other liabilities and reserves	7,630,050.83		8,066,901.61		6,930,017.47		6,413,903.83		5,077,871.62	
Total liabilities and reserves		24,935,941.74		23,750,002.19		24,754,304.23		30,007,406.72		24,362,388.76
CAPITAL										
Capital stock [1]	6,784,300.00		6,784,300.00		6,784,300.00		6,784,300.00		6,784,300.00	
Earned surplus	[2]4,992,177.45		[2]5,490,314.80		[2]1,956,623.05		1,723,990.34		2,385,620.36	
Total capital		1,792,122.55		1,293,985.20		4,827,676.95		8,508,290.34		9,169,920.36

[1] Chiefly owned by U. S. Maritime Commission.
[2] Deficit.

American President Lines, Ltd.—Continued

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit on shipping operations		[1] $729,962.53		$880,928.36		$4,761,725.26		$8,807,922.98		$5,053,658.70
Operating differential subsidy		832,644.82		2,542,047.45		3,203,200.57		2,733,643.77		30,135.04
Total		102,682.29		3,422,975.81		7,964,925.83		11,541,566.75		5,083,793.74
Officers' salaries	$41,847.53		$138,726.55		$138,459.02		$151,065.58		$161,929.23	
Depreciation of vessels	889,571.84		1,039,616.02		916,982.11		1,336,294.65		876,146.40	
Other costs and expenses	2,018,112.90		2,165,803.88		1,855,036.62		1,836,544.75		1,724,889.89	
Total		2,949,532.27		3,344,146.45		2,920,477.75		3,323,904.98		2,762,965.52
Net profit before taxes		[1] 2,846,849.98		78,829.36		5,044,448.08		8,217,661.77		2,320,828.22
Provision for Federal income taxes		0		0		0		0		12,350.32
Net profit after taxes		[1] 2,846,849.98		78,829.36		5,044,448.08		8,217,661.77		2,308,477.90
Set aside for recapture by U. S. Maritime Commission						1,321,696.45		4,653,540.58		2,872,330.96

[1] Loss.

Calmar Steamship Corporation

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Dec. 31, 1941		Dec. 31, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$2,553,349.00		$3,710,349.00		$5,162,445.00		$7,084,557.00		$4,967,585.00
Vessels	$2,312,815.00		$2,312,815.00		$2,312,815.00		$2,312,815.00		$1,420,579.00	
Less reserves	995,889.00		1,265,225.00		1,425,226.00		1,260,067.00		806,284.00	
		1,316,926.00		1,047,590.00		887,589.00		1,052,748.00		614,295.00
Voyages in progress								98,047.00		129,414.00
Securities of subsidiaries								10,000.00		10,000.00
Other assets								484,603.00		4,352,114.00
Total assets		3,870,275.00		4,757,939.00		6,050,034.00		8,729,955.00		10,073,408.00
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	224,034.00		391,187.00		873,725.00		3,367,355.00		2,365,161.00	
Voyages in progress	168,701.00		510,123.00		486,859.00					
Sundry operating reserves							280,710.00		[2] 4,037,944.00	
Total liabilities and reserves		392,735.00		901,310.00		1,360,584.00		3,648,065.00		6,403,105.00
CAPITAL										
Capital stock [1]	3,000,000.00		3,000,000.00		3,000,000.00		3,000,000.00		3,000,000.00	
Earned surplus	477,540.00		856,629.00		1,689,450.00		2,081,890.00		670,303.00	
Total capital		3,477,540.00		3,856,629.00		4,689,450.00		5,081,890.00		3,670,303.00

[1] Owned by Bethlehem Steel Corporation.
[2] Includes 3,734,091 deferred credits.

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit on shipping operations		$725,151.00		$1,382,146.00		$2,829,887.00		$5,166,880.00		$2,619,391.00
Other income				16,424.00		600.00		2,564.00		5,786.00
Total		725,151.00		1,398,570.00		2,830,487.00		5,169,444.00		2,625,177.00
Officers' and directors' salaries and other remuneration	$10,475.00		$18,440.00		$32,350.00		$99,967.00		$75,189.00	
Depreciation of vessels	78,276.00		117,467.00		121,129.00		109,940.00		102,094.00	
Other costs and expenses	213,959.00		212,785.60		355,070.00		590,714.00		394,421.00	
Total		302,710.00		348,692.00		508,549.00		800,621.00		571,704.00
Net profit before taxes		422,441.00		1,049,878.00		2,321,938.00		4,368,823.00		2,053,473.00
Provision for Federal income taxes		84,124.00		220,789.00		589,117.00		2,626,383.00		1,665,060.00
Net profit after taxes		338,317.00		829,089.00		1,732,821.00		1,742,440.00		388,413.00
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
Dividends declared			15	$450,000.00	30	$900,000.00	45	$1,350,000.00	60	$1,800,000.00

Isthmian Steamship Co.

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Dec. 31, 1941		Dec. 1, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$10,206,647.38		$13,106,546.75		1,222,710.78		$24,573,183.99		$29,170,290.74
Vessels	$23,280,444.30		$23,280,444.30		$23,306,905.80		$22,493,878.41		$13,923,990.59	
Less reserves	14,911,485.39		15,732,015.17		16,553,007.97		16,802,488.51		10,901,827.51	
		8,368,958.91		7,548,429.13		6,753,897.83		5,691,389.90		3,022,163.08
Vessels under construction								2,242,099.51		
Other assets		118,659.55		136,180.47		179,866.75		1,959,355.39		8,954,966.48
Total assets		18,784,265.84		20,791,156.35		25,156,475.36		34,466,028.79		41,147,420.30
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	460,086.74		680,015.55		2,169,083.24		7,035,675.60		7,228,543.11	
Voyages in progress	363,740.95		1,519,134.74		3,018,131.58		5,432,573.06		2,299,014.61	
Sundry operating reserves	1,521,748.84		1,573,511.59		1,671,359.59		2,446,066.96		[4] 12,605,508.34	
Total liabilities		2,345,576.53		3,772,661.88		6,858,574.41		14,914,315.62		22,133,066.06
CAPITAL										
Capital stock [1]	10,000,000.00		10,000,000.00		10,000,000.00		10,000,000.00		10,000,000.00	
Capital surplus [2]	7,715,940.02		7,715,940.02		7,715,940.02		7,715,940.02		7,715,940.02	
Earned surplus	[3] 1,277,250.71		[3] 697,445.55		581,960.93		1,835,773.15		1,298,414.22	
Total capital		16,438,689.31		17,018,494.47		18,297,900.95		19,551,713.17		19,014,354.24

[1] Owned by United States Steel Corporation.
[2] Premiums on capital stock issued.
[3] Deficit.
[4] Includes $4,852,103.39 miscellaneous other liabilities.

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit on shipping operations		$2,664,514.88		$2,666,559.91		$5,866,667.93		$9,632,436.38		$9,277,255.44
Other income		457,293.47		486,827.00		521,256.33		515,967.52		539,474.85
Total		3,121,808.35		3,153,386.91		6,387,924.26		10,148,403.90		9,816,730.29
Officers' salaries	$51,920.00		$66,400.00		$89,650.03		$110,691.67		$123,500.00	
Amortization and depreciation of vessels	1,237,645.77		1,225,047.86		1,229,252.10		1,248,748.70		1,012,053.81	
Other costs and expenses	617,478.84		677,010.89		780,422.66		1,426,551.64		1,794,017.57	
Total		1,907,044.61		1,968,458.75		2,099,324.79		2,785,992.01		2,929,571.38
Net profit before taxes		1,214,763.74		1,184,928.16		4,288,599.47		7,362,411.89		6,887,158.91
Provision for Federal income taxes		135,647.95		105,123.00		935,096.88		2,194,524.86		4,272,801.15
Net profit after taxes		1,079,115.79		1,079,805.16		3,353,502.59		5,167,887.03		2,614,357.76
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
Dividends declared	10	$1,000,000.00	5	$500,000.00	20	$2,000,000.00	40	$4,000,000.00	40	$4,000,000.00

Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Dec. 31, 1941		Dec. 31, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$2,019,758.41		$2,584,259.92		$3,816,675.27		$9,133,807.27		$11,739,392.11
Vessels	$14,047,990.53		$13,278,995.12		$14,603,362.97		$15,650,088.61		$13,701,510.55	
Less reserves	12,914,829.38		12,337,981.05		13,253,077.59		13,561,674.22		12,336,316.42	
		1,133,161.15		941,014.07		1,350,285.38		2,088,414.39		1,365,194.13
Edgar F. & Lewis Luckenbach		7,690,644.31		7,755,753.12		8,305,163.40		8,327,694.13		8,346,548.49
Securities of and receivables from subsidiaries		3,080,848.43		2,852,121.24		109,950.49		118,767.40		101,628.55
Other assets		398,436.37		399,673.68		505,523.62		1,019,522.70		548,427.51
Total assets		14,322,848.67		14,532,822.03		14,087,598.16		20,688,205.89		22,101,190.79
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	1,911,634.42		1,528,525.51		1,393,013.46		4,461,290.77		1,711,124.36	
Voyages in progress	509,739.19		504,270.40		754,532.12		2,009,343.51		2,919,025.29	
Owing to subsidiaries	1,543,594.92		1,577,785.15		1,459,967.03		588,941.22		652,652.16	
Other liabilities and reserves	638,061.24		834,190.33		585,162.07		576,781.59		3,916,201.75	
Total liabilities		4,603,029.77		4,444,771.39		4,192,674.68		7,636,357.09		9,199,003.56
CAPITAL										
Capital stock [1]	5,228,250.00		5,228,250.00		5,228,250.00		5,228,250.00		5,228,250.00	
Earned surplus	4,491,568.90		4,859,800.64		4,666,673.48		7,823,598.80		7,673,937.23	
Total capital		9,719,818.90		10,088,050.64		9,894,923.48		13,051,848.80		12,902,187.23

[1] Owned by Edgar F. Luckenbach.

Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.—Continued

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit on shipping operations		$2,166,802.84		$2,131,791.48		$3,409,779.05		$8,070,385.09		$3,089,612.79
Other income		[1] 62,556.09		[1] 33,342.11		4,397.02		19,869.40		[1] 104,455.93
Total		2,104,246.75		2,098,449.37		3,414,176.07		8,090,254.49		2,985,156.86
Officers' salaries	$84,851.20		$85,836.68		[2]		[2]		[2]	
Depreciation of vessels	202,771.48		192,146.08		$217,291.05		$308,596.63		$301,228.05	
Other costs and expenses	1,448,580.10		1,504,316.22		1,590,177.66		1,448,135.88		816,410.36	
Total		1,736,202.78		1,782,298.98		1,807,468.71		1,756,732.51		1,117,638.41
Net profit before taxes		368,043.97		316,150.39		1,606,707.36		6,333,521.98		1,867,518.45
Provision for Federal income taxes						760,000.00		2,373,770.93		
Net profit after taxes		368,043.97		316,150.39		846,707.36		3,959,751.05		1,867,518.45

[1] Loss.
[2] Officers' salaries not stated.

Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Dec. 31, 1941		Dec. 31, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$2,628,752.94		$4,961,355.20		$5,585,426.26		$8,020,532.64		$14,418,473.42
Vessels	$3,133,731.87		$2,946,181.55		$12,445,222.64		$14,566,302.84		$10,688,659.65	
Less reserves	901,707.55		986,648.32		886,499.54		1,237,402.97		1,259,234.02	
		2,232,024.32		1,959,533.24		11,558,723.10		13,328,899.87		9,429,425.63
Vessels under construction		38,310.11		43,959.26		137,716.44		1,597,154.02		5,248,273.90
Securities of subsidiaries		173,670.02		173,670.02		117,177.86		117,177.86		217,827.86
Other assets		1,215,770.43		1,902,754.81		8,771,933.39		14,457,139.44		19,778,033.11
Total assets		6,288,527.82		9,041,272.53		26,170,977.05		37,520,903.83		49,092,033.92
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	919,723.01		867,329.22		1,657,131.88		2,979,840.83		2,184,892.42	
Voyages in progress	300,557.01		1,906,396.65		3,126,508.52		3,835,939.69		1,555,342.16	
Recapture of profits, U. S. Maritime Commission	21,326.86		338,539.92		2,389,508.64		5,613,696.97		5,634,030.29	
Other liabilities and reserves	27,071.77		103,610.56		2,053,594.03		1,147,156.82		73,330.39	
Total liabilities and reserves		1,268,678.65		3,215,876.35		9,226,743.07		13,576,631.31		9,447,595.26
CAPITAL										
Capital stock	3,500,000.00		3,500,000.00		3,500,000.00		3,500,000.00		3,500,000.00	
Earned surplus	1,519,849.17		2,325,396.18		13,444,233.98		20,444,272.52		36,144,438.66	
Total capital		5,019,849.17		5,825,396.18		16,944,233.98		23,944,272.52		39,644,438.66

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit from shipping operations		$221,040.92		$1,078,082.04		$7,331,192.66		$13,257,206.43		$11,670,603.27
Operating differential subsidy		1,687,527.60		1,340,851.62		1,193,741.53		1,451,684.91		23,392.80
Other income		59,562.47		49,817.82						24,342.62
Total		1,968,130.99		2,468,751.48		8,524,934.19		14,708,891.34		11,718,338.69
Officers' and directors' salaries	$96,700.00		$96,450.16		$108,366.38		$98,687.50		$96,900.08	
Depreciation of vessels	237,131.38		126,913.71		195,743.94		549,753.06		602,787.93	
Other costs and expenses	1,148,628.58		1,000,106.18		1,203,641.84		1,735,493.41		1,618,232.78	
Total		1,482,459.96		1,223,470.05		1,507,752.16		2,383,933.97		2,317,920.84
Net profit before taxes		485,671.03		1,245,281.43		7,017,182.03		12,324,957.37		9,400,417.85
Provision for Federal income taxes						207,315.60		300,170.78		482,778.28
Net profit after taxes		485,671.03		1,245,281.43		6,809,866.43		12,024,786.59		8,917,639.57
Profits recapturable by U. S. Maritime Commission		21,326.86		317,213.06		2,050,968.72		3,224,185.33		20,336.32
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
Dividends declared			5	$175,000.00	23.7	$830,000.00	47.1	$1,680,000.00	25	$875,000.00

Matson Navigation Co.

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$14, 753, 326. 36		$16, 275, 294. 87		$20, 216, 996. 89		$22, 978, 960. 82		$34, 098, 502. 17
Vessels	$32, 923, 701. 71		$33, 032, 718. 29		$31, 289, 555. 37		$31, 825, 325. 92		$29, 505, 160. 24	
Less reserves	20, 438, 764. 16		20, 410, 692. 01		19, 797, 974. 08		17, 054, 199. 07		16, 744, 636. 47	
		12, 484, 937. 55		12, 622, 026. 28		11, 491, 581. 29		14, 771, 126. 85		12, 820, 523. 77
Voyages in progress		60, 589. 96		292, 775. 22		305, 266. 77				
Securities of and receivables from subsidiaries		7, 273, 082. 65		6, 972, 582. 65		6, 750, 677. 65		5, 079, 258. 89		5, 079, 258. 89
Construction reserve fund								6, 338, 784. 46		6, 343, 176. 36
Vessels under construction						2, 983, 964. 40				
Other assets		8, 144, 977. 98		8, 564, 468. 82		8, 359, 493. 26		10, 495, 829. 73		11, 338, 043. 45
Total assets		42, 716, 914. 50		44, 727, 147. 84		50, 107, 980. 26		59, 663, 960. 75		69, 679, 504. 64
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	2, 023, 897. 38		1, 923, 306. 52		3, 647, 600. 08		7, 389, 861. 38		12, 584, 299. 93	
Voyages in progress							615, 807. 81		638, 957. 54	
Other liabilities and reserves	2, 824, 958. 81		3, 155, 293. 49		3, 161, 513. 72		5, 870, 527. 82		6, 888, 020. 66	
Total liabilities		4, 848, 856. 19		5, 078, 600. 01		6, 809, 113. 80		13, 876, 197. 01		20, 111, 378. 13
CAPITAL										
Capital stock	33, 204, 053. 34		33, 204, 053. 34		33, 204, 040. 00		33, 204, 040. 00		33, 204, 040. 00	
Capital surplus	945, 295. 42		957, 920. 42		970, 288. 76		970, 288. 76		970, 288. 76	
Earned surplus	3, 718, 709. 55		5, 486, 574. 07		9, 124, 537. 70		11, 613, 434. 98		15, 393, 797. 75	
Total capital		37, 868, 058. 31		39, 648, 547. 83		43, 298, 866. 46		45, 787, 763. 74		49, 568, 126. 51

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit on shipping operations		$5, 836, 782. 24		$6, 055, 037. 86		$8, 352, 698. 35		$11, 040, 079. 39		$10, 083, 585. 98
Other income		330, 533. 01		360, 690. 39		2, 543, 159. 22		1, 868, 671. 37		5, 378, 951. 29
Total		6, 167, 315. 25		6, 415, 728. 25		10, 895, 857. 57		12, 908, 750. 76		15, 462, 537. 27
Officers' and directors' salaries	$130, 291. 00		$131, 005. 87		$125, 593. 59		$145, 541. 35		$120, 992. 00	
Depreciation of vessels	2, 105, 899. 20		1, 636, 806. 11		1, 463, 537. 13		1, 650, 278. 66		1, 585, 024. 55	
Other costs and expenses	1, 210, 050. 25		1, 713, 209. 58		2, 132, 964. 10		2, 174, 013. 01		1, 810, 370. 33	
Total		3, 447, 240. 45		3, 481, 021. 56		3, 722, 094. 82		3, 969, 833. 02		3, 516, 386. 88
Net profit before taxes		2, 720, 074. 80		2, 934, 706. 69		7, 173, 762. 75		8, 938, 917. 74		11, 946, 150. 39
Provision for Federal income taxes		574, 054. 26		619, 056. 57		1, 800, 919. 32		4, 185, 629. 88		6, 062, 590. 54
Net profit after taxes		2, 146, 020. 54		2, 315, 650. 12		5, 372, 843. 43		4, 753, 287. 86		5, 883, 559. 85
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
Dividends declared	5	$1, 659, 950. 25	6½	$2, 157, 389. 05	6	$1, 986, 423. 90	7½	$2, 476, 920. 60	7½	$2, 469, 848. 10

Shepard Steamship Co.

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Nov. 30, 1941		Nov. 30, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$81, 255. 75		$117, 964. 78		$1, 379, 825. 31		$1, 834, 247. 45		$1, 392, 274. 09
Vessels	$1, 112, 415. 13		$1, 120, 193. 75		$431, 870. 01		$219, 780. 96			
Less reserves	437, 216. 30		503, 588. 34		176, 990. 48		60, 971. 18			
		675, 198. 83		616, 605. 41		254, 879. 53		158, 809. 78		
Securities of subsidiaries								40, 000. 00		90, 000. 00
Other assets		42, 218. 81		36, 145. 58		82, 550. 03		74, 001. 17		757, 720. 00
Total assets		798, 673. 39		770, 715. 77		1, 717, 254. 87		2, 107, 058. 40		2, 239, 994. 09
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	57, 364. 26		26, 947. 99		38, 367. 55		104, 608. 23		$18, 010. 58	
Voyages in progress	25, 173. 97		121, 808. 59		107, 822. 18		71, 246. 47			
Owing to subsidiaries	849, 223. 30		726, 635. 46		550, 000. 00		550, 000. 00		615, 000. 00	
Total liabilities		931, 761. 53		875, 392. 04		696, 189. 73		725, 854. 70		633, 010. 58
CAPITAL										
Capital stock [1]	200, 000. 00		200, 000. 00		200, 000. 00		200, 000. 00		200, 000. 00	
Appreciation surplus	90, 851. 45		82, 123. 47							
Earned surplus	[2] 423, 939. 59		[2] 386, 799. 74		821, 065. 14		1, 181, 203. 70		1, 406, 983. 51	
Total capital		[2] 133, 088. 14		[2] 104, 676. 27		1, 021, 065. 14		1, 381, 203. 70		1, 606, 983. 51

[1] Owned by Shepard Morse Lumber Co.
[2] Deficit.

Shepard Steamship Co.—Continued

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Nov. 30, 1941		Year ended Nov. 30, 1942	
Gross profit on shipping operations		$209,185.31		$281,877.17		$440,376.38		$823,794.45		$238,556.57
Other income		[1] 14,502.41		[1] 25,739.33		919,187.94		17,753.30		[1] 10,133.88
Total		194,682.90		256,137.84		1,359,564.32		841,547.75		22[illegible],422.69
Officers' salaries	[2]		$20,000.00		$26,000.00		$38,191.63		$42,676.07	
Depreciation of vessels	$56,809.32		57,644.06		32,604.42		19,205.40		7,696.68	
Other costs and expenses	108,983.50		135,864.81		123,565.35		94,622.79		42,800.33	
Total		165,792.82		213,508.87		182,169.77		152,019.82		93,173.08
Net profit before taxes		28,890.08		42,628.97		1,177,394.55		689,527.93		135,249.61
Provision for Federal income taxes		0		8,082.07		492,886.24		0		
Net profit after taxes		28,890.08		34,546.90		684,508.31		689,527.93		135,249.61
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
Dividend declared							56	$112,919.75	22	$44,008.81

[1] Loss.
[2] Not shown.

Waterman Steamship Corporation

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Dec. 31, 1941		Dec. 31, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$1,001,747.19		$1,195,189.53		$2,188,966.80		$7,645,842.26		$10,585,648.66
Vessels	$3,393,447.37		$3,986,795.14		$5,121,961.90		$4,707,837.72		$12,054,738.91	
Less reserves	1,588,685.66		1,939,728.87		2,503,702.19		2,931,641.57		2,121,962.88	
		1,804,761.71		2,047,066.27		2,618,259.71		1,776,196.15		9,932,776.03
Vessels under construction								3,112,797.27		
Securities of and receivables from subsidiaries		409,114.16		290,111.66		2,241,993.24		5,204,368.08		6,547,040.61
Other assets		170,829.97		290,163.98		2,088,862.25		687,306.85		2,918,037.92
Total assets		3,386,453.03		3,822,531.44		9,138,082.00		18,426,510.61		29,983,503.22
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	500,016.77		289,476.10		2,993,360.99		3,918,911.62		7,579,073.00	
Voyages in progress	375,293.77		990,513.73		798,235.98		5,002,690.04			
Other liabilities and reserves	419,101.42		592,361.71		762,933.93		543,177.83		6,963,285.52	
Total liabilities		1,294,411.96		1,872,351.54		4,554,530.90		9,464,779.49		14,542,358.52
CAPITAL										
Capital stock	1,102,800.00		1,112,700.00		1,516,600.00		1,516,600.00		1,516,600.00	
Capital surplus	37,620.00		37,620.00		53,086.50		53,086.50		53,086.50	
Earned surplus	951,621.07		799,859.90		3,013,864.60		7,392,044.62		13,871,458.20	
Total capital		2,092,041.07		1,950,179.90		4,583,551.10		8,961,731.12		15,441,144.70

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit from shipping operations		$797,325.40		$542,787.62		$4,782,520.29		$9,210,834.34		$9,210,187.41
Other income				46,000.45						
Total		797,325.40		588,788.07		4,782,520.29		9,210,834.34		9,210,187.41
Officers' and directors' salaries and other remuneration	$103,700.64		$135,658.50		$176,220.41		$430,184.94		$349,892.05	
Depreciation of vessels	362,661.25		300,037.55		515,138.89		588,030.30		919,900.23	
Other costs and expenses	323,160.18		210,561.76		488,191.01		708,908.40		1,019,460.53	
Total		789,522.07		646,247.81		1,179,550.31		1,727,123.64		2,289,252.81
Net profit before taxes		7,803.33		[1] 57,459.74		3,602,969.98		7,483,710.70		6,920,934.60
Provision for Federal income taxes				1,572.93		942,021.24		4,212,978.76		6,159,029.42
Net profit after taxes		7,803.33		[1] 59,032.67		2,660,948.74		3,270,731.94		761,905.18
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
Dividends declared, preferred	7	$28,024.50	7	$43,263.50	8¾	$60,710.13	7	$69,786.50	7	$69,786.49
Dividends declared, common	25	129,585.00	10	49,465.00	59	309,790.00	120	623,580.00	[2] 16.8	873,012.00

[1] Loss.
[2] On May 21, 1941, 10 shares of stock were issued for 1 share of old issue.

Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co.

CONDENSED BALANCE SHEETS

	Dec. 31, 1938		Dec. 31, 1939		Dec. 31, 1940		Dec. 31, 1941		Dec. 31, 1942	
ASSETS										
Current assets		$282,288.48		$509,219.20		$580,812.24		$1,364,141.99		$2,061,268.36
Vessels	$1,739,540.03		$1,750,799.54		$2,560,795.81		$2,606,626.01		$1,866,616.21	
Less reserves	882,055.94		975,706.51		1,063,062.96		1,201,677.75		1,039,817.66	
		857,484.09		775,093.03		1,497,732.85		1,404,948.26		826,798.55
Voyages in progress		220,119.63		25,262.12		110,318.23				
Other assets		112,758.49		175,020.37		123,881.69		664,540.67		1,280,373.26
Total assets		1,472,050.69		1,484,595.72		2,312,745.01		3,433,630.92		4,168,440.17
LIABILITIES										
Current liabilities	238,056.51		242,154.76		621,161.97		758,363.38		1,787,439.01	
Voyages in progress							1,085,353.24		575,484.55	
Total liabilities		238,056.51		242,154.76		621,161.97		1,843,716.62		2,362,923.56
CAPITAL										
Capital stock [1]	800,000.00		800,000.00		800,000.00		800,000.00		800,000.00	
Capital surplus	478,635.74		478,635.74		478,635.74		478,635.74		478,635.74	
Earned surplus	[2] 44,041.56		[2] 36,195.78		412,947.30		311,278.56		526,880.87	
Total capital		1,234,594.18		1,242,439.96		1,691,583.04		1,589,914.30		1,805,516.61

[1] Owned by Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.
[2] Deficit.

CONDENSED INCOME STATEMENTS

	Year ended Dec. 31, 1938		Year ended Dec. 31, 1939		Year ended Dec. 31, 1940		Year ended Dec. 31, 1941		Year ended Dec. 31, 1942	
Gross profit on shipping operations		$202,174.47		$377,997.13		$756,269.30		$1,170,398.88		$2,097,445.79
Other income		3,302.25		1,746.07		2,172.94				3,977.22
Total		205,476.72		379,743.20		758,442.24		1,170,398.88		2,101,423.01
Officers' and directors' salaries	$12,787.50		$13,450.00		$15,725.00		$18,495.84		$19,058.16	
Depreciation of vessels	98,732.17		91,565.61		104,810.28		164,348.77		138,459.28	
Other costs and expenses	68,114.74		66,297.79		79,837.24		106,709.35		79,250.44	
Total		179,634.41		171,313.40		200,372.52		289,553.96		236,767.88
Net profit before taxes		25,842.31		208,429.80		558,069.72		880,844.92		1,864,655.13
Provision for Federal income taxes		5,007.12		34,535.02		133,936.73		527,554.60		1,352,136.19
Net profit after taxes		20,835.19		173,894.78		424,132.99		353,290.32		512,518.94
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
Dividends declared			20	$165,000.00			44	$350,000.00	37.5	$300,000.00

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, starting off with the very first one, American Export Lines, it will be found that this company between 1938 and 1943 increased its assets from $9,000,000 to over $43,000,000, that it increased its capital from $4,000,000 to $31,000,000, and that while it paid no dividends on preferred stock in 1938 and 1939, it has paid 5 percent for the years 1940, 1941, and 1942.

Here is the most amazing thing of all. This company paid 55 percent dividends on its common stock in 1938, 96 percent in 1939, 100 percent in 1940, 150 percent in 1941, and 200 percent for the year ending December 31, 1942.

If ability to increase its assets 450 percent during these years, and to pay 200 percent dividends on common stock, indicates need of greater profits, then I wonder what these people would be satisfied with.

The American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., for instance, declared a 10-percent dividend in 1938, which was increased to 50 percent in 1941, the year of the Red Sea charter profits, and the company paid 30 percent in 1942.

The American President Lines, of course, is owned practically by the Maritime Commission.

The Calmar Steamship Corporation paid no dividends in 1938, paid 15 percent in 1939, and increased the rate to 60 percent in 1942.

The Isthmian Steamship Co. paid 10 percent in 1938, and increased its dividends to 30 percent in both 1941 and 1942.

And so on, until we get to the Waterman Steamship Corporation, of which we have information, and which paid 25 percent in 1938, and got up to 120 percent in 1941. Then on May 21, 1941, 10 shares of stock were issued for 1 share of the old issue, and it still paid 16.8 percent.

As I have said, only two of these companies, the Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co., and the American President Lines, which latter is controlled by the Maritime Commission itself, have submitted to renegotiation.

I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a memorandum dated April 28 from Oscar S. Cox, whom I presume to be counsel for the Lend-Lease Administration, to Mr. E. R. Stettinius, Jr.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF LEND-LEASE ADMINISTRATION,
April 28, 1943.

To: Mr. E. R. Stettinius, Jr.
From: Oscar S. Cox.
Subject: Renegotiation of Red Sea voyage charters.

Beginning in May of 1941, American vessels were used to carry cargo to the Red Sea area for the British Ministry of War Transport. The ships were secured for these voyages by the United States Maritime Commission. Rates and terms were set by negotiation between the owners and the Commission. The charter hire was paid directly to the owners out of defense-aid funds allocated to the Maritime Commission for that purpose.

The rates on these Red Sea voyages were on a space-charter basis until December 1, 1941, when they were placed on a time-charter basis at the standard rates which had been set by the Maritime Commission on July 30, 1941. While operating under the space charters, the owners are alleged to have received excessive profits. It is my opinion that these charter contracts can now and should be renegotiated under the provisions of the act of April 28, 1942, as amended by the act of October 21, 1942.

Section 403 (c) (1) of the act of April 28, 1942, provides:

"Whenever, in the opinion of the secretary of a department, the profits realized or likely to be realized from any contract with such department, or from any subcontract thereunder, whether or not made by the contractor,

may be excessive, the secretary is authorized and directed to require the contractor or subcontractor to renegotiate the contract price."

The charters for the Red Sea voyages, although in form between the British Ministry of War Transport and the shipowners, were in every substantial respect between the Maritime Commission and the owners. The British had made a request to the American Government that shipping be made available to them as a service under the Lend-Lease Act. At the request of the Division of Defense Aid Reports, the Maritime Commission undertook to provide this service. The Commission secured the ships; it negotiated the charter terms and the rates; it made subsequent reductions in these rates; all bills were sent by the shippers to the Commission and were paid directly to the shippers out of lend-lease funds which had been allocated to the Commission; all moneys payable by the owners were received directly by the Commission. The British Ministry had the use of the ships, but they cannot be said in reality to have chartered the ships. Their name appeared on the charter only in order to give them the necessary power to designate cargo, destination, etc. The Maritime Commission was in reality the charterer, since it concluded the bargains with the owners and was responsible for making all payments to them.

It was the clear intent of Congress, through the renegotiation statute, to protect all war contracts made by the Federal Government. The words "any contract with such Department, or * * * any subcontract thereunder whether or not made by the contractor" are clearly intended to include all contracts of such a character that excessive profits made thereunder would result in unnecessary expenditure by the Federal Government. The Red Sea charters are clearly contracts of this character.

Renegotiation of the Red Sea charter contracts is not precluded because the charters were entered into before the passage of the renegotiation statute or because the majority of the voyages had been completed before that date. The renegotiation provisions are "applicable to all contracts and subcontracts hereafter made and to all contracts and subcontracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts or subcontracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause" (sec. 403 (c) (6)).

The sole limitation on this retroactive character of the act is not applicable to the Red Sea charters. This provision states that the act is not applicable if "final payment pursuant to such contract or subcontract was made prior to April 28, 1942" (sec. 403 (c) (6) (i)). Although the hire for the Red Sea voyages was paid in probably every case before April 28, 1942, there were other payments for demurrage, and so forth, due the owners on that date in probably all cases. Even at the present time payments have been made in full for only 15 of the 90 voyages. It is probable that even in these 15 cases some payments were still outstanding on April 28, 1942. The payment of the charter hire, which was usually made soon after the ship sailed, cannot be said to be the "final payment." The total amount due the owner could not be calculated finally until all the various contingencies of the voyage which could raise or lower the charter hire had been determined and until all the various charges arising out of the voyage, such as demurrage, had been calculated. Only then could a true "final payment" be made.

A further limitation on the power to renegotiate is the provision that "no renegotiation of the contract price shall be commenced by the Secretary more than 1 year after the close of the fiscal year of the contractor or subcontractor within which completion or termination of the contract or subcontract, as determined by the Secretary, occurs." This section is not applicable, under any possible interpretation, to the approximately 50 percent of the voyages which terminated in 1942.

Since the fiscal year of most shipping companies is the calendar year, it may be argued by the owners that no renegotiation can be started now for those voyages which terminated in 1941. In my opinion, the termination for a charter contract is not coincident with the termination of the voyage which is provided for in the charter unless a final financial settlement is reached at the same time. As I have pointed out, even now only 15 percent of the charters have been paid in full. It is very unlikely that any of them was paid in full during 1941.

In the case of the Red Sea voyages, considerable time elapsed after the voyage was terminated before a full accounting could be made. Payment was withheld in order that complete financial statements for each voyage might be prepared by the owners and examined by the Commission. It was necessary to wait until such examinations took place before it could be determined whether payment should be made in full or some form of renegotiation of the contracts should be started. The contracts cannot be said to be completed or terminated until such a financial examination has been made and payment made in full.

Under the provision in question the time of completion or termination of contract is to be determined by the Chairman of the Commission. This provision gives him the clear power to determine that contracts are not completed until ful payment is made.

In any event, the section in question applies only to renegotiation of the contract price; it does not concern withholding of payments which would result in excessive profits or the recapture of such profits. The renegotiation statute throughout indicates that renegotiation may take the form of a revision of the contract price or of withholding or recovering excessive profits. See sections 403 (b) (1) and (2), 403 (c) (2), and 403 (d). Even if it be held, therefore, that the provision in question precludes a retroactive lowering of the charter rates, it does not preclude the withholding or recapture of profits which were excessive.

Section 403 (c) (5) provides that a contractor may file "statements of actual cost of production and such other financial statements for any prior fiscal year or years of such contractor or subcontractor, in such form and detail, as the Secretaries [the Chairman] shall prescribe by joint regulation." If notice of renegotiation is not given within 1 year of such filing, the contractor may not "thereafter be required to renegotiate to eliminate excessive profits realized from any such contract or subcontract during such fiscal year or years." It does not appear that any such statements were filed more than 1 year ago. The financial statements for the individual voyages to the Red Sea which were requested by the Maritime Commission were filed during the summer of 1942. It is unlikely that any were filed as early as April 1.

Each of the shippers did file before April 15, 1942, the operating statement for 1941 required by the Commission under section 21 of the Shipping Act of 1916. Such statements have been filed for many years. They do not give sufficient detail for the Commission to determine whether or not profits on individual voyages were excessive. They cannot, therefore, be considered as statements for the purposes of section 403 (c) (5).

Each of the charter hires was for a sum in excess of $100,000. There can thus be no claim of exemption under section 403 (c) (6) (iii).

It is, therefore, my view that the Red Sea charters may still be renegotiated by the Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Mr. Cox holds that the Red Sea voyage charters can be renegotiated. The last sentence of this memorandum reads as follows:

It is, therefore, my view that the Red Sea charters may still be renegotiated by the Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

I ask leave also to insert in the RECORD a memorandum from Wade H. Skinner, general counsel, United States Maritime Commission, to the United States Maritime Commission, under date of September 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 6, 1943.

To: United States Maritime Commission.
From: General counsel.
Subject: Renegotiation of Red Sea charters.

Only 2 of the 19 operators who participated in the Red Sea venture for the British Ministry of War Transport in 1941 and 1942 have responded to the Chairman's request to make voluntary adjustment of the charter rates paid by the Maritime Commission out of lend-lease funds. Efforts to obtain voluntary adjustments from the remaining 17 operators have been unavailing. It is, therefore, recommended that demand for renegotiation of the charters be made upon 16 of these operators, in accordance with the provisions of the renegotiation law (Public Law 528, 77th Cong., as amended).

One of the operators, the Norwegian Shipping and Trade Mission, is exempt from the act, which does not apply to any contract with "any foreign government or any agency thereof."

Attached is a copy of a memorandum prepared by Mr. Oscar Cox, general counsel of the Lend-Lease Administration (likewise Assistant Solicitor General of the United States) and forwarded to the Chairman of the Commission by the Lend-Lease Administrator. This memorandum holds that the Red Sea charters are subject to the renegotiation statute. The memorandum will, it is believed, fortify the Commission's position if it becomes necessary to refer the matter to the Attorney General for suit.

The statute directs the Chairman, whenever in his opinion the profits realized from any contract with the Commission are excessive, to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price, and upon such renegotiation to eliminate the excessive profits either by reduction, withholding, repayment, or recovery. The Chairman may bring suit to recover from the contractor any amount of excessive profits actually paid to the contractor.

The memorandum prepared by Mr. Cox discusses the points which may be raised by the contractors against the application of the renegotiation law to the charters in question. Examination of the accounts discloses that one, and possibly two, of the charters may have been closed by final payment within the meaning of the statute.

Attached is a list of the 19 operators who participated in the Red Sea venture, showing the vessels employed, the charter hire paid, the voyage profits, per vessel and by operator, and the amount withheld from final settlement.

It is accordingly recommended:

That the Commission refer the contracts listed in the attachment (excepting the contracts with (a) the Norwegian Shipping and Trade Mission; (b) American President Lines, Ltd.; and (c) Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co.) to the Price Adjustment Board for processing in the usual manner, including report to the Commission of any operator who shall fail to respond, for appropriate citation by the Commission to the Attorney General for recovery by suit from any such contractor.

WADE H. SKINNER,
General Counsel.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to quote from this memorandum, as follows:

It is accordingly recommended:

That the Commission refer the contracts listed in the attachment (excepting the contracts with (a) the Norwegian Shipping and Trade Mission, (b) American President Lines, Ltd., and (c) Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co.) to the Price Adjustment Board for processing in the usual manner, including report to the Commission of any operator who shall fail to respond, for appropriate citation by the Commission to the Attorney General for recovery by suit from any such contractor.

Yet, Mr. President, in spite of the advice of the attorney for the Lend-Lease Administration and the attorney for the Maritime Commission, these contracts have not been renegotiated, and I have heard of no cases being referred to the Attorney General for recovery by suit up to this time.

An investigation would also reveal that unconscionable profits have been made through the payment by the Commission for almost worthless vessels at 13 to 16 times their legal valuation.

Investigation would further reveal that ships have been sunk at sea which were insured for as high as 64 times their legal valuation as determined by the Maritime Commission itself.

The excuse may be offered that this is wartime, and that we have to put up with such things in wartime; indeed, that excuse has been offered to me by those holding responsible positions in the Maritime Commission itself, but the facts are that mismanagement and wastefulness existed in the Maritime Commission long before the war began.

We need good government always, but we need it more than ever in wartime. Congress may be blind to what is going on in some of our departments, but the people are not. Is it any wonder that millions of them are asking, "What is the matter with the Congress?"

POLITICAL PROPAGANDA DISTRIBUTED TO AMERICAN TROOPS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND PROPAGANDA UNDER O. P. A.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, some time ago I read into the RECORD a letter I wrote on February 22 to the Honorable Elmer Davis, of the Office of War Information, with respect to the distribution by the British Ministry of Information of a 4-page tabloid newspaper to all American troops, which contained, without crediting to any source, the following:

Roosevelt's opponents are ready to spend $50,000,000 to beat him if—as they assume—he makes a fourth-term bid for President at the November elections.

The Ministry of Information declined to permit an American press reporter to examine a copy of the issue which contained the story.

In response to my inquiry, Mr. Davis advised me that the British Ministry of Information has had a large quantity of 4-page leaflets prepared and that it was true that this story was contained in the leaflets that were distributed to American troops.

Upon further inquiry from me as to where this story originated, I was informed by Mr. Davis that it originated with the British United Press. I then communicated with the British United Press and have received a letter from Mr. R. W. Keyserlingk, managing director of the British United Press at Montreal, to the effect that this article was sent by one of the staff writers of the British United Press at New York, and that the fifty-million-dollar estimate was his own; that he had no information to sustain this statement, which was purely conjectural on the part of this correspondent.

I am not disputing the right of a news agency to send out news dispatches, but I desire again to emphasize that the British Government should not, by direction or indirection, or in any way whatsoever, attempt to influence an election in the United States by the distribution to American troops of any information through an official document which would tend to influence the opinion of these troops in an American election.

In this instance it is now admitted that the story was without foundation, and the insertion of it in an official British publication to be distributed to our troops can be regarded in no other way than as purely political propaganda.

I speak as a friend of the British Government, but I say that nothing will do more to destroy the unity between our two countries than occurrences such as this. The American people will bitterly resent any outside interference in our elections here, and any effort along this line by the officials of the British Government will do incalculable harm to the cordial relations that must exist between our two great nations if we are to solve the war problems confronting us.

I am inserting this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I think the representatives of Great Britain in America should inform those who control these leaflets which are being distributed to American troops that they can do no greater disservice to their country than to insert political propaganda in these publications which are given to American troops while they are on British soil.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert as a part of my remarks the entire correspondence, both with the Director of War Information and the British United Press.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1944.

Hon. ELMER DAVIS,
The Office of War Information,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DAVIS: I have just seen the Associated Press dispatch from London, dated February 19, which is as follows:

"To give American troops newly arrived in Britain a quick fill-in of the news they have missed while afloat the British Ministry of Information distributes a little four-page tabloid newspaper at ports of arrival.

"A recent issue, it was learned today, carried the following story, not credited to any source.

" 'Roosevelt's opponents are ready to spend $50,000,000 to beat him if—as they assume—he makes a fourth-term bid for President at the November elections.' "

"The Ministry of Information declined to permit an Associated Press reporter to examine a copy of the issue which contained the story. However, the same story was published in the London Daily Express."

I cannot imagine anything more disruptive of the relations between Great Britain and America than for the British Ministry of Information to attempt to propagandize American troops in the coming election, especially when such propaganda is based on rumor and is submitted without details or proof.

I would be obliged to you if you would investigate the matter and ascertain whether this report is correct, namely, that the British Ministry of Information is distributing a newspaper to all of the American troops arriving in Great Britain and including in this newspaper such items as the quotation above given—to the effect that the opponents of Roosevelt are ready to spend $50,000,000 to defeat him.

As the final effort is being made by Great Britain and America to administer the death blow to our enemies, it is vital that our relations not be disturbed by an attempt on the part of Great Britain to influence by propaganda, or otherwise, the results of our election.

We Americans will fight out our political battles within our own shores and any effort by foreign nations to influence this election will be deeply resented. Nothing more mischievous could be done to disturb the harmony that should exist in time of war between two great peoples who are fighting side by side for the common cause.

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

FEBRUARY 24, 1944.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In your letter of February 22 you call attention to recent stories in the press concerning the distribution to American troops arriving in Great Britain of a four-page leaflet sponsored by the British Ministry of Information. One leaflet was reported to contain a news story to the effect that the political opponents of President Roosevelt are ready to spend $50,000,000 to defeat him should he run for another term.

Upon inquiry, I find the facts to be these.

In a laudable effort to extend hospitality to arriving American troops, the British Ministry of Information has had a large quantity of four-page leaflets prepared. With two of the pages left blank, these leaflets are distributed to various of the principal ports of entry in the British Isles, where they are placed in the hands of local newspaper editors. Upon learning of the arrival of American troops, the local editors select recent items of American news in which they think the American soldiers will be interested. They print these news items on the blank pages, and distribute the leaflets to the troops.

In the case under discussion a local editor at one of the ports, on his own initiative and not at the instigation of the British Ministry of Information, selected as a news item the story to which you have referred. It is my understanding that this story was sent from the United States by one of the news agencies as part of the agency's regular news file, and that it had appeared in a number of British papers a day or two before it was picked up and reproduced in the leaflet for American troops. It is my further understanding that proper steps have been taken to see that local editors use better judgment in the future.

I am quite satisfied that the incident represents a mistake by an editor who proved to be more newspaperman than diplomat, and that it was not, by any stretch of the imagination, a studied attempt by any British

governmental agency to influence political trends in the United States.

Cordially,

ELMER DAVIS.

FEBRUARY 28, 1944.

Hon. ELMER DAVIS,
Director, the Office of War Information,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DAVIS: Thank you very much for your prompt reply to my letter of February 22, with respect to the distribution by the British Ministry of Information of a leaflet containing a news story to the effect that the political opponents of President Roosevelt are ready to spend $50,000,000 to defeat him should he run for another term.

This is such obvious propaganda that I am surprised the officials of the British Ministry of Information did not appreciate their unethical action in including this in the four-page leaflet distributed under the auspices of the British Government to the American soldiers as they arrived in England.

I note this was sent to Great Britain by one of the news agencies. Could you give me the name of the news agency and likewise let me know whether the O. W. I. approved sending this dispatch abroad? Furthermore, would you be kind enough to send me a copy of this leaflet and future leaflets as they are distributed to the American troops?

Thanking you, I am,

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

FEBRUARY 29, 1944.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am informed that the agency which sent the news story about the alleged raising of $50,000,000 to defeat the President, should he run for another term, was the British United Press. As for your question, Whether the O. W. I. approved sending this dispatch abroad? I am a little at loss to understand it. We have, of course, no right to approve or disapprove any dispatches sent abroad by news agencies, nor do we in ordinary course have any knowledge of their contents until they are seen in print by our offices overseas.

We should be glad to try to obtain for you any future leaflets distributed to American troops, but suggest that delay might be obviated if you applied directly to the office of the British Ministry of Information in the Embassy here, from whom we should have to get them.

Cordially,

ELMER DAVIS,
Director.

MARCH 3, 1944.

The BRITISH UNITED PRESS, LTD.,
Washington, D. C.
(Care of the United Press.)

DEAR SIRS: Attached is a copy of a letter I have received from Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information.

Will you kindly inform me from what source you obtained the report which was published in the British papers and then republished in the leaflet distributed to American troops arriving abroad, as follows:

"Roosevelt's opponents are ready to spend $50,000,000 to beat him if—as they assume—he makes a fourth-term bid for President at the November elections."

Thanking you, and with best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

MONTREAL, CANADA, *March 15, 1944.*

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: As your Washington office probably informed you, I made a trip to New York and Washington last week in connection with the British United Press dispatch which appeared in the British press in January estimating that $50,000,000 would be spent in attempt to defeat President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

I found that this story was written by one of our staff writers and that the $50,000,000 estimate was his own.

It is a violation of our traditional news policy for any correspondent to use his own estimate in a matter of this kind and I can assure you that the correspondent in question has been properly reprimanded so that nothing of this sort is likely to happen again.

* * * * *

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

R. W. KEYSERLINGK,
Managing Director,
British United Press, Ltd.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I now want to call attention to another piece of political propaganda sent out by one of the agencies of the Federal Government at the expense of the United States taxpayers and printed and mailed under Government frank, but the worst of it is that it was sent to 890 local war price and rationing boards in an official communication.

This quite lengthy article of political propaganda was signed by G. C. Adams, Social Circle, Ga., and concludes with these words:

Let's lay aside our mulligrubs, and get on our knees and thank God for Roosevelt and his N. R. A., O. P. A., A. A. A., and F. H. A.

I immediately took up the matter with Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and received a letter in reply, in which he admits that this article was sent from the Atlanta office under the official stationery of the O. P. A. He has imposed upon the person who sent out the article the punishment of requiring him to pay the cost of the publication. As a matter of fact, I think any employee of the Government who would so abuse the franking privilege as to send out such an article as this as an official communication should be dismissed from the public service.

I am glad, however, that Mr. Bowles states in his letter that he is using this example again to caution his staff in Washington and in the field that the operation of price control, rationing, and rent control must be kept completely free of politics.

This is but another instance of the abuse of the franking privilege by the thousands of branch and local offices of the different bureaus of the Government. It recalls the fact that not long ago an article was sent out under Government frank attacking the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and myself because of a stand we took in reducing an appropriation which was resented by the employees of this agency of the Government.

I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks the letter I received from a member of a rationing board in Virginia, in which he enclosed the circular in question. For obvious reasons I have withheld this person's name and address.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In serving as chairman of the war price and rationing board, I see most of the printed matter sent out by O. P. A. I am enclosing a recent circular which was received at our rationing board office, in Government franked envelope, which smells to high heaven of politics.

In passing this along to you, I call your attention to the last paragraph of the circular.

The letter was mailed out of Atlanta office of O. P. A. I would say that most of the Eastern and Southern States rationing boards received it. It is quite possible that it was given national prominence.

Most of the printed matter of this nature is consigned to the waste basket, but I thought you might be interested in this particular one.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter to Mr. Bowles and his reply thereto.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 29, 1944.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
The Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BOWLES: It has just been called to my attention that the enclosed letter was mailed out of the Atlanta office of the Office of Price Administration in a Government franked envelope.

Is it possible that your organization is disseminating political propaganda such as this at Government expense?

I would appreciate your advice as to who paid for the printing of this letter and as to whether it has been generally distributed over the country.

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Thank you very much for calling to my attention the reprint of a letter to the Atlanta Journal, which our Atlanta office had mailed out.

Frankly, this came to me as very much of a shock. An investigation has disclosed the following facts:

This letter to the editor appeared in the Atlanta Journal February 3. On February 4 the Atlanta regional information executive directed the Office for Emergency Management to reprint 3,000 copies to be included with the weekly letter that the regional O. P. A. office sends to its 890 local war price and rationing boards. The entire printing was used for this mailing within the organization. The Atlanta office distributed no copies to the public, and none outside its region. The printing cost $8.84.

Because the letter contained figures showing increases in farm income in the last 10 or 12 years, the Atlanta regional information executive thought that it would be of interest to local boards.

However, it is apparent that the letter might be interpreted to have political implications, and politics is none of O. P. A.'s business. Obviously, the order to print the relatively few copies that were run off was a serious error of judgment.

I have directed that the man responsible for the printing shall pay the bill himself so that there will be no expense to the Government. In addition, I am using this example again to caution our staff, in Washington and in the field, that the operation of price

control, rationing, and rent control, must be kept completely free of politics.

Again, thank you for your courtesy in calling this to my attention.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia a question. As I understand, the British agencies involved have admitted now the utter error of the statement in question, and that it was without foundation. Does the Senator know whether any steps have been taken or are to be taken to see to it that these erroneous reports are corrected?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator from Maine that I do not know of any steps that have been taken along that line. The item was sent by the British United Press, and I received a letter from the British United Press, as follows:

As your Washington office probably informed you—

The letter was sent to me from Montreal, Canada—

I made a trip to New York and Washington last week in connection with the British United Press dispatch which appeared in the British press in January estimating that $50,000,000 would be spent in attempt to defeat President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

I found that this story was written by one of our staff writers and that the $50,000,000 estimate was his own.

It is a violation of our traditional news policy for any correspondent to use his own estimate in a matter of this kind and I can assure you that the correspondent in question has been properly reprimanded so that nothing of this sort is likely to happen again.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator from Virginia inquired from Mr. Elmer Davis as to whether or not he would take appropriate steps to see that there was inserted in the Army publication in Great Britain which goes to our troops an authoritative statement summarizing what the Senator has found?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that I asked Mr. Davis to do that, and he writes me:

I am quite satisfied that the incident represents a mistake by an editor who proved to be more newspaperman than diplomat, and that it was not, by any stretch of the imagination, a studied attempt by any British governmental agency to influence political trends in the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would not good faith be shown by a readiness and willingness to give to our soldiers in Great Britain a correction?

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with the Senator, and I will suggest to Mr. Davis that such action be taken.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it would be most appropriate.

NORTH DAKOTA LEADERSHIP IN FOURTH WAR LOAN DRIVE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very proud to bring to the attention of the Senate the record of the State of North Dakota in the fourth war-loan drive. I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Dunseith Journal for March 23, in which the war-loan record of the State of North Dakota is stated. The article reads as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA TOPPED THE NATION IN FOURTH WAR LOAN

North Dakota topped the Nation in percent of series E War bond quota reached during the fourth war-loan campaign, according to an official release by the Treasury Department giving the final report of the fourth war loan.

The three leading States in percent of series E quota are: North Dakota, 181 percent; Wyoming, 152 percent; Iowa, 147 percent. North Dakota ranked second in percent of total quota. The three leading States are: Mississippi, 154 percent; North Dakota, 153 percent; Minnesota, 144 percent. Our State was also in second place in percent of individual quota reached. The three leading States are: Florida, 148 percent; North Dakota, 139 percent; Oregon, 135 percent.

R. R. Wolfer, executive director, North Dakota war finance committee, in a statement today said that this outstanding record was made possible by the patriotic service of more than 12,000 volunteer workers throughout the State serving on county and local war finance committees. He said that the help and cooperation of the schools of the State was also an important factor in the success of the campaign.

Mr. Wolfer pointed out that North Dakota's War bond sales record during the fourth war-loan campaign, which ranked North Dakota first or second in all three quotas, places our State at the very top among the States of the Nation. He further stated that this record proves the determination of North Dakota people to "back the attack" to a finish. He said that our people were ready and willing to make all their War bond quotas, not only in the expanded war-loan drives, but also in the regular month-to-month campaigns.

The North Dakota series E, F, and G War bond quota for March is $2,600,000.

Mr. President, I wish to say that North Dakota's record was made despite the fact that the administration has not placed a single war industry within the borders of our State. North Dakota is the only State in the Union which has not received one war industry during the present war.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical materials available, is authorized for not more than five years to construct, maintain, and operate one of more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, and one or more demonstration plants to produce liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products, with all facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the products. The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this Act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products. Any activities under this Act relating to the production of liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products shall be carried out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and subject to the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

"(a) to conduct laboratory research and development work, and with pilot plants and semiworks plants to make careful process engineering studies along with structural engineering studies in order to ascertain lowest investment and operating costs, necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation;

"(b) to acquire, by purchase, license, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents granted by this or any other nation; to acquire by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, land, and any interest in land (including easements and leasehold interests), options on real or personal property, and plants and their facilities; to assume the obligation to pay rentals in advance on property so acquired, and to pay damages arising out of the use of any such property: *Provided, however,* That the maximum quantity of land or any interest therein, or any other property, acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry on experiments for the purposes herein provided;

"(c) to engage, by contract or otherwise, engineers, architects, and any private industrial organization or any educational institution he deems suitable, to do all or any part of the work of designing, constructing, or operating the plants, the operation to be under his supervision, and through leases or otherwise as he believes advisable;

"(d) to cooperate with any other Federal or State department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, educational institution, or corporation, in effectuating the purposes of this Act.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell the products of the plants at not more than actual cost, including amortization of capital expenses, as determined by him, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal or any State government, but priority shall be given to orders placed by the War or Navy Departments. Any remaining products may be sold at going prices to any purchaser through regular commercial channels. The Secretary of the Interior, subject to approval by Congress, shall also have authority to dispose of any lands or other real or personal property acquired, but in his opinion no longer useful, for the purposes of this Act; and he shall have authority to grant, on such terms as he may consider appropriate, licenses under patent rights acquired under this Act: *Provided,* That such licenses are consistent with the terms of the agreements by which such patent rights are acquired. No patent acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under this Act shall prevent any citizen of the United States, or corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, from using any invention, discovery, or process covered by such patent, or restrict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such person or corporation on account of such use.

"SEC. 4. All moneys received under this Act for products of the plants and royalties shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Interior shall render to Congress on or before the first day of January of each year a report of all operations under this Act.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this Act. The authority and duties of the Secretary of the Interior under this Act shall be exercised through the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

"SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $30,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Amend the title to read as follows: "An Act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOHN M. ROBSION,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I understand the bill, it deals with the development of the coal and other fuel resources of the West.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill is the synthetic-fuels bill.

Mr. LANGER. I believe it is the bill the passage of which we have been endeavoring to secure for some time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has been under consideration in the last Congress and in the present Congress, and the Senator from North Dakota has been very much interested in securing its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

INCREASED POSTAL AND OTHER RATES UNDER NEW TAX LAW

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to bring to the attention of the Senate the manner in which a part of the new tax bill which went into effect yesterday will penalize the people who patronize the post offices, which are owned by the people themselves, and will favor the banks, the express companies, and the monopolies. In the West we have a saying, "You don't have to eat a whole beef to find out whether it is tainted." Therefore, Mr. President, without mentioning the major defects of the tax bill which has just gone into effect, I quote an advertisement published in a North Dakota newspaper. It was published in the March 22, 1944, issue of the Bismarck Tribune, on page 8. The advertisement was inserted by the Dakota National Bank & Trust Co., and is entitled "Bank Money Orders Cost Less." It reads as follows:

Bank money orders cost less; and as of March 26, 1944, the saving will be even greater. Here's the new schedule of postal money orders as compared to the cost of our bank money orders.

Amount	Postal money order	Our bank money order
$0.01 to $2.50	$0.10	$0.05
$2.51 to $5	.14	.05
$5.01 to $10	.19	.10
$10.01 to $20	.22	.10
$20.01 to $40	.25	.10
$40.01 to $50	.30	.10
$50.01 to $60	.30	.15
$60.01 to $80	.34	.15
$80.01 to $100	.37	.15
		(1)

[1] $0.10 per hundred or fraction.

Bank money orders cost less, they are available in whatever amount is required, a receipt is issued for your record, and the canceled money order is retained in our files for future reference. When you need money orders come to the Dakota National Bank, "the friendly bank." Affiliated with Northwest Bancorporation; member, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

From the schedule which appears in the advertisement we find that a money order for an amount between 1 cent and $2.50 will cost, if purchased at a post office, 10 cents; but if it is purchased at a bank in the same town, the cost will be 5 cents.

Likewise, under the new tax measure, if one buys at a post office a money order for an amount anywhere between $2.51 and $5, the cost will be 14 cents, whereas one can go to any bank in that town and buy a money order in the same amount for 5 cents. If a money order is bought at a post office, which is owned by the people, for an amount between $5.01 and $10, it will cost 19 cents, but one can go to any bank and buy it for 10 cents. If the money order is for an amount between $10.01 and $20, if one buys it at a post office, the cost is 22 cents, but one can go to any bank and buy it for less than half, or for 10 cents. Under the new tax bill, of which some people are so proud, if one buys a money order for an amount anywhere between $20 and $40 at a post office, it will cost 25 cents, but the same money order at any local bank will cost 10 cents. If a person buys a money order for an amount anywhere between $40.01 and $50 at a post office, it will cost 30 cents, but it can be bought at a bank for 10 cents. A money order for an amount between $60 and $80 will cost at a post office 34 cents, but at a bank the cost will be 15 cents. A money order for an amount anywhere between $80 and $100 will cost 37 cents at a post office, but will cost only 15 cents at a bank.

So, Mr. President, we see that the law passed by the Congress is putting our own Post Office Department out of business insofar as the issuing of money orders is concerned. The rates charged are so high that, as I said before, a money order for an amount anywhere between $80 and $100 will cost 37 cents at a post office, but will cost only 15 cents at a bank. So there will be a saving of 22 cents to the patron of the bank. I say that the increased postal rates will result in having the business diverted from the post offices to the banks insofar as money orders are concerned.

Mr. President, under the new tax rates, registration fees are increased approximately one-third, and insurance and c. o. d. fees are doubled. The local letter rate has been increased from 2 to 3 cents an ounce. The domestic air-mail rate has increased from 6 to 8 cents an ounce.

All of us are familiar with the terrific fight put up a few years ago against the parcel post by the express companies; yet we find that every parcel post package will require at least 1 cent more in postage, under the new tax bill, which requires an increase of 1 cent or 3 percent, whichever is the greater, this at a time when the express companies are making more money than ever before in their history, and when we have the situation described a few moments ago by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

This Congress, which refused to tax future issues of tax exempt securities and was so eager to pass the $9,000,000,000 Ruml income tax forgiveness, and which also refused to limit salaries to $25,000, increased the tax on electric light bulbs 15 percent, so light bulbs, which formerly cost the laboring man or the farmer $1, will now cost him $1.15. Charges for telephone services will increase to another 5 percent on local service, and 15 percent more on toll calls.

Mr. President, I rise to congratulate myself for having voted against this tax bill, and to express the hope that when the people of this country really understand what a miserable tax bill was passed by this body, they will more closely watch future tax legislation.

When this tax bill was under consideration I said that more millionaires would be created in World War No. 2 than were created in World War No. 1. I said then that the large corporations were making more money after taxes were paid than ever before in the history of America, and I repeat that assertion today. The poor people, and not the rich, are the ones who are paying for this war.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—legislative," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

For the payment to Elysabeth C. Barbour and Sharon Barbour, daughters, and Warren Barbour, son, of W. Warren Barbour, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey, $10,000, as follows: One-third thereof to Elysabeth C.

Barbour, and two-thirds to Frederick K. Barbour and Charles S. McVeigh, legal guardians of Sharon Barbour and Warren Barbour, minors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 10, to insert:

For payment to Cornelia Morton McNary, widow of Charles L. McNary, late a Senator from the State of Oregon, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 13, to insert:

For payment to Marie K. Van Nuys, widow of Frederick Van Nuys, late a Senator from the State of Indiana, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 3, line 14, after the numeral "3", to insert "and McEvoy versus Peterson as audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections Numbered 2."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to insert "Hugh Peterson, $581.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, after the words "In all", to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$8,581.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government Printing Office", on page 5, line 11, after the words "ceiling price", to insert "orders and"; in line 13, after the word "such", to insert "orders and"; and in line 16, before the word "schedules", to insert "orders and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—Office for Emergency Management", on page 6, after line 18, to insert:

Office of Defense Transportation: The funds appropriated to the Office of Defense Transportation for the fiscal year 1944 shall be available for the employment of a Director at $12,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent executive agencies", on page 7, after line 7, to insert:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Education and training, defense workers (national defense): For an additional amount for payments to States, and so forth, fiscal year 1944, for the cost of vocational courses in food production and conservation, mechanics, farm-machinery repair, and farm-labor training of less than college grade, as provided in paragraph 3, under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, $4,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency", on page 8, line 12, after "and 1541)", to strike out "$127,500,000" and insert "$112,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 2, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 172, and"; and in line 4, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$3,589.30" and insert "$7,682.92."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes to speak on this bill as the representative of American women. The appropriation for the Federal Works Agency which is included in the deficiency appropriation bill is of deep concern to them because those funds will make possible the continuance and expansion of Federal aid to our nursery schools and child-care centers for the children of working mothers.

Today there are more than 5,500,000 women with children under 14 employed in America. Those women cannot do their best work, and many of them cannot even stay on the job, unless they have some assurance that their children are being adequately cared for.

The funds allocated to date to the Federal Works Agency for the War Public Works and War Public Services Program have made possible the establishment by local communities of 2,243 projects caring for 65,772 children. It is clear that this program needs to be expanded considerably to meet the needs of working mothers. Applications for 302 new projects have been held up for weeks because the funds of the Federal Works Agency were all allocated.

As Senators know, the President requested Congress to grant an additional appropriation of $150,000,000 to the Federal Works Agency. It is a great disappointment to me that these funds have been so seriously cut. The House reduced the appropriation to $127,500,000. The bill which is now before us further reduces the amount to $112,500,000.

There is another and even more serious weakness in the bill before us to which I should like to call attention. There is at present a limitation of $40,000,000 on the funds which can be spent by the Federal Works Agency for maintenance and operation of facilities. That limitation applies to the funds which were authorized by Congress for the Federal Works program after July 1, 1943. If that limitation remains in the law the child-care centers will have to close, regardless of how much money we appropriate.

General Fleming testified before the House Appropriations Committee that they have already made allocations of approximately $30,000,000 for maintenance and operation of projects since July. He said "if the limitation remains in the law, we would be unable to continue essential service projects or to approve any in new locations."

If that limitation is not removed, therefore, the Federal Works Agency will not be able to use the funds we appropriated for it to keep the present child-care centers open for another year. It will not be able to open the 300 new centers which have already been certified as essential to our war effort.

I wonder if Senators realize what that would mean. It would mean thousands of women leaving their war jobs at a time when our War Production Board has just announced that our war output is behind schedule. It would mean thousands of more door-key children on our streets.

I should like to see inserted in this bill a provision to remove the $40,000,000 limitation so that the child-care program which is so urgently needed in all our war areas can go ahead without further loss of time.

In conclusion, I should like to read a letter which six women Members of the House submitted to the House Appropriations Committee when this matter was before that body.

FEBRUARY 24, 1944.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, *Chairman.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As of course you know, under the wartime child-care program funds are allotted for assistance in the operation of facilities for the care of children whose mothers are employed in jobs essential to the war effort. Local communities participate in the cost of the service to the extent that funds are available, and the parents pay a fee which must cover, at least, the cost of food. As of January 31, 1944, a total of $20,204,565 of Lanham Act funds had been allotted for wartime child-care services. As of February 9, the last date for which a report is available, there were in operation 1,431 nursery schools with an enrollment of 37,439 preschool children and 812 centers with an enrollment of 28,333 school-age children. This makes a total of 2,243 centers with an enrollment of 65,772.

You have under consideration before your committee a request from the Director of the Budget for an appropriation of $150,000,000 to the Federal Works Agency for War public works. An important part of this fund is for the continuation and expansion of the child-care program.

We want to call to your attention the urgency of this program because of the vast number of women now in industry and the need for more than 1,000,000 additional women workers by July 1.

At the present time, only 65,772 children are being taken care of in 2,243 projects. This does not begin to meet the existing need, as evidenced by the fact that four out of five women hired today leave their jobs because of home problems. One of the most common of these is lack of adequate care for these children. The War Manpower Commission estimates that one out of every seven women workers has a child needing care. This means that at least 142,000 more children than at the present will need care by July 1 if the recruitment program is to be successful. As you know, an increasing number of women with small children are being forced to seek employment as fathers are drafted into the armed forces.

The health and safety of our children, as well as the achievement of our war production goals, depend on speedy provision of the necessary funds.

The program at present is at a standstill. No new projects can be opened even though applications for 302 child-care projects from local communities, certified as essential to the war effort, are pending. Facilities cannot be provided for the children in these areas and the existing projects will be forced to close as their grants expire unless this appropriation is ganted at once.

A further step is necessary to the fulfillment of this program. The limitation of $40,000,000 imposed by act of Congress of July 15, 1943, on the amount of funds permitted to be used for maintenance and operation of these war services should be lifted. Allocation of funds to the child-care projects already approved and pending would bring the total allocation up to the limit imposed. Therefore, the failure to remove this limitation would mean a total collapse of the child-care program.

Therefore, we women members of Congress, assume the responsibility of speaking for the millions of working mothers of our country and of impressing upon you the need for action. Women cannot do their best work

in their war jobs, or are prevented from making a contribution altogether, if they are constantly worried and insecure about the care of their children. We owe it to our fighting fathers to safeguard the health and future of American youth. We sincerely hope that this committee in its wisdom will join with us in making it possible to secure the services of the thousands of women who are anxious to do their part in providing the means to achieve victory. We know of no better way to secure their services than in making adequate provisions for safeguarding the health and happiness of their children.

MARY T. NORTON.
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.
FRANCES P. BOLTON.
MARGARET C. SMITH.
WINIFRED C. STANLEY.
CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, supplementing the excellent remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, I may say that today some of the officials discussed the matter with several of us. The Senator from Georgia and myself have discussed the matter with the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that at this time not all the committee amendments have been offered.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. After all committee amendments have been acted upon, the subject to which the Senator refers may be presented.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; I had understood that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know whether the Senator so understood.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wished to mention the fact that we have held discussions relative to the matter, and at the proper time we will submit an amendment to increase the appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Veterans' Administration," on page 11, line 5, after the word "expended", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$31,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture", on page 17, after line 8, to insert:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Salaries and expenses

Agricultural engineering investigations: For an additional amount for agricultural engineering investigations, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, and including not to exceed $10,000 for the construction of a building at the Houma (La.) station, $74,000, to remain available until June 30, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Commodity Credit Corporation," on page 18, line 10, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$312,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Bureau of Reclamation," on page 19, line 12, before the word "weir", to insert "temporary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Office of the Secretary," on page 22, line 13, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 169, and"; and in line 15, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$9,934.70" and insert "$15,928.73."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast Guard," on page 22, line 24, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 170, and"; and on page 23, line 2, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$4,110.85" and insert "$4,610.85."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transfers of appropriations," on page 23, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$262,314,000" and insert "$262,759,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Naval Personnel," on page 23, line 17, after "Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho", to strike out "$1,530,000" and insert "$1,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 18, after "Lake Seneca, N. Y.", to strike out "$1,530,000" and insert "$1,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 19, after "Port Deposit, Md.", to strike out "$945,000" and insert "$1,050,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 22, after the name "Navy", to strike out "$6,525,000" and insert "$6,970,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 24, line 10, after the word "vehicles," to insert a comma and "including one at $3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department (out of the postal revenues)—Departmental," on page 26, after line 7, to insert:

Contingent and miscellaneous expenses, $4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department," on page 31, after line 3, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Restoration of capital impairment, Commodity Credit Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the United States, to restore the amount of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of March 31, 1943, by a contribution to the Corporation as provided by the act approved March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-1), $39,436,884.93.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Civil functions," on page 32, after line 19, to insert:

GENERAL PROVISION

Damage claims: For the payment of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death adjusted and determined by the Secretary of War under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," approved July 3, 1943 (Public Law 112), as fully set forth in Senate Document Numbered 167, Seventy-eighth Congress, $75,286.98.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—War overtime pay and other compensation increases—District of Columbia," on page 63, line 16, after the numerals "1944," to strike out "$3,100" and insert "$9,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 19, after the word "funds", to strike out "$2,056,900" and insert "$2,062,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the amendment on page 31 of the bill. The amendment was stated so rapidly I did not understand its purpose. I refer to the amount stated in line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will restate the amendment on page 31, beginning in line 4.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, after line 3, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Restoration of capital impairment, Commodity Credit Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the United States, to restore the amount of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of March 31, 1943, by a contribution to the Corporation as provided by the act approved March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-1) $39,436,884.93.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to have an explanation by the Senator in charge of the bill as to why it is necessary to appropriate nearly $40,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation. If the management of that Corporation is not efficient enough to conduct its business profitably, or at least keep it out of the red, we should change management.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe the Senator should understand that the fault lies in an act which Congress itself passed directing that wheat be bought from places in countries outside the United States, and that it should be sold at a lower price than wheat was bringing at the time. The losses were charged to the C. C. C. The Commodity Credit Corporation merely carried out the directions of the Congress. I regretted very much to see Congress take the view which it took. I doubt very much the wisdom of the act Congress passed, but Congress directed this authority to perform the task at a loss. The figure contained in the amendment of $39,436,884.93 represents the loss, and we must restore it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that this appropriation is for wheat purchased outside of this country?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It was my understanding that the wheat was Government wheat, wheat held by the Government, which was sold at a loss.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was some of that wheat also. By direction of the Congress it was handled in the same way. Some of our own wheat, of lower quality, was sold at a loss and charged to the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I read from the report:

Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-1), an act to maintain unimpaired the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation at $100,000,000, and for other purposes, an appraisal has been made of all assets and liabilities of the said Corporation as of March 31, 1943. As a result of such appraisal and on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for the 12 months' period ended March 31, 1943, whichever was less, it has been determined that the liabilities of the Corporation, including capital stock of $100,000,000, exceed the assets by an amount of $39,436,884.93.

The act cited above provides that in the event the net worth of the Corporation, as shown by the appraisal by the Secretary of the Treasury, is less than $100,000,000, the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the United States, shall restore the amount of such impairment. To enable the Secretary to make such payment there is authorized to be appropriated annually, commencing with the fiscal year 1938, an amount equal to any capital impairment found to exist by virtue of any appraisal.

The amount recommended by the committee is necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to discharge the duty imposed upon him by the above-mentioned act.

What Congress did was to have the wheat sold at less than the market price, and thereby create a subsidy. The purpose of this appropriation is to supply money for the purpose of paying the subsidy.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The situation is that the Government took a couple of hundred million bushels of wheat—whatever the amount was—sold it for less than was paid for it, and it is now proposed to take money out of the Treasury in order to restore what was lost by poor business management.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly the situation, and Congress is responsible for it. I am not a subsidy man and, for that reason, I am not blaming myself particularly for what occurred, but Congress passed the law, and it is our duty, of course, to pay the amount which is needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. As the matter has been explained, I think it does not cover the whole story. This amendment restores the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the losses it has suffered up to April 1, 1943. The law requires that on April 1 of each year there shall be an inventory taken of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. An inventory was taken and a finding made. Another inventory will be taken in a few days which will show an even greater loss, due to the wheat bought at parity in the United States and bought a little cheaper from Canada—there were some purchases from Canada—and then sold for feed for dairy stock and for poultry and for cattle feed generally. That loss will be even greater in another year; we will find the capital stock again impaired, and to carry out the provisions of the law the Congress will be required again to restore the capital stock.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee permit me further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It appears to me that this means it is a continuous operation of digging into the Treasury to buy cattle feed and other livestock feed for one certain particular group or portion of our population.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Congress of the United States, after long debate in both Houses, directed that that be done. After action taken by the Committees on Agriculture of the House and the Senate, Congress by legislation directed that wheat should be bought and then should be sold at not less than the parity price of corn. The loss must be made up in this way. Everybody knew when we passed the act that it was a transaction for the benefit of the dairy industry, for the benefit of cattle feeding, for the benefit of the poultry industry in order to cut down the price of beef, the price of butter, the price of eggs, and the price of poultry. It was in the nature of a subsidy, and we are paying the subsidy or a part of it now.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. While it is true, as the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Arizona have said, that this loss is largely due to the sale of feed grain, yet this whole amount probably cannot be charged up against the farmers or the farmers' feed bill, because, as Senators will recall, the Commodity Credit Corporation was furnishing quite large amounts of grain for the manufacture of alcohol so that the synthetic-rubber program could be inaugurated. If my memory serves me correctly, the Commodity Credit Corporation sold a considerable amount of corn, on which they realized only about 5 cents a bushel, the loss on which would probably be included in this amount.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure the Senator is correct. There was a loss on that as well as on the grain sold for alcohol.

Mr. McKELLAR. But nothing like the loss that was incurred in connection with the other program.

Mr. AIKEN. What I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee is whether the Commodity Credit Corporation has ever submitted to the Appropriations Committee an accounting of their transactions or balance sheets when they come before the committee and ask for new appropriations?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they submit them to the House and I think they are in the House hearings.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Commodity Credit Corporation submits balance sheets to the Banking and Currency Committee whenever they come before us requesting an increase in their borrowing power or in subsidy payments. There will be found in the hearings the balance sheets of the Commodity Credit Corporation in each case.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it broken down?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it is broken down showing what they have lost on each commodity.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is it very long?

Mr. TAFT. No; it only covers 2 or 3 pages.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator has it I wish he would put it in the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. I will send for it and will place in the RECORD the most recent one, if I can obtain it.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the point at which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and I had a discussion regarding the Commodity Credit Corporation, the balance sheet of the Corporation as of October 31, 1943, with some explanatory matter.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation—Balance sheet, Oct. 31, 1943

ASSETS

Cash	$109,459,814.16
Loans receivable	228,161,871.89
Accounts receivable	388,351,837.15
Inventories:	
Agricultural supplies	199,864,398.82
Barley (304,486 bushels)	163,198.38
Cotton (2,597,289 bales)	162,506,866.46
Dairy products	1,055,901.40
Foreign commodities	184,106,376.96
Other commodities	7,145,908.05
Rye (315,682 bushels)	198,035.65
Tobacco (214,541,136 pounds)	128,150,161.17
Wheat (142,668,348 bushels)	181,884,647.77
Total	865,075,494.66
Accrued charges on commodities owned	5,781,006.23
	870,856,500.89
Fixed assets	27,898,061.85
Deferred charges and prepaid expenses	2,008,008.30
Total assets	1,626,736,094.24

LIABILITIES

Guaranteed obligations of United States:	
Notes payable:	
Series G	$411,596,000.00
U. S. Treasury	700,000,000.00
	1,111,596,000.00
Bank loans payable:	
Demand loans	57,915,000.00
Cuban sugar	44,303,327.83

LIABILITIES—Continued		NET WORTH	
Guaranteed obligations of United States—Continued		Capital stock	$100,000,000.00
Bank loans payable—Continued		Deficit	33,362,046.20
Wool purchases	$64,745,522.44		66,637,953.80
Peanuts	5,409,302.14		
Letters of credit	22,351,685.97	Total liabilities and net worth	1,626,736,094.24
	194,724,838.38	[1] See the following table:	
	1,306,320,838.38	Loans held by private banks	$272,675,922.95
Accounts payable	253,777,302.06	Applications for letters of credit	17,764,314.42
Contingent liabilities ($290,440,237.37) [1]			
Total liabilities	1,560,098,140.44	Total	290,440,237.37

Commodity Credit Corporation investments and obligations, Oct. 31, 1943

	Commodities owned by Commodity Credit Corporation	Loans held by Commodity Credit Corporation	Loans held by banks	Outstanding commitments	Total
Corn	$7,146,000	$800,000	$1,873,000	$25,000,000	$34,819,000
Cotton	162,507,000	192,342,000	61,097,000	285,203,000	701,149,000
Tobacco	128,150,000	601,000	1,993,000	70,150,000	200,894,000
Wheat	181,885,000	26,273,000	196,390,000	92,857,000	497,405,000
Flaxseed		18,000	1,387,000	5,827,000	7,232,000
Barley	163,000	161,000	2,143,000	6,928,000	9,395,000
Rye	198,000	99,000	1,079,000	3,669,000	5,045,000
Grain sorghums			2,000	5,000,000	5,002,000
Dry beans and peas		71,000	556,000	49,142,000	49,769,000
Hay and pasture seed			19,000	9,981,000	10,000,000
Hemp	954,000			35,520,000	36,474,000
Naval stores	12,097,000	2,125,000		11,328,000	25,550,000
Potatoes		6,000	91,000	99,903,000	100,000,000
Prunes				44,000,000	44,000,000
Raisins				65,975,000	65,975,000
Canning vegetables				24,965,000	24,965,000
Oilseeds and products	48,631,000		61,600	194,584,000	243,276,000
Sugar	105,308,000			27,940,000	133,248,000
Butter and cheese	65,414,000			26,234,000	91,648,000
Corn price adjustment				1,469,000	1,469,000
Cheddar cheese				940,000	940,000
Fluid milk				7,000,000	7,000,000
General commodities purchase program				150,000,000	150,000,000
Dairy feed stabilization				60,000,000	60,000,000
Wool and mahair	65,227,000			85,009,000	150,236,000
Loans to Agricultural Adjustment Agency				50,000,000	50,000,000
Foreign commodities	78,798,000	2,864,000		153,293,000	234,955,000
Miscellaneous agricultural supplies	8,597,000	2,801,000		37,167,000	48,565,000
Carrying charges				72,587,000	72,587,000
Total	865,075,000	228,161,000	266,691,000	1,701,671,000	3,061,598,000

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not want anything I have said to be considered as a criticism of the Commodity Credit Corporation, for I consider of all the agencies that have not been required to be audited the Commodity Credit Corporation has been about the most useful and it has tried very hard to do good work and has done good work.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that the statement made by the Senator from Arizona is exactly correct as to the general law with regard to replacing losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It may be inevitable that on the loans that have been made and many other transactions there will be losses. I want to make only one reservation, however, about next year. When next year this bill comes before the Senate it will have to provide not $39,000,000 but probably in the neighborhood of a billion dollars to make up losses if the Corporation proceeds as it is now doing.

I want to state my view that the milk-feed subsidy which is now being paid at the rate of $400,000,000 a year is, in my opinion, contrary to law. In my view, the Commodity Credit Corporation has no power to pay subsidies in that way. The Commodity Credit Corporation may buy property and may sell it at a loss and it may legally pay some kinds of subsidies; but the milk-feed subsidy is paid by simply asking a man how much milk and butter he sold and figuring so many cents and then giving him a Government check through the A. A. A. for that amount. I raised that legal objection when the Commodity Credit Corporation matter was before our committee. There is a long opinion from the Solicitor maintaining their right to do so, which is found in the record, and with which I wholly disagree. The Commodity Credit Corporation officials ought to know when they come before Congress next year and ask for replacement capital that I think there is a very sound objection to replacing the capital stock because of the payment of that particular subsidy and perhaps one or two others, which cannot be paid in a legal way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 31, beginning in line 3, has been agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee a question. As I understand, the appropriation of $39,436,884.93 is to pay the amount of loss which has been sustained and which has impaired the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; up to April 1, or March 31, 1943.

Mr. WHERRY. In listening to the explanation of the Senator as to what brought about this loss, he referred to loss sustained in the purchase and sale of wheat.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. But the entire loss on the sale of wheat was about $183,000,000 was it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So that in reality this is a deficit which has been sustained by the loss on all the activities as against the assets and whatever has been earned by the Commodity Credit Corporation during that period of time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it was largely, in fact almost entirely, due to the loss which we have been discussing.

Mr. WHERRY. In the hearings held before the House committee on this same bill, on page 552, the chairman in reply to a statement by Mr. Bartelt as to the cumulative losses said:

> In other words, you have a continuous and consistent loss on every activity.

He was referring to the losses which have accrued through the different organizations to which the Commodity Credit Corporation loans money. One I take it is the R. A. C. C., another the Federal Security Administration, and 50 or 60 others. Am I right in that?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator is right.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator is correct in that the sum of money is the net amount of loss up to April 1, 1943, from all sources. I asked Mr. Hutson——

Mr. WHERRY. So it is not chargeable exclusively to wheat; it is chargeable to the loss, as the chairman of the House committee said, on all their activities?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think that is so. As a matter of fact, the loss on wheat alone has been $183,000,000, if I remember correctly, and the profits have reduced that to about a $39,000,000 net loss.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. If I may read from the record on page 33 of the Senate committee hearings, I asked this question of Mr. Hutson:

> Senator HAYDEN. Where have you had your principal losses? Take the wheat, for example; has that been handled at a loss?
>
> Mr. HUTSON. The biggest item of loss in connection with the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation is the sale of feed wheat.
>
> Senator McKELLAR. How much did you lose in that?
>
> Mr. HUTSON. The total losses on the sale of wheat during the past 2 years, through January 31, 1944, are approximately $183,000,000.

That covered a 2-year period. We are only taking care of the combined losses up to a year ago.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Tennessee will further yield, that answers the question I asked, and this is the net loss. Over a period of time, it is true, we lost $183,000,000 on wheat, but if we had not lost money on other activities and operations we might not have this deficit today. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the losses on wheat have been greater than on anything else. This is the large item. Other losses might have been made up out of profits, but this capped the climax so far as losses were concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. I think there is no defense, and I think Congress should appropriate whatever money is necessary to make up losses sustained on wheat, because we approved the action in the Congress, and, of course, we should pay the loss.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have to do it.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I wish to raise is that this net loss comes from other activities, in addition to that regarding wheat, and some of those activities, I think, should be brought up for consideration, if not at this time then during the consideration of deficiency bills which will come before us later, because it is a question whether those activities should be continued. One of them is the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. I should like to know how we are to make up the losses sustained in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think there is a great deal in what the Senator says.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water fund," on page 68, line 17, after the word "funds", to strike out "$2,117,100" and insert "$2,123,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of expenses," on page 68, line 24, after the numerals "201", to strike out "$135,676,249" and insert "$135,682,249."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Judgments and authorized claims—Property damage claims," on page 70, after line 20——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments covering auditing claims be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 70, after line 20, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent establishments, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sum not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 171, Seventy-eighth Congress, as follows:

Executive Office of the President:

Office for Emergency Management:

Division of Central Administrative Services, $303.87;

Independent establishments:

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, $65;

Federal Security Agency, $1,408.15;

Department of the Interior, $271.81;

Navy Department, $4,707.17;

In all, $6,756.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States courts," on page 71, line 24, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document No. 168."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 72, to strike out:

Federal Works Agency (Work Projects Administration), $6,421.86.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 2, to insert:

Federal Works Agency:
Public Buildings Administration, $2,350;
Work Projects Administration, $6,421.86.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 5, to insert:

Navy Department, $1,275.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 9, after the words "In all," to strike out "$17,355.51," and insert "$20,980.51."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States Court of Claims," on page 74, line 10, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document No. 174, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 25, after "War Department," to strike out "$114,627.54" and insert "$124,024.91."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 1, after the words "In all", to strike out "$526,560.06" and insert "$535,957.43."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Audited claims," on page 88, after line 23, to insert:

(b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1941 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 173, Seventy-eighth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

The Judiciary: For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, 65 cents.

Independent Offices: For youth work and student aid, National Youth Administration, $380.34.

For maintenance, National Institute of Health, Public Health Service, $41.41.

For maintenance, National Cancer Institute, Public Health Service, $56.14.

For general administrative expenses, Public Buildings Administration, $14.50.

For salaries and expenses, public buildings outside the District of Columbia, Public Buildings Administration, $4.95.

For salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator, Federal Works Agency, 80 cents.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $2,908.75.

Department of Agriculture: For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture, $4,645.13.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation), $101.19.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, act of June 28, 1937), $122.69.

For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, $120.72.

For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, $36.96.

For liquidation and management of resettlement projects, Department of Agriculture, $60.20.

Department of Commerce: For civilian pilot training, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, $736.

Department of the Interior: For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to Interior, Indians), $47.50.

For Indian Service supply fund, $260.

For support of Indians and administration of Indian property, $2,176.41.

For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $67.90.

For conservation of health among Indians, $77.22.

Department of Justice: For salaries and expenses of district attorneys, etc. Department of Justice, $1.85.

For salaries and expenses, Lands Division, Department of Justice, $50.

For miscellaneous salaries and expenses, field, Department of Justice, $37.50.

Department of Labor: For miscellaneous expenses, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, $91.

Navy Department: For general expenses, Marine Corps, $8,366.25.

For maintenance, Bureau of Ships, $63,319.62.

For general expenses, Coast Guard (Navy), $25.32.

For aviation, Navy, $42,862.61.

For foreign-service pay adjustment, appreciation of foreign currencies (Navy), $25.

For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $1,032.24.

For pay and allowances, Coast Guard (Navy), $336.83.

For Naval Reserve, $2,832.14.

For engineering, Navy, $5,711.54.

For maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, $6,831.75.

For ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, $215,985.58.

For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, $399.93.

For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $2,203.33.

Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For clerks, first- and second-class post offices, $67.86.

For operating supplies for public buildings, Post Office Department, $123.75.

For transportation of equipment and supplies, 98 cents.

Department of State: For emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, $42.

War Department: For Air Corps, Army, $8.90.

For Army transportation, $4.09.

For working fund, War, ordnance, $127.36.

For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), $40.27.

Total, audited claims, section 304 (b), $362,387.16, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General provisions," on page 93, after line 20, to insert:

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 15, to change the section number from 401 to 402.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the Senate return to page 9, the item covering the National Housing Agency, and I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee give me an explanation of what that appropriation is for. I am sorry I was not in the Senate at the time the appropriation of $7,500,000 was under consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the item is to make up the deficit for the present year, up to June 30. The Budget estimate of $25,000,000 was reduced to $7,500,000, or a reduction of $17,500,000.

The war-housing program has been proceeding under a total authorization by the Congress of a billion, five hundred million dollars, of which one billion three hundred and fifty million has been appropriated, leaving an unappropriated authorization of $150,000,000.

The Agency sent in an estimate of $25,000,000, which was cut down to $7,500,000 for the remainder of the year, and I think the committee acted wisely.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this for temporary housing, or permanent housing?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is for defense housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have been concluded. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain amendments which the committee has directed me to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

The appropriation "Training for nurses, Public Health Service (national defense)", in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby made available, for the entire fiscal year, for transfer to and consolidation with appropriations of St. Elizabeths and Freedmen's Hospitals in such amounts as may be deemed necessary by the Federal Security Administrator to cover the cost of items furnished to student nurses in training under plans approved for such hospitals in accordance with the act of June 15, 1943 (Public Law 74), as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment is designed to put the housing for the two hospitals mentioned on a parity with other housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 22, after the words "outplant facilities", it is proposed to insert *"Provided further,* That the limitation of $40,000,000 contained in Public Law 150, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 15, 1943, on the total amount that may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, is hereby increased to $65,000,000."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection to the proposal to increase the limitation from $40,000,000 to $65,000,000, but I understand there is some question about raising it higher. I should be willing to go as high as $70,000,000, if that is agreeable to the authors of the proposed amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as this item is concerned, $65,000,000 was substituted for $40,000,000, which increased the appropriation by $25,000,000, and it was reported in that form by the committee. Since that time the Department has reported that it has allotted already some $23,000,000 out of the $65,000,000, and it would like to have as much as $80,000,000.

The Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Georgia asked me if I would be willing to raise the $65,000,000 to $75,000,000, and take it to conference, so that we could see exactly what has been allotted and what has been spent, and settle the matter in that way. I have no objection to the larger amount being taken to conference.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, members of the House committee, which has already approved an unlimited grant presumably, will be on the conference committee, so that I do not think there is much of a compromise in taking the matter to conference. Whatever would go to conference went out on a point of order in the House, but the House committee agreed to an unlimited range. I should like to speak on the subject before we finally reach a conclusion.

The purpose in the enactment of the Lanham Act originally was not that contemplated in the pending amendment, but the act was intended primarily for the construction of war public works. I was very much interested in securing the enactment of the law, and played an active part in getting it through the Senate. But let me list the activities that were supposed to be undertaken under that act. Probably any activity is justified because the language is very broad in the first instance.

The act provides:

The term "public work" means any facility necessary for carrying on community life substantially expanded by the national defense program, but the activities authorized under this title shall be devoted primarily to schools, waterworks, sewers, sewage, garbage- and refuse-disposal facilities, public sanitary facilities, works for the treatment and purification of water; hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, and streets and access roads.

A good deal of the money proposed to be spent in this appropriation deals, in the first place, with the establishment of child-care centers, which are not in any way mentioned in the Lanham Act, except that they come under perhaps the general statement of facilities necessary to carrying on community life—rather a thin reed on which to rest this very large appropriation.

Further on in the act it is said that the Administration may make loans or grants and may make contributions "to public or private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works, upon such terms and in such amounts as the Administrator may consider to be in the public interest."

It was felt that there might be districts where a school might be established, and where it might be necessary for a short time, until the locality was able to take it up and make its arrangements, for the Federal Government to help support that school district. It was purely incidental, and it was not considered an important part of the program.

Last spring, when we authorized $250,000,000 more for this general purpose, this very general purpose, of spending Federal money throughout the country on everything and anything, we imposed a limitation of $40,000,000 on operations, not because we did not feel these works should be operated, but because we felt that the localities should be able to take them over gradually and do the work themselves.

It is now proposed that the limitation be raised, and the estimate submitted by the Federal Works Agency proposed that, whereas they wanted to spend $72,000,000 for public works, they wanted to spend $70,000,000 for the operation of public works. That was the original program submitted to the House of Representatives. The House cut the total amount, and the Senate committee has also cut it.

Mr. President, there seems to be no reason to expand further the business of providing Federal funds for operating all kinds of local public works. Something has been said about 5,000,000 mothers being taken care of. The truth is there are only 50,000 mothers, as I understand from the testimony, who are really taken care of by this Federal job. The purpose of the appropriation, however, is not simply to continue this job, but it is to expand it and to provide more Federal grants for different public works. I do not see how a Federal grant can, strictly speaking, be made for a child-care center, for instance, which has not been built. The

original purpose of the Agency was to maintain public works which the Federal Government has provided. But there appears to be a constant expansion of grants for child care, for something local people are willing to do. Child care provides one of the greatest appeals to charitable organizations. It is something the local organization can well do.

Originally 10 percent of the Agency funds were spent for operations. Last year we authorized 20 percent for operations as against construction, whereas now request is made for a 50-percent grant for operations. There has been a gradual extension of grants for schools, for child care, and so forth. The actual amount proposed for schools out of this total appropriation is $25,000,000, for child care $22,000,000, for hospital operation $8,000,000, for recreation $11,000,000, for other types of activity $1,800,000. The Agency has already spent about $23,000,000 of the $40,000,000 provided. If we now say, "All right, continue the projects which you are operating until June 1945 at a cost which you estimate to be $42,800,000, and add the $23,000,000 to make a total of $65,000,000"—if we thus increase the $40,000,000 to $65,000,000, it will enable the continuation of every project which, through this Agency, is now being supported by the Federal Government, and it seems to me that is enough. I see no reason why we should go on expanding this Federal activity at a time when the localities are themselves quite willing to handle the problem, and when there are no great new centers in operation. Because of the fact that some Senators felt that the amount provided should be increased, I did not greatly object to adding $5,000,000 to take care of extraordinary contingencies, but it seems to me that $70,000,000 for operations is the very limit that we ought to provide. That will give, as I have said, $5,000,000 for expansion in case there is some new center where the Government moves in, or some new plant. There are very few now being created, but there are one or two.

I hope very much that we may reach a compromise agreement of, let us say, $70,000,000. The committee approved of only $65,000,000. That is entirely satisfactory to me if it shall be the limit. But if we suspend the rule and enter the domain of legislation, and then the amount is to be raised to $75,000,000 or $80,000,000 or $100,000,000, I would object to undertaking legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The reason I suggest increasing the amount provided in line 13 of the amendment from $65,000,000 to $75,000,000, is because the Senator from Georgia and I were told—and I dare say other Senators were also told—that the Agency had already allocated $23,000,000 as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has stated. That would leave $42,000,000 unallocated in case $65,000,000 were provided.

Mr. TAFT. It would be $47,000,000 in case $70,000,000 were provided.

Mr. MAYBANK. Last year the program cost about $50,000,000 on the same basis as that on which the Agency is now operating.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, no; the Senator is wrong about that.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not familiar with what was spent last year, but I may say that the general counsel advised me only a few hours ago that the amount was $50,000,000 and that it was now proposed to provide a sufficient amount to wind up the work. I am simply saying what was told to me.

Mr. TAFT. I understand. The figures set out on page 680 of the House hearings are very clear, and I make the statement without qualification that the Agency could continue operation of every existing project until June 30, 1945, if the limit were raised to $65,000,000. If we add to that $5,000,000 more to take care of possible emergencies I would be quite willing to agree.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, as the Senator said, it is the desire of some individuals to take off the limit entirely, but the committee refused to permit that. Naturally I would not be willing to do so.

In view of the fact that I have been advised that $50,000,000 would be needed to do the work on the same basis as last year, I wonder if the Senator would not be willing to split the difference between $70,000,000 and $75,000,000 and permit the Agency to have what we have been told is necessary to operate approximately the projects in existence today. Will the Senator agree to that?

Mr. TAFT. Seventy million dollars will give them more than they now have. On their own figures it will give them $5,000,000 more than it would take to operate all their projects in the way of schools, child care, hospitals, and recreation until June 30, 1945.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. We were advised that the total cost would be $80,000,000. We were then distinctly told that $23,000,000 of the money had already been allocated, and that they will have no chance to get any of it back. I wish the Senator would agree to split the difference between seventy and seventy-five million dollars, and let us take the matter to conference.

Mr. TAFT. I will be willing to split the difference and agree to $70,000,000 instead of $75,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Why not let us agree to provide $72,000,000, and then after the conferees have looked into the program, if they consider it proper, let them readjust it to $70,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. No; I think $70,000,000 is the limit we should provide. This is one of the Government agencies which is making numerous miscellaneous grants in all directions. The Agency bypasses the States. No one outside the agency passes on who shall receive the money. The program in question is a wholly inadequate one. If an individual who applies makes a hit with the Federal Works Agency he receives the grant. If someone applies whom the Agency does not like, he does not receive a grant. There is no systematic program for doing this job. The organization was originally the W. P. A., which would like to have some excuse to continue through the war and possibly revive itself during the post-war period. That is what, in my opinion, is behind this constant expansion of Federal grants which were not intended in the original Lanham Act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the interest of peace and harmony I shall ask my friend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to agree to the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and let us insert the sum of $70,000,000 in the amendment. Will the Senator agree to that?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is that satisfactory to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, Mr. President, that is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment now pending carries in line 13 the figure "$65,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment offered on behalf of the committee, so as to insert "$70,000,000" in place of "$65,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the amendment is modified accordingly.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 8, in line 22, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wonder if while we are on this paragraph the Senator would permit the offering of one or two other amendments?

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely. Does the Senator propose amendments to the same paragraph?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in lines 13 and 14, on page 8, and also in lines 16 and 17, on page 9, it is stated that the Lanham Act money is "to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941." It is a long time since we referred to that declaration of national emergency, and I see no particular reason why we should recur to it or why an appropriation should have an unlimited scope of that sort. It ought to come to a definite end.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that, on page 8, in lines 13 and 14, the words "during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941," be stricken out and that the words "until June 30, 1945" be inserted, so that the provision will be effective for the remainder of this year and for the next fiscal year. I may say that the estimates submitted covered that period of time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I see no objection to making that change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on page 9, lines 15, 16, and 17, I move that the words "during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941" be stricken out and that the words "until June 30, 1945" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 69, after line 15, and before the heading "Title III—Judgments and authorized claims," it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay to regular, full-time civilian officers and employees, whose basic compensation is determined on a daily or hourly basis, overtime compensation, pursuant to the joint resolution of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1068), and the act of May 7, 1943 (Public, No. 49, 78th Cong.), on any basis other than at the rate of 1½ times the basic rate of payment for work actually performed by such officers and employees in excess of 40 hours per week, without proration or the use of any formula which has been adopted to determine the daily compensation of per annum officers and employees; it being declared to be and to have been the true intent and meaning of the aforesaid enactments to provide for the payment of the overtime compensation of such employees only upon the basis herein described: *Provided*, That any overtime compensation in excess of the compensation so authorized under the above joint resolution and act which has been paid in reliance upon, and in accordance with, any decision or decisions of the Comptroller General is hereby approved and the Comptroller General shall allow credit therefor in the accounts of the officers accountable therefor, and shall make no charges against any certifying officer because of certification of such excess overtime compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is one other matter I should like to mention with reference to the Federal Lanham Act funds. At the bottom of page 8 there is the proviso that "not more than $7,500,000 of the funds for war public works shall be used for construction of outplant facilities." I myself doubt whether the Lanham Act authorizes the use of any money for outplant facilities. As I understand the matter, outplant facilities are intended to be store buildings for commercial use in areas around war plants where there do not happen to be any other stores.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand the matter, the outplant facilities may sometimes be store buildings in which there may even be theaters. In fact, I have had certain persons write to me that they understood theaters were to be constructed as a part of the outplant facilities, near plants which perhaps are not very close to any town.

I think the policy is very doubtful. I move, as an amendment, that on page 8, in line 20, the figure "$7,500,000", be stricken out, and that the figure "$5,000,000" be inserted, so that the Senator from Tennessee can take the item to conference, in order that the matter may be open to discussion with the House conferees.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to taking it to the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Tennessee a question about title IV.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly. To what page does the Senator from Colorado refer?

Mr. MILLIKIN. To page 93, title IV. That provision constitutes a prohibition against the employment in the Federal service of disloyal persons.

Mr. McKELLAR. Such a provision has been carried in similar bills for a number of years, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. Information has come to me, and I hope it is correct, that the Civil Service Commission has been making quite a study of men charged with disloyal activities who are on the Government pay roll. Information has also come to me, and I hope it is incorrect, that the Civil Service Commission in making that study does not confront such persons with the evidence against them, but that it assembles affidavits and certain statements, listens to verbal statements and, although it withholds those matters from the accused, reaches a judgment on him, and in certain cases makes a recommendation that he is unsuitable for Government employment, without giving him a chance to confront the witnesses against him or to examine the testimony against him or to present evidence in his own behalf. As I stated, I hope that information is incorrect. Let me ask the senior Senator from Tennessee whether anything of that kind is contemplated as a permissible procedure under the title we are discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I take pleasure in saying that no one had it in contemplation; and it is not contemplated by any Member of this body or by any Member of the other body, in my judgment, that any such course shall be taken. I had not heard that it had been taken; but if it has been taken, it should be corrected. Of course, such persons should have the right to confront the witnesses against them before any action is taken.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the information which I have received, but I have questioned the Civil Service Commission with reference to a specific case. I am delighted to have the clarifying statement of the senior Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 4346) was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. BROOKS conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF MONOGRAPH 31, TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: PATENTS AND FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Printing, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 274, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 274) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Patents of the Senate is hereby empowered to have printed for its use 700 additional copies of Monograph 31 of the Temporary National Economic Committee relative to patents and free enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if there is nothing further——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee what the program for tomorrow is.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate will meet tomorrow, and I understand there are several small matters to come up. I myself do not know exactly what they are.

Mr. WHITE. Are any appropriation bills to come up?

Mr. McKELLAR. No appropriation bills are to come up tomorrow. It may be that we shall have a conference report. I hope we shall.

Mr. WHITE. On what bill will the conference report be made?

Mr. McKELLAR. On the first deficiency appropriation bill, which the Senate has passed today.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 29, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 28 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO SIGNAL CORPS

Lt. Col. George Francis Wooley, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1942.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lt. Bidwell Moore, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1943.

TO INFANTRY

Second Lt. Thomas Wilson Sharkey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1941.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. John Metcalf Broderick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

Second Lt. Lyle Marvin Lappin, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from January 19, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou by whom we come to the eternal God, teach us the pathway of prayer; so often the clouds interrupt the vision and we fail to reach the mount. Thy inspiration is not confined to temples made with hands; we praise Thee that the doors of communion and fellowship are more than we can number or understand. Graciously accept us and breathe upon us Thy spirit of brotherhood. Do Thou acknowledge us to be one with the Father and grant that weakness may be made strength according to Thy promise.

Dear Lord, in this shuddering earth with its deep-rooted evils, arm us with the truth that Thy spiritual forces are infinitely more potent than that which is beheld by mortal eyes. Allow not our trust to collapse in the recoil of inaction. With Thy timeless truth stealing into the hearts of men, O take them out of their old tragic ways and lift them above themselves. Let plans for self and comfort be crucified on the cross of conviction and use their lives fully from dawn to sunset in the intensity of a mighty faith. Help us all to seek the road which the Lord hath ordained for them who tread the mill of sacrifice and service. In the name of our Saviour who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a document entitled "Outline of Problems of Demobilization in California," by the California State Chamber of Commerce. It will take over three pages. I have an estimate from the Public Printer in the amount of $135. I ask that this be included in the RECORD, notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article on prices of gold and silver in foreign markets induce confidence in United States advance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on four different matters, and in the first to include an editorial which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on March 17 of this year entitled "Light on O. P. A."; in the second to include an article that appeared in the Pilot, published in the city of Boston, Mass., on March 18 of this year, entitled "After They Leave the Fox Holes"; in the third to include an article that appeared in the Jeffersonian, published in Boston, Mass., entitled "Democrat of the Month," which refers to Mr. Eugene T. Kinnally, secretary to majority leader, Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK; and in the fourth to include a speech that I delivered before the Chelsea Scientist Emergency Council, Chelsea High School auditorium, Chelsea, Mass., on March 22.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous-consent requests: One, to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News and also to include a letter from the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, as well as affidavits and letters from the California Cattlemen's Association, all of it on the subject matter of coercion which has been brought up on the floor recently in the last bill presented. The Government Printing Office has estimated that this will cost $105. Notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer, I ask that this be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have here an advertisement which says, "Buy All You Want. Rationing Suspended. No Coupons. Buy Your Favorite Roasts, Steaks, Cuts, Prime Commercial Beef, Sirloin Steaks, 39 Cents a Pound. Round Steak, 35 Cents a Pound. Short Rib Roast, 29 Cents a Pound." In addition, there is listed almost every kind of meat. No points are necessary. No black market prevails.

Do not become jubilant about this, however, because it does not come from a paper in the United States. It is from a Canadian paper. I rise to ask the question: If Canada, under efficient management, can do this with meat and shoes, and can give their motorists a better break in gasoline allowances than we get in the United States, and when we further consider that much of these products come from the United States; when are we going to see an end to administrative muscle-dancing on rationing in the United States, and some common sense put into the program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Inside Your Congress," written by the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, former Member from the Third Congressional District of Indiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF HIDES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pressed to take the floor today not to alarm this House but to point out to the individual Members that before long your constituents are going barefooted, and I say that because 4,000,000 hides——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the weather will be warm soon.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is all right, but 4,000,000 hides are necessary to make the shoes which must be

manufactured this next year. The civilian and military quotas are short that number, yet there are 83,000,000 head of cattle roaming around the country at this time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I suggest you take that proposition of going without shoes up with the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I just want to warn the gentleman that his constituents are going barefooted if something is not done very soon. Besides, Madam Perkins has nothing to do with this. The New Deal has made it impossible for ranchers to sell their cattle. What the Government should immediately advocate is the slaughter of at least 4,000,000 head so that shoe manufacturers can go ahead meeting the leather and shoe requirements of the Nation. American soldiers and American civilians must have shoes to win the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] with regard to the prices of food in Canada, this morning I received a letter from a sister of mine who has lived in Quebec for a number of years.

She says in part:

> We feel little or no effect from the war. Rationing has not reached us. What has become of the American spirit? With the things we hear over the radio and read in the Canadian newspapers, we wonder what has become of the great American spirit that I know used to predominate in Congress.
>
> Why doesn't any one or group arise and demand an explanation for the President's stubborn refusal to recognize de Gaulle who represents the democratic spirit of France. Would the President dare admit to the world that he has completely sold out America. Who is controlling the radio and the news. Why does the President seek to destroy nazi-ism in Germany and establish fascism in France and Italy?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], because I think I can answer his question.

The confusion created by those in charge of the administration of our food problems steadily increases until now it appears that the whole matter is getting out of hand. While we have more cattle in this country than ever before, War Food Administration officials now decree there is to be a further curtailment in meat for civilian consumption during the next 3 months. At the same time many carloads of canned goods, eggs, cabbage, and other foods in the hands of the Government are being given away free and will continue to be distributed to prevent deterioration. Carload after carload is being given free to various institutions throughout the country without requiring ration points for the same. We are to be given a little more butter, probably because it was admitted in testimony before a Senate committee within the past week that 35,000,000 pounds of butter had spoiled and must be renovated.

All this proves the necessity for placing all the food activities of the Government under one responsible head, as is provided in the Fulmer bill and the Jenkins bill, as advocated by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee.

There is pending before the Committee on Agriculture a bill sponsored by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee and introduced by the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS, H. R. 4275, which should be immediately considered and passed because it will remedy this whole situation of Government food surpluses. The Phillips bill will give authority with responsibility for the orderly distribution of these Government food surpluses and will tend to bring order out of the chaos being created.

1942 MODEL AUTOMOBILES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, some 2 years ago, in the name of the war effort the sale of automobiles was forbidden and thousands of automobiles were placed in what amounted to dead storage. The argument was advanced that no one could predict the course of the war and the possible necessity of using this potential reservoir of mobile transportation in the war effort.

Months have gone by now and the Government apparently has so many jeeps on hand that it has even permitted some of them to be sold to private purchasers. Meanwhile, almost forgotten in the preoccupation of our Government officials with the thousand and one details of the war effort, the 1942 model automobile with its deteriorating rubber tires reposes unseen and unheard in thousands of warehouses and on musty floors above once-exciting show rooms in every city in the land.

And simultaneously, thousands of used cars, some of them scarcely fit for further use, are being sold to a public clamoring for means of transportation. Certainly it is clear that we shall not need these cars in the war effort. They should be released to the public.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Idaho Statesman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by me last Saturday night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on America's Answer to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON, MASS., FIRST TOWN IN UNITED STATES TO BE NAMED AFTER GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article from a Boston paper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House, including general debate on the naval construction bill; but not its consideration under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include

therein a letter which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 26.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 465, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee to be known as the "Committee on Post-war Military Policy," to be composed of 21 Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker as follows: 7 members of the Committee on Military Affairs, 7 members of the Committee on Navy Affairs, and 7 Representatives who are not members of either such committee. A vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to investigate all matters relating to the post-war military requirements of the United States; to gather information, plans, and suggestions from informed sources with respect to such military requirements; to study the plans and suggestions received; and to report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) from time to time during the present Congress the results of findings made and conclusions reached.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the committee (1) may employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, and (2) may request such information and assistance (including the services of personnel) from departments and independent agencies of the Government as it deems necessary.

(b) The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, in carrying out this resolution, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 1, line 3, strike out "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-three", and in line 6, strike out "seven" and insert "nine."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and pending that I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a resolution to set up a select committee to study one thing and one thing alone. That is, the post-war military affairs of this country. About 6 weeks ago this House set up a special committee known as a House Special Committee on Post-War Policy and Planning. That resolution was broad enough to cover every phase of the post-war problems which we will be called upon to face. It was broad enough to cover, and did cover, the substance of the resolution that is before you today. But this resolution would take from that committee the one thing, the specific thing, as I say, of post-war military policy. There should not be any misunderstanding about that. When the gentlemen who were sponsoring this resolution were before the Committee on Rules, that question was gone into. The able gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], one of the sponsors of this resolution, made it very plain that that was the objective sought by this study. As chairman of the other select committee that was set up by the House about 6 weeks ago, to which I referred, I want to say that I welcomed this resolution and I am sure the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, also welcomes this resolution because here is a specific technical thing to be considered, and it is of sufficient importance to require the time and the effort and the study of a special or a select committee for that purpose. This resolution as amended calls for the appointment by the Speaker of 23 Representatives of the House, 7 members from the Committee on Military Affairs, and 7 from the Committee on Naval Affairs; and the balance to be made up of Members of the House at large.

Sometimes I wonder if in all of this post-war planning we are not prone to feel that we have won the war and that all we have to do now is to look to the post-war problems. Of course, that is not so. We all realize that we are in the throes of a gigantic, global warfare and that our first objective is to win that war. But it is as equally important for us to consider the problems which will confront the country after the war as it is to win the war, because if we win the war and win the peace, but lose our economic stability, most anything can happen in this country. I think that this committee, which I think you are going to approve here today, together with the committee to which I referred a moment ago on post-war policy and planning, are two of the most important committees that will have been set up by this House.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished friend from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I assume the gentleman in formulating this resolution to appoint Members of the Congress to formulate a program had in mind that this committee would be responsible to the public for its acts and would be at any time called upon to discharge its responsibility, instead of appointing a committee of civilians elsewhere who would not be responsible to the public and therefore would not be responsible for any failure it might make in a program suggested to the Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Quite so, I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina, just as every other committee of the Congress is responsible to the people. And they are the proper persons to be responsible to the people of the country. I shall not detain you longer on this except to say I have great and abiding confidence in the gentlemen who, I understand, will be appointed by the Speaker when this resolution is adopted to carry out this program. I believe they are going to do a good job and I am not going to try to tell them now how to do it because I have enough problems of my own.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the creation of a special committee of 23 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker to formulate, after a study, a military and naval policy for our country after the war. To that extent I am heartily in favor of the resolution, because I think it is the duty of the Congress to formulate the military and naval policies right here in the House and in the Senate. The question, of course, arises, Is it necessary? We have a Committee on Military Affairs and we have a Committee on Naval Affairs, whose functions are to establish such policies and to ascertain the requirements of the Army and Navy and also of the Air Force. I see one main objective for this committee by which it can render a great service to the country. I hope that the Members will concentrate their efforts on a survey as to the feasibility of establishing one single department of national defense after the war. It is probably too late now to put it into effect during the war, and I do not believe it is the function of this committee, because it is a post-war committee, to recommend the establishment of a single department of national defense at the present time. This proposed committee has no legislative powers and can merely recommend measures, not report them to the House. It will also have the right to suggest, if after a careful study it so determines, that there be only one committee in the House on national defense and to do away with the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs and combine them into one great policy committee. That is the general purpose of the present resolution. Today our commanders in chief, commanders like General MacArthur, in his area, command not alone the infantry and artillery and the Army units but the Navy and Air Force as well. It applies to other generals, to General Eisenhower in England, who commands the entire British Army and our own Army in England and the Air Force and Navy as well.

Taking that as a precedent, it seems to me we should have one single committee in the House on national defense, and one single department in the Government. I

believe that is inevitable, because it is logical and sound and has proven to be almost a necessity in this war.

I hope this committee will have that as one of its main objectives, and if it is found desirable, to make such a report to the Congress. I hope the committee will not feel that it is a necessity at this time to consider the question of putting into effect a post-war universal military service law. That should go over until the war has been won. Then the conditions will be entirely different. We will not then be in the midst of war, in the hysteria of war. The question of imposing upon the American people universal military service and the drafting of some 2,000,000 boys annually, should, therefore, be delayed until the war has been won and we know exactly what the peace situation is in the world. We are fighting to crush militarism. We are fighting to crush the German Army and the Japanese Navy and all the armed forces of aggressor nations. Therefore, we should not rush in now to build up a huge peacetime armament until we know the conditions in the world after victory has been achieved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I think we will all agree on one thing in the House, Republicans and Democrats, that we will require a large navy even in time of peace, as a guaranty of world peace. We are all united and determined on winning the war. We do not know whether it will be won in a year or 2 years, but we are confident that we will win the war, and we probably agree that we must maintain a large navy afterward. I would like to have us maintain a Navy greater than the British Navy, or greater than any single navy in the world. I would like to see us maintain an air force greater than any air force in the world. But when it comes to having a huge Army, when it comes to copying the warlike nations of Europe who have become involved in one war after another, due in large part to their militarism, when it comes to invoking that precedent of universal military service upon which European militarism is based, I hope it will go over until after the war. Of course, this committee can only recommend. Its recommendations must come back to the Naval Affairs Committee and to the Military Affairs Committee for their determination, and the Congress in the last analysis, will be the judges of what military policy will be best for the country.

In the Rules Committee, this morning we had the head of the O. W. I., Mr. Elmer Davis, before us. As a minority member I want to say that he made a fine impression, at least, upon me, as he answered our questions openly and fully. I asked him if there was any conflict between the Office of Strategic Services and the Office of War Information and he claimed there was not. Then I asked him why it was that the morale branch of the Army is headed by a major general—a man of the highest character, whom I have known for over 40 years, a man who comes from my old election district; but a man who never had 1 day's service in the Army in any war—and why on the other hand such a gallant soldier as William J. Donovan, one of the heroes of the last war, who won a Medal of Honor, and was a fighting colonel of the famous Fighting 69th Irish Regiment from New York, should, as the head of the Office of Strategic Services, whose functions are world wide in scope, be only a brigadier general. If the head of the morale division of the Army, a former civilian, without any war service, is made a major general, then Bill Donovan ought to be a lieutenant general. Who is responsible for this discrimination? I propose to ask the Military Affairs Committee to look into the situation and give us the facts.

I would like to know from some of these military experts around here why he has not been promoted not only to a major general but possibly to a lieutenant general. I am afraid that this proposed committee which deals with post-war problems will not be allowed to investigate that. We ought to get the facts now and not have to wait until the war is over.

Mr. Speaker, this committee is purely for post-war requirements, and to establish a post-war policy. I do not think it conflicts with the committee which the House recently created, headed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] as chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself 2 additional minutes. I do not think it conflicts with that Committee on Post-war Economic Planning and Policy except perhaps in one instance, and I am sure our committee would have no objection to their investigating that—the needs of the Army and the Navy for surplus war supplies and for warehouses to take care of their requirements for strategic metals, stock piles, and such after the war. It is only in that instance that I see any conflict at all between this committee and the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. It is a small detail and there is no reason why the proposed committee should not study the requirements of the Army and the Navy so that they might have all the surplus war supplies and the strategic materials they need for defensive purposes, and stock piles and warehouses and other buildings that may be necessary.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree that this committee is one which, in my opinion, should be established, and there is no conflict between this committee and the Colmer committee, which I think was another wise move. I wonder if the gentleman does not agree with me that we should complete this triangle by passing House Resolution No. 28, which I introduced on the opening day of this Congress, to provide for post-war planning from the standpoint of the peace, and the standpoint of international relations and domestic problems as they interweave with each other after the war.

Mr. FISH. I want to answer the gentleman on that. I do not think they are on parallel grounds. This has to do with establishing a military and naval policy. Why should not the Congress establish the military and naval policy of the country? In fact, it is their duty to do that. If the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee do not do it, certainly this committee should do it.

Now when it comes to peace, it is not the function of the Congress of the United States to negotiate a peace treaty. That is purely the function of the Executive branch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

That is the function of the Executive branch of the Government alone. Further, I want to say to my distinguished colleague, with whom I generally agree, that I am not at all certain whether we would accomplish anything by discussing peace terms at the present time, or by trying to solve the peace problems before we have won the war. Until you know the war and peace aims of the Soviet Government and the British Empire, it seems to me it would be a waste of time trying to formulate any peace terms of our own.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the gentleman feel that perhaps the British Government and the Russian Government would also like to know more about the peace aims and the war aims of our Government?

Mr. FISH. The Congress of the United States cannot declare a policy regarding peace terms. They have passed the Fulbright resolution stating they are willing to cooperate internationally to try to promote world peace; that is as far as the Congress can go.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a beautiful general theory.

Mr. FISH. That is about all there is to it.

Mr. MUNDT. But that does not get down to details, does not get down to principles of a policy.

Mr. FISH. How can you do it?

Mr. MUNDT. And the peace which is to be written is to be written with the advice and consent of the Congress, especially the Senate. There is nothing in the Constitution to imply that peace terms are to be made except after confirmation of the treaty.

Mr. FISH. I wish I could agree with the gentleman. I wish Congress had some power in negotiating the peace terms, but it has no such power—the President of the United States negotiates the peace terms under the Constitution.

Mr. MUNDT. With the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. FISH. And it must be ratified by the Senate. We cannot initiate it.

I asked a very simple question today in the Committee on Rules of Mr. Davis, head of the O. W. I. I asked if in his propaganda broadcasts he included the

Atlantic Charter, I asked him if the Atlantic Charter was still alive. The Atlantic Charter was supposed to be the basis for peace terms, and yet Mr. Davis did not know whether it was still alive or not. Evidently the Atlantic Charter is dead already. This to me is a most pathetic situation. We announced a peace policy based on the Atlantic Charter. The President had a right to announce it. He had planned it, but now it is practically repudiated and no one in executive authority upholds it anymore. How can we in Congress proclaim a peace policy when the very one proclaimed by the President is already cast aside even before the war is over and is evidently a corpse?

Mr. MUNDT. Maybe that is just another argument for setting up some such post-war planning commission as I have in mind, not to initiate peace negotiations but to establish principles and policies on which this country will cooperate with the rest of the world after the war.

Mr. FISH. We have already made a statement of general principles. I do not think we can go any further than the Fulbright resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman from New York give us specific evidence that the Atlantic Charter is not still alive?

Mr. FISH. I hope very much it is alive, but I have been trying to find it, I have been looking for it for the last 6 months, but cannot find it. I am, therefore, inclined to believe that it has either been buried and is actually dead or is hidden away somewhere. The gentleman asks for specific evidence; I will give him some.

The Atlantic Charter stated in so many words that small, independent nations should be protected against aggression, and should be allowed to determine their own form of government, and that they should not lose any of their territory. That is practically what the Atlantic Charter said. We find, however, according to the press—because we can get no information in Congress on our diplomatic commitments—that agreements have been entered into that Poland is to sacrifice a part of her territory. Of all countries, Poland. War was declared in 1939 on the basis that Poland was to be protected in its territorial integrity and national independence. That was the official reason given for going to war against Germany, the aggressor nation. Under the Atlantic Charter Poland, the Baltic states, and the Balkans were all to be protected in their sovereignty and their independence against aggression. Now we find, according to the press, at least, because none of us here are in the confidence of those who attended the Cairo, Moscow, and Teheran Conferences, that these small, sovereign, and independent nations are to be sacrificed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McMURRAY. If I may, I wish to refer briefly to the Atlantic Charter. It was promulgated by the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States. The President of the United States has the right and the duty to state what our foreign policy is to be with, of course, the advice and consent of the Senate, if treaties are involved, as was brought out by the gentleman. They said first that their countries, that is Great Britain and the United States, seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other; and, second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. There is no statement in the charter that there will be no territorial changes, but "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."

Mr. FISH. That is exactly what I said. It was a declaration of policy made by the President of the United States and Mr. Churchill on board a ship somewhere at sea 2 or 3 months before we got in the war, I think in August of 1941. Since then the Soviet Government ratified it, but since ratifying it, the Soviet Government is demanding a part of Poland and apparently is to have the Baltic nations and probably some of the Balkans as well.

Mr. McMURRAY. But has the President of the United States or the Secretary of State made any statement on those claims?

Mr. FISH. The Soviet Government has publicly stated its intentions in defiance of the Atlantic Charter. Has the President of the United States or any official of the State Department so far repudiated the Soviet claims and stated our policy, that we did not propose that these small independent nations shall be partitioned or despoiled of their territory?

Mr. McMURRAY. Nor has the President approved it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

MILITARY RADIO INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the determination of a proper post-war military policy for the country, consideration should be given to the question that has arisen as to who should handle military radio intelligence, the Army and the Navy, or the Federal Communications Commission.

This question thrust itself upon Congress during the hearings on the appropriations for fiscal 1945 for the Federal Communications Commission before the Appropriations Subcommittee for Independen Offices. There was brought to the attention of the committee the following letter by Admiral William D. Leahy for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to the Secretary of the Navy, under date of February 1, 1943:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In response to your memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated September 11, 1942, on the subject of responsibility for the conduct of security of military communication activities, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have had made a thorough and comprehensive study of the problems referred to therein in which full consideration has been given to the views of the military and naval commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence. A summary of the findings is given in the following paragraphs:

In general, radio intelligence is the method of determining the enemy's plans and dispositions through observation of his radio communications. The facilities used for this are also used to assist our own forces through monitoring of communications channels to enforce security standards and to render assistance to our own craft.

Both the Army and Navy are engaged in radio intelligence and related activities. In addition, the Federal Communications Commission has set up an elaborate system of its own which is engaged in—

(a) the location of enemy units at sea and abroad;

(b) the interception of enemy army, navy, and diplomatic traffic;

(c) the location of clandestine stations;

(d) the giving of bearing aids to lost planes;

(e) the maintenance of a marine watch at distress frequencies; and

(f) the monitoring of military radio circuits. These activities of the Federal Communications Commission are constantly expanding and are a substantial drain upon available material and personnel.

Radio-intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission tend to be less and less useful as the art progresses. This is due to integration into proper radio-intelligence systems of large quantities of secret military information accumulated through special processes by the armed forces, including exchanges of military information with our allies, knowledge of present and proposed disposition of forces, and other special information which for obvious reasons cannot be disseminated to an agency such as the Federal Communications Commission.

Moreover, information obtained by the Federal Communications Commission through its own radio-intelligence activities is not, in the military sense, secure, due to inherent tendencies toward publicity of Federal Communications Commission activities, use of nonsecure methods of reporting and correlation, and the necessarily close relationship of the Federal Communications Commission military intelligence activity with other phases of the agency's work.

Because of the essential differences between military and Federal Communications Commission standards and methods it has not been possible to integrate their information, with the result that the attempted duplication by the Federal Communications Commission of work that is being more effectively done by the military has in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence.

In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasi-military radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission and confining such activities to the Army and Navy.

Since the Army's present need for personnel and equipment in the field of radio intelligence is greater than that of the Navy, all of the radio-intelligence facilities of the Federal Communications Commission should

forthwith be transferred to the Army entirely. The personnel of the Federal Communications Commission heretofore engaged in radio intelligence should be made available initially as civilian employees of the Army, pending decision by the Army as to which shall be placed in military status, which replaced by military personnel, and which would be best retained in the Army as civilian employees.

The foregoing conclusions are supported by the views of the Army and Navy commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff therefore request the Secretaries of War and Navy to join in a recommendation to the President that he transfer to the Army personnel and equipment now used by the Federal Communications Commission in the field of radio intelligence. A proposed Executive order is enclosed.

From the standpoint of the present problem the promulgation of this Executive order would leave the Federal Communications Commission in the radio field, with the responsibility for monitoring, processing, and disseminating foreign voice, news, and propaganda broadcasts (its Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service), the monitoring and inspection of stations licensed under the Communications Act of 1934, all necessary licensing procedures, including revocation and suspension, and the institution of prosecutions of licensed stations and operators for violations of treaty, statute, or regulations.

The Army and Navy (in accordance with divisions of function between themselves) would have full and exclusive responsibility for the conduct of military radio intelligence as described in the present report.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM D. LEAHY,
Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of Staff to the Commander
in Chief of the Army and Navy
(For the Joint Chiefs of Staff).

PROPOSED EXECUTIVE ORDER

TRANSFERRING RADIO INTELLIGENCE FUNCTIONS TO THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

By virtue of the authority vested in me by title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, approved December 18, 1941, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. All functions, powers, and duties of the Federal Communications Commission in the field of radio intelligence and particularly in the conduct of direction-finding activities; the location of enemy radio transmissions abroad and at sea; the interception of radio traffic of foreign countries (excluding voice broadcasting); the detection, location, and suppression of clandestine or illegal stations, both abroad and within the limits of the United States, its Territories and possessions and the areas occupied by its armed forces; the giving of radio and direction-finding navigational aids to vessels and aircraft; the monitoring of United States Army and Navy communications circuits and the maintenance of distress-frequency watches are transferred to the Departments of War and Navy in accordance with distribution of functions established between them.

2. All records and property (including radio transmitting and receiving equipment) and all personnel of the Federal Communications Commission used primarily in the performance and administration of the functions transferred by this order are transferred to the War Department for use in the performance and administration of functions transferred by this order, but any personnel so transferred who are found by the War Department to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the performance and administration of such functions, powers, and duties shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government or separated from the service. So far as possible, personnel transferred who are found qualified therefor shall be placed in a military status.

3. So much of the unexpended balance of the appropriations or other funds available, including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, to the Federal Communications Commission in the exercise of functions transferred by this order as the Director of the Budget, with the approval of the President, shall determine, shall be transferred to the War Department for use in connection with the exercise of functions so transferred. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations or other funds prior to the transfer.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February —, 1943.*

It was then brought to the attention of the committee that on February 8, 1943, the letter of Admiral Leahy and the proposed Executive order were transmitted to the President by a joint letter of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, reading as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We join with the United States Chiefs of Staff in recommending that you promulgate the attached Executive order transferring from the Federal Communications Commission to the Department of War certain radio-intelligence functions.

Through radio-intelligence activities, the military forces of the United States and our allies obtain military information of the utmost importance. Radio intelligence is an important military weapon.

Participation by the Federal Communications Commission in radio intelligence should be discontinued, because:

Since radio intelligence develops information as to the movements and dispositions of the enemy, it is essential, for reasons of coordination and security, that there be full military control;

Since the responsibility for military action rests with the armed forces, the responsibility for obtaining the technical information governing that action must also be in the armed forces;

Military activities have been hampered by severe shortages of trained personnel and critical equipment essential to radio intelligence.

The Secretary of the Navy, on September 11, 1942, requested the Joint Chiefs of Staff to study the problem of responsibility and security of radio intelligence. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have made a thorough and comprehensive study, and their response, based on that study, is attached hereto. They, as well as the responsible military commanders in the field, are of the belief that radio intelligence, the location of clandestine stations, the supervision of military communications security and related activities must, in their very nature, be under the sole control of the military forces.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter from Admiral Leahy recommending this action.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy.
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. James Lawrence Fly, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, during questioning by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], sought to have the committee refrain from asking questions on the matter on the grounds that it was a closed subject, the President having declined to take the action requested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretaries of the Army and Navy. When the committee, however, indicated that it did desire to consider the matter in relation to the advisability of making appropriations, in view of the statement by the Chiefs of Staff that duplication of functions was involved as well as the security of military intelligence, Mr. Fly asked that the record include the following letter by the President:

SEPTEMBER 7, 1943.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in response to your letter of February 8, 1943, signed by you and Secretary Stimson proposing an Executive order transferring the radio intelligence functions of the Federal Communications Commission to the War and Navy Departments. Your suggestion has been given careful study by the staff of the Executive Offices. After full consideration I have determined that the transfer should not be made.

The work of the Radio Intelligence Division of the Commission was founded upon the long existing radio-monitoring functions carried on by the Commission as a part of its essential peacetime work. The need for the expansion of these functions was brought to my attention prior to our entry into the war and I approved the general set-up. Expansion has been made to meet the wartime needs of the Commission itself and of other agencies of the Government.

The Radio Intelligence Division serves important wartime needs of several of the civilian Government agencies in the radio intelligence field, including the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Censorship, the Bureau of Economic Warfare, the Weather Bureau, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and others. In addition, I understand that the Commission stands ready to perform for the Army and Navy such services as are expressly requested by them. The Commission and its Chairman have expressed to me their desire to cooperate with the Army and Navy in every possible way.

It is my desire that matters of the kind presented by the present proposal be dealt with at the outset by conferences between the interested agencies. If differences should occur, the matter should be reviewed by the Board of War Communications, which is the responsible interdepartmental body I have charged with the responsibility in the field of wartime communications.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. Fly also stated that the President had before him a document which he regarded as "of great significance," when he acted, and which he asked also be placed in the record, which follows:

APRIL 6, 1943.

SECRETARY, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C.

Through: Commander G. B. Myers.

1. In compliance with JCS 138/3, dated December 1, 1942, subject: Security of ciphers, and in accordance with the allocation of Government agencies made to the Army and Navy security sections, respectively, the following summary of findings at the Federal Communications Commission is submitted:

(a) Cryptographic security—excellent.

(b) Physical security (cryptographic systems)—excellent.

(c) Documentary and information security—excellent.

(d) Qualification of personnel—excellent.

(e) Cooperation was given fully and willingly.

2. In view of the above it is considered that no concern need be felt over communications originating or passed in the Federal Communications Commission at this time.

3. The established contact between Signal Security Service and the Federal Communications Commission will be continued.

EARL F. COOK,
Lieutenant Colonel, Signal Corps
(For the Chief Signal Officer).

In the light of these documents, and especially in the light of the very strong statements in the letters of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretaries of the Army and Navy that their conclusions were based upon studies in the field, it became an inescapable duty of the committee to weigh the evidence for its bearing upon the desirability of making appropriations to the Federal Communications Commission to continue work which the Army and the Navy said duplicated theirs, hampered their activities by reason of "severe shortages of trained personnel and critical equipment" and by its methods "in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence."

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] sought to determine the relationship of these documents by an inquiry on the chronology of them, with the following questions and answers which are from the printed record:

Mr. STARNES. I am wondering about the chronology of this matter. It would seem, as I get it from Mr. WIGGLESWORTH's questions, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff initiated the study and transmitted a letter, or a request, in September 1942.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The request of the investigation was made in September 1942.

Mr. STARNES. And the letter written by Admiral Leahy was in February 1943?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. February 1 of 1943; and the letter of the two Secretaries to the President on February 8 of 1943.

Mr. STARNES. And here comes a subordinate charged with signal work for the Army, in April 1943, with a letter of this kind?

Mr. FLY. Just let me make that clear.

Mr. STARNES. I am just asking the question, not making a statement. I am trying to get clear in my own mind what the chronology is.

Mr. FLY. It is not the chronology that I am getting at; it is this idea of a subordinate. This is a survey made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They requested the Chief Signal Officer to make this survey, and the staff of the Chief Signal Officer made the survey, and the results of that survey were transmitted to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in accordance with that delegation of authority, on behalf of the Chief Signal Officer.

Mr. STARNES. It was pointed out that that letter was written after the Joint Chiefs of Staff had already acted and presented the matter to the President. I am just trying to get the dates straightened out.

Mr. FLY. That is right. But the survey had been in progress since December. It was an extensive survey, and the Joint Chiefs, had they really made any substantial effort to get the facts, could have gotten the facts from the office of the Chief Signal Officer who had made the survey.

Mr. STARNES. And the President did not make any decision in this matter until September 1943, a whole year after the matter was initiated; and the matter was initiated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. FLY. He made a very intensive study of it.

To me, it seemed important to determine whether the Joint Chiefs of Staff had ever changed their minds in the matter, whether they were of the same opinion still, in other words. So I interrogated Mr. Fly on that point and the following exchange took place:

Mr. CASE. Are you able to say whether or not the Joint Chiefs of Staff have ever withdrawn the recommendations made in the letter, which was read by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH?

Mr. FLY. For the record, they made visits to our office periodically and continue to give us this same endorsement.

Mr. CASE. My question was first, are you able to state whether or not the Joint Chiefs of Staff have ever withdrawn the recommendations made in the letter read by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH?

Mr. FLY. I do not suppose one withdraws a request when the matter has been finally disposed of.

Mr. CASE. I am not asking for a comment on it. I am asking you whether you are able to state, whether or not they have ever withdrawn it. Are you able to state that or not?

Mr. FLY. There was no formal withdrawal. I do know that the chief signal officer expressed to me his own feeling that he does not desire to have a transfer made.

Mr. CASE. Then, so far as you know, the Chiefs of Staff have never withdrawn those recommendations?

Mr. FLY. I would not know, but I do not assume there is any occasion for their withdrawing them. They present a formal document to the President and the President disapproves of that and that settles the matter.

Mr. CASE. It makes a difference as to the question of how their judgment stands before the committee.

Mr. WOODRUM. They have acquiesced in it, have cooperated?

Mr. FLY. They surely have.

Mr. STARNES. They would have no choice, however.

Mr. FLY. They have acquiesced.

Mr. STARNES. They must acquiesce because their Commander in Chief has so ordered.

In the light of that evidence and more discussion of the same character, the subcommittee prepared the annual appropriation bill and left out of it the funds the Federal Communications Commission had requested for carrying on the functions which the Army and Navy had said were a duplication and a danger to the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence. That action was approved by the full committee and later by the House. And since that time, I understand, another body has ratified that action.

However, in the meantime a peculiar and interesting incident occurred. On the 29th of February 1944 the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] was about to address the House on a subject pertaining to the Federal Communications Commission. During a call of the House, immediately prior to his speaking, I was called to the telephone room by a long-distance call. I related the incident on the floor of the House in the following language, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day:

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I am a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices, which handles appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission. A very unusual thing happened to me this afternoon. During the call of the House immediately preceding the gentleman's speech I was called by long-distance telephone from Aberdeen, S. Dak., the call being placed by Harvey Jewett, who is the owner or principal owner of a small radio station there and who also happens to be the National Republican committeeman for the State of South Dakota. Mr. Jewett told me that he had a letter which he had received from the head of a broadcasting association of which his station is a member, which asked him to get in touch with me. He read a letter to me over the telephone.

The letter, as nearly as I can recall, said that the writer had been in telephonic communication that morning, the morning of the writing of the letter, with Mr. James L. Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in which Mr. Fly told him that FRANCIS CASE, a Republican from South Dakota, was a member of the committee that was trying to deny the Federal Communications Commission a proper appropriation. The writer of the letter suggested that Mr. Jewett kindly do what he could in the matter and further suggested that a copy of any communications showing what he did in the matter be sent to Mr. Fly in Washington.

Mr. Jewett said that he knew nothing about the matter other than what was in the letter and had called up to find out what the score was. He did not attempt to tell me what I should do but merely asked me what it was all about.

I told Mr. Jewett that it was very interesting that some interesting statements were expected to be made on the floor this afternoon with regard to the Federal Communications Commission and that I hoped that he would send me a copy of the letter. I advised him that the appropriation matter was now before the Senate, that the withholding of the appropriation by the subcommittee, and the House, was taken as an action of the committee in which there was only one member of the subcommittee who opposed it; that the action was taken upon testimony before the committee that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, in writing, had made a specific recommendation to the President, urging on grounds of military security that certain functions of the Federal Communications Commission be transferred to the Army and the Navy; and, that to accomplish that transfer, the subcommittee decided not to recommend appropriations to the Federal Communications Commission for those functions.

In some paragraph or sentence of the letter read to me the suggestion was made that the reason that the committee was acting was because of some misleading information brought before it by the special and select committee. As the RECORD will show at the time that appropriation was under consideration here on the floor and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts knows, the action of the subcommittee was taken on the basis of a specific recommendation by the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported by a field study, by the opinions of the theater commanders, and endorsed and transmitted to the President by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in a strongly worded letter accompanied by the text of a proposed Executive order.

I have made this statement, under the indulgence of the gentleman from Massachusetts, because this incident happened within the hour, and when the gentleman spoke of political intimidation, it occurred to me that this attempt to get the owner of a small station in South Dakota, who happens to be the

national committeeman of my party in my State, to influence my position in an appropriation matter taken with Members of both parties on what we deemed to be its merits, was perhaps a little evidence in point.

I did not catch clearly the name of the writer of the letter nor the name of his firm or agency. I did not presume to mention them. Imagine my surprise and interest, therefore, Mr. Speaker, on the 7th of March, to receive a letter from Mr. John W. Boler, president of the North Central Broadcasting System, Inc., stating that he had received "an air-mail special delivery envelope, postmarked Washington, D. C.," containing a copy of what he termed my "speech to Congress." Of course, I did not send the RECORD to Mr. Boler. I had neither his name nor address at the time. Who identified him as the party who had asked Mr. Jewett to contact me in behalf of restoring the appropriations? Your guess is as good as mine.

The letter asked that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I understand that, without waiting to find out whether I would place it in the RECORD, it was circularized generally to Members of the House and to at least one broadcasting magazine with a request that it be printed. Regardless of that, here it is and my reply:

NORTH CENTRAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
St. Paul, Minn., March 4, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received an air mail special delivery envelope postmarked Washington, D. C., this morning with no return address or other identification which contained a copy of your speech to Congress on February 29, 1944. From its contents, it is very evident that you, with some other Congressmen, are using the Federal Communications Commission as a political football.

I request that this communication be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because statements which you have made and interpretations of my letter and contact with you were misconstrued, and therefore your statements were false and misleading.

James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, did not call me and did not call Harvey Jewett, National Republican committeeman, and solicit our sympathy or support.

Being the licensee of two radio stations and the operator of a regional network, I have business with the Federal Communications Commission, and it was I who called Chairman James Lawrence Fly regarding business that I have with the Federal Communications Commission, which I have the occasion to do very often.

The only statements that ever get before Congress, or that ever have obtained just consideration by Congress or the House Select Committee investigating the F. C. C., are statements, innuendos, and derogatory accusations hurled at James Lawrence Fly and the Federal Communications Commission. The House Select Committee never allowed anyone to appear before the committee in an open meeting that had any statement to make favorable to the Federal Communications Commission, the Commissioners, or its Chairman. Congressman Cox, and the New York attorney whom the committee hired, appeared prejudiced against the Federal Communications Commission from the beginning, and their resignation is proof of something or other.

As a voter, I have the right to contact a personal acquaintance and voter in the State of South Dakota—your State—and ask him to express his views as a voter to you. However, you choose to call it intimidation, instead of investigating further.

You say that your action, or the committee's action taken to withhold the appropriation to the Federal Communications Commission was based wholly on the recommendations of the joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, which was sent to the President with a strongly worded letter. As I recall, the House Select Committee spent a considerable amount of time interviewing members of the Army and Navy, and many attempts were made by the House Select Committee to get the Army and Navy to make certain statements which apparently had political implications, which were aired by Congressman Cox in the press and all the trade publications.

I, for one, am personally of the opinion that in the interest of public service, convenience, and necessity, and in the interest of this democracy, that radio functions should remain under the jurisdiction of one agency, the Federal Communications Commission. There isn't any reason why this agency cannot perform its duties in the best interest of the war effort in cooperation with the Army and Navy as well as any and all other agencies are doing, and I am confident there are many others who share the same opinion.

I have tried for months, and consistently, to get your House Select Committee to permit me to appear and allow me to testify as to our experience with the Federal Communications Commission and as to what the Federal Communications Commission has done for the several hundred small and independent radio station operators in the United States. Chairman Cox and Mr. Garey, however, saw fit not to permit me to appear.

Radio is my business, and we look toward the Federal Government agency that necessarily must exist to guide and direct the licensing of our broadcast stations in the United States. The listening public and the voters should not permit you, or any other Congressman, to use this branch of the Government as a political football, which you are doing, and I intend not to permit it if I can contribute anything toward that cause.

I object to your speech to Congress, placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement embodying comments which I have made and the contact of a friend of mine in your State as a means of hurling another blow at the Federal Communications Commission and call it "intimidation of our good Congressmen representing 'we the people'." We have the right, I believe, to contact our Congressmen and tell them how we feel and how we would like them to vote and represent us in Congress, as that's what we send you there for. Therefore, you are not being intimidated. The Federal Communications Commission did not solicit political support and did not solicit my intervention or contact with you and never has requested any such support. I want this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that every Congressman will know it.

I would be an ingrate, to say the least, if I ignored the calumny heaped upon the already much-maligned Mr. Fly in return for the inestimable service he has rendered hundreds of small independent radio stations. I may not agree with everything Mr. Fly has done, but an honest investigation of his record will reveal, not a dictator seeking to control broadcasting, but a gentleman anxious that justice be meted out to the small, as well as the large radio stations. Therefore, I respectfully request that this letter be given consideration before Congress to erase the black mark created by your misinterpretation of my request of Mr. Jewett.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN W. BOLER,
President, North Central Broadcasting System, Inc.

cc James Lawrence Fly.

To that letter from Mr. Boler, I replied as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1944.

Mr. JOHN W. BOLER,
President, North Central Broadcasting System, Inc., St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. BOLER: I have received your letter of March 4, which you request be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will be very glad to place this letter in the RECORD, if I may also place in the RECORD the letter which you wrote to Mr. Jewett—which was the basis of his telephone call to me.

You are quite mistaken in thinking that I want to use the F. C. C. as a political football. I have not the slightest desire to do that—I would say that three motives are controlling in my attitude on this whole matter, viz:

First, to approve a proper appropriation for the proper functions of the Federal Communications Commission. No more and no less.

Second, to guard against any tendency within or without the Federal Communications Commission to permit or encourage it to gain any control over the radio stations of the country that would be inconsistent with free speech.

Third, to avoid appropriating money to the Federal Communications Commission to carry on activities that would impair the effective prosecution of the war.

I am not a member of the House select committee and have very little acquaintance with its activity or the evidence which it has taken. I have nothing whatsoever to do with its procedure.

I do not question your sincerity when you say: "I, for one, am personally of the opinion that in the interest of public service, and necessity, and in the interest of this democracy, that radio functions should remain under the jurisdiction of one agency, the Federal Communications Commission."

You make that statement in relation to my statement that our Appropriations subcommittee took its action to withhold a certain appropriation to the Federal Communications Commission on the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Navy, which was sent to the President with a strongly worded action. And action was so taken. And, I really believe that if you were in our position, with the same evidence before you, that you would have agreed with us.

Let me quote these sentences from the letter to the President, signed jointly by the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, which said:

"Participation by the Federal Communications Commission in radio intelligence should be discontinued, because: Since radio intelligence develops information as to the movements and dispositions of the enemy, it is essential, for reasons of coordination and security, that there be full military control. Since the responsibility for military action rests with the armed forces, the responsibility for obtaining the technical information governing that action must also be in the armed forces."

And further, that—

"* * * The Joint Chiefs of Staff have made a thorough and comprehensive study, and their response, based on that study, is attached hereto. They, as well as the re-

sponsible military commanders in the field are of the belief that radio intelligence, the location of clandestine stations, the supervision of military communications security and related activities must, in their very nature, be under the sole control of the military forces."

The recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, signed by Admiral William D. Leahy, as Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, said:

"Because of the essential differences between military and Federal Communications Commission standards and methods it has not been possible to integrate their information, with the result that the attempted duplication by the Federal Communications Commission of work that is being more effectively done by the military has in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence."

Now, I am sure that you did not know that and that you would not presume to place your opinion in the matter above that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the theater commanders based upon actual studies in the field, any more than would I.

Moreover, I feel confident that you with millions of other Americans, do not want the Appropriations Committee spending money for duplicate activities if we know it—and particularly, if that duplication "endangers the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence." It would be bad enough if it were harmless.

With this information, you may prefer to revise your letter of March 4, before it is placed in the RECORD. If so, will you kindly send me the copy you wish placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with the copy of your letter to Mr. Jewett.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

And to my letter, I received the following reply:

NORTH CENTRAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
St. Paul, Minn., March 14, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: Thank you for your letter of March 8 and the information contained therein.

In view of the fact that it is my plan to be in Washington on Friday, March 17, I would like the opportunity to talk with you personally in further detail regarding this subject.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BOLER,
President, North Central
Broadcasting System, Inc.

On Friday, March 17, Mr. Boler called me by telephone, said that he was in Washington, and would like to come in Saturday morning, the 18th. He did. We had an interesting conversation for more than an hour, during which Mr. Boler stated that he had looked into the matter further since coming to Washington and still desired to have his letter placed in the RECORD.

Of course, I said to Mr. Boler that nowhere in my remarks in the House would he find any statement or even insinuation that Mr. Fly had called him on the telephone. Nevertheless, I pointed out, something must have come up to bring the subject of appropriations into their conversation and to bring my name into the picture in that connection.

Mr. Boler stated that he had called Mr. Fly on other matters, that he had asked Mr. Fly how things were going for the Federal Communications Commission, or something to that effect, and whether there was any way in which he could be of service to them. That brought out the subject of the reduction or prospective reduction in appropriations, according to Mr. Boler, and after the telephone conversation was over he looked up a list of the membership of the Appropriations Committee which he had on his desk, discovered that a Member of the House from South Dakota was on the committee, and accordingly wrote Mr. Jewett, a member of his broadcasting agency with a station in South Dakota.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to Mr. Boler that I was not a member of the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission, nor did I have access to their files, nor had I followed their hearings, nor had I considered any evidence other than that which came before the appropriations subcommittee handling F. C. C. appropriations.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to Mr. Boler that the action had been taken by a majority of the committee, and ratified by the House, while in his letter to Mr. Jewett he had singled me out as having opposed "allowing the Commission a proper budget," and wondered how he could or would have done that had not Mr. Fly brought my name into their telephone conversation.

To refresh our memories on that point, and also to show how closely my report of the letter read to me on the telephone corresponded to the actual letter, I then read to him the pertinent paragraphs from the letter itself, which follows:

NORTH CENTRAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
St. Paul., Minn., February 26, 1944.

Mr. HARVEY JEWETT,
Aberdeen Broadcast Co.,
Aberdeen, S. Dak.

DEAR HARVEY: While talking with Mr. Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, on the phone this morning, I learned that the Appropriations Committee in Congress are trying to knock out a million five hundred thousand dollars from the Federal Communications budget.

This budget is used and badly needed by the Federal Communications Commission to carry on their work in connection with the war effort.

FRANCIS CASE (Republican), South Dakota, is on the Appropriations Committee and to this point has been opposing allowing the Commission a proper budget. From our previous conversations, you will recall that the House select committee under Congressman Cox were carrying on an investigation of the Communications Commission which was very definitely unwarranted and unjustified and which we all opposed. Due to this investigation, I am confident that many Congressmen are confused regarding the operation of the Federal Communications Commission and have been prejudiced against the Commission due to misleading statements made by Cox and his committee.

I would deeply appreciate it if you would write, wire, or phone Congressman CASE and express your views, which I know are in favor of the Federal Communications Commission.

Will you send James Lawrence Fly copies of any correspondence or the details regarding any action you may see fit to take, which I assure you he will appreciate.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BOLER.

As to whether I misconstrued the letter or misinterpreted its intent, inspiration, or misquoted it in any respect, Mr. Speaker, I leave to those who read it. But that is not so important, Mr. Speaker, as the question of whether the country does the right thing about military radio intelligence. It is not the major question to be considered by the special committee that is proposed to be created by the pending resolution, but it is one of the important questions that the committee should consider. Surely it is a question which should be studied carefully and not one which should be left in such a position that members of an Appropriations Committee are charged with bad faith and subjected to unusual approaches if they act affirmatively upon recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretaries of the Army and Navy based, as they stated, upon "a thorough and comprehensive study" supported by "the responsible military commanders in the field."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein certain letters by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Leahy as Chief of Staff for the President, and certain communications between Mr. John W. Boler and myself relative to the operations of the Federal Communications Commission and its bearing upon military security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased that the gentleman from New York is in favor of the resolution, and that he has with one small exception eliminated politics. He had, of course, to bring in the fact that one of his friends, rather, one of his constituents, holds a higher rank than does General Donovan. I feel that General Donovan is an exceptionally capable man and has rendered valuable service, but I understand that the officer to whom the gentleman from New York has referred, who has been appointed and obtained higher rank than General Donovan, is also a very capable man. I have called attention to the fact that we have too many generals. I am sorry the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. MAY], is not here, but I am informed there are from 30,000 to 40,000 more officers than we actually need. I hope he will call that fact to the attention of the Secretary of War; but as to these appointments and granting of commissions, the gentleman from New York, of course, knows that the Secretary of War is a Republican from his own State, and the gentleman from New York ought to have confidence in him because it is claimed

he is a splendid man. Unfortunately, I think he has permitted some things to be done that should not have been done, but not being as reckless in my statements as some of my friends on the other side, I shall not question certain activities of the Department at this time.

Mr. Speaker, as to the pending resolution, originally I was fearful that it might somewhat affect the activities of the splendid committee that we authorized a few weeks ago, but I have been assured by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that it will not. I may say that originally I was not inclined to favor the resolution for that and for several other reasons. As I stated, I was fearful that the creation of this committee might interfere with the activities of the Colmer committee on post-war planning and also might interfere with existing conditions that now confront the Nation.

I feel that every effort and all of our energies should be devoted in seeking to aid and assist the Army, Navy, and our Air Forces in bringing about the early defeat of the treacherous and ruthless enemy that we may again enjoy the peace that was ours before Pearl Harbor. After my conference I have been enlightened by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] as well as by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who, I understand, will be chairman of this important committee, and in view of the special interest of the Speaker of the House I have come to the conclusion that these gentlemen possess greater wisdom and are just as patriotic, just as anxious to bring about an early victory, and that they will do nothing that might in any way interfere with our activities; therefore, I have consented and will vote for the pending resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this committee can, after careful consideration, render a valuable service to the Nation. I know that we have expended millions upon millions of dollars for buildings, plants, and factories in many sections of our country; we have expended millions of dollars in foreign nations and we will have, I hope shortly, millions, yes billions, of dollars' worth of surplus property. Now, I am not satisfied with the way that is being handled today. I think the Government is losing millions of dollars by the reckless disposition of surplus property or property that is no longer needed by the War Department, by the Navy Department, or by any other department of Government. I have the utmost confidence that the chairman of this committee, and the splendid members of that committee, will study carefully what is going on and make recommendations that will put a stop to the dishonest disposition of these properties through which the Government is defrauded of millions upon millions of dollars. It will be quite a task, but I feel that this committee, which will be composed of seven members of the Naval Affairs Committee, seven members of the Military Affairs Committee, and seven members to be appointed by the Speaker, will devote a great deal of their time, and a real study, not only to the matters to which I have called attention but to any other post-war matters that may help the future well-being of our country, so that when the war is over we will be in position to proceed without delay to reestablish our commercial activities, not only in our own country but in every other country.

I know what some of the other nations are doing now. They are preparing even at this time to grab the commerce of the world. Though this may be only a committee appointed to look after the post-war military affairs, I hope that the members of that committee will see that the millions we have invested, so far as our commercial efforts are concerned, will be utilized in the interest of our Nation and that we will not delay in doing our part to safeguard and protect our commerce the world over.

Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to this resolution, and there should not be any dissenting votes against it. This will be one of the most important committees that we have ever created and I have utmost confidence that it will render an important service to the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the sponsor of the pending resolution, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been very thoroughly discussed and I do not expect, in fact it would be quite impossible if I wanted to do so, to hold the attention of the House for any length of time. It is not at all interesting, I know, but I confess on this occasion that the objectives sought by this resolution have been in my mind for over 20 years. Never in our history has the Congress or any body of the Congress sat down seriously to discuss what would better be the military policies of the United States. The result has been that in every contest in which we have engaged we have found ourselves more or less unprepared.

I have rejoiced that thus far, apparently, this proposal meets with the approval of the Members of the House with whom I have discussed it. In preparing this resolution I have had long and intimate discussion with the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the ranking members and several members on both sides of that committee, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the ranking members, in fact several members on both sides of that committee, as well as with the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders. More than that, I took it upon myself to explore the opinion of the War and Navy Departments and I found a very favorable response from both departments. As a matter of fact, it is no secret, I am sure, that there are elements in both of those departments already working and studying this vital problem of the future military policy of the United States. Some items of that study have already been mentioned here this morning. One might think of several other items.

Obviously, of course, no committee, put together to advise the Congress from time to time as this committee is to be put together, can estimate with any degree of exactitude the size of our military forces to be maintained when this war is over. But there are certain fundamental policies connected, for example, with the procurement and the training of men for all the forces, the tie-up which that procurement and training program will have and should have with the educational facilities of the country which can be studied with great benefit and recommendations made from time to time with respect to them.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has indicated, it might be well for the committee to study that problem which I have described on other occasions as the problem of unity of command; also the disposition of Government-owned property, military property of the United States, a vast amount of it. We may be able to study those things, secure comprehensive inventories of all of those properties and facilities and perhaps assist in laying down a program for their use or disposition after the war is over.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it the gentleman's opinion that his resolution is broad enough to permit a study and recommendation to be made by this committee regarding the use or disposal of the insular territories which come under the American flag by reason of conquest?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do, but obviously that study could not be completed in anything like the near future. Many things are going to happen in the next 2 or 3 years, and I express my own view when I suggest that it will be quite impossible to reach a definite and final conclusion on what might be called defensive outposts of the United States until we know what kind of a world we are to live in after the war is over.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the appointment of this committee because I do not want to have happen to our country what happened after the last war. We came out of that war the victor in a military sense. In my humble judgment we had an opportunity at that time to erect a sound military policy for the United States, not the policy of an aggressor nation but a policy to make us safe and secure and go very, very far toward keeping us out of other wars. We have never made an effort of that kind following any of our wars.

Again, in my humble judgment, our failure to do so has cost the United States and its people billions and billions of dollars and tens of thousands of lives. Let us hope that we are learning lessons during this war and that we will learn more lessons when it is over. When we get a comprehensive view finally of this world and America's position in it, we should then adopt a comprehensive military policy for the United States that will keep us safe and secure.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I notice the resolution provides "that it shall be the duty of the committee to investigate any matters relating to the post-war military requirements of the United States." As I suggested to the gentleman in the Rules Committee, would it not be well to offer an amendment to investigate post-war policies and requirements? Does the gentleman from New York believe that the resolution is broad enough and that requirements will be interpreted to include policy?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Personally, I have no objection to an amendment such as proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, but I do believe that the general expression in this resolution, including the use of the expression "military requirements," contemplates, for example, that military requirements are governed by policy.

Mr. MICHENER. That would probably be true, but it occurred to me that it might be rather difficult for any committee to even conjecture as to what the requirements will be after the war until—quoting the gentleman's speech a few moments ago—we know the kind of a world in which we shall be living. It would be entirely proper, feasible, and possible to consider a peacetime military policy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. I think the resolution in its general phraseology makes it clear that the duty of this committee is to study policy. Of course, policy is connected with military requirements, whatever they may be in the future. I have no objection to an amendment of that sort, but I do not regard it as necessary.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am glad to hear the gentleman's statement about the planning of adequate defense to match the situation in foreign affairs, or our relationship to other countries. For instance, I call to mind the tardiness of our approach to preparedness in the years 1939 and 1940. A policy committee such as this would lead us to start preparedness to match the dangers in the world a little ahead of our awakening in 1939, I take it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And a similar awakening in 1917.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. And, similarly, the post-war period.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And 1898.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes. We have never been adequately prepared for any crisis that has yet come on us.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read House Resolution 486, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 465, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Post-War Military Policy, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and investigation or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Accounts unanimously agreed this morning to recommend that $25,000 be provided for the Post-war Military Policy Committee. The gentleman from New York, Congressman WADSWORTH, the author of the resolution which created this select committee, as well as the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman WOODRUM, who has been named chairman of this select committee, attended the hearing and outlined the purposes and objectives of the study.

The Committee on Post-war Military Policy is to be composed of 23 Representatives, including 7 members of the Committee on Military Affairs, 7 members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and 9 Representatives who are not members of either such committee.

Under the resolution it is the duty of the committee to investigate all matters relating to post-war military requirements of the United States. This will involve gathering information and preparing plans and suggestions from informed sources with respect to military requirements.

It will also be the duty of the committee to study the plans and suggestions received and to report to the House from time to time the results of findings made and conclusions reached.

The select committee will serve as a forum where members of the armed services directly affected, as well as individuals and private organizations, can come and offer suggestions. Many problems such as the policy relative to the disposition of the immense investment the Government has put into plants as well as other large projects, and the procedure and principles we should employ to recruit our armies in the future, will be considered by this select committee. They also plan to make a study of educational institutions and their part in the military program in the future.

It was pointed out at the hearing that immediately after the First World War there was a mad scramble to demobilize which resulted in the maladjustment of our economic structure. One of the objectives of the committee will be to formulate plans which will prevent a recurrence of the chaotic condition which characterized demobilization at the conclusion of the First World War.

This is a joint committee and it has simply recommendatory powers. It will have no authority to report bills but will simply be confined to recommending appropriate action to effect the results desired.

Both the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] stated that they did not contemplate a great deal of expense. The committee does not propose to travel but will simply conduct the study and investigation as provided in the original resolution. It was felt that no large expenditure of money would be necessary and that an appropriation of $25,000 would be sufficient.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS FROM COAL AND OTHER SUBSTANCES

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical materials available, is authorized for not more than five years to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, and one or more demonstration plants to produce liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products, with all facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the products. The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government

to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this Act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products. Any activities under this Act relating to the production of liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products shall be carried out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and subject to the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

"(a) to conduct laboratory research and development work, and with pilot plants and semiworks plants to make careful process engineering studies along with structural engineering studies in order to ascertain lowest investment and operating costs, necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation;

"(b) to acquire, by purchase, license, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents granted by this or any other nation; to acquire by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, land, and any interest in land (including easements and leasehold interests), options on real or personal property, and plants and their facilities; to assume the obligation to pay rentals in advance on property so acquired, and to pay damages arising out of the use of any such property: *Provided, however,* That the maximum quantity of land or any interest therein, or any other property, acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry on experiments for the purposes herein provided;

"(c) to engage, by contract or otherwise, engineers, architects, and any private industrial organization or any educational institution he deems suitable, to do all or any part of the work of designing, constructing, or operating the plants, the operation to be under his supervision, and through leases or otherwise as he believes advisable;

"(d) to cooperate with any other Federal or State department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, educational institution, or corporation, in effectuating the purposes of this Act.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell the products of the plants at not more than actual cost, including amortization of capital expenses, as determined by him, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal or any State Government, but priority shall be given to orders placed by the War or Navy Departments. Any remaining products may be sold at going prices to any purchaser through regular commercial channels. The Secretary of the Interior, subject to approval by Congress, shall also have authority to dispose of any lands or other real or personal property acquired, but in his opinion no longer useful, for the purposes of this Act; and he shall have authority to grant, on such terms as he may consider appropriate, licenses under patent rights acquired under this Act: *Provided,* That such licenses are consistent with the terms of the agreements by which such patent rights are acquired. No patent acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under this Act shall prevent any citizen of the United States, or corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, from using any invention, discovery, or process covered by such patent, or restrict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such person or corporation on account of such use.

"SEC. 4. All moneys received under this Act for products of the plants and royalties shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Interior shall render to Congress on or before the first day of January of each year a report of all operations under this Act.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this Act. The authority and duties of the Secretary of the Interior under this Act shall be exercised through the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

"SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $30,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Amend the title to read as follows:

"An Act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOHN M. ROBSION,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the text struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The substantive differences between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following statement:

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances. The House amendment also specifically authorized the Secretary to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products. The conference agreement retains this provision of the House amendment, but provides that any activities under the act relating to the production of fuels from agricultural and forestry products shall be carried out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and subject to the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture has been for many years engaged in studying and experimenting with the production of such fuels, and it appears wise to provide that any program carried out under this act relating to fuels from agricultural and forestry products should be fully coordinated and integrated with the existing program of that Department. The Senate bill contained a provision, which was not in the House amendment, which limited the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the construction, maintenance, and operation of demonstration plants to a period of not more than 5 years. The conference agreement retains this provision.

Section 2 (a) of the Senate bill contained a provision, which was not in the House amendment, specifying that the Secretary of the Interior, in conducting research and development work, is authorized, with pilot plants and semiworks plants, to make engineering studies in order to ascertain lowest costs. The conference agreement retains this provision.

Section 2 (b) of the House amendment included acquisition by license among the methods by which the Secretary is authorized to acquire patent rights and other rights, and would have authorized the acquisition of interests in lands by condemnation, among other methods. The conference agreement retains the authority to acquire patent and other rights by license, but eliminates the authority to acquire land by condemnation. The conference agreement also retains a provision in this paragraph which was in the Senate bill, but not in the House amendment, and which provides that the maximum quantity of land or any interest therein, or any other property, acquired under the act shall not exceed that necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 2 (c) and (d) of the House amendment contained provisions, not in the Senate bill, specifically including educational institutions among the organizations which the Secretary is authorized to utilize and with which he is authorized to cooperate. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

The House amendment contained a provision, which was not in the Senate bill, and which would have exempted leases made under this act from the provisions of sections 321 and 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, and would have provided that such leases could be made for a term of years notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, or any other provision of law. This provision is omitted from the conference agreement, as there appears to be no necessity or justification for exempting these leases from the provisions of sections 321 and 322, referred to above, and the earlier provisions of the bill specifically authorize leases to be made for a term of years.

The conference agreement retains a provision which was in the House amendment, but not in the Senate bill, and which provides that the authority of the Secretary to dispose of any lease or other property acquired under the act shall be exercised subject to approval by Congress.

The House amendment contained a provision, which was not in the Senate bill, and which authorized the Secretary to grant, on such terms as he may consider appropriate, licenses under patent rights acquired under the act, if such licenses are consistent with the terms of the agreements by which such patent rights are acquired. The conference agreement retains this provision of the House amendment. The Senate bill contained a provision, which was not in the House amendment, and which provided that no patent or patent rights acquired by the Secretary under the act should prevent any citizen of the United States or any domestic corporation from using any invention, discovery, or process to which such patent or patent rights related, or restrict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such citizen or corporation on account of such use. The conference agreement retains this provision in a modified form which makes it applicable only with respect to patents acquired by

the Secretary of the Interior under the act. The purpose of this provision is to make available to the citizens and corporations of the United States the use of any inventions, discoveries, and processes which may be invented or discovered in operations under the act, and the use of other inventions, discoveries, and processes covered by patents which are acquired in their entirety by the Secretary under the act. It does not mean that when the Secretary uses a patent under a license from a private owner of such patent, the public will also be permitted to use the patent merely because the Secretary has been licensed to do so.

The conference agreement makes clerical changes in the title of the bill.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOHN M. ROBSION,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 1243.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report. I notice the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] is on his feet.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Michigan is correct. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] has signed the report. It is a unanimous report of the managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain how agriculture comes into this picture, and explain that agricultural products can be used for producing synthetic liquid fuels?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will gladly explain it, I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska, because we have retained what the House did at the time we considered the bill H. R. 3209.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which is presented today is, I believe, of importance to the Members of the House. The House amendment to this bill struck out all of the Senate measure after the enacting clause and inserted a complete substitute, which we considered on the House floor, the bill being known as H. R. 3209. However, there were few differences of special importance between the House and the Senate versions. The conference agreement follows very largely the House amendment. There are some differences in substance from the measures, as we considered them in both Houses, to which I should like to refer.

The conference agreement retains the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], relating to the method by which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire patent and other rights and to acquire lands and interests in lands. The conference agreement eliminates the word "otherwise" from that portion of this amendment which relates to the acquisition of land. The effect of eliminating the word "otherwise" would be to eliminate the power of the Secretary to acquire land for the purposes of this act by condemnation.

The conference agreement also retains the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] which provides that licenses granted by the Secretary under patent rights acquired under the act must be consistent with the terms of the agreements by which such patent rights are acquired. It seems appropriate at this point to call attention to a provision in the conference agreement which was taken from the Senate bill. This provision, as it appears in the conference agreement, provides that no patent acquired by the Secretary under this act shall prevent any citizen or corporation of the United States from using any invention, discovery, or process covered by such patent, or restrict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such citizen or corporation on account of such use. The purpose of this provision is to make available to such citizens and corporations the use of any inventions, discoveries, and processes which may be invented or discovered in operations under the act, and also the use of other inventions, discoveries, and processes covered by patents which are acquired in their entirety by the Secretary under the act. It does not mean that when the Secretary is licensed to use a privately owned patent the public will also be permitted to use the patent merely because the Secretary is licensed to do so.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who is on his feet, has had much experience in connection with the subject of patent rights. I recall his special interest in that provision at the time this legislation was under consideration.

Mr. SABATH. I was and still am interested that the Government be protected in every way and not be subjected to many claims by those who have acquired these patents. Is the bill now so worded that the rights of the Government will be safeguarded against any possible attack on the part of those gentlemen who by hook or crook may have obtained some of those patents from the men who actually made the inventions?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That provision is retained. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] had in mind just that result. I think both phases of the patent picture, the protection of the private individual and the corporation, and the protection of the Government, are taken care of by our agreement.

I think the importance of the agricultural picture as presented here in a question asked by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is proper to bring to your attention at this time.

The agreement retains the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to say to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia that, in my opinion, he has rendered our country an outstanding service in sponsoring this legislation. I predict the day will come when future generations of Americans will thank him with all their hearts for pioneering this work of developing liquid fuels from basic resources which we have in abundance here in our own country. Now I am very much interested in the provisions about the patents. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that assuming that some process is perfected or developed in the course of this work which the gentleman's bill is going to make possible, then that patent will be freely available for use by any person who desires to make use of it, under a proper license?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct, any individual or corporation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is in the bill as it now stands? I believe that to be very important and very right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. The gentleman from California makes an observation which is important to the House, as we bring to final passage what we believe to be a most important measure, and I am deeply grateful to my friend for his gracious reference to my work.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON], you will recall, was the subject of debate in the House during the consideration of this bill. That amendment specifically authorizes the construction and operation of one or more demonstration plants to produce liquid fuel from agricultural and forestry products.

In connection with this provision, the conference report provides that any activities under the act relating to the production of liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products shall be carried out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and subject to the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture has carried on research and experimental work relating to the production of alcohol since 1906. In recent years, most of the work relating to the production of liquid fuels from agricultural products has been performed by the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry in the regional agricultural laboratory at Peoria, Ill., and most of the work relating to the production of fuels from forestry products has been done by the United States Forest Service in the Forest Products Laboratory, at Madison, Wis. It seems evident that any further experimental and demonstration work for the production of fuels from these products should be closely coordinated and integrated with the work of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON] is still in the bill in substantial form?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. There will be one or more demonstration plants using, as a base, agricultural or forestry products. All we have done is to have that program carried on in the Department of Agriculture, where we have the experts and where the valuable work has been done, rather than in the Department of the Interior, although the language of the conference report calls for a cooperative effort in this connection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. It just puts it under the direction of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. The studies have been going on for many years. Experimentation and research in these subjects has been helpful.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. We do not object to the Department of Agriculture experimenting in the making of fuel out of agricultural products. We believe it should remain in the Department of Agriculture, but we want to be assured that in this authorization bill, and it is merely an authorization bill inasmuch as no money is provided in it, the agricultural and forestry products are protected in this legislation. And the gentleman assures us that agricultural products and forestry products are protected and will participate in whatever experiments are being made under the provisions of this legislation. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Nebraska is correct. We further believe it, and it is evident in the language reading as follows:

> In connection with this provision, the conference report provides that any activities under the act relating to the production of liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products shall be carried out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture.

I think that is the viewpoint taken by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; it is.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The conference agreement retains the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL]. That provision related to oil shale, as you remember, "or substance" added to the word "coal." The original Senate bill had simply contained the word "coal" and then used the words "and other substances." We specifically name oil shale in the agreement. Then there was an amendment which was included in the House amendment which was passed on the floor and which was offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ]. He wishes inserted the words "or any educational institution." We believe in going forward with these studies on a cooperative basis. Private individuals and corporations are authorized, or should be consulted, of course, and we believe that educational institutions in many instances have done valuable work and can be further used. For that reason that amendment has been retained in the bill in the agreement of the managers on the part of the House with the Senate.

The agreement also retains the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] requiring the approval of Congress for the disposal of any lands or other property acquired by the Secretary under the act. You will remember that restriction was a provision inserted as an amendment during the consideration of the House bill. I think it was the thought of the House, practically unanimous, that Congress had a right to reassert itself in connection with future legislation in insuring against individuals acting without regard to the legislative branch and its prerogatives. We believe it is a provision which is necessary to the better functioning of this type of development.

The conference agreement contains provisions from the Senate proposals which were not in the House amendment, and which specifically authorized engineering studies to be made in connection with the research and development work, and which also restrict the land and other properties which may be acquired under the act to the quantity necessary for carrying out its provisions.

In other words, only that necessary property which was actually to be used could be purchased. They could not go out by a blanket authority and purchase here and there and buy this and that unneeded land. The Secretary would confine it strictly to the purposes for which the act is intended.

The conference agreement eliminates a provision of the House amendment which exempted leases made under the act from the provisions of sections 321 and 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, and provided that such leases might be made for a term of years notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes or any other provision of law. The first part of this provision was eliminated, as there appears to be no necessity for exempting leases made under this act from the provisions of sections 321 and 322, which are referred to above, which embody certain restrictions with respect to leases made to or by the Government. There appeared to be no necessity for the latter part of this provision, relating to leases for a term of years, as section 2 (b) of the bill specifically authorizes leases for a term of years to be made in order to carry out the purposes of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I personally thank my colleagues for their support of this legislation. I have also appreciated the cooperation of Senator O'MAHONEY, author of the Senate bill. I trust the future will vindicate the action we have taken to keep America secure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining has gone into this matter in great detail and I think has stated clearly and fully what this measure undertakes to accomplish. In the first place, it is brought to the House as a war measure to help win the war. You understand that there are two methods by which we may increase our oil and gas production in this country: One, through the utilization of coal; and two, through the utilization of oil from agricultural and forestry products. I know that many of us who do not live in oil and coal countries have had for sometime considerable concern in our own minds about the future supply of oil and gas. In my section of the country we have an abundance of coal and we have considerable oil. But if this war continues for sometime and uses oil and gas at the rate we have been consuming it, and if we continue to cut down our reserves, one of the important questions that is going to confront us in the future is as to the supply of oil and gas. Germany could not have carried on this war with the success that she has if she had not developed synthetic oil and gas from coal and from plants and trees. Therefore we now know that unless we discover some great pool in the future we are going to have to have our supply of oil and gas from other sources. It must come from coal or from the plant life of the country

Now, this does not put the Government in the business of producing oil or gas. It simply sets up experimental stations to find out the best methods to secure this oil and gas at the lowest price at which it can be produced. So it is a wise and necessary step for Congress to adopt this resolution. As I recall, it was adopted unanimously by the House and the Senate, and the conferees have carried into this report, by unanimous agreement of the conferees, all of the essential points that were in the House and the Senate bills.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would like to observe that by the passage of this legislation the Congress will be giving an insurance to the country in the future that we will not be caught in the predicament we were when our crude supplies of rubber from the Dutch and British were cut off and we had to turn, almost overnight, to the building of a synthetic rubber industry in this country. We are looking ahead, and, as the gentleman said, we will be prepared as a nation, not to be an importer of oil, but here at home with our own products to sustain ourselves either in peace or in the exigencies of war.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We have hundreds of millions of acres of good coal, and we can produce an unlimited supply of oil and gas and it will make our country self-sufficient in those very essential and important commodities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the conclusion of the day's business and any other special orders that may have been entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 6 OF THE DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT OF 1941, AS AMENDED

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3912) to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the necessity for this increase in the authorization?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I will be very glad to explain the bill.

This bill has been considered by the Roads Committee, and the bill is unanimously reported from that committee.

The reason for the urgency of the passage of the bill at the present time is brought about through a history of the legislation. I would like to briefly call the attention of the House to that legislation.

In 1941 we passed what is known as the Defense Highway Act. In this act we provided that the Commissioner of Public Roads should be authorized to provide the construction of access roads and the improvement of access roads to military and naval reservations; and also to defense and industry plants. In order to accomplish this purpose we authorized an appropriation at that time of $150,000,000. That work has been going on since that time. In other words, all the work that is being done in connection with the defense-highway program is certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to the Commissioner of Public Roads. The Commissioner of Public Roads is then obligated to do this work.

Since the original authorization we amended the act on July 2, 1942, to authorize $260,000,000, and we thought at that time that that would be sufficient to do the work designed in connection with this defense program. However, it now develops that roads are being damaged, roads used to and from military developments, and there is no money to pay these sums. In order to pay the sums that the Commissioner is already authorized by the Congress to expend, it is necessary now to increase that authorization.

The Commissioner of Roads appeared before our committee and after very careful examination and testimony he proved to the unanimous satisfaction of the committee that it was necessary that we immediately authorize this money so that it could be paid to the people who are doing the work on these roads.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. For the information of the House, I will say the Rules Committee has granted a rule on this bill. Consideration of it now will save time. Two gentlemen, especially, from Tennessee, have made an urgent plea for immediate consideration of this bill because many of the roads, not only in Tennessee, but in many other sections, have been destroyed by the heavy trucks used by the Army. In view of that, a rule was granted. If unanimous consent now is granted it will save perhaps 2 hours of our time, because, as I understand, there is no opposition to the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is no opposition in the committee, and it is a military necessity that this money be authorized as quickly as possible.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I thank both the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I desire to express my thanks and the appreciation of my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. MCCORD] for the kind and courteous consideration given by both the chairman of the Rules Committee and the Committee on Roads to our problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 3912), as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended by the act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106), is hereby further amended by striking out the amount "$260,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$290,000,000."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "thereof", strike out "$290,000,000" and insert "$285,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet seeking to offer an amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman from Tennessee takes that position, the understanding of the Chair was that the bill would be taken up by unanimous consent. Of course, the Chair, in accordance with a statement made last week, would feel that the action which the gentleman from Tennessee has in mind would be a violation of the statement made by the present occupant of the chair to the minority leader.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the arrangement entered into by the present occupant of the chair preclude the offering of an amendment to which no opposition has been voiced?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have considered the amendment and I think most of the members of the committee have considered the amendment that has been suggested by the Members from Tennessee. As far as I know, there is no opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman explain what the amendment is?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is anxious to help, but there are certain limits. If there is going to be any controversy about this bill——

Mr. GORE. Would the Chair indulge the gentleman from Tennessee for a brief statement on the urgency of the situation so that we can see if any opposition develops?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To be practical in the situation, rather than strictly parliamentary, without objection the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee for 1 minute.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we have been very patient here with all these consent requests. We certainly wish to take up the rule on the bill out of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I hope no more requests of this nature will be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The observation of the gentleman from New York is timely and pertinent.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the rather desperate situation in the maneuver area in Tennessee arises out of the very fact that 26 counties in Tennessee were selected as a permanent maneuver area for the United States Army. Those maneuvers, however, are ending this week. Troops have been maneuvering in this area for several months with the heaviest type of equipment—30- and 34-ton tanks, the heaviest guns, all of the equipment used in the final maneuver training of troops before they go across—and they have completely destroyed miles upon miles of roads. In some instances, children cannot go to school, milk trucks cannot haul milk, nor can

the roads be used in any normal manner.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This bill has nothing to do with that situation. This is to increase the amounts available for the construction of access roads.

Mr. GORE. May I say, however, that the subject matter of the bill is such as to make pertinent an amendment authorizing sufficient funds to restore these roads.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that this will probably become a very controversial subject. The committee did not have hearings on it.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman is mistaken, for I appeared before the committee myself on it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have not had any hearings on this particular question.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the gentleman must have been absent, because I myself appeared before the gentleman's committee on the question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. All right; we will say that hearings were held, but the committee did not see fit to increase the allocations for that purpose because we had nothing before us from the department that would justify any increase of these funds. We could not therefore accept an amendment such as the gentleman proposes without some report from Mr. McDonald.

Mr. GORE. Mr. McDonald appeared before the gentleman's committee. The gentleman was absent that day. Not only was Mr. McDonald there, but other representatives from the Public Roads Administration were there and representatives from the War Department. The War Department admits responsibility but expresses the preference that it be undertaken by the Public Roads Administration.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I was not there. My attention has not been called to it. I have in mind that it may be necessary to rewrite the formula by which the States are reimbursed for damage to the Federal highway system.

Mr. GORE. There is no intention on the part of the War Department so far as I have been able to find out to shirk the responsibility of restoring the roads. The roads have been utterly devastated by these maneuvers, but the War Department feels, as I understand it, that they have a war to prosecute and that if the Public Roads Administration can do the job then it would be best to have them do it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman very frankly that if his amendment is offered it will probably cause considerable controversy. This bill itself has been called up under unanimous consent because it was urgently necessary to increase the funds for the construction of access highways. The gentleman's amendment brings in an entirely new question which I do not believe we, under the policy of the minority, can let pass without debate.

Mr. GORE. The access roads are no more necessary or urgent than the repair of roads in this area of Tennessee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We can bring in another bill on that and we will if it is necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill has already been passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table, but in view of the situation, the gentleman from Tennessee desiring to offer an amendment, if there will be no objection, and I have to put the question, the Chair will ask unanimous consent that the entire proceedings by which the bill was passed be vacated; but the Chair states frankly and wants it clearly understood that the Chair had no knowledge at the time the bill was called up under unanimous consent that any amendment would be offered. It was only on that understanding that the Chair recognized the gentleman; but the Chair will ask unanimous consent that the entire proceedings be vacated, in which event the Chair would then feel constrained not to recognize the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will not insist on his amendment, but will let us proceed, because this is the only way we are going to get the money for these access roads which are needed by so many people.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This may be a little irregular but the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Tennessee for 1 minute.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, it will not be my purpose to object to the passage of this bill, nor will it be my purpose if the proceedings by which the bill was passed are vacated then to object, nor shall I in any way stand in the way of the passage of this needed bill; but the gentleman from Tennessee cannot refrain from expressing deep regret that the arrangements which have been entered into are adjudged to preclude at this time the consideration of a matter of extreme urgency to the people whom he represents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is sure the gentleman from Tennessee recognizes the legislative situation and appreciates the position the Chair is in.

Under those circumstances, the bill stands as passed.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO PROCEED WITH CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 469 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4381, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "one hour" and insert in lieu thereof "two hours."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule was given to the former member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, now a member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], who is unavoidably absent, believing that the bill would not be called up before 2 o'clock. In his absence I therefore call it up because it is urgent that we consider at this time the bill made in order by the rule.

The rule provides for 2 hours general debate. Originally it was contemplated and asked by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee that only 1 hour of general debate be allowed and that time was provided in the original rule. However, the Committee on Rules felt that a bill providing an authorization of about $1,644,000,000 was of such importance that other Members than those on the Committee on Naval Affairs might also desire to speak.

Personally I want to congratulate and commend the Committee on Naval Affairs, especially the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], upon submitting a report which explains thoroughly and effectively every provision of the bill. You gentlemen who are interested may obtain the report and by perusal thereof you will find that very seldom have we been furnished such a splendid report, which gives the House complete information on every authorization, the total of which is, as I stated, $1,644,000,000. That is a great sum of money, but the Navy requires it, and immediate favorable consideration of this bill should be had.

Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I hope that in the interest of economy and in the interest of the country at large, he will bring home to the Secretary of the Navy the fact that it is absolutely necessary, in view of the ever-increasing taxes that are being levied upon our people, to have real economy practiced and that the heads of the various bureaus be instructed to be careful in letting and awarding contracts to the lowest and most responsible bidder.

At the same time I hope he will stress that any surplus property that is not needed by the Navy at this time, and which is contemplated being sold, will be disposed of in a manner whereby the people at large, and not one or two individuals, will have the opportunity to bid on the same so that the highest possible price may be obtained for the mil-

lions and millions of dollars' worth of property that is about to be disposed of. In the last session we passed a bill authorizing a committee of the House and Senate, a joint committee, to pass upon and examine all of the sales of Army and Navy surplus property but unfortunately our action has not yet been approved by the other body. I hope that it will be shortly, because I feel it is absolutely necessary for the Congress to watch carefully the disposition of this vast storehouse of surpluses that are accumulating and which are no longer needed.

I make this observation because I have heard and you have read in the newspapers how some of the surplus properties have been disposed of at ridiculously low prices, perhaps at 10 cents or 20 cents on the dollar. That should not be tolerated and we should safeguard our interests and the country's interests to the best of our ability. I recollect that after the last war a great deal of property was sold in a manner that did not do credit to the administration and those in power at that time. Some men were charged with fraud, some were indicted and I think convicted of defrauding or being party to a fraud through which the Government suffered tremendous losses at that time. In view of that fact I hope the chairman of this great Committee on Naval Affairs, who I realize has worked hard—he has had a hard task—will be particularly careful and see that the Government interests are protected, the same as he has done in other instances.

Mr. Speaker, with this statement I shall conclude my remarks because I cannot explain all of the provisions as ably as the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. There are several hundred items that this bill covers and I know he can in a shorter space of time give the information and explain to you each and every item intelligently and to your entire satisfaction so that when the bill is considered there will be no question in the mind of anyone as to the need for this legislation and immediate action thereon.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with a unanimous report of the Rules Committee. I have since learned that there may be some controversy about the bill in connection with the Budget figures. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has made a study of these figures, will take half the time under the rule to discuss that feature of the bill. In the Rules Committee apparently it is not necessary for very much consideration to be given any legislation fathered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. He merely appears before the Rules Committee, courteously favors us with a few words, smiles in his benign way upon us and goes out with a unanimous report of that committee. This is due, of course, not only to our confidence in the gentleman and his distinguished committee but because we are in a war and these items are regarded as military necessities. I am glad, however, that the gentleman from New York will break down part of the bill and give the House the benefit of his investigation because that is our duty, to get all the facts. We cannot do that in the Rules Committee, but the Members of the House are entitled to have all possible information and to have a clear-cut debate upon what is before us.

Mr. Speaker, there is in this bill one major item of $1,019,000,000 for overseas bases. This is two-thirds of the bill and I would like to make some comment upon that item. It does not tell us where these bases are to be set up and established. It just refers to "advance base construction, material, and equipment, $1,019,000,000" out of a total of $1,644,000,000 contained in the authorizations in this bill.

It is perfectly proper that they do not tell us where these bases are to be set up, and it is perfectly proper that they should be military secrets. On the other hand, I hope, as one Member of the Congress, that we will hold on to those islands that we have acquired in the far Pacific through the blood of our sons, if they can be of any service whatever for the defense of America in the future.

It seems to me that the Congress has a duty to perform, and that is to put the interest of America first and keep our interests uppermost all the time, because if we do not do it no other nation will do it for us. I feel that this is the opportune time and that we are not talking out of order when we take the floor in the Congress and say that we not only hope but we insist that these islands out in the far Pacific which can serve as defense bases for us in case of future wars shall be retained and that the sacrifices of our sons shall not have been made in vain, and I hope that the money contained herein, the $1,019,000,000 will be spent on fortifying these islands for the strategic defenses of America. If we own those islands and have them properly fortified and defended, we need not fear any attacks on America unless those islands are captured by some foreign foe. We need not fear any attack by sea or possibly by air. If that is so, then we do not need universal military service after this war. We do not need to draft 2,000,000 young Americans into an army if we retain those islands in the Pacific and use them as an outer shield for the defense of the United States.

I am in favor also of negotiating with Great Britain to acquire every one of the islands on our eastern coast from Bermuda to South America, where we have airfields now on 99-year leases. We are not a 99-year country. We ought to own all of those islands outright for our own defense, and we should take steps to acquire them now. We ought not to go hat in hand and sneak in the back door of some conference after this war has been won and beg for those islands. We ought to point out to Great Britain, who is our friend and whom we helped save from disaster at the time of her greatest need, and are now giving her billions of dollars in lend-lease, that we want those islands for ourselves. They are of no use to her. We ought to speak out and not wait until the war is all over and then crawl in the side door and whisper, "They might help us a little bit in the future."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I now yield to my friend from New York, and I would like to proceed with the argument I have been making after hearing his contribution.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, as the gentleman knows, I share his views completely, but I want to find out more explicitly what the gentleman's views are in regard to the retention of islands which might come under the American flag by reason of our conquest.

Is it the gentleman's view that we should retain islands acquired by us through conquest irrespective of the flag which was flown over those islands before we gained them, even though that flag might have been that of one of our allies?

Mr. FISH. My contention is simply this, that we should retain all the Japanese-owned islands that we need for the strategic defense of the United States; every single one that we need. We ought to serve notice that that is our policy; that we have won them by conquest and force of arms, and we are going to keep them if we need them for our own defense.

As to the other islands that might have flown another flag, if they are necessary for our defense, I think we ought to go to those nations in a forthright way and simply put our case before them in the most friendly manner and say, "We believe it is in the interest of our country and our national defense that we should acquire these islands," and I am quite confident that if we did that, and we did it aboveboard, openly, and fearlessly, and put all our cards right on the table, we would get the fullest cooperation, whether it was from the British or from the French or from any other nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, the gentleman realizes that many of the islands taken over by the United States troops under the domination of one of our allies, principally Great Britain, were never a part of the British Empire, but were under the British flag only through mandate from the League of Nations, so the British Empire could not properly lay claim to those islands.

Mr. FISH. They were originally mandated as the result of the last war, and I think the gentleman has raised a very pertinent point. But I am not alarmed whether they were part of the mandate or even a part of the British Empire. I believe that Great Britain will agree to yield her sovereignty over certain islands out in the far Pacific if they are necessary for American bases. And I say that deliberately and it is a rather broad statement, because in the past the British Empire has not been very willing to yield any of her territory anywhere in the world, and I do not know that I blame her for it. It has been her policy not to haul down her flag. But we are facing an entirely different

situation. We are in a global war for the first time. We have certainly been most helpful to Britain in protecting her empire and her interests throughout the entire world. I would not want to believe for a minute that the British would not cooperate with us gladly if we made our position clear and made our requests openly and on a friendly basis. But when it comes to secret diplomacy, I know we are lost. I know we are lost if we wait until after the war. America has never won an international conference. We have never lost a war. I honestly doubt that we will win the post-war conference, but I am confident that we will win the war. The time to act is now, to speak right up in Congress as the representatives of the people, and have our State and War Departments go along with us and make these requests in a most friendly way.

If I thought these islands were of any use to Great Britain, or if I thought the islands off our eastern coast were of any particular use to them as far as their trade or their commerce is concerned, or if these islands were necessary to them for defense, it might be a different matter, but these islands are right off our own coast, all the way down, and should be owned outright by us as a protection to our coast and to the Panama Canal. We do not know what is going to happen 25 years from now as the result of this war. We do not know where and how far communism will spread. We do not know who our next enemy is going to be. We ought to look out for our own interests and protection. That is the policy of Great Britain; they always take care of themselves. That is why they have lived for 400 years as a great empire. All other great nations do. The time has come for us to protect ourselves, the lives of our sons, and our sons' sons, and our destiny as the greatest Nation I hope for the next 400 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself another 5 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure I understand the gentleman's thought in regard to entering into negotiations with Great Britain as to these islands. Is it the gentleman's view that those negotiations should begin at once or that they might well wait until after the war?

Mr. FISH. No. My theory of the whole thing is that we ought to make our policy known now, clear-cut, and not wait until the war is all over and won, because if we do I do not believe we will get anything, not a foot of territory anywhere in the world. We are not imperialists. We do not want territory. We only want these islands for our own defense, and I think that is little enough to ask.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So far as Greenland is concerned, we should have Greenland. The gentleman will remember that the United States sent some Red Cross people over there instead of sending our troops in, and all the time, under the guise of Norwegians, we were sending in supplies.

Mr. FISH. I am convinced. I will amend my statement to include Greenland.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And Iceland?

Mr. FISH. Oh, I do not go as far as Iceland. I would like to stay on this side of the Atlantic. I do not want to get involved in any more European wars. Also, our soldiers are none too happy in Iceland at the present time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We are a young country. I think in time we will win at the peace conference also.

Mr. FISH. I hope so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We must and we will.

Mr. FISH. I sincerely hope the gentlewoman is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Along the line of the gentleman's last remark, I take it he would not propose that we take over enough islands so that we could effectively protect a pipe line across Arabia?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman knows my views. I am against any such Arabian pipe-line dreams. I am against any such dollar diplomacy and imperialism which will lead us into another war.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. So am I.

Mr. FISH. I do not want an oil war. I want to stop these foreign wars or at least to keep out of them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will not the gentleman agree that in all probability a pipe line of that sort clear on the other side of the world would be more likely in case of war to be a benefit to our enemies instead of ourselves?

Mr. FISH. I do not know whether it would be a benefit to our enemies or to ourselves, but I know that if we have a Government-owned pipe line some 5,000 miles away, in foreign nations, it might involve us in another war within 25 years. I think we have had enough wars for the time being. I do not know who will benefit in case of war, but I am quite sure if we follow any such imperialistic program we shall be involved in another war. Congress should put a stop to any such war-provoking and imperialistic program.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Might it not be wiser to use the same money to buy out the Standard Oil Co. at Elk Hills, so we would have a secure reserve here at home?

Mr. FISH. That is probably around the gentleman's own district, and he ought to lead that fight. I have enough to do. But I would say that I do not see any reason to build with American dollars this Canol pipe line up in Alaska. It is bad enough to put $100,000,000 into Alaska, but to put $300,000,000 into the sands of the Arabian Desert is something I do not understand at all. Why not build a much-needed additional pipe line from Texas to New York to take care of the needs of 40,000,000 Americans?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The Canol project is not in Alaska. If it were, it would be different.

Mr. FISH. The Canadian Alaskan project, I mean.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROWE. What would be the gentleman's conclusion if we were to meet an unalterable "no" in the proposition?

Mr. FISH. If we are going to receive an unalterable "no" in the proposition? before this war is over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

If we receive an unalterable "No," I think then we ought to call the attention of some of these governments to the huge sums of money we have been lend-leasing them, which is a 90-percent boulevard one way and 10 percent return. That ought to be understood. We ought to have good accountants to know exactly what it is. I do not believe in driving any hard bargain, but I do not believe any nation will refuse us such a just request. We all know what happens in peace conferences, and what happens when the war is all over, and how quickly other nations forget the contributions made by America in time of war. That is why I am discussing this subject now, when we have an item of $1,019,000,000 for overseas bases before us.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Does the gentleman know whether or not any overtures or any efforts have been made to sound out the attitude of Great Britain on this question?

Mr. FISH. No; I am sorry, I am not in the confidence of the Chief Executive. I assume the gentleman is.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. The gentleman is not. The gentleman from New York is inaccurate in that statement.

Mr. FISH. I know that one of the gentlemen in the other body has been preaching this same doctrine for many years—Senator TYDINGS. He probably would know whether the State Department or the Executive has made any overtures. I know that this is not anything new with me because I took it up 20 years ago, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] knows. I advocated it after the last war, and we got nowhere. We will get nowhere now unless we act before the war is over—unless we put our cards on the table and tell them what our interests are. This is the time to act. It will be too late when the cards are all down and the war is won.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. It might interest the gentleman to know that some members of the Committee on Naval Affairs shared this view over a year ago and undertook to persuade the proper de-

partment of Government to that view, but met with no encouragement whatever.

Mr. FISH. I am glad to have that contribution. I did not know it. I think it was a very constructive act.

There is a little item in this bill that is of great interest to me and all lovers of soft ball. I am sure that Lowell Thomas—I am a member of his team, called the "Nine Old Men"—and many others will be interested in this. There is a provision in this bill for 14 soft-ball fields to be erected at the different naval hospitals. I believe there are 6 to be erected alone at the naval hospital outside of Washington. I call to the attention of the Members in a nonpartisan way, Democrats and Republicans alike, that later in the spring or summer we might have some practice games out there. We might even have Lowell Thomas bring his team down here, and the Members of Congress can give them a game on the new naval hospital softball field for the benefit of the disabled gobs, for which this Congress is about to make an appropriation. Soft ball is a great American pastime and is growing all over the country. Even the women are now playing this game. I am glad we are about to provide that those who are being hospitalized as a result of this war will have an opportunity to get that form of recreation.

Before I conclude I want to call attention to the fact, which, of course, is very important to me, that there is an item in this bill of $820,000 to build roads and wharves and repair buildings at Iona Island, in my new district. I can assure my colleagues that this is a much-needed improvement and a constructive project. This is a permanent ammunition depot located on Iona Island, about 50 miles up the Hudson River in Rockland County. This naval ammunition depot has been expanded during this war, but it will be continued as a permanent depot after the war. Therefore it does not come into the category of temporary war buildings that will be scrapped in a few years. I assure the House that the $820,000 will be well spent and will serve a useful and lasting purpose for the permanent defense of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to my colleague from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the war has been going along for 2 years and 4 months at this time. The Congress has appropriated enormous sums of money, larger sums than I believe have ever been appropriated by any other country at any other time. There has been a unanimous desire to provide funds sufficient to meet the emergency. Now we are approaching the time in the war when the additional facilities in the United States ought to begin to be less. We are approaching a time when it is incumbent upon the Congress, in my opinion, to appropriate money perhaps a little oftener and not quite so freely. We should not provide the Navy or the Army or any other institution with more funds than they can within reason obligate and have put in use within a few months. This is so because of the manpower situation. It is so because of the requirement for additional men in the services.

It is so because we are getting to the point where it is necessary for us to show some selectivity in the projects which we embark upon. Right now the manpower situation is such that Mr. Nelson is telling us that with the changes in the draft requirements it is going to be necessary to slow down some of our activities. I have this in mind in connection with this bill. If any of you have the report of the committee before you, you will see that on page 46 of the bill there is a letter from the Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy. If you will turn to page 2 of the bill you will see what was given to the authorization for the different items.

Fleet facilities: Requested, $33,351,500. Amount of authorization, $41,716,500.

Aviation facilities: Amount requested, $182,594,000. Amount allowed, $228,375,000.

Storage facilities: Amount requested, $72,225,000. Amount authorized, $90,335,000.

Marine Corps housing and training: Amount requested, $20,287,000. Amount authorized, $25,375,000.

Ordnance facilities: Amount requested, $96,668,600. Amount authorized, $120,806,554.

Personnel training and housing facilities: Amount requested, $37,241,700. Amount authorized, $46,579,670.

Hospital facilities: Amount requested, $33,636,800. Amount authorized, $42,071,750.

Shore radio facilities: Amount requested, $3,246,000. Amount authorized, $4,060,000.

Naval Research Laboratory: Amount requested, $1,273,000. Amount authorized, $1,593,550.

Miscellaneous structures: Amount requested, $19,475,900. Amount authorized, $24,360,000.

Advance base construction: Amount requested, $1,000,000,000. Amount authorized, $1,019,000,000.

I want to say this, that a Budget estimate has been submitted to the House by the President for the total amount requested by the Secretary of $1,500,000,000, which is $144,373,040 less than the amount of the authorization carried here.

For the item "Advance bases," which is an item that perhaps has to be as large as it is, and ordinarily so, the difference between the request and the authorization is only $19,000,000, or a very small sum comparatively. I want to say that the hearings before the Byrd committee, and some of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Army, indicate that we have rather largely overdone some of our appropriating. I am not going to criticize that policy in the past. I do say that we ought not to be too careless in the future. I do feel we ought to provide every dollar that is needed but I also feel that we ought to be much more careful in the future than we have been in the days past.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I see there are some provisions here for additional airports for the Navy. I was told by the Army today that the Army is releasing and offering to the Navy, if the Navy can use them, approximately 80 airports. I wonder if in considering this bill the committee has taken into consideration that these Army air bases which are not needed for the Army will be available for the Navy?

Mr. TABER. I do not know.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will say to the gentleman that in every instance we have tried to ascertain if the Army has abandoned property that the Navy can use, and for which they are asking authorization or appropriations. I want to say this, that the Navy Department, during the hearings, informed the committee that they had oftentimes inquired of the War Department if they had abandoned property, and they have not yet been advised what property has been abandoned that the Navy could use. However, if the Army has abandoned any airports that will fit into the Navy's program, the Navy will use them. Of course, the Navy should not use or build any new projects if we can use an Army project. We all recognize that.

Mr. STEFAN. Are there any of these airports that are available today for the Navy now?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not now.

Mr. STEFAN. I was told so.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed gratified that on this important bill we were not obliged to listen to political speeches and personal attacks. I hope from now on that we will be able to cooperate, having in mind at all times the best interests of our Nation. In all the bills and rules that I have reported during this session and last session, there is not a single dollar appropriated or authorized to be expended in my own district. But I am trying, as you are, to do my share and my part, so that we can have cooperation and unity so as to bring about the early defeat of the ruthless enemy who has already cost us nearly 200,000 lives and billions of dollars in carrying on the war, with suffering and misery to a large number of our citizenry. I hope when we are through with the war we will bring about such a peace that for generations we will not subject others who come after us to be placed in the same unfortunate position we have been in for the past 2 years.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman cite any illustration or recall any time that the Congress has not fully cooperated in the appropriation of money needed for the war effort?

Mr. SABATH. I am not going to talk about that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is just a simple question.

Mr. SABATH. I could say that from the start we did not listen to the President, which I know everybody regrets now. But I do not wish to touch upon it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am speaking from the standpoint of from the beginning of the war.

Mr. SABATH. I hope we will not in the future talk about things that have happened in the past; because we have been too careful, or too niggardly, or too indifferent to the protection of our country and providing for certain defenses recommended by the President whereby the things that have happened would not have happened.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Since the declaration of war, has not Congress appropriated every cent we have been asked to appropriate for the War and Navy Departments?

Mr. SABATH. I said so, and I will say it again, I think we have acted as patriotic men and women in this House and that we have done our full duty, and I hope we will continue to work in harmony until this damnable war that was forced upon us is over and victory will be ours.

I will concede—in fact, I admit—that since the treacherous Pearl Harbor attack all of the Members, with few exceptions, voted for all the appropriations urged or requested by the military and naval forces. I am happy that for once during the consideration of a war authorization appropriation bill that the discussion of politics has not entered into the debate and therefore, I do not wish to call attention to the fact that some gentlemen opposed the appropriations for fortifications, bases, and so forth; nor how some Members in 1938, 1939, and even in 1940 viciously opposed some defense measures, but I am going to stop right here. I am not going to say what I have asked others to refrain from saying.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MINORITY REPORT ON H. R. 3693

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave may be granted to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 3693.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4381) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4381, with Mr. MURPHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with and the same is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, $41,716,500; aviation facilities, $228,375,000; storage facilities, $90,335,000; Marine Corps housing and training, $25,375,000; ordnance facilities, $120,906,554; personnel training and housing facilities, $46,579,670; hospital facilities, $42,071,750; shore radio facilities, $4,060,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $1,593,550; miscellaneous structures, $24,360,000; advance base construction, material and equipment, $1,019,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed $1,644,373,024: *Provided further*, That prior to the acquisition or disposal, by lease or otherwise, of any land acquired for naval use under the authority of this, or any other act, the Secretary of the Navy shall come into agreement with the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the terms of such prospective acquisitions or disposals; and recital of compliance with this proviso in any instrument of conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of this or any other act shall be conclusive evidence of the Secretary's compliance with this proviso as to the property conveyed: *Provided further*, That effective December 13, 1943, temporary housing is authorized for transient personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with their dependents, on a rental basis, for periods not exceeding 60 days, without loss of rental allowance or money allowance for quarters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is an authorization bill for what is known as the shore establishment of the Navy, $625,373,024 of it to be spent in the continental United States, and $1,019,000,000 for advance bases outside of the United States.

The Naval Affairs Committee conducted a long hearing, as will be disclosed by the report which was purposely filed so that Members of the House can become thoroughly conversant with how this money is to be spent. We came to the conclusion that the facts justified a favorable report. So, therefore, we have submitted it to you with the recommendation that this bill do pass.

In the hearings it developed that the Navy Department had asked the Bureau of the Budget for $1,644,373,024. The Bureau of the Budget arbitrarily reduced it approximately 20 percent, making it $1,500,000,000. We conducted a hearing to determine upon what ground or justification the Bureau of the Budget had, which required the Navy Department to reduce its estimate 20 percent, or in dollars and cents, $144,373,024. After a thorough investigation the Committee on Naval Affairs was convinced, and it is justified by the facts, that the Bureau of the Budget did not have sufficient supporting data, or it was not predicated upon a firm foundation to refuse the estimate of the Navy Department, $144,373,024. So, therefore, we restored the amount, which we felt that the facts did justify the Navy in asking, and the committee in recommending, the amount of money that the Navy had requested of the Bureau of the Budget, which was $1,644,373,024.

The naval authorities, charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the war, said that on account of the expansion in the Navy of some 750,000 enlisted men, officers, and WAVES, it was necessary that this money be authorized to carry out the program. I have here a letter from Admiral Horne, which I will ask to have put into the RECORD at this point, stating that in the opinion of the military authorities, charged with the responsibility of prosecution of the war, it is absolutely essential that favorable consideration be given to these projects called for in this bill; that they are justified and are absolutely necessary to enable the Department to carry on the aggressive prosecution of the war.

The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, March 17, 1944.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In connection with the consideration of the public works bill, authorizing the construction of certain naval public works, it has come to my attention that a question has been raised as to the necessity for additional construction within the continental limits of the United States. It appears that in addition to the conception that the Navy's continental shore establishment has already been built to ultimate capacity, there is a feeling that recent optimistic statements with respect to the progress of American arms would indicate a probable early termination of the war.

As already indicated in my oral statement to the committee, the continued expansion of the naval forces afloat and in the air automatically entails the necessity for a further expansion of the shore support for those forces. Surface ships due to go into commission during the current calendar year will require an increase in all categories of naval and Marine Corps personnel of approximately 750,000 persons, or an expansion of approximately 25 percent over our present forces. This personnel must be trained, equipped, and housed pending their assignment to duty afloat or overseas. The new ships must be outfitted and facilities built for their maintenance and repair.

As I have indicated to the committee, the great increase in our operations in the Pacific entails a corresponding increase in the facilities necessary to process personnel and matériel to serve the expanded operating forces. I can state, unequivocally, that the continental establishments which we now have are not adequate for this purpose, and that, unless additional facilities are con-

structed within the continental limits, the expenditures already made and to be made for ships and planes will not be fully productive. More important still, the direct operating support which the fleets and aircraft require from the continental United States will not be available to them, and the efficiency of our striking forces will suffer correspondingly.

The programs for continental shore construction which have been presented to the Committees on Naval Affairs and Appropriations are based upon detailed studies carried out by the various bureaus and offices of the Navy Department, whose missions have been assigned to them by the Commander in Chief in conformity with the over-all strategic plan formulated by the combined Chiefs of Staff and, in turn, transmitted through the joint Chiefs of Staff to the Commander in Chief, United States Fleets.

I would like to invite your attention to the fact that within recent months the development of new weapons and of new kinds of warfare has necessitated the establishment of new types of training facilities, experimental establishments and production plants. When consideration is given to the involved technical character of the warfare which we are now carrying on, it can be readily seen that as long as the war lasts we may expect such new developments.

With respect, specifically, to our training facilities both for surface craft and for aviation, we have reached a point where we can give the men complete and adequate training before they are sent into battle. It would be most unfortunate if a curtailment in the continental shore construction program should prevent our continuing this practice and thus increase the hazard to the lives of our fighting men. This is particularly applicable to the current status of our aviation training.

While we can face the future with confidence in our ability to carry this war to a triumphant conclusion, there is, in my opinion, nothing in the current situation which justifies a degree of optimism so great as to warrant a reduction of the preparations which we are making to bring the maximum weight to bear on the enemy. As I have stated hereinbefore, unless the necessary logistic support, is provided for the fighting forces, the direct expenditures made for those forces will not be fully productive, and our men will not have the implements which they need to do their job. As the necessary training, production, and operating facilities within the continental limits of the United States constitute an essential part of this logistic support, I sincerely trust that the Congress will see fit to make available whatever the Navy considers necessary for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. HORNE,
Vice Admiral, United States Navy,
Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

So, with these facts before the committee, we either had to say we were going to be charged with the responsibility of running the war or else that we were going to support the men who are charged with the responsibility. Therefore we restored $144,373,024 which the Budget had disallowed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the testimony at the hearing showed that the Navy Department had already cut the estimates made in the field by 25 percent?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] developed fully the mechanism by which these estimates reached the Department. It disclosed that the field—I mean the different naval districts—had requested far more than the Navy Department asked the Bureau of the Budget to allow; that they screened the estimates in the Navy Department; they scrutinized all of these requests. Then oftentimes they reduced the field estimates by 25 percent, 35 percent, 40 or 50 percent. Then when the Navy Department makes its decision as to the absolutely necessary items it goes to the Bureau of the Budget, and in this case the Budget arbitrarily said—I do not know for what reason or with what justification: "You must take a cut of 20 percent." The Naval Affairs Committee inquired into that and felt that the facts justified the approval of the amount the Department asked of the Bureau of the Budget.

Of course, it may be possible in this bill for a great amount of money to be saved by utilizing certain activities of the Army that have been abandoned. If it can, of course, the Navy will do so. The mere fact that a field or any other activity has been abandoned out in central Illinois, or Kansas, or Missouri, does not necessarily mean that it can work into the Navy's program, because the Navy is a seagoing organization, and it bases its training with that objective in view, and military facilities in connection with an Army base may not be suitable to work into the Navy's scheme. But if it can be worked in, then, of course, they will use it.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not a fact that the Navy has already considered what abandoned facilities of the Army it can use, and that it knows now, to a certain extent, and that was a fact in the consideration of this bill? I might state that in the program that was placed before the Roads Committee a few weeks ago for access highways it was stated that the matter of using abandoned facilities of the Army by the Navy had already been taken into consideration so that they would know what they needed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

Now let me call the Committee's attention to how the committee handled this bill. When you break down and try to show how to spend $1,644,373,024, or $625,373,024, because there is no breakdown of the $1,019,000,000, it requires considerable detail; but the Naval Affairs Committee did it. We read every one of these authorizations item by item to get an explanation and a justification for each one.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. ROWE. Of the $1,500,000,000 carried was not the greater part the result of the Budget Commission's working with field and Navy Department requests rather than the Navy's recommendation itself?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; the $1,500,000,000 is what the Budget permitted the Navy to come to Congress and ask for. The Navy had asked for $1,644,373,024 and the Budget approved only $1,500,000,000. Under the customary procedure when the Budget disapproves an amount the department can come to Congress and ask for only the amount the Budget has authorized them to request, but that does not preclude Congress from saying what in its opinion is the amount the department needs to carry out its undertaking and its obligation.

Mr. ROWE. Then my conclusion is correct that the limitation of $1,500,000,000 is by the interposition of the Budget limitation rather than by the Navy Department itself.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right; the gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. MOTT. Has the Committee on Naval Affairs always followed the recommendations of the Budget in respect to the expansion of the Navy, including the shore stations facilities? If we had followed their recommendations instead of our own judgment and the judgment of the Navy how far along would we have been with the program?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me say that I think we are charged with the responsibility of reaching the decision. We want to have it fortified, of course, by the Budget. I have no criticism of them, but I do feel that the Committee on Naval Affairs when it gets the facts is in a better position to make a decision.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we certainly would not have had Plum Point had we followed the Budget instead of our own judgment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And we certainly would not have had Quonset or the South Boston naval repair depot.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Budget is all right. In this instance, in our opinion, the Budget was too conservative.

As I started to remark a moment ago when we had these hearings we took up each one of these items and had naval officers there to explain them. There are 29 members on the committee. They are just as much concerned about economy as anybody else in this country because our constituents have to pay taxes just like every other Member's constituents, and we have to pay them ourselves, so every dollar we possibly can save we do save, but we do not practice false economy.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. But the gentleman's committee did not undertake to justify every single item brought before us today.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. To be absolutely accurate I may not have reached the same conclusion as the Department reached on each expenditure. I might have felt they could spend the money in another way to aid the prosecution of the war a little better. For instance I might not think it was necessary to have so

much recreational facilities at a naval hospital as to provide seven soft-ball fields at one hospital, but if the medical authorities are of the opinion that their patients require that I am not going to set myself up and say that that is not the way to accord those boys recreation facilities.

Mr. PLUMLEY. In order to win the war.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If I were charged with the responsibility I might say they should build some other kind of recreation facilities.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to break this down. We have done two things in this bill: We have given flexibility and we have tried to retain control over the acquisition and disposition of property. Let me talk first about the proposition of flexibility. Because an item is included in the bill does not mean that each of these items is going to be constructed just like this report shows because the war changes; to use a military expression, the war is so fluid one cannot tell today what is going to be needed next week. It may therefore happen that some of these plants will not be expanded as called for in this report. But if the Navy Department brings in a new establishment, something new that has not been covered by the committee, they must come back to the Committee on Naval Affairs and notify it that what they contemplated when they appeared before the committee originally on this item must be changed to meet altered conditions, that they need to use the funds for another item instead of the one appropriated for. We have got to do this. We cannot tie them down to any hard and fast condition.

As I said before, we provide in the bill that no property can be acquired or sold until the Naval Affairs Committee of the House and the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate have approved the transaction and approved the acquisition or disposition. We deemed this necessary for two reasons. First, because it lets Congress know what is going on; and, second, in the interest of economy it allows Congress to have a hand in the acquisition or sale of property.

Every week the Navy Department sends in to the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate requests to lease or buy this piece of property or that piece of property. We have a hearing on it at which time they justify it or if they fail to justify it the item is rejected. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY], and myself have been delegated by the Naval Affairs Committee as a subcommittee charged with the responsibility—and we try to discharge that duty in a faithful and efficient manner—of seeing that economy prevails.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. As an indication of the extensiveness of the responsibility of that subcommittee in passing on the acquisition of real-estate items, can the gentleman advise the committee as to the number of items the Naval Affairs Committee has considered and passed upon?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am sorry, I have not that information, but it is enormous.

Just as soon as we finish with this bill a hearing of our committee will be held with reference to renting property all over the United States. The officer must come here from the Navy Department and justify the acquisition before the Navy Department takes a lease. We wrote that requirement into law because we want the Congress to have control and a voice in these matters.

Mr. COLE of New York. As a matter of fact, the committee has passed upon well over 2,000 items.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes; a great many.

Mr. Chairman, that covers this bill. We break it down so every Member may find exactly what is in the minds of the Navy Department. There is only one item in this bill that has not some immediate bearing to the direct prosecution of the war and that is an item with reference to certain expansion at the Naval Academy. That is not directly concerned with the prosecution of the war but it is indirectly in that it is affording better facilities for the training of the young men who come to the Naval Academy to be educated as officers of the Navy. We felt therefore that it would be perfectly proper to authorize it, but there will be no criticism from us if the Committee on Appropriations does not allow it on the theory only that all they are allowing is the immediate items necessary in the prosecution of this war.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, and even in the question of the Naval Academy expansion program which has been recommended over a period of many years by the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, we did not until this year because of the expansion of our personnel and the training of cadets at the Naval Academy see fit to take care of this increase.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

FIGURES SHOW THAT ROOSEVELT CANNOT CARRY NEW YORK STATE IN 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, a strong Republican trend in New York shown by elections since 1940 indicates conclusively that Mr. Roosevelt cannot carry that State in 1944.

The most recent significant evidence of that trend occurred in a special election on February 29 in the Twenty-first District. There, the Republican candidate was defeated by a margin of only 1,531 votes by a Democrat who was also supported by the American Labor Party. The Republican vote was 10,136 and the combined Democratic-American Labor vote was only 11,707, of which incidentally only 8,481 were actually Democratic votes, the Republican thus receiving 46.4 percent of the total vote. This would leave 53.6 percent for the Democratic and the American Labor Parties.

In this same district in the 1942 election the Democratic and American Labor candidate had a plurality of 29,792, his vote being 60,558 against 30,796 for his Republican opponent. The Republican percent was 33.7, while the Democratic and American Labor vote was 66.3 percent.

The Republican percentage gain in the recent special election over the 1942 election was therefore 12.7 percent.

Although the Twenty-first District is a strong Tammany district, the Republican vote in this district in 1942 was only one-tenth of 1 percent less than the Republican percent of the vote for Representatives in Congress for New York City as a whole. Therefore, if the Democratic vote in this district has fallen off, it is only fair to assume that it has fallen off to the same percentage in the other districts in that city. In short, the gain in the Republican percent of the vote in the Twenty-first District indicates a similar gain in the city as a whole.

It may be argued that because at the recent election in the Twenty-first District the vote was much smaller than the vote in 1940 and 1942 that it is not a safe base of computation. It is generally considered that in off years and in elections in which the vote is light that the organization candidates get a larger percentage of votes than the nonorganization candidates. The Tammany organization and the Marcantonio organization were both united in their support of the Democratic candidate, yet their total strength in this, one of their most favorable districts in the State, was only 53.6 percent. If that is the best they can do in one of their most favorable districts in the State, what hopes have they when it is a recognized fact that New York outside of New York City always has been and will be Republican by a tremendous vote?

In the 1942 election 604,874 Republican votes were polled for Representatives in Congress in all New York City districts as against 1,177,949 Democratic and American Labor Party votes. The Democratic and American Labor plurality was 573,075.

If we assume a 12.7 percent Republican gain in New York City since the 1942 election, the Republican vote based on the 1942 figures just cited would be increased by 76,819 and the Democratic and American Labor vote would be decreased by a similar figure. This would raise the Republican vote to 681,693 and decrease the Democratic and American Labor vote to 1,101,130 with a resulting decrease of the Democratic and American Labor plurality to 419,437. In short, in an election held today, Democratic candidates for Representatives in Congress would not in the aggregate carry New

York City by more than approximately 420,000 as compared with 573,000 2 years ago.

It may be said that the picture will be more favorable to the Democrats if Roosevelt heads the 1944 Democratic ticket and that he himself would win New York City by a considerably larger plurality than the 420,000 just cited. This is not so. As a matter of fact, Roosevelt's 1940 vote in New York City was approximately 4 percent under the aggregate vote for Democratic Representatives in Congress, and his plurality in the city was about 225,000 less. When you consider that Roosevelt did not get as many votes in 1940 in New York City as the Democratic Congressmen got, you cannot successfully maintain that he is a strength to the ticket. The large number of new Congressmen who came into Congress through the 1932–34–36–38 elections came because of Roosevelt's popularity in States other than New York. The fact that for the past few congressional elections the Republican membership in the House of Representatives has greatly increased until the membership is about even is proof that the name "Roosevelt" has lost its magic.

Assuming that as of now Roosevelt is still 4 percent weaker in New York City than the city Representatives in Congress, the Republican vote in New York City can be increased by 4 percent over the aggregate of 681,693 which their Representatives in Congress would now receive and the Democratic total would be correspondingly decreased. On this basis the comparative vote in the Presidential election in New York City with Roosevelt heading the Democratic ticket and assuming that he would receive the support of the American Labor Party which he did in 1940 and which enabled him to carry the State that year would be:

Republican, 708,960; Democratic and American Labor Party, 1,073,503; plurality, Democratic-American Labor Party, 364,543.

While it is true that the total vote in 1944 will be much larger than the figures here used, which are based on the 1942 vote for Representatives in Congress, it is yet to be proved that the Democrats would benefit any more by a larger vote than would the Republicans. There is sure to be a big Republican increase in upper New York, while it is sure that there will no Democratic increase in the city of New York.

This Roosevelt plurality of 364,543 is far less than would be necessary to carry New York State in the face of the large up-State Republican pluralities. For only under landslide conditions is the Republican up-State plurality less than 400,000, and usually it is considerably greater. Thus, while in 1936 Landon's plurality outside of New York City was only about 263,000, and in consequence he lost the State by nearly 1,000,000 votes, Willkie in 1940 had a plurality of 494,029 outside of the city and only lost by 224,440. The present Governor likewise in 1938 lost the State to Lehman by the close margin of about 67,000. but had a plurality of about 602,000 up-State. In 1942 the Governor had an up-State plurality over the Democratic and American Labor Party candidate combined of nearly 655,000.

Mr. Hanley, in the special election of 1943 in his spectacular race for Lieutenant Governor, had a margin of nearly 670,000 outside of New York City. With a trend of this character Roosevelt would have to carry New York City by well over half a million to win the State in 1944.

If the Democrats and American Labor Party could carry this recent New York election by only a 7.2 percent majority then on a total vote of 3,213,707, which was the vote cast in New York City in 1940, they would only carry the city of New York by a vote of 231,386. This would not match the up-State New York vote by about 438,000. After making all fair allowances the Republican nominee for the Presidency should carry New York State by 350,000.

The total vote for Democratic Congressman in a large majority of the districts of New York was much lower in 1942 than 1938. This shows a general falling off of the Democratic vote in the State for the past 4 years.

In the 1940 Presidential election in the race between Wendell Willkie on the Republican ticket and Franklin D. Roosevelt on the Democratic ticket, Willkie received 3,027,478 votes and Roosevelt received only 2,834,500 votes. In other words, running as a Republican against a Democrat, Willkie got 192,978 more votes than Roosevelt got. In spite of this Roosevelt is given credit for having carried the State because the American Labor votes were counted for Roosevelt. The American Labor vote was 417,418. This was sufficient to wipe out the Republican majority and leave Roosevelt with a bare majority over Willkie in the whole State of only 224,440 votes.

Three-fourths of the American Labor vote in the State was cast in the city of New York. This group had a choice between Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate, and Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Thomas received a vote of 18,950 in the whole State of New York, most of which was from New York City. The American Labor Party which operates almost exclusively in New York City although it polled a very small vote proved to be the balance of power in the New York election of 1940.

Since 1940 the State of New York held a State-wide election for Governor in 1942. The figures in that election prove conclusively that New York is a Republican State and will without doubt go Republican in 1944. The Republican candidate for Governor carried New York State outside of the city of New York against the Democratic candidate by 732,404. The Democratic candidate carried New York City by only 85,309, leaving the Republicans a majority of 647,095 in the State. In that same election the American Labor candidate got a total in the whole State of 403,609, four-fifths of which were cast in New York City. If we would have given all of the American Labor vote to the Democratic candidate, the Republican candidate would still have had a majority of 243,468.

Summarizing:

First. Roosevelt has never been as strong in New York as has been claimed. He has not been as strong as his ticket in recent elections.

Second. The Republican Party has been gradually gaining in strength and the figures show it is much stronger than the combined strength of the Democratic Party and the American Labor Party. The Republicans hold the governership and control the legislature and are holding many positions of power and influence in the State. And there is an unmistakable Republican trend in the country.

Third. The American Labor Party, which is the New Deal Party, has but little strength outside of New York City. It is now being torn by disunity. It never was able to function effectively in State-wide elections. It will not be as strong in New York City as formerly.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and also to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, today there is being held in the Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma a special election to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives. As bearing upon the significance of that election I desire to read into the RECORD an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Washington Daily News. The title of the editorial is "Oklahoma's Byelection." The editorial reads as follows:

OKLAHOMA'S BYELECTION

Having lost an uncomfortable number of byelections in the last year, the Democrats have wheeled in their heavy artillery to win the contest in the Second Oklahoma Congressional District tomorrow. They have sent no less a personage than Senate Leader ALBEN BARKLEY to sing the administration's song at Muskogee tonight.

On the record, the Democrats should win. If they can't carry that gerrymandered district they might as well quit. In its 30 years of existence the district has gone Republican only once—in the Harding landslide of 1920. In the last election, 1942, the Democratic nominee for Congress won by only 385 votes. But there were special circumstances which made the Republican vote so large. An unpopular Democratic Senator, Josh Lee, was being voted out of office; and a full Republican slate of candidates for Senator, Governor, other State offices and county and township offices, was on the ticket. In tomorrow's contest there are only the candidates for the Congress seat, and Democratic Bill Stigler is better and more favorably known than the Republican, E. O. Clark. There is no such thing in that district as a Republican organization, while the Democrats have State, county, and township machines working together.

In good years, the Democrats carry this district by 2 to 1; in normal years their majority is about 15,000. If the Democrat wins tomorrow it will be only what is expected. If the Republican wins it will be an upset that will reflect not a trend but a tidal wave.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say to the gentleman that that editorial sounds very much like an alibi in advance. The gentleman is just presenting it here in the House so that Members of Congress who are Republican, in case they are disappointed tomorrow, may point to this editorial and the gentleman's little talk and say, "Well, we did not expect to win anyhow."

Mr. HALLECK. If I may suggest to the gentleman, speaking for myself, I am of the opinion that we are going to win although everyone knows we have an uphill fight in a strong, traditionally Democratic district. The fact of the matter is that the conditions as stated apparently do not quite satisfy the gentleman.

Mr. DREWRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DREWRY. May I ask the gentleman one question, if he would classify that statement as inspired propaganda?

Mr. HALLECK. No; I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] it seems as though he is expounding in advance the theory of "heads I win, tails you lose."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time and I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, $41,716,500; aviation facilities, $228,375,000; storage facilities, $90,335,000; Marine Corps housing and training, $25,375,000; ordnance facilities, $120,906,554; personnel training and housing facilities, $46,579,670; hospital facilities, $42,071,750; shore radio facilities, $4,060,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $1,593,550; miscellaneous structures, $24,360,000; advance base construction, material and equipment, $1,019,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed $1,644,373,024: *Provided further*, That prior to the acquisition or disposal, by lease or otherwise, of any land acquired for naval use under the authority of this, or any other act, the Secretay of the Navy shall come into agreement with the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the terms of such prospective acquisitions or disposals; and recital of compliance with this proviso in any instrument of conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of this or any other act shall be conclusive evidence of the Secretary's compliance with this proviso as to the property conveyed: *Provided further*, That effective December 13, 1943, temporary housing is authorized for transient personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with their dependents, on a rental basis, for periods not exceeding 60 days, without loss of rental allowance or money allowance for quarters.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: On page 3, after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. RAMSPECK having resumed the Chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MURPHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4381) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 469, reported the same back to the House with an amendment agreed to in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

COOPERATIVES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago in a gloomy, depressed English village 27 men and 1 woman worked out a new method of meeting the economic needs of the common people of the world. These people met together because they and their fellow citizens were in want of the common necessities of life. They had tried to secure an increase in their wages and had failed. In searching for some method of relieving their families' hardships, they hit upon the idea of pooling their meager resources and purchasing power and going into business for themselves. If they bought together the things they all needed, might they not be able to reduce the cost of the necessities of life?

It took them a whole year to accumulate a capital of 28 British pounds, or a little over $100 in our money, with which to pay a quarter of a year's rental on a dingy little shop and to purchase their first supplies of flour and oatmeal. At first people made fun of them; and their little store was almost wrecked by rioters who sought to ridicule their efforts. But they had rediscovered the one basic principle upon which all human society must ultimately be based, the principle of group loyalty. On that principle they built their little business and out of that principle has grown the most solid single hope of human betterment that this distressed world knows.

For that little shop in Toad Lane in the city of Rochdale, England, gave birth to the cooperative movement which today claims the active participation and allegiance of more than 100,000,000 people throughout the world. In England today the original Society of Rochdale Pioneers boasts 30,000 members and a capital of 558,000 British pounds; while one-sixth of all British retail trade is handled by cooperatives.

The light of Rochdale spread to other countries, in some of which various forms of cooperative activity had been experienced throughout the centuries. In China there are records of a cooperative movement centuries prior to the day of Rochdale. Today the Rochdale pattern is being applied there and millions of Chinese are now developing their cooperatives. In Sweden, in Switzerland, in Finland, in Norway, in France, in Belgium, in Denmark, in Holland, and 30 or more other countries the cooperative movement developed.

In our country small cooperative societies began to develop almost a hundred years ago. Many failed and then sprang up again. Later the cooperative movement spread to the farms and culminated in the tremendous Grange movement of the nineteenth century. After another period of decline there began to grow the cooperative movement of today, perhaps the strongest united movement among the American people.

It is difficult to obtain absolutely accurate estimates of membership in this country, but it is fair to say that as many as 12,000,000 of our people are associated with the Rochdale cooperatives of this country—in credit cooperatives or credit unions; in health and insurance cooperatives; in grocery and oil and feed and seed and fertilizer and machine cooperatives. At least one-third of American farmers belong to some type of cooperative. More than one-third of the food supplied to our armed forces has been sent through cooperatives. Thou-

sands of our city people have been organized in cooperative societies which include farmers and city workers alike. For the cooperative movement is one which can and must abolish class lines of all kinds and bring together in a common enterprise townsfolk and farmers and men of all classes, creeds, nationalities, colors, and kinds.

Out of the darkness of the present hour there come the clear voices of men convinced by long, and sometimes difficult, experience that here in this method ordinary men and women can find answers to their problems.

"I firmly believe that the people themselves hold in their own hands the tools to shape their destiny," said Murray D. Lincoln, president of the Cooperative League of the United States and manager of the great Ohio Farm Bureau Cooperatives. And under Lincoln's direction, not only are the cooperatives of Ohio proving the truth of what he declares, but through his leadership also cooperative organizations throughout the country are springing up to carry on.

Cooperatives once established are inherently strong institutions. Even opposition of the cruelest sort cannot kill them because they draw their inspiration from the deepest wellsprings of decent human action.

At this moment, cooperatives are of immeasurable importance to the democratic forces in this world. In China, for example, industrial cooperatives have been one of the most important factors in enabling the Chinese to continue the production necessary to their heroic resistance against Japanese aggression. The number of Chinese cooperative societies has jumped from 47,000 in 1937 to 167,000 today and the membership has more than quadrupled. The Ministry of Social Affairs of the Chinese Government, with the wholehearted support of the Cooperative League of China, is now promoting the organization of a closely coordinated network of agricultural and industrial cooperatives throughout the country. The agricultural cooperative societies will be linked up with the industrial cooperatives which in turn will be connected with the consumer societies. The agricultural cooperative societies will produce raw materials which will be supplied to industrial cooperatives. The industrial cooperatives will then use these raw materials for the manufacture of consumer goods and these consumer goods will be distributed to the cooperative members through affiliated cooperative societies. Under such a system production will take place for an absolutely assured market and a degree of economic security heretofore unknown in China can be established.

In Sweden the cooperative movement has played the most important role in shaping wartime economic policy. It has fought successfully against inflation and it has done it basically by guarding the supply lines. The Swedish cooperatives are directly and exclusively responsible for the fact that Sweden, though cut off from supplies from the rest of the world, has suffered so little from acute shortages. For, seeing the danger of war and seeking to protect their members and their nation, rather than to profiteer as a result of scarcity, the cooperatives went out in the months before the war and bought great quantities of coffee, rubber, and many other things. When the war came, at the Government's request, the co-ops sold some of their supplies to the private trade which otherwise would have been seriously short of such supplies. The importance of this service by the Swedish cooperatives to their nation is impossible to overestimate.

In the United States cooperatives were the first to point out the necessity and justice of rationing scarce commodities. And had there been three or four times as many members of consumer cooperatives as there were when the war came, these institutions might well have been an important enough element in our trade to have controlled and kept down prices for consumers simply by means of effective competition. Even the O. P. A. might have been unnecessary except to control monopoly prices had the co-ops been stronger.

When Adolf Hitler undertook to conquer Europe and destroy democratic institutions on that Continent he was confronted by thousands of cooperative businesses and societies in every country he invaded. He tried his best to destroy them or at least to make them subservient to his purposes. He failed. And by a sort of poetic justice the cooperatives of the countries he has thought he conquered, may one day succeed to ownership of much of the property which he has stolen. For in discussing the problem of Nazi-seized property which the United Nations must face, Fortune magazine in May 1943 made the following highly important proposal:

After the period of reconstruction and rehabilitation, the administrators should turn the properties back to their rightful owners, whenever the latter can be found. If there is no one to raise a claim, either because the enterprises have always been in German hands or because the legitimate owners have been killed without leaving heirs, the administrators would have various alternatives. They could turn the properties over to the States for nationalization. They could sell them to competent, trustworthy, private individuals, perhaps even financing such men. Or they could adopt a third alternative: Turn them into cooperatives.

There are strong recommendations for this last course. By their very nature, cooperatives train those who participate in them in democratic methods; and while teaching self-reliance, they also teach interdependence—in a word, cooperation. These are qualities that we shall want to encourage. Moreover, while satisfying the European urge for amalgamation and integration, they also enforce competition. There have been many instances, especially in Sweden, where cooperatives have broken cartel-rigged price structures. Most important, the common people of Europe have had a great deal of experience with cooperatives, understand them, and like them.

Before the Nazis came to power, about one-seventh of the population of Europe belonged to one or another cooperative group. The English Cooperative Wholesale Society has grown during the war, but in occupied Europe the Nazis have confiscated co-op properties and funds and have done their best to uproot the whole idea. Indications are that they have not succeeded; that the movement will command at least as many supporters once the Nazis are removed; and that with the restoration of the physical equipment the system can be put back in working order rapidly. If the orphan properties were handed over as well, the system could begin to function earlier and might soon give to many troubled parts of Europe the stable, satisfying character of the Swedish "mixed system" economy.

In addition to the suggestion made by Fortune with regard to a salutary disposal of property seized by the Germans, the cooperatives among rural and city people in the conquered areas of Europe also offer the one best way whereby a program of true rehabilitation can be carried out in those nations if only the United Nations seize upon the opportunity. For how much better it would be to help these people to help themselves by providing seeds for planting, eggs for hatching, and loans of needed commodities to be distributed through the cooperatives as wages to their own fellow citizens for work in rehabilitating their countries instead of relying upon the direct relief of a charity sort which otherwise will in all probability be employed.

In this connection Dr. J. P. Warbasse, president emeritus of the Cooperative League of the United States, had the following to say at the recent international conference of cooperatives held in Washington under the sponsorship of the Cooperative League of the United States of America:

The common man has two things which are essential for the development of the cooperative movement after the war. He has working power and consuming power. The consuming power is a necessity and the working power is an essential in order that he may live to enjoy that necessity. We in the cooperative movement disapprove of the idea that he is to be assisted by philanthropy. The resources made available by the taxing power of governments make available funds for beginning rehabilitation. It is the cooperative program that the funds collected by governments which these governments otherwise would use in a philanthropic way, making presents to individuals in order to keep them alive, should be allocated to individuals who are organizing for the purpose of self-help rather than for the purpose of getting something for nothing. These people, with the consciousness of self-help and mutual aid, organized in cooperative societies, can take such funds and by their own efforts gain more advantages for themselves and get more rehabilitation than if each individual is treated as a mendicant and receives the largesse of his government.

Is not this the answer to the problem so often expressed as to how we are to exercise our humanitarian desire to help the people of war-ravaged Europe without turning them into dependents upon our charity?

Let us help people to help themselves, and in so doing let us try to rehabilitate in a way that will lead naturally into permanent reconstruction—

Said Wallace Campbell at the same conference on international rehabilitation through cooperation.

And as to genuine reconstruction—

He continued—

we have talked a lot about the century of the common man. Here is a formula whereby the common man can get into action

right away. We have talked about wholesales in this international scale, but we have got to see that after the holocaust is over in Europe, these ordinary people can do something for themselves, and this cooperative business is a way for neighbors to get together, even in small groups of half a dozen to a hundred, to a thousand—getting together in groups to do something for themselves. And actually, the people's business, which is our nickname for cooperation, is a way for the common man to take hold of this century and make it his own.

Francis Gabrovesek, a member of the Yugoslavian Parliament and now associated with the Yugoslav Committee for Post-war Reconstruction in London, has made the following significant argument for the use of cooperatives in reconstruction work:

In our country most of the people are members of cooperatives * * * our people understand that they own the cooperatives. * * * We must do everything to respect the dignity of man and to insist that the state must realize it is the subject of man and not that man is owned by the state. That is the precise issue in Europe today and, in fact, the issue before the entire world. We must make our choice and we will make our choice in some degree in the rehabilitation machinery which we set up.

It is not only in the devasted and wartorn regions of the world, however, that the cooperative movement offers hope of a brighter tomorrow. Here in our own country we confront at war's end the age-old problem as to how a reasonable security of life can be assured to the average citizen at the same time that he retains those freedoms and that liberty which Americans have always prized so much and which lie at the root of our constitutional governmental system. On the one hand private monopoly, stronger than ever before, will seek to restrict production and to exact monopoly prices from the consumers of the Nation. On the other hand there will rise the danger of ever-growing government with more and more people depending on it for some form of direct action to aid them in their difficulties. Somewhere between these two extremes there must be found a middle road, a means whereby groups of citizens by the application of intelligence and initiative can work out, without governmental assistance or special favors of any sort, a reasonable answer to their problems. Fortunately for us there are already millions of people in our country who have put into practice the cooperative method of doing business which offers this middle road.

What then are the principles of organization which have enabled the average man, whether he be farmer, consumer, or city worker, to develop for himself the answer to many of the problems which have confronted him? The basic Rochdale principles are now well known to many people, but they certainly belong here in this speech delivered on the one hundredth anniversary of this truly great movement. Here they are—seven in number:

First. Membership open to any man of good will whoever and whatever he may be.

Second. One member, one vote; no voting by proxy.

Third. Share capital is paid a limited return—usually 4 percent.

Fourth. Earnings of a cooperative are returned to each member to the degree to which he has used it—the patronage dividend.

Fifth. Neutrality on the part of the co-op in religion and politics.

Sixth. Trading on a cash basis and at the going market price.

Seventh. Education of members and nonmembers with reference to cooperative principles.

Based on these principles, by 1941, 6,000 consumer cooperative stores had been established in the United States, with a membership of a million and a half and doing an annual business of $583,000,000. There were in 1941, 660 service co-ops with 177,000 members, 700 Rural Electrification co-ops with 575,000 members, 9,510 credit unions with over 3,000,000 members, and 6,800,000 members of insurance cooperatives.

The farm people of America, who through the years have been noted for their practical common sense, have led the way in the formation of cooperatives in the United States. Not only do over one-third of the farmers of America sell their crops cooperatively but cooperatives of farmers purchase approximately one-sixth of all farm supplies bought in the United States. These purchases consist largely of feed, seed, fertilizer, oil, and gasoline, which products are being manufactured and produced to a greater and greater extent by cooperatives belonging to the farmer consumers.

Mr. Howard A. Cowden, manager of the Consumer Cooperative Association, of North Kansas City, Mo., one of the most successful cooperatives in the whole world, has pointed out that through cooperation the common people are able to own the things for which they pay. He has emphasized the fact that whereas consumers in purchasing the products of industry actually pay for the industrial plant and the distribution mechanism through the prices of the goods they buy, it is only when they become members of cooperatives that their payments result in their own ownership of the plant or industry involved. Thus through cooperatives hundreds of thousands of American citizens who otherwise could never hope to hold ownership in any part of the great industrial structure of this Nation are able to increase and broaden their stake in the economic life of our country. Thus a road to true independence, to real free enterprise lies open, the importance of which to the future of our country is hard indeed to over-emphasize.

A cooperative differs from a joint stock company primarily in the fact that it is a business organization where a large number of people with small resources pool these resources together in order to go into the business of either manufacturing or purchasing for themselves a certain product, or of selling to themselves certain products jointly purchased. The ordinary corporation, on the other hand, comes into existence because a small number of people with large capital organize the corporation for the purpose of manufacturing and selling certain products to other people at a profit.

Perhaps one or two examples of the successful operation of cooperatives in our own country will give specific point to the message of this speech.

The close of the First World War saw American farmers face to face with a commercial fertilizer combine as powerful in its field as any trust in the land. The monopoly refused to reduce its prices to levels which farmers could afford. True to the basic principle of American freedom the farmers accordingly went into business for themselves. They began by pooling orders for carload lots of fertilizer. Sometimes their local distributors, under the thumb of the Fertilizer Trust, refused to deal with them. But their business had soon become large enough so that the cooperatives were able to buy on contract from the large chemical companies. By the late thirties the cooperatives of Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and a few other States, were in a position to pool their resources and build their own fertilizer factories. At last the Fertilizer Trust began to cut its prices. It attempted to cut them to such a point as to ruin the cooperatives' business, but the cooperatives were possessed of a resource which monopoly did not understand. That resource was the loyalty of their membership. The membership "stood behind" the cooperatives and they were able to likewise cut their cost of production through capacity operation of their plants, and to meet the price cutting of the monopoly on its own ground. These farmer-owned cooperatives now operate 13 fertilizer factories in 9 States in the United States. Meanwhile the Department of Justice has brought action against the fertilizer manufacturers for a monopoly in restraint of trade. But already the problem was largely solved by groups of free American farmers without necessary recourse to governmental intervention, and to a considerable extent the so-called Fertilizer Trust had ceased to exist.

One hundred million dollars' worth of petroleum products are handled each year by cooperatives in the United States. In the State of Indiana the margin on gasoline delivered by tank truck to farmers was 7 cents per gallon when the cooperatives went into business several years ago. Today that margin has been reduced to scarcely more than a cent per gallon. Similar stories could be told of the situation in other States. By 1942 more than a fifth of all refined petroleum products consumed on farms was being supplied by consumer cooperatives. Today some of these cooperatives have built their own oil refineries and acquired ownership of a number of oil wells. One such refinery constructed by the Middle Western Consumer Cooperative Association at Phillipsburg, Kans., has had a history which is worth briefly recounting. In accordance with sound cooperative methods, the products of this refinery were sold at the going market price and the margin of earnings between cost of production, on the one hand, and that market price, on the other, was devoted to the liquidation of the entire cost of

construction of the refinery before any patronage dividends were paid. It took less than 3 years for the entire construction cost of this refinery to be paid off, simply by devoting its earnings to that purpose. Not only does this mean that by the pursuit of sound cooperative business methods the farmers and other members of the consumer cooperative association now own an oil refinery, free and clear of debt, but it also indicates how very substantial a margin of profit has normally been included in the price of refined petroleum products. Information of this sort made available to the American people out of the hardest, most practical sort of experience is, I think, clearly invaluable not only to cooperative members but to the Nation as a whole. Every inch of the way they have been fought by the oil monopoly. But the cooperatives are still growing and expanding, and they may yet give us the constructive answer to the basic problem of our oil industry.

The fire-insurance companies are coming to Congress asking it to pass legislation exempting them from the antitrust laws. Apparently these insurance companies are blind to the fact that the very Federal regulation which they are seeking to avoid would become inevitable as a result of the kind of monopolistic practices which almost certainly would further increase if Congress gave them the green light by preventing the antitrust laws from reaching these insurance companies. Meanwhile, however, the Farm Bureau cooperative insurance companies of Columbus, Ohio, have demonstrated another way. From the date of their organization in 1926 these companies have grown and expanded until now they serve 11 States. They have served as a constant yardstick as to the cost of insurance and insurance service on the part of the old-line companies. In the State of Ohio, for example, they have been directly responsible for reduction of the insurance premiums on school busses by some 40 percent. Meanwhile these cooperative insurance companies have been in a position to pay patronage dividends ranging from 25 to 40 percent of the amount of the established premiums.

Cooperatives are in the best tradition of America. They bank on the free enterprise and initiative of Americans. They do not look to the Government for help, nor do they produce solely to make profit. Cooperatives are an evolutionary development away from the old savage idea of survival of the fittest and toward a new and more civilized idea of mutual aid—a means whereby each citizen can look after his own self-interest and simultaneously contribute to the social good. The effect of such organization is to increase individual responsibility and develop individual freedom. Cooperatives are potentially the most efficient form of business ever devised, because they distribute and produce goods for a known demand. There need be no gambling on raw materials, on inventories, or on markets. They eliminate the excessive cost of selling in a competitive market, for the plants are owned by the customers. At the same time, by their very nature they tend to encourage an economy of abundance rather than an economy of scarcity. Dr. Warbasse expressed a basic cooperative principle when he said, "If any business can supply people's needs more effectively than cooperatives, then we welcome that business." The contrast between such a philosophy and that of monopoly, scarcity, and restraint of trade is so obvious as to require no comment.

At the present time it seems to me that three distinct trends exist in this country, any one of which may become dominant as we strive to solve our economic problems.

The first is the tendency toward big monopoly producers controlling the economy. They produce that which is most profitable to sell—but not too much of it—and they charge all the traffic will bear. If the devil does not take the hindmost, he most assuredly takes the consumer. These monopoly producers, although they are disturbed somewhat by Government regulation, are nonetheless strong enough to control the supply of many types of goods in this country, and if they become dominant after the war we will once again experience the artificial scarcity, the lack of widespread purchasing power, and the concentration or control which brought on the depression of 1929.

However, we were pretty badly scared by the years of unemployment and hunger and distress in that depression. So it may be that we shall try to avoid the evils of big business by adopting those of big Government. We may set up large and flourishing bureaus to control business. We may plan huge programs of deficit-financed public works to make sure that everybody has at least some means of working for a living. Along this road lies the danger of a constant growth of Government, and whatever it be called, it will be organization from the top down and not from the people up.

Neither of these prospects looks very attractive to me, and I doubt if they do to the little men in this country: The white-collar workers, the farmers, the school teachers, the ministers and lawyers, the small storekeepers, the laborers in our factories, the men who sail our merchant marine. Either picture looks like something a long, long way from the realization of the American dream. The first will make a few people mighty rich and a lot of people mighty hungry. The second will increase the population of Washington, and will lead us to the very philosophy of state control which we are fighting all over the world this moment.

But it is not required of us that either of these situations come into being. True, the seeds for both exist at this time in American soil. But another kind of seed lies also in the fertile ground of this country—one which has grown and expanded since its first beginning—the cooperative way of doing business. It was not so long ago that our country was in the grip of the great depression. We were confronted with the strange paradox of a vast productive capacity standing idle while people were in want of the very things they themselves were readily capable of producing. We did not know then how to get the necessary purchasing power into the hands of the people who needed food and because we had the idea that if people had no money to buy food it was better to destroy it, we at first wrung our hands and let so-called surpluses go to waste. Introduction of the so-called stamp plan and especially of the school-lunch program changed this to some extent and it is in my judgment nothing short of tragic that the present Congress should have refused to authorize that same school-lunch program when it had the opportunity a couple of weeks ago.

When this war has finally been won we shall be confronted with the undeniable necessity of preventing the conditions of 1929 from returning again to our country for we shall have, coming back from winning this war, a generation of young men who by and large will be the same young men upon whom the great depression came, depriving them of their rightful opportunity as American citizens to work, earn a living, marry and raise children. No, Mr. Speaker, those things simply cannot happen again. No duty has rested more insistently upon any public body in all the history of the world than rests the duty upon this Congress of putting the feet of America on a road to true economic health after this war has been won. And if experience means anything, it means that if we are to accomplish that purpose it will be a woefully inadequate method simply to return to the policy and program of the 1920's which led inevitably into that great depression of which I have just spoken. No; we have to be men enough to face the future with courage and to know that it is going to be different from the past.

The burden of my speech today, however, is not to ask for congressional legislation, or to suggest the passage of any bill, or the appropriation of any money. Quite the opposite. For a cooperative movement depending upon the subvention of government becomes no cooperative movement at all. What I am really asking for is understanding. Understanding of the need of people confronted by a great crisis in their history, to have available at one and the same time, a method of solving their everyday economic problems which can also give them a profound inspiration and make them feel that, in their day-to-day dealings with their fellowmen, they are helping in some measure to bring the kingdom of God on earth.

If I did not believe cooperatives could help to do this, I would not be making this speech today. But they are founded, as I have said before, on the basic principles of group loyalty and mutual aid which lie at the base of every great religion the world has ever known, and especially at the base of the Christian religion which most Americans profess. Nor is this all. For by the necessary fact that the cooperative is devoted to the service of its own members, so the impact of its influence in the market places of the Nation must necessarily be one

which will benefit not only its own members but all other citizens as well.

And so, Mr. Speaker, on this hundredth anniversary of the birth of cooperation in a dingy English village, I hail the courage, the foresight, and the devotion of those men and women around the world who are offering by practical demonstration to future generations, not only a solution of the problems which have afflicted the nations ever since the industrial revolution came to England a couple of centuries ago, but also a way of life in which they and their children can walk with happiness.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. The cooperative and the corporation find their premise in the same organic law of free enterprise, however, do they not?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. They certainly do.

Mr. ROWE. The only difference between the two is the matter of the motives that actuate the people who comprise those institutions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Partly that, but may I add to my answer to the gentleman that where people say that those who form a cooperative are violating the American way of life, or something of that kind, what they really are saying is that a few people with a lot of money who organize a corporation to sell a product at a profit to others are in accord with the American principle, but that a lot of people, each with a little money, who go into exactly the same line of business and sell at the same market price, but who do it in order that they themselves who own the business may directly benefit, are not in accord with the American way of life. I just do not follow that argument, and I know the gentleman does not, either.

Mr. ROWE. I think I can agree with the gentleman in his conclusion in that respect. However, I do feel that the charge of selfishness may be made against the cooperative as well as the corporation. That being true, it would be a difficult thing for any charity to emanate from that source any more than from a corporation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The motives of cooperating is inevitably different.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, who is always deeply interested in anything which will increase the welfare or add to the freedom of the people.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman's account of cooperatives through 100 years is very interesting and instructive. I hope the gentleman will extend his remarks so as to include illustrations of cooperatives.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have done so. One illustration is from fertilizer, one from oil, and one from insurance.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should also like the gentleman to include in his extension of remarks an answer to the question I am about to ask, which I fear he cannot answer in his limited time remaining. Is not the ideal cooperative, which the gentleman is so appropriately eulogizing, based on sound business principles of traditional American free enterprise and private property?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman. Indeed through cooperatives many, many of our people have discovered their only opportunity to engage in free enterprise and to acquire modest property rights which they could not otherwise have had.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUGAR RATIONING

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on two different occasions during recent months the President has stated that sugar rationing could probably be dispensed with. In a newspaper release dated February 26, 1944, the War Food Administration stated that civilian supplies of sugar would be lower in 1944 than they were in 1943. A release by the Department of Agriculture appearing in the newspapers on March 21 last, bore the headlines "Big sugar surplus forecast this year."

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has given a great deal of attention to this problem and finds no excuse for these contradictions.

It is contradictory statements like these, constantly emanating from administration sources, that cause some of the confusion that exists not only in the administration of our food problems but in the minds of the American people. No one has a right to play politics with the food supplies of this Nation, yet there are many who believe that the rationing quotas of sugar have purposely been reduced to commercial users for the first 6 months of 1944 in order that a grandstand, magnificent gesture may be made by the administration just prior to the elections by removing sugar from the ration list.

Five of the most important basic foods of this country are bread, meat, milk, butter, and sugar. There have been repeated threats of milk rationing because of the critical cattle-feeding problems that have been created by the lack of coordinated administration of food production and distribution. This same lack of coordination now threatens the rationing of bread before another 12 months have passed. We have had feast and famine periods with rationed meat. The continued control of theoreticians in dealing with our problems of food—and meat in particular—will continue these periods of feast and famine, with a gradual deterioration in the quality of the meat we can purchase below the level to which is has already fallen. The application of roll-back subsidies to rationed butter caused it entirely to disappear from the markets for a long period of time, with a loss of some 100,000,000 pounds of butter to domestic consumers. Housewives of the Nation, with ration stamps, were not able to use those stamps. And now these same New Deal dreamers are developing a scarcity of sugar.

True they have not reduced the amount of sugar the American housewife may go to the store and purchase. She has not complained about her sugar rations. The American housewife has taken all forms of rationing with good grace and little complaint, believing that these things were all necessary to win the war. The reduction in the sugar allotment has been made in a backhanded slap against the housekeepers of the Nation by further curtailing commercial use of sugar by bakers, confectioners, beverage manufacturers and bottlers, dairy product processors, canners, flavoring extract manufacturers and others, to only 70 percent of their 1941 consumption. Industry is puzzled and bewildered by this action, for it is known that the stocks of sugar carried over from last season to this season were more than 1,000,000 tons above that carried over in peacetime years. The sugar allotment to commercial users had already been cut to 80 percent of the 1941 pre-war level, and there appears to be no justification whatsoever for a further decrease to 70 percent.

It was not difficult to understand the reasons for a decrease in the sugar supplies available in 1942 and the first half of 1943. There was apparent reason for strict sugar rationing to decrease the use of sugar because of the loss of a million tons of sugar a year normally shipped from the Philippines; from the forced reduction of nearly 200,000 tons a year that was produced in Hawaii; because of the serious shortage in shipping and because of the losses sustained by submarine action in the Caribbean area.

There is undoubtedly some justification for a continued rationing of sugar, particularly for commercial use and to prevent hoarding, until the risks of war are eliminated. But there can be no justification in the light of the supplies now available for such severe restrictions upon the commercial use of sugar as to create unnecessary handicaps and changes in the dietary habits of our people today. Conditions are entirely different from a year ago. The submarine menace has been licked. American industry produced over 2,000,000 tons of shipping last year and more than 1,000,000 tons in 1942. The United States and the United Nations as a whole have infinitely more ships and better ships today than at any time in history. The excuse is being made that the demands for the coming invasion of Europe require all of the ships that can possibly be made available to carry supplies to our troops overseas. They should have those supplies, and the ships should be furnished to transport them to the right locations in every part of the globe. Information that comes to hand, however, indicates that there is such poor administration in the use of these ships that

millions of tons of shipping of needed commodities are lost forever.

It is reported that so many ships are engaged in the transportation of materials of war to our overseas forces that we do not have the dockside facilities quickly to reload those ships upon their return to this country. As a result, it is alleged that ships sometimes wait as long as 30 and 40 days after their return from overseas to be reloaded with further military supplies. If this fact is true, there is no reason under the sun why many of these ships on their way back from European ports cannot stop at Caribbean sugar ports and bring into the United States all of the sugar that is available at offshore points.

It is a sad travesty on democratic administration of government that in a land where American industrial ingenuity can convert from a peacetime basis to a wartime basis without destroying the standard of living, as America has done, that we cannot have in Government offices that caliber of men who can practically meet the problems our wartime economy creates.

Before the war our greatest annual consumption of sugar in the United States totaled 6,750,000 tons, with a normal carry-over of from one and one-half to two million tons. On January 1, 1944, the total continental stocks and offshore stocks of sugar carry-over amounted to 3,026,000 tons. It is estimated by industry that the total production available to the United States will amount to 7,950,000 tons in the year 1944, which, with the carry-over of 3,026,000 tons, will total 10,976,000 tons. This is exclusive of 800,000 tons to 1,000,000 tons which will be converted into molasses for the alcohol program. The allocations for noncivilian sugar usage during the first half of 1944, according to the War Food Administration, is as follows:

Armed forces and war services, 269,378 tons; lend-lease and other purposes, 79,618 tons; other noncivilian uses, 573,580 tons; which is exclusive of another 500,000 tons the War Food Administration estimates will be shipped direct from the Caribbean area to the United Kingdom, Canada, and Russia during the entire year. If we double these amounts to produce an annual estimate, they aggregate about 1,848,000 tons, which, with 500,000 tons for our allies, totals about 2,350,000 tons. In addition, 200,000 tons is to be set aside as a reserve for the alcohol program. This leaves a total of 8,425,000 tons for domestic consumption and carry-over on January 1, 1945.

While the War Food Administration estimates that a minimum of 1,607,000 tons should be retained as a carry-over into next year, I would prefer to allow 2,000,000 for this purpose. This would leave 6,425,000 tons of sugar available for domestic civilian consumption in the United States.

On the basis of present rationing, the O. P. A. proposes to curtail civilian consumption to only 4,800,000 tons. No one can explain what the purpose is of the additional 1,625,000 tons of sugar.

There can be no possible legitimate reason for curtailing the commercial use of sugar to 70 percent of the 1941 consumption when there is a visible supply of an excess quantity of 1,625,000 tons for which no use is being considered.

In discussing this matter with officials in the administrative branch of Government, I learn that they refuse to consider sugar as available unless it is within the continental limits of the United States. Some of them maintain that the War Shipping Administration will not make the ships available to them. I have already pointed out how by a mere matter of sensible administration in the routine of ships now engaged in North Atlantic transportation they can readily bring into the United States far more than the potential production of sugar in the Caribbean area. But, presuming that this is not feasible, let us look at the matter from another viewpoint. The American merchant marine has been built up to more than 2,000 Liberty ships of some 10,000 ton capacity each, and there are hundreds of other oceangoing vessels capable of carrying sugar and other freight. The reduction of sugar rationing to commercial users from an 80-percent level to a 70-percent level amounts to less than 20,000 tons of sugar per month. Shipping men advise me that it requires not more than 25 days for a round trip, including loading and unloading, for a vessel from the Caribbean area to the United States, and not more than 30 days to Hawaii. This simply means that the assignment of 2 ships or less than 0.01 percent of the ships available can furnish all of the sugar needed to retain rationing of sugar at the 80-percent level to industrial users.

If the Administration is not playing politics with food, there can be only one other reason assigned for the insistence of those in administrative authority to reduce sugar consumption in this country to the low level of 4,800,000 tons. That reason is the forwarding of the efforts already made by some food faddists in our Government to discourage the consumption of sugar. They would have the American people go without candies, confections, ice cream, and soft drinks, all of which are items recognized by all psychologists as essential to both civilian and soldier morale. Sugar is one of the cheapest and quickest sources of energy available to the human race. The United States Public Health Service has strongly recommended that this type of refreshment be made available to factory employees to relieve fatigue, reduce accidents, and increase production. The public welfare demands that as a supplementary food the largest amounts be made available. Bureaucratic whim on the part of those temporarily invested with authority has no rightful place in the American Government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a brief table of statistics which sets forth the availability of sugar to the United States for 1943 and 1944. The figures given for 1943 are largely factual, based upon known production and consumption. The figures for 1944 are the best estimates obtainable by those in the most authoritative position to know. I submit them for the consideration of Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. RAMSPECK]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Note: All figures used in this discussion are based on raw value in short tons.

	Short tons, raw value	
	1943	1944
Stocks in continental United States and offshore producing centers on Jan. 1, 1943:		
United States refiners, beet processors, domestic cane, importers	2,136,000	1,746,000
Cuba (export raws and refinec)	1,650,000	675,000
Puerto Rico (export raws and refined)	145,500	233,000
Santo Domingo (export raws and refined)	312,000	330,000
Hawaii (export raws and refined)	25,500	10,000
Haiti (export raws and refined)	15,000	32,000
Total initial stocks	4,284,000	3,026,000
Add new crop production:		
Cuba (net export, excluding local consumption)	3,000,000	4,000,000
Puerto Rico (net export, excluding local consumption)	942,000	700,000
Santo Domingo (net export, excluding local consumption)	440,000	500,000
Hawaii (net export, excluding local consumption)	800,000	820,000
Haiti (net export, excluding local consumption)	38,000	55,000
Domestic beets	1,071,500	1,250,000
Domestic cane	460,000	525,000
Miscellaneous full-duty imports	114,100	100,000
Total available	11,149,600	10,976,000
	Indicated or estimated	
Distribution and shipments:		
Armed forces, lend-lease, other exports ex the United States	1,409,000	[1] 1,254,000
United States civilian use	5,400,000	[1] 2,700,000 [2] 2,375,000 [3] 200,000
Shipments of all kinds to "other countries" direct from producing centers	1,314,000	1,300,000
Total distribution and foreign shipments	8,123,600	7,829,000
Balance: Stocks on hand in United States and producing centers	3,026,000	[4] 3,147,000

[1] Home use.
[2] Industrial use.
[3] Alcohol reserve.
[4] These stocks might be divided as follows, based upon normal expectancy of movement:

In continental United States	1,607,000
Cuba	965,000
Santo Domingo	350,000
Puerto Rico	200,000
Hawaii	25,000
Indicated stocks, Dec. 31, 1944	3,147,000

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to make a brief observation. I wish first to compliment him on the very illuminating report on the question of sugar. I, too, have made some investigation because I feel the cut in the quota of commercial sugar from the 1942 basis of 80 percent to 70 percent was too

deep. It is creating a hardship in my part of the country, where traveling salesmen have no goods to sell to the merchants who are called upon by the consumers for badly needed foodstuffs.

The matter of sugar is very important to us in Nebraska. Its uses are badly needed now. The gentleman's report is timely. I was told in my investigation that we normally use around 6,000,000 tons of sugar a year. Our peak was near 8,000,000. I have the impression from my inquiry that we are now short about 2,000,000 tons of sugar which we need. The gentleman indicates that amount could be made available to us. My information is that much of the Cuban sugar now goes into industrial alcohol. The matter of lack of bottoms came into my investigation when I looked into the egg problem.

The House may like to know that the country is now flooded with eggs. Never before have we had so many eggs on hand. Agriculture tells me one reason is that farmers raised too many hens. Agriculture tells me that they asked farmers to increase egg production about 2½ percent and that the increase was 16 percent. They tell me they cannot find cold-storage space to store the eggs. They also tell me that produce which should have stayed in cold storage has been taken out to make room for eggs. We are glutted with eggs. The farmers were told that they would be guaranteed 90 percent or 100 percent parity for their eggs. But purchase of eggs stopped temporarily in the Middle West and I am told now that eggs are selling in my State as low as 20 cents a dozen. We pay up to 50 cents here in Washington. However, Agriculture tells me that they will again start buying eggs at 100 percent parity in the Midwest. This may relieve the situation slightly—but not sufficiently. Farmers and farm wives cannot raise eggs and sell them for 20 cents with the present high price of feeds. And the feed situation is serious. The lack of cold-storage space and the lack of bottoms will continue to keep this egg problem in chaos. I am told that lend-lease ships are not coming in to load these eggs and some other farm products. The reason for that may be a military secret but I add this information for what it is worth in order to indicate that there may be some shipping problem now both as regards to sugar and also eggs. I do feel, however, in view of what the gentleman has said, that we must work out this food distribution problem in order that there may be no hardship to either the producer or consumer.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

STATUS OF RETIRED JUDGES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report on the bill S. 156 relating to the status of retired judges (H. Res. 487, Rept. No. 1304) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 156) relating to the status of retired judges. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FOREST RESOURCES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and in behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES], I submit the following report on the bill H. R. 3848 to amendment section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources (Rept. No. 1305).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The resolution is referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

The resolution (H. Res. 488) follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3848) to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FOREST PERPETUATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES] I submit the following report on the bill (S. 45) to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; U. S. C. 566) (H. Res. 489, Rept. No. 1306).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

The resolution follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 45) to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566). That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4346. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. BROOKS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3261) entitled "An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, and Mr. VANDENBERG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 555. An act for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1243) entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of

August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. Office for Emergency Management.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WISCONSIN POLITICS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a wise man once said "Politics make strange bedfellows." The continued truth of that statement is very apparent as a result of the political associations arising in the campaign now being waged to secure delegates to the Republican National Convention. In the current battle for delegates in the State of Wisconsin, we find certain violently pro-New Deal and pro-fourth-term newspapers urging editorially and otherwise the nomination of Mr. Wendell Willkie on the Republican ticket. We find the newspaper PM urging his nomination on the Republican ticket. These New Deal editors attack all Republicans who are mentioned as possible nominees of the Republican Party Convention except Mr. Willkie. They want him nominated as the Republican nominee. Make no mistake, however, they do not intend to support him if he is nominated. They have already pledged their support to Mr. Roosevelt.

Many people are wondering what prompts these violent new dealers to take such a pretended interest in the nomination of a Republican candidate for the Presidency. Perhaps some indication of the connection may be found in the statement of the Democratic national chairman contained in a speech made recently at Boston and which was reported in the Washington Star of Sunday, March 26. I quote from the newspaper account of this speech:

> In obvious reference to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, Mr. Hannegan told a Jackson Day banquet there have been predictions the G. O. P. will nominate a man who is not even a candidate in the party primaries, one who is "smirking and lurking and dodging behind the pretense that he is not a candidate for the Presidency and hence has no obligation to discuss the fundamental problems which lie before the American people. If Republican leaders plan to put over such a candidate, then we propose to turn on the searchlight of truth so that all may know their plans. And so tonight I challenge the Republican Party to take the public into its confidence."

In a number of speeches recently delivered in Wisconsin, Mr. Willkie has given voice to substantially the same sentiment. Without specific reference to names, he has attacked Gov. Thomas E. Dewey because of the latter's failure to announce his candidacy and his failure to barnstorm the country in a campaign for delegates. It is indeed strange that the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, New Deal editors, and Mr. Willkie should be giving expression to substantially the same sentiment. It should be understood that under Wisconsin law a citizen may vote in any one party primary. Thus, an appeal is being made to those committed to the policies of the New Deal to vote in the Republican primary in an effort to assist in the nomination by the Republican Party of a candidate whom these new dealers have no thought of voting for at the November election. The very clear and manifest attempt now being made to divide and destroy both the Democratic and Republican Parties is deserving of serious thought by the American people. Our Nation is based upon the conception that we must have two strong political parties. Criticism has been leveled at the "Democratic New Deal Party" because of its one-man character. It is very apparent that efforts are being made in some quarters to develop a Republican Party along similar lines. The accomplishment of this objective would no doubt be pleasing to the new dealers who are promoting a fourth term for the present occupant of the White House. We assert, however, that the successful culmination of such an effort would leave those who believe in true republican doctrine and those who believe in Jeffersonian democracy politically stranded.

I would like to ask Mr. Hannegan, who pretends to speak for the Democratic Party, who his candidates for the Presidency are. Despite the fact that those who worship at the shrine of Mr. Roosevelt have long ago proclaimed their support of his candidacy for a fourth term, no word has come from the White House either that the President is or is not a candidate. Intimations are permitted to leak out to the press occasionally of sufficient moment to keep public interest aroused and stimulated. No definite statement, however has been made by the President as to his plans. As an illustration, I refer to a statement quoted in the Washington Star of March 26 made by Mr. Aubrey Williams, former head of the National Youth Administration. I quote:

> Mr. Williams, former head of the National Youth Administration, said he left the White House only a few nights ago, after dining with the President, with the distinct impression that he would not run again, although he did not say so directly.

Why not sweep in front of your own doorstep, Mr. Hannegan? Why are you so afraid that the people of America will demand the nomination by the Republican Party of Thomas E. Dewey of New York as their candidate for the Presidency. Why are you taking up the cudgels against Mr. Dewey at this time in support of the candidacy of Mr. Willkie on the Republican ticket? Why do you not stay in your own party and tell the people of America who the Democratic candidate is going to be? Why do you not insist that your candidate get out and discuss current problems with the people of America, if you believe that is the only proper thing to do? I assume your answer would be that it is all settled that Franklin D. Roosevelt is to be your candidate and that he is too busy with the duties of his office to be discussing political questions. We may assume by the same token that Governor Dewey has been too busy carrying out the campaign pledges which he made to the people of the State of New York and giving to that State an efficient administration to be devoting his time gadding about the country in search of delegates committed to his nomination at the Republican National Convention.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has interrupted me several times. Does he think he has anything that will contribute to this discussion?

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman from Wisconsin has.

Mr. KEEFE. Then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman from Wisconsin would like to know if the Governor of New York is going to keep those campaign pledges which he made to the people of New York when he said he was a candidate running for Governor of New York.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has asked a question.

Mr. McMURRAY. When he said that he would serve as Governor for 4 years.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield for any speech from the gentleman. He has asked a question.

Mr McMURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. All that I can say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin is that the best information I have on the subject, reported, editorial, and otherwise, from papers of all political complexions and from people of all political complexions, tells me that the Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, has stayed on the job and has supervised the fulfillment of his campaign pledges to the people of New York through the enactment of legislation by a legislature that just concluded its work a week ago last Saturday. That is an answer to the gentleman. If he has any other ideas on the subject he may discuss them in his own time.

The people of this country, Mr. Hannegan, are intelligent. They know what is going on. They know the issues. They know what Wendell Willkie believes in and stands for. He has told them. They know who Tom Dewey is and what he stands for. They know who John Bricker is and what he stands for. They know who Commander Stassen is and what he stands for. The people are the ones who will determine who the Republican nominee will be. You know, Mr. Hannegan, that the people will have little or no voice in determining who the Democratic candidate will be. The present occupant of the White House will determine that question for them, and from all indications the question is apparently already decided.

I have no criticism of the right of any man to seek the Republican nomination for the Presidency. Discussion of public issues may be worth while. I do object, however, to new dealers attempting to dictate who the Republican candidate

for the Presidency will be. That is a right reserved to the people of this country who see in the Republican Party the future hopes of our Nation. The people of this country must have an opportunity, once and for all, in this coming election, to pass judgment upon the New Deal which has been in power nearly 12 years. This can only be done by submitting to the people a candidate for the Presidency who believes in the principles and policies of the Republican Party as announced in the party platform. I intend to support the nominee of the Republican Convention, with full knowledge now that the people of this country represented by that great convention will nominate one who is worthy of such support. I believe that the people should have a clear voice in the determination. The mere fact that a man is not an avowed candidate does not bar the people of this country in convention assembled from naming their choice. If the people of this country want Thomas E. Dewey as the Republican candidate, they have the undoubted right to have their wishes respected, and no man is big enough to reject such nomination. I have no doubt, regardless of anything that has been said on the subject, that if Mr. Dewey is nominated, he will accept the nomination and conduct a forthright, vigorous campaign. On the other hand, if the people of this country want Mr. Willkie or Governor Bricker or Governor Warren or ex-Governor Stassen or General MacArthur as their Republican candidate for the Presidency, they have the right to have their wishes respected. I have no way of knowing what the people of the great State of Wisconsin may determine in the delegate election which will take place on April 4. Everyone concedes, however, that the results of this election may determine the course of the Republican Convention. The issues involved are transcendent in character. I have full confidence that the voters of Wisconsin will go to the polls on April 4 and vote for delegates pledged to vote for the nomination of the one they believe most truly represents their ideals and hopes.

I may say in passing that if there are those people in Wisconsin who believe that Franklin D. Roosevelt most clearly represents their ideals and hopes, they should go into the Democratic primary and vote for the delegates who are pledged to his nomination. They should not be urged by any person to go into a Republican primary and vote for delegates pledged to a candidate whom they do not intend to support at the November election. Such a course of conduct, in my humble opinion, is political treachery of the worst kind. I have supreme confidence that the voters of Wisconsin understand the problems that confront the country and despite any smears that may be heaped upon Thomas E. Dewey or any other Republican candidate by Mr. Hannegan and his coterie of New Deal editors, the voters of Wisconsin will go to the polls and repudiate any attempt to have the Republican nomination dictated by new dealers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want the gentleman to yield to interrupt his speech, because I think it is a good thing to have Members on both sides speak for the cause in which they believe. It is healthy. I was interested in Wisconsin. In Massachusetts if one goes in and votes in the primary and asks for a Republican ballot or a Democratic ballot, he cannot in the following year vote in the other party. In other words, they continue as a registered Republican or Democrat until they go in and change over. I was wondering if that law existed in Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. It does not. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, I just got through stating that the situation in Wisconsin is quite different than it is in some other State. A citizen of Wisconsin can go into any party primary he desires. He can only vote in one party primary, but a Democrat may vote in the Republican primary. A Progressive may vote in the Democratic primary, and vice versa, and thus you have a situation develop which has developed in the past that candidates are nominated by the votes of people who, when they cast their votes, have no intention of voting for the person at the November election.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, it can work both ways.

Mr. KEEFE. It can work both ways.

Mr. McCORMACK. My observation was not to criticize, because the primary laws of each State usually have a historical development. In Massachusetts that could not exist, and the whole theory of the Massachusetts law is to protect the integrity of each political party from what you might term invasion.

I registered some years ago. As long as my name is on the list I am carried as a Democrat, and in the next primary I can only get a Democratic ballot. Anyone who has registered as a Republican 5, 10, or 15 years ago, unless they go in and change over, or unless they have their names taken off the list, and they have to be reregistered, would have to accept the ballot of the party that they originally declared for when they voted for the party.

Mr. KEEFE. May I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comment. I think I have a right to assume, in face of the comment which the distinguished gentleman has just made, that he is in complete accord with the statement which I have tried to fairly make, that it would be politically wrong for a person who is an advocate of the nomination of delegates pledged to Franklin D. Roosevelt in reality to step over into a Republican primary and vote for delegates pledged to a Republican candidate.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, of course, went further than I intended to go and dragged me into the Wisconsin situation. I am telling you what the Massachusetts law is, and what I conceive the situation to be.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman would not approve, would he, of a person who was a well-known new dealer, who was advocating ultimately the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, going into a primary election and doing as I have stated?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was a new dealer in 1933, when he first came here.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. "New Deal" is simply a characterization to distinguish between the vigorous leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the old deal do-nothing negative leadership of former President Hoover.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield further. This is my time. May I just answer the gentleman right now?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not answered the gentleman's other question.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, yes, the gentleman has answered it, and I do not yield to him for anything further.

I want to answer the gentleman by asking this question: What sort of a deal does your party stand for now? If I understood the President correctly, he said that the New Deal was out the window; that they were not going to use it any more; that it was something that was dead. Mr. Willkie stated in Wisconsin two or three times that the New Deal had become cynical and old and was sick and was dying.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Willkie said that same thing about some Republicans in the House quite recently. He paid you some very nice compliments.

Mr. KEEFE. What sort of a party is the gentleman advocating now, the New Deal of 1932 or the new sort of a new deal, the new New Deal that the President is suggesting for 1944?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want an answer?

Mr. KEEFE. In view of the fact that the gentleman has injected himself into the discussion, I have asked him a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not injected myself in a hostile sense. The gentleman from Wisconsin has produced this hostility.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think there is any hostility. I thought the gentleman arose to compliment me on my fine presentation of a subject that the gentleman believes in as well as anybody else.

Mr. McCORMACK. By "hostility" I mean pleasant hostility. I had just inquired of the gentleman what the law of his State was, to show that that could not happen in Massachusetts.

Mr. KEEFE. It could not happen in Massachusetts, because I assume the distinguished gentleman was a member of the legislature in Massachusetts and saw to it that there was put on the statute books legislation to remedy the situation which he admits is wrong in Wisconsin under our law. I assume that as a matter of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not put myself in the position of criticizing the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which my good friend from Wisconsin himself just did. I assume the legislature in its wisdom passed the law which permits that, and it was a historical development, so the gentleman from Massachusetts is not going to be placed by the gentleman from Wisconsin in a position

of attacking the Legislature of Wisconsin, which he has not, and which the gentleman from Wisconsin has.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Massachusetts is very adroit and very suave and very adept or he would not be the majority leader. I sometimes marvel at his ability to twist and turn and torture his own mental processes in order to try to establish a point. I often wonder when he is in the midst of his tortured twisting of his mental processes, which sometimes flow out of his mouth, why it is, so frequently when we pick up the RECORD the next day those things do not appear in the printed RECORD. The gentleman has a great facility for saying things here on the floor which would not look too well in print, when it appears in the cold print of argument in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the next day.

Mr. McCORMACK. I challenge the gentleman to give any illustration of when I said anything on the floor that did not appear the next day, unless it was with the consent of the person to whom I might have made reference. The gentleman from Wisconsin is himself aware of that situation just as well as I am. If there is one thing I want it is to be honorable. Any time I did not put anything in the RECORD, it was with the complete knowledge of the gentleman with whom I had had an exchange of remarks in an extemporaneous debate on the floor of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman think this is extemporaneous debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. What else is it? The gentleman has a prepared statement.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, no; I do not have a statement in this debate. This is purely extemporaneous.

Mr. McCORMACK. This colloquy is purely extemporaneous.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. Does the gentleman want this to stay in the RECORD?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman wants it to, there is no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the point.

Mr. McCORMACK. But when the gentleman makes the statement that I have made statements on the floor that have not appeared in the RECORD, the gentleman makes a statement that, standing by itself, is without foundation.

Mr. KEEFE. I think everybody understands and knows that the gentleman frequently makes statements on the floor of the House and then suggests to the party with whom he had the colloquy that he would like to remove those statements, and in a spirit of generosity to the gentleman, people usually accede to his request so that his remarks do not appear in the RECORD. That is understood, and I have had that experience with the gentleman myself. But anything that I personally state on this floor in a prepared debate or extemporaneous colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts is said with the express purpose that what I say shall go into the RECORD, and I have no apologies for anything. In the many debates which I have had with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, he cannot recall a single instance when I ever asked him for permission or privilege to remove anything from the RECORD. I think it is a bad practice, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. When the gentleman makes that statement he convicts himself all the more on his original statement. I have never taken anything out of the RECORD but what could have gone into the RECORD, and the only reason I took it out was because in extemporaneous debate some remarks were made that, with the agreement of some other Member of the House, were not put in the RECORD. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows that.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman has made himself perfectly clear. It resolves itself down to this: In the heat of debate sometimes the gentleman from Massachusetts says some things that perhaps would not look well in the RECORD, and with the consent of the party on the other side he has asked permission to take them out, and usually by agreement such remarks do not appear in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. That statement is not correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Let it stand. The RECORD will speak for itself, because the RECORD will be printed tomorrow exactly as it appeared here with my consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. When we talked about the black market, the gentleman did not like my rejoinder when he butted in where he did not belong.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, history is history. The record will speak for itself. I feel very meek and humble here in the well of the House when I have thrust upon me the great mental processes of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. I admit it is pretty difficult to keep up with him. I have many times not been able to follow him, and I suppose there will be similar situations arising again. But I am just wondering what prompted the gentleman to engage in this outburst. Does he not agree with me that it would be unwise for people who are well-known followers of the New Deal to step into a Republican primary in Wisconsin or anywhere else in an effort to nominate a Republican candidate for office? Regardless of the law, as a matter of sound common decent principles of politics, does not the gentleman agree with me that such a course of action ought not to be indulged in and that people ought to vote in their own party primaries?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I started out originally to answer that by calling attention to the fact that Massachusetts protects the political parties. I was trying to make a pleasant contribution. Then the gentleman asked me some very pointed questions. I assume that Wisconsin has a justification for its present law, but I frankly say that I think that as a general practice it would not be right for either party to enter the primary of the other party.

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. However, I can see that on rare occasions a situation might arise where there would be some justification, not to nominate a man for political purposes, but where some public question arose where a Democrat, for example, or a Republican, might advocate something that the people generally did not like, and of necessity those who opposed him might enter into the other primary for the purpose of nominating one who did not stand in support of some particular public question. But as a general rule, one way or the other, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman very, very much for that fine commendation of what I had said in my main address.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a bill I introduced today that would provide prosthetic appliances to disabled veterans of World War No. 2, and provide for their training in the use of such appliances. I hope it will go in the so-called G. I. bill as an amendment, but I want it to pass as a separate bill if it does not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK in the chair). Is there objection to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The bill referred to is as follows:

A bill to insure the furnishing of necessary artificial limbs and other appliances to disabled World War No. 2 veterans, to provide for appropriate instruction and training in the use thereof, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That no person requiring a dental appliance, wheel chair, artificial limb, or similar appliance for disability incurred in line of duty shall be discharged or released from active duty in the armed forces until such person is fitted with a satisfactory appliance or other prosthesis, and has received adequate instruction and training in the use thereof, including institutional training where necessary: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not preclude immediate transfer to a Veterans' Administration facility for hospital care, or treatment on an outpatient basis, and in such event the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to carry out the purposes of this paragraph.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 3693

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] and I concur in the reasons expressed in the minority report in opposition to the enactment of legislation known as H. R. 3693, and I ask unanimous consent that we may be permitted to file separate views on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his own remarks and include therein an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two addresses I have made, one on the subject of Franco, Otto, and Carol, and the other on the subject of some pertinent questions on Palestine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore appointed the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and POWERS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein certain editorials and letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, for many, many months I have been deeply concerned with the affairs of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. There have been, and there undoubtedly will continue to be, constant efforts made to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in a period of time much shorter than that originally contemplated by the Congress of the United States in the enabling legislation. That move, I may say, is not entirely spontaneous but seems actuated and motivated by certain interests which would like to obtain a portfolio of securities now belonging to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

In order to make very clear the direction which this campaign is taking, I desire to exhibit to the Members of the House a publication of the United States Savings and Loan League dated February 15, 1944, numbered M-145. This is an official publication sent to all members of the United States Savings and Loan League, dealing with the legislative program of that league.

In one of the paragraphs we find the statement that Senator BYRD had introduced a measure referred to in the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures' report on the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, rendered May 20 of last year. Then appears this statement, which I desire to read to you:

> The men who signed this report and the work they have done, as the Byrd committee, on many problems of economy in Government have earned the respect and confidence of businessmen, Government departments, and the thinking public. Besides Senator Byrd, junior Senator from Virginia, who is chairman, they are: Representative Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, who is vice chairman of the committee; Senators Walter F. George, Georgia; Robert M. La Follette, Wisconsin; Carter Glass, Virginia; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; and Gerald P Nye, North Dakota; Representatives Thomas H. Cullen, New York; Allen T. Treadway, Massachusetts; Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Clifton A. Woodrum, Virginia; John Taber, New York; Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr.; and Director of the Bureau of the Budget Harold D. Smith.

Now, it is interesting to have this document stating that the men whose names are printed there had signed that report and approved the recommendation of the Byrd committee for the immediate and very prompt liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. In fact, it was so interesting that I took it upon myself to write to the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of that committee, a letter which I will here put into the RECORD in full:

MARCH 24, 1944.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your committee released last May a report on the H. O. L. C.

The members of the United States Savings and Loan League have recently received from the headquarters of that association in Chicago a release dated February 15, 1944, M-145, which deals with six subjects, the second one being the liquidation of the H. O. L. C. That release comments on the fact that on February 4 you introduced S. 1696, a bill to facilitate the liquidation of the H. O. L. C. Your bill is reproduced in full as an appendix to the publication of the United States Savings and Loan League.

This release quotes from your committee's report on the H. O. L. C. and quotes this conclusion:

"Therefore, a bill is proposed to be introduced which will facilitate the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation through the transfer and cash sale of its assets to individuals and to local banks, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, cooperative banks, trust companies, insurance companies, and other mortgage institutions."

That quotation is followed by this very interesting paragraph:

"The men who signed this report and the work they have done, as the Byrd committee, on many problems of economy in Government have earned the respect and confidence of businessmen, Government departments, and the thinking public. Besides Senator Byrd, junior Senator from Virginia, who is chairman, they are: Representative Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, who is vice chairman of the committee; Senators Walter F. George, Georgia; Robert M. La Follette, Wisconsin; Carter Glass, Virginia; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee, and Gerald P Nye, North Dakota; Representatives Thomas H. Cullen, New York; Allen T. Treadway, Massachusetts; Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Clifton A. Woodrum, Virginia; John Taber, New York; Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and Director of the Bureau of the Budget Harold D. Smith."

Knowing that some of the people whose names were signed to the report did not share these views with reference to H. O. L. C., I have taken the trouble to check a little bit on it. I find that your colleague, Senator LA FOLLETTE, did not see the report and did not sign it. I do not believe that Representative DOUGHTON saw your report, signed it, or subscribes to its comments. Representative Cullen is now dead and Representative TREADWAY is not available. I do not wish to embarrass your colleague from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] by asking him but I think if you checked with Representative CANNON of Missouri you will find that he neither saw nor signed your report. You will also find that the Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr Smith did not sign the report and do not now subscribe to it.

Under these circumstances I think it unfortunate that Morton Bodfish, executive vice president of the United States Savings and Loan League, should sign such a message as he has sent to the members of that league. I think it is too bad that he should so flagrantly misrepresent the attitude of the Secretary of the Treasury or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Members of the Senate and the House as to claim that they signed the report of your committee on the liquidation of H. O. L. C.

Mr. Bodfish has become an employee of the Government though he continues to be the $25,000-a-year paid lobbyist of the United States Savings and Loan League. He is a deputy chief of the M. O. branch of the Office of Strategic Services and operates as such on a salary basis. I feel that he should be called to account for this misrepresentation and I would therefore appreciate having from you, if you care to supply it, a statement as to whether any members of the committee, other than yourself as chairman, signed the report on H. O. L. C. I should like to ask whether the report was submitted in advance of its release to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to Senators NYE, GEORGE, and LA FOLLETTE, and to the Members of the House of Representatives, particularly to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

That letter has gone to the distinguished Senator, and I hope we may have a reply on it in due course.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. Did not the Senator speak to the gentleman just yesterday?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. And did not the Senator then say in effect that all those attending the meeting a majority attending, approved of this report? The Senator has just told me that within the last few minutes. I have checked with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who states definitely that, so far as he is concerned, the report was unanimous. I have checked with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; he approved the report. I have checked as

nearly as I can and find that not a single person attending the meeting that approved this report indicated any opposition; but several days later, after the report came out, the only person objecting to it and indicating his objection was the Secretary of the Treasury Mr. Morgenthau. I am authorized to say this in fairness to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the committee. The members approving this report were Senator BYRD, chairman; Representative DOUGHTON, vice chairman; Senator GEORGE; Senator GLASS, who authorized Senator BYRD to cast his vote for the report; Senator MCKELLAR; Senator NYE; Representative TABER, who is here; Representative Cullen, who was then well and able and who attended the meeting and did not object; Representative TREADWAY approved the report. I have checked these facts within the last half hour. Nine of the committee at least approved the report and none at the meeting disapproved.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Well, I can assure you I talked to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Bodfish, perhaps, made a mistake when he thought this report had been signed. The gentleman knows, I believe, that no signatures were added to this report. But no minority report was filed. There was no indication of record of any objection at any time, I believe, until the gentleman took the floor today. There were two hearings. At the last hearing this report was approved. All present voted for it. That was unanimous. There was no objection except by Mr. Morgenthau later on.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Let me say just briefly that I checked it with the distinguished Senator and he did not say to me that a majority of the committee was present. He did say that people had authorized him to act in their absence. But he was not willing to state that any member of the committee other than the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], and himself had been present and approved it at that time. He was not able to recollect who else was there, and he said to me some other things which I think will become apparent as we go along in this discussion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this, that it is invariably the practice of Senator BYRD in advance of a meeting where a report is expected to be presented for consideration, to send out the proposed report and notify us when it will be brought up for consideration. It was done, so far as I am concerned, with this particular report. I attended the meeting and it was presented. Now, I cannot tell who was there. I cannot tell whether the same kind of letter with a copy of the proposed report was sent to the other members of the committee, but I presume that is true, probably 4 or 5 days ahead. And there were present, either in person or by proxy, or through authorization to Senator BYRD to speak for them, according to my understanding, a majority of the committee. I will not say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], or the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], were there.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Did the gentleman say the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] was there?

Mr. TABER. I would not say. I could not remember. I would not know. I think Senator GEORGE was, and I think Senator MCKELLAR was, but I am not sure of that.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] just a few minutes ago, when I explained to him here on the floor that you were going to criticize some letter that Senator BYRD sent out, said "So far as I am concerned this report is unanimous."

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is interesting.

Mr. CHURCH. Of course, the gentleman understood——

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I asked the question, "Would you state who was there?" He assured me that he was not, but he assured you that he was?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know whether he was there.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is all very interesting.

Mr. CHURCH. It was very clear he received the report and so far as he was concerned, his vote was for it and the report was unanimous.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Let me show you how unanimous it was.

Here is a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, addressed to Senator BYRD, dated May 29, 1943, which I will read in full into this report:

MAY 29, 1943.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 22, 1943, I received your letter of May 20, 1943, postmarked at 8:30 p. m., May 21, 1943, enclosing two reports of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, one on the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and one on the National Youth Administration

Before your letter was received, the report on the Home Owners' Loan Corporation had been released by you to the Senate on May 20, and the report on the National Youth Administration was released at noontime on Monday, May 24. Each report indicates that it represents committee action.

Pursuant to the statute establishing the committee, the Secretary of the Treasury is a member of the committee, and while I have kept currently informed of the committee's activities in accumulating data with respect to these organizations through its public and executive hearings, the copies of the committee reports forwarded with your letter of May 20, 1943, afforded me the first knowledge that definite committee reports and recommendations were contemplated.

Inasmuch as apparently I am not to be given an opportunity to express my views upon committee reports before they are released, or to have such views printed as part of the documents incorporating the committee reports, I shall appreciate it if you will incorporate in subsequent reports released in this manner a statement indicating that I have not had an opportunity to review the committee's recommendations and, accordingly, the recommendations do not necessarily represent my views as a member of the committee.

Very truly yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, Jr.

That is the whole situation. The report was prepared by the clerk and after that it was sent to Mr. Morgenthau and to other members of the committee. I was not quarreling so much with the action of Senator BYRD and the members of his committee, who have done very fine work, but I thought it was improper for the secretary of the United States Savings and Loan League to send a letter to every member of that organization, stating that various Senators, including Senator LA FOLLETTE of Wisconsin, and a man like Henry Morgenthau, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, had approved such a report when they did not approve it then and do not now approve it.

Further, I would like to call attention to the fact that Mr. Smith, director of the Bureau of the Budget, testified in the hearings on the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the independent offices appropriation bill at page 364. His testimony was given on April 4, 1943, 30 days ahead of the Byrd report, and he indicated then to the members of that committee certainly that he had no approval whatsoever of the thing that was later recommended by the Byrd committee.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has been very fair. He has mentioned Mr. Bodfish's name. When Mr. Bodfish received a report like this, which is signed by HARRY F. BYRD, chairman, and then on the first page, the committee and all the members of it——

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I regret that my friend keeps saying "signed by them," because it is not signed by them. The names of the members of the committee are carried on one side and there is not the faintest indication as to who signed, or who approved it.

Mr. CHURCH. All right. Perhaps Mr. Bodfish did make a technical error there. Do you know of any votes that Mr. Smith, Director of the Budget, ever cast in any committee, even though he is a member of those committees?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. No.

Mr. CHURCH. He does not. He is in the habit of never voting and that is his practice.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Then I would object to it being stated that the committee unanimously approved the report. I think it is too bad that under date of February 26, 1944, on the stationery of the Congress of the United States, over the signature of the chairman of the committee, there was a letter

sent out to Ernest L. Rhodes, of Atlanta, Ga., which says:

After extensive investigation and hearings the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, composed of Members whose names appear on this letterhead, presented to the Congress and the President a unanimous report recommending the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

Mr. CHURCH. Was there one single recorded objection to the report after two hearings?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Certainly.

Mr. CHURCH. What?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I just finished reading it to you.

Mr. CHURCH. Not one single member of the committee objected. It was reported out by the 9 votes, a majority of 14 members.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am going on with my discussion, but the letter I read to you was dated February 26, 1944. The report was made May 20, 1943, and the Secretary of the Treasury sent in his protest a couple of days afterward. When this letter was written it was written with the full knowledge that it did not have the unanimous approval of the members of that committee.

Now, let me go on and deal with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation itself.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON] quoted to us one day some words which a former speaker of the House from his State, Champ Clark, was fond of using—that the Senate was a saucer into which to pour and cool the hot tea that the House of Representatives had brewed. I find myself today comforted by that quotation but at the same time encouraged to hope that in the matter of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the House this year might not brew hot tea but might instead distill a little sober wisdom in the handling of this agency.

Last year when the matter came before the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] presented an amendment which you will find would have reduced the appropriation to H. O. L. C. from $12,142,200 to $8,310,734, and then provided that H. O. L. C. should not incur administrative expenses in excess of $833,333.33 for any month from July to December 1943, nor in excess of $208,333 for any month from January to June 1944. That amendment carried on a division in this House by 5 votes. It remained in the bill, was carried to the Senate, was early tossed aside by the Senate, but it was only after severe and prolonged persuasion on the part of the Senators that the House conferees were induced to abandon Mr. DIRKSEN'S idea and not cut the funds to $208,000 per month.

At the time the Dirksen amendment was before the Committee of the Whole Hause, I tried my best to defeat it. I put into the RECORD dozens of figures to show that H. O. L. C. was liquidating rapidly and in full compliance with the law under which it had been established. The Congress laid down the basis upon which H. O. L. C. should liquidate when it brought the Corporation into being in 1933. It provided that loans should be amortized after the first 3 years on a 15-year-basis and thereby, the Congress said, and in my opinion said wisely, that this Corporation by its own devices and the terms of its own mortgages would liquidate itself by 1952.

There is a possibility that the theories of the gentleman from Illinois as to the early liquidation of H. O. L. C. will again be presented to this House, and that I again will seek to persuade my colleagues that they are not based on a proper conception in our duties as trustees over a billion-and-a-half-dollar business. I am frank to confess that being a member of a Board of Directors seeking to control and direct a business whose assets run to a total of a billion and a half dollars is a new experience to me, but I take it nonetheless seriously. I wonder what every Member of this House would do if he were suddenly transplanted back into his home community and given the responsibility for a critical decision on a billion-dollar business. I imagine that he would be very sober, very cautious, and that he would want plenty of figures.

I wish the Members of this House could go back to that day on February 17, 1943, when we debated the H. O. L. C. appropriation and read again the debate. They would be struck, I am sure, by the absence of statistical information in the addresses of those Members who favored the Dirksen amendment. They might be interested, as I was, in the comments that were made then, in the figures that were produced that day, and in the experience of the Corporation in the intervening 12 months during which the record of the Corporation itself proved or disproved the assertions which were made on this floor.

It was my effort that day to give a great many statistics which I had dug from the records or had estimated on the basis of experience. I told this Congress last February that at the end of the fiscal year in which we were then operating the mortgages of the Corporation would drop to about $1,472,000,000. Today we know the actual figure. It was $1,441,153,110.68. I hope the House will remember that, if I quote figures again this year. I told the House that H. O. L. C. was liquidating property since the gentleman from Illinois had questioned how rapidly this was being done. I reminded the House that on July 30, 1942, there were 35,190 pieces of property in the hands of H. O. L. C., but that by the end of the coming June it was anticipated only 23,477 houses would be left. Actually the number of houses to which the Corporation had title was 24,934, a little higher than the figure I had used, but it is interesting to note that by December 31, 1943, the figure had dropped to slightly over 12,000. I hope the House will remember that, and I would be happy if any individual Member would take the time to go back and check every figure I introduced in that debate and judge for himself as to the accuracy of the statements made.

Since that day in February in 1943 when this House was persuaded to approve the Dirksen amendment I have wondered what would have happened had the "hot tea" not cooled in the saucer of the Senate. I remind you that if the Dirksen amendment had been enacted into law, during the month of January 1944 by decree of this Congress initiated in this Chamber, H. O. L. C. would have been limited to an administrative expense of $208,000 per month. What would have been the effect of that? In the light of today's experience we have a right to look at the Corporation to see what the proposal would have done, for our debate last year hinged on the desirability and the wisdom of that reduction.

Let me give you part of the answer. I recognize that there would have been many possible courses which H. O. L. C. could have taken under the reduced budget if the Senate had yielded on the Dirksen amendment. The two most obvious were: First, to distribute the cuts proportionately over the whole operative function, or second, to concentrate on the most vital function and eliminate all the others.

Let us examine the second of these possibilities—namely, that we retain one function and let all the others go. Naturally in a mortgage institution dealing with installment accounts, the most important single function is the collection of revenue and keeping the records of the Corporation. Could we do that? No. The Corporation could not have even done that much because it costs approximately $275,000 a month for that one function alone and the gentleman from Illinois, in effect, tried to say to H. O. L. C. "If you follow that path you must throw away the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, you must give up the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the two agencies which have helped to build Nation-wide a system of local building and loan corporations with $6,000,000,000 of assets. You must junk all your property for whatever it will bring under the hammer and you will then not be permitted to have enough money to keep track of your mortgages and the payments made by the home owners to the corporation designed to assist them in that most American of ambitions—the ownership of the roof that is over their heads."

I say to this House that it was pretty heavy medicine to dish out in one afternoon. I suggest that it was not even the last word in human wisdom. I do not think there is a Member of this House who would stand up and contend that we should make that type of break between a good, going organization making millions of dollars by its mortgage operations, then overnight reduce it to a disrupted and destroyed business frantically struggling to liquidate within the framework of a resolution which did not even give it enough money to hire sufficient help to keep track of installment payments as they rolled into the office and to supervise the millions of dollars' worth of property which were producing a profit to the Corporation.

I call your attention early to the fact that in the fiscal year ending June 30,

1943, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation made a net income of $32,098,813.40 from its mortgages and from the management of its property. That is a pretty nice business. By the old stock-market 10X formula that is a business worth $300,000,000 as a going business and not worth a cent as a dead one. That is a business worth salvaging if it were in trouble, but it is certainly a business worth preserving while it pours money to the tune of $32,000,000 per year into the Federal Treasury. Remember now that you are not a member of a political party on this issue. You are a trustee of a big business with a billion and a half dollars in assets and if some man comes to you in your position as trustee and says, "Let's liquidate," you say to him, "What's the matter, does somebody else want this $300,000,000 business free? Does somebody else want this $32,000,000 a year?" You think about that when somebody tries to strike at the vitals of this Corporation.

Of course someone might say, "I only want to sell the good loans to the good people of my district. I only want to give the United States Savings and Loan League the gilt-edge paper. The Corporation would still have a chance to carry on with the scrapings from the bottom of the barrel."

All right. Let us assume that in this partial liquidation the Corporation would have sold by January 1, 1944, all of its good loans and would have had left only those which private purchasers would not take, the Corporation would still, in my judgment, have had left fully three-fourths of its outstanding mortgages. The servicing and bookkeeping costs for such mortgages would have exceeded the amount of money which the House would have made available to the Corporation for monthly expenses after January 1.

Inasmuch as the total amount carried in the Dirksen amendment was not sufficient for one of the most vital of its functions, H. O. L. C. obviously should not have followed that route in its endeavor to restrict its operations to a restricted budget. Let us, therefore, examine the other alternative—a general cut in all functions. As anyone can see at a glance, a maximum of $208,000 per month is approximately one-fourth of the $833,333 which were to be available to the Corporation each month from last July up to January 1. Suppose it had been possible to cut the expenses of each department of H. O. L. C. by three-fourths so that it could proceed on the remaining one-fourth, what would have been the effect? From the standpoint of business, the proposal was so monstrous that my imagination cannot, on any reasonable basis, conjecture what the Corporation could have done. No sound business liquidates that way.

By process of simple arithmetic it is easy to compute the staff which the Corporation could have retained in each administrative and operating division if three-quarters of all its 3,300 or more employees had been discharged. Since the average salary of its employees is more than $200 per month and these employees had accumulated leave of more than 30 days, it is obvious that the Corporation would not have had in its budget of $208,000 per month enough to pay the accumulated leave of its discharged employees. In fact, if they could have drawn on the full budget for 2 months they still would not have had enough, yet our restrictions would not have permitted the use of more than $208,000 in any 1 month. Thus, an honorable corporation would have been forced to do the dishonorable thing of throwing its employees out without paying salaries when they fell due.

Another alternative was suggested last year by the managers of H. O. L. C. before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. That alternative was to anticipate the cut proposed in the House and prepare for it by discharging a large number of H. O. L. C. employees before entering upon the 1944 fiscal year. Such a course would have meant the discharge of 1,064 employees by May, 1943, or 2 months before the end of fiscal year 1943. It would have meant the termination of 2,330 more employees by November, 1943, and would have left 777 employees on the pay roll as of January 1, 1944. This number of employees was not enough to take care of home office accounting controls and auditing and carry the necessary accounting and billing operations in the regional offices. Fortunately, the cut was not required and the Corporation was permitted to continue its orderly course.

While we are dealing, however, with the subject of employment, you are entitled to know that the threat of speedy liquidation last year resulted in the resignation of many of the Corporation's most experienced and competent employees who, turned to other and in some cases more remunerative work. Clearly, the effect of the House action, in whatever course H. O. L. C. might have preferred, would have been to embarrass the Corporation and plunge one of the Federal Government's most efficient agencies into unnecessary hardships and a mad jumble of confusion and costly disorder.

During the past fiscal year which ended June 30, 1943, the Corporation had a net operating income before making provision for losses of $32,000,000 so I am glad it could go on and make this money for the American taxpayer. This income was $9,500,000 more than in 1942. This increased income of fiscal year 1943 was accomplished in spite of a decrease of interest income and an increase of curtailments and of loans paid in full during that year.

Although the Corporation had an income of $10,500,000 less in fiscal 1943 than it had in fiscal 1942, its expenses for over-all operations were approximately $20,000,000 less, and it was thereby able to produce an increase of $9,500,000 in the net operating income. Inevitably, this favorable showing would have been impossible if the Corporation had been forced to a rapid liquidation.

Against the net operating income of $22,500,000 for fiscal 1942, the losses sustained amounted to $26,700,000, leaving a net loss of $4,200,000. During the fiscal year 1943, the losses on the sale of properties amounted to $27,600,000—nearly a million higher than the previous year. However, because of reductions in operating expenses for the fiscal year 1943 there was left a net proft of $4,400,000 after absorbing all losses. This profit of $4,400,000 as against the net loss of $4,200,000 in 1942 represents a net gain of $8,600,000 in 1943 over 1942, after deductions for all losses.

I am informed that the Corporation, according to its careful estimates, will collect during the current fiscal year between $300,000,000 and $400,000,000, at an administrative cost of less than $10,000,000, and that if allowed to continue its orderly liquidation to the end of its contract obligations there is a clear possibility it will wind up its affairs without any loss to the Government or to taxpayers. Indeed, according to the estimates of the Corporation, there is an excellent possibility that it can complete its task without disturbance of private mortgage markets, and in the final reckoning show a small financial profit.

To support his argument for a destructive cut in the H. O. L. C. appropriation, the gentleman from Illinois called attention to the fact that H. O. L. C. was created as an emergency agency, and that it should immediately proceed to liquidate. He must have known, because he has sat on the House Appropriations Committee for many years, that H. O. L. C. had made no loans since 1936, and continuously for more than 8 years has been engaged in progressive liquidation. In spite of the knowledge, he gave his colleagues the impression that H. O. L. C. was not liquidating. Here is what he said on February 17, 1943, during last year's debate:

> There is no disposition to liquidate. That is the trouble. That is the trouble with bureaucracy. That is the trouble with an emergency bureau, once it becomes entrenched, they do not want to liquidate. They do not want to let loose. * * * There is only one way to liquidate and that is to liquidate.

What are the facts? Is it true that the Corporation has shown no disposition to liquidate? Let me give you a very quick but accurate summary of its accomplishments in liquidation:

Its outstanding loans have been reduced in number from 1,005,968 in fiscal 1936 to 736,693 in fiscal 1943, a reduction of 26.77 percent.

Its outstanding loans have been reduced in amount from $2,944,500,704 in fiscal 1936 to $1,441,153,111 in fiscal 1943, a reduction of 51.06 percent.

Its acquired properties have been reduced from a cumulative peak of 195,644 to 24,991 as of June 30, 1943, a reduction of 87.2 percent, and the coming June 30 should see the number drop to 7,500.

The total amount of properties acquired has been reduced from a cumulative peak of $1,009,838,109 to $187,952,363 as of June 30, 1943, a reduction of 81.4 percent.

Its outstanding bonds have been reduced from $3,046,839,375 in fiscal 1936 to $1,735,509,700 in fiscal 1943, a reduction of 43.0 percent.

Its employed personnel has been reduced from approximately 21,000 in fiscal 1935 to 3,319 on July 1, 1943, a reduction of 84.19 percent.

This too shows that there is a disposition to liquidate, that there is a desire to cut down and that progress is properly being made in that direction.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I had an instance of a desire to liquidate a home where it took 5 months to get a discharge of the mortgage from the New York office to a bank for the purpose of closing a real-estate deal where they were to have the mortgage paid off. I have called it to the attention of Mr. Fahey but I have not received any explanation although a month has passed.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think the gentleman from New York is entirely correct in calling the attention of Mr. Fahey to things of that nature. I think that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation does not function perfectly: I will admit that any time. I know very few Government organizations that do. All I say is that with $32,000,000 a year rolling into the Treasury to take up last year $27,000,000 of property losses it is a good piece of business. Further than that we will have left this June only 7,500 pieces of property. We will take losses on those pieces of property running into 30, 40, or possibly 50 millions of dollars. If we can have the income from the mortgages for that period, to take those losses out of a going business and not throw them onto the Treasury and the taxpayers of the United States, I will be satisfied and happy about it. When that comes I will not worry quite so much about the matter of liquidating H. O. L. C.

Mr. TABER. I should like to call attention to this too. I have had very grave doubts about the efficiency with which the outfit was being managed and I raised certain questions. They sent a man around to see me whom they said was a direct representative of Mr. Fahey. His name escapes me for the moment. I spent a whole forenoon going over things with him and I called attention to the fact that very many of the statements that we obtained from Mr. Fahey's organization were not correct and I wondered what the explanation was. That was at least 6 weeks ago and the explanation has not yet arrived.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say that I too have wanted information about certain phases of the operations of the Corporation. Rather than have them send a man down to my office, I got on the train and went up to New York City, where I went as carefully through the office as I would have gone through it had I been a stockholder in the Corporation. I found some things I would not have tolerated in my own individual business, but I also found things there that I thought were extremely commendable. I found fine samples of record work. I saw a lower cost of keeping track of installment mortgages than some of the finest insurance companies having that type of loan can boast of in the United States today. The general picture is not all good, as I am quite willing to concede; it could be greatly improved. What I have asked is that we hold on to this income until we have fully absorbed the losses on the sale of properties. Then we will be in much better position to handle it than we now are.

To give a final example of the desire and intention to liquidate the corporation in an orderly fashion.

Its obligations for administrative expenses have been reduced from $37,426,579 in fiscal 1935 to $10,718,379 in fiscal 1943, a reduction of 71.36 percent.

Does this show evidence of "no disposition to liquidate?" Can it be that the scholarly gentleman from Illinois was being misled? Or can it be that to make the better H. O. L. C. mortgages available to private business firms he was himself ignoring, and would have had us ignore, the facts? I have some familiarity with home-mortgage finance. It is my belief that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, on a national scale, has done a better job of liquidation than any private business in the country has ever done with similar loans and mortgage assets. For H. O. L. C., by its congressional charter, deals in only one type of paper—bad loans on poor risks.

Our colleague from Illinois, again for the purpose of forcing a budget cut and thereby speeding the liquidation of H. O. L. C., called attention to the administrative expenses of the Corporation, and seemed to imply that these came out of public funds. What are the facts?

From the beginning of its operations through June 30, 1943, the total operating and other income of the Corporation was $1,144,007,144.40. Operating and other expenses during the same period amounted to $954,168,938.73, leaving a net income before provision for loss of $189,838,205.67. During the last fiscal year, as I have pointed out, the balance of operating and other income over operating and other expenses was in round numbers $32,000,000. Were it not for the losses which the Corporation is obliged to suffer in the sale of its less desirable real estate, its operations would show a substantial profit. Undoubtedly, it is these profits which attract the mortgage lending institutions to clamor for a slice of the H. O. L. C. mortgage portfolio. These institutions, said the gentleman from Illinois, would like to purchase the good loans. If they were able to buy the good loans of the Corporation without carrying any of the costs of delinquency or any of the losses on the sale of real estate, they could make an annual profit of $19,000,000—and no renegotiation. Naturally, such a large profit is attractive to these institutions. What business would not like the Government to hand over to it an annual profit of $19,000,000? That is big money even in these days of inflated national income.

Following his recital of heavy burdens on the Treasury for H. O. L. C. operating expenses, the gentleman from Illinois complained that it costs 811,000 citizens substantial amounts "because these expenditures come out of the citizens." Let us look at the facts and see what expenditures are coming out of H. O. L. C. borrowers, these citizens to whom our colleague refers. These H. O. L. C. citizens are now paying 4½ percent interest on their loans, and, happily, they are not burdened by extra fees, fines, forfeitures, or frequent refinancing commissions. How many private corporations are even today in these flush times lending money to their borrowers on real-estate mortgages at the low rate of 4½ percent? How many are doing as the H. O. L. C. did, absorbing appraisal fees, title searches, legal fees, recording fees, and such, without charging them to the borrower? It is safe to say that if H. O. L. C. loans which formerly were held by private institutions were returned to them the rate would be substantially higher, and new charges would be levied on the borrowers. Interest rates might, because of the poor character of many of the loans and the small amounts of the majority, rise to 5½ percent or 6 percent, or go back to the old average of more than 7 percent, at which these loans were carried before the H. O. L. C. took them over. So let us ask: What is coming out of the citizens? I wonder if our colleague can answer.

Instead of implying that the citizens who are H. O. L. C. borrowers are carrying heavy expenses because of H. O. L. C., perhaps he should in all honesty have pointed out that they enjoy a lower rate of interest, plus more other advantages, than have ever been given to home-loan borrowers in our entire business history. He should have told you that H. O. L. C. borrowers enjoy more leniency and more cooperative assistance than have ever been extended to such borrowers by any type of lending institution. Instead of that, he concluded his argument on the burden of H. O. L. C. to citizens by saying: "If we continue the Corporation there is going to be one of two answers. Either we are going to continue to bleed the borrowers or we are going to have to pay it out of the Federal Treasury."

Does the low rate and favorable terms of H. O. L. C. constitute bleeding? If so, what about private rates when the H. O. L. C. came into existence? Let him answer. As I have pointed out, the H. O. L. C. original rate of 5 percent was at least 2 percent below the average rate charged by private lending institutions on home mortgages. These rates, due to the influence of H. O. L. C., have gone down. So has the charge to H. O. L. C. borrowers. It is now 4½ percent. Have private rates gone as low as 4½ percent? Let him answer. I am safe in saying that they have not gone to that low point for even the safest of home mortgages without Government insurance, and I am safe in saying that the average rate for home mortgages throughout the United States is still at least 1 percent higher than the current H. O. L. C. rate. Moreover, most of the home mortgages financed by private lending institutions are on less favorable terms. Many of them are written as they were written before the depression, for a 1-year period only. Others are written for a period of 3 to 5 years. These are the so-called straight type, and must be renewed at the end of the contract period.

Then they are rewritten, usually for a smaller amount, and usually at the cost of a commission and legal expenses.

I have before me evidence that some of the institutions which have succeeded in persuading H. O. L. C. borrowers to refinance their loans with them, are rewriting the mortgages for 1 year, and are inserting in the mortgage instrument a clause which provides for 8 percent interest in case of default. Does this procedure give evidence of any more favorable consideration by private lenders of home mortgage borrowers?

Before I leave the subject of H. O. L. C. expenses and the cost of H. O. L. C. in the handling of its mortgage loans, let me submit a brief statement of the Corporation's financial structure. When it was created, Congress authorized the Treasury to supply capital to the Corporation up to $200,000,000. It authorized, in addition, the issue and sale of bonds or their exchange for defaulted home mortgages up to a total of $4,750,000,000. Not all of the bond authorization were issued, and of those issued about half have since been retired. At the present time the Corporation enjoys a spread of approximately 2¼ percent between the money due as interest on bonds and the income due as interest on mortgages. Out of this difference of 2¼ percent, the Corporation is able to pay all of its administrative expenses without taking one cent of public funds for its appropriated or other expenses.

You will remember that when the Home Owners' Loan Act was passed in June 1933 we were in the pit of the depression. Because the depression was no respecter of persons or political beliefs, those who created the Corporation and subsequently organized it undertook to deal with the problems presented by the depression on the basis of sound, nonpartisan business. The action taken on home-loan legislation by both House and Senate was practically unanimous. In the Senate there was no recorded vote. In the House roll call there were only four dissenting votes. It is clear from the record that Republicans and Democrats alike joined in creating the H. O. L. C. and in making it a nonpartisan relief activity to rescue home owners and home-financing institutions from financial ruin.

It was the intent of Congress that the Corporation, after a brief lending period of 3 years, devote itself over a period of 15 years to liquidation. That was the liquidation plan of the Congress. Later, in 1939, the House and the Senate, without record votes in either instance but without a single objection, extended the period of liquidation from 15 years to 25 years so as to give borrowers who were having difficulty in meeting their mortgage payments and taxes more time at slightly lower monthly payments in which to discharge their burden of debt. The Congress did that, not H. O. L. C.

The country knew when the Corporation was created, and we have known all along, that the mortgages placed by H. O. L. C. which could survive would become increasingly safe and increasingly attractive to lending institutions. We knew that as home owners by their month-by-month payments increased their equities and reduced their debts, the risk of the Federal Government would become steadily less and the security of the home owners increasingly large. We knew last year what was known as far back as 1935, that certain mortgage lending institutions were organizing their forces for the purchase of selected H. O. L. C. mortgages.

Several years ago it was evident that some H. O. L. C. loans had become fairly safe investments for private institutions. Agitation for their sale to certain private institutions began as early as 1935. It was not, however, until 1942 that an organized effort was begun in the House to turn H. O. L. C. investments over to hungry financial institutions. Much has been said to the effect that H. O. L. C. has opposed such action, but remember this: Any day a private mortgage company wants an H. O. L. C. loan at par, all it need do is find a borrower who prefers to deal with the private company, supply the mortgage money, pay off the Government loan, and record its own loan. It is that simple. But if the company wants a discount, or a bargain—that is something else.

Let us now examine minutely H. O. L. C.'s acquisitions and the record of liquidation of its owned real estate. The Corporation's experience in the acquisition and sale of property dates back to the early years of its operations. By the end of 1935 it had acquired a total of 129 properties, with a cumulative dollar value of $509,436. Acquisitions continued from year to year as additional borrowers were unable or unwilling to meet the most liberal terms ever made for home mortgages. By December 31, 1943, it had acquired a total of 196,749 properties.

During the last 3 years of that 9-year period comparatively few properties were taken. However, in the peak year of 1937 nearly 65,000 properties were acquired. In the next year, 1938, more than 48,000 were acquired, and in 1939 about 24,000 were acquired, a combined acquisition of real estate greater by many times than any other lending institution in the country, enough to house a city population of more than three-quarters of a million people.

What is H. O. L. C.'s record of sale or liquidation of these properties? In 1936 it sold 142. In 1939 it sold nearly 38,000; in 1940 slightly under 50,000; in 1941 nearly 35,000. Since then its sales have declined because the great bulk of its properties have been disposed of. In 1942 the total sales were slightly under 17,000, and in 1943 only a little over 14,000.

As a matter of significant fact, the Corporation's record of the disposal of its foreclosed real estate is better with respect both to volume and to prices than that of the private lending institutions in the same communities for the same types of property. Let me be specific and take a few cases in the most difficult area with which the Corporation has had to deal—that of New York. There, a total of 9,164 sales were closed during the period of January 1 through December 31, 1943. Complete data is available on only 9,113 of these sales. Analysis of these shows that 11,440 purchase offers were submitted. Of these offers, 1,733 were rejected and 594 were withdrawn or in negotiations failed to result in offers that were satisfactory. As a result of negotiations prior to the approval of purchase offers, an increase of $909,279 over initial offers was secured. This figure represents an average increase of $100 for each closed sale.

Included among the 9,113 properties on which sales were closed were 1,300 properties on which offers to purchase were previously rejected but on which sales were subsequently made at higher offers. Analysis of these 1,300 sales discloses an increase of $606,154 in total sales prices obtained above the original offers which had been rejected. This figure represents an average increase of $466.27 for each affected property.

The figures I have quoted indicate the precautions taken by the Corporation to obtain the best possible prices for its properties, but always with due consideration of the current market and the influence of its sales on community values.

In spite of the evidence which we have and which, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he has had from year to year, the gentleman from Illinois complained a year ago that the Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration "makes every building and loan institution, every insured institution get rid of its bad real estate," and he then asked this House, "Why should not the Home Owners' Loan Corporation abide by the same rules? If it is a good rule for others of the country, it is a good rule for Mr. Fahey."

Well, now, I wonder. Let us see what sort of a story that was. The evidence clearly shows that the management of H. O. L. C. is taking its own advice and vigorously applying the rules laid down with respect to the sale of foreclosed real estate. As of June 30, 1943, the Corporation had reduced its holdings of acquired properties by 81.4 percent. Since that time the percentage of reduction has exceeded 90 percent. I doubt if lending institutions generally throughout the country have made any such favorable record even though their loans were admittedly better and most of them made on a basis of 66⅔ percent of appraised value rather than the liberal 80-percent loans of H. O. L. C.

Some weeks ago, on January 7 to be exact, the gentleman from Illinois sent a form letter to banks, savings institutions, and private mortgagors throughout the United States, asking if they wished to purchase some of the assets of H. O. L. C. His letter said nothing about purchasing these assets at a premium, and gave no encouragement to bid on the slow assets of the Corporation. His intention apparently was to offer these institutions some attractive investments for their excess funds. He did not even advance to them the suggestion that they pay a premium for the better H. O. L. C. mortgages which are certainly worth a premium. Why he failed to suggest a premium price he does not disclose, yet on the floor of this House a

year ago he stated: "We could actually get a premium on the great bulk" of H. O. L. C. mortgages. Why his failure to suggest a premium in this year of political campaigning? Is he issuing a general come-on invitation in the expectation that this Congress will be deluged with a volume of requests for bargains that will not develop and which will ultimately result in dissatisfaction, the onus of which may be adroitly placed upon H. O. L. C.?

Because of the importance of this question, I made it my business to obtain the facts and to organize and present them so clearly that you could have the benefit of them before taking action on the future conduct of H. O. L. C. as a business instrumentality of the Federal Government.

We have been told that the H. O. L. C. should liquidate. I have presented to you facts which show the H. O. L. C. is liquidating and has been liquidating for the past 7 years with commendable results. We have been told that its budget should be cut radically, nearly 50 percent in 1 year and from normal monthly expenses of $800,000 to monthly expenses of about $200,000, to force a rapid and precipitous liquidation. I have indicated some of the destructive and wasteful effects of such a course of action. We have been told that the H. O. L. C. is no longer needed, and that its assets should be transferred to the advantage of private lending institutions. I have undertaken to show what the probable effect of this requirement would be. In our deliberations on this subject a year ago, we made a decision which was unwise, but which, without the intervention of the Senate, would have been imposed. I hope that this time our better judgment will be applied, and we shall permit the H. O. L. C. to continue without further interference in its important public services and its orderly liquidation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I address you upon a subject of high importance not alone to the two and one-half million people in six Southeastern States whose electrical needs are served by the Tennessee Valley Authority, an agency of the Government in the United States, but a question of importance also to the entire Nation. This speech is occasioned by the fact that the other body of Congress on last Friday adopted an amendment to the bill appropriating funds for the T. V. A., offered by the senior Member of that body from the State of Tennessee, that has such far-reaching meaning, should it become law, as not only seriously to hamper both the hopes and prospects of the people of this great region for social and industrial development but actually to change the basic character of the Nation's greatest and most successful experiment in unified regional development, possibly changing its prospects of even greater success and achievement to an outlook of atrophy and ultimate failure.

In making these remarks, I do not question in any way the motives of the senior Member of the other body from my State. This gentleman has worked too hard and has done too much for the development of the hydroelectric, flood, and navigation facilities of the Tennessee and other rivers for me to think that he desires to do, or believes that he is doing, a disservice either to the people of his State and Nation or to this great public utility. I can only interpret his action as mistaken judgment.

I have referred to the T. V. A. as an experiment in unified regional development. It was thus conceived and planned, the first of its kind. It was by no means the first time the Government had undertaken a project of flood control or to make a stream navigable. Nor was it the first adventure in public ownership of power facilities. What was new was the plan to coordinate not only these purposes and functions in one project but to unify and correlate them not only with themselves but with the development of an entire river valley, immeasurably rich in natural and human resources.

The enthusiasm with which the overwhelming majority of the people of this region have accepted and supported the project has only been matched by the virulency and determination of its opponents.

Congress, which with the President, created the T. V. A., has steadfastly given it support. It is now an immense development, the largest engineering and construction job ever carried out by one single agency, public or private, in the Nation's history.

To be sure, it has cost a lot of money. Over $700,000,000 of the people's money has been spent upon the program. But the whole project belongs to the people, and I believe it is a good investment.

To my colleagues who are the elected Representatives of the people and the guardians of their interests, there would naturally arise the question: What have the people got for their money? This question can be answered, I believe, satisfactorily.

First, let me point out the utterly invaluable contributions of the T. V. A. facilities to the war program. Electrical energy, one might almost say, is the lifeblood of modern war production. When war descended upon us with such sudden treachery and our need for planes became so acute, the Nation had this great source of electrical energy for production of aluminum. Electrical power from the T. V. A. facilities has produced a major part of the aluminum for America's aircraft. At one critical point of the war, it produced more than one-half. And let it be remembered that to make one large bomber takes more electricity than the average American family would use in 400 years.

But aluminum is only one example. The production facilities brought into being by and because of the T. V. A. have turned out a record of war production which, once the full story can be told, will, in my opinion, forever justify this great national development and investment. Even now, one of the Nation's largest, most strategic, and highly secret war projects is under urgent construction somewhere within the valley, served by T. V. A. power.

The T. V. A.'s contribution to the war, however, is not the only thing the people of the Nation have to show for their money. The T. V. A. and its far-flung facilities can conservatively be regarded as a very valuable capital asset. Its properties are new and it is, in fact, a going concern of proven feasibility.

For one direct benefit to the Government, the per capita level of income of the region's people, though still far too low, has shown a healthy increase. By 1940, the per capita income of the seven Tennessee Valley States showed a 73-percent increase over the level of 1933, while the national increase for the same period was only 56 percent. As a result of this increased income, the increase in income taxes paid to the Government from that region is considerably above the increase for the country as a whole.

The benefits to the Nation by making this great river navigable must be considered as similar to the benefits of making many other of the Nation's rivers navigable. The benefits go not only to shippers, industries, and consumers using the Nation's navigable channels, but the business enterprise and the economic activity of the entire Nation is given a boon, thereby benefitting the whole people. Similarly, we must consider the flood-control investment on the Tennessee River and in that valley as a protection from hazards similar to that provided by flood-control projects on many other of the Nation's streams.

I mention some of the above things not to avoid a dollar-and-cents question on the Nation's investment in T. V. A. power facilities, but to emphasize that the power facilities are by no means the only national benefit from the T. V. A.

As to the power, the answer is not so difficult, because power is sold and revenues provide a dollar-and-cents measurement. It is not a discouraging record, either. For instance, during the last fiscal year, income from power sales amounted to more than $31,500,000. After deducting the expenses to produce and distribute that power, including tax payments and liberal depreciation allowances, there was a surplus of more than $13,000,000. This would indicate that the people have made a good investment in these power facilities.

During the current fiscal year the T. V. A. has already retired $2,000,000 in outstanding bonds out of current receipts.

While this operation has given satisfactory results to the people of the country as a whole, it has been a boon and a blessing to the people of the Tennessee Valley. What, then, is the justification or the reason for this disturbing amendment? I do not think there is sufficient justification, and I shall not here undertake to discover a reason, if any.

The amendment which the other body has adopted and which may soon be a question before the House, requires that all receipts of the T. V. A., wherever and however collected, must be paid into the general funds of the Treasury, just as taxes, import duty, or any other ordinary

governmental revenue. Once in the general funds of the Treasury these revenues would be commingled with the other revenues of the United States. There would be no earmarking, no identification of these funds. In other words, when a consumer of T. V. A. electricity paid his light bill it would not go into the operating funds of this public utility, as is the case with every other utility in the United States, but it would go into the general revenue of the United States just like income-tax payments.

Once these moneys are in the general fund of the Treasury, they cannot be withdrawn by the T. V. A. or by any other agency except as they are appropriated by Congress.

So, under this proposal, the receipts from the operation of T. V. A. would no longer be available, as they are now, to pay the ordinary operating expenses of the T. V. A., with only the net proceeds required to be paid into the Treasury general fund. Instead all receipts would, as I have said, become Government revenue and the T. V. A. would have to rely upon direct appropriations from Congress for every solitary penny of its expenditures.

Perhaps it would be helpful, Mr. Speaker, to review briefly the history, not of the entire T. V. A., which is not in question here, but the manner of handling the receipts of the T. V. A. By the original Tennessee Valley Authority Act the net proceeds, after payment of its ordinary expenses, were required to be paid into the Treasury at the end of each calendar year. There is no requirement in the original act that the current receipts be either paid into the general fund or deposited in the Treasury. Insofar as the Tennessee Valley Authority Act is concerned, the T. V. A. board could select any local bank, or banks, or other financial institutions, in which to deposit its current funds. Only the net proceeds, let me repeat, are required to be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

But in 1935, upon the joint suggestion of T. V. A. and the Treasury, Congress wrote into the appropriation bill an amendment which permitted the T. V. A. to pay its receipts into a Treasury special fund. In other words, the T. V. A. was given permission to deposit its current receipts, along with appropriated funds, in a special fund within the Treasury. In this way this Treasury special fund is the banker of the T. V. A., holding its funds on deposit and paying its withdrawals.

Far from being a Lilienthal trick, as has been recently alleged, this was and is a sound method for a governmental agency engaged in business operations to safeguard large public funds.

This same provision has been included in every bill appropriating funds for the T. V. A. since 1935. It does not in any way alter the requirement that the net proceeds of the T. V. A. be paid into the general funds of the Treasury or permit the use of receipts on any unauthorized project. The only reason the net proceeds have not been paid into the general fund, after the end of each fiscal year, is that Congress, prior to then, had appropriated these net receipts or balances for use by the T. V. A. These have, nevertheless, been available and, but for these appropriation bills, would have been paid according to law into the Treasury general fund.

The amendment adopted last Friday by the other body would not permit a deposit of receipts in a special Treasury fund, but, instead, as I have earlier said, would require that all receipts be paid into the general fund of the Treasury as revenue.

This amendment is advocated on the grounds that the T. V. A., like other governmental agencies, should make an accounting to Congress. Now right here, I would like to refute the canard that T. V. A. has not been making an accounting to Congress. The fact is there are few, if any, governmental agencies with a finer record of accounting to Congress than the T. V. A. has. It has been remarkably successful and entirely free of fraud and mishandling of its funds. Its reports to Congress have been full, open, and in more detail than required by law. Its operations are not only audited by the Comptroller General's office but are also audited by one of the Nation's leading private auditing firms. A congressional committee was appointed to investigate the T. V. A., and after an exhaustive investigation gave a very favorable report on its operations.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will not confuse the T. V. A. and its operations with an ordinary governmental agency. Like it or not, the T. V. A. is big business—a big business owned and operated by the Government of the United States. It is one of the Nation's largest utility systems. To require it to operate on the self-same principles as the Federal Trade Commission, for example, would be fruitless folly.

Congress has neither the time nor the technical staff to operate a large utility. Yet, that is virtually what Congress would be doing if this amendment becomes law.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to point out some of the difficulties. Every Member of Congress knows that work on appropriations and estimates for appropriations begins many months before the money is actually appropriated and available for expenditure. As an example, the T. V. A. went before the Bureau of the Budget in September 1943 to present estimates of their expenditures for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 and ending June 30, 1945. The bill presently under discussion embodies these estimates. Fortunately, the T. V. A. is asking for the appropriation of no new money for next year, asking only for the appropriation of the unexpended balance to be used together with its receipts.

The use of its receipts gives to this public utility a businesslike flexibility. Increased expenditures, reflected in increased demands for power which cannot be accurately anticipated, would mean increased revenue. The two would likely offset each other and maybe the increased business would result in a benefit to this agency owned by the people. As an example in point, in 1939, just after the declaration of war by Great Britain, the Aluminum Co. of America, located in this valley, found itself in critical need for more power because of an increasing demand for aluminum. As it happened, the supply of power from its own hydro facilities was actually decreased because of a drought. This company appealed to the T. V. A. for power way beyond T. V. A.'s contractual obligations. The T. V. A. supplied a large block of power, largely by bringing into operation some of its stand-by steam plants. The company paid to the T. V. A. for this power $1,600,000. In producing that power, the T. V. A. spent $1,300,000, leaving a profit to this agency of the Government of $300,000.

The T. V. A. was able to enter into such a contract because it could use its increased income to pay its increased expense, as other prudent business organizations can do. It could not have done it without considerable delay that would have meant less aluminum, if it had been necessary to wait for passage of an appropriation bill.

Now, suppose that instead of continuing this businesslike method we require the T. V. A., as is proposed by this amendment, to pay all of its receipts into the Treasury as revenue and come to Congress for the appropriation of all of its expenditures for the innumerable details and contingencies for the operation of a very large utility business. How could Congress do this intelligently with our present methods? How could even the T. V. A., and much less the Congress, accurately estimate the detailed expenditures of such a huge business operation a year or more in advance?

The first big contingency would be unpredictability of the weather, particularly in the T. V. A. region. There is always the possibility of a dry year. When a drought comes, less power can be produced from the hydroelectric generating facilities and, therefore, more power would necessarily have to be produced from steam plants. One difference between electricity and other products is that it cannot be stored. It must be transported and used when produced. Constant supply means constant production. Continuity of supply is essential. That is one thing customers pay for. So, when power cannot be produced sufficiently from hydrofacilities, the standby steam plants must be used.

Now, it costs more for the T. V. A. to produce power by the steam plants than by the hydrogenerators. The difference in this cost of power might vary as much as $10,000,000 from a good to a bad year. To take care of this contingency, the T. V. A. has incorporated in contracts with large power-consuming units a compensating factor by which it is permitted to charge proportionately more for the electricity which it has to produce from steam plants. There, again, the increased cost of operation is taken care of by increased income.

But under the method proposed by the amendment all of the receipts, including the compensatorily increased rates, would go into the general fund of the

Treasury and there would be no corresponding increase in the previously fixed amounts appropriated for use by the T. V. A. Such increased expenditures, made necessary by drought, could not be made except by passage of another appropriation bill unless, of course, the T. V. A. appropriation bill contained a large contingent fund, which is another name for a blank-check appropriation.

The second most important contingency comes about through acts of God, such as flash floods, tornadoes, and storms. These cannot be accurately estimated nor could proper provisions be made for them under the amendment except, again, through a large contingent fund.

The third large contingency arises out of unanticipated demands for electrical energy—a new industry, for instance, or increased activity on the part of big industrial users, such, for instance, as the demand for more power for making more aluminum, requiring new transformers and substations.

Another large contingency might arise out of a major break-down of large generating or transmission facilities.

I firmly believe that to treat all of the receipts of this public utility as general revenue and then to rely upon direct appropriations by Congress for all of its detailed expenditures would result either in reduced efficiency of the agency and an effective stifling of its use and development, or in huge blank-check contingent appropriations for it.

Now some will argue that it can be handled through contingent appropriations. In a measure that is true. But let me point out that this kind of blank-check appropriation is being increasingly frowned upon by Congress. At best it would be an inefficient substitute for the present method.

Now should we come down to an item-by-item appropriation for the T. V. A., which would be the logical step to follow enactment of this amendment, there would then be brought into focus and into the lap of Congress the myriad small items incidental to the operation of one of the Nation's largest utility businesses. These, indeed, would be baffling. Suppose, for instance, that we appropriated a given amount to be used in a given year for automotive vehicles. Suppose then that after this amount had been used, the T. V. A. had a wreckage of some essential power trucks. What would be the situation? It could not replace these trucks, leaving the people unserved, until an additional appropriation bill could be passed. At best, this is a slow process. At its worst, disaster to a dynamic, productive undertaking of great promise for the future if unmolested.

Should Congress try to operate a public-utility business, Mr. Speaker, we would soon find ourselves knee-deep in highly technical details, guess estimates, and unpredictable contingencies. If it should prove unworkable from the standpoint of Congress, it would be calamitous to the region served by the T. V. A.

Frankly, I believe all you will have to do to stop the industrial development of this great section of our Nation is to place the T .V. A. knee-deep into politics and subject its every activity to previous approval and item appropriation by Congress. Do you think, for instance, that the Reynolds Metal Co. would have made a huge investment in the T. V. A. area if it could not have been assured of contracting with a responsible agency for power over a long-time period, or if the T. V. A. should have been unable to make the contract, profitable or unprofitable, until the location of the plant, its business, and its needs had been aired before Congress and a bill passed appropriating the money? I doubt it.

Suppose one of the municipalities in this area, Nashville, for instance, has in sight a new plant or business which would require a large block of additional power, maybe the building of a new transformer or a new transmission line. Obtaining this new plant and productive facilities would be a good stroke for everyone concerned, not only for Nashville and the surrounding area but for the entire Nation. Under the present method of operation, the T. V. A. could immediately undertake and contract to supply that power, after being satisfied that the increased revenues would justify the increased expenditures. But, under the method proposed by the amendment, the city of Nashville and the prospective new industry would have to look not to a business contract but to some politician or statesman, as the case might be, to get a new appropriation bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will not cast this stumbling block in the pathway of a people who have for so long had unequal opportunities and now look up hopefully and proudly. We are grateful for this great investment by the people of the United States. We think it is a good investment. We confidently believe that it not only has already brought great dividends but that, in the future, the people of the United States will be amply benefited and rewarded for every dollar invested there.

I hope and believe that the conferees representing this body in conference with representatives of the Senate will be fully aware of the importance of this question to the Nation as a whole as well as to the people in the Valley of the Tennessee. I trust they will resist this amendment and that the House will oppose it.

It is a question not of private versus public ownership, which has already been settled in this region, but of efficient operation of a great project owned by all the people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FULBRIGHT, for a period beginning April 12 and ending May 14, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 29, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

A special meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands has been called for Wednesday, March 29, 1944 at 10 a. m., to hear a statement by Congressman JERRY VOORHIS relating to H. R. 2596.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1343. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Santa Ynez River watershed in California (H. Doc. No. 518), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 486. Resolution authorizing the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 465, of the Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2241. A bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943; with amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 487. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 156, relating to the status of retired judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 488. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3848 to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; without amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 489. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 45, to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566); without amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4497. A bill to name the Pacific equatorial current the Pacific current; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 4498. A bill to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of date November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., St. Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 4499. A bill to extend the benefits of the Social Security Act to certain legally adopted children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4500. A bill to insure the furnishing of necessary artificial limbs and other appliances to disabled World War No. 2 veterans, to provide for appropriate instruction and training in the use thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 4501. A bill to adjust the basis of compensation for overtime service of certain employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4502. A bill to amend the act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska," as amended; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 261. Joint Resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Maja Platzer; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Lewis E. Newton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 4505. A bill for the relief of Patrick Joseph O'Connor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4506. A bill for the relief of George Smalley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4507. A bill for the relief of Henry Hillgameyer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Frank Zych; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4509. A bill for the relief of John G. Condon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4510. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Michael Keating, to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4511. A bill for the relief of John Evans; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4512. A bill granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Swope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4513. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5362. By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5363. By Mr. CASE: Petitions of A. S. Hill, of Highmore, and George W. Lane, and S. L. McGie, of Mitchell, S. Dak., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, or any bill to deprive the American people of the use of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5364. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Frances Wolfert and 17 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5365. Also, petition of A. C. Urbahns and five other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5366. Also, petition of H. L. Baird and four other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5367. Also, petition of Rene J. Montbrand and 11 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5368. Also, petition of Alex Harper and 15 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5369. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Concord Methodist Sunday School of Beaver Falls, Pa., representing approximately 130 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5370. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of sundry citizens of Fort Madison, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 4269; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all men, from the ravaged ground of this mad and sad earth, haunted by sorrow and drenched with the blood of man shed by his brother's hand, we lift our soiled faces to Thy pitying eyes. The centuries sob with the ceaseless horror of war and our spirits cry out to Thee in revolt against its blasphemies; and we know that our righteous anger at this ghastly harvest of hate is answered by Thy holy wrath. Give to us peace in our time, O Lord.

As servants of this stricken generation may our proudest distinction be that our names shall be written among the souls who greatly dared, of whom the future will record "Blessed are the peacemakers." Show Thy erring children at last the way from the City of Destruction to the City of Love. Fulfilling the longing of the inspired souls of all ages who saw from afar the shining City of God, help us in the courage of faith to seize what has now, in our day, come so near and, taking the whole of life, to build Thy glory there. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 28, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. POWERS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3912. An act to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 4381. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 179)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $1,902,800 for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1945, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. Doc. No. 180)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce in the amount of $329,000, fiscal year 1945, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, submitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 130 (agreed to April 9, 1943), the eleventh monthly report of the Board covering January 1944 (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Resolution 857

"Joint resolution memoralizing Congress and the Agricultural Committees of the Senate and House in the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for and continuing Federal assistance for the community lunch program

"Whereas many cities and towns of the State of Rhode Island have been participating either in full or in part in the community lunch program, which includes the school milk program; and

"Whereas the mothers of the State have noted with keen approval the increased health of their children; and

"Whereas the body-building program of the youth of the Nation is one of the most progressive measures of our modern times: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the members of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island respectfully memorialize Congress, and more particularly the agricultural committees of the Senate and the House in the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation providing for and continuing Federal assistance for the community lunch program; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the state is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the agricultural committees of the Senate and House in the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Beloit, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 569) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, and the bill (S. 682) to prohibit the paid advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

RESOLUTIONS BY JOINT LIVESTOCK COMMITTEE—EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred, 7 resolutions adopted March 25, 1944, at Chicago, by the joint livestock committee from 20 States, representing 130 farmer-producer organizations, dealing with the proposed extension of the Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Act of 1942.

I just desire to call the attention of the Senate to the position taken by these livestock-producer organizations, which Mr. Joe Montague, of Fort Worth, Tex., representing the committee, presented to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee yesterday.

This committee probably represents nearly 2,000,000 livestock producers. Summarized, the committee recommends continuation of the Price Control Act, as amended, for 1 year from June 30, 1944; asks that definite standards be set up, to the end that the price controls shall be operated under provisions of law, not by Executive directives; opposes consumer food subsidies and roll-backs; urges one department in charge of food production and food prices; asks for court review for those who believe O. P. A. orders have injured them; asks for clear definition of agricultural commodities; and opposes profit-control activities of the O. P. A.

I recommend these resolutions to the consideration of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Government by law—not regulation: We recommend that the act of Congress extending the policy of price control and management set up definite standards and policies that must be followed by all Government agencies authorized to carry out the purposes of the act, so that we may again live under a system of laws enacted by Congress rather than regulations and directives issued by individuals.

2. Antisubsidy: Livestock producers are fully aware of the disastrous results of inflation. We are anxious to avoid all influences that lead to general inflation. We recommend that a reasonable price management program be authorized by the Congress. We believe that the system of roll-backs in prices and consumer subsidy payments is not only not anti-inflationary but that it is in itself an inflationary policy in that it adds to an already excessive purchasing power and increases the public debt. We are unalterably opposed to all subsidy payments affecting the livestock and meat industry and we urge that prices be stabilized in accordance with the standards established in clause 2 of section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942.

3. Food controls under one department: As American citizens, we deplore the development of a policy in our Government whereby the executive department of the Government has, by decree or directive, created or established agencies or bureaus with powers delegated to them that are superior to the powers and functions of those agencies which have been created by act of Congress.

We recommend that the Congress of the United States create one single and distinct agency to which will be granted, in the creative act, all responsibility concerning the administration of the wartime food management and control program that is to be adopted by the Congress; and

We recommend that this creative act clearly outline the powers and functions to be given to this agency so that there will be no conflict with the powers and functions of other agencies and so that none of its powers or responsibilities can be taken from it by Executive order.

4. Court review: We recommend that the Congress, in extending the policy of price management and control, provide for the use of regular courts and regular procedures by any person who may feel that he has a just cause for complaint in a matter involving the administration of the act, and we recommend that all Federal district courts be given jurisdiction to hear such complaints so that the person will not have to incur the great expense and trouble of submitting his cause to a bureaucratic court situated in Washington.

5. Definition of "Agricultural commodities": We recommend that, by act of Congress, a clear and understandable definition be made of what is intended by the terms "agricultural commodities," "agricultural products," and "products derived in whole or substantial part from the processing of agricultural products," so that the definition will be comprehensive enough to include livestock, meat, and products derived from livestock and meat.

6. McKellar amendment: We recommend that the act extending the policy of price control and management be so written by the Congress that it shall contain no language which would be discriminatory either in favor of or against any segment of the industry; and

We recommend that this act provide that the agency, in fixing price ceilings, shall not attempt to guarantee profits to any part of the industry, it being our opinion that intelligently managed retail-price ceilings and proper rationing will serve the purpose to get proper production and distribution.

7. Extension of O. P. A.: Conditioned upon the incorporation in the extending act of the modifications we are recommending to the Congress by these resolutions, we support the extension of the policy of price control and management for a period of not to exceed 1 year from June 30, 1944.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusets, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1801. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Virginian Railway Co., a corporation, for railroad yard enlargement purposes, a parcel of land of the Camp Allen Reservation at Norfolk, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 780); and

H. R. 4377. A bill authorizing the President to present in the name of Congress a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 781).

Mr. Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1432. A bill to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; with an amendment (Rept. No. 782).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1247. A bill for the relief of the Bishopville Milling Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 784).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2234. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen; without amendment (Rept. No. 785); and

H. R. 2648. A bill for the relief of Avid Evers; with an amendment (Rept. No. 786).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3668. A bill for the relief of C. C. Evensen; without amendment (Rept. No. 787).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 2928. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 788).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 789);

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 790); and

H. R. 3602. A bill to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 791).

HEARINGS BEFORE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL WIRE AND RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on March 13 the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] submitted a reso-

lution which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The resolution, which is Senate Resolution 268, provides for an investigation of international communications by wire, and proposes to make available from the contingent fund of the Senate $5,000 for the expenses of the investigation. I have consulted with the Senator from Maine, who is entirely familiar with the matter, and from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report the resolution favorably, without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. WHITE. I take it the resolution is to provide funds for an investigation, which has been previously authorized by the Senate, of international communications. I recall that a resolution authorizing a study by the Interstate Commerce Committee or a subcommittee thereof was adopted some weeks ago, and I take it this resolution is to provide funds for the investigation or study.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the report made to me by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHITE. I think the resolution should be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 268) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That for the purposes of Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to October 19, 1943, authorizing an investigation of international communications by wire and radio, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places, either in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee for such purposes, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 28, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1821. A bill relating to the granting of commissions to members of the armed forces who have had training under the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1822. A bill granting a pension to Fred Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (for Mr. KILGORE) introduced Senate bill 1823, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

WAR MOBILIZATION AND POST-WAR ADJUSTMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a few days ago the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] left the city upon some work for the Truman committee. Before his departure he asked me if I would introduce in his behalf a bill upon which he has been working for some time, a bill to establish an Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment. Out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill, and I also ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from West Virginia explaining the bill may be printed in full in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred and the statement presented by the Senator from Wyoming on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1823) to establish an Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The statement prepared by Mr. KILGORE in explanation of the bill is as follows:

In recent months, changes in military programs, particularly impending cut-backs, have emphasized the need for a comprehensive program which would provide for the even more efficient prosecution of the war and at the same time facilitate the reconversion of our economy without violent declines in production or decreases in employment. The Executive has already seriously addressed itself to these problems in the extensive report prepared by Messrs. Baruch and Hancock for the Office of War Mobilization. This detailed report provides a preliminary blueprint for an orderly transition from war to peace without major dislocations and disruptions. In Congress, the George committee, the Truman committee, and other special and standing committees are proceeding with the study of many of the detailed problems which confront us in the transition.

Some 18 months ago a group of Senators and Congressmen initiated a proposal for over-all war mobilization machinery. Congress studied these proposals. Following the recommendations of the Senate Military Affairs subcommittee, which was charged with studying this legislation, the President created by Executive order the present Office of War Mobilization. In the same forward-looking manner, Congress must now take the initiative in extending the functions of the Office of War Mobilization so that the momentum of full production attained during war will not be lost in the difficult days of reconversion to peace.

The Baruch report has provided an outline of the essentials of a transition program. The proposed legislation takes into account the recommendations set forth in the Baruch report and attempts to implement it with a specific legislative program susceptible of immediate adoption.

The proposed legislation is a minimum program for total mobilization and adjustment. Its sponsors recognize that its language and its provisions will be improved in committee hearings and floor debate, and it is their hope that the committee assigned to consideration of the bill will give it rigorous scrutiny and examination. Congress has already legislated in detail and doubtless will continue to legislate on matters which are the subject of the bill. The salient features of the proposed legislation include—

(a) A program to ensure orderly procedure for transition from war to peacetime production, guided by a single unifying Government agency, the Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment, which will jealously guard the overriding requirements of war production while it remains vigilant in reemploying the released manpower and facilities for civilian free enterprise production;

(b) Machinery for the cooperation of the major groups of our economy—government, industry, labor, and agriculture—in war mobilization, reconversion, and reemployment programs;

(c) Establishment of a program and planning bureau under the Director of War Mobilization which, because it is based on and tied into the operating functions of war mobilization and reconversion, will remain practical, realistic, and tough-minded. The bureau will also serve as a clearing house for the post-war programing of the Government agencies and hundreds of local public and private groups which have been set up in the last year;

(d) Orderly disposition of Federal surplus property to foreign and domestic markets in such manner as to promote production, protect small business, and increase employment;

(e) Provision for a more generous mustering-out pay for veterans, and then employment opportunity or vocational or other training. If training or job opportunity should not be available, then provision is made for interim pay during the period of reconversion.

Substantially similar placement provision is made for workers displaced from war production or essential civilian jobs. This recognizes the simple truth that what returning servicemen and returning war workers need and want is not bonuses in the one case, or unemployment compensation in the other, but suitable jobs in private industry; and if jobs are not immediately available while plants and facilities are being retooled, then interim pay should be provided for both groups alike during the reconversion period.

The United States is today the outstanding industrial nation of the world. If we can maintain this preeminence and its accompanying prosperity within our own Nation and collaborate with other nations for mutual economic progress we will have taken a decisive step toward permanent peace.

For the sake of peace as well as prosperity we must maintain an economy of full production and employment. No nation can long remain at peace while its people fear want and lack security. Peace among nations must spring from the peace of mind and heart of their peoples. Congress cannot permit our economic machine to break down as it did 15 years ago. More was at stake then than we realized. Today the stake is even greater.

It is the clear duty of Congress to initiate such measures as will guarantee that our traditional economic system will remain, in peace as well as war, an economy of full production and full employment.

The positive, creative work of our war agencies in converting our economy to war and insuring its continuing operation at maximum efficiency can be turned to the purposes of peace. No mere imposition of restrictions could have redirected our economy to war. No mere lifting of restrictions will reconvert it to peace. Complex national economies do not automatically adjust themselves in an orderly fashion to the radical changes of war and peace. Some framework must be provided within which the modern industrial colossus will move, and procedures

and mechanisms developed to facilitate that movement. In a sense, reconversion presents even more intricate problems than the original conversion to war. New facilities have been created, additional persons brought into the labor market. This new industrial potential cannot be dissipated. We are striving to obtain an orderly and gradual resumption of civilian production, while production for war continues or is even increased. Certainly the war production machine must be ever ready to adjust to sudden changes in military needs. We must integrate the mounting or changing war production with orderly resumption of civilian production.

Title I of the bill recognizes the essential unity of mobilization and demobilization problems and the need for an over-all coordinating agency. It establishes an Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment to encompass these objectives through the development of a unified program, and charges it with general oversight of Federal agencies engaged in carrying out the several aspects of that program. Title I furthermore insures the participation of all sectors of our population in the formulation and execution of this program through the medium of a National Production-Employment Board composed of representatives of industry, labor and agriculture.

Title II establishes in the Office, under the immediate supervision of the Director, a bureau of programs whose functioning will begin immediately. This bureau is charged with continuing review of existing programs of the various war agencies and recommending such revision as may be required to achieve interagency coordination and to fulfill the objectives of the act. This bureau will act also as a clearing house for post-war programs and activities sponsored by various units of local government, economic, and other groups, and will compile summary progress reports of all war agency activities and will recommend legislation as required.

Production planning for full mobilization and adjustment is outlined in title III. The War Production Board, with the advice of a committee representing the interested agencies, is directed to establish policies and programs for production cut-backs of military items so as to synchronize such cut-backs with the resumption of production of essential civilian goods. Authority is granted to W. P. B. to coordinate the day-to-day cutback problems, down to the level of the industry segment and the individual firm, as well as to prepare over-all national plans for X day.

Title IV proposes procedures for the disposition of surplus property which will prevent dislocation of markets, provide full employment of our resources and manpower, strengthen the competitive position of small business concerns, and open the way for the increase of our foreign markets. A surplus property administration is created and charged with supervision of the sale and transfer of surplus goods by Federal agencies. All goods of the same type are to be disposed of by one disposal agency, so the businessman interested in one product can get all his information from one source. Safeguards are provided against sales encouraging monopoly or undue concentration of industry or commerce through bulk sales of plants or facilities, and speculators are discouraged by a requirement to sell in small lots.

In connection with this title, we used earlier bills and materials and studies of the War Contracts Subcommittee, headed by Senator MURRAY. We know that Senator MURRAY and his staff are engaged in perfecting their final draft of a surplus-property bill which Senator MURRAY expects to introduce in a few days. We shall look forward to that bill as the most complete and constructive treatment of the complicated surplus-property problem.

Title V is designed to insure the planned and orderly recruitment of manpower for war production and the reintegration of demobilized servicemen and war workers into expanding civilian production. It is the conviction of the sponsors of this bill that the unhampered operation of our free competitive economy is our guaranty of full employment. We must nevertheless be prepared to mitigate the hardships which may be wrought upon individual workers and servicemen during the transitional period, as a consequence of temporary maladjustments. We must furthermore, counteract any tendency toward the formation of pools of unemployment by an adequate program for vocational rehabilitation, retraining, transfer, and placement. Such a program is needed to encourage the rapid demobilization of our servicemen without fear of glutting the labor market. Title V therefore creates a work administration under the chairmanship of a work administrator to draw up a unified program of recruitment, training, transfer, and placement taking into consideration schedules of military and civilian production and projected rates of demobilization, and to have general supervision over a system of interim pay benefits described in the act. Interim pay is standardized at $20 per week, with extra dependency allowances up to $15 for three or more dependents.

We recognize that such a comprehensive bill as this might well have included a title on contract termination. We feel, however, that that question has been well handled by Senators MURRAY and GEORGE's bill S. 1718, which can very easily be joined to this bill.

It is the recommendation of the sponsors of this bill that the war powers relating to priorities and to price control be immediately renewed and extended for the duration and at least 6 months thereafter, to enable the carrying out of the integrated policies envisioned by this act.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 3912. An act to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 4381. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESS BY THE GOVERNOR OF RHODE ISLAND, AT LAUNCHING OF THE S. S. "JESSE H. METCALF"

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that on Friday, March 3, 1944, there was launched in the city of Providence a Victory ship named after a former Member of the Senate, a distinguished colleague whom many now in the Senate will remember with friendly interest, Hon. Jesse H. Metcalf.

I know that Senator Metcalf's former associates in the Senate will share with me a feeling of gratification at this very appropriate tribute to his memory.

In this connection I ask that there be printed in the RECORD the eloquent address delivered by the Governor of Rhode Island, Hon. J. Howard McGrath, on the occasion of the launching of the ship.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MacDonald, Mrs. Metcalf, friends of our late dearly beloved Senator Metcalf, Rhode Island soldiers of production here at Walsh-Kaiser, and friends today, into the waters of Narragansett Bay and into the home waters that he so dearly loved glides a ship with a name that could not be more truly American, nor sincerely Rhode Island, than the name Jesse Metcalf. Into the service of a country he was proud to serve, and for the security of the favored and the unfavored, the fortunate and the unfortunate, the spirit of Jesse Metcalf is launched anew.

Great mills to the north of us, historic institutions of service and learning all about us, vibrate at this moment to the new life of this ship. Brown University, the School of Design, Rhode Island Hospital, boys' clubs and boys' camps of which the Scouts here present are a living symbol, unheralded benefactions and generosities so great that they cannot be anonymous, now become kindred to this ship that we dedicate to liberty and human dignity.

There are uncounted men and women, too, in this very yard who have built their own patriotism into the might of the S. S. *Jesse Meltcalf;* and the patriotism that they have thus bestowed is the outgrowth of a citizenship made better for the influence that the personality and presence of Jesse Metcalf had upon them as boys and girls.

There are men and women in this yard whose training and skill and education have shaped themselves into this great vessel, and that training and education has come a little easier to them through the generous citizenship of the man whose name it bears.

Senator and citizen, manufacturer and benefactor, human and humanitarian, gentle and generous, we esteemed him in life for all of these qualities, and we honor him in this dedication for them, too. Our regard is not for his wealth but rather for the fact that in his good fortune he evidenced the conviction that he held so much of his goods in trust for the less fortunate. We extoll him for his powers of leadership, but in a larger sense for that gift for success, and that one so busy with the affairs of life could find so much time for public service. Our appraisal of his character comes not by reason of a recognized ability to command lofty positions in his community as much as for the human nature that kept him always close in hand and in heart to the lowly, the suffering, and the young.

As long and as often as this ship shall come within vision of Narragansett shores there will be men to recall the days they walked with him, and he worked with them. Until these shores themselves shall sink into the sea of human forgetfulness there will be men who will owe something of their opportunities to the understanding citizenship of Jesse Metcalf. So long and as often as this vessel visits in home ports or the war ports of the world and the curious inquire the whence and why of the name, *Jesse Metcalf,* may there always be someone near at hand to tell the story that now is history, a part of history that is a glory of our little State.

In our compact Rhode Island a man cannot stretch forth his arms without touching the hand of a neighbor. To know one's neighbor, we believe, is the way by which we come to love him, to respect him, and to serve with him in common causes for the common good. Because so many of us have stretched forth our arms and touched, and been touched by Senator Metcalf, we can truly say that knowing the man we have come to love him.

Strangers come within our gates and they are constantly bewildered by the pattern of our behavior. They marvel that we are so lightly touched by the continental storms that have so enflamed men's passions, that ships like this are necessary. There is no magic secret to that way of life, for we have learned that outweighing pressures and partisanship are the beautiful characteristics of human personalities. They were present in Jesse Metcalf, and we recognized them, so nothing else mattered. His name has and will live long after the faded trappings

of tinsel fame have vanished in the grave; and we remember that outshining the glamor of power and place there was a service of love to his community, untouched by selfishness.

Whether the name we have given to this ship were bestowed upon the flagship of a mighty fleet, or the ship that has its humble place in a nameless convoy, I am sure that Jesse H. Metcalf would accept the honor regardless; and I am sure, also, that all Rhode Island claims a share in that honor, too. This is a dedication that goes beyond a name or the possessions of a family. It is recognition for a spirit of service that has benefited his country and blessed his community.

Good luck to this vessel and to all who sail and serve thereon, and may God be good to the soul of Jesse H. Metcalf.

RELATION OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY TO THE FRAMING OF THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Relation of National Sovereignty to the Framing of the Peace," delivered by him before a citizens-for-victory luncheon at New York, September 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S POLITICAL CREED—ADDRESS BY GEORGE W. MAXEY

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Political Creed of George Washington," by George W. Maxey, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, delivered at Congress Hall, Philadelphia, on February 22, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF THE TRUMAN COMMITTEE—ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN OBSERVER

[Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. MEAD) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Work of the Senate Truman Committee," published in the American Observer of March 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEROISM OF EDWARD O'BRIEN AND OTHER SEABEES

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Lee Van Atta entitled "Ten-Man Patrol Kills 320 Japs," which appears in the Appendix.]

OPERATIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles on the operations of the Social Security Board, one by Stuart Chase, and the other by Jerome Beatty, published in the April 1944 issue of the Reader's Digest, which appear in the Appendix.]

WHAT IS THE "ISSUE"—ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What is the 'Issue'?" written by George E. Sokolsky, and published in the New York Sun of March 28, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF THE FARMER—EDITORIALS FROM THE SOUTHERN AGRICULTURIST

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three editorials from the Southern Agriculturist, discussing the problems of the farmer, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AT ITS BEST

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "American Conscience at Its Best," which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no pending business before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think it might be desirable for the Senate to take a recess for a couple of hours or so.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, in connection with the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona, I may say that we expect to consider and act upon a conference report on an appropriation bill as soon as the House acts on it. The House will have to act on it first. That is why it might be advisable to take a recess at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask is it expected that the conference report will be messaged to the Senate during the early afternoon?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; I am sure it will be messaged to the Senate in a comparatively short time.

Mr. HAYDEN. The conferees have met and signed the conference report, but it has to be acted on by the House.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is the conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill, and it should be agreed to before the contemplated Easter recess.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to inquire, if I may, whether anything else is in contemplation for this afternoon?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], I believe, has a noncontroversial bill relating to the District of Columbia which he would like to have considered. The Senator from Nevada is engaged in a committee hearing at the moment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the bill to which the Senator refers?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a bill pertaining to the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITE. It is a bill, is it not, dealing with the salaries of officials of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I want to call the Senator's attention to another bill, namely, the bill to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, which has been passed by the House, and which will probably be taken up this afternoon, too, if I may have consent to have it considered.

Mr. WHITE. Is that a conference report?

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; but the bill has been messaged to the Senate by the House of Representatives today, and I hope we may be able to consider it sometime after 2 o'clock.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, according to a statement previously made, there is nothing to do today except to pass on the conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill, which has not as yet come to the Senate. For that reason I move that the Senate recess until 2:30 o'clock p. m. this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes) the Senate took a recess until 2:30 p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4381, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4381) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, in connection with the bill, I should like to read an admirable statement made by Admiral Horne, which is in the nature of a report on some naval activities to date, and indicates the contemplated needs of the Navy for the immediate future. The statement is not long; but it is worth while, I believe, to have it read by me and printed in the RECORD. It was made in executive session, but Admiral Horne has expressed a willingness to have it made public. It reads as follows:

The construction and procurement programs provided for in this bill are based upon the operating programs of the various bureaus and offices of the Navy Department, including the Marine Corps, which in turn flow from the operating force plan for the fiscal year 1945. In other words, these programs are based upon the numbers and types of vessels and aircraft which will be in service during the fiscal year 1945 and the proposed plans for their operations. It follows, therefore, that the continental construction and advance base procurement herein contemplated are designed to support the active operations of the fleets and of their supporting aircraft during the fiscal year 1945.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the appropriation of $1,644,373,024 for the building of public works for the Navy for the fiscal year commencing July 1 next.

Admiral Horne further stated:

At the present time we have overcome the submarine menace in the Atlantic. This menace may become active again and, therefore, no let-up in our antisubmarine measures can be permitted until Germany is out of the war. We have attained mastery of the sea and air in the Pacific to the extent that operations are being projected by our task forces into waters heretofore controlled by the Japs. Our submarines in the Pacific patrol the Japanese vital sea lanes to the very coasts of their homeland, and are taking a tremendous toll of their shipping. The United Nations control the air on all active fronts and over Germany itself. Nothing the enemy can do can stop us now, provided we meet the requirements in men, ships, planes, weapons, and bases, to support bold and well-conceived plans.

Readjustments are now being planned with the objective of throwing our full weight against the Japanese, as soon as possible after the defeat of Germany.

The transfer of additional power to the Pacific means no reduction in our over-all war effort, but rather a concentration of it. To carry this burden alone our Pacific ports and facilities would be greatly overtaxed and, therefore, the Atlantic and Gulf ports must continue to operate for some time at near capacity. Any slackening of our war effort as a result of success in Europe can serve

only to prolong this war, with the consequent cost in additional lives of our men.

I am convinced that if we are to provide the shore support which is essential for maximum efficiency of our operating forces, we should at this time authorize those works which now appear to be necessary. I do not mean to imply that projects which are now unforeseen may not arise during the year. We have tried to be as economical as is consistent with the war effort in estimating our requirements. However, there arise from time to time important strategic demands which have been unanticipated in any budgetary request. There is no way of ascertaining or of estimating in advance the amounts so required. It is, therefore, highly essential that in budgetary estimates there be provided a cushion to take care of unforeseen contingencies, and this cushion should be provided in such form that sufficient freedom of action is conferred upon executive direction to make available funds needed for unexpected "must" items. In the present rapid tempo of war there is not always time to go to Congress for authorizations and appropriations for such unexpected requirements, and yet it is essential that these requirements be met and met promptly if the war is to be waged successfully.

In this public works authorization bill our method of providing for unforeseen requirements of importance is to request authorization of the entire sum in one fund granting authority to the Secretary of the Navy to vary the amounts set up for each class of works upward or downward as necessity dictates. This is the procedure previously established by the Congress and which has worked out in such manner that if an unforeseen project of great urgency and importance arises it can be undertaken by displacing a project of lesser urgency. As an example of the necessity for this cushion to provide for unexpected "must" items, we have the new operational or precommissioning training bases which are being set up on both coasts in order that the operational training previously given on board ship, but which is impracticable during wartime, can be provided.

The chairman of the committee then interrupted, and asked the following question:

Is that a new undertaking, getting the training on shore, and substituting it for the training of the men on ships?

That is a very important departure in the naval program.

Admiral Horne replied as follows:

Yes, sir. In other words, we try to get the crews and the ship itself ready to go into battle before we turn it over to the fleet.

Mr. President, the Navy is building on shore, particularly on the Pacific coast, and also on the Atlantic coast, replicas of the new ships, with the proper equipment, and so forth; and the members of the crew and the officers who are to be assigned to a ship which is still being built are trained on the replica of the ship, before the actual ship is commissioned, so that they will be prepared to go aboard the ship and take it into action very shortly after it is commissioned. Heretofore such training was done on the ship itself, and several months of training were required, after the ship was commissioned, before the officers and crew were ready to take it into action.

Admiral Horne also said:

In addition, there have been extensive installations for the development of the new weapons, radar training facilities, vastly expanded amphibious training facilities, etc. We have found in a global war such as we are now waging, where every scientific and technical resource of the Nation is being brought to bear on the enemy, that new weapons are constantly being introduced, new uses for old weapons are being found, new tactical maneuvers are being developed, and there are shifts in emphasis in the utilization of existing weapons, all of which result in new types of training facilities, shop equipment, shipping facilities, and other requirements for additional installations on shore.

Mr. President, one of the important items in the bill is the one for funds for the scientific research laboratory of the Navy. The Admiral who testified on this subject before our committee called attention to the rapidity of development and the novelty and the unusual type of new weapons which the Germans from time to time have developed. It is the duty of this laboratory which has expanded greatly during this war, to get possession of those weapons, as it has been able to do in many instances because of our occupation of Italy, the Germans having left behind certain types of war matériel which fell into the hands of our troops, and to try to develop a weapon to combat the German weapon, and also to try to develop weapons of our own which may be in conformity with the weapons the enemy are using, and if possible more effective than theirs are.

Admiral Horne further stated:

The bill which the committee has before it represents the results of careful planning by the various bureaus and offices of the Navy Department to complement the production of ships and planes and the operating plans of the fleets with the necessary shore construction, in order that the expenditures for ships and planes and the effectiveness of the fleets shall not be vitiated by lack of adequate support. It must not be thought, however, that once this program is approved by the Congress the various bureaus and offices of the Department will be given carte blanche to proceed without restraint.

This shows the Navy's realization of and sympathy with the movement in the country and the Congress for economy.

It is pertinent to state that every individual public works project which is proposed for construction, before or after funds become available, is subjected to a meticulous and detailed screening process to determine, first, whether the project is essential for the conduct of the war; and, second, whether it conforms with the Department's policy of strict economy with respect to scope and type of construction. A project must, in fact, be essential for the conduct of the war if it is to gain approval. Moreover, we have recently established in each of the continental naval districts an office of assistant commandant (logistics).

There are at present 16 naval districts.

One of the major duties of these offices is to screen each public works project that may originate in the district, or in Washington, to determine the need for the project, and to investigate the availability of some similar facility or activity that might suffice as a substitute therefor. This includes any Army or other Federal facility suitable for our needs that may be found to be available for the Navy's use.

Our overseas advanced base program represents a sizable proportion of the estimates being submitted. This program is based upon absolute needs to support planned operations in active combat areas. We have now gained considerable experience in the establishment of advanced bases. From this experience we are able to plan our procurement and assembly of advanced base material so that the required installation can move in as soon as the initial assault is over.

In closing, I would like to leave with the committee the thought that this program of public works construction and advance base procurement is one of the essential parts of the entire naval program for the fiscal year 1945 which must be fitted together and integrated to provide an effective instrument of war to carry the offensive into the heart of the enemy's domain. Without these facilities, the expenditures already made and to be made for ships and aircraft and for the recruiting and training of personnel to man them will not be fully effective, nor can we provide to the fleets in operation the shore support which they must have for the maximum striking power.

Mr. President, this is an admirable statement. It is a source of great gratification to have an admiral of the Navy present such a fine, comprehensive statement, and base his request for this authorization upon such an attitude of cooperation and support with the Congress.

Mr. President, as I previously stated, this bill is the annual bill to authorize appropriations for public works in the Navy. A few months ago we had an auxiliary bill supplementing the annual bill of a year ago, and it may become necessary again to have an auxiliary bill. However, this bill is supposed to represent what the Navy conceives at this time to be its needs during the fiscal year 1945 for shore establishments of various kinds.

These projects are first submitted from all naval stations to the commandants of the various naval districts throughout the country, who scrutinize them and determine whether they are really needed. Thereafter reports come to the bureaus of the Navy Department, and then to the Chief of Naval Operations. The Chief of Naval Operations delegates to an admiral or to a board the screening of all the projects which have been submitted from various districts.

The next step is to submit the projects to the Bureau of the Budget for approval or disapproval. In this case, I wish to be frank with the Senate, because I think the Senate should have all the information which the Committee on Naval Affairs has. The amount asked by the Navy Department was $1,644,373,024. The Bureau of the Budget cut that recommendation to $1,500,000,000. The House passed a bill giving the full amount requested by the Navy. The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs has likewise recommended an authorization for the full amount. We were unable to determine on what basis the various reductions were made. As nearly as we could determine, it was to have a round figure—namely, $1,500,000,000. We were convinced that the Navy Department had made a very thorough investigation and was entitled to the amount of money which it requested for the various items. There are hundreds of items in the bill, of every kind and character, relating to naval bases and naval establishments, naval training, and naval ordnance and all types of equipment.

There are some major items to which I ought to call attention. Perhaps the largest of all the items is that for ad-

vance-base construction, material, and equipment, $1,019,000,000. That is two-thirds of the entire authorization. Of course, the amount must necessarily be flexible. The words "advance-base construction" indicate the nature of the item. When our forces enter into territory of the enemy and gain possession of it, construction corps immediately begin the construction of highways, airfields, and so forth, clearing away the conditions which have caused malaria, which has been a source of much trouble and has impaired the health of our combat forces. I wish I could divulge to the Senate the extent to which malaria has affected our troops. It has been a very serious problem. A large percentage of naval personnel and marines have contracted the disease, and many have had a recurrence of it. However, it is gratifying to know that great progress is being made in the control of the disease. Some of the items in the bill are for additional hospital facilities, and facilities for convalescents.

Incidentally, speaking of advance construction, I should like to call attention to a unit in the Navy about which we hear very little in commendation, but which is doing a magnificent job. I refer to the Seabees.

Great credit is due Admiral Moreell for his work in organizing the unit known as the Seabees, consisting of tradesmen, carpenters, plumbers, and mechanics of various types and characters. In some cases they advance with the troops themselves, but in all cases they follow up the advance made by our forces.

Only today I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of a 19-year-old boy who happened to be from my State—I suppose that is why Admiral Moreell sent me the memorandum concerning him—and was one of the Seabees stationed on one of the islands in the Pacific. He organized 9 of his Seabee companions, and the 10 together killed 320 Japanese in 1 encounter and lost only one of their number. I had the story of the heroism of that young man, 19 years of age, inserted today in the RECORD. The story is really thrilling. It shows the fine work which the Seabees are doing.

Another important item in the bill relates to hospitalization. The Navy now has hospital accommodations for 60,000 beds. It is proposed during the next year to increase the number by 20,000. So the hospitalizing facilities will be increased to that extent if the authorization is enacted and if Congress appropriates the money.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to go through this long list of items. They are divided into the following categories:

Fleet facilities.
Aviation facilities.
Marine Corps housing and training.
Storage facilities.
Ordnance facilities.
Personnel housing and training facilities.

I have already referred to the hospital facilities, for which item I note the total approved authorization is $42,071,750.

Shore radio facilities.
Naval research laboratory.
Chapel buildings.
Miscellaneous structures and facilities.
Improvement of and expansion of water supply and such systems at the various naval bases, and so on.

Mr. President, I am sure that it is unnecessary to go into the detailed items because the committee took a whole day in which to hear the various representatives of the Navy Department concerning these matters. I may say to Senators that the committee felt they were obligated to examine into every one of these items, so that their chairman would be in position to say that the committee conscientiously and honestly believed that the Navy had presented a convincing argument in favor of each one of the items. I can say that all the members of the committee are of this opinion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I notice an authorization for advance base construction, material and equipment of $1,109,000,000. Is the Senator in position to tell us whether there are any permanent bases to be constructed in the eastern Mediterranean in connection with the proposed pipe line which is being contemplated? I do not know whether such information would be of a confidential nature. I do not wish to ask for confidential information, but there is a rumor to the effect that in connection with the proposed pipe line there is to be a permanent naval base in the eastern Mediterranean.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is nothing in this bill dealing with such a project. These advance bases are mostly in the Pacific and, as I explained, I think when the Senator was not present in the Chamber, they are advance bases established on enemy territory after we have taken possession of the territory. The organization known as the Seabees moves on to the territory with lumber, cement, bricks, and material of every kind, as well as machinery of every type, and immediately begins the construction of roads, the building of airfields, and—very important—the removing of unsanitary conditions, filling in of swamps, and the removing of underbrush so as to eliminate danger of the men in combat units contracting malaria.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We were informed that contraction of malaria behind the lines has been practically eliminated, but the men who go forward into the malaria-stricken country are not free from the possibility of contracting malaria because they cannot wear masks, and they are subject to the bites of mosquitoes. It is very difficult to prevent malarial infection on the part of the troops who have to make the advances. However, the construction of advance bases has made at least the territory behind the lines wholesome and healthy so that our marines and the naval and army forces can live under fairly sanitary conditions.

I am pleased to yield for a further question from the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. In any event I assume from the proviso contained in the bill, that the question of the acquisition of any land for a naval base, permanent or otherwise, would first have to be submitted to the committee.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is true. The Naval Affairs Committee provided in a previous bill, which the Congress enacted, that land for a building may not be leased or any lands or buildings purchased by the Navy Department, without first submitting the matter for the approval of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House. If any question is raised, the chairman of each committee must submit the matter for investigation by the whole committee.

If there are no further questions, Mr. President, I submit the matter to the Senate for its action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, has the Senator from Massachusetts asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes. I supposed that unanimous consent had been granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent was granted.

Mr. WHITE. Then that rather estops me from saying anything about the situation. I wish to say one word, however.

I note that there are a number of other bills on the calendar from the Committee on Naval Affairs. A desire has been expressed by other Senators to call up bills on the calendar and have them passed this afternoon. I think it was pretty well understood when the Senate last recessed that the only matters which would come up today would be those which might arise in connection with an appropriation bill or a conference report. I have no objection to the calling of the calendar, but an embarrassment is presented when Senators rise and ask to take up individual bills which are on the calendar.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. WHITE. Has there been a request made to take up any other naval bill?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. No, but this bill could hardly be considered on a call of the consent calendar. It is too important. It involves approximately $1,600,000,000.

Mr. WHITE. Please allow me to finish. I wish to say that the bill is of so much importance to the whole country that I have no purpose to interpose objection to its consideration and passage, but I wish to voice a general objection to reaching into the calendar at this time, under these circumstances, and calling up a particular bill.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The reason the bill was called up was because

of the impending recess. If the Senate is to remain in session I will stay until Friday or Monday and then move to take up the bill.

Mr. WHITE. I was saying that I had no possible objection to the consideration of this bill unless it should open up the whole calendar to individual requests for the consideration of particular bills. I wish to give notice that, unless there are special reasons which justify the taking up of a bill from the calendar, I shall hereafter today object to the consideration of calendar bills.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Of course, if there had been objection made I should have moved to take up the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield there?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Let me answer the Senator from Maine. I am in full accord with the Senator from Maine, and I challenge him to show that on any occasion at any time I have sought to take a bill from the calendar that was not a major bill and have it considered. I agree that what the Senator objects to is very bad practice and should not be indulged. But this is a major bill; it is like the appropriation bills for the Navy, Army, and other departments, which I assume have the right-of-way in the Senate for consideration. As I have said, I would not have urged or suggested the consideration of this bill today except for special reasons. There is a recess coming and the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Senate are now considering the appropriations for the Navy, and this authorization must be provided before the naval appropriation bill is acted upon. That is the reason for my request.

Mr. WHITE. I tried to say twice, at least, that I have no objection to the consideration of this bill, but I was rather objecting to future requests of this sort, and I was trying by what I said in a way to anticipate objections by myself to future requests of this kind.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If I displayed a little spirit in my reply, I want the Senator to know it was not intended to indicate that I was not in accord with his general position. I do not believe in promiscuously calling up bills on the calendar without notice. I do not do it; I do not believe in that practice; but, as I have already said, this is a major bill of vast importance, and before the Congress takes an Easter recess I felt it was my duty to move that it be considered and acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 1770 is a companion bill to House bill 4381, which has just been passed, and is identical in title. Without objection, Senate bill 1770 will be indefinitely postponed.

DEMAND FOR SILVER IN THE ORIENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal, on its front page today, has an article which is exceedingly significant. The subhead of the article is Silver in Bombay Hits a New Wartime High—Waiting List for Gold.

This article, Mr. President, as I have said, is exceedingly significant to America, since its discloses that India and other countries of the Old World are demanding silver because the populace is demanding silver and looking with disfavor upon the circulating media of paper. It shows that silver today hit an all-time high in India of $1.12 per fine ounce, calculated in American money.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which is brief, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAP GAINS SPEED UP FLIGHT FROM PAPER CURRENCY IN INDIA—SILVER IN BOMBAY HITS A NEW WARTIME HIGH—WAITING LIST FOR GOLD

LONDON.—The developing Japanese invasion of Indian territory has stimulated the already heavy hoarding demand for gold and silver among the native population.

Reuter's News Agency yesterday reported from Bombay that silver on that uncontrolled market has set a new wartime high equal to 60 pence an ounce (139 rupees per 100 tola). This compares with the London official (control) price of 23½ pence.

The Reserve Bank of India, it is estimated, has sold about 750,000 ounces of gold to private buyers within the past 8 days. The demand is broadening and sales are made up to 8 days ahead. It is understood the bank restricted yesterday's sales to 175,000 ounces and on Monday sold 150,000 ounces.

A Reuter's dispatch from Teheran states that the National Bank of Iran has sold 500 tons of silver to the Indian Government, lending support to reports that the Government intends to intervene in the silver market, which, as yet, it has made no attempt to control.

ORDER FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago when I announced the probability of a recess beginning tomorrow I suggested that we might call the calendar before the recess took effect. There are only a couple of pages of bills on the calendar beginning where the last call was concluded, and while we are waiting for the conference report to come from the House of Representatives I think we might well take up the calendar. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS OF DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. McKELLAR. From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I desire to report favorably House bill 3912 to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended. To the bill, which has passed the House, the Senate committee has added two amendments.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that in 1941 Congress passed a bill authorizing $260,000,000 for access roads to be built to various war plants and Government institutions which were aiding in the prosecution of the war. That authority has about expired; and all the money has been used except a small amount. This bill provides for increasing the authorization to $290,000,000, which is an increase of $30,000,000.

As the bill came over from the House it authorized $285,000,000, but the Senate committee increased the authorization to $290,000,000, and added a proviso reading as follows.

And provided further, That not exceeding $5,000,000 of this appropriation be used by the Commissioner of Public Roads in areas certified to the Federal Works Administrator, by the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, or by their authorized representatives, as maneuver areas, for such improvement and construction as may be necessary to keep the roads therein, which have been or may be used for training of the armed forces, in suitable condition for such training purposes, and to repair the damage caused thereto by the operations of men and equipment in such training.

I ask unanimous consent not only to submit the report, but for the immediate consideration of the bill, because it is a matter of vital importance to many States where camps are being discontinued. If I may do so, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report the bill, with amendments, and submit a report (No. 783) thereon. I make the request for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Without objection, the report will be received, and the Clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3912) to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is the bill on the calendar?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, it is not; it has just been reported. The committee met this afternoon and I reported the bill. The Senator from Kentucky has just asked me whether the report was unanimous. It was unanimous.

Mr. DANAHER. Does a report accompany the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator withhold his request with reference to the bill for a few minutes?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Connecticut that I withdraw the request for the consideration of the bill this afternoon, and we will consider it tomorrow, if it meets with their approval.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 12, and 17 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 36 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 662) to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the clerk will proceed to call the calendar, beginning with order No. 766.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that the Senate will meet tomorrow, and it seems to me that any measure on the calendar could be taken up at that time. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my only interest in suggesting that the calendar be called today was, in the first place, that we have had to wait for the conference report, which has now come from the House, and in the next place I thought it would accommodate Senators who are interested in bills on the calendar.

I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the calendar today be vacated, with notice that we will attempt to have it called tomorrow, and I hope Senators who are interested in measures on the calendar will be present at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$115,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and shall not be available for obligation for new projects after June 30, 1945"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and shall not be available for obligation for new projects after June 30, 1945"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 12, 13, 17, 36, and 42.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives as to the action of the House on certain amendments of the Senate, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 29, 1944.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 12, and 17 to the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendments: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after "employees", insert "subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended"; and

At the end of the matter inserted by such amendment, before the period insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That no claim shall be considered by the General Accounting Office on account of any payment prohibited by this section."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 36 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13 and 36.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Tennessee give us a brief explanation of what is involved?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to. Amendment numbered 13 refers to vocational training for food production under the Office of Education. The amendment was offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and it was supported by a large amount of evidence. The House seemed to feel that we should not insert such a provision at this time, and therefore I have made the motion that the Senate recede from the amendment, and I hope the motion wil' be agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to observe that I regret very much to see the Senate recede on this amendment. The committee went into this question very thoroughly in the hearings, and we took the testimony of a number of witnesses. I do not think there is any more important work being done at the present time to assist in the production of the enormous quantities of food we need in the war, together with the preservation and processing of the foods, than the work which has been done under this appropriation.

The House conferees were adamant in their opposition to the item, but I sincerely feel that the country will suffer a real loss when the Senate recedes from its amendment. I realize that time is very important, and I shall not oppose the adoption of the motion, but under normal conditions I should oppose as vigorously as I could the motion which has been made by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia made out a very strong case in favor of his amendment, and it is to be regretted that it was not agreed to, but it has not been accepted, and therefore I have moved that the Senate recede.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say, further, that I was utterly unable to understand the position of the House conferees in

refusing to accept the amendment of the Senate relating to the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This is a case in which the Congress has instructed an instrumentality of government to pursue a certain course, knowing full well that losses would be incurred, and then the Congress refuses to make good those losses. To me it is incomprehensible that any legislative body would take such a position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13 and 36.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I can only repeat what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said, that the capital stock was decreased because of laws passed by the Congress and signed by the President. It seems to me that the Senate proposal should have been agreed to, but it was not, and we are compelled to recede.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, so as to complete action on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that completes action on the bill, does it not, I will ask the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it completes action on the bill.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is a matter which I think I should explain to the Senate. A few days ago I announced that a recess would probably be taken from tomorrow until the 12th day of April. It happens, however, that the President has until midnight on Friday of this week to act upon the soldiers' vote bill. I have no advance information as to what action the President will take. It is necessary that Congress be technically in session when the President takes whatever action he may propose to take. After consultation with leaders of the House it has been decided that, in order to comply with that technicality, we will have to be in session technically on Saturday. It is therefore my purpose to move a recess until tomorrow, and from tomorrow until Saturday, so that the time will have elapsed in which the President can act one way or another on the bill. There will be no business transacted on Saturday, I will say. I do not imagine there will be much business transacted tomorrow. But what I have stated raises a technicality with which we will have to comply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Leroy P. Raynor to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of February 1944; and

John H. Brittain to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of February 1944.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Col. Albert W. Foreman, United States Army, retired, for appointment as State director of selective service for Delaware, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. WALSH, of Massachusetts; from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral Robert C. Giffen, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Caribbean Sea frontier;

Capt. Felix B. Stump, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1943; and

Capt. Alfred M. Pride, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of July 1943.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter J. LaBuy to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude P. Stephens to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin D. Bolger to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLLAR. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 30, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 29 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

PROMOTION, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Milton E. Miles, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of March 1944.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Helen E. Sellers, Banks, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Attie D. Hancock, Gardendale, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Paul B. Curtis, Glenwood, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Duncan G. Kimbrough, Harpersville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ARKANSAS

Louella Boswell, Almyra, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary L. Cherry, Bay, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Claude Gregory, Cash, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harriet M. Shrigley, Coal Hill, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Erma M. Odom, Fulton, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CALIFORNIA

William H. Frost, Etiwanda, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

IDAHO

Cleo Snyder, Cataldo, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sibyl O. Rudisill, Star, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

INDIANA

Ruth I. Perin, Glenwood, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Maurice G. Fougerousse, Jasonville, Ind., in place of Ivan Conder, removed.

Crystal B. Shaw, Markleville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Claude M. Bowman, Norman, Ind., in place of A. E. Fish, retired.

IOWA

Myrtle B. Stark, Boxholm, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marie Dougherty, Dougherty, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Cyrus V. Nordblom, Harcourt, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ida Kelly, Harpers Ferry, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Albert N. Wendel, Meservey, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Richard E. Russell, Mingo, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William Bowers, Runnells, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KENTUCKY

Thomas E. Hite, Philpot, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

LOUISIANA

Lucie L. Dugas, Bellerose, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Beatrice J. Jacobs, Edgard, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Willie Pennington Foster, Georgetown, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Raoul Meche, Krotz Springs, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Cyprien D. Trahan, Maurice, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elsie L. Goings, Mount Hermon, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

DeLuke Thibodeaux, Morse, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ermina M. Serpas, St. Bernard, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Hilda E. Sawtelle, East Wilton, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MARYLAND

Amos H. Wyatt, Marydel, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MINNESOTA

Arnold R. Krogh, Spring Grove, Minn., in place of A. R. Krogh. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MISSISSIPPI

Irma E. Blanks, Collinsville, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sallie C. Walker, Lauderdale, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Charles S. Elliott, Mayersville, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bessie Abernethy, Woodland, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSOURI

Hugh W. Parks, Canalou, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ida F. Davison, Elkland, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Joseph C. Mosley, Mokane, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Earl A. Banning, Oregon, Mo., in place of H. T. Meagher, removed.

MONTANA

August Cor, Black Eagle, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mary A. Willey, Fremont, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Patrick J. McGrath, Bayonne, N. J., in place of C. A. Heiser, resigned.

Margaret M. Leach, New Monmouth, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Margaret A. Esposito, Sicklerville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Frederick A. Glynn, Crayville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clifford Veeder, Marilla, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Helen J. Dygert, Russell, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Walter I. Nash, Sandlake, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Myron A. Paul, West Falls, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH CAROLINA

Katie E. Kellihan, Cerro Gordo, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Blanche W. Poole, McAdenville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

William F. Goff, Jones, Okla., in place of W. F. Goff. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1942.

G. Ben Grigsby, Sapulpa, Okla., in place of E. R. Unger, resigned.

Elsie J. Britton, Turley, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OREGON

Eugene Bedell, Alsea, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Walter W. Mascall, Dayville, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Norton H. Campbell, Jr., Pendleton, S. C., in place of C. C. Crenshaw, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Robert W. Simmons, Jr., Sharon, Tenn., in place of R. W. Simmons, Sr., retired.

TEXAS

William G. Fuchs, Thrall, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sarah B. Morris, Voth, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

UTAH

Affalone Jensen, Centerfield, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Bertha M. Symonds, American Lake, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harry C. Egbert, Easton, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arnold G. Thorsen, Graham, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Nancy J. Stidham, Mossyrock, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sydney Moon, Pacific Beach, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WEST VIRGINIA

Thomas J. Evans, Chattaroy, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Loma L. Nester, Eckman, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John E. Hafer, Elkview, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harry O. Lockman, Helen, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Usher A. Cobb, Kopperston, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clara L. Hardy, Montcalm, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James H. Trail, Winding Gulf, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WISCONSIN

Josephine H. Webster, Oneida, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George H. Geisler, Ridgeland, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 29 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter J. LaBuy to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Claude P. Stephens to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Edwin D. Bolger to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Edward L. Toof, Fern Park.

HAWAII

Victoria K. Burke, Honokaa.

IOWA

Bernard E. Fraley, Albion.
L. Pearl Beans, Camanche.
Laurel L. Krieger, Mount Union.
Dale Fichter, Randolph.
John M. Slattery, Waterville.

KANSAS

Bernard May, Colwich.
Mary Agnes Lane, Delia.
Bessie M. Stafford, Easton.
John O. Larrick, Edgerton.
David H. Clare, Holcomb.
Francis A. Brinkman, Olpe.
Rosa E. Collier, Randall.
Philip Louthan, Simpson.
La Vera Wheeler, Towanda.

KENTUCKY

Lester B. Young, Fredonia.
Charles H. Jones, Highsplint.
Rema R. Harper, Lakeland.
Claude L. Clayton, Morehead.
Thomas F. Hatcher, Wayland.

MICHIGAN

Charles C. Malosh, Lake.
Harry J. Skinner, McMillan.
Sister M. Margaret Rose Dushane, Nazareth.
Homer B. Fouts, Omena.
James C. Bedell, Wakefield.
Mae Dust, Wellston.
Howard S. McCormick, Whitmore Lake.

MINNESOTA

Ida S. Knauff, Glyndon.
Agatha M. Gertken, St. Joseph.
Myrtle T. Ellingboe, Sunburg.
Theresa M. Reichensperger, Waite Park.
George J. Klosterman, Woodstock.
Albert H. Sugg, Zumbro Falls.

NEVADA

Gladys P. McMichael, Gabbs.

NEW JERSEY

Frank Archibald Farrell, Allendale.
Margaret A. Bernard, Gloucester Heights.
Orrin C. Whaites, Hanover.
Gerald J. Buchanan, Parlin.

NEW MEXICO

Daniel Moreno, La Mesa.

NEW YORK

Henrietta Fairbanks, Bainbridge.
Maria A. Goodwin, Blue Point.

NORTH CAROLINA

William Lewis Joyner, Rocky Mount.

PENNSYLVANIA

Stanley V. Reppy, Plymouth.
Ernest F. Haeussler, Shillington.

WEST VIRGINIA

Londa E. Green, Beaver.
Edna E. Arnold, Bownemont.
Kittie C. Kirk, Kermit.
Elizabeth A. Barker, Mona.
Thelma F. Settle, Page.
John J. Mathison, Wheeling.

WISCONSIN

Neal D. Strong, Chetek.
Ottilia A. Agathen, Eagle.
Paul E. Sweeney, Edgerton.
Ida I. Serley, Exeland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou who comest unto the hearts of men with love and cheer, let Thy power flow through human weakness; may we realize that they serve who only stand and wait. Behind the curving sky, beyond that mysterious shore

where the night winds sigh and murmur, out through the endless stretch of space, Thou art infinite and yet our most gracious and loving Father. How we marvel when we meditate on Thy condescension and the care of Thy merciful providence wherein we may read life's deepest meaning in the light of Thy goodness. As duty and loyalty are our trusts, we pray for a voluntary abnegation of our powers for the sake of others.

As we approach Thee in repentance and confession, hear us, gracious Master; dwell in fellowship with our souls and exalt our ideals; broaden our vision and fill the veins of our thoughts with immortal courage that will lift us in to the very presence of God. Our calling is not by the whisper of the night, but by the thunder of the day. Take our country under Thy guidance that conquest may be by the sovereignty of self-denial and fortitude. As the sons of freedom, ever impress us with the urgency of our mission, that the world may see us coming into our glorious heritage—dealing justly, conquering wrong, and guarding our national honor. In the name of St. Mary's holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1110. An act providing for the designation of certain Mondays during the present war as Memory Monday.

MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that the Speaker has appointed the following Members of the House as members of the Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy created by House Resolution 465, Seventy-eighth Congress: Mr. WOODRUM, of Virginia, chairman; Mr. MAY, of Kentucky; Mr. VINSON, of Georgia; Mr. BLAND, of Virginia, Mr. DREWRY, of Virginia; Mr. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; Mr. THOMASON, of Texas; Mr. SNYDER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. MERRITT, of New York; Mr. COSTELLO, of California; Mr. SHEPPARD, of California; Mr. MAGNUSON, of Washington; Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas; Mr. ANDREWS, of New York; Mr. MAAS, of Minnesota; Mr. WADSWORTH, of New York; Mr. ALLEN, of Illinois; Mr. POWERS, of New Jersey; Mr. MOTT, of Oregon; Mr. SHORT, of Missouri; Mr. ARENDS, of Illinois; Mr. COLE, of New York; Mr. MILLER, of Connecticut.

THE LATE LT. ROBERT T. BROWN

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have lost a young friend. He was one of our boys we selected to fight for the freedom of the world. He died in that cause.

War took that young man, Mr. Speaker, as war will continue to take millions of other young men and boys. That is the history of war. War always has taken the best, the bravest, and the youngest.

Our young friend had much to live for. He was the son of fine parents. He came from a Christian home. He had the prospect of a successful career predicated upon education and opportunity. While there is nothing that we might do or say that could be of much comfort to his bereaved parents, yet may we not for ourselves extend to our colleague, PAUL BROWN, and to Mrs. Brown, his father and his mother, this public expression of our grief and our sympathy and in expressing sympathy and love for them may we not do so for all others whose sons have made the supreme sacrifice upon the altar of their country.

Lt. Robert T. Brown was an honor graduate of the University of Georgia, where he completed a 4-year course in 3 years and made Phi Beta Kappa, probably the only person to make Phi Beta Kappa under these circumstances. He received every honor offered by the university and all the honors to be bestowed by the School of Journalism.

He was within 6 months of obtaining his law degree at the University of Georgia when he applied for active duty immediately after the Pearl Harbor attack, having enlisted in the Naval Reserve V–7 program in September 1941.

After a 4-month special course in engineering on the U. S. S. *Prairie State* he was commissioned an ensign and attended the special school in Diesel-engine operation at Pennsylvania State College, upon completion of which he was assigned to a submarine.

He chose submarine duty because when his class graduated on the *Prairie State* there was a call for volunteers for such duty. There were not enough volunteers and he thought it was his duty to volunteer. He was the youngest man to graduate in his class of 800 or 900 on *Prairie State*, and the only one from Georgia.

He had qualified to wear the dolphin insignia. An officer on submarine duty is entitled to wear dolphin insignia only after he has been on such duty for a sufficient length of time to be considered qualified in all respects as a submarine officer, which means that he has proved himself capable of handling any and all matters relating to submarine and is qualified to perform practically all duties in the operation of the ship in event of an emergency. But the mere fact that a naval officer has satisfactorily completed submarine training and has been assigned to duty does not of itself entitle him to wear dolphins. It is a distinct honor finally to reach the point where one has been approved as a submarine officer to wear the dolphin insignia.

Just before his untimely death, Lieutenant Brown had been granted a furlough. This he did not live to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, war destroys youth. It robs mother, wife, and child. It invades the homes of the wealthy and the poor. It destroys the accumulated wealth and culture of civilization. It pillages, it robs, it burns, and it consumes. There is but one force to which it will yield and that is the principles of universal justice and love and these have their root in the religions of the world.

Civilization too long has tolerated and condoned the agony and the horror of war. It must be for us to resolve that at the conclusion of this war there be a lasting peace. There must be no planting of the seeds of future wars. So far as lies within our power we must eradicate the enmities, the animosities, the jealousies, and the hatreds that breed war in order that there may be peace on earth and good will among men.

SPECIAL ELECTION, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, OKLAHOMA

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is no news to any Member of this House that a special congressional election of considerable importance and outstanding significance was held in Oklahoma on yesterday. Newspapers in Washington and the country have carried front-page stories concerning the Oklahoma election daily for the past few weeks. It is news, however, and cheerful news. to announce at this time that the Democrats of the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma won a smashing victory in yesterday's bitterly contested election, by giving the Democratic nominee, my good friend and former colleague in the State of Oklahoma Senate, Hon. BILL STIGLER, a majority approximately 10 times that given the Democratic nominee in the same district and contested by the same opponent in 1942.

According to all the newspaper reports and radio commentators in the discussions of this contest for the past several days, the issues were clearly drawn. In fact, the Republican opposition insisted on forcing the issue along strictly national lines. The Democrats accepted the challenge. Neither side pulled any punches. The opposition centered its attack against the Roosevelt administration and appealed to voters over the radio, through the press, from the platform, in circulars and in full-page advertisements, to defeat the Democratic nominee as a rebuke to President Roosevelt and what they sarcastically and sneeringly call the New Deal. In fact, according to many reports, the opposition from the very beginning to the closing hour of the campaign sang a song of hate against President Roosevelt and the present national administration.

Every person who had suffered any inconvenience or discomfort as a result of wartime restrictions was appealed to in every conceivable manner to show his or her resentment at the polls. Little, if any, constructive program was offered by the opposition. The result of yesterday's election is abundant evidence that citizens of Oklahoma, and I think of the entire country, are more interested in winning the war than in carry-

ing on a campaign of hate in connection with domestic issues. It is also a warning to the Republican Party that it cannot hope to win a national election on a platform of negation, and opposition to wartime restrictions. The people are demanding a constructive program. It was on a strictly constructive program that BILL STIGLER won his race by an impressive majority on yesterday.

Both the Democratic and Republican nominee reside in the same town. They are not only personal friends and neighbors, but their law offices are across the street from each other in the town of Stigler. The Republican nominee had the advantage of having made two previous district-wide races for Congress, and as Members familiar with his long-drawn-out contest here know, was defeated by only a small margin in the 1942 election.

The successful candidate, Oklahoma's newest Democratic Congressman, has had the advantage of a long outstanding and devoted public service. He is a native Oklahoman and is a member of one of the well-known pioneer families of our State. BILL STIGLER is especially proud of the fact that the blood of one of the Nation's great Indian tribes courses through his veins. He has not only a brilliant mind, a magnetic personality, but his record of accomplishments and his sterling character will be a power for good in his new and wider field as a national legislator.

The Oklahoma delegation, of which I have the honor of being chairman, is proud and happy to welcome him as a member of this great body. He comes to this Congress fresh and direct from the people. You will find him a tireless worker, a clear thinker who is intellectually honest, and who has the courage of his very deep convictions. I predict for Congressman BILL STIGLER, of Oklahoma, a long and exceptionally useful public career.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, heretofore I have refrained from making any comments on the political situation, as I felt that it would be better in this emergency through which we are moving not to fan the flames of partisan disagreements. However, on yesterday, my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, chairman of the Republican congressional committee, read into the RECORD, on page 3219, a statement from a Washington paper with reference to the congressional contest in the Second District of Oklahoma, the election being held as of yesterday. The statement was so definitely partisan that I think some reference should be made to it, especially because the election now has been held, the results are in, and a Democratic victory has been assured. The reading of the statement brought forth from one of my Democratic colleagues the thought that the statement sounded very much like an alibi in advance, and I suggested to the gentleman from Indiana that it might be well if he would classify the statement as inspired propaganda. The people of the Second District of Oklahoma have gone to the polls in good old Democratic fashion and have indicated that their hearts are still in the right place, as well as their minds. I have no desire to gloat over my discomfited political enemies, nor do I wish to twit my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, with being a little "previous" in reading said statement. However, it seems to me that this is a very good time to clear up a number of references which have been made through the newspapers concerning the results of the special elections that have been held in this session, for a great deal of misunderstanding has resulted from said statements.

Special elections, as a general rule, do not indicate trends in political thought. There are too many factors involved in such off-elections to enable any definite analysis as to the trend of an election which will not take place for many months. The newspapers favorable to the Republican cause, and possibly even some that are favorably Democratic, have thought as was expressed in this statement referred to above, and this is what I wish to analyze. Quoting from said statement, the opening sentence reads "having lost an uncomfortable number of byelections in the last year", and even in this morning's papers, I quote from one "the result gave the party of Roosevelt its third triumph in 11 special congressional elections over the country since 1942, the Republicans having won 8, including 3 seats which, like that at issue here, were Democratic." These remarks, on their face, are, of course, correct, but I wish to set out each one and show that the only indication of a trend, if any, is that the seats which were Republican have in the main remained Republican, and those which were Democratic have in the main remained Democratic. In other words, the results indicate very much a political condition which has existed since the beginning of this session.

Special elections, Seventy-eighth Congress:

Republican seats remaining Republican: Sixth Missouri, Second Kansas, Twenty-third Pennsylvania, Seventeenth Pennsylvania, Thirty-second New York.

Republican seat won by Democrat: Second California.

Democratic seats remaining Democratic: Twenty-first New York, Third Alabama, Second Oklahoma.

Democratic seats won by Republicans: Fourth Kentucky, Second Pennsylvania, First Colorado.

To summarize, in eight districts Democrats succeeded Democrats or Republicans succeeded Republicans. In three districts Democratic seats were filled by Republicans, and in one district a Republican seat was won by a Democrat—a net loss to the Democrats of two seats.

The Democratic national congressional committee has stated that it expected that the Democratic majority in the House would be increased by the 1944 elections. We see no reason to change that statement.

So far as the election on yesterday in the Second District of Oklahoma is concerned, it is a fact that the Republicans planned to make a great deal of their victory if they won. To that end, they brought into the district some of their "big guns" and the Republican Party in the district was amply provided with the "sinews of war." The Democratic Party, of course, met the challenge and the people of the district were the judges and decided the issue. It might be noted that while 2 years ago the district went Democratic by only 385 votes, the returns of yesterday seem to indicate that the Democratic Party had won by nearly 4,000. If any trend is indicated by such an election, it seems reasonable to say that the trend was decidedly Democratic.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma yesterday got back into home production. She is sending a native son, BILL STIGLER, from the town of Stigler, that was named for the father of the successful candidate. He is of Choctaw Indian blood. His people were on the reception committee that greeted the *Mayflower* and those that came later. He is an able statesman. He served 8 years as State senator. He was State commander of the American Legion, Department of Oklahoma, and former president pro tempore of the State senate. He is able. He will make a good Congressman. He is a worker, and he knows what to do when he gets here.

We are happy to greet him as a Member of Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there can be scant comfort for the new dealers in their greatly reduced margin of victory as against the normal, overwhelming, Democratic majority in the Second Oklahoma District. In this district where they have heretofore just taken success for granted, they pulled all the stops, threw in everything they had, and finally squeaked through.

The showing made by our candidate against such tremendous odds gives added confidence that with good candidates, a constructive platform, and hard work, Republicans will win in November.

After all, this result merely confirms the widespread belief that the Democrats can still carry some of the overwhelmingly Democratic districts, particularly in the South. It just shows what they are up against in the Nation as a whole.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who have been here for the last 7 or 8 years there is nothing startling or amazing in the fact that the majority should rejoice so greatly over the election of a good, hard-working Democrat. We are glad to have somebody sent us from Oklahoma—at least, I am—who will help us on legislative business, as have the Members from that State. I congratulate the majority because I am quite sure the new Member will offset and nullify your victory in New York, where Sidney Hillman, of the American Labor Party, won out in spite of the opposition of Dave Dubinsky. Perhaps this good American from Oklahoma will counterbalance the Red branch or faction of the American Labor Party which the Democratic Party took to its bosom yesterday in the city of New York.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CRIMINAL CODE, CHAPTER 7

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3408) to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "Sale", insert "or expose or keep with intent to furnish or sell."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, after "manufactured", insert "furnished."

Page 1, line 10, after "States", insert "or any token, disc, or other device issued or authorized in connection with rationing by any agency of the United States."

Page 2, line 14, after "him", insert "or exposed or kept with intent to furnish or sell."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN FOLDING ROOM

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 260) entitled "Joint resolution providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives," with Senate amendments thereto and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 4, after "the", where it occurs the second time, insert "Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the."

Line 5, strike out "is" and insert "are."

Line 5, after "hereby", insert "respectively."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 29, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SPEAKER RAYBURN: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Honorable Sam Jones, Governor of the State of Louisiana, my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Third District of Louisiana, effective April 15, 1944.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES DOMENGEAUX.

ELECTION CONTEST—JOHN C. SCHAFER, CONTESTANT, AGAINST THADDEUS F. WASIELEWSKI, CONTESTEE

Mr. DOMENGEAUX, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, submitted the following privileged report for printing in the RECORD:

The Committee on Elections No. 1, having had under consideration the election contest of John C. Schafer, contestant, against Thaddeus F. Wasielewski, contestee, Fourth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, submits its unanimous report and recommends the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the election contest of John C. Schafer, contestant, against Thaddeus F. Wasielewski, contestee, Fourth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, be dismissed.

STATEMENT

The issues raised by John C. Schafer, the contestant in this case, are that Thaddeus F. Wasielewski, the successful candidate for the seat in the House of Representatives from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin in the general election of November 3, 1942, made expenditures in violation of the laws of the State of Wisconsin and the Federal Corrupt Practices Act; that the said Thaddeus F. Wasielewski failed to file correct reports of political transactions with the secretary of State of Wisconsin and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States as required by law; that the said Thaddeus F. Wasielewski violated laws of the State of Wisconsin relating to the publishing of false and improper statements, pamphlets, and publications concerning the contestant during the said election; and that Thaddeus F. Wasielewski for these reasons is not the duly elected Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin and that the contestant, John C. Schafer, is the duly elected Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin.

The contestant does not question the fact that Thaddeus F. Wasielewski received approximately 17,000 votes over his nearest opponent, John C. Schafer.

The Wisconsin statutes limit to $875 the amount of money that can be spent by a candidate for Congress in the general election. The Wisconsin statutes, however, place no limitation upon receipts and expenditures of individuals or groups that might voluntarily interest themselves in behalf of a candidate.

Thaddeus F. Wasielewski filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives on November 5, 1942, a statement, as required by Federal law, showing receipts of $1,689 and total expenditures of $1,172.

On December 17, 1942, contestant filed notice of contest of the election of Thaddeus F. Wasielewski in which he pointed out that the sum set forth in the statement filed by Thaddeus F. Wasielewski with the Clerk of the House of Representatives was in excess of expenditures permitted under Wisconsin law and the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and that Thaddeus F. Wasielewski was, therefore, in violation of the statutes of the State of Wisconsin and of the Federal statutes.

On its face, the statement of receipts and expenditures filed by contestee with the Clerk of the House of Representatives violates the laws of Wisconsin and the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. The direct evidence, however, indicates that the contributions listed were paid to the Wasielewski for Congress Club and the expenditures made by that organization, which was shown to be a voluntary committee rather than a personal campaign committee as defined by the laws of Wisconsin.

The Wasielewski for Congress Club was organized and managed by Vernon E. Waters, John Kobelinski, and Martin B. Gedlen. The latter was one of Mr. Wasielewski's secretaries during the campaign of 1942 and prior thereto. From this relationship it might be inferred that the Wasielewski for Congress Club was controlled by Mr. Wasielewski and that its funds were collected and disbursed with his knowledge, consent, and approval, were it not for the undisputed testimony to the contrary.

In filing his personal return with the Clerk of the House, the contestee avers that he erroneously included $1,689 received by the Wasielewski for Congress Club and $1,172 expended by it. It must be said that the statement was drawn up in a negligent and careless manner. The committee does not condone such negligence.

Under all the circumstances, the committee is of the opinion that Mr. Wasielewski, who received a substantial plurality of votes, approximately 17,000, in the general election of November 3, 1942, over Mr. Schafer, his nearest opponent, should not be denied his seat in the House of Representatives on account of the errors made in the statement filed by Mr. Wasielewski with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The committee feels that the will of the electorate of the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin was clearly shown and should not be thwarted on account of the irregularities in accounting.

The committee did not find any evidence of fraud.

The committee recommends that the petition of the contestant be denied and that the election contest be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES DOMENGEAUX, *Chairman.*
C. JASPER BELL,
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
JAMES V. HEIDINGER,
JOHN JENNINGS, JR.,
ROBERT W. KEAN.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 490.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of John C. Schafer, contestant, against Thaddeus F. Wasielewski, contestee, Fourth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, be dismissed.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the Committee on Elections No. 1 voted unanimously to dismiss the election contest.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two different subjects, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it was so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] may make three separate extensions in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUGAR FOR COMMERCIAL USES

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday considerable was said regarding the shortage of sugar. I have made careful inquiry into the problem because commercial users of sugar in my part of the country are worried over recent cuts in the quota. Then, too, I feel that every effort should be made now to secure large stocks of sugar for our domestic use in order that housewives will have sufficient supply on hand when the canning season arrives.

Various figures have been given us regarding the supply of sugar. We are aware of the fact that the supply from the Philippines has been cut off. We now must depend upon the supplies from Cuba, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and our domestic beet and cane. I have been told that considerable Cuban sugar goes into industrial alcohol now. Also that considerable sugar must move to the United Kingdom and as a result we in the United States are short about 2,000,000 tons of sugar. For that reason, I am informed the quotas must continue and that the future for the next 12 months is not very bright.

In the course of my inquiry into the sugar-shortage problem I ran across a rumor that because of lack of bottoms, some sugar or molasses in Hawaii had been dumped into the sea. I endeavored to run down this rumor and learned from reliable sources that this rumor has been going the rounds for some time. These sources of reliable information reveal that there is absolutely no foundation to this rumor and that no sugar or molasses in Hawaii has been dumped. Actually, I am told, that while some molasses has been stored in Hawaii, sugar is coming through from Hawaii without unnecessary delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein the Committee Resolution No. 10, adopted by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries yesterday, and also to include therein other letters and papers and a portion of the radio address of Mr. Fulton Lewis delivered Tuesday, March 28, from Los Angeles over Station KHG, dealing with the critical necessities of the fishing industries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therewith an article from the American Federationist of March 1944, entitled "Labor Fights for the Serviceman." Mr. Speaker, the printing of this article will require one-fourth of a page more than that which is authorized by the rules. The article consists of two and one-half pages and costs $101.25. I ask unanimous consent that, despite this extra cost, it may be included with my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES' CLUB

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call the attention of the Members of the House to a double-feature motion-picture program that is offered by the Congressional Secretaries' Club in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building at 8 o'clock tonight. One picture will be Battle of the Beaches, said to be a red-hot war film, the latest issued by the Navy and not yet generally shown. The other will be the Saga of South Dakota, which is an unusual picture showing the largest gold mine in the country in operation. Of course, this picture was taken when the mine was operating, before the W. P. B. shut down on gold mining. It will show the processing of gold from mine to mint.

This program is sponsored by the secretaries of the South Dakota congressional delegation, and on behalf of them and the Congressional Secretaries' Club you are all very cordially invited to attend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter containing a resolution from a local labor union, urging universal conscription.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LABOR FOR VICTORY BROADCAST

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter addressed to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RAMSPECK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including therein an editorial that appeared in the New York Sun last night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I received from the State medical society and my reply to that letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a statement concerning Major Christie.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a manuscript by Arthur Lowrie, at a cost of $45, entitled "Absorptive Capacity of Palestine."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding, and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FREYA STARK—PAID AGENT AND PROPAGANDIST OF BRITISH MINISTRY OF INFORMATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic indeed to have Britain seal the doors of Palestine against Jewish immigration, despite its violations of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, the concurrent resolution of Congress in 1922, the League of Nations mandate, and the Balfour declaration.

But the British Ministry of Information adds insult to that injury by importing into this country one Miss Freya Stark. She is a paid "agent provocateur" touring Canada and the United States, spreading lies concerning the Palestine Jews in her efforts to justify the infamous MacDonald White Paper which bars Jewish immigration into Palestine.

She is a decided mischief maker, a sort of modern Molly MacGuire trouble-breeder. She bears watching. She is a Judeaphobe and an Arabphile.

She is the usual stooge of power politics. We want none of her kind in this country. We need no paid propagandist here to spread lies, even in the interest of British colonial policy in Palestine.

Speaking in Montreal, she had the temerity to state:

> The Arabs are the rightful owners of Palestine, and they have been silent too long and allowed the Zionists to put out a lot of propaganda which has created a wrong impression of the actual conditions in the Middle East.

She also had the audacity to say:

> The Arabs are cooperating everywhere with the British in the war.

This, she said despite the fact that Iraq revolted against the British and had to be beaten into submission, despite the fact that the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, former puppet of Great Britain, is now in Berlin as Hitler's gauleiter, spreading distrust and intrigue against the Allies, despite the fact that the Egyptian Prime Minister was caught betraying British military secrets to the Axis, despite the fact that in Britain's darkest hour in the east King ibn-Saud could not find a camel or a donkey to spare for the Allied cause. Fine cooperation.

This Freya Stark dare not tell the truth. She refuses to tell about the magnificent efforts that the Palestine Jews made in contributing to the Allied victories, that they died and bled for the Allies, that more than 6 percent of Jewish Palestine volunteered and are now serving with the British Army, that they supplied hospitals, doctors, nurses, sanitary corps, food, medical supplies, critically needed chemicals and machinery.

This Freya Stark is a sort of piscator that prods and irritates and infuriates the victims of Arab effendi hatred and British colonial duplicity.

It is amazing that the British Ministry of Information, a creature of the British Government, allows this woman to make these outrageous statements to the Canadian and American public.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in a New Jersey newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to announce to the Members of the House today that the Dies committee has completed its report on Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee, and copies of the reports will be available to Members of the House this afternoon. One copy will be sent to every Member's office this evening. I suggest that the Members of the House read this very exhaustive report carefully.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial, Our Friends Glare at Us, which appeared in the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, under date of March 26, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter from a freckled-faced tail gunner on a bomber, a Martin Marauder.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars; in one to include a short editorial, and in the other to include a recent radio speech by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to the wounded soldiers of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LYNCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter in which it is pointed out that Washington, Va., antedates the oldest of the other 27 Washingtons, by 27 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the text of a scroll presented to Elmer Davis, Director of War Information, by the Sons of Indiana of New York, and the text of an address I made today in presenting this scroll to Mr. Davis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, is is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes this afternoon following the other special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, March 30, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 12 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution and two supporting communications relative to the enactment of H. R. 4229.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on three matters and to include therein two very interesting articles which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of March 19 and one which appeared in the same paper on March 26.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by Mr. Alton Jones, president of the War Emergency Pipe Lines, Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain information with reference to farm labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.)

FAILURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the agriculture appropriation bill passed by the House last Friday failed for the first time in many years to carry an appropriation for Federal contributions in the form of surplus food to the school-lunch programs of local school districts. Few people in the Nation realize or even believe this as yet. They will fully realize it when the next term of school comes in the fall.

The Appropriation Committee is not to blame. The House itself turned the program down and refused to authorize it in spite of the efforts on its behalf by all Democratic members and some Republican members of the Agriculture Committee. A majority of the House said in effect: "We want farm surpluses purchased as part of a price support program but we refuse to permit that food to be used for the benefit of undernourished American children in our schools."

At this very moment, due to a winter production of unprecedented volume, the price of eggs throughout the Nation is severely depressed. One reason for this is the difficulty of disposal of the eggs after they are purchased by the Food Distribution Administration, as should be done under the price-support program. I am informed storage facilities are nearly full to the brim, that there is a serious labor shortage in all lines of egg processing and that the one available outlet for surpluses which is really effective at present is the school-lunch program.

I ask that every person who has opposed that program consider what the situation will be a few months from now when as a result of action by the House of Representatives there won't be any school-lunch program any more.

I just do not believe the matter is going to stand there. I believe Members will hear from their people at home and that their voices will be clear and strong. There are bills before this House and before the Senate that can correct the wrong action that has been taken. Somehow I still believe those bills will be passed. For this basic idea that where there is food available, the needs of America's school children shall be fully met is too right, too logical, too simple and true, too fundamentally Christian to be rejected by this Congress.

In the Appendix of the RECORD, page A1729, you will find some extended remarks of mine covering this whole school-lunch question. I hope Members will read them. I have no fear but that teachers, and mothers and fathers will do so.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE AGED

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there are still in the United States hundreds of thousands of elderly citizens attempting to survive on a very small income. They are confronted with the fact of having to live in a world at war with the cost of living exceedingly high, particularly the costs these old people must assume in order to live. Medical care, food, hospitalization, clothing, all of the simple necessities they require, have risen with inflation and the cost of war. We in the Congress have been rather derelict in making some provision for this age group of our people. They are receiving from $5 to $40 a month throughout the United States. This is a starvation allowance in free America with a national income of one hundred and forty billions.

There are a number of pieces of legislation pending in the Congress which would tend to alleviate this critical situation, one being the bill in which I am interested, H. R. 1649, which is sometimes known as the Townsend national recovery plan. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON] and I have caused to be made a very exacting, critical, and careful study of the social-security programs and particularly the one to which I have referred. This study has been made by a gentleman who has had very large experience in matters of this sort, a political economist of outstanding reputation, Mr. John Donaldson. He has prepared a report which we are sending to the Members, which they will probably receive tomorrow. It contains a wealth of information along the line of social security, care of aged people, matters which have had careful consideration by him and by the membership of Congress. I hope you will take the opportunity to read it.

There is pending at the Clerk's desk Petition No. 17 to take H. R. 1649 from the committee and bring it up for consideration in the House. It will come up under an open rule allowing amendments to be made to any of its provisions. I sincerely hope in the interests of our old folks you will sign this petition. The time to act is now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. During general debate?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PALESTINE, THE JEWISH HOMELAND

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], let me say that I think he is doing a great disservice to this country and a great disservice to the Jewish people of this Nation by rising on this floor and attacking the British Empire about the situation in Palestine.

If the conservative American Jews could speak, in my opinion they would be opposed to it. Secretary of State Hull and General Marshall have spoken on this subject, and their request is that this resolution do not pass.

We are in the midst of a great war, the most terrible war of all time. The English-speaking world is joined in a contest against the dictators of Germany and Japan; and all over the world Englishmen, Scotchmen, Welshmen, Canadians, New Zealanders, and Australians are fighting and dying side by side with American soldiers.

To wave a red flag in the face of the British Empire now comes as a distinct disservice that may cause friction between this country and Great Britain, arouse the ire of the Moslem world, and cost the lives of thousands of our young men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from New York has just spoken once. Unless I am permitted to answer him I shall object. I am tired of these attacks on our allies from the floor of this House, and I expect to answer them from now on.

I object, Mr. Speaker, unless I have 1 minute in which to reply.

Mr. CELLER. Is the gentleman scared? Is he afraid?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am not afraid of a thousand like you.

Mr. CELLER. Certainly the gentleman is afraid. The gentleman is never right.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to permit the gentleman from New York to wave the red flag in the face of the British Empire on this floor without my answering him.

Mr. CELLER. I will retaliate, I warn the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; I will be here.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman will get no chance to speak under unanimous-consent request, either.

Mr. RANKIN. I can speak without asking the gentleman from New York. These attacks on our allies from the floor of this House during these critical times must stop.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 29, 1944.

The SPEAKER,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning.

Respectfully,

R. E. THOMASON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that the Speaker has appointed the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] as a member of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

EXPATRIATING OR EXCLUDING CERTAIN PERSONS FOR EVADING MILITARY AND NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 482, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons on account of evading military and naval service. It aims to preclude from reentry into the United States of a large number of men who have left this country for the purpose of avoiding service in the United States armed services. Surely no one in the House is opposed to this resolution. I am informed that there are a large number of these men who left the country because they did not wish to serve the country when every able-bodied man is needed and when every man should be more than pleased to be of aid at this time to his country, the greatest in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say any more because I think it is unnecessary. The bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Immigration, and you know what that means, and the rule has been unanimously reported by the Rules Committee. Therefore, as I stated, I am not going to take any further time, feeling satisfied that the rule as well as the bill will pass by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield in a few minutes, 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX]. Before I yield the floor, I want to say a few words about this gentleman because, fortunately, it has been my pleasure and honor to meet him from time to time and I have always admired him very much.

I am informed that today he is about to leave us in order to enter the service of his country. I regret exceedingly that we will lose him because he has been an exceptionally valuable Member. I do not know of anyone who within the 4 years that he has served here has made a greater number of friends than has the gentleman to whom I have referred. He is loved by everyone in the House and I know that I express the sentiment of every Member of the House when I say that I wish him Godspeed when he enters the armed service and I hope that he will in devotion to his duty and to his country serve just as faithfully, courageously, and conscientiously as he has served as a Member of this House.

While we are losing him, fortunately for our side, we are gaining a gentleman who was elected yesterday in the great State of Oklahoma; so although we lose an exceptionally good man, I am informed we will gain one from Oklahoma who, I am told, was elected by a majority 10 times that given to this individual's predecessor. In view of that fact, he must be a very good man, a very able man and one who is exceptionally well qualified for the duties he is about to assume as a Member of this House. I congratulate the people of the district in Oklahoma that elected him and the House, I am sure, will gain an experienced, able man. I regret exceedingly losing our beloved friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX]. I am saying this notwithstanding the fact that I understand the gentleman contemplates criticism of the administration later. Holding him in such high esteem, I regret exceedingly that he should be so prejudiced, but I presume he will do this on account of political conditions in Louisiana.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] has served, I wish to concur in all that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has said about the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX]. We regret exceedingly losing him, because he has been a valuable member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and he will be very hard to replace.

Mr. SABATH. I have not said half as much as I could on behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Members on the minority side, I should also like to express our regret in losing this fine, capable, able, young man, with whom I have served on the Insular Affairs Committee for a good many years. That committee also has benefited exceedingly by his valuable help.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman accept the suggestion that he yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] his time in order that the gentleman may join with him in yielding to the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from New York is so anxious to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana that I am not going to deprive him of that pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, the usual 30 minutes. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] but before that I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, reserving the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from Louisiana 10 minutes, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have yielded myself this time to join with others in paying my respects and a tribute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] who is resigning of his own accord from the Congress of the United States to which he was elected by an overwhelming vote from an absolutely safe district, with no opposition at all, in order to enter the armed forces of the United States in the greatest war in the history of America.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the declaration of policy of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, who has stated that Members of Congress must resign from Congress in order to serve in our armed forces. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that in Parliament one-third of the members of that body are in the armed forces of the British Empire. There have been a great many casualties and a great many members of Parliament killed on the field of battle in this war so far. I do not see why there should be any different rule for the Congress of the United States than for the parliaments of the other democracies of the world or for the elected representatives of the people in any of the democratic nations. The electors back home have the final decision and if they want their elected Representative to serve in the armed forces or approve or disapprove of his action, they can always express their sentiments and wishes at the polls.

The Senate and the House of Representatives decide on the qualifications of their own Members, and if any Member wants to serve in the armed forces and the people continue to elect him,

that is their business. But he cannot take two salaries. If he takes a leave of absence to go in the Army he must take the salary he gets in the Army and surrender the salary he receives in the House. But at least as long as he is elected by the people and wants to make this sacrifice and serve his country in our armed forces and thus set an example of the highest patriotism, the people back home should have something to say about it and so should the Members of the House of Representatives who pass on the qualifications of their own Members. I do not believe that the President has any right to pass upon the qualifications of Members of Congress.

For that reason, with the precedents existing in every single democratic nation, with the precedents existing in the past in our own country, I do not agree, and I want to take this occasion to say so, with the declaration of policy issued by the Chief Executive.

I admire the gentleman from Louisiana. I am sorry that I do not know him as well as I would like to. He is setting a noble example. He is voluntarily sacrificing his seat here and his salary. He is a young man, 36 years of age, with a great future, and he has made a fine record in this House. He is a distinguished Member who already has rendered a great public service. We would like to have him continue in the House. We are sorry that he has to resign under the President's regulations in order to serve his country in time of war; that he cannot continue to be a Member and serve at the same time in the armed forces as they do throughout the rest of the democratic nations. But as long as he is to go, we on the minority side feel exactly the same as those of you on the majority side. We wish him good luck, Godspeed, and a safe return.

We know that he will carry into the armed forces the same devotion to America, the same high spirit of courage and patriotism that he has shown on the floor of the House, and that he will serve his country just as well and ably in the armed forces as he has in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Does not the gentleman feel, in line with what he said, that the Military Affairs Committee should report and the Congress should enact a law that would establish a policy on this question?

Mr. FISH. I certainly do, and I have felt that way since the war began over 2 years ago.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not a fact that the Congress on previous occasions, in past years, has decided exactly the same way as the President?

Mr. FISH. No; because Members have gone into the armed forces in the past. In the Civil War many of them were in the Union Army, and in World War No. 1 a number of Members even received their salaries from Congress on their return from overseas service.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not a fact that in Hinds' Precedents there are decisions of this Congress that are inconsistent with the gentleman's statement?

Mr. FISH. I am talking about the practice throughout the democratic nations of the world and our own in the past. I am not familiar with the precedents the gentleman alludes to, but I believe that the House alone should determine the qualifications of its own Members and that they should be encouraged to enter the armed services even if it meant the loss of a Democratic majority in the House. The welfare of the Nation and not partisanship must come first in time of war.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial, and further to extend my remarks and include therein a statement and editorial with reference to the passing of Mr. Jesse S. Cottrell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has said that the Members of Congress receive their congressional salary, or they did during the last World War. They did not receive both salaries.

Mr. FISH. No; but they were voted later on by the Congress full pay.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that a man in the service can render very valuable service to the Congress. Every other country in the world permits men to serve in the legislative branch and in the armed services. I extend my cordial congratulations to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], who resigned today to enter the United States Army to fight for us. He was an able and fine statesman. May good fortune attend him and may he soon return safely to us.

Mr. FISH. I think it would be a help in the conduct of the war and in the successful prosecution of the war if we had a number of Members of Congress in all branches of our armed forces to send back or bring back information we ought to have and are entitled to have in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the 10 minutes yielded by the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] I yield him 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret and intense reluctance that I rise to address the House today. It has been my very great good fortune to have been associated with you and the membership of this House during the past 3½ years. Those years, so far as that association is concerned, have been years of unalloyed happiness. They have been years, too, of lofty inspiration, of abundant learning, of rare experience, and of many warm and enduring friendships.

My regret springs from the fact that I have submitted my resignation as a Member of this House, so this will be the last time that I shall have the opportunity or the honor to address you formally in this Chamber so hallowed by the memory of the many great who have preceded me. For, Mr. Speaker, as I address you today, stirred as I am by the emotions of the occasion, I am made all the more impressively aware of the spirit of the fathers who spoke in this Chamber and sat in these seats. I would not name any lest I omit one; for all were honored by their presence here.

I recall very vividly the day on which I first entered here as a Member-elect of the House of Representatives. I was moved by the same lofty sentiments that, I am sure, have animated all who have been elected to membership in this, the greatest parliamentary body of the world. I recall no less vividly the oath we all take to support the Constitution of the United States and to discharge faithfully the duties of our office. I remember well the crowded galleries, the emotional tension, and the hushed anticipation which, by the grace of God, still is associated with the opening session of a new Congress.

I recall the indulgence accorded me so graciously during my "freshman" year, as well as the fine fellowship of later years. They are memories that I shall cherish always. Yet, Mr. Speaker, distinctive though the honor, rare the opportunity, and hallowed the associations, I am constrained to resign from the House in order that I may offer my services to the military forces of our country and take up arms against her enemies. I would not have you think that it is a capricious choice. It is the result of prayerful deliberation. I have tried while here to perform my duties in accordance with my oath of office. Only I can be the judge of my intent to perform them faithfully; you, my colleagues and the people of my district whom I have had the honor and privilege to represent in Congress are the judges of the result of my efforts.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to be a Member of the House of Representatives for even a short time without forming very definite concepts of the practical operations of our Government. Whatever our early environment, our studies, or our theories of our Government, membership in the House brings us into intimate contact and close relationship with

our Government in practice—with democracy in action. We revise or abandon erstwhile theories. We discover new principles and new practices, and we make new applications. We can observe the operation of economic principles in practice as they affect our people in their daily lives and relationships. We legislate in part for the general welfare of more than 130,000,000 souls living in 48 sovereign and independent States spread over a vastly diverse geographic area. The economic fate of our citizens depends in increasingly large measure upon the kind of legislation we enact.

While it is true, Mr. Speaker, that a number may have found it necessary to revise or abandon some erstwhile ideas of government, I am sure that there are only a few who have not discovered the persistent permanence of many of our traditional concepts of government. Time has verified the validity of the political philosophy of the fathers and confirmed the soundness of their economic theories and principles. We venture upon dangerous ground, indeed, when we repudiate their philosophy or reject their experience.

Since I have been a Member of the House, Mr. Speaker, I have noted that many of the measures referred to the legislative committees of the House are so-called administration measures that have been prepared in the executive department. While it is true that our committees hold hearings on these measures, and frequently amend, revise, or modify them before reporting them to the House, they remain, nevertheless, administration measures. And yet I am told by Members older in years and in service that time was when all measures were written originally under the dome of the Capitol.

Do we not find reflected here some measure of the degree to which our Congress has unwittingly delegated away powers, duties, and functions exclusively those of the Congress? When Congress transfers its function of writing our laws to the executive department, and restricts itself to a mere approval of administration measures presented under pressure that cannot be resisted, the need for Congress will vanish and we shall have been transformed into that totalitarian status that we approach so rapidly even now. Such, Mr. Speaker, was the path of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. It is the path of every totalitarian state. That certainly, indeed, will be our fate, too, lest Congress move rapidly to recapture those powers, functions, and duties that it has permitted the Executive to assume.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of the changes wrought by war. I think we all are. These changes have affected us in our daily way of life. They have affected our social and political economy in many ways. The constitutional fathers knew what the impact of war means. They had but emerged from war. They realized full well the necessity for concerted, concentrated effort in the successful conduct of war; and they wisely made provision in our Constitution.

While reserving to the Congress exclusively the power to declare war, they conferred upon the President the power and the authority to conduct war by making him Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. They did not define or delineate his functions, powers, or duties in that capacity. They left that, as they did so many other provisions, to time, circumstances, and events. No one will contend, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that in the capacity of Commander in Chief the functions, powers, and duties of the President should not be very large. Obviously, they must be large enough to prosecute war to a successful conclusion. And, in our constitutional way, our Supreme Court has so construed them.

How large, Mr. Speaker, really are the President's powers as Commander in Chief? Time does not permit a review of all the decisions of our highest court here; yet necessity compels me to refer at least to the case of *Fleming et al.* v. *Page* (9 How. 602, (1850)), in which Chief Justice Taney, referring to the President, said:

> His duty and his power are purely military * * * his conquests do not * * * extend the operation of our institutions and laws beyond the limits before assigned to them by the legislative power.

And yet we find, Mr. Speaker, that subordinate officers of the Government, although engaged in the civil service, yet resting upon executive directives, do not hesitate to defy the Congress of the United States and its legally constituted committees and refuse to furnish evidence essential and necessary to the efficient functioning of the law-making body. That is, they do not hesitate to defy until they are threatened with prosecution for contempt. The statement has been made upon the floor of the House that although the Congress has enacted 4,553 laws during the past 10 years, the executive department has issued during the same period 3,703 Executive orders or directives, all having the full force and effect of law. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether this is not a violent departure from the intent of the founding fathers and our general concept that it is the Congress which is to enact the laws and that the Executive is to enforce them. How long can so violent an encroachment continue without the complete collapse of our entire structure of Government?

Mr. Speaker, I have been told by older Members of the House that they recall the time in our history when the number of Federal boards, bureaus, and commissions could be counted almost on the fingers of one hand. Today, Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that there are not less than 100 parent boards and bureaus of this nature, with more than 2,000 lesser organizations or offices below them. Today, that vast parasitic horde literally infests the land. They control almost all our human relationships, they regulate our daily lives. They prescribe our medicines and our diets. They cut the patterns of our clothes. They model our homes and fix the mortgages we may bear. They direct our lives from the cradle to the grave and all the steps between. They have placed floors under our coffins and ceilings on our tombs. While we fight for freedom for all the world, we permit bureaucrats to enslave us.

Mr. Speaker, like yourself, I am from the South. My people are a devout people. They are largely descendants of Evangeline's Acadians, familiarly known among us as Cajuns. They have impressed their reverence upon our habits, our institutions, and our customs; indeed, upon the land itself. They were inspired to designate the principal political subdivisions of our State as parishes, the English derivative of a transmuted French term, having in its original Greek the concept of "beside the house"—that is, alongside the House of God. These are among the names of the parishes in the district I have the honor to represent: St. Mary, St. Martin, and Assumption. But the reverence of my people is reflected no less in the esteem in which they hold their ancestors; for here, too, is the parish of Lafayette. Lest they forget the land of their fathers there is the parish of Iberia; and the parish of Terrebonne bears evidence of their love of God's good earth. The parish of Vermilion indicates their artistic nature, and the parish of Lafourche their apt expression of geographical formations.

As in many other Southern States, there is a large population of Negroes among us. Except when aroused by self-seeking demagogs our Negroes have been happy and contented. They have shared with us in our fortunes and our ills. None have ever suffered want. They work in our fields, our factories, and our homes. They were assured always of a security far surpassing in its real benevolence the bureaucratic scheme of modern days and there were neither deductions nor withholdings to maintain it. I will not say that our Negroes had the empty glamour of Harlem, but I will say they have been spared its iniquities, its crimes, its poverty, and its hunger. Within the limits of our means we have accorded our Negroes such educational facilities as we could afford and for which they have evinced capacity and need.

Mr. Speaker, there are evil forces existent in our land that threaten to upset our peaceful relations with our Negroes. They are not interested in the real welfare of the Negro. Their ostensible solicitude springs from base motives. They would delude the Negro and lure him by false promises to hope for a status they know he never can attain. They are self-seeking demagogues, mischievously and maliciously pandering to baser elements. They are stirring up racial strife and racial jealousies and racial animosities. They have already caused overt demonstrations accompanied by violence and bloodshed that have retarded and impeded the war effort in numerous defense industries and plants. The slight political advantage these racemongers hope to gain is trifling compared to the evils they produce.

Mr. Speaker, we have been engaged in active warfare for more than 2 years. Our enemies have not yet been conquered. Indeed, they are still very powerful and they challenge our progress step by step. We stand upon the brink

of European invasion. The enemy's fortress is strong. He has had ample opportunity to fortify it almost to the point of invincibility. We cannot know how strong he is until we make the main attack. Daily the press brings news of the bitterly fought Italian campaign with its ghastly toll of American boys as they fight against entrenched forces and difficult terrain.

Apparently, we are engaged in some sort of temporary military alliance with the great powers with whom we are fighting. We have entered into executive agreements with them, the full extent of which never has been divulged to any branch of the legislative department; and yet, Mr. Speaker, there is a very reasonable constitutional presumption that the Senate of the United States is to share in the treaty-making power. We have bypassed the Senate, and we find ourselves confronted by a situation in our international relations that has assumed almost a state of crisis. Certainly we find one branch of our treaty-making authority definitely upon the defensive as to our existing foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I will not say that wars produce good. I will admit a very obvious and patent fact, namely, that wars do accelerate physical progress, and they do stimulate inventive genius. In the present war that stimulated inventive genius has almost suddenly succeeded in conquering space and time. The world has been made smaller. Events move with a rapidity hitherto undreamed of. Because of our marvelous achievements we find ourselves in the role of leadership throughout the world. We have a two-ocean Navy, the greatest in the world. We have a merchant marine greater than we ever anticipated and surpassing that of our closest rival. We have airplanes by the thousands, and we have reached the stage of their mass production. We have 11,000,000 men and women in the armed forces—superb young men and women trained physically and mentally under most favorable circumstances and conditions. We did not solicit world leadership. That leadership has been thrust upon us. What, Mr. Speaker, will we do with it?

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of the House, for this opportunity to address you today. I want you to know that the memories of my work and my associations here will inspire and strengthen me as I leave this great body to enter the armed forces of our country.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard our colleague, Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana, announce that he is resigning his seat in the Congress in order to be inducted into the armed forces of our country. Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself, and I feel quite certain that I voice the sentiments of all of the members of the Louisiana delegation in this Congress, I am proud of my colleague, and I know the people of his district and the entire State of Louisiana are proud of the action taken by Congressman DOMENGEAUX today. There is no greater glory than to fight for one's country, and at this time I am reminded of a quotation by Winthrop:

Our country—whether bounded by the St. John's and the Sabine, or however otherwise bounded or described, and be the measurements more or less—still our country, to be cherished in all our hearts, to be defended by all our hands.

For many months I have known of Congressman DOMENGEAUX's desire to join the armed forces of his country, and during the last year on the occasion of the visit of Louisiana's hero, General Chennault, Congressman DOMENGEAUX volunteered to join General Chennault's Tigers, but without success. I know that Congressman DOMENGEAUX has had joining the colors in mind for many months. I am also informed that the President and many of Congressman DOMENGEAUX's constituents importuned him not to give up his seat in Congress to enter the service, but without avail.

We have worked together since I have been in Congress in complete harmony, and I know that he has discharged his duties in a most efficient and commendable way. He has protected the interests of his district and his State, and has served his constituency well. He has been an able and valuable Congressman. I desire to express the sincere wish of the Louisiana delegation to Congressman DOMENGEAUX for Godspeed and good luck, and may he come back safe and sound.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Cox). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from New York desire to be recognized?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes; and I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I want merely to make an observation with reference to the splendid address to which we have just listened, by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], my neighbor on the west. I have known this fine young gentleman only since his arrival here as a Member of Congress from the great State of Louisiana. I shall not comment upon or attempt to commend his many virtues, but because of my intimate association with him since he has been here, and because of the fact that he is my immediate neighbor, I want to voice this public commendation upon the decision which he has made to leave the Halls of this House of Representatives, which are so dear to him—and which are coveted by so many people from his district, no doubt—to join the armed forces of his country. It is purely a matter of choice, although he is a young man, and my knowledge of the political situation in Louisiana convinces me of the fact that he could be reelected without opposition to follow the less hazardous undertaking of a legislator. But in preference to that and by his own choice, he prefers to don the uniform—the uniform of a private in the Army of his country. He has sought no commission. He has preferred to take his chances just as the boys from his congressional district and from the country at large take their chances when they enter the armed services of the country. I am sure that politically ambitious as he may be, we all appreciate this great example of personal sacrifice. I predict for him a glorious future in the great State of Louisiana.

(Mr. COLMER assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker pro tempore, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, it is a great honor to address the House while the gentleman is in the chair. I concur with everything he says about the gentleman who is about to go into our armed forces. I would further point out to the House that here is a Representative elected by the people, of French origin, typical of America, which is composed of all races, creeds, and groups from all over the world, but when his country calls he volunteers and gives up his job in the Congress of the United States to take his place with the other soldiers from his own district.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I have known the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] more intimately than some. That has been my splendid privilege. The gentleman from Louisiana has a character like a wall against which the blandishments of society are harmless and ineffectual. He has an honor as pure and true as the temper of a Damascus blade and a mind that is not only brilliant but capacious. While he will serve capably and well in the armed forces, he served here with credit and distinction. I, for one, applaud and admire the step that he is taking. I, for one, abhor the fact, however, that this Congress sits here without a system to pass on such a resignation. This Congress, as a coordinate branch of the Government, is in a position, if we do nothing to correct the situation legislatively, of being subject to the decisions of another branch of the Government on this subject, which is only a coordinate branch of the Government under the Constitution and on a par. I think that the decision as to whether or not a Member of Congress could be given a leave of absence to serve in the armed forces, as was done in other historic instances in this country, is one that should rest solely with the Congress. A citizen can be selected to serve in Congress by no other method than a direct vote of the people. A Senator, a judge, or other official can be appointed under given circumstances, but only the people can appoint or select a Congressman; there is no other method under the Constitution. Hence, a Congressman is the direct Representative of the people and independent of everyone else or every other part of Government. He is independent of the Executive; he should be independent of the other branches of Government. He is subject only to the people. He is their hired hand. The welfare and the wishes of the people should be his only restraint in all his actions. The people, and only the people, have any right to decide what a Congressman should do. I believe that the people of Congressman DOMENGEAUX's district would be willing for him to take a leave of absence to serve in the war, and I believe they ought to have the chance to decide. It is the fault of Congress that no possibility exists for the Congress or

the people of Louisiana to pass on the question of legislators serving in the armed forces. We should legislate on the subject and amend the House rules on seniority to protect the interests of the people in the congressional districts affected. I find here today a deep admiration for the characteristic frankness, boldness, and ability with which my colleague and dear friend has reviewed some of the fundamental matters affecting this Government and has commented with brilliance on the situation that confronts us as a country on the many issues with which the Congress should grapple now.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to bid this friend Godspeed. I do not believe there is any young Member of Congress who has served more faithfully and with greater distinction. JAMES DOMENGEAUX is a man of great talent and ability. His is a mind of unusual scope and depth. I am confident his will be a great contribution to the history of Louisiana. His is a rising star. We in Congress love and admire JAMES DOMENGEAUX as I know the people of Louisiana do. I regret his leaving us and my earnest good wish attends his every endeavor.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] on his splendid valedictory address. I have known him only 3½ years, but during that time I have learned to love, admire, and respect him. He will be missed here for his many sterling qualities. I am sure that the whole House joins in my wish that God may bless him as he continues to travel along the chosen path of duty.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that should have the wholehearted support of every Member of Congress. All you have to do is to read the title of it, "To Expatriate or Exclude Certain Persons for Evading the Military and Naval Service." You do not have to go any further. This is aimed at the draft dodgers who left America to go to some foreign nation to keep out of the draft. This excludes them from citizenship. It does not permit aliens to return to the country. That is all the bill provides. As far as I am concerned, I am wholeheartedly in favor of it. If you could make it any stronger in any way, I would be for that, too.

Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to get into any controversy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], over the Palestine resolution, but I cannot refrain from making a few comments about it.

In 1922 I was the author of a resolution to establish a homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine. Senator LODGE introduced a similar resolution in the Senate. In the parliamentary mix-up my resolution was the one that was passed unanimously and signed by the President, putting the Congress of the United States on record in favor of the Balfour resolution of establishing a homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine.

The Balfour resolution was adopted in time of war during the last war, and it was approved and upheld by the act of the House and the Senate and the President of the United States at that time. Now, in the midst of war, the British Government has seen fit, through the white paper issued in 1939, to limit the immigration of Jews into Palestine, and practically ban all immigration after this year. Everyone of us knows that the Jewish people of Europe have been persecuted and hounded almost to death in central Europe. They have no place to go, and they merely want permission to enter Palestine in accordance with the Balfour resolution, and in accordance with the pledges and the word of the British Empire and the approval of the Congress of the United States.

It may be a question whether the particular resolution should have been reported out or tabled in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think that resolution went too far, because it included a guaranty to establish a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. I think it was a mistake to have included those words in the resolution before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I think that committee, in its wisdom, decided that it was not the proper thing to do, because if that had been passed upon by the Congress, then it would have meant almost a guaranty by the Government of the United States to interfere in the case of any trouble in Palestine arising over the creation of that commonwealth. However, I do believe that some resolution is in order and eminently proper, to place Congress on record against the provisions of the White Paper and to permit the continuation of Jewish immigration into Palestine from central Europe, those devastated areas whence they have been hounded out and to live in Palestine, to own property, and to work there in that ancient homeland of their fathers. That would be in accordance with the Balfour resolution and our own act of Congress and the pledged word of the British Empire. I believe a resolution of that kind can be worked out that will be satisfactory to Congress and by request I am preparing such a resolution. I hope the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs will consider it in the near future and that it will not be opposed by the British Government. I am inclined to think that Prime Minister Churchill would welcome such a resolution. He has been for the Balfour resolution from the beginning. He has made innumerable speeches in support of it, and I believe we would be upholding his hands if we passed a simple resolution condemning the white paper as repudiating the Balfour resolution and my resolution in favor of establishing a homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine and urging that the gates of Palestine be kept open so that the Jewish people who are now persecuted and hounded in Central Europe may find a haven, a refuge, and a homeland there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in the first speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] he criticized the President's policy of precluding Members of the House and the Senate from joining our armed forces. There may be good reason on the part of the President for that because we have so many patriotic gentlemen in the House, courageous, capable and desirous of serving their country, so that if the policy adopted by the President had not been pursued, I fear we would have lost a great many more useful and efficient Members of Congress. That not only applies to the Democratic side but it applies to the Republican side also to some extent. However, I do not know—perhaps the President may have felt that we would lose too many on the Democratic side in view of the small majority that we hold at this time, which of course, will be increased in the next Congress; or he was probably fearful that legislation in the highest interest of the country might suffer, and, as has been stated, this bill is a step in the right direction. Just look at the difference between men. Here is an outstanding Member of Congress resigning his seat, to serve his country. On the other hand, we know of five or six hundred men who received the protection of their country who left their country just to avoid serving in the armed forces of their Nation. This bill says to them, "You have left the country. Remain in the country to which you have gone. Remain there; you cannot come back." And this is as it should be.

As to the second statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], to a great extent I agree with him, especially as to the demand that Great Britain comply with the Balfour Declaration and that the white paper be revoked. We all know, I especially, that the vast majority of the American people sympathize with the unfortunate position of the Jewish people. I know also that when the time comes the great American people will act and aid these unfortunate millions who have been persecuted, driven from their homes, and deprived of their all for the last 4 years, that some action will be taken to aid and succor them. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish people of America are patriotic, the vast majority of them do not wish to do anything that will in any way impede or hinder our friendly relationship with Great Britain, or any other nation. I myself am the last man who would do anything that would in any way tend to cause or create friction between the Allied Nations.

In addition to the Jewish question, we have the Polish question, that is brought forth frequently. I hope for the time being the Polish question will be forgotten, because, as one who has always advocated the cause of Russia and Marshal Stalin, I still have and shall continue to have implicit confidence in the people of Russia under their great leader, Marshal Stalin, fully believing that when the time comes he will treat fairly and justly with Poland and the Polish people, as he has frequently pledged to do. Surely the Polish people, regardless of what happens, will always have our re-

spect, our sympathy, and our aid; but I know they will not suffer at the hands of Russia; I know that Marshal Stalin must keep his word, not to reduce Poland's original standing. Obviously Poland will fare better under a victorious Russia than she would fare under a victorious Germany.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I noticed in the Washington Post the gentleman's position with reference to this matter. While I am in favor of preserving the integrity of these small countries and doing the best we can by men and women of every faith, I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Rules for the decision he reached. I believe that during times of war we ought to rely upon the State Department to guide us with reference to matters of foreign policy.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate the expression of the gentleman and thank him. That has been my position. After all, my country comes first. Naturally, I am interested in my people. During the last war I helped to effect the independence of all the small European nations deserving of independence. I am again desirous of doing my share, my part; and I pledge myself today to leave nothing undone to bring to all these people their freedom and independence, of which they have been so ruthlessly robbed by the Nazi hordes.

I urge upon a few Members of Congress that they desist from making these unnecessary, unjustifiable attacks upon people because of their religion, creed, or race, in the interest of American unity and harmony. Under the Constitution we have done well. Let us continue in the future as we have in the past; let us here avoid the unnecessary criticism and attacks which are not doing Congress any good and which are not doing America any good.

I observed that some Member a little while ago said he was a good Christian. I was not born a Christian, but I say I have always followed the underlying principles of brotherly love, faith in humanity, and devotion to duty the same as any man, whatever his religion or church might be. I believe in justice, in humanity, in brotherly love, and in charity. That is what we all should stand for, and I hope and trust we shall continue the broad-minded, liberal, and humanitarian policy we have pursued, a policy which has made America the greatest country in the world. Let us hope she will continue to be the leader of mankind the world over.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. In the language of the Bible, the gentleman from Illinois believes in that Scripture which admonishes: "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone."

Mr. SABATH. I do; I believe in the teachings that should be followed by all: In brotherly love, in justice, in humanity. Some men unfortunately fail to recognize or approach them.

With that I conclude and move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service, with Mr. DOMENGEAUX in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me compliment our worthy Attorney General, Francis Biddle, for his fine study of the question we are now considering and for his fine and excellent cooperation in calling the attention of the Congress and the entire American people to the urgent necessity of this proposed legislation. I wish also to compliment the F. B. I., under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, who had something to do with making this study on the problem of what we call draft dodgers, and Earl Harrison, our able Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, and his special assistant, Mr. Shaughnessy, who have always been of great assistance to the committee.

I would classify this piece of legislation as a bill to denaturalize and denationalize all draft dodgers who left this country knowing that there was a possibility that they might be drafted in this war and that they might have to serve in the armed forces, in the naval forces, or the marines, and in an effort to get out of such service. We are all American citizens and our country has a great stake in this war; nevertheless, we have found hundreds of men who have left this country to go to certain parts of Mexico and other South American countries with the idea of evading military service and of returning after the war is over, and taking their old places in our society.

Mr. Chairman, this country does not want that kind of citizen.

Mr. Chairman, I can summarize in a few words this piece of legislation as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to amend section 401 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1168; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 801), so as to add a new subsection providing for the denationalization of citizens who depart from or remain outside the jurisdiction of the United States in time of war or during a period declared by the President to be a period of national emergency for the purpose of evading or avoiding training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States; and to amend the exclusion section of the basic Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136), so as to deny admission into the United States of persons who have departed from the jurisdiction of the United States for the purpose of evading or avoiding training or service in the armed forces of the United States during time of war or during a period declared by the President to be a period of national emergency.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say again that I compliment the Department of Justice for calling this matter to the attention of the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. Any man, any American, who leaves this country for the purpose of not serving his country in time of war is a traitor, in my judgment.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is it a part of the qualification of the bill that he leave for the sole purpose of evading the draft or the call of an emergency?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right. In the last war we had a similar statute, but it was repealed. When war was declared by this Congress we found that there were hundreds, knowing they would be subject to the draft or subject to the service of their country, who left the country for the purpose of evading service.

Mr. ROWE. I understand by that if they are within the qualifying age and an emergency exists, then it is determined they have left the country for that purpose?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. In the hearings which the gentleman's committee had on this measure, was it determined approximately how many had left the United States in order to escape service in the armed forces?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As far as I know from the hearings, the Department seems to have proof in several hundred cases. That is as far as we know definitely, but there seems to be many more who have left whose cases have not been investigated yet, and where there is a strong suspicion that the action was taken to evade service because they were within the age limits under our law.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask whether or not those who have left the country in order to escape service were scattered generally throughout the country or whether they came from any particular locality in the United States?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. From information furnished by the F. B. I. the majority of the cases thus far discovered come from certain portions of Texas, I believe around El Paso. Then we have a sprinkling of it over various other States, in not quite the same number as around El Paso. They are men who have slipped away with the idea of staying out of this war, then coming back and claiming the right of citizenship.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LESINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. The majority of those who left the United States are of Mexican birth and the purpose was to escape from here to Mexico.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would correct that from observations and from studies that have been made. We have not the exact figures, but there are a lot of people, native-born as well as naturalized, who have left the country for this purpose and I say they have no right to retain their citizenship or to be allowed to return. I say their papers and their citizenship ought to be taken away from them.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman and I concur entirely with what the gentleman has stated.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How about the case of some Americans who have gone into certain countries and are held by the Axis Powers?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is another question. If they are prisoners of the Axis Powers, certainly this does not apply.

Mr. STEFAN. Suppose they are not prisoners, but they are not allowed to leave.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If they cannot come out, and if we have no consul there to assist them in securing a release—this bill would not apply to those people.

Mr. STEFAN. It would not apply to those who are held against their will in other countries?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. If they are held against their will and there is no possible way of rescuing them, I do not think it would apply to them.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman realizes there are quite a number of those people who cannot come back.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate that. In the last World War we had a number of people who were classified under the head of "Yellow draft dodger." They left the country with the idea of evading the call of their country. They simply slipped out of the country and then were not within the jurisdiction of the United States. They waited until the war was over, and then came back to claim the same status they had when they left. It seems to me that persons in that category should not be allowed to call themselves Americans or should not be allowed to be citizens of the United States of America.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4257 is a bill that was on the Consent Calendar and came up for action by unanimous consent on last Consent Calendar day. It would have passed on that day by unanimous consent, but there was no one on the floor who could vouch for the fact that the bill provides for court review of decisions made in these cases. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], asked that question, we could not guarantee him on that matter; however, that point has been cleared up and the bill does provides for court review of any such decisions that may be made, so that obstacle has been removed and this bill should be passed by unanimous consent.

There is not a Member of Congress who does not agree completely with the purposes of the bill to denaturalize, I would put it, or expatriate, any citizen who dodges the draft by skipping out of the country and also to permanently exclude any alien who does the same thing. Those are the two provisions of the bill. They are clear, they are plain, and every one agrees to them.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have no more requests for time on this side, I yield back the balance of the time on this side to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the other body of Congress ought to act on some important pieces of legislation that we have sent over there if we take the patience and trouble to pass these bills.

I call attention to one particular bill that is resting over there, H. R. 1284, providing for naturalization of aliens serving in the armed forces who cannot prove legal entry into the United States. We have in the armed forces today a number of men who are fighting but who are not citizens of the United States. We passed a bill to expedite making them citizens, but the Immigration Committee of the Senate has done nothing to enact this much-needed legislation. From what I understand, one particular Senator has held himself out as the judge and jury, but in my judgment he is just a restrictionist and does not care about the merits or the facts of the matter.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In a minute, when I have completed my statement. If the Members will remember, Mr. Chairman, under the Second War Powers Act, if a man entered the country legally, upon joining the armed forces he could be naturalized, and this the Immigration Service and the Department of Justice have been doing in the camps and abroad.

We found by a study of the present law that thousands of young men, who do not know when they entered the country, whose parents are dead, who do not know what boat they came over on, cannot be naturalized because they are unable to show that they entered on a certain date under legal terms. We discussed that on this floor and by unanimous vote provided that persons who wore the uniform of the armed forces and who were inducted, fighting the war on our side, irrespective of legal entry, should be given the right to citizenship.

That bill has been over there now for 1 whole year. There are a number of these boys fighting in fox holes on every front who do not even have the satisfaction to know that they are citizens of the country for which they are fighting. One distinguished Senator, and some others, are holding up consideration of this bill, and I propose to bring that to the attention of the country unless some action is taken. I understand that the War Department wants it and General MacArthur wants it, because these boys in their fox holes, who are fighting our battles, are men without a country, and if they are captured they are going to be shot without even a trial because they will be considered spies instead of war prisoners.

Now I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I merely rose to ask the gentleman to give us a description of the bill that he says is being delayed in the other body. He has described it fully and I agree with what he said about it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. MASON. Reserving the right to object, under the rule adopted by this House, debate on this bill is to be restricted to the bill. If the gentleman wants to speak out of order, he will have to ask unanimous consent, and I am constrained to object to that unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CELLER. I do hope the gentleman will not take that stand.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the bill.

Mr. CELLER. This bill has the phraseology "in time of war or during a period declared by the President to be a period of national emergency."

In the early part of the day I made a statement concerning one Freya Stark, a paid propagandist agent of the Ministry of Information. I wanted to state, and I would have so stated had I been given the opportunity to reply to the gentleman from Mississippi, who refused me an opportunity to reply to him because he refused unanimous consent, that the activities of that Judea-phobe and Arab-phile agent, Freya Stark, were impeding the war effort.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not speaking to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the bill.

Mr. CELLER. This bill, the passage of which would accelerate our war efforts to eventual victory, is one that materially concerns the Near East and the Levant.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. The provisions of this bill have nothing whatever to do with the subject of Palestine.

Mr. CELLER. I am not talking about Palestine.

Mr. MASON. Or the Near East or anything of that kind, and I want to know if the gentleman is to be permitted to bring in remarks that are not pertinent to this bill or whether we can have those remarks, if they are brought in, expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. CELLER. Shall I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed. He will confine his remarks to the bill.

Mr. CELLER. In my humble opinion—and I am just as jealous of the rights and prerogatives and duties of the House membership as those who have made the objections—there are certain factors in the conduct of this war which militate against a successful conclusion, just as the failure to pass this bill would militate against the successful conclusion of the war, a speedy conclusion that will be favorable to our side. I wanted to advert to those factors in the early part of the day. I wanted to draw attention to the fact that erroneous statements that have been made by the lady (Freya Stark) I referred to, namely that the Arabs were cooperating with the United States and other allies in the conduct of the war.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is not speaking to the bill. He has been admonished several times, he has refused, and I am obliged to make the point of order myself, though I regret it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained and the gentleman is again requested to confine himself to the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. How many times do we have to call the gentleman to order and try to get him to confine his remarks to the bill before the privilege of the House is withdrawn?

The CHAIRMAN. This will be the last time. If the gentleman does not proceed in order, he will be requested to take his seat.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state as follows: In the light of the statements made by the gentleman who has just spoken, who does not care to hear me reply, I shall here and now desist.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1168; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 801), be, and it hereby is, amended by substituting a semicolon and the word "or" in lieu of the period at the end of subsection (h) and by adding thereto a new subsection to be lettered subsection (i), reading as follows:

"(i) Departing from or remaining outside of the jurisdiction of the United States in time of war or during a period declared by the President to be a period of national emergency for the purpose of evading or avoiding training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136), is further amended by inserting the following clause before the clause "persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude;": "persons who have departed from the jurisdiction of the United States for the purpose of evading or avoiding training or service in the armed forces of the United States during time of war or during a period declared by the President to be a period of national emergency."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service, pursuant to House Resolution 482, reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—HEIRS OF SIMON M. MYHRE (H. DOC. NO. 519)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1273 (78th Cong., 2d sess.), entitled "A bill for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre."

This bill authorizes and directs the payment by the Secretary of the Treasury to J. Kyle Anderson, attorney for the 18 heirs therein named of the late Simon M. Myhre, of the sum of $1,080.

Mr. Myhre died intestate on September 21, 1936. He left an estate appraised by the County Court of Waupaca County, Wis., at $137,142.39. Final distribution was made in 1940. As the result of an investigation made in that year, it appeared that the decedent had filed no income-tax returns for several years, including the year 1921. A deficiency of income tax for the year 1921 in the amount of $6,612.38 was determined, and the heirs, to whom the estate had been distributed, were charged with liability as transferees. The heirs filed petitions with the United States Board of Tax Appeals (now The Tax Court). After the liability was charged it was established that a return for the year 1921 had been filed and its acceptance without change had been recommended by an investigating officer in 1925. The representative of each of the petitioners and counsel for the Government entered into a stipulation to the effect that assessment and collection of the transferee liability were barred by the applicable statute of limitations. Pursuant to the stipulation the Board ordered and decided that no liability of the heirs as transferees of Simon M. Myhre, deceased, existed with respect to the year 1921.

The sum of $1,080, which under the bill would be paid for the benefit of the heirs, would cover outlay for filing and attorney fees. It may seem that equitably the parties should be compensated for expenses arising from the mistake on the part of the Government. However, it must be admitted that the parties covered by this bill are not the only ones incurring expense through governmental mistakes, a certain number of which are bound to occur. It is not the general policy to compensate persons suffering expense or inconvenience through such mistakes. Otherwise every person making a successful defense to a criminal proceeding would be entitled to reimbursement for expense so incurred. This bill selects a number of persons for special treatment by excepting them from the general policy. The whole body of persons subject to Federal law is thus discriminated against, and a precedent is established for the presentation of claims by other persons who feel that they have suffered through governmental error. I do not believe that the field of special legislation should be opened to grant to a few persons a benefit not generally accorded.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 29, 1944.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and the bill be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by General Somervell, and further to extend my remarks and include a speech by John Temple Graves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer on the subject of Federal action being necessary to diminish the flood dangers along the Schuylkill River, and further to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "What We're Fighting For."

Th SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered over the radio on the Town Hall program by Langston Hughes on February 17, and also a speech made on the same occasion by Carey McWilliams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial with which I agree, from the Arkansas Gazette.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$115,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following; "during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and shall not be available for obligation for new projects after June 30, 1945"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and shall not be available for obligation for new projects after June 30, 1945"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 12, 13, 17, 36, and 42.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4346) entitled "A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for expenses of the Senate in the manner and amounts proposed by the Senate amendments.

Nos. 5, 6, and 7, relating to the House of Representatives: Appropriates $581.50 for contested-election expenses of a Member of the House.

Nos. 8, 9, and 10, relating to the Government Printing Office: Modifies the House provision prohibiting the printing in the Federal Register of Community Ceiling Price Schedules of the Office of Price Administration to include in the prohibition the printing of community ceiling price orders of such Administration.

Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, relating to community facility funds under the Federal Works Agency: Appropriates $115,000,000 instead of $127,500,000 as proposed by the House and $112,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; continues the funds available during the period of the unlimited emergency as proposed by the House instead of until June 30, 1945, as proposed by the Senate, but provides that the amount shall not be available after June 30, 1945, for obligation for new projects; and limits the amount that may be used for outplant facilities to $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Nos. 18 and 19: Appropriates $4,093.62 as proposed by the Senate for payment of claims by the Public Roads Administration settled as provided by law.

No. 20: The House bill provides that the $7,500,000 appropriated for war housing shall be available during the unlimited emergency declared by the President; the Senate amendment places the date at June 30, 1945; and the conference agreement restores the House limitation but provides that the sum shall not be used after June 30, 1945 for obligation for new projects.

No. 21: Appropriates $31,650,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House for hospital and domiciliary facilities under the Veterans' Administration.

No. 22: Strikes out the appropriation of $74,000, inserted by the Senate, for agricultural engineering investigations.

No. 23: Makes available from the corporate funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation the sum of $250,000, instead of $312,000 as proposed by the Senate and $100,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 24: Inserts the word "temporary" in connection with the appropriation for a weir in the Colorado River.

Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, relating to the Navy Department: Appropriates for damage claims arising in connection with collisions by naval and Coast Guard vessels and determined pursuant to law; transfers as proposed by the Senate, sufficient amounts to provide $1,700,000 each for the naval training stations at Lake Pend Oreille, Oreg., and Lake Sampson, N. Y., and $1,050,000 for the station at Port Deposit, Md., instead of $1,530,000 each for the Lake Pend Oreille and Lake Sampson stations and $915,000 for the Port Deposit station, as proposed by the House; and provides one passenger automobile at $3,500 as provided by the Senate.

Nos. 35, relating to the Post Office Department: Appropriates $4,500 as proposed by the Senate for departmental contingent expenses.

No. 37: Appropriates $75,286.98 for payment of damage claims settled pursuant to law by the War Department.

Nos. 38, 39, 40, and 41, relating to the District of Columbia: Appropriates $6,000 additional as proposed by the Senate for war overtime pay for the Corporation Counsel's office.

Nos. 43 to 54, inclusive: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, for the payment of judgments, authorized property damage claims, and audited claims certified by the General Accounting Office, all certified to the Senate after the bill had passed the House.

Nos. 55 and 56: Inserts the usual section, carried in general appropriation bills, relative to payment of salary or wages to any person who is a member of a subversive organization.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments:

No. 11: Providing for the remainder of the present fiscal year, for the salary of the Director of Defense Transportation. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 12: Approving the transfer of funds from the appropriation for "nurses training" to St. Elizabeths and Freedmen's Hospital in connection with the nurses' training program. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 13: Appropriating $4,000,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year 1944 for education and training of defense workers under the Office of Education. The House managers will move to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment.

No. 17: Increasing from $40,000,000 to $70,000,000 the amount which may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for maintenance and operation of community facilities. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

No. 36: Appropriating $39,436,884.93 for restoration of the impairment of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The House managers will move to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment.

No. 42: Prohibiting certain retroactive payments and the adoption of a new method of computing the pay of certain employees subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and now compensated on a time-and-a-half basis for work over 40 hours a week. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with clarifying amendments.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 4346.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents the unanimous agreement of the House Members of the committee of conference. It is a particularly satisfactory adjustment of the differences between the two Houses especially in its reduction of proposed expenditures. The total amount carried in the bill, as perfected by the conference report, is less than the budget estimates; is less than that carried in the Senate bill; and is less than was carried in the bill as it passed the House.

It is hardly necessary to discuss in further detail the agreements reached in the conference report. They are set out in the statement by the managers on the part of the House which has just been read and have been so thoroughly debated on the floor during the consideration of the bill that I shall not take them up again unless further explanation is requested.

Following the adoption of the conference report, the House will take up six amendments which require separate consideration under the rules.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is $40,000,000 below what it was as it passed the Senate, and it is approximately $11,000,000 to $12,000,000 below what it was when it passed the House. I think that kind of conference report ought to be satisfactory to the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: On page 6, line 19, insert "Office of Defense Transportation: The funds appropriated to the Office of Defense Transportation for the fiscal year 1944 shall be available for the employment of a Director at $12,000 per annum."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 12: Page 7, line 19, insert: "The appropriation 'Training for nurses, Public Health Service (national defense)', in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby made available, for the entire fiscal year, for transfer to and consolidation with appropriations of St. Elizabeths and Freedmen's Hospitals in such amounts as may be deemed necessary by the Federal Security Administrator to cover the cost of items furnished to student nurses in training under plans approved for such hospitals in accordance with the act of June 15, 1943 (Public Law 74), as amended."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 13: Page 8, line 4, insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Education and training, defense workers (national defense): For an additional amount for payments to States, and so forth, fiscal year 1944, for the cost of vocational courses in food production and conservation, mechanics, farm-machinery repair, and farm-labor training of less than college grade, as provided in paragraph 3 under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, $4,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: Page 9, line 10, after the word "facilities" insert "*Provided further*, That the limitation of $40,000,000 contained in Public Law 150, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 15, 1943, on the total amount that may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, is hereby increased to $70,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 17, and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 36: On page 32, line 2, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Restoration of capital impairment, Commodity Credit Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the United States, to restore the amount of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of March 31, 1943, by a contribution to the Corporation as provided by the act approved March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1), $39,436,884.93."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 36.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 42: Page 70, line 16, insert:

"SEC. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay to regular, full-time civilian officers and employees, whose basic compensation is determined on a daily or hourly basis, overtime compensation, pursuant to the joint resolution of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1068), and the act of May 7, 1943 (Public, No. 49, 78th Cong.), on any basis other than at the rate of one and one-half times the basic rate of payment for work actually performed by such officers and employees in excess of 40 hours per week, without proration

or the use of any formula which has been adopted to determine the daily compensation of per annum officers and employees; it being declared to be and to have been the true intent and meaning of the aforesaid enactments to provide for the payment of the overtime compensation of such employees only upon the basis herein described: *Provided*, That any overtime compensation in excess of the compensation so authorized under the above joint resolution and act which has been paid in reliance upon, and in accordance with, any decision or decisions of the Comptroller General is hereby approved and the Comptroller General shall allow credit therefor, in the accounts of the officers accountable therefor, and shall make no charges against any certifying officer because of certification of such excess overtime compensation."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 42, and concur therein with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In line 3 of the matter inserted by such amendment, after the word "employees," insert "subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended", and at the end of the matter inserted by such amendment, before the period, insert ": *Provided further*, That no claim shall be considered by the General Accounting Office on account of any payment prohibited by this section."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the votes by which the several motions were agreed to, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have leave to extend their own remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CONDITIONS TODAY AS COMPARED WITH 2 YEARS AGO

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to review conditions of today as compared with conditions 2 years ago. Then, as now, it was the people's desire to win the war and stop strikes and labor racketeering and stabilize agriculture. We have shown the world our capacity to raise and equip an Army and Navy, and an Air Force. This Congress has taken two steps forward in unleashing labor racketeers' stranglehold on the war effort and the economic life of America in the passage of the Smith-Connally Act and the amendment to the Revenue Act of 1943.

Section 117 of the Revenue Act of 1943 provides that labor organizations "shall file an annual return, which shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, stating specifically the items of gross income, receipts, and disbursements."

The Smith-Connally law says, "It is unlawful for any corporation or any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election in which Federal officers are chosen."

Yet in the face of the Smith-Connally law it is alleged that the C. I. O. political action committee has raised the staggering sum of $700,000 for use in this year's election. On January 25, 1944, the Times-Herald, of Washington, published a news item, in which Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. political action committee, said he would make public "a list of Senators and Representatives to be 'purged' by the committee in the 1944 election. The committee is aiming at a goal of at least $5,000,000 with which to carry out its political program."

The labor unions have been given the right by law to tax. Almost every citizen who has rendered his service in a war plant has had to pay labor-union dues before he or she could work for his own Government. The Government goes so far as to collect their dues in many respects by what is called the check-off. There is no limit to the dues they can and do collect. Congress has given the labor organizations so much power that this Government itself is in jeopardy.

When there was a great labor shortage in the construction of defense plants and cantonments in and near my district, the patriotic farmers and workers with their small kit of tools loyally answered the call of their country and were met by a labor agitator who said "you do not work until you pay us a tax of $25 to $100 or more." Yet if reports are true, the C. I. O. will take this same money, collected in accordance with the power exercised by them and use it in trying to elect Members of Congress who will accept their dictation and be all-out for their cause, which is opposed to the interests of the farmers and unorganized workers.

Organized labor leaders did not stop at taxing farmers and workers. Last September, according to a news report in the New York Times:

An American Federation of Labor union collected dues from soldiers who volunteered for jobs in two southern New Jersey canning factories during the recent labor emergency in the tomato-processing industry.

They stop at nothing in levying tribute from the American people and their own membership, and even prisoners of war. The United Press wrote a news release as follows:

CAMDEN, N. J., February 11.—An A. F. of L. butchers' union today sought to collect 25 cents a week dues from 165 German war prisoners working under military guard at the Seabrooks Farms, Bridgeport, N. J.

Just how far some so-called leaders of labor are willing to go to enforce their rackets was clearly brought out when the House had under consideration H. R. 653, the Hobbs bill to outlaw certain lawless acts of labor organizations. It was clearly proved that certain labor groups were meeting, at State and city limits, trucks carrying foodstuffs to be sold therein and demanding $9.42 for each large truck and $8.41 for each small truck for permission to proceed. If these extravagant demands were refused, the trucks were turned over, their contents destroyed, and in many cases the drivers were brutally assaulted and beaten.

Remember these practices were engaged in when every effort was being made to conserve food and increase its production so as to assure an ample supply for our increasing Army and for civilian consumption. Remember, too, it was at a time when increased food prices were beginning to be reflected in an increased cost of living which placed additional financial strain not only upon those of limited, fixed income, but upon the rank and file of labor itself. It was at a time when labor agitators were demanding wage increases for themselves based upon the increased cost of food. Yet the conduct of the racketeers added approximately $8.93 to the cost of every truckload of food entering many points of consumption in this country. Despite the denouncement of such tactics by an outraged public as well as by many honest men of labor, these goon squads insisted upon their right to exact tribute from truckers and continued to do so until the passage of the Hobbs bill by the House of Representatives on April 9, 1943.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I voted for and supported the Hobbs bill to end this reign of terror carried on by lawless and irresponsible labor racketeers. And for that reason, among others of like kind, organized labor has pledged itself and a share of the $5,000,000 it is raising for the purpose, to create opposition to me in my district and bring about my defeat as a Member of Congress. They seek to find as my successor a pliant tool who will accept their dictation and condone and support their lawless and un-American program. Whether anyone can be found who will accept this role of infamy, remains to be seen. Of one thing, however, I am sure and that is: I shall not veer from my course by so much as the breadth of a hair to curry the favor of such lawless elements or to avoid the fundamental issue they have raised. The people of the Third District of Oklahoma may be depended upon to comprehend the true situation and to properly dispose of it.

I cannot believe the rank and file of the memberships of the unions want their money extorted from them and

used by racketeers and agitators to control elections. I cannot believe that the rank and file of labor condone the extortion of $8.92½ from every farmer bringing his produce to market—this extortion is passed on to the housewife in the buying of food for the family.

Mr. Speaker, I accept the challenge here and in Oklahoma. With all their ill-gotten funds and their goal of $5,000,000, they cannot defeat me or any other Member of Congress with a like attitude. The people know all about the many strikes and the wrong collection of money by labor leaders for a right to render honest toil in the furtherance of winning the war. The people challenge organized labor in its arrogance and stupidity in this hour of war.

On the 8th of June 1942, Charles Hathaway, president of the Oklahoma State Federation of Labor, issued a letter to members of organized labor with the following statement:

> There is important business at hand—the business of defeating PAUL STEWART, who is running for Congress in the Third District.

Continuing his charge against me, he said:

> It is my desire to consolidate labor's strength against STEWART.

Then he named one of my opponents as labor's choice saying:

> Seldom is a Congressman 100 percent for labor, but ——— ———'s record is outstandingly good.

My position now is as it was 2 years ago when I went to the people of my district and pledged my solemn support in stopping strikes and labor racketeering and on all occasions I have voiced and voted this sentiment.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to discuss the question of parity. Practically every support and ceiling price for farm commodities in force today is figured on the basis of parity prices. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance to the farmers that parity prices be fair and include all costs of production.

That is the reason I have actively supported the Pace bill, H. R. 1408, which passed the House March 23, 1943, and is now awaiting action by the Senate. This bill provides that the Department of Agriculture, in fixing parity prices, shall take into account and include all farm-labor costs, including the hired worker and the family worker.

Government figures show that farm wages have doubled since the base period, 1909 to 1914, and yet at this time not one penny of this increase is taken into account by the Department in determining parity prices. As farm labor represents 32 percent of the cost of producing a crop, you can readily see how unfair and unjust it is not to include this item in setting up parity prices. And you can also understand how very important it is to the farmer and how much it means to his welfare to secure the early passage of this bill.

If this bill were the law today, and farm labor costs was included in parity, then the parity price of cotton would be 25 cents per pound, wheat would be $1.80 per bushel, and other prices would be increased proportionately.

I hope the Senate will take early and favorable action on this bill and assure the farmers of my State a fair price for the crops which their Government has urged them to produce.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation of the work done by the able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], who to my way of thinking, has the clearest picture in this matter of parity prices of anyone I have ever had the privilege of hearing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to make a few observations regarding subsidies—a hidden wage increase, if you please, for organized labor.

Subsidies are a subject about which many misleading statements have been made. We have heard high officials and others say that, without consumer subsidies the fight to prevent inflation would be hopeless and the cost of living would rise to unheard of levels.

Let us look at this subject realistically.

First, the entire subsidy program can mean no more than $6.32 annually to any individual because a break-down of the subsidy payments cannot mean more than that to any one person. That is certainly not an amount that can be magnified into the prominence it has been given as a sole dam against inflation and it is not a startling amount in the total annual cost of living figure.

Since the real reason for subsidies cannot be the one that is assigned by its advocates, then what is this real reason? Even a casual observation will disclose the reason as being a bait held out to organized labor to secure its support. It is a subtle way to add that insignificant amount to the wages of labor in order to secure the political support of that large element of voters. It is really an insult to labor for it pre-supposes that their support can be secured in this way and for this niggardly amount.

Such subsidies are dangerous and unwholesome. They constitute a political raid on the Public Treasury for purposes other than the public good. There is no legal justification for such payments and certainly the majority of the Congress and the majority of the people oppose them, but by rule of the minority they have paid and are being paid.

And such subsidies, in addition to adding to the public debt, are themselves an inflationary influence. Inflation is caused by two things: a shortage in supplies and an abundance of purchasing power. Subsidies do not increase supply and do add to purchasing power, thus being doubly inflationary in their nature.

But, above all, subsidies are abhorrent because they are a system of passing on to the next generation of taxpayers a part of our present grocery bills. I mean my grocery bill, your grocery bill, and the grocery bill of every person in this country be he rich or poor. And who is this next generation of taxpayers to whom we are passing on the obligation to pay a part of our grocery bills? That generation is the noble band of men we have fighting for us on every continent, on and under every sea and in all the skies above this earth. Do you think that they believe they are fighting for the privilege of paying our grocery bills? You know they are not and that they do not realize this tax burden is being passed on to and built up for them. If they did realize this embarrassing fact, we would hear from them in no uncertain terms.

So eliminating all the camouflage surrounding this question, I say to you that such subsidies are un-American, unwholesome, and acutely dangerous and should be, must be, stopped.

I wish to acknowledge the valuable information imparted by Judge Joe G. Montague, general counsel, Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, upon the subject of how subsidies affect agriculture—every farmer and cattleman helps pay the hidden wage increase of organized labor. Judge Montague is a real authority who knows the cattle and agricultural ills as few men do and during my term in Congress he has made many appearance to better the interests of the cattlemen and the farmers.

Most of the leaders of farm organizations have a kindred view as to the injustice of subsidies, especially if such farm organization is not controlled by leaders more in sympathy with organized labor than the well-being of the farmer.

Remember, every worker who is not a member of a union is dubbed a "scab" in the words of all labor racketeers and agitators and remember further that there are far more of us so-called "scabs" than there are members in all the unions and in order to preserve our American way of life it is very necessary that we exercise our right of suffrage and cast our votes for men and women who feel that all men are born equal and entitled to equal opportunities.

Labor dictators will not aspire office in their own name. They will choose to support and sponsor a candidate who will refuse to mention organized labor's interests much less say anything about being the recipient of a large campaign contribution, but believe you me whoever their candidate may be, he will do their bidding. The Book of Books, St. Matthew, chapter 7, verse 15, will be quite applicable to the coming campaign:

> Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.

Just today I received my April issue of the Oklahoma Farmer-Stockman showing the steady increase in the price of feed that the farmer has had to pay over a period of the past 3 years. It is a matter of common knowledge that the price the farmer has received for his livestock and chickens and eggs has steadily decreased to the point where many small herds and laying broods have gone to market and unless immediate adjustments are made, many others will have to follow a like course. The table of

prices appearing in the Farmer-Stockman is as follows:

United States average prices paid by farmers as of February 15 for 1942, 1943, and 1944 are as follows—per 100 pounds:

Feed	1942	1943	1944
Bran	$1.98	$2.20	$2.42
Middlings	2.08	2.28	2.46
Corn meal	2.08	2.40	2.96
Cottonseed meal	2.49	2.44	3.05
Linseed meal	2.47	2.57	2.99
Peanut meal	2.50	2.50	3.12
Mixed dairy feed, 16% prot.	2.18	2.44	2.94
Mixed dairy feed, 20% prot.	2.39	2.63	3.18
Mixed dairy feed, 24% prot.	2.49	2.72	3.30
Laying mash	2.86	3.07	3.60
Scratch feed	2.30	2.47	3.13
Tankage	4.22	4.19	4.31
Alfalfa hay, baled per ton	20.77	24.70	32.60

These figures are reported by Kansas City branch market news, W. F. A.

Mr. Speaker, I wish further to call to the attention of the Congress my position on old-age assistance. I feel that there should be but two qualifications—first, age; second, citizenship. I feel that each eligible person should draw an equalized pension in lieu of the present expensively administered old-age assistance under the present social-security law. I have given more than a year's study to the preparation and drawing of a workable bill that will guarantee such a plan. At the completion of a little more work on this bill I will introduce it and fight for its passage. In the meantime I have supported such bills as are now pending that would remove the constant worry of the old people. All old people who want to work during these war days should be permitted to do so without losing or having their old-age assistance reduced. Congress has taken a forward step with respect to those on the farms, but a general provision should be enacted to apply to each and every person drawing old-age assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians in common own in my district a great segregated coal and asphalt deposit worth many millions of dollars and the Government by solemn treaty agreed to dispose of these valuable deposits in 1902 within 3 years, but it is a sad story after 42 years. These two tribes of Indians still own this property in common. They are very anxious to sell it and have the Government keep faith with its agreement. Soon after my election to Congress I introduced a bill which will enable the United States Government to make good their contract. The bill has been amended by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House after having had extensive and interesting hearings.

In the meantime Senator THOMAS has sponsored a companion bill in the Senate which has passed that body and is now in the House before the Indian Affairs Committee. We are putting forth every effort to convince the committee to accept the Thomas bill in lieu of the Stewart bill. We have asked for further hearings on the Thomas bill and feel that the committee will grant us the hearing in the very near future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that these spoken words are the views and sentiments of the people of the Third Congressional District of Oklahoma. I am fresh from their arms and a steady flow of letters and telegrams well confirm my position relative to labor racketeering, subsidies, parity, and the stabilization of agriculture. Having spent 50 years of my life in this district and knowing my people I have to the best of my ability put forth every effort to carry out their mandate without having entered into any personal entanglements, confining my activities purely to the issues as they have arisen in Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HEROISM AND COURAGE

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1942, a 19-year-old Texan from Childress joined the marines. Shortly thereafter his father, 44, an Army veteran of five major battles in World War No. 1, enlisted and joined his son in the ranks. Through boot camp they went together and resolved that, come what may, they would see the war through shoulder to shoulder.

Somehow or other after boot camp the two became separated. Later, through the consideration of the Marine Corps, they were reunited in the same company, the father a corporal, the son a private first class. Once more together, their unit was sent to the southwest Pacific. These two were among the first to plunge, side by side, into the assault on Namur Island on Kwajalein Atoll. The son, Pvt. (1st cl.) Jack H. Brown, was killed.

Soon thereafter I received a letter from the mother of this young Texan—killed in action—which I want to read to you:

CHILDRESS, TEX.,
February 29, 1944.

HON. GENE WORLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WORLEY: I suppose you know that my son, Pvt. (1st cl.) Jack H. Brown, was killed in action. I want to thank you again for what you did for us in helping them to be together. We are strong believers in what will be will be, so I think it was his time to die, and he would have died at home just the same. I couldn't bear this if I didn't think that. I am so very thankful his father was near when he died.

If you have time, would you tell the Marine Corps officials who helped us that I thank them for being nice and generous to my marines? I do appreciate all the nice things that were done for them.

I haven't heard from his father yet, but he is a very strong-willed person and I feel sure this is his own individual, personal war from here on.

Again so many thanks for your kindness and generosity.

Sincerely,

MRS. EARL A. BROWN.

I confess that my eyes became dimmed as I read her letter. I thought perhaps her courage might give comfort to other mothers who have lost their sons on the field of battle. I asked Mrs. Brown for permission to place her letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and received the following reply:

CHILDRESS, TEX., *March 11, 1944.*

HON. GENE WORLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WORLEY: I received your very nice telegram yesterday and if you really think my letter would help other mothers, of course, I couldn't refuse. But I don't consider myself courageous. I am just taking this the best I can.

For real courage—heroic courage—let me send you a copy of my husband's letter to me. He was there—went through the horror of battle and the terrible blow of losing his boy and then having to write to me what he could. There is courage. He is alone in a foreign land and grieved.

He wrote me on V-mail and I'd hate to part with that letter. But I would like for you to have a glimpse of his courage.

Thanking you again for all your interest and help and true friendliness.

Sincerely,

MRS. EARL A. BROWN.

Subsequently I was granted permission to also place in the RECORD the letter which she mentions—the letter from her husband:

To MRS. EARL A. BROWN,
702 Avenue D. NW., Childress, Tex., U. S. A.
From Sgt. EARL A. BROWN,
Company I, Third Battalion, Twenty-fourth Marines, Fourth Division
c/o Fleet Post Office, San Francisco, Calif.

FEBRUARY 23, 1944.

DEAREST: Excuse the way I am writing but we don't have time and mail don't go out often. I will try to do better. I hope you are feeling better by now. I am. As I look back on it I think I have expected this all along. Jack and I had the longest visit with each other the last week that we ever had. I will never be sorry I was with him at that time. He did not expect to get back and told me all of the things he wanted done. He had tried to get more insurance in November but never did get it. He wanted you and the girls to use that money to buy the nice things you wanted or needed. I miss him like hell but we will just have to keep our chins up. We have done that several times together but this time it will be alone for the present. I am sorry that I am not with you, it would help us both, but we have to take life as it comes. Yes, I have always figured we had so many days to spend on this earth, do as we will with them. I know of no other way I would rather die, or my son, than for his country. I have never been able to understand why young people die, I guess I am not supposed to. I have lived to see a good many things that looked bad at the time turn out for the best later. This one, I will never be able to see. I had figured on trying to get out after this summer but I will stay for the duration now. I hope and believe you will understand. This is the first time in my life to know what the word hate means.

We have left the Marshalls and tell Sterling that I will try to see Dick before I get back. I love you and the girls more than ever if that is possible. This I promise, I will be back. You can count on that.

Love,

EARL.

These letters in their simple eloquence tell the story of the heroic strength and courage of the millions of mothers and fathers of this Nation. These letters show the strongest fabric from which mankind is made. The mother remains at home rearing two little girls. The father, now Sgt. Earl A. Brown of the United States Marines, is still somewhere in the southwest Pacific—fighting. He fights side by side with other marines—but in another sense, he fights alone.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and other special

orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, week before last, I believe it was on a Sunday evening, Mr. Winchell, employed by Jergens and speaking over the Blue Network, creating discord and disunity, stated that he was not on active duty with the Navy because when he had asked to be put on active duty he was told by someone in authority, and I quote:

> Some men must go overseas to be shot and some must stay over here to be stabbed in the back.

Then he said he could not reveal the name of the individual who gave him that order until after the war was over.

PM of this morning, March 29, contains an article with this caption:

> Winchell says Hepburn asked him to stay on radio. Official said his broadcasts were more useful than sea duty.

No doubt most of the American people would subscribe to that on the theory that any sea duty he might render would be of little if any value to anyone. On the radio he is a perfect example of what a broadcaster should not be. Then PM quotes this letter it stated was received by Winchell on December 17, 1941, from Admiral Hepburn. It reads:

> We all feel that you are doing better work for the Navy in your present broadcasting activity than you would do in some other station of minor importance.

My point in calling attention to this is because many people reading PM or hearing Winchell quote it may jump to the conclusion that that was the statement to which he referred when he said he was asked to stay on the air though he might be stabbed in the back. It may be Winchell misconstrued his orders, if he ever received any orders of that kind. His conduct indicates that if he ever received such an order he construed it to be an order to stab someone else in the back as for example the whole Congress when he said it was "the House of Reprehensibles," and when he said that there were saboteurs in Congress.

I am wondering if Admiral Hepburn, when he asked Winchell to stay on the air, if he did ask him, had in mind this statement of Winchell made in his column of April 11, 1939, in which among other things he wrote:

> Once again Europe is rolling the loaded dice of destiny; once again her miserable diplomats are pointing down the one-way street to war as the only avenue to peace; and once again America is asked to play the role of great international sucker.
>
> The time has come for us to pause and consider. If we must have another unknown soldier, let us not ask him to die for an unknown reason. And just what will be accomplished by dying in the mud? He will not increase America's resources; the last war nearly ruined the Great Plains. He will not increase America's wealth. In the last war we loaned our gold and were gold-bricked in return. He will not increase our liberties—for no man may protest slaughter after it starts. The truth is that external disaster never solved internal trouble. We must develop our youth, not sacrifice it. America must learn that her sons abroad will bring monuments to her glory, but her sons at home are a monument to America's common sense. The future of American youth is on top of American soil, not underneath European dirt.

Surely, Admiral Hepburn did not have some of Winchell's broadcasts in mind when he wrote him, if he did write him, to stay on the air. No doubt Winchell did aid in selling War bonds; no doubt he gave information to the F. B. I. So did a million other Americans—who do not brag about it. We are still waiting for Mr. Winchell to tell us who it was gave him the order to stay on the air even though he might be stabbed in the back. That is the information that has been asked for several times from the floor of Congress. But on that question he is silent. He intimates it might be a military secret. Well, well; a warning to Winchell of what he might expect is a part of our war strategy, is it? It may be that if some high official told Winchell to smear and accuse the Congress of disloyalty he would be exposed and that if he stood forth in his true light it would be a stab in the body politic of the Communist Party.

Another matter: Today the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] had something to say about an inquiry I made of F. B. I.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have not followed this very carefully but if I get the gentleman's position clearly he is not trying to force on the Navy or any other of our armed forces anybody they do not want, is he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, no, no.

Under this bill I filed yesterday to amend the statute governing the Navy by placing in it three sections that are contained in the statute governing the Army providing that a person might be dismissed from the force if he was guilty of conduct unbecoming a gentleman, officers, and individuals who serve in the Navy, whatever may be their rank, may be discharged if they are convicted of certain named offenses. It would form an exit through which Mr. Winchell or any other officer might be pushed out of the status of a Reserve officer without pay, without uniform, and without duties if he violated the law. Mr. Winchell's name is still on the rolls. That proposed amendment would just add to article 8, chapter 21, title 34, sections 1534, 1562 and 1567 of chapter 36 of title 10 of the United States Code.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In just a minute.

Mr. Speaker, I was not attempting the other day to cast any doubt upon the value of the service rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or J. Edgar Hoover, as will be seen by a reference to the RECORD of March 13, pages 2537–2538 and 2547. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] spoke today, had he taken the trouble to read the RECORD through he would have found as other Members will find, that when I spoke a few days ago I called attention to the fact that Winchell had time and time again in his column and in his broadcasts created the impression that he did have access to the confidential files of the Department of Justice and of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1944, page 2538.

That was the matter about which I inquired and 16 days ago I put into the RECORD (see p. 2548) the letter of Mr. Hoover to the editor of the Hartford Day Spring, the same letter the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] today again inserted in the RECORD. If the F. B. I. is so jealous, if it is so touchy, then J. Edgar Hoover, in whom the people of this country have confidence, whose every request for appropriation of funds has been quickly and gladly granted by the House, should make a public statement that Winchell has never had access to the F. B. I. files, he should inform the public, even though it may be embarrassing to him, and brand Winchell's repeated claim that he did have access to the files of the F. B. I., as false.

Mr. Speaker, one thing more. If a Member of Congress day after day had associated with persons of doubtful character, we know very well that man would never come back to the House; but J. Edgar Hoover, if reports are true, can associate with, can dine with Mr. Winchell, he may accept Winchell as a friend, we might say a companion, he may take or go with Winchell to places of entertainment or to places where food is served in Washington. While that same man denounces to millions of people the Congress of the United States—refers to it as a "House of Reprehensibles," introduce him as a social equal. If J. Edgar Hoover accepts Winchell as a social equal, entertains him and is entertained by him, if he can do that, and of course Winchell wants that done so he can rub off, as I stated the other day, some degree of respectability, Mr. Hoover will sooner or later be tarred with some of the smut that Winchell always carries around with him.

The time has come for the F. B. I. and for J. Edgar Hoover to make a choice. No man can serve two masters. J. Edgar Hoover can choose between the man Winchell, who says there are saboteurs in Congress, and the Congress of the United States. When next the F. B. I. comes before Congress for appropriations it will be pertinent to ask Mr. Hoover and the representatives of the F. B. I. what they think of the head of the organization associating with a man who describes

the Congress as the "House of Reprehensibles."

Someone will ask Mr. Hoover, I hope, "Who are those saboteurs that your friend Winchell said were in Congress? Your friend, your dinner companion, your associate, Mr. Winchell, said that there were saboteurs in Congress. As you are head of the F. B. I., have you asked Mr. Winchell to give you the names, to produce the evidence against these saboteurs? If you have not, then tell us. Why not, Mr. Hoover, disclose to the Department of Justice or to some grand jury the names of these men in Congress who Winchell, your friend, says are saboteurs? Why not produce the evidence, why not bring them to trial?" Is it because you know the charge of Winchell is false? Does it not destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress to permit such charges to go unchallenged?

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the Department of Justice and the F. B. I. should make its choice whether it is going to support the Congress of the United States, the Congress which appropriates the funds which enables the F. B. I. to be active, to discharge its duties which enables it to uncover those who are working against this Government, or whether it intends to permit those who accuse Congress of being composed of "Reprehensibles" who accuse individual Members of disloyalty and of treasonable conduct to make those charges without requiring proof of their statements. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Mr. Winchell, who claims to be your friend, says there are saboteurs in Congress. He made that charge months ago. He repeated it last Sunday night. Is it true or false, Mr. Hoover? The F. B. I. cannot be on both sides of the issue. You either have faith in the Congress or you lack faith in the Congress. You cannot, if you are for the Congress, go along with those who are continually charging it with disloyalty.

I ask J. Edgar Hoover why it is that he permits this man, who would destroy the confidence of the people in 435 of its chosen Representatives, this man who week after week goes on the air over a Nation-wide broadcast and assails individual Members as well as the Congress as a whole, to make these statements without investigating their truth or falsity and reporting to the people or a grand jury. Is it true that J. Edgar Hoover associates with Winchell, accepts him as a friend, as Winchell intimates, while Winchell is falsely charging the people's representatives of criminal conduct? Something better is expected of the head of the F. B. I. Let him confine his conversation, his relationship with Winchell to the disclosing by Winchell of information which will aid him in his duty, until he has made an investigation of the charges made by Winchell against Congress. There would seem to be no reason why by associating with him he should lend weight to Winchell's broadcasts and to Winchell's false charges.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. This companionship to which the gentleman has referred is a strange thing to me. What is the foundation for that statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Statements made to me by two Members of Congress at a dinner here at Harvey's Restaurant.

Mr. ROWE. When?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Last week. Not only that, but if you have read Winchell's column you will know that the man has claimed that he received advance secret information either from the Department of Justice or from the F. B. I. I want to repeat here what I said a few days ago, every time the F. B. I. or J. Edgar Hoover has asked for an appropriation, a half-dozen or more Members of Congress have voluntarily risen, paid tribute to Hoover, and to the F. B. I., and have gladly gone along with every request of the F. B. I. or of Hoover. When the administration made its assault on J. Edgar Hoover and the F. B. I., the Congress stood back of him and the Department of Justice. So we get back to that old proposition that a man is known by the friends he keeps. The Department of Justice will be coming here for appropriations, and when it does come, let me repeat again, Mr. Hoover and those who come here and ask for money to be appropriated by the people's representatives who have been vilified by Winchell should be asked to explain why it is that by association they lend credit, they lend apparent substance to the charges of Winchell that this body is disloyal, that Members of this body are saboteurs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENDRICKS). Under previous special order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

POSTPONE THE INVASION

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the American people, when they know the truth, have a mighty common sense which is wiser than any public official they ever elect. But, to date, the American people have not been told the facts about blunders in foreign policy and war strategy, which would enable them to rise up and avert future mistakes. If Congress does not act to avert blunders, who will?

Today, though we will surely capture Rome, the Italian losses have been such that America will be dangerously less well prepared to invade western Europe than we expected to be at the time Stalin was given the promise we would invade this spring. Our preparations are much more crippled than it was expected they would be 2 weeks ago when the bill to postpone invasion was introduced. But the anachronistic plan to invade western Europe this spring has not been canceled.

The spark of hope that the British Prime Minister may execute a coup, perhaps by resigning, which would save the day and prevent the invasion going through on schedule, may prove to be a will-o'-the-wisp. The fact that Mr. Churchill urged postponement until Germany would be worn down by the new bombing technique, now roasting multitudes of German women and children alive, has been thoroughly publicized in America. What more can we expect of him? Since when must the American people depend for salvation upon a British Prime Minister as if America were one of the more backward British colonies considered unworthy to enjoy self-government?

Did any nation in history ever toss away lives of its citizens so wantonly? American military experts have vociferously opposed every major military decision, including the plan to finish Hitler before Japan, the plan to invade up through Italy, the plan to invade Sicily, and the plan to invade western Europe now. To win the war in Europe one ally, Mr. Churchill, urged the plan for invasions in southern Europe; the other ally, Stalin, urged a substitute plan, the invasion of western Europe. Like the extravagant shopper who cannot choose between two hats, we adopted both plans. If such multiple frittering away of American lives is not homicidal lunacy, what is it?

Small news of the two bills which would rescue our country from this insane situation got into the newspapers. But hundreds of alert Americans from all corners of the United States sent messages God blessing the effort. Typical was this paragraph from one woman who has a boy in war:

> I wish I might have the privilege of dedicating my every hour to saving these boys from the hideous fate which will be theirs. Couldn t we, the women, roll up our sleeves and battle this out before it is too late? Nothing else is so important.

Of course, there were some protests against the bills. The protests came from New Deal editors and writers, the human squids who obscure their un-American activities by squirting ink. One such ink squirter owns a Chicago newspaper. He denounced, as sheer malice the explanatory speech which, before delivery, had been read and warmly approved by qualified experts. If you uphold the vital American principles all American statesmen once upheld religiously, he calls you an "Anglophobe" and a "Russiaphobe." What is he? A hydrophobe, maybe. As in the Coward song: "Mad dogs and Englishmen go out in the Chicago Sun."

Still, without these ink squirters, plenty of Americans would not have found out that there exists a bill to postpone the invasion and also a companion bill to shorten the war in the Pacific. Enclosing the syndicated column of Ink Squirter Grafton, an irate citizen of Seattle wrote:

> We find it unpleasant to receive notice of your timely, patriotic resolutions through the column writtten by this unpleasant little drip, instead of through the pages of the controlled press.

One still active old citizen, who has done more than his share of building up this country, however, wrote the following startling observation:

> A great many people who used to think for themselves have had the privilege taken from them the past 12 years, so they have become reconciled to their fate. The young men and women and children grab all the

joy and pleasures as they present themselves and don't care to bother their heads about the future, as the angel of the White House has provided social security and old-age pension, so why worry? Let Roosevelt and Stalin worry.

A little taste of slavery such as Hitler has given them in Germany and the countries he has taken over might awaken a few people, but a lot of them would be put down in the mud unconscious, for they would never be roused by anything that might be said to them as they are living on the intoxication of New Deal policies.

Surely that indictment of us is too critical. But something is wrong. What is it?

Last week a letter sent to every member of the Committee on Military Affairs in the House urged immediate action. It received hearty cooperation—from only two or three members. The attitude seems to be—what we do not know will not hurt us, so why try to find out much?

War in Italy has already cost America some 100,000 lives. The invasion may cost a million lives. The carefully nourished notion that Congress should ignore conduct of the war, under such circumstances, seems preposterous. It seems equally preposterous that Congress should pay no attention to foreign policy now that diplomatic blunders are rendering our war effort in Europe worse than useless. Who cares whether Europe is ruled by Hitler or Stalin? The difference between those two ambitious tyrants is not worth the life of a single American boy. The somnambulism is bipartisan. This week, more than one old-guard Republican pundit urged that Congress stay asleep and trust to luck—or rather, Cordell Hull. It is easy and comfortable for Congress to be Reichlike. But why be a Republican if you lack faith in the Republican principles of government? That paralyzing slogan—leave everything to the leader—is what has caused our Republic to devolve into a comatose state. Shall we continue to confine ourselves to domestic policies as if the House of Representatives were only a doll house? Foreign policy blunders have already determined the way Congress shall be forced to vote on major domestic policies for years to come.

It is not as if a devoted Congressman cannot ferret out what one needs to know around the embassies, the State Department, the War Department, and the Navy Department. There are still patriotic bureaucrats willing to whisper to you if it will help save our country. The Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, admitted in a Senate hearing last week that his only foreign policy, until the war ends, is to win the war. What a decrepit idea that is. Does he think that Americans are fighting this war just to show that we can win a fight? No, says he, but all we have to do is wait until we have won the war and have a League of Nations—that is the cure-all. That escapist philosophy, to Europeans around town here, is a tragic laugh. They say, "If you Americans cannot force Stalin to cough up the aggressions which are making him master of Europe now, you never can. Now his army is engaged. Now you are giving him lend-lease. Now you have an Army in Europe. But you will have no hold whatever on him after the war is over. We surrendered our countries to Hitler to avoid destruction. Now you come over to liberate us. Your bombers are killing our children, destroying our property. Before you are through, you will have demolished our 2,000-year-old civilization. And what do you give us instead? Stalin!" Thanks to recurrent diplomatic faux pas, our good-neighbor policy in South America also seems to be curdling.

The two bills advocated offer the only sensible solution in sight. House Joint Resolution 252 postpones the invasion, first, until we can persuade Hitler, by continued bombing, and Stalin, by postponement of invasion and diplomacy, including restricted lend-lease, to cough up their aggressions; and, second, until qualified American military experts agree that the invasion is reasonably necessary to American military security. House Joint Resolution 253 shortens the war in the Pacific by providing a unified single command and sorely needed equipment.

Unless and until some such plan is adopted the bloody invasion of western Europe is simply not worth while. Unless such a plan is adopted all we shall get out of this murderous expedition is boatloads of corpses and another world war to fight.

Today the book every thoughtful American should read is Stockton's Inevitable War. But you cannot buy it at any Washington book store. Written in 1932 by a military man, it expresses—so experts say—authentic opinions. Why is this book not being circulated? It tells why Americans would be fools to trust American security to any kind of league of nations. It shows why America should maintain independent adequate military strength. It shows how, in the past, America eased into wars, including the Civil War, which adequate military force would have averted. It reveals that the wars we did win were inexcusably costly in lives and money, and were won therefore more by luck than good sense. It shows that no human President of the United States could possibly have mind enough to override intelligently the vast accumulated judgment of War and Navy experts. It convinces you that the whole future of America depends upon a President's subordinating his own ideas of military strategy to the conclusions of a qualified general staff of American military experts, providing, of course, that they stand up for America.

Maybe what America needs today is another Billy Mitchell.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I agree with the gentlewoman that what the country needs is another Billy Mitchell, but far more than that, it needs another ex-President.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

It is said that if the Military Affairs Committee were to hold hearings on these bills, what would happen is what always happens. The Army and Navy never tell the Congressional Military and Naval Affairs Committees one bit more than just enough to get requested appropriations and power. It is said that if War Department officials come over to Congress, gagged with military discipline, as they are, they will either testify what they are told from above to say or testify that it is against public interest to say anything. It is pointed out that when Billy Mitchell broke military discipline and opened his mouth for the good of the country, he was court-martialed and drummed out of the Army.

What is the American Army for except to preserve the United States and the lives of its citizens? Congress has the constitutional power to control the Army. Congress should not permit military discipline to be so misused as to conceal and support homicidal blunders in the conduct of war. Blunders costing perhaps a million lives, and risking in one throw the whole future of the United States, are about to be made which can be averted if generals will tell the truth—the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Who knows to what heights of heroism a single man may rise? Maybe the Chief of Staff himself will speak out frankly, if we, the American people, in and out of Congress, show a real determination to stop acting like sheep. Sheep are poor, dumb animals. They cannot get out of a burning barn unless they are dragged out.

The House Military Affairs Committee owes it to Congress, the Congress owes it to the American people, the American people owe it to themselves, their children and their children's children, to find out the truth and do their duty. Angels can do no more. Christian Americans can do no less.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Post of Saturday, March 25, 1944, entitled "Our Last Chance."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPORT AND QUESTION PERIOD FOR CABINET MEMBERS AND EXECUTIVE OFFICERS—REPLY TO MR. CANNON

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, during the debate on the agricultural appropriation bill, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], discussed H. R. 327, a resolution to amend the rules to make it possible to invite heads of departments and independent agencies to report and answer questions on the floor of the House. The gentleman from Missouri

[Mr. CANNON] set forth certain arguments as to why he did not think the adoption of this resolution is in the public interest. I wish at this time to answer the points of opposition made by the distinguished Member from Missouri and to make certain additional observations as to the value the machinery contemplated by H. R. 327 would be to the Members of Congress, the executive officials, and to the Nation as a whole.

The gentleman from Missouri accurately explained the provisions of the resolution. He correctly reported that it has aroused widespread interest, that it has been editorially reviewed by practically every metropolitan newspaper and radio commentator in the country, and that in all the comment on the resolution there has not been a single sentence of criticism or dissent.

Amplifying Mr. CANNON's statement, I wish to say that my attention has been called to editorials commenting on this resolution from more than 250 daily newspapers, and all have spoken approvingly of it. Many of the editors have been vigorous in their support. A recent survey of the Gallup poll showed that 72 percent of those interviewed were favorable to H. R. 327. Only 7 percent were opposed.

In November 1943 I sent copies of the resolution to about 300 leading citizens, political scientists, and men with governmental experience throughout the country. I asked the opinion of the value of this proposed plan. I have had replies from about 250 of these outstanding citizens and educators. All but 3 gave the idea endorsement.

Notwithstanding the great interest and the general desire for improvements of the channels of communication between the legislative and executive branches of the Government, I have not been able to get the chairman of the great Committee on Rules of the House to grant a hearing on H. R. 327. I have made repeated requests, but they have met with no success. On one occasion the chairman set the resolution down for hearing on February 1, but 2 days before that date he called off the hearing. More than 25 Members of the House have expressed a desire to appear before the Rules Committee in support of the resolution, and several members of the Committee on Rules have stated that they are interested in the proposal and that they thought a hearing should be held. Many prominent citizens and several members of the Cabinet have expressed their desire to testify in support of the measure. Even so, the chairman of the Rules Committee continues to refuse to grant a hearing.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] observes in his discussion that many suggestions have been made for procedure on improvement from time to time "and all improvements in the rules and in House procedure have resulted from such resolutions and suggestions." He is eminently correct in stating that proposals must at least be considered and given a trial if we are to improve our machinery. Yet in spite of the great interest and support in this measure the chairman of the Rules Committee is adamant in refusing to give its proponents a day in court.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] says that the present methods of securing information and of communication between the branches of the Government are sufficient. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is the best versed and most capable parliamentarian in this country. He has had a long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives and occupies the most important position of chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. It may be that the present methods are adequate for him. As chairman of the Appropriations Committee he does have an opportunity of keeping in touch with the plans and programs of the various agencies. But all of us cannot be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and only a fortunate few can even be members of that great committee.

A point that is frequently overlooked is that the average tenure of a Member of the House is a fraction over two terms, so, over a course of years the majority of votes cast by the House are by men who have been here slightly over two terms. We must consider, in determining whether our machinery is adequate or not, the question of whether that machinery enables the second-term Congressmen to become acquainted with the ramifications of the departments, the policies of the departments, and to find out whether they are doing their job as was intended by Congress.

I am serving my third term. I am frank to confess that there are many departments of the Government with which I am very poorly acquainted. Certainly I do not have time or the means under our present system to know as much about the workings of the bureaus as I should. These bureaus, mind you, were established by us and it is our duty to acquire more knowledge of what they are doing and to become better versed with their problems.

I have an idea that even a well-versed Member like the distinguished gentleman from Missouri would secure much valuable information, particularly on international relations, from reports by the Secretary of State, the Administrator of Foreign Economic Administration, and other officials who have charge of the direction of our international affairs.

The principal arguments advanced against the proposal by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and my reply to them are as follows:

I. Argument: The difference between the English and the American systems makes parallels between the two inapplicable.

Reply: The fact that the American Cabinet is responsible to the President rather than directly to Congress makes it all the more important that Congress as a whole should have ways and means to inform itself as to whether its intentions are in fact carried out. It is also all the more important that it have opportunities the better to understand the operations of the Executive. When Cabinet members—as in the British system—are also members of Parliament, such opportunities are normal and frequent, and interchange of ideas is consequently natural. In the American system such interchange of ideas is as fully desirable as under the British system, but special procedures must be set up in order to secure such interchange.

II. Argument: The United States already has measures permitting Congress to inquire of and investigate the Executive. These measures are the resolution of inquiry, the standing committees, press conferences of the President, personal contact, Government reports.

Reply: Each of these measures, while appropriate and effective within limits, suffers from certain defects. The resolution of inquiry is somewhat cumbersome and relatively little used. Where it is used it seldom, if ever, is reported favorably by the appropriate committee. If it were frequently used it would provide a much greater burden upon the time of Congress than the question hour now proposed, inasmuch as presumably each resolution would have to be debated by the House as a whole before it would be passed.

Questioning by committees is the most effective of the devices at the present time. Nevertheless, but few Members relatively are present at committee hearings, and the time of Members does not allow them to follow the hearings of committees other than their own in any detail. The committees are most suited to lengthy and detailed investigations, whereas the question hour in the House as a whole should, and would, furnish a far better opportunity for questions and declarations concerning general policy and for focusing attention upon some particular event.

The suggestion that Congress should abdicate its investigatory function to reporters of the press is a strange one. This argument also suggests that Congress should overlook the opportunity to gain back some of its own lost prestige through the publicity which would attend its proceedings.

Personal contact is excellent as far as it goes. However, it is not a substitute for a responsible public declaration of policy.

Government reports also are excellent for a comprehensive view of an agency's work. These views are uniformly favorable rather than critical. However, questions which would be asked would, to a considerable extent, deal with problems of the kind which the reports would not, and often could not, include.

H. R. 327 is designed not to supersede existing channels but to add to them one which would have peculiar advantages of its own. It would promote not only the securing of information but the betterment of understanding. Such understanding is characteristic of person-to-person contacts of this type.

III. Argument: The proposal violates separation of powers insofar as it would force the Executive to attend to the wishes of the legislative branch.

Reply: In the first place, separation of powers under our Constitution was from the very outset intentionally and pro-

foundly modified by the constitutional system of checks and balances. Controls of the executive by the legislative branch were provided for under the constitution, in connection with appropriations, investigations, impeachments, and approval of appointments. Moreover, that it is a bad thing for the executive branch to attend upon the wishes of the legislative branch would not find very many supporters. This argument smacks of a bureaucratic origin.

IV. Argument: The proposal would result in a bitter partisan fight and would increase the dissension between the executive and the legislative.

Reply: This argument assumes that Congress would not behave responsibly. In fact the whole development of the argument seems to imply that the Rules and other committees and the individual Members of the House would operate after the fashion of a Roman holiday. The selection of questions to be asked and the control of the time of the House by responsible leaders and committees, as well as the good sense of the overwhelming majority of the Members, could and would establish a tradition of responsible behavior which would befit the occasion.

V. Argument: The interest in and publicity attendant upon the question hour would crowd the House and fill the newspapers.

Reply: This is an argument in favor of the measure and not against it. It would go far toward creating a feeling on the part of the American public that Congress really mattered and would at long last result in publicizing congressional activity more on a par with the Executive.

VI. Argument: It would flood the Rules Committee.

Reply: The Rules Committee would only have to decide upon the length of time of each report and question period. It could establish a certain day each week, or every 2 weeks, and could fix the time uniformly at 1 or 2 hours. In any event, this should not take more than 5 minutes of the time of the Rules Committee per week, and the tremendous advantages of the proposal would warrant some additional work on the part of the committee, and additional printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There might even be a reduction of printing as far as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is concerned, inasmuch as the question period would be more economical as regards time in the illumination of questions than would the ordinary debate.

VII. Argument: The measure would have been adopted on one of its previous proposals had it been a good one.

Reply: The fact that the measure has been continuously the subject of agitation would indicate that there must be some fundamental weakness in the procedures of Congress in response to which the proposal has been repeatedly made. This weakness lies in part in the weakness of the ways and means for better understanding between Congress and the Executive and in part in the weakness of procedures designed to make the Executive more responsive to the wishes of Congress as the representative of the people. There was never a time in our history when such understanding and such responsiveness were as important as today. Consequently, the measure, which is long overdue, cannot be allowed to remain an unrealized dream any longer.

NUMBER OF INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES WOULD BE REDUCED

Dozens of resolutions for the creation of investigating committees are filed during each session of Congress. The fact that these resolutions are filed shows that the Members are seeking information and it shows a desire for knowledge of facts. During this Congress we have authorized the appointment of several select committees to make special investigations into the way executive departments are carrying out their functions. After a law is passed we have no direct method of ascertaining whether the intention of Congress is being carried out. The Smith committee is now making a special investigation of the instances in which the intention of Congress was not followed in the administration of laws. The necessity for most of the investigating committees would be obviated if we could invite the administrators into this forum and here, face to face, ask them to give an account of the stewardship of their departments.

IMPORTANCE OF CONGRESS WOULD BE STRESSED

A procedure would be inaugurated, if this resolution were passed, which would establish the importance of Congress in the public mind. At present executive administrators hold press conferences. These press conferences are given more play in the newspapers and over the radio than action taken by Congress on important measures. If the plans and proposals for the administration of laws are brought out on the floor of the House, pursuant to questions from Members, the important news would arise from what was said on the floor and not what was said at some press conference.

EXECUTIVES WOULD DERIVE GREAT BENEFITS

This procedure would be beneficial to the Cabinet members and heads of the departments. In the first place, the President in making appointments would have to take into consideration that they would be called upon to appear on the floor of the House. The President's administration would be judged to a considerable extent by the impression these administrators made. He would be doubly sure that he secured outstanding men as heads of the executive agencies of the Government. The procedure would enable the administrators to obtain the people's view as expressed directly by the people's representatives. The administrators would consider more deliberately their decisions if they knew they would be called upon to give an account of what they were doing before the House. There could be no ghost writing. These men would have to know their departments and be able to give facts.

It frequently happens that rumors or unjust criticism are spread about executive officers. If this criticism comes from a Member of the House, the executive officer has no opportunity to answer except through the newspapers. Under this procedure he would be given an opportunity of appearing and explaining his side of the controversy.

POLICIES WOULD HAVE TO BE DECIDED BY EXECUTIVE

In a complex society such as we have today, it is necessary to concentrate great and far-reaching power in the Executive. This condition will continue regardless of the administration in power. One of the great values of having Cabinet members and administrative agents report in person to the Members of the House is that such appearances would necessitate clear definitions of policy on the part of the Executive. Some Cabinet members and heads of agencies do not know what the President's policy is on certain particular matters under their jurisdiction. This is no reflection on the present administration as the same condition has always existed. Before an administrator appeared at a question period, he would naturally call upon the Chief Executive to clearly define the policy of the administration in regard to the matters about which he would be questioned. Also, many questions of policy which should be decided by the administrator himself remain undetermined. Faced with the invitation of making a personal report to Congress, the administrator would be running a great risk if he did not settle those undetermined matters of policy affecting his department before submitting himself to the House Members for interrogation.

Would not it be of great help to the Members of the House if Mr. Baruch were given an opportunity of explaining his thinking and the original ideas of his committee relative to demobilization? After the war we may have to have some kind of international currency agreement. How many Members of Congress know the details of the various plans proposed or the intricacies of the problems of international currency? Would not it be of interest if the Banking and Currency Committee would invite some administrator to the floor of the House to tell all of us what is being thought of and planned in the matter of international currency?

CONCLUSION

To sum up—if Congress wants to hold its authority, if the House wants to keep pace with the executive departments, if the House wants to meet the expectations of the people of this country, we must improve our machinery. I think this plan is worth trying. I think it would work to the benefit of Congress, the departments, and the people. If it does not, the committees do not have to issue any invitations and, furthermore, if we do not like the way the system works, we can repeal the rule. Let us at least give it a trial.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain editorials and transcripts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it grieves me very much that I have to take the floor and say what I have to say on this much discussed question of Winchell, Dies, Hoffman, and Rankin. In my judgment, Winchell has become a symbol of persecution by the Congress of the United States. Congress has given this verbal battle so much publicity, time, and energy that the American people have begun to wonder whether we have forgotten about the war. Again and again during the last 6 months we had to listen to attacks upon Walter Winchell on the floor of this House Why? Because he has criticized certain Members of Congress. He has not criticized the Congress of the United States as a political institution. I may not agree with everything he has to say, but I would let him say it since that is his privilege as a free citizen of a democracy.

It was very surprising to me to hear my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] just a little while ago make the "charge" that J. Edgar Hoover was seen in a restaurant with Walter Winchell. Is it such a terrible thing to discover, that a public official is having dinner—or a chat—with a newspaperman? If it is, then many of us here are guilty of such "misbehavior"—it seems we all like to talk to newspapermen. Now the gentleman from Michigan gives notice and threatens that because of that incident he is going to see to it that we withhold appropriations from the F. B. I. Because of his dislike of one man, the gentleman from Michigan threatens to hold up the appropriation used by an important Government agency in its work carried on for the protection of all the citizens of the United States and not for any individual person, whether it is J. Edgar Hoover, its able director, or any of the five or six thousand men who are under him. If that is not a misuse of congressional power to intimidate people, I do not know what to call it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I gladly yield. I tried to get the gentleman to yield to me before, but was unable to get him to do so. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would have yielded but there was not time. I just want to correct something.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly. I want to be corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is absolutely wrong in saying that I suggested that appropriations should be withheld. I made no such statement. I said that when the Department of Justice came up here for appropriations we should ask Mr. Hoover where he stands, whether he is going along with Winchell in his attacks on Congress, on the loyalty of Members of Congress, whether he is going to continue to let Winchell use him and the Department for the benefit of his broadcasts. It is time the F. B. I. tells the public and the courts whether in its opinion it is true as charged by Winchell that there are saboteurs in Congress. That is what I said, and I stand on that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am willing to accept the gentleman's statement. Understand, I am not trying to bring about a quarrel.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not quarrel with the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am asking to be heard on the facts as a Member of this body, and I am willing to accept the gentleman's modification.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not making a modification; I am just making a correction.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Be it as it may—the gentleman can ask Hoover anything he wants but if this is done while the appropriation for Mr. Hoover's agency is being considered, it may be misinterpreted, to put it mildly. I do not think it concerns this Congress whether Hoover is seen with Mr. Winchell or Johnny Jones or Johnny Brown. It is his privilege and his right as an American citizen to choose the company he wants to keep in his private life. We, the Congress, cannot interfere in his personal affairs. Get that straight.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will yield further: does he mean that it is not Edgar Hoover's business and the business of the F. B. I. to investigate and spread the truth on the record when charges are made that there are saboteurs in Congress? Are not the people entitled to know?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have been here long enough to know that the Members on both sides of the aisle are Americans of oustanding ability, and everybody is trying to do his job. In trying to do one's job one necessarily steps on other people's toes and as people in public life we should expect attacks from our opponents. The record of a man in public life is a much better weapon than any speech he can make to defend himself against such attacks. If a man's record is such as to make a liar out of his accuser, why not just point that out and let the American people who have a lot of good common sense, decide the issues involved. We have been acting like a lot of prima donnas lately. Someone may attack some of us in Congress with whom he disagrees and immediately somebody will get on his feet here and make it appear as though there were accusations against the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, but Mr. Winchell said without any qualification that there were saboteurs in Congress. My point is that when he broadcasts that to millions of Americans, those who elect and pay us are entitled to have the Department of Justice, the F. B. I., point out and name them. And Mr. Winchell charged some time ago that Congress was "the house of reprehensibles." That was a charge against Congress as an institution.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is just a matter of what your state of mind is and how you want to interpret the language of anyone. I can interpret the gentleman's language in two or three different ways and he can do the same thing to me. But let us not be prima donnas and react violently to every bit of criticism. We know as loyal Americans and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, elected by a constituency who have faith in us, that we should not be afraid of Winchell or anybody else who says something about us. We are still living in a democracy. The gentleman has the right, as he has done previously, to take the floor, which is his privilege, although that privilege is denied to any other citizen, except Members of Congress, even if his loyalty has been challenged by a Member of Congress. You can attack every individual commentator, you can say anything you want, and you enjoy immunity under the Constitution, while an ordinary citizen may be reached under the libel law for any statement he makes about you. Do you not think that the advantage, if there is any, is on our side?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think the Congress should sit quiet and not make inquiry when over the air it is charged that we have saboteurs in Congress? Does he think we should let that go uncontradicted?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is one thing to call the Members' attention to a statement made, but it is another thing to go on wasting our time by repeating the statement over and over again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then you charge——

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not believe any charge made to the effect that there are saboteurs in Congress. I still have faith in the Congress. I still have faith in the people who sit on this floor under oath to do their duty. I would not pay a bit of attention to any charge of that kind. My dear friend, you and I know that Winchell has been deliberately made a target of all kinds of unfounded attacks in the last few months. A resolution was introduced and referred to the Naval Affairs Committee to find out Winchell's status. The Navy Department was contacted and you got a report. Another resolution was introduced to find out whether he was drawing pay. That information was given, too. We got all the answers. Unless you want to legislate to send all people who may be lying to jail. Well, that may be all right, and we should have quite a conglomeration of inmates in the huge jails we would have to build for that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is not the point. The point is that this man has said, as I told you a moment ago, to millions of people over the radio that this House shelters and accepts into its membership saboteurs. Is it not the duty of the F. B. I. and the Department of Justice

either to verify or to repudiate that charge?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, how do you know that the F. B. I. and the head of the office, Mr. Hoover, in whom I am sure all Members of this body have every confidence, are not making some investigations dealing with that question? I do not know it, but I know as a fact that they have never missed up on anything concerning saboteurs in this country. So far no one was hurt as far as the Congress is concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But that charge was made months ago, and still neither the Department of Justice nor the F. B. I., nor J. Edgar Hoover has issued a statement on it. The people have a right to know whether there are saboteurs in Congress or whether Winchell is trying to destroy, by false charges, the people's confidence in Congress. Now, the gentleman has objected many times when charges have been made against him, and rightfully so. I think it is his duty to do so. I think it is my duty, when this man says there are saboteurs here—you say you are not one, I say I am not one, and other gentlemen say they are not saboteurs. Then who are the saboteurs in Congress? That is what I want to know. I do not believe there are any, any more than you do.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I may have defended myself against attacks, that is my privilege, but I certainly did not threaten anyone to drag him before a congressional committee to explain his dislike of my way of doing things. But you will agree that Mr. Winchell has been made the football of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Winchell made a football? He has been kicking Congress around and the gentleman seems to feel we should let him continue.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. He was made a football in the Congress of the United States, and you have given the matter more serious consideration than you should.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, that was when he made charges. No one mentioned him until he made these charges.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The record will show.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. He has been hit pretty hard by certain Members, and not always in a manner which would contribute to the dignity of the House. As a matter of fact, some of the language used in attacking him might have been all right if used during a brawl in some beer cellar, but certainly did not help in creating respect for the Halls of Congress throughout the country. Why carry on this seemingly endless dispute?

Mr. HOFFMAN. And there never will be an end until the truth or falsity of the base, scandalous charges he has made is determined

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Then let us get the facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. That is what I want. What do you think people in other lands think of Congress when that charge goes uninvestigated, undenied?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, let me say to the House, if Mr. Hoover was seen with Winchell or any other newspaperman or commentator, that is none of our business. He sees a lot of people; that may be the way he gets his information.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure. He has his stool pigeons and he must have.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. So what is wrong with Winchell being seen with Hoover in Harvey's restaurant? Is this not a ridiculous issue to raise?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That would be all right if Winchell admitted he was or if he is a stool pigeon, but he claims to be a buddy of Hoover.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am surprised you do not give us a report on what they had to eat that night.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And who paid for it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right. That would be very important to this inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would be willing if the gentleman were inclined to gamble—I am not and I know he is not—but I would be willing to venture that Winchell did not.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Did not what—eat or pay? Well, I do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not either.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You would not take an oath on it, would you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Take what?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You would not take an oath on who paid for the check?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know what you mean by that. I do not know whether any Congressman's name on a note would be any good.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh! Yours would be. You can always make a touch on me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about doing it right now? Do not forget that. I will see you in the lobby.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is all right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this situation has become so serious that the Dies committee saw fit to take over the functions of the F. B. I. I want you to bear with me for a moment—and I am serious.

In the past several weeks much fuss has been made about Winchell's alleged lack of truth in his broadcasts, so much so that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and others have stated that Winchell's broadcasts were 60 percent untrue and only 40 percent true. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who is chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the committee, incidentally, of which I was the original creator in 1934, and the resolution under which my committee was functioning, was the same resolution under which the present committee is working—undertook to subpena the records and documents of Winchell's broadcasts for the past 2 years. He proposes to take each statement separately and establish its truth or falsity.

I have a high regard for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] as a Member of the House and as an American. He is able and conscientious, but, in my judgment, I believe that he has not given this matter his most careful study and consideration, in that it is my judgment, and I believe the judgment of many Members of this House and the legal profession at large, that the gentleman from Texas has no power to issue a subpena to any individual, person, or corporation for the purpose of determining the truth of statements, whether in the press or on the radio. The powers vested in him as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities do not go that far.

House Resolution 282, Seventy-fifth Congress, under which the gentleman from Texas, Congressman DIES, is pursuing his investigation, deals with three questions:

First. The extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States.

Second. The diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution.

Third. All other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

It would appear, therefore, from the powers of the committee that whether Winchell stretched his script or overstated his case as an American, through radio or the newspapers, does not constitute "un-American activities," and I believe that after careful study by the distinguished chairman, he will be convinced of the soundness of that principle.

The powers vested in his committee under this resolution were not intended to subpena Americans who did not come within the scope of the committee's activities. If Congress desires to investigate whomever its Members may term "liars," it should create a special committee for that purpose.

We must bear in mind, however, that persons who misstate facts in broadcasts or stretch their case would not even come within the purview of such a specially created committee. If a Member of this body is attacked by any commentator or newspaper, the privilege is fully guaranteed to him to take the floor on the question of personal privilege to explain and discuss it here, a privilege which has been exercised by many Members of the House. That is as far as we can go. If, on the other hand, any commentator or newspaper or individual has in any way slandered any Member of Congress or individual, there is a remedy at law. Newspapermen and radio commentators are not exempt from the law of slander or libel, and it would seem to me that they do not have to account to Congress or any Government agency for their opinions. To hold otherwise would be to make a mockery of freedom of speech and the press.

I know something about the authority and powers granted to the Dies committee because the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and myself were the original sponsors of the resolution setting up a committee to investigate un-American activities. The language of our resolution was identical with the resolution setting up the Dies committee and there are certain things that just cannot be done under this resolution and one of them is to subpena the scripts and records of a newspaperman or commentator who is a loyal

American citizen, just because he attacks the way the committee investigation is being carried on. I feel sure that the courts would sustain me on this ruling if they were called upon to decide this issue. When the original Committee to Investigate un-American Activities held hearings during the Seventy-third Congress, we too were attacked for various steps we took or failed to take. Sure we were angry. But it never occurred to me or any other member of our committee to subpena the newspapermen who disagreed with us. We were fully aware of the fact that such action did not come within the purview of our committee.

Newspapermen and radio news commentators are not exempt from the law of libel or any other law which they might violate, and any individual, whether he be a Member of Congress or not, may avail himself of the protection afforded to him by the laws of our country. It is absurd to take the stand that individuals, just because they are Members of Congress, should be permitted to use congressional committees to settle their differences with other people who they claim made false statements regarding their activities. Such action on the part of members of congressional committees would be an overstepping of authority and power granted to them. A congressional committee is created for a specific purpose and its authority is limited to the functions designated under the resolution under which it has been created.

It is my opinion, that to use a congressional committee as a means of attacking people individual members of such committee may not like, in addition to being contrary to the established rules of Congress, will expose Congress as a whole to the criticism and ridicule of the whole country which will rightfully resent such improper use of congressional power.

Why, my dear friends, Congress now, has practically become a cosponsor of—what is that lotion—Jergens' lotions—all the free publicity we have been giving this product must have boosted its sale quite a bit. We have made it so popular in the last few weeks—mentioning it repeatedly on the floor of the House that everybody should have heard about this product by now. We have given more publicity to Jergens' lotion than Jergens himself could possibly ask or pay for. Now, what is it all about? Let us take the facts, and I do not try to be facetious. I did not come here to create a fight. I am giving you the facts. I have sat on this floor for months, day in and day out and have heard "Winchell," "Lipschitz," and other names being flung around with all kinds of insinuations and innuendoes attached to them. Let us look at the record. Walter Winchell comes from Manhattan, lower Manhattan, in New York. He was born in this country. His name never was Lipschitz, his name was and is Winchell. But one of our colleagues thought it was very funny and said it is "Lipschitz." Now where did he get that "Lipschitz"? During the investigation of Fritz Kuhn, and you, my good friend, might listen to this——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am listening very attentively.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am grateful to you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, you are welcome, sir.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Thank you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I always am instructed and entertained by the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Thank you. Well, you will not be entertained by this one.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Perhaps I can cite you the book where Winchell offered $100,000 to anyone who would prove his name was Lipschitz.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Why do you not find out?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You did not hear what I said.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is a chance for you to make a couple of hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; I never said his name was Lipschitz, but I will cite you the book where Winchell offered $100,000, years ago, if anybody could prove his name was Lipschitz. I do not need the money. I did not have the proof. I did not make the charge. I care not at all what his name may be. His ancestor's name was Adam—as was yours and mine.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I know; neither do I. None of us needs the money. I appreciate that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It might be dirty money collected from some racketeer; I would not want it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. How are you going to determine where a dollar bill came from? They all seem to look alike.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But I can smell the source from which some come.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You could not be that good a smeller. If you were you would not continue to utter some of the statements you have been making here every day.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will admit that some statements nauseate me, some which come up here in connection with Winchell, but what can I do?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If they nauseate you why do you not stop it? Let us be dignified.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whenever on the farm anything smelled very badly we buried it out behind the barn. That is what we are trying to do here.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do not compare Congress to a barn. Let us not create any more trouble. Some other people may get insulted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not talking about Congress. Do not misunderstand me. I am talking about something you were talking about, the same individual.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All right. Now, do you know where that word "Lipschitz" came from?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do you want to listen to it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. If you want to talk.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Thank you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Pardon me for interrupting you. May I stand while I listen?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh sure, I appreciate the respect you are according my remarks, but I think you would be more comfortable sitting down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I would not. All right.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All right. Stand up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was born to work.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, Mr. Winchell had been pounding and exposing Fritz Kuhn and his bundsters. After we organized our committee in 1934, every day he would expose a group of men who are today either in jail or have been deported through the Immigration and Naturalization Service. When the Dies committee subpenaed Fritz Kuhn in Washington, and while he was being examined and while he was sitting at the table of the Dies committee, or a subcommittee of the Dies committee he whispered to someone—as they brought up the question of Winchell's making certain charges, "His name is not Winchell. His real name is Lipschitz." And the press got it. From that day on there has been this spread of propaganda that Winchell's name was really Lipschitz. To have a man of Kuhn's mentality make a remark like that is not surprising, but to have a Member of the United States Congress repeat it on the floor of the House is shocking. Suppose it was Lipschitz? Would that make him a better or a worse American? What's in a name, especially in a country that owes its independence and successful development to men and women of many nationalities?

Winchell is a native New Yorker, born on April 7, 1897, who spent the early part of his life on the stage, until World War No. 1 saw him as a member of the Naval Reserve. He has been a member of the Naval Reserve ever since.

After being on the stage for awhile, he turned his attention to newspaper work and became connected with the New York Mirror as a dramatic critic and columnist. He is undoubtedly one of the best known columnists in the United States and his readers can be numbered in millions.

There are countless other millions who listen to him on the radio. Winchell is, therefore, one of the most representative men in the United States and he is never backward in expressing his views and voicing his opinions.

I do not expect every Member of this House to agree with him—I may not always agree with him myself—but I do expect that the Members of this House will treat him with the respect to which his integrity and common sense justly entitle him. To use undignified language in characterizing an individual who is as public spirited as Walter Winchell is not becoming to the dignity of the House of Representatives.

Now, my good friend here and distinguished colleague introduced a bill which is clearly aimed at Winchell. It is class legislation—not authorized by law. He is not trying to correct a general evil or

affect anyone else except Winchell. Is that not so, may I ask the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That bill of yours which you have introduced.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Which bill are you referring to?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, you have more than one every Monday?

Mr. HOFFMAN. One? Listen. I have a bunch of them, introduced down through the years.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You have? Well, that is wonderful.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Over the years I have introduced many a constructive bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not question the number.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman had supported them and they had been adopted we might have been out of some of our trouble.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do you not think you ought to save paper and stop introducing all these bills?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have not noticed any indication on your part to save paper. Maybe we ought to get together and save a little paper.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Maybe we ought to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is this bill you are talking about?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That bill, the last bill you discussed here a little while ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not discuss any bill here.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You did. You said you introduced a bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You mean the bill to amend the law which governs the Navy?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right; I believe it is H. R. 4490.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You mean the bill to amend the law which governs the Navy?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You say it is aimed at Winchell?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Isn't it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think Winchell would be taken care of by that bill. Do you not think that the officers of the Navy are gentlemen and should not be required to associate with officers who are not gentlemen?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you not agree with that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But——

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right then, why do you not support my bill?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let me analyze your bill a little bit if you do not mind.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not mind. I am still sitting at your feet for instruction.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You do not have to sit at my feet, there is a nice seat for you. Your bill says, "Any officer who uses contemptuous or disrespectful words against the President." Good God, if you put every one——

Mr. HOFFMAN. What did you say, "Good God"?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. "Any person who uses disrespectful language against the President," I am quoting from your bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. Any what?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Any officer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; you forgot that word "officer."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, I beg your pardon. Now, can you imagine how many people sometimes use disrespectful words against the President in the armed services——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me ask you a question. Will you strike that from the code which governs the Army?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Wait, wait, let me get through.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will read further, "or the Vice President, Congress of the United States, Secretary of War, or the Governor or legislature of any State or Territory," and so forth. I say that Congress is part of the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Right?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It was, prior to 1933.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, it is part of the Government now, is it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I am not so sure. It gives signs of becoming part of the Government.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Since you are worried about the Navy officers' status as gentlemen, and since one of your basic requirements for a gentleman is his refraining from using disrespectful words against the President and the Vice President, and so forth, I must call your attention to the fact that many a Member's status as gentleman may be seriously challenged if we recall the language they used while referring to the President and the Vice President. If certain conduct is expected from gentlemen in one branch of the Government the same standards should be set up for all other branches of the Government. What right have we——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Listen. When I retaliated when the President said that we were perpetrating a fraud by passing the so-called soldiers' vote bill, and when he charged we were passing a bill for the greedy when we put through the tax bill—might be—might be—we are exchanging compliments with the White House—might be. Members of the majority used stronger language than did I. So did Members of the other body—members of the President's own party.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In all seriousness, Mr. HOFFMAN——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am serious about it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think this bill is class legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a moment. That same provision is in the Federal statute governing the Army.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am reading now from your amended bill which you add to the present law today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And the gentleman is adding additional substantive sections in order to reach just one or two people whom he dislikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Two sections, not to reach certain individuals but to correct a situation, to plug a loophole.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Two sections that come from the law governing the Army. Would the gentleman repeal them so far as the Army is concerned?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why does not the gentleman want them to apply to the Navy?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let us be fair about it. Those amended sections the gentleman proposes in H. R. 4490 are intended solely for one or two people, most likely only for Winchell.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; there are other people besides Winchell in this world. The gentleman may not recognize any, but I know there are a lot more in this world than Winchell.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I know the gentleman claims to have a great knowledge of the set-up of the world.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not at all. I just happen to think that an officer who is not a gentleman has no place in the Navy. The gentleman takes the position that what is good for the Army is not good for the Navy.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; it is good for both.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why does not the gentleman support my bill?

Mr. DICKSTEIN Well, because it is cockeyed, it is ridiculous. The Navy Department seems to have been getting along very nicely without this specific statute and did not request it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, according to the gentleman's own statement the Army is governed by a statute that is cockeyed.

The amendment which I proposed was to take the words found in sections 1534, 1562 and 1567 of chapter 36 of title 10 United States Code which applies to the Army and add them to article 8 of chapter 21 of title 34 of United States Code, which covers the Navy.

The effect would be that officers of the Army and the Navy would all be governed by the same law which at present covers only the officers of the Army.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to complete my statement without further interruptions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman asked me to listen to what he had to say and I was helping him out. I will quit now, if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I may have invited him to listen to me but I did not invite him to use up all my time. Oh, the gentleman can stay but I should like to finish.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is very kind of the gentleman; that is almost as kind as Winchell.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That would not be so bad. I have seen men misquoted in the press and improperly criticized, and I have heard commentators make statements against certain Members of Congress some of which were true and some of which were false. Are we as a body going to take on the task to determine who is telling the truth and who is not telling the truth? Is that a subject to occupy the time of Congress, the highest legislative body of this country? I think we are pursuing the wrong policy, and I only pray to God that we come back to our senses and stop this nonsense about Winchell, Pearson, or anybody else.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. In other words, if anybody says anything against us that is not so, if we ignore it it dies of its own weight anyway, does it not?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct.

Remember the privilege of this floor gives a Member absolute immunity. On this floor a Member can make statements which, if made on the outside, would make him guilty of libel and subject him to damages that all the money in China could not pay.

Mr. RAMEY. Certainly; I agree with the gentleman in toto in that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. A Member on this floor, if he is so inclined, can malign anyone all he wants because the Constitution gives him immunity.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. That is not the question, although I agree with the gentleman in toto in that respect. I say we are wasting our time here in paying attention to statements like that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. RAMEY. It is silly.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RAMEY. If we simply ignored untrue statements made by Mr. Winchell, or anybody else, they would fall of their own weight. If they were true they would speak for themselves.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right; I agree with the gentleman 100 percent.

Mr. RAMEY. So, as far as he is concerned, let us quit abusing him and get down to business.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is right. As it is we are only advertising Jergens and I feel sure that every time a speech is made on this subject the sales of the lotion increase.

Mr. RAMEY. I have seen letters in which the writers asked us if Winchell and some of the Members of Congress were in league to sell this stuff.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think it is high time we stop wasting our time and energy on such idiotic things and get back to the serious problems confronting our Nation at present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That GEORGE W. ANDREWS, of the State of Alabama, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committees of the House of Representatives on World War Veterans' Legislation and on Roads.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, all of my life my home has been in the Tennessee Valley in north Alabama. From my earliest days I have known the Tennessee as a mighty river. I saw the start made toward harnessing the power in this great stream in 1918, when the great Wilson Dam was commenced as a war project. With all of the people of that area, I experienced the uncertainties as to what was to be done with the Wilson Dam, the powerhouse, and the nearby Government-owned properties built for the manufacture of nitrates. Rumors spread and hopes grew and collapsed time after time as varying attempts to dispose of the development were made during the period from the end of the First World War to 1933. Having lived there and having experienced all of the hopes and disappointments with the people of the Tennessee Valley, I believe I know something about the facts behind the present effort to hamstring T. V. A.

In 1933 there was one Government-owned dam on the Tennessee River—Wilson Dam, located at Muscle Shoals, in Alabama, in the district I have the honor to represent. Farther up the river, near Chattanooga, Tenn., Hales Bar Dam had been built by a private power company. Those two dams were the only river structures from the mouth of the river near Paducah, in Kentucky, to Knoxville, over 600 miles away. For all practical purposes the river was entirely uncontrolled. It was almost useless for navigation; it was little used for recreation; only a modest amount of electricity was generated at the two existing dams. The river was, in fact, a menace. We lived in fear of floods, and we watched in helpless apprehension every year as the muddy waters washed the fertility of our soil away to be lost in the sea.

That was in 1933. The river is changed today. In 1933 Congress determined that the Tennessee should be put to work for the people. Congress did more than that. It determined that in this one valley the river should not be developed alone but as one part of a bigger program. It provided that all the resources of nature—the water, the soil, and the minerals—should be seen as a whole, developed together by a single agency with a single purpose, to guarantee a richer life for the people and to assure a greater contribution to our national life from this region. The Congress created T. V. A. It was the first time in the history of this country; that such an experiment had been tried. Of course, rivers had been developed by the Federal Government for generations. Hundreds of millions of dollars had been spent for navigation and for flood control. Vast sums had been appropriated for national programs of soil conservation. The novel thing about the T. V. A. was that in this river valley a single agency, the T. V. A., was directed to see as one job the separate tasks of developing all the resources with which nature had richly endowed this region, to face the problem as a whole.

Of course, a new kind of statute had to be created, a new type of administration set up, to do a new kind of job. Congress deliberately wrote a statute to meet the situation. I was not a Member of the Congress when the original act creating T. V. A. was adopted, but I have seen how it has worked, and I want to say that I think that act could stand as a model of statutes that promote efficient administration. Congress gave the Board of T. V. A. authority to equal its responsibilities. It set out broad policies clearly and specifically, but gave the Board of T. V. A. freedom to determine how those policies should be carried out in the day-by-day decisions. The best principles of modern business management were adapted to an enterprise of government. The act cut out red tape. It provided for a decentralized administration, with decisions made away from Washington close to the people those decisions would affect. I want to report how that experiment, begun in 1933, has worked out, whether the program approved by Congress has been accomplished, whether the freedom and flexibility Congress gave the Board of T. V. A. has been abused or used effectively.

It seems to me that the best test to apply to the T. V. A. and the way it has worked for more than 10 years now is whether or not it has satisfactorily done the job it was set up to do. To get the answer we should examine the record it has made and inquire of the people among whom its work has been done.

This is what has happened in a decade. Instead of two dams, there are today eight great concrete barriers across the Tennessee, which put the river's force at work for the people, and the last and greatest of the main river dams, Kentucky, near Paducah, will be finished before the year is ended. These new dams have been built by T. V. A., not under contract, but built by men working for their Government. Hales Bar Dam has been acquired by purchase and is now a part of the T. V. A. system. On the tributaries six giant dams have been completed, and the highest of all, Fontana, in North Carolina, will be in service this year. A great steam plant has been built at Watts Bar. All this has been done in a decade, the greatest engineering job the world has ever seen. There is no other river in the world so fully controlled today; no other river anywhere contributes so fully to the welfare of the people it used to threaten and impoverish.

We have no fear of general floods any more, and only a few local protective works, near Chattanooga especially, will be required to make every town and city and every farm in the valley safe. We have a river highway now, safe for service all year around. Instead of a few short hauls of sand and gravel, grain comes down from the Midwest, Army jeeps and ambulances from Michigan. Last year jeeps and trucks and weapon carriers, pig iron, limestone, machinery, coal, and petroleum products moved on the river. During 1943 there were 224,290,264 ton-miles of such commerce, an increase of 330 percent over that moved during 1939. We have four new modern public-use

terminals in operation. And at Decatur, in my district, there are two shipbuilding works today where cotton used to grow—busy building oceangoing cargo ships, fuel-carrying barges, and invasion boats.

In the last fiscal year over 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours was generated at all T. V. A. plants, and almost 90 percent came from the river itself. About 75 percent of T. V. A. power goes into war production now, making explosives, aluminum for bombers, phosphorus for smoke screens or for fertilizer to increase war-food production, calcium carbide for synthetic rubber, chemicals for war uses. Power from the river is lighting our homes, running the farmers' pumps and saws, lighting the streets of town and village, turning the wheels of industry.

Even with this great war load the people have more electricity today than they did 10 years ago, and they are paying less than they used to. Over 5,000 miles of transmission lines carry the power from T. V. A. plants where it is generated to the municipalities and farm cooperatives who distribute it to their consumers over systems locally owned and managed. In 1933 consumers in this area used less electricity in their homes and on the farms than the average for the Nation. Now they use more than the average. Last year the average residential consumer in the Nation as a whole used 1,044 kilowatt-hours, while the average consumption in the T. V. A. area was 1,598 kilowatt-hours. And, the average residential bill for the year was from $31 to $35 in the T. V. A. area, $7 less than the average bill in the Nation. If T. V. A. customers had paid at the rates they paid in 1933, their total bill would have been more than $10,000,000 greater than it was. There was that much saving to consumers.

In 1933 only one farm in 25 had electric service in my State. Now in the counties in my district, all served by T. V. A., one out of every three is electrified. That means more than comfort, it means relief from back-breaking toil. It means that we can change our agricultural habits. We are introducing livestock on the farms of north Alabama. We are going into dairying. Five new cheese factories in north Alabama tell the story.

Of course, it took more than cheap electricity to make this change. I pointed out in the beginning of my remarks that in this region the resource-development program entrusted to T. V. A. was a total program. The water and land were to be developed together. At its plant in Muscle Shoals T. V. A. has been producing highly concentrated prosphatic fertilizer, and for several years it has been demonstrating, in cooperation with the land-grant colleges of 29 States, and on more than 40,000 farms, how that fertilizer could be used in a type of agriculture which will raise the farmers' income and increase food production without any additional manpower or any more machinery.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a Representative of a district in the T. V. A. section also, I want to pay a very high compliment to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for his very factual and intelligent statement of the great benefits that the Nation has derived from the T. V. A. program. I hope some time during the gentleman's address he will dwell on the many and the substantial ways in which the T. V. A. program benefits not only the people of the Tennessee Valley but people in every other region of the United States. I have heard the gentleman discuss that aspect of the subject one-time before when he showed that generators and other things that we are now able to buy in the valley are manufactured and developed elsewhere. I hope the gentleman will touch on that some time during his remarks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Of course, the gentleman, like myself, has lived in the Tennessee Valley and he knows from first hand the experience and the results that have been worked there. I was just calling attention to the wide spread of this program with reference to the agricultural phase of it, showing that it is not confined to the T. V. A. area but is carried on in 29 different States of the Union on 40,000 different demonstration farms.

The results of that program have been astonishing. Production of war-scarce foods—eggs and meat and dairy products—has increased by an average of 30 percent on these test-demonstration farms, and on the same land. And at the same time the fertility of the soil has been increased. The results of this program may prove to be T. V. A.'s greatest contribution to the permanent well-being of our Nation.

Every one of T. V. A.'s achievements is a contribution to the Nation. It should be. T. V. A. was not created for our local benefit alone. It was a national project, and it is a national program. The Nation as a whole will benefit as this region grows stronger and more prosperous. The soil of every State will be richer as a result of the T. V. A. fertilizer program. The experiments tried out here will benefit every State and every region. Public and private enterprise alike will profit. And at the same time income from power sales will pay back the debt owed by the power consumers of the Tennessee Valley to the people of the United States.

Congress intended this system to be self-supporting. It directed the Board of T. V. A. to establish rates that would insure wide use, but which would at the same time provide a surplus to return to the taxpayers whose money had been invested in power-producing facilities. Section 26 of the T. V. A. Act provided that after paying all power expenses, the costs of maintenance and operation of the system, and after paying certain other costs, the receipts remaining should be paid into the Treasury of the United States. And already power consumers of this system are repaying the investment. Last year after paying all power-production expenses, all the costs of maintenance and operation, after making payments to States and counties in lieu of taxes, after depreciation, a net income of more than $13,000,000 remained, used by T. V. A. pursuant to congressional authorization to carry out its program.

In all fairness, I submit, the T. V. A. has met the test—it has done a good job under the basic legislation provided in the original T. V. A. Act of 1933. The record shows that to be true.

Now, let us inquire of the people among whom it has worked as to what they think of it. There has recently been a demonstration of what the people of the Tennessee Valley think of T. V. A.

In the other body recently an amendment, a legislative rider to an appropriation bill, was adopted which would repeal section 26, and would require the T. V. A. to put its receipts currently into the general funds of the Treasury, depending upon annual appropriations for money to operate and maintain its system.

I think the demonstration that has been given by the people served by the T. V. A. is the finest tribute that could be paid to the T. V. A. for its honest, competent, and efficient management. Even though the conflict so far has been at the other end of the Capitol, I have received, and I know that many other Members of the House have received, hundreds of letters, telegrams, telephone calls, communications of every kind, resolutions from civic clubs, chambers of commerce, and various other groups protesting against the hamstringing amendment that proposes to repeal section 26 of the basic T. V. A. Act.

The power boards that have control of the distribution systems throughout the T. V. A. area are unanimous in their opposition to this amendment. In this connection I may mention that a great many of these power boards or their managers are made up of former private power-company officials. They understand well the practical effect of this proposed amendment on power operations.

The feeling of the people of the T. V. A. area is well expressed, I think, in a telegram that was recently sent to every Member of the Senate signed by the officials of cities and counties served by T. V. A. in Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a copy of an editorial from the Chattanooga Times, dated March 14, dealing with this particular telegram.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The editorial is as follows:

ALABAMA ACTS

When United States Senators went to their desks yesterday they found a telegram signed by a representative citizen from every county in Alabama served by the T. V. A.

That telegram is as follows:

"Our Alabama Senators BANKHEAD and HILL are fighting against political wrecking of T. V. A. Please support our Senators and the people of Alabama by voting against the McKellar amendments to the appropriations bill. We in Alabama are just like the people in your home State who ask that you defend them against that which is unjust. We know

T. V. A. is operated to benefit the people because we live with it every day. Help us to build our future by defending our rights to that future."

The telegram was signed by T. R. Harrison, mayor, Decatur, Morgan County; R. H. Richardson, Jr., mayor, Athens, Limestone County; Isaac Johnson, judge of probate, Lawrence County; State Senator John Benson, Scottsboro, Jackson County; A. W. McAllister, mayor, Huntsville, Madison County; Dr. E. H. Couch, mayor, Guntersville, Marshall County; Dr. J. A. Keller, president, Florence State Teachers College, Lauderdale County; Andrew Johnson, judge of probate, Fort Payne, De Kalb County; J. L. Andrews, Sheffield, Colbert County; A. A. Griffith, circuit judge, Cullman, Cullman County; Edgar Underwood, judge of probate, Russellville, Franklin County; State Senator Lem Cobb, Center, Cherokee County; Julian Harris, circuit judge, Decatur, Morgan County; Jap Bryant, mayor, Bessemer, Jefferson County; A. N. Cameron, mayor, Tarrant City, Jefferson County.

Decatur took the lead in this action, and it was Decatur which led the Alabama opposition to Senator MCKELLAR'S previous attacks.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much what the gentleman has said about the attitude of the people who live with the T. V. A. In connection with his statement that many telegrams and communications and resolutions have been sent to Members of Congress, I thought the gentleman might be interested in knowing that I made a tabulation a few days ago, and at that time there were far more than 100 different organizations, ranging from chambers of commerce up and down through all of the various categories of organizations, who had adopted resolutions opposing this amendment that was added to the appropriation bill in the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman. I think I have never seen a more unanimous uprising in regard to legislation than has happened in this present case.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is, of course, familiar with a great many of the resolutions and actions taken by our cities, municipal groups, and power boards in Tennessee as well as in Alabama. I think practically every municipality, city, and power board in Tennessee has passed a resolution condemning this amendment. Practically every newspaper—certainly every daily newspaper that I know of—has had very strong and bitter editorials in condemnation of the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was going to make some comment on that a little later.

In last Sunday's Huntsville Times an editorial had this to say regarding the T. V. A.:

The T. V. A. is the greatest single instrumentality for the growth, progress, and advancement of the Tennessee Valley.

The past decade has given ample proof of this fact.

But for the T. V. A., our farms would have been much poorer, and less fertile.

But for the T. V. A., scores of industries, large and small, would not have been established in the Tennessee Valley.

But for the T. V. A., the Huntsville and Redstone arsenals could not have been built here, for there would not have been power to supply them.

But for the T. V. A., the enormous Reynolds aluminum plant and the huge electrometallurgical plant at the Tri-Cities would not have been built.

There are numerous other, and smaller, plants and factories that owe their construction to the cheap power and river transportation benefits that the T. V. A. has afforded.

All of these have come in a decade, in the midst of the harnessing of the Tennessee River. That process soon will be completed, and a further tremendous supply of electric energy will be available for the industrialization of the valley, after this war is over and the pursuits of peace can be resumed.

But large consumers of electricity, who were enabled to lower their production costs, and at the same time to give employment to great numbers of men and women, have not been the only beneficiaries of the T. V. A.

Every home in city or village, most farms, every store, every mill—all of these have shared in the rich reductions in power rates. These have ranged from 20 to 40 percent.

At the same time, cities and rural cooperatives in the T. V. A. domain are well on the way toward paying for their own plants, and in a few years will be able to own them outright, when they can further reduce rates, or perhaps use surplus revenues to bear current expenses, or provide other benefits for the people of this valley.

Best of all, the reduced rates already have permitted all to share in all the conveniences and advantages of this electrical age.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I want to express my appreciation of the gentleman's bringing to the House the information about the tremendous good to the Nation that has come from the T. V. A. In connection with the thought expressed a few moments ago as to the tremendous benefits the other parts of the Nation have received from this organization, I wish to call to his attention the fact that perhaps the Tennessee Valley Authority had a lot to do with the development of the tremendous bauxite fields in Arkansas. Through the power received from the Tennessee Valley we have established aluminum plants in that area and brought from our section into the war effort the largest supply of bauxite in the United States. Of course, in that manner the entire Nation has reaped untold benefits therefrom.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman is correct. I would like to spend a good deal of time discussing what the T. V. A. has done along the very line the gentleman has suggested, but that would take considerable time and I want to hurry on and finish my statement.

Recently there appeared in the Huntsville (Ala.) Times an editorial entitled "McKellar Fights Alone." I shall ask unanimous consent to include this editorial in my remarks. The purpose, however, in calling attention to it is to show how truthful it is to say that the author of the proposed amendment stands alone in our section. His hometown papers have editorialized very strongly against his action. In fact, practically every paper in Tennessee has done likewise. I have not seen a single Tennessee paper that did not oppose him in this matter. I have heard that there is one but I have not been able to find out what paper it is. Powerful political figures who have been his stalwart supporters in the past have differed with him on this matter. Every Member of the House Delegation—both Democratic and Republican—and the other Member of the Senate from Tennessee likewise take a different view. So far as Tennessee is concerned he certainly stands alone.

So far as Alabama is concerned, I know of no one living in that area served by the T. V. A. who is not opposed to this amendment and to this effort to put T. V. A. and our whole region in a strait jacket. In fact, the support of the T. V. A. in this matter is not limited to the area served by the T. V. A. Practically every paper in the State of Alabama has had strong editorials advocating the continuance of T. V. A. under the basic law. This is true of other States. In fact, I have here several hundred editorials taken from papers all over the United States, all of them urging the defeat of this proposed legislation.

This widespread support of T. V. A. is quite understandable. Many people who opposed T. V. A. originally or who questioned it have now accepted it as a reality and have come to support it because of the results that it has produced.

One thing that puzzles me, and I know must puzzle a great many people, is why this amendment would be proposed at this particular time when T. V. A.'s success is most apparent. Not only has it met every challenge for war production and for doing a good job throughout the entire Tennessee Valley, but it has so well conducted its business that for 2 years straight it has had to ask for no direct appropriations from Congress. Under the authority of section 26 in the original act its use of power revenues plus the unexpended balances carried over from the preceding year T. V. A. has made it unnecessary to ask for direct appropriations even during a period of active construction. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent without ever one charge or, so far as I know, a single suspicion of any mishandling of funds.

In his original message to Congress asking for the establishment of a Tennessee Valley Authority, President Roosevelt in 1933 said that it ought to be "a corporation clothed with the power of government, but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise." Other Government corporations have been given similar flexibility and no effort has been made to take it away from them. T. V. A. alone is marked. The effect of the pending amendment would be to destroy the flexibility and the initiative with which the corporation has been clothed.

A great many people see in this move an effort to "get" Dave Lilienthal, the Chairman of the T. V. A. Board. I know Mr. Lilienthal quite well. I have not agreed with him on everything that he

has done. I have argued with him many times and have failed many times to carry my point, but I want to say that I have found him always to be not only competent, but honest and conscientious in the discharge of his duties.

In the debate on the other side of the Capitol when this amendment was pending an effort was made to quote Senator Norris as charging Mr. Lilienthal with dishonesty. It is interesting to note, however, that in the quotation of Senator Norris a simple sentence was lifted from its context and a succeeding sentence was completely omitted. This matter was fully discussed in an editorial from the Chattanooga Times a few days ago. I am asking unanimous consent to insert this editorial.

The citizens of my district do not want the management of T. V. A. removed to Washington. They want the record kept straight. When they pay their bills, they want to know, and they want their fellow citizens in other parts of the country to know that this is a self-supporting system, that they are paying all the expenses of operation and maintenance, that they are paying the in-lieu tax payments authorized by law, that they are providing for depreciation, and that they are repaying the investment made by the taxpayers of the United States in all the power-production facilities. They are rising to the defense of the system of financing laid down in the act.

I think they are right. I stand with my constituents in demanding that this move to remote control should be abandoned. They agree, I know, that Congress should always demand full accountability from this and every other agency. Congress should always establish policies. But they know that the management of T. V. A. has always held itself accountable, that every transaction is fully reported. They know that the operation is efficient and it is honest.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind this House that the final accountability of any agency is to the people it serves. On that score no Federal agency has a better record. T. V. A. has the confidence of the people. The people whom I represent cannot speak in the well of the House. I bring their judgment to you today.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the basic law provides, and the administration of it provides, that repayment to the Government shall be made so that this great investment shall ultimately be returned to the Public Treasury?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is being done. It provides that they shall set their power rates so as to pay all of the costs of operation. Then it provides that they shall turn their revenues back into the operation. Eventually it will be repaid.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to have that confirmed, for I thought it was true and that the outlay by the Government was a sound investment even from a financial standpoint.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, some of the editorials to which I have referred are as follows:

[From the Huntsville (Ala.) Times of March 15, 1944]

M'KELLAR FIGHTS ALONE

Senator K. D. McKELLAR of Tennessee seems in a fair way to "tear his britches" by reason of his bitter, unrelenting assault upon the T. V. A. and its board of directors.

Edward H. Crump, boss of the political machine that has let McKELLAR stay in the Senate all these years, has served public notice that he will back maintenance of the T. V. A. on its present basis against Senator McKELLAR.

The Tennessee delegation in the House, 10 Members, is also for maintaining the T. V. A. as it is, while Senator STEWART, who came very nearly taking a licking at his last election, on the T. V. A. issue, has indicated that he may part with his colleague this time, in the latter's effort to hamstring the T. V. A. board of directors.

Senators HILL and BANKHEAD of Alabama have sung out that they will fight the McKellar amendments with all their power when they come to the floor of the Senate.

The senior Tennessee Senator now seems to be obsessed with the idea that he is the owner, bag and baggage, of the T. V. A. For instance, in a statement in Washington yesterday, he said, in part:

"I have devoted the best years of my life, and the best abilities of which I am capable, to the building of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I was fighting vigorously for the Tennessee River dams when Lilienthal was a boy in school. I am just as strong for it as I ever was. I got most of those dams built."

The fact is that Senator Norris was the "father of the T. V. A.", and fought most of its early battles. In the House, LISTER HILL, as the member of the Military Affairs Committee from Alabama, was the joint author of the T. V. A. bill.

While Senator McKELLAR caught the bandwagon early, his services for the T. V. A. have never been sufficient to justify naming even one of the dozen or more dams in his honor, although the effort to so honor him has often been made.

AN OUTSIDE VIEW

Arkansas doesn't figure heavily in T. V. A. territory, but the absurd attacks of Senator McKELLAR upon the Tennessee Valley Authority appear ridiculous to the Arkansas Democrat, published at Little Rock.

In hard-punching language the Democrat says this concerning the latest move of Senator McKELLAR to slap T. V. A. into the palm of his political hand:

"As grandpa used to say, 'Come hell'er high water,' Tennessee's Senator McKELLAR is determined to drag the Tennessee Valley Authority into politics. He has been licked a couple of times but he's 'still in there pitching,' though even his old pal, Brother Crump, overlord of west Tennessee politics, is against him.

"McKELLAR wants T. V. A.'s power taken away from it by requiring that all of its income be deposited in the United States Treasury and all its funds to be voted to it by Congress.

"Parliamentary devices are the Senator's chief weapon. He has made his proposal a rider on the vital independent offices appropriation bill. He tried that once before and got it by the Senate but the House took the very sensible view that such tactics were 'poison' to good government and blocked his move.

"When it was written into the laws establishing the T. V. A. that it should have autonomy over its conduct of its business, the purpose was to keep it out of politics. The people in the valley protested loudly when Senator McKELLAR tried his first trick and still are protesting against his last effort. They know what a fat patronage trough T. V. A. could be made.

"Liberal newspapers in Tennessee, like the Nashville Tennesseean, the Knoxville News-Sentinel, and the Chattanooga Times have so declared themselves. Says the News-Sentinel: 'Senator McKELLAR wants to rule or ruin T. V. A.—It looks as if the people of the valley again will have to petition Congress by every means possible to save T. V. A. from the clutches of the politicians.'

"And, from our nickel seats on the outside, the Senator's sorry efforts to rule or ruin the Authority, also look pretty sour. Apparently it's another instance where the people must practice eternal vigilance or be gypped."

This language is characteristic of the newspapers throughout the South where T. V. A. is known for excellent execution of the law under which it was created by a far-seeing Congress.

NOT A STATE PROJECT

Because the central station of T. V. A. is in Tennessee, Senator McKELLAR has assumed that legislators from that State ought to direct its activities and furnish most of its officials, or else—

Congressman WEAVER declares that T. V. A. is a national blessing, not a preserve for Tennessee. It took North Carolina a long time to convert Tennesseans to the importance of making the Great Smokies a national park, and then they wanted the big voice in its management. When Senator McKELLAR's amendments threatened defeat of the construction of the French Broad and Asheville watershed, Congressman WEAVER said: "Hold! Enough!" of tampering with the use of T. V. A. for other States than Tennessee. The North Carolina Senators will doubtless join WEAVER in stopping the legislation proposed to hamstring the T. V. A.

The country owes a great debt to McKELLAR and George Norris for preventing the gift of Muscle Shoals to private ownership and exploitation. The Tennessean ought not to do anything to contract its wide usefulness. Boss Crump, of Memphis, is not in sympathy with McKELLAR's latest move, which WEAVER is determined to checkmate. Crump is one boss who has always stood firmly against the grabs of utility companies. He is still fighting that all the people may enjoy cheap light and power, which T. V. A. has advanced.—Raleigh News and Observer.

[From the Chattanooga Times of March 21, 1944]

MISQUOTING NORRIS

Senator McKELLAR will doubtless check more carefully hereafter on his sources of information.

In attempting to show that Senator George Norris once regarded Chairman Lilienthal, of T. V. A., as "a deceitful falsifier," Senator McKELLAR last Thursday read a quotation from a speech made by Senator Norris in 1938. Immediately after Senator McKELLAR had quoted that speech of Senator Norris, Senator HILL, of Alabama, arose to read a telegram which he had just received from Senator Norris in which the veteran Nebraskan praised Lilienthal.

The Times has stated that Mr. Lilienthal is not the issue, but that continued efficient and nonpolitical operation of T. V. A. is the issue. However, a correspondent of the Nashville Tennesseean had dug back into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to resurrect that speech by Senator Norris which Mr. McKELLAR quoted, and with astonishing results.

In that speech of 1938 Senator Norris was actually defending Mr. Lilienthal against attacks by Dr. Arthur Morgan, former T. V. A.

Chairman, in connection with Senator George Berry's famous case against T. V. A. growing out of the flooding of marble lands.

Here is what Mr. McKELLAR read in the Senate last Thursday as being the words of Senator Norris concerning Mr. Lilienthal:

"People generally have an idea that when these marble claimants and Mr. Lilienthal and the other Morgan were about to rob the Government of millions of dollars, Dr. Morgan stepped in and called a halt and saved the day."

But the correspondent of the Tennesseean says that Mr. McKELLAR failed to quote the very next utterance by Senator Norris, which was, "He did not do anything of the kind."

Nor did Senator McKELLAR go on with the quotation. If he had done so he would have disproved his own point, for Senator Norris continued:

"I suppose he (Dr. A. E. Morgan) was suspicious. I think he has reached such a stage in his mentality that if he saw Lilienthal going to church he would charge him with being treasonable, because he would say: 'He is trying to fool God Almighty.'"

What probably happened was that this quotation was furnished Senator McKELLAR by some of his office staff, and that he was not given the full quotation. He would hardly have quoted Norris wrongly as attacking Lilienthal if he had known that the words he was quoting were actually said in defense of Mr. Lilienthal.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald of March 15, 1944]

THE T. V. A. UNDER FIRE

Senator McKELLAR, of Tennessee, is back in his familiar role of trying to hamstring the Tennessee Valley Authority. Previously he has met defeat in all his efforts, but this time, due to a stronger reactionary Senate sentiment, there is a danger that he may succeed in getting through legislation that will hamper the work of the T. V. A.

The T. V. A. was scrutinized by the House Appropriations Committee and was given a clean bill of health. The committee praised the T. V. A. for its contribution to the war effort. Its methods of handling its finances were approved.

But despite the unbiased congressional approval of the Work of the T. V. A., Senator McKELLAR is seeking in the Senate legislation regarded by friends of the T. V. A. as "the greatest danger T. V. A. has ever faced." He would require the T. V. A. to turn over its power revenues to the Federal Treasury and to come to Congress each year for funds. Since T. V. A. makes complete annual financial reports and its books are at all times subject to independent audit by Treasury representatives, the McKellar legislation can have no result but to put the T. V. A. into politics.

Both Alabama Senators are opposed to McKELLAR's amendments. Former Senator Norris, author of the T. V. A. Act, is against it. Most of Tennessee's Congressmen oppose it. It would be a mistake and a tragedy—if personal spite against any officials of the T. V. A. should be permitted to interfere with its work.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal]

SENATOR M'KELLAR VERSUS THE TENNESSEE VALLEY

Senator KENNETH McKELLAR, of Tennessee, is already on the defensive in his feud with the Tennessee Valley Authority. This may allay the apprehensions of the Knoxville News-Sentinel lest Congress in its present temper adopt his amendments to the appropriation bill which would give Congress control of T. V. A. fiscal policies and the Senators control of its personnel. Representative WEAVER, of North Carolina, who sees flood control on the French Broad threatened by one of the amendments, is confident of its defeat.

But Senator McKELLAR defends his motives without explaining them. He wires a Chattanooga paper that Chairman Lilienthal is circulating falsehoods against him. "Surely," he pleads, "no one in Tennessee believes I am trying to obtain patronage." If the paper he addressed is the Chattanooga Times, it believes he is. Just a week ago today the Times said: "Reviving his bill to force T. V. A. to * * * go to Congress for appropriations, Senator McKELLAR yesterday admitted that his long-fought plan is political. * * * If he succeeds, the people who have honored Mr. McKELLAR by sending him to the United States Senate would be the sufferers." The Nashville Tennesseean refers to Senator McKELLAR's motive as "for his own personal political reasons." The Knoxville News-Sentinel says, "He wants to make T. V. A. beholden to himself and other politicians. * * * He wants to rule or ruin T. V. A. Even the chambers of commerce of Knoxville and Chattanooga have actively opposed Senator McKELLAR's scheme." In Huntsville, Ala., a valley town, the Times describes the Senator as "unfortunately the type of public man who thinks in terms of patronage. T. V. A. represents a fat turkey if he can get his hands on it and turn the screws on the chairman." As acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Huntsville Times foresees, he would be in a position to harry T. V. A. if his amendments passed.

It seems to be the Tennessee Valley press and chambers of commerce with which Senator McKELLAR has a crow to pick. Chairman Lilienthal's contribution to the Senator's discomfiture was the revelation that the Middle West Corporation, of Chicago, successor to the Insulls' Middle West Utilities, is conducting a propaganda campaign against T. V. A. while he attacks it in the Senate. The coincidence of at least a common cause was instantly noted by the press. The Tennesseean, which verified Mr. Lilienthal's statement at the Chicago offices of the company, expects "we shall have the utilities quoting McKELLAR as proof of T. V. A. mismanagement and McKELLAR in turn requoting the proof as synthesized by the utilities."

[From the Atlanta Journal of March 26, 1944]

T. V. A. IMPERILED

Just as 2 years ago, the Nation must look to the House to defeat Senator McKELLAR'S attempt to destroy the financial autonomy of the Tennessee Valley Authority and turn it into a hog-wallow of political patronage. The Senate on Friday accepted two of Mr. McKELLAR'S amendments to the independent appropriations bill, which would permissively make possible such perversion of the great national enterprise that has functioned with notable success for 11 years.

However, there still is hope that the House will put back the bars which the Senate has let down. It did so in 1942 when the Senate, in the same reprehensible manner of tying legislative amendments onto a vital appropriation bill, had fallen in with McKELLAR'S plan for political domination of the T. V. A. The House struck out the devious amendments, and refused in committee to recede from its forthright stand.

The debate preceding the Senate vote was an illuminating discussion of T. V. A. and the success with which it has been operated for the common good of the Nation. No abler speeches have been heard in the Chamber in years than those by Senators HILL and BANKHEAD, of Alabama, and BARKLEY, of Kentucky, who pleaded with their colleagues to respect the integrity of T. V. A. and keep meddling and obstructive hands off an enterprise which has become under efficient, honest, and wise administration one of the country's greatest assets. Against their pleas appeared only the rambling, self-contradictory, shouting of Senator McKELLAR, obsessed by a personal hatred for David Lilienthal, one of T. V. A.'s directors.

When Senator McKELLAR had finished his 2-hour harangue, Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, made a brief speech in which he stated the issue in these clear words:

"In the Tennessee Valley Authority experiment we have attempted for the first time in any great river valley in the world to develop all of its natural resources, to conserve them and, insofar as possible, to restore them in order that they may be maintained for the oncoming generations, in such magnitude and plentitude that they may afford a sound and adequate basis for a continued civilization of this Nation. It seems tragic to me, after this experiment has gone through its initial stages of development and has attained its great success, that it should now be subjected to amendment which inevitably would cripple and greatly impair the operations of the enterprise.

"It seems passing strange to me that support for these amendments should come in many instances from those who are often critical of the lack of business priniciple and practice in governmental operations.

"And yet these proposals, taken as a whole, will have the effect of preventing this gigantic enterprise, in which more than $750,000,000 of the taxpayers' money has been invested, from operating on sound business principles—principles and practices which are followed by every corporation in the United States that is properly and prudently managed."

The unanswerable arguments of BARKLEY, HILL, BANKHEAD, LA FOLLETTE, and BONE, of Washington, went unheeded by the Senate. A majority followed the lead of the embittered Tennessean who sits in seats of power on the Appropriations and Post Office Committees and who boasts that he never forgives an enemy nor forgets a friend.

So we must rely on the House to defeat this attempt to hamstring if not destroy T. V. A. and make it a helpless victim of the spoils system operating through the device of senatorial courtesy. We regret that our two Georgia Senators voted for the McKELLAR amendments and hope that our delegation in the House will oppose them as dangerous and probably disastrous to one of the greatest assets of the South and of the Nation.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News]

M'KELLAR AT IT AGAIN

There's one thing about Tennessee's Senator KENNETH D. McKELLAR. He never quits trying. It has been his boast for many years that he never forgets a friend nor forgives a foe. To the eulogy of himself he should add that he never forsakes a fight he has started.

The Senator has renewed his battle to get control of the Tennessee Valley Authority despite the many lickings he already has taken. He wants T. V. A.'s autonomy taken away from it by requiring that all its income be deposited in the Treasury and all its funds to be voted to it by Congress. Liberal newspapers in Tennessee, such as the Nashville Tennesseean, the Knoxville News-Sentinel, and the Chattanooga Times, have fought his move, saying boldly that it is a scheme by which the senior Senator (acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee) wants to turn the T. V. A. into a patronage trough.

As he has previously done, the Senator seeks to accomplish his purpose by devious parliamentary device. He has made it a rider on the vital independent offices appropriation bill. Two years ago he tried that stunt and got it through the Senate, but the House rejected it, moved probably by the storm of protest that arose throughout the Tennessee Valley. Whatever the influence, the House took the sound and forthright position that Senator McKELLAR'S amendment constituted

legislation attached to an appropriation bill, something anathema to good government.

The proviso giving T. V. A. autonomy over its conduct of its business was written deliberately into the laws which established it 11 years ago. It was done to give the agency the flexible and responsible management which private industry enjoys. But the Knoxville News-Sentinel says: "Senator McKELLAR wants to rule or ruin T. V. A. * * * It looks as if the people of the Valley again will have to petition Congress by every means possible to save T. V. A. from the clutches of the politicians."

The renewal of the McKELLAR effort comes at a time when opportunity for a great industrial expansion lies before the Tennessee Valley. It will be well to maintain ceaseless vigilance against the attempts to make T. V. A. a patronage hog trough. It is a priceless asset which can easily be destroyed by spoils rule.

[From the Asheville Citizen]

SENATORIAL UNWISDOM

Yesterday's action by the Senate stripping T. V. A. of its financial autonomy may have far-reaching consequences. In effect it alters the basic concept of the Authority—a corporation clothed with the power of government but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise. It alters fundamentally the laws of Congress under which T. V. A. has been operating successfully, and without valid question of honesty and efficiency, for the past 11 years.

It is regrettable that the Senate should have taken such a step on the slim evidence, or rather the total lack of evidence, which was presented by the sponsor of this move—Senator McKELLAR. A reading of the debate reveals no substantial argument against T. V. A. save the personal animus of Senator McKELLAR for David Lilienthal, chairman of the T. V. A. Board. The Senator from Tennessee has been out to nail Mr. Lilienthal for years. If, in the process, he has nailed T. V. A. also, the country will be the loser for the unwisdom of the Senate majority in blindly following his questionable lead.

[From the Paducah Sun-Democrat]

THE T. V. A. RECORD DOESN'T DESERVE THIS BLOW

The Tennessee Valley Authority has made a splendid record because it has been operated as a nonpolitical agency for the benefit of the people of the Tennessee Valley.

That record does not deserve the blow which would be struck at it by the legislation sponsored at Washington by Senator McKELLAR and approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Senator McKELLAR once was a great backer of the T. V. A. Then he ran into trouble in getting his way with the agency on everything he wanted. So he has been sniping at it ever since in the Senate, seeking to place its operations under the control of the committee of which he is chairman. That would give him effective control of the T. V. A. and, presumably, the patronage that he wants.

The trouble with his proposal is summed up in the following statement by the T. V. A. board of directors: "The senatorial confirmation proposal to restaff the T. V. A. organization of technicians and managers with those who are measured on the basis of the acceptability of the political beliefs and party affiliations would, in effect, destroy the T. V. A. system of appointment on merit."

As an example of what McKELLAR would do, under his legislation the T. V. A. directors would be prohibited from issuing statements on legislative matters. This means that they could not point out the dangers in what McKELLAR is trying to do to them. In other words, he wants to control them and fix them so they can't even complain about it.

What is proposed is not good for the T. V. A., and so is not good for the valley or the country. We hope that Senator McKELLAR will not find a warm reception in Congress for his political planning.

[From The Detroit News of March 18, 1944]

T. V. A. MENACED

In this political year, as Congress seethes with partisan and factional dissensions, the effort to subject the Tennessee Valley Authority to political domination is menacingly renewed. Dispositions made of proposals affecting T. V. A. will bear watching.

Senator McKELLAR nearly succeeded 2 years ago in having every T. V. A. jobholder—several hundred in all—who is paid $4,500 a year or more, made subject to confirmation by the Senate. He is trying to do it again. They work in Tennessee, his State. It would mean turning over a big pay roll to the political machine run in Tennessee by Boss Ed Crump

An accompanying proposal is that T. V. A.'s receipts from sale of electric power, now large because of heavy consumption by war industries, be turned in to the Treasury. The management and operation would then be dependent in every detail on appropriations by Congress. This would give McKELLAR a strangle hold on the enormous enterprise. He ranks next to Chairman CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, in the Democratic membership of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Because of age and poor health, GLASS is inactive.

In the light of the war needs for speedy and huge expansion of the country's industrial facilities, it seems that the hand of Providence accounts for the strides during the years just before the war in harnessing the Tennessee River and its tributaries. The huge resulting enterprise, thus far kept independent, on the whole has been well managed. If made subject to political control, Democratic or Republican, its efficient operation in the public interest could not be expected.

The chief congressional creators and former protectors of T. V. A. are no longer in the Senate—George Norris, of Nebraska, now retired, and the late Charles L. McNary, of Oregon. The newer forces in Congress, particularly in the increased Republican membership, should show progressive and public-minded interest. The table seems set for a feast on political spoils.

This is not a brief for T. V. A. as a New Deal enterprise. It should be considered alone as a good work, begun in President Roosevelt's first administration, which has withstood many assaults and which has been justified for continuance no matter which party rules at Washington.

[From the Washington Post of March 18, 1944]

BAITING THE T. V. A.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator McKELLAR has ample opportunity to indulge his favorite sport of baiting the T. V. A. Once more he has tried to shackle the activities of that agency by attaching various invidious riders to the independent offices bill. At present the T. V. A. has a revolving fund consisting chiefly of receipts from sales of power. Under an amendment to the independent offices bill it would be required to turn all its receipts into the Treasury's general fund and obtain direct appropriations from Congress to meet its current expenses. In addition, T. V. A. would be prohibited, among other things, from undertaking numerous activities such as buying land, constructing buildings, steam plants, or dams without specific congressional authorization. The auditing of its accounts by any nongovernmental agency would likewise be forbidden. The effect of these multiple restrictions would be to deprive T. V. A. officials of all discretionary power, and substitute bureaucratic rigidity for the managerial flexibility that is so necessary to the successful conduct of a business enterprise.

It is most unfortunate that a legislator obviou y so prejudiced as Senator McKELLAR should be in a position to heckle the T. V. A. and other independent Federal agencies. For the consequence of his known bias is to discredit the attempts of dispassionate legislative critics to deal with the problems and abuses resulting from the emergence of a multitude of Federal agencies rightly dubbed "independent." Certainly the T. V. A. does not deserve to be singled out invidiously by advocates of stricter control, for it has stood up well under searching scrutiny. Congress is under an obligation, however, to look into the activities of the multitude of agencies that have sprung up in recent years. It ought to know much more about the precise nature and the limits of their activities and establish firmer controls over their accounting practices and the auditing of accounts.

As a matter of fact, the T. V. A. submits to a commercial audit as well as an audit by the General Accounting Office, whereas countless other Federal agencies that spend and lend billions of dollars of public funds escape auditing by the G. A. O. That ought not to be the case. Furthermore, Congress ought to define the scope of activities of the so-called independent agencies with greater particularity. Otherwise a large field of governmental activity is left virtually free from legislative supervision. The way to establish such control is to pass general legislation for the purpose, not to attach irrelevant riders to appropriation bills, and clamp onerous restrictions on agencies that happen to have incurred the enmity of some influential Member of Congress.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen of March 13, 1944]

KEEP T. V. A. OUT OF POLITICS

Senator McKELLAR, of Tennessee, is a vigorous fighter. Sometimes he is found in praiseworthy crusades for the public interest and for the prerogatives of Congress. But he is a patronage hunter, and it is in that role that we find him waging a fight year after year on Chairman David E. Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, a fight which now becomes a personal vendetta will succeed this year unless friends of good government in and out of Congress stop the rampaging Tennesseean.

Senator McKELLAR has not been able to dictate appointments in T. V. A. Appointments have been made on merit, without regard to politics. That is one reason why T. V. A. has been free of the inefficiency and bureaucracy which often characterize Government-operated projects.

Senator McKELLAR has put into the independent-offices appropriation bill a requirement that T. V. A. revenues must go into the Treasury's general fund, a requirement that Senate approval be required for all employees with salaries of $4,500 or more, and other provisions that would hamstring T. V. A.

The danger is that some Senators and Congressmen will mistake the McKELLAR proposal for a part of the present wholesome movement by Congress to reassert its importance, responsibility, and dignity. It is just the reverse.

Congress was functioning in a statesmanlike way when it set up the Tennessee Valley Authority, laid down its objectives, and its method of operation, and then allowed it to function as a business corporation, managing its own funds, free from Washington bureaucracy and free from national and local politics. Congress, which is commendably looking toward modernization to give itself

collective efficiency and prestige equal to the ability of its individual Members, should not take a step backward in the matter of T. V. A.

T. V. A.'s record shows that governmental activities can be free from bureaucratic stuffiness and inertia, free from corrupt politics, free from graft and waste. Congress, which deserves much of the credit for this, should not allow its successful design to be tampered with.

Conservatives opposed to public power should not delude themselves as to the issue. Mr. MCKELLAR is not opposed to public power; he merely wants to control it personally. His proposal will not bring back a single private company. It will merely make a mess of the public's investment.

Republicans should not fall for a typical piece of grabby Democratic machine politics. Liberal Democrats should brand it a backward step.

[From the Washington Post of March 16, 1944]

WASHINGTON CALLING—M'KELLAR'S ATTACK ON T. V. A.

(By Marquis Childs)

The record of the Tennessee Valley Authority has been such that the enemies of this great public power project have been unable to find any major flaws in its operation. That is why when Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, starts out after T. V. A. he has to use a bludgeon aimed at destroying the whole structure. Once again the incomparable MCKELLAR has come forward with a series of proposals which would make the operation of the project centered in his State virtually impossible on any sound basis. And this is in the face of evidence that the people of the valley are for T. V. A.

The major line of attack is through an amendment requiring the Authority to turn into the Treasury all of its revenues from the sale of power. Then the directors of T. V. A. would have to come to Congress for an annual appropriation to operate the power system. They would have to make their estimates of money needed many months in advance.

Obviously, no going business can be run on that basis. It would destroy the essential principle at the root of T. V. A.'s success. Independent of political interference, it has been operated in the region where it functions. T. V. A. has never had more than a dozen employees in a Washington office.

MCKELLAR'S repeat performance—he tried the same thing 2 years ago— is weird. A little joker might help to explain it. He proposes that all T. V. A. employees receiving more than $4,500 a year be made subject to confirmation by the Senate.

That adds up to a handsome nest egg of patronage. Some 600 employees, most of them in the State of Tennessee, would be put in the patronage bracket.

* * * * *

Two years ago the Senate adopted MCKELLAR'S T. V. A. amendment. This year the same thing will probably happen. In committee, only one Republican, Senator HAROLD BURTON, of Ohio, voted against MCKELLAR in favor of keeping T. V. A.'s independence of action.

This time two good friends of T. V. A. are gone. One is former Senator George Norris, now living in retirement in Nebraska. Norris fought for years for low-cost power in the Tennessee Valley.

The other friend was the late Senator Charles L. McNary of Oregon. He knew the importance of abundant low-cost power to the development of his own great Northwest. He voted for T. V. A. and in the last fight indicated he would speak for the Authority if it was necessary. As the Republicans line up behind their new leadership, they would do well to remember this phase of wise old Charlie McNary's record.

Two years ago when the Senate followed MCKELLAR'S lead, the House refused to go along. The crippling amendment was knocked out in conference, but it was a narrow squeak. Friends of T. V. A. are fairly confident that the House will once again reserve the independence of the Authority, although the margin may be even narrower.

What makes the fight more complicated is that the McKellar proposals should be tacked onto an appropriation bill. This is becoming a pernicious habit—hanging onto measures that must go through broad riders which would completely reverse some major policy.

The real answer to the McKellars is, of course, T. V. A.'s own record. Power production has been doubled as a result of the war and 75 percent of all T. V. A. power goes to win the war. We would have a lot fewer planes today if it were not for T. V. A.

[From the New York Times of March 17, 1944]

SENATOR M'KELLAR'S HOBBIES

Tennessee's senatorial warhorse, KENNETH MCKELLAR, has renewed his fight for two favorite proposals. One is to require Senate confirmation for 30,000 or more appointees to Federal jobs carrying salaries of $4,500 a year and up. The Senate accepted this suggestion last year, but the House did not. The other McKellar plan is to make the Tennessee Valley Authority turn all its power revenues into the Treasury's general fund and rely on annual appropriations for the money needed to keep its generators running. It is Senator MCKELLAR'S custom to attach these things as riders to the independent offices appropriation bill, and this is what, as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he has done this year.

The job project requires little argument. It would put every $4,500 position or better into politics. Neither the President nor the Senate could even pretend to consider 30,000 or more appointments on their merits. So far as the Senate is concerned, they would be subject to the ancient rule of senatorial courtesy and allocated as spoils. T. V. A., for instance, would have to have Mr. MCKELLAR'S blessing before it could hire an engineer. The second proposal is a body blow at T. V. A., with which Senator MCKELLAR is not on the best of terms. It would change the nature of that Government corporation, making it impossible for T. V. A. to follow ordinary business practices in conducting what actually is a business. Chairman Lilienthal believes that this would wreck T. V. A. It would certainly hamstring it. The General Accounting Office ought to be competent to see that T. V. A. does not spend money in a way it ought not to. So far no trace of corruption or misuse of funds has been detected in the agency. And Congress itself has unquestioned power, at any time, to modify the policies or purposes of T. V. A.

We have to rely on the House to override Senator MCKELLAR'S hobbies, both of which would be destructive.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of March 14, 1944]

AGAIN, MULISH M'KELLAR

Senator MCKELLAR, the Tennessean with the elephantine memory for grudges and the incurable itch to get his paws into the patronage trough even farther than they are already, has launched another vendetta against the Tennessee Valley Authority. Having been beaten last year and in various previous years when he made similar attempts, he is back in the fight again with an amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill which would give him the power to coerce T. V. A.

Already there is an outburst against his proposal such as we have seldom seen. Although T. V. A. was called "Socialistic," "Communistic," and pretty nearly everything else in the dictionary when it was first proposed, its record has been such that the agency now is defended by many of the same interests which formerly assaulted it unmercifully. Consider, for example, the fact that we have discovered so far not one single newspaper editorial defending MCKELLAR'S patronage grab at the expense of T. V. A., whereas we have come across a number whaling MCKELLAR unrestrainedly for his renewed effort to cripple this invaluable agency.

The Atlanta Journal says, for instance, that T. V. A. "is a priceless asset which can easily be destroyed by spoils rule," and that it should "maintain ceaseless vigilance against the attempts to make T. V. A. a patronage hog-trough." The Knoxville News-Sentinel, one of the anti-New Deal Scripps-Howard newspaper chain, adds that MCKELLAR "wants to rule or ruin T. V. A.," and that the people of the valley "will have to petition Congress by every means possible to save T. V. A. from the politicians."

The Louisville Courier-Journal speaks of MCKELLAR'S "subversive amendment," and expresses the hope that "other valley Senators and Representatives will frustrate the design." The Chattanooga Times, in two long editorials, blisters MCKELLAR, and says that if he, "blinded by his hatred for Chairman Lilienthal, of T. V. A., succeeds in pulling down the pillars of the T. V. A., his own political career may be one of the casualties."

Whether the mulish Tennessean will be deterred by any of this is extremely doubtful, however. He has demonstrated ere this that when he harbors a grudge, as he has done for years against Chairman Lilienthal, because Mr. Lilenthal has refused to let politics get into the organization, he will go to practically any lengths in satisfaction of that grudge. If the public interest suffers in the process, that is the least of MCKELLAR'S worries.

He must be beaten again on this issue, if one of the Federal agencies which is indispensable to effective prosecution of the war is not to be turned into a political stamping ground for small-bore politicians.

G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, seldom has a bill come before the Congress which merits such complete endorsement as the G. I. bill of rights, formulated and presented by that great organization, the American Legion. The soldier and sailor of today is acutely aware of the sacrifice he has made in order to serve his country in time of national peril. He wants to win this war—yes—but he wants to get it over with as soon as possible in order that he may return to normal living.

On ship or ashore, he talks much of his problem, which is: "What is to become of me when this is over? Will there be a place for me in the home town when I go back? Will I fit into the new picture of things?" He is realistic in his thinking and he will not be satisfied with mere lip service. He feels that the service he gave, which other men did not give, entitles him to the fair chance of getting back on his feet again.

Many of these men have left families behind them, creating new problems and new heartaches. Many were forced to give up positions or established busi-

nesses which they had worked patiently and diligently for years to achieve. If no provisions were made to help these men, many careers would not only be interrupted, they would be destroyed. This is the predicament which confronts every man and woman who serves in the armed forces.

There are others who will sacrifice much more and for whom, even the greatest efforts of the Congress will be inadequate. These we will help to the very best of our legislative ability, but beyond that, we must pledge our unremitting respect and understanding of their special problems as long as they and we shall live.

We must implement the faith for which they fought. In the continuity of American life, we must think and provide, insofar as we are able, for the future. Out of the soldiers and sailors of today will come the leaders of tomorrow. That responsibility of theirs must not be undermined, must not give way to any disspirited cynicism, by any failure of ours.

We must take action to provide opportunities for these men and women, now. Over 1,000,000 have already returned to civilian life to face the problem of starting all over again. Many Members of this House heard the radio address given by Winston Churchill on Sunday, March 26, for his people, and for the world.

Perhaps you were impressed, as I was, with the emphasis he gave to the problems and responsibilities of rehabilitation. Even before the great military operations which shall decide this war begin, this leader of the British Government was concerned with the post-war problems facing his people. He felt it necessary to assure them that the sacrifices the British people have made, and will make, are not in vain.

As our soldiers and sailors gird themselves for the supreme test, they must have full faith in us. They have been certain events on the home front which have not served to encourage our men on the battle fronts. Here, in this bill, we have the opportunity to make up for the past mistakes and to send our men into battle, secure in the knowledge that we are for them. There is a glaring inequality of service in this war. It is our job to make adjustments that will, in some measure, balance the scale.

Britain's leadership in the period following the last war suffered grievously because so much potential leadership was lost in battle. It also suffered because little provision was made to help the returning veterans. Small wonder that the anemic leadership called appeasement followed. The men who should have led did not. They had lost faith in a nation which forgot.

Mr. Churchill recognized the tragic mistake of his predecessors. He is determined that it shall not be repeated. And so are we. Our privileged position is that we can put our solemn pledges to the American service man and woman into effect at once, even before the Easter recess. Let America give practical leadership in this urgent matter. Let us back up our promises, with performance. Lest we—forget.

Our moral obligation to those who served must be based, not on any concept of charity but on the factual recognition of the extracitizenship they have given to the Nation.

And before the soldier or sailor is discharged let us make sure that he is completely informed as to his rights under this bill so that, knowing its procedures, he too will cooperate to make it fully effective.

The G. I. bill of rights is the most comprehensive legislation affecting veterans ever to come before this House. It first provides for the hospitalization of veterans of this conflict. In this respect, it is advisable for the armed forces to give a thorough physical examination to every man and woman upon discharge, to detect and correct incipient weaknesses before they develop. In return for Government assistance, periodic check-ups should be required. In this manner, adequate medical treatment will be given in time to effect a cure. We will not be confronted with the pathetic cases which developed during the nineteen twenties and thirties, when a veteran presented himself for hospitalization too late for curative treatment.

The second provision deals with vocational, professional, or refresher education for the veteran who so desires it. Uprooted from pre-war ways of living and broadened by travel, many veterans will find themselves restless and dissatisfied with former occupations. In line with their widened horizons, the Government will train these veterans to fit themselves for new and more satisfying jobs.

Home and farm aid to veterans is another provision which ameliorates the restlessness induced by war. This gives the veteran an incentive to self-reliance. It helps him to rediscover the stability from which we called him to service. Employment for veterans is the major problem which this bill seeks to solve. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall establish a veteran's representative in each State with sufficient personnel and equipment to register veterans; to list all available employment opportunities; to interest employers in hiring veterans; to exert every influence to improve the working conditions and to secure opportunities for advancement; and to make certain that no veteran, able and willing to work, shall be denied his American birthright.

The transitional period from war to peace is the most critical time for the returning veteran. To tide him over this readjustment gap, this bill provides unemployment allowances for former members of the armed forces up to a period of 1 year. This takes care of his existence needs for a reasonable period and gives him the freedom to search for the employment for which he is best suited.

This bill is aptly termed the G. I. bill of rights. It is on a plane with the democratic foundations of our Government. It has the sincere and overwhelming support of our people. Of this there can be no doubt. A grateful Nation is anxious to do more than praise. Its self-respect demands that these men and women, as they return, shall find realized the security and opportunity which they fought to save, not only for themselves but for us.

To wish him good luck is not enough. Lt. Col. C. B. Rhoads, Director of the Rehabilitation Division of the United States Marine Corps, has said:

> To discharge a man without some adequate preparation for civilian readjustment may be as fatal to his future as sending him into combat without teaching him how to shoot.

Half measures and dilatory tactics will invite the whirlwind of post-war unrest. Let us anticipate and avoid.

The immediate passage of the G. I. bill of rights by this House will inspire millions of our fighting men and women as no other deed can do.

Let us cut across all sectional and party lines to crystallize the unity of America's gratitude.

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today is the seventy-sixth birthday of one of the greatest Americans in public life, a most able and a most distinguished Member of this House.

If I were to describe him further as the vigorous and scholarly gentleman of 6 feet and 2, weight 195 pounds, with a snow-white and touseled shock of hair, all would undoubtedly know I speak of the dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, the ranking minority member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, affectionately referred to as "Doc" EATON.

I know of no man who commands greater respect and admiration in this body than our beloved dean. I know of his contributions to the good and welfare of our Republic over many decades, two of them in the Congress. His burning desire at the moment is to promote unity, win the war, and assist in the building of a better world.

Just a moment ago I called the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, on the phone to wish him happy returns, and I asked him how he felt. This was his answer, "The spirit of '76 is invincible."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the Members on both sides of the aisle will join with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey in paying high tribute to one of the great men and great statesmen of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate that contribution, and I am sure that the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, will also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would not detain the House at this late hour except that I want to join with my friend who has preceded me in regard to the so-called G. I. bill of rights. He has done well in attracting to our attention the merits of this measure which is before a committee of the Congress at this time. I, too, hope that it will be enacted if possible before we have the Easter vacation, for I recognize both its needs and its merits. Since I am a schoolman of many years' experience, you would expect me to lay stress upon one particular phase of that bill as it is now being considered and as it has already passed the other body. Yes, I do want to say that I am favorably impressed with the provisions in it for continuing the education of these men and women now in uniform, especially those whose education has been interrupted. In my judgment the bill cannot be too liberal in that respect, for when these men and women come back home we want them to have all that a grateful Nation can furnish them in the way of compensation for the sacrifices and offerings which they have made and recompense for time taken out of their young lives. I know of nothing better than a completed education, which I think is the minimum, that the country can offer for these defenders of our Nation. Education is something that cannot be taken away from them and proper education will fit them for greater service in times of peace.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think that the G. I. bill of rights is overlooking one possibility in title III in regard to homes for veterans, farm homes and the like. Loans for homes are offered and home ownership is to be encouraged, all of which is looking in the right direction. I heartily approve it and want to suggest a further method of providing those homes.

Yesterday I went before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and made mention of this. There are now being irrigated in our western semiarid regions about 20,000,000 acres of land, which not many years ago was desert land, occupied by jack rabbits and rattlesnakes. Today it is now highly productive.

I think before this omnibus bill is finally enacted it should take into consideration the possibility of further developing the water and power resources of the country so as to make it possible to make homes on 20,000,000 acres of land for our returning soldiers. I think that should be done. I hope to see that incorporated in the bill when it is finally passed.

I need not recall that after the War between the States we had at that time a great public domain, partly in the humid section and partly in the arid or semiarid regions. The soldiers of the War between the States, both those who wore the blue and those who wore the gray, went west and settled on the land. The law facilitated it. They have built up these great western communities, one of which I represent in this Chamber. We are proud of the way they tamed the wilderness.

At the close of the First World War there were many returning veterans who wanted to make homes in the West. Many attempted to do so, but the best land had been taken. I know of some pathetic cases where men attempted to go out on poor land on which they could not possibly hope to make a living. That must not happen again, for we must offer them more than sagebrush and cactus. However, there are rich lands in the West which, with cheap power and the development of our water resources, can be turned into gardens of Eden and made as productive as the valley in which I live. I hope to see that done.

Home ownership is the very foundation of our economic stability, and ownership of land in a farm home is the best type of home ownership of which I know. We would like all citizens to be home owners, for we feel that the stability and security of our country is measured by the proportion of our citizens who are home owners. It would be even more ideal if each veteran who returns from this or any war should become a home owner as a reward in part for that which he fought to save. We know that love of home is a part of love of country. It is a powerful stimulant to bolster the courage and steel the fighting spirit of our soldiers. Mercenary soldiers are not usually good soldiers. An army will not fight for a boarding house with the same courage and zeal as those who fight for their homes. Therefore, along with an educational recompense, which the bill now being considered provides, I think next to it in importance, if not equal to it, is that other provision of the bill under title III which provides for loans for home ownership.

As I indicated earlier, the old frontier to which veterans turned after other wars now no longer exists as before. We must seek a new frontier for the veterans of this war. To do so, I maintain that it is not necessary to go outside the limits of the continental United States. There are plenty of great open spaces with great possibilities in the West. It is true that nature has dealt harshly with the West in certain respects, for it is certainly more difficult to carve homes out of the wilderness in a semiarid region than it was for our fathers to establish homes in the great Ohio and Mississippi Valleys and in the humid sections. Out in the intermountain country nature has been prolific in many of the natural resources needed for home and community building, but it is there that nature challenges the ingenuity of society and offers the greatest problems for the hydraulic engineers. Mountain streams must be harnessed for storage of irrigation waters and for production of abundant power. Farming is profitable as well as healthful out there, but initial investments must be greater and a larger degree of cooperation is necessary. In my judgment, the great West now furnishes a new and broader frontier than earlier veterans had, if our Government will do the right thing by its defenders. Let us see that more is done for them than our country has offered to the soldiers of any other war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD my own remarks and to include a letter received from Rainier Bros., at Salisbury, Md., in regard to price fixing on perishable goods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made this afternoon certain editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I believe the membership of the House will approve and applaud the action of Secretary of State Cordell Hull in selecting one of our very able colleagues to head the Special Committee on Post-war Education, that is soon to confer with representatives of all the United Nations on that subject. Those of us who have served here with the gentleman from Arkansas, [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who has been designated chairman of that committee, know of his ability. We know of his ability to see a broad program and at the same time to see the important details for working out that program.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think any better Member of Congress could have been chosen than the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for this very important job. He will be accompanied by Dr. Archibald MacLeish, Dr. Studebaker, and Dr. Grayson Kefauver. This is a most important commission that he is heading up.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have been a schoolman all my mature life and I recognize the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] as my colleague in education. I congratulate the country on the choice made by Secretary Hull. I want to say that the people of Arkansas ought to be mighty proud of our congressional freshman Member who has been thus honored.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure they will be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1110. An act providing for the designation of certain Mondays during the present war as Memory Monday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 555. An act for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow;

S. 662. An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes; and

S. 1243. An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 30, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1344. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of War Information for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $64,390,000 (H. Doc. No. 521); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1345. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to estimates for the Federal Security Agency in the form of an amendment to the Budget for fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 520); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1346. A letter from the Chief Scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting a copy of the thirty-fourth annual report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 450); to the Committee on Education and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX: Committee on Elections No. 1. House resolution 490. Resolution to dismiss election contest case of John C. Schafer, contestant, against Thaddeus F. Wasielewski, contestee, Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4485. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2522. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through civilian employment with countries allied with the United States in the Second World War; with amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIES: Special Committee on Un-American Activities, pursuant to House Resolution 282. Resolution for the investigation of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4514. A bill to provide for issuance of temporary certificates for air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 4515. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 4516. A bill to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon persons discharged from the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps on account of disability as are conferred upon members of the Army of the United States who serve during the present war; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4517. A bill to remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 4518. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the establishment of an interregional system of highways, and to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed highway facilities in the locations where such facilities are most urgently required and where the conversion from war to peacetime activities will require the cushioning effects of public works construction; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 4519. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4520. A bill to provide certain individuals desiring to visit relatives remaining in the land and naval forces after the present war with transportation at cost; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4521. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Franklin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4522. A bill for the relief of David Stiefel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 4523. A bill for the relief of the Harper independent school district, Harper, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4524. A bill for the relief of Henry S. Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4525. A bill for the relief of M. Grace Murphy, administratrix of the estate of John H. Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4526. A bill for the relief of Edwin Doyle Parrish; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4527. A bill granting a pension to Laura E. Silvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4528. A bill for the relief of L. M. Feller Co. and Wendell C. Graus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 4529. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Kitten; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5371. By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5372. Also, petition of sundry residents of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5373. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Miss H. Oliver and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5374. Also, petition of Stanley M. Millard and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5375. Also, petition of D. Seltzer and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5376. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Fairview Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Industry, Pa., representing approximately 50 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5377. Also, petition of the adult department of the Methodist Sunday School, of Ambridge, Pa., representing approximately 60 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5378. Also, petition of the Sabbath School of the College Hill Reformed Presbyterian Church, Beaver Falls, Pa., representing approximately 75 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the

United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5379. Also, petition of the Riverview Evangelical Church of Beaver Falls, representing approximately 225 persons urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5380. By Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Petitions of Samuel Brown, Maurice Tucker, and others, and signed following the tabling of the Palestine resolutions, urging that the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5381. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petitions containing the signatures of 60 citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5382. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5383. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Anna Marstaller, of Lisbon Falls, Maine, and other citizens of that section, urging action on House bill 2082 to stop manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5384. Also, petition of Harvey Jones, of Freeport, Maine, and other citizens of that section, urging action on House bill 2082 to stop manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5385. Also, petition of Mrs. C. H. Briggs, of Turner, Maine, and other citizens of that section, urging action on House bill 2082, to stop manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5386. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolutions of the Sons of Veterans, Auxiliary No. 6, Belvidere, N. J.; Belvidere Temple, No. 32, Pythian Sisters, Belvidere, Warren County, N. J.; Warren County Rod and Gun Club, Unit No. 2, Belvidere, N. J.; General Judson Kilpatrick Camp, No. 233, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, and petition signed by approximately 135 residents of Belvidere, N. J., urging passage of the McNary-Angell bill (H. R. 2017 and S. 65) the Voorhis-Downey bill (H. R. 375 and S. 910) or some other measure making a reasonable blanket grant of an equal sum to all blind persons with an income of less than $100 per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, fountain of our being, light of all our seeing, for the beauty of the earth robed in the blooming garb of spring, and for the tint of the tiniest flower, we raise our hymn of morning praise. For the blessed trinity of sunshine, wind, and rain, we lift the Te Deum of our gratitude. But above all we thank Thee for that knowledge of Thyself which illumines our life with eternal splendor and for that giving of Thyself which has made us partakers of the divine nature, of the divine suffering, of the divine glory.

In our deep concern for the Nation and for mankind everywhere, in our grim resolve at any cost to overwhelm the forces of darkness which threaten our heritage of freedom, in our gnawing anxieties for dear ones far from native land, facing mortal peril, at the sleepless remembrance of which countless hearts are weeping, this is our prayer without ceasing: "Cast me not away from Thy presence and take not Thy holy spirit from me." We ask it in the name of that One in whose face is the light of Thy glory, who won His throne by His cross of shame and who rose from His tomb to reign forever in the hearts of men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, March 29, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 8408. An act to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code; and

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 555. An act for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow; and

S. 1243. An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE ITALIAN COMMITTEE OF LIBERATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a message addressed to the Congress by the Italian Committee of Liberation, forwarded to the Department of State by the United States member of the Advisory Council for Italy, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and a translation of the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE JUNTA OF LIBERATED ITALY,
Naples, February 9, 1944.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

The Permanent Executive Junta of Liberated Italy, elected during the first congress of the true and sole representatives of the Italian people, held at Bari on January 28 and 29, 1944, at the moment of beginning its labors sends its greetings to the Congress of the United States of America.

The Italian people, through its free representatives, has with unanimous vote assigned us two tasks: First, to bring about the abdication of the King as the principal person responsible, along with Mussolini, for all the disasters that have befallen Italy; second, to prepare the formation of a national democratic government which, having the confidence of the people themselves, can make a valid and real contribution to the war against Nazi-ism and begin the solution of the grave problems confronting our country.

As is being shown every day by the Italian patriots who, though ill-clad, ill-nourished, and meagerly armed, are fighting valorously against the Germans in occupied Italy, the Italian people wish to take an active part in this war of liberation. However, they cannot do so under the guidance of those same institutions and men who for 20 years have oppressed and betrayed them.

The Italian people want a government which can intensify the war effort, give all guaranties of honesty, and bring about in this country the "four freedoms" proclaimed by President Roosevelt.

Only a national government, formed by the Italian anti-Fascist parties and the men who for 20 years have fought and suffered in the fight against fascism, can give those guaranties and win the confidence of all the Italian people.

VINCENZO ARANGIO RUIZ,
A. RAFFAELE JERVOLINO,
FRANCESCO CERABONA,
ORESTE LONGOBARDI,
PAOLO TEDESCHI,
VINCENZO CALACE,
The Permanent Executive Junta.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FUTURE STATUS OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS AND PERSONNEL TRANSFERRED TO THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the future status of certain functions and personnel transferred to the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

LANDS IN OKLAHOMA BETWEEN THE CIMARRON BASE LINE AND THE NORTH BOUNDARY OF TEXAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relative to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Associate Director of the National Park Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1944,

covering the appropriation "Maintenance, Executive Mansion and Grounds" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORTS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Letters from the chairman of the board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law (confidential), reports of the Corporation for the months of October 1941 to June 1942, inclusive, the month of January 1944, and a report covering operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization, February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1943, inclusive (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the files of the Departments of State, Navy, and Interior; the Federal Security Agency, United States District Court for the District of Maryland, Tennessee Valley Authority, Office of Emergency Management, and Office of Defense Transportation which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

LETTERS, ETC., RELATING TO CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Washington Ministerial Union, letters from the Interdenominational Ministers' Alliance and the Communist Party of the District of Columbia, and a telegram from Arthur D. Gray, president of the District of Columbia branch of the N. A. A. C. P., all in the District of Columbia, relating to the chairmanship of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1743. A bill to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes and grasses required in the war food production program; with an amendment (Rept. No. 792); and

S. Res. 276. Resolution to investigate matters relating to the manufacture and distribution of farm machinery (submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri and Mr. GILLETTE on March 24, 1944); without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1824. A bill to assist the States to establish and maintain school-lunch programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. 1825. A bill to extend the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the Virgin Islands; and

S. 1826. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), relating to the exportation of certain commodities, and to continue said act in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: TOMBIGBEE AND TENNESSEE RIVERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT

Mr. BYRD submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1945.

INVESTIGATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION IN CONNECTION WITH MANAGEMENT OF THE KANSAS CITY SOUTHERN RAILWAY CO.

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. CLARK of Missouri) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 278), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Whereas it is alleged that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, have engaged in activities for the purpose of unduly, unreasonably, and improperly influencing the management and direction of the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., particularly with respect to a meeting of the shareholders of such company to be held on May 9, 1944, for the purpose of electing directors for such company; and

Whereas it is alleged that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Secretary of Commerce have also engaged in activities for the purpose of unduly, unreasonably, and improperly interfering with the relationship between such company and the foreign holders of shares in such company; and

Whereas the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by means of its financial interests in and control over large segments of the business economy of the Nation, is able to exert undue influence over business enterprises in which it has no direct or substantial financial interest; and

Whereas any attempt to improperly exercise such influence should be fully investigated and such measures as may be appropriate should be taken to prohibit the improper exercise of such influence: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to any activities engaged in by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other agency or officer of the Government for the purpose of unduly, unreasonably, or improperly influencing the management or direction of the Kansas City Southern Railway Co. or other railroad companies, or the relationship between such companies and the owners, including foreign owners, of shares in such companies, and any other matters relating to the relationship between such companies and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or other agencies of the Government. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to exercise the powers conferred upon the committee by Senate Resolution 46, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 14, 1943. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed the remaining balance available within the limit of expenditures authorized for the committee under such Resolution 46, as increased by Senate Resolution 220, Seventy-eighth Congress, and shall be paid from such remaining balance.

INVESTIGATION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. SMITH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 279), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to December 9, 1943 (authorizing the employment of assistants and the expenditure of funds in a proposed investigation of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act) and under Senate Resolution 238, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, agreed to February 8, 1944, is hereby increased by $7,500.

DECLINE IN THE CONSUMPTION OF COTTON—REFERENCE OF A RESOLUTION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on February 21 I submitted Senate Resolution 257, calling for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the reasons for the decline in the consumption of cotton. The resolution has been lying on the table. For the past 5 days, and especially this morning in the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, much information has been brought out concerning this subject. Therefore, I respectfully ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency in order to expedite the

hearing and to save whatever funds it may be possible to save.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 257) providing for an investigation with respect to the reasons for the decline in the consumption of cotton was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COLORADO RIVER WATER—PROPOSED TREATY WITH MEXICO

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as all Senators know, water is the lifeblood of my State. The residents of States with an abundant rainfall can hardly realize the great value of water in the semiarid regions of the West. My State of Utah has an area of about 53,000,000 acres. Only about 350,000 acres have a full season water right. These are the only acres within the State upon which there can be matured crops that require a full season's growth. Please realize this is only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the State's area. This simple statement serves to emphasize how keenly we appreciate the value of water and how earnestly we will fight to protect our right to an equitable share of the waters of the Colorado River.

More than half the area of Utah is in the Colorado River Basin. There are men in my State who have spent more than 20 years, since before the signing of the Colorado River Pact in 1922, in studying the Colorado River and in devising ways for its comprehensive development and the equitable division of its waters among the States and between the United States and Mexico. For many years a committee of 14, consisting of 2 representatives from each of the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, and California, have been devoting themselves to the same task. These men, together with representatives of the Department of State and the United States Reclamation Bureau, have had under consideration for more than 2 years the question of an allocation to Mexico of a share of the Colorado River waters. The Colorado River compact, which was ratified by all 7 States and by the Congress of the United States, makes provision for an allocation of a share of these waters to Mexico. Seven States are interested. At least 5—and I am confident 6—of these States approve the treaty with Mexico as submitted to the Senate.

Because of the recent speech by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] I feel called upon to make this statement and to say that at the hearings to begin in the near future a record will be made which, in my opinion, will compel the conclusion that through consultation with and the cooperation of the Department of State, the Committee of Fourteen, and the Bureau of Reclamation, together with the representatives of Mexico, a treaty has been agreed upon and submitted to the Senate of the United States which should be promptly ratified.

Mr. MILLIKIN subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to add just a few words on the subject which has been so ably illuminated today by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

A great deal of prominence has been given to California's position with respect to the treaty with Mexico, now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, relating to the equitable division of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers, and the lower Rio Grande.

I do not propose at this time to reply to California's arguments. The facts will be fully developed at the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, which is the appropriate forum for that purpose. In order, however, that there may be no misunderstanding about this matter, I wish to say that there are three rivers involved, not merely one; there are eight States directly concerned, not California alone; and the matter has national, not merely local, significance.

So far as I know, only California has voiced opposition to the treaty. Thus far, her views alone have been expressed before this body. It is sufficient now to say that the facts do not support many of the assertions made in support of her position.

This matter is one which has received serious consideration for several years by many people. There has existed for some years a committee, devoted to the interests of the Colorado River Basin in the United States, composed of two representatives from each of the seven Colorado River Basin States, including California, plus two representatives of the power interests, also from California. This committee is known as the Committee of Fourteen and Sixteen. The State Department consulted freely with this committee, before initiating negotiations with Mexico, in order to get the views of the States most directly concerned with the problems of the Colorado River. The representatives of five of these States approved a formula upon which the provisions of the treaty relating to that river were finally based. Only California was in opposition.

Mexico is now putting to beneficial use more water than is allocated to her under the treaty, and is rapidly expanding her uses. The United States, on the other hand, is using less than half the water which would be available to her under the treaty. Even California, which contributes no water to the river, but which claims the right to use almost one-third of the total available supply, is now using less than half of the quantity to which she lays claim. And in the meantime an average of over 7,000,000 acre-feet of water is wasting annually through Mexican territory into the Gulf of California.

Colorado contributes about 70 percent of the waters of the Colorado River. We are thus concerned in no small measure. We believe the treaty to be just and equitable to both countries. Mexico is developing rapidly. Her development has created a condition of uncertainty as to her rights in the waters of the Colorado River, which in turn makes for economic unrest in the basin in the United States, and firm development is thus retarded.

All these matters, as I have said, will be fully developed at the proper time and place. In the meantime, let me observe that the building of Boulder Dam was made possible by all the people of this Nation, acting through their representatives in Congress. No single State can justly claim a monopoly of its benefits. The Nation which built this dam, and thus harnessed the waters of a great international stream, owes to its neighbor certain international obligations which cannot be overlooked. The Colorado River compact, of which California is a signatory, recognizes this obligation. It is in the interest of all the basin States, including California, and of the Nation as a whole, that this obligation be defined and limited, once and for all. This, the treaty does. In the minds of most of us who are vitally concerned, it does so fairly and equitably.

THE HOUSING PROGRAM—ADDRESSES BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two addresses by Senator ELLENDER on March 25, 1944; one, entitled "Facts About Housing," delivered over Station KSD, at St. Louis, Mo., and the other entitled "Common Sense in Post-war Housing," delivered before the National Public Housing Conference at St. Louis, Mo., which appear in the Appendix.]

EVACUATION DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Evacuation Day address delivered by him at the South Boston Citizens' Association banquet, March 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a St. Patrick's Day address entitled "The Day We Celebrate," delivered by him at the Clover Club banquet in Boston, Mass., March 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, 1943 MODEL—ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Collective Bargaining, 1943 Model," delivered by Hon. Edward R. Burke, former Senator from Nebraska, at the annual meeting of the Operators' Association of Williamson Field, Williamson, W. Va., on February 24, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL ACT—STATEMENT BY ALBERT S. GOSS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, made before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, on March 30, 1944, in relation to the extension of the Price Control Act, as amended, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRACKERLAND IN WASHINGTON—ARTICLE FROM ATLANTA JOURNAL

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Crackerland in Washington," written by Ralph Smith, and published in the Atlanta Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

SURPLUS GOODS PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY L. J. CARLETON

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Surplus Goods Problem," written by L. J. Carleton, and published in the Underwear and Hosiery Review for February 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH FOR DECEMBER 1943 AND JANUARY 1944

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to present a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of January 1944, also a report of the number of employees by civil-service classifications and others for the month of December 1943, and ask that the report together with a statement relating thereto be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The total number of employees for January 1944 is 2,978,229, which is a net increase of 8,951 employees over the revised total of 2,969,278 for the month of December 1943.

This is the first month since June 1943 that civilian employment of the Federal Government has shown a definite increase and it reduces the net decrease to 153,712 employees since the peak employment of June. I wish to bring this to the attention of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget in view of the recommendations of the committee. It has been stated by the President that there has been a reduction of 205,000 employees since the peak month of June 1943, but on the basis of reports submitted to the committee by all departments and agencies it is evident that there has been only a reduction of 153,712 paid employees since that time.

Thirty-one departments and agencies have increased the number of their employees by 16,300, while 34 departments and agencies have eliminated only 7,349 employees since December 31, 1943.

Substantial increases were made by the following: Navy Department, 11,243; Treasury Department, 970; War Relocation Authority, 643 (207 of this increase is due to the transfer of a project to War Relocation Authority from the Office of Indian Affairs); Department of the Interior, 627; Veterans' Administration, 609; and Office of Price Administration, 514.

Greatest reductions were made by the following: Department of Commerce, 1,353; Post Office Department, 1,265 (this is a reduction of temporary-substitute employees); War Department, 1,125; Panama Canal, 756; and Department of Agriculture, 661.

For the month of December 1943 there were 11,006 new positions filled in the executive branch of the Federal Government and 17,060 full-grade promotions made. The count of both new positions and full-grade promotions is exclusive of those of the War and Navy Departments which are unable to furnish the committee with this information.

TABLE I.—*Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government by department and agency for months of December 1943 and January 1944, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees*

Department or agency	January 1944	December 1943	Increase	Decrease
Bureau of the Budget	547	559		12
State Department	8,631	8,607	24	
Treasury Department	87,097	86,127	970	
War Department [1]	1,213,989	1,215,114		1,125
Justice Department	29,874	29,593	281	
Post Office Department	349,857	[2] 351,122		1,265
Navy Department [3]	719,917	[2] 708,674	11,243	
Interior Department	39,382	38,755	627	
Agriculture Department	80,529	81,190		661
Commerce Department	30,000	31,353		1,353
Labor Department	6,063	6,176		113
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES				
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	101	98	3	
Division of Central Administrative Services	4,444	4,490		46
National War Labor Board	3,465	[2] 3,526		61
Office of Alien Property Custodian	1,014	1,027		13
Office of Civilian Defense	892	998		106
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1,345	1,339	6	
Office of Defense Transportation	5,024	5,006	18	
Office of Economic Stabilization	10	9	1	
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,173	1,146	27	
Office of War Information	5,396	5,225	171	
Office of War Mobilization	21	20	1	
Selective Service System	28,531	[2] 23,623		92
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,761	1,565	196	
War Production Board	17,723	17,979		256
War Manpower Commission [4]	24,582	24,782		200
War Relocation Authority	2,510	1,867	[5] 643	
War Shipping Administration	4,703	4,522	181	
Foreign Economic Administration	6,096	6,197		101
Office of Censorship	12,097	12,120		23
Office of Price Administration	55,794	55,280	[6] 514	
Office of Strategic Services	1,780	1,692	88	
Petroleum Administrator for War	1,413	1,412	1	
INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS				
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	0	0
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation	76	79		3
Civil Aeronautics Board	330	329	1	
Civil Service Commission	7,040	6,972	68	
Employees' Compensation Commission	518	523		5
Export-Import Bank of Washington	60	59	1	
Federal Communications Commission	2,174	2,194		20
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,072	1,077		5
Federal Power Commission	669	670		1
Federal Security Agency	30,764	30,889		125
Federal Trade Commission	456	455	1	
Federal Works Agency	21,111	21,508		397
General Accounting Office	10,830	10,651	179	
Government Printing Office [7]	7,751	7,923		172
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,154	2,174		20
Maritime Commission	9,741	9,599	142	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	4,783	4,630	153	
National Archives	345	348		3
National Capital Housing Authority	267	264	3	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	19	18	1	
National Gallery of Art	265	261	4	
National Housing Agency	20,541	20,817		276
National Labor Relations Board	719	743		24
INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS—con.				
National Mediation Board	88	81	7	
Panama Canal	32,419	33,175		756
Railroad Retirement Board	1,648	1,512	136	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,775	7,825		50
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,223	1,231		8
Smithsonian Institution	422	427		5
Tariff Commission	300	301		1
Tax Court of the United States	124	125		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	24,111	24,161		50
Veterans' Administration	47,672	47,063	609	
Total	2,978,229	2,969,278	16,300	7,349
Net increase			8,951	

[1] Does not include employees outside of the continental United States.
[2] Revised.
[3] Includes 10,324 employees of stations in the hands of the enemy.
[4] Includes training-within-industry and the U. S. Employment Service. Liquidation Division of the National Youth Administration is now under the Federal Security Agency.
[5] 287 of this increase is due to a project taken over from Office of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior.
[6] Increase due in part to without-compensation employees not previously reported.
[7] Government Printing Office has not been included in previous reports of the committee.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar-per-annum employees and without-compensation employees of the consultant-expert type who are authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence.

TABLE II.—*Paid civilian employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government by civil-service classifications and others, also number of new positions and full-grade promotions for the month of December 1943*

Inside metropolitan District of Columbia area	264,307
All other areas	[1] 2,704,971
Total	[1] 2,969,278
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal	902,386
Professional	86,907
Subprofessional	94,039
Craft, protective, and custodial	190,921
Clerical, mechanical	5,870
All others	[2] 1,689,155
New positions	[3] 11,006
Full-grade promotions	[3] 17,060

[1] Does not include civilian employees of the War Department outside of the continental United States.
[2] Includes employees classified by yearly rate of pay; force account employees; some part-time and when actually-employed employees; without-compensation and dollar-per-annum employees authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence; and some employees in terminal leave status.
[3] Exclusive of those of the War Department and Navy Department which are unable to report on them.

COOPERATION IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS BETWEEN CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has become a common occurrence to hear speeches before this body fraught with references to the critical times which we are passing through or the critical times that lie just ahead.

I believe that the most critical of all times is now.

Just as the present has its roots in the past, so does the future have its roots in the present.

We heard the echoes of Casablanca in President Roosevelt's state of the Union speech—almost a year after Casablanca. We are told that the military results of the Quebec Conference are being made manifest in the Pacific today. Yet, neither the Senate nor the people of the United States have been given any real insight into what actually was agreed upon at that meeting from the point of view of a national foreign policy. Of the Cairo Conferences and the Teheran Conference, we know only what President Roosevelt—with a singularly characteristic lack of openhandedness—has permitted us to learn.

Let it be known now that we have never asked or expected a revelation of military plans. What we have expected, and what the Senate was entitled to, was the same accounting which Prime Minister Churchill is required by custom to furnish the British Parliament. We have even more of a right to demand such an accounting, since our Constitution provides for the confirmation of treaties by this body by a two-thirds vote. Both Mr. Churchill's and Marshal Stalin's governments may enter into treaty relationships without fulfilling this requirement.

I do not accuse President Roosevelt of having made commitments without the advice or consent of the Senate. I say that, at this very minute, we do not know whether or not he has made such commitments.

Only after the Moscow Conference was there any semblance of this body being taken into even the partial confidence of the administration. Then Secretary of State Cordell Hull appeared before us to clarify some of the matters discussed at Moscow.

Has this distinctly bipartisan body shown any indication of lack of interest or desire to get behind a unified foreign policy? I ask again, has the Senate in any way indicated that its mind is closed against cooperation?

The overwhelming majority by which the Senate concurred in the resolution introduced by the Senator from Texas is most certainly proof of our interest and our desire to take our rightful place in the American system of checks and balances by giving our President the constitutional advice and guidance and consent to which he is entitled; and which, also according to the Constitution, we are equally entitled to give. We are concerned with the destiny of this Nation and of the people who compose it. No group more than this group has a higher duty or a greater responsibility to the present and the future; and that is why I so often stress this matter in the Senate.

Secretary Hull was asked to appear before this body a year before Pearl Harbor by a resolution which I submitted. The resolution requested a report on the state of affairs in the Far East. The Secretary of State did not appear, for the resolution was not considered.

On September 17, 1942, I submitted another resolution to establish a better working liaison between the executive and congressional branches in the formulation of any peace.

I repeat this resolution herewith, the better to clarify my stand. It is Senate Resolution 290:

Resolved, That the Chief Executive be invited to join with the Senate in the creation of a foreign-relations advisory council to be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, other technicians whom the Secretary of State might designate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate.

I sent a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State and received a reply under the date of October 21, 1942, in which Mr. Hull indicated that what advice the Senate might possibly give would be courteously received and courteously ignored. Two days after Secretary Hull sent me this letter I forwarded him my reply.

I wrote, among other things:

Historians have lodged grave indictments against those responsible for the death of the Versailles Treaty and for its train of consequences.

So that history shall not lodge a similar or even a graver indictment after the conclusion of this peace, we must now establish machinery to provide for effective collaboration between the Chief Executive and the Congress in the formulation of any peace.

I received a reply to my letter of October 23 on November 5. Secretary Hull restated his position. He maintained the supremacy of the Executive under a Constitution that provided for strong executive, legislative, and judicial branches. In other words, my fellow Senators, I had been given what is commonly known in Washington as the brush-off, or, as others have called it, the ring around or push around.

Today we are essentially in the same position in which we found ourselves on November 5, 1942, in the vitally important matter of laying the groundwork for the constitutional formulation of a just and lasting peace. I repeat, we are in a critical position today. We need to learn to play ball together. We need to have an executive who can demonstrate that he has a sense of collaboration with other parts of government which are as important as himself.

The administration has followed the traditional attitude of tolerantly overlooking the advice of the Senate, a practice popularized by President Wilson. I wish the American people could see the true picture President Wilson submitted to the Senate in the years that are gone, after the last World War, a treaty which was not the result of getting the advice or consent of the Senate, but was literally written when it was submitted to the Senate, and the President said, "Take it or reject it"; and the Senate rejected it. Yet, there is more than a suspicion that the administration has abandoned President Wilson's other concept of "open covenants, openly arrived at."

Under the British Constitution, the Prime Minister is virtually the Government. No man and no group limits the power of Marshal Stalin in the Soviet Union. I do not presume to criticize our allies who are fighting for the same cause of liberation for which we are fighting. Rather, I say, let us set our own house in order before we begin to interrelate the affairs of this Nation with those of other nations.

Those are not idle words, Mr. President. If we are called upon to demonstrate to the peoples of this globe cooperation and collaboration, words will not do it, acts will, and if we show the peoples of the earth that there can be cooperation and collaboration between the Executive and the Congress, then the way will be opened for more constructive action in a wider field.

I do not speak for a weak Executive and a strong Congress; nor do I speak for a weak Congress and a strong Executive. Nor do I want a weak Court. I want a strong, independent Executive; a strong, independent Congress; a strong, independent Court. When that is accomplished, we will have what the fathers had in mind as a government of checks and balances, no one department subordinate to another, each learning how to collaborate and cooperate. Our need demands a strong Executive, a strong Congress, and a strong and independent Court—no more "yes" Congress, no more "yes" Court. I do not believe this situation is incompatible with possibility. I believe it is possible. I believe it is on the way now. Should the Executive honestly seek our advice we would honestly give him our advice. The President sent Secretary Hull to Moscow to lay the groundwork for Cairo and Terehan. It is hard to believe that the distance between 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and this Chamber cannot be traversed more easily. Secretary Hull went the long distance to Teheran. It is not very far from this Capitol to Secretary Hull's office, or to the President's office. Once liaison between the Executive and Congress is firmly established, we can confidently look forward to the adequate solution of the problems which face us now and will face us at the peace table.

Our allies of Russia, Britain, and China recognize the interdependence of the executive and legislative in the United States Government. These people know about that. They know that Congress, the courts, and the Executive are independent of each other. They want to know whether we can play ball together, whether we can cooperate, whether the President will get off his pedestal and recognize that in these perilous times we should forget differences, join hands, and go to work for the common good.

The nations I have mentioned cannot lead us to peace any more than we can lead them. The small nations have shown us the way. Frank treaties for mutual good have been signed between small nations. Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, Belgium, the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, in their treaty relationships, are a living signpost on the road to a better world for us. Let the Executive, with the advice, full knowl-

edge, cooperation, and consent of a Congress joined to him by bonds of understanding liaison, bring nations large and small into treaty relationships with this Nation. Then, this Nation will be able to meet the new tasks, the new responsibilities of a new age, freed from doubt and dissension, and blessed by Almighty God with victory and peace.

I trust, Mr. President, that the movement toward cooperation which was indicated by the Secretary's actions a few days ago will be accelerated and that there will be established between this body and the Executive a working liaison committee such as I suggested more than 3 years ago, a liaison committee having for its object the ironing out of differences, the building of plans, a liaison committee before which the ambassadors and the representatives of other nations could come and submit their ideas and concepts, a liaison committee which will work out the common problems for the common good.

CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution pertaining to a recess of Congress, which has come over from the House, be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 75, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 30, 1944, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, April 12, 1944.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move to amend the concurrent resolution by striking out "Thursday, March 30", and inserting in lieu thereof "Saturday, April 1."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Without objection, the concurrent resolution, as amended, is agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of Congress from Saturday, April 1, 1944, to Wednesday, April 12, 1944."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the time for the signing of the soldiers' vote bill, or not signing the bill, will expire Friday night, and the adoption of the resolution, as amended, will take care of that situation?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

B'NAI B'RITH STUDENT FELLOWSHIP AT UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement dealing with the establishment by B'nai B'rith of an interfaith student fellowship at the University of Kansas in memory of William Allen White.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

B'NAI B'RITH ESTABLISHES INTERFAITH STUDENT FELLOWSHIP AT UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—In memory of the late William Allen White, world-famous editor of the Emporia Gazette, whose journalistic career was marked by a lifetime crusade against bigotry and intolerance, B'nai B'rith, through its national Hillel commission, has created the William Allen White interfaith fellowship at the University of Kansas, it was announced here today by Henry Monsky, president of B'nai B'rith, the Nation's oldest and largest Jewish service organization.

The national Hillel commission, governing body of the Hillel Foundations, which B'nai B'rith maintains on 141 college and university campuses as centers of religious, cultural, and social activities for Jewish civilian students and for Jewish men and women in uniform assigned to college Army and Navy training units, determined to establish this memorial to Mr. White "as a permanent testimonial to a great American whose life was a symbol of democratic living and who fought to keep America what he himself called 'a land where to be brave we must be free: where the free must be brave,'" Mr. Monsky said.

Together with his announcement of the fellowship, Mr. Monsky made public a statement from Chancelor D. W. Mallott of the University of Kansas, who said, "we accept the fellowship with deep appreciation" and "are very much honored by your confidence in the University of Kansas."

One of the Nation's outstanding liberals, Mr. White, broke his lifelong rule against seeking public office when he became an independent candidate for the Governor of Kansas in 1924 "to free Kansas from the disgrace of the Ku Klux Klan." While he was defeated, his campaign helped destroy the Klan in his State. When the Reverend Gerald Winrod ran for the Senate from Kansas, White's voice and pen worked night and day to defeat the outspoken anti-Semite. White was among the first to denounce Charles A. Lindbergh "for injecting the Nazi race issue in American politics" in his Des Moines speech in 1941.

Mr. White was a vigorous supporter of President Wilson when he nominated Louis D. Brandeis to the Supreme Court, the Kansas editor having assailed the reactionaries who opposed the confirmation of Brandeis by the Senate. A friend of Jewish Palestine, Mr. White was a member of the American Palestine Committee and a vigorous advocate of large-scale Jewish colonization in Palestine. In 1941 he signed a protest against a State Department ruling halting entrance to the United States of aliens with relatives in Germany or Nazi-occupied countries. He also served as chairman of the Bill of Rights Sesquicentennial Committee of the Council Against Intolerance.

Following the pattern of interfaith awards already created by B'nai B'rith at the Universities of Alabama, Illinois, and Michigan, and Ohio State University, the William Allen White Fellowship will be awarded annually to a student in his junior year, who, in the opinion of an interfaith faculty committee, has made the most outstanding contribution to interfaith understanding on the campus of the University of Kansas. Nominations for the award will be made by the directors of the student religious foundations at the university.

Three years ago the B'nai B'rith Hillel Commission created the Grover Cleveland Hall award at the University of Alabama in memory of the late Grover Cleveland Hall, crusading editor of the Montgomery Advertiser, who did so much to smash the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama. At the University of Illinois, B'nai B'rith annually gives the Edward Chauncey Baldwin Fellowship in honor of the late Prof. Edward Chauncey Baldwin, for nearly a generation professor of Biblical literature at Illinois.

Early in 1944, B'nai B'rith also established interfaith fellowships at the Universities of Winconsin and Minnesota in honor of King Christian of Denmark and King Gustaf of Sweden, whose humane dealings with refugees won the admiration of the civilized world. At Ohio State University and the University of Michigan the Hillel interfaith awards are memorials to a former leader of the Hillel Foundation at the University of Michigan.

Through grants from the Goldring Foundation in New York City and from Mr. and Mrs. Morris Furman, B'nai B'rith is also creating interfaith awards at City College, Brooklyn College, Hunter College, and Queens College in New York. The Furman grant is to be a memorial to Burton J. Furman, United States Navy, who went down when the aircraft carrier *Lexington* was sunk in the Pacific.

Through the initiative of B'nai B'rith leaders, there was established in 1943 at Hunter College, in New York, the Sara Delano Roosevelt Interfaith House, where Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish students conduct their extracurricular activities under one roof. The Roosevelt Interfaith House was formerly the town homes of President Roosevelt and his mother. The Interfaith House is a memorial to the President's mother.

DECLARATION OF WAR AIMS BY FARMERS' WAR AND PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the Farmers' War and Peace Conference, attended by many farmers and farm organization leaders from California, Colorado, New Jersey, and Middle Western States, held at the Hotel Jefferson, St. Louis, Mo., on March 25 and 26, 1944, adopted a 15-point declaration of war aims for 1944 and after. This conference was called by the National Agricultural Mobilization Committee and Ralph O. Brown, of Hoytville, Ohio, chairman of the National Agricultural Mobilization Committee, presided.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the 15-point program adopted, as well as the introductory statement.

There being no objection, the introductory statement and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Until victory is won, the first objective of all Americans is to win the war. We affirm our support of the Commander in Chief on war measures, and our determination to do our utmost to assure an early victory and a lasting peace.

Our determination is based on the knowledge that only through victory will we enjoy the opportunity to build for ourselves the kind of world in which we wish to live. As victory approaches, it is appropriate to set forth a declaration of our war aims: The objectives which we, as American farmers, seek to achieve through victory in the years of peace.

America entered the war just as agriculture was emerging from the worst crisis in its history. For the first time in many years most American farmers were able to look forward to a future in which they would be secure in the tenure of their land, could market their crops at a fair return, and could expect to conserve the fertility of the soil.

Challenged by the wartime need for food, the farmer has, with limited labor, machinery, and fertilizer, increased the production

of food by 21 percent since 1939. The vast majority of farmers have willingly accepted the need for price controls and other war restrictions. They will continue their all-out production efforts as long as is necessary, under whatever difficulties the war imposes, except for the lowest-income group of farmers—one-third of all—who have been deprived of making their full contribution by lack of credit and the opportunity for full employment.

This tremendous increase in production has not been achieved without serious losses. Though the record in this war is far ahead of World War No. 1, soil conservation and reclamation have lagged; we have further drained the fertility of our land. Farm machinery and buildings have deteriorated without adequate repairs and replacements. The advance of rural electrification has been halted. Improvements in rural housing, education, and medical care have been deferred. Many farm youths have left the land to enter war industries or the armed forces.

Again agriculture faces a great crisis. There is much lost ground to be reclaimed, new goals to be achieved. Victory will permit us to resume our efforts to build a farm economy based on Nation-wide full production, employment, and consumption, and to build a more democratic machinery of agricultural management.

The American farmer wants for himself and his children a life as productive and rewarding as that of town and city folk, a life that will challenge the ability, initiative of each new generation. He wants full participation in the processes of his Government, which in many areas is prevented by restrictions, of which the poll tax as a qualification for voting is a glaring and evil example.

We recognize that progressive farmers, workers, and businessmen stand on common ground, and that farmers' objectives can be achieved only with the support of—not at the expense of—other groups of the American people.

We have, therefore, set forth here 15 points as the war aims of a representative group of progressive American farmers, 15 points which we believe are the building stones of a strong agriculture and a better farm life. Believing that they constitute a part of the necessary foundation for a strong economy and a better life for the Nation as a whole, we invite business and labor groups, all political parties, and all candidates for public office to join us in support of the 15 points. We will welcome the opportunity of joining with them in support of similar programs for business and labor.

FIFTEEN-POINT PROGRAM

1. Full support of the Commander in Chief on war issues, including all-out war production; prevention of inflation by price and wage control, and by direct subsidies; heavier taxation of profits and personal incomes; full voting opportunities for the men and women of the armed forces.

2. Full and democratic American participation, including agriculture, in world peace conferences, in post-war relief and rehabilitation, in trade and economic conferences, and in other measures of international cooperation in support of the "four freedoms" for which the United Nations fight—in all of which the farmer has a vital stake.

3. Continued full production after the war, planned and adjusted to total needs, and expansion of industrial uses of surplus farm crops, matching full production and employment in industry. This can be done only if restrictions on free enterprise are abolished, including artificial scarcities enforced by private monopoly, discriminatory freight rates, use of patent rights to limit production, and the use of tariff walls and interstate tax barriers to stifle trade.

4. Elimination of the dangerous coexistence of farm surpluses and undernourished people in America through a two-price system such as the food-stamp plan, the school-lunch program, and any other program necessary for the full realization of freedom from want.

5. A permanent program of conservation of land, water, forest, and wildlife resources; immediate provision of funds and facilities to regain lost ground in soil conservation and reclamation after the war, and to make farm land available to land-hungry veterans and tenants.

6. A land-ownership program offering veterans, tenants, and small farmers an opportunity to own land, as a means of arresting the spread of tenancy, absentee landlordism and corporation farming, and of promoting the American ideal of the family-type farm. The principles of such a program are embodied in the proposed Farmers Home Corporation, to which should be added rehabilitation loans as a step toward ownership.

7. Agriculture, the basic industry of the Nation, as such should have credit facilities and interest rates on a basis comparable to that enjoyed by any other industry. The borrowing facilities now available to agriculture through the different agencies of the farm credit system should be maintained and democratically administered.

8. A true cooperative movement can and should be the answer to fascism—the democratic way of the future. Present laws under which these nonprofit organizations are chartered and operate should be maintained. The consistent 25-year Federal policy of encouragement of farmer cooperatives should be continued.

9. With parity income as the goal, a permanent system of farm-price supports, loans, and crop insurance, as indispensable protection for a full production program.

10. An ever-normal granary for all key crops, and Commodity Credit Corporation loans, to assure adequate supplies at all times.

11. A unified Federal farm program, including an adequate information service, administered through a single office in each county and for each State, under administrative boards freely elected by their neighbors; with Federal, State, and county officials, specialists, and technicians working as servants, not masters, of the farm community.

12. Adequate public rural housing programs, rural education, power and telephone system, public roads, medical services, and other facilities, so that future generations of farmers may participate more fully in the advance of science and technology.

13. Simplification of distribution systems, improvement of packing and processing facilities, and the promotion of more efficient marketing practices, by the development of cooperatives and by the joint efforts of agriculture, business, labor, and Government, so that consumers in all groups may buy more goods through the elimination of waste.

14. Immediate stabilization of farm-land prices through high taxation of speculative land profits. Continued inflation of land prices can deny thousands of worthy farm people and returning farm war veterans an opportunity to become established on the land.

15. War salvage goods and plants should be disposed of by the Government as quickly as available in a manner which will permit farmers to acquire needed supplies, either directly or through their cooperatives, in the interest of immediate full production of foodstuffs and for the creation of a permanent economy of abundance.

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT AND CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] a question. I received a letter today which referred to news items that were inclined to criticize the Congress for not giving the Army and Navy full support, and asking for certain information. I remember that on a former occasion the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, spoke on the subject to which I shall refer. I understand he has been a member of the Naval Affairs Committee—for how many years?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is so long that I cannot remember. I should say for about 20 years.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has been a member of the committee for 20 years, and has been chairman of the committee for how many years?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was for a time acting chairman and then chairman by appointment for the past 8 years.

Mr. WILEY. During the time that the Senator has been chairman of the committee has he at any time had any information to the effect that requests for appropriations by the Government for the Navy were ever reduced or lessened?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I cannot recall a single instance where any request made by the Navy Department to the Naval Affairs Committee was not granted by that committee and later approved by the Senate. In this connection it should be noted what the procedure is in regard to requests for authorization and appropriations from the Navy Department. The Navy Department has to obtain the approval of the Commander in Chief and the Budget before it can recommend any legislation to the Congress or request any appropriations. On this account we have no way of knowing what the Navy Department may have asked and been denied before it comes to the Congress. Therefore, I repeat, the Naval Affairs Committee and the Congress have only been in a position to approve or disapprove of what the Navy Department requested and which had been approved by the Commander in Chief and the Budget Bureau.

There are several instances, however, where Congress has taken the initiative or legislated in excess of requests made by the Navy Department. The first of these instances, since I have been chairman, is in the act approved May 17, 1938. In that bill, which originated in the House, appropriation was made directing the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board to investigate and report upon the need for the establishment of additional naval and air bases upon the coasts of the United States, its Territories, and its possessions. Mark you, this was not requested by the Navy Department but was initiated by the Congress itself. As a result of that law, the outgrowth was the establishment of many of the bases we now have in Alaska and in the Pacific. Another example that occurs to me is in the Naval Expansion Act of 1938. In that act the Navy asked for authority to build three additional battleships of 35,000 tons each and two additional aircraft carriers of 15,000 tons each. The Senate commit-

tee recommended, and the Senate approved the recommendation, increasing each of these battleships to 45,000 tons and each of the aircraft carriers to 20,000 tons.

Another instance was in the naval air bases bill approved April 25, 1939. The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs recommended the adoption of amendments which authorized the establishment of the naval air stations at Quonset Point, R. I., and at Corpus Christi, Tex.

Another instance was the Navy Expansion Act approved July 19, 1940, to make an increase of approximately 70 percent in the number of naval vessels. This was a congressional measure and was introduced jointly in the Senate and House by the chairmen of the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and Senate. This was known as the 2-ocean naval bill. This bill also increased the number of useful naval airplanes from 10,000 to 15,000 and provided that—

> If in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy the total number of airplanes authorized herein is not sufficient to meet the needs of the naval defense, he may, with the approval of the President, make such plans for procurement as the situation may demand.

This act, initiated by the Congress through these two committees, and special credit is due the chairman of the House Committee, Mr. VINSON, gave unlimited scope and power to extend the appropriations to build up our airplanes to any strength the Navy thought necessary. It is unnecessary to enumerate other statutes which the Congress had passed which did not originate with the Navy Department. It should be stated that the Navy Department enthusiastically accepted and was delighted with every action taken by the Congress that during these years increased the strength of the Navy through the building of naval vessels and increase in airplanes.

The Senator may recall that last Navy Day I received a strong letter from Admiral Ernest J. King, Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet, thanking the committee for the hearty cooperation and support which the Naval Committee and the Congress have given the Navy, and stating that when the history of this war is written the record will show that the Navy's achievements have been in great measure brought about by the confidence that the Congress has shown toward the Navy.

Mr. WILEY. Then, can we say, generally, that from 1933 to the present time, to the knowledge of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, every request made to the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs to appropriate funds for naval purposes has been met in full?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I can certify that that is the fact. One request made by the Navy which was not complied with at the time it was made was the request for $5,000,000 to dredge the harbor at Guam. This item was eliminated by the House, but the following year, namely 1940, it was incorporated in one of the Navy appropriation bills.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1944

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I have been instructed by the committee to report, with the recommendation that it be adopted, Senate Resolution 263, which was referred to the committee by the Senate. The resolution is in exactly the same form as that of a resolution which was agreed to 2 years ago in connection with the matter of congressional elections, with the exception that there has been added to the provision with reference to expenditures made in connection with campaigns for nomination and election of United States Senators a provision relative to the expenditures made in connection with campaigns for nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President.

The resolution calls for the appropriation of $30,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate. That sum is in the same amount as that which has previously been appropriated for that purpose. I trust that now, as then, the resolution may be unanimously agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator ask for immediate consideration?

Mr. GREEN. I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator to say that this resolution is in the precise form of the resolution of 2 years ago.

Mr. GREEN. With the exception that reference to candidates for President and Vice President was added. There were no such candidates 2 years ago; there were only candidates for the Senate and House.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, the resolution is in accord with the practice of late years.

Mr. GREEN. That is true. Every 2 years a similar resolution is offered. With the exception which I have indicated, this resolution is verbatim, the same as the resolution of 2 years ago.

Mr. WHITE. I have consulted with such minority Members as I could, and I have no objection to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the resolution been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it must be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate before it can be acted upon finally.

Mr. GREEN. I understand that; and I took that matter up with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President. I have word from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with regard to this resolution. He recommends that it be reported favorably. I have consulted with such other members of the committee as I could reach. Since the resolution is in the ordinary routine form, I cannot see any advantage in postponing action on it. I therefore ask unanimous consent to report the resolution from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, in order that it may have immediate consideration by the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I know it is unpopular to suggest that we should spend a limited amount of money for an investigation of this kind; but I wish to call attention to the fact that year after year committees have been appointed to handle this matter. The legal problems have been simplified, and the law on the subject has been settled. The law on the subject is available to any committee which may be appointed. The only expense I can conceive of is that for a secretary and investigators. There may be a great deal of such work to be done; but merely because $30,000 was appropriated in other years, I cannot see why it is necessary to appropriate the same amount now. I feel that a smaller sum than $30,000 would be sufficient to start this operation. I wish to make it clear that I am not opposed to the resolution. I repeat that in the beginning there was a great deal of conflict about the law, and considerable investigating was done on that subject. Lawyers had to be employed, and legal research was necessary. That is all over. The only necessary expense is that for a secretary and investigators. It seems to me that we could make a start with $15,000, and increase the amount later if necessary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my colleague the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] was chairman of this committee 2 years ago. The same sum of money was then authorized. My recollection is that the actual expenditures did not amount to a quarter of that sum. I am sure the same situation would prevail with respect to the Senator from Rhode Island. If the money is not needed, we can trust him not to spend it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I think we ought to set an example of economy in the appropriations which we make for senatorial committees. I appreciate the difficulties and I know of the pressure upon members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I think we ought to be very cautious in the amount of money we appropriate out of our own treasury to take care of these investigations and reports.

I have no objection to the resolution. I think the undertaking is very commendable; but I wished to call attention to the fact that it seemed to me, in view of the work which had gone before, that the amount might be less.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, it so happens that 4 years ago I was chairman of the same sort of a committee,

and the same amount of money was appropriated, as I recall. While I appreciate the position taken by the Senator from Massachusetts, I think the sum of $30,000 is not at all out of line with the needs.

The committee acts as a result of complaints made to it. In line with the policy which has been followed for a number of years, the committee does not of its own initiative investigate these matters; but when complaints are brought to its attention which seem to be worthy of investigation, the need is immediate. There is no opportunity to obtain additional money. It may be necessary to send investigators to Seattle, Wash., or Portland, Maine, and send them at once. So, with the legal counsel required and the need for immediate action, it seems to me that a committee of this kind would be handicapped if the amount were reduced below the figure provided in the resolution. I do not believe that a committee of this kind would spend a dollar which was not necessary. It is important to have the money immediately available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 263) submitted by Mr. GREEN on March 3, 1944, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, from States in which no Senator is to be elected at the general election in 1944, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to—

(1) the extent and nature of the expenditures made by all candidates for the office of President, Vice President, and United States Senator in 1944 in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office;

(2) the amounts subscribed and contributed, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available (including personal services, and the use of billboards and other advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobiles, and other transportation facilities), by any individual, group of individuals, partnership, association, or corporation to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign, or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any primary or general election, or at any convention, held in 1944, at which a candidate for President, Vice President, or United States Senator is to be nominated or elected;

(3) the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress with a view to determining whether any such funds have been or are being expended by any department, independent agency, or instrumentality of the United States, by any State or political subdivision thereof, or by any instrumentality of any State or political subdivision thereof, in such a manner as to influence the votes cast or to be cast for any such candidate at any such primary or general election or convention;

(4) the use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates; and

(5) such other matters relating to the election of President, Vice President, and United States Senators in 1944, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the Senate in enacting remedial legislation or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the Senate.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee thereof.

SEC. 4. The committee by majority vote may authorize any member of the committee, or any member of a duly authorized subcommittee, to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any member so authorized may hold public hearings, issue subpenas, and provide for the service thereof, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, administer oaths, and take testimony.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may authorize any one or more persons to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any person so authorized may hold such public hearings, issue such subpenas, and provide for the service thereof, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, and take such testimony, as the committee, or any such duly authorized subcommittee, may from time to time authorize.

SEC. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate on the first day of the next regular session of the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

CANCELATION OF SEED AND FEED LOANS AND LIENS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, upon other occasions I have spoken to the Senate about the seed and feed loans and liens owed by farmers to the Government and its various agencies. The Senate itself has been most sympathetic, and privately many Senators have assured me that they would go so far as to vote to cancel them in their entirety prior to the year 1940. The opposition to this legislation has come, not from the Congress, but from the various governmental agencies.

In view of the resignation of Gov. A. G. Black, of the Farm Credit Administration, I want the Senate, the Congress, and the farmers of the Northwest to know that I am making renewed efforts to secure the cancelation of these seed and feed loans and liens, and I express the hope that a man will be appointed to succeed the former Governor Black as the head of the Farm Credit Administration who will join in this proposal that has been delayed all too long. Other countries, including Canada, have long since canceled these feed and seed liens.

It has been my belief that in a matter of such grave importance to the farmers of the Northwest the Attorney General's office ought to assist the Farm Credit Administration rather than the Farm Credit Administration's private attorneys. This is substantiated by the fact that the Attorney General's office through the United States district attorney, P. W. Lanier, of North Dakota, had just concluded criminal prosecution against some solicitors who induced farmers to go into bankruptcy and to conceal part of their assets. In view of the intimate knowledge obtained by the Attorney General's office in these prosecutions, I wrote a letter to Hon. Tom C. Clark, First Assistant Attorney General.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 27, 1944.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
First Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Office of the Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: Very earnestly I bring to your attention and urge your immediate consideration of the feed and seed loan and lien situation which has caused untold grief, turmoil, and unhappiness among the farmers of the Northwest.

Mr. Attorney General, I believe that nowhere in this country have the people suffered greater privation than when the Northwest was unhappily the scene of the Dust Bowl droughts.

During those long years the overwhelming number of farmers stayed loyally at their chores. They plowed; they borrowed money again and again for seed and feed; they planted; but they harvested not at all, or very, very little.

Now, when prosperity finally came to the Northwest, as it has come, unfortunately prosperity did not come to all people alike. Some have not had good crops and have not prospered. Some have had continued misfortune, and are still hopelessly in debt, mainly to the Federal Government for seed and feed loans obtained as much as 14 years ago, which are still unpaid and still drawing interest.

Many of these people have left their farms to work in the defense industries, feeling that they could never pay the liens upon their property. Others have been babied along by various agencies, who got what they could and are charging interest on the rest.

To meet this situation I have had many conferences with various heads of the Department of Agriculture, most particularly with Gov. A. G. Black, of the Farm Credit Administration. At some of these confer-

ences I was accompanied by elected officials from the State of North Dakota. Two and a half years ago the Honorable Ben Larkin, then chairman of the Public Service Commission of North Dakota, and I spent an entire afternoon with Governor Black and his staff in an effort either to prepare a satisfactory measure to wipe out and cancel seed and feed loans and liens, or, if that was impossible, to prepare a bill which would give representatives of the Department of Agriculture, such as county agents or A. A. A. boards, the authority to scale down debts and make necessary adjustments.

At the present time we have had the unhappy situation where a farmer, deciding to pay his debts as best he can, is able to get his debt scaled down with his private creditors, but is entirely unable to get debts scaled down if the Government is his creditor.

As a result, Mr. Attorney General, some men with good hearts and good intentions persuaded themselves that it was their duty to solicit these farmers to take advantage of the bankruptcy laws. Some 1,300 farmers in North Dakota did so. Then, of course, we inevitably have the corrupt individuals who saw in the bankruptcy law an opportunity to profit, with the result that your office and the Federal Bureau of Investigation were called in.

In view of the evidence produced in these criminal trials, it is my belief that the people of this country are entitled to have you appoint such assistants as is necessary to make a thorough investigation and to make recommendations to the Federal land bank and other Departments of the Federal Government making loans to farmers in an effort to secure justice, fair dealing, and equity to all concerned.

A Government that could cancel billions of dollars of World War No. 1 debts due from foreign countries certainly ought to be able to cancel or scale down the petty debts of the patriotic men and women who kept forth during the dreadful drought period and maintained the great Northwest, which during the Second World War, the time of our greatest national need, has become the greatest food producing area in the world.

This Congress has given your Department liberal appropriations. The people of North Dakota have contributed their full share in payment of taxes, purchase of bonds, contributions of trained men and women, and an unprecedented production of food. I believe these people of the Northwest are more than entitled to this consideration.

I hope, therefore, that it will be possible for you to give prompt, careful, and energetic consideration to the needs of those thousands of poor people who still owe the seed and feed liens, who get up every morning harassed by the thought that they want to do their utmost to produce food in this war, yet have not been given the consideration by their own Government that the citizens of foreign countries, like Canada, have received from their government where seed and feed liens have long since been canceled.

With the deepest respect, I am,

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Today I am happy to state that Hon. Tom Clark promptly replied as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Thank you so much for your letter of March 27 regarding the feed and seed loan and lien situation.

You may be sure I appreciate your interest in this matter and that it will receive our prompt attention.

Please call upon me whenever you feel that I can be of service to you here.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

TOM C. CLARK,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. Clark did not let the matter rest there, however, and stated that he was appointing a special assistant attorney general and whatever other help might be necessary to make a prompt survey of the situation with the various governmental agencies, particularly with a view to ascertaining how this legislation would affect the stability of Federal land-bank bonds and other bonds issued by the Government, the method of securing an equitable adjustment for loans which the farmers were still owing, and to determine whether some of the older loans should not be canceled in their entirety.

Inasmuch as I have been unable to secure any cooperation from the various agencies looking toward scaling down or cancelation of these liens, I wish to express publicly, on behalf of the farmers of the Northwest, my gratitude to Mr. Clark for this evidence of keen interest and assistance and to state that the cancelation of the major portion of seed and feed loans would not only be a blessing to the farmers of the Northwest but would prove a very profitable act on the part of the Government because it would result in increased production of food in our all-out war effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks the two most recent bills (S. 574 and S. 722) introduced by me on the subject of seed and feed loans and liens and to express the hope that at last we may get definite, prompt, and favorable action on this most important subject.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 574

A bill providing for cancelation of certain crop production and harvesting loans

Be it enacted, etc., That the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration is authorized and directed to provide for the immediate cancelation of all loans made to farmers pursuant to the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1937, as amended and supplemented, or pursuant to any prior act or joint resolution, under the terms of which loans of a similar character were authorized to be made either by the Secretary of Agriculture, or by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

SEC. 2. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration is also authorized and directed to release all liens given to secure the loan or loans made to any such farmer pursuant to such act, and to notify each such farmer that no further payments of principal or interest shall be required after the date of enactment of this act with respect to any loan so made to him.

S. 722

A bill providing for cancelation of certain loans to farmers in case of crop failure

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any provision of law pursuant to which loans are made to farmers by any agency of the United States for the purpose of financing the production of crops which are essential to the war effort, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, in any case where through no fault of the farmer the proceeds from any such crop are not sufficient to repay the principal and interest on such loan, to provide for the cancelation of so much of such indebtedness as is in excess of the proceeds from such crop and to release any lien given to secure repayment of such loan. For the purposes of this act, the proceeds from any crop shall be determined in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe: *Provided*, That in determining such proceeds, consideration shall be given to any portion of such crop consumed on the farm.

AIR TRANSPORTATION IN RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Civil Aeronautics Board is now holding hearings in Washington relative to air transportation in New England. The whole of New England, and especially my State of Rhode Island, is much aroused because its interests are vitally at stake. It is something new for New England to be aroused over air transportation. I know that not very long ago I had difficulty in arousing interest in Rhode Island as to the necessity of developing air transportation, and procuring a State airport. However, I was finally successful, in spite of complacent indifference, in having the State airport established. Now we are in danger of being bypassed by some possible ruling of the Civil Aeronautics Board because one of its investigators has recommended that the use of our State airport be monopolized by one air transport company.

In this connection I shall not take the time of the Senate to elaborate, but I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a short editorial from the Providence Sunday Journal of March 26, 1944, entitled "Rhode Island's Case." It summarizes the situation and shows of what vital interest the subject is to my State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RHODE ISLAND'S CASE

The economic future of this State is directly involved in the Civil Aeronautics Board hearing in Washington tomorrow on the petition of three commercial air transport companies to serve New England. Under the present set-up, Rhode Island is in the same position in commercial air service as in rail transportation. For many years we have tried, unsuccessfully, to free ourselves from dependence upon a single railroad system.

Now we are confronted with the same dependence and the same handicap in the air. At a preliminary hearing in New York several weeks ago an examiner for the C. A. B. recommended that the New England territory be denied the competing services which several large commercial airlines are anxious to provide us. We would be restricted by this recommendation to the services rendered by the American Airlines, plus such auxiliary air transport as would be furnished by a smaller company operating between Maine and New York via Boston.

Every resident of Rhode Island should understand how severely this State would be penalized if this recommendation of the C. A. B. examiner were to be accepted by the Board. We have many industries that make products small in size but high in value. The materials of which they are made are in some instances unusually expensive, such as certain lines of jewelry. In other products in which Rhode Island excels a great deal of highly skilled labor is represented by a small article, notably such items as fine tools.

Now these are things that are virtually made to order for the services that commercial air-transport companies will be able to render when the war ends. Probably the industries of no other State, relatively speaking, are so naturally suited to capitalize the services of swift transport. For the value of a host of Rhode Island manufactured items

is so large in dollars and cents in relation to their compact physical size that rapid transit by air is the logical means of shipping them.

If we have the air facilities to place such products in the hands of customers throughout the country in the quickest possible time, obviously we will be in position to realize to the fullest extent upon the potentialities of our skilled craftsmen, our very sizable investment in plant and equipment, and our know-how in the fabrication of fine tools, expensive jewelry, and small machinery in which artistry in design and workmanship is a conspicuous attribute. For generations we have excelled in the processing of such goods. But it has required days to deliver them to customers 1,000 or 2,000 or even 3,000 miles from Rhode Island. Consequently in later years our producers have lost out at times in competition with plants that have sprung up nearer to the sources of demand.

Now the air lines promise to correct this disadvantage of geography for us. The Middle Atlantic States and the States bordering the Great Lakes are only a few hours away. The Middle West beyond the Mississippi River can be reached in less than a working day. People on the Pacific coast and the Mexican border today can be using products that only yesterday were being completed in this State. Our factories and mills no longer are far removed, hidden away in a small corner of New England. In practical effect, thanks to air transport, they are now as near the Mississippi Valley as they were New York and Philadelphia a generation ago.

But this will be true only in part unless the Civil Aeronautics Board discards the recommendation of its trial examiner and gives New England competitive through service by air to the West. The character of Rhode Island's economy is complete evidence in itself of the necessity for such service. We are an industrial State. As never before for generations, opportunity to realize upon our unusual industrial situation is arriving on the wings of commercial air transport.

It is impossible to believe that any Federal agency, once it fully comprehends the case of Rhode Island industry in relation to air transport, will deny us a natural and wholly logical right to competitive through service on as many air lines as possible. Certainly we do not intend, if we can prevent it, to be bottled up in the air as we are on the rails. We want a chance to develop and grow in order to serve both ourselves and the Nation.

The Civil Aeronautics Board now faces the issue of whether Rhode Island shall be permitted to have what it wants in the way of air transportation or whether it must endure indefinitely a monopoly in air service as it has in rail transportation. We have a right to expect that our true economic welfare shall be the deciding factor.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 766.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 766.

EXEMPTION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION FROM CERTAIN CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

The bill (H. R. 3847) to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee what employees are to be exempted, and why?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration would be exempted. The reason for the bill is that throughout the Nation we have rationing boards the members of which are working without compensation. The Attorney General has issued a pronouncement that section 109 of the Criminal Code applies to the members of those boards. Section 109 of the Criminal Code is as follows:

> Whoever, being an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with, any executive department of the Government of the United States * * * shall act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States—
>
> Shall be subject to fine or imprisonment.

Individuals, serving without compensation on rationing boards, fall under the criminal statute, as declared by the Attorney General; and the purpose of the bill is to remove them from the effects of the criminal statute in view of the fact they are serving without compensation.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Would the Senator have objection to including in the RECORD at this point the very able report which our chairman has submitted to accompany the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection; and if the Senator will so request, I shall be glad to concur.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on House bill 3847.

There being no objection, the report (No. 753) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3847) to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes, having considered the same, report the bill favorably to the Senate with the recommendation that it do pass, without amendment.
>
> STATEMENT
>
> The purpose of the bill is to exempt uncompensated volunteers employed on war price and rationing boards and in other capacities under the Office of Price Administration, from sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) set forth below.
>
> Section 109 of the Criminal Code provides that "whoever, being an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with, any executive department of the Government of the United States * * * shall act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States" shall be subject to fine or imprisonment.
>
> Under section 113 of the Criminal Code it is unlawful for "the head of a department, or other officer or clerk in the employ of the United States" to receive or agree to receive any compensation for services rendered or to be rendered in relation to claims or other matters affecting the United States, as therein set forth.
>
> Necessity for the proposed legislation became acute when the Attorney General published the following opinion under date of December 9, 1943:
>
> "OPINION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
>
> "PROSECUTION OF CLAIMS BY MEMBERS OF WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARDS
>
> "Members of local War Price and Rationing Boards of the Office of Price Administration are to be regarded as coming within the words 'officer or clerk in the employ of the United States,' as used in section 113 of the Criminal Code, and the words 'a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with any executive department of the Government of the United States,' as used in section 109 of the Criminal Code.
>
> "The word 'department' when used in a statute is not necessarily to be understood as including only the 'executive departments' denominated as such in the Revised Statutes.
>
> "Later cases in the Supreme Court make it clear that one may be an 'officer' of the United States and that a governmental establishment may be a 'department' within the contemplation of particular statutes without necessarily meeting the tests suggested in *United States* v. *Germaine* (99 U. S. 508).
>
> "Section 190 R. S. is inapplicable to members of local War Price and Rationing Boards because by express provision of the Revised Statutes the title in which it is contained, and the word 'department' as used therein, are applicable only to the executive departments therein specifically named."
>
> DECEMBER 9, 1943.
>
> The PRESIDENT.
>
> MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to refer to your request for my opinion whether section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) and sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) are applicable to persons, including attorneys, who serve as members of the local War Price and Rationing Boards of the Office of Price Administration.
>
> The members of these boards are appointed by the Price Administrator under the authority contained in section 201 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 23, 29). He states that in order to assure the successful carrying out of the price control and rationing programs it is essential to secure the services, as members of these boards, of attorneys of high repute and standing in their respective communities. He further states that difficulty has been encountered in securing such services because of a natural reluctance on the part of attorneys to risk the possibility of violating the statutes mentioned.
>
> Section 190 of the Revised Statutes provides that it shall not be lawful for any person appointed as an officer, clerk, or employee in any of the departments, to act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States which was pending in either of said departments while he was such officer, clerk, or employee * * *."
>
> Section 109 of the Criminal Code provides that "whoever, being an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with any executive department of the Government of the United States * * * shall act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States * * *" shall be subject to fine or imprisonment.
>
> Under section 113 of the Criminal Code it is unlawful for "the head of a department, or other officer or clerk in the employ of the United States" to receive or agree to receive any compensation for services rendered or to be rendered in relation to claims or other

matters affecting the United States, as therein set forth.

Concerning section 190 R. S., there appears to be no doubt that it is inapplicable because by express provision of the Revised States (R. S., secs. 158, 159; U. S. C., title 5, secs. 1, 2) the title in which it is contained, and the word "department" when used therein, are applicable only to the executive departments therein specifically named. Sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, however, are not thus limited by any applicable statutory provision.

A legal memorandum prepared in the Office of Price Administration holds that sections 109 and 113 are inapplicable. The following cases are chiefly relied upon to support this conclusion: (*United States* v. *Germaine*, 99 U. S. 508; *United States* v. *Mouat*, 124 U. S. 303; *Burnap* v. *United States*, 252 U. S. 512; *Dropps* v. *United States*, 34 F. (2d) 15; *Hoeppel* v. *United States*, 85 F. (2d) 237). An examination of these cases indicates that such support as they afford is to be found in language which originated in the first-mentioned case and was repeated or paraphrased or cited in the succeeding cases. The substance of this language is succinctly set forth in the following excerpts from *United States* v. *Mouat* (p. 307);

"What is necessary to constitute a person an officer of the United States, in any of the various branches of its service, has been very fully considered by this court in *United States* v. *Germaine* (99 U. S. 508). In that case, it was distinctly pointed out that, under the Constitution of the United States, all its officers were appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, or by a court of law, or the head of a Department; and the heads of the Departments were defined in that opinion to be what are now called the members of the Cabinet. Unless a person in the service of the Government, therefore, holds his place by virtue of an appointment by the President, or of one of the courts of justice or heads of Departments authorized by law to make such an appointment, he is not, strictly speaking, an officer of the United States."

United States v. *Germaine* undoubtedly stated the correct rule for ordinary application at the time the case was decided (1878). The executive branch was then divided into seven so-called departments under which were grouped the various bureaus and offices. The first of the great independent establishments, as we know them today, was not created until several years later (37 Op. A. G. 227, 230).

Nothing in the Constitution warrants a holding that a division of the executive branch must actually have the word "department" as a part of its name in order to be deemed a "department" in the constitutional sense; and none of the above cases involved precisely that point. Each case dealt with an appointment made by a subordinate within a department (save one, which concerned an appointment by the President), and in each case the Court was merely making the point that in order to constitute one an officer he must be appointed by the President or by the head of a department, rather than by the head of a bureau or other subordinate within a department. None of these cases arose under the statutes herein considered.

Later cases in the Supreme Court make it quite clear that one may be an "officer" of the United States and that a governmental establishment may be a "department" within the contemplation of particular statutes without necessarily meeting the tests suggested in *United States* v. *Germaine*. The fact that the rule advanced in the *Germaine* case is not of universal application was pointed out by the Supreme Court in *Steele* v. *United States, No. 2* (267 U S. 505, 507). As the Court there indicated, the congressional intent is the controlling factor and the word "officer" when used in a statute is not to be given the limited constitutional meaning if it is apparent that this would not accord with such intent. It was concluded that an appointee of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (the head of a bureau within the Treasury Department) was "a civil officer of the United States" within the meaning of these words as used in the Espionage Act of June 15, 1917, and adopted in the National Prohibition Act.

That the word "department" when used in a statute is not necessarily to be understood as including only the "executive departments" denominated as such in the Revised Statutes was made clear in *Emergency Fleet Corp.* v. *Western Union Telegraph Company* (275 U. S. 415, 418, 426). The Court enumerated the so-called independent establishments existing at that time (1927) and termed them "minor independent departments." It concluded that the Emergency Fleet Corporation was "a department of the United States," within the meaning of these words as used in the Post Roads Act (ch. 230, 14 Stat. 221, approved July 24, 1866; R. S. 5263, 5266).

The Attorney General has heretofore taken the same position. In an opinion of August 12, 1933 (37 Op. 227), it was determined that the Civil Service Commission is a "department" within the meaning of the word as used in the Constitution and that the three members who constitute the Commission are the "head of a department" in the constitutional sense.

Attorney General Gregory in a letter of January 21, 1918, to the Alien Property Custodian concluded that for the purposes of section 109 of the Criminal Code the Alien Property Custodian's office should be regarded as an "executive department of the Government of the United States." This letter has not heretofore been published as an opinion. I feel that it should be published and I am therefore attaching it as an appendix hereto, omitting only the introductory paragraph and a quotation from the statute (sec. 109).

With respect to section 113 of the Criminal Code, Attorney General Wickersham declared that, considering the history and purpose of the section, there is no doubt the Congress intended it to have a broad, rather than a limited, application (29 Op. 397). I quote from the opinion (p. 398):

"The terms of the statute are comprehensive. * * * The prohibition * * * extends to every officer or clerk in the employ of the Government, whatever his rank or function. * * * The statute is a penal enactment, but it had a remedial purpose, and it was plainly the intent of Congress to make the remedy an adequate one, and so, instead of selecting and enumerating in detail all the offices and positions in which the danger of abuse was apparent, Congress made sure of its purpose by including generally every officer and clerk in the employ of the Government. * * *

"It was clearly within the power of Congress to make the statute comprehensive of everybody in the employ or pay of the Government, and the nature of the case called for a general, rather than for a limited, designation of the persons to be prohibited."

In such circumstances the rule properly applicable is that laid down in *Steele* v. *United States No. 2*, supra—that is, the word "officer" when used in a statute is not to be given a narrow meaning if it is apparent that this would not accord with the intent of Congress.

The memorandum prepared in the Office of Price Administration appears to proceed upon the theory that members of the war price and rationing boards would be officers, rather than clerks, save for the supposed impediment arising from the manner of their appointment. The phrase "officer or clerk" in section 113 is a comprehensive term, and it is not to be supposed that one may escape its application because his position is elevated somewhat above that of the ordinary clerk and yet is not quite an office. It is to be noted in this connection that bureau chiefs who supervise clerical workers under the general direction of the head of a department, have long been regarded as clerks within the meaning of the term as used in various statutes (15 Op. A. G. 3, 6; 20 id. 728; 21 id. 363; 29 id. 116, 120).

Aside, therefore, from whether the board members are technically officers or clerks, it is my opinion that they are to be regarded as coming within the words "officer or clerk in the employ of the United States," as used in section 113 of the Criminal Code, and the words "a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with any executive department of the Government of the United States," as used in section 109 of the Criminal Code.[1]

As you know, the Congress has heretofore provided by the acts of May 5, 1941, and December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 150, 861), that the three statutes herein considered shall not be deemed to apply to the members of certain boards appointed under the authority of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (U. S. C., title 50, appendix secs. 301–318) and the Alien Enemy Act of 1798, as amended (U. S. C., title 50, secs. 21–24). If, as stated by the Price Administrator, it is desirable to exempt also the members of the war price and rationing boards, I suggest that the Congress be requested to enact similar legislation affecting them.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS BIDDLE.

"APPENDIX

"Excerpts from Attorney General Gregory's Letter of January 21, 1918, to the Alien Property Custodian

"There is no hard and fast definition of the terms 'officer of the United States' and 'Executive Department.' While used in the Constitution and in a number of different statutes, they do not necessarily mean the same in all places. 'A word is not a crystal transparent and unchanged, it is the skin of a living thought and may vary greatly in color and content according to the circumstances and the time in which it is used.' Mr. Justice Holmes in *Towne* v. *Eisner*, decided January 7, 1918 [245 U. S. 418, 425].

"No doubt there is room for the contention that the attorneys and accountants in your service are neither 'officers of the United States' nor hold places 'under any Executive Department of the Government of the United States,' within the meaning of section 109 of the Criminal Code. As prosecuting officer, however, I could not adopt so narrow a view, but would have to contend for a construction of the words commensurate with the evil struck at. The very comprehensiveness of the language used in every line of the section shows, I think, a special effort on the part of Congress to make the remedy here as broad as the evil.

"What that evil is was thus stated in an opinion by Attorney General Knox, holding that a person appointed as counsel for the delegates of the United States to a Pan-American Conference, 'as to both the intent and letter of the section, comes within the description of a "person holding any place of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any executive department of the Government of the United States."

---

[1] The memorandum submitted by the Office of Price Administration also relies upon the statement in my opinion of April 27, 1942, "it has been ruled that" section 109 is inapplicable "to officers in independent Government agencies outside the 10 executive departments." As indicated above, a careful examination of the precedents which seem to support this view shows that they do not really warrant the implications heretofore drawn from them particularly in the light of the situation existing today.

" 'The wisdom and policy of such a statute are obvious, and the reasons which operate to forbid one holding an important position in the Government to engage in the prosecution of claims against it, with the opportunity, real or suspected,, to bring the influence of his position to bear in support of the claim he is advocating are operative also in the case of one holding such a place as that to which you refer' (23 Op. 533).

"It is not easy to see how it is any less an evil for persons holding responsible positions in the Alien Property Administration to be prosecuting claims against the United States than it would be, say, for persons holding corresponding positions in the Department of Agriculture to do so."

The committee is advised that there are 5,516 local war price and rationing boards in the United States, with at least 1 in every county in the country. The members of these boards serve without compensation, as do large numbers of volunteer assistants and employees. The duties of members of rationing panels include the review of applications for rations and the determination of the applicants' rights to their rations, the interpretation and explanation of rationing orders, and the holding of hearings to determine whether rations issued by the boards have been misused. In addition, local attorneys who are not board members are used as hearing officers without compensation in administrative proceedings concerning alleged violations of rationing regulations.

Persons serving in such capacities without compensation frequently in their private practice represent clients in cases involving the Government. It seems unreasonable to expect such persons to sacrifice private practice in order to continue this volunteer work.

Legislation similar to that proposed in the bill was enacted in behalf of persons serving on selective service boards, appeal boards, and advisory boards (Public Law 47, 77th Cong., approved May 5, 1941, 55 Stat. 150), and for persons serving as members of alien enemy hearing boards (Public Law 376, 77th Cong., approved Dec. 26, 1941, 56 Stat. 861).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY HOMES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2618) to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Columbia", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That notwithstanding any provisions of section 4 of this act such a license shall be issued forthwith to any corporation or association chartered by special act of Congress and having under its charter the purposes or powers of a child-placing agency as herein defined."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 3, after the word "confidential", to strike out "and shall not be open to inspection or divulged except with the authority of the Board of Public Welfare."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 3, after the word "parents", to insert "and requiring the Board of Public Welfare to verify the allegations of the petition, make investigation, and report its findings and recommendations to the court."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 13, after the word "rights", to strike out "in the presence of at least one witness."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 16, after the word "agency", to insert "in the presence of at least one witness."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. The Board of Public Welfare is authorized to make such investigations and inspections as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 25, to change the section number from 9 to 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 3, to change the section number from 10 to 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2618) was read the third time and passed.

JOHN JOSEPH DEFEO

The bill (H. R. 2337) for the relief of John Joseph Defeo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH LANGHORNE WALKER

The bill (H. R. 3247) for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS FROM THE BRAZILIAN GOVERNMENT

The bill (S. 1772) to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson are hereby authorized to accept from the Government of the United States of Brazil such decorations, orders, medals, and emblems as have been or may be tendered them, hereby expressly granting the consent of Congress required for this purpose by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL ORDNANCE MANUFACTURING FACILITIES FOR THE NAVY

The bill (S. 1771) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $65,000,000 for necessary tools, equipment, and facilities for the manufacture or production of ordnance material, munitions, and equipment at either private or public plants.

SEC. 2. The authority herein granted shall include the authority to acquire lands at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy may deem best suited to the purpose, erect or extend buildings, acquire the necessary machinery and equipment, and in private establishments provide plant-protection installations, and shall be in addition to all authority heretofore granted for these purposes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy from time to time, but not less frequently than every 60 days, shall transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisitions of land, by lease or otherwise, effected under the authority of this act.

AMENDMENT OF PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF JUNE 16, 1942

The bill (S. 1708) to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, relating to travel allowances, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 365; 37 U. S. C., Supp. II, 112), as amended, is further amended as follows: In the second paragraph of section 12, strike out the word "thereof" appearing in the next to the last line and insert in lieu thereof the words "of subsistence," so that the proviso of said paragraph when amended shall read as follows: *"Provided,* That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and of the legally constituted Reserve of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $7 per day."

SEC. 2. That the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 365; 37 U. S. C., Supp. II, 112), as amended, is further amended as follows: In the fourth paragraph of section 12, sixth line, immediately after the word "travel" strike out the words "by privately owned conveyance," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "at their own expense," so that the said paragraph when amended shall read as follows: "Individuals belonging to any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including the National Guard and the Reserves of such services, traveling under competent orders which entitle them to transportation or transportation and subsistence as distinguished from mileage, who under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, travel at their own expense, shall be entitled, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, to a money allowance at the rate of 3 cents per mile for the same

distance: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person entitled to traveling expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926."

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO U. S. S. "WOLVERINE"

The bill (S. 1720) to vest title to the U. S. S. *Wolverine* (ex-*Michigan*) in the Foundation for the Original United States Ship Michigan, Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the U. S. S. *Wolverine* (ex-*Michigan*) is hereby transferred to and vested in the Foundation for the Original United States Ship Michigan, Inc.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR LOSS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

The bill (S. 1714) to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $571.75, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FOR LOSS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

The bill (S. 1741) to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V–3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $2,775, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy and civilian personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire in hangar V–3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1757) to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia" was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask the former chairman of the committee to give us an explanation of the purpose of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill, which was approved by both the House and Senate committees, would place officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as regards salaries, on the same basis as officers and members of the Police Department. The bill has been approved by the Commissioners and by the people generally.

Mr. WHITE. Is it limited to equalizing the situation as between the Fire Department and the Police Department?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "marshal", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$3,600"; and in line 6, after the word "machinery", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$3,600", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved July 1, 1930 (46 Stat. 839), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be as follows: Chief engineer, $8,000; deputy chief engineers, $5,000 each; battalion chief engineers, $4,500 each; fire marshal, $5,000; deputy fire marshal, $3,600; inspectors, $2,460 each; captains, $3,600 each; lieutenants, $3,050 each; sergeants, $2,750 each; superintendent of machinery, $5,000; assistant superintendent of machinery, $3,600; pilots, $2,600 each; marine engineers, $2,600 each; assistant marine engineers, $2,460 each; marine firemen, $2,100 each; privates, a basic salary of $1,900 per year, with an annual increase of $100 in salary for 5 years, or until the maximum salary of $2,400 is reached. All original appointments of privates shall be made at the basic salary of $1,900 per year, and the first year of service shall be probationary."

This act shall become effective on the first day of the month following the month in which approved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER ERVIN AND CORA ERVIN

The bill (H. R. 1216) for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

G. F. ALLEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3661) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment on page 2, line 25, after the word "said", to strike out "account" and insert "accounts".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAUL B. LINGLE

The bill (H. R. 1421) for the relief of Paul B. Lingle was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

E. C. FUDGE

The bill (H. R. 2273) for the relief of E. C. Fudge was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REV. JAMES T. DENIGAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of Rev. James T. Denigan, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,578.85."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. JUDITH H. SEDLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1416) for the relief of Mrs. Judith H. Sedler, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the name "Indiana", to insert "administratrix of the estate of Anthony F. Sedler, deceased," and on the same page, in line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,753", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Judith H. Sedler, of Jeffersonville, Ind., administratrix of the estate of Anthony F. Sedler, deceased, the sum of $5,753, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Anthony F. Sedler, assistant general superintendent of the Dahlem Construction Co., engaged on a project at Fort Knox, Ky., resulting from an M4–A4 medium tank of the United States Army, in the service of the Army and operated by a unit of the Army, driving over an automobile which he occupied after having parked it by direction of the military police of the United States Army to permit a convoy of tanks to turn east onto First Avenue from Wilson Road, Fort Knox, Ky., on December 19, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the

amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judith H. Sedler, administratrix of the estate of Anthony F. Sedler, deceased."

SALARY OF SECRETARY OF ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3362) to fix the annual compensation of the Secretary of the Territory of Alaska, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the date of passage of this act the salary of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska is fixed at $7,500 per annum.

SEC. 2. All acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are repealed to the extent of such conflict.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what is the present salary of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska?

Mr. DANAHER. The report shows that the present salary of the secretary of Alaska is $5,600.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ISABELLA TUCKER

The bill (H. R. 3075) for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF AWARDS IN CONNECTION WITH WAR MINERALS RELIEF STATUTES

The bill (H. R. 2616) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war materials relief statutes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE AND DELIVERY OF REVENUE BONDS IN HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 2778) to ratify and confirm act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO WORK ON TUNNEL SITES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1479) providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites, which had been reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "as", to strike out "proclaimed by the President," and insert "determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress," and at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this act and ending 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress, no location on the line of a tunnel run for the development of a vein or lode or for the discovery of mines, or veins or lodes not appearing on the surface, made by parties other than the owners of such tunnel, shall be considered valid because of the failure of such owners to prosecute work thereon with reasonable diligence as required by section 2323 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and no right to undiscovered veins on the line of any such tunnel shall be considered to have been abandoned because of any failure to prosecute work thereon during such period: *Provided*, That every claimant of any such tunnel site, in order to obtain the benefits of this act, shall file or cause to be filed in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, within 6 months from the date of this act, a notice of his desire to hold the tunnel site claim under this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1801) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Virginian Railway Co., a corporation, for railroad yard enlargement purposes, a parcel of the Camp Allen Reservation at Norfolk, Va., was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to object to Calendar No. 792, Senate bill 1801.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

PRESENTATION TO ADMIRAL NIMITZ OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4377) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility as Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet from December 31, 1941, to the present time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I inquire of the able Senator from Massachusetts whether this is an exception to the general rule or whether this is the establishment of a new rule in respect to the presentation of medals? I have, of course, no objection to any decoration which may be awarded Admiral Nimitz; I am simply wondering whether we are here setting a new precedent in this respect.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this bill originated in the House of Representatives. The Committee on Naval Affairs of the House thought that the record made by Admiral Nimitz was such that if Congress took this action it would be in the nature of approval and commendation of the fine services he has rendered. The members of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate could see no objection to approving the House action.

While I am on my feet, I should say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that personally I do not believe in bestowing honors or decorations on Army or Navy officers while the war is in progress. I think after the war is over we ought to extend to the limit whatever powers Congress may have in expressing commendation and appreciation of outstanding military services.

Some years ago from this floor Mr. Justice Holmes was paid a tribute for his excellent service as a Justice of the Supreme Court. He wrote back to the Senator who paid him the tribute a remarkable letter in which he said that nobody ought to be thanked for or praised for doing his full and complete duty, for being an honest judge or an able judge, or other public servant. I have felt that that sentiment applies also to the officers and men of the Army and Navy and to other faithful public officials.

The President himself has already under existing law bestowed upon Admiral Nimitz the Distinguished Service Medal. He has full authority to do this. The action therefore by the Congress at this time is in the nature of giving sanction and approval to the action of the President.

The Senator's inquiry presents an opportunity to state briefly the law with reference to giving of medals. There are two kinds of medals under the law which the President is authorized to bestow: Medals for heroic conduct in action such as the Congressional Medal of Honor, Navy Cross, and so forth; the other type is the Distinguished Service Medal which is given to persons who perform outstanding services to the Government in positions of great responsibility. The President of the United States is authorized by the Congress to bestow these medals in his discretion and only one, the Congressional Medal of Honor, is bestowed in the name of the Congress.

The Congress having delegated its power to the President to give in the name of Congress the Congressional Medal of Honor has not removed from Congress the right itself to request the President to bestow the Congressional Medal of Honor on certain individuals.

Approximately 40 Congressional Medals of Honor have already been bestowed by the President, but Congress has not directed that any be bestowed during this war. It is to be noted that this award is the Distinguished Service Medal and not the Congressional Medal of Honor.

I repeat therefore that the President, having the right to make this award, and having done it, the action by the Congress now seems to me to merely amount to the Congress concurring in the action that the President has taken and therefore makes the bestowing of the medal

not merely upon the initiative and discretion of the President but also upon action by the Congress.

After this law is enacted I assume the Navy will issue a citation to Admiral Nimitz calling attention to the action taken by the Congress.

Mr. President, I can see no objection—and I am sure the Senator from Michigan cannot—to Congress taking this action in this instance, but I should like to say to the Senator, in view of what I have said, that I feel our action in the future in regard to these awards ought to be guarded while the war is in progress. Nobody knows what mishaps may occur in the months ahead, and we ought not to overdo the matter of extending our thanks and our appreciation by special acts of Congress. I am informed that in the last war no medals or awards were granted until after the war was over. Then a board was set up that made recommendations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator whether there is any other officer in World War No. 2 to whom this sort of recognition has been extended?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is none.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, of course I shall not object to the bill, because any such objection would necessarily infer some relationship to Admiral Nimitz, who certainly is entitled to all the credit and appreciation which a grateful country can give him; but I respectfully suggest that it is somewhat invidious, except as we are going to pursue this system, to confine the Nation's recognition at this moment to just one out of the galaxy of heroic and able patriots who are serving in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Michigan has expressed my own sentiments and those of the members of the committee. He is embarrassed by reason of the fact that this bill is on the calendar, and he may feel, as I do, that perhaps it is not wise policy to begin bestowing such honors at this time.

It is only fair to say—and I am sure the Senator from Michigan agrees with me—that this officer has conducted himself most admirably and has made a glorious record.

The Senator from Michigan understands, of course, that this bill was initiated by the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, and that Admiral Nimitz himself did not seek the honor which the bill proposes to confer upon him.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Would the Senator have any objection to having printed in the RECORD the admirable report of the committee on the pending bill?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have no objection at all.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask unanimous consent that following the discussion the report of the committee on the bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of the Congress, a distinguished service medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the able Senator insert this documentation on behalf of Admiral Nimitz. I wish to repeat that I totally concur that Admiral Nimitz has earned every possible expression of appreciation that a grateful Government can give him. My comment has not related in any aspect to that phase of the matter. I am simply suggesting that, if we are to pursue this method, then there are many others to whom similar acknowledgment is past due.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the report (No. 781) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4377) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill H. R. 4377 is to authorize the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility as commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet from December 31, 1941, to the present time.

The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs concur with the following excerpts from the House of Representatives Report No. 1253, dated March 13, 1944:

"Immediately after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Admiral Nimitz was detached from duty as Chief of the Bureau of Navigation and ordered as commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet. He assumed that duty on December 31, 1941, and despite the losses at Pearl Harbor and a serious shortage of ships, planes, and supplies, he organized his forces and carried on defensive warfare which resulted in the halting of the Japanese advances. As rapidly as ships, personnel, and material became available to him he shifted from defensive to offensive warfare and under his brilliant guidance and leadership the Navy won victories in the Coral Sea, off Midway, and in the Solomon Islands. Recently forces under his command have captured and occupied the Gilbert and Marshall Islands, and he is now striking blows at Japanese positions even farther to the westward. These accomplishments have been possible because of the untiring devotion of Admiral Nimitz to his duty and to his skill as a strategist.

"The committee are aware of the fact that the President is empowered, without congressional action, to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Nimitz, and, in fact, such a medal was presented to him in June 1942. However, the enactment of H. R. 4377 is a proper and fitting action indicating recognition by the Congress of the outstanding service he has performed for his country.

"The committee are of the opinion that the distinguished service rendered by Admiral Nimitz should be thus specially recognized and unanimously recommend enactment of the bill."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1432) to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in line 6, after the date "July 1, 1949", to insert "*Provided*, That the appropriation hereunder shall not exceed $30,000,000 per annum", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 is amended by striking out the date "July 1, 1944" in the second sentence of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the date "July 1, 1949": *Provided*, That the appropriation hereunder shall not exceed $30,000,000 per annum.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of this bill. Every department which purports to be concerned with the subject matter objects to its consideration and adoption, and it is my recollection that the press recently carried reports to the effect that the civilian pilots, some 30,000 in number, as I recall, who had been partially or wholly trained under this program were now being found to be unnecessary to the service. I feel that we are entitled to an explanation from the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill was introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada, who is the author of the original Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939. The Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, so far as it would train civilian pilots, will expire in June of this year. In order that the authority for carrying on such a program may continue to exist, I thought it necessary, and I now believe it to be necessary, that the life of the present law be extended for another 5 years. Whether it will be put into active operation or not will depend on whether an appropriation is made annually to carry on the training of civilian pilots.

Regarding the expression of the able Senator from Connecticut to the effect that the bill is opposed by departments, letters from which appear in the report, let me say that if he will read the first expression of the first report he will find that these agencies deem the enactment of the bill unnecessary for military purposes. That is true, because the training of pilots for military purposes, both in the Army and the Navy, has now been taken over by the Army and by the Navy, but the training of pilots for civilian life and civilian activities is just as important today as it ever was, and will be more and more important as time goes on.

It is true that we would have a great reservoir of pilots if the war were to end tomorrow or the next day, and undoubtedly when it does end there will be a great many trained pilots; but those trained pilots will divide themselves into several groups. There will be one group returning from the war who will say, "I never want to see a plane again. I have had all the airplanes I want." There will be another group who will be approaching the age when they can no longer serve properly as pilots in commercial air activities, because by the

time a young man reaches 32 to 35 years of age, his service as a commercial pilot has about approached its conclusion. The matter of pilot training addresses itself to youth. The pilot who has attained the age of 35, and beyond, as a rule has lost the imagination of youth, and has lost the best qualifications of a trained commercial pilot. That being true, in my judgment, and in the judgment of the Committee on Commerce, it was deemed necessary to have the training of civilian pilots go forward, either now or in the future, sometime between now and the end of 5 years from now.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Am I correct in my understanding that several thousand, perhaps 30,000, civilian-pilot training course men have recently been rejected by the services as of no special value for military purposes?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think that is true; I think the contrary is the fact. The military departments of the Nation, both the Army and the Navy, are looking for pilots and for aviation experts. They look for trainees for ground service, and for pilot service as well.

It is true that at the present time the Army and the Navy have said that civilian aviation training is no longer necessary, and they have taken the entire training of military pilots out of the Civil Aviation Authority and jurisdiction and turned it over to the Army and the Navy.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Am I correct in stating that about a year ago the distinguished Senator from Nevada was here explaining to the Senate that those engaged in civilian pilot training were being discriminated against and being unjustly treated, and that he introduced a bill at that time which would tend to mitigate the difficulty in which they found themselves?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. Please understand that when the war started the Army found itself without any adjunct for training, so it took hold of the C. A. A., because the C. A. A. had been carrying on a program. It turned its trainees over to the C. A. A. for training. The Navy likewise did that, and for some reason or other the Navy attracted the very finest young men of the country to its training group. The Army woke up one morning and found to its consternation that so many young men had gone into the Navy to be trained as pilots that it was going to be difficult to secure pilots for the Army. So the Army asked the C. A. A. to reach out and collect and induce a great group of young men who had been otherwise rejected for military service to enter into that particular line of training, and they were induced to come in, and they did come in by thousands.

After they had volunteered and subjected themselves to orders, although they were not in the Army, or in the military service at all, but had subjected themselves to orders, so that they might be trained for military purposes, all of a sudden they found that the training was not going forward, due to the fact that sufficient money was not available, or for other reasons. These men had left their homes, had separated themselves from their regular business, and had gone to wherever they were directed to go for training. Some of them were compelled to sustain themselves in one way or another. They did everything from selling newspapers to driving taxis in the various towns where they were waiting for training. So we had to get the money for the program to which the Senator refers in order to take care of these men.

Mr. DANAHER. I was acutely aware of the situation to which the Senator from Nevada refers, and appeared before his committee myself in an effort to prove of some help in that respect.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Having all this background in mind, my questions were directed to ascertaining whether we should perpetuate the possibility of the recurrence of such injustice. It seemed to me those men were unjustly dealt with. Indeed, I know of cases of men who were employed under that program at this minute being offered the choice of being cooks or bakers in the Army service. It seems to me a situation of that kind calls for some public notice, and I wanted the comment of the Senator from Nevada on that point.

Mr. McCARRAN. The pending bill will not extend the program to which the Senator refers. I hope the Senator will permit the bill to be passed.

Mr. DANAHER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOURS OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was on page 1, line 8, after the word "require", to strike out the words "postmasters of the first, second, and third classes."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, may I have an explanation why postmasters of the first, second, and third classes are eliminated from the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has charge of this particular bill. May we pass the bill over temporarily, so that I may send for the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

IMPROVEMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN ROADS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3912) to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$285,000,000" and insert "$290,000,000: *And provided further,* That not exceeding $5,000,000 of this appropriation be used by the Commissioner of Public Roads in areas certified to the Federal Works Administrator, by the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, or by their authorized representatives, as maneuver areas, for such improvement and construction as may be necessary to keep the roads therein, which have been or may be used for training of the armed forces, in suitable condition for such training purposes, and to repair the damage caused thereto by the operations of men and equipment in such training."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill, but I do object to the amendment. I wish to have an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment is for the purpose of remedying this situation: In a number of States—I do not know how many, but in most of them, I imagine, although I am not positive about it—the Army has held maneuvers, and as a result of the maneuvers roads have been damaged to a large extent, as was shown by proof before our committee. The increase of $5,000,000 is for the purpose of making it possible to repair roads which were damaged in Army maneuvers, in cases where it is certified by the Army and the Navy that the damage has been so caused. That is the reason for the increase, and I hope the Senator from Connecticut will be willing to let the bill be passed.

Mr. DANAHER. I am not on the committee, and have had only a few minutes to examine the report, the bill having been brought to us only yesterday afternoon, and I have no over-all comprehension of what is expected of us in the enactment of the bill. Therefore I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. When a maneuver area has first been designated, the Secretary of War, I take it, has so designated the area, either himself or through general officers under his command.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. In the maneuver areas, were the roads to which the bill would apply already constructed at the expense of the States?

Mr. McKELLAR. For the most part. Of course, the first-class roads were all constructed under what is known as the Federal Aid Act, under which the States and the Federal Government contribute half and half in constructing roads. Access roads which have been destroyed would be built entirely at the expense of the Government. Other roads which have been cut up or injured are to be rebuilt by the counties or the States. It is a matter that would seem to appeal to almost everyone. Here is an area which the Army has designated as a maneuver area, and the Army hauls its big guns and tanks and other instruments of warfare over the area. When roads have

been injured by the Army, and the Army itself has certified that it has injured them, it would be a proper matter for the Government to reimburse the States. That is all the bill provides.

Mr. DANAHER. One further question. Why should not such request for additional appropriations be made by the War Department, or by the Navy Department, to the extent that either Army or the Navy is responsible for the damage? As I understand, this bill comes from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and constitutes an amendment to the Defense Highway Act of 1941.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill went originally to the Roads Committee of the House. In the Senate we have one committee, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which deals with post offices and with roads. In the House there are two separate committees, one a Roads Committee, and the other a Post Office Committee. If the Senator will notice the language of the bill itself, it provides that nothing can be done unless a certificate is made by the War Department or the Navy Department. So the matter is referred to the War Department or the Navy Department in any event.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think I might help answer the question. When the subject of maneuver damage first came up the War Department very frankly said, "We do not have in the Department men who are capable of evaluating such damage." The best agency the Federal Government has to deal with the question is the Public Roads Administration. For that reason we required in the first place that when a maneuver took place it should be promptly reported by the Army, and the area should be promptly examined by the Public Roads Administration, as well as by the State highway officials who make the complaint. In that way we can obtain an estimate of the damage. The Army said, "We have every confidence in the world that justice will be done by the organization, which has been functioning now for more than 25 years." The Army said it did not want to assume the responsibility of passing upon the damage itself, because it did not feel qualified to do so.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator tell me for what the $290,000,000 would be used?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will look at the item he will find that only $30,000,000 is involved; $260,000,000 has already been spent under an authorization bill which was passed a couple of years ago—as I recall in the first part of 1942 or the last part of 1941. That was an authorization of $260,000,000, and the amendment simply adds $30,000,000 to the $260,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it to be used to build farm-to-market highways?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. DANAHER. For what is the $30,000,000 to be used?

Mr. McKELLAR. The $30,000,000 would be used for access roads to Army plants and to camps.

Mr. DANAHER. To docks and wharves?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and to docks and wharves and such places. The item of $260,000,000 misled me at first. But the provision is simply to increase the authorization from $260,000,000, which, except for a very small portion, a few hundred thousand dollars, as I recall, has already been spent.

Mr. DANAHER. One other question. Does the term "maneuver area," as used on page 2, line 2, have a definite meaning?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. The Army in an order fixes the maneuver area in any State.

Mr. DANAHER. It might be several hundred square miles?

Mr. McKELLAR. In my own State a number of counties were involved. I do not recall the number. Six or eight or ten counties, at any rate, were included in the maneuver area.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not have the floor really. However, if I have it, I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether any limit of time is attached with respect to the money. In my State there are outstanding from 1941 claims for damage to roads which have not yet been paid.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the bill does not fix the time. It simply completes the authorization.

Mr. MAYBANK. It provides that whatever is approved shall be paid?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. The proviso in the committee amendment is:

That not exceeding $5,000,000 of this appropriation be used by the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Is the work in question to be done by the public highway departments?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is to be done by the agency of which Mr. MacDonald is the head. That is the Public Roads Administration.

Mr. DAVIS. The work will be done under his supervision, but the work itself will be done by the public highway agencies of the States?

Mr McKELLAR. The work will be done under Mr. MacDonald's direction. The Army and the Navy will certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads, and the work will be done by his organization.

Mr. DAVIS. By the Federal organization—Mr. MacDonald's organization?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3912) was read the third time and passed.

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of House bill 2928, which, in my absence, was temporarily passed over a moment ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to state that the bill was passed by the House July 5, 1943. It remained a long time in our committee, because the House included in the bill postmasters and post-office inspectors, who were not originally estimated for by the Post Office Department. Objection was raised in our committee. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] did not feel that he had sufficient information with respect to the effect upon postmasters and post-office inspectors, so at a meeting of the committee yesterday it was decided to strike out the postmasters and post-office inspectors.

There is no dispute about the overtime payments that are due to other employees. In that amended form the bill is supported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "require", to strike out "postmasters of the first, second, and third classes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "service", to strike out "post-office inspectors and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 11, after the word "Service", to strike out "Cost Ascertainment employees (until such time as they shall be transferred to the departmental roll)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 2, after the word "time", to insert "such overtime, however, to be payable only upon so much of the earned basic compensation as does not exceed $2,900 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 8, after the word "compensation" and the period to insert "In computing the overtime compensation the base pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one three hundred and sixth of the respective per annum salaries and the base pay for 1 hour shall be considered to be one-eighth of the base pay so computed for 1 day."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2928) was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF PARCEL OF LAND TO VIRGINIAN RAILWAY CO.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a few moments ago, when Calendar No. 792, Senate bill 1801, was called, my attention was temporarily distracted, and the bill was passed over at the request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I now ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1801 be considered. Since the Senator from North Dakota requested that the bill be passed over I have conferred with him and showed him the report on the bill. The amount of property involved is less than $300. An agreement was made by the Navy Department with the railroad company to give the railroad 0.93 acre in return for building a fence and highway for the Navy. The whole amount involved is less than $300. The Navy has been much benefited by the improvement which has been made. I assume the Senator has now no objection to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1801) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Virginian Railway Co., a corporation, for railroad-yard enlargement purposes, a parcel of land of the Camp Allen Reservation at Norfolk, Va., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey to The Virginian Railway Co., a corporation, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip or parcel of land of the Camp Allen Reservation, Norfolk, Va., for the enlargement of its railroad yard, said parcel of land being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at point "C" on PW Drawing No. 10,545, on file in the Navy Department, which point is north forty-nine degrees forty-four minutes west and three hundred and twenty feet more or less distant from the center line of the Seventh Avenue entrance into Camp Allen and is on the present right-of-way line of the Virginian Railway Co.; thence north fifty-four degrees twenty-six minutes thirty seconds west two hundred and forty-three and sixty-four one-hundredths feet, more or less, to point "D"; thence north forty-nine degrees forty-four minutes west one thousand and fifty-six and seventy-one one-hundredths feet, more or less, to point "E"; thence north sixty-five degrees nineteen minutes fourteen seconds west three hundred and seventy-three and nine one-hundredths feet, more or less, to point "A"; thence to the right along the arc of a curve having a radius of six hundred and two and eighty one-hundredths feet, more or less, for a distance of three hundred and eighty-six and thirty-two one-hundredths feet, more or less, to point "B"; thence south forty-nine degrees forty-four minutes east one thousand two hundred and ninety-nine and fifty-five one-hundredths feet, more or less, to the point of beginning; containing all told ninety-three one-hundredths acre, more or less, situate in Norfolk, Va.

BISHOPVILLE MILLING CO.

The bill (S. 1247) for the relief of the Bishopville Milling Co. was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Bishopville Milling Co., of Bishopville, S. C., the sum of $870.05, in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States for compensation for property damages sustained when a truck and trailer owned by such company was demolished in a collision with a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 521, near Lancaster, S. C., on October 29, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MRS. CHRISTINE HANSEN

The bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. C. EVENSEN

The bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of C. C. Evensen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AVID EVERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2648) for the relief of Avid Evers, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

APPLICATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS TO CERTAIN SEAMEN

The bill (H. R. 3259) to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT MAKING IT A MISDEMEANOR TO STOW AWAY ON VESSELS

The bill (H. R. 3602) to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CERTAIN MERCHANT MARINE CASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3257) to amend Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 15, after the word "than", to strike out "four" and insert "two."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 16, after the word "hereof", to change the period to a colon and insert:

Provided, That no such agreement or modification shall be entered into in any case where the right to sue the United States has expired at the time of making the agreement or modification unless made within 60 days after the enactment of this proviso.

SEC. 2. Whenever the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, finds that a meritorious claim arising on or after December 7, 1941, against the United States, or any agent or employee thereof, for loss of or damage to cargo has lapsed by reason of failure to commence suit against the United States or any agent or employee thereof within the time provided by law, and that such failure to institute suit was based on lack of information not resulting from lack of due diligence, or other causes sufficient in the opinion of the Administrator to excuse such failure to institute suit, the Administrator may compromise, or settle any such claim on the same basis as though the time for suit had not expired: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to extend the time to commence suit.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEF ON EDUCATIONAL AND PHYSICAL FITNESS OF CIVILIANS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I report favorably Senate Resolution 277, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 copies of part I, and each subsequent part, of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee during the current Congress, pursuant to Senate Resolution 74 (78th Cong., 1st sess.), authorizing an investigation of the educational and physical fitness of the civilian population as related to national defense.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator make an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Subcommittee on Educational and Physical Fitness of Civilians of the Committee on Education and Labor has been holding hearings relative to wartime health and education. We are particularly interested in obtaining a reprint of the hearings relating to juvenile delinquency. The number of

hearings printed has been insufficient, and the resolution provides for the printing of an additional 1,000 copies. It has heretofore been necessary to arrange to have the hearings reprinted. However, if the resolution is agreed to 2,000 copies, instead of 1,000 will be printed.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

INQUIRY INTO LEGAL AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago Senate Resolution 252 was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary and, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The resolution provides that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a survey of the statutory or constitutional authority on the basis of which Executive orders and other orders by executive departments have been issued. When the resolution was reported, I asked that it go over, in order that I might look into it.

After conferring with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and also with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], I now ask that the resolution be taken up for present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 252), which had been reported by Mr. MCCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary, and subsequently referred to and reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for section 1, which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated. The substitute is agreeable to the Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and also to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all of page 1 and lines 1 and 2 on page 2, and in lieu thereof to insert:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, for the information of the Senate and as a basis for any legislation the committee may deem it advisable to recommend, is hereby authorized and directed to study, survey, and report to the Senate not later than the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the constitutional or statutory authority upon which any or all Executive orders issued by the President since March 4, 1933, were based, and likewise the statutory or constitutional basis upon which directives, rules, and regulations have been issued during the same period by or under the authority of any executive department or independent agency of the United States Government.

So as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, for the information of the Senate and as a basis for any legislation the committee may deem it advisable to recommend, is hereby authorized and directed to study, survey, and report to the Senate not later than the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the constitutional or statutory authority upon which any or all Executive orders issued by the President since March 4, 1933, were based, and likewise the statutory or constitutional basis upon which directives, rules, and regulations have been issued during the same period by or under the authority of any executive department or independent agency of the United States Government.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants to require such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I desire to substantiate what has been said by the Senator from Kentucky, although of course it is not necessary that I do so. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has been consulted about this matter, in conjunction with the Senator from Kentucky, and it is agreed that the proposed amendment is perfectly satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the resolution is agreed to, I wish to call attention to the fact, for the RECORD, that the issuance of Executive orders by the President of the United States is not a new matter. Running all the way back to President Abraham Lincoln, the Presidents have issued Executive orders not only in time of war but in time of peace.

I have before me a compilation of the number of Executive orders and proclamations which have been issued by various Presidents, beginning with President Abraham Lincoln. The compilation is very brief, and I think it will be interesting to the Senate to have it read:

Abraham Lincoln issued 2 Executive orders and 49 proclamations.

Andrew Johnson issued 5 Executive orders and 51 proclamations.

Grant issued 13 Executive orders and 55 proclamations.

Hayes issued no Executive orders and 15 proclamations.

Garfield issued none of either variety.

Arthur issued 3 Executive orders and 17 proclamations.

Cleveland during his first administration issued 5 Executive orders and 22 proclamations.

Harrison issued 3 Executive orders and 66 proclamations.

Cleveland during his second administration issued 68 Executive orders and 53 proclamations.

McKinley issued 50 Executive orders and 60 proclamations.

Theodore Roosevelt issued 111 Executive orders and 407 proclamations.

President Taft issued 699 Executive orders and 365 proclamations.

President Wilson issued 1,770 Executive orders and 361 proclamations.

President Harding issued 484 Executive orders and 80 proclamations.

President Coolidge issued 1,248 Executive orders and 201 proclamations.

President Hoover issued 1,004 Executive orders and 168 proclamations.

Up until 1936, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued 1,469 Executive orders and 121 proclamations.

Bringing that figure down to yesterday, the 29th day of March 1944, President Roosevelt has issued 3,361 Executive orders and 572 proclamations, most of them, of course, having been brought about because of the war.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator please state the date of the RECORD from which he has been reading?

Mr. BARKLEY. The date of the RECORD from which I have been reading is March 17, 1936.

Mr. DANAHER. And will the Senator state the volume and page numbers, if he has them, please?

Mr. BARKLEY. The table from which I am reading is on page 3883, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, volume 80, part 4.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator please state how many such Executive orders his capitulation shows President Roosevelt had issued down to March 1936?

Mr. BARKLEY. The number is 1,469.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, so far as I recall, the Senate has not heretofore agreed to a special resolution authorizing or directing a committee to make a survey of the statutory or constitutional basis upon which the various Executive orders have been issued. Personally, I think such information might be useful to the Senate and to the country. We all know that in time of war, Presidents are required to issue Executive orders in great numbers, as well as proclamations. It is not desired, of course, and my information comes from the chairman of the committee, that the committee go into a fishing expedition to determine the policy involved in the Executive orders; because no committee has the right or power, or if it had such,

would not attempt to exercise it, to call the President before it, in order to inquire what went on in his mind as the basis for the issuance of an Executive order, any more than it would call before it the Supreme Court and inquire what happened in a conference which resulted in a decision of the Supreme Court. That is not the object of the resolution. It is simply for the purpose of surveying the statutory and constitutional authority upon which they are based, for the information of the Senate and as a basis for any legislation the committee might recommend. In that sense I believe that the survey may be helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 29, 1944, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 250. An act to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife;

S. 1410. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940;

S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizating payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry naval nominations which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Milton E. Miles, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from March 22, 1944.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Albert W. Foreman to be State director of selective service for Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leroy P. Raynor to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with the rank of commander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John H. Brittain to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with the rank of lieutenant commander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN BILLS AND RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives; and that the Vice President be authorized to sign any bills or resolutions ready for his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO SATURDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Saturday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Saturday, April 1, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, March 30 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Donald B. Duncan, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 2d day of March 1943.

Capt. Thomas R. Kurtz, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, on the retired list for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Eastern Sea Frontier.

Capt. Burrell C. Allen, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, in the retired list for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Western Sea Frontier.

Capt. Marion C. Robertson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier.

Capt. Charlton E. Battle, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Service Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Capt. John H. Magruder, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier.

Capt. Paul S. Theiss, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Amphibious Forces, Pacific Fleet.

Capt. Homer W. Graf, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Seventh Fleet.

Capt. Allen G. Quynn, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Service Force, Pacific Fleet.

Capt. Clinton E. Braine, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Fourth Fleet.

Capt. Howard A. Flanigan, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, on the retired list for temporary service, while serving as deputy chief of staff to commander, Twelfth Fleet.

Capt. George A. Seitz, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as chief of staff to commander, Air Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Capt. Leonard Doughty, Jr., United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, on the retired list for temporary service, while serving as commander, advanced bases, Italy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 30 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Col. Albert W. Foreman to be State director of selective service for Delaware.

THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 1944

Leroy P. Raynor
John H. Brittain

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals, for temporary service

Felix B. Stump
Alfred M. Pride

To be vice admiral, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier

Robert C. Giffen

POSTMASTERS

KANSAS

Martin A. Basgall, Hays.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Anna C. Liggett, New Underwood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, for the love that kept us through the night and for the miracle of dawning day, we praise Thee. Though confusion may bewilder us and cares distract us, keep us invincible in spirit with hearts of charity and the disposition to make every duty a delight and doing good to others a sacred privilege. No bitter word ever lightened a burden, no complaint ever made a dark day brighter or a rough road smoother.

We draw near to Thee, our Father, by way of our merciful Saviour who was touched with a feeling of our infirmities and bore our transgressions. Dear Lord, spare us from the vice of ingratitude and forbid that we should deepen the wounds of Him who embraced the antagonisms of a dark world that we might know how to redeem it. In this season, as we measure His holy steps, turn us aside from things unworthy and make the service of our lives commensurate with the holiness of His mission and the splendor of His courage. Let the benedictions of Thy love and happiness bless all our homes and unfold their sweetest joy and beauty upon all hearthstones. Keep alive in our breasts the promise of a living world, seeking the brotherly ways and feeling that we are moving on to a glorious forever, with the memories of earth enriching our heaven. In the name of Him who is our peace, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4381. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4346) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 13 and 36 to the foregoing bill and agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment numbered 42 to said bill.

THE LATE JAMES A. O'LEARY

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of JAMES A. O'LEARY, or Jim as he was lovingly known to the members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, there was a feeling of genuine sorrow. It was hard to think that we would miss hereafter his cheery greeting, always graced by his genial smile. Each member cherished him as a personal friend, and knew that his discussion of the most difficult problem would be illuminated always by his rich Irish wit.

Jim was devoted to the merchant marine, and worked untiringly for its success. We all found him wise in counsel, zealous in work and industrious to spare no effort that would make our Nation more sea-minded and more conscious of the national importance of merchant ships. He achieved much and was never satisfied that all had been done which should be done. He constantly strove for greater results, and I owe much to him for his genial comradeship, his continued support, his inspiration, and his zeal. I believe all of Jim's colleagues on the committee feel as I do.

I present for spreading upon the RECORD of the House, where he served ably, the following resolution adopted by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries at its session on Tuesday, March 28:

Committee Resolution 9

Whereas on the 16th day of March 1944, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives suffered in the loss of JAMES A. O'LEARY, of New York, one of its most industrious, diligent, and faithful members, and an invaluable factor in upbuilding an American merchant marine, in promoting the American fisheries, in expanding the United States Coast Guard, and in providing navigation aids, in supporting marine hospitals, and in upbuilding the Panama Canal: Now therefore be it

Resolved—

First. That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries recognizes in the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, Representative from the Eleventh District of New York, the loss of a devoted public servant, a faithful Representative, a sterling patriot, and a loving friend whose record in Congress was marked by industry, energy, ability, fidelity, zeal, and patriotism, and whose sound judgment, signal ability and wise statesmanship, were of inestimable benefit to this committee in its deliberations at all times;

Second. That the committee will ever cherish the memory of their association with Mr. O'LEARY, and will find in the patience, intelligence, and zeal with which he served an example and inspiration;

Third. That the committee extends to the district which Mr. O'LEARY served and to the family which survives him its deepest sympathy in their sorrow; and

Fourth. That these resolutions shall be spread upon the minutes of this committee, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that a copy shall be sent to the family of the deceased.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the resolution referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF MEMBER FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF COLORADO

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MARCH 29, 1944.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. DEAN M. GILLESPIE as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of Colorado, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GILLESPIE presented himself before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein three editorials from New Orleans newspapers in connection with the death of former Governor Sanders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks on two matters and include therein two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article by Frank C. Waldrop.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and other special orders I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the American Red Cross does not sell cigarettes.

In its current campaign for much-needed funds this great humanitarian organization, which has a glorious record of achievement of services rendered our soldiers and sailors and their families, has had to face the rumor that it indulged in these sales.

This week I had a letter from a constituent who had heard our men in China were thus being treated. The national headquarters of the American Red Cross here in Washington has sent me the following statement:

The American Red Cross does not sell cigarettes. From time to time rumors similar to the one reported by your constituent have been brought to our attention and in each and every instance where there has been sufficient information to trace the allegations down to the source we have never found an instance in which the American Red Cross did actually sell cigarettes. The rumor is generally the result of confusion in someone's mind.

For example, we have found that the Army post exchange has been located either next door to an American Red Cross service club or sometimes under the same roof, and because the serviceman buys cigarettes from the post exchange, which is operated by the Army, the American Red Cross has been said to sell cigarettes. As you know, we have no control over Army post exchanges.

From time to time American Red Cross warehouses have been broken into and cigarettes have been stolen and placed on the market. When the soldier opens the cigarette package he finds a statement which says, "A gift of the American Red Cross." He thinks, of course, that the American Red Cross has sold the cigarettes. Army Intelligence vigorously traces down every theft of cigarettes from the American Red Cross and takes appropriate action for the organization.

We shall wire our authorities in China to endeavor to trace down the allegation made in this case.

SERVICEMEN'S AID ACT OF 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be considering the Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944, commonly known as the omnibus G. I. bill of rights for the veterans of the Second World War. I have received many communications from veterans' organizations and citizens in New Hampshire urging the passage of this measure. I have long been in favor of the proposed legislation and will give it my wholehearted support. The veterans' bill of rights providing for "Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans" will, I hope, soon become law.

The Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944 makes the Veterans' Administration an agency of the United States second only to the War and Navy Departments. The functions of the Federal Government in connection with aid to the veterans of World War No. 2 are placed under the Veterans' Administration. The act provides for hospitalization, education and vocational guidance, loans for homes, farms, and businesses, employment service, and benefits for the unemployed. This comprises a fine program to help the returning service men and women of this war.

We must do everything within our power for those who are fighting that democracy may endure, that the institutions which have made this Nation great may continue. Our first task is to care for the needs of the returning veterans of this war. It is our duty to develop a program of complete assistance for those serving in the armed forces. I favor the passage of this measure and hope that we shall act upon it immediately after the Easter recess.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the impending International Monetary Conference, called at the invitation of President Roosevelt and Secretary Morgenthau, causes me to issue a word of warning to the administration against making any international monetary commitments to bind the United States before specific authority is given by Congress.

The British scheme advocated by Lord Keynes for an $8,000,000,000 international stabilization bank and a $10,000,000,000 international reconstruction bank, and a somewhat similar United States Treasury—White plan—would put the control over American economy, and that of every participating country, into the hands of an international board of directors, the majority of which would represent debtor nations to the United States. I am not willing to turn the control of our country and its future welfare over to an international banking group.

A study of both the Keynes and White schemes, clearly reveals that these international proposals would delegate to an international board of directors over member nations, the following powers:

First. To place economic sanctions against any nation.

Second. To regulate the value of foreign exchange.

Third. To fix the value of money within any country.

Fourth. To regulate imports and exports to and from any country.

Fifth. To fix the value of gold and silver held by the United States.

In other words, the future destiny of the people of the United States and other countries would be placed in the hands of an international board.

Since the United States would provide a large share of the capital for both international banks, I strongly insist that Congress should pass on the issues involved before the administration commits the country to a policy which will jeopardize the future of the American people. Furthermore, I am of the opinion that Congress cannot delegate the powers sought to be conferred upon the international board without amending the Constitution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter from very reputable and sound farmers in Cambria County, Pa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]?

There was no objection.

ARE WE HEADED FOR A DICTATORSHIP NOW ANY MORE THAN AT ANY TIME IN THE PAST?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, you as well as the rest of us have heard many people assert that we are headed for a dictatorship in this country. On several occasions I have assured the people of the United States that there is absolutely no occasion for alarm. Any time a war is on, from the very nature of war itself and the speed by which we must act, it is necessary to do a lot of things in a summary manner, all in the interests of the national defense. I do not need to take time now to enumerate all of the curtailed rights which are suspended during this war emergency. I have done that before. It is enough to say that no general or admiral can wait for directions from Congress—he must act quickly—he must issue orders quickly—many of which may be in total disregard of the Constitution. Congress tried to run the Civil War by directing General McClellan in all his actions. The result was disastrous. When Grant assumed command, he refused to take the job unless he could use his own judgment. Lincoln, without any authority from Congress said, "All right, Grant, go ahead."

All this talk of usurpation of powers by the President was not only raised against Lincoln in the heat of the War between the States, but even in peace times we have heard the same thing. While none of us personally remember events, our history never forgets.

Here is a resolution passed by the people of Cumberland County, Pa.:

Our Government is disorganized: We see the President of the United States and the Senate in hostile array against each other; the Members of the House of Representatives disorderly and factious; maxims and usages of our Government tested and approved by the experience of half a century are repudiated; the Chief Magistrate is striving to concentrate in himself most dangerous powers, "in derogation of the laws and the Constitution." He claims the right to appoint and to dismiss Cabinet and other officers at his

pleasure, without the "advice and consent of the Senate," and to reappoint after the nominee has been rejected; he has improperly vetoed great and important bills passed by both Houses of Congress; he has undertaken to control and rebuke the Senate for the independent exercises of their legitimate duties.

To whom do you suppose this resolution was directed? Does it not sound as though it was made yesterday in the House or Senate of the United States? Have you not heard speeches just like it in this Congress? Well, it was not directed to any other person than President Andrew Jackson just 110 years ago. The Senate at that time passed a resolution scoring President Jackson in a broad and sweeping indictment. We were not then at war. It was directed against Jackson because he refused to permit the continuance of the Bank of the United States, which was in fact privately owned and operated and which used the Government credit for its own profits.

After the first flurry against the President for his unlawful usurpation of powers, the people came to realize what the fuss was all about. The Legislature of the State of Ohio, to show its disapproval of what the Senate had done in censuring President Jackson in their resolution, passed the following resolution:

Whereas the Senate of the United States did, on the 28th of March 1834, by resolution declare "that the President, in the late executive proceedings in relation to the revenue, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the Constitution and laws, but in derogation of both"; and whereas the same was spread upon the journals of the Senate, and now stands a part of the records of that body; and whereas that declaration was unauthorized by facts, and the adoption of said resolution by the Senate of the United States a manifest usurpation of the impeaching power of the House of Representatives, as well as a dangerous invasion of the rights of the Executive, both as such and as a citizen of the Republic; and whereas the President, on the passage of the resolution aforesaid, caused to be laid before the Senate his protest against it, requesting the insertion thereof upon the journals of that body; and whereas the Senate did refuse compliance with such just and reasonable request; and whereas, if the said act of the Senate be permitted to pass uncensured, a precedent would be thereby established, founded in usurpation and injustice, and subversive of the first principle of a free government, the right of the vilest criminal to meet his accusers face to face and be heard in his own defense; and whereas the people of the State of Ohio require and demand of their representatives in the legislature assembled a solemn and decided expression of disapprobation of the said act of the Senate: Therefore,

1. *Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio*, That the said resolution of the Senate, and the action had thereon by that body, were without precedent, gross "assumption of power not conferred by the Constitution and laws," but in violation of the spirit of both.

2. *Resolved*, That the Senators representing in Congress this State be, and they hereby are, instructed and required to vote for the expunging of the resolution aforesaid from the journals of the Senate.

3. *Resolved*, That we believe the right of instruction one of the fundamental principles of a representative government, and essentially necessary to the purity and stability of our republican institutions; and that, in case the agents of the people are unable to obey the instructions of their respective constituents, it is their solemn duty to resign the power intrusted to them into the hands of those who gave it.

4. *Resolved*, That the Governor of this State be requested to transmit to each of the Senators aforesaid a copy of these resolutions; also, a copy to the President and Vice President of the United States.

5. *Resolved*, That in consideration of the distinguished relation in which the Honorable Thomas H. Benton, one of the Senators in Congress from the State of Missouri, stands to the subject of the foregoing resolutions, the Governor of this State be also requested to transmit a copy of these resolutions to that Senator.

We are not headed toward a dictatorship unless the people vote for a dictatorship. This is the only Nation on earth today holding regular elections the same as always. Every qualified citizen can vote and will, we hope, be given an opportunity to vote, and as long as we continue this program the people, the highest authority in any government, will get what they want.

MRS. IDA FUHRMAN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to honor an aged lady, a constituent of mine, who has been blind the past 10 years. She is Mrs. Ida Fuhrman, of York, Pa. She is doing her bit to help win this war and calls herself an armchair general, keeps well posted on the progress of the war by use of the radio. She has just completed her one hundred and tenth sweater for the Red Cross. In her early life she was a school teacher and has one daughter. Coming from a poor family, she was assisted in getting her education by Mr. David Peters, who was a public-spirited citizen of that day. She says we are going to win this war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including therein an item from the York Dispatch, of March 3, 1944, paying tribute to her loyalty and her useful life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

The item referred to from the York Dispatch is as follows:

BLIND WOMAN KNITS 107 WAR SWEATERS—MRS. IDA FUHRMAN, 80, IS BUSILY ENGAGED IN RED CROSS WORK—"WE'RE GOING TO WIN"

Blind, but mentally alert and well-informed on current events through radio newscasts, Mrs. Ida Fuhrman, 80 years old, 121 South Richland Avenue, is contributing her bit to the war effort by means of her busy knitting needles.

As she stitched away on her one hundred and seventh sweater for the Red Cross, Mrs. Fuhrman, or Aunt Ida, as she is affectionately known, conversed with a Dispatch reporter, discussing the war with all the knowledge and vigor of a news commentator. She is admittedly an armchair general, and proud of the fact that she can contribute in some small way to the winning of the war despite her physical handicap.

"Of course we are going to win," she said, in her gentle, yet decisive manner. "But I believe the worst is not over yet, and everyone will have to do with less than we have now."

Her knitting needles flew rapidly as she stated her views on the progress of the war, gained from her daily session with Baukhage, Gabriel Heatter, and other commentators.

"The United States is in for worse things to come," she continued, somewhat pessimistically. "I don't believe the war will be over this year. We have our forces scattered on too many fronts, and our enemies are strong and won't crack up voluntarily. They are out to inflict as much bloodshed and suffering on us as they can. But we will win eventually."

Mrs. Fuhrman, the widow of James Fuhrman, was born in York Township, near Spry, and taught school in that township for 31 years before her retirement in 1919. Her husband, a cigar maker, was at one time leader of the Spry band. She makes her home with a daughter, Mrs. Phoebe Ness, at the Richland Avenue address.

Despite her advanced years (she will be 81 on May 16) Aunt Ida possesses a keen mind that brushes away irrelevancies and gets down to fundamentals. Her conversation is intelligent and quite abreast of the times.

Even before Pearl Harbor, she wanted to do something for the Red Cross, an organization for which she has great respect. During the First World War she knit sweaters and socks for the York chapter, and when war clouds began to gather again, she straightway proffered her services again. So once more her knitting needles fly as she sits beside the radio listening to her favorite programs.

In the past 4 years Mrs. Fuhrman has knitted 106 sweaters for the Army, bed socks, 30 shoulderettes, many of which she gave to her friends, and 6 afghans. Ordinarily, she can make one sweater without sleeves in a week's time, while one with sleeves requires 2 weeks.

The finished product that unrolls under Mrs. Fuhrman's skilled fingers is well-nigh perfect. Once in a great while, she admits, she drops a stitch, and then requires some help. Otherwise, she goes right through the job all by herself, measuring according to specifications, on a notched ruler.

In 1928, Mrs. Fuhrman lost the sight in her left eye and later the sight in the right eye also failed. Despite this handicap she maintains a cheerful demeanor and has a mental outlook that stretches far beyond her darkened horizon.

Deeply religious, the octogenarian attends services at St. Matthew's Lutheran Church. In her younger years, she taught a Sunday school class at the Spry Lutheran Church, of which her husband was also superintendent.

Mrs. Fuhrman, somewhat flustered when a reporter and photographer called on her, was nevertheless graciousness itself as she gave them a cordial welcome. Later, as she bade them good-bye, she turned again to her knitting, and her nimble fingers deftly guided the khaki yarn as it slowly unwound into the 107th sweater that may—who knows—help to keep some United States doughboy warm in the chill of the Arctic climate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a short magazine article on Governor Saltonstall of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN]?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTION OF RELIGIOUS, EDUCATIONAL AND CHARITABLE DONATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University who is generally credited with fathering the principle that 15 percent of an individual's income, if given to religion and charity, is exempt from the Federal income tax. That has been the basic law throughout the years that we have had an income-tax law.

To abandon this principle that gifts to religious, educational, and charitable institutions are exempt from taxation means not only the ultimate serious impairment of these institutions, but it means a Government subsidy for every church, college and charitable institution. Such a form of stateism would destroy religious and intellectual freedom.

Heretofore every American could lessen his tax bill by making contributions to these institutions. This principle must be preserved for every American taxpayer. Under the withholding law and as it is proposed to be amended, the wage earner has his taxes taken out before he ever gets his pay check. That wage earner who gives substantially to religion and charity is entitled as a matter of right to have a lesser amount in taxes deducted from his pay check by reason of his gifts. To deny the wage earner that right is class legislation and unwise.

The principles of H. R. 3473, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] and H. R. 3472, introduced by myself, should be incorporated in our withholding-tax law. Millions of wage earners want this. Many large employers are enthusiastically for it. Two of the largest manufacturers of business machines say that it will not complicate the handling of pay rolls. It will benefit the Treasury of the United States by eliminating the costly handling of refunds. In addition to all of this, it will greatly better the position of every religious, educational, and charitable institution in America.

SHORTAGE OF HIDES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of nearly 20,000 workers, honest and patriotic men and women of the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Corporation, I am introducing today the following resolution and hope that the committee will adopt it as soon as possible:

Whereas the tanning and shoe industries of the United States are facing a most serious situation due to a shortage of hides and are not currently able to obtain enough hides to make leather and shoes; and

Whereas the year 1944 is witnessing the presence of the greatest cattle population the country has ever known, there being over 83,000,000 cattle on the hoof at this time in the United States; and

Whereas the supply of hides coming into the market this year will be insufficient to meet the absolutely necessary requirements for military and civilian needs to the extent of about 4,000,000 hides; and

Whereas the consuming public will suffer immeasurably if hides are not made available at an early date: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture be authorized to investigate the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration for the purpose of finding out why the necessary hides have not been made available.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a broadcast from Fulton Lewis, Jr., commenting upon the administration of the Veterans' Bureau.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PALESTINE

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, 1917, a star of hope was planted in the long night of despair for the Jewish people. It was announced to the world through what has become known as the Balfour Declaration, the preparation of which was participated in by the President of the United States, that henceforth the British Government viewed with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and that it would use its best efforts to facilitate the achievement of this object.

In furtherance of this announced policy, the Congress of this country unanimously adopted a resolution in 1922 approving the Balfour Declaration. Then in 1925 the American Government gave further recognition to the proposal to establish a national home for Jews in Palestine by approving the granting of a mandate to England, and thereupon entered into a convention with Great Britain respecting the control of Palestine.

The convention was not ambiguous at that time. It was crystal clear to the signatories to it that the impelling reasons for this deed of power to Great Britain over Palestine and its people was the promised establishment of a national home for those of the Jewish race who chose to return to the land of their fathers.

In the preamble of the mandate there was recited these significant words, "The historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country." Obviously this was a reaffirmation of the Balfour Declaration and seemed upon the face of things to breathe a breath of expectancy into the terms of the mandate.

Likewise, this gave purpose and meaning to the joint resolution of the Congress. However, history does not confirm a definite intent on the part of the mandatory power to carry out the obligations so fully expressed and so freely assumed. The fiduciary position of England seems to have drifted into a double and dubious role—one to the Jewish people, another to the Arabs.

Imperial interests in Moslem lands have frequently altered the announced purposes of nations. The mandatory power seems to have followed a shifting policy; first, for the Jews against the Arabs, and then the Arabs against the Jews. In some mysterious manner, the fate of these people has been subject to the changing fortunes of expediency and power politics, until at last there is left little semblance of the mandate entrusted with the League of Nations.

An impartial appraisal of the white papers issued from 1922 to 1939 leads almost to the realization that the purposes of the mandate have been repudiated.

In the intervening years there has been no clear-cut or well-defined American policy regarding Palestine. With the rise of Hitler to power and the outbreak of war in 1939, the attitude of this Nation has not been disclosed. What was once a well-defined national course has now settled into an occasional expression of sympathy for the plight of the Jewish people.

The record of our State Department in recent years indicates a lack of interest in and responsibility for the establishment of the Jewish national home. Although it has been evident to everyone that the responsibilities of the trust created by the mandate have not been met and discharged by England, nevertheless this Nation has not uttered one word of public protest. When the white paper appeared in 1939, making a virtual mockery of the mandate and nullifying the obligations of the trust, nothing was said in protest.

As the storms of war began to gather upon the Continent of Europe and there appeared the most urgent need for a haven of refuge, the door of escape was beginning to be closed in the face of an oppressed people.

It is an unpleasant task to examine the conduct of one's own country in respect to the extent to which it may have contributed to the present plight of the entrapped Jewish people in Rumania,

Hungary, and Bulgaria. The absence of any determined and consistent policy regarding Palestine during the years of its mandate control is no doubt responsible in some measure for the present situation.

The Wright-Compton resolution introduced in the House was intended to reaffirm the views previously expressed by this body in 1922, and to express the will of America that her pledged word be kept to the letter. It was hoped that this resolution might aid in the formulation of an American policy which would clarify the confused condition that has prevailed.

As but one humble Member in the great Congress of the United States, I plead that the doors of Palestine should be kept open to Jewish refugees. Our commitments and our sacred honor as a Nation are at stake. This cause should enlist the interest and support not only of every Member of this body but of every fair-minded American. Decency and justice demand the establishment of a national home for those of the Jewish race who desire it. The catalog of crimes committed against these people is known to all and has shocked even the conscience of a war-calloused world. Now, as the specter of more certain abuse and destruction stalks them in Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, the reasons become more compelling to insure at least a tempory refuge from the heel of oppression, starvation, and death.

Considerations have been advanced in opposition to the resolution before the House urging a prompt solution and clarification of the Palestine problem. The peril of the present hour demands that these be brushed aside. The prestige of America and the power of the Presidency are sufficient to insure a prompt response to the protests of our Nation that the doors of Palestine should not be closed against an innocent and injured people. The conscience of the world cries out to America for action—yes, immediate action—lest it be too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a striking article by Dr. Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, on Nathaniel Bacon and the cause of freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent letter from the Commissioner of the National Housing Agency of the Federal Public Housing Authority which I have been requested by some of my constituents to insert in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two statements made by me before different committees of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three topics, in one to include a statement by the Yugoslav Americans in the Pacific Northwest, and in another to include two statements made by Federal judges of the State of Washington, including our former colleague, Charles H. Leavy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of inquiring of the Chair—who happens to be the majority leader—as to what legislative program, if any; there is for today.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the inquiry, as far as I know there is no legislative business today except the conference report on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill.

I might say for the information of the House, while I am on my feet, if the gentleman will permit me, it is my understanding that the recess resolution will be amended so that we shall adjourn on Saturday instead of today.

Mr. MICHENER. Just another question. As far as the conference report is concerned, I understand it is a unanimous report by the conferees and is not contested.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair might state, in accordance with the announcement made last week by the present occupant of the chair in his capacity as majority leader, that no new matter will come up except by unanimous consent.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I was present this morning in the Rules Committee when the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, suggested that a short resolution be reported out authorizing the appointment of a committee composed of nine members, three from the Committee on the District of Columbia, three from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and three from the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, having jurisdiction of the matter, and requesting that committee to make a report to the House within 2 weeks to eliminate some of the discordant conditions that exist here. I believe there will be no opposition to it. It was passed unanimously, as you know, and I think the gentleman from Virginia is now preparing the resolution which he proposes to introduce. I think it should be taken up at this time because I really believe something should be done without any delay.

Mr. MICHENER. Following the suggestion of the Chair and the understanding of the House, that will have to come up by unanimous consent?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman and the membership of the House that the soldiers' bill, what they call the G. I. bill of rights, will not be reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in time to be taken up by the House this week. We are very busy holding hearings. We will probably complete the hearings today or tomorrow, and after that we want to go into executive session and consider the bill very carefully, line by line and page by page; so I am just stating for the benefit of the Members that it will not be taken up in the House until after the recess.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. May I take this opportunity to ask what reference the gentleman from Illinois made to the District of Columbia apropriation bill that is coming up?

Mr. SABATH. A resolution is being drafted which will be introduced today, and the Rules Committee has agreed

to act on it this afternoon. We hope it will be passed by unanimous consent. It will provide for the appointment of nine members, three from the Committee on the District of Columbia, three from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and three from the Appropriations Subcommittee having jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, for the purpose of seeing what they can recommend and agree upon to relieve the situation here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. I happen to be a member of the committee making the appropriations for the District of Columbia, but I have not heard anything about this.

Mr. SABATH. It has not passed yet. I suggest that it be passed by unanimous consent, so that this committee may have the opportunity within the next 2 weeks to look into the matter and see what can be done to relieve the unfortunate conditions that exist here.

Mr. STEFAN. Will we take that resolution up today?

Mr. SABATH. I hope to; yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to state for the benefit of the House his construction of the announcement he made last week with regard to bringing bills up by unanimous consent. The Chair feels that that would mean unanimous consent to pass the bills without debate, although the Chair would not consider a little colloquy under a reservation of the right to object as violative of the statement the Chair made to the House last week. But the Chair feels that to submit a unanimous-consent request for the consideration of a bill and then enter into debate would violate what the Chair considers to be a promise and commitment to the Members of the House, that after the definite program had been disposed of this week no matter could be brought up except by unanimous consent.

The Chair assumes that the Members will interpret the statement he made last week to mean that a conference report would occupy a little different situation, but fortunately the one conference report we have had so far has gone through by unanimous consent, and the Chair understands that the conference report that is to be brought up later is not controversial.

Does this statement of the Chair accord with the understanding of the distinguished acting minority leader?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; that is the understanding.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I correct in assuming that earlier in the week action was taken by the House to the effect that the House would adjourn today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A concurrent resolution was passed to that effect.

Mr. MICHENER. In view of the fact that we are not adjourning today, is it necessary for the House to take any further action?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We have to await the action of the Senate. If the Senate should amend the concurrent resolution and substitute adjournment Saturday for adjournment today, then of course that question would come before the House when the resolution is messaged back to the House.

O. P. A. REGULATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the morning paper carries the announcement that the O. P. A. is establishing ceiling prices in and around Washington for certain types of fresh vegetables and fruit, including carrots, peas, potatoes, snap beans, string beans, and spinach. The retailers will be required to post the ceiling and selling prices. In this article you will note that Maine potatoes will sell 5 pounds for 23 cents; Idaho potatoes, 5 pounds for 29 cents.

It is my understanding that there is about 15,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes in the country. They will either spoil or be sent to dehydrating plants for the making of starch or alcohol. In my district near Scottsbluff, Nebr., they are attempting to get some 2,000 carloads for dehydration purposes. The War Food Administration sets a price of 94 cents a hundred on the good No. 2 potatoes. This is less than 1 cent a pound to the producer as compared to the 5½ cents which the consumer must pay in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that someone besides the farmer is making entirely too much profit off some of the necessities of life. This should be investigated. It is not the raiser of potatoes, vegetables, and fruit, it is the middleman.

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to call your attention to the fact that within the last month some 40,000 acres of winter and spring vegetables were plowed under in the Rio Grande Valley and the State of Louisiana. In one field five and one-half million heads of cabbage were plowed under.

The O. P. A. a few months ago issued a 2,500-word directive regulating the sale of cabbage seed. I am wondering if this directive coupled with their other silly attempts to control production has anything to do with the destruction of the vegetables in the South.

I note also that eggs are selling for 55 cents a dozen in Washington, while my farmers are getting about 20 cents a dozen for fresh eggs in Nebraska. The farmer cannot produce eggs at 20 cents a dozen and show a profit. He cannot produce potatoes at 94 cents a hundred and stay in business.

Mr. Speaker, there is still much confusion in the departments of government who are charged with regulating the various angles of food production. I am convinced that all phases of the production, distribution, and selling of food should be under one agency. If this is not done there will continue to be much confusion and dissatisfaction not only among the producers of food but among the consumers who must pay exorbitant prices for the necessities of life. The middle man apparently is making more in a few minutes than the farmer makes in a whole season of hard work.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MUNDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HOUSING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the purpose of the resolution he expects to be brought up tomorrow or Saturday?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] called the attention of the Committee on Rules this morning to certain conditions that exist here and to the law that goes into effect July 1, which may create a great deal of trouble in the District of Columbia if nothing is done. He thought that if a committee composed of three members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, three members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and three members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having jurisdiction in the matter, could be appointed, they could look into the matter between now and that time and perhaps make recommendations that would save the situation and eliminate any unnecessary trouble.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday in the discussion of the bill H. R. 4257 a colloquy occurred between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. After the third objection by the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was not confining himself to the bill the gentleman from New York made certain remarks.

At that point I rose to object, considering that not to be in good order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said he would withdraw those remarks, yet I find that they still remain in the daily RECORD, and I still do not consider them to be in good order. I ask unanimous consent that these words be stricken from the permanent RECORD.

Mr. CELLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent was given that the words be deleted. Who makes the deletion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] calls attention to the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] during debate yesterday stated that certain words which he had uttered would be corrected or deleted from the RECORD, but the gentleman from Ohio now states that the words appear in the RECORD.

Does the Chair understand the situation correctly?

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE], on the assumption that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] unintentionally overlooked deleting the words in his revision of the remarks, now asks unanimous consent that these words be stricken from the permanent RECORD.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the RECORD shows that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] asked unanimous consent to withdraw the words to which objection was made and the words were not withdrawn. They are now in the daily RECORD. So that, after he received unanimous consent to withdraw his words, he failed to withdraw them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask for my own future instruction and for the enlightenment of the Members, who does the deleting, the Clerk or the reporter, or who is it who does that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state in the first instance the Member making the remarks, when he is revising them. Of course, the Chair does not feel that is a parliamentary inquiry. We all know by common experience what the procedure is. But the Chair understands that the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Ohio is based upon the assumption that the gentleman from New York unintentionally overlooked the matter in revising his remarks.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it was not my purpose to leave those words in on revision. It was my understanding that the Clerk of the House or the reporter having the matter in charge would follow the instructions. It was not my purpose, as I thought that would be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without regard to what the circumstances are, the Chair is proceeding on the assumption that it was an honest misunderstanding and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE], the Chair assumes, is proceeding on that assumption in asking for unanimous consent that the words be deleted from the RECORD.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF STARVING WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN OCCUPIED DEMOCRACIES

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. I regret, owing to the parliamentary procedure and the agreements entered into, that it will be impossible to bring up for the consideration of the House before the recess House Resolution 221, which was reported unanimously out of the Committee on Rules today, providing for relief of starving women and children in the occupied democracies. This resolution will have to go over and come up under the rule after the recess. As sponsor of the resolution, I shall try to expedite its consideration by the House. Time is of the essence. Millions of innocent children in the occupied democracies are on the verge of starvation. None of us knows now how long this will last. If the war lasts another year in Europe millions of young, helpless victims of the war in the occupied nations who had nothing to do with causing it, will die of mass starvation next winter.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman feel in the amendment of the Senate to the U. N. R. R. A. bill, that a limitation is placed upon the activities of U. N. R. R. A., which would effectively prevent any assistance from the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization from extending any aid to children in occupied countries?

Mr. FISH. U. N. R. R. A. has no connection whatever with this resolution. This is a separate House resolution putting the Congress of the United States on record in favor of feeding the starving women and children in the occupied democracies. The Senate passed a similar resolution. There is no possible conflict with the U. N. R. R. A. This resolution seeks to enlist the support of the neutrals, such as Sweden and Switzerland, to distribute milk, meat, fat, and vitamins bought largely with the funds of the occupied nations in America, Argentina, and South Africa, and to be transported in Swedish ships, and with definite safeguards and agreements that none of this food will be used by the German Army or civilian population. We are already sending food to Greece and our own prisoners, and also French, Belgian, and Dutch war prisoners in Germany. We have a great moral responsibility to try to save millions of children in France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, and other occupied nations from mass starvation and death by tuberculosis and pestilence.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that in one of the amendments of the other body to the U. N. R. R. A. bill, when it came back to the House for agreement on the conference report, there was a limitation which provided that none of their activities should be carried on in enemy or enemy-occupied countries, which would effectively prevent U. N. R. R. A. from doing anything for starving children in Greece, for example. I have been told that Turkey is supplying some food to children in Greece, having announced to the belligerents that they were going to send out a ship at such and such a time to deliver some food for the purpose of feeding starving civilians there and its mission was respected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is quite right. That is a part of U. N. R. R. A. But this has nothing to do with U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. CASE. That is correct, your proposition has nothing to do with U. N. R. R. A. and I think that the RECORD should be clear that the Congress acted to prevent U. N. R. R. A. from doing anything for the children in occupied countries. If something is to be done for them, additional legislation is necessary. Authority will have to be given to some other agency or the limitation upon U. N. R. R. A. will have to be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial by former Congressman Pettengill. This article is one-third beyond the legal length. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost of the entire article amounts to $105.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts of a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House again that under the provisions of the U. N. R. R. A. bill, no relief organization can operate without the consent of the U. N. R. R. A. The Red Cross or any other relief organization cannot operate without the consent of U. N. R. R. A. Certainly the resolution of the gentleman from New York will have the interest of every Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks which I recently made and insert them in the appendix of the RECORD, together with the proclamation issued by the Governor of South Dakota.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION TO SIT THIS AFTERNOON.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPLY TO CHARGES IN CONNECTION WITH MILK FURNISHED TO THE SCHOOL CHILDREN OF CHICAGO

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, every day from 8 to 12 Members, and sometimes more, rise on the Republican side to criticize and to make charges of all kinds, without first ascertaining as to their truth or veracity.

Day before yesterday my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] presumably in justifying his vote against the appropriation for school lunches for poor children, charged that excessive prices are being paid for milk in Chicago and asserting that an overcharge of one-fourth to one-half cent went to the Democratic organization in that city, and that otherwise the milk could be purchased for less.

Without knowing of any of the alleged facts or about the milk trust or combination—nearly all of whose officers are Republicans and reside in the gentleman's district—I am sure they, as such, would not contribute to a Democratic campaign fund. Furthermore, the Democratic organization in my city, under the leadership of Mayor Kelly who has given the city an honest, highly efficient, and economical administration in contrast to the discreditable and scandalous administration under which Chicago suffered during the regime of the last Republican mayor, would not accept such contributions. This cannot be said of the present Republican organization whose representatives have been visiting many plants, business places and factories not only asking but demanding campaign contributions, threatening investigations and to cause trouble if contributions were not forthcoming.

While my attention has been called to this situation, I have not brought it to the notice of certain agencies or to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, because I do not take accusations or charges for granted which invariably come from concerns which have failed to obtain contracts or arise from complaints registered by disgruntled or discharged employees. I was convinced when my colleague made his accusations that the charges were not justified and had no foundation in fact and were only made for political purposes in smearing the Democratic organization of Chicago, but I did not have the opportunity or at the time have information at hand to disprove his accusations. However, today I have in my possession a statement from the superintendent of lunchrooms, Board of Education, of Chicago, in which is included letters from principals of schools, who were appointed and employed under the civil-service law, clearly showing that the charges are not founded on facts.

The statement shows that one small dairy sold milk at a price one-quarter or one-half cent lower than the dairies regularly supplying the schools with milk. An inspection of the milk furnished by this one dairy showed that the quality of their milk was below standard and quantities furnished to the schools on occasions were near-sour or sour, and some students had become ill from drinking it. I am not even going to mention the name of this dairy, but shall ask that the report which I have mentioned be made a part of my remarks. This report signed, as I have stated, by the superintendent of lunchrooms and the principals of the schools should convince my colleague that he has not received a true picture of the situation and that he was erroneously informed. I therefore hope that he will follow the example of his colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] whose attention was called to some charges made—I do not recall whether made by him or someone else—relative to the spoilage of a large quantity of sugar in Hawaii which charge, it was ascertained, was not true in that such spoilage did not occur. May I urge my colleague in view of these facts to make like retraction. I have submitted the report to him which I know he has read, but which I have only glanced over hurriedly, and I now ask him, hoping that he is big enough, to request that his charges be withdrawn. Whether he will do so, I do not know, but I feel it is his duty to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and place this statement in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, except to ask the gentleman if in that statement there is any denial at all of the contributions, about which I spoke, to the Democrats having really been made. I understand that in looking over the statement there is no such denial. Therefore I am not going to object.

Mr. SABATH. I understand there was nothing——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has long since expired.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] rose for the purpose of reserving the right to object to my unanimous-consent request. In view of that, I have the right to explain why my unanimous-consent request should be granted.

Mr. CHURCH. I have already withdrawn my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is granted.

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

On March 2, 1944, after a series of articles in the Chicago Daily News relating to the amount paid for milk in the Chicago public schools, I reported to the business manager, Col. Howard P. Savage, of the board of education, who in turn reported to the board of education the following with reference to milk contracts:

Effective September 1943, and still continuing, all Chicago public schools, 409 in number, are being served with milk at 1 cent per half-pint bottle for which we receive indemnity from the State and Federal Governments. The business is being divided between 12 dairies, who are as follows:

1. Borden-Wieland division of the Borden Co.
2. Bowman Dairy Co.
3. Capitol Dairy Co.
4. Cunningham Farms.
5. Dauphin Park Dairy Co.
6. Hamilton Dairy Co.
7. Hawthorne Mellody Farms.
8. Hunding Dairy Co.
9. Scholl Dairy Co.
10. Sidney Wanzer & Sons.
11. Western United Dairy Co.
12. C. J. Wieland & Son, Inc.

It is reported that the Chicago Back-of-the-Yards Neighborhood Council buys milk at 3 cents per half pint for 27 schools and 3½ cents per half pint for 9 other schools and for some others at 4 cents per half pint.

I am advised that the 3 and 3½-cent milk is bought from a company with which the board of education formerly had contractual relations and under the terms of which the milk was delivered to the Chicago public schools at the rate of $0.0248 per half pint during the month of September 1942. Shortly after the company began serving the Chicago public schools, it was found that the milk was not up to standard. I began receiving complaints from the schools, typical of which is the following letter received from F. G. Mabrey, principal of the Arnold School:

ARNOLD SCHOOL,
Chicago, Ill., September 23, 1942.

Mr. F. O. WASHAM,
Director of Lunch Rooms,
Board of Education, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Since school started and we began being served by the Lake Valley Milk Co., we not only have had several complaints, but yesterday, the 22d, our head attendant informed us that at least 10 children refused to drink the milk after buying it. The children say it is sour.

Yours truly,

F. J. MABREY,
Principal.

And report from my staff of supervisors, typical of which is the report from Mrs. J. M. Corcoran, district supervisor:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1942.

Mr. WASHAM: Just received a call from Grant School re penny milk.

Three hundred and seventy bottles of milk were sour yesterday. The dairy took back 200 bottles.

The milk was delivered at 7 a. m. It is sold at recess.

The lunchroom manager ices it in tubs at about 7:30 a. m.

Mrs. Berg reported that the teachers have had several children sick today. They blame it on the milk although it did not taste sour today.

J. M. CORCORAN.

(Lake Valley Dairy is the firm which supplied this milk.)

Quoting report from Mr. James C. Allmon, assistant director of lunch rooms, who is now

in the armed forces, dated September 24, 1942:

"With reference to the service of the Lake Valley Farm Products Co., the first week they seemed to handle the situation in better condition than they are doing at the present time. On September 22 I received complaints from the Everett, Green, Mitchell, Ross, Thirty-seventh and Wells, Drummond, and McClellan Schools, in regard to sour milk. These schools claimed that the children would not drink the milk and would pour it down the sewers. This matter was taken up with Mr. Mosier, of Lake Valley Co., and he assured us that this condition would be corrected. On Wednesday, September 23, I again received complaints about sour milk. * * *

"Another serious complaint which I have been receiving from the numerous schools served by Lake Valley, is in regard to the type of cases they are using to deliver the milk.

These cases are dirty and we are receiving complaints that they are carrying roaches into the schools, due to the filth accumulated in them. The principals assured me that they will not tolerate this condition and that if it is not cleaned up they will discontinue penny milk in their schools. * * *

In checking with the school principals, I also find that this dairy is not living up to its agreements in connection with icing the milk and this matter should be brought to its attention immediately, as this milk is not to exceed a 50° temperature at the time of serving. This is the temperature required by the board of health.

Yours very truly,

JAMES C. ALLMON,
Assistant Director of Lunchrooms.

As the result of complaints lodged by me to the health department, the health department wrote this company to discontinue selling milk. Following are letters from the health department:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1942.

Mr. ANDREW SMALL,
(Vendor for Lake Valley
Farm Products Co.),
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Please be advised that an inspection of your vehicle on September 17, at 9 a. m., at Gillespie School, State and Ninety-third Streets, disclosed that the temperature of homogenized milk was 56° F.

The rules and regulations of the board of health require that all pasteurized milk and milk products shall be cooled immediately following pasteurization to a temperature of 50° F., or less, and remain thereat until delivery to the final consumer. You will, therefore, discontinue selling milk or milk products not complying with the foregoing requirement.

By direction of:

The BOARD OF HEALTH,
City of Chicago.

C—Mr. Frank O. Washam, superintendent, lunchrooms, Board of Education, Chicago, Ill.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1942.

Mr. THADDEUS REID,
Vendor for Lake Valley Farm Products Co., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Please be advised that an inspection of your vehicle at 8:45 a. m., September 16, at 3419 South Bell Avenue (in front of the Everett School), driven by George Bowker, disclosed that the temperature of homogenized vitamin D milk was 59° F., and of milk was 58° F.

The rules and regulations of the board of health require that all pasteurized milk and milk products shall be cooled immediately following pasteurization to a temperature of 50° F., or less, and remain thereat until delivery to the final consumer.

You will, therefore, discontinue selling milk or milk products not complying with the foregoing requirements.

By direction of:

The BOARD OF HEALTH,
City of Chicago.

C—Mr. Frank O. Washam, superintendent of lunchrooms, Board of Education, Chicago, Ill.

On September 30, 1942, Col. Howard P. Savage, acting upon my recommendations that the contract be abrogated as between this company and the board of education, notified the company of the cancelation of the contract and so reported to the board and the board concurred in his action, at a meeting held November 4, 1942, report No. 42520G.

Immediately afterward the board secured the agreement of five reliable Chicago dairy firms to serve the schools for the balance of 1942 at 2½ cents per one-half pint although this represented a loss to these firms.

For the following year there was a raise in the amount of the bids to .036 cent per one-half pint, and again on February 1, 1944, there was a further rise in price to 4 cents per one-half pint which reflects the rise in cost of producing and distributing milk and is no greater than that noted in the food commodity market generally. The Federal Milk Market Administrator and Office of Price Administration agree that 4 cents per half pint represents only a fair price for milk distributed in the wholesale market in Chicago. A recent inquiry discloses the fact that the Chicago parochial schools are paying 4 cents per half pint for milk at the present time as evidenced by the following letter dated March 29 addressed to me by Msgr. D. F. Cunningham, superintendent of the Chicago Catholic School Board:

MARCH 29, 1944.

Mr. F. O. WASHAM,
Board of Education, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. WASHAM: I have received your recent letter regarding the price which our parochial schools are paying for the half pints of milk being served to our students under the federally sponsored school lunch program.

In reply, I wish to say that our parochial schools are paying 4 cents per half pint.

Very sincerely yours,

Very Rev. Msgr. D. F. CUNNINGHAM,
Superintendent of Schools.

Other large purchases in the Chicago district are paying at least 4 cents per half pint for milk.

For the period beginning February 1, 1944, we received one lower bid from the Forest Glen Dairy Co. of 3¾ cents, but I advised the board not to accept it because of the fact that the milk they had been sending was frequently sour when it arrived, and they also failed in the matter of service by not delivering the milk as needed or at the hours required. These conditions continued despite written notification and repeated warning that the service and quality of the milk was such that we would have to cease doing business with that company. Following is letter written to this company:

MAY 28, 1943.

FOREST GLEN DAIRY,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: It has come to my attention through my organization that the service and quality of milk served by your dairy to the Wells High School lunchroom and to the Waller High School lunchroom has not been up to standard.

Unless an immediate improvement is reported by my school-milk supervisor, I shall recommend to the business manager that these contracts be canceled.

Very truly yours,

F. O. WASHAM,
Director of Lunchrooms.

The above letter was occasioned by reports received from my supervisory staff. The following are copies of some of these reports:

"MILK PROGRAM REPORT, FOREST GLEN DAIRY
"WELLS HIGH SCHOOL, MAY 17, 1943

"Complaint: Sour whole milk was delivered today, May 17, 1943.

"1. Milk very badly soured—not just 'on the turn.'

"2. Forced to remove all milk from counter.

"3. Children were denied milk for lunch.

"4. Mr. Papielewski very nonchalantly said they couldn't help it.

"5. When I complained about service and quality, Mr. Papielewski said perhaps we should give this school to another dairy.

"(See following letter from Miss Leander, lunchroom manager.)

"Recommendation: Would recommend that this dairy continue serving this school until the close of the school term, providing no further serious complaint arises. However, I would not recommend renewing this award when the new term starts.

"VIVIAN A. READING,
"Penny Milk Program Supervisor."

WELLS HIGH SCHOOL,
Chicago, May 18, 1943.

Mr. F. O. WASHAM,
Director of Lunchrooms,
Board of Education.

DEAR MR. WASHAM: On Monday, May 17, the whole milk delivered to the Wells High School lunchroom by Forest Glen Dairy was sour. It wasn't discovered until the students started to return it the first lunch period. I immediately removed all the whole milk from the counter and called the dairy. I then notified Mrs. Stansell and Miss Reading who came out promptly to investigate.

I refused to sign the invoice for the first delivery of whole milk; however, I did sign for six cases of fresh milk which they delivered for my last lunch period.

This is the second time this semester we have received sour milk from Forest Glen Dairy. The other time it was their chocolate milk.

I hope you will take action to prevent any recurrence of this unfortunate incident as it is very destructive to the school-milk program which we are all working to develop.

Sincerely,

JANICE LEANDER,
Lunchroom Manager.

MARCH 26, 1943.

MR. WASHAM: We have been having trouble for some time with the chocolate milk at Waller. I am bringing down three bottles all delivered today—two of them were returned by students and the third taken off the ice, for comparison. They are all sour.

CATHLENE PICKERING,
District Supervisor.

(Forest Glen Dairy Co. supplied this milk.)

MARCH 26, 1943.

MR. WASHAM: I have checked on this complaint with Miss Nafe at Waller. There were 120 one-half pints of chocolate milk returned as sour during the first lunch period. I called Mr. E. J. Papielewski at Forest Glenn Dairy. He promised to go into this thoroughly and prevent a recurrence. Full credit is being given to Waller for the loss.

V. A. READING,
Penny Milk Supervisor.

Our chief concern is to supply wholesome food to students in our public-school lunchrooms, always purchasing at the lowest price consistent with good quality and service. As a result of this policy the number of students dining in our public-school lunchrooms has increased more than 200 percent during the past 9 years that I have supervised Chicago public-school lunchrooms.

F. O. WASHAM,
Director of Lunchrooms,
Board of Education, Chicago.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of Congress from Thursday, March 30, 1944, to Wednesday, April 12, 1944.

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House, House Concurrent Resolution No. 75, with a Senate amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment: On page 2, line 3, strike out "Thursday, March 30" and insert "Saturday, April 1."

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of Congress from Saturday, April 1, 1944, to Wednesday, April 12, 1944."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the procedure?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman propounding a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the procedure on this resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is a privileged resolution, and the procedure would be for some Member—and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has done so—to make a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And then a vote is taken on the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that require a quorum?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any action by the House requires a quorum if the one who takes such step raises that question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand the situation, whether there is a quorum present or not, unless this amendment is agreed to the resolution does not become final until this amendment is disposed of. That is correct, is it not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. And therefore we would not be in a position to recess for the time mentioned until this amendment is disposed of one way or the other.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The understanding of the Chair is the same as that of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The gentleman from Georgia moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 75) will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2850) to authorize the rezoning of certain property in the District of Columbia as a residential area.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from West Virginia explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Nebraska is correct in asking an explanation of the measure. For the purpose of giving a very clear, yet concise statement I would ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], who gave most careful study to this measure, to explain its provisions at this time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2850 has for its broad object to further the comprehensive planning of the District of Columbia, and its more specific purpose is to sustain the action of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia so as to assure the continuance of the orderly development of lands bordering the park system and to maintain the private residential character of Sixteenth Street NW., north of Piney Branch Parkway and the territory adjacent thereto.

Parcel 70/100 is a heavily wooded unimproved tract of approximately 2 acres, and is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Sixteenth Street and Shepherd Street. This tract, together with a very small corner immediately across on the east side of Sixteenth Street, are the only tracts north of Piney Branch Parkway on Sixteenth Street zoned for multifamily—apartment house—structures. From the parkway north to the District line on this street, as well as on lands adjacent thereto, will be found single-family dwellings only. All of this portion of the District, with the exception of the two tracts mentioned, are zoned only for single-family dwellings. The zoning of the two excepted tracts for apartments is strictly spot zoning and thus not in keeping with other structures north of Piney Branch Parkway.

For the history leading up to this situation I most respectfully refer you to the Report 1276 on this piece of legislation.

If the private residential character of Sixteenth Street NW., north of Piney Branch Parkway and the territory adjacent thereto is to be maintained, and by all means it should be, this legislation is very necessary.

The legislation will authorize and direct the Zoning Commission to act and zone the property accordingly.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made a very fine explanation of this bill. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to conform with the orderly development of the District of Columbia as the National Capital, the Zoning Commission created by the act of March 1, 1920 (41 Stat. 500), is hereby authorized and directed to amend the zoning maps so as to provide that all of parcel 70/100 located at the southwest corner of Sixteenth and Shepherd Streets NW. and all of square 2695 lying south of the center line Shepherd Street NW. extended, located at the northeast corner of Sixteenth Street and Arkansas Avenue NW. be zoned as residential 40' "A" restricted area.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE MINIMUM WAGE LAW OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 242, to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a Minimum Wage Board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1918, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman explain the bill? Do we not have a minimum wage law in the District of Columbia at this time? If so will the gentleman explain why it is necessary to amend the law at this time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; the gentleman is correct in observing that there is a minimum wage law in the District of Columbia. This measure makes no fundamental change in the law and applies only to the publication of regulations issued by the Industrial Safety Division of the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board for the benefit of contractors who employ workers under the law. Because of shortage of space in newspapers we are simply attempting to

facilitate the printing of the regulations, but still make them available to contractors. Instead of requiring publication in two newspapers in Washington as under present law we provide in this bill for the publication of the regulations in one newspaper with reprints available to the contractors. As I say, this comes about through lack of space in the papers for even news stories and other advertisements.

Mr. STEFAN. What medium of advertising is to be used?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Instead of using two newspapers as at present it would be published in one with reprints made available to those who need them.

Mr. STEFAN. Nothing in this proposed bill will preclude the general advertising in newspapers after the emergency is over?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No, indeed.

Mr. STEFAN. This would not set any precedent whereby the newspapers would not be able to get this advertising, whereby the general public would not be fully informed as to what is going on under the minimum-wage law?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. The newspapers of the District have been consulted. We would be the last to ask that this be written into permanent law.

Mr. STEFAN. And this would be agreeable to the newspapers?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is; we have conferred with them.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 4, title II, of the act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a Minimum Wage Board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1918, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the words "they have been published at least once in two of the daily newspapers of general circulation in the District of Columbia," and inserting in lieu thereof "publication of notice at least once in a newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia that they have been adopted and copies are available to the public at the office of the Board."

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN POSITIONS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with the further indulgence, for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4347) to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. With pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, I may say for the benefit of the gentleman from Nebraska and the membership that this is not a salary raise; it is a readjustment of classification of certain positions within the fire department to make those positions comparable with similar positions in the Metropolitan Police Department. This matter was gone into fully by the committee, and it was found that in practically every city in this country the classifications for firemen and policemen are the same. We desire simply to bring the firemen in line with the policemen in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. Has this bill been approved by the Commissioners?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It has; yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are soon to hold hearings on appropriations for the District of Columbia, including firemen and police, I wonder if the gentleman would not let this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; the gentleman, of course, wants to cooperate.

Mr. STEFAN. I see the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee on the District of Columbia. I should like to hear his opinion.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I agree with my colleague the ranking member on the appropriations subcommittee for the District of Columbia. I hope the gentleman from West Virginia will not press for action on the bill now, for our subcommittee is about to take up the District of Columbia bill, and we should like to cover this subject in our hearings.

Mr. STEFAN. Inasmuch, Mr. Speaker, as we are going to take up the matter of the salaries of firemen and police in the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, I think perhaps we should let this bill go over for the time being.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want, of course, Mr. Speaker, to defer insofar as possible to the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the District of Columbia. We work together and always have cooperated. We felt that this was a legislative matter, but certainly there is involved also the element of appropriation, and I am happy to withdraw the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. I appreciate the cooperative spirit of the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has withdrawn the bill from further consideration.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I do not want the remarks made by either the gentleman from Nebraska or myself to be construed in any sense as passing upon the merits of the proposed bill called up by the gentleman from West Virginia. As far as I know, there is merit in the bill, but I am sure the gentleman is exercising excellent judgment in postponing its consideration temporarily.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if I may not inquire whether this legislation will not be necessary for the Committee on Appropriations to act on without violating the rules of the House prohibiting legislative provisions on an appropriation bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That question has been before the House, of course, not only in connection with the District of Columbia bill but on other measures presented by the Appropriations Committee. I reiterate, however, that it is our desire in legislating for the District of Columbia to cooperate with the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield again to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. The gentleman from Alabama is correct; it is not the policy of the Appropriations Committee to incorporate legislation in an appropriation bill.

What the gentleman from Nebraska, the ranking member of the subcommittee, had in mind was that our hearings will commence shortly and thereafter we will consult with the gentleman from West Virginia and the proponents and opponents of the bill. If during the hearings it develops that the bill seems to be meritorious—and I have no doubt there is much merit in the bill—then we will consult with the gentleman from West Virginia suggesting that he bring this bill up again on the floor if it should be passed before our Appropriations Subcommittee comes to marking up the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield again to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to corroborate what my chairman has said, that we work very closely with the gentleman from West Virginia, chairman of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia. We have no intention of trying to override the prerogatives of the Legislative Committee. We certainly do not want the right to legislate on an appropriation bill. We realize that there are injustices in the salaries paid members of the Fire Department and we want to eliminate them and do all that we possibly can, but I am sure the gentleman understands what we are endeavoring to do. We want to collaborate and to coordinate our efforts in order to be helpful to one another.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this House in passing legislation for the benefit of District of Columbia residents should bring into play, whenever possible, the viewpoint of its Subcommittee on Appropriations as well as the Legislative Committee; therefore I am very glad to have the measure laid over temporarily.

REGULATION OF BOXING CONTESTS AND EXHIBITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4327) to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Boxing Commission for the District of Columbia created by the act of April 24, 1984 (48 Stat. 608), is hereby abolished and there is hereby created for the District of Columbia the District Boxing Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, to be composed of three members (one of whom shall be a member of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia) appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. No person shall be eligible for appointment to membership on the Commission unless such person at the time of appointment is, and for at least 3 years prior thereto has been, a resident of the District of Columbia. The Commission first taking office under terms of this act shall be composed of the same members who immediately prior to the date of approval of this act constituted the Boxing Commission and who shall hold office as and constitute the Commission created by this act for the unexpired terms of their respective appointments as members of the Boxing Commission. A successor to a member of the Commission shall be appointed for a term of office expiring 3 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The Commissioners may remove any member for cause appointed pursuant to this act. The members of the Commission shall be entitled to compensation, not to exceed $1,800 each per annum. Section 58, title 5, United States Code, shall apply to members and employees of the Commission. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall furnish to the Commission such office space as may be necessary. The property, books, and records of the Boxing Commission shall be transferred to and become the property, books, and records of the Commission created by this act. The rules, regulations, and orders of the Boxing Commission not in conflict with this act heretofore promulgated shall remain in force and effect as the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission, unless and until the same shall be repealed or modified in accordance with the provisions of this act. The Commission shall report annually to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia its official acts during the preceding year and shall make such recommendations as it deems expedient.

SEC. 2. Subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Commission may appoint a secretary and may employ such clerical and administrative personnel, in accordance with rates fixed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and such inspectors, examining physicians, and other personnel, whose compensation shall be fixed by the Commission, as may be necessary to administer this act. Compensation of members of the Commission and its employees and all expenses of the Commission shall be paid from the trust fund created by section 10 of this act.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall have power (1) to supervise and regulate boxing contests and training exhibitions in connection therewith, for prizes or purses, or where an admission fee is charged or received, within the District of Columbia; (2) subject to approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to make and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; and (3) to cooperate with organizations engaged in the promotion and control of amateur and collegiate boxing. In the event that the authorities in charge shall notify the Commission that they do not desire its supervision, then the provisions of this act shall not apply in any way to any amateur boxing contest conducted by or participated in exclusively by any school, college, or university, as defined in this act, or by any association or organization composed exclusively of such schools, colleges, or universities when each contestant in any such contest is a student regularly enrolled for not less than one-half time in a school, college, or university as herein defined. As used in this act, "school, college, or university" includes every school, college, or university supported in whole or in part from public funds and every other school, college, or university supported in whole or in part by a religious, charitable, scientific, literary, educational, or fraternal organization which is not operated for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

SEC. 4. No person shall hold or conduct a boxing contest or training exhibition in connection therewith in the District of Columbia without a permit from the Commission. Each such permit shall be limited to a period of 1 day, except that in case of any interscholastic or intercollegiate meet a permit may be issued for the duration of such meet, and for training exhibitions in connection with boxing contests where an admission fee is charged or received, a permit may be issued for the duration of the training period. No permit as described in this section shall be issued to any person unless such person agrees to accord to the Commission the right to examine the books of accounts and other records of such person relating to the boxing contest or exhibition for which such permit is issued, and such permit shall so state on its face. A permit may be revoked at any time in the discretion of the Commission.

SEC. 5. No person shall participate as contestant, second, manager of professional contestant, matchmaker, promotor, referee, judge, timekeeper, or announcer, in any boxing contest, or training exhibition in connection therewith, in the District of Columbia without a license from the Commission. Such license shall entitle the licensee to participate or engage in boxing contests, or training exhibitions in connection therewith, in the District of Columbia in the capacity named in the license for the period specified therein, and the Commission may suspend or revoke any such license at any time for violation by the licensee of any order, rule, or regulation of the Commission, or for other cause.

SEC. 6. Any permit or license issued by the Commission shall not be valid for the purpose of holding or engaging in any boxing contest, or training exhibition in connection therewith, which does not conform to the rules established by the Commission.

SEC. 7. The Commission is authorized to issue licenses and renewals thereof and permits, and to fix and collect fees therefor, as follows:

For professional contestants and seconds, not to exceed $5 per annum.

For managers of professional contestants, not to exceed $15 per annum.

For promoters, not to exceed $25 per annum, and, in addition, not to exceed $10 for each show.

For amateur contestants, not to exceed $1 per annum.

For referees, not to exceed $10 per annum, and for such other occupations as the Commission may by regulation prescribe, not to exceed $10 per annum.

SEC. 8. Applications for licenses shall be accompanied by the required license fee, payable in advance, and shall be made on such forms and contain such information as may be required by the Commission. Licenses shall expire 1 year from date of issue unless sooner revoked and may be renewed annually. Before a license shall be granted to a promoter, he shall execute and file with the Commission a bond in the sum of $2,000 or 10 percent of the estimated receipts, whichever is the larger, to be approved as to form and sufficiency of sureties by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or by such official as they may designate, or in lieu thereof cash or certified check in equal amount, conditioned for the faithful performance by said promoter of the provisions of this act and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, the fulfillment of his contracts with contestants or their managers, and the payment of license and permit fees and taxes on gross receipts. In case of default in such performance, recovery may be had on such bond in the same manner as other penalties are recovered by law.

SEC. 9. Every person holding or conducting any boxing contest, for which an admission fee is charged or received, shall notify the Commission not less than 5 days in advance of the holding of such contest, and after the holding of such contest shall pay forthwith to the Commission a sum, hereby designated as a "gate tax," which shall be an amount equal to 6 percent of the gross receipts, exclusive of any Federal taxes thereon. Payments of money required by this section shall be accompanied by reports in such form as shall be prescribed by the Commission. All tickets of admission to any such boxing contest shall bear clearly upon the face thereof the purchase price of same.

SEC. 10. All funds, whether in cash or other form derived from license fees, permit fees, taxes on gross receipts, penalties, and receipts of whatever nature collected or due under the act of April 24, 1934, remaining unexpended or unobligated on the effective date of this act or provided for by this act shall be paid to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia and deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the account "Miscellaneous trust-fund deposits, District of Columbia Boxing Commission," and shall be disbursed in the same manner as other trust funds are disbursed by the District of Columbia. The said trust fund shall be available to pay compensation of members and employees of the Commission and reasonable and necessary expenses, including office supplies, furniture and fixtures, postage, official badges, ring equipment, trophies, and actual and necessary traveling expenses of members of the Commission or employees thereof incurred in the performance of their official duties. The said fund shall not be available to pay compensation to members of the Commission unless the same is sufficient to pay the secretary and other employees of the Commission their accrued compensation. If, on the last day of any fiscal year—that is to say, June 30—after the payment, or provision made for payment, of all lawful obligations and of all then accrued compensation of members and employees of the Commission, the said trust fund

shall exceed the sum of $10,000, such excess shall be deposited to the credit of the District of Columbia as miscellaneous revenues. The disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the Commission, upon requisitions previously approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia, sums of money not to exceed $500 at any one time, to be used for office and sundry expenses of the Commission and for payment of compensation of inspectors, referees, judges, timekeepers, and examining physicians.

SEC. 11. It shall be the duty of the auditor of the District of Columbia to audit the accounts of the Commission quarterly and make reports thereof to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The auditor shall have free access to all books of accounts, records, and papers of the said Commission.

SEC. 12. Each member of the Commission shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations and examine witnesses concerning any matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. The Commission shall be vested with the same powers to issue subpenas as to matters within its jurisdiction as are vested in trial boards of the Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments; false swearing on the part of any witness before said Commission shall be punishable in the same manner as false swearing before said trial boards, and obedience to any subpena issued by the Commission may be compelled in the same manner as obedience is compelled to subpenas issued by said trial boards, as set forth in the act approved April 16, 1932 (47 Stat. 86).

SEC. 13. The members of the Boxing Commission of the District of Columbia shall not be personally liable in damages or for court costs for any official action of the said Commission performed in good faith in which the said members participate.

SEC. 14. Any person who (1) holds any boxing contest in the District of Columbia without a permit valid and effective at the time, or (2) engages or participates in any boxing contest in the District of Columbia without a license valid and effective at the time, or (3) violates any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 15. Prosecutions for violations of the provisions of this act, or of any rule or regulation made under the authority thereof, shall be on information in the municipal court for the District of Columbia by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants.

SEC. 16. The term "person", as used in this act, includes individuals, partnerships, corporations, and associations.

SEC. 17. The acts of April 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 608), and June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 691), are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the courtesy of the Chair. That is all we have to offer from the District of Columbia at the present time.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 4133, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4133) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6 and 7, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$412,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated by this title shall be used to pay the salaries of more than eighteen messengers assigned to duty in the Office of the Secretary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$143,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,910,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$318,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
M. E. TYDINGS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
J. W. BAILEY,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4133) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I. TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2, salaries, Office of the Secretary: Appropriates $412,500, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $425,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restores the House language, stricken out by the Senate, amended so as to limit the number of messengers to 18, instead of 13 as originally proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4, salaries and expenses, Bureau of Internal Revenue: Appropriates $143,400,000, instead of $135,400,000 as proposed by the House and $144,900,000 as proposed by the Senate; and limits the total amount available for personal services in the District of Columbia to $13,910,000, instead of $13,134,000 as proposed by the House and $14,057,150 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II. POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 5, Bureau of Accounts: Appropriates $318,000, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House and $336,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6, salaries of inspectors, Office of Chief Inspector: Appropriates $3,273,400 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,154,711 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7, Rural Delivery Service: Appropriates $107,690,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $103,315,000 as proposed by the House. The increase of $4,375,000 above the House figure is for the sole purpose of carrying out the provisions of Public Law 205, Seventy-eighth Congress, "to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service." The Budget estimate for this item was not submitted to Congress until after the bill had passed the House.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4133), the Treasury-Post Office Departments' appropriation bill, and I also ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we are engaging in a bad practice when we take up conference reports on regular appropriation bills immediately after they are submitted by the conferees. We have no idea in the world what the conferees have agreed to. The statement will be read at the desk, but to properly understand what has been done we should have the printed copy. There might be some very important amendments in there.

Mr. Speaker, there is no hurry about this. We are only going to recess for a few days and there will be plenty of time, as the conference report can be agreed to between now and the middle of June.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I assure the gentleman there is no controversial matter whatever in this report. This is unanimously agreed to by all members of the conference and it has been unanimously agreed to by the particular members of the subcommittee having to do with it. There are only seven very slight inconsequential amendments in it and the matter has been ironed out satisfactorily to everyone concerned. I assure the gentleman that had there been anything controversial we would have held it up. This matter, however, has no controversy in it and we thought it desirable and proper to get this out of the way before

recess. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of what the gentleman says I am not going to object, but I want to serve notice that this is not to be considered a precedent. Submit the reports for printing under the rule and call it up the next day if you desire. We should have an opportunity to read conference reports on appropriation bills before they are called up, unless it happens to be the last day or two before the end of the fiscal year. I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, if there is anyone who feels this conference report should not be taken up today I think it would be bad practice to take it up because it does not make a particle of difference whether it is agreed to today or a month from now.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. The objections of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] were not to the conference report. He was objecting to what he considered to be a bad practice. In this particular case I assure the gentleman there is no controversy in it and there is no reason why it should not be taken up and disposed of right now.

Mr. TABER. If anybody feels at all that it should not be taken up, I would not think of taking it up if I was in charge of the matter. If anybody feels it should not be taken up I hope they will object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the House with a unanimous report signed by all conferees, does it not?

Mr. LUDLOW. It does.

Mr. TABER. And represents the viewpoint of the entire committee that worked on this bill?

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact this is a unanimous report and in view of the fact that the amendments are not consequential and are agreeable to everyone, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] for 30 minutes.

AMERICANS ALL

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1938, in my remarks to this House in connection with relief for oppressed and persecuted peoples abroad, I said the following:

> I represent a district where we have people of all religions—coming from many foreign countries—Ireland, England, Germany, Italy, Poland, Hungary, Russia, Scandinavia, France, and many other nationalities. We all live peacefully and are tolerant of each other's rights. That is America.
>
> For 300 years America has been a refuge for the oppressed. There came here the Pilgrims, the Huguenots, the Irish, the Germans, the Italians, the Jews, and many others. It was their love of liberty and the knowledge that America believes in free speech, free press, free assemblage, free religion, that brought them here. All these qualities, summed up, symbolize democracy, and no one can deny that many fine, high-type people came to America, and that their descendants now do them honor. Here they could work, here they could conduct their businesses, here they could till the soil, they could send their children to school, they could go to their respective places of worship unmolested, and hold honorable public office without restriction. Here was a glorious country, and these people in turn made good. They worked hard and long in the factory, in building the railroads, in the mines, in business, in the fields of education, in science, in the professions, in the arts. And, when our country called, they fought valiantly in every war. They became recognized as a definite contribution to America and to its growth.

At that time Hitler and his Nazis had invaded and seized Austria. I knew that the suffering that Hitler had created in Germany was now brought to those in Austria. The devil was moving and I appealed to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, in behalf of the oppressed and persecuted people of Austria, urging him, in view of the hardships and suffering inflicted because of their religion, to have leniency exercised in the granting of visas, in order to save human life. I am pleased to state that our great Secretary of State cooperated and made plans to facilitate the emigration of political refugees from Austria and Germany. The President of the United States immediately thereafter extended the plan to the oppressed people of all the lands, and I wired to him the following:

> It made me happy to read the humane stand you have taken in behalf of the oppressed of all lands. It is characteristic of the United States, where freedom prevails, to help others in other lands who do not enjoy this privilege. You have indelibly stamped yourself as the true humanitarian that you are. Accept my heartiest thanks.

Recently there was set up the War Refugee Board in order to bring hope and life to millions of people threatened with horrible and ruthless German annihilation, and just a few days ago our President appealed to nations abroad to rescue as many as possible from those countries being seized and occupied by the Nazis.

In 1938 I saw that Hitler and his hordes would sweep on and destroy before him all liberty-loving people. The story has now been told—Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Poland, Greece, and so down the line—death and suffering is what he brought to these poor innocent people.

Today we are engaged in the greatest conflict that ever faced this Nation. This struggle will decide whether freedom-loving people have the right to live their lives without molestation, oppression, and slavery from a few dictators and their henchmen.

It is true that since the early development of this Nation some of the people have not been willing to extend the freedom from persecution to other groups. At times it was the Catholic who was denied this freedom, or maligned; at times it was the Jew, and still at other times it was the Protestant. However, America and the great majority of its people believed that freedom was the keystone upon which the United States was founded, and freedom was extended to all regardless of creed. The views of our great statesmen, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Roger Williams, and Lord Baltimore prevailed. And, as I said, the United States became the greatest leading Nation in the world, and became the pattern of tolerance and liberty to all peoples. In this country we have no place for hate of our fellow man, and if one expects to receive tolerance there must be tolerance of the other fellow—otherwise bigotry, racial, and religious persecution are but the means to self-destruction and the tearing down of our democracy and the rights upon which it is based.

For a little over 50 years I have lived amongst all types of people. I have had dealings, both in business, socially, and politically, with many—Italians, Irish, Jewish, Germans, Poles, white and Negro—and I can state from my own experience that I have found no essential difference between people of any national origin or religious belief, or color, and that I judge a man not from what country he is or his parents came, or what church he attends, but how he stands up as a man and what his contributions are to society and to America.

In my home—and I believe the home is the greatest institution of all, presided over by the greatest faculty God has ever devised for mankind, our own father and mother—I was raised with the concept and on the principles of helping my fellow man wherever I could; to listen to the truth and to judge people by their deeds, and never to urge any slander against anyone; that we were all part of the brotherhood of man. I have tried to live up to those plain and basic principles.

At times we hear and we read of instances that occur in various localities where a small minority of the people engage in practices that are foreign to believers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of this country. They desire and seek to stir up hatred in the hearts of Americans against other Americans. They seek to divide and conquer. This condition is European. It is not American. Unfortunately, there is another group who will listen to this spreading of poison, and without investigation of the facts or without thinking for themselves, accept these slanderous and vile remarks as true and become parties to these unthinkable and seditious practices. Ofttimes, whether consciously or otherwise, remarks are

made in this legislative hall, which are not wise or prudent, and are jumped upon by these spreaders of hate and widely circulated. For, if they are made under the dome of the Capitol of the United States, then certainly they have prestige, and will be accepted by others in the land. We must, therefore, be cautious of what is said, whether in the heat of excitement or otherwise, for the Capitol of the United States still represents a symbol—the heart of our fair Nation.

Some people would rather listen to the vague accusations than to stand up and raise a voice to defend those who are slandered, when, if the charges made were exposed to the sunlight, they would dry up and disappear. I never had much use for one who would spread gossip, and I have still less use for one who would spread poisonous propaganda. At times people come to me with some of this bigotry, but I immediately attack it with facts rather than give it credence, and when the mail brings this type of malicious slander, it receives the same treatment.

We must stand together—Protestant, Catholic, Jew—united, and when the Catholic is attacked, then the Jew and Protestant must be duty-bound to defend the Catholic; when the Jew is attacked, it is a like duty of the Catholic and Protestant to defend the Jew; and similarly, when the Protestant is attacked, it is the duty of the Catholic and the Jew to defend the Protestant. We are all Americans. What church we attend should not matter. For, we have seen in Europe that where one religious group is attacked, you may be sure that the other religious denominations will come in for their share of brutality. Hitler did not discriminate when inflicting brutality on Catholic, Jew, and Protestant alike. It is most certain that he will fail and bring about his own destruction. We must stand united against hate breeders and crush them wherever they raise their ugly heads. The schools, the churches, labor, management, the press, the radio, the theater, the Government, and every other means must be employed in combating this menace. The spirit of unity, which has been America's heritage and strength from the Declaration of Independence until now, must be continued by us, as men fight and die to preserve it.

We are all God's children. We all believe in religion. We should therefore all believe in the tenets of our faiths, which preach that we should extend to our fellow neighbor the same rights that we expect to have extended to us. Tolerance is the very essence of democracy. That portion of the Constitution guaranteeing religious liberty is of utmost importance to our democratic system. We must all uphold this precious right if our democracy is to endure.

Yes, I said in my speech in 1938, "and when our country called them, they fought valiantly in every war." Today our soldiers are fighting all over the globe. The American people are now engaged in a war to determine the future history of the world. The men and women from every city, town, village, and country site, of every creed, race, and ancestry, are waging a determined fight in order that decency, brotherhood, and freedom will be restored and perpetuated for all liberty-loving people.

When they enlisted or when they were called for service, they were not asked what their religious beliefs are. Today these Americans of all faiths are fighting gallantly, side by side, in the front lines, in the air and on the sea, against Germany and Japan, in order to preserve the freedom and liberty in America, and keep safe those human values upon which our civilization rests.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not true that all races, all peoples, and all nationalities are fighting the common enemy, intolerance, for the safety of the American people and for the preservation of this great country of ours?

Mr. BUCKLEY. All races and all creeds; yes.

There is no distinction in the ranks as to one's religion. They all wear the American uniform. They are enduring hardships of every kind and description; they are giving their lives for their belief in this country, and when the lists of heroes are read, and when the lists of casualties are read, you find the names of people of every origin and religious belief. We hope and pray that this war will be a short one, and that the principles for which they fight shall be sustained.

Let all of us, whether we be Catholic, Jew, or Protestant, join hands in fighting any evidence of hatred that we may come across. We cannot afford to sit idly by, for we all love America, and America is based upon religious freedom to all people.

On the Liberty Bell, which rang out in 1776 in Philadelphia to announce the signing of the Declaration of Independence, is the following inscription, taken from the Holy Bible: "Proclaim liberty to all the land and to all of the inhabitants thereof!" We will continue to do that, and we shall be a happier people as a result.

And, in closing, may I read a verse by H. I. Phillips, of the New York Sun, which is entitled "Study in American Strength"; it was inspired by the fact that three American airmen—Edward Mallory Vogel, Tennessee; Izzie Goldberg, the Bronx, N. Y.; and Edwin J. Sipowski, Waukegan, Ill., killed in a take-off in San Juan Harbor, were buried side by side, with a Protestant chaplain, a Roman Catholic priest, and a rabbi officiating. The flag for which they fought flew over them.

A chaplain, a priest, and a rabbi—
  Protestant—Catholic—Jew—
Three Yanks in three simple caskets—
  Three colors, red, white, and blue.
A hush on a tropic island
  As notes from a bugle fall—
Three rituals slowly chanted—
  Three faiths in a common call.

A lad from the Bronx; another
  Who joined up in Tennessee;
A third one from far Waukegan—
  A typical bunch, those three;
A crash in a naval airplane,
  A rush to its crumpled side,
And nearby Old Glory marking
  The reason the trio died.

They answered a call to duty
  From church and from synagogue—
From hillside and teeming city
  Three names in a naval log;
Each raised in his separate concepts—
  Each having his form to pray—
But all for a faith triumphant
  When rituals fade away.

A prayer in Latin phrases—
  And one with more ancient lore;
A Protestant simple service—
  All one on a distant shore;
"Qui tollis peccata mundi"
  And, "Enter ye unto rest";
A blessing from ancient Moses
  For three who had met the test.

This is the story mighty
  Making our sinew strong:
Boys from the many altars
  Warring on the one great wrong.
This is the Nation's power,
  This is its suit of mail:
Land where each narrow bigot
  Knows that he can't prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ARMY CONTRACT FLYING SCHOOLS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, for months now the Air Forces of the United Nations have been battering Hitler's fortress Europe with some of the most terrific and effective bombing that the world has ever seen, preparing the land invasion.

How did this mass air force come into being? How was it trained? What is going to happen to it and to the set-up which created it?

There have been a lot of unanswered questions in this war. We have been content that they should be unanswered so long as national security or the safety of our boys has been concerned. But now that our air arm and ground forces approach their top in striking power it is time to tell a story about some forgotten men and the part they have played in our war effort.

Decatur and Limestone County, Ala., are a long way from Rome and Berlin as land miles go, but what is happening in those cities is taking place because of what has happened in Decatur, Ala., and some 63 other communities like it.

Decatur, Ala., is a typical small American city. Limestone County is a typical American county. Their people are alert to the Nation's needs. Their people also have known the burdens and the heartaches of the Nation's wars and they have known the triumphs and the gladness of the days when soldiers return. They also have an eye to the Nation's future needs.

So I want to speak today to tell a story which for most Americans hitherto has been unknown. It concerns folks like Frank Hulse, Bud Cornell, Capt. Robert Hubbell and a lot of other folks down Decatur way. If we link up what these folks did in Decatur and Limestone County with the national defense picture we get a new understanding of what has happened. It is a story largely unknown to Americans generally and even to most

Alabamans. It is one so eminently worth telling that I believe public interest will best be served by telling it in some detail. It is a story of American initiative, of American achievement and if you will but hear it through I guarantee you will learn things which up to now you never knew about our war effort. They will thrill you with the knowledge that only in America has inspired military leadership teamed so effectively with civilian know-how.

The development of these schools reads like story-book fiction. Let me go back almost 5 years—to May 1939. That was a day when war clouds were darkening the skies of Europe. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces, read in those clouds warning of a storm of world shaking dimensions and he knew that the thunder and the lightning of the madmen of Europe would menace our shores. So Hap Arnold did a daring thing. He called together a group of men he knew who operated private flying schools.

There were Maj. C. C. Moseley, from California. Maj. W. F. Long came on from Dallas, Hal S. Darr from Chicago, Max Balfour from Tulsa, Oliver Parks from St. Louis, Claude Ryan from San Diego. These men had all fought in World War No. 1 and served their country with honor and distinction. There were others too like Allan Hancock and E. S. Sias, also pioneers who contributed substantially to early aviation. When General Arnold got the men around him he talked straight. He said that the Army did not have time to prepare primary flight training facilities. He said if the job was done that flying school men like them must do it. He told them the plants must provide not only flight and ground school instruction, but also barracks, mess halls, and the like for housing and feeding air force cadets. He told them they would have to use their own credit and trust him.

The way I heard the story, one of the boys was a little doubtful and wondered just how the deal could be financed. Hap Arnold stood up straight and gave it to them straight. "I have no money to give you," he said. "My job is to raise money in Congress but I can promise you nothing. Are you with me?"

Right there those flying-school operators showed the stuff they were made of. They rushed home to get ready and 6 weeks later they received their first classes. Some of them were operating for weeks before they even had a scratch of the pen by way of a contract. No banker would have touched such an indefinite financial arrangement. But these operators, men of the era in aviation when planes were first called crates and pilots were hardy adventurers in a new medium—these men kept the faith. They did the job.

Meanwhile the war was going on—and looking worse for our side. France fought behind her Maginot line but the experts knew her number was up. England was getting round-the-clock bombing and it looked like we might have to go it alone against the Axis. Again General Arnold called these flying-school operators in and told them that they had to expand and do it immediately. Those boys went home and built schools costing up to around a half million dollars apiece, on sites which the War Department approved. If you do not think half a million dollars or even $200,000 is a lot of money, go out some time and try to raise it.

How did these fellows do that job? Some of them were men of substance, but a lot more were men of moderate means.

Hap Arnold gave them just 40 days to set up schools that could accommodate 300 or more cadets at a class and turn out a class every few weeks. Some of these flying-school men mortgaged the houses in which they lived. Some, it is said, even hocked the wife's wedding ring. They scratched deep and they scratched hard to raise the money. But they managed to get it. Some of our citizens go into rhapsodies about the wonderful spirit of the Russian people and what they did, acting under a Communist economy, in repelling the enemies who invaded their country. I submit that the record of these American individualists, operating under a democratic economy, was even greater.

These men knew if they failed that we as a nation might perish. They also knew that if we did not build a mass air force in jig time that we as a nation would go down. They believed if younger men of fighting age could risk their lives, that they could risk their pocketbooks, their all. Of course, if the war had ended then they were all out on a limb and stood no chance of recouping their losses. They would have been stone broke. But they took that risk.

I submit that in gambling their bottom dollars in backing the vision of Gen. Hap Arnold as to what needed to be done, the American system of individual enterprise had its vindication, its highest proof of unselfishness. They could have been wiped out in the early stages of that operation. Let us remember that when authority to create the training system came up in Congress it passed by only two votes. Remember they had only 40 days to do the job. Did they stand back and wait until the last "t" was crossed and the last "i" dotted before they went to work? They did not. They did the job. While some other branches of our industrial picture were groaning and beating their chests about such insurmountable difficulties as bad weather, transportation shortages, manpower lacks, priorities, and labor troubles, these fellows just went ahead and did the job. They did it without fuss, furore, or fanfare, and as far as I know, up to now there never has been any public recognition either on the floor of this House or elsewhere of the outstanding job these men did.

But as we moved toward war the job got bigger and bigger. The schools operated by the eight pioneer operators that General Arnold called in were not enough. Each doubled the number of schools he was operating. Even that was not enough. More aviation schoolmen of experience and patriotism were needed. This second wave brought in men like Frank Hulse and his manager, Bloomfield Miller Cornell, or as most folks in Decatur call him, Bud Cornell.

Who are Frank Hulse and Bud Cornell? I am going to tell you because they are typical of a group of Americans who all unnoticed by most of our citizens have done a top job in the national interest—a job they were particularly qualified by education, experience, and personal preference to do. Frank Hulse began flying in 1928 and has devoted himself to aviation ever since. He is a graduate of Georgia School of Technology. He knows not only the theory but the practice of aviation. He knows both the inside and the outside of engines and planes. He began operating flying schools in 1936.

In 1941 when it became apparent that more schools would be needed Frank Hulse stepped forward to do his part of the job. A training detachment was activated while a suitable site was sought for the school. The first location was disapproved by the Medical Corps because mosquitoes were too numerous. But Frank Hulse did not get discouraged. He did not quit. He found a site where the job could be done and done right.

That site is in Limestone County, Ala., some 3 miles from Decatur, on United States Highway No. 31. He did not even wait until the crop on that site was harvested. Tenant farmers were paid for their half-grown cotton. Construction got going in July 1941. That first class 42–D had 51 cadets. It was hot and dusty during those days of hurried building and the sound of hammers was continuous, but those cadets learned to fly. But Cornell, who had been director of the ground school at Hulse's flying school at Camden, S. C., came in that September to be general manager of Southern Aviation Training School as the new institution at Decatur came to be known. Bud Cornell is a tall, muscular fellow who graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1927. He attended the torpedo school at the naval station at San Diego, Calif., and then took aviation training at the Pensacola, Fla., naval air station. He got his wings in 1929 and was commissioned lieutenant, junior grade, later serving on the Lexington in fighter squadron operation. He retired from the Navy in 1932 and later became professor of aeronautical engineering at Alabama Polytechnic Institute. But when he was needed in the training program he came back to do a job on the flight line.

That is the kind of men that have been entrusted with the job of creating a mass American air force and who have done that job. Included in this second wave of school operators are John Paul Riddle, a pioneer in air-line development; Albert I. Lodwick, an outstanding builder of aviation and former right-hand man of that giant of aviation, Tom Morgan; as well as William R. Kent, of Memphis, Tenn.; Jack Connelly and Leland Hayward, of Phoenix, Ariz.; and Harry White, formerly of San Francisco, and now of King City, Calif. All these men operate two or three training schools for the Air Forces and have contributed much to the success of the program. The second wave also included

one of the Nation's outstanding racing and stunt pilots, "Tex" Rankin, of Tulare, Calif.

These schools expanded to 63, dotting the entire Southland from the Carolinas down around the Gulf coast and Texas, out through Arizona and the west coast up as far as King City, Calif.

Building those schools and setting up the organizations to do the training was not easy. Alabama is my home and I love the State and perhaps I am at least a little bit prejudiced when I say that the Limestone County school, near Decatur, sprang into being with at least no more difficulties than those of the average school. I say this advisedly, for the records prove that many of these 63 schools that did the training job had to be built during the rainy season in the South. From the banks of the Mississippi in Missouri down to the Gulf region in Texas, floods were the rule during the time those schools were building. Maybe the Lord was testing us to see if we as a nation were fit to work, to fight, indeed to survive. One school was flooded out, another had a gas explosion that killed some of its key personnel and almost wiped out its operator. In dozens of places workmen labored for weeks at a time literally waist deep in water to build those schools and get drainage started on the level ground so necessary for proper landing fields. Why in Texas during the rainy season they even called one site for one of the schools, Brayton's Bay. But the barracks and hangars were built, the fields drained, the runways constructed.

Now, let us look and see what has been accomplished since this training program was started. Let us see what these school operators have done in building an air force. As Americans we feel instinctively that a good job should be willing to stand scrutiny. Has this job been done safely, efficiently, inexpensively? Has it shown good utilization of manpower? Have the over-all results been good? I believe it will serve the public interest to look at the record of these schools.

Early this year it was officially reported by Gen. Henry H. Arnold that military personnel in the Army Air Forces, which numbered only 21,556 in 1939, now total the tremendous number of 2,385,000. That expansion was possible only because great military leadership teamed up with civilian know-how in a typical American partnership. General Arnold tells about some of these problems and achievements in his report:

The over-all program of the Army Air Forces was designed—

He wrote—

on the basis of a plan to give us overwhelming air superiority in the shortest possible time. There was no question whether the training program could be carried out; the Army Air Forces had to become the largest single educational organization in existence in a very short time. Facilities were secured, teachers were hired, and textbooks were written while the first classes were being held.

Now, of course, it is common sense that the need was of tremendous urgency and General Arnold tells something about what the situation really was in 1939 in another part of his report:

To provide airmen to fly the planes then being built—

He reported—

it was necessary to expand Army Air Forces training facilities at once. The Army Air Forces did not have sufficient instructors to train 2,400 pilots a year. To build another Randolph Field to handle 500 pilots a year would take 5 years. The idea was criticized as being against precedent, but heads of our civilian flying schools were called in by the Army Air Forces. They were to get ready to train huge classes in primary flight. The Army Air Forces could offer them no contracts at the time to justify complete change-overs of their programs, but flying schools immediate prepared to help handle the pilots.

The figure was raised to 12,000 pilots a year and later to 30,000. We could not possibly have trained so many airmen quickly without these schools. Today our pilot-training rate has left these earlier goals far behind.

Now, I do not know how many pilots are coming out of these Aeronautical Training Society schools which are doing flight training, and, if I did know, I could not tell it here for the number up to now has been a military secret. It was reported some months ago that more than 100,000 young Americans had been taught to fly since schools now included in the society started to train cadets. We do know that General Arnold has reported that War Production Board schedules 145,000 planes for completion in the 15-month period we now have just well begun. Many of these are large planes. It is known that most bombers require a skilled pilot, a copilot, and crews requiring varying amounts and kinds of aviation skills. This set-up which Hap Arnold envisioned and created is cutting the mustard. It is providing the pilots.

At this point parents, particularly mothers, ask, and rightly, But have not there been quite a lot of accidents in this training program? Let General Arnold answer that question. He says:

Basically the accident record is good. Ninety-five out of every 100 Army Air Force pilots in training can be expected to fly through the next 12 months without a scratch.

What about fatal accidents? The most recent Army figures on that are reassuring. They show that the fatal-accident rate is only one for every 43,478 hours of primary flight. On the basis of 100 miles per hour, that is only one per 4,347,800 miles. The basic and advanced training likewise is also surprisingly safe.

Down at Southern Aviation School, which is doing primary flight training, there have been only two fatal accidents in more than 200,000 hours of flying. And even that is not the top record, although it is very, very good. I am informed that one large A. T. S. school has flown over 375,000 hours without a single fatality. At the time that record was made the school was nearing 3 full years without any flying fatality. Parents may breathe easier when they think of these cadets in training for it means that they really are being trained safely. They are being trained safely because, man for man, these civilian instructors are veterans of aviation. There is a large percentage of these men who are over combat age, and this group includes many World War No. 1 pilots. A man whose own boy is a cadet will do his best to see that other cadets are trained safely. There are hundreds of these older instructors in the schools. There are some younger men, too, but many of them would be IV–F for combat purposes. The fact that these instructors maybe have a finger off, or a slight limp, or just naturally a little too old for combat does not hurt them as instructors as the record shows. These men can do a good job teaching cadets how to fly for the very good reason that a lot of them have been teaching boys to fly in civilian life for 10, 25, or even more years.

Now Gen. Hap Arnold showed himself smart in other ways when he decreed that civilians should teach the Army curriculum to cadets. His foresight has paid off to the tune of perhaps 150,000 soldiers saved for combat. Otherwise about that number of soldiers would be busy with flight instruction, plane repair, feeding or housing cadets, and doing the hundred-and-one other jobs that are necessary around a Regular Army installation. Remember now the Army needs to provide only a small complement of officers and men in these civilian schools to look after discipline, organization matters, and medical care. This shrewd utilization of manpower that comes about by letting the civilian half of this partnership in these schools do everything connected with flight instruction, aircraft maintenance, feeding, housing, and guard duty not only has saved the country fighting men but a lot of money. I don't know to a nickle how much it is, but the annual savings certainly exceed $250,000,000.

What is the quality of the pilots being turned out by these schools? Well, just look over the daily papers—any daily paper any day, and read of our air heroes. If the boy received his primary training since midsummer 1939, he learned to fly in one of the sort of schools I have been talking about. Air heroes of this war from Lance Wade of those pioneer Eagle Squadrons down to Capt. Robert Hubbell are products of these A. T. S. schools.

Capt. Robert Hubbell, wearer of the Air Medal, learned to fly at Southern Aviation Training School near Decatur. It was he who not long ago brought back the Flying Fortress *Decatur Deb* shredded with shell fire but safe from a successful foray over Germany. He married a Decatur girl and learned to fly in Decatur so his exploits are of particular interest to us. However, he is only typical of the more than 100,000 boys who learned to fly safely and well in these schools. They learned that way because instruction was the Army curriculum for flyers and the civilian instructors know their jobs. They know they must teach a cadet to fly or that cadet is "washed out." That in military parlance means that he will be reclassified to some other phase of aviation training such as navigator or bombardier.

What about schools like Southern Aviation Training School in the future?

If you look at the sturdy brick-veneer administration building, the brick mess hall, brick barracks, the concrete flight strip before the group of steel hangars, the set-up seems to have a solid sort of college campus look. The buildings form a quadrangle, for there are other buildings of asbestos-shingle construction that fill in the gaps. This school has plenty of barracks for its needs, a ground-school building, hospital, and Link trainer canteen building. That mess hall alone can feed 500, family style, at a sitting. I do not know what the future may hold, but I know such plants ought to find constructive use in the future economy of our country.

If you will multiply this Decatur institution by 63 stretching from coast to coast over the entire Southland, you see at a glance what this country has in the way of tangible assets in physical properties alone. After the other World War we had made promising beginnings of worth-while aviation development. In the soft, forgetful peace years we permitted those resources to disintegrate and be forgotten. We must not make this mistake twice. If we do a kindly providence may not let us off so easily next time. I say easily advisedly, for even the terrible cost in men and treasure which the current struggle involves is slight compared to consequences of a war in which we might as a result of unpreparedness be the conquered instead of the victor.

So I say that these resources of physical properties, this partnership of Army direction and civilian know-how, deserve to be preserved and perpetuated. We have the schools, we have the management, we have the civilian personnel—a flexible, efficient, inexpensive method of doing a mass training job, under the smartest Army direction that the world has ever seen. Ably assisting General Arnold in this phenomenal training program are Maj. Gen. R. W. Harper, Lt. Gen. Barton K. Yount, Maj. Gen. Gerald C. Brant, Maj. Gen. Ralph P. Cousins, Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Hanley, Jr., Maj. Gen. George Stratemeyer, and others. This national asset must not be allowed to wither and die on the vine. We have a going business here which is of incalculable value not only for national defense but for preserving peace in the world.

This old earth is going to be an unsettled, hazardous place for as long in the future as any of us can see. Air power has proved the decisive factor in this war thus far. We have this advantage and, if we are smart, we will keep it.

It is not enough to sit back and say complacently, "Yes, of course air power is important, but after all we won't need any more pilots since we've just trained over 100,000." I would like to answer that before anyone repeats such a dangerous fallacy. We have trained 100,000 pilots and more. That is true. But combat flying is a young man's game. Pilots get obsolete at about the same rate as military aircraft. Some top air force authorities would never send a boy over 27 at the controls on a bombing mission. They prefer fighter pilots 25 and under. That means that a lot of our boys from a combat point of view are already old men. Have you seen the faces or the pictures of the faces of men who have been out on a few dozen bombing raids? Anyone who has knows that men age faster in this deadly business of combat aviation than any place in the world. There are no atheists in fox holes, and there are no men who stay young in bombers.

We must be realists and face the facts, if we would survive as a Nation and keep the world's peace. Our measure of air combat personnel in the post-war period will be the number of men young enough and trained enough to fly the newest and hottest plane off the production line. Anything less will not do. Anything less is to invite national obliteration. We must keep on doing this job and, if we are smart, we will do it as safely, as efficiently, and inexpensively as possible.

We have taught over 100,000 young Americans—the pick of our young manhood—how to fly. The social implications of this action are tremendous and none of us has all the end results let alone all the answers. But I believe that several things are manifest. One is that these boys who have won their wings never again will be the earth-bound men they were before they took up flying. Some of them can continue in the Army Air Force in assignments commensurate with their training and skills. Their usefulness as combat pilots may be limited to years or even months, but there is another side—a brighter side to remember. These boys—or at any rate most of them will be able to do a lifetime job in civil aviation. There will be mail and passengers to carry, express and freight to fly, schools to run in the days that lie ahead.

So I say that the Nation owes those lads who want to continue in aviation a chance to keep their place in the Nation's air when peace day comes. They have earned it. Let us give it to them. They will need to be gentled to the radio practices, the traffic patterns, the amenities of civilian flying. Let us see that they get this retraining at the hands of those who can do it most safely, efficiently, and inexpensively. I have no favorites for this job. Let all applicants come in and show what they have done and can do.

I know that schools like Southern Aviation Training School will be among those named to do the job if the record is examined closely and fairly. I know that these men who in the years before did a top civilian flying training job and who since 1939 have done the Army contract flying school job, merit consideration for doing whatever civilian or military flying training job that the Nation requires. These men who have done this job for Hap Arnold have worked quietly, unobtrusively, and effectively. They have made so little fuss that they have been almost overlooked by the unthinking. They have been the forgotten men of the war effort. Their achievement when it is known and comprehended will appear as one of the brightest pages of civilian effort in this war. It is high time that this national asset be recognized and preserved to do the job they know best how to do. We owe that to the boys who come back, the boys who do not come back, and to our future safety and well-being as a Nation. Let us look at the record and act. It is not too early.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to my friend from Texas and also my colleague on the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMASON. I want to commend my friend from Alabama for his able defense of the contract air schools which have done such a marvelous training job during this war. I have some personal knowledge of the subject because the Pacific Air School at Fort Stockton, Tex., in my district, belongs to this group and I say without hesitation that no training school in the country, whether it be Army or civilian, has done a better job. The weather conditions in that section are ideal, and there has been no interruption in the training. Hundreds of our finest young men have graduated from that school and many of them have distinguished themselves in combat. That school has only recently been closed by order of the War Department because they say it is no longer needed. The Secretary of War says that the air training period in this country is far advanced, and the time has arrived for fighting. I cannot argue this question with the "powers that be" because I have nothing to do with the training or placement of our fighting men. I do, however, want to join with my friend in demanding that some department of our Government put these abandoned schools to some useful purpose. Almost a million dollars was spent on the Fort Stockton school and the citizens of that community either donated or procured 762 acres of land and the Defense Plant Corporation advanced $800,000 for buildings and equipment to make it one of the finest schools of its size in our land. Certainly schools such as the one in the district of my friend from Alabama and the one in my district must not be permitted to become junk. Only recently a good friend of mine, Mr. Marsh Lea, of Fort Stockton, and one of the most public-spirited citizens of that community, was here, and he and I had conferences with the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Robert P. Patterson, Gen. Frank T. Hines, head of the Veterans' Administration, and Mr. Jesse Jones, whose agency loaned the money to build the Fort Stockton school. Mr. Lea and I insisted that this school and others like it should, as soon as possible, be converted into some other useful and beneficial purpose. We were assured by all three of these prominent officials that the problem was being given careful study. I only hope that an early solution will be found, and I expect to join with my friend from Alabama in doing everything possible to that end. Some program should be worked out at once to use these valuable properties for vocational schools, rehabilitation centers, hospitals, or perhaps integrated into the great Army and civilian aviation

program that is sure to follow in the post-war period.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank my friend from Texas, who is the ranking member on the Military Affairs Committee of the House, for his comments. I know something about the facts he has stated regarding the school in his district, and I am pleased to tell him that I am in full accord with the sentiments he has expressed.

In this connection I may say that no Member of this House has taken a greater interest in the building up of the armed forces and in the training of our airmen than has my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SERVICE AND SACRIFICE BY THE JEWISH PEOPLE ENTITLE THEM TO THE RESPECT OF THEIR FELLOW AMERICANS AND AN END OF JEWISH PERSECUTION HERE AND ABROAD

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, the supremely courageous action recently taken by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in opening the gates of the Eternal City to the Jewish people who fled there seeking refuge from the murderous hordes of the followers of Hitler and his refusal to give up these people to the German soldiery seeking to assassinate them should serve as an inspiration to faith, courage, and fortitude not only by the followers of the Vicar of Christ, but to right-thinking people the world over, regardless of their religious beliefs. To challenge death for the protection and preservation of the oppressed and persecuted not of his faith is unparalleled in the annals of history and stamps His Holiness as a worthy disciple of the Divine Master who gave to the world not only the admonition of "Peace on Earth to Men of Good Will" but likewise advocated the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. These admonitions so vital to the happiness and welfare of the human family are today generally disregarded, and we find the hand of man raised against his fellow man throughout the world and the seeds of hatred sown everywhere. There is a consolation, however, in the knowledge that in a period of warfare, spiritual and material values are best approximated and the futility of striving for material ends alone and the necessity for spiritual idealism influences everyone. There comes to us first of all the realization that the only thing that we take away with us on departing this life is the record of service to God and our fellow man which each of us write during our brief stay on earth. It has been well phrased by the poet-philosopher Omar Khayyam, who wrote:

> The moving finger writes, and having writ, moves on; nor all your piety nor wit, shall lure it back to cancel half a line, nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

Ah, how many lines every individual would like to wipe away that have been recorded in the Heavenly ledger and for which one day each in his turn must answer. Upon this day I bespeak in the name of mother, in the name of home, and in the name of spiritual idealism, justice rather than tolerance, not only for the weaker and smaller countries of the world, but more particularly for the peoples of the world that suffer persecution because of race, creed, or color. We are all children, creatures of and created by Almighty God and the indisputable proof of God's creation of each individual is the fact that of all the millions of people that have inhabited the earth since the beginning of creation, no two have had the same fingerprints. Yet, in the face of this indisputable evidence of the Creator of mankind's intent and purpose, that each individual had been endowed and created by Almighty God for a specific purpose, we find the spirit of hatred still alive in the world.

When the Divine Master preached on the shores of Galilee, the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, He did not specifically designate that any particular group created by Him should be privileged to hold in subjection or persecution or oppression any other group, and yet down through the ages the powerful have persecuted and oppressed the weaker.

America, since the establishment of our Government, has proven not only a haven of refuge for the persecuted and the oppressed of the world without regard to race, creed, or color, but has raised its voice against persecution and oppression when practiced in other countries of the world. I can well recall the very great honor conferred upon me as a Member of the Sixty-second Congress some 32 years ago, of being selected by the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, the late lamented Honorable Champ Clark, to preside over the House when a resolution was adopted abrogating commercial treaties with Russia representing in excess of $100,000,000 annually, because of the refusal at that time of the Russian Government to end pogroms and substituting therefor trial by jury for the Jewish people in Russia. The measure was adopted by the House and Senate and signed by the late lamented Woodrow Wilson, and shortly after pogroms ended in Russia. No group in the history of the world has suffered persecution in the same measure as have those of the Jewish race.

Reading over the history of persecutions, anyone unfamiliar with the facts would labor under the impression that the individual woman or man victim of persecution because of race, creed, or color, was responsible for his or her race, creed, or color. The fact is that we come into the world as Almighty God decreed we should come into it, and due to the fact that our parents were of a certain race and a certain color and professed a certain creed, we cannot escape the race of our parents, or the color of our parents, and we rarely change from the creed of our parents. And this has been the unvarying rule from the beginning of creation. In view of these conditions, beyond the control of the individual, there is no way in which to justify the persecution or oppression of an entire race or an entire group because of their color or of their creed. Yet, despite this fact, public opinion, which, if crystallized could be a determining factor in the promotion of justice and in the destruction of racial and religious persecution, remains quiescent and permits the development of conditions destructive to society as a whole.

The persecution and oppression of the Jewish people by the Germans under Hitler must not be permitted in America. When the framers of the American Constitution met, they endeavored to prevent the development of conditions which today shock the world in Europe by the declaration that all men were created equal and that they were endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which were the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness without regard to race, creed, or color.

While it is true from time to time the black flag of bigotry has been in evidence in this fair land of ours, it is equally true that the fundamentals of our Government have been sufficiently accepted and impressed upon our people to cause sanity to assert itself and justice for all races to prevail.

The Jewish people have been the target for oppression and persecution through the centuries, notwithstanding the fact that their contribution to the spiritual, cultural, and industrial development has been as great in proportion to their number as that of any other race. They have contributed freely of time, energy, money, and life itself both in hours of peace and in hours of crisis, and as beneficiaries of their contribution, it is clearly our duty at this time to voice our protest against further persecution of the Jewish people whether it be in Germany or any other portion of the world. In every war in which the American Nation has participated from the beginning of our Government, they have been a potential factor, not only for the establishment of the Government, but for its preservation and perpetuation.

The words "home" and "mother" convey the same sweet blessed thought to the Jews that they convey to those of every other race, and in the spirit of the mothers of men, who journey down in the shadow of the valley of death that we might come into being; and in the sacred name of home and in the name of our priceless heritage of liberty and equality, I appeal to all to demand, not in the name of tolerance, but in the name of justice and fair play for the Jewish people throughout the world an end of hatred and persecution.

It is fitting that the contribution by those of Jewish blood be presented so that America may have the opportunity to determine upon merit whether Americans shall be permitted through lack of facts and absence of knowledge to embark upon a program of hate, the success of which would cause the hands of many millions of Americans to be raised against other Americans absolutely without justification.

At a period when the movement for the liberty of the American colonists was

undertaken, the number of Jews in America was extremely limited, being less than 3,000 upon the entire American continent. Nevertheless, they furnished not only many soldiers but more than 20 officers, some of whom enjoyed the friendship and confidence, in a large measure, of the father of our country, General Washington. When the cause of the colonists appeared darkest and the prospects for victory most remote, when desertions were common, dissensions were general, and disintegration apparently inevitable, it was a group of Jews in America aided by Haym Salomon, of Philadelphia, who contributed over $600,000 that the troops might be fed and clothed and paid, that the war might go on until victory for the colonists had been established.

It is fitting to recall that it was a Jewish citizen by name, Judah Tuoro, that contributed in a manner more generous than any other individual to the completion of the erection of the Bunker Hill Monument, a memorial to the soldiers who fought in the War of the Revolution. It was the same Judah Tuoro who, during the second war with England, entered the ranks as a common soldier and was severely wounded and that more than a score of other citizens of Jewish blood served as officers in this war.

It was the same story in the Mexican War of 1846, where more than a half score of officers serving in that war were of Jewish extraction. Notwithstanding the prejudice which has from time to time been evidenced toward the Jews, the fact remains that Gen. David Leon, not once but twice, was voted the thanks of the American Congress for his courage during the war. In the Civil War, although the total population at that period in the United States was but 150,000 Jews, some 8,000 served in the Northern Army.

In the First World War, it is conservatively estimated that more than 200,000 persons of Jewish extraction served, representing 4 percent of the total armed forces of the United States as against 3 percent of the total population. In the First World War nearly 15,000 Americans of Jewish extraction were wounded and some twenty-eight hundred made the supreme sacrifice that free government might continue to be the heritage of America.

Their contribution has been most notable in the line of peaceful pursuits where men are judged by character, merit, and service, free of the debasing and degrading practice of indulging in what might savor of narrowness and bigotry. We have been mindful of the contribution to philanthropy made by Julius Rosenwald, to jurisprudence made by Louis D. Brandeis, of the contribution to the financial well-being of America in the critical period of the World War by Morgenthau and Baruch, of the contribution to medical science of Rosenau, of the contribution to science of an Einstein, of the contribution to art and to literature and to science from the days of Moses to the present. Mindful of this most notable of contributions, we can only view with disgust and a feeling of shame the position taken by those whose preachments of hate and bigotry would serve to divide the people of free America. The record of achievement by the people of the Jewish faith in the present war is now being written in their blood and at the conclusion of the war to be translated into the records of our country.

The chief charge leveled by propagandists against the Jewish citizens is that they are to be found largely in the noncombat service. A recent publication issued by the National Jewish Welfare Board of New York City gives the lie, however, to the assertion. The total number of doctors of Jewish faith in the United States, according to a survey made in 1939, is 18,000. The largest group is to be found in the New York area comprising Brooklyn and the Bronx sections, and of this number the religious faith of 92 percent of the total number, or 6,836 is found to be Jewish. Of the Jewish physicians in this area numbering 4,409, it is found that 32 percent are in the armed forces as against 2,427 non-Jewish doctors, or 27.5 percent, in the armed service. The survey was made of 2,895 inductees of Jewish faith in Pennsylvania and it was estimated this number represents one-half of all Jewish citizens of Pittsburgh in the armed forces; of this number, 25 percent of the total, or more than 700, are serving in the most dangerous branch of the service, namely, the Air Forces, while the remainder are divided up, with 9.5 percent in the Medical Corps, 9.4 percent in the Infantry, 7.4 percent in the Field Artillery, 7.3 percent in the Quartermaster Corps, 5.5 percent in the Coast Artillery, 5.4 percent in the Engineers, 4.8 percent in the Signal Corps, and 3.3 in the Armored Forces.

It is interesting to contrast the above figures with the noncombat service, namely, Army administration, which has but seven-tenths of 1 percent, and Army finance but 1.2 percent; the remaining 20.3 percent is to be found in other branches of the Army, including Cavalry, Chemical Warfare, Chaplain Corps, Military Police, and Paratroopers.

These figures which have been compiled through Army sources give the lie to the story that has so long been current that men of Jewish faith were largely in the noncombat services.

A list has been compiled by the War Review of the National Jewish Welfare Board to November 1, 1943. While it is incomplete, it nevertheless is sufficient to indicate the injustice of the charge that the Jews are not doing their full duty in the present war.

The record of the awards of the Purple Heart, the Silver Star, distinguished-service decorations is most inspiring and is worthy of study by every citizen who still harbors the illusion that men of Jewish faith are lacking in courage, loyalty, or full sense of patriotic duty for a common country.

HONORS AND AWARDS

Pvt. (1st. cl.) Leslie Aaron, 23, of Oak Grove, L. I., Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Jacob Abelman, United States Marine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Sgt. Allan A. Aberbrook, 24, of the Bronx, N. Y. Citation from Colombian General Pablo Lopez. For heroism in the Panama Canal Zone.

Sgt. Abraham Abramowitz, 21, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Air Medal and four Oak Leaf Clusters. He took part in numerous raids over Europe.

Pvt. Itzchok Abramowitz, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Seymour Abramovitz, 23, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. John M. Abrams, 35, Medical Corps, of Kansas City, Kansas. American Defense Medal. For heroism in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Norman Abrams, 27, of Youngstown, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Bizerte, Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Michael Abrams, 30, of Newark, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Melvin Abramson, 21, of New Rochelle, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. (1st. cl.) Louis W. Ackerson, 24, of Palo, Mich. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Lt. Julian S. Adleman, 32, of Revere, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Ben Adler, Medical Corps, of Paterson, N. J. Purple Heart. For heroism in Hawaii.

Lt. Jerome M. Adler, 22, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For heroism in air combat over north Africa.

Pvt. Julius B. Adler, 32, of Hartford, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Lt. Monroe A. Adler, 24, Army Air Forces, of Allentown, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For extraordinary achievement in aerial flight while piloting a transport plane in the South Pacific during more than 175 operational missions, transporting troops and equipment and evacuating wounded personnel.

Capt. Philip M. Adler, 27, Army Air Forces, of Lebanon, Ind. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal and Purple Heart. Capt. Adler has taken part in numerous raids against the Japs in China, as operations officer of a squadron and pilot of a Liberator bomber. He was wounded in action during one raid.

Capt. Philip M. Adler, 28, Army Air Forces, of Lebanon, Ind. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in China.

Pvt. Sam Adlin, 21, of Paterson, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Italy.

Lt. Isidore Alfred, 25, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star. Posthumously awarded for heroism in air combat near Java where he died in action when his plane was shot down.

Sgt. Sam R. Allen, 28, New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Nathan Alper, 25, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Edward Altglass, 29, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Frederic G. Altman, Army Air Forces, of Little Rock, Ark. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal and nine Oak Leaf Clusters. For his heroism as bombardier aboard a B-17 bomber in 50 bombing missions over north Africa and Europe, including Sicily.

Lt. Arthur Amron, 25, Army Air Forces, of Rockaway Park, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Sgt. Murray Andriessc, of Newport, R. I. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Morris Applebaum, 25, Army Air Forces, of Birmingham, Ala. Purple Heart. Killed in action in south Pacific.

Sgt. Robert Arch, of Valley Stream, N. Y. Silver Star. For heroism in north Africa during the Oran offensives.

Sgt. Arnold E. Arnold, 21, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action over Germany.

Pvt. Justin Barry Arnold, 20, United States Marine Corps, of Minneapolis, Minn. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Sanford N. Aronbeck, 26, Army Air Forces, of Auburn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. For extraordinary heroism in aerial combat in the north African campaign. On one occasion his quick thinking and adroit handling of a plane enabled him to save the lives of 10 crew members.

Lt. Albert M. Aronson, 28, Army Air Forces, of Kingstree, S. C. Purple Heart and Air Medal. For his work as navigator of a B-24 Liberator bomber which took part in numerous raids on Europe, failed to return from a raid on Rumanian oil fields.

Capt. Lloyd H. Aronson, 24, Army Air Forces, of South Norwalk, Conn. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For heroism in the Far East. He saved a twin-engine plane at an allied airdrome in China from destruction during a bombing raid.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Abe Aronowitz, 27, or Paterson, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Australia.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Josef Z. Asbel, 22, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Jack Ascher, 21, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross. He was radio operator on a bomber which sank a German submarine off the coast of South America.

Lt. Jerome H. Ash, 27, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Italy.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Nathan Frederick Asher, United States Navy, of Philadelphia, Pa. Commendation from Secretary Knox. He assumed emergency command of destroyer on the day of the Pearl Harbor attack.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Daniel C. Bain, 26, Sutersville, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Pvt (1st cl.) Reuben Robert Baitchman, 39, of New Orleans, La. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Sgt. Martin Balick, 26, of Wilmington, Del. Silver Star. For leading his outfit over a hill in Tunisia under heavy enemy fire. A private at the time, he took command in the absence of an officer.

Pvt. Joseph Baskin, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Jacob Bass, 26, of West New York, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Asiatic seas.

Lt. Samuel Bass, 25, Army Air Forces, of North, S. C. Air Medal. For outstanding aerial achievement as navigator and bombardier on a bombing mission in the Middle East.

Pvt. Sam Bassoff, 29, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Norman D. Bauer, United States Marine Corps, of Lamar, Colo. Purple Heart. Wounded in action.

Corp. Raymond D. Bauer, 23, of Jersey City, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Clifford Baum, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Abe Bearman, 33, of Allentown, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Seaman Milton S. Becker, 30, United States Navy, of Newport News, Va. Purple Heart. For heroism at sea during the invasion of Sicily.

Corp. Sidney Becker, 25, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Irving Beeber, 23, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Pvt. Meyer Belofsky, 25, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the southwest Pacific.

Lt. Morris Berenson, Army Air Forces, of Garfield, N. J. Air Medal and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For his part in bombing raids over Tunisia and Tripoli, and for disabling seven enemy craft in a Nazi-held port.

Pvt. Bernard E. Berg, 21, of Philadelphia, Pa. Silver Star and Purple Heart. He crawled through enemy fire on Guadalcanal to render aid to an officer and dragged the officer to safety despite wounds in his back.

Sgt. Marwin A. Berg, 23, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Lt. Sidney Berk, 25, Army Air Forces, of Jacksonville, Fla. Purple Heart. Killed in action over France.

Sgt. William Berkman, 30, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Sgt. Arthur Berkovitz, 23, Army Air Forces, of East Chicago, Ind. Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters. For his part in numerous bombing raids over occupied Europe. Reported missing in action.

Capt. Jack Berkovitz, 23, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Air Medal. He took part in 40 bombing missions against Japanese positions in New Guinea and other Southwest Pacific bases.

Lt. George Berkowitz, 25, Army Air Forces, of Dallas, Tex. Silver Star, Purple Heart, and Nineteenth Bombardment Group citation. For heroism in action in the South Pacific, where he was wounded.

Pvt. Harold N. Berkowitz, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Marvin Berkowitz, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star and Purple Heart. For heroism and wounds received in action in the Southwest Pacific. Now reported missing.

Pvt. Samuel F. Berkowitz, 22, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Irving Berman, 23, Army Air Forces, of Paterson, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Aleutians.

Lt. Samuel D. Berman, 25, Army Air Forces, of Terrace Park, Ohio. Air Medal. For his part in "dangerous operational flights over mountainous terrain" in the Far East.

Pvt. Herman Berne, 32, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Bernard Alvin Bernstein, 21, Army Air Forces, of Des Moines, Iowa. Purple Heart. Killed in action over Europe.

Sgt. David Bernstein, 31, Army Air Forces, of Winsted, Conn. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. Killed in air action over Sicily.

Sgt. Harry P. Bernstein, 27, of the Bronx, N Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Corp. Saul Bernstein, of Farmingdale, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sidney Bernstein, 24, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Ted Bernstein, 22, Army Air Forces, of Santa Ana, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in north Africa.

Maj. Arthur Berwald, 28, of Dallas, Tex. Purple Heart. Killed in action at Kiska.

Maj. Louis Besbeck, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at Bataan. Missing in action.

Metalsmith Solomon Bessel, 23, United States Navy, of Glen Cove, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Lt. Leonard Bessman, 35, of Milwaukee, Wis. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Africa.

Sgt. Theodore Billen, 21, Army Air Forces, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, Purple Heart, and 3 citations. As an aerial engineer and gunner, he personally accounted for several Zeros during 63 bombing raids and air battles in the Pacific.

Lt. Sidney Lewis Binderman, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Java Sea.

Pvt. Bernard Binetsky, 30, of Newark, N. J. Purple Heart. He was wounded during the invasion of Sicily when a German shell broke his right leg.

Corp. Peter O. Binswanger, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Arthur Biskin, of Albany, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Hawaii.

Lt. Howard W. Blank, 23, Army Air Forces, of Terre Haute, Ind. Purple Heart. Wounded in action over France.

Lt. Paul Blank, Army Air Forces, of Maplewood, Mo. Air Medal and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For repeated acts of heroism during months of air action over Europe.

Lt. Melvin J. Bleakman, 25, Army Air Forces, of Baltimore, Md. Air Medal. As copilot on a bombing attack over Nazi-held Europe, he led a formation of Flying Fortresses when the pilot was injured, and succeeded in bringing his own ship to its base although a shell hole had pierced its side and half its control cables had been shot away by enemy fighters.

Lt. Donald S. Bloch, 23, Army Air Forces, of Roxbury, Mass. Air Medal. He distinguished himself during the bombing of Nauru in the South Pacific.

Lt. Maurice I. Bloch, 21, of Selma, Ala. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Ensign Jules H. Bloch, 27, United States Navy, of Oklahoma City, Okla. Navy commendation. For heroism as officer in charge of a gun crew aboard a merchant ship on the route to Murmansk.

Sgt. Harold Block, 31, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal and five Oak Leaf Clusters. For heroism as radio operator of a Liberator bomber during raids on Europe, including the bombing of the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania.

Lt. Irving C. Bloom, 28, Army Air Forces, of Hannibal, Mo. Distinguished Flying Cross. Air Medal and six Oak Leaf Clusters. He completed 37 missions over Sicily, Italy, Greece, Rumania and Austria.

Lt. William A. Bloom, 23, of Houston, Tex. Purple Heart. Killed in action in western Europe.

Lt. Robert B. Blum, 25, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Blumenfeld, 26, of St. Paul, Minn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Joseph Blumstein, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the southwest Pacific.

Lt. Allan L. Bobrow, 24, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Air Medal. For exceptionally meritorious service as pilot of a Flying Fortress. Reported missing in air action over occupied Europe.

Lt. Wallace M. Bonaparte, 26, United States Navy, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Harry Brande, 20, of New York, N. Y. Legion of Merit award. For heroism in New Guinea, when he deliberately exposed himself to malaria as part of a medical experiment.

Yeoman Bernard William Brender, United States Navy, of Columbus, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at sea.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Meyer Brener, 37, of New Orleans, La. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Lt. Roy Bright, Army Air Forces, of Eveleth, Minn. Silver Star and Distinguished Flying Cross. For action at Midway and gallantry in the Southwest Pacific.

Lt. Comdr. Jerry Brock, 32, United States Navy, of Buffalo, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at sea.

Capt. Jacob S. Brody, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Sgt. Milton Bromberg, 27, of Paterson, N. J. Legion of Merit award. For heroism during the invasion of north Africa.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Ben Richard Bronstein, United States Naval Reserve, of Manchester, N. H. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Isadore Brookoff, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Capt. Nathan Brooks, 30, Medical Corps, of Detroit, Mich. Silver Star. Heroic work in caring for wounded soldiers while Jap planes bombed their field hospital at Buna, New Guinea.

Pvt. Albert M. Brown, 25, of Detroit, Mich. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Corp. Milton J. Brown, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Pacific area.

Pvt. Sidney E. Brown, 22, of Buffalo, S. C. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Raymond Budman, 23, of Philadelphia, Pa. Legion of Merit. For his heroism as leader of an infantry group during the fighting on Gaudalcanal.

Lt. Joseph Buntin, 27, United States Marine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Navy commendation. He demonstrated expert initiative and leadership on Guadalcanal in withdrawing his platoon intact to a more suitable defensive position, enabling his company to break up an enemy assault.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Milton Burman, 22, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Louis H. Burns, 30, of Fincastle, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Sheldon Burnstein, 21, Army Air Forces, of Elgin, Ill. Air Medal. He shot down a Messerschmidt 210 on a bombing mission over southern Italy, as a gunner on a bomber.

Pvt. Jack M. Burt, 32, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Archie S. Busch, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Herman Buchsbaum, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Phillip Bzaza, 29, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Louis Calderon, 22, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Salomon M. Candelaria, 23, of San Mateo, N. Mex. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Howard Cantor, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and a group citation. He was tail gunner in a B–17 bomber at Midway and Guadalcanal, and is credited with shooting down 9 Zeros in the South Pacific in the course of 67 combat missions and 27 bombing flights.

Maj. Alexander Samuel Caplan, of Denver, Colo. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Comdr. Stanley Caplan, 27, of Elmira, N. Y. Commendation from Secretary Knox. For taking a destroyer to sea on the day of the Pearl Harbor attack and, with three other ensigns, shooting down four Japanese planes and depth-bombing two enemy submarines.

Sgt. Maynard L. Carp, 27, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Seaman Benjamin M. Carpman, United States Navy, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Pacific area.

Capt. Bernard W. Charles, 22, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Capt. Lester J. Chase, 35, of Worcester, Mass. Silver Star. Missing in action since the fall of Bataan, where he earned the award as an infantryman.

Radio Operator John Cherneck, United States Navy, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed at Pearl Harbor.

Capt. Marvin L. Chernow, 29, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Aleutians.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert Chick, 31, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Fought in four north African battles.

Corp. Edward Chitlik, 25, United States Marine Corps, of Cleveland, Ohio. Silver Star and commendation from Secretary Knox. For restoring communications between headquarters and the front during a battle in the Solomon Islands.

Pvt. Frank Churgin, 25, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. For heroism in north Africa as a member of an armored unit.

Maj. Max Clark, United States Marine Corps, of Galveston, Tex. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Philippines.

Sgt. Robert Clifford, Army Air Forces, of Perth Amboy, N. J. Purple Heart. Heroism at Hickam Field, Hawaii, on day of the Pearl Harbor attack.

Lt. Alfred J. Cohen, Army Air Forces, 25, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa. Air Medal. Air action over Sicily.

Musician Allan Cohen, United States Marine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Arthur Cohen, 29, of Bridgeport, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Edward S. Cohen, 23, Army Air Forces, of Rumford, Maine. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For participation in the transportation of troops from England to north Africa on the nights of the invasion despite adverse weather and poor communications, and for heroism in the air over Sicily.

Lt. Jack Cohen, 22, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. He was one of a group of fliers who downed 24 enemy planes in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Harry Cohen, 29, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Herman Cohen, 23, Army Air Forces, of Port Arthur, Tex. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Petty Officer Hershel Cohen, 23, United States Navy, of Canton, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at sea.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Heyman S. Cohen, 24, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Jethro I. Cohen, 21, of Elgin, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Lt. Joseph Bondi Cohen, 34, of University City, Mo. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Lawrence Cohen, 23, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Maj. Leonard P. Cohen, 29, Army Air Forces, of Fall River, Mass. Legion of Merit award. For his services to the Ninth Air Force in the Middle East and north Africa.

Lt. Louis Cohen, 27, of Atlantic City, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomons.

Sgt. Melvin Cohen, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Sgt. Mitchell Cohen, United States Marine Corps, of Lawrence, Mass. Purple Heart. For bravery under fire, and wounds received in action in the Far East.

Sgt. Perry E. Cohen, 29, of Buffalo, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Robert Cohen, 23, Army Air Forces, of Flushing, N. Y. Air Medal. For long-range antisubmarine flights carried out in the Caribbean area during hazardous weather.

Pvt. Russell L. Cohen, 22, United States Marine Corps, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Corp. Samuel Cohen, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Samuel Cohen, 23, of Dorchester, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Schiller Cohen, 23, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, 10 Oak Leaf Clusters, and a Group Citation. As a flying fortress waist gunner Cohen has been credited with shooting down 1 enemy plane and scoring 4 probables during 254 combat hours over north Africa and Europe.

Lt. Stanley Cohen, 25, Army Air Forces, of Pulaski, Tenn. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Group Citation. He took part in one of the longest bombing missions ever undertaken, as navigator aboard a heavy bomber. His squadron flew more than 3,000 miles to blast objectives at Japanese-held Bangkok.

Pvt. William Cohen, 28, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Algeria.

Capt. Joe B. Cohn, of University City, Mo. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Capt. Melvin M. Coleman, 26, Army Air Forces, of Denver, Colo. Air Medal and Purple Heart. He took part in a hazardous mission to Tunisia, transporting paratroops to the front, died in action shortly afterward when he refused to bail out of a crippled plane which developed a defect in the fuel supply.

Lt. James Howard Cooper, 34, Army Air Forces, of Birmingham, Ala. Purple Heart. For heroism in north Africa.

Pvt. Jacob Cooperman, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Allan Cotler, 25, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross. For extraordinary achievement in aerial flight. He participated in 200 hours of operational flight missions in the southwest Pacific, including bombing missions against enemy airdromes and installations, armed reconnaissance flights, and attacks on enemy naval vessels and shipping.

Lt. Signey S. Cowen, 30, of Belle Harbor, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Jesse A. Craft, 23, of Benton Harbor, Mich. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Herman R. Cummins, 21, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Milton Cusher, 23, of Chelsea, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Irving Cutler, 19, Army Air Forces, of Paterson, N. J. Silver Star and Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa, where he had distinguished himself as radio operator aboard a bomber.

Lt. Mandell L. Cypress, 23, Army Air Forces, of Buffalo, N. Y. Air Medal. For his part in a bombing raid on Japanese-held Wake Island.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Leslie Daichman, 25, of Newark, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Sidney S. Damb, 24, of Springfield, Mass. Silver Star. For gallantry in Tunisia. He assumed control of his squad when the leader was wounded and, exposing himself to enemy fire to more effectively direct mortar fire, deployed his men so that maximum damage was inflicted on the enemy.

Sgt. Robert P. Damsky, 22, Army Air Force, of Swampscott, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded at Hickam Field during the Pearl Harbor attack.

Capt. Otis Daneman, 29, paratrooper, Army Air Force, of Staten Island, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Sydney Daniel, 27, of Reading, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Foster Daniels, 21, Army Air Force, of Pikeville, Ky. Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters, and Purple Heart. Killed in action over Wilhelmshaven, Germany, after participating in numerous raids on the continent.

Lt. Edward L. Danziger, 28, of New York, N. Y. Silver Star. For gallantry in action in Tunisia.

Capt. William Hays Davidow, 23, Army Air Force, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Chester Davis, 25, Army Air Force, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. For wounds sustained in a raid on Europe. He also participated as a gunner in the first all-American raid on Europe, over occupied Holland, on July 4, 1942.

Sgt. Harry Cohn, 28, Army Air Force, of Hazelton, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Herman Davis, 24, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Radio Operator Joseph Davis, United States Navy, of Liberty, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Lt. Norman Davis, 24, Army Air Force, of New York, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For outstanding aerial achievements in the Middle East. He has 260 hours of operational flights over north Africa to his credit.

Pvt. Aaron Dechoretz, 22, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Sidney Devers, 24, Army Air Force, of Boston, Mass. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For heroism as a top-turret gunner on a B-17, during raids on occupied Europe.

Corp. Leroy Diamond, 24, United States Merine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Navy Cross and Purple Heart. He was leader of a three-man squad in a machine-gun nest who thwarted an enemy advance during the early fighting on Guadalcanal, piling up more than 200 dead during the battle. One of the group was killed, another blinded. Diamond was wounded, has recovered.

Pvt. Harold Gustave Dick, 18, United States Marine Corps, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomons.

Lt. William A. Dietch, 25, Army Air Force, of Chicago, Ill. Silver Star. For air action with the nineteenth bombardment group in Java. Australia and New Guinea, as a navigator on a bomber.

Lt. Maurice L. Docton, 26, of Cleveland, O. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Samuel Dorfsman, 31, of Dorchester, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. David Draeger, 27, of Watertown, Wis. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Italy.

Lt. Clifton I. Dreyfus, 23, Army Air Forces, of Birmingham, Ala. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Maj. Joseph C. Dreyfus, 38, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in a tank battle at El Guettar, north Africa.

Lt. Daniel T. Drubin, 24, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in air action over Europe.

Lt. Samuel Dunn, 23, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Air Medal. For heroism in air action over north Africa.

Sgt. Daniel D. Dvorin, Army Air Forces, of Linden, N. J. Distinguished Flying Cross. As tail gunner on a Flying Fortress, he participated in 200 hours of operational flights over Guadalcanal, frequently under fire.

Pvt. Rubin Dworkin, 34, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Aviation Radioman Leonard S. Edelstein, 23, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Navy commendation. For his efforts in freeing the lifeboat of a rapidly sinking Navy patrol bomber in the north Atlantic, thereby saving the lives of 13 crewmen.

Sgt. Samuel L. Edwards, 32, Army Air Forces, of Washington, D. C. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. As aerial gunner on a Flying Fortress, he distinguished himself during numerous raids over north Africa and occupied Europe.

Sgt. Abraham A. Ehrenreich, lu, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For participating in 5 sorties against the enemy over Europe, and in 10 raids over north Africa.

Corp. Martin D. Eichman, of Chicago, Ill., Marine Corps commendation. For valor at Corregidor.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Henry R. Eiseman, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Eisen, 24, of Detroit, Mich. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Capt. Everett A. Eisenberg, 27, Army Air Forces, of Long Island City, N. Y. Air Medal. Flight leader of a squadron of Liberator bombers, he helped shoot down three Zeros in the New Guinea area.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Harold C. Eisenbruch, 21, Paratrooper, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) David Eisman, 24, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Jacques Rodney Eisner, 24, United States Navy, of Red Bank, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomons.

Lt. Henry B. Elkind, 25, of Holyoke, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Chief Pharmacist's Mate Fred S. Epstein, 38, United States Naval Reserve, of Washington, D. C. Naval commendation and citation. For heroism at Coral Sea and Midway.

Pvt. Hyman Epstein, 22, of Omaha, Nebr. Purple Heart. Killed in action in New Guinea, after he had gone through fire to administer medical aid to wounded soldiers.

Petty Officer Robert Erlich, United States Navy, of Troy, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in the South Pacific.

Pharmacist's Mate Max Erlichman, 22, United States Navy, of Peoria, Ill. Navy commendation. For bravery under fire and beyond the call of duty on Guadalcanal.

Lt. (Sr. Gr.) Arthur N. Ershler, 32, Naval Air Corps, of Hudson, N. Y. Navy Cross. For his part, as a dive bomber pilot operating from an aircraft carrier in "softening up" gun emplacements and other defense installations to ease the invasion of French Morrocco for land troops.

Corp. Jacob Farash, United States Marine Corps, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Far East.

Pvt. Hyman Fatt, 22, of Newburgh, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Harry Feigenbaum, 22, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters and Purple Heart. He was killed in action when his plane crashed into the sea after demolishing a large enemy convoy off Bizerte. He had been on 18 combat flights during the north African campaign.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert H. Feingold, 36, of West New York, N. J. Silver Star. He voluntarily went against enemy machine gun fire and single-handedly blew up an enemy pillbox in Sicily, enabling his unit to advance.

Seaman Bertram David Feinman, United States Naval Reserve, of South Euclid, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Sgt. Edward Feinstein, 22, of Cleveland Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Sgt. Jacob Feinstein, 28, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Capt. Sylvan Feld, 24, Army Air Forces, of Lynn, Mass. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Oak Leaf Cluster. A fighter pilot, he downed nine enemy planes over north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Philip Feldacker, 37, Engineer Corps, of St. Louis, Mo. Silver Star. For gallantry in action in north Africa.

Corp. Lloyd Felder, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Jack H. Feldman, 19, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Lt. Leon Feldman, 25, Army Air Forces, of New Orleans, La. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. He participated as bombardier on a Flying Fortress in 10 raids on occupied Europe, and is credited with shooting down a German fighter plane during 1 mission.

Lt. Leonard M. Feldman, 23, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Leonard Feldman, 26, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Lt. Norbert B. Feldman, 22, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. Killed in action. He was copilot of a Flying Fortress which took part in numerous raids on Europe.

Lt. Lewis Earl Feldstein, 27, Army Air Forces, of Portland, Oreg. Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters. He took part in numerous raids over Germany, France, and Italy.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jerry Fellenbaum, 28, Army Air Forces, of Crestline, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Fireman William Feller, United States Naval Reserve, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Sgt. Oscar Ferkauff, Army Air Forces, of Kansas City, Mo. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Radioman Bernard Fields, 25, United States Navy, of Cleveland Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph J. Fine, 24, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. He was a member of an armored tank division in the north African campaign, is reported missing in action.

Corp. David Fineberg, 25, of Roxbury, Mass. Purple Heart and Oak Leaf Cluster. He was twice wounded on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Harry Fineman, 24, of Wilmington, Del. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Sgt. David Fingeret, 24, Army Air Forces, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Air Medal. For air action in the Aleutians.

Lt. Joseph Fink, 28, of New York, N. Y. Silver Star, Croix de Guerre, Purple Heart, and Gold Star. He distinguished himself in north Africa, reorganizing a scattered platoon at Kasserine Pass and undertaking reconnaissance work "in front of the front" during the Tunisian fighting.

Corp. Benjamin W. Finkelstein, 26, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in western Europe.

Corp. George L. Finkelstein, 23, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. For rescuing the crew of a loaded bomber which crashed immediately after taking off from an airfield at a southwest Pacific base.

Pvt. Harry Finkelstein, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Samuel Finkelstein, 24, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. He was radio operator and gunner on a 4-engined heavy bomber which took part in 44 raids and reconnaissance missions in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Eugene D. Finn, 21, of Breighton, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Carl Fintuch, 25, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sidney Fischbein, 24, of Newark, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Howard Philip Fischer, 24 United States Navy, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Far East.

Lt. Philip S. Fischer, 23, Army Air Forces, of East Orange, N. J. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster and Purple Heart. For air action over western Europe, during which he was wounded.

Pvt. (1st cl.) David Fisher, 27, of Newark, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Louis Fishman, 24, of Irvington, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Martin Flaum, 20, United States Marine Corps, of Syracuse, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Sgt. Irving Flax, 25, Army Air Forces, of Richmond, Va. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Asiatic area.

Pvt. Simon Flax, 26, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Edward K. Fleischman, 18, of San Francisco, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Attu.

Pvt. Nathan Flesher, 31, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Jerome L. Fluster, 29, of Albany, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Milton S. Fonorow, 23, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Air Medal. He has been on missions over St. Nazaire, Lorient, Brest, and other Axis targets, as a bombardier.

Lt. Jerome L. Foreman, 21, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the European theater.

Corp. Alexander Fox, 21, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Capt. Lester Irving Fox, of Haverhill, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Philippines.

Sgt. Philip F. Fox, 26, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert Frank, 22, of Bellaire, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Lt. Irving H. Frank, 25, Army Air Forces, of Savannah, Ga. Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters. He took part in numerous raids over occupied Europe.

Sgt. Marvin L. Frank, 25, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Milton Frankel, 25, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Heroism in north Africa.

Commander Samuel B. Frankel, 38, United States Navy, of Stapleton, N. Y. Distinguished Service Medal. For his work as Assistant Naval Attaché in Murmansk and Archangel, U. S. S. R., during 1942.

Lt. Monroe D. Franklin, 24, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Jacob Howard Franz, 26, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, four Oak Leaf Clusters, and Silver Star. He took part in more than 200 hours of long-range bombing missions in the South Pacific, participated in the Battle of Bismarck Sea, Milne Bay, Kavieing, New Ireland, the Solomons, and New Britain. He has 700 combat flying hours and 88 missions to his credit.

Pvt. Irwin Freed, 23, of Pittston, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Aleutian area.

Corp. Isadore Freed, of Canton, Ohio. Purple Heart. While in combat in Algiers, he was wounded from the air by a strafing Messerschmidtt.

Pvt. Isadore Freemond, 27, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Charles W. Freschauf, 26, Army Air Forces, of David City, Nebr. Air Medal and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For exceptionally meritorious achievement during numerous raids on Europe.

Lt. Herbert Friedberg, 28, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Col. Ralph Friedenthal, 39, of Denver, Colo. Purple Heart. Following the Pearl Harbor attack, he directed the salvage and storage of all mess stores and equipment from the wreckage at Hickam Field, going without rest or sleep until he could secure proper messing facilities for his troops.

Pvt. Jacob Friedes, 22, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Capt. Frank Friedman, 24, Army Air Forces, of University City, Mo. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Oak Leaf Cluster. As a pilot member of Squadron X, operating in the Aleutians, he distinguished himself in aerial combat, participating in the American invasion of Attu.

Machinist's Mate Joseph Friedman, 27, Naval Air Corps, of Fall River, Mass. Letter of commendation. For heroism while on naval aviation patrol duty in the North Atlantic.

Pvt. Leo Friedman, 31, of Memphis, Tenn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Lt. Leon J. Friedman, 22, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Citation for valor. He was a member of a flying squadron responsible for destroying a considerable amount of enemy equipment in north Africa during low-level strafing sorties.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Raymond Lester Friedson, 24, United States Navy, of Kansas City, Mo. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Herbert Friedwald, 26, of New York, N. Y. Silver Star and Croix de Guerre. He directed an assault gun section which accounted for three tanks, two 88-mm. guns, and mortar crews in north Africa.

Pvt. Emanuel Frish, 28, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Capt. Gabriel J. Frumkin, 29, Army Air Forces, of Memphis, Tenn. Silver Star, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. As a Flying Fortress navigator and copilot, he shot down five Zeros during the Battle of Java, helped destroy two enemy aircraft carriers, piled up more than 200 combat hours in the air, was forced down three times, and was wounded in aerial combat.

Capt. Nat Fuchs, 33, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Harold L. Fuchsmann, 25, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and nine Oak Leaf Clusters. A Flying Fortress navigator, he completed 50 missions over north Africa.

Pvt. Stanley Fultz, 23, of Hedgeville, Ky. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Seaman Burton J. Furman, 26, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at Coral Sea.

Capt. Rafael Gamso, 31, Medical Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star. Under enemy fire so heavy that some of the wounded were wounded again, he treated the injured of a company trapped between Buna Mission and Giropa Point on New Guinea, continuing to aid these men in the midst of battle with utter disregard for his own safety.

Sgt. Simon Garelich, 22, of Kansas City, Mo. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Corp. Julius Garfunkel, 32, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Theodore P. Gelbstein, 19, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Larry Geller, 27, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Abraham W. Ger, 40, of Miami Beach, Fla. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Bernard Gefstein, of Detroit, Mich. Purple Heart. Wounded in action during an enemy raid on Dutch Harbor, Alaska.

Sgt. Charles Gilbert, 22, Army Air Forces, of Phoenix, Ariz. Air Medal. For heroism in bombing missions over occupied Europe.

Pvt. Howard Gillman, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Capt. Nathan Ginsberg, 27, Army Air Forces, of Kansas City, Mo. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Irving Gishkin, 25, of Woodside, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. David J. Gitelson, 22, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Norman Glass, 24, Army Air Forces, of Baltimore, Md. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Oak Leaf Cluster. He took part in more than 30 bombing missions over occupied Europe, distinguishing himself on numerous occasions as radioman on a Flying Fortress.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Lawrence Glassberg, 22, Army Air Forces, of San Francisco, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Sgt. Frank Glassman, 29, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. He participated in many combat missions in the Southwest Pacific, and was wounded in aerial combat. He is reported missing in action.

Corp. Sidney B. Glick, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Capt. Edwin L. Gluck, 25, Army Air Forces, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal and six Oak Leaf Clusters. He took part in raids on Ploesti, Rome, Weirer, Neustadt, and other European objectives, and was cited by Maj. Gen. Lewis Brereton for volunteering to execute an experimental and dangerous attack on enemy installations last spring.

Pvt. Herman Goldbaum, 34, of Benton Harbor, Mich. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Bernard Goldberg, 21, of Atlantic City, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Asiatic area.

Sgt. Harry L. Goldberg, of Toledo, Ohio. Silver Star and Purple Heart. For gallantry and wounds received in action. He was in the rear of a truck attacked by four enemy planes. Twice wounded, and subjected to further strafing, he remained in the truck, at great personal risk, to render first aid to the wounded.

Lt. Hyman L. Goldberg, 26, Army Air Forces, of Norwich, Conn. Distinguished Flying Cross and Purple Heart. He insisted on staying at his bomb sight and releasing his bombs on enemy ships after he was severely wounded in flight over north Africa by an exploding shell.

Sgt. Irving Goldberg, 21, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in in Sicily.

Sgt. Irving M. Goldberg, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Isadore Goldberg, 30, of Beverly, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the southwest Pacific.

Lt. Jerome Goldberg, 24, Army Air Forces, of Paterson, N. J. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal and six Oak Leaf Clusters. He participated in 35 aerial assaults on occupied Europe, including raids on Austria, Greece, Rumania, and Italy, as bombardier aboard a B-24 Liberator.

Capt. Jerrold I. Goldberg, 27, of Rochester, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Maurice Goldberg, 23, of San Francisco, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the battle of Attu.

Sgt. Norman R. Goldberg, 22, of New York, N. Y. Legion of Merit award for heroism during the invasion of Sicily.

Lt. Julius E. Goldblatt, 23, United States Marine Corps, of Lawrence, Mass. Silver Star. He crawled across an open area in the Solomons swept by enemy fire to rescue two severely wounded marines in his platoon.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Harold Goldie, 26, of Hollis, N Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Theodore Goldbum, 24, of Philadelphia, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross and Silver Star. He was at Pearl Harbor when the Japs attacked, took part in the bombing of Jap installations and airdromes at Midway, has to his credit more than 200 hours of combat flying time in the South Pacific.

Pvt. George Goldfarb, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Alex S. Goldfisher, 25, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Adrian Goldman, 24, Army Air Forces, of Torrington, Conn. Air Medal. For heroism as a tail gunner in the South Pacific in 15 operational flights.

Sgt. Carl S. Goldman, Army Air Forces, of Mayesville, S. C. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For heroism as aerial gunner on a Flying Fortress. Missing in action.

Capt. Max Goldman, 31, Medical Corps, of Dorchester, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action during an air raid on Port Moresby, New Guinea.

Pvt. Max Goldsmith, 32, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Italy.

Sgt. Arthur T. Goldsmith, 26, of Freeport, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Max Goldsmith, 32, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at Salerno, Italy.

Pvt. Wilbert D. Goldsmith, 21, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Alfred Goldstein, 31, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. George G. Goldstein, 23, Army Air Forces, of Hampton, Va. Air Medal and three Oak Leaf Clusters. A Thunderbolt pilot, he took part in more than 40 missions over Nazi-held Europe.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Harold A. Goldstein, 31, of the Bronx, N. Y. Silver Star. For gallantry in action in Tunisia, as a member of a tank company. He rescued a wounded man from a disabled tank in the face of heavy enemy fire.

Sgt. Fred Harris Goldstein, 21, Army Air Forces, of Shaker Heights, Ohio. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. The Distinguished Flying Cross for bringing ammunition and food supplies to the firing line on Guadalcanal and evacuating injured and sick under fire by air; Air Medal for extraordinary achievement in operational flights over the Solomons totaling 208 hours, frequently under enemy fire.

Sgt. Harry Goldstein, 27, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Oak Leaf Cluster. An aerial engineer and gunner, he shot down two enemy planes in the course of numerous bombing missions on European objectives. Reported missing.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Herbert S. Goldstein, 23, of Ambridge, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Jerome J. Goldstein, 27, Army Air Forces, of Far Rockaway, N. Y. Air Medal. For heroism as bombardier aboard a B-26 Marauder during a number of missions in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Lester Goldstein, 26, of Collinsville, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Sgt. Norman S. Goldstein, 28, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Silver Star and Air Medal. When the mechanism for releasing bombs failed on his plane during an American raid in the Far East, he risked his life to release the bombs by hand.

Flight Officer Sandy Goldstein, 27, Army Air Forces, of New Bedford, Mass., Air Medal. For air action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. William B. Goldstein, 33, of Shreveport, La. Purple Heart. Wounded in action, New Georgia.

Pvt. Fred Golub, 29, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Jack J. Gomberg, 26, of Chester, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in south Pacific.

Sgt. Philip Gononsky, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. He was aboard one of two bombers which sank two large Japanese cargo ships and damaged a transport in Rabaul Harbor, New Britain.

Lt. Alexander Goode, 31, Chaplains Corps, of Washington, D. C. Purple Heart. He was one of four chaplains, two of the others Protestant, one Catholic, who gave their lifebelts to enlisted men on a torpedoed American cargo transport which sank in the North Atlantic. Reported as missing in action.

Radioman David Goodman, 23, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star and Oak Leaf Cluster. Silver Star for his work on the mosquito boat which carried General MacArthur and Philippines President Manuel Quezon from Corregidor to Australia. Oak Leaf Cluster for the daring attack made by his squadron under Lt. Comdr. John Bulkeley, resulting in damage to a Japanese cruiser in the Mindanao Sea, near Cuba in the Philippines.

Pvt. Charles Goodman, 27, of Washington, D. C. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Walter Goodman, 24, Army Air Forces, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Caribbean area.

Capt. Howard K. Goodman, 25, United States Marine Corps, of Long Beach, N. Y. Silver Star. He led his platoon in three successive bayonet and hand grenade charges under heavy enemy fire, contributing to the annihilation of an entire Japanese battalion, with minimum casualties to the American platoon.

Lt. Victor I. Goodman, 24, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal. Oak Leaf Cluster and Purple Heart. In 19 missions over north Africa as navigator and bombardier of a B-26 bomber he accounted for four enemy planes; was wounded once during aerial combat.

Sgt. Joseph Gorchoff, 22, Marine Air Corps, of Chicago, Ill. Air Medal. He took part in several major aerial battles over Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Abe Goodman, 25, of Williamsport, Pa. Silver Star. For gallantry in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Henry Goodman, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Benjamin Gordon, 26, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. Flight engineer and top turret gunner. Numerous raids over occupied Europe.

Pvt. Milton Gorobetz, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star. When a ship was torpedoed from under him on the first day of the north African invasion, he swam to the beach and under heavy fire worked among the wounded men who had fallen there, mindless of furious enemy strafing and bombardment.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Carl C. Goshman, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Battle of Attu.

Pvt. Arthur Gould, of Jamaica, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Lester Martin Gould, 22, Army Air Forces, of Lafayette, Ind. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Philip Gram, 23, Army Air Forces, of St. Louis, Mo. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For his feats in combat as a bombardier in the Middle East.

Lt. Milton Green, 27, Army Air Forces, of Denver, Colo. Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Flying Cross. Air Medal and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For exceptional valor and outstanding service as a Flying Fortress pilot during 25 raids in the European war theater.

Seaman Tommy Green, of Lexington, Ky. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at sea.

Pvt. Eddie Greenberg, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Max Greenberg, 24, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Raymond Greenberg, 26, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Charles David Greenburgh, 31, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Algiers.

Pvt. Leon Greene, 24, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Calman Greenfield, 24, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Benjamin Greenspan, 23, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Seaman Irving E. Greenstein, of Philadelphia, Pa. Citation. For gallantry in action at Pearl Harbor.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Nathan Greenstein, 30, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Leo Greenwald, 29, Engineer Corps, of Kansas City, Mo. Purple Heart. Wounded by a German land mine in Tunisia.

Sgt. Nathan Greese, 23, of Chicago. Distinguished Service Cross. When his platoon was pinned to the ground by enemy fire in the Guadalcanal jungle he went forward alone despite sniper fire and crawled far enough ahead to hurl hand grenades at this objective and destroy it. In his advance he killed five enemy snipers with a Browning automatic rifle.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Greitzer, 26, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Goodman G. Greller, 35, of Minneapolis, Minn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Battle of El Guettar, north Africa.

Corp. Alfred Groden, 21, Army Air Forces, of Maplewood, N. J. Air Medal. He took part in more than 100 hours of operational flying in the South Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Al Gross, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action over occupied Europe.

Seaman Jerome S. Gross, of Ellenville, N. Y. Navy commendation. For his heroic conduct aboard the U. S. S. *Nautilus* when the ship attacked and sank an enemy aircraft carrier of 10,000 tons at Midway.

Lt. Jacob Grossman, 27, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Leo Grossman, 24, Army Air Forces, of Clifton, N. J. Air Medal. He participated in 15 bombing missions over north Africa and Italy. Missing in action.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Robert L. Grossman, 22, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Robert P. Grover, Army Air Forces, of Washington, D. C. Purple Heart. Killed in action over Germany.

Pvt. Richard A. Grubel, 20, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Ralph Victor Guinsburg, 27, Army Air Forces, of Chappaqua, N. Y. Air Medal and Purple Heart. For heroism and wounds

received in action in the European area. When the Flying Fortress on which he was navigator was forced down over the English Channel, he rescued a fellow flyer although he himself was badly hurt.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Howard E. Gurney, 19, United States Marine Corps, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Julius J. Gutlow, 31, Medical Corps, of Detroit, Mich. Silver Star. He performed operations on wounded men at American field hospitals in New Guinea in the midst of enemy bombing attacks.

Pvt. Joseph Guttmann, of Union City, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Lt. Sidney Guzick, 24, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For heroism during numerous raids in the Far East.

Lt. Benjamin Ghetzler, United States Navy, of San Antonio, Tex. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Lt. Louis Oppenheimer Haas, Army Air Forces, of Montgomery, Ala. Air Medal. For his part in carrying out the longest massed, unescorted, nonstop troop-carrying flight ever successfully performed during the north African invasion.

Lt. Norman S. Haber, 27, Naval Air Corps, of Venice, Calif. Distinguished Flying Cross. His plane was attacked by Zero fighters in a dog-battle that lasted more than an hour. His controls and rudder badly damaged by fire, and his elevator completely jammed, he managed despite these handicaps to destroy one enemy plane, evade others, and execute a safe landing.

Maj. Louis Halperin, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. For valor in New Guinea.

Lt. Carroll Hament, 22, Army Air Forces, of Baltimore, Md. Air Medal and four Oak Leaf Clusters. As pilot of a B-25 bomber he took part in numerous aerial assaults on occupied Europe.

Sgt. Milton Hamill, 20, Army Air Forces, of Lynn, Mass. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement during aerial combat. He participated in bombing raids over France, Germany, and Holland.

Sgt. Morris Hammerman, 23, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal. For extraordinary achievement while serving as aerial photographer on long-range reconnaissance and photographic mission over a hazardous air route in the far north.

Corp. Edward Handleman, 26, of Hartford, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Solomons during the Munda offensive.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Handverger, 36, of Lynn, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action.

Sgt. Paul Hanson, 27, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and three Oak Leaf Clusters. Tail gunner aboard a Flying Fortress, he has gone on 25 daylight raids over occupied Europe, including Brest, Lorient, Lille, Wilhelmshaven, Rouen, Paris, St. Nazaire, Bremen, Antwerp, Kiel, Meaulte, and Nantes.

Corp. Erwin S. Harber, 23, of Asbury Park, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Edward J. Harris, of Milwaukee, Wis. Purple Heart. Killed in action in New Guinea.

Lt. Lewis S. Harris, 23, Army Air Forces, of Stamford, Conn. Air Medal. He completed 100 hours of combat missions throughout Burma.

Pvt. Ralph Harris, 23, of Zanesville, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Sidney Harris, 26, of Paterson, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Comdr. Jerome Hartman, United States Navy, of Dayton, Ohio. Special mention and decoration by the British. For heroism in tending wounded men when the aircraft carrier *Illustrious* was bombed.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Frederick Hecht, of Spring Valley, N. Y. Silver Star and Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa after distinguishing himself during the initial landing operations setting up a communications post in enemy territory to guide the invasion force.

Maj. Morris Hecht, Army Air Forces, of Columbus, Ga. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Morris G. Heffler, 23, Army Air Forces, of Hartford, Conn. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Clusters. For meritorious achievement while flying antisubmarine patrols in the Caribbean theater.

Lt. Leslie Heitel, 27, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) William Helfand, 26, of Detroit, Mich. Purple Heart. Wounded in action during the battle of El Guetar in north Africa.

Capt. Abraham Robert Heller, of Asbury Park, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Lt. Bermard Heller, 25, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. Air action in north Africa.

Yeoman Irving Herman, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Lt. Leonard W. Herman, 26, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters. For heroism in air action over Europe. He was wounded during a raid over Germany.

Seaman Howard I. Hermann, 44, N. M., of Glendale, Long Island. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Atlantic.

Lt. Charles H. Herr, 24, of Watertown, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Jack H. Hersch, 25, Army Air Forces, of Passaic, N. J. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For heroism as navigator with an antisubmarine squadron based in England.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Max Herzedow, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Myer Hesselberg, paratrooper, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Italy.

Lt. Alfred Heyman, Army Air Forces, of Youngstown, Ohio. Distinguished Flying Cross and Silver Star. He saw action in the Philippines and Java; won the Silver Star for heroism at Coral Sea and the Distinguished Flying Cross for completion of a secret mission in the same locale.

Coxswain Harry Heyman, 25, United States Navy, of Steelton, Pa. Silver Star. For his part in the destruction of a U-boat in the North Atlantic.

Samuel Hill, United States Navy, of Westport, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Pvt. Sol Himmel, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Bernard Hindes, 20, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Israel H. Hintz, 21, United States Navy, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded on Guadalcanal.

Lt. David Hirsch, 25, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. He was navigator of a Fortress which bombed Milne Bay, New Guinea, and ran into enemy opposition. When the co-pilot was wounded and the bombardier killed by shrapnel, Hirsch, himself wounded, stayed with his maps and charts and directed the maimed Fortress back to its base.

Lt. David Hirsch, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sidney Hirshberg, United States Marine Corps, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Pacific area.

Corp. Jacob B. Hodiss, 22, of Syracuse, N. Y., Purple Heart. Killed in action in western Europe.

Sgt. Herman J. Hochman, 23, Army Air Forces, of Rosenberg, Tex. Air Medal. For his part in shooting down 2 Messerschmitts and 1 Italian plane during a raid on Italy.

Lt. Jacob Hochman, 23, Army Air Forces, of Plainfield, N. J. Air Medal. Air action over north Africa.

Maj. Arthur Hoffman, 26, Army Air Forces, of St. Louis, Mo. Silver Star. Purple Heart. Four group citations. A member of the "Gypsy 93d" Squadron of the 19th Bombardment Command, he fought the Japs as a navigator in the skies over New Britain, the Philippines, Dutch East Indies, Australia, New Guinea, Coral Sea, and Malaya.

Sgt. Herbert Hoffman, 29, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action over western Europe.

Lt. Sidney Hoffman, 31, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Lt. Leonard Holland, 26, of Providence, R. I. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the southwest Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jack Horowitz, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in north Africa.

Seaman Samuel E. Horowitz, 22, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in South Pacific.

Corp. Jerome Horwitz, 26, Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Seaman Theodore Houseman, of Muskegon, Mich. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Lt. Morris Howitz, 23, Army Air Forces, of Columbus, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the European area.

Petty Officer Marvin C. L. Huffman, 24, United States Navy, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north African invasion.

Lt. Morton M. Hurwitz, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Julian H. Hurt, 23, of Hermitage, Tenn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Capt. Morris Herman Hurwitz, 36, of Hartford, Conn. Legion of Merit Medal and citation. For heroism in north Africa as a member of the Medical Administrative Corps.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Irving Hurwitz, 29, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Sgt. Robert Hutner, of Dallas, Tex. Army citation. For meritorious conduct over and above his assigned duty during the battle of Attu in the Aleutians.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Morris Hyman, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the European area.

Pvt. Nathan E. Hyman, 27, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Walter Hymovich, Army Air Forces, of Stamford, Conn. Air Medal. He took part in more than 25 combat missions in the Southwest Pacific.

Capt. Rubin Iden, 24, Army Air Forces, of Detroit, Mich. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomon Islands.

Pvt. Darrell Edward Iskiwitch, Army Air Forces, of St. Louis, Mo. Purple Heart. Killed in action at Clark Field in the Philippines.

Lt. Comdr. Samuel Isquith, United States Naval Reserve, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Legion of Merit and Purple Heart. He remained at his post through the torpedoeing and sinking of the *Vincennes* in waters off the Solomons. As medical officer, he attended the sick and wounded, although wounded himself. He is believed to be the last man to leave the ship. When rescued he worked for days without sleep, helping wounded survivors of the cruiser.

Commander Soloman Isquith, of Brooklyn, N. Y. United States Navy. Navy Cross. He was responsible for saving 90 percent of the crew of the sunken target ship *Utah*, of which he was commander at Pearl Harbor.

Lt. Leonard Israel, 23, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Robert R. Israel, 28, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Corp. Max Itzkewitz, 28, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Samuel Jackson, 27, United States Navy, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at the battle of Savo Island.

Fireman Edwin M. Jacobs, United States Naval Reserve, of Vicksburg, Miss. Navy and Marine Corps Medal. For heroic conduct while serving aboard a United States warship damaged by a shell during the occupation of French Morocco.

Pvt. Clifford Jacobs, 27, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Charles Marvin Jacobs, United States Marine Corps, of Troy, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Israel Jacobson, 21, of Rochester, N. Y. Silver Star for his courage in standing by his lieutenant who was fatally shot while on night patrol in enemy territory in north Africa.

Lt. Morris C. Jacobson, United States Navy, of Birmingham, Ala. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at sea.

Sgt. Preston H. Jacobson, 21, Army Air Forces, of Waltham, Mont. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in European area.

Lt. Sidney William Jacobson, 26, Army Air Forces, of Shreveport, La. Silver Star and Purple Heart. Gallantry in action while acting as a copilot on a B-25 bomber over Lae, carrying out a dangerous mission in the face of heavy enemy fire, missing in action.

Lt. Sydney Jacobson, Army Air Forces, of Shreveport, La. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Alexander Phillips, Jacobey, 26, of Jamaica, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Corp. Arnold R. Jaffe, 32, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on New Georgia Island.

Lt. Harold M. Jaffee, 26, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Air Medal. He took part in the longest massed unescorted nonstop troop carrier flight ever successfully performed from England to north Africa.

Sgt. Jacob Jaffee, 25, Army Air Forces, of Rochester, N. Y. Air Medal. For exceptional aerial performance in the Tunisian campaign.

Lt. Herbert Marvin Jay, 24, Navy Air Corps, of East Liverpool, Ohio. Presidential citation. He was a member of Torpedo Squadron 8 during the Battle of Midway, served 11 months during the fighting on Guadalcanal, has participated in five major battles in the South Pacific.

Ensign Ira Weil Jeffery, 24, United States Naval Reserve, of Minneapolis, Minn. Posthumous commendation from the Secretary of the Navy. He attempted by hand to keep an ammunition supply line going on board the battleship *California* until he was felled by enemy fire.

Seaman Howard Robert Johnson, of Waterbury, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Capt. Jacob Joseph, 22, United States Marine Corps, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. (1st cl.) David Josephson, 22, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in north Africa.

Capt. Fred Josephson, 27, of Muscatine, Iowa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Walter Jossen, 20, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross. For heroism in aerial combat in the Southwest Pacific.

Corp. Morris A. Kalmus, 23, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Joseph Kalter, 23, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Milton Kalter, 29, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal. For heroism in aerial flight in the western Aleutians.

Sgt. Mark B. Kamen, United States Marine Corps, of Hightstown, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Theodore J. Kamen, 24, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For heroism as navigator of a bomber during a raid on the Japanese-held Gilbert Islands of Nauru and Tarawa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Ben Kampfer, 36, Parksville, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Sam Kanner, 23, of Charleston, W. Va. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Nathan Kantrow, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Tunisia.

Corp. Abraham G. Kaplan, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Lt. Bertram H. Kaplan, 23, Army Air Forces, of Great Neck, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and three Oak Leaf Clusters. As a Flying Fortress pilot he took part in numerous bombing raids on occupied Europe, including Kiel, Wilhelmshaven, Paris, Bremen, and Lorient.

Sgt. Harold Kaplan, 24, Army Air Forces, of Worcester, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in western Europe.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Harry Kaplan, 27, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Harry E. Kaplan, 35, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Sgt. Isaac Kaplan, 23, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross and Silver Star. For heroism during bombing raids on targets in the New Guinea area.

Commander Leonard Kaplan, 42, naval engineer, of Baltimore, Md. Legion of Merit Award. For his services in connection with the repair and salvage of naval and merchant vessels in Iceland.

Pvt. Maurice B. Kaplan, 34, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Seaman Max Kaplan, Bronx, N. Y. Navy Commendation. For his part in the sinking of a 10,000-ton enemy aircraft carrier during the Battle of Midway.

Pvt. Morris S. Kaplan, Dorchester, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Stuart Kaplan, Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. John J. Kapstein, 25, Army Air Forces, Providence, R. I. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For meritorious achievement while participating in sorties against the enemy in north Africa as pilot of a marauder bomber.

Sgt. Bernard Karasin, 24, Army Air Forces, Bronx, N. Y. Air Medal. For air action in north Africa. Missing in action.

Pvt. Morton I. Karp, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Morton I. Karp, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Victor H. Karpass, 34, Medical Corps, Chicago, Ill. Distinguished Service Cross and Purple Heart, posthumously awarded. Ill in bed on an American warship engaged in battle during the invasion of Algeria, he refused to abandon ship and insisted on going into the sick bay to perform an operation on a wounded soldier. In the midst of the operation he was struck by an enemy shell and killed.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Max Karpin, 36, Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Meyer Kashkin, merchant seaman, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Caribbean area.

Lt. Milton Kaslow, 22, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Far East.

Lt. Allan Kass, 25, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Air Medal. Air action in the Middle East.

Pvt. Alexander Katcheuk, 25, United States Marine Corps, of Sacramento, Calif. Silver Star. During an aerial bombardment in the Philippines he took over a truck abandoned by its driver to bring two wounded marines to a hospital, despite repeated air attacks—thus saving the lives of both wounded men.

Lt. (Sr. Gr.) Aaron Katz, 26, Naval Air Corps, Cleveland, Ohio. Navy Cross and two Presidential citations. He took part in the Battle of Midway as a member of the famed torpedo 8 plane squadron, and distinguished himself as a flyer in the Solomons.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Aaron Katz, Naval Air Corps, Cleveland, Ohio. Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism as pilot of a torpedo plane during action in an aerial torpedo raid against a Japanese task force in the Solomons.

Corp. Harry Katz, 27, paratrooper, United States Marine Corps, Syracuse, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Aaron Katz, 36, merchant seaman, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Corp. Abraham Katz, 32, Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Alfred L. Katz, 18, Army Air Forces, of Memphis, Tenn. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Hirsch Katz, 27, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Maj. Irvin J. Katz, 38, Army Medical Corps, of Washington, D. C. Legion of Merit award. For exceptionally meritorious service in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Jacob H. Katz, 28, of Chelsea, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Martin S. Katz, 23, of West Brownsville, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Robert Katz, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Siegfried Katz, 23, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jack Kaufman, 38, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Storekeeper Jess Kaufman, 23, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in the South Pacific.

Corp. Louis Kaufman, 21, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Pvt. Samuel Kaufman, 31, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. William Kaufman, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Tunisia.

Capt. David Kelman, Army Air Forces, of San Antonio, Tex. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For extraordinary heroism during numerous missions over north Africa and Italy.

Lt. Harold Arthur Kepnes, United States Marine Corps, of Chelsea, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Earl Lowry Kerbow, 21, Army Air Forces, of Dallas, Tex. Air Medal and Purple Heart. In numerous bombing missions over occupied Europe. Killed in action during a raid on St. Nazaire.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Bernard Kesse, 20, United States Marine Corps, of Syracuse, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Robert Kessler, 21, Army Air Forces, of McKeesport, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross, Silver Star, Air Medal, and Oak Leaf Cluster. As radio operator and gunner aboard the B-24 Liberator *Black Maria* he chalked up 349 combat hours in the Middle East, never missing a scheduled raid. Later took part in the first American raid on Rumanian oil fields. Completed 35 bombing missions, brought down 7 enemy craft, and scored 3 probables.

Corp. Samuel Kessler, 28, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Fred Kettner, 24, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross. For heroism in the South Pacific as copilot of a bomber.

Sgt. Samuel H. Keyser, 21, Army Air Forces, of Hartford, Conn. Air Medal. For his part in bombing raids over Burma. On one occasion shot down a Zero.

Lt. Edward Kezur, 27, Medical Corps, of Toledo, Ohio. Purple Heart. For wounds suffered in battle in the Aleutians.

Pvt. Martin E. Kirschbaum, 24, United States Marine Corps, of Savannah, Ga. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Machinist's Mate Henry Kirschman, 28, United States Navy, of Hamden, Conn. Navy citation. He captured 11 prisoners during the invasion of Fedala, French Morocco.

Pvt. (1st cl.) William Kirschner, 24, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action.

Corp. Seymour C. Kirsh, 23, of San Francisco, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Irving Kirshner, 25, Army Air Forces, of Lincoln, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Jerome C. Kisseleff, 22, Army Air Forces, of Arlington, Va. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the European area.

Pvt. Milton Klaiman, 22, of Lawrence, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Barnet S. Klass, 29, of Dorchester, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Stanley W. Klauber, 26, of Long Island City, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Morris Klaw, 21, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in north Africa.

Sgt. Julius Kleiman, 20, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action when the Fortress on which he was ball turret gunner ran into a squadron of 15 German fighter planes on the return trip from a raid over Germany. He was killed in an exchange of gunfire with one German plane, shot down the plane just before he died.

Pilot Henry J. Klein, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the West Pacific.

Pvt. Lawrence L. Klein, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sidney G. Kleinberger, 23, Army Air Forces, of Scranton, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For his part in 25 operational flight missions in the South Pacific, flying at extremely low altitudes over mountainous terrain in an unarmed transport plane to drop supplies and transport troops to advanced positions.

Corp. Benjamin Kleinburd, 23, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Air Medal. Air action in the Aleutians.

Pvt. Jack Leinfeld, of Passaic, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Mortimer V. Kleinmann, United States Naval Reserve, of New York, N. Y. Silver Star. As a fighter plane pilot, he brought down two Japanese bombers over Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Julius Kliffer, 29, Army Air Forces, of Minneapolis, Minn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the European area.

Pvt. Leonard Kling, 20, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Twice wounded in action during the north Africa invasion.

Seaman Horace Roy Klonin, 20, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the north Atlantic.

Pvt. Morris Knoff, 25, of Dorchester, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Sanford Lochman, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Aleutian area.

Sgt. Arthur Kohn, 24, Army Air Forces, of Bayonne, N. J. Purple Heart. For heroism in air action over Sicily, as radio operator aboard a bomber.

Pvt. Harold Kohn, 23, of Hartford, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Aleutians.

Sgt. Sidney L. Kohn, 25, Army Air Forces, of St. Louis, Mo. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For heroism during bombing missions over occupied Europe. Missing in action.

Pvt. Moe Kollin, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Harold Kolon, 23, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Hawaii.

Lt. Morris Konier, 26, Army Air Forces, of Milwaukee, Wis. Air Medal and Purple Heart. For heroism during bombing missions over occupied Europe, in the course of which he was wounded in aerial combat.

Pvt. Herbert Kopelman, 32, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Max J. Koplow, United States Marine Corps, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Arthur B. Koplowitz, 25, of Lynden, Wash. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Stanley D. Kops, 34, United States Marine Corps, of New York, N. Y. Navy Cross. Killed in action at Guadalcanal, where, as commander of the Third Division, First Marine Raider Battalion, he "inspired his men by his outstanding bravery" and led them in a successful attack against enemy forces after holding a position despite overwhelming odds.

Pvt. Martin M. Kornstein, 31, of Elgin, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in north Africa.

Sgt. Frederick Kosak, Medical Corps, 26, of New York, N. Y. Silver Star. He saved the life of his commanding officer during the bombing of a field hospital somewhere in New Guinea.

Lt. Norman Kossis, 26, Army Air Forces, of Seattle, Wash. Air Medal and Purple Heart. For his part, as a Flying Fortress bombardier, in damaging a submarine base at L'Orient. Later killed in action in aerial combat over occupied Europe.

Seaman Leonard Kram, 20, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Lt. Alfred Kramer, Army Air Forces, of Kew Gardens, N. Y. Air Medal. For heroism in aerial flight over Europe. Missing in action.

Pvt. Meyer Kramer, 25, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Ronald R. Kramer, 25, of Auburn, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Paul M. Krasne, 23, of Council Bluffs, Iowa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Lt. Oscar Krebs, 23, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters and Purple Heart. As a Flying Fortress navigator, he took part in numerous raids on Europe, and was wounded in action during a return flight from a raid on German objectives.

Lt. Leonard Krisel, 24, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Arthur C. Krohn, 28, United States Navy, of Utica, N. Y. Navy citation. For heroism as gunnery officer aboard a vessel attacked while on convoy duty.

Sgt. Philip S. Krow, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Richard L. Kruse, 23, Army Air Forces, of Ypsilanti, Mich. Air Medal. Air action over Europe.

Lt. Irving Kunin, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Middle East.

Corp. Sidney M. Kupetz, 26, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Chief Machinist's Mate Abe Kushman, 23, United States Navy, of Oakland, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action when the aircraft carrier *Wasp* was sunk in the South Pacific.

Lt. Adolph William Kutner, 34, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Capt. Richard George Labovitz, 26, of Mattapan, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Tunisia.

Lt. David Lachterman, 25, Army Air Forces, of Alexander City, Ala. Purple Heart. Killed in action over France.

Pvt. Eli Lader, 21, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Sanford I. Lakin, United States Navy, of Columbus, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Lt. Herbert R. Lakow, 25, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. For heroism and wounds received in action as a Flying Fortress navigator in the European theater.

Ensign Alec G. Land, United States Maritime Service, 21, of Des Moines, Iowa. Merchant Marine War Service Bar. For action in the South Pacific.

Corp. Leo L. Landau, 30, Army Air Forces, of Youngstown, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Karl H. Landes, 33, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action.

Pvt. Edward Henry Lang, 18, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the North Atlantic.

Sgt. Phil Langman, Army Air Forces, of St. Paul, Minn. Air Medal and four Oak Leaf Clusters. For meritorious achievement while participating in missions against the enemy in north Africa as a radio operator and later for shooting down an enemy plane as a gunner on a B-26 bomber during an Allied raid on Salerno.

Pvt. Alen L. Lansky, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Capt. Reuben T. Lapidus, 30, Medical Corps, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action when he struck a land mine while attempting to reach installations in Tunisia.

Pvt. Sanford Larkin, 24, of Boston, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded by shrapnel while advancing into Japanese-held territory on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Julius E. Larman, 27, Signal Corps, of Hartford, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jacob Laskau, 26, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. David Lasker, 27, of Hackensack, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Battle of Attu.

Capt. George Laven, 26, Army Air Forces, of San Antonio, Tex. Distinguished Flying Cross, Distinguished Service Cross, Air Medal, and Oak Leaf Cluster. He took part in one of the first pursuit attacks of the war on the Japanese at Kiska, damaging an enemy ship and blasting a Japanese flying boat at Kiska Harbor in the face of heavy antiaircraft fire, and he participated in numerous subsequent raids in the Aleutians.

Lt. Charles Laxin, 24, Army Air Forces, of Lebanon, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Oak Leaf Cluster. He participated in numerous bombing missions over north Africa and took part in the transportation of hundreds of parachute troops without the loss of a single transport during the invasion of Sicily.

Sgt. Allen Leavy, 22, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Machinist's Mate Raymond Leblang, 24, United States Navy, of Pottstown, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Lt. Julian I. Lebo, 22, Army Air Forces, of Memphis, Tenn. Air Medal. For achievement as pilot during bombing missions in the Middle East.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Morton Lebowitz, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Julius Lefkowitz, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Flight Officer Peter Lehman, 26, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal. For heroism during two raids on Emden as a Thunderbolt pilot. He is the son of Herbert Lehman, former New York State Governor.

Pvt. Joseph Lehrer, 29, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Bernard Leibowitz, 31, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal, 10 Oak Leaf Clusters, and Purple Heart. For repeated acts of heroism in aerial flight during numerous raids on European and north African objectives, including Tunisia, Sardinia, Bizerte, Palermo, Messina, Naples, Rome, and Trapani. He participated in more than 50 bombing missions, and was wounded in action in an air encounter with enemy planes over north Africa.

Pvt. Jacob A. Lempert, 30, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Ensign Robert L. Leopold, 27, United States Naval Reserve, of Louisville, Ky. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Pvt. Irving Lesser, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Robert B. Leventhal, 22, Army Air Forces, of St. Louis, Mo. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. Killed in action in the European area.

Sgt. Fred Levey, 25, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Abraham Levin, 18, Army Air Forces, of Richmond, Va. Air Medal. He took part in a bombing attack on an enemy encampment at Kiska in the Aleutians.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Abraham Levin, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Maj. Clarence Levin, 36, of Brookline, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Tunisia.

Pvt. Irving A. Levin, 24, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Meyer Levin, 25, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Silver Star, 2 Oak Leaf Clusters, and Purple Heart. As Capt. Colin Kelly's bombardier, he launched the bombs which sank the Japanese battleship *Haruna* off the Philippines, later sank an enemy cargo ship at Coral Sea, took part in more than 60 combat missions; died in the act of saving his crew mates when a Flying Fortress on a reconnaissance flight crashed in a storm off New Guinea.

Sgt. Meyer Levin, 28, Army Air Forces, of St. Louis, Mo. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. For his part in air raids over occupied Europe as a Flying Fortress waist gunner.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Samuel D. Levin, 24, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Abe I. Levine, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Corp. Joseph Levine, 26, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action during the invasion of Sicily.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph Levine, 26, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Murray Levine, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Maj. Robert Levine, Army Air Forces, of Columbus, Ohio. Silver Star. For gallantry in action in Tunisia.

Sgt. Saul Levine, 24, Army Air Forces, of Lowell, Mass. Air Medal. He was radioman on the transport plane which landed the first paratroopers in Sicily.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sherman Levine, 18, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Irwin T. Levinson, 21, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Corp. Benjamin Levitan, 35, of Roselle, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. William A. Levitan, 22, Army Air Forces, of Roxbury, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in New Guinea.

Pvt. Isaac Levy, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Flight Officer Joseph Levy, 23, Army Air Forces, of Scarsdale, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross and Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Aleutians, where he distinguished himself as pilot of a P-47.

Pvt. Maurice Levy, 26, of Chicago, Ill. Distinguished Service Cross and Purple Heart. As a sniper, he shot 25 Japs in one night of action near Sananda, New Guinea, sufficiently weakening enemy resistance so that American troops were able to advance. He was subjected throughout the night to severe and accurate enemy fire and was wounded four times.

Sgt. Melville Leo Levy, 29, of New Orleans, La. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Robert T. Levy, 22, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal and Purple Heart. After months of action in Flying Fortress raids over Europe, he was killed when his plane was shot down over the target during a raid on St. Nazaire. He was bombardier and had successfully blasted the target.

Pvt. Ralph Lewin, 28, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Bernard Jack Lewis, 21, Army Air Forces, of Asbury Park, N. J. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. He took in numerous bombing missions over north Africa as a bomber pilot and bombardier, and participated in the Sicilian invasion.

Lt. Chas. H. Lewis, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Lt. Julius Paul Lewis, 24, Army Air Forces, of Washington, D. C. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Corp. Theodore J. Lewis, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action at Pearl Harbor.

Seaman Abe Libby, 35, at Dyersburg, Tenn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomons.

Corp. Arthur Liblit, 24, of Jamaica, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Oren Libson, 23, of Minneapolis, Minn. Distinguished Service Medal and Purple Heart. He drove an armored tank which was blown up by a land mine while riding into battle in Tunisia. He was the only surviving crew member. Blown 10 feet, he began to run and stumbled over a sergeant whose leg had been shattered. He stopped to render first aid, suffering shrapnel wounds in his own leg as a result.

Maj. Carl Lichter, 29, Army Air Forces, of St. Paul, Minn. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster to the Air Medal, unit citation, and four Oak Leaf Clusters to the citation. He escaped from Clark Field, Philippine Islands, after the enemy attacked, eluded the Japanese Air Force for 3 days, got through to Bataan, where he fought with the infantry, escaped to Australia, and has since gone out on at least 75 operational missions.

Capt. Alfred M. Litchman, 25, United States Marine Corps, of Syracuse, N. Y. Silver Star. For conspicuous gallantry in action against the enemy in the Solomons.

Sgt. Isadore Lieberman, 21, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. He flew the Atlantic for 400 hours on antisubmarine patrol.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jules Lieberman, 31, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Stanley Lieberman, Army Air Forces, of Cleveland, Ohio. Air Medal. Air action in north Africa.

Sgt. Leo Liebling, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action over occupied Europe in an aerial battle during which he destroyed a Messerschmitt 110.

Lt. Aaron Liepe, 23, Army Air Forces, of Dubuque, Iowa. Distinguished Flying Cross. He completed more than 50 combat missions in the Far East, destroying 2 enemy planes in aerial combat.

Corp. Jacob Lifschitz, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Jacob Nathan Ligom, 39, of Fitchburg, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the battle of Attu.

Sgt. Alton Lipkin, 29, of Minneapolis, Minn. Silver Star. He was in a machine-gun nest in New Guinea when one of his men was wounded by enemy fire. At the risk of his own life he pulled the wounded man to safety.

Lt. Arnold William Lipkin, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action when a B-24 Liberator, on which he was copilot, crashed in the South Pacific.

Corp. Norman J. Lipman, 21, Signal Corps, of Chicago, Ill. Citation from General MacArthur and Oak Leaf Cluster. For heroism in the Southwest Pacific area.

Lt. Arnold B. Lippman, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For his part, as navigator on a bomber, in bombing Jap bases at Nauru and Tarawa.

Lt. Comdr. Joseph Lipshutz, 38, United States Naval Reserve, of Portland, Oreg. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Petty Officer Richard H. Lischin, 23, United States Navy, of Atlantic City, N. J. Silver Star. For his part in sinking a submarine off the New Guinea coast as crew member of a PT boat.

Sgt. Harry Liss, of Minneapolis, Minn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Tunisia.

Lt. Emanuel R. Loeb, 23, Army Air Forces, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Air Medal. For meritorious service in the transportation of troops from England to north Africa.

Lt. Walter H. Loeb, 24, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Middle East.

Sgt. G. J. Lomberg, Army Air Forces, of Minneapolis, Minn. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement as first radioman on a Flying Fortress.

Pvt. Paul M. Londe, 22, of St. Louis, Mo. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Maurice Londer, 23, Army Air Forces, of Minneapolis, Minn. Distinguished Flying Cross, Silver Star, Air Medal, and Nineteenth Bombardment Group citation. In the course of 5 major campaigns in the South Pacific and 50 air battles in which he participated as an aerial engineer gunner, he destroyed half a dozen Zeros.

Lt. Sidney D. Lovitt, Army Air Forces, of Providence, R. I. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. For heroism in air action and wounds received.

Maj. Martin L. Low, 25, Army Air Forces, of Wyoming, Ohio. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Oak Leaf Cluster. He shared in more than 100 combat missions in the New Guinea area.

Lt. Gordon Lowe, 22, Army Air Forces, of Jamaica, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Stanley Lowitz, 24, of Jamaica, N. Y. Silver Star. For outstanding courage under fire in Tunisia.

Pvt. Saul Lubin, 24, of Hartford, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Sidney Lubin, 22, of Albany Park, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Corp. Walter R. Lubinski, 27, of Eau Claire, Wis. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Milton Lunenfeld, 25, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and two Oak Leaf Clusters. For heroism in the course of 51 aerial missions over north Africa and occupied Europe as a navigator.

Lt. Raymond Lunenfeld, 23, Army Air Forces, of Jamaica, N. Y. Air Medal and Purple Heart. Killed in action during aerial combat over occupied Europe.

Capt. Herman Lusky, 26, Army Air Forces, of Nashville, Tenn. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For his part in numerous transport flights over China in the face of continuous hazards.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Irwin Mack, 25, of Elmhurst, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action over north Africa.

Lt. Morton Macks, Army Air Forces, of Oakland, Calif. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. Air action over occupied Europe.

Seaman Fred M. Magenheim, 40, United States Navy, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in South Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Eugene Magidson, 24, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. For heroism as a member of a commando outfit based in north Africa. Wounded in action.

Pvt. David Magolefsky, 20, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Abraham A. Mahl, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Capt. Jerome I. Malkin, 32, Medical Corps, of Jamaica, N. Y. Silver Star. Heroism during the north Africa invasion.

Lt. Sidney W. Malkin, 24, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Capt. Frank Mandell, 25, United States Marine Corps, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Guadalcanal.

Lt. Herbert Irving Mandell, 26, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star. For heroism in the South Pacific.

Lt. Comdr. Richard Si Mandelkorn, 33, United States Navy, of Honolulu, Hawaii. Navy commendation. For his part in rescuing men trapped aboard the U. S. S. *Oklahoma* during the Pearl Harbor attack.

Capt. Irving R. Mandelson, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Philippines.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Morris Mankoff, 21, of Buffalo, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Pvt. Hyman Mantel, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Myron Louis Mantell, 23, Army Air Forces, of Stamford, Conn. Air Medal. He completed numerous missions as a member of the Four Hundred and Seventeenth Bomber Squadron.

Sgt. Jerome Marcus, 24, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For heroism as an aerial engineer-waist gunner aboard a Flying Fortress. He completed 25 daylight raids over occupied Europe, including St. Nazaire, Hamm, Brest, Wilhelmshaven, Rouen, Antwerp, Kiel, and Bremen

Lt. Lawrence E. Marcus, 25, of St. Louis, Mo. Two Croix de Guerre awards. For destroying a nest of 19 enemy machine guns and for shooting down a German plane with a machine gun in north Africa.

Pvt. Abraham A. Marder, 26, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Jacob Margolen, 23, of Ludlow, Ky. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Harold Margulies, 22, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Lt Henry Mark, of Los Angeles, Calif. Distinguished Service Cross, Purple Heart. Killed in action on Bataan when he attempted to smash enemy tanks advancing on his position with hand grenades. Running across an open field to hurl the grenades, he was felled by an enemy sniper.

Pharmacist's Mate Irving Markheim, 32, United States Naval Reserves, of Miami Beach, Fla. Purple Heart. Heroism on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Louis D. Marks, 23, United States Naval Reserves, of Memphis, Tenn. Silver Star. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity as Commanding Officer of the United States Navy Armed Guard aboard a merchant vessel during aerial attacks by enemy forces.

Capt. Mortimer Marks, 24, Army Air Forces, of Bayonne, N. J. Distinguished Flying Cross. He is credited with the destruction of three enemy craft in the course of more than 50 combat missions in the Far East.

Pvt. Abe Markowitz, 29, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Dan Markowitz, 27, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action over France.

Pvt. Fred Markowitz, 34, of Alexandria, Va. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Jack L. Matisoff, 26, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Merwin Bogen Mattes, of Hamden, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. William Max, 23, of Allentown, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Max H. Mayer, 25, Army Air Forces, of Memphis, Tenn. Silver Star and Air Medal. For his part in bombing four ships off the northeast coast of New Guinea, for helping to battle flames in his Flying Fortress above the clouds after bombing enemy planes on the ground, and for meritorious achievement in aerial flight in the New Guinea area.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Milton Mednick, 21, of Edgemere, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Manuel Mandelson, 23, Army Air Forces, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and 3 Oak Leaf Clusters. He took part in 25 missions over occupied Europe, including a raid on the Messerschmitt factory in Regensburg and an assault on Hannover during which his squadron was engaged by fighters in a battle lasting 2½ hours.

Pvt. Louis Meister, 20, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Corregidor.

Lt. William Mehlman, 24, of Hartford, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Salerno.

Lt. Bernard J. Melman, 22, Army Air Forces, of Waco, Tex. Silver Star. For gallantry in action at a south China base.

Pvt. Meyer L. Melman, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Milton Melman, 24, Army Air Forces, of Middletown, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For his part in sinking an enemy convoy in the South Pacific, and for bagging a Zero in aerial combat, as tail gunner on a Flying Fortress.

Aviation Cadet Leonard J. Melser, 21, Army Air Forces, of Elizabeth, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Aleutian Islands.

Sgt. Fred Stephen Mencher, 27, Army Air Forces, of Newark, Del. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Edward Mendelewski, 31, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Kenneth M. Messenger, 25, of Bridgeport, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Richard Messenger, of Bridgeport, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Aaron Meyers, 27, of St. Louis, Mo. Silver Star. Gallantry in action in New Guinea.

Lt. George G. Meyers, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Lt. Robert Michaels, 30, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Bizerte, north Africa.

Sgt. Arnold R. Michelson, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action.

Sgt. Barney E. Miller, 30, of Norman, Okla. Army citation. For heroism in north Africa.

Cpl. Charles S. Miller, United States Marine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. David Miller, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded during the invasion of north Africa.

Pvt. David Miller, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Sgt. Gerald Miller, 22, Army Air Forces, of Baltimore, Md. Air Medal. For heroism as a radio gunner aboard a bomber during 300 hours of antisubmarine patrol flights over the Atlantic.

Capt. Hubert E. Miller, 27, Army Air Forces, of Ridgeland, S. C. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and 3 Oak Leaf Clusters. A Flying Fortress navigator, he has gone out on numerous raids over north Africa and occupied Europe, including several major aerial assaults on Germany.

Lt. Jack E. Miller, 22, United States Marine Corps, of Dallas, Tex. Navy Cross and Purple Heart. Killed in action while leading a raider platoon in an assault on an enemy gun position at Guadalcanal.

Lt. Jack Miller, United States Marine Corps, of Dallas, Tex. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Nathan E. Miller, 20, of Charlestown, W. Va. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Samuel W Miller, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Walter Miller, 36, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Jack Vincent Milton, Army Air Forces, of Ozark, Ark. Air Medal and Purple Heart. Killed in action over Germany, after participating in many raids on the Continent.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jerome Mintz, 19, of the Bronx, N. Y. Army citation. For exceptional heroism in the handling of a machine gun during the Pearl Harbor attack.

Sgt. Marvin Mitchell, 22, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Air Medal and 10 Oak Leaf Clusters. For heroism as a Flying Fortress gunner during 50 bombing missions over occupied Europe, in the course of which he shot down 4 enemy planes.

Pvt. Lawrence J. Mitzman, 25, of Oakland, Calif. Purple Heart. For gallantry in action during enemy attacks on Dutch Harbor, Alaska.

Pvt. Raoul Modiano, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the European area.

Lt. Milton Moldafsky, 25, United States Navy, of St. Louis, Mo. Navy commendation. For distinguished service and devotion to duty in performing the duties of torpedo officer and communications officer, and for standing watch as officer of the deck on the bridge for a period of 30 hours at sea in the South Pacific, on the day of the Pearl Harbor attack.

Sgt. Melvin Monheit, 21, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross and Purple Heart. During a raid on the Heinkel aircraft plant in Warnemuende, Germany, the release mechanism on Monheit's bomber was disabled by antiaircraft fire. Monheit was let down by parachute straps and released bombs over the target by hand. He had previously been wounded in action over Europe.

Pvt. Edward E. Morris, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Robert Morris, 25, Army Air Forces, of Bridgeport, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Max Morrison, 29, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Aleutian area.

Sgt. Charles G. Mosses, 25, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Corp. Norman Moskovitz, 21, of Detroit, Mich. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Bernard Moskowitz, 20, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Morris Moskowitz, 22, Medical Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart and Oak Leaf Cluster. For heroism and wounds received in action in New Guinea.

Pvt. Oscar Moskowitz, 22, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Victor Moskowitz, 24, of Newark, N. J. Letter of commendation. For heroism in action in New Guinea.

Pvt. Max Mostowsky, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Abe Muscoplat, of Minneapolis, Minn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Sgt. William L. Myers, 23, Army Air Forces, of Arcadia, Fla. Air Medal. Heroism in air action in the Middle East.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert A. Nadler, 28, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. He suffered nine shrapnel wounds during the invasion of Sicily.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert A. Nadler, 28, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Italy.

Sgt. William D. Nadler, 31, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action over Germany.

Pvt. Herman Nahmias, 23, of Indianapolis, Ind. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Sgt. Robert Natkin, 24, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Edward H. Nauman, 25, of Waterloo, Iowa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Capt. Joseph P. Nelson, 33, Medical Corps of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart and Oak Leaf Cluster. Twice wounded while tending the wounded at the front lines in north Africa.

Pvt. Carl Neufeld, United States Marine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal

Corp. Alfred Newman, 18, United States Marine Corps, of Portland, Oreg. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Alvin Leonard Newman, 24, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Benjamin Newman, 24, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Eugene Newman, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star and Purple Heart. Gallantry in action in north Africa.

Corp. Harry Newman, 23, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded while performing acts of essential service at Oahu during the Pearl Harbor attack.

Sgt. Irving R. Newman, 23, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Middle East.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Louis Newman, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Nathan Newman, 23, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Air Medal. Air action in north Africa.

Pvt. Samuel Newman, 26, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Oscar Nisnevitz, 29, of Jersey Homestead, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Pvt. Sidney Noretsky, of Chelsea, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Louis North, 39, of Rockaway Beach, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at Casablanca.

Pvt. Sidney Novak, 24, of Syracuse, N. Y. Legion of Merit award. He rescued a wounded soldier in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Irving A. Novak, 24, Army Air Forces, of Aurora, Ill. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For his part in successful bombing raids in the Gilbert Islands and for meritorious achievement in air action near Hawaii.

Lt. Edward Nussbaum, Jr., 24, of Seattle, Wash. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Siegfried Oberdorfer, 29, Medical Corps, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Sgt. Leon Off, 32, Army Air Forces, of El Paso, Tex. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the European area.

Pvt. Samuel P. Offenberg, 29, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Irving Oppenheim, 23, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Leonard Oppenheimer, of Baltimore, Md. Army commendation. For heroism as a radio specialist in work with a combat team in north Africa.

Pvt. George Orenstein, 26, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Julius Oster, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Samuel L. Pachowsky, 33, of Fairfield, Maine. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Hospital Apprentice Morris Jack Partnow, 29, United States Naval Reserve, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Lt. Comdr. Ralph E. Patterson, 40, United States Navy, of Philadelphia, Pa. Navy commendation. He volunteered to go back with a rescue party to save the doomed aircraft carrier *Yorktown* in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Edwin C. Paul, of St. Louis, Mo. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Harold Pazofsky, United States Marine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. David Peltz, 26, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. William J. Pennamacoor, 26, of Newark, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Ira Penzner, 26, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Benjamin Perlman, 29, of Pittsfield, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Bernard Pesick, 30, of Detroit, Mich. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Marine Gunner Michael Peskin, 44, United States Marine Corps, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Battle of Midway.

Sgt. Murray Phillips, 22, Army Air Forces, of Evansville, Ind. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Maj. Martin Philipsborn, 34, of Chicago, Ill. Silver Star, Purple Heart, and Croix de Guerre. For gallantry in action in north Africa.

Radioman Sidney Pierce, 21, United States Navy, of Taylor, Tex. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Sgt. Louis Pinckney, 29, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. For heroism in action in Tunisia.

Pvt. Benjamin J. Inson, 25, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Louis Podolsky, 35, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Lt. Alfred Pollack, 25, United States Navy, of Fresno, Calif. Navy citation. For his heroic rescue work when the Steamship *Pollux* went down off Newfoundland.

Lt. Seymour J. Ponepone, 22, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For his part in a long-range troop-carrier flight from England to north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) George Popel, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. James Poris, 21, of Elmhurst, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Irving Posner, 26, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Wilbur E. Quint, 29, United States Navy, of Lowell, Mass. Silver Star and Purple Heart. For heroic participation in an engagement during which American forces won an important naval victory in the Solomons. He had two vessels shot out from under him—the *Hornet* and, a month later, the *Barton*.

Seaman Hyman Rabinowitz, 22, United States Navy, of Paterson, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Benjamin Radensky, 22, Army Air Forces, of Sacramento, Calif. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For heroism in action as a radioman aboard a Flying Fortress during bombing missions over occupied Europe. Missing in action.

Seaman Maurice Raderman, United States Naval Reserve, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Pacific.

Lt. Harold Radetsky, 24, Army Air Forces, of Denver, Colo. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and three Oak Leaf Clusters. He was leader of an American Air Forces bomber squadron in north Africa, and took part in numerous raids on occupied Europe.

Radioman James L. Rakusin, 24, United States Navy, of Providence, R. I. Silver Star. He put out a raging gasoline fire on an aircraft carrier during the Battle of Santa Cruz, thereby saving the ship.

Pvt. Abraham R. Randall, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Saul E. Rantz, 31, United States Marine Corps, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Solomon Islands.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sidney Rapeport, 28, of Cleveland, Ohio. Distinguished Service Cross. For extraordinary heroism in wiping out five German machine-gun nests in Tunisia.

Capt. Louis Rappeport, 39, of Indianapolis, Ind. Purple Heart. Killed in action at Oran.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Edwin Rashkind, 25, of Jamaica, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Pvt. Leo Raskin, 27, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. For heroism in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph M. Ratner, 32, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Sidney M. Rattner, 28, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Sgt. Milton Rayberg, 24, Army Air Forces, of Roxbury Mass. Air Medal. For heroism while on antisubmarine patrol as a radio operator.

Gunner's Mate Samuel Reingold, 39, United States Navy, of Tannersville, N. Y. Navy commendation. He risked his life to secure an anchor which had been torn from its lashings by the force of a storm at sea on a Navy minesweeper. The ship would otherwise have been lost.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Julius Reisman, 25, of the Bronx, New York. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Lt. (j. g.) Charles Reiter, United States Naval Reserve, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action off Newfoundland.

Lt. Michael L. Reitman, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For his achievements as a pilot while flying supplies in unarmed planes to troops trapped in New Guinea jungles. He completed more than 50 hazardous missions.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Ralph N. Rentz, of Lansdowne, Pa. Purple Heart. Heroism in action at Java. Now a prisoner of the Japanese.

Pvt. Hyman Resnick, 21, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Sol L. Reiches, 28, Army Air Forces, of Cleveland, Ohio. Air Medal. For meritorious achievements in aerial flight during raids on Europe.

Sgt. Bernard Resnicoff, Army Air Forces, of Baltimore, Md. Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters. For meritorious achievements in aerial flight during numerous raids on occupied Europe. Now missing in action.

Sgt. Joseph Ribeck, 23, Army Air Forces, of Dorchester, Mass. Air Medal. As a ball-turret gunner on a flying fortress, he shot down a Nazi plane at 24,000 feet in an air battle over France.

Lt. Morris Ribyat, 27, of Utica, N. Y. Purple Heart. He was machine-gunned leading an infantry bayonet charge on an enemy position in the Battle of Hill 609, in north Africa.

Sgt. Arthur Rice, of Milwaukee, Wis. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Sidney M. Richman, 24, Army Air Forces, of Oshkosh, Wis. Distinguished Flying Cross. For exceptional heroism in the Aleutians.

Capt. Robert R. Riesman, of Chestnut Hill, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Corp. Newton I. Riess, 22, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Capt. Bernard Jay Rike, 29, of Pueblo, Colo. Purple Heart. Killed in action in New Guinea.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Nathan Rinkov, 26, of Columbus, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Capt. Joseph Risman, 30, of Lynn, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action, New Georgia Island.

Lt. Murray J. Ritter, 22, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Capt. Ben Robbins, 30, of Forest Hills, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Tunisia.

Lt. Sumner L. Roberts, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brookline, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action over Germany.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Harry Robinson, of Peoria, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Lt. Kenneth E. Robinson, 22, Army Air Forces, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action over Germany.

Capt. Roy Robinton, of Mobile, Ala. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Bataan.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Charles Rochwerger, 25, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Bert A. Rodman, 23, of Ferndale, Calif. Silver Star. He was 1 of a force of 10 men and an officer who made a prompt and necessary reconnoitering sortie of the battle situation under heavy enemy fire while establishing a beachhead during the landings in north Africa.

Lt. Robert E. Rohrlich, 21, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. Killed in action in aerial combat over occupied Europe. He was bombardier on a Flying Fortress and had completed 11 missions.

Capt. Jack Roller, 27, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. Extraordinary heroism in air action over occupied Europe.

Brig. Gen. Maurice Rose, 43, of Denver, Colo. Silver Star and Oak Leaf Cluster. He carried the terms of unconditional surrender to Nazi General Boroweitz in Tunisia, and commanded an American combat team which captured Palermo in the Seventh Army's drive through Sicily. Medal awarded for rallying men in an advance in Tunisia with disregard for enemy fire.

Boatswain's Mate Leon J. Roseman, 27, United States Navy, of Akron, Ohio. Navy commendation. He plunged into an icy sea, after others had failed, to save the life of a fireman washed from the deck of a destroyer.

Capt. Eugene Rosemont, of San Francisco, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Philippines.

Pvt. (1st cl.) David Rosen, 28, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Maj. David V. Rosen, 41, of San Francisco, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Harry Rosen, 19, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. David B. Rosenberg, 26, of Yonkers, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Maj. Harry Rosenberg, of Rochester, N. Y. Legion of Merit awarded and Purple Heart. Sergeant Rosenberg, killed in action in north Africa, had served in the Army for 34 years. The award was given posthumously for his untiring efforts and devotion to duty * * * an inspiration to all personnel in his regiment.

Sgt. Hyman P. Rosenberg, 23, Army Air Forces, of St. Louis, Mo. Distinguished Flying Cross. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. As a gunner and radio operator, he took part in a raid on Japanese-held Wake Island.

Pvt. Jack H. Rosenberg, 30, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Martin Rosenberg, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in North Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Philip Rosenberg, of Lawrence, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Stanley Rosenberg, 24, United States Marine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Walter Rosenberg, 23, of Greenwich, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Abraham Rosenblatt, 26, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Seaman Murray Rosenblatt, United States Navy, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Caniel D. Rosenblum, Army Air Forces, of Jersey City, N. J. Letter of commendation. For heroism under fire at Pearl Harbor.

Corp. Paul A. Rosenblum, 24, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Ira Rosenfeld, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Herbert Rosenheimer, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Irving Arthur Rosenstein, 29, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Radioman Alfred Rosenthal, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Morris Rosensweet, 26, of Providence, R. I. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Lt. Jerome Rosner, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Arnold Z. Rosoff, 26, Army Air Forces, of Brookline, Mass. Air Medal. Meritorious work in antisubmarine activities.

Corp. Alexander A. Ross, 23, of Mattapan, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Barney Ross, 34, United States Marine Corps, of Chicago, Ill. Silver Star. He accounted for 22 Japs while he guarded 3 wounded comrades through one night of fierce fighting on Guadalcanal. He was wounded in action and contracted malaria during months of action in the Guadalcanal jungles.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Alvin S. Roth, 27, of Berkeley, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the North Pacific area.

Lt. Eli Roth, 27, United States Navy, of Jackson Heights, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Emanuel M. Roth, 24, of Long Beach, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Harold Morton Roth, 34, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Lt. Selig Rothman, 22, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Air Medal. For meritorious achievements in aerial flight over China.

Pvt. Hymen Rudin, 34, of Jamestown, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Seaman Louis Roth, 20, United States Navy, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Abraham Rothenberg, 35, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Allan Rothenberg, 24, United States Navy, of Washington, D. C. Navy Cross and Silver Star. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepid service as a commander of a patrol plane at Midway, and for aerial torpedoing of two Japanese cruisers off Guadalcanal.

Lt. Joseph Rothenberg, 24, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Sidney Rothenberg, 28, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the North Atlantic.

Capt. Edward Rothkrug, 20, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Silver Star, and Air Medal with eight Oak-Leaf Clusters. As a navigator he fought in numerous air battles in north Africa and took part in a raid on the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania. He has chalked up 300 hours of combat flying.

Lt. Theodore I. Rothman, 24, Army Air Forces, of Cleveland, Ohio. Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters. Air action over occupied Europe.

Pvt. William Rothman, 21, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Seaman Joseph Rotstein, 25, of Vicksburg, Miss. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Marcus Rubenstein, 29, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Morton Rubenstein, 27, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Lt. Albert O. Rubin, 21, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in aerial combat, returning from a bombing mission over Europe.

Lt. Albert Rubin, 21, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Asiatic area.

Pvt. Alfred Rubin, 20, of Newark, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Jack Rubin, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Rubin, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Alexander Rubinstein, United States Marine Corps, of Malden, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Solomon Islands.

Lt. Seymour D. Ruchamkin, 25, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Navy Cross. For heroism aboard the U. S. S. *Cushing* during action off Savo Island in the Solomons. Missing in action since that engagement.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Aaron Ruder, 33, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Sol Rudolph, 31, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Morris Ruff, 28, of Elizabeth, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Samuel Rusnak, 28, of Youngstown, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Samuel J. Ruttenberg, 26, of Dallas, Tex. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Lt. Ralph Rutz, of Minneapolis, Minn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Sgt. Herman Sachnoff, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters, and Purple Heart. For extraordinary heroism during 10 months of aerial combat in north Africa, where four different planes on which he served returned to base too severely damaged for further use.

Lt. Col. Henry N. Sachs, 38, Ordnance Department, of New York, N. Y. Silver Star. Over and above the call of duty, he proceeded through burning buildings, while Hickam Field was still under attack, and supervised the unloading of fully fuzed ammunition from a nearby ship.

Pvt. Morris Sachs, 30, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Morton L. Sachs, 27, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement while participating in an aerial flight against the enemy in the middle-east theater.

Radioman Jake Sachter, United States Navy, of Portland, Oreg. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Capt. William Louis Sackler, 28, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. He was lead navigator of a squadron which made a number of successful raids on occupied Europe.

Lt. David A. Hacknoff, Army Air Forces, of Portland, Maine. Air Medal and seven Oak Leaf Clusters. Pilot of the Fortress *Snow White*, he has participated in more than 40 raids against the enemy. Once, during a raid over Axis-held territory in Tunisia, his plane returned to base with more than 500 shell and bullet holes in it.

Corp. Murray Salkin, 25, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on the Dieppe raid.

Pvt. Irving B. Salsberg, 24, of Kennett Square, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Stephen Saltzman, Coast Artillery, of Wilmington, Del. Silver Star. At Hawaii, on December 7, 1941, he fired from the ground with a rifle at a Jap plane, killed the pilot, and sent the plane crashing to earth.

Sgt. William Saltzman, 26, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in New Guinea.

Lt. Warren Salz, 22, Army Air Forces, of San Francisco, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Isaac J. Sanders, 31, of Marion, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Irwin Sandick, 19, United States Marine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomon Islands.

Pvt. Abraham Saperstein, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Jacques Conrad Saphier, 27, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star and Purple Heart. During a Japanese attack on Guadalcanal, he proceeded to the front lines and gave medical aid to the wounded in the face of accurate and heavy Japanese fire. Moments later he was hit by a bullet and killed.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Louis Saslovsky, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Lawrence Savadkin, of Forest Hills, N. Y. Silver Star and Purple Heart. For gallantry in action and wounds received in north Africa.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Lawrence Savadkin, 23, United States Navy, of Forest Hills, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Melvin Saxe, 19, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Sgt. Jack Schaffer, 21, Army Air Forces, of Peoria, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the European area.

Lt. Jay J. G. Schatz, 25, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Distinguished Flying Cross and Purple Heart. For meritorious achievement during bombing missions over Germany and occupied Europe. He was wounded during one raid over Antwerp.

Pvt. Herman Schechter, 25, of Detroit, Mich. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Robert L. Scheinman, 19, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Martin Scheffler, 24, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Sgt. Julius Schellenberg, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. He was one of a group of thirteen men who volunteered to enter an ammunition dump in the New Guinea area to remove explosives while a grass fire nearby threatened to explode them. Most of the munitions were saved.

Sgt. Mortimer Schenkman, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Lawrence Scher, 24, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Abe Schestopol, 27, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star and citation. For courageous action during the bombing of Canton (China) airdrome, which resulted in the destruction of six enemy bombers.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph Schiffman, 23, of Mingo Junction, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Abraham A. Schindler, 22, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Leonard Schlafmitz, 21, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Aid Medal. For outstanding heroism on more than 20 bombing raids on Kiska.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Louis Schleifer, 19, Army Air Forces, of Newark, N. J. Silver Star and Purple Heart. He was killed in action while attempting to shoot down one of the Japanese planes attacking Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

Lt. Morton Schlesinger, 27, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the European war theater.

Pvt. Edward Schlessel, 21, United States Marine Corps, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Harry Schlovowitz, 28, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Pvt. David D. Schlucker, 24, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Schmerin, 32, of Johnstown, Pa. Purple Heart. For heroism in action in north Africa, where he was wounded.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Benjamin Schmolovitz, 35, of Malden, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Henry D Schnedier, 22, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Aaron Schonman, 21, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Charles Schpak, of Chicago, Ill Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Capt. Harry Schreiber, 29, Army Air Forces, of Monroe, La. Purple Heart, two Oak Leaf Clusters, and Nineteenth Bombardment Group citation. Navigator of the Fortress *Alexander the Swoose*, he participated in countless air battles in the Pacific war zone. During one raid, in which he received a shrapnel wound in his arm, his plane was shot down, but the entire crew came through alive.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Israel E. Schulman, 30, of Rockaway Beach, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Albert Schwartz, 29, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Abraham Schwartz, 20, of Detroit, Mich. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Corp. Carl Schwartz, 33, of Highland Park, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Corp. Gershon Schwartz, 26, of Revere, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Harold Schwartz, United States Navy, of Newark, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at sea.

Pvt. Harry M. Schwartz, 22, paratrooper, of Denver, Colo. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Italy.

Sgt. Irving Schwartz, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. For outstanding heroism in north Africa, where he was killed in action.

Sgt. Israel Schwartz, 22, Army Air Forces, of Minneapolis, Minn. Air Medal. For participating in more than 200 hours of operational flights.

Sgt. Leon L. Schwartz, United States Marine Corps, 22, of New Orleans, La. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Maurice Schwartz, 33, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Monroe P. Schwartz, 26, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters, and Purple Heart. For outstanding achievement during participation in bombing raids on north Africa and Italy.

Lt. Morton B. Schwartz, 23, United States Naval Reserve, of Chicago, Ill. Citation from Rear Admiral T. S. Wilkinson. In charge of landing craft in the Solomon Islands, he succeeded several times in saving his ships from Japanese destroyers.

Lt. Paul Schwartz, 24, of Syracuse, N. Y. Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, and Purple Heart. He was leader of an American patrol of 14 men which captured a village in New Guinea from a greatly superior Jap force and destroyed a cache of enemy arms and ammunition. Shortly afterward he was wounded in action.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jack Schweibish, 21, United States Marine Corps, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Solomon Islands

Pvt. Max I. Schweid, 31, of New York City, N. Y Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Danny B. Schwimmer, 21, Army Air Forces, of Newton Center, Mass. Air Medal. For meritorious service while participating in over 200 hours of antisubmarine patrol.

Corp. Sidney Schwimmer, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Silver Star. Gunner on a Flying Fortress during an air battle over New Guinea, he shot down seven Jap Zeros and dispersed a formation of others.

Lt. Nathan Scolnick, 27, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For heroism in air action in the Middle East.

Lt. Dolph B. Sears, 25, Army Air Forces, of Birmingham, Ala. Air Medal. He took part in a nonstop massed troop-carrier flight from England to north Africa, carried out despite adverse conditions and enemy activity.

Pvt. Charles Segal, 39, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Sgt. George J. Segal, 19, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Middle East.

Lt. Norman Segal, 24, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For outstanding heroism during participation in more than 30 sorties in north Africa.

Pvt. Seymour M. Segal, 20, of Far Rockaway, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Ensign Joseph D. Segall, 25, United States Navy, of New Bedford, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Aleutian Islands.

Pvt. Marvin Segel, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Ensign Daniel Seid, United States Navy, of Encino, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Gilbert and Marshall Islands engagement.

Pvt. Frank Seidel, 31, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Bernard Seiden, 20, United States Marine Corps, of Irvington, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomon Islands.

Sgt. Justin Seitenback, 23, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Harold M. Sena, 26, Army Air Forces, of Bridgeport, Conn. Air Medal. For outstanding heroism during bombing missions over north Africa. Following a raid on January 15, 1943, he was reported missing in action.

Capt. Sidney Senfeld, 33, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Seaman Harry A. Seymour, 19, United States Navy, of Phoenix, Ariz. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Sgt. Albert Shafran, 26, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement during bombing missions over occupied Europe.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Herbert Shafer, of Buffalo, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Abraham Isaac Shapiro, 24, of Dorchester, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Arthur S. Shapiro, 23, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Battle of Attu.

Corp. Jack Shapiro, 24, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in north Africa.

Maj. Jacob Shapiro, 29, of Brookline, Mass. Silver Star, Croix de Guerre, and Purple Heart. For extraordinary heroism as leader of an American tank unit in Tunisia and for wounds received in action there.

Corp. Jacob Shapiro, 23, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in north Africa.

Lt. Alfred Sharff, 27, of Portland, Oreg. Distinguished Service Cross and Purple Heart. He engaged the enemy during a north African battle and succeeded in diverting them so that American troops captured the position. This gallant action cost him his life.

Pvt. Joseph Sharp, Ordnance Department, of Seattle, Wash. Purple Heart. While manning an antiaircraft gun at Dutch Harbor he was killed by Japanese dive bombers.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph Sharp, 22, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action at Dutch Harbor, Alaska.

Sgt. Louis Benjamin Shein, 22, Army Air Forces, of Fresno, Calif. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement in aerial flight over occupied Europe.

Corp. Reuben Sheinman, 22, United States Marine Corps, of Jamaica, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Isidore Shepard, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the western Europe area.

Lt. Morton Sher, 21, Army Air Forces, of Greenville, S. C. Purple Heart. Killed in action in China.

Seaman Nathan Sherman, 18, United States Navy, of Harrisburg, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Seaman Eliot I. Sherris, United States Navy, of Buffalo, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Harold E. Shifrin, 23, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Abraham Shinder, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Louis B. Shluger, 26, of Hartford, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Corp. Saul Shocket, 24, of Providence, R. I. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Murray Shubin, 26, Army Air Forces, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Distinguished Service Cross. During 45 minutes of air combat at Guadalcanal he succeeded in shooting down 7 Japanese planes.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Harold Silverman, 29, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Sgt. Harry Shultz, 35, of Kansas City, Mo. Distinguished Flying Cross. Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal, and Purple Heart. He participated in a number of air assaults on occupied Europe. On one occasion when his plane caught fire during an attack, he crawled over the bomb bay although wounded, extinguished the flames, and helped bring his plane and crew members, several of whom were wounded, back to base. Since being released from the hospital he has taken part in a raid on Rumanian oil field.

Pvt. Irving I. Shure, 22, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Bernard S. Siegel, 27, of Belleville, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. George Siegel, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph Siegel, 24, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Seaman Lawrence Siegel, 24, United States Navy, of Buffalo, N. Y. Navy letter of commendation. For accepting and executing a difficult assignment of great military importance in the Southwest Pacific.

Lt. Raymond T. Siegel, 22, of Baton Rouge, La. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sanford Siegel, 29, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Sidney Siegel, 22, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement in aerial flight in the north Africa area where he was wounded in action.

Lt. Irving Silerman of Buffalo, N. Y. Silver Star and Purple Heart. For gallantry in action and wounds received in north Africa.

Lt. Irving Silverman of Buffalo, N. Y., 27. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Joel M. Silverman, 27, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters. For extraordinary heroism during more than 30 aerial missions over Germany and Africa. He was recently reported missing in action in the Middle East.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Stanley Silverman, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Service Cross and Purple Heart. For extraordinary heroism and wounds received in action in Tunisia.

Pvt. Jerome L. Silverstein, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Leo Silverstein, 22, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Comdr. Max Silverstein, 32, United States Navy, of Baltimore, Md. Silver Star and citation from Secretary of the Navy Knox. During the Battle of Coral Sea, he directed gun operations successfully and drove off two Jap attacks. Following the second attack when his ship was sunk, he is believed to have gone down with it.

Pvt. Walter Silverwatch, Army Air Forces, of Lawrence, Mass. Purple Heart. For outstanding heroism during a Japanese attack on Hickam Field, where he was wounded.

Sgt. Herbert M. Simes, 21, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star and Purple Heart. For outstanding achievement during participation on bombing mission over enemy territory in Europe.

Pvt. Morton Simoh, 23, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Herbert L. Simon, 37, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Norton Simon, 23, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Distinguished Flying Cross. For heroism in air action in the South Pacific as a member of the famed Nineteenth Bombardment Group.

Sgt. Raymond L. Simons, 25, Army Air Forces, of New Haven, Conn. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and three Oak Leaf Clusters. He helped navigate a bullet-riddled plane with two crewmen disabled from Germany to its base in Britain following a raid on Nazi objectives.

Sgt. Abraham Simonowitz, 28, Army Air Forces, of Trenton, N. J. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. For out-

standing service during 14 bombing raids over enemy territory and shipping in north Africa.

Lt. Jerome Simpson, 24, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and three Oak Leaf Clusters. A Spitfire pilot, he is credited with more than 200 hours of air combat over north Africa and occupied Europe. He is also credited with shooting down several planes.

Pvt. Leo Sindelman, 21, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in south Pacific.

Sgt. Irvin Singer, 26, Army Air Forces, of Reading, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in New Guinea.

Sgt. Saul Singer, 24, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement in air action during the invasion of Sicily.

Lt. William Singer, 25, Army Air Forces, of St. Louis, Mo. Silver Star. He was bombardier aboard the first plane which blasted the enemy in an attack at Rabaul Harbor blowing up two warships.

Lt. Jack I. Singer, 24, Army Air Forces, of Stamford, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Southwest Pacific.

Pvt. Raymond Sinowitz, 27, of Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Sidney Slotoroff, 28, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement when carrying troops in his plane from England to north Africa during the invasion on November 7 and 8, 1942.

Sgt. George Joseph Smith, 24, Army Air Forces, of Lynbrook, N. Y. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. For extraordinary heroism during bombing missions over New Guinea. He was recently reported killed in action.

Maj. Herman Smith, 33, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Jayson Marshall Smith, 26, Army Air Forces, of Atlanta, Ga. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement in aerial flight over Europe as pilot of a Thunderbolt.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Stanley N. Smith, 25, of Forest Hills, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Maurice Smithberg, 22, Air Forces, of Savannah, Ga. Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters. For exceptional achievement in aerial flight during numerous raids in north Africa. In one aerial battle he accounted for two German planes.

Sgt. Louis Smulowitz, 30, Army Air Forces, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the European area.

Lt. Robert Nathan Snider, Army Air Forces, of El Paso, Tex. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Virgin Islands area.

Lt. Emanuel Snitkin, 24, Army Air Forces, of Newark, N. J. Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters. For outstanding heroism in air action against Japanese forces and installations in the New Guinea area.

Pvt. Robert H. Snyder, 20, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Guadalcanal.

Lt. Sidney A. Snyder, 30, of Norfolk, Va. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Solomon Islands.

Aviation Radioman Alvin A. Sobel, 23, United States Navy, of Paterson, N. J. Distinguished Flying Cross. For participating in the bombing and strafing of the fleeing enemy force during the Battle of Midway.

Lt. Abraham Soffer, 25, Army Air Forces, of Branford, Conn. Air Medal. Meritorious achievement in aerial flight during raids on enemy positions in New Guinea.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Herbert D. Solomon, 32, United States Naval Reserve, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Letter of commendation. Having completed a successful landing operation in enemy-occupied territory in the Solomons, he defended his ship against an enemy attack by two planes, personally accounting for one of the enemy planes and scoring the other as a probable. He then took part in rescuing several hundred survivors of a torpedoed destroyer in the same vicinity.

Lt. Max Solomon, 22, Army Air Forces, of Turners Falls, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Dutch Guinea.

Pvt. Daniel Soloway, 20, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Jay Jerome Sosenko, of Camden, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Africa.

Pvt. Bernard Speck, 20, of Youngstown, Ohio. Purple Heart. For heroism during the fighting in north Africa, where he was wounded.

Lt. Martin Spector, 26, Army Medical Corps, of Philadelphia, Pa. Citation for bravery in action. During heavy fighting in the New Guinea area he remained in the line of enemy fire and continued to treat the wounded.

Boatswain's Mate Edwin Speery, United States Naval Reserve, of Stephentown, N. Y. Navy Cross. As a member of a demolition party during the north African fighting he was largely instrumental in the accomplishment of the party's task, that of cutting a passage through a navigational obstruction at the mouth of the river.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Leo Stechenberg, 24, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Capt. Herbert Spiegel, 29, of McKeesport, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Battle of Mateur.

Corp. Stanley J. Spierer, 19, United States Marine Corps, of the Bronx, N. Y. Silver Star and Purple Heart. For outstanding and courageous action during the fighting at Guadalcanal, where he was wounded by a mortar shell during the taking of a Japanese machine-gun nest.

Sgt. Joseph Mordecai Spiro, 22, Army Air Forces, of Newark, N. J. Air Medal and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For outstanding heroism during bombing missions over occupied Europe. He was recently reported missing.

Seaman Samuel Stark, United States Navy, of Pennsauken, N. J. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the North Atlantic.

Pvt. Stanley Staum, 26, United States Marine Corps, of San Francisco, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action off the Ellice Islands.

Lt. Carl Stein, 36, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Lt. Carl Stein, 30, of Everett, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Fred P. Stein, 25, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For meritorious achievement during bombing and combat missions over enemy territory in Burma.

Sgt. Eugene Herman Stein, 23, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For courage and heroism during bombing missions over enemy territory in Europe and for shooting down a German plane. He was recently reported missing in action.

Corp. Herman Stein, 21, of Woodbine, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. Jesse J. Stein, 21, United States Marine Corps, of Bayonne, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Seymour H. Stein, 25, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For bravery and skill in landing paratroops during the invasion of Sicily.

Sgt. Hyman Steiner, 22, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Egypt.

Col. Benjamin Stern, 43, of Lincoln, Nebr. Legion of Merit award. For the performance of outstanding services to the Signal Corps during the north African campaign.

Ensign Charles M. Stern, Jr., United States Navy, of Albany, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Hawaii.

Sgt. Philip Stern, 24, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Francis H. Sternberg, 30, of Richmond Hill, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Tunisia, where he fought as a member of a tank crew.

Lt. Donald Michael Sternglanz, 24, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action over France.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Sternlicht, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Lawrence R. Stickler, 28, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Middle East.

David Stockton, merchant seaman, Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Storekeeper David H. Straus, United States Naval Reserve, of Houston, Tex. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Yeoman Martin S. Strause, 19, United States Navy, of Easton, Pa. Navy Cross, citation, and Purple Heart. During a sudden attack by low-flying Japanese fighters and bombers, he was wounded. He was taken to sick bay, but he insisted on returning to his gun post and helped to rout the enemy.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Henry Strausman, 23, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Martin M. Strauss, 20, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For participated activity in 24 bombing raids over occupied Europe. He was reported missing after the Bremen raid on April 17, 1943.

Pvt. Morris Strauss, 26, of Buffalo, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Battle of Gafsa.

Pvt. Nathan Strauss, 20, of St. Louis, Mo. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Philippines.

Sgt. Herman Straussner, 25, Army Air Forces, of Forest Hills, N. Y. Air Medal. For heroism in aerial flight during the invasion of Sicily. He also earned a French decoration for helping to rescue three French generals lost for a week in the African desert during the north African campaign.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Abraham Strom, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Letter of commendation. Purple Heart. Oak Leaf Cluster. During a surprise attack, he saved the life of his commander and was wounded in action three times.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Abraham Strom, 24, Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Oak Leaf Cluster. Commendation. Wounded in action in Tunisia.

Corp. Kolman Stumacher, 21, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star and Air Medal. For participation in the successful bombardment of a Japanese island base and for bluffing the Japs when his gun jammed during one combat.

Capt. Alexander P. Suer, 27, of Peekskill, N. Y. Army citation. For gallantry in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Edward Sufka, 24, Army Air Forces, of Hillman, Minn. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement in air action.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jack Sugerman, 20, United States Marine Corps, of Media, Pa. Navy Cross. He saved the lives of 9 officers and killed 132 Japs in a battle in the Solomons.

Lt. Irving Joseph Superfine, 28, United States Navy, South Bend, Ind. Silver Star. As officer in charge of a salvage crew he boarded an abandoned vessel in an active combat area and despite enemy observation and attack managed to rescue the vessel's valuable cargo.

Sgt. Saul Suskind, 21, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. For outstanding heroism during bombing mission over occupied Europe. He was reported killed in action during a raid over Germany in January 1943.

Lt. Manford Susman, 28, Army Air Forces, of Houston, Tex. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For outstanding achievement in the face of danger in combat missions in the Middle East and for more than 250 hours of aerial combat.

Pvt. Joseph Susterowitz, 20, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Nathan Sutin, 28, Army Air Forces, of Albany, N. Y. Air Medal. For participation in more than 200 hours of antisubmarine patrol duty.

Sgt. Leon Svirsky, Army Air Forces, of New Haven, Conn. Air Medal. For meritorious achievement in aerial flight over occupied Europe.

Capt. Arnold D. Swartz, 27, United States Marine Corps, of Brockton, Mass. Silver Star. For outstanding heroism in action at Pearl Harbor, Midway, Tulagi, and Guadalcanal.

Lt. Gerald H. Swatzberg, 26, of Santa Barbara, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jacob Sylvetsky, 28, of Bridgeport, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Frank Symonds, 25, of Manchester, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Pincus P. Taback, 24, Army Air Forces, of Newark, N. J. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal and 9 Oak Leaf Clusters. For outstanding service and heroism on more than 50 combat missions in north Africa, during which he was credited with shooting down 2 German planes and several probables.

Pvt. Irving E. Taffel, 19, Paratrooper, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Sidney D. Tannenbaum, 22, Army Air Forces, of Milwaukee, Wis. Air Medal and three Oak Leaf Clusters. For heroism in air action during the Tunisian campaign and the Sicilian invasion.

Sgt. Ralph Tarad, 31, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action off the coast of Australia.

Corp. Alvin A. Tarant, 26, United States Marine Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomon Islands.

Maj. Archie Tax, 37, Army Medical Corps, of Menomonee Falls, Wis. Silver Star. When an ammunition vehicle was hit during the fighting in Tunisia he went over to it and, despite the explosions, evacuated and administered aid to the injured vehicle passengers.

Pvt. Steve Telent, 24, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Morris Tepper, 22, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action over France.

Randolph Thune, 22, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. David Timinsky, 25, of Passaic, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Hyman Tlumak, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Saul Tobias, 22, Army Air Forces, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Australia.

Fireman Harold G. Tobin, 22, United States Naval Reserve, of Erie, Colo. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Abraham Todras, 21, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters. For extraordinary heroism as gunner on a bomber during the Aleutian Islands fighting.

Lt. Harry M. Topolsky, 31, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Battle of Attu.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Edward E. Tornow, 28, of Lewiston, Idaho. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Battle of Kiska.

Seaman Seymour L. Treib, United States Coast Guard, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Commendation from Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs for courageous action resulting in the rescue of all survivors after his vessel had been damaged.

Lt. Bernard Turansky, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For meritorious achievement in aerial flight in the European theater, including the bombardment of Rome as a Flying Fortress bombardier.

Lt. Henry Turick, 30, Army Air Forces, of Detroit, Mich. Silver Star and Air Medal. For his work as a member of a fighter pilot group credited with shooting down 148 Jap planes in the New Guinea area.

Flight Officer Milton Tushman, 24, Army Air Forces, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Maurice Umans, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. For heroism and wounds received in action in Guadalcanal.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Max Umansky, 29, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Alfred M. Union, 35, Army Air Forces, of Coral Gables, Fla. Purple Heart. Killed in action over occupied Europe.

Lt. Barry Urdang, 28, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action over occupied Europe.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Max Uretsky, 24, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Benedict Veiner, 27, of Millis, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the southwest Pacific.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Murray Velcoff, 26, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Corp. Coleman Vicstein, 27, of Cleveland, Ohio. Silver Star and Purple Heart. For gallantry in action during the Oran invasion and wounds received in action in Tunisia.

Lt. Leonard H. Victor, 23, of Pueblo, Colo. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Max Joseph Victor, 23, Army Air Forces, of Madison, Wis. Air Medal for outstanding heroism during air action in the Aleutians.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jack Vogel, United States Marine Corps, of Kansas City, Mo. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Hawaii.

Corp. Joseph J. Volkel, 24, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Irving B. Warshauer, 23, Army Air Forces, of New Orleans, La. Purple Heart. Killed in action over Germany.

Lt. Harold Warshow, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Solomon Wasser, 21, Army Air Forces, of the Bronx, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Seaman Irving Weber, 33, of Dayton, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Ben L. Wechsler, 21, Paratrooper, Army Air Forces, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Lt. Lawrence A. Wechsler, 21, Army Air Forces, of New York, N. Y. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For exceptionally meritorious service on bombing missions over occupied Europe.

Pvt. John Henry Weil, 23, of Dorchester, Mass. Presidential citation. For heroism on Guadalcanal.

Corp. Aaron A. Weinberg, 25, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st. cl.) David Weinberg, 28, of Newark, N. J. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Corp. George K. Weinberg, 23, of Providence, R. I. Silver Star. For extraordinary heroism in the north Africa fighting where he went out of cover, rescued a wounded soldier, and carried him a mile under fire to an aid station.

Capt. Gordon Weinberg, 24, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Air Medal. For extraordinary heroism during the invasion of Java.

Pvt. Felix Weinberger, 24, of Willow Grove, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Pvt. Henry A. Weiner, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Died in a Jap prison camp.

Lt. Herbert Cofton Weiner, 25, Army Air Forces, of Lynn, Mass. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomon Islands.

Seaman Julius Weiner, 32, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Pacific.

Pvt. (1st. cl.) Max C. Weinfield, 31, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. For heroism and wounds received in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st. cl.) Murray Weinrib, 25, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Machinist's Mate Murray Weinrub, United States Navy, of Los Angeles, Calif. Silver Star. He was a crew member of the submarine which foiled the Jap's attempts to seize stores of gold and securities on Corregidor by loading and transporting the valuables to a waiting cruiser.

Seaman David Weinstein, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action at sea.

Sgt. Max Weinstein, 22, of Rochester, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) John L. Weisbeck, 25, of Hamilton, Mont. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph M. Weisberg, 29, of Roxbury, Mass. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Arthur Weiss, United States Marine Corps, of Carrollton, Ga. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on Guadalcanal.

Pvt. Sydney Jack Weiss, 26, of New Haven, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Elliot Weissbuch, 23, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Died in a Jap prison camp.

Sgt. Arthur Weitz, 22, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Distinguished Flying Cross, Silver Star and Air Medal. For extraordinary heroism during more than 50 missions in New Guinea.

Pvt. Julius Wertheim, 24, of New York, N. Y. Commendation from commanding officer. For rapid action which reduced the injuries sustained by an officer who had been accidentally splashed with flaming gasoline.

Pvt. Edwin F. Westendorf, 24, of Fairbank, Iowa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in New Guinea.

Lt. David K. Westheimer, 25, Army Air Forces, of Houston, Tex. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. He received his awards for gallantry and for having completed more than 100 hours of aerial combat.

Lt. Haskell Wexler, 24, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, and Oak Leaf Cluster. For extraordinary heroism during bombing missions over New Guinea.

Capt. Nathan H. Wexler, 35, Army Medical Corps, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Soldier's Medal. For saving the life of Lieutenant General Kenney, commander of the Allied forces in the Southeast Pacific area.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Wexler, 28, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Solomon Wexler, 29, of the Bronx, N. Y. Silver Star. For heroism in action in the north African fighting.

Lt. Abraham Wilensky, 27, Army Air Forces, of East Lyme, Conn. Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster. For heroism during numerous aerial missions in the South Pacific.

Pvt. Julius Willen, 25, of New York, N. Y. Silver Star. Despite constant enemy machine gun and mortar fire he managed to keep open the lines of communication.

Pvt. Myron M. Winograd, 27, United States Marine Corps, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Solomon Islands.

Sgt. Solomon I. Wise, 33, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Air Medal. For heroism during bombing mission over occupied Europe. Sgt. Wise was recently reported missing in action.

Pvt. Morton Wishna, 23, of Glendale, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Edward D. Wiskusky, 23, of Massillon, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Sgt. Martin Wisman, 34, Army Air Forces, of Kansas City, Mo. Air Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster, and Purple Heart. For heroism in air action over occupied Europe during which he was wounded.

Pvt. Joseph Wisotsky, 23, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. Killed in action in Sicily.

Corp. Eugene Wohl, 32, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Arthur Wolf, 26, of New Haven, Conn. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the Philippines.

Lt. Edwin J. Wolf, 20, Army Air Forces, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Killed in action in French Guiana.

Lt. Gilbert H. Wolf, 42, Army Medical Corps, of New York, N. Y. Purple Heart. For heroism in action during the north African fighting. Reported killed in action.

Pvt. John R. Wolf, 22, of Ladd, Ill. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Lt. Philip Wolf, 23, Army Air Forces, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Air Medal. For having taken part in more than 25 operational missions against the enemy.

Corp. Walter H. Wolff, 25, of Ringtown, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Morton E. Wolfson, 26, United States Navy, of Chicago, Ill. Silver Star. For extraordinary heroism as commanding officer of the armed guard aboard a merchant vessel, during 4 days of constant enemy attack.

Pvt. Victor Wolinsky, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Letter of commendation. For heroic action in Tunisia when he risked his life crawling within 100 yards of the firing line to administer blood plasma to a wounded soldier.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Wolkin, 28, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in the South Pacific.

Sgt. Paul A. Worstein, 21, Army Air Forces, of Findlay, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Lt. Saul Yabrow, 26, of Jamaica, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Capt. Charles H. Yellin, 30, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Wounded in action in the battle of Attu.

Pvt. Leonard York, Coast Artillery, Columbus, Ohio. Purple Heart. For heroism at Pearl Harbor where he was wounded after downing two Jap planes with machine-gun fire.

Lt. Simon P. Yotive, 28, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action on the New Georgia Islands.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Reuben Youdkowitz, 29, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the Battle of Attu.

Fireman Allan Ytkin, 19, United States Navy, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action on Guadalcanal.

Sgt. Eddie Zaban, 28, Army Air Forces, of Chicago, Ill. Purple Heart. Killed in action over France.

Lt. Irwin Zaetz, 26, Army Air Forces, of Burlington, Vt. Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal. For successfully completing a number of operational flights in the China, Burma, and India theater under hazardous conditions.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph Zach, 28, of Philadelphia, Pa. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Joseph H. Zafron, 34, of Salamanca, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in north Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Samuel Zaremsky, 32, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Wounded in action in Sicily.

Sgt. Alexander Zaretsky, 21, Army Air Forces, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Distinguished Flying Cross, Silver Star, Air Medal, Commendation from President Roosevelt. Radio operator and gunner on a bomber. He is credited with more than 580 hours of aerial combat.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Edward Zatz, 25, Medical Corps, of Chicago, Ill. Silver Star and Oak Leaf Clusters. During the heavy fighting at Guadalcanal he rushed into enemy fire lanes and rescued several wounded Americans.

Lt. Al. Zeidenfeld, 25, of Denver, Colo. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the European area.

Maj. Samuel Zemmurray, 31, Army Air Forces, of New Orleans, La. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Pvt. Morris Zeritsky, 31, of Baltimore, Md. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Corp. Philip Ziff, 21, United States Marine Corps, of Chicago, Ill. Presidential citation. For heroism in the south Pacific.

Seaman Joseph Zilbert, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Purple Heart. Wounded in action at sea.

Corp. Abraham D. Zimmerman, 33, of East Hartford, Conn. Purple Heart. Killed in the Philippines.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Milton A. Zimmerman, 28, United States Navy, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Silver Star. During the Solomon Islands fighting he remained at his gun post and brought down seven Jap planes despite the fact that his ship was on fire.

Maj. Albert Zipser, 24, Army Air Forces, of Milwaukee, Wis. Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, Eight Oak Leaf Clusters, and Purple Heart. He served as a fighter pilot with the Fighting Fifty-seventh in north Africa, which helped the British Eighth Army defeat Rommel's forces.

Lt. Charles S. Zucker, Army Air Forces, of Cleveland, Ohio. Purple Heart. Killed in action in north Africa.

Lt. Arthur M. Zuckerman, 25, Army Air Forces, of Los Angeles, Calif. Purple Heart. Killed in action in the South Pacific.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to express my personal gratitude and I am sure in doing so I express the gratitude of all people of Jewish extraction in America for the splendid statement and able presentation made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Let me tell him, also, that there are at least 300,000 or more Jews in the armed services today and many more ready to go. I am sure they consider it an honor to fight for America.

In discussing a certain bill yesterday under consideration on the floor we were informed of numbers of Americans who had left the country for the purpose of dodging war service for their country. Not one of them was Jewish.

Mr. CURLEY. I am pleased to know that. We hold hatred against people only when we are not on the friendliest of terms. Being on friendly terms with the Jews we cannot hate them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We do not ask for favoritism above other Americans; all we ask for is a square deal.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY] has been in public life for many years. I say this in no flattering sense but in the complimentary sense of one who has always admired him, considering him one of the outstanding authorities in the United States in the political science of our Nation and in understanding public problems and in being a constructive leader. As a young man I can remember him in public life. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY] has always been a leader in progressive thought and action. Above all, he has exemplified and inspired others to follow the noblest traditions for which our country stands, first and foremost being tolerance on the part of all for the other; he is a man who has always vigorously condemned intolerance and bigotry in any form.

Mr. CURLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EASTERN EUROPEAN POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and that they may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss for a few moments the critical shortage of paper and paper products that faces the Nation and to point out the absolute need of cooperation on the part of all to avert a developing crisis that will affect both the war and the home fronts.

As we Members of Congress gather in peaceful assembly to discuss and meditate our Nation's problems we are far removed from that flaming perimeter that constitutes the world's far-flung battle fronts. In perfect safety we wend our way, and it is only when we gather in the evening in our homes that we notice there are vacant chairs and missing faces, faces of those who are now serving our country in its armed forces.

Those men and women now in uniform are the ones to whom we owe our safety. They are the ones who hold the battle lines in the steaming jungles of the Solomons, the muddy fox holes of Italy, or upon the icy slopes of Attu. They are doing a 100-percent job, and many of them have given the full measure of devotion to duty, and above their last resting place rises a simple cross marked "Here lies a soldier."

As we cast about in America we see the skies above our cities each night reddened with the reflected glow of mighty blast furnaces. We hear the mighty roar of American machines and American industry as in a miraculous and seemingly

endless stream, they pour forth supplies for our allied armies. We see giant locomotives as they thunder through the night, their headlights pointing like rapiers toward the great ships in our ports which carry the guns, the tanks, the planes, and thousands of other articles used by our soldiers.

Our armies are winning, and we accept it with smug complacency. But let us take stock of ourselves and see if we are cooperating in this mighty war effort as completely as the buddies who are missing from our midst.

The war on the battle fronts is going well. The war on waste on the home front is losing ground. We state that there is no sacrifice too great for us to make for our soldiers. Let us prove it in a way other than through lip service.

We willingly supply the money through War bond purchases to finance the war effort and feel that in so doing we are meeting every vital need. It is true that we have met financial needs, but money cannot purchase materials that do not exist.

Do you know that the most critical war shortage in America today is a material which we thoughtlessly destroy? Do you know that the newspaper that you carelessly cast aside may be the medium of preserving or saving the life of your son or the son of your neighbor? When you glance at a pile of waste paper do you know its value? When you accumulate an amount equal to 100 pounds do you realize that the waste paper contained therein would make 20 protective bands for 250-pound bombs, or that it would protect seventeen 500-pound bombs or eleven 1,000-pound bombs, or that it would make 50 casings for 75-millimeter shells or 100 casing for average shells? Do you realize that it would provide material for 1,100 cartons, each containing fifteen 50-caliber bullets, or 2,100 cartons, each containing five 45-caliber bullets? That it would provide a protective covering for 200 containers for blood plasma, one of which might save the life of your own son, or 200 containers for soldiers' field rations? Do you know that 100 pounds of waste paper would provide 1,410 boxes for emergency lifeboat supplies which will be called upon to sustain the lives of American soldiers and sailors adrift at sea, or 650 cartons containing Army K rations, which your or your neighbor's sons may have to depend upon for food while they crouch in a fox hole? That it will produce 2,900 cartons, each containing 10 cartridges, which are used for inflating life rafts, or cartons to carry enough yellow-fever vaccine to inoculate 120,000 men?

Do you know that on each flight of American heavy bombers over Berlin our planes carry, in addition to 12,000 American boys, 3,000 tons of bombs, and that each bomb requires protective paper bands? They also carry 19,000,000 rounds of ammunition, each clip of which was shipped in a paper box; also 120,000 rounds of cannon ammunition, each round of which was transported in a paper container, and that all these containers were made from waste paper?

Do you know that each 155 millimeter shell charge requires three-fifths of a pound of waste paper; each 75 millimeter shell container, 1 9/10 pounds; each 500-pound bomb requires 12 pounds of waste paper for rings, tops, and bores; and that each container for blood plasma that is sent to our fighting men requires one-half pound?

Do you know that 7,000 sheets of blueprint paper are required for the plans of a heavy bomber, and that 175 tons are required for the blueprints of a modern battleship?

Do you know that it is estimated that during each month of this year 540,000 tons of paper and paperboard, representing nearly 40 percent of total production, will be used by the Government and war plants, and that another 33 percent will be used by industries and services that are allied with the war effort, and that only 27 percent, or about 375,000 tons, will remain for our civilian economy?

Do you know that the war needs in this country for paper and paper products are approximately 20,000,000 tons annually, and that even before the war it was necessary to make imports of this material? Do you know that of our present 20,000,000 ton need, 8,000,000 are not recoverable because of its use in public records, building construction, and overseas shipment? Do you know that of the 12,000,000 tons that can be salvaged, only 6,000,000 tons are being saved, and herein lies the problem, the solving of which is a job that calls for the assistance, not only of manpower in operating the great pulp mills and paper-processing plants; it is a job that calls for united womanpower, girlpower, and boypower. Although we are faced with this critical shortage, we are salvaging only 6,000,000 tons annually. To avert a crisis we must increase this amount to 8,000,000 tons.

The production of pulpwood, our chief source of paper supply, has fallen off at an alarming rate because of its loss of manpower. We find, upon investigation, that we are producing 3,500,000 cords less annually than we did in normal times. This shortage must be made up.

When we face realities we realize that the civilian front will be the first to suffer when a shortage develops, for we must meet our war needs. We at home want the continued publication of newspapers and magazines. We want an adequate supply of the paper products necessary to protect our health and meet the Nation's sanitary requirements. We want to continue to print good books and informative material that the home front may be kept informed. Most of these things can be done if we all join hands in a coordinated effort to save 2,000,000 additional tons of waste paper each year which is now being carelessly destroyed.

Should we fail to meet the need for civilian requirements we may also fail to meet the needs of our war requirements. That boy of yours who now crouches in a fox hole on the battle-front needs your help. You would not willingly deprive him of ammunition or food or any of the 2,800 items which are shipped abroad for his protection and comfort, yet, through negligence, we can deprive him of the containers these things are shipped in. We would not take from his side the ammunition with which he defends himself and our Nation from our enemies, yet we can, through thoughtlessness, deprive him of the box in which it is shipped. America has never faced a problem that it could not solve and it will not fail in its solution of this one.

The Victory waste-paper campaign being conducted by the Salvage Division of the War Production Board in cooperation with America's newspapers, mills, and waste-paper dealers, has made some progress, but much more waste paper is needed at once if we are to produce enough new paper to supply our armed forces and our home-front war economy.

Our soldier's problem is to carry the battle—ours is to back him up. His efforts are dedicated to action in our interest. Let us dedicate our efforts to salvage in his behalf. Let every man, woman, and child in this Nation assume their portion of this responsibility. Let us realize that the lives, the health, and the welfare of our men abroad and our people at home depends upon our actions.

Let us realize that not alone in the mighty roar of our factories will this battle be won. We can help win it in the quiet and peaceful atmosphere of the American homes. Let us help by saving every scrap of paper and place it in the hands of those smiling youngsters and other collectors who are so patriotically doing their bit.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the Congress a resolution memorializing the Governors to cooperate, by enacting legislation similar to that now pending in New Jersey, thus placing into effect in their respective States, a waste-paper conservation program. I am confident that America will rise to this occasion as we have to others. We have patriotically responded to bond issues and in every drive we have gone over the top. We have met the requirements of the Red Cross and have assisted that great mother of humanity to spread her wings of mercy over a suffering world. We have given of our sweat and our dollars to preserve our liberty and with tears we have watched the marching away of our sons. Let us, therefore, pledge that we who remain at home will back them up. Let us each carry a bundle in this march toward victory. Bundles of waste paper, bundles for brothers, the brother whose rifle protects our home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and the day before the House resounded to loud cries by two or three Members on the Democratic side that some Members on the minority side were wasting their time in talking about a certain individual and demanded that we should all be here and attend to the Nation's business. I notice today that over on the Democratic side of the House not a single Member is in his seat, although in front of me sits the gentleman

from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is very faithfully attending to the duties and the business of the Nation.

A goodly number of Republicans are present. I notice two Members on the Democratic side have just come in. Now comes a third.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I was called to the telephone and I just came from there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder where these gentlemen are who wanted to attend to the Nation's business, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who was here yesterday and who thought we were wasting our time, but who is not here today.

With reference to the recess, it was my judgment that we could get along without taking a 10-day recess; that if the House remained in session, if we adjourned 3 days at a time, we would be on hand if anything came up that needed our attention. For that reason I talked with some of the Members who I thought could be induced to follow that course, but apparently my efforts were unavailing. I am not disposed to attempt to impose my will on the majority so as to hinder those who have other business perhaps more important than the business of staying here. The folks at home realize, although they protest against adjournments or recesses, that much of our business must be transacted in the districts. So far as I am concerned, whenever the people call me home, or whenever I think it is necessary to go home and learn what they want me to do, I go, whether the House is in session or not, because I can always come back in a very short time.

Sometimes we transact business a little too rapidly. Last week the House put through a joint resolution to adjourn today. Had the Senate agreed, as was expected, and Congress taken that proposed recess and the President returned to Congress tomorrow the so-called soldier-vote bill without his approval it would not have become law and then he could have charged that we went home for a vacation—failed to enact legislation to enable the men and women in the service to vote. That would have been a nice kettle of fish, would it not? Sometimes it pays to take a little time to consider just what we are doing My objection to the recess resolution today may cause a little thought along that line.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] yesterday protested very vigorously because I was talking about certain charges that had been made against the Congress.

One of the fine things about our Government is that while there are 435 Members of this House, every individual Member has an unlimited right to express his opinion, and if I offended the gentleman from Ohio, if I followed a course which did not meet with his approval or judgment, I can only say that I am sorry. It just seemed to me then and it does today, that when a Member is accused of wasting the time of Congress when he is replying to charges made against the integrity of the Congress, the loyalty and the patriotism of Members of Congress, that charge is absurd. He is in fact doing a service to every Member of Congress.

I note in the RECORD that the gentleman from Ohio thought we should disregard any charges that there were saboteurs in Congress, but unless memory fails me, I recall that when the C. I. O. was after the gentleman from Ohio, when they published cartoons that he thought were offensive, he did not hesitate to complain to other Members of the House and ask them what should be done to counteract those charges.

If there is anything that is more important in this country, outside of the war and the war effort, than maintaining the integrity of the House and renewing the confidence of the people in their elected representatives, then I know not what it is.

My only purpose in speaking on this one subject several times during the last few weeks has been to demand of those who are charged with the duty that they investigate the charges which have been made against the Congress as a whole and against individual Members of Congress, where individual Members of Congress have been charged with a crime, and spread on the RECORD for the public, for our constituents, the truth so that from a reading of the RECORD the people may learn whether or not those charges are true or false. I know of no more important business before this House than the purging, if that be necessary, of individual Members of the House, if any there be, who have been guilty of some of the charges which have been made against them. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] said yesterday he did not believe any of those charges. He was quite positive that he was not a saboteur, and I was quite positive that I was not. I do not know of any man in this House who has said a disloyal word or who has performed a disloyal act, yet the House has failed, so far at least, to demand that investigation be made and the untruthfulness of those serious charges spread upon the RECORD.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I have not seen the RECORD, but my sense of the situation was this. If someone says something about you that is not true, or if someone says something about your colleagues, or the group, that is not so, is not the thing to do to ignore it? If something is not true it dies of its own weight. A lie drops of its own weight. If something is true, of course it should be told. But it seems to me when you reply to an asinine statement you dignify it. That is the way it looks to me. Why reply to something that is not so? I have learned that. There is not a man living that has not had things said about him that are not so. I have learned that if you reply to such a charge you give it weight, you dignify it. You merely allow that charge that you talk about to be advertised throughout the world, without paying for space.

Something was said about getting down to business. We have a flood in our district which is terrible.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just yielded for something along the line we were talking about. If the gentleman wants to talk about that flood disaster, he can get his own time.

Mr. RAMEY. I want to say something about the remarks that we should get down to business.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield for that.

Mr. RAMEY. I was giving the reason why I thought we should not discuss charges such as the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I get the gentleman's position. It is that if someone calls you names, disregard it. I agree with that to a certain extent. But when over the radio to millions of people, week after week, a great commercial concern, the Jergens Co., buying time of the Blue Network or whoever sells it to them, makes the charge that a branch of the Government is a "House of Reprehensibles," when the charge is made over the radio that Members of Congress are saboteurs, does the gentleman believe we should let those charges go uncontradicted?

Mr. RAMEY. Everybody knows different.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Apparently everyone does not know the charges are false, because I receive mail, usually post cards, unsigned, which contain statements that Members of Congress are Hitler's agents, and it is evident from the contents of the cards that those cards are inspired by radio talks of Jergens' agent Winchell. For instance, here comes a card that says, "What are the saboteurs doing in Congress? Why does not Congress clean its own house?" The gentleman from Ohio must remember that there are honest, God-fearing, patriotic loyal people out in the country who do not have time to read the daily papers. They turn on the radio and they hear these false charges. They are honest and truthful themselves and they just cannot believe such statements would be made if false—as they are false—they do not know that some people make a living by spreading false gossip. They never get the truth about this thing. People write in and say, "Why do you not sue them?" They do not realize that if you wish to sue some of these radio announcers, somebody, for instance, pretending to broadcast from New York, when as a matter of fact, he is down in Florida, or somewhere else; they do not realize that for making a false charge you would be forced to go where he can be found. I would have to go to New York to get the Blue Network or any of those who speak over it from New York and who resides there, unless I could catch him where I reside. If a man could step into a local court and sue some of these people we would end this thing. To aid in ending those irresponsible charges, I have introduced a bill making a radio company or one who puts out false reports over the air liable

in the United States District Court in the area where the broadcast is heard. There is nothing unfair about that.

USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR CAMPAIGN PURPOSES MUST END

The last few weeks there has been disclosed a most amazing and brazen attempt to strengthen the administration and win the next election through the use of Government funds and Government agencies.

Members have disclosed on the floor how farmers needing and seeking gasoline for farm operations have been told, either directly or indirectly, that if they wished their needs supplied, they should sign on the dotted line of the A. A. A.

Other farmers have been told that if they wished farm labor or their sons deferred, from active service, they, too, should sign on the dotted line.

Typical of some of this coercion, practiced not by an agency but by an individual employed by a Federal agency is that related in a letter which I quote:

LEONIDAS, MICH., *March 25, 1944.*

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Fourth District, Michigan,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Some time ago Mr. Leon Holmes, local agent for the triple A called on me to sign in favor of that organization. I had no intentions of signing and told him so. He then told me that if I didn't sign I would get no gas. I supposed that was the ruling, so signed. I cannot very well get along without gas. Since signing, I have learned that Holmes had no authority to tell me that if I didn't sign I would get no gas. I called on the triple A board in Centreville and asked them if they had authorized Holmes to tell farmers they would get no gas unless they signed in favor of the triple A and they told me they had not, also that Holmes had no right to do so.

This practice of coercion on the part of local agents is so universal that it makes one suspect that coercive measures have been advocated somewhere along the line. What, if anything, do you know about it?

I have witness that what I have written is a fact. Furthermore, if it comes to a showdown, I will face Holmes with the facts.

Thanking you in advance for any information on this subject you may be in a position to offer, I am,

Respectfully yours,

HERMAN JANES.

We have had before us and before the people of the country instances of how the British in England have propagandized the men in our fighting forces in an effort to induce them to support the President for a fourth term.

Now comes evidence, not that the Army and the Navy or the responsible officers of either but that one individual in uniform apparently attempted to influence those about to be inducted into the service against candidates who have opposed, who may oppose, the New Deal's domestic policies while doing their utmost in support of the war.

It is quite evident and it is only natural that at least some of the several hundred who were about to be inducted into the service of their Government, had opinions of their own on political issues. They are leaving their homes to fight for their country. When they enter the service they are required to accept without question the orders of their superiors, but the right of the superiors to give them orders is confined to military matters—no officer has the right to attempt to influence the political views of anyone under him. These young men are fighting not only for home and country, but for freedom from dictation on political issues.

Read the following letter from a young man who is the 4–H Club's supervisor for three of the counties in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan and then determine for yourself whether the war effort is promoted by such statements made to inductees.

CASSOPOLIS, MICH., *March 23, 1944.*

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I was very much disappointed with an incident that occurred during our preinduction physical examination in Chicago, Wednesday, March 22. While waiting to get our file papers, which we carried with us as we visited the various stations in the check-up, the man in Navy uniform, who called individual preinductees as their papers were ready, made remarks reflecting on your congressional integrity.

The Navy man, a first-class petty officer, I believe, addressed his audience (over 600 southwestern Michigan men when I was present) over a loudspeaking system and attempted to be humorous between calls through the use of sarcasm. Several of us felt that he went way out of bounds, however, when he uttered the following remarks:

(Speaking of Michigan to Michigan men): "You have an isolationist Representative up there . . . His name is . . . Let's see now, what's his name? . . . What is his name anyway?"

From someone in audience, "HOFFMAN."

Navy man again, "Oh, yeah, CLARE HOFFMAN. . . . He's some guy . . . Oh, I guess he may be good to his wife . . . In fact I guess he's almost ready to declare war on Hitler."

Remarks like the above, whether they reflect the attitude of the Navy Department or an individual in the Department should not be made at such an occasion.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD L. SPARKS.

In connection with the same incident, I have an affidavit and another letter, which reads as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
County of Berrien, ss:

Eugene Baker, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is a resident of the city of Niles, Berrien County, Mich.; that on March 22, 1944, he was sent by local draft board No. 3, of Berrien County, Mich., to Chicago, Ill., for preinduction physical examination; that while this deponent was in the room with several hundred other registrants from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan awaiting physical examination, a man wearing the uniform of the United States Navy talked to these registrants over the loud speaker system; that during the course of this man's remarks, he inquired what the men thought of Willkie; that he also mentioned that the men present in the room were from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, where they had an isolationist Representative; that he then hesitated as though trying to think of the Representative's name, and then said, "Oh, yes, CLARE HOFFMAN." That the man in the uniform of the United States Navy continued with the remark that if things continued as they were going, he, HOFFMAN, would probably work himself up to a point where he would be willing to declare war on Hitler; that these statements so made by the man wearing the uniform of the United States Navy were interspersed between the calling of the names of persons to continue their physical examinations.

EUGENE BAKER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March A. D. 1944.

[SEAL] PHILIP A. HADSELL.
Notary Public, Berrien County, Mich.
My commission expires July 16, 1947.

JAMES W. BOOKWALTER,
Niles, Mich., March 26, 1944.

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: It was with much surprise that I heard several comments of a political nature when I was called to Chicago for preinduction physical examination on March 22. The men of Berrien County Selective Service Board No. 2 (Niles), some 400 of us, were waiting in a room for our physical examinations. The man at the microphone, a chief petty officer of the Navy, I believe, although I had no time to learn his name or rank, talked to us for several minutes while our papers were being prepared. While part of his comments were quite entertaining, the following extract was hardly in line with the policies of our armed forces:

"You men from Berrien County have an isolationist Congressman. What's his name? * * * That's right, CLARE HOFFMAN. [Pause.] Oh, I guess he may be good to his wife! * * * In fact, I understand he's almost ready to declare war on Hitler!"

While these comments may have been merely to pass time, they certainly should have had no place in a meeting of which the Army and Navy of the United States had charge.

I heard many criticisms of the incident from my comrades from Berrien County during the remainder of the trip and feel that you should be apprised of the situation.

Respectfully,

JAMES W. BOOKWALTER.

Upon being advised of this incident, I called it to the attention of the Secretary of the Navy by a privileged resolution and asked that he furnish me the name of the Navy officer who addressed inductees on that date.

I have since been advised over the phone by a representative of the Navy that the Department has received the following information:

Men from the southwestern portion of the State of Michigan were given their preinduction physical examination at Chicago on the 22d of March and no Michigan men have appeared at the induction station since that date except one or two hold-overs. As is the custom, these men were given a preliminary instructive talk on the routine in the station. This takes place in reception room No. 60 on the sixth floor of the Insurance Exchange Building. The orientation talk is in the matter of advice and is meant to ease the strain and apprehension of the selectee before he is given a physical examination.

This talk is given by a Navy petty officer under the supervision of an Army processing officer.

Upon investigation, neither the Navy petty officer nor the Army officer can recall any reference to any particular individual.

I was also told in the same conversation that it might be possible that those informing me referred to a different occasion and that as stated some remarks might have been made to the inductees who were waiting for their file papers. Further investigation was promised and I know the Navy will take the proper action to see to it that political activities are not carried on by recruiting officers

or those connected with the induction of men in the service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to discuss a problem along the lines suggested by the gentleman from Michigan. I know that the gentleman did not mean to impugn any Member of Congress or criticize their absence here today while he was speaking when he said that there was work to be done, intimating it should be here on the floor. Unfortunately, probably, for many Members of Congress, when the gentleman is making one of his numerous speeches on the floor of the House we would like to be here to answer, but we have other matters to attend to, and the gentleman knows that the bulk of the work of Congress is not on the floor of the House, but in the committees and in our respective offices, in meeting with our constituents at departments, and such things of this nature. I hope the impression does not go abroad that he was criticizing the Members of Congress for not being here while he is speaking under special order. To many of us other things have priority.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to agree with the gentleman. I want to say to you I think nine-tenths of our work is off the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD and in fairness to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules of the House, Mr. SABATH, to whom the previous speaker referred as not being on the floor, I want to note I see him at the present time in very serious discussion with the parliamentarian about the business of the House. I think the RECORD ought to show that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is always on the job.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I know he is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. His constituents in Illinois have known that for 36 long years. That is why he is the dean of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Michigan had this recent colloquy. Like the Member from Ohio I think perhaps sometimes we dignify these things too much.

Mr. Speaker, the past few days has seen evolved from the floor of the House, in the press, and on the radio a very bitter controversy between a national well-known radio commentator and some Members of the House. I do not wish to be drawn into that controversy as to the issues involved. I cannot agree with some of my distinguished colleagues regarding some of the charges made. Many of them, the charges, have been very personal and some, in my opinion, have been relatively unimportant, compared to the great national issues and surely this House has more vital matters to occupy their time, particularly when part of the controversy descends to questioning the motives of personal friendships or with whom he eats his meals and that should work both ways.

However, one charge has been made that should not go unchallenged insofar as the RECORD is concerned. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a permanent indelible history of our Nation. It should be treated as such by all of us. We should be careful that facts placed therein are correct. Again, this caution should be exercised discreetly and above all, fairly upon any attack upon a man's patriotism in time of war. Regardless of what any of us may think of an individual personally, that individual's family is entitled to have the RECORD clear—it is a permanent RECORD—one that a man's family can read to posterity. It is a serious matter to so charge or impugn a man's patriotism, and that should apply to citizens in their statements about Members of Congress as well—unless the facts are clear.

The gentleman from Michigan stated last week in the RECORD of March 22, 1944, at page 2908, as follows:

> While Winchell was wearing the uniform of the United States Navy, his conduct became so offensive to so many Americans that the administration was forced to strip him of his uniform, of his pay, of his duties; but to the disgrace of the Navy be it said, it retained him as a Reserve officer.

Naval Affairs Committee had this matter up informally some weeks ago. I believe the gentleman from Michigan was one of those who suggested that we look into the matter. I thought at that time the matter of Mr. Winchell's naval record—and his naval record alone—was made clear.

Apparently it was not, in view of the above statement. In fairness to the commentator and more specifically his family, let me again make the record clear—the other controversy can go on indefinitely and the Nation will form their own opinion about that.

The record is:

The gentleman involved was not stripped of any uniform. It is a typical record of the average Naval Reserve officer of his age. His present status is the same as the status of many of us in the Reserve—including myself and other Members of Congress who have been put on inactive duty. We still have the rights of the Naval Reserve. We are still subject to call at any time the military or the Commander in Chief feels our usefulness in the service would be greater than what we are doing in civilian life.

But let us not confuse the civilian life of any Reserve with his strict military record. That gives rise to interpretations not always fair or just. It surely has no place in the midst of our desperate struggle.

However, that record is this: July 22, 1918, Mr. Winchell enrolled as an apprentice seaman, in the United States Naval Reserve Force, at New York City, N. Y. August 1, 1918, his rating was changed from landsman to yeoman.

On September 9, 1918, he was ordered to active duty by the Commandant, Third Naval District, in the office of the commander, Cruiser Force, Squadron 2.

December 5, 1918, after the Armistice, he was released from active duty. His proficiency marks were 4.0 in proficiency; 4.0 in sobriety, and 4.0 in obedience.

I might say for the information of the Members that 4 is the highest record a man can get in the Navy.

On July 1, 1921, he was placed on inactive duty and his rating changed from landsman for yeoman to apprentice seaman.

On September 30, 1921, he was discharged from the Naval Reserve Force in accordance with the Navy's general letter of September 29, 1921, explaining that owing to drastic cuts in Naval Reserve appropriations it was necessary to reduce the Naval Reserve Force.

Several members of the Reserves were cut off at that time.

On March 23, 1934, he submitted his application for commission in the Naval Reserve as a lieutenant or lieutenant commander, class I–V (S), via Commandant, Third Naval District.

On May 24, 1934, he was examined at headquarters, Third Naval District, and found to be physically qualified to perform active duty at sea or on foreign service in the rank for which he was a candidate for appointment.

On August 8, 1934, the Commandant of the Third Naval District sent a letter to Mr. Winchell advising that no action can be taken on his application for commission as no vacancies now exist in that district.

On August 24, 1934, the Commandant of the Third District, first endorsement to Bureau of Navigation forwarding application of Winchell in compliance with telephone conversation between the Office of Naval Intelligence and the district intelligence office.

August 28, 1934, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery sent a second endorsement to the Bureau of Navigation approving the action of the board of medical examiners in that Winchell be found physically qualified for appointment to the rank he applied for.

On September 6, 1934, a third endorsement was sent and he was assigned to the quota of the Office of Naval Intelligence.

On September 12, 1934, he was appointed lieutenant in the Reserve to rank from September 10, 1934. His commission was dated September 11, 1934.

On September 24, 1934, he accepted appointment as lieutenant.

He was then issued the usual Naval Reserve courtesy card, and so on.

On December 26, 1940, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, in a letter to Winchell via commandant of the third district, expressed appreciation of assistance rendered in disseminating constructive news concerning the Navy.

On February 7, 1940, Commander H. R. Thurber, in a memorandum to Admiral

Nimitz expressed appreciation of dissemination of news concerning naval activities.

On December 18, 1940, he was appointed lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, Intelligence Volunteer Service.

On June 24, 1941, director of public relations, Third Naval District, in a memorandum to Winchell quoting Bureau of Navigation dispatch No. 132209 of June 13, 1941, in which Naval Reserve officers in an inactive status were requested to submit requests for deferment of active duty if they so desired.

On June 27, 1941, the Bureau has a letter from Winchell via commandant, Third Naval District, requesting deferred status as he believes he can best serve the interests of the Navy by remaining in an inactive status.

On July 18, 1941, there is a letter to the Bureau of Navigation from the commandant of district No. 3 requesting 2 weeks' training duty.

On July 18, there is a further letter to the commandant authorizing the commandant to order Winchell to training duty with pay and allowances at the public-relations office, Third Naval District.

On July 22, 1941, Winchell reported for active duty.

On August 1, 1941, he reported to the commandant again for further training duty and was again assigned to district office of public relations.

On August 15, 1941, his training duties were completed and he was returned to inactive duty.

I might say again for the benefit of the Members of the House that we all did that during peacetime. We asked for 2 weeks' active duty when we could.

On August 23, 1941, the Deferment Board said, "You will not be ordered to active duty until your services are urgently needed."

This was apparently done upon his own request asking for active duty. This record shows he was trying to get into the Navy at all times if needed.

On February 13, 1942, the Chief of Naval Operations recommended that the classification of Lieutenant Commander Winchell be changed from "Intelligence, Volunteer, Special" to "Deck, Volunteer, Special" because of the transfer of the Office of Public Relations from the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations to the Office of the Secretary.

On March 17, 1942, he was ordered to active duty under the commandant, Third Naval District, with confidential orders.

On April 1, 1942, his classification was changed again.

On November 20, 1942, an order of transportation to further report to the commander of the South Atlantic Force. He was then physically qualified for that duty.

December 1, he reported to the commandant of the Seventh Naval District.

That is South America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On December 6, 1942, he arrived at Brazil, and reported to the commander, South Atlantic Force.

On January 13, 1943, the Navy Department stated his duty in the South Atlantic Force was completed. Reports are that he did a good job on that assignment.

And on February 17, 1943, he returned to inactive duty.

That is the Navy record, and I hope this puts an end to all this. He is in the same status as all other Reserve officers. Several Members of Congress, including myself, are on inactive duty, subject to the call of the Navy Department or the Commander in Chief at any time they feel we can best serve the interest of the country in military service rather than here in Congress or in a civilian status. I hope in this time of war a man's patriotism and his naval record, when it becomes a matter of record, will not be constantly thrown at him. This record is a black-and-white book and clear to all.

His family is entitled to this courtesy. He is on inactive duty. There are several thousand Reserve officers in the same status, and I know many of them. His record as a Naval Reserve officer is typical of all Naval Reserve officers of his age, including my own.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What you have read there I think has been available, or at least I was familiar with it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I presume it is. It is the Navy record. It is not my own.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think it has been before the Naval Affairs Committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will you tell me whether or not Winchell was not called over before the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee with Admiral Leahy and told it would be necessary for him to resign? Have you ever talked with the chairman?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I never have; no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I now suggest that you do that if you want to get the facts. Just remember this: I am not making any attack upon Winchell's patriotism. That is not the purpose at all. All I am asking is that his charges that there are saboteurs in Congress, for example, be investigated; not because there may be some such man here, for I have no such idea, but the record should show whether this man, who is a Reserve officer in the Navy, who says there are traitors in Congress, is telling the truth or not. The more important his position——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. I am saying the more important his position the greater the necessity for ascertaining the truth of his charges. Do you not think they ought to be investigated—his charges against Congress?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan I do not know what statement he has made. I do not want to be drawn into this controversy on that. I am giving the public and his family his clear naval record in hopes it will be enscrolled once and for all without all this innuendo and misstatement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but he said——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Now, just a minute. Let me answer your question. If this man or anyone else made a statement that there are saboteurs in Congress, that is just about as preposterous as some of the things I have heard the gentleman from Michigan say. I do not believe he meant it at all in the light you interpret it, if he did say it. What I mean is, we are picking on little things and making those things look big. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] that we have a war to fight. Let us quit fighting one another. We are all patriotic. We take some of these preposterous statements, take these little mole hills and make mountains out of them until the soldier boys are wondering what the devil they are fighting for, if we cannot behave and act intelligently at home, and in particular in this body.

I think if we get down to business here and forget about radio commentators and other things we will be well advised. Truth always stands on its own pedestal. If men tell lies about Congress or Congressmen, or if Congressmen tell lies about citizens, in time the lies catch up with both.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What does the gentleman believe these boys who are doing the fighting think when they hear the announcement or read the statement that there are saboteurs in Congress?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3912. An act to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 3912) to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended, with a Senate amendment and concur with the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment as follows:

Senate amendment: Lines 6 and 7, strike out "$285,000,000" and insert "$290,000,000: *And provided further*, That not exceeding $5,000,000 of this appropriation be used by the Commission of Public Roads in areas certified to the Federal Works Administrator by the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy or by their authorized representatives, as maneuver areas for such improvement and construction as may be necessary to keep the roads therein which have been or may be used for training of the armed forces, in suitable condition for such training purposes, and to repair the damage caused thereto by the operations of men and equipment in such training."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the Senate amendment increases the House bill by $5,000,000 and authorizes the $5,000,000 to be used in maneuver areas for the repair of roads. I have talked to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and other members of the delegation, and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]. As far as I am concerned the Senate amendment is in keeping with what a majority of the committee would have liked to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE SLUM CLEARANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the following resolution.

The Clerk read House Resolution 492, as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of 15 Members of the House of Representatives to be composed of 5 members of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia of the Appropriations Committee, 5 members of the District of Columbia Committee, and 5 members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to be appointed by the Speaker to take testimony, investigate and report to the House of Representatives within 60 days, as follows:

"A specific plan for slum clearance within the District of Columbia with the view of abolishing alley dwellings and substituting therefor more suitable, sanitary, and adequate dwellings; and for eliminating slum areas where in the judgment of the committee present dwellings are unfit for human occupancy, and constitute a menace to the health, morals, and well-being of the inhabitants.

"Said committee shall recommend such legislation as may be desirable or necessary to carry out the provisions of such plan, and shall recommend the methods of financing same, and what portion of the cost should be borne by the District and Federal Governments respectively; and to what extent and by what method it may be necessary to subsidize the rentals of such project to the end that their occupancy may be confined to the lower-income groups, whose present dwellings will be eliminated by such proposed slum clearance.

"Said committee shall also recommend such legislation as may be necessary to prevent hardships that would arise by reason of the provisions of Public Law 307 of the Seventy-third Congress, making it unlawful to occupy any alley dwelling in the District of Columbia after July 1, 1944.

"The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act within the District of Columbia whether the House is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to acquire by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpena shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by him. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this resolution."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I merely wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether in the hearings on this resolution anything was said as to the means of financing this investigation and approximately how much was it estimated would be spent.

Mr. SABATH. No; because we are of the opinion that the costs will be very limited. It is expected that this committee will report within a short space of time. We know also that the different committees from whose membership the members of this committee will be chosen already have a great deal of information on this subject. I do not believe it will cost $5,000.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman that it will probably not cost a lot of money, but I think the House ought to know where these funds are coming from and what provisions have been made to get them.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Nebraska will be one of the members of this committee. This being so, I know the interests of the House and the taxpayers will be protected.

Mr. STEFAN. Expenses will be involved in the preliminary investigation, in all probability. What arrangements have been made for these preliminary funds?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand this proposal it simply brings together in one committee five members each of three standing committees of the House who deal with this subject matter within the District of Columbia, which committees already have a wealth of information affecting the subject matter. The Committee on Rules was told that the need is urgent because of critical alley conditions here.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. We all know, of course, that funds are going to be needed for the preliminary investigation.

Mr. MICHENER. I can answer that.

Mr. STEPHAN. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. MICHENER. Any investigating committee spending money must go before the Committee on Accounts and make application for it. The Committee on Accounts reports a resolution to the House providing funds for the select committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Did the gentleman get any information at all as to how much money was going to be used in this investigation?

Mr. MICHENER. Personally, I did not.

Mr. STEFAN. The chairman indicated that $5,000 might be spent. Was that sum mentioned at any time?

Mr. MICHENER. It was not in my presence. I am frank to say that knowing so distinguished and careful an economist in District of Columbia matters as the gentleman from Nebraska was going to be a member of this committee gave me absolute faith and confidence to know that not a single penny would be spent for this purpose unless it was in the interests of the District of Columbia and the people at large. I have that faith in the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I appreciate very much the compliment paid me by the gentleman from Michigan. Coming from such a distinguished statesman I feel doubly complimented.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to the chairman of the committee. I am very glad that members of the District Legislative Committee have been put on this investigating committee, also members from the Committee on the Public Lands and from the Committee on Appropriations. I notice in the original draft of the resolution there are three members from each committee, which has now been increased to five.

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. There is one item in this resolution which is important, and I desire to make reference to it. That is the information that the chairman gave us about this slum-clearance proposition. There is also the eviction program, evicting these people from their homes on July 1 of this year. A resolution should be offered in this House advancing that date in order to give any committee that may be organized a chance to have a real study of this problem made and not create any hardship on these people who are living in these slums. I believe in slum clearance. I believe it is necessary and important, and I address myself to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. A resolution should be passed by this House extending that date, July 1, 1944, because I do not believe you are going to have time to take care of this proposed program before July 1, 1944.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In drafting the resolution I specifically provide that this select committee may recommend to the House such changes in that law as it deems necessary as the investigation progresses. I would regret to see a resolution passed merely extending the date of evicting these alley dwellers.

Mr. STEFAN. That is, giving the committee time to act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We have been fiddling around here about cleaning up these slums under the shadow of the Capitol for years, years, and years. When we passed the Slum Clearance Act we put a proviso in there that no alley dwellings should be occupied after the 1st of July this year, assuming by that time that the whole business would be cleared up. Now we have not done that.

Mr. STEFAN. You are passing a resolution here indicating that this proposed committee can solve the whole

alley dwelling program within 30 to 60 days. It cannot be done in that length of time. If you extend this resolution and give the committee time to study, without creating a hardship on these people who are living in these dwellings, I think it will result in some relief.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That committee can recommend whatever they think about it and the House, having confidence in the members of that committee, I am sure will do what that committee recommends. I would regret very much to see that the only result of this resolution would be to postpone the time of evicting the alley dwellers, then forget about it and not do anything about it.

Mr. STEFAN. How many days have you given them to report?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Sixty days.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been thoroughly explained by the gentleman from Michigan, as well as the gentleman from Nebraska and the proponent of the resolution. The aims of this resolution have been thoroughly gone into. In the Rules Committee we heard the statement of the gentleman from Virginia and that committee came to the conclusion that it should have immediate consideration. Replying to the gentleman from Nebraska with reference to the point he made about increasing the membership from three to five, I may say that the Speaker viewed with alarm the fact that there would be two Democrats to one Republican on that committee and he thought, in fairness, that the membership should be increased to five, so that there will be three to two instead of two to one in fairness to the minority, and I may say the proponent of this resolution has agreed to that.

Mr. STEFAN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, that in the Subcommittee on Appropriations having to do with the District of Columbia we never mention politics. We know that the distinguished majority leader, the Acting Speaker here today, has always been fair.

Mr. SABATH. He has demonstrated that again today.

Mr. STEFAN. I have heard in the District of Columbia that there is no man in the House of Representatives who is better inclined toward the taxpayers of the District of Columbia than is the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. McCORMACK]. Today, with a lot of important work before the House, the distinguished Acting Speaker has carried out his promise that he made to the people of the District of Columbia that when there are any District bills ready to come up for consideration, they may be brought up without delay indicating to the people of the District of Columbia the great friendship of the Acting Speaker for them.

Mr. SABATH. The Acting Speaker will not, I am sure, ask that the words of the gentleman from Nebraska be stricken from the record.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about more Republicans. I do not know very much about the party policy over here, but, speaking for one Republican, I am sure that I am agreeable to letting the Democrats clean up this whole mess.

Mr. SABATH. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, who has reconsidered leaving us and has decided to stay and will act in his present capacity that he has fulfilled so splendidly during the last 4 years.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the chairman of the Rules Committee for the dispatch which he and the members of that group have exercised in bringing this worth-while resolution to the House this afternoon. I also wish to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], for sponsoring such a proposal. In the past we have had efforts directed toward slum clearance in the District of Columbia. Some efforts have been more successful than others. On many occasions there has been a difference of opinion and a certain overlapping which has of necessity slowed the program. I am certain that the coordination of effort of all Members from the three House committees sitting on this select committee will bring about a plan which the Congress can look forward to with hope as a possible solution to a very vexing problem.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. May I observe that in my limited law practice I learned very early that I might lose my case if I talked too much. I have not anything further to say.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman. May I ask if the gentleman has conferred with the gentleman from Missouri as to what funds will be provided for this?

Mr. SABATH. I think the gentleman from Virginia will have enough influence with the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, to obtain the few dollars that will be required.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman explain the resolution and its purposes?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the resolution has been read. I can explain it if the gentleman insists. It merely creates a committee of 15 members, 5 each from 3 different standing committees having something to do with this particular matter, and it provides that that committee shall make an investigation and a report to the House within 60 days. This is all for the purpose of bringing order out of any chaos that might exist.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, has the question been put to adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair had put the question but will put it again. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, when we left here a little while ago, we were told that those having special orders would be permitted to speak and then the House would adjourn. Now, what kind of a resolution has been brought up?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has called up a resolution, which the gentleman referred to earlier in the day.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let the Clerk again report the resolution. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the pending resolution.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread House Resolution 492.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present. We have too many investigations going on now. Further, this resolution was never introduced or printed. It is typwritten, is introduced and reported at the same time. We are duplicating what the Senate is doing, and the Senate duplicates what the House does. It is getting so someone wants an investigation every time some argument occurs. These investigations cost money. The District Committee has jurisdiction to make an investigation of housing in the District any time it desires.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Illinois withdraw the resolution for the time being. Without objection, all previous proceedings will be vacated.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I dislike to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Do not withdraw it, then. I will find a way to stop its consideration. I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. SABATH. In accordance with the request, I am withdrawing the resolution for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If I understand the parliamentary situation, there has been unanimous consent for consideration of the resolution; is that right?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct, but the Chair further stated that without objection, the previous proceedings would be vacated.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker. The House considered this resolution when the gentleman from Missouri was absent. I am not sure that the gentleman should be permitted to come in and get red in the face and upset the proceedings in the House after unanimous consent has been given for the consideration of the matter, and if the gentleman wants to take the responsibility of beating the resolution, why that is his responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair suggests, since the resolution is withdrawn and the previous proceedings vacated, that under the circumstances the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Illinois confer with the gentleman from Missouri. The House will be in session tomorrow. There are but few differences from a practical angle. I have no objection to matters going through with unanimous consent, but we have to be very practical under the circumstances, and I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois appreciate that as well as I do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I certainly appreciate the consideration the Chair has given the matter, but I do not feel inclined to simply surrender on the statement of one Member that he is going to make a point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Virginia that, perhaps this afternoon or before tomorrow's session, some satisfactory solution will be arrived at, because we must remember the gentleman from Missouri is chairman of the Committee on Accounts, and on the adoption of the resolution the matter would have to go before that committee for appropriation.

Mr. SABATH. It is understood, Mr. Speaker, that I am withdrawing it for the present. As I said, I obtained unanimous consent; but in view of the gentleman from Missouri making the point of order of no quorum, I realize that it would be hard, perhaps, to obtain a quorum and subject a lot of Members to the inconvenience of coming here, if we can accomplish that, perhaps tomorrow, without the gentleman from Missouri making the point of order. I think if the gentleman from Missouri would know the facts and the need for this committee, which will hardly cost anything at all and may accomplish a great deal of good, he himself would ask that it be passed, I am satisfied, because he always has the interest of the people to whom this matter refers and aims to aid at heart. I know that if he had been informed—and I regret that I did not have the time to consult with him—I think he would not have objected. I am satisfied of that, because at all times, as long as I have known him, his interest has been in the interest of these people that need aid, and so on.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the present occupant of the chair made an announcement with reference to the business for this week. At no time did I read or did I hear the present occupant of the chair say anything in reference to this resolution. He did say the so-called Wadsworth resolution was coming up. I never heard of this resolution until a few moments ago.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; the gentleman knew about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, of course, does not want to enter into a controversy with anyone, particularly his friend from Missouri, but the Chair stands upon what was stated last Thursday, that there would be a definite program, and then only such matters as could be brought up by unanimous consent would be considered. The Chair feels bound by that statement. The Chair wishes to state, however, that he considers the status of this resolution to be as if unanimous consent had never been asked, that all proceedings are vacated, because the Chair said, "Without objection, the proceedings will be vacated." The Chair wants that definitely understood.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I make this practical suggestion? Unanimous consent was asked to vacate the proceedings, and I reserved the right to object, which I still wish to reserve. Would it be practical to just pass the matter for a little while until we have had an opportunity to consider it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman desires to object, that is his privilege. The Chair, of course, has announced that without objection the proceedings would be vacated. The Chair recognizes that a Member has difficulty in objecting or reserving the right to object under those circumstances. The Chair assumed there would be no objection. The Chair does not under any circumstances want to take an unfair advantage of any Member.

If there is no objection, the proceedings will be vacated.

Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under the rules of the House, would it be possible to have a recess of, say, half an hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By unanimous consent that could be done.

Is there objection to vacating the proceedings?

Mr. SABATH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I hope that our distinguished chairman will not do that, for this reason: The present occupant of the chair made a statement last week as to what the program would be. He provided specifically, and it is in the RECORD, that only such matters could come up as came up by unanimous consent. This morning, elaborating upon that same observation, he made clear that if matters like this resolution were to come up before the House they were to be passed by unanimous consent and not simply brought up by unanimous consent, and then have extended debate.

Mr. SABATH. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Michigan and the desire of the Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to vacating the proceedings?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair suggests that those interested in the resolution confer with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri about it. If it can be brought up by unanimous consent and passed without debate thereafter, the Chair will entertain such a request tomorrow.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE LATE WILLIAM JOSEPH SEARS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the death at 5:17 a. m. today at Kissimmee, Fla., of one of our former colleagues, the Honorable William Joseph Sears, of Florida. He served for many years as a Member of Congress, from the Sixty-fourth to the Seventieth, and the Seventy-third and Seventy-Fourth Congresses. His passing is a source of great regret to his many friends who served with him here. I feel that the Nation and my State have lost a loyal public servant and I have lost a personal friend.

At a later date I will also extend my remarks with a further eulogy of the long public service of such a fine, laudable character.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 31, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1347. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the Forty-fourth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held at New York, N. Y., September 28 to 30, 1943 (H. Doc. No.

522), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4163. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3524. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument; with amendment (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4254. A bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4530. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 4531. A bill to prohibit certain subsidy, indemnity, and other payments with respect to short staple cotton and commodities manufactured from such cotton; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORD:

H. R. 4532. A bill to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to make certain loans to cooperative associations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 4533. A bill to establish a chiropractic corps in the medical department of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4534. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 which permit the free importation of horses and mules for immediate slaughter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 262. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig-Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the utilization of waste paper is of great importance in the war effort, and recommending to the States the enactment of legislation designed to prevent the willful destruction of waste paper; to the Commitee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 492. Resolution to investigate slum clearance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 493. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Res. 494. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript of the explanation of the action taken in the interest of soldiers missing in action, entitled "Army Personnel Missing in Action," by Col. George F. Herbert, A. G. D., Chief, Casualty Branch, appearing on page 4, volume 2, No. 3, Prisoners of War Bulletin, American Red Cross; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to inquire into the relative value of water for domestic, farm, irrigation, and industrial purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4535. A bill for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4536. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 4537. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Truscon Steel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4538. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of A. G. Bailey against the United States of America; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DILWEG:

H. R. 4539. A bill for the relief of George V. Kapitz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H R. 4540. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Wachtel and Sophie D. Wachtel and Leszek J. Wachtel; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 4541. A bill for the relief of Oliver N. Knight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr JUDD:

H. R. 4542. A bill for the relief of Harold Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4543. A bill for the relief of Verne V. Gunsolley, Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 4544. A bill for the relief of J. P. Harting; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to continue in full force and effect patent No. 1,628,096; to the Committee on Patents.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5387. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, urging enactment of legislation providing for Federal assistance for community lunch program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5388. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 52 residents of New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., and vicinity, urging the enactment of the American Legion's omnibus bills, H. R. 3917 and S. 1617, which will insure adequate compensation, hospitalization, educational rights, and other important features for the protection of the men and women in the armed forces; to the Committee on World War Veteran's Legislation.

5389. Also, petition of the Madison Street Baptist Church of Rochester, Pa., representing approximately 20 persons urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5390. Also, petition of the First Baptist Sunday School of Rochester, Pa., representing approximately 170 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5391. Also, petition of the Nazarene Church of New Galilee, Pa., representing approximately 27 to 30 persons urging the enactment of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5392. By Mr. KEE: Petition of Mrs. C. L. Borden and 19 other residents of Bluefield, W. Va., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5393. By Mr. KELLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, favoring the enactment of the American Legion's omnibus bill (H. R. 3917 and S. 1617); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5394. Also, petition of the Syrian-American Club, opposing the constitution of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5395. Also, petition of the Northern Illinois College of Optometry students, requesting support of proposed bill authorizing appointment of optometrists as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5396. Also, petition of the congregation of the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Monessen, Pa., appealing for the good offices of the United States as mediator between Finland and Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5397. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Finnish descent, of Monessen, Pa., appealing for aid to Finland in securing a just peace with the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5398. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by R. A. Peterson, of Newberg, Oreg., and 88 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5399. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Ludwig D. Schreiberm, city clerk, city of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5400. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Gobierno Municipal, Rio Grande, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the administration of Hon. Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 31, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, who at the creation looked on all Thy works and called them good, move on the minds of men that they may love Thy name and obey Thy law. As we meditate on Thy countless providences, we are humbled by the sense of our abject weakness and our failure to realize the inheritance of human life and our whole duty toward a torn world. Gild our souls with the spirit of the heroic and sweep aside all error that we may understand that our labor is imperative to the divine order and to maintain our inspired liberty.

Dear Lord, we pray that men may not be blunted in business, hardened by disappointment and conflicts. O let us have done with the drudgery of fear and friction which so often make unendurable our duty. Help us all to believe again in the dreams and in the aspirations of youth and trust again the blessed ideals of the home altar. Lead us to endeavor to ascend the spiritual heights for aspiration and outlook. As we wander along the outlines of Thy great world house, feeling somewhat its marvelous immensity, rearm us with faith and courage in our selected vocation. Almighty God, when the lights come on again, grant that our fair land may be found living in flesh and spirit for the extension of Thy kingdom the world round. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 28, 1944:

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan;

H. R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff, as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume; and

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization.

On March 29, 1944:

H. R. 324. An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner; and

H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1216. An act for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Paul B. Lingle;

H. R. 2234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen;

H. R. 2273. An act for the relief of E. C. Fudge;

H. R. 2337. An act for the relief of John Joseph Defeo;

H. R. 2616. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes;

H. R. 2778. An act to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker;

H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker;

H. R. 3259. An act to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration;

H. R. 3362. An act to fix the annual compensation of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 3602. An act to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of C. C. Evensen;

H. R. 3847. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; and

H. R. 4377. An act authorizing the President to present in the name of Congress a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1247. An act for the relief of the Bishopville Milling Co.;

S. 1416. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judith H. Sedler, administratrix of the estate of Anthony F. Sedler, deceased;

S. 1432. An act to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939;

S. 1479. An act providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites;

S. 1708. An act to amend section 12 of the Pay Adjustment Act of June 16, 1942, relating to travel allowances;

S. 1714. An act to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943;

S. 1720. An act to vest title to the U. S. S. *Wolverine* (ex-*Michigan*) in the Foundation for the Original United States Ship Michigan, Inc.;

S. 1741. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V–3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942;

S. 1757. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia;

S. 1771. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 1772. An act to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; and

S. 1801. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Virginian Railway Co., a corporation, for railroad-yard-enlargement purposes, a parcel of land of the Camp Allen Reservation at Norfolk, Va.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2648. An act for the relief of Avid Evers;

H. R. 2928. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended;

H. R. 3257. An act to amend Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3538—An act for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan; and

H. R. 3661. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of State.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. Office of Defense Transportation.
6. Office for Emergency Management.
7. Tennessee Valley Authority.
8. United States District Court (District of Maryland).

SLUM CLEARANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, after it was assumed that there would be no business transacted other than special orders, I left the Chamber. Later by chance I learned that a resolution was being considered in the House to create a select committee of 15 Members to make an investigation and report to the House within 60 days on a plan for slum clearance with a view of abolishing alley dwellings in the District of Columbia. The resolution had never been

introduced, was never printed, was considered by the Rules Committee yesterday afternoon, reported favorably, and called up by unanimous consent immediately after it was presented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Rules Committee. I reached the floor just as the Speaker was placing the resolution on final passage, and in order to prevent that vote I raised the question of a quorum.

Mr. Speaker, it has long been known that I think we have gone far enough in the creation of select committees, although I am willing that every resolution stand on its own bottom. If, after carefully considering the resolution, I feel it is justified, I will not oppose it. Where there is a duplication of effort, I think I am justified in my opposition.

Now, what are the facts? Since last November a special committee of the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate has been investigating this matter. That committee is composed of Senator BURTON, of Ohio; Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada; Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland; and Senator CAPPER, of Kansas. The committee has held extensive hearings; in fact, I understand they are voluminous. It has gone into every phase of this subject, and right at the moment, Mr. Speaker, that committee is in session considering the very questions that this select committee would be required to look into. I talked to Senator BURTON last night. He advised me that their investigation had been very extensive and not only had they heard all interested that desired to be heard and those that the committee called, but that the committee had personally visited the slums and the alleys, and I am sure Members of the House will recall seeing the pictures of the Senators in the newspapers at the time they made their visit. Senator BURTON informed me several bills have been introduced, and aside from that there is a bill at the present time before the Director of the Budget and, when it is cleared by that official, that bill will be presented to the Senate Committee. Senator BURTON said it was the purpose of the committee to pass legislation that will take care of this situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, almost every day there is some complaint from some Member of the House about waste and extravagance and duplication of effort in the executive branch of the Government. Are we not subject to criticism if we carry out a program that will result in waste of the taxpayers' money in duplicating what the Senate has already done?

This Congress is not going to permit those who are now occupying these unsuitable houses, which might properly be called shacks, to be put out on July 1 as the present law provides when there is no place for them to go. I am perfectly willing to support a resolution right now amending the existing law so that eviction will not be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House placed jurisdiction on the District of Columbia Committee to investigate this matter at any time it desires. The Committee on Buildings and Grounds, which under the resolution will have five members on this select committee, has authority by special resolution to investigate defense housing and received an appropriation for expenses. Five members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handle the District of Columbia appropriation bill will also be members of this select committee. The House by resolution provided that the Appropriations Committee could make investigations from time to time, and, further than that, the House appropriated $100,000 for expenses. If the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the District of Columbia bill desires this matter investigated, it can request the chairman to send investigators into the field. Checking up on the balance of the $100,000 which was made available, I find there is over $70,000 still to the credit of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am just as interested in slum clearance as any Member of this House. That is not the question I raise. I say this is a duplication of the work that a subcommittee of the Senate has been performing since last November. I further say that we are not justified in creating this select committee. I dislike to quarrel with my friends, but as chairman of the Committee on Accounts it is my duty to protect the contingent fund of the House as much as I possibly can. Feeling as I do, I think it is my duty to require a quorum of the House to pass upon this resolution and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will object to its consideration by unanimous consent, and if it is called up will insist that a quorum be present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the House today adopts the concurrent resolution on the adjournment, fixing the time of adjournment tomorrow until some day in April, and then if, tomorrow or tonight before midnight, the President sends back the so-called soldiers' vote bill without his approval, the House and Senate having already agreed to this matter of adjournment, what would be the situation? Would the House, without a quorum present tomorrow, be in a position to act?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan postpone that inquiry? I think that the matter might be answered a little later in a more effective way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly.

SLUM CLEARANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] a moment ago with respect to the resolution which I offered to investigate the subject of slum clearance in Washington, I want to say that the gentleman is not going to get into a quarrel with me about it. I merely want to make it clear that all of us who had anything to do with the presentation of that resolution yesterday did it in a purely disinterested way to try to find a solution of a matter that is urgent with respect to alley dwellings in the District because of the fact that we have passed a law that is going to make it unlawful for people to live in those dwellings after the 1st of July. Unless we do something about it, we are liable to have a lot of people thrown out on the street. Nobody wants to see that done. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has said that another body in the Capitol is working on that and holding hearings. I have been here a good many years, but I have never known the House to depend upon the action of the Senate in respect to hearings. We have always made our own investigations, conducted our own hearings, and formed our own judgments, which, of course, we will do in this case. If the gentleman from Missouri thinks this ought not to be done, I am not going to quarrel with him. He is not going to get into any fuss with me about it, because I have no interest in the matter except the same interest that these other gentlemen who spoke yesterday on the matter—to correct a bad situation in the city of Washington.

I want to give the gentleman from Missouri notice now that if it is not corrected, and the House as well as the Senate does not do something about it, you are going to have a mighty bad situation in the United States Capital within the next few months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

SOLDIERS' VOTE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 523)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am permitting S. 1285, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes," to become law without my signature.

The bill is, in my judgment, wholly inadequate to assure to service men and women as far as is practically feasible the same opportunity which they would have to vote if they were at home.

Because of the confusing provisions of the bill and because of the difficulty of knowing just what will be the practical effect of the bill in operation, it is impossible for me to determine whether in fact more service men and women will be able to vote under the new measure than under existing law. That determination will largely depend upon the ex-

tent to which the States cooperate to make the measure as effective as its provisions permit. In view of this situation, I have resolved the doubt, in favor of the action taken by the Congress, and am permitting the bill to become law without my approval.

In other words, this bill might fairly be called a standing invitation to the several States to make it practicable for their citizens to vote; in this sense the Congress is placing a certain responsibility on each State for action. But it will, of course, be understood by those in the armed services, who want to vote but cannot, that the Congress itself shares the responsibility through the complexities of this bill.

The issue regarding soldiers' voting has been confused. The issue is not whether soldiers should be allowed to vote a full ballot, including State and local offices, or a short ballot confined to Federal offices. I am, and always have been, anxious to have the Federal Government do everything within its power compatible with military operations to get the full State ballots to the men and women in the service. I always have been, and I am now, anxious to have the States do everything within their power to get the full State ballots to the men and women in the service.

The real issue is whether after the States have done all that they are willing to do to get the full State ballots to the men and women in the service, and after the Federal Government has done everything within its power to get the full State ballots delivered to the men and women in the service, those who have not received their full State ballots should be given the right to cast a short, uniform Federal ballot which can readily be made available to them. This right, which should be assured to all men and women in the service, is largely nullified by the conditions which the provisions of this bill attach to its exercise.

In my judgment, the right of a soldier to vote the Federal ballot if he does not receive in time his State ballot should not be conditioned, as it is by this bill, upon his having made a prior application for a State ballot, or upon the prior certification by the Governor of the State that the Federal ballot is acceptable under State law. This bill provides a Federal ballot, but because of these conditions it does not provide the right to vote.

The Federal Government will and should do everything it can to get the State ballots to our men and women in the service. But it is not in my judgment true, as some have contended, that the Federal Government can assure the use of State ballots as readily as the use of Federal ballots. No matter what effort the Federal Government makes, in many cases it will not be possible to insure the delivery in time of State ballots to designated individuals all over the world or their return in time to the respective States.

Some of the service men and women, not knowing where they will be a month hence or whether they will be alive, will not apply for their ballots. Others will not receive their State ballots in time or be able to get their ballots back to their States in time. Remember that a number of States still require a special form of application and that the postal card application forms supplied by the Federal Government are only treated as an application for an application for a State ballot.

The Federal Government can insure, and in my judgment it is the duty of the Federal Government to insure, that every service man and woman who does not get his State ballot in time shall have the right to use a short and uniform Federal ballot.

It is in my judgment within the authority of the Congress to use its war powers to protect the political rights of our service men and women to vote for Federal offices as well as their civil rights with respect to their jobs and their homes. If Congress did not hesitate to protect their property rights by legislation which affected State law, there is no reason why Congress should hesitate to protect their political rights.

In 1942, Congress did exercise the war powers to provide Federal war ballots and they were counted in almost every State. What was constitutional in 1942 certainly is not unconstitutional in 1944.

In allowing the bill to become law, I wish to appeal to the States, upon whom the Congress has placed the primary responsibility for enabling our service people to vote, to cooperate to make the bill as fully effective as its defective provisions will allow. The response of the Governors to my questions, and reports made to me by the War Department, indicate that many States have not yet taken action to make the bill as fully effective as it could be and that a considerable number of States do not presently contemplate taking such action.

I wish also to appeal to the Congress to take more adequate action to protect the political rights of our men and women in the service.

It is right and necessary that the States do all in their power to see that the State ballots reach the men and women in the service from their States. In particular, I appeal to them to see that their State laws allow sufficient time between the time that their absentee ballots are available for distribution and the time that they must be returned to be counted.

I also appeal to the States to see that the postal-card application forms for State ballots distributed by the Federal Government to the troops are treated as a sufficient application for their State ballot and not merely as a request for a formal application for a State ballot.

I also appeal to the States to authorize the use of the Federal ballots by all service people from their States who have not received their State ballots before an appropriate date, whether or not they have formally applied for them. No State or Federal red tape should take from our young folk in the service their right to vote.

I further appeal to the Congress to amend the present bill, S. 1285, so as to authorize all service men and women, who have not received their State ballots by an appropriate date, whether or not they have formally applied for them, to use the Federal ballot without prior express authorization by the States. If the States do not accept the Federal ballot, that will be their responsibility. Under this bill, that responsibility is shared by the Congress.

Our boys on the battle fronts must not be denied an opportunity to vote simply because they are away from home. They are at the front fighting with their lives to defend our rights and our freedoms. We must assure them their rights and freedoms at home so that they will have a fair share in determining the kind of life to which they will return.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1944.*

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention, of course, to quarrel with the President with reference to his soldiers' voting bill. I am glad he did not veto it.

Having led this fight for States' rights and for providing a method for these young men and women in our armed forces to cast an untrammeled ballot in a constitutional election, having led the fight to preserve the rights of the States under the Constitution, I want to say now that we have provided the very best law we could obtain under the circumstances.

If the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission will do their part in getting these ballots to the members of our armed forces, they will every one get an opportunity to vote in a constitutional election, in a legal election, under a law that does not violate the Constitution, destroy States' rights, or tend to wreck those institutions for which they are now fighting and offering up their lives.

This has been a great fight. It has brought great punishment to me in a way. It has been one of the greatest constitutional battles we have had in 50 years, and I am proud of the part I have had to play in it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who voted for the bill which the President has just discussed. Frankly, it did not go quite as far as I would like to have gone. I voted for the Worley substitute in the Committee of the Whole as amended by the Tarver amendment, which would have done just what the President has asked us to do in this message. It seems to me that under the circumstances surrounding this measure the President's message was

most temperate and an effort to cooperate with the Congress and the States. I wish to commend him for the attitude he has taken about this matter, knowing as I do how strongly he feels about the subject. There is no reason for us to have further controversy about it as I see it.

I would hope that the Congress might follow his recommendations, and I certainly hope the States will make this act effective by taking the necessary steps to provide the time in which the soldiers can get their ballots and can participate in the election. Certainly no one is more interested in the future of this country than the men and women in our armed services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House House Concurrent Resolution 75, providing for an adjournment of the House from Thursday, March 30, 1944, to Wednesday, April 12, 1944, with Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments: Lines 2 and 3, strike out "Thursday, March 30" and insert "Saturday, April 1."

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of Congress from Saturday, April 1, 1944, to Wednesday, April 12, 1944."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. RANKIN. He had better yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hopes there will be no display of temper.

Mr. RANKIN. The Chair need not indulge any fears about the temper of this discussion, because I am always temperate. Temperance is one of my long suits.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the Members of the House, as far as I know, were not consulted about this recess. I know I was not. If I had been I should have opposed it.

We are today in a great turmoil. No one can read the papers and listen to the broadcasts without realizing this fact. In my opinion it is necessary for Congress to stay on the job. If I had been consulted, which I feel as a humble Member of this House I had a right to be, I should have insisted that we take 3-day recesses instead of an adjournment for 2 weeks.

I am not going to vote for this amendment, because I believe that the Congress should stay in readiness. We do not know what the next few days or even the next few hours may bring, and I believe it would be a serious mistake for us to leave here for 2 weeks with all the work we have on hand and with the condition of the world as it is today.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. As I understand the amendment it does not provide for a 2 weeks' adjournment, but only about 10 days.

Mr. RANKIN. Ten days now. It was for 2 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to embarrass other Members. Many of them have gone home with the understanding that this resolution would be adopted, and I am not going to make a point of no quorum in order to try to kill it; but I do want to express my views and to say that from now on I am not going to vote for Congress to take these periodic recesses at a time when the world is in the condition it is now and when it is necessary in my opinion for us to be here. The men on the slopes of Cassino are not getting a 2 weeks' recess. The men in the Southwest Pacific are not getting a recess. We have legislation of pressing importance to attend to and I think we should have taken 3-day recesses and not a 2 weeks' recess.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, so that there may be no misunderstanding, on yesterday I said I would not make a point of no quorum and prevent the recess if this message came up, and I stand by that agreement; but, like the gentleman from Mississippi, I serve notice now that this is the last time I will fail to make a point of no quorum in order to prevent a recess.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that I feel as though I was a party to that agreement of yesterday, because I did protest. If I had been going to object I should have done so then, for then a great many Members who have gone to their homes would be here today.

For the reasons I have set forth, I am not going to make a point of no quorum, but I was elected to Congress for 2 years. Regardless of what happens in the future I feel it is my duty to be here. I had to leave 1 day last week on account of illness in my family, but during the time I have been in Congress I have tried to be here at all times and I expect to continue that policy to the end of my service.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is one other reason why a recess might be of some benefit. During the last few days we have heard considerable from two or three Members on the majority side that we should let this discussion as to a certain radio commentator die down. The House will not be in session for 10 days, there will not be any opportunity for that gentleman's critics to say anything; so while the recess is on I suggest to the gentlemen on the other side who want to stop this controversy that they get the ear of that commentator and let him confine his observations over the radio to the truth and quit charging that Congress is a House of reprehensibles and that Members of Congress are disloyal. I commend that to your consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me call attention to another thing: There is a certain element that has been trying to force through a resolution that in my opinion would create extreme friction between the United States and Great Britain, our great ally. On day before yesterday a question arose in the British House of Commons over an immaterial matter. To show how nerves are strained, because the administration lost by one vote on a practically immaterial matter, the question of payment for women school teachers, the Prime Minister demanded a vote of confidence and got it, of course.

If those questions concerning Great Britain are going to continue to be agitated in my opinion they will tend to create friction between us and Great Britain. That is another reason why the Members of the House and Senate should be here to answer those criticisms.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I think there are more important questions than that which ought to be considered. In the State of Nebraska today people who are asked to raise eggs have so many eggs on hand that they cannot get rid of them. Farmers are selling eggs out there for 20 cents a dozen. You have to pay 52 cents a dozen in Washington for them. The feed situation in Nebraska is bad. The people you are asking to raise food for our armed forces and our people at home cannot get feed to feed their livestock.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I think that is more important than what is happening politically in the British House of Commons.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think so.

More important than what is happening in Nebraska is the raging flood today on the Tombigbee River down in my district and I wish I could take a bunch of you down there. Maybe you would change your minds when that matter comes up again.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to embarrass the House. I merely wanted to state my attitude on this proposition.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a soldier boy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

THE MANPOWER SHORTAGE

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a letter from the chairman of a selective service board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers this morning and for the last few days indicate an acute shortage of manpower. I want to call to the attention of the House an indefensible policy of the Executive department of the Government of the United States which is adding to the acuteness of this situation. A policy which I believe should be changed immediately in the interest of efficient government, of keeping expenses to the minimum, and for the efficient conduct of the war.

I refer to the cost-plus system of letting Government contracts, especially in connection with the production of war materials. Under this system, no matter how many idle men an employer is able to keep in his factory, he is entitled to count in the cost of the material that he produces for the Government of the United States the wages of those idle men.

As a result, we find throughout the United States thousands—perhaps hundreds of thousands—of idle men who are performing no useful function in industry but who are kept on the pay rolls by the employers simply because those employers can add the wages of the idle men to the cost of the goods they are furnishing the Government of the United States.

In addition to this reservoir of idle manpower there is another large group classified as I–A (L) from which Selective Service can draw, and in addition to those sources it should be known that the induction officials of the Army are themselves to blame for the failure of many selective-service boards to fill their quotas. Mr. Speaker, I am today in receipt of a letter from the chairman of a selective-service board in my district which reveals this deplorable situation. It is as follows:

MARCH 28, 1944.

HON. EARL R. LEWIS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: The many newspaper articles and radio broadcasts in recent weeks which have intimated that Selective Service has fallen far behind its quotas in the past 6 months, have been very disturbing to the uncompensated personnel of local boards, who have been trying honestly but sometimes vainly to keep up with the constant changes in the regulations. There can be no doubt that local boards, through misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the numerous changes in policy, and confusion caused by the constant outpouring of newspaper interviews by dozens of officials upon the subject of selective service, do make many errors. The miracle is that they are willing to stay on the job at all and battle through such a maze of contradictory circulars, bulletins, regulations, letters, and numerous changes of policy.

It is obvious, however, that much of the delay in getting men into the service is due to a lack of ingenuity and initiative on the part of officials at induction and reception centers. Local board members and clerks get the idea sometimes that they are playing a game in which induction officials are trying to outwit them in keeping selectees out of the service. Here are a few examples of the conditions that exist:

1. There are certain types of specialized training for which men can enlist and having been accepted they must then be inducted through the local draft boards. It frequently happens that the orders given these men before they come to the local boards are entirely conflicting with requirements of officials at the induction station to the extent that a stalemate results—in other words an aviation cadet may be told, when accepted by enlistment officials, that he must be inducted by a certain date in order to qualify and that he need not be sent with a contingent of selectees for final examination, but can go directly to reception center. When we try to cooperate with him we find that he will not be accepted at the reception center without having first gone through this final examination although he had already been examined and passed before applying to the local board and in some cases there is no opportunity to get him qualified within the time specified.

2. After a group has been finally examined and the necessary 21 days have passed they are then inducted into the service under the most recent regulations I have had time to read. They must take with them certain forms prepared by the examining staff and the local board. It has come to our attention that groups who appear for induction with any one of those forms missing are sent back home to await further call when the missing form could readily be produced through the medium of a telephone call within a few hours. Judging from the reports coming to us the amount of money wasted and time lost in getting men into the armed forces through such stupid procedure, must be numerous over the entire country. Such things have happened in this board and in other boards of this county to my knowledge. We have been told by selectees returning from their examination that in one instance 150 men were returned to their board because they did not have with them a Form No. 218 which could have been supplied within a few hours. This last I cannot verify, but it was told to us by one of our boys who was sent home because he did not have with him a Form No. 219. This boy was a volunteer anxious to get into the service, but because that specific form was not with him he was unable to enter the service on that day. When he returned, men from our selective-service State headquarters, who were in the office advised our clerk what to do to get him in with the group leaving the following day and the clerk followed their instructions implicitly all to no avail. The boy was again sent home and compelled to lie around here without a job for a month awaiting another call.

A great deal of lost time and money would be saved, it seems to me, if induction officials would cooperate with the spirit of selective service and assume sufficient responsibility to hold groups of men for a few hours where there is some clerical error or omission in the papers transmitted and contact the local boards to ascertain whether they are in fact qualified. I note also in today's radio and newspaper items that a great furore is being raised over getting IV–F's into the service. I would like to call to your attention that we have a large group of men in much better condition than the IV–F's, who are classified in I–A (L) meaning that they can be used for limited service, yet the Army finds no use for most of these men and we are never able to send for induction more than 2 per month. Many of these men are anxious to serve and have signed as volunteers but can't get in, so why talk about inducting IV–F's? We have 39 in I–A (L) as of this date.

This will give you a little idea of some of the things that upset the equanimity of local draft board members as they struggle to be of service to their country and seem to find their efforts thwarted by the Army itself while it cries out that selective service has not furnished its quotas.

Yours very truly,
(Name omitted),
Chairman, Local Board No. 1.

Mr. Speaker, these reprehensible practices with respect to war contracts and the failure of induction officials of the Army to discharge their duties sensibly and efficiently must be stopped.

PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE ON SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in the veto message that we have just heard read, the Chief Executive has told us he will not sign the soldiers' vote bill, yet he will not veto it. Our memory is not so short but that we recall a short time ago a scorching message that was sent up here from the White House saying something about Members of Congress ducking or failing to stand up and be counted. Today it is a case of the shoe being on the other foot.

THE LATE KNUTE ROCKNE

Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago today the Nation was stunned by the news of the untimely death of the immortal Knute Rockne of Notre Dame. A commercial plane plunged to earth on the fields of Kansas carrying to death all of the occupants of that plane, including this Danish immigrant who rose to be the idol of millions of young Americans, a man who had a profound influence on clean and wholesome living in America.

A few days ago the genial gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] read from the rolls of the House a list of fighting Irishmen. In that list of Members of Irish descent I did not even make the second team. But, having attended that great institution, Notre Dame, and having the honor to represent the district in which it is located, I insist that I must be counted on the team. One of the treasures of those priceless years spent at Notre Dame is the memory of the immortal Knute Rockne, that molder of character, that maker of men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LACK OF A DEFINTE FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, for lack of a definite foreign policy, today marks another defeat for this administration in its relations with Europe. For want of insistence on the inviolability of an international treaty our friend and ally, Great Britain, consummates a breach of contract today. For our failure to act

or even to protest, the doors of Palestine close today, this March 31, 1944, because the imperialistic policy of the British Colonial Office is more important to the present administration than furnishing a haven for millions of Hitler's victims in Europe.

Today the British white paper promulgated in 1939, without the assent of any one of 52 nations who gave Great Britain the mandate over Palestine, finally by decree closes the doors of that tiny country to the wandering Jews of the world.

Last week the President of the United States, in what was intended to be a sympathetic statement, asked the nations of the world to open their doors to the refugees of Germany and the suffering people of occupied countries, well knowing that this was not practical, and yet he made no move nor spoke no word to keep open the comparatively few square miles set aside in Palestine by all the nations for immigration of Jews. There are 600,000 of their kinsmen waiting, praying, and earnestly offering a home for their stricken brethren, but all they receive is sympathetic words.

Today marks another milestone in the sad history of a wandering race and not one to which the democracies can look with pride.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Edward Alexander Parsons, president, Louisiana Historical Society.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject The Critical Manpower Shortage in Fisheries and to include therein certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject The Merchant Marine as an Instrument of Commerce and to include therein an address delivered by R. Earle Anderson, Director of Finance, United States Maritime Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

HON. WALTER J. LABUY

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, March 29, the Senate confirmed the nomination of the Honorable Walter J. LaBuy, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

This is the first time in the history of our country that an American of Polish descent has been elevated to such a high and distinguished position. I am proud to say that I have known the newly appointed judge intimately for many years, and who, for the last 12 years, has been one of the leading circuit judges of Chicago, with an outstanding record of achievement behind him. Many of his decisions have received appraisement throughout the United States.

It is my humble opinion that our President has again shown excellent judgment in the selection of Judge LaBuy for this important assignment. All Americans of Polish descent feel that they share in this high honor as well as the recognition of ability, and have received the news with a deep feeling of gratitude.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, in the first to include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star, and in the second, to include a brief article on Canadian air policy from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 15-minute special order granted me for today be transferred to Thursday, April 20.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business is disposed of today, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. STEWART and Mr. HOFFMAN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LESLIE M. RAPP

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today for the purpose of paying tribute to a loyal, faithful, and efficient employee of the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means. I refer to our clerk, Leslie M. Rapp, who first became associated with the committee back in 1925. Since that time he has become recognized as one of the country's outstanding authorities on internal revenue and other taxation. Today he is severing his connection with our committee, he having resigned to associate himself with one of the leading law firms in New York City. The loss that we sustain in his departure will be the gain of the firm that he is joining.

Not only do I want to express my deep and heartfelt thanks to this faithful friend and adviser, but also do I wish to extend to him my very best wishes and the best wishes of my colleagues on the committee. He will take with him our affection, our esteem, and our respect, and I know that he will attain outstanding success in his chosen field, because he is the kind who achieves outstanding success in whatever he undertakes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman submit a request that any other Member of the House may have leave to extend his remarks at this point with reference to Mr. Rapp and his work?

Mr. KNUTSON. I make that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, personally, I am going to miss the close association of Mr. Rapp. He has been most helpful to me.

For 19 years Les, as his friends prefer to call him, has been associated with this committee, most of the time in the capacity of minority clerk. He is not only a tax man of exceptional ability but a man of excellent character and few bear acquaintance as well as he. Whenever a minority member found himself facing tax difficulties he invariably turned to Les, and he did not turn in vain, as he

would soon have him straightened out. He was most beneficial in the drafting of tax statements, and to say that he is going to be missed is putting it mildly indeed.

Les was loath to depart from his associates of years' standing, but felt that it was his duty to accept the new position, as it not only carries a lucrative salary but offers the opportunity of splendid advancement.

While we regret his departure in the deepest sense of the word, we rejoice in his good fortune and wish him unbounded success in his new line of endeavor. We congratulate his new employers in being able to secure the services of such an exceptional young man as Mr. Rapp, and we know they will appreciate his ability and advice more and more as time goes on.

So good luck to you, Les, and may Dame Fortune smile on you always.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is always a source of deep gratification to me whenever ambitious and aspiring youth receives proper recognition for services faithfully and efficiently rendered. I doubt if any committee of Congress has been served by an employee with greater ability and fidelity than has the Ways and Means Committee by its minority clerk, Leslie M. Rapp.

Such outstanding ability as has characterized the service rendered to our committee by Mr. Rapp could not fail to attract the attention of the legal firms engaged in the field of tax law. Such firms are ever in search of outstanding legal talent. Much as I regret the loss of Mr. Rapp as our minority clerk, I rejoice that his fine character, his exceptional legal ability, and his broad experience in all phases of tax legislation have been recognized by and have brought to him a position with a leading law firm in New York City.

I know that my good friend, Leslie M. Rapp, enters upon his professional career in New York with the best wishes of every member of the Ways and Means Committee, which he has served so faithfully, diligently, and efficiently for the past 19 years.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to all that has been said of Mr. Rapp. He has been a great help to me. His assistance was marked by cheerfulness and willingness which made working with him a pleasure. I acknowledge my gratitude to him. Last week I was chosen by the Committee on Ways and Means to provide a suitable token to be presented to Mr. Rapp in appreciation of their personal regard and of his services to the committee. Each member of the committee subscribed to the fund to provide the token, and at a social gathering on Wednesday afternoon we presented Mr. Rapp with a silver tray inscribed:

Presented to Leslie M. Rapp in appreciation of his outstanding services to the Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives, 1925–1944.

I am glad of this opportunity to express to Mr. Rapp my every good wish for success and prosperity and long life to enjoy it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Ways and Means Committee; however, I remember when Leslie Rapp first became attached to the committee. A handsome, fine, young man, hardly more than a boy. I have watched him grow and develop down through the years. Capable, courteous, industrious, and efficient, he soon won the confidence of all those with whom he came in contact. He was never too busy to lend a helping hand to a bewildered Representative when tax matters were involved. He did not always have the answer, but he always volunteered to get it.

If there are any tax experts around the Capitol, Leslie Rapp is one of them. I consider his leaving Capitol Hill a personal loss and am sure that this same feeling is shared not only by members of the Ways and Means Committee but by the House in general. We dislike to see him leave us but we congratulate him upon his promotion and wish him well in the years that are to come.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, while we love to say and to think that all men are created equal, yet this is not quite true. What we mean is that we are all created equal in the sight of God and in the sight of the law.

Biology and experience teach us that we are not all equal physically or mentally. Some of us are brilliant, and some are mediocre, and some are dull. Some have fine, discriminating judgment and pleasing personalities and some are unfortunately deficient in these respects.

Fortunate, indeed, is the man who is in good health and in the prime of young manhood and who has been blessed with a brilliant mind which has been trained under the most favorable circumstances and who possesses a pleasing personality and whose character is above reproach.

Such a man is my esteemed friend, Leslie M. Rapp. I am sorry to see him leave his position with the Ways and Means Committee of this House, but I have encouraged him to take this step because I know it is the best course for him and for his fine family.

I want my words spoken here today to be a recorded testimonial to this worthy and very superior young man. I want to assist him to attain the great heights for which his ability and his character have so eminently prepared him. The Nation, and especially the Ways and Means Committee and this House, will suffer a severe loss, but the people whom he will serve as their legal counsel on complicated tax matters will benefit.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as this day draws to a close there ends with it the long period of efficient service rendered the Congress by Mr. Leslie Rapp, now the clerk for the minority of the Ways and Means Committee. I am privileged as a member of that committee to express my personal regrets that he has left us. Mr. Rapp leaves Washington for New York, where he associates himself with a law firm, and where he undoubtedly will address his great talents to tax law.

I am happy to have served with the committee during Les Rapp's period of service as clerk. He devoted himself to his duties, he helped members old and new in point of service; he was ever willing to sacrifice his time and skill for the committee.

I join the other members of the committee in wishing Mr. Rapp that long continued success in his new duties which is so richly deserved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article from Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a communication I received from the Federal Works Agency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very able radio address delivered by the Honorable John Kerrigan, president of the Boston City Council.

I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a eulogy to the mother of our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] entitled "Mrs. Annie Bates."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, during the recess period until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on more than one subject if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the acting leader if there will be opportunity to make 1-minute or other speeches tomorrow?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I would say so. There will be no business tomorrow unless it is that kind of business, I think.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long after the

termination of this recess would it be before that RECORD became permanent?

Mr. RAMSPECK. My understanding is that the RECORD does not become permanent until 30 days after the daily RECORD is issued.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, how long is it, after the current RECORD is made, before it becomes permanent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair's understanding is that after 30 days it is bound in permanent form.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I am asking for information is, if anything is put into this RECORD that is in violation of the rules of the House, the Members ought to have an opportunity to challenge it and ask to have it stricken.

Mr. RAMSPECK. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, this is a request that is usually made.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I am not quarreling with the gentleman from Georgia. I have no objection to his request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today the Speaker pro tempore be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions passed by the two Houses, examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House, and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PLACING OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY HOMES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2618) to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after "Columbia", insert ": *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provisions of section 4 of this act such a license shall be issued forthwith to any corporation or association chartered by special act of Congress and having under its charter the purposes or powers of a child-placing agency as herein defined."

Page 4, line 24, strike out all after "confidential" over to and including "Welfare" in line 2, page 5.

Page 5, line 24, after "parents", insert ", and requiring the Board of Public Welfare to verify the allegations of the petition, make investigation, and report its findings and recommendations to the Court."

Page 6, line 7, strike out "in the presence of at least one witness."

Page 6, line 9, after "agency", insert "in the presence of at least one witness."

Page 7, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 9. The Board of Public Welfare is authorized to make such investigations and inspections as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

Page 7, line 15, strike out "9" and insert "10."

Page 7, line 18, strike out "10" and insert "11."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been handled entirely by the Committee on the District of Columbia. It has been before the Congress a long time. Much consideration has been given to it. As I understand, these changes are not material, and they coincide with the views of the House committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The acting minority leader is correct. The House in the Seventy-seventh Congress passed legislation similar to that which we have before us today. The Senate failed to act at that time. In this Congress, the Seventy-eighth, the House again acted favorably on H. R. 2618. The subject was under consideration in hearings before our Committee on the District of Columbia, and then the measure was considered in hearings before the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. The Senate took favorable action in bringing the bill to the floor, and certain amendments were then added. After careful consideration by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and by Members of the House who are not on that committee but who have a special interest in and are close to this subject, like the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], we believe we are doing the correct thing in concurring in the Senate amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. It will be recalled that the day this bill passed the House there was considerable debate and several amendments were offered. Although I am not a member of the committee that handled this bill, I am intensely interested in the subject of child placing. I am glad to note that the Senate retained the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], and the amendment offered by me. I have not given extensive study to the Senate amendments, as they just came to my desk this morning, but I am inclined to believe that this is a subject that has long been neglected and ought to become law. If it needs to be amended later, it can then be amended.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Nebraska is correct. For many years there has been an abuse of the placement of children in homes within the District of Columbia. We believe the passage of this legislation, and the signature of the President in making it a law, will bring a new and enlightened era to the District of Columbia in dealing with this problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF FIRE AND CASUALTY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1028) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill may be very important, and I wish the gentleman from West Virginia would explain its provisions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Michigan is always correct and alert in matters of this kind, and the chairman of the House District Committee desires always to have the Members of the House informed as to the provisions of any legislation we bring to the floor.

This measure has passed the Senate unanimously. It was sponsored by Senator MCCARRAN of Nevada. It has to do with the adjustment of penalties for violations in connection with the practice of insurance in the District of Columbia.

The Insurance Commissioner brought to our attention the fact that the penalties are so severe at the present time in connection with the operation of insurance agencies here that he only has the option of either revoking the license of the agent or suspending his activities as a result, so he has permitted many minor infractions to go by the board without attempting to enforce this heavier penalty. Therefore, we have reduced the penalty so as to allow a monetary penalty of $200 to be inflicted in certain cases. This provision, which is section 1 of the bill, is the practice in most of the States in the Union.

Section 2 of the bill has to do with certificates for practice. It is rather a regulatory improvement which we believe the legislation carries.

Section 3 reduces the amount of bond required from the present $5,000 to $1,000. The $5,000 was placed in effect in the first instance, and it has been found that under the practice that amount is excessive, and that there is sufficient protection with the $1,000 bond. The experience of the insurance companies indicates that.

Section 4 strengthens the regulation of agents and brokers by providing two additional causes for the revocation of licenses.

We believe this legislation to be meritorious. It brings the District of Columbia Insurance Division more in line with those of the States and protects the persons who deal with insurance com-

panies as well as the organizations that deal in insurance themselves.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3, chapter II, of the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia (Public, No. 824, 76th Cong.; 54 Stat. 1066; title 35, sec. 1306, D. C. Code, 1940), be amended by deleting the period at the end of said section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and by adding thereto the following: *"Provided further*, That, in lieu of revoking or suspending the certificate of authority of any company for causes enumerated in this section after hearing as herein provided, the superintendent may subject such company to a penalty of not more than $200 when in his judgment he finds that public interest would be best served by the continued operation of the company. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by the company through the office of the superintendent to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. That section 36, chapter II, of such act (54 Stat. 1079, title 35, sec. 1340, D. C. Code, 1940), be amended by deleting the period at the end of the said section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and by adding thereto the following: *"Provided*, That, in lieu of revoking or suspending the license of any policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried company employee for causes enumerated in this section after hearing as herein provided, the superintendent may subject such person to a penalty of not more than $200 when in his judgment he finds that public interest would be best served by the continued operation of such person. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by such person through the office of the superintendent to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. That section 32, chapter II, of such act (54 Stat. 1078, title 35, sec. 1336, D. C. Code, 1940), be amended by deleting therefrom the figures "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000," so that the first sentence of the second paragraph of the said section as so amended shall read as follows:

"Resident and nonresident brokers shall, as a prerequisite to the issuance of a license, file with the superintendent a corporate surety bond in an amount not less than $1,000 for the benefit of any person who may suffer loss resulting from fraud or dishonesty on the part of said resident or nonresident broker."

SEC. 4. That section 40, chapter II, of such act (54 Stat. 1080, title 35, sec. 1344, D. C. Code, 1940), be amended by deleting the period at the end of the said section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and by adding thereto the following: "or if the agent or broker has placed with any unauthorized company any risk which could be placed with an authorized company except for abnormal provisions of the policy, or if the agent or broker has procured from an unauthorized company any policy which covers a risk of a class generally covered in the District by authorized companies and which authorized companies would cover at a rate not higher than that charged by authorized companies on other District risks of the same class."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AVID EVERS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2648) for the relief of Avid Evers, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,000" and insert "$5,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAVIS NORRINE COTHRON AND OTHERS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and for the three minor children of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the late William Edward Cothron, namely, Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, GREEN, and SAUTHOFF.

EDDIE T. STEWART

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1411) for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. MCGEHEE, PATTON, and JENNINGS.

REV. C. M. MCKAY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 544) for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs, MCGEHEE, FERNANDEZ, and CHENOWETH.

EDWARD E. HELD AND MARY JANE HELD

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2625) for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. MCGEHEE, FERNANDEZ, and JENNINGS.

LOUIS COURCIL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 248) for the relief of Louis Courcil, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. MCGEHEE, DICKSTEIN, and PITTENGER.

MILDRED B. HAMPTON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1412) for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. MCGEHEE, PATTON, and CARSON of Ohio.

DELORES LEWIS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1313) for the relief of Delores Lewis, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. MCGEHEE, ABERNETHY, and CARSON of Ohio.

LESLIE M. RAPP

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, Leslie M. Rapp, minority clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means, I am informed, has tendered his resignation and will take up the practice of his profession at an early date. His resignation is effective the 1st of April. Mr. Rapp and myself began work on the committee in 1925, he as assistant clerk, and myself as a member of the committee. I have known Mr. Rapp intimately since that time and have observed him very closely in his work. During my work on that committee and since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, I have known of no one connected with the work of the Congress who has discharged his duty more efficiently, more faithfully, and more conscientiously than Mr. Rapp. His leaving will be a great loss, not only to the minority, but to the entire committee. He has been most helpful in many ways to the committee as a whole. He is a good parliamentarian. His experience, his ability, and his industry have made him a most useful and capable and helpful coworker on the committee, and we all very deeply regret his leaving us. It will be a distinct loss to the committee, and he leaves with the confidence and respect of all who know him. Certainly we wish him great success in his new work and congratulate those with whom he is to be associated.

COST-PLUS CONTRACTS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD correspondence with the War and Navy Departments, and the W. P. B., concerning the cost-plus system. Similar copies of the letter to Secretary Stimson were sent to Secretary Knox and Donald Nelson.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the material which I would like to include in the RECORD will cost $105.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to act as Speaker pro tempore tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BOMBING OF GERMANY

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I could not allow this opportunity to pass to pay my respects to Maj. George Fielding Eliot and the splendid way in which he last night on the air handled the subject of bombing. He, with a colleague, was a participant in a debate on one side of the question and Mr. Norman Thomas with another on the other side, discussing the part the United States and Great Britain are taking in bombing Germany. Mr. Thomas and his colleague seemed to desire to handle this matter with gloves on. Among other things it was suggested that sanctuary should be established in Germany by agreement. There was one man in the audience whom I would like to meet and whom I now desire to compliment. He asked: "With whom do you propose to have these agreements—with Hitler and Tojo?" Then the meeting broke up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a news item, and also another news item about the heroic deeds of some of our fine youth who are members of the Seabees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include as a part of those remarks a study made by the National Education Association entitled "The Continuing Crisis in Education."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, there are several million of our fellow citizens in the United States known as white-collar workers whose financial situation is distressing.

This group is largely unorganized. They have had no lobby to present their problems. They have had no organized pressure power to raise their income during this war period.

Recently, in Atlanta, in my congressional district, there has been organized the National League of White Collar Workers, Inc. The president of this new organization is Mr. Watson Cary, a well-known citizen of Atlanta. Mr. Cary has written me a letter which I wish to read to the House. It is as follows:

MARCH 17, 1944.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Government statistics show that living cost has advanced 23.4 percent, others report 40 percent. We will take our Government's word for it.

In behalf of white-collar workers and all those of fixed income in the United States, those who are members of this organization and those who are not, we respectfully request that our employers be permitted to adjust our wages to compensate us for this increased cost in living expenses.

We, of frozen incomes, have fixed obligations, family expense, withholding tax, luxury tax, income tax with lowered exemptions, and many other additional expense too numerous to mention, which naturally decreases our net balances with which we must make ends meet.

We like to be patriotic and buy Defense bonds, contribute to the U. S. O., Red Cross, and other agencies designed to promote the welfare and comfort of our men and women in uniform. Many of us are in dire and destitute circumstances, unable to meet our legitimate obligations, unable to maintain our usual standard of living.

Therefore in behalf of the numberless millions in this category, we in unity petition our Congress for redress of this grievance. No part of any wage adjustment our employers are permitted to give us at this time will in any way have the slightest tendency toward creating inflation (which we are unanimously opposed to). It would merely partially absorb some of the increased cost of living we are subjected to over which we have no control.

May we respectfully request that this communication be read on the floor of the House and some appropriate and immediate action taken thereon. We further request that this communication be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Trusting that the plight of the white-collar workers of America will receive your immediate attention and consideration.

We are,

Yours very truly,

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WHITE COLLAR WORKERS, INC.,
WATSON CARY, *President.*

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does not the gentleman think they have a just grievance in accordance with the suggestions they make in that communication?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. I think a great many of them have, without any question.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to read this letter to the House and thereby have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as requested by Mr. Cary.

I am deeply concerned with the problems of this group. In fact, most Members of this Congress are in that group. Those of us who depend upon our salaries, those without outside income, can certainly understand what Mr. Cary is talking about.

Our salary today is the same as it has been for almost 20 years. Our cost of living has increased greatly. Our income taxes, which many people think we are exempt from, have increased many-

fold. Washington is perhaps the most expensive city in the United States in which to live. Due to the war, we now remain almost continually in session, which adds to our cost of living.

So I say to Mr. Cary, "Yes, I am glad to have your message and I wish you success in your effort to impress upon the country the plight of the white-collar workers."

In my reply to Mr. Cary I have pointed out the fact that the salaries and wages of this group are not frozen. Employers can increase their pay, but not without approval by Federal authorities.

I am afraid that with respect to this group the Treasury Department has adopted a too rigid policy in considering increases proposed by employers. I have had many complaints of this.

It is my hope that this group may receive the same consideration given to the better organized groups. They are entitled to the same consideration, no more and no less, than the organized groups.

Of course, I realize that the Federal authorities cannot initiate action for the benefit of these persons, but when an employer proposes an increase, careful consideration should be accorded such request. The same rule should apply as that given to the organized groups.

While I do not claim to have detailed information as to the number of cases denied by the Treasury Department, I am afraid that the policy in such cases has been more rigid than that of the War Labor Board, which deals with the other workers.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Has it been the observation of the gentleman that at any time employers have used this so-called stabilization and qualifying condition to obtain increased pay as a reason for not granting it? That is, they welcome the restriction so that they may deny employees the right to have this increase?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think perhaps the gentleman's suggestion is a valid one. I have heard of such cases, although my own experience has been that there have been a great many instances in my district where employers have tried to make increases for white collar workers and they have been denied by the Treasury Department, with what they consider too little consideration.

Mr. ROWE. I agree with the gentleman. I have found exactly the same circumstances with people in my district.

In other instances I have found conditions where it was a rather welcome restriction on the part of the employers. Can the Congress do anything that would set an established percentage, wherein it would not require the sanction of the Treasury Department to grant an increase, so that that would not be used as a fulcrum by the employer to deny an increase to the employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. I think the Congress could, by law, say that they were entitled to 15 percent over January 1, 1941, which is the Little Steel formula.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making. He is discussing something that is of very vital interest throughout the country. In keeping with the suggestion the gentleman has made, I would like to mention briefly a case that I had some experience with only recently. A certain business firm in my district wanted to increase the salary of one of its key personnel from $2,700 a year to $3,600 a year. It was made necessary, not only because of the increased load that this particular man was carrying, but due also to the fact that the Government itself had put in a number of war plants and war contracts in that particular area and had created a very keenly competitive field, so that this man could easily have shifted over to a war job and received $3,600 a year or more. Yet, when he went to the stabilization unit they allowed an increase of $120 a year, or $10 a month. The matter is now on appeal to Washington. A few days ago, I talked with the people in the stabilization unit of the Internal Revenue Department and they tell me they will not take into consideration the competition that the Government itself has created for that man's services.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I have had some similar cases in my own district.

SCHOOL TEACHERS

I want to call special attention to the situation with regard to one group of our citizens whose salaries have always been inadequate. I refer to the patriotic men and women who make a profession of teaching.

We are all interested in the welfare of our young people. The students of today are the citizens of tomorrow.

How can we expect our teachers to continue working for the mere pittance they are paid? We have no right to ask that they do so. Yet, we must have good teachers.

I am frank to admit that I do not understand how many of them exist. They are paid so little that I cannot but wonder why they continue.

Many of them have left the profession of teaching because they could not exist upon the salaries being received. In some cases schools have been closed for the want of teachers.

In a report made last December the National Education Association says:

> Studies of the school year 1942–43 revealed an acute manpower crisis in elementary and secondary schools. In terms of both number and quality of teachers the American people were losing an important battle on the home front. While this manpower crisis was caused in part by war conditions the major disintegration factor in education was the actual and relative unfavorable economic status of teachers. This status, never equal to the social importance of the teacher's work, had since Pearl Harbor been pushed back 20 years.

That statement poses a most important problem for our people. If not solved, its effects will be felt for generations to come.

The association further says:

> The present estimates show that the crisis of 1942–43 is continuing in 1943–44 with little or no abatement. Teacher turnover or replacement continues to be double its normal rate. Thousands are leaving the profession and their positions are left vacant, eliminated, or filled by persons with less than standard qualifications. Salary improvements, relatively small in amounts, have come too slowly and still have failed to reach thousands who are working for substandard payments.

It is stated that during this school year there are 254,000 teachers being paid less than $1,200 per year, and 44,000 receiving less than $600.

Can you imagine how many of these faithful teachers exist on such pay? Many industrial workers receive as much in a few weeks as these men and women are paid in a year.

Many teachers have left the schools for employment in war industries where the pay is much greater. Others have gone into the armed services.

The record shows that fewer persons are training themselves for teaching. They simply cannot see any future in the profession with such inadequate salaries.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to thank the gentleman for the splendid statement and presentation of the case for the underpaid school teachers of America. I want to add, if I may, that I was surprised and delighted a few evenings ago on a streetcar in Washington to see a placard along with the other advertising matter displayed in the street car, calling attention to the services of the teachers of this country and asking that they be given patriotic consideration. I know who pays for expensive ads, but I am just wondering what public-spirited citizen or group would thus do as the gentleman from Georgia is doing, call attention to the needs and the deserts of these people.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's fine talk, but if the gentleman will yield for a moment I want to congratulate him on the fine speech he is making and the constructive service he is doing for this country in calling attention to these matters. Back in my district last fall I encountered businessmen who called attention to the fact that our Treasury Department and other Government agencies had entirely overlooked this white-collar group and also the school teachers in connection with the rising costs of living and increased taxes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

In my own State, 70 percent of the teachers are paid less than $1,200 per year, and 15 percent less than $600. A similar situation exists in most of the Southern States.

This condition is not due to our unwillingness to pay more. It is due to the fact that our section has a low per capita income, but a high birth rate.

We of the South have less money than other sections of the country, but we have more children.

We spend a larger proportion of our income for schools than do other more-favored sections, but we spend less per pupil.

Contrast the facts I have stated as to Georgia with the pay of teachers in some other States. In Washington State no teacher is paid less than $1,200. In Pennsylvania, only 2 percent receive less than $1,200. In Delaware, it is only 3 percent.

You in the more fortunate States may say that this situation does not affect your people. It does, because those receiving an inadequate education migrate to your sections. It is also true that lack of adequate educational facilities in the South tends to keep down the income of its people and thus curtails the market in our section for many products manufactured in other sections of the Nation.

It is because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, that I am proposing legislation for Federal aid to the States for education and teacher pay.

The bill is so worded as to safeguard local control. I would not support any bill which, in any way, interfered with local control of our schools. I do not favor a Federal Department of Education.

However, I do believe that our National Government should help the States that need assistance, so that better educational opportunities may be had in such States. We need to equalize the opportunities for our young people in those States having more than their proportion of children of school age. It can be accomplished only through Federal aid.

The bill also provides temporary assistance for teacher pay. That is of particular importance just now. Many States are not financially able to meet this problem now.

The House Committee on Education has set May 9 as a tentative date for hearings on this proposal. While you are at home for Easter, I hope that you will talk with your school authorities and find out what they think of this proposal. Let them tell you of the problems facing our schools.

No group in our Nation deserves additional income more than our teachers. For the sake of our young people we should meet that need. We will be a better and a stronger Nation if we are an educated people.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am sure this Congress is interested in the subject matter not only of the legislation which is proposed by the gentleman from Georgia but also in the explanatory remarks he has made today. I want to be very clear as to my understanding of the gentleman's position, because I believe we think perhaps along the same channels on this subject.

The gentleman's legislation would in no wise destroy the independence of the educational processes of the school systems within the States; is that correct?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And the gentleman asks Federal assistance only so there may be a further raising of the standards of education which will reflect itself not only in Georgia, not only in my own State of West Virginia, but in every Commonwealth of our Union; is that correct?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is right about that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gentleman's attention to the subject, and I know the Congress is interested.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I will go further and say to the gentleman that I would not vote for my own bill if it should be amended so as to interfere with local control.

The gentleman from West Virginia is a former teacher, and I know of his active interest in the deplorable plight of this group, because he has discussed the matter with me on several occasions.

The Senate has passed legislation providing educational opportunities for those in our armed services, when they return. I favor that and I am sure the House will pass it also.

Shall we forget the younger persons, not yet old enough to serve in the armed forces? They will, in many cases, be old enough before this war ends. If not, they, in part, must shoulder the burden of paying for this war, for solving the complex problems following in its wake—they are our citizens of the future. We should give them every opportunity to be well trained to preserve the freedom to be earned by the blood of our valiant soldiers, sailors, and marines.

In a democracy we must have an educated and well-informed citizenry. We will not have that unless we meet the grave problems now facing education in the United States.

I therefore urge each Member of this House to give thought and study to this question. I solicit your help in meeting this problem in a way that will preserve the local control of our schools.

THE CONTINUING CRISIS IN EDUCATION

Studies of the school year 1942–43 revealed an acute manpower crisis in elementary and secondary schools. In terms of both number and quality of teachers, the American people were losing an important battle on the home front. While this manpower crisis was caused, in part, by war conditions, the major disintegration factor in education was the actual and relative unfavorable economic status of teachers. This status, never equal to the social importance of the teacher's work, had since Pearl Harbor been pushed back 20 years.

The present estimates show that the crisis of 1942–43 is continuing in 1943–44 with little or no abatement. Teacher turn-over or replacement continues to be double its normal rate. Thousands are leaving the profession and their positions are left vacant, eliminated, or filled by persons with less than standard qualifications. Salary improvements, relatively small in amounts, have come too slowly and still have failed to reach thousands who are working for substandard payments.

INADEQUATE SALARIES

The outlook for 1943–44, as of September 1943, is that 254,000 teachers will be paid less than $1,200; 44,000 will receive less than $600. Thus in a total of 882,450 teachers nearly 30 in every 100 will be below $1,200; 5 in every 100 will be below $600. In the past school year 360,000 received less than $1,200 and 66,000 received less than $600.

In 1942–43 only two States paid all of their teachers $1,200 or more; four States reported in this category this year. Since State bonuses and new minimum-salary provisions were not clearly effective in September, the total this year may possibly be as high as eight States.[1]

Twenty-two States this year will pay some teachers below $600; last year 26 did so.

RESTLESS TEACHERS

In 1943–44 it is estimated that more than 170,000 teachers will be new to their positions as compared with a turn-over of 180,000 in 1942–43 and a normal annual replacement of about 90,000. The situation this year, as it was last year, is most acute in the Middle West, stretching in a band from Montana to Texas. In this area from 30 to 40 percent of the teachers will be new this year. Although statistically most of the other States are better off, actually a destructive amount of turn-over exists in the rural areas and small towns of the entire Nation.

GAINS AND LOSSES

Teacher turn-over does not measure the number of persons leaving the profession, since many "new" teachers have shifted from other school systems. Last year the profession lost an estimated total of 39,000 teachers who entered the military services; this year the expected loss will be 29,000. In 1942–43 apparently 37,000 teachers entered war industries and similar nonteaching employment; in 1943–44 about 25,000 are expected to leave for similar reasons. The total number leaving because of military service, nonteaching employment, marriage, death, and other factors is expected to reach 80,000 teachers.

How will this gap be closed? In the first place, 10,000 positions have been eliminated since the school year 1942–43 and 8,000 other positions are vacant (in October). Subtracting these curtailments from 80,000 leaves about 62,000 positions that have been filled by recent graduates of teacher-education institutions and persons holding emergency credentials. In September 1943 the estimates showed more than 40,000 emergency certificates as necessary in 1943–44 and by October the estimated number had risen to 50,000. Educational institutions, which normally supply about 50,000 new teachers each year, possibly provided as few as 10,000 persons.

In brief then the schools will be short this year at least 68,000 qualified teachers (total of vacancies, eliminations, and emergency certificates). This figure is not far below the total of 75,000 estimated in March 1943 as the probable shortage of qualified teachers for 1943–44.

The potentially most destructive development is the decline of teacher education. In 1940–41 the teachers colleges enrolled 175,000 regular students; in 1941–42 a total of 146,-

[1] For example, in Oregon the State association reported that under the new minimum-salary law of $1,200 practically no teachers would receive less than that amount in 1943–44. The State department, however, reported 5 percent under $1,200 since a few schools may operate only 8½ months instead of the 9 months required for the $1,200 minimum. Pennsylvania and several other States provided special increases or bonuses but the extent of change under these new laws was not always apparent in September when the salary status was surveyed for this study.

000; in 1942–43 a total of 113,000; and in 1943–44 an estimated total of 72,000 (not including military students). These institutions have declined 60 percent of their prewar enrollments. In the same period the number of emergency credentials will be increased from 2,300 to 50,000—an increase of 2,000 percent. Obviously, many substandard teachers are being employed to take the places of those normally prepared by teachers colleges. If present trends continue the situation after the war will be especially destructive of teaching efficiency and professional morale.

SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS

In 1940–41 the elementary school enrolled 18,583,849 pupils, and the estimated total for 1943–44 is 17,551,500. This represents a decline of 5.6 percent.

In the same period high schools have declined 19.1 percent. The estimated high-school enrollment for 1943–44 is 5,421,700.

The apparent loss in elementary- and secondary-school enrollment for the past 3 years is 2,316,330. Part of this drop must be explained by the declining birth-rate which began affecting elementary-school enrollments in 1930. Since the high schools have not been seriously affected yet by general population decline, the estimated high-school loss of 1,283,981 must represent youth who have entered the armed forces or have quit school for full-time employment.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated number and percent of teachers and total turn-over in 1942–43 and in 1943–44*

State	Total number of classroom teachers, principals, and supervisors		Turn-over 1942–43		Turn-over 1943–44	
	1942–43 (January 1943)	1943–44 (September 1943)	Number	Percent of column 2	Number	Percent of column 3
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Alabama	19,900	19,800	3,800	19	3,400	17
Arizona	3,600	3,600	200	6	500	14
Arkansas	13,100	13,000	4,500	34	3,900	30
California	42,200	42,500	6,300	15	7,800	18
Colorado	9,200	9,000	2,700	29	2,000	22
Connecticut	10,350	10,350	540	5	800	8
Delaware	1,650	1,640	360	22	370	23
District of Columbia	3,500	3,450	300	9	150	4
Florida	13,700	13,500	2,100	15	2,400	18
Georgia	22,000	21,800	8,800	40	6,000	28
Idaho	4,300	4,250	2,270	53	1,800	42
Illinois	47,500	47,000	4,700	10	5,000	11
Indiana	23,000	22,700	3,400	15	3,800	17
Iowa	24,000	23,500	8,000	33	7,500	32
Kansas	18,500	18,100	5,500	30	5,200	29
Kentucky	18,180	18,000	3,500	19	4,000	22
Louisiana	15,000	14,700	3,700	25	2,500	17
Maine	6,200	6,200	1,800	29	1,000	16
Maryland	9,000	9,200	1,760	20	2,000	22
Massachusetts	25,100	25,000	3,700	15	2,500	10
Michigan	34,500	34,000	8,600	25	7,000	21
Minnesota	21,000	20,500	5,200	25	5,000	24
Mississippi	16,200	15,700	4,000	25	5,000	32
Missouri	26,000	25,500	7,800	30	8,500	33
Montana	4,960	4,800	2,000	40	2,000	42
Nebraska	13,900	13,700	4,100	29	5,000	36
Nevada	900	890	300	33	350	39
New Hampshire	2,920	2,900	560	19	600	21
New Jersey	28,000	27,750	2,190	8	2,800	10
New Mexico	3,980	3,900	1,465	37	1,000	26
New York	76,500	76,000	5,400	7	6,000	8
North Carolina	26,000	26,200	3,900	15	4,000	15
North Dakota	7,000	6,900	2,450	35	2,500	36
Ohio	41,000	41,000	8,000	20	6,000	15
Oklahoma	19,000	18,700	7,000	37	6,500	35
Oregon	8,000	8,000	2,800	35	3,060	38
Pennsylvania	61,500	61,000	6,200	10	7,000	11
Rhode Island	4,200	4,100	400	10	300	7
South Carolina	15,000	14,800	3,700	25	2,700	18
South Dakota	8,000	7,700	3,200	40	2,800	36
Tennessee	20,000	19,500	4,060	20	3,700	19
Texas	48,000	46,000	16,800	35	13,000	28
Utah	4,500	4,600	900	20	600	13
Vermont	2,700	2,670	500	19	750	28
Virginia	18,100	18,000	2,100	12	2,500	14
Washington	11,300	11,500	2,200	19	3,000	26
West Virginia	16,100	15,400	2,400	15	1,800	12
Wisconsin	21,000	20,700	5,060	24	5,500	27
Wyoming	2,800	2,750	1,100	39	1,000	36
Total	893,040	882,450	182,195	20	172,520	20

TABLE 2.—*Estimated number and percent of t eachers paid less than $1,200 and less than $600 in 1943–44*

State	Total number of classroom teachers, principals, and supervisors (September 1943)	Paid less than $1,200		Paid less than $600	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6
Alabama	19,800	14,850	75	5,940	30
Arizona	3,600	360	10	----------	0
Arkansas	13,000	9,750	75	3,900	30
California	42,500	----------	0	----------	0
Colorado	9,000	2,250	25	90	1
Connecticut	10,350	725	7	----------	0
Delaware	1,640	49	3	----------	0
District of Columbia	3,450	----------	0	----------	0
Florida	13,500	5,400	40	675	5
Georgia	21,800	15,260	70	3,270	15
Idaho	4,250	1,700	40	----------	0
Illinois	47,000	10,810	23	----------	0
Indiana	22,700	1,135	5	----------	0
Iowa	23,500	11,750	50	470	2
Kansas	18,100	9,955	55	3,620	20
Kentucky	18,000	13,500	75	3,600	20
Louisiana	14,700	5,880	40	2,205	15

TABLE 2.—*Estimated number and percent of teachers paid less than $1,200 and less than $600 in 1943–44*—Continued

State	Total number of classroom teachers, principals, and supervisors (September 1943)	Paid less than $1,200		Paid less than $600	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6
Maine	6,200	3,286	53	62	1
Maryland	9,200	552	6		0
Massachusetts	25,000	1,000	4		0
Michigan	34,000	5,100	15		0
Minnesota	20,500	7,175	35		0
Mississippi	15,700	14,287	91	7,850	50
Missouri	25,500	12,750	50	1,275	5
Montana	4,800	1,440	30		0
Nebraska	13,700	6,850	50		0
Nevada	890	134	15		0
New Hampshire	2,900	1,305	45		0
New Jersey	27,750	1,388	5		0
New Mexico	3,900	1,950	50		0
New York	76,000		0		0
North Carolina	26,200	10,480	40	262	1
North Dakota	6,900	5,175	75	207	3
Ohio	41,000	6,150	15		0
Oklahoma	18,700	9,724	52	187	1
Oregon	8,000	400	5		0
Pennsylvania	61,000	1,220	2		0
Rhode Island	4,100	205	5		0
South Carolina	14,800	11,544	78	3,996	27
South Dakota	7,700	4,620	60	1,155	15
Tennessee	19,500	14,625	75	3,900	20
Texas	46,000	9,200	20	920	2
Utah	4,600	460	10		0
Vermont	2,670	1,388	52	27	1
Virginia	18,000	10,800	60	540	3
Washington	11,500		0		0
West Virginia	15,400	1,848	12		0
Wisconsin	20,700	5,175	25		0
Wyoming	2,750	880	32	28	1
Total	882,450	254,485	29	44,179	5

TABLE 3.—*Estimated number and percent of turn-over to be lost to armed forces and industry in 1943–44*

State	1942–43 turn-over	1943–44 loss to armed forces		1943–44 loss to industry	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6
Alabama	3,400	500	15	450	13
Arizona	500	200	40	100	20
Arkansas	3,900	750	19	800	21
California	7,800	1,700	22	500	6
Colorado	2,000	400	20	200	10
Connecticut	800	250	31	75	9
Delaware	370	50	14	30	8
District of Columbia	150	40	27	10	7
Florida	2,400	350	15	250	10
Georgia	6,000	750	13	500	8
Idaho	1,800	200	11	300	17
Illinois	5,000	1,300	26	1,000	20
Indiana	3,800	750	20	550	14
Iowa	7,500	800	11	1,200	16
Kansas	5,200	650	13	700	13
Kentucky	4,000	750	19	700	18
Louisiana	2,500	700	28	1,000	40
Maine	1,000	150	15	150	15
Maryland	2,000	400	20	250	13
Massachusetts	2,500	500	20	200	8
Michigan	7,000	1,200	17	1,000	14
Minnesota	5,000	750	15	500	10
Mississippi	5,000	1,000	20	500	10
Missouri	8,500	1,600	19	1,200	14
Montana	2,000	300	15	300	15
Nebraska	5,000	350	7	800	16
Nevada	350	100	29	60	17
New Hampshire	600	60	10	75	13
New Jersey	2,800	800	29	250	9
New Mexico	1,000	100	10	90	9
New York	6,000	1,500	25	800	13
North Carolina	4,000	500	13	350	9
North Dakota	2,500	300	12	200	8
Ohio	6,000	1,200	20	1,100	18
Oklahoma	6,500	700	11	800	12
Oregon	3,000	300	10	400	13
Pennsylvania	7,000	2,500	36	750	11
Rhode Island	300	100	33	50	17
South Carolina	2,700	500	19	700	26
South Dakota	2,800	200	7	600	21
Tennessee	3,700	300	8	650	18
Texas	13,000	1,500	12	3,000	23
Utah	600	150	25	250	42
Vermont	750	50	7	100	13
Virginia	2,500	400	16	250	10
Washington	3,000	600	20	350	12
West Virginia	1,800	450	25	350	19
Wisconsin	5,500	550	10	500	9
Wyoming	1,000	200	20	350	35
Total	172,520	29,450	17	25,200	15

TABLE 4.—*Estimated vacancies and emergency certificates*

State	Vacancies		Emergency certificates	
	1942-43 (January)	1943-44 (October)	1942-43 (January)	1943-44 (October)
1	2	3	4	5
Alabama	400	350	2,200	2,500
Arizona	50	30	100	275
Arkansas	600	600	1,680	1,500
California	400	300	850	1,000
Colorado	150	200	787	1,200
Connecticut	40	75	150	300
Delaware	16	10	24	100
District of Columbia	50	20	50	0
Florida	150	150	1,000	1,500
Georgia	650	750	1,600	1,850
Idaho	120	50	33	400
Illinois	2,200	180	700	1,350
Indiana	100	120	250	1,000
Iowa	340	100	1,200	1,800
Kansas	500	100	1,300	2,500
Kentucky	400	300	2,300	3,500
Louisiana	150	350	250	900
Maine	100	130	500	250
Maryland	150	50	150	500
Massachusetts	150	70	500	200
Michigan	350	150	2,500	3,500
Minnesota	200	50	1,500	1,700
Mississippi	500	600	500	700
Missouri	250	200	1,300	1,100
Montana	150	75	150	400
Nebraska	200	50	1,200	1,500
Nevada	15	10	50	100
New Hampshire	0	10	78	80
New Jersey	60	100	600	500
New Mexico	200	50	450	300
New York	250	250	600	1,200
North Carolina	500	225	800	1,000
North Dakota	210	375	500	800
Ohio	300	175	2,700	2,100
Oklahoma	200	150	630	1,200
Oregon	365	75	0	700
Pennsylvania	0	140	1,600	2,200
Rhode Island	0	30	10	50
South Carolina	450	140	750	1,200
South Dakota	160	40	450	650
Tennessee	400	200	600	2,400
Texas	1,000	1,000	450	1,200
Utah	50	20	300	250
Vermont	50	20	250	300
Virginia	200	75	550	1,200
Washington	100	100	350	1,700
West Virginia	250	50	500	800
Wisconsin	200	75	1,500	2,100
Wyoming	50	50	162	200
Total	12,626	8,420	36,654	53,755

TABLE 5.—*Enrollments in teachers' colleges and normal schools*

	Enrollment
1940-41	[1] 175,000
1941-42	145,597
1942-43	112,740
1943-44 (exclusive of military)	[1] 72,000

[1] Estimated. Data based on reports of the U. S. Office of Education.

TABLE 6.—*Enrollments in elementary and secondary schools*

Year	Elementary	Secondary
1	2	3
1940-41	18,583,849	6,705,681
1941-42	18,193,649	6,394,114
1942-43		
1943-44	[1] 17,551,500	[1] 5,421,700

[1] Estimated by the National Education Association research division on the basis of October reports received by the U. S. Office of Education from local superintendents of schools.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to get the gentleman's reaction to this thought which I have had as far back as I can remember: Every child is a citizen of the United States; to make this child a citizen fit to accept responsibility, is there not placed upon the country the prior responsibility of seeing that as nearly as may be every child in every State shall have an equal opportunity for education?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina. There is a distinct responsibility resting upon the Federal Government. There are other reasons why I might say that the Federal Government should participate in the solving of this problem. For instance, the Supreme Court has held some time ago in a case that the Southern States—all the States, for that matter—must make equal salary payments to teachers of different races performing the same work. Frankly, it had not been the policy in the South to pay colored teachers as much. If we are to apply that directive from the Federal judiciary, I feel that we must have some help in those States where we have inadequate funds for education, as the situation now stands. The argument made by the gentleman from North Carolina is even stronger—that the Federal Government by constitutional amendment has made every person who reaches the age of 21 a citizen of America; therefore the Federal Government does have a responsibility to see that the future citizens of this country may have equal opportunity and be qualified to discharge the duties of that high position.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

VIVIAN KELLEMS—SPONTANEOUS OR INSPIRED CRITIC?

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I called the attention of the House to the seditious remarks of a Connecticut woman named Vivian Kellems, who, in an address made in Kansas City, urged American businessmen to refuse to pay income taxes—taxes vitally needed to support the war effort of the United States and the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, at that time Miss Kellems indignantly denied that there was anything un-American in her remarks. Since her Kansas City talk Miss Kellems has made speeches in Bridgeport, Conn.; Providence, R. I.; Springfield, Mass.; and Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, this woman claims she is a patriotic American. She protests vigorously any insinuation that un-American motivations are behind her appeal to American businessmen to refrain from paying taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, when I charged on the floor of this House that Miss Kellems was motivated in her remarks by seditious enemy influences, I

knew whereof I spoke. Miss Kellems claims to be 100-percent American. She claims that she is a loyal, patriotic citizen—do not they all claim to be loyal, patriotic American citizens?

Miss Kellems hides behind a cloak of ancestry. She says that she had 17 known ancestors who fought in the American Revolution. Miss Kellems admits that her antecedents did not arrive on these shores aboard the *Mayflower*, but she says that her first ancestor came from England to the beautiful eastern shores of Virginia in 1635. Mr. Speaker, Benedict Arnold fought in the Revolutionary War—but, he, too, was a traitor to his country.

Odd, indeed Mr. Speaker, that Vivian Kellems, who ruthlessly defies the Constitution and endeavors to sabotage our war effort, claims to be free of foreign influences and of subversive motivations in making these charges. It is definitely odd when one has available, as I have, excerpts from correspondence which this same Miss Vivian Kellems, of Wilton Road, Westport, Conn., has for some 2 years been carrying on with a well-known Nazi agent named Count Frederick Karl von Zedlitz in Buenos Aires, Argentina. For 2 long years now Miss Kellems has been in close touch with Nazi agent Von Zedlitz, discussing with him her political thoughts and personal affairs.

Should there be any doubt of the identity of Count Frederick Karl von Zedlitz, one must only inspect British blacklist No. 1760, which clearly identifies him as residing at 1829 Avenida Alvaer, Buenos Aires, Argentina. In fact, Miss Kellems has written him as recently as January of this year.

I have here an excerpt from a letter which Miss Kellems wrote Nazi agent Von Zedlitz in Argentina on December 28, 1943, addressing this enemy agent as "My darling boy." In this letter she discussed a Christmas gift and acknowledged a telegram from her Nazi boy friend, which read:

All my thoughts wish see and have you near here.

FREDERICK.

Two months before that, in October 1943, Miss Kellems talked with Zedlitz on the long-distance telephone and wrote him later:

You could not have understood much of what I said and the censors would not let me say what I thought.

She told the Nazi agent that she had been to an astrologist who told her that she would "play a part, not only in national affairs but also in international affairs." Indeed, Mr. Speaker, shades of Adolf Hitler. Miss Kellems concludes her letter by saying, "How could that be if I am not married to you?" Thus, we see clearly, Mr. Speaker, that Miss Kellems, in her own words, has every intention of marrying this agent of the German Reich. But, lo and behold, here is something even more interesting:

The same Miss Vivian Kellems, who advises American businessmen not to pay their income tax and support the war effort, admits that she consulted with the Nazi agent in Buenos Aires on her proposed seditious speaking tour. In that same month Von Zedlitz wrote to Miss Kellems from the address on Avenida Alvaer in Buenos Aires, wishing her "joy" in the "monstrous speaking program."

Earlier, on October 13, 1943, Miss Kellems addressed a letter to Nazi agent Von Zedlitz signed, "All my love, sweetheart, Vivian." In this letter, she reports that she discussed with an unidentified third person the possibility that Nazi agent Von Zedlitz might return to the United States. This third party brought her a letter from the Count, which she describes as a masterful presentation of world conditions, and I am delighted to have it. This was material from the Nazi agent to Miss Kellems, and the speech, in which she urged American businessmen to play the Hitler game by refusing to pay their income tax, followed shortly. As if all this were not enough, Mr. Speaker, we find one letter written by Miss Kellems on September 26, 1943, while she was aboard the Twentieth Century Limited, en route to Chicago to speak before the Engineers' Club, in which she wrote her Nazi Count as to how she had arranged speaking engagements in St. Paul, St. Louis, Danbury, and Chicago. In this letter, she referred to a book which Nazi agent Von Zedlitz had sent her. This book was not vicious enough for her. It was not un-American enough for Miss Kellems. She said that the book was "too American." Mr. Speaker, the rules of etiquette and the spirit of fair play prevent me from including any more excerpts from Miss Kellems' correspondence with the Nazi Count of Argentina.

But let us examine further the spoken words of Miss Vivian Kellems. Last February 9, Miss Kellems addressed the Rotary Club in Philadelphia. She said, and I quote:

We are but one step removed in this country from the firing squad and the concentration camp.

Were that true, Mr. Speaker, Miss Kellems would not be running around the country making speeches, denouncing our form of government and urging Americans to refuse to suport our war effort. Miss Kellems poses as a patriot; yet, she has consistently played the Nazi game. Vivian Kellems is today giving aid and comfort to the enemy. Vivian Kellems is today a tool of the Goebbels propaganda machine.

This is nothing new for Vivian Kellems. Let us go back to 1940, in July—Miss Kellems is an old hand at Hitler's "divide and conquer" scheme. We all know that strategy. Hitler used it well to conquer many countries. In July 1940—on July 9 to be exact—Miss Kellems was interviewed by the New York World-Telegram on her return from Europe aboard the *Yankee Clipper*. Miss Kellems said that the British accused the United States of being yellow. This in itself might have passed as an innocent statement to the uninitiated, but lo and behold, less than a week later the German bund newspaper, Hitler's personal organ in the United States, the Deutsche Weckruf und Beobachter, carried a screaming eight-column headline across page 12, "British Call America Yellow." This Nazi rag, edited by Fritz Kuhn, now in jail as an enemy agent, used Miss Kellems' remarks to give aid and comfort to the Nazi cause. Rarely, if ever, has there been a more clear-cut incident of an American playing the Nazi game of "divide and conquer."

Mr. Speaker, I say that Vivian Kellems is a menace to the American war effort. This woman, who is in constant contact with our hated Nazi enemies—this woman, the lover of a Hitler "fifth column" spy in Argentina, admits by her own statements that right now in Connecticut she is engaged in work for the armed forces of a highly restricted and confidential nature and that she has in her desk blueprints, drawings, and specifications of inestimable value to the enemy.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time the Justice Department put an end to this incredible conspiracy.

Here is an editorial from the Washington Post, which discusses Miss Kellems rather dispassionately and which poignantly suggests that Miss Kellems' activities are highly distasteful to patriotic Americans:

AMAZING AMAZON

The reasons given by Miss Vivien Kellems, war contractor who contended for Representative LUCE's seat in Congress, for calling a tax strike and urging businessmen to follow her example are not at all clear from the rather confused and rambling statement of financial embarrassment accompanying her appeal. However, Miss Kellems' assumption that a refusal to pay taxes can be justified by a conviction of their unfairness or by a lack of ready cash is extraordinarily naive. So is her surprise at Secretary Morgenthau's declaration that it "smacks of disloyalty" to advise citizens to refuse to pay taxes. Miss Kellems' reference to the famous Boston Tea Party is all of a piece with her general muddleheadedness. For the lady, who yearns to stage a modern version of that picturesque affair, forgot that the men who dumped tea in Boston Harbor as a protest against taxation without representation were rioters from the standpoint of the Government then in power—not the patriots that they seem to present-day Americans.

Deliberate refusal to pay taxes is in fact a form of rebellion against authority that calls for most drastic treatment. History teaches that lesson and warrants the stern language used by Secretary Morgenthau. As Mr. Morgenthau says, taxes are levied by Congress, and it is the duty of the Treasury to collect those taxes. Citizens who are dissatisfied with the tax system may urge changes in the law, but that is all they can do without falling foul of the law. If every man short of cash were to withhold taxes on the ground that he lacked money for payment, if every manufacturer insisted on building up postwar capital reserves before payment of taxes, we should soon fall into a state of financial anarchy. Whatever our opinion of the existing tax laws—and they are none too flattering—the individual is obligated to meet payments in full. To assume otherwise is to betray gross ignorance of the nature of constituted government.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask Miss Kellems whether or not her boy friend, currently residing in the Axis-dominated Argentina, is not the brother of Herr von Zedlitz who was chief of staff of the Nazi army before Stalingrad.

I have given the foregoing information because I believe the American people are entitled to know the facts. It

affords me no pleasure to refer to the personal life of any lady in a critical way. Yet, Miss Kellems did not hesitate to apply whips to those of us who dared to criticize her.

She is the lady who ran against our own gentlewoman from Connecticut, CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, in 1942. She is the lady who finds the administration to be wholly intolerable because of its tax policies. This is the lady who was, and is, the welcome guest of chamber of commerce service organizations and civic groups and who sets herself up as an authority on fiscal matters. This is the lady who had the colossal temerity to advise fellow industrialists to sabotage the Government of her own country.

Under the Espionage Act and the sedition laws of the United States, it is my contention that any American citizen, in time of war, who deliberately advises businessmen and/or taxpayers of our country not to pay taxes which the law imposes, is guilty of such reprehensible conduct as justifies her prosecution at the hands of the Department of Justice. Under the judicial interpretations of those acts, a mere expression of opinion, unsympathetic with the war program, is compatible with and not in contravention of the Bill of Rights; but when one urges her fellow citizens not to pay taxes indispensable to the financing of the war, she then falls within the well-defined category of the indictable offenders, consisting of those who have the intent to incite to action hostile to the preservation of our Government.

Shall this lady be vouchsafed immunity because she happens to be a member of the feminine sex?

I do not make these remarks because of any enthusiasm over current taxes. I voted against both the 1943 and 1944 tax laws because, in my judgment, they were unfair, inequitable, inadequate in some particulars and provided special favors in others; because these laws required complicated forms to be filled in order to abide by them—but not for one moment do I believe such laws should be repudiated when they are enacted by the majority vote of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the American people awoke to the true situation. Those who would destroy us from within should be appropriately rebuked. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the Department of Justice put an effective end to the amazing conspiracy of Nazi advisers in foreign countries collaborating with American industrialists, whether male or female. Away with all such tactics as those I have described. We are fighting a desperate war. The sacrifices of our boys in the service require, as a minimum measure of justice and support for them, that we crack down upon sabotage of every kind on our home front.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1247. An act for the relief of the Bishopville Milling Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1416. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judith H. Sedler, administratrix of the estate of Anthony F. Sedler, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1432. An act to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1479. An act providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

S. 1708. An act to amend section 12 of the Pay Adjustment Act of June 16, 1942, relating to travel allowances; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1714. An act to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1720. An act to vest title to the United States ship *Wolverine* (ex-*Michigan*) in the Foundation for the Original United States Ship Michigan, Inc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1741. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V-3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1771. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1772. An act to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1801. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Virginian Railway Co., a corporation, for railroad-yard-enlargement purposes, a parcel of land of the Camp Allen Reservation at Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1216. An act for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Paul B. Lingle;

H. R. 2234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen;

H. R. 2273. An act for the relief of E. C. Fudge;

H. R. 2337. An act for the relief of John Joseph Defeo;

H. R. 2616. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes;

H. R. 2778. An act to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker;

H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker;

H. R. 3259. An act to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration;

H. R. 3362. An act to fix the annual compensation of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 3408. An act to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 3602. An act to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of C. C. Evensen;

H. R. 3847. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes;

H. R. 3912. An act to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4346. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4377. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy;

H. R. 4381. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, April 1, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1348. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 11, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Yazoo River, Miss., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 29, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1349. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated August 19, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Aguadilla Harbor, P. R.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1350. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the future status of certain functions and personnel transferred to the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1351. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relative to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1352. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Muskingum watershed conservancy district against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

1353. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

1354. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

1355. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1356. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for the month of January 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1357. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting reports of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the months of December 1943 and January 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1358. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1359. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of the government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1360. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a series of five tables covering his determinations during the third quarter of the fiscal year 1944, of numbers of employees required by the Executive Departments and Agencies for the proper and efficient exercise of their respective functions; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1361. A letter from the president, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to clarify the meaning of references in the act to number of employees supervised and size of organization unit; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1362. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3054. A bill to amend the Expediting Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4244. A bill to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 1331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322). Referred to the Committee of Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Lessie C. Selman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2470. A bill for the relief of J. G. Sullivan; with amendments (Rept. No. 1326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2624. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon; with amendments (Rept. No. 1327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2788. A bill for the relief of Frank Baptiste; with amendments (Rept. No. 1328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2874. A bill for the relief of Robert Will Starks; with amendment (Rept. No. 1329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3038. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page; with amendment (Rept. No. 1330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 4545. A bill to equalize State old-age assistance payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4546. A bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on 25 April 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4547. A bill to amend the act of February 14, 1931, as amended, so as to permit the compensation on a mileage basis, of civilian officers or employees for the use of privately owned airplanes while traveling on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 4548 (by request). A bill to amend the civil-service law; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to acquirement of lands within this State by Federal instrumentalities; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4549. A bill for relief of Sandy C. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 4550. A bill for the relief of Ben Judell; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5401. By Mr. HEIDINGER: A communication from O. A. McRill, of Wayne City, Ill., in reference to the difference in comparative prices that the farmers are receiving for certain of their products and the price they have to pay for the commodities they have to buy; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5402. Also, a communication from the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolis, Ill., signed by W. R. Tiner, secretary, giving the views of their organization on international air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5403. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of Ella Sundberg and 67 other citizens of Stromsburg, Osceola, and Benedict, Nebr., urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, APRIL 1, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, maker of all things, judge of all men, solemnize our hearts with reverential and penitential awe as these holy days over which is the shadow of a cross we follow the wounded foot-

steps of man's Best Man, love's Best Love as in lowly pomp He rides on into His Nation's crowded Capital. Teach us anew, as we look on Him in whose face Thy glory is revealed, the pretense of pride, the hollowness of ambition, the vanity of power, the deceit of riches, the disillusionment of fame. In the set and steadfast face of that Servant of all who rides on to die, may we see anew the might of love, the royalty of self-giving, the majesty of meekness.

"O Thou whose dreams enthrall the heart, Ride on! Ride on!
Ride on 'till tyranny and greed are evermore undone.
In mart and court and parliament the common good increase
'Till men at last shall ring the bells of brotherhood and peace."

In the dear Redeemer's name who hath swallowed up death in victory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 30, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 31, 1944, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy; and

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of March 30, 1944, the following message from the House of Representatives was received during the recess of the Senate:

That the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1028) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia.

That the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2648) for the relief of Avid Evers.

That the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3912. An act to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended.

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4133) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

That the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 75) providing for an adjournment of Congress from Thursday, March 30, 1944, to Wednesday, April 12, 1944.

That the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 248) for the relief of Louis Courcil; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. DICKSTEIN, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 544) for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. FERNANDEZ, and Mr. CHENOWETH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1313) for the relief of Delores Lewis; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. ABERNETHY, and Mr. CARSON of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1411) for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. PATTON, and Mr. JENNINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1412) for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. PATTON, and Mr. CARSON of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2625) for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. FERNANDEZ, and Mr. JENNINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mavix Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. SAUTHOFF were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2850. An act to authorize the rezoning of certain property in the District of Columbia as a residential area;

H. R. 4327. An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a minimum wage board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1918, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under authority of the order of March 30, 1944, the Vice President during the recess of the Senate signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had been received from the House of Representatives and signed previously by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 1216. An act for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Paul B. Lingle;

H. R. 2234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen;

H. R. 2273. An act for the relief of E. C. Fudge;

H. R. 2337. An act for the relief of John Joseph Defeo;

H. R. 2616. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes;

H. R. 2778. An act to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker;

H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker;

H. R. 3259. An act to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration;

H. R. 3362. An act to fix the annual compensation of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 3408. An act to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 3602. An act to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of C. C. Evensen;

H. R. 3847. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes;

H. R. 3912. An act to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4346. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4377. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy;

H. R. 4381. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR CHARLES L. McNARY

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the Progressive for March 20 appears a beautiful tribute, entitled "Oregon's 'Charlie Mac'," written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, for years one of Senator McNary's dear friends. The deftness of the

writer's touch as he treats of our late friend betokens an affection of which the RECORD should speak, and I ask unanimous consent that the tribute be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON'S "CHARLIE MAC"

(By Capt. Richard L. Neuberger)

He was one of the last links with the old progressives of the great tradition. William Borah is gone and so are Tom Walsh and the elder Bob La Follette. George Norris is in retirement. And now Senator Charles McNary, of Oregon, is gone, too.

He was essentially a kind man. He was moved by generous impulses and by deep human sympathy. He had few preconceived social and economic beliefs. This was one of the reasons for his unrivaled personal popularity among men of all political faiths. He was no breast beater, no table pounder. He neither proclaimed nor declaimed. He never looked down from Olympian heights. He did not aspire to rule or sovereignty or power.

Charles Linza McNary, for 26 years United States Senator from Oregon, was happy in that position. He declined many opportunities to be Governor of his State. He was a reluctant candidate for Vice President. Once his friend, Senator Jim Couzens, of Michigan, wanted to contribute $100,000 to a campaign fund to back McNary for the Presidency.

McNary smiled and little crow's-feet appeared at the corners of his eyes, as he scrawled on the back of the restaurant menu:

"The Presidential bee is a deadly bug.
I've seen it work on others.
O Lord, protect me from its hug,
And let it sting my brothers."

McNary's beliefs and convictions stemmed from kindness and tolerance. In basic philosophy he was neither a liberal nor a conservative. His views spanned both sides. He was for public ownership of water power but he was skeptical of Government bureaucracy. He voted against extending the draft, but he favored the original lend-lease bill. He backed up much of the criticism which his running mate, Wendell Willkie, directed against the New Deal, but he did not go along with all of Willkie's comments on foreign affairs.

FRIENDSHIPS CUT PARTY LINES

He liked people. His friends were universal. He liked the President immensely, and this regard Mr. Roosevelt reciprocated. BOB LA FOLLETTE and Senator ARTHUR CAPPER were among McNary's closest cronies. Gen. George C. Marshall was another intimate of the Oregon Senator. They first met when Marshall was a brigadier general in command of the historic old post at Vancouver Barracks.

There was a rectitude about Senator McNary which no events could wear away. He was Republican minority leader, but when he felt the administration was moving in the right direction, he went along with administration policies. He was Willkie's running mate, but when he could not agree with Willkie's views he said so. He and President Roosevelt were good friends, on warm, personal terms, but he did not hesitate to challenge the President on many issues.

McNary's family went back a long way in Oregon history. He once told me, "I go back a long way too, Dick." He was acutely conscious of the events behind him. He knew that his grandfather had crossed the continent in a covered wagon and floated, hungry and tattered, down the Columbia River on a raft.

His farm, Fir Cone, held for him memories of his grandmother, Linza, and of his other pioneer predecessors. Fir Cone was one of his conversation pieces. "I want to see Fir Cone," said BOB LA FOLLETTE as he arrived in Oregon for the funeral. "Charlie never got tired of talking about Fir Cone."

SENATE'S BEST-LOVED MEMBER

Senator McNary was wise and cynical and urbane, yet he delighted in chatting with his farm neighbors in the Willamette Valley. He liked people and people liked him. He always was to Oregon what Jefferson must have been to Virginia. Fir Cone was for a quarter of a century Oregon's Monticello. Without bias, malice, or personal ambition he studied the questions which affected his native State. Many things which unscrupulous politicians might have wanted to do they did not do because of fear of him and his influence.

Oregon was proud of Harry Lane, and later of Harry Lane's successor. When Senator Lane died, the elder La Follette quoted, "He added to the sum of human joy, and if everyone to whom he had done some loving service were to bring a blossom to his grave he would sleep tonight beneath a wilderness of flowers."

That could have been said about Harry Lane's successor. "Charlie Mac" was the best-loved Member of the United States Senate, and he was almost a final link with the men who 20 years ago fought for equality for agriculture and to retain Muscle Shoals for the people.

Oregon is not represented in Statuary Hall in the National Capitol at Washington, D. C. A number of States are represented by former Senators—New Hampshire by Daniel Webster, South Carolina by John C. Calhoun, Wisconsin by Robert M. La Follette, Sr., Louisiana by Huey P. Long, Missouri by Thomas H. Benton. Someday Charles Linza McNary may be there, too.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 523)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the message was read to the House of Representatives yesterday and has already been printed in the RECORD, I suggest that it be printed at this point in the RECORD of the Senate proceedings, without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President of the United States is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am permitting S. 1285, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes," to become law without my signature.

The bill is, in my judgment, wholly inadequate to assure to service men and women as far as is practically feasible the same opportunity which they would have to vote if they were at home.

Because of the confusing provisions of the bill and because of the difficulty of knowing just what will be the practical effect of the bill in operation, it is impossible for me to determine whether in fact more service men and women will be able to vote under the new measure than under existing law. That determination will largely depend upon the extent to which the States cooperate to make the measure as effective as its provisions permit. In view of this situation, I have resolved the doubt, in favor of the action taken by the Congress, and am permitting the bill to become law without my approval.

In other words, this bill might fairly be called a standing invitation to the several States to make it practicable for their citizens to vote; in this sense the Congress is placing a certain responsibility on each State for action. But it will, of course, be understood by those in the armed services, who want to vote but cannot, that the Congress itself shares the responsibility through the complexities of this bill.

The issue regarding soldiers' voting has been confused. The issue is not whether soldiers should be allowed to vote a full ballot, including State and local offices, or a short ballot confined to Federal offices. I am, and always have been, anxious to have the Federal Government do everything within its power compatible with military operations to get the full State ballots to the men and women in the service. I always have been, and I am now, anxious to have the States do everything within their power to get the full State ballots to the men and women in the service.

The real issue is whether, after the States have done all that they are willing to do to get the full State ballots to the men and women in the service, and after the Federal Government has done everything within its power to get the full State ballots delivered to the men and women in the service, those who have not received their full State ballots should be given the right to cast a short, uniform Federal ballot which can readily be made available to them. This right, which should be assured to all men and women in the service, is largely nullified by the conditions which the provisions of this bill attach to its exercise.

In my judgment, the right of a soldier to vote the Federal ballot if he does not receive in time his State ballot should not be conditioned, as it is by this bill, upon his having made a prior application for a State ballot, or upon the prior certification by the Governor of the State that the Federal ballot is acceptable under State law. This bill provides a Federal ballot, but because of these conditions it does not provide the right to vote.

The Federal Government will and should do everything it can to get the State ballots to our men and women in the service. But it is not, in my judgment, true, as some have contended, that the Federal Government can assure the use of State ballots as readily as the use of Federal ballots. No matter what effort the Federal Government makes, in many cases it will not be possible to insure the delivery in time of State ballots to designated individuals all over the world or their return in time to the respective States.

Some of the service men and women, not knowing where they will be a month hence or whether they will be alive, will not apply for their ballots. Others will not receive their State ballots in time or be able to get their ballots back to their States in time. Remember that a number of States still require a special form of application and that the postal-card application forms supplied by the Federal Government are only treated as an application for an application for a State ballot.

The Federal Government can insure, and, in my judgment, it is the duty of the Federal Government to insure, that every service man and woman who does not get his State ballot in time shall have the right to use a short and uniform Federal ballot.

It is, in my judgment, within the authority of the Congress to use its war powers to protect the political rights of our service men and women to vote for Federal offices, as well as their civil rights with respect to their jobs and their homes. If Congress did not hesitate to protect their property rights by legislation which affected State law, there is no reason why Congress should hesitate to protect their political rights.

In 1942, Congress did exercise the war powers to provide Federal war ballots and they were counted in almost every State. What was constitutional in 1942, certainly is not unconstitutional in 1944.

In allowing the bill to become law, I wish to appeal to the States, upon whom the Congress has placed the primary responsibility for enabling our service people to vote, to cooperate to make the bill as fully effective as its defective provisions will allow. The response of the Governors to my questions, and reports made to me by the War Department, indicate that many States have not yet taken action to make the bill as fully effective as it could be and that a considerable number of States do not presently contemplate taking such action.

I wish also to appeal to the Congress to take more adequate action to protect the political rights of our men and women in the service.

It is right and necessary that the States do all in their power to see that the State ballots reach the men and women in the service from their States. In particular, I appeal to them to see that their State laws allow sufficient time between the time that their absentee ballots are available for distribution and the time that they must be returned to be counted.

I also appeal to the States to see that the postal-card application forms for State ballots distributed by the Federal Government to the troops are treated as a sufficient application for their State ballot and not merely as a request for a formal application for a State ballot.

I also appeal to the States to authorize the use of the Federal ballots by all service people from their States who have not received their State ballots before an appropriate date, whether or not they have formally applied for them. No State or Federal red tape should take from our young folk in the service their right to vote.

I further appeal to the Congress to amend the present bill, S. 1285, so as to authorize all service men and women, who have not received their State ballots by an appropriate date, whether or not they have formally applied for them, to use the Federal ballot without prior express authorization by the States. If the States do not accept the Federal ballot, that will be their responsibility. Under this bill, that responsibility is shared by the Congress.

Our boys on the battle fronts must not be denied an opportunity to vote simply because they are away from home. They are at the front fighting with their lives to defend our rights and our freedoms. We must assure them their rights and freedoms at home so that they will have a fair share in determining the kind of life to which they will return.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1944.*

THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD two editorials from recent issues of the Philadelphia Record, dealing with a recent opinion of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

One editorial is headed "Pennsylvania common law—Republicans are innocent." In that editorial the court says:

> The question is entirely one of law. Our conclusion is not to be understood as approving the morals of the transaction.

While this same court, in the opinion written by Chief Justice Maxey in the famous Puffendorf decision, says:

> All laws should receive a sensible construction. If we construe (the Philadelphia city charter) literally it means that a mayor of Philadelphia must be elected on November 4.

Then the court went on to argue that—

> The common sense of man approves the judgment mentioned by Puffendorf, (1694) that the Bolognian law which enacted that "whoever drew blood in the streets should be punished with the utmost severity" did not extend to the surgeon who opened the vein of a person that fell down in the street with a fit.

The other editorial deals with the profits in G. O. P. politics sanctified by anonymity. The decision in this case was per curiam, without any one of the seven justices even signing it. They were so ashamed of the opinion that they lacked the courage to sign it.

This case involved a rake-off of $250,000 in the Municipal Water Co. transaction in the city of Chester, Delaware County, Pa., the lower court having ruled that it was up to boss John McClure and his associates to return the $250,000. The supreme court reversed that opinion and put the stamp of approval on this dishonest and dishonorable transaction.

I have said before on the floor of the Senate that I have nothing but contempt for the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and especially for its chief justice.

Whether or not our founding fathers were right when they based our Constitution on the separation of public powers into three equal branches, the executive, legislative, and judicial, I have long been of the opinion that if American liberty should ever be extinguished, behind that crime would be found the political courts of several States, and I may add that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania would head the list.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of March 22, 1944]

PENNSYLVANIA COMMON LAW—REPUBLICANS ARE INNOCENT

The all-Republican Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has reaffirmed this State's oldest and most consistently respected legal precedent:

That no important Republican politician shall be convicted.

John J. McClure, notorious boss of Delaware County, is the present beneficiary of this doctrine, as he has been before.

In a unanimous decision the all-Republican supreme court has ruled that McClure and his political confederates may keep $250,000 they split when they bought the Chester waterworks for $750,000 and sold it to the Chester Municipal Authority for $1,000,000.

This case was a tough test for that classic legal doctrine of Republican impeccability, which some now suggest be called Maxey's law.

The facts were quite clear. No one denied McClure and his pals made $250,000 profit on the deal. No one denied they sold the water works to a municipal authority made up largely of men who owed their election to McClure and his machine.

In the lower court, where McClure and his associate, William C. Purdy, were convicted and ordered to pay back $85,000 a piece, Judge Shull declared:

"The conclusion is irresistible that McClure was permitted to make this profit only by reason of his position as political leader and by the influence that fact would have on the action of men who, with his approval and support, had been elected to office."

But the all-Republican supreme court reverses that decision on the ground that the evidence did not show any "confidential relation"—a highfalutin term meaning "in cahoots"—between McClure and Chester officials.

In effect, the all-Republican supreme court denied that one of the biggest Republican political bosses in Pennsylvania had any influence with his own stooges.

This finding was so naive, so ludicrous to anyone aware of the "facts of life" about Pennsylvania politics, that the court felt obliged to add this comment:

"The question is entirely one of law. Our conclusion is not to be understood as approving the morals of the challenged transaction."

That in itself is a shocking statement. For there is only one point in the whole transaction involving morals: Whether or not McClure was both seller of the waterworks and boss of the purchasers?

The all-Republican supreme court could have corrected that matter of morals simply by upholding the lower court, by accepting the fact known to everybody else in Pennsylvania—that McClure was boss; boss of his councilmen and all the rest of his Delaware County machine.

But, quibbles the court, proof of McClure's influence was not put into the record. Would the court, on a cloudy day, demand proof that the sun still existed?

Our supreme court has not always based its rulings entirely on the law. In the

famous "Puffendorf" decision, written by Justice Maxey, the court held:

"All laws should receive a sensible construction. If we construe (the Philadelphia City charter) literally, it means that a mayor of Philadelphia must be elected on November 4." Then the court went on to argue that—

"The common sense of man approves the judgment mentioned by Puffendorf, that the Bolognian law which enacted that 'whoever drew blood in the streets should be punished with the utmost severity' did not extend to the surgeon who opened the vein of a person that fell down in the street with a fit."

Back to the seventeenth century and Baron Puffendorf went the all-Republican supreme court when the clearly worded law of this century interfered with the G. O. P. scheme to make Barney Samuel mayor without an election.

There was no strict interpretation of law in that opinion.

Now that Republican Boss McClure wants to keep his $85,000, the strictest interpretation of the statute is dragged out and McClure keeps the dough.

This decision of the supreme court will effectively discourage other taxpayers from attempting to fight Republican corruption through the courts of this State.

Why, then, not end the quibbling over law? Why not simply put into the statutes the really controlling doctrine, the so-called Maxey's law—that no big Republican politician shall be convicted?

It may seem odd to name this doctrine for the chief justice, who only last week denounced the Republican Party for putting inferior men in office. But the McClure decision has proven his point—brilliantly.

[From the Philadelphia Record of March 23, 1944]

PROFITS IN G. O. P. POLITICS SANCTIFIED BY ANONYMITY

There is noteworthy peculiarity in the opinion whereby the State supreme court upheld John J. McClure and his henchmen in their $250,000 take from the malodorous Chester water deal.

The opinion was anonymous.

Contrary to usual procedure where the ruling is long and important, no justice professed authorship by affixing his signature.

The all-Republican tribunal's decision, concurred in by the entire bench, carried the ultimate in impersonalized signatures—"Per curiam," or by the court.

Of that the man in the street, the average Pennsylvanian, can have but one thought: Was this anonymity an effort to distribute responsibility, to avoid the placing of it on one or several justices?

Pennsylvanians have leaned over backward to maintain a respect for their courts.

But they will be profoundly disquieted and their faith heavily taxed by a decision so issued which works to the great benefit of a powerful Republican politician.

They will remember that the decision in favor of Delaware County Boss McClure, overruling a lower court, is the latest in a series of opinions by the high court in which the ends of Republican politicians and policies have been served.

The court upheld the city wage tax. It halted the probe into the G. O. P. registration commission here which had an admitted 150,000 improper registrations on the books. It handed down the "Puffendorf" decision which maintained Bernard Samuel in office and prevented Philadelphians from voting for mayor as provided by the city charter.

In the McClure opinion the supreme court refused to accept as self-evident that a confidential relation did exist between McClure, who bought the Chester waterworks for $750,000, and the members of the Chester Municipal Authority, to whom he sold it for $1,000,000.

This is contrary to usual judicial acceptance. If a man is a political boss, and nobody denies that McClure is the boss in Chester and Delaware County, it is obvious that he has a confidential relation, in other words, influence, with the men who hold office only by his consent. Such is usually assumed by a court of law.

The effect of such a ruling goes far beyond the interest of the parties directly involved.

McClure and his henchmen are allowed to keep their $250,000, which comes directly out of the pockets of the 60,000 inhabitants of Chester. That only amounts to about $4 per capita. It won't make them or break them to hand McClure this gift.

The effect will be felt also by the 9,900,000 odd inhabitants of Pennsylvania who don't live in Chester. They know Chester and they know McClure. They know that Pennsylvania's highest court has stretched the cloth of legalistic logic to such a tortured length and breadth that it now covers with sanctified immunity almost any act a political boss (genus Republican) cares to perform.

Profit and G. O. P. politics are now more synonymous than ever.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

MUSKINGUM WATERSHED CONSERVANCY DISTRICT VERSUS THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of *Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, submitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to clarify the meaning of references in the act to number of employees supervised and size of organization unit; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, submitting, pursuant to law, a series of five tables covering his determinations, during the third quarter of the fiscal year 1944, of numbers of employees required by the executive departments and agencies for the proper and efficient exercise of their respective functions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

Letters from the Administrative Officer, Executive Office of the President (the White House office); the Director, Office for Emergency Management, Executive Office of the President (Division of Central Administrative Service); the Acting Postmaster General (Office of the Postmaster General); the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce (Office of the Secretary of Commerce); the Secretary of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and the Officer in Charge of the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1944, for their respective offices (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to make provision enabling persons serving in the armed forces of the United States or who have served therein and who have been honorably discharged, to establish and rehabilitate themselves in the post-war era, under a farm home-ownership plan and to provide adequate Federal funds to be loaned to such persons, as provided in the Bankhead-Jones Act and as administered by the Farm Security Administration

"Whereas it is highly important to make provision enabling persons serving in the armed forces of the United States, or who have served therein and who have been honorably discharged, to establish ownership of farm homes for themselves and their families after the termination of the present war, and that it is necessary that adequate provisions be made by the Federal Government by appropriating sufficient funds to be loaned to such persons desiring to take advantage of same, such provisions to be made under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Act as administered by the Farm Security Administration; and

"Whereas experience has demonstrated that loans made in the past under said act have been highly satisfactory to the borrowers and to the loaning agency of the Federal Government and has afforded the greatest measure of security for continued home ownership as compared with any program of similar nature yet devised: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the 1944 extraordinary session of the legislative assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully urged to make an appropriation of Federal funds sufficient to provide loans to be made to persons serving in the armed forces of the United States, or who have served therein and been honorably discharged, and who desire to rehabilitate themselves and establish farm home ownership under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act as administered by the Farm Security Administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to United States Senator COOLEY, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring):

"Whereas both the United States Army engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation have proposed water development projects for North Dakota; and

"Whereas these projects or any combination of them depend for their success upon an adequate water supply which can be made available only from the Missouri River; and

"Whereas it now appears that there may not be sufficient water in the Missouri River to supply all of the demands which may be made upon it; and

"Whereas proposed navigation developments alone may be of sufficient magnitude to require all of the water available in a dry season; and

"Whereas the vital needs of North Dakota, for the maintenance of economic stability, and for future development depend upon an adequate quantity of water for domestic, farm, irrigation, and industrial purposes; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States ought to allot the waters of the Missouri River on the basis of the greatest good to the greatest number and to the Nation as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Twenty-eighth General Assembly of the State of North Dakota in extraordinary session duly assembled (both house and senate concurring)*, That the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby petitioned to inquire into the relative value of water for domestic, farm, irrigation, and industrial purposes, as well as for the needs of navigation, and to allot to domestic, farm, irrigation, and industrial purposes—upon which an adequate food supply for the Nation may easily depend in the near future—that proportion of the water of the Missouri River which it needs for domestic purposes and for the development and maintenance of irrigation projects in this and other States, both present and prospective; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States is further petitioned to adopt a policy for the development of streams in the western part of the United States which will allocate their waters on the following basis: First, for domestic, farm, irrigation, industrial, and mining needs; second, for the needs of and purposes of navigation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota in the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to work for the adoption of such a policy so that the interests of North Dakota may be properly protected; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the secretaries of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, to the chairmen of Committees on Appropriations, Irrigation, Flood Control, and Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives and to the proper committees of the United States Senate, before which such measures will probably come for consideration, and to the Governors of each of the several States in the Missouri Valley."

A resolution of the quarterly conference of Asbury Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., relating to the chairmanship of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"House Resolution 913

"Resolution requesting the United States Department of the Navy to name one of any new battleships under construction or to be constructed in the near future *Rhode Island*, in recognition of the outstanding part Rhode Island has played in the establishment and development of the United States Navy.

"Whereas the first official action to establish an American Navy was taken by a Rhode Island General Assembly at its session in Providence, R. I., on the third Monday in August 1775; and

"Whereas the first naval force established by the Continental Congress was placed under command of Esek Hopkins, a Rhode Islander, with Rhode Island seamen commanding one-half the total force of the fleet and this same Esek Hopkins was also the only American naval officer ever to hold the title of commander in chief.

"From this beginning of the American Navy to the present time, Rhode Island has played a large part in its development and has furnished to the Navy and to the Nation a long and brilliant line of officers and a large and patriotic force of men.

"Oliver Hazard Perry was one of these, whose ringing words, 'We have met the enemy and they are ours,' in reporting his famous victory on Lake Erie, September 10, 1813, the first notable success in our second war with Great Britain, have inspired generations of Americans.

"Matthew Calbraith Perry was another. He opened Japan to the western world. Under his direction the first steam vessel of the Navy was built and under his command the utility of steam vessels for Navy purposes was proved. He originated the naval apprentice system, represented by the Newport Naval Training Station; developed the present United States lighthouse service and performed other notably outstanding service for the Navy of the United States through war and peace.

"Rhode Island has at Newport the finest naval anchorage in America, as well as the first naval torpedo station and the first naval training station for our Navy.

"Rhode Island was one of the original 13 English colonies in America and the first to declare her independence, May 4, 1776.

"No battleship of the United States Navy has borne the name of this State, since 1907, at which time the citizens of this State presented that *Rhode Island* with a large silver service. That ship has been ordered out of commission. This silver service is now retained at the Rhode Island statehouse, at Providence waiting opportunity for another presentation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantation does hereby respectfully request of the United States Department of the Navy that one of any new battleships under construction, not yet named, or to be constructed in the near future for the United States Navy shall be named *Rhode Island* in recognition of the brilliant part this State has played in the establishment and development of the United States Navy and directs the Secretary of State to transmit to the Secretary of the Navy a duly certified copy of this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, respectfully requesting them to take all necessary steps to accomplish the purpose of this resolution."

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution respectfully memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon proposed legislation relative to the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan

"Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States a bill authorizing the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

"Whereas the need of this hospital has been long standing, the Upper Peninsula Association of American Legion Posts having recognized the necessity of such hospital facility in 1936; and

"Whereas a thorough study has been made and this need attested to in resolutions adopted by numerous civic, social, labor, and veterans' organizations, as well as many individuals; and

"Whereas the reasons advanced after a long and thorough study of this project are:

"1. Because of the geographical situation of the Upper Peninsula, the nearest point of the Upper Peninsula is approximately 300 miles and the farthest point is approximately 700 miles from Detroit where a Veterans' hospital was erected consisting of only 350 beds, the distance of travel being even greater to the Wood Hospital near Milwaukee and the Hines Hospital in Chicago, the point being that transportation is a vital problem to any veteran seeking hospitalization.

"2. The facilities of these hospitals are greatly overcrowded, necessitating veterans in need of hospitalization waiting months before they can be hospitalized.

"3. There are approximately 14,000 World War No. 1 veterans within the boundaries of the Upper Peninsula, approximately 550 being disabled veterans drawing compensation, and approximately 30,000 World War No. 2 servicemen, and great numbers of these veterans require medical or surgical attention each year, presenting a large transportation problem, whereby they could be taken care of in a facility located closer to their homes, thereby saving human lives and misery to an untold extent, and would mean savings of many dollars in transportation and would expedite the recovery of disabled veterans.

"4. A survey made through officers of the American Legion, Disabled Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars shows that there are approximately 250 veterans in the Upper Peninsula desperately in need of hospitalization at this time.

"5. Cost of transportation and miscellaneous expense necessary for a veteran to appear before an examination board after appeal is prohibitive under the present policy, and as this cost is usually borne by the local posts, the individuals generally not being able to bear this expense, it works a hardship on those furnishing this relief; and

"Whereas it is imperative to the best interest of the Commonwealth to alleviate suffering and misery which now exists among the veterans in this section of the country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Michigan Legislature hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to promptly consider and approve the proposed legislation aforesaid; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a suitable copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to Vice President Henry A. Wallace; Speaker Sam Rayburn, of the House of Representatives; to all Michigan Members of the Congress of the United States; to Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and Chairman of Board of Hospitalization; and to Governor Kelly and Lieutenant Governor Keyes of the State of Michigan.

"Adopted by the Senate, January 31, 1944.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives, February 4, 1944.

"EUGENE C. KEYES,
"President of the Senate.
"FRED I. CHASE,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HOWARD NUGENT,
"Speaker of the House.
"MYLES F. GRAY,
"Clerk of the House."

"House Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation simplifying income tax return blanks

"Whereas the income tax return blanks now required to be filled out by the public are not only complicated and difficult to understand, but almost impossible for the people to file without the assistance of experts; and

"Whereas, taxation, although a proper burden on the public and one the public is willing to bear, should be so imposed that the taxpayer understands the tax he is paying; and

"Whereas no confusion should exist with respect to the filling out of income-tax returns, in order that the public may understand the tax being paid, and the Government may receive needed revenues: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature earnestly urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation simplifying income tax return blanks so that the public may understand the tax being paid and may be able to comply with the requirements incident to the preparation of the return; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress; and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"The concurrent resolution was adopted by the house of representatives on February 9, 1944.

"The concurrent resolution was adopted by the senate on February 18, 1944.

"HOWARD NUGENT,
"Speaker of the House.
"MYLES F. GRAY,
"Clerk of the House.
"EUGENE C. KEYES,
"President of the Senate.
"FRED I. CHASE,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution by the Michigan Association of Insurance Agents, favoring the continuation of the regulation of insurance by the several States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the legislative committee of the Michigan Bankers Association at Detroit, Mich., protesting against the enactment of pending legislation to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by members of the Monroe quarterly conference of the Evangelical Church of the State of Michigan, protesting against desecration in all forms of the Christian Sabbath; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The petition of members of the Civitan Club, of Saginaw, Mich., praying that Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration and that a democratic Jewish commonwealth be established in fulfillment of the Balfour Declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL AIRCRAFT CONFERENCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate nine resolutions adopted by the National Aircraft Conference, which were referred, or ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Appropriations:

RESOLUTION ON N. L. R. B. COMPANY-UNION RIDER

Whereas an Appropriations Committee rider to the N. L. R. B. appropriation, known as the Frey amendment, in effect, legalizes company unions by preventing the Board from interfering with any contract between an employer and any employee organization which has been in effect for 3 months or more: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this First National Aircraft Conference urge the Congress to eliminate this rider which constitutes a back-door attack upon the basic purposes of the National Labor Relations Act.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

RESOLUTION ON PRICE REGULATIONS

Whereas the runaway of prices will further reduce the living standards of the American people; and

Whereas no real effort is being made on the part of Government agencies to stabilize prices of consumers' goods due to laxity or insufficient appropriations; and

Whereas stabilization of prices at equitable levels is sought by labor for the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That pending the establishment of stabilized wages, the O. P. A. freeze the prices of all consumers' goods; and be it further

Resolved, That when wage stabilization becomes an actuality, the price level of consumers' goods be reconsidered for the purpose of establishing a proper relationship between price and wage levels.

SUBSIDIES

Whereas the joint C. I. O.-A. F. of L. report on the cost of living, submitted by President R. J. Thomas and George Meany, proves that the cost of living has increased at least 43.5 percent since January 1941; and

Whereas the cost of living will increase still further if the present subsidy program of the administration is not reenacted by Congress; and

Whereas the failure to control the cost of living is a primary factor in the high turnover rate in aircraft plants: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the First National Aircraft Conference of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. give complete support to the administration's subsidy program; and be it further

Resolved, That the international union and all affiliated local unions working with farm and consumer organizations continue their political action program to bring pressure to bear on Congress to reenact the subsidy law.

To the Committee on Education and Labor:

RESOLUTION ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Whereas the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee has been under continuous attack by reactionaries in and out of Congress, in spite of the splendid work done by the F. E. P. C. in helping to eliminate discrimination in industry; and

Whereas bills have been introduced by Congressmen DAWSON, SCANLON and MARCANTONIO to make the F. E. P. C. permanent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this First National Aircraft Conference supports the present F. E. P. C. as a necessary measure for the full and fair utilization of all manpower and that we also urge action to get Congressional support for a permanent F. E. P. C.

RESOLUTION ON OVER-ALL GOVERNMENT PLANNING

Whereas the prevention of a catastrophic post-war decline in airplane employment depends in large measure upon a high level of production in all industry; and

Whereas with the disestablishment of the National Resources Planning Board, there is no over-all Government planning agency; and

Whereas such planning as is now carried on by Government agencies is so scattered and inadequate as to offer no satisfactory antidote to post-war planning by reactionary and monopoly interests: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this First National Aircraft Conference endorse the view expressed in the recent Baruch-Hancock report that "There is no need for a post-war depression. Handled with competence, our adjustment, after the war is won, should be an adventure in prosperity"; and be it further

Resolved, That President Roosevelt, the Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Byrnes, and the Congress be urged to reestablish the National Resources Planning Board or set up some new over-all planning agency; and be it further

Resolved, That provision be made in any such agency for full labor participation.

To the Committee on Finance:

RESOLUTION ON WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL BILL

Whereas President Roosevelt in his recent message to Congress emphasized the necessity of providing economic and social security to the people of the United States in the post-war period; and

Whereas the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill, by extending the coverage of the present Social Security Law and increasing its benefits, will provide necessary assistance to workers temporarily unemployed because of cut-backs and reconversion; and

Whereas opponents of the bill in Congress have for the past 12 months been engaged in a campaign of misrepresentation that is aimed at defeating the bill and preventing the realization of the President's "second bill of rights": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this First National Aircraft Conference of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. recommend to the International Educational, Publication, Health and Accident and Political Action Departments:

1. The launching of an immediate campaign to clarify and publicize the provisions of the bill to the American people.

2. The application of concerted political pressure on Congress to initiate immediate hearings on the bill.

3. The development of a unified campaign among affiliated locals and members to urge their Congressmen to approve passage of the bill.

4. A program for full cooperation by the U. A. W.-C. I. O. with all other labor, farm, white-collar and professional organizations supporting the bill.

Ordered to lie on the table:

RESOLUTION ON POLL TAX REPEAL

Whereas the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has consistently supported the drive to repeal the poll tax by financial aid, by publicity, and by education: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this First National Aircraft Conference urge the Senate of the United States to speedily approve H. R. 7, which has already passed the House; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge all local unions to intensify their efforts wherever possible to make financial contributions to the National Committee to Abolish Poll Tax, in Washington, D. C. for the final push for passage of the bill.

RESOLUTION ON SOLDIER VOTE BILL

Whereas it is obvious that present State and Federal soldier-vote legislation will permit only a few soldiers to cast their ballots in the coming elections; and

Whereas a simple uniform Federal ballot will enable service men and women to vote; and

Whereas all so-called States' rights bills, proposed by an unholy alliance of reactionary Republican and poll-tax Democrats have been properly labeled by President Roosevelt "a fraud upon the American people": Therefore be it

Resolved, That this First National Aircraft Conference of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. give full and unqualified endorsement to a Federal soldier vote bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the issue of votes for soldiers be made the basis for the broadest kind of political action by a united labor and other groups in the country, for the purpose of de-

feating reactionary Congressmen, who would preserve their power by depriving the defenders of this country of their democratic right to vote.

RESOLUTION ON SUPPORT OF F. D. ROOSEVELT'S TAX VETO

Whereas the present Congress has lent itself as a tool in the hands of reactionary, antilabor and antiwar forces; and

Whereas the enactment of the present shamefully inadequate measure, truly a tax to serve the greedy and impoverish the needy, and the subsequent overriding of the President's veto thereof indicates Congress' desire to fight a soft war on the home front; and

Whereas further acts of Congress, notably those of denying the soldiers an opportunity to vote and the attempt to strangle subsidies have placed the integrity of Congress in jeopardy; and

Whereas labor has on occasion criticized the President for making concessions to the congressional wrecking crew, and

Whereas the President has taken a firm stand on the basis of principle on the issues of the tax bill, soldiers' vote, and price control; and

Whereas the press and radio confuse the issue by declaring it a fight of the President versus Congress and ignore the merits of the particular issues involved: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this First National Aircraft Conference affirm its support of the President's stand on the issues involved, and declare its resolve to effect a speedy victory and a lasting peace; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Speaker of the House, and President of the Senate.

RESOLUTION BY KANSAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS—LIMITATION OF OPIUM PRODUCTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Mrs. F. S. Hawes, Russell, Kans., president of the Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs, and a director of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, a resolution approved by that organization urging me to do everything possible to secure the passage of House Joint Resolution 241 introduced by Representative JUDD, of Minnesota, which requests the President of the United States to urge the restriction of the production of opium. I ask unanimous consent to have Mrs. Hawes' letter embodying a resolution, adopted by the General Federation convention, printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Russell, Kans., March 28, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. CAPPER: As president of the Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs, and a director of the General Federation, I do urge you to assist in every possible way the passage of House Joint Resolution 241, introduced by Representative W. H. JUDD, of Minnesota, on February 21, 1944, which requests the President of the United States to urge upon the governments of those countries where the cultivation of the poppy plant exists, the necessity of immediately limiting the production of opium to the amount required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has for years been on record for a suppression of the growth of opium except for medicinal purposes, and in 1942 the writer was in attendance at the General Federation convention at Fort Worth, Tex., when the following resolutions were passed at its regular convention:

"NARCOTIC RESTRICTIONS

"Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has been instrumental in obtaining the enactment of the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act (with amendments in some cases) in 40 States, 2 Territories, and the District of Columbia; and

"Whereas conditions in a world at war require the conservation of narcotic drugs for medicinal purposes and the continuance and intensification of efforts to suppress drug addiction for the furtherance of the public welfare: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs participate in securing additional and amendatory narcotic legislation, Federal and State, as is deemed necessary by the Department of Public Welfare and its advisers on narcotics;

"*Resolved*, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs actively supports efforts made for the protection of the Army, Navy, and civilian personnel against violation of the narcotic drug laws."

Now, personally—and on another question—when this terrible war is over, we Kansans believe that our Members of Congress will do everything possible to help work out, this time, a just and lasting peace.

With personal regards.

CLARA MAY HAWES
(Mrs. F. S. Hawes).

TRACTOR FUEL FOR FARM OPERATION—THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement signed by four farmers of Polk County, Nebr., in connection with the matter of their signatures to the farm program for the ensuing year, it appearing that, perhaps through misinformation, a member of the county committee has represented to them that they must sign for the farm program before they can be furnished the tractor fuel needed for the ensuing year. I ask that the statement, as well as a letter transmitting it, be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OSCEOLA, NEBR., *March 28, 1944.*

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We enclose a statement signed by four Polk County farmers, and an affidavit signed by one of them, David C. DeTurk.

I am writing you personally because I know all these men, and know that if they had not been told what is set out, they would not state that to be a fact; in other words, I know them well enough to know that they would not misrepresent the facts.

Two of them, Mr. Bahr and Mr. Langhammer, I did not see yesterday, but the other two men were in the office, and they told me Mr. Bahr and Mr. Langhammer were signed up with the farm program because of that statement having been made to them. Mr. Rosenberry signed up at a schoolhouse meeting, and was later advised that he did not have to sign in order to get his fuel and went to the farm office, and after considerable argument got his papers back. He then went to the ration board direct and got his fuel ration. Mr. DeTurk refused to sign anything and went to the ration board and got his fuel coupons.

However, both of these men are very emphatic in their statements that Herman Jones, a member of the farm committee, told them at the schoolhouse meeting relative to the farm program, that they would not be able to get any fuel unless they signed up with the farm program.

We, the undersigned farmers of Polk County, Nebr., do hereby state that a member of the County Agriculture Committee has told us, each individually, that before we could get our tractor fuel for the year for farm operation we would have to sign up for the farm program.

We further state that we have signed this statement in the presence of David C. DeTurk and with the understanding that it be sent to Members of the Nebraska delegation in Congress.

Dated March 27, 1944.

DAVID C. DETURK.
PAUL ROSENBERRY.
ARTHUR LANGHAMMER.
W. E. BAHR.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
Polk County, ss.

David C. DeTurk, being first duly sworn, on oath says that he is one of the signers of the foregoing statement; that all of the other signers, signed in his presence and that each of them read the foregoing statement; that affiant was informed in the office of the A. A. A. in the courthouse, at Osceola, in said county, by Herman Jones, one of the members of the county committee, that he could not get any fuel rations for 1944 until he signed for the farm program; that two of the lady employees in the same office made the same statement to him; that he refused to sign for said program and later went to the fuel ration board of the county and secured his ration stamps for 1944.

DAVID C. DETURK.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1944.

PHIL B. CAMPBELL,
Notary Public.

My commission expires May 5, 1945.

RESOLUTION BY EDUCATORS OF NEBRASKA: PROGRAM FOR EDUCATING AND TRAINING WAR-SERVICE PERSONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have just received copy of a resolution adopted recently by a group of Nebraska educators, interested in problems of higher education. The resolution was unanimously adopted by representatives of church schools, State teachers colleges, the University and junior colleges. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and properly referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1

That the membership of this conference recommend that the administration of the program for the education and training of war-service persons shall be a responsibility of the United States Office of Education, and further, that the active director of the program be subject to the authority of the United States Commissioner of Education.

Resolution 2

That section 7 of the report of the committee sponsored by the American Council on Education is acceptable to this group with the added suggestion that if the legislature deems it advisable to appoint a board, the board so created shall provide

representation of all significant types of approved private and public institutions of higher learning.

Section 7 of the report of the committee sponsored by the American Council on Education reads as follows:

"States wishing to participate in the benefits of this act shall through their legislature designate an appropriate State educational agency or, if no such agency exists, provide for the creation of such an agency to be known as the State Agency for the Education and Training of War-Service Persons: *Provided*, The Governor of the State may designate or create such agency pending action by the legislature: *Provided further*, That in those States in which a single board exercises jurisdiction over public elementary, secondary (including vocational), and higher education that board shall be designated as the State Agency for the Education and Training of War-Service Persons: *And provided further*, That in those States in which no single board exercises such jurisdiction over public elementary, secondary (including vocational), and higher education, the agency designated or created as provided in this section shall consist of not fewer than seven members and shall utilize so far as practicable the regularly constituted officers, boards, and other agencies such as chief State school officers, State boards of education, State boards for vocational education, and State boards for higher education in carrying out the purposes of this act."

REPORT OF THE CLAIMS COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1461) for the relief of Frederick G. Goebel, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 793) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 30, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 555. An act for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow;

S. 662. An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes; and

S. 1243. An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1827. A bill for the relief of Oliver N. Knight; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. LUCAS) introduced Senate bill 1828, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 1829. A bill to authorize the payment of certain sums to jobbers in connection with their logging of timber for the Menominee Indians on the Menominee Reservation during the logging season 1934–35; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the President's message permitting Senate bill 1285 to become law without his signature sets forth clearly the reasons why the bill in its present form is wholly inadequate to accomplish the purpose for which it was introduced. It draws attention to the confusing provisions of the bill. It emphasizes the difficulty in comparing the number of service men and women who will be able to vote under the new law in comparison with the old law.

While I agree that any definite comparison must be inadequate because of the number of uncertain elements involved, yet I am still convinced that more men and women in the service could vote under the old law than under this new law. To cite only one reason: Under the old law the necessity of registration and of paying a poll tax is waived, but apparently they are not waived under the new law, although there are contradictory provisions in it as to this matter. These two conditions of voting, with which the servicemen cannot comply by reason of their service, may prevent millions of them from voting. Even if some States waive these conditions, many States will not do so.

The President calls the bill a standing invitation to the States to make it practicable for their citizens to vote. The new law does that, too. It must be remembered, however, that these changes in State law do not affect the comparison between the old law and the new law, because they might well go into effect in either case.

However, this invitation to the States ought to be widely accepted. The changes suggested by the President should be adopted. It is a gratification to me that my own State, Rhode Island, is already taking effective action to accomplish this purpose. Last Tuesday it held a constitutional convention for this very purpose, the first constitutional convention to be held in my State for 102 years.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. There has been the suggestion from the White House, in a special message to the Congress, that we should all "stand up and be counted on the soldier-ballot bill." I should like to inquire of the very learned Senator from Rhode Island how the President is now to be counted on this measure. Is he for it as indicated by his action in letting it become a law? Or is he against it as indicated by his criticisms? Is he standing up or sitting down?

Mr. GREEN. The Senator is in possession of all the facts of which I know, and can reach his own conclusion.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Rhode Island will yield, what is really disturbing the Senator from Maine is how the votes are to be counted in November, not how the President is to be counted. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. We have no doubt regarding the count in November.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I was a delegate to and chairman of the committee on resolutions of the convention in Rhode Island to which I have referred, and the resolution on this subject adopted will be submitted to the people for approval on April 11 and will enable the general assembly to pass the legislation necessary to accept the President's invitation. I have no doubt that the people and general assembly will approve of such action.

May I suggest that Rhode Island's action should be an example to other States of the Nation, because this subject, to me and, I believe, to the American people as a whole, is one of the most vital issues we have for solution at the present time.

The President also extended an invitation to the Congress to amend Senate bill 1285, which is now the law. Accordingly, I now, for myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, and so forth, and request that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and so referred.

The bill (S. 1828) to amend Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the Act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes," was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2850. An act to authorize the rezoning of certain property in the District of Columbia as a residential area; H. R. 4327. An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a Minimum Wage Board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1918, as amended.

SUBSIDIES AND FOOD ALLOTMENT PLAN—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. CLARK of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Senator LA FOLLETTE by Mr. Bennett, of the National Broadcasting Co., on the subject Subsidies and the Food Allotment Plan, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REPUBLICAN JOB—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, at the Republican State convention, held at Topeka, Kans., on March 31, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS OF FORMER GOVERNOR COX ON PEACE LEAGUE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Asso-

ciated Press Dispatch under the headline "Cox urges United States to join world peace league," which appears in the Appendix.]

ITALIAN LEGAL CODES—ARTICLE FROM LIBRARY OF CONGRESS QUARTERLY JOURNAL

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Italian Legal Codes on the Eve of the Allied Invasion," published in the Library of Congress Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTING STRENGTH OF STATES AT NATIONAL CONVENTIONS AND IN ELECTORAL COLLEGE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a table, from the document Factual Campaign Information, showing the voting strength of the States at National conventions and in the Electoral College in 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Streamlining Congress" from the Easton (Pa.) Express, and an editorial entitled "Self-Rescue" from the News, of Greensboro, N. C., which appear in the Appendix.]

OUR IRRESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY CHARLES A. BEARD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Irresponsible Government," written by Charles A. Beard and published in the Progressive of March 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY IN COSTA RICA

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Forty Million Dollar Lesson," discussing the work of the United States Army Engineers on the Inter-American Highway in Costa Rica, written by Alvaro Facio and published in the Inter-American of March 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPPING AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—ARTICLE FROM THE GRACE LOG

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Shipping and the National Defense," published in the Grace Log for February-March 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INSURANCE AND AIR COMMERCE

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from A Study of Insurance, prepared by the Civil Aeronautics Board, which appear in the Appendix.]

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4133) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6 and 7, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$412,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated by this title shall be used to pay the salaries of more than eighteen messengers assigned to duty in the Office of the Secretary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$143,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,910,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$318,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
M. E. TYDINGS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
J. W. BAILEY,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF SENATOR HOMER T. BONE AS JUDGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a message from the President of the United States has come to the desk, and to the membership of the Senate, in which the President honors, signally, a Member of the Senate by appointing him to the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit.

Mr. President, the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary require that when a nomination for a judgeship is sent to that committee, the committee shall give 1 week's notice of a hearing on the nomination so that anyone who cares to protest the confirmation may appear. In this instance a Member of the Senate of the United States is named by the President, a Member of the Senate of outstanding ability. His ability has been made manifest on the floor of the Senate many, many times. He has represented his State with unusual ability and unusual zeal.

This morning I hurriedly called a meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary, at which a quorum only attended. I attempted to confer with as many other members of the committee as possible for advice as to the course to be pursued. By direction of the committee, I am taking the floor now to ask unanimous consent that our colleague, Hon. HOMER T. BONE, named by the President of the United States to be judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, be confirmed without the nomination being referred to the committee. Similar action has been taken before in one or two instances, and never, in my judgment, was it more justified than it would be on this occasion.

Senator BONE has been a Member of the Senate for so many years that every Senator knows him, respects him, and admires him for his fearlessness, for his independence of thought and action, and for his unusual ability.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination of Hon. HOMER T. BONE to be judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a nomination, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of HOMER T. BONE, of Washington, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the procedure suggested short circuits many of the rules and practices of the Senate, but I feel so sure that Senator BONE would receive the unanimous approval of the Senate when the matter might again be presented to us that I see no reason for objecting now to the course proposed by the Senator from Nevada. I am sure the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle have the very highest respect for the abilities and character of the Senator from Washington, and I feel sure there would be no objection to the confirmation of his nomination at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to express my profound regret at the departure of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] from the Senate. I congratulate him upon his appointment, if he wanted to go upon the bench, and I assume he did or he would not have consented to have his name sent to the Senate by the President. Nevertheless, I do regret his departure from the Senate for any reason. He has been one of the ablest, most consistent, and persistent advocates of legislation for the benefit of the whole people. His ability is recognized, of course his character is respected, and his intellectual honesty is beyond question.

I did not want Senator BONE's nomination to be confirmed without expressing my very deep sorrow that he is leaving

the Senate, where he has made a very outstanding record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

T. N. E. C. MONOGRAPH ON PATENTS AND FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement in the nature of an advertising notice for the Superintendent of Documents. The Senate adopted a resolution earlier in the week authorizing the Committee on Patents to republish the monograph of the Temporary National Economic Committee on Patents and Free Enterprise written by Prof. Walton Hamilton, of Yale University Law School. The Superintendent of Documents has already sold 3,275 copies of the original issue. In other words, the public demand for this document has been rather great, and the Superintendent of Documents, acting upon the authority of the Senate which has authorized this republication, has ordered some additional copies for sale. I make the announcement so that readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who may be interested may know that these copies will now be available at 25 cents each.

It may be of interest to the Senate to know that the Superintendent of Documents has already collected almost $1,000 from the sale of this document to date.

The demand for copies of the monograph—it is known as Monograph No. 31—has come from schools, courts, industry, economists, inventors, and the general public. Members of Congress receive many requests for the document, as I know from the number of telephone calls and letters which have come to my office from both Senators and Representatives. I make this announcement so that they also may be aware of the new edition.

IMPROVEMENT OF LOCAL RURAL ROADS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in November of last year I introduced a bill (S. 1498) providing for the construction of all-weather types of farm roads. I wish to make a brief statement with respect to the bill.

Throughout this country we have vast networks of hard-surfaced highways which are, perhaps, the finest in the world. We have super highways and we have super-duper highways; but 42 percent of our farms are still in the mud.

I believe the improvement of local rural roads is this country's foremost transportational need.

Of the 2,400,000 miles of these roads, the farm-to-market mail routes, school-bus routes, and the like, in our 48 States, only 45,000 miles have high-type pavement and some 99,000 additional miles have low-type. The bulk of this vast over-all mileage probably does not warrant pavement, but, as can readily be seen, only a ridiculously small fragment has been hard-surfaced.

Many county and State highway departments are now and for years have been engaged in improving local rural roads, and there are now sections of the country which are adequately, or almost adequately, supplied with hard-surfaced byways. But this amounts to only a pitiful part of the whole, a few patches on the map.

I have been long concerned with getting the farmer in my State out of the mud. I believe it has now become a responsibility of the National Government. Already our Government has, through financial and other assistance, been instrumental in bringing this country's systems of National and State highways to their present widespread development. It is high time that we should give a hand to the mud-bound farmer.

In considering this problem, it occurred to me that if we are to spend Federal money to aid in reconverting this country to a peacetime economy, if we are to spend money to keep the machine in motion, we could hit upon no more constructive public-works enterprise than a program for improving local rural roads. As Senators already know, road building is one of the best of job providers. It goes without saying that any reduction in the farmer's cost of getting his produce to market will be economical for the city man as well as the country man.

With these considerations in mind, I introduced in the Senate last November a bill (S. 1498) which would provide for the expenditure of a billion and half dollars during the 3 succeeding years following the end of the war for the construction of all-weather types of farm roads. The expenditure of this money should provide jobs for more than a half million men for 3 full years.

At the time I introduced the bill, I gave no explanation of it on the floor. Since that time, several Members of this body have expressed to me their interest in the measure and have asked for some exposition of its provisions.

Under the bill there would be appropriated annually $375,000,000 for 3 years, to be matched by the States and counties receiving it on a 3-to-1 basis. This matching scheme would provide an aggregate of $500,000,000 a year for the program. Before arriving at this figure for the over-all expenditure, I consulted officers of the American Road Builders Association and various State and county highway officials. It was their conclusion, as a result of their experience and research, that not more than this amount could be profitably expended yearly on such a program.

It will be observed that under my proposed joint project, the Federal Government would be carrying the big end of the financial load. This may be considered unwarranted generosity, but I do not regard it in the light of generosity at all. In the first place, if the program is to serve the needs of reconversion, the work contemplated must get under way quickly upon the cessation of hostilities. Few county governments would be ready to meet a heavy expenditure for roads, still fewer would be able to do so speedily.

Moreover, the farmers will pay their share of the Federal taxes going to make up the appropriation, and the roads, once built, will benefit the city man as well as the country man.

I might say that I went even further in devising machinery for speedy action. In paragraph (d) of section 4 of the bill it is provided that the Federal Road Commissioner may enter into agreement with State and county authorities for surveys, plans, and rights-of-way, and that such agreement becomes a contractual obligation of the Government. And again, in section 7, it is provided that the Commissioner may advance to any State, county, or other local political subdivision the Federal share of the joint construction money to enable it to make prompt payments for work as it progresses.

The Federal Works Administrator would be authorized to deal directly with counties and other local political subdivisions within the State, as well as with State highway departments. This would constitute a departure from the Public Roads Administration tradition of dealing strictly with the State agencies, but I believe it absolutely essential to any widespread accomplishment under the program.

I discussed the provision at length with the officers of the county roads division of A. R. B. A. and with county road men in my State. They were unequivocal about it. These county men believe, on the basis of past experience, that if the counties are to get the full benefit of the money appropriated for them, it must be prorated to the counties, and the counties be given an opportunity to expend it through their own agencies.

It is a matter of record, I believe, that in many States past Federal appropriations for local rural roads for different reasons never reached them.

Of course, one of the chief difficulties in drafting a bill to apply to every situation in all 48 States is to make it flexible enough. In drafting Senate bill 1498 I have made every effort to do so. Let me point out that in some five of our States the State highway departments construct and maintain the local roads as well as the State roads. In other States the towns or townships, rather than the county governments, maintain agencies for local road building. Furthermore, in many of the States only a few counties have highway departments adequate to undertake such a road-building program as is contemplated in the bill.

All these cases have been considered and provided for. One such provision would allow two or more counties to act jointly in setting up a highway agency; another would allow any county not qualified to do the work itself to rely upon its State highway department.

But one thing which is positively and definitely provided is that the Federal Government shall do none of the hiring, firing, or contracting. Under this bill there can be no more W. P. A.

In connection with the matter of the need for flexibility, I should like to point out, too, that such need has been given due consideration in developing standards for road construction. One of the criticisms most commonly made among county road men concerning past policy in the Federal Public Roads Administration is that it has fixed standards too high for local rural needs generally. In some of the populous city counties wide,

hard-surfaced roads that cost $20,000 a mile to build may be needed. In rural counties an adequate all-weather type of road may be built for as little as $1,000 a mile. Other and more technical considerations vary. Indeed, the standards must allow for conditions as variable as the changes in topography and climate encountered over the whole vast stretch of this continent.

For these reasons section 12 of the bill vests the Commissioner with power to formulate "policies governing design, plans, and construction standards which will be consistent with the service expectancy, cost, and requirements of economical maintenance for the character of roads contemplated in this act," namely, the all-weather type of roads.

The Federal moneys to be appropriated under this bill would be prorated, first, among the 48 States on the basis on which other Federal road moneys are divided; namely, one-third on the basis of area, one third on the basis of population, and one-third on the basis of road mileage. Then the share allotted for each State on this basis would be prorated among the counties or other local political subdivisions of the State on a basis of 50 percent on mileage, 30 percent on population, and 20 percent on area.

I may explain that the latter plan for prorating the funds to counties represents no personal preference of my own, but was placed in the bill to conform to the recommendation of the county highway officials' organization of A. R. B. A., made in 1943, when it met in Chicago. Since I introduced the bill, that organization has held another meeting, and has revised its recommendation in this regard, so as to make the percentage division an equal one-third for each category. I am quite willing to amend my bill to conform to their later decision.

Not only would the Federal appropriation be prorated directly to the local subdivision in which it would be spent, but I have incorporated in the bill a provision that such moneys shall be held as long as is practicable to the credit of the county, so that it may have full opportunity to take advantage of them.

Section 8 of the bill provides that any sums allocated to a county shall remain available for matching for 3 years, when, if it is not matched, it may be reapportioned among other counties of the particular State. The bill goes further; a second paragraph provides that any sums allocated to towns or townships shall remain available for 2 years, when, if they are not matched, they shall be reapportioned among the other towns or townships within the same county.

Past experience has shown that under looser reapportionment provisions some States and some counties have received far more than their share of Federal road moneys. I do not want to see the counties and States which are less prepared to take immediate advantage of this aid lose to those which are quicker on the jump, for the chances are that the less ready will have the greater need.

There is a further provision for the States in which there are no county highway departments. For the States in which State highway jurisdiction has been extended to include all the roads formerly within local jurisdiction, it is provided that the funds shall be applied to the systems of roads which, before inclusion in State control, comprised the road systems within local jurisdictions. In other words, I wish to see this money spent for local rural roads and for local rural roads only.

In order that the work may proceed by orderly plan, under which there will be no haphazard building or personal favors swapped among county road commissioners, I have provided that the local road agencies or the boards shall submit for the commissioner's approval the plan for the system of highways which within the jurisdiction is to comprise the rural local Federal-aid highway system. In order to further insure orderly procedure, it is provided that the mileage allowed to be under construction at any given time shall be limited to 10 percent of the total of the system.

The bill requires that all construction projects exceeding $10,000 in amount shall be contracted for under competitive bidding. This provision would not, however, prohibit any local political authority from itself joining in the competitive bidding. Such liberalization was deemed necessary in order to be sure that no county would be hamstrung by reason of a lack of private road contractors willing to bid on its projects.

I have purposely left for the last the discussion of the Federal administrative set-up proposed by the bill. The bill, as I introduced it, would provide for a rural local roads administration separate from and coordinate with the present Public Roads Administration. It would be headed by a local rural roads commissioner responsible only to the Federal Works Administrator. This feature of the bill has been more criticized than any other. Indeed, it is the only feature which has incurred any general criticism among those with whom I have discussed the measure. I included provision for this independent set-up at the insistence of the leaders of the county highway officials' organization and other county highway men. They seemed to be convinced that their problems were so different and were surrounded by such different circumstances that successful administration from Washington required complete divorcement from the organization which dealt with the State highway departments.

I included such a provision reluctantly, and now I am convinced that there is more to be lost through such a procedure than there is to be gained. I have been engaged for some time in trying to work out a substitute provision to insure that the local rural road program will be administered only by men who are in full sympathy with, and who are fully experienced in, the needs and problems of local rural roads, but who at the same time have the benefit of the valuable experience which comes from service in the Public Roads Administration, and also to insure that the program may have, above all, the benefit of the administrative genius of the widely known and highly esteemed head of the Public Roads Administration, Commissioner Thomas H. MacDonald. I hope to be able to offer such an amendment in the committee hearings.

PROPOSED CURTAILMENT OF BASIC MAGNESIUM PLANT, NEVADA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the outset of the war the United States found itself exceedingly short of certain war-essential metals. One of those metals was magnesium, sometimes called the metal of mystery. Its production in vastly increased quantity was regarded as all-important for the successful prosecution of the war.

After England had been bombed and some of its industries put out of business, when the British agencies which had theretofore manufactured magnesium were unable to obtain brucite or magnesite from which to produce magnesium, they came to the United States and brought with them the blue prints and plans for installing the British system for the treatment of ores for the production of magnesium.

In the State of Nevada they found ore in sufficient quantities; they found ample electrical energy for power and for treatment; they found water; and they found climatic conditions proper and conducive to the best interests of such production. Our own Government, in order to facilitate and aid in every possible way, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation applied, in all, about $133,000,000 to the construction of what is known as the Basic Magnesium plant in the vicinity of Las Vegas, in Clark County, Nev. This plant is only a few miles from the famous Boulder Dam, one of the greatest power plants in the world, if not the greatest. It is owned by the Government of the United States, through the Defense Plant Corporation.

Paid for by $133,000,000 coming from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, this gigantic plant has been producing and is now producing at the rate of from 160 to 165 tons each day of the mystery metal known as magnesium. This magnesium has been produced because the war effort needed this metal. At other places in the country other plants have been established for the production of magnesium. For instance, magnesium is produced at a place called Marysville, Mich. There the cost has been much higher than at some other places. Some of this metal is being produced in Texas, and some of it at other places throughout the United States.

The question now seems to be whether or not there shall be a curtailment of the production of magnesium at Basic Magnesium, in Nevada, and whether or not other plants shall be permitted to operate, notwithstanding the fact that the cost of production is either equal to or greater than the cost of production at Basic Magnesium.

The four units of the Basic Magnesium plant which it is proposed to close cost the Government of the United States $53,000,000. It will cost at least $640,000 per unit to put those units back into production. This means, in my opinion, that four units, representing $53,000,000

of the taxpayers' money, are to be junked if production at Basic Magnesium is now curtailed. That is rather ruthless handling of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, the reason I rise on the floor of the Senate at this time is that I am not alone in proclaiming that in the War Production Board as it is now constituted there appear to be men who in years past have been active members of the boards of great industrial activities and who, when they came to the War Production Board, were on the pay rolls of their respective institutions, some of them receiving salaries as high as $65,000 a year. It is not to be supposed that those men, many of whom are geniuses in their respective lines, would lay aside their first love, namely, the institutions which they served in years past, and forget the interests of those institutions while serving on the War Production Board.

In my judgment, Mr. President, a man who in years past has served private industry, and who now seeks to serve private industry in some capacity by reason of his place on the War Production Board, is not serving his country as he should serve it. If he were in some other countries I might mention at this time, not only would his services not be called for in the Government, but in all probability he would be stood up against a wall at sunrise. To exercise for private advantage any power given to a member of the War Production Board is unconscionable at this hour when this Nation is struggling for its existence and when every heart and mind in America is bent upon successfully ending the war. This is no time for members of the War Production Board to try to determine how the particular enterprise which they served in years past can be successful against its competitors in the post-war era.

Mr. President, that appears to me to be the policy of some members of the War Production Board today. Certain reasons have been stated by members of the War Production Board for closing down 40 percent, or four units, of this great plant which cost the Government of the United States $133,000,000. These reasons were stated because we called upon them for reasons.

They gave as a reason, first, the saving of oil, because it was contended that stand-by steam plants in southern California which were using oil could better use the power which is being used at Basic Magnesium for the production of this all-essential war metal.

That excuse was completely exploded. It was exploded not only by the investigation of the committee of which I have the privilege of being chairman, known as the Special Committee to Investigate the Effects of the Centralization of Heavy Industry, but it was exploded by a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, acting as Petroleum Administrator for War, in which he said that such a shut-down was entirely unnecessary.

Another ground given for closing down Basic Magnesium was a postulated saving of manpower. It was claimed that 1,500 men could be released from Basic Magnesium and sent into an essential area in southern California, to be employed in other pursuits. But it was disclosed by the War Manpower Commission, over the signature of Governor McNutt, that those men, if released from Basic Magnesium in southern Nevada, could not be housed anywhere in the essential area of southern California, and that there is now a tremendous turnover because men cannot find housing facilities in southern California.

At the same time it was disclosed that by closing down what is known as the Vernon plant, an aluminum plant in southern California, 3,000 men, double the number of men which it was claimed could be released from Basic Magnesium, could be released, and all the 3,000 are now housed, and are on the ground with their families in southern California, in the very vicinity in which their labor might be required in the war effort. So that excuse fell by the wayside.

Then it was claimed that a saving in transportation would be effected by closing down 40 percent of Basic Magnesium in southern Nevada. That claim was met by the fact that through the vicinity in which Basic Magnesium is located some 10 trains a day pass eastward over the Union Pacific Railroad, each train consisting of about 60 cars. Therefore, approximately 600 cars a day pass eastward through Las Vegas, Nev., to points east. Of the total number of cars going eastward through that point over the Union Pacific about 60 or 65 percent are empty. The reason for that is that the flow of freight is to the westward and the cars are returned empty to be loaded again. The output of Basic Magnesium would not exceed 5 carloads a day. So, of the 600 cars, or thereabouts, which go eastward empty each day, only about 5 would be required to carry the product of Basic Magnesium. So the argument of transportation falls without weight by the wayside.

It is also claimed, as another excuse for closing down Basic Magnesium in part, that a saving would be effected in haulage from Canada of what is known as peat moss. Peat moss is a product which in the past has been used at Basic Magnesium because it is a part of the British process of manufacturing magnesium.

However, today about half of the plant of Basic Magnesium is not using peat moss at all, and in about 10 days no peat moss whatsoever will be in use at Basic Magnesium. So the position taken by the War Production Board that it was necessary to shut down Basic Magnesium because of the bottleneck in respect to peat moss falls by the wayside because in a very short time no peat moss will be necessary for the operation of that great plant. The plant today is producing more magnesium than any other plant in the world. Today the demand for the product from Basic Magnesium is 11,000,000 pounds for the month of April. In other words, various agencies engaged in the war effort have made requests of Basic Magnesium for the production of 11,000,000 pounds of its product during April. If the plant is closed down within 30 days, it will not be able to produce in accordance with the demand made upon it.

I make reference to this situation, Mr. President, because I contend that today there are sitting in the War Production Board men who have in the past been members of boards of directors of present or prospective competitors of Basic Magnesium, and who now want Basic Magnesium to be closed down in whole or in part because by doing so they will aid the agency or organization which they served so well in the past in time of peace. Such an attitude is an outrage and a shame. We should have men who will not lend themselves to such a policy while sitting as members of a board which has to deal with the war and its success, and has in its hands the money of the people, as well as the welfare of the Nation.

The fact that the Senate is about to recess and that Senators are awaiting the adjournment hour prevents me from going into more detail concerning the question of the interests and personalities involved in attempts which have been made and which are now being made to foster monopoly. Following the recess of the Congress, I shall attempt to do what I do not have the time to do today without unduly delaying the adjournment of the Senate. At that time I shall have considerably more to say concerning the interests and personalities involved in this effort, and concerning the shape of the plan which, I am convinced, many persons in high places are seeking assiduously to advance; a plan for shackling and fettering American industry under a system of world-wide international cartels. The Senate special committee investigating industrial centralization knows some of the details of this plan, and proposes to learn more; we know some of the men who are working for the advancement of this un-American program, and we propose to seek out the others who are aiding either actively or through passive ignorance in this effort to betray the basic principles of American enterprise. This plan and this program are so big as to stagger the imagination, already so far advanced that revelation of the facts in this regard will appall the people of this country, and so well entrenched that their frustration will require the most ardent and untiring efforts of every Member of the Congress and of the Government who holds dear the basic ideals and concepts upon which this Nation was founded.

Mr. President, knowing what the program is, I shall not delay the Senate at this hour. The matters concerning Basic Magnesium were all presented to the representatives of the War Production Board by myself and by my committee. After that the intimation was given out that, notwithstanding the fact that we had met every single argument which they had made and had knocked out every thought they had relative to the shutting down of this plant to which I have referred, the plant would be curtailed in its operations. In my statement made to the representatives of the War Production Board I went into detail

in regard to this matter and presented uncontradicted facts which had been elicited from unbiased sources. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the argument which I presented for my committee to representatives of the War Production Board a few days ago.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At hearings on February 28 and March 2, before the Special Committee on Centralization of Industry, it was stated by representatives of the War Production Board that the proposed 40 percent curtailment of Basic Magnesium was necessary and justified because it would result in:.

I. Saving of oil.
II. Saving of manpower.
III. Saving of transportation.
IV. Saving of haulage of peat from Canada.

I propose to deal with each point particularly and to demonstrate that the reasons advanced, taken either individually or collectively, do not substantiate the contention of the War Production Board.

I. FUEL OIL

It has been stated that by reducing Basic Magnesium, Inc., 40 percent, 135,000 barrels of oil per month would be saved and made available in southern California. This saving is to be accomplished by transferring the power to be released at Basic Magnesium to war industries in southern California and thereby eliminate the use of steam plants which now use fuel oil to manufacture electrical energy.

That such a drastic cut at Basic Magnesium is wholly unnecessary to accomplish the saving is demonstrated by the following facts:

(a) As of March 17 there had been made available in southern California sufficient liquid petroleum gas to conserve 173,000 barrels of fuel oil in the production of power. I am reliably advised that due to warmer weather, companies dealing in liquid petroleum gas in California are right now soliciting new customers on the basis of surplus rates as a result of increased quantities of gas. By using liquid petroleum gas to produce the necessary excess power at Long Beach, Calif., the fuel oil in question can be entirely eliminated without reducing Basic Magnesium by even 1 percent instead of 40 percent.

(b) After July 1, the use of natural gas for excess power can be, and will be supplemented with increased power production by the Southern California Edison Co., utilizing spring run-offs in its hydro plants. These run-offs, which this year are unprecedented due to extremely heavy snowfall throughout that area, will enable the Edison system to produce all of the excess power needed, and thereby eliminate the use of natural gas, as well as the fuel oil in question.

It should be pointed out that regardless of whether fuel oil in these stand-by power plants is released by using natural gas; or by accelerating hydro plants with the spring run-offs; or by curtailing Basic Magnesium 40 percent; these plants must continue to use about one-half of their present consumption of fuel oil as a safety factor to equalize the power-line load.

Therefore, it is apparent that the release of 60,000 or 80,000 kilowatts at Basic Magnesium at once would save, between now and the time when excess power is available from natural gas, and from spring run-offs only about 215,000 barrels of oil. Any additional saving in oil anticipated by the W. P. B. must be attributed to either one, or both, of the foregoing facts, and not to the 40 percent proposed curtailment of Basic Magnesium, Inc. This is subject to correction now.

Realizing this fact, Mr. Secretary Ickes, in his capacity of Petroleum Administrator for War, addressed a communication under date of February 28, 1943, to Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, recommending that such action be not taken if it is predicated on the shortage of fuel oil on the west coast. In that letter Secretary Ickes states categorically that a cutback in magnesium production at Basic Magnesium cannot be justified from a fuel-saving standpoint. The letter is attached hereto and designated "Exhibit A."

The proposed cut-back is not only unjustified from a fuel-saving standpoint, it cannot be justified on the ground that power in excess of present supplies is in demand, which demand will entail the use of greater quantities of fuel oil. I am advised that this latter phase was broached on March 4, 1944, by Defense Plant Corporation, to the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, the Southern California Edison Co., and the California Electric Co. in an effort to determine if power released by curtailing Basic Magnesium would be absorbed in southern California, and if there was any need for such power.

On March 7, 1944, the board of water and power commissioners, through Mr. E. F. Scattergood, advisory engineer, informed the power procurement officer of the Defense Plant Corporation, as follows:

"We understand that the question of partial curtailment of operations at the Basic Magnesium plant at Las Vegas involves several considerations of which possible fuel oil saving of the immediate future in this area is but one. However this may be, the electric utilities of this area, through partial operation of their steam electric plants, have plenty of power with which to supply all demands and are not seeking the power which would be made available should partial curtailment at the Magnesium plant be ordered."

I received similar information from the Department of Water and Power of Los Angeles by letter, dated March 13, containing the following significant statement of fact:

"The power contractors, who have formed a power pool in southern California, have plenty of power to supply all demands. In doing so they are operating their steam plant capacities to some extent, and we are informed that the War Production Board and other interested governmental agencies are considering the possible curtailment of the magnesium plant for various reasons, one of which is in line with their effort to save fuel during the crucial period of several months in the immediate future.

"We certainly do not want to encourage any curtailment of war industries either at Las Vegas or in any other part of the Pacific Southwest, and for this reason refuse to negotiate with Mr. Stanfield, as shown by the enclosed correspondence, at this time for the reason that it might encourage such curtailment or at least make it appear that the electric utilities of this area are seeking to encourage it, which is not true."

Consequently, it can no longer be asserted that such curtailment at Basic is necessary, either for power in southern California or to save fuel oil.

In connection with the saving of fuel oil, it must be remembered that the shortage of coal in the East is as critical as the shortage of oil in the West. The estimated deficit in coal for 1944 is 20,000,000 tons. If it is desirable to curtail magnesium production to save fuel oil it is just as desirable, if not more so, to curtail magnesium production to save coal.

Now, the magnesium plant at Marysville, Mich., uses coal exclusively for its power. It produces approximately five and one-half million pounds of magnesium per month, at a power cost of 7½ cents per pound. It is therefore material to consider the consequences of curtailing the Marysville plant to save coal, as compared to the consequences which necessarily result from curtailing Basic Magnesium to save oil.

In the first place, the coal saved at Marysville will be a constant saving for the duration of the war, whereas the oil saved by curtailing Basic will be a saving only until excess power comes into production from other sources—or a grand total of not to exceed 215,000 barrels at most as already demonstrated.

Second, eliminating the Marysville plant will reduce magnesium production by approximately 5,250,000 pounds per month, whereas curtailing Basic will reduce production only by about 4,000,000 pounds per month.

Third, eliminating the Marysville plant will affect only one of four plants now using the "Dow cell"—a proven process where the basic cost of production has already been reached, whereas curtailing Basic Magnesium, which is using a new process, where the cost of production per month has been constantly reduced every month until it is now in a position to operate a successful post-war plant, will make it impossible to know at any time in the future what the cost of production might have been, had the plant been permitted to run.

Fourth, the Government must continue to purchase the entire output of Basic Magnesium, even though it be but 60 percent of its present production. It is a fact that curtailing production 40 percent will automatically increase the cost of production per pound on the remaining 60 percent by 4 cents per pound. Not only must the Government pay the increased cost of 4 cents per pound but, in addition, all means of ascertaining the extent to which cost of production might be reduced will be lost. It will be lost forever, because no private company will take over the operation of Basic Magnesium at 60 percent of capacity in the face of an increased cost of production of 4 cents per pound and confronted with the cost of rehabilitating the entire plant so as to achieve full production if the cost per pound is ever to be reduced.

Fifth, to rehabilitate the units closed down at Marysville will cost approximately $100,000 per unit, whereas to rehabilitate the units closed down at Basic Magnesium will cost approximately $640,000 per unit, or about six times as much as Marysville.

Sixth, the fact that the Marysville plant presently manufactures a special crystal for the Army can have no effect on the decision to close down this plant, or continue it in full operation. I am advised that these crystals are useful because of their purity; that the purity has no relation to the output of the plant, or method of manufacture, but rather is dependent upon a redistillation process of a small tonnage of magnesium; and that this distillation could be done by Dow Chemical at its Midland plant, or, in fact, at any magnesium plant.

Finally, the power contract at the Marysville plant requires that if power is taken beyond May 1 the contract cannot then be canceled for 12 months. The minimum charge for each of those 12 months is fixed at $90,000 per month, so that the Government will be obligated to pay not less than $1,080,000 on this contract, even though it is later decided to eliminate production at Marysville.

Thus, it is extremely important that due consideration be given at once to the curtailment of the Marysville plant, as compared to the proposed curtailment at the Basic plant.

If saving of fuel oil or additional electricity is the primary force behind the proposed curtailment at the Basic plant, it is likewise extremely important that due consideration be given at once to curtailing the aluminum plant at Vernon, Calif. According to estimates, shutting down four units at the Basic plant will save 1,300,000 barrels of oil per year. On the same basis, 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours per month will be released at the Basic plant. Shutting down three pot lines of the Vernon plant will release 72,000,000 kilowatt-hours per month, and, using the same estimate applied to the Basic plant, will save 2,000,000 barrels of oil per year.

Since it must be conceded that reserve stocks of aluminum are just as great as reserves of magnesium, and that aluminum is no more essential or critical in the war effort today than magnesium, we should not hesitate to curtail aluminum production if such curtailment will release the electricity believed necessary to save the fuel oil in question.

All of these consequences to Basic Magnesium are to be incurred in the name of making fuel available on the west coast, notwithstanding that no appreciable saving of fuel oil can be attributed to curtailing the Basic plant.

Again let me direct your attention to the position taken by the Petroleum Administrator for War that no cut-back in magnesium production can be justified from a fuel-saving standpoint. I would further say that if such a cut-back is to be made the cold facts direct that it should be made at the Marysville plant or at the Vernon plant, instead of at Basic Magnesium.

II. MANPOWER

It has been stated that by reducing Basic Magnesium 40 percent, 1,500 men will be released for employment in war industries in a manpower shortage area in Los Angeles County. It is hoped that all of the 1,500 will journey to southern California. It should be remembered that we have no labor draft. There is no method of compelling released Basic employees to seek employment elsewhere. Thus, the exact number that may do so is wholly in the realm of conjecture.

But even assuming that all such employees will go into southern California, what is to be the cost to the Government, and is such cost justified?

As already indicated, Basic Magnesium will continue 60 percent of production, or 62,000,000 pounds per year at an increased cost of 4 cents per pound. The increased cost to the Government will amount to approximately $2,480,000 per year. Add to this figure the economic loss to the Government in shutting down four units, at $600,000 per unit, or $2,400,000, and it is at once apparent that not less than $4,880,000 will be lost by the Government if Basic Magnesium is curtailed 40 percent. Is this the price we are to pay—$2,933 per man for 1,500 men—all of whom probably will not journey to the manpower shortage area? In other words, it will cost the Government $2,933 per man if every one of the 1,500 released employees goes to Los Angeles County. Obviously the cost per man will increase proportionately to any number less than 1,500 that may reach the shortage area. I make the statement without fear of contradiction that we have not reached such a critical stage with respect to manpower shortages where it is necessary to recruit labor at $2,933 per man, which immediately raises the question. Is this cost justified?

Just how critical is the manpower shortage? I am reliably advised that already more than 2,000 applications have been submitted seeking employment on the oil pipe-line project in Arabia. Is there any reason why this manpower should be sent abroad, at the expense of the Government? Is there any reason why each of these applicants cannot be employed here in the United States?

Or, to bring the situation closer to the area in question I am advised by Mr. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, by letter dated March 17, that the labor shortage estimate for the Los Angeles County area from January through June 1944 is approximately 24,000 employees. Fifty percent of this shortage is concentrated in the Long Beach section. All of the shipbuilding and repair activities, and some of the aircraft establishments are located in that area. Mr. McNutt states that "Recruitment of workers for this demand is exceedingly difficult because of (1) the inadequacy of housing facilities for workers in the area, and (2) the long commuting distance from other centers of population from which workers might be drawn."

Mr. McNutt advises that "although approximately 36,000 additional family housing units have been completed since 1942, housing remains a major problem, particularly in subareas such as Long Beach."

The foregoing report from Commissioner McNutt affirms the conclusion that it is useless to bring into Los Angeles County additional employees from outside areas because there is no place in that vicinity where they may be housed.

Moreover, a similar report which I have received from the American Federation of Labor, dated March 17, 1944, quotes the War Production Board as describing the housing situation in Los Angeles as acute, and states that "the building of 37,000 new housing units was approved last fall, but even when these are built there will not be nearly enough to house war workers already in Los Angeles."

The report from the American Federation of Labor affirms the conclusion that it is useless and sheer folly to bring additional workers into this labor-shortage area, where housing is so critical.

As to the backlog accumulation of houses needed for war workers already employed in Los Angeles, I am advised that additional accommodations are especially needed for Negroes, for whom only 2,500 units have been allocated. An immigration of some 10,000 Negro families has been authorized by the War Manpower Commission for this area, notwithstanding the total lack of housing accommodations. To attempt to superimpose upon this chaotic condition 1,500 additional workers, with families, from the Basic Magnesium plant is to invite disaster in war activities in southern California. Such action, if unnecessary, must be condemned.

However, even assuming that the manpower situation is sufficiently critical to justify a total or partial curtailment of war plants so that such employees might be transferred into other war activities, the Basic Magnesium plant should not be curtailed if production in other war plants located in Los Angeles County can be reduced so as to obtain "surplus employees."

To that end, immediate consideration should be given to the Vernon aluminum plant at Vernon, Calif.

Overproduction of aluminum is just as critical as overproduction of magnesium. Consequently, curtailment of aluminum production is just as essential as curtailment of magnesium production. Curtailing the Vernon aluminum plant, in addition to the saving in fuel oil already discussed, and in addition to the release of electricity, would make available approximately 3,500 employees in Los Angeles for transfer to other war activities. What is even more important, these employees are all located in the shortage area at the present time. They are presently lodged in suitable living quarters so that there would be no huge loss in labor turn-over, as would be the case with respect to the 1,500 to be released at Basic Magnesium.

Thus, curtailing or closing down the Vernon plant would make available more than twice as many employees as would be released at Basic, and such employees would already be located and housed in the shortage area. I repeat that these workers are now in the area so that they would not further complicate the housing situation which so concerns Commissioner McNutt.

Therefore, either the manpower shortage is not sufficiently critical to justify the curtailment at Basic; or, if it is critical, it does not justify a recruitment of labor at a cost of $2,933 per man; or, even if it does justify the closing of war plants, then the Vernon aluminum plant should be the first to go.

III. TRANSPORTATION

It has been stated that the 40-percent reduction is necessary in order to relieve transportation. A brief examination of the facts will easily disprove this statement.

In the first place, recent improvements in truck haulage of ore from Gabbs Valley to the Basic Magnesium plant have made it possible to practically eliminate hauling ore by railroad. This alleged burden is no longer on the transportation system, and the 30 tons of rubber per year necessary to keep the trucks on the road is practically negligible.

Secondly, the shipment of magnesium east can by no stretch of the imagination be regarded as a load or burden on the transportation system. Approximately 10 trains of 60 cars each pass through Las Vegas daily traveling east. Of these 600 cars, about 75 percent, or 450, are empties. The total production of Basic Magnesium does not exceed 4 cars per day. Thus the shipment of magnesium from Basic has the effect of reducing the number of empty cars moving eastward from 450 to 446. Certainly this is no load on the transportation system.

However, if transportation is a factor to be considered, then again I draw your attention to the Marysville magnesium plant, where the total cell feed originates in Ludington and must be shipped by rail some 250 miles to Marysville, in a transportation shortage area. Thus the shutting down of the Marysville plant would save far more vital transportation than could possibly be saved by curtailing Basic Magnesium.

IV. HAULING OF PEAT MOSS FROM CANADA

It has been stated that the transportation of peat moss from Canada to Basic Magnesium constitutes a problem and a load on the transportation system. If this be the reason for curtailing production at Basic by 40 percent, it can now be entirely disregarded. Recent changes have been made at the plant whereby peat moss is no longer needed. I am advised by the Defense Plant Corporation that within a very short time the total shipment of peat moss will be stopped, due to these recent changes, which will soon be completed at a cost of approximately $100,000.

Therefore, the transportation load with respect to peat moss cannot be regarded as a factor in this proposal.

Mr. McCARRAN. To recapitulate, let me present the bald facts to you.

I. OIL

First. Liquid petroleum gas is available and can be used between now and July 1 to effect the anticipated saving of fuel oil.

Second. Increased power production after July 1, using unprecedented spring run-offs in hydropower plants, will effect the anticipated saving of fuel oil, and will even eliminate the use of petroleum liquid gas.

Third. If Basic Magnesium were curtailed today, the fuel oil saved by, and directly attributable to, the release of such power could not exceed 215,000 barrels, because any additional saving could

have been accomplished with liquid petroleum gas (first) or through spring run-offs; (second) It is therefore misleading to assert that "1,300,000 barrels of oil will be saved by curtailing Basic Magnesium 40 percent," when such a saving can be effected without curtailing Basic Magnesium 1 percent.

Fourth. The Secretary of the Interior, in his capacity of Petroleum Administrator for War, states that a cut-back in production at Basic Magnesium cannot be justified if it is to save fuel oil. See letter of February 28, 1944.

Fifth. The proposed curtailment cannot be justified as necessary in order to save fuel oil that might be used in the production of additional power because there is no demand for additional power in that area, and there is no shortage of power.—Scattergood letter of March 7, 1944.

Sixth. If saving of fuel oil is the criterion, then the aluminum plant at Vernon, Calif., or the magnesium plant at Marysville, Mich., should be the first shut down, because both are unessential, if Basic is unessential, and curtailing either one will release more fuel than curtailing Basic Magnesium.

Seventh. Therefore, no cut-back in magnesium can be justified from a fuel-saving standpoint, but if it is to be made for this reason, it should be made at the Vernon plant, or the Marysville plant, and not at the Basic Magnesium plant.

II. MANPOWER

First. Although the proposed reduction will release 1,500 men, all of these employees will not go to the Los Angeles labor shortage area.

Second. Assuming that the entire 1,500 reach that area, the cost to the Government of the United States will be $2,933 per man.

Third. More than 2,000 applications have been received from southern California seeking employment on the oil pipe-line project in Arabia.

Fourth. The labor shortage is not so critical that we must recruit labor at $2,933 per man.

Fifth. One thousand five hundred, or any number of men, released from Basic Magnesium, Inc., will be unable to go to work in the Los Angeles area because of the absolute lack of housing facilities.—McNutt report and report of American Federation of Labor.

Sixth. Any shortage of labor in the Los Angeles area can be met immediately, in part, by closing down the Vernon plant in the Los Angeles area, thus releasing 3,500 employees already housed in the labor shortage area. Therefore the manpower shortage does not justify labor curtailment at $2,933 per man, and such shortage cannot be met, even in part, by closing down Basic Magnesium, Inc., but can be met in part by closing down the Vernon plant.

III. TRANSPORTATION

First. The proposed reduction at Basic is not necessary to relieve transportation because the total production does not exceed four cars per day.

Second. There are 450 empty cars moving eastward daily through Las Vegas.

Third. Therefore capacity production has the effect of reducing 450 empty cars daily to 446 empty cars daily, which certainly is no "load" or "burden" on the transportation system.

IV. PEAT MOSS

First. The transportation of peat moss from Canada is no longer a problem because recent improvements at the Basic plant, when completed, will entirely eliminate peat moss.

CLEARLY DEFINED DOMESTIC POLICY A FOUNDATION FOR FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I realize that Members of the Senate who are present wish to recess, and I shall not detain them for any length of time. I feel, however, that I should say a few words on the subject that our foreign relations must be preceded by a constructive domestic policy.

I have received many letters from my constituents. I know that other Senators have received letters from theirs. Many of the letters have come from persons in my State who are now concerned with the question of whether farmers will get machinery, whether the boys who are still left on the farm will be taken, and whether there will be adequate feed to carry the stock through the spring. They are concerned, of course, with the reduction in gasoline rations.

By and large, Mr. President, the real issue, as I see it, and as it is reflected by the letters, is, Will the Senate and the leaders of the country be in a position, when the war is over, to see to it that some form of authority or organization is created which will do away with war? We can read in every line of the letters received that the writers are concerned over their boys who are leaving for Europe and those who are in Europe, as well as the boys who are in the Far East. They are concerned over whether or not there shall be adequacy and competency, not only in this Government, but other governments as well, to the end that there may be perfected some form of organization which will effectuate the maintenance of peace.

In recent months I talked over Wisconsin radio stations and gave my views on the serious problems involved in our present and future foreign policies. The reason I have devoted so much time to my constituents in a discussion of these problems concerning foreign relations is not that I feel that I have any particular opinion or set formula which will adequately insure an era of post-war peace, or that I have any particular formula which will insure the success of the peace negotiations themselves at the close of the war. Frankly, I do not feel that any such formula exists. My purpose in presenting the series of talks was merely to outline a number of conclusions which I feel involve factors essential to any consideration of our future foreign policy. I shall not reiterate my conclusions today, but I shall devote this brief period to a discussion of what our domestic attitude and policy must be if we are ever to be successful in the field of foreign relations.

All my discussions thus far in the radio series have dealt with a rather specific and carefully planned pattern for our international thinking.

In this discussion I wish to emphasize one vital thought, namely, that no approach to our problems in foreign relations can be successful unless it is built on a bedrock foundation of clearly defined domestic policy. This seems to be such an obvious conclusion that I hesitate to devote time to a discussion of it. Nevertheless, it becomes increasingly evident that too many of our leaders are proceeding in their thinking along lines which may mean a repetition on an international scale of blunders which we have made on a domestic scale. It is inconceivable that in the field of international relations we can secure harmony if in our domestic program we have not been able to secure harmony. How can we secure cooperative world effort if we do not first insure that there shall be completely unified cooperative effort on the domestic front? If in our domestic governmental philosophy we pit class against class, labor against labor, creed against creed, town folk against country folk, how can we conceivably expect to unify many races and creeds in a utopian post-war world?

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not disparage such an ideal. In fact, I fervently subscribe to it, because I believe it is the salvation of mankind. What I insist upon, however, is that we cannot create such an ideal on an international scale if we ignore it on a domestic scale. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link, and our first obligation is to supply the strongest conceivable link in whatever kind of post-war association may be contemplated.

If in this land of ours our national policy panders to labor or to management, or to any other special interest group, how can we expect that a post-war association of nations can deal equitably with many groups of many interests?

If in this land we shape our national fiscal policies so that we stand perilously close to the twilight zone of national bankruptcy, how can we then blithely expect to set up an international monetary stabilization system.

If in this land we cannot write a clearly defined labor policy—and we have not done it during the years—how can we conceivably expect to set up general labor standards for all civilized humanity?

If in this land we cannot set up a clearly defined all-over food policy, how can we conceivably expect to direct the food policy for starving millions all over the face of the globe?

This morning, Mr. President, there was a meeting between a number of Senators and representatives of certain Government agencies in relation to the egg situation in this country. It is tragic. As everyone knows, some farmers have paid as much as 50 cents a piece for chicks. The chicks have grown into mature hens and are now laying eggs. The farmers were promised 30 cents a dozen, but they are receiving only 20 cents a dozen, and feed prices are such that they cannot afford to feed the hens which produce the eggs. That indicates

how we are "missing the boat" on the home front and failing to get together on the home front on the problems which we should consider and solve.

If in our land we cannot eliminate and arrest the mounting tide of juvenile delinquency, how can we conceivably expect on an international scale to obliterate the scars of a relentless and ruthless war from the hearts and minds of millions of European children?

If in our land we permit our legislative policies to be shuttled back and forth on the shifting sands of sectional interests, racial groups, and regional economies, how can we in good conscience expect to effect a world-wide unification of all these diverse factors?

Let there be no mistake about it. We must have international world planning. We live in a contracted world. We cannot escape our obligations. We would be false in our trust if we did not endeavor to participate in some kind of thinking which would insure that our children and our children's children shall not again travel along dreary roads to armed international conflict.

But let it also be crystal clear that the millennium will not come by some legislation superimposed from a far-off Mt. Olympus. There will be no international promised land mythically conjured out of the clouds of abstract thinking. International good will, international peace, international prosperity must be built on the solid bedrock of good will and prosperity and clearly defined policies in the various domestic components which seek to bind together in an international order.

In other words, Mr. President, in order to do missionary work it is necessary for us to be absolutely certain we have religion ourselves. If we are going to rush headlong into the most gigantic international financial undertaking in the history of the world, then it is just plain, ordinary, backwoods horse-sense that we put our own fiscal house in order. Here we are actually contemplating this fabulous international venture into a world-wide fiscal Alice-in-Wonderland, and actually we do not even today have adequate congressional machinery for the consideration of our own domestic budget.

We still draft our fiscal legislation with the most unbalanced, outmoded legislative machinery of which the mind of man could possibly conceive. We still evade the direct constitutional mandate for Congress to initiate revenue legislation. We still wait for some handy man of the executive branch to come here and tell Congress what kind of revenue legislation shall be written. We still muddle revenue legislation through a long, hazardous passage, involving separate House hearings before the Ways and Means Committee; a long, tortuous passage through the House itself; another perilous trip through the Senate Finance Committee, and finally through the Senate itself; and then to a dynamite-ridden conference, and then back to both Houses for confirmation.

We still do not have joint House and Senate committee action to formulate such legislation. We still make no attempt whatever to correlate money-raising and money-spending activities in Congress. We still use the same fiscal machinery of revolutionary days to handle the involved fiscal affairs of the Nation which spends more money and raises more money than any other Nation on earth.

If we do not have the vision and the foresight to revise our congressional machinery so as to make it adequate to handle the increased magnitude of our domestic problems, how can we possibly adopt a policy which will insure international stabilization?

I believe in the objectives of such an international monetary stabilization, but I insist that cannot be achieved unless we have achieved some degree of domestic stabilization.

Today in all this mighty land of ours, with the largest Federal Agriculture Department ever maintained in the history of our Nation, there is no man who can point to a single decisive unified coordinated all-over food program for the Nation.

In this brief address I do not have the time to outline the manifold shortcomings in our haphazard, crazy food policy, but every housewife in the land is aware of our lack in this direction.

Throughout the entire war period, and even today, our food policy is divided between half a dozen different agencies and leaders in government, with the result that conflicts and chaos continue interminably.

I may say parenthetically, Mr. President, that this morning I had a discussion with some of the representatives of the Government. I said we were considering merely the one segment of eggs, but that we must consider all other segments, which include, of course, the question of feed, milk, prices, and all this and that. One of these gentlemen replied, "I cannot discuss that with you, because that is not in my province." Then I said we should get all the Government representatives together who were considering the various segments, so that we would have them all in one room and the matter could be discussed intelligently.

Mr. President, there have been countless pleas from Congress for the adoption of a single head for the food program, with a single policy, but, frankly, these requests have never been met.

Now, I submit, in all honesty how can we plan on meeting the food requirements of half the civilized world if we cannot write one single food policy for this land?

How can we expect to inject ourselves as arbiters for feeding the world when there is so much confusion in America?

How can we assert our influence in international affairs to secure certain wage levels and certain wage standards and the elimination of certain economic maladjustments if in this land we have not even been able to definitely establish the validity of the Little Steel formula for wages; if in this land we still have not been able to establish some definite relationship between farm wages and industrial wages?

If we contemplate a vast international association dedicated to the finest and highest ideals, how can we insure that there will be an equitable ratio of influence and votes from various nations in this group, when we have not even been able to assure the sacred right of the franchise to every American citizen, whether he be in the armed forces or here at home?

I have no desire in any measure to cast a reflection on the desirability of sound international planning. I subscribe heartily to that doctrine. My only point in this discussion today is the simple one that in our concern with post-war international planning we shall not overlook or underestimate the fact that sound international planning must be built on the bedrock of sound domestic planning. Home economy should be established first, and I repeat, we cannot became a part of the international picture with blinders on our eyes, and expect to set free the economy of the world, until we have demonstrated on our home front a sound domestic economy.

Let me emphasize also that neither international planning nor domestic planning need be a matter of abstract ideals or pious hopes.

In the committees of Congress we have a tremendous number of very specific, very definite proposals both in connection with international planning and in connection with our domestic planning.

On the domestic front particularly, countless proposals have been made—proposals which seek to correct certain obvious shortcomings in our domestic governmental machinery, proposals which would, for example, insure some kind of over-all practical social security, proposals which would insure some kind of efficient congressional fiscal machinery, proposals which would insure workable and completely revised tax legislation, proposals which would have insured unified food control, proposals which would have defined our shifting labor policies, proposals which would have defined our manpower policies and our wage policies.

Mr. President, all these proposals must not accumulate dust in the pigeonholes of congressional committees. All these proposals must not lie dormant until the executive branch of Government is finally prodded into action. Congress must regain its rightful stature by insisting on a clarification of domestic policies. Such clarification is a prerequisite to sound international planning.

After the clarification and the definition of domestic policy, Congress must insist on the establishment of a working liaison between the executive and the legislative branch in the conduct of the peace. I have spoken on this subject so many times that I know some think I should not refer to it further, but I am so sincerely convinced we are "missing the boat" by failing to have such a liaison that I repeat my comment briefly.

If we are to sell the "four freedoms" all over the world, we must demonstrate their vitality and their verity here on the home front. If we are to sell the world on the virtues of a republic in a democracy, then we must make certain that our Government functions as a republic in a democracy.

In conclusion, let me say that the greatest single contribution which the United States of America can make to post-war planning is a sound United States of America.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a convention, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Milton E. Miles to be commodore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations of today, including that of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] to be judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO APRIL 12, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, and in accordance with the concurrent resolution heretofore adopted by both Houses, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 75, to Wednesday, April 12, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Edgar Bernard Brossard, of Utah, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1950. (Reappointment.)

JUDGE, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

HOMER T. BONE, of Washington, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, vice Hon. Bert E. Haney, deceased.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL WITH RANK FROM MARCH 10, 1944

Brig. Gen. Frank Thomas Hines, Inactive Reserve, who resigned his commission as brigadier general, Regular Army, after more than 15 years of military service, and who subsequently served for a period of more than 15 years as Director of the Veterans' Bureau and as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

IN THE NAVY

Commodore Bertram J. Rodgers, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of January 1943.

Capt. Theodore D. Ruddock, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 29th day of September 1942.

Capt. Charles T. Joy, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of December 1942.

Capt. Francis C. Denebrink, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of March 1943.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Robert J. Carson to be an ensign in the Coast Guard, to rank from the date of oath as ensign.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

HOMER T. BONE to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be commodore

Milton E. Miles

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Byron O. Gillies, Prescott.
Lawrence D. Larke, Rogers City.

NEVADA

Emery C. Smith, Wells.

NORTH CAROLINA

Pearl L. Ennett, Swansboro.

NORTH DAKOTA

Horace T. Storm, New Leipzig.

OHIO

James L. Collins, Cleveland.
Muza R. Grove, Curtice.
Alice Salzman, Excello.
Earl D. Richardson, Lisbon.
Joseph H. Landrum, Wilmington.

TEXAS

Mamie L. Taylor, Asherton.
Maude M. Woods, Burkeville.
Theodore E. Duncan, Chillicothe.
Ben O. Sanford, Covington.
Katie H. Sharp, Crandall.
Henry F. Priesmeyer, Garwood.
Lena Griffin, Goodrich.
Alex E. Jungmann, Lacoste.
Joseph E. Pate, Omaha.
Tony G. Bonano, Stafford.
Mollie S. McHaney, Sylvester.
Frank M. Bell, Tyler.
James W. Allen, Wingate.
Ethel Gill, Winnie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, APRIL 1, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAMSPECK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Day Star from on high, we lift our hearts to Thee; our thoughts ascend to realms where Thy glory and praise are without end and the wonder of Thy love never grows weary. Help us this day to pursue our path cheerfully and by honest work and faithful service find that the trivial round and common task are made worthy by doing something good to make it good. Thou who emptied Thyself of dignity and power, walking with the poor and needy, sanctify all pride and grief that they may redound to the splendor of the Christian's creed.

Father, we are troubled by what we see and hear; this striving world seems to be drifting without a certain course. We turn to Thee in pathetic eagerness for divine guidance. May we know by our humility, our patience, our power to endure hardness as a good soldier that the greatest treasure is within, inspired by a never-ending hope. Grant that the glory of the Lord shall soon come and be manifested in the walks and conversations of men. Lead all nations away from their prejudices and disobedience that they may be gathered into better communities and states, making them humble, honest, united in the spirit of our untrammeled Saviour.

"Teach me to feel another's woe,
To hide the fault I see,
That mercy I to others show,
That mercy show to me."

Direct us until the morning breaketh. In the name of our Lord and Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4133) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Hon. Edward C. Carroll, of South Boston, on the occasion of the Evacuation Day exercises held at Dorchester Heights, South Boston, Mass., on March 17, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on two or three occasions Congress has enacted the necessary laws requiring the War Food Administration to place a support price under all the farm products necessary to support the war effort. Under existing law the price of eggs should not be below 27.8 or 28 cents a dozen, but today eggs are selling for 20 and 21 cents a dozen in Nebraska. This means that these farmers are going to cut down their flocks. They cannot do otherwise, with feed and labor costs as high as they are. They are selling them, putting them on the market because the War Food Administration has failed and refused to do that which the Congress directed it to do.

Mr. Speaker, why does not this administration, through the War Food Administration, follow the law? Why should the contract of the Government with farmers who have increased production be broken by this administration?

AGREEMENT BETWEEN RUSSIA AND JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the abrogation by Russia of the Japanese coal and oil concessions in northern Sakhalin has been publicized in the press as a major Russian victory and on the radio as indicating that Russia has gained everything and Japan nothing. I wonder.

In my view, this is not the case because the Japanese are now no longer dependent on Sakhalin for part of its oil and coal needs. There is no doubt but that Japan has been able to reopen the oil wells and reconstruct the refineries in the Dutch East Indies and that they are now producing to capacity and fulfilling all of our enemy's needs. Furthermore, the coal deposits in Manchuria alone have been and are more than sufficient for Japan's requirements in that respect.

It is well to keep in mind that in giving up her coal and oil concessions, Japan is having her fishing rights extended from 1 to 5 years. As fish furnishes one of the two staple elements in her diet—the other is rice—the conclusion may be drawn that Japan is augmenting her food supplies at home and in return giving up concessions over coal products which at present are of little or no value to her. We must remember that prior to this war Japan could not supply more than 10 percent of her oil needs from the shale of Manchuria and the concessions in Sakhalin. The rest of her supply she had to get from outside sources, primarily from Dutch Indonesia and, to a lesser extent, from the United States. Now with complete control of the Indies oil fields she is independent of any outside source and what she has given up is indicative of her complete independence in the petroleum field.

This new agreement between Russia and Japan is more significant than meets the eye at the moment. In my opinion it signifies a need for a staple food in the Japanese Empire being met; and as a concession she is giving up her rights in coal and oil which she no longer needs. Japan is, as a result, making herself stronger to defeat both at home and in her conquered territories. I fear this agreement goes far deeper than newspaper headlines and radio accounts indicate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short essay written by Miss Romeo, winner of a State-wide WAC essay contest sponsored by Gov. Dwight Green, of Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the merchant marine as an instrument of commerce and to include therein an address delivered by R. Earle Anderson, Director of Finance, United States Maritime Commission. I am informed that the matter will make approximately two and one-half pages of the RECORD and that the estimated cost will be $112.50. The material is valuable and I ask unanimous consent that it may be published in the RECORD notwithstanding the estimated length and cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts of a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POLAND

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a poem entitled "When Poland Comes Home."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the liberty-loving people of the United States look sympathetically today upon Poland in her dark hour. We are resolved that when this war is ended, Poland shall again be a free and independent nation and that no other country shall rule over any section of it. She shall not be divided again to satisfy another nation, but shall enjoy the full freedom that is her heritage. Poland has given to the world a people who are strong of character, honest, industrious, and devoted to the ideals of freedom.

Many border disputes are to be settled in Europe. One of the most acute will be over the Polish-Russian border. I feel certain that the controversy now existing between Poland and Russia as to the border to be established will be settled to the satisfaction of Poland and justifiably so, because of their great efforts in this war.

The United Nations have already made an intensive effort to restore diplomatic relations between Soviet Russia and Poland. Poland was the first country that dared to resist Hitler's demand and preferred war, rather than yield a foot of her land or relinquish any of her sovereign rights. For nearly 5 years she has been suffering more horribly at the hands of the oppressors than any other conquered country, and it is my hope and prayer that a fair settlement will be made by the United Nations that will bring justice and peace to all the world.

The Polish-Americans have contributed much to America's cause and their children are at this very moment fighting that we may continue our way of life. A strong bond has always existed between the United States and Poland. Both countries have much in common. Both are liberty-loving people. Both have fought in the past for freedom's cause. Both are fighting today for the preservation of that liberty. Polish patriots fought that our Constitution might come into existence and it is therefore fitting that Americans of today fight to restore Poland to its former independence and liberty.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a poem written by J. R. McIntosh, entitled "When Poland Comes Home":

WHEN POLAND COMES HOME

Poland has gone away for awhile
A victim of cowardly murderers' guile.
Her land o'errun by soulless horde;
Held in bondage, lashed by slavery's gourd.

Everything held dear destroyed by merciless Hun;
Cities bombed, left in ruins by plane and gun.
No regard for lives, of man, woman, or child;
Every law of humanity broken and defiled.

Every valued possession taken by force,
Stolen by thieves, vultures, Nazis, the source.
Homeless and hungry, seeking rest and food;
Driven to depths of despair, comes vengeful mood.

No word of complaint permitted or given;
Silenced the voice. Gone for all you have striven;
Nothing left of the joys of life;
Wounded your hearts, endless the strife.

Your bodies broken, vitality at low ebb;
Ensnared by captors, caught in their web.
Complete subjugation, their aim and goal
Victory over your body, still free your soul.

The spirit and soul never will die;
They live on forever, though war's conflicts are nigh
There comes calm after every gale.
Justice applied treachery and conquest fail.

Stricken, devastated, trampled in mire
In all-out destruction, by shell and fire,
A country enveloped by merciless might,
A heartrending condition, a terrible plight.

Your eyes can see the injury done
By a ravaging beast, a soulless Hun.
With saddened heart and darkened brow
Vengeance will come. You make solemn vow.

Again a freed Poland will take her place,
Repel the invader, suppress and efface.
Freedom and liberty again dwell in your land;
Sing songs of victory, triumphant and grand.

Two great Nations fight for freedom for you,
Have courage and faith, start over anew,
United States and Great Britain make solemn decree
That your beloved Poland once more will be free.

The bonds that hold will be torn away,
Your hearts will be happy, your laughter gay.
Once more a nation never more to roam,
A glorious welcome when Poland returns back home.

—*J. R. McIntosh.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein copies of two telegrams and copy of a letter from a constituent with respect to the price of eggs and the woes of the farmers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], that he be granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter written to Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A., by the Reverend J. G. Steinmeyer, who is chairman of the Pipestone County War Price and Rationing Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH SEARS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I was not present recently when the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] announced the death of a prominent constituent of mine, a former Member of the House, the Honorable Joseph Sears. We called him Uncle Joe in the State of Florida, and as evidence of the esteem in which he was held in our State, for 14 years Uncle Joe Sears represented the old Fourth District of Florida, which held practically half the population of the State. Then for an additional 4 years he represented the entire State as a Representative at Large. Uncle Joe Sears might have held his seat much longer in Congress had he chosen to remain in his old home, which is in my district. In 1936, when a new district was created, and I was canvassing the district to run for Congress, I found there was a strong sentiment for Uncle Joe to come back to his home and to run from the new Fifth District. Had Uncle Joe Sears decided to come back and run from the new Fifth District, I would not have been a candidate. I want to take this opportunity to say that in the State of Florida we feel a great loss in the death of Uncle Joe Sears.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter addressed to me by a student.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION BILL

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, before the Congress adjourns today for the Easter recess I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that for the past several weeks the Committee on Roads of the House has been holding hearings on H. R. 2426, the $3,000,000,000 highway construction bill. That committee, of which I have the honor to be a Member, hopes to be able to report the bill to the House shortly after the conclusion of the recess.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is not only the largest highway bill which has ever been introduced in Congress, but it will be the first bill providing for a comprehensive post-war construction program, which the present Congress will have the opportunity of considering. It will be a bill, also, under which the entire control of this important phase of the post-war program will be retained in the Congress, and I trust in this respect it will establish a precedent which will be followed in every other phase of post-war legislation.

As a member of the Roads Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, the Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy, and other standing and special committees upon which the responsibility to recommend post-war legislation will devolve, I have insisted and shall continue to insist that every post-war program shall be authorized by the Congress and that it shall be carried out under mandatory law of Congress, and not through orders and decisions of executive agencies of the Government

Recently I had the pleasure of representing the Committee on Roads at the twenty-ninth annual convention of the National Association of State Highway Officials in Chicago, and of addressing the convention on this legislation. In that address I endeavored to explain why it is necessary for the Congress at this particular time to guard against encroachment upon its legislative jurisdiction by the executive department of the Government, either in respect to this highway bill or any other phase of the post-war program, and I am happy that the views I there expressed upon that question have met with the approval not only of the highway associations but of the people generally.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent at this point to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein the address I have referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

ADDRESS BEFORE THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, CHICAGO, ILL., DECEMBER 1–3, 1943, BY HON. JAMES W. MOTT, OF OREGON, MEMBER, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ROADS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

It is a privilege and an honor indeed, Mr. Chairman, to have the opportunity of attending this convention. When I first went to Congress 11 years ago, one of my first assignments was to the Committee on Roads. Since that time I have attended as many conventions of the Association of State Highway Officials as I could. It has always been a very great pleasure personally to be with you and to talk to you, and I have always gained a great deal of practical information from these conventions which, as a member of the Roads Committee, I have tried to put to good use in the consideration of highway legislation. I am particularly glad to be here at this time because I believe that following this convention your work will be of greater importance to the States you represent and to the Nation than it ever has been before.

Now, I am going to make a confession to you. I have three highway bills in my pocket. Two of them have been considered

by the House Committee on Roads. Two of them, in fact, have been enacted, and one, the authorization bill for post-war road planning, will soon be the subject of very exhaustive hearings by the committee. I wrote out a speech on this legislation and it was my intention to deliver it here to tell you what I thought you ought to do in regard to post-war road planning and building. But on further consideration I realized that you, as experts in this field, knew so much more about it than I do as a member of the committee that it would be unfair to you to take up your time on that kind of a discussion. So, if you will pardon me, I am going to talk on another phase of road building and post-war planning, and I will have to do it extemporaneously.

Mr. Chairman, it goes without saying, I presume, that the prosecution of the war is so paramount that every other problem and every other consideration is secondary and of relatively small immediate importance. Nevertheless, it is obvious to us all not only that this war sooner or later must end, but that it must end in complete and total victory for the United States and the Allied Nations, and that when that time comes, the Congress and the country must consider legislation and must be prepared to formulate and execute the plans whereby our economy may be transferred from a wartime economy into a peacetime economy in the shortest time possible and with as little disruption as possible.

You will notice I said the Congress and the country must do this and that I did not say the Government must do it. The reason I did not say the Government is that I did not want to run the risk of confusing you. Many of our people have of late years been confused as to just what constitutes their Government. Many of them seem to be of the notion that the Government means an administration in power, and particularly the executive agencies of that administration and so, I have said as plainly as I cound that in my opinion this planning is a job that should be done by the Congress and the country. And I mean just that.

Under our Constitution, the Congress of the United States is the only body or agency which has any authority whatever to make law. It is the business and the province of the executive agencies of the Government to execute and to administer the law which the Congress makes. Post-war programs of any kind, including roads, therefore, should be based upon the mandatory law of Congress and it should not be based upon the decisions or the whims or the discretions of any of the executive agencies of the Government, whose only proper function, as I said a moment ago, is to administer the law of Congress and not to make law themselves.

And so I say to you, as a very important group of the people of this country, by far the most important group in the field of road construction and road planning, a group which has cooperated more closely with the representative branch of our Government in that field than any other, I say to you that it is incumbent upon you to prepare and to formulate your plans now for post-war road construction in cooperation with the Congress, which will enact the basic law under which those plans are to be carried out. And I say to you that the principal reason why you should do this and do it now is because if you don't do it, these executive agencies will do it for you, just as they did in the days of the W. P. A.

I am sure I need not explain to you how this was done at one time or how it may be done again. I simply warn you that unless you insist upon exercising your rights and privileges as citizens of the United States, and unless you are resolved henceforth to keep your own Government and not permit it again to be transferred to the bureaucrats in the executive agencies, the bureaucrats will take over the post-war road-building program just as they took over the depression road-building program, and you will have another W. P. A. And now I think I had better define that term "bureaucrat" and also explain what I have referred to as "executive agencies."

By bureaucrats, I don't mean people like Tom MacDonald, who, of course, is a chief of a bureau, and the executive agencies that I am referring to do not include agencies like the Public Roads Administration. This and other old established agencies of the Government are the creatures of the Congress. They were created by law and they were created for the purpose of carrying out the mandate made by the people's representatives in the Congress. They are legitimate and necessary agencies of Government, and we will always have bureaus and agencies of this kind.

But during the past 10 years there has grown up in this country an entirely different kind of bureaucracy—a bureaucracy such as we have never known before. It is the bureaucracy which is represented by the so-called alphabetical agencies. It is a bureaucracy which is alien to our American system of government and which in many respects is directly opposed to representative government. Some of these alphabetical agencies started in the depression days when it was necessary for the Congress, in order to alleviate depression conditions, to grant to the Executive certain broad powers, which he in turn delegated to others. In almost every case the bureaucrats who headed these new executive agencies not only took the full broad power which was granted to them by statute, but they construed those statutes in such a way as to enable them to write orders, directives, and proclamations which had no statutory sanction but which, they claimed, had the force and the effect of law. Many of those orders and directives imposed penalties of fine and imprisonment upon people if they violated them. The Congress has been able to recapture very little of this usurped authority from the bureaucrats because, until the convening of the Seventy-eighth Congress, at least, it lacked an independent majority large enough to pass the necessary remedial legislation.

Then when the war came, it was necessary for the Congress, as every previous war Congress has had to do, to pass broad war powers acts, and that has resulted in the creation of still more new agencies. These new executive agencies have gone even further than the old ones and they have made orders, directives, and proclamations which affect the activity, the industry, the business, and the very life of all the people of this country, and in instance after instance they have done this without any authority of law whatever.

Nearly all of this new bureaucracy, nearly all of the new agencies representing it, have been busily engaged in post-war planning ever since this war started. Most of them had no statutory authority to engage in planning but they have nevertheless engaged in planning and some of them have completed their plans and are ready to put them into effect whenever the opportunity offers; and their plans—mark you—do not exclude road building.

The best known, perhaps, of all these executive planning agencies was the National Resources Planning Board and, I am sure, you all remember that amazing outfit. You probably have read a part of its latest report, its "cradle to the grave" report, under which the future life of all of our citizens was mapped out and planned and controlled and regimented, not only from the crade to the grave but for a considerable period beyond. And you may recall also that this National Resources Planning Board was not created by any act of Congress. It was established without any authority of law whatever. It succeeded in worming itself into the structure of the Government and, from time to time, in securing appropriations to carry on its work, which so far as law was concerned was entirely illegal.

You may recall particularly, because you are in the road-building business, that when the President vetoed the defense highway bill a couple of years ago he vetoed it, not upon the advice of the Administrator of Public Roads and not upon the advice of any agency of the Government which had been created by the Congress; he vetoed that bill on the advice of the National Resources Planning Board, no member of which knew anything about road building.

I had always opposed that Board, as well as every other planning board which had no authority in law to act, and I voted against appropriating money for it each time I had an opportunity to do so. I don't know whether I had anything particularly to do with its final demise, but, as you all know, the present Congress, when it came to appropriating further money to prolong the illegal life of this agency, denied it any further finances, and it is now nonexistent as a board. But individually it is not nonexistent, because you will still find members of the National Resources Planning Board in a half dozen other agencies of the Government, and they are still planning. They are all planning—planning to regiment the country in the post-war period as they did in the depression period, when they almost succeeded in making the depression a permanent institution.

Now, I want to bring up the old W. P. A. road-building and planning program because you are all so familiar with it, and to recall to your minds just what planning by an executive agency, without authority of Congress, can do, when such planning is put into practice.

You all remember how the W. P. A. road-building plan worked. More money was spent on that program for road building than was spent in the regular, constitutionally authorized way. Roads were built, of course. They were built, primarily, not to solve the transportation problem of the country, but they were used very largely as a vehicle for boondoggling. You will remember that Mr. Harry Hopkins, who was the head at that time of W. P. A., heartily defended boondoggling. He is said to have declared upon one occasion that the reason the American people didn't understand or appreciate boondoggling was that they were "too damned dumb." You will recall, also, that he, or one of his satellites in that great executive planning agency, said that his slogan was "Tax and tax—spend and spend—elect and elect." And they easily got away with this on the ground that the country faced a great emergency.

Now it is perfectly possible, unless we do our own road planning now, for an agency like W. P. A. to be revived and to take charge of our road-building program in post-war emergency. There is no essential difference between an agency like W. P. A. and many of the other agencies which have sprung up in recent years and which are now actually operating without authority of law. They all have several things in common. One is their desire to perpetuate themselves in office. Another is their desire to expand their jurisdiction and their control over the people and to pursue their alleged right to govern by orders and by directives instead of by law made by the representatives of the people.

Much of this planning we know little about because recently an Executive order was issued which prohibited any of these agencies from making a report to a committee of the Congress, or even a report to an individual Member of Congress, unless the agency first obtained the consent of the Bureau of the Budget, where most of this planning activity is concentrated. You may be interested in hearing one or two paragraphs of this order.

This order was issued on October 4, 1943. The first paragraph reads as follows:

"In order to facilitate budgeting activities, all departments and establishments of the executive branch of the Federal Government now or hereafter authorized by law to plan, propose, undertake, or aid public works in improvement projects financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government shall prepare and keep up to date, by at least annual revision, carefully planned and realistic long-range programs of such projects, all such programs being hereafter referred to as advanced programs."

Now these advanced program makers have been placed in a number of agencies and departments of the Government. They are in O. P. A. In fact, O. P. A. is full of them. They are in the War Production Board, and the War Manpower Commission. They are in the State Department. We have dozens of brilliant young men in dozens of agencies who have never had any practical experience in anything, who have been engaged for years at the taxpayers' expense in planning a better and bigger world not only for us but for the millions of people outside of the United States. "All such departments and establishments," the order continues, "shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget at the earliest possible date estimates of such appropriations for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 as are necessary to provide, plan, and prepare for those public works and improvement projects proposed or undertaken during the first 3 years of their advanced programs. Thereafter, in order that plans for these public works and improvement projects will always be available in advance, all such departments and establishments shall prepare and submit to the Bureau during each fiscal year estimates of such appropriations and such estimates as may be necessary to provide plan preparation for those projects proposed for undertaking during the succeeding 3 fiscal years of their advance program. All estimates shall be accompanied by recommendations as to the additional known legislation or amendments to existing legislation that may be necessary to bring projects in their advanced programs to an appropriate readiness for prompt undertaking when and where needed."

And now, listen to this:

"Before any department or establishment shall submit to the Congress or to any committee or member thereof a report relating to exhibiting in whole or in part its advanced programs or the public works and improvement projects in such programs or the results of any plan or preparation for such programs or project, such report shall be submitted to the Bureau for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President. When such report is thereafter submitted to the Congress or to any committee or member thereof it shall include a statement of the advice received from the Bureau."

Now, any of you gentlemen who think that a road-building program with which the Congress may have nothing to do and with which the people generally may have nothing to do, or with which you as a group will have nothing to do, is not contemplated in this multifarious planning set-up simply do not understand the history or the philosophy of modern bureaucracy in America. Therefore, I say to you that it is incumbent to do your own planning now, and have it ready to be put into effect under mandatory law of the Congress, and administered and supervised by the agency set up by the Congress for that purpose, which is the Public Roads Administration, and unless we do that, it is my opinion that another W. P. A., or perhaps something worse, will return.

The regimentation of our people is being planned and prepared by these agencies, who have no authority under law to do it, and unless the people prevent it and unless they support their representatives in Congress by insisting that this post-war planning be done by law, it is entirely possible that the people may lose control of their Government.

No committee in Congress has been more aware of this possibility of bureaucracy taking over the control of the Government, as it actually did in the depression years, than has the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives, because we have had that question before us continuously. The real problem, the real difficulty, the real controversy in all important road legislation in the last 10 years has not been the amount of money involved. It has been a question as to who would have authority to dispense this money and who would have jurisdiction to say what roads should be built, if at all, and how much should be expended upon them. In other words it has been a fight between bureaucracy and representative Government.

You will recall when we received the veto for the highway defense bill, the veto, as I said a moment ago, was suggested by this National Resources Planning Board and not by the Bureau of Roads or any other regularly constituted agency of the Government. The reasoning upon which that veto was based was that it did not give enough discretion to the executive agencies of the Government. I think I need not tell you, because you have been before our committee so many times, and I am sure I need not tell any colleague of mine on the committee, that there has never been a time in the last 10 years when we could not have secured as much money, within reason, as we wanted, in any one year, had we only consented to put the expenditure of this money into the discretionary jurisdiction of an executive agency, and one of the reasons why you still have your basic road law intact today is that the Public Roads Committee of the House of Representatives has always refused to do that and it has been willing to take a smaller amount of money and still retain its constitutional and legal jurisdiction.

The basic road law of the United States is one of the finest examples of mandatory congressional legislation which can be found upon the statute books of this country. From time to time it may need amendment and revision, but we insist that that amendment and revision, if and when necessary, shall be made by mandatory law and it shall not be made in any case by an encroachment upon our jurisdiction by any of these alphabetical executive agencies.

The Roads Committees of the House and Senate, knowing this, knowing the danger which we have always faced, and knowing the increasing danger which we will continue to face, have undertaken, with your help and advice and assistance, to make a mandatory post-war road building program of our own. I am not going to discuss this legislation, as it was my original intention to do, because, as I say, you, having basically originated it yourself, are just as familiar with it as I am. I do wish very briefly to tell you, however, what it is.

The first item of this program was Public Resolution No. 146. That was the bill which authorized $50,000,000 for planning and surveys. This money is to be expended for planning and surveys. It was not authorized or appropriated to be played with by any outfit like the National Resources Planning Board or by any of the professors in any other executive agency. It was authorized to be expended by the Commissioner of the Public Roads in cooperation with the highway departments of the several States. You are using that money now for planning and surveys, and when you finish your planning and your surveys, we will have the basic plan on which to build the highway construction program after the war. There will be a plan which will actually come from experts in their fields, because there are no greater experts in any field than the members of your association are in your own field. So, you who are most vitally interested are the ones who have really made those plans. You submitted them to your legally constituted committee of the legislative body of this country and that committee has reported it out and the Congress has translated it into law, and that law is mandatory.

Another item on this program will interest you. I have told you that these various alphabetical agencies have from time to time tried without authority of law to appropriate unto themselves a part of the jurisdiction of the Congress and the Roads Committee in regard to roads. And in two or three cases they succeeded, temporarily. I could tell you of one of the most amazing examples of bureaucratic encroachment which happened before our committee. The thing was so amazing that I could hardly believe it myself.

When the second access road bill was introduced from the time of its introduction until the time the committee began consideration of it, the professors down in the Road Division of the War Production Board began to take a hand in it, and they wrote an order which was designated as Order L-41, which upon examination, insofar as the construction of access roads was concerned, nullified the mandatory law of Congress and provided that, notwithstanding the law, we could not begin the construction of a necessary naval or military access road unless we made application, to whom do you suppose? To the Administrator of the Federal Housing Authority.

Well, some of us, when we read this order, wanted to know how it came about. So at our request, the chairman of the committee called up the professor who was to administer the order, the engineer who was supposed to give him advice on this critical matter, and the lawyer for the Division who was supposed, I imagine, to see that this agency did not undertake to nullify a law of Congress. We found that the man who was to administer the order had never built a road, knew nothing about road building, and wasn't even interested in it; that the engineer was consulted only on a minor matter, and that when it came to the fundamental issue at stake, whether an act of Congress could be nullified by the order of an executive agency, the attorney had never even been consulted on the question.

Well, at the conclusion of this hearing, the order was rescinded, as far as it affected access roads. But we have found that when these agencies say they rescind or modify an order, you cannot always depend upon it. It will crop up in another place, and they will usurp jurisdiction whenever they get an opportunity. So, having that experience behind it, the Roads Committee reported out and passed House Resolution 243, which gives the committee the right to investigate these agencies encroaching upon the jurisdiction of the Congress and the committee, and gives the committee power to subpena witnesses, including these very bureaucrats, notwithstanding the order that I read a moment ago, which declares that these bureaucrats may not give any information to committees of Congress or to the individual Members of Congress unless they have the consent of the Bureau of the Budget.

Not only the Roads Committee, but a number of other committees of the Congress have been obliged to put themselves in the position, by special acts of Congress, of investigating committees having the power of subpena, so that they can call these executive planners in and make them tell what they have been doing, notwithstanding any Executive order to the contrary.

The final item on this congressional program for post-war road building, of course, is the bill authorizing appropriation of the money to put the program into effect, and directing how and by whom the money shall be spent. That bill originated in your body.

I am not going to discuss it. There are several provisions in it with which I may not entirely agree, and possibly most of the Members would entertain difference of opinion on some of its provisions. I wish to say only this about it: It is fundamentally sound and legislatively proper. Not only is it fundamentally sound to authorize this $3,000,000,000 for a post-war construction program, but the great virtue of it is that the authority for the program comes from a mandatory bill to be enacted by the Congress of the United States. It is a bill and a program in which none of these executive agencies is to have any discretionary authority whatever.

Before I conclude, I wish to say just a word about the financing of this huge future undertaking. Some have contended that an amount so large would be too great a tax burden upon the people of the United States. I would like to say at this point that that kind of a contention has no foundation in fact whatever. The financing of roads in this country is a unique proposition. It is not paid for by the general taxpayer at all. All of the financing of roads, State roads, and of Federal roads, or Federal aid to States in building roads, is all financed by excise taxes levied upon the road users of the several States—and that is a thing which none of you should ever forget when they talk about the great burden of a large road-building program upon the general taxpayer, because it is not the fact. Everyone who uses the roads pays for those roads. The payment is in effect a toll. You pay for using a road whenever you drive over it because you have to buy the gasoline on which is levied not only a State but a Federal tax. None of this Federal money used in aid to the States comes out of the pockets of the general taxpayer. It is paid into the Treasury, of course. But the Government in the past 10 or 15 years has been spending in aid to States for road building only about one-half of the money that it collected from the road users of the several States. Some years ago I told you in Seattle that if I ever became chairman of this committee I would try to put a stop to that nefarious practice of the Government actually taking money from the road users of the States and then not using it on roads, but using it for general governmental purposes. I believe, and I always have believed, that that is wrong, and my pledge to do my utmost to put a stop to it still stands.

I trust very much, gentlemen, that my discussion of bureaucracy, as it has affected and may again affect road building, has been accepted by you in the spirit in which I have offered it. I hope none of you will presume that there has been anything political in my observations. I assure you there has not been. You may be surprised to know that none of these questions I have been discussing, particularly none of these questions coming up before the Roads Committee of the House, has ever been considered upon political lines. From hearing a discussion of members in the Roads Committee, and that is true of many other committees, it would be impossible for an onlooker to tell what political party a member belongs to. The same is, to a large extent, true in the body of the Congress itself, and that also may surprise you. Very little important legislation in the Congress of the United States is ever decided upon political party lines. There are two groups in Congress—one which tolerates bureaucracy in government and one which insists that this shall be a government of law and not of men. That is the controversy and that is the line upon which most of this controversial legislation is divided. That struggle is going on now. It is a struggle which will determine whether the representatives of the people in Congress shall make the law under which we all must live, or whether in the future we shall live under directives and proclamations and orders made by the executive agencies. That question has to be settled. I think it will be settled in this Congress; if not in this one, then in the next one, after the people shall once more have had the opportunity to exercise their franchise. And I believe when it is settled that government by law will prevail over government by men.

My distinguished colleague who preceded me mentioned a sad incident of a wounded boy returning from the front. We all have sons or sons-in-law in this war. Many of them will not return. As for my own, if he returns, I pray that he may return to a country which still is free, a country wherein his life will not be regimented, wherein his rights and duties and privileges will not be determined by the whims or fancies of bureaucratic officials. I pray, rather, that he may return to the same country which his fathers helped to build. The country which, of right, is his heritage, where every man may have a chance to live his life and be the master of his own destiny. Only if we can preserve that kind of a country will this war be really won. If we defeat the enemy and still lose our own free government, then the sacrifices of these boys will have been in vain. But if we are true to them, if we are true to ourselves, then the sacrifice, whatever it may be, will have been well made. For, then, and only then, may we fulfill the high resolve pronounced by Lincoln at Gettysburg, "that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the critical shortage of keymen in the fisheries industries; to include a plan proposed by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries yesterday to the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]; and also a resolution from the commissioner of fisheries of the State of Virginia, and other documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-eighth Congress is about to recess for a short period. This session has been a busy one. The Congress has accurately interpreted the public mind and has devoted itself largely to the country's most important task—that of winning the war. Both political parties have cooperated in this respect.

Next in importance to the war activities is the problem of food and sustenance. Food is a military problem as well as a domestic problem. We must not only feed ourselves, but we must assist the unfortunate in overrun countries. All this involves problems of production, distribution, and transportation.

The Republican Party has not only cooperated in every way with the administration in solving intricate food problems, but it has offered many constructive suggestions, some of which have been accepted.

To the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee must go much credit for the improvements recently noted in the administration of the food problem. This was accomplished by constructive suggestions and by just criticism in some cases.

It was only natural that much confusion would result when the administration of the food problems was put under the authority of many different agencies. The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, by reason of its unity of purpose and by its constructive action, has been able to relieve the country of much of this confusion. There remains much to be done. Our committee still maintains that the whole food problem should be placed under one head, with full authority and full responsibility. The first major accomplishment of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee was the introduction of the Jenkins bill, which is still pending before Congress. The Fulmer bill, which is of the same import, has resulted from the studies of this committee and has been supported by this committee. These two bills propose the centralization of all food administration under a single head, with full authority as well as full responsibility.

The spontaneous action of the Committee on Agriculture in favorably reporting the Palmer bill served notice on various Government food agencies that the country is fully aware of the dangerous situation into which it is being driven. As a result of this proposed legislation the various food agencies of the Government have shown a marked tendency to compose their jealousies and their overlapping jurisdictions. One of the two bills above mentioned and the principles involved therein should be adopted into legislation immediately.

The continuing and consistent action of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee in throwing the spotlight of publicity upon troublesome weaknesses in the administration of the food problem has had an important part in changing the trend of bureaucracy. Conflict between bureaus is never remedied by the bureaus themselves until some outside influence is asserted.

In many instances the committee, through the individual efforts of its members, has taken an interest in specific problems, thereby forcing better administration and encouraging producers and processors of food and feed to increase their output. This committee has taken a special interest in the problems of the canners and in the problems of the producers of poultry and dairy products. Likewise the shortage of farm labor and farm machinery has claimed the attention of the committee, and good results have been accomplished. Livestock and meat products have presented some difficult problems, which the committee has attacked and from which good results have been accomplished.

The committee has not only considered the problems of the producer, but it has held a number of public hearings in the

large consuming centers of the country. These hearings have been attended by representatives of consumers, distributors, and producers. By reason of these hearings the committee has been able to offer constructive suggestions and to relieve chaotic conditions.

More recently the committee has made comprehensive studies of the serious problems involved in Government food surpluses. This situation is becoming worse and worse, as will appear from the fact that the Government has been compelled to give away, without price and without points, great quantities of food supplies in an effort to prevent the same from spoiling. As a result of these studies, the Phillips bill (H. R. 4275) has been introduced in Congress and is now pending before the Committee on Agriculture. This bill provides for the orderly disposition of Government food surpluses by a single agency, which would absorb the functions of other agencies now involved in the same work. The Phillips bill should be passed immediately.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has endeavored to lend itself cooperatively to individual Members, and has encouraged them to present their individual problems to the committee for consideration. The committee has by its action served notice on the executive branch of the Government that the Republican membership in Congress feels the importance of food in the national economy, and that the food problem is not in any way a matter of politics.

In these days we hear and read much about post-war planning. The conferences held some time ago at Hot Springs, Va., and at Atlantic City were engaged principally with discussions of the international aspects of the food problem. This movement, commonly designated as U. N. R. R. A., has tremendous possibilities and must be carefully watched. Unwise commitments may involve us in serious international complications and may wreck our national economy. Agriculture is still America's basic industry, and it should not be drawn into international complications that will endanger its efficiency. Likewise our national debt has been dangerously expanded and must not be unwisely increased.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee would impress upon Congress and upon those responsible for the administration of the food activities of the Nation that the food problem is still a serious one, and that it calls for the most serious and conscientious consideration.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee is encouraged to continue its efforts because of the importance of these serious problems.

It is pertinent to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the fact that the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has functioned without a single penny of expense to the taxpayers of the Nation, and without any appropriation of Government funds.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on the great record of our Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Glenville (W. Va.) Democrat, dealing with the soldier vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Mr. Carroll Miller, secretary of the West Virginia Horticultural Association in connection with price control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INCOME-TAX RETURNS FOR FARMERS

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a general misunderstanding among the farmers of our Nation regarding the filing of estimates for income-tax purposes on April 15. Many farmers write me they are being advised by attorneys and others that a farmer must file an estimate of his income for the year 1944 on April 15. This is not correct.

When Congress enacted the Current Tax Payment Act of 1942 it fully appreciated the difficulty of anticipating a farmer's income and therefore a farmer need make no estimate of his income until December 15 of the current year. Should a farmer desire to make an estimate in April and make quarterly payments he may do so. This is purely optional.

The Current Tax Payment Act of 1942 did not greatly change the method of income-tax collections for farmers. Let us take for example the year of 1943 under the old law. The farmer's income tax was due on January 1, 1943, and payable March 15, 1944, either in whole or in four quarterly payments. The return for the income tax and the amount of the tax was due January 1, 1944.

Under the Current Tax Payment Act of 1942 a farmer must file an income-tax return on December 15 for the current year and pay at least two-thirds of his estimated income for the full year. A final return is due January 1 and the final adjusted payment is to be made on March 15, 1944. Therefore, a farmer does not have to come within 33⅓ percent of correctly estimating his income on the December 15 payment. The adjustment is to be taken care of on the March 15 date. This leaves just 15 days for a farmer to guess within one-third of what his annual income will be, and in most cases this would give sufficient leeway. In reality there are only 15 days' difference between the existing law and the old law insofar as the due date for the year's tax liability is concerned.

In January I introduced a bill containing a provision which, if enacted into law, would advance the December 15 date to January 15. This recommendation was approved by the Ways and Means Committee last Thursday and if approved by Congress will eliminate the estimates and penalties which are so confusing. Congress can and should simplify and improve the present method of tax collections.

It is my sincere hope that this statement will relieve some of the confusion and uncertainty regarding estimates for the farmers of our Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Hon. Vinson D. Nicholson, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration and associate solicitor in charge of Rural Electrification. I have received an estimate from the Government Printing Office that this exceeds two pages and will cost $234. It is in answer to a statement inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] on March 2, which cost $330.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding the excess cost and without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION IN BEHALF OF VETERANS' G. I. BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein some provisions of the Wagner bill that was introduced in the Senate recently and also similar provisions of the soldiers' bill now pending before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I probably shall not object, I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi desires a quorum?

Mr. RANKIN. No; the brains of the Congress being present, I think I can proceed with safety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of publicity concerning what is called the G. I. bill for veterans' rehabilitation, now pending before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am chairman. We have been holding hearings on that measure for some time. We refuse to be stampeded; we are going to take our time and go through the bill carefully and try to bring to the floor of the House a measure that we can all support and defend.

There is one provision that is causing a great deal of concern. That is the provision for unemployment compensation, ranging up to 52 weeks, or a calendar year, after a man is discharged from the service. If he is single, the unemployment pay would be $15 a week; if he has a wife and two children it amounts to $25 a week, or $100 a month. The danger I see in a provision of this kind is that it might encourage unemployment and at the same time discriminate against the man who goes back into his old job, back into his shop or his store, or to the farm, and therefore gets no such unemployment pay.

Again, I am afraid it might result in a demand for an extension of this unemployment pay at the end of the year. There would probably be hundreds of thousands or maybe several millions of them drawing this unemployment pay, which could amount to several billions of dollars a year.

There is also a provision that it shall not be considered unemployment if a man applies to and is refused employment at a shop that is closed on account of a strike. That provision should be eliminated because if these boys feel about these strikes, all of them, as do the ones who write from overseas, they are going to take delight in breaking up some strikes when they get back home, and I do not want to see them shut out by any such provision; nor do I want this law used as an excuse for not giving them work.

The unemployment provisions of this bill, S. 1767, are almost a duplicate of a similar title in a bill, S. 1545, which was introduced in the Senate by Senator WAGNER, of New York, on November 26, 1943. The unemployment provision of the Wagner bill reads as follows:

TITLE XII

UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Benefit period and eligibility

SEC. 1201. (a) Any eligible member of the armed forces of the United States who shall have been discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions after the effective date of this title or within the 52-week period preceding such date shall be entitled, in accordance with such regulations as the board may prescribe, to receive an allowance for each week of unemployment, up to 52 weeks, which (1) begins after the effective date of this title, and (2) occurs during the 15-month period after he is so discharged or relieved from active duty: *Provided*, That no such allowance shall be paid him during the four weeks following the receipt of mustering-out pay under the Mustering-Out Pay Act of 1943 or for any period for which he received educational allowances under the Servicemen's Education and Training Act of 1943.

(b) Such member of the armed forces shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of unemployment if he makes a claim for such allowance and the Board finds with respect to such week that—

(1) he is residing in the United States at the time of such claim;

(2) he is completely unemployed in that he has performed no services and received no wages, or he is partially unemployed in that he has performed services for less than a full workweek and his wages for the week are less than his allowance under this title plus $3;

(3) he registers with and continue to report to a public employment office, or such other agency as the Board may designate, in accordance with regulations of the Board; or

(4) he is able to work and available for suitable work or is with the approval of the Board attending a training course: *Provided*, That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

Disqualifications

SEC. 1202. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1201 a claimant shall be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

(1) he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or if he is suspended or discharged for misconduct in the course of his employment;

(2) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work, in accordance with regulations of the Board, or to accept suitable work when offered him; or

(3) he, without good cause, does not attend a free training course, in accordance with regulations of the Board.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1201 a claimant shall also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week with respect to which it is found that his unemployment is due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a labor dispute at the factory, establishment, or other premises at which he is or was last employed: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply if it is shown that—

(1) he is not participating in or indirectly interested in the labor dispute which caused the stoppage of work; and

(2) he does not belong to a grade or class of workers of which, immediately before the commencement of the stoppage there were members employed at the premises at which the stoppage occurs, any of whom are participating in or directly interested in the dispute; *Provided, however*, That if in any case separate branches of work which are commonly conducted as separate businesses in separate premises are conducted in separate departments of the same premises, each such department shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be a separate factory, establishment, or other premises.

(c) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) of this section, the disqualification period shall be the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and the consecutive weeks of unemployment, not more than four, which immediately followed such week.

(d) (1) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work or the existence of good cause with respect to a claimant, there shall be considered, among other factors, the degree of risk involved to his health, safety, and morals, his physical fitness and prior training, his experience and prior or probable earnings in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the length of his unemployment, his prospects for obtaining work in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the distance of available work from his residence and prospects for obtaining local work. No work shall be deemed unsuitable for an individual solely because the wages are less than his unemployment allowance.

(2) No work shall be deemed suitable if—

(a) the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute;

(b) the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to him than those prevailing for similar work in the locality; or

(c) as a condition of being employed he would be required to join a company union or to resign from or refrain from joining any bona fide labor organization.

Amount of an allowance

SEC. 1203. (a) The allowance for a week shall be—

(1) $15 plus

(2) (A) $5 if the claimant has one dependent, or

(B) $7.50 if he has two dependents, or

(C) $10 if he has three or more dependents, less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3: *Provided*, That where the allowance is less than $1, it shall be raised to $1.

(b) (1) As used in this section the term "dependent" includes only—

(a) the lawful wife of a claimant living with him or receiving regular support from him, who, in the week for which an allowance is claimed, has not received $5 or more either as wages, as an allowance under this title or under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law; or

(b) an unmarried child either (i) under 18 years of age, or (ii) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

(2) As used in this section the term "child" shall include only:

(a) a legitimate child;

(b) a child legally adopted;

(c) a stepchild, if a member of the claimant's household; or

(d) a child to whom the claimant stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of claim on behalf of such child.

(3) The Board may find an individual to be a dependent of a claimant if a claimant certified the facts required by the provisions of this subsection.

(c) Where a child is a dependent of more than one claimant, allowance for the child shall be made only on behalf of one claimant, as determined by the Board.

(d) Where a claimant seeks an allowance for a dependent who is separated from him

under court order or written agreement, the allowance for the dependent shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or in the written agreement. If such amount is not fixed at a weekly rate, the portion payable for each week shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Board.

Payment

SEC. 1204. (a) Unemployment allowances shall be paid at reasonable intervals prescribed by the Board.

(b) Any allowance remaining unpaid upon the death of a claimant shall not be considered a part of the assets of the estate of the claimant, or liable for the payment of his debts, or subject to any administration of his estate, and the Board may make payment thereof to such person or persons it finds most equitably entitled thereto.

Adjustment of duplicate benefits

SEC. 1205. Where an allowance is payable to a claimant for a week under this title and where, for the same week, either an allowance or benefit is received under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law or a Federal or State noncontributory benefit is received, the amount received from such other source shall be subtracted from the allowance payable under this title.

Administration

SEC. 1206. (a) The Social Security Board, under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator, is authorized to administer this title and to prescribe such rules and regulations and require such records and reports as it may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

(b) The Board may utilize the available facilities and services of other Federal departments and agencies, through agreement with the heads of such departments and agencies, and payment therefor shall be made either in advance or by reimbursement. It may enter into agreements with appropriate State or other public agencies and private persons, agencies, or institutions to utilize their facilities and services with or without compensation: *Provided*, That any State unemployment agency receiving funds under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, desiring to cooperate under such an agreement shall be permitted to do so as long as it functions in accordance with the terms of such agreement. It may delegate to any officer or employee of its own or of any agency of the Federal Government or of any State, such of its powers and duties, except that of prescribing regulations, as it may consider necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. It may require any such officer or employee to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as it may deem necessary and the cost of such bond may be paid out of sums appropriated for the administration of this title.

(c) Allowances shall be paid, upon certification by the Board and in accordance with such regulations as it may prescribe. The Board shall also, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in advance or otherwise such sums as it estimates to be necessary to compensate such agencies, institutions, or persons for their administrative expenses under this title. Such sums shall cover periods of no longer than 6 months.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, and prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall pay, at the time or times fixed by the Board, to the individuals or agencies designated, the amounts certified pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Any money paid to any cooperating agency, person, or institution which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement with such agency, person, or institution, be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current appropriation for carrying out the purposes of this title or, if returned after the expiration of this title, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Liability of certifying and disbursing officers

SEC. 1207. (a) No person designated by the Board as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any allowance certified by him under this title.

(b) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated by the Board.

Hearing

SEC. 1208. Any claimant whose claim for an allowance has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal in accordance with regulations of the Board.

Decisions and procedure

SEC. 1209. (a) Any decision or certification with respect to an allowance by the Board, or by any agency or person to whom authority to make such decision or certification has been delegated, shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in subsections (g) and (h) of section 205.

(b) During any hearing, investigation, or other proceedings, the Board and, to the extent the Board determines, any agency or person to whom the Board has delegated such authority may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Insofar as they are applicable to the administration of this title, the Board shall have all the powers and duties conferred upon it by subsections (d), (j), and (k) of section 205 and the provisions of subsections (e) and (f) of that section and the provisions of sections 204, 206, and 207 shall be applicable to this title in the same manner and to the same extent as they are applicable to title II.

Requirement of reporting

SEC. 1210. Any claimant shall report the occurrence of any event which makes him ineligible for, or reduces his allowance. Any claimant who fails to report any such event of which he has knowledge and who accepts an allowance to which he is not entitled because of such event shall be ineligible to receive an allowance for 4 weeks of unemployment thereafter.

Penalties

SEC. 1211. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any allowance authorized under this title, or for the purpose of causing any allowance to be paid where none is authorized under this title, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received or the period during which earned or paid, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any allowance under this title, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such a claim shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Appropriation authorized

SEC. 1212. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time sums sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title.

Definitions

SEC. 1213. As used in this title—

(a) The term "week" means such period of 7 consecutive calendar days as may be prescribed in regulations by the Board.

(b) The term "United States" used geographically means the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(c) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(d) The term "wages" means all remuneration for services from whatever source, including commissions and bonuses and the cash value of all remuneration in any medium other than cash.

Effective date

SEC. 1214. This title shall become effective 3 calendar months after the month in which the Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943 is enacted.

The unemployment provision of the pending bill (S. 1767) reads as follows:

TITLE V

CHAPTER VII—READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

SEC. 700. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been separated from active service under other than dishonorable conditions after the date of enactment of this title or within the 52-week period preceding such date (except that no person shall be eligible for any benefit under this title by reason of any period of service from which he shall have been discharged or released on his own initiative to accept employment unless he had served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska), shall be entitled, in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe, to receive a readjustment allowance as provided herein for each week of unemployment, up to 52 weeks, which (1) begins after the effective date of this title, and (2) occurs during the 24-month period after final payment of mustering-out pay: *Provided*, That no such allowance shall be paid for any of the first 4 consecutive weeks following any payment of mustering-out pay, or for any period for which he receives increased pension under part VII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a) or a subsistence allowance under part VIII of such regulation: *Provided further*, That no readjustment allowance shall be payable for any week commencing more than 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war.

(b) Such person shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of unemployment if claim is made for such allowance and the Administrator finds with respect to such week that—

(1) the person is residing in the United States at the time of such claim;

(2) the person is completely unemployed, having performed no service and received no wages, or is partially unemployed in that services have been performed for less than a full workweek and the wages for the week are less than the allowance under this title plus $3;

(3) the person is registered with and continues to report to a public employment office, or such other agency as the Administrator may designate, in accordance with regulations of the Administrator;

(4) the person is able to work and available for suitable work: *Provided*, That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this

subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

CHAPTER VIII—DISQUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 800. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 700, a claimant shall be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

(1) he leaves suitable work voluntarily, without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct in the course of employment;

(2) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work in accordance with regulations of the Administrator or to accept suitable work when offerered him; or

(3) he, without good cause, does not attend a free training course (not within the purview of part VIII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a)), in accordance with regulations of the Administrator.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 700, a claimant shall also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week with respect to which it is found that his unemployment is due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a labor dispute at the factory, establishment, or other premises at which he is or was last employed: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply if it is shown that—

(1) he is not participating in or directly interested in the labor dispute which causes the stoppage of work; and

(2) he does not belong to a grade or class of workers of which, immediately before the commencement of the stoppage there were members employed at the premises at which the stoppage occurs, any of whom are participating in or directly interested in the dispute: *Provided, however*, That if in any case separate branches of work, which are commonly conducted as separate businesses in separate premises, are conducted in separate departments of the same premises, each such department shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be a separate factory, establishment, or other premises.

(c) (1) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, he shall be disqualified to receive any readjustment allowance for the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and for not more than four immediately following weeks.

(2) In addition to the disqualification prescribed in paragraph (1) above, the Administrator may, in cases of successive disqualifications under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, extend the period of disqualification for such additional period as the Administrator may prescribe, but not to exceed eight additional weeks in the case of any one disqualification.

(d) (1) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work or the existence of good cause with respect to a claimant, there shall be considered, among other factors, the degree of risk involved to his health, safety, and morals, his physical fitness and prior training, his experience and prior or probable earnings in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the length of his unemployment, his prospects for obtaining work in the customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the distance of available work from his residence and prospects for obtaining local work. No work shall be deemed unsuitable for an individual solely because the wages are less than his readjustment allowance.

(2) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work, no work shall be deemed suitable for an individual if—

(A) the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute; or

(B) the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to him than those prevailing for similar work in the locality.

CHAPTER IX—AMOUNT OF ALLOWANCE AND PAYMENT

SEC. 900. (a) The allowance for a week shall be—

(1) $15, plus

(2) (A) $5 if the claimant has one dependent, or

(B) $8 if he has two dependents, or

(C) $10 if he has three or more dependents, less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3: *Provided*, That where the allowance is not a multiple of $1, it shall be computed to the next highest multiple of $1.

(b) The number of weeks of allowances to which each eligible veteran shall be entitled shall be determined as follows: For each calendar month or fraction thereof of active service, the veteran shall be entitled to eight weeks of allowances, but in no event to exceed the maximum provided in section 700.

(c) (1) As used in this section the term "dependent" includes only—

(A) the lawful wife of a claimant living with him or receiving regular support from him, or the lawful husband of a claimant if dependent upon his wife for support, who, in the week for which an allowance is claimed, has not received $5 or more either as wages, as an allowance under this title, or under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law; or

(B) an unmarried child either (1) under 18 years of age, or (2) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

(2) As used in this section, the term "child" shall include only—

(A) a legitimate child;

(B) a child legally adopted;

(C) a stepchild, if a member of the claimant's household; or

(D) a child to whom the claimant stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of this claim on behalf of such child.

(d) The Administrator may find an individual to be a dependent of the claimant if the claimant has certified the facts required by the provisions of this subsection.

(e) Where a child is a dependent of more than one claimant, allowance for the child shall be made only on behalf of one claimant, as determined by the Administrator.

(f) Where a claimant seeks an allowance for a dependent who is separated from him under court order or written agreement, the allowance for the dependent shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or in the written agreement. If such amount is not fixed at a weekly rate, the portion payable for each week shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Administrator.

SEC. 901. (a) Readjustment allowances shall be paid at reasonable intervals prescribed by the Administrator.

(b) Any allowances remaining unpaid upon the death of a claimant shall not be considered a part of the assets of the estate of the claimant, or liable for the payment of his debts, or subject to any administration of his estate, and the Administrator may make payment thereof to such person or persons he finds most equitably entitled thereto.

CHAPTER X. ADJUSTMENT OF DUPLICATE BENEFITS

SEC. 1000. Where an allowance is payable to a claimant for a week under this title and where, for the same week, either an allowance or benefit is received under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law, or a Federal or State noncontributory benefit is received, the amount received or accrued from such other source shall be subtracted from the allowance payable under this title (except that this section shall not apply to pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration); and the resulting allowances, if not a multiple of $1, shall be readjusted to the next higher multiple of $1.

CHAPTER XI. ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 1100. (a) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to administer this title and shall, insofar as possible, utilize existing facilities and services of Federal and State departments or agencies on the basis of mutual agreements with such departments or agencies. Such agreements shall provide for the filing of claims for readjustment allowances with the Administrator through established public employment offices and State unemployment compensation agencies. Such agencies, through agreement, shall also be utilized in the processing, adjustment, and determination of such claims and the payment of such allowances. To facilitate the carrying out of agreements with State departments or agencies and to assist in the discharge of the Administrator's duties under this title, a representative of the Administrator shall be located in each participating State department or agency.

(b) The Administrator shall prescribe such rules and regulations and require such records and reports as he may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this title: *Provided, however*, That prior to the adoption of any rules and regulations relating to the performances of Federal or State departments or agencies with which agreements have been made, the Administrator shall consult and advise with representatives of such departments or agencies as to the provisions of such rules and regulations.

(c) The Administrator may delegate to any officer or employee of his own or of any other department or agency of the Federal Government or of any State such of his powers and duties, except that of prescribing rules and regulations, as the Administrator may consider necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. The Administrator may require any such officer or employee to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Administrator may deem necessary and the cost of such bond shall be paid out of sums appropriated for the administration of this title.

(d) Allowances shall be paid upon certification by the Administrator. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, and prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall pay, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, to the departments, agencies, or individuals designated, the amounts so certified.

(e) The Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, in advance or otherwise, such sums as he estimates to be necessary to compensate any Federal department or agency for its administrative expenses under this title. Such sums shall cover periods of no longer than 6 months.

The Administrator shall also from time to time certify to the Social Security Board such State departments or agencies as may be participating in the administration of this title. Upon such certification the Social Security Board shall, in addition to the amounts certified under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State such amounts as the Board determines to be necessary for the administrative expense of such State under this title.

(f) Any money paid to any cooperating agency, person, or institution which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement

with such agency, person, or institution, be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current appropriation for carrying out the purpose of this title, or, if returned after the expiration of this title, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 1101. (a) No person designated by the Administrator as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any allowance certified by him under this title.

(b) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated by the Administrator.

SEC. 1102. Any claimant whose claim for an allowance has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal of the State agency or such other agency as may be designated by the Administrator. The representatives of the Administrator shall be the final authority in regard to contested claims, subject to appeal to the Administrator.

CHAPTER XII—DECISIONS AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 1200. The authority to issue subpenas and provisions for invoking aid of the courts of the United States in case of disobedience thereto, to make investigations, and to administer oaths, as contained in title III of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2033-34; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 131-133), shall be applicable in the administration of this title.

CHAPTER XIII—REQUIREMENT OF REPORTING

SEC. 1300. Any claimant shall report the occurrence of any event which makes him ineligible for or reduces his allowance. Any claimant who fails to report any such event of which he has knowledge and who accepts an allowance to which he is not entitled because of such event shall be ineligible to receive any allowance for 4 weeks of unemployment thereafter.

CHAPTER XIV—PENALTIES

SEC. 1400. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any allowance authorized under this title, or for the purpose of causing any allowance to be paid where none is authorized under this title, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any allowance under this title, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such claim, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

CHAPTER XV—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 1500. As used in this title—

(a) The term "week" means such period or periods of 7 consecutive calendar days as may be prescribed in regulations by the Administrator.

(b) The term "United States" used geographically means the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(c) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(d) The term "wages" means all remuneration for services from whatever sources, including commissions and bonuses and the cash value of all remuneration in any medium other than cash.

(e) The term "noncontributory benefit" means a cash benefit, allowance, annuity, or compensation (including payments under any workmen's compensation law) payable by reason of the past employment or services of any individual, under any law or plan of the United States, any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, creating a system of such payments to individuals (including payments made under any such law or plan by private insurance carriers), if with respect to such individual the benefit system is supported without direct and substantial contributions by wage earners.

As I pointed out a moment ago, there is a great deal of apprehension among members of the committee that such provisions might encourage unemployment among certain elements, and provoke resentment because of the discrimination against the ones who secure or make their own employment.

For my part, I am of the opinion that it would be much better to extend the base pay for a given length of time, regardless of employment, and in that way treat all the servicemen alike. That could take the place of adjusted compensation, and prevent another controversy such as the so-called bonus fight the servicemen went through after the last war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the so-called bill of rights, the Legion bill, will pass the House very quickly after we return. Canada had a similar bill. In fact, I think this bill was based largely upon the provisions of the legislation which went on the statute books in Canada.

One of the finest things in the bill, I think, is the fact that the returning veterans discharged from the Army and cut off from the Army pay roll, or disabled veterans, or widows and orphans of veterans can have one place to which they can go where they can file their claims, get their insurance, be allowed to start their education. Going to one agency will greatly facilitate their securing these benefits. Their records will be in one spot. There is not quite such leeway in the case of those who have no service-connected disabilities, but there is provision for all to receive refresher courses, or a certain amount of added education. We know that many of the boys and girls who have gone into service had not finished high school. Many of them wanted to go on to college, but could not. This bill will give these boys and girls an opportunity to secure knowledge that will be of great value to them in later life. I hope that shortly after the passage of the bill, by giving the veterans speedy service on their claims of all kinds, that it will be possible for a service man or woman or his or her dependents to secure benefits immediately instead of having to wait for a long time. The bill provides for more hospitals and for training for the disabled. Some amendments must be placed in the bill, including increased benefits to the disabled, but the objectives of the bill are fine. It must be enacted on the earliest possible day. I think it is humiliating that this or similar legislation has not been enacted before.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest and very close attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] with respect to the soldiers' vote law which is now on the statute books. I notice he said he joined with all other Members in appreciation of the fact that this bill did become a law.

I hope the gentleman did not intend to give the impression that all the Members of the House are satisfied with the soldiers' vote bill as it finally became law, because there are a very considerable number of us who certainly are not satisfied and who feel that it is inadequate, that it will not serve the purpose its proponents claim for it. I notice also the gentleman from Michigan said the State ballot was preferable to the Federal ballot if a soldier could get the State ballot. I agree with him to that extent. If we could get a State ballot to the soldiers it certainly would be preferable, but that is the great question. The proponents of the Federal ballot law, of course, took into consideration the recommendations of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy when they said it would be almost impossible to get a ballot to the various soldiers under 48 different State laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I believe the position of most of the Members of the House is that each of them could suggest some improvement in the soldier vote law which was passed. Personally I would have done everything possible to remove the disability of absence which the Government created for the soldier, as was evidenced by the bill H. R. 4283, which I introduced. The President, however, and a majority of both Houses of Congress accepted the proposition that the bill passed represented a great deal of legislative effort on the part of the Members of this body and of the other body of Congress and was possibly the

only thing on which any agreement could be reached at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein some remarks I made at the annual convention of the South Dakota State Reclamation Association and a brief excerpt from the hearings of the House Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with flood control pertaining to the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, also to the gentleman from Michigan, that all of us, of course, were in favor of the State ballot, but that was not the point at issue. As I see it, we were trying to give as many soldiers as possible the right to vote.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Surely.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to misinterpret the position of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania. I thought every Member in the House was glad that the bill was on the statute books, because it gives a better opportunity to the servicemen to vote than they would have under the old law. I based that entirely on what the President said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

RELIEF FOR STARVING PEOPLES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on House Resolution 221, looking to the relief of the starving people of Europe (Rept. No. 1333) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 495

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 221) favoring action looking to relief for starving peoples of Europe. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I take this time, Mr. Speaker, merely to clarify the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. As I understood, he merely reiterated the hope expressed by the President that those in the armed forces would be able to obtain the State ballot. I am sure that was the thought that he sought to convey, and nothing else.

Regardless of the contention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and others, I have always maintained that the soldiers' 1942 act was constitutional and that it would enable a greater number of servicemen and servicewomen to vote than under the provisions of the conglomerated bill that the President was obliged to let become law without his signature because of his desire to avoid any further friction with Congress. He hoped and relied upon the assurances and promises of the various Governors to amend the State laws that would give the service men and women the fullest opportunity to cast their votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Gladly.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that they need not worry about these State ballots; the soldiers will all get ballots from home and they can probably get them more easily than they could have got the bobtailed Federal ballots.

Now, this fight over the soldiers' vote bill is over. There is not going to be any other such bill brought to the floor of the House or to the floor of the Senate, I am quite sure. The people back at home are just as much interested in these boys having the right to vote as you and I are, and they are going to see that State ballots are sent to them. For this purpose free air-mail service both ways is provided and the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission are directed to do everything possible to get these ballots to the boys in the service and back.

Mr. SABATH. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I am always right, on this proposition.

Mr. SABATH. Sometimes.

Mr. RANKIN. All the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, with the growing shortage of farm labor, and the continued depletion of farm machinery, there is an increased interest in the provision by the Federal Government for the supply and distribution of supplementary farm labor through the War Food Administration.

In response to various inquiries as to the origin and operation of the Federal aid system and funds appropriated for the purpose, I wish to call attention briefly to the details of the program and the success with which it is being administered.

Two direct appropriations have been made by Congress for farm labor supply and distribution. The appropriation for the calendar year 1943 was made in the act approved April 29, 1943, appropriating $26,100,000 to the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution—now War Food Administrator. Of this sum not less than $9,000,000, and not more than $13,050,000 was allocable by the Administrator to the extension services of the States for intrastate labor and not more than $13,050,000 was usable by the Administrator for interstate and foreign labor.

Some funds were available prior to the act of April 29, 1943, by allocation from the President's fund in the fall of 1942, and also by use of some funds of the Farm Security Administration. The amount allocated from the President's fund was $4,500,000 and the amount of Farm Security Administration funds was $1,694,904. These sums added to the $26,100,000 above cited made the total for 1942–43 calendar years, $32,294,904.

The amount of the Budget estimate for the calendar year 1943 on which the act of April 29, 1943, was based was $65,075,000, and Congress allowed $26,100,000, a decrease of $38,975,000.

The appropriation for the calendar year 1944 was based upon a Budget estimate of new direct appropriation of $35,000,000, and a revised estimate of reappropriation of funds carried over from calendar 1943 of $6,750,000, making a total of $41,750,000, of which $12,800,000 was for allocation to State extension services for intrastate activity and approximately $29,000,000 to the War Food Administrator for interstate and foreign activity.

The act of February 14, 1944, appropriated $30,000,000 plus the unexpended balance of approximately $8,425,000, making a total of $38,425,000, or a decrease in the Budget estimate of new appropriation of $5,000,000. The new act made adjustments in the amount allocable to the States for intrastate workers. Amounts made available by the law for 1943 were not used in full. Of the minimum allotment for State extension services for 1943 of $9,000,000, only $4,700,000 was used. The 1944 act carried the balances forward and the amount therefor available to State extension services for the 1944 program is $10,382,000 of new allocation and $3,418,000 of 1943 allocations, making a total of $13,800,000 for 1944 for allocation for State extension services for intrastate labor.

The amount remaining available to the War Food Administrator under the 1944 act is approximately $24,625,000 for interstate and foreign workers.

The Budget estimates for 1944 act contemplated carrying on the domestic worker program by allocation to State extension services as contemplated and provided by Congress in the 1943 act. Congress, however, in the 1944 act directed the War Food Administrator to enter into contracts with the State extension services to perform for the United States the camp operations, feeding, health and medical services, and the keeping of contract performance records for the interstate and domestic workers and the funds for such agreements would be paid from the $24,625,000 provided the War Food Administration for such workers.

At the beginning of the program in 1942 under money from the President's fund it is my understanding that the program was handled by the Farm Security Administration and the Budget estimates presented for the 1943 bill were contemplated to be handled in the main by the Farm Security Administration. The act of April 29, 1943, providing the funds for calendar 1943, changed all this, and in the administration of that act the Farm Security Administration performed some accounting duties and administrative work only, the camps being handled by the Office of Labor for the War Food Administration. In the 1944 program it is my understanding that the Farm Security Administration will not perform even accounting services and the only agency dealing with the program under the War Food Administration so far as interstate and foreign labor are concerned is the Office of Labor, and the domestic labor side is the Federal Office of Extension, so far as domestic labor handled by State extension services are concerned.

According to reports received up to this time, although it is too early in the season to observe more than the plans being made to take advantage of the system, the work is being handled with efficiency and to the satisfaction of all cooperating farm units with every prospect that it will contribute materially to increased agricultural production.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recognized for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[Mr. CANNON of Missouri addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my remarks to the gentleman from Michigan who concluded his statement by saying that the President thought the present law would permit more men to vote than H. R. 712. Where in his message did the President make such statement?

Mr. MICHENER. On numerous occasions the President stated he would veto this bill unless he were satisfied more soldiers could vote under it than under existing law.

Mr. DILWEG. The gentleman does not intimate at this time that there is any such statement in the President's message, does he?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I believe anyone familiar with the situation at all, reading the statement together with the President's other utterances, plus his telegrams to the various Governors, can reach but one conclusion. I believe the President himself, if the gentleman would address a letter to him and ask the question, would say that he permitted this bill to become a law because he felt more people could vote under it.

Mr. DILWEG. That is the gentleman's personal interpretation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on March 13, and also to revise and extend the remarks I am going to make today, and to include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the comments on the soldiers' vote bill, when the First Lady returned from her recent trip if she was correctly quoted, and I think she was, she stated the soldiers were not greatly interested in voting. So I wonder why all this hullabaloo in the House and the other body. That was her statement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. This is one occasion when the gentleman agrees with the First Lady?

Mr. HOFFMAN. When I agree with her?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If she would stay at home more or remember that she was not elected to office I would agree with her oftener. I think the first thing in the minds of the soldiers—and when I say "soldiers" I mean the men and women and all those who are in any and every branch of the armed services—is that they want to know the extent of the job which they must do before they can say, "The war has been won; the war is over." That is my understanding from what they say to me and what they write. They want to know how far our armies and the armies of our allies must travel, how far into other countries they must go, and what armies and countries they must conquer so as to know when the job will be finished. That is the first thing those in the service want to know. When is our job to be finished, not in point of time but in point of accomplishment. The next thing they want is to come home when the war has been won. We all want them to vote if they care to vote and under the law that has been passed they will vote if they desire to do so and if the ballots are sent to them by the Army and Navy.

With reference to the proposition that the President has not approved this bill—I have not read his message. I heard it read yesterday. I am inclined to think he did informally approve this bill. No other conclusion can be reached when we remember that he said the bill we put over originally was a fraud upon the people and upon those in the armed forces. As much as I dislike the New Deal, I do not believe the President would approve a bill that was a fraud on the men in the armed services. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois who sits here facing me, Does he think that the President would approve a bill which is a fraud on the American people and on those in the armed forces?

Mr. SABATH. He has not approved it. He merely let it become law because he did not want to have any friction with Congress. That is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I stand corrected. By returning the bill to the Congress, when he could have kept it or vetoed it and so prevented it becoming law—but he did not—does the gentleman think he approved of a fraud?

Mr. SABATH. He did not want to have any more friction with Congress. He desires to cooperate with Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So he cooperated with Congress in putting over a fraud?

Mr. SABATH. This bill he is willing to let become law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The only logical conclusion, the only fair answer, is that he reread the legislation, he gave it further consideration, and he discovered after it was approved in conference that it was the better bill of the two, and manlike, he admitted a former error; so he sent it down here and, in effect, said, "All right, boys, I do not want to go so far as to acknowledge I was mistaken before by putting my John Hancock on this bill; it is all right, and the servicemen can vote under it." That is the only reasonable construction.

Mr. SABATH. The chances are he did not read my speech on that bill. I think if he had he would not have sent it down here.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The President was not willing to stand up and be counted himself on this bill as he asked us to do, as he intimated we did not have the courage to do. He would not

approve the bill by signing it, he would not disapprove it by a veto. He did not choose to stand up and be counted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He just got himself in a hole as most of us do at times. I am not inclined to criticize him too much. We all make mistakes. It may be he just let somebody write a message for him and before he considered it he just put his name on it and he said in effect that we were a Congress willing to perpetrate a fraud on the people. Then he reread the bill after it had been to conference and some minor changes had been made and now he comes back, when we are about to adjourn, and in effect says, "Everything is lovely. I think the bill will let more of the servicemen vote than would the other bill." The President has relieved himself of a situation that must have been embarrassing.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman has properly stated that the President termed this bill a fraud. I assume he did that, as does the gentleman believe, because he thought so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He has so many duties that no one should criticize him if he makes a statement like that once in a while, but he should relieve himself by letting someone else do some of the work—and he too often tries to belittle too many who do not agree with him.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The fact that the President did not veto the bill, as he had every reason in the world to do if he still believed the bill to be a fraud, indicates that whatever he may have said in extenuation of having returned the bill or permitted the bill to become law without his signature is just a little of his usual shadow boxing, is it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President is so overwhelmed with duties I am not disposed to criticize him too often. The First Lady is back. Let them have a few days together before she starts again on another trip and before he has to go on with some of his more important duties. Congress will have adjourned in the meantime and for 10 days at least will do nothing to irritate anyone.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention to the fact that the bill that passed was not the one the President referred to in his message.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It was amended in very minor particulars in conference.

Mr. RANKIN. We improved it in conference and made it square with the Constitution. The bill that is now on the statute books will permit all the men in the armed forces to vote in a constitutional election and at the same time preserve the rights of the States. If we had left that old law, No. 712, on the statute books alone, the first intelligent court that got hold of it would have declared it unconstitutional and you would have had no law at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The bill as it passed the House squared with the Constitution. There is a matter to which I wish to call the attention of the House. I want to refer to the dissatisfaction of our returning men with the way things are carried on here at home. Here are two letters from a man who has been overseas 8 months. He writes me as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 22, 1944.*

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: There is something else that needs attention at once, and they are the ships that were built in Cleveland, Ohio, and delivered to the American Ship Building Co., One Hundred and First and Calumet, Chicago. They arrived here in bad shape and they have not the facilities or mechanics to put them in first-class shape. It seems as though this shipyard is trying to get all the money they can for nothing. I have seen myself 24 painters and only 1 gallon of paint. Boilers are not in first-class shape, the engines on 2 of the ships I know had every bearing on both engines of both ships was wiped and some of the rods scored.

There is another ship the Peoria, at Lockport that has to have engines completely overhauled, what causes all this trouble? I think there should be an investigation and at once of the United States Maritime, 320 South Michigan Avenue, and the American Ship Building, One Hundred and First and Calumet River. I am in the hospital now for a check-up, but will be out soon. In case I am needed to verify things that I've said, and if investigation is coming, I can say a hell of a lot more. I was overseas 8 months. Hoping you get some action, I remain,

———.

Here is his second letter:

MARCH 30, 1944.

DEAR FRIEND: Am out of the hospital and am O. K.; it was a nervous condition, caused from arguing with shipyard bosses trying to get things done properly. Well, maybe they played their cards, but I am going to trump and take the last trick.

Yes, Clare, I had a long haul, 8 months and 3 days, New York to Panama, to Australia, up into Iran, Persian Gulf, to Mombasa in Africa, 700 miles south from Capetown to Santos, South America, Rio de Janeiro, Victoria, Bahia, Trinidad, and back to New York, about one and one-half times around the world and never lost a revolution with engine, although we came in with a hole in her. I was on a Kaiser ship, too, and she was O. K. by me. I have citations from Washington for being in five theaters of war, and we did not have any bread, eggs or what have you for 6 weeks. As to that damn shipyard racket, I am one that wants things as they should be and not turn over a ship to a bunch of young kids and less experienced men to cause them trouble that could have been avoided, and when a yard has not the facilities to build, why in hell do they let them practice on something costing $3,000,000? I wish you would see BLAND and you and him get any experienced marine engineer, ask him one question. What would be the cause of all bearings being wiped on the engines of two separate ships and each ship has two engines. He will probably say out of line or a bad installation. Warped tubes in flash-type boilers, grease on tubes, when boiler was not used only on trial run. This is not all and should I be called on I can say a-plenty. I am called into the office tomorrow morning and was told they have some good news. I wonder if there was a leak that I wrote you. But what I blew up for was a fireman stays away 2 days and I fire him and he goes to Maritime Commission, they put him on what they call standby. He gets his regular wages, hotel room paid, and $1.80 a day for eats, gets that for nearly 2 weeks and then when called, don't take the job. Oiler sleeps on job, fire him, and in a few days he is sent back by the office, and when asked to do something, tells you, the engineer, to go to hell. Men that quit go on this said standby and get paid for doing nothing. Its been a damn racket.

The one that is at the head here in Chicago is a Mr. Murphy, I don't blame him as he recently took over. But if you can see someone there from United States Maritime Commission and have them write to United States Maritime Commission, a Mr. Murphy, 320 South Michigan Avenue, and ask all details on this standby racket, also to furnish names of men whom have been discharged or quit of their own accord who have been receiving these benefits.

This is darn near a book, but I am sore. Make my money out where it's tough going, and pay here and see it wasted. Enclosed a clipping, you can see a father and a son from Allegan County doing there part, and what's going on here.

Thanks for your letter.

———

His complaint is that while those who are in the armed services are doing their utmost day after day and all day long, here at home there is altogether too much of what he calls racketeering going on.

I hope that those in the administrative branch of the Government who have charge of these activities will take effective steps to put an end to some of these conditions which exist.

Shortly we are going to be called upon to pass additional draft legislation, legislation drafting men and women, drafting and putting into the service those who have been classified as IV–F, and putting them into jobs assigned to them by some administrative officer. That means conscripted labor. If the laws are enforced, if the administration will cease playing politics with Communists and labor politicians there will be no excuse for conscription of labor. Before we conscript women and men for civilian jobs some consideration should be given—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] spoke about the same thing yesterday—to those who are holding jobs but who are not performing work. To the evil results of the cost-plus system I venture to suggest that there is not a single Member in this House from an industrial district who has not received letter after letter complaining about the fact that many men in the factories are on the pay roll and that some employers and some union officials are conspiring to hoard labor. Sometimes employees show up. Sometimes they do not check out and their time still goes on, men who are not performing 1 hour's work out of the 8 for which they receive pay.

Not long ago I put into the RECORD a statement where two Ford employees at Edgewater, N. J., performed in a third of the time the testing operations which the union in that particular plant insisted should occupy three times as many minutes. Those men were able to do this job in 15 minutes. The union insisted that it should take 45.

Here is the point about that. Notwithstanding the fact that the men wanted to do the work and could do it

properly, the union demanded their discharge from the company, and when the company refused to discharge them because they were doing the work in one-third of the time prescribed by the union, the union threatened to and then did call a strike. That is the kind of a situation which must be corrected.

In my judgment we do not need this law drafting either men or women for civilian jobs if we end the practice the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] spoke about the other day, cost-plus, of permitting a manufacturer to carry on the pay roll as many employees as he wishes, whether they work or whether they do not work, and to charge their wages to the Government, to the taxpayers. If they will cut that practice they will have plenty of manpower to carry on here at home.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not also a fact that that is carried on in many instances under the very eyes of the inspectors of the Government?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is true. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] that that is a matter of common knowledge in some of the larger plants. All who are familiar with war production know that practice is all too common. Last night's paper carried the statement that Tom De Lorenzo, who appeared before a subcommittee on Naval Affairs and testified under oath, said that the employees in the Brewster plant were only one-third efficient. He was at the head of the union there. The Navy was in charge of the Brewster plant, but under the set-up and under the contract the Navy just sat back. It had to under the contract that was forced upon it by the union and the administration. It needed the planes. It had to have them, and so it let those fellows loaf one-third of the time. De Lorenzo has been indicted. He may or he may not be guilty. But it is an indication that the Navy is trying to do a job. I have confidence that if they are permitted to do so they will see that the job is done, and that same thing holds true for the Army activities. And so will industry and loyal workers do the job if the administration and union politicians get off their necks. Politics and industrial production never did do a job when tied together. The trading of special privileges and consideration by the administration for votes and political support will not increase production. Let that practice end before Congress returns.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise, extend, and delete from the remarks I made on March 13, and also to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include certain letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein some excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a situation that is developing that I am very much afraid will bring again to the American people the coal riots that were experienced back in 1918. I have in my hand a communication from the Solid Fuels Division this morning which would indicate that they are very apprehensive of the potentialities and probabilities for this coming winter. The production of coal in the United States will admittedly be down some twenty or thirty million tons, and if the more recent drastic selective service rules are put into effect it will probably increase the shortage beyond that. Despite that decreased production, the demands of our neighbor to the north will remain substantially the same. If we are going to get the materials we need from Canada we must send an amount of coal there equal to that which has been going in past years. This constitutes about 5 percent of our production. In southern Europe we can expect an increasing demand for coal for the people we have sent there to fight the war.

In addition, it appears very much there will be no relief either from fuel oil or natural gas. There will be a large transfer of the requirements for heat from natural gas to coal. This all points to a shortage this coming winter, a shortage that, I am afraid, we will be unable to cope with unless certain things are done, and done rather quickly.

I suggested to the House at another time that we organize a committee of Congress or ask some regular standing committee to contact the Solid Fuels Division, the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration and attempt to correlate these agencies so that we can get production, and, where production cannot be obtained, make all those things possible for use that are necessary to conserve the fuel we have in this country. It is paradoxical that the Solid Fuels Division makes a request and gives much publicity insisting that people do what they can to conserve fuel by the insulation of their homes, yet when the people who provide that implementation to the home for the conservation of solid fuel go to the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, and other regulatory bodies they run into the impasse of being unable to obtain the materials to make these things available to conserve fuel.

The statement has been made that a very small percentage of the homes in the country are insulated for the conservation of fuel. It is further stated that if 10 percent of the homes were insulated properly to conserve heat it would save for the country approximately 75,000,000 tons of coal annually.

Our production will be down to 525,000,000 or 600,000,000 tons of coal for the coming winter as compared to what we have been producing—up to 712,000,000 tons.

You can appreciate that with the demand made by Canada, since we are depending on them for many things as yet; coal must be taken into Canada and the Michigan Peninsula during the summer season—during what is called the lake navigation season—because after the lakes and rivers freeze up we cannot take the coal up there.

I am reliably informed that there are approximately 2 or 3 weeks' supply of coal on top of the ground at the present time. When inroads are made into that, and the increase in the production of steel and other things to prosecute the war results in an additional consumption of coal this summer, we are going to approach this winter with so little coal above the ground that we will not be able to provide more than 2 or 3 weeks' supply to the people.

When it comes to food we can make substitutes, but when it comes to coal, there is nothing known that we can substitute for fuel. As I said in the beginning of my talk, unless something is done, we will experience what we did in 1918, when there were coal riots, when no one could safely drive a truck load of coal on the streets of our cities, when the railroads could not safely carry through any city carloads of coal without these riots occurring. When people were prevented from taking this coal they would gang up, and consequently we had the coal riots. That is what we are going to have again unless something is done. I do not know what to suggest to the committee that has the proper authority so that it can approach this question to correlate the Solid Fuels Division, the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration, so that they will get after this problem before we have a very serious situation on our hands.

Rationing of coal is now predicted, and the purported plan is ration it to the distributors. I predict if this plan is carried out, it will encourage black-market practice and will leave many families without any fuel. This is the Government's problem, and the Government will have to answer for whatever may occur in the coming winter. The shortage is admitted, and the American people will share hardships if its Government does all it can to see fair distribution is made of those hardships. We cannot avoid some suffering if everything is done that can be done, but we will not avoid very serious situations in possible riots if we do nothing.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio on his remarks, and also compliment

him and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] on their assistance in securing an Ohio man in the Solid Fuels Division of the Department of the Interior, Judge William A. Cuff. May I say to the majority party here that Judge Cuff is a member of the Democratic Party, and that the gentlemen from Ohio I have mentioned helped to get him into that Department because of his efficiency. With his good work, I believe Ohio will not be the forgotten State in the future in regard to fuel that it has always been in regard to flood and disaster.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I wish to read at this time part of a letter received from the Solid Fuels Division, addressed to me:

I should like to point out that in the fixing of maximum prices by the Office of Price Administration the Solid Fuels Administration for War has authority only to make recommendations. It cannot fix prices. As a matter of fact, recommendations for price increases to producers made to the Office of Price Administration by the Secretary of the Interior, who is the Solid Fuels Administrator for War, have been repeatedly turned down. These recommended price increases were, first, those considered necessary to meet legitimate cost of production increases and, second, those considered necessary to keep mines from going out of business.

The Solid Fuels Administration is asking the War Production Board to make available materials for insulation of homes and for heat controllers, and is further requesting the American public to save as much coal as possible. We think this should be done because, as you point out, and correctly so, there is a substantial savings in fuel provided a proper and effective conservation program can be initiated.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Ohio upon a very timely and enlightening speech. It is too bad there are not more Members of the House present to have the benefit of this speech. I hope the proper authorities will give their attention to the gentleman's remarks that they should, and will act accordingly.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I appreciate that the gentleman has been a student of the coal industry and the coal activity practically all his life, because he was brought up in that kind of community. Is it not a fact that this year, in spite of strikes and compromises and various other impediments that have been injected into the coal situation, more coal has been produced than in any year in the history of the country?

Mr. ROWE. Per capita that is true, but in the total amount it is not. We have produced less coal, but the worker of today is producing an annual average of a ton and a half more per capita than he did during the last war.

There is one other thing I probably neglected to mention in this talk, that there are a number of miners on strike in South Wales at the present time, and for about the same reason our miners struck here. We are rushing machinery to South Wales to mechanize the mines to get greater production, because their production is far below the American miner per capita. If that machinery goes in it is going in to get a greater production, solely because of the urgency of the fuel situation in Britain this coming winter. Should they fall short in production, there is but one place they can make their demand, and that is on the already admittedly short supply we shall have for domestic use. This impending fuel shortage will mean one of two things, that we will have to divert coal from the essential industries that are producing war materials and give it to the residential consumers to maintain heat within their homes, or the residential consumers will have to go coalless.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COLLECTION OF SEED AND FEED LOANS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of Congress, and probably for a year or two before, one of the problems confronting the country has been what to do about the uncollected seed and feed loans which were made to the distressed farmers of the Middle West throughout the serious drought years of the thirties. That problem is still unsolved. As a result there are many people on the Federal pay roll, out in the Middle West and Southwest especially, whose job it is to contact the farmers whose debts on these drought loans have not been paid. Without much success these Federal field agents continue to pound away at these collections and interest continues to pyramid on the past due obligations.

There are several bills now before Congress which would bring this whole problem out in the open and provide for a means of adjustment and final settlement of these long-standing loans. I hope Congress during the present session, and I hope shortly after the recess, will act on one or another of these bills and set up a device for solving this long-standing and perplexing problem.

From the figures as they apply to my State of South Dakota, I find that in 1934 and 1935 drought relief loans were granted to farmers who were in distress due to no fault of their own but because of a combination of drought, grasshoppers, and depressions, and who needed assistance in order to keep them on the farm and keep them in production and help them stay there another calendar year. These loans numbered 43,989 in South Dakota, in the total amount of $16,263,348. A vast percentage of these loans have never been paid and have not been collected. Many of them are simply and entirely uncollectible. Many of the farmers have left the State, and many have died in such conditions of poverty that it was impossible to pay their debts out of their estates, but there still remain on the books out there $10,055,933 of unpaid loans, which, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture, might conceivably some day be collectible. They represent 29,442 individual accounts.

Obviously, somebody in Government has to supervise those accounts, has to contact these 29,442 farmers, has to attempt to make these collections, at an expense which is exceedingly high and out of proportion to the returns received.

There are at least two bills now before the Congress on this subject. One of them was introduced by my colleague in the other body, Senator BUSHFIELD—S. 1688—which provides a means for solving this problem and bringing about a final adjustment and a cleaning up of the books and the dissolution of the field forces now necessary to patrol the accounts. Another bill was introduced in the House, House Joint Resolution 97, by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] which strives to reach the same objective. There are other bills, I think, both in the Senate and the House, dealing with aspects of the same problem. I submit that it just does not make sense that we should continue to let this problem accumulate cost to the Government and distress to the people of the Middle West, and not take some tangible steps to solve it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I can recall that 4 years ago the gentleman from South Dakota who is now addressing the House was very instrumental in urging upon the Congress that something should be done in this matter. I can also recall that the House Committee on Agriculture, a member of which, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], is here present, aided those of us interested in this particular problem in securing the passage through the House of a bill which would have done much good toward solving this problem. Further, I recall that when that bill passed the House and went to the Senate, it was due to administration objection that nothing was done about it.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct. The administration forces defeated our efforts.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from South Dakota for his continued efforts in doing away with this great wrong which hangs like a millstone around the necks of farmers who went

through the disastrous droughts of 1933-34 and 1935.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman. I will be the first to admit that it is a pretty badly frayed string on which I am continually harping. I think we must continue to work along these lines until a final adjustment is made, however.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield now to the distinguished agricultural leader from Minnesota and my good friend.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his gracious introduction.

When we reported out the bill to which my colleague from Minnesota has referred, it was agreed unanimously by our committee that all of these loans that were unpaid and older than 6 years would really be wiped off the Government's books. It occurs to me that if we should reenact such a law and have it approved over Presidential opposition, we would solve most of the accounts to which the gentleman from South Dakota has referred. Ordinarily the statute of limitations runs on accounts that are more than 6 years old.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; if the debts are older than 6 years, frequently they are automatically thrown out by the statute of limitations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes. That was one idea we had in mind in the settling of these debts, to apply that principle where the accounts could not be collected.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I want to say that in South Dakota we appreciate very greatly the help that the two gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] have been because we have a large number of these accounts in our State. While you have some in Minnesota, I presume we have more in South Dakota.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very well acquainted with the hearings on the two bills to which the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] refers. We have had this matter up for about 8 or 9 years in the Committee on Appropriations. We have gone into these matters very carefully and I personally have found that in some of the activities of these collectors the expense of endeavoring to collect these old drought, feed, and seed loans far exceeded the amount of the loans themselves.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right—or perhaps I should say that is not "right" but it is true.

Mr. STEFAN. I think something should be done about this and done very soon, because there are many farmers who are quitting their farm business because of this situation. They just cannot continue.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. And unquestionably, as you have said, the immutable law of diminishing returns has set in in this case and we are getting back less in collections in many cases than is actually paid out to collectors for fees, salaries, and expenses.

Mr. STEFAN. That is a tax upon the taxpayers. The taxpayer is paying double indemnity.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. We are bringing distress to one group of people and imposing a great cost upon another group of people and doing benefit to no one. I want to call the attention of the House to another fact. We had a somewhat analagous condition growing out of a situation which has been terminated, in fact, the termination of which was on February 17 of this year. I refer to the fact that the Department of Agriculture, under the Commodity Credit Corporation, based upon some executive authority, whether rightfully or improperly received, granted to the so-called drought victims of Virginia and Maryland drought relief payments of $13.50 per ton of hay, as an outright gift, with no attempt or endeavor at all being made to collect back to the Federal Treasury that $13.50 per ton. And I have the figures from the Office of the Commodity Credit Corporation showing that about $2,400,000 have been thus expended in drought relief to an area of the United States which many people will be surprised to learn has been added to the dust bowl, and has become a drought area, namely Virginia and Maryland.

In all events it would seem to me if it is logical and right for the Government to give drought relief without expectation of collecting it, to the farmers of Virginia and Maryland, it is not improper to believe that some adjustment should be made on these long-term debts incurred by the original victims of the drought in the Middle West where drought was officially recognized to be a major disaster in many States.

Mr. Speaker, these old drought loans in the Middle West and in the Southwest have become very disturbing inasmuch as the Government persists in its efforts to collect them rather than charging them off as direct drought relief to ameliorate a major disaster as was done this year and last with the States of Virginia and Maryland. When a farmer-borrower of these drought-relief loans for seed or feed in 1934 and 1935 dies, in accordance with the original Bankruptcy Act which provides that an insolvent estate must pay the United States first, these claims of the Government take precedence over all other debts. While the Government has made provisions for compromising some of the debts between individuals which would otherwise have become uncollectible due to drought and depression, no plans to compromise the obligations of these drought stricken to the Government have been perfected. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that some such legislation was permitted by the administration to receive the congressional consideration and approval which it deserves.

It should also be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the genuine drought-relief loans made to the impoverished farmers of the West during 1934 and 1935 were made on the basis of need—they were not simply made available to rich and poor alike without consideration of a farmer's financial status. As I understand it, on the other hand, the outright grants-in-aid extended as direct Government relief to farmers in Maryland and Virginia were projected with equal generosity to rich and poor alike, to large operators as well as operators of family-sized farms. It is certainly a perversion of justice which in one section of the country sends out Federal field agents to attach the widow's mite in an effort to collect payment for drought-relief loans while in another section of the country it makes Government largess available with no thought of collection and without regard to whether the recipients are rich or poor, needy or greedy, large or small, solvent or insolvent.

Since it has become Government policy to distribute these generous grants to a comparatively small number of farmers who were short on feed to the extent of costing the Federal Government $2,400,000 it would not appear inconsistent, now, for the same executive agencies to withdraw their persistent objections to the scaling down and adjustment for final settlement of the loans extended to much needier farmers during a drought of much more serious proportions.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the time has come when Congress should enact and the President should approve legislation providing for the downward adjustment and final settlement, without interest charges, of the feed and seed loans extended the battling farmers of the drought section during their courageous contest with nature during the dark, dry days of the dust-ridden years of 1933, 1934, 1935, and even later in some areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for some time certain problems pertaining to the United States foreign policy have been weighing very heavily on my mind. Although my words are not going to be soothing to some people, as my parents used to say, "It isn't always what you like that is best for you." Anyway, the people of my district seem to like knowing how I feel about certain situations and especially what I am thinking in regard to the progress of the war, whether they agree with my way of thinking or not.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I would rather be "cussed a little" by my constituents "than neglected," and I am afraid the things I have to say here may be a little too plain and too frank to be consoling to every listener, but I simply must get them off my chest.

First of all, our foreign policy has not been made clear to me. I do not know exactly in what fire our chestnuts are. I do not know who put them in, or who is going to pull them out, or what in the devil they are going to be good for when we get them out. Unless we get at the root of these problems and determine the answers, how are we going to be sure that once we get our chestnuts out of the fire they will not be thrown right back

in again? Besides, those who threw them into the fire should be the first to burn their fingers pulling them out.

Right here I want to make it clear that I am not and have never been an isolationist, nor am I, nor have I ever been, an interventionist, but I will go as far as anyone in helping any person or any people to help themselves. However, I will never be a party to drugging America's friends with the mistaken idea that I favor imposing handicaps upon my own people for the sake of poisoning the rest of the world with an impractical and impossible outlook or national philosophy of living.

We, as a nation of free people, can help the world most by keeping our Republic strong and impregnable, as a shining example of the workability of the doctrines we preach.

I have not forgotten the words of Col. Charles Lindbergh, who said, in effect, we cannot win in Europe. At the time he made that statement, Germany and Russia were at peace, with no indication that Germany would ever go to war with Russia. Now, with Russia on our side for 2 whole years and after having destroyed some five to eight million crack German troops and much of her precious war equipment, we are not yet ready to risk a second front across the channel. In all fairness, may I ask you, If Germany had not gone to war with Russia, do you think we could now, or ever have opened a second front across the channel? Certainly not.

Whether we like it or not, without Russia's help, I doubt if there would have been an England today. After 2 years we have not opened that second front, and until we have a definite understanding as to the afore-mentioned problems, I pray to God that we never try it.

A well-known and popular New Deal interventionist, Quentin Reynolds, radio commentator, has just said over a wide network that "we will lose more than 50 percent of the invading force once we open that second front." That is price enough to pay for a very definite and well-understood objective, but it is far too great a price to pay for a blind date or a sight-unseen objective.

While the objectives of this war, due to the complete lack of any foreign policy, are so hazy or, may I say, absolutely nonexistent in the minds of Members of Congress, how do you think my parents and millions of others whose sons are in the service feel about their boys being thrown into that holocaust?

It is entirely possible that we may be permitted to march to Berlin without opposition, in fact, by invitation, if the Russians keep forging ahead. This free right-of-way would be granted by Germany in order that we could reach Berlin ahead of the Russians in the hope of averting Russian revenge for Nazi atrocities. There is no doubt in my mind but that Russia would march on to Berlin in due time and in my opinion she alone knows the peace terms and therefore what our foreign policy is to be, for I doubt very much if Premier Stalin has as yet informed President F. D. R. and Prime Minister Churchill as to the details.

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more obvious every day that we have no foreign policy abroad, just as we have had no domestic policy at home during the past 11 years. The nearest we can come to claiming a foreign policy is a promise of an international W. P. A., if you please, which has worked so shamefully in this country where we have shifted from one emergency racket to another, as fast as one situation became too hot to handle. Our program has been one of scarcity, of suffering, and of economic disaster. I can assure you that there is no such weak-kneed lack of purpose among our allies.

England, today, is demanding a strong post-war Germany, as a buffer state between her and Russia. Such a desire is indicative of absolute mistrust and suspicion. Russia, in recognizing Badoglio and King Victor Emmanuel, has committed what amounts to the scrapping of the Atlantic Charter. However, England was the first to scrap that document when she reserved the right to interpret to which of her possessions it would apply. Russia, again, has said that she will determine the eastern boundaries of Europe, and today, Mr. Speaker, while our sons and brothers, fathers and daughters are fighting and dying that England will live, workers in the English shipyards and coal mines are out on strike.

So far it looks as though we are, in addition to offering up the lives of our young men, also offering up our economic and natural resources for the sake of interfering in the age-old quarrels of Europe.

Our real problem is how to get our chestnuts out of the fire in the Pacific. We know whose chestnuts they are. They are ours. We know who threw them in. Japan. We know who must pull them out. We, ourselves, must do that job, and we know who will dictate the terms of peace and be responsible for seeing that they are not again thrown into the fire.

Yes; today, it is becoming clearer and clearer that our war is in the Pacific, and unless the objectives of the European war can be clarified in the minds of our people, we can expect little more progress than is now being made at Cassino, and, therefore, unless or until a better understanding is brought about, we had better pull out of Europe and fight our battle in the Pacific.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I wonder if the gentleman would reduce the general to the particular and inform us what he meant when he said, "We have rushed from one emergency racket to another." What are those emergency rackets? Will the gentleman particularize?

Mr. WILSON. I am afraid that that would take a great deal of time to even do a fair job or an acceptable job. I think it would take a few hours.

Mr. RAMEY. I wonder if we could have it in your revision of remarks, because when you mention that we have rushed from one emergency racket to another, if we have been in rackets I think the House should know what the rackets are.

Mr. WILSON. I think if the gentleman will stop and check up on the events of the last 11 years, sit down and take counsel with himself over the events leading up to the war and the situation we found ourselves in when war broke out, he will be able to clarify this point in his own mind.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. In prefacing your statement by saying that "after W. P. A. each emergency moved thereafter," you intended to state that, in your opinion, that constituted a substitute for constructive procedure?

Mr. WILSON. That is exactly what I meant. When one of these emergency measures became too hot to handle, they took the heat off by developing a new emergency measure and diverted the attention of the people to that new measure. Does that clarify the matter for the gentleman?

Mr. RAMEY. The word "racket" is an unusual term.

Mr. WILSON. It is rather mild in this case, does not the gentleman think?

Mr. RAMEY. The word "racket" is something like an underworld affair.

Mr. WILSON. The lives of eight or ten or twelve million boys are involved in pulling these chestnuts out of the fire and in the beginning we had too few and too inadequate tools with which to do the job. Our natural resources, to some extent, had been given away to our enemies for their use.

Mr. RAMEY. Like scrap iron to Japan?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; and petroleum.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. RAMEY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and others who are grateful that all the men in the armed services will have an opportunity to vote a complete ballot.

There is one man in the South Pacific who will indeed be happy over the enactment of this legislation. I refer to Alvin Recknagel. He is a hero in the South Pacific. His wife is a heroine in the city of Toledo. She teaches school. She is an aviatrix and a lawyer, and has been keeping the home fires burning and paying off the mortgage.

Mr. Speaker, she is a Democratic candidate from Lucas County for the Ohio State Legislature. That hero in the South Pacific can now vote for his wife. He is a Republican, but he will scratch the ticket and have a complete ballot and vote for his good wife who is keeping the home fires burning.

Had the Federal bobtail ballot passed, he and thousands of other brave heroes would have been betrayed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1216. An act for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Paul B. Lingle;

H. R. 2234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen;

H. R. 2273. An act for the relief of E. C. Fudge;

H. R. 2337. An act for the relief of John Joseph Defeo;

H. R. 2616. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes;

H. R. 2778. An act to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Mrs. Isabelle Tucker;

H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker;

H. R. 3259. An act to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration;

H. R. 3362. An act to fix the annual compensation of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 3408. An act to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 3602. An act to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of C. C. Evensen;

H. R. 3847. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes;

H. R. 3912. An act to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4346. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4377. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy;

H. R. 4381. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 75, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution No. 75, the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 12, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1363. A letter from the secretary, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting its estimate for the quarter ending June 30, 1944, of its minimum personnel requirements to perform its duties; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1364. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting its estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1365. A letter from the Director, Office for Emergency Management, transmitting copies of the Quarterly Estimates of Personnel Requirements for the Division of Central Administrative Services for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1366. A letter from the secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements presented to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1367. A letter from the Associate Director, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, transmitting a copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1944, covering the appropriation "Maintenance, Executive Mansion and grounds"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1368. A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting the estimate of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1369. A letter from Maj. Charles B. Shaw, the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the American Battle Monuments Commission for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1370. A letter from the Administrative Officer, the White House, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the White House office; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1371. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a draft of proposed provisions pertaining to an appropriation for the fiscal year 1945, in the form of amendments to the Budget for the Department of Labor for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 524); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1372. A letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the estimates of personnel requirements for the various ceiling units of the Department of Commerce for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1117. A bill to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 495. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Resolution 221 favoring action looking to relief for starving peoples of Europe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1333). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 4551. A bill relating to commissioned officers of the Army separated from service through reclassification proceedings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 4552. A bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 4553. A bill for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., and Memphis Park Commission; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4554. A bill authorizing the appointment of X-ray technicians as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4555. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for recreational demonstration projects for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4556. A bill to prohibit aliens from acting as officers or agents of corporations or business associations engaged in interstate commerce, or of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution requesting certain information from the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. Res. 496. A resolution requesting the President of the United States to remove Rexford Guy Tugwell from the position of Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to enable persons returning from the armed forces to rehabilitate themselves under a farm home ownership plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:
H. R. 4557. A bill for the relief of John Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:
H. R. 4558. A bill for the relief of Mark D. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5404. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the United Auto Workers Local, Oakland, Calif., approving Alameda County Congress of Industrial Organizations council's resolution urging that broadcast of the proceedings of Congress be arranged for; to the Committee on Rules.

5405. Also, resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Contra Costa County, Calif., recommending that necessary legislation be provided for a post-war airport program at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5406. Also, petition of Mrs. W. Nicolson, of Alameda County, Calif., signed by herself and 117 other citizens, urging the enactment of legislation excluding all members of the Japanese race from further residence in the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5407. Also, petition of the Alameda County Congress of Industrial Organizations council Union, Oakland, Calif., urging a readjustment of the national wage policy; to the Committee on Labor.

5408. Also, petition of the Alameda County Congress of Industrial Organizations council, Ruby Heide, secretary, urging enactment of the Scanlon Resolution No. 198 establishing a wage board for Government service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5409. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Mechanicsburg Wesleyan Methodist Church and their friends in the community, representing approximately 100 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5410. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Evert Burlingame and 129 other residents of Cortland County, N. Y., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5411. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of J. E. McComb, Mrs. M. G. Knight, and Mrs. Worrell Wilson, of Seattle, Wash., and Mary Cramer, of San Rafael, Calif., favoring House Joint Resolution 244; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5412. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Hupp E. Otto, president, Wheeling Typographical Union, No. 79, Wheeling, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 4000 as an aid to the manufacture of newsprint; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5413. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of Gottfred J. Anderson and 27 other citizens of Oakland, Nebr., urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5414. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 3891, adopted by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on March 20, 1944, memoralizing the Congress of the United States and urging that a further appropriation be immediately made available to provide for the continuance of the child-care center project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5415. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Society Daughters of the Union, 1861–65, Inc., Lebanon, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immigration of returning veterans of the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1944

The Reverend Oscar Thomas Olson, D. D., minister, Epworth-Euclid Methodist Church, Cleveland, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, Thou art the source of all true peace and joy; grant unto us insight and understanding, so that no selfish purpose shall thwart Thy will. In Thy will is our peace. In Thy service is perfect freedom. Develop within us an inner genuineness that we may persistently seek those realities that are permanent, seeing the truth steadily and following the light faithfully. We are thankful to Thee, God, our Father, for the many blessings that Thou hast given our country. Defend our liberties; preserve our unity. Endue with Thy grace the President of the United States. Grant true wisdom to those selected to govern the Nation, and to all who share in authority and responsibility. God of infinite love, we commend to Thy keeping all those who are venturing their lives in the service of those freedoms that lend worth and dignity to our human adventure. Look with loving kindness, O Lord, upon our distracted and distressed world. Forgive the mistaken ambitions and the presumptuous claims of men. Lead us in Thy paths of righteousness that Thy will may be done and Thy kingdom come. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND NOTATION OF POCKET VETO

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 1, 1944:

S. 662. An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes.

On April 5, 1944:

S. 1243. An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced the pocket veto on April 11, 1944, of the bill (S. 555) for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces on February 29, 1944, under a provision of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 149 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

SUITS IN ADMIRALTY AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a list of suits arising under the act of March 9, 1920 (41 Stat. 525), authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty involving merchant vessels, in which final decrees were entered against the United States, exclusive of cases on appeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUITS UNDER THE PUBLIC VESSEL ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting a list of suits arising under the Public Vessel Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1112), in which final decrees were entered, exclusive of cases on appeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAUDE R. WHITLOCK

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PAYMENT OF ATTORNEYS' FEES FROM OSAGE FUNDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS, VIRGIN ISLANDS

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands and the Municipal Councils of St. Croix and St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

SALE OF PERISHABLE FARM COMMODITIES

A letter from the War Food Administrator, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the sale of perishable farm commodities below the parity or comparable price, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

UNITED STATES WAR BALLOT COMMISSION

A letter from the executive officer of the United States War Ballot Commission, informing the Senate of the organization of the United States War Ballot Commission in Washington, D. C., under the provisions of law (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (confidential), the Secretary of Labor, the Comptroller General of the United States, Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, Acting Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, the Director, Division of Administrative Management, National War Labor Board, the Administrator of the

National Housing Agency, the Chairman and Administrator of the War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Archivist of the United States, the Director of the Selective Service System, the Third Vice President, Panama Railroad Co., the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, the Director, Committee for Congested Production Areas, the Administrative Office of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, the Director, Office of War Mobilization, the Director, the Office of Censorship, and the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce (revised estimate), transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices, etc., for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury and Agriculture (4), Federal Security Agency, Federal Works Agency (2), and War Production Board which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
"Albany, March 16, 1944.

"Whereas the Bill of Rights, which guarantees our fundamental freedoms of speech, press, worship, and peaceful assembly, is an immortal monument of human liberties serving as a guiding light to the people of all nations of the world; and

"Whereas the present world crisis demands that this Nation again declare its faith in those assurances, and its determination to cherish and defend them before its own people and all men in these United States; and

"Whereas on the occasion of each anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights, American citizens should refresh their memory and reabsorb the deep meaning of the Bill of Rights, so that, knowing well its full significance, they can act concertedly and with determination to better uphold the principles upon which it is based and defend it from being ravaged or distorted; and

"Whereas it is desirable and fitting that Bill of Rights Day be designated as a day to be observed by appropriate patriotic ceremonies in schools, colleges, and other educational institutions and by patriotic organizations throughout our land to the end that the people of our country may more highly prize their precious and privileged enjoyment of their inalienable rights: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby are, respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action for the observance of Bill of Rights Day throughout the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress and each United States Senator elected from the State of New York.

"By order of the assembly,
"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"Clerk.

"In senate, March 16, 1944, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the senate,
"WILLIAM S. KING,
"Clerk."

A concurrent resolution of the General Court of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Federal Hospitalization Board of the United States Veterans' Administration

"Whereas there are a large number of war veterans residents of this State who are in need of hospital care and treatment; and

"Whereas there is a lack of sufficient facilities in the Veterans' Administration hospitals in the New England area to care for these men, many of whom need immediate hospitalization; and

"Whereas it is the established policy of the Federal Government to furnish hospital care and treatment to needy war veterans; and

"Whereas there are only three States in the Union, of which New Hampshire is one, that do not have within their borders a veterans hospital: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives in general court convened and the senate concurring, That every effort be made by the Federal Government to assign a veterans hospital to the State of New Hampshire; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted at once to the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, to the Director General of the Veterans' Administration, to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, to Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, and Congressmen FOSTER STEARNS and CHESTER E. MERROW."

A concurrent resolution of the General Court of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Commissioner of National Cemeteries, Washington

"Whereas the National Government has recently purchased additional acreage at Arlington National Cemetery at Washington and suggested the establishment of national cemeteries in the various States; and

"Whereas the creation of a national cemetery in New Hampshire would be of great comfort to the families of our brave sons and daughters who have laid down their lives for their country; and

"Whereas immediate action should be taken on this highly important matter: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives in general court convened and the senate concurring, That every effort be made by the Federal Government to assign a national cemetery to the State of New Hampshire; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted at once to the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, to the Commissioner of National Cemeteries, to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, to Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, and Congressmen CHESTER E. MERROW and FOSTER STEARNS."

Resolutions, petitions, etc., by the board of directors of the Washington Federation of Churches; the Washington Council of Church Women; the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Washington, D. C., and vicinity; the Association of Oldest Inhabitants (colored), Inc.; United Federal Workers of America, Local No. 10; the Department of Civil Liberties, I. B. P. O. E.; the Stanton Park Community League; and the Southeast Neighborhood Council of the Council of Social Agencies, all in the District of Columbia, relating to the chairmanship of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution by the War and Post-War Conference, Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, at St. Louis, Mo., relating to the development of apprenticeship training through the Apprentice Training Service of the War Manpower Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the War and Post-War Conference, Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, at St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation to simplify income-tax forms; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the War and Post-War Conference, Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of national war service legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution by the municipal assembly of Arecibo, P. R., extending a vote of confidence, thanks, sympathy, and support to the Governor of Puerto Rico, Hon. Rexford Guy Tugwell; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to make provision enabling persons serving in the armed forces of the United States or who have served therein and who have been honorably discharged, to establish and rehabilitate themselves in the post-war era, under a farm home ownership plan and to provide adequate Federal funds to be loaned to such persons, as provided in the Bankhead-Jones Act and as administered by the Farm Security Administration

"Whereas it is highly important to make provision enabling persons serving in the armed forces of the United States, or who have served therein and who have been honorably discharged, to establish ownership of farm homes for themselves and their families after the termination of the present war, and that it is necessary that adequate provisions be made by the Federal Government by appropriating sufficient funds to be loaned to such persons desiring to take advantage of same, such provisions to be made under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Act as administered by the Farm Security Administration; and

"Whereas experience has demonstrated that loans made in the past under said act have been highly satisfactory to the borrowers and to the loaning agency of the Federal Government and has afforded the greatest measure of security for continued home ownership as compared with any program of similar nature yet devised: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the 1944 extraordinary session of the legislative assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully urged to make an appropriation of Federal funds sufficient to provide loans to be made to persons serving in the armed forces of the United States, or who have served therein and been honorably discharged, and who desire to rehabilitate themselves and establish farm home ownership under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act as administered by the Farm Security Administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United

States, to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the United States Senator COOLEY, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota."

Three concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution regarding additional quota allotment specifically designated for returning soldiers, sailors, and marines

"Whereas considerable difficulty is being encountered by persons discharged from the armed forces who wish to engage in agriculture and other callings, because of the shortage of farm implements and other critical materials; and

"Whereas it is the sense of this legislative assembly that first priority should be granted to such men and women who are returning to civilian life to reestablish themselves: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives in the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring), That the situation of these returning service men and women be by means of this resolution, drawn specifically to the attention of the Congress of the United States for appropriate legislation, if such action is necessary, or by specific regulation if the end sought can be accomplished in that way to provide a special quota in addition to quotas already established so as to permit such individuals to be given priority in obtaining their needed supplies and equipment."

"House Resolution 3

"Whereas there prevails in North Dakota a critical shortage of farm machinery; and

"Whereas if maximum production of agricultural produce is to be achieved by this great agricultural area; and

"Whereas it is absolutely necessary that a great number of tractors, combines, harvesting equipment and other farm machinery be alloted to this area to complete the planting, harvesting, and threshing of the 1944 crop; and

"Whereas power equipment is more vitally needed than ever before by reason of the critical manpower shortage; and

"Whereas a quota system of alloting machinery is based on past sales, and in western North Dakota this has resulted in a greatly aggravated condition by reason of the small purchases during the drought years: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the President and the Congress of the United States exert every influence to provide for this vitally necessary equipment in this most critical period in this Nation's history, and that close examination be made into the shipment of such farm equipment as is required in North Dakota which is now being made to foreign countries and, in many instances, have demonstrated that they do not require full use of them or desire them."

"House Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President to take immediate steps for securing necessary tires for the use of farmers

"Whereas due to the present war emergency there is a great shortage of automobile tires in this country; and

"Whereas it has been particularly called to the attention of this twenty-eighth legislative assembly in extraordinary session assembled that the farmers of North Dakota are in dire need of automobile, tractor, and truck tires of a quality adequate for the conduct of farm operations involving travel over long distances on rough roads and hauling heavy loads of produce; and

"Whereas the tires now on the market in North Dakota seem largely to be grade III, as classified by the Office of Price Administration, which are not adequate for use for the aforementioned purposes, causing breakdowns resulting in loss of time from the production of food, endangering life through failing on the road during our severe winter temperatures; and

"Whereas because of the great distances to be traveled in the State of North Dakota where there is no other mode of travel than by auto and truck, it is absolutely necessary and essential that Congress and the President of the United States take immediate steps to provide the necessary tires of grade I quality for the farmers of the State of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States and the President take steps forthwith to see that the farmers of the State of North Dakota are provided with tires of adequate quality to permit full production of food for victory; be it further

"Resolved, That it is not the intent of this resolution to criticize the work of the War Production and Rationing Boards, whose members are, in our opinion, fairly and conscientiously discharging their duties; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to all of the United States Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota at Washington, D. C."

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Utah; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress respecting the policy of the State of Utah relating to the completion and post-war operation of the Geneva steel plant

"Whereas the Federal Government, by and through the Defense Plant Corporation, has commenced the construction of the Geneva steel plant within the State of Utah for the purpose of fabricating steel and steel products as a part of the national war program effort; and

"Whereas the completion of said plant, including the plate mill and the structural mill, is deemed to be necessary to supply the western needs for steel during the war period; and

"Whereas it is essential to the continued well-being of the State of Utah and the people residing therein that the operation of the Geneva plant, together with all of its facilities, be continued in the post-war era wherever such operation can be carried on successfully on a competitive basis; and

"Whereas it is necessary to make an early determination of the post-war policy relating to the sale or lease to private industry of the aforesaid plant in order that the post-war management may be carried on to meet the competitive market, including, if necessary, redetermination of railroad rates for steel products on the basis of competition with eastern plants using an all-water route: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and the house of representatives in session assembled (the Governor concurring therein), That it is the policy of the State of Utah that the Geneva steel plant be completed so as to utilize during the present conflict all of its potential facilities furthering war-production effort; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the policy of this State that said plant, together with all its facilities, be utilized and maintained during the post-war era, that to this end the Defense Plant Corporation immediately prepare engineering plans for conversion of the facilities to peacetime production, and that the Congress of the United States enact such legislation as may be necessary to carry into effect the aforesaid policy; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Utah."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Utah; to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to construct a suitable plant for the processing of coal and oil shales within the State of Utah

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the Utah State Legislature that in all probability the Congress of the United States will make an appropriation in a considerable amount for the purpose of establishing under the Bureau of Mines of the Interior Department, a program through which an intensive study will be made of methods for the processing of bituminous coal and oil shales in the United States; and

"Whereas, within the boundaries of the State of Utah, some of the largest deposits of bituminous coal and oil shales exist; and

"Whereas it has already been proven that the Utah coals are extremely valuable from the standpoint of their content in oil, resin, and other byproducts and the oil shales of Utah have been proven to contain tremendous quantities of a very high-grade oil: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Utah State Legislature in special session assembled, That we petition as follows:

"1. That the Congress of the United States makes available a sum of money for the purpose of making a study of the processing of coals and oil shales.

"2. That if such appropriation is made available that the Bureau of Mines of the Interior Department be authorized to administer such funds.

"3. That if and when said funds are made available that the Bureau of Mines establish within the State of Utah, preferably in the area where the deposits exist, one of the plants or installations, through which such study will be made.

"4. That a copy of this resolution be directed to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior and to the Utah congressional delegation, with the request that they use their good offices to meet the end herein petitioned for."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Utah; ordered to lie on the table.

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Utah State Legislature endorsing the principles and purposes of United States S. B. 1767, relating to benefits and protection for veterans of World War No. 2

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States S. B. 1767, sponsored by the American Legion, providing legislation for the benefit and protection of veterans of World War No. 2; and

"Whereas S. B. 1767 is necessary and essential for the protection of the rights of

veterans of World War No. 2: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah in special session assembled, endorse the principles and purposes of S. B. 1767 and recommends them to the earnest consideration of our representatives in the National Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the Congress of the United States, and to the chairman of the veterans' subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee of the Congress of the United States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was ordered to lie on the table.)

GOVERNMENT HEALTH PROGRAM—RESOLUTION BY OMAHA (NEBR.) ACCIDENT AND HEALTH UNDERWRITERS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Omaha (Nebr.) Accident and Health Underwriters.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill now pending in the United States Congress relative to the amendment of the Social Security Act is objectionable and, if enacted, would be detrimental to the welfare of the general public for the reasons that:

1. It would be a death blow at voluntary private disability insurance and voluntary cooperative hospital and medical service plans, would substitute therefor a compulsory, monopolistic Government system of insurance, hospital, and medical services.

2. It would centralize the control of all public employment offices, of all existing unemployment compensation programs, of all health and hospital supervision, and of all health and accident insurance in Washington.

3. It would lend to Federal control of doctors and hospitals, to the consequent lowering of medical standards, and to the decline of medical research by removing one of the most powerful incentives therefor.

4. It would create a gigantic and unwieldy Government monopoly and would destroy voluntary hospital service plans; voluntary medical service plans, fraternal benefit plans, cooperative labor union and mutual benefit employee plans, and competitive health and accident insurance.

5. It ignores and would destroy individual initiative, private enterprise, and freedom of opportunity, the factors that have contributed much to the genius and greatness of America.

6. It would increase the taxes of individuals and of employers to an unbearable amount: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Omaha Accident and Health Underwriters in session assembled at Omaha, Nebr., That we hereby express our unqualified and unalterable opposition to said bill or to any other bill that would lead to the objectionable results enumerated above, and that we forward copy of this resolution to each Member of the Senate and Congress from the State of Nebraska.

RESOLUTIONS OF IOLA (KANS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, two resolutions adopted by the Iola (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce. One resolution would amend the income-tax laws so that railroads can set aside maintenance funds in a reserve where because of the labor and materials situation it is impossible to use the funds at this time. The other resolution favors allowing the railroads to engage in the air-transport field.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Finance:

Whereas due to the emergency created by the war, the railroads of the United States have had a greater passenger and freight traffic than ever before and the railroad facilities have been used to the limit in meeting the military and civilian needs; and

Whereas the railroads along with other industries have encountered labor shortages and shortage of materials needed for maintenance of railroad facilities for the payment of which maintenance expenses reserves have been set up from current earnings; and

Whereas such reserves are now subjected to the excess profits tax provisions of the Federal income-tax law contrary to the true spirit and intent of that law when enacted and working an injustice to the railroads in their efforts to provide ample reserves for the payment of needed maintenance of their facilities as soon as same can be done: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Iola, Kans., That the chamber does hereby go on record in favor of the immediate enactment of legislation by Congress changing the provision of the excess-profits-tax law to exclude reserves set up out of current earnings by railroads to provide for funds for the payment of maintenance on their facilities, which funds the railroads have been unable to use for that purpose immediately on account of the existing war conditions; be it further

Resolved, That T. E. Shanahan as secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Iola, Kans., is hereby directed to forthwith mail a copy of this resolution to each of the members of the Kansas delegation in Congress.

To the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Be it resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Iola, Kans., That the chamber does hereby go on record as favoring legislation permitting the railroads of the United States to organize and operate air transport lines for the handling of freight and passenger traffic to the same extent that other businesses and corporations who can qualify are now permitted to do; be it further

Resolved, That the chamber does hereby disapprove of the present policy of the constituted authorities and laws which have resulted in such discrimination and demand that such unfair and unjust discrimination be removed without delay; be it further

Resolved, That T. E. Shanahan, as secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Iola, is hereby directed to forthwith mail a copy of this resolution to each of the Members of the Kansas delegation in Congress.

REPORT OF COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3028) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 794) thereon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported favorably the following nominations:

Capt. Donald B. Duncan, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 2d day of March 1943;

Capt. Thomas R. Kurtz, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, on the retired list, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Eastern Sea Frontier;

Capt. Burrell C. Allen, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, on the retired list, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Western Sea Frontier;

Capt. Marion C. Robertson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier;

Capt. Charlton E. Battle, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Service Force, Atlantic Fleet;

Capt. John H. Magruder, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier;

Capt. Paul S. Theiss, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Amphibious Forces, Pacific Fleet;

Capt. Homer W. Graf, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Seventh Fleet;

Capt. Allen G. Quynn, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Service Force, Pacific Fleet;

Capt. Clinton E. Braine, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Fourth Fleet;

Capt. Howard A. Flanigan, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, on the retired list, for temporary service, while serving as Deputy Chief of Staff to Commander, Twelfth Fleet;

Capt. George A. Seitz, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Air Force, Atlantic Fleet;

Capt. Leonard Doughty, Jr., United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, on the retired list, for temporary service, while serving as Commander, Advanced Bases, Italy;

Commodore Bertram J. Rodgers, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of January 1943;

Capt. Theodore D. Ruddock, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 29th day of September 1942;

Capt. Charles T. Joy, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of December 1942; and

Capt. Francis C. Denebrink, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of March 1943.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1830. A bill for the relief of David Stiefel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1831. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1832. A bill to amend the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended by the Act of May 29, 1934, with respect to the limitation on tours of duty in the Army of the United States in foreign service; and

S. 1833 (by request). A bill fixing the discharge status of members and former members of the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who have participated in the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. 1834. A bill to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment," approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314), with respect to the movement at Government expense of dependents and household effects of certain military personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1835. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Brown and others; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for Mr. STEWART):

S. 1836. A bill to amend the Transportation Act of 1940 so as to extend for 4 years the life of the Board of Investigation and Research, established by section 301 of such act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1837. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Hugh A. Shiels, U. S. N. R.;

S. 1838. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions;

S. 1839. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters at naval advance base depot, Fort Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944;

S. 1840. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentina, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943;

S. 1841. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1842. A bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943; and

S. 1843. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Newport News, Commonwealth of Virginia, a right-of-way over certain lands of the United States at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., for water-pipe-line purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

FURLOUGHS FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WITH FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that as far as practicable, members of the armed forces who have served continuously outside the continental limits of the United States for 2 years or longer shall be returned to the United States and be granted 30-day furloughs or leaves of absence to rest and visit their families before reassignment to duty. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are requested to make effective as soon as is feasible and practicable the policy outlined in this resolution.

EDISTO RIVER, S. C. (S. DOC. NO. 182)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of War dated March 3, 1944, together with a report of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, being a review of reports on Edisto River, S. C., be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAMPA HARBOR, FLA. (S. DOC. NO. 183)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War, dated April 4, 1944, together with the report of the Chief of Engineers of the Army on a review of report on Tampa Harbor, Fla., and request that it be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Chicago Daily News on March 30 published a front page editorial containing among other things the following:

We cannot win the war without soldiers. And we cannot win the war without men to make the vital materials that soldiers use. Therefore, it is both sound and just to insure that we get men for both purposes by the same system of selection.

No one wants to apply the compulsory principle to all labor. All the Army and Navy is interested in is applying the compulsory system when it is needed, and only in essential war industries—and after the voluntary system has failed.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial which is entitled "The Manpower Problem," printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

THE MANPOWER PROBLEM

On the war production side the Nation has acquitted itself magnificently. What has been done, industrially, is nothing less than a miracle. And its accomplishment is a tribute to the application and patriotism of American management and American labor.

But the achievement of this remarkable rate of production is not the whole job. The rate must be maintained. We are just entering upon the most strenuous and most costly phase of the war—costly in men and equipment and supplies. Any shortage of equipment and supplies will mean increased cost in human lives, as well as incurring the danger of defeats, and consequent prolongation of the war.

Failure to maintain the necessary rate of production of essential war supplies and equipment is not threatened any longer by lack of raw materials. Generally speaking, we have these now in abundance. It is lack of manpower in essential industries, combined with a lack of young manpower to fill the ranks of the Army and Navy, and to supply replacements, that has compelled a revision of methods of dealing with the manpower problem. This attempted revision has been accompanied by a veritable babel of tongues which leaves the public in confusion and dismay. Numerous expedients are proposed, most of them unpromising at best, and all of them temporary in effect.

There is but one effective and permanent cure for the manpower situation—the adoption of a properly drawn national service law. The politicians (election-conscious) shrink from the suggestion as from a plague; denounce it as a "labor draft law"; talk loudly about invasion of constitutional rights, and insist there is no longer any manpower problem. The truth is they don't understand what is proposed, and don't want to understand. But the people are beginning to understand, both that there is a problem, and what is under discussion as a solution.

There is universal agreement that we could not have fought the war without the selective-service law, which gives Government the power to draft men for fighting. The justice of this system is now universally recognized. Our experience has also taught us, unmistakably, that there are certain industries engaged in the production of essential war materials, that are just as vital to fighting the war as is the carrying on of battles with the enemy at the front. It has now become completely and unquestionably clear that in some of these industries which are vital there is a continuing shortage of men required to produce these supplies.

If it is logical and just arbitrarily to assign men to the task of fighting, it is equally logical, when it is necessary, to assign men, arbitrarily, to the task of making the weapons with which to fight.

We cannot win the war without soldiers. And we cannot win the war without men to make the vital materials that soldiers use. Therefore, it is both sound and just to insure that we get men for both purposes by the same system of selection.

No one wants to apply the compulsory principle to all labor. All the Army and Navy is interested in is applying the compulsory system when it is needed, and only in essential war industries—and after the voluntary system has failed.

The truth is that such a national service law would be felt by only a small percentage of the total population. It would only be applied in vital war industries, and only in these when there is an actual shortage of labor. The overwhelming majority of people would never know such a law was in operation. But the Army and Navy, who depend upon these vital war products would know, because then they would be sure to get the war supplies they need when they are needed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 1, 1944.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, before that is done, in view of the informal agreement that no business should be transacted, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. We can then recess until Monday.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment? Several Senators wish to place matters in the RECORD. There is no objection to the recess, however.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I withhold the motion.

THE DRAFT SITUATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a statement prepared by me discussing the draft, with a headline

review of the different orders made during the past 3 weeks.

There being no objection, the statement and review were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been 3 years since Congress adopted the National Service Act empowering the President to draft manpower on an orderly basis for the fighting services. More than 2 years have elapsed since the United States entered the war. On May 5, 1942, nearly 2 years ago, I introduced a bill to classify all men subject to draft into seven classes based on age and family status, with definitely assigned priorities. On June 18, 1942, I presented a complete analysis of the different groups and made more definite suggestions of classification. Power to classify by age groups was given to the Director, but not used. In 1943 I proposed a definite deferred classification of fathers over 30. It was rejected because of a completely illogical letter from General Marshall. Now the administration has come a long way toward one of my proposals with a distinction at age 26. But how long will they stay there?

Today the entire draft situation is just as muddled, just as confused as ever. There is hardly a day goes by that a new order is not issued, that President Roosevelt does not differ with Manpower Director McNutt, or McNutt with General Hershey, or Secretaries Stimson and Ickes with all of them.

The time has come to quit playing fast and loose with the existence of American men and their families. It is utterly ridiculous at this stage of the war to have married men telling their families goodbye, giving up their jobs, and selling their businesses, only to be told the next day it was all a mistake and they will not be needed; that they can go back home and pick up the scattered threads of their lives. But not securely, for they might be called again on a moment's notice.

Such confusion is not only harmful to public morale, but also must be a deterrent to constancy in war production.

I propose a four-point program:

1. Develop a long-range draft plan for the armed services based upon probable manpower needs, with agreement among all of the executive heads concerned. Make the classifications clear and definite and permanent.

2. Announce it to the public as final except as some great emergency clearly requires a change.

3. Stick to it, once adopted, so that those in the various categories can plan their lives accordingly, at least for a few months.

4. Stop confusing every person in the country between the ages of 18 and 38, and let the people get down to the serious business of winning the war.

A HEADLINE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT MUDDLE

March 19, 1944: Chairman of War Production Board and War Manpower Commission reach agreement on budgeting manpower.

March 25, 1944: United States speeds plan to draft men under 26. Status of older registrants will not be changed until the younger are inducted. New draft program faces struggle over industry needs. McNutt committee to rule on keymen.

March 28, 1944: Seven million IV-F's, I-C's, and 38 to 45's probable labor-crisis solution. Men classified as unfit for military service are ones who must keep essential production going.

March 29, 1944: General Hershey would draft IV-F's to work.

March 29, 1944: Paul McNutt, W. M. C. Chairman, thinks manpower situation is under control and is reported to have written Roosevelt he will resign if Army and Navy interference is not terminated.

March 30, 1944: Roosevelt reported favoring Hershey plan of inducting IV-F's not in war work.

March 30, 1944: Work draft officials views at variance. President Roosevelt favors enactment of national-service legislation on broad scale. McNutt before House Military Affairs Subcommittee says there is no need for such legislation. General Hershey in Providence speech says he will insist IV-F's 18 to 26 be taken for service in war jobs.

April 1, 1944: Colonel Keesling, legislative liaison officer of Selective Service, proposes Nation-wide campaign to convince IV-F's of their moral obligation to enter war work.

April 2, 1944: McNutt's interagency committee on manpower bogged down in quarrel over which industrial activities are entitled to request occupational deferments.

April 5, 1944: General Hershey says men 26 to 37 will fill Army gaps, not enough under 26.

April 5, 1944: Maritime service told to halt enlistments of men under 26. Men 26 to 29 next group to feel pressure of stricter occupational deferments. IV-F's warned they must enter war work or face possible legislative and administrative action to insure they do necessary work.

April 7, 1944: Ickes says draft will hit coal hard unless deferments given to miners 22 to 25 with 3 years' experience.

April 7, 1944: Army now attains peak strength of 7,700,000 men and Navy within 400,000 of goal of 3,600,000 men expected to be attained September 1. Draft calls, however, must continue at present levels until July 1 to supply replacements.

April 8, 1944: Men over 29 put last in future draft. Divides draftees into three groups in considering them for occupational deferments (1) 18 to 25 (2) 26 to 29 (3) 30 and over.

April 8, 1944: General Hershey and Paul McNutt make joint request on IV-F's to check with local offices of U. S. Employment Service on whether they are employed in work essential to war. If not they are advised to seek through U. S. E. S. work in lines listed as essential. Draft boards, however, ordered to go easy on men over 30, especially fathers.

April 9, 1944: Draft is halted for men over 26 in all "war-supporting activities." Order exempts even those called for April 10. Earlier ruling rescinded.

THE TEXAS NEGRO VOTE DECISIONS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star, of April 9, 1944, entitled "The Texas Negro Vote Decisions." I had intended to discuss the matter today, but, in view of the statement of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that a recess is to be taken until tomorrow, I shall wait until that time to discuss it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TEXAS NEGRO VOTE DECISIONS—STATUS OF PARTY PRIMARY AS STATE AGENCY ISSUE CAUSING REVERSAL

The complete reversal by the Supreme Court of a 1935 decision by the Court, in which the right of the Democratic Party in Texas to exclude Negroes from voting in the party's primary was upheld, has raised the question of how nine men can decide one way at one time and how eight men (seven of them new) can decide exactly the opposite way 9 years later. The text of the two decisions, with some eliminations, is printed below to give the readers of the Sunday Star a better understanding of the reasoning which brought about the ruling in each case.

The Supreme Court in 1935 was composed of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes and Justices Willis Van Devanter, James C. McReynolds, Louis D. Brandeis, George Sutherland, Pierce Butler, Harlan F. Stone, Owen J. Roberts, and Benjamin N. Cardozo. The 1935 decision was unanimous.

GROVEY AGAINST TOWNSEND (1935)

(Mr. Justice Roberts delivered the opinion of the Court)

The petitioner, by complaint filed in the Justice Court of Harris County, Tex., alleged that although he is a citizen of the United States and of the State and county, and a member of and believer in the tenets of the Democratic Party, the respondent, the county clerk, a State officer, having as such only public functions to perform, refused him a ballot for a Democratic Party primary election, because he is of the Negro race. He demanded $10 damages. The pleading quotes articles of the Revised Civil Statutes of Texas which require the nomination of candidates at primary elections by any organized political party whose nominees received 100,000 votes or more at the preceding general election, and recites that agreeably to these enactments a Democratic primary election was held on July 28, 1934, at which petitioner had the right to vote. Referring to statutes which regulate absentee voting at primary elections, the complaint states the petitioner expected to be absent from the county on the date of the primary election, and demanded of the respondent an absentee ballot, which was refused him in virtue of a resolution of the State Democratic convention of Texas, adopted May 24, 1932, which is:

"*Be it resolved,* That all white citizens of the State of Texas who are qualified to vote under the constitution and laws of the State shall be eligible to membership in the Democratic Party and as such entitled to participate in its deliberations."

Lack of legal excuse charged

The complaint charges that the respondent acted without legal excuse and his wrongful and unlawful acts constituted a violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Federal Constitution.

A demurrer, assigning as reasons that the complaint was insufficient in law and stated no cause of action, was sustained; and a motion for a new trial, reasserting violation of the Federal rights mentioned in the complaint, was overruled. We granted certiorari, because of the importance of the Federal question presented, which has not been determined by this court. Our jurisdiction is clear, as the justice court is the highest State court in which a decision may be had, and the validity of the constitution and statutes of the State was drawn in question on the ground of their being repugnant to the Constitution of the United States.

The charge is that respondent, a State officer, in refusing to furnish petitioner a ballot, obeyed the law of Texas, and the consequent denial of petitioner's right to vote in the primary election because of his race and color was State action forbidden by the Federal Constitution; and it is claimed that former decisions require us so to hold. The cited cases are, however, not in point. In *Nixon* v. *Herndon* (273 U. S. 536) a statute which enacted that "in no event shall a Negro be eligible to participate in a Democratic Party primary election held in the State of Texas," was pronounced offensive to the fourteenth amendment. In *Nixon* v. *Condon* (286 U. S. 73) a statute was drawn in question which provided that "every political party in this State through its State executive committee shall have the power to prescribe the qualifications of its own members and shall in its own way determine who shall be qualified to vote or otherwise participate in such political party." We held this was

a delegation of State power to the State executive committee and made its determination conclusive irrespective of any expression of the party's will by its convention, and therefore the committee's action barring Negroes from the party primaries was State action prohibited by the fourteenth amendment. Here the qualifications of citizens to participate in party councils and to vote at party primaries have been declared by the representatives of the party in convention assembled, and this action upon its face is not State action. The question whether under the constitution and laws of Texas such a declaration as to party membership amounts to State action was expressly reserved in *Nixon* v. *Condon*. * * * Petitioner insists that for various reasons the resolution of the State convention limiting membership in the Democratic Party in Texas to white voters does not relieve the exclusion of Negroes from participation in Democratic primary elections of its true nature as the act of the State.

Primary required by statutes

First. An argument pressed upon us in *Nixon* v. *Condon*, which we found it unnecessary to consider, is again presented. It is that the primary election was held under statutory compulsion; is wholly statutory in origin and incidents; those charged with its management have been deprived by statute and judicial decision of all power to establish qualifications for participation therein inconsistent with those laid down by the laws of the State, save only that the managers of such elections have been given the power to deny Negroes the vote. It is further urged that while the election is designated that of the Democratic Party, the statutes not only require this method of selecting party nominees but define the powers and duties of the party's representatives, and of those who are to conduct the election, so completely, and make them so thoroughly officers of the State, that any action taken by them in connection with the qualifications of members of the party is in fact State action and not party action.

In support of this view petitioner refers to title 50 of the Revised Civil Statutes of Texas of 1925.

A perusal of these provisions, so it is said, will convince that the State has prescribed and regulated party primaries as fully as general elections, and has made those who manage the primaries State officers subject to State direction and control.

Expense not borne by State

While it is true that Texas has by its laws elaborately provided for the expression of party preference as to nominees, * * * it is equally true that the primary is a party primary; the expenses of it are not borne by the State, but by members of the party seeking nomination * * * the ballots are furnished not by the State, but by the agencies of the party; the votes are counted and the returns made by instrumentalities created by the party, and the State recognizes the State convention as the organ of the party for the declaration of principles and the formulation of policies * * *.

We are told that in *Love* v. *Wilcox* * * * the Supreme Court of Texas held the State was within its province in prohibiting a party from establishing past party affiliations or membership in nonpolitical organizations as qualifications or tests for participation in primary elections, and in consequence issued its writ of mandamus against the members of the State Executive Committee of the Democratic Party on the ground that they were public functionaries fulfilling duties imposed on them by law. But in that case it was said:

"We are not called upon to determine whether a political party has power, beyond statutory control, to prescribe what persons shall participate as voters or candidates in its conventions or primaries. We have no such state of facts before us."

Committee's power restricted

After referring to article 3107, which limits the power of the State executive committee of a party to determine who shall be qualified to vote at primary elections, the Court said:

"The committee's discretionary power is further restricted by the statute directing that a single, uniform pledge be required of the primary participants. The effect of the statute is to decline to give recognition to the lodgment of power in a State executive committee, to be exercised at its discretion."

Although it did not pass upon the constitutionality of 3107, as we did in *Nixon* v. *Condon*, the court thus recognized the fact upon which our decision turned, that the effort was to vest in the State executive committee the power to bind the party by its decision as to who might be admitted to membership.

In *Bell* v. *Hill*, * * * the same court, in a mandamus proceeding instituted after the adoption by the State convention of the resolution of May 24, 1932, restricting eligibility for membership in the Democratic Party to white persons, held the resolution valid and effective. After a full consideration of the nature of political parties in the United States, the Court concluded that such parties in the State of Texas * * * are voluntary associations for political action and are not creatures of the State * * *. The Court declared that a proper view of the election laws of Texas, and their history, required the conclusion that the Democratic Party in that State is a voluntary political association and, by its representatives assembled in convention, has the power to determine who shall be eligible for membership, and, as such, eligible to participate in the party's primaries.

We cannot, as petition urges, give weight to earlier expressions of the State courts said to be inconsistent with the declaration of the law. * * *

In the light of the principles so announced, we are unable to characterize the managers of the primary election as State officers in such sense that any action taken by them in obedience to the mandate of the State convention respecting eligibility to participate in the organization's deliberations, is State action.

Second. We are told that sections 2 and 27 of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of Texas as construed in *Bell* v. *Hill*, violate the Federal Constitution, for the reason that so construed they fail to forbid a classification based upon race and color, whereas in *Love* v. *Wilcox*, they were not held to forbid classifications based upon party affiliations and membership or nonmembership in organizations other than political parties, which classifications were by article 3107 of Revised Civil Statutes, 1925, prohibited. But, as above said in *Love* v. *Wilcox*, the court did not construe or apply any constitutional provision and expressly reserved the question as to the power of a party in convention assembled to specify the qualifications for membership therein.

Third. An alternative contention of petitioner is that the State Democratic convention which adopted the resolution here involved was a mere creature of the State and could not lawfully do what the Federal Constitution prohibits to its creator. * * * We are not prepared to hold that in Texas the State convention of a party has become a mere instrumentality or agency for expressing the voice or will of the State.

Fourth. The complaint states that the candidates for the offices of Senator and Representative in Congress were to be nominated at the primary election of July 9, 1934, and that in Texas nomination by the Democratic party is equivalent to election. These facts (the truth of which the demurrer assumes) the petitioner insists, without more, make out a forbidden discrimination. A similar situation may exist in other States where one or another party includes a great majority of the qualified electors. The argument is that as a Negro may not be denied a ballot at a general election on account of his race or color, if exclusion from the primary renders his vote at the general election insignificant and useless, the result is to deny him the suffrage altogether. So to say is to confuse the privilege of membership in a party with the right to vote for one who is to hold a public office. With the former the State need have no concern, with the latter it is bound to concern itself, for the general election is a function of the State government and discrimination by the State as respects participation by Negroes on account of their race or color is prohibited by the Federal Constitution. * * *

We find no ground for holding that the respondent has in obedience to the mandate of the law of Texas discriminated against the petitioner or denied him any right guaranteed by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

Judgment affirmed.

The present Supreme Court is composed of Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone and Justices Owen J. Roberts, Hugo F. Black, Stanley F. Reed, Felix Frankfurter, William O. Douglas, Frank Murphy, Robert H. Jackson, and Wiley Rutledge. The decision last Monday was eight to one, Justice Roberts dissenting.

SMITH VERSUS ALLWRIGHT (1944)

(Mr. Justice Reed delivered the opinion of the Court)

This writ of certiorari brings here for review a claim for damages in the sum of $5,000 on the part of petitioner, a Negro citizen of the forty-eighth precinct of Harris County, Tex., for the refusal of respondents, election and associate election judges respectively of that precinct, to give petitioner a ballot or to permit him to cast a ballot in the primary election of July 27, 1940, for the nomination of Democratic candidates for the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and Governor and other State officers. The refusal is alleged to have been solely because of the race and color of the proposed voter.

The actions of respondents are said to violate sections 31 and 43 of title 8 of the United States Code in that petitioner was deprived of rights secured by sections 2 and 4 of article I and the fourteenth, fifteenth, and seventeenth amendments to the United States Constitution.

The district court denied the relief sought and the circuit court of appeals quite properly affirmed its action on the authority of *Grovey* v. *Townsend* (295 U. S. 45). We granted the petition for certiorari to resolve a claimed inconsistency between the decision in the Grovey case and that of *United States* v. *Classic*.

Nomination by qualified voters

The State of Texas by its constitution and statutes provides that every person, if certain other requirements are met which are not here in issue, qualified by residence in the district or county, "shall be deemed a qualified elector * * *." Primary elections for United States Senators, Congressmen, and State officers are provided for by chapters 12 and 13 of the statutes. Under these chapters, the Democratic Party was required to hold the primary which was the occasion of the alleged wrong to petitioner. These nominations are to be made by the qualified voters of the party.

The Democratic Party of Texas is held by the supreme court of that State to be a "voluntary association" (*Bell* v. *Hill*), pro-

tected by section 27 of the bill of rights, article I, Constitution of Texas, from interference by the State except that—

"In the interest of fair method and a fair expression by their members of their preferences in the selection of their nominees, the State may regulate such elections by proper laws."

The Democratic Party on May 24, 1932, in a State convention adopted the following resolution, * * *:

"*Be it resolved,* That all white citizens of the State of Texas who are qualified to vote under the constitution and laws of the State shall be eligible to membership in the Democratic Party and, as such, entitled to participate in its deliberations."

Resolution basis of refusal

It was by virtue of this resolution that the respondents refused to permit the petitioner to vote.

Texas is free to conduct her elections and limit her electorate as she may deem wise, save only as her action may be affected by the prohibitions of the United States Constitution or in conflict with powers delegated to and exercised by the National Government. The fourteenth amendment forbids a State from making or enforcing any law which abridges the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States and the fifteenth amendment specifically interdicts any denial or abridgment by a State of the right of citizens to vote on account of color. Respondents appeared in the district court and the Circuit Court of Appeals and depended on the ground that the Democratic Party of Texas is a voluntary organization with members banded together for the purpose of selecting individuals of the group representing the common political beliefs as candidates in the general election. As such a voluntary organization, it was claimed, the Democratic Party is free to select its own membership and limit to whites participation in the party primary. Such action, the answer asserted, does not violate the fourteenth, fifteenth, and seventeenth amendments as officers of government cannot be chosen at primaries and the amendments are applicable only to general elections where governmental officers are actually elected. Primaries, it is said, are political party affairs, handled by party, not governmental officers. * * *

Issue considered by court in 1924

The right of a Negro to vote in the Texas primary has been considered heretofore by this court. The first case was *Nixon* v. *Herndon.* At that time, 1924, the Texas statute, * * * declared "in no event shall a Negro be eligible to participate in a Democratic Party primary election in the State of Texas." Nixon was refused the right to vote in a Democratic primary and brought a suit for damages against the election officers under * * * the present sections 43 and 31 of title 8, United States Code, respectively. It was urged to this court that the denial of the franchise to Nixon violated his constitutional rights under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. Without consideration of the fifteenth, this court held that the action of Texas in denying the ballot to Negroes by statute was in violation of the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment and reversed the dismissal of the suit.

The Legislature of Texas reenacted the article but gave the State executive committee of a party the power to prescribe the qualifications of its members for voting or other participation. This article remains in the statutes. The State executive committee of the Democratic Party adopted a resolution that white Democrats and none other might participate in the primaries of that party. Nixon was refused again the privilege of voting in a primary and again brought suit for damages. This court again reversed the dismissal of the suit for the reason that the committee action was deemed to be State action and invalid as discriminatory under the fourteenth amendment. The test was said to be whether the committee operated as representative of the State in the discharge of the State's authority. * * * The question of the inherent power of a political party in Texas "without restraint by any law to determine its own membership" was left open.

Absentee ballot was requested

In *Grovey* v. *Townsend,* this court had before it another suit for damages for the refusal in a primary of a county clerk, a Texas officer with only public functions to perform, to furnish petitioner, a Negro, an absentee ballot. The refusal was solely on the ground of race. This case differed from *Nixon* v. *Condon,* in that a State convention of the Democratic Party had passed the resolution of May 24, 1932, hereinbefore quoted. It was decided that the determination by the State convention of the membership of the Democratic Party made a significant change from a determination by the executive committee. The former was party action, voluntary in character. The latter, as had been held in the Condon case, was action by authority of the State. The managers of the primary election were therefore declared not to be State officials in such sense that their action was State action. A State convention of a party was said not to be an organ of the State. This court went on to announce that to deny a vote in a primary was a mere refusal of party membership with which "the State need have no concern," while for a State to deny a vote in a general election on the ground of race or color violated the Constitution. Consequently, there was found no ground for holding that the county clerk's refusal of a ballot because of racial ineligibility for party membership denied the petitioner any right under the fourteenth or fifteenth amendments.

Since *Grovey* v. *Townsend* and prior to the present suit, no case from Texas involving primary elections has been before this court. We did decide, however, *United States* v. *Classic.* We there held that section 4 of article I of the Constitution authorized Congress to regulate primary as well as general elections, "where the primary is by law made an integral part of the election machinery." * * * By this decision the doubt as to whether or not such primaries were a part of "elections" subject to Federal control, which had remained unanswered since *Newberry* v. *United States,* was erased. The Nixon cases were decided under the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment without a determination of the status of the primary as a part of the electoral process. The exclusion of Negroes from the primaries by action of the State was held invalid under that amendment. The fusing by the Classic case of the primary and general elections into a single instrumentality for choice of officers has a definite bearing on the permissibility under the Constitution of excluding Negroes from primaries. This is not to say that the Classic case cuts directly into the rationale of *Grovey* v. *Townsend.* This latter case was not mentioned in the opinion. Classic bears upon *Grovey* v. *Townsend* not because exclusion of Negroes from primaries is any more or less State action by reason of the unitary character of the electoral process but because the recognition of the place of the primary in the electoral scheme makes clear that State delegation to a party of the power to fix the qualifications of primary elections is delegation of a State function that may make the party's action the action of the State. * * *

The statutes of Texas relating to primaries and the resolution of the Democratic Party of Texas extending the privileges of membership to white citizens only are the same in substance and effect today as they were when *Grovey* v. *Townsend* was decided by a unanimous court. The question as to whether the exclusionary action of the party was the action of the State persists as the determinative factor. In again entering upon consideration of the inference to be drawn as to State action from a substantially similar factual situation, it should be noted that *Grovey* v. *Townsend* upheld exclusion of Negroes from primaries through the denial of party membership by a party convention. A few years before this court refused approval of exclusion by the State executive committee of the party. A different result was reached on the theory that the committee action was State authorized and the convention action was unfettered by statutory control. Such a variation in the result from so slight a change in form influences us to consider anew the legal validity of the distinction which has resulted in barring Negroes from participating in the nominations of candidates of the Democratic Party in Texas. Other precedents of this court forbid the abridgment of the right to vote. * * *

It may now be taken as a postulate that the right to vote in such a primary for the nomination of candidates without discrimination by the State, like the right to vote in a general election, is a right secured by the Constitution. * * * By the terms of the fifteenth amendment that right may not be abridged by any State on account of race. Under our Constitution, the great privilege of choosing his rulers may not be denied a man by the State because of his color.

We are thus brought to an examination of the qualifications for Democratic primary electors in Texas, to determine whether State action or private action has excluded Negroes from participation. Despite Texas' decision that the exclusion is produced by private or party action, *Bell* v. *Hill,* Federal courts must for themselves appraise the facts leading to that conclusion. * * * Texas requires electors in a primary to pay a poll tax. Every person who does so pay and who has the qualifications of age and residence is an acceptable voter for the primary. * * * Texas requires by the law the election of the county officers of a party. These compose the county executive committee. The county chairmen so selected are members of the district executive committee and choose the chairman for the district. Precinct primary election officers are named by the county executive committee. Statutes provide for the election by the voters of precinct delegates to the county convention of a party and the selection of delegates to the district and State conventions by the county convention. The State convention selects the State executive committee. No convention may place in platform or resolution any demand for specific legislation without endorsement of such legislation by the voters in the primary. Texas thus directs the selection of all party officers.

Primary elections are conducted by the party under State statutory authority. * * *

We think that this statutory system for the selection of party nominees for inclusion on the general election ballot makes the party which is required to follow these legislative directions an agency of the State insofar as it determines the participants in a primary election. The party takes its character as a State agency from the duties imposed upon it by State statutes; the duties do not become matters of private law because they are performed by a political party. If the State requires a certain electoral procedure, prescribes a general election ballot made up of party nominees so chosen, and limits the choice of the electorate in general elections

for State offices, practically speaking, to those whose names appear on such a ballot, it endorses, adopts, and enforces the discrimination against Negroes, practiced by a party entrusted by Texas law with the determination of the qualification of participants in the primary. This is State action within the meaning of the fifteenth amendment.

The United States is a constitutional democracy. Its organic law grants to all citizens a right to participate in the choice of elected officials without restriction by any State because of race. * * *

The privilege of membership in a party may be, as this court said in *Grovey* v. *Townsend*, no concern of a State. But when, as here, that privilege is also the essential qualification for voting in a primary to select nominees for a general election, the State makes the action of the party the action of the State. * * *

Grovey v. *Townsend* overruled.

FOREIGN RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on September 17, 1942, I submitted a resolution which provided for a Senate liaison committee. I ask that the resolution (S. Res. 290) be printed in the RECORD and that following the resolution an editorial published in the Washington Morning Post, entitled "Advice and Consent," be also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the resolution and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Senate Resolution 290

Resolved, That the Chief Executive be invited to join with the Senate in the creation of a foreign relations advisory council to be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, other technicians whom the Secretary of State might designate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate.

[From the Washington Post]

ADVICE AND CONSENT

Response to Secretary Hull's request for a Senatorial committee to advise and consult with the Department of State on post-war peace problems has been almost universally favorable. The country is keenly aware of the necessity of collaboration between the legislative and executive branches in order to avoid repetition of the Versailles Treaty fiasco. Coming along with Mr. Hull's more detailed explanation of our foreign policy, his bid for a preliminary meeting of minds notably brightens the outlook for a stable peace in which the United States will be a positive factor.

The only exception that might be taken to Mr. Hull's request is that it was addressed to Chairman CONNALLY of the Foreign relations Committee rather than to the Senate itself. Actually, of course, it is the Senate as a body which must ratify any peace treaty that the Administration may negotiate. So the Senate itself might well decide what group shall represent it in consulting with the State Department. Naturally some unit within the Foreign Relations Committee will be selected for that task, but we think that the importance of its assignment is such that it might well be designated by the Senate as a body or by the recognized leaders of the Senate. Undoubtedly the Senate as a body will be more inclined to give weight to the work and recommendations of the consultatory committee if it is set up in accord with action of the Senate.

On several occasions we have indorsed the Wiley resolution designed to set up a foreign relations advisory council to be composed of representatives of the Department of State, the Senate, and House. Now that Secretary Hull has requested such collaboration, the purpose behind this resolution could doubtless be accomplished through the creation of a joint foreign-relations advisory committee. We thoroughly agree with Congressmen BLOOM and JOHNSON that the House should be represented. And the desirability of having one consultatory body instead of two scarcely need be stated.

The joint committee idea is appealing for another reason. One of the first tasks of this advisory group might well be sponsorship of an amendment to the Constitution eliminating the two-thirds vote in the Senate for ratification of treaties. In its place should be put a requirement for approval of treaties by simple majorities of both the Senate and House. Recognition of the House's interest in the whole realm of foreign relations would be an appropriate prelude to this proposed change.

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 181)

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an address on the foreign policy of the United States, by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, delivered last Sunday evening at 6:30 p. m., and broadcast over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

I also ask that the address be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The address was ordered to be printed as a document, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to talk with you this evening about the foreign policy of the United States. This is not, as some writers assume, a mysterious game carried on by diplomats with other diplomats in foreign offices all over the world. It is for us the task of focusing and giving effect in the world outside our borders to the will of 135,000,000 people through the constitutional processes which govern our democracy. For this reason our foreign policy must be simple and direct and founded upon the interests and purposes of the American people. It has continuity of basic objectives because it is rooted in the traditions and aspirations of our people. It must, of course, be applied in the light of experience and the lessons of the past.

In talking about foreign policy it is well to remember, as Justice Holmes said, that a page of history is worth a volume of logic. There are three outstanding lessons in our recent history to which I particularly wish to draw your attention. In the first place, since the outbreak of the present war in Europe, we and those nations who are now our allies have moved from relative weakness to strength. In the second place, during that same period we in this country have moved from a deep-seated tendency toward separate action to the knowledge and conviction that only through unity of action can there be achieved in this world the results which are essential for the continuance of free peoples. And, thirdly, we have moved from a careless tolerance of evil institutions to the conviction that free governments and Nazi and Fascist governments cannot exist together in this world, because the very nature of the latter requires them to be aggressors and the very nature of free governments too often lays them open to treacherous and well-laid plans of attack.

An understanding of these points will help to clarify the policy which this Government has been and is following.

In 1940, with the fall of France, the peoples of the free world awoke with horror to find themselves on the very brink of defeat. Only Britain in the West and China in the East stood between them and disaster, and the space on which they stood was narrow and precarious. At that moment the free nations were militarily weak and their enemies and potential enemies were strong and well prepared. Even before that this country had begun its preparations for self-defense. Soon thereafter we started upon the long, hard road of mobilizing our great natural resources, our vast productive potentialities, and our reserves of manpower to defend ourselves and to strengthen those who were resisting the aggressors.

This was a major decision of foreign policy. Since that decision was made we have moved far from the former position. We and our allies are attaining a strength which can leave no doubt as to the outcome. That outcome is far from achieved. There are desperate periods still before us, but we have built the strength which we sought, and we need only to maintain the will to use it.

This decision which we have made and carried out was not a decision to make a mere sporadic effort. An episode is not a policy. The American people are determined to press forward with our allies to the defeat of our enemies and the destruction of the Nazi and Fascist systems which plunged us into the war. And they are also determined to go on, after the victory, with our allies and all other nations which desire peace and freedom to establish and maintain in full strength the institutions without which peace and freedom cannot be an enduring reality. We cannot move in and out of international cooperation and in and out of participation in the responsibilities of a member of the family of nations. The political, material, and spiritual strength of the free and democratic nations not only is greatly dependent upon the strength which our full participation brings to the common effort, but, as we now know, is a vital factor in our own strength. As it is with the keystone of an arch, neither the keystone nor the arch can stand alone.

This growth of our strength entails consequences in our foreign policy. Let us look first at our relations with the neutral nations.

In the 2 years following Pearl Harbor, while we were mustering our strength and helping to restore that of our allies, our relations with these neutral nations and their attitude toward our enemies were conditioned by the position in which we found ourselves. We have constantly sought to keep before them what they, of course, know—that upon our victory hangs their very existence and freedom as independent nations. We have sought in every way to reduce the aid which their trade with the enemy gives him and to increase the strength which we might draw from them. But our power was limited. They and we have continually been forced to accept compromises which we certainly would not have chosen.

That period, I believe, is rapidly drawing to a close. It is clear to all that our strength and that of our allies now makes only one outcome of this war possible. That strength now makes it clear that we are not asking these neutral nations to expose themselves to certain destruction when we ask them not to prolong the war, with its consequences of suffering and death, by sending aid to the enemy.

We can no longer acquiesce in these nations drawing upon the resources of the allied world when they at the same time contribute to the death of troops whose sacrifice contributes to their salvation as well as ours. We have scrupulously respected the sovereignty of these nations; and we have not coerced, nor shall we coerce, any nation to

join us in the fight. We have said to these countries that it is no longer necessary for them to purchase protection against aggression by furnishing aid to our enemy—whether it be by permitting official German agents to carry on their activities of espionage against the allies within neutral borders; or by sending to Germany the essential ingredients of the steel which kills our soldiers; or by permitting highly skilled workers and factories to supply products which can no longer issue from the smoking ruins of German factories. We ask them only, but with insistence, to cease aiding our enemy.

The Allied strength has now grown to the point where we are on the verge of great events. Of military events I cannot speak. It is enough that they are in the hands of men who have the complete trust of the American people. We await their development with absolute confidence. But I can and should discuss with you what may happen close upon the heels of military action.

As I look at the map of Europe, certain things seem clear to me. As the Nazis go down to defeat, they will inevitably leave behind them in Germany and the satellite states of southeastern Europe a legacy of confusion. It is essential that we and our allies establish the controls necessary to bring order out of this chaos as rapidly as possible and do everything possible to prevent its spread to the German-occupied countries of eastern and western Europe while they are in the throes of reestablishing government and repairing the most brutal ravages of the war. If confusion should spread throughout Europe, it is difficult to overemphasize the seriousness of the disaster that may follow. Therefore, for us, for the world, and for the countries concerned a stable Europe should be an immediate objective of allied policy.

Stability and order do not and cannot mean reaction. Order there must be to avoid chaos. But it must be achieved in a manner which will give full scope to men and women who look forward, men and women who will end fascism and all its works and create the institutions of a free and democratic way of life.

We look with hope and with deep faith to a period of great democratic accomplishment in Europe. Liberation from the German yoke will give the peoples of Europe a new and magnificent opportunity to fulfill their democratic aspirations, both in building democratic political institutions of their own choice, and in achieving the social and economic democracy on which political democracy must rest. It is important to our national interest to encourage the establishment in Europe of strong and progressive popular governments, dedicated like our own to improving the social welfare of the people as a whole—governments which will join the common effort of nations in creating the conditions of lasting peace, and in promoting the expansion of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples.

It is hard to imagine a stable Europe if there is instability in its component parts, of which France is one of the most important. What, then, is our policy toward France? Our first concern is to defeat the enemy, drive him from French territory, and the territory of all the adjacent countries which he has overrun. To do this the supreme military commander must have unfettered authority. But we have no purpose or wish to govern France or to administer any affairs save those which are necessary for military operations against the enemy. It is of the utmost importance that civil authority in France should be exercised by Frenchmen, should be swiftly established, and should operate in accordance with advanced planning as fully as military operations will permit. It is essential that the material foundations of the life of the French people be at once restored or resumed. Only in this way can stability be achieved.

It has always been our thought in planning for this end that we should look to Frenchmen to undertake civil administration and assist them in that task without compromising in any way the right of the French people to choose the ultimate form and personnel of the government which they may wish to establish. That must be left to the free and untrammeled choice of the French people.

The President and I are clear, therefore, as to the need, from the outset, of French civil administration—and democratic French administration—in France. We are disposed to see the French Committee of National Liberation exercise leadership to establish law and order under the supervision of the Allied Commander in Chief. The committee has given public assurance that it does not propose to perpetuate its authority. On the contrary, it has given assurance that it wishes at the earliest possible date to have the French people exercise their own sovereign will in accordance with French constitutional processes. The committee is, of course, not the Government of France and we cannot recognize it as such. In accordance with this understanding of mutual purposes the committee will have every opportunity to undertake civil administration and our cooperation and help in every practicable way in making it successful. It has been a symbol of the spirit of France and of French resistance. We have fully cooperated with it in all the military phases of the war effort, including the furnishing of arms and equipment to the French armed forces. Our central and abiding purpose is to aid the French people, our oldest friends, in providing a democratic, competent, and French administration of liberated French territory.

In Italy our interests are likewise in assisting in the development at the earliest moment of a free and democratic Italian Government. As I said some moments ago, we have learned that there cannot be any compromise with fascism—whether in Italy or in any other country. It must always be the enemy and it must be our determined policy to do all in our power to end it. Here again, within these limits, it is not our purpose or policy to impose the ultimate form or personnel of government. Here again we wish to give every opportunity for a free expression of a free Italy. We had hoped that before this enough of Italy would have been freed so that we might have had at least a preliminary expression of that will. Events have not progressed according to our hopes.

The present situation, then, is this: In October 1943 the President, Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin accepted the active cooperation of the Italian Government and its armed forces as a cobelligerent in the war against Germany under the supervision of an Allied Control Commission. The declaration regarding Italy made at Moscow by the British, Soviet, and American Governments confirmed the policy initiated by the British and American Governments that the Italian Government shall be made more democratic by the introduction of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism; that all institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed; that all Fascists or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from the institutions and organizations of a public character; and that democratic organs of local governments shall be created. Finally, it recites that nothing in the declaration should operate against the right of the Italian people "ultimately to choose their own form of government."

This policy has been and is being carried out. Only that part which calls for the introduction into the central government of more democratic elements has not yet been put into effect. This does not signify any change in the clear and announced policy. Thus far it has been thought by those chiefly responsible for the military situation that it would be prejudiced by an imposed reconstruction of the Government, and a reconstruction by agreement has not yet been possible. But there is already promise of success in the activities of the political parties which are currently holding conferences with a view to drawing up a program for the political reconstruction of their country along democratic lines. The permanent executive junta is seeking a solution which will provide for the cooperation of the liberal political groups within the Government. Thus, after 21 years, we see a rebirth of political consciousness and activity in Italy, which points the way to the ultimate free expression of the Italian people in the choice of their government.

What I have said related to some of the most immediate of our problems and the effect of our policy toward them as we and our allies have moved from a position of weakness to one of strength. There remain the more far-reaching relations between us and our allies in dealing with our enemies and in providing for future peace, freedom from aggression and opportunity for expanding material well-being. Here I would only mislead you if I spoke of definitive solutions. These require the slow, hard process, essential to enduring and accepted solutions among free peoples, of full discussion with our allies and among our own people. But such discussion is now in progress. After 2 years of intensive study, the basis upon which our policy must be founded is soundly established; the direction is clear; and the general methods of accomplishment are emerging.

This basis of policy and these methods rest upon the second of the lessons which I said at the outset of my remarks was found in the pages of our recent history. It is that action upon these matters cannot be separate but must be agreed and united action. This is fundamental. It must underlie the entire range of our policy. The free nations have been brought to the very brink of destruction by allowing themselves to be separated and divided. If any lesson has ever been hammered home with blood and suffering, that one has been. And the lesson is not yet ended.

However, difficult the road may be, there is no hope of turning victory into enduring peace unless the real interests of this country, the British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union and China are harmonized and unless they agree and act together. This is the solid framework upon which all future policy and international organization must be built. It offers the fullest opportunity for the development of institutions in which all free nations may participate democratically, through which a reign of law and morality may arise and through which the material interests of all may be advanced. But without an enduring understanding between these four nations upon their fundamental purposes, interests and obligations to one another, all orgaizations to preserve peace are creations on paper and the path is wide open again for the rise of a new aggressor.

This essential understanding and unity of action among the four nations is not in substitution or derogation of unity among the United Nations. But it is basic to all organized international action, because upon its reality depends the possibility of enduring peace and free institutions rather than new coalitions and a new prewar period. Nor do I suggest that any conclusions of these four nations can or should be without the participation of the other United Nations.

I am stating what I believe the common sense of my fellow countrymen and all men will recognize, that for these powers to become divided in their aims and fail to recognize and harmonize their basic interests can produce only disaster and that no machinery, as such, can produce this essential harmony and unity.

The road to agreement is a difficult one, as any man knows who has ever tried to get two other men, or a city council, or a trade gathering, or a legislative body to agree upon anything. Agreement can be achieved only by trying to understand the other fellow's point of view and by going as far as possible to meet it.

Although the road to unity of purpose and action is long and difficult, we have taken long strides upon our way. The Atlantic Charter was proclaimed by the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain in August 1941. Then by the declaration of the United Nations of January 1, 1942, these nations adopted the principles of the Atlantic Charter, agreed to devote all their resources to the winning of the war, and pledged themselves not to conclude a separate armistice or peace with their common enemies.

After that came the declaration signed at Moscow on October 30, 1943. Here the four nations who are carrying and must carry the chief burden of defeating their enemies renewed their determination by joint action to achieve this end. But they went further than this and pledged cooperation with one another to establish at the earliest practicable date, with other peace-loving states, an effective international organization to maintain peace and security, which in principle met with overwhelming nonpartisan approval by the Congress in the Connally and Fulbright resolutions.

Further steps along the road of united allied action were taken at the conference at Cairo, where the President and Mr. Churchill met with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and at the conference at Tehran, where they met with Marshal Stalin. At Tehran the three Allies fighting in Europe reached complete agreement on military plans for winning the war, and made plain their determination to achieve harmonious action in the period of peace. That concert among the Allies rests on broad foundations of common interests and common aspirations, and it will endure. The Tehran declaration made it clear also that in the tasks of peace we shall welcome the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, which wish to enter into the world family of democratic nations.

The Cairo declaration as to the Pacific assured the liquidation of Japan's occupations and thefts of territory to deprive her of the power to attack her neighbors again, to restore Chinese territories to China and, freedom to the people of Korea.

No one knows better than we and our allies who have signed these documents that they did not and do not settle all questions or provide a formula for the settlement of all questions or lay down a detailed blueprint for the future. Any man of experience knows that an attempt to do this would have been as futile as it would have been foolish.

There has been discussion recently of the Atlantic Charter and of its application to various situations. The Charter is an expression of fundamental objectives toward which we and our allies are directing our policies. It states that the nations accepting it are not fighting for the sake of aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise. It lays down the common principles upon which rest the hope of liberty, economic opportunity, peace, and security through international cooperation. It is not a code of law from which detailed answers to every question can be distilled by painstaking analysis of its words and phrases. It points the direction in which solutions are to be sought; it does not give solutions. It charts the course upon which we are embarked and shall continue. That course includes the prevention of aggression and the establishment of world security. The Charter certainly does not prevent any steps, including those relating to enemy states, necessary to achieve these objectives. What is fundamental are the objectives of the Charter and the determination to achieve them.

It is hardly to be supposed that all the more than 30 boundary questions in Europe can be settled while the fighting is still in progress. This does not mean that certain questions may not and should not in the meantime be settled by friendly conference and agreement. We are at all times ready to further an understanding and settlement of questions which may arise between our allies, as is exemplified by our offer to be of such service to Poland and the Soviet Union. Our offer is still open. Our policy upon these matters, as upon all others, is the fundamental necessity for agreed action and the prevention of disunity among us.

So it is with the basic conviction that we must have agreed action and unity of action that we have gone to work upon the form and substance of an international organization to maintain peace and prevent aggression, and upon the economic and other cooperative arrangements which are necessary in order that we maintain our position as a working partner with other free nations. All of these matters are in different stages of development.

It is obvious, of course, that no matter how brilliant and desirable any course may seem it is wholly impracticable and impossible unless it is a course which finds basic acceptance, not only by our allies, but by the people of this country and by the legislative branch of this Government, which, under our Constitution, shares with the Executive power and responsibility for final action.

A proposal is worse than useless if it is not acceptable to those nations who must share with us the responsibility for its execution. It is dangerous for us and misleading to them if in the final outcome it does not have the necessary support in this country. It is, therefore, necessary both abroad and at home not to proceed by presenting elaborate proposals, which only produce divergence of opinion upon details, many of which may be immaterial. The only practicable course is to begin by obtaining agreement, first, upon broad principles, setting forth direction and general policy. We must then go on to explore alternative methods and finally settle upon a proposal which embodies the principal elements of agreement and leaves to future experience and discussion those matters of comparative detail which at present remain in the realm of speculation.

It is a difficult procedure and a slow procedure, as the time which has been required to work out the arrangements for such a universally accepted objective as international relief makes evident. It is a procedure in which misunderstanding, the premature hardening of positions and uninformed criticism frequently cause months of delay and endless confusion, sometimes utter frustration. It is a procedure in which the people, who are sovereign, must not only educate their servants but must be willing to be educated by them.

In this way we are proceeding with the matter of an international organization to maintain peace and prevent aggression. Such an organization must be based upon firm and binding obligations that the member nations will not use force against each other and against any other nation except in accordance with the arrangements made. It must provide for the maintenance of adequate forces to preserve peace and it must provide the institutions and procedures for calling this force into action to preserve peace. But it must provide more than this. It must provide for an international court for the development and application of law to the settlement of international controversies which fall within the realm of law; for the development of machinery for adjusting controversies to which the field of law has not yet been extended; and for other institutions for the development of new rules to keep abreast of a changing world with new problems and new interests.

We are at a stage where much of the work of formulating plans for the organization to maintain peace has been accomplished. It is right and necessary that we should have the advice and help of an increasing number of Members of the Congress. Accordingly, I have requested the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to designate a representative, bipartisan group for this purpose. Following these and similar discussions with Members of the House of Representatives, we shall be in a position to go forward again with other nations and, upon learning their views, to be able to submit to the democratic processes of discussion a more concrete proposal.

With the same determination to achieve agreement and unity we talked with our allies at Tehran regarding the treatment of Nazi Germany, and with our allies at Cairo regarding the treatment which should be accorded Japan. In the formulation of our policy toward our enemies we are moved both by the two lessons from our history of which I have spoken and by the third. This is that there can be no compromise with fascism and nazi-ism. It must go everywhere. Its leaders, its institutions, the power which supports it must go. They can expect no negotiated peace, no compromise, no opportunity to return. Upon that this people and this Government are determined and our allies are equally determined. We have found no difference of opinion among our allies that the organization and purposes of the Nazi state and its Japanese counterpart, and the military system in all of its ramifications upon which they rest are, and by their very nature must be, directed toward conquest. There was no disagreement that even after the defeat of the enemy there will be no security unless and until our victory is used to destroy these systems to their very foundation. The action which must be taken to achieve these ends must be, as I have said, agreed action. We are working with our allies now upon these courses.

The conference at Moscow, as you will recall, established the European Advisory Commission, which is now at work in London upon the treatment of Germany. Out of these discussions will come back to the governments for their consideration proposals for concrete action.

Along with arrangements by which nations may be secure and free must go arrangements by which men and women who compose those nations may live and have the opportunity through their efforts to improve their material condition. As I said earlier, we will fail indeed if we win a victory only to let the free peoples of this world, through any absence of action on our part, sink into weakness and despair.

The heart of the matter lies in action which will stimulate and expand production in industry and agriculture and free international commerce from excessive and unreasonable restrictions. These are the essential prerequisites to maintaining and improving the standard of living in our own and in all countries. Production cannot go forward without arrangements to provide investment capital. Trade cannot be conducted without stable currencies in which payments can be promised and made. Trade cannot develop unless excessive barriers in the form of tariffs, preferences, quotas, exchange controls, monopolies, and subsidies, and others,

are reduced or eliminated. It needs also agreed arrangements under which communication systems between nations and transport by air and sea can develop. And much of all this will miss its mark of satisfying human needs unless we take agreed action for the improvement of labor standards and standards of health and nutrition.

I shall not on this occasion be able to explain the work which has been done—and it is extensive—in these fields. In many of them proposals are far advanced toward the stage of discussion with Members of the Congress prior to formulation for public discussion.

I hope, however, that I have been able in some measure to bring before you the immensity of the task which lies before us all, the nature of the difficulties which are involved, and the conviction and purpose with which we are attacking them. Our foreign policy is comprehensive, is stable, and is known of all men. As the President has said, neither he nor I have made or will make any secret agreement or commitment, political or financial. The officials of the Government have not been unmindful of the responsibility resting upon them; nor have they spared either energy or such abilities as they possess in discharging that responsibility.

May I close with a word as to the responsibility which rests upon all of us. The United Nations will determine by action or lack of action whether this world will be visited by another war within the next 20 or 25 years, or whether policies of organized peace shall guide the course of the world. We are moving closer and closer to the hour of decision. Only the fullest measure of wisdom, unity, and alertness can enable us to meet that unprecedented responsibility.

All of these questions of foreign policy which, as I said earlier, is the matter of focusing and expressing your will in the world outside our borders, are difficult and often involve matters of controversy. Under our constitutional system the will of the American people in this field is not effective unless it is united will. If we are divided, we are ineffective. We are in a year of a national election in which it is easy to arouse controversy on almost any subject, whether or not the subject is an issue in the campaign. You, therefore, as well as we who are in public office, bear a great responsibility. It is the responsibility of avoiding needless controversy in the formulation of your judgments. It is the responsibility for sober and considered thought and expression. It is the responsibility for patience both with our allies and with those who must speak for you with them. Once before in our lifetime we fell into disunity and became ineffective in world affairs by reason of it. Should this happen again, it will be a tragedy to you and to your children and to the world for generations.

POLAND'S POST-WAR STATUS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on April 2 in Detroit, Mich., dealing with Poland's post-war status, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM OF SPEECH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GURNEY

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on freedom of speech delivered by him on the America's Town Meeting of the Air program in Cincinnati, Ohio, April 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAZI PERSECUTION OF SMALL NATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him over Wisconsin radio stations on April 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FORGOTTEN MAN—THE WHITE-COLLAR WORKER — ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Forgotten Man—The White-Collar Worker," delivered by him December 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANALYSIS OF REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL SITUATION

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of the Republican Presidential situation, written by Roy A. Roberts, managing editor of the Kansas City Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLIGHT INSTRUCTORS—EDITORIAL FROM DAVENPORT DEMOCRAT AND LEADER

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Those Flight Instructors," published in the Davenport Democrat and Leader, of March 28, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALCOHOL AS A SUPPLEMENT TO GASOLINE

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a news release under the heading "Farm block plans determined fight to assure alcohol important place as a supplement to gasoline," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FARMER AND THE WAR—EXTRACTS FROM COLUMN OF W. H. McWILLIAMS

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD extracts from the column of W. H. McWilliams published in the Times-Leader of Martins Ferry, Ohio, relating to the farmer and the war, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SIZE OF THE ARMY—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK NEWS

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Big an Army," published in the New York Daily News of March 5, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ARABIAN OIL PROJECT—ARTICLE FROM WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Strong Imperialistic Tinge Seen in United States-Saudi Arabia Oil Project," written by Felix Morley and published in the Wall Street Journal of February 25, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HERBERT HOOVER'S ENDORSEMENT OF GOVERNOR DEWEY—ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding Hon. Herbert Hoover's endorsement of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, from the Washington Merry-Go-Round, published in the Washington Post April 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEWEY AND INTERNATIONALISM—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Dewey and Internationalism," written by Marquis Childs and published in the Washington Post of April 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MOTHER AN' ME—EDITORIAL BY MARK M. SHAW

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mother an' Me," by Mark M. Shaw, from the Greater Nebraskan, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR ALLIES AND US—EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBIA CITY COMMERCIAL-MAIL

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Allies and Us," from the Columbia City Commercial-Mail, of Columbia City, Ind., for April 10, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a convention, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon, with the announcement that tomorrow a motion will be made that a recess be taken until Monday; so Senators may govern themselves accordingly.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 13, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 12, 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Max Waldo Bishop, of Iowa, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

John L. Bankhead, of North Carolina, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

L. Randolph Higgs, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

GENERAL COUNSEL

Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr., of New York, N. Y., to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury, in place of Randolph E. Paul, resigned.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George J. Schoeneman, of Newport, R. I., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Joseph P. Marcelle, of Brooklyn, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of New York, in place of Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE SANITARY ENGINEER DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE APRIL 2, 1944

Lawrence M. Fisher

SENIOR SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTORS EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1944

James A. Crabtree
Lucius F. Badger

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1944

Lloyd F. Summers
Martin G. Van Der Schouw
Randolph P. Grimm

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, who offered Thine only begotten SON to be made perfect through suffering, do Thou sustain all those whose loved ones are giving the full measure of sacrifice in the service of our free institutions. Redeem the sorrow of their grief, knowing that they who give gain, they who lose have, and they who die live. We praise Thee for the heroic constancy and grandeur of our glorious armies as they strive and die for human freedom. Thou who art high above all tumults of the nations and stillest the noise of the turbulent waters, we pray Thee to preserve us as a people from the fateful error of disunity, from the clutch of selfishness, and from the heat of passion. Heavenly Father, continue to hear us:

"In simple trust like theirs who heard
Beside the Syrian sea
The gracious calling of the Lord,
Let us, like them, without a word,
Rise up and follow Thee.

"Drop Thy still dews of quietness
'Till all our strivings cease;
Take from our souls the strain and stress
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace."

In the name of Him who shall reign forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 1, 1944, was read and approved.

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF HON. W. G. STIGLER AS A REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT TO THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS FROM THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. W. G. STIGLER as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Jack Nichols, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STIGLER presented himself before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House in connection with the death of a former Member.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES T. LLOYD

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of Hon. James T. Lloyd at his home in Canton, Mo., on April 3, at the age of 87 years.

For 20 years Mr. Lloyd was an outstanding Member of this body, retiring in 1917.

Ten times the people of the First District of Missouri elected him as their Representative in this Congress.

To know Mr. Lloyd was really an inspiration. He was devoted to his duties, and everyone was impressed by his deep sincerity as well as his character and integrity.

During his service in this House he was chairman of the Committee on Accounts, a position I now have the honor to hold. He also served as chairman of the Democratic Congressional Committee. He was a close friend of the late Speaker Champ Clark, and in his third term was selected as whip of the Democratic Party. There are few here today, like you, Mr. Speaker, who served with Mr. Lloyd. One of the kindliest of men, he was ever ready to pass on his experience to new Members.

Mr. Speaker, for 30 years I had the pleasure of enjoying a close personal friendship with Mr. Lloyd. In 1934, when I was a candidate for the Senate, he was chairman of a meeting held in my behalf at Canton. I will always remember his kind expressions when he introduced me to his neighbors.

Following his voluntary retirement from Congress, Mr. Lloyd opened a law office in Washington. He became interested in civic affairs and was elected president of the Board of Trade and also served as a member of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, returning to the place of his birth, Canton, in 1925. Mr. Speaker, the State of Missouri and the Nation have lost an outstanding public servant and I a close personal friend.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1334), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana reserved all points of order on the bill.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES H. BURKE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House to announce the death of a former Member.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce to the House that on Good Friday last the Honorable Charles H. Burke, of South Dakota, passed away in this city. He had just commemorated his eighty-third birthday on the previous Saturday.

Having served seven terms in this body, the last of which was concluded in 1915, Charley Burke, as he was familiarly known to thousands of South Dakotans, had many friends and acquaintances in this body, and he was a frequent visitor to this Chamber. He also spent a great deal of time attending sessions of the Supreme Court and he never lost his keen interest in all governmental trends and policies.

We in South Dakota had grown to honor Charley Burke as the grand old man of South Dakota politics. His life and accomplishments were a source of inspiration to young and old alike. Having served for 8 years as the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to which position he was appointed by President Harding, Mr. Burke retained up until the time of his death a very special interest in the Indian problem. Not more than 2 weeks before his death he made a special trip up to my office to discuss with me some of the possible objectives to be achieved by the Indian investigating committee recently authorized by this House.

Charley Burke was a resolute, rugged, righteous American. His whole life typified the pioneer spirit which contributed so much to building the framework and to perfecting the functions of this Republic. I recall that on his last visit to this Chamber, less than a month ago, one of my colleagues noted his presence and asked me, "Who is that determined-looking old gentleman with the cane?" I was honored to inform him that the visitor was former Congressman Charles H. Burke, of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the determined old gentleman with the cane is no longer with us and will not again honor us with a visit to our Chamber, but the America which he helped to determine is a better place in which to live because of his clear-sighted contributions to the Republic.

The following is a newspaper report of the death of Charles H. Burke, from Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., April 7, 1944:

EX-CONGRESSMAN BURKE DIES IN NATIONAL CAPITAL, AGE 83—INDIAN COMMISSIONER, 1921–29, HAD BEEN IN ILL HEALTH SINCE JANUARY—LAWMAKER SEVEN TERMS

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Charles H. Burke, 83, former Commissioner of Indian Affairs and one time Congressman from South Dakota, died today after a lingering illness. His condition had been serious since January.

Funeral arrangements will be made after arrival of his son, Walter H. Burke, of Pierre, S. Dak., tomorrow afternoon.

INTERESTED IN INDIANS

Service to the American Indian was one of his principal accomplishments, not only as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, but during seven terms as Congressman from South Dakota. Insight into needs of the Indians, gained from personal experience in South Dakota, enabled him to act resourcefully in matters of national policy.

Born near Batavia, Genesee County, N. Y., April 1, 1861, he was educated in New York public schools and came to South Dakota in 1882, settling in Beadle County. In 1883, he moved to Hughes County and soon established himself as a forceful figure in the State. He studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1886.

CONGRESSMAN AT TWO PERIODS

After serving as State representative from Hughes and Stanley Counties from 1895 to

1897, Mr. Burke entered national politics and was elected Congressman for four consecutive terms, 1899–1907. Defeated for nomination for a fifth term, he came back 2 years later and was chosen for three more terms, 1909–15.

Mr. Burke was an unsuccessful candidate for United States Senator in 1914. He defeated Coe I. Crawford, of Huron, for the Republican nomination but lost in the November election to Ed S. Johnson, Democrat.

APPOINTED BY HARDING

During the war, he was engaged in relief work, and on April 1, 1921, was appointed by President Warren G. Harding as United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He continued in that office until June 30, 1929, when he was succeeded by C. J. Rhoads.

Mr. Burke was married January 14, 1886, to Caroline Schlosser. There were four children, Grace F. (Goodner); Bessie (Sherman); Josephine L., and Walter H.

The former Indian Commissioner was an Episcopalian and a Republican. He was a member of the Elks, Masonic, and Ancient Order of United Workmen lodges.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a newspaper report from the Daily Argus Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., of April 7, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief quotation from an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MRS. MARY McDONOUGH

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit the following privileged resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 497, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Mary McDonough, widow of Michael J. McDonough, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Michael J. McDonough.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. JENKINS and Mr. DISNEY asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

FURLOUGH TRANSPORTATION FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a number of petitions that have been sent to me by mothers, wives, and relatives of servicemen from my district urging the speedy passage of H. R. 1504, known as the Hall furlough transportation bill, which would provide free furlough transportation for the boys in the service.

I present these petitions at this time, and I wish to say that many hundreds of names will follow on other petitions from day to day as they are mailed in to me by the various furlough clubs that have been organized throughout my district. I hope the House will give serious consideration to this bill which has long been pending and that fair treatment may be given to the wives, mothers, and sweethearts of our servicemen, as well as to our fighting men themselves. We owe this much to those who are giving up everything they have for their country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Sergio Osmena, vice president of the Philippines, entitled "Dewey's Naval Victory and the American Pioneers in the Philippines," delivered on April 3, 1944, before the Naval Academy Woman's Club at Annapolis, Md.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Puerto Rico on the subject of Puerto Rican statehood.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two short letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Baton Rouge Times eulogizing the late Governor Sanders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today, if there are any, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short poem written by one of my constituents appearing in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and also to extend my remarks and to include a short excerpt from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTION OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN FROM THE SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, there is not a city in this country of over 50,000 population that today does not find itself with a definite shortage of policemen and firemen. This, despite the fact that every municipality of our country has increased police and fire department problems.

In my own city, the great metropolis of New York, our police department is in the neighborhood of 2,300 men under its quota, while the fire department is 1,500 under its allowed strength. Never in the history of the city have these two great departments been called upon to face such problems as they find today. Our police department is confronted with a wave of juvenile delinquency plus an influx of thousands of noncitizens who have been affected by the hysteria of the war. Our fire department is confronted with the storage of millions of tons of war matériel within the city borders, much of which is of a highly explosive and inflammatory nature. If a conflagration or sudden wave of lawlessness were to start in almost any of our large cities it might develop into a major calamity due to the shortage of manpower in these two correlated departments.

The major reason for the shortage in these departments in almost all of the cities is the operation of the Selective Service Act which does not of itself automatically defer firemen and policemen. Anyone who has lived in a large city knows that these two departments are the first line of defense of the citizenry. Both are groups of highly trained, seasoned and experienced men who cannot be replaced by amateurs or physical misfits. If the Selective Service Act continues to empty these departments of their manpower almost all of our citizens will find themselves in a helpless position against two enemies—crime and fire.

In an effort to alleviate this situation, I have today introduced into this House an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would exclude from the provisions of that law all members of the fire and police departments in cities containing more than 50,000 inhabitants. I sincerely hope that the committee to which the amendment will be referred will give it due consideration and in time will allow the House to vote upon its merits.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial from the Daily Signal of Crowley, La.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Phelps Adams appearing in the New York Sun of Monday, April 10, entitled "O. W. I. Goes Round and Round, Comes Out Here."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the O. W. I. has gotten out a handbook of the United States of America. They advertised it for sale all over Great Britain in the newspapers. The New York Sun attempted through its Washington bureau to obtain a copy of this document and spent about a week's time to follow it up and find it without success. I have a copy of that book and I am going to talk about it more a little later on.

Mr. Speaker, that book is filled with New Deal political propaganda. It is the kind of stuff that those who want to impair the war effort voted for when they voted for a larger appropriation than we should have given the O. W. I.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very recent editorial from the Boston Traveler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, once again I am compelled to avail myself of the privileges extended a Member of the Congress to direct the attention of yourself and my colleagues, whether they sit on the right or left side of the aisle, to a certain segment of the press, which, from its editorial pages and news columns screams for the freedom of the press, and yet, muffles the voices of those who seek to exercise and perpetuate that freedom of expression.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, when the masks of hypocrisy must be torn from the faces of these journalistic Jekyll and Hydes and their perfidy exposed in all its ugly nakedness.

Those of us who love freedom of expression, whether it be on the printed pages of newspapers, through the microphones of the radio, or from the public platform, must accept as our responsibility the task of exposing these journalistic charlatans, less through their sabotage from within, they destroy that freedom of expression upon which this Nation is builded.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, is "eternal vigilance the price of liberty" but eternal vigilance should be the watchword of America in zealously guarding freedom of expression and ever keeping on the alert for the mouthings of those who would march under the valiant banner of such a freedom and yet deny that same freedom to those who do not possess the same, or an equal medium of expression as they.

Remember that as long as freedom of expression lives in this country, America lives. When freedom of expression dies, America dies.

There are some editors and news purveyors in this country who preach freedom of speech but practice it not when it involves them or conflicts with their views.

It is of more than passing interest, Mr. Speaker, that in this connection the editor who derides Congress as a body, and does everything in his power to destroy the confidence of the people in their elected representatives, is the same editor who is usually guilty of the practices which I have described.

These narrow-minded, bigoted men, reeling in drunkenness from the mighty power of the press which has been placed in their mortal hands, vilify, condemn, misrepresent, and even slander Members of the Congress with whom they disagree politically; they ridicule Congress as an institution; they gnaw away at the very foundation of our form of govern-

ment by reckless charges, false and untrue, without fear of correction or repudiation because they refuse to give to those so attacked and maligned the right to answer and defend themselves through the same medium by which they are attacked.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, in making these remarks to even suggest that I would attempt to stay the hand which pens such calumnies. Indeed not. On the contrary, I defend their right to write and speak as they so desire. It is their right under the freedom of expression, which I champion, to write and say what they please. But, by the eternal, Mr. Speaker, I declare that it is equally the right of the attacked to face his accuser on a common meeting ground and to let the people determine for themselves which is right and which is wrong. Could anybody ask for less?

I regard the newspapers and radio of this country as much responsible to the people of this Nation as any elected official who holds office through the sufferance of the electorate. As you well know, I am a newspaper man by profession and I am proud of that profession. It is because I am proud of that profession and because I have always accepted it as a public trust, responsible to the people who are the bone and sinew of this Nation, and who accord me the freedom of expression which I enjoy, that I resent most bitterly any action or practice which would tend to destroy that privilege.

Members of this Congress will pass away. Editors of this Nation will pass away, but freedom of expression will not pass away as long as there are those among us who are willing to defend it every day of their living lives and to expose its traducers as they come upon the scene.

What I have said up until this point has been of a general nature, an over-all expression of the importance of guarding against the strangulation of freedom of expression by those who owe their very existence to such freedom, yet who would deny to others what they themselves survive and thrive on.

I will now become specific and definite in order to emphasize my point to you.

I do not know how many of the Members have in your own district such an individual as I have described.

Unfortunately I have the sad experience of having one in my district and it is my intention to turn the light of truth on him in the hope that others may profit by my experience.

This is not a pleasant duty but I would not be worthy of the confidence which the people of my district have in me if I shirked this duty and failed to place the records before the people for judgment.

You will realize how unpleasant this task is when you know that it involves one at whose knee I grew up in the newspaper business and until recently believed to be one of my dearest and closest friends. Although, because of my newspaper training and experience, I should be immune from shock and should be beyond disillusionment, I confess that I am as human as anybody else and as emotional as any adolescent youth when those of whom I am fond fall from grace. What queer quirk in his make-up has caused his present attitude and complete loss of appreciation of the value of intellectual honesty, I cannot say.

During my entire 23 years newspaper experience I grew up on the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States of New Orleans, La. I knew no other newspaper employment. I knew no other newspaper tutors than those with whom I came in contact on these two newspapers. I cherished the heritage of honesty, fairness, and impartiality. I had particular affection for the New Orleans States on which I eventually became its city editor and from that city desk came to the Congress of which I am now privileged to be a Member. I am happy that I still enjoy a personal friendship with the publishers of these newspapers and some of their highest officials. I also have retained a deep affection for those men and women on these newspapers alongside of whom I worked so long and spent so many happy days.

I worked across the desk from James Evans Crown, who was my superior during the era when he was city editor and who upon the death of that gallant newspaper veteran, J. Walker Ross, advanced in the ranks simultaneously with me. Mr. Crown was promoted to the post of managing editor and editor of the New Orleans States, succeeding Captain Ross, and I succeeded him and became city editor.

National fame came to both of us in what is now historically known as the Louisiana scandals.

Naturally our names were linked closely together. Mr. Crown boasted of me as "his boy" and frequently expressed great admiration for my ability, capacity, and adherence to duty.

There came the day, however, when I chose to support candidates for public office of my own choice and not of the choice of those who told and instructed Mr. Crown which candidates he had to support.

From then on I became politically persona non grata with my old friend and superior although our personal relations remained the same.

In truth politics does make strange bedfellows and those on whom Mr. Crown had showered flowing baskets of bouquets and with whom I elected to continue my association, became the object of derision from the same throats which only a short time before had sung their praises from on high.

In contrast there crawled into the political bed with Mr. Crown many from the political arena who only a short time before had been denounced by him. What an unholy sight to behold. And what tirades were unloosed on those who refused to agree with the position taken by Mr. Crown.

It was perfectly proper for Mr. Crown and his associates to become bedfellows of those who had been denounced by them, but it was an unforgivable sin to associate with those who previously had been lauded but were now in disfavor. It was the old story of "whose ox is being gored" which counted in the ultimate.

I do not dispute the right of any gentleman to change his mind or his political faith at any time he deems it wise. If Mr. Crown wanted to change political face that was all right with me. I do take issue with him, however, when he deliberately misrepresents me in his editorial columns because I disagree with him politically, and then consistently refuses to allow me the courtesy of replying to his falsifications.

Not once, not twice, but thrice did I respectfully request of Mr. Crown the privilege of replying to his editorial attacks on me, and thrice have my pleas fallen upon deaf and unresponsive ears.

Yet this same individual hurls a bully-like challenge at you Members of this Congress that you are not fair, that you are not impartial, that you close the door on those whom you see fit to criticize without allowing them the opportunity of defense.

There never was uttered a more vicious falsehood.

I repeat, repeat, and repeat that I regret it has become necessary for me to resort to this method of procedure in order to get this situation before you, but I have no other recourse. Mr. Crown, by his action, allows me no alternative.

Undoubtedly Mr. Crown will violently abuse me for taking up the time and patience of this Congress and the expense involved, but if a crime has been committed it is to be laid at the door of Mr. Crown's office and not mine.

All this would not have been necessary had Mr. Crown granted me the same right and privilege of freedom of expression which he himself enjoys but which he abuses and most certainly is not worthy of. If Mr. Crown had granted me the right to express myself in opposition to his misstatements and falsehoods by merely granting my request and printing my letter to him it would not have been necessary for me to come before you with this extended exposé of his practices.

The editor of the New Orleans States has closed the columns of the newspaper which he controls to me but he does not and cannot close the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or the right of expression in the well of this House to me. These are the means at my command and these are the means I am using to rip off the toga of sanctimonious self-righteousness from this imposter.

And I repeat the offer which I have made to him on previous occasions, that if he desires his reply to me as a result of these remarks to be brought before this Congress I shall be happy to do so upon his request. I do not refuse to allow him the right of expression before those who hear him condemned. In all sense of fair play and justice I invite him to reply to me. I invite him to ask me to have his reply printed in extensio, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I assure him his request will be granted immediately. I readily offer him a privilege which he has so consistently denied me.

Can he boast of equal fairness and justice?

I will let the record speak for itself.

On Thursday, March 23, 1944, there appeared on the editorial page of the New Orleans States the following editorial which I quote in full.

I ask you to read every line of this editorial and listen attentively to its charges against you the Congress of the United States.

It is a most amazing document, all the more amazing when you come to know of events which not only preceded but supplemented its publication.

Under the caption "Dies-Winchell," I quote as follows:

This newspaper holds no brief for Mr. Walter Winchell, widely read columnist and radio commentator. It does not share his views on some subjects or sympathize with all of his activities. It does agree with some of the things he says and writes. We do believe that he is entitled to the right of free speech and the right of enjoying the privileges of a free press.

Mr. Winchell should also enjoy the right of defending himself against any charges made against him, no matter where they originate. This is the right of every American citizen. It is not observed, however, for those unfortunate enough to come under the ban of some congressional committees.

MARTIN DIES is chairman of the Committee on Investigation of Un-American Activities. He has asked the radio company over whose airways Mr. Winchell gives his views, and the company sponsoring Mr. Winchell, to furnish the committee with all the expressed views of the commentator.

This, by implication, at least, throws the air of suspicion around Mr. Winchell. No effort on the part of the man under fire has been made to deny the committee free access to all of his recorded views. He does ask, however, that he be allowed to appear before the committee to refute any and all charges that may be expressed or implied against him. In all fairness and decency, he should be given this opportunity.

It seems to be the practice of some congressional committees to hear only one side of a controversy, especially when its membership seeks to conduct a smear campaign. Congress is notably unfair in other ways. Any Member can get up on the floor or have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD attacks on the character of a citizen. The citizen has no comeback and no recourse, no matter how untrue or vicious the charges made by a Congressman are. To our way of thinking, this is unpardonable and unjust. It is just like hitting a man when he is down.

Congress has another habit, that of allowing its Members to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD diatribes against those they or their friends oppose politically. Louisiana had an example of this very recently when Leander Perez attacked Governor Jones in a radio speech here, which Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT had incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This was done despite General Pipsqueak's charges having been in a large measure at variance with the facts. No one enjoyed the privilege of giving views in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in opposition to those of General Pip.

A Congressman can abuse and vilify in the strongest kind of terms those he cares to, and the law does not hold him responsible.

When this country denies the right of a citizen to defend himself from accusers, then it is no longer a republic. Mr. Winchell should be given every opportunity to meet any charges or criticism made by the Dies committee or Mr. DIES. He will be if the American principle of fair play is to survive.

Of course I was particularly interested and incensed at the paragraph which alluded to me on the occasion on which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by the Honorable Leander H. Perez, duly elected district attorney of the Parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines in the State of Louisiana.

I was incensed because this was such a flagrant misstatement of the truth and the facts involved. And parenthetically I might mention that the lower courts have upheld the position taken by Mr. Perez and have ruled against the position held by the editor who would be a pseudo judge and legal Solomon. I am not discussing this phase of the issue, however, but am only pointing out what occurred after this editorial appeared.

Keeping in mind such statements made in the editorial as—

Mr. Winchell should also enjoy the right of defending himself against any charges made against him, no matter where they originate. This is the right of every American citizen. * * * He does ask, however, that he be allowed to appear before the committee to refute any and all charges that may be expressed or implied against him. * * * In all fairness and decency, he should be given this opportunity.

Although all previous attempts to have my side of an issue presented in the columns of the New Orleans States had failed I thought perchance that once again the chameleon had changed its color and maybe Mr. Crown would start practicing what he preached.

Hoping against hope I dispatched Mr. Crown the following letter on Saturday, March 25:

Mr. JAMES E. CROWN,
Editor the New Orleans States,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. CROWN: I have before me a copy of the editorial entitled, "Dies-Winchell," from the New Orleans States of Thursday, March 23, 1944, which I quote in part as follows:

"Congress has another habit, that of allowing its Members to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD diatribes against those they or their friends oppose politically. Louisiana had an example of this very recently when Leander Perez attacked Governor Jones in a radio speech here, which Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT had incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This was done despite General Pipsqueak's charges having been in a large measure at variance with the facts. No one enjoyed the privilege of giving views in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in opposition to those of General Pip."

In view of the statement which you have made in this editorial, which is at complete variance with the facts in the case, I am writing you this letter merely to keep the record straight and without any hope of it ever coming to the public's attention through the columns of your editorial page, because in the past you have consistently and persistently refused to practice what you preach.

You advocate publicly giving both sides of the question and privately you refuse to do just that. I have no hope of the leopard changing its spots at this late date because you know that I know exactly what's in your mind and what causes it to so function.

The statement in the editorial, "No one enjoyed the privilege of giving views in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in opposition to those of General Pip," is a damnable, malicious, and deliberate falsification of the facts, and you know it. In a previous instance when you saw fit to criticize me for exercising my legal and moral right in my conduct in Washington I directed a letter to you on December 7, 1943, respectfully requesting that you publish it in order to keep the record straight. You ignored this letter. I then called on you personally and repeated my request and told you that unless the letter was published I would have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to keep the record straight.

You did not publish the letter and subsequently carried a news story concerning my insertion of the letter in the RECORD and deleted from the news story certain pertinent passages from the letter which gave it a false color.

In that letter of December 7, I said this:

"In conclusion may I say this to you, that if it is your desire to have this exchange of correspondence printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I shall be very happy to do so upon your request. Further, if you care to bear the expense of reprinting and addressing of envelopes, such as Mr. Perez did, which was certainly not at the Government expense and did not cost the taxpayers one penny, I shall be very happy to do so upon receipt of your check to cover same."

Could there be a more clear-cut offer to present your side of the case at controversy than this? I think the record speaks for itself, but in passing let me say that this is just one of many instances in your inaccuracy, misrepresentation, and deliberate falsification in your mad tirade against those who dare to express different political views.

Not only have you done this, but to my own knowledge you have deleted from your news columns complimentary items about me from nationally known writers. I guess you call that fair play.

I assure you it is not my intention to get in any controversy with you or any other newspaper, but my sense of fairness and justice revolts at such practices as which you are presently engaged in.

And, making it all the more bitter is the fact that I believed you to be a friend of mine, whether we always agreed politically or not. I can well understand now what Caesar must have felt when he received the knife from Brutus, and not to be sacrilegious, certainly not (but since you are always quoting the Bible) to feel the emotions which Christ felt when Judas walked up to Him and kissed Him.

Undoubtedly you will plead lack of space for somebody to defend himself and keep the record straight, but there is no lack of space when you prostitute the otherwise honest and fair columns of a great newspaper which has a heritage for honesty and integrity.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Leonard Nicholson, editor and publisher, and to Mr. John F. Tims, Jr., vice president, because I am sure otherwise they would not know you had received this communication, and am further doing it in the hope that I can at least shame you into publishing it. I will at least have accomplished something then in my otherwise futile effort to get the facts in the columns of the New Orleans States.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

The letter was received by him on Monday morning March 28, 1944.

Today is Wednesday, April 12, 1944. The first edition of the New Orleans States of Wednesday, April 12, has just appeared on the streets of New Orleans and I am informed there is no mention of the letter nor has there been any mention of the letter from Monday, March 28, a period of exactly 17 days since he received it.

And this is the man who parades himself before the reading public of his newspaper in the role of a champion of

freedom of expression and who writes that in "all fairness and decency" anybody accused should be given an opportunity to present his side of the case.

Oh, but the shoe is on his foot now and it is pinching and pinching pretty hard, so the rule of fairness and decency does not exist when Mr. Crown is to be stripped of his Jekyll and Hyde character and exposed in his true colors.

This is the man who writes in his editorial columns:

> When this country denies the right of a citizen to defend himself from accusers, then it is no longer a republic.

I say to him that when an editor or a newspaper denies the right to a citizen, whether he be a private citizen or a public official, to defend himself from that editor's or newspaper's accusations, that editor or that newspaper forfeits the right to enjoy himself the privilege of such freedom of expression.

If this man be sincere and intellectually honest he cannot reconcile wrong with right. What is right is right, what is wrong is wrong. There can be no middle ground.

If Mr. Crown comes to the conclusion that a country which denies the right of a citizen to defend himself from accusers is no longer a republic, he must of necessity, come to the inevitable conclusion that an editor of a newspaper which denies the right of a citizen to defend himself from accusations made by that newspaper, does not believe in freedom of expression.

There can be no other conclusion and those who would deny the right of freedom of expression deny the sacred principles upon which a republic and a free government are founded. There can be no double standard in the ideals of democracy and the freedom of expression which it guarantees to all.

Mr. Crown is caught in his own trap by his own words.

He refuses to print my answer to his lie. He refuses me the right to answer my accuser.

I told you that on three different occasions the same stand was taken by this man who charges that "Any Member [of this Congress] can get upon the floor or have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD attacks on the character of a citizen. The citizen has no comeback and no recourse no matter how untrue or vicious the charges made by a Congressman are. To our way of thinking, this is unpardonable and unjust. It is just like hitting a man when he is down."

Does he not think he is guilty of hitting a man when he is down when he refuses to publish a letter from a public official he has misrepresented in his editorial columns?

Of major importance is the fact that this refusal to publish communications which expose the fraud of his editorial comment is not the exception but the rule. And this individual prates of fairness and decency and talks about the existence of the Republic. Shame on such hypocrisy.

Now, to prove that this policy of condemning without regard to fact is now the established policy of Mr. Crown, I direct your attention to an occurrence on March 18, 1942, more than 2 years ago.

At the time I wrote my first letter of protest I was totally unaware that the man with whom I had worked and for whom I had a great respect and admiration had strayed from the path of decency and honesty in dealing with the public. It was indeed an indictment of my naiveness in human nature, sophisticated as I thought myself to be.

This first letter of protest and correction called Mr. Crown's attention to the fact that he had written an editorial relative to the stand of myself and other members of the Louisiana delegation on strikes during wartime and had not presented my position in the matter.

The amazing thing about the whole affair was that Mr. Crown had in his possession 24 hours before the editorial was written a telegram from me clearly stating my position. This didn't make any difference, however, to the blatant Mr. Crown. He went ahead and wrote the editorial as though he had never heard from me. Did such procedure reflect an appreciation of the "fairness and decency" which he now haloed around his head?

Of course he never published my letter of March 21, 1942, setting forth the true facts in the case. That, Mr. Speaker, was the gentleman's first transgression of his self-styled appreciation of "fairness and decency" as far as I was concerned.

But I was to learn plenty more during the days to come. Indeed my eyes were to be opened far greater than I had ever expected or anticipated.

On December 3, 1942, I again wrote Mr. Crown a letter, which, in part, said:

> I have just finished reading your editorial of December 1, entitled "Congress Should Act," and I have read it with no little amusement because of the inconsistencies and failure to state the facts. * * *
>
> Positively and definitely this letter is not for publication but only to keep my own records in the matter. I recall on another occasion when I was presented in your editorial column contrary to what the records were and my request for correction fell on blind eyes and deaf ears.

Of course, the fact that I said the letter was not for publication did not make any difference. It was because I was clinging to a small string of faith in the man I believed to be intellectually honest and I did not want to destroy that last vestige; so I gave him "an out," if you please. I gave him a chance to save face by allowing him the opportunity of voluntarily publishing the correction.

Even if I had asked for that particular letter to be published, it would not have been, as witness what subsequently took place on December 7, 1943, when I protested once again against misrepresentation surrounding the insertion of Mr. Perez' speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

When Mr. Crown refused to publish my letter, which again exposed him, I caused the letter which he refused to print in his newspaper to be inserted, as you will recall, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of December 20, 1943.

That was the first time I publicly exposed him and stripped him of the false veneer of "fairness and decency" with which he gilds himself.

He has never forgiven me for that exposure and now has announced that he will drive me from the Halls of Congress. He takes the position of the culprit who has been convicted by the district attorney and swears vengeance against the district attorney as a result.

What meat does this would-be journalistic Caesar feast upon that he feels himself so powerful that he can drive men from this body who dare expose him as a purveyor of misinformation and untruths?

I accept this challenge, Mr. Speaker.

I accept his challenge with the statement that I will be a Member of Congress long after the name of the present editor of the New Orleans States is removed from the editorial page of that newspaper.

I do not desire to engage in any controversy with a newspaper. Nobody better than myself knows the futility of such a procedure. I refuse, however, to take such violent and malicious attacks lying down and without striking back. I would be less worthy of being called a man entitled to public office if I did less.

Let Mr. Crown and his ilk shut the door of response to me by closing the columns of his newspaper to my replies to his attacks. Let him attempt to destroy freedom of expression through such procedure. He cannot and shall not close the avenue of the floor of Congress, and I warn him that I shall walk along that path to the fullest extent. He cannot destroy freedom of expression except in the columns of his newspaper. I mean to guard the freedom of expression as vigorously as he attempts to destroy it.

I am reminded of what a great newspaperman once said of the freedom of expression. I am reminded of what Benjamin Franklin once said, and which is most appropriate to recall at this time:

> Without freedom of thought, there can be no such thing as wisdom. And no such thing as public liberty without freedom of speech, which is the right of every man as far as by it he does not hurt or control the right of another; and this is the only check it ought to know.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the end of my discussion.

I am grateful for the privilege which has been accorded me by my colleagues in being allowed to call the attention of yourself and this Congress to the insidious actions of those who would march under the banner of freedom of expression, yet in practice choke off all exercise of such freedom to others.

The pattern which they follow is the same pattern followed by those who, under the guise of patriotism, attempted to lull this Nation into a sleep from which it would never have awakened had not we recognized the danger of un-American activity in our midst. There were those who preached Americanism while standing under the Stars and Stripes but whose hearts at the very same time were beating in unison with the very things which would have destroyed America and all it stood for.

Mr. Speaker, those editors, that segment of the press which cries out for freedom of expression and at the same time refuses to grant freedom of expression to others is no less guilty of striking at the very foundations of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, long after these editors have gone to their graves unwept, unhonored, and unsung; long after this particular editor has been called upon to answer for his transgressions before the supreme tribunal; long after I have drawn my last breath; long after the pages upon which have been scrawled his falsifications, have turned yellow—the words which I speak here today will live on the pages of the RECORD of this Congress.

I know I will not have spoken in vain if the flame of freedom of expression will be kept lighted by those who are to follow. I know and realize that as long as the American Nation exists, there will be those who will attempt to deny the right of freedom of expression, but I know also there will always be those who will rise to expose freedom's saboteurs who would dare extinguish the flame. There will always be the conflict between good and evil; there will always be a clash between right and wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I have abiding faith that freedom of expression shall not pass from the face of the earth as long as there is a Congress elected by the people, existing on the American Continent. Freedom of expression is as everlasting as the willingness of those to fight for its preservation. The willingness to fight for such an ideal is a precious heritage of every American.

Mr. Speaker, I take my stand alongside the legions not only marching under that banner of free expression but also those legions of fearless editors who are breathing and living, by example and practice, such freedom's ideals and principles.

Mr. Speaker, I demand in the name of a representative of a free people, the continued right of freedom of expression for every man and woman in this free Nation; I demand complete freedom of expression whether that expression be freedom of the press, freedom of the air, or freedom of the forum.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no substitute or limitation on freedom of expression lest this free Nation perish, and it shall not perish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PRIMARY ELECTION IN ILLINOIS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], who just preceded me, it may be gathered that he was displeased about something that someone wrote about him. If two of the Members who were here at the last session before recess, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] were present, they undoubtedly would have filed a protest against wasting the time of Congress. They are not here today. They suggested that anyone who, on the floor, calls attention to the fact that some columnist, editor, or radio commentator has charged a Congressman with disloyalty, is wasting the time of the House; that such charges, whether made against Congress or individual members of Congress, should pass unnoticed, unchallenged from the floor.

The libeling of Congress as an institution, of Congressmen as the people's representatives, has been going on for a long, long time. It is encouraging to me to note that a number who feel they have been lied about and slandered, who have had their loyalty and their patriotism questioned, resent it. I do not feel so lonesome when I hear gentlemen protest on the floor against the unfounded false charges. Some true representatives of the people will not permit such false charges to go unchallenged.

As near as I get it, no Member of this body objects to anyone criticizing him when the truth is told. That is one of the things we must expect when we are elected to office.

As far as I am concerned, if the ones who tell these falsehoods about Congressmen individually, would only respond by submitting to jurisdiction in the district where the Congressman lives so that our people would know the truth or falsity of his charges, that would help and would clear the air.

These gentlemen on the other side, who object when I talk about a certain radio commentator, whose name I will not mention because they say it is a waste of time, would let that gentleman go on indefinitely making any and all charges he desires to make without any answer being made here or elsewhere.

In my judgment, it is time—it is long past time—when this Congress should take some action to determine the truth or the falsity of charges which are made against individual Members, and against the Congress as a whole, which reflect upon the Congressmen in their representative capacity, upon this branch of the Government, and the way it acts, and which impair its usefulness.

Those false statements go out through the papers. They go out over the air. The country being at war, when someone gets up week after week and makes the charge that there are seditionists in Congress—and that charge has been made—when that same individual makes the charge not once but twice, weeks apart, that there are saboteurs in Congress, then he should be brought down before a committee of the House, treated with the utmost courtesy, and asked to produce the proof. And, if he fails to produce the proof, then he should be asked, "Then you did not tell the truth, did you, or did you?" And he should be required to answer, "Yes, I did" or "No, I did not." And if he cannot produce the proof, then he should be asked the further question, "Then you lied, did you not? Yes or no? Did you, or did you not?" When he answers that one, and if he answers it truthfully and says that he did not tell the truth, then he should be asked, "Then you are a liar, are you not?" And upon the record should be spread the facts so that he who is accused, he who accuses, may be branded with a true brand. And those questions should be put to him, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, and then the air would be cleared, and it would not be necessary for us longer to continue the discussion.

Then the gentlemen on the other side, if any there be, who want to lend their approval to this gentleman's false charges, would no longer charge us with wasting the time of Congress.

My purpose in speaking today was to call attention to the fact that the tail no longer wags the dog. New York and the international bankers and those who ask royalty over here to file an application for lend-lease funds, or for ships, or for something else, no longer control the elections of this country.

All too long certain publications, like the New Republic, New Masses, the Daily Worker, PM, and the Chicago Sun—the Chicago Sun you know is published in Chicago, in Illinois, in the great Midwest—have assumed to speak for the people. Marshall Field put some of that inherited money into that paper in order to, as the Sun would express it, educate the people, to tell the people the way in which they should go; how they should vote.

SANE, SOUND, AND FIRM ON THEIR FEET

The financial wizards, the international bankers, those who kowtow to royalty, who think of America last, should have been able by this time to have discovered that a part of our country lies west of the Adirondacks; that we are not a puppet province or dominion of some foreign power, and that the people of the great Midwest indulge in sane thinking, form sound judgments, and stand squarely on their own feet.

Without in any way intending to promote sectionalism—because in this land of ours there should be no East, no Midwest, and no West—it may be said that, while so much of the liquid wealth of this country is concentrated on the eastern seaboard, it is unfortunate that that region should be the harbor for those who promote internationalism at the expense of our national existence.

The control of much of the financial wealth of this country was overlong centered in the city of New York, and it and adjacent cities and territory were the headquarters of many of those who believed that the Constitution was outmoded, the world so contracted by rapid means of communication and transportation, that we could no longer maintain our independence, our existence as a free, sovereign nation.

Powerful, financial interests, able apparently to purchase almost unlimited space in metropolitan papers, rode roughshod over all those who ventured to express belief in the ability of our people, confidence in the efficiency of our form of government, faith in our future as a nation.

Early in the present administration, New Deal spokesmen, like Tugwell, expressed the opinion that the old ways were shopworn, that a revolution was on its way, and he expressed the hope that that revolution would be as bloodless as possible. He said our future was becoming visible in Russia.

WALLACE wrote of the making over of America. More recently, he declared

that those who transact business in New York in Wall Street, were Fascists, and he described a Fascist as one "whose lust for money or power is combined with such an intensity of intolerance toward those of other races, parties, classes, religions, cultures, regions, or nations as to make him ruthless in his use of deceit or violence to attain his ends. The supreme god of a Fascist to which his ends are directed may be money or power; may be a race or a class; may be a military clique or an economic group; or may be a culture, religion, or a political party."

Measure this administration by the yardstick laid down by WALLACE and form your own opinion.

The President himself labeled those who had acquired property by industry, business acumen and thrift, as economic royalists and worse. He sneeringly referred to the horse and buggy days—glorious days in the history of our country—as being days which we should forget.

The supposed virtues of the New Deal were painted with glowing words and in brilliant colors, until it became apparent that it was but a word picture, and then we were asked by its creator to forget the title, "the New Deal."

The New Deal did not cure unemployment. It did not end the depression. It assumed power in 1933 and after a liberal application of it, the President told us in 1936 that "recovery is with us," "factories singing the song of industry, markets humming with bustling movement, ships and trains running full." But, within 6 months, he reversed his position and, in a message to Congress, said that one-third of our people were "ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed."

The New Deal has been tried and found wanting, and the people of this country, in the 1942 elections, gave unmistakable indication that they had had more than enough of it.

Yet the administration went serenely on its way, governing by order and directive rather than by law. The New Deal not only did not cure unemployment, not only did it fail to bring a return of prosperity, it gave us an overwhelming public debt. Today, under it hundreds of thousands of young Americans are fighting on foreign soil, on distant seas.

The people have had enough of the New Deal; they have had too much of it and now, with 10,000,000 men and women in the service, with millions on foreign soil, engaged in a war from three to nine thousand miles from home, they have determined apparently to end the New Deal.

The New Deal having failed in time of peace to solve our domestic problems, the people of the great Midwest at least are in no mood to permit the do-gooders, the professors, the dreamers, to carry on a war involving the lives of their sons and brothers.

The people of the great Midwest spoke at the Wisconsin election of a few days ago, when they repudiated Willkie and his internationalism. The people of the Midwest will back every effort to win this war, but they want efficiency; they want common-sense methods. They want the war to be won with the least possible loss of life, and they are above all determined that no group of internationalists shall substitute for the Declaration of Independence a declaration of interdependence; that no faction, no political party, shall haul down the Stars and Stripes and, in lieu thereof, run up an international flag.

The people of the great Midwest believe in this country; in the ability, the courage, the determination, of our people, just as thoroughly as Churchill believes in the British Empire. Our people respect Stalin because he fights ever with the interests of Russia, his country, in mind.

Yesterday's election in Illinois should be notice to the internationalists, to those who think the Constitution is a dead document, to those who believe that we need an international flag, that our people will not follow advocates of such a course. Cooperation, collaboration—yes. But surrender of national sovereignty, of our independence—no.

About the first opportunity they had to vote since the Sun was rebuked in 1942 was in the primary of yesterday.

Now the Chicago Sun and these other publications that I have named have been after our colleague, STEPHEN DAY, from that great State of Illinois. They have lied about him, and so have these eastern, what do you call them, "housemaids in the house of royalty," people who just go wild when they see a prince or a duke, a duchess, or a princess. Notwithstanding all the charges made against our colleague, notwithstanding all the charges made against the Chicago Tribune—you remember how the Department of Justice was out there investigating the Chicago Tribune to see if that was not a seditious publication—our colleague was renominated. And you remember that the New Deal snoopers could not find anything wrong with that publication or its publisher.

The people out there, when they had a chance to vote for a candidate for United States Senator, repudiated the Sun and all its works.

The issue was clearly drawn in Illinois. The Republican candidate for nomination for United States Senator, Richard Lyons, made a clear-cut fight on the issue of whether we should preserve our national sovereignty while aiding in the winning of the war. His victory was overwhelming.

He has been preaching—I must not say America first, but he has been following in the footsteps of Churchill, who believes that the interests of Great Britain should come first. Lyons, as I get it from what I have read of his talks, believes in collaboration. He believes in helping those other nations just as the United States always has helped to a greater extent than any other nation, or any other combination of nations, in time of flood, fire, earthquake, or any disaster which has come to other peoples or nations. He believes in continuing that policy and going along, but he still believes, according to his speeches, that this country should retain its sovereignty. He does not go along with the idea that the horse and buggy days—the days of the enforcement of the Constitution—of living under the Constitution, are gone. He does not go along with that idea of Tugwell that we must have a revolution. Tugwell was kind about that. He said he hoped it would be as bloodless as possible. Lyons does not go along with that idea of WALLACE'S that we should remake campaign. Richard J. Lyons, candidate for the nomination for United States Senator, supported by the Chicago Tribune, opposed by the Chicago Sun, time and again expressed his faith in our form of government, in our way of life, and pledged adherence to the doctrine of preserving our sovereignty.

So the result in this election out there was that Lyons polled 435,000 votes, while this man Watson, this interventionist, this fellow financed, I suppose—I do not know who financed him—this fellow who represented the views of the interventionists who want our boys to go over and fight indefinitely and for some indefinite objective, that man in opposition to Richard Lyons, who was supported by the Chicago Tribune, polled 68,652 votes.

Our colleague the gentleman from Illinois, STEPHEN DAY, running for the nomination as a candidate for Congressman at Large, overwhelmingly defeated his opponent, Colonel Davis—and, by the way, a very fine citizen. Our colleague polled 308,566 votes, while the colonel, making a strenuous campaign but being, it was believed, a symbol of internationalism, polled but 144,357 votes.

Our colleague, you will remember, has been the target of New Republic, of the Daily Worker, the New Masses, PM, of the Chicago Sun, of the smear brigade, of the Washington Post, William Power Maloney, and all the motley crew which numbers among its members Avedis Arthur Derounian, alias John Roy Carlson, alias George Pagnanelli, alias Thomas L. Decker, alias John Correa, alias Rudolph Kibers, alias Henry Renard, alias Mrs. Frances Olivia Downes.

So we need not worry too much over the home front; the people are coming into their own, the people are beginning to ask when, not in point of time but in point of objective, the boys can come home. They are determined to win the war, but they know that the New Deal failed when the country was at peace, failed to create employment, failed in every way, and they have no disposition to go along now when the lives of our women and our men who are in the service are at stake; when we are gambling, not with dollars, not with property; but when the lives of our people are at stake, they do not want any politically conceived campaigns or methods of conducting war.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. It would appear from the election returns just quoted that the Chicago Sun is setting rather than rising.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It has always been setting insofar as financial stability is concerned; it has been setting on the nest egg of the great-grandfather of this Marshall Field, and it has hatched out,

not a decent, respectable brood of chicks but a lot of vultures.

Mr. SHORT. As the gentleman well knows, of course, and as the American people should know, this paper that is operated at a financial loss has those losses deducted from the income-tax returns of this playboy educated in England who inherited more than $75,000,000 from his grandfather and on which he has never paid any tax at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That may be one of the objectives in operating the paper in addition to vilifying and slandering and trying to drive from public life everyone who does not go along with those who come from abroad who have no use for America, who believe that a crown or a purple robe will cover all sorts of inefficiency.

Mr. SHORT. I think the opposition of such a publication is a help rather than a hindrance. Every kick is a boost. We ought to welcome their opposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; it is not a help. Some people believe what they see in print.

Whatever might be said about the issue in Wisconsin, in Illinois it was clear and unmistakable. The Chicago Tribune was the standard bearer of those who still believe, as do the overwhelming majority of the people of the Midwest, that the Constitution is a clear, sound, living statement, not only of the principles which have guided us in the past but a guide for our future.

The result in Wisconsin and in Illinois proves that the spirit, the determination, the faith, of the pioneer still lives. The great Midwest will contribute of its wealth, its genius, its productivity, its manpower, to the winning of the war, and with just as much enthusiasm, determination, and effectiveness, it will see to it, when the war has been won, that the United States of America remains a nation ready and willing to help the unfortunate wherever in the world they may be found, but determined always that the principles of government laid down by our forefathers shall be maintained, undiminished, here at home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JARMAN, until May 12, on account of official business.

To Mr. HALE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 13, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1373. A letter from E. G. Allen, rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life into the Coast Guard Reserve during the period February 1 to March 31, 1944, who have not had prior commissioned military service, and in the Marine Corps and United States Naval Reserve for the period January 28 to March 27, 1944, inclusive; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1374. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment," approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1375. A letter from the Director, Office of Strategic Services, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Strategic Services; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1376. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period February 1, 1944, through March 31, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1377. A letter from the Director, Committee for Congested Production Areas, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Committee for Congested Production Areas for the period April 1, 1944, through June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1378. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Economic Stabilization, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1379. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the President, the White House, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the Liaison Office for Personnel Management, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1380. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for The National Archives, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1381. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board, for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1382. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the General Accounting Office, during the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1383. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from this Department to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, together with forms executed by various bureaus, offices, and divisions of this Department, reflecting the number of employees estimated to be required during the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944, for the proper and efficient exercise of their respective functions; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1384. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting estimates of personnel requirements for the Navy Department, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1385. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the information for the purpose of making a determination of the number of employees necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Federal Works Agency, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1386. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the War Production Board, for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1387. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the information which has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for his use in determining the number of employees required by this Department during the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1388. A letter from the Director, Office of War Mobilization, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Mobilization, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1389. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1390. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting information which specifies the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Department of Labor and its bureaus, for the quarter beginning April 1, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1391. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1392. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy of the following legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands: Bill No. 1, an act to provide for public assistance and welfare service for the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1393. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1394. A letter from the War Food Administrator, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale of perishable farm commodities below the parity or comparable price, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1395. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

1396. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $4,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, to remain available until expended, for the War Department for rivers and harbors (H. Doc. No. 528); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1397. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters at naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

1398. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

1399. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the foreign war relief appropriation for the fiscal year 1944, extending its availability until June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 529); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1400. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 149 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1401. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 17, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Sabine River, Tex., authorized by the flood control acts approved on May 15, 1936, and June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1402. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 3, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations on a review of reports on Lake Worth Inlet, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 20, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 530); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1403. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 11, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Malheur River and tributaries, Oregon, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937, and by the acts of Congress approved on June 13, 1934, and March 4, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 531); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1404. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $1,139,000 (H. Doc. No. 532); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1405. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 19, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 2, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 533); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1406. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 16, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mad River, Ohio, and Mad River at Springfield, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1407. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 11, 1944, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Santa Ana River and tributaries, California, covering Lytle Creek, San Bernardino County, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 534); to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

1408. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Newport News, Commonwealth of Virginia, a right-of-way over certain lands of the United States at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., for water pipeline purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1409. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the annual report of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1410. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of suits arising under the act of March 9, 1920 (41 Stat. 525), authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty involving merchant vessels, in which final decrees were entered against the United States, exclusive of cases on appeal; to the Committee on Claims.

1411. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of suits arising under the Public Vessel Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1112), in which final decrees were entered, exclusive of cases on appeal; to the Committee on Claims.

1412. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1413. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1414. A letter from the acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions; to the Committee on Claims.

1415. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Hugh A. Shiels, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

1416. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice, for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1417. A letter from the Administrative Officer, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Office for Emergency Management, transmitting its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1418. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting revised estimate for the ceiling unit working funds (other than foreign trade), Bureau of the Census, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944, which is to be substituted for that submitted with his letter of March 29, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1419. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting copies of the requests for personnel needs during the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944, as placed before the Bureau of the Budget on April 1; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1420. A letter from the Chairman, War Manpower Commission, transmitting Bureau of the Budget forms, No. 80-R001.1, for the War Manpower Commission, during the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1421. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting the information with respect to the number of persons needed for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Bureau of the Budget for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1422. A letter from the Director, United States Department of the Interior, War Relocation Authority, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, for the War Relocation Authority for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1423. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the Federal Trade Commission for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1424. A letter from the Director, Division of Administrative Management, National War Labor Board, transmitting a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the National War Labor Board for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1425. A letter from the third vice president, Panama Railroad Company, transmitting on behalf of the United States offices of the Panama Railroad Company quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1426. A letter from the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Executive Office of the President, Office for Emergency Management transmitting a copy of the estimate of the number of employees required for this office during the period ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1427. A letter from the Director, the Office of Censorship, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1428. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the estimate of personnel requirements of the United States Tariff Commission for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 497. Resolution granting a gratuity to Mrs. Mary McDonough; without amendment (Rept. No. 1335). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHEPPARD: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4559. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. House Resolution 139. Resolution referring the bill H. R. 2015 to the Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure; without amendment (Rept. No. 1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 527. A bill for the relief of Mary Hertz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 933 A bill for the relief of Conrad H. Clark; with amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2387. A bill for the relief of John Salfi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2576. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims: H. R. 2601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton and Jimmie Dale Singleton, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2965. A bill for the relief of Ross Engineering Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3388. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of Billie Stooksberry and Lon L. Stooksberry; with amendment (Rept. No. 1347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3739. A bill for the relief of the Wesix Electric Heater Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3859. A bill for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck; with amendment (Rept. No. 1349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4560. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital and home of domiciliary care in central California; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4561. A bill authorizing the construction of a new hospital and diagnostic center in the county of Queens, city and State of New York; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4562. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, approved February 3, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4563. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the exemption of firemen and policemen in cities whose population is over 50,0000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4564. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Newport News, Commonwealth of Virginia, a right-of-way over certain lands of the United States at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., for water-pipe-line purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution favoring the return of members of the armed forces who have served continuously on foreign soil for 2 years or longer to the United States for a 30-day furlough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to assign a veterans' hospital to the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to assign a national cemetery to the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURCHILL of New York:

H. R. 4565. A bill for the relief of Angelo Ferrari; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4566. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Grant Logan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4567. A bill for the relief of William Everett Flake; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4568. A bill for the relief of Hattie Bowers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 4569. A bill for the relief of Charles Scott Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 4570. A bill for the relief of the Eastern Contracting Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5416. By Mr. BARRETT: Post cards from Max L. Hornby, Rev. Henry B. Bondurant, Mrs. F. D. Rutherford, Anna L. Cummins, D. Y. Blair, Mrs. Max Hornby, Frances Gobble, Olive L. Blair, Mrs. J. W. Thurman, Mrs. J. B. Bullock, Birdie Bullock, of Torrington, Wyo., requesting support of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5417. Also, petition of the pastor and sundry members of the First Baptist Church of Burlington; Mrs. Albert Voight, of Chugwater; Mr. and Mrs. H. Parker of Shawnee; and the Garland Sunday School of Worland, Wyo., urging support of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5418. Also, petition of Muriel J. Woods and 34 other citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., urging the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization and petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5419. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Niobrara County, Wyo., urging appropriate action to secure the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5420. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Methodist Church, Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, Mrs. F. A. Ingraham, of Cody, Wyo., urging support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, to take alcoholic beverages from the camps and defense plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5421. Also, petition of Margaret Lewis and 47 other citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., urging the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5422. Also, petition of Rev. Melvin E. Arn and 49 other citizens of Lance Creek, Wyo., and vicinity, urging earnest support of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, and Senate bill 860; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5423. Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Baxter and 29 other citizens of Burns, Wyo., urging consideration and support for the passage of House bill 2082, suspending the alcoholic beverage traffic for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5424. Also, petition of Olga M. Ostling and 426 other citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082 which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5425. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of 154 residents of Herkimer, N. Y., and vicinity, opposing passage of Senate bill, 1161, amending the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5426. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Cle Elum, Colfax, Colton, Eltopia, Kennewick, Lind, Moses Lake, Pasco, Ritzville, Roslyn, Tekoa, Toppenish, Walla Walla, Yakima, and adjacent areas, in the State of Washington, protesting the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5427. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Irene Fowler, Eric Roller, Nell McDonald, Evelyn Joly, Mollie Fitzgerald, Mrs. D. A. Whittington, Esther Bryant, Mrs. W. T. Stubbs, Mrs. A. L. Bohanon, Mrs. C. J. Joly, Mrs. M. A. Evarts, Mrs. Ella Cowling, Mrs. Grady Parker, and Mrs. W. T. Stuckey all of Ennis, Tex., favoring House bill 2400; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5428. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Eva T. Wimmer and 45 other citizens of Robinson, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5429. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of D. W. Kesler and 48 other citizens of Sabetha, Kans., protesting against the passage of House bill 3947; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5430. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Lucas County, Iowa, in the interest of the Bryson bill, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic

liquors, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5431. Also, petition of sundry citizens of University Park, Fremont, and Oskaloosa, Iowa, in the interest of the Bryson bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5432. By Mrs SMITH of Maine: Petition of Mamie E. Benner and other citizens of Waldoboro, Maine, urging action on the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, to lessen absenteeism in defense plants and make for greater fitness in our military forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. William K. Anderson, D. D., educational director of the commission on courses of study of the Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

We stand in Thy presence, our Father, this morning in deep humility of spirit. We are Thy children, but we are hardly worthy to approach Thee. We come seeking Thy forgiveness. Thou hast made a world of beauty, and we, Thy children, have made it ugly. Thou hast filled it with good things, and we have brought desolation. Thou hast made us of one blood, and we have erected barriers. Forgive us, we pray Thee, and grant to us new vision and strength. We thank Thee that they who wait upon the Lord renew their strength, and we pray Thee that we may mount up with wings as eagles, may run and not be weary, may walk and not faint.

We thank Thee for every good purpose accomplished, every noble ideal conceived, every unselfish act performed by men in the history of our Nation and by those who lead its affairs today. And we pray Thee our God that even as our fathers sought Thy wisdom and Thy truth, so we also may seek Thy wisdom and Thy truth. In a day when problems are too great for mankind may we come to Thee and find in Thee the strength, the vision, and the wisdom which we need. In the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BANKHEAD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, April 1, 1944, and of Wednesday, April 12, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period February 1, 1944, through March 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SPECIAL STATISTICAL STUDIES BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FOR OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of statistical studies performed by the Department of Labor for other than Government activities during the period January 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PAN AMERICAN PETROLEUM & TRANSPORT CO. *v.* THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 184)

A letter from the Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, in compliance with Senate Resolution 84, Seventy-seventh Congress, and section 151 of the Judicial Code, certified copy of the court's findings of fact and conclusions rendered on February 7, 1944, in re *Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co.* v. *the United States*, Congressional 17765 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Director, War Relocation Authority, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Administrator of the National Housing Agency (revised estimate), transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
Albany, March 18, 1944.

Whereas this country is on the threshold of a period during which great readjustment and expansion of civil aviation is certain to take place; and

Whereas it is essential for the best interests of this country and the 48 States thereof that we assert leadership in assuring the fullest development of aviation in all its phases, both from the international and domestic standpoint; and

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a civil-aviation bill, designated H. R. 3420 and commonly known as the Lea bill, the avowed purpose of which is to advance all branches of civil aviation; and among other things to assure in the interests of the public the greatest degree of safety in flying activities by the creation of a separate and independent office of director of air safety, to improve the administration of governmental regulation, to codify the civil-aviation law, and to provide means and methods of practical planning for the post-war usefulness of the airplane; and

Whereas objections have been raised to the Lea bill concerning the extent to which it infringes upon the sovereignty of the several States and the extent to which it applies Federal regulation to the operation of airports within the several States; and further, that the provisions of the bill as they codify existing law prevent surface carriers from entering the air-transportation business; and

Whereas air transportation is one of many means of transportation available to the public and its regulation as well as the regulation of other modes of transportation should be considered from the point of view of the public interest as a whole, both Federal and State; and

Whereas the State of New York has always maintained a leading position in the production of aircraft, aircraft engines and accessories, the promotion of private flying, the establishment of airports, all of the foregoing resulting in bringing to this State and to the city of New York the headquarters of the leading domestic and international air lines and in furnishing to its citizens outstanding air-transportation service to all parts of the world; and

Whereas the city of New York is presently developing on Jamaica Bay, Idlewild, a new airport destined to become the world's greatest center of aviation activity; and

Whereas it is the intent and purpose of the State of New York to continue its leadership in the field of aviation during the post-war period and to promote and encourage the maximum development of civil aviation by wholehearted cooperation with the various States and the Federal Government in their respective spheres of jurisdiction; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States as follows:

(1) To take immediately all steps necessary and proper to assure this country's continued aviation progress and to make possible its world leadership in that field; and

(2) To bring about prompt enactment of constructive legislation which will assure to this country equal opportunities with the other nations in the development of air-transport services and equal privileges in the use of airports and other facilities developed in the course of this war; and

(3) To make certain, in the course of enactment of legislation to effectuate the foregoing purposes that Congress specifically exclude from its operation those fields of aviation jurisdiction properly reserved to the individual States; and

(4) To make certain, in addition, that no State be deprived of the power to regulate aviation activities within that State so long as such does not thereby interfere with the enforcement of laws properly enacted by the Federal Government in the public interest; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly,
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI, *Clerk.*

In senate, March 18, 1944, concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the Senate,
WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk.*

RESOLUTIONS BY BUFFALO COUNTY (NEBR.) FARMERS' UNION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter embodying resolutions

adopted by the Buffalo County Farmers' Union, Nebraska.

There being no objection, the letter embodying resolutions was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 31, 1944.

Senator FRED A. MUELLER,
Kearney, Nebr.

DEAR MR. MUELLER: At the quarterly Farmers' Union meeting held in Pleasanton this month, the following resolutions were adopted.

Would you please send these to Senators BUTLER and WHERRY and Congressman MILLER?

"We, the Buffalo County Farmers' Union, in quarterly session, believe that the support price of hogs should be left at the present price and not lowered, as lowering of support prices will curtail production."

"*Be it resolved,* That we, the Buffalo County Farmers' Union, request the selective-service board give careful consideration to the experienced farm-labor situation in making their selections for armed service, where production will be seriously curtailed and in some instances would be stopped."

Thanking you, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HARRY E. CAMPBELL,
County Secretary, Kearney, Nebr.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. REYNOLDS), by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 1844) authorizing the President of the United States to extend the time for awarding decorations to persons for service in the armed forces in any war, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

USE OF FLAX FIBER IN THE MANUFACTURE OF BAGS AND TWINE

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 280), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether any agency of the Government has attempted directly or indirectly to discourage the utilization of domestically produced flax fiber in the manufacture of bags, twine, and similar products, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $--------, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY HON. BRECKINRIDGE LONG

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Foreign Affairs of the United States in Wartime and After," delivered by Hon. Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, before the American Federation of Labor Forum on labor and the post-war world, in New York City, April 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT ON RIGHT OF NEGROES TO VOTE IN PARTY PRIMARIES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on yesterday I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Sunday's Washington Star giving the recent opinion of the United States Supreme Court on the right of the Negroes to vote in party primaries. This article also reprints a previous decision by the Supreme Court on the same question, but which is in direct contrast to the views now held by the present Justices of the Supreme Court, with the exception of Mr. Justice Roberts.

In this world crisis I feel that above all else we must have unity among our people. We are in a terrible war. It is unfortunate indeed for anyone to stir up racial strife in times like these.

During my campaign for reelection last year some of my opposition sought to secure votes against me because I had not used the forum of the Senate to denounce agitators who were seeking to uproot certain customs and procedure in the South with reference to the Negro. I refrained from doing this because I felt that immediately after the atrocities of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor and in the Pacific islands was no time to discuss these issues.

Prior to the war, in my official position, I was among the southern leaders in Philadelphia in 1936 who fought the repeal of the two-thirds rule of the Democratic Party, and again, as the Governor of my State in 1940 I was among those who opposed the interference of the Federal Government at that time when the antilynching bill was being considered by this body. Again last year, when the poll-tax question was brought up, I was one of the southern Senators who were singled out by the Sergeant at Arms to return here to make a quorum for the purpose of passing the poll-tax legislation, which, in short, is legislation against the Constitution, against State rights, and against our southern democracy.

These agitators have continued to work to upset our election laws and our custom of segregation, which has proved mutually satisfactory to the vast majorities of both races in South Carolina.

The people of the South are worried about the war and are using their efforts to aid in every way possible. They have not had the opportunity publicly to express themselves as they would be able to if conditions were different. The young men in the South are absent in the armed forces. For fear that this situation may cause those in other sections to be under some false impression, let me say that the people of South Carolina feel as keenly on this subject as they ever have during the years that have passed.

In fact, not in many years have my people been so much disturbed as they are now. Because of their patriotism they are being taken advantage of by those who are using the war to promote their own ambitions.

In my opinion, these agitators are making a serious mistake, when during the stress of war they seek by law to abrogate customs which are as old and deep-rooted in the South as our civilization itself.

I regret that the Supreme Court has seen fit to reverse its previous decision with reference to the rights of the States in selecting those who are to serve them in public office. This high tribune could not have picked a worse time to stir up this subject. They have abandoned the wisdom of their predecessors.

Mr. President, the white people of the South will not accept these interferences. We are proud of our section. We know what is best for the white people and the colored people. We are going to treat the Negro fairly, but in so doing we do not intend for him to take over our election system or attend our white schools.

Regardless of any Supreme Court decisions and any laws that may be passed by Congress, we of the South will maintain our political and social institutions as we believe to be in the best interest of our people.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BANKHEAD. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until next Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 17, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Philip M. Klutznick, of Nebraska, to be Federal Public Housing Commissioner in the National Housing Agency, vice Herbert Emmerich.

GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Brig. Gen. Joseph C. Mehaffey, United States Army, for appointment as Governor of the Panama Canal, provided for by the Panama Canal Act, approved August 24, 1912, vice Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton, United States Army, resigned.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. James L. Underhill to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of September 1942.

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Watson to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 20th day of January 1944.

Col. Samuel C. Cumming to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 19th day of September 1942.

Col. Oliver P. Smith to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of October 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 13 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

IN THE NAVY

TO BE REAR ADMIRALS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM THE DATES PLACED AFTER THEIR RESPECTIVE NAMES

Donald B. Duncan, March 2, 1943.

Bertram J. Rodgers, January 28, 1943.

Theodore D. Ruddock, Jr., September 29, 1942.

Charles T. Joy, December 19, 1942.

Francis C. Denebrink, March 15, 1943.

TO BE COMMODORES, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Thomas R. Kurtz to be a commodore on the retired list while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Eastern Sea Frontier.

Burrell C. Allen to be a commodore on the retired list while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Western Sea Frontier.

Marion C. Robertson to be a commodore while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier.

Charlton E. Battle, Jr., to be a commodore while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Service Force, Atlantic Fleet.

John H. Magruder, Jr., to be a commodore while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier.

Paul S. Theiss to be a commodore while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Amphibious Forces, Pacific Fleet.

Homer W. Graf to be a commodore while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Seventh Fleet.

Allen G. Quynn to be a commodore while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Service Force, Pacific Fleet.

Clinton E. Braine, Jr., to be a commodore while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Fourth Fleet.

Howard A. Flanigan to be a commodore on the retired list while serving as Deputy Chief of Staff to Commander, Twelfth Fleet.

George A. Seitz to be a commodore while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, Air Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Leonard Doughty, Jr., to be a commodore on the retired list while serving as Commander, Advanced Bases, Italy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou anointed One, who taught truth, purity, and kindness, be not too great for our beliefs nor too little for our hearts. We praise Thee for the greatness which makes room for all and provides home and shelter for even the meanest life; Thou wilt steady us in the last and greatest adventure of the soul. Graciously bless them whose tired feet press courageously on as they thread the labyrinth of life's long lane. Far from the touch of strife, give them sustaining peace and comfort which flow from the loving litany of the pilgrims' chant as they move on to greet the sunrise.

Teach us the repose that is in a life which is responsive to the message of Nature; how marvelous is the vision which it unfolds; grant that the virtues which it symbolizes may enrich and ennoble our lives. Let us share the thoughts of Thine infinite mind and the emotions of Thine heart that the sense of Thy goodness may possess us. When the night is dark and the day dreary may we not be discouraged nor depressed; allow not their trial to leave a stain on the helmet of our courage; be Thou our shield forever. To Thee whose mercies have been over us through the passing years, we devoutly pray for our President, our Speaker, the leaders, and Members of our Congress that all their labors shall be acceptable in Thy sight. All glory be unto Thee, O Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE HONORABLE SOUTH TRIMBLE, CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is fit and proper, I think, that the House of Representatives should pause at this opening hour to pay its tribute of esteem and affection to one of the most popular men who have served it in our time, or at any other time.

South Trimble, the beloved Clerk of the House, is 80 years old today. More appropriate it would be to say that he is 80 years young, for it is only the calendar that runs against him and creates the wholly false impression that he is getting old.

He seems somehow or other to be gifted with perennial youth which keeps him physically fit and mentally as keen as a Damascus blade. As he dashes with sprightly step by another milestone today his friends acclaim him and rejoice, but it is just another day in his busy life and finds him hard at work in his little office room off of Statuary Hall, the room where President John Quincy Adams died. It may be that while he toils he is doing a little dreaming, for the fishing season is around the corner, and fishing is his favorite recreation. He is a skillful fisherman and, unlike some fishermen, he is fair and reasonable in his description of the results of his piscatorial prowess.

The sterling quality of Mr. Trimble's democracy seems to have been foreordained, when, very appropriately, he was born in the same month and on the same day of the month as Thomas Jefferson. He is a deep student and thinker in respect to problems of politics and the public service and is an outstanding authority on the remonetization of silver.

Born in the bluegrass country of Kentucky, a farmer by inheritance and by choice, he got his first bath of political fire as speaker of the legislature of his native State during the stormy and tragic epoch that was high lighted by the assassination of Gov. William E. Goebel. His role in those dark and tempestuous days required courage of the highest order and the young speaker arose magnificently to the occasion.

The Kentucky speakership was the springboard that landed him in the national arena as a Member of this House, where he served three terms, from 1901 to 1907, as a Representative from Kentucky in the Fifty-séventh, Fifty-eighth, and Fifty-ninth Congresses. I was a member of the Press Gallery upstairs at that time and I have known Mr. Trimble more than 40 years. Since he first came to Congress as a Member of the House, approximately 3,000 Members have come and gone. Ten Speakers have been in office, only 2 of whom are now living.

Seventeen times he has been nominated by the Democratic caucus as his party's candidate for the office of Clerk of the House.

One of the confirmed habits of the Democracy of the House, whether it is in power or out of power, is to nominate South Trimble for Clerk. He is the only Democratic Clerk of the House in half a century and is now serving his eleventh term in that office.

He was Clerk of the House during the First World War, from 1911 to 1919, and his present service dates back to 1931, covering World War No. 2 up to date.

As Clerk during these two periods of astronomical expenditures, he has signed bills carrying over twice as much money as all of the bills signed by all of the other Clerks of the House in the entire history of the Nation.

I asked Marc Sheild, who is the world's handiest man with figures, to make a computation for me showing the total amount of money carried in the bills which Mr. Trimble has signed as Clerk of the House of Representatives, and, after considerable pencil exercise, Mr. Sheild reported that the total is in the neighborhood of $470,000,000,000, which is more by almost $100,000,000,000 than the total estimated wealth of the United States as shown by the last census of national wealth.

Mr. Trimble's friends are legion. He has been in many a sharp political fight, but has always managed to emerge without any scars or heartburnings, either his own or the other fellow's, for he is a kind and understanding soul who binds men to him as with hoops of steel. It has been said of him that "the more he fights, the more friends he makes." He is a wise counselor; and if everyone whom he has helped over the rough places of life were to send him a bouquet on this his eightieth anniversary, he would have to move out of his office and commandeer Statuary Hall to accommodate the floral overflow.

I know that I speak the unanimous sentiment of the House of Representatives when I say that we congratulate Mr. Trimble on the fulfillment of a career of distinguished service to his fellow beings and that we wish for him much happiness and success in the eventful years to come.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, our friend from Indiana has so well paid tribute to the Clerk of this House that I can only hope to add to it by seeking to emphasize the significance of this occasion.

After 20 years of service as the Clerk of the House of Representatives, a longer official term in that capacity than it has ever been the good fortune of any man to enjoy, "age has now stamped with its signet that ingenuous brow" of our good friend South Trimble. The records—and only the records—show that his term of service has been so long, or that he has arrived at the distinction in years of having lived 10 beyond the biblically allotted span. He has made good use of overtime.

I know that all his friends on my side of the aisle—and I mean all of them—wish for him, as I do, that he may live as long as he may wish and have whatever and all that he may wish so long as he may live.

Truly, his way of life has not, as Shakespeare has it, "fallen into the sear, the yellow leaf." On the contrary, he is honored by having the love and respect and obedience of troops of friends, well won, whose adoption he has tried.

Mr. Speaker, this is an event and an occasion unusual and historical in its nature, and in fact. It has no duplicate in congressional annals, nor will it ever have one. To be 80 years young and to be Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is an honor and a mark of distinction which never before has been enjoyed by any man.

Incidentally, today is also the anniversary of the birth of the greatest Democrat of them all, Thomas Jefferson, whose memory all Americans revere.

So, South Trimble, salutations and congratulations. I speak for your old friend and colleague, my father, for myself, and for all those who have in days gone by crossed swords with you as a Member of the House, and for those who have been the beneficiaries of your nonpartisan and zealous contribution to their welfare in your capacity as the Clerk of the House these long years. You have discharged the duties of every office to which you have been called efficiently, with fidelity, honor, and great distinction.

I wish you to know that we do not today count a man's years until he has nothing else to count. Age measured in years is not important. It is the man who counts.

So may you live long and prosper.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the tributes paid to our distinguished friend, South Trimble, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], are tributes that South Trimble richly deserves. I know that on this day South Trimble values very much the many friendships that he has made and that he enjoys today, and is thinking also of the many friends of his of bygone years who have taken the journey into the Great Beyond. This is a joyous day for South Trimble and one that should be enjoyed by him and his fine wife who has accompanied him in the journey through 59 years of married life, and their children and their grandchildren. It is not my purpose to dwell at length upon South Trimble himself because that has already been done. We entertain for him that warm feeling of respect, confidence, and friendship which his character as a man and the character of service which he has rendered to our country and to this House so richly deserves.

But, I think in addition to South Trimble, and congratulating him, we might look behind South Trimble. In every person's character there is usually the influence of a mother, and there is no question but what his dearly beloved mother has played a very important influence in his life, particularly in the formative years, in the molding of that great character which he so outstandingly and nobly exemplifies. In addition to that, there is also the influence of a wife. When we find any man who is successful we usually find the arms of a woman somewhere around him. I had today the pleasure of meeting for the first time the girl he married 59 years ago, still young, still a beauty. I was very much impressed, and I could see in addition to the influence of his dear mother the tremendous influence that that dear girl of his, whom he married 59 years ago, has had upon his life. The one thing that impressed me as I went over to congratulate South Trimble and met Mrs. Trimble on that occasion, and the example that was conveyed to me, was the fact that after 59 years of married life they are still a couple of sweethearts. So, I think in pausing to congraulate this great man today we should also think of his dear mother who contributed so much in the molding of his character, but also that dear girl of his, his wife, who for 59 years has been traveling the journey of life with him. They have been blessed with children and grandchildren, constituting a fine spiritual and a fine American family. Mrs. Trimble is entitled to more credit for the great progress South Trimble has made than South Trimble himself. I know my friend, South Trimble, will not take issue with this observation.

To South Trimble, I extend my congratulations on this, his birthday anniversary, and my best wishes for many more years of fruitful work in the service of the House of Representatives, and our country.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a genuine pleasure to rise and pay my tribute of honor, love, and respect to South Trimble. He has been here a long time. He does not serve any more as an individual. South Trimble is an institution in connection with the House of Representatives. He is a part of it. Coming here as a Representative of the great Bluegrass State, an ardent, young, enthusiastic, and capable Member of Congress, he conducted himself well and acquitted himself admirably as a Member of Congress. His people had every reason to be proud of him. Later it was his good fortune to be selected by his former colleagues in the House as one of the officers of the House. He has been for lo these many years a splendid official in this important capacity.

Little can be added to what has been said by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] and others. However, we must not forget that in the life and the character and the daily work of South Trimble he has exemplified at all times the typical American with the highest ideals. A man of learning, scholarly, courteous, refined, a reader of good literature, he adds to the number of the great men who have served in this House.

I am sure that I speak the sentiments of all those on the Republican side of the

aisle, when I express the hope that South Trimble will live for years and years to come, to enjoy the heritage which he has builded for himself and be available to the legion of friends whose confidence he has. The only thing I can see on the horizon that might add a tinge of sorrow just now is that he will possibly—if all indications come true—along with the majority party, retire as Clerk of the House at the beginning of the next Congress. We only hope that when that does happen South Trimble will be one of the minority remaining with us. He helps all of us. We need him. He fights always when it is time to fight, but he never strikes below the belt. Disagreement with him never leaves mental wounds.

Partisan; yes. He is a party man. He is a Democrat, and thank God, I think he is an old-fashioned Jeffersonian Democrat, just as I am a Jeffersonian Republican at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is the hope of all of us that our distinguished friend may live for many years to come, a credit to himself, a joy to his family, and an asset to his Nation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, public life at any time is never an easy thing. In times of great stress and strain, particularly in time of war, when the Nation's fate is at stake, it is a most trying task.

Grow old along with me!
The best is yet to be,
The last of life, for which the first was made.

I think Robert Browning must have had in mind South Trimble or his prototype when he wrote those words, because with the increasing years South Trimble has grown mellow and sweet, and has never allowed any of the vicissitudes of fortune or time ever to make him sour. I can truthfully say he is one of the noblest characters whom I have ever met. The younger Members of this House who have not had the privilege and the pleasure of sitting at his feet and drinking at the inexhaustible fount of wisdom and of inspiration have missed the greatest treat any Member of this House can have.

South Trimble believes that happiness is the only good, reason the only torch, justice the only worship, and love the only priest.

For three terms he served as a Kentucky Democrat in this House, and was not a candidate for reelection, loyal to his party and always patriotic to his country. After that tenure of office, without a single exception he was nominated by his party as Clerk of the House of Representatives, and served through the First World War and is serving now, although he has reached the ripe age of four score years in this honorable body.

I hope you gentlemen will go in to see him, and I wish you could sit down and listen to him expound just for a little while on Henry Clay, who, without a doubt had perhaps the most remarkable and colorful career of any man in American political life, who was elected as Speaker of this House the first day he entered this body. South will tell you a lot of things that are not contained in the history books. Henry was a great boy but South Trimble is a great man.

Because my grandparents on my mother's side came from Kentucky, I am naturally in love with Kentucky, and because Kentucky has more or less mothered Missouri. We recall the Breckenridges and the Clarks and the Stones and the Francises, Hawes, and Crittendens and all the others who came out of the hills of Kentucky to Missouri. I never quite understood why they left Kentucky, except that when anyone leaves Kentucky he swears two things: First, he will never return, and, second, he will not tell on the other guy.

Mr. Speaker, I count it an honor and a privilege to be allowed to say a few words, feeble as they may be, in tribute to a man who has lived a long, honorable, and useful life. Often when I see the people in these galleries who work and toil to pay the taxes to keep us in office, I think that this is just a show window. After all, the Members of Congress do not run this House, it is the men behind the scenes, it is the Clerk of this House, in season and out of season, when Congress is in session and out of session, and these other faithful employees, and that includes you, Kenneth. These other Members of this body who toil in the background without public acclaim, without any recognition or publicity, give their all and their very best for their Government and their country.

So the Republicans and Democrats today congratulate South Trimble, and this aisle knows no line. The richest reward of any Congressman is the friendships he forms here, the friends he binds to him with hoops of steel, because after all, you have gone through the same battle we have. When you have the pitiless searchlight of public opinion turned on you, and survive a primary campaign and then a general election, you know that every man in this body has something on the ball, or he would not be here. Anyone who has served for three terms in this House and then served as Clerk of the House all these many years, since 1901, 43 years ago—oh, what a babe I was at that time—that man has something on the ball. So I join you in expressing the highest personal esteem, the fondest affection, and the very best wishes to South Trimble and to his better half, on this grand and glorious day that he celebrates his eightieth birthday. God bless him and give him peace and prosperity.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am the only Member of the House of Representatives, as now constituted, whose service began simultaneously with the service of South Trimble as Clerk of the House. I was first elected a Representative in Congress in 1910, my term of office beginning on March 4, 1911. At that time Mr. Taft was President and he convened Congress in extraordinary session, if my memory serves me correctly, on April 4, 1911, for the consideration of the Canadian Reciprocity Treaty.

When the Sixty-second Congress was organized, Champ Clark was elected Speaker and South Trimble was elected Clerk for the first time. Thus we began our work in this House at the same time. He had previously been a Member of the House. I have never heard South Trimble criticized during these many years by anybody about anything. He has been a most useful, faithful, and exemplary servant of the House and the people. His ability, his fidelity, his efficiency, and his courtesy have always been recognized by the membership of the House, not only recognized but appreciated. So far as my knowledge goes, but few have served his country longer and none has served it better than South Trimble. He has brought to the discharge of the duties of the responsible position which he has filled all the qualities of both mind and character, head and heart, necessary to make a useful, courteous, able, and efficient public servant.

I am very happy to join in paying tribute to him on this the eightieth anniversary of the birth of this most gifted and useful man.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Kentucky has contributed great men to every western State. Speaker CLARK in recounting their deeds and their greatness wondered what would have happened if all had stayed at home and spent their lives together in their native State. So it is a matter of particular interest that we honor here today a great Kentuckian who in his wisdom and good fortune has never strayed from the bluegrass and bourbon of that noble commonwealth. It is a State famed in song and story for its fine liquor, its fast horses and its fair women. And the distinguished and beloved statesman whom we so delight to honor on this happy anniversary is a connoisseur of all three.

But Kentucky long ago yielded any narrow provincial claims to the exclusive allegiance of this great son of the South, this eminent American. He has become a national institution. Here on Capitol Hill we inevitably gravitate to his office not only for counsel and advice on all Congressional and governmental matters but for any needed information not found in the encyclopedias and for spiritual and intellectual solace and fellowship. And to his sanctum from day to day troop historians, scholars, scientists and savants from all the States and all the world.

South Trimble is one of the most versatile of men. In his office, like Saul at the feet of Gamaliel, I learned the fundamentals of monetary economics, read some of the most fascinating chapters from the unwritten history of the Nation, and was imbued with the evangelistic philosophy of purest Jeffersonian democracy. And never yet have I found

his recollection remiss or his logic vulnerable.

After long and useful service in the House, he was promoted to his present high position where he has had the unusual distinction of serving through two world wars. Let us hope he will never have that distinction again. But his career as Clerk of the House is just beginning. He is serving now as Clerk of the Seventy-eighth Congress and will serve as Clerk of the Seventy-ninth Congress and on ad infinitum. In the language of Joe Jefferson's Rip Van Winkle, "Here's to you, young feller. May you live long and prosper."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, last evening Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, made a very splendid speech in New York City, entitled "Preparation for Peace on the Home Front." I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include that speech.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by George Morris, in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., of April 6.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House tomorrow, April 14, for 15 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative business and after any special orders already entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain recommendations by the Southern Great Plains Agricultural Council.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Colonel Sanders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was granted permission by unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Sergio Osmeña, Vice President of the Philippine Islands. The address exceeds the limit allowed by one-third of a page and the Public Printer estimates that the cost of printing will be $105. Notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the said address in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AN ACT TO PROMOTE THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 498) on the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio broadcast delivered by me on April 2, and also ask unanimous consent to include a broadcast delivered on April 9.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOSEPH A. LAFRAMBOISE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to pay public tribute and to express my admiration and esteem for a very capable public servant in our State and one of my outstanding constituents, State Senator Joseph A. LaFramboise, who has served as mayor of the city of Gladstone. For many years he has served on the City Council of Gladstone, and is now completing his second consecutive term in the Michigan State Senate—all this service as a Democratic incumbent. He has always been recognized as a capable, fair public official—a fearless and clean fighter. Now he has shown exceptional wisdom and extreme political acumen because he has recently switched his party affiliation. I welcome him into the Republican Party, since he has announced his opposition against me for the Republican nomination for Representative in Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in three instances to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), indefinitely, on account of death in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1028. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I would like to see if we cannot agree as to the time to be spent on general debate.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to prepare to consume at least 3 hours in general debate to be equally divided.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, that is perfectly agreeable. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to 3 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] and one-half by myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not, I should like to find out if it is the intention to complete the bill today, because if it is and if the bill is completed, I shall submit a unanimous-consent request later in the day that when the House adjourns today, it will adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that in view of conversation I have had with other Members of the House the bill can be passed today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just wanted to inquire so as to govern myself accordingly.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, unless there is a roll call on the bill, there should be no question about being able to finish it today, as I have only four requests for time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is certainly no intention on my

part to seek a roll call, I assure the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] is recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I am presenting for consideration the naval budget for the fiscal year 1945.

It is the third regular annual naval budget since Pearl Harbor. It is the fifth regular annual naval budget since June 30, 1940, and naval budgets even earlier than that were written under the influence of the imminence of this war.

For the period July 1, 1940, to date, and that period has been used heretofore as the war-cost period, we have made available to the Naval Establishment, including unliquidated contractual authority, roundly ninety-four billions of dollars. The 1945 budget, as it is brought here by the committee, will raise that total approximately to one hundred and sixteen billions of dollars.

They are what we used to speak of as astronomical amounts. They still are, and there is no certainty today that it will not be necessary appreciably to add to them before our enemies have been completely subdued.

One does not have to sit long at a hearing table or delve into a mass of details to learn that the Navy's big part in the war lies ahead, and that the need continues to supply such sinews of war as those upon whom we must rely for technical guidance determine upon as likely to be necessary.

The nature of the war and the tremendous areas involved create demands previously undreamed of.

At this moment, the situation, generally, leaves us pretty much at sea. "If" factors confront us at every turn.

The invasion of the continent of Europe no doubt is not far ahead. It is not going to be solely a military operation. The Navies of Great Britain and of the United States, plus combined air power, bust open and maintain the way. The employment of landing craft of various types will run into the thousands. Casualties among such craft we have every right to expect will be large. Casualties among large ships, too, conceivably may be considerable.

It is something we cannot definitely gage or prophesy. Conceivably we may be turned back, which would mean trying again, and that would entail considerable delay and expense in reorganizing and reequipping.

Conceivably, the operation may be crowned with successes that the most sanguine of our leaders had not thought possible.

Until the operation is launched and we know the outcome, military and naval programs must be predicated upon assumptions that may or may not materialize. As I said before, "if" factors are many, and they cannot be ignored. As Admiral Blandy once said, speaking particularly of ammunition, "it is a misdemeanor to have too much, and a crime to have too little."

Looking to the westward, the march is indisputably on. Great and remarkable strides have been made in breaking through the outer barriers to the final areas of assault. That operation is synchronized with the over-all offensive programed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As the situation in Europe eases we may expect a more concerted and intensive effort on the part of our sea, air, and ground forces. The combination of Navy and Army air power, each of the proportions that now exist—and each is daily growing more potent—may be expected quickly to neutralize all resisting areas and speed the ending of Japanese dominance in the Orient.

We cannot expect the Navy and its team members—the Marines and the Coast Guard—to do the job alone or in conjunction with such ground forces as presently are available. In all history, the record is that ground forces, in the end, must finish the job and maintain subjugation until final determination has been made of the course to be followed by those with whom decision may be vested.

As to the over-all offensive, Mr. Chairman, we may reconcile ourselves to the fact that there will be set-backs; that the timetable here and there must give way. The enemy, unfortunately, does not always accommodate himself to his opponents' plans.

Such set-backs result in set-backs of reduced war budgets. This is inevitable. But, if the march goes forward on all fronts, closely conformable to schedule, I think the time is not far ahead when we may expect a marked decline in future money demands.

I say that because then there could be a marked contraction in shipbuilding costs and airplane building costs. There could be contraction in personnel training programs; there could be contraction in many shore activities, and it is possible that combat maintenance preparations will have been sufficiently met to permit of appreciable curtailment.

People wonder, no doubt, over the size of past appropriations, and why they must be added to so largely. I think it would be interesting to point out some of the contributing factors, Mr. Chairman.

It has been necessary to guard the lines of communications on both coasts, through the Caribbean, about the Canal, to South America, Alaska, Hawaii, Australia, and New Zealand. It has been necessary to protect the lifeline to England, to engage in landings, and support military operations in Africa, Sicily, Naples, and sooner or later, those that will create the second front. Fighting and conquering the submarine menace has been a Herculean task, not yet finished. The job ahead in the Pacific is manifest to everyone who reads. To accomplish the objective, which Admiral King has said to be the destruction of the Japanese Empire, the admiral further said that—

> We must deliver the heaviest attacks of which we are capable, as soon and as often as possible, where it will hurt the most. This will require every ship, every landing craft, every airplane, and every piece of material—and the trained personnel to man them—that can be made available.

Such a vast and ramifying task has called for thousands of vessels of all kinds, thousands of airplanes, a tremendous shore establishment, the procurement and training of great numbers of officers and enlisted men, great quantities of ammunition for sea and air forces, and great quantities of other expendables.

Preparing for and executing such tasks—tasks that never before have confronted any Navy—are the answers for the great amounts of cash and contractual authority heretofore voted. I should like to give you the general objects for which the cash amounts have been and are now proposed to be made available:

	Fiscal years 1941–44	Proposed for 1945	Total
Personnel	$9,394,814,708	$6,229,919,172	$15,624,733,880
Maintenance and operation of fleet	18,952,319,749	5,710,000,000	24,662,319,749
Aviation	16,483,470,520	4,600,640,000	21,084,110,520
New ships	20,546,650,736	8,029,000,000	28,575,650,736
New shore construction	5,432,982,361	281,060,000	5,714,042,361
U. S. Marine Corps	2,291,547,991	1,144,000,000	3,435,547,991
U. S. Coast Guard	1,305,678,694	438,406,231	1,744,084,925
Miscellaneous	225,440,746	58,177,533	283,618,279
Total	74,632,905,505	26,491,202,936	101,124,108,441

The employment of that vast sum, actual and projected, has been detailed heretofore, and in the hearings on the 1945 Budget, to the extent that the Navy Department has deemed appropriate.

The Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1940, which commenced on July 1, 1939, immediately preceded the appropriation acts for the period covered by the foregoing table. It carried appropriations totaling $773,049,151. That fiscal year is used as the nearest normal one to the fiscal year (1941) in which we became involved in war, and I wish to use it to convey to you, by comparison, why appropriations of such

magnitude have been and continue to be necessary. I realize, as all of you, I am sure, do, that such comparisons will not give the whole answer, because costs are not the same under war conditions and neither are the products, and much of the larger cost grows out of improved or entirely new implementation.

These comparisons, I am sure, will be of interest:

The 1940 act provided for a naval personnel strength of 126,271. For 1945, the corresponding total is 3,006,000.

The 1940 act provided for a Marine Corps personnel strength of 19,924. For 1945 the corresponding total is 478,000.

The 1940 act provided for the operation of 340 naval vessels. For 1945, the projected total is 6,623 and, in addition, there will be available for employment a total of 74,925 non-self-propelled craft.

The 1940 act provided for the operation of 1,454 airplanes of all types—less than the number used on a single bombing raid on the continent of Europe. For 1945 the number will exceed 24,000.

While referring to airplanes, let me call your attention to the following which is indicative of why we cannot reach and maintain certain levels of implementation. Just the other day on a raid over Germany we lost 80 planes. Out of the 80 planes 64 were bombers. The bombers cost completely equipped approximately $19,000,000. Sixteen fighters also were lost and a fair estimate of their cost would be $1,280,000, making a total monetary loss in that one instance alone of around $20,000,000. Let me say also, Mr. Chairman, that those losses do not take into consideration the fact that many of the planes returning from the operation will be tied up for an indefinite length of time for repairs, all of which means additional cost. This is merely one incident in the over-all program, but quite apropos to conditions we must consider and weigh as we pass upon the appropriations presented in this bill.

The 1940 act appropriated $270,000,000 for new ship construction. For 1945 the amount proposed is $8,029,000,000.

Such comparisons should suffice to illustrate why naval budgets have reached such huge proportions, and, also, Mr. Chairman, why it is necessary still to appropriate further inordinate amounts.

The bill I am now presenting is based upon Budget estimates calling for a total of $28,069,819,500 of cash for the fiscal year 1945.

In that amount there is $10,501,060,000 for the liquidation of prior contractual authority. That applies mostly to ships, but it includes, also, $1,991,000,000 for airplanes, $281,060,000 for shore facilities, and $145,000,000 for floating dry docks and vessel-repair facilities.

The remainder—namely, $17,568,759,500—is for—

First. Naval personnel, and that is a big item. The total is $6,252,848,000.

Second. For maintenance and operation of the fleet, which has assumed, as I have indicated, very large proportions.

Third. For maintenance and operation of the fleet air arm.

Fourth. For the support of the Marine Corps.

Fifth. For financing Coast Guard activities.

And I should like to say in passing as to the two latter activities, Mr. Chairman, that they have performed and are performing a truly wonderful service. We hear much of the Navy in the communiques, but we must remember that these two organizations are members of the team, and very important and indispensable members.

The details entering into the funds for such purposes and activities are multitudinous, presented to us in several volumes.

Apart from the building programs—vessels, aircraft, and shore establishments, the cost is dictated by operating programs worked out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There will be an increase over the current fiscal year in the number of ships operating. The number will increase from 5,290 to 6,623.

There will be a staggering increase in the number of vessels of the landing-craft type, and in the general category of non-self-propelled craft. The number will go up from 53,973 to 74,925.

There will be an increase in operating aircraft. The total number, apart from training planes, will be 19,035, and, in that connection, I wish to emphasize that increased weight and horsepower has added very greatly to operating costs. I might say here that the Navy's presently established airplane objective is 37,735.

Such increases, Mr. Chairman, all make necessary larger ground facilities; larger forces for the operation of such facilities, and they all require more service personnel, and that means training that personnel.

In our examination of the Budget estimates we had before us all of the civilian heads of the Department, Admiral King, Vice Admiral Horne, and all of the Bureau chiefs, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and many officers and civilians subordinate to such officials. We do not hear much of these keymen, Mr. Chairman. The men out on the fronts get the headlines, and they certainly earn them, but, after all, it is very largely the wisdom, the industry, and the great devotion to duty of the Washington leadership that have enabled those in the field to perform with such distinction.

We have made some reductions. The Department itself volunteered some in consequence of changes in original estimating factors. Frankly, some of our reductions may not endure because of dependence upon the progress of the war. I am sure there will be no fault found with procedure of that kind, because I think all of us would prefer to have the Department officials come back when they may be more definite about needs, rather than to provide them with amounts which may or may not be needed.

We have shunned reductions for facial effect. That course could be pursued in connection with any bill, but it just does not make sense in cases where all signs point to the need for the money, such as the liquidation of previously authorized obligations.

We have made a reduction of $800,000,000 by transferring from cash to contractual authority under aviation. The Budget estimates include $2,800,000,000 of contractual authority under aviation, and we have increased that amount to $3,600,000,000, because it is quite evident that the money will not be needed for disbursement prior to the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1945. We can even hope that some of it never may be needed, which is conceivable should the war proceed on a time schedule such as we all should like to see maintained.

All of the reductions the committee proposes are listed in the table commencing on page 6 of the report. Most of them speak for themselves. I see no need to make any special comment concerning them.

There are one or two about which I should like to say a word.

The Budget proposes an appropriation of $2,720,000 under the head of "Operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserves." Of that amount, $1,670,000 concerns naval petroleum reserve No. 1, in California. Such amount anticipates legislation dealing with such reserve, and has been eliminated for that reason. What to do with the California reserve has been a problem before the Naval Affairs Committee for several months. My information is that a recommendation will be forthcoming from such committee in the not distant future. It is due private concerns interested and the public welfare that the matter be promptly settled.

Over and above the normal amount of $50,000 for administering the several oil reserves, the committee is recommending approval of the Budget estimate of $1,000,000 for ascertaining the oil possibilities of a vast area in Alaska, comprising 35,000 square miles. Oil seepages have been located within the area, and the appropriation is intended to finance such measures as may be necessary to establish the possibilities of the area as a future source of supply for military needs.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. As a matter of fact, you have had hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee for weeks on this proposed bill; is that right?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am not a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. However, I have been informed by the Chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that there have been quite extensive hearings held with regard to a course of action respecting reserve No. 1. Whether or not they have been completed I am not in position to tell the gentleman.

Mr. PITTENGER. The bill that we are now considering has the endorsement of the officials of the Navy Department; is that correct?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have not consulted the Department since the bill was reported.

Mr. PITTENGER. I have reference to the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand. The reductions that this committee has made of its own volition were not made in consultation with anybody in the Navy Department. I am sure the gentleman appreciates that. They are determined upon by us, predicated upon justifications presented by officials of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. DIMOND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. I would like to inquire whether the bill now under consideration carries any money for oil exploration in the Territory of Alaska?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, I am glad to say to my friend, we have included $1,000,000 for the purpose of exploring a large area bordering the Arctic Ocean in the vicinity of Point Barrow to determine whether or not we have an oil deposit up there that may prove of value primarily as a naval petroleum reserve. I may say to the gentleman, having been in that country in past years, that the prospects are encouraging. It may turn out to be of benefit to the entire Nation.

Public works is another subject I should like to discuss for a moment. Just before the Easter recess a new public-works bill was passed authorizing appropriations of $1,019,000,000 for advance bases and $625,373,024 for projects of various kinds within continental United States. All of the projects in the latter category will be found listed in House of Representatives Report No. 1255, of the present session.

Pursuant to such legislation, a Budget request has been presented for authority to enter into contracts up to $1,000,000,000 for advance bases, and $500,000,000 for projects within continental United States, selection of the projects within the whole amount to be left to determination by the Navy Department.

The committee has approved the Budget submission pertaining to advance bases, but has reduced the amount for projects in continental United States to $474,931,400. That is a reduction of $25,068,600, and it is in no sense arbitrary. For instance, the authorization act includes projects for the Naval Academy, estimated to cost $11,395,000. Not a single superior administrative official of the Navy Department advocated going ahead with such projects. Such law authorizes a number of other projects, which it would be most difficult to classify as essential to the conduct of the war. It is the committee's understanding that the authorization law includes projects which neither the advocates nor proponents thereof intended should be proceeded with at this time. Very largely, the reduction proposed by the committee ensues from the fact that it has found that the Navy Department had not made a canvass of existing properties or facilities, publicly or privately owned, which might be utilized in place of building new or enlarging existing establishments. The committee learned that the War Department was prepared to release a number of properties which may or may not prove to be suitable for the uses proposed. Both the authorization and the Budget estimates preceded such a canvass. At the instance of the committee, the Department has embarked upon a survey of properties, publicly and privately owned, which may be available and usable, even though some additional expenditure may be necessary to adapt them to naval requirements, and it is hoped that such a survey may prove fruitful. A goodly portion of the reduction proposed anticipates that it will.

The committee does not wish to leave the impression that the Navy Department has not availed itself in the past of properties which the War Department has found itself without further need. Several such properties have been taken over and steps are in progress looking to the utilization of others. These, however, are independent of the needs contemplated by the new authorization.

The committee has attached to the bill a provision requiring, as a condition precedent to undertaking or proceeding with new projects, ascertainment of the fact that suitable properties of facilities, publicly or privately owned, are not available.

Apart from 1945 appropriations, the committee has had under consideration supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $1,081,000,000, and we have included that amount in title II of the bill.

Such additional amount ensues for the most part from personnel expansion in excess of that originally contemplated, and such enlarged program dovetails into the program projected for the fiscal year 1945, and for which the bill under consideration makes provision. Apart from personnel, changed situations occasion an additional amount of $125,000,000 under "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," which supports both fleet and shore establishments, for fuel and transportation, $77,400,000, and for transportation of material, $135,000,000. Such additional amounts are thoroughly justified in the opinion of the committee.

The committee gave considerable attention to naval procurement procedure, because it feels that economies—possibly large economies, would flow from a consolidation of procurement in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts to the extent that such Bureau handled procurement prior to the war, and if there would be a resumption of the old-fashioned form of competitive bidding in all but a few isolated cases where there is warrant for negotiating fixed-price contracts. It is true that the employment of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee type of contract has very greatly diminished, but there seems to prevail a belief that the time has not yet arrived for its complete abandonment.

As to either of such procedures, the committee is not prepared to take the initiative to the extent that it might do so under the rules, because there always is present the responsibility of requiring a course that might turn out to be hurtful to the war effort. The committee is convinced, however, that the former procurement procedure can and should be gradually resumed and completely resumed before the close of the ensuing fiscal year, and that the end of such fiscal year should see the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract completely discarded. The department's course toward such ends will be carefully followed.

Mr. Chairman, that covers about all I care to say at this time.

The bill, in my judgment, is well proportioned and calls for no larger amount than conditions presently obtaining warrant. It will give to those in whom we must place dependence for victory the personnel and matériel they have requested for carrying on, and I know I am unanimously joined in wishing them Godspeed.

Before concluding, I should like to say that I am deeply grateful to the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for the splendid cooperation they gave me throughout the extensive hearings and for the patience they have all had, and I want to pay especial tribute to Mr. John Pugh for the splendid assistance he has given to the subcommittee throughout the entire proceedings.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I placed in the RECORD an article from the New York Sun, entitled "O. W. I. Goes Round and Round" and relating to the efforts that the New York Sun made to obtain a copy of the handbook entitled "A Handbook of the United States of America." I have that book here. It is printed on thin paper.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. TABER. I hope the gentleman will not press it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw the point of order for the present.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have that book here. You see it has two covers on the outside, both front and back. It has two charts showing the executive branch of the Government and how it operates.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Does it give the number of employees?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no. I wish to read a few lines from that article in the New York Sun:

> This is a simple little story about an editor who was so innocent and so naive as to suppose that an American taxpayer has a perfect right to read the propaganda he is paying the O. W. I. to produce. This editor, while glancing casually through the pages of a British newspaper, noticed an advertisement which read:
>
> "Produced by the United States Office of War Information.
>
> "A handbook of the United States of America.
>
> "This is a book written to promote a clear understanding of America. The Office of War Information has compiled this handbook in the hope that it will be of value to the British public."

After looking it over, I am not a bit surprised that the New York Sun or any other American outfit would be given the run-around when they tried to obtain a copy. It starts off with two charts which are seemingly required to show how small the legislative branch of the Government is and how big the Presidency is.

On page 2, I quote:

> Even in less critical periods, the Nation in the twentieth century has come to expect the President to take the lead. Increasingly the President has become a legislative leader, setting a definite program before Congress and using his influence to secure its enactment into law.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Could the gentleman inform the House as to how Members of Congress might be able to secure a copy of that book?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. I asked for it and got it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Whom did the gentleman ask for it?

Mr. TABER. Elmer Davis.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. You asked Mr. Davis personally?

Mr. TABER. By letter.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. On page 4, I quote:

> The general approval of the American people and the frequent congressional recognition and ratification of Presidential action under the emergency powers have conclusively answered the objections of those who would construe the Constitution so narrowly as to make the President powerless in a time of national crisis.

We all know that many of the vicious, dangerous, and destructive operations of the Roosevelt administration have come as a delegation of power. The direct legislation that has been passed by Congress has been bad largely because of bad and dishonest administration, and the operations of Executive orders have been utterly destructive.

The National Recovery Administration and its wrecking of enormous numbers of small businesses and large businesses; the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the slaughtering of little pigs—both of which were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court—are samples of false statements contained in the book.

On page 2 appears half a column on the House of Representatives, half a column on the Senate, and then it begins with the Presidency and runs into the top of page 5. Then it begins to describe the executive agencies.

Notwithstanding the fact that the book was written and published in January 1944 there were large paragraphs devoted to the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, the Work Projects Administration, and the National Resources Planning Board. These were amongst the major rackets of the New Deal. They were utterly destructive and designed to destory the moral and the character of the American people. Finally Congress, obtaining a little courage following the elections of 1938 and 1942, killed them off.

The book was advertised for sale in Great Britain and was evidently designed to promote the establishment of the Hitler type of government with the executive holding all the power, rather than the people under the authority of the Constitution and the Congress. I would presume that the British would be smart enough to recognize the propaganda character of the document and that it was designed to promote the Hitler type of government.

Beginning on page 33 is a chronology of American history. It takes to the middle of the first column on page 37—4¼ pages—to describe the history of America from the year 1000, when Lief Ericson discovered it, down to 1933. From 1933 to date requires 10¾ pages, indicating what a great man Mr. Roosevelt is.

The only slip that I can see in their glorification program, although they do not mention it in that way, is the signing by the President of the Neutrality Act in 1935 and 1937 which had more than anything else to do with getting us into the war, because it was a declaration to Mr. Hitler that we were afraid and that is never the way to keep out of trouble. It abandoned our claim to the freedom of the seas.

It is perfectly apparent that the funds appropriated to the Office of War Information for the fiscal year 1944 have been abused and wasted, not only in the compiling of this book but in the ring around and administrative incompetence represented by the failure of the New York Sun after many days, to be able to get information about this document. It is evident that those who were contacted by the Sun are either incompetent or else are operating under orders to deceive the American public. It is evident that there are very many on the pay roll of the O. W. I. who are of no value to the war effort.

Yesterday's papers carried stories of these high-salaried foreign employees of the O. W. I. doing work that a sergeant could do without the least bit of difficulty. It is apparent that the appropriation for the O. W. I. is not an appropriation to further the war effort, and that it has been used to upset and destroy morale of our troops.

I might say that those who have had experience across the water do not rate the O. W. I. as very high in its propaganda efficiency. Nothing could come nearer proving the case against the O. W. I. than that they clearly are ashamed of the book and did not want it to reach the American public where its faults and its idiosyncrasies could be developed.

I wonder how many thousands of dollars they wasted on editing and printing this book and others like it. We only run into a few of the rackets by accident but we run into so many that it makes us believe that the whole thing is a racket. Those who voted to give them more money than they should have were contributing and helping, not only with the waste of the Government funds but to make America ridiculous.

Just so we may know that they were ashamed of having our people find out about it, let me read a little red slip that is pasted on to the book:

> Restricted: This publication is not for distribution in the United States or to American civilian or military personnel overseas.

They did not want the American people to know how they were fooling away our money.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I notice from the frontispiece of the publication that it is issued by the Overseas Branch of O. W. I., but I notice that the foreword is signed only by the editors. Does the gentleman have any information as to the individuals who prepared this book or who are its authors?

Mr. TABER. No. I thought we might be able to find that out, so as to have a clue as to the places the appropriation estimate might be cut.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman's committee inquire as to the authors and as to the number of these books published?

Mr. TABER. We certainly will.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I inquire whether this book was printed in any language other than English?

Mr. TABER. I hope to find out. I do not know.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps the gentleman has noticed in connection with the publication of the Victory magazine, which is supposedly designed for propaganda purposes in foreign countries, that most of these books are printed in English, or, rather, I should say more are printed in English than in any other language.

Mr. TABER. That would be so. There are 178 pages in this book, and it is rather fine print, so that you can see it is a very substantial-sized book.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, that publication, printed in English, would be of no benefit in the case of countries where English is not spoken.

Mr. TABER. Not at all.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Consequently, inasmuch as it is printed in English, it is evidently being used to a wide extent in Great Britain, an Allied nation.

Mr. TABER. That is the inference to be drawn from the advertisement the New York Sun found in a British paper.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In the gentleman's opinion, is it necessary for the United States to expend public funds to propagandize Great Britain, an ally?

Mr. TABER. One would not naturally think so. I do not believe it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman have any knowledge as to the goal we may be seeking in propagandizing the British people with this sort of material?

Mr. TABER. The only thing I could think of was that the natural inference to draw is that it is an attempt to sell the Hitler type of government, with the

Executive having complete control. That is the only inference I can draw from it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps the gentleman has noticed that I have introduced in the House, and now have pending before the Committee on Rules, House Resolution 431, to investigate certain propaganda activities of O. W. I. and other governmental agencies. I wonder if the gentleman would care to express himself as to the need for having an investigation of that type or a complete investigation of O. W. I.

Mr. TABER. I would think there should be a very complete investigation of O. W. I. As I understand it, the Committee on Rules has not yet reported it out. I would presume that the gentleman, being a prominent member of that committee, would know more about the operation there than I would. I would hope that resolution might be reported out so that the public may have an opportunity of finding out what their money is being used for.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For the information of the gentleman and for the information of the House, I might state that the chairman of the Committee on Rules did see fit to call Mr. Davis as a witness on that resolution 2 days after I had left the city on official business and after I had notified the chairman of the Committee on Rules that I would be absent and had specifically requested that no consideration be given to the resolution during my absence.

Mr. TABER. Perhaps it might be considered a little later. Of course, there are those who feel that we should be careful about spending money for investigations, but we have to take into consideration the fact that Mr. Davis is asking for $64,000,000 in a budget estimate and that is probably a great many times the amount that an investigation would cost, and that the investigation ought to be able, if it is handled intelligently, to save millions of dollars.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. From the time that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has served in the House and in view of his long service on the Committee on Appropriations, has it not been his observation that often an investigation which costs some money results in saving a great deal more money for the taxpayers?

Mr. TABER. It does save a great deal of money a good many times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio, who is a member of the Committee on Rules, if he recalls that during the latter days of our session, just before the recess, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who is chairman of the Committee on Rules, objected to the fact that we were not transacting business here in the House but "wasting time," as he called it. Does the gentleman from Ohio know where his chairman is today and whether or not he is giving consideration to the resolution that was introduced?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not certain, of course, where the chairman of the Committee on Rules is today, but in a meeting of the Committee on Rules from which he was absent I was informed he was still at his home in Chicago.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You mean in Illinois?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In Illinois, yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The subject under discussion has to do with the expenditure of money; is that true?

Mr. TABER. It does.

Mr. COCHRAN. Under the authority already granted to the Committee on Appropriations, plus an allowance of $100,000 to make investigations, why cannot your committee look into this question without having another special investigating committee?

Mr. TABER. We are doing the best we can to investigate all of these activities, but I would call attention to the fact that we are expected to report a war agencies bill, and our schedule at the present time calls for continuous hearings day after day from 10 o'clock in the morning until 5:30 at night on different war agencies, and we are able to allot out of that time but 2 days to the O. W. I. That is the picture we are presented with and that is probably the reason why we cannot make as thorough an investigation as should be made on the O. W. I.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. COCHRAN] who was formerly chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, let me say that that committee, which ordinarily would investigate some of this waste, extravagance, and incompetency in the administration, has been completely muzzled for a number of years and the gentleman while chairman, as I recall, and while these other committees which are investigating some of these activities were being formulated, never did the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments do any investigating. If it had been permitted to function, perhaps some of these committees might not now be necessary.

Mr. COCHRAN. Thanks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is welcome.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, all of us are proud of our Navy. We have the greatest Navy the world has ever known. We are proud of our ships. They are strong and sturdy. We are proud of our fighting men, our officers, and our enlisted men. Daily they are doing a noble job. We are proud of our bureau chiefs. It is their job to supply our fighting men with the wherewithal to do the fighting jobs. These bureau chiefs work long and hard and their jobs are far from being pleasant.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the Members of the House will be pleased to know that one of the outstanding bureau chiefs, a man who has made a wonderful record, Vice Admiral Ben Moreell, is recovering from an illness at the Naval Hospital and will soon be back on the job.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution. I had the pleasure of paying my respects to him yesterday in his hospital room and he will be out of the hospital within the next 4 or 5 days. I might add to what the gentleman from Missouri has already said that Vice Admiral Ben Moreell is certainly one of the outstanding men in our Navy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Yes; I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas include in his commendation of bureau chiefs, Secretary of the Navy Knox?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I will say to my distinguished friend from Michigan, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, is a member of his party. I think he is doing a really fine job, and I am glad to call him my friend.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You mean for the Navy?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. For the Navy, and for the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself briefly to the question of cost. I am going to confine my observations to three big Bureaus of the Navy, the Bureau of Aviation, the Bureau of Ordnance, and the Bureau of Ships, because between 70 and 75 percent of the total expenditures of the Navy goes to those three large Bureaus. In the first place, quite a bit of misinformation has permeated our country with reference to the form of our procurement contracts for ships and airplanes and all types of ordnance. A lot of people still think we have what was commonly known as a cost-plus contract, which existed, as I am told, in World War No. 1. Well, there is no such thing as a cost-plus contract during this war so far as the Navy Department is concerned. There are two types of contracts, one is the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee.

Under that contract the more it costs to produce a ship, or a gun, or an airplane, the less the manufacturer makes out of it. He is given a premium when he reduces his cost and he is penalized when his cost gets out of bounds.

The other type of contract is the unit-price contract. In my judgment, that is the most desirable type of contract. I may say that your committee has urged the Navy, year after year, to reduce their cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts and to convert them into unit-price contracts. We believe, and the Navy believes they can

save money by getting away from the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, and certainly they can save man-hours—labor and material, if you please. The Navy has done a magnificent job in handling those contracts. Today 80 percent of all the contracts made by the Bureau of Ships, and I understand it has some 154 yards directly under its supervision, are on a unit-price contract basis now and not on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. The reason the other 20 percent are not on a unit price is because they are constantly changing models at the direction of the Navy Department. Under those conditions, it is very difficult to set up an accurate yardstick on a new type of ship that is under construction. For that same reason the Bureau of Aviation in the Navy Department has not made quite as good a record in getting away from the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract to the unit-price contract as has the Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance. But the Bureau of Aviation has done a magnificent job in reducing its costs.

I refer the membership to page 845 of the hearings. There you will gain some very valuable information. It shows that since 1942, on through 1943 and 1944, the cost per airplane has been reduced from 15 to 20 percent. There are now 25 different companies building airships in this country. Sixty percent of them are still on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, but in terms of dollars and cents the 40 percent which are on a unit-price contract basis are doing about 62 or 63 percent of the dollar volume for the Navy.

Ordnance has made a grand record, perhaps a better record than any of the other bureaus in getting away from the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Over 90 percent of its present business is on a unit-price contract basis. There is good reason for that. The guns and patterns have already been established, and it is a constant repetition of the same type of guns, ammunition, and so forth. Therefore, their business is more susceptible to the unit-price contract. But the committee has the assurance of all the bureaus in the Navy which do any procuring that they will continue to hammer at these cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts and gradually convert them into unit-price contracts.

Mr. Chairman, let me make a few observations about the Bureau of Aviation of the Navy. I think Admiral Ramsay, the Chief of that Bureau, has done a magnificent job. He has been Chief of the Bureau for something like a year. Prior to his coming back to the Bureau as its Chief, he spent some 12 or 15 or 18 months in the Pacific, in the very midst of that war. As of January 1 of this year, the Navy had on hand approximately 25,000 airplanes. About 15,000 of those planes are what the Navy calls usable planes. The remaining 10,000 are of the obsolescent type, that are gradually getting older; changes in construction are being made, and they are producing better planes, but still that 10,000 serve a useful purpose today in the Navy.

The present bill under consideration carries funds for 24,230 planes. But those planes will not be delivered until the latter part of the calendar year 1945 and the majority of them, of course, will come in during the calendar year 1946. So, of these billions of dollars for naval aviation, there is a faint hope that some of these dollars may be saved through a sudden ending of the war. But that is merely a faint hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau operates hand in glove with the Bureau of Personnel. After all, it is the Bureau of Personnel who is the trainer, who furnishes the schools to train these aviators. The Navy, like the Army, is drastically cutting down on the number of pilots—flying men, if you please. Last year the Navy had approximately 43,000 aviators in training. This bill carries funds to train only 29,000.

The Bureau of Ships also has a large amount of funds in this bill. If my memory serves me correctly, for the Bureau of Ships, when it comes to new construction and armor and armament for those new ships, the total is around $8,000,000,000. The Bureau also informs the committee that if it finds in the future that it is necessary to build all the tonnage this Congress has authorized it to build, it will cost an additional $7,000,000,000 over and above the $8,000,000,000 that is in this bill. That covers new ships and ship's ordnance. In terms of tonnage that means between three and four hundred thousand tons of combat ships that have not been laid down, and approximately 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary craft.

I believe the evidence before the committee shows that in terms of actual combat ships the Navy will undertake to complete approximately 600 this year and, under present plans, about 50 percent of that number for next year, but who knows what next year will bring? Admiral Cochrane and Admiral Mills compose a perfect team. As the Chiefs of the Bureau of Ships, they are doing a magnificent job.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to give the House some information that is very interesting to me, and I trust it will be interesting to the House. You will remember what we have been told about those fanatical Japs. We know they are fanatical; we know they are barbarians; we have heard our own naval officers who have escaped their prison camps in the Philippines tell of their barbarity, but, on the other hand, sometimes we may get the idea from reading various articles and publications that these Japs are poor, ignorant peons, if you please, who are under the domination of the Emperor and their war lords; that they are an irresponsible people; that they have no education, and so forth. This is far from the truth. The vast majority of men in the Japanese Army and Navy are high-school graduates, and many of them college men. They are intelligent and most dangerous. I have here some information relative to the percentage of illiteracy in Japan as compared with the United States, France, Germany, England, and Switzerland. Let us see about these poor little ignorant peons in Japan. Do you know that less than 1 percent of illiteracy exists in Japan? To be accurate, according to this information, it is eighty-eight one-hundredths of 1 percent. In our own country as of 1942, taking in all races, the percentage is 8.4. In Germany according to the German Embassy's figures of 1937–38 there was no illiteracy. They may not have had any illiteracy, but they certainly had some crackpots. For England the figure is thirty-four one-hundredths of 1 percent; for Switzerland thirty-nine one-hundredths of 1 percent; and for France 6.57 percent.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may have permission to revise, extend, and to delete remarks made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself so much time as I desire to use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, except for the opportunity afforded to emphasize some items, there is really no justification for me to attempt to amplify the comprehensive statements just made by Chairman SHEPPARD and my colleague from Texas, or to try to add to the information to be found in the hearings and in the report of the subcommittee, both of which are before you.

I will say that all members of the committee, under the guidance of its efficient chairman—aided by its clerk, John Pugh, than whom there is and never can be anybody better informed—worked hard and long and cooperatively and conscientiously to bring to you this bill as the result of an intelligent handling of all matters and things therein contained.

As laymen we all know that there are items which it would seem might have been or might be radically reduced, but to do that involves interference with the progress of the war and a conflict with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Nobody would like to have it said of him that he had delayed the day of victory by being parsimonious with respect to an appropriation for some portion of a program set up and laid down as essential by those whose business and responsibility it is to work out the way to win as early as may be, and at the smallest cost of the blood and brains and brawn of American boys. Dollars do not measure such values to be saved.

Before I discuss figures, may I refer to page 8 of the report and make it a part hereof, so far as it refers to the operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserves:

OPERATION AND CONSERVATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

The Budget proposes an appropriation of $2,720,000 under this head for the following objects:

(1) Normal expenses of administration	$50,000
(2) Shutting in of production wells on reserve No. 1, in California, in event of condemnation of private lands and leases by Government	275,000
(3) Purchase of leasehold interests and lessee's operating equipment, reserve No. 1	717,835
(4) Payment due Standard Oil Co. of California under temporary operating agreement	677,165
(5) Exploration of reserve No. 4 in Alaska	1,000,000
Total	2,720,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1,050,000, made up of items 1 and 5 above.

The course to be pursued with respect to reserve No. 1, in California, awaits legislative action consequent upon investigation and recommendation by the Committee on Naval Affairs. Items 2, 3, and 4, therefore, have been passed over. Item 4 is of questionable legality, though it has sound moral basis. It should be legalized in any legislation dealing with reserve No. 1.

Item 5 pertains to an area of about 35,000 square miles of lands bordering the Arctic Ocean in the vicinity of Point Barrow, Alaska, and extending inland therefrom approximately 130 miles. Oil seepages have been located within the area, and the appropriation of $1,000,000 is intended for the initiation of geophysical surveys, posthole drilling for geological data, and such other preparatory work as may be necessary properly to locate and instigate the drilling of test wells, all looking to the ascertainment of the possibilities of the area as a future source of supply of oil for military needs. The details of the $1,000,000 are given on page 1119 of the hearings.

I desire to call your attention to item 5 and in that connection wish to say that oil and aviation—civil, military, and naval—are tied together inseparably. The international commerce of the future promises to depend upon the direct transport between the United States, Canada, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and China to such an extent that the region of the North Pole may become the crossroads of the world. The evidence is convincing that indigenous oil sources of great value await only to be developed.

The potential petroleum resources of the far North may well be half as large as our own American resources, which are 60 percent of the world's petroleum supply.

It was made to appear to our committee that one of the most impressive surface manifestations of petroleum in the Western Hemisphere is situated near Cape Simpson, east of Point Barrow on the Arctic coast of northernmost Alaska. Up to date, although the Point Barrow region has been reserved to the United States Navy over an area of 30,000 square miles, no proper attempt at exploration has as yet been made. As you will learn from the hearings, this part of Alaska is open to ocean transportation only 2 or 3 months each year, which situation, together with the lack of marine transportation facilities, the isolation of the area, and the bleak environment, has discouraged development. The developments in aviation, however, afford an opportunity long sought to permit such exploration and development as that for which we have undertaken to provide.

As Wallace Pratt, an acknowledged authority on oil geology in various parts of the world, declares in his article Oil Fields in the Arctic:

Oil in the Arctic awaits the advance of civilization upon this, the last of our geographical frontiers. Conspicuous evidences of petroleum confront us throughout this region: Prolific seepages in the rocks of Alaska; other seepages and a major oil field on the mainland of Canada; seepages on various Canadian Arctic islands; seepages and oil wells at frequent intervals along the entire Arctic coast of Siberia. But only the forward-looking Russians have availed themselves so far of these potential sources of fuel and energy. Perhaps the rest of us have yet to grasp the fact that the great ice age is already behind us. We escaped its extreme advance at the end of the Pleistocene only "by the skin of our teeth," according to Thornton Wilder's colorful drama, but now at length we should have pulled ourselves together sufficiently to begin to follow up its retreat and to reclaim for mankind the vast empire released to us by the return of the sun to the "friendly Arctic."

As Joseph Pogue, petroleum engineer-economist, onetime assistant director of the Bureau of Oil Conservation, and active today in the work of the Petroleum Industry War Council, reminds us, the United Nations are now flying to victory on the wings of petroleum.

Mechanization is the keynote of modern warfare, and mechanization means oil. * * * Petroleum is also the key to the strategy of this war. To assure their supply of oil, the Germans occupied Rumania, and brought on our attack on Ploesti and the present Soviet advance toward Bessarabia. The invasion of Russia became a mad gamble for the oil reserves of Maikop and Baku, and the blunder may have marked a turning point in the war in Europe. The African campaign was conducted on both sides with an eye on the oil fields in the Middle East. In seizing the Dutch East Indies, the Japanese had oil as well as rubber for a prize.

The burden of the war's requirements is being borne by our American oil fields. When the submarine campaign in the Atlantic cut off other sources of supply for the war in Europe, the accessibility of our ports saved the day for the United Nations. The result has been not only a drain on our productive capacity, the whole pattern of the industry has had to be altered, and the American petroleum industry has been mobilized under a Petroleum Administration for War.

And he asks, "Must an oil war follow this war?" and says:

The world needs American enterprise and skill in the discovery as well as in the development of its oil reserves. The distinguished geologist gifted with insight, Wallace Pratt, states in his readable little book, Oil in the Earth:

"* * * There is abundant evidence that Americans search for oil more assiduously and find oil more effectively than any other people on earth. In fact, it is Americans who find the oil in the earth. In addition to the oil in their own country Americans have found much of the oil in other countries. Even where foreign capital has financed oil-finding enterprises, the actual work of exploration has commonly devolved upon American technologists, geologists, and engineers. More than once the American staffs of foreign oil companies have succeeded in finding oil on a prospect after earlier attempts by foreign experts have failed. Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela are outstanding achievements of Americans in oil finding. In Iran, Iraq, Burma, and Peru, American technical skill as well as American machinery bore the brunt of the exploratory effort. Americans were identified too with the early development of the oil fields of Russia and Rumania."

If we could only drive this simple fact home and affirm its dynamic and constructive implications, there might be some chance of escaping from the dampening clutches of such cliches as "dollar diplomacy," "international cartels," "Yankee imperialism," and the like, which politicians are prone to employ to obscure the issue and to promote narrow objectives. The fact is that our Nation and all nations would be immeasurably benefited if American oil-finding genius were encouraged to go into the far places and vigorously develop the commodity that confers such benefits upon mankind. No government, not even the greatest, can match this potent force; but our Government can make it possible that this benefit be conferred more amply upon all peoples. It can also prevent it.

* * * * * * *

The search for new oil fields must go on, and it will require the initiative of pioneers, free from the restraints of collectivist economies. Risks must be faced, and the willingness to face them will spring from individual enterprise. In the past, discoveries have been largely due to American daring, to American methods, to American technique; and future expansion will require a setting for the exercise of the special American competence. Undiscovered oil will not serve as a medium for world reconstruction.

Digressing from oil to aviation for a moment, I would like to say that, having sat for years as a member of committees considering defense measures, I notice with approval as one step in the right direction the setting up of the post-war committee which shall consider the problems of aviation.

This is only one step, however. Another, and the first that should be taken, in my opinion, is for the appropriation subcommittees handling military, naval, and civil aeronautical problems to be constituted a special committee to study, mutually, all matters involved in this aviation business now. Unless there is some such consolidated effort and resultant over-all supervision and/or direction of civil, military, and naval aviation, for now and after the war, the tax burden imposed to carry on the disintegrated activities involved in the widespread aviation problem will alone not only make paupers of us but of a generation yet unborn.

We should not again undertake to do or be held responsible for doing too little too late.

The United States should have a policy—and that before it finds it cannot have one. In all the governments in the United Nations set-up, except our own, aviation planning is second only to war planning. The struggle in and for the control of the air is bound to come, and will be one of the epics of history. We should make history now.

Now, in addition to what my distinguished chairman has had to say so comprehensively, I would like to emphasize and make a matter of record some

matters and things which have strongly impressed me as being of interest, not only to Members of Congress but also to the people who pay the bills.

The Congress and the people should realize that since June 30, 1940, the Congress has appropriated to the Navy, including defense aid allocations, $94,000,000,000. By June 30, 1944, 62.5 billions of dollars of this will have been converted into articles, equipment, and services, a creditable achievement as it represents naval power ready to be applied in terms of ships, aircraft, munitions, and personnel.

This new 1945 Navy bill adds cash and authority of approximately 31.5 billions of dollars to the above, but 10.4 billions of dollars of this is to liquidate prior contract authority. This is the largest single Navy bill of all time. It compares to total cash appropriations of 28.5 billions of dollars in 1944, twenty-four billions of dollars in 1943, and eighteen and seven-tenths billions of dollars in 1942. The Navy is now obligating and expending money at the approximate rate of two billions of dollars per month. These are alarming figures. But I hope and expect this is the last big bill because the Navy should begin to level off in 1945. About the end of that year military operations should permit of contractions in future appropriations and in the rates of expenditure.

Huge as these figures are we know we have to win the war. We must provide the necessary facilities to do it. On the other hand we do not wish to squander money. We wish to get a useful dollar's worth for every dollar we spend both as to material and operation. That the material and ships are being produced is evidenced by results.

It is gratifying to observe that the Navy in the last year has shown the way to victory over the Japanese in the Pacific. It has pulled up the Nipponese advance and commenced to drive it back. Our power has built up rapidly since the procurement machinery has caught up the slack and begun to furnish the equipment and ships and personnel required to carry on global war.

The magnitude of the operations the Navy carries is often overlooked due to inability to grasp the tremendous distances involved and the scope of the operations that are being pursued. Positions thousands of miles apart are the rule. This is, in truth, a global war. The Navy's chief war tasks have been:

(a) Creating and protecting the supply line to Europe and the Mediterranean;

(b) Keeping the coastal sea lanes off the Atlantic coast clear, as well as off the Caribbean, the shores of South America, and the South Pacific;

(c) Transporting to the Mediterranean and the British Isles expeditionary forces which are carrying on, and will carry on, land operations in those theaters;

(d) Furnishing craft to make the landings and establishing behind them repair facilities, port control, and escorts to maintain the supply overseas;

(e) Keeping the submarine menace under control and ship losses down.

The United States combatant sea power and supply services have built up to the extent that there are not only secure routes to Australasia and New Zealand and to our forces who are fighting throughout the Southwest Pacific, but the fleet currently is carrying on offensive operations through the Carolines and the Marshalls to clear the entire Central Pacific area for further operations against Japan. The northern Pacific was first successfully defended and sea power then enabled us to throw the Japanese out of the Aleutian chain. The Japanese Navy and merchant marine is weakened to such an extent by undersea and air warfare that it can no longer challenge effectively our operations in the Pacific theater. All this has occurred since the landing on Guadalcanal on August 7, 1942.

The greater part of the combatant tonnage available for operation is in the Pacific theater because the duties of our forces in the Atlantic have to do primarily with the control of submarine warfare, the escort of convoys, landing force operations on the continent, and the furnishing of armed guard crews to the merchant marine. The tonnage involved is not large, nor is the personnel, but it covers a wide range of organizational activities.

It is not to be overlooked that while the Navy has been carrying on these operations it has undergone a tremendous expansion. The total personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard combined on July 1, 1940, was 203,126; on December 31, 1943, it was 2,959,128; and the bill provides funds for 3,006,000 at the end of fiscal 1945, although the end-of-the-year figure may be higher.

During that period, 1941 to 1944, inclusive, the Navy has expanded in vessels from 653 to 31,130, including landing craft. By the end of the fiscal year 1944 the figure will be 49,890, the bulk of which will be landing craft. I shall not include table A to which I have referred. It is sufficient to say that the Navy is still expanding to meet requirements for planned operations. It is, of course, impossible to produce ships overnight, but the ships and equipment of previous programs are coming off the lines in large numbers and will continue to do so in the fiscal year 1945. The Navy will commission about 2,032 new vessels during the fiscal year 1945, an increase of 46 percent over the number commissioned in the fiscal year 1944. The number of ships in operation at the end of fiscal year 1945 will be 8,684, an increase of 2,700 over those operating at the end of fiscal year 1944. It is, of course, necessary to secure and train the personnel to man these units; to make engineers, radio, ordnance, fire control men, seamen, and so forth, in huge numbers.

The 1945 appropriation bill for the Navy, including the Coast Guard and Marine Corps, carries about 31.5 billions of dollars. These funds are primarily for shipbuilding, aviation, personnel, and the maintenance and operation of the war facilities which have been created. There is actually only one new major project in the bill, and that is a procurement program for 24,230 new aircraft, deliveries of which are scheduled to commence in September 1945 and to end on June 30, 1946. The cost is $4,443,637,000, of which the cash request is $843,637,000, and the remainder, $3,600,000,000, contract authority.

With the gradual completion of the procurement and building programs, expenditures are shifting from procurement of material to pay, maintenance, and operation. For example, there will be an increase of the percentage of funds used for maintenance and operation in 1945, over that in 1944, of 14 percent—see table B.

Of the amount requested in the bill for the fiscal year 1945, a very considerable portion, or $10,446,060,000, is for liquidating prior commitments, shipbuilding contracts, public works, and aviation contract authority. Outstanding contracts and contract authority must be liquidated in future bills of about 12.5 billions of dollars against existing contracts, primarily for ships and aircraft—see table C.

TABLE B

The following table, showing a breakdown of funds for the fiscal years 1942 to 1945, inclusive, as between recurring and nonrecurring items, indicates this trend. Recurring items, of course, are those for maintenance and operation, while the nonrecurring items represent procurement:

	Recurring		Nonrecurring	Total
		%		
1942	$1,508,939,620	8.0	$17,203,234,112	$18,712,173,732
1943	5,078,409,844	21.3	18,728,636,937	23,807,046,781
1944	8,450,127,625	30.9	18,984,659,573	27,434,787,198
1945	11,969,805,448	45	14,521,397,488	26,491,202,936

TABLE C

The following table shows the amounts which will be required in the 1945 estimates and subsequent to the fiscal year 1945 to liquidate these commitments:

Liquidation of contract authority

Appropriation title	Included in 1945 estimates to liquidate contract authority	Required subsequent to 1945 estimates to liquidate contract authority
Aviation, Navy	$1,991,000,000	[1] $3,809,000,000
Repair facilities, Navy	95,000,000	40,000,000
Construction of floating drydocks	50,000,000	
Public works	281,060,000	1,474,931,400
Increase and replacement of Navy vessels:		
Construction and machinery	6,500,000,000	[2] 4,827,864,337
Armor, armament, and ammunition	1,300,000,000	[2] 2,272,465,629
Emergency construction	229,000,000	[2] 113,175,843
Total	10,446,060,000	12,537,437,209

[1] Includes contract authority for aviation $3,600,000,000, and for plant facilities $200,000,000 carry-over from 1942 and $9,000,000 from 1944.
[2] Future liquidation of existing programs.

The subcommittee has gone as thoroughly as possible into the justifications for each of the items in the bill. It has worked hard to insure that items were necessary. The justifications are too

voluminous to present and it must suffice to discuss the major items with a brief statement on each. These major items are ships, ordnance, aviation, personnel, training, and public works—see table D.

The ship construction estimate is $8,029,000,000. The upkeep and operation of the expanding fleet, overhauls and dockings, major repairs and alterations, ship materials, maintenance of shore establishments, investigations and tests, and miscellaneous operating costs, amount to $1,860,000,000. Consequently, ship construction and maintenance will total $9,889,000,000, or almost 37 percent of the total appropriation requested.

The Navy is proceeding with the construction of a well-balanced fleet, but the program is changed from time to time in accordance with the requirements brought about by changes in the progress of the war. From time to time it is imperative to place emphasis on immediate procurement of special types of vessels to meet immediate demands.

Much of the construction in the fiscal year 1943 and part of 1944 was of the destroyer-escort type of vessel, developed specifically for antisubmarine work. Similarly, the auxiliary aircraft carrier is another type which had to be constructed in large numbers. Landing craft were produced in quantity in these years and have been used, as publicly announced, in the Southwest Pacific, in north Africa, and in Sicily. Construction of all these types continues although necessary adjustments are made from time to time. It may be of interest to note that the Navy is today delivering into service in each 3-month, or quarter-year, period about the same dollar value of naval vessels as comprised the entire naval shipbuilding program of World War No. 1, constructed between the period 1916 to 1922. The Navy began the design of a new large landing craft in May 1942 and delivered the first one of those into service 6 months later.

TABLE D

A quick analysis, by general objects, of the Budget estimates for 1945, the amounts by which they differ from the appropriations for 1944 and the amounts proposed by the committee indicates:

Object	1945 estimates	Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with 1944 appropriation	Committee proposals, 1945
New ships	$8,084,000,000	−$1,034,120,000	$8,029,000,000
Aviation	[1] 5,870,000,000	+1,286,275,000	4,600,640,000
Public Works	281,060,000	−1,574,257,405	281,060,000
Pay, subsistence, transportation; training, education and welfare; Naval Reserve	6,111,678,000	+1,891,286,016	6,089,037,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Ships	2,000,000,000	+264,120,000	1,860,000,000
Ordnance and Ordnance stores	2,600,000,000	−876,800,000	2,600,000,000
Floating drydocks, repair facilities	145,000,000	−15,000,000	145,000,000
Transportation of things	400,000,000	+200,000,000	375,000,000
Miscellaneous	991,503,300	+268,668,735	929,059,705
Marine Corps	1,144,000,000	+170,208,516	1,144,000,000
Coast Guard	442,488,200	−25,268,560	438,406,231
Total	[1] 28,069,819,500	+555,112,302	26,491,202,936

[1] Plus $3,600,000,000 contract authority for new aircraft construction.

The aviation estimate is $8,200,640,000, including $3,600,000,000 contract authority. This represents an increase of $1,616,915,000 over the current 1944 appropriations and contract authority. Deliveries on the new program will commence in the fall of the calendar year 1945 and will be completed by June 1946. By the end of the fiscal year 1945 the number of aircraft on hand, excluding losses, will be 45 percent greater than the number on hand at the beginning of this calendar year.

Aviation requirements comprise instruments, maintenance, experiments, and construction of aircraft. Instruments include navigational, aerological, testing, and photographic equipment. The maintenance item covers the cost of overhaul and operation of aircraft, aviation gasoline, special equipment, and major repairs and alterations at air stations, and various other similar requirements. The value of the experimental work in aircraft and development of new types is so well known it is believed nothing need be offered in the way of explanation.

The next major item is ordnance equipment, ammunition replacement, and maintenance. To cover ordnance for aircraft and ships, in view of the increase in the number of both mentioned above, there must be a large increase in the ordnance equipage and ammunition. This equipage includes repairs and alterations to the original equipment and spares for installations afloat and ashore and also the replenishment of ammunition and the upkeep and operation of shore establishments to complement this equipment. Modern war consumes large quantities of ammunition. The amount requested under this heading is roughly $2,600,000,000. Beyond this program it is necessary to provide armament for all the 20,000,000 tons of vessels of the merchant marine being built this year. Ordnance equipment and replacement of aircraft is furnished in this appropriation. This includes bombs, bomb details, pyrotechnics, aerial and surface-craft torpedoes. The Bureau of Ordnance, due to reductions in cost, low attrition rates, and the expedition of production was able in the fiscal year 1944 to reduce its requirements $1,179,000,000.

I have, so far, dealt with ships, ordnance, and aviation. These are only the instruments of warfare. A ship is, in effect, merely a gun platform. An aircraft on the ground is vulnerable and virtually useless. To make ships and aircraft effective they must be manned and operated by skilled personnel. The money requested for the fiscal year 1945 for the pay, subsistence, transportation, training, education, and indoctrination of personnel is the money required to render the ships and aircraft effective.

Training is the largest single task with which the Bureau of Naval Personnel is charged and it accounts for $399,500,000 in the bill. Approximately 350,000 recruits will have to be processed through the training stations in the fiscal year 1945. The principal changes occurring in training are greater emphasis along technical lines and operational procedure and the lengthening of the training periods. Longer training periods have always been desirable but unobtainable due to the urgent need of manpower afloat overseas in all operating areas. For advanced technical and operational training some 600 schools will be in operation furnishing instruction to about 1,000,000 enlisted men and 113,000 officers. The college-training program, although designed primarily as a long-range plan to fill annual requirements for college-trained personnel, is an effective contribution of very great importance.

The public works cash request amounts to $281,060,000 but $1,474,931,400 contract authority is also contained in the bill of which $1,000,000,000 is earmarked for advance bases. This billion provides for the construction of advanced bases in the areas of operations and for additions to existing stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, and $475,000,000 is for work on the continental establishment necessary to support the fleet. The peak of construction in the United States has been passed. The bulk of funds from now on will be expended on the procurement of material and equipment for the establishment of supporting bases in the active theaters of war. Expansion of these will depend on the vicissitudes of war, the success of our offensive action, spread of the zones of attack, and other unpredictable factors.

At the time of the preparation of the Navy's estimates decision had not been taken as to extension of the lend-lease law. Consequently, there is no money in this bill for lend-lease purposes, as such.

The amount of defense articles delivered and services rendered from naval appropriations, as of December 31, 1943, was $370,969,889. The value of ships transferred as of the same date was $995,000,000. Of course the shipbuilding funds in this bill include funds to continue the ship-construction program and some of the ships under construction may be leased to foreign governments. As to totals as of December 31, 1943, the Navy had transferred to foreign governments articles to the value of $1,623,599,755, including articles purchased with allocations from defense-aid appropriations, which allocations amounted at the same date to $3,268,828,238.

That day has come of which Tennyson wrote when he said he—

* * * dipt into the future far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue.

That day is here.

It is the burden of our responsibility to vote the taxpayers' money wisely and well to the end that the least expenditure of money may be made which will bring earliest victory.

This bill is the contribution of our subcommittee dedicated to that end.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman and other members of the committee have covered in their discussion the general operations of the Navy, the amount of expansion provided for in this appropriation bill. It has been a pleasure to serve with the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], with Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. COFFEE of Washington, Mr. PLUMLEY of Vermont, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, and Mr. PLOESER of Missouri. These gentlemen have been very diligent in their work and have been motivated by the highest motives in which partisan politics played no part. It is a pleasure to serve with each of them. The committee is fortunate in having Mr. John Pugh as its clerk. Few persons anywhere have the knowledge of the armed services, its history and growth as does Mr. Pugh. He rendered great service to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, as we come to consider this annual appropriation bill for the Navy Department, I feel it is fitting that I join with other members of the committee in saying that we are all proud of the splendid record which our Navy is making and has made in this war. I think, as we consider the huge amount of money involved in this bill, that we should also devote some thought and attention to the terrific problem which is facing this Nation. Certainly it is the desire of this subcommittee to see that the men who are waging this war have every ship, every plane, every hospital and medical facility, and all the supplies, shells, and other things that go to make the way as easy as possible for them. We have made every effort in this appropriation bill to be sure we were doing that. If by spending ammunition, planes, and ships, lives can be saved, it is our duty to provide such ammunition, planes, and ships. If we are to make any mistakes along those lines, certainly we must make those mistakes toward the end of safety. We must give too much instead of too little. We cannot be responsible for having too little and having it too late.

We have found, however, that there are many officers in the Navy Department and there are many officers in the War Department who are gradually and rapidly in some instances coming to the same belief that some of us on this committee have, that the time has been reached when we as a Congress should look with care on the request of any Department and try to see that the money which they request is needed in the war effort. I know that there are those in this Congress who have made the statement that anything the armed services want they should have, but, Mr. Chairman, I differ with that. I feel that we must give to the Army and to the Navy everything that they need, and I admit that in the final analysis we must leave it up to them to say what they need, but when they come before a committee of this Congress and say, "We want this but are not willing to say that we need it," then I think that we should do as this committee has done, cut the appropriation down to what is really needed. By taking this view I believe I am rendering them a service.

What may be easily overlooked here today is the fact that of each dollar that any department of this Government spends only 40 cents of it is being paid out of current taxes. The other 60 percent is being paid for by the issuance of bonds by the Federal Government. Those bonds will be paid in the future, therefore, of each dollar that this Congress spends, 60 percent of it must be paid in the future and will largely be saddled on to the backs of the men who are fighting this war, and it is with that in mind that this committee considered the appropriation bill which we bring to you today. As I tell you, we have not cut down on ships, we have not cut down on planes, ammunition, armament, equipment, and supplies or on those things that are so essential to fight this war. We want our men to be the best equipped in the world, and they are today. We want them to have the best ships and the greatest number of ships, we want them to have the greatest number of planes and the finest treatment, and I am glad to say that the Navy Department has done a wonderful job in providing that to them. We, as a committee, have done our part in this appropriation bill. But as great as the effort is today. We find that there are other particulars in which Members of Congress can come to the assistance of our high military officers.

We developed that the Secretary of the Navy had issued a directive that no new facilities be constructed if there were available facilities which would meet the needs of the Navy Department. There was created a joint board of Army and Navy officers to bring the two Departments together in the handling of this problem.

The showing before the committee, however, disclosed little evidence that this board or this directive was effective. The Army was vacating bases, the Navy was building new ones.

There was little if any evidence that there was any joint programing of future needs of the two Departments. If the Army no longer needed a facility it was tendered the Navy but we could not see that there was any effort made to notify the Navy Department of any prospective reduction in the future in the Army's program so as to release facilities for the use of the Navy.

Neither could we see that there was a submission of the future needs of the Navy Department to the War Department with the request for the Army to report what facilities they could release in time for Navy use.

The committee made every effort to make the cooperation between the services more effective. Accordingly on the 18th of March, during our hearings, the Navy Department was directed to request a complete list of facilities which the Army had abandoned and which could be available to the Navy. The Army replied that they had abandoned no facilities and the Navy replied to the committee that no facilities had been abandoned and therefore none were available to meet the needs of the Navy as outlined in their requests of the committee.

Not being satisfied with this report, the committee went directly to the War Department. It developed that while the Army had placed many facilities on a stand-by basis none had been abandoned. Also they had theretofore reserved the right for the Army to reenter which precluded the use of such vacated facilities. Upon this basic problem being called to the attention of the War Department on March 20, its policy was changed and its vacated facilities were placed in three categories.

First. Those facilities in which the Navy could take over outright, of which there were 46.

Second. Those which the Army would share jointly with the Navy, of which there were eight.

Third. Those which the Navy could use but on which the Army would have to hold strings or the right of reentry, only one being in this category.

The Navy Department immediately notified its personnel in the field to investigate the possible use of these facilities by the Navy Department. The committee was requested to continue its hearings until such report could be made. I am advised that the Navy will be able to use quite a number of these facilities.

The joint committee of the Army and Navy is now really functioning and I am advised that much good continues to come from the committee's investigation.

We on the committee are not in position to pass on the proposition of a department of national defense suggested as the answer to this problem by some. This is a matter that, of course, must be determined by those charged with the operation of the war effort. However, we have come to realize that there are many natural problems which are the result of two independent departments. Personally, I am of the opinion that at least there should be a joint board on use of facilities to which each of the services should have to report their program and needs for the future, a board which would have the authority to make full use of facilities regardless of which service may have constructed them, to the end that the Navy have facilities it needs, the Army the facilities it needs and that no facilities be constructed when, by reassignment of facilities between the serv-

ices, the requirements for new facilities would become unnecessary.

The high ranking officials in both the War Department and the Navy Department were most cooperative when this matter was called to their attention. These officials desire as we do, to prevent needless duplication of facilities. They are making every effort to meet that problem. Perhaps the real trouble we found comes from the two-department system. However, as stated, we on the committee are not in position to pass on the most effective way of fighting the war, nor in the position to say there should be only one department of national defense.

As the result of this matter we have gone into, this committee has written into this bill and recommended to the House a restrictive clause which provides that the Navy shall not use the money appropriated under the terms of this bill for the building of facilities in the continental United States if there are available other facilities which are available to the Navy and which are suitable for its needs.

There was much evidence which caused the committee to make this reduction under the terms of the authorization bill I mention. The Navy Department was recently authorized to spend around $11,000,000 in funds for a stadium and other facilities at the Naval Academy at Annapolis. I am glad to state the Department withdrew this request during our hearings. In this bill of authorization there was $35,000 for a restaurant for 75 civilian workers, who had been doing a good job and getting along up to now in a town of 1,500 people. There was another authorization of $75,000 for a restaurant for a few hundred civilian workers and many other items of a similar nature. On some of these the Chief of Naval Operations and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy stated that they wondered how such items could have been requested by the Department.

We felt the Department should attempt to make an effort to find existing facilities which would answer those purposes and thereby limit in every possible way the bonds of the Nation which must be paid in the future.

I understand that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, intends to make a point of order against this provision. I rather think, in view of the contract authority which was granted under the bill recently passed, that if he presses that position, most likely his point of order will be sustained and this restrictive clause will go out.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that I do intend to make a point of order on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I am in hearty accord with the objective of it, and if it were brought in in the usual manner, it would have my hearty support. The only complaint I have is that the Appropriations Committee must confine its activities to appropriations and not to legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman, and am glad he is in entire accord with the position taken by the committee so far as its desires are concerned. I mention this fact, and I have gone rather thoroughly into detail as to the reasons we saw fit to put this restrictive provision into the bill. I say to the gentleman that if we have called it to his attention and if the provision goes out, we feel that we have done a good day's work by placing it in the bill so that it will have the attention of his committee, which has the legislative right to pass on such matters. I trust that he will see fit to have his committee take appropriate action if the provision goes out of this bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the position the gentleman is taking is sound and well fortified by the facts. It should be incumbent upon the Navy Department to make inquiry to see if there are any available facilities anywhere in the country that can eliminate the construction authorized by the act of April 4. The only complaint I find is that we must adhere strictly to the prerogatives of the legislative committee and of the Appropriations Committee, and if it were not for that I would interpose no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I might say to the gentleman that we are in thorough accord with that view, and surely no member of this committee has any desire to encroach on the rights and the prerogatives of the legislative committee.

I might say further that we gave long and hard work toward trying to write a provision which would in no way encroach on the gentleman's committee. I do say that in my opinion we have done a very good day's work by including it here, even though it goes out, because by so doing we call attention to the need for having such a measure written into the law. The gentleman and his committee are the appropriate committee to consider that in the event it should go out of this bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The committee report also referred to it, and it was a matter that was properly brought to the attention of the Navy Department that a complete survey should be made before any money was used according to the act of April 4.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I am sure that every member of this committee is, of course, delighted to hear the statement by the chairman of the legislative committee, one that we naturally would expect from the distinguished gentleman in his devotion to the cause of economy and the cause of our great Navy.

Might we expect an additional act, not exactly compulsion, but one to demonstrate the sincerity of this Congress, if such a procedure be carried out, that the legislative committee in its next bill, when it does come before this Congress, might include such a provision?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, may I suggest that I called the Naval Affairs Committee's attention to the language in the limitation, and the sentiment of the committee this morning was that we are in accord with the principle and the objective, and if it were not for the fact that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, we would heartily concur with that objective and permit it to go on. I will be happy to state to the gentleman and the Committee that we will endeavor to impress upon the Navy Department that we, too, share the same viewpoint, and if it does become necessary to have legislation, we think it should properly be presented in a bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. As I have stated before when this matter came to the attention of the committee we found that there was a joint board between the Army and the Navy which was supposed to function in this particular regard. I do say there was little, if any evidence, that this board or the directive of the Secretary of the Navy—who, incidentally, has issued a directive along this line—was functioning properly. The hearings will demonstrate that by reason of the action of this committee some fifty-odd facilities were tendered to the Navy, which had not been considered, and which the Navy admitted were not considered, prior to the request for $644,000,000 for expansion of facilities in the United States, and on which they asked us to give them time to see if they could not be used after we had gotten the Army to tender them to the Navy. That full responsibility does not rest with the Navy Department. Part of it is with the War Department where it had reserved the right to reenter on these bases. Part of it comes from the very fact of having two separate departments to make and wage this war and the problems inherent in the system.

I am not passing on whether that is a correct procedure. I know nothing about the military, but I do realize that there are certain problems that naturally flow from having two separate departments. As to whether there should be a joint board to whom each Department must go in applying for facilities, a board that perhaps would have authority to direct as to each one which facilities it could use so that the Navy could have the facilities on the coast which it might need and the Army might have the facilities which it might need, I am not in a position to pass on those things. I am glad to state that when the situation was called to the attention of the Departments we had the full cooperation of the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, Mr. Lovett; of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson; of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral King; and of Admiral McCain, in charge of naval aviation, and of other officials, and the situation was corrected.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it might be added, in order to be completely candid with the House, that some of us at least, although there was no testimony to that effect, gathered the impression that until this subcommittee delved into the mysteries of the use of these various facilities which were being discarded by the Army and were possibly available to the Navy, the joint board had never met prior to such questioning before the subcommittee, and that the activities have been worth while since. I think it should be made clear to the armed services and this House that the application of such joint management of both services should apply not alone to the use of facilities which they have now used, but might well apply to the use of new public works or the preparation and creation of new public works or of new facilities of any kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Along that line, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri, certainly, that there was little evidence, if any, that this board had been very effective up to the time this was gone into. I know there was testimony from high-ranking Army and Navy officers that it has been meeting almost continuously since that time, and that full accord has been worked out between the members of the respective Departments.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then the inquiries of the distinguished gentleman of the subcommittee have already begun to bear evidence of good results.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think so.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No doubt about it. May I say that when the bill was presented on April 4 an inquiry along this line was made by the gentleman. He submitted to me a field that had been abandoned by the Army. I in turn submitted it to the Navy Department. It begins to look as if the Navy Department can use the field. So the seed has been sown on fertile soil, and there will be a bountiful harvest of economy growing from it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the gentleman's statement is appreciated by the committee, as far as that goes, but when we get to economy, this committee, like others, cannot economize and place cost above lives in the protection of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have not economized when it came to ships, planes, armament, equipment, supplies, medical attention, and hospital, and these other things so essential to victory and the welfare of our forces, but when it comes to expansion of facilities in the United States, certainly every use should be made of available facilities before new ones are constructed. Every dollar which is spent needlessly is not a help to the men in service but an added burden upon them when they return.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman must bear this in mind: While he has economy in mind, and he has said he has not applied it so strictly to ships, yet the whole expansion program is to enable the Navy to be in position to operate these ships. It would be useless to spend money to have ships built unless there were trained personnel available to operate the ships. The act of April 4 was to permit a 750,000 expansion of personnel. The present facilities not being sufficient, it necessarily means that training facilities must be expanded.

Mr. WHITTEN. I doubt that there is any way to get an argument between the gentleman from Georgia and me, since he takes the same view as I have taken and which was taken by the committee. There are many things about which we could argue, but I do not think he would argue with me about them. One is the stadium at Annapolis, and several restaurants, and things of that type which are eliminated. Those things which are essential, which the Navy itself said it needed, we have gone along on with the Navy, but as to those things which they just wanted but which they were not willing to say they had to have, we were not willing to go along. We have cut the facilities in the United States about $169,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is only about $25,000,000 under what the Budget has recommended, but $169,000,000 under what the Department wanted. I think the committee was clearly justified in making its reductions.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

As to the use of facilities, while we were limited to trying to look after the Navy's end of it and seeing that they fully used facilities available from the Army or elsewhere, this situation goes far beyond the Army and Navy. As a result of this, I investigated one air base which the Army had recently vacated.

I do not know the Army's needs, and doubtless they knew they no longer needed it. They probably knew when they put it into commission that they would possibly need it for only a little over a year; I do not know. But the thing that is unexplainable and for which there can be no excuse is to find out that the Federal Housing Authority had spent $1,000,000 building housing there, which was completed just as the base was vacated; nobody ever moved into it because the Army moved out the minute the housing was completed. Things like that occurring all over this Nation are certainly going to stir up the people of this Nation, and rightly so. It stirred up this committee. As far as we were concerned, we tried to take appropriate action. We wrote this restrictive clause into the bill to insure that our desires were carried out. We may not be in position to keep it in here, but I am glad to hear the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, who has the authority in the event that it is held that this is legislation on an appropriation bill to see that it is written into law, say that it is in line with his views, and I certainly hope he will take action to see that it is enacted into law by his committee.

This is a huge bill. We have found in listening to the officers and officials from the Navy Department that through the months since this war started we have learned that by having a supreme or a complete mastery in the number of ships, planes, and equipment, and in the number of loads discharged from our guns, we are saving the lives of American men. I say that as long as we can increase the size of this Navy, and as a result of increasing it, limit and reduce the number of boys who lose their lives, the money is well spent. But while we do that we should, I feel, also look to see that we do not have any greater debt than we necessarily must have, so that we will not have any added debt placed on these boys when they return.

We only hope that the present cooperation between the services will continue and do believe that the restrictive provision would cause, on the part of the Navy, a greater determination to get around new construction where at all possible.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to be critical of those Navy and Army leaders who have a tremendous task to perform. The members of this committee were privileged to hear off the record reports of the great work, the great preparations that have been made by both the Army and Navy. We learned in detail of the great heroism shown by the American servicemen everywhere. As Americans we should take pride in the way each service is conducting its part of the war.

The Nation should take pride in the great effort made by the Army and Navy leaders and by the Congress to provide adequate training, sufficient arms, ships, planes, materials, and supplies, medical care and attention. Full preparations have been and are being made.

Our military leaders are performing an almost impossible job well. To them and the services we owe every effort to meet their needs. This we, as a committee, have tried to do. As stated before if we are to make mistakes they should be on the side of safety.

While we have tried to base the amount of this appropriation on need we must of necessity leave to the naval officers in charge of the strategy the determination of need. We, as a Congress, cannot risk supplying too little and too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I shall not discuss the various items contained in this bill in detail. The printed hearings give practically all the information that is available to the committee. Any additional information we may have is confidential and, as such, cannot be mentioned.

Many of the items in this bill have been very poorly justified, and if we were not at war, I dare say, many items in this bill would not be presented to the House on the justifications given the com-

mittee. We realize that in wartime it is hard to strike a balance between the actual needs of the Navy and the things the Navy would just like to have.

It is the desire of this committee to give the Navy everything it needs to win the war. We want to see the Navy supplied with an abundance of material, and we commend the Navy for its policy of using great quantities of material in order to save lives. But while we are providing this material, we do not want to see needless waste and extravagance practiced. We realize there is always waste in war, but there is no need for deliberate and scandalous waste, and it should not be tolerated.

I want to make a few observations which I think are wholly justified by the hearings and by general observation since the beginning of this war. No one takes more pride in the accomplishments of our Navy than do the members of this committee, and no one is more chagrined at the waste and extravagance of the Navy than the members of this committee.

This war has developed at least one outstanding defect in our military and naval set-up. We should have a single qualified directing head of all branches of our armed forces. In theory we have this, but in actual practice we do not. The President, by virtue of his office, is Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy and, as such, is empowered to exercise complete control. Very seldom have we had a President who was a military and naval strategist, and even if we had one, his duties as executive head of our domestic Government are so great and complicated that he would not have time to devote to the military and naval matters, or if he were qualified and did attempt to take complete charge of military and naval matters, he would, of necessity, have to neglect the domestic phase of our Government. Directing the military and naval activities is a full-time job, and directing the domestic affairs of Government is a full-time job. In his radio speech last Christmas Eve, the President, in referring to General Marshall and Admiral King, said—I quote:

> Upon them falls the great responsibility of planning the strategy and determining when and where we shall fight.

During the past 11 years we have experienced the most wasteful, extravagant mismanagement of governmental affairs in all history. With this record of the past 11 years in the domestic branch of our Government, how could we reasonably expect anything different in the conduct of domestic affairs during the war and of many matters connected directly with the war.

The committee hearings show definitely that there has been little effort made to cooperate between the Army and the Navy, and especially is this true in regard to exchanging or utilizing the facilities of each branch of the service by the other. There has been no real effort made. The Army and Navy have not notified each other of their needs for facilities, and they have not notified each other of facilities each would no longer require.

We should have someone who has the authority to force the Army and Navy to cooperate and to exchange facilities wherever it is possible to do so, instead of spending great sums of money needlessly and wasting precious materials and manpower in new construction which practically duplicates facilities abandoned by the other branch of the service. Especially is this true in regard to flying fields, warehouses, and defense plants.

We should have a Department of National Defense with full power to tell the Army and the Navy what facilities to use and to force full cooperation and coordination in the use of all facilities.

Another observation I would like to make is that some single purchasing agency should be set up for both the Army and the Navy. We have the best admirals and generals in the world. They have devoted their lives to the study of the science and art of war. They know military and naval strategy, and they know what weapons they need to successfully carry on a war. They know how to properly train and condition those in the various services. We are proud of their abilities along these lines, and we are proud of the accomplishments of the Army and the Navy under their leadership, but they have not been so efficient in the procurement of the weapons needed or of training facilities.

I think these admirals and generals should continue to conduct our military and naval operations and to determine what weapons and supplies they need and when they need them, but I think we should have an agency directed by a hard-headed businessman, and composed of people experienced in business, to make the purchases for the Army and the Navy.

There are few localities in the country that have not witnessed gross waste and extravagance, either in the procurement of sites and the construction of camps, flying fields, or defense plants. The amount of the taxpayers' money which has been utterly wasted in this connection is tremendous, to say nothing about the waste of materials and manpower. Not only is this a burden on the taxpayers for generations to come, it is actually injuring our efforts to win the war and is requiring our Nation to raise much more money to finance the war than it should be necessary to raise.

In my district the War Department spent upward of $65,000,000 on a defense plant which was practically abandoned as soon as it was completed. At another place in my district twice as much land was purchased for a defense plant as was needed. The Real Estate Division of the Army Engineers objected to the purchase of all the land, claiming that one-half of the land was all that would be needed, but the Real Estate Division was overruled and the land was purchased. About one-half of the land has never been used, and now it is officially ruled as surplus property. This has worked a hardship on Government financing and a greater hardship and injustice on the owners of the land. They were required to give possession of their homes and farms on 60 days' notice. Many could not find a place to move their stock, feed, and machinery on such short notice. This compelled them to sell their stock, feed, and machinery at a loss and then go out looking for a place on which to live.

At another place the Navy spent $5,000,000 to expand an existing privately owned plant, supplied about $1,000,000 worth of tools and machinery, and then never gave the company a single order. Also, 450 houses were constructed at this plant as a defense-housing project, but none of the houses has ever been occupied, and they are now being moved to another location. The record is full of such instances.

If we had a purchasing agency staffed with qualified men of business experience to provide the material, the weapons, and supplies required by the Army and the Navy, such instances of waste and extravagance would not occur. Also, in that event our military and naval officers, who have been schooled in war science, would be free to devote their time and energies to the winning of the war, while the matters of procurement and supplies would be left to those nonmilitary men experienced in extracting a dollar's worth of value for every dollar of the taxpayers' money expended. This would make more military and naval men available for military and naval activities and at the same time insure a businesslike set-up for the purchase of all ordnance, supplies, and facilities.

We all realize there are many capable and competent officers in the procurement divisions of both the Army and the Navy, but they are so much in the minority and their jurisdiction is so limited, and the whole set-up so involved in rank and red tape, that the present system of procurement has proven to be very inefficient, as well as extremely costly and wasteful.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to serve on this committee. It has been our united effort to provide the Navy with everything it needs. There has been no partisanship in the committee. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has been very thorough and fair in conducting the hearings. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] of the majority party, and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], the other minority party members, have been very thorough and painstaking in their efforts to provide the best navy in the world. Mr. John Pugh, clerk of the committee, has rendered most valuable service and I cannot compliment him too highly. It has been our constant effort to be fair and just to the Navy while at the same time looking after the welfare of the taxpayers.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has paid splendid tribute to his colleagues on the committee and to the clerk of the committee. As one Member of the House I want to express appreciation to this

committee for the work it has done on this particular bill. A bill carrying approximately $32,000,000,000 has been brought to the House only after the most careful, conscientious consideration and check-up. The fact that this bill will pass, either unanimously or very nearly so, is a tribute to the confidence which the Congress has in the painstaking work of this splendid committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, both for myself and for the members of the committee.

We believe we have the best Navy in the world, and it is our hope and our belief that the Navy will be one of the real moving factors in bringing this war to a victorious end. It is our hope and our prayer that the war will soon be over and that our American boys can soon return to their loved ones. There is not a member of this committee who would deny the Navy a single penny of appropriations to provide anything that is needed for the proper training, or for supplies of any kind which would in any way assist in protecting them or which would assist in their efforts to conquer the enemy. We are vitally interested in the welfare of those who are fighting this war for us. Mr. Chairman, taking everything into consideration this bill is probably as good as could be brought before the House under existing circumstances.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill provides for an appropriation and contractual authority of $32,647,134,336. I deem it pertinent at this time to let the House know the activities of the Navy in the war so far, and to pass on to the House some of the information available to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Because of its constant and close contact with the Navy Department, the Committee on Naval Affairs has accumulated a vast fund of information bearing on naval activities and it is my purpose to make available to the House as much of that information as is compatible with the national security and to let the House know what the Navy has done and what it proposes to do in the prosecution of the war. We know from the public press the glorious results that the Navy has achievied, but the planning and laborious administrative work that have been necessary to assure those results do not constitute news and, consequently, have received scant recognition.

Since the landings on Guadalcanal and in north Africa, our offensive operations have gradually expanded, until now the United Nations hold the initiative in all theaters of operations. At the present time we have overcome the submarine menace in the Atlantic, a notable feat that permits us to supply our forces in Europe to the limit of available shipping. However, this menace may start up again and, therefore, no let-up in our antisubmarine measures can be permitted until Germany is out of the war. We have attained mastery of the sea and air in the Pacific to the extent that operations are being projected by our task forces into waters heretofore controlled by the Japs—an open challenge to their fleet to come out and fight. Our submarines in the Pacific, patrol the Japanese vital sea lanes to the very coasts of their homeland, and they are taking a tremendous toll of his shipping. The United Nations control the air on all active fronts and over Germany itself. Nothing the enemy can do can stop us now, provided we meet the requirements in men, ships, planes, weapons, and bases, to support bold and well-conceived plans. And it is on the basis of the Navy's needs for its share in the execution of these plans that the appropriation is proposed.

Last year the escort vessel building program was of the utmost importance, and every resource was applied to increase the speed of production of this type of craft to meet the growing threat of the U-boat campaign. The effort expended in pushing the destroyer escort and the escort-carrier programs has paid enormous dividends in overcoming the submarine menace. The numbers of these escort craft now available, and becoming available, are steadily enhancing the security of our shipping lanes; but here, too, we must assume that the enemy is on the alert for any signs of slackening in our effort. The Navy's program for escort vessels must, therefore, continue as now planned.

Practically every offensive operation undertaken, or planned, involves amphibious warfare, with the resulting need for more and more landing craft. The types range from small amphibious tractors to the relatively large landing ships. The numbers required are large, and the losses in operations, while not excessive thus far, still necessitate considerable replacements and this can be expected to continue. The stepping up of amphibious operations will require more and more landing craft. In short, if our offense is to continue to succeed, our production schedules for landing craft must be met.

The shipbuilding program, as a whole, is progressing satisfactorily. Experiences in actual combat with the enemy have proved the soundness of the Navy's designs and construction. Building periods have been substantially reduced, even though design changes must frequently be made as a result of new weapons and of lessons learned. Losses are to be expected, and we are prepared to accept them as the price of our mounting offensive, but with the assurance that the enemy will suffer by comparison.

The success of our operations, particularly in the Pacific, has been due in a large measure to our growing aircraft-carrier strength and our shore-based aviation. Recent operations have seen the greatest concentrations of carrier-based planes ever known, and through complete mastery of the air our losses in surface craft and aircraft in such actions have been kept at a minimum. To maintain this superiority, as we drive the Japanese back into his inner ring of defenses, we are going to need every carrier and plane that our program will provide.

This emphasis upon the contribution of carrier-based aircraft in no way indicates a lessening in our need for other types of combatant ships—battleships, cruisers, destroyers—to comprise the naval teams that are now so successfully operating in the Pacific. I stress this idea of naval teams, for no one type can operate without the others, to round out the whole and thus be prepared for any combat eventuality.

Thus far I have discussed primarily our combatant vessels and their operations. Here I should like briefly to go into the requirements to support those vessels and their operations. Such support involves large numbers of auxiliary vessels and vast installations on shore both at home and projected into the areas of operations in order to insure full mobility of our forces. This naval mobility is one of the most potent reasons behind the success of our operations.

Always a pressing need, and one most often overlooked, is ample and efficient maintenance of our forces afloat. A ship in commission and operating must be kept in good condition and, in addition to battle damage, time alone increases the required upkeep. Each ship must have available many types of spare parts, some on board, but mostly stored where they can be readily supplied in case of need. Another point, not always realized by those not thoroughly familiar with naval operations, is the real need for large numbers of smaller craft, such as tugs, barges, lighters, and so forth, in all ports and bases where combatant ships are restocked with supplies and are repaired and overhauled, and particularly in island bases where very few, if any, waterfront facilities are available.

The Navy's advanced base program represents a sizeable proportion of the appropriation. This program is based upon absolute needs to support planned operations in active combat areas. The Navy has now gained considerable experience in the establishment of advanced bases. From this experience the Navy will be able to plan its procurement and assembly of advanced base material, so that the required installation can move in as soon as the initial assault is over.

BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

The Bureau of Naval Personnel, under the able guidance of Vice Admiral Randall Jacobs, administers the entire personnel of the Navy.

The personnel requirements of the Navy in the fiscal year 1945 were carefully studied by the Committee on Naval Affairs in connection with the 1945 appropriation bill which is now before the House. The Navy's manpower needs, its training programs, and the provisions it makes for the care and morale of all naval personnel are of vital interest to the Congress and the Nation. I will summarize briefly the personnel development of the Navy thus far in the war and the plans for its continued expansion during the coming fiscal year.

The Members of the House are familiar with the extraordinary expansion in the

size of the Navy since our entry in the war. It has increased more than six-fold—from 35,000 officers to more than 220,000; from 290,000 enlisted men to more than 2,000,000; and from 800 nurses to more than 7,000. When it is remembered that of the personnel in the Navy today less than 5 percent of the officers and men were in the Regular Navy at the start of the war, we can appreciate the magnitude of the problem of making this vast sum of trained sailormen available to man our ships.

Although 95 percent of our naval personnel had no, or at best a very limited, background of training or experience as sailormen, they were to be required to operate and maintain the most highly mechanized fighting ships in military history. As the number of ships in commission began to increase at a rapid rate, the personnel timetable likewise had to be accelerated. Back in 1941 the Bureau of Naval Personnel was called upon to man only about 1 ship per day. During 1942 more than 3 ships were commissioned each day. In 1943 the average number per day began to approach 6 ships, and in the calendar year 1944 the estimate is an average of between 11 and 12 ships commissioned each day. I am speaking only of commissioned ships, such as battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, submarines, and so forth, and have not included oil barges, tenders, and other district craft, which also must be manned by naval personnel.

Required to schedule its procurement and training to the changing timetable of ship construction, the Bureau of Naval Personnel also had to keep in mind the technical demands of all the new developments and techniques which have revolutionized the science of naval warfare. A training program geared to handle 25,000 officers and over 425,000 enlisted men at any one time was developed step by step.

The length of training ashore varies, depending upon the specialty for which the man is selected. If he is to be an aviator he will have more than 18 months of training and more than 400 hours of flying before he is ready for combat assignment. If he is to be a radio technician, repairing and maintaining the radar, radio, and sound equipment which has played so important a part in our victory, it is necessary to give him almost a year of training. If he is to be a machinist's mate, gunner's mate, or torpedoman, he will have 4 months of advanced training after he has completed his recruit course.

As a new aircraft carrier, battleship, cruiser, destroyer, or destroyer escort is being built in the yard, the men who will man her are undergoing training at sea or in many of the more than 300 naval schools, and in not one single instance has the commissioning of a ship been delayed for lack of trained personnel. This has meant the most exact planning so that the output of all of these schools in different types of training can be geared into the ship-completion dates.

Your Naval Affairs Committee has been particularly interested in, and watchful of, the measures taken by the Bureau of Naval Personnel for the welfare and morale of the men in the Navy. Not only is there a highly advanced program for keeping the men in fine physical condition, and providing for recreation and entertainment all over the world, but the men are given the opportunity to continue their education in any field they choose during the evenings and whenever there is a lull in activity. The morale of the men at sea is directly affected by the care and protection that are being given to their families at home. The Congress has played its part by legislation for dependent's allowances, for the protection of insurance rights, the continuance of allotments for the dependents of men in a missing status, and for maternity care for the wives of the men. I can assure you that the morale of the men in the Navy is high and great credit is due to the Bureau of Naval Personnel and the Congress for the administrative and protective leadership that has been shown in looking after this vital need.

Because the size of the Navy is geared to the ship construction program, the Navy's personnel problems are today quite different from those of the Army. The Navy college-training program is a good illustration. It is of vital importance that a continued supply of officers be available for the Navy next year and in succeeding years. The Navy college-training program is designed to meet this need, for the men in the program are studying mathematics and the technical and engineering sciences which are the prerequisites of a competent deck officer. On the first of March there were nearly 70,000 in the V-12 program. While this number may be reduced during the next year, there is no indication that this program can or should be eliminated.

In the calendar year 1944 the strength of the Navy will increase by more than 600,000 under authorization already approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President. It may well be that a still larger increase will be required as a result of the extraordinary job that American industry is doing in producing thousands of amphibious craft without materially delaying the production of larger vessels. The recent experiences in the Central Pacific, the Marshalls, Caroline Islands, and the Admiralty Islands, give hope that the amphibious forces will hasten the day of Japanese defeat. If the Navy needs more men in coming months, I believe it is the responsibility of the Congress to see that the Selective Service System operates to produce them.

The Appropriations Committee gave thorough and expert study to the personnel items in the present appropriation bill. I note that the committee has allowed the Navy a sufficient latitude so that it can make many of the changes in its facilities that will be required by the changing course of events in coming months. From long experience with these matters, the Naval Affairs Committee knows that you cannot estimate precisely today the scope and character of projects which may well be required tomorrow. With the advance of technical developments, new needs arise, and the Navy must be in a position to shift emphasis from one type of training to another and to change its facilities to meet the new need. I believe the Members of the House will agree that the realistic approach to this question by the Appropriations Committee is not only necessary for the speedy progress of the war effort, but also will prove in the end to have resulted in economies.

I speak for the Committee on Naval Affairs when I say that the Bureau of Naval Personnel, under the leadership of Vice Admiral Jacobs, has done one of the outstanding jobs of the war. The people of our country can be assured that their boys who are in the Navy are receiving the finest training, and every measure for their care and morale that the best brains of our Navy have been able to devise. These vast personnel operations have been conducted with economy of funds and strategic materials. Careful planning has avoided the uneconomical use of the Navy's manpower.

BUREAU OF SHIPS

After the disarmament conferences the total combatant ship strength of the entire world was about four and one-half million tons. It is anticipated that the under-age strength of our Navy will almost equal that tonnage by December 31, 1944, and in addition we will have over-age ships of almost one-half million tons available for service. On December 1, 1941, there were less than 1,000 ships in commission in the Navy, and by July 1943 this number had increased to nearly 4,000 ships, exclusive of landing craft and other smaller types of vessels. That will give you an idea of the magnitude of the shipbuilding program that has been carried on by the Bureau of Ships.

During the years 1940 to 1943, inclusive, 762 fighting ships of nearly two and one-half million tons have been added to the fighting fleet, and in addition 28,472 auxiliary vessels such as mine craft, patrol craft, landing craft, and district craft have been added to the fleet. Approximately 75 percent of this work was completed in the year 1943 alone. The numerical strength of the combatant fleet on January 1, 1943, was doubled in the first 11 months of that year.

By the end of 1943 the production rate per quarter was substantially equal to the entire shipbuilding program of World War No. 1.

The outstanding accomplishment in the Navy shipbuilding program in 1943 was the destroyer escort program. None of these ships had been delivered by February 1, 1943, but in the remaining months of that year 306 of them were delivered. At the same time 65 aircraft carriers of various types, including the escort carrier, were delivered.

The efficiency of the shipbuilding program as a whole is well illustrated by the decrease in the number of man-hours required for the construction of various types of ships. The required man-hours for the construction of a destroyer escort has been reduced in one instance from 1,200,000 to 550,000. The hours required for the construction of a light cruiser has been reduced from 7,700,000 to 5,500,000, and a tank landing

ship—L. S. T.—which formerly required 750,000 hours is now being built in 450,000 hours.

All outstanding records for speed in construction have been shattered in 1943. A destroyer escort vessel was launched less than 5 days after its keel was laid, and was delivered for service on the twenty-fifth day after the keel laying. This compares with the World War No. 1 record of 45½ days for construction of a destroyer. The records for other combatant ships are: Battleship, 45,000 tons, 33 months; aircraft carrier, 27,100 tons, 15.9 months; destroyers, 4.5 months; and submarines, 7.3 months.

Not only has extreme speed been accomplished in construction, but such speed has prevailed in planning and design. For example, the 157-foot infantry-landing craft—L. C. I. (L)—was first conceived in May 1942. The first ship of this design was placed in service in 1942 and hundreds were completed in time to play an important role in the operations at Sicily, Salerno, the Aleutians, and the South Pacific.

The mass production of ships and the speed obtained has not resulted in any sacrifices in quality. Nonessentials have been eliminated, and their elimination has permitted the strengthening and improvement of the peacetime design of ships, and has contributed materially to their combat effectiveness. The elimination of nonessentials has permitted increases in the fire power of our vessels. As an example, the U. S. S. *South Dakota* when undergoing repairs in 1943 received an increase of 600 percent in the number of barrels of her close-in antiaircraft battery. The antiaircraft fire of a large carrier was increased 109 percent.

Despite the remarkable accomplishments made in the shipbuilding field, we should not lose sight of the work which is being done in the field of maintenance and repair. By July 1943 there were nearly 4,000 ships in service in the Navy. They were operating for long periods of time with little rest in port and at speeds greatly in excess of normal peacetime operations. A month of wartime operation approaches from 6 months to a year of normal peacetime operation. This has tremendously increased the ship-repair load. During 1 month in 1943, 436 vessels were under repair in the 9 navy yards, and for the first 9 months of 1943 a total of 3,376 ships were overhauled and converted in these yards. Also, extensive salvage operations were conducted in all quarters of the globe, the most notable being the raising of the U. S. S. *Lafayette*—ex-*Normandie*—which was completed in November 1943.

The Bureau of Ships is making splendid progress, and with Rear Admiral E. L. Cochrane at its head, we can expect the continued efficient performance by this Bureau.

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

Since August last the Bureau of Aeronautics has functioned primarily as a material bureau. At that time the office of the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Air—was created. This office is headed by the previous Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, Vice Admiral McCain, and took over the functions of training, planning, personnel, and flight, leaving the Bureau of Aeronautics, now headed by Rear Admiral Ramsey, with the problems of procurement, production, engineering, and maintenance.

Upon our entrance into the war, we had a highly skilled and well-trained naval aviation personnel equipped with the finest naval airplanes then in existence. The deficiency was one of number only. It was clear then as it is clear today that our ultimate major national aviation effort would be in the Pacific theater but, because of the heavy losses inflicted by enemy submarines in the Atlantic, it was necessary to accord first priority to that theater. Countermeasures placed in effect in that theater have substantially reduced our losses and in those operations naval aircraft played a most effective part. They continue to take a heavy toll of Hitler's undersea fleet.

Since the Battle of Midway in June 1942, in which our naval flyers were primarily responsible for the destruction of four first-line Japanese aircraft carriers, our strength in ships, planes, pilots, and bases has increased to the exent that we have been able to launch overwhelming power against important enemy positions in the South, Southwest, and Central Pacific areas.

The reluctance of the enemy to seriously challenge these advances is indicated by the fact that the last carrier duel was fought in October 1942. Our naval forces, spearheaded by carriers, have since January 1, 1943, been on the offensive, but Japanese resistance has been confined in the main to night air attacks and submarine operations with no indication of their desire so far to expose their heavy ships. Although our carrier strength has increased eightfold numerically since Pearl Harbor, it is important to note that the expansion is made up in the main of vessels of merchant-type construction of relatively low speed and limited airplane-operating capacity. A continuing need will exist during the course of the war with Japan for all the large, fast carriers we can put in service in the Pacific.

From a handful of naval aviation-training establishments, fields, stations, and bases in commission at the beginning of the war, we now number such facilities in hundreds and they are increasing daily as we consolidate our newly won positions in the Marshalls and Gilberts. Our pilot strength, including the marine flyers, has increased tenfold and I am sure I am safe in saying that the training system in effect has produced airmen second to none in any service in the world. The pilot-training program is of such interest and importance that I will deal with it later in detail. In the field of aircraft production the output capacity now, for the first time in the expansion period, exceeds requirements. It is possible, therefore, for the Bureau of Aeronautics to place even greater emphasis upon the quality of the planes and equipment procured and to introduce a larger number of experimental prototypes to insure that the relatively superior position we now hold with respect to the enemy in the power, performance, endurance, and resistance of our naval airplanes will remain unchanged throughout the duration of this war.

A review of the current naval aviation situation cannot help but give us a feeling of satisfaction and optimism about the future trend of events in the Pacific, but, coupled with this optimism, we must be patient and not think for one moment that victory is just around the corner. We all know of the fighting qualities of the Japanese and of their fanatical devotion to cause and country. We must expect reverses and serious losses before the road to Tokyo is traversed and victory is won. While it will be the objective to explore every practicable and reasonable method of foreshortening the duration of the war, this must not be done at the expense of extravagant personnel losses. The offensive will be maintained, we can be assured of that, but there will be no rash uncalculated adventures with attendant unnecessary wastage of men and materials.

The successes which our naval forces in the Pacific have recently enjoyed and in which naval aviation has taken such a prominent part have been due primarily to the overwhelming concentrations of power at the right place at the right time.

The availability of large numbers of our aircraft carriers and planes in the theater of war of the Navy's primary interest are the factors that operate to increase the attrition imposed upon the enemy while at the same time reducing the attrition suffered by ourselves. Such concentrations are hard on enemy morale while elevating to our own. They provide a factor of safety against losses and, in spite of such losses, permit the continued prosecution of a plan of attack which otherwise would have to be abandoned. I will now take up the pilot-training program.

The training of naval aviators in peacetime was a small-scale, single-station operation. Except for elimination training conducted at the Naval Reserve aviation bases, all stages of pilot training were given at a single naval air station—Pensacola.

The war forced the transformation of pilot training into a Nation-wide, large-scale operation. In terms of pilots and planes, the training establishments are now larger than the entire air force of the Navy and the Marine Corps at the time of Pearl Harbor. Training establishments now have more than twice as many planes and about 25 percent more naval aviators acting as instructors than the total number of planes and naval aviators in the service at the time of the declaration of war. Training is conducted at air stations located literally from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Canadian border to the Gulf.

Without quoting exact information as to the numbers trained, this much can be said: Pilot production quadrupled in 1941 and 1940, quadrupled again in 1942, and doubled in 1943 over the level

reached the preceding year. Output in 1944 is expected to approximate the level reached last year.

While fully recognizing the necessity of meeting production goals in terms of numbers, naval aviation never has departed from its fundamental objective—namely, to turn out qualified pilots as close to battle readiness as the needs of the service permit. This process of fitting a pilot for combat is long and arduous and has many angles. It is to achieve this objective that the final stage of pilot training includes the flying of modern combat aircraft in combat tactics and maneuvers.

The training of a naval aviator involves much more actual flight time in a plane, however. In peacetime, aviation cadets were required to be college graduates before they entered flight training. These requirements have been reduced until at present high-school graduates are being accepted. In order to raise the general educational level of flight students, thus better to equip them for the problems they will encounter in service, aviation cadets from civilian sources are now being processed through the Navy college-training program, in which they receive 8 months of college work. Even in the actual flight-training stages, a substantial part of the cadets' time and energy is occupied with ground-school subjects such as navigation, aerology, communications, aircraft engines, theory of flight, and so forth. Naval aviators completing their training today receive more hours of instruction in a better integrated ground-school program than did the naval aviators trained in peacetime.

Another aspect of the training of a naval aviator is that of military indoctrination and physical training. Since the majority of the pilots receive commissions as officers, it is necessary that they be given thorough grounding in military matters as a part of their training program. It is not sufficient that a man be able only to pilot a plane; in addition, he must be trained to assume the responsibilities of an officer in a military organization. A well-developed program of physical training, which includes substantial emphasis upon survival tactics, is also a part of the training process.

Pilot training activities are planned in conjunction with other phases of naval aviation—such as the completion dates of carriers, the formation dates for squadrons, and the production of aircraft. Requirements for pilots are reviewed continuously and are revised to reflect accruing battle experience.

Progress and improvement in training can never stop. Planes are becoming faster and heavier; instruments are becoming more complex; combat maneuvers must be drilled in until responses become automatic. Now that the pressure of ever-expanding requirements has been alleviated to some extent—the objective will be further to improve the quality of training as soon as student load conditions permit. By the end of the year it is hoped that the flight hours in the combat planes may be increased by at least 50 percent, and doubled if possible. New types of training are being developed to meet the needs of the war. As they become available, aviators with actual combat experience are being ploughed back into the training establishments in order that they may teach to the pilots of tomorrow the battle lessons of today and yesterday.

This fact must be emphasized—training cannot become static so long as the war is in progress. Some facilities now used for training will be diverted to other uses as student loads permit. Six primary stations already have been released from primary training and two more are slated to be converted to other uses within the next few months. However, other stations may require modification or improvement in order to fit them into the training program.

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

The Bureau of Ordnance, headed by Rear Admiral Hussey and formerly by his illustrious predecessor, Rear Admiral Blandy, is responsible for converting the ships and planes of the fleet from mere vehicles to fighting instruments of war. This Bureau is charged with the responsibility for the research, design, procurement, manufacture, issue, and maintenance of the Navy's offensive weapons and defensive armament. It is fulfilling this obligation with such success that today our naval ordnance can accurately be described as superior to that of any other navy. This Bureau has, with certain exceptions, established the requisite research, production, and maintenance facilities with which to discharge its duties.

Current production rates on most ordnance programs are sufficient to meet the requirements of new combatant ship construction, improving and modernizing existing vessels, repairing battle damage, arming our merchant craft, and supplying defense aid needs for ordnance. Production rates for certain other important requirements are not adequate at this time. These requirements stem from increased demands from the fleet for certain types of antiaircraft ordnance, for bombardment ammunition, and for equipment peculiar to amphibious operations. In addition, there are a number of new programs undergoing development, the results of which will be intensively applied in the future. An example of this is the tremendous rocket program and its numerous ramifications.

Perhaps the outstanding accomplishment in naval ordnance in this war to date has been the tremendously improved ability of our ships to repel air attacks. At the start of the war, many prophets predicted the early demise of naval surface ships. They had an abundance of good arguments, but, far from having succumbed, naval ships have not only survived and greatly multiplied in number but several new types have been created. Particularly in the case of capital ships, our ships have clearly demonstrated that they contain within themselves the resources to beat off sustained enemy air attacks. Not one capital ship—cruiser, carrier, or battleship—has ben sunk by enemy airplanes in the past 14 months.

The guns which constitute the antiaircraft protection range in caliber from five inch down to one-half inch. Various combinations of these batteries have been installed on all ships. Typical of the improvement in antiaircraft defense is that of some of our battleships whose antiaircraft fire power has been increased as much as 1,000 percent since the time of Pearl Harbor.

The Japs have learned sound lessons about these guns and, as a consequence, have been less inclined to press home their air attacks, thereby decreasing the effectiveness of their efforts. Further, the Japs have learned that day attacks are becoming increasingly costly, and they are putting more efforts on night tactics. These developments have affected our ordnance program. If the enemy will not come in close, we are going to reach out for him. Hence the preference by the fleet for greater numbers of the larger-caliber, longer-range automatic weapons. Another reason for an ever-increasing demand for the weapons is their great value in amphibious operations. The Bureau now considers the heavy automatic weapon programs to be among its most important projects. Monthly production rate of these weapons will be more than doubled during the coming year. Proportionate increases will be necessary in both the directors to control their gunfire and in the ammunition. These programs will require readjustment and some increases in facilities.

The changes in tactics in the Pacific in the past year from the defensive to offensive has increased the demand for bombardment ammunition, which is designed for maximum bursting and smash effect for shore bombardment.

At Tarawa the Navy learned that what had theretofore been regarded as a very extensive softening-up by gunfire and bombs was not sufficient to prevent a heavy sacrifice of life among the landing forces. How well this lesson was learned was evidence by the assault on Kwajalein only a few months later, when the expenditure of ammunition was greatly increased in proportion to what it was at Tarawa, and the loss of life was very much lower.

Tremendous quantities of this type of ammunition will be needed for future operations of this nature, and present facilities are being expanded to meet these needs.

I mentioned earlier that the rocket program is under rapid and extensive development. Naval rockets have not enjoyed the same publicity given to the use of German and so-called London-bound rockets, but the Bureau of Ordnance for some time has been supplying them to the fleet in steadily increasing quantities. They have been used with good results on landing craft, and with respect to this use particularly a large procurement program is under way. The entire rocket field will doubtless undergo great expansion which will involve new and necessary production facilities Currently, the equipment for the production of propelling charges is critical.

As a corollary of the increased emphasis on offensive weapons and craft of

all types for shore assaults, the Bureau is intensifying procurement of a number of miscellaneous ordnance items, such as demolition equipment, smoke devices, and the like.

The production accomplishments of the Bureau are strikingly indicated by comparing the total weight of groups of projectiles and of guns, as represented by the weight of the finished barrel, produced in our first month of war with a month 2 years later. In December 1941 the Bureau produced 1,400 tons of 6- to 16-inch projectiles, and 2 years later, in 1 month, production for this same group was over 5,000 tons; for 3-, 4-, and 5-inch projectiles, 2,500 tons compared to 9,000; and for the smaller projectiles, 20-millimeter, 1.1-inch, and 40-millimeter, the increase was greatest, from 1,200 tons to over 8,000 tons. The production in the larger-caliber guns above 6-inch was 125 tons for the average month in 1941, whereas in the average month for 1943 it was 300 tons; for the intermediate double-purpose 3-, 4-, and 5-inch guns, production increased from slightly under 100 tons to over 800 tons; and in the antiaircraft machine-gun group the increase was most spectacular, production climbing steadily from a total of only 10 tons in December 1941 to close to 200 tons in December 1943.

Similar increases could be enumerated for all types of ordnance, but times does not permit. However, it is perhaps worth noting that the production of torpedoes and fire-control directors; two fields of ordnancce who do not lend themselves to mass production but which require great skill, maximum precision, and assembling by hand; showed the following remarkable increases in production: Torpedo production was 900 percent greater in December 1943 than in December 1941 and the gun directors increase between the same 2 months was 3,000 percent. Lead computing sights for directing the fire of the 20-millimeter gun against the dive and torpedo planes were not in production in December 1941, however, production in 1944 will exceed the year 1942 by 2,700 percent.

The Bureau has continued to provide all the essential ordnance equipment such as guns, bomb racks, and bomb sights, as well as the requisite gun ammunition, bombs, and torpedoes for all naval planes put into service during 1943. The number of aircraft equipped with ordnance during the year approximated 20,000, and the number will be substantially increased during this year.

Submarine warfare, to mix a metaphor, is a shoe on the other foot for the Axis Powers. The Navy does not claim to have entirely licked the submarine but justly points out the success of our antisubmarine efforts. The Bureau of Ordnance shares in this success and has developed and supplied the necessary weapons. The procurement program is not a static one, however, and requirements in certain equipment have been reduced, but this decrease has been offset by newer devices already in production or undergoing development.

Our submarine offensive in the Pacific has been most fruitful. Jap merchantmen losses at the beginning of this year exceeded 3,000,000 gross tons, of which our submarines, chiefly by means of torpedoes, have sunk between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000 tons. The monthly production of submarine, aircraft, and surface-craft torpedoes steadily increased during 1943 to the point where our monthly production exceeds the total produced in World War No. 1.

The Bureau maintenance problem is increasing as the result of the growth in size and increased operation of the fleet. The extension of our gains, particularly in the Pacific, imposes added logistic requirements, and battle-damage work has increased. This has not particularly affected production programs since spare equipment and parts have been provided for in the course of normal production. However, it has imposed the need for large increases in the ordnance staffs at various stations and for the establishment of additional foreign base facilities for the overhaul and maintenance of ordnance equipment. The increase in this type of work load is indicated by the fact that there were three times as many ships in yards at the close of the year as there were in a comparable period 6 months previous. Indications are that this work will continue to increase.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

In the field of public works our Navy has done more than expand from a one-ocean to a seven-ocean fleet. Since the beginning of the emergency nearly 4 years ago, the Navy's shore establishments—shipbuilding and repair facilities, air stations, hospitals, ordnance and storage facilities, and all the other less spectacular components of our Navy ashore—have increased nearly twelvefold.

On July 1, 1940, after the fall of France had awakened us to the full extent of our danger, the Navy's shore establishment was valued at approximately $600,000,000. Since that time the Bureau of Yards and Docks and the officers of the Civil Engineer Corps, lead by Vice Admiral Ben Moreell, have directed and supervised construction of installations in this country costing nearly $5,200,000,000, while overseas we have built advanced bases at a cost of more than $1,775,000,000. In short, the emergency expansion of the Navy's shore facilities represents an investment of nearly seven billions.

Second only to the construction of advanced bases has been development of facilities for naval aviation. More than $1,600,000,000 has gone into construction of over 30 new major naval air stations and 20 important auxiliary stations, as well as the expansion of existing stations. An outstanding example is the world's largest aviation training center at Corpus Christi, Tex. This $90,000,000 plant, comprising the main station, 6 auxiliary stations, and 45 outlying fields, covers a 40-square-mile area. Its facilities include housing for 3,000 officers, 6,500 aviation cadets, and 20,000 enlisted personnel.

Shipbuilding and ship repair have been a close second to aviation. Needs of the expanded Navy and merchant marine have necessitated installations costing approximately $1,340,000,000. These facilities include our massive graving drydocks, the floating drydock program, and all the shops and utilities necessary in the building and repair of ships.

The graving dock program has produced 34 separate docks, including 13 for battleships and 8 for cruisers. All of our graving docks are now usably complete except 3 small docks recently begun at Hunter's Point, Calif. Incidentally, when that base is completed, it will boast 6 drydocks, 2 capital-ship piers, and 3 submarine piers, in addition to a long quay wall, many new shops, and housing facilities. Facilities already constructed there have cost approximately $53,000,000.

Even more extensive has been the expansion of the New York Navy Yard. Involving expenditures of well over $100,000,000, this undertaking necessitated construction of two 1,100-foot shipbuilding docks and 2 major shipbuilding piers. It also included many accessory buildings and facilities, including a 16-story warehouse, 2 large subassembly and welding shops, a new foundry, and a modern material-testing laboratory. To construct these facilities required less than one-third the time required in peace days.

Simultaneously, on the west coast, the Bureau was building some $34,000,000 worth of facilities at the Roosevelt fleet base on Terminal Island, San Pedro, Long Beach, Calif., consisting of fleet installations costing $20,600,000, personnel housing valued at $9,000,000, and a $4,000,000 air station.

Special emphasis has been placed on floating drydocks which can support the fleet at advanced bases. These include docks capable of servicing the heaviest carriers and battleships. Already 150 floating docks of all types have been built with a total lifting capacity of 1,200,000 tons.

To provide the fleet with fuel and supplies, nearly a half billion dollars has been expended for storage warehouses and fuel reservoirs. Fortunately, the development of new construction methods has enabled the Bureau to keep pace with the demand. It is now possible to build storage tanks in the interiors of mountains or deep underground in the time formerly required for surface installations. Furthermore, a new technique permits the substitution of concrete for steel in their construction.

For supplying the guns of the fleet, another half bililon dollars has gone into the construction of ordnance plants, such as the huge projects at Crane, Ind.; Hastings, Nebr.; and McAlester, Okla. The smallest of these covers 71 square miles. Together they contain 40 loading plants and more than 4,000 magazines. Their combined cost was approximately $164,000,000.

Another tremendous undertaking has been the half billion dollar training camp program which has brought forth such establishments as the stations at Bainbridge, Md.; Sampson, N. Y.; and Farragut, Idaho. Costing approximately $55,-

000,000 each, they have combined facilities for 130,000 men. A part of this program is housing facilities for the marines which, with other shore installations constructed for them, represent expenditures of approximately $170,000,000.

Training camps are only a part of the construction for naval personnel. For example, since the emergency more than $185,000,000 has been expended to insure adequate hospitalization. It has built 25 new hospitals throughout the country as well as providing extensions to 11 other naval hospitals previously built and extensive remodeling of 7 others.

An outstanding example of this work is the Navy Medical Center at Bethesda, Md. Rising to a height only 40 feet below that of the Washington Monument, this hospital will soon have a capacity of 1,500 beds when new temporary wards are completed. The main permanent structure and school facilities at the center represent a $6,200,000 investment.

Probably the most dramatic example of emergency construction was that undertaken at Pearl Harbor. Two huge graving docks were started on January 23, 1940, and the first was scheduled for completion in mid-September 1942. However, the imminence of war prompted the Bureau to order a speed-up in the contract. How important this foresight proved to be was evidenced by the fact that this dock was completed nearly 11 months ahead of schedule and was able to go into use 3 days after the Jap sneak attack. The other dock was finished shortly thereafter, and a third dock, begun in February 1942 was finished last October. The value of these docks to our war effort is immeasurably more than the $23,000,000 which they cost.

In carrying out the Bureau's over-all construction program, the Civil Engineer Corps officers have developed unique plans, materials, and equipment.

An outstanding contribution in this field has been the Navy's new pontoon gear which has played an important part in recent amphibious operations. Causeways made by putting strings of these pontoons together greatly speeded the unloading of guns and equipment at Sicily, Italy, and in the Marshall Islands. The equipment unloaded included other Bureau developed innovations such as portable huts, magazines, and laundry, decontamination, and galley equipment.

The tremendous quantities of materials used in the entire construction program prompted the establishment within the Bureau of a conservation division. Its purpose has been to examine carefully all activities to make certain none of doubtful value or scope are undertaken and to promote salvage of all excess or scrap materials, both at home and abroad. The division also has sought design changes which would save critical materials. Last year, the division achieved savings totaling well over $200,000,000.

The newest branch of the Navy is the construction battalions, popularly known as the Seabees, whose job it is to carry out the construction of Naval Shore Establishments in the combat zones. Enlisted from the ranks of skilled civilian construction workers, they have been whipped into a military organization and given sufficient training to defend what they build. Already they have constructed scores of air fields, fuel-supply and ship-repair bases throughout the Pacific as well as key bases in the Atlantic and in defense of the Panama Canal.

The past year has brought a new and additional function of the Seabees. It is to break the bottleneck in unloading and loading merchant ships carrying supplies to the fighting front. Seabee special battalions have been organized around a nucleus of men with civilian stevedoring experience. Special training facilities for stevedores and longshoremen have been set up, with the result that today approximately 25 of these special battalions are now in the combat zones speeding the flow of supplies.

The work of the construction battalions is just beginning, for advanced bases are essential to pressing home the attack on our enemies. As a result, the emphasis of the Navy's entire construction program is shifting from continental to overseas construction. This change of emphasis will be further heightened by the fact that more than twice as many Seabee battalions are at work overseas now than at this time last year, with their work speeded up by cumulative experience and improved techniques and equipment.

The Congress and the country can be proud of the outstanding achievements of Vice Admiral Moreell and his Bureau. We are indeed fortunate to have this very able and highly efficient officer as the head of our Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks, and too much praise cannot be given to him for his splendid accomplishments.

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, which has at its head Vice Admiral Ross T. McIntire, provides for the medical and dental care of the Navy, and at the outbreak of war in Europe it was operating 18 hospitals, 2 hospital ships, and a number of dispensaries. There were 841 medical officers, 255 dentists, 438 nurses, 132 warrant officers, and 4,348 corpsmen. This Bureau was quick to realize the imminence of war and to plan accordingly, and its facilities have kept pace with the rapid expansion of the Navy. It now operates 34 hospitals and 6 convalescent hospitals in the continental United States and 3 hospitals outside the United States. The bed capacity of its hospitals has increased from 6,147 in 1940 to approximately 60,000 at the end of 1944.

This Bureau has carried on a program of recruiting through the Reserve Corps, and now has the required number of trained medical men to man these hospitals and hospital ships. It has endeavored to furnish 1 dentist for every 500 enlisted men and to see that all enlisted personnel were made dentally fit before going to sea. This was an ambitious undertaking and is very near to accomplishment. Nurses have been recruited in required numbers, and to date all requirements have been met.

The Bureau has provided an extensive training program for hospital corpsmen and now has 100,000 of such personnel.

In addition to its program for caring for the current needs of the Navy in the medical field, this Bureau has conducted an extensive research activity and has carried out special work in the field of preventive medicine. It has also developed the science of aviation medicine, and at the present time has over 1,200 officers assigned to that field.

The outstanding accomplishment of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery has been the marked reduction in the death rate among wounded men. During World War No. 1 this death rate was approximately 8 percent. In the present war the rate has been reduced to 3 percent for the Army and the Navy together, and the Navy's death rate is even lower than that.

The field treatment of the wounded places emphasis on the prompt attention to his needs by a hospital corpsman and by a medical officer at the earliest opportunity. The man is given first aid where he falls, and if he is suffering from shock he is given an immediate injection of blood plasma, and morphine is administered. After this field treatment, every effort is made to get the patient to a hospital equipped to give him the best modern medical treatment. Where adequate ground hospital facilities are not available, men are moved by hospital ships and such ships are complete in every detail and afford facilities for treatment of all classes of cases comparable to those to be found in any modern continental hospital.

The administration of blood plasma, which is donated by the citizens of the country, has been one of the biggest factors in the reduction of death from wounds. The plasma makes it safe to move the patient and reduces the shock which in the past has caused the death of so many wounded.

In its hospitalization, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery endeavors to return to duty as many men as possible, and the expectation is that 60 percent of all the wounded will return to full-time duty. Those who are not physically able to return to full-time duty will be retained in service for limited duties wherever feasible, as it is considered that this contributes to their morale and saves to the Navy the valuable, practicable experience of these men. The Navy is also carrying out a program to fit disabled men for jobs in industry. In two hospitals experiments are under way to provide for the instruction of the men before their discharge, to aid them in their rehabilitation when they can no longer perform duty in the Navy.

The Navy is most fortunate in having such a capable medical officer as Vice Admiral McIntire in charge of the Bureau responsible for the health of its personnel.

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

Indispensably linked with our naval operations in the prosecution of the war are the functions of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

This Bureau is charged with and responsible for the procurement, purchase, receipt, custody, warehousing, issue, and shipment of all supplies, fuel, and other materials for the Navy, except supplies for the Marine Corps, the procurement of certain technical items, and the storage and issue of medical stores, ammunition, and explosives. It also keeps the money and property accounts of the Naval Establishment.

The type and volume of procurements by this Bureau, storage requirements, the strategic location of stores, the warehousing, transportation, and issue of materials are determined and dictated by fleet operating plans, which are subject to constant and continuous change to meet the exigencies of war. The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, like the entire Shore Establishment of the Navy, exists solely for the support of our fighting forces afloat.

This Bureau feeds, clothes, and pays the Navy. In those functions it is a powerful and one of the most important factors in building and maintaining morale. Its role in developing the material readiness of the fighting forces is, of course, a vital factor in naval operations.

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts procures all subsistence items—all the food required by the Navy. It buys all the clothing and textiles—all the fuel for naval vessels, the coal, fuel oil, Diesel oil, gasoline, greases, all petroleum products, including aviation gasoline.

It also is responsible for the procurement, storage, shipment, and issue of all the many thousands of items of general stores, including aeronautical spares and parts, and it buys any and all technical items used by the technical bureaus of the Navy Department when requested by those bureaus to make such procurements.

The Purchase Division of the Bureau, through the services of commissioned personnel taken directly from the top executive ranks of American business and industry, has been able to expedite the Navy's procurement program to meet the demands of our rapidly expanding forces.

Under the authority of the First War Powers Act, naval procurements have been speeded up to the point that when an urgent requirement is received by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the morning a contract for that material is issued on that same day.

Procurement speed, formerly computed in terms of weeks and months, now may be measured by hours and days. The over-all average time required to complete a contract after the requisition is received in the Bureau is only 10 days.

To further expedite procurement, there has been a decentralization of purchasing authority to meet local and emergency needs. Throughout the continental United States there are 16 field purchasing activities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. These major purchasing activities may make direct purchase from suppliers for perishable provisions, supplies, and materials needed in an emergency, and materials or services required for immediate use on approved projects or job orders.

In the procurement of food for the Navy, the methods that were efficient in peacetime proved to be inadequate in war when the demand on the national food supply has been so monumentally increased. Three time-saving and money-saving innovations have been adopted which fit the Navy's demand for food into the system of rationing that extends to the civilian population. They are coordination of purchases with the Army and the War Food Administration, decrease in the number of subsistence items purchased by local Navy activities, and the development of long-range advance estimates of requirements.

Our sailors are well fed, but they waste no food. The food-conservation program throughout the Naval Establishment has been found by inspections and observation by competent authorities to be effective in preventing waste.

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts has been able to meet the demands for uniforms and special clothing of our swiftly expanding Navy. Navy personnel are well outfitted, not only with items of the Navy uniform but with special and protective clothing. Special clothing has been developed by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts to give our sailors the maximum bodily protection under all climatic and operating conditions. That is a major factor in maintaining health and fighting efficiency of our naval personnel.

The progress of the Navy's procurement program has developed, inevitably, a storage problem of large and difficult dimensions.

There has been great emphasis in recent weeks on the need for planning proper disposition of possible post-war surpluses. With that, we all agree. But we must not lose sight of the fact that we still are engaged in a great war—the successful prosecution of which requires supplies and equipment in quantities far beyond those that could have been foreseen in early planning of warehouse and storage facilities.

Our Navy is still expanding. Under present plans, its maximum strength will not be reached until sometime in 1945. It is estimated that during the calendar year of 1944 an average of about 12 ships will be commissioned each day, and that does not include small miscellaneous craft.

All these ships must, of course, be supplied. Reserves of stores are being built up to meet continuing increases in requirements.

Adequate storage facilities for the Navy, strategically located, are indispensable in supporting naval operations. Storage is an essential part of the distribution system. In most cases, the Navy's need for storage is at specific locations, for the supplies required to stock or replenish stores of vessels and meet loading schedules must be where they are needed when they are needed.

The orderly and uninterrupted flow of supplies for the support of our naval forces demands a prompt and satisfactory solution of the critical storage problem.

Although there has been great expansion in the Navy's storage facilities, through new construction and the purchase or leasing of available commercial storage space both at coastal supply points and inland, this expansion has not kept pace with necessary procurements of materials. Up to the present time most of the materials procured have gone directly into use, but as production catches up with immediate requirements so that essential stocks may be maintained the need for storage space multiplies.

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, which is responsible for the warehousing and storage of all Navy materials, with certain stipulated exceptions, will have in use by June 30, 1944, approximately 57,000,000 gross square feet of covered storage, including space that has been leased or rented. This represents an increase of about 100 percent since January 1, 1942, which is far less than the increase in procurement and the expansion of the Navy as a whole.

It is estimated that in order to store materials on hand, already scheduled, or definitely anticipated, it will be necessary during the next fiscal year to provide approximately 15,000,000 square feet of additional covered storage space, beyond what may be leased or rented or acquired from other Government agencies.

Every possible effort has been made by the Navy to utilize all available commercial storage space that can be leased and every square foot of space that other Government agencies can release. Open storage has been utilized and will continue to be utilized in every instance where the materials will not seriously deteriorate under such exposure.

Authorization of the 15,000,000 square feet of additional coverage storage space required by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—which includes the over-all requirements of the Navy for the storage of all programs of expanding material needs—offers the only solution of a critical problem in the support of our battle fleets which is definitely linked with maintaining the highest possible fighting efficiency to hasten the day of victory.

While the material readiness with which the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts is closely concerned is of foremost importance in war, this Bureau renders many other services to the Navy which figure importantly in the fighting and winning of this war.

New methods in materials handling promulgated by the Bureau, improved packaging, and compacting of shipments have effected tremendous savings in money and man-hours and give maximum assurance of the arrival of supplies at the ultimate destinations in condition for immediate use.

A streamlined system of aviation supply, developed by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in close cooperation with the Bureau of Aeronautics, has materially strengthened the Navy's air arm. The assembly by the Bureau of all supplies required for movement to advanced

bases, the development of a coordinated system of inland storage depots, and the operation of material-recovery units overseas which have salvaged large quantities of equipment and supplies are among the outstanding accomplishments of this service bureau.

In the accounting and disbursing functions of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts procedures have been simplified to increase efficiency and economy of operations.

The new Navy pay-roll system that has been developed by the Bureau and now is being installed throughout the Naval Establishment is the latest major example of the constant effort of the Bureau to improve the services it renders to the Navy. Under this ingenious simplified pay plan, every Navy man is assured of getting all the pay due him when it is due him, regardless of where and how he may be serving. It is solving the problem of paying personnel punctually during the swiftly moving and far-reaching operations of global war.

By its continuous study to achieve maximum results with the minimum of time and effort in all its activities, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts has saved our people many millions of dollars in the cost of this war, while effectively expediting its prosecution. The success achieved by this Bureau is in a large measure attributable to the zeal and ability of its head, the Paymaster General of the Navy, Rear Admiral W. B. Young.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Although the Marine Corps is numerically small as compared with the Army and Navy, it has played an extremely vital part in the gaining of the victories of this war. Since Guadalcanal the Marine Corps has carried the battle sharply forward to the enemy in the Pacific, and its prodigious record of successes has won the proud, enthusiastic, and unceasing acclaim of the people of our Nation.

The Marine Corps has been able to do this by assuring the utmost use of every man and every single piece of equipment made available to it. Every man is trained and double-trained until he becomes a specialist in his own right, and until he has acquired that unwavering confidence in himself, his weapons, and his leaders and comrades which collectively is known as esprit de corps—a superb fighting quality for which our marines are traditionally famous.

The expansion of the Corps since December 7, 1941, has been abrupt and steep. The complexities of the Corps' duties have multiplied many times in the course of this war. The strain placed upon its training facilities consequently has been very severe. We might reasonably have expected the leaders of the Corps to compromise their insistence on highly individualized training and to have fallen back upon mass production methods.

But they have by no means done so. On the contrary, they have intensified their individualized training programs to a point never before believed possible. From their recruit depots to their most advanced schools, they have broadened and reinforced their facilities to cover every kind of activity that lies in their field. It has been their determined purpose to give every man the best possible preparation for action, wherever his post may be—on land, at sea, or in the air.

This policy has paid exceptional dividends to the Nation, for the reason that the Marine Corps' specialty has always been amphibious warfare. In this war, the world has become our battlefield, and its waterways our highways of attack. From the outset we have faced something new, something vastly different; we have faced the severe problems of modern amphibious fighting. In our abilities to solve those problems has lain our ability to conduct successful offensives in every theater of action.

For 20 years before this war began, the marines, with such men as General Vandegrift and General Holcomb taking the lead, devoted untiring effort to the study and development of amphibious techniques. So it was that when the Japanese hurled their forces against us, and our immediate need for amphibious skill became desperately apparent, the marines were ready.

Who will ever forget the men of Wake Island? Their story is an inspiration that will never fade from the memory of our people. To marines, it is an ideal that has guided and will guide them along the paths of heroism throughout this war.

Marines on the ground repulsed the first enemy attempt to take Midway Island on December 7, 1941, and marines in the air helped to blast and turn back Japan's greatest invasion fleet in the second Battle of Midway 5 months later.

Marines fought at Bataan, and when they were pushed back to Corregidor they manned the beach emplacements there, firing the last American shot of that tragic defense.

Appropriately, the marines were charged with undertaking this country's first land offensive of the war at Guadalcanal. Many of our people, I believe, have never fully realized what an extremely critical experience that first landing operation against the enemy was for us. Guadalcanal was to tell us whether our amphibious principles were sound, or whether we were not yet ready for the test. If our amphibious principles had proven unsound and unsuccessful against the Japanese, our situation would then have been—and would now be—extremely grave.

I, for one, do not like to contemplate what the consequences might have been if we had not been ready. But, as events proved—and as General Vandegrift and his valiant marines proved—we were. By seizing Guadalcanal, we thrust our foot into a steel door which the enemy was striving to slam shut. From that foothold we were able to pry open the door—the door of the Solomons—through which we have now advanced to the inner sanctums of Japanese defense.

Throughout that hard, bitter, perilous push up through the malarial jungles of the Solomons, and the blood-stained coral of the Gilberts and the Marshalls, the marines led the way ashore, drove the fanatic enemy back from the beaches, and ran up the Stars and Stripes.

The world has stood amazed at the sledge-hammer progress made by our magnificent Navy in its drive across the sea lanes toward Japan. Milestones along that way have been the searing, decisive marine victories at New Georgia, Choiseul, Bougainville, Cape Gloucester, Tarawa, Kwajalein atoll, Eniwetok, and Telesea. The Japanese admiral in command at Tarawa told his men that a million of the world's best troops could not overwhelm them. Six thousand marines did it.

At the same time, marines have stood guard over many of our vital defensive posts and bases in the Pacific, trained and equipped to repel any amphibious attempt the enemy may himself make to recoup some part of the losses that have begun to tell so heavily against him.

And where our enemies do not encounter marines directly, they still may feel the influence of the corps. Besides training its own men, the Marine Corps, during the past 2 years, has imparted the benefits of its long experience in amphibious operations to other branches of the service by helping to prepare American forces for the sea-borne landings that have been made so successfully in all theaters of the war.

Marine Corps aviation has taken its proud place with Navy and Army aviation in the establishing of our brilliantly won, and brilliantly maintained, aerial superiority in the Pacific. Marine fighter pilots have taken a heavy toll of Japanese planes of all types. From the standpoint of the number of enemy planes shot down, 7 of the 10 leading American fighter aces of this war to date are marines. Dive bombers and torpedo planes manned by marines have helped to wreak havoc upon Japanese shipping. It was marine airmen, in two scout bombers, who pioneered a long and hazardous flight through enemy skies to photograph the defenses at Truk—a job which had to be done before our Navy's first big carrier attack on that enemy mid-Pacific bastion could be made.

The quickening tempo of the offensive in the Pacific has been highly gratifying to all of us, but we have no glittering illusions. We know very well that the hardest part of the journey lies yet ahead. We know that the greatest, most difficult amphibious operations are yet to come. Our marines—our specialists in ship-to-shore fighting who have carried out to the letter every task assigned them since Guadalcanal, without faltering, without once stopping short of their full objective—those marines are ready and anxious to carry on their complete share of the burden.

As one marine recently put it: "We intend to do every job allotted to us on schedule, and in full measure. Some may call that optimism; we call it confidence." That resolute marine was the veteran, battle-wise commander of the corps—Gen. Alexander Vandegrift.

Such time-proven confidence merits our most loyal, our most thoroughgoing support. The fighting men of

the Marine Corps, given that support, will be able to apply their special training and special talents to the coming battles of the Pacific with ever-expanding success, and will sweep on to win the greatest victories of their corps' 168 years of glorious service to the Nation.

In conclusion, as the Navy stands today midway in its extraordinary expansion, it can be proud of the record it has made; and I have the utmost faith that we can look forward to the future with complete confidence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], such time as he may require.

OUR NAVY IN WAR AND IN PEACE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, your Appropriations Committee proposes that this House authorize an appropriation of more than twenty-seven and one-half billion dollars—and more than five billion dollars in additional contract authority—for the United States Navy in the fiscal year of 1945. Many good Members of this House will wonder if such a huge sum is necessary, but all will vote the sum, enormous as it is. The vote of this House will be a vote not to expend money alone but a vote of confidence in our great Navy, its leadership, and its millions of fighting men of the sea.

Never, in all history, have the seven seas floated a navy of any nation, or combination of enemy nations, which even approximated the size or strength of our Navy of today.

With this present-day enormity of fighting sea power it must be emphasized that we have not yet built the ultimate strength planned for the finish of our global war. By the end of the fiscal year 1945, which is to say by the middle of our calendar year 1945, the building of size and power will have been completed. This Navy then will be several times the estimated size and power of our strongest naval adversary, Japan. America will be the strongest naval arm in the world for years to come in all the waters of the world—under the sea, on the surface of the sea, and in the air above the sea—submarines, ships, and aircraft, and, above all, manpower, the toughest, the finest, and the greatest in number.

This is not the two-ocean Navy once decried. This is a world Navy. It is a Navy built to crush all adversaries in war. Such a potent military force of destruction can as well be turned to use as a protective sword in peace. Destruction of our enemies in war should have for its ultimate result and goal but one purpose—that purpose is a firm foundation for peace. This very same Navy built for victory in war may soon become America's greatest instrument for the maintenance of our peace.

I do not predict that we will, nor recommend that the United States should, maintain such great naval strength in the days after the war. I do recommend that we should by all means maintain the greatest of post-war naval forces. I hope that America will keep afloat, within her fiscal means, a Navy so strong that our enemies of today will forever seek our friendship in the future—a Navy so strong that our allies of today will forever look away from any temptation to become our enemies of tomorrow. Such a Navy, operated in the spirit of peace and in the cause of justice, may command the respect of all nations for the American desire for peace and fair dealing, nonaggression, and the autonomy of nations, large and small, throughout the world.

Such a mighty ring of defense can for generations to come guarantee the sovereignty, the independence, and the peace of America.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a source of great satisfaction to me to serve with the other six Members of this House charged with the responsibilities of the Navy Subcommittee on Appropriations as well as the very able committee clerk. These men are genuine and trustworthy. The sincere manner in which they have accepted me as one of their number has given me the concern of a deeper obligation of public service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, for one, am very grateful because of the gentleman's fine presentation of the need for a large adequate Navy after the war. I was in Boston recently and there was brought to my attention the fact that a number of years ago the Navy Department was going to recommend the closing of the navy yards at Charleston and at other points over the country. I was one of those who did battle to keep that navy yard. It was kept. I think the point the gentleman is stressing here is very timely.

Mr. PLOESER. I commend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts on her stand for the strong defense of this country through the Navy. It is regrettable in my opinion that we ever listened, wisely or unwisely, at the time to the demobilization of the Navy after the last war, or to those who decried a two-ocean Navy as "plain dumb" just prior to this war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was a great tragedy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of saying to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] that I, as chairman of the naval subcommittee, am most grateful that those who control assignments to committees on your side of the House chose you for assignment to the naval subcommittee. You have done a wonderfully cooperative job, and we are most appreciative of having you with us.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Missouri as he may require.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my feeling of deep personal gratitude to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee. He by his very nature and leadership of the committee makes it easy for one to work with the committee.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the United States Navy is our first line of defense. We have had to build a navy under the stress of war second to none. That navy must be maintained throughout all future time in such strength as to guarantee the maintenance of peace against any and all potential enemies. This can only be accomplished by maintaining an adequate merchant marine of proportional tonnage sufficient to meet any demands of supply the Navy may require at any time.

The effectiveness of the United States Navy is largely measured by the ability of our American merchant marine to maintain those lines of supply. In time of war the merchant marine becomes an integral part of the Navy. In times of peace it must be maintained at the highest possible level of efficiency and of such size as to meet any wartime condition. We cannot again afford to go through a period similar to that following the attack on Pearl Harbor waiting to build up a merchant marine or a Navy to meet wartime requirements. The speed of modern warfare will not again permit such delays.

The American merchant marine, unlike the Navy, is a tremendous economic asset to the peacetime economy of the Nation. Money spent on the maintenance of a navy in peacetime is insurance against war. Money spent on a merchant marine in peacetime is not only insurance against war, but it is also an investment in the development of our standards of living by increasing our world trade and finding markets for surplus commodities.

It is peculiarly strange that our naval authorities have not recognized the threat to their supply lines—the American merchant marine—by the strait jacket into which it is placed by the Civil Aeronautics Board's interpretation of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and the further threat that hangs over the American merchant marine to perpetuate this destructive legislation through H. R. 3420, the so-called Lea bill, now pending.

If we are to have a merchant marine that can support our Navy adequately, Congress must take positive action to remove the destructive restrictions now imposed by the action of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Its past action has destroyed the opportunity for the American merchant marine to successfully meet foreign competition in the post-war period, due to the fact that foreign maritime nations, with foresight and vision, are now providing for the coordination of air transport and surface overseas transport by the shipping companies.

Every Member of Congress knows that experience is our greatest teacher. Following World War No. 1 we scrapped a

great Navy in the interest of peace. That peace did not endure. Congress must not permit our merchant marine to be bartered away at a peace conference, nor should it permit the merchant marine to be destroyed by destructive legislation such as the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 or the pending Lea bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, it is a source of much satisfaction to me and to all other residents of the Territory of Alaska, and I think it ought to be a source of satisfaction to every citizen of the United States, to know that at long last through an appropriation carried in this bill some attempt will be made in the coming year to determine how much oil there is in the great naval oil reserve of northern Alaska. Many geologists, some of them of national and even of international repute, have visited this Arctic region during the last 20 years and have seen the evidences of oil, oil coming out of the ground, because it appears on the surface in many places. A number of seepages were found and can be seen by anyone who visits that region; in one case a very considerable lake is covered to a depth of several feet with raw petroleum.

For a long time I thought that perhaps during the course of all of the hundreds of centuries that have elapsed since that oil was put in its present location, most of it had come to the surface and run down to the Arctic Ocean. But my apprehensions in that respect were ended by a conversation which I recently had with a really eminent oil geologist and engineer. He told me there was not a single solitary chance that any such thing had happened because there was no evidence, through patches or heaps or vast amounts of residue, that any very large part of the oil underlying the surface in Arctic Alaska had actually come to the surface in the past. He said if any considerable amount of oil had so been wasted or lost we would have found vast quantities of what they call in the East, I believe, pitch or bitumen, what they called in Biblical times pitch, with which Noah is supposed to have calked his ark and, which is after all only the residue of petroleum that seeped to the surface during the millenniums past, so that the amount that was so lost may have been only the small part of that which has since been found in the ground.

Some question was voiced at the hearings, and I refer to pages 1112 and 1120 of the printed record as to whether or not it would be practicable or even possible to bring this oil out of Arctic Alaska if any considerable quantity were discovered. When the Canol project was first undertaken—and I digress here to say that no part of that project lies in the Territory of Alaska except a pipe line which leads into Fairbanks from White Horse in Canada—I expressed the same doubt to men who knew something about oil, but I was assured by those who at least claimed to be experts in the transportation of oil by pipe line that oil will flow through a pipe line under temperatures as low as 70 degrees below zero. It is true that once in awhile, perhaps once every 10 years, the thermometer will fall to 70 degrees below zero in that area between Fairbanks and Point Barrow, but those occasions are infrequent and the periods of low temperature are of very short duration; therefore it seems not at all improbable, in fact it seems certain, that if any oil in material amount is found in northern Alaska it can readily be brought by pipe line to the city of Fairbanks, 450 miles, thence again by pipe line to the coast or over the Government-owned Alaska Railroad to the city of Seward, which is the coast terminus of that railroad.

The suggestion has been made that the cost of bringing the oil out of the northern Alaska area might be prohibitive. There is no reason why such cost should be unduly high provided, of course, any considerable amount of oil is found there. It would seem expedient to pipe the oil from the Arctic coast to Fairbanks rather than depend upon the brief season in which transportation by sea may be undertaken, a period that normally lasts not more than 2 months each year. The distance from the Arctic to Fairbanks is about 450 miles. Our experience with respect to road building in Alaska indicates that an adequate serviceable road could be built for $20,000 per mile, which would make the total cost of the road, indispensable to the laying and maintenance of a pipe line, $9,000,000. The cost of the pipe line, itself, will, of course, depend largely upon its size, and so no figure can be given for that item of expense. But the laying of the pipe line in that region should not greatly exceed the cost of laying pipe line in other relatively remote places. I assume, however, that this work can be undertaken in the normal manner, for we all realize that if we try to "buy time" in the construction of roads or pipe lines or anything else the cost is bound to skyrocket. That has been evidenced recently in the cost of building the highway to Alaska and the cost of the Canol project.

Oil, like gold, is where you find it. Although, according to geologists, the prospects of oil in the northern part of Alaska are most promising, we will never be certain that oil in any substantial quantities is there until we discover and produce it. In recent years much more thought has been given to the possibilities of oil in the Arctic regions than ever before. Recently Mr. Walter E. Pratt, in an article appearing in the January 1944, issue of Harper's magazine, discussed the oil possibilities in northern Asia and the northern part of North America. At the time the article was written he undoubtedly had available the information about the developments so far undertaken in the Norman Wells area, which is a part of the Canol project. According to the testimony given by witnesses at the hearings before the Truman committee, it appears that when the project was undertaken only approximately 4,000,000 barrels of oil were known to exist in that area, but later work demonstrated that at least 50,000,000 barrels would be found, and the estimates have run as high as 100,000,000 barrels of probable oil in the northwest district. In fact, still other geologists think that the probabilities of finding large quantities of oil both in the Mackenzie River Valley and on the northern coast of Alaska are all but incalculable and that the same is true of very considerable areas in northern Siberia.

It is refreshing to know that at long last several wells are to be drilled in Arctic Alaska. Engineer after engineer and geologist after geologist have examined the area and pronounced it favorable, but never before has the Navy or any other agency of the Government really made an effort to find out what we have. Under other circumstances perhaps the exploration of this region for oil would not be so important, but many people have told us in recent years that our available oil resources are being used up so rapidly that the United States may be faced, at no distant time, with an acute shortage of this precious fluid. Even though the Alaska oil is not used in any considerable quantity for a long time to come, it surely is the part of wisdom to determine just what we have and then we can make our plans accordingly.

Moreover, Alaska occupies a unique strategical situation with respect to all western Asia and practically all Siberia, as well as a considerable part of China. The short great circle route to the regions mentioned, which is bound to be followed by the air transport of the future, lies through Alaska or along the coast of Alaska. Therefore, it becomes highly important to find and develop in Alaska, if we can, a source of fuel for the thousands of airplanes which we can envision for the future. Indeed, one could almost say, "for the present" when we include within our estimates the military aircraft. Even today it is known that a steady flow of war planes made in the United States is being fed over Alaska airlanes to the Russians for use on the western front. In fact, it has been said that some planes have gone into action against the Nazi troops within 5 days after they left our factories in the United States. This lane provides an overland rather than an over-water route, and so even today a supply of local oil in Alaska would be of material help to our present military operations and might well be invaluable for operations in the immediate future which we may undertake against Japan through Alaska and the Aleutians.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is particularly appropriate now, in the midst of a historic struggle for liberty, to mark the annual observance of Pan-American Day. Revised and extended, pan-Americanism, as a great concept of international cooperation, made its entry on the stage of history in 1826 when the illustrious South American liberator, Simon Bolivar, called the first meeting of American states. In the intervening years, pan-Americanism has taken

strong root and grown into a fruitful system of cooperation—the inter-American system. Now this system of voluntary cooperation among the American states has an outstanding role in the unfolding drama of the United Nations' fight for freedom against ruthless Axis aggressors.

The Americas may differ in language, in resources, in peoples. But certainly they have one fundamental and enduring bond—a common love of independence and the courage to fight when their liberties are threatened. In this greatest of struggles for freedom since the Americas became independent nations, it is altogether fitting that Pan-American Day should remind us that the idea of inter-American cooperation goes back to South America's fighter for freedom, Bolivar. In the imagination of this intrepid American rose the vision of a powerful system of American states, bound together by a common love of independence by proximity of neighborly interests and by the mutual advantages of trade founded upon natural interchange of complementary production.

The farsighted vision of Simon Bolivar, recognizing the common interests of the American states, has brought its chief results in this war. The inter-American system, operating as a mechanism of procedures and agencies, has been tested and strengthened during these fateful years of crisis and battle. Bolivar, and those many wise statesmen of all the Americas who helped forge this system of inter-American cooperation, have been vindicated by history. They worked for hemisphere unity. They saw that through joint action the Americas, with vast natural resources, could become strong while maintaining their independence within a framework of voluntary cooperation. Out of their diversities of resources and peoples the Americas could organize a system of tremendous power. That vision, rising in the minds of Bolivar and his successors, has been realized. The American states are working together in the strongest system of cooperative action yet achieved in this hemisphere.

What this joint action among the Americas is contributing to the defeat of the Axis, to the titanic struggle for freedom being waged, throughout the world, is indeed a worthy theme for Pan-American Day. Airplanes, guns, tanks pour from our factories en route to the fighting fronts in an overwhelming tide. Huge armies girding for decisive battles are fed largely by the Americas. It was no idle boast that the Americas would become the arsenals of democracy. That is demonstrable fact. And these arsenals have achieved their immense production through close collaboration among the Americas, through the pooling of raw materials, plant capacity, labor, and other resources in a joint mobilization.

Without a high degree of unity among the Americas, the United Nations would not be as far along as they are now on the road to victory. When Hitlerite Germany more than a decade ago began to prepare for war, Nazi strategists realized from the outset the potential importance of the Americas in the event of a world conflict. Divide and conquer was Axis strategy in the New World as well as the Old. Long before war broke in Europe, Axis agents were busy in Latin America trying to divide the Americas so that the great natural strength of the Western Hemisphere republics never could be arrayed into a solid front against Axis spearheads of world conquest.

Fortunately, the seeds of inter-American unity which Simon Bolivar planted more than a century ago had become a sturdy growth of pan-Americanism. On foundations laid by many workers in behalf of inter-American unity the New World republics had built practical mechanisms of collaboration. A series of conferences of the American states had established and elaborated procedures of cooperation. The good-neighbor policy of the United States had helped cement into a firmer structure the work of preceding generations of pan-American statesmen. Against this structure of inter-American unity Axis agents schemed in vain, although at times before the supreme crisis of Pearl Harbor it seemed the Axis fifth column was making headway in some places.

How magnificently the Americas responded to the need for unity after the assault upon Pearl Harbor is recent history. At the Rio de Janeiro Conference in January 1942 American foreign ministers adopted a broad program for the mobilization of hemisphere resources, for the severance of relations with the Axis. Inter-American cooperation soared to new peaks of achievement. Twelve of our neighboring republics, including the great Republics of Brazil and Mexico, became our active war allies. Others broke relations with the Axis and, through the development of raw materials and food supplies, through joint effort in strengthening hemisphere defenses, contributed heavily to the increase in United Nations' strength.

Many are the details of the wartime achievements of inter-American cooperation. Air and naval bases, strategic highways, and miscellaneous military installations have been constructed or strengthened at numerous points in Latin America. The defenses of such vital hemisphere areas as the Panama Canal, the Caribbean islands, and Brazil's "bulge" have been organized with the hearty assistance of our neighbors. Thanks to Brazil's assistance, the greatest air-transport routes in history have been established from the United States to distant fighting fronts by way of northern Brazil, and Brazil is now preparing an expeditionary force for overseas fighting.

Now that the enemy has been driven out of Africa, and the Japanese are being rolled back in the Pacific, the Axis pincers movement no longer threatens Latin America as it did on Pan-American Day 2 years ago. But, looking back over these crowded years, one can assert with assurance that the turning point in the war and the United Nations' offensive would have been slower in arriving, and harder to follow up, if the Americas had failed to achieve the degree of unity which was sealed at the Rio de Janeiro Conference and subsequently enacted into specific works for the strengthening of hemisphere defenses and development of strategic resources. With the enemy in retreat, and the war tide rolling back from American shores, hemisphere countries naturally feel more secure.

Still, in the enhanced security of the Americas, and in the reversal of the war tide, there is eloquent testimony to the wisdom of the inter-American system and the effectiveness of joint effort.

For it is joint effort, as I stated earlier in this address, which has made possible in substantial degree the mobilization of the resources of this hemisphere behind the United Nations' offensive. I cannot in my allotted time run through the whole list of materials and products Latin America is contributing to the war effort. It is too long. But let us recall that this is a war of machines; that machines are made largely of metals and that machines run on oil and rubber. The machines coming off our assembly lines are made in considerable part with raw materials from neighboring countries. Brazilian quartz crystals, mica, and industrial diamonds are essential to our war industry. So are Chile's copper, Mexico's minerals, the oil of Venezuela and Colombia. Essential also is Latin-America's increasing production of rubber, fibers, quinine. Latin America is providing the main replacements for the tropical-grown materials the United Nations lost in the Far East.

I regret that I cannot recite precise statistics on these items. For security reasons, official foreign trade statistics are not published. However, the trend may be illustrated in other ways. For instance, our use of quartz crystals in the manufacture of radio and other war equipment has increased almost 50 times from pre-war levels. Brazil supplies this vital material and, as part of her contribution to the war, has increased production to meet the war need. This trend is carried out in other wartime developments of hemisphere resources. For example, the expansion of fiber production in Central America and the Caribbean is replacing in substantial part the loss of fiber supplies in the Far East. The Navy and merchant marine lost their chief source of Manila hemp for the making of rope in the Philippines. In Central America, 40,000 acres are being planted to abaca, the source of Manila hemp.

The story of inter-American cooperation to produce essential materials also includes insecticides; the development of high-grade iron ore deposits in Brazil; the expansion of Mexico's output of minerals; increased production of balsa and other woods in Central and South America; the development of natural rubber; and procurement of minerals indispensable to steel making, such as tungsten and chrome.

It is an inspiring story, justifying the dream of Bolivar, who more than a century ago saw clearly the basis which existed for a strong system of American states, working together for common ends in the solution of common problems. On this Pan-American Day, it is well to pause and reflect on what has

been accomplished by New World unity. Surely Bolivar would be proud to see how his vision has become actuality; how the inter-American system now plays a decisive part in the greatest struggle for freedom since he proposed a conference of the American states.

Bolivar set aglow a light which guides the faltering steps of men in their efforts to find an international system of peace and security for all peoples. Pan-American Day is a bright beacon on the tortuous road to a world system of peace and order, secure against the schemings of such would-be world conquerors as we have seen in action during these grim war years. Inter-American cooperation is one of the most effective bulwarks yet devised against the enemies of freedom.

Pan-American Day symbolizes the strength the Americas have achieved through joint consultation and effort. Now, this united strength of the Americas mingles with that of our allies overseas in a momentous battle for that preservation of human liberties and for the attainment of a larger system of international cooperation in which nations may work together for mutual advantage, while preserving their independence as sovereign States. Pan-Americanism, tested in a global war for freedom, lives as a dynamic testimonial to the faith of those wise architects of the Inter-American system who saw long ago that the Americas could remain independent only by joining their strength in a voluntary union of cooperating republics.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, although the bill before us making annual appropriations for the Navy for the fiscal year 1945 does not cover the problem which I want to place before the House, the bill does have considerable to say regarding aviation.

I take this time to plead the cause of some 6,000 men in the Enlisted Air Corps Reserve who have tried for over 2 years to get into the active Army. Beginning in August–September 1943 the Civil Aeronautics Administration's War Training Service found it necessary to cease flight training of several thousands of its Air Forces enlisted reservists, most of whom had already completed 10 months to a year's flight training and amassed 100 to 200 excellent air-hours of such training. These men, almost without exception, were summarily activated into the Army Air Forces as privates. I am informed that none of them, with the exception of those who could pass age and physical requirements for aviation cadets, will fly an airplane for the duration. Yet a tremendous amount of the taxpayers' money was expended to train them into experienced pilots. This Congress should make some inquiry into an accurate total of the wasted thousands of dollars, man-hours, and invaluable experience in this program.

As the Civil Aeronautics Administration's War Training Service closes its schools throughout the country and cuts its number of indoctrination centers by more than half at the request of the Air Forces, thousands of C. A. A. W. T. S. flight instructors, nearly all of whom are members of the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve Corps, have been released from the training schools. After a 30-day period of grace, these instructors will be activated into the working Army or the Air Forces enlisted ground personnel. Many have from 500 to 5,000 total flying hours, all have commercial licenses, instructors' ratings and some even have considerable instrument flight time to their credit. Small minority of these men have only one opportunity—the Air Transport Command offers any W. T. S. instructor who has 1,000 hours' total flight time, of which 200 of these hours were logged in aircraft of 200 horsepower or over, the opportunity of applying for A. T. C. Ferrying Division work on a civil-service status. These qualifications for eligibility to A. T. C. for male pilots should be given serious attention.

The qualifications in the same organization with many of the same duties for women—who have about 35 hours total time, a student permit and no license necessary. The A. A. F. will train them from scratch because it is claimed they are badly needed. That statement was made during March of this year in a publication known as the Ladies Home Journal.

The majority of these W. T. S. instructors who are slated for activation as privates in the very near future are not qualified for this A. T. C. duty because of the lack of one requirement—namely, 200 hours of 200 horsepower or over, logged time. Most of the W. T. S. instruction was done in light aircraft and about 80 percent of these instructors have less than the required 200 hours, while their log books certify hundreds and, in many cases, several thousands, of hours of 65 horsepower, 125 horsepower, and 165 horsepower time. Many of them feel they are being discriminated against in favor of women who do not have anywhere near the experience.

I do not wish to be placed in a position of criticizing these fine women who are doing excellent work, but it seems to me that these thousands of men who have instructed many of our pilots and who have so many hours of experience and flying time and in whom we have millions of dollars invested should not be grounded. Their service and experience ought to be used in the war effort and no discrimination should be used against them. I feel that the treatment of these flying instructors has been too severe and something should be done to correct what I feel may have been a real error. I feel the Military Committee of the House should correct the situation and get these men into the war effort in the capacity the men are trained for. A bill has been introduced to correct this problem, but the bill, in my opinion, does not go far enough. It takes care of students in the active Army who were in flying training. It does not take care of the instructors of these students, who, at a cost of tremendous amounts of money, now cannot find employment in the war effort. At the same time it is proposed to investigate the WASPS or the women civilian Government employees who are now being trained at additional expense. There is some question raised as to why we should train more flyers when we have a pool of 6,000 men in the Enlisted Air Corps Reserve, who have tried for over 2 years to get into the active service. I feel an investigation should be made in order that the present pool of trained flying instructors can be utilized into the Army.

I have taken this matter up with the Army Air Forces of the War Department and have an explanation from Col. Warren S. Ege, which reads as follows:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 1, 1944, regarding the disposition of Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service personnel.

It was intended to utilize the services of graduates of the C. A. A. program as civilian instructors in the primary phase of aviation cadet training. However, the peak of the Army Air Forces requirements for civilian flight instructors has been passed. Emphasis must now be placed on the training of needed pilot replacements for combat service. This has necessitated the discontinuance of the C. A. A. program and will mean that the services of many reservists now employed as instructors will no longer be required.

Individuals undergoing training in this program were called to active duty in the Army Air Forces in order to continue with their instruction at C. A. A. facilities in a military status. This personnel is now being retained for service in the Army Air Forces and is being carefully screened by boards of officers in order that each individual may be appropriately assigned to operational or technical duties consistent with his qualifications and existing needs of the service.

Reservists who have been permitted to remain in inactive status, by reason of their employment as instructors with facilities of the C. A. A., will be called to active duty or discharged. Those electing call to active duty will also be carefully screened at Air Forces basic training centers, in order that they may be assigned to available duties consistent with their qualifications.

If qualified for aviation cadet training under existing standards, former trainees and instructors of the C. A. A. program may be assigned to air crew training if they desire.

The efforts and services of these instructors and trainees are appreciated by this headquarters and you may be assured that necessary action has been taken to insure their careful processing in order that the air forces may obtain maximum utilization of their qualifications.

I include this letter in my remarks in order to give the Army side of the situation. But this does not explain, Mr. Chairman, why, if this large pool of instructors has been capable of training pilots, they cannot be used in some actual flying or instructor program.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Selden Menefee in his column America at War in this morning's Washington Post has given us something to think about concerning morale, now and its effect in the post-war era:

MORALE IN THE OUTPOSTS

When our servicemen come home, many of them will find it as hard to adjust psychologically to civilian life as to make an economic adjustment.

The obvious problems of jobs for returning soldiers, and of rehabilitating wounded men and neuropsychiatric cases, have come in for plenty of discussion. But the larger question of the millions of men whose whole outlook and way of life will have been damaged by several years of military service has been almost ignored.

The magnitude of this problem in human relations was brought home to me by the remarks of a sailor who recently returned from a year's tour of duty in the Pacific. More than three-quarters of the men who have been out there for more than a few months, he said, are in a state of mental lethargy approaching the apathy produced by drugs.

They are doing a magnificently efficient job in that area. He made that clear. But deadening routine duty, especially among those who have seen little or no front-line action, has produced a listlessness among the men that will be hard to shake off. Their military training does not fit them to cope with the situation, because it is training in following orders rather than in developing initiative of any kind.

NO DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

There is practically no discussion of the issues involved in the war, but rather a tacit agreement not to talk about such things. Army orientation courses have made a slight impression on some of the soldiers, but the enlisted man in the Navy gets little or no education on political or social questions.

Nor is there any interest to speak of in home-front questions. Last year's strikes produced considerable resentment. When the issue of Life magazine describing the Florida boom arrived, there was also high feeling. But contrary to my previous assumption, it did not offset the resentment against labor. For most servicemen the main line of cleavage is between themselves and civilians in general, rather than between labor and management or any other group.

There was some grumbling about the soldier-vote issue, but most of it was among the minority of better-educated men. When the cards were distributed on my friend's ship to determine the voting residence of the men, most of them did not bother to return them.

There were some good books in the ship's library, but they were mostly untouched. When magazines arrived, the men dived for the picture books and comics, and the more serious ones were ignored. Many a lad of good education took to buying an armload of comic books as reading matter whenever he hit port—seeking sheer escapism with a minimum of effort.

For the rest, the main pastimes are playing poker, often for high stakes; griping about the officers and military and naval life in general; talking about sex, with an emphasis on its abnormal aspects, and just sitting.

ESCAPE FROM ROUTINE

A few of the men escape this routine by writing letters, taking correspondence courses (which are readily available at low cost), studying to improve their ratings, or developing hobbies such as metal working. But they are the exceptions.

There are many reasons for this prevalent loss of initiative. One is that most of the men have been left too long in one station. The boy who spent 6 months on a lonely island in the central Pacific, 2 weeks in Honolulu, and then 18 straight months at another Pacific outpost is an example.

In isolated places too often little attention is paid to the recreational needs of the men. Entertainment is rare, except for movies, although in a few of the larger bases real efforts are made by the Army to encourage organized recreation such as G. I. theater productions.

Then there is the barrier that is set up between officers and men. In the Navy there is a feeling of hopelessness about opportunity to advance from the ranks and a prevalent impression that the officers were chosen because they went to college rather than because of their ability to handle men.

Mr. Chairman, I look back on my own experience in the Navy in World War No. 1 with a certain reassurance in the American way of life because I served under a splendid officer. He was a leader and inspired the confidence of his men. The officers in the fighting forces of America today can, by their conduct, make or break the attitudes of the youths in those forces not only toward the armed services now, but, also, toward the Government and way of life for which they fight. This factor means much to our social-political atmosphere in the post-war rehabilitation period.

Finally, there is the lack of organized intellectual life—discussion groups on current events, for example—especially in the Navy and in isolated Army outposts.

All of these shortcomings can be corrected, though the job will not be easy. If we fail to face the issues we will be storing up trouble for the post-war period. These things are indicated:

1. More frequent changes of station for the men. Even if this only meant a shift from one isolated island to another every 6 months, it would help to relieve the monotony.

2. Training of officers to lead, rather than merely to command, so that they may gain the respect of the men; and increase promotions from the ranks, especially in the Navy, which is far behind the Army in this regard.

3. The extension of the educational forum program, with forward-looking handbooks and discussion leaders, in the Navy as well as the Army.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this legislation calls for the appropriation of $32,000,000,000 to the United States Navy. It is my intention to support it, although in so doing I realize that hundreds of millions of dollars will be wasted. It will be wasted because of the lack of coordination between the armed forces and lack of planning.

May I cite an illustration of this waste that exists in my congressional district? The United States Government, through the Defense Plant Corporation, in conjunction with General Steel Castings Co., constructed a $26,000,000 plant which is listed with the Federal Government as Plancor 270. This plant was built originally for the construction of tanks. Shortly after its construction it was abandoned. A portion of it was then leased to the Standard Steel Spring Co. and converted for their use at a cost of $382,000 additional to the Government and is now known as Plancor 2032.

Of the original expenditure of $26,000,000 for construction and equipment, $8,000,000 was expended for furnaces and heat-treating equipment. Five open-hearth furnaces cost $2,000,000. Eighteen heat-treating furnaces cost $6,000,000. The buildings in which this equipment is housed cost $10,000,000. The entire unit comprises one of the most modern heat-treating and forging plants in the world. One-half of the buildings represent an investment of $5,000,000 and the entire $8,000,000 blast furnaces and heat-treating equipment is now being junked. It is being junked in spite of the fact that it would fit perfectly into this Navy program. Castings from 1 pound to 120 tons can be made with its facilities. It can turn out gun turrets for battleships, shields for anti-aircraft guns, motor blocks for landing barges, or any piece of casting or forging that may be needed. This building at present is the property of the Ordnance Department. It is now being stripped of equipment. Heat regulating instruments are being removed from blast furnaces, sanding mills, cranes, and sand bins are being wrecked, every item of which will be needed in this Navy program. Patterns for anchors are even now stored at this plant. I call for a closer coordination between the armed forces to stop such waste. I demand that the Defense Plant Corporation stop wrecking this plant which has been completed less than 1 year at a cost of $26,000,000. Equipment which has been removed at a tremendous loss should be returned and no further demolition should be made, pending a complete check by the Navy and other branches of the armed forces of these facilities.

I know this plant. I helped build it and I defy anyone to prove that it has no value in the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND CONSERVATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions contained in the act approved June 4, 1920, as amended (34 U. S. C. 524), requiring him to conserve, develop, use, and operate the naval petroleum reserves, and to drill and equip exploratory wells in naval petroleum reserve No. 4, $1,050,000: *Provided*, That out of any sums appropriated for naval purposes by this act, any portion thereof, not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available to enable the Secretary to protect naval petroleum reserve No. 1, by drilling wells and performing any work incident thereto: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum made available in the foregoing provision for the protection of naval petroleum reserve No. 1 shall be expended if satisfactory agreement ar agreements can be made with owners of land within or adjoining said reserve No. 1 not to drill wells for the purpose of producing oil or gas.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we have now reached an important part of the naval appropriation bill—operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserve. Therefore, I deem it important to call the committee's attention that the Naval Affairs Committee has before it a draft of a proposed agreement between Standard Oil Co. of California and the Navy Department dated January 20, 1944, relating to Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, Elk Hills. The Secretary of the Navy, through the Speaker of the House, has sent a proposed bill to the Naval Affairs Committee which would legalize and

authorize such a contract. On February 7, 1944, such a bill, S. 1773, at the request of the Navy Department, was introduced in the Senate by Senator WALSH of Massachusetts, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

The Attorney General has twice held that similar contracts required legislation, in his opinion, to authorize the Secretary to enter into such contracts. I am unalterably opposed to any departure from the settled policy of the Congress, maintained consistently for some 30 years, to keep the oil reserves of the Navy in the ground. The whole matter has been returned to Congress for consideration after committee hearings of November 9 and 10, and December 8, 1943, when the Attorney General appeared before us.

The legislation, S. 1773, is much broader than the contract. It takes in oil reserve No. 2 as well as the Elk Hills reserve No. 1—which is the only one under this contract—and in addition it embraces the oil-shale reserves.

The issue here is clear-cut and vital to the interests of this country. It is an attempt to use the war as a pretext for exploiting and developing oil in these reserves which the Congress has said repeatedly must only be touched to prevent drainage. It is a contract and legislation which will strip the Congress of its control of these vital resources and turn them over to the executive with full power of development.

This pressure is not new. It has been on the Congress ever since the greedy eyes of the oil operator surveyed the oil resources of the Government. It has divided the Congress—fortunately into an overwhelming majority demanding that we keep the mortgage off our future and save our oil in the ground until all else has been exhausted. It is the new pressure to turn the control over to the executive branch of the Government upon some theory that that branch can handle this question of policy better than the Congress, overlooking, of course, the unhappy experiences of such an action in the past. I do not agree that the administrative branch—one single Cabinet officer—has the right to or ought to be permitted, whatever his pretext, to enter into any contracts for the development of these reserves. That is the issue.

Let us take a good look and see just exactly where we are heading under this proposition. Heretofore and consistently the Congress has denied the executive authority to do more than conserve the oil in this reserve in the ground and to cause its extraction only to prevent drainage. That has been the declared policy since 1920. Yet right today Standard Oil is pumping away from this reserve No. 1—not to prevent drainage, but to pump oil—and we are asked to legalize a contract which will remain in "force and effect as long as oil, gas, natural gasoline, and associated hydrocarbons can be produced in paying quantities," to be terminated, to be sure, at any time by the Secretary after giving 6 months' notice.

When this contract was first held to be unauthorized it was because it exceeded the power given by the Congress to the Executive. Those decisions of the Attorney General, it seems to me, were inescapable because neither the old contract of November 20, 1942, nor the present one could be called anything else than arrangements for the complete development of this reserve. We are to throw away the controls for the protection of our future to the Executive, and sanction the complete exhaustion of the oil in this reserve if the Executive is pleased to permit it. I oppose such a plan. I know that executives can succumb to pressure just as they did in the twenties—just as we have had pressure from the developers for my full 30 years. It came in one form or another all the time. It has been a constant fight in court and out of it against the exploiters. Admiral Horne, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, testified that he was once impelled to write a memorandum opposing any development of this reserve "at a time when there was a good deal of pressure being brought on the Navy to produce more oil from these reserves because the commercial people wanted it." That was on September 4, 1942. The admiral has appeared again before us but he now says that this field, in his opinion, should be placed in some kind of readiness. All the admiral wants is someone out there to produce the oil. Now in order to do that I am not going to turn this field over to Standard Oil Co.

But there is a new plan. That is to come before us with a clause permitting cancelation by the Navy on 6 months' notice, each party to keep his share of the oil which has been pumped out in the meantime. As the Attorney General said when such an arrangement was proposed, "it would be the expression of a temporary policy", enabling us to contract or condemn when we had determined our proportionate interests. We would have a temporary agreement such as we have now and meanwhile the oil would be coming out of the ground at the pleasure of the producers without reference to what would have been lost through drainage. We would have nothing more than we have today—a temporary agreement—for the removal of oil. The Attorney General calls it a stopgap measure, and says that therefore "an early choice by Congress between condemnation and a permanent agreement would be in the public interest." I am ready and I hope the Congress is ready to make that decision now.

Why, this contract provides that Standard may withdraw up to 25,000,000 barrels of oil. Under that arrangement, if the contract were to be terminated after they had gotten out their 25,000,000 barrels, we would have to draw out a total of 91,000,000 barrels or nearly one-sixth of all the oil in the reserves, just in order to get even, mind you. Under the scheme that has been in operation since November 20, I do not know how much more oil we will have to withdraw in order to get even with Standard under this "stopgap measure," as the Attorney General calls it.

Now let us turn to the contract itself. One of the virtues cited for it is that it gives control of this reserve to the Secretary of the Navy. He can determine, he says, when the oil will be developed—if he can resist some more of the kind of pressure that Admiral Horne says was being exerted by the commercial people back in September 1942—and if he can resist the pressure that some of us are getting to cause the exhaustion of all the oil. Congress will not be able to help resist the pressure as it has been for the last 30 years. He will be all on his own and I do not think I want to see him under that sort of pressure. We know that the Congress can and has resisted. But not so the Executive.

I have told you the term for which this contract runs. Under the contract, the field is to be developed under the supervision of an engineering committee on which each side is to be equally represented—although admittedly 64 percent of the oil belongs to the Government—and that committee is to determine the respective participating percentages in the various zones not yet developed. Their decisions are supposed to be unanimous and, if they are, then they are binding upon the Secretary. Note that. But you say, "Well, if they do not agree the Secretary has been authorized to give the final decision." That would be small compensation if, as could well happen, the engineering committee was misled and happened to agree unanimously against the interests of the United States.

I would like to call your attention, however, to one peculiar thing about this contract. Every time you say the Secretary may overrule the engineering committee if they happened to be in disagreement this contract returns you to page 26, and that says that in those cases the Secretary shall "submit the matter to an independent petroleum engineer, for the purpose of securing an advisory report." Oh, it is true that the contract continues and says that after such report has been received his decision shall be final thereon. But will it? He must "act after consideration of the report" and Standard is to have a copy of it. If the Secretary is to be given such a final decision, why this requirement? What is the effect of it? Two of these engineers are to be members of the operating committee which is to determine the location of wells and the rate of production, and so forth. Again the representation is 50–50 and the participating 64–36.

Now let me make some further observations on the provisions of the contract. Briefly, the presently proposed contract provides as follows:

(a) Navy and Standard pool their oil lands in the Elk Hills reserve for development and operation, again in the nature of a partnership, just as under the 1942 contract.

(b) The parties are to share in the oil produced in accordance with the percentages, subject to revision, fixed by engineers pursuant to estimates of acre-feet of oil-bearing formations underlying the respective lands, which is initially determined to be approximately 64 percent for the Navy and 36 percent for Standard, just as under the 1942 contract.

(c) Standard is entitled to extract and receive from the shallow oil zone in the reserve 15,000 barrels of oil a day during the so-called primary period, which is until 6 months after the cessation of the present hostilities, or until it has received 25,000,000 barrels of oil and associated hydrocarbons, but no more than one-third of the estimated amount in the shallow oil zone under its lands.

(d) After the primary period Standard is entitled daily to pump out and keep enough oil to enable it to raise the money to pay its share of the costs of maintaining the property and the taxes on its property and on its rights under the contract, provided such pumping cannot exceed one-third of the estimated amount of oil in all zones under Standard's land.

(e) During the primary period, the Navy can extract oil from the reserve to any extent and from any zone it desires; if it does, then Navy will keep all extracted from the shallow oil zone in excess of the 15,000 daily barrels due Standard up to the point where the production received by each is in accord with the parties' 64–36 percentages; and any excess production from the shallow oil zone over the amount necessary to balance these percentages will be divided in accordance with the percentages. Again if the Navy does desire to make the further production, and the production is made from the Stevens zone, the Navy will receive its allotted 64 percent of that production, and until the production received by both parties is in balance, also two-thirds of Standard's 36 percent from that zone, so that, while the production-received accounts between the parties are not in balance during the primary period, because Standard has received more than Navy, yet Standard will receive one-third of its share of any Stevens zone production, and two-thirds of its said share will go to Navy in reduction of the advance deliveries to Standard.

(f) If the Navy does not extract oil for itself during the primary period, then the advance delivery to Standard of 25,000,000 barrels is thereafter to be brought into balance with its percentage by the delivery to Navy, when oil is produced, of two-thirds of Standard's 36-percent share of the oil when so produced.

(g) After the production accounts of both parties have been brought into balance with the 64–36 percentages the oil will be divided in accordance with their said percentages.

(h) The contract is retroactive to the date of the contract of November 20, 1942, and it supersedes the Recession of Temporary Operating Agreement of 1943, and it is provided that all oil from the shallow oil zone received by Standard since November 20, 1942—under the illegal contract and under the temporary operating agreement—is to be charged against Standard's percentage interest in that zone and Standard is not otherwise to account for that amount, and that Standard is to account to the Navy in cash—less Navy's share of the costs—for the oil which has been received by Standard from Steven's zone, and such oil is to be charged against the percentages of each party in that zone.

(i) Navy agrees to acquire certain lands from the Kern County Land Co., and it is provided that all oil extracted from these lands since November 20, 1942, shall be charged against Navy's percentage in the zones from which such production came, that is, in balancing Navy's account for oil received against Standard's account of the same nature, it is to be considered that such oil from the Kern County Land Co.'s lands was received by Navy.

(j) The costs of development and operations are to be ultimately borne by the parties in accordance with the percentages in which they are entitled to share in the oil produced.

(k) Navy is to bear a portion of Standard's prior expenses of $1,118,519 in developing the Steven's deep zone; the portion to be assumed by Navy being—according to the initial oil percentages—approximately 64 to 36 percent, or $732,089.70; thus reducing Standard's said prior costs in that zone to $386,429.30.

(l) The parties are to currently pay the costs in accordance with a variable and somewhat involved formula: Generally, in proportion as they receive the oil produced; but if during the primary period Navy desires to increase the productive capacity of the joint lands to an excess of the present capacity of 15,000 barrels a day—all of which goes to Standard—then Navy is to currently pay the costs of such development work; that is, insofar as the payment of current costs during the primary period is concerned, Standard will pay currently the costs of extracting the 15,000 daily barrels to which it is entitled, and will not ordinarily have to pay any current development costs because the reserve as it now stands is sufficiently developed to produce its 15,000 daily barrels; but, if during that period Navy wants to produce oil for itself, that is, if Navy is to get any oil during that period, it must currently pay all necessary development costs of any such program; which means that insofar as current development costs are concerned during the primary period Standard gets the exclusive benefit of all existing wells, on its own and on Navy's lands, while, if Navy wants oil during that period, it must currently pay all development costs in connection therewith.

(m) There are special provisions in connection with the payment of costs, ultimately and currently, in connection with exploratory wells: If the engineering committee—which the contract establishes and on which each party is equally represented—approves drilling a well for the purpose of getting data to revise the parties' percentages, then the costs of the same are to be paid by the parties in accordance with their respective percentages in the zone in which the well is drilled; but if the committee does not approve the drilling, either party may proceed with the drilling but is required to pay the entire cost of the same. If the parties agree on a drilling to establish a new zone, the costs of the same are to be borne equally, and, if such drilling establishes a new zone, the prior costs are to be adjusted so as to be in accord with the several participating percentages in the new zone; but if the parties do not agree on such drilling, either party may have it done, but at their sole expense.

(n) Each party is to currently pay its costs in connection with exploratory wells, but if Standard, in taking its 15,000 daily barrels during the primary period, elects to take production from any exploratory well that is productive, then it is to currently pay the costs of such wells.

(o) Navy's assumption of a portion of Standard's prior exploratory work in the Stevens deep zone has been referred to; this is to be made up to Standard in the following manner: Navy is to currently pay all exploratory costs in connection with the Stevens zone until it has absorbed the amount so assumed, and the parties' current outlay in connection with that zone are in accord with their percentages in that zone.

(p) After the primary period, Standard will currently pay all costs of operating the reserve involved in extracting the amount of oil to which it is entitled in order to have money to pay its share of the costs and expenses of maintaining the reserve, but all other current costs of maintaining and preserving the reserve are to be borne by the parties in accordance with their currently determined percentages in the several zones.

(q) Each party must provide its own storage facilities.

(r) Navy may keep all extractable helium but must pay all costs of extracting it.

(s) Navy is designated the operating agent of the reserve and must keep and render all proper accounts, but Navy may, by further contract, let out the operating of the reserve to others, including to Standard.

(t) An operating committee on which each party is equally represented is established to direct operations on the reserve, including the locations, and so forth, of wells.

(u) An engineering committee is established to determine and revise the parties' percentages by making studies and estimates of the underlying acre-feet of oil-bearing sands or formations.

(v) The Secretary of the Navy has power to resolve any disputes of the operating and engineering committees.

(w) The contract is to continue in effect as long as oil can be produced from the reserve in paying quantities, but the Navy may at any time, by giving 6 months' notice, terminate it. In event of such termination by the Navy, the parties are to make a financial accounting in accordance with their participating percentages as determined at that time. The provision for termination by the Navy was put in, I understand, following a suggestion by the Attorney General that such would be desirable, though he said its inclusion did not change his views as to the legality of the contract.

I have summarized the important provisions of the proposed contract without color and without argument. Now let me point out some of the effects of the proposed contract and legislation.

Under S. 1773 any Secretary of the Navy may, with the approval of the

President, enter into a contract to, and cause, the complete exhaustion of any or all of the naval petroleum or oil shale at any time.

The new proposed contract omits the provisions in the contract of November 20, 1942, providing for payment of Navy's share of the costs in oil. Such a provision is one of the most unwise that can be conceived of from the standpoint of conservation in the ground, because it calls for a production and sale in ordinary channels, merely to pay costs in large amount of oil, oil that could be saved in the ground if the Government paid its costs out of the Treasury by appropriation when needed. It was this provision in the contract of November 1942 that underlined its general character as a development contract.

But, hold on a moment, look at bill S. 1773. That bill expressly includes a grant of power to the Secretary of the Navy to make such a contract. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to raise money to pay costs of development and operations by extracting and selling the oil from the reserves. Thereby it flies further in the face of conservation in the ground. It is now proposed that instead of saving our oil we dispose of a great portion of it whenever the Secretary desires to develop and operate our reserves. If S. 1773 is enacted such a provision may be included in the proposed Elk Hills contract, and in any contracts respecting the other reserves, and Congress can go dance for its appropriating power.

This provision obviates the necessity of coming to Congress for appropriations. We should not create an executive substitute for the power of appropriation. We should hold onto, so as to be able to check, the power over the use and application of public property and funds.

It is clear that the provisions in question, allowing the sale of the oil in the reserves to raise money to pay costs of development and operations, is patently illegal under existing law, because Congress alone has power to dispose of public property. The Secretary of the Navy could just as well be authorized to sell our battleships to raise money to erect a new building for the Navy Department.

As I have said, the present proposed contract does not contain such a provision, but the Secretary will have it if we pass this bill and he can amend his contract accordingly. Then where is the Congress?

Let us examine a few of the provisions of the contract and some of the arguments that may be put forward in support of the contract:

Though under the contract the Secretary of the Navy, or any Secretary of the Navy, may indefinitely limit Standard's immediate pumping from the reserve to 25,000,000 barrels, yet he or any Secretary of the Navy may also cause the complete development and exhaustion of the Elk Hills reserve at any time.

Under the proposed contract, if, as it proposed, Standard obtains an advance delivery of 25,000,000 barrels of oil, it will be necessary, before the production accounts of the parties have been brought into balance with their percentages of 64 and 36 percent, to extract from the reserve 91,400,000 barrels of oil. That is, before the Navy will be on even terms, the reserve will have to be depleted by one-sixth of its present estimated amount.

Actually, under S. 1773, and under the proposed contract, the Government would give the Secretary, or any future Secretary of the Navy the power at any time to cause the complete exhaustion of not only the oil of Standard in the reserve, but also of the oil of the United States in the reserve, and this possibly without even the pro forma approval of whoever may be President, because the Presidential approval required by S. 1773 would be satisfied when the contract was executed. There would be created a situation—because of the advance delivery of the 25,000,000 barrels to Standard—in which the longer the Government waited to take out the 91,400,000 barrels necessary to balance the oil-received accounts, the more economically disadvantageous the contract would be for the Government. So that, from a purely business standpoint, there would be potent reasons, becoming daily, more irresistible, to impel the Secretary of the Navy to disregard conservation and take out oil merely to put the Government on even terms with its partner in the venture. There would be created a situation in which Standard, the partner whose chief interest is production and sale of oil, would naturally desire, and in all probability seek to convince the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with production, and this pressure, arising out of the incongruous nature of this partnership—unlike all other partnerships—here the objectives of the partners are contradictory—would add greatly to the reasons impelling the Secretary to give way. There would follow a situation in which, as in the past, as I have pointed out, local and other groups and interests would exert their influence and apply pressure, apparently with success, to cause production from and even exhaustion of the reserves. And there would be created a situation, and I dislike mentioning it, but I would disregard the lessons of history if I did not, where the sole protection of the Nation's oil was the current occupant of the Secretary's office. I am unwilling to put so much responsibility on one human being in such an incongruous partnership.

Consider human conduct. Since 1920 we have had conservation assured to the full extent that a solemn act of Congress can attain that end. What, in the meantime, has been the fate of the oil reserves, the law notwithstanding? Even with the law, and the Congress, as protective bulwarks, executive officials in 1920 launched an all-out program to exhaust the reserves, and, in 1942, though without any suggestion of dishonesty, our executive officials, suffering from inability to correctly apply the law embarked us on a program to completely develop, and, at their pleasure, allow the extraction of all of the oil in the Elk Hills reserve. In every instance, before those ventures were halted, much oil had been taken out and is being taken out of the reserves.

I say to you, if we cannot, and the above events show that we cannot, because of human behavior, obtain assured and inviolate conservation with the aid of a clear mandate of Congress, with the requirement, as we have, that the Congress first approve the taking away of oil, then, without any doubt whatsoever, we can be absolutely certain that, once the formidable though not impregnable protection of existing law is removed, once the matter of conservation and the fate of the reserves is taken from Congress, once it is placed solely in the hands of one of the executive officials—some already overburdened with responsibility—against whose judgment will be pitted the combined influences of the commercial people, as Admiral Horne calls them, then we have not much to hope for.

If we are to approve this contract, let us be honest, let us not do it in the name of conservation, let us not try to becloud our action. Let us do it in the name of exploitation, of use, of sale, of exhaustion; let us at least do it in the name of development, which is the word often appearing in the contract.

THIS IS NOT CONSERVATION

It may, and probably will, be said that the proposed unit contract solves the problem of drainage. The argument is this: As the situation now stands, Standard has a legal right to take out oil from and through its lands, which operations, because of the checkerboarded character of the Elk Hills reserve, will drain away some of the Navy's oil, and that the only other feasible way to protect the Navy's interest is to drill and operate offset wells; so that, in either event, whether under the proposed contract or under an offset drilling program, some of the oil will have to be taken out of the land, and it is best to take out 25,000,000 barrels than to have to pursue the uncertainties of an offset drilling program.

This argument sounds plausible enough, but, as with most of those arguments that may be advanced in favor of the proposed contract, it is fallacious for several definite and specific reasons, namely:

(a) The argument assumes that we must always and forever be confronted with the problem of drainage, and, therefore, it fails to include all of the alternative methods of handling the problem. It omits the only real method, that of eliminating, not merely limiting, the problem of drainage; that is, there is the other alternative of acquisition by the Government of Standard's lands, which, if done, will, once and for all, do away with drainage.

Congress, in the act of 1938, has already passed on and authorized the acquisition by purchase or condemnation. It is apparent, therefore, that when I mention it, I am not presenting something novel.

(b) The second argument is that Navy is assured, under the contract, when the oil is taken out, or when the final accounting is made, of getting, or receiving an accounting for, every drop of oil it now owns; wherefore, under the contract,

Navy cannot stand to lose by drainage a single drop of oil or a penny in the value of oil.

But while it may be sound from a financial point of view, it is not sound from a conservation point of view. For conceding, for the sake of argument, that the engineers can do all that is said for them, what the Government gets is protection from financial loss, since the Government will get its share in either oil or in money. But, while the Government is thus being kept from loss, and when it is finally made whole, what has happened to the oil? Is it still in the ground? No. It is gone. This argument means only that, assuming the engineers are underground soothsayers with a perceptibility of the bowels of the earth, which is open to reasonable dispute, the contract, instead of protecting from drainage by keeping the oil in the ground, merely protects the Government against financial loss as and after the oil has been taken from the ground.

(c) The drainage argument, even assuming there was not the alternative of acquiring Standard's lands, is predicated on the more serious fallacy that, in order to protect against drainage, we must open up the entire reserve to complete development and exhaustion. The argument is the old one of cutting off the arm to save the finger. It embraces the greater evil to avoid the lesser. The argument simply says that to solve the drainage problem we must abandon the policy of conservation in the ground.

TERMINATION AGREEMENT

It will be probably argued that the contract does not assure the exhaustion of the reserve, because of a provision in the contract which gives the Navy an election to terminate the contract at any time on 6 months' notice. This provision was negotiated by the Navy following a suggestion by the Attorney General that such would be a desirable addition; though when the Secretary of the Navy told the committee he had obtained the termination clause, the Attorney General, in his testimony, said that it did not change his opinion as to the legality of the contract. In other words, this clause does not convert the contract from a development to a conservation measure.

That is so clear as to require no reasoning. But why the Attorney General thought such a clause desirable is beyond me, unless his reason was that there should be some way at some time to escape from a bad bargain. Now, if it is desirable to have an escape, it is patently extremely questionable whether there should ever be an entry into such a bargain at all. The adding of the termination clause itself proves that the contract contains dangerous consequences. The only merit ascribable to that clause is that it renders possible an attempt to lessen the irreparable damage suffered by the reserve in the meantime.

If the contract is terminated prior to full performance—that is, prior to the time of the complete exhaustion of the reserve—then it will have constituted no more or no less than an arrangement for the pumping out and depleting of the reserve to the extent of the oil taken out.

Furthermore, in the event of such termination, not only would conservation be frustrated, but what would happen to all of the proponents' arguments about drainage protection under the contract? The parties would revert to their present situation as respects drainage, and that problem would not have been touched, much less solved.

Finally—and this is the crucial consideration which shows that the termination clause constitutes merely so many words—it would be most rash, from a financial standpoint, for the United States to ever invoke the termination clause.

This follows because, since November 20, 1942, the oil has not been extracted from the lands of Standard and Navy in accordance with their participating percentages, and it is not intended or contemplated that such will be done in the future. Now, if the contract is terminated by the Navy prior to full performance, then, since the oil will not have been extracted in accordance with the participating percentages, the Government may be a severe loser, because it can happen, and will have happened, that more than 64 percent of the oil will have been taken from Navy's lands. In such event, not only would the accounting not make the Government financially whole, but the Navy's reserve would have been depleted to a greater proportionate extent than Standard's.

PRESENT NEED FOR OIL

It possibly may be argued that the contract is desirable because it has been shown by the testimony of Admiral Horne that the needs of the present war require that there be taken from the Elk Hills reserve an average of 15,000 barrels of oil a day, which is only the amount that the contract permits to be extracted; and, therefore, the contract only fulfills a required demand of the present war; and, that, even though the Government acquire Standard's lands the 15,000-barrel daily production would have to be made from the reserve, so that such acquisition would not further conservation any more than does the contract.

Such a contention is as unsound as the others, because—

(a) Conceding for argument that it is necessary in this war to take out 15,000 barrels a day from the Elk Hills reserve, the contract not only makes provision for 15,000 barrels daily, but it does much more—it also opens up to complete exhaustion the whole of both Navy's and Standard's lands in the Elk Hills reserve. If the Government acquired Standard's lands, and if the present war does require some limited production from Elk Hills, that production, and only that, should occur. There should be no commitment, as under the contract, to complete exhaustion whenever an executive officer so decides. The issue presented by the argument is a question of degree: Whether we are to embark on a venture of inviting full development to meet a need which the proponents admit is limited, or whether we shall by acquiring all the lands in the Elk Hills reserve make certain that any development shall be confined to such limited need.

Admitting again that the present war requires the taking of 15,000 barrels a day from the Elk Hills reserve, why does the Navy Department seek the power to be able at any time to go to the extreme of using up all of the reserves, including shale?

COST

It has been argued that the proposed contract should be authorized because it would not cost the Government any money.

The answers to such argument are obvious. In the first place, the contract in nowise achieves conservation, but the contrary, whereas acquisition of Standard's lands is the only method of conserving and enlarging what we have.

In the second place, the contract will now, and hereafter until the reserve is exhausted, cost the Government money. The Attorney General pointed that out in his formal opinion that the functioning of the contract would require present and future appropriations by Congress. The financial commitments of the Government under the contract are:

(a) The Navy is obligated to pay its percentage share—approximately 64 percent—of the operating costs. Now, even though this, or all of this, will not be required now, but only as and when oil is produced for the Navy, yet the contract creates this clear liability.

(b) Navy is to assume to pay, and to ultimately pay off, as and when further development work occurs in the Stevens zone, approximately $732,089.70 of Standard's prior development costs of $1,118,519 in that zone. This is real money, and the requirement of paying it may arise sooner than later, but is assured in any event.

(c) If Navy wants to produce any oil for itself while Standard is getting the 15,000 daily barrels of assured oil, then Navy will have to currently pay all development and operating costs in connection with such production, since all present facilities are devoted to producing Standard's 15,000 barrels.

(d) If the Navy wishes to make any studies to ascertain whether the initial 64-percent participation is fair to it, and common prudence may dictate that it will, then it will have to drill exploratory wells, and will be required to pay the cost of them, unless Standard's representatives on the engineering committee—that is, unless Standard—approves such drilling. It is within the realm of possibility that Standard may be content with the present percentages, and will not approve such drilling but will leave the monetary risk to Navy of any attempt to secure data to revise those percentages. This would cost the Navy money. Further, even though Standard did approve such drilling, Navy would have to currently pay its percentage—64 percent—share of such costs, and this will cost the Navy money now, unless Standard should decide to and need to take the oil from such wells to make up its 15,000 daily barrels. Of course, if such drilling does not bring in any productive well, then there would not be any possibility that Stand-

ard would, or even could, take over Navy's current liability for the drilling.

(e) The same considerations hold true as to any Navy drilling, without Standard's agreement to establish any new zone—without Standard's agreement—Navy will bear and currently pay the entire costs of such drilling, unless the drilling is successful, in which event Navy will still bear its share, and it will then have to currently pay its share, unless again Standard decides to take production from the wells drilled in order to make up its 15,000 daily barrels.

(f) After the primary period Navy will have to currently pay its share of the costs of maintaining the reserve over and above the amount, which Standard alone will currently pay, involved in extracting the amounts of oil sufficient to enable Standard to raise money for its maintenance costs and taxes.

(g) Navy will have to provide its own oil storage facilities, and pay for them.

(h) Navy must finance any program to extract helium.

(i) Navy must currently pay all costs of any program to ready the reserve for immediate quantity production.

I do not say that all or many or any of the above provisions are from a business standpoint, unfair to the Navy, or that they indicate overreaching in a bargain by Standard; nor do I inquire whether as a business matter some of the provisions may work to the benefit of one party or the other; but I do say that the provisions of the contract summarized above conclusively show the fallacy of any contention that the contract will not cost the Government any money now or in the immediate future.

These conclusions I have reached from an analysis of the contract, and they are fortified by the further consideration, outside the terms of the contract; that is, since, as it is contended, the 15,000 daily barrels of oil would be produced for the war effort, then, it follows, that the Government is the intended and prospective buyer of that oil. Therefore, as a result of the contract, and the event which will follow, the Government will be put to an expenditure now or as the oil is produced in order to acquire it.

ACQUISITION BY PURCHASE OR CONDEMNATION

It has been urged to the Naval Affairs Committee that we should enter into this contract because it will enable the Government to avoid the speculative or uncertain element inherent in a condemnation of Standard's land, arising from the fact that no one knows just haw many barrels of oil are under Standard's lands, and perhaps there will not be as much there as a jury in condemnation should decide; so that the jury's determination of this uncertain factor may result in giving Standard a better price than it should have for its lands.

I think this argument would come with better grace if those who urge it were not at the same time pressing for adoption of a contract which includes as its keystone as great an uncertain element on the same subject matter, namely, the measuring of the content of the underground in oil sands or formations.

There is no difference between the uncertainty inherent in the contract and that which would be involved in purchase or condemnation of Standard's lands. In the case of purchase or condemnation qualified engineers, after a study of all available data and of the history of past operations, would testify in court that their opinion and conclusion is that Standard's lands contain so much oil-bearing sands or formations in which was a stated amount of oil. In the case of the proposed contract, the engineers have, following a study, reached opinions and conclusions that there are oil-bearing sands or formations of determined area under Standard's lands, and under Navy's lands, that the percentage of the whole under Navy's lands is approximately 64 percent and under Standard's lands 36 percent, or some such percentage. That is what happens in any event and it is all that happens.

It may be considered by some that the Government should enter into this contract, because the other alternative, a condemnation of Standard's lands, will involve the expenditure of a vast sum of money by the Government.

I agree with the proposition that the Government should not expend money recklessly or foolishly. But I have reached the conclusion that the money involved in purchase or condemnation would be wisely spent.

It is not necessary to approach this problem as though it were now being for the first time presented to Congress. Congress, in the act of 1938, considered, and decided this question, and it then approved purchase or condemnation and authorized the appropriation of the necessary funds. The purpose sought to be achieved was to insure the Navy's lands against drainage if that protection could not be achieved by other methods.

The question then remaining is whether it would be unwise to spend the money necessary to achieve the beneficial results of enlarging our reserve and assuring its conservation in the ground. Standard has put a value on its lands in the reserve, it is said, of $146,337,862, which the Navy considered exorbitant. The fair value in Navy's opinion is not now known, but it can be assumed that it is considerably lower than Standard's figure. Whatever the cost charged in condemnation it would be less than Standard's hold-up purchase price, and, more than that, American citizens would fix the price.

Against this sum of $146,373,862, we should set up the expenditures made to acquire our fighting equipment and shore stations which served it. The amount to be paid for the oil lands would be comparatively insignificant, and, of course, the value of the preservation of this Nation is not measured by money. But it is not necessary to take such a broad basis for comparison. Compare the amount of money in question with the cost of a single modern battleship and bomber plane, and it is seen that we now, without hesitation or debate, spend more than that much money for only 2 such battleships and for quite a few less than 100 of the big bombers.

The money question then is this: Is the assurance of possibility of fuel for victory in future battles and wars worth now to us the amount of money we spend now on 2 battleships or less than 100 bombing planes?

The wisdom of this expenditure cannot only be tested against national insurance, but it can be examined on the basis of a commercial business transaction. This approach to the problem sustains the proposal for the Government's acquisition of Standard's lands. The money would not be sunk into a venture or article that would depreciate and, in time, be lost. The Government would get value, of a continuing and permanent character, for its money. The oil purchased would be a good and desirable investment from a business standpoint. There has hardly ever been in the past, and it is most unlikely there will be in the future, a time when there is any more secure investment for money than in proved oil lands. It is not unfair to Standard, whose leaders are businessmen, for the Government to learn from them a lesson in investment. It is because Standard can conceive of no better and no more conservative an investment than these proved oil lands that Standard wishes to retain them. The money spent in condemnation will not be loss of money to the Nation, but the gaining of an asset.

There is a further matter that should be considered when the subject is approached from a business point of view. If under the contract method the oil would be saved for the time when the Navy would use it, as the proponents of the contract hope and intend though such is not assured by the contract, the Government would at that time have to buy or pay for the oil anyway. The contract would not obviate this later expenditure. It is safe to assume that the price of oil will not decline. The probability is, with oil becoming scarce, that the price of crude oil will increase in the future. So without considering any possible increase or decrease in the cost of extracting and refining the oil, at present the acquisition will probably be less expensive than purchasing oil in the future.

We thus acquire oil in the ground and pay its value as such—which, naturally, is less than oil out of the ground—to which has necessarily been added the costs of development and extraction. The future acquisition of the oil out of the ground will require a larger immediate outlay; while acquisition in the ground now, and later payment of costs of extraction, will spread the Government's total expenditures into what might be classed as one for purchase and one for development when needed later on.

LOCAL TAXES

Some have favored the proposed contract and have made objections to condemnation on the ground that the latter would cast on the local county government in Kern County, Calif., a great burden by reason that it would lose tax revenue from the lands of Standard that the Government would acquire.

I am keenly interested in all local government, and feel that no injustice should be done any. But the taxes which Kern County will get from Standard if we enter into the contract will be raised by Standard by extracting oil from the ground and selling it.

The local taxes will come out of oil and, in so doing, will add to the depleting of the oil in the ground. This is contrary to conservation and contrary to the broad national interest.

The issue for us, then, is whether the present local tax situation should be preserved at the cost of having used up oil which would otherwise be kept in the ground for the benefit of the whole Nation, including Kern County, when the national life is at stake.

I feel the national interest comes first in this case.

CONCLUSION

In an effort to bring home the importance of assuredly saving the oil in the ground, I have pointed out the purpose of the reserves, which is to save the oil for fighting craft only, and only when other supplies are exhausted; I have shown the wisdom of the policy of assuring that the oil shall be preserved in the ground, and the danger of permitting even the possibility that it may be used in whole or in part before its time; I have shown that even the clear mandate of law has not been, even as late as 1942, sufficient to keep the reserves out of danger; I have shown that the proposed contract in reference to Elk Hills will expose the reserves to exploitation, and, according to experience, bring about their use and exhaustion; I have shown that the only feasible method of assuring the inviolability of the reserves is the continuation of the present law the rejection of this contract and bill S. 1773, and the purchase or condemnation of the privately owned lands in the Elk Hills reserve. I submit that, therefore, the path of action for us is clear and unmistakable.

I will add only a few other final remarks. After the 1942 Elk Hills contract was held illegal the Navy entered into a so-called temporary operating agreement for 90 days with Standard, which permits the latter to operate and take oil out of Navy's lands in the Elk Hills reserve—subject to a limitation of production to 15,000 barrels a day—from the joint lands of both parties, and providing that Standard pay for the oil taken from Navy's lands. Later this agreement was revived for another 90 days. At those times, because of the necessity of terminating the illegal agreement of 1942 and inadequate time for study as to the legality of the temporary agreement, the Naval Affairs Committee of the House consented, and, for legal support, rested on the opinion of the Attorney General, who approved the temporary operating agreement.

Since that time I have studied the matter further and have reached the conclusion that unless the oil being taken out of the Navy's lands is being extracted as a drainage protective measure, then the temporary agreement is illegal. On the face of the temporary agreement it would appear that there is presently only a production from Navy's lands for sale, not for protection from drainage. Some of the oil is coming from wells drilled under the 1942 illegal agreement and these wells were not drilled for protection but for quantity production. It has not been made to appear to the House Naval Affairs Committee that the present production is protective. I now wish to let it be known that unless it is shown to the committee that the production now being made is merely protective, then I shall not consent to any further renewal of the temporary operating agreement, and shall insist that the act of 1938 be enforced.

Finally, in connection with S. 1773, and the question of purchase or condemnation, let me remind you that the Secretary of the Interior has proposed, and possibly begun to undertake, the construction in Arabia of an oil pipe line that is estimated to cost $165,000,000, or as much or more than it will cost to acquire Standard's lands in Elk Hills. I say to you that 1 barrel of oil safely conserved in the ground in the United States is worth more for the ultimate defense of this Nation than 1,000 or 10,000 barrels in Arabia. If we let go by this opportunity to enlarge and guard our domestic reserves, because of the cost involved, a cost which is comparatively insignificant, then we have endangered the Nation at what may in the future be its most vulnerable point—a supply of oil to enable our ships and planes to protect it.

To repeat:

The Navy has long recognized the fact that the private lands in the reserved area must some day be acquired by the United States—first, to protect and make possible the reserving of the oil and gas in the Government's lands by removing the threat of drainage should such lands be developed; and second, to augment the reserves of oil and gas in the United States because of the Nation's ever-increasing requirements.

The company is fully cognizant of the desire and necessity for the Navy to acquire its holdings in the reserve and believe that common sense would dictate that the Government acquire them at the present time. * * * Fully expecting the Government to start action to obtain the lands either by purchase or condemnation in the near future, the company has commenced drilling sufficient test wells. * * * The Navy Department does not believe that this project should be delayed until after the war emergency, but strongly recommends that the lands be secured at the earliest date possible for the following reasons:

Among them—

The effect of the Standard Oil Co.'s drilling to date has been to delineate partially the extent and to indicate the productivity of the unknown oil sands of the untested area of the field. * * * While these discoveries have added millions of barrels to previous estimates of recovery oil from both Government-owned and privately owned lands in the reserve, they have also made it even more essential in my mind that the United States acquire now all lands of the Standard Oil Co. of California in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1.

That argument and that conclusion seems to follow logically and inescapably from the things I have discussed in this statement. The language is not mine. The same conclusion was reached by Secretary Knox on February 23, 1942, in his letter to the President; and the President said on March 21, 1942, in response to that letter—

You are authorized to proceed immediately with negotiations toward the purchase, if possible—

And—

if satisfactory arrangements cannot be promptly concluded with the owners, then you are authorized to institute condemnation proceedings through the Department of Justice.

And the Congress since 1938 has said that the Secretary "is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President, to acquire such privately owned lands or leases in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 by purchase or condemnation."

In the face of all of this why do we not carry out the conclusions of the Secretary, the direction of the President, and the mandate of the Congress and acquire this property now?

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved April 4, 1944 (Public Law 289), to enter into contracts for public-works equipment, materials, and construction, including collateral public-works items and the acquisition of land, in the amount of not to exceed $1,474,931,400 and without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided*, That $1,000,000,000 of such amount shall apply exclusively to advance base construction, material, and equipment: *Provided further*, That no part of these funds shall be used for the construction of new naval facilities or the enlargement of existing naval facilities in the continental United States in cases where existing facilities (owned or controlled privately, or by the War Department, or by other Federal agencies, or by States, or by other public bodies) are available and suitable for the Navy's purposes, and which will cost less for capital outlay and maintenance and operation (considering these and other ascertainable factors of comparable cost, including use of naval personnel) than such new naval facilities or the enlargement of such existing naval facilities.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning on page 26, line 15, and ending on page 27, line 2, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, all special fund receipt accounts and special fund appropriation accounts established for housing projects developed under provisions of the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676); September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 872); October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1125); March 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 14); May 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 197); and December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 810), are abolished as of June 30, 1944, and all moneys then on hand or thereafter derived from the rental or operation of such housing projects shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: Page 55, after line 21, insert the following section:

"SEC. 120. If at any time during the fiscal year 1945 the termination of the act entitled 'An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service,' approved April 9, 1943, or of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes,' approved May 7, 1943, shall be fixed by concurrent resolution of the Congress at a date earlier than June 30, 1945, the appropriations contained in this title shall cease to be available on such earlier date for obligation for the purposes of the terminated act and the unobligated portions of appropriations allocated for the purposes of such terminated act shall not be obligated for any other purposes of the appropriation during the fiscal year 1945."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, this is the section that we have been placing in all of the regular annual appropriation bills to recapture overtime compensation money, should the authority to pay such overtime cease before the end of the fiscal year 1945. It was omitted from this bill entirely through inadvertence. Textually, the provision is identical with those that have gone before.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time of the Committee to make a suggestion, I think an important suggestion. I have been reading some of the signs of the times and some newspapers. I am convinced that we are doing entirely too much talking about post-war business. It is a fine thing for us to consider our post-war problems, make whatever preparation we can for the future, but we are overdoing the talking end of it. Our troops are exactly where they were weeks ago in their march on Rome. We have only begun the recovery of what we lost in the Pacific one Sunday morning because we lacked the caution which the realization of our danger would have given. It is a mighty bad thing to divert the attention of the country too much from the fact that the first thing to do is to get us a post-war. There is not a bit of doubt about it.

I have studied human nature all my life and know that people work harder, more unitedly, accomplish more, and protect their interest better when they realize they might lose, than when they feel they have a cinch. Supposed to be cinches are dangerous. I do not care whether it is fighting a war, fighting a political campaign, or doing anything else on this earth that human beings do. The most dangerous thing is a supposed cinch. It is only the last battle that wins a war. Too many things can happen. Allies may fall out. Separate peace can be made. New implements of war may be invented making existing equipment obsolete. This continued statement we are bound to win is not the sort of thing to speed ourselves on.

We are doing too much talking of the same sort as before Pearl Harbor. If we could have realized before Pearl Harbor that this country was really in danger of getting into serious trouble or might even lose the war if we were not wide awake to our danger, we would not have had a Pearl Harbor disaster. We were saying then, if we get into trouble with the Japs we will clean them up before breakfast. That was dangerous. People have to watch themselves. They have to watch the drift of their own psychology. Our best and safest psychology would be we could lose the war. That would not make us lose the war. That would make us work harder to keep from losing it, would help get as many of our boys back home as soon as possible, home alive; victorious. The average person who pays any attention to what he reads in the newspaper could well think that we have just about got through with this war. Spending all kinds of money, sitting on all sorts of commissions and committees figuring out what we are going to do with these conquered countries. That is all right in a way, but we had better conquer some countries first, before devoting too much time and talk to their post-war treatment.

When the Germans were moving toward the Maginot line the French people were being told how impregnable it was, how certain they were to win. They put into their own national structure the element of weakness which assurance gives. Strife, struggles internally for profits and gains, for group and class advantage—these things were present when the Maginot line was broken. Then consciousness of a common danger exerted its solidifying, unifying, revitalizing influence. A united people with but one purpose, with much of industrial France in German hands, produced incredible quantities of war materials. Men, women, and children worked until they dropped in their tracks, we are told, but it was too late. I am not opposing reasonable consideration of post-war problems, but the first thing in point of sequence and of importance is to get us a post-war. We can see our problems in clearer detail then. There is too much battle smoke just now. We can get a better inventory then of what material the world will have available for its rebuilding, including the attitudes of peoples of the world. This running around and talking so much by these post-warites could be cut at least half in two and the public interest would not only not suffer one bit, but would be much benefited. The American people are not jittery. They do not need to be jollied along. They are not going to quit. The greatest disservice which can be rendered to any contestant, whether it be an individual or a nation, is to create the impression that he or it has a cinch. Egotism breeds incaution and incaution may breed disaster.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal in what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] said, because the first job we have is to win the war. The best state of mind for the American people to possess is not one of despondency, but one of grim determination to do the job as quickly as possible. If I interpreted the mind of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] correctly, he did not mean to say that the American people should be pessimistic or discouraged, but they should realize that no matter how good things might appear to be going, we are engaged in a war with a powerful enemy and, while the picture has changed from what it was a few years ago, that is no reason why we should get overconfident. If my interpretation of his mind is correct, I am in thorough agreement with him. The best way we on the home front can contribute is by possessing what I have stated publicly on many occasions, a feeling of grim determination to do everything we can as individuals, and to make every sacrifice we can in our own little way toward hastening the termination and the winning of the war. In other words, toward winning the war as quickly as possible. If we lose the war, everything and every ideal that we, as individual Americans, without regard to party, race, color, or anything else, believe in and love, and we stand on one common ground, the great rights guaranteed to us by the Constitution, and every ideal that our Government stands for will be meaningless and will fall to the ground. So I agree with the gentleman from Texas. His remarks are very timely. While we can give proper consideration to matters that reasonably will confront us in the immediate future, we should not overemphasize the important questions which confront us to the neglect of doing those things that are going to win the war.

There is just one observation I want to make. We are now passing a Navy appropriation bill. I am not going to bring up the past. In making the observations that I am, it is not bringing up the ghosts of the past, because we have to profit by past experiences insofar as our present and future planning is concerned. We now have the most powerful Navy the world has ever seen. The necessities and exigencies of war have produced that Navy. The United States is so located geographically that our Navy is essentially its first line of defense. I think that will be true in the future as it is at the present time and has been in the past. Without discussing what has happened in the past, but thinking of the present and the immediate future, and this does not conflict with the observation made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], I do hope that after this war is over, whatever party and individuals might be entrusted with the control of our Government, and I make this observation without regard to party, I do hope those who are entrusted with the conduct of our Government after the war is over, and victory comes to our cause, that this great Navy of ours which we have built will not be sunk. Our Navy is our first line of defense. We will need it after the successful termination of this war just as much as we have ever needed it in the past and as we need it now as our first line of defense. I take the floor to make these few observations and to

state that if I am a Member of Congress when that day arrives, if any effort is made to decimate the Navy of the United States, whether I am in the majority or in the minority, and whether my party is in control of this House or not, I shall do everything within my power to preserve the integrity and the strength of the United States Navy and to always have it in a position where it will be what it has to be—our first line of defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am intensely interested in the very keen observations made by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] and by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK]. There have been many warnings made against overconfidence, either as to date of victory or as to ultimate victory in this war. I think if properly publicized and handled by the press of the Nation, the very action of this House this day is indicative of the fact that the appropriating authorities in this Government are not overconfident.

We today have the largest Navy in the world, and if compelled to, could fight this war to its ultimate finish with our present-day Navy. We today have the greatest Air Force in the world, and if compelled to, could probably fight to an ultimate finish in this war without any increase in the size of the Air Force. Our Army is likewise great in strength. If this House harbored any feeling of overconfidence we would not here today unanimously, as we will in a few minutes, authorize an expenditure of $32,000,000,000, not for just the maintenance of the Navy, but for maintenance plus an enormous program of expansion.

Our Navy will not reach its peak strength until the middle of the calendar year 1945 either in men, or in ships, or in aircraft. Is it difficult to interpret that we believe this war is dated in its ultimate end beyond that period? If we did not believe so, why would we set our sights for a peak strength of power more than 1 year hence?

It was only earlier this afternoon when I made the plea that this Navy be kept for all times the strongest of all the navies of the world. While I have only the right to speak for myself as a Member of the minority, I think I could assume without any fear of contradiction, that I speak also for the other two distinguished Members in the minority. Yes; I would dare say for all of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling this bill.

We will soon appropriate in excess of $50,000,000,000 for the Army. We all realize that only 40 percent of this bill is being paid currently and that the remaining 60 percent of this bill is a debt on the future of the Nation; that it is a burden to our children, to their children and to their children for goodness knows how many generations to come. Would we project that burden on to posterity if we felt overconfident as to the date of victory in this war? Of course we would not. So no words or act of this House today should be interpreted to the country or to the world that we feel the date of victory is near at hand—a matter to be accomplished within days, or even weeks, or even a very few months. I do not think there is any military authority in this Nation, if in the world, that dates the conclusion of the Pacific war any earlier than 2 years beyond the conclusion of hostilities in the European theater. If any of us on our committee had any such ideas we would not be asking this House to authorize $32,000,000,000 for the Navy, at the same time anticipating that the subcommittee for the War Department will, one of these days in the very near future, bring in an authorization, which I can only guess will be somewhat short of $55,000,000,000; certainly in excess of $50,000,000,000. I, for one, want to cut the expenses of this Government to the bone at the earliest possible date. I so vote at every opportunity. When I join in this request for thirty-two billion it is because I am concerned and determined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Such actions by this House are acts of determination. Our words are words of confidence in the future, but not overconfidence. If we were cocky about the outcome of this war we would go on in the belief that we can destroy our enemies with what we have. But we are not cocky about it. We know that we are in a struggle to the death as it applies to nations. We have not won. There are still many pitfalls ahead of us. There is no absolute surety that we will win, save that we still have confidence in American ingenuity and American ability and in American determination and American tenacity to stick to the job until we do win. For that victory and the hope for the tranquility of peace after victory we are willing to mortgage our future, as we do today.

Those who have the duty of interpreting the acts of this Congress to the Nation should say this simple thing, "That the Congress is determined that this war shall be won and is withholding no resources to the end that it shall be won; but that the Congress is not cocky; the Congress does not believe that this war has been won. The greatest evidence possible that we do not have that spirit of cockiness, is the fact that we appropriate, not to maintain the strength of the Navy, the largest Navy in the world today, but to build it to such an extent that it is many times larger in men, ships, and power than any other navy in the world, particularly that of our most potent adversary, the Japanese Navy." While the obligations of secrecy of war do not permit an estimation of how many times larger it will be, I say that the hope of this committee, the hope of this Congress, the hope of the Navy Department, is that the striking power of our Navy will be so potent that no one adversary, no combination of adversaries yet to be formed, could stand up against the naval power of the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is extremely proper, before the debates are concluded on the bill under consideration that the remarks just placed in the RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], who just addressed us, should have been uttered. The distinguished majority leader indicated the hope that never again would we sink the ships that now constitute our Navy. I assume, as he stated, that he intended no tinge of partisanship to be implied from that statement. I think it can be readily said that such a statement perhaps reflects the present attitude of the membership of this House on both sides, as well as the attitude of the people of this Nation. I think it is well that that statement be repeated and repeated again and again, if you please, because my recollection is that opinions change with times. I recall the attitude, after the last World War. That attitude was not one that was dominant among the Republicans of this Nation, that there should be disarmament. It was a universal attitude that was prompted by people burdened all over the world with taxation in the race for competitive armament of nations.

I recall very distinctly reading the contemporary literature of that time from 1918 to 1921 and how this Nation took the leadership in the effort to effect naval limitations. I recall the conference that was held and the treaty that was entered into. In the light of events that have transpired in the years that followed, we can perhaps say, using our so-called vernacular hindsight, that the attitude of the people of the world as reflected in that treaty perhaps was not the right attitude. At least, however, it reflected the attitude not only of Republicans but of Democrats as well, and people throughout the world who were demanding relief from this intolerable race for armaments. Because the distinguished majority leader in a speech which he recently made up at Boston asked the people of the Nation to read the record, I spent some of my time during this recess doing that very thing. I intend to speak at some length upon the subject a little later. Having had the opportunity to do a little research, I went back and read some of those historic documents that we call political platforms. I read them all from 1900 right down to date, and in line with the very thought that the gentleman is now speaking about I find his party down at Houston when they nominated Al Smith in 1928 adopting a platform damning and criticizing the Republican Party of this Nation.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. In a moment.

Why? Because they had failed to go far enough in the matter of naval limitations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Massachusetts will recall that. I do not say this in any spirit of criticism or bitterness but merely to call attention to the fact that people's minds do change. The Naval Limitation Treaty of 1921 and 1922 asked only for the sinking of battleships. It is really funny to read some of these platforms of the past and see how sentiment changes. The Republican Party which was responsible for the calling of the naval-limitation conference was bitterly assailed and bitterly condemned by the Democratic Party because they did not provide for the sinking of the whole Navy but provided only for the sinking of battleships; condemned because they did not provide for the destruction of airplanes, the destruction of submarines, the elimination of poison gas, and the destruction of cruisers. How public opinion does change! Yes; the opinion of political parties does change; 1928 to 1944, the lapse of just a few years, and now the hope expressed is that we will never again sink a single ship. I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts that he and many on our side and citizens generally throughout the country are now determined to renounce that old philosophy of bitterness and come to a common agreement that we built this Navy for the protection of the United States and that we intend to keep it for that purpose.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will note—and I think he has interpreted my mind—that I was looking to the future. I deliberately refrained from going into the past because it would only confuse the present situation and future consideration of the problems. We are never going to decide present and future problems by having recourse only to the past except where we can utilize it as an assistance to clear thinking and in establishing a sound policy.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for the fine contribution but I might say again that I was prompted to look to the past because of the suggestion of the gentleman himself made to the people of this country that they read this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and find out what is in it and see what happened down there at Washington. I went just a little bit further than reading the RECORD itself, I went quite a ways back to find what happened. I believe the gentleman will concede and admit that times do change, that conditions do change, and that the gentleman is eminently correct that we should not look back too far and rake up too many of these old sores, because my examination of the RECORD discloses some obvious changes of position of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, which might cause great embarrassment if referred to today——

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I was here at the time of the disarmament conference in 1921. Together with other Members of the House I think I attended every one of the plenary sessions of that conference. We were all gratified at that time to see Charles Evans Hughes; Oscar Underwood; the great Democratic leader of the Senate, Joseph T. Robinson; and the great Republican leader of the Senate standing side by side in that conference doing that which they thought at that time was for the best interests of the world and the best interests of United States. Let us not be partisan about those things.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I say anything of a partisan nature? I was looking to the future. My friend from Michigan is referring to the past. We have got to agree at least on trying to formulate a policy. I feel that the observation of the gentleman from Wisconsin about times changing is correct. The important thing is that we should attempt to try in our own way to formulate what we consider to be healthy, sound public opinion.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I am glad to have the gentleman say that. I took him at his word that he meant nothing political. In previous times, of course, I have heard remarks made on this floor that would indicate the contrary. I just wanted to keep the record straight, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate in changing the subject at this point because the discussion up to this point has been very entertaining, but I want to present a few facts to my colleagues concerning how we may be able to cure much of this current manpower shortage, if you will bear with me for a few moments.

The manpower shortage can largely be cured at a negligible increase of cost by going from three 8-hour shifts to two 10-hour shifts. I wish to present some figures for your consideration and to consider a situation in a hypothetical industry where the average base wage rate is $1 per hour, where 12,000 workers are employed equally divided in 3 shifts.

I do not know how many of you know it, but the day shift always works its full 8 hours for 8 hours' pay. The swing shift works 7½ hours for 8 hours' pay plus a 10 percent bonus.

The graveyard shift works 7 hours for 8 hours' pay and with an added 15 percent bonus. If you consider a 12,000-man industry at 4,000 workers per shift and take the actual working hours of 8 hours in one shift, 7½ hours in the next shift and 7 hours in the third, you will find that they total 90,000 man-hours per 24 hours in that industry. If the plant facilities are adequate, and you can divide those 12,000 workers into two equal shifts at 6,000 per shift, the actual working time of the day shift will be 10 hours for 6,000 men and 9½ working hours for the swing shift of 6,000 men, totaling 117,000 man-hours. In other words, you have increased the manpower utilization in that industry by 27,000 man-hours per 24 hours, which is the equivalent of adding to that industry 3,375 employees or 28 percent. If you reduce the number of workers employed to turn out merely a 100-percent production on the two 10-hour shifts basis you will make available to other industries 23 percent of the total force, thereby aiding in relieving the manpower shortage elsewhere.

Furthermore, when you reduce the number of shifts from three to two, you have available added supervisory personnel. As everyone knows, we have a very great shortage of capable, experienced supervisory personnel. If one-third of them can be either culled out or utilized more profitably in the other two shifts, much improvement could be made in the production itself.

I have prepared some cost figures which show for the 4,000 men per shift on a three 8-hour shift basis a total cost of $104,000 per day. The total cost per day at the base average rate of $1 per hour would be $104,000 for 90,000 hours of actual working time. When you divide one into the other you will find that the result is $1.15½ an hour average wage.

If you utilize two 10-hour shifts of 6,000 men at $1 per hour for 8 hours plus time and a half for the 2 additional hours and the 10 percent bonus for the swing shift, you arrive at a daily pay roll of $138,500. The actual working time on the two-shift basis is 117,000 hours per 24-hour day. Dividing the hours into the pay roll, you will find that the cost per hour will be $1.18½, an increase of 3 cents per hour for the average wage in the plant over the three-shift basis.

It seems to me that in order to make available 3,375 additional man-days of work, or 3,375 additional men for the war effort, the added cost on the average of 2½ percent is not very great. Furthermore, by concentrating the supervisory force into 2 shifts, a net over-all improvement in production should be had which could very easily offset completely the small additional wage cost per hour and might in fact turn it into a saving.

Therefore, and I am speaking here of the theoretical maxima, by going from three 8-hour shifts to two 10-hour shifts, we could increase production up to 128 percent, or if only 100 percent is needed, we could stand a decrease in working forces of 23 percent.

Several plants on the Pacific coast have already made this change and found it advantageous in curing manpower shortages, particularly where there was a shortage of skilled workers. I am informed that workers are not at all averse to it as 10 hours' work brings time and a half for an additional 12 hours per week. Some absenteeism may develop, but, generally speaking, the plan has in many

cases relieved the necessity for employment of many who are in the habitual absentee group. I think it is worth trying in more industries during the war, and so recommend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN), there were—ayes 50, noes 0.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1429. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of statistical studies performed by the Department of Labor for other than Government activities during the period January 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943; to the Committee on Labor.

1430. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Smithsonian Institution for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1431. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a revised copy of the first page of their ceiling request for the fourth quarter containing the required analysis of the employees requested for the quarter, in substitution for the corresponding information in the request transmitted on April 5; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 498. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4254, to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, a amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1350). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3646. A bill to amend section 42 of title 7 of the Canal Zone Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4571. A bill to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4572. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California," approved May 18, 1928; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4573. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4574. A bill to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4575. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4576. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 4577. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4578. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 4579. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 4580. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4581. A bill to provide for the examination and survey of the Choctawhatchee River, Fla.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4582. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), and to continue said act in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4583. A bill to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment," approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4584. A bill to remove the limitation on the right to command of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army which limits such officers to command in that corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4585. A bill to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 264. Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the method of ratification of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4586 A bill for the relief of Athan Peter Brakoulis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 4587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Ellwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4588. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Whiddon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4589. A bill for the relief of the Muskingum watershed conservancy district; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4590. A bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4591. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4592. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4593. A bill for the relief of Thomas R. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5433. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Cora Beals West and 39 other citizens of Jennings, La., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5434. Also, petition of Mrs. E. W. Yates and 115 other citizens of Cumberland, Md., urg-

ing enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5435. Also, petition of Margretta Alford and 51 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5436. Also, petition of J. W. Stafford and 48 other citizens of Cumberland, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5437. Also, petition of James L. Boyer and 62 other citizens of Mansfield, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5438. Also, petition of Carroll Davis and 37 other citizens of Rock Hall, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5439. Also, petition of Margaret M. Fisher and 84 other citizens of Burlington, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5440. Also, petition of Rev. William A. Herpich and 44 other citizens of Boonsboro, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5441. Also, petition of Minnie C. Ressinger and 62 other citizens of Warsaw, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5442. Also, petition of Mrs. Ed Cobb and 116 other citizens of Correctionville, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5443. Also, petition of Norman Riedesel and 83 other citizens of Niobrara, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the wining of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5444. Also, petition of Clarence A. Bratt and 33 other citizens of Clarence Center, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5445. Also, petition of Earl Schlegel and 48 other citizens of Staunton, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5446. Also, petition of Leillie Kuhn and 245 other citizens of Rockford, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5447. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of James H. McManaway and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of any type or kind of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5448. Also, petition of O. George Heyl and 29 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of any kind of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5449. Also, petition of Mike Hogan and 100 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of any type or kind of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5450. Also, petition of Florence Ludwig and eight other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of any type of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5451. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Greater New York Congress of Industrial Organizations Council, urging Congress to make arrangements to broadcast the proceedings of the Congress and requesting that in the event the existing broadcasting companies refuse their cooperation in providing this essential service to the people the Congress take steps to establish federally owned radio broadcasting stations for this purpose; to the Committee on Rules.

5452. Also, petition of the New York State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action for the observance of Bill of Rights Day throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5453. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petition signed by sundry residents in Peekskill, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5454. Also (by request), petition signed by John J. Whalen, of Pleasantville, N. Y., and other residents in Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5455. Also (by request), petition circulated by the board of governors of Port Chester Lodge, No. 863, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Port Chester, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5456. Also (by request), petition signed by John Cox Farrall, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., and other residents in Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5457. Also (by request), petition signed by Samuel Kadish, of White Plains, N. Y., and other residents of Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5458. Also (by request), petition signed by John Bandel, of Peekskill, N. Y., and other residents of Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5459. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the College Hill Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Beaver Falls, Pa., representing approximately 170 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5460. Also, petition of 20 residents of Renfrew, Pa., requesting the enactment of House bill 2082, which would stop the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and during demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5461. Also, petition of the adult group of the Free Methodist Sunday School of New Brighton, Pa., representing approximately 83 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5462. Also, petition of the United Presbyterian Sunday School, of Darlington, Pa., representing approximately 50 adult persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5463. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 3, West Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 102 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504), providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5464. By Mr. KEOGH: Letter received from Francis Burns, of the Gray Envelope Manufacturing Co., Inc., 55 Thirty-third Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., with respect to pending tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5465. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition signed by 60 residents of Catskill, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5466. Also, petition containing signatures of sundry residents of Hudson, N. Y., protesting against prohibition legislation, sponsored by Frances Kostozewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5467. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Virginia E. Smith, and 30 other signers from Belfair, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5468. Also, petition of Ed Pisor and 54 other signers from Mineral, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5469. Also, petition of A. J. Kent and 87 other signers from Mossy Rock, Wash., and

adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5470. Also, petition of William F. Austin and 29 other signers from Allyn, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5471. Also, petition of George W. McAter and 69 other signers from Centralia, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5472. Also, petition of Mary Evelyn Gibson and 206 other signers from Olympia, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5473. Also, petition of Maude M. Meyers, and 11 other signers from Centralia, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5474. Also, petition of Eugene Russell and 64 other signers from Olympia, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5475. Also, petition of George Ferris and four other signers from Hoquiam, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5476. Also, petition of Dean Brown and 24 other signers from Raymond, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5477. Also, petition of Oscar Perry and 14 other signers from Vader, Wash., and adjacent area, protesting against the enactment or consideration of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5478. By Mr. PLOESER: House Resolution No. 33 of the House of Representatives of Jefferson City, Mo., on the subject of soft-red winter wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Pilot of Galilee, who when the waters were contrary and Thy disciples looked to Thee for help, didst calm the waters, be with us as we face the threatening seas. Sobered by our mistakes, challenged by the virtues of our people, inspire us to take up anew the tasks awaiting us. Give us a conquering faith and spirits zealous for toil that the good in our daily lives shall last forever. In all our avenues of service, grant that the fear of the Lord may be the beginning of our wisdom and that a better day shall come for all.

O Man of Sorrows, for the joy that was set before Thee endured the cross, watch over those who are our defenders, temper every storm and bring them into the harbor of safety. Be Thou in the institutions of the poor, the unfortunate, and the forgotten; search out the broken-hearted and the lonely and give them peace. Remember all who minister unto others and those who guard our streets and homes; free our souls from self-seeking and by prayer and meditation make us beautiful within. Help us to take the adventurous way, the high way, and the unexplored way which makes life worth living, making the springs of time and sense blessed with eternal good. In the name of Him who will go with us to the end. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post entitled "T. V. A. and Politics."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, first, to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the school hot-lunch program, and, second, to extend my own remarks in connection with legislation for the benefit of men and women in the armed forces and also servicemen who have been discharged.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer indicating that this will take two and a quarter pages at a cost of $101.25. I ask that notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit I be permitted to insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, regarding War Damage Corporation insurance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] be permitted to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech which she delivered before the Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Allen, Ill.	Gilchrist	Murray, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Newsome
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gore	Norrell
Andrews, Ala.	Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Barrett	Green	O'Connor
Bates, Ky.	Gross	O'Toole
Bennett, Mo.	Hale	Outland
Bolton	Hall, Leonard W.	Face
Bonner	Harris, Ark.	Peterson, Ga.
Boren	Hart	Phillips
Brehm	Hays	Poage
Brooks	Heffernan	Poulson
Brumbaugh	Hobbs	Pracht, C. Frederick
Buckley	Holifield	Price
Burch, Va.	Howell	Priest
Burdick	Jarman	Rabaut
Busbey	Jeffrey	Ramey
Butler	Jennings	Reed, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Anton J.	Rees, Kans.
Capozzoli	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rizley
Carrier	Johnson, Okla.	Robsion, Ky.
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Ward	Rockwell
Carter	Judd	Rolph
Case	Kefauver	Russell
Celler	Kelley	Sabath
Chapman	Kennedy	Sadowski
Chenoweth	Kerr	Sauthoff
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Scanlon
Clark	Klein	Schwabe
Coffee	Knutson	Shafer
Compton	Kunkel	Sheridan
Courtney	Lambertson	Sikes
Curley	Landis	Simpson, Ill
Davis	Lane	Slaughter
Day	LeFevre	Smith, Maine
Dickstein	Lesinski	Smith, W. Va.
Dies	Luce	Snyder
Dingell	McCord	Starnes, Ala.
Disney	McGregor	Stewart
Domengeaux	McWilliams	Sumner, Ill.
Douglas	Maloney	Talbot
Durham	Manasco	Talle
Elmer	Marcantonio	Tarver
Elston, Ohio	Martin, Mass.	Taylor
Engle, Calif.	Mason	Vorys, Ohio
Feighan	Merritt	Welchel, Ohio
Fellows	Merrow	Weiss
Fish	Miller, Conn.	Wene
Fogarty	Monkiewicz	Whelchel, Ga.
Ford	Monroney	White
Fulbright	Morrison, La.	Whittington
Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.	Wickersham
Gallagher	Mruk	Winstead
Gamble	Murdock	Winter
Gavin	Murphy	Woodruff, Mich.
Gerlach		Wright
Gifford		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 260 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion by Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NAVY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the question on the passage of the bill H. R. 4559.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN), there were—ayes 190, noes none.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 258, nays 0, not voting 172, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—258

Abernethy	Gearhart	Myers
Allen, La.	Gibson	Norman
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillespie	Norton
	Gillette	O'Brien, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Gillie	O'Hara
	Gordon	O'Konski
Andrews	Gossett	O'Neal
Angell	Graham	Patman
Arends	Grant, Ala.	Patton
Arnold	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.
Auchincloss	Gregory	Pfeifer
Baldwin, Md.	Griffiths	Philbin
Barden	Gwynne	Pittenger
Barrett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser
Barry		Plumley
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Powers
Beall	Hancock	Pratt, Joseph M.
Beckworth	Hare	
Bell	Harless, Ariz.	Ramspeck
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Randolph
Bennett, Mich.	Harris, Va.	Rankin
Bishop	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Hays	Reed, N. Y.
Bland	Hébert	Richards
Bloom	Heidinger	Rivers
Boykin	Hendricks	Robertson
Bradley, Mich.	Hess	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Hill	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ga.	Hinshaw	Rohrbough
Brown, Ohio	Hoch	Rowan
Bryson	Hoeven	Rowe
Buffett	Hoffman	Sasscer
Bulwinkle	Holmes, Mass.	Satterfield
Burchill, N. Y.	Holmes, Wash.	Schiffler
Burgin	Hope	Scott
Byrne	Horan	Scrivner
Camp	Hull	Sheppard
Canfield	Izac	Short
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Carlson, Kans.	Jensen	Smith, Ohio
Carrier	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Va.
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, J. Leroy	Smith, Wis.
Church		Somers, N. Y.
Clason	Johnson, Luther A.	Sparkman
Clevenger		Spence
Cochran	Jones	Springer
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Stanley
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Stearns, N. H.
Colmer	Kearney	Stefan
Cooley	Kee	Stevenson
Cooper	Keefe	Stigler
Costello	Keogh	Stockman
Cox	Kilday	Sullivan
Cravens	King	Sumners, Tex.
Crawford	Kinzer	Sundstrom
Crosser	Kirwan	Taber
Cunningham	Kleberg	Taylor
Curtis	LaFollette	Thomas, N. J.
D'Alesandro	Lanham	Thomas, Tex.
Dawson	Larcade	Thomason
Delaney	Lea	Tibbott
Dewey	LeCompte	Tolan
Dilweg	Lemke	Torrens
Dingell	Lewis	Towe
Dirksen	Ludlow	Treadway
Dondero	Lynch	Troutman
Doughton	McConnell	Vincent, Ky.
Drewry	McCormack	Vinson, Ga.
Dworshak	McCowen	Voorhis, Calif.
Eaton	McGehee	Vursell
Eberharter	McKenzie	Wadsworth
Elliott	McLean	Walter
Ellis	McMillan	Ward
Ellison, Md.	Maas	Wasielewski
Ellsworth	Madden	Weaver
Engel, Mich.	Magnuson	Welch
Fay	Mahon	West
Fenton	Mansfield, Mont.	Whitten
Fernandez		Wigglesworth
Fisher	Mansfield, Tex.	Willey
Fitzpatrick	Martin, Iowa	Wilson
Flannagan	May	Wolcott
Folger	Michener	Wolfenden, Pa.
Forand	Miller, Mo.	Wolverton, N. J.
Fuller	Miller, Nebr.	Woodrum, Va.
Furlong	Miller, Pa.	Worley
Gale	Mott	Zimmerman
Gathings	Mundt	
Gavin	Murray, Wis.	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—172

Allen, Ill.	Gross	Newsome
Anderson, Calif.	Hagen	Norrell
Anderson, N. Mex.	Hale	O'Brien, Ill.
	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, Ala.		O'Connor
Baldwin, N. Y.	Harris, Ark.	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Outland
Bennett, Mo.	Heffernan	Pace
Bolton	Herter	Peterson, Ga.
Bonner	Hobbs	Phillips
Boren	Holifield	Poage
Brehm	Howell	Poulson
Brooks	Jackson	Pracht, C. Frederick
Brumbaugh	Jarman	
Buckley	Jeffrey	Price
Burch, Va.	Jennings	Priest
Burdick	Johnson, Anton J.	Rabaut
Busbey		Ramey
Butler	Johnson, Calvin D.	Reed, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.		Rees, Kans.
Capozzoli	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rizley
Carter		Robinson, Utah
Case	Johnson, Okla.	Robsion, Ky.
Celler	Johnson, Ward	Rockwell
Chapman	Judd	Rogers, Calif.
Chenoweth	Kefauver	Rolph
Chiperfield	Kelley	Russell
Clark	Kennedy	Sabath
Coffee	Kerr	Sadowski
Compton	Kilburn	Sauthoff
Courtney	Klein	Scanlon
Curley	Knutson	Schwabe
Davis	Kunkel	Shafer
Day	Lambertson	Sheridan
Dickstein	Landis	Sikes
Dies	Lane	Simpson, Ill.
Disney	LeFevre	Slaughter
Domengeaux	Lesinski	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Luce	Smith, W. Va.
Durham	McCord	Snyder
Elmer	McGregor	Starnes, Ala.
Elston, Ohio	McMurray	Stewart
Engle, Calif.	McWilliams	Sumner, Ill.
Feighan	Maloney	Talbot
Fellows	Manasco	Talle
Fish	Marcantonio	Tarver
Fogarty	Martin, Mass.	Vorys, Ohio
Ford	Mason	Weichel, Ohio
Fulbright	Merritt	Weiss
Fulmer	Merrow	Wene
Gallagher	Miller, Conn.	Whelchel, Ga.
Gamble	Mills	White
Gerlach	Monkiewicz	Whittington
Gifford	Monroney	Wickersham
Gilchrist	Morrison, La.	Winstead
Goodwin	Morrison, N. C.	Winter
Gore	Mruk	Woodruff, Mich.
Gorski	Murdock	Wright
Granger	Murphy	
Green	Murray, Tenn.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Schwabe.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Anton J. Johnson.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Bennett of Missouri.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Compton.
Mr. Manasco with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Newsome with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Monkiewicz.
Mr. Green with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Hart with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Marcantonio with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Harris of Arkansas with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Outland with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Talbot.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Talle.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Ward Johnson
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Bonner with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Elston of Ohio.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Day.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Priest with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Miller of Connecticut.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Ramey.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Wright with Mr. McWilliams.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Gallagher
Mr. Clark with Mr. Phillips.
Mr Durham with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Winter.
Mr. McCord with Mr. Rockwell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 20, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Special Committee to Investigate all Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Massachusetts be kind enough to announce the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

On Monday the Unanimous-Consent Calendar will be called. There is one suspension, H. R. 4115, providing for preference for the veterans of this war. It is quite probable there might be a roll call on the passage of that bill. After that the consideration of the lend-lease bill will start.

On Tuesday there will be the call of the Private Calendar, after which debate on lend-lease will continue. I understand that the rule provides for 2 days' debate on lend-lease.

On Wednesday there will be continuation of the debate on lend-lease. Upon

the termination of the debate on lend-lease the following bills will be taken up in the order I announce them: House Resolution 495, the Fish resolution, to aid the starving people of Europe; S. 45, the forestry bill; H. R. 3848, another forestry bill; H. R. 3570, authorizing the construction of Hungry Horse Dam.

If any other matters are to be taken up, I will give the House as early notice as I can; but as far as I know at this time, that is the program for next week.

Mr. MICHENER. The veterans' bill, known as the G. I. bill, will not be taken up next week, as I understand it.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding. If it is reported out of the committee in time, it will probably be taken up. However, if it is, it will probably be reported so late in the week that it could not be considered, although as soon as possible after that bill is reported out it is the intention to bring it up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, just before the recess a number of gentlemen on the majority side felt the House was wasting its time. Can the gentleman assure us that there will not be any legislation brought up tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And we would not be wasting our time if we adjourned over tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman will be in his office working very hard. I know I will.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know about the rest of the members. I know I will be there.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure that the members on both sides are working very hard. They have plenty of office work, and also the study of bills and other matters. I can vouch for the fact that the gentleman from Michigan works hard.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can I have the gentleman's permission to use that in the campaign?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HEARING BY PETROLEUM SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, at an executive session of the members of the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee this morning a general program was agreed upon for hearings of the committee to begin next Wednesday, April 19.

The first matter for investigation will be that of the black market in gasoline, the extent and methods of its operation, its effect upon the civilian and war supplies, and proposed methods for elimination of the black market.

A further subject of investigation will be the rationing system as now in operation involving the question as to the extent of the limitations necessary upon the civilian supply and as to whether or not there is an inequality of treatment as between different areas, individuals, and in the agricultural and industrial uses of gasoline.

A further matter to be investigated will be the supply and distribution of oil and its products generally, and particularly as to supplies to refineries in different areas and between refineries within the same areas. This matter will also involve the element of transportation as it affects the distribution of both oil and gasoline.

The situation of the retail distributors will also be covered by the investigation before it is completed.

The subcommittee has heretofore held some executive sessions in reference to possible foreign oil supply and recently as to the proposed Arabian source of supply. This matter will be gone into more extensively later and before the committee has concluded its hearings.

It is the purpose of the committee to make these hearings as broad and comprehensive as may be necessary to properly establish the facts as to these practical current problems as to the supply and distribution of petroleum products.

The committee will welcome information from any reliable source that will aid in developing the facts as to these problems.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] be given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the course of time I may extend my remarks in the RECORD on five different subjects and include short excerpts in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NAVAL OIL RESERVES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] addressed the House and made what I regard as one of the most statesmanlike speeches on an important basic question confronting this House that has been made in a long, long time. It appears on page 3462 of the RECORD. I hope the Members who did not hear it will take the trouble to read it. It concerns the right solution for the Elk Hills Naval Oil Reserve.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Civil Aeronautics bill, 1938, and include therein a letter from the Pacific-American Steamship Association to the gentleman from California, Congressman LEA.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemar from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, today we had a roll call on the Navy appropriation bill, at which time some of the Members of the House were absent. I do not know who insisted upon the roll call, but I do know that several Members of the House have been called away on matters of an official nature and could not be here. The reason I take this time is that my colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. COFFEE], from Tacoma, was one of them. I think it is only fair that the House know that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is a member of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations. He has worked night and day on this bill for 6 or 7 weeks. He went away with the understanding that the bill was complete. I think it only fair that the RECORD show that one of the hardest workers on the Naval Appropriation bill was the gentleman from Washington. I know exactly how he would have voted had he been here, because in effect this bill is his own sweat and blood.

The same situation applies to my other colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] who is also necessarily absent conducting official hearings for this Congress on the west coast as a member of the Committee on Smaller War Plants. He, too, upon inquiry, relied upon the understanding that there would be no roll call on this bill. I know they deeply regret not being here and of course it goes without saying that should they have been present they would have been enthusiastic in their support of this vital measure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a fine speech by Mr. Howard Bruce of the Office of Services and Supplies of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CANNON of Missouri addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excellent address by our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], at the Bataan Day exercises held in Boston on Sunday, April 9, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of April 9, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some recent articles from the Boston Traveler and other newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report by Alexander M. Campbell, of Fort Wayne, Ind., United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SUGAR SUPPLY

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr Speaker, on March 28 last, just a few days before the recess, I called the attention of the House to the confusing administration reports on our sugar supply. It was further shown that while continued rationing was advisable, there was no excuse, need, or reason for the reduction of sugar allotments for commercial use of bakers, confectioners, beverage manufacturers, dairy-product processors, canners, and others from 80 to 70 percent of 1941 consumption.

Attention was directed to reliable statistics which showed that on January 1, 1944, the total continental stocks and offshore stocks in Caribbean ports amounted to 3,026,000 tons. It was further shown that indicated carry-over stocks on December 31, 1944, making liberal allowances for all demands—that is, civilian use, armed forces, lend-lease, alcohol production, and so forth—would be 120,000 tons more, or 3,146,000 tons.

It was further stressed that the Republican congressional food-study committee had investigated this situation and in discussing the matter with officials in the administrative branch of the Government had learned that these officials refused to consider sugar as available unless it was within the continental limits of the United States; that sugar in Caribbean ports was not considered available. It was further pointed out that these officials maintained that the War Shipping Administration would not make ships available to them.

It was also explained to the House, as it had been suggested to administration officials, how by a mere matter of sensible administration in the routing of ships now engaged in North Atlantic transportation, they could readily bring into the United States far more than the potential production in the Caribbean area; that our shipping situation was considerably improved over that of a year ago; that for the present at least we have the submarine menace whipped; that we produced over 3,000,000 tons of shipping since our entry into the war; that it would take only two 10,000-ton ships of this shipping to bring in the difference between a 70 and 80 percent quota of sugar for commercial use.

But, and here comes the rub, it was reported that so many ships were engaged in the transportation of material of war to our overseas forces that we do not have the dockside facilities to quickly reload those ships upon their return to this country. As a result it was alleged that ships sometimes waited as long as 30 or 40 days after their return from overseas to be reloaded with further military supplies. It was asserted that there was no reason under the sun why many of these ships on their way back from European ports could not stop at Caribbean sugar ports and bring into the United States all the sugar that is available at offshore points. All to no avail however, and it appears that it was not until this inane, inefficient, not to say bungling waste of shipping was exposed before the Congress, that the administration was stirred into action.

The public generally and especially the commercial users of sugar undoubtedly will be pleased and encouraged to know that after our criticism of this shipping waste, we have reports of substantial improvement.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not a fact that really cannot be contraverted that since the gentleman's speech of about 2 weeks ago the Department now has done the very things he said ought to be done?

Mr. JONKMAN. Absolutely, and to an even greater extent than I asked for.

During the recess and within 2 weeks from the date of the aforesaid exposure in the House, I am informed that the administration promised a more efficient use of available shipping to increase the amount of sugar brought into this country from Cuba and Puerto Rico. Idle ships now on stand-by orders of the armed forces in eastern ports will, under permission obtained from the armed forces, be employed immediately to bring in more sugar.

Whether this means immediate improvement remains to be seen. It is my understanding that 16 boats have been diverted for at least 1 cargo of sugar, and 3 more may be diverted. In my speech of March 28 it was simply maintained that imports of 20,000 tons a month would make unnecessary the cut in allotments from 80 percent to 70 percent for commercial use. This increased shipping, however, will bring in 110,000 additional tons in April and May, all of which would seem to indicate that the domestic civilian commercial use of sugar could be restored to 80 percent of 1941 use.

This, of course, is good news and a gratifying result. It is pleasing that the administration agrees with and is carrying out my recommendations. However, there is not the slightest excuse why this remedial action should not have been undertaken long ago. It is but another example of the failure of the administration to bring our war effort to the highest efficiency. In the matter of our food supply, so essential to the success of our war effort, the Republican congressiona' food study committee has on severa' occasions offered and supported constructive and corrective suggestions similar to the above shipping suggestions for sugar. Most of these would have been unnecessary had the administration not obstructed one of the major proposals of that committee in the Jenkins bill and the Fulmer bill for a single food administrator. The failure to utilize idle shipping for sugar is another example of the administration's greatest weakness of making every need everybody's business, which makes it nobody's business.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know whether the gentleman is interested in this point, but I do know that in Washington at the present time, a great many representatives of green vegetable producers are in exactly the same predicament as is the case in the sugar situation and they now are bringing out and magnifying really beyond any peradventure of doubt, the very things you are arguing about—one-man control.

Mr. JONKMAN. There is no question about it, as I say, in this last paragraph:

A single food administrator would not only make for efficiency in understanding and handling food problems, but for an attentive ear to constructive measures, an advocate for such measures, and also responsibility for inefficiency. In other words, we have in the sugar fiasco

another potent example of need for legislation provided by the Fulmer bill which has been reported out of the Committee on Agriculture but lies prostrate under administration obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LEFEVRE (at the request of Mr. COLE of New York), indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. SHEPPARD, for 30 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. BUTLER, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a speech recently made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1432. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 30, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Rough River and its tributaries, Kentucky, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 535), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4519. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4594. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4595. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who have participated in the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

H. R. 4596. A bill to amend Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4597. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States, during the present war, of certain transportation expenses of enlisted members of the armed forces while on emergency furlough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 4598. A bill to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4599. A bill to provide for the investment in United States Savings bonds of pay and allowances credited to prisoners of war and certain other persons absent from their posts of duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediately all steps necessary and proper to assure this country's continued aviation progress and to make possible its world leadership in that field; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action for the observance of Bill of Rights Day throughout the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4600. A bill for the relief of the York Products, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4601. A bill for the relief of Ed Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 4602. A bill for the relief of Benjamin D. Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4603. A bill for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4604. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters at naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4605. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Hugh A. Shiels, United States Navy Reserves; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4606. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain naval personnel and former naval personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4607. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5479. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the New York State Legislature setting forth their recommendations for certain amendments to the civil aviation bill, House bill 4320, now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5480. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 4, tenth ward, Binghamton, N. Y., and signed by 112 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5481. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5482. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Oliva Hunter, of Shelton, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5483. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Bessie B. W. Luce and other citizens of Camden, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082 to insure greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5484. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Jean Thomas and 19 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5485. Also, petition of Mrs. H. Wall and 43 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5486. Also, petition of Ruth Layton and 43 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5487. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petition opposing legislation to permit one form of transportation from encroaching on another; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5488. Also, petition to form an Italian relief committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5489. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, stewards' council of Local 825, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the immediate enactment of Senate bill 1767; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5490. Also, petition of the Alameda County (C. I. O.) Council, Local 1412, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the re-

quest that arrangements be made to broadcast important proceedings of Congress to the people of the United States; to the Committee on Accounts.

5491. Also, petition of William Taylor, of New York City, and various merchant seamen of the National Maritime Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging support of the Fair Employment Practice Committee in getting representatives to sign the Marcantonio discharge petition 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5492. Also, petition of the secretary, Municipal Assembly of Aguadilla, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to approval of Congressman McGEHEE's resolution requesting the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell from the Governorship of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal Spirit, who art as great and blazing as the sun and yet as near and gentle as the sunshine of this new day calling out the flowering beauty of the spring, to Thy radiance help us to lift the curtains of our darkened lives. Thou hast called us to play our part in tragic yet glorious years. Midst all the tumult we seek the unshaken assurance of those whose minds are stayed on Thee. Bring us at noontide to a wayside shrine where face to face with eternal verities we may find a sanctuary inviolate and still—untouched by the shattering events which fling their angry fury across our world. At this altar of prayer steady us with the realization that back of all the dark tragedy there is a permanent good in which we may believe and to which we must be loyal if life is to be saved from frustration at last. In bitter and bewildering days give us the vision that appeals from the temporal to the eternal. Fit our hearts to receive the gift of citizenship in that kingdom which cannot be shaken.

As decisive days draw near in the struggle against tyranny which demands our all, strengthen us with might for whatever the future holds, dread and danger, perhaps wounds and death for our dear ones, and heartaches for us all which Thou alone knowest. In all unknown, distant scenes, grant us Thy healing and Thy peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 13, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the President of the United States has appointed me a delegate to the annual meeting of the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from the sessions of the Senate during the time I shall be at the conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD AND CITY OF NEW YORK RELATING TO FOREIGN-TRADE ZONE NO. 1

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Chairman of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, and the annual report of the city of New York, covering operations of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 1 during the calendar year 1942 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

A letter from the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for that Office for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORTS BY THE ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

Letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Archivist and the Fourth Annual Report of the Archivist as to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, both for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Library.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War (2), Navy (3), Interior (3), and Agriculture (4); War Manpower Commission, Office of Price Administration (2), Office for Emergency Management, and War Food Administration which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Whereas the Thirty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado was convened on January 28, 1944, by Gov. John C. Vivian for the purpose of passing legislation which will allow the men and women in the armed forces who are residents of the State of Colorado to exercise their right to cast their ballots for the selection of public officials, National, State, and local, and such legislation is now in the process of being enacted; and

"Whereas any bill passed by this assembly will undoubtedly be enacted before any bill regarding voting by persons in the armed forces is enacted by the Congress of the United States, and must therefore be passed without knowledge of the contents of any such law of Congress relating to this subject; and

"Whereas, under the Constitution of the United States, the determination of the qualifications of the persons who may be permitted to vote for all public officials, including Members of Congress and Presidential electors, rests solely in the States, except that no State may deny the vote to any person solely because of color or sex; and

"Whereas the determination of the form and contents of the ballot, the time, and the method of casting the same, and the canvassing of the results of the election are solely the right and responsibility of the States; and

"Whereas the delivering of absent voters' ballots to the voters entitled to receive them and returning said ballots to the proper State and local officials is the right and responsibility of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas every voter is entitled and obligated to so cast his ballot that no other person, except under the most unusual circumstances, may know how he voted; that every envelope containing an absent voter's ballot will clearly so indicate and will be addressed to an unnamed public official; that such ballots should not be subject to censorship, and the Congress should insure that ballots of military personnel shall not be censored: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-fourth general assembly in first extraordinary session convened (the senate concurring herein)*:

"First. That Congress is hereby memorialized to assume the obligations of getting to the men and women in the armed services the absent voters' ballots to which they are entitled, prepared by the States, and to return said ballots to the proper State and local officials, with all due dispatch, insuring secrecy in the ballot.

"Second. That Congress is further memorialized and requested not to attempt to assume the right to determine the qualifications of the voters and the form and contents and time and method of casting, counting, and canvassing the ballots.

"Third. That a copy of this memorial shall be sent immediately by the secretary of state of Colorado to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, to Senators ED C. JOHNSON and EUGENE D. MILLIKEN, and to Representatives J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, WILLIAM S. HILL, and ROBERT ROCKWELL, and to the presiding officers of all State legislatures now in session, and the secretary of state of Colorado shall send to the presiding officers of each State legislature convening hereafter and prior to November 1, 1944, a copy of this memorial."

A resolution adopted by Local 1, United Federal Workers of America, of Washington, D. C., relating to the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of members of Local Association No. 14, National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation placing the Bureau of Navigation

and Merchant Marine Inspection Service permanently under the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, favoring the establishment of an express parkway between Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

WAGES OF UNITED STEEL WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter and resolution, which I have just received from Mr. Charles Rivers, international representative of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Bridgeport, Conn. The resolution urges that the National War Labor Board order the steel companies to grant the wage demands of the United Steel Workers of America.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO & MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Bridgeport 3, Conn., April 11, 1944.

Senator FRANCIS MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by 250 officers and shop stewards of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, representing the employees of the following Bridgeport shops: General Electric, Bryant-Hemco, Columbia Recording, Auto-Ordnance, Decca Corporation, Siemon Co., Producto Machine, Allison Co., Bassick Co., Remington-Rand, Manning, Maxwell & Moore, Remington Arms, and Singer's.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES RIVERS,
International Representative.

Whereas the antilabor forces in Congress have seen to it that only wages have become stabilized, thereby scuttling the President's entire stabilization program; and

Whereas prices of the necessities of life, taxation and all the other points of the President's stabilization program have been so misapplied by Congress, so that undue and unfair burdens have been placed on the shoulders of labor; and

Whereas only the enforcement of the proper wage policy and application of the President's entire stabilization program will enable all the people of our country to make their proportionate and all-out contribution to the war effort; and

Whereas the disposition of the wage demands of the United Steel Workers of America by the National War Labor Board will decide whether or not labor will receive enough wages to meet its needs during the war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Bridgeport U. E. Local Union officers, local executive board members, and shop committee members, employed in the following shops: G. E., Bryant-Hemco, Columbia Recording Corporation, Auto-Ordnance, Decca Corporation, Siemon Co., Producto Machine, Allison Co., Bassick Co., Manning, Maxwell & Moore, Remington Arms, and Singer Co., assembled on March 26, go on record as fully supporting the wage demands of the United Steel Workers of America, and call upon the National War Labor Board to abandon the rigid and unrealistic wage policies that it has been pursuing; and, be it further

Resolved, That we insist that the National War Labor Board order the steel companies to grant the wage demands of the United Steel Workers of America; and be it further

Resolved, That every step be taken in conformity with the program worked out by the national office of the U. E., to acquaint and involve our membership and our community in the struggle to revise the Little Steel formula and enactment of the President's entire stabilization program by Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the copies of this resolution be forwarded to the public members of the National War Labor Board, President Roosevelt, Philip Murray, Congresswoman Luce, Congressman at Large Monkiewicz, Senators Danaher and Maloney, national office of the U. E., and to the press.

JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE—U. S. S. "FORT WAYNE"

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred two very brief resolutions, one adopted at a mass meeting held in Indianapolis on the 5th day of March having to do with the Palestine question, and the other a resolution of an organization in my own city under the title "U. S. S. Fort Wayne."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the people of the United Nations look forward with growing confidence to the early prospect of victory and peace; and

Whereas the wounded conscience of history demands that with the coming of victory and peace, the great historic wrongs against all peoples be permanently righted, in accordance with the highest moral and ethical teachings of the civilized world; and

Whereas the Jewish people, which has contributed so much to human progress, was the first target of the Nazi aggressor, having undergone a ruthless process of slaughter resulting in the extermination of more than one-third of its number; and

Whereas this gigantic catastrophe has reemphasized the tragic homelessness of the Jewish people and their need for a haven of refuge for the thousands who will survive this global holocaust; and

Whereas by the consent and approval of our own great country, together with 51 other nations, a historic promise was made to the Jewish people in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 "to facilitate the establishment of a national homeland for the Jews in Palestine"; and

Whereas in the intervening decades the progress made by the Jewish national homeland has been among the most remarkable achievements of modern times, since more than a half million victims of prejudice and intolerance have been enabled without infringing on the rights of any other peoples or religious groups to reshape their lives in dignity and self-reliance on their ancestral soil; and

Whereas the British white paper of May 1939—a relic of the era of appeasement of the pre-Pearl Harbor days—condemned by Mr. Winston Churchill as "a plain breach of solemn obligation," threatens the doom of the Jewish national home by closing the doors of the Holy Land to further Jewish immigration as of March 31, 1944: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, citizens of the city of Indianapolis, gathered at the war memorial auditorium on Sunday, March 5, 1944, record our prayerful hope that the document known as the British white paper in Palestine be permanently scrapped; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, the Senators and Representatives in Congress, together with our urgent request that every effort be made to insure the nullification of the British white paper by the immediate passage by Congress of H. R. 418 and H. R. 419 and Senate Resolution 247, to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

Attest:

Rabbi ISRAEL CHODOS.

To the Committee on Naval Affairs:

U. S. S. FORT WAYNE
SHIP 48 NAVY CLUB,
Fort Wayne, Ind., April 15, 1944.

Whereas Fort Wayne, Ind., is one of the historic spots of the United States of America; and

Whereas one of her distinguished sons was killed in the service of the United States in the present war, and among his personal effects was found an unmailed letter directed to the mayor of Fort Wayne urging that a ship be named after his home city; and

Whereas the naming of such ship would serve as a memorial to men who are serving and who have died in the service of the Navy of the United States in the present war, and to Harold R. Bailey, deceased, who made the request prior to his death: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by U. S. S. Fort Wayne Ship 48 Navy Club, That this club does hereby approve the request of said Harold R. Bailey, deceased, of the United States Navy, that a fighting ship be named the "Fort Wayne"; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be placed before the Secretary of the Navy, and that the Navy Department be earnestly requested to so name such ship.

OMAR R. MYERS, *Commandant.*

RESOLUTION BY ANITA GARIBALDI LOGGIA, NO. 1621, RUTLAND, VT.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution by the Anita Garibaldi Loggia, No. 1621, of Rutland, Vt., asking for support of House bill 50.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American people of Italian descent have given outstanding support to the war effort of the United States, with 800,000 men and women in the armed forces, with widespread participation in War Loan drives, with active work for the Red Cross and support of its fund-raising campaigns, with wholehearted support of, and sharing the work of, the civilian-defense program, and with thousands employed in vital work in war plants; and

Whereas the Italian people themselves have shown by their actions, by their fighting side by side with the Allies wherever their troops have been free and equipment available, and by the help and encouragement they have offered Allied forces, so far as lay within their powers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Anita Garibaldi Loggia, No. 1621, O. F. di I. in America, Inc., in the city of Rutland, Vt., duly assembled this 11th day of April 1944, That full support be given H. R. 50, submitted to Congress by the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, asking the Congress of the United States, democratically elected by the people, to wel-

come the people of Italy into the family of liberated nations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Vermont's representatives in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, urging their wholehearted support of this measure.

THE ANITA GARIBALDI LOGGIA, No. 1621,
LAURA J. BENINCASA, *Secretary*.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce at Massena, N. Y., on March 30, 1944, in support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce and its membership are vitally interested in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas the welfare of the people of the State of New York is directly concerned in the successful completion of the project; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River will remove the last major obstacles to deep-draft navigation throughout the Great Lakes system to the Atlantic Ocean and the ports of the world; and

Whereas the same development will simultaneously make available 1,100,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity, under a self-liquidating State power project; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York on March 15-16, 1944, by unanimous vote adopted a resolution declaring that this State urgently requires the prompt development of the St. Lawrence to furnish low-cost power to millions of industrial, rural, commercial, and domestic consumers; and

Whereas the Aiken bill, S. 1385, is now pending before the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, under which those benefits may be realized without further delay: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the State of New York, representing a score of separate communities and civic and trade organizations throughout the St. Lawrence Valley, declares its unqualified support of this project as an imperative necessity for post-war reconstruction in this area and for the future balanced growth and development of the entire Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we appeal for the immediate enactment of the Aiken bill, S. 1385, authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development as a post-war project, and strongly urge the United States Senators and Representatives of the State of New York and the Congress of the United States to give this measure their active support.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR (PT. 4 OF REPT. NO. 398)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing from the Committee on Education and Labor a report pursuant to Senate Resolution 266 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, the report being part 8 of the committee's reports on employers' associations and collective bargaining in California. The report is entitled "The Associated Farmers of California, Inc.: Its Reorganization, Policies, and Significance."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that the report be printed?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be received and printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order and as in executive session, to submit reports from the Committee on Naval Affairs of sundry nominations to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, before consent is given to the request of the Senator from Iowa, as I understand, he asks that something be done as in executive session. Would that constitute an executive session of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it would not.

Mr. WHITE. I merely wished to be sure of that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports will be received as in executive session and the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Brig. Gen. James L. Underhill to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of September 1942;

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Watson to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 20th day of January 1944;

Col. Samuel C. Cumming to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 19th day of September 1942; and

Col. Oliver P. Smith to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of October 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1845. A bill to exempt the Salvation Army from all taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1846. A bill granting a pension to Amelia Esser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (by request):

S. 1847. A bill to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds; and

S. 1848. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1849. A bill for the relief of Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District; and

S. 1850. A bill for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson & Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1851. A bill to establish for the investigation and control of tuberculosis a division in the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SERVICE-CONNECTED PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY COMPENSATION, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1724) proposing that no reduction be made in service-connected permanent and total disability compensation and/or insurance ratings, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

SUIT AGAINST UNITED STATES BY MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 166) to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that the amendments be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs for their consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be referred as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

INVENTORIES AND DISPOSITION OF MATERIALS AND OTHER WAR PROPERTY HELD BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 281), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a thorough investigation with respect to facts and policies on inventories, and disposition of war materials and other tangible property, real or personal, acquired, held, or utilized by the Government of the United States for war purposes. It is the purpose of this undertaking, first, to assure the most efficient control of existing and prospective inventories so that the military agencies will possess a minimum supply of war materials, consistent with reasonable margins of safety, at the close of hostilities. Secondly, it is the purpose of this investigation to assure that policies and methods be adopted for the orderly disposition of such materials and other surplus properties of the United States Government.

This committee shall have the authority to obtain data from all Government agencies on inventories of all war materials, excluding only the weapons and matériel on which data must obviously be held secret. For other than fighting equipment, the committee is authorized to gather all information necessary to the successful conduct of this investigation; on the basis of mutual agreements between the committee and the armed services such information may be withheld from public use but must be available to the committee. The information should cover not only end products, components, and raw materials, but also productive facilities and military construction.

For the purposes of this investigation the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to employ professional and clerical assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the

presentation of correspondence, documents, and reports, to administer oaths and take testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to the successful conduct of the investigation. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $15,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RESOLUTIONS BY TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the sound advice contained in the resolutions adopted recently at the twenty-fifth annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

The American farmer, for the fourth consecutive year, is being asked to increase his production. To accomplish this, due consideration must be given in the following ways:

(a) Selective service boards must continue to defer essential farm workers in 1944. Further withdrawal of skilled dairy, livestock or other farm workers must be stopped. * * *

There must be positive assurance that very large additional amounts of farm machinery will be made available. Depreciation of machinery under heavy and continuous use has been terrific during the past 4 years. Despite the announced additional heavy allotments of steel to the manufacturers, it now appears that production for spring and early summer will be entirely inadequate.

Mr. President, a "machinery starved" agriculture cannot be expected to go on producing foodstuffs and feed and fiber in continually increasing quantities, and I say it is high time the Washington agencies, particularly the W. F. A. and W. P. B., take action to get adequate machinery and equipment for American farmers.

Just the other day I received a letter from Mr. Charles E. Howland, of Mankato, Kans., chairman of the county war food committee of Jewell County, that shows conditions as they are, not theories as given out through Government press releases. He wrote me that as of March 15, his office had application for 30 grain drills, 6 delivered; 60 combines, none delivered; 8 manure spreaders, none delivered; 5 corn binders, none delivered; 14 corn pickers, 5 delivered; 36 mowers, 2 delivered; 4 side-delivery rakes, none delievered; 4 pick-up balers, none delivered; and 148 tractors, 21 delivered.

Mr. President, the Government may as well face squarely the proposition that unless farmers have machinery and labor, sooner or later there is going to be a slump instead of the needed increase in food production—and the slump is likely to come at a critical period in the war effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point for the information of the Senate the resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its recent annual convention.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO. 1. RURAL AMERICA AT WAR

Rural America, aided by divine providence, has achieved during the past year a record of production of food and fiber vital to the war. The farm families of the American Farm Bureau Federation are proud of this accomplishment attained under unprecedented stress and difficulty. Fully aware of the long, hard fight that yet must come before final victory, rural America is again prepared with toil and sweat to extract from the good earth in another year the huge supply of farm products indispensable to our fighting armies and our fighting peoples.

This war will end. A day of peace will come. The energies of America will turn from destroying to building. We will in these days perform cheerfully each and any act within our strength that may in any way bring nearer such day of peace. We will harden our hands and strengthen our hearts so that we will avoid soft compromise and will carry this fight to a clean decision. We would still and destroy the voices and the forces that might again seek to impose their evil bonds upon the safety and freedom of present and future generations.

We must do the job well. We do demand of all in America, her leaders, and her people, that this war shall not be in vain, so that when we next rebuild we shall do so for a longer time and shall uphold for America and for the world the ideal that peace, security, and freedom are of God and can endure.

NO. 2. RURAL AMERICA AND PEACE

This war with its terrifying toll of life and property is in part the price that America is paying for her neglect of a sound and constructive foreign policy. America must face the post-war world with strength and with courage. She must not be so tired that she will lack the energy to assume the responsibility of planning and building with other nations a better world for all its people.

The American Farm Bureau Federation believes that America's world leadership imposes a world responsibility. The federation does not believe that America can by gift and favor solve the problems of foreign relationships, but does contend that the way to world peace lies in a course of conduct between nations that will be continuously cooperative, mutually beneficial, and mutually respectful of sovereignties.

The members of the federation are eager for the development of a continuing national collaboration with peace-loving foreign powers. The American Farm Bureau Federation urges upon our national leaders the devotion of our best thinking to the formulation of a program of understanding and action that may build for the world a fair economy and a lasting peace.

NO. 3. AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AND NATIONAL FARM PROGRAM

Meeting our war goals in farm production is the most important responsibility of farm people. For some time after hostilities cease, "ability to produce" will be the major farm problem. During this period all governmental policies should give full consideration to the Nation's interest in protecting this ability of farmers to produce food in amounts necessary to meet these food requirements or goals.

The transition of production from war needs to the needs of peacetime poses many problems for agriculture, industry, and labor. Full production by all groups to meet the demands for goods, with equitable price relationships prevailing between all groups, is a vital necessity in this transition.

Price supports for this period have been authorized, and in many cases, directed by Congress. Failure of the Food Administration to use every reasonable means at its command to support hog prices in line with announced guaranties and later steps taken by the War Food Administration to lower such announced support prices in certain markets of the country constitute a breach of faith, and unless immediately corrected, will result in a break-down of the confidence of farmers in all Government guaranties or assurances. Farmers bitterly resent such breach of contract. Such disappointment will wreck our war and post-war production programs.

The adjustments involved in the transition from war production to peace production can best be achieved through the Agricultural Adjustment Act and associated laws. They have proved their effectiveness in securing orderly production both in peace and war. Their effective and sympathetic administration will be invaluable to the farmers and to the Nation in obtaining balanced prices and production. We reiterate again our support of these basic laws.

Less detailed direction and authority over the program should flow from Washington. Greater direction, authority, and responsibility should be vested at both State and county levels for the purpose of developing programs more adapted to the localities.

The food production records being made are largely possible because of the years of soil-conservation work that has been done. These records are also being made at the expense of much soil depletion, and require the use of many acres that would otherwise be in soil-building crops. In wartime, this depletion is justified, although every effort must be made during this period to hold this depletion to a minimum by practical soil-conservation practices. Present depletion of soil must be compensated for in the post-war period by placing greatly increased acres in soil-conserving and soil-building crops. This must not be done at the expense of heavy loss in farm income. The Soil Conservation Act provides the governmental machinery for the building and maintenance of our soil resources, which are of great importance to the Nation as a whole, as well as to future American agriculture.

We have about reached the limit of our productive capacity with present handicaps of labor, machinery, and supplies, and we are still far short of the total production of food required. We appeal to all citizens, industry, and governmental users of farm commodities to exercise extreme care in preventing waste.

NO. 4. INFLATION CONTROL, CEILINGS, SUBSIDIES

The American Farm Bureau Federation reaffirms its position in favor of a strong and aggressive program to control inflation. We again reiterate that any plan to control inflation must be equitably applied to industrial prices, farm commodity prices, and wages. Immediate steps should be taken to reduce the excess purchasing power of the people by the adoption of a more adequate tax and savings program. Such a program would bring consumer demand more nearly in line with available supplies, and relieve much of the economic pressure which leads to higher prices. A more adequate tax program would also permit paying a larger part of the cost of the war out of current income, retard the increase in the national debt, and strengthen the monetary position of the Nation.

We favor the establishment of price ceilings, where necessary and workable, on agricultural and other products. We insist, however, that price-control programs be administered in such a manner as to be equitable among the various groups of our Nation, and in a manner that will bring forth the greatest volume of essential products needed for the war effort. Price ceilings for agricultural products should be announced for a specified period and far enough in advance to permit farmers to plan their operations accordingly, and should not be lowered during such period. We insist that all price-control agencies follow the plain intent and specific provisions of the laws passed by the Congress. Willful disregard of such laws by the ad-

ministrators is a serious threat to our democracy.

The Federation is unalterably opposed to so-called roll-back subsidies or Government payments to farmers in lieu of prices in the market place which will assure maximum production. National income is at an all-time high, having doubled since 1939. The percentage of consumer income required to buy food is lower today than at any time on record. To reduce the market price of food by payments from the Federal Treasury increases the inflationary pressure, increases the demands on our food supply, leaves more money in the hands of the public to spend for other goods, tends to establish for post-war periods false standards of fair farm prices, and necessitates additional borrowing by the Federal Government. This means a larger national debt, with its inflationary effect upon the monetary system of the country, to be passed on to future generations.

Farmers also fear that consumer subsidies will lead to the socialization of agriculture and the Nation. Once established, they will be hard to eliminate, and will likely develop into a permanent and pernicious growth upon our national economy, making farmers subject to the whims and caprices of an entrenched Federal bureaucracy. Food subsidies are like habit-forming drugs. Having once tasted them, consumers will think they cannot get along without them, and will call for more and more. The Federation firmly believes that not only the immediate, but long-time interest of this Nation will be best served by the immediate discontinuance of consumer subsidies.

NO. 5. ESSENTIALS FOR MAXIMUM FARM PRODUCTION

If the American farmer is to contribute his full share to the anticipated international demand for food as the now subjected Axis countries are liberated, United States food production must continue to expand. The American farmer, for the fourth consecutive year, is being asked to increase his next year's production. To accomplish this, due consideration must be given in the following ways:

(a) Selective-service boards must continue to defer essential farm workers in 1944. Further withdrawal of skilled dairy, livestock, or other farm workers must be stopped. Every effort must be made to make available additional skilled and fulltime farm workers. The agencies handling farm labor requirements must be closely correlated, and existing conflicts in authority eliminated. We insist that full authority and responsibility for handling all regular and seasonal farm labor be vested in the Extension Service.

The commendable voluntary efforts of vocational agriculture departments, school superintendents, youth, women's clubs, chambers of commerce, service and other like organizations must be encouraged and expanded in 1944. These voluntary efforts in cooperation with farm organizations, county war boards, and the Extension Service, gave invaluable service to agriculture in many parts of the country.

(b) There must be positive assurance that very large additional amounts of farm machinery will be made available. Depreciation of machinery under heavy and continuous use has been terrific during the past 4 years. Despite the announced additional heavy allotments of steel to the manufacturers, it now appears that the production and delivery for next spring and early summer will be entirely inadequate. We urge that steps be taken to speed up its production and delivery to farmers.

(c) The marketing of agricultural products and farm supply deliveries are now dependent on inefficient and worn truck equipment. We urge that steps be taken to make available truck motor and other repair parts and such new equipment as may be necessary to meet the transportation needs of agriculture. Even with such aid it will still be necessary to make available military and other trucks to transport the peak of our loads.

(d) We urge that full responsibility for the development of all policies and the administration of all programs with respect to production, distribution, rationing, fixing of floor and ceiling prices, and all other phases of the food program be placed in the War Food Administrator.

When asking farmers to increase production abnormally, the Government should accept responsibility for providing markets currently and assure producers against loss when responding to such Government requests.

(e) A minimum of regulation or restriction will assist in obtaining maximum production. We urge that all unnecessary restrictions of production supplies and the rationing of production supplies be eliminated. The announced further restrictions on the rationing of gasoline for farm use seem entirely unwarranted. We recognize, however, the necessity of some of these restrictions and regulations, but insist that such restrictions shall be as few and simple as possible, if maximum production is to be maintained.

NO. 6. FEED AND PROTEIN SUPPLIES

In view of the short supply of feeds in relation to livestock and poultry numbers, it is urgently requested that immediate steps be taken to insure that available supplies are handled in such a manner as to yield the greatest production of food for the war effort.

Price relationships should be such as to bring about equitable distribution of feeds among the various areas of the Nation. Every practical step should be taken to see that transportation facilities are provided to move feed supplies. For the period of the war emergency, we recommend that the importation of grains from Canada should be encouraged; that the feed wheat program be continued; and that every effort should be made to increase high protein feeds by the importation of meat scraps, by increasing fishing activity, by bringing various protein-bearing products on ships returning from foreign ports, and developing new sources of high protein feeds.

It is urgently recommended that necessary steps be taken to prevent the mixing of proteins in such a manner as to lessen their effective use. A higher percentage of the available protein supplies should go directly to the farmer as protein concentrates.

Every effort should be made to increase feed supplies for the coming year by providing adequate experienced labor, additional machinery, and other supplies necessary to obtain maximum production.

NO. 7. TRANSPORTATION

Agriculture is vitally concerned with transportation because the proper distribution of goods and services depends on adequate transportation facilities.

The rapid development of air transport calls for a careful study of the manner of controlling air lines and coordinating them with existing systems of transportation. Free competition should be encouraged so as to utilize the most economic and efficient features of all systems of transportation. We believe this can be best accomplished with a minimum of Government control.

Economy, speed, and adaptability to the needs of shippers are the essences of successful transportation. To keep competitively apace of current trends we suggest that railroads modernize their freight service to correspond with improvements already wrought in passenger service. Similar modernization should be made by our inland waterways systems.

As a matter of fairness and equal opportunity, we recommend that the Interstate Commerce Commission readjust freight rates that discriminate against certain sections and certain commodities.

Land grant freight rates should be discontinued because they compel the railroads to charge higher rates to all shippers to offset the loss sustained on land-grant rates.

We urge that any Federal superhighways constructed after the war be routed to serve existing market centers so as not to disrupt established farm markets. Any road-building projects should also provide for the expansion of present farm-to-market road systems and connect rural roads with Federal and State highways.

Since farm trucks are a vital weapon in the food-production battle, we urge that materials be allocated for the resumption of their manufacture.

We recommend the elimination of so-called ports of entry, unreasonable weight limits, excessive taxes, and other practices which operate as barriers to the movement of farm produce between States.

Our wartime merchant marine would seem to assure an important outlet for United States farm products in world markets after the war, and therefore should be preserved under American control in a way which will make it most effective in the transportation of goods.

We disapprove the expenditure of our tax dollars in helping to develop highway and transportation systems in other countries, except as directly necessary for the successful prosecution of the war and the development of our foreign-trade routes. All such facilities should be available after the war to our foreign trade at least on an equal basis with the countries in which these developments are made.

NO. 8. FARM CREDIT

The American Farm Bureau Federation has always considered a cooperative system of farm credit essential to the well-being of American agriculture. Our confidence in the ability of farmers to build and maintain such a system is not shaken by experience. Time has proved that properly directed and properly administered cooperative credit institutions can weather the storms of adversity.

The need for Government capital and Government direction is recognized in the early stages of developing a cooperative system on a Nation-wide basis, but gradually cooperative capital should supplant Government capital and cooperative control should supplant Government direction. Cooperative ownership and cooperative administration, and not Government ownership and Government administration, should be the ultimate goal.

We believe that it was the intention of those who framed the original Farm Credit Act to lay the foundation for the farmer owned and controlled cooperative farm-credit system. The purpose of later acts was not only to broaden the foundations of this system but to strengthen its cooperative features. Our responsibility now is to further improve the system. To that end we recommend—

(a) That control of the farm-credit system be vested in its farmer owners, and that its administration be vested in a bipartisan board.

(b) That initiative and responsibility in the local associations as the basic units in a sound cooperative system be encouraged and preserved.

(c) That funds now available be used in establishing permanent revolving funds to be made available to all units of the system when needed to maintain their service to farmers.

(d) That Government capital, when advanced to the system for any purpose, be retired in an orderly way through mandatory annual payments in amounts that would not

disturb the necessary functions of the institutions.

(e) That immediate steps be taken to consolidate relief and emergency types of credit into one agency under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. Separate and independent administration of these different types of credit can only lead to the development of competing systems.

NO. 9. TAXATION AND FISCAL POLICIES

The huge expenditures necessary for the successful prosecution of the war necessitates a very carefully planned tax program which will lessen the inflationary pressure on our economy, preserve insofar as possible a sound war and post-war financial structure, and apportion the tax burden fairly.

First, and of primary importance, is the complete elimination of all unwarranted and unneeded services of government that are now requiring heavy expenditures and manpower which otherwise would be released for essential services. We also insist upon the greatest practical economy and efficiency in the administration of all necessary Government activities.

We therefore endorse all necessary taxes, designed to withdraw as far as practical the excess buying power which now exerts such a tremendous inflationary pressure upon the price level.

We also recommend that the sale of Government bonds be encouraged among all citizens, and that efforts be made to discourage their premature redemption, at least until the threat of inflation is diminished. This accomplishment would constitute an effective means of avoiding inflation and provide purchasing power during the post-war period, when it will be greatly needed to maintain employment and avoid depression.

Many interested and informed people are becoming increasingly concerned over the danger of an inflationary spiral in the price of farm land.

We authorize the board of directors to take such action as may be appropriate and necessary to avoid a repetition of a land and real estate boom such as occurred after World War No. 1.

NO. 10. LABOR RELATIONS

Agriculture and labor have a mutual interest in maintaining American prosperity at a high normal level. Labor's stake in a prosperous agriculture is no less than agriculture's stake in the full employment of labor at good wages. The ability of each group to absorb maximum production of the other is dependent primarily upon an equality of purchasing power. Low farm income curtails the farmer's capacity to consume industrial products and leads to unemployment. Industrial unemployment in turn limits the farmer's market and backs up depressing surpluses on the farm. Balanced purchasing power is the key to full production and full consumption.

Maintenance of economic balance between groups seems to be endangered by some developments of recent years. With the aid and encouragement of Government, and by pressure, threat, and force, some labor leaders have wrested a dangerous advantage which, if not speedily checked, will threaten economic disaster and endanger our democratic form of government. An unbalanced economy is injurious to all groups and can be of no permanent benefit to any.

We will continue to support the right of workers to assemble themselves together in organizations of their own voluntary choice, to seek through legitimate means the improvement of their lot. We believe all groups—farmers as well as industrial workers—should not only have but should exercise this right. But when unionization is forced and frozen on workers through undemocratic means, and ruthlessly used as a club not only against the public but against its own members, unionism cannot be said to be in the public interest. Unfortunately, the more extreme labor leaders seem more interested in a contest for personal and political power and a reckless race for dues with which to build up private war chests to maintain and exploit this control, than in the permanent welfare of working people.

This perversion of the labor movement has resulted in such abuses as the closed shop with enforced membership, jurisdictional strikes, manpower wastage, interruptions of war production, racketeering practices which are taking an enormous toll from farmers and consumers, hot cargoes, secondary boycotts, slow-downs, and other interferences with the production and movement of products to market, use of threats, violence and coercion, and collusion of labor leaders with other groups to acquire monopolistic controls over prices and production. We deplore and vigorously condemn these practices and demand the necessary legislation to end these abuses, restore collective bargaining to a voluntary basis and safeguard the constitutional rights of all citizens, union members included.

We hold Government, as well as unwise labor leadership, responsible for the dislocation of wage structures in industry and on the farm It is significant that the Government itself has set the pace in the payment of excessive wages for war plant construction and operation and that the resulting readjustments in all industry have set in motion a wage inflation that is still unchecked and which numbers among its consequences the stripping of the farms of much of their skilled manpower. Equally reprehensible and fundamentally more vicious is the artificial restriction of production forced by labor leaders and condoned by the Government. Farmers do not believe that the great rank and file of American working people are responsible for, or are in agreement with such policies and procedures.

At a time when American men and women are enduring hardships and risking their lives on a round-the-clock basis in the service of their country and when farmers are toiling long hours in the food production battle at home we vigorously disapprove a Government policy that does not encourage a similar sacrifice on the part of labor, but instead, forces the payment of premium wages for any work over 40 hours a week.

If this compulsion were removed and the workweek lengthened, we believe that the so-called manpower shortage would be materially relieved.

Likewise we insist that the basing of Government-made wage increase formulas on the hourly rate of pay is both misleading and inflationary in view of the premium pay practices referred to above. The amount in the weekly pay envelope is the real index of wage income and should be so considered in any adjustment of wages.

Most of all we condemn wartime strikes, slow-downs, and unnecessary absenteeism.

We firmly believe that the long-term interests of all working people can be best served by the elimination of these abuses and uneconomic practices, and that when this is done agriculture and labor can cooperate on a basis of mutual respect and helpfulness.

Only when each group respects the integrity of the other can this cooperation be achieved.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has repeatedly expressed both privately and publicly its willingness and desire to confer with the leaders of American labor and American business in efforts to cooperate in securing a stabilized economy that is fair to all groups and in the public interest. We renew and reaffirm this desire and position.

NO. 11. FEDERAL LAND HOLDINGS

Removal from tax rolls of tracts of property through Federal acquisition and control confronts rural, urban, and State units of Government with serious problems. Consequent loss of revenue has impaired necessary public services in numerous communities throughout the entire country. In Western States these services are further impaired by the Federal administration of the water, watershed, forest, mineral, and other resources in the public domain, and the withholding from economic use and development of such resources.

We recognize that successful prosecution of the war necessitates the Federal Government using many forms of property, but we urge that Federal purchase of properties needed only for short periods be avoided and that property purchased during the present emergency be returned to private owners and local tax rolls at the earliest possible time.

We recommend that immediate attention be given these problems and proper action taken, including legislation, if necessary, to alleviate undue hardship and correct injustices on State and local units of Government and property owners of the respective areas. We also recommend repeal of the Antiquities Act.

* * * * *

NO. 16. POST-WAR PLANNING

The United States of America, citadel of human liberty and individual rights, will face grave duties and responsibilities in and to the post-war world. We can discharge these solemn obligations only through policies based on our historic ideals of Christian democracy. It would be a tragedy of world-wide proportions were we to fail to grasp our opportunity for constructive service to humanity on a world-wide basis. Actuated by the principles proclaimed in the Sermon on the Mount, we as a Nation must dedicate our national energies to this monumental task, inspired by the resolute faith and fortitude that are a part of our Christian heritage which has lifted human hopes and aspirations to levels never before attained in the history of civilization.

1. We favor the United States of America assuming its rightful share of the responsibility for cooperation with other nations in:

(a) Holding aggressor nations in check after the end of the war.

(b) Maintaining world trade policies that will give opportunity to all nations to obtain the materials necessary to maintain a sound peacetime economy, and

(c) Providing the opportunity for political and economic freedom for all people, to the end that a just and lasting peace may be maintained among the nations of the world.

2. We favor extending aid to the people of the war-ravaged nations to relieve human suffering, but in every case, in order to avoid misunderstandings and unfortunate consequences, we should make certain that no commitment is made which our Nation within reason cannot fulfill. The primary objective should be to assist them in their rehabilitation plans and programs so as to enable them to help themselves in meeting their own needs insofar as they desire and request such assistance.

3. We favor domestic policies that will assure full production and full employment, which will result in constantly rising living standards for all groups. To attain this objective, an equitable balance in purchasing power among all groups must be maintained.

We believe that this can best be accomplished by industry, labor, and agriculture through voluntary adoption of price and wage policies based on a philosophy of abundance. Only if each group will do its part to formulate and carry out such a program, can they effectively protect the general welfare against the development of extremely paternalistic policies on the part of Government.

4. We recognize that as civilization becomes more complex, Government must assume new functions, but we insist—

That our historic constitutional form of government with its balance of powers among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches be reverently observed and jealously guarded.

That the continuation of successful democracy demands that individuals and groups shall assume the greatest possible responsibility for the solution of social, political, and economic problems.

To the extent that governmental aid is necessary, it should be carried on as far as possible by governmental units closest to the people, and where Federal action is required, such powers should be administered as far as possible through agencies locally responsible and which can adapt such programs to local conditions.

Too great reliance upon governmental action alone will inevitably destroy our democratic institutions and lead us into some form of statism with the accompanying loss of our freedom. Government should be the servant and not the master of the people.

5. We favor the adoption of monetary and credit policies, domestic and international, that will encourage and facilitate maximum production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services, on a fair-exchange basis.

6. We favor adjustment or removal of foreign and domestic barriers so as to facilitate the maximum exchange of goods and services between nations, and between groups in our own country, to the end that maximum employment and production may be achieved throughout the world.

7. We favor every legitimate and necessary aid by private industry, labor, and agriculture in cooperation with Government, to provide opportunity for profitable and satisfactory employment for men and women demobilized from the armed forces and war plants.

We favor the speedy reconversion of privately owned industrial plants to the production of peacetime goods. Agricultural land, industrial plants, and unneeded inventories owned by the Government should be disposed of as rapidly as practicable on terms and conditions that will make the maximum contribution to our peacetime economy.

8. We believe that fiscal and tax policies should be adopted that will retard inflation, that will be as nearly as possible on a pay-as-you-go basis, and will encourage the system of free enterprise. We urge that prompt action be taken to put into operation a definite program for the retirement of the public debt as rapidly as economic conditions will permit.

9. Public educational opportunity must be enlarged for the youth of America and for its adult population as well. To the extent Federal assistance is needed it should be limited to financial grants, without Federal control to the States on the basis of need with local and State governments responsible for performing this function.

The educational system must aid our citizens in the function and use of organization in behalf of their individual and general welfare.

The dignity of agricultural pursuits must become more widely respected. Urbanism must not be pitted against ruralism, for each is dependent on the other. The country and small-town youth of America must have equal opportunity with urban youth.

10. We favor an intensive attack on the problems of better medical and hospital care for all groups. This is particularly necessary in rural areas. In general, we favor action on this problem by the voluntary organization of cooperative health and hospital associations. We stand ready to cooperate with the medical profession and other groups in the solution of this problem.

11. Neither agriculture, labor, nor industry can solve their own problems without giving due consideration to the problems of the others. The goal of full production and full employment through private enterprise can only be attained through their cooperation and their support of Nation-wide policies and plans directed toward the good of all instead of each striving to obtain a position of monopolistic advantage. We therefore urge that all possible efforts be made by industry, agriculture, and labor to promote better relationships and more effective cooperation between these great economic groups for the common welfare. We call on all groups to join in conference to sincerely seek the solution of our mutual problems in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

12. Our national agricultural policy must include a constructive soil-conservation program and mechanism to assist farmers to adjust production to changing conditions, to assure abundant supplies of food and fiber for domestic and export needs, and to maintain economic balance between agriculture and other segments of our national economy. Eventual destruction of our soil wealth, which would be followed by national disintegration, will be inevitable unless farm products can be traded on a fair-exchange basis for the goods and services produced by other groups.

13. Our post-war planning must be done on a democratic basis. Government agencies may furnish information but the people should make the decisions on plans. We therefore urge that Congress, as the elected representatives of the people and the policy-making body under our Constitution, at once assume its proper responsibility in cooperation with the executive department in all post-war planning, both national and international, by the Federal Government.

We favor the establishment by Congress of a joint congressional commission to study these post-war problems, to consult with representatives of all groups in the Nation, and to submit definite recommendations to Congress.

NO. 17. FORWARD FARM BUREAU

Nineteen hundred and forty-three has witnessed phenomental growth in the membership of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Our member States have enrolled a total of nearly 700,000 farm families under the Farm Bureau banner, the largest record in our history. We congratulate the loyal State and local leaders on their outstanding work in behalf of a great organization and a constructive and forward-looking program.

Best of all, Farm Bureau spirit is at an all-time high. Most of our States are increasing their membership quotas for 1944. Farm Bureau leaders throughout the Nation are more optimistic and determined than ever before. A concerted effort by all the States will write a new chapter in membership strength of the Federation in 1944.

Parity of opportunity for farmers in an organized world can only be achieved through parity of power and parity of prestige obtainable only through membership in family organization.

NO. 18. OUR PLEDGE

After 2 terrible years of active participation in war, America and her allies are facing brighter days on many fronts. These successes call for renewed effort, for greater toil and heavier sacrifices to speed the day of final victory, and so save precious human life.

We shall continue relentlessly our all-out war effort, in sustaining our sons and daughters in the armed forces, and in doing our utmost to achieve new high records of farm production. When peace comes we shall cooperate just as wholheartedly in post-war adjustment, in working for economic balance in America and freedom of opportunity throughout the world.

AMERICAN FASCISM—ARTICLE BY VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "American Fascism," written by Vice President WALLACE and published in the New York Times magazine of April 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BILBO BEFORE MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by him before the Mississippi Legislature, on March 22, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

A LEAGUE OF SOVEREIGN NATIONS AND NOT A WORLD STATE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A League of Sovereign Nations and Not a World State," delivered by him on the Win-the-Peace Forum program at Youngstown, Ohio, on Saturday, April 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RIGHTS OF MAN IN THE POST-WAR WORLD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Rights of Man in the Post-War World, delivered by Senator O'MAHONEY to the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce at Richmond, Va., April 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAKING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ATTRACTIVE—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Making International Relations Attractive," delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon at Kansas City, Mo., April 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson Day dinner address delivered by Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at Detroit, Mich., on April 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAWYER AND THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY G. L. DELACY

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Lawyer and the Peace," delivered by G. L. DeLacy, president of the Nebraska Bar Association, at the Lincoln Bar Association dinner at Lincoln, Nebr., on March 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the school-lunch program, delivered by Dorothy Thompson on March 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANPOWER IN THE PRODUCTION OF CHEESE IN WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release issued by him dealing with manpower in the production of cheese in Wisconsin, together with an editorial from the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of April 14, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TRUMAN AND THE TRUMAN COMMITTEE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senator TRUMAN Diligent in Task of Watchdog of War Effort," by Paul W. Kearney, from the Washington Star of April 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELIMINATION OF SLUMS AND PROVISION FOR LOW-RENT HOUSING

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release entitled "Builders Ready to Eliminate Slums and Provide Low-Rent Housing," issued by the National Association of Home Builders of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MILK SHORTAGE—ARTICLE FROM DETROIT FREE PRESS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Milk Gluts Sewers as City Goes Without," published in the Detroit Free Press of April 7, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSUMPTION OF GASOLINE BY MRS. ROOSEVELT

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. W. R. Hubbard, a constituent, inquiring into the consumption of gasoline by Mrs. Roosevelt, and a reply thereto from H. G. Crim, head usher at the White House, which appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BURCH of Virginia, Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. HARTLEY, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President.

S. 1028. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2648. An act for the relief of Avid Evers; and

H. R. 4133. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RELATIONSHIP OF UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION TO EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the time the United Relief and Rehabilitation Administration resolution was pending before the Senate the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] offered an amendment reading as follows:

None of the funds appropriated in pursuance of this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

While I totally agreed with the context and purpose of the amendment as ably presented by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, I took the position and asserted to the Senate the fact that the amendment was unnecessary because there is absolutely nothing in the agreement which would by any stretch of the imagination justify U. N. R. R. A. in participating in any educational program abroad under its auspices.

This morning I wish to complete the record officially, because I think the record now may be said to be plain that the interpretation for which I made myself responsible is totally justified,

I have a letter this morning from Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in which he transmits to me a statement made officially by U. N. R. R. A. itself entitled "Relationship to Educational Activities." The final paragraph in U. N. R R. A.'s own statement reads as follows:

Finally, it should be noted that the Administration does not, in any circumstances, contemplate taking any actio which may result in interference in the educational system of any country.

Assistant Secretary Acheson also sends me a statement issued by the State Department on March 31, entitled "Statement of Policy on the Participation of the United States in Emergency Educational and Cultural Rebuilding of the War-Torn United Nations." I wish to quote briefly from this statement:

It would be unwise for this Government to undertake to apply, much less impose, a foreign educational program or system in any liberated country, or to develop a program for the placement of American teachers in the schools of these countries, or for the preparation of textbooks in the United States for use in such schools.

The official statement from the State Department continues as follows—I read one further paragraph:

In order to help the war-torn countries to help themselves in the rebuilding of essential educational and cultural facilities, the Department proposes to collaborate for the time being with the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London, and to cooperate with the nations represented in this Conference and the other United Nations, and with the nations associated with the United Nations in the war in forming, as soon as practicable, a United Nations organization for educational and cultural reconstruction. It recognizes that a significant effort has already been made abroad and that useful work has been begun in the shaping of an emergency program to meet this need.

In other words, Mr. President, the State Department officially asserts that the entire problem of emergency educational and cultural rebuilding of the war-torn United Nations is to be undertaken under totally different auspices, which will subsequently come to Congress for our congressional attention.

In conclusion, I merely wish to read two sentences from Dean Acheson's own letter. First he says:

I believe that you will see that this accords entirely with your understanding of the matter.

I assume, Mr. President, that that means that the State Department approves the interpretation which I announced on the floor of the Senate when the agreement was pending.

I also read this final sentence from Dean Acheson regarding "the Department's policy on United States participation in emergency educational and cultural rebuilding. You will note that our participation in this field is not to be carried out through U. N. R. R. A."

In other words, Mr. President, I think this officially concludes the record and justifies the assertions which I made to the Senate at the time the agreement was pending.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum issued by U. N. R. R. A. and the statement made by the State Department be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. R. R. A.'S RELATIONSHIP TO EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

I

1. Section 2 (a) of article I of the agreement defines the purposes and functions of the Administration as the "relief of victims of war * * * through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, shelter, and other basic necessities, medical and other essential services," and the facilitation, "so far as necessary to the adequate provision of relief," of the production and transportation of such articles and the furnishing of such services.

2. In describing the range of supplies and services which the Administration will provide, the Council, in its resolution relating to the scope of the Administration's activities, has taken the position that U. N. R. R. A.'s activities will include "assistance in procuring material equipment for the rehabilitation of educational institutions." (Resolution No. 1, pt. II, par. 4.)

3. The limited purpose behind the above provision with respect to education is apparent from the résumé of the discussion which took place when this provision was originally proposed and adopted. (Journal No. 9, November 19, 1943, p. 213.) This discussion indicates that U. N. R. R. A. would not itself procure materials for the rehabilitation of educational institutions but would assist in such procurement. The Director General, it was said, might serve as a middleman in obtaining, on the one hand, information as to material available in the countries that have not been occupied and, on the other, information as to the material needed for the rehabilitation of educational institutions within the various liberated areas.

4. In enumerating the principles to guide the Administration's activities with respect to shelter, the Council stated that "priority in the rehabilitation of essential shelter or accommodation in the liberated areas" should be given to hospitals, schools, and habitations for homeless persons. (Resolution No. 13, par. 2.)

II

In view of the above provisions of the agreement and the Council resolutions, the position of the Administration may be summarized as follows:

(a) The Administration's relationship to educational activities will be indirect and very limited in scope.

(b) As part of its general shelter program, the Administration will, to the extent possible, make arrangements to provide hand tools and other building supplies and equipment urgently needed in the liberated areas, some of which may be used to provide emergency school accommodations. The Administration does not, however, contemplate itself undertaking any general school rebuilding program.

(c) Also as part of its general program of operations the Administration will make available food, clothing, and other relief supplies to the victims of war of the liberated areas. These victims of war will, of course, include needy children of school or preschool age. In some of the liberated areas, moreover, the schools may in fact be utilized as a means of distributing relief to undernourished children.

(d) Where certain types of specialized personnel are needed in a particular liberated area in order to carry out a successful relief program, the Administration will, to the extent feasible, undertake to train such personnel. Such training will, however, be designed solely to provide personnel needed to assist the Administration in meeting its emergency relief problems and therefore will be outside of the field of education rehabilitation as such .

(e) The Administration does not contemplate undertaking to provide either materials or services intended solely for the purpose of reestablishing the teaching process in the schools of the liberated areas. In other words, the Administration is not planning either to initiate efforts to procure such materials or services, or to provide any finances therefor.

(f) On the other hand, the Administration will provide assistance, when requested by a member government, in obtaining information as to the availability of material equipment urgently needed for educational purposes within the liberated areas, and will assist that government in procuring such equipment for its own account.

(g) In its work in this connection, the Administration will cooperate with the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education or any other intergovernmental agency or agencies established to deal with the problem of educational rehabilitation in liberated areas to the extent that the plans of the Administration as set forth herein are of interest to the conference or such other agency or agencies. As stated above, however, it is expected that the Administration's assistance in the field of procurement will be given directly to the particular member government requesting such assistance rather than through the above-mentioned conference or other intergovernmental agency or agencies.

(h) Finally, it should be noted that the Administration does not, in any circumstances, contemplate taking any action which may result in interference in the educational system of any country.

[Department of State, March 31, 1944, No. 100]

STATEMENT OF POLICY ON THE PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN EMERGENCY EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL REBUILDING OF THE WAR-TORN UNITED NATIONS

War is destroying the educational and cultural organization of the countries occupied by the enemy. Universities, schools, libraries, museums, and scientific laboratories have been wrecked or greatly damaged. Books and equipment have been stolen. Retreating Axis armies are likely to do still more injury.

Teachers, students, and scientists have been singled out for special persecution. Many have been imprisoned, deported, or killed, particularly those refusing to collaborate with the enemy. In fact, the enemy is deliberately depriving his victims of those tools of intellectual life without which their recovery is impossible.

Educational disorganization and economic and social distress are connected, one intensifying the other. Increasingly the war-torn countries are likely to suffer declines of their standards of living and health to critically low levels. The whole people will suffer, but in a special degree the children. Such conditions unavoidably tend toward internal disorder and external difficulties, and may create new threats to the economic stability and political security of the world, upon which, in fact, depend the well-being and peace of the American people.

The peoples who survive this ordeal will need help—in order to help themselves. They are facing enormous problems in rebuilding educational and cultural life, without essential facilities, and without adequate trained personnel. Plans for these tasks must be made now and the work undertaken as soon as possible.

Because of the unprecedented crisis which must be faced in this regard, the Department of State believes that the participation of the United States Government in an international program for the rebuilding of essential educational and cultural facilities of the war-torn countries in the period immediately following hostilities is an important service in the national interest and in the interest of international security and that steps looking to this participation should be taken.

In the Department's study to date of the kind of program that would be practicable and desirable, certain conclusions have already become clear. It would be unwise for this Government to undertake to apply, much less impose, a foreign educational program or system in any liberated country, or to develop a program for the placement of American teachers in the schools of these countries, or for the preparation of textbooks in the United States for use in such schools.

In order to help the war-torn countries to help themselves in the rebuilding of essential educational and cultural facilities, the Department proposes to collaborate for the time being with the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London, and to cooperate with the nations represented in this conference and the other United Nations and with the nations associated with the United Nations in the war in forming, as soon as practicable, a United Nations organization for educational and cultural reconstruction. It recognizes that a significant effort has already been made abroad and that useful work has been begun in the shaping of an emergency program to meet this need.

This program, it now appears, may consist of (1) assistance in the restocking of essential educational facilities, especially with books and scientific and other teaching aids, (2) assistance in the providing of opportunities for the training of carefully selected foreign students in American educational institutions, (3) assistance in reestablishing essential library facilities, and (4) assistance in the recovery and the restoration to their rightful owners of educational, scientific, artistic, and archival materials looted by the Axis countries.

In this program, as in all other activities in educational and related fields, the Department will seek the advice and cooperation of other agencies and organizations, both governmental and private. It will attempt to operate in a manner equally advantageous to all the countries concerned. This reciprocal relationship is basic in any sound program of educational and cultural relations.

This statement concerning the participation of the United States in emergency restoration of essential educational and cultural facilities of the war-torn United Nations deals with only one of the important educational and cultural problems in the international field which are receiving active consideration. Also, of very great significance is the long-range furtherance of educational and cultural relations among nations. The Department wishes increasingly to encourage democratic international cooperation in developing reciprocal and desirable educational and cultural relations among the nations and peoples of the world, especially looking toward the promotion of free and friendly intellectual intercourse among them in the interest of international peace and security.

No attempt is made here to deal with the important questions concerning the educational and cultural programs of the Axis countries.

SERVICE OF DR. WILLIAM J. THOMPKINS AS RECORDER OF DEEDS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, this day is the tenth anniversary of the service in the office of recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia of Dr. William J. Thompkins, who is a citizen of the State of Missouri, and who is now ill. I should like very much to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement dealing with the service of Dr. Thompkins as recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the office of recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia, or any other jurisdiction, is one of the most important of governmental posts, involving as it does the recording, filing, and protecting of the real and personal property rights of citizens of the respective jurisdictions.

In the several States the recorders of deeds, in most instances, function under the supervision of State courts and are State officers of the counties in which they are elected.

In the District of Columbia, the seat of the Federal Government, the recorder of deeds performs his duties under the supervision of the President of the United States and the Congress.

The duties of the recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia, unlike in other jurisdictions, are not confined to the recording of deeds, but in many respects his duties are synonymous with those performed by the secretaries of state in the several States.

Along with the judges of the courts in the District, the clerk of the District Court for the District of Columbia, and notaries public, the recorder of deeds is empowered by the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1276) to take acknowledgments.

The act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1284) makes the recorder of deeds custodian of all corporation certificates. No corporation can

be organized in the District of Columbia, unless its certificate, examined and approved by the recorder, is filed in his office.

In the District of Columbia no lien against an automobile is valid notice to the public unless it is recorded on the certificate of title by the recorder of deeds.

No conditional sale contract, where the purchase price exceeds $100, is valid against third parties, unless the terms of the sale are reduced to writing and filed in the office of recorder of deeds, within 10 days after its acknowledgment.

Mr. President, the duties of the recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia are so multifarious that they require a full-time staff of 74 employees, including two deputy recorders, and a $500,000 building used exclusively by the recorder.

It is significant, therefore, that this important post has been held by Negroes, with only three exceptions, since 1869.

The present recorder, Dr. William J. Thompkins, former prominent surgeon, health commissioner, and superintendent of the city hospital, of Kansas City, Mo., has served longer than any previous recorder, and has more distinguished accomplishments to his credit than any other.

He was publicly acclaimed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt for totally liquidating in 6 years the deficits of previous recorders which totaled $201,202.92 when he assumed office.

Through efficient administration, which included passage by the Congress of legislation recommended by the recorder, Dr. Thompkins had in 6 years' time deposited surplus fees into the United States Treasury amounting to $231,792.99. Subtracting the total deficit he found of $201,202.92 from Dr. Thompkins' surplus deposits, it is revealed that he has completely wiped out this huge deficit and has made a net profit to the Government of $30,590.07.

Other accomplishments of the present recorder, Mr. President, include modernizing of the system of indexing old land records, recopying old land records on the typewriter that had been copied by hand, the institution of the lot-and-square system of indexing land records, and the decoration of the walls of the library with oil paintings of former recorders of deeds.

The lot-and-square project, when completed, will give to the office an added value of $17,000,000.

The long line of accomplishments of Dr. Thompkins was culminated when, with a congressional appropriation of $500,000, work was begun on a new building for the exclusive use of the recorder of deeds.

The importance of this position was exemplified when President Roosevelt, in a ceremony unprecedented, broke the ground for the erection of the building, and delivered the principal address on September 26, 1940.

The building was turned over to the recorder on March 31, 1942. It is the most modern office of its kind in the country.

Recognizing that the contributions the Negro has made to America are not told in murals in any Government building, Dr. Thompkins had the new building designed so as to accommodate seven mural paintings, which now adorn the walls of the beautiful lobby.

The subject matters covered in the seven murals are as follows:

1. Crispus Attucks: First patriot killed in Boston massacre.

2. Bejamin Banneker presenting plans for the District of Columbia to President Jefferson.

3. Negro soldiers with Gen. Andrew Jackson, "Old Hickory," in the Battle of New Orleans.

4. Colonel Shaw at Fort Wagner.

5. Frederick Douglass appealing to Lincoln for enlistment of Negro soldiers in the Civil War.

6. Courageous act of Cyrus Tiffany in Battle of Lake Erie.

7. Commander Peary and Matthew Henson at the North Pole.

Mr. President, the Negroes of the United States look to the person holding the office of recorder of deeds for interpretations of political questions, they look to him for advice on problems affecting their race.

We here in the Congress have frequent occasion to consult and advise with him on matters concerning our colored constituency back home.

The Congress recognized the value of his advice on political matters when it specifically excluded him from the prohibitions contained in the Hatch Act. Dr. Thompkins, as recorder of deeds, is the only Negro Government official permitted under the Hatch Act to participate in political campaigns.

Dr. Thompkins has been seriously ill for the past several weeks, but he is still capable of handling and directing the affairs of his office from his sick bed in Freedmen's Hospital.

Dr. Thompkins was appointed recorder of deeds by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 17, 1934, and promptly received the unanimous consent of the Senate.

Mr. President, on next Monday, April 17, he will round out a decade of service in the important position of recorder of deeds for the Nation's Capital.

His many friends in public and private stations, of both races, will be paying him tribute on that occasion.

I think, Mr. President, that I speak the sentiments of the membership of the Senate who confirmed his appointment, when I say that the body joins with his many friends on his tenth anniversary in congratulating him on his service to his country and in wishing for him a speedy and complete recovery from his affliction.

COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES RENDERED BY MEMBERS OF SELECTIVE SERVICE DRAFT BOARDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in September of 1940 the Congress passed the Selective Service Act. In October of that year there were organized throughout the Nation some 6,441 draft boards. I think it is about time that the Nation, which pays everyone for his efforts in connection with the war, should give a little concern to the matter of paying the members of the Selective Service System draft boards, who render service in practically every community. Not for days or for months, but for years, these board members have given up what amounts to in most cases about one-third of their time in the performance of their necessary but often unappreciated functions in connection with the Selective Service System. These are the men and women who are damned and hated, who perform their duties, but, as I have said, receive little or no appreciation. What is more, they are necessarily obliged, like the rest of us, to eat, and they have other incidental expenses, but they are not even compensated for their expenses. The higher ups in the Selective Service, the officers in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, who occupy State supervisory offices, are paid for their services, and they sit in plush seats. But the men out in the field, those who might be called the privates of the Selective Service, who do the work, receive nothing.

I now ask, Mr. President, Is it not utterly unfair for this great Government to treat these citizens of ours, these draft board members, in such a way? They are citizens, like you and me, and have their businesses to look after, their problems to take care of, their burdens of expense and taxation. Is it not unfair and inequitable to require them, without compensation, to give up one-third of their time in this important, but as I say, unappreciated service?

Of course, it is, and it is time that Congress should do something about it. Congress appropriates money for the Selective Service, but it leaves out in the cold the men and women who do the work, who have to bear the brunt of the battle on the home front with the selectees, their parents and the farmers, and the manufacturers. It does not make sense, Mr. President, and I ask that my remarks be especially referred to the Military Affairs Committee, and that the committee have an appropriate bill drafted to provide for an appropriation for compensating members of local draft boards for their time and expense.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he included in his request that the Military Affairs Committee be instructed to bring in a bill of some kind?

Mr. WILEY. Yes, draft a bill, along the lines I suggested.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a little unusual.

Mr. WILEY. I realize that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it is a proper legislative procedure. If that is what the Senator is asking for I would have to object in the interest of legislative order. The Senator's speech will be in the RECORD tomorrow, and the members of the Military Affairs Committee can read it if they wish to, and the committee can bring in a bill if it wants to, without being instructed to do so by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILEY. I did not ask for unanimous consent that it be instructed to do so. I simply asked that my remarks be especially referred to the Military Affairs Committee, and that the committee have the appropriate bill drafted.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is equivalent to asking the committee to bring in a bill. I think that is a little unusual. I have no objection to the Senator's remarks being referred to the committee for its consideration, but for a Senator to obtain unanimous consent that a committee be instructed to bring in a bill seems to me rather to transcend the ordinary proprieties with respect to committees.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I had no idea of trespassing on the rights of the Military Affairs Committee or any other committee. My experience and the experience of most of us in the last 5 years is that if some of us introduce a bill and it is referred to a committee, it is frozen in the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know——

Mr. WILEY. I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, the Senator nearly always has it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has the floor. The Chair thought the Senator from Wisconsin had concluded his remarks, and he recognized the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WILEY. I understood that the Senator from Kentucky requested permission to ask a question of me, and I am answering it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care who has the floor, so far as that is concerned. I am trying to get at the proprieties. The Senator complains that sometimes bills introduced by individual Senators are frozen in committees.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not imagine that a bill has greater likelihood of being frozen in committee than any Senator's speech has of being frozen in committee. The likelihood is that a speech will be even more frozen than a bill which he has introduced. The freezing process, however, is one in which I am not interested just now. I think it is a little unusual to ask that a committee be instructed or requested to draw up a bill on a subject in which some Senator may be interested. If the Senator wants to introduce a bill, he ought to do it himself. He is able to draw a bill and have it referred to the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I do not need to be instructed by the majority leader——

Mr. BARKLEY. No, I am not instructing the Senator from Wisconsin. That would be a hopeless task.

Mr. WILEY. I agree that it would, sir. I do not think the Senator would be lucid enough to do it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct about that, because lucidity is not one of his specialties. But I do not want to get into a quarrel with the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator from Kentucky does want to get into a quarrel with the Senator from Wisconsin. I think that is why the Senator from Kentucky rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well; the Senator can have his own opinion about that. If the Senator is asking that the Committee on Military Affairs be instructed to draw a bill because he wants one drawn and is unable to draw it himself, I shall have to object to that portion of the request.

Mr. WILEY. If the distinguished leader has concluded his remarks on the subject, and admitted his purpose, I wish to say that I withdraw my request that the committee be directed to draft a bill, and make the request that my remarks be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to these remarks or any remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin being referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the remarks will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILEY. I am very grateful to the distinguished majority leader. I am sorry that he felt my previous request to be of such a nature as to get under his skin.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Wisconsin need not worry about getting under my skin.

Mr. WILEY. No; it is too tough.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct; it is too tough for him.

THE RED CROSS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to have the attention of the majority leader, because I desire to call attention to the motion to reconsider the votes by which Senate bill 469, known as the Red Cross bill, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed. The motion to reconsider has been lying on the table since January 19, 1944.

It will be remembered that this bill is a measure which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and provides that the American Red Cross Society, in accordance with the Geneva Convention of 1929, which the United States has ratified, shall have the exclusive right to the use of the red cross symbol, and that commercial use of the symbol shall be prohibited. On the 19th of January 1944 the Senate passed the bill. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] had urged an amendment which would permit commercial users who deemed that they had been injured by the enactment of the law to file claims before the Court of Claims. That amendment was rejected by the Senate. However, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], because of his interest in the principle involved, gave notice at that time of a motion to reconsider, and in fact made such a motion. The late Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana, who at the time was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I, who was in charge of the bill, at the personal request of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], did not at that time make a motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider, as we might have done, because it was our desire that the fullest opportunity should be granted for consideration of the point of view held by the Senator from Maryland and possibly by the Senator from Tennessee. The unfortunate death of the late Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana, which occurred shortly thereafter, and certain other conditions, made it impossible to bring up the matter for consideration prior to the recess. I consulted the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] shortly before the recess was taken, with the purpose of having the motion considered at that time. But both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Georgia had pressing engagements, and asked that the matter be permitted to go over until the Congress reassembled.

The unofficial understanding was that the matter should be one for action by the Senate as soon as the Senate reassembled. For that reason I am raising the question now. The Senator from Maryland this morning told me that it would be impossible for him to be present in the Senate today. The Senator from Georgia, who also desires to be present when the matter is considered by the Senate, is now absent in Georgia; and I understand that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] himself will have to be absent some days this week. With the understanding of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I think we can set the motion down for disposition on Friday of this week.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I will say to him that it is my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, and on tomorrow to move that the Senate take a recess until Friday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is entirely agreeable. I have consulted with the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the minority leader, and have stated that it is my desire that the matter may be disposed of on Friday, if that is agreeable to all concerned.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to say that the Senator from Wyoming has recited substantially correctly the facts concerning the motion to reconsider, as I recall them. I would only add that at the time when the vote was taken, it was a viva voce vote. We did not have a yea-and-nay vote. I was concerned with the principle involved; and for that reason, as the Senator from Wyoming has stated, I made the motion to reconsider, but did not press it at the time. As a matter of fact, I asked that consideration of the motion to reconsider go over for a day or two until the bill could be given a little more thought by some of us who had not given it a great deal of thought up to that time, and who did not know as much about it as did those who had attended the committee hearings.

I am not opposed to the bill; in fact I am for it, and I intend to vote for it. But I thought there was involved in the matter a principle to which the Senate should give very thoughtful consideration, namely, the principle involved in the Tydings' amendment, which I believe was presented at that time by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and which simply would give to the Court of Claims jurisdiction or authority to hear and determine whether any damage had resulted to the commercial users of the Red Cross symbol.

I do not wish to have any further delay. I am sorry there has been this much delay. It has been several months since the motion to reconsider was made. The matter has not been thus delayed by my procurement, at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was just an unfortunate sequence of events which brought about the delay.

Mr. STEWART. That is correct. The Senator from Wyoming has stated the facts in that connection. The late Senator Van Nuys died, and other Members of the Senate were ill from time to time, including, I believe the Senator from Wyoming, who had a very severe case of influenza. I myself was absent

on one occasion that I recall. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has been engaged in the senatorial campaign in Maryland, and that caused a delay some 2 or 3 weeks ago.

The only interest I have in the motion which is now under discussion is my desire that the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Georgia shall have opportunity to be present, because I told them I would not endeavor to bring up my motion to reconsider in their absence.

Of course, I realize that the Senate can set the motion for consideration at any time it desires. However, I wished to have the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Maryland present when the motion was considered. I understand that the Senator from Wyoming has spoken to the Senator from Maryland this morning, and that it would be satisfactory to him to have the motion considered on Friday. The Senator from Georgia is out of the city. He is engaged, as is the Senator from Maryland, in a senatorial campaign. I talked to his secretary a few minutes ago, as did the Senator from Wyoming also. I am not sure that the Senator from Georgia can be present on Friday. I simply desire to suggest that if arrangement is made for the consideration of the motion on Friday, I should like to have such an arrangement made tentatively, with the understanding that if the Senator from Georgia is not able to be present in the Senate on that day the matter will not be pressed. I should like to have such an understanding had.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to be sure that I understand the Senator. I should like to ask either the majority leader or the Senator from Wyoming about the situation. As I understand, the Red Cross bill passed the Senate some time in January.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On the 19th of January.

Mr. WHITE. I further understand that thereafter there was filed a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; on the same day.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that there is now some likelihood that an agreement will be reached with respect to the differences between Senators relative to the provisions of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not say so.

Mr. WHITE. If no agreement has been reached as to the form of the bill, there is a general understanding that the motion to reconsider can be taken up on Friday of this week; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. I have talked with the Senator from Maryland, who desired the adoption of the particular amendment which is in controversy. It is the only matter that is in controversy. He stated to me only this morning precisely what he stated to me last January, that his only desire is to have an opportunity to present the question again to the Senate. This morning he told me that he would be quite willing to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement whereby the motion should be voted upon, say, at 2:30; and he is willing that time on a particular day be divided between himself and those who are opposed to the amendment. The Committee on the Judiciary is opposed to the amendment. As evidenced by its vote on January 19, the Senate is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if there is any understanding that the motion to reconsider is to be agreed to?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was just about to ask that we have a unanimous-consent agreement that the motion to reconsider be agreed to, with the understanding that it is solely for the purpose of considering the amendment which the Senator from Maryland sought to persuade the Senate to adopt.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it seems to me that what the Senator from Wyoming now suggests is somewhat unusual—that is, that we shall have a unanimous-consent agreement that the Senate shall vote to reconsider the passage of the bill on Friday. I know of no reason why the bill should not go forward on Friday, but I do not feel that the Senator ought to ask now for unanimous consent as to how the Senate shall vote on a motion to reconsider.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand that the Senator is asking unanimous consent now that the vote by which the bill passed be reconsidered. That might be done Friday, or whenever it is taken up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would require unanimous consent——

Mr. McFARLAND. I give notice now that I will object to any such unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would require unanimous consent and, in the absence of that, a vote of the Senate to reconsider the vote on the passage of the bill.

The motion to reconsider the vote has been pending for nearly 3 months, and in my judgment it ought to be disposed of without further delay, because it is a matter in which the Red Cross and those interested in the Red Cross are very much concerned. It has been unintentionally delayed by force of circumstances, but I think it ought to be disposed of without further delay.

As I stated a while ago, we are planning to take a recess until tomorrow, and then until Friday, with the understanding that the matter will be taken up, unless there is some insuperable objection at the time, which I hope will not exist.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure that there will be no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the only business in sight, except that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is seeking consideration of a seed bill which he desires to have considered following the disposition of the Red Cross bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to make it clear that my purpose is to have this measure disposed of before the Senate becomes involved in matters of immediate war importance and other questions. In my judgment there is practical unanimity in the Senate that the bill should be passed. The Senator from Maryland is concerned only with having the opportunity to present his argument again. He has stated that he will not use this opportunity for the purpose of delay, and that he is willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate, an agreement which would be altogether satisfactory to the American Red Cross Society and those of us who are urging passage of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understood the Senator to ask unanimous consent for reconsideration of the bill. The Senate has already passed the bill; and I should certainly object to the bill being opened up for amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was precisely what I was trying to avoid. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. McFARLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader referred to a bill in which I am interested. I give notice now of my intention, after the disposition of the Red Cross bill on Friday, if that program is to be carried out, to move for consideration of the so-called seed bill, Calendar 804, Senate bill 1743. Time is an important element in that connection. I would not insist on the bill being taken up on Friday, if it could be made the unfinished business after the disposition of the Red Cross bill, and go over until Monday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Maine are agreed that when the Senate assembles on Friday the matter of the pending motion for reconsideration of the vote on the passage of the so-called Red Cross bill will be the business of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. That is correct.

PROBLEMS OF THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the situation with reference to the poultry industry generally, and particularly in our State of Delaware, has reached such a stage that I deem it desirable to call public attention to it. In doing so, I do not care to reflect at all on either Mr. Bowles or Mr. Jones, the heads of the two organizations which are particularly interested, but I believe that a public statement as to this situation may not be against public interest at this time.

The poultry industry is one of the industries that have grown rapidly in the United States. Raising poultry is one of the ways of growing a large amount of meat in a short period. Our State of Delaware probably produces 60,000,000 broilers a year. These chickens are marketed at from three to three and one-half pounds each. It can thus be seen that in the small compass of a State of 2,000 square miles a tremendous amount of meat is produced in this manner.

The industry is a changing one. This must necessarily be true because of the changing costs of production. Baby chicks vary in price from 5 cents each to 17 cents each. Within the past few years the cost of feed has increased from

approximately $2.50 to $4.10 a hundred pounds. To make the problem a greater one, the chicks, as the demand has increased, have become poorer in quality. This comment also applies to the quality of commercial feeds upon which growers must rely. Three or 4 years ago the price of broilers by the pound reached as low as 14 cents. Yet people continued in the business.

The prices of both commercial feeds and of baby chicks have never been controlled by the O. P. A. or any other governmental agency. However, the great number of broilers grown in our State has attracted numbers of buyers of broilers. These buyers have large and expensive equipment for the purpose of hauling, and in many instances of dressing, chickens. A great number of buyers have come from without the State and settled in Delaware, making that State their home. These buyers go to the various farms and broiler houses and buy the broilers for shipment to large cities all over the East. Some buyers have as many as 20 large trucks which are sent with loads running as high as 10,000 pounds of live poultry per truck. There are many large dressing plants in the area where many thousands of chickens are dressed and shipped daily to the most desirable market. These dressing plants make it possible to store the dressed chickens at any time when the demand is less and hold them for the market until there is a greater demand.

This industry has created employment for thousands of persons. In the growth of broilers 1 man can attend to 15,000 or more chicks. Thousands of persons are employed in hauling and dressing poultry. Many hundreds of men are engaged in the delivery of feed to the numerous growers. Our soil is a sandy one, and its fertility has been greatly increased by the manure produced in this industry. Every business in the State of Delaware has been improved by reason of the increased business activity growing out of the broiler business. The United States Army has purchased or seized for the use of the Army and Navy large quantities of live or dressed poultry. Large numbers of gangs of men who catch and weigh broilers have been formed. These men make their living by this work, and many of them do nothing else. Those chickens are delivered either alive or dressed to wholesale establishments in the large cities. The wholesale establishments in turn distribute them to the retailer, and the retailer to the consumer.

The scarcity of help in all lines has also affected the broiler industry. However, the producers are so scattered that this industry has felt the effect of the scarcity of help in a lesser degree than many other kinds of business. As the price of feed increased and the quality deteriorated, the mortality rate increased. There was a time when the present ceiling of 28½ cents at the farm would have been considered an extremely high and profitable one. However, instead of the poorer food producing a 3-pound broiler in 13 weeks, it now frequently takes 16 weeks to produce the same weight. Instead of producing 950 broilers from a thousand baby chicks, the grower frequently produces less than 500 of the present-day broilers from a thousand baby chicks. The actual cost of a pound of broiler meat has increased until it has reached the ceiling price, and in most instances has now passed the ceiling price. This condition affects the situation as to everyone who grows, buys, sells, hauls, catches, dresses, or eats broilers.

As the necessary cost of broilers reached the line where they could not be grown profitably everyone connected with the industry in any of the capacities which I have mentioned was faced with the alternative of violating the law or of quitting the business. So long as there was a reasonable profit in the legitimate business, the temptation to indulge in illegal practices was slight. Several months ago when there was a great demand for broilers and hundreds of new buyers drove into Delaware from all sections, many from small towns, increased prices were frequently offered and received. Those violations did not have the sympathy of law-abiding citizens, because at that time such violations were not necessary. Profits could be and were being made legitimately. Therefore people frowned upon the illegal profits made through the black market. The black market profit was simply an additional means of obtaining money. Thousands of people frowned on those law violations.

When it became apparent that under the rules of the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration, the business could no longer be legitimately continued, delegations of growers, buyers, and others interested in the industry came to Washington and consulted with the officials of those two organizations. The facts were laid before both the War Food Administration and the O. P. A. I personally called Mr. Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, and told him of the conditions which were facing this industry which represents a selling price from my own State of Delaware of somewhere from forty to fifty millions of dollars a year. No encouragement or satisfaction seemed to be obtainable from either of those organizations.

On the 28th day of March 1944, I wrote to both Mr. Chester Bowles and Mr. Marvin Jones practically identical letters, the letter to Mr. Jones being in the following language:

MARCH 28, 1944.

HON. MARVIN JONES,
Administrator, War Food Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR JONES: I hesitate to write you with reference to the poultry situation in my State. However, conditions have become so serious that I think you are at least entitled to know something about it before the protest becomes more general.

Something over a year ago a number of our growers and buyers of poultry were arrested and indicted for violations of the O. P. A. orders. At that time there was not a great amount of sympathy for those who were found guilty of these violations, for the reason that it appeared to be in most instances an attempt to place a great addition to the reasonable profits that were already being earned by the growers and dealers. Since that time, with little or no discouragement from the Government or any of its organizations, the price of feed became exorbitant, as well as inferior in quality. The price of day-old chicks went as high as 17 cents. Mortality of chickens has been very high, running in many instances as much as 50 percent. This has been caused principally by two things. The first is that the chicks themselves have been weak, and usually not culled by the hatchers. So great was the demand that it was not necessary for the hatchers to cull the chicks in order to sell. The second reason has been the poor quality of the feed, which caused the chicks to have so little resistance to disease that it was impossible to grow to broiler size a very large percentage of the chicks. The result has been that nearly all growers have been unable to produce broilers at the 28½-cent ceiling price in our section. The actual cost has, I believe, in most instances been above the legal selling price. This situation has been made clear to your assistants and the Office of Price Administration.

I see by the newspapers that many of our buyers and dressers have been arrested in an attempt to make a profit, or at least to get the actual cost, out of broilers handled by them. This industry in our State probably amounts to $40,000,000 a year. When the price is fixed at a point where the growers must either violate the law or quit the business, the situation is serious. Under the ceiling price regulation, the situation as to the grower is not greatly affected by the number of chickens grown. If 1,000 chickens should be grown to broiler size, the grower of that one thousand would in all probability lose money by his operation. The fact that his neighbors or competitors are growing broilers neither adds to nor subtracts from his cost of production. The ceiling fixes the legitimate amount he can receive. Your office answers those who approach it in the hope that this industry will not be entirely obliterated with the statement that plenty of broilers are being produced. These wholesale arrests are in the main of persons with whom I am personally acquainted. I am sure that they do not desire to be criminals. The operation of the two offices of War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration has given them no legitimate way of continuing in the business in which their livelihood is made if they are found guilty of the charges against them, and those charges are determined to be criminal violations. If your organization desires some limitation of production I suppose that that could be done. An effort was made 2 years ago to limit production by limiting the capacity of houses for the production of broilers that could be built on any one farm. This method has been fairly effective in my opinion. I presume there are other methods of limiting production that could be used.

We are told that Mr. Fitzgerald, of the War Food Administration, is the man who is standing adamant as to the poultry situation. We are even told that it will not do to produce more broilers, as that will draw food away from the cattle and hogs of the Middle West. I suppose the thought naturally follows this conclusion that a lessening of the broiler production in the East will increase consumption of both beef and cattle from the West. I don't believe that it is necessary to destroy an industry of this size in order to keep people eating pork and beef. I believe there will always be a demand for pork, beef, and all kinds of poultry.

I am told that in many instances the persons arrested in my State include persons who are interested in growing, buying, and dressing poultry. This matter is so serious to the people of Delaware that I cannot longer remain quiet and see them in such large numbers deprived of a business which has been developed at the instance and with the encouragement of the Federal Government. I

called the War Food Administration some weeks ago. I have called both the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration. I have attempted to show the unfair position in which the people of my State are placed by these regulations. The only answer to me has been that plenty of poultry was being produced. If these defendants are convicted, the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration will be able to see that the consumer has not been greatly benefited. If your two organizations succeed in destroying the industry in our State by trying to compel our producers to grow at a loss, you will have reduced the food supply of the Nation. The only advantage which I can see growing out of it is that which I have mentioned, the pork and beef producers of the Middle West will then be able to produce more pork and beef at the expense and with the sacrifice of the poultry industry. The only alternative which your office and the Office of Price Administration give to our poultry people is to either starve or go to jail. I don't believe that the purpose of the Federal Government is or should be to force our citizenship in wartime to take either of these courses.

I am writing the Office of Price Administration a similar letter. I hope that you will both see the seriousness of the position in which you are placing a large industry employing and supporting thousands of our citizens. Both the Army and Navy seem to consider this industry of sufficient importance to require a large percentage of its product.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES M. TUNNELL.

Not having heard from either of these men, on April 12 I addressed to each of them a letter, the letter to Mr. Bowles being in the following language:

APRIL 12, 1944.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR BOWLES: On the 28th of March I wrote you a lengthy description of the serious situation in our State because of the attitude of the Office of Price Administration and War Food Administration with reference to the poultry industry. I am very much disappointed that neither you nor Mr. Jones has considered my letter of sufficient importance to reply to it. The situation continues to be serious, and the attitude of the Office of Price Administration and War Food Administration continues to be inexplicable. I shall be compelled to take other means of calling this situation to the attention of those interested.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES M. TUNNELL.

I received a reply to this letter, dated April 14, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1944.

Hon. JAMES M. TUNNELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR TUNNELL: This will acknowledge the receipt of your letter of March 28, 1944, regarding the poultry situation on the Delmarva Peninsula.

We are sorry for the delay in answering your recent communication. The delay was brought about by the fact that we are anticipating some definite action regarding the present poultry situation. However, due to the complexities involved, we are still unable to state what definite action is planned. I can assure you that some relief is planned for the commercial producers and live poultry shippers in the immediate future.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES, *Administrator.*

I have received no answer to either of my letters to Marvin Jones.

On April 15 I replied as follows to Mr. Bowles' letter of April 14:

APRIL 15, 1944.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I am, as you know, very much dissatisfied with the condition with reference to the poultry situation in Delaware. Your letter of April 14 has been received. However, our people are given no satisfaction. Large flocks of poultry are being fed, perhaps at a loss, and in interviews with the Office of Price Administration and War Food Administration, our broiler people are given no satisfaction.

A couple of days ago an announcement came through the newspapers that some increase in price was anticipated, and some idea of what that increase was to be was set out. However, in your letter of April 14, just received, there is nothing specific suggested. The situation is serious and the dissatisfaction naturally great. Instead of some relief being furnished, our people are being threatened with jail and bankruptcy, some one and some the other. The prosecutions started will in some instances result in both if successful. Instead of a spirit of cooperation, the poultry people are being met in a spirit of hostility, in most instances frankly told that they will get no relief.

Hoping that some relief may be speedily furnished, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES M. TUNNELL.

Persons in Mr. Jones' organization tell us, and have told us right along, that there is no probability of any relief. There is here some intimation that there will be some relief. What it will be or when we will get it, is not told. In the meantime, our people are in distress.

From the Office of the Relief Administration we are told that there is no difficulty because the number of eggs incubated is increasing. I think that is true, the number has increased; but twice as many eggs are necessary if one loses half his chickens. The people are living in the hope that there may be some relief so that they can get for their broilers at least the amount they have put into those particular broilers.

The announcement came in the newspapers that some relief was to be granted, and on Saturday last, April 15, the following announcement appeared in the Journal-Every Evening, published at Wilmington, Del.:

O. P. A. ANNOUNCES BOOST IN PRICES OF POULTRY

Charles W. Hardesty, Delaware O. P. A. director, has announced that the prices of poultry will be increased from the farms to the markets, effective Monday.

The increase will amount to 1.8 cents a pound for April, 2.2 cents for May, and 1 cent for June, with the present scale to become effective again on July 1.

While the increases do not affect the conditions against which live buyers of poultry have been on strike, Mr. Hardesty said he anticipates additional compensation for the live buyers in the near future.

This morning my office called the Office of Price Administration, and we were told that there was no one authorized to issue any such statement, that if there is to be any increase in the price of poultry, it has not yet been announced, and there is no authority for announcing it.

Mr. Jones had long before the 28th day of March assured me that he would investigate the conditions which I described to him. We are told by the War Food Administration that the purpose of the restrictions placed on this industry is to make it possible for the growers of pork and beef to have more feed for their industries, and that there is not enough food produced for all of the three industries. However, the rules as promulgated by these organizations make it just as near impossible for the industry if it produces only 1,000 chicks to do so profitably as if it had produced a hundred million.

A ceiling is fixed, so that one cannot make a profit even if there is only one lot of a thousand chickens grown in the whole United States. The amount which can be received by the grower is limited to 28½ cents, no matter how many broilers he produces, and no matter how many broilers are produced in the United States.

I am a firm believer in price control. However, I am opposed to a policy which brings paralysis or bankruptcy to an industry as essential to the war effort as it is to ordinary American lives. The same ceiling price and the same cost prices will drive out all of an industry, regardless of the number of broilers grown, unless the law and the rules of the O. P. A. are violated.

We are told that as much as 80 percent of the poultry grown is being sold in the black market. If that is true, one can see how the War Food Administration can point to the fact that a large number of chickens are being grown, but if so, they are being sold in violation of the rules of the O. P. A. That is our information.

One of the best periods for the sale of broilers to the consumer is over the Easter holidays. A short time before the Easter holidays suits were brought in the Federal court in Wilmington, Del., and restraining orders issued which paralyzed the purchase and sale of broilers at the time when there was the greatest demand for broilers. I saw the announcement in one of the Philadelphia papers that on days prior to Easter, when the market could have absorbed 170,000 pounds of poultry, it received only 30,000 pounds.

The black market operations were also very seriously crippled by the court proceedings, but in crippling the black market these Government agencies entirely destroyed the legitimate market. The demand is so great for poultry that the commonest chickens grown will sell for the ceiling price to practically any buyer. Thus the grower who produces fancy broilers can receive no more per pound than the grower who produces only culls. This situation is against all economic reasoning and experience. The good grower is on a par with the poor grower. A pound of culls may cost more than a pound of thrifty broiler meat, but the fancy broiler meat is more desirable and must be sold at the same price.

One of the greatest difficulties which the buyers of poultry have encountered from the rules of the O. P. A. arises from the fact that these rules compel the buyers of poultry in Delaware to sell on the New York market at the New York weight—that refers to any city in which poultry is sold—but at the same time so limiting the price that he is not permitted legally to sell the poultry at more than enough to make a legitimate profit if there should be no shrinkage. We are told that a 10,000-pound load of live broilers will lose, between Delaware and New York, five to eight hundred pounds, depending on the weather, the condition of the chickens, and other circumstances such as the feed which is given them immediately before or while in transit. This matter was discussed between representatives of the O. P. A. and the poultry dealers. The dealers were given to understand that no exception would be taken to this practice of selling on the New York market at farm weight. There is a difference of 2¾ cents between the buying price at the farm and the selling price in New York. There is a difference of only 1¾ cents between the buying price at the farm and the sale price in such cities as Philadelphia. The Philadelphia people have complained bitterly that they receive no chickens because of the 1-cent difference between New York and Philadelphia. In my opinion there will always be a discrimination in favor of New York so long as there is a regional headquarters in New York taking in the territory in which Philadelphia is also located. The 2¾-cent margin between the farm price and the New York selling price is barely enough to pay for the chickens themselves, the catching, hauling, and feeding of them in order to make the sale in New York.

When the O. P. A. forbids any allowance for the shrinkage which takes place at all times, it refuses to recognize not only one of the fundamental facts of the business, but a natural and well known phenomenon as well. The O. P. A. has ordered prosecutions where buyers of live poultry have purchased the poultry and sold it to dressing plants at a sufficient increase to cover the cost of catching and hauling those chickens to the dressing plant. This is one of the most unreasonable requirements in all the regulations. A dressed poultry plant can hire someone else to haul its chickens from the farm to the dressing plant. It cannot pay the live poultry dealer the same rate for hauling those chickens above the cost of purchase as it would cost to hire someone else to haul them.

The Federal Government seizes or purchases large quantities of these chickens. If taken alive they are sent to the dressing plants for slaughter. The dressing plants, of course, can get no more from the Government than the ceiling price. So the Government is getting a sufficient amount of poultry at ceiling prices. However, many of the broilers which are not sold to the Government are sold in the large cities to the consumer at black-market prices. In many instances neither the original buyer nor the dressing plant receive the benefit of this increased price, but someone is obtaining that increase in black-market price because the consumer is paying it.

Undoubtedly a very large proportion of poultry is being moved at black-market prices. This is particularly true since under the regulations of the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration, poultry cannot be delivered at ceiling prices in view of the cost of production and hauling, or production, dressing, and hauling, as the case may be. At any rate the consumer is not obtaining the benefit of O. P. A. regulations, though the Federal Government is receiving that benefit.

This attitude on the part of the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration is all the more dangerous since it involves not alone a temptation, but a command to violate the law or get out of business. In addition, the O. P. A. has the power and is apparently attempting either to drive out of business all poultry growers, buyers, sellers, and consumers, or so to limit the production that there will not be enough poultry anywhere near to meet the present demand. The O. P. A. can drive out all of this business. It has paralyzed the industry, and unless its attitude changes it will entirely drive it out of existence. Civil suits to collect from dealers three times the amount claimed to have been wrongly charged for poultry have been filed in the Federal court. These profits which have been demanded after having been multiplied by three are not and never were in the hands of the persons against whom the suits have been brought. The amounts claimed are based very largely on the amounts collected by reason of a failure to sell at delivery weight rather than at farm weight. Since the dealer purchased at farm weight, and has spent practically all of his margin of profit in catching, hauling, feeding, and labor, the suits which have been brought under the provision of the law providing for triple damages are suits to recover something which the dealer never had.

The article in the journal to which I have called attention says that the buyers of live poultry have been on strike. They have not been on strike. They have simply quit buying because they are not permitted to obtain the cost of the goods they purchase.

To make the matter worse, the Government is going back and trying to collect three times the imaginary profit for a period of 14 months. A judgment for these amounts means bankruptcy for every dealer in poultry who has been purchasing to any great extent from the area in question. This custom of the trade of selling at farm weights was well known to the O. P. A. in the State of Delaware, and the buyers were encouraged by the O. P. A. to continue this custom, as this was the only way by which, under the ceiling prices prescribed, the buyers could get as much as they paid for the poultry.

Unless the situation which threatens to incriminate or to bankrupt practically all those in the industry can be relieved, I propose to submit a resolution providing for an investigation at an early date, and ask that a committee be appointed speedily to investigate and report back to Congress the purpose of this unexplained and inexplicable conduct on the part of these two governmental agencies which are, whatever their intentions may be, making criminals of law-abiding citizens by silly and unnecessary regulations which do not benefit the American people nor hold the line. The consumer is paying black-market prices. The producer must either get black-market prices or go out of business. The merchant has to pay more than the legitimate price, or get no poultry. And this statement prevails from the producer to the person who eats the cooked chicken. Protests have thus far been without avail. Large numbers of persons in the industry are under bail, many are being sued for amounts greater than they were ever worth or ever will be. People are angry and justifiably so, in my opinion, because under these conditions the governmental agencies are compelling them to violate the law and are then attempting to punish them for the very violations for which the Government itself is solely responsible.

Mr. President, while promises are made that some relief will be given, the relief which has been suggested of raising the price to the grower will in no sense relieve the situation after the grower has sold the poultry. The buyer of that poultry will be in just the same position if the ceiling price is raised 2 cents; the cost to the buyer will simply be 2 cents more. Unless the O. P. A. or the War Food Administration—and both agencies are managing this situation—will permit the buyer to sell at the rate at which he buys or else make the differential greater, the problem will remain just as serious as it is now. Unless something is done it will mean the destruction of one of the largest businesses in our State, a business which is going to be one of the largest of the Nation.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I ask the Senator to do so in order to inquire if he can tell me whether there is likely to be an executive session tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. That will depend on whether there is any executive business on the calendar tomorrow. There is none on the calendar today.

Mr. WHITE. Then I gather from the Senator's reply that he is not able to tell me whether there will be an executive session tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot tell definitely.

Mr. WHITE. Some Members of the Senate, on this side of the aisle, at least, are anxious to know when the next executive session will be held.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot tell now, I am sorry to say.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 18, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 17 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service office of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Richard Evans Glasson Opie, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1942.

Second Lt. Frederick Charles Uhler, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

TO CAVALRY

Lt. Col. Hobart Raymond Gay, Quartermaster Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from August 18, 1940.

TO INFANTRY

Maj. Murray Bradshaw Crandall, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1941.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Bruce Wilds Postlethwaite Edgerton, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Robert Edward Harrington, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from January 19, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Gordon Rowe, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander fleet air, Quonset Point.

Capt. Malcolm F. Schoeffel, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of July 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most righteous Father, be pleased to accept our praise of Him who, in the surging breast of this life, hath given us the light by which our souls grow and aspire. He is our God forever and forever, and will be our guide even unto death. Therefore, let us not mourn our vanquished dreams with their poignant losses, nor allow misfortune or difficulty to break down our spirits, but, rather, seek their solution in the strengthening of the soul. O, give us braver and warmer hearts.

Thou who dwellest in the heavens and earth, Thou who art a great God and greatly to be praised, grant that our wisdom and devotion may be exemplified in our moderation, desisting from self-praise and invidious comparisons. In our thoughts and actions, we pray for a basis of life that shall be credible and inspiring to the best interpretation of politics, education, and religion. Teach us to avoid lapses, needless diversions, and wasted time, and never be holden by the bounds of narrowness in word or deed. We pray for that devotion to our country and for that fidelity of righteous purpose which nothing can lessen or many waters drown. Based on noble principles, brightened by enduring patriotic hopes, crown us all with a sublime sense of duty, and Thine shall be the praise. In the name of Him whose God is the Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 14, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. Federal Security Agency.
4. Federal Works Agency.
5. War Production Board.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter from Hon. Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, addressed to the Speaker of the House, in relation to the coming International Labor Conference, which is to be held in Philadelphia on April 20. This letter extends an invitation to Members of Congress to be present, and states that those desiring to be present will be provided with appropriate cards of admission and detailed information as to the program as it is developed.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including this letter, addressed to the Speaker from the Secretary of Labor, at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 15, 1944.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to extend to Members of the House of Representatives an invitation to attend the sessions of the International Labor Conference, which will open at 11 o'clock in the morning, April 20, in Philadelphia, Mitten Hall, Temple University. At this meeting 300 delegates, representing 40 countries, will come together to discuss and vote on recommendations to the United Nations for present and post-war policy, and to outline plans for the maintenance of high employment levels after the war. Each national delegation will be composed not only of official Government delegates, but will also include representatives of employer and labor organizations from each country. Senator THOMAS of Utah and I have been appointed by the President as the two Government delegates of the United States. The names of the employer and labor delegates are about to be announced.

This will be the twenty-sixth annual conference of the International Labor Organization, of which the United States has been a member for 10 years. It is being held here at the official invitation of our Government. The conference in Philadelphia will offer an unparalleled opportunity for observing the proceedings of an international congress at first hand. This world assembly follows the same pattern as that of the United States Congress. In addition to plenary sessions, there will be a number of working committees and group caucuses. The importance of the topics on its program and the gravity of the present world situation should lend historical significance to the proceedings.

I sincerely hope that a number of Congressmen, despite their busy schedules, will be able to attend the conference sometime during the 3-week period of its sessions. If Congressmen will communicate with me, I shall be glad to see that they are provided with appropriate cards of admission and detailed information as to how the program will be developed.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS,

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2928, to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BURCH of Virginia, Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. HARTLEY, and Mr. MASON.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution, House Resolution 499, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That DEAN M. GILLESPIE, of Colorado, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

MRS. MARY GLUSING ELLIOTT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution, House Resolution 500, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Mary Glusing Elliott, widow of William P. Elliott, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said William P. Elliott.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the conclusion of the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business today and such other special orders as may have been entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a short editorial from the Washington Star entitled "It Needs Looking Into."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short article from the Chicago Sun and an editorial from the Chicago Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which I wrote to the New York Herald Tribune for the relief of the starving children of the German-occupied countries of Europe, which appeared in that paper on April 16, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL OIL LEASES

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times in regard to American foreign policy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the keynote address delivered in Hartford, Conn., on April 13, by our distinguished minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two separate subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, it was very unfortunate that one of our colleagues last week gave to the press letters that he had written to General MacArthur and letters that General MacArthur had written to him.

In my opinion, General MacArthur is a great soldier and a great organizer. I have known him for years and thought a great deal of him. It seems to me that I noticed in some paper that these letters were private. Will someone please inform me whether they were marked "confidential" or "private" or "not for publication"? I would like to know this.

Ah, sir! Here in the midst of a great war General MacArthur must realize as a commander in chief in the Pacific the seriousness of the publication of these letters written to him by our colleague. It seems to me that I have heard something from the gentlemen on the minority about a smear political campaign. Everyone can realize from the letters sent from here that a smear campaign is being attempted, and I might say to the gentleman who sent these letters, who made the statement that the General could carry all the States, that this is at least a gross exaggeration, and others realize that this is one and realize then that there are other exaggerations in the letters.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Danville Register, Danville, Va.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I made at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Chicago, Ill., on March 21, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the gentleman in the White House and the gentleman from Mississippi started Wendell Willkie on his campaign, one by sending him around the world, and the other by talking about him so often from the well of the House, and Willkie was making the most of it. Now, if you on the Democratic side will just keep your noses out of our Republican business we will get along all right, and we will put someone in the White House who will start this Nation on the way it should travel to win the war with the least possible loss of

life, on the return to constitutional government.

Mr. RANKIN. I was not advocating any particular candidate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina seemed to be finding fault with either General MacArthur or with our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]. I could not determine whom he was criticizing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein an address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DRAFT BOARDS AND DEFERMENTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the resentment surrounding the drafting of married men with families and the recommendations of General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, to defer their induction, I was under the impression that all those over 30 years of age would not be drafted by reason of the fact that the records of the War Department conclusively prove that they cannot stand the rigorous training and that very few could be used in combat service. It was my understanding that the draft boards would heed the instructions of General Hershey. However, while at home in Chicago my attention was called to the fact that the draft boards still refused to defer married men from 32 and up to 38 years of age with families and, at the same time, continued to grant deferments to young men from 18 to 26 years of age who are engaged in industry and on the farms. Naturally there is resentment against such practice and the administration is held responsible when, in fact, all these draft boards have been appointed by the Governors of the various States and in my city nearly all those serving on the draft boards are Republicans. Consequently, I will insist and demand, as I did a year ago, that the board members be given strict instructions covering deferments and in the event they refuse to comply with such instructions that they shall be excused from further service and fair and independent members named to replace them.

Mr. Speaker, I have received reports on deferments in several plants and I am informed that in most instances where young men are exempted, older men could easily take their places. I feel that this practice should no longer be countenanced and that it will be in the interest of the country if older men replace these young workers as it will result in the saving of millions of dollars in the form of allowances and allotments to the wives and children of men taken into the service.

I feel that it is manifestly unfair to charge the administration with being responsible for these conditions, especially in the Midwest, where all these boards have been appointed by Republican Governors and are composed of nearly all Republican members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TO EXPEDITE PAYMENT FOR LAND ACQUIRED DURING WAR PERIOD

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 919, to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FERTILIZERS, FEEDS, ETC., THAT MAY BE DISTRIBUTED BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3405, making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 537, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, APPROVED MAY 2, 1942

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2908, to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO CREATE THE WAR SHIPPING FIELD SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, House Joint Resolution 182, to create the war shipping field service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO ESTABLISH A BOARD OF VISITORS FOR THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Clerk called the next bill, Senate Joint Resolution 77, to establish a board of visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter about which I wrote the Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMPUTATION OF DOUBLE-TIME CREDIT AWARDED BETWEEN 1898 AND 1912 IN DETERMINING RETIRED PAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1675, to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credit awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, prior to 1912 anyone serving in the armed forces beyond the continental limits of the United States was given a double-time credit for that service. That provision, however, was repealed by the Congress in 1912.

This bill seeks to give to those persons who served outside the United States in the armed forces in the period between 1898 and 1912 double-time credit for that service; but in the drafting of the bill itself it is worded in such a way that a person might have served outside the United States during those dates for a period of but 2, 3, or 4 years and go on the retired roll at the maximum retired pay now allowed for any retired person in that particular grade.

I have discussed this phase of the bill with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], author of the bill, and he has agreed to make such correction in the bill itself.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment which I am sure will cure the situation the gentleman mentions. I believe he is correct. I will offer the amendment at the proper time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) approved June 16, 1942, is amended to read as follows:

"Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his grade for each 3 years of service up to 30 years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard

of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That retired enlisted men and warrant officers heretofore or hereafter retired who served beyond the continental limits of the United States between 1898 and 1912, such service having been computed under previous laws as double time toward retirement, shall be entitled to receive the maximum pay now provided for the grade in which retired."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY:

On page 2, line 12, after the word "maximum" insert the word "retired."

On page 2, line 8, after the word "retired" insert "with credit for 30 years' service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN ALIEN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4238, providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a new section is hereby inserted between sections 323 and 324 of the act entitled "An act to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code," approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149):

"SEC. 323a. A person who was a member of the military or naval forces of the United States at any time after April 5, 1917, and before November 12, 1918, or at any time after April 20, 1898, and before July 5, 1902, or who served on the Mexican border as a member of the Regular Army or National Guard from June 1916 to April 1917, who is not an alien ineligible to citizenship, who was not at any time during such period or thereafter separated from such forces under other than honorable conditions, who was not a conscientious objector who performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, and who was not at any time during such period or thereafter discharged from the military or naval forces on account of his alienage, shall, if he has resided in the United States continuously for at least 2 years pursuant to a legal admission for permanent residence in lieu of the usual 5 years' residence within the United States and 6 months' residence within the State of his residence at the time of filing the petition for naturalization, during all of which 2-year period he has behaved as a person of good moral character, be entitled at any time within 1 year after the date of approval of this act to naturalization upon compliance with all of the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that—

"(1) no declaration of intention shall be required;

"(2) no certificate of arrival shall be required unless such person's admission to the United States was subsequent to March 3, 1924; and

"(3) no residence within the jurisdiction of the court shall be required.

"Such petitioner shall verify his petition for naturalization by the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses who are citizens of the United States, or shall furnish the depositions of two such witnesses made in accordance with the requirements of subsection (e) of section 327 of the Nationality Act of 1940, to prove the required residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and favorable disposition toward the good order and happiness of the United States. On applications filed for any benefits under this act, the requirement of fees for naturalization documents is hereby waived."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 19, strike out "date of approval of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "effective date of this section."

Page 3, line 14, strike out the word "Act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "section."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF STARVING PEOPLES OF EUROPE

The Clerk called the next bill, House Resolution 221.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House resolution?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I notice that there are 13 whereases to this bill. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs whether he feels that this is going to be the practice when he brings out legislation to insert 13 or more whereases?

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that it is not up to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to say whether the whereases are going to be in there or not. The whereases are not printed when the bill is finally passed as an act or anything else. They are left off. That is the general rule in connection with all bills and resolutions. The whereases are not included.

Mr. KEAN. Do they add anything to the bill?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman had better ask the introducer of the resolution. It is just explanatory, that is all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Whereas the democratic countries of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and others have been invaded and occupied; and

Whereas these countries which are allied with us in the cause of democracy resisted to the limit of their strength the onrush of invading forces; and

Whereas the usual economic processes of these countries have been completely dislocated as a result of being occupied by invading forces; and

Whereas the food supplies of all these nations are dangerously exhausted due to requisition of native food supplies by the Germans, and inability to secure their usual imports through the blockade; and

Whereas no relief can be brought to them unless there be international action through which their native supplies can be protected and imports be made through the blockade; and

Whereas starvation has already begun; and

Whereas a plan for feeding the people of Greece has been in effect for several months in Greece under supervision of the Swedish and Swiss Governments and the International Red Cross; and

Whereas after 6 months' trial this relief has been certified by the State Department as working satisfactorily and without benefit to the Germans; and

Whereas the Governments of Belgium, Norway, and Poland have requested that their people be given relief; and

Whereas there are food surpluses available in the United States and in South America; and

Whereas many of the invaded countries have money with which to purchase the food needed to keep their people alive and have signified their desire to use funds for that purpose; and

Whereas the Swedish Government has ships not available to the Allies which could be used for transportation; and

Whereas the specter of mass starvation among friendly and noncombatant women and children is a tragedy that the compassionate heart of America wants to avert; and

Whereas France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and others have lived in friendship with the United States during our entire national existence, and have sent us millions of our most useful and helpful American citizens, and now have no means whatever of securing the necessary agreements by which this disaster can be averted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does express the conviction that immediate steps should be taken to extend the Greek experiment and thereby prevent this impending tragedy of mass starvation heretofore named; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives respectfully urges that the Government of the United States, through the Secretary of State, endeavor as quickly as possible to work out, in cooperation with the British Government and the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland, and the accredited representatives of the other governments concerned, the setting up of systematic and definite relief for all stricken and hungry countries where the need is now the most acute; this relief to be based on agreements by the belligerents for the protection of the native and imported food supplies, with rigid safeguarding of such relief so that no military advantage whatever may accrue to the civil populations or armed forces of the invading nations.

The House resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF THE REGISTERS OF THE DISTRICT LAND OFFICES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 866, to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That commencing 60 days after the approval of this act the positions of registers of the district land offices

shall become subject to the Classification Act of 1923 (42 Stat. 1488; 5 U. S. C., sec. 661, and the following), as amended: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall operate to reduce the basic annual compensation of any register below the amount paid to such officer, exclusive of overtime pay, during the fiscal year immediately preceding the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Any moneys heretofore appropriated for the salaries and commissions of registers shall be available for the payment of the compensation of the registers under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary for that purpose.

SEC. 3. No provision of this act shall relieve any public land applicant or claimant from the necessity of making payment of fees, commissions, or other moneys required by law or regulation. Commencing 60 days after the approval of this act, the registers shall not receive any compensation based on fees, commissions, or other receipts and all amounts collected by them shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 4. Sections 2237 and 2240 of the Revised Statutes and the act of May 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 684; 43 U. S. C., sec. 80), as amended, are hereby repealed and all other provisions of law inconsistent with this act are repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall not extend to the Territory of Alaska.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXAMINATION NOT TO BE REQUIRED AS A CONDITION TO APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1565, relating to the appointment of postmasters.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no postmaster at an office of the fourth class shall be required, in the event such office is advanced to the third class, to pass any competitive or noncompetitive examination as a condition to appointment or service as postmaster at the office so advanced; and no postmaster at an office of the third class shall be required, in the event such office is relegated to the fourth class, to pass any competitive or noncompetitive examination as a condition to appointment or service as postmaster at the office so relegated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF PREFERENCE TO VETERANS WHO DESIRE TO COMPETE FOR POSITIONS IN THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4115, to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice as it will come up under suspension of the rules today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

ELIMINATION OF THE PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON REFUND CLAIMS COVERING SERVICE OF 1 YEAR OR LESS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4292, to amend section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting, immediately following the first proviso, the following: "Except that no such interest shall be allowed on any separation unless the service covered thereby aggregates more than 1 year."

SEC. 2. That the last proviso of section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, is amended by inserting after "so returned to an officer or employee" the following: "with respect to which interest was paid."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out all of lines 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPUTATION OF INTEREST ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4320, relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 (b), as amended, of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 724 (b)), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In computing interest under this subsection, a fractional part of a month shall be disregarded unless it amounts to more than half a month, in which case it shall be considered as a full month."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING THE FILLING OF A VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3732, to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges," approved May 24, 1940 (54 Stat. 219), which reads: "*Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in each of said districts shall not be filled," be, and it hereby is, repealed insofar as it relates to the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LANDS AND FLOWAGE EASEMENTS FOR PLEASANT HILL RESERVOIR, OHIO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2752, to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, with the consent of the owners thereof, the Secretary of War in his discretion shall acquire, on behalf of the United States, title in fee simple to, or flowage easements over, such additional lands in the vicinity of Perrysville, Ohio, as the Chief of Engineers may find to be subjected to flooding as a result of the impounding of water in the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, a unit in the Muskingum watershed flood-control project. If the owner of any land found to be subjected to flooding does not desire to sell, or grant a flowage easement over, such land to the United States, he may present to the Secretary of War from time to time claims for damages on account of the flooding of such land. The Secretary of War shall thereupon determine the amount he may find to be due such claimant and certify such amount to Congress as a legal claim for payment out of funds which are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the payment of such claims.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "War", insert "in his discretion."

Page 2, line 1, strike out all of the bill after the word "project."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENEFITS TO MERCHANT SEAMEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4163, to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (relating to seamen's insurance) of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes," approved March 24, 1943 (Public Law 17, 78th Cong.; 57 Stat. 45), is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after the first sentence of subsection (b) thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "There shall be no recovery of any money paid on account of insurance provided for the master, officers, or members of the crew of, or individuals transported on, any vessel under this subsection or under subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, from any person who in the judgment of the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, is without fault, and when in the judgment of the Administrator such recovery would defeat the purposes of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience."

(2) By adding at the end of said section new subsections to read as follows:

"(c) The Administrator, War Shipping Administration, is also authorized to make adequate payments to a master, officer, or member of the crew of, or any persons transported on, a vessel owned by or chartered to

the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration or operated by, or for the account of, or at the direction or under the control of the Commission or the Administration, for permanent total or partial disability as long as such disability resulting from causes related to the war effort whether heretofore or hereafter arising exists.

"(d) The War Shipping Administration shall have the right of intervention and a lien and right of recovery in the cases and to the extent of any payments paid and payable under this section or under subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in the manner provided in the last paragraph of subsection (c) of section 105 of the act approved December 2, 1942 (Public Law 784, 77th Cong.; 42 U. S. C., sec. 1701), as amended by Public Law 216, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 23, 1943. Any amounts recovered under this provision shall be covered into the marine and war-risk insurance fund, War Shipping Administration."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLISHMENT OF THE JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2241, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the area embraced within and constituting said monument to its status as part of the Teton National Forest.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF HARPERS FERRY NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3524, to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept donations of land, interest in land, buildings, structures, and other property in the vicinity of Harpers Ferry, W. Va., not to exceed 1,500 acres, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and donations of funds for the purchase and maintenance thereof, the evidence of title to such lands to be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. Any Federal land within the area designated by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary for monument purposes shall be transferred to the administration of the Department of the Interior and when so transferred shall become a part of the monument: *Provided*, That the Federal department or agency having administration over such land shall agree in advance to such transfer.

SEC. 2. The property acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act shall constitute the Harpers Ferry National Monument and shall be a public national memorial commemorating the Harpers Ferry, campaigns of the War between the States (Civil War) and the great cause of human freedom. The Director of the National Park Service under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of such national monument and shall maintain and preserve it for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," as amended.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to—

(1) Maintain, either in an existing structure acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act or in a building constructed by him for the purpose, a museum for relics and records pertaining to historic events that took place at Harpers Ferry, and for other relics of national and patriotic interest, and to accept on behalf of the United States, for installation in such museum, articles which may be offered as additions to the museum; and

(2) Construct roads and facilities and mark with monuments, tablets, or otherwise, points of interest within the boundaries of the Harpers Ferry National Monument.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "commemorating", strike out the word "the" and insert "historical events at or near."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "campaigns of the War between the States (Civil War) and the great cause of human freedom."

Page 3, line 10, after the word "the", insert "improvement and maintenance on the land and sites donated under the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO EXPEDITING ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3054, to amend the Expediting Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903, chapter 544, be amended to read as follows:

"In every suit in equity brought in any district court of the United States under any of said acts, wherein the United States is complainant, an appeal from the final decree of the district court will lie only to the Supreme Court and must be taken within 60 days from the entry thereof: *Provided, however*, That if, upon any such appeal, it shall be found that, by reason of disqualification, there shall not be a quorum of Justices of the Supreme Court qualified to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, then, in lieu of a decision by the Supreme Court, the case shall be immediately sent by the Supreme Court to the senior circuit judge of the circuit in which is located the district in which the suit was brought and it shall be the duty of the senior circuit judge to designate immediately three circuit judges of said circuit, one of whom shall be himself and the other two of whom shall be the two circuit judges next in order of seniority to himself, to hear and determine the appeal in such case and it shall be the duty of the judges so designated to assign the case for argument at the earliest practicable date and to participate in the determination thereof and the decision of the three circuit judges, or of a majority in number thereof, shall be final and there shall be no review of such decision by appeal or certiorari or otherwise.

"If, by reason of death or otherwise, any of said three circuit judges shall be unable to participate in the decision of said case, any such vacancy or vacancies shall be filed by the senior circuit judge by designating one or more other circuit judges of the said circuit next in order of seniority and, if there be none such available, he shall fill any such vacancy or vacancies by designating one or more circuit judges from another circuit or circuits, designating, in each case the oldest available circuit judge, in order of seniority, in the circuit from which he is selected, such designation to be only with the consent of the senior circuit judge of any such other circuit.

"This amendment shall apply to every case pending before the Supreme Court of the United States on or after the date of enactment of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903, chapter 544, be amended to read as follows:

" 'In every suit in equity brought in any district court of the United States under any of said acts, wherein the United States is complainant, an appeal from the final decree of the district court will lie only to the Supreme Court and must be taken within 60 days from the entry thereof: *Provided, however*, That if, upon any such appeal, it shall be found that, by reason of disqualification, there shall not be a quorum of Justices of the Supreme Court qualified to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, then, in lieu of a decision by the Supreme Court, the case shall be immediately sent by the Supreme Court to the circuit court of appeals of the circuit in which is located the district in which the suit was brought and it shall be the duty of the senior circuit judge of said circuit court of appeals, qualified to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, to designate immediately three circuit judges of said court, one of whom shall be himself and the other two of whom shall be the two circuit judges next in order of seniority to himself, to hear and determine the appeal in such case and it shall be the duty of the court, so comprised, to assign the case for argument at the earliest practicable date and to hear and determine the same, and the decision of the three circuit judges so designated, or of a majority in number thereof, shall be final and there shall be no review of such decision by appeal or certiorari or otherwise.

" 'If, by reason of death or otherwise, any of said three circuit judges shall be unable to participate in the decision of said case, any such vacancy or vacancies shall be filled by the senior circuit judge by designating one or more other circuit judges of the said circuit next in order of seniority and, if there be none such available, he shall fill any such vacancy or vacancies by designating one or more circuit judges from another circuit or circuits, designating, in each case, the oldest available circuit judge, in order of seniority, in the circuit from which he is selected, such designation to be only with the consent of the senior circuit judge of any such other circuit.'

"This amendment shall apply to every case pending before the Supreme Court of the United States on or after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar for today.

PENSIONS TO CERTAIN UNREMARRIED DEPENDENT WIDOWS OF CIVIL WAR VETERANS WHO WERE MARRIED TO THE VETERAN SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 26, 1905

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 86) to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the dependent unremarried widow of a Civil War veteran who is barred from the receipt of pension because her marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to June 26, 1905, but who is otherwise entitled to such pension either under the act of May 1, 1920 (41 Stat. 585), or under the act of June 9, 1930 (46 Stat. 528), shall be entitled to pension in her own right under said acts at the rates and under the conditions specified therein and to the additional pension provided for minor and helpless children in the act of May 1, 1920, provided she married the veteran 10 years prior to his death and lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death except where there was a separation which was due to misconduct of or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow: *Provided*, That if pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child of the veteran or to a child or children of the veteran under 16 years of age, the widow shall not be entitled to the pension authorized in this act until the pension to the child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and when these conditions are fulfilled and the pension is granted to the widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; except that in the event the amount being paid to such child or children is less than the amount authorized to the widow by this act, then the difference between said amounts will be paid to the widow: *Provided further*, That no pension shall be payable under this act to a widow under 60 years of age.

SEC. 2. Payment of pension as provided by this act shall be effective from the date of receipt of application in the Veterans' Administration, in the form prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but not prior to the date of enactment of this act. Pension under this act shall not be paid to the widow of a veteran of the Civil War who has remarried either once or more than once, and upon the remarriage of such a widow her pension shall be terminated. The penal and forfeiture provisions of the pension laws providing pensions for veterans of the Civil War and their widows and dependents shall be applicable to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. No agent, attorney, or other person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of the necessary papers in the application to the Veterans' Administration for benefits under this act. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for such preparation or assistance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 86, is similar to bills that were reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions during the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses. Both bills were passed by the House without amendment or dissenting vote, and both bills were favorably reported by the Committee on Pensions of the United States Senate, but failed of enactment prior to the adjournment of the Congresses.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This bill has for its purpose the granting of service pensions to a restricted group of Civil War widows who are not now eligible for service pensions because they were not married to the veteran prior to June 27, 1905.

Under existing service-pension laws, a widow of a Civil War veteran, if married to the veteran prior to June 27, 1905, may receive pension at the rate of $30 per month if under 70 years of age, $40 per month to those 70 years of age or over, or $50 per month if married to the veteran during his Civil War service. Under the existing laws, remarriage of the widow subsequent to the death of the veteran is no bar to the receipt of pension if the subsequent remarriage was terminated or the remarriages were terminated without fault on the part of the widow. Under the provisions of this bill, if the widow has remarried subsequent to the veteran's death, she would be barred from receipt of pension thereunder. The provisions of existing law do not require that the widow show dependency. The bill requires that dependency be shown under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Under existing laws, as heretofore stated, pension is payable to a widow under 60 years of age, whereas under this bill it is required that the widow be at least 60 years of age in order to be eligible to receive benefits thereunder.

Under the provisions of this bill, a new group of widows would become eligible notwithstanding the present marriage delimiting date, June 27, 1905, and receive pension if otherwise entitled under the service-pension laws if marriage to the veteran occurred at least 10 years prior to the veteran's death and the widow had lived with the veteran continuously from the date of their marriage to the date of the veteran's death, except in those instances where separation is clearly the fault of the veteran.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

If this bill is enacted into law in its present form, the conditions on which award will be predicated are as follows:

First. No pension is payable under the act unless the widow is 60 years of age.

Second. Marriage to the veteran must have occurred at least 10 years prior to his death.

Third. The widow must have lived with the veteran continuously from the date of marriage to the date of the veteran's death, except in those instances where a separation is clearly the fault of the veteran.

Fourth. Dependency must be shown. This showing will be based upon regulations to be drafted by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and will presumably conform to the criteria now in force with respect to the dependency of mothers and fathers who are claimants for pension or compensation.

Fifth. The widow must have remained the lawful widow of the veteran. If she has remarried subsequent to his death, she is barred from receipt of pension under terms of the bill.

Sixth. The widow may not be granted pension while the veteran's child or children either helpless or under the age of 16 years are on the pension rolls, unless it is shown that the child or children are in her care and custody. However, if the rate being paid the child or children is less than that the widow would receive if the child or children were in her care, then any difference may be paid her.

Seventh. The widow will be barred from receiving pension if she is found to be living in open and notorious adulterous cohabitation subsequent to the veteran's death.

Eighth. The veteran must have served 90 days or more in the Civil War, or if he served less than 90 days, must have been discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

The Veterans' Administration furnished the revised estimate to the committee as to the cost, and it is estimated that approximately 2,000 new cases would be eligible for pension at the cost of approximately $960,000 for the first year. There are also 400 widows now pensioned under special acts that would be entitled under the provisions of this bill, and it is estimated that the cost would be $44,000 for the first year. The total estimated annual cost would be approximately $1,004,000, affecting 2,400 widows. However, the Veterans' Administration has informed the committee that, based upon their experience, it is not likely that more than one-half of the new cases will apply the first year, which would reduce the estimated cost for the first year to $524,000, affecting 1,400 widows.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE LEGISLATION

There has been recently approved a Spanish War pension bill, which advanced the marriage date from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938. There was also approved an Indian war pension bill that contained this provision, identical with this bill—namely, that a dependent unremarried widow, in order to secure pension, must have attained the age of 60 years and was married to the veteran 10 or more years prior to his

death. Prior to the enactment of this law, widows of Indian war veterans who married subsequent to March 3, 1917, were denied a service pension.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two respects, in one to include some correspondence I have had with Secretary Stimson, and in the other to include a short poem about Mr. South Trimble on his birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain brief newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project and include therein three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include therein two editorials from the Chicago Times and another editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE IN THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4115) to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed, with the amendments adopted by the committee.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Veterans' Preference Act of 1944."

SEC. 2. In certification for appointment, in appointment, in reinstatement, in reemployment, and in retention in civilian positions in all establishments, agencies, bureaus, administrations, projects, and departments of the Government, permanent or temporary, and in either (a) the classified civil service; (b) the unclassified civil service; (c) any temporary or emergency establishment, agency, bureau, administration, project, and department created by acts of Congress or Presidential Executive order; and (d) the civil service of the District of Columbia, preference shall be given to (1) those ex-service men and women who have served honorably in any branch of the armed forces of the United States who have established the present existence of a service-connected disability or who are receiving compensation, disability retirement benefits, or pension by reason of public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the War Department or the Navy Department; (2) the wives of such service-connected disabled ex-servicemen and the husbands of such service-connected disabled ex-servicewomen as have themselves been unable to qualify for any civil-service appointment; (3) the unmarried widows of deceased ex-servicemen who served honorably in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized), the widowers of any deceased ex-servicewomen who have served honorably in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized) who are supporting any children under 18 years of age of such deceased ex-servicewomen; and (4) those honorably discharged ex-service men and women who have served in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized).

SEC. 3. In all examinations to determine the qualifications of applicants for entrance into the service 10 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (1), (2), and (3), and 5 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (4) of this act: *Provided*, That in examinations for the positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians competition shall be restricted to persons entitled to preference under this act as long as persons entitled to preference are available and during the present war and for a period of 5 years following the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President or by a concurrent resolution of the Congress for such other positions as may from time to time be determined by the President.

SEC. 4. In examinations where experience is an element of qualification, time spent in the military or naval service of the United States shall be credited in a veteran's rating where his or her actual employment in a similar vocation to that for which he or she is examined was interrupted by such military or naval service. In all examinations to determine the qualifications of a veteran applicant, credit shall be given for all valuable experience, including experience gained in religious, civic, welfare, service, and organizational activities, regardless of whether any compensation was received therefor.

SEC. 5. In determining qualifications for examination, appointment, promotion, retention, transfer, or reinstatement, with respect to preference eligibles, the Civil Service Commission or other examining agency shall waive requirements as to age, height, and weight, provided any such requirement is not essential to the performance of the duties of the position for which examination is given. The Civil Service Commission or other examining agency, after giving due consideration to the recommendation of any accredited physician in the service of the United States, shall waive the physical requirements in the case of any veteran, provided such veteran is, in the opinion of the Civil Service Commission or other examining agency, physically able to discharge efficiently the duties of the position for which the examination is given. No minimum educational requirement will be prescribed in any civil-service examination except for such scientific, technical, or professional positions the duties of which the Civil Service Commission decides cannot be performed by a person who does not have such education. The Commission shall make a part of its public records its reasons for such decision.

SEC. 6. Preference eligibles shall not be subject to the provisions of section 9 of the Civil Service Act concerning two or more members of family in the service, or to the provisions of section 2 of that act concerning apportionment of appointments in the Government departments in the District of Columbia among the several States and Territories according to population, but may be required to furnish evidence of residence and domicile.

SEC. 7. The names of preference eligibles shall be entered on the appropriate registers or lists of eligibles in accordance with their respective augmented ratings, and the name of a preference eligible shall be entered ahead of all others having the same rating: *Provided*, That, except for positions in the professional and scientific services for which the entrance salary is over $3,000 per annum, the names of all qualified preference eligibles, entitled to 10 points in addition to their earned ratings, shall be placed at the top of the appropriate civil-service register or employment list, in accordance with their respective augmented ratings.

SEC. 8. When, in accordance with civil-service laws and rules, a nominating or appointing officer shall request certification of eligibles for appointment purposes, the Civil Service Commission shall certify, from the top of the appropriate register of eligibles, a number of names sufficient to permit the nominating or appointing officer to consider at least three names in connection with each vacancy. The nominating or appointing officer shall make selection for each vacancy from not more than the highest three names available for appointment on such certification, unless objection shall be made, and sustained by the Commission, to one or more of the persons certified, for any proper and adequate reason, as may be prescribed in the rules promulgated by the Civil Service Commission: *Provided*, That an appointing officer who passes over a veteran eligible and selects a nonveteran shall file with the Civil Service Commission his reasons in writing for so doing, which shall become a part of the record of such veteran eligible, and shall be made available upon request to the veteran or his designated representative; the Civil Service Commission is directed to determine the sufficiency of such submitted reasons and, if found insufficient, shall require such appointing officer to submit more detailed information in support thereof; the findings of the Civil Service Commission as to the sufficiency or insufficiency of such reasons shall be transmitted to and considered by such appointing officer, and a copy thereof shall be sent to the veteran eligible or to his designated representative upon request therefor: *Provided further*, That if, upon certification, reasons deemed sufficient by the Civil Service Commission for passing over his name shall three times have been given by an appointing officer, certification of his name for appointment may thereafter be discontinued, prior notice of which shall be sent to the veteran eligible. Whenever in the Postal Service two or more substitutes are appointed on the same day, they shall be promoted to the regular force in the order in which their names appeared on the civil-service register from which they were originally appointed, whenever there are substitutes of the required sex who are eligible and will accept, unless such vacancies are filled by transfer or reinstatement.

SEC. 9. In the unclassified Federal, and District of Columbia, civil service, and in all other positions and employment hereinbefore referred to in (c) of section 2 hereof, the nominating or appointing officer or employing official shall make selection from the qualified applicants in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. The Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to hold an examination, during the next succeeding quarterly period, for any position to which any appointment has been made within the preceding 3 years, for any person included under

section 2 (1), (2), and (3) of this act upon application for examination for any such position.

SEC. 11. The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to promulgate appropriate rules and regulations for the administration and enforcement of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 12. In any reduction in personnel in any civilian service of any Federal agency, competing employees shall be released in accordance with Civil Service Commission regulations which shall give due effect to tenure of employment, military preference, length of service, and efficiency ratings: *Provided*, That the length of time spent in active service in the armed forces of the United States of each such employee shall be credited in computing length of total service: *Provided further*, That preference employees whose efficiency ratings are "good" or better shall be retained in preference to all other competing employees and that preference employees whose efficiency ratings are below "good" shall be retained in preference to competing nonpreference employees who have equal or lower efficiency ratings: *And provided further*, That when any or all of the functions of any agency are transferred to, or when any agency is replaced by, some other agency, or agencies, all preference employees in the function or functions transferred or in the agency which is replaced by some other agency shall first be transferred to the replacing agency, or agencies, for employment in positions for which they are qualified, before such agency, or agencies, shall appoint additional employees from any other source for such positions.

SEC. 13 Any preference eligible who has resigned or who has been dismissed or furloughed may, at the request of any appointing officer, be certified for, and appointed to, any position for which he may be eligible in the civil service, Federal, or District of Columbia, or in any establishment, agency, bureau, administration, project, or department, temporary or permanent.

SEC. 14. No permanent or indefinite preference eligible, who has completed a probationary or trial period employed in the civil service, or in any establishment, agency, bureau, administration, project, or department, hereinbefore referred to shall be discharged, suspended for more than 30 days, furloughed without pay, reduced in rank or compensation, or debarred for future appointment except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose discharge, suspension for more than 30 days, furlough without pay, or reduction in rank or compensation is sought shall have at least 30 days' advance written notice (except where there is rea onable cause to believe the employee to be guilty of a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed), stating any and all reasons, specifically and in detail, for any such proposed action; such preference eligible shall be allowed a reasonable time for answering the same personally and in writing, and for furnishing affidavits in support of such answer, and shall have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from an adverse decision of the administrative officer so acting, such appeal to be made in writing within a reasonable length of time after the date of receipt of notice of such adverse decision: *Provided*, That such preference eligible shall have the right to make a personal appearance, or an appearance through a designated representative, in accordance with such reasonable rules and regulations as may be issued by the Civil Service Commission; after investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Civil Service Commission shall submit its findngs and recommendations to the proper administrative officer and shall send copies of same to the appellant or to his designated representative: *Provided further*, That the Civil Service Commission may declare any such preference eligible who may have been dismissed or furloughed without pay to be eligible for the provisions of section 15 hereof.

SEC. 15. Any preference eligible, who has been furloughed, or separated without delinquency or misconduct, upon request, shall have his name placed on all appropriate civil-service registers and/or on all employment lists, for every position for which his qualifications have been established, as maintained by the Civil Service Commission, or as shall be maintained by any agency or project of the Federal Government, or of the District of Columbia, in the order as provided in section 7 hereof, and shall then be eligible for recertification and reappointment in the order and according to the procedure as provided for in sections 7 and 8 hereof. No appointment shall be made from an examination register of eligibles when there are three or more names of preference eligibles on any appropriate reemployment list for the position to be filled.

SEC. 16. Any preference eligible who has resigned shall, upon request to the Civil Service Commission, have his name again placed on all proper civil-service registers for which he may have been qualified, in the order as provided for in section 7 hereof, and shall then be eligible for recertification and reappointment in the order, and according to the procedure, as provided for in sections 7 and 8 hereof.

SEC. 17. The term "Civil Service Commission" or "Commission" as used in this act shall mean the present United States Civil Service Commission or any body or person who may by law succeed to its powers and duties, or any of them, or which or who may be designated by law to perform any specific duty and possess any specific power concerning matters covered by this act.

SEC. 18. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions hereof are hereby modified to conform herewith, and this act shall not be construed to take away from any preference eligible any rights heretofore granted to, or possessed by, him under any existing law, Executive order, civil-service rule or regulation, of any department of the Government or officer thereof.

SEC. 19. It shall be the authority and duty of the Civil Service Commission in all cases under the classified civil service to make and enforce appropriate rules and regulations to carry into full effect the provisions, intent, and purpose of this act and such Executive orders as may be issued pursuant thereto and in furtherance thereof.

SEC. 20. Nothing contained in this act is intended to apply to any position or appointment which by the Congress is required to be confirmed by, or made with, the advice and consent of the United States Senate: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this act shall apply to appointments under Public Law No. 720, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, approved June 25, 1938.

SEC. 21. If any part of this act shall be found to be unconstitutional, the rest of it shall be considered as in full force and effect.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], the author of the bill.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, from the very inception of our Republic our Government has extended certain special benefits and privileges to the men who have offered their lives in the defense of the country and its institutions. This is a sound principle. Those who are selected from among us to wear the uniform and to serve the country on the firing line are certainly entitled, when peace has been won through their efforts, to be selected and given special consideration and preference in employment by their Government in peacetimes. That is a reward to an American who has willingly and gladly offered his life in an effort to save and to sanctify for us the principles of government under which we live, and which by their sterling efforts is being handed on to posterity.

Most of the provisions of this particular bill have been in practice for a number of years. Since World War No. 1 various Executive and administrative orders have extended to veterans throughout this country privileges in Government services. However, it is a matter of regret to me that the Congress has not heretofore established by law preference to veterans in Government employment. This is the first step in that direction. We are laying down a broad, general policy, and in some instances we are being quite specific in this bill in providing preference for veterans in Government. The biggest problem in the post-war period is providing jobs for able-bodied American citizens who have served in the armed forces. Jobs by which they can support themselves and their families; jobs which will permit them to retain their self-respect and feel that the country for which they have offered their all has not failed them.

When this war is over and our boys come home they should not be forced to tramp the streets looking for jobs, nor to live on charity. There should be a job ready and waiting in private enterprise or with the Government, Federal, State, and local, for every American fighting man when he comes home when victory has been won.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I understand this bill presents for the first time recognition for the women as veterans.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. And that this bill will apply the same to both men and women.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct, and I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for bringing the matter to my attention. This bill does, for the first time, recognize the principle of preference for women in service and for the husbands or widowers of the ex-servicewomen.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I commend the gentleman and his committee on the timely steps that are being taken

in this measure. As I understand it, it is a qualifying, all-embracing measure, and I think the gentleman deserves a lot of credit for it.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the three great veterans' organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, have endorsed and recommended this legislation for passage.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can the gentleman inform me whether or not under this bill the men who receive a blue discharge are entitled to receive veterans' preference, or is it limited simply to those with an honorable discharge?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. It is limited to those who have honorably served, as I recall the provisions of the bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. The blue discharge is a discharge neither with honor nor without honor. The gentleman says this is limited to those men who are honorably discharged?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is my recollection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I believe this is a very splendid bill. I am also sure it will receive the support of all the Members. However, I hope the distinguished author of the bill will point out for the benefit of the record wherein this bill gives added privileges or rights to male veterans. The gentlewoman from Ohio has made mention of the fact that women are now admitted, which is certainly the right and proper thing to do. There are some of us who have not been able to read the record in its entirety. I should like to know if this bill changes or alters the present laws, or in what respect it adds to existing law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The history of the present legislation is that for the past 8 years, originally as a member of the Committee on the Civil Service of the House and as a member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I sponsored for them at their request bills providing veterans' preference. Three hearings have been held upon the bills which they have requested me to introduce. Finally they came to a complete and unanimous agreement on this bill, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, the three major veterans' organizations. This bill has the unanimous support of the House Committee on the Civil Service and it has support of the President of the United States as expressed in a letter addressed to the chairman of this committee.

If you will refer to pages 3 and 4 of the committee report, you will find the comments of the committee with respect to the chief additions to existing rules and regulations with reference to preference extended to veterans.

Section 2 defines the groups or classes of veterans to whom preference is to be granted. It includes for the first time the husbands and widowers of service-connected disabled ex-servicewomen, because, as we know, this is the first time the Congress has recognized the status of women as ex-servicewomen in serving their country. They have done a magnificent job, as usual.

Section 3, in addition to carrying into law the present provisions of the civil-service rules providing for the addition of 10 points for disabled veterans and 5 points for others, provides that as long as persons entitled to preference are available, civil-service appointments for certain classes of positions, such as guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians, shall be available exclusively to veterans. We go one step further in that we authorize the President during this war and for a period of 5 years after the cessation of hostilities to set aside for the exclusive appointment of veterans certain types or classes of Government jobs.

In section 6 we waive the right of apportionment which has been set up in the Civil Service Act, under which jobs are apportioned to the District of Columbia and the various States and Territories according to population. We waive that provision with reference to the appointment of veterans, and we go further and waive section 9 of the Civil Service Act of 1883, concerning two or more members of a family in the service. In other words, we waive that provision of the original Civil Service Act which states that two or more members of a family shall not serve, and permit any number of veterans in the same family to obtain Government employment.

In section 7 we exempt to a certain extent from the provisions of this act preference for specially skilled jobs where the salaries are over $3,000 per annum. However, less than 1 percent of Government employees are presently affected by that, and in normal times it would probably be less than 1 percent.

In section 8 we provide that when a veteran is passed over by an appointing agency the appointing officer must file his reasons in writing with the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service Commission must make an investigation, and that the objections or reasons for failure to appoint a veteran who has been passed over must be made available to that veteran or to his representative upon request. That is new, and it strengthens the provision with reference to veterans' preference.

Section 12 provides for procedure in any reduction in personnel in any civilian service of any Federal agency, specific provisions appearing with respect to the preferred status of veterans in retention. Provision is also made in this section directing that when any or all of the functions of any agency are transferred to, or when any agency is replaced by, some other agency, or agencies, all preference employees in the function or functions transferred or in the agency which is replaced by some other agency shall first be transferred to the replacing agency, or agencies, for employment in positions for which they are qualified, before such agency, or agencies, shall appoint additional employees from any other source for such positions.

Section 14 gives special preferences to veterans in the way of prior notice before they are discharged, suspended for more than 30 days, furloughed without pay, reduced in rank or compensation, or debarred for future appointment except for such cause as shall promote the efficiency of the service and for reasons given in writing. This section gives such a preference eligible the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from an adverse decision of any administrative officer, with the further right of making a personal appearance or an appearance through a designated representative, in accordance with the rules and regulations as may be issued by the Civil Service Commission.

Sections 15 and 16 relate to the preference granted veteran eligibles in connection with appropriate civil-service registers.

Section 20 provides that this proposal would not apply to positions where Senate confirmation is required; however, it would apply to postmaster appointments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration, H. R. 4155, and known as the veterans' preference bill, continues the law and Executive orders that have been in effect for a number of years providing for veterans' preference in governmental employment. This bill also provides additional features that are of special interest to World War veterans, their wives, and dependents. This legislation includes for the first time, husbands and widowers of service-connected disabled ex-servicewomen.

In addition to continuing the present rules providing for the extension of 5 points for nondisability preference and 10 points disability preference, it gives veterans first priority for positions of guard, elevator operator, messenger, and custodian positions, as far as they can be filled by ex-service men and women. This list could be extended to include a number of additional positions for which servicemen and servicewomen could qualify without difficulty, especially when there are vacancies in such positions.

One of the most important provisions in this bill requires that when an appointing officer passes over a veteran eligible, and selects someone who is not a veteran, then such officer shall file with the Civil Service Commission his reasons for so doing and the veteran shall be entitled to a copy thereof. The veteran also

will have a right to an appeal from this decision.

This measure, as you have been advised, has the approval of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the disabled veterans organizations. The bill, as I have suggested at the beginning, strengthens and improves veterans' legislation heretofore passed by Congress.

I believe this legislation will meet with the approval of both Houses of this Congress. In fact, I have heard little objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a consensus of opinion and rightly so, that veterans should be given preference for jobs in industry and business as well as in Government when they are released from the armed forces. Industry and business as well as the Government have assured members of the armed forces they shall have the first right to their former jobs just as far as can be done when the war is over. Our Government should lead the way in the protection of that right.

Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation could go still further and give the veteran a chance to compete for positions that have been filled in any agency of the Government since the emergency was declared, whether that position be in an old-line agency or in what may be described as a war agency. In other words, where a position is continued when the war is over and has been filled by a nonservice man or woman, such position shall be open for a veteran who can qualify for such job. I believe this to be fair for the reason that the person now holding such position understood when he or she came into the service that it was for the "duration and 6 months thereafter." If such legislation were enacted, it would give a chance for a good many deserving veterans to compete and qualify for a number of Government positions that may not come under this act. I think the House could very well give favorable consideration to such legislation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Perhaps I do not understand this legislation correctly. Is this the way it works? If the Government should advertise for an electrical engineer or a certified public accountant, and a number of people took the examination, the top three veterans would get the positions regardless of whether they were electrical engineers or certified public accountants, or whatever the skill was that was required.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The veteran would have to take the competitive examination. He does now. That situation is not changed in this bill.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But if their marks were only 10 and the highest marks were 90, whoever were the three top veterans would be in line to get the jobs and nudge out the people who were qualified?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; that is not right, and that is not in the bill.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The veteran in order to pass has to get a grade of at least 60. Then he gets a 5- or 10-percent preference, as the case may be, added to his grade. Then his name goes to the top of the list with others who have passed the examination, and he competes with others who qualified.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But if he got 70 percent with his preference, he would knock out a man who got 80 percent; is that right? He could do that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct; he does go to the top of the list by reason of the preference granted. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who also takes a deep interest in veterans' legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is not this very much in line with the veterans-preference laws already on the statute books in many of our States?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; it is. As a matter of fact, it changes the present veterans-preference laws very little in the respect suggested by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This guarantees the soldier a job after the war is over when the soldier returns who has been willing to fight for his country on the fighting front.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right, as I suggested a few moments ago; I think it is generally understood, and it has been stated on the floor of the House, that veterans ought to have the first chance for jobs when they return from the service. I believe we ought to go one step further, and let the United States Government set the pace in that regard. If the Government does not protect these servicemen with respect to getting jobs, then we are not in very good shape to ask industry and business to give them preference for jobs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Personally, I think we could go even further than the bill goes in giving these men opportunities for jobs. I think that as to all war jobs that have been created since the beginning of the emergency, if they are retained after the war, servicemen and servicewomen should have a chance for those places if they can qualify for them.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman has stated that this bill embarks upon a new principle in that it makes available to a man whose wife has a service-connected disability, a civil-service preference. Is it specifically written in the bill that the husband must be dependent upon the wife for his livelihood in order for him to be eligible for the preference, or is the fact of marriage sufficient?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The bill provides that husbands of women veterans who have service-connected disabilities shall have the same preference as is accorded wives of men who have service-connected disabilities, and that widowers have the same preference as widows in such cases.

Mr COLE of New York. But it is the opinion of the gentleman and the opinion of the committee that for a man to qualify for a preference under this bill he must be dependent upon the wife, who likewise must have a service-connected disability?

Mr. REES of Kansas. His wife, an ex-servicewoman with service-connected disability, is the dependent. There is the further provision, that if the husband of an ex-servicewoman is supporting a child of such woman, then he is entitled to preference.

Mr. COLE of New York. He must establish some degree of dependency on the woman veteran?

Mr. REES of Kansas. A dependency must be established.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is, dependency either through himself or by virtue of their children?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] offered the amendment in the committee. I shall yield time to Mr. LAFOLLETTE so he can further explain it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all for this legislation. I want to ask the gentleman one question. In what degree is greater consideration given to a disabled veteran than to another veteran except the five points additional preference?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not any in this legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the whole sum and substance of it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, so far as the disabled veteran is concerned. Except as I have pointed out, both classes of veterans do have advantages under this bill, but the advantages under this bill are the same.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understood the disabled veteran would come on the list ahead of the veteran that was not disabled.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not necessarily.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not necessarily?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is, unless the five points give him that position? Is that right?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I shall be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio, who has also manifested a deep interest in legislation for the benefit of veterans.

Mrs. BOLTON. Did the committee define the real meaning and interpretation of "veteran"? I think all of us are beginning to have a doubt in our minds as to when a man becomes a veteran, because some of them who have been discharged from the Army are being taken back into the Army. Now, when do they become veterans?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The House Committee on Civil Service did not give consideration to that matter. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has called attention to a very important problem, and one to which this House should give consideration in the near future. The situation to which she directs attention should be clarified.

Mrs. BOLTON. It would be very interesting if we did have some definition of that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman whether it is not now the law that a disabled veteran goes to the top of the list if he passes an examination?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And whether that would not be continued under this legislation?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It certainly would. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman. What I wanted to explain is that whatever further advantages as are provided under this legislation apply to both classes of servicemen. The advantage of the disabled veteran over the able serviceman under the present law is not changed by this bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor of these two amendments for the benefit of the women who are now serving. You will note in the bill that there are four different categories in which veterans are given preference. The first and the fourth provide equally for men and women. The second, as originally written, provided that the wife of a disabled service-connected veteran should get preference if, because of his disability, he himself could not pass the examination. It seemed to me it was also proper to protect the disabled service-connected woman by permitting her husband, who is supporting her, to get the preference in the same way, because it really runs to the woman. And it is the same with the amendment to subdivision three. This amendment provides that if a disabled, service-connected woman dies then her husband, or whoever was living with her, her widower, who is supporting her children under 18, can then have preference as long as he supports her children. In other words, it runs to the benefit of the woman and the children.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem manifestly unfair unless we take care of the women and children, because after the war is over it is going to be especially difficult to secure employment?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. It applies to the women as well as the men.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand in the case of a husband securing a preference, there must be dependency existing?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes. First, his wife must not be able to pass the examination herself because of disability. We do that now for the wife of a disabled service-connected man when she gets a preference if her husband is so badly injured that he cannot pass the examination. Under my amendment to subdivision two, the woman in the service has the same right; if she is terribly disabled, her husband gets a preference, not because it runs to the man, but because it helps to support her.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, too, in case he is supporting her child, that would constitute dependency under the provisions of this act.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. That is right, as long as he supports her children under 18 years of age. Again, that gives this woman some assurance that her children will be taken care of. If she bears children, they are closer to her and if she dies the husband who survives her, as long as he supports her children, gets the preference until they become 18 years of age.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it is a splendid amendment. I think this is a good bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman stated that the husband of a woman veteran or any man who might be supporting her children would be eligible for this preference?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. What I was trying to say is this. Suppose a woman is married and has children and then the father died but the woman married again and then she died; if the man she married the second time continued to support her children until they became 18 years of age, he gets a preference. In other words, the benefit goes to her direct line, from the woman to her children.

Mr. COLE of New York. But it is not necessary to have an established marital status between the man and woman in order that he might get a preference?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Only that there be children.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is that the only criterion or must there be a marital status?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. He must be her widower.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Was it the committee's thought that this increased the opportunities for marriage among women who had served in the armed forces?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I will say to the gentlewoman from Illinois, to some extent it was my thought that they are entitled to it, and I am sure the gentlewoman from Illinois would be glad to come under it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is not the real purpose of the gentleman's amendment to keep the veteran's family intact as much as possible?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Exactly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I just wish to say a few words with reference to this bill. For several years the Committee on the Civil Service has had legislation of this type pending, but this is the first time the major veterans' organizations have agreed to it. That is the main reason, I would say, why we have not heretofore tried to legislate. It will be noted on page 7 of the report that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans have agreed on this legislation. Those are the major veterans' organizations.

In addition to that, this legislation has the approval of the Civil Service Commission and it has the approval of the President of the United States. It is true, Mr. Speaker, this act does not make a great many changes in the present veterans' preference, which exists largely by Executive order, but it is important, I think, that those Executive orders be given legislative status by the Congress.

It does give some additional strength to the veterans' preference, by strengthening the Executive orders now in existence. For the first time it includes the husbands and widowers of service-connected disabled women. It also gives absolute preference to veterans in examinations for the position of guard, elevator operator, messenger and custodian, as long as preference eligibles are available. It also gives the right to assign other groups of positions for a period of 5 years, to veterans only; which is a rather important provision in view of the situation that has prevailed. It strengthens the law as to passing over veterans, so that a veteran himself, or his designated representative, may know what the reason is. That is one of the things the veterans themselves have been very much interested in.

I think this is a sane law, and yet it is no more than the men who are fighting for the freedom of our people in this country are entitled to and should have.

I hope there will not be a single vote against this bill.

I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of H. R. 4115, a bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed, and I urge the

passage of this veterans' preference bill, which has the support of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled World War Veterans.

At this time I urge the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to favorably report out H. R. 4057 to the House for action.

I favor this legislation because this Nation of ours has trained 12,000,000 fighting men to destroy and kill. They have been taken away from schools, colleges, and jobs. Their home life has been broken up, and they have turned into hard, tough soldiers and sailors, yes, the best in the world.

Gentlemen, this war will not go on forever. One of these days it will be over; I pray soon.

We will then face a tremendous problem. It will be a problem of returning all these fighting men and women, too, back into normal channels of civilian life. This is a most important problem because it affects 10 percent of our entire population. It is the most vigorous 10 percent of the Nation—the young men and women upon whom the future welfare of this country will depend. Every effort must be made that nothing will interfere with the physical and economic development of this segment of our people.

It is, therefore, a problem that must be solved well, and not in a haphazard, hit-and-miss manner, but must also be solved with understanding and sympathy because it is first of all a great human problem.

Yet the solution will not be easy. As I said previously, these millions of men have been taught how to destroy and kill. Now we have to retrain them how to build and live.

They will be coming back at a time when the country's national economy may be under terrific strain, when millions now employed in war production may be laid off, plants may shut down; no one can accurately predict the shape of those things to come.

But one prediction can be made with certainty. The millions of men and women returning from the war fronts and camps will need jobs, money, training, hospitalization, and other assistance. They will expect stability and security, so that they can start rebuilding their private lives.

We must give them all that. It is the least we can do for them because they will have given us continued freedom and liberty.

All this calls for being ready for a sound and orderly program. It must be a program that is fair alike to veterans and taxpayers. Such a program is needed now because men and women already are being discharged from the armed forces by the thousands every day. This is not only a major post-war program, it is also a today program.

It is my opinion that the American Legion has prepared such a master plan for demobilization and rehabilitation in its omnibus bill for World War No. 2 veterans—their G. I. bill of rights.

If enacted, this bill will provide a sound, modest, constructive plan for dealing with the entire veteran problem of this war. It will substitute order and system for the chaos and confusion now existing as a dozen different Government agencies are quarreling over control of certain functions for veterans. It will centralize responsibility, reduce red tape, eliminate overlapping services, reduce costs, and, most of all, assure the new veterans of a decent break.

The bill will also prevent a repetition of the tragic mistakes under which World War No. 1 veterans suffered.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I attended a committee meeting this morning at which Mr. Green was present. I wanted to ask about veterans preference on a project of the Government, where a union card is necessary. Would the soldier's preference card, even from us, supersede a union card? Could he have the job, or because he did not have a union card would he be refused?

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman is referring to Government projects, he would be given preference. The Government does not recognize any closed shop agreement, as far as I know. Wherever the Government employs people they have a right to belong to a union, but there is no closed-shop agreement. This bill will give the veterans preference on any jobs where the United States Government, in the executive branch of the Government, is the employer.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. As I understand it, a person now taking a post-office examination, who is going into the service, cannot be considered as eligible for that post office. Does not the gentleman from Georgia feel that that situation should be corrected?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Of course, I am not familiar with the question which the gentleman has asked. I did not know of any such rule existing, but it would not have any effect on this legislation. I will be very glad to look into the question which the gentleman has raised, but it does not affect this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 88, noes none.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 1, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—312

Abernethy	Gilchrist	Mansfield, Tex.
Allen, La.	Gillespie	Marcantonio
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillette	Martin, Iowa
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gillie	Martin, Mass.
Andresen, August H.	Goodwin	Mason
Andrews, N. Y.	Gordon	May
Angell	Gossett	Merritt
Arends	Graham	Merrow
Arnold	Grant, Ala.	Michener
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	Miller, Conn.
Barden	Gregory	Miller, Mo.
Barrett	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Barry	Gwynne	Miller, Pa.
Beall	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mills
Beckworth	Hall, Leonard W.	Monkiewicz
Bell	Halleck	Monroney
Bennett, Mich.	Hare	Mott
Bennett, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	Mundt
Bishop	Harness, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.
Blackney	Hartley	Murray, Wis.
Bland	Heffernan	Norman
Bloom	Heidinger	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolton	Hendricks	O'Brien, Mich.
Bonner	Herter	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boykin	Hess	O'Hara
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	O'Konski
Brehm	Hinshaw	O'Toole
Brooks	Hobbs	Outland
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	Pace
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Patman
Brumbaugh	Holifield	Patton
Bryson	Holmes, Mass.	Peterson, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Holmes, Wash.	Peterson, Ga.
Burch, Va.	Hope	Pfeifer
Burchill, N. Y.	Howell	Philbin
Burgin	Hull	Pittenger
Busbey	Izac	Ploeser
Byrne	Jackson	Plumley
Camp	Jeffrey	Poage
Canfield	Jennings	Poulson
Capozzoli	Johnson, Anton J.	Powers
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson, Calvin D.	Pracht, C. Frederick
Carrier	Johnson, Ind.	Pratt, Joseph M.
Celler	Johnson, J. Leroy	Priest
Church	Johnson, Luther A.	Rabaut
Clason	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Ramey
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Ramspeck
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Randolph
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Rankin
Colmer	Kean	Reece, Tenn.
Compton	Kearney	Reed, Ill.
Cooper	Keefe	Rees, Kans.
Costello	Kelley	Richards
Courtney	Keogh	Robertson
Cox	Kilburn	Robinson, Utah
Cravens	Kilday	Robsion, Ky.
Crawford	King	Rockwell
Crosser	Kinzer	Rodgers, Pa.
Cunningham	Kirwan	Rogers, Calif.
Curley	Kleberg	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis	Klein	Rohrbough
D'Alesandro	Knutson	Rowan
Davis	LaFollette	Rowe
Dawson	Lambertson	Sabath
Day	Lanham	Satterfield
Delaney	Larcade	Scanlon
Dewey	Lea	Schiffler
Dickstein	LeCompte	Scott
Dilweg	Lemke	Scrivner
Dingell	Lesinski	Short
Dondero	Lewis	Simpson, Pa.
Doughton	Luce	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Ludlow	Smith, Ohio
Eaton	Lynch	Smith, Wis.
Elliott	McConnell	Snyder
Ellis	McCord	Spence
Ellison, Md.	McCormack	Springer
Ellsworth	McCowen	Starnes, Ala.
Elmer	McGehee	Stearns, N. H.
Elston, Ohio	McGregor	Stevenson
Engel, Mich.	McKenzie	Stigler
Feighan	McLean	Stockman
Fish	McMillan	Sullivan
Fisher	McMurray	Sumner, Ill.
Fitzpatrick	Madden	Sumners, Tex.
Flannagan	Magnuson	Sundstrom
Folger	Mahon	Taber
Forand	Maloney	Talbot
Gallagher	Mansfield, Mont.	Talle
Gamble		Tarver
Gathings		Taylor
Gavin		Thomas, N. J.
Gibson		Thomas, Tex.
Gifford		Thomason
		Tibbott

Tolan	Wasielewski	Winstead
Torrens	Weaver	Winter
Towe	Welch	Wolcott
Treadway	Wene	Wolfenden, Pa.
Troutman	West	Wolverton, N. J.
Vincent, Ky.	Whelchel, Ga.	Woodruff, Mich.
Vinson, Ga.	Whitten	Woodrum, Va.
Voorhis, Calif.	Whittington	Worley
Vorys, Ohio	Wickersham	Wright
Vursell	Wigglesworth	Zimmerman
Wadsworth	Willey	
Walter	Wilson	

NAYS—1

Smith, Va.

NOT VOTING—116

Allen, Ill.	Ford	Morrison, La.
Anderson, Calif.	Fulbright	Morrison, N. C.
Andrews, Ala.	Fuller	Mruk
Baldwin, Md.	Fulmer	Murdock
Baldwin, N. Y.	Furlong	Murphy
Bates, Ky.	Gale	Myers
Bates, Mass.	Gearhart	Newsome
Bender	Gerlach	Norrell
Boren	Gore	Norton
Bradley, Pa.	Gorski	O'Connor
Buckley	Granger	O'Neal
Buffett	Green	Phillips
Burdick	Gross	Price
Butler	Hagen	Reed, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Hale	Rivers
Cannon, Mo.	Hancock	Rizley
Carson, Ohio	Harris, Ark.	Rolph
Carter	Harris, Va.	Russell
Case	Hart	Sadowski
Chapman	Hays	Sasscer
Chenoweth	Hébert	Sauthoff
Chiperfield	Hoch	Schwabe
Clark	Horan	Shafer
Clevenger	Jarman	Sheppard
Coffee	Jenkins	Sheridan
Cooley	Jensen	Sikes
Dies	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Ill.
Dirksen	Jones	Slaughter
Disney	Kee	Smith, W. Va.
Douglas	Kefauver	Somers, N. Y.
Drewry	Kennedy	Sparkman
Durham	Kerr	Stanley
Eberharter	Kunkel	Stefan
Engle, Calif.	Landis	Stewart
Fay	Lane	Ward
Fellows	LeFevre	Weichel, Ohio
Fenton	McWilliams	Weiss
Fernandez	Maas	White
Fogarty	Manasco	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Green, with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Hart, with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. O'Neal, with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Hoch, with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Buckley, with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Sparkman, with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Lane, with Mr. Schwabe.
Mr. Manasco, with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Fay, with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Gorski, with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Sadowski, with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Engle of California, with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Ward, with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.
Mr. Boykin, with Mr. Rolph.
Mrs. Norton, with Miss Stanley.
Mr. Sheppard, with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Kennedy, with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama, with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Somers of New York, with Mr. Carson of Ohio.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana, with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Furlong, with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Murdock, with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Chapman, with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Fulbright, with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Newsome, with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Slaughter, with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland, with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania, with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri, with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Drewry, with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Harris of Virginia, with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Jarman, with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Weiss, with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia, with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Kerr, with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Kee, with Mr. Mruk.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 12, 1944.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, has resigned from the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, and I am writing to advise you that I have appointed Hon. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI, of New York, to serve in his place.

Yours very sincerely,
S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article by Gould Lincoln entitled "Sphynx of Albany, Tom Dewey."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed attending a session of the House on last Friday. Had I been present I would have voted for the naval appropriation bill.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 498, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254), to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], to be used as he deems proper, and I yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 4254, reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4254, with the exception of one amendment, simply provides for an extension of the Lend-Lease Act adopted in 1941 for the period of 1 year.

At the hearing before the Rules Committee on the application for a rule it was disclosed that this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The action of the Rules Committee on the pending resolution was unanimous. A splendid report was filed with the bill. It sets forth convincing reasons why the bill should be accepted. If there is doubt in the minds of Members, I would suggest that they obtain a copy of the report from the Clerk's desk. It is brief and informative and would be helpful to you in getting a clear picture of what has been done in administering the Lend-Lease Act.

I notice that the report refers to lend-lease as an essential part of our organization for waging war. I get some degree of satisfaction out of that declaration made by the committee.

Continuing, the report reads as follows:

> Lend-lease has been built into the fabric of the supply arrangements of the United Nations and has been approved, over and over again, a flexible and valuable part of our mobilization for war, serving the needs of our many battle fronts in ways which contribute to the development of sound and harmonious relations with our allies. So long as the war continues—and it is the duty of every civilian officer of the Government, as Mr. Stettinius pointed out, "to work, think, and plan for war until the shooting stops"—the Lend-Lease Act is a military necessity of the first importance.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who will recall that in 1941, when this lend-lease proposal reached the House, I referred to it as an act of war. That statement was rather shocking to some because the country had been educated into the belief that it was a movement in behalf of peace. I think it was along about that time I stated publicly that I regarded both the destroyer transaction and the lend-lease proposal as acts of war. I could not see that they were efforts to maintain peace. We were unprepared for a war that we could not escape. We needed time to prepare. In this report they now acknowledge lend-lease to have been an act of war. There was no disposition, however, on my part to quarrel with those in charge of public affairs and who were insisting that the lend-lease and destroyer transactions were moves on the part of the Government in behalf of peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Some, having much to do with the advancement of these proposals, probably realized that they were in fact acts of war, but because of public sentiment were unable to take that position. Very frankly, I think the President traveled in the direction of war just as rapidly as he could safely afford to without so shocking public sentiment as to get a reaction which would operate as a depressant upon the preparations for war that were then necessarily going on, and of what he has done in waging war I have nothing but praise.

Mr. Speaker, the committee reporting this bill offers an amendment. As to what the House should do with it I make no suggestion. It simply imposes something of a limitation upon the power of the President which the original may have carried. As for myself, I see no objection to the amendment. As a matter of fact, it is my disposition to give it my support, although I have the feeling that there are those who think it ill-advised and will insist that it not be carried in the bill if and when it is finally passed by this House.

I hardly feel that it is necessary to discuss this matter. I am convinced that all Members of Congress realize the importance of the extension of this act and have knowledge of the part it has played in the waging of the war we are now carrying on in all parts of the world. I hope it is adopted without a dissenting vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill extends for 1 year the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act which was approved March 11, 1941. It comes to you with the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Rules.

I believe that in the long time I have been a Member of the Congress and of the House of Representatives we had the most extended and controversial debate on the passage of the original lend-lease legislation. I remember very well that the gentleman from Georgia—and I think he was the only Member of the House to do so—stated at that time that the lend-lease bill was actually an act of war. I further remember complimenting the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] on his intellectual honesty in making that statement, because those of us who opposed the original lend-lease bill always stated that it was a step toward war and those who advocated it said, not all, it was aimed to keep us out of war, and was an act short of war. I spoke repeatedly upon the bill and always said that I opposed it because I felt it was a step to get us into war. Now it is virtually admitted, although it may be an academic question that it was an act of war at that time, as the gentleman from Georgia said. The public did not know it back home or the bill would not have gone through, because the public were not for war.

I remember now—and I have not looked over the bill—one provision in that bill. I am not discussing the question of the merits or demerits of the provision, I am merely pointing out that that provision was an act of war in itself. It provided for the reoutfitting and rebuilding of belligerent battleships and warships of all kinds, a complete repudiation of all international law and of the traditional policy of America laid down by the Alabama Claims case some 70 years ago, and subscribed to by every civilized nation.

There were other parts of that bill also that were acts of war, but the majority leader and everybody else supporting the bill told us it was a measure short of war and that it had for its purpose keeping us out of war. Now we find 3 years later quite to the contrary.

It is not only the gentleman from Georgia who makes such a statement. I have here a similar statement from a distinguished American, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, editor and I believe owner of the New York Times, one of the greatest newspapers in America if not in the world. Speaking a short time ago before some Red Cross gathering, he had this to say:

> I happen to be one of those who believe that we did not go to war because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. I hold rather that we were attacked at Pearl Harbor because we had gone to war when we had made the lend-lease declaration.

That statement has been carried in all the newspapers of the country. I admire his honesty just as much as I admire the intellectual honesty of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wish to make the observation that I agree with the gentleman that Pearl Harbor or no Pearl Harbor, we were in the war. I think we were in the grip of forces over which we had no control. It was because of the feeling that we were being drawn into the war and without the possibility of helping ourselves that I supported lend-lease and the destroyer transaction.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. FISH. I certainly am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Georgia, but I am afraid I have to disagree with the gentleman from New York. I believe there was a sincere effort made, at the time the Lend-Lease Act was passed, to keep us out of war, but I do believe that the inevitable drift of circumstances at that time, which, of course, many of us did not foresee, carried us into war. I do believe that unless we had passed the Lend-Lease Act we would have fought the war, but we would not have had any allies.

Mr. FISH. I am not going to argue as to the merits or demerits of lend-lease as that is today more or less an academic question. I think 80 percent of the American people were very desirous of keeping out of the war until we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. I confess that even after the passage of the Lend-Lease Act I had some hopes we would keep out of this European or world war, which has become a global war since we have entered it. I think most American people hoped that also. But actually, when we passed the original lend-lease bill, according to some of its supporters, they believed we entered the war then and that it was an act of war. I want this question as a matter of historical data to be discussed now and placed in the RECORD. Of course, I have no apologies for my views. I would have done anything in the world to keep out of the war. I do not agree with those who say we would have been involved in this war anyway. The American people were almost united in their determination to stay out of war until or unless we were attacked by Japan or any other nation. After we were attacked in that dastardly and lawless manner at Pearl Harbor the whole Nation was unified, interventionists and noninterventionists alike, and all but one Member of Congress voted for war. All Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, since then have voted for every appropriation to win the war. We all are united and determined, no matter what it costs in blood, money, and tears, to win the war. I am going back to the time we first passed the lend-lease bill, and I am placing in the RECORD statements made by its supporters who now claim it was an act of war when the entire American public and the Congress were told by the proponents of the measure that it was a peace measure to keep us out of the war and who were always saying it was a measure short of war. Now we find, long afterward, that that was not the fact.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would not quarrel with any individual's position prior to Pearl Harbor. I am convinced there was a difference of opinion; in most cases it was an honest difference of opinion. The only quarrel I have with the gentleman from New York is the implication in his remarks that if we did not pass the lend-lease bill we would not have been involved in the war. I maintain we would have been involved in the war, but we would not have had any allies to fight the war with.

Mr. FISH. That is one thing neither I nor the gentleman from Pennsylvania can possibly prove. You are entitled to your views and I am entitled to mine. If we had actually entered the war at the time of the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, it would have been disastrous, as Germany would never have attacked Soviet Russia and we would have held the war bag. I believe that the lend-lease bill and the measures that followed it were all direct steps to war. But today it is not the noninterventionists who were opposed to these measures who are saying it, but those who advocated the lend-lease and other measures who are now saying that the lend-lease virtually was an act of war. And it is not our side, I mean the noninterventionist side, that makes that contention, but it is the proponents of the bill, who were always say-

ing this was a measure short of war and to keep us out of the war, and that it was for America's interest primarily to keep us out of this conflict.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I venture to say that if the gentleman would consult the ideas of Members of Congress who were here when the Lend-Lease Act was passed, that at the time, with the exception of the gentleman from Georgia who was quite frank, and I remember his statement that it was an act of war, most, if not all of the gentlemen beside him were convinced that we might be able to avoid war in that way by bolstering up our allies.

Mr. FISH. I think they made it very clear so far as the public is concerned, in voting for it they voted for it as a peace measure and not a war measure. Many of us, not on this side alone, because it was nonpartisan to that extent, said this is a step toward war and that this would involve us in war. That is why we were opposing it because we wanted to keep out of war. Mind you, we were not opposed to helping England. We were not opposed to giving supplies and arms to England because as I recall now, as I am speaking, I made the motion to recommit, to give $2,000,000,000 to England to buy supplies and weapons in this country in order to protect herself in her hour of need. As a matter of record England did not use under this bill the $2,000,000,000 during the first year. So my proposal, which was voted upon in the motion to recommit on a record vote, was to make that $2,000,000,000 available immediately, showing we wanted to help England, but did not want to get into war by doing so. We knew that if we equipped and repaired belligerent battleships that it was in itself an act of war and a repudiation of every principle of international law and our own American traditions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Does not the gentleman contend that the passage of the Lend-Lease Act was an act of war and that it forced us into the war and that if we had not passed it we would not have been involved in this war?

Mr. FISH. My contention was that it was one of many steps which involved us in the war, which is now admitted by many of its proponents. Those of us who felt differently but wanted to aid England by measures short of war, which was our position, and which at one time was the position of both parties, offered this amendment for $2,000,000,000, so England could buy all the supplies, ammunition, foodstuffs, and everything else in this country during that year and if she needed more the next year we were willing to make additional appropriations, but we did not want to be involved in the war, which these and other provisions in the bill actually did accomplish.

Mr. SABATH. What I want to know is whether the gentleman contends that the passage of the lend-lease bill brought us into war?

Mr. FISH. I am contending just as my language indicates, which I think is very clear, that this was one of the steps that led toward war. The proponents of the bill, including Mr. Sulzberger, say now it was actually an act of war.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to take some time to discuss a bill which went through unanimously under the very able leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], who today put through by unanimous consent a bill of which I was the author, to feed the starving women and children in the occupied democratic countries of Europe. That bill having gone through by unanimous consent, I think it is proper there should be some discussion of it at the present time. Time is of the essence. It will do no good, it will be a mere gesture, a mere scrap of paper, if we just pass this resolution and do nothing more about it. I take it it is the unanimous purpose of the House of Representatives and of the Congress of the United States, because the Senate has passed a similar bill, to use our influence and use it now, a great moral influence, to try to persuade our friends and allies, the British, to relax the blockade so that millions of little starving children in France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, and other democratic nations can be saved from starvation. Unless we act, and unless our Government acts, carrying out the desires and the will of the Congress and the elected Representatives of the people, urging the British to relax this blockade, millions of small, innocent, helpless children in Europe will die of starvation during the coming winter, if the war lasts that long, because it must be self-evident that there will be not enough food to go around in these occupied democracies during the coming winter. They are on the verge of starvation now. Many of them have already died of starvation and dread diseases such as rickets. Sixty-five percent of them have some form of incipient tuberculosis.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I will yield myself 5 additional minutes.

We, in America, are indeed fortunate. We have plenty to eat. We have been so far saved from air raids and bombings by the enemy but these mothers and children in the nations that have been overrun by the Germans are the victims of war and its ravages. They did not cause the war. They had nothing to do with the war whatever. Their fathers fought against the Germans until they were defeated and their countries overrun. Today, as a matter of record, we are feeding our own prisoners in Germany. Great Britain, who so far has refused to relax the blockade, is also feeding hers in Germany, and let me say in all fairness, the English people feel exactly the way we do, and Parliament feels the same way, and I predict that within a short time the blockade will be relaxed and these occupied nations with their own money, because they have gold and other securities in the United States and England, will be able to buy food and milk and vitamins to send in Swedish ships, neutral ships, to France, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Poland, and other occupied countries, including Finland if advisable.

I believe the British have already about made up their minds, or are going to make up their minds shortly, and this resolution will be very helpful, showing the will of the Congress and of the American people, in favor of relaxing the blockade. We can understand perfectly well that in the first part of the war, when England was under attack, she could not afford to relax the blockade. Conditions are different today, and England is not in any immediate danger of attack. During the last war Herbert Hoover was the administrator of relief in Belgium for 4 long years. He fed 7,000,000 Belgians and kept them alive. It is claimed that not 1 pound of this food went to the German Army or to the German population. Today we are sending to Greece great quantities of food. Turkey and Canada are doing likewise. We are sending it in Swedish ships and keeping the young children and mothers of Greece alive, where a short time ago they were on the verge of starvation and death. It has worked well wherever it has been tried. I know of no military reason for not permitting those occupied countries to buy food, or even for us to put up the money to buy food and let them buy it elsewhere, in Argentina or South Africa, or wherever food may be had. But we have a great moral responsibility in America. We cannot simply sit quietly and wash our hands like Pontius Pilate, and let millions of innocent children die in the agony of starvation, with bloated stomachs, or die from some dread disease while we evade the issue and evade the moral responsibility as one of the partners in a war, with food abundant to save these unfortunate and helpless from death or from living with twisted and distorted bodies and minds.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why not ask former President Hoover to feed the hungry children again? He did a good job at that time.

Mr. FISH. I think he could do just as good a job today as he did before. But one thing I want to make abundantly clear is that if 1 pound of this food goes to the German Army or goes to the German population, then we should stop it immediately. If they did take all of it, nothing would be lost, as it would not be enough to last 24 hours. At least we would have made an honest effort. At least we would have carried out the desire of the American people to help those starving children and to try to save them from death by starvation and disease.

I predict that unless something is done immediately there will be mass starvation, and millions of these helpless children—Jews and Gentiles—will die that terrible death of hunger within the next 6 months. It would be the greatest tragedy of the war, and we would be morally

responsible unless we make a sincere and honest effort to persuade the British Government to relax the blockade and permit us to ship the much-needed food to the occupied nations. So I am hoping that not only this Congress will be listened to by No. 10 Downing Street, but I hope that the women of America, who are primarily interested in this kind of humanitarian relief legislation, will write to the Secretary of State and to the President and ask them to use their influence in accordance with the unanimous request of the Congress of the United States, to start feeding these children before it is too late. Even now millions of European children will be crippled for life, and if food is not forthcoming soon, the future destiny of these occupied nations will be ghastly beyond words.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, to my mind it is unthinkable that this bill should not pass. I believe it will pass unanimously. To stop lend-lease at this stage of the war would be a tragedy.

There is one amendment, however, that I plan to introduce, which I feel is very important. Under the master agreement, article V, the Government of the United States—this is the agreement with Russia:

> The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency, as determined by the President of the United States of America, such defense articles transferred by this agreement, as shall not have been destroyed, lost, or consumed, as shall be determined by the President to be useful in the defense of the United States of America or the Western Hemisphere, or to be otherwise of use to the United States of America.

Under the terms of the act, the President, for the Government, has the power to bring back supplies to this country, or to dispose of them in the country where there is a concentration of supplies or some supplies, or transfer them to some other country or countries. My amendment would provide that, before disposition of such concentrated supplies shall be made by the President, the Congress must approve it.

It is a vital amendment for the protection of the United States. I remember the time when the United States was shipping supplies to Japan over my protests—scrap iron, cotton, and copper; supplies that were used against us and are still being used against us. Nobody knows what the future will bring forth. Nobody knows whether these countries who are now our allies will be our allies after the war is finished. We hope that they will be with us and that it will be possible for us to be with them, but nobody knows. I want to make sure that before final disposition is made of thousands and thousands of airplanes and thousands and thousands of tanks and other material of war, the Congress shall have some say in that final disposition.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently talked with a great many men, a great many wounded men and veterans who have been fighting in the South Pacific and fighting in the Atlantic. It is the wish of the men with whom I have talked that the Congress should have some decision in the final disposition of the materials of war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] wrote a very able letter on the feeding of women and children of occupied democracies which appears in today's issue of the Herald Tribune. She has also incorporated it in the RECORD. I believe it is worth reading by all those who are interested in the details of feeding these children.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4254, with Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up much time in explaining this bill (H. R. 4254) because it is very brief. We have gone over the lend-lease legislation twice before. This is the third time. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has held very lengthy hearings on the extension of this act.

May I say that the legislation now under consideration extends the Lend-Lease Act for 1 year. It is just the same as the previous renewal legislation that we have passed, with one exception. On page 2 of the bill a new section has been added, as follows:

> SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 3 is amended by striking out the period after the word "satisfactory" and inserting the following: "*Provided, however,* That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure."

That section, Mr. Chairman, was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and accepted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Its object is to perfect the legislation, if it needs perfection, with reference to post-war conditions. Outside of that the legislation remains the same except for the fact it is extended for 1 year from July 1, 1944.

Lend-lease is a major weapon for victory.

On the battle fronts all over the world lend-lease has demonstrated its value.

Lend-lease has put guns and planes and other munitions into the hands of our gallant Russian, British, Chinese, and other allies. This investment in our national security and in the joint security with our allies has produced victories and has saved the lives of many American boys as well as those of our allies. In the great offensives to come, it will prove its worth even more fully.

The forces of each of the United Nations have been equipped principally from its own war industries. But the forces of each have been strengthened by supplies and services received from its allies. This joining of men and materials is enabling the United Nations to strike harder blows against the Axis on every battle front—in the air over Europe, on the plains of Poland and Rumania, in the mountains of Italy, in the islands and on the sea of the South and Southwest Pacific, in the jungles of Burma, and in the air over China.

Through lend-lease we have helped to equip the men of our allies fighting shoulder to shoulder with our men on these battlefields. To each of these battle fronts we have sent under lend-lease thousands of planes, tanks, and guns. And to the arsenals of our allies behind these battle fronts we have sent quantities of war-production supplies to help increase the amount of munitions they turn out and food to nourish the war workers turning them out.

In return our forces stationed abroad receive as reverse lend-lease from our allies all of the supplies and services that can be locally procured. Our forces in the South and Southwest Pacific theaters, for example, receive as reverse lend-lease 90 percent of the food they eat. Even Britain, with an area smaller than New England, supplies without payment by us 20 percent of the food consumed by our forces in the British Isles. And French North and West Africa are producing quantities of food that are turned over without cost to our troops in the Mediterranean theater. Each of our allies, no matter what may be the size of its contribution to us in the form of reverse lend-lease, is putting everything it has into winning the war.

The cost of the lend-lease program up to January 1, 1944, amounted to slightly less than $20,000,000,000. That is a lot of money. But it is less than we are presently spending in 3 months to win this war. The costs of this war are high in any terms. But the costs to this country in the blood of our men and the tears of their mothers, as well as in dollars, would have been immeasurably greater if we had been forced to fight this war alone or without some of our fighting allies.

The armed forces of the United Nations are poised both in Europe and the

Far East for new and greater offensives soon to come. The supply plans for these offensives are based on the solid foundation of each of the United Nations helping each other through lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. Only if we supply the Soviet Union with more planes, guns, steel, and food can she strike with fullest effect more mighty blows from the east while we strike from other sides. Only with an ever-increasing volume of aid can China become the great land base from which we can hit at the heart of Japan. Only if we continue to help arm the airmen, the soldiers, and the sailors of Britain can they play their full part by our side in the invasions to come.

On two great principles—the efficient pooling of material resource made possible by lend-lease and reverse lend-lease and the free interchange of fighting manpower made possible by unity of command—rest our entire plans for fighting this war to final victory. The flexible, strategic use of fighting men and fighting resources wherever they are most needed and can do most to achieve victory is the key to our war operations.

Any change in these great and proven principles at this stage of the war is unthinkable. Not to extend the Lend-Lease Act would be to call off an important—and successful—part of the war. No one who has the best interests of American security and of our brave fighting men at heart would possibly vision that. This House will, I am sure, overwhelmingly endorse again the wisdom and forethought it showed in enacting and extending lend-lease as one of the outstanding bulwarks of our security.

We are at a critical hour in the history of this great country. We are on the eve of new and greater offensives. When our heroic men go into the battles to come they will be shoulder to shoulder with our brave allies. They will be part of a United Nations fighting team which has been strengthened through lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. We shall reach final victory sooner, and with less loss in the treasure of our manhood, because we have learned to work and fight together with other free and brave peoples.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy extended me by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. Perhaps the members of the committee will indulge me for a moment in a discussion of a certain amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the so-called Lend-Lease Act, which will be found on page 2 of the bill. It relates to section 2 of subsection (b) of section 3 of the act. It is that subsection which confers upon the President the power to make what are called the final settlements of lend-lease agreements.

In view of the potential importance of those settlements the committee believed it might be well to propose an amendment and urge its adoption which would make it clear beyond all doubt that the President of the United States in making final settlements with one of our allies, for example, at the termination of hostilities, should not commit the United States in any manner with respect to future economic post-war policies or post-war military policies. It is for that reason that this language has been proposed as a proviso to be added to subsection (b) to which I have already referred.

Provided, however, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

From time to time there has been a good deal of discussion among Members of the House and other people with respect to just how far the President of the United States might commit the Government of the United States in the future in the making of the so-called final settlements with one of our allies. Some people have expressed the fear, I may say, that in the making of those settlements, which really have to do with goods and supplies, the President might enter into some sort of an agreement with another government or nation which would have an effect upon the future policy of the United States, in trade relations, for example, facilities for air transportation internationally, a semimilitary alliance, and so forth. One might conjure up a number of fields of future policy which under a strained interpretation of the law as it now stands, and I use that language advisedly, to which the President might commit the country. Hence, your Committee on Foreign Affairs, seeking to clarify that situation, proposed this amendment.

While we are talking about final settlements, perhaps the members of the committee will indulge me further, because a little further discussion as to their nature is necessary in order to more accurately measure the meaning and the significance of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Of course, no one of us can tell when the war will end, and I always hesitate in indulging in too much of visionary thinking as we attempt to solve in advance some of the problems that will confront us when the war is over. The lend-lease program, which I am convinced has become an extraordinarily effective military weapon, has great ramifications. For example, to state it briefly, if you examine the extent of the lend-lease operations in Russia, if you will examine our report and the hearings and the testimony taken in those hearings, you will note that under the lend-lease program we have sent to Russia over 8,000 airplanes. They are all combat planes. They are flown by Russian fliers against the Germans. We have sent to Russia 170,000 trucks, all for use by the Russian army in carting supplies over ever-lengthening lines of communication, as the Russians advance westward driving the Germans out of their own country and approaching the borders of Germany itself.

In addition, according to my best recollection, something like 30,000 other motor vehicles of one type or another, and used by the Russian Army, have been contributed to Russia under this program.

Let us try to visualize the end of the war, and remember, as we do so, under the Lend-Lease Act the title to all of that property remains in the United States. We have not given it away. We have loaned its use without charge. Whatever there is left of it at the conclusion of the war, whether it be in Russia or Britain or Australia or New Zealand, or wherever, all of it that is left is the property of the United States. Of course, the problem will then arise—and we all hope it will be approached by sensible and practical people—of appraising the value of the property that is left.

And probably we will find at the end of hostilities that a very large number of trucks and other motor vehicles sent to Russia have been literally worn out and would have very little more than a scrap-iron value. Others would be partially worn out. You can all visualize the condition of that motor equipment after serving for months and months in the mud and snows of one campaign after another. Some of it at the end of the war may be quite usable and well worth salvaging for the use of the United States itself. Some one will have to decide, and undoubtedly it will be done by the military people on the ground, what the United States will do with its property. Of course, that decision will involve really a study of the salvag value of all this material.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a fact that a great deal of that property might be credited against the commitment of this Government under the U. N. R. R. A. program of $1,360,000,000, and those nations will give us credit for that material and leave it in Europe? It would not pay to bring it back to the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is possible, of course, although the U. N. R. R. A. program is completely separate and distinct from lend-lease.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. That arrangement will be dependent upon those charged with the responsibility of U. N. R. R. A. rather than lend-lease, would it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would say jointly. That is a possibility. We cannot stand here this afternoon and say what we are going to do with 10 jeeps that are found in Liberia half worn out when this war is over. Our military people are the people who are responsible for the delivery of all this equipment to our allies. None of it has been sent to our allies except on the recommendation and the request of our own military high command, centering up to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after emanating from such distinguished men as General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz or whatever high command of the American military is in existence.

Of course, the time will come eventually—and it would be splendid if it came next month—when this salvaging operation will have to be embarked upon. As I visualize it, and I am speaking only my own opinion, it will be done almost entirely by our military people on the ground, serving with our own forces, and with the French and with the Russians and with the British, as the case may be, and who will be in a position to say whether or not that particular truck is worth sending back to the United States, or would it be better to send it to another theater of war, against Japan, for example, if Japan is still in the war, or would it be so far worn out that it would not be worth our trying to use it again, and therefore it might be sold for what it will fetch like an old used automobile, with which we are all so familiar.

That same problem will come along with airplanes. Of course, the wastage in airplanes is terrific. They wear out very fast. All sorts of injuries and damages are inflicted upon planes in addition to losses in battle. When the end comes it is inevitable that in one country or another we will have a lot of planes. Again, it will be a salvage problem that the military people, I think, will be competent to settle.

The law says, of course, that this final settlement shall be made by the President, but I cannot visualize any President of the United States informing himself in detail with respect to thousands and thousands of items scattered over the face of the earth. Of necessity, whoever is President will have to delegate that function to men who know something of the value of the equipment that is left over.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think that the salvage of property is further complicated by the fact that we have to be rather careful about glutting our own markets with some of this war equipment and keeping our industries from turning out new equipment and thus keeping our industries from employing the men coming back?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are various complications of the sort mentioned by the gentleman, all of which have to be taken into consideration.

Perhaps I am anticipating the discussion that may arise here concerning an amendment which may be offered to the effect that the basic act shall be amended so as to bring back to the Congress of the United States the job of making those final settlements. For the life of me, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how the Congress can ever do it. It would just be impossible for any committee or combination of committees of the Congress to sit down here in Washington and appraise the value of half worn-out trucks in Egypt or India or Burma, if you please, or Russia.

It might soothe our pride a little bit if we insist that we do it, but I know we could not do it. We just could not. From a practical standpoint, it is impossible. In my judgment, it would take us years to do it. Under the law it is left to the President, and as I said a moment ago, I do not suspect for one moment that the President will be the man to do it. It will be the man in the field. We have to trust to that man's sound common sense to protect the interests of the United States, remembering always that all of this property belongs to us and does not belong to Great Britain or Russia or the French Committee of Liberation or Australia or New Zealand. It all belongs to us.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The property belongs to us wherever it may be?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Wherever it may be.

Mr. WRIGHT. If it is transferred from one country to another, it still belongs to us?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It always does. We never lose title. We have merely loaned the use of the material.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ELMER. If it belongs to us, what becomes of the report of the Senators who were over there that the English and the Russians had traded a lot of it off to other countries? How are we going to get it back then?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We found that that is not true.

Mr. ELMER. That is reported by the Senators to be true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad to say that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has found that that is not true.

Mr. ELMER. It is generally believed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. None of our property has been traded away, none of it.

Mr. ELMER. Where is the proof? Has the gentleman proof of this?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the testimony in the hearings. That was inquired into last year and it was inquired into again this year.

Mr. ELMER. The gentleman heard the statement of that Russian up here a short time ago that it was being traded on by Russia. Another thing is that we are shipping lend-lease now, are we not, from the western coast of the United States in Russian ships through the Japanese lines, landing on the east coast of Russia? Who gets that material? Where is it going?

Mr. WADSWORTH. As far as I know—and there are other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs present—no such statement has ever been made to us about that traffic. I am not in a position to answer every rumor that comes up.

Mr. ELMER. Some Members of this House know that Russian ships are carrying goods from the United States through the Japanese lines and landing them on the east coast of Russia. Does the gentleman believe they are shipping that material 8,000 miles, over to the German front, or are they trading it to the Japs?

Mr. BLOOM. They are not trading anything.

Mr. ELMER. That is what the gentleman says, but the indications are that they are trading it to the Japs.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no such indication whatever.

Mr. ELMER. It has been known for over a year here that commerce is going on between the Japs and the Russians just the same as ever.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no such indication whatever in the testimony. We have inquired about those things to the limit. I do not suspect for one moment that the Russian Government is stealing our property and handing it to the Japanese.

Mr. ELMER. Are we not making exchanges of goods with Spain, and is not Spain delivering some of that gasoline and other material they get from us to Germany?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Spain and our relations with Spain have no relation whatever to lend-lease; none whatever.

Mr. ELMER. Generally, on trade and traffic, including lend-lease.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no lend-lease traffic with Spain.

Mr. ELMER. What does the Secretary of State mean, then, by cracking down on neutrals that are trading with our enemies?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is an entirely different field of endeavor. That is part of our economic warfare effort to prevent neutrals like Spain from sending vital material to Germany. Lend-lease has nothing to do with that.

Mr. ELMER. It is all in the same category of trading.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad the Secretary of State, if he has done as the gentleman says, has clamped down on Spain.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to pages 231 and 232 of the hearings. If he will read those facts brought forth in the hearings, he will find all the answers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I said at the beginning of my somewhat rambling remarks, the concern your committee had with respect to what is known as the final settlement was confined to that thought that perhaps the President of the United States, whoever he may be, in making those settlements might commit the Government of the United States to a future military policy or a future economic policy. This amendment states in effect that no such commitment shall be made without recourse to our established constitutional procedure.

There are two of those procedures, with which I assume every Member is familiar. If the proposed committal is temporary in character and does not involve a long-term course of action, it is generally reached in the form of what is known as an Executive agreement, which lasts, we will say, only 2 or 3 years, like

U. N. R. R. A., which is to last only 3 years, as I recollect. But that Executive agreement cannot become operative unless the Congress of the United States by action of both Houses legislates on the subject to the extent of authorizing the implementing of the program. So if it is merely an executive agreement committing the United States for a short period to some course of action, the Congress must pass upon it.

If the President of that day proposes the committal of the United States for a long-term performance binding the Government and the people of the United States to a course of action which can only be set down in a contract in treaty form, then, of course, a committal of that kind must come back to the Senate of the United States and be ratified, under the Constitution, by a two-thirds majority. That is the intention of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman says the title to all this lend-lease material we are sending to the various countries remains in the United States and will remain in the United States after the war is over. I am wondering if there has been any provision made to prevent the countries where this lend-lease material is located from charging us storage on it after the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know of any specific provision of the Lend-Lease Act which forbids the beneficiary from charging storage. It would go beyond my comprehension how any one would dare try such a thing. We hold the upper hand in this. If the gentleman will just stop and think, he will realize that we hold the upper hand.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If title remains in us, and if no provision is made against it, they can legally charge us storage on all that equipment after the war, and thereby consume all or a part of its value.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will not assert that there is specific provision in the Lend-Lease Act which forbids a thing of that sort, but I honestly believe that the gentleman's fears are not well founded. This material will be outdoor material, nearly all of it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The new lease-lend that we have before us will provide that no lease-lend is to go to nonparticipating nations, nations who are not actively participating in the war on our side.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We do not propose any change in the existing Lend-Lease Act as to the eligibility of nations to receive any of this aid. They are the people who are fighting alongside of us.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then we can continue to build roads in South America, with lease-lend funds; can we?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have not done that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Senator Butler says we have done it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not under lend-lease.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is done, whatever you call it; it is done with American funds that are squeezed out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. What are we going to do to stop that kind of spending?

Mr. WADSWORTH. You cannot stop it under the Lend-Lease Act because it is not in the act.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then you can write a provision there to stop it from being done under the other acts which Congress has enacted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would probably be subject to a point of order. I would like to say something about the South American situation. There has been a lot of misunderstanding about it. We hear, and doubtless a good deal of what we hear is true, that certain agencies of our Government have spent money or loaned money, or made grants of money in South America in extravagant fashion. Those loans or grants have not gone through lend-lease. All we have done through lend-lease in South America has been on the urgent advice of our military authorities. The total of contributions to all the South American countries put together under lend-lease is only $127,000,000. That is all, and two-thirds of that has been used in Brazil. In Brazil it has been used to build airports near Natal, from which our own planes fly to Ascension Island and on to the West Coast of Africa, from there to Khartoum and to India. It has been used to help the Brazilians equip their own air corps. With their own air force they patrol the South Atlantic against the submarine menace in our behalf and they have already themselves, with planes furnished by us and flyers furnished by themselves, sunk German submarines. That is the nature of lend-lease contributions to the South American countries. There has been no financing of industrial undertakings in South America through lend-lease. If that has been done, it is coming through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or some other agency of the Government in sums far greater than lend-lease has expended. And lend-lease, as I say, has expended funds solely for military purposes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from New York stated that an amendment of that kind would be subject to a point of order. It would be clearly in order under the Holman rule, because it would be a limitation on expenditures.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is not an appropriation bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is an authorization.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps so, I do not know. But it has nothing to do with the extension of lend-lease.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Am I correct in my understanding that some 46 nations have participated or benefited from lend-lease?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it is 40 nations.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. In line with the question of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] it would seem that if the expenditures under lend-lease were limited to those nations which are actively engaged or participating in the war, a great amount of the funds would be saved and it would seem the war has reached the point where we could limit the expenditure to those nations. In Brazil, I agree with the gentleman from New York, they should be assisted because they have participated actively and used their forces and navy for patrol purposes and have shown themselves disposed to help. But I cannot see the wisdom of extending the operations under lend-lease to other nations not in any way remotely connected with the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I believe there are two categories of nations. One category includes those who have declared war against Germany and Japan and the other category consists of those nations who have broken off diplomatic relations and helped to establish what we know as the blockade. I stand subject to correction by members of the committee on that statement. Those latter nations receive next to nothing, it is so very small.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. One thing I would object to, I am informed that American ships after hauling lend-lease materials and supplies to England are charged for berthing the ships from which the supplies are taken and we also pay for the sand which is used for ballast in returning the empty ship to this country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman has heard something which is not substantiated by facts. Every American ship reaching Great Britain is berthed and serviced and repaired at the expense of Great Britain. That has been made perfectly clear in our testimony.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is a part of lend-lease in reverse. Every ship of ours that goes over there which needs any repairs is repaired in a British dock or shipyard at their expense and serviced at their expense.

Mr. SCRIVENER. And then the amount is charged back.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is called lend-lease in reverse.

Mr. ROWE. The amount is charged back.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Lend-lease in reverse, I might say, Mr. Chairman, is growing very gratifyingly and we have received some very important help from other nations.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman will recall in the hearings when we had the

State Department before us, we were informed of certain agreements with South America which we were not at liberty to make public. There were agreements with South America which were different from the agreements made with other nations across the water. Does the gentleman from New York recall that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do recall the incident; yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. I bring that out in order to keep the record clear.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We were given to understand it is wiser not to make those agreements completely public because under them today we are securing from certain Central and South American countries a certain amount of very, very vital supplies and rare minerals. That is not done under lend-lease. It is done under other agencies of Government. That is part of the financing, I imagine, that has taken place in those countries, but not under lend-lease. Those agreements will not be exposed to German and Japanese view lest they know just what we are getting.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The malaria-control project in Venezuela is not under lend-lease, but is handled through the Office of Inter-American Affairs?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be able to state that lend-lease in reverse, so-called, shows a very encouraging trend upward. Our troops in the South Pacific under General MacArthur get 90 percent of their food free of charge from Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. ROWE. When you say "free of charge," it accrues as a credit to the nation with whom we are doing business, and charged back against our account whereby we sent them supplies?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it is fair to say that Australia and New Zealand would never ask to be paid for that food any more than we would ask them to pay for ammunition which they are shooting out there because we sent it to them.

Mr. ROWE. In other words, it checks and balances one against the other more or less?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is right. The biggest lend-lease is to Great Britain and Russia. Great Britain's lend-lease in reverse is growing very rapidly.

Mr. ROWE. I would like to hear the gentleman make a statement as to one other rumor early in the history of lend-lease which filtered through, that in Great Britain lend-lease materials were going to some 30 countries, subordinate and within the domain of Great Britain. Has the gentleman any facts on that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The truth is that no such thing happened. Under the agreement with Great Britain, and I think the same agreement stands with all the others, Great Britain is forbidden to export any lend-lease article sent to her by us or any similar article of equal value. In other words, if we send her 4 bales of cotton and she gets 4 bales of cotton from Egypt and could get along with 4 bales, under the agreement she cannot export any of them. So her export trade, so far as these particular items are concerned, is in a firm grip.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. On that point, that applies now and after the war is over also as far as exports are concerned and it applies to all items. They cannot export anything without our consent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As long as the agreement lasts.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman who is now addressing the Committee heard the rather extensive hearings which we had upon this bill, and I am glad that some of the questions have been asked of him with reference to these false rumors. I simply want to ask the gentleman from New York is it not true in the hearings the committee had that various similar rumors with reference to the lend-lease came to the attention of the committee and the committee, after investigating them, found out there was no foundation whatever for these criticisms after these fears had been expressed?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true. May I remind the Members of the various statements of rumors with respect to goods sent by lend-lease to north Africa. They were all sent under the advice of our military authorities. Some of the articles may not have seemed to be of direct military use or value. But they were so regarded by our military authorities as useful and valuable in establishing a friendly attitude among the French and Arabs. But every penny of it has been paid back. The French Committee on Liberation has paid back in cash for all the stuff we have given them—$62,000,000.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. One of the things I am pleased to know, information has been brought to me that where formerly we were shipping coal either under lend-lease or whatever agency may have been handling it, to the Mediterranean area, at the same time England was exporting coal to the Argentine. However, that has been stopped, and this Nation is now sending some 15,000 tons per month to the Argentine, and coal which was formerly transshipped is now going into the Mediterranean area. That shows the cooperation the gentleman has been referring to and I am happy to know that has been brought about.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about the large quantities of farm machinery that have been allocated for foreign export?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not have the figures before me, but the committee examined into that with great care.

Mr. KNUTSON. When we first took it up they disclaimed all knowledge of it. Then a certain member produced photostatic copies showing the invoices, and then they admitted it, quite reluctantly. I am wondering whether this Committee is taking this man's word for it, this man who will not give us the information.

Mr. WADSWORTH. First, let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota that that question occurred in connection with the deliberations of the House on the so-called U. N. R. R. A. bill. It is completely separate from lend-lease, but our Committee on Foreign Affairs did examine into the question of the exportation of farm machinery and we found that in the approximately 3 years of operation of lend-lease, the percentage of our total production of farm machinery which lend-lease has loaned to Australia and New Zealand, for example, to increase their crops, and to Great Britain to increase its crops, amounts to something like 3 percent of our total production. That is all.

Mr. KNUTSON. But our farmers cannot get equipment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Neither can the British or Australian or New Zealand farmers get equipment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why neglect our own people? This is the arsenal of democracy we are told. I presume it is the breadbasket too, if we look into it a little further.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota there comes into the question which he propounds the consideration of policy. We have sent thousands and thousands of troops to Australia, who from there range their attack through Guadalcanal, up through the Solomon Islands toward Rabaul and New Guinea and all that vast area, for thousands of miles. Australia is something like 6,000 miles from the Pacific coast of the United States. Everything we send down there for the supply of those troops has to be sent in ships. If we sent sufficient food to feed all those troops it would take a great many more ships. The Australians and New Zealanders say to us, "Under this lend-lease agreement we will be glad to feed your men, but to do so we will have to increase our crops. If you can send us some farm machinery and some seeds, with the seeds we will increase our acreage, with the farm machinery we will increase our harvests, and we can feed all the men you send." A tiny, little dribble of farm machinery, compared with the whole production of the United States, was sent to Australia and New Zealand. Quite a great many cream separators were sent. That does not look like a military weapon, but New Zealand and Australia vastly increased their production of dairy products, and our men are eating them. They need more cream separators to do it.

Mr. KNUTSON. How many men have we in Australia?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I could not tell you.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is not as many as would warrant the shipments that have been made there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would advise the gentleman from Minnesota to take that up with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman commented upon the shipping of commercial articles to north Africa for sale to the natives, and that those articles were paid for in cash by the French committee. I wish to remind the gentleman that the natives in north Africa are not so much interested in cash as what they can buy with it. They are not much interested—the Arabs—in raising wheat or wheat products unless they get something that they want besides money. Therefore what is happening there is that various sorts of articles which the Arabs wanted were imported, not to give to them but so that the French could sell them to them, so that the Arabs, in order to have some money with which to buy those articles, would raise more wheat and sell it to the French or to the Allies in order to get the money to buy the articles that we imported. Therefore the importation of some articles which look exceedingly unwarlike resulted in increasing the production of what they call commercialized wheat in north Africa, commercialized wheat being wheat that you persuade the natives to get out of their granaries and into commercial channels.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. And north Africa is a great wheat-producing region. Also a very heavy producer of fresh vegetables, and is now coming back into form again in the production of food. We have helped that a great deal and it has not cost us a cent. It has paid us back for everything we have sent there.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I am informed that we purchase wheat in Canada and grind it here and then send it to England under lend-lease. Is there any substantiation back of that statement?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not sure that I know the answer completely, but I know we have no lend-lease agreement with Canada. Canada has her own arrangement with Great Britain under which she has agreed to furnish directly to Great Britain large amounts of food. We have no lend-lease agreement with Canada at all. The gentleman says wheat has been purchased in Canada and ground into flour in this country?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And then sent to England under lend-lease.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it might be purchased by the Canadian Government and ground into flour on our side and then sent to England. But I do not know the facts.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. On the former question there was considerable confusion relative to the 2 or 3 percent. The machinery which was programed for U. N. R. R. A. was tried to be explained by a statement which emanated from up on Sixteenth Street, I am told, at a press conference, that we had only exported about 2 percent of the farm machinery which we had manufactured. The statement was made as to how much we had exported, compared with what we were intending to export, and I am gratified to find out that statement, just released, is in connection with U. N. R. R. A. and it has been changed from 136,000 tons to 30,000 tons.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not surprised at all at that information.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Perhaps the gentleman saw in the press within the past few weeks that Canada has passed a law which they have labeled "A mutual war aid bill," keeping away from what I consider a misnomer—lend-lease.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Terrible.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And in their legislation they provide they will furnish articles under agreements with various nations for mutual war aid, and that unless specifically provided in the agreement, they do not expect to get the article back. They have a realistic bill on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself sufficient time to answer a few questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, one question to which I wish particularly to refer is to whether Japan and Russia have been exchanging merchandise. I invite the Committee's attention to pages 230, 231, and 232 of the hearings where answers to most of the questions that have been asked here today will be found. I read from page 232 of the hearings:

> Perhaps the most sensational rumor is the one that the Russians have taken some of the planes we sent them and have traded them to the Japanese in return for rubber. These planes were then allegedly used against our forces in the Pacific.

The fact with reference to this rumor, as printed in the hearings, is as follows:

> Rumors of this type, frequently emanating from Radio Tokio, have been repeatedly investigated by representatives of the State Department and other agencies, and proved to be without foundation. There is not an atom of truth in this particular rumor.

Mr. Chairman, I wish also to call attention to the statement appearing at the bottom of page 7 of the report dealing with the question of the total value of lend-lease material exported to other American republics.

> The total value of lend-lease materials exported to other Latin-American republics from March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1943, was $127,000,000.

This has already been stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

> Commercial exports from the United States to Latin America in the years 1941, 1942, and 1943 totaled $2,300,000,000, 18 times the lend-lease total.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Do the hearings contain anything in regard to the question I propounded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] as to whether or not England received lend-lease materials from this country which she channeled to one of her dominions and used in commercial trade?

Mr. BLOOM. I have never heard of that. I do not see how that could happen. There are many rumors; as a matter of fact, yesterday's New York Times, on page 1, carried an article on lend-lease rumors. All these lend-lease rumors that are known are answered in the hearings, starting on page 230. If the gentleman has any new ones, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. ROWE. Is there anything pertaining to that rumor in the hearings?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not recall anything like that.

Mr. ROWE. One other question: If England did not channel lend-lease materials received from the United States to one of her dominions, did she export to that dominion like materials of like value to be used in commercial trade?

Mr. BLOOM. No; she could not do that under lend-lease.

Mr. ROWE. The reason I ask these questions is because I recall seeing a letter signed by Mr. Stettinius, as head of Lend-Lease, stating that such a thing had occurred. I am going to see if that letter is available, and if it is, place it in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman finds it, I should like to have a copy of it. If the gentleman inserts it in the RECORD, I think an answer to it should be inserted in the RECORD at the same time by me.

Mr. ROWE That is the reason I mentioned it; I want to know the truth or falsity of the rumor, and the facts.

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that the Foreign Affairs Committee went over every phase of this subject. We tried to get the facts we want the facts in order to present them to the Congress. If the gentleman will read the hearings and the report, he will find that we have taken up every question with reference to what lend-lease has been doing and what lend-lease has not been doing. We have answered all the questions, and the answers are to be found right in the hearings. We are just as anxious to get facts and give them to the membership as the Members are to receive them.

Mr. ROWE. I think my reactions, if I may continue, are no different than those of the gentleman from New York, that any person charged with responsibility for the welfare of this country would deliberately do things that would militate against its interests and when these things come to my attention it gives me a sense of alarm, as it would the gentleman, I am sure.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is quite right; there is no doubt about that. If the gentleman will write out these questions or rumors, I shall be very glad to investigate them.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. It is rumored that England purchases all the beef that is exported by the Argentine. I am further informed that those purchases are with American lend-lease funds. Is that true? Or has the gentleman any information on it?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no, no; that is not correct.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Has the gentleman any information on it? I would like some information concerning it.

Mr. McMURRAY. We do not lend-lease any money.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will write out his questions tonight and send them to me, I shall be very glad to investigate and give the gentleman a definite answer as to what the facts are with reference to them. We want to get the facts. We do not want to hedge or hide or try to hide. Give me the questions, and I shall be very glad to get the facts and answer the questions.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. How much has lend-lease cost us to date?

Mr. BLOOM. About $22,000,000,000. Something like $24,000,000,000 was appropriated; $22,000,000,000 has been expended and allocated.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is about one-third the total expenditures of the other United Nations since the war broke out. The war has cost us $180,000,000,000, but it has cost the other belligerent countries only about $68,000,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman must remember that although we have given Russia and some of the other countries a lot of material and a lot of aid and assistance, it has cost them a lot in blood and human lives, and they have done a great job. I think the gentleman will admit that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not questioning that.

Mr. BLOOM. Then I would not criticize. I would not want to measure life and blood against money, or money against life and blood.

Mr. KNUTSON. But how about the future solvency of America? Does that enter into it at all?

Mr. BLOOM. I will answer that in this way: Do not ever sell America short at any time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Four more years of the New Deal and you could not sell America at all.

Mr. BLOOM. In answer to that I still say do not ever sell America short at any time.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. ELMER. Does the gentleman recall that the State Department protested to Great Britain against the selling of lend-lease goods to her colonies?

Mr. BLOOM. Do I recall that?

Mr. ELMER. Or can the gentleman find out from the State Department whether that is a fact?

Mr. BLOOM. I want to have all the rumors answered. If the gentleman wants me to find out whether that rumor was true or false, I shall be very glad to.

Mr. ELMER. All we can learn is what we read in the newspapers.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; no.

Mr. ELMER. That is what Will Rogers once said.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. If the gentleman will read the hearings and the reports instead of depending only on the newspapers, he will find what the facts are.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Do I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the expense for lend-lease since 1941 is only what was expended directly under the lend-lease law? While the things sent under lend-lease may tend to aid their military activities, yet it does not include things like armaments and such matters as are handled by the Army and Navy.

Mr. BLOOM. Right, right.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The $22,000,000,000 covers more or less nonmilitary matters, such as food——

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. It does not include munitions and things of that kind.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; the $22,000,000,000 is directly under lend-lease. The other would be entirely different.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. So actually the expenditure under the Lend-Lease Act approximates sixty to sixty-five billions of dollars, including things furnished by the Army, Navy, lend-lease.

Mr. BLOOM. No; not that much.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I wish to be correct about it.

Mr. BLOOM. Let me give it to you. I have been giving these amounts from memory. I will read them from the record now. Twenty-four billion dollars has been appropriated to the President, of which about $22,000,000,000 has been allocated. Then there are thirty-five billions on transfer of authority to the War and Navy Departments. That is what the gentleman refers to.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Yes; that is what I am referring to.

Mr. BLOOM. There is no secret about it. It is public.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I realize that, but I wanted the country to know that the 35 and the 22 would equal the total.

Mr. McMURRAY. All of the war implements that have been transferred are in the $22,000,000,000.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I realize that, and I am perfectly willing to tax my district and the rest of the country and the individuals therein, to give aid and assistance to those who are participating in the war.

Mr. BLOOM. So is every Member of the House.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. But I do not want it passed out to 30 other nations that are not engaged in the war. That is the only objection I have. We are passing it out to some 40 nations, with only 15 actively engaged in the war. The balance of them are receiving assistance.

Mr. BLOOM. They all need some assistance. They are all helping us. They are all allies of ours.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. It has reached the point where five or six fellows can get together over there, declare war on the Axis, and then walk into Washington with a satchel.

Mr. BLOOM. No. Of course, I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ELMER. Did the gentleman have the Senators who made this world trip before his committee to testify, the Senators who made this world trip and who made the charges about lend-lease and England?

Mr. BLOOM. No. Would the gentleman? We did not have them before our committee to testify. What would you do? We obtained the facts from the proper sources.

Mr. ELMER. I asked the gentleman if he had those Senators before his committee.

Mr. BLOOM. No. We went right to the source to get the correct information and that is the information you are getting.

Mr. ELMER. Would not they be the source of the rumors that are sent out?

Mr. BLOOM. No. They brought too many rumors back themselves.

Mr. ELMER. I heard them make the speeches over in the Senate and they made charges. Why did you not have them before the committee?

Mr. BLOOM. Because we had the real authority and received the correct information.

Mr. ELMER. You did not want to find out the facts about it, is that it? You did not want to find out the truth about it?

Mr. BLOOM. I would not say that.

Mr. ELMER. Why did you not have those Senators before your committee?

Mr. BLOOM. We did not think it necessary. We have received the true facts from official governmental sources.

Mr. ROWE. Now, I think the gentleman from New York wants to handle this job in a nice manner. We cannot joke about $24,000,000,000, and I think anyone who rises to ask a question of the chairman of the committee—he may be wrong as I was in some of these instances—should be answered courteously. We should not joke about the matter. We should accord men the courtesy that the situation demands.

Mr. BLOOM. Have I not done that?

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman asked what would the gentleman do, with reference to questioning a Senator. The chairman of the committee knows that is impossible and I think you should advise the gentleman of that fact.

Mr. BLOOM. We went to the source to get the real information. We did not go to people who go into a town for a couple of hours and come out with a lot of rumors. We went to the real source, to your representatives, to your agents; that is the only place we can go to get real information.

Mr. ROWE. The only thing I had reference to is this: It is a very serious matter and we should not treat it too lightly. At least, as far as I am concerned, I feel deeply about it.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman should read the reports of the hearings. We

had 10 days of hearings on this, and that is not treating it lightly.

Mr. ROWE. That statement has been made two or three times by the gentleman who is now yielding to me. The report came to the desk only a little while ago. It is impossible to read that report and the hearings in the time we had to consider this bill. By tomorrow that statement may be appropriate. Today it is not.

Mr. BLOOM. You have had the printed hearings since Saturday.

Mr. ROWE. No; I have not had it since then.

Mr. BLOOM. I am reminded of the fact that we will not read this bill for amendment until Wednesday. So the gentleman will have tomorrow and Wednesday to read the report and the hearings. I may say that the committee filed its report on March 30, so you have had from March 30 to April 17 to read this report. That is not putting it in overnight.

Mr. ROWE. I may be wrong in some of the things I have heard but, if I may suggest to the gentleman, he does not want us to be wrong with our vote.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. I know your vote is going to be all right.

Mr. ROWE. Discourtesy is the easiest way to change it.

Mr. BLOOM. No one could ever accuse me of being discourteous.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has made the statement he did with reference to the vote on this bill. I am advised by the leadership that it has been agreed to read this bill for amendment on Wednesday and vote on that day, if possible; so that these interesting proceedings will go on today and we will then have more tomorrow, if there is more; then the reading of the bill and the vote will come on Wednesday.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think the most significant aspect of the question which is before us today, tomorrow, and Wednesday is not whether or not we extend the lend-lease for another year, because I am convinced, as I think most of you are, that that is going to be done. It must be done. We have to finish the winning of this war.

The significant aspect is that we have an amendment which I want to talk about a little while today, brought into lend-lease for the first time since lend-lease first came down to us from a sort of Executive Mount Sinai a few years ago. Away back then in 1941 an effort was made by us minority members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, both in committee and on the floor, to write in an amendment which would bring Congress into the picture a little more definitely than it was in the original language of the bill. That effort failed.

We have renewed the effort every time since when lend-lease has been before us, and every time since the effort has also failed. But the Democratic majority of our Foreign Affairs Committee are reasonable men and like granite their resistance wears away with the constant dripping of water.

This time by unanimous vote we have agreed on language that brings Congress into the picture of lend-lease settlements for the first time. As a committee we have recognized that we went a bit too far in vacating all congressional authority over the outcome of lend-lease, its operations, and its settlement. So this amendment, a sort of Topsy affair which grew up in the committee, everybody contributing a little bit to its eventual development, was unanimously agreed to.

It was the original brain child of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER], who brought it in and advocated it very eloquently and persuasively for several days in different forms. After considerable discussion, the gentleman from New York added to the proposal, he revised the language, offered it and resubmitted it in modified forms, and again the amendment lay on the table. We discussed it. It was mulled over and modified somewhat, until finally this Schiffler-Wadsworth amendment has come before us in the language in which it now appears for your consideration.

I think this is a tremendously important piece of legislation because it marks the first time since this bill came before us in the original instance that the Congress has written its intentions into lend-lease, that the Congress has asserted itself, that Congress has said there is something in this which we should do, there is a place where we should also be consulted. This amendment defines the lend-lease responsibilities of Congress and limits the lend-lease authorities of the President.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman's train of thought.

Mr. MUNDT. That is quite all right.

Mr. WRIGHT. I take it the thought behind the amendment was that lend-lease is a war or military weapon and the committee wanted to be sure that lend-lease should not be carried over into post-war planning and post-war relations between the various countries. To safeguard the lend-lease program against that, the amendment was suggested and unanimously adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman is exactly correct. There is nothing in the intent of the amendment and nothing in its operations which could in any way change the Lend-Lease Act as a war measure. It deals with post-war activities and implications of lend-lease and the final lend-lease settlements. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read this amendment because I have a suggestion which I think perhaps should be included in the amendment, which I brought up in committee, but in this Topsy-like growth in connection with the evolvement of the amendment my suggestion failed to be included in the final version.

I think it failed to attach itself in part because I did not have it expressed in very good language at the time, but since then I have been in consultation during the recess with the legislative counsel, and we have worked out what I believe is appropriate language. So if the idea appeals to the Members of the House, I hope it accepts this amendment, because it seems to me it rounds out the thing which we are endeavoring to do by the amendment developed by Mr. SCHIFFLER and Mr. WADSWORTH.

Let me, first of all, read the amendment as it appears before us and then suggest my very minor modification in language, but I think important modification in significance. This is the amendment, and I will read the portion of the act which it amends, which is now section No. 2, so that section 3 (b) of the original act would read as follows:

> The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

This is the language of the amendment as adopted by our committee:

> *Provided, however,* That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

During the discussion of that amendment in committee I suggested that it seemed to me that we had rather conspicuously left out a third aspect which ordinarily appears in discussion on legislation dealing with governmental operations.

We ordinarily talk about economic, military, and political consequences; economic, military, and political operations; economic, political, and military activities—so I suggested that perhaps we should put in this amendment also the words "post-war political policies"—so that other nations would have crystal clear before them that under our concept of government they, too, have to come back to Congress through an established constitutional procedure. The not altogether united, but rather well collectivized and highly persuasive, counsel of my colleagues convinced me however that that was not very satisfactory language and we sort of agreed to drop it for the time being and I would continue my study along that line.

As I say, with the aid of the legislative counsel, I now bring before you this proposed language which I think should be inserted in the amendment as we have adopted it in order to round out the picture and present to the country and to our allies exactly the position which Congress understands to be evolved in this connection. I would add to the amendment where it now reads "that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy" these words "or

any post-war policy involving international relations," which I am told conforms with the legislative standards and the legislative language and the legislative policies of prior legislation. This would round out the table and would give us, if you please, the third leg of a three-legged support upon which we are building our foreign policy and our post-war lend-lease operations.

I think it is fully as important that we do reserve to Congress the constitutional procedures by amendment in this bill which involve post-war international relations and policies pertaining thereto as it is important that we make these reservations for activities in the field of economics and activities in the field of military operations.

I am hopeful that the members of the committee, after hearing this discussion and the presently proposed language, will agree with me and that we can during the course of this discussion agree on a committee amendment which will incorporate this third aspect in language which is appropriate and in language which reserves to Congress specifically its constitutional prerogatives in the field of foreign policies and international relations just as we are doing it in the fields of economics and military affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am in thorough accord with the principle the gentleman is seeking to state, but what I am not clear on is this: How can we draw the line between temporary or military executive agreements that probably must be concluded by the President and the broader international political agreements where we are determined that the people's representatives shall pass on them before they shall go into force?

I have in my mind a very clear determination that our foreign policy—military, political, and economic—shall be evolved by the President and Congress together, and not by the President, but I am somewhat at a loss as just how to state that difference, and I wonder if the gentleman feels that his amendment will make that difference clear?

Mr. MUNDT. It will make it as clear in the field of international relations as it is clear in the field of economics and military operations, because in all three instances it applies only, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania a few minutes ago, to post-war activities and post-war operations and post-war agreements which will continue and project themselves beyond the end of the war.

There will be many intermediate emergency agreements in the field of economics and in the field of military operations and in the field of politics—assuredly in the field of politics—which are temporary things, to meet an emergency situation, a temporary expedient, but this amendment deals with the long-term continuing things.

We have Members in Congress and members in the executive branch who feel that lend-lease should be used as sort of a wedge with which to determine the sovereignty of certain countries and the sovereignty of certain islands and the willingness of certain nations to cooperate in commercial transactions, as well as in permanent international organizations. We have other members of the executive branch and in Congress who feel that lend-lease should not be used in such a manner at all in the post-war field.

Whether it is or whether it is not, it seems to me it certainly is something that should be handled in accordance with established constitutional procedure just as should decisions on post-war military and economic policies.

It might be argued by some, if you were inclined to oppose this, that it is unnecessary. Perhaps it is, but it is never unnecessary in my opinion to spell out in the legislation itself the right which Congress has. It may add nothing significant by its presence but it does obviate this danger that by omitting this important part of the triumvirate of language we eloquently imply something by our silence if we do not put it in. If we include it, then we have made ourselves clear.

I bring to you that hoary old question of Abraham Lincoln when he once asked a former constituent which leg of a three-legged stool is the most important. I do not know, and I do not know which leg of this three-legged amendment is the most important, the military one, the economic one, or the one dealing with international relations. However, if any are important, all are important, and for that reason I urge you Members of the House to work along with me on this and see if we cannot unanimously agree to incorporate this language in the Schiffler-Wadsworth amendment when it comes up on Wednesday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in renewing lend-lease for another year we ought to exercise a little of that Yankee shrewdness and canniness derived from our Scottish ancestry that is supposed to pervade our private dealings and carry those virtues over into the field of international relations.

There are certain things that we know were charged to us by certain of the Allied Nations in the First World War that rankle still in the minds of the American people who know about them. I refer particularly to the pretty well-authenticated statement that France charged us rental for the trenches we dug in her soil, that she charged us for every fruit tree or forest tree we destroyed in prosecuting that war to save France.

There is a pretty well-defined belief that the American people through lend-lease are being taken for a similar ride. I suggest in perfect friendliness to all of the Allied Nations that here on the floor this afternoon has been revealed one case of that. I refer to the so-called reverse lend-lease. When the gentleman from New York was asked the question about reverse lend-lease, he stated that we are not being charged for dockage and wharfage, or whatever the charges are for unloading ships, but that England pays for those. However, as I understood him—and I shall be glad to be corrected if I am wrong—England then proceeds to charge those charges that she has paid in the first instance back against us. Is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is part of the story. We also charge England with what we give to her. It is merely to keep some account of what we give and what we get.

Mr. LEWIS. Does the gentleman mean that we charge England with the lend-lease goods that are given her, that we keep a set of books?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We keep a set of books upon the goods we give or lend. Great Britain keeps a set of books as best she can of what she gives and lends to us, for our information, as we do it for their information. It is not a charge that we shall ever have to pay. It is merely for our information.

Mr. LEWIS. We are not getting any money back from England at the end of this war for the lend-lease goods we have given her, are we?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I assume we will not get any money back for the goods that have been utterly consumed, like food or ammunition. I think it would be absurd for us to try to collect from them for the food they have eaten and the ammunition they have fired off. But if some of the goods, some of the trucks, some of the jeeps, some of the airplanes are of any use to us, they are ours and we can take them back.

Mr. LEWIS. What happens to this charge for dockage and wharfage and those unloading charges at the port of entry in England?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We shall never have to pay it.

Mr. LEWIS. It is charged against us, though, is it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Merely as an item of information.

Mr. LEWIS. I am not very clear on that. It is a charge and it is not a charge.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not a charge.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think, unless I am mistaken, that we have not precluded ourselves from charging England for that balance which remains after we deduct what she has furnished us, but, as a practical matter, we probably never will collect it. The supplies we have given to England, the services we have given to England in repairing her ships, are considerably greater than Britain's. So as a practical matter, any of these charges about which the gentle-

man speaks will never be collectible, because if you want to put it on a debtor and creditor basis, England will wind up owing us a credit on the lend-lease.

Mr. LEWIS. Very well. However that may be, I did not want to deal very much with that end of the problem, although it seems to me that we ought to make sure that we are not placed in the ridiculous position of having to recompense these Allies of ours for such charges for instance as the French made against us, after the last war, when they charged us for the use of their trenches or the trenches that we dug in their soil to save their country. That was done and that is pretty well established. It seems to me that such charges against us are utterly indefensible, and that those who are charged with the responsibility for administering lend-lease are derelict in their duty if they do not see to it that before these goods are furnished there shall be no possibility of any such ridiculous countercharges being made against us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. At the conclusion of this war, I do not know what the United States is going to expect at the peace conference, but I suspect that because of the rapidly developing aviation industry and, in the post-war world, the necessity for round-the-world air lines, one of the things we will want and need very, very urgently indeed, will be aviation bases around this world, over which our airplanes can fly to deliver the produce and the commerce of America. I suggest that before this legislation renewing lend-lease finally becomes law, the responsible officials of this Government dealing with these matters make clear to the nations that are receiving lend-lease from the United States that we shall expect at the conclusion of this war such and such and such aviation and other bases the world around, and shall get unequivocal promises from them that America shall in the post-war settlement receive those bases.

That is only one of the things we will need and that we shall have a legitimate right to demand, but I submit to you that as shrewd Yankee traders now is the time to begin to trade and not after these goods—these billions—have been expended, and then come hat in hand to the peace-conference table and present our requests there. If we wait until the peace conference maybe we will get them and maybe we will not. Let us get them now while the getting is good.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I note that about $6,600,000,000 of goods were sent to Great Britain, according to this report, of which about 32 percent were agricultural products. I think I am betraying no Executive secret when I say that before my committee the inquiry was made as to that part of it which the British public consumed. We asked if that was sold to the British people and were told "Yes." We asked if the money received for it was returned to lend-lease in the form of a revolving fund, and they said "No." Here is a sum somewhat in excess of $2,000,000,000 that must have been used for exchange to buy food in various parts of the world.

In fact, that question was asked, and it was said that they had to buy a lot in the Argentine. So I think that there is an inquiry about the $2,000,000,000, along the line of which the gentleman is speaking. It is sold to the British people, the money is received, and it is not returned to lease-lend in the form of a revolving fund.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. On the very question the gentleman has mentioned, on page 4 of the report that incident is cited. It shows 32 percent of $6,595,000,000 as agricultural products sold. The gentleman spoke of shrewd trading. This would mean that $2,000,000,000 in foodstuffs is delivered to England. The English people are receiving the benefit of $2,000,000,000 in food. That is sold to the British, and they receive in turn $2,000,000,000, with which in turn they purchase other supplies in the Argentine, about which I raised a question a moment ago. So $4,000,000,000 in food products is going in there. If we get it back, it will strike a balance. If we do not get it back, the $2,000,000,000 we are paying to them is going into the coffers of their treasury, purchasing food in other places, and twice the amount of the original allocation is being brought to the benefit of the English. It is a very shrewd business proposition. I admire them for being able to handle it.

Mr. LEWIS. I might say to the gentleman, I admire these allies of ours. I admire every one of them. I hope that the Congress of the United States can admire the executive department of this Government just as much after the conclusion of this further extension of 1 year of lend-lease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAGNUSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4254, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PRESIDENT'S WAR RELIEF CONTROL BOARD

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of the House a matter which I believe is vital to our unity and to our people. This matter deals with relief to war areas by the United States. In my district I have many thousands of Italians, outstanding Americans, who complain to me that they have not been given an opportunity to make contributions to assist the people in Italy, some of whom are their relatives, and that proper agencies have not been set up in accordance with their requests and their demands. I know that in every congressional district Americans of Italian descent have made similar protests because they feel that proper and better treatment could be given to the Italians in the occupied areas if there were greater funds at our disposal for that purpose. To get to the point I want to call the attention of the House to the President's War Relief Control Board established by Executive Order 9205, transferring to the Board administrative authority regarding solicitations and collections of funds and contributions for relief purposes.

The Board controls the solicitations, collections, and distributions of funds for charities for foreign and domestic relief and also provides registration or licensing or renewal or cancelation of such registrations and licenses permitting solicitations and collections for the purpose of feeding and caring for persons who need that care in the occupied areas of Europe. Under the regulations of this Board a group of Italian-Americans of outstanding ability led by one Generoso Pope, Judge Freschi, and others sought to establish a national organization for the purpose of collecting money from people who were willing to contribute toward this fund in order that the Italians in occupied Italy, in order that the women and children may get better care and treatment and get milk, clothing, and other necessities of life. Although the President's war fund has made contributions for that purpose, in my judgment it has not been sufficient. Better treatment and greater friendship could be brought about even amongst the Italian people in occupied Italy, that portion of Italy which is in the control of the Nazis, who feel that the people of Italy are not getting what they were promised by the Allied Nations if they surrendered. So, Mr. Speaker, these Americans of Italian descent have organized a group of outstanding American citizens who are ready to give their time and energy to help the Italian people. But the President's War Relief Control Board in Washington, which is controlled by Joseph E. Davies, Chairman, Charles P. Taft, Charles Warren, Melvin D. Hildreth, general counsel, and James Bruno, executive director, have failed to cooperate with a group of Americans and with their committee known as the American Committee for Italian Relief, Inc., with national headquarters at the Hotel Biltmore, in New York City, and

have deprived this group of the privilege to help and refused to give them a license to operate and collect money, which would positively relieve the American taxpayers from digging into their own pockets. For 1 whole year the matter has been pending before this President's War Relief Control Board without any action having been taken.

Suddenly a few days ago we heard that a committee had been formed, not of the people who had originally suggested the formation of such a committee. They named Arturo Toscanini, who in my judgment is a fine gentleman, but who is too old to carry on a strenuous fund-raising campaign. He could not go out campaigning. They named Don Ameche. They also named Dr. Angelo Patri and Gen. John Hildring and Mr. Justice Marchisio. It seems to me that the matter should be looked into, if necessary by Congress, in order that we may be in a position to tell this Board that if any citizens, whether they be of Italian, Polish, or Czech descent, are seeking to raise additional funds for the relief of occupied areas—which activity is essential to the war effort—they should be given some cooperation instead of abuse.

As I mentioned before, some time in the fall of 1943, a committee was organized in the city of New York on a national basis for the special purpose of bringing relief to the people in occupied Italian territory.

This committee consisted of Judge Pecora, of the New York Supreme Court; Luigi Antonini, president of the Italian-American Labor Council; Dr. Fama, the chairman of the medical board of the New York City pension system; Judge Allesandroni, of the Philadelphia common pleas court; Judge Freschi, of the New York City general sessions court; and other very prominent men in civic and fraternal life in the United States.

In order to conduct its activities, it was necessary to obtain an appropriate clearance from the War Relief Control Board in the State Department. The person contacted was Mr. Charles Taft. It was my privilege to speak to Mr. Taft personally about the set-up.

In addition to the persons mentioned, Mr. Generoso Pope, a prominent publisher in the city of New York, was to be treasurer of the organization. Mr. Pope has an exceedingly fine record with reference to his ability to raise relief funds, and since the plan of this committee was to raise some $20,000,000 for that purpose, it was the consensus of opinion that Mr. Pope would be the logical person to act as treasurer of the committee. In various War Loan drives Mr. Pope had raised millions of dollars and his benefactions and charities likewise run into large sums of money.

When the matter was discussed with Mr. Taft, the only question raised was that the committee which was to be created was not representative enough, and Mr. Taft gave me a list of names of people who should be included in that committee. These names surely would have been included as it was not the desire of that committee to keep out anybody who could be helpful. The committee had one purpose, and one purpose alone, which was to be able to offer effective relief to people in the Italian territory occupied by our forces. I have no doubt that if these men were permitted to serve, we would receive a substantial cooperation not only from the people of Italy who are now under our military occupation, but other Italians in the Axis-controlled portion of Italy as well. After all, the object of this committee was not only to raise funds so as to relieve our Government from the burden of supporting these unfortunate victims of Nazi aggression, but also to create good will for the American effort in that part of Italy which is now occupied by the Nazis.

Men of the type I have described are of exceedingly great importance to our war effort and it is our duty to utilize the influence these men have with the people of Italy for whatever good this influence can do for our war effort. I therefore thought it would be worth while to give Mr. Taft a detailed outline as to the background of the various men who were proposed for this committee for Italian relief.

First. The ability of the persons named to raise funds and, second, the prestige and importance of those persons both among the people of Italian extraction in the United States and many Italians in Italy.

As I stated before, one of the most important members of this committee would be Mr. Pope. Mr. Pope has always been a successful financial sponsor of any drive where funds had to be raised, and our Government saw fit to avail itself of his help to a large extent during the Third War Loan drive, in which Mr. Pope sold close to $50,000,000 worth of bonds to approximately 650,000 persons. Likewise, during the Fourth War Bond drive, just concluded, Mr. Pope sold $40,671,140 worth of bonds to some 555,000 persons.

After a long delay in obtaining some action on the part of the President's War Relief Control Board, I finally addressed a letter to Mr. Taft asking him to advise me what the situation was. Mr. Taft then wrote to me as follows:

APRIL 8, 1944.

DEAR MR. DICKSTEIN: I have your letter of April 3. I note that you expected to hear from me. I am sorry that there was some misunderstanding because I thought that you were going to attempt to get the Italian groups to come together voluntarily.

I enclose a copy of the announcement of our action. Mr. Jonathan Daniels at the moment is attempting to work out a solution of the arguments among the Italian groups, with the resulting addition of various persons to this temporary board of trustees.

I note your reference to money raising. I tried to emphasize to you at the time that you called on me that our board will not permit any national drives other than the National War Fund and the United Jewish Appeal. The Red Cross comes in March and the bond drives, three or four a year, so that our instructions from the President to reduce the burden of such appeals make it absolutely impossible for us to permit the Italian appeal. Furthermore, there is no necessity for it, because the National War Fund is prepared to allot from its contingent fund whatever may be necessary.

A further consideration is that the raising of any large amount of money to be spent in Italy is not only not a help, but it is a positive danger. The inflation situation is extremely serious, and the people in need can only be assisted by additional shipments and by competent personnel. Plans are well under way for providing for this.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES P. TAFT,
Acting Chairman.

This letter, to say the least, is amusing. In the first place, no mention is made of the previous stand taken by Mr. Taft, when he wanted to include other names in the proposed set-up. Now it is no longer a question of additional names, but the responsibility of according relief to the people in American-occupied territory in Italy. I do not know how much money there is in the national war fund for this purpose, but I doubt very much that a fund of this type could have reached such tremendous proportions that no other collections for relief purposes should be necessary. I have some unofficial information to the effect that the national war fund has people on its pay roll, who draw tremendpusly high salaries. The committee which was going to be organized by Judge Pecora and others would be serving without compensation, and every cent collected by them would be to the people concerned, without any deductions for expenses or any other purpose. The best figures I have at the present time on the financial situation of the Italian-American division are about $150,000 from the national war fund. Of this $150,000, a full third, namely $50,000, was contributed by one labor union. I cannot believe that this would be an adequate sum to take care of all the cases which call for relief in Italian territory, occupied by our forces.

Reports reaching this country from Italy tell of the horrible conditions that exist in the liberated area of that country. Among many cases cited, the following is a typical one of a family consisting of a father, mother, and eight children, the youngest 2 months old. This family is living on a cellar floor, 3 inches under water and containing the usual dirt and filth which is brought on by the conditions caused by war. This family is crowded into three small rooms. The father is unemployed. The youngest baby is terribly undernourished due to lack of milk which is impossible to obtain. It is pathos like this that requires immediate relief to alleviate the suffering of the people in Italy.

There is no question that the creation of this committee would have been a tremendous help to the morale of Americans of Italian descent and would bring about close understanding and good will on the part of the Italians. It would be just one of those things which would cement our friendship with our erstwhile enemies and make loyal and devoted followers of the United Nations of many Italians who are otherwise lukewarm to our cause. We let this opportunity slip by, largely because of Mr. Taft's lack of cooperation, and we lost valuable help and again missed the bus in our dealings with Italy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania, for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. SASSCER, from April 17 through Friday, April 21, on account of official business, attending as a member of the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2648. An act for the relief of Avid Evers;

H. R. 4133. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 18, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Tuesday, April 18, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of S. 1767.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1433. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service

1434. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the Railway Labor Panel, for the period ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1435. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year, beginning April 1, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1436. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 500. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary compensation and $250 funeral expenses to Mrs. Mary Glusing Elliott, widow of William P. Elliott, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1353). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4608. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to assure to the United States world leadership in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 4609. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4610. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4611. A bill to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4612. A bill to amend the act of October 17, 1942, authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and a service lapel button, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4613. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 4614. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the State of Texas a certain tract of land situated in Travis County, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 4615. A bill to establish, for the investigation and control of tuberculosis, a division in the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 4616. A bill to prohibit certain subsidy, indemnity, and other payments with respect to short-staple cotton and commodities manufactured from such cotton; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4617. A bill to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing and other districts, and to distribute such materials, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 4618. A bill to repeal the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act relating to political contributions by labor organizations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee to Investigate Federal Government Competition With Private Business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. Res. 501. Resolution to provide for an investigation of the small-loan business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 502. Resolution requesting information from the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 503. Resolution requesting the designation of Sunday, May 21, 1944, as a Day of Prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the prompt settlement of war contracts on termination thereof and for the removal and disposition of Government-owned facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Guaynabo, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution demanding from President Roosevelt the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Fajardo, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution demanding the removal of Rexford G. Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Juana Diaz, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution requesting the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell from the governorship of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4619. A bill for the relief of George Lassila; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 4620. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Gdaniec; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4621. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 4622. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5493. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the observance of a Bill of Rights Day throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5494. Also, letter received from the Railroad Workers' Protective League of Western New York, favoring the enactment of the Boren land-grant bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5495. Also, resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, voicing their views in connection with House bill 3420; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5496. Also, resolution adopted by the Common Motor Carriers of Western New York, Inc., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1161; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5497. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 1, North Side, Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 98 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5498. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of Herbert E. Cook and 87 other citizens of Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2032); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5499. By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: Petition of Nellie Peterson and 50 other citizens of Moline, Ill., regarding prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war in order to reduce absenteeism and conserve manpower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5500. By Mr. MARCANTONIO: Petition of more than 4,000 registered voters of the Borough of Manhattan in the city of New York, protesting against enactment of any prohibition laws as encouraging bootlegging and harming the war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5501. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution adopted by executive committee of the New Hampshire Bankers Association, Manchester, N. H., opposing the passage of Senate bill 1642 and House bill 3956 and supporting the position taken by the Federal Reserve Board in connection with the issues raised; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5502. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Pacific Coast Transportation Advisory Board of San Francisco regarding induction of essential railroad personnel into the armed forces, adopted March 16, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God who art behind the enshrouding mists and in them, we turn to Thee in whom there is no darkness at all. Through the mystery of earth's shadows lead our pilgrim feet as day by day we follow the gleam of Thy unfolding will for our lives, knowing that we cannot drift beyond the circle of Thy love and care. In patience and fidelity may we guard the flickering flame of the light within. Grant by Thy grace that in our particular sphere of service we may not be found wanting in this solemn hour of world crisis, when the bugles are sounding and the battle is set. We pray, as increasing trials come upon us, we may not shirk the issues of these creative days, nor lose our victorious faith in the final overthrow of evil and the enthronement of righteousness and truth, but, solemnly committing ourselves and our country unto Thee, who knoweth the way we take, that we shall come forth like gold tried in the fire. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 17, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 866) to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 86. An act to grant pensions to certain unmarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905;

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters;

H. R. 1675. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay;

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3054. An act to amend the Expediting Act;

H. R. 3524. An act to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument;

H. R. 3732. An act to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey;

H. R. 4115. An act to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed;

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4238. An act providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917;

H. R. 4292. An act to amend section 12 (b) of the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 4320. An act relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service.

INVITATION FROM SENATE OF NORTHERN IRELAND TO MAKE VISIT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Ambassador of Great Britain to the United States; together with a letter of invitation from the Speaker of the Senate of Northern Ireland, which were read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I have been asked by the Foreign Office to transmit to you the enclosed letter.

Believe me, dear Mr. Vice President,
Yours very sincerely,

HALIFAX.

The Honourable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Senate Office.

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE
VISCOUNT BANGOR, O. B. E.,
Stormont, Belfast, March 21, 1944.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am directed by the Senators of Northern Ireland to extend to the delegation from the Senate of the United States, which, it is understood, may visit Great Britain in the near future, a very cordial invitation to spend some days with them as their guests in Northern Ireland.

Senators are very anxious to cement the excellent relations which have existed between the forces of the United States and th people of this country during the war, and to promote a closer association between this Parliament and Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

BANGOR,
Speaker of the Senate of Northern Ireland.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS UNDER NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the Railway Labor Panel, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL WAR HOUSING—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF A BILL

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on December 18, 1943, I introduced S. 1607, a bill "to provide for the disposition of Federal War Housing." At the time of the introduction of the bill I had discussed this measure with a member of the National Committee on Housing, and was under the impression that the bill had the support of that committee. I have since learned that, while the bill reflects in substance proposals which that organization has made and published, proposals which have had wide approval, the committee seems to believe that most of its recommendations can be accomplished under existing laws.

I also received, on January 13, 1944, a letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, a paragraph of which reads:

In summary, we feel that, through the process of experience over the past few years, and through the splendid cooperation of the

Congress in shaping the Lanham Act to meet our needs as they have arisen and as the Congress and the Agency have foreseen them, we now have practically all of the necessary legislative tools to deal effectively and efficiently with the disposition of federally owned war housing.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1607, and that the bill may be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 86. An act to grant pensions to certain unmarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 1675. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 3524. An act to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 3054. An act to amend the Expediting Act; and

H. R. 3732. An act to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4236. An act providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 4115. An act to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed;

H. R. 4292. An act to amend section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 4320. An act relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil-service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

PRELUDE TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON

[Mr. JACKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Prelude to Peace," delivered by him at the seventy-fourth anniversary banquet celebration of Perry Lodge, F. & A. M., Marysville, Pa., March 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Edwin Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, before the State Federation of Labor, at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., April 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECEIPTS BY FARMERS UNDER 1942 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter and tables from the Department of Agriculture relative to estimated gross payments under the 1942 agricultural conservation program, which appear in the Appendix.]

IRAQ'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Iraq's Contribution to the Common War Effort of the United Nations," compiled from Iraq Government official sources by Maj. Chefik Haddad, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. ALBANS MESSENGER

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relative to the St. Lawrence seaway, published in the St. Albans Messenger for April 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] presented for the RECORD an article from a Detroit newspaper showing that milk was flowing in the gutters in Detroit.

On April 15, I wrote the War Food Administration an inquiry, and received in reply a letter dated April 15, 1944, a part of which I wish to read:

> The increasingly critical milk production situation, the increased urgency in volume of military and lend-lease needs for dairy products, and the continued increase in civilian consumption of fluid milk in this country made it necessary last fall that we either take some type of action to limit any further increase in civilian sales of fluid milk, or that we default in our job of meeting dairy products requirements for direct war uses.

Mr. President, this morning there came to my desk a telegram stating that milk prices have been cut 10 cents a hundredweight in Wisconsin, effective March 16, but it was not announced to the farmers until the checks were delivered on April 17.

Just think of that. On April 17 the farmers who went to the extraordinary effort asked of them, farmers whose boys have been taken from the farms, these farmers who had, through the winter, with the aid of the youngsters and the oldsters, met the demands of the Government for a super supply of milk, now find that the checks for their milk, which were due on March 15, have been cut to the extent of 10 cents a hundredweight.

The telegram states:

> I ask that you protest price cut to O. P. A. and War Food Administration.

I agree with what is implied in this message, that the cutting of prices to extend back a month before the farmers have notice is not only unethical, but it is contributing to a demoralization of the home front right now, when we need morale as we never needed it before.

I wish to speak briefly about the situation as it exists in Wisconsin, and as I know it exists in other States throughout this country. Right now we can divide the proposition into three parts. First, what is the situation in relation to the transportation facilities in Wisconsin and other States? That goes to the question of trucks. The situation in Wisconsin, as it relates to farmers' milk trucks, and all milk transporting trucks, is becoming tragic. The Government asked that the farmer produce, and produce and produce, and he has done it. Then the Government reached in and took the farmers' help, and kept on taking his help, and it is taking his help now.

There will soon fall on the transportation facilities of the milk industry one of the most tremendous loads in the history of our State. This increased burden is being piled on a transportation system which is rapidly breaking down beyond economical repair. It is getting to the point where farmers cannot take their trucks in and get them overhauled. The trucks need new motors, but the farmers cannot get new motors. The chassis are going to pieces, even beyond repair. New trucks are what the farmers need and what the milk industry needs.

If the Government has surplus trucks available, it must see to it that the milk industry obtains them in order that milk may be transported. As I have said, already milk is flowing in the gutters of Detroit. I shall mention an incident which was related to me by a professor at the University of Wisconsin, indicating how serious is the situation at another part of this front. The Government is asking for more milk, more farm commodities, and it owes an obligation to make sure that those commodities get to the market and to the consumer. Someone must take hold of the situation at once.

I have received a letter from Mr. R. K. Froker, professor of agricultural economics, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin, at Madison, Wis., with which he sent to me two tables indicating, first, the balance of the life of the trucks used to haul milk in seven Wisconsin counties, and, second, the total mileage on trucks used in hauling milk in seven Wisconsin counties. In his letter to me, Professor Froker says, among other things:

> Only a very open and mild winter has prevented a general breakdown in our milk-truck assembling system in the State. We have heard many complaints of the difficulties our dairy plants are now having in keeping their trucks operating. Practically no new milk trucks have been added since the fall of 1941. Approximately one-half of our milk trucks would have been replaced by new ones had normal supplies of trucks been available. Moreover, our present trucks are much more heavily loaded due to fewer trucks and increased milk production. To add to this situation is the general difficulty of obtaining adequate repair parts and finding capable mechanics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the two tables from Professor Froker be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., April 15, 1944.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have your wire asking for a copy of our transportation study on trucking conditions in Wisconsin as it applies to the milk industry. The material which we have published has dealt largely with possibilities of conserving mileage through the reorganization of milk truck routes. The other phases of the study have not been published to date.

I am, however, enclosing a copy of two tables which I believe will show you the general condition of our milk trucks in Wisconsin. You will note that the truck situation is becoming progressively more serious. Only a very open and mild winter has prevented a general break-down in our milk-truck assembling system in the State.

We have heard many complaints of the difficulties our dairy plants are now having in keeping their trucks operating. Practically no new milk trucks have been added since the fall of 1941. Approximately one-half of our milk trucks would have been replaced by new ones had normal supplies of trucks been available. Moreover, our present trucks are much more heavily loaded due to fewer trucks and increased milk production. To add to this situation is the general difficulty of obtaining adequate repair parts and finding capable mechanics.

Very truly yours,

R. K. FROKER,
Professor of Agricultural Economics.

Estimated life of trucks used for hauling milk in 7 Wisconsin counties, August 1943 [1]

	On basis of present service and ability to get repairs		If adequate service and repairs are provided	
	Number of trucks	Percent of those reporting	Number of trucks	Percent of those reporting
6 months and under	92	17.0	24	4.5
7 to 12	169	31.3	83	15.5
13 to 18	43	8.0	36	6.7
19 to 24	142	26.3	163	30.5
25 to 30	14	2.6	38	7.1
31 and over	80	14.8	190	35.7
Total	540	100.0	534	100.0
Not reporting	113		119	

[1] Compiled by Clifford M. Hardin and Rudolph K. Froker, department of agricultural economics, University of Wisconsin.

Total mileage on trucks used for hauling milk in 7 Wisconsin counties, August 1943 [1]

Total mileage	All models [2]	Percent of all trucks reporting	Model of truck								
			1942	1941	1940	1939	1938	1937	1936	1935	1934 and older
Under 50,000	234	40.2	50	91	52	19	6	9			4
50,000 to 74,999	167	28.7	3	47	47	28	13	13	11	3	2
75,000 to 99,999	86	14.8	3	12	24	14	12	10	4	3	4
100,000 to 124,999	52	9.0		3	16	11	7	7	4	1	3
125,000 to 149,999	14	2.4			4	3	1	4		1	1
150,000 to 174,999	16	2.8			6	4		2	3		1
175,000 to 199,999	5	.9			1				2	2	
200,000 to 224,999	6	1.0			1	1	1		2	1	
225,000 and over	1	.2			1						
Total	581	100.0	56	153	152	80	40	45	26	14	15

Compiled by Clifford M. Hardin and Rudolph K. Froker, department of agricultural economics, University of Wisconsin.

[2] 72 trucks did not report this figure.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been in contact with Brig. Gen. C. D. Young, Deputy Director, Office of Defense Transportation, who has agreed to collaborate in trying to find the solution to this problem. There have been many things which have contributed to the scarcity of trucks available for the home front. The completion of one of the oil pipe lines was delayed, but that is now completed. The delay meant using certain tank trucks to meet the critical oil situation. The flush milk season will soon be on in Wisconsin, and it is up to Government to see that the transportation system for much-needed foodstuffs, such as milk and other farm commodities, does not break down.

Mr. President, the administrative branch of the Government is not doing the job it should do. The Congress created the various bureaus and agencies. They are stepchildren of Congress. When they fall down on the job it is for Congress to see to it that they get back on the job and do what should be done.

Mr. President, now I wish to discuss the subject of manpower as it relates to the cheese factories, and also to discuss the related subject of milk. I hold in my hand a letter from W. W. Clark, associate director of the agricultural extension service, University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture, at Madison, Wis. I wish to read certain paragraphs of his letter, which is dated April 14, 1944. I realize that this matter does not seem of great significance, perhaps, to those who listen or to those who are not listening, but if the vast food laboratory called the State of Wisconsin, which produces this year between 60 and 65 percent of the Nation's cheese, breaks down, the situation will be very serious. When we realize that the Army and the Navy are taking 75 percent of our cheese for Army and Navy and lend-lease use, it must appear to any reasonable person that it is a serious situation to permit a paralysis of a great industry like the milk, cheese, and butter industry. That is what is likely to happen if we do not obtain the needed trucks, or, second, if we do not keep in our cheese factories the men who know how to produce cheese, and if the farmers do not receive different treatment relative to the price of milk.

I read from Mr. Clark's letter:

You have no doubt already had your attention called to the very serious situation which faces the Wisconsin cheese industry through the operation of the recent policy of National Selective Service headquarters in drafting all men between the ages of 18 and 26 for military service, with certain exceptions. My purpose in addressing you is to provide information on this situation which you may not have conveniently available and which you may find helpful in considering the problem.

Listen to this, Mr. President. Mr. Clark then says:

Much of the following information has already been transmitted to General Hershey by Col. John F. Mullen, State director of Wisconsin selective service, but up to the present time no relief has been provided.

Let me interject parenthetically that I have been in contact with General Hershey's office now for over a week or 10 days. He passes the buck back to Marvin Jones. When I get in contact with Jones, he passes the buck to Hershey. In the meantime, cheese factories in the State of Wisconsin are closing, and the milk we need will be running down the gutters. How much longer will this situation continue?

General Hershey apparently feels that there should be no deferment of men 26 years of age unless he receives some kind of directive or recommendation. I have called his attention to the serious nature of the situation existing in the State of Wisconsin. I have told him that there are in the neighborhood of 1,623 cheese factories in the State, and that 150 of them are 1-man cheese factories. But the other day, according to Mr. Clark's letter, when the Selective Service reached in and took 1 of those men, the farmers of Clark County got hold of 1 of the cheese inspectors and forcibly compelled him to enter that cheese factory and run it. The Army wants the cheese; the Navy wants the cheese; the Lend-Lease wants the cheese. Yet, they have not enough brains to understand the necessity of making sure that this 1 man remains on the job. He cannot be replaced. That is the situation.

Professor Clark says in his letter that 135 of these men are the sole operators of 1-man factories. Mr. Mooney, the secretary of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers Association, wrote me a letter in which he said there are 150 men who are the sole operators of 1-man cheese factories. Yet, I have not been able to get any action.

Let us take a typical situation. Suppose 150 farmers in a certain area supply their milk to a cheese factory run by 1 cheese maker, and suppose that all at once the Selective Service takes that cheese maker into the armed services. A cheese maker cannot be trained overnight. He is a specialist. He has to know his business. The drafting of a cheese maker is quite different from the drafting of an ordinary farmer. The drafting of an ordinary farmer affects only 1 farm. I had such an experience, when a farm boy was taken off my farm. Of course, when he was drafted

the only effect was upon my farm; production on my farm subsequently decreased. But, Mr. President, when the Selective Service drafts a cheese maker out of a 1-man cheese factory which is the receiving source of the milk from 150 to 500 farms, then the Selective Service not only makes it impossible for the milk on those farms to be delivered to the cheese factory and for the cheese to be made from the milk, but the Selective Service lights a flame in the minds of those milk producers who have been working 70 and 80 hours a week; and God knows we cannot light any flames to break the morale in America. I say it simply does not make sense, and that is why I am talking here today.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire letter of Prof. W. W. Clark be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., April 14, 1944.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

DEAR SENATOR: You have no doubt already had your attention called to the very serious situation which faces the Wisconsin cheese industry through the operation of the recent policy of National Selective Service headquarters in drafting all men between the ages of 18 and 26 for military service, with certain exceptions. My purpose in addressing you is to provide information on this situation which you may not have conveniently available and which you may find helpful in considering the problem.

Much of the following information has already been transmitted to General Hershey by Col. John F. Mullen, State director of Wisconsin Selective Service, but up to the present time no relief has been provided. I am also furnishing Judge Marvin Jones, of the War Food Administration, with this information. My feeling is that this situation needs to be remedied, not because of the results which the drafting of young cheese makers would have on individuals, important as these may be, but because of the very serious effects which widespread drafting of young cheese makers will have upon the production of milk and cheese for the national war effort.

In the 1,623 cheese factories in Wisconsin there are 1,475 men 18 through 25 years of age. One hundred and thirty-five of these men are the sole operators of 1-man factories. Their drafting will close most of those factories. About 400 men, 18 through 25, are employed in 2-man factories and about 900 men of the same ages in larger factories.

This morning I was told of an operator in a one-man factory in Clark County who was ordered to take a preinduction physical examination. His absence for the day left absolutely no one in his community who could take care of the milk delivered to his factory. The report is that farmers located a State cheese inspector in another part of the county, surrounded him and insisted that he make the cheese for the day in their factory to prevent the loss of the milk.

About 75 percent of our cheese factories are located in sparsely settled rural communities. The established custom is to use cheese makers' sons and young, healthy and strong farm boys as trainees in the plants. Factories are unable to hire labor from urban areas or from older age brackets due to the generally prevailing low-wage scale, the long work schedule (7 days and 70–80 hours a week), and the heavy physical labor involved. Women are not generally adapted to this work for the same reasons. (Cans of milk weigh around 115 pounds, Cheddar cheese around 75 pounds, and Swiss cheese drums 175 to 225 pounds.) Single men are generally employed because they can board and room with the cheese maker in the living quarters above the factory. Married men are not attracted to the industry as helpers because of the absence of living quarters for families and the inconvenience and difficulties of daily transportation from urban centers.

There are absolutely no replacements available for trained cheese makers included in this group and a considerable proportion of the experienced helpers cannot be replaced for the reasons stated above.

State selective-service headquarters estimates that of the nearly 1,500 young men now working in cheese factories, it is imperative that at least 550 be deferred to prevent loss of food and reduction in milk production. My own judgment is that unless an even larger number is deferred there will be serious difficulty in handling milk in the cheese areas through the flush season which is now coming on.

I am receiving reports from county agents and others in various parts of the State indicating material increases in the rate of milk production over the same period in 1943. For example, the county agent in Pepin County has collected figures showing that farmers in that locality are producing 11 percent more milk than they did at the same time a year ago. A condensery operator in Door County is receiving 12 percent more milk from fewer patrons than he had a year ago. The Badger Consolidated at Shawano reported 2 or 3 weeks ago that over the previous 30-day period they had received 6 percent more milk per patron than they did a year ago. Other less definite reports indicate that in many sections of the State there is a material increase in milk production. Professor Froker, of the college of agriculture, estimates that our plants are now handling 40 percent more whole milk than they did in 1939, of which about half is due to an increase in production of milk and the other half due to shifting from farm separated cream production to delivery of whole milk.

This situation is significant, because it means that milk which is now going to cheese factories could not be manufactured in other plants in this State during the coming flush period, even if it were desirable to do so. In fact, I have reports of condenseries which are unable to handle all the milk which they are getting now and are shipping part of their normal receipts of milk to other condenseries for processing. With the spring flush coming on, this situation will become more serious due both to the normal seasonal increase in milk and the removal by draft of young men from the other milk-processing plants.

I need not include to you a statement as to the importance of the Wisconsin milk industry in the national food program, but many other people, including, I presume, General Hershey, may not realize that Wisconsin produces one-eighth of all the milk in the United States and half of the Cheddar cheese produced in this country. Approximately one-half of all the cheese bought by the Government for the Army and lend-lease purposes comes from Wisconsin.

Of course, if nothing is done to retain these young cheese makers in their factories there will still be cheese made in Wisconsin, but the production of this type of food will be badly disrupted, and considerable amounts of milk will spoil or will be fed to livestock. I sincerely hope the National Selective Service headquarters can be convinced that this situation should be handled with judgment and not find it out by experience when it is too late.

Respectfully yours,

W. W. CLARK,
Associate Director.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I read one paragraph of the letter:

I need not include to you a statement as to the importance of the Wisconsin milk industry in the national food program, but many other people including, I presume, General Hershey, may not realize that Wisconsin produces one-eighth of all the milk in the United States and half of the cheddar cheese produced in this country. Approximately one-half of all the cheese bought by the Government for the Army and lend-lease purposes comes from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, we now come to the third subdivision of my remarks and that is the reduction in the price of milk. It has been clearly pointed out earlier in my remarks that the farmers have performed miracles in production. By working their children and their grandparents, and by every other means, they got the production that the Government wanted. Now, without any notice to them, their milk checks are reduced by 10 cents a hundred. That is fine encouragement. It is wonderful treatment by the Government. This is not keeping faith.

But the real issue is, What are we going to do about it? These bureaus, divisions, and other agencies are our foster children. They are accountable to us. We created them. I know how easy it is for the Senate to overlook things and pass the buck once we have created an agency and told someone to do a certain thing. "Let George do it."

Mr. President, I received a letter today from a businessman—a big businessman this time—who operates four or five factories in my State. He stated that if Congress did not do something, the people would get the impression that there was no further need for Congress. That is a pretty serious statement.

Mr. President, I wish to talk about milk. About a year ago, when the Office of Price Administration granted an increase in the selling price of case goods for evaporated milk, the newspapers carried the story that the O. P. A. based its finding of $4.10 a case on a price to producers of $2.46 for milk of 3.5 percent butterfat. Several persons in the industry have told me that the O. P. A. has given this same type of information to the evaporated-milk industry. The producer's price of $2.46 a hundred was supposed to have been arrived at by taking the historical margin between the price of case goods and the amount paid to the producer. For example, if the case-goods price were $4.10 a hundred, and the producers were being paid $2.46, subtracting $2.46 from $4.10 would leave a remainder of $1.64, which is supposed to be the historical margin on which the evaporated-milk industry operates. This does not reflect the margin which the O. P. A. is supposed to have today. The

O. P. A. claims to have used the historical margin of $1.55 a hundred. In that case the producer's price would be $2.63 a hundredweight, without respect to what the proper historical margin should be. The evaporated-milk producers claim—and I have been in contact with them—that the O. P. A. found the proper price to the producer to be $2.46 a hundred. When the selling price of $4.10 a case was established, the evaporated-milk industry was paying $2.60 to the producers in Wisconsin. Therefore, under those circumstances, it can be seen how inappropriate it is at this time to take 10 cents from what the farmer has been receiving.

It appears to me that the subsidy payment has been used as a vehicle to permit the evaporated industry to gain 15 cents per hundredweight, for which they have been fighting for about a year. It is my further observation that the Government will reduce the feed subsidies effective the 1st of May. I have heard from some quarters that the reduction subsidy will be 20 cents per hundredweight. There are others who say it will be reduced as much as 30 cents per hundredweight. In the event the Government reduces the subsidy payment by 30 cents per hundredweight, effective May 1, the producer will be taking 45 cents per hundredweight less for his milk than he was during the first 15 days of March.

Historically, surpluses in the flush period from the small milk plants in Wisconsin are handled by the large evaporating companies. It has long been the policy of the evaporating people to pay these small plants a small premium over and above established producer prices. In recent years this premium has amounted to about 15 cents per hundredweight. This permits the small plants, cooperatives, and cheese factories to absorb the additional handling charges that are involved when they have to pay two hauling costs on the milk; one to get the milk to the plant, and another to get it to the factory plant. There are other small plant charges, such as cooling and reassembling for the evaporating plants.

When one realizes that the Pure Milk Products Cooperative (one Wisconsin milk group) produced 1,105,340,000 pounds of milk last year, and when one also realizes that the whole State of Maryland produced only 945,000,000 pounds, one can readily see how important it is to give to an area which can produce much of the needed milk consideration equal to that accorded a State such as Maryland, where high-cost production prevails. Wisconsin's total milk production will run 15,000,000,000 pounds per year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator give us an explanation as to why 10 cents a hundred was taken from the milk checks?

Mr. WILEY. I have no adequate explanation. I can assure the Senator that the farmers were in the dark until it bumped them in the eye. When they received their checks, 10 cents a hundred was taken from them, just as though someone should reach into the Senator's pocket and take what belongs to him. I am saying that the Government should see to it that the farmers are better treated. The population of my State is about 3,100,000. The State is about 50 percent industrial and 50 percent agricultural. We cannot treat a million and a half people like that and get by with it very long in the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Do the farmers receive their checks from the A. A. A. office in the State?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; through feed subsidy checks. The reduction came in the checks from the condenseries the Government furnished the vehicle. The farmers had no knowledge of what was going on. All at once it hit them.

Mr. President, within the past day or so the Army has announced its procurement needs with respect to evaporated milk. I understand that the Army is asking for 16,000,000 cases of evaporated milk to be delivered at the rate of 5,000,000 cases for May, 5,000,000 cases for June, three and a half million cases for July, and two and a half million cases for August. I believe that is almost double the amount heretofore required for the same period of time.

Last fall the Government said to the boys and girls and old folks, "Go out and produce; we will fix the price." The price was fixed. Now the Army wants double the amount it previously required, and the farmer gets it in the neck. His price is reduced 10 cents a hundred pounds. What is happening? His machinery is wearing out. He must work with fewer facilities, less manpower, and less capital; and now the price of his milk is reduced 10 cents a hundred. As I have stated, I believe that the amount requested is double the amount of milk heretofore required for the same period of time. Five million cases of milk a month is just about the capacity of the evaporated-milk industry. With such a tremendous increase in demand, it does not seem possible that there should be such a reduction in the price as has been made.

I am advised that in Maryland and Virginia the producers have had a base price of $4 a hundred, with a feed subsidy of 80 cents a hundred, and a subsidy of $13.50 a ton on hay. The total subsidy on hay alone is about $2,000,000. There is a feed subsidy of 80 cents a hundred, to say nothing about the hay subsidy paid to the producers of Virginia and Maryland. The price of milk to the producers in Wisconsin was reduced on March 15 by 10 cents a hundred. That is enough to discourage further production.

On the other hand, as I have already stated, Wisconsin supplies one-third of the evaporated milk needs of the Nation, and the farmers get it in the neck. It is only natural to assume that there is a greater potential possibility of increasing production in Wisconsin than in any other State. We have the factories, the cows, and the means of manufacturing dairy products. If subsidies are to be paid as an incentive to increase milk production in Wisconsin, Wisconsin should be recognized for its ability to supply the milk. An increase in milk production should be brought about by a substantial increase in incentive payments.

Mr. President, perhaps I have talked long enough. The record is here. If the Government does not move, I fear a situation which may be truly tragic. If 700 cheesemakers are taken away from Wisconsin, the result will be not only a reduction in production, but also a direct loss in foodstuffs. Milk flows to the cheese factories just as water flows through the faucets in a house. If cheese factories are shut down, we can imagine what will happen.

But that is not all. We can ruin the economic life of a State by such practices. In addition, we can do what is suggested by the businessman who wrote to me. He operates five factories. We can so sabotage the mentality of our people that they will say, "There is no further need of a legislative body."

I wonder if someone is planning it that way. I wonder if someone is thinking that course through. I wonder if back of all this there is not only misdirection and lack of action, but an absolute feeling that the day of legislative power is over. We can so crucify the people by failing them in their economic needs that they may take steps which they would not take in more sober moments. Only a few years ago the farmers were battling with pitchforks and guns. Why did they do it? They did it for the same reason that actuated men during the American Revolution. They did it to protect their homes and their economic life blood. They did it to sustain their families. Now the Government tells farmers to produce milk, cheese, and butter, and at the same time takes away from them their help. It allows them inadequate facilities with which to transport their produce, and it wrecks initiative by cutting down, without justification or equity, the compensation that they should receive.

Mr. President, in view of these facts, I lay this subject in the lap of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce having in charge the rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 3961, I wish to give notice that hearings on the bill will begin before the subcommittee on Tuesday, April 25. I have charge of the naval appropriation bill, and hope to get through with that bill Friday of this week, and then I should like to take up the rivers and harbors bill immediately afterward, because after that will come the flood-control bill, which we hope will be sent over to the Senate from the House by the time we conclude consideration of the rivers and harbors bill. Following that will be the bill relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MEAD in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I advised the Senator yesterday, with a group of Senators from various States, Governors of Western States are very much interested in making a presentation to the subcommittee of which the Senator from Louisiana is chairman with respect to the rivers and harbors bill. These Governors are coming East for the Governors' Conference on May 28, and it was hoped that opportunity might be provided for them at that time to make their opinions known to the subcommittee.

We agreed yesterday to make an effort to see whether or not the western Governors could come at an earlier date. I will say to the Senator that in spite of my efforts I have not yet received any definite answer. But I want to make the record clear that it is our desire to make certain that the points of view to be presented by these Governors may be presented to the committee.

Mr. OVERTON. I may say that I shall be very glad to cooperate with the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators as far as I possibly can. There will be a number of controversial items in the rivers and harbors bill, the hearings on which will occupy some appreciable time—I do not know how long—but when we start the hearings I should like to go through with them, and I should like the cooperation of the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators from the Western States who are interested in the bill, to aid me in expediting the hearings.

I assume the Governors, a number of whom are coming, can be here before the conference begins. They cannot all testify on the same day. Then there will be other witnesses who can be heard on the subject matter in which the Senator from Wyoming is interested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Every effort will be made to bring these Governors here as long in advance of the conference as possible.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I heard the Senator from Louisiana make some reference to proposed legislation with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway. Just what is that legislation, and is the Senator making any request to present it at this time?

Mr. OVERTON. No. I said that following the rivers and harbors bill there will be the flood-control bill. I happen to have the honor of being chairman of the subcommittee dealing with those measures. I am also the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. WHITE. I merely desire to make certain that no unanimous-consent agreement is entered into with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway until we have a chance to see what it is.

Mr. OVERTON. No; there is no such request whatsoever. I simply stated that certain measures were in futuro, and that the measures were coming up for consideration in the ordinary course of events, in the sequence I mentioned.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. NYE. Can the Senator indicate what might be the earliest or the latest time when it would be convenient for the committee for these western Governors to be heard?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be very glad to hear them at anytime following Tuesday, April 25, just as soon as they can be here. But if additional time is required, I am sure there are going to be other controversial features of the bill which will require some testimony, and we can take up those features first. I shall be very glad to cooperate along that line. I cannot say how long it will take to consider those features.

Mr. NYE. The Senator cannot determine now how long hearings on the other matters might require?

Mr. OVERTON. No; that is correct.

Mr. NYE. Might it be as much as 10 days?

Mr. OVERTON. Possibly so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that if it should be determined that the hearings on the rivers and harbors bill should be delayed in order to permit the western Governors to make their appearance and give their testimony in the latter part of May, then the proponents of the seaway bill, as they have advised me, would be prepared to give their testimony by the 1st of May. Included among the witnesses would be some Governors from the Eastern States. If it should be found advisable to postpone the rivers and harbors hearings until the latter part of May, I am sure the advocates of the seaway would be glad to make good use of the intervening time in presenting their case before the committee, as they are already prepared to do so.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator from Vermont, but I will say that there is no intention to delay the hearings on the rivers and harbors bill. I simply stated that the hearings will begin on Tuesday, April 25, and then we shall proceed as expeditiously as possible. It is my intention to take up the flood-control bill thereafter.

Mr. AIKEN. But, Mr. President, it occurred to me that if the rivers and harbors bill should be considered before the St. Lawrence seaway bill, and if the hearings on the rivers and harbors bill do not begin until the last of May——

Mr. OVERTON. They are to begin on Tuesday, April 25.

Mr. AIKEN. The hearings will begin on that day?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood one of my colleagues to say that the Governors could not appear before the last of May.

Mr. OVERTON. They are going to attend a Governors' conference toward the last of May, but they are also going to be present at these hearings before May 25 or 28, or whatever time the conference is to be held.

Mr. AIKEN. Personally I hope the hearings on all these bills may be held as soon as possible.

Mr. OVERTON. I think we ought to get through with the rivers and harbors bill sometime in the middle of May.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand, the Senator will get to the controversial features of the bill first. Does the Senator anticipate that the navigation features of the bill relating to the Missouri River will come up, say, prior to a week or 10 days hence? My reason for pressing the question is that we have some technical men who are working on those features.

Mr. OVERTON. Well, making a guess, I should think that probably the Missouri River project, if it is to be taken up last, will not come up until 10 days after April 25, the day when the hearings are to begin.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator again yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I inquire of the Senator whether the big Missouri River project, the billion-dollar project, is in the rivers and harbors bill, or the flood-control bill? My understanding is that it is in the flood-control bill, which is to come up later.

Mr. OVERTON. The project for deepening the channel from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River is in the pending rivers and harbors bill, and that is the project to which the Senators from the West are referring.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The rivers and harbors bill, concerning which the Senator from Louisiana has been speaking, includes, as I understand, a great many other projects besides those which have just been mentioned by various Senators who have spoken.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. BURTON. I particularly wish to say that I hope the bill includes a project at Youngstown, Ohio. I appreciate the action taken by the Senator from Louisiana with respect to providing early hearings on the bill, which involves not only this matter, but also involves a great many other matters which it will take much time to consider. I hope we can quickly proceed with hearings on the various items contained in the bill, and reach a conclusion with respect to them in the early part of the spring.

I appreciate very much the Senator from Louisiana having given notice of the hearings, and wished to mention the project at Youngstown, Ohio, which comes before the Senate as a new matter. It is not contained in the House bill.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. OVERTON. I may say that a great many requests have come to me to proceed with the hearings as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to express my appreciation of the fact that immediate consideration is to be given to this very important project. It is necessary that consideration be given almost immediately to the situation in the Carolinas along the Atlantic Ocean. I again wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana for expediting the hearings on this important matter.

Mr. OVERTON. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that there is one project in his State which is of supreme importance.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; the project in Charleston, S. C.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, April 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of life and spirit of truth, we bless Thee that in all sublime creation there is the working of the divine purpose, a power other than ourselves. Not by our own might can we attain the highest levels, but through Thy spirit these may be glorified. Lay Thy hand upon us that our neglected gifts may be revived; make clean our hearts within us and take not Thy holy spirit from us.

Have mercy upon this old world with its hard face and stone walls. O lift the mirror of truth and show America her real self, her easy faith, the pathos of spiritual declension, the slacking of her zeal in holy worship. Inspire in her breast a more sincere spirit, a consecrated soul rich in emotion and intensity. By the historic standards of eternal principles, may we test afresh our actions and forever dissipate the dream of easy tasks and the nightmare of failure. Stay by, O God, when hostilities arrest our hopes and our cause seems ready to fail. O keep us silently, steadily, and persistently at our work, knowing that soon there will be a glow in the sky of freedom's horizon. In the name of our mediator, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE McKELLAR AMENDMENTS TO THE T. V. A.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FLANNAGAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HOUSE AND SENATE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SATTERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a clipping.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Miles F. Hollister, of Altoona, Pa., before a number of service clubs and civic organizations throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the West Frankfort Chamber of Commerce, West Frankfort, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE TYPICAL AMERICAN MARINE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in this Hall, so representative of the variety that is America, I believe that we should pause in reverence to the memory of the typical American marine.

His name was Fernand G. Bernard, of Lawrence, Mass. "Pete" they called him. This kid who won his letter in football at high school, who became a mill worker in a mill city, a church-going youth who liked to tinker with the family car, to swim at Forest Lake, to take his best girl to the movies on the traditional Wednesday night date. You see, there was nothing exceptional in his background except that he was an average American boy.

Perhaps, with an intuition greater than understanding, he sensed the danger to the people he loved, long before the rest of us did, and he resolved to do something about it.

The biggest challenge to his young life was coming up and he did not want to sit on the side lines.

In May of 1941 he enlisted with the finest body of fighting men, the United States Marine Corps. He trained at Parris Island. It was then that he was selected by a national magazine in a seven-page photo-history as the typical American marine.

He became a member of the Marine Raiders and for 13 months was overseas. On March 8, 1944, somewhere in the South Pacific theater, Sgt. Fernand G. Bernard was killed in action.

Lawrence, Mass., grieves her loss, yet stemming from this sacrifice comes the consciousness, with this heritage, which he passed on to us, of the great responsibilities we must meet and match as typical Americans.

AMENDMENT TO USE TAX STAMP ACT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE FLIGHT OF THE "CONSTELLATION" FROM CALIFORNIA TO WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a giant air transport, the new Lockheed *Constellation*, flew from Lockheed Airport in Burbank, Calif., to Washington in 6 hours and 56 minutes, thus beating the fastest speed record made heretofore by nearly a half-hour and the fastest coast-to-coast transport record by more than 3 hours. I hope the Members of the House will join with me as the Representative of the Twentieth District of California in taking pride in that aircraft which was designed and built in my district. It was conceived on the drafting board more than 4 years ago. That is notice to the House that you do not turn out a wonderful airplane in a day; however, we now have that aircraft and can produce many more just like it for the service of our country. It presents a preview of what we may expect in civil air transport after the war is over.

This giant transport was conceived by Jack Frye and Howard Hughes, of T. W. A. It was designed and built by Lockheed Aircraft Corporation for T. W. A. and Pan-American Airways, but war intervened and the contracts were taken over by the Army Air Force.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TALBOT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and to include therein three short resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address given on April 13 on the Town Meeting of the Air program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project and to include a letter that the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, wrote the Commerce Committee of the Senate in connection with that project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk today, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

THE FLIGHT OF THE "CONSTELLATION" FROM CALIFORNIA TO WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in 1937 a hard-working young man endowed with much initiative and creative ability designed and had built a worthy service airplane in Los Angeles, Calif., and flew it to New York in 7 hours and 29 minutes. No other man has been able to equal that record to date.

Five weeks ago today I visited the Lockheed factory located at Burbank, Calif., with this same forward looking and patriotic gentleman, Howard Hughes. We went through and inspected and observed the *Constellation*, the big plane designed by Mr. Hughes that landed at the National Airport yesterday after a flight of only 6 hours and 56 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this huge transport is the largest land plane ever built. Mr. Hughes built it over the same design that he used in building his small plane in 1937. Another remarkable trait of this philanthropist is that he not only flew around the world in the shortest time, but piloted this big plane with Co-Pilot Jack Frye, on its history-making trip yesterday. I am sure you join with me in congratulating not only Mr. Hughes and Mr. Frye, but the management and labor force that built this giant of the air.

In less than a year we will witness Mr. Hughes and Mr. Frye flying an air giant three or four times the size of the *Constellation* from California to the Washington Airport in less than 6 hours and 56 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, portending what is to come in the future air world, I received an air-mail letter last night which was placed in my box at the hotel at 6 o'clock that was mailed in Los Angeles, Calif., on the same day at 3 a. m. I congratulate my old friend, Mr. Jack Frye, and may I say that Howard Hughes appears to be one wealthy young man in this country who has put his money to good use and substantial scientific work and he ought to be complimented. Too many in his position do otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I am putting in the RECORD today a long report on the Aleutian Islands. I spent some time up there during January. It is a little known war front. I am sure the Members will be interested in reading it. A substantial portion of it of necessity had to be deleted by the Navy, but the remaining generalizations will suffice to give a good picture of this northern frontier.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the subject of the Aleutian Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DILWEG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, first in connection with Religious Book Week and the other on the subject Refugees in the Far East.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]?

There was no objection.

THE RIGHT OF NEW YORK SOLDIERS TO VOTE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if ever soldiers are getting a run-around, it is those of my State of New York. A Governor has refused to provide any easy method for them to obtain the ballot. Each and every man must personally and in writing apply for the ballot and otherwise satisfy the cumbersome provisions of this Dewey "soldier-can't-vote law."

Months will elapse before the ballot is received in New Guinea, Iran, or India.

We sought to simplify the process in New York so that the wives, parents, or relatives could ask for the ballot for the soldiers, but with Draconian cruelty Dewey said "No." Pontifically and from on high he proclaims, "If a soldier wants to vote, he will vote my way or not vote at all."

Furthermore, he must vote for an entire ticket, from President down to and including constable, dogcatcher, and judge of the local pie-eating contest. Finally, to add to the injustice, members of the Red Cross and merchant marine cannot vote at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made last night and also an article entitled "An Alien Speaks."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein letters, telegrams, and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

UNJUST CRITICISM OF GOVERNOR DEWEY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York who just finished speaking, practically charges Governor Dewey with an attempt to steal an election. There is absolutely no foundation for such a statement. If I caught the gentleman's remarks correctly, what he is kicking about is that due to the insistence of the New York Legislature and Governor Dewey, the

soldiers will have a chance to vote for county, city, State, and national candidates they desire to see nominated and elected. What this gentleman would like to have them do is have the legislature turn over the voting machinery to either the American Labor Party, the Communists, or to the new dealers. That will not be done. Due to Governor Dewey and the New York Legislature the soldiers are going to vote and they are going to vote their own convictions. It is not going to be a typical New York Tammany vote theft. Some are sore because the New Deal will not be in a position to control the soldier vote. The racket-busting prosecutor will do his part to prevent control of soldier voting by political racketeers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter received by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe of April 16 by Charles A. Merrill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE RIDE OF PAUL REVERE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are somewhat confused as a result of the speeches of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The first two gentlemen showed how we have speeded up air-mail delivery, so as to fly across the continent in a few hours, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] seems to think it is not fast enough to get ballots to our boys in the service.

Today is the anniversary of another great flight, one of the most important in all history. It is the anniversary of the midnight ride of Paul Revere, which inspired the American people to renewed vigor in the War of the Revolution, that resulted in the adoption of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, with its sacred Bill of Rights, as well as all those American institutions which we now enjoy.

On that Constitution we based the law covering the right of the soldiers to vote. Every one of them is going to get to vote a free and a complete ballot whether the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] likes it or not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

REV. JAMES T. DENIGAN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House the following: Messrs. MCGEHEE, KEOGH, and PITTENGER.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

GARNET CHARLES WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the first individual bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1718, for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized to nominate and appoint, by and with the advice of the Senate, Garnet Charles Williams, formerly lieutenant colonel, infantry, Eighty-seventh Infantry Brigade, Forty-fourth Division of the National Guard of the United States in the Army of the United States, a lieutenant colonel in the National Guard of the United States in the Army of the United States as of December 19, 1940, and place him immediately on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant colonel as of said 19th day of December 1940, with the same privileges and retired pay as provided by law for officers of the Regular Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM E. WIDBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3674, for the relief of William E. Widby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, sec. 777), William E. Widby, who has received compensation under such act for injury suffered on December 15, 1938, while an employee of the Works Progress Administration, is relieved of any liability to refund to the United States any sum in excess of $600, in the event a settlement in the amount of $1,800 is made by him or on his behalf in satisfaction of his claim against a third party on account of such injury.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. FRANK HOLEHAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 962, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $3,190.21, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for damage to certain property owned by them, which resulted when a United States Navy airplane crashed into such property on November 25, 1942, and for loss of rent from such property as a result of such damage: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK KNOWLES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1399, for the relief of Frank Knowles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Knowles, of Montgomery, Ala., the sum of $110, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of three typewriters owned by him which were destroyed by fire while on loan to the Work Projects Administration, at Opelika, Ala., on November 21, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE A. GIDDENS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1433, for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence A. Giddens, of Orlando, Fla., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States (1) for compensation for the death of his daughter, Betty Lou Giddens, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by her when an Army airplane crashed into the apartment of the said Clarence A. Giddens on June 5, 1943; (2) for compensation for personal injuries sustained by his

daughter, Carol March Giddens, as a result of such accident; (3) for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and funeral expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries and death; and (4) for compensation for loss and damage to his personal property as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER EUGENE HAYES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1484, for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter Eugene Hayes, the sum of $4,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the Government for damages sustained by the said Walter Eugene Hayes on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when a truck owned and operated by him was struck by a United States Army airplane attempting to make an emergency landing on United States Highway No. 101, near Arroyo Grande, Calif., on May 6, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. GUY DORSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3296, for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay R. Guy Dorsey, the sum of $7,000, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of claim for damages as a result of being struck by an Army truck on July 29, 1942, at the intersection of Kneeland Street and Harrison Avenue, Boston, Mass.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the comma, insert "of Bay Pines, Fla."

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,000" and insert "$2,515," and after the word "any", strike out the word "moneys" and insert "money in the Treasury."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "claim for damages" and insert "all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of wages, medical and hospital expenses."

At the end of the bill, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY SCHULTZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3977, for the relief of Harry Schultz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry Schultz, the sum of $1,560.89. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damage to real and personal property owned by him caused by a United States Navy airplane on October 30, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCH A. BROWN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4361, for the relief of Arch A. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $169 to Arch A. Brown, Union City, Ind. (formerly Manteo, N. C.), in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the payment of travel expense of transportation of personal and household effects, and use of own conveyance, due to his transfer from manager, Shelby Forest recreational demonstration area, Millington, Tenn., to manager, Cape Hatteras, national seashore project LD–NC–13, Manteo, N. C., while an employee of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAFF SGT. MARION JOHNSON AND SGT. GEORGE B. KRESS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1517, for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, the sum of $283.50, and to Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve, the sum of $214, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for the value of their personal camera equipment lost in a fire in the Marine Corps Recruiting Station, 76 Forsyth Street NW., Atlanta, Ga., on August 25, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary nothwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1542, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O–3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such

sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $4,797.15, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire in building B. O. Q. O–3, at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. S. E. McCARTY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1632, for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty, Supply Corps, United States Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $388.25 to reimburse Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy, for the value of personal property lost or damaged by a storm on August 17, 1942, which flooded Government quarters occupied by him at the United States Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. MAJ. RICHARD SHAKER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1676, for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sergeant Major Shaker, United States Marine Corps, the sum of $85, which sum represents the value of a radio lost while in the custody of the Marine Corps authorities at Quantico, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. (JR. GR.) NEWT A. SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1677, for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $272.50 to reimburse Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of the Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1681, to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,483.36, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire that destroyed quarters assigned to certain officers of Marine Utility Squadron 152 on February 9, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. R. D. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1045, for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs R D. Robinson (formerly Miss Kay Bayne), the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. R D. Robinson against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on April 28, 1940, when the automobile in which she was riding on the highway between Columbus, Ga., and Fort Benning, Ga., was struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESSIE C. SELMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1668, for the relief of Lessie C. Selman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lessie C. Selman, Quincy, Fla., the sum of $1,754.39. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lessie C. Selman against the United States arising out of damage to real and personal property on March 22, 1942, when a United States Army aircraft crashed on her farm and destroyed a tobacco barn and its contents.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after "March", insert "22."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. G. SULLIVAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2470, for the relief of J. G. Sullivan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to J. G. Sullivan, of Woodson, Tex., for permanent and total physical disability incident to and sustained as a result of the use of sodium arsenite poison to control grasshoppers on his farm in May 1938, this poison having been furnished by the United States Department of Agriculture without directions for its use, causing permanent disability from the effects of multiple arthritis: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

Line 6, strike out "for permanent and total physical disability incident to and" and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. R. DIXON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2624, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claim of J. R. Dixon, of Nansemond County, Va., against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as a result of injuries to certain oyster beds and oysters on such beds, operated by the said J. R. Dixon under perpetual franchise or lease from the Commonwealth of Virginia, caused by officers, employees, and/or agents of the United States in performing dredging operations in the Nansemond River during the year 1940. Such suit shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, and the liability of the United States in such suit shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases between private individuals.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "the", insert "latches or."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "year", insert in lieu thereof the word "years."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "1940", insert in lieu thereof "1941, 1942, and/or 1943."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK BAPTISTE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2788, for the relief of Frank Baptiste.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Baptiste, of Hilo, Hawaii, T. H., the sum of $507, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the monetary loss suffered by reason of the death of his wife, Matilda D'Almeida Baptiste, when she was run down and killed on the public highway by a servant of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$507" and insert "$2,507."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "monetary loss suffered by reason of the."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "States", insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT WILL STARKS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2874, for the relief of Robert Will Starks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Will Starks, Lewisburg, Tenn., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert Will Starks against the United States for personal injuries sustained on March 22, 1942, when he was severely burned while working in the laundry of the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Georgia", insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GRACE PAGE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3038, for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Grace Page, of Oakland, Calif., the sum of $1,399.08, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, and hospital, medical, and other expenses incident thereto, and for property damage, sustained when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a dump truck of the United States Engineer Corps, at about 8:45 a. m., on December 14, 1942, at the intersection of Broadway and MacArthur Boulevard, in the city of Oakland, Calif.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike "$1,399.08" and insert "$645.08."

Page 2 line 4, after the word "Calif.", insert the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JOHN GELLATLY

The Clerk called the next business, House Resolution 139.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2015) entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of John Gellatly, deceased, and/or Charlayne Whiteley Gellatly, as administratrix of the estate of John Gellatly, deceased," now pending in the House of Representatives, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved May 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the House of Representatives in accordance therewith.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL M. FRASURE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1477, for the relief of Carl M. Frasure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected; and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MARY HERTZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 527, for the relief of Mary Hertz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Hertz, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries sustained by the said Mary Hertz on October 16, 1941, when she was severely and permanently injured as a result of the careless and negligent manner in which the Work Projects Administration was engaged in the installation of water and sewage pipes at the southeast corner of Van Cortlandt Park South and Gouverneur Avenue, in the borough of the Bronx, city of New York, State of New York: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$750."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONRAD H. CLARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 933, for the relief of Conrad H. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Conrad H. Clark, of Cranston, R. I., the sum of $500, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical expenses suffered by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred in Cranston, R. I., on February 27, 1939, when the automobile which he was operating was struck by a Government-owned Ford coach and operated by an employee of the Work Projects Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$500", insert "and to pay the sum of $200 to Rocco Cellette, of Cranston, R. I."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "expenses", insert "and loss of wages."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "him" and insert in lieu thereof "them."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "he was operating" and insert in lieu thereof "they were riding."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "Work Projects" and insert in lieu thereof "Works Progress."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN SALFI

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2387, for the relief of John Salfi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Salfi, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $6,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained, and expenses incurred, as the result of a collision, on October 10, 1940, in Westerly, R. I., between the automobile in which the said John Salfi was a passenger and a National Youth Administration truck operated by Louis Gradilone, an employee of the National Youth Administration. No part of the sum appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to, or received by any agent or agents or attorney or attorneys on account of services rendered in connection with such claim; and it shall be unlawful for any agent or agents or attorney or attorneys to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any part of the amount so appropriated in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,000" and insert "$3,046.55."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,046.55" and insert "$2,046.55."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUFFY BROS., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2576, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the lapse of time and notwithstanding section 4 of the act of June 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 975), jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to consider all questions of law and fact and to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc., resulting from alleged increased costs of performing a contract entered into between said Duffy Bros., Inc., and the United States, said costs allegedly being increased as a result of the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 193): *Provided*, That such suit shall be brought within 6 months of the enactment of this act.

Any judgment rendered in favor of the claimant, Duffy Bros., Inc., shall be paid in the same manner as other judgments of said Court of Claims are paid.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLOSSIE LEESER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2601, for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Flossie Leeser, of Tulsa, Okla., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital, and medical expenses, sustained as a result of being run into and knocked down by a United States soldier at Miami Beach, Fla., on January 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WINNIE O'DELL SINGLETON AND JIMMIE DALE SINGLETON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2916, for the relief of Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton and Jimmie Dale Singleton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton, a sum of $5,000; to Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton as duly and legally appointed and qualified administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased, the sum of $685; to Jimmie Dale Singleton, a minor, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims arising from

the death of Gaylord W. Singleton, husband of Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton and father of Jimmie Dale Singleton, the said Gaylord W. Singleton having been killed in an airplane accident on August 26, 1942, at the Lubbock Army Flying School, Lubbock, Tex., the said Gaylord W. Singleton being post tailor for said Lubbock Army Flying School and his said death occurring as the result of the crash of two Army planes which collided in midair and one of which fell into the tailor shop operated by deceased, crushing him to death.

Payment of the $5,000 for Jimmie Dale Singleton, a minor, shall be made to Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton as the duly authorized and qualified legal guardian of said minor. The $5,000 provided for her in her own individual right shall be paid directly to her. The $685 being compensation for the loss of four sewing machines, threads, braids, and other materials storage cases, mirrors, and other tailor-shop equipment belonging to the said Gaylord W. Singleton, shall be paid to Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton as duly and legally appointed and qualified administratrix of the estate of the said Gaylord W. Singleton: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid, delivered to, or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and it shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person or persons violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after the word "to", down to and including the word "Singleton" on page 2, line 20, and insert "Mrs. Winnie Singleton, as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased, the sum of $5,035, in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising from the death of said Gaylord W. Singleton, who was killed on August 26, 1942, as the result of the crash of an Army airplane at the Lubbock Army Flying School, Lubbock, Tex."

Amend the title.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Winnie Singleton, as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased."

ROSS ENGINEERING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2965, for the relief of Ross Engineering Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ross Engineering Co., of Washington, D. C., the sum of $5,964.22. Such sum represents the amount of occupation taxes, interest, and penalties paid by Ross Engineering Co., herein called the contractor, to the State of West Virginia, in connection with the contractor's contract with the Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration, for the construction of a post office and courthouse at Fairmont, W. Va. The contract was entered into on July 26, 1940, and was to be performed within 360 days thereafter upon a Federal area over which the United States exercised exclusive jurisdiction by virtue of a grant from the Legislature of West Virginia, which reserved to the State only the right of the State to serve process thereon. At the time such contract was entered into the State of West Virginia had no authority to levy or collect from the contractor any State taxes with respect thereto, and in estimating the cost of the work the contractor excluded all State taxes. After such contract had been entered into and partly performed by the contractor the Congress enacted an act (Public, No. 819, 76th Cong.), approved October 9, 1940, and effective January 1, 1941, which relaxed the exclusive jurisdiction exercised by the United States over various Federal areas so as to permit the several States to levy and collect from contractors under Government contracts, and others, sales, use, and income taxes not theretofore collectible by the several States because of the exclusive jurisdiction exercised by the United States over the Federal area. Acting in pursuance of this act of Congress, the State of West Virginia was enabled to levy and collect from the contractor the sum above referred to as an occupation tax of 2 percent upon the gross income from the contract received after January 1, 1941.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN P. HAYES, POSTMASTER, ALBANY, N. Y.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3388, for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $5,685.53. Such sum represents a shortage in the account of the said John P. Hayes caused by thefts of post-office fund by a former clerk who has been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for such thefts. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of the said John P. Hayes in the sum of $5,685.53. The surety on the bond of the said John P. Hayes is released from any liability on account of such shortage.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, after the enacting clause, strike out the remainder of the bill. Insert in lieu thereof: "That John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $5,685.53; that the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $5,189.87. Such sums represent a shortage in the accounts of said postmasters, caused by theft of post-office funds by a former clerk who has been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for such thefts. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of John P. Hayes in the sum of $5,685.53 and to credit the account of the estate of John P. McCormack in the sum of $5,189.87. The surety on the bond of said postmasters is released from any liability on account of such shortage."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of John P. McCormack, former postmaster at Albany, N. Y."

BILLIE STOOKSBERRY AND LON L. STOOKSBERRY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3535, for the relief of Billie Stooksberry and Lon L. Stooksberry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Billie Stooksberry, a minor, 9 years of age, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for personal injuries inflicted on the said Billie Stooksberry, on July 15, 1943, resulting in the breaking of one of his legs, fracturing his skull, and otherwise wounding, bruising, and injuring him throughout his entire body and limbs, which said injuries are permanent; said Billie Stooksberry being thus injured while he was walking on and along the edge of Highway No. 61, about one-half mile north of Clinch River near Moores Bridge in Anderson County, Tenn., by being struck by an automobile which was the property of the United States and one of its agencies, Clinton Engineer Works, bearing license No. 1A-188, at the time being used by employees and officials of the United States and said Clinton Engineer Works, within the scope of their employment on official business, and which automobile was at the time driven and operated by Benny M. Buckner, an employee of the United States and of said Clinton Engineer Works and which at and prior to the time it struck said Billie Stooksberry, was being driven on and along said Public Highway No. 61, at a high dangerous, wantonly negligent, and unlawful rate of speed, and in a wantonly negligent manner; and the sum of $5,000 to Lon L. Stooksberry, the father of said minor, Billie Stooksberry, to reimburse him for moneys spent by him for doctor bills, hospital bills, medicine, and otherwise spent by him in the effort on his part to have his said minor son treated for and, insofar as possible, cured of his aforesaid injuries, and for the loss of services of said minor son: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the words, "sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill down to the colon on page 2, line 23, and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500 to the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor; and to pay the

sum of $974.23 to Lon L. Stooksberry, of Clinton, Tenn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses sustained as the result of Billie Stooksberry being struck by a United States Army vehicle on July 15, 1943, near Moores Bridge in Anderson County, Tenn."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry."

WESIX ELECTRIC HEATER CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3739, for the relief of the Wesix Electric Heater Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Wesix Electric Heater Co., San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $1,507.24. Such sum represents the amount deducted during October and November 1940 from the contract price of certain heaters furnished by the said Wesix Electric Heater Co. to the Panama Canal. Such deduction was made because of delay in the performance of the contract, such delay being alleged by the said Wesix Electric Heater Co. to have occurred because of (1) the fact that it was impossible for the company to comply with certain incorrect specifications of the contract until they were modified, and (2) indecisive action on the part of the Panama Canal after it was notified of this fact.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$1,507.24" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,297.80."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. BIRD GILES AND SHERMAN BECK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3859, for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sums of $180 to E. Bird Giles, of Belle Fourche, S. Dak., and $483 to Sherman Beck, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., in full settlement of their claims against the United States for services rendered the Department of Agriculture as farm-debt adjustment committeemen in South Dakota, from August 1936 through July 1937. Such sum, in each case, represents the difference between the salary stipulated by the farm-debt adjustment supervisor and the salary actually received on account of said services as farm-debt adjustment committeemen.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$483", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$251.50."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of the War Production Board, and his reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a program delivered over the Mutual network on Friday, March 17, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. William T. Kerr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) extending the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act for 1 year, with Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, the lend-lease program is now entering the home stretch of its run. For 3 years it has been a mighty dynamic force in the war against the Axis. It has proven to be an invaluable military and psychological instrument in the welding of United Nations power into common effort and common purpose. On the basis of the President's periodic reports and the testimony before our committee, I feel that Congress should and will extend the program for another year.

Many were honestly skeptical of the lend-lease program when the legislation was first before Congress. At that time we were not at war, but, with a great part of the world already on fire, realization came that we must get our fire-fighting machinery in order.

When lend-lease first became law it carried two main objectives. First, to help Britain, Russia, and China to hold the line while we armed. Second, to underwrite the great expense industry in this country would have to incur in changing over from peacetime to war production. What American industry has done in changing over to war production is one of the wonders of history. Industry could not have taken that financial risk without assurance that this Government would underwrite the expense of the change through lend-lease purchases. Thus, through this program the United States not only provided an arsenal for democracies already at war, but also started rolling the industrial wheels of preparedness at home.

If there was any legitimate argument why the lend-lease program should not have been inaugurated before we entered the war there can be none that it should not be continued now, since we are in this conflict to the hilt. We are not going to discontinue now what has proved to be one of the most effective instruments of our cause.

From the time the original Lend-Lease Act was passed on March 11, 1941, to the end of 1943 the United States under this act conveyed goods and services valued at about $20,000,000,000. More than two-thirds of this aid was rendered during 1943. This $20,000,000,000 has covered a little over 14 percent of the total cost of the war to date, and to my mind it is doubtful whether any other 14 percent of the total cost has done more to finally steer the United Nations on the road to victory. If you will read the testimony before our committee, you cannot but be convinced of the vital, if not deciding, part that lend-lease has played in this war. It is easy to conclude that if it had not been for the tanks, planes, motor vehicles, machine parts, and gasoline sent around the world to Montgomery's army in Egypt, Rommel's army might have not been forced to retreat, and Africa might not now be cleared of the enemy.

If it had not been for lend-lease supplies flown thousands of miles over the

highest mountains in the world to China, that heroic nation may well have considered herself abandoned by her allies.

If it had not been for the thousands of trucks, vehicles, tanks, and planes and the thousands of tons of supplies sent to Russia, the Germans might not be on the run in Europe today.

If it had not been for lend-lease and the planes, high-octane gasoline, plane parts, and other equipment, the R. A. F. would not have been able to build itself into so gigantic a force and operate with such destructive effects upon Germany.

These are some of the things that lend-lease has done.

From the very first, lend-lease has been a give and take proposition. Through it we have received certain benefits from our allies. On account of circumstances and ability to deliver, we have only taken about one-tenth of what we have given and most of this has come from the British Commonwealth.

When lend-lease was first enacted into law Mr. Churchill called it the most unsordid act in all recorded history. That statement was true then and it is true now. It was the fruition of our good-neighbor policy and of our avowed intention to hold out the helping hand to those fighting despotism anywhere.

We want nothing out of this war but assurance of a peaceful world. That, too, is an unsordid desire. We have a right to expect that our allies in this war take lend-lease in the spirit in which it is given and by their actions, now and hereafter, show that they appreciate that spirit.

We are now on the road to victory, and victory will surely come if the spirit of lend-lease dwells in the midst of the United Nations and holds them together until the bitter end. Germany and Japan and their satellites have no possible chance of achieving anything like victory, or even a stalemate, out of this war unless misunderstanding, distrust, and selfishness rear their heads among the United Nations before common victory is reached.

The Atlantic Charter, the Washington Conference of United Nations, the Moscow Conference, the Teheran Conference all voice unity of purpose now and after peace comes. A policy of no separate peace has been guaranteed by these conferences. The "four freedoms" have been acknowledged. The right of peoples to the government of their choice has been guaranteed. The right of small nations to sit on a basis of equality with the great in forming the post-war world has been admitted. The principle of our international body to preserve and enforce world peace has been approved.

Mr. Hull's 17 points also embody these principles clearly and admirably. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt and Mr. Hull these pledges have become the foreign policy of the United States. They have not deviated from the broad lines of this policy. Though beset with the demands of minorities here, there, and everywhere that a more specific and detailed foreign policy be enunciated, they have never wavered in their faith in the broad principles of our policy. As a needle to the pole, they have clung to this general policy, realizing that our first and major objective is to win this war and that until the war is won foreign and military policy must be in some respects one and the same, and that the assertion of American post-war rights at this time may impair the war effort and give comfort not only to the enemy but also to some in this country who seek political advantage this summer by demanding now a more specific and detailed foreign policy.

The President and the Secretary of State have claimed nothing for the people of the United States out of this war but a decent world to live in. Doubtless they realize that our post-war needs will require additional outposts of defense, particularly in the Pacific, but they also realize that, in the interest of harmony in our military effort and success in our common cause, any claim that we may have to present to insure the defense of the United States should be agreed upon now by all concerned, or wait until victory is won. Those in charge of our foreign relations have made no policy announcement without consultation with others of our allies.

It is to be regretted that all of our allies have not followed the same unselfish course which explicitly or by implication they agreed to in their joint meetings with us. Already zones of influence are being declared and national claims are being advanced without consultation with us. Russia has announced that she will handle the Polish question in her own way, thus creating in some quarters distrust of her purposes.

Recently the unkindest and most disturbing cut of all came from the Commonwealths of Australia and New Zealand. These countries, saved from destruction by American arms, the recipients of lend-lease materials by the millions of tons and articles, these people whom we admire and love and respect because they would rather die than lose their liberty, this sturdy race which has proven its valor on the battlefields of the world, the Government of these people, though it knows that the United States must be the principal grantor of peace in the Pacific hereafter, and that for our own defense and security we must have additional air and naval bases in the Pacific to see that militarism in Japan does not again rear its ugly head, knowing that they are not powerful enough alone to preserve peace in that sphere—knowing all this, the Governments of Australia and New Zealand on January 21 entered into a unilateral pact which in effect served notice on the world that these two members of the British Empire must have a predominant say-so in any disposition or administration of the islands of the Pacific, including the Marshalls, Marianas, Carolines, Pelews, and other islands, Japanese possession of which doomed the Philippines, Guam, and Wake.

The pact asserts that the two nations will unitedly oppose any change of sovereignty in any islands of the Pacific without their consent. It asserts sole regional control of all Pacific islands south of the Equator. It hands us a crumb by agreeing to the creation of a South Seas regional advisory commission with England, France, and the United States as members. So far as we are concerned, membership of the United States in this body would be an empty honor. New Zealand would have one vote, Australia one—and they have agreed to vote together on any Pacific Ocean issue—England one, France one, and the United States one. We would be out-voted in the beginning and our say-so would amount to nothing. The pact assumes that the United States would acknowledge that the Anzacs had title to the islands in the zone mentioned south of the Equator when as a matter of fact we could in self-respect admit no such thing.

The general objective of this Australian-New Zealand agreement seems to be to secure post-war civil aviation and shipping advantages in the Pacific. If this be so, then the step is in line with the oldest principles of the British Empire which call for control of the channels of trade and commerce.

This is no time to argue about trading posts, but since the point has been forced upon us we need not ignore the fact that prosperity for the United States after this war will be dependent to an important degree upon the possession of shipping and aviation outposts as well as military outposts.

The agreement in no way recognizes nor appreciates the present dependence of its signatories on the American Army, Navy, and Air Force, and that our boys are dying by the thousands to defend that area now.

So far as I have been able to learn the United States received no notice that the pact was under consideration, nor was the United States invited to participate.

I have been unable to find out whether Great Britain proper was notified of or invited to the conference. If so, she was a silent partner to the agreement. If not, then the action of New Zealand and Australia should be and probably is very embarrassing to their mother country.

In voting for the continuation of lend-lease, I feel that Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, China, and Russia should know and acknowledge that there are certain additional bases in the Pacific area essential to the defense of the United States and that they should be permanently occupied by the United States to prevent future aggression. Without other island bases to support them Guam and the Philippines have been and will continue to be indefensible. Events have shown that our allies are dependent on the United States to protect the Pacific. If we are to protect that area during this war, we must have bases. If we are to police that area to preserve the peace after this war, we must have police stations from which to operate. The Allied commissions meeting in London should now be discussing this problem and finding a solution to it. The United States must have advance agreements in this connection.

To win this war we must have unity. It may not be wise at this time for the United States to assert its territorial needs in the Pacific. Certainly we should not do so during the progress of this war unless we have come to complete agreement with our allies. The assertion of separate zones of influence such as has been announced jointly by Australia and New Zealand without consultation with other friendly powers is a menace to the successful prosecution of this war, can only sow distrust and discord among the United Nations, and will defeat the purpose of those who visualize a great international body to preserve and maintain the peace after the war is over. If we cannot work cooperatively during this war when we need each other, we can never do so afterward when immediate danger is past.

The unselfish ideal of the lend-lease program—the give and take spirit of this program—should and must be observed during this conflict and the period following victory; else, another generation will see its sons die on the battlefields of the world because of lack of an effective, unselfish world cooperative organization to preserve and maintain the peace.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to report to the House some aspects of lend-lease I observed while on a recent trip through the European theater of operations, during which I spent 2 weeks in England and a week in north Africa.

Military mutual war aid is operating very satisfactorily. Everyone now takes it as a matter of course. Remember that the Allied military commands are thoroughly mixed up as to personnel, with an American having a Britisher as his deputy or vice versa, and so forth. Each command in each field of operations is calling for just about all of the troops and supplies it can get. No one pays much attention as to where the troops or supplies come from. All of it is needed to defeat the enemy. On the military side, an American observer is more impressed with our direct military aid to the common war effort, the 86 percent our own troops are using, than the indirect war aid, the 14 percent we are furnishing our allies. On the other hand, in England the war aid furnished us, the so-called reverse lend-lease, is impressive. The bomber bases built and maintained for us are spread all over England. The British radio location system, which is mentioned briefly in the committee report and which is still highly secret, is an unbelievably accurate system for flying control in operations near the enemy and is saving American air crews and bombers wherever they understand it and use it.

There are other phases of so-called reverse lend-lease, which our troops, who are the best paid, fed, and clothed in the world, do not greatly appreciate. A. G. I. talking to us in London said, "You Congressmen should do something about this reverse lend-lease underwear we are getting from the British. It doesn't fit and it scratches." Thus, American troops are being brought in contact with different standards of living among our allies in a very graphic, although scratchy, way through reverse lend-lease.

The nonmilitary phases of lend-lease are not operating as satisfactorily from our standpoint. While the continued functioning of British economy is, of course, necessary to the war effort, it seems to me that our arrangements must somehow be put upon a more business-like basis. So far as this country is concerned, these phases of lend-lease form a part of our whole foreign economic administration in fact, as well as in name. Where to draw the line between economic and military activities is difficult, and where to distinguish between war activities and the beginning of post-war activities is difficult, but we must start to draw these lines soon. The head of our foreign economic mission in London, Mr. Phil Reed, seemed to me to be doing a very good job in a very difficult situation. Lend-lease is only one of the many economic activities which are covered in his office. I understand that machinery we furnish which has a post-war use is now being paid for by the British. This is a good beginning.

In north Africa the distinction is clearly drawn between military lend-lease and economic cooperation. We are furnishing mutual war aid, as in other theaters, and on the same basis, but economic aid is paid for in cash, even though this aid is of direct benefit in the war effort. The foreign exchange situation of the French Committee of Liberation is not as good as it was during the period of great military activity in north Africa. The frozen French assets in this country give us ample security for any advances we may make. Our relations with the French Committee, as trustees for the French Republic, are not in a satisfactory state from the standpoint of either side. I hope progress is being made toward a better relationship.

I sat in at a meeting of the North African Economic Board and witnessed the way in which this Board handles the mixture of economic and military questions which confront it. I saw our Army representatives dealing with members of this Board. I do not believe I should reveal the details of the transactions, but I was deeply impressed with the businesslike way the Board went about their job.

Mutual war aid must, of course, be continued so long as we are at war. Lend-lease as a post-war economic mechanism will not work, and we must remember that many post-war activities are starting, and should start, now while the war continues. The Eden white paper, which forbids the reexport of lend-lease materials should be revised on a business basis which is satisfactory to the British economy and to our economy.

I want to see our future relations with our allies, and particularly with Britain, be close and satisfactory, but to be close they must be satisfactory to all concerned, mutually satisfactory.

The day I was in Parliament, March 14, a number of interesting things happened.

The resolution inviting Members of Congress to visit Parliament was adopted, and some fine speeches were made on Anglo-American relations.

Later, there was a debate on post-war civil aviation during which one member said that the United States "would like to dominate the world's air—just as this country dominated the oceans in the nineteenth century—a perfectly legitimate aspiration, but one in which, I think, we must have our say as well."

Other Members expressed the same thought and urged that British Empire controlled air bases be used in bargaining for air rights. When we talk about getting air bases in return for lend-lease, I think of those speeches. I realize that the final settlements must go far beyond the scope of lend-lease to be satisfactory to us or any other country. Now is not the time to attempt to outline what those settlements should be, but I suggest that, insofar as Britain is concerned, the lend-lease plan whereby a nation with one-half as many voters as we have, less than one-fourth our national income, and one-tenth our contribution to lend-lease, should not forever have a 50–50 control through combined boards of the bulk of our foreign economic activities. We are used to the ways of representative government, where numbers of voters count; we understand the corporate method, where each votes his stock interest. A combination of these might work. Whatever the arrangements are, they must be satisfactory to Congress.

On that same day in Parliament a member asked the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, whether he could "give an assurance that no final or binding commitment in regard to post-war trade or Empire economic policy will be entered upon by the Government until such a matter has been freely debated in the House."

The Prime Minister answered, "Yes, sir."

I think we should obtain the same assurance from our Executive by amending the lend-lease law itself. Up to date lend-lease has been characterized by trust in our allies and suspicion of Congress. This will have to change. We must provide by law for congressional approval of our post-war economic policies when we extend lend-lease possibilities until 1948, as we do in this 1-year extension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am not one who likes to bring up matters for the purpose of creating any disturbing incidents, but for the purpose of having a fair understanding of the situation, I call the gentleman's attention to an incident reported in a letter handed me last week. It was written by a boy who is in Iran. He stated as

a matter of personal knowledge that the 5-gallon cans of gasoline which are furnished by us to the British under lend-lease at $2.50 a can are purchased back by the United States Government at $55. He cited some other incidents along that line. It may be that under lend-lease there may never be any repayment, or it may be that there will be just a lot of bookkeeping, but I am wondering if the gentleman thinks that in connection with the extension of lend-lease we can have some understanding that if any materials we furnish any other country are in turn refurnished to this country for our own use, the rate of charge shall be the same as that made when we extend the aid in the first place?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I do not know about the incident mentioned by the gentleman. If the facts are as given by your correspondent, then this is a shocking practice which should be stopped. As to the reports I heard about, I tried to run them down and found a very good explanation or found that the report was not true. For instance, I read in the London papers about how 40,000 lend-lease radios had been sent over there and there was a kick made that they were not being made available to the public for sale. I took that up with Mr. Reid and found there had not been any lend-lease radios for civilian use, but that they had been sent over to complete an old commercial order and they were properly being put on public sale.

I think we have got to watch to keep from straining at gnats and swallowing camels. The unimportant thing, in my judgment, is what happens with the stuff that has been lend-leased. As you all know, I think lend-lease is a phony as a label for what we are doing. What happens to second-hand gunpowder and a number of other war materials is not very important. What is of enormous importance is the arrangement we make for the future. These agreements will not be as a matter of settlement for past lend-lease, but will be as a matter of future business interest, political interest, and military interest, in preserving the peace and prosperity of the world for ourselves and others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In these agreements looking to the future, I think the negotiators for our country must, among other things, look after the interests of our country, the commercial, political, and diplomatic interests, and so forth. But I do not think that we are going to get very far in talking about a quid pro quo for lend-lease and that is why I want to see arrangements other than military lend-lease kept out of the lend-lease picture. I think steps are being made in that direction.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to ask the gentleman just what is being done definitely in regard to the bases, air bases, particularly, that we have built both in the Pacific and in the Atlantic as to protecting the rights of our country and the tremendous sums which have been expended. In regard to that matter, can the gentleman give us any definite information?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I cannot give any definite information because there is not any definite information right now. I was at 14 air bases which I would consider of great strategic importance right now, and many of them will be of great strategic importance for a long time to come. Many of those air bases were built with British funds. However, they are thickly populated with American-built planes, both the ones we are flying and lend-lease planes. It does not do any good to make an arrangement about an air base unless you can arrange about the air between that air base and the next base. I think that one of the matters which we ought to go into and get a settlement about now is a post-war arrangement with as many countries as we can, but particularly with the British, as to civil-aviation rights on a basis that will be mutually satisfactory. That is the gist of the debate I heard in the Parliament. I happen not to be an enthusiast for the national monopoly system, which was advocated strenuously that day, or the international corporation system that the Socialists in Parliament were mentioning. I favor our American competitive system. But I think we have got to make those agreements sometime, and, of course, they will involve our bases. If we get the bases back and do not get the rights as to air travel to go with them, the bases would not be very valuable.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that the Congress should have some say-so regarding the lend-lease supplies of stock piles in foreign countries after the war is over? We had a very bitter experience with Japan when this country, over my strenuous and bitter protests, was shipping cotton and scrap iron. A great deal of it went out of the port of Boston. I saw a ship going out to Japan loaded with scrap iron, cotton, and other commodities of war which are now being used against us. We do not know what the Allies will do after the war, but we hope, of course, that they will be with us, and we will be with them.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think that Congress should have submitted for its consideration the general policies and agreements with reference to the disposition of these materials. I do not think that Congress is in a position to deal very intelligently or effectively with this jeep or that tank.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What I had reference to was stock piles of materials.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I do not think that Congress is in a position to deal very intelligently or effectively with this pile of material or that pile of material. I think, however, that the policy should be submitted for congressional approval for the disposition of lend-lease materials after the war. Let us not get into our minds that this war is going to end like the last one and that there will be a certain minute one day when the war is going on and the next minute when it will not be going on. I think there is quite a possibility that this war may trail off and may not end up that way. We want to make our plans for post-war activities that will start while the war is going on and we want to make as many arrangements as we can for post-war plans while the war is going on.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We do not want an arrangement with Japan.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Insofar as the lend-lease equipment in the hands of our allies after the war, I believe the agreements provide at the present time that that equipment belongs to us and it should be returned to us. I do not see how we can do anything further than provide by agreement concerning such matters. We cannot send an armed guard to assure its return.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. With reference to that point I think there is no way in the world to decide in advance what we want to do with second-hand military equipment. Perhaps one of the worst things a country could say to us would be, "Now, this is all yours. You have got to come over here and maintain it." Perhaps the best thing to do with many pieces of material in the shape they are in would be to say, "Could we please scrap it right here?" You have got to wait and see what shape the stuff is in and what use there can be for it elsewhere.

Mutual war aid is a gigantic task. We must keep at it. Post-war planning presents perplexing difficulties. We must get at it. Our country must make both war and post-war plans at the same time. One is the primary responsibility of the Executive. The other is the joint responsibility of the Executive and the Congress. Each branch of our Government must measure up to its full responsibility in this critical time, if we would keep faith with those who are doing the fighting and the dying.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, false rumors, carelessly initiated or idly circulated, in these days of national tensity, harm or subvert constructive governmental action. Harmless in their incipiency, they tend to destroy the very basis of our plans and hopes. Designed for harm in origin they vitiate and annul attempts for unanimity of national action. False or careless rumors like slanderous gossip are avoided by men of character. Such rumors lengthen war.

The American mind of today is a war mind. Public reaction to a given report is a war reaction. Details of a story designed to incite become inflammatory. The war mind is easily aroused, but assured with difficulty. Man today the

world over is preoccupied with his burden of the present world holocaust and welcomes any opportunity to relieve his tension by the expenditure of mental energy, too often in misdirected and unfortunate attempts to escape the reality of today's life. Rumor mongers know this. Careless or coldly calculating, harmful, or subversive thoughts scattered through vicious mouthings are deliberately planted in some cases by these purveyors of falsity in the mind of those known for loose talk and looser thinking. A harm desired is thus a damage accomplished.

Careful speech and thoughtful expression of opinion based on alleged fact should be the first rule of conduct of every American. We all are conscious of the ease with which the simplest repetition of self-evident truths become distorted. Being aware of this tendency toward indifference in relating reports of events, Americans all should guard against the slightest untruth or equivocation, however simple, in matters affecting public interest. "Speak only the truth which you know to be true" should be the byword of every citizen.

Rumor by innuendo is equally devastating in result.

In one of the leading newspapers of New England, the Boston Herald, there is carried each week a rumor clinic, the purpose of which is to expose false rumors that are carried about the war. Through this medium the Boston Herald has and is performing a great public duty. Newspapers in other parts of the country could well follow this fine example.

I might say the Boston Herald, on its editorial angle is Republican, so my views are purely impersonal. This paper is rendering a great service in conducting the rumor clinic that it does each week.

One of the effective ways that we on the home front can help out is not to believe rumors—and if we hear of any to inquire as to their truth before we repeat them. Rumors are usually circulated to divide us by appealing to our emotions and our prejudices.

The press of our country can help out tremendously in exposing fake rumors. They can also help out by ascertaining the truth first before printing something that is not correct. I do not say this in any critical sense—as the press of our country generally are doing a fine job. Instead of criticism—this is a constructive suggestion.

Members of Congress should also be careful before making sensational and unfounded statements—or making statements on the floor of the House or Senate that appeal to emotions or prejudices without first ascertaining the truth of what they say.

These are days when silence on some occasions and the exercise of prudence on others will help our country.

Unfounded and fake rumors are harmful to our country. They help the enemy. They tend to produce misunderstanding and division. It is strange to note how many of these rumors start in Berlin and Tokyo and come over through German short-wave broadcasts, and in a few days are accepted by even some well-meaning persons as the truth, without making any inquiry at all; and everywhere we go we meet the rumor being repeated and repeated. That is dangerous. It should be stopped. The only way it can be stopped is by each one of us hearing any rumors checking and inquiring and not repeating them. They can only be stopped by restraint, self-control, the exercise of prudence, and inquiring before repeating.

The lend-lease law passed as a part of our national defense, has been used as a vehicle for all kinds of fake rumors. One follows the other. It seems as though there is an organized effort in some directions, among a small but organized propaganda group, to use this law as a vehicle to create and circulate rumors that are harmful to the conduct of the war.

Some of these rumors have originated in the Congress as a result of utterances by some Members that were later shown to be unfounded and inconsistent with the true facts. Such utterances do harm.

And those Members are very few and far between. The great majority of the membership of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, have been acting and speaking with restraint. But unfortunately that cannot be said about all Members.

The testimony of Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Director, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs when this bill was under consideration by the committee, shows the danger of such rumors. He testified to the number of rumors that have received wide circulation throughout the country, all of which were false. He could have given testimony to one or two statements made by Members of Congress that were incorrect. Those statements received wide publicity. The truth, when told to the public, received very little publicity.

How often have we heard the rumor—in time believed to be the truth by many fine persons—that lend-lease funds were used for a Washington party, wining and dining, and so forth, an Allied purchasing commission to the United States. That rumor had its bad effect. It was false.

What about the charge made in the newspapers by a Member of Congress—not of this body—that we had purchased large quantities of wheat from the Free French, and paid a much higher price than it could be purchased for here. The effect upon the farmer who grows wheat was harmful. The effect upon our people generally was harmful—throwing our money away. That story received wide circulation. It is still repeated. It was false. The truth is that while we did get a large quantity of wheat, from which thousands of barrels of flour were made, that our soldiers abroad needed, that we gave credit on reverse lend-lease at the prevailing price where the wheat was purchased. We did not pay any actual money for this wheat. Someone was fed a story. Without inquiring he made his startling and sensational charge. The public was stunned and believed the charge was incorrect but, yet, the damage has been done.

The man who made that harmful charge is a good American. His motive was political—to injure President Roosevelt. The real result was to injure the war effort.

Do you remember the famous diaper story? Another Member of Congress—not of this body—made that startling and sensational charge. He talked before he inquired. Another false impression conveyed to the American people.

There are many others that I will not mention, as the ones I have ought to be sufficient to show the danger of rumors and passing them along before inquiring.

The great majority of the Members of Congress are conscious of their responsibility in not making statements that produce misunderstanding and division among our people. Every Member should.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has it occurred to the gentleman that many of these baseless rumors gain circulation because the administration insists on keeping the American people in the dark as to what is going on? I would like to get the gentleman's views on that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Rather than answer the gentleman's question, let me state my views broadly. What I say has nothing but the hope that rumors will not be passed on. My view, in answer to the gentleman's question—and eliminating the administration—is that the American public should be taken into their confidence by those entrusted with the conduct of government and the conduct of the war to the fullest extent that can be done consistent with the best interests of our country. I think I have answered the gentleman's question without reacting to the particular question, and I am giving my personal views. The American public should be given all the information possible that can be given at a particular time and which will not at that time be inimical to our country's interest; and if at a particular time it is, when that danger passes over, then it should be given to our people as quickly as possible.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is just the reply I expected from the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is not only a very able and valuable Member of this House but who always tries to be fair and take a nonpartisan view of most questions.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Remember, we can be members of the Democratic Party or the Republican Party, and we can fight hard and honorably for our parties. As a matter of fact, I like to see it, but I do not like to see small, petty stuff—sniping, and so forth. At the same time,

when the interest of our country transcends that of party, country comes first.

A charge made on the floor of the House, or in the Senate, or in the press by a Member of Congress is news, and is naturally and properly carried by the press. If the charge is not correct, and it tends to divide our people, the damage is irreparable. The truth has a difficult time overcoming fake charges when such charges appeal to emotion or prejudice. It is a dangerous game to play in wartime. The facts should be ascertained before charges are made.

The testimony of Mr. Crowley, setting forth a long list of false rumors, should receive wide circulation by the press so that all of us will realize and appreciate the danger to our country of false rumors. His testimony is amazing. It should cause all of us to stop, look, and listen when we hear a rumor, and to inquire as to its truth before repeating.

We must remember that false rumors always divide—they never strengthen our people.

If we pay heed to the testimony of Mr. Crowley about false rumors, and profit thereby, we can greatly assist our country during the remaining days of the war.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this pending measure, H. R. 4254, which provides for the extension of the lend-lease law, presents some very serious aspects. In this Chamber where so many debates have occurred, and where so many appropriation bills have been passed for the benefit of our allies, both before and during this war, many of us view with alarm the implications of this measure. While each one of us want to do everything humanly possible to aid in the winning of this war as quickly as possible—we want our boys to come back home at the very earliest possible moment—yet we do not want our boys who are serving in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and in every branch of the service during this frightful war, to return and find our own country so completely wrecked and torn by debt that life will be a burden and progress will be utterly impossible.

Mr. Chairman, we have financed our own war. In addition to that very heavy burden, we have financed, in large part, the war which is waged by many other countries; we have financed countries, under the provisions of lend-lease, which have not actively participated in this war. Our country, through those in power, has been extremely generous in giving, dispensing, loaning and casting upon many nations, both engaged in active participation in this war, and those who are not actively participating in this war, our money, property, and resources; many of those countries who have received those benefits from us have accepted them, but they have not been in great need of them. Many of the South American countries have received from us vast sums of money, for many things that are not needed for war. They have received the taxpayers' hard-earned money for needless things—and, yet, those same countries are not involved in this war. They have no active participation in it. And, as we meditate upon our own dismal financial situation in this country, under this same policy pronounced under the lend-lease law I assume those in power, and those who are administering the lend-lease, will continue to give away our money and our property regardless of the hardship that will eventually result to our own people because of it. The operation of lend-lease has been on a one-way boulevard.

Mr. Chairman, when this war is over, and when our soldiers and sailors return home and find a depressed and despondent people caused by an insurmountable debt, and with the many ills that flow therefrom, where factories and mills are idle, where the economic situation is bad, and where the people clamor for the foreign debt to be paid, and nothing is paid or even offered to us, then the people of this Nation, with the soldiers and sailors returned from war, will have something to say.

And, may I observe today, when they discover that this administration has given, to a very large extent, the vast sums of money, the property, our resources, and our stores of property and supplies and that the foreign countries do not owe us anything and they will not pay us anything, but this is our debt, there will be confusion in this country. To a large extent, this has come about through lend-lease. It has been the agency by and through which the people of this country have been both betrayed and hoodwinked—because their hard-earned money, which they supposed was to be used for our war against our enemies, has been lavished upon many countries and for many needless purposes. But the result of a terrific debt will sooner or later catch up with those who engage in creating it. That is inevitable.

Mr. Chairman, whatever is necessary for the promotion of this war to a speedy conclusion, I will support. My record of the past confirms that position. Whatever may be necessary to equip our Army, and our Navy, as the best equipped Army and Navy in the world, I will gladly support. Whatever may be necessary to aid in equipping our active allies, I am in hearty accord with the policy to provide it where it will aid in bringing this war to a speedy termination. But, there should be a complete understanding that this is a loan, and that definite arrangements should be established upon that subject. The days of giving our all away, without any prospect of any return, have passed. We have reached the day when we must deal at arms length with our allies, because we have reached the very bottom of the financial barrel in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this measure should not be passed unless there is some safeguard placed around the spending and giving of our money and resources away. The Congress is the proper body to constitute this group to check the operation of Lend-Lease. In the past, the waste and the extravagance—the giving of our money away for useless and needless things—has been far beyond the imagination of men. This must not continue. There must be a system whereby the spending and the loaning of our money, our property, and our resources may be limited to the bare necessity for the prosecution of this war. The plan of boondoggling in many foreign countries must be abandoned, and we must get down to the one and single policy of doing those things which are essential for our victory in this war. I will support that plan which will place the Congress in control of the use of the funds under Lend-Lease, insofar as it is possible, because I am convinced that the representatives of the people should have a voice in this program; the people are providing the money for this war; they, through their representatives, should have the right to participate in the decision of those purposes for which their money is to be used.

Mr. Chairman, as we go forward, today, let us go forward in progress, in thought, and in action. Let us give the people the voice they demand in determining the policy under Lend-Lease, and let us demand that the unwise spending and giving of our resources for needless things be abandoned, and that we get down to the one essential thing, today, of winning this war—and when the war is over, to win the peace as a lasting and a permanent peace.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the House is to be congratulated, and the country as well, on the spirit of unity that is manifested with reference to the consideration, and, I think, the support of the pending resolution which extends for 1 year the so-called Lend-Lease Administration.

I believe we all realize that with the country at war there must be unity, and there certainly must be unity with reference to the granting of aid to our allies under lend-lease, which has done as much and perhaps more than any other agency of the Government in helping us to win this war.

I want to commend and endorse the remarks just made by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], in saying that we should decry petty and unfounded criticism. I do not believe there has been any activity of government where there has been more false rumors circulated than with reference to lend-lease. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has given very serious and prolonged consideration to this measure and to all of the facts pertaining to the administration of lend-lease. Could the entire membership of the House have been present during our hearings of nearly a month on this bill and have heard the explanations and answers made by those who know the facts to these various critics they would be satisfied. Our committee was satisfied and voted unanimously to favorably report this bill.

I want to commend the Administrator of Lend-Lease, or rather the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, Mr. Leo Crowley, and Oscar Cox, its very able general counsel, who have been helpful, frank, and cooperative in giving us information as to the administration of lend-lease. I think the American people should be pleased with the very fine record and the splendid administration that has been made of this agency of the Government. I shudder to think what would have happened to the United States of America if we had not had lend-lease when the attack came upon us at Pearl Harbor.

It was as I stated at the time of its passage by the House in February 1941 a measure for the defense of the United States and we did not take that step any too soon. Lend-lease became a law on March 11, 1941. At that time England was fighting alone. China was fighting alone. Russia was alined with the Axis Powers. England was almost exhausted from daily and nightly bombings and it then seemed only a question of a short time until Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, with Hitler in supreme command, would be the masters of the world. Hitler's submarines had control of the seas and he was mobilizing a force at Dakar in South Africa for an attack on Brazil and Nazi agents and fifth columnists with plenty of Nazi money were operating in the countries of Central and South America, and some of them were carrying on their pernicious activities in our own country, and the whole world was intimidated and frightened by these masters of brute force.

It was a courageous thing and a right thing for our country at such a time to give material aid to those who were fighting these enemies of civilization and lend-lease was the most effective means of giving this aid. England would have fallen long before our entry into the war but for the aid which she received under lend-lease. Russia was invaded and attacked by Hitler within 3 months after the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, and but for lend-lease and the supplies she received under it Hitler would have conquered her. Stalin has publicly admitted the supplies received under lend-lease saved Russia. If we had not passed lend-lease when we did it would have been too late and we would be fighting the Axis Powers today by ourselves, and England and Russia would be conquered and occupied countries impotent and helpless like France, Belgium, and the rest.

In the remainder of my time I want to point out somewhat in detail just what is being done and what is being accomplished today under lend-lease.

The Lend-Lease Act is a military instrument of the first importance.

Military items—planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and other finished munitions—have constituted the backbone of the lend-lease program. More than half of our lend-lease aid has been made up of such items. In 1943 they constituted 61 percent of all lend-lease exports and in the month of December 1943, 67 percent.

By January 1, 1944, we had sent to our allies under lend-lease 21,000 planes. Of these 7,800 went to the Soviet Union and 4,000 to the Allied forces in the Pacific and Far East theaters. A large number of those sent to the Far East have been used to maintain the vital air link with China—"over the hump" from Assam Province in the northeast corner of India to Yunnan Province in the southwest corner of China. The rest went principally to the Middle East, Britain, and training areas all over the world.

By January 1, 1944, we had lend-leased 21,000 tanks and 500,000 military vehicles—truck, jeeps, and scout cars. Three thousand five hundred of the tanks and 175,000 of the motor vehicles have gone for use in the war against Japan. Four thousand seven hundred of the tanks and 230,000 of the motor vehicles have gone to the Soviet Army—more than to any other theater of the war.

And while we have been sending these planes, tanks, military vehicles, and quantities of other military items, we have built and equipped the strongest Army we have ever had in our history and a Navy bigger than any the world has ever seen before. American industry has indeed done a magnificent job.

The next largest group of items we have sent under lend-lease has consisted of supplies and equipment for making or repairing weapons, railroad equipment for hauling goods to the fronts and to the factories, and petroleum products for fighting planes and other combat vehicles. These constitute 20 percent of our lend-lease exports. By sending steel to Britain, for example, we have put to use in the cause of the United Nations the skilled labor of British workmen, British power capacity, and British industrial plants which can turn out shells and bombs to strike at Germany and Japan. By sending canning equipment and tin plate to Australia and New Zealand, we enable those countries to turn out great quantities of food which are furnished to our armed forces in the South and Southwest Pacific as reverse lend-lease.

Foodstuffs for soldiers and war workers have made up 12½ percent of our lend-lease aid. By March 1, 1944, we had sent to Russia 2,600,000 tons of food needed to maintain Soviet Army rations—more than to any other theater. These shipments have been necessary to replace the produce from the Ukraine, Russia's richest agricultural region, which was overrun by the Nazis. Now that the Ukraine has been liberated after more than 2 years of occupation we have sent 13,000 tons of seeds to assist the farmers of the U. S. S. R. replant the devastated lands.

Most of the rest of our lend-lease food shipments have gone to Britain to help feed her soldiers and war workers. These shipments constitute a vital 10 percent of the food consumed by Britain. Britain has always been dependent on imports for a large portion of her food. But by plowing up lawns, parks, and playing fields she has been able to increase food production to 70 percent over prewar levels. Part of this increase she shares with us. Our forces stationed in Britain receive as reverse lend-lease 20 percent of the food they consume.

Each piece of military equipment, each piece of war-production material, and each ounce of foodstuff sent under lend-lease is for but one purpose—to enable our allies to strike harder blows against our common enemies. Our allies are now striking hard blows with us against our common enemies. On every battlefront in the world—the British whose bombers are nightly destroying the roof over Hitler's European fortress, while our Eighth and Ninth Air Forces do likewise by day; the Russians, whose armies have crossed the borders of Rumania and Czechoslovakia and are pushing on toward the centers of Nazi resistance; the Australians, British, Canadians, French, Greeks, Indians, New Zealanders, Poles, and Yugoslavs, who have fought shoulder to shoulder with us in the truly combined operations in the Mediterranean and Italy; the Australians, the Dutch and the New Zealanders, who are advancing with us on the islands and the seas of the South and Southwest Pacific; the British, the Chinese, and the Indians, who are now fighting with us in the jungles of Burma; and the Chinese, who are fighting with us in China to carry the war to the center of Japanese power.

All of our allies are putting everything they have into this war. Each has equipped its armies principally from its own resources. And each is turning over to us as reverse lend-lease as many supplies and services as it is in a position to do. From the British Commonwealth we had by January 1, 1944, received supplies and services valued at $2,000,000,000, and we are currently receiving reverse lend-lease from them at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a year. Our armed forces in Britain receive without cost to us one-third of their supplies currently required by them. The monthly rate of reverse lend-lease from Australia and New Zealand is now almost equal to the rate of lend-lease aid to them. Even French North and West Africa, whose territories have only so recently been liberated, have turned over to us supplies and services valued at $30,000,000.

The Chinese and the Russians have not been in a position to supply us with reverse lend-lease in such substantial volume. But no one can say of them that they are not doing their part. Certainly not the Chinese, who have now been fighting the Japanese on their own land for nearly 7 years. Certainly not the Russians, who have now driven the Nazis almost completely out of their country, destroying millions of German soldiers as well as tens of thousands of German planes, tanks, and guns in the process. Each German or Japanese soldier or piece of equipment destroyed by our allies means that much less opposition for our American forces to face.

The victories that the United Nations have so far achieved have been based upon the pooling of resources through lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. The United Nations are now fast approaching the crucial hour. The men of the United Nations and their matériel are deployed to strike new and greater blows both in Europe and in the Far East. The plans

for these new offensives are based upon the freest interchange of fighting manpower and fighting equipment. The first will be achieved through unity of command. The second through lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. It is absolutely vital that nothing be done at this critical stage of the war to disrupt these plans. The Lend-Lease Act must be extended.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday a question was asked with reference to the distribution of lend-lease food in the United Kingdom. I have received a statement, Mr. Chairman, which defines and explains everything with reference to this matter. The statement is as follows:

THE DISTRIBUTION OF LEND-LEASE FOOD IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

A considerable portion of the food supplied to the United Kingdom under lend-lease is not sold but is made directly available for consumption by the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of Britain. Another part of the food is distributed free of charge to needy school children, pregnant women, the crippled and destitute. The balance is sold for sterling by the United Kingdom Government through the regular channels of distribution to wholesalers who in turn sell through regular retailers but under controls and at prices which are rigidly controlled to prevent unequal distribution and profiteering.

The distribution of lend-lease food in any other manner would not be feasible. About 10 percent of Britain's food requirements is obtained through lend-lease. The remainder is grown at home or imported from the dominions and colonies. To segregate lend-lease food and distribute it through separate channels would require a new system of distribution which would waste manpower, would inevitably lead to great confusion in the pricing system, and would thus interfere with the prosecution of the war.

The proceeds from the sale of that part of the lend-lease food that is distributed through the regular distribution channels are, of course, received in sterling and not in dollars. These proceeds are retained by the United Kingdom Government and are not turned over to us. In view of the really tremendous volume of supplies and services we are receiving as reverse lend-lease, we have little present need for pounds sterling to purchase supplies and services in British territory.

Retention of the proceeds does not result in a double benefit to the United Kingdom. From the fiscal standpoint, the effect of the transaction is to reduce the amount of money the British Treasury has to raise by taxation or borrowing. The sterling receipts of the United Kingdom Government cannot, for example, be used to buy supplies in the United States. Since this is an internal matter, the only benefit to the British Government and therefore, to the British people, is that goods for the prosecution of the war are provided that otherwise would not be available. This is the benefit intended by the Lend-Lease Act. It's the same benefit whether the lend-lease goods are consumed directly by the Government as in the case of food consumed by the armed forces or of food sold through commercial channels for the use of war workers.

I should like to add, however, that the United States similarly retains the proceeds from the sale of reverse lend-lease goods. The dollars we receive, for example, from the sale of Ceylon rubber or tea obtained under reverse lend-lease, are retained by the United States and are not turned over to the British. The British are now supplying us as reverse lend-lease for importation into the United States certain raw materials, commodities, and foodstuffs heretofore purchased in the United Kingdom and colonies for cash. When these commodities arrived in the United States, our Government sells them through ordinary commercial channels and deposits the proceeds in the Treasury.

This question of the sale of lend-lease food by the British has been considered many times by your committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations both last year and this year. In its report last year to the Senate recommending the extension of the Lend-Lease Act, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations said:

"Some discussion was had as to the methods employed in distributing lend-lease food in Great Britain. The committee was advised that sale of the food through ordinary commercial channels was the most practical and efficient way to distribute it, and that transfer of sterling proceeds of that sale to the United States would be undesirable, in view of the over-all exchange problem, and the impressive volume of lend-lease in reverse we are receiving. It seems clear, however, that due account can be taken of whatever benefit accrues to the United Kingdom Government in consequence of this transaction in any final reckoning of the costs to the United Kingdom Government of the lend-lease-in-reverse program."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER].

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, I shall take the time given me now to discuss an amendment that has been placed upon the Clerk's desk and which I shall submit when the bill reaches the point at which such an amendment is properly in order.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to modify the existing law and require that all final settlements of lend-lease transactions from the date of this enactment be subject to the approval of Congress.

The amendment contains a provision whereby all duties and obligations arising out of or in connection with existing agreements shall in no manner whatsoever be affected by the passage of this amendment. This amendment would not, in any manner whatsoever, impair the effectiveness of present lend-lease operations between the contracting nations under present lend-lease agreements. If, however, any of the existing agreements were to be amended or in any respect modified whereby the provisions or terms would be liberalized, the additional benefits granted, as the result of such modification, would be subject to review and approval by Congress. The existing act contains the following language:

The terms and conditions upon which any foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection A shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

Under the provision of this act, the President has the absolute right to completely forgive each and every obligation or debt arising out of or in connection with any and all lend-lease transactions. This is admitted by all who have carefully read the act, and the President recognizes that he possesses such authority.

In the preliminary print of the eleventh report to Congress on lend-lease appropriation, dated August 25, 1943, the President, in his initial letter of transmittal, said:

The Congress in passing and extending the Lend-Lease Act made it plain that the United States wants no new war debts to jeopardize the coming peace. Victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid

This statement brought forth considerable criticism and in the official letter of transmittal, submitted to the Congress with the eleventh report, that language was deleted.

I cannot conceive that it was the intention of Congress in enacting the lend-lease law to vest the President of the United States, whomever he may be, with the absolute authority to completely discharge every receiving nation of every obligation and debt arising in connection with the operation and extension of lend-lease property and money. It undoubtedly was the intention of Congress to grant broad powers to the President to administer such law and to grant lend-lease benefits where it could be of direct benefit in the winning of the war. I do not believe it was the intention of Congress that lend-lease benefits would be granted that would be of an economic or political benefit and extend beyond the duration of the war. The Lend-Lease Act was enacted into law prior to our military participation in the war. It was approved March 11, 1941. Our active military participation began 9 months later. A number of lend-lease agreements have been entered into with substantially all of the United Nations. Certain master agreements have been entered into. The terms and conditions of the master agreements which have been the subject of controversy, especially the commitments made in article 7 of the master agreements with Russia and Great Britain. Article 7 is in the following language:

ARTICLE VII

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in return for aid furnished under the act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the basic

principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.

At an early convenient date conversations shall be begun between the two governments with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded governments.

In addition to the agreements made public, certain secret agreements have been entered into for the extension of lend-lease benefits. The terms and conditions of these secret agreements are unknown to the Members of Congress. It is reported that some 15 or more secret agreements exist. I have no knowledge of the contents of these agreements. I do know, however, that some of such agreements contain provisions that are distinctly beneficial to the other contracting nations. This information was given to the Foreign Affairs Committee, in executive session, and under the rules of the committee and of the House I am not permitted to disclose the information which I have regarding the distinct advantages that accrue to the favored nations, under the terms of these secret agreements. I believe I am privileged to say that such agreements are in the main with South American countries.

The proposed amendment is designed to vest in the Congress, and very properly so, concurrent control with the President in the making of final settlements upon lend-lease transactions originating from this date henceforth. It does not attempt to modify in any respect whatsoever any of the existing agreements or to vitiate or impair any of the obligations and duties now existing by virtue of lawfully heretofore executed agreements. It does not prevent the making of new agreements. It will, however, prevent clauses in such agreements whereby the assets transferred by lend-lease or debts or obligations thus created can be completely forgiven without the approval of Congress. In the end, Congress may well approve such and grant such complete forgiveness. That is a matter for the Congress to determine when such proposals for settlements are submitted to the Congress.

It has been suggested that this would result in endless controversy and that Congress would be met with a tremendous responsibility. This is the duty of Congress under the Constitution of the United States. The necessity for the amendment is made apparent at this time by the desire of nations securing lend-lease benefits to amend and modify the existing agreements. New Zealand, Australia, and especially Great Britain are seeking discussions having for their object the modification of the existing agreements, and particularly a modification that would permit lend-lease materials to be used for reexport and for the sustaining of the economy of the contracting nations. This amendment will not, in any manner whatsoever, impair the effectiveness and efficiency of our war effort, or of the war effort of our active cobelligerents. It will, I trust, protect with reasonable degree the rights and property of our Government in the final settlement that would be made of all lend-lease accounts. Each year lend-lease has been reviewed and without modification renewed. This process of review has consisted largely of an appraisal and stock taking of the whole lend-lease operations. When it is realized that there has been made available for lend-lease a colossal fund that now approximates $63,000,000,000 it is imperative that this Congress look carefully into this matter at this time and to the present status of lend-lease, as well as its future operations and of its effect upon the post-war economy of this Nation.

The direct appropriations for lend-lease to date amount to $24,833,629,000. In addition, transfers are authorized from other appropriations in the amount of $35,970,000,000, and in addition Congress has authorized the leasing of ships with funds appropriated to the Maritime Commission without numerical limitation as to the dollar value or the number of such ships so leased, but which accounts also exceed $2,000,000,000, or a grand total of more than $63,000,000,000 and which is now available or subject to disbursement under the administration of lend-lease. This represents more than one-fifth of the total wealth of our Nation and nearly one-half the current national income. This money does not belong to the President; neither does it belong to the Congress. It belongs to the Government of the United States and is derived by the payment of taxes by the citizens of this Nation. The right and duty to levy taxes is constitutionally conferred upon the Congress, as is also the duty and responsibility of disbursing the funds thus obtained from the taxpayers of this Nation. To confer upon any single individual the right to arbitrarily deal with this stupendous sum of money, without a check or the approval of the Congress, as the direct representative of the people, who supply such, is, in my judgment, absolutely contrary to the will of our citizens.

This amendment is not personal in the sense that it would restrict President Roosevelt only. It would be equally and just as forcibly applicable to any President, whoever he may be and of whatever political party. It is not American in principle, nor does it follow the principles of our Government to grant such broad powers, which, in my judgment, are in contravention of the Constitution, and I believe that Congress ignores the intent of the Constitution by delegating such authority.

Arguments will be made that the committee amendment submitted by Mr. WADSWORTH is sufficiently restrictive. A careful reading of this amendment will clearly disclose that it does not reach the objective sought to be reached by the present amendment. It does not touch upon the question of approval of acts performed by the President under authority of the Lend-Lease Act, and which are exclusively embraced in executive agreements, and do not require congressional approval. It merely prohibits the President from making a commitment that would create an obligation affecting our post-war economic or post-war military policy which would be restrictive only of the things undertaken to be done in article 7 of the master agreements, and would in no sense whatsoever require congressional approval of acts done under the Lend-Lease Act for final settlement of the lend-lease accounts as between the United States and other contracting parties.

The necessity for such amendment at this time becomes apparent by reason of the attitude of our allies, some of whom are seeking a modification of the lend-lease agreements. I wish to call your attention to an Associated Press dispatch dated March 15, 1944, which is as follows:

UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN TRY TO CLARIFY FUTURE OF LEASE-LEND SET-UP

LONDON, March 15.—A determined effort to reach an accord on several basic problems of lease-lend—an issue of mounting importance in British-American relations—is understood to be in progress to clarify the present and future economic position of both Britain and the United States.

The first objective probably will be a clearer understanding of the scope of British industrial exports at a time when this island nation is dependent on a life line from America for huge quantities of goods.

DIVISION OF PRODUCTION

The crux of the situation is how much of Britain's industrial capacity should be used for export production, how much is needed to maintain a war-pared trade minimum, and how to settle problems arising from the shift in shipping supremacy from Britain to America.

It is understood in London that rough drafts of a proposed agreement on one or more of these entwined questions had been drawn and then discarded after conferences in Washington. It is sure to be near the top of the agenda for coming discussions between Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., American Under Secretary of State and British officials.

Although the export problem alone is far reaching in its economic implications, it is just one of several which will tax the diplomatic, industrial, and trade brains of both nations in order to preserve the amity born of wartime partnership.

POST-WAR SHIPPING PROBLEMS

Other questions attracting mounting attention include—

1. Will there be post-war shipping pool by the two nations with a division of markets, or will there be out-and-out competition? What will be the position of smaller shipping nations such as the Dutch? Should an accord be reached now on subsidized shipping and tariffs?

2. What arrangements should be made now to dispose of the huge quantities of war materials—such as clothing and motor vehicles—to civilian use after victory without duplicating the chaotic market conditions that prevailed after the last war? What, for example, should be done with surplus machine tools to prevent a long shut-down in industry?

Both the British and Americans are approaching these and related issues with an increasing realization of their gravity, a growing desire to get them out of the way as the military situation brightens and gradual recognition of the political implications a solution holds for each other.

I also want to call your attention to another very important subject reported in

the New York Times, April 16, 1944, and which I quote as follows:

Publication of British dollar accumulations, it was added, is opposed by our own Government officials because it might "furnish a weapon" to some legislators who urge curtailment of lend-lease aid without considering the future consequences of such an action. The new arrangement announced Friday, when approved, it was held, would constitute a "reasonable approach" to the use of British held dollars.

FIVE BILLION CREDIT URGED

However, it was argued, in order to lay plans in accord with the vague terms of the Atlantic Charter, Britain must be heavily backed by gold, possibly along the lines recently suggested by Leon Fraser, president of the First National Bank, of New York, who urged extension of a credit of $5,000,000,000, formal cancelation of the balance of British war debts of World War No. 1, and a 5-year moratorium on lend-lease repayments. The extension of such a credit would be predicated on an agreement that neither nation would engage in competitive exchange depreciation.

The extension of such a credit by private banks, it was pointed out, is prevented by the Johnson Act of 1934, which prohibits any group but a Government corporation to float loans for a country which still has an unpaid balance from debts resulting from the last war. No Government corporation has seriously indicated a willingness to make such a commitment and Congress has not paid attention to the problem.

Endorsing this reasoning by traders, Wilbert Ward, vice president of the National City Bank, of New York, and president of the Bankers Association for Foreign Trade, yesterday stated that he agreed "Britain is in a hot spot." British representatives who have visited the United States have not been able to return to Britain and report to that country's authorities "on what support they could count upon from this country," he declared.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ELMER. From the gentleman's speech I take it he would admit that the original Lend-Lease Act provided that we should not receive any pay whatever for any of the lend-lease products or goods furnished to any Allies; is that right?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I take it from the language of the act that the right to forgive all debts and obligations is completely vested in the President.

Mr. ELMER. That certainly is the law; is it not?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Correct.

Mr. ELMER. And that has been the law up to the present time; is that correct?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is correct.

Mr. ELMER. And the commitments and contracts have been made with the Allies under that law?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is right.

Mr. ELMER. How are you going to amend the act so as to change the obligations of the contracts that have been entered into between the United States and other nations?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. The language of the amendment itself cares for that without impairing our obligations under existing agreements.

Mr. ELMER. The gentleman is a lawyer; is he not?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Yes.

Mr. ELMER. Can you change a contract by action on the part of one party to a contract?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. No; but if the gentleman will permit me to read the language of the amendment he will find that it properly cares for such situation.

Mr. ELMER. Can you change it by amendment?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. We are not attempting to do so by amendment.

Mr. ELMER. Can you?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Let me answer your question, please.

Mr. ELMER. Then you can require these people to settle for all the goods they have received as a gift, is that right?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. If the gentleman will permit me to read the amendment I will try to inform him as what it contains with respect to that particular provision.

Mr. ELMER. I do not care what it contains. The question is whether you can do that, no matter what it contains.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. The language of the amendment reads:

Provided, however, That all duties and obligations heretofore lawfully created and arising out of or in connection with all existing contracts or agreements, shall in no manner whatsoever be impaired or vitiated by this act.

Mr. ELMER. Then the gentleman recognizes that the contracts exist and we cannot change them, and all the goods that have been delivered cannot be reached or touched by this amendment.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. No.

Mr. ELMER. The only thing is that in the future they may agree to modify previous contracts, and that is the only way you can reach it, with or without your amendment.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. No; I think not. I think the amendment provides in the final settlement any benefits would subject to being submitted to the Congress for its approval before such settlements became final.

Mr. ELMER. If we have given several billion dollars and received reverse lend-lease from these people and there is a balance due us, according to the gentleman's computation now, how are we going to get it without their consent, without their modifying their contracts with us?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I cannot say that those are the terms of the contracts. I believe whatever those terms are they should come back to this Congress for approval.

Mr. ELMER. The gentleman understands, does he not, that if he and I make a contract I cannot change that contract without his consent?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Positively. I recognize that to be the law.

Mr. ELMER. Then how can the Congress change those contracts without the consent of the other parties?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. We are not doing that in existing contracts but only those made in the future.

Mr. ELMER. Then it applies only to lend-lease going out of here in the future?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Precisely.

Mr. ELMER. All right. Let us get it clear in the RECORD.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is a contract valid or binding that is a one-way affair?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is rather a moot question.

Mr. KNUTSON. I ask the gentleman as a layman. This lend-lease is all going out and nothing coming back.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. What this amendment proposes to do is to put back into this Congress, where I think it properly belongs, the right to say definitely what will become of the American taxpayer's dollar, whether it shall be forgiven or not be forgiven.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Missouri expounds a very interesting doctrine when he talks about a contract between the United States and some bankrupt nation that is just getting and getting and giving nothing in return. It would be terrible if that contract were vitiated.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. If we attempt by amendment now to interfere with what was an agreed contract and it applied to the whole Lend-Lease Act and not any part thereof, just how effective would your amendment be?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I will answer that in this way, that the Wadsforth amendment which came in and is a part of the committee print of the bill, is an attempt to repudiate a contract entered into in the master agreements in article VII. If you will read article VII of the master agreements, there are international commitments made as to which the Wadsworth amendment, part of the committee print, now requires that before the acts intended to be done under article VII shall be done, it shall be done in accordance with constitutional procedure.

Mr. ROWE. If I may proceed with this one further question, am I to believe that the Wadsworth amendment now is an admission that we did sign a complete contract at first, and we are now saying we do not want to agree to what we agreed to at that time?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. The Wadsworth amendment in effect puts the brakes on what was done in article VII of the master agreement, and now gives that authority back to the Congress.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the author of the amendment, when he spoke

yesterday, said, I believe, that he did not think that lend-lease gave any authority to the Government to make any post-war commitments, but he just wanted to make it doubly sure by having it expressly contained in the act lest some person might take that authority from the Lend-Lease Act. I do not know whether I am quoting the gentleman correctly or not. He is here and he can correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Irrespective of that, the Wadsworth amendment goes directly to the text of article VII of the master agreement, where certain commitments have been made with respect to post-war conduct on the part of the United States.

Mr. ELMER. What did the gentleman mean a while ago when he talked about constitutional processes?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is contained in the Wadsworth amendment.

Mr. ELMER. What does the gentleman mean by "constitutional processes"?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is a rather difficult question for me to answer. I assume it relates only to those contracts which rise to the dignity of a treaty and not those that are within the category of executive agreements.

Mr. WADSWORTH. With that I cannot agree. I think it covers executive agreements.

Mr. ELMER. Does the gentleman not think that these contracts ought to be definite and certain so that anybody who reads them can understand them?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ELMER. If you draw a contract for your client, that is the way you try to make it.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is correct.

Mr. ELMER. Is not that the way the gentleman would make it?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Of course.

Mr. ELMER. Does the gentleman not think these contracts that he has been talking about with other governments are on the basis of what the President may think and how he may construe those contracts later on?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I think the power and authority is given him under the act to construe them in any way he desires.

Mr. ELMER. All right.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. It has been suggested that this would result in endless controversy and that Congress in attempting to settle final accounts would assume a responsibility that it was incapable of discharging. That is a duty of the Congress. It is not to be assumed that any representative of this body is going out into the field to check whatever may be left in foreign countries of the supplies shipped there under lend-lease. We are to have submitted to us in written form a statement of what remains there under lend-lease and is to be returned to this country. We are then to determine whether or not that shall be forgiven. For instance, we supplied entire plants and have shipped entire plants to Russia. In 1 year we shipped over 600,000 miles of copper wire. We cannot recover that. It would likely be the better plan to abandon such and to forget it.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I note in article V of one of the master agreements this language:

> The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency—

That is what I want to accentuate—

> at the end of the present emergency, as determined by the President of the United States of America, such defense articles—

And so forth. That refers to the end of the present emergency as decided by the President. What would occur in the event any one country of the United Nations should desire to make a separate peace with the common enemy? That would not terminate the present emergency except as to the country making the separate peace. What would happen as to the lend-lease or defense articles in the hands of that country, and would that stop any further shipments? Is there any understanding about that in either the master agreements or in the act itself?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I know of nothing in the master agreements. I think the act itself would cover it. It would be entirely discretionary with the President as to what would happen to the residue of any lend-lease property in that country.

Mr. DEWEY. Naturally, I agree with that, because the President has complete authority to lend-lease or do anything he pleases with any of these articles under any terms; but does not the gentleman think it might be advisable to give the Congress some power to express itself on a matter as important as that?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. In my judgment, if there were a settlement made with that country, under the amendment I am proposing that settlement would be subject to the approval of Congress.

Mr. DEWEY. True enough; but I am seeking to have a definite stop in case some country should make a separate peace. In that event, I think it would probably be advisable to have all use of lend-lease stopped and all further shipments stopped.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I think under the terms of the act that automatically would occur.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not very important to have my amendment incorporated in the bill, which would provide that before any final settlement under lend-lease should be made it would come back for the Congress to act on under concurrent resolution?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Yes; I think so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That would be an added protection.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I think the gentlewoman's proposed amendment accomplishes something that neither the Wadsworth amendment nor the amendment which I propose accomplishes. The Wadsworth amendment is directed to a certain objective, and I think a very sound one. I think the gentlewoman's amendment is proposed to reach another situation, and is also sound.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think possibly the Wadsworth amendment could take care of the amendment I have in mind, but I want to make sure.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I doubt very much that it does.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If we had a military alliance it would not, would it?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to attempt to address myself as best I can to the Schiffler amendment and the Wadsworth amendment.

There was considerable discussion in committee as to the function of Congress in any post-war settlement that might be made with reference to lend-lease. My colleague from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] is an able lawyer. I am afraid he has approached this matter too much from the standpoint of a lawyer and possibly is neglecting some very practical considerations which might bear upon the wisdom of his amendment and upon the House's decision as to whether or not it should be adopted.

To me this is not a partisan matter, and it is not to him. I think we are both eager, and I think all the Members of the House are eager, to see that the prerogatives of the House are insisted upon, that there shall be no bypassing of the proper functions of Congress either in the war or in the peace.

Lend-lease articles and services are extended to our allies for the purpose of the mutual prosecution of the war. It is not a debtor-creditor relationship. We make a great mistake if we consider the people who are the recipients of lend-lease as our debtors. We are putting guns into their hands from the practical point of view that they can better assist us with those guns than possibly we could if we fired them ourselves.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I do not believe the gentleman will find any particular objection to the allocation of guns or munitions or implements of war on either side in the administration of lend-lease. It is the varied other activities that have brought about the criticism.

Mr. WRIGHT. To what is the gentleman referring? He is going to have to be a little more specific if I am to answer him.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Forty nations are participating, but only 12 of them are fighting.

Mr. WRIGHT. The objection of the gentleman was discussed and, I believe, answered yesterday. I should like to proceed with the thought I have, and if I have any time later I shall be glad to attempt to answer the gentleman.

I may say that the bulk of lend-lease is going to the nations that are doing the actual fighting. The major part of lend-lease is going to Russia and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

What is going to happen after the war is over? You are going to have military equipment, some agricultural equipment, some manufacturing equipment, and undoubtedly some transportation equipment all over the world. It is going to add up to a great amount of money. Also, there will be a great number and variety of items in various places all over the world, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] suggested yesterday. The question will arise as to what to do, for instance, with a certain number of small arms in Russia or in one of the islands adjacent to Australia, and he suggested very properly the decision should be made by the military commanders in the field.

Otherwise you are going to put upon the Congress an almost impossible job of accounting. As I said before, the fundamental error is that the gentleman from West Virginia is considering the relation between these countries as the relationship between debtor and creditor, a business relationship, and is treating lend-lease as a commercial debt whose payment must be enforced. Remember also that the master agreements provide that all of the equipment which is not used or not consumed remains the property of the United States. If it is to our interest to secure its return, we have the legal right to do so.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; I will yield, although I was trying to develop a point.

Mr. ELMER. If at the close of the war or at the end of any emergency or at anytime we were to have, as we have at this stage of the game, about $5,000,000,000 worth of equipment in Russia, which consists of 8,300 airplanes, 220,000 vehicles, 200 locomotives, and 3,000 freight cars, how are you going to get it back?

Mr. WRIGHT. I maintain it is going to be impossible physically to get most of it back, and it would probably be to the financial detriment of this country if we did, if we loaded up the country and glutted our markets with a lot of equipment that was made for war purposes. It would be better economically if we scrapped it or permitted our allies the continued use of it. That is a decision which should be made at that time.

Mr. ELMER. Then you mean, if we give away everything we have, we would be in better shape than if we kept it?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; better off than if we try to get back the war materials and try to use them for peace purposes. I do not want to go into that question too far, because that is a decision we do not have to make at this time. It is a decision that should be made at a later date.

Mr. ELMER. If all of this material is in Russia, could you get that down into an area near Japan so that it would help us out?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is what I hope and what we all hope—that Russia will continue to use the material to help us.

Mr. ELMER. How are you going to do it without Russia's consent?

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course, it must be used with their consent. It would be a much better use for us if the Russians used the very same weapons and guns and their men against the Japanese. That is what every person in Congress hopes and every person in America, I am quite sure of that.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Stimson testified, according to the report here, that he would not know how it could be done. Do you know of anybody who does?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not know of anybody. Does the gentleman know anybody?

Mr. ELMER. No; that is what I am kicking about. They will keep it. You know they will keep it. They will never return a nickel of it to us.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not have the gift of prophecy. I do not know what is going to happen in the future. However, I am addressing myself to this particular amendment.

Mr. ELMER. In my opinion, there is no nation on the face of this earth that in their own interest would not cut the throat of the United States if they got the chance.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman is possibly a little pessimistic.

Mr. ELMER. That is what you may think. That is what I think.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I think that remark is very unfair. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not think that remark should be carried in the RECORD. I wish that the gentleman would kindly withdraw it. It is a very serious allegation to say that they would cut our throat.

Mr. ELMER. That is what I think about it.

Mr. BLOOM. I think it is very unfair. They are our allies and we should treat them as allies. I do not think the gentleman means that statement should remain in the RECORD.

Mr. ELMER. We have not any allies. They are United Nations or associates. That is what they are called.

Mr. BLOOM. We are allies; we are fighting together to win this war. I think any representations or any statements made against our allies should be in other terms than as stated by the gentleman. I hope that before the RECORD goes to print tonight the gentleman will reconsider his remarks and withdraw them from the RECORD.

Mr. ELMER. The gentleman from New York will change his mind at the close of the war. You will see if you do not.

Mr. BLOOM. What I am saying is in all fairness to our allies.

Mr. ELMER. I am not going to do it because that is what I believe.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I regret the gentleman's statement. It is most unfair, unjust, and most regrettable, particularly at this time when complete cooperation and mutual trust are so essential in winning the war.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is another objection to the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia which I think is basic. I want you to consider for a moment the power that is exercised by the leaders of our allies, due to their forms of government, which are different than ours. The central Russian Government undoubtedly does not have to go to the legislative body to get consent for every business transaction that has to do with the joint waging of the war. Under the British parliamentary system the Prime Minister speaks for the Parliament. The Prime Minister acts for Parliament. He is their agent, you might say. He has power to speak for England and to make agreements for England. In the beginning of this war, even before the war started, we felt that it was better in order to insure flexibility and efficiency of military operation, to give the President great powers so that he would not be hampered in the proper conduct of the war. I personally do not think, and I do not believe that the Members of Congress think, that this is a time to change the rules of the game. If we do we are going to greatly handicap our President, acting through our military leaders. All of us have confidence in our military leaders. I believe that all of us have confidence in our President, in his patriotism, and in his sincere efforts to further the interests of this country. It is not a good idea to hamper the executive arm of the Government, acting through our military at the present time by imposing a condition subsequent upon any agreement which might be made with reference to lend-lease.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It seems to me, as to these future agreements the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER], or some such amendment, merely states the facts of the case. There is not any way in which the Congress can constitutionally hamper the President in making military agreements and executive agreements which are within his power, even if it tried to.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On the other hand, the nations abroad are fully conscious of President Wilson's 14 points and the Treaty of Versailles and what happened afterward. The fact is that the President of the United States, whoever he may be, cannot make an agreement that other countries will rely upon unless it is backed up by the Congress. So that when we write into the fundamental law the fact that future agreements must be approved by the Congress, all we are doing is writing in what is needed in order for the President to negotiate effectively with other nations.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad the gentleman has brought that point up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to make a distinction at this time as to the type of agreement under the lend-lease authority which has antecedent legislative approval and needs no further legislative action. By lend-lease we empower the President, the Lend Lease Administration, to make agreements which are binding without any subsequent approval by Congress. We understand that. I think for the purpose of making war that is the only efficient way of doing it.

But I am also thankful that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], with his usual statesmanlike approach, proposed the amendment which he did, because, if I can make the distinction, and I would like to make it clear, when we come into post-war agreements and post-war planning and post-war relations among the nations, Congress should definitely have a hand, as the Constitution provides that it should. What does the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] provide? It does not attempt to hamper our military forces or Lend-Lease Administration in making agreements with other nations, insofar as the supplying of arms and the necessary material of war is concerned. It does not in anyway interfere with the conduct of the war, but once the war is over it prevents any agreement looking beyond the war. It says, in effect to the Executive, "Stop, you cannot commit this country to any settlement as to lend-lease which is going to impose a post-war obligation upon the country unless you go to the Senate, in the case of a treaty, or unless you seek the approval of both Houses, in the case of an Executive agreement." So consequently there is this distinction between the amendments. The amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] ought to be defeated because I believe it will hamper our military and hamper our Lend-Lease Administration. It will impose new conditions upon lend-lease agreements and thus tie the hands of the administration. It will create an uncertainty in the minds of the nations with whom we make agreements as to whether or not the Congress is finally going to approve a settlement of their accounts. On the other hand we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] because it asserts the prerogative of Congress in dealing with post-war military relations and post-war business relations. I realize the nations of Europe at the present time recognize the fact that after the last war the division between the Executive and the Senate did very much to wreck the peace.

I am just as anxious as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that we do not have a repetition of that. I think the Wadsworth amendment tends to remove that chance, or at least make it less probable.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. By "the Wadsworth amendment" the gentleman means the committee amendment which was offered in the committee by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and which was unanimously approved by the committee?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Does the gentleman contend that it was the intention of the Congress when it originally enacted lend-lease that lend-lease goods should be shipped to the receiving countries and be resold by those countries and the proceeds put into the exchequers of the countries receiving lend-lease aid and utilized for general governmental purposes of those nations?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; I do not.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. This amendment is precisely the thing that is intended to check that practice.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is not necessary that the gentleman's amendment be passed. There is at present an agreement, as I understand it, between the nations that there shall be no lend-lease goods exported. Even under the terms of our master agreement they have no right to do it, because the title to the goods remains in us.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is not the case according to the statement of Mr. Stettinius himself in reply to questions before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year in which he admitted that the food shipped to Great Britain was being received and sold for cash by the British Government.

Mr. WRIGHT. To the British people.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. By the British Government to the British people and that the funds went into the exchequer and it went for the production of supplies to carry on the war. It might be used for the payment of troops or the building of a battleship or the repairing of a cruiser or buying potatoes or any other purpose. Does the gentleman contend that it was the intention of the Congress that it was to be utilized for such purposes?

Mr. WRIGHT. Perhaps we did not intend that, but I do not think the situation is as bad as the gentleman paints it. That is a relation between the British Government and their own people. The food is purchased by the Government.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I am speaking of lend-lease funds.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, but whether they raise the goods on their own land or buy it from some other source, or whether they get it from lend-lease is immaterial. I understand the way they handled their food distribution, most of it is purchased by a central authority and then put on the market. In some cases it is given to the people and in some cases it is sold to the people. Our relations are with Great Britain. If Great Britain should sell lend-lease goods abroad, we would have a kick coming. But the way they handle their own food distribution is not a matter that is as grave as might be suggested by the gentleman nor a matter which is particularly our concern.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it is pertinent to ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] if Great Britain did not dispose of those goods to its civilian population by sale, would the gentleman prefer that Great Britain just gave it out free, without charging anything for it, not get anything into the exchequer? Or would the gentleman have them set up a system over there, by which they sell the goods directly to the people? You have to dispose of them some way. And the only way to dispose of them is by sale. It is much better than giving them away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. In answer to that inquiry——

Mr. WRIGHT. May I take the 1 minute, please? To amplify what my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said the British Government is being charged a running account of lend-lease, with that food. If it would give the foods to its people it would have no means of paying for the food eventually. It is either a question of the British Government being charged for the food or of the people of Great Britain paying for it directly to us, which would be an indescribably confused situation. This matter was brought up last year. As I say, I do not think it is as bad as the gentleman would suggest. It does not compare to the shipment of goods to another country by a recipient of lend-lease which would amount to obtaining merchandise by credit from us, and selling for cash abroad, and to which I think we have a definite right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and that I be not interrupted during the course of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska that he may speak out of order?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of interest has been stirred by the fact that I have seen fit to release for publication some correspondence I have had with General MacArthur. Because of that interest I feel it my duty to explain my reasons for thus disclosing my support of the general for the Republican nomination for the Pres-

idency. As a humble Member of Congress and of the Republican Party, I felt it my duty to settle in my own mind the question of who would be the most outstanding and experienced man that the party could nominate. In going about this work I made it a point to see and talk to the men who were being prominently mentioned for President and to gain whatever other information I could about them. Since I could not talk to General MacArthur I studied his record and talked with those who knew him. Then I wrote him and received courteous replies. I made the correspondence public, and all of you now know its contents.

There are some people greatly concerned over the release of these letters for publication. I did this on my own initiative. I did not consult the general. In my opinion the general in no way was entirely agreeing with me in my criticism of the New Deal. Criticizing this administration is my privilege and duty. If the columnists and the members of the majority party want a whipping boy they should use me. Personally, I feel that the publication of the letters has again thrust the general back into the interest of the public. The amount of publicity through the press and radio has been most amazing. A thousand fires have been started which eventually will have good results.

I have received some 300 letters and telephone calls. I would estimate that 10 percent of the letters were of the smear type—vicious, malignant, and unsigned. Some 15 percent ask questions, have doubts about MacArthur. Seventy-five percent are glowing with praise of the general and the possibility that he may be the next President and Commander in Chief of the armed forces. There are letters from church groups praising the general's humility and his belief in the Deity and his strong Christian statements. Others say, that an "experienced general in the White House will shorten the war." "MacArthur knows the Pacific warfare." "We may well fight the Japs single-handed." "MacArthur has built up defenses in the Pacific, knows that type of warfare." "Let's have an experienced soldier in the White House for one term to shorten the war." "The general knows diplomacy and foreign affairs." "He will deal with a firm hand at the peace table and with the Japs." "He will help write an American peace." "He will deal firmly with selfish blocs and groups seeking to destroy this country." All these letters have a ring of sincerity and seriousness. They are not from professional politicians but from the folks in the country who think in simple, honest terms. They want someone in the White House who will get the war over as quickly as possible and then write a just and a lasting peace. The letters represent the outpouring of the heart of America.

As a result of my study and these many letters I became convinced that Gen. Douglas MacArthur has the qualifications and experience to make a great President, and that the Republican Party should present his name to the people as its nominee. This is no reflection on the other outstanding men who are being mentioned.

The Republican Party has a number of outstanding statesmen who would undoubtedly make great Presidents. It is the duty of the delegates and those in the political saddle to select the individual who can give the best service. They should remember that the war is still on. There is no doubt but what General MacArthur has a tremendous national popularity. It is not based on sentiment, emotionalism, or hero worship, but rather upon the knowledge that he, above anyone else upon the horizon today, is better equipped to assume and fulfill the role of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and President of the United States. His popularity comes from a deep feeling that here is a man who could be entrusted with the task of bringing this war to a conclusion in the shortest time possible and in doing so would see to it that we would not "inadvertently slip into the same condition internally as the one which we fight externally."

It should be remembered that General MacArthur has already held the highest military office in the United States Army. He has served in three wars. He has served for a long time as Chief of Staff, and had General MacArthur's wishes and plans been listened to and followed in regard to fortifying the Philippines in the days when he was Chief of Staff, there might not now have been such a tragedy as Bataan and Corregidor. When President Roosevelt, through an unprecedented Executive order, continued him in office as Chief of Staff, he said:

> It gives me great pleasure to promote so brilliant a soldier. I feel certain that General MacArthur will maintain the high standard set by eminent men who have preceded him as Chief of Staff.

General MacArthur knows how to get along with Congress.

The general had recently a most valuable experience in working with Admiral Halsey in the Pacific operations. This has given him an "on the job" knowledge of the use of combined Army, Navy, and military forces that is possessed by few other living men.

Is there anyone who can say that it is not most important at the moment, and for the months ahead, to have as President a man who by training, knowledge, and experience has such high qualities of Commander in Chief as is possessed by General MacArthur? It is a consensus of opinion that the war in Europe may be over early in 1945. We will then have the task of whipping the Japs. Who is better qualified to do that than General MacArthur? It does seem to me that any civilian nominee not having a military experience would undoubtedly be greatly handicapped. There are some people who would feel that continuing the New Deal would be the lesser of two evils rather than changing to some untried and inexperienced candidate.

A few of my letters have said in effect: "MacArthur is a fine general and is doing a good job in the Pacific, but what does he know about running the country?" It makes one wonder if a few of the citizens have become so conditioned in the past 12 years with the idea that one man, or the President, runs the country. The events of the past few months rather indicate that Congress and the Senate still function, and if General MacArthur were elected President, he would have the advice and counsel of men well qualified with experience in handling the internal affairs of the country.

The need now undoubtedly is for the office of President of the United States to function more as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy rather than to devote his time to internal domestic affairs. There are plenty of capable representatives of the people who can look after domestic affairs.

I do not believe that the average voter will be touched or stirred by high-pressure campaigning by either party. Their thinking follows simple, honest, and direct lines. They voted for Roosevelt for a third term, not because they necessarily liked him, but the world was approaching a war. They might vote for Roosevelt again unless a candidate of unusual qualifications with military experience is brought forth. The voters are stating quite simply that since we are at war few men know the situation as well as Roosevelt and that a new man, regardless of his fine qualifications, unless he had a knowledge of military affairs might make some mistake. I do feel, however, that there is a mass movement among the people who are dissatisfied with this administration's conduct of the war and the home-front operations. They will vote for a Republican. The next House of Representatives will be Republican. They do want outstanding military experience in the White House. Who, may I ask, knows more about the Pacific and how to fight the Japs than General MacArthur? The Republican Party has several fine candidates, but are they the right men for this election fight? Does not the average man feel that the next occupant of the White House should understand military operations and international maneuvers in order to avoid mistakes when he takes over the reigns of government?

It is my opinion that General MacArthur has every special qualification that would cause the average voter to put him in office. He has a tremendous national popularity. He is trusted by the people. He has humility and respect for the Deity. The average man will not need much selling to win his vote for MacArthur. He would well think that here is a man who comes home to help us do the things on the home front that will help our boys on the battle front.

The opposition would find little political ammunition in campaigning around the thought that he is not fully acquainted with the war in the Pacific or that he lacks knowledge of home-front problems.

After the war the big job will be that of making a just and lasting peace. Success in this undertaking will depend upon our relations with our allies while the

war is being won, and in our post-war negotiations. I do not think for 1 minute that General MacArthur is an isolationist. With his experience he must know that in order to assure peace in the world we must work with other countries. I am sure, however, that he is not imbued with the idea that it is our duty to make the world over according to the idealistic schemes of the social planners who dominate this administration, and who shout "isolationist" at everyone who disagrees with them. I am sure that he will do everything possible to help the other nations establish and maintain a just and lasting peace. He will strongly represent American ideals, but he will not attempt to meddle in affairs of other great nations and thus engender feelings that will lead to other wars. In carrying on our foreign relations I am sure he will be guided by an informed public opinion.

The other job that confronts the next President is the solution of our domestic problems. Our biggest domestic problem now is to bring about an unselfish and united effort to back up our armed forces. By its policy of favoring certain groups and opposing others the New Deal has divided this country into warring factions. Somebody is needed who can call all the people from their own interests and galvanize them into a united force. Again, I say, who could better do this than the man who has done so much with so little, who not only stopped the Japs short of Australia, but who drove them back even though his has been considered a secondary front. He is free from obligation to any faction of our people. He could talk to them in the words of our soldiers and sailors on the battle lines.

General MacArthur is a born leader of men. He has been fearless in his contacts and has been right in his judgments. He has a profound belief in the essential good judgment of the American people once they know the truth. He believes in constitutional government. By every standard he measures up to the high stature of the Presidency.

In conclusion, let me emphasize my previous statement, as to my motive in publishing this correspondence. I was moved by an intense desire and the need of the country and hoped the Republican Party would nominate a man who could win the election and who would be wholly competent to lead our country in this critical time to a quick victory and the writing of a lasting peace without this country losing some of the things which we are fighting to protect. I believe that in releasing this correspondence that it has focused the country's attention upon this critical need. I take full responsibility for my act and ask that criticisms for it be directed entirely at me. In the general's replies to me I did not, nor do I now consider that he endorsed in whole my criticism of the New Deal, although I feel that the general is gravely concerned with the way things are going in his beloved country. Other generals and high officials have felt free to express their concern. Every American has that right, or should have it. I did what I thought was right. This may be politics and politics often does strange things but it has given the people a chance to think.

It is most necessary that the Republican Party will nominate a man of General MacArthur's ability and ideals and if they do they will be electing a great American as President of the United States.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, in the midst of the exacting intellectual toil of this body in considering this very important legislation, I am sure we are grateful to the gentleman from Nebraska for injecting a one-man nomination convention at this point. I want to thank him for the relief and pleasure it has given me personally.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss the situation as it exists in the Far East at the present time. I believe that this country, due to recent developments, has become more cognizant of the serious threat to our security that lies in that area. In order to comprehend the situation, we have to understand some of the factors affecting the different countries, located in that part of the world.

Even though Russia, in a military sense, is not engaged in the Pacific war, she is, nevertheless, in a position of considerable importance. Some of the American planes that are playing such a vital part in the defeat of Hitler on the Russian front have reached the Russian Army by way of Siberia. Other lend-lease supplies are still being shipped in by way of Vladivostok and are transported from that port by means of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, not only to the European front but perhaps also to possible fronts in Asia. The Russians still have a large concentration of troops on the Manchukuoan-Korean frontier and as long as that concentration remains where it is, so long will Japan have to divert some of its army and air force to that area for its own protection. On that basis some hundreds of thousands of Japanese troops are immobilized and that means that those troops cannot be used elsewhere.

There have been reports lately emanating from Chungking to the effect that a sizable portion of the Kwantung army has been dispatched from Manchukuo, its headquarters, for service in central China for a drive against Chungking, and also for service to southwest China for a possible drive against the American-trained Chinese divisions located north of Burma in the Chinese province of Yunnan. Just what this indicates is, of course, hard for a layman to know, but it would appear that Japan is girding itself in an effort to compensate for losses suffered in the Pacific at the hands of MacArthur, Halsey, and Nimitz. Japan does not have the naval power or the air power to stop us for long on any front that we desire to set up in the Pacific Ocean, but she does have a concentration of forces in China proper and perhaps elsewhere on the Asiatic Continent to strike telling blows. We cannot afford to become too sanguine about our Pacific successes because there we have to fight not only the Japanese but space and time as well, and those two elements have been, and still are, on the side of the Japanese and they are allowing our enemies to consolidate their conquests and to exploit the resources in the conquered territories.

In their attempts to strike telling blows, to compensate for their Pacific losses to us, the Japanese have undertaken the invasion of India which to date, from their point of view, has been a very successful operation. It is not a matter of liberating India as far as the Japanese are concerned, nor do they consider seriously the setting up of a provisional government to administer the affairs of that sick country. Rather it seems to be a well-calculated and long-thought-out plan to break into certain parts of India, obtain some degree of control and use those parts of the country, specifically the state of Manipur, to cut China's heart by disrupting her supply route from Calcutta to Assam.

From a study of the map of east and northeast India it appears that the Japanese are striving to cut transportation on the Bengal-Assam railroad, which of course will mean, if they are successful, that the supply lines leading to the Ledo Road now being built by American and Chinese forces under Stilwell, will be cut off and it also means that the advance air fields in Assam from which supplies are flown into China will be rendered negligible from a transportation point of view. While the cutting of the Bengal-Assam railroad would not keep all supplies from going into China or north Burma it would diminish its effectiveness to such an extent that American transport planes would have to fly farther, carry more gas and smaller loads of vitally needed matériel. All our troops under Stilwell's command would be placed in a very hazardous position because they would have to be supplied by air and this is at best a difficult undertaking.

We know that for the past year and a half that Americans have been stationed in the high spots of the Himalayas and that those men located in those isolated areas have to be fed by parachute. All the material which would have to be sent in by air to China would be considerably less because of the necessity of feeding the Americans, and the Chinese carrying forward the work of opening the supply routes to China and subsequently would bring about a lessening in the flow of matériel needed to carry on the war in that area. The effect of this would undoubtedly be a long delay to the struggle in Asia and it might, if carried on long enough, bring about the loss of China in this war. Too often have we kept the Chinese alive on promises, and too often have the Chinese been let down only to bounce back again. There is a limit to a people's and a nation's endurance and the psychological effect of what Japan has been able to do in India has hurt our prestige with the Chinese and lowered their resistance to a dangerous degree. If the Japanese are successful in India and Burma, it is not too

much to assume that China with its internal weaknesses such as unchecked inflation and ideological conflict may be forced out of the war.

That is something that we must take into consideration all the time, that is one of the reasons why we must be aware of what is going on in the Far East and recognize the facts for what they are. I have taken as active an interest as I possibly could in our great ally China not so much because I like the Chinese people—and I do—but because I feel quite strongly that the more assistance we get into China and the greater use we can make of China's manpower the less difficult will be our part in the Pacific war and the more American lives we will save.

Our bombers have begun to make their presence felt in China, although in that theater we have not yet assumed the offensive. On the Asiatic mainland, time has, in one sense, been fighting on the side of the Celestial Empire. But time is a fickle ally. Potentially, China remains our most effective base for aerial operations against Japan.

Supply is our problem in China. To supply our growing air strength in that country has been perhaps the greatest single challenge to the efficiency of the air forces. Every item of equipment necessary for the maintenance and operation of our Fourteenth Air Force must be flown into China from the outside. That is the primary, fundamental fact of our present strategy in Asia.

It may throw some light to consider this fact in terms of gasoline alone. In the round trip over the hump between Assam and Kunming, the C–87 transport now in use can deliver 4 tons of 100-octane gasoline. To do so, the airplane must consume 3½ tons of the same precious commodity.

The crews of a heavy bombardment group in China must ferry over their own gasoline, bombs, replacement parts and everything else in their own B–24's—the C–87 is a converted B–24. Before this bombardment group can go on 1 combat flight, it must make 4 trips over the hump. To perform 1 extremely dangerous mission, those crews must make 4 separate flights over the most hazardous mountain terrain in the world. Until such time as we conquer the territory and build the road into China, and/or capture a seaport, we must follow this procedure whether it is for 40 aircraft or 4,000.

Our problem of making supplies flow into China by no means starts in Assam. When Maj. Gen. Lewis H. Brereton and his men first arrived in India from Java they found a total of 10 airdromes in that entire subcontinent. Until that time, the British defense of India had been based on the assumption that the only threat could come from the northwest frontier—the Kyber Pass. The Japanese seizure of Burma suddenly threatened attack not from the northwest but the east.

A complete and rapid readjustment of defenses was in order, a formidable task in any country—let alone India. There, the enervating heat, the apathy of the natives, the total absence of modern methods and equipment, combined to form a staggering prospect.

Assam is separated from the rest of India by the Brahmaputra, one of the longest rivers in the world, and one that has not a single bridge through its length in that country. Its mean level varies with the seasons. At certain times of the year, a 25-foot rise and fall puts river ports out of commission during both flood and ebb periods.

There is no through road between Assam and Calcutta. Rail transportation is complicated by changes in gage, and the existence of antiquated train ferries. The capacity of the inland water system was for a long time even lower than usual because power units and barges had been moved to Iraq. And during the monsoon season, nearly all nonriver transportation ceases because the area is completely flooded.

The monsoon season lasts, in Assam, from mid-May to mid-November. The average rainfall is about 150 inches as compared to a 20-inch average for a similar period in, say, Virginia. Malaria is a constant threat.

Life and labor are cheap in India. Sections of tea land were cleared for our airdromes and runways were painfully built with rocks taken from the river bottom and carried in baskets on the heads of coolies. Antediluvian stone rollers, pushed by other coolies, are used to pack down the rock.

Our flying transport operations are no less difficult. The pilots who fly our transports in that weather are as exposed as any in actual combat. Seventeen thousand-foot mountains have to be cleared by instrument flying; if our men veer to the north they meet 22,000-foot peaks while to the south they drift over Japanese-held Burma. It is no country to crash-land in.

That is the route our supplies must travel after they have already been shipped more than 10,000 miles—supplies not only for our Fourteenth Air Force but to help equip the Chinese Army and to build and defend China's airdromes.

And yet the Fourteenth Air Force is in the skies over China. Under the command of a master tactician, Gen. Claire L. Chennault, American fliers of the Fourteenth have from February 2, 1942, to October 31, 1943, brought down 351 Japanese aircraft, with a loss to themselves of only 68, an unrivalled record. That is not counting enemy aircraft probably destroyed or damaged.

A record of this scope is all the more impressive in that it was built up in the course of what is, by today's standards, aerial guerrilla warfare. The pre-condition of all successful guerrilla operations—an actively friendly countryside—exists in China, and the Fourteenth has taken advantage of this by helping the Chinese create one of the most efficient aircraft warning systems in existence. Our bases are notified of the approach of a Japanese flight almost at the moment it takes to the air. This warning system was one of the factors that enabled the Fourteenth to provide the support which helped to stop the Japanese cold in the Tungting Lake offensive of May and June 1943.

In its primary mission of protecting the terminal bases of air transport, the Fourteenth Air Force has been completely successful. At the same time, we know that air transport must be established for our Chinese bases. It need hardly be stated that we have no intention of allowing our air operations from the Asiatic mainland to remain on the level of guerrilla warfare. Neither Japanese shipping nor Japanese industry will survive the bombing in store for them.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, my able colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The remarks of the gentleman about China and the Orient should be of interest and should carry weight because the gentleman is familiar from personal knowledge he has had by reason of residence, as I understand it, in China. For how many years did the gentleman live there?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Just 3 years.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. But the gentleman knows the conditions over there, and I think he House is interested in hearing upon that question for the reasons stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

If China is, because of circumstances, forced out of this war we will live to rue the day that such a happening occurred. The only way that we can keep China in this war and fighting as she has over the last 7 years is to see to it that she gets the tools, because we can be very certain that if we keep her supplied she will do her job, and do it well.

The present method of acquiring lend-lease material for China is not too satisfactory. The material sent in is not the property of China but rather is American goods, and is at the disposition of the Joint Munitions Board. This Board may at any time change the destination of these shipments. China does not have a representative on this Board, the reason being, I believe, that China is not one of the producing nations and is therefore not entitled to a seat. Her needs are stated by an American Army officer specifically assigned to this particular job. All matériel destined for China is shipped to the commanding officer in India, who is General Stilwell, on a month-to-month assignment. This perhaps is necessary, but the objection to it is that this war cannot be waged on a month-to-month basis. Furthermore, the exigencies of other fronts sometimes divert supplies originally intended for China. China would prefer to have the United States make no promises except those which we can carry out. We have been overenthusiastic too many times and promised to China matériel which we could not under any circumstances, in view of our own needs, send to her. The result has been

that China has suffered one let-down after another, and this is not very conducive, as you can well understand, to a feeling of harmony and strength. China's thanks would be much more warm and sincere if we would promise a small degree of help and produce it rather than promise much and produce only a small part. China would like to have 60 divisions, or 600,000 men fully equipped so that they could be in a position to carry out a real offensive against Japan. At the present time the Chinese have only 3 or 4 divisions fully equipped, and they are located in India and on the Burma front. In China not even 1 division is equipped with American matériel.

While we have been doing remarkably well under lend-lease I feel that we should be able to do a great deal more. Certainly American ingenuity is not to be satisfied with an aerial route over the hump of the Himalayas into China and a proposed road through northern Burma. We know, of course, on the basis of what Admiral Nimitz and General Stilwell have both said that we are going to drive across the Pacific until we acquire control of a seaport on the China coast, but that is going to take a long time and until that day is at hand it appears that we will have to be satisfied with what routes we now have either in operation or under consideration.

In 1942 we sent over the hump something like 5,500 tons of supplies into China; in 1943 we sent in 12 times that amount and in the month of December alone we transported into China by air more than twice as much as we sent in during the entire year 1942. This indicates a great advance in the amount sent in but it by no means comes anywhere near satisfying the requirements of either Chennault and his Fourteenth Air Force or the forces of the Chungking government. However, in all honesty it must be admitted that this aerial transport route is probably the toughest road in the world. The average round trips between Assam, the starting point, and Kunming, Chennault's headquarters, were 5,000 a month which indicates, of course, that a great deal of traffic was being carried on. However, in northwest India the precipitation is the heaviest in the world and because of this plus extremely cloudy conditions and the mountain barriers which have to be flown over, the job is a tremendously difficult one. At the present time of the something in excess of 100,000 American troops in India 20,000 are being used in the building of the Ledo Road which is progressing favorably and which will, if the Japanese are stopped in Manipur and driven out of India, connect with the Burma Road eventually.

This road is being built by American troops and guarded by Indian-trained, American-equipped Chinese soldiers under Brigadier General Boatner. They are doing a splendid job and the Chinese troops have been able to furnish all the necessary protection. When the Ledo Road connects with the Burma Road, and that should not take too long, it will mean that the Japanese will have to be driven from the Burma Road area which they occupy in northern Burma up to the China frontier itself. This is going to take a long time and added to that is the fact that the Burma Road itself will have to be repaired to a considerable extent, and when one considers the chasms which must be bridged and the other topographical difficulties to be encountered, one can begin to comprehend the seriousness of the situation. It is along the China end of the Burma Road that Chiang Kai-shek has some three or four divisions of American-trained troops, and to get back to what I said earlier in this talk, it is to this particular part of Burma and China that, supposedly, some of Japan's Kwantung Army soldiers have been dispatched.

I believe that the Lend-Lease Administration is doing everything in its power to speed up aid to China but I am far from satisfied with the actual tonnage which has been sent to our gallant ally. We are not fighting this war alone nor are we fighting to make the world safe for democracy. We are in effect fighting for the right of democracy to live, and whoever fights our enemies fights with us at the moment, and we are not under any circumstances obligated to accept what they think or believe. We have to realize that this is a global struggle and that it will take the united efforts of all those allied with us to bring this war to a victorious conclusion. To say that we have now entered on the most critical years we have ever known is simply to state the obvious. We cannot afford to let differences of opinion sway us at a time like this. We have an obligation to keep faith here just as do the men on the battlefields all over the world The men on Wake, Tarawa, and Bataan kept that faith to the end. It is up to us, all of us, to finish the job they started. But valor alone will not win in this modern warfare of dive bombers and tanks. The final result will be determined by the united, organized, civilian army which supplies the uniformed armies with the shoes, planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, food, clothing, and medicine—everything possible for victory.

We cannot afford the type of mental or military unpreparedness which has characterized the Indian and Burma military strategy too often in this war. We have underestimated many things such as the striking power of the Japanese Army, the reaction of colonial peoples, and the defensive strength and dogged determination of the Chinese. Psychologically we have waged a very poor war and we seem not to have learned too much as a result of what we have been through. We have to realize that this is a life and death struggle and that, unfortunately, our losses are going to be great. That is the sad part about any war because while you can re-create wealth you cannot bring back a life.

I am interested in bringing an end to these barbaric struggles which plague each of our generations and I would like to save as many lives as we possibly can in this present war. That is why, I repeat, I am so interested in China and the part it should play. China is more than willing to assume her share of the burden of carrying on the war in the Far East. She knows her limitations but she desires to work as a team—the Chinese to use their manpower to carry on the infantry operations if we will give them the supplies and the material, and we to use our ingenuity and skills to carry on the sea and air warfare. Our whole war plan in the Pacific is based on the belief that China will continue to oppose Japan indefinitely, but China—near the brink of exhaustion—cannot continue this policy unless we get the supplies to her. It is therefore obvious that we must take every conceivable step and use every power at our command to strengthen China's Army and to keep China in the war. Not only must we do it for selfish reasons at the present time but also because in a long range consideration of the matter a strong China will have the good will of the peoples of Asia and by that token we will have their good will also. China could lead the way to democracy in Asia. China could use her growing influence morally as well as politically to help build up a better order in the Pacific and, finally, China could make an important contribution to the enforcement of peace in the Pacific because with her great resources, both natural and human, as well as her geographical position, a strong China would be able to share with other great powers the responsibility of keeping the peace in the Pacific region and making that area one of security rather than the powder keg it is at the present time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Gladly.

Mr. JUDD. I want to pay tribute to the very scholarly and sound statement made by the gentleman from Montana in regard to the situation in the Far East. I am very sure that America, naturally preoccupied with the coming invasion of Europe, is not paying adequate attention to the seriousness of the situation in the Far East.

Admiral King last summer said that our job would be made almost impossibly difficult if China were to drop out of the war. The way in which the white man has crumpled up like a house of cards and been caught unawares again, and again, and again in South China, South Asia, in Burma and India, is most disconcerting from the Chinese standpoint; yes, but primarily from our standpoint, because for every Chinese they lose we have to put in an American who, under these difficult circumstances, is not the equal of a Chinese soldier. I want to express my great appreciation to the gentleman for bringing this subject before us at this time when it is of such crucial importance to our own conduct in the war.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. As this House knows, I have a high regard for the gentleman and consider him one of the outstanding authorities on the Far East in the entire country. As I have stated on many previous ocassions, we are indeed fortunate to have him here as a Member of this body.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD; and at the appropriate time, when we go back into the House, I am going to ask permission to insert articles V, VI, and VII of the master agreement, and sections of the original act of 1941, to show the necessity, I feel, for the amendment which I am going to propose tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman, however, asks now for permission to extend her own remarks?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A great deal of interest has been expressed concerning my amendment, and a great deal of approval, and in order that the Members may have it before them at this point in the RECORD so that they can refer to the master agreement with Russia, which is a sample agreement of the master agreements with other countries—and that master agreement will be found on page 72 of the report of the Seventy-eighth Congress on lend-lease operations.

The following is the section of the Lend-Lease Act to which I refer, and articles V, VI, and VII of the lend-lease report of the Seventy-eighth Congress:

(b) The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

(c) After June 30, 1943, or after the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses before June 30, 1943, which declares that the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a) are no longer necessary to promote the defense of the United States, neither the President nor the head of any department or agency shall exercise any of the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a); except that until July 1, 1946, any of such powers may be exercised to the extent necessary to carry out a contract or agrement with such a foreign government made before July 1, 1943, or before the passage of such concurrent resolution, whichever is the earlier.

ARTICLE V

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency, as determined by the President of the United States of America, such defense articles transferred under this Agreement as shall not have been destroyed, lost or consumed and as shall be determined by the President to be useful in the defense of the United States of America or of the Western Hemisphere or to be otherwise of use to the United States of America.

ARTICLE VI

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics full cognizance shall be taken of all property, services, information, facilities, or other benefits or considerations provided by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics subsequent to March 11, 1941, and accepted or acknowledged by the President on behalf of the United States of America.

ARTICLE VII

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in return for aid furnished under the act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end, they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the basic principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.

At an early convenient date, conversations shall be begun between the two Governments with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded Governments.

I shall read my amendment:

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of March 11, 1941, as amended, is amended by inserting '(1)' after '(b)' and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(2) Nothing in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be construed to authorize the President to enter into any final settlement with respect to the disposition, other than the return to the United States, of defense articles in the possession of any government of any foreign country and not necessary to the defense of such foreign country until the terms and conditions of such settlement shall have been submitted to the Congress and approved by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses.'"

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In listening to the reading of the amendment which the gentlewoman proposes I notice it refers to a particular subsection; that nothing in that subsection shall be construed as giving the President authority to make any settlement without the approval of Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is the subsection that gives him authority to leave in a country, if he wishes, or transfer, if he wishes, stock piles of defense articles from one country to another and allow that country to transmit goods or sell it or do anything else with it.

Mr. CASE. It is clear then as to the meaning of this amendment that it would prevent the President from incurring any agreement under any power anywhere in the lend-lease program without the approval of Congress, pertaining to the final settlement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman doubtless knows that the Committee on Foreign Affairs accepted the following amendment which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 3 is amended by striking out the period after the word "satisfactory" and inserting the following: ": *Provided, however,* That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure."

That amendment affects settlement of our post-war economic and post-war military policies.

My amendment refers to the final settlement insofar as defense supplies are concerned. There are very large stock piles of airplanes, tanks, and other materials of war in certain countries. I believe there are ships. We want to make sure that those countries at some time or another are not going to use those materials of war against us or against some other country that we feel should be protected not only for its own sake but for our own protection.

Mr. CASE. I think the purpose of the amendment is distinctly good. I just wanted to be sure that the reference there to the particular subsection did not limit it to a portion of the final agreements instead of to any power the President might have with respect to final agreements.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that is the part that gives the President the authority. The President now has the authority to bring back the goods or leave them in the countries where they now are. I think that is a very dangerous thing. Nobody knows what is going to happen after this war is over. This Nation stood by among other nations and watched Germany arm and arm and arm and arm.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is the amendment the gentlewoman is now discussing the amendment with reference to disposing of surplus lend-lease property?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is with reference to surplus lend-lease property after the war is over, and it may not be after the war is over. It might be that one country would make a separate peace. Certainly then this would serve as a great protection to the United States.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This is the same amendment discussed yesterday?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The same amendment discussed yesterday, although I have gone into the wording of

the amendment today. Yesterday I did not give the exact words.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is the gentlewoman going to put in the RECORD the amendment as she proposes to offer it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have just read it, and I am going to ask that the printed copy of the amendment go into the RECORD. I think it would be a great protection. I said yesterday that plenty of veterans who are now fighting, who are now in the service of our country, have been very much interested in a provision of this sort. They are suffering today because of lack of foresight on the part of the Government. They want to take no chances after this World War.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. On yesterday I interrogated the distinguished chairman of the committee as to how much had already been spent under lease-lend, and I understood him to say $22,000,000,000. I have since been informed by another member of the committee that it is $27,000,000,000. A difference of $5,000,000,000 these days is not much. Can the gentlewoman give us some definite information as to that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to get that definite information. I do not have it here at the desk at the moment. I think the definite information so far as possible should be given to the House. I shall try to have what is available inserted in my speech.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Did I correctly understand the gentlewoman to say she has been trying to get the information and could not get it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I said it was difficult for Members of Congress to get it.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentlewoman certainly knows that the amount of money that has been appropriated for lend-lease is $24,000,000,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not have the figures before me. I shall ask to have them inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. BLOOM. They are available in the office of the Committee on Appropriations. I think the gentlewoman would find if she investigated that the amount of money that has been spent and allocated up to the present time under lend-lease is $22,000,000,000. In reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota, I do not see how more can be expended than was appropriated, because I think there is a law against that; in fact, I know there is. So the amount of money that has been appropriated up to the present time, and which I put in the RECORD yesterday, is $24,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. The laws limiting any action of this administration are more honored in the breach than in the observance. Of course the gentleman knows that.

Mr. BLOOM. Only $24,000,000,000 is appropriated under lend-lease. Twenty-two billion dollars has been spent and allocated up to the present time, according to the records. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will take that statement as being correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The following is a table which appears on page 197 of the lend-lease regarding authorizations and transfers authorized from other appropriations.

Lend-lease appropriations

[Millions of dollars]

Category	Amounts appropriated					Adjusted appropriations Dec. 31, 1943	Percent change in appropriations[1]
	First appropriation	Second appropriation	Third appropriation	Fourth appropriation	Total		
1. Ordnance and ordnance stores	1,343	1,190	----------	----------	2,533	1,692	−33.2
2. Aircraft and aeronautical material	2,054	685	----------	----------	2,739	2,680	−2.2
3. Tanks and other vehicles	262	285	129	----------	876	739	−15.6
4. Vessels and watercraft	629	850	734	1,553	3,766	3,872	+2.8
5. Miscellaneous military equipment	260	155	----------	----------	415	354	−14.7
6. Production facilities in United States	752	375	112	----------	1,239	1,105	−10.8
7. Agricultural and industrial commodities	1,350	1,875	3,567	4,452	11,244	12,600	+12.1
8. Servicing, repair of ships, etc	200	175	208	259	842	791	−6.1
9. Services and expenses	40	285	675	----------	1,000	800	−20.0
10. Administrative expenses	10	10	----------	9	29	29	0
Total	7,000	5,985	5,425	6,273	24,683	24,671	−.05

[1] The Lend-Lease Appropriation Acts provide that with the exception of the appropriation for administrative expenses, up to 20 percent of the consolidated appropriation for any category may be transferred by the President to the consolidated appropriation for any other category, but no consolidated appropriation may be increased by more than 30 percent. The Fourth Lend-Lease Appropriation Act provided an exception in the case of ordnance and ordnance stores; certain transfers could be made from that category to agricultural and industrial commodities.

AMOUNTS OF LEND-LEASE AID AUTHORIZED

The amount of lend-lease aid that may be provided under the various acts is summarized as follows:

I

Lend-lease appropriations to the President

First lend-lease appropriation	$7,000,000,000
Second lend-lease appropriation	5,985,000,000
Third lend-lease appropriation (fifth supplemental, 1942)	5,425,000,000
Fourth lend-lease appropriation	6,273,629,000
Total	24,683,629,000

II

Transfers authorized from other appropriations

Direct appropriations have been made to the War and Navy Departments and to the Maritime Commission for the procurement of items which are in the main common to the uses of our own armed forces and those of our allies. These items when produced can be used, in other words, by our own armed forces or those of our allies in the manner in which they can be most effective in defeating our common enemies. It is not until they are ready for distribution that they are allocated by the military experts in accordance with the strategic needs. The appropriation acts in question authorize transfers to our allies up to stated amounts under the Lend-Lease Act. That does not mean that transfers up to the stated amounts have to or will necessarily be made. All that it means is that there is sufficient flexibility for the military experts to assign the supplies where they will do the most good in winning the war.

War Department, third supplemental, 1942	$2,000,000,000
War Department, fourth supplemental, 1942	4,000,000,000
War Department, fifth supplemental, 1942	11,250,000,000
War Department, sixth supplemental, 1942	2,220,000,000
War Department, Military Appropriation Act, 1943	12,700,000,000
Navy Department, second supplemental, 1943	3,000,000,000
Departments other than War, third supplemental, 1942	800,000,000
Total	35,970,000,000

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a great deal of confusion about this whole question of lend-lease and what it has done and what it is proposed to do.

On yesterday I interrogated several speakers, among them the chairman of the committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I understood the chairman to say in reply to a question of mine that only $22,000,000,000—I should not say "only," because $22,000,000,000 is a lot of money—has been released under the operation of the lease-lend law. I do not know why we call it lease-lend, because we shall never see any of it again. We are neither lending or leasing, we are giving it.

The point raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] on yesterday as to whether there would be a danger of our associate nations charging us rent for storage of this property after the war is over evoked some smiles on the majority side, but it would not surprise me in the least if some of our associate nations would present us with a bill for storage after the war is over.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman if he has ever heard anything from this administration or from any part of it that would indicate that these people would ever be called upon to reimburse us even in part for the expenditures we are now making?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think they have been assured that they do not need to pay us back, that "Uncle Sap" does not expect them to pay us back. Of course, this war is costing us anywhere from 25 to 40 percent more than it should. I want to read to the House a little extract taken from an address delivered by Dr. George Mecklenburg at the Wesley Church in Minneapolis on Sunday, March 19. This appears in the Wesley News. I may say that Dr. Mecklenburg enjoys a splendid reputation in our part of the country. He is one of our outstanding clergymen. He was rather strong for intervention, as I recall. I think he castigated me several years ago because I was not so feverish to get into this war, which, of course, is merely a continuation of World War No. 1.

Let me read what Dr. Mecklenburg, who just returned from a trip to Latin America, said:

> Coming down through southern Mexico on the Vera Cruz-Tapachula Railroad, I got an earful about American extravagance. They told me that the United States was spending $200,000,000 on that railroad, and it is a Mexican railroad belonging to the Government. Mexico has plenty of money to repair her own railroads now, yet we are down there doing it for them. Senator HUGH BUTLER, after traveling 20,000 miles through Latin America, comes home and attacks our good-neighbor policy. He says, "We have appropriated $6,000,000,000 for Latin America, to be spent in 3 years."

I recall that statement very well. It was challenged by the New Deal proponents, but before Senator BUTLER got through with them he convinced the country that he knew what he was talking about, and he furnished us with audited figures to show that what he said was true.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I might say to the gentleman that when Senator BUTLER finally employed a firm of very eminent accountants and had gone over the figures he found that the 3-year program that he had spoken about called for an expenditure of $8,000,000,000 instead of $6,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not surprised.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, please?

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Does the gentleman mean to say that the amount of money that he just mentioned as being expended in other parts of the world is being expended under lend-lease, or is it an entirely different thing that the gentleman is speaking of?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am talking about American money being expended in other countries.

Mr. BLOOM. But the gentleman will admit this is not lend-lease money he is talking about?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is American money. It is money that is wrung from the taxpayers. It is money squeezed from the pockets of our people.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman knows it is not lend-lease money.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is not a part of the economy program that the President promised the American people back in 1932.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly, if the gentleman from New York is through.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I quite agree with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] that only a small part of it is a part of lend-lease, but nevertheless it shows the length to which this administration will go in wartime in the reckless waste and squandering of public money in every corner of the world.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, lend-lease is not the only tap on the Federal Treasury. We are showering American gold all over the world. In one locality we use the lend-lease nozzle. In another locality we use the good-neighbor nozzle. But the nozzles are going all the time and it is not to be wondered at that Uncle Sam is now taking 33⅓ percent of every dollar we earn for Federal taxes, which does not take into consideration the taxes of the other political subdivisions.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. The gentleman seems to be somewhat at a loss as to the actual amount of money available under lend-lease and the amount that has been expended.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not think I am any more at a loss than some of the members of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Let me read to you now from the hearings, from a schedule supplied in those hearings, on page 197. The actual amount, according to the schedule supplied by the Lend Lease Administration as of January 31, allocated in the sum of $22,247,335,000. The amount of lease-lend aid authorized and set up in this schedule by direct appropriation amounts to $24,683,629,000. By transfers from other appropriations $35,970,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Do I understand that there have been transfers to lend-lease of funds totaling $35,000,000,000 from other funds.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. They are the authorizations for transfers from the War Department and Navy Department funds, aggregating $35,970,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Most amazing.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. That is nothing new. That is what I put in the RECORD yesterday. The figures are correct and there is no secret about it. It has been open to the committee and it is open to the world, so there is nothing secret about it.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I am not indicating it has been a secret. I am merely giving the figures to the gentleman who seems to have made some inquiries about them.

Mr. BLOOM. I put them in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Then in addition to that, I might say there is approximately $2,000,000,000 that has been transferred from the Maritime Commission, making a total of something like $63,000,000,000 available under lend-lease for mutual aid or whatever term is used to describe it.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would say lend-lease funds seem to have a very high velocity.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I think the gentleman has taken care of the situation very nicely, so I will withhold any further remarks I have at this time.

Mr. KNUTSON. I want to read a little further, if I may. Dr. Mecklenburg goes on and quotes Senator BUTLER as follows:

> He says that we have appropriated $6,000,000,000 for Latin America to be spent in 3 years. He goes into details about it. He speaks of a sanitation project in Guatemala City which will cost us $750,000 and the Guatemalan Government only $19,000. He speaks of a road-building project for unemployment in San Salvador to give employment to 2,000 men. I know in the Senate investigating committee this project was denied, but I talked to the man who had charge of it. He was an American. He told me that Senator BUTLER told the truth. Senator BUTLER says that we are spending one-half a million dollars in Honduras, while the state only puts in $7,360 to match it. Two hundred health centers financed and projected by America are under way in Latin America now. This may be fine missionary work and if we agree to do it it must be all right. But certainly we Americans knew nothing about it.

He is talking about us Americans here at home.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel that good will is being built up in South America?

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, I think we could build up just as much good will if we set up 500 Christmas trees strategically placed.

Mr. BREHM. Last summer in my home town, Dr. O. B. Foster, an authority on Latin American affairs, told a local audience that our neighbors to the south still distrust us despite the New-Deal generosity with John Q. Public's money.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I will come to that in just a few minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me get this little gem in, Mr. Chairman, if you please, and then I will be glad to yield.

Dr. Mecklenburg goes on as follows:

I was told in Guatemala when we built the military camp there we started to pay such high prices for everything that President Ubico had to step in and put a ceiling on wages and prices so as not to demoralize the finances of the republic.

They do not say anything about demoralizing the morale of the people, but that would follow, of course.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] for whom I have a very high regard.

Mr. BLOOM. I thank the gentleman very much. It is mutual. Speaking about the highways in San Salvador, that is the Pan-American Highway that was voted upon by this Congress. I think the gentleman voted for it years ago. That is where that money is being expended. It has nothing to do with lend-lease.

Mr. KNUTSON. I still come back to the old theme that it is American money.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, yes; but the Congress appropriated it.

Mr. KNUTSON. And whether it is loaned out—not loaned out—that is a misnomer—whether it is given out by lend-lease or the Federal Highway Department or someone else, the taxpayer suffers just as much agony when the money is being extracted from him.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. Concerning this overburdened taxpayer, would the gentleman care to comment upon whether or not this overburdened taxpayer has more money left after paying taxes today, say 1944, or even in 1943, than he had after paying taxes in 1932, a year that the gentleman remembers very well?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; of course. Yes; he has much more money because he cannot buy much of anything now.

Mr. McMURRAY. Oh! That is why?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. He cannot get gasoline; he cannot get sugar; he cannot buy a double-breasted suit of clothes with a vest and cuffs on the trousers; he cannot get tires unless he is related to the reigning family. Oh, yes. He should have more money because there is no place to spend it. At least when the Republicans were in power we could find a place to spend our money.

Mr. McMURRAY. But does he not have more income?

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course he has more income, because there is no place for him to spend his income.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not a little unfair to base income——

Mr. KNUTSON. I am so glad the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] is having such a good laugh. It sounds like it comes from a vacuum.

Mr. BREHM. I think it is unfair to attempt to take the national income and say that we get that income raised by blood and sweat and tears. It took a war to get that income raised.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course.

Mr. BREHM. I would rather have no income and have peace.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; up to the time of this war you gentlemen have heard me say through the years that there was only one way Roosevelt would solve the depression and that was through a war. That is the only way he could get rid of unemployment in this country.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Possibly the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] is not aware of the fact that our national debt today is approximately 10 times what it was in 1932.

Mr. KNUTSON. Very true. Now, laugh that off.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Of course, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] does not take into account the fact that if the taxpayer has more money now he has a national individual debt of some several thousand dollars, according to the number in his family. That was touched on by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. But the observation I would like to make is this, and it is in line with what the gentleman is speaking about: We have no yardstick by which we can judge the value of a billion dollars. You can say it as easily as a million, but we have lend-lease now, according to the gentleman from West Virginia, something like $67,000,000,000. It is easy to say that, but that is equal to twice the value of all the real estate in the United States today.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true, and there is a priority on everything but Government bonds.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. On this point about the debt, remember that every dollar of public debt also represents in the pockets of certain American people, that much assets. We are no worse off, as a total economy, because we have that debt, because the debt is property in the vaults of your own banks and of your own accounts, and if you cancel the public debt completely—do not misunderstand me on this—if you cancel that public debt completely you would not increase the wealth or decrease the wealth of the United States of America one cent. You would merely redistribute the wealth.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about the people?

Mr. McMURRAY. Some people would gain and some would lose. You take the money out of one pocket and put it into another pocket, but the two pockets are in different pairs of pants.

Mr. KNUTSON. I know the President says our national debt is not a debt because we owe it to ourselves.

Mr. McMURRAY. I did not say it was not a debt. I said it was a debt owed by all of the people to some of the people.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is giving utterance to a very interesting, if not new, philosophy of economics. It is the kind one would expect to come out of the University of Chicago.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman cannot find an economist in the country that will disagree with what I have said.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] should bear in mind that when a nation loses its self-respect, it is indeed a poor nation. That is what can happen by going on and on and on with the debt.

Mr. McMURRAY. But the gentleman never suggested that we lose our self-respect or that we do not pay our debts. Do not read into my remarks something I did not say. I was merely trying to explain the economic basis of this.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] misunderstood the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]. What the gentleman from Wisconsin said is that if the Government were to repudiate its bonded indebtedness, nobody would lose anything.

Mr. McMURRAY. No. The gentleman did not say that.

Mr. KNUTSON. If I can understand the English language, that is what the gentleman said.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman did not say that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will you please say what you did say.

Mr. McMURRAY. I will say it, and I will say it so simply that it will be understood even on this floor.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman. I am very simple-minded.

Mr. McMURRAY. I said that if this debt were repudiated—let us assume the debt is $300,000,000,000—if the debt is repudiated, all the American people would gain $300,000,000,000, all of them put together, and some of them would lose the $300,000,000,000, which is represented by the bonds they now own.

Mr. KNUTSON. I get you. It is a bookkeeping transaction.

Mr. McMURRAY. All right. Put it this way. There would be as much gain to all of the people as there would be loss to the specific holders of the bonds.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. That was my point. If America repudiates her debt we have lost our self-respect and we are indeed a poor nation.

Mr. McMURRAY. But I did not suggest repudiation.

Mr. CURTIS. But you said it would not hurt us.

Mr. McMURRAY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I got the impression that no one would be hurt if we repudiate our debt.

Mr. McMURRAY. No; I did not want to give that impression. Some people would get hurt badly.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is a mind reader.

Mr. McMURRAY. No. I said—let me repeat—I said it would not increase or

decrease the national wealth by one penny, and that is an economic truth.

Mr. KNUTSON. Therefore, no one would be injured.

Mr. McMURRAY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. What I would like to know is what is happening to the material wealth of the Nation, all the vital materials that we are disposing of, in the transaction the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. KNUTSON. You had better take a trip with lend-lease and find out what is becoming of our material wealth.

But I want to read further. I will not take much more time. I surely appreciate the gentlemen's indulgence.

Now, let us get back to Dr. Mecklenburg's remarks. He says:

> What the South American hates about this lend-lease business, giving them $2,000,000,000 a year, is just that. It makes America the giver and Latin America the receiver. It puts them in a lower class, and they hate it. They like our money. They receive it, and much of this money is doing good, but all the same, they hate it. It is impossible to make friends by lend-lease.

That brings me back to the theory, may I say to my good friend from Wisconsin who has been an ardent advocate of the good-will policy, that I think we could accomplish more for an infinitesimal fraction of what it is costing us if we were to install Christmas trees at strategic points over Latin America, strung with popcorn and other delectable things that used to appeal to our childhood hearts. You remember how thankful we used to be on Christmas morning when we could take an apple off the Christmas tree instead of having to bob for it in a bucket of water.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does not the gentleman seriously, in his attack on lend-lease——

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not attacking; I am merely taking the cover off to see what makes it smell.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does the gentleman believe we would have been better off if we had not sent 8,000 airplanes to Russia to be flown against the Germans on the Russian front? Does the gentleman think we should have kept those 8,000 airplanes home?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think we would have been much better off if we had sent 2,000 of them over to Bataan and Pearl Harbor.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Please do not interrup this delightful colloquy.

Mr. BLOOM. I do so because I regret to say I do not enjoy the comedy; lend-lease is too serious.

Mr. KNUTSON. I admit it is serious to those who are in this fight; it is also very serious to us who are paying for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, for I have no desire to trespass on the good will or the time of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman made a statement with reference to South America. I stated yesterday, and I want to say it again—and I want to have the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota—I should like to state, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Committee and for the RECORD, especially for the benefit of the gentleman who just relinquished the floor, that the amount of money expended in South America under lend-lease was $127,000,000. During 1941, 1942, and up to the present time, however, South America has bought from the United States $2,300,000,000 worth of merchandise.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is very unfair to try to place our friendly neighbors to the south in the position with reference to lend-lease that the gentleman from Minnesota just did, to emphasize what they are getting from us, when they have bought $2,300,000,000 of goods from us. They have received under lend-lease $127,000,000. I want the RECORD to show the situation with reference to our neighbors to the south.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the debate during the past few minutes has been very illuminating. I happen to have the information relative to our expenditures in South America. I believe the greater part of the lend-lease money that has been expended down there has been for airfields which are helpful to us in the war effort. Is that correct? I ask the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know; I have not the figures at hand, but I agree with a great deal of what the gentleman has said. Much of this money was spent in Panama, I believe. That does not show in this picture because it comes under the heading of protection of the Panama Canal. Most of the airfields were built in the jungles of Panama.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman that I do not believe the expenditure of money to which we refer contemplates any of the air fields built within the Panama Canal Zone. I believe all of the airfields that have been built outside of the Canal Zone have been included in the hundred-and-some million dollars from the lend-lease fund, the gentleman mentioned. I believe it is a perfectly proper expenditure. No one can question the expenditure of any part of the lend-lease fund that goes for an actual and direct help in the war in which we are now engaged; and certainly no one can change the fact that the building of airfields in South and Central America has been help of that type. So far as that is concerned, I am in complete agreement. But I do want to say that the expenditure of a sum of nearly eight billions of dollars in a 3-year program of W. P. A. projects out of funds entirely removed from lend-lease or war activities in South and Central America or even to attempt to spend this additional amount at a time when we are called upon to spend such vast sums for war purposes is unconscionable and something the people of this country ought not to tolerate. Such spending at a time like this, such planning, it seems to me, can be the product of nothing less than disordered minds.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], I should like to call his attention to page 8 of the committee report, where he will find a full explanation with reference to lend-lease aid extended in South America. He will find it very enlightening. I shall read one paragraph from it. I should like to read all, but time does not permit. I hope the gentleman will read the balance of it himself, for I believe if he will do so he will get the information he is seeking:

> Substantially all lend-lease shipments to the other American republics have been military equipment such as tanks, guns, airplanes, and small naval vessels. In addition, small amounts of essential equipment and materials have been shipped for the production of munitions. The lend-lease program for the American republics is designed to strengthen the Western Hemisphere defenses, and the schedule of munitions to be supplied to the American republics was approved by the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Secretary of State.

I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that there are other explanations in the report with reference to South America that I know he will find very enlightening and interesting.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I may say to my friend from New York that I shall be pleased to read the report. On the other hand, however, does the gentleman claim that all of our expenditures in Central and South America have been approved by our Chief of Staff?

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman refer to lend-lease or to all expenditures?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I refer to all the expenditures to be made by this administration in the Central and South American republics during the current 3-year program.

Mr. BLOOM. For military purposes, yes. There are other things that we are doing down there; we are helping to build the Pan-American Highway and other things; but all things of a military nature that come under lend-lease, let me say to the gentleman, have been approved by the military authorities.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Let me say to the gentleman that I approve every penny of expenditure of lend-lease funds that goes for actual help toward the war effort.

Mr. BLOOM. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman has brought up the question of military equipment supplied to the Central and South American republics. I cannot see how that will be very helpful to us in this war, and I am not sure that the Chief of Staff has approved every one of those items.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD. I suppose permission to include letters, telegrams, and so forth, including a couple of letters from Drew Pearson, I would have to obtain in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will have to get that permission in the House. If the gentleman wishes to extend his own remarks on this bill at this point he may ask for such consent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I did not extend my remarks, I suppose I could read those letters, could I not?

The CHAIRMAN. If time were yielded to the gentleman from Michigan, he could read them with the consent of the Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the Chair mean I would actually have to read them?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman propound a unanimous-consent request to extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I obtained permission before the House went into the Committee of the Whole to revise and extend my own remarks and to include certain telegrams, letters, and newspaper articles. Could those come in at this point, or will I have to make that request again?

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair is only Chairman of this Committee, but the Chair believes the gentleman has permission if he obtained it in the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To put them at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. No; not at this point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, can I raise a question of personal privilege in the Committee of the Whole, or do I have to wait until we go back into the House?

The CHAIRMAN. That cannot be done in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAGNUSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4254, to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include part of a report of the commanding general of the Army Air Forces pertaining to the Far East to immediately follow the remarks I made today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Flathead Monitor of Thursday, June 10, 1943, concerning the proposed Hungry Horse Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein articles V, VI, and VII of the master agreement with Russia, which is a sample agreement made with all the other countries under lend-lease; also certain paragraphs of the original Lend-Lease Act; also certain material from the hearings on lend-lease which gives the amount of money which has been expended for lend-lease and that has been transferred from other departments to lend-lease, and if I can get the record, I want to include information regarding the amount of supplies, not in dollars and cents, that have been transferred from other departments to lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] just obtained unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD. I notice in looking at them there on the desk of the official reporters there are some charges against other Members of this body. Is there any way now that I can object or must I wait until tomorrow and ask to have them stricken?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already received permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that is the ruling, and I understand it is a correct ruling, we will have to ask that everyone submit their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Any Member has the privilege of objecting.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will test that ruling now. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain telegrams, letters, and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. That is in accordance with the rules of the House. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address I made on April 2, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the Honorable I. H. Hull, of Indianapolis, before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from a speech delivered by the Governor of South Dakota, Mr. M. Q. Sharpe, on the subject I Am Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, during the recess the Honorable Charles Burke, a

former Member of this body passed away. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD at a later date in order that I may pay proper tribute to the memory of Mr. Burke.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes this afternoon at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders for today I may proceed for 5 minutes, revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein newspaper articles, letters, and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I noticed in a Mississippi paper where the city marshal in one of the towns of my district was indicted, charged with depriving Negroes of their civil liberties. This newspaper article did not give any of the facts in the case. I do not know whether that indictment was written in Washington and sent down but do know that others have been. I served 8½ years as district attorney of the district in which that city lies and know that the law-enforcement officers certainly have a hard job enforcing the law in cities having a Negro section, particularly on Saturdays and Sundays. In their efforts to keep the streets safe and to maintain order these officers have had and must have the support of the right-thinking citizenship. Such indictments as this only make their job harder. This marshal enjoys a splendid reputation, was fair and courteous in his treatment of persons he had to deal with in the discharge of his duties. I have full confidence in the Court seeing that only justice is done.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that such indictments are being returned at the insistence of the Justice Department here in Washington in the hope that some Federal judge will be required to sustain a demurrer to an indictment and thereby a test case can be brought to the Supreme Court that Mr. Frankfurter may have another opportunity to write some more, in my opinion, un-American law.

Mr. Speaker, we remember when in our section it was unsafe for a lady to walk the streets after dark as I understand it is in some sections of Washington today. We don't expect to see that day return in Mississippi. The C. I. O., and other organizations, which I understand are sponsored by it, may use all the force against me and other Members of Congress they may desire. We expect to continue the fight.

This is national campaign year. Many say the drive of the Justice Department here to indict individual officers and the South generally is for the purpose of securing Negro votes in the coming national election. If that be the purpose, I say that politics are being carried too far. Those determining such a policy are making a mistake. This method is the one sure way, if carried far enough, to be sure that the Democrats of the South will push from their bosom those who call themselves Democrats but who all the while are trying to destroy the South, which has nurtured the Democratic Party through the years.

Mr. Speaker, during this war these labor unions have collected tribute from men who desired to work for this Nation's war effort; not regular members of such unions but citizens who had to join, pay dues and initiation fees, in order to work for their Government in the time of its greatest peril. Money so collected has amounted to millions of dollars, has increased the debt of the Nation, by increasing the cost of war and will have to be paid, largely by the servicemen returning. There can be no excuse. These labor unions have forced American citizens to pay dues and belong to their unions before they could have the right to work and, Mr. Speaker, this they have done while preaching freedom. These organizations have collected millions and now they use them in an effort to control the Congress by opposing all Members who have the views which I entertain and for which I have fought. They hope to elect men in our place who will bow to their dictation.

I supported the Smith amendment of 1942 which would to a large extent have corrected this situation and which died in the other body. I supported and spoke for the Smith-Connally bill to control strikes passed over the President's veto. Unfortunately many of its most worth-while provisions were taken out over the strongest opposition we were able to muster. At that time a letter came to my office that if I supported that measure, I and all others who supported it could expect the C. I. O. to use all means at its disposal to insure our defeat. Mr. Speaker, I told this group then to crack its whip, that I would vote for such control so long as I remained a Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke at length against the bill to repeal the poll tax in the Southern States. Here again we find the un-American leaders of organized labor urging the passage of an unconstitutional act to strike at the South and again threatening each of us from that area who had the courage to oppose them.

I supported the Hobbs bill, which would prevent virtual highway robbery in the name of a labor union right. This bill passed the House only to be tied up in the Senate. In recent months we have seen the situation grow worse. We have seen a Supreme Court not interpret the law, but write the law as they believed it should be—and with Justice Frankfurter and others of his type determining what it should be, we are seeing serious inroads being made in the very foundations of our Nation. This Court has held that no longer can a party determine its own membership.

Mr. Speaker, we in the South do not intend to take this move of leaders of organized labor lying down. We expect to continue to run the Southland for the best interests of all its citizens. We frankly believe in white supremacy and expect to see that it is maintained in our area. Too well are the dark days of reconstruction remembered.

Mr. Speaker, at this hour the Nation and particularly my beloved South stands in the gravest peril not only from without but from within that has faced us since the dark days of reconstruction.

Those waging this fight for our destruction from within seem to care not that we in the South have and are supporting the war to the greatest extent of any section. During the little more than 2 years I have been in Congress I have seen the organized effort of the C. I. O. and of other labor organizations in their desire to increase the Negro membership in their organizations so that they could collect more dues, wage a fight on the South. These great sums of money, for which they did not have to account until recently, through their political action committee they expect to use and today are using in an organized effort to gain further control of the Nation by defeating those Members of Congress who have the same views I have and who have waged a fight to rid the Nation of their strikes, their right to a check-off of dues and their other un-American activities.

Mr. Speaker, there are those in high positions who have agitated this situation and made it worse. The Congress of Industrial Organizations by using the tremendous sums at its disposal, by reason of its privileges given to it by laws passed before I became a Member of this body has done more than any other group to destroy the real America. These activities are certainly not conducive to unity and have in many instances seriously retarded the war. Now it appears that this labor union has not only the backing of agencies of Government, having had a favorable Supreme Court on construction of labor laws, but now have the support of that Court in striking for so-called social equality, and the destruction of every man's right to choose his own company.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked hard to be of real help to the Nation. I feel that I can claim some credit for having called attention to the illegality of the Elk Hills-Standard Oil contract which resulted in the contract being canceled.

Some time ago I was able to increase the penalty for charging commission to secure Government contracts from 8

months in jail to 5 years in the penitentiary. This racket was broken up.

Recently I feel that I contributed greatly to the new policy whereby the Army cut loose its right of reentry on air fields and other facilities which it no longer needed thereby enabling the Navy to make use of them. In all our minds, first and foremost, we must win the war. Just as certain there are some other things which will bear of no compromise: the safety of our womanhood, the individual right of a man to select his own associates, the right of a State to run its own affairs in a truly constitutional way—all are of more import to us in the South than anything short of the necessity of winning the war.

Certain party leaders might take time to realize these facts before the die is cast and the South is forced to protect these rights through its own ingenuity and actions.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to continue to oppose with all the force I possess the attempt to destroy the State governments and the efforts of these forces in our Nation to stir up trouble for us in the South, the only place where the two races have resided in harmony. Segregation of the two races has proven to be the only basis for harmony. We expect to keep that segregation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter written by the Citizens' Public Celebrations Association of Boston for Patriot's Day, which includes the towns of Arlington, Boston, Brookline, Cambridge, Concord, Lexington, Medford, and Somerville, this letter being signed by E. B. Mero, secretary, and also to include a description of the significance and scope of Patriot's Day, also a resolution that I introduced on April 19, 1943, House Joint Resolution 117, which would authorize the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriot's Day for the commemoration of the event that took place on April 19, 1775.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have offered a resolution, House Joint Resolution 117, authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775.

Exactly 169 years ago the people of the district I have the honor to now represent and the people of America decided that they would fight, they decided that if necessary they would lay down their lives and fight in order that this country might have liberty and freedom of action.

At this time, when the boys and men of the United States are fighting to preserve this freedom, it is appropriate to remember the patriots of those early days, 1775, who laid down their lives for the same thing. It is important to keep before us constantly the sacrifices made by the men of those early times and to think on Patriots' Day of the men in the present war who are giving their lives, of men who are giving perhaps more than their lives, giving their health and their strength and parts of their body—living examples of the sacrifice they made in order that their country might survive.

One hundred and sixty-nine years ago this country was the beginning of the Nation that we now have and love today.

CITIZENS' PUBLIC CELEBRATIONS
ASSOCIATION OF BOSTON,
April 18, 1944.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: This association, because of its basic purposes stated briefly on this letterhead, is naturally interested in House Joint Resolution 117 that you introduced some months ago seeking to have the 19th of April of each year proclaimed as Patriots' Day.

We are interested because of its relation to historical events in this section of the country, but we also are interested because of the national significance of this date in the unfolding story of the establishment and development of this Republic of the United States of America.

The 19th of April has had particular attention in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for many years, and Patriots' Day was designated thus by act of the general court, chapter 22 of 1938, calling for an annual proclamation by the Governor and specifying that the observance is to commemorate "the opening events of the War of the Revolution and the struggles through which the Nation passed in the early days."

It is not merely an occasion for commemorating that famous and picturesque midnight ride of Paul Revere, nor the accompanying ride of William Dawes, nor of the part played by a third and often overlooked rider, Dr. Samuel Prescott.

Patriots' Day is set apart in Massachusetts, and also by the State of Maine, to pay tribute to all the men, women, and influences that led up to those man-to-man fighting acts at Lexington, at Concord Bridge, at Arlington, and by the men of the other towns who thus began an 8-year war for independence of country and people that other men of 1944 at this moment are at war to preserve.

There is a further and less known significance to this date.

When the armed conflict that followed the preceding years of preparation for freedom and independence had resulted in victory, the Commander in Chief, Gen. George Washington, purposely selected the 19th of April as the date of the Peace Proclamation which was formally and officially read to the troops assembled for the purpose at Newburgh, New York State, on the 19th of April 1783.

Thus this date marks both the beginning and the ending of one of the world's great historic events.

May we suggest that favorable action to advance the proposed legislation may be timely? Such action now could be of morale value in the present war that is being carried on to insure that what was gained for the people and the Government of this Republic by the determined efforts of our forefathers, and for the people and the governments of other lands that are inspired thereby, shall not be diminished but shall continue to be a beacon of liberty.

A jointly arranged observance of Patriots' Day is in progress in eight cities and towns of eastern Massachusetts. Appended to the advance public announcement is the following statement which might be enlarged to apply to a wider observance of this and similar anniversaries:

"In Massachusetts we remember now the determination, planning, struggles, and sacrifices of the colonial patriots of 169 years ago.

"We observe Patriots' Day 1944 as inspiration toward victory to insure perpetuation of the privileges of freedom and liberty that we have inherited."

By request of the committee.

Very truly,

E. B. MERO, *Secretary.*

SIGNIFICANCE AND SCOPE OF PATRIOTS' DAY

Each year the 19th of April, an anniversary date of national meaning and with important historical significance, is observed as a Massachusetts holiday with an official proclamation by the Governor of the Commonwealth calling for a renewal of familiarity with—to quote from the act of the General Court establishing this fixed observance—"the opening events of the War of the Revolution and the struggles through which the Nation passed in the early days."

Patriots' Day focuses attention on the advance planning and organization for defense and offense that made possible the victorious conflict of the 19th of April in 1775 that involved one way and another the combined activities of the men and women of all the eight cities and towns which jointly observe the anniversary with particular reason.

The annual picturesque reenactment of the famous rides of the 3 messengers who spread the alarm by direction of the watchful committee of safety of that time, organized and prepared for such an emergency action—this is an item in the current celebrations that attracts much interest, locally and outside—even nationally. The long-time prearranged efforts that focused into stern action here on that date 169 years ago made world history. Then it was war. Again in 1944 it is war, this time for the perpetuation of those valued items by which the Minute Men, the Sons of Liberty, and the Patriots generally throughout this and the other Colonies were determined to do their utmost to have freedom and liberty established with independence of government. Victory came from their determination, actions, and sacrifices.

Some of the yet far-off aspects of World War No. 2 can be better understood by realizing that it was right here in these eight communities in colonial days that almost parallel situations and stirring episodes were taking place, not all as much publicized and as popularly interesting as the "midnight ride" of either of the ordinary, everyday individuals whose contribution of that 18th and 19th of April long ago are made the focusing point of the 1944 Patriots' Day observances.

HISTORY IS AND SHOULD BE A GUIDE TO PRESENT AND FUTURE ACTION

What our predecessors did here years ago was due in a marked degree to the same inspiration that impels the war activities of men, women, and groups of citizens today. They wore different clothes and had different facilities for everyday living and for work and such pleasure as was possible, but the basic ideals and aims were not much different on the part of the patriotic ones then from the same things today.

When Paul Revere's impersonator goes riding along, or the modern William Dawes, or Samuel Prescott, they are not just theatrical figures out of imagination. They represent realities, and their appearance must inspire realism, not alone for young people but for parents and all adults.

And not merely for the enlightenment or temporary interest of this small eastern area

of the United States. The lessons and verdict that came out of the risky adventure of 169 years ago are at this minute up for confirmation or for destruction. This year's observance of this anniversary of the small skirmishes that struck the spark that lit the fire that inflamed a nation and a world is certainly not just a holiday of frivolity, spring outing, and fun. The element of recreation, of course, belongs with the observance, and festivities of various types are included in the day's programs. The point is that while this is so, the basic importance of this Patriots' Day as already outlined needs to have attention, too.

Patriots' Day in Massachusetts took the place of the older Fast Day in 1894. The present plan of observance was produced by the Citizens' Public Celebrations Association of Boston, which has supervised the annual arrangements. Each of the cities and towns immediately concerned has its own local committee designated by mayor or selectmen to arrange and conduct local ceremonies. The association is the coordinating agency.

The first reenactment of the Revere Ride under this plan was in 1916. The first similar Dawes Ride was in 1920. Since 1930 a Prescott has ridden from Lexington Green to Concord Battlefield.

Paul Revere was an experienced messenger, and a businessman of prominence, used by the Colonial officials for various confidential missions, of which his 18th and 19th of April journey was the one that became most known. His other services and experiences were important, and are duly recorded.

William Dawes, Jr., was a young tanner, less well known, but also a trusted agent; and his services that night of 1775 were of equal importance. As recorded by Revere in his own record, each was sent from Boston by a different route; a precaution of the committee of safety against failure of their plans.

Boston was then under siege and no one supposed to leave the town without permission, especially as the enemy troops were moving that night in what they hoped was complete secrecy.

Dawes went in disguise of a miller and got by the sentry posted at Boston Neck on his way to Roxbury, presumably walking, and took horse at that point. He apparently proceeded without undue incident until he got to Lexington.

Revere walked from his home in the North End, got his instructions, was rowed across to Charlestown, and there took horse. At about the same time the enemy was departing for the same destination from Boston Common, but their scouts were already abroad—as Revere found out when one group of Red Coats almost captured him before he got out of Charlestown.

After both riders had performed their missions by giving the alarm to previously designated leaders along the way, they arrived at Lexington. Leaving for Concord both were intercepted. Revere was captured and while prisoner improved the opportunity to watch the later happenings, which he recorded.

Dr. Samuel Prescott, on his way home from a late evening, or early morning, social call, met them, got the news, escaped from the enemy scouts and he carried the word to Concord.

House Joint Resolution 117

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775

Whereas the 19th day of April 1775 witnessed the first military engagement between the American colonists and British troops, and the fighting that then occurred at Concord and Lexington, in Massachusetts, formed the prologue to the mighty drama of the Revolution and determined the character of its first campaign; and

Whereas the significance of April 19 in the history of our country is not to be measured by the extent of the military forces that engaged in local battle in 1775, but by the direction and strength of the intangible forces then set in motion which in due course established the United States of America; and

Whereas a frequent recurrence to the events out of which this Nation arose, and a better understanding of the principles upon which our forefathers grounded their independence cannot fail to stimulate and renew that high sense of patriotism which has ever been the glory of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue his proclamation, annually, emphasizing the significance of the events that occurred on April 19, 1775, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all public buildings on April 19, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the patriots who laid down their lives for the cause of independence.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 506), as follows:

Resolved, That THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Elections No. 1.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 507), as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM G. STIGLER, of the State of Oklahoma, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Indian Affairs, Flood Control, Roads, World War Veterans' Legislation, Claims.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

SMEARERS ARE DESPERATE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, however worthy the purpose, if any one of the individuals who have been indicted as seditionists is connected in even the remotest degree with the movement, PM and those pursuing a similar policy attempt to hold up to public scorn everyone whose name may be mentioned in the same connection.

A recent illustration is the attitude of PM, when Protestant Chaplains Association wrote a letter, asking that a resolution be introduced proclaiming a day of prayer for the American Republic, for the guidance of American patriots in the Halls of Congress and for those who are now in the armed services both here and abroad. One of those letters came to me. It was as follows:

PROTESTANT CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., March 25, 1944.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: The Protestant Chaplains Association, a national organization of Protestant clergymen, founded in 1938 and dedicated to God and country, to the welfare of the men and women of the armed forces of these United States and to the rehabilitation of our veterans upon their return to civilian life—is asking that you cooperate with them and with the Protestant churches of the country in proclaiming a day of prayer for the American Republic and for the guidance of those sterling American patriots in the Halls of Congress who for some years past have been the victims of a highly organized campaign of ridicule, slander, and abuse by certain elements within this Commonwealth who have no love for America, the Constitution, or its institutions.

This campaign is being conducted throughout the Nation through the medium of the Protestant churches for a day of prayer on Sunday, May 21, this year, and is something worthy of your support and that of every other public official who loves this Republic as we know you do. The Governor of your State is already cooperating with us in this direction.

The Governors of every State as well as the mayors of every city throughout the country, and every other prominent man and woman in religious and political life in the Nation have been petitioned to proclaim this day of prayer; and we are glad to report to you now that the response has been overwhelming, and is 100 percent in favor thereof.

Congressman HOFFMAN, we are going to ask you to prepare a resolution for introduction on the floor of Congress, setting aside Sunday, May 21 this year as a national day of prayer for the preservation of this Republic and for the men and women who have made the supreme sacrifice, and for those who have been maimed and wounded and are lying in our hospitals at home and abroad, and for the safety of those now fighting on the far-flung battlefields of the world.

We have singled you out, Congressman HOFFMAN, for this high honor * * * because of the abuse and slander and vilification and lies that have been hurled at you by the subversive elements in our midst.

May I quote a statement issued to the press relative to the day of prayer, May 21, 1944, by Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut:

"Prayer is man's method for self-transmission of personal needs and beliefs to Almighty God. It gives strength to the weak and brings humility to the strong. Prayer is a denominator of good for all peoples in time of war. As the divine method for establishing relationship between man and his Creator it deserves special recognition in our religious life.

"I urge the people of Connecticut to make special observance of Sunday, May 21, as a day of prayer. In this holy way may we ask God's blessings upon our Nation and our people."

We shall be guided by your good judgment in preparing this resolution to be submitted to the Congress. And at your early convenience will you kindly send a copy of same to us for press release?

Believe us to be, with the best interests of our beloved country at heart, and for your continued good health in that you may serve it further, and the great State of Michigan which has so highly honored you, we are, for God, our homes and country.

Yours in the service of Christ,
Rt. Rev. ALEXANDER A. LOWANDE,
Deputy Chief Chaplain.

I had no knowledge of the organization except as it was given on the letterhead, but immediately replied as follows:

MARCH 30, 1944.

DEAR CHAPLAIN: Many thanks for your kind letter of the 29th.

If you have the wording of the resolution referred to in mind—make a clear and concise one and send it on.

Respectfully yours.

In reply I received the following letter:

PROTESTANT CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., March 31, 1944.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: In compliance with your request for a proposed resolution, please find enclosed copy of same, which you can add to or take from, according to the parliamentary rules, except for the fact that we would like to have our name incorporated in the act.

We are now asking the cooperation of the Roman Catholic hierarchy throughout the country, for we feel that we would be un-Christian and un-American if we did not ask them to participate with us in this most worthy cause.

We can now assure you that we are receiving 100-percent support from all over the country.

Please let us have a copy of the resolution or act which you present on the floor.

Thanking you for your kindness and cooperation, we are, for God, our homes, and country.

Yours in the service of Christ,
Rt. Rev. ALEXANDER A. LOWANDE,
Deputy Chief Chaplain.

To which I made answer on April 3, as follows:

APRIL 3, 1944.

DEAR REVEREND LOWANDE: Replying to yours enclosing the resolution.

The resolution came in too late for introduction in the House before it recessed, but it will be presented in proper form as soon as the House meets again. I did, however, put it in the Appendix of the RECORD on Saturday.

Sincerely yours.

The resolution was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A1692. In view of what followed it should be read.

Then, on April 12, to my surprise came the following wire:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 11, 1944.*

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Edward James Smythe, now awaiting trial for sedition, has organized with one Alexander Lowande a Protestant chaplain's association, whose letterhead bears your name as member of a committee sponsoring its campaign for a day of prayer. Please advise us whether you gave permission for such use, and if so whether you were aware of Smythe's record and connection with the organization when you did so.

GEORGE V. MCINTYRE,
Assistant Managing Editor the Newspaper PM.

To that wire, I replied at once as follows:

Neither Protestant Chaplains Association, any individual or organization was given authority to use my name. Do not know Smythe. Inserted CONGRESSIONAL RECORD April 1, resolution at request of Protestant Chaplains Association. Smythe's name does not appear on letter sent me. Do not know any individuals so named.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

I also, on the same day, wrote Rt. Rev. Alexander A. Lowande the following letter:

APRIL 12, 1944.

Rt. Rev. ALEXANDER A. LOWANDE,
Protestant Chaplains Association,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR REVEREND LOWANDE: Because I was advised this morning that my name had been used in connection with that of Edward James Smythe and this resolution, am not introducing it today.

Enclosed is copy of wire received from PM today. What is the answer?

Sincerely yours.

On the fourteenth he wired me:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: Replying to your letter of April 12, please be advised that PM articles are based on fraud, falsehood, and misrepresentation characteristic of this newspaper. Two employees of this office have been identified as operatives of the so-called Nonsectarian Antinazi League, who stole papers from this office and turned them over to PM. The names of the employees are Edwin P. Banta, of 215 East Seventeenth Street, New York City; and Mrs. Florence Harris, of 8818 One Hundred and Thirty-ninth Street, Jamaica, Long Island. Banta was discharged last Saturday, and on the following Monday, last Monday, April 10, went to the printer and obtained several copies of the letterhead which contains the names of representative Americans who had been kind enough to write us commending the purpose of our enterprise, namely, the establishment of a Nation-wide day of prayer for the American Republic. These letterheads had not been delivered to our office and not a single one of them was sent out of this office. But Banta turned his copies over to PM who in turn wired to all the names that appeared on the letterhead for explanation without first inquiring of us, and thus presented the matter in false light. These letterheads would never have been used by us having been unsatisfactorily printed. This organization is sincere and patriotic in its work. It is no fund-raising racket as PM would maliciously describe it. We received $2 to date and returned the same since we are not soliciting funds. Smythe was interested in our work but has voluntarily resigned. I knew nothing of his background, being concerned solely with the character of the enterprise and its high and noble aims. In America, of course, a man is presumed innocent until he is found guilty. Smythe will have his day in court, but I need not point out to you the purpose of the smear articles in PM. Personally, I have been engaged in religious work since 1895, and ordained in the ministry in 1903. I was consecrated as bishop of the United Christian Church November 18, 1934. I hope, my dear Congressman, that this will be a satisfactory answer to your inquiry and you are at liberty to give it the widest possible publication to the end that truth shall be triumphant, with assurance of my high regard, I am,

RT. REV. ALEXANDER A. LOWANDE.

PM, on April 14, said that 46 Representatives, 14 Senators, 14 Governors, and 6 mayors had been listed as sponsors of Protestant Chaplains Association and charged that it was about to conduct a fund-raising campaign. Some 6 Senators and 11 Representatives denied, as did I, that they had authorized the use of their names for any such purpose.

In my wire to PM, I also stated that I did not know Smythe. To refute that statement, PM then published a letter which it claims Smythe received from my office back in 1941, and which read as follows:

Friend Smythe: Thanks for yours of the 11th. Shall be glad to receive the information referred to therein.

If Smythe should walk into my office, I might recognize his face, for I may have seen him, but I would not connect that face with his name.

Many people write Congressmen letters, either enclosing or offering to send on information on topics in which they are interested. When such letters come to me, if they deal with a new subject and I or one of the clerks has the time, a reply is sent, telling the writer to send on whatever information he may have.

The letter quoted above and reprinted in PM was not dictated by me, but was sent on by one of the clerks, although, had the matter come to my personal attention, the procedure would have been the same.

The fact that Smythe was addressed as "Friend Smythe" meant no more than do the words of the President in his fireside chats, when he so frequently uses the term, "My friends."

Not from Smythe nor from any of his codefendants—no; not even from PM—but from a former investigator of a congressional committee came these purported copies of two letters alleged to have been written by Drew Pearson.

One is addressed to Smythe as "Dear Mr. Smythe." Note the following letter from Pearson to Smythe:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1937.

Mr. EDWARD J. SMYTHE,
National Committee Against Communism, New York City.

DEAR MR. SMYTHE: This is to acknowledge your letter of July 10. I appreciate your frankness and understand from the last paragraph of your letter that you are willing to have us use your statement that you are a Fascist organization, etc.

Very sincerely yours,

DREW PEARSON.

By the above, was Pearson leading Smythe to believe that he would cooperate with him?

And the next year, it is alleged, Pearson was writing Lt. Col. Pearson B. Brown as follows—Brown, according to my information was the vice president of the Protestant Chaplains Association:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1938.

Lt. Col. PEARSON B. BROWN,
New York City.

DEAR COLONEL BROWN: Thank you for your letter enclosing a copy of yours to John Hamilton.

I am wondering whether your organization has taken note of the tremendous Catholic lobby which was exercised in Washington during the discussion and vote on the reorganization bill. How did your organization stand on this bill?

Very sincerely yours,

DREW PEARSON.

In the latter letter, was Pearson attempting to get something to throw at a religious organization?

Was Pearson's letter to Brown a come-along letter? Brown is reported to have been the vice president of the Protestant Chaplains Association, of which Smythe was coorganizer.

Was Pearson attempting to incite that organization to enter into a controversy which might cause ill feeling between religious groups? Was he encouraging the Protestant Chaplains Association to start a fight with the Catholic Church

over some proposed legislation, the enactment of which was then before the Congress?

PM's viciousness, its unfairness, is illustrated by this incident, by its attempt to make it appear that all those who advocated a day of prayer for the preservation of the Republic, for the sick and wounded in hospitals here at home and abroad, for the speedy return of those in the armed forces, and for the souls of those who have made the supreme sacrifice, were in some way guilty of some improper association or connection with Smythe, who has been indicted for sedition, but who, under our law, is presumed to be innocent until convicted.

PM and its editors may not believe in prayer. I do. And I have no doubt that every one of the Senators and Representatives whose names were mentioned believes in a Deity, in the efficacy of prayer.

The Communists deny the existence of God. In some of their literature they proclaimed that religion was a fraud; that the priests and the ministers were hypocrites. There is no law which prohibits PM following the Communist lead.

It is regrettable, when so many Americans—fine young Americans—are dying in foreign lands for the preservation of our Government, for the Nation which places its trust in God, that any publication should condemn a resolution asking for a day of prayer.

It will be noted that the Right Reverend Alexander A. Lowande, in his wire to me, denied that the Protestant Chaplains' Association was engaged in any fund-raising campaign. But, even if it was, and if Smythe was as guilty as the devil himself, that is no reason why those of us who believe in prayer should be condemned because at some time Smythe may have been a member or even the founder of that organization. Some of us have not forgotten that a thief on the cross, by virtue of a prayer, had his sins forgiven and was promised a home in Paradise. Only by its attacks on decent folks does PM gain attention.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STARNES of Alabama for 15 days, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2648. An act for the relief of Avid Evers; and

H. R. 4133. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) Wednesday, April 19, 1944, at 12 o'clock the House adjourned until tomorrow, noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Wednesday, April 19, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of S. 1767.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, April 20, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 3998, authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions; and H. R. 4517, to remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1437. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, United States of America, transmitting a copy of the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1438. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of foreign-trade zone No. 1, during the calendar year 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1439. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States, which covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Library.

1440. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report on the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, which covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 3688. A bill to change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1354); Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4623. A bill to authorize the use of space in the old Post Office Building in Portland, Oreg., by the State of Oregon for its use as a museum for relics from the battleship *Oregon*, together with all other historical documents, objects, and relics of Oregon and the old Oregon country held by the State for public display; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 4624. A bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4625. A bill to extend the existence of the Alaskan International Highway Commission for an additional 4 years; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 4626. A bill to declare a portion of the Illinois and Michigan Canal an unnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4627. A bill to amend subdivision (e), of subsection (4), of section 3540 of chapter 33A, title 26, of the Internal Revenue Code, known as the Use Tax Stamp Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 4628. A bill to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the establishment of an interregional system of highways, and to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed highway facilities in the locations where such facilities are most urgently required and where the conversion from wartime to peacetime activities will require the cushioning effects of public-works construction; to the Committee on Roads

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to post-war planning; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr AREND:

H. Res. 504. Resolution to investigate the question of effective legal protection for property and proprietary rights and ownership in original thoughts, conceptions, and ideas in art, literature, science, mechanics, and the pure and useful arts; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 505. Resolution to provide for the payment of expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 504; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Wolf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4630. A bill for the relief of Marvin Sachwitz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4631. A bill for the relief of John L. MacNeil; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 4632. A bill for the relief of Mose Lee Hogan and Mary Alen Hogan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5503. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 3, West Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 118 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5504. By Mr. JUDD: Petitions of 140 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., and vicinity, opposing House bill 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Clifford Ross Johnson, pastor, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in Thy being, wisdom, power, justice, holiness, goodness, truth, and love, Creator of all worlds, Ruler of all men, Sovereign of all nations, we praise Thee for Thine immeasurable blessings upon the great land in which we live. Thou hast given us gracious gifts which far too often we have squandered; Thou hast given us glorious privileges which often we have abused; Thou hast placed upon us ennobling responsibilities to which we have selfishly closed our eyes. We invoke Thee to forgive us, through Thy Son, Christ Jesus, whose cross marks the starting point and whose crown marks the consummation of history. Fill us with a new sense of Thy graciousness, that we may be filled with a new consecration to our tasks.

For those who legislate, we pray intuitive insight into Thine eternal laws that undergird all men and nations; for those who execute, we ask gifts of true statesmanship under the sovereignty of Him who is the Lord of all rulers; for those who interpret, we beseech Thee that they may "let justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream."

Grant that our political and military leaders may, together with those of us who follow, recognize that we have battles to win, not only against foreign foes but also within ourselves. May we never lessen the intensity of our attack against our own pride, greed, and ungrounded prejudices, against our own injustices and corruption. May we who write the present pages of our Nation's history write chapters no less inspiring than those mighty lines which fill its opening pages; may we erect a superstructure that does full justice to the strong foundations upon which we build. We pray in the name of Him who, having been "the stone which the builders rejected, has now become the Head of the Corner," even Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANSWER TO SUBPENA DUCES TECUM IN THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST JOSEPH E. McWILLIAMS ET AL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

APRIL 18, 1944.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, commanding me to appear before said court on the 20th day of April 1944 at 9:45 o'clock a. m., as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Joseph E. McWilliams et al.* (No. 73086, Criminal Docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers, therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The papers in question are on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the Rules of the House, having been received from the Special Committee to Investigate Nazi Propaganda Activities in the United States and Related Questions, authorized by House Resolution 198 of the Seventy-third Congress, and are now in possession of the House of Representatives in the custody of the Clerk.

Your attention and that of the House is respectively invited to a resolution of the House adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 680), upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House before any court or officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied and such as the House itself may have made public, to be taken without the consent of the House first obtained."

And to a resolution adopted by the House in the Forty-ninth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1295), from which the following is quoted:

"*Resolved*, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission.

"That when it appears by the order of a court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House."

These resolutions resulted from the issuance of subpenas duces tecum upon the Clerk of the House to produce certain original papers in the files of the House.

Permission to remove from their place of file or custody any documents or papers was denied by the House, but the court was afforded facilities for making certified copies. This seems to have been the uniform practice in respect to subpenas duces tecum issued by a court upon the Clerk of the House to produce in court original papers from the files of the House.

The subpena in question is herewith attached and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 508), as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Joseph E. McWilliams et al.* (No. 73086, Criminal Docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpena duces tecum was issued by the Chief Justice of said court and addressed to South Trimble, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 20th day of April 1944 at 9:45 a. m. and to bring with him certain and sundry original papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That South Trimble, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the officer named in the subpena duces tecum before mentioned, with certified copies of the documents and papers mentioned in the said subpena, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office, or under his control, or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding, and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House, and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said Clerk, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question or two on this very point being presented to the House now?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will be very glad to yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not the purpose to cooperate with our Government in a trial that is taking place at the present time on the question which is before the House now? As I understand it, the clerk of the court desires certain documents now in the possession of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, dealing with the prosecution of McWilliams and others. Do I understand that this is going to be denied to the court in giving the original documents and exhibits now on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives? Does this resolution take care of it?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman from New York will understand from the resolution that the authority is being given if the resolution is adopted for the Clerk of the House to take certified copies to the court.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement in explanation of this matter. The communication addressed to the Speaker of the House, I assume, is self-explanatory. The resolution is for the purpose of authorizing the Clerk of the House to respond to the subpena under the direction of the House. Not,

however, to take with him the original documents, but to take certified copies of the documents which the court requires to be used in the trial of this case.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The question arises in my mind whether or not certified copies of documents on file would be admissible in a court of record, therefore the resolution would defeat the very purpose of the subpena.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I may say to the gentleman in perfect candor that I see no reason why a certified copy of a document in the possession of the proper custodian of that document, ought not to be admissible. This will be a photostatic copy. But in order that the position of the House may be clear and in order that there may be no notion at all that the House is not desirous of cooperating in the fullest degree with the court, I think I have the liberty to assure the Members of the House if certified copies are not admissible, if for any reason they should not be admissible, I believe it would be the disposition of the House and I think the House would provide whatever is necessary. But I think we can all understand why these original documents are not to be taken from the custody of the House if it can be avoided any more than should original records such as deeds and records in the office of a county clerk or whoever is the custodian of the recorder of deeds and other books of record ought not to be taken out when a certified copy could perform the same service. Besides, I think the reason is apparent why certified copies ought to be used. I have never examined the question closely, but I think that certified copies should serve the purpose.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Would a photostatic copy meet the requirements of the law and be acceptable in court?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is the purpose to provide photostatic copies which ought to be better than the ordinary certified copies, because in such a case you would have a picture of the instrument and if any question with reference to the signature should arise, that question could be determined by an examination of the photostatic copy just as well as from the originals.

As I say, I have never examined the question, but even though it may have been held in certain instances that certified copies would not be admissible, I think the court would modify that determination and hold, upon a proper presentation, that photostatic copies would be admissible.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, my colleague on the committee [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, the situation is this: It is claimed by the Department of Justice that there is within the control of Congress documentary evidence which is needed in the trial of the case in court?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. The only question now is whether Congress will permit a certified copy of this evidence to be submitted in lieu of the regular official document?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. I understand it to be the gentleman's position that if the certified copy is found to be inadequate by the court, he then would favor the production of the original documents, if that is legal?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is a correct statement of my own position and I think clearly it would be the position of the House. But I think the position of the House also is and ought to be, at least, that these original documents ought to be kept here and ought not to be carried all over the courts. There is only one original; there cannot be two originals, and it is perfectly apparent if a trial was being held in Texas or New York or some place else, you would have to bundle up the original documents and send them there and perhaps at the same time another court would be hearing a similar case or a case requiring the same documentary evidence somewhere else. It is not sensible to have the original documents go out.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has suggested that the judge would relax the rule sufficiently to accept these documents. Does not the gentleman think the authority of the court to either accept or reject such documents lies in the statute law and that if the court sought to relax the rule and permit these documents to be received in evidence in the form of a certified copy or a photostatic copy, it might inject into the case error sufficient to reverse the lower court in the Supreme Court?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I did not want to take too much time. I can only continue to repeat what I have said, which is when the documents are presented to the court if, for any reason, they are not acceptable, I am sure the House would be disposed in this particular case to comply with the subpena of the court and send the original documents.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All I really wanted to know was whether or not the original documents will be produced in court if necessary. In my judgment, I am inclined to agree with my colleague that there may be some question as to the certified copies. McWilliams' material is so common throughout the country you can almost dish it up in my own office. There is nothing so personal in the Clerk's office that they cannot produce the original and avoid the question of my technicalities with respect to the admissibility of photostatic copies of something that is so common and so hate-breeding in this country.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The letter from the Clerk, together with the subpena, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on the Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, irrespective of any bill, held hearings through 2 months or more on post-war planning, in order to get factual information upon which a property policy might be predicated. We had many very prominent people from various walks of life to appear and testify before that committee, and without any expense to the Government. Those hearings have now been printed. I just want to give notice that because I believe they are especially informative and helpful a copy of the hearings will be sent to each Member of the House of Representatives. Please preserve these copies, as the supply is quite limited.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF THE WARSAW GHETTO

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and insert some excerpts from two newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a clipping from the Ohio State Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a poem composed by our own Horace C. Carlisle concerning our late colleague, Hon. James A. O'Leary, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a weekly news release relating to the post-war period.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LAWYERS IN O. P. A.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by a ration board to the Administrator of O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, on this the 19th day of April, which is a holiday in Massachusetts, it seems fitting to call to the attention of the House the fact that the city of Somerville, a portion of which is in my district, has, through its board of aldermen, passed a formal resolution asking the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to report favorably upon the proposal of the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] to have an annual proclamation made by the President for national observance of Patriots' Day.

The resolution is as follows:

BOARD OF ALDERMEN,
CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASS.,
April 13, 1944.

Whereas it is fitting and appropriate at this time when the city government of Somerville, Mass., will again carry on the annual tradition of observing each anniversary of the first Patriots' Day; and

Whereas the city of Somerville as one of the few honored cities and towns that played so important a part on that first Patriots' Day April 19, 1775, is not only desirous of permanently preserving this privilege as provided by action of the general court of this Commonwealth, but is also concerned in strengthening general interest and knowledge of his historic event: Be it

Resolved, That the members of this board of aldermen of our city government in session assembled hereby request that favorable action be taken by the Judiciary Committee at Washington on House Joint Resolution 117 of 1943, introduced into the Congress of the United States by Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, asking that national recognition be given to this date by authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day, for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Judiciary Committee of the Congress, to our Massachusetts United States Senators, and to Congressmen ANGIER L. GOODWIN and JAMES M. CURLEY, and to Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS sponsor of House Joint Resolution 117 of 1943.

CHARLES J. SULLIVAN.

I trust the Committee on the Judiciary may take prompt and favorable action upon House Joint Resolution 117 in order that our people, country-wide, in the fateful days and years which are ahead, may have prominently called to their attention annually that series of thrilling events which occurred on April 19, 1775, including the ride of Paul Revere, the Battle of Lexington, and the historic and heroic stand at Concord Bridge, where was "fired the shot heard around the world."

The progenitors of the people of Somerville and adjoining communities played a prominent part in the stirring drama of destiny enacted on the original Patriots' Day. There the torch of liberty was lighted. Today, 169 years later, we are engaged in a war to prevent that light from going out. We do well to encourage a vivid remembrance of all that the 19th of April means to a freedom-loving people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

KEYNES-MORGENTHAU INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION SCHEME

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this coming Friday Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, is scheduled to hold another secret meeting with the Banking and Currency and several other House committees on the Keynes-Morgenthau international stabilization scheme. I have made a rather extensive study of this scheme, and next to the war, I believe it to be one of the most important problems confronting this country.

It is wholly of foreign origin and was first formally worked out by Lord John Maynard Keynes and was adopted practically in toto by the administration. Should this proposal go through, it will have a powerful effect in destroying the sovereignty of our Nation and forcing us to divide our standard of living with the rest of the world. This is not what our soldiers are fighting for. I shall not lose any opportunity to warn Members of Congress and the people throughout the country of the danger to the safety and security of the United States that is involved in this un-American proposal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution passed by the National Grange on the St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter and resolution from a rationing board on O. P. A. regulations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SELECTIVE-SERVICE RULES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest the muddling of the selective-service rules by the national headquarters of the Selective Service. It has been my observation that our local draft boards and all others connected with the administration of this act have done a very good job. They have a most difficult task. But the rules and regulations that come down from Washington have created a state of confusion over the country. A great many individuals have quit their jobs, closed out their businesses, or held a farm sale, or abandoned their law practice and prepared to go into the service, only to be notified that the rules have been changed and they were not to report. A few days will go by and then they would resume their business activity again or attempt to, only to be notified once more that the regulations had been changed.

Surely it is not necessary for an individual to buy a morning paper, a noon paper, and an evening paper and then listen to the 10 o'clock news to find out where he stands in the draft. It is the opinion of the Military Affairs Committee that no new legislation is needed, but better top administration is necessary. This we must have.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech given by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F. B. I.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech delivered by myself over radio station WHN on Monday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today Massachusetts is commemorating Patriots' Day, the one hundred and sixty-ninth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord.

I have the great honor and distinction of representing that district. Yesterday I placed in the RECORD some brief remarks and also a resolution which I introduced, which would authorize the President to declare April 19 Patriots' Day, that it may be recognized and commemorated all over the United States.

I am glad that my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN] spoke to the resolution. I hope it will be speedily passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a poem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Allen, Ill.	Fellows	May
Anderson, Calif.	Fogarty	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Ford	Morrison, N. C.
	Fulbright	Murdock
Andrews, Ala.	Fuller	Myers
Arends	Furlong	O'Connor
Baldwin, Md.	Graham	O'Neal
Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	Price
Bates, Ky.	Green	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Gross	Rizley
Bennett, Mich.	Hale	Rogers, Calif.
Bonner	Hart	Russell
Boren	Heidinger	Sheridan
Bradley, Mich.	Hendricks	Short
Cannon, Fla.	Hoch	Sikes
Carson, Ohio	Hoffman	Slaughter
Carter	Jarman	Sparkman
Chenoweth	Jensen	Starnes, Ala.
Chiperfield	Judd	Stewart
Coffee	Kee	Thomas, N. J.
Compton	Keefe	Tolan
Dawson	Kennedy	Towe
Dies	King	Treadway
Dirksen	LeFevre	White
Disney	Lewis	Willey
Engel, Mich.	Maas	
Engle, Calif.	Manasco	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 4254, with Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate on the bill has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 3 of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1944" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945"; by striking out "July 1, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1948"; and by striking out "July 1, 1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1945"; and subsection (b) of section 6 of such act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 3, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 3 is amended by striking out the period after the word 'satisfactory' and inserting the following: ': *Provided, however,* That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure'."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLOOM to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 10, strike out the word "or" and insert the word "policy" and a comma, and after the words "military policy" insert the following: "or any post-war policy involving international relations."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], stated Monday he intended to offer. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has accepted Mr. MUNDT'S amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall place at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD, a very interesting letter from the Foreign Economic Administration concerning lend-lease aid rendered to Saudi Arabia. There has been sent to Saudi Arabia about $3,000,000 worth of lend-lease goods, including textiles, drugs, medical supplies, tires and tubes, and motor-trucks, exclusive of 5,000,167 ounces of silver likewise to be supplied to Saudi Arabia under lend-lease to meet the urgent currency needs of that country.

In my research concerning Arabia I find that there has been no appreciable aid rendered the Allied cause by the ruler of that country. Not even a donkey or a camel was offered, apparently. We are usually not told this.

This lend-lease aid must thus be given in connection with the proposed pipe line to conduct oil across Arabia to the Mediterranean coast. It is a sort of baksheesh. There have been many conflicting reports concerning this proposed pipe line, that is estimated to cost $150,000,000. Some tell us that the pipe line will be of advantage to us in the present war. Contrariwise, we are told, for example, by the Petroleum Industry War Council and by others of like authority, that that pipe line could not possibly be built before the end of the war. It will cross terrain that involves the greatest amount of difficulties, it will cross desert wastes. No skilled labor will be available. All labor will have to be imported. Further, it crosses an area which no conquerer in history has ever bypassed. The Middle East has figured prominently in almost every great conflict in history, from the days of Alexander the Great, Genghis Kann, and the Arab caliphs to the days of Napoleon and these two World Wars. No one was ever able to hold for any definite period that portion of the Near East across which that pipe line is supposed to be built. Therefore, there is inherent in this situation grave difficulties. It bristles with embarrassments.

Further, if this pipe line is not to be used in the present war, is it to be used for future wars? The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey asked a very pertinent question of the Secretary of the Navy during the hearings on the pending bill with reference to the need of protection for that pipe line. Perhaps the gentleman, who is on his feet, may want to interpolate a few remarks at this juncture in that regard, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. EATON. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the recent reports in the newspapers that the mandate under which Great Britain occupies the Palestinian territory forbids the building of such a pipe line without the consent of the League of Nations.

Mr. CELLER. I am aware of that situation. That is one of the real inherent difficulties.

I said, Will the pipe line be used for future wars? Is it to be used in connection with the war with Japan? Let us toy with that idea a moment. The pipe line is to be built westward from the shores of the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea. If it is to be used in the Japanese war, one would imagine that efficiency would dictate the building of the pipe line eastward from the Persian Gulf to and across India and then to the Indian Ocean, so that the oil might be used by our ships which would be in the closest proximity to the Jap theater of war operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what this has to do with the legislation we have under consideration? I am afraid the gentleman is giving a wrong impression to the Committee. I should like to have him explain that this has nothing to do with the pending legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. May I say to the gallant chairman of the distinguished committee having jurisdiction over lend-lease that I said at the inception of my remarks I could conceive of no reason for this lend-lease aid unless it were a sort of baksheesh or bribe for Arabian cooperation in the building of the pipe line. We are seeking to placate Saudi Arabia by according to the king of that country and to that country lend-lease aid to the extent of $3,000,000, together with over 5,000,000 ounces of silver. That

is the excuse, beyond peradventure of a doubt, for the lend-lease. Arabia is not our ally. It has neither hindered nor helped our war effort. Arabs generally have been pro-Axis, not pro-allies. The pipe line is the reason for lend-lease to Arabia.

We are told on the one hand that we have an excessively dwindling supply of oil, that our reserves are being depleted. On the other hand, we are told that that is not the case. For example, John A. Brown, president of the Socony Vacuum Oil Co., in a recent message to the stockholders of his company, said:

> We have in this country sufficient future supplies to carry on indefinitely in accordance with our high living standards and to provide for our national defense in the future. Domestic supplies can be supplemented at any time by imports of foreign crude oil, including the rich Latin-American sources.

Further, practically all the domestic oil companies who are parties to the Petroleum Industry War Council likewise say that we have a sufficient amount of crude oil and gasoline and its derivatives in this country.

This is very perplexing. One knows not where we are going in that regard. Where does the truth lie? Who has the wisdom and the knowledge to tell us, the Members of Congress, what our attitude should be with reference to this pipe line? Certainly it is not sufficient to have Mr. Ickes write an article for one of the current magazines and express his views there. Are those views official? We have some views expressed by the Secretary of the Navy who appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Various others take, in common parlance, potshots at this subject. But there has not been, as far as my research tells me, any clear-cut view as to the attitude of our administration or our Government concerning this very perplexing problem. I would like to have an answer to the question really propounded by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey. Are we making commitments to protect that pipe line? What good will the pipe line do? Of what avail will the expenditure of $150,000,000 be unless we are committed to the idea of keeping soldiers there and keeping our Navy nearby? American companies owned a good part of the Ploesti oil refineries in Rumania. It availed us naught to own or to have had an interest in those supplies of oil. We did not protect those Ploesti fields and refineries. Thus no supply will help us unless we prevent it from getting, as in the case of Ploesti oil, into the hands of the enemy. So there must be involved certain commitments. I think, as a coordinate branch of the Government, we are entitled to know of those commitments. We are entitled to know whether we believe in the Atlantic Charter and the setting up of a comity of nations to prevent future wars, or whether we contemplate a future war with reference to the building of this pipe line. What is the pipe line for? Is it to be used in a future war? And if that is the case, are we throwing aside the tenets of the Atlantic Charter? Those questions I would like to have answered.

Furthermore, it is charged in an article by Henry J. Taylor, Scripps-Howard staff writer, that King Ibn Saud is backing out of the deal we made with him. He is playing the United States off against Britain. He reports that the senatorial committee investigating the oil deal has found that after getting $63,250,000 from United States oil companies and under lend-lease arrangements, the Arabian monarch has begun to make advances to Britain. He notified the American minister that if the oil pipe-line operations would be conducted by the United States Government, he would prefer closer oil relations with Britain, although she has no concessions in his country. Ibn Saud has already appointed a British petroleum adviser to guide him, and is about to appoint a British financial adviser.

Thus, at the very inception of our negotiations for this pipe line, we are getting involved pretty deeply in diplomatic intrigue and "power politics."

I am not for or against this pipe line. I want information about it. One cannot make up one's mind unless the facts are known. What are the facts?

We are apparently embarking upon a new Middle East policy. According to reports in the press, some way or other, we, the American Government, have paid twenty-five millions to King Ibn Saud. I have seen no confirmation of this, but, doubtlessly, money or lend-lease has been turned over to Ibn Saud even before the project is started.

Ibn Saud's sons visited the United States recently. Unquestionably they conveyed some promises of commitments to their father.

What effect will this pipe line have on our Palestinian Jewish-Arabian problem? Will our attitude be purely economic? Will we turn a deaf ear to the pleas of Jewish refugees, seeking entrance into Palestine? Will we turn a deaf ear to the cries of the martyred? Will we turn back the clock and deny the import of the concurrent resolution of Congress of 1922 which encouraged the Jews to think that the United States was wholehearted in its espousal of the cause of a national homeland for the Jews in Palestine? Will desire for oil and the building of this pipe line involve concessions to King Ibn Saud who opposes further immigration of Jews into Palestine, forcing the United States to deny the purposes of the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate?

Finally, is this pipe line the opening gun in the new American campaign of imperialism?

As Eliahu ben Horin implies in his article Arabian Pipe Line—A Venture in Imperialism in the current issue of World Petroleum will this pipe line bring "oil for future wars or future wars for oil"?

APRIL 11, 1944.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CELLER: With reference to your telephone request for information as to the amounts of goods which are being furnished to Saudi Arabia under lend-lease, the Budget for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, provides for shipment of goods, excluding silver, to a total value of approximately $3,000,000. The value of shipments thus far is somewhat less than this amount.

With the exception of the lend-leasing of silver, the details of which are contained in the attached statement, goods going to Saudi Arabia consist of the following: Textiles, drugs, and medical supplies, tires and tubes, motortrucks.

Of the above-mentioned items, textiles are by far the largest, accounting for approximately $2,000,000 of the $3,000,000 budget. We are endeavoring to aid in the establishment of commercial sales to middle eastern countries, including Saudi Arabia, and hope that the $2,000,000 textile item will be eliminated by the use of regular commercial channels. The problem in this connection is one of foreign exchange; you will appreciate that commercial channels can only be opened if importers in Saudi Arabia are able to purchase with dollars, and at present the dollar position of Saudi Arabia does not appear to permit of this. If, however, we are successful in arranging for commercial shipments of textiles, the budget mentioned above will be reduced to approximately $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945.

In addition to the materials lend-leased to Saudi Arabia, the United States Army operating in that theater has transferred certain military items. Details of such transfers would have to be obtained from the War Department.

I hope this information will serve your purpose. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

[Attachment.]

STATEMENT ON SILVER LEND-LEASED TO SAUDI ARABIA

1. Last fall Saudi Arabia requested that 5,167,000 ounces of silver be supplied to it under lend-lease to meet urgent currency needs of that country. No other source of silver was available. The Treasury investigated Saudi Arabia's need for silver coinage and recommended that the 5,000,000 ounces of silver be supplied under lend-lease for this purpose from Treasury stocks of free silver.

2. Saudi Arabia has agreed to return an equivalent amount of silver within a specified period after the end of the war.

3. The Saudi Arabian coins minted from the lend-leased silver were consigned to the American Minister in Saudi Arabia, who turned them over to the proper Government officials there. It is believed that all the coins minted from the 5,167,000 ounces have arrived in Saudi Arabia.

4. Silver for essential coinage purposes has also been supplied under lend-lease—under similar agreements for return of the silver on an ounce-for-ounce basis—to the United Kingdom, Australia, the Netherlands, and India.

5. In every case the need for coinage has been carefully investigated, and the silver has been supplied only after the determination of the War Production Board that the silver was not more urgently required for essential industrial purposes in the United States.

6. The Senate Special Silver Committee has been kept advised of every lend-lease silver transaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] I made reference to a letter which I had seen, which related to the sale of some lend-lease gasoline back to the United States. I now have that letter

here. It is a letter written by an American soldier stationed in Iran. It is handwritten. I have here the original envelope in which the letter came. The letter was passed by a censor. It was postmarked in the month of March 1944. For obvious reasons I shall not give the name of the soldier or the name of the censor. But the letter says the following:

Boy, I sure would like to tell what really is going on over here, but the censor might cut it out. The United States should investigate this deal over here. It is really terrible. To give you some idea of what the British pull on us, we sell them on lease-lend, for example, a 5-gallon gas can for $2.50. We are short, so we have to buy it back on reverse lend-lease for $55. Also clothes. We have been using a lot of these work clothes and shoes. They cost us about five times more than we sell them ours for and the Army here are buying a lot of things from the British that we supply them on lease-lend. The British have a large dump in Iraq and also India.

Now, as I said yesterday at the time I interrupted the gentleman from Ohio, I never bring up incidents of this character for the purpose of making a story or causing a little excitement. I had no intention of bringing up this letter on the floor and would not have except that discussion turned to such stories yesterday. This letter was recently handed to me by the person to whom it was addressed and whom I know. It is simply a letter by an American soldier to his former employer, who is in the oil business. This American soldier was an employee in the oil business when he was in the United States. Part of the letter deals with his hope that when the war is over he can come back and work for his former employer. I do not know but what he reports may be an isolated incident. I make no insinuations or charges for I know nothing more about the matter than is in the letter. Obviously, however, it is pertinent to a great deal of the discussion on the pending resolution, and obviously it represents this soldier's conviction. He was on the ground. And, obviously, it passed a censor who apparently thought that the information should come back to the United States.

The incident is of particular interest in view of the fact that Mr. Leo T. Crowley, the Lend-Lease Administrator, in his appearance before a committee of the House of Representatives, I suppose before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as reported in the Christian Science Monitor of April 17, listed charges of this character, involving gasoline on reverse lend-lease as the kind of charges that are not true. I will read here a paragraph from the Christian Science Monitor of April 17, in which this citation is given of Mr. Crowley's statement:

8. Charges that Lend-Lease was selling gasoline to a foreign government for 2 cents a gallon which later the United States Army had to buy back from that government for 42 cents a gallon.

And the Crowley comment is:

Not true. Gasoline is provided America's allies under lend-lease and provided America under reverse lend-lease.

Obviously the incident cited by this American soldier is an example of that sort but whether it is untrue or not, your opinion is as good as mine.

The Crowley comment as reported in the Monitor goes on:

Practically all of these tall tales have been traced to the Axis. But the manner in which they have been picked up by Americans and unwittingly spread to the detriment of Allied unity has caused considerable unnecessary friction and explanation, Mr. Crowley suggested.

Some years ago when I was active in the newspaper business, I found that when we reported some incident where a local personage got into trouble, somebody would come in and say, "Please do not put that in the paper." Our reply to them always was this: "It is the business of the newspapers to report news. We do not create the news. We merely report it. The best way to keep your name out of the paper it not to do these things." Similarly I would say, the best way to stop reporting of such incidents is to avoid giving any foundation for them. It is difficult for me to believe that the Axis Powers have access to this soldier to spread this tale to him. He was there on the ground. He used to be in the oil business. He ought to recognize a gasoline can and ought to know something about it. I would say in commenting on situations like this simply that it is poor administration of lend-lease if things like that are taking place and those responsible, if they do not want these incidents to come to the attention of the American people, ought not to permit them to happen. I might paraphrase: "We do not create these instances; we merely report them to the American people."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman have reason to believe that such incidents actually did take place? In other words, what opportunity for knowledge does this soldier friend of yours have by reason of his position in the Army which would acquaint him with the sale price of lend-lease to the British Government or any possible retail price such as you suggested to the American Government?

Mr. CASE. This soldier, as I see by his return address on the envelope, happens to be in a unit which could be engaged in the transportation and handling of supplies. He was formerly in the oil business in this country. His letter was written to his former employer. I know his employer, but I do not know the soldier. The letter, I may say, was brought to my attention at the time I was home last week, without any solicitation on my part. I had no thought of bringing it up in connection with this matter except for the fact that yesterday during the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio he referred to the damaging effect upon morale of various incidents and stories that are told. I can see, obviously, if this soldier and others like him feel these things are being carried on it does not do their morale any good. The way to get these things corrected, it would seem to me, is to bring them to the attention of the American people so they can be stopped, and they can be stopped by proper administration of the lend-lease program.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman know that this man would not have access to the information as to the price which the Government has charged?

Mr. CASE. I think, by the assignment that is indicated by his military organization, that he probably has access to that figure, probably more likely than he has to the figure at which the gasoline was sold or listed to the British Government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under lend-lease we do not sell any gasoline.

Mr. CASE. Do we loan it to them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. CASE. When we get it back——

Mr. WADSWORTH. We do not get it back. It is expended.

Mr. CASE. All right. Some of this letter goes on to speak of the dumps that the British had. When the American forces ran out they turned to the British to get supplies from them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And we do not pay the British under lend-lease. If they have stock to spare and we need it, we use it. There is no exchange of dollars. Your correspondent is wrong about our selling and buying gasoline.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman means there is no charge placed on the books anywhere when we turn over goods to the British, under lend-lease?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is an estimate of the value of the goods, simply put on the books for public information, but there is no exchange of money.

Mr. CASE. All right—but on the reverse transaction is there not similarly an estimate placed somewhere of the value of goods we get back?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We do our best to estimate the value of what we get back. We also do our best to make estimates for the contributing country of what they have given us. That goes on all over the world. We are not selling or buying under lend-lease.

Mr. CASE. If the entries in the exchange were equal, of course, one would wash out the other but the point at issue is whether or not the same valuation is used in the return transaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHIFFLER to the committee amendment: After the word "procedure", on page 2, line 11, insert the following:

"However, no final settlement shall be made by the President until the terms and conditions of such settlement have been submitted to the Congress of the United States and shall have been approved by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That all duties and obligations heretofore lawfully created and arising out of or in connection with all existing contracts or agreements, shall in no manner whatsoever be impaired or vitiated by this act."

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is very obvious when we take into consideration the existing act and connect the amendment with the language of the existing act, and determine what its interpretation has been.

The particular section which this amendment proposes to modify and amend reads as follows:

The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the payment to the United States may be by payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems necessary.

Now, let us see what the interpretation of that language has been. In the initial letter of transmittal with the eleventh report made to the Congress last year—and this language was later deleted from the final letter of transmittal—the following language was used:

The Congress in passing and extending the Lend-Lease Act made it plain that the United States wants no new war debts to jeopardize the coming peace. Victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid.

The amendment that I propose brings back to the House the authority, and I think properly so, that it delegated at the time of the passage of the Lend-Lease Act on March 11, 1941, and it brings it back at this particular time because the urgency of bringing it back is accentuated by developments over the world today.

When we recognize that we have made available for lend-lease use $63,000,000,000, and that part of that $63,000,000,000 is going into the coining of silver money that is being used, as has been outlined to you by one of the preceding speakers, for the coin of Arabia, and we are using lend-lease for that type of economic support throughout the world, we recognize that this Congress must retrieve to itself at least the right to have some final say in how lend-lease accounts shall be settled.

This amendment will not in any way vitiate or impair the validity and the life of existing lend-lease agreements. It will in no way affect the effective prosecution of the war. It will not destroy the right to make new agreements, but it will provide that in any new agreement or in the modification of any existing agreement whereby the terms are liberalized, such new agreements and the provisions of the liberalization thereof, shall be subject to the approval of this Congress. That is what the amendment proposes to do.

I do not think it was the intention of this Congress and I certainly know it is not the will of the people of this Nation, to have delegated to any single individual, whoever he may be, whether the present President or a future President, or whether he be a Democrat or Republican, or whatever he may be, the singular right to have complete control of a fund that comprises approximately one-half of the current national income, and approximately one-fifth of our total national wealth. I think if the Congress recognizes the importance of this resolution and the amendment to it, and recognizes its duty to itself and to the people of the country, it cannot do other than support the amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. If I understand the gentleman's amendment, it is to give to the Congress, as set forth under the Constitution, the right to supervise any agreements made by the President?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. The President's right is exclusively conferred in the Lend-Lease Act itself, and not by virtue of any constitutional provision. It is a specific grant within the Lend-Lease Act, and this amendment merely retrieves to Congress some of the power that it originally delegated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Vriginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of hesitation that I suggest the unwisdom of the amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER]. In all probability, I would not venture to do so, if this amendment had not been considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and rejected by it, after very serious consideration.

I think no one will charge me with supporting any movement to deprive the Congress of the United States of its constitutional prerogatives. I am a great believer in the House of Representatives as a democratic institution—especially the House of Representatives. Wherever its authority can be employed effectively under the Constitution, I am heartily in favor of employing it. But here we have an exceedingly difficult situation. The amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] provides that no final settlement shall be made by the President until the terms and conditions of such settlement have been submitted to the Congress or shall have been approved by the Congress.

Then conscious of the fact that under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act our Government has already entered into agreements for the administration of the lend-lease program involving already the prospect of many settlements, the gentleman from West Virginia has put what might be termed a saving clause in his amendment in order to avoid part of the difficulty which this thing is bound to encounter, for the amendment reads:

Provided further, That all duties and obligations heretofore lawfully created and arising out of or in connection with all existing contracts or agreements shall in no manner whatsoever be impaired or vitiated by this act.

Or rather by this amendment. In other words, his amendment is directed solely, as I read it, to whatever agreements we make from this point on or any modification of an existing agreement which we may make from this point on.

It is conceded, and conceded, I think, unanimously by our committee, that it would be utterly impossible for the Congress to pass final judgment and give its approval to the final settlement of these agreements, because it would involve the Congress in undertaking the job of appraising the value of half-worn-out trucks, tanks, planes, guns, and supplies of one kind and another scattered all over the world in the hands of our allies at the termination of hostilities; and, as I tried to point out in general debate the other day, while this section of the law as it now stands gives the President the power to make those final settlements, from every practical standpoint, of course, it will not be the President at all; it will be our military people on the ground who will be right there when we have whipped Germany, for example, and Russia ceases to need the equipment we have sent them; our military people will be right there on the ground and will be the only people competent to pass on the matter.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot yield.

The military people there on the ground will be the only people competent to judge what the stuff is worth. All of it will be our property; under the terms of the law all of this material is still the property of the United States Government we can do anything we want with it at the end of the war. If we want, we can load it all on ships and bring it back home, but a lot of it will be scrap, half worn out, three-quarters worn out, 100 percent worn out. Some of it may be sold locally if it has any commercial value left; some of it may be brought home. It will include hundreds of items.

The gentleman's amendment proposes that with respect to agreements to be made in the future, or the modification of any agreement which may be made from this time on the Congress must approve the final settlement. Mr. Chairman, this war changes with lightning rapidity, and the demands of war are constantly reflected in the character of supplies we send or exchange. We get much from the others, as we give much to them. The character of the supplies and their destination and the nature of their use may change from month to month, and any one of the agreements heretofore entered into may have to be changed tomorrow. To whatever extent that change is made it becomes a new agreement, and under this amendment

that agreement can never be settled without the Congress of the United States trying to do something which, in my judgment, is physically impossible.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That applies only to final settlement.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; final settlement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The idea that your Committee on Foreign Affairs had in mind was that in the making of these final settlements it should be perfectly clear that the President of the United States, whomever he may be at the time, shall not include in those settlements with one of these countries any committal of the United States Government to a post-war military or economic policy, something looking toward the future. We wanted to, and did, make perfectly clear with our amendment from the committee as perfected by the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] which is now pending before you, that the purpose was to safeguard the people of the United States against reckless committals which possibly might be made. Who knows? We tried to see to it that our constitutional procedure is preserved and that committals of that kind must be acted upon by the Congress in the usual constitutional way. But when it comes to the proposal for the Congress to decide what shall be done with what is left of 7,000,000 pairs of shoes given to the Russian Army—how are we ever going to do it? If a new agreement is made, if we get into another theater of war, our military authorities—and all these things are based on the advice of military authorities — if emphasis changes from one theater of war to another and the military authorities decide that some of this material should be shifted we will say from Russia to Yugoslavia under an agreement and used there for the rest of the war, under this amendment that is a new agreement. The Congress I suppose would have to send a committee to Yugoslavia to view the remains when the war is over, and I think it would be an impossible situation. That is why I believe our committee declined to recommend the amendment to the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. How will this amendment affect the post-war agreements which have already been made under the master agreements?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Those post-war agreements have not yet been made. They have been sketched, as it were, the nature of them has been sketched in the famous article 7; and it is the reading of that article which gives concern to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee lest under that article it might be presumed that a President of the United States could commit the Government to an undertaking having effect after the war; hence our amendment to see to it that Congress must pass upon any such thing.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the gentleman will indulge me to ask a further question, then do I understand the gentleman to make the specific statement that if this amendment is passed it will cancel out the master agreements?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it will not cancel them out but whatever is proposed later on under the master agreement will have to be submitted to the Congress if the committee amendment is adopted.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from New York made a point on reporting to the Congress and Congress passing on all these things. Could not the War Department report to Congress just as well as to the President? After all, it is going to be a War Department recommendation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but the settlement could not be made until Congress after spending months and months on the thing had given its approval.

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not know why the Congress would have to spend any more time on it than the President would.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I feel that the Army authorities can be trusted to determine the interests of the United States in the salvage of this property after the war is over. Let them decide whether a truck is worth $100 or $500. How can we decide?

Mr. BUSBEY. The President is not going to decide any more than the Congress; the committee is going to decide that and report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I differ with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], for whom I have such great respect, in the construction of the amendment which the committee adopted. I urge adoption of the Schiffler amendment as carrying out specifically what the Congress thinks the committee amendment provided. The committee amendment provides that no new obligation shall be assumed under lend-lease agreements except in accordance with established constitutional procedure. I was not present when our committee considered this matter, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] assures me that counsel for the State Department stated that, if the committee amendment were adopted, the Executive would have to come to Congress before any post-war commitment could be made. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT], however, has very ably pointed out that the Lend-Lease Act can now be construed to have given the President power to make agreements with respect to the final determination of benefits under lend-lease, so that the President may now have power, under established constitutional procedure, to make what Assistant Secretary Acheson called forward-looking agreements under the famous article VII. As to final determination of benefits—I think those are the words used in article VII—the lend-lease master agreements look forward to economic arrangements which will benefit this country and others, and those benefits might involve incidental new obligations on this country.

The Schiffler amendment makes it clear that any new obligations, any final settlements, will have to be considered and approved by the Congress.

Now as to the final settlement of items such as shoes over in Russia and the tanks, jeeps, and equipment scattered all over this great planet, I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from New York that it is not within the province of the Congress to review and to pass upon each of those items; the Army, the Executive, however, can come in here with a plan, which does not now exist, for final settlement of all those items and Congress can approve or disapprove that general plan, and then the Executive and the Army can go ahead and carry out the plan as approved by Congress.

I referred in my remarks of yesterday, which will be found on page 3538 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to a question asked Prime Minister Churchill in Parliament when I was a visitor in the gallery about a month ago. The Prime Minister was asked the question whether he could assure the Parliament that "no final or binding commitments in regard to post-war trade or Empire policy will be entered upon by the Government until such matter has been freely debated in the House."

The Prime Minister answered, "Yes, sir."

He gave that assurance to the Houses of Parliament. In my opinion, the Congress of the United States is just as good as Parliament when it comes to a consideration of post-war economic commitments for our country and should demand similar assurances as to the participation of Congress in determining our post-war policies.

All that the Schiffler amendment does is to provide for review of the final settlements not of all the details of the 44 wartime mutual-aid agreements. It does not affect present obligations at all but refers to final forward-looking settlements and states that those final settlements shall be reviewed by the Congress and approved by the Congress of the United States. It seems to me that insofar as creating new obligations are concerned that is merely saying what our Constitution requires. It seems to me, as Secretary Hull pointed out in his famous Sunday night speech of a short while ago, that other countries know what we know, and that is that no Executive agreement with reference to post-war policies has any force until it

does have the approval of the Congress. Foreign countries, remembering Wilson and his Fourteen Points and Versailles and what happened afterward, are not going to place much reliance on any President of our country, whoever he may be, unless and until they know that the proposal he makes, the agreement he suggests, does have some assurance of approval by the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the other countries know that our President can only make reliable agreements when they are supported by the people's Representatives through Constitutional processes, either through the treaty-making power of ratification, or through forward-looking legislative action, or through later legislative authorization.

When we put through the authorization for U. N. R. R. A. a few weeks ago, we wrote into that law that no new obligations under the U. N. R. R. A. agreement could be assumed by this Government unless and until they were approved by the Congress.

When we extend the lend-lease authority, not until 1945, but until 1948, because the agreements made can be carried out until 1948, when they are extended into a period when, God willing, we will at least be entering into partial peace some place on this planet, we ought to write into the fundamental law that forward-looking agreements or final settlements under lend-lease must be approved by the Congress.

This is not a matter of foreign policy. It is a matter of domestic policy, and what kind of Government we are going to have here. I believe that the time has come when, regardless of who is President, the Congress must assume its full share of responsibility in the determination of the foreign policy of our Republic from now on. Here is a step we can take which will not hamper anybody, but which will merely make it clear to our own Government, to our people, and to our allies that the Congress intends to take its place in the processes of the Republic, I hope that this amendment which makes clear that the Congress has this power will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is one that requires thought before a correct judgment can be reached with reference to its effect. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who has just spoken in favor of the amendment unfortunately was not in Washington at the time this amendment was considered by our committee and he did not have the benefit of the discussion which we had at that time. Knowing his sound judgment, I believe if he had been here he would probably have reached the same conclusion that the committee did, that is that the amendment is unwise and should not be adopted.

When the amendment was first offered in the committee it looked upon its face as a fair amendment and the first impression was favorable toward the amendment, but when we considered it in its practical effects we found it is unworkable, unwise, and undesirable.

Mr. Chairman, as a substitute for this amendment there was worked out the committee amendment, which was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and which accomplishes everything that was designed to be accomplished by the Schiffler amendment without its objectionable features. The gentleman from Ohio evidently has not considered the Wadsworth or committee amendment because the speech which he made was that the President should not commit our Government to any policies unless they had the approval of the Congress. Now, that is just what the Wadsworth or committee amendment does.

Let me read it. It says:

Provided, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

Which has been amended this morning by the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to make it cover also any post-war international relations.

There is the expression on the part of the Congress that the President and those administering lend-lease cannot make any obligations whatever that will bind this country with reference to our post-war economic, military, or our international relations. That is all right, and I think it should be adopted. Our committee unanimously voted for that amendment when it was offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], but rejected the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER].

The Schiffler amendment goes beyond that. It goes beyond the matter of policy. It gets down to a question of settlement, of bookkeeping, of dollars and cents. It puts the Congress of the United States in a position where it has to give its approval to the final settlement which is made, whether there are any commitments made with reference to our post-war military or economic policy or not. And it would not work.

Let me point out to you the reasons why it would be unworkable and why it would impede the war effort. We have made with these various countries what are called master agreements. There are, as I recall it, about 34 of these master agreements. Those agreements go into detail with reference to what should be done concerning our country's position toward these contracts and what theirs shall be. If the Schiffler amendment is adopted, it means that those people who enter into those contracts, those other countries, will have notice that the President is not authorized to make those agreements without the consent of Congress which would have to approve them. The President and those agencies acting under him could not hereafter in good faith make contracts with other governments unless first submitted to Congress and approved by the Congress, because the Congress would have to approve all of them, if the Schiffler amendment is adopted.

Furthermore other governments would not feel like entering into a contract with the United States unless it was going to meet with the approval of Congress, and it would give notice that the President would not have the power and that Congress could repudiate the agreements made, and it would cause distrust on the part of our allies and those with whom we deal that the Congress did not believe in the President of the United States.

I say, it is not workable. The Congress and the Executive would both find themselves faced with an impossible and an impractical situation. It would impede the prosecution of the war. Unlike the Wadsworth amendment or the committee amendment which deals with post-war economy and post-war military policy, this amendment deals with wartime economic policy, because the making of these contracts would be affected by the fact that the settlement would have to be made by Congress and not the executive branch of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Have any of these nations with whom we have had these agreements enacted laws for reverse lend-lease or reciprocal lend-lease outside of these agreements? I am not referring to the agreements that the gentleman refers to but to laws enacted by these other governments. Can the gentleman identify such legislation on the part of these other governments?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. For the moment I would not be able to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BLOOM. Would that not be what the different nations call mutual aid? It is the same thing, but they call it by a different name.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand that Canada has adopted legislation which is entitled a mutual aid law, or something of that sort.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. England uses the term "mutual aid" rather than "lend-lease." We have had no lend-lease agreements with Canada, as I understand.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. But outside of Canada, has any one of these other

nations adopted legislation? I am not referring to agreements. We know that agreements unless ratified by their governments are just like the Atlantic Charter. Have any of these other nations enacted laws ratifying reverse lend-lease or reciprocal lend-lease?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am not prepared to answer the gentleman's question as to what laws they have passed. A great many governments do not have to pass legislative acts to bind their countries.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Of course, other governments have dictators or kings.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not all of them have dictators.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Where it is a democratic government, there is an act of parliament or the parliamentary body, or there is an edict of the dictator or the decree of the king; but is the gentleman able to give us the information as to laws, whether by king, dictator, or parliament, enacted by these other governments for reverse lend-lease?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I have not gone into that, and I could not answer the gentleman's question, because I do not know, and I am only at this time concerned with the present amendment.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. In the committee hearings, on page 197, I notice under the heading "Amounts of lend-lease aid authorized" under the subheading "Lend-lease appropriations to the President," a total of twenty-four billion plus; and in section 2, "Direct appropriations to the War and Navy Departments," a total of thirty-five billion. That sum of money, as I understand it, comes out of the Army and Navy appropriations.

Then, on page 198——

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman please hurry? I have only 5 minutes. That has nothing to do with the pending amendment. If the gentleman has some question with reference to the pending amendment, I will be glad to answer him. There was discussed yesterday the amount appropriated and spent under lend-lease.

Mr. ELLIS. I thought the gentleman would clarify it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I would rather not try to do it now, because the pending amendment is what I wish to address myself to at this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is what I was going to say: This amendment is an amendment that should be defeated, because it will not accomplish what it is intended to do, and it will have a bad effect upon the war and its conduct, and after the war is over.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not quite yet. Here is the position I want to take, and I want to make this clear. If the Congress of the United States has to pass upon these various settlements, it is going to take up a great deal of time, because the Congress will have to be consulted before these agreements are made, and it will involve a good deal of bookkeeping, meaning that the Congress will have to take up time it should devote to other questions of major importance.

Furthermore, what if this situation should arise? What if, when the final report came in, the Congress did not approve the settlement? Then we would be left with our relations with other countries never settled; the curtain would never be rung down on it, and this thing would stand here unsettled and undetermined. So I say the only right thing to do and the only sensible thing to do would be to take the committee amendment, providing that any settlement which makes any commitment on our part, which binds our Government to anything, is not binding unless it is approved by the Congress. With reference to these various settlements about jeeps and this amount of money and that amount of money, that should not have to come before the Congress for final settlement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would just like to call attention to the fact that some of these agreements which the Congress has been called upon to pass on are 90 years of age, some of them going back as far as the Mexican War, 1848. It took us nearly a hundred years to settle them, and the same thing will occur in this case if the Congress has to approve every little item.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. There ought to be a final settlement made as soon as possible for the sake of good relations of our country with the other countries.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I would like to have the gentleman's explanation regarding a statement he made on two or three occasions that the passage of this amendment would hinder the war effort. I would like him to point out in what respect this amendment would have anything to do with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. In answer to the gentleman I will say this, that it would impede the war effort, because hereafter any agreements made between our country and any other country could not be entered into by the executive branch unless Congress was consulted and expressed its approval, because in good faith the executive branch is not going to make any agreement, if Congress has to ratify it, without first having Congress pass on it, and that would delay the war effort and would delay what has to be done quickly.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether I can add anything to the arguments of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Texas. However, there is one aspect of this amendment which appeals to me. I do not know whether it will be of any enlightenment to the House, but I am going to try to give my idea of it nevertheless.

I do not believe there is any Member of Congress who would willingly do anything to diminish the prestige of our Government in dealing with its allies and with foreign nations. I think we must remember that when the President, acting through the Lend-Lease Administration and the military authorities, deals with the other nations of the world, he represents our country, and has in his custody and care the welfare of America.

You may ask in what respect the adoption of this amendment would diminish the prestige of the President. I might answer that in 1941 this Congress felt that in order to prosecute the war effectively the President should be entrusted with the power to negotiate lend-lease agreements, to decide what was going to be done or what was going to be received in consideration for lend-lease material and services rendered. Now, in the middle of the war we are asked by the gentleman from West Virginia to change the rules of the game. We are asked to advertise to the world that we have as a nation lost confidence in our military leaders and in our Lend-Lease Administration, and that we no longer trust them to conclude these lend-lease agreements.

As the gentleman from New York has pointed out, the accounting job contemplated by this amendment is a staggering one, but it possibly could have been accomplished if that had been the procedure outlined in the passage of the original act. I do not know. But I do know that, having made our rules, having passed our statute giving the executive branch of the Government, the Lend-Lease Administration, and the military the power to conclude these arrangements with foreign nations, we cannot, when so many great questions of vital importance to this country and the world are at stake, advertise to the world that these agents whom we have appointed and entrusted with this authority no longer have our confidence, and that any agreements that are made in the future must be made differently than all other agreements that have been made in the past and must be referred to the Congress itself for final determination.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman that we should not change the rules of the game in the middle of the war, but the committee amendment which has already been adopted, and to

which the Schiffler amendment refers, takes in only post-war agreements and refers only to final settlements which are going to be made post-war, so that this could not conceivably be considered as a reflection upon our war leaders.

Mr. WRIGHT. If I may answer the gentleman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment that was offered in committee by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and unanimously adopted, for the reason that I wish to uphold the prerogatives of Congress when it comes to charting the course of this Nation in its relation to the other nations after the war. But the lend-lease agreements which are now made by the President with antecedent legislative authority from this body are not post-war or permanent agreements; they are within the peculiar prerogative of the Executive. Action in war must be speedy in order that this Government can deal on equal terms with the parliamentary Government of Great Britain, where the Prime Minister has great authority, or with the Government of Russia, where Mr. Stalin speaks with such authority. Our President must be given ample power to deal with these great nations on a like basis.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. The gentleman wishes to change the character of the American Government so that the President of the United States would have the role of the gentleman in Russia or the gentleman in England to whom he refers.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not wish to change the character of the American Government. I wish to emphasize the traditional character of the American Government, that the Executive is recognized as the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy and it is his prerogative to lead this country in the waging of war. Lend-lease is a war instrument. The gentleman from West Virginia by his amendment tries to bring Congress into a scene in which I do not believe it really belongs. When we get into the province covered by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], which is international relations and dealings of a permanent nature between nations after the war, certainly I think the Congress should be consulted, and I would be just as emphatic as the gentleman who has just questioned me in defending the right of the Congress to exercise its share in the settlement of world-wide questions after the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter of my own.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the disposition of salvaged property and the sale and disposition of property, the title to which will remain in the United States Government after the war, now under discussion, I call your attention to a transaction which occurred in my State with reference to the salvaging of a battleship which is very near and dear to the hearts of the people of Oregon.

During the Spanish-American War we had a battleship in the American Navy named the *Oregon*. It was commissioned shortly before that great engagement took place. This ship made a heroic trip around the Horn through the Straits of Magellan on to Key West and then to Santiago, driving against time to take part in that memorable battle which resulted in the destruction of the Spanish Fleet and eventually in our Government's winning the war.

When it came to disposing of the ship later, it then being out of use and outdated by reason of over age and obsolescence, it was turned over to the State of Oregon to be maintained as a shrine and a heroic object within our State, for the inculcation of patriotism and morale. It was maintained for a period of almost 20 years by the State for that purpose, although title was vested in and retained by the Federal Government.

When the present war broke out, and eventually when scrap material became scarce and it was necessary to comb every source to secure material for salvage, the Federal Government, the owner of the ship, through the President, ordered this old battleship taken from its moorings in the historic park where it had been placed within the city of Portland, and scrapped. The ship had cost the Federal Government originally $6,280,000, and launched October 26, 1893. The State of Oregon had appropriated over $154,000 for the reconditioning and care of the vessel. There was expended on the project from contributions by civic bodies, the port of Portland, the city of Portland, school children, and school districts, a sum of money perhaps much larger than that. A beautiful park in the heart of the city of Portland, within its corporate limits, on the Willamette River was provided by the city of Portland as a permanent home for the old fighter and was dedicated and known as the Oregon Marine Park, to be the moorage place of this old ship as long as God in His wisdom permitted it to weather the elements of nature, so that it might remain as a heroic object of patriotism to our people, young and old.

Over 6,000 school children every year visited this vessel.

As I say, it was ordered to be scrapped and torn from its moorings and from the hearts of the people of Oregon. I happened to be in Portland in my district at the time and I sent this telegram to those in charge of the salvaging of the *Oregon*:

Oregon cooperating 100 percent in war effort. Willing to sacrifice old *Oregon* battleship so near to our hearts that the old ship may again, in a new form, perform gallantly as she did in her memorable fight. We hope you will see that the ship be not sold to dealers, but may go through to war needs without profit to anyone. Please advise if this can be done.

I received the following letter in reply from Commander R. W. Berry, of the United States Navy, Deputy Director in the Office of Public Relations, Navy Department, which reads as follows:

As our official news release indicated, the U. S. S. *Oregon* is to be dismantled under the strict supervision of the War Production Board and the Navy Department.

I am advised, however, by the Salvage Construction Section of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, that it cannot be guaranteed to have the ship wrecked "without profit to anyone."

The only way she can be dismantled is by a qualified wrecker. The project is an enormous one. It is regarded as being next to impossible to obtain the services of a wrecker who will do this job without profit and for sentiment only. Unless you, or perhaps some one else, knows of a person or a company on the West Coast who will warrant to wreck the *Oregon* without profit, there is no alternative to proceeding as contemplated.

Please be assured that your feelings about the *Oregon* are fully appreciated. Every effort will be exerted by all concerned to wreck her in accordance with the spirit of your wishes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this week I was informed that the battleship *Oregon*, which cost over $6,000,000, as I have said, and on which the State of Oregon had expended over $154,000, and perhaps an equal amount through other civic contributions and the Federal Government, was disposed of after the above letter was written to me for $35,000. I doubt if any appreciable amount of the salvage has gone into our war effort so far. Right now I am advised that the Federal Government is buying back equipment and salvaged material from the ship at prices wholly inconsistent and perhaps far in excess of the miserly sum of $35,000 which was paid for this $6,000,000 ship upon which some $200,000 or $300,000 have been spent. I am asking our Committee on Naval Affairs today, through the committee itself or through a subcommittee thereof, to make a full investigation and report to this Congress as to just what was done in the salvaging of this ship. As I stated to the committee chairman, the value of the old *Oregon* for war purposes as a historical shrine in maintaining and building morale and patriotism in our people far exceeded the nominal value of the material involved for purely salvage purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I include as a part of these remarks the following letter, to which I referred, which I sent to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the House Committee on

Naval Affairs, asking for an investigation of the disposal and salvaging of the battleship *Oregon:*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1944.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I most respectfully request that the Naval Affairs Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, make a full and complete investigation of the dismantling and salvaging of the battleship *Oregon*. Facts have recently come to light in the Portland district, which I have the honor to represent, that full utilization of the material in this battleship has not been made by the Federal Government, and portions of the material and equipment have been sold to the Federal Government by the purchaser of the ship for salvage purposes at prices disproportionate to the ridiculously low sum purporting to have been received for the ship.

I call to your attention and to the attention of the committee that the battleship *Oregon* performed, as you know, a most heroic service in the Spanish-American War. The battleship *Oregon* was constructed pursuant to an act of Congress June 30, 1890, at a cost of $6,280,000, and was launched October 26, 1893. Capt. Charles Edgar Clark assumed command on March 17, 1898, and was in command when the historic ship made its famous run around South America, through the Straits of Magellan, on to Key West, and then to Santiago, arriving in time to play an important part in the famous Battle of Santiago, which resulted in the destruction of the Spanish Fleet on July 3, 1898.

The citizens of our Nation and particularly the State of Oregon are proud of this heroic achievement of the battleship *Oregon*. When the time arrived for retiring the *Oregon* from active service in the Navy, possession was turned over to the State of Oregon, and from June 1925 to October 1942 the State had possession and custody under the memorandum receipt executed to the Secretary of the Navy by the Battleship Oregon Commission, an agency of the State. Title, however, remained in the United States. The *Oregon* was moored in a historic park on the banks of the Willamette River, within the corporate limits of the city of Portland, where it was maintained by the people of Oregon as a shrine to instill in the hearts and minds of our people, and particularly the boys and girls, patriotism for our country.

The biennial reports of the secretary of state for Oregon show that from 1927 to June 1941 the State appropriated $154,961.14 for the care and maintenance of the ship, under the supervision of the Battleship Oregon Commission, the members of which served without compensation or other allowance. During this period these appropriations by the State, together with appropriations by the port of Portland, the city of Portland, public subscriptions, and contribution from the United States, made possible providing a permanent anchorage for the *Oregon* in the historical park to which I have referred, which was dedicated and improved with the assistance of the Work Projects Administration and was known as the Battleship Oregon Marine Park.

The *Oregon* as maintained by the Commission was not only a relic of great historic and patriotic interest but was maintained as a museum for the preservation and display of historic objects having reference to the old battleship. The gun deck also served as a meeting place for the Boy Scouts, Sea Scouts, Boy Rangers, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, Girl Mariners, and various other civic, patriotic, and character-building organizations, particularly having to do with the youth of our Nation. There was an average monthly attendance of 6,000 visitors to the ship, composed largely of school children and other organizations. The old ship, by reason of its heroic achievements in the Spanish-American War and its glorious history as a fighting battle wagon in the American Navy and its maintenance through the years by the State of Oregon as a symbol of patriotism to our country had enshrined itself in the hearts of the people of Oregon to such an extent that it had become an invaluable factor in all patriotic endeavors engaged in by our State, particularly in time of war. In passing I may say there can be little question that the value of the ship for war purposes as a historic shrine in building morale and patriotism in our people far exceeded the nominal value of the material involved for purely salvage purposes.

On October 12, 1942, the Navy Department, with the approval of the President, in order to meet the exigencies of the war occasioned by the shortage of scrap metals, ordered the vessel scrapped, and these operations began on about December 8, 1942. I was in Portland in my district at the time, and I sent a telegram to the officials in charge of the dismantling of the ship, reading as follows:

"Oregon cooperating 100 percent in war effort. Willing to sacrifice old *Oregon* battleship so near to our hearts that the old ship may again in a new form perform gallantly as she did in her memorable fight. We hope you will see that the ship be not sold to dealers but may go through to war needs without profit to anyone. Please advise if this can be done."

In reply to this telegram, on October 24, 1942, I received a letter from R. W. Berry, commander, United States Navy, Deputy Director in the Office of Public Relations, Navy Department, reading as follows:

"As our official news release indicated, the U. S. S. *Oregon* is to be dismantled under the strict supervision of the War Production Board and the Navy Department.

"I am advised, however, by the Salvage Construction Section of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, that it cannot be guaranteed to have the ship wrecked 'without profit to anyone.'

"The only way she can be dismantled is by a qualified wrecker. The project is an enormous one. It is regarded as being next to impossible to obtain the services of a wrecker who will do this job without profit and for sentiment only. Unless you, or perhaps someone else, knows of a person or a company on the west coast who will warrant to wreck the *Oregon* without profit, there is no alternative to proceeding as contemplated.

"Please be assured that your feelings about the *Oregon* are fully appreciated. Every effort will be exerted by all concerned to wreck her in accordance with the spirit of your wishes."

Through the public press I have recently noted that the battleship *Oregon* was disposed of for approximately $35,000, and, as I have said, rumors and reports in the press indicate that the Federal Government is buying back portions of the equipment and salvage material out of the ship.

In justice to our people and to the Nation and that the facts may be known, it seems proper that your great committee should make a full and complete investigation of all of the transactions in connection with the dismantling and salvaging of the battleship *Oregon*, and I respectfully request that this be done.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise not to make any remarks on either of the two pending amendments, but to ask some questions if I may, of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from West Virginia. I am very sure that all of these questions were fully covered in discussion in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but not having the honor of being a member of that committee, I do not know what was said. In regard to the disposition of lend-lease materials, I believe section 5 of one of the master agreements, perhaps that section is contained in all the master agreements, speaks of the disposition of material after the cessation of hostilities. As I queried yesterday, without getting a response, it might be that hostilities would discontinue in one area and not in another area. I am wondering if the stock piles of lend-lease materials existing in an area in which active warfare has stopped, could be disposed of by lend-lease authorities, we will say, to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Committee. May I query the gentleman from New York, if he would be kind enough to give answer to that question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. All the material, of course, still is the property of the United States. Under the law, the President, of course, who will act through the military authorities, will have to decide what it is worth and where it had better go and what we had better get out of it. It is possible, of course, that part of it which might be useful for the purpose, could be transferred to another branch of our governmental effort including our participation in U. N. R. R. A. That might save us some money.

Mr. DEWEY. Of course, if it would save us money, that would be all right, but I was wondering who would put a price on it, inasmuch as we only have a small voice in these matters.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The price will be put on it under the terms of the lend-lease act and not under the terms of U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. DEWEY. But there would be some responsible authority reporting to the United States as to what price was put on?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. DEWEY. That is not a matter of fundamental policy. It might be a matter of expediency. I want to ascertain if we would not get a lot of our materials used for purposes for which they were not originally intended and which might be used either for rehabilitation or relief under U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In any event the United States Government, would get credit for its value.

Mr. DEWEY. In other words, that would diminish the appropriation asked by U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, sir; it would be bound to be.

Mr. DEWEY. And that would have to be accounted for by U. N. R. R. A. as having been received and it would be offset on their appropriation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. When the Committee on Appropriations of the House is asked to make an appropriation they might well ask, "Did you not succeed in getting some of the half-worn-out material left over from lend-lease in a certain country?"

Mr. DEWEY. I think that would show great wisdom on the part of that committee and I am sure they will do it.

May I ask the gentleman from West Virginia as to his feeling on that, if he has anything to say as to the use of those stock piles?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I think the interpretation given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is correct and is covered by section 4 of the act, whereby the President may give permission to any country to transfer title to property that has been delivered to that country and he can, if it is within that country, order it transferred to any other place.

Mr. DEWEY. I am asking these questions only to clarify in my own mind the post-war situation as it may be complicated by the lend-lease supplies.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. It might go to U. N. R. R. A. or might go to any other agency or for any other purpose. I think the President has the authority, under section 4 of the act, to direct the country in which that property is located to deliver it over to anybody else or any other nation.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does not the gentleman feel any broad plan for the distribution of surplus stock piles of lend-lease material should be submitted to the Congress and approved by Congress?

Mr. DEWEY. I certainly feel we should be consulted, particularly as the gentleman from New York has stated the title to these goods is in the Government of the United States. I do feel we have a number of plans, not before the Congress, but at least being discussed as to post-war cooperation and I just wanted to be sure that there will be good accounting and our taxpayers receive as many benefits as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted. It will be a great protection to the United States. In answer to the gentleman from Ohio regarding the surplus supplies and the disposition of them on final settlement, I have an amendment which will take care of that. My amendment provides that before the final disposition of those defense articles the Congress should approve of such disposition. We do not want to leave tremendous stock piles of materials of war, even ships, that might be used against us at some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHIFFLER) there were—ayes 107, noes 110.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were appointed, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BLOOM and Mr. SCHIFFLER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 114, noes 134.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Page 2, after line 11, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of March 11, 1941, as amended, is amended by inserting '(1)' after '(b)' and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(2) Nothing in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be construed to authorize the President to enter into any final settlement with respect to the disposition, other than the return to the United States, of defense articles in the possession of any government of any foreign country and not necessary to the defense of such foreign country until the terms and conditions of such settlement shall have been submitted to the Congress and approved by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses.'"

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides that the surplus defense materials not necessary to the defense of that country shall not be left in final settlement in other countries or transferred from one country to another without the approval of the Congress. It in nowise interferes with the war effort, it nowise interferes with lend-lease goods being shipped today and being used by foreign countries or from being transferred from one country to the other countries who are our allies.

I would remind the House that airplanes are lent today under lend-lease to different countries. Ships are delivered to our allies under lend-lease through the Maritime Commission transferring them to lend-lease; supplies of tanks and other matériel of war likewise.

Mr. Chairman, years ago I warned the House what the Government was doing in sending scrap iron, cotton, and commodities of war, matériel of war, to Japan. After our experience at Pearl Harbor, I should like to ask the Members of the House if they want to leave large supplies of lend-lease matériel of war in any country after the war which country we may deem not to be with us, may be against us? I should like to ask the House what it thinks those boys who have been wounded in the South Pacific think about the matériel of war that was furnished to Japan before Pearl Harbor by the United States over my vehement protest and the vehement protest of some other Members of Congress. We were told then that we must do nothing to offend the feelings of Japan. Mr. Chairman, we do not want history to repeat itself. I say to you that after the war is over, before the war is over, there may be a separate peace, one of our allies may make a separate peace. We must make sure that that ally is not allowed tc have matériel of war with which to injure us, not only through use by that country but by transfer from that country to some other country which is unfriendly to us. It seems to me this is a very vital amendment to this bill. The House does not realize, although some Members know, I think, that some years ago several of the moving-picture persons took talking movies of me explaining the danger of Japanese methods to this country. Those movies were never allowed to be shown. If only mine and other warnings had been heeded there would not have been a Pearl Harbor. I tell you this because I think it is extremely significant. I cannot let it be upon my conscience not to make every effort possible to see that the matériel of war in the final settlement is not left in countries that may do us damage.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that my amendment merely provides that the President is not authorized to enter into any final settlement with respect to the disposition, other than the return to the United States, of defense articles in the possession of any government of any foreign country and not necessary to the defense of such foreign country until the terms and conditions of such settlement shall have been submitted to the Congress and approved by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses.

I pray it may pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anyone can take the thirteenth report of the operations of lend-lease and analyze it very carefully without at the same time being in favor of this amendment. I think the amendment is highly constructive and greatly in the interest of the protection of the United States.

On the evening of Easter Sunday I listened very carefully to the address of Secretary of State Cordell Hull. I noticed how he emphasized the important part the Atlantic Charter, the declaration by the United Nations, lend-lease, and the Four Power Pact plays in our present foreign policy; and then we have this effort on the part of certain countries to bring about control of stock piles of goods and materials and ships incident to the post-war period. We must bear in mind that our own Government agencies are the largest holders of stock piles of economic materials in the world today.

As I understand this amendment—and if I am in error I should be pleased to

have the gentlewoman from Massachusetts correct me—as I understand this amendment it strengthens the hands of the United States in controlling stock piles of all commodities, goods, ships, and equipment, embraced in the concept of lend-lease, and which are now moving across international boundaries, and bring those stock piles as of the date of cessation of hostilities back under the control of the Congress of the United States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It applies in the final settlement; the gentleman is correct, the final settlement of defense materials, matériel of war. I do not see how anyone can refuse to support it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just for a correction, lend-lease does not possess any stock piles abroad.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I certainly did not say that lend-lease possessed any stock piles abroad. I pointed out they belong to our Government agencies.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment therefore does not apply.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask the gentleman from New York this question: When does lend-lease cease to have jurisdiction of the things they ship?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are under the jurisdiction of the United States in the first instance. The right to use them is all that goes with them when they are turned over to our allies.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, title remains in the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Title remains in the United States. As I understand this amendment, then, it would prohibit the President from disposing of title to those lend-lease stock piles. Is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are not stock piles.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, whatever you want to call them; inventories of food, equipment, materials, or what not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are worn-out jeeps and trucks.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, no; oh, no. Worn-out jeeps and trucks are not the only things getting into the channels of lend-lease. We might as well be accurate about this thing now. Take the thirteenth report of lend-lease operations and analyze it and see what does get into the channel of lend-lease.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Airplanes, ships, and such things also are sent under lend-lease.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is my understanding.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The President may bring them back to this country after the war if he wishes; or if he wishes he can leave them in Russia, England, or any other country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is, under present conditions?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Under present conditions. Before he could do that, other than return them to the United States, bring them back, the Congress would have to agree, under my amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exactly the way I understand the situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is exactly the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And as we move into this horse-trading period of the post-war era, somebody will have to speak in the interest of the United States first. That is what I am interested in. I want that power left in the hands of the Congress of the United States. It is because of the surrender of too much of that power of Congress that I have up to this point consistently voted against lend-lease operations. We went into lend-lease on the assumption that the balance of the world would do the fighting, we would furnish the matériel and the monetary means and the credit. Later we went into the war furnishing of men and all we have. Today, therefore, we have a situation that is entirely dissimilar to what it was when lend-lease began to operate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Lend-lease was enacted 9 months before the United States was actually engaged in war. Does it not make good sense that now after the 2½ years America has been in the war clarifying amendments should be added to a law which was enacted 9 months before our entrance into the war?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is particularly true in line with what Secretary Hull said last Easter in his broadcast to the Nation.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman knows, of course, that not only $74,000,000,000 which have either been appropriated for or allocated to the lend-lease fund by the President, but other than money is involved in lend-lease; in other words, that $74,000,000,000 does not by any means encompass all of the things that actually come under the lend-lease law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate the gentleman's observations at this point.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The law does authorize the President to transfer to anyone he likes all of the matériel of war, all of our shipping, all of our supplies; as a matter of fact, everything we have really comes under lend-lease if the President so wishes and I think it is about time that the Congress of the United States should stand up on its own two feet, demand an itemized accounting of every dollar spent and for what it was spent. It is established that less than twenty of the seventy-four billions credited to the fund have been spent in the first 3 years of its existence. What the balance will be spent for, how much more will be demanded, what will be done with it, for what it will be used, unless the Congress insists upon an exact accounting, God only knows.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When you add to the gentleman's observation the list of nations which have qualified for lend-lease benefits, so many of which are not now actually active in the war with military forces, you get an additional significance to the observation made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] insisted that the American Congress ought to have as much right in supervising these settlements as the British Parliament because, in his opinion, the American Congress is as good as the British Parliament. I would like to point that, as far as I know, in the British Parliament there are no American agents. That is one difference between the two bodies.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should not think there would be many American agents occupying seats in the British Parliament.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. If this machinery, trucks, automobiles, and so forth are as usable as the gentleman from New York would like to have us believe, why does he want to give them away?

Mr. CRAWFORD. They go over there in new form. Mr. Chairman, keeping out of the field of diplomatic negotiations, may I say that by all the rules of decency the people of this country have a right to expect their Representatives here in Congress to keep things within our control for the post-war period. That is just a cold fact, it does not need any debate; it is so academic it is almost axiomatic, you may say, and I cannot understand why there should be any opposition to an amendment of this kind.

Mr. ELLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. I notice in the report that appropriations to the President for lend-lease are $24,000,000,000 plus, other appropriations, for the Army and Navy, $35,970,000,000, Maritime Commission, $5,000,000,000, totaling some $65,000,000,000 for lend-lease; is that correct?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is my understanding. And the proposition was originally sold to us on the basis of a $7,000,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. ELLIS. Does the authorization we are concerned with this afternoon affect

only the lease-lend appropriations of the President?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman mean this amendment?

Mr. ELLIS. No; the whole bill. This bill has to do only with the lend-lease appropriations of the President or the extension of it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is not my understanding that the bill today is limited to the direct appropriations to the President.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The President has transferred goods from the Army and Navy and a large amount of the $35,000,000,000, or quite a large part, comes about in that way. It is credited to lend-lease, but it has been transferred from the Army and the Navy. The Maritime Commission has lent $2,000,000,000 worth of ships. We do not want to feel that someday those ships may be used against us if left over there. Conceivably those countries will look after themselves after this war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And, Mr. Chairman, let me say at this point that I am greatly disturbed over some of the complications and problems arising out of the lend-lease operations and about which there has been far too little debate, if any. I now refer to the international currency situation which comes about through our shipping to so many countries lend-lease goods for which we require no immediate payment and wherein for the goods we purchase from those countries—I have particular reference to the Latin-American republics—we allow them dollar credit which they in turn reduce to earmarked gold for their account. One only needs to closely analyze our rapidly developing unfavorable position from not only an exchange standpoint internationally speaking but as well from the situation that is coming about through the shifting ratio of gold back of our reserve bank currency issues and the deposits carried by those banks. Our whole economy is becoming greatly disturbed incident to these developments and apparently those who support the lend-lease program seem to be little, if any, concerned about the trouble to which I am here referring.

And, Mr. Chairman, another of my principal grievances against lend-lease is the manner in which that agency of our Government has not allocated military supplies and equipment to our fighting forces in the southwest Pacific area and particularly our forces, and those gallant allies—the Chinese—and our forces located in that great country.

I am, of course, not in position to pose as a world strategist nor as a prophet nor a son of a prophet. I have, however, developed considerable interest in different theaters of operations; and as regards the far-eastern area I have had the benefit of conversations with various people who, by virtue of their long residence in the Far East coupled with opportunities which they have for extensive travel in many of the countries in eastern Asia, are in a position to speak with some authority. One man whose observations I am always glad to have is Carl Neprud, who has worked with the Chinese Government for over 30 years, during which time he has lived in practically all parts of China, and since the outbreak of hostilities between China and Japan has, in his capacity as a liaison officer, had a unique opportunity to become acquainted with adjoining territories like Burma and Assam—the very territories where fighting is now in progress.

At times Neprud has had occasion to set his views down in writing. It has been my privilege to obtain copies of three of his memoranda and in view of the information they contain and the general soundness of the views they express, I believe they are worthy of being embodied in the RECORD for others to read; and Mr. Chairman, in due course, I shall ask for unanimous consent to incorporate the three memoranda in the RECORD. While two of the memoranda bear directly on the strategy of our operations in Southeast Asia since Pearl Harbor, I propose to include a pre-Pearl Harbor memorandum which Neprud sent to the President under cover of a letter dated July 9, 1940, in which he stressed the importance to the democracies of maintaining control of the Manila, Singapore, Surabaya area by throwing more naval and other forces into that area to prevent the Japanese from going south to capture Malaya and the Netherlands East Indies and thus assure themselves of an ample supply of strategic materials, such as oil, rubber, chrome, tin, and iron, with which they could fight a war on a large scale; and would establish among all the islands in that area a second hornet's nest—comparable to the one they have in the home islands—out of which it would be difficult to dislodge them. A reading of that interesting memorandum will show that the writer sensed at that time that a thrust south on the part of Japan would mean also the cutting of the Burma Road—then virtually China's only supply line. Neprud felt strongly enough on this point to be sent on a mission in the spring of 1941 by his chief, Dr. H. H. Kung, China's vice premier, and, concurrently, Minister of Finance, to India—to Upper Assam—to study different matters relating to the possibility of a direct air route between China and India, the thought being that if the Japanese attacked Britain they would take the whole of Burma—and China would have no practical route to the outside world except by a direct air hop to India. As we all know events developed in exactly that manner. Our only communication line with China now is by the upper Assam air route.

Within the last few weeks the Japanese have launched an offensive to cut the supply lines for that air route. This is a very serious business because if the Japanese succeed in their effort, they will virtually isolate China, depriving her of any worth-while aid until either this supply route is reestablished or until some new route is opened up. From recent press reports it would appear that the Japanese are entering on a program of creating a stronger military position for themselves in China. For instance, directly after the conclusion of the recent agreement with Russia concerning the fishery question and the oil and coal concessions in northern Sakhalien, there were reports that the Japanese were moving units of their crack Kwantung army from Manchuria to points in central and southern China; and only yesterday I read an Associated Press item from Chungking in the New York Times concerning a new offensive which the Japanese have started near Chengchow on the Peiping-Hankow Railway line, at a junction point with an important east and west line. The inference drawn by the authorities in Chungking, according to the Associated Press correspondent, is that the Japanese are making a bid to open up land communications across China from north to south. In order to accomplish that objective they would, aside from clearing certain areas along the Peiping-Hankow line, require also to obtain control of Chinese-held portions of the Hankow-Canton line. With the losses which General Chennault and his American and Chinese airmen are inflicting on Japanese shipping, both along the coast and on the Yangtze River, coupled with the damage done by American submarines operating in the China Seas, the Japanese have good reason to think in terms of developing land communications.

Men who have a real acquaintance with the situation consider that the way to break up the Japanese empire is to destroy her shipping. The main weakness in the safeguarding of her newly acquired territories lies in the fact that they are not connected with Japan nor, for that matter, with each other by any good land routes. Even in China, Japan has no usable route to Central China for maintaining her forces in that area and for moving supplies out except the Yangtze River; and as regards the ports which she holds along the coast from Shanghai south there are no railways or improved highways connecting them; so again, there is need to rely on shipping which is extremely vulnerable to attacks. As her shipping lines continue to suffer it is only natural that Japan will have to attempt to strengthen her land communications, especially in China, where she is not only vulnerable to attack but in which country she will conceivably require to make her last line of defense outside of the islands themselves.

It would seem of vital importance that the Allies should throw the necessary weight against the Japanese forces which have penetrated into India to prevent them cutting the supply routes to the Upper Assam airports from which planes carry supplies to the Chinese armies and to General Chennault's air force. Not only is it essential that our air-route facilities should be maintained but they should be increased; and one hardly needs to be an aviation expert to appreciate that the simplest way to increase the tonnage is to provide more of the larger type of transport planes. Not only will such planes deliver more supplies to Kunming and other points in China but they will do it at less cost and without requiring to refuel in China. And, also, what is important, they will increase the

tonnage capacity of airports at either end. This is no small item when it is recalled as was pointed out last Tuesday by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in a very clear discussion of this important subject. The gentleman from Montana stressed the need of providing more planes for the Assam-China air route, but I do not recall that he emphasized the advisability of using larger types of transport planes, like for instance th so-called Sky-Master now being produced on an assembly line basis at the Douglas plant in Chicago.

Mr. Chairman, with the importance to the whole Allied cause of preventing Japan from succeeding in her latest effort to isolate China and develop land communication routes like opening the railway from north to south and seizing airports near the Yangtze and coastal areas from which Allied planes are operating against Japanese shipping, and so forth, and so forth. I want to inquire why the lend-lease authorities who had it in their power to allocate planes have so far failed to provide a fleet of large transport planes of say, the Skymaster type for use on the India-China air route? This is a matter of grave importance to the American people as well as all the allies and it is worthy of immediate attention.

Another important point in favor of this action is that in case the Japanese succeed in cutting the Assam railway supply line even for but a temporary period, it will be possible, by the use of such larger planes with their longer range, for us to maintain communications with China and this for the reason that such large capacity planes having longer range can take off from points to the west of the Japanese penetration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment requiring congressional approval for the disposal of surplus lend-lease material would do nothing but create confusion.

Title to all lend-lease equipment and supplies—with a few very minor exceptions—is retained by the United States. All of the lend-lease agreements provide that the President can recapture for the use of the United States any lend-lease supplies or equipment which are not destroyed, consumed, or exhausted. There has never been the slightest doubt or question in the minds of the lend-lease countries about this clearly reserved power of the United States. This power is further buttressed by the legal requirement that no lend-lease country can retransfer any lend-lease supplies to another country without the consent of the United States.

Almost every day guns, munitions or other equipment lend-leased to one country is retransferred to another in line with the strategy and exigencies of the war.

No one can seriously think that Congress is equipped to or wants to handle this kind of varied, complex, and detailed administrative problems. For if it tried to do so, Congress would have to give its formal approval through committee action and the vote of the whole Congress every time a jeep originally made available for Russia is turned over to Tito's partisans or a plane supplied to Britain is redistributed to China. Various aspects of these problems arise virtually every day on every battle front of the world and in every lend-lease supply depot outside the United States. They require immediate solution.

Every day some piece of lend-lease property is damaged and must be disposed of. Today it may be a Martin Marauder lend-leased to Dutch flyers and severely damaged by Japanese antiaircraft fire over New Guinea. Tomorrow it may be a sack of flour damaged by salt water while being shipped to Russia or Britain.

Every day as the forces of the United Nations move forward toward the centers of Axis resistance, they leave behind them some lend-lease supplies which were procured for the spot those forces have just vacated and cannot be used at the spot to which they have advanced.

Each of these cases presents a problem that must be settled on its own facts. Foodstuffs damaged while in transit to the Soviet Union might be left in the hold of the merchant vessel because of the extreme scarcity of ballast that can be picked up at Russian ports for the return voyage. Foodstuffs damaged while in transit to Britain might be sent to a reclamation plant. And foodstuffs damaged while in transit to north Africa might be dumped in the ocean because there are no reclamation plants there and because it is more important to the war effort to bring back some other cargo than to bring the damaged food back to a reclamation plant in this country. No matter which solution is chosen, the important thing is to have an on-the-spot decision so that shipping and warehouse space will not be tied up.

These day-to-day operating problems are arising constantly today. They will arise with greater and greater frequency as the war draws to a victorious close. Obviously Congress is not equipped and does not desire to consider each of them as it arises. If it tried to do so, Congress would have time for nothing else and would delay the disposal of lend-lease property for years.

Congress' interest in surplus property disposal is not with these operating problems but with over-all policies governing the disposal not only of surplus lend-lease materials but of all surplus war materials. More than 35 bills attempting to lay down principles to guide the solution of this bigger problem have already been introduced into Congress, and more than 15 congressional committees are now studying the problem. I am sure that the Congress will soon pass legislation governing the disposal of all surplus war properties. I am also sure that such legislation will create some agency to lay down policies for all Government agencies holding surplus property and will set up some standards to guide the agency laying down the policies.

The proposed amendment, if adopted, could do nothing but interfere with the development of a sound policy for the disposal of all surplus war properties. It would, in effect, say to the agency responsible for over-all policy that you can set policies for the disposal of all surplus war properties except lend-lease materials, and that the Congress is going to decide how each of hundreds of thousands of pieces of surplus lend-lease material in the hands of each of some 40 lend-lease countries will be disposed of. Such a division of authority could lead only to confusion and divergence of policy. What we need is a unified policy, not a division of authority.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman knows that at the present time there are 35 different resolutions already introduced in the Senate and the House that apply to this one thing, for the disposition of the surplus material of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and lend-lease—and these committees are considering this now. They should dispose of it and make disposition of it all at one time.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman is right. We should have an over-all policy with reference to all surplus war materials, not only with reference to lend-lease material, but with reference to all surplus material used during the war and afterward. The committees of Congress are now working on it. We should not say with reference to lend-lease material, that we have one policy and with reference to other war materials some other policy.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas, like many of the gentleman discussing the other amendment, has failed to discuss the amendment. There is nothing in this amendment that remotely refers to most of the argument that has just been made. So far as material moving with the armies of the world, the Allied forces, this amendment has nothing to do with it whatsoever. This amendment is directed to the final settlement.

As we are situated today, unless we change it, whoever is President will have the right to continue the give-away policy of the goods and supplies of this country that have been wrung from the sweat and toil and sacrifice of the people of this country who are paying these taxes for the colossal and necessary expense and the colossal and unnecessary waste that has obtained throughout our waging of the war. This refers to the final settlement when there will be billions of dollars worth of matériel, not old worn-out tanks and jeeps, but battleships and destroyers, airplanes, and expensive bombers and of everything that we are sending to the four corners of the earth to help win this struggle, and we are going to be left in the position where the final settlement will rest with the President of the United States, and unless Congress takes a different position from what it is taking today on lend-lease, even though there may be 35, yes, 55 resolutions introduced, it seems that

it shall be the will of this Congress, unless they change, that none of them will amount to anything, and this great responsibility will be left in the hands of the Chief Executive, notwithstanding who he may be.

I look upon this resolution as an opportunity of the Representatives of the people and as a responsibility, the solemn responsibility of the Representatives of the people, to protect the interests of the people of this country; a call to the Congress on both sides of the aisle to put themselves in the position where the Congress of the United States finally can and will speak up for the American people and the American Republic who, after all, have gone through such tremendous sacrifices and expenses toward a successful conclusion of the war. It is solely applied in the interest of the people in this country. It is an opportunity to put the Congress of the United States on a parity with the Parliament of Great Britain, and I think that the Congress ought to take this opportunity now to respond to the will and to the protection of the people of this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As we go into the post-war period in an effort to give work to the ten or twelve million men and women who will come back from military service into peacetime endeavors, we will need every pound of scrap iron that is possible for American industry to round up, to feed into the furnaces with the raw ore, because we have to have scrap in order to manufacture steel products. Whether you address it to scrap iron or otherwise, it is worth being brought back to this country in our own ships to maintain employment, instead of having it go for scrap to some other country on a gratuity basis or some other agreed price.

Mr. VURSELL. There is no question but what the gentleman is right. We are not only giving some of the finest flower of American manhood in this war but we are exhausting the natural resources of this country, and this will be an opportunity to get some of that back.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to answer the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just spoke has correctly stated that the gentleman from Texas did not speak to my amendment. My amendment has nothing to do with lend-lease during the war. It is the post-war settlement that my amendment applies to, and I want to make that point absolutely clear in the minds of the Members of the House. It has nothing to do with lend-lease. I voted for lend-lease and I shall vote for this bill, but I do beg and implore you to protect your men, your boys who are fighting today, to make sure that the supplies that are going over there now shall never be used against them to further some other government's interests.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take 5 minutes. I just want to make one or two observations. In the first place, I believe the gentleman from Texas did address himself to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, because insofar as any particular store of military matériel is concerned, there is a final settlement as soon as that is disposed of.

Final settlement does not necessarily mean the last settlement that exists between two or more countries. Final settlement, insofar as any material is concerned, occurs when that material is disposed of, and final settlements are being made with reference to certain military matériel all during the progress of the war. If those final settlements had to be brought back to the Congress for deliberation and action we would not have the settlements made and we would not have the war fought with the efficiency and dispatch with which the war must be fought.

There is no essential difference between this amendment and the amendment that was defeated in the House. The amendment that was defeated addressed itself to a financial accounting. This amendment comprehends material rather than the money which it represents. Remembering that the title to the material in lend-lease remains in the United States, and also that this House has decided that it is not going to bring this final, elaborate accounting back to the House, there is no reason why we have to bring back an assay or estimate of the disposition of the stock pile itself.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me this is a very different amendment from that offered by the gentleman from West Virginia and was so considered when we discussed it when we were writing the report. Of course, the President can bring the material back if he wishes but also he can leave it in foreign countries. I feel that the President—I do not mean the present President, because we do not know how long the war will last—but any President ought to be glad to have the consent and the approval of Congress before he makes final disposition of defense material. I say, the fact that there are 35 resolutions for the disposal of surplus supplies in the Senate and several in the House shows the interest and the way the public feels.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I say in answer to the gentlewoman that I have sufficient confidence in the American people to believe that they are not going to elect a President who will be either so stupid or so unpatriotic as to dispose of the military equipment of the United States in order to help some foreign nation that has malicious designs against us.

There is one more point I forgot to make that the gentlewoman brought out in her argument. She stated that one of the countries might make a separate peace. Is anybody so foolish as to believe that if a country broke its agreement with us by making a separate peace with our enemies it would pay any attention to any law we passed in this Congress as to any equipment it might have on hand at that time?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. May I ask the gentleman if this amendment, that nothing in paragraph 1 of this subsection shall be construed to authorize the President—whether he is one man or another does not make any difference—to enter into any official settlement with respect to the disposition of defense articles in the possession of any government, does not have the practical result of making it physically impossible to dispose of it at all? They will just have to go off and leave it until Congress sees fit to approve.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is right. I can very easily fancy years of debate as to what is going to happen with this stock pile or that. I think from the point of view of efficiency it is extremely unwise.

May I say this in closing: What I am particularly concerned about is that we do not change the rules of the game in the middle of the war and that we do not say to the foreign nations that we have no confidence in our military leaders, and no confidence in the Lend-Lease Administration, and thus very seriously injure the bargaining power of this country in dealing with the great nations of the world.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the lend-lease bill when it comes to a vote, no matter what provisions are put in or left out, but I do not like this idea of saying that we will hurt our war effort by eliminating our bargaining power after the war is over.

I expressed my surprise here about 2 weeks ago when it was stated in the papers that the Treasury Department had come to final agreements with the other nations of the world as to the general policy of post-war financing. We want to keep ourselves in a bargaining position; we want to do our best and our part with all well-disposed nations. But I can see nothing in the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that has anything to do with the present business of lend-lease. After the war is over, we can then take up the matter of our existing lend-lease supplies in various countries and bargain with those countries.

I think that when you gentlemen go home this summer and meet your constituents who have paid their March 15, their June 15, and will pay their September 15 tax bills, and when they know that the public debt of the United States will probably be $300,000,000,000, you will find that they will want to have you keep your finger on everything that belongs to this country. I shall vote for the lend-lease bill to help our war effort. But do not give away your bargaining power around the peace tables.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle-

woman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 94, noes 114.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. BLOOM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 97, noes 124.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: Page 2, add a new section 3:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds of lend-lease or goods under lend-lease shall be used in or given to any nation not actively engaged in war against Germany or its allies: *Provided*, That no part of lend-lease shall be given to any nation unless it promotes and assists our war effort: *And provided further*, That no farm implements or other machinery or goods be given to people of other nations that are essential for our own welfare unless they are essential in our war effort, or unless required to feed and clothe the people of nations occupied by our enemies or recovered from them by the armed forces of the United Nations."

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I feel the time has come to give some thought to our own people, as well as to foreign people. I, too, intend to vote for the extension of lend-lease, but that does not mean I am going to surrender the opportunity of improving it. I believe there is abundant evidence that at least one-third of lend-lease has been wasted and perhaps boondoggled. This in Latin America and other countries. This did not aid the war effort.

The time has come when we must demand that all of lend-lease be used to help in the war effort. Therefore, I have proposed this amendment. This amendment does not interfere with the power of the President nor with his discretion, except that it limits him in using the funds for the purposes for which lend-lease was originally passed, namely, to win the war.

This war is not over; let us bear that in mind. Many more sacrifices have to be made and it is more than possible that it will continue for a year or two. If we continue to wreck our own Nation by useless waste, then we will prolong the war and not shorten it. Let us remember that we constitute about 6 percent of the population of the world. We have less than 10 percent of the raw material of the world, yet we have furnished more than 50 percent of the energy and material that has gone into this war.

When this war is over, it has been estimated we will owe $358,000,000,000, which is almost equal to the entire amount spent in the war effort by all belligerents and it is almost equal to the indebtedness of all the other nations with whom we are engaged in winning this struggle. Therefore, I say, let us protect our own people. Let us protect the financial structure of this Nation, and let us protect the people who are producing the things we need in this war.

We know a great many farm implements have been taken away from our own people and given to foreigners who do not know how to use them. We know a great deal of essential material and manufactured goods that we need for our own use has been given to foreigners and thrown away. In some cases, the semi-civilized natives did not know what use to make of these things. But the time has come, I repeat, for us to think of the American people as well as of foreigners. As long as I am a Member of Congress I shall never forget my responsibility to the United States of America, as well as to the United Nations with whom we are engaged in this war.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think Members ought to specify and particularize when they make charges that one-third of lend-lease has been wasted and one-third has been boondoggled. Those statements are rather dangerous for a Member to make on the floor of the House. I think it is a fine thing for Members to take the floor and specify when they think something is being done that should not be done, or to comment on something they feel should be done, that is not being done, and to make constructive criticisms. We must keep in mind that whatever is done under lend-lease is done with the authority and permission of, and in cooperation with, our military leaders. The gentleman from North Dakota, whom I like very much, and I am speaking temperately, charges one-third has been boondoggled and one-third wasted. Those are serious charges to make with the country at war. Responsible Members make specific charges and then constructively suggest what they think should be done by way of improvement.

The gentleman says the war effort is not over. I agree with him. We all agree to that. All Americans agree with that statement; and yet the gentleman offers an amendment which, if adopted, would have a limiting effect upon the conduct of the war by our military leaders. In no heated sense, but in a most impersonal manner, I make these observations in the hope that future statements of a general nature will not be indulged in or at least that they will be made with restraint, and particular illustrations given. In the case of the gentleman from North Dakota he might give an illustration of where he thinks there is money wasted or where boondoggling is being engaged in. We must remember that the military leaders in the various theaters in which the war is being carried on, pass upon everything that is done.

Certainly, we have confidence in our military leaders. In time of war we must have confidence in them. If they are not doing their jobs, then they must be replaced by somebody who will do the job.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not entering into any controversy with the gentleman. Because of the fact that the gentleman's amendment would have a limiting effect upon the ability of our military leaders to conduct the war, and the further fact which the gentleman so frankly admitted, that the war is not over yet, with which statement I agree, I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MACNUSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution No. 498, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 334, nays 21, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—334

Abernethy	Burdick	Dondero
Allen, La.	Burgin	Doughton
Andersen, H. Carl	Busbey	Douglas
Anderson, N. Mex.	Butler	Drewry
Andresen, August H.	Byrne	Durham
Andrews, N. Y.	Camp	Dworshak
Angell	Canfield	Eaton
Arends	Cannon, Mo.	Eberharter
Auchincloss	Capozzoli	Elliott
Baldwin, Md.	Carlson, Kans.	Ellis
Baldwin, N. Y.	Carrier	Ellison, Md.
Barden	Case	Ellsworth
Barrett	Celler	Elston, Ohio
Barry	Chapman	Fay
Beall	Church	Feighan
Beckworth	Clark	Fenton
Bell	Clason	Fernandez
Bender	Cochran	Fish
Bennett, Mo.	Cole, Mo.	Fisher
Bishop	Cole, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick
Blackney	Colmer	Flannagan
Bland	Cooley	Folger
Bloom	Cooper	Forand
Bolton	Costello	Fuller
Bonner	Courtney	Fulmer
Bradley, Pa.	Cox	Gale
Brehm	Cravens	Gallagher
Brooks	Crosser	Gamble
Brown, Ga.	Cunningham	Gathings
Brown, Ohio	Curley	Gavin
Brumbaugh	Curtis	Gearhart
Bryson	D'Alesandro	Gerlach
Buckley	Davis	Gibson
Bulwinkle	Dawson	Gifford
Burch, Va.	Delaney	Gilchrist
Burchill, N. Y.	Dewey	Gillespie
	Dickstein	Gillette
	Dilweg	Goodwin
	Dingell	Gordon

Gore	Luce	Robertson
Gorski	Ludlow	Robinson, Utah
Gossett	Lynch	Robsion, Ky.
Grant, Ala.	McConnell	Rockwell
Grant, Ind.	McCord	Rodgers, Pa.
Gregory	McCormack	Rogers, Calif.
Gwynne	McCowen	Rogers Mass.
Hagen	McGehee	Rohrbough
Hale	McGregor	Rowan
Hall,	McKenzie	Rowe
Edwin Arthur	McLean	Sabath
Hall,	McMillan	Sadowski
Leonard W.	McMurray	Sasscer
Halleck	McWilliams	Satterfield
Hancock	Madden	Sauthoff
Hare	Magnuson	Scanlon
Harness, Ind.	Mahon	Schiffler
Harris, Ark.	Maloney	Schwabe
Harris, Va.	Mansfield,	Scott
Hart	Mont.	Simpson, Ill.
Hartley	Mansfield, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Hays	Marcantonio	Smith, Maine
Hébert	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Va.
Heffernan	Martin, Mass.	Smith, W. Va.
Herter	May	Snyder
Hess	Merritt	Somers, N. Y.
Hill	Merrow	Spence
Hinshaw	Michener	Springer
Hobbs	Miller, Conn.	Stanley
Hoeven	Miller, Mo.	Stearns, N. H.
Holifield	Miller, Nebr.	Stevenson
Holmes, Mass.	Miller, Pa.	Stigler
Holmes, Wash.	Mills	Stockman
Hope	Monkiewicz	Sullivan
Horan	Morrison, La.	Sumners, Tex.
Howell	Mott	Sundstrom
Hull	Mruk	Taber
Izac	Mundt	Talbot
Jackson	Murphy	Talle
Jeffrey	Murray, Tenn.	Tarver
Jenkins	Murray, Wis.	Taylor
Jennings	Newsome	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson,	Norman	Thomason
Anton J.	Norrell	Torrens
Johnson, Ind.	Norton	Treadway
Johnson,	O'Brien, Ill.	Troutman
J. Leroy	O'Brien, Mich.	Vincent, Ky.
Johnson,	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vinson, Ga.
Luther A.	O'Toole	Voorhis, Calif.
Johnson,	Outland	Vorys, Ohio
Lyndon B.	Pace	Vursell
Johnson, Okla.	Patman	Wadsworth
Johnson, Ward	Patton	Walter
Jonkman	Peterson, Fla.	Ward
Kean	Peterson, Ga.	Wasielewski
Kearney	Pfeifer	Weaver
Kefauver	Phillips	Weichel, Ohio
Kelley	Pittenger	Weiss
Keogh	Ploeser	Welch
Kerr	Plumley	Wene
Kilburn	Poage	West
Kilday	Poulson	Whelchel, Ga.
Kinzer	Powers	Whitten
Kirwan	Pracht,	Whittington
Kleberg	C. Frederick	Wickersham
Klein	Pratt,	Wigglesworth
Kunkel	Joseph M.	Wilson
LaFollette	Priest	Winstead
Landis	Rabaut	Wolcott
Lane	Ramey	Wolfenden, Pa.
Lanham	Ramspeck	Wolverton, N. J.
Larcade	Randolph	Woodrum, Va.
Lea	Rankin	Worley
LeCompte	Reed, Ill.	Wright
LeFevre	Rees, Kans.	Zimmerman
Lemke	Richards	
Lesinski	Rivers	

NAYS—21

Arnold	Knutson	Shafer
Clevenger	Lambertson	Short
Crawford	Mason	Smith, Ohio
Day	O'Hara	Smith, Wis.
Elmer	O'Konski	Sumner, Ill.
Griffiths	Reed, N. Y.	Winter
Jones	Scrivner	Woodruff, Mich.

NOT VOTING—74

Allen, Ill.	Dies	Hendricks
Anderson, Calif.	Dirksen	Hoch
Andrews, Ala.	Disney	Hoffman
Bates, Ky.	Engel, Mich.	Jarman
Bates, Mass.	Engle, Calif.	Jensen
Bennett, Mich.	Fellows	Johnson,
Boren	Fogarty	Calvin D.
Boykin	Ford	Judd
Bradley, Mich.	Fulbright	Kee
Buffett	Furlong	Keefe
Cannon, Fla.	Gillie	Kennedy
Carson, Ohio	Graham	King
Carter	Granger	Lewis
Chenoweth	Green	Maas
Chiperfield	Gross	Manasco
Coffee	Harless, Ariz.	Monroney
Compton	Heidinger	Morrison, N. C.
Murdock	Rolph	Stefan
Myers	Russell	Stewart
O'Connor	Sheppard	Thomas, N. J.
O'Neal	Sheridan	Tibbott
Philbin	Sikes	Tolan
Price	Slaughter	Towe
Reece, Tenn.	Sparkman	White
Rizley	Starnes, Ala.	Willey

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Graham for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

General pairs:

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Compton.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Fulbright with Mr Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr Tibbott.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr Willey.
Mr. Green with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Carson of Ohio.
Mr Manasco with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr Engle of California with Mr Keefe.
Mr. Slaughter with Mr Towe.
Mr King with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Myers with Mr Anderson of California.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Tolan with Mr Chenoweth.
Mr Boykin with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr Fellows.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Stefan.
Mr Jarman with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Monroney with Mr Heidinger.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr White with Mr. Buffett.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered before the Jersey City Real Estate Board in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the New York Sun on April 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. REED of New York and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Flathead Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Washington Post today written by Melvina Lindsay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, following the gentleman from California, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1358) back favorably without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 80) authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to post-war planning.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance

with paragraph 3 of section 2, of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use, 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to post-war planning.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include therein certain governmental information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a letter with which I heartily agree, that is, some of the World War veterans be employed by those in charge of the operation of lend-lease. It is an excellent suggestion and would be very helpful to those veterans and show appreciation for what they have done for us, and their experience would make them very valuable in the administration of lend-lease.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, on April 18 I was granted unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Miles F. Hollister, of Altoona, Pa.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the address will require 3½ pages of the RECORD, the cost of which will be $157.50.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, I be permitted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein the address referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 509), as follows:

Resolved, That CARTER MANASCO, of the State of Alabama, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3257) to amend Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "four" and insert "two."

Page 2, line 16, after "hereof", insert ": *Provided*, That no such agreement or modification shall be entered into in any case where the right to sue the United States has expired at the time of making the agreement or modification unless made within 60 days after the enactment of this proviso."

Page 2, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 2. Whenever the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, finds that a meritorious claim arising on or after December 7, 1941, against the United States, or any agent or employee thereof, for loss of or damage to cargo has lapsed by reason of failure to commence suit against the United States or any agent or employee thereof within the time provided by law, and that such failure to institute suit was based on lack of information not resulting from lack of due diligence, or other causes sufficient in the opinion of the Administrator to excuse such failure to institute suit, the Administrator may compromise, or settle any such claim on the same basis as though the time for suit had not expired: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to extend the time to commence suit."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. BLAND. All of the Senate amendments are restrictive upon the bill passed by the House. In the first place, we provided for an extension of 4 years. The Senate amendment makes it 2 years.

Then there was a question as to the authority of the Administrator to waive the statute of limitations. That was in our bill, but there is a reservation, where they have the right to sue, that it shall be exercised within 60 days. And there is also a limitation on the right to sue the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREST-FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 489 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 45) to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566). That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield to the gentleman from Ohio 30 minutes.

This rule makes in order Senate bill 45, which has been passed unanimously and has been approved by the House committee by unanimous vote. It authorizes the appropriation of $9,000,000 for forest-fire protection and the safeguarding of public as well as State and private forests. It is provided that the $9,000,000 cannot be expended in 1945. The bill limits the expenditures to be made in the years 1945, 1946, 1947.

It is believed by those who are familiar with the situation that this legislation is absolutely necessary, because in the act of 1924, if I recollect correctly, we agreed to match the expenditures of various States for the preservation of our forests. Unfortunately, due to the conditions, the amount that was available was not sufficient to match the expenditures of the States and even that contributed by the private owners of various forest lands.

I believe that this legislation is timely and needed. It has been unanimously passed by the Senate, unanimously reported by the House committee, and consequently the rule making it in order should pass without opposition. In view o the fact that the chairman of the committee will later on explain the provisions of the bill more thoroughly and in detail, I shall not take up any further time other than to say that the rule provides for 1 hour's general debate which, I am informed, will be used in favor of the bill on the part of both the gentlemen representing the majority as well as the minority.

I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who, unfortunately, I think, questioned my action on the floor of the House in giving a hearing at a Committee on Rules meeting on his resolution providing for an investigation of the Office of War Information on a day when he was absent. I was under the impression that the gentleman was always present at meetings of the Committee on Rules but have since learned that he was out of town. I did not take up the resolution that day upon my own volition. The gentleman's colleagues stated that the hearing should go on, and I acceded to the wishes of the majority as well as the minority members of the committee. Therefore, I should not be charged with willfully calling up the resolution when he was not present.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois is again laboring under a misunderstanding and an illusion, because there are a number of reasons why he

should be subject to criticism for bringing up a measure, of which I was the author and the sponsor, before a committee of which I was a member during my absence, especially after I had notified him that I would be away from Washington on official business and requested, as the chairman should remember, that the measure not be brought up during my absence. Of course, once the witnesses were present and were ready to testify, my colleagues did not want to put them to the inconvenience of being called back again, and permitted their testimony to be given the committee. I have read the transcript of that testimony and I expect to call the attention of the chairman again, when the Committee on Rules meets and he is present, that he did transgress the amenities of the occasion.

Mr. SABATH. Of course, that is not admitted on my part.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. However, that is neither here nor there. I wish to speak on the question that is before the House; that is, the adoption of a rule making in order the consideration of S. 45, a bill to amend the Clarke-McNary Act, which was originally passed on June 7, 1924, so as to increase the authorization for appropriations for forest-fire prevention work in the Department of Agriculture from $2,500,000 to $9,000,000 per annum.

In this connection, let me point out that in the last two or three appropriation bills for this purpose the House has exceeded the authorization in the actual appropriation made, and this measure is a corrective one for the purpose of giving authority to the appropriations that will be made in the future and also, if I am correct in my understanding of the situation, to cure any actions that have been taken in the past in making appropriations that were at that time over the authorization.

This bill also carries with it a limitation as to the amount of money that may be expended during the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1945. This limitation is $6,300,000. The limitation is raised each year until the total authorization of $9,000,000 per annum may be reached, if, in the discretion of the Committee on Appropriations and in the discretion of the House, it is found advisable.

I believe this House is well aware of the importance to the Nation of our timber and lumber supply. I believe every Member of this body recognizes the necessity of protecting the forests of America, certainly more so now than ever before, because timber and lumber, the products of the forest, are one of our greatest natural resources, and today, incidentally, one of our rarest resources.

It is of the utmost importance that this legislation be passed so that the Committee on Appropriations and the House in their wisdom may take steps to meet the situation that presently exists in the great lumber industry and throughout our American forests which are such an important part of our natural resources.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Rules upon the request of the Committee on Agriculture, which likewise was unanimous in its endorsement of the bill. I am informed that the bill, S. 45, passed the Senate by a unanimous vote, and I am firmly of the belief that when the measure comes to a vote in the House tomorrow it will be passed by this body by a unanimous or practically unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the following facts for which I had to send out last night were not available in time to present them during the debate on the lend-lease bill, but it seems very important, in view of our relations with Poland, that this correction be placed in the RECORD.

The statement on lend-lease aid to Poland presented by Mr. Crowley and included in the minutes of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs held in March 1944, contains some inaccuracies concerning the help for Polish leportees in Russia. The statement—extension of Lend-Lease Act, H. R. 4254, page 50, and appendix J, page 251—asserts that—

> Arrangements are being made between the Polish Government in exile, the Soviet Union, and the Foreign Economic Administration whereby Polish refugees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be supplied with clothing and foodstuffs. These refugees, who escaped to the Soviet Union from Nazi-occupied Poland, are the families and relatives whose menfolk are now in the Polish armed forces fighting side by side with the Allies. The Soviet Government has indicated its willingness to cooperate in the delivery of these supplies to the Poles.

The fact is, according to the Poles, that there are no Polish refugees in Russia, but 1,500,000 persons forcibly and cruelly deported from their homes in eastern Poland during its occupation by Soviet Russia in the period following the Ribbentrop-Molotov partition agreement and the German attack. The arrangements about lend-lease help for those deportees referred to in the statement as in force at present, had in reality only been working during the short time after diplomatic relations between Russia and Poland had been resumed at the initiative of General Sikorski in July 1941.

Unfortunately, already in the summer and early fall of 1942, the Soviet Government destroyed the relief administration set up by the Polish Embassy in Kuybyshev, and seized huge quantities of lend-lease supplies prepared for distribution among the Poles. After a brief period of improvement in the reciprocal Soviet-Polish relations in the winter of 1942–43, the Soviet Government declared in January 1943, that all the deported Polish citizens had become Soviet subjects.

Since the severance of diplomatic relations with the Polish Government by the Soviets in April 1943 under the pretext of the tragic and mysterious Katyn affair, no help whatsoever has been reaching the 1,500,000 Polish deportees, the majority of whom is constituted by women and children, mostly families of Polish soldiers and prisoners of war.

Since that time, all the supplies have been definitely confiscated by the Soviet Government. What then is the use of concealing in Mr. Crowley's report the truth about the Soviet Government's unlawful procedure of seizing supplies which had been charged to the Polish Government under the lend-lease agreement and to mislead the House of Representatives about this unprecedented breach of international law and custom by a stronger United Nation in its dealings with a weaker one?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the bill—S. 45—which we are now about to consider following the adoption of the pending rule, is designed to authorize Congress to appropriate money annually under the procedure known as the Clarke-McNary cooperative forest-fire protection program in State and private forest lands. The present Clarke-McNary authorization is limited to only $2,500,000 a year, but because of the wartime fire situation last year Congress made available a total of $6,300,000. The bill S. 45 would amend the Clarke-McNary Act by raising the authorization to $6,300,000 for the fiscal year 1945 and gradually thereafter to $9,000,000 a year by 1948. It would more nearly bring the Clarke-McNary limitation into line with the recognized neds of the program. The bill has been passed by the Senate and has been approved by the House Committee on Agriculture. Last year more than 31,000,000 acres of State and private forest and watershed land was burned over in nearly 200,000 separate fires. The monetary damage was estimated at about $44,000,000. Though the cooperative program was begun back in 1912, following the enactment of the Weeks law, the forerunner of the Clarke-McNary Act, there are still 137,000,000 acres of State and private forest land without organized fire protection, and protection within the remaining 290,000,000 acres is far from what it should be. Federal Clarke-McNary money is expended on a dollar-per-dollar basis with the State and with private owners. The record shows that the latter have consistently spent a larger annual total than the United States Government on this program. For example, in 1912, 60,000,000 acres was given protection at an expenditure of $51,000 by the Federal Government and of $237,000 by 11 States. In 1925 the figure was 142,000,000 acres at an expenditure of $399,000 by the United States and $1,884,000 by 29 States.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry, after a Nation-wide investigation, reported in 1941 that the annual cost of adequate protection from fire for the 428,000,000 acres of State and private forest lands would properly be about $18,000,000 a year, and accordingly recommended that the Federal authorization in the Clarke-McNary Act be raised to $9,000,000 in order that the Federal Government might be in a position to share the cost of full protection on a 50–50 matching basis. This $18,000,000 estimate is based on the value of the prewar dollar. The public interest in the protection of these lands is obviously very great. These lands constitute more than 70 percent of all the Nation's forest

land. They contain the best three-fourths of standing timber of the Nation and they provide about 95 percent of the timber supply. Aside from destroying or damaging valuable timber, fires reduce the flow of water in streams for domestic and commercial use and water power and remove the forest cover needed by wildlife. It is also a fact that 50 percent of the forest fires on these lands are caused not by the owners or anything that owners do but by visitors such as hunters, campers, and the like. It is highly important to all of the forest lands in the 48 States that this Clarke-McNary authorization be increased so that additional funds can be provided on a matching basis.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not a fact that very large areas, particularly in our own territory, have been destroyed by fire within the last several years and that a provision of this sort, insuring the protection of the forests, is a most necessary item in our national economy?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is absolutely correct. I would point out to my colleagues in just 1 fire in the State of Oregon, a few years ago, a total of 12,000,000,000 feet of timber was wiped out by fire. To translate that into terms more easily understood, that amount of timber would build 2,000 cities of 5,000 population each.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not a fact also that timber now is one of the critical materials needed in the war effort?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the provisions of this bill. I have always felt that our national forests were one of the great assets of the Nation.

I would like to point out that the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry, of which I was a member, recommended what is substantially the bill before the House. We traveled over the entire country and held public hearings in every forest region, and I can safely say that the majority of the people who testified favored Nation-wide forest-fire protection and completion of the United States Forest Survey.

We found great confusion among those testifying at the hearings with respect to the Nation's timber supply. Even experts on this matter disagreed as to the total remaining volume of timber and the annual growth in our forests. We should have positive information about these matters and H. R. 3848 provides the opportunity.

I understand that much of the work cannot be done until after the war is over but we should prepare now.

Wood is increasing almost daily in its importance and is likely to continue in that direction.

During that investigation I saw perhaps more clearly than I had ever seen before, the necessity for fire protection for our forests. I think one of the most ghastly sights that I witnessed was not so very far out of the city of Portland, where fire had broken out and swept over a most magnificent tract of timber. Those great trees stood there like ghosts. When you consider the length of time it takes to grow a tree in the forest and what a tremendous asset the forests are to the Nation, we can well afford to spend a good many millions of dollars to protect our forests from these fires. There certainly is more danger from fires during a period of war when there is apt to be sabotage than during any other time.

The conservation of our timber supply is also important in view of the depletion of our mineral resources, such as iron ore and other metals. The mines in time will become exhausted. We know what this war is doing to the mineral resources of the country. I was very much interested in an article which appeared in the paper recently which is as follows:

NEW CHEMICAL MAGIC TRANSMUTES SOFTWOODS INTO BEST OF TIMBER

(By William L. Laurence)

A new chemical process that transmutes all types of softwood into wood of any desired hardness, thus providing a chemical magic wand with which hundreds of millions of acres of American forests of pine and other softwoods can be transformed into woodlands yielding the best of timber, was announced yesterday by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

With the new process, it was announced, "poplar becomes harder than hard maple, which in turn can be made harder than ebony." The compressive strength of wood is so increased and other properties imparted by the process to such an extent, it was added, "that the result is actually no longer natural wood, but a new material that may be termed 'transmuted wood.'"

The chemicals used in the process are derived from coal, air, and water. The first step is to use these three for synthesizing ammonia, carbon dioxide, and methanol (synthetic wood alcohol). The carbon dioxide and ammonia react to form urea, a substance widely used as a fertilizer. The methanol yields formaldehyde, which condenses with urea to form a substance named "dimethyl-urea." When the latter is mixed in water with urea and compounds are formed that are known as methylol-urea. These chemicals are the magic wands that can transform softwoods in a few hours into hardwoods that takes nature a hundred years to grow.

Both urea and di-methylol-urea, it was explained, are commercially available and inexpensive chemicals now being produced on a large scale. Both are on allocation by the War Production Board but in the small quantities required for investigation and preliminary tests, "they are available without formal allocation," it was announced.

The new development was described yesterday by Dr. J. F. T. Berliner, and was demonstrated by chemists of the du Pont ammonia department, before a meeting of press and trade representatives at the Waldorf-Astoria, where articles made of the transmuted wood were exhibited for the first time.

The chemicals—white, water-soluble solids—are impregnated by pressure into the structure of wood in a water solution. The methylol-urea, it was explained, reacts with components of wood to form hard, water-insoluble, unmeltable resins within the piece of lumber being treated. Natural acids present in timber start the chemical reaction. Heat, such as kiln drying, speeds the conversion of the methylol-urea into resins within the wood. The change takes place throughout the wood, not just on the surface. The cost is from 3½ to 4½ cents a board-foot.

COLOR IMPARTED THROUGHOUT WOOD

Color also may be imparted permanently throughout the wood by mixing a dye with the impregnating chemical, it was announced.

"Light colored pine," Dr. Berliner said, "can take on the hues of cherry, the glamor of rosewood, or the depth of mahogany, or it may be colored in brilliant reds, greens, or purples.

"Such woods as soft maple, tupelo gum, yellow poplar, a number of the pines, and other woods can be treated to improve their usefulness. They could be used to release hard maple, oak, walnut, and other more desirable and costlier woods. In turn, these woods, too, can be improved.

"Tidewater cypress with its pleasing grain, California redwood with its satin texture and warm red color, and our almost white cottonwood, matching the best bleached woods, are but a few of the examples of the many woods that may now compete on even terms with other species.

"Even sawdust shavings, and similar wood wastes may be molded into articles, and dyes or pigments incorporated. Other cellulose and fibrous products, including cotton, farm wastes, paper, and leather also lend themselves to the treatment. Likewise it is applicable to bamboo and similar cane and fiber materials."

CHEMICALS ADD STRENGTH

The chemical treatment, it was added, "reconstitutes wood to order, even to making it strong enough to substitute for steel in certain machinery parts; it enables industry to create in a few days woods harder than ebony, which nature takes a century to grow."

The new process, for example, permits the construction of doors, windows, and drawers that will not swell and stick, or contract and become loose. Furniture made of the transmuted wood could be shipped throughout the world, to humid tropics or dry areas, without swelling, shrinking, or warping.

Of interest to musicians was the statement that the transmuted woods may be used for musical instruments. It may be that woods could be made to order to match the best that was available to Stradivarius or the other great violin makers of Cremona.

There are now in the United States 50 types of woods that are usable and 1,000 types for which at present no practical use has been found largely because of their softness. To the latter type belong 200,000,000 acres of southern pine forests. With the new magic wand created by chemistry all these vast resources can now be added to raise the standard of living in a victorious post-war America, it was declared.

The du Pont chemists developed the process following a line of research that paralleled studies conducted by the forest-products laboratory of the United States Department of Agriculture.

It goes on to show what can be done with wood as a result of this new process. It is not entirely new, because I recall quite a number of years ago visiting a plant that furnished parts for automobiles, located in the city of Poughkeepsie. The man in charge of that factory had developed through his laboratory a process for treating wood with chemicals and then placing the wood under hydraulic pressure, with the result that he made a wheel for an automobile that would not warp. He came to Washington at that time and took it

up with the War Department. The officials of the War Department said, "You cannot possibly make a wheel for an automobile out of wood that will not warp." He said, "I would like to have you test it." They said they would test it. So he brought down one of those compressed pieces of wood. They soaked it in water, and left it out in the sun and then went at it with an axe, but they could not damage the processed wood. The Ford Motor people and some other automobile concerns took it up and this man had a tremendous output of steering wheels for automobiles that would not warp when exposed to the weather.

But apparently, this du Pont is a somewhat different process. It is very important however, at this time when metals are being used up with such great rapidity, to have this new process developed as a substitute for metal. If there is a process by which timber can be saved to conserve our materials we ought to be able to spend a considerable amount for that purpose.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Does the gentleman realize that the alcohol needed for war should be made from wood waste? There is a project for that purpose actively under consideration by the War Production Board. As a matter of fact, we are using 160,000,000 bushels of grain out of a scarce grain supply for manufacturing alcohol, when wood waste could be used.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I understand that is true. I also understand that through research laboratories in the South they have brought new prosperity to many sections of the country by which soft wood can be manufactured into paper. The lumber is quickly grown in the South.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PALESTINE—CROSS ROAD OF THREE CONTINENTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, some have envisioned the unceasing struggle for the realization of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine as a specialized activity limited to the needs of one particular people. But they have failed to see that the struggle is bitter, precisely because the Jewish national homeland is the acute concern of those nations who now measure, or will measure, their greatness by spheres of influence and the holy concept of the balance of power.

More concretely, Palestine is a link between three continents. Passage through Palestine, through its bordering waterways and land routes make it one of the most strategically placed areas in the Middle East. Britain's control of Palestine has given it a vantage point in the structure of its empire that no other nation among the powers has today. In an analytical article in Harper's for April it has been pointed out by Eliahu Ben-Horin, keen student of the Near East that Russia's veering away from the previously stern anti-Zionist point of view clearly reflects its contemplation of a friendship with Palestine that might help in her age-old struggle for an outlet to the warm seas. France, it must be remembered, reluctantly relinquished spreading her sphere of influence into Palestine, only on the condition that a British mandate would result not in another British acquisition, but in a national homeland for the Jewish people. Germany, again and again has wooed Arabian chieftains, for it is a fat prize, this strategic strip of land of Zion.

Added to the valuable mineral deposits in the Middle East is the reservoirs of oil that have been so greatly in the public eye of late.

In all this teeming activity centered about little Palestine, each interested party has made its stand clear, if not by direction, then by indirection. Great Britain has openly declared its policy of control, set forth in the MacDonald white paper of 1939. It ignored the international ratification of the Palestine mandate which committed it to facilitating the establishment of a national homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine. It flouted the intent and purpose of its own Balfour Declaration. It breached without a by-your-leave the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924. These were the overt acts. More subtly, it strove to set Arab against Jew and Jew against Arab and thus step into the breach. It maneuvered the puppet strings of Arabian governments to protest against any official American approval of the national homeland. It seemingly cultivated a spurious pan-Arabian federation, aware of the impossibility of achievement. It allowed fleeing refugees to drown off Palestinian shores rather than admit more Jews than suited its purpose.

British officials, especially Brendan Bracken, has welcomed criticism of British policies. Such fairness and tolerance gives me confidence to take exception to some of Britain's actions. I have confidence in Britain. I take comfort in the hope that England will finally do justice in Palestine, that England will have a contrite heart.

Russia likewise has played its hand openly as to Palestine. In October 1943 Ivan Maisky, the former Soviet Ambassador to the Court of St. James, visited Palestine, an act of official awareness. Russian Jewry, Mr. Ben-Horin reveals, has been permitted to acknowledge its ties with world Jewry. A Soviet diplomat praised the wondrous achievements in the colonization of Palestine. In January 1944 an exhibition of Jewish colonization in Palestine was on display in Russia. Palestine, the Russians are saying in effect, may yet be our key to the Mediterranean.

France's hold on Syria and Lebanon have weakened. Is Great Britain the logical successor? The question is merely by way of saying that control of the Middle and Near East is one of the problems in which all nations are perforce interested.

Surely, then, in striving for a durable peace, in acknowledging the necessity for close-knit world collaboration in peace as well as in war, the United States cannot crawl into its shell and dismiss Palestine as no concern of hers. It can be no idle lesson for us to have learned that what happens in the blue waters of the Mediterranean, as surely affects us as what happens in the Gulf of Mexico. Our role is that, and rightly so, of seeking no territorial aggrandizement but rather that of winning the fruits of the Atlantic Charter. The United States can ill afford to turn aside as a stabilizing force in the tug of war now being played in the Middle East.

For, caught in this tug of war, is a defenseless people who have been driven from pillar to post for 2,000 years, without the dignity of a homeland, dispersing and settling, knitting the broken strands of life the best it can. For the past 27 years, relying on the promise of a mighty nation, the Jews of the world have redeemed Palestine, restoring where it could, its Biblical richness of soil out of the wasteland, building industry and commerce. As the only successful colonization in our time and without benefit of sword, Palestine has more than earned its place in the sun, not only for the miracles that have been wrought therein, but for its courageous, unstinting pouring out of lives and materials for the Allied cause. Surely, as the only ally in the East, Palestine has merited the generous and fair consideration of the United States and Great Britain.

The United States, officially, has acknowledged its concern over what happens in Spain, in Argentina, in Algiers. It is part of the pattern of war. Palestine is no less part of that pattern, and an official, forthright declaration of American policy is now long overdue.

Secretary of State Hull not so long ago said:

> We cannot move in and out of international cooperation and in and out of participation in the responsibilities of a member of the family of nations. The political, material, and spiritual strength of the free and democratic nations not only is greatly dependent upon the strength which our full participation brings to the common effort, but, as we now know, is a vital factor in our own strength. As it is with the keystone of an arch, neither the keystone nor the arch can stand alone.

Precisely so. The rivalry of nations in the Middle East that casts so ominous a shadow today must not be left to develop and spread. I must emphasize that the United States must not withdraw from the scene. Once having thrown the weight of her approval upon the side of the Jewish national homeland, as she did in 1922 by congressional resolution and in 1924 by a duly solemnized treaty with Great Britain, hers will be the one stabilizing influence, not self-seeking interest, in a storm center.

Unfortunately, after the last war we sought to wash our hands of the mess our

former indifference had gotten us into. It shall not happen again. We are no longer, internationally speaking, in our swaddling clothes; we are full grown and must assume our allocated responsibilities in the world of today.

Doubtlessly, there will emerge from this conflict some sort of comity of nations that will strive for perpetual peace. The coming into power on a cannon top of another Schickelgruber is unthinkable. This comity of nations will control the parceling out of many lands. Neither the attitude of the United States or that of Russia, France, England, or China can be of the possessory kind. There will be many places in the category of no-man's land.

After the last conflict, mandates were offered to England, France, Japan, and the United States. We would have none of it. The fact that Japan swallowed the mandated areas known as the Marshalls, Carolines, and Mariannas has given us food for thought. It has sobered us into the idea that we cannot shrink from our responsibilities. This new League of Nations will undoubtedly reexamine the stewardships of the mandatory powers. What has England and France been doing with and to the former German and Turkish possessions like those in South Africa and the Middle East? We shall call England to account and examine her trusteeship over Palestine. There have been many defaults. The record is not good.

Will Britain be permitted to continue her suzerainty or mandate over Palestine, over Iraq, over Transjordania? Will France be permitted mandated control over Syria and Lebanon? These questions bristle with difficulties. Assuredly, neither France nor England followed the glowing example of the United States in her stewardship over the Philippines. We were "protectors" in the very finest sense of the word.

It has been pointed out that a grievous error has been made by the League of Nations when it granted to a single great power each mandated territory. England and France were the main beneficiaries and, unfortunately, they treated the mandates as though they were rewards for their sacrifices in the war; in fact, they were regarded as the spoils of victory. They assumed the cruel attitude of "divide and conquer." In justification of their attitude of ownership, the nineteenth century self-pitying cry of "white man's burden" was raised. But I am often impelled to ask, "Who is really carrying the burden?"

I humbly present the idea, not new to me, that we may no longer permit one nation like England or France or even the United States to be the sole mandatory power over any land. May we again entrust to one large power the destinies of any people? It may be far better to have several partners in the enterprise, a condominium of nations, two or three. One would act as a deterrent to the other. Such a plan might prevent the subjugation of nations, prevent monopolies of natural resources, permit industrialization, prevent tariff discriminations, and would insure a gradual self-government. I leave the idea with you. I welcome your comments.

As to Palestine, it has been suggested that at the coming peace conference, the United States, Russia, and Great Britain become a condominium of nations to aid in the final establishment of a Jewish commonwealth with due regard to the interests of Arab nations and with uttermost protection to the holy places in Jerusalem.

Such a plan, it is claimed, might preclude the excesses and mistakes of a British Colonial Office. It would open the doors of Palestine to mass Jewish immigration and rescue the remnants of Jews from anti-Semitic forces of Europe. I am not married to the condominium idea. I seek enlightenment. Is not the idea worth exploring?

England has betrayed her trust and pledge. She has violated the mandatory treaty and the Anglo-American treaty of 1924. She has violated the spirit of the congressional resolution of 1922 approving the establishment of a national homeland. She has issued the white paper of 1939 which provoked the displeasure of the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

Deep down in their hearts Churchill and Roosevelt know that the MacDonald white paper of 1939 is a shocking violation of all that is decent and honorable.

Once bitten, twice shy. Should England be permitted to continue her sole control of Palestine? I leave the question with you.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 511), as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES H. TORRENS, of the State of New York be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Census, Elections No. 1, Invalid Pensions, Labor, Rivers and Harbors, World War Veterans' Legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. SMITH of Maine, indefinitely, on account of appointment by Secretary of State Hull as United States Advisor to the International Labor Organization Conference on post-war labor and social service in Philadelphia beginning April 20.

To Mr. DILWEG, for 5 days, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 866. An act to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Wednesday, April 19, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of S. 1767.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, April 20, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 3998, authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions; and H. R. 4517, to remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1441. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated March 14, 1944, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Sitka Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1442. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1443. A letter from the Chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1444. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting revised estimate form of the ceiling unit Office of Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1445. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 142 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1446. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to bring about uniformity and coordination in the allocation of field positions to the grades of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1447. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 11, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Woodbridge Creek, N. J., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 24, 1942; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1448. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 17, 1943, submitting a report, together with

accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Santa Monica Canyon and Kenter Canyon, Calif., which comes within the authorization of the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938, for streams in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties draining the Santa Monica Mountains, Calif., directly into the Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1449. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 11, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Raritan River, N. J., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 27, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1450. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 30, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study at Mission Beach, Calif., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, and an act of Congress approved on June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1451. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting a copy of a summons received by him from the District Court of the United States with reference to papers now in the possession of the House of Representatives with regard to Joseph E. McWilliams and others (H. Doc. No. 538); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4469. A bill to facilitate the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1356. Report on the disposing of certain papers. Laid on the table.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1357. Report on the disposing of certain papers Laid on the table.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to post-war planning; without amendment (Rept. No. 1358). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SATTERFIELD: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4348. A bill to amend the act approved August 18, 1942, entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 4633. A bill authorizing the construction of certain hydroelectric power facilities on the St. Marys River, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 4634. A bill to furnish conscientious objectors a special form of honorable discharge from the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 4635. A bill to provide for the prosecution of claims for supplies for the Military Establishment and United States bureaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4636. A bill to authorize the naturalization and the admission into the United States under a quota of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4637. A bill relating to the posthumous award of the decoration of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 4638. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 265 Joint resolution to reduce the tax on admissions to cabarets, roof gardens, and similar entertainments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 510. Resolution providing for the consideration of House bill 4469; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4639. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Rainger, Diane Rosser, Roberta Rosser, W. H Baker, and Mrs. Katherine D. Wert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DREWRY:

H. R. 4640. A bill for the relief of Robert Lee Slade; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5505. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Josephine McMahon and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5506. Also, petition of Albert Ackrich and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5507. Also, petition of Herman E. Heberer and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5508. Also, petition of C. G. Rose and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5509. Also, petition of Lawrence A. Spatz and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5510. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 3, West Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 87 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5511. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of San Francisco City and County Federation of Women's Clubs, San Francisco, endorsing House Resolution No. 3761, providing full military rank for Army Nurse Corps and others; also providing for and defining an Army Nurse Corps in military department of the Army, adopted March 31, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5512. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. H. H. Moore and 1,103 other citizens of Marshall County, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5513. By Mr. TOWE: Petitions of Josephine Frola, of Fort Lee, and 69 other citizens of Bergen County; Henry Koenig, of West Englewood, and 114 other citizens of Bergen County; Leonard Metzler, of Closter, and 58 other citizens of Bergen County; Anton Andres, of New Milford, and 72 other citizens of Bergen County; Peter Rasmus, of Carlstadt, and 38 other citizens of Bergen County; August Becker, of Coytesville, and 72 other citizens of Bergen County, all of the State of New Jersey, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5514. Also petitions of Farrell's Tavern, of Englewood, and signed by 13 citizens of Bergen County; Plaza Bar and Grill, of Fort Lee, and signed by 73 citizens of Bergen County; T. J. Sakol Association, of Little Ferry, and signed by 77 citizens of Bergen County, all of the State of New Jersey, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5515. By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania Petitions of 200 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., and Delaware County, Pa., opposing House bill 2082 or the passage of any similar legislation imposing prohibition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5516. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Italian-American Labor Council, Inc., New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of a democratic policy toward Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Reverend John F. McCadden, O. P., treasurer of the College of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist, with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude, the President and the Congress of these United States, that their administration may be conducted in righteousness, and may be eminently useful to Thy people, over whom they preside, by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion; by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy; and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of this Congress, and shine forth in all its proceedings and in the laws it frames for our rule and government; so that they may tend to the preserva-

tion of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

Enter into our hearts, O God, and remain with us. Teach us what we are to do, and grant us the strength to do it well. Show us what we must accomplish in order that, with Thy help, we may be able to please Thee in all things; and be Thou alone the author and finisher of all our judgments. Suffer us not to disturb the order of justice, Thou who lovest equity above all things; let not ignorance draw us into devious paths, nor partiality sway our minds; neither let respect of riches or persons pervert our judgment; but unite us to Thee, that we may be one in Thee and never forsake the truth. Inasmuch as we are gathered together as representatives of Thy people, so may we in all things hold fast to justice tempered by mercy, so that in this life our judgment may in nowise be at variance with Thee, and in the life to come we may attain to everlasting rewards for deeds well done. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter, which was read:

APRIL 18, 1944.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to submit herewith my resignation from the following committees, to be effective immediately: Committees on Labor, Rivers and Harbors, Flood Control, World War Veterans' Legislation, Census, Invalid Pensions.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS F. BURCHILL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF STARVING PEOPLES OF EUROPE

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that House Resolution No. 495 reported from the Committee on Rules, submitting a special rule, making in order the consideration of House Resolution 221 favoring action looking to relief of starving peoples of Europe, should be laid upon the table because the resolution No. 221 favoring action for the relief of the starving peoples of Europe was passed on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar on Monday last. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until 12 o'clock noon of Friday, April 21, to file a report of that committee or H. R. 4624.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein portion of a speech made by the Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply, on the subject of aviation in the House of Commons in Ottawa, Canada, on Friday, March 17, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

MRS. MARY McDONOUGH

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which House Resolution 497 was passed on April 12 be vacated because of an error in the name of the beneficiary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this is all about?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] introduced a resolution having to do with the payment of death benefits to the widow of the clerk of the Committee on Revision of Laws. He erred in stating the widow's name. He used the name of the daughter rather than the widow. My purpose, if the proceedings are vacated, is to move to lay the resolution on the table and present a substitute therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

MRS. BARBARA McDONOUGH

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 512), as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Barbara McDonough, widow of Michael J. McDonough, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Michael J. McDonough.

The resolution was agreed to.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING TERMS AND CONDITIONS TO BE IMPOSED UPON OUR ENEMIES FOLLOWING UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs on House Concurrent Resolution 77, requesting certain information from the President.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States, as such, in the execution of this high office, acts in a tripartite capacity, viz: First, as Chief Executive, in charge of the executive and administrative departments of government, and in charge of the enforcement and execution of the provisions of the Constitution and of all laws enacted thereunder by the Congress; second, as the exclusive representative of the Government of the United States in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States, as well as the negotiation of treaties and of other contractual obligations to which the United States shall be a party; and, third, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States; and

Whereas we are now engaged in wars against Germany, Japan, and other nations throughout the world, and in which we are allied with Great Britain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, and other nations of the world, and in which all our resources are solemnly pledged to the accomplishment of a complete victory over our enemies; and

Whereas it is imperative for the general welfare of our Nation and for the common good of our people that the specific terms and conditions to be imposed upon our enemies, following their unconditional surrender, be made known to the Congress of the United States and to the people of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to transmit to the Congress of the United States a communication advising the Congress of the United States of the terms and conditions to be imposed upon our enemies following the unconditional surrender of our enemies, and to include in such communication information as to provisions made for the establishment of peace, and for the creation of appropriate machinery to maintain an enduring peace among the nations of the world.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, who introduced this resolution?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does he know it is coming up at this time?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. He was at the meeting yesterday when it was reported adversely. It has to come up. It is a privileged resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I realize that. The gentleman from West Virginia is present. Is that satisfactory to him?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. It is.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the "whereases" in this resolution be stricken from it.

The SPEAKER. The whole resolution has been laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Very well. I withdraw the motion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Army Times, dated April 15, 1944, entitled "The G. I. Bill of Rights."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein

an article by Constantine Brown appearing in Human Events.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three particulars: First, to state the reason for Mr. KING'S absence yesterday in not voting on the lend-lease bill; second, to include a poem written by the father of a boy killed over Berlin; and third, to include a radio broadcast.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the New York World-Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the American Legion Magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion bill is aptly termed the "G. I. bill of rights." It is on a plane with the democratic foundations of our Government. It has the sincere and overwhelming support of our people. Of this there can be no doubt. A grateful Nation is anxious to do more than praise. Its self-respect demands that these men and women, as they return, shall find realized the security and opportunity which they fought to save, not only for themselves but for us.

Half measures and dilatory tactics will invite the whirlwind of post-war unrest. Let us anticipate and avoid.

The immediate passage of the G. I. bill of rights by this House will inspire millions of our fighting men and women as no other deed can do.

Let us cut across all sectional and party lines to crystallize the unity of America's gratitude.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on James Buchanan, fifteenth President of the United States, by Arthur Cornwall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FLUID MILK PRICE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times yesterday carried an Associated Press dispatch stating that the State agricultural commissioner of New York State had issued an order establishing the price for fluid milk in the Hudson-Mohawk milk marketing area at $4.60 a hundredweight, "regardless of any directive or order of any other agency of government." The same dispatch quoted the Albany district director of the Office of Price Administration as stating that this constituted a direct violation of the ceiling established by the O. P. A.

Mr. Speaker, price control is not a pleasant thing to endure, but the alternatives are far more unpleasant. When the State agricultural commissioner of New York deliberately issues a directive violating our national price control program, he is treading on dangerous ground. It is fair to assume that he would not have done this without the approval of the Governor of that State. Now the Governor in question, who has repeatedly announced that he is not a candidate for the Presidency, seems to be doing right well in obtaining votes for himself at the coming Republican convention. It would be interesting for the American people to know whether or not Mr. Dewey is encouraging his State commissioners to deliberately issue directives calculated to injure our price-control program, or whether he just doesn't know what is happening in his own State.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on May 3, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MANPOWER MOBILIZATION BILL

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REES of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New Pioneer, the only English-language publication for and about Americans of Rumanian descent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, a short while before the vote on the lend-lease bill on yesterday I was called to my office, and when I returned the vote had been completed. If I had been here I would have voted "aye."

REV. ANGUS DUN, D. D.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include as a part of my remarks the text of the consecration sermon delivered by the Right Reverend Bishop Sherrill, of Massachusetts, and a prayer delivered by him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Superintendent of Public Works Charles H. Sells, department of public works, State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MEETING REGARDING INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION PROPOSAL

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to again call the attention of Members of the House to the secret meeting that has been called for tomorrow by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau with the Banking and Currency and other committees of the House relating to the Keynes-Morgenthau international stabilization scheme. It is only through dark secrecy that the promoters of this scheme can ever have any possible hope of putting it through. It would not stand the light of day for a single minute for if the public knew what is being attempted here, they could not possibly hope to finagle the American people into its acceptance.

This thing of the Secretary of the Treasury holding a so-called meeting with the various committees of the House and Senate is a trick to fool the country into believing that Congress is being consulted on this international scheme. The fact is that these meetings are nothing but rump sessions of several committees which, so far as I know, have not individually or collectively any power under the rules of the House or any other authority to formally transact any official business.

I have always demanded that any conferences held by any of our public officials with committees of Congress on the Keynes-Morgenthau international stabilization proposal be in open session so that the press may inform the public of what is actually taking place. I again intend to make the same demand tomorrow when the next secret session takes place. I think every Congressman owes it to his constituents to demand that an end be put to the clandestine manner in which the promoters of this un-American scheme are operating.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON and Mr. SHAFER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

MEETING REGARDING INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION PROPOSAL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, is carrying out his promise to keep all Members of Congress informed. How can it be considered such a secret undertaking when all the members of three major committees of the House, about 75 Members, both Democrats and Republicans, are invited? Where do you see such a sinister scheme in that procedure? It occurs to me to be a very wise and commendable thing to do. I wish all the Cabinet officers would adopt that same policy of keeping advised just as many members as possible of the committees that are concerned with the legislation which they are considering if they have not already done so. I think Mr. Morgenthau is to be commended rather than criticized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury, at his own request, is appearing tomorrow before several committees of the House to make a progress report on the Treasury's international stabilization plan. This meeting follows up the meetings with the Secretary on April 5 and October 5 of last year, and at that time Secretary Morgenthau asked permission to keep the Congress completely informed of every development, although discussions with other nations will remain at technical levels until a final plan is submitted to the Congress for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The meeting was not called by the Secretary of the Treasury. It was called by the Speaker. The Speaker invited these Members to meet the Secretary at the Secretary's request.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right. The Committee on Foreign Affairs was invited to appear there the same as the other committees. There is really nothing secret about it and nothing that is being hidden from the public, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not a fact that when the Secretary appeared before the three committees before he gave out a statement to the press?

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the majority leader what the program is for next week? As the gentleman from Massachusetts well knows, there is a primary in Pennsylvania and the Members would like to know the program ahead of time so that they can make their plans accordingly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to announce the program for next week.

Monday is District day, and District bills of a noncontroversial nature will be called up, with the understanding that if a controversy arises they will be withdrawn.

There is no program for Tuesday, and I shall not assign any bill for consideration on that day.

There is no program for Wednesday, except that there is a possibility that one bill may be considered. I have not been able to discuss it with the Member who reported it from committee, and I do not like to put anything on the program without conferring with the members of the committee reporting the bill. It happens that this Member comes from Pennsylvania, and probably he is doing what I would do if I had a primary next Tuesday, that is, look after my own interest. So I am unable to state now whether or not it will come up on Wednesday, but the probabilities are that it will not come up then. I think it is noncontroversial.

On Wednesday the Interior Department appropriation bill will be reported, and its consideration will commence Thursday. I am unable to state now what time will be allowed for general debate, because, as the Members know, as to that I accept whatever the members of the committee agree upon. Whatever time for general debate they agree upon is always agreeable to me. Whether the general debate will run for 1 or 2 days I am unable to state now, but the bill will be brought up Thursday.

That is the program I am announcing now. Any bills that are brought up other than that will have to be considered by unanimous consent. There will be nothing controversial on Monday, nothing on for Tuesday, and if there is anything on for Wednesday it will not be controversial.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us when we may expect the so-called veterans' bill to be brought in?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to give that information. I see the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is here. Perhaps he can give us some information on that.

Mr. RANKIN. I would be delighted to. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we are now in executive session on that bill, which is probably the most explosive and most far-reaching measure of its kind ever proposed in Congress. We are going over it line by line and paragraph by paragraph. We had General Hines and Colonel Ijams before us this morning.

This measure has some provisions in it that are very disturbing to a large number of Members of the House. We are not going to be stampeded into bringing in a half-baked measure and force the House on record on it.

There is one provision in that bill that is extremely disturbing to me. It provides for unemployment compensation for all unemployed veterans of from $60 to $100 a month for 12 months after discharge. That is to the exclusion of men who find or make employment and go back to work. It would cost probably five or six billion dollars in that

form, and might drive a wedge into the ranks of the men who are now fighting the battles of this Nation, without consulting them, by discriminating against the man who does go back to work and encouraging other men to stay on the unemployment rolls.

We are doing our best to work out a sane measure, and as I said we are not going to be stampeded.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am merely seeking information as to when the bill will be brought up.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts is not trying to stampede us. If you could see the C. I. O. propaganda that is piling in here from the same crowd that is raising money to try to defeat Congressmen, you would realize the pressure that is being inspired and brought to bear on the Members of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The chances are that it will not be brought up next week?

Mr. RANKIN. No; it will not be brought up next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish to announce also that a week from Tuesday there will be the primaries in Indiana, and in making up the program I shall have regard for that situation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We appreciate that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, on the 18th of this month the Washington Star contained a very fine editorial upon the subject of lease-lend rumors. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein that editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Westmoreland Observer published in Greensburg, Pa., taking to task a lot of demagogs and Communists for their taking up the time of the Congress of the United States prating about an anti-poll-tax law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FOREST-FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 45, to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566), the consideration of which was made in order by the rule that was agreed to yesterday, be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566), is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of Agriculture shall expend such portions of the appropriations authorized herein as he deems advisable to study the effects of tax laws, methods, and practices upon forest perpetuation, to cooperate with appropriate officials of the various States or other suitable agencies in such investigations and in devising tax laws designed to encourage the conservation and growing of timber, and to investigate and promote practical methods of insuring standing timber on growing forests from losses by fire. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not more than $9,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That the appropriation under this authorization shall not exceed $6,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, $7,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and $8,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the object of this legislation is to further protect our private and State-owned forest lands from fire by increasing the Federal aid provided for in section 3 of the Clarke-McNary Act.

The bill was recommended by the Department of Agriculture, cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, unanimously passed by the Senate, and after full hearings and careful study unanimously reported by the House Committee on Agriculture with an amendment that in no way affects the aim and object of the Senate bill. Moreover, the legislation has not only the approval but the active support of the Department of Interior, the United States Forest Service, the American Forestry Association, the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, the State foresters of the respective States, and the National Grange, and the American Farm Bureau.

Now, permit me to make a brief statement as to the origin of this legislation, what it has accomplished, and the urgent necessity for the increase of Federal funds.

Back in 1924 the Congress passed what is known as the Clarke-McNary Act. Section 3 of the act authorized an annual appropriation of $2,500,000, to be used in matching State and private funds upon a 50–50 basis, the combined Federal, State, and private funds to be used in the protection of State and privately owned forest lands from fire. The wisdom of this legislation is now recognized by all. Substantial and worth-while results have been obtained in that damage from fires in the protected areas has been greatly reduced. The record shows that about 1 percent of the protected forest areas burn annually against 16 percent of the unprotected areas. The urgent need, of course, is to extend the protection to all of the forest lands.

In acreage there are approximately 426,000,000 acres of State and privately owned lands. Today approximately 282,000,000 of these acres are being protected, which is about two-thirds of the total acreage. This leaves 144,000,000 acres unprotected, or in percentage around one-third of the total acreage. From these lands come about 95 percent of our national timber cut.

Forty-two States and Hawaii are now cooperating under section 3 of the Clarke-McNary Act. And to show how effective the law has worked, let me call attention to the fact that during the past year fires on the unprotected one-third forest lands were responsible for losses aggregating $28,428,786, while only $8,742,267 worth of timber was destroyed on the protected two-thirds forest lands. These facts show that had it not been for the Clarke-McNary law, last year our losses from fires on State and privately owned lands would have been $85,286,358 instead of $37,171,053.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The States—42 out of the 48 States are participating in the program—and private timber owners are clamoring for the enactment of this legislation. Of the $11,165,326 used last year for forest protection on the State and private forest lands, the States and private owners contributed $8,465,320 and the Federal Government $2,700,006. A conservative estimate for adequate protection on all of the lands is $18,500,000. The Senate amendment provides for $9,000,000 of this amount, changing the authorization in the Clarke-McNary Act from $2,500,000 to $9,000,000, and provides for the immediate use of the increased authorization. The House committee, after thorough hearings, while it agreed that the authorization should be increased to $9,000,000, was of the opinion that the increase should be brought about in an orderly manner. The committee, therefore, added an amendment to the Senate bill to the effect that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, the appropriation should not exceed $6,300,000; for the year 1946, $7,300,000; and for the year 1947, $8,300,000. The United States Forest Service concurred in this amendment. It is thought that this orderly increase will permit the Federal Government to watch State and private funds.

While the authorization provided for in this legislation is exclusive of and in addition to the authorizations for the protection of the national forests, it should be kept in mind that forest fires know no boundaries. Fires that start on State or privately owned lands spread to adjoining federally owned lands. The

protection of State and privately owned lands, therefore, assures added protection for our national forests.

I unhesitatingly recommend the passage of this legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As a Representative from one of the Western States we feel this bill is of great importance and it is gratifying to me to have the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] present it as well as he has. I would like to call to the attention of the House that it was unanimously reported by our committee.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is correct. I thank the gentleman from California.

Before I close, may I be permitted to make a few observations with reference to the program in Virginia. We have a wide awake and efficient State Forester and he has been doing a good job. He is deeply interested in this legislation and made a splendid witness when he appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture. Our Virginia situation is about this: We have 14,832,000 acres of forest lands, which is about three-fifths of our total land acreage. Of this forest acreage approximately 13,250,000 acres are privately owned and State owned. To break this ownership down further, let me state that the State owns around 40,000 acres, the farmers around 7,000,000 acres, and the balance is owned by lumber and pulp companies and other individuals other than farmers.

This, of course, presents a tremendous problem of proper land use. Apparently its greatest potential value is for the production of successive forest crops. Our farmers, who own approximately one-half of our forest lands, will continue down through the years to derive a considerable annual income from the sale of forest products, provided the forests are protected from fire and sound forest practices are followed in cutting and reforestation.

At present approximately 80 percent of our non-Federal forest lands are under some degree of State organized fire control, leaving 20 percent unprotected. The unprotected areas are, of course, great fire hazards to the protected areas, and if this great hazard is removed and these unprotected areas brought up to their fullest productive capacity, fire control must be extended to our entire forest area. This is the goal toward which we are striving in Virginia.

In Virginia we have been expending between $150,000 and $250,000 per year, depending on the severity of the fires, in forest-fire protection. Our Federal allotment has been around $50,000. Last year, for instance, Virginia appropriated $101,000, the Federal allotment under the Clarke-McNary Act was $51,000, and the balance was put up by companies and individuals.

I merely make this statement showing the situation in Virginia in order to record that our people are deeply interested in complete fire-protection coverage. My opinion is that the sentiment in Virginia is but indicative of the sentiment in practically all the States.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great compliment to the American people that they have been and are as nearly unanimous in the support of the war effort of our country as it is humanly possible for a great population to be. All of us are inclined to think that we are doing our part yet when we see how much more some persons are doing than we are doing, we are not so sure that we are doing our best.

One of the most striking illustrations of this fact is being demonstrated every day in one of the cities of the district I have the honor to represent.

Mrs. Ernest McGraner, who lives in Athens, Ohio, has almost single handed carried on a work which would seem to be almost beyond the endurance of any human being. She began this work upon the most patriotic impulse and without any hope of the Nation-wide fame that has come to her. She now has soldiers, sailors, WAC's and WAVES in all parts of the world who know her and love her for her untiring efforts to serve them.

Now let me tell you her story. The main east and west line of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad runs through Athens, Ohio. Practically all passenger trains going either way must stop at this station for coal and water. The telegraph agents, about 1 hour's ride either side of Athens, wire Mrs. McGraner of the approach of troop or hospital trains. Mrs. McGraner meets these trains whether it be 3 o'clock in the afternoon or 3 o'clock in the morning. She has met every troop train and hospital train that has passed through that city since the movement of troop trains began. She and her assistants go through these trains while they are being serviced and supply the troops with magazines, post cards, playing cards, song sheets, and so forth. This service has been so greatly appreciated by the troops that all over the world she is now known as the Athens magazine lady.

Mrs. McGraner began this work by herself and carried it on for a time by herself. But her work was so much appreciated by the troops and the demands on her became so heavy that local persons recognizing these facts volunteered to help her. Up to March 1, 1944, she had distributed 235,000 magazines, 27,000 post cards, 11,741 decks of playing cards and 3,500 song sheets. Since that time her work has increased. This great supply of magazines and other literature has been pouring in on her from all the neighboring counties and from all over the country. Interested persons and societies and patriotic organizations have taken an interest in securing material for her. She is now a fixed institution doing a thriving business without any compensation except the love and affection that the armed forces of the country bestow upon her and the high regard that all patriotic people have for her and the great service that she has rendered so humbly and so sacrificially.

She began this work meekly and she has carried it on with appropriate dignity. Many letters and messages of praise and commendation which she has received from grateful members of the armed services all over the world and from persons and organizations high in official and civil life, encourage her to continue in her splendid work.

As her Representative in Congress I most sincerely add my praise and compliments and I call her efforts to your attention with a glowing pride.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of adequate fire protection is a subject worthy of serious consideration by this body. Fundamentally, it is basic to safeguard and perpetuate one of our very important natural resources—the forest. Many present no doubt question why it is necessary to expend large sums for the prevention and suppression of forest fires.

It is important that everyone fully understands and appreciates the need for providing a sufficient sum of money to insure the adequate protection of our forest resources. We have in this country today some 137,000,000 acres of forest land without any organized fire protection whatsoever, and in addition much of the forest land already under organized protection is not adequately protected.

A review of fire records and fire statistics indicates that the annual damage from forest fires is far in excess of the cost of adequate protection. Then, too, these same statistics reveal that by far the greatest percentage of forest fires are man-caused. This points to the fact that the bulk of the people in this country do not yet realize the seriousness of willfully or carelessly setting fires promiscuously throughout our forest areas. All of which means that these same people are not aware of the damage which is incurred by the timberland owners and the Nation as the results of such fires.

I think it is logical to assume, and statistics strengthen the assumption, that the timberland owners, as a rule, do not destroy their own property by the careless use of fire. It is the general public that has access to these timberlands for hunting, fishing, picnicking, and so forth, that through carelessness unleash the ravages of fire. And it is these people that must be educated to the necessity of outlawing fire.

To accomplish this objective we must provide for well-financed State forestry agencies organized with trained personnel and adequate equipment for the suppression of forest fires. This program of suppression must be proceeded by an intensive educational program designed to acquaint the public at large with the need for prevention and control of forest fires with emphasis on what the perpetuation of the forest will mean to the

Nation, to the State, and to the individuals. The responsibility of the Federal Government in this program is indicated by the action of the joint congressional committee in recommending an expenditure of $9,000,000. I strongly recommend immediate passage of S. 45 authorizing this increased expenditure for forest-fire prevention and control.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman, and I believe the gentleman will concur with me, that this bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture, and that committee feels it should be passed unanimously by the House of Representatives in the interest of conservation of our forestry lands throughout the country.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is correct. The Committee on Agriculture was unanimous in supporting this authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, everyone who lives in a mountainous or timbered country will hope that this bill passes. For each one knows the truly terrible threat that comes with a forest fire, and knows the unwritten code that brings every available man to fight the fire when the word goes out that the wind has shifted and made a small blaze one of great danger. During the recess last summer I was on a fire line for the first time, I think, in about 10 years. I was impressed by the improvement in tactics that the Forest Service has developed, and the speed with which the Rangers taught teamwork to new recruits. I was also interested in the equipment that they made available for amateurs like myself, little pressure tanks that a man could carry on his back, with a nozzle to direct a small stream upon a smoldering rotten log or batch of needles with force. Even the combination rake and hoe seemed to me to be far more efficient than the tools that we had 10 years ago.

Our forests have increased in value. During the war we have learned anew how important they are as a national resource. We no longer can look with complacency on any blaze. They do not represent merely so much timber or lumber; they are a part of the national security itself. I hope this bill passes by an overwhelming vote.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PANEL OF CONGRESS FOR AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS

Mr. CASE. I have been asked to call attention to an unusual meeting that will take place tomorrow night. The American Society of Newspaper Editors is meeting in Washington. In previous years they have met with the President or with some of the executive agencies of the Government. This year Mr. Alexander F. Jones, managing editor of the Washington Post, who is chairman of the local entertainment committee, conceived the idea that it would be profitable to have a meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors with the legislative branch of the Government, with Congress.

So tomorrow night at 8 p. m., in the Senate caucus room, they will meet with a panel of Members of Congress, with Mr. Roy Roberts, publisher of the Kansas City Star, and president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, presiding. The panel discussion will be on the general subject of the legislative branch of the Government and on proposed changes in rules and organization procedures of the Congress, in particular.

The announcement which was handed me with reference to the panel reads, as follows:

Members of the panel from the Senate will be Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming; Senator FRANCIS MALONEY, of Connecticut; Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., of Wisconsin; and Senator JOSEPH H. BALL, of Minnesota. Members of the panel from the House will be Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri; Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma; Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; and Representative FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota.

Mr. Jones also says, "We hope as many Members of Congress will join us as can possibly attend."

It is to be hoped that we may have a reasonably good representation from the House of Representatives, because I am sure the members of the panel will appreciate the questions and points that will come up if there is a good sprinkling of the Members of the House among the Society of Newspaper Editors as they sit there tomorrow night. No doubt the leading editors from your State will be there and you will want to be with them.

Incidentally I might say in behalf of myself and other members of the panel if you have any suggestions of the topics you would like to have discussed, your suggestions will be appreciated at any time between now and 8 o'clock tomorrow evening in the Senate caucus room. I hope everyone may make some contribution, either by his suggestion or presence, to insure that this unusual meeting is one of pleasure and profit to the American Society of Newspaper Editors attending this annual meeting in Washington.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

THE PRO FORMA AMENDMENTS WERE WITHDRAWN

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, it is very gratifying to see no apparent opposition to this bill. This bill, it seems to me, is a tremendously important one. It is important to protect our national resources of lumber and the other resources which are protected by the shield and cover of lumber, equally as important as it is to furnish fire protection for the protection of our homes and communities. I wish to present a few brief arguments in behalf of the passage of this bill.

Since 1912, the Federal Government has shared under a dollar-for-dollar matching arrangement with the States and private forest landowners in protecting their lands from fire.

This program was begun following passage of the Weeks law in 1911, and was strengthened through enactment of the Clarke-McNary law in 1924.

Today, 42 States and Hawaii have joined with the National Government in protecting 291,000,000 acres from forest fire, Federal expenditures in 1943 amounting to $4,624,154, and State and private expenditures totaling $9,127,000.

But there still remains without organized protection of this kind 137,000,000 acres of forest and watershed lands in State and private ownership, while protection on a considerable amount of the area with organized protection is far from adequate.

Estimates based on the pre-war dollar are that to do the full job of protecting the total of 428,000,000 acres of these lands will require annual expenditures of at least $18,000,000. In fact, recommendation for an $18,000,000 program, the expense to be shared on a 50–50 basis between the Federal Government and the States and private owners, was included in the report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry in 1941.

However, the present Clarke-McNary Act, under the authority of which the present cooperative forest-fire-protection program is carried on, limits the amount that can be appropriated by Congress for this purpose to $2,500,000, which, as things now stand, is a serious handicap to full protection of these lands.

Senate bill 45 is an amendment which would increase this authorization to the $9,000,000 figure recommended by the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry, increasing the authorization to $6,300,000—the amount expended this year in Clarke-McNary and war-emergency funds—for the fiscal year 1945, and gradually up to $9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948.

These lands comprise 70 percent of all forest lands in the United States. They include three-fifths of the Nation's saw timber, and provide more than 90 percent of the timber supply.

But that they are the chief source of the timber and forest-products supplies of the Nation is not the sole reason why the public welfare demands that the Federal Government share in protecting them from forest fires—forest fires that annually burn over about 30,000,000 acres with monetary damage estimated at $44,000,000.

The further fact is that 50 percent of these fires are started by citizens and others not owners of the lands but visitors, such as hunters, campers, and the like.

And further still the public would suffer—and does suffer—huge handicaps where the forest cover is burned from these lands, because maintenance of the forest cover is directly tied up with continuance of water flow for domestic and commercial use and for water power. Also protection of the forest cover is a protection against floods, soil erosion, and silting of streams and reservoirs. It

also safeguards the public's opportunity for outdoor recreation and protects wildlife.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to support the pending bill.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to point out a situation in my district which presents a most deplorable condition, and which bids fair to threaten the very future of the community in which I live.

I refer to the fact that there are available no hides from which to make shoes. The shoe business is the very supporting industry of my district; and in the community in which I live the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Corporation has for years been the bulwark of the community in its economic set-up. You will be interested to know from my observations taken on a tour I made of the Endicott-Johnson plants last summer that the tanneries have not enough hides so they can operate and produce the leather to fill the shoe quota they have already been called upon by the Government to manufacture. I speak of military and civilian needs they have been ordered to fill. So, Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to point out that 83,000,000 cattle are today on the hoof throughout the entire country, yet due to the mismanagement of certain bureaus and agencies of the Government an insufficient number of cattle has been slaughtered to supply enough hides to manufacture the shoes which must be made in order to meet the Army orders and bare civilian needs.

It is about time that O. P. A. and W. P. B. got together and ordered the slaughter of at least 4,000,000 cattle so there will be enough hides for the industry to take care of the military and civilian shoe needs of the country. Not long ago I introduced a resolution which would call for an investigation of those agencies to find out why they have not taken steps to see that sufficient hides are made available.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Since the gentleman from New York introduced his resolution on this subject I have conferred with some of the leaders in the tanning industry to find out why they are not delivering more leather to the Endicott-Johnson Co. and other companies. I am informed that there is a shortage of essential labor in the tanneries in this country so they are not able to tan all of the hides they can get for leather purposes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will ask the gentleman to join me if it is at all possible for him to do so to take a tour through the Endicott-Johnson tanneries and shoe factories. He will change his mind after he has gone through the shoe factories and will conclude that there is enough labor, particularly in the tanneries, to tan and to cure a great many more times the number of hides that have been made available. I assure the gentleman that sufficient labor is available, the only problem is to get the hides.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If there is any trouble over manpower we should take it up with Mr. McNutt.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not agree that there is any trouble as far as manpower goes from the standpoint of my community, because both men and women are employed in these tanneries and factories.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman says about his community applies with equal force to the entire tanning and shoe industry of the United States.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not prepared to speak for the entire shoe industry throughout the country, but I can vouch for this much, that in the triple city area—Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott—labor is not the immediate problem. The reason the Endicott-Johnson Co. has not been able to continue the production of civilian and military requirements is the fact they have been prevented from getting enough hides from either domestic or foreign sources. There was some discussion about Argentinian hides being brought in, but they were not able to get any.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of the bill S. 45 and it is of great importance to my State.

Washington has a total of 11,315,000 acres of State and private forest land very nearly all of which are receiving some form of organized protection from fire under the Clarke-McNary cooperative program. This land has high actual and potential value for producing forest crops.

In 1942 a total of 1,246 fires were reported, burning over 29,897 acres. Corresponding figures for the 5-year average 1936–1940 were: 1,727 fires with 72,308 acres burned.

Under present limitations in the amount authorized to be appropriated by the Clarke-McNary Act, the amount contributed by the Federal Government represents a relatively small percent of total necessary expenditures (9 percent in 1942).

With more adequate Federal appropriations this percent would approach the 50–50 sharing authorized by the Clarke-McNary Act. Under the existing limitation it is impossible to provide Washington with a reasonably adequate Federal allotment and at the same time give to States which are financially weak, or where the work is initiated under great handicaps, the support without which protection work vital to the public interest would be discontinued or not undertaken.

I yield back the balance of my time.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 45 is to increase the authorization for cooperative forest-fire protection on non-Federal lands, as provided for under the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924, to $6,300,000 for the fiscal year 1945 with gradual annual increases up to $9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948.

The Clarke-McNary law authorizes Federal participation on a matching basis with the States and landowners in protecting State and privately owned lands from forest fires. Forty-two States are cooperating in this program, which involves 428,000,000 acres or 70 percent of all forest lands. About two-thirds of these acres are now under organized protection, while one-third is without protection due primarily to lack of funds. Last year nearly 200,000 fires occurred on these lands, burning over 31,000,000 acres, and causing damages conservatively estimated at about $44,000,000. This needless national loss can and should be reduced. To withhold the funds needed to meet the forest-fire problem is false economy.

The authorization under the act set up in 1924 at $2,500,000 was based on a much lower appraisal of fire protection needs than is now considered essential. Based on a pre-war estimate, it will cost at least $18,000,000 a year to do an adequate protection job.

The States and landowners cooperating in the project are now contributing more than half that amount and they ask and believe that the Federal Government should contribute the other half or $9,000,000. Due to the wide public benefits derived from forests, this would be a wise expenditure of public funds and will pay handsome dividends. It would represent a Federal expenditure of only a little over 2 cents an acre.

This bill has the effect of bringing the Clarke-McNary Act up to date. Under this act the States and the owners of privately owned forest land must match in each State the Federal expenditure for fire protection. At the time that the Clarke-McNary Act was passed in 1934 and for some time thereafter State and private expenditures were less than the $2,500,000 authorization. State cooperation, however, has increased rapidly in recent years and for the fiscal year 1943 State and private expenditures increased to something over $9,000,000. Total Federal expenditures for the fiscal year 1943 were $6,300,000.

When the bill was under consideration by the House Committee on Agriculture it was stated by the Forest Service that they were not immediately prepared to expend up to $9,000,000. The committee, therefore, amended the bill to provide that the amount authorized should be stepped up gradually from $6,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, to $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for each year thereafter.

There are some who might raise the question as to why the Federal Government should participate in a program of fire protection for State and privately owned forests. That question, as far as the matter of policy is concerned, was settled by the passage of the Clarke-McNary Act, but it might be well at this

time to briefly summarize why the Federal Government is justified in participating in this program.

In the first place, fires which originate in private or State forests cannot be confined there. They greatly endanger adjacent national forests. In the second place, the public has a great interest in our forests, no matter under what character of ownership they are held. The protection of our forest resources is a matter of national concern. The destruction of valuable timber, whether privately or publicly owned, means the loss of a great national resource which cannot be replaced for many years, and which may never be replaced. In the third place, protection of forests is tied up with soil and water conservation, including navigation, water power, and irrigation. Forest fire protection is intimately related to the prevention of floods and soil erosion. Then, again, forestry is tied up with wildlife conservation and with the development of recreational facilities.

Furthermore, most of the fires which start on privately owned land are started by people who have gone on the land for recreational and similar purposes. This constitutes a hazard for which the landowner, when subject thereto, should not be held entirely responsible.

This legislation met with the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Agriculture. It was recommended by the Special Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry, which made a thorough investigation of our forest resources a few years ago. It has the support of conservation and forestry organizations everywhere and of the Association of State Foresters. No one appeared before the Committee on Agriculture in opposition to this measure and I have heard no opposition anywhere. The passage of this measure will mark a great step forward in conservation of our forest resources.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, the interests of my district are so diverse and numerous that I find it necessary to appear on the floor of the House here practically every day. I am pleased to approve the bill now under consideration which affects my State, and especially my district which is one of the most important timber-producing areas of Louisiana. I have received many letters from my constituents asking that I support this legislation. I have also received a number of telegrams calling my attention to the interest of Louisiana and my district in this bill, foremost being one from the commissioner of agriculture and the commissioner of conservation of the State of Louisiana, Hon. Joseph L. McHugh, which reads as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Washington, D. C.:

Have been informed that S. 45 and H. R. 3848 will be presented to the House at an early date. We wish to direct your attention to previous wires and correspondence from this office expressing Louisiana's interest in the passage of these bills with particular reference to S. 45. Passage will enable Louisiana to greatly advance her forestry program. Your cooperation is appreciated.

JOS. L. MCHUGH,
Commisisoner of Conservation.

Mr. Speaker, Louisiana is interested in all of the provisions of S. 45, but most particularly in the protection of our forests and timberlands from the menace of fire.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Members of the House at this time to certain figures I have obtained from the Department of Agriculture with respect to losses on timber lands from fires in the United States as follows:

The Agricultural Department reported today that forest fires destroyed 31,854,124 acres of woodlands last year, at a loss of $45,000,000.

There were 208,218 fires, an increase of 8,516 over the previous year. They destroyed 5,449,739 acres more than in 1941.

Loss of experienced fighters because of the manpower shortage, and adverse weather conditions were the chief causes of the year's increased damage, the report said.

Ninety percent of the total areas burned, or 28,531,119 acres, were in 11 Southern States; the Eastern States lost 1,362,894 acres; North Central States, 263,221 acres; and Pacific States, 573,469.

The Department said there had been a sharp rise in incendiary forest fires during the year. Nearly one-third of all fires on protected lands were of that character. In the South, it is said, a large percentage of the incendiary fires resulted from "traditional but misguided woods burning practices."

Fires caused by smokers ranked second in frequency, and careless burning of debris was third.

Lightning caused 6,707 fires; railroads, 5,020; campers, 3,398; smokers, 18,248; debris burning, 13,944; incendiary, 26,571, and lumbering 1,336.

Louisiana's woodlands represent one of her most important resources. Perpetuation of this resource in a production condition is essential to the well being of her people. Despite excellent practices on a small proportion of her forest land, wartime timber cutting is causing serious deterioration in the condition of a large proportion of her wooded area. To maintain this vital resource in an adequately productive state, there must be a tremendous improvement in cutting practices. Educational work and technical assistance on a greatly increased scale is essential. In addition, Forest Service experience points to the need for certain public controls which will insure continued productivity on lands the owners of which would not otherwise keep them productive.

Mr. Speaker, last year the State of Louisiana from one of the national forests in the State returned to the Federal Government $224,313 from timber saved in that area.

The State of Louisiana is one of the most important lumber and timber-producing States in the United States and is contributing largely in that respect to the war effort, therefore is very much interested in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will have a favorable vote on the same.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said, there is no opposition to this bill. It is very important from two standpoints, first of all to preserve a very important industry throughout the United States and particularly in those States of the Far West and the South; secondly, it is important from the war standpoint, in that lumber products, a very critical material, are now very much needed in the prosecution of the war. One disastrous fire will consume property values far in excess of the amount of the appropriation authorized by this bill.

I think it is very fortunate to find today unanimity of opinion in support of a measure of this sort. It was very unfortunate when we had the matter up in the House before that we were restricted by reason of parliamentary procedure so that we could not make adequate appropriations for fire prevention in forests at that time.

As many of you know, the State of Oregon, a portion of which I have the honor to represent, is a very heavy timber-producing State, one of the greatest in the Union, as a matter of fact. Forestry and industries using forest products are the major industries of our State; therefore, we are naturally most interested in the passage of this law in order that we may have adequate protection for this great industry.

Mr. Speaker, S. 45, the bill now under consideration, has for its purpose the amendment to section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924, generally known as the Clarke-McNary Act for cooperative forest-fire protection. It is a very meritorious measure which I am happy to support and I hope that every Member of the House will likewise give it his support.

Under the Clarke-McNary Act the appropriation is limited to $2,500,000 a year, which is wholly inadequate as a contribution by the Federal Government in a cooperative effort to protect forests. Under the amendment this authorization is raised to $6,300,000 for the fiscal year 1945, with accrued increases thereafter equaling $9,000,000 a year by 1948. As you know, the bill has been approved, I understand, unanimously by the Senate and has the approval of our own Committee on Agriculture.

As pointed out by my colleague yesterday, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], last year more than 31,000,000 acres of State and private forests and watershed land was burned over in nearly 200,000 separate fires. I call your attention to the fact that each year forest fires destroy property valued at thirty to forty-five million dollars and in bad fire years the damage has exceeded one hundred million. Fire prevention and the suppression of forest fires is a cooperative effort between Federal Government, the States, and private owners. During the fiscal year 1942 the States and private owners expended $8,465,320. In the same year the Federal Government under combined cooperative and emergency provisions expended $2,700,006, thus making a total expended from all sources of $11,165,326, which is about 4 cents for each acre under protection, as pointed out by the committee. I should point out that these expenditures are exclusive of and in addition to those appropriated for the protection of the national forests owned by the Federal Government. There are

426,000 acres under State and private ownership, which are generally recognized as in need of organized forest protection in the 42 States and Hawaii now cooperating under the act of June 7, 1924. This protection, however, is only given to 282,000 acres under existing laws and funds made available for that purpose, which leaves a third of the forest area without protection. As pointed out by the Senate committee in its report, during the past year, fires on the unprotected forest lands resulted in loss aggregating $28,428,786, while only $8,742,267 of timber was destroyed on the protected lands.

It is a short-sighted policy for the Federal Government to refuse to give full cooperation with the States and with private owners in affording full protection to our forests, which constitute one of the greatest natural resources still remaining in the United States. Many of the natural resources, such as oil and minerals, are subject to depletion and ultimate extinction by development and use, whereas the forests, if properly conserved by reforestation and protection from destruction by fire and pests remain a continuing asset yielding an annual crop of great value. It should not be overlooked that the Federal Government in its own right is the owner of immense areas of forest lands throughout the United States and particularly in the West, which gives it a proprietary interest requiring adequate provision for preservation and the protection of its own property. In my own State the Federal Government and other public agencies own over half of the area of the State, including, of course, timber and nontimber areas.

Public enemy No. 1 of our great forest resources is fire. It requires continuous care and cooperative protective efforts during the dry seasons to prevent the beginning and spreading of forest fires. Crown fires in the heavily timbered areas of the West are most disastrous, resulting in the greatest property loss and the most difficult to control and eradicate. Such fires take place in the crowns of the densely covered forest areas of the West and 100 feet or more from the ground and travel through the crown area of the forests almost beyond the reach of fire-fighting equipment and facilities.

In my own State of Oregon some of the most disastrous fires have occurred in recent years. A few years ago one fire destroyed over 12,000,000,000 feet of timber in the heavily timbered area of western Oregon. As pointed out by my colleague yesterday in the discussion of the rule, this loss alone destroyed timber sufficient to build 2,000 cities of 5,000 population each. I have often traversed this great area which before the fire was a magnificent stand of Douglas fir, a very valuable type of commercial timber, many of the trees being several hundred years in age, now completely destroyed, with the naked boles now standing pointing heavenward as sentry symbols of the negligence and lack of foresight by our Federal Government in providing adequate protection against such holocausts.

In advocating the passage of this measure providing protection for this great natural resource—our forests—we must not overlook the fact that it is an important factor in our war effort. Lumber products have now become a most critical material in the prosecution of the war and every effort is being made by our Government to conserve timber, convert it into lumber and other forest products available for use in war construction, including pulpwood, plywood, fuel, and railroad ties, in addition to lumber for general construction. It is estimated that the annual cut of forest products is approximately 11,400,000,000 cubic feet. Forty-three percent of the world's forest production comes from the United States. Oregon and Washington—in the Northwest—lead in the production of forest products, by reason of which the people of my district and State are intensely interested in adequate protection for this great industry, which is the major industry in the State.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested yesterday in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] calling attention to the new uses being developed for wood products and particularly the processes recently discovered by which through the use of chemicals softwoods are transmuted into hardwood, practically indestructible and possessing many more valuable qualities than does hardwood in the natural state. I call attention to the fact that the timber industry has pointed out that the census of the uses of wood reached a count of 4,500 without approaching the full classification of the uses to which wood may be put. It is now generally known that edible sugar can be derived from wood products and has been produced in commercial quantities in certain European countries. The fibers of bark together with wool have been woven into fabrics resulting in serviceable and desirable substitutes for wool or cotton fabrics. Rayon is now being manufactured from wood cellulose. Alcohol is now being produced from wood wastes, resulting in great savings.

One of the greatest advanced uses of wood in modern industry is the development of plywood and plastics. In 1942 it is estimated that approximately three and one-half billion square feet of all types of plywood were manufactured. Plywood may be manufactured into all sizes and thicknesses affording a most desirable product for building construction as well as construction of various types of furniture, boxes, and other products. A process has been developed by wood manufacturers known as compregnated wood. This is a heavy, strong, and dense wood product made by laminated resin-treated veener under pressure and heat which greatly increases the density of the wood.

In my district an industry of considerable proportions has been developed in producing laminated wood. This is produced by gluing together layers of wood with the grain of all layers running in the same general direction. By this method a large beam may be formed either straight or curved, by joining a number of small pieces which makes it possible to produce beams much larger in size and greater in strength than the original trees from which they were cut. Immense trusses are now being constructed for the support of barrel-shaped roofs without interior support, which has made possible the construction of large buildings with the entire floor space unhampered by interior supports.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to call to your attention some of the modern uses for our forest products which have become a major part of the industrial economy of our country. Many of you, my colleagues, who do not come from forest States may not be fully aware of the many uses to which our forests are now being put and the magnitude and economic importance of this industry.

In addition to the uses of the timber products themselves, it should be pointed out that these great forest areas afford a shield and protection for snow and rainfall which accumulate during the winter and rainy seasons and afford an adequate continuous supply of water for domestic purposes, irrigation, and navigation through the drought season. With the loss and destruction of the forests on the great watersheds in the timbered areas of the West resulting damage aggregating millions of dollars has taken place by reason of the destruction of this protection of the watersheds, resulting in floods and diminished water supply in summer.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all my colleagues will join in the passage of this bill in order that adequate steps may be taken to protect against loss by fire the forests of our country so essential to our welfare both in peace and war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain quotations and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to say a brief word in reference to the pending legislation. I have recently been presiding over a committee which has been investigating the war needs so far as timber is concerned. While I do not expect to take any length of time today to review what has been done by this subcommittee, I do wish to say that we are in fact consuming at the present time some three or four billion feet of timber more than we are producing. Most of this timber is being used in the war effort and all of it is being used in essential needs of the present day.

As a nation, Mr. Speaker, we are, in fact, consuming our cut timber reserves and we have reached the point, for instance, in the consumption of pulpwood and pulp where we are actually running on a week by week basis. The situation is almost as critical with reference to lumber.

Mr. Speaker, in reviewing Senate bill 45 I am impressed by the provision of this bill which permits an investigation of and recommendation of new laws designed to encourage and to promote the growing of timber. There is in the Southwest, especially in the State of

Louisiana, hundreds of thousands of acres of land which were once bloomed with virgin forests. These lands have been denuded by the lumber companies many years ago. These lands have not been reforested as these companies should have reforested them at the time they were denuded. It is true that this presents the problem of reforestation, but, Mr. Speaker, I believe our laws can be so developed to further promote and encourage the reforestation of these millions of acres of land which once were virgin forests, the finest in North America, and which today are barren and completely denuded. If this legislation accomplishes that one single purpose, it will have been a godsend to certain sections of the United States.

I mention this to call the attention of the enforcing agencies which will later take over the execution of this act to the situation, and I hope in studying this program they will give close and immediate attention to the great problem of reforestation in some sections of our Nation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is very pleasing to me to have the privilege to support all of these forestry protection bills, but I am particularly interested in S. 45, since this bill promises to put our forest-protection program on an adequate basis for the most important work that it proposes to do.

Our forests are of immense value to this Nation, and our failure to adequately protect them against any contingency amounts virtually to sabotage. I hope that the House will pass this bill, for it will be consistent with the alertness that this body has many times manifested regarding our national resources and interests.

NATION-WIDE FOREST SURVEY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, out in my State of Washington we are fortunate in having had the forest survey completed several years ago. But we are not satisfied to let the study rest there. We want the information kept up to date. The results of the original survey have been published by the Forest Service and can be found in the offices of most large lumber companies and public agencies. We consider the survey the only basic study of our forest resources available to us, and public and private agencies and individuals use it in all phases of forest planning.

To date 21 counties in the heavily timbered areas have been recruised to determine the change since the first survey some 10 years ago. These comparisons have proven even more enlightening than the first results, and have brought to light sharply the volume of depletion, the growth, and the acreage of land that is not restocking. Generally the comparisons show that we are making some gain in forest growth, but the rate is not fast enough. We must get our nonstocked land covered with trees, put our old growth stands in a growing condition, and strive to close the gap between current growth and drain.

The survey provides basic information needed in any sound forest policy, either public or private, and especially now in war times when the drain on the forests is extremely heavy, particularly in the high-quality timber required for aircraft and ship construction.

The bill should pass. Every Member of my delegation has the keenest interest in the matter.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill just passed at this point in the RECORD, and that all Members who wish to do so may have permission to extend their own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, this request is made to save time because there is no opposition to the bill and I hope unanimous consent will be granted the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FOREST RESOURCES

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3848) to amend section 9 of the act of Ma. 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to complete and keep current for the United States the forest survey authorized and directed by section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 699, 702; 16 U. S. C. 581h), said section is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, under such plans as he may determine to be fair and equitable, to cooperate with appropriate officials of each State of the United States, and either through them or directly with private and other agencies, in making and keeping current a comprehensive survey of the present and prospective requirements for timber and other forest products in the United States, and of timber supplies, including a determination of the present and potential productivity of forest land therein, and of such other facts as may be necessary in the determination of ways and means to balance the timber budget of the United States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $750,000 annually to complete the initial survey authorized by this section: *Provided*, That the total appropriation of Federal funds under this section to complete the initial survey shall not exceed $6,500,000. There is additionally authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $250,000 annually to keep the survey current."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 488 is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point on the bill just passed and that all Members who may desire to speak on the legislation have permission to revise and extend their own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

H. R. 3848

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation was introduced for the purpose of amending section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, commonly known as the McSweeney-McNary Act. The McSweeney-McNary Act, as many know, is ofttimes referred to as the charter for forest research in this country. Outside of the Clarke-McNary Act, in my opinion, more good has been accomplished under the McSweeney-McNary Act than any other piece of forest legislation. May I briefly recount the purposes of the act, which is made up of 10 sections.

Section 1 states the general purposes of the act.

Section 2 provides for research in forest management, with an authorization of $1,000,000 per year.

Section 3 provides for the investigation of forest tree diseases, with an authorization of $250,000 per year.

Section 4 provides for the investigation of forest insects, with an authorization of $350,000 per year.

Section 5 provides for the investigation of forest wildlife, with an authorization of $150,000 per year.

Section 6 provides for the investigation of forest fire weather, with an authorization of $50,000 per year.

Section 7 provides for the investigation of forest range resources, with an authorization of $275,000 per year.

Section 8 provides for an investigation of forest products, with an authorization of $1,050,000 per year.

Section 9 provides for a Nation-wide survey of forest resources, limits the annual authorization to $250,000 per year, and places a limit of $3,000,000 on the total appropriation for the project.

Section 10 provides for forest economic investigations, with an authorization of $250,000 per year.

In this legislation we are only concerned with section 9. Now, the objects of section 9 are fourfold.

First. An inventory of the area, location, and condition of forest lands, and the quantity, kind, and quality of the timber on the land.

Second. A determination of the rate of growth of our forests, by types, regions, and species.

Third. A determination of the rate at which our timber is being depleted by cutting and by fire, by insects, diseases, and so forth.

Fourth. A determination of the current and probable future requirements for forest products for all purposes and uses.

In the beginning let me call your attention to the fact that section 9 is the only section that places a limitation on the total appropriation. While section 9 authorizes an appropriation of $250,000 per year, a limitation of $3,000,000 is placed on the total appropriation for the survey. The limitation has just about been reached. At the beginning of the year $2,707,313 had been expended on the survey and the survey was approximately one-half completed.

The House Committee on Agriculture held complete hearings on the bill, which was introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. It appears from these hearings that some 300,000,000 acres of our total 630,000,000 forest acres have been covered by the survey. The survey was commenced in 1930 and continued until interrupted by the war, and the cost so far has been 1.6 cents per acre. Let me digress at this point to state that the survey has been of untold value to our war effort. The War Production Board has used the survey and the personnel connected with the survey for the purpose of locating the various species of timber for various purposes, such as aircraft and ship timber, and so forth, and in securing information on the rate of production and factors effecting production, why production was falling off, or was not increasing in places needed, and so forth. Had it not been for the survey the production of lumber for war purposes would have been greatly retarded.

The evidence before the committee is to the effect that it will take an additional $3,500,000 to complete the survey, which will make a total cost of $6,500,000. The evidence further shows that it will take $250,000 per year to keep the survey current. Of course, the survey unless kept current would be of little or no value. The bill unanimously reported by the House Committee on Agriculture increases the total authorization of $3,000,000 contained in section 9 of the McSweeney-McNary bill to $6,500,000 in order for the survey to be completed and authorizes $250,000 per annum to keep the survey current. The bill as reported authorizes an annual appropriation of $750,000 of the additional $3,500,000, the evidence showing this amount can be used annually in completing the survey.

The importance of this legislation from the standpoint of the States is excellently stated by Mr. Joseph F. Kaylor, State forester of Maryland, who testified before the committee for the Association of State Foresters. Mr. Kaylor stated:

In many States, forestry departments are considered the keystone of the conservation arch. Yet, as things stand, State officials must attempt to build a structure without adequate architectural plans. The forest survey will supply facts and figures for such plans.

State forestry agencies are continuously asked to produce factual information for forest industries, especially when emergency arises, and high-grade products are in demand. Many of the 41 States which I represent here today do not have the facts and figures to supply timber-using agencies, nor do they have this information to say definitely that we should or should not cut or remove what is very likely to be valuable growing stock that may be sacrificed in a very wasteful manner. State forestry departments have, therefore, been placed in the rather awkward position of discouraging additional development of forest industries for fear that new industries will remove much of the potential wood fiber, and thereby wreck havoc in existing industries now using products of the forest.

State forestry departments are charged with the protection of nearly 400,000,000 acres of forest land. I must admit, as a representative of the State foresters, that we do not have adequate data on which to submit State-wide forest fire protection plans based on a knowledge of conditions, costs, and an acceptable plan of action. This cannot be worked out until we know more about the basic conditions of our timberlands, such as the total stand of timber, condition of the growing stock, growth, and drain on the timber. We must have information upon which to establish forest transportation systems, the location of fire towers, and to determine administrative districts. It is also essential to indicate the ultrahigh hazard areas where intensive forest-fire protection is imperative.

As the agencies to whom our citizens look for information on forest products, the State foresters are continually called upon to make market studies, and similar investigations, but are faced with obsolete or inadequate information to form a basis for such activities.

Forest-type maps such as are developed by the forest survey should prove invaluable to other bureaus of the State conservation agencies. I refer to the assistance which could be rendered to game and fish authorities by supplying them with vegetative-cover maps to show what lands are best adapted to raising deer or quail and what the carrying capacity of these lands is at the time of the investigation. With the survey's facts and figures State foresters are in position to effectuate a Nation-wide flood control program in the uplands. I am thoroughly convinced that for every dollar spent for intensive fire protection and upstream engineering work, a greater return in flood control and prevention of soil erosion can be derived than from any other public expenditure.

To permit State officials to function as they should in the public interest, we hope that your committee will approve and authorize a continuation of the forest survey.

The value of the survey to the farmers of America was ably presented by Mr. Fred Breckman, Washington representative of the National Grange. Mr. Breckman stated:

I said one-third of our forest lands are in farm wood lots.

Our farm wood lots comprise about 185,000,000 acres, or an average of about 50 acres per farm. Between six and seven billion board feet of lumber is required annually by our farmers. In addition, vast quantities of fuel wood, posts, poles, and so forth, come from these wood lots. It is, therefore, important that they should be properly handled.

But before any natural resource can be intelligently managed, basic facts about it must be available. The forest survey is obtaining this information for both private and public forest lands of all kinds as a basis for sound programs and policies.

As we understand it, about one-half of the country's forests have been surveyed, and the appropriation made to conduct this work is nearly exhausted.

The National Grange has formally recommended the speedy completion of the forest survey. The war has brought home the critical need for information on farm production, whether it be food, fiber, or lumber. Since the purpose of the forest-survey amendment which is now being considered is to authorize funds to complete the survey for the remainder of the country, we favor its enactment. Considerable funds are expended annually to obtain production data on farm crops other than timber, and we feel that more facts about the wood lots are needed for sound land-use management on farms.

Yes; the extension foresters have been of great help to a few farmers in managing their farm wood lots properly. They show them which trees to cut and many other things, and right now in a few places a marketing program is in effect under which the farmer is advised how to estimate the value of his timber. That is an important matter for the average farmer. A speculator or somebody like that may come around and say, "I will give you a thousand dollars for the timber on your place." The farmer, not having an accurate idea as to the value of the timber, might fall for that proposition, where if he had a chance to consult with somebody to make an intelligent estimate for him, that person might say, "Why, you can get a thousand dollars for half of it, and still have the rest." It is of great value to the farmer to get the right kind of information when he needs it.

This legislation was recommended by the Department of Agriculture, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and after full hearings and careful study, unanimously reported by the House Committee on Agriculture. Moreover, it has the support of the United States Forestry Service, the American Forestry Association, the West Coast Timbermen's Association, the Association of State Foresters, the National Grange, and the American Farm Bureau.

The bill should pass.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has spoken of the necessity for the pending bill. It is important that the House act favorably on H. R. 3848, and it is my belief that the Senate will concur in the passage of a measure intended to complete the survey of the forest resources of the United States. The forests in our country comprise about one-third of the land area, or more than 600,000,000 acres. It is a big task.

West Virginia, in company with other States, has not been embraced in the work done to date. There are approximately 10,000,000 forest acres in our State to be checked. The Monongahela National Forest of about 1,000,000 acres, and the George Washington National Forest, in part, are located in West Virginia. Approximately one-half of the forest lands, public and private, have been inventoried in the Nation. It is vital that the remaining work go forward at once, because the prosecution of this war has drained the timber supply of the Nation. We need to have information for the establishment of a basic forest policy.

In a statement in behalf of this bill, when a hearing was held before the Committee on Agriculture, December 7, 1943, I said:

After more than 300 years of settlement this country is still forced to rely on estimates or guesses about a national resource which keeps numerous industries going and paying wages which support five to six million persons. In addition, woodlands help support 2,500,000 farm families. The Government spends millions to collect information on the production of soil crops other than timber, and I think the farmers are entitled to the same consideration regarding their woodlands which make up one-third of our commercial forest land.

Forest lands supply game with food and shelter and millions of Americans with opportunity for recreation. Forests conserve water and help prevent floods and erosion.

Forests are one of our most important renewable natural resources. They must be managed, not mined. This resource must be perpetuated and made secure for the people.

I would like to paraphrase my prepared statement at this point by saying that certain scientists and research experts in America today believe that it is very possible that within 40 or 50 years from now we will be thinking very definitely in terms of the production of fuels from wood products, and so I would like to attempt to reinforce what I have said here on the other values of forest products from the standpoint of a possible source of fuel in the future.

To set up this type of program we must make it perpetuating, and we must bring it to the people in a manner which will cause it to be secure. To set up policies and programs to do this requires authentic information such as the forest survey is obtaining on the extent, location, and condition of forest land and the timber on it, the rate of depletion, and the present and prospective requirements of the country for the forest products which we know will be increasingly used.

America, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, is a rich nation, but we cannot expect our resources, particularly forest in nature, to continue to supply a nation at war and during the reconstruction period when peace has come again if we indiscriminately cut the trees from the land without laying down a pattern for scientific renewal of our reserves. This survey will return threefold the money necessary to carry it forward.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor of the House on March 23 regarding the need for forest research I touched briefly on this survey. It is progressing too slowly and unless this amendment is passed the study will have to stop in another year or so, with the country only half covered, because the funds authorized to start the survey will all have been appropriated. This situation arises not because of any inefficient use of the funds, but clearly on account of the magnitude of the job. I am told that the 300,000,000 acres already covered has cost less than 2 cents per acre.

This survey obtains information on the area and condition of forest land, volume and growth of the timber, and the requirements of the wood-using industries for raw materials from the forests. Such facts are essential for the sound development and utilization of a region's forest resources. Unfortunately they are not available for the Central State because the Forest Survey has not covered it.

In regions such as the South which have been studied, excellent use has been made of the findings in determining the supply of critical timber for war purposes and in adjusting industrial development to the capacity of the land to produce timber. Another important use of the results is in bringing out the condition of the forest land, and in most cases the need for better forest practice to produce a permanent and increased supply of timber for industry, both of which are basic to community stabilization and regular employment.

I sincerely trust that this resolution will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed and that they may appear immediately following the statement of the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed and that they may follow those of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

There was no objection.

HUNGRY HORSE DAM

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 481, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3570) to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 3570, be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of providing additional storage for water which shall be used for (1) the generation of electric energy urgently needed for the war effort, and (2) the irrigation and reclamation of arid lands, and other beneficial uses, primarily in the State of Montana but also in downstream areas, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to proceed immediately with the construction of the proposed Hungry Horse Dam (including facilities for generating electric energy) on the South Fork of the Flathead River, Flathead County, Mont., to such a height as may be necessary to impound immediately approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet of water.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to complete, as soon as the necessary additional material is available, the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam so as to provide a storage reservoir with an ultimate capacity of approximately 1,500,000 acre-feet of water.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That for the purpose of irrigation and reclamation of arid lands, for controlling floods, improving navigation, regulating the flow of the South Fork of the Flathead River, for the generation of electric energy urgently needed for the war effort, and for other beneficial uses primarily in the State of Montana but also in downstream areas, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to proceed as soon as practicable with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Hungry Horse Dam (including facilities for generating electric energy) on the South Fork of the Flathead River, Flathead County, Mont., to such a height as may be necessary to impound not less than 1,000,000 acre-feet of water.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to complete, as soon as the necessary additional material is available, the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam so as to provide a storage reservoir of the maximum usable and feasible capacity.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388 and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in such Federal reclamation laws; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of constructing said dam and reservoir. Said dam and reservoir and said irrigation works may be utilized for irrigation purposes only pursuant to the provisions of said Federal reclamation laws.

"SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves the Columbia River, one of the truly great rivers of the world which drains considerable portions of the four Western States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

The principal tributary of the 74 rivers which make up the Columbia watershed is the Snake River, whose headwaters are in Wyoming.

For over a year these five States involved have been working in harmony with the Federal Government in the de-

velopment of a logical and comprehensive program by which all of the peoples of the area drained by the Columbia River may equitably participate in the benefits of this great river.

This bill is a first product of this progressive and congenial arrangement, a tentative five-State agreement has been entered into and I feel that it is both significant and encouraging that the Federal Government, as represented by the Bonneville Power Administration, has welcomed and whole-heartedly worked with these five States in the furtherance of the several proposals for the full development of the Columbia River.

While it is true that this bill could have been proposed by the Department of the Interior under existing laws, it is also true that a certain amount of stalemate occurred because of differences between the War and Interior Departments as to just where a storage dam in Montana should be located in order to create more industrial firm power downstream for the war effort. This bill was introduced in order to propose a logical alternative, and to break this departmental deadlock.

The dam to be authorized by this bill will be self-liquidating. It will pay for itself.

This fact will be fully explained by my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in whose district the Hungry Horse storage dam would be located.

The Columbia River is truly one of the great assets of the United States.

It is fed by the lakes and the glaciers of the high Rockies and with its 74 principal tributaries and a fall of over 6,000 feet from Jackson Lake, in Wyoming, to Bonneville, near sea level. This river is capable of tremendous benefits to the industrious people of that area, and through them to the Nation. This area is capable of consuming tremendous quantities of products produced in other parts of the United States, and in turn is capable of producing many of the essentials which go to make a great and strong nation. Right now some 40 percent of all our domestic aluminum is produced here.

In the past our rivers have been developed almost by force of circumstance. If floods occurred, we built levees. If we wanted reclamation, we tapped the river at the nearest point consistent with the gravity problems involved. If we wanted navigation, we either put our dredges to work or waited months until flood waters made this possible. If we wanted power, we put our dams in where civilization or industry had already been developed. Logical development has been a secondary matter.

Under the five-States agreement we come upon a new vision. We propose to construct storage dams and impound the water at the highest practicable point of origin. Thus it will be possible for us to so manage this river that we can eliminate floods, encourage navigation through the elimination of the danger of delta and channel obstructions. We can reclaim an additional 2,500,000 acres. We can reduce erosion to a minimum. We can end for all time the danger of drought. And last but not least, we can create a condition of firm power for all the power projects along the Columbia River.

Of particular importance to this Nation, I think, and to this House, which directly represents the people of the Nation, is the fact that in the final analysis, much of the balance of power, both in peacetimes and in war, lies with the nations which have, and wisely manage, great rivers. Part of the unseen strength of our German enemy lies in her complete harnessing of the Rhine River through storage dams and other developments. We learn that the Rhine is managed down to the last bucketful. Our Nation is just beginning to see the wisdom of this comprehensive river development.

In the end much of our national strength lies in an intelligent management of our great rivers so that maximum benefits will accrue to all who live within their drainage areas, and through these industrious people, the entire Nation will be benefited on the basis of mutual service to all of us.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, we of Montana owe a great deal to the sterling efforts of Congressmen WHITE, O'CONNOR, HORAN, ROCKWELL, and all the other members of the Irrigation Committee for their untiring efforts in behalf of this proposed legislation.

I rise at this time to speak in behalf of H. R. 3570, a bill to provide for the authorization of the Hungry Horse Dam on the south fork of the Flathead River in northwestern Montana. First, I want to thank the House for the consideration it has shown to me and to the people of my State during the period of grave emergency and great anxiety of last summer when Flathead Lake was threatened and when our security and hopes were at a very low ebb. At that time we were fearful that the Bonneville Administration and the Army engineers would, under the War Powers Act, come in and raise our lake initially 17 feet and by 1946, 37 feet. Because of that the entire Montana delegation—Senators WHEELER and MURRAY, Congressman O'CONNOR, and myself—met with the Bonneville Advisory Commission and urged them not to go ahead with their plan. We were given the assurance that before anything was done meetings to discuss the situation would be held by the Army engineers and the Bonneville Administration with the Montana people. These meetings were held on June 1 and 3, 1943, and I should like to call your attention to the newspaper headlines and clippings regarding them, which I have collected so that you will be able to have some idea as to how this situation affected us.

At the first meeting, held June 1 at Helena, the State capital, Brig. Gen. Warren T. Hannum made the statement that—

> Of four proposals for Northwest power development considered, raising of Flathead Lake by 17 feet to provide the needed supplemental storage for Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams was the only one that was feasible to meet the war emergency.

May I repeat, General Hannum said in effect that the raising of Flathead Lake was the only proposal of four considered that was feasible to meet the war emergency. I further quote from a statement made by the general at the Helena meeting and carried over the U. P. to the effect that—

> The survey just completed will be submitted for approval to the Bonneville Power Administration and the War Production Board and after the Secretary of War asks Congress for the appropriation we intend to begin work July 1.

That, as you see, was a pretty bald statement because we were told in Montana that our site was the only feasible one, that there was a war emergency, and that work begin July 1. You can well understand how those words affected the thinking of the people and 2 days later at the public meeting called in Kalispell, Mont., the people showed their feelings in unmistakable terms. These headlines on the chart show how it was felt in the press in various parts of the State.

It is easy for any Member of this House to envisage the situation which arose. Not only was Flathead Lake itself to be raised, which the Army engineers said was necessary to furnish storage for power downstream in Washington and Oregon, but in addition it would have affected the welfare of 25,000 people directly, and 50,000 people indirectly throughout western Montana; it would have destroyed a large lumber industry; it would have brought about the removal from their homes of people who had determined to spend the rest of their lives in the beautiful Flathead Valley; it would have inundated something like 50,000 acres of the best agricultural land in the country; it would have wiped out some towns completely, others partially; and it would have made a stinking morass of the most scenic area in the United States.

At this public meeting, the Flathead County High School auditorium which normally seats 1,500 was crowded to the limit, and it was estimated that 3,200 people were inside the auditorium and a like number outside taking in the proceedings via loudspeakers. The people came to the meeting determined to do all that they possibly could to stop this despicable plan, and I am afraid that had the attempt to raise Flathead gone through there would have been trouble at that time. If the people of the Flathead country were convinced that the raising of Flathead Lake was a war need they would, I assure you, have given their wholehearted assent to what was necessary. However, they did not believe that such was the case and I agree with them wholeheartedly, because all of us from that part of the country knew that there were other areas such as the Hungry Horse which could be developed which would not have affected the economy of the region as the Flathead Lake proposal would. Montana has never failed in meeting its country's needs.

The Flathead has sent in excess of 4,000 of its sons and daughters into the armed forces of the United States to fight to protect their homes and country. I sincerely hope that when they return they will not find that they have won the war abroad only to find that they have

lost their valley and the homes which they have looked forward to and which they felt that they were defending in this war. Montana has made many contributions to the war through its manpower. Forty-eight thousand three hundred and eighty-eight out of a draft register of 127,958—and this includes all the 18–44's—had by December 9, 1943, entered the service of their country. We have been among the leaders in the buying of bonds and in the giving of our natural resources, but Montana has been treated shabbily in the matter of war industries since the war started and many of our people have been forced to leave the State to work in other parts of the country. This matter of the proposed raising of Flathead Lake was another indication of our being treated unfairly. However, thanks to the consideration which Congress gave us and to the deadly serious and united support of every person in the State of Montana, we were able to have an investigating committee sent to the Flathead this past summer and out of that has come the proposal for the authorization of the Hungry Horse Dam.

Few States in the Union have greater water resources than Montana, but we have not realized the full value of them until just lately. Two of the largest rivers in the United States, the Missouri and the Columbia, rise in Montana, and Montana is the only State which can boast of rivers draining into the Pacific Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and Hudson Bay. The annual flow of all its rivers would cover the entire State with 6 inches of water, and this flow would irrigate in excess of 10,000,000 acres, although actually only 2,000,000 acres are irrigated at the present time and less than two-thirds of these have adequate water all the time. The rivers of Montana could supply 3,700,000 horsepower of electric energy, which is about one-tenth of the estimated hydroelectric capacity for the entire United States. Only four States—California, New York, Oregon, and Arizona—have greater potential power resources, and yet Montana's actual production is less than 500,000 horsepower.

Montana, fortunately perhaps, probably can never become a center of heavy industry or even predominantly industrial in the sense of light manufacture. However, there is no reason why, in time, power should not be developed in Montana to further the use of our alumina clays, our metals, and our forest resources. We would like to see in our State a well-developed, sound industrial economy, not based on war but based on a system whereby we would have a permanent means of integrating our resources, our power, and our people. We do want to advance gradually and soundly.

We in Montana look upon our State as a part of the Northwest and what is done in developing such projects as the Hungry Horse, we think, will benefit all the States of the region. Montana has raw materials in lavish supply, all kinds of minerals, and a varied and imposing list of agricultural products. We have a vigorous and hardy people who can furnish the necessary labor supply, for they are descendants of great men and women—the pioneers who settled this area in the first place. We have a great job to do in taking our place in the family of States. It cannot be done without sound thinking, wise planning, and hard work.

The answer to our problem concerning Flathead Lake and the Hungry Horse lies here in Washington. We have done everything we possibly can do, and now we are coming to you and asking that you give us the assurance, in the authorization of this bill, that nothing further will ever be done to destroy Flathead Lake. In the past there have been two attempts to take over that lake but to date they have been unsuccessful. We of Montana feel that though we have been successful in thwarting outside efforts twice, it is quite possible that the danger will rise again. Hence I am introducing this bill to cover authorization for the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam. This is an alternative proposal, in case another attempt is made to raise Flathead Lake. It is also insurance to us that such an attempt will not be made again if another and more feasible project is authorized.

The Bonneville Power Administration is behind the authorization; the Reclamation Service, which would have the control of the project, is in favor of it, and the Reclamation Service has indicated that approximately 100,000 acres would be benefited from irrigation furnished from the Hungry Horse Reservoir. In addition, of course, it would be of great value in power benefits to the State and to the region when the hydroelectric facilities are completed, and it would be of some value in flood control not only in the Flathead Valley itself but as far west as Idaho. Furthermore, on the proposed Hungry Horse site there is no farm land to be taken out of production, no railroads or highways or telephone lines to be flooded out, no homes to be destroyed. It is up in the mountains in the Flathead National Forest and it will not decrease the value of the tax rolls.

It might be well also to point out at this time that in the State of Montana, and throughout a large part of the Northwest as well, our water flows fluctuate up and down. We have a series of wet years and a series of dry years, and if we should experience another dry period, as we did in the thirties, it might be imperative that the Bonneville Power Administration would have to develop quickly some new storage plan. In such a situation we would be afraid that they would pick Flathead Lake for the project if this bill—which I am discussing—is not passed.

I have with me today the report of the Northwest States Development Association, which is an organization of the Governors of Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming, in which is recommended the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam as an immediate necessity. This association has made a very careful study of the various projects in the five Northwest States and has availed itself of all possible information from governmental departments, State, and private sources. The association recommends for immediate or early postwar construction only such projects as are urgently necessary and self-liquidating, which means that the Government will be entirely reimbursed and that there will be no charge against the taxpayers of the United States for such construction. The Hungry Horse project is, I repeat, entirely within the national forest, has no agricultural value, and a very limited value for the future production of timber as evidenced by the statement before the Irrigation Committee from the Department of Agriculture.

A few more facts before I finish. We have been told by reclamation engineers who have carried on soil analyses in the Flathead area that much of our land will be worthless inside of 20 years if it is not taken care of and built up now through use of irrigation waters and rotation of crops.

For almost 16 years the question of the raising of Flathead Lake has been held as a sword of Damocles over the heads of the people of Montana. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the insecurity this caused has retarded development in Montana and that the resulting instability has cost many times more than the price of the cost of the Hungry Horse Dam.

I should also like to call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that every person and every group in Montana is wholeheartedly behind this project. For the first time in the history of our State we have achieved unity on a single domestic proposition. That unity was born when the Flathead was threatened last summer; that unity has survived in the desire for the authorization of the Hungry Horse. This is not class or partisan legislation; it is the plea of a united people for what they believe to be right and just. They believe that this is the most important piece of legislation they have ever asked from Congress and they feel that its enactment will benefit them and the entire Northwest for all time.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated the case for the Hungry Horse. This bill means everything to the people of my State and they are looking to this House this afternoon with hope and confidence. In their behalf I urge you with all the energy that I have not to let us down. We have felt all along that our only safeguard was the Congress of the United States. We fought hard to retain what we think is justly ours. I am asking you this afternoon to pass this bill which we know will give us security, assure our future, and lay the ground work for the development of a greater Montana and, by the same token, a greater America.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I insert some suggestions concerning the economic justification for the Hungry Horse Dam project.

The proposed Hungry Horse Dam is a major feature of a large comprehensive plan now in preparation for maximum economical utilization of the headwaters of the Columbia River in Montana for irrigation of lands in the so-called Kalispell area, for power production, and for flood-control and related benefits.

Originally a dam at Bad Rock Canyon was planned to divert adequate water

from the natural flow of the Flathead River below the junction of the North and South Forks to supply the Kalispell area. However, after a thorough examination of the Bad Rock site, it became apparent that unfavorable geologic and topographic conditions preclude the construction of a safe structure except at a tremendous cost necessary to overcome unusual foundation conditions and topographic difficulties in connection with an exceedingly large spillway requirement. The unsuitability of the Bad Rock site eliminates the North Fork as a potential direct source of supply, thus making upstream supplemental storage on the South Fork a necessary requirement.

The Hungry Horse site on the South Fork of Flathead River would be so situated that it would afford, as one of its multiple functions, this service to the irrigation project and was therefore considered by the Bureau of Reclamation as a post-war development in connection with the Kalispell area.

Flathead Lake has been looked to as a resourceful site for regulation of the headwaters of the Columbia River. However, regulation accomplished through raising the Kerr Dam constructed by the Montana Power Co. at the outlet of Flathead Lake would bring about the inundation of nine towns: Polson, Big Arm, Elmo, Dayton, Rollins, Somers, Lakeside, Holt, and Big Fork, also a portion of the town of Kalispell and about one-fourth of the irrigable land in the Kalispell area.

The construction of Hungry Horse Dam, Reservoir, and power plant would eliminate present agitation and possible future proposals for raising Kerr Dam with its accompanying wasteful abandonment of properties surrounding Flathead Lake. The proposed dam affords the desired stream flow regulation for flood control as well as for downstream power plants, and would materially increase the firm power output of these plants, including Grand Coulee Dam. It would also permit the generation of electrical energy at the site and afford an adequate stored water supply for the irrigation of about 100,000 acres north of Flathead Lake. H. R. 3570 authorizes the immediate construction of the dam, including facilities for generating electric energy, to a height necessary to impound approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet and also later construction of the remaining portion of the dam and additional irrigation works when necessary materials are available.

Although the investigations are not fully completed, reliable information is in hand which emphasizes the economic feasibility of the undertaking for immediate construction and for its long-range benefits to the region, the State, and the Nation.

The regulation of 1,000,000 acre-feet of storage at the Hungry Horse site would result in an immediate increase in the firm power output of existing downstream plants. The need for an increase in the hydro firm output in the Northwest area was emphasized during past low run-off periods demanding the consumption of a valuable and limited fuel-oil supply in order to supplement the hydro production of electrical energy. It is highly significant that this waste of fuel oil can be eliminated, and, in addition, new blocks of energy can be made available during the war period without the expenditure of highly critical materials and labor involved in the manufacture and installation of additional electrical generating equipment if that means were resorted to.

The firm power output of the hydro power plants on the Columbia River system is limited to production which can be sustained during the period of critical low run-off. Had Hungry Horse Reservoir been in operation during July 1940 to March 1942, the most critical low run-off period of record, it would have been possible to increase the sustained release of Flathead Lake by 800 second-feet, permitting the following increases in firm output at existing and prospective power plants:

Plant	Head	Increase in firm continuous output with Hungry Horse storage
Existing power plants:	*Feet*	*Kilowatts*
Kerr	185	9,000
Thompson Falls	50	2,400
Grand Coulee	300	14,700
Rock Island	32	1,600
Bonneville	50	2,400
Total existing	617	[1] 30,100
Potential power plants:		
Cabinet Gorge	107	5,200
"Z" Canyon	280	13,700
Foster Creek	160	7,800
Chelan	90	4,400
Rocky Reach	55	2,700
Priest Rapids	130	6,300
Umatilla Rapids	50	2,400
Arlington	50	2,400
John Day Rapids	60	2,900
The Dalles	75	3,700
Total potential	1,057	[2] 51,500

[1] Say 30,000.
[2] Say 50,000.

A conservative valuation of downstream power benefits has been assumed on the basis of $10 per kilowatt-year for the existing power plants which would give an annual value of $300,000.

Using the entire live storage content of the reservoir to supplement the natural stream flow during the critical low-flow period July 1940 to March 1942, a continuous discharge of 2,000 second-feet could be maintained at Hungry Horse power plant. The average head during this period is estimated to be 315 feet. Assuming an over-all efficiency of 80 percent, there would have been produced 43,000 kilowatts of firm continuous power, or 377,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm energy annually. The irrigation project will require annually approximately 9,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm energy for pumping. It is estimated that an annual average of 120,000,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary energy will also be available. The total output is thus expected to be as follows:

	Kilowatt-hours
Use for project pumping	9,000,000
Firm commercial	368,000,000
Secondary	120,000,000
Total	497,000,000

The firm power generated at Hungry Horse power plant is estimated to have a value of $17.50 per kilowatt-year delivered at load centers. On the basis of a 70-percent load factor and 10-percent transmission-line loss for the 42,000 kilowatts of firm continuous output in excess of project pumping, the annual gross value is $950,000. Annual operation and maintenance charges, replacements, and repairs, and transmission costs are estimated to be $300,000, leaving a net annual value—ahead of interest and amortization—of $650,000.

Most of the potentially irrigable area to be served from the project is now dry-farmed. Of this area approximately 30 percent is devoted to the production of wheat and other small grains. The rainfall, about 7½ inches during the crop-growing season, is inadequate to assure the pasture and forage that is needed for the livestock industry of the area. Such hay crops as are produced are usually limited to one cutting per year. Some potatoes and peas are grown under dry-farming methods on these lands, but the average yields are very low and the results uncertain due to low rainfall.

With irrigation, the production of potatoes, dairy products, and peas will be substantially increased. The present livestock industry would be materially benefited and stabilized through the increase in assured forage crops. The potentially irrigable area is about 100,000 acres.

Indicative of what may be expected on the Kalispell area with irrigation is the fine record of production being achieved on the nearby irrigated area below Flathead Lake, where approximately 180 bushels of potatoes, 25 bushels of dried field peas, 35 bushels of wheat (spring and winter), 50 bushels of barley, 85 bushels of oats, 25 bushels of rye, and 3 to 3½ tons of alfalfa hay are yielded per acre. Preliminary information indicates that, with irrigation, the lands in the Kalispell area will bring about the creation of food and new wealth to the extent of approximately $2,000,000 annually over and above the present production.

Control at Hungry Horse Dam of high-water flows would allow a sustained production on 8,000 to 8,500 acres of nearby lands on the main stem of the Flathead River. These lands are now used only to produce wild hay. With the threat of inundation removed, they will be elevated into a class of high productivity. Flood-control benefits will also extend many miles downstream to additional lands and areas with a noticeable effect being experienced as far as Pend Oreille Lake. It is roughly estimated that flood-control benefits will approximate $100,000 annually.

With due regard for the worth of fulfilling war demands, post-war rehabilitation, social and prosperous growths, recreation and other indirect immeasurable benefits, the estimated value of direct benefits anticipated from the development of the Hungry Horse Dam project offers sufficient cause for justification for its construction. The direct benefits alone exceed the total estimated project costs.

Assuming 3 percent interest and a 40-year amortization period, the total annual Federal cost on a $40,000,000 investment would be $1,800,000. The landowners' annual cost would be interest on their investments $150,000, irrigation operation and maintenance $150,000, and increased taxes, and so forth, $100,000, making a total landowners' cost of $400,000. Operating costs for power features have been deducted in computing benefits. The total national annual cost is therefore $2,200,000. The annual direct benefits total $3,050,000, as follows:

Irrigation (gross)	$2,000,000
Flood control	100,000
Local power	650,000
Downstream power	300,000
Total	3,050,000

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Hungry Horse Dam is a major feature in the development, not only of the western part of Montana, but of the entire Northwest as a whole. As a member of the investigating committee authorized by this House and sent to the Northwest last summer, I feel that I am in a good position to report to you not only my feeling on this proposed authorization but also the feelings of the people of Montana as a whole. When the Army engineers came into the Flathead last spring, it was the second attempt on the part of the Federal Government in 16 years to regulate the raising of Flathead Lake to such a degree that great harm would result, not only to the country as a whole but to the people living in the areas adjacent to the lake itself. The original proposal was to raise the lake 17 feet and eventually, within a 2 or 3-year period, 37 feet. The raising of the lake, of course, would have meant that a huge storage reservoir would have been created and that in drought periods that reservoir would be released to furnish firm water power for Grand Coulee and Bonneville downstream on the Columbia. It would have meant also that this raising and lowering of the lake to fulfill the needs of the downstream power concentrate would have made an unsightly mess of the surrounding territory and in that we would have destroyed one of the scenic wonderlands of this country. In addition, forty-five to fifty thousand acres would have been taken out of production and 25,000 people would have been directly affected and many more throughout western Montana indirectly affected. People who have saved all their lives to retire to the Flathead would have been forced to leave the area due to the destruction of their homes. Whole towns such as Big Fork, Dayton, Somers, Big Arm, and Lakeside, would have been under water nd large towns and cities like Polson and Kalispell would have been partially inundated and made to a large extent worthless. A large and thriving lumber industry would have been destroyed and the effects of all these factors mentioned would have been felt as far away as Missoula to the south, Butte and Helena to the east, and Great Falls to the northeast.

The people were alarmed and rightly so at the proposal that faced them. They were told that this was a war emergency and that the Flathead Lake had to be raised to keep the war industries functioning farther down the Columbia and there are no more patriotic people in the world, Mr. Speaker, than the people of my State. They have far exceeded their quota on every War bond drive. They have contributed, as my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has already stated to you, in excess of 50,000 men to our armed forces. In the last war we sent more men on a per capita basis into the armed forces than any other State in the Union and after that war many of them did not return. This time, we want those service men and women of ours to come back to a Montana that they know and love. It is about time that we began to develop our resources for the benefit of our people so that the Treasure State, as it is so aptly termed, can build on a foundation of security.

The people of Montana are vitally interested in this proposed authorization bill and they are looking to the Congress of the United States to heed the just and reasonable request that this bill be passed. They have always, Mr. Speaker, looked to this body as their final hope and they feel that you will give them the just consideration which is due every American by right. I could go into detail explaining the situation which existed in Montana during the last spring and summer but I am sure that by this time all of you are acquainted with the dangers, and they were really dangers which we faced and which had to be overcome. We think that by the passing of this bill that we will take the first step toward the building of a sounder State and that in building up a sounder Montana we can encourage industry to come in and which will use our resources and benefit our own people. Fundamentally we feel that in doing this we will be contributing to the welfare and prosperity of the Northwest as a whole. We are not selfish in fighting for what we consider our right because we feel that if our water resources are developed properly the rest of the region will likewise benefit through the creation of a permanent water supply and in that respect irrigation can be carried on. In other parts of the region industry will advance because of the secure knowledge that firm water power will be available and the people as a whole will be able to develop a well-integrated economy which will work for the benefit for not only one State but all States in that region and we who represent that region feel that in building a greater Northwest we can contribute to the welfare and the future of a greater America.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 481 was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks on this bill immediately preceding the vote on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] for 10 minutes.

REPLY TO REPRESENTATIVE McMURRAY'S EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF APRIL 18, 1944—SCURRILOUS ATTACK UNWARRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday, April 18, the gentleman from Wisconsin, HOWARD J. MCMURRAY, extended his remarks in the RECORD on page A1851 and included a copy of a letter addressed to the Milwaukee Journal, which appeared in that publication on the 14th of April 1944.

I take this time to reply in part to a question that was asked by the writer of the article which challenges the patriotism of the five Republican Members from the State of Wisconsin who voted for the soldiers' vote bill, which was passed. I quote in part from that letter:

> I wonder if Representatives SMITH, STEVENSON, KEEFE, MURRAY, and O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin have sons in the service If this item receives space, will the above-mentioned Representatives be kind enough to reply to the writer justifying their defeating votes? I am sorry to say that 5 of the 224 defeating votes were from Wisconsin.

The gentleman who wrote that letter is somewhere in New Guinea, and his name is alleged to be A. C. Stikl. From this insertion it is safe to assume that the gentleman who offered the extension was in accord with the idea expressed by the writer.

In order to keep the record straight, I want to speak, of course, for my own family. I might say, in passing, however, that so far as the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON and Mr. O'KONSKI] are concerned, they have no members eligible for the service. I do know that so far as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is concerned, he has three children: A boy who at the present time is in the service, and two daughters who are married to young men, one of whom is serving in the Southwest Pacific and the other in the Navy on Atlantic patrol duty. I know, as a matter of fact, that the only member of the gentleman from Wisconsin's [Mr. MURRAY] family who is eligible for military service is in the military service and has been for more than 5 years.

As to my own family, what I have to say about it is with considerable humility. There are three children in my family. My oldest child, a daughter, is with the American Red Cross and is today serving in India. My second daughter is married, and her husband has served for 2 years in the military service. My only son has served in New Guinea for 26 months.

I submit to you that that is the answer to this scurrilous letter, and I further submit to you Members of this House that we should not be compelled to defend ourselves from the floor of this House against the act of a colleague who ought to have known better.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the statement he has just made, and to make this further observation: The distinguished gentleman who now has the floor served in World War No. 1 for almost 20 months overseas. He also served as department commander of the American Legion in his own State of Wisconsin. Not only that, but he served as national executive committeeman from the State of Wisconsin for that great peacetime organization, the American Legion.

May I say further that at the present moment the wife of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin is now serving as national president of the American Legion Auxiliary for the United States of America.

I know what the gentleman did with respect to the soldiers' vote bill. He did everything within his power to obtain the right for every soldier and every sailor to cast a full and unlimited vote for his choice of all candidates for all offices. I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman who is now speaking and the other Members from the great State of Wisconsin, who did likewise.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. May I point out that I checked the RECORD, and this Representative from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY], who put that letter in the RECORD, and who purports to be such a great friend of the men in the service, was not even present to vote when the soldier vote bill came up for a vote.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Am I not correct in stating that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin who now has the floor is the one who introduced a bill providing for the education of the returning servicemen of World War No. 2?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It seems to me that criticism of the gentleman from Wisconsin comes with poor grace from one who apparently is not familiar with his record.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know what purpose the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY] had in putting this letter into the RECORD, but I wish the gentleman who is now speaking would insert in the RECORD the military record of the gentleman who inserted that letter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. For the gentleman's information and the information of the House, he has none, and I believe that he is eligible for service in this war.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I know our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has told you the record of the sons of the Republican Members of Congress. I usually do not stand up here and try to wave the flag, but I just want to take this opportunity to tell some of my boy friends that if this is the opening gun for this coming campaign they can choose their own weapons and name their own poison.

My son happened to be down in Panama the day Pearl Harbor was attacked. You can imagine how anyone would feel with the papers and the radio saying all the time that it was expected that the Panama Canal was going to be the next point of attack by the Japanese. You can also imagine how one felt the day we, of necessity, had to pass the bill that provided that these boys who had made a contract to go in the Army or the Navy for 4 years should stay in the service as long as the war might last.

This war is pretty serious and life is pretty serious to most people. I have noticed that anyone in this body who has lost a son in this war, like our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN], or anyone who has a son in the service, is not sitting around on this floor skinning his teeth like a Cheshire cat and making himself ridiculous before the Members of this House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHERIDAN (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER) for 7 days, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3257. An act to amend Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 24, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Friday, April 21, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m. Monday, April 24, 1944, in room 1011, New House Office Building, to hold hearings on H. R. 4628.

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 25, 1944, in room 1011, New House Office Building, to hold hearings on H. R. 2426.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1452. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 (H. Doc. No. 539); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1453. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the legislative establishment, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 540); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 512. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary compensation and $250 funeral expenses to Mrs. Barbara McDonough, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1360). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Senate Joint Resolution 112. Resolution authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4307. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 1363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4624. A bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 77. Concurrent resolution requesting certain information from the President (Rept. No. 1361). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4641. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to transfer jurisdiction over commercial prints and labels, for the

purpose of copyright registration, to the Register of Copyrights," approved July 31, 1939; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4642. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 4643. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and operate forest-products pilot plants in the Northwestern States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4644. A bill to insure the maximum production of oil during the war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 4645. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 3002; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly, of Lares, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman MCGEHEE'S resolution requesting the immediate removal from office of Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell and the appointment of a new Governor; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Yauco, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman MCGEHEE'S resolution demanding from the President of the United States the immediate removal of Rexford G. Tugwell from the governorship of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Rio Piedras, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman MCGEHEE'S resolution asking the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell, from the governorship of Puerto Rico and the appointment of a new Governor that may uphold the traditions of American government and guarantee the people of Puerto Rico impartial elections in November of 1944; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Aguas Buenas, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman MCGEHEE'S resolution, requesting the immediate removal of Rexford G. Tugwell from the governorship of Puero Rico and the appointment of a new Governor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Adjuntas, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman MCGEHEE'S resolution demanding the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico, as well as the appointment of a new Governor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Canovanas, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support the resolution of Congressman MCGEHEE to demand the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Corozal, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman MCGEHEE'S resolution requesting the immediate removal from office of Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Juncos, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support the resolution of Congressman MCGEHEE to demand the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Manati, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support Congressman MCGEHEE'S resolution demanding the removal of Rexford G. Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Isabela, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman MCGEHEE'S resolution requesting the immediate removal from office of Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5517. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Pearl Kinney and 1,200 other citizens of Saginaw, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5518. Also, petition of Cora Armstrong and 76 other citizens of Concquenessing, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5519. Also, petition of George C. Patteron and 61 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5520. Also, petition of Raymond Jackson and 51 other citizens of Clay City, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5521. Also, petition of Rev. L. G. Leech and 32 other citizens of Clay City, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5522. Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Schlapbach and 56 other citizens of Blackwell, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5523. Also, petition of Ethel Rogier and 69 other citizens of Patoka, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5524. Also, petition of Mrs. W. W. Weaver and 80 other citizens of Greensboro, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5525. Also, petition of H. N. Gerry and 137 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5526. Also, petition of J. R. Holland and 142 other citizens of Hillsboro, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5527. Also, petition of Mrs. W. L. Wilson and 119 other citizens of Modesto, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5528. Also, petition of H. B. Church and 61 other citizens of Roseburg, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5529. Also, petition of Esther Owens and 54 other citizens of Brazil, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5530. Also, petition of George Lindman and 154 other citizens of Cheboygan, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

5531. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition from the Board of Aldermen of the city of Somerville, Mass., favoring passage of the G. I. bill of rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5532. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of Edith Pursell and eight other residents of

Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of the Wagner bill (S. 1161); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5533. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 1, Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 33 other residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furlough for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5534. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petition protesting against the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5535. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Martha Payson and other citizens of Brooks, urging action on Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of all alcoholic liquors near camps and defense industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5536. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, specialist in management and statistical control, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his filing of income-tax returns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Ruler of all nature, in the blue beauty of the soft spring skies and the blossoming glory of the awakened earth our hearts sing with the singing birds:

"This is my Father's world * * *
And though the wrong seems oft so strong
God is the ruler yet."

Day and night, Thou knowest our poignant thoughts are with our absent sons and daughters who across these terror-stricken days march and sail and fly against cruel foes. We think gratefully of the armies of youth who have inherited such a sorry world, called to contend to the death with the unleashed powers of darkness. The courage and cheerfulness of these knights of the trackless air in the face of deadly peril shame our petty complaints and our magnified discomfitures here in our homeland and theirs. Give us prophetic glimpses of the new earth we can construct if together, after this holocaust of hate is past, we harness the sacrifices, the grim resolves, the ingenuities of war to the service of all Thy children. And as today and in the days to come, in this historic Chamber, Thy servants face questions of national concern, may every decision add something to the growing vision of the far-off years as they may be if redeemed by the sons of God; that with bows of burning gold and with the sharpened arrows of desire we, too, may do battle for Thy children and ours. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, April 18, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan;

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. 0-3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943;

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy;

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps;

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.; and

S. 1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3257) to amend Subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark;

H. R. 1045. An act for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Lessie C. Selman;

H. R. 1718. An act for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of J. G. Sullivan;

H. R. 2576. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 2601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2788. An act for the relief of Frank Baptiste;

H. R. 2874. An act for the relief of Robert Will Starks;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Winnie Singleton as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased;

H. R. 2965. An act for the relief of Ross Engineering Co.;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, N. Y.;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry;

H. R. 3674. An act for the relief of William E. Widby;

H. R. 3739. An act for the relief of the Wesix Electric Heater Co.;

H. R. 3859. An act for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck;

H. R. 3977. An act for the relief of Harry Schultz;

H. R. 4254. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 4361. An act for the relief of Arch A. Brown.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 80) authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before that committee during the current session relative to post-war planning, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 866. An act to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

H. R. 3257. An act to amend Subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are many who

are interested in the river and harbor bill and wish to know when different projects in connection with it are to be taken up by the subcommittee handling the bill, I am submitting a schedule of hearings on the bill and ask that it be published in the RECORD at this point in order that Senators and others interested may be advised.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

April 25: Army engineers on new projects reported to Congress since action by the House.

April 26, 27, 28: Tennessee-Tombigbee and Alabama-Coosa projects.

May 1, 2: Beaver-Mahoning Canal, Ohio.

May 3: Amendment concerning Assawoman Island project, Virginia; Erie, Pa., project; Larchmont Harbor, N. Y.

May 4, 5: Section 4, concerning Central Valley project, California; Department of the Interior and Senator BONE amendments.

May 8: Missouri River project.

THIRTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF SAMUEL L. CLEMENS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, today marks the thirty-fourth anniversary of the death of Samuel L. Clemens, better known as Mark Twain, who was a native of my State, having lived in Hannibal. Mark Twain was the greatest humorist in the world, who made the world happier by living in it. His keen observations will live forever.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRESIDENTIAL, VICE PRESIDENTIAL, AND SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of the members of the Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1944, under the terms of Senate Resolution 263, agreed to March 30, 1944, as follows: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

INVITATION TO ATTEND INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter of invitation from the Secretary of Labor, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 13, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I wish to extend to Members of the Senate an invitation to attend the sessions of the International Labor Conference, which will open at 11 o'clock in the morning, April 20, in Philadelphia, Mitten Hall, Temple University. At this meeting 300 delegates representing 40 countries will come together to discuss and vote on recommendations to the United Nations for present and post-war policy, and to outline plans for the maintenance of high employment levels after the war. Each national delegation will be composed not only of official government delegates but will also include representatives of employer and labor organizations from each country. Senator THOMAS of Utah and I have been appointed by the President as the two Government delegates of the United States. The names of the employer and labor delegates are about to be announced.

This will be the twenty-sixth annual conference of the International Labor Organization, of which the United States has been a member for 10 years. It is being held here at the official invitation of our Government. The conference in Philadelphia will offer an unparalleled opportunity for observing the proceedings of an international congress at first hand. This world assembly follows the same pattern as that of the United States Congress. In addition to plenary sessions, there will be a number of working committees and group caucuses. The importance of the topics on its program and the gravity of the present world situation should lend historical significance to the proceedings.

I sincerely hope that a number of Senators, despite their busy schedules, will be able to attend the conference some time during the 3-week period of its sessions. If Senators will communicate with me, I shall be glad to see that they are provided with appropriate cards of admission and detailed information as to how the program will be developed.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 142 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to bring about uniformity and coordination in the allocation of field positions to the grades of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, and the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce (revised estimate), transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"No. 10. Resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico

"Whereas by virtue of an Executive order of the honorable the President of the United States of America, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, there was constituted in our country in May 1935 an agency of the Federal Government named the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, in charge of undertaking the necessary activities for carrying out the purposes indicated by its name, and that action was taken by the honorable the President of the United States, exercising his faculties and powers with a lofty and humanitarian sense of justice, as a consequence of the deplorable situation which our island was facing, with its agriculture ruined, its lack of vital industries, its commerce impoverished, and its legions of men with idle hands due to the devastating hurricanes that razed our cities, our towns, and our fields when we had not yet recuperated from the serious financial crisis caused by the last World War;

"Whereas among the various rehabilitation programs wisely adopted by the said Federal agency there is the organization and award in usufruct of agricultural farm settlements in the rural districts to workmen who rendered their services on the farms needing rehabilitation, the said awards being made on the basis of the payment of a certain monthly rent which is not credited against the price of the farm until the said farmer has occupied the farm for 5 or more years, a policy which causes the said farmer to lose his love for both his farm and his work, and for such reason legions of farmers are seen leaving their farms because they believe that these will never become their property;

"Whereas it is a well known fact that the occupants of the said farms absolutely lack food or resources, and due to the abnormal conditions which Puerto Rico is now suffering on account of the war, which unfortunately will last for some time, the farmers have no income or work, and due to the lack of fertilizer cannot cultivate their farms as in peacetimes, and with the aggravating circumstance that the cost of living, both for food and household goods, has increased enormously for them;

"Whereas the circumstances outlined in the preceding paragraph determine, as an unquestionable fact, that the said farmers cannot hereafter pay the rent which they are obligated to pay, and it is considered that an altruistic expression on the part of Congress, in behalf of Puerto Rico, where the United States has only enthusiastic and decided cooperation in its democratic endeavors, would convey to the homes of those farmers, now worried, the ease of mind and the individual independence entailed by the possession of a piece of land of their own which may protect them from any possible attempt at exploitation and oppression in their work: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:

"SECTION 1. To submit, as it is hereby submitted through this resolution, an earnest appeal to the Congress of the United States of America to pass the bill introduced in that honorable legislative body by the Honorable Bolivar Pagán, Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, resolving to direct and directing the proper body or authority to grant in favor of each and all of the farmers occupying the farms specified in the second whereas above, a title of ownership for the sum which they have paid as rent up to this date.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the honorable the President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to the two Houses that compose the Congress of the United States, to the chairmen of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, to

the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; and to the Honorable Bolivar Pagán, Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, requesting the latter to ask that said bill be considered."

A resolution by Local No. 1391, Screen Office Employees Guild, Hollywood, Calif., favoring the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution by Local No. 1391, Screen Office Employees Guild, Hollywood, Calif., favoring expansion of the O. P. A. subsidy program so as to hold the cost of living in line; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions adopted by the National Maritime Union of America, Cairo, Ill.; Local 1–9, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; Local Union No. 106, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers; and Local No. 104, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, all of Seattle, Wash., favoring the adoption of measures to establish a Nation-wide broadcast of the proceedings of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition which has come to me from Rev. Otho G. Brewer, of Clayton, Del., signed by numerous citizens, asking for favorable action on Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

I also ask unanimous consent to present a petition which has come to me from Rev. W. B. Ruddock, of the Cheswold Methodist Church, signed by numerous citizens of Cheswold, Del., also asking for favorable action on Senate bill 860.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Delaware will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX IN ELECTION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS—PETITION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition, signed by numerous seamen, relative to the abolishment of the payment of poll taxes, and requesting the enactment of pending legislation relating thereto, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

Senator WALLACE WHITE,
Senate Minority Leader,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As seamen who have been through battle we know how terribly our Nation suffers from disunity rooted and fostered in the poll-tax States. We know from life the falseness of color prejudice for there is no segregation or discrimination on N. M. U. ships. Our first national act in support of the Atlantic Charter, Moscow, and Tehran must be eradication of poll tax.

All N. M. U. men, their voting dependents, and relations are awaiting your support. We are urging you to use your influence to get your party members to support cloture and accept no amendments for the passage of H. R. 7.

WALTER E. HARRIS, Jr.,
HADLEY A. COLLINS,
DANIEL F. WOODS
(And sundry other citizens).

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 795) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in connection with the Navy Department appropriation bill, which I have just reported, I wish to give notice, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that it is my intention to move to suspend the applicable rule of the Senate in order to take up certain legislative amendments to the Navy Department appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments namely:

Amendment No. 1: On page 23, after line 15, insert the following:

"NAVAL PROCUREMENT FUND

"The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon request of the Secretary of the Navy, to transfer $1,000,000 from the naval emergency fund (17X0300) to the naval procurement fund (Public Law 653, approved July 3, 1942), and advances by check or warrant and reimbursements to the naval procurement fund from naval appropriations may be made on the basis of the estimated costs of a project without further accounting distribution of expenditures to the individual appropriations involved."

Amendment No. 2: On page 26, line 4, after the word "diem", insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to sell the tract of land of approximately 532.4 acres, in Cleveland County, Okla., commonly known as Moore Field, and more particularly described in, and acquired through, a declaration of taking executed by the Under Secretary of the Navy and filed in the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, and judgment entered thereon, in the proceedings in such court entitled 'United States of America, petitioner, against 532.4 Acres of Land, More or Less, in Cleveland County, Okla., and Mrs. J. R. Holliday, and Others, defendants, No. 1120–Civil,' and to execute and deliver a deed, or deeds, to the person, or persons, or their heirs or assigns, from whom the original holdings were acquired: *Provided further*, That the sale price for such land shall be a sum sufficient to cover the original purchase price and any sums expended by the Navy Department upon such land or arising out of the use and occupancy thereof by the Navy Department: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to make rules and regulations necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this section."

Amendment No. 3: On page 26, line 13, after the word "equipment", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of these funds shall be used for the construction of new naval facilities or the enlargement of existing naval facilities in the continental United States unless the Secretary of the Navy first determines that no existing facilities, publicly or privately owned, are, or can be made, available for the purposes to be served at a cost deemed reasonable by him."

Amendment No. 4: On page 55, add a new section as follows:

"DEFENSE AID

"SEC. 120. Subject to authorization by other law for the rendering of defense aid, information and services, the authority contained in section 103 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, is hereby extended to and made applicable to the appropriations for the naval service made subsequent to such act and contained in this act without any increase in the amount limitation fixed in such section: *Provided*, That 'information and services,' authorized to be rendered by the act of March 11, 1941 (Public, 11), need not be connected with the procurement or disposition of any defense article."

Mr. OVERTON also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4559, the naval appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1572. A bill for the relief of Frank Robertson; with amendments (Rept. No. 796);

H. R. 1628. A bill for the relief of John Hirsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 797);

H. R. 2438. A bill for the relief of Bernadine Salmons; without amendment (Rept. No. 798);

H. R. 2472. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gertrude Mullins; with an amendment (Rept. No. 800); and

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Margaret Hamilton, Mrs. Catherine Higgins, Mrs. Rebecca Sallop, and Mrs. Dora Projansky; without amendment (Rept. No. 799).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Christian Wenz; without amendment (Rept. No. 801).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 1565. A bill relating to the appointment of postmasters; without amendment (Rept. No. 802).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 4278. A bill to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate

the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 803).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 17, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1028) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 1852. A bill for the relief of John W. Giesecke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1853. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1854. A bill for the relief of Walter S. Faulkner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1855. A bill for the relief of Lewis Harkins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1856. A bill to increase the maximum amount of national service life insurance which may be carried by any person in the armed forces by an amount equal to $5,000 for each child of such person; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1857. A bill granting an increase in pension to Esther Ann Hill Morgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1858 (by request). A bill to give honorably discharged, disabled, or retired marine employees of the Panama Canal civil-service preference, to extend to them the facilities of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

(Mr. MALONEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 122, which was passed and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSEL BY PETROLEUM RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, adopted March 13, 1944.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut give us a brief explanation of what is involved in the joint resolution?

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to do so, Mr. President, and, because it is a technical matter, I have prepared a statement.

This resolution has been authorized by the so-called Petroleum Resources Committee of the Senate to meet the situation which confronts the committee with respect to the proposed employment of Richard Joyce Smith as its chief counsel for a period of several months, and the employment of other counsel as may be required by the committee on a temporary basis.

Mr. Smith is a member of the New York City law firm of Whitman, Ransom, Coulson & Goetz. That law firm has numerous clients, many of whom have tax claims pending against the Federal Government, and are or may be involved in various administrative proceedings before Federal agencies which might be construed to be a "proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter or thing in which the United States is a party, or directly or indirectly interested"—section 113, Criminal Code.

Since it is proposed to retain Mr. Smith as chief counsel of the committee on a temporary basis, it is not feasible for Mr. Smith either to withdraw from his law firm or to waive his participation under the partnership agreement in the net fees of the law firm. Because of that situation, Mr. Smith has raised the question as to the possible application of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code to him if he is to act as chief counsel for the committee. Further questions appear also possibly to be raised under sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes.

Sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code provide penalties against any person who being an officer of the United States or discharging any official function thereunder, or being a clerk of the United States, joins in the prosecution in the support of any claim against the United States, or receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation for any services rendered in relation to any proceeding or claim or controversy in which the United States is a party, or is directly or indirectly interested.

Sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes provide that no fee shall be allowed or paid to any attorney or counselor for any service which is required to be rendered of officers of the Department of Justice, and also provide in effect that the Department of Justice shall have control over the naming of Government counsel. It is probably doubtful that these latter sections of the Revised Statutes would be applicable in this matter. However, following the precedents established in other cases, it is advisable to have the exemption proposed in the joint resolution apply to these sections also.

While this question arises initially with respect to the committee's retaining Mr. Smith as its chief counsel, it is anticipated, in view of the shortage of qualified lawyers, that the committee may be unable to retain additional counsel, except upon a temporary basis under which such additional counsel would be permitted to continue to participate in professional fees for private practice.

Mr. Smith as a lawyer is bound under the ethics of his profession, by all the sanctions of professional censure and other punishment, not to engage in any professional activity which would be inconsistent or incompatible with his work as counsel for the Senate committee. Mr. Smith has represented to the committee that his law firm is not engaged in any work which, from a professional point of view, would be deemed incompatible with his work as counsel for this committee.

Specifically, he has assured the committee that neither he nor any members of his firm represent any oil companies or interests whose business would be the subject of the committee's investigation. The proposed exemption is merely to limit the broad application of general statutory provisions as they might be held applicable to Mr. Smith under his retainer as counsel for the committee.

It should be noted that these provisions of the Criminal Code became law many years ago, when claims or controversies in which the United States might be a party, or directly or indirectly interested, represented a minor part of the general practice of the law. Because of the increase in Federal regulation in recent years, there is probably no well-established law office with a general practice, and having the usual cross-section of business and individual clients, which does not at any given time have pending before some department of the Federal Government a matter which might be construed as a claim or controversy in which the United States is directly or indirectly interested. The statutes in question certainly were not enacted on the basis of the present ramification of Federal regulation.

Therefore, unless some such exemption is adopted as is proposed by this joint resolution, it will be difficult for a committee of the Congress to secure the best available legal talent. This difficulty is increased under war conditions, which have caused a pronounced shortage of qualified lawyers.

The exemption is not proposed to permit counsel for the committee to continue

his active private practice while at the same time working for the committee. Except for incidental consultations, Mr. Smith will be devoting his full time to committee affairs.

The chairman of the committee referred this question to the Attorney General, and received from him an informal opinion that an employee of a congressional committee is an officer or clerk in the employ of the United States within the meaning of sections 109 and 113. But the Attorney General apparently is not prepared to advise that Mr. Smith's situation as outlined above would not fall within the technical provisions of those sections.

The proposal of a joint resolution to limit the operation of these statutes is not new. The same procedure has been followed in the past. Attention is directed to House Joint Resolution 230, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, which the proposed resolution follows in form, and which was designed to cover the employment of counsel by the House under House Resolution 386, Seventy-eighth Congress. The report of the House Committee on the Judiciary accompanying House Joint Resolution 230, Report 1117, also states that a similar resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 54, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, Forty-third United States Statutes, pages 5, 6, was passed to enable Owen J. Roberts to appear in the Teapot Dome cases.

I should like to advise the distinguished minority leader that I discussed this matter at length with the Department of Justice and with the Attorney General, and that in our committee and everywhere else there is unanimous approval of the contemplated action.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will yield, I should like to say to him from the minority side of his committee that we totally agree with his statement. The joint resolution is not only essential but desirable.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark;

H. R. 1045. An act for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Lessie C. Selman;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of J. G. Sullivan;

H. R. 2576. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 2601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2788. An act for the relief of Frank Baptiste;

H. R. 2874. An act for the relief of Robert Will Starks;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Winnie Singleton, as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased;

H. R. 2965. An act for the relief of Ross Engineering Co.;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, N. Y.;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry;

H. R. 3674. An act for the relief of William E. Widby;

H. R. 3739. An act for the relief of the Wesix Electric Heater Co.;

H. R. 3859. An act for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck;

H. R. 3977. An act for the relief of Harry Schultz; and

H. R. 4361. An act for the relief of Arch A. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1718. An act for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4254. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment, and Mr. WEEKS (for himself and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE SAULT STE. MARIE (MICH.) POWER PLANT—AMENDMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit an amendment to House bill 3961, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which I propose to offer at the appropriate time, covering the construction of a new hydroelectric power plant in the St. Marys River, Mich. I present the amendment together with accompanying papers, including a letter from Representative FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan, and a copy of the hearings before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors on the subject, and ask that the amendment be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION OBTAINED THROUGH CENSORSHIP

Mr. REED submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 282), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the censorship of communications under section 303 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, with particular reference to the use and unauthorized disclosure of information obtained through such censorship. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

MANPOWER AND WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, today through the press and by radio and other means of communication the people of America, and probably of the world, are being informed that vital industry faces a draft of 1,385,000 young men for the armed forces, probably to be taken between the ages of 18 and 26.

Notwithstanding the great confusion of information we have had upon this subject during the past 2 weeks, there is no escaping this necessity, for our divisions must be capable of being replenished by replacements made necessary by casualties within 36 hours after the casualties occur. Those replacements have to be made with men competent, in the matter of age and physical condition, to take the places of the casualties. Not only that, they must be drawn from industry and agriculture early enough so that they may have the training necessary to qualify them for their own protection in battle and for the protection of their comrades into whose ranks they are to be infiltered in the line of battle.

In addition to the obvious shortage which would be created by the draft of such men from industry and agriculture, the country is being informed of a demand by railways for 101,000 men during the ensuing year, by the lumber industries for 121,000 men, and there are demands from various other industries, such as those producing radar devices, ball bearings, landing craft, and the larger type of planes, as well as mines, particularly those from which mica and such products are taken. So the demand for manpower is about to be much greater than it has been in the past, and of a vital character, a demand which will call for capacity to mobilize our people quite flexibly and quite promptly.

We have also the information that today the turn-over in our factories is greater than it has ever been heretofore. Although the graph does not show a continuously smooth curve upward, yet for the past 4 years the curve, by ups and downs, has gradually attained a higher level all the time, until at its present point we have to have an average of five men in line to take the place of the one man who is separated from his job either by being inducted into the armed forces or by virtue of his own quitting for reasons which seem satisfactory to him.

In the situation which we face today I think that Congress should give publicity to facts which are contained in the text of the statement by the three men under whom directly all the production of munitions is made, that is, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission. The statement was made following a meeting yesterday with about 65 of the leaders of industry who are principally organized in the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Manufacturers' Association, and the Association of American Railways.

Regarding this meeting and the statement, the Washington Post this morning published an article by Ben W. Gilbert containing the full text of the statement issued, and I ask unanimous consent that the article, with the statement, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

At the same time I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of this morning which refers specifically to the duty of Congress in this situation. In order to have the point before Senators at the time my request is submitted, I read the last paragraph of the editorial:

This third recommendation points straight toward the enactment of some form of national war service legislation which will impose upon able-bodied citizens at home, whose efforts are needed on the war-production line, the same legal and moral obligations to help with this war which now rest solely upon young men of draft age. The case for such legislation is presented strongly and, in our judgment, unanswerably, in the statement issued yesterday in Washington by Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox and Admiral Land. The fact that this statement was issued after conferences in which General Marshall and Admiral King participated and in which the whole problem of manpower was reviewed ought to gain for it the immediate attention of Congress, despite the now threadbare comment that "this is an election year."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 21, 1944]

VITAL INDUSTRY FACES DRAFT OF 1,385,000—SERVICE LAW DEMANDED BY STIMSON, KNOX, LAND—NEEDED TO INSURE CARRYING OUT WAR PROGRAMS, THEY SAY; BUSINESS DEMURS

(By Ben W. Gilbert)

Bidding for industrial support for national service legislation, the heads of the War and Navy Departments and Maritime Commission warned last night that the armed forces would have to induct at least 1,385,000 additional men this year mainly from vital industries which must find replacements and in many instances increase their working forces.

Industry—speaking through the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce—promptly expressed unequivocal opposition to any labor draft, while some civilian agency heads were reported bringing pressure to bear on Selective Service to protect vital war industries from possible disruption by the draft when the induction of men over 26 in essential activity is resumed.

PRODUCTION LOSS FEARED

One official who asked that his name be withheld asserted that the Nation was in danger of losing its industrial power unless it took steps to protect men over 26 in key industries with measurable skills, particularly technicians and administrative personnel.

Moves also were under way to obtain clarification of draft policies to remove the uncertainty hanging over hundreds of thousands of family heads by the recent indefinite postponement of induction of men over 26 in essential activities. In the District, scores of men over 30 who were classified I-A prior to the issuance of the induction stay order have experienced difficulty finding jobs because of the uncertainty of their draft status, even though the services have stated that they do not want older men.

Meanwhile, the House Military Affairs Committee indorsed a report of its special subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN M. COSTELLO, Democrat, of California, asking the armed services to induct for noncombatant duty those IV-F's who refused to enter activities contributing directly or indirectly to the war program.

Although the services have indicated that they might accept legislative controls over IV-F's as a substitute for national service legislation, they have flatly declined thus far to institute the controls themselves.

JOINT STATEMENT ISSUED

In a joint statement, War Secretary Henry L. Stimson, Navy Secretary Frank Knox, and Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, declared that service legislation was necessary to insure the success of essential war programs and added:

"Someone must step up to the bench, the lathe, and desk of every warworker who leaves to fight for his country. More than that, the Nation's working forces must be made flexible enough to fill the needs of high priority military production. Disorderly migration of labor must be arrested. The turnover rate in war industries is alarming. We, as a people, are not meeting many of the labor shortages in critical programs, in the midst of a war for survival."

The statement disclosed that they had met with representatives of the chamber of commerce, National Association of Manufacturers and Association of American Railroads to solicit their support of war service legislation. The sharply dissenting statements issued later by the National Association of Manufacturers and chamber of commerce indicated that they did not make much progress. Meetings previously held with labor leaders failed to remove labor's unqualified opposition to national service.

"DISASTROUS," SAYS GAYLORD

Robert M. Gaylord, president of National Association of Manufacturers, stated that application of such a law would be disastrous to production, and added: "Industry knows that the way to get production is to lead men, not to drive them. It wants no part of forced labor."

The chamber of commerce said "imposition of a compulsory law upon the industrial workers of the Nation would bring complications which actually might retard rather than advance the war program."

The estimated needs of the armed forces for the rest of 1944 included naval requirements (Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard) for 635,000 men, with 230,000 as replacements, and Army replacement needs for 750,000. The Army reached full strength on April 1.

The three agency heads warned that a larger number of men might be required in view of the uncertainties of the impending invasion.

Strong pressure from civilian agencies to prevent the armed services from getting a large part of the needed men from essential industries may be expected. One official argued that draft policies ought to be changed to take young men out of agriculture before taking older men out of industry.

It was pointed out that some basic industries which are not considered critical today, and hence receive no protection from the draft of men under 26, may take on extreme urgency later on, due to a shift in the war program. Then, without necessary skilled men, it may be unable to do the job assigned.

LOT OF MEN OVER 30

It is believed in some quarters that, despite the demands made by the armed services, it may never be necessary to make important inroads into the pool of men over 30 in essential industries, yet the status of this age group remains unclear. On the other hand, it is generally agreed, that a new deferment yardstick will have to be established in the 26-to-30 age group.

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, gave this picture in an address last night:

"The selection of men for the armed forces in the future will include every possible man under 26 physically fit; the balance must come first from those 26 through 29 with greater consideration for deferment being given to those men in industrial and agricultural activities and who are critically needed by those activities.

"The balance of the men required by the Army and Navy will come from those past 30, particularly those who are engaged in activities that do not contribute in a material way to the winning of the war, or those who, although engaged in such activities, do so in a half-hearted manner."

DRAFT QUOTAS MAY DROP

Allocating the 1,385,000 among the 9 months from April through December indicated that monthly draft calls may drop from the present 175,000 to 200,000 level to 125,000 or lower. However, Hershey, apparently making independent calculations, asserted that it "would be overly optimistic" if less than 150,000 a month is allowed for replacements to maintain the Army at its 7,700,000 full strength and the Navy at the 3,600,000 full strength projected for September 1.

According to the figures released in the Stimson-Knox-Land statement, Army rereplacement needs are expected to average 83,000 a month over 9 months, while Navy replacement needs are slated to be slightly over 25,000 a month, for a monthly total of 108,000.

On the subject of legislation to control the job movements of IV-F's the Costello report stated:

"It has been brought to the attention of the committee that while the War Department has indicated an unwillingness to adopt and place in effect the recommendations of the committee, nevertheless the authority to do so still remains, and the committee takes the position that until it is pointed out wherein the laws which have already been enacted as a result of the committee's legislative action are shown to be

inadequate, further legislation is not necessary."

SEVEN RECOMMENDATIONS MADE

Specifically, the Costello group made seven recommendations:

1. That reclassification out of IV–F of those in essential activities continue.

2. That Selective Service and War Manpower Commission list industries in which IV–F's may be granted deferments.

3. That IV–F's holding deferments be required to secure the permission of their draft boards before changing jobs.

4. That IV–F's not in essential activities be required to notify their draft boards of willingness to accept essential employment.

5. That IV–F's who are unwilling to accept essential employment be deemed subject to induction into the armed forces.

6. That they be accepted by the armed forces for noncombatant duty.

7. That, if an insufficient amount of manpower is provided by these techniques, the same procedures be applied to those discharged from the armed forces (I–C's) and to all registrants between the ages of 38 and 45.

[From the Washington Post of April 21, 1944]

TEXT OF LABOR DRAFT DEMAND MADE BY STIMSON, KNOX, LAND

The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission announce that they have met today with representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Association of American Railroads to discuss the necessity for national war-service legislation.

Also present and joining in the discussion were Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff; Admiral Ernest J. King, Commander in Chief, United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations; Lt. Gen. Brehon H. Somervell; Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard; Senator Warren R. Austin, of Vermont; and Representative James W. Wadsworth, of New York.

Conferences previously had been had with the national labor leaders.

STATEMENT BY OFFICIALS

Following today's meeting, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, and Admiral Land issued a joint statement describing the need for legislation to provide adequate manpower for essential industries which must increase production despite transfer of some 1,400,000 of their employees to military service. The statement:

After meeting with national leaders of organized labor, we invited representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Association of American Railroads to meet with us for a discussion of the critical industrial manpower problem and to solicit their support for war-service legislation.

Before the end of the year we estimate that the armed services will require an additional 1,400,000 men. The uncertainties of the invasion may largely increase this total. Most of them—almost all—will be obtained through the democratic processes of the Selective Service System.

Most of them, too, will be drawn from vital industries which must not only obtain replacements for their employees called to the armed services but which must in many instances increase their working forces.

The Nation has summoned 11,000,000 men to the colors. It is the essence of democracy that there should be equality of obligation as well as equality of privilege. If it is logical to require some to fight, then it is equally logical to require others to supply them with weapons. Only war service legislation can insure fair distribution of the burden we must all bear to win the victory in which we all will share.

Such legislation is necessary, in our opinion, to insure the success of essential war programs. Legislation of universal application is not, in our opinion, necessary. What is needed is a law so designed as to meet the actual conditions which confront the Nation and its men on the fighting fronts. What those conditions are shall be stated.

It is imperative that the country realize that the present methods of industrial service cannot do the whole job; that the American people must adopt some system of national industrial service which will provide workers for essential war industries, wherever shortages in manpower appear.

TELL OF PROPOSED ACT

It is our thought that the War Work Service Act should first provide for the recruiting of voluntary industrial workers before the selective service principle is invoked. When a given war industry in a given locality is found suffering from a labor shortage, that fact should be proclaimed in a call for volunteers to fill the shortage.

Emphatically the law must prevent depletion in the ranks of other essential industries to man the one in distress, because one of the greatest of present difficulties is the excessive turn-over in employment. The volunteers must come from labors not necessary to the Nation's war needs.

In case sufficient volunteers do not appear in answer to the call, then the national selective service principle must be invoked to supply the essential need. That is our judgment. It is based on facts such as these:

Before the end of 1944 the Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps will require 635,000 men, of whom 230,000 will be needed as replacements;

In the same time the Army, which has reached its complement, will need 750,000 additional men as replacements;

That is a total of 1,390,000 men, a minimum total which may have to be greatly increased before 1945;

The greatest part of this number will be drawn from the shops and farms and mines, the factories, and the railroads; most will have to be replaced, because essential industries must keep on supplying our fighting forces with the materials and instruments of war;

The aircraft plants and the shipyards must not only be provided replacements for men called into the armed forces but they must be given 200,000 additional workers to supply the demand for planes and ships;

Navy yards will need 5,000 additional workers just for the construction of submarines alone;

In the shipyards building landing craft and all the amphibious warfare vessels, 18,000 workers above all replacements must be found before September. If we do not have the landing craft we cannot take or hold the beaches.

In two east coast yards alone 11,000 men are immediately needed to build tankers to fuel our fleets.

OTHER MANPOWER NEEDS

These are but examples. Plants making synthetic rubber, tire fabrics, and heavy-duty tires must have 19,000 more workers before September. Radio and radar factories are in urgent need now for 30,000 workers, more than 4,000 additional workers are needed in the manufacture of aviation gasoline. And all these are in addition to industrial replacements.

This Nation sacrificed 60 bombers and 600 men to cripple the German ball-bearing industry in Schweinfurt, but it cannot obtain the workers here at home to fill the production lines of our own bearing and foundry industries upon which the armament program depends.

The railroads, upon which the Nation depends for moving troops and the products of our factories and farms, assert that they are jeopardized by a shortage today of 100,000 men. The coal mines, source of the power that drives the wheels of industry and transportation, will send 45,000 workers into the armed forces this year from an already insufficient crew of miners. The lumber industry calls for 40,000 men at once.

Someone must step up to the bench, the lathe, and desk of every war worker who leaves to fight for his country. More than that, the Nation's working forces must be made flexible enough to fill the needs of high-priority military production. Disorderly migration of labor must be arrested. The turnover rate in war industries is alarming. We, as a people, are not meeting many of the labor shortages in critical programs, in the midst of a war for survival.

From March 1943 to March 1944 the civilian labor force declined by 1,500,000—equal to the number of men who will be drafted into the armed forces this year. In consequence, the Nation suffers with 67 labor-shortage areas. Nearly every industrial center in the country needs workers. There are enough persons in most of these areas who are idle or employed in unessential work to make up these deficiencies.

Out of every 1,000 workers employed on February 1, 1944, 65 quit. Only 53 workers are recruited to take their places. That means that last February the Nation lost a net of 12 men out of every 1,000. Where 1,000 were turning out the munitions of war on February 1, only 988 were working on February 29.

Labor turn-over has reached a rate of more than 6 percent per month, 3 times the peacetime average.

In short, in order to keep a constant force of 100 men working, an employer had to hire 72 new hands in the course of the year.

Why are they quitting? One reason is that successes in battle result in adverse trends in employment and production. Every victory seems to inspire in thousands the belief that the war is won. False public interpretation of what are only local victories on the perimeter of the enemies' strongholds may indeed imperil victory when we thrust at the foes' heart.

We have yet to meet the major forces of Germany, and of a Japan commanding a large share of the natural wealth and human resources of eastern Asia. We are still 2,000 miles from Tokyo, with all the enemy land and sea and air forces between us and that goal. For our fighting men, the war is just entering its critical stage. For our civilian labor forces, there must be no relaxation of effort.

OUR GREATEST UNDERTAKING

We are poised for our greatest undertaking as a Nation since we achieved our national independence and unity. We dare not falter at the front—or at home. Present methods have not and are not solving our critical manpower problems. There is little evidence to believe that they will provide for the greater problems of the future.

The very real possibility that we may suddenly be forced to shift thousands of workers into the production of some entirely new weapon, which experience in combat or the secret inventions of our enemies demand, is a contingency which we cannot ignore.

In practice a national war-service law would probably affect only a small proportion of the Nation's employables, for most of the shortages are specific, rather than general, and the aggregate numbers needed to meet them are but a fraction of our potential working force.

From the experience of our allies, it can be predicted that once the obligation to serve is made a duty by law the volunteers will come forward. Be that as it may, the need for a law to mobilize and maneuver the industrial manpower of the Nation cannot, in our judgment, be denied or evaded.

Experience has taught us that we must use selective processes to man our fighting forces; experience is now teaching us that we must invoke the same national power to provide them the weapons.

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.
FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy.
EMORY S. LAND,
Chairman, U. S. Maritime Commission.

[From the New York Times of April 21, 1944]

STILL A WAR TO WIN

Three men who know at first hand the resources and the strategy of the armed forces of the United States spoke last night in Times Hall on the theme, "We still have the war to win." They agreed that the unfinished task that lies ahead is still formidable enough to require every ounce of effort and devotion that we as a Nation can put into it. Speaking for the Navy, Rear Admiral Cooke, Deputy Chief of Staff, pointed out that despite our brilliant naval successes in the Pacific we have not yet found a way of "deploying ground forces sufficient to bring to defeat the very strong Japanese ground forces on the battlefields necessary for close blockade and for securing the positions necessary for bombing Japan"; moreover, as we move westward in the Pacific "our lines of communication become longer, the Japanese lines shorter, the Japanese perimeter of defense smaller." Speaking for the Army, Under Secretary of War Patterson urged us to look at the map and face realistically the size of the problems involved in maintaining an uninterrupted flow of munitions to armies stationed at the ends of 56,000 miles of sea lanes. As Director of Selective Service, Major General Hershey declared that while the still undetermined fortunes of war make any precise estimate impossible, we shall be "overly optimistic" if we do not plan on replacement for our armed services at the rate of 1,800,000 a year.

These sober appraisals give us some measure of the task with which we are confronted and warn us again against the dangerous assumption of taking victory for granted. The war is still far from won. It will still be far from won when Allied troops have succeeded in landing on the well-armed coasts of France and when Allied naval forces, venturing far past Sabang and Truk, are prepared to strike at Singapore and the Philippines. We may hope for an earlier end of the fighting on all fronts than the present military situation warrants; but we cannot for a moment afford to base our efforts and our plans on any other assumption than that a long hard struggle lies ahead.

What can the stay-at-home do to help shorten that struggle besides continuing to give his best efforts to any useful task on which he is employed? Secretary Patterson recommends a three-point program for those of us who are on the safer end of the long lines of communications. First, trust in our allies. "The job is too big for us alone. Wholehearted cooperation in our world struggle is a plain necessity." Second, trust our military leadership. "Critics who attack from the comfort of their armchairs individual segments of an over-all complex pattern do damage." Third, leave nothing undone that will help achieve "an inseparable linking of ourselves in thought and action with our fighting men."

This third recommendation points straight toward the enactment of some form of national war-service legislation which will impose upon able-bodied citizens at home, whose efforts are needed on the war-production line, the same legal and moral obligations to help with this war which now rest solely upon young men of draft age. The case for such legislation is presented strongly and, in our judgment, unanswerably, in the statement issued yesterday in Washington by Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, and Admiral Land. The fact that this statement was issued after conferences in which General Marshall and Admiral King participated and in which the whole problem of manpower was reviewed ought to gain for it the immediate attention of Congress, despite the now threadbare comment that "this is an election year."

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McKELLAR

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority, delivered by him in Knoxville, Tenn., on April 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS SERVICE FLAG DEDICATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on April 16 on the occasion of the dedication of the national service flag under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus at New Haven, Conn., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER AT SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE N. R. E. C. A.

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on March 7, 1944, at the second annual convention of the N. R. E. C. A. in Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAN-AMERICAN DAY ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, in celebration of Pan-American Day, before the Pan American Union on April 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON, A GREAT AMERICAN—ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JACKSON

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Thomas Jefferson, delivered by Associate Justice Jackson of the Supreme Court of the United States before the Virginia State Society, Washington, D. C., April 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVASION AND THE FINAL CHALLENGE—EDITORIAL BY McGRAW-HILL PUBLISHING CO.

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Invasion and the Final Challenge," prepared by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. and published in the Washington Post of Thursday, April 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR BOND PURCHASES BY NINETY-NINTH LONE STAR BATTALION

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence and a news release relative to the purchase of War bonds by the Ninety-ninth Lone Star Battalion, which appear in the Appendix.]

ISOLATIONISTS, NATIONALISTS, AND INTERNATIONALISTS—EDITORIAL FROM IRON AGE

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strange Words; Queer Bedfellows," published in the Iron Age of April 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM—ARTICLE FROM McCALL'S MAGAZINE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the school-lunch program, published in McCall's Magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIALS FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials by John W. Owens, one entitled "The Lag on Russia," published in the Baltimore Sun of April 12, 1944, and the other entitled "On the Loose Again," published in the Baltimore Sun of April 14, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN'S PEACE AND OURS—EDITORIAL FROM ILLINOIS STATE REGISTER

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lincoln's Peace and Ours," published in the Illinois State Register of April 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEARINGS BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS RELATIVE TO POST-WAR PLANNING

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 80, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2, of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to post-war planning.

Mr. TRUMAN. The concurrent resolution authorizes the printing of certain hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS COURCIL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 248) for the relief of Louis Courcil, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree

to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

REV. C. M. McKAY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 544) for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

DELORES LEWIS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1313) for the relief of Delores Lewis and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ROBERTSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

EDDIE T. STEWART

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1411) for the relief of Eddie T Stewart, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

MILDRED B. HAMPTON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1412) for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD E. AND MARY JANE HELD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2625) for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

MAVIS NORRINE COTHRON ET AL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

REV. JAMES T. DENIGAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan, and, requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES

Mr. GILLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I asked recognition in order that I might move that the Senate take up a bill for consideration, but I shall be glad to yield for routine matters, and I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement issued on April 19, 1944, by the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Petroleum Resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate Petroleum Resources Committee has held a number of executive sessions in preparation for public hearings which, it is expected, will begin soon after the first of May.

Mr. F. A. Davies, president of the Arabian-American Oil Co., attended the committee's meeting today.

Previously the committee has heard the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, who was accompanied by Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator; Commodore A. F. Carter, executive officer of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board; and Col. John H. Leavell and Charles Rayner, of the Department of State.

The representatives of the various governmental departments have exhibited to the committee full cooperation in these preliminary deliberations.

Under its organic resolution, this committee is "authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to petroleum resources, and the production and consumption of petroleum and petroleum products, both within and outside the United States, in their relation to our national welfare and security."

The committee is further directed upon the basis of its study to make an early report to the Senate "together with its recommendations for the formulation of a national petroleum policy."

The committee does not conceive its initial duty to be to enter upon a detailed collection of statistics on petroleum resources. It is not intended to engage in studies of a factual nature which for practical purposes would duplicate work already completed by other committees of the Senate, agencies of the executive department and various branches of private industry.

This is a policy committee. Its essential function is to make recommendations for the formulation of a national policy in which particularly, in its international aspects, the Senate of the United States has a direct responsibility

Petroleum has emerged in this war as a natural resource of the highest strategic significance. After the war its use and conservation may be expected to play a dominant role in the maintenance of peace and security among nations and in promoting prosperity among peoples.

These are propositions readily accepted. The more difficult questions relate to methods by which this Nation and other nations are to govern the impact of petroleum upon a world moving out of war and into peace.

The United States is by far the leading nation in producing and consuming petroleum products. The policy it adopts toward the production and distribution of this great natural resource, and its derivatives, is bound to have a profound influence not only upon the domestic economy of the country, but also upon the course we, as a nation, are to pursue in foreign affairs.

Congressional participation in the formulation of this policy is essential, if the policy is to be truly national and an authoritative pronouncement which the people of the country will be prepared to accept and implement.

With the organization of this committee, congressional participation in the formulation of a national petroleum policy has begun Other departments of the Government have already indicated a readiness to keep the committee fully advised on developments and to assist the committee in its studies and investigations.

It is recognized, in line with Secretary Hull's recent declaration, that the Congress is to be given adequate participation in charting the country's course in foreign affairs.

To the extent that the determination of a national petroleum policy may involve understandings, arrangements, or agreements with other countries, with possible influence on the broad principles of foreign policy, the committee has been assured that the Congress will be fully consulted in advance of final commitments.

In a matter so grave and far reaching in its effect upon the national economy and upon the country's post-war position in world affairs, the Congress has a duty to do more than merely to formalize by legislation a policy previously determined by others. It is for this reason that the committee has undertaken a comprehensive study of the petroleum situation both at home and abroad.

Thus, the work of the committee, even in advance of formal recommendations to the Senate, should aid in bringing to the Congress valuable information upon preliminary deliberations affecting a national petroleum policy.

It is recognized that in the utilization of petroleum products for the immediate purposes of waging war, our military services must act quickly and must adopt temporary measures which cannot await the determination of a long-range plan or policy.

Neither the Senate as a whole, nor this committee, has any intention to interfere with this exclusive responsibility of the Army and Navy. It is always proper, however, to consider whether measures taken for military purposes might also affect the long-range policy on petroleum.

It is the committee's view that the representatives of private industry in petroleum should be asked to join with the Government in the work leading to the formulation of a petroleum policy. We initiate these studies with no preconceived ideas on the restriction of private capital in fields of legitimate enterprise. We believe that on this tremendous post-war problem the country needs the candid and open-minded cooperation of Government and industry working together in the interest of national welfare and security.

It may well be that the principles agreed upon in the formulation of a national petroleum policy, and the technique adopted for integrating the work of Government and industry in this field, will create a pattern for solving the problems related to other natural resources.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ENGAGED IN COMBAT SERVICE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on March 16 of this year I introduced a bill, Senate bill 1787, to provide additional pay for members of the armed forces engaged in combat service. The bill provides that "officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services," and so forth, "shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in actual combat against the enemy or to serve regularly and frequently in immediate combat areas with troops engaged in actual combat against the enemy."

That bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I find that Representative WEISS, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. In the Washington Post of this morning appears a Gallup poll undertaking to sound the sentiment of the people of the country on the proposed legislation. The Gallup poll demonstrates the great preponderance of opinion of the country favoring the passage of my bill, S. 1787.

The passage of the proposed legislation could never result in fully paying for their services the men who engage in actual combat, but it would be a recognition of their service and show that we regard them with esteem and appreciation and that we contemplate with feelings of earnest sympathy the harsh, difficult, and dangerous situations which they necessarily must encounter.

Therefore I bespeak the attention and support of the Members of the Senate to the bill when it comes before the Senate for consideration.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD the Gallup poll, which appears in the Washington Post of April 21, 1944, and also a radio address which I made on April 6 over the Blue Network on the subject of the proposed legislation. As I desire to have the Gallup poll and the radio address printed together in the RECORD, and as a copy of the address will not be available to me in time for printing in today's RECORD, I ask that the poll and address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD of Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The poll and address appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A1922.]

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in today's RECORD a letter under date of March 22, 1944, which I wrote to Rev. Daniel Gambrillis, of Chicago, chairman of the committee having in charge the observance of the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of Greek independence at Ashland Park Auditorium, Chicago, together with a brief speech which I sent to him as a tribute to the Greek people on that anniversary.

There being no objection, the letter and the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 22, 1944.

Rev. DANIEL GAMBRILLIS, *Chairman,*
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR REVEREND GAMBRILLIS: I am grateful to you for your telegram advising me of the forthcoming observance of the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of Greek independence at Ashland Park Auditorium.

Your invitation to send a message I appreciate very much.

I rejoice with the Greek communities everywhere on this one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of Greek independence and take satisfaction in the historic fact that the United States, although a young Nation itself, was the first nation to recognize the Greek Government. Ever since then we have held Greece in high esteem. Her sons and daughters have enriched our American citizenship.

Feeling as I do, in consonance therewith, I have had the privilege of appointing as principals and alternates to the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis the following boys of Greek ancestry: Alexander James Papatones, Somersworth, N. H.; Kaston R. Zablackas, North Conway, N. H.; Louis G. Scliris, Portsmouth, N. H., and Demosthenes Paul Dakos, Manchester, N. H. These young men are demonstrating a high standard of scholarship and character in these schools.

Today Greece is passing through a time of trial, and I join with her people and her friends in earnest prayer for her complete liberation from the thralldom of Axis forces and for a bright and glorious future.

I salute not only the glory that was Greece but the glory that is to be Greece of the future.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator from New Hampshire.

In many parts of our Nation, the sons and daughters of Greece are observing this year the one-hundred-and-twenty-third anniversary of Greek independence.

Despite the tragic fact that Greece is suffering today under domination of the Axis Powers, the spirit of the Greek people is unconquerable, and they will, with our help, cast out the invaders and rise to a new epoch of national progress and well-being.

In 1941 I submitted Senate Joint Resolution 45 to the United States Senate, authorizing a loan of $100,000,000 to the nation of Greece to assist her in her struggles against the Nazi powers. I did it in the full confidence that here was a country that would give a good account of herself against the Axis war machine.

Subsequent events have proved this statement. I like to remember that Greece was the first nation in Europe to follow the American pattern of becoming an independent nation.

With fortitude and courage she revolted in 1821 against the Ottoman Turks, and in the year 1830 won her independence.

Our country, young though it then was, was the first to recognize the Greek Government, and ever since we have held her in our highest esteem and admiration.

That period, during which the Greek Nation rebelled, spelled a turning point for the betterment of all the world's people, because our freedom from England followed by this one, gave courage and hope to the French who rose against Charles X and dethroned him; then to Belgium, which soon gained her independence; and to Poland, which rose against the Czars.

But to the Greeks, from the protocol of London February 3, 1830, and before, and to this very day and hour, have gone the respect of all thinking men for their devotion to the right and for their accomplishments.

During the closing days of the last World War, many maintain, and with good reason I believe, that the presence of the Grecian Army on the Macedonian front made victory possible there. Von Hindenburg himself is said to have admitted that the German collapse on the Macedonian front rendered their chance to force a suitable peace, a hopeless task.

In this present strife, in this war's darkest hour, and while the Nazis still looked unbeatable, little Greece resisted her with all she had and forced Hitler to hesitate. This gained precious time for the British and her allies. Overwhelming were the odds against her but she did not falter. Blood, starvation, destruction, and death have been her portion but stanch and unconquerable has been her courage.

The progress of Greece has been the progress of civilization. Her ancient architecture still rates with the beautiful, the most beautiful. Her sculpture still reigns. The tragedy and comedy of her literature, the poetry and grace of the ancient Grecian dances are still superb but, great as have

been her contributions to the arts and sciences, she has made a more fundamental contribution to the United States in the sons and daughters of Hellas who have come to America and have become a real part of our national life. Thrift, integrity, industry—these are their outstanding attributes and we gladly pay them tribute today.

May the culture, charm, and beauty of all that was ever Greece have a new birth for the glory of the whole world, when this bitter war is won.

TRIBUTE TO DANNY JACKSTADT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me in order that I may read a short editorial into the RECORD?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, recently I received from Capt. Irving Dilliard, who is with the Allied Expeditionary Force in Italy, a letter and a copy of the Stars and Stripes. In the copy of the Stars and Stripes appears an editorial entitled "Undestroyable." The editorial merely quotes another editorial, written by James O. Monroe, editor of the Collinsville (Ill.) Weekly Herald, which pays tribute to a printer named Danny Jackstadt, formerly employed by Mr. Monroe, who made the supreme sacrifice on the Italian battle front. The tribute is so touching and beautiful that I shall take the time of the Senate to read it into the RECORD. It is as follows:

I am framing Danny Jackstadt's picture and putting it on the wall above the desk where I write. Nearly every time I look up I will see the broad grin of that young printer of ours who a month ago gave his life in Italy to help keep us safe from savagery and let us continue to live our lives as we all lived them together here before Danny went away. And I will smile back at Danny now and then, as I used to do when he was here, and behind my smile there will be a firm determination, as there always was behind Danny's, to live faithfully and well the daily life ahead. And while I shall not be called on to make the sacrifice which he made all in one sudden, sharp, unheralded moment, I am called upon by his smile above me to make every sacrifice of time and effort, every exertion of heart and brain, to be worthy of him, to carry forward the cause for which he lived and fought and died—the cause of a good life in a free world.

Danny was good. To see his picture every day will make me better. And that will help me to help others to make their lives better. And thus, in God's strange way, will Danny's sacrifice weigh in the immortal scales, creating a balance of good in others equal to the good life he himself would have lived if he had been permitted.

It must be that no good is ever lost.

PRODUCTION OF LEGUME AND GRASS SEED

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I sought the floor and secured recognition for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1743. I did so in the absence of the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. SMITH], who is now in the Chamber. Therefore, I yield to him.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1743.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1743) to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes and grasses required in the war food-production program.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a question about the bill before action is taken on his motion?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I yield; but I wish to state that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is the author of the bill, and is thoroughly familiar with it. I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut ask his question of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before we proceed, I should like to make a statement, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield to me.

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to have the RECORD show that the Red Cross bill, which is the pending business of the Senate, is being only temporarily laid aside for this purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the Red Cross bill is not the pending business, but that it was merely stated as being the intention of the Senate to make it the pending business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well, Mr. President; whatever may be the technical description of the status of the bill, I wish to make it clear that it was the understanding of the leadership upon both sides——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That the Red Cross bill would be taken up today; and it is now the understanding that it is being temporarily laid aside for reasons which are known to the leadership, namely, the absence of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who desires to be heard upon the matter; and that when the Senate assembles on Monday the Red Cross bill will have the preferred position, whatever technically it may be.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. When does the Senator say the Red Cross bill will be in order to be taken up?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the understanding, I will say to the Senator, that the Senate will take it up at the opening of the session on Monday. It is indicated that the bill in which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are so much interested can, without question, be passed without any delay, and that thereafter the Senate will go over until Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there has been reported from the Appropriations Committee the naval appropriation bill for the ensuing fiscal year, and we are very anxious to have it passed on Monday. Does the Senator think there will be time to pass both bills on Monday?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who desires to present an amendment to the Red Cross bill, has assured me that he would be quite willing to have an agreement by which the Senate will vote not later than 2:30 on Monday on the pending matter. So I have no doubt that both bills can be disposed of on Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will give ample time.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to say that the seed bill is very necessary and very urgent. There is difficulty in getting seed for the farmers.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina has kindly yielded to me in order that I may put some questions to the Senator from Iowa, who is the author of the proposed legislation.

I notice that section 3 of the bill provides that—

The Administrator is authorized and directed to make payments * * * to producers of seed of grasses and legumes specified in section 2 (a) or designated by the Administrator as war emergency forage crop seed.

Is it the purpose of the Senator that title to the seeds shall pass to the Administrator upon the making of the payments authorized?

Mr. GILLETTE. No; definitely not. The payment is an incentive one, made through the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, just as other payments to producers are made by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. When the producer has produced the seed, has turned it into consumptive channels, and has complied with the regulations, he is eligible to receive the payment.

Mr. DANAHER. Is any payment to be made to any producer before the seed is in fact introduced to consumptive channels?

Mr. GILLETTE. No; absolutely not.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the purpose of the Senator actually, therefore, to provide some form of incentive payment which will take account of the great and urgent need for the seed, and which therefore will induce the producer to produce more seed and make it available for ourselves and our allies?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is the whole purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. Has the Senator in mind any quantitative sum which will measure the fair amount of incentive payments so required?

Mr. GILLETTE. In answer to that question, I will say that a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and myself conducted hearings on the proposal. Question arose as to what amount would be necessary. There is at present in the Agricultural Adjustment Act a provision for the payment of $3.50 an acre, which payments have been made for production of this type. It is not sufficient for the object which is sought, and it is proposed to be supplemented by a provision that for clean seed turned into consumptive channels an additional payment may be made. There are many types of seeds of legumes and grasses, and there is no way to know what amount would be necessary. The Agricultural Adjustment Agency's representatives thought that

approximately $35,000,000 would be required. It was the opinion of the subcommittee that no such sum would be necessary. On the basis of our best estimates, after conferring with representatives of the War Food Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, the sum of $25,000,000 was thought to cover the necessary production. If no seed is produced, no payments will be made.

Mr. DANAHER. Has the Senator canvassed the possibility of establishing a support-price program with reference to each of the seeds to be specified?

Mr. GILLETTE. Very definitely; and the Senator will be interested, I am sure, in a statement made to us by the president of the American Seed Trade Association, Mr. Sexauer, who said:

An increase in the support price will not meet the situation, as this would involve raising ceiling prices, to which the O. P. A. have indicated they would object, as it would also involve raising the ceiling price of hay, and would produce other maladjustments. In addition to this objection, the small marginal producer would not be attracted by a relatively high support price, because of the work and red tape involved in obtaining a loan on a small quantity of seed; and, too, he recalls that the support price does not necessarily mean a corresponding market price, which was the case of corn and wheat a few years ago.

Mr. Sexauer speaks of three definite objections. I may say to the Senator, as a technical matter with which he may be familiar, that in most of these instances the seed is produced from a hay or forage crop. If it is used for hay or forage it is not utilized for seed. The sole purpose is to induce our farmers, who find themselves with increased need for forage and hay, to save a portion of their crop, even if it is only an acre or more, and harvest it for seed, being assured of a fair price.

Mr. DANAHER. My fears have derived from the possibility that the mechanics of this bill might be utilized to evade the Office of Price Administration with reference to its general control of price ceilings in this type of seed. Has any such suspicion crossed the mind of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GILLETTE. Not at all. I assure the Senator that if any such suspicion had crossed my mind I would not have introduced the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator further whether or not Mr. C. R. Enlow, the gentleman whose name appears in the report, is a Government official?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. Mr. Enlow, whose statement was made before the committee, and is embodied in the report, is a representative of the War Food Administration, who appeared before us and made the statement which is printed in the report.

Mr. DANAHER. I find from an examination of the report that there is no indication contained in it that Mr. Enlow procured permission from the Bureau of the Budget to submit a report or make a statement. Is there any reason for that?

Mr. GILLETTE. I cannot answer the question as to whether there was any clearance with the Bureau of the Budget. If a report has been made to the chairman of the committee, I do not know it.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Iowa knows that usually reports contain some such statement.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. But there is no clearance indicated in this report.

Mr. GILLETTE. Not so far as I am advised.

Mr. DANAHER. I wondered if, in fact, this particular program was in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am confident that it is, in view of the fact that the representatives of every organization which is at all interested in this situation appeared and supported the proposal.

Mr. DANAHER. Did the War Food Administrator concur in the recommendation of Mr. Enlow?

Mr. GILLETTE. He did, through Mr. Enlow, who came at our request to speak for the War Food Administration.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1743) to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes and grasses required in the war food production program, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "War Emergency Forage Seed Act."

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "war emergency forage-crop seed" includes field-crop seeds of alfalfa, red clover, alsike, clover, sweetclover, and ladino, the seed of Sudan grass, crested wheatgrass, bromegrass, Dallis grass, ryegrass, orchard grass, range grasses, and the seed of such other grasses and legumes as may be desinated by the War Food Administrator.

(b) The term "Administrator" means the War Food Administrator appointed pursuant to Executive Order No. 9334, dated April 19, 1943.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of providing for the increased production of seed of grasses and legumes in 1944 essential to the success of the war food program, the Administrator is authorized and directed to make payments through the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, within the limits of appropriations made therefor pursuant to section 6 of this act, to producers of seed of grasses and legumes specified in section 2 (a) or designated by the Administrator as war emergency forage-crop seed. Such payments shall be made on an acreage basis and cleaned-seed basis and shall be paid in such amounts and under such conditions as may be determined by the Administrator to be necessary to encourage the retention and harvest of war emergency forage-crop seed and the movement of this seed into consumption channels for planting in 1945.

SEC. 4. (a) Any duties devolving upon the Administrator by virtue of the provisions of this act may with like force and effect be executed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or such officers, agents, or employees of the War Food Administration or the Department of Agriculture as the Administrator may designate for such purpose.

(b) The Administrator is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Administrator is authorized to cooperate with any other department or agency of the Government, with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any department, agency, or subdivision thereof, and with any domestic producing, trading, or consuming organization: *Provided, however,* That such cooperation be limited to encouraging and securing the production of war emergency forage seed.

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed $25,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) The Administrator is authorized to make expenditures in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for necessary expenses, including rent and personal services, of the administration of this act, from funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in subsection (a) of this section, not to exceed the sum of $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACTION BY LEGISLATURE OF WYOMING TO ENABLE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES TO VOTE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in connection with the soldiers'-vote law, I wish to report to the Senate that the Legislature of the State of Wyoming was called into special session by the Governor on Monday, April 17, 1944, and passed a bill which enables qualified voters of the State of Wyoming, serving with, or attached to, the armed forces of the United States, to cast their ballots at the general election of 1944.

The law provides that the date of the primary election shall be advanced from August 22, 1944, to July 18, 1944. The law also provides that registration prior to receiving the ballot shall not be required. The law further provides for personal requests for ballots by service men and women, but specifies that, regardless of requests, the county clerks shall, not later than August 20, 1944, mail ballots to all qualified electors in the armed services as shown by available records.

Out of a total population of about 230,000, the State of Wyoming has approximately 24,000 men and women serving with the armed forces.

The law also provides that service men and women shall use the same ballot or ballots given to other electors for general county, State, and National elections. It does not authorize the use of a supplementary short Federal ballot.

I think it will interest the Senate to know that only 13 hours elapsed from the time the legislature was convened until the bill was passed unanimously by both the house and the senate, signed by the Governor, and the legislature adjourned.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, it has been frequently charged that America has no foreign policy. That charge has been under discussion in the House of Representatives for several weeks. It has been the subject of commentators and magazine editors. The State Department and the President have taken notice of it. Some Members of Congress

have been invited in for discussion. On Sunday evening, April 9, the Secretary of State made an extended radio speech in explanation of this policy.

In that speech Mr. Hull said:

This is not a mysterious game and our foreign policy must be simple and direct.

I agree that it is not a mysterious game, but is it simple, and is it direct?

He based his speech upon three propositions:

First, since the outbreak of the present war we and our allies have moved from real weakness to strength.

Second, during that same period we have moved from a deep-seated tendency toward separate action to the knowledge and conviction that only through unity of action can there be achieved the results which are essential for the continuance of free people.

Third, we have moved from a careless tolerance of evil institutions to the conviction that free governments and Nazi and Fascist Governments cannot exist together in this world.

I shall not undertake to discuss the soundness of his premise because in an analysis of the charge that we have no foreign policy it is not necessary either to agree or disagree with his statements just quoted.

Foreign policy is established by public pronouncements from the President or the Department of State. Therefore, in a discussion of the charge it is necessary that we examine the speeches and writings of those two officials.

I have the highest personal regard for our distinguished Secretary of State. I respect his ability and his great service to our country. In analyzing his speech or the public statements of the President I shall refer to them only for the purpose of analyzing the charge under discussion, and not for the purpose of criticizing or condemning the course of action indicated therein.

Mr. Hull says that our determination to arm ourselves for a strong self-defense was "a major decision of foreign policy." It may well be asked why it was not just as important in 1933 as in 1938.

The 1932 platform of the Democratic Party condemned the Republican Party for spending money for increased naval armament. Not until 1938 were increased appropriations for defense asked for by the President.

Whether a complete reversal of policy from that of pacifism to one of sound national defense was a major decision of foreign policy, is subject to our several interpretations. To me, it was a major decision because it was a right-about face.

But let us review briefly the President's policy prior to 1938.

On May 7, 1933, Mr. Roosevelt said:

We are seeking a general reduction of armaments and through this the removal of the fear of invasion and armed attack.

On May 16, 1933, he said:

The World Economic Conference will meet soon and must come to its conclusions quickly. The ultimate objective of the Disarmament Conference must be the complete elimination of all offensive weapons.

It is high time for us and for every other nation to understand the simple fact that the invasion of any nation or the destruction of a national sovereignty can be prevented only by the complete elimination of the weapons that make such a course possible today. Such an elimination will make the little nation relatively more secure against the great nation.

On December 28, 1933, the President said:

The definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention. We are not members (of the League of Nations) and we do not contemplate membership. I have said to every nation in the world something to this effect: Let every nation agree to eliminate over a short period of years and by progressive steps every weapon of offense that it has in its possession and create no additional methods of offense.

On January 3, 1934, the President said:

I have made it clear that the United States cannot take part in political arrangements in Europe.

On March 27, 1934, he said:

It has been and will be the policy of the administration to favor continued limitation of naval armaments. It is my personal hope that the Naval Conference to be held in 1934 will extend existing limitations and agree to further reductions.

On October 7, 1935, he said:

It is not surprising that many of our citizens feel a deep sense of apprehension lest some of the nations of the world repeat the folly of 20 years ago and drag civilization to a level from which world-wide recovery may be all but impossible.

In the face of this apprehension the American people can have but one concern—despite what happens in continents overseas, the United States of America shall and must remain unentangled and free. We not only earnestly desire peace, but we are moved by a strong determination to avoid those perils that will endanger our peace with the world.

It is true that other nations may, as they do, enforce contrary rules of conscience and conduct. It is true that other policies may be pursued under flags other than our own, but those policies are beyond our jurisdiction. As President of the United States, I say to you most earnestly once more that the people of America and the Government of those people intend and expect to remain at peace with all the world.

On October 17, 1935, the President said:

I have pledged myself to do my part in keeping America free of those entanglements that move us along the road to war.

In a letter written to Hon. Norman Davis, dated October 5, 1934, the President said:

The abandonment of these treaties (referring to the limitation of arms treaties with Great Britain and Japan) would throw the principle of real security wholly out of balance. I ask you, therefore, to propose to the British and Japanese a substantial proportional reduction in the present naval levels. I suggest a total tonnage reduction of 20 percent below existing treaty tonnage. The United States must adhere to the high purpose of progressive reduction.

I am compelled to make one other point clear. I cannot approve, nor would I be willing to submit to the Senate of the United States, any new treaty calling for larger navies. Governments impelled by common sense and the good of humanity ought to seek treaties reducing armaments; they have no right to seek treaties increasing armaments.

Excessive armaments are in themselves conducive to those fears and suspicions which breed war. Competition in armament is a still greater menace. The world would rightly reproach Great Britain, Japan, and the United States if we moved against the current of progressive thought. We three nations, the principal naval powers, have nothing to fear from one another. The important matter to keep constantly before our eyes is the principle of reduction.

On January 3, 1936, the President said:

The policy of the United States has been clear and consistent. The United States is following a twofold neutrality toward any and all nations which engage in wars that are not of immediate concern to America. First, we decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States. Second, we seek to discourage the use by belligerent nations of any and all American products calculated to facilitate the prosecution of a war in quantities over and above our normal exports of them in time of peace.

Shipment of steel, scrap iron, and gasoline to Japan was not prohibited until August 1940.

In the same message of January 3, 1936, the President said:

I realize that I have emphasized to you the gravity of the situation which confronts the people of the world. Peace is threatened by those who seek selfish power. This administration, as you know, stands for adequate national defense. When we say adequate defense we mean just that. We are maintaining a system that will meet our defensive needs. We have no plans for any other kind of system.

Continuing, the President said:

As I have said, we seem to understand very well what the problems of the world are. We have, perhaps, a kind of sympathy for their problems. We want to help them all we can; but they have understood very well in these latter years that that help is going to be confined to moral help, and that we are not going to get tangled up with their troubles in days to come.

On August 14, 1936 the President said:

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign war; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations.

We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war.

In the same speech the President discussed neutrality as part of our foreign policy. He said:

The Congress of the United States have given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war. The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality. Nevertheless, and I speak from a long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

On August 31, 1935, when he signed the Neutrality Act, the President said:

I have given my approval to the neutrality legislation which passed the Congress last week. I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint

resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end. The policy of the Government is definitely committed to the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of any entanglements which would lead us into conflict.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans to realize the inevitable penalties.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

On April 2, 1937, when his attention was called to the fact that we were sending $50,000,000 worth of steel a month to Great Britain, the President said:

It is an amazing thing for us to be sending forty or fifty million dollars' worth of steel per month to Europe.

By the fall of that year we saw a change in his thinking. October 5, 1937, in Chicago he said:

If we are to have a world in which we can breathe freely and live in amity without fear—the peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort to uphold laws and principles on which alone peace can rest secure.

But in the same speech he further said:

How happy we are that the circumstances of the moment permit us to put our money in bridges, boulevards, dams, and reforestation, the conservation of soil and many other kinds of useful works rather than into huge standing armies and vast supplies of implements of war.

In the same speech he also said:

It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading. When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease.

In a press conference following the Chicago speech the President was interviewed. He was asked this question:

Is there a likelihood there will be a conference of the peace-loving nations?

The President. No; conferences are out of the window. We never get anywhere with a conference.

Question. Foreign papers put it as an attitude without a program.

The President. That was the London Times.

Question. Wouldn't it be almost inevitable if any program is reached that our present neutrality act will have to be overhauled?

The President. Not in any way.

In his annual message January 23, 1938, the President made this statement:

We, as a peaceful nation, cannot and will not abandon active search for an agreement among the nations to limit armament and end aggression, but it is clear until such decision is reached we are compelled to think of our own national safety.

On July 14, 1938, almost a year after the quarantine speech at Chicago, he had this to say about armaments:

Money spent on armament does not create permanent income-producing wealth, and about the only satisfaction we can take out of the present world situation is that the proportion of our national income that we spend on armaments is only a quarter or a third of the proportion that most of the other great nations of the world are spending.

November 5, 1938, the President was asked this question in regard to arming this country:

Mr. President, are you considering the possibility of it being necessary to build a fleet large enough to defend both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts at the same time?

The President. No.

In his annual message January 12, 1939, the President said:

It is equally sensational and untrue to take the position that we must at once spend billions of additional money for building up our land, sea, and air forces on the one hand, or to insist that no further additions are necessary on the other.

Calling attention to these facts does not remotely intimate that the Congress or the President have any thought of taking part in another war on European soil.

In a press conference on February 3, 1939, he summed up his foreign policy in this way:

Well, let us do a little analyzing for the benefit of some people. In the first place, the foreign policy of the United States has been thoroughly covered in my messages to Congress, completely and adequately covered in every way. There is nothing new about it. A great many people, some members of the House, some Members of the Senate, and quite a number of newspaper owners are deliberately putting before the American people a deliberate misrepresentation of facts.

The foreign policy has not been changed and it is not going to change. If you want a comparatively simple statement of the policy, I will give it to you.

No. 1. We are against any entangling alliances, obviously.

No. 2. We are in favor of the maintenance of the world trade for everybody, all nations, including ourselves.

No. 3. We are in complete sympathy with any and every effort made to reduce or limit armaments.

No. 4. As a nation, as American people, we are sympathetic with the peaceful maintenance of political, economic, and social independence of all nations in the world.

Now, that is very, very simple. There is absolutely nothing new in it.

September 1, 1939, Germany invaded Poland. Two days thereafter the President, in a public speech by radio, said:

Let no man or woman thoughtlessly or falsely talk of America sending its armies to European fields. This Nation will remain a neutral nation.

But on September 21 he urged the repeal of the Neutrality Act. At that time he said:

Let no man or group in any walk of life assume an exclusive protectorate over the future well-being of America, because I conceive that, regardless of party or section, the mantle of peace and patriotism is wide enough to cover us all. Let no group assume the exclusive label of the "peace bloc." We all belong to it.

I ask that the Neutrality Act be repealed. I regret that Congress passed it. I regret equally that I signed it. It is dangerous, in my opinion, to American security and, above all, American peace.

These embargo provisions, as they exist today, prevent the sale to a belligerent by an American factory of any completed implements of war, but they allow the sale of many types of uncompleted implements of war, as well as all kinds of general materials and supplies. They, furthermore, allow such products of industry and agriculture to be taken in American ships to belligerent nations. There in itself, under the present law, lies a definite danger to our neutrality and our peace.

From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we can give employment to thousands by doing it here?

It has been erroneously said that return to that policy might bring us nearer to war. I give you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today.

On April 4, in a letter to Dr. Mary E. Woolley, the President said:

It has been the continuous policy of this Government for many years to cooperate in the world-wide technical and humanitarian activities of the League of Nations without in any way becoming involved in the political affairs of Europe.

A TWO-OCEAN NAVY

In discussing the question of a larger navy, the President on May 14, 1940, only 18 months before Pearl Harbor, said:

A two-ocean navy is an entirely outmoded conception of naval defense, and it has been since about 1847. I just never discuss a two-ocean navy in one way or the other, because it is not sensible to talk of naval defense in those terms.

It really is an outworn conception that nobody who knows anything about defense would ever use. Such a conception [of two-ocean navy] of the Nation's floating defense was just plain dumb.

In a campaign speech made October 24, 1940, at Madison Square Garden, in New York, he said:

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent and that they must stay out of war zones.

Six days later, in the city of Boston, October 30, 1940, in a campaign address, the President said:

Our objective is to keep any potential attacker as far from our continental shores as we possibly can.

And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, again, and again:

"Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores."

At Buffalo November 2, 1940, he said:

Your President says this country is not going to war.

In Cleveland, Ohio, the same day he said:

There is nothing secret about our foreign policy. It is not a secret from the American people and it is not a secret from any government anywhere in the world. I have stated it many times before. Let me restate it like this:

The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war. At the same time we seek to keep foreign conceptions of government out of the United States. That is why we make ourselves strong.

The second purpose of this policy is to keep war as far away as possible from the shores

of the Western Hemisphere. Finally our policy is to give all possible material aid to the nations which will resist aggression across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

In describing his foreign policy in connection with extending aid to Great Britain he said:

We may come to it, I don't know—and that is a gift; in other words, for us to pay for all these munitions, ships, plants, guns, etc., and make a gift of them to Great Britain. I am not at all sure that that is a necessity, and I am not at all sure that Great Britain would care to have a gift from the taxpayers of the United States.

What I am trying to do is to eliminate the dollar sign. That is something brand new in the thoughts of practically everybody—get rid of the silly, foolish old dollar sign.

The President was then questioned by representatives of the press.

Question. The question I have is whether you think this takes us any more into the war than we are?

The PRESIDENT. No; not a bit.

Question. As long as this is being made to our account and we are lending it to Great Britain, would we deliver the goods in Great Britain that are going to be used in that way?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, I suppose it would depend on what flag was flying at the stern of the ship.

Question. Would it be an American flag?

The PRESIDENT. Not necessarily. That would bring up another subject; that would bring up a subject which might be a dangerous one, quite frankly, of American sailors and American passengers taking the American flag into a war zone. You need not worry about that one bit, because you don't have to send an American flag and an American crew on an American vessel.

On December 29, 1940, the President said:

The people of Europe who are defending themselves do not ask us to do their fighting. They ask us for the implements of war, the planes, the tanks, the guns, the freighters which will enable them to fight for their liberty and for our security.

There is no demand for sending an American Expeditionary Force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

On January 6, 1941, he said:

By an impressive expression of the public will without regard to partisanship we are committed to full support of all those resolute peoples everywhere who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our hemisphere. Our role is to act as an arsenal. They do not need manpower. They do need billions of dollars worth of the weapons of defense.

On February 25, 1941, the President stated there was no danger of our running short of rubber. On January 5, 1942, all rubber was frozen and rationed because of the shortage of rubber.

March 5, 1941, he said the lend-lease policy was not a war policy, but the contrary.

On July 24, 1941, the President said:

Here on the east coast, you have been reading that the Secretary of the Interior, as Oil Administrator, is faced with the problem of not enough gasoline to go around on the east coast, and how he is asking everybody to curtail their consumption of gasoline. It was essential for Great Britain that we try to keep the peace down there in the South Pacific by furnishing gas to Japan.

There was a method in letting this oil go to Japan for the good of the defense of Great Britain and the freedom of the seas.

Five days later, July 29, 1941, at a press conference, he refused to comment on British Prime Minister Churchill's assertion that the United States was moving to the verge of war.

On August 16, 1941, when returning from his conference with Winston Churchill he said that he and Churchill had reached a complete understanding on all aspects of the war situation. Although stating in answer to a question that the United States was no nearer to war than when he departed, the President left no doubt that his return signalized the opening of a new era of anti-German collaboration to achieve the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny.

The historic Atlantic Charter, written and signed at sea on August 14, 1941, by Roosevelt and Churchill, provided as follows:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them

Fourth. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

Fifth. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

Sixth. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Seventh. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Eighth. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

What did Cordell Hull say about the Atlantic Charter policy? On April 9 he said:

In Italy our interests are in assisting in the development at the earliest possible moment of a free and democratic Italian Government. As I said some months ago, we have learned that there cannot be any compromise with fascism—whether in Italy or in any other country. It must always be the enemy and it must be our determined policy to do all in our power to end it.

Within these limits it is not our purpose or policy to impose the ultimate form or personnel of government. Here again we wish to give every opportunity for a free expression of a free Italy.

Then the Secretary proceeded to say that the declaration regarding Italy made at Moscow by the British, Soviet, and American Governments confirmed the policy initiated by the British and American Governments that the Italian Government shall be made more democratic by the introduction of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism; that all institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed; all Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from the institutions or organizations of a public character; and that democratic organs of local governments shall be created.

Just how the Secretary is able to justify his statement with the Atlantic Charter is beyond my comprehension. It reminds me of an old farmer in my State who said to his daughter, who was very much in love and wanted to marry a neighbor's son, "Daughter, I don't want to interfere with your decision in marriage and you are entirely free to choose your own husband just so long as you marry Tom Jones."

In other words, the Secretary construes the Atlantic Charter for Italy to mean that the Italian people can have any kind of a government they want just so long as they take the kind the Secretary of State and the President say they may have.

It is possible that the Italian people may decide they want a king. Is it our place to tell them they cannot have a king or any other kind of government they may choose? Is that our purpose in this war? Are we going to thrust down the throats of all the people in this world the kind of government, including personnel, which Mr. Hull and Mr. Roosevelt decide is best for them? Is that what our 10,000,000 American boys are fighting for? Or did Mr. Hull mean something else? If he did not, where does it leave Mr. Roosevelt with his platitude of self-determination for all people?

On February 12, 1943, Mr. Roosevelt expressed himself emphatically upon his position. He said:

It is one of our war aims as expressed in the Atlantic Charter that the conquered populations of today, the overrun countries, shall again become the master of their destiny. There must be no doubt anywhere that it is the unalterable purpose of the United Nations to restore to the conquered people their sacred rights.

Has Mr. Roosevelt changed his position?

Sacred rights of the people of Italy, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, and Finland should and do mean the same thing as sacred rights for the American people. Our sacred rights are those set forth in the Constitution of the United States. How then can the people of these small countries be given their sacred rights, or rather be protected in them, if we are

going to force them to accept the kind of government we decide is best for them and to force them to accept the personnel we approve? If that be foreign policy, then it seems to me there should be a restatement of the whole situation.

On April 9, Mr. Hull said:

> We are at all times ready to further an understanding and settlement of questions which may arise between our allies as is exemplified by our offer to be of such service to Poland and the Soviet Union. Our policy is the fundamental necessity of agreed action and the prevention of disunity among us.

Why should we offer to arbitrate the rights of Poland, a free nation? It is entitled to complete independence if the President meant what he said. The rape of Poland is indefensible under any code of morals or law.

In his speech, the Secretary made this statement:

> As I look at the map of Europe certain things seem clear to me. As the Nazis go down to defeat they will inevitably leave behind them in Germany and the satellite states of southeastern Europe a legacy of confusion. It is essential that we and our allies establish the controls necessary to bring order out of this chaos as rapidly as possible and to do everything possible to prevent its spread to the German occupied countries of eastern and western Europe while they are in the throes of reestablishing government and repairing the most brutal ravages of the war.

In this hope, Senators, every American joins. But establishment of controls for the safety and security of the people of those particular countries themselves, as well as the rest of the world, is the job of the armed forces. The Army is trained for that work, and is now in charge of planning and executing the moves needed to win this war. They have our complete confidence. It is only when political controls are proposed to be substituted for military controls that we have cause for concern. What kind of control does Mr. Hull mean?

He speaks repeatedly of the destruction of fascism and of the creation of institutions of a free and democratic way of life. That is our way of life. That is the type of government we hope to maintain. But other nations may not want our kind of government. We cannot proclaim that all people will have the choice of the kind of government and the kind of administrators they desire without interference from us, and at the same time force them to accept our particular kind of government.

If the Italian people or the other peoples involved in this world-wide struggle prefer a king or an emperor or a dictator or a military government, why should we insist that they accept our kind of government?

But Secretary Hull said:

> It is important to our national interest to encourage the establishment in Europe of strong progressive popular governments, dedicated like our own to improving the social welfare of the people as a whole—governments which will join the common effort of nations in creating the conditions of lasting peace, and in promoting the expansion of production, employment, and the exchange of consumption of goods which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples.

Again one may agree with the Secretary, but I question the advisability of notifying the world that all nations will be free, and then telling them they must accept the kind of freedom we give them.

We have a situation in Italy which by no stretch of the imagination can be called satisfactory.

One of our allies, Soviet Russia, has recognized General Badoglio as the head of the existing government. The existing government is a monarchy.

Are we going to say to Italy in defiance of Mr. Stalin that we will not recognize General Badoglio; that we will not recognize King Emanuel, but will insist that the Italian people discard the monarchy and establish the kind of government we want them to have?

Again Mr. Hull said:

> What I have said relates to some of the most immediate of our problems. There remain the more far-reaching relations between us and our allies in dealing with our enemies and in providing for future peace, freedom from aggression, and opportunity for expanding material well-being.
>
> I would only mislead you if I spoke of definite solutions. These require the slow, hard process, essential to enduring and accepted solutions among free people, of full discussion with our allies and among our own people.

While everyone is in accord with Mr. Hull in that statement, what evidence have we that there will be a full and free discussion among our own people and what are the proposals? None have been presented to us for discussion up to this date.

The President has held conferences at Casablanca, Cairo, Teheran, and Quebec. As yet we know nothing about them. No proposals have been disclosed for our discussion. The famous Moscow agreement between Great Britain, Russia, and ourselves was scarcely returned to the respective governments before divergent viewpoints appeared. Mr. Hull told us that the Moscow agreement meant the end of alliances, of spheres of influence, of balances of power. Differing sharply with that interpretation, to Russia it meant no central European federation, no artificial union of power, no cordon of small states at their western boundaries. Then Great Britain said it meant to her the restoration of the balance of power. The life of England depended upon it. Thus we have a different interpretation by each of the Three Powers signing the agreement.

Which interpretation will prevail?

The Atlantic Charter, prepared by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, is not a foreign policy any more than the Golden Rule is a foreign policy, or the Sermon on the Mount.

Mr. Hull said that we are determined upon a world organization for cooperative action for peace. We agree in principle. But I have received at least a thousand plans for world organization during the last year and a half. What plan does the President propose? Let the Secretary specify the kind of world organization he has in mind. Let him describe the framework of such an organization so that we can discuss it among ourselves, and thus together work out a real foreign policy, instead of one of generalities, vagueness, uncertainty, and changing views, which swing as quickly as a weather vane swings to every breeze. We have moved from a policy of complete freedom and independence for all nations to one in which we propose to dictate their form of government and their domestic policies. If that be Mr. Hull's and the President's foreign policy, I am sure the people of America will want to discuss it.

The brilliant senior Senator from the State of Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] forcefully and courageously said in a recent speech:

> As I have said before, I concur in our own State Department's plea that this is no time—until we have won the war—to start the reallocation of innumerable controversial boundary lines. But if it is not time for us to do so, then it is no time for others to do so either, and I know of no reason why our Government should not persistently and relentlessly say as much It is a poor rule which does not restrain all the United Nations alike and in equal measure or which, by the same token, does not permit as great a candor in Washington as is enjoyed in Moscow.

It is now stated openly that the Soviet Union intends to claim all or many of the little countries along its western border, including Poland; and we have tacitly approved and agreed to that grab.

But Mr. Hull objects to a public discussion by Congress or the people. He said:

> A proposal is worse than useless if it is not acceptable to those nations who must share with us the responsibility for its execution. It is dangerous for us and misleading to them if in the final outcome it does not have the necessary support in this country. It is, therefore, necessary both abroad and at home not to proceed by presenting elaborate proposals, which only produce divergence of opinion upon details, many of which may be immaterial.

Does Mr. Hull mean that commitments, agreements, or proposals he may make with foreign countries must be completed in every detail before we know what they are? That is not the way a representative government is operated. Only after the fullest public discussion of all proposals, plus Senate approval, can action by our Government be considered final. Our present practice of secret discussion and agreements is a confession of lack of faith in the people. It is the reason for the present storm of criticism against the State Department and the President. The people are not, as one prominent official is credited with saying, "Too damn dumb to understand." They want to help. They want to cooperate, but how can they do either if they know nothing about it?

When Mr. Hull says he cannot speak of plans publicly at the present time because of fear of dissension and lack of agreement, he is not entirely fair with the Senate or with the people, because these discussions have been going on for 2 years between the State Department and the governments of other countries. We know nothing about them. No details have been submitted to the people or to the Senate. Apparently, we will know nothing about them until the last "i" is

dotted and the last "t" is crossed. Cooperation within our Government is just as important as with other nations.

In his report Mr. Hull said:

> However difficult the road may be, there is no hope of turning victory into enduring peace unless the real interest of this country, the British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union, and China are harmonized and unless they agree to work together. This is the solid framework upon which all future policy and international organization must be built.

In effect, the Secretary's proposal is for a wheel within a wheel. We will have an organization of United Nations, but within that organization we will have a controlling one composed of the four principal powers. That will bring friction, disunity, and suspicion. It may bring war. Such a plan will not work. All nations must work together with an equal voice in our cooperative efforts.

The Secretary proposes that we have an organization wherein the member nations will solemnly bind themselves and agree not to use force against each other or against any other nation, except in accordance with the arrangements made by the United Nations organization.

With this, adequate forces for peace are proposed. But what are the proposals? Is it to be a world government, with a president and a congress? Which nations are to furnish the men and equipment for this United Nations force? How is it to be maintained? How is it to be selected? Will the personnel be drafted? And after all these matters are arranged, who then will have the power to call out this power to enforce its orders? Do Senators think that either Russia, Great Britain, or the United States will agree to an international force so large and powerful that it can overcome the defensive forces of any of those nations in case of a difference of opinion?

These and many other questions come to one's mind in discussing this most important feature of international relationship.

Then Mr. Hull says:

> We are at a stage when much of the work of formulating plans for the organization to maintain peace has been accomplished.

Think of that! And we know nothing whatsoever about it. Congress has not been advised of the steps agreed upon. The people have not been told. Only by indirection do we learn that these steps are being taken—such as the food conference of a year ago only recently released, or the conference now being held in London. Adolph Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, took with him complete plans to this conference for an agreement upon international aviation with the British Government. We in Congress have not been told what these completed plans are, or what is proposed to be done, nor have the American people been informed. Only the brief statement that Mr. Berle, representing the State Department, has arrived in London with plans prepared for him by an interdepartmental committee in Washington has been disclosed.

The announcement by Secretary Hull that he had requested the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to designate a bipartisan group to consult and advise the State Department on foreign policies is admirable. Nearly everyone approves such procedure, but let it be understood that the participation by one or two Members of the Senate does not imply the consent and approval of the Senate or of the people.

Then Mr. Hull offers this:

> Much of all this will miss its mark of satisfying human needs unless we take agreed action for the improvement of labor standards and standards of health and nutrition.

This sounds very much like the world planners' dreams of giving us a completely socialized world in which the wealth and the production of the American people is to be used to finance the world-wide planners. But how can the American people discuss the wisdom or unsoundness of the plan unless we are told what it is?

The Secretary closes his remarks with this statement:

> Our foreign policy is comprehensive, is stable, and is known of all men.

But is it? Outside the administration, no man knows. Editors and radio commentators charge that the foreign policy of the President and the State Department is neither comprehensive or stable or known, and the record sustains the charges.

Joseph N. Jones, for 5 years economic and financial expert of the State Department, said:

> The State Department is run by men without faith in the people.

Much of Mr. Hull's speech we approve, but as a statement of a foreign policy he left much unsaid. We are no wiser today than before the speech was delivered and we are completely mystified and confused as to the real objective of this administration.

The Atlantic Charter has been thrown out the window.

Approval of the land-grab by Russia has been given. Apparently, we are expected to recover Hong Kong and Singapore for Britain and the Dutch East Indies for the Netherlands, but what about the many important questions which should be discussed by the American people and by the Congress?

What does the President propose to do about Spain? The present Spanish Government was founded upon bloodshed, revolution, and barbarity. It was established with the aid of Hitler and Mussolini and is still furnishing Germany with supplies, and at the same time is receiving supplies from our country.

Italy is ruled by King Victor Emanuel. He and his father have been in power since the days of Garibaldi. Is the King to be thrown out, or is he to be retained without decision by the Italian people?

The Dutch East Indies never heard of self-determination. They have been exploited for generations by the Dutch. Are those islands to be recaptured by us and returned to the Dutch without regard to the people?

In India millions of citizens have no voice in their Government. Is self-determination to be ignored there? We cannot insist upon one rule for some nations and ignore it for others—or can we?

In France, proverbially our friend, we find the government destroyed by traitors from within as well as enemies from without. A self-appointed committee of Frenchmen now claim they represent France, while an army of Frenchmen equipped by the United States is at bitter odds with the committee.

In China, Chiang Kai-shek has control over three or four provinces only in that huge area. Does he represent the people of China? Is he the government with whom we are to deal as the free selection of the Chinese people after the war?

Palestine is part of modern Arabia and is under British mandate. Many Jewish people want to make their homes there, but Britain has denied them admittance. Are we going to support England, or Arabia, or the people?

In Finland, whose courageous people we have respected and honored for more than a quarter of a century, we see a definite indication that Russia intends to absorb a part or all of that little country.

From Poland hundreds of thousands of her people have come to us as welcome citizens. She was invaded, without fault on her own part. Defeated and crushed, she still fights on. Russia states that she intends to keep Poland.

Mr. President, all these and many other problems are pressing for discussion and for eventual solution.

I agree with Mr. Hull that boundaries cannot be discussed now; that there is only one supreme issue before us today, and that is to win the war, but each and everyone of these problems will be facing us within a matter of months and they are problems that must be met and not evaded or settled by secret conferences.

Mr. Hull, representing the President, proposes a world organization with a police force strong enough to carry out its orders. We must ask ourselves certain questions which are essential to the final determination of this war.

Russia has a population of about 200,000,000. The British Commonwealth of Nations has about 500,000,000 people. China has a population of 400,000,000. We in America have 135,000,000 people. If this world government is to be operated upon the basis of actual representative government by free people, then representatives of this world order must be chosen accordingly. If that is done, the United States will be outvoted. We will not have an equal place in the family of nations, but we will be expected to pay the bills.

If, as some proponents of this plan contend, the four big nations must be on an equal footing, which one among us is going to say to Russia, with the largest and most powerful army in the world, that she can have no more votes than we have? If she disagress, is America going to send her sons to war with Russia to compel her to accept the orders of the supergovernment?

For a thousand years Russian rulers have dreamed of and schemed for a warm-water outlet to the sea. Peter the Great built St. Petersburg on the Baltic Sea to have an ocean outlet, but the

Baltic is frozen most of the year. Today is Russia's opportunity. Does anyone doubt that she will make the most of it? If she does, who is going to stop her? Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, even the Balkans or Turkey cannot prevent her. Is it our job to do so? You and I know that it is not, and we are not going to do so. Thus ends the Atlantic Charter and we gain the hatred of every small nation to which we break our promise of self-determination.

Will we say to Great Britain that she cannot have India or Hong Kong or Singapore or Malaya or Egypt or British Guiana or Trinidad?

Are we to say to the Netherlands she cannot have the Dutch East Indies? If we do, whose sons are to do the fighting?

Other problems that confront us and which should be proposed for discussion are our future policy of lend-lease, of U. N. R. R. A., of the fantastic plans of the President's Food Conference.

Russia has stated her demands.

Great Britain says that she does not intend to liquidate the British Empire.

Why should not we state our terms of peace? Certainly Mr. Roosevelt, who has been working on plans for 2 years, can disclose what he has in mind. This need not be concealed upon the ground of military expediency.

The protection of the United States is our fundamental foreign policy. It is the cornerstone of our whole structure of national life. Any stone that does not fit into that structure should be rejected. Any policy that is in derogation of America and of her people should be rejected. America is our first consideration. The world should be told our aims. If we evade or conceal, there will be misunderstandings.

Secretary Hull said that the signing of the Moscow agreement meant the end of the old balance of power.

The Nineteenth Century and After, an English publication founded over 50 years ago and largely representative of British Government policy, printed this statement:

It is fashionable to dismiss the balance of power as an obsolete doctrine. It is not a doctrine. It is, for Great Britain and the empire, the immutable condition of survival. Any power that becomes undisputed master of the European mainland can become master of the British Isles. This is an old truth. If it fades out of the national consciousness and ceases to inform national policy, then the days of England's greatness will be over.

England has no one permanent foe in Europe, for none of her vital interests conflict with the vital interests of any European power. Her only foe is that power, or that coalition of powers, which may endeavor to dominate Europe. Against that foe she must always be ready, always be strong, and always have allies. As her foe varies, so her allies vary. The foe of yesterday may be the ally of tomorrow and the ally of yesterday the foe of tomorrow.

The power of the British Empire, plus the power of Continental allies, will, if the Empire is strong, always balance the power of whatever power seeks domination. And as long as the balance is maintained, there will be peace, for no one power can prevail over the rest of Europe plus the British Empire, as long as the Empire is strong.

This simple mechanism is the balance of power. It exists by virtue of the immutable physical realities. Neither the League of Nations, nor any system of collective security, nor disarmament can change these realities. As soon as the balance of power is challenged, every collective system will collapse and England will, if she is not to perish, make the counterchallenge. She did so in 1939. England fought to preserve the balance—for that reason and no other.

The nature of the peace must be determined by the enduring realities of the European situation, not by transient phenomena like fascism, socialism, or communism. The exorbitant strength of Germany must be reduced and it must be kept reduced. Better a despotically governed Germany that is not too strong than a liberal Germany that is too strong. The peace that will end the second World War must be such that the balance of power will be restored and will be preserved for generations to come. This must be the primary war aim and peace aim of Great Britain. All other aims are secondary or irrelevant, or insofar as they obstruct and obscure the primary aim, a deadly menace.

The balance is not the cause of war—the failure to maintain it is the cause of war.

Europe cannot submit to a general, uniform federation. When differences are deep, they are not solved but intensified by union. A general federation would not put an end to war but would merely replace war between nations by civil war. It is only when great nations have a certain community of outlook and common vital interests that federation is possible, and by vital we mean essential to life, to sheer existence. The nations between the Baltic and Aegean have this vital interest in common. They are under a double and deadly menace.

Whatever power is master of that region is master of all Europe.

If England were to abdicate in eastern Europe, she would be abdicating in all Europe.

A resolute foreign policy, a firmness in upholding national interests against foreign aspirations that are prejudicial to them, even if these aspirations are those of Allied Powers, is as necessary today as it always was and always will be.

Russia is promoting the disintegration of all Europe and, in particular, of the region between the Baltic and the Aegean. She has declared the future annexation of the eastern half of Poland. By thwarting every attempt at collaboration between Poland and Czechoslovakia and by promoting the disintegration of Yugoslavia in particular and of the Balkans in general, she has isolated Czechoslovakia and now proposes to complete this isolation by inviting the Czechoslovak Government to make its headquarters in Moscow. She is also promoting the disintegration of Rumania. She is determined to secure direct, unimpeded access to the Mediterranean and perhaps even to the Adriatic.

Mr. Molotov, of Russia, says of the Moscow Declaration that—

Any artificial union of small nations would be fraught with most serious consequences not only for those nations but for the future peace of Europe.

The Soviet Union, and this must be especially emphasized, firmly rejects any attempts to launch a policy of a sanitary cordon regardless of the form in which it may be masked. It must be recognized that several projects for federation that have emanated recently from the West reeked pungently of the long bankrupt anti-Soviet policy.

This forthright declaration of aims by Soviet Russia should also be considered with the statements of David J. Dallin, a member of the Moscow Soviet and a publisher of numerous books. I refer particularly to the book, Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy published in 1942 by the Yale University Press. Some of the comments of Mr. Dallin are extremely interesting and enlightening. I quote from the book:

Bukharin stated in a speech on the Communist program: "We have grown up so much that we can conclude a military alliance with the bourgeoisie of any one country and use its help in order to crush the bourgeoisie of another country. This is a question solely of strategical and technical expediency." If as time goes on the bourgeoisie of such an Allied country happens to suffer a defeat, other tasks will arise which you will easily visualize yourselves.

In 1938, almost on the eve of the war, an article of Stalin's was reprinted in the Soviet press and distributed throughout the nation. It stated in part as follows:

Our army is an army of the world revolution, an army of the workers of all countries. Nucleus of world communism, the Soviet Union was the only fatherland, and its defense a national task for the Russians, was an international task for all Communists. Hence, expansion of Soviet territory also became a goal of world communism.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in his able address of April 2, said:

Our American foreign policy as of today is sound when it puts military victory in this war ahead of every other consideration. Beyond that point, our American foreign policy, as of today, is a vague and often mystifying generality. Frankly, it is largely locked up in the White House.

On January 21, in the United States News, David Lawrence, one of the ablest editors of this generation, said:

The President is just back from a conference with Stalin, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek, and from the battle zones. Here was afforded an occasion, too, to interpret to a bewildered humanity, not only inside America but throughout the world, the great aims and purposes for which men die so bravely every hour of the day on some battlefield or on some open sea.

The President in his message has not given us the leadership we need on the home front. Possibly it's because he's tired. Possibly it's because he's poorly advised. The message reads as if it had been patched together by a fatigued mind.

The question may be asked, What, if anything, do I have to propose? I have criticized the State Department's and the President's failure to declare a stable foreign policy. What do I suggest?

The aspirations of all peoples in the world are for peace. A declaration by our State Department or by the President upon what general terms of peace are we willing to terminate the war would be welcomed by all the people of the earth. It is neither necessary nor advisable to give a blueprint of such a proposal. A general statement of peace aims or peace terms can be made now and that is what I hope our State Department will do.

The necessary and fundamental requirements of peace are few and can be quickly named. They are—

Complete disarmament and demobilization of the Axis countries.

Trial of those responsible for the war.

Return of or payment for all loot taken by them.

Complete demobilization of all plane, gun, and munition factories in enemy countries.

Commercial air lines and radios in the Axis countries should be under Allied supervision.

Feeding the people of the war-ravished countries must be by joint contribution.

Adjustment and terms of final settlement of our lend-lease accounts with other governments should be completed.

Complete restoration of the pre-Pearl Harbor status of the Philippine Islands or immediate independence.

Sufficient air bases, American owned and controlled, throughout the world to insure our own defense.

An organization of nations working together in cooperation to insure peace. The Pan American Union was organized in 1890. It has functioned well for 54 years. Why not a similar union of European and Asiatic countries?

A world court of eminent jurists has been suggested. Most lawyers will agree that such a court is desired. On the other hand, Senators, I wish to warn that we do not want a court having such power that it can interpret the agreements we may make in the future, or whatever action the American Government may take.

An Army, Navy, and Air Force of sufficient power to protect us against any aggressor.

A declaration now that our foreign policy includes these proposals will bring an earlier and less costly peace.

The world is gloomy today and rightly so, but peace will come just so surely as spring will come again with its flowers and birds and happiness. Winter, with its cold and snow and desolate days, is always followed by the resurrection. So the spring of peace will follow the winter of war.

Loss of life and material must be endured. Many of our young men will not return. But with the coming of peace we will build again for the future. Only the loss of life is irreparable, and that is why we are bound, if we attain nothing else, to make certain within the range of our ability to prevent its recurrence.

The President's foreign policy stands on the record, convicted of uncertainty and confusion.

It is vague, changeable, and unconvincing.

It displays a lack of confidence by the President in the people.

It breeds suspicion and fear.

It shows a lack of trust in Congress, the coordinate branch of our Government.

In the face of that record I hope the President will abandon secret conferences, commitments, agreements, and proposals. Open covenants, openly arrived at, as President Wilson said, will cement America in a foreign policy that will safeguard us from every danger that the future may hold.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. STEWART. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Robert J. Carson to be ensign in the Coast Guard, to rank from the date of oath as ensign.

By Mr CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Francis L. Spalding, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

Max Waldo Bishop, of Iowa, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

John L. Bankhead, of North Carolina, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

L. Randolph Higgs, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Gordon Rowe, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander Fleet Air, Quonset Point; and

Capt. Malcolm F. Schoeffel, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of July 1943.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

PREVIOUS CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF SENATOR BONE TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly of a situation which has arisen and which has given me and others some concern.

On April 1 the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] stated to the Senate that the rules of this committee required that when a nomination for a judgeship was sent to it, a week's notice of a hearing on the nomination should be given that any one caring to protest confirmation might appear before the committee for that purpose. He added that a Member of the Senate had been named for such a place. At that time, however, the nomination had not been referred to the committee.

The Senator from Nevada, with his customary frankness, further told us that on that morning, that is on the morning of April 1, he had hurriedly called a meeting of his committee at which only a quorum—6 members of a total membership of 18—attended. We were also advised by the Senator from Nevada that the committee had directed him to take the floor to ask unanimous consent that our colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] nominated to be a judge of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, be confirmed without the nomination being referred to the committee. This request was thereupon made and agreed to. The nomination by this means came before the Senate and the question of confirmation of the nomination was forthwith presented to the Senate.

Brief words of appreciation of the character and service of the Senator from Washington were spoken by the distinguished majority leader and by myself, and thereupon confirmation of the nomination was voted.

This whole proceeding upon this nomination involved the waiver of established rules of the Senate and, as a consequence of such waiver, the avoidance of a long recognized rule of the Judiciary Committee.

The minority members join with the majority in consenting that the nomination need not be sent to the Judiciary Committee, and in agreeing that the question of confirmation might be put on the day the nomination was received, the Senate rule to the contrary notwithstanding. We on this side were asked by this course to show and do courtesy to a colleague, and the minority, without a dissent, joined with the majority in the expression of good will to our colleague and, with unanimous voice, voted his confirmation.

Mr. President, these events thus outlined happened 3 weeks ago and ever since rumors have circulated in the press and among others, that our colleague will not take the oath of his new office until all possibility of the appointment of a Republican successor has passed. The political import of these rumors we may disregard. This is unimportant. One more Republican or one less Democrat will not affect in any consequential degree the political complexion of this body during this Congress. Moreover, I am unable to believe that Senator BONE would be a willing participant in such a plan and purpose.

But there are aspects of this case which are of major import. We of the minority accorded Senator BONE the courtesy of immediate confirmation. In the request for such action and in the statements made to the Senate there was implicit the expectation and the assurance that there would be prompt consummation of the nomination and of our confirmation by the assumption of the judicial office by the confirmed Senator. There could be no other reason or justification for the requested speed in action. Mr. President, the comity which should exist between the sides of this Chamber and the courtesy, one to the other, which should distinguish our relationships, require that full faith and credit shall be given by all of us to understandings whether they be found in

written or spoken words, or in the course of events. Failure in the present circumstances to assume this judicial position as soon as practicable I would regard as a default in this obligation.

Moreover, Mr. President, every thinking Senator must recognize the incongruity of the situation confronting the Senate. This body, so far as we have voice in the matter, has acted. We have approved the appointment of our colleague to a judicial office. Is our colleague to sit among us, to act with us, to exercise the functions and enjoy the emoluments of a Senator after we have played our part in bestowing another honor upon him and have confirmed him in this new place of distinction? No sophistries and no evil precedents can make compatible these two offices of Senator and justice of a high court of the United States. The judicial office, the judicial obligations should not be subordinated beyond a necessary hour, to the convenience of individuals, or to the exigencies of political life.

I recognize that this is the last day upon which a motion to reconsider the vote of confirmation of Senator BONE can be made. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington has intellectual integrity. He is not devious, but is direct. He abhors sham and subterfuge. I have, therefore, no question that he will recognize, if he does not already do so, the embarrassment the present circumstances cause to many who have for him only good wishes, and the impropriety of this duality of position in which unwise friends would place him. To move now a reconsideration of the vote of confirmation would, in my view, cast doubt upon the sincerity of those upon this side who by vote and voice have heretofore expressed confidence in our colleague. I am content to trust to the judgment and conscience of the Senator from Washington to do, in the appropriate time, that which is right in this matter. I shall therefore make no move to bring about reconsideration of our earlier confirmation, and I express the hope that no other Senator of the minority will do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate, as I am sure Senator BONE does, the very fine and generous attitude expressed by the Senator from Maine.

Of course, there is nothing new in the confirmation by the Senate of Members of the Senate appointed to judicial or other positions, without the formality of reference to a committee. Such action has not been peculiar to any political party. As far back as I can remember there has never been objection to the immediate confirmation by the Senate of the appointment of one of its Members to any position where confirmation has been necessary, with one exception. That was in regard to the appointment of a Democratic Member of the Senate to the Supreme Court, in which case this rule of courtesy was not followed.

There is reason for the practice which has been followed. We serve here with one another, we know one another, we know the character and standing of our colleagues. The reason for the rule sending nominations to a committee is that the committee may investigate the character and the fitness of the appointee for the position to which he has been designated. It is easy to understand why from time immemorial, with the one exception to which I have referred, the Senate always has by unanimous consent waived the formality of reference to a committee, because the Senate has known its own Members, Senators have known their own colleagues, and therefore investigation by a committee in order to ascertain the fitness of such an appointee was not necessary. Because of that fact, the custom of immediate confirmation has grown up. Of course, immediate action can always be frustrated by a single objection.

When Senator BONE'S nomination came to the Senate I expressed my regret that he had been appointed to the bench, because he has been an able Senator, we all respect him, and I regarded him, and still regard him, as a valuable Member of this body. But if he had any desire to go on the bench, and the President desired to appoint him, of course, there was nothing I could say about it except to express my regret that he was leaving the Senate.

I have not seen the Senator from Washington since his appointment, and have not talked to him personally about it. I think I am in a position to say, however, that no one who has said anything about it had any authority from the Senator to discuss his intentions with reference to the judicial appointment.

Rumors began to float around, the responsibility for which I know nothing, but I have here a statement which has been handed to me by the secretary of Senator BONE, the Senator now being in the hospital. The statement was sent to me to be read in the Senate if the matter came up in any form. Therefore I feel it not only my duty, but it is my pleasure, to read the statement to the Senate, so that Senators may understand, insofar as the statement discloses, exactly what Senator BONE'S attitude and his situation are. This is a memorandum prepared for me:

> Senator BONE has expressed the hope that if remarks are made with regard to the date at which he will take oath of office as judge, the following statement be placed in the RECORD:
>
> "I am going to be in the hospital for an indefinite period. My plans after that are yet to be determined. Nobody in the Senate has ever talked to me about my plans."
>
> I think the RECORD ought also to show that Senator BONE entered the Naval Hospital at Bethesda on April 1, before his name came down from the President. He had no knowledge of how the confirmation was to be handled. He is very grateful to his colleagues for having expressed their confidence in him by giving the confirmation in such a quick manner.
>
> Senator BONE suffered a broken femur in 1939. At that time he underwent a prolonged period of hospitalization. Complications set in which forced him to enter the Mayo clinic last year for another operation, and he spent 4 months there. Upon returning here, he has undergone constant physiotherapy in the hope of obtaining some improvement. This physiotherapy continued until the time he entered the Naval Hospital. Physiotherapy was not sufficient. Now, at the Naval Hospital he is undergoing more radical type of treatment, including the application of a heavy brace to his leg. This makes it impossible for him to do anything other than stay at the hospital until further developments. The doctors do not know how long he will have to be there.
>
> Attention should be called to the fact that if he were now to take the judgeship and go out to San Francisco, he would have to enter a hospital there for treatment similar to that he is receiving here. He thinks it is best to take care of his physical condition now in the hope that a permanent cure will be effected.

Mr. President, that is a statement authorized by Senator BONE. I am sure it is sincere, and we all sympathize with him on account of his condition and appreciate the embarrassment under which he labors because of it.

I thought that in justice to Senator BONE, in view of the rumors to which reference has been made, this statement should be made for the RECORD, and for the benefit of those who may be interested in the matter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, when this delicate question in Senate relationships came up through publication of various disturbing rumors in the press, I felt that the key to the whole situation was Senator BONE'S own personal attitude toward the situation in which he finds himself, and my own complete confidence in Senator BONE'S shining integrity was such that I felt that if it were possible to get any direct word from him it would clear up the entire unfortunate controversy regarding a long delay in his induction as a Federal judge while he still sat as a Senator following his Senate confirmation.

Under those circumstances I wrote Senator BONE a letter and gave it to his secretary to transmit to Senator BONE at the hospital, with the understanding that it should not be presented if it was calculated in any way to disturb him in his unfortunate illness. The letter was presented, and the secretary replied to me orally substantially in the language which the Senator from Kentucky has read, although I think perhaps the oral statement went a little further.

If I correctly understand the attitude of the Senator from Washington, he is unable at the moment to anticipate when his recuperation may permit him to leave the hospital, and certainly no one, by any stretch of the imagination, could attribute any impropriety to whatever delay in assuming his new judicial office shall be occasioned by his continuation in the hospital. Certainly he has our total sympathy in his long and painful illness.

I further gather that upon his release from the hospital he intends to conclude the liquidation of his 12 years of office records and Senate responsibilities as expeditiously as possible, and intends, within reasonable time thereafter, to proceed upon his way to his new high assignment to the circuit court of the United States.

It is because of these facts that I entirely concur with the statement made by the Senator from Maine that nothing further shall be done about the matter in the Senate at the present time. Otherwise I should feel that a very serious principle would be involved in this situa-

tion and that a motion to reconsider the confirmation should be made for procedural reasons and without any reflection whatever upon the character or qualifications of the able senior Senator from Washington.

I cannot forget—and I think we may as well be frank about it—the situation which was presented in the Senate when another able Senator from Washington was appointed to the bench, and his appointment similarly was immediately confirmed by the Senate unanimously, and without reference to the committee. The confirmation went to the White House, and there it remained in a pigeonhole, shall we say, for several months, before the commission was issued, to the great and constant embarrassment of the Senator himself. I felt at that time that it was an utterly anomalous position in which the Senator himself and the Senate and the judiciary were placed by that unfortunate and illogical hiatus.

The Constitution of the United States says specifically:

> No person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either house during his continuance in Office.

Of course, that cannot be applied literally to cases of the nature of the one before us, because in the present instance, for example—as was true in the former—the Senator from Washington technically is not holding a judicial office at the present time. Therefore there is no literal conflict with the constitutional rule. But, in cold fact, there is an obvious and ominous collision. Mr. President, clearly under such circumstances there is a direct and specific conflict not only with the purpose of the constitutional rule, but with the indisputable necessity which underlies the rule.

Under the theory of the American Government, the judicial branch of our Government and the legislative branch are two totally distinct, separate, and independent institutions; and by no stretch of the imagination is it possible to defend an indefinite duality of tenure as between the judiciary and the legislature. I feel very keenly upon that point; and if there were the slightest reason to place any credence in the stories which have appeared in the newspapers that a judge-designate intends to remain indefinitely in his senatorial status, I should be one of those who, despite my great affection and complete respect and confidence for the Senator from Washington, would wish to interpose a motion to reconsider for the purpose of keeping the record straight—even though I would subsequently vote to reconfirm.

I may add that word came to me that the Senator from Washington had never indicated to any newspaper that he had any such intention at any time. Under the circumstances I, too, am completely willing to rely upon my opinion of the fine character and integrity of the able senior Senator from Washington. It must be remembered in this connection, of course, that the Senator cannot take his oath until the President issues his commission. It was the President, let me make it plain, who was responsible for the long delay upon the previous occasion to which I have referred. I simply express the hope that we may never again confront any such insufferable precedent as the one which was involved upon this previous occasion; because in my judgment any such lapse between confirmation and induction runs squarely counter to the basic theory upon which constitutional government exists in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James L. Underhill, to be major general.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas E. Watson, to be major general.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel C. Cumming, to be brigadier general.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oliver P. Smith, to be brigadier general.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of nominations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

AUSTIN L. TIERNEY

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to enter a motion in connection with Senate bill 176, for the relief of Austin L. Tierney, a minor bill which passed the Senate and also passed the House, following which action conferees on the part of the Senate were named. The bill is now pending in the House of Representatives. Therefore, I enter a motion that the Senate reconsider its action in appointing conferees on the part of the Senate on Senate bill 176.

I now move that the House of Representatives be requested to return the bill, with the accompanying papers, to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 24, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 21 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

ADMINISTRATOR, UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

Philip M. Klutznick, of Nebraska, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency, vice Herbert Emmerich.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Austin J. Mahoney, of Rochester, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y. (Reappointment.)

Martin O. Bement, of Buffalo, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y. (Reappointment.)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943:

Donald B. Hubbard, a citizen of North Carolina.

Frank W. Stopinski, Jr., a citizen of Alabama.

Myron K. Minnick, a citizen of California.

William R. Shockley, a citizen of Missouri.

Edward R. Messer, a citizen of Kentucky.

Redge F. Henn, Jr., a citizen of California.

John C. Pritchett, a citizen of Texas.

Staff Sgt. Richard C. Andrews, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 3d day of November 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944:

Wilson B. Baugh, Jr., a citizen of Florida.

Robert W. Allen, a citizen of New Jersey.

Frederick R. Korf, a citizen of Connecticut.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 21 (legislative day of April 12), 1944.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be major generals

James L. Underhill
Thomas E. Watson

To be brigadier generals

Samuel C. Cumming
Oliver P. Smith

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Helen E. Sellers, Banks.
Attie D. Hancock, Gardendale.
Paul B. Curtis, Glenwood.
Duncan G. Kimbrough, Harpersville.

ARKANSAS

Louella Boswell, Almyra.
Mary L. Cherry, Bay.
Claude Gregory, Cash.
Harriet M. Shrigley, Coal Hill.
Erma M. Odom, Fulton.

CALIFORNIA

William H. Frost, Etiwanda.

INDIANA

Ruth I. Perin, Glenwood.
Maurice G. Fougerousse, Jasonville.
Crystal B. Shaw, Markleville.
Claude M. Bowman, Norman.

KENTUCKY

Thomas E. Hite, Philpot.

MAINE

Hilda E. Sawtelle, East Wilton.

MISSISSIPPI

Irma E. Blanks, Collinsville.
Sallie C. Walker, Lauderdale.
Charles E. Elliott, Mayersville.
Bessie Abernathy, Woodland.

NEW YORK

Luther C. Empie, Guilderland Center.

OKLAHOMA

William F. Goff, Jones.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Norton H. Campbell, Jr., Pendleton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Thomas J. Evans, Chattaroy.
Loma L. Nester, Eckman.
John E. Hafer, Elkview.
Harry O. Lockman, Helen.
Usher A. Cobb, Kopperston.
Clara L. Hardy, Montcalm.
James H. Trail, Winding Gulf.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 21 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Philip M. Klutznick to be Federal Public Housing Commissioner.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as a new day lights up a stricken and struggling world and a battle raging with ever-increasing fury, our weary souls seek the pavilion of Thy changeless love where beyond these voices there is peace. The earth which waits to be a watered garden and the happy habitation of Thy children, whom Thou has made of one blood, lies in darkness, anguish, and tears, rocked by explosive hatred. Man has forsaken meekness and mercy and slighted Thy word. Forgetting that ever there standeth Thine immutable law that only the meek finally inherit the good life, refusing to bend at the lowly gate of humility and sacrifice, he has lost the road to truth and goodness and reaps in this awful hour the bitter harvest of cruelty, persecution, division, and dissension.

From the valley of futility and despair we lift our eyes to the hills of eternal verities which stab the horizon like great and glorious steeples pointing to the sky; for we know our help and our hope is in Thee who made heaven and earth.

"God the All-righteous One! man hath defied Thee;
Yet to eternity standeth Thy Word;
Falsehood and wrong shall not tarry beside Thee;
Give to us peace in our time, O Lord."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 21, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1929, VOLUMES II AND III

A letter from the Secretary of State, calling attention to the release of three volumes entitled "Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1929," and stating that copies of the document edition of the set (H. Doc. No. 517, 71st Cong., 2d sess.) will be available to Members from the folding room (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF ACT GRANTING INCREASED COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public, No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS DATA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of costs, cancelations, and miscellaneous irrigation data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects, compiled as of June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Under Secretary of the Interior, the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Acting Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices, etc., for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

CLAIM OF J. FLETCHER LANKTON AND JOHN N. ZIEGELE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of J. Fletcher Lankton and John N. Ziegele against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

PAYMENT FOR ACCUMULATED LEAVE DUE GOVERNMENTAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for lump-sum payments for accumulated leave due to Government officers and employees at death or upon separation from the service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 185)

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEBRUARY 1944 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the transactions of the Corporation for the month of February 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, submitting, pursuant to law, the eighth report of the Administration covering the period ended December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ELECTRIC POWER REQUIREMENTS OF INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its newly issued report entitled "Electric Power Requirements of Industrial Establishments" 1939–42 (actual) and 1943 and 1944 (estimated) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

CHAIRMANSHIP OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Alpha Omega Chapter of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Washington, D. C., relating to the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY — RESOLUTION OF CHAMPLAIN VALLEY COUNCIL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and ask to have referred to the appropriate committee a resolution favoring the St. Lawrence seaway adopted by the executive committee of the Champlain Valley Council on April 17 last.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Champlain Valley Council has consistently advocated the St. Lawrence

seaway, as embodied in the pending Aiken-Pittenger bill now before the Congress; and

Whereas the taxpayers have in 2 years already paid, in subsidies and lost income from direct electrical and transportation benefits, more than the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway itself; and

Whereas the shortage of feed, fuel, and other farm and civilian supplies, caused largely by the lack of proper water transportation, now retards the development, not only of the farm, but of mining and the industries of the northeastern states, especially as compared with other sections of the United States; and

Whereas the cheap power generated and distributed would create a necessary and vast improvement in the agricultural and general welfare of labor in industry, throughout New York and New England; and

Whereas it is estimated that 78 percent of the cost of this St. Lawrence seaway project is for labor, direct and indirect, and some 10,000 men will be employed, thus creating an enduring national asset, which will contribute in no small way to post-war employment: Now therefore

We resolve, That the Champlain Valley Council urge prompt approval by Congress of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power agreement with Canada, in order that the project may go forward and thus create this new water highway, with its great electrical benefits.

REDUCTION OF INTEREST RATE ON FARM LOANS—RESOLUTION BY KANSAS FEDERATION OF NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Kansas Federation of National Farm Loan Associations, to reduce the Land Bank Commissioner interest rate on loans to 4 percent. The resolution is signed by E. S. Parsons, and Paul Mann, secretary-treasurer of this association.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it hereby resolved, That the Kansas Federation of National Farm Loan Associations at its regular board of directors' meeting held in Wichita, Kans., on March 21, 1944, have adopted the following resolution which is of the effect that all Land Bank Commissioner loans should be reduced to 4 percent and new loans made by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation should be made at that rate of interest effective June 30, 1944.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 461. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 804).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 522. A bill providing for separation from the classified civil service of persons absent from their official duties for certain periods; with amendments (Rept. No. 805).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1508. A bill to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 806); and

H. R. 3176. A bill to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment; without amendment (Rept. No. 807).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 21, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 866) to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1859. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Watie Hart a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1860. A bill amending the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salary and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath business committee and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1861. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1862. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Mark Wolfe a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 1863. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Christine Red Stone a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mr. BAILEY) introduced Senate bill 1864, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1865. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Emily Hamilton and Mrs. Kay Graziano; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution authorizing payments to producers of Irish potatoes and commercial truck crops for fresh consumption under the 1943 agricultural conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE SERVICE AND TRAINING ACT TO COVER INDUSTRIAL WORKERS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and to briefly explain what it proposes. By this bill the agricultural provision of the Selective Training and Service Act, the so-called Tydings amendment, would be extended to industrial workers, with the idea that the agricultural manpower shortage has been very materially alleviated by the provisions of the Tydings amendment, and that if it is extended to include industrial workers, it can materially assist in meeting what is unquestionably a very serious problem in that field, as has been repeatedly pointed out by the Senator from Vermont. If we stop this turn-over in industry of the men between 18 and 45, which he has so forcefully pointed out, we will contribute to accomplishing certain of these results:

First. We may not have to reallocate so many contracts.

Second. Hoarding by plants to take care of the turn-over will be eliminated, and those hoarded will be released for other work.

Third. Men and women being recruited to replace men now leaving will not be needed and will be available for other work.

Fourth. Pressures on the War Labor Board by employers in less attractive activities to raise wages beyond fair amounts for the work involved will stop. Inflation will be controlled to that extent, and the War Labor Board will perform its proper function in allocations.

Fifth. We may be able to contribute to a fair and proper demobilization of war activities at the proper time.

So far as labor is concerned, the plan tends to stabilize employment, and thus union membership. Everyone is interested in encouraging men not now in war work to get into war work.

The requirement concerning the 1,700,000 agricultural workers is contained in the proviso of section 5 (k) of the Selective Service Act, which subsection is commonly referred to as the Tydings amendment. We have not heard any objections from these 1,700,000 agricultural workers to this requirement. Presumably they have recognized the fairness of that requirement and have been willing to leave the matter in the hands of the same local boards which withdrew them from the induction line. Unquestionably this provision has cut down the turn-over from the farms, other than from selective-service withdrawals, to a minimum, and, in my opinion, has greatly contributed to ameliorating the farm manpower situation.

No such legislative provision has been provided for industrial workers. The Tydings amendment proviso has, therefore, not affected industrial workers, regardless of their physical status or age. Also, under existing circumstances, it has been ineffective concerning farm registrants who have been physically examined and have been placed in class IV–F, because the armed forces have not been inducting that type of registrant. Information discloses that many farm registrants, upon being reclassified from II–C to III–C into class IV–F, are therefore leaving the farms.

Information and testimony concerning the men between 18 and 45 presented to the Senate and House Committees on Military Affairs reveals an alarming rate of turn-over in essential war industry, particularly among those who have been physically rejected or who are in the

38-to-45 age bracket. It would appear that if such turn-over from causes other than selective-service withdrawals could be substantially curtailed the manpower requirements would be considerably reduced and we would go a long way toward solving the manpower problems.

I wish to add that I am introducing this bill on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and myself. He joins with me in the statement which I have made explaining the purposes of the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1864) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, as amended, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mr. BAILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1565) relating to the appointment of postmasters, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT—ADDITIONAL COPIES

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 283), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That one thousand additional copies of the committee print of the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning of the Senate, relative to the role of the Federal Government in highway development, being an analysis of the needs and proposals for post-war action, shall be printed for the use of said committee.

RICHARD E. HAGAN

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 284), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Richard E. Hagan, widower of Virginia G. Hagan, late an employee in the Office of Senator BROOKS, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LEADERSHIP—ADDRESS BY COL. WILLIAM H. NEBLETT

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Leadership," delivered by Col. William H. Neblett, Air Corps, to the officers of the Quartermaster School at Camp Lee, Va., on April 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LIEUTENANT GENERAL VANDEGRIFT AT GRADUATION EXERCISES OF F. B. I. NATIONAL POLICE ACADEMY

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Lt. Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift, Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, at the graduation exercises of the twenty-fourth session of the F. B. I. National Police Academy on April 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER AT GRADUATION EXERCISES OF F. B. I. NATIONAL POLICE ACADEMY

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the graduation exercises of the F. B. I. National Police Academy on April 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE SOLDIER VOTE LAW—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address relative to the soldiers' vote bill, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley on April 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT TOWARD WORLD ORDER—ADDRESS BY DR. O. FREDERICK NOLDE

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Christian Movement Toward World Order," delivered by Dr. O. Frederick Nolde in the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

POWERS OF THE O. P. A. THREATEN THE RIGHTS OF AMERICANS—RADIO ADDRESS BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Powers of the O. P. A. Threaten the Rights of Americans, delivered by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on April 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF THE LEND-LEASE ACT—EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Encouraging Vote," published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETIREMENT OF CHARLES P. COUCH—EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT (LA.) JOURNAL

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Journal of April 5, 1944, concerning the retirement of Charles P. Couch as chairman of the board of directors of the Kansas City Southern-Louisiana & Arkansas Railways, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX—ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the poll tax, by Mark Sullivan, from the Washington Post of April 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOMESTIC LEND-LEASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE MISSOURI FARMER

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD and editorial entitled "Domestic Lend-Lease", by F. V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers' Association, published in the Missouri Farmer for April 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICE CONTROL RENEWAL—EDITORIAL FROM NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Price Control Renewal," published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune for April 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD O. P. A. BE CHANGED?—DEBATE ON AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the March 21, 1944, program of the American Forum of the Air on the subject To What Extent Should O. P. A. Be Changed?, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PEACE—STATEMENT BY JOHN D. PERMAIN AND ASSOCIATES

[Mr. MURDOCK (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "A Yardstick by Which To Measure Plans for Post-war Peace," which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS ARMY MATERIAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I was privileged to speak on the floor of the Senate in relation to surplus Army material, and the disposal of post-war surplus Army goods. It was brought out clearly that the Army at this time is disposing of certain materials which threaten the economic life of the small businessman.

This morning I have a letter from The Hub, Wheeling, W. Va., reading as follows:

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It seems that rackets will never end, and the enclosed copy of a letter received this morning may be of interest to you.

I shall keep the original on file. In case you desire it for any investigation, it will be forwarded to you upon request.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
THE HUB.

Mr. President, I should like to read the letter that was enclosed, without identifying the writer. It is dated April 19, 1944, is from —— & ——, War Surplus Distributors, Washington-New York Headquarters, 1131 Powhatan Street, Alexandria, Va. It is addressed to The Hub, Fourteenth and Market Streets, Wheeling, W. Va. Listen to this, Mr. President:

DEAR SIR: Within a few weeks excess war surplus merchandise will be released by the United States Government.

The writer says:

Excess war surplus merchandise will be released.

This merchandise will consist of thousands of items and will be released to the general public on an invitation-bid basis. Some of this merchandise is new and unused and still in original packing cases, others is slightly used.

Our organization is now able to assist firms in bidding for this merchandise. In addition to seeing that a reasonable bid is placed and secured, our representative goes to the storage warehouse and checks condition and quality of merchandise available.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

At present we are only interested in handling new accounts desiring the following merchandise: 1, clothing; 2, electrical appliances; 3, shoes; 4, watches; 5, radios; 6, automobiles; 7, furniture; 8, office machines.

If you are interested in our service we shall appreciate you writing us so the immediate notice of released merchandise can be forwarded to you.

Mr. President, the reason I take the time of the Senate to read this letter into the RECORD is to emphasize to the committee which is considering this matter the importance of giving immediate attention to it, so that we shall not in the near future have a flooding of Army goods upon the market which will operate to paralyze the small businessmen of the Nation.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM FOR SALE OF CORN—PRESS RELEASE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this morning at 11 o'clock a press release was issued through the Office of War Information. I doubt very much whether it has received the attention of many Members of the Senate, because perhaps it does not affect many of them as directly as it does some of us who come from the corn-producing areas of the country. Therefore I should like to impose upon the Senate for a few minutes in order to read the press release into the RECORD. It comes from the Office of War Information. It is dated today, for release after 11 a. m., and is entitled "Farmers Urged To Sell Corn to Government." It reads as follows:

FARMERS URGED TO SELL CORN TO GOVERNMENT

To assure continued production of critical war materials depending on processed corn products the War Department, War Production Board, and the War Food Administration issued an urgent appeal today to farmers in the surplus-producing counties of the Corn Belt to sell corn to the Government. The appeal is for corn not required for the farmers' own needs or the needs of feeders in their own communities.

Economic Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson, Price Administrator Chester Bowles, and War Food Administrator Marvin Jones, said there would be no increase in the ceiling price of 1943 crop corn.

The W. F. A. announced a program to protect the source of supply and assist farmers in marketing the necessary corn. This program will be in effect in 125 designated counties in Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, and Indiana for 60 days unless the objective of attaining adequate supplies for essential processors is reached before the end of the 60-day period. The program follows:

Movement of corn from farms or elevators in these counties after 12:01 a. m., Tuesday, April 25, is restricted to sales to the Commodity Credit Corporation except that feeders who present evidence of immediate need may apply to the county A. A. A. committee for authorization from the W. F. A. to purchase and transport a limited supply. Purchases made by C. C. C. will be handled through local elevators.

Corn owned by feed mixers can be used by them in the manufacture of mixed feed in amounts not in excess of the average used by them in the manufacture of mixed feeds during the corresponding period in 1942 and 1943. This provision becomes effective May 1.

To avoid the necessity of farmers interrupting their spring work, W. F. A. will provide shelling service at the farm and transportation to the local elevator through contracts with operators of portable shellers. Shelling service and transportation to the local elevator will be supplied at no cost to the farmer. In addition to these services, the farmer will be paid the local elevator ceiling price.

County and community A. A. A. committeemen will begin immediately in the designated counties to visit farms to determine the amount of corn available for purchase by the C. C. C. and to arrange for shelling and transportation services.

W. F. A. has received reports that several processing plants supplying corn products to war industries have been operating at reduced capacity or temporarily have been closed for lack of corn.

Counties in which the corn purchase program is effective:

Minnesota: Blue Earth, Brown, Chippewa, Cottonwood, Faribault, Jackson, Lac qui Parle, Lincoln, Lyon, Martin, Murray, Nobles, Pipestone, Redwood, Renville, Rock, Watonwan, Yellow Medicine.

Nebraska: Burt, Butler, Cass, Cuming, Dodge, Douglas, Lancaster, Otoe, Sarpy, Saunders, Seward, Thurston, Washington.

Iowa: Audubon, Boone, Buena Vista, Calhoun, Carroll, Cerro Gordo, Cherokee, Clay, Crawford, Dallas, Dickinson, Emmet, Franklin, Fremont, Greene, Grundy, Guthrie, Hamilton, Hancock, Hardin, Harrison, Humboldt, Ida, Jasper, Kossuth, Lyon, Marshall, Mills, Monona, Montgomery, O'Brien, Osceola, Page, Palo Alto, Plymouth, Pocahontas, Polk, Pottawattamie, Poweshiek, Sac, Shelby, Sioux, Story, Tama, Webster, Winnebago, Woodbury, Wright.

Illinois: Bureau, Cass, Champaign, Christian, De Witt, Douglas, Edgar, Ford, Fulton, Grundy, Iroquois, Kankakee, Kendall, Knox, La Salle, Lee, Livingston, Logan, McLean, Macon, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Putnam, Sangamon, Scott, Stark, Tazewell, Vermilion, Will, Woodford.

Indiana: Benton, Fountain, Jasper, Montgomery, Newton, Pulaski, Starke, Tippecanoe, Vermillion, Warren, White.

Mr. President, the program outlined in the release is highly impractical. It is described as if it would allow the farmer to have the option whether to sell his corn or not to sell it. However, it is nothing of the kind. It simply amounts to direct confiscation of the corn on the farms.

Knowing the agriculturalists as well as I think I do, I am quite certain that if the corn is needed so badly, if the farmers are given an opportunity to sell it voluntarily, without having it thus taken away from them, they will do so.

Already word of this release has gone out through the corn-producing area. I have begun to receive telegrams, and I am sure many other Members of the Senate will receive similar ones, asking where the poultry raisers are to get the corn to feed their poultry, where the dairymen are to get the corn they will need in order to continue the operation of their dairies, and where the cattle feeders are to get the corn they will need in order to continue to produce meat.

We have on hand today the largest number of cattle in the history of our country. At the same time we have, strange as it may seem, the smallest amount of beef available, due entirely to the mismanagement of our feed program. I regret very much that those in charge of it, no matter how honest their intentions were, did not consult with persons who have more practical knowledge and more practical ideas of the problem than were evidenced in the issuing of an order of this kind.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, immediately following the remarks I made earlier I should like to have inserted a copy of the order to which the press release referred. It is War Food Order No. 98.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE 7.—AGRICULTURE—CHAPTER XI, WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION (WAR FOOD ORDERS) [WAR FOOD ORDER NO. 98]

PART 1468. GRAIN: LIMITATIONS ON SALE, TRANSPORTATION AND USE OF CORN

The fulfillment of requirements for the defense of the United States has resulted in a shortage in the supply of corn for defense, for private account, and for export; and the following order is deemed necessary and appropriate in the public interest and to promote the national defense:

SEC. 1468.6. *Limitations on sale, transportation, and use of corn.*

(a) Definitions:

1. "Person" means any individual, partnership, association, business trust, corporation, or any organized group of persons whether incorporated or not, and includes any State or political subdivision or agency thereof.

2. "Corn" means yellow, white, or mixed shelled corn, whole corn, ear corn, or snap corn, of the dent or flint varieties, excluding however, seed corn, popcorn, grain sorghums, sweetcorn, broomcorn, and corn used for canning purposes.

3. "Elevator operator" means a person who owns or operates a grain elevator, warehouse, or barge or car-loading facility, and who receives corn for resale.

4. "Commodity" means the Commodity Credit Corporation.

5. "Chief of A. A. A." means the Chief of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, War Food Administration, or any employee or agency of the Department of Agriculture designated by him.

6. "Designated area" includes the following:

Illinois: Counties of Bureau, Cass, Champaign, Christian, De Witt, Douglas, Edgar, Ford, Fulton, Grundy, Iroquois, Kankakee, Kendall, Knox, La Salle, Lee, Livingston, Logan, McLean, Macon, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Putnam, Sangamon, Scott, Stark, Tazewell, Vermilion, Will, Woodford.

Indiana: Counties of Benton, Fountain, Jasper, Montgomery, Newton, Pulaski, Starke, Tippecanoe, Vermillion, Warren, White.

Iowa: Counties of Audubon, Boone, Buena Vista, Calhoun, Carroll, Cerro Gordo, Cherokee, Clay, Crawford, Dallas, Dickinson, Emmet, Franklin, Fremont, Greene, Grundy, Guthrie, Hamilton, Hancock, Hardin, Harrison, Humboldt, Ida, Jasper, Kossuth, Lyon, Marshall, Mills, Monona, Montgomery, O'Brien, Osceola, Page, Palo Alto, Plymouth, Pocahontas, Polk, Pottawattamie, Poweshiek, Sac, Shelby, Sioux, Story, Tama, Webster, Winnebago, Woodbury, Wright.

Minnesota: Counties of Blue Earth, Brown, Chippewa, Cottonwood, Faribault, Jackson, Lac qui Parle, Lincoln, Lyon, Martin, Murray, Nobles, Pipestone, Redwood, Renville, Rock, Watonwan, Yellow Medicine.

Nebraska: Counties of Burt, Butler, Cass, Cuming, Dodge, Douglas, Lancaster, Otoe, Sarpy, Saunders, Seward, Thurston, Washington.

7. "Designated agent" means an elevator operator located in the designated area and authorized by Commodity to receive corn for the account of Commodity.

b. "County committee" means the county agricultural conservation committee.

9. "Feeder" means any farmer or other person who acquires corn for the purpose of feeding livestock or poultry.

10. "Authorized agent" means any employee of the United States, any State or local agency, whose services are utilized by the

Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to (k) hereof.

11. "Mixed-feed manufacturer" means any person who uses corn in the manufacture of mixed feed for sale.

(b) Limitations on sale and transportation. Except as hereinafter otherwise provided:

1. No person shall sell or deliver corn located in the designated area to any person other than Commodity or its designated agent, and no person other than Commodity or its designated agent shall purchase or accept delivery of corn located in such area.

2. No person shall accept corn located in the designated area for transportation or delivery to any person other than Commodity or its designated agent. This provision shall not be construed to prevent any person or his agent from transporting corn owned by him from any point within the designated area to another point within such area.

3. No person shall transport corn from the designated area to any place outside of such area, except to Commodity or its designated agent.

(c) Exemptions:

1. Any feeder whose establishment is located in the designated area and who has less than a 30-day supply of corn for feeding requirements may, upon application to the county committee for the county in which his establishment is located, be authorized by the committee, in writing, to acquire and transport:

(i) From any person other than an elevator operator in the designated area either 50 bushels of corn located in such area or such amount as is necessary to make his inventory equal to a 30-day supply, whichever amount is the greater; or

(ii) From any elevator operator located in the designated area either 50 bushels of corn not subject to the set-aside requirements of War Food Order No. 96 (9 F. R. 3253) or War Food Order No. 96.1 (9 F. R. 3628), or such amount of such corn as is necessary to make his inventory equal to a 30-day supply, whichever amount is the greater.

2. Upon the surrender to the seller of an authorization issued by the appropriate county committee in accordance with (c) (1) hereof:

(i) Any person other than an elevator operator in the designated area may sell and deliver to the person named in such authorization the amount of corn specified therein; and

(ii) Any elevator operator located in the designated area may sell and deliver to the person named in such authorization corn not subject to the set-aside requirements of War Food Order No. 96, supra, or War Food Order No. 96.1, supra, in the amount specified in such authorization.

3. Any feeder, upon application to the county committee for the county where corn owned by him is located, may be authorized by such committee, in writing, to transport such corn to any point outside of the designated area for the purpose of feeding livestock or poultry owned by him.

4. Any person who buys, sells, or transports corn in accordance with the provisions of any authorization issued by a county committee under this order shall comply with all directions contained in such authorization.

(d) Transportation:

1. Any person transporting corn within or from the designated area by any means other than rail shall stop upon request by an authorized agent, shall identify the source and destination of such corn, and shall allow inspection of any shipping papers in his possession; and any authorized agent who has probable cause to believe that any person is transporting corn in violation of this order is authorized to stop such person and make the inspection herein provided for.

2. Any person transporting corn within or from the designated area in accordance with an authorization issued under (c) hereof shall, while engaged in such transportation, carry a copy of such authorization which shall be submitted for inspection by an authorized agent upon request.

(e) Limitations on use:

1. Beginning May 1, 1944, no mixed-feed manufacturer located in the designated area shall use during any month any quantity of corn in the manufacture of mixed feed which is in excess of the average quantity of corn used by him in the manufacture of mixed feed during the corresponding month of the calendar years 1942 and 1943.

2. Every person who, under an authorization from Commodity, acquires corn from Commodity or any of its designated agents shall comply with all the terms and conditions specified in such authorization, and any failure to comply with such terms and conditions shall constitute a violation of this order.

(f) Contracts: The provisions of this order and of all orders or regulations issued pursuant thereto shall be observed without regard to contracts heretofore or hereafter made, or any rights accrued or payments made thereunder.

(g) Records and reports:

1. The Chief of A. A. A. shall be entitled to obtain such information from, and require such reports and the keeping of such records by, any person, as may be necessary or appropriate, in his discretion, to the enforcement or administration of the provisions of this order.

2. Every person subject to this order shall, for at least 1 year (or for such period of time as the Chief of A. A. A. may designate), maintain an accurate record of his transactions in corn.

3. Every elevator operator shall, prior to any sale or delivery of corn under the provisions of (c) hereof, report to the county committee for the county in which his elevator or other facility is located the amount of corn on hand on the effective date of this order which was not subject to the set-aside requirements of War Food Order No. 96, supra, or War Food Order No. 96.1, supra.

(h) Audits and inspections: The Chief of A. A. A. shall be entitled to make such audit or inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or stocks of corn of any person, and to make such investigations as may be necessary or appropriate, in his discretion, to the enforcement or administration of the provisions of this order.

(i) Request for relief from hardship: Any person affected by this order who considers that compliance herewith would work an exceptional or unreasonable hardship on him may file a request for relief with the county committee for the county in which the corn is located. The request shall be in writing and shall set forth all pertinent facts and the nature of the relief sought. Such request shall be acted upon by the Chief of A. A. A. or any employee of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency designated by him.

(j) Violations: Any person who violates any provision of this order may, in accordance with the applicable procedure, be prohibited from receiving, making any deliveries of, or using corn or any other material subject to priority or allocation control by any governmental agency. Any person who wilfully violates any provision of this order is guilty of a crime and may be prosecuted under any and all applicable laws. Civil action may also be instituted to enforce any liability or duty created by, or to enjoin any violation of, any provision of this order.

(k) Delegation of authority: The administration of this order and the powers vested in the War Food Administrator, insofar as such powers relate to the administration of this order, are hereby delegated to the Chief of A. A. A. The Chief of A. A. A. is authorized to redelegate to any employee of the United States Department of Agriculture, or to any agency or employee of the United States, any or all of the authority vested in him by this order, and to utilize the services of any Federal, State, or local agency in the administration of this order.

(l) Communications: All reports required to be filed hereunder and all communications concerning this order shall, unless instructions to the contrary are issued by the Chief of A. A. A., be addressed to the Chief of Agricultural Adjustment Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C., Ref.: W. F. O. 98.

This order shall be effective for 60 days beginning at 12:01 a. m., central war time, April 25, 1944.

NOTE.—All reporting and record-keeping requirements of this order have been approved by, and all subsequent reporting and record-keeping requirements of this order will be subject to the approval of, the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

(E. O. 9280, 7 F. R. 10179; E. O. 9322, 8 F. R. 3807; E. O. 9334, 8 F. R. 5423; E. O. 9392, 8 F. R. 14783.)

Issued this 22d day of April 1944.

GROVER B. HILL,
Acting War Food Administrator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 45) to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566), with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3570. An act to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3848. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources;

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan;

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943;

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy;

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps;

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va; and

S. 1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3570. An act to provide an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 3848. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROTECTION OF THE NAME "RED CROSS"

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the understanding which was reached upon the floor last week, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 469 was passed. The motion to reconsider was made by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] on January 19, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 469) to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the emblem and name of the Red Cross.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the motion to reconsider——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Overton
Andrews	Eastland	Radcliffe
Austin	Ellender	Reed
Bailey	Ferguson	Revercomb
Ball	George	Robertson
Bankhead	Gerry	Russell
Barkley	Gillette	Shipstead
Bilbo	Green	Smith
Brewster	Guffey	Stewart
Bridges	Hawkes	Taft
Brooks	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Butler	McClellan	Tydings
Byrd	McFarland	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wagner
Chandler	Maloney	Weeks
Chavez	Maybank	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Murdock	White
Connally	Nye	Wiley
Cordon	O'Daniel	Willis
Danaher	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to the annual meeting of the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the motion to reconsider the Red Cross bill is now before the Senate by reason of the fact that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] on the 19th of January, when the bill was passed by the Senate, indicated that he desired a few more days in which to reexamine the facts upon which were based an amendment offered at the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] by which commercial users of the Red Cross symbol who deemed themselves injured by reason of the adoption of a law implementing the Geneva Treaty should have the right to appear before the Court of Claims and demonstrate their injury and damage, if any.

Unfortunately, the then chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] died within a few days thereafter, and consideration of the amendment was thereby postponed until now, a period of 3 months. The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Maryland indicated to me that their only purpose was to have for a few hours the opportunity to reconsider the contentions upon which the proposed amendment is based, and I was very glad to indicate a willingness to go along with that proposed arrangement. Of course, from the parliamentary point of view, there is always the opportunity to move to lay such a motion upon the table, a motion which is then presented for action without debate. The Senator from Maryland has been good enough to indicate to me on several occasions that he is quite willing to have the debate limited.

Mr. President, since the only matter which brings about the motion to reconsider is the particular amendment in question, I therefore ask unanimous consent that there shall be a vote upon the motion to reconsider not later than 3 o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the Senator will bear with me——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I had not quite finished.

Mr. TYDINGS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Maine wish to make a statement?

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator from Wyoming making request for unanimous consent respecting the time for voting?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I feel at the moment that I must object.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator will withhold his objection, because my purpose, of course, is to carry out an understanding which was had, and to clear the way for the appropriation bill which is to come before the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no desire to interpose a personal objection, but I think at least one or two Senators on this side have some interest in this matter, and I should like to get in touch with them and talk with them before I consent to a definite time for a vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in those circumstances, of course, I shall not proceed with the request. But I will say that an understanding had been reached with respect to limiting the time for consideration of the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Wyoming. The only thing we want to have reconsidered, so there may be a more extended understanding of the whole matter, is the amendment which was rejected when the bill was originally considered. Since there is only one matter in dispute between those who favor and those who do not in any way at all favor the bill, I suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that he so frame his unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote on that one matter, which will automatically end the whole discussion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, why is it necessary at this stage of the proceedings to ask for unanimous consent? Why can we not proceed? It may very well be that we can dispose of the entire bill while we are talking about unanimous consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Maine is quite right, and the Senator from Maryland indicates that he does not desire to take up more than an hour or an hour and a half.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, by no means.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt that the matter can be disposed of, so I shall withhold my unanimous consent request.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I express the hope that the debate and the vote on the motion to reconsider will take place at an early hour this afternoon. We have now in the Senate the Navy Department appropriation bill, which is extremely important, and we should like very much indeed to take it up today. It was scheduled to be taken up today. Tomorrow I shall be engaged in the hearings on the river and harbor bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall not consume an hour. The matter now before the Senate is one with which, I make bold to remark, very few Members of this body have much familiarity. Even the lawyers in the Senate have had very little occasion to examine the law of trade-marks. I myself, having practiced law for a long time, have had little or no occasion to examine into it. Since the matter first came up I have made a very extended examination of the subject, and I have in my office a long line of decisions of the Supreme Court defining the origin of trade-marks.

My good friend, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], when this matter was previously before the Senate, said that Congress gave trade-marks to business concerns, and therefore could take them away. I shall later quote the Senator's language exactly. The misconception which I think many of us have with respect to the matter has caused the improper consideration of the amendment I offered.

First of all, Mr. President, Congress does not give anyone in America a trade-mark. A trade-mark is something which came up through common law. The only trade-mark legislation of a national kind is the Trade-Mark Act, which permits the holder and user of a trade-mark, which may be two or three centuries old and in continuous use, to register it so that he can stop others from using his particular label in the sale of goods. The Congress has given nothing. As the Supreme Court decisions abundantly show, and some of which I shall read in part, trade-marks hundreds of years old have been protected by the common law long before the Geneva Convention, which dealt with the humane society known as the Red Cross, and long before any legislation was enacted on the subject by the American Congress. So if we can remove that misconception from our minds, I think we will approach this matter with the degree of fairness which the particular circumstances make necessary.

I quote the exact words used by my good friend, the Senator from Texas, when this matter was previously before the Senate. He said that a trade-mark "is an act of grace on the part of the Government of the United States; and if the Government wishes to take that privilege back it can do so."

That is the general conception which we all have. I will show presently that a trade-mark has nothing to do with the grace of any government. As I said, its origin is in the common law; and, as many justices of the Supreme Court have said, it is a matter primarily in the keeping of the States.

About 30 or 40 years ago the Federal Government for the first time took cognizance of the whole trade-mark arrangement, and in the act which we call the Trade-Mark Act the Federal Government simply provided that the user and holder of a trade-mark could register it so as to protect his right to its use from infringement by others. That is primarily the essence of the trade-mark law. The Government did not give any trade-marks. They were already in use, long before that act was passed or before any official congressional notice was taken. So if we get that misconception out of our minds, we will understand how seriously the pending bill could affect the rights of our citizens without the brief limiting amendment which I hope to offer.

Now let me cite a few dates, which are the next things to keep in mind. I am standing in front of my seat, facing the rear of the Chamber, so that Senators on both sides of the aisle may be better able to hear me.

On August 2, 1864, the Geneva Convention adopted a red cross with a white background as its symbol, and promulgated a general international treaty. Mark you, Mr. President, the United States was not represented at that convention. The convention was a Swiss convention which gave the Red Cross organization its birth, and we had no part whatsoever in it.

The second date to bear in mind is 1872 and the period 1872 to 1905. From 1872 to 1905 numerous firms in the United States adopted a red cross as a trade-mark to designate the products they manufactured.

The third date to bear in mind is 1900. The act of June 6, 1900, was passed. It is a Federal statute by which the American National Red Cross, the humane society, was incorporated by an act of Congress. We should keep in mind the date when that act was passed; namely, June 6, 1900.

As a matter of fact, no present Member of the Senate and no one appearing before any committee hearings has denied that C. B. Silver & Son, a small canning establishment in Havre de Grace, Md., was using the red cross trade-mark and had used it on hundreds of thousands of cases of food for 14 years before this Government took any official action in respect to the Red Cross. That fact is beyond dispute.

So, Mr. President, what is the situation? We find that since 1876 a man has been using the red cross brand on his products. In 1900, for the first time, there was created by Federal law the American National Red Cross, a most worthy and fine organization. In 1905, 5 years later, an act to incorporate the American National Red Cross was passed. That act forbade the commercial use of the words "red cross" or the red cross symbol, but the act contained a grandfather clause preserving the rights of commercial users "lawfully entitled to use" it prior to 1905. So, when the Government took action, the Congress placed in the act a provision that thereafter commercial users could not use the red cross as a trade-mark, but that all those who had used it before the Government acted could continue to use it, as, of course, the Constitution provides that a man's property cannot be taken without due process of law; and without that provision incorporated in the act, the act would have been invalid.

Briefly, because I do not wish to tire Senators who are kind enough to listen by an elaborate effort in support of my contention, let me state that I hold in my hand many decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, all of which, without a single exception, show that a trade-mark is a property right. I shall read only excerpts from three or four of the decisions, in order to illustrate the point. Before I do, let me quote what the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States says:

> Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

That is the Constitution. Here is what the Supreme Court of the United States has to say:

> The right to adopt and use a symbol or a device to distinguish the goods or property made or sold by the person whose mark it is, to the exclusion of the use of that symbol by all other persons, has been long recognized by the common law and the chancery courts of England and of this country, and by the statutes of some of the States. It is a property right—

Still quoting from Mr. Justice Miller, who is of recent vintage on our Court—

> for which damages may be recovered in an action at law, and the violation of which will be enjoined by a court of equity, with compensation for past infringement. This property and the exclusive right to its use were not created by the act of Congress.

Here is one of the Supreme Court Justices who, in a unanimous opinion, says that this property right was not created by act of Congress; that it has its ramifications in the common law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say to the able senior Senator from Maryland, inasmuch as he has read the provision of the Constitution that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, that I think one of the very pertinent questions in respect to this whole matter is that it is not one involving the taking of property for public use but involves the taking of property, certainly a thing of value, and the giving of it to a private organization for its private use. It is not a taking for public use by a public or Government agency.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, of course that is the case. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall come to that very observation. It would be bad

enough if we took property for use by the Government without compensation. There might be some slight color of "Well, the Government can do anything in a period of emergency," although that doctrine would be totally erroneous. But when we take private property and give it to some private institution which only has the Government's supervision or benefaction, so to speak, then the aggravation is much worse.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should prefer not to do so. I am afraid my friends will go to lunch before I reach the pertinent question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the Senator is taking the position which I took upon this question.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is, that the bill originally reported should not be passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

I have read excerpts from a recent opinion by Mr. Justice Miller, and I have quoted him exactly. The trade-mark is a property right created by the common law. To quote further:

> This property and the exclusive right to its use were not created by the act of Congress, and do not now depend on that act for their enforcement. The whole system of trade-mark property and the civil remedies for its protection existed long anterior to the act of Congress and remain in full force since its passage.

The milk in the coconut of this dispute is this: In 1872 a man who had a valid claim to a trade-mark was using it. It was on every piece of goods he manufactured. Fourteen years later the American Red Cross was incorporated. Miss Mabel Boardman, than whom there is no higher figure in the Red Cross in all the world, and who has been associated with it for 40 years, in testifying before a congressional committee, stated that it would be improper to preclude those who had used the red cross symbol prior to the enactment of this legislation from continuing to use it. She said, "We ask only that, by an amendment to the Trade-Mark Act, no new users be permitted from now on."

Thus, in the first congressional enactment, the words were written in which left to those who were in rightful possession of red cross trade-marks the right to use them without any question of interference by the Federal Government. Mr. President, that is a fact which stands out like a lighthouse. We cannot argue around it. No one will dispute it. No one will question the wisdom of that provision. That has been the universal policy of Congress up to this hour.

I wish to read another decision or two to illustrate what I have been talking about. In the case of Little Tavern Shops, Inc., against Davis, the Court said:

> The Courts recognize a right of property in a trade name which has been adopted by a person to denominate his business, and has been so used by him in asscciation therewith as to acquire a special significance as the name thereof.

In another case, May against Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., the Court said:

> Now, however, to deprive it (defendant) of the use of the mark which it has so widely popularized would not only cause it an enormous loss in trade and in goodwill, but would hopelessly confuse and deceive the buying public which has come to know the mark as designating the product of this defendant.

I could read hundreds of decisions. I have read 50 or 60 of them. There is no utterance by the Supreme Court to the effect that trade-marks are not property. They are property. In one of Mr. Justice Holmes' decisions he says that, like any other property, a trade-mark cannot be taken from its rightful owner without due process of law.

To digress for a moment—for I am trying to make this explanation as brief as possible—let me tell the Senate what some trade-marks have sold for in the market.

The trade-mark "Maxwell House Coffee" was bought by General Foods for $42,000,000. What was Maxwell House coffee? A standard brand of coffee in the mind of the public. Only a very small percentage of this enormous price was paid for brick, mortar, and inventory. My authority is Babson's report of November 17, 1930.

The trade-mark "Jell-O" was bought by General Foods for $35,000,000, according to Babson's report of November 17, 1930.

The trade-mark of Dodge Brothers, Inc., was sold to a banking syndicate. The comment in Printer's Ink of April 16, 1925, is "$16,000,000 a letter."

The trade-mark of Bull Durham tobacco was estimated by Mr. Duke to be worth from $10,000,000 to $20,000,000 because of the good name of that product. My authority for that statement is Printer's Ink of November 11, 1920.

Ivory, Victrola, Kodak, and Uneeda are four names which we recognize instantly. "One million dollars a letter" is a common saying in advertising circles. In 1920 an offer of $10,000,000 by a rival tobacco company for the trade-mark of Camel cigarettes was rejected. My authority for that statement is Printer's Ink of November 11, 1920.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Considering the great values, does the Senator recognize that there is no property in a trade-mark of itself, separated from the goods which it represents?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. AUSTIN. Therefore, a large part of the value of a trade-mark consists in the goods to which it is applied.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. The two go together, but without the trade-mark the goods have no standard, and the public does not buy. That is the decision of the courts over and over again, as the Senator well knows.

The trade-mark of Sun Maid raisins was sold by the Sun Maid Raisin Growers' Association to a bankers' syndicate for $5,600,000.

On the balance sheet of the Coca-Cola Co. the trade-mark "Coca-Cola" is carried at $24,960,681, as against only $4,250,000 for tangible property. In other words, there is $4,250,000 worth of machinery, equipment, supplies, and what not; yet in its inventory the concern claimed, in its annual balance sheet, that $24,960,681 represented the goodwill behind the trade-mark "Coca-Cola." Take away the trade-mark "Coca-Cola," and put the product in bottles labeled "Berry Cola" or something else, and the market immediately disappears. So it is with all trade-marks.

I do not wish to labor the point by elaboration on many other trade-marks concerning which I have accumulated information from balance sheets to support my contention. I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks I may insert such pertinent data in the RECORD, for those who wish the sources from which I have quoted in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the data may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

(See exhibits A, B, C, and D.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us go to the testimony by the attorney for the American Red Cross before the committee of the House, presided over by Mr. ROBERT CROSSER, of Ohio. I wish to read only two or three questions and answers.

> Mr. DENISON. So it comes down to the fact that if you have a majority, that is all you are concerned about?
>
> Mr. HARTFIELD. If a man used this before 1882—
>
> The C. B. Silver Co., of Havre de Grace, Md., used it in 1876.
>
> If a man used this before 1882 and advertised it and his emblem is of value, it does take away from him that value and does deprive him of a thing of value, and to that extent it might be said to be harsh, just as in the case of Congress condemning a piece of property and taking it away from a man frequently works injustice.

This is the testimony of the chief counsel of the American Red Cross, testifying only a few months ago before the House committee. Continuing, he said:

> There is hardly any legislation that is not unjust in individual cases. Look at what is involved in all kinds of legislation that is being passed now.

Here Colonel Hartfield himself admits that a thing of value—just as in a case where a piece of property is condemned—is, without due process of law, being taken from a man in rightful possession of it.

I may wish to take some little time in rebuttal, but I shall leave this general picture with Senators.

First, the Supreme Court has uniformly held that trade-marks are property rights, the same as in the case of any other property, and that a man rightfully

in possession of a trade-mark cannot be deprived of it without due process of law. I have shown the intrinsic value of numerous trade-marks. I have likewise shown that trade-marks were not created by an act of Congress. Trade-marks were not created by an act of grace flowing from a great Government to individuals, but they came up, the Supreme Court has said, from the common law, and were protected by State statutes. The Federal Congress did not act in the matter until many years after the concern in question had been using the emblem, and then Congress passed the trade-mark law to allow the user of the trade-mark to register it only for his own protection.

I have likewise shown that Miss Mabel Boardman, when testifying before a committee of Congress, said with respect to those concerns which had used the red cross label before any Federal action had been taken in the matter, that it would be wrong to take from them their right to continue to use the red cross symbol, and that only those concerns wishing in the future to adopt use of the red cross symbol should be prevented from doing so.

What do we ask for in this amendment? What is the amendment I have offered, which causes such trouble? We merely ask that anyone who used the red cross trade-mark in his business, in a bona fide way, long prior to any action on the part of our Government in this matter, and who, by the pending bill, would be deprived of its use in the future, be given at least a hearing in the Court of Claims to ascertain if compensation for any damage is due him under the laws of our country. I do not ask that the parties concerned be awarded damages. I do not prejudge the case by a single implication in the amendment. I simply seek to give them a day in court. That is all my amendment would do. I ask that they shall be given the right to come into court and ascertain whether or not under the laws of the United States of America they have been injured as a result of this proceeding.

Mark you, Senators, the amendment applies only to those persons who had and used the red cross trade-mark for years before the Federal Government took any action of any kind, manner, or form, having to do with the red cross. It applies only to those concerns which used the red cross before a trade-mark law was passed by our National Congress.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the theory of the Senator from Maryland, who would pay the damages? Would it be the Government, or the Red Cross?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Court of Claims held that concern A was entitled to damages, the question propounded by the Senator from West Virginia would be a moot one. I do not know the answer to it. What the court would do, would be to make a finding. Of course, Congress would still have the right to refuse to appropriate the amount which the court had found to be due.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Red Cross Society, which is a corporation, had received the benefit of the symbol which was taken, would not the proceeding properly be against the Red Cross Society?

Mr. TYDINGS. Personally, if the amount were reasonable—and in every case of which I can conceive the amount would be reasonable—I should like to see Congress appropriate for it.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a moment I will yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

However, I should not want to see these citizens, in this day when democracy is on trial, deprived of their property without at least giving them the opportunity to go into court to show that the Government took unjust action against them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. In answer to the question propounded by the Senator from West Virginia, I may say that the amendment provides that if any compensation shall be awarded it shall be against the United States Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. I had forgotten that feature of the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. The amendment states:

> Any person, corporation, or association that had a right to use and actually used the red cross, or whose assignor had a right to use and actually used the red cross, for any lawful purpose prior to January 5, 1905, and subsequent to January 5, 1905, but prior to the date of enactment of this act, who shall have been deprived of such use because of the enactment of this act, and who deems himself to have been injured thereby, may bring an action in the Court of Claims against the United States for compensation for such injury. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of any such person, corporation, or association, and, in any case in which it determines that such person, corporation, or association has been so injured, to render judgment thereon against the United States in an amount not exceeding the amount of the financial loss which shall have been suffered or may reasonably be expected to be suffered by such person, corporation, or association, by reason of such injury.

And so forth.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the amendment which has just been read by the Senator from Tennessee, and which I assume represents the position of the Senator from Maryland, demonstrates to me the falsity of the whole situation. It provides for taking public money and paying for a right, or a thing of value, or property, which the Government takes from one private individual and gives to another private individual.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree completely with the philosophy as expressed in the statement of the Senator from West Virginia. I maintain that the Government has no right to take the property of one man or two men and give it to another man, no matter how worthy the purpose, without due process of law. Indeed, I go further: It is my conviction, after having read many scores of cases dealing with this subject, that the passage of the bill in its present form will represent a Pyrrhic victory, for if we can take a man's property without due process of law—and, in view of the uncontradicted flow of decisions from the Supreme Court, what is being attempted here is to take by legislative fiat the property of Charles B. Silver & Co., in whose possession the property was in 1876, and who have used it ever since—because in 1905 the Congress passed an act for humanitarian purposes, in my opinion, the court will strike it down. But it is likewise my opinion that the motives and purposes behind this proposed legislation are worthy ones, and that if some cushioning of losses and differences can be brought about, and if those citizens to whom I have referred are partly compensated for losses which, in my judgment, they are bound to sustain, they will find other trade-marks, and will be patriotic enough to consider their loss as one of the unequal sacrifices which, during a great war, Congress has called upon them to bear. However, I am in basic accord with the truth and righteousness of the opinion expressed by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield in order that I may make one more statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If this bill, upon reconsideration, shall be passed, containing the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, by which the Congress would take property of one private individual and give it to another private individual, and pay for it with public funds, how soon will some other worthy organization—such as the Salvation Army or the American Legion—come before Congress and say, "We want a piece of property, a building, if you please, and we are asking you to take money of the people of the country and purchase it and give it to us"? I do not know of anyone who will doubt the worthiness of the Red Cross, but the fact that it is a worthy organization cannot justify us in using the public funds to take a property or a thing of value from one private individual and give it to another, however worthy, and use the money of the people of this country to pay for it. For that reason it seems to me that upon reconsideration, if possible, we ought to go back to the original bill as reported and not take this step and set a precedent here, for it would be a precedent so far as I know, but, whether a precedent or not, we should not take public funds to buy private property and give it to a private individual.

Mr. TYDINGS. The only trouble with the Senator's position, as I understand it, is that his position contradicts his philosophy. He lays down the premise first that we ought not to take property from one person and give it to another or to another agency, no matter how worthy. I offer an amendment to

ameliorate the injustice. The Senator says I propose to strike down the amelioration and take the property from one individual and give it to a worthy cause. Did I follow the Senator rightly?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No, sir; the Senator did not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I said we could not take property at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator would be against the bill, then.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator would be against the bill if it would take property. I still do not see why we should make a victim of the people of this country and the public purse by taking the public money to pay for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then the Senator's position is absolutely clear and unequivocal, and I think he has stated not only the law but the facts with crystal-clear accuracy. The only reason I am here is that I am in the position of a man defending a client whom he knows to be innocent but, because of notoriety or sentimentalism or whatever it may be, in the community, is afraid the jury is going to find him guilty. Therefore, rather than have him hanged for a supposed offense, I am trying to get him off on a charge of petty larceny.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. It seems to me we are overlooking a very clear and fundamental distinction. The purpose of this bill is not to take away a trade-mark and give it to another for commercial purposes. The theory of the bill is that the Red Cross should be protected in the interest of the public welfare and the public good. There are innumerable situations in which we have appropriated money to pay for property that was taken, confiscated, destroyed for the public benefit. That has happened from time to time throughout our history, and that is the theory on which this proposed legislation proceeds.

I think it would have been much better and much sounder if the exemption had been put into this measure that has been put into prior legislation, to wit, that it should not be construed as affecting the right of the holder of a trade-mark who had made continuous use of it prior to a certain date; so that those who had established their right could be protected and there would be no liability on the part of the Government or on the part of the Red Cross.

I do not think it would be wise to subject the Red Cross to any payment whatsoever. I think it would be entirely equitable and fair and right and just to say that the Government should stand any actual loss that the holder of a trademark could establish in a court of law, if he could establish an actual financial loss, because it is the taking of a trademark and giving to a humanitarian institution, a world-wide institution as a matter of fact, the use of that mark in the interest of the public welfare or the public good. Therefore, it is on all fours with an appropriation to pay for cattle which the Government orders killed because it is suspected that there is some disease in the herd of cattle or in other cattle in a particular area. That is done on the theory that we are protecting the general welfare, and I think we might well say that in the case of the Red Cross we could allow the exclusive use of this name to that institution and if there is to individuals, who have used the name, a financial loss which can be established in court, the Government itself would stand the loss.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Senator a question at that point.

Mr. TYDINGS. If both Senators who are now on their feet will allow me to yield to them after about a minute, I have four short paragraphs to read of questions and answers that I could not put my hands on a moment ago. Remember that this is a committee of the other body asking questions to which Colonel Hartfield, a very able lawyer, who was counsel for the Red Cross, is replying. Out of the mouths of the so-called opposition I can abundantly prove my contention, if the Senators will give me their ears. I quote from the House hearings:

Mr. CROSSER. Suppose some other society with very good motives would come along and adopt the trade-mark of the Quaker, like that the Quaker Oats people use, and acquire a desirable reputation throughout the country as a charitable or other institution represented by that trade-mark, what do you think of the justice of their proceeding in the courts or through Congress to deprive the commercial people of their right to use it?

That might happen, I think.

Mr. HARTFIELD. I would say such a statute would be unconstitutional, in that it would deprive them of it without due process of law, unless that society was an integral part of the Government. It gets down to that.

Now following:

Mr. CROSSER. In other words, the Government can get the property without compensating for it.

Mr. HARTFIELD. If the Government has adopted an emblem for any of its branches, it can protect that emblem.

Mr. CROSSER. You will, of course, concede that there might be very valuable property in some trade-mark.

Mr. HARTFIELD. No doubt.

Here is a statement by Colonel Hartfield, who is the principal witness for the Red Cross and a very shrewd attorney, that the law would be unconstitutional if it took property without due process of law. Congress seems bound to take it anyway without due process of law, for there is no condemnation provided. Congress cannot take a man's property, except by going into a court and condemning it. That is not even proposed here. The Constitution is to be torn into a hundred shreds. It is not even proposed to give a hearing to the people who are affected, and if my amendment is voted down they will not have a hearing because the Government cannot be sued without the authority of Congress. If the Government, as Colonel Hartfield says, desires to condemn a piece of property it has to file condemnation proceedings and invoke the right of eminent domain, in which case witnesses are put on the stand, and the value of the property is fixed by a jury. The owner of the property is then compelled to sell it, but not until he gets the money for it in his hands and all in a court of law. What is proposed to be done here? Colonel Hartfield admits this is property. The Supreme Court of the United States again and again has said it is property. But it is not even proposed to go to court first. Why? Because there is no authority for the court to condemn property for the use of a fraternal or beneficial organization. Are we to issue a legislative decree and wipe out a property right of all the people who own these trade-marks?

I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut, who rose first. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky, and then to the Senator from West Virginia, who have risen.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me first thank the Senator from Maryland for his courtesy in yielding.

There are two points which have been referred to by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Maryland which it seems to me should be met by a general denial at this point. First, the Senator from Georgia says that this case is on all fours with the case of the taking of cattle by the Government in the public interest in order to kill those which are diseased. Such an instance constitutes condemnation. That definitely is not the case in this instance, for the reason that the United States Government is not condemning the use of the red cross as a trade mark even by those who were users prior to 1905. The United States is not condemning the use of the mark at all, either for the use and benefit of the Government or for the public interest. This is a case in which the Senate is acting pursuant to an obligation which derives from a treaty which was entered into under the Constitution, and which, by virtue of its treaty status, becomes the supreme law of the land. Consequently it is not in any sense a taking for American use, and since there is not a condemnation, we are not required to proceed to the courts first. Were there a condemnation of the use of this red cross mark as an advertising symbol to the benefit of the United States, condemnation proceedings would be required. But that is not our situation here.

If we do not have the right to act in this case to implement a political decision which was made pursuant to constitutional political authority, as when the President of the United States, and this body, entered into a treaty, thus jointly participating, pursuant to our treaty-making power——

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator give the date at that point?

Mr. DANAHER. Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine—then everything the Senator from Maryland has said, and the point made by the Senator from Georgia, would be sound. But that is not our case. We have a situation in which, once a

treaty is entered into, the treaty may override the law of a State, it may even override the provisions of the constitution of a State, insofar as either may be repugnant to the treaty.

Mr. TYDINGS. It will not override the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. It will override the law of any State.

Mr. TYDINGS. But it will not override the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. No question of the fifth amendment or of the fourteenth amendment is involved in the slightest respect. Whenever, pursuant to the exercise of political power of our Government in a constitutional way, there should result a loss, it is just as clearly established by the Supreme Court of the United States as any point could be——

Mr. GEORGE. Let me ask the Senator whether there is anything that would prevent our doing simple justice, and saying that we have entered into this treaty and are going to take certain property rights, but that we are going to pay for those rights? Does the Senator know of anything that stands in the way of the Congress doing justice to American citizens?

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, there is nothing in the Constitution, or otherwise, that would stand in the way of our doing justice. All I have sought to do was to direct the argument back from the very plausible but actually untenable grounds upon which it was proceeding, to the actual theory upon which the proposed legislation proceeds. It is on the latter point I make my interposition, and that is all. I am not even attempting to argue the point. I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. In connection with the Senator's amendment, which provides that suit may be brought in the Court of Claims to establish damages suffered as the result of loss of the right to use this symbol——

Mr. TYDINGS. Loss only to those who used it before the treaty was ratified.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is on the basis that the use of the symbol was beneficial to the user. Does the Senator's amendment provide, or what does he think of the idea, that the Government should have the right to offset the damage by any claim of benefit conferred by the use of the emblem?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not follow the Senator. Does the Senator mean if the Red Cross as a social organization has helped a private concern?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but assuming that the use of the emblem has been of benefit to the user of it as a trademark, what does the Senator think about allowing the Government to show that fact in mitigation of any damages?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Government could do so, but it would be pretty hard to prove it. Let me say to the Senator that, while its motivation would be good, that would, in my judgment, be a little farfetched for the following reasons: The holders of this private red-cross trade-mark, who have held it since 1876, many decades before the Government got into the picture at all, will be the ones who will be hurt. The Government is not going to be hurt.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no idea that the Government is going to be hurt, unless some pretty large damages are shown.

Mr. TYDINGS. Penetrating the Senator's idea—and I now see more clearly what he has in mind—I do not believe that anything that could be shown along the line suggested would be excluded, but I may say that, in my judgment, that would be a pretty intangible thing, in the face of a set of books which showed that in the year 1930, for example, the business of such and such a concern using the red-cross emblem was thus and so, and that year it was taken away and they had to use a new emblem, and in 1931 their receipts dropped 30 percent. It would be pretty difficult to show that the fact that the Red Cross was a humanitarian organization was responsible for their sales in 1930, but it would be easy to show that taking away the red-cross symbol in 1931 certainly played a major part in the loss of the receipts.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator is as familiar as I am with certain phases of the law under which damages are sought in the civil courts of the country. For instance, if a railroad goes through a man's farm, or if a public road is projected through a man's farm, not only the value of the land may be taken into consideration, but the question of benefits conferred upon the property by reason of the improvement can be taken into consideration in offsetting the amount of damages to which the owner might be entitled.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If a railroad goes through a farm, and the farmer sues later, not for the value of the land but for damages which have resulted, then the railroad company may seek to offset the damages by showing benefits.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am wondering whether the same theory might apply to the litigation in the Court of Claims now suggested.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not see any reason why it would not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say only a word, since the matter has been brought up, regarding the reference of the able Senator from Georgia to our doing simple justice. I do not see that simple justice is involved in this matter in the way we are about to handle it. If my property were taken from me by the Government, which had the power to do it through the enactment of law, and given to my neighbor, it might be a very good thing for me to have the Government reach out and take money from the public and pay me; but that would not be simple justice. Certainly it would not be simple justice to the people of this country whom we represent and whose interests we are to protect. I do not consider that we have a right to take the personal property of one individual and give it to another, not to the Government, not for the general welfare or for public use.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I never asserted such a theory. I am sure I should not want the Senator to labor under that misapprehension. I think that if we look at this matter thoroughly, we will see that it is conferring upon the Red Cross the exclusive use of this particular emblem in the larger interest of all the people. It is not turned over to them so that they might manufacture spring beds, or any kind of vegetable soups, or anything else, under that symbol. The Red Cross is, of course, an agency not strictly of the Government, but we have appropriated money and have given money to the Red Cross to use. We have relied upon the Red Cross to do many things which might be properly classed as governmental functions. We do it whenever a storm comes and devastates an area. We turn over materials and supplies to the Red Cross. So I take it the Red Cross cannot be compared—or at least I am not willing to make the comparison—to an individual who has been given a commercial product, or property, or thing of value which was taken from some other individual citizen. I think the cases are different. It seems to me, however, that when we consider the character of the Red Cross, its functions, its duties, its responsibilities, and its performances, we would be justified in saying that whatever we do for the benefit of that organization we can properly charge to all the people of the country, because we would not want to charge it to the Red Cross. I agree with the Senator's original concept. It is my considered judgment that in writing the legislation the committee should have said that no one else shall make use of the red cross.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the future.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If that had been done we would all be in agreement respecting the whole matter. We are reaching out here to take a property which has been in existence for years.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, since we now give the Red Cross the exclusive use of the symbol it seems to me that very properly we might say that just compensation shall be given to anyone who can establish a property right in the trade-mark. I do not place it on any technical, legal basis, and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] misunderstood me if he thought I said that the taking of this symbol and giving to the Red Cross Society its exclusive use was on all fours with the taking of private property, such as cattle that had been condemned for destruction. It is not at all on all fours, but it is a very similar or analogous principle. I have been forbidden by Federal act to make shipments of perfectly sound and wholesome property from my State into, say, the adjacent State of Florida. Why? Not because anything was wrong with my property, but because there was a fear that certain diseases in vegetable and animal life might be spread. When the Federal Government takes property from an individual it oftentimes com-

pensates the individual. I do not say that the present case is on all fours with that precise principle, but it seems to me to be analogous to it, because here we are acting—or else there is no justification for our action—on the theory that in the public interest and general welfare we believe the Red Cross should have the exclusive use of the symbol.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say briefly in reply that there is not any question about the Red Cross being a great institution, a great benefactor and helper in time of flood and distress. But so is the Salvation Army. So are the church organizations. So is the American Legion. I saw the American Legion in action in the great flood on the Ohio River, when it was the first organization in action there. Of course all these organizations are great in the work they perform. But are we going to set the precedent here of taking public money to pay some individual for a thing of value which we have taken from him, or from several individuals, to give to these worthy organizations?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator from West Virginia will allow me to interject at that point, I will say that if we do not by legislative action take an individual's property and give it to these organizations, then my answer is, "No," but if by legislative act we take his property and give it to these worthy organizations, then by that same legislative act we ought at least to give the injured individual his day in court to prove what his damages are.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree with the Senator that we ought to give the injured individual his day in court and let him prove his damages, but we ought to let him prove his damages against the one who receives the gift, not against the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator can succeed in having an amendment making such provision adopted, I will accept it, but I cannot have such an amendment adopted, and must take what I can obtain.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the original bill which provided for the taking of the property from an individual and giving it away to another was wrong, however worthy the recipient organization might be.

Mr. TYDINGS. All the wrongs of mankind are perpetrated under the guise of goodness.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Exactly so.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is one reason for the downfall of civilizations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the guise of goodness in doing this we are doing a wrong to the people of the country we are supposed to represent here. It is really taking the property of one individual and giving it to another and then assessing each citizen of the country or each taxpayer with taxes to pay for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I cannot, however, go so far as the able Senator from Maryland goes. I was very much impressed with his illustration of defending an innocent client who was about to be convicted. But the wrong with the position taken by the able Senator is that in order to save his client from being convicted before the jury, he reaches out and brings about the punishment of an innocent man. The innocent man in this instance is the American public who pay the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, yes; the Senator is going to make the people of the country pay for the injury.

Mr. TYDINGS. The jury, Mr. President, sits right here in this Chamber. The jury is not outside this room. As a matter of fact, Mr. Silver, in a little town of 4,500 inhabitants, operates a rather up-to-date and modern but small canning house. He has been in business, I think, ever since 1871, when the canning industry was born in my county. That man has his little concern in that little town. He is being tried nowhere else except here in the Senate of the United States. This is where he makes his appeal, so to speak, for a hearing. If my amendment is stricken down, Mr. Silver is denied even a hearing. We have taken his property, but we will not go far enough to say: "At least we are going to give you a chance to present any evidence you have in order to substantiate your point of view."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. With respect to Mr. Silver, he is about to have his property taken away from him, and, I say, wrongfully.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But the Senator from Maryland would go one step further and say "Since Mr. Silver's property is going to be taken away from him, I ask that he be paid." But where is the money coming from with which to pay Mr. Silver for the property which is being taken from him? The money is coming from the people of this country, not from the one who receives the property taken from Mr. Silver, to wit, the Red Cross.

Mr. TYDINGS. There, Mr. President, is where, in my opinion, the logic of the Senator from West Virginia does not follow straight down the track. I am asking the same body which takes his property away from him, that is the Congress of the United States, to provide for paying him. If Congress perpetrates the wrong, what better agency is there under the blue sky of heaven than Congress, the very body which perpetrates the wrong, to redress the wrong?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I must say that Congress would be perpetrating a second wrong if it were to take from the people we represent the money to provide the payment.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the point is if this man is wronged then the Senator from West Virginia and I are in agreement that the wrong is done to him by reason of the passage of the legislation now before the Senate. He is not wronged by the Red Cross. The Red Cross cannot pass legislation. The Red Cross cannot take anything from Silver. It is not a court which is taking Silver's property from him. The Congress of the United States is doing it. All the rules of common decency demand that the agency which perpetrates the wrong against an honest, patriotic, and deserving American citizen should at least in the same act under which it deliberately commits the wrong, give the individual such redress as honest men give other men when they commit wrongs against each other. The Red Cross cannot vote on this bill. Why should we make the Red Cross pay for the damage?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Red Cross is receiving the benefit of the legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Red Cross is not composed of 10 individuals or 6 individuals. It is not merely a name. It is composed of hundreds of thousands, yes, of millions of individuals. But the judge and the jury here is the Senate of the United States. The Senate says, "Yes, it is too bad, Silver. You had this trademark away back in 1876. You had it 19 years before Congress did anything about the red cross. You came by it honestly. The Red Cross was given sole use of this emblem. But because you are only one individual, and have no great political influence, and because your case presents no great mass appeal, we are going to treat you a little differently than we do others, such as those we help through the W. P. A. or the P. W. A., or the National Youth Administration. We give the victims of economic distress our abundance and our aid and all that, when we have not done any wrong to them; but we will not even let you go into court, although we admit on the floor of the Senate that what we are doing is not right."

How can we reconcile that position with our act in appropriating millions of dollars for the W. P. A., millions of dollars for the C. C. C., and $1,000,000 for damages, which we paid the other day to the Swiss, after some of our airplanes inadvertently bombed, by accident, a small Swiss village. Our check for $1,000,000 went there within a week. But when it comes to one of our own citizens, we say, "We are going to do you wrong, we are going to take your property, not for the Government, but for another institution, another entity. We are going to give your property to them. We are not going to pay you a cent, and we are not even going to let you have a hearing in any court of law." We do that in the name of justice, fairness, and democracy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say, somewhat by way of repetition, that the Senator from Maryland and I are absolutely in accord on the first proposition.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We are entirely in accord on the proposition that it is wrong for the Congress to take property or some other thing of value, by whatever term it may be called, and give it to a private organization or private corporation, however praiseworthy its functions in private life may be. I think

that is wrong In doing so, we are going far beyond what has been done before, so far as I know.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But then the Senator from Maryland goes one step further. He says, "I see that is going to happen, however, wrong it is, so I am going to take steps to recompense the man who has lost his property through a wrongful act." The Senator from Maryland admits the act is wrong, and I, too, say it is wrong.

Mr. TYDINGS. And it is admitted to be wrong by the body in which the Senator from West Virginia sits.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But the Senator from West Virginia is not going to vote for that wrong.

The Senator from Maryland goes one step further. He says, "Since this wrong is going to be committed——

Mr. TYDINGS. By the Senate of the United States——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. The Senator's amendment says, "If this wrong is to be committed by the Senate of the United States, which represents the people of the United States, I am going to reach out to my principals, the people, and take the money of the people to reimburse the man who has been done wrong, not for a public good but for a private gift which I gave a very worthy fellow."

I think that second proposition of payments with public money is wrong as well as the original wrong of taking the property. I desire to have my position on that point made clear. I wish we could go back to the beginning of the consideration of this matter, and could take up the original bill, and either amend it to the extent suggested by the Senator from Georgia or not pass it. That is the proposition which should be brought before the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we can reconsider the bill, of course I have no objection to having the people who are being hurt excluded, as they should have been in the first place. But the fact remains that Charles B. Silver is about to have a valuable property right taken from him without compensation and without the right to have a day in court in order to show what his loss has been. He is an old man. He is almost 80 years old. He has worked hard all his life. He began as a man in relatively poor circumstances, and worked his way up. He has accumulated a competence. He is an honest and God-fearing man of splendid reputation. His years are not few. Here he stands with all the integrity at his command. His business has customers all over the country, and it goes back to 1871. He is being tried today and his property is being taken from him, not by the American Red Cross, not by any court in this land, but by the Senate of the United States. We are sitting as a jury of condemnation. We are admitting that his property has value, because our experts are the Supreme Court of the United States who, over and over and over again, say that a trade-mark in use in connection with the sale of property is property and has value. We admit all that. Then we say, "We, the Senate of the United States, Mr. Silver, are going to take your property. We are going to give it to someone else, someone not connected with the Government. We are not going to pay you for it, and we are not even going to let you go into court to show any damages that you may have suffered."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I ask him not to address his remarks to me, because I will vote very definitely against permitting the Government to do what the Senator from Maryland has just stated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, I realize that. I do not address my remarks to the Senator personally.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say that, as the Senator from Maryland well knows, there are numerous persons who have used the red cross symbol.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not many, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There are a number of persons who have used the red cross symbol as a trade-mark and who have established their goods on the market. I do not think the right to use that trade-mark should be taken from them unless the person who receives the benefit of the taking pays for it, and not the people of this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Senator to wait for a moment, inasmuch as I am about to conclude. The Senator from Wyoming has been very patient.

Mr. President, I simply wish to ask my colleagues to consider this matter today, if they will do me that honor, more or less as if they were a jury with one American before it. That is all I am here for. The only case I know of in this connection is that of Mr. Silver, an American who comes before the Congress and proves that he owns a valuable property, and proves he has owned it ever since 1871, long before the Red Cross came along. I ask my colleagues to consider that they, as jurors, have decided to take that property from him—for that is the present aspect of this case—and I ask my colleagues, as men of fair intent to our own citizens, whether he is not entitled to a day in court on the matter of the redress of the damages we are about to inflict upon him?

EXHIBIT A

RIGHT TO EXCLUSIVE USE OF TRADE-MARK IS PROPERTY UNDER FIFTH AMENDMENT

1. The word "trade-mark" is of double meaning, i. e., it may be used to designate the mark itself as, for instance, a red cross, or it may be used (and more properly) to designate the exclusive right to use a given mark to distinguish the user's goods from like goods of other origin. While there can be no property right in a representation of a red cross, the right to exclusive use of such mark to distinguish certain goods is a very valuable property right.

2. Congress, in enacting the trade-mark law has limited registration to "the owner of a trade-mark" (15 U. S. C. 81).

3. Executive Order 9095, of March 11, 1942 (see p. 659 of the second supplement to the 1940 U. S. Code), ordered:

"2. The Alien Property Custodian is authorized and empowered to take such action as he deems necessary in the national interest, including—but not limited to—the power to direct, manage, supervise, control, or vest, with respect to: * * *

"(d) Any * * * trade-mark or trade-mark application or right related thereto in which any foreign country or national thereof has any interest."

Under this authority a large number of foreign trade-marks have been vested in the Alien Property Custodian and presumably are being or will be sold or licensed to American firms just as during the last war.

4. The Supreme Court has never said that a trade-mark is not property; it has repeatedly said that it is. In order, however, to make it entirely clear that it does not recognize a property right in a mark per se, the decisions always include a statement to the effect that the property right is "appurtenant to an established business or trade."

The very cases cited by the committee in its report make it clear that the right to the exclusive use of a given trade-mark in a certain business is a property right. Mr. Justice Pitney made the matter very clear in *Hanover Milling Co.* v. *Metcalf* (240 U. S. 403, 413, 414) wherein he said:

"Common-law trade-marks, and the right to their exclusive use, are, of course, to be classed among property rights (*Trade-Mark cases*, 100 U. S. 82, 92, 93); * * * in denying the right of property in a trade-mark it was intended only to deny such property right except as appurtenant to an established business or trade in connection with which the mark is used."

What Justice Pitney meant was that none can claim to own, for instance, the sign of a red cross broadly and without regard to any established business or any particular articles of merchandise. The property right is acquired by selecting a particular mark and using it to identify the products of a certain merchant. The property right thus acquired is the right to the exclusive use of such mark for such purpose. Naturally, such right cannot exist apart from the business and its value can only be measured by reference to the business. However, the property right is there—it has a value—such value can be measured; and when the exclusive right to use the mark in such business is taken away, the value is extinguished just the same as if the owner's factory or power plant were taken away from him.

In the second case cited by the committee (*United Drug Co.* v. *Rectanus*, 248 U. S. 90, 97), Justice Pitney reaffirmed his previous holding, saying: "It (a trade-mark) is not the subject of property except in connection with an existing business."

It follows that a trade-mark is property if it is connected with an existing business.

What this and other like decisions seek to convey is that a company which used the red cross as a trade-mark for oysters in the years prior to 1900 and then went out of business cannot today claim a property right in or sell that trade-mark because it is no longer connected "with an existing business." The property right is automatically extinguished when the business is abandoned. This is just what has happened to the great majority of red cross trade-mark rights. Of the hundreds who claimed such right in 1905, there are now less than a score who still have an "existing business" in which the mark has been continuously used.

5. It must be recognized that the Federal Government has not granted any trade-mark rights to anyone; such rights have been acquired and are today acquired under the common law of the several States as modified by State trade-mark statutes. It is not, therefore, as Senator CONNALLY maintains, a

case of the Federal Government taking back something that it gave; it is a question of the Federal Government taking away property rights vested in certain firms under the common law of the several States. The present red cross trade-mark law (the act of January 5, 1905, as amended) gives commercial users nothing that they did not already possess under the common law prior to such enactment. That act did, however, recognize that such property rights were in existence and could not be disturbed by Federal enactment.

6. Mr. Joseph Hartfield has appeared as one of the legal representatives of the American National Red Cross at the hearings on the present bill and on previous bills. In his testimony on a similar bill in the Sixty-fifth Congress (H. R. 14330), and which testimony is reported at page 383 of the House hearings on the present proposal, Mr. Hartfield said:

"If a man used this before 1882 and advertised it and his emblem is of value, it does take away from him that value and does deprive him of a thing of value, and to that extent it might be said to be harsh, just as in the case of Congress condemning a piece of property and taking it away from a man frequently works injustice."

Later in the same hearing (p. 387 of the House report) Congressman CROSSER asked Mr. Hartfield:

"You will, of course, concede that there might be very valuable property in some trade-mark?"

Mr. HARTFIELD. No doubt.

In other words, the leading legal light of the American National Red Cross has never questioned the fact that a trade-mark right is a property right; his contention has been that such rights may be confiscated by the Government without compensation. In his answer to the preceding question, he made his position more explicit as follows:

"I would say such a statute would be unconstitutional in that it would deprive them of it without due process of law, unless that society was an integral part of the Government."

In other words, the position of the American National Red Cross is that because such society is an integral part of the Government (as to which there is considerable doubt), property rights may be confiscated in behalf of such society without compensation. That such position is untenable will hardly be denied by any Senator.

CITATIONS

"A right to adopt and use a symbol or a device is a property right for the violation of which damages may be recoved in an action at law and the continued violation of it will be enjoined by a court of equity with compensation for past infringement." Encyclopedia of United States Supreme Court Reports, 618—citing *Manhattan Medicine Co.* v. *Wood* (108 U. S. 218, 224, 27 L. Ed. 706); *McLean* v. *Fleming* (96 U. S. 245, 255, 24 L. Ed. 828). (From Sebastian's Digest of Cases of Trade Marks, etc., London, 1879. *Stokes* v. *Landgraff*, October 1853; September 1854 (N. Y. Sup. Ct., 17 Barb. 608; R. Cox 137).)

"The principle is well settled that a manufacturer may, by priority of appropriation of names, letters, marks, or symbols of any kind to distinguish his manufactures, acquire a property right therein as a trade mark. * * *" (Per Strong, J.). (*Bradbury* v. *Dickens*, March 26, 1859 (Romily, M. R., 27 Beav. 53; 28 L. J., ch. 667; 33 L. T. 54).)

"The property in a literary periodical like this is confined purely to the mere title, and the title of this work is 'Household Words,' and that forms part of the partnership assets and must be sold for the benefit of the partners if it be of any value." (*Hall* v. *Barrows*, Mar. 16; Dec. 21, 1863. (Romilly, M. R., 32 L. J., ch. 548; Lord Westbury, C., 33 L. J., ch. 204.))

"A trade-mark consists in the exclusive right to the use of some name or symbol as applied to a particular manufacture or vendible commodity, and such exclusive right is property." (*Leather Cloth Co., Ltd.* v. *American Leather Cloth Co.*, July 8; Dec. 21, 1863; May 12, 1865. Wood, V. C., 32 L. J., ch. 721; Lord Westbury, C., 33 L. J., ch. 109; House of Lords, 35 L. J., ch. 53.))

"It is correct to say that there is no exclusive ownership of the symbols which constitute a trade-mark, apart from the use or application of them, but the word 'trade-mark' is the designation of these marks or symbols as and when applied to a vendible commodity, and the exclusive right to make such use or application is rightly called property." (*Barnett* v. *Leuchars*, Dec. 4, 1865. (Stuart, V. C., 13 L. T., N. S. 495; 14 W. R. 166.))

"According to the principle which governs these cases, an owner has an exclusive right to a trade-mark or label, and that right is to be regarded as his property." (*Ainsworth* v. *Walmsley*. (Wood, V. C., 35 L. J., ch. 352.))

"And inasmuch as the court protects the owner of the mark, he is entitled to authorize another, when he hands over his business to him, to place that mark on his goods. That is a right which, being protected by this court, may be disposed of for value, may be bought and sold, and is, therefore, in that sense of the word, property." (*Congress & Empire Spring Co.* v. *High Rock Congress Spring Co.* (N. Y. Sup. Ct., 57 Barb. 526; N. Y. Ct. of App., 45 N. Y. (6 Hand) 291.))

"A property in trade-mark may be obtained by transfer from him who has made the primary acquisition, though it is essential that the transferee should be possessed of the right either to manufacture or sell the merchandise to which the trade-mark has been attached. And it may also pass by operation of law to anyone who at the same time takes that right."

Browne's Law of Trade-marks (1898) quotes the following:

"Rhodes, J., in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court of California in *Derringer* v. *Plate*, 29 Cal. 292, in 1865, said: 'The right of property does not in any manner depend for its inceptive existence or support upon statutory law, although its enjoyment may be better secured and guarded, and infringements upon the rights of the proprietor may be more effectually prevented or redressed, by the aid of the statute than at common law. Its exercise may be limited or controlled by statute, as in case of other property; but, like the title to the goodwill of a trade, which it in some respects resembles, the right of property in a trade-mark accrues without the aid of the statute.'"

Paul on Trade-marks (1903) says (par. 17):

"Upon whatever idea the courts proceeded, as soon as their decisions established in a particular individual a right, exclusive as against the world, to use a particular label or mark whereby trade was attracted to him, that right at once became a thing of value, and hence property, in a sense more strict than that in which many other incorporeal rights, such as the elective franchise or the right of presentation to a vacant benefice, have been regarded as property. Moreover, the courts of chancery were appealed to, successfully, to enjoin the infringement of trade-marks in cases where no fraud was intended, and where the relief could hence be granted only on the idea of property in the user of the mark. Accordingly, it has become a settled doctrine of the English and American courts that trade-marks are protected, not exclusively on the ground of fraud, but also on the ground of property. It is hence settled law that the right to use a trade-mark is not a mere personal privilege, but that, within certain limits, it is property, capable of being bought and sold, and for the invasion of which an action for damages will lie, and the exclusive use of which it will be protected, when necessary, by injunction." (Citing numerous United States decisions.)

N. B.—It may be noted that our present trade-mark law provides for an action for damages for infringement of a trade-mark right.

FIFTH-AMENDMENT CASES

The franchise of a private corporation is property which cannot be taken for public use without compensation. (*Wilmington & W. R. Co.* v. *Reid*, 13 Wall. 264 (1872).)

Letters patent for a new invention or discovery in the arts confer upon the patentee an exclusive property in the patented invention which cannot be appropriated or used by the Government itself, without just compensation, any more than it can appropriate or use without compensation land which has been patented to a private purchaser. (*James* v. *Campbell*, 104 U. S. 358 (1882).)

Where the Government appropriates a portion of an entire tract of private land for public purposes it is also liable, in ascertaining the just compensation, for the damage to the remainder resulting from such taking, embracing injury due to the use to which the part appropriated is to be devoted. (*Archer* v. *U. S.*, 251 U. S. 548.)

CONCLUSION

The following points should be borne in mind:

A. Trade-mark rights are acquired under the common law of the States and not from the Federal Government. They are not copyrights and registration is immaterial.

B. A trade-mark is one thing; a trade-mark right is another. One cannot own or have a property right in a trade-mark per se; but one can own and have a property right in the exclusive use of a given mark to identify certain goods of his manufacture or selection. That such property right is acquired by adoption and use under the common law does not detract from its value.

C. The courts have never said that a trade-mark right is not a property right; what they have said is that the property right is in the combination of a mark and a business, i. e., the adoption and use of a given mark in connection with a given business. There is no property right in the word "Kodak," but there is a property right in the exclusive use of that name to identify cameras of a certain manufacture.

D. The proposed law is probably the first bill that has even passed a House of Congress wherein it is proposed to vest in any person or corporation "the sole and exclusive right to use, within the territory of the United States" a given combination of words. Obviously, such grant is unconstitutional since Congress cannot take away from the citizenry the right to use the words "red cross" verbally or in writing. In this very bill the sponsors have gone farther than any decision of record in recognizing a trade-mark to be a property right.

E. "Exclusive use" is the heart of the property right; when the Congress takes away this exclusive use from the commercial users and gives it to the American National Red Cross, it is seizing property rights for a public use.

F. "Goodwill" and "trade-mark" are simply names that are loosely used to designate intangible rights having a property value commensurate with the preference of the trade and public for the products which they identify by a given mark. When the mark disappears the trade and public can no longer

identify the product and the goodwill vanishes.'

G. In Cuba, Argentina, and other countries, trade-mark rights are granted by the government to the first applicant. In the United States they are acquired by priority of adoption and use under the common law. In either case a property right results. There is nothing to prevent the State of Maryland from enacting a law granting trade-marks to the first applicant so long as such law recognizes rights already established under the common law. The eventual right is the same whether it is by State grant or by recognition of the common law. In each case a property right results.

H. An act preventing a man from using his home would be just as effective a taking as an outright condemnation. Whether the property right is "extinguished" by the Government or taken for Government use appears to be immaterial; the owner's right is "taken" away from him and he must be compensated.

EXHIBIT B

The bill should be reconsidered for the following reasons:

1. There was not a full attendance and the vote was very close on the compensation amendment.

2. Senator GEORGE's amendment is inoperative unless also included in section 4.

3. The emblem protected by the bill (a red Greek cross on a white field) is not that stipulated by the convention, viz, "the heraldic emblem of the red cross on a white ground formed by reversing the Federal colors of Switzerland."

4. The bill was brought up without prior notice even to members of the committee.

5. The bill gives the American National Red Cross "the sole and exclusive right to use * * * the emblem of the Greek red cross on a white ground, and the words 'red cross' and 'Geneva cross' without limitation as to purpose or character of such use. No such broad grant is warranted by the convention or the Constitution. Senator O'MAHONEY's assurances that the bill does not prohibit fraternal or secular use can hardly be reconciled with the above-quoted language of section 1 of the bill.

6. Various remarks made in support of the bill during the discussion on the floor appear to be in error as follows:

A. That a trade-mark "is an act of grace on the part of the Government of the United States; and if the Government wishes to take that privilege back it can do so."

On the contrary, trade-mark rights are acquired under the common law of the several States and our first Federal law was held unconstitutional because it followed the erroneous assumption that trade-marks can be granted by the Federal Government. (*Trade-Mark Cases*, 100 U. S. 82.)

B. That trade-mark owners "have had a monopoly * * * which the Government has protected and guaranteed to them."

The Federal trade-mark law is not a substantive law but merely provides procedural advantages in case of infringement of a mark used in interstate or foreign commerce. The Federal Government has never granted or guaranteed any trade-mark right.

C. That trade-marks are protected by the copyright laws and that "a copyright may be taken back whenever the Government wishes to take it back."

A trade-mark cannot be registered or protected under the copyright law. Even a copyright cannot be taken back because it is given in return for publication of the work. (*James* v. *Campbell*, 104 U. S. 358.)

D. That Chas. B. Silver & Son did not register its trade-mark in 1876.

Registration No. 4021 was granted to its predecessor September 26, 1876. The registration No. 5592 granted January 29, 1878, to a predecessor of United States Rubber Co. also covers a mark still in use.

G. That the Supreme Court has held that there is no property right in a trade-mark.

On the contrary, the very decisions cited in the committee report recognize property rights in a trade-mark as long as such trade-mark is not divorced or separated from a going business. Such property right has been admitted by counsel for the American National Red Cross (p. 383 of the House hearing).

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 28, 1944.*

Hon. MILLARD TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: As against the theory that trade-marks are not property, I think it may be worth while to cite:

(1) 26 U. S. C. 119 requiring "rentals or royalties for the use of or for the privilege of using * * * patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulas, good will, trade-marks, trade brands, franchises, and other like property" to be treated as income.

(2) 11 U. S. C. 110 vesting bankrupt's title "to all * * * (2) interests in patents, patent rights, copyrights, and trade-marks, and in applications therefor" in the trustee.

(3) 15 U. S. C. 81 and particularly the amendment tacked on the end thereof by the act of June 10, 1938, which provides for registration of a "collective mark" to "any natural or juristic person, including nations, States, municipalities, and the like, which exercises legitimate control over the use" thereof.

This amendment recognizes that a person may own a mark which he himself does not use but over the use of which he exercises a legitimate control. Hundreds of such marks have been registered in the Patent Office since this amendment was adopted. For instance, Walt Disney licenses different manufacturers to use the name and picture of Donald Duck as a trade-mark for a consideration and on the basis of such use he (or his corporation formed for that purpose) registers the mark in the Patent Office as his property. To say, under these circumstances, that he has no property right in the Donald Duck trade-mark is absurd because, of course, it is a naked property right which returns to him a very substantial revenue. There is nothing to prevent him from licensing John Smith to use Donald Duck on doll carriages this year and then taking the right away from John Smith and licensing Richard Roe to use it on his doll carriages next year.

The mark means merchandise selected by Walter Disney and the mark is his property right which he may license as he sees fit.

While the Federal statute does not create or grant this right, it recognizes and provides registration therefor with the procedural advantages flowing from such registration.

Sincerely yours,

C. P. CARTER.

EXHIBIT C

JANUARY 21, 1944.

RE: A TRADE-MARK AS PROPERTY WITHIN THE PROTECTION OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

The fifth amendment provides: "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

A trade-mark is not only a recognized form of property but it is a property created exclusively under and by virtue of the laws of the States. These two principles were established by the Supreme Court in the leading trade-mark opinion in American judicial history. This opinion was rendered in The Trade-Mark Cases. Its citation is: *United States* v. *Emil Steffens, United States* v. *Adolph Wittemann, United States* v. *W. W. Johnson* (100 U. S. 98).

In this opinion the Supreme Court held invalid a Federal statute attempting to regulate the creation and incidences of trade-marks.

Speaking for a unanimous court Mr. Justice Miller said, at page 92:

"The right to adopt and use a symbol or a device to distinguish the goods or property made or sold by the person whose mark it is, to the exclusion of the use of that symbol by all other persons, has been long recognized by the common law and the chancery courts of England and of this country, and by the statutes of some of the States. It is a property right, for which damages may be recovered in an action at law, and the violation of which will be enjoined by a court of equity, with compensation for past infringement. This property and the exclusive right to its use were not created by the act of Congress, and do not now depend upon that act for their enforcement. The whole system of trade-mark property and the civil remedies for its protection existed long anterior to the act of Congress, and remain in full force since its passage.

"These propositions are so well understood as to need no citation of authorities or elaborate argument to prove them.

"The property in trade-marks and the right to their exclusive use resting on the laws of the States in the same manner that other property does, and depending, like the great body of the rights of person and of property, for their security and protection on those laws, the power of Congress to legislate on the subject, to establish the conditions on which these rights shall depend, the period of their duration, and the legal remedies for their protection, if such power exist at all, must be found in some clause of the Constitution of the United States, the instrument which is the source of all the powers that Congress can lawfully exercise."

Citing the opinion above, Justice Holmes stated in *United Drug Co.* v. *Rectanus Co.* (248 U. S. 90, 98):

"Property in trade-marks and the right to their exclusive use rest upon the laws of the several States, and depend upon them for security and protection, the power of Congress to legislate on the subject being only such as arises from the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes" (*Trade-Mark cases*, 100 U. S. 82, 93, 25 L. ed. 550, 551).

Other pertinent quotations are—

1. *U. S. Ozone Co.* v. *U. S. Ozone Co. of America* (62 F. (2d) 881, 885):

"Trade-mark rights growing out of prior appropriation and use of a device or symbol to distinguish or identify commodities made or sold by the owner of the trade-mark have long been and continue to be recognized by the common law as property, and as such entitled to protection by the courts (*Trade-Mark cases*, 100 U. S. 82, 25 L. ed. 550; *Stephano Bros* v. *Stamatopoulos*, C. C. A. 238 F. 69, L. R. A. 1917C, 1157; *Hanover Star Milling Co.* v. *Metcalf*, supra). While trade-mark rights may be fixed or limited by statute, they are not dependent on statutory enactment, but arise under the common law from prior, exclusive appropriation and use (*Trade-Mark cases*, supra; *Piggly Wiggly Corporation* v. *Saunders*, D. C. 1 F. (2d) 572; *Phillips* v. *Hudnut*, 49 App. D. C. 247, 263 F. 643; *Stephano Bros.* v. *Stamatopoulos, supra*).

"The Trade-Mark Act of 1905, as amended (15 U. S. C. A. 81-133), without changing the substantive law, provides for the registration of marks used in interstate or for-

eign commerce which, without statute, would be entitled to legal and equitable protection. (*Beckwith* v. *Commissioner of Patents*, 252 U. S. 538, 40 S. Ct. 414, 64 L. Ed. 705.)

"Registration of a trade-mark simply constitutes prima facie evidence that the registrant is entitled to the mark."

2. *Little Tavern Shops, Inc.*, v. *Davis* (116 F. (2d) 903, 905):

"The courts recognize a right of property in a trade name which has been adopted by a person to denominate his business, and has been so used by him in association therewith as to acquire a special significance as the name thereof."

3. *May* v. *Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.* (10 Fed. Sup. 249, 259):

"Now, however, to deprive it (defendant) of the use of a mark which it has so widely popularized would not only cause it an enormous loss in trade and in good will but would hopelessly confuse and deceive the buying public, which has come to know the mark as designating the product of this defendant."

4. *Hanover Star Milling Co.* v. *Metcalf; Allen & Wheeler* v. *Hanover Star Milling Co.* (240 U. S. 403, 413):

"Common law trade-marks, and the right to their exclusive use, are, of course, to be classified among property rights (*Trade-Mark Cases* (100 U. S. 82, 92; 25 L. Ed. 550, 551)); but only in the sense that a man's right to the continued enjoyment of his trade reputation and the good will that flows from it, free from unwarranted interference by others, is a property right, for the protection of which a trade-mark is an instrumentality. As was said in the same case (p. 94), the right grown out of use, not mere adoption."

5. *American Agricultural Chemical Co.* v. *Moore, State Com. of Agriculture and Industries* (17 F. (2d) 196):

"Any trade-mark or name not unlawful in itself nor against public policy, which has become of a pecuniary value or a business advantage becomes a property right, and, as such, is entitled to the protection afforded by the courts."

"Undoubtedly, the plaintiff has a valuable property right in its trade name, and the court cannot permit the destruction of that right, as no substantial or justifying reason can be found."

6. *Beech-Nut Packing Co.* v. *P. Lorillard Co.* (273 U. S. 629):

Mr. Justice Holmes delivered the opinion and stated:

"A trade-mark is not only a symbol of an existing good will, although it commonly is thought of only as that. Primarily it is a distinguishable token devised or picked out with the intent to appropriate it to a particular class of goods and with the hope that it will come to symbolize goodwill. Apart from nice and exceptional cases and within the limits of our jurisdiction a trade-mark and a business may start together, and in a qualified sense the mark is property, protected and alienable, although as with other property its outline is shown only by the law of torts, of which the right is a prophetic summary. Therefore, the fact that the goodwill once associated with it has vanished does not end at once the preferential right of the proprietor to try it again upon goods of the same class with improvements that renew the proprietor's hopes."

7. Historical Foundation of the Law Relating to Trade-Marks, By Frank L. Schecter; chapter VII, page 177 (published by Columbia University Press 1925):

"(2) Using the term property in its modern legal sense, viz, as a right having a pecuniary value which will be protected by the legal agencies of society, rights in or pertaining to trade-marks may be classified as property."

8. Speaking for the Supreme Court as recently as June 1, 1942, in *Mishawaka Rubber & Woolen Co.* v. *S. S. Kresge Co.* (316 U. S. 203, 205; 86 L.E. 1381, 1385), Mr. Justice Frankfurter stated:

"The owner of a mark exploits this human propensity by making every effort to impregnate the atmosphere of the market with the drawing power of a congenial symbol. Whatever the means employed, the aim is the same—to convey through the mark, in the minds of the potential customers, the desirability of the commodity upon which it appears. Once this is attained, the trade-mark owner has something of value."

It is obvious that whatever definition may be employed in defining the property in trade-marks, some definitions being predicated upon a now irrelevant early history of English Chancery proceedings, a trade-mark owner does have "something of value" within the meaning of the prohibition of the fifth amendment.

As to what prices are paid for this property, this "something of value," see attached schedule entitled "Certain Trade-Marks Appraised."

Certain trade-marks appraised

Name of trade-mark	Value	Transfer	Source reference
Maxwell House Coffee	$42,000,000, including a "very small percentage for brick, mortar, and inventory."	From Maxwell House Coffee Co. to General Foods in 1927.	Barron's Report, Nov. 17, 1930.
Jell-O	$35,000,000	From Jell-O Co. to General Foods in 1927	Do.
Dodge	"Sixteen million dollars a letter"	From Dodge Bros., Inc., to a banking syndicate	Printer's Ink, Apr. 16, 1925.
Bull Durham	$10,000,000 to $20,000,000 (estimated by Mr. Duke)		Printer's Ink, Nov. 11, 1920.
Ivory, Victrola, Kodak, and Uneeda.	"A million dollars a letter"—a common saying in advertising circles.		Do.
Camel (cigarette)	$10,000,000	A rejected offer in 1920	Do.
Coca-Cola	$24,960,681 (versus $4,250,681 for tangible property)	Annual balance sheet, 1920. (1941 and 1942, $37,126,972 for goodwill and trade-marks.)	Printer's Ink, Mar. 3, 1921.
Sun Maid Raisins	$5,600,000	From Sun Maid Raisin Growers Association to a banking syndicate.	Printer's Ink, July 21, 1932.
Calumet (baking powder)	$32,000,000	From Calumet Baking Powder Co. to General Foods in 1927. President of Calumet said, "It is safe to say that for $32,000,000 the plant could be duplicated many times."	Printer's Ink, Sept. 27, 1928.
Castoria	$12,500,000 (including an estimated value of tangible assets of not over $2,000,000).	From The Castoria Corporation to Household Products in 1929.	Printer's Ink, Nov. 27, 1930.
Sunkist	$1,000,000 to $10,000,000 (estimated)		Printer's Ink, Nov. 11, 1920.
Paramount	$15,000,000	Mr. Zuckor stated this to be the value	Printer's Ink, April 1931.
Lysol	$7,600,000	Lehn & Fink value on books	Printer's Ink, Apr. 26, 1928
V-8 Cocktail	$3,000,000 (of which in excess of $2,000,000 represented trade-mark alone)	From Loudon Packing Co. to Standard Brands	
Woolworth's	$50,000,000 (evaluation of good will under recapitalization).		Printer's Ink, Nov. 11, 1920.
Shinola, Bixby, and 2-in-1	$8,300,000 including $4,300,000 for other property; being thus $4,000,000 for trade-marks alone.	From F. F. Salley Corporation to Mr. George K. Morrow, president, of the 3 companies.	Printer's Ink, Oct. 10, 1929.
Naturals (Cigarette)	$2,000,000	From Schinasi Bros. to Tobacco Products Corporation in 1915.	Printer's Ink, Nov. 11, 1920.
Pebeco, Hinds	$6,214,000 (goodwill included in this amount)	From A. F. Hinds Co. and Pebeco, Inc., to Lehn & Fink.	Printer's Ink, Aug. 6, 1925.
Melachrino, Naturals, Rameses, and Herbert Tareyton.	American Tobacco Co. in 1925 agreed to pay $2,250,000 a year for 99 years for use of listed trade-marks.		

In the April 16, 1925, issue of Printer's Ink, Charles R. Flint is quoted as saying:

"Who cares about the mere factories in which Ivory Soap, or Baker's Chocolate, or Royal Baking Powder are made if you can buy the right to trade under these names? The market is glutted with manufacturing plants offered for sale at prices far below their appraised value; but there are few, if any, trade-marks of proved value being offered for sale."

EXHIBIT D

CHRONOLOGY

Eleventh century: Beginning at least as early as the eleventh century, the red cross became a prominent and familiar symbol in Christian countries, and since 1189 has been the national emblem of England.[1]

August 22, 1864: Geneva Convention, which adopted a red cross on a white ground as its symbol.[2] United States not represented.

[In the source references, "H. H." refers to hearings before House Committee on Foreign Affairs on H. R. 6911, Government Printing Office. "S. H." refers to hearings before Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. 2441 and H. R. 7420, Government Printing Office.]

[1] H. H., p. 154 et seq.; see also Johnson & Johnson's Historical Use of the Symbol and Words "Red Cross."

[2] H. H., pp. 271–272.

1866: Bellows committee, which had an ephemeral existence and dissolved in 1872 without taking action.[3]

1869: Miss Clara Barton, founder of American Red Cross Society, first hears of Geneva Convention.[4]

1872–1905: Numerous firms[5]—of which not more than a dozen are still in existence and using the mark—adopted as a trade-mark the

---

[3] See letter of Johnson & Johnson of September 1, 1943, to members of Senate Committee on Judiciary.

[4] Johnson & Johnson letter of September 1, 1943.

[5] H. H., p. 374.

historic [6] symbol of the red cross or the words "Red Cross" or both. And at least three present uses—or their predecessors—started use prior to 1881. (Canepa Co. of Chicago, in 1872, adopted the symbol on macaroni [7] and has been using this trade-mark on its product continuously ever since—70 years. Canepa came from Genoa, Italy, and adopted the red cross symbol because it was the ensign of the province of Genoa and the ensign of St. George, the patron saint of the province of Genoa.[8] Seabury & Johnson, predecessor of Johnson & Johnson, started using the historic symbol in 1879.[9] Charles B. Silver & Son claim continued use since 1876.[10])

1881: An American committee, formed by Miss Barton in 1877, incorporated under the name, "The American Association of the Red Cross." [11]

1900: Act of June 6, 1900,[12] first Federal statute incorporating the American National Red Cross. The act made no reference to commercial use of the trade-mark.

1903: Emil Zofnass started in Boston his business of making mattresses, and adopted the red cross for his trade-mark. (In 1903 the society had 298 members and receipts of $1,353.91.) [13]

1905: Act of January 5, 1905.[14] An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross. The act forbade commercial use of the words or symbol, but with a "grandfather" clause preserving the rights of commercial users "lawfully entitled to use" prior to 1905.

1906: International Geneva Convention of 1906.[15] By article 27 of the Convention,[16] the signatory powers, "whose legislation shall not now be adequate, engage to take or recommend to their legislatures such measures as may be necessary to prevent" trade-mark use of the emblem or name.

1910: Act of June 23, 1910,[17] to amend Act of January 5, 1905, and satisfy obligations imposed by Geneva Convention of 1906. As to trade-mark use, same provision and "grandfather" clause as act of 1905, with the limitation that continued use by those lawfully entitled shall be "for the same purpose and for the same class of goods." (At the hearing before the House Committee of Foreign Affairs, Miss Boardman, the then secretary of the society, stated that the society did not "want to disturb" existing trade-mark rights.[18])

1912: Mr. Zoffnass' business, meanwhile incorporated as the New York Mattress Co., registered its red cross trade-mark for mattresses on the basis of continued use since prior to 1905.[19]

1916: Act of June 15, 1916, incorporating the Boy Scouts of America. Section 7 of the act gave the organization the sole and exclusive right to emblems and words theretofore used by the society, but with a "grandfather" clause preserving "established or vested rights." [20]

1919: H. R. 14330 introduced.[21] This bill forbade all trade-mark use of the words or symbol. The House committee heard proponents and no further action was taken.[22]

1926: Act of May 24, 1926, [23] forbidding any bank or person, etc., engaged in banking, etc., to use the word "Federal," the words "United States," or the word "Reserve," etc., as a portion of its name or title, but with the usual "grandfather" clause, preserving the rights of firms, etc., "actually engaged in business under such name or title prior to May 24, 1926."

1929: The Geneva Treaty of July 27, 1929.[24] Article 28 [25] is in language almost identical with that of article 27 of the 1906 convention (supra), and applies not only to the red cross symbol and name, but also to the arms of the Swiss Confederation, constituting a white Greek cross on a red background. (At the convention in Geneva Mr. Eliot Wadsworth, who headed the United States delegation, stated to the assembled delegates: "We can say, in summary, that in the United States the emblem of the red cross is very effectively protected by law and by the authority of the local chapter.") [26]

1936: Pursuant to communications to the State Department by the Swiss Legation regarding legislation as to commercial use of the Swiss emblem (the white Greek cross on the red background), pursuant to article 28 of the 1929 treaty (supra), Mr. Hull wrote the President on May 14, 1936, that the Swiss Legation had been advised that our State Department recognized the obligation under the convention "and would endeavor to recommend to Congress enactment of suitable legislation to fulfill that obligation with an equitable reservation of the rights of persons or corporations who had lawfully adopted and legitimately used a design and insignia similar to the Swiss coat of arms." [27] The bill to accomplish this purpose was introduced and passed, being act of June 20, 1936,[28] which forbade use of the insignia of the Swiss coat of arms as a trade-mark, but containing the usual "grandfather" clause.

1938: In response to inquiry of the Minister of Switzerland (acting for the signatory powers) as to what action the United States had taken pursuant to the provisions of the convention of 1929, Mr. Hull, in his reply letter of March 10, 1938,[29] stated as to article 28 of the convention (supra): "I have the honor to state that it is thought that the present laws of the United States are adequate for those purposes." Mr. Hull then quoted the act of January 5, 1905, as amended June 23, 1910 (supra), and the act of June 20, 1936 (supra).

April 1942: Message from the President to Congress,[30] transmitting for consideration proposed legislation to abolish all further commercial use of the words or insignia, "designed the more effectively to carry out our obligations under the Red Cross Convention of 1929."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 469) was passed on January 19.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Overton
Andrews	Eastland	Radcliffe
Austin	Ellender	Reed
Bailey	Ferguson	Revercomb
Ball	George	Robertson
Bankhead	Gerry	Russell
Barkley	Gillette	Shipstead
Bilbo	Green	Smith
Brewster	Guffey	Stewart
Bridges	Hawkes	Taft
Brooks	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Butler	McClellan	Tydings
Byrd	McFarland	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wagner
Chandler	Maloney	Weeks
Chavez	Maybank	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Murdock	White
Connally	Nye	Wiley
Cordon	O'Daniel	Willis
Danaher	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, sometimes I think that Members of the Senate are so busy with other matters pending before the various committees that they do not always have the opportunity to look closely into the law or the facts governing questions of this kind.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has said, and what the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has said. I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion their argument is based upon a complete misconception of the law and the facts in this case.

In the first place, there is no property right involved. The Senator from Maryland quotes decisions of the Supreme Court in cases involving the issue of a property right in a trade-mark, arising in a controversy between two commercial users as to the value which should be placed upon such a mark.

And so if we attended carefully to what the Senator said we would have noted that he was speaking always of a property right for sale. That is not the issue here. The Supreme Court of the United States has pointed out in words of one syllable the fact that a trade-mark is solely and wholly a symbol which has grown up in the law of fair trade practices.

Allow me to read to the Senate two statements which are to be found in the report of the Judiciary Committee. One is the language of Mr. Justice Pitney in the case of the *United Drug Company* v. *Rectanus* (248 U. S. 90, p. 97). I read from page 3 of the report. Mr. Justice Pitney said:

> There is no such thing as property in a trade-mark except as a right appurtenant to an established business or trade in connection with which the mark is employed. The law of trade-marks is but a part of the broader law of unfair competition; the right to a particular mark grows out of its use, not its mere adoption; its function—

And this I ask Senators to heed—

> its function is simply to designate the goods as the product of a particular trade and

---

[6] H. H., p. 154 et seq.
[7] H. H., p. 104.
[8] S. H., p. 65.
[9] H. H. p. 175.
[10] S. H. p. 87.
[11] S. H. p. 87.
[12] H. H. p. 298.
[13] H. H. pp. 264, 265.
[14] H. H. p. 308.
[15] H. H. p. 331.
[16] H. H. p. 339.
[17] H. H. p. 344.
[18] H. H. p. 45.
[19] Reg. No. 88,345, dated Sept. 10, 1912.
[20] 39 Stat. 23, sec. 7; title 36, U. S. C., sec. 27.
[21] H. H. p. 371.
[22] H. H. p. 165.
[23] Title 12, U. S. C., sec. 585.
[24] H. H. p. 391.
[25] H. H. p. 396.
[26] H. H. p. 152.
[27] H. H. p. 416.
[28] H. H. p. 414.
[29] S. H. p. 33.
[30] H. H. p. 2.

to protect his goodwill against the sale of another's product as his; and it is not the subject of property except in connection with an existing business.

A trade-mark is used to protect the business of one against unfair trade practices by another. It is a common law right. The Senator from Maryland was quite correct when he said that the trade-mark law is merely a procedural law. It does not give any right. It merely establishes the means by which the user of a trade-mark may protect his right to use it against his competitor. We are not concerned here with the use by a competitor of the red cross symbol.

Allow me to read the language used by Mr. Justice Holmes in the case of *Prestonettes v. Coty* (264 U. S., at p. 359). The sentence which I shall read appears on page 368:

> A trade-mark only gives the right to prohibit the use of it so far as to protect the owner's goodwill against the sale of another's product as his.

That is the whole purpose and effect of a trade-mark.

So, Mr. President, I assert briefly that there is no question of a property right per se involved in this matter. This bill would undertake to implement a solemn treaty of the United States, ratified in a constitutional manner by this body. When that treaty was ratified the Government of the United States assumed an obligation to pass the bill which is now before the Senate. So we are acting under the superior power of a treaty obligation of the United States.

This is not a taking of private property for private use, as the Senator from West Virginia seems to have conceived. It is not a taking of private property for private use, first, because it is not a taking of property. It is not a taking for use, whatever the trade-mark may be, because it is a taking for the American Red Cross.

Now, what is the American National Red Cross? To say that it is a private institution, and that what Congress does to protect it is to conserve a private interest, is a total misconception of the American National Red Cross. It was organized to carry out the public obligation of the Government of the United States under the Treaty of Geneva. It is not a private institution. The passage of this bill would not in any way create a precedent such as the Senator from West Virginia fears, for the taking of public funds to enrich some private institution.

I should like to read into the RECORD a few brief paragraphs from the charter of the American National Red Cross. This charter was granted by the Congress of the United States to carry out the Geneva Treaty. I read:

> The purposes of the corporation are and shall be—
>
> First. To furnish voluntary aid to the sick and wounded of armies in time of war, in accordance with the spirit and conditions of the Conference of Geneva of October 1863, and also of the Treaty of the Red Cross, or the Treaty of Geneva, of August 22, 1864, to which the United States of America gave its adhesion on March 1, 1882.
>
> Second. And for said purpose to perform all the duties devolved upon a national society by each nation which has acceded to said treaty.
>
> Third. To succeed to all the rights and property which were prior to January 5, 1905, held, and to all the duties which were prior to January 5, 1905, performed by the American National Red Cross as a corporation duly incorporated by act of Congress June 6, 1900, which is hereby repealed and the organization created thereby is hereby dissolved.
>
> Fourth. To act in matters of voluntary relief and in accord with the military and naval authorities as a medium of communication between the people of the United States of America and their Army and Navy, and to act in such matters between similar national societies of other governments through the Comité International de Secours, and the Government and the people, and the Army and Navy of the United States of America.
>
> Fifth. And to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace and apply the same in mitigating the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities and to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same.

The American National Red Cross is not a private institution. It is a public institution created by the Congress of the United States to carry out a public duty in the field of national and international needs. It is not a society for profit. It makes no profit. It is a society solely for the alleviation of the sufferings of humanity. Mr. President, there is no soldier or sailor of the United States today fighting on any front who does not have the satisfaction of knowing, and whose parents do not have the satisfaction of knowing, that the American National Red Cross is there beside him to help him, and the insigne of that service is the red cross.

Therefore, Mr. President, when Senators rise on this floor and in effect say, "You shall not give the exclusive right to the use of this symbol to this great organization, because, forsooth, it was used at some time or other by confessedly private and commercial institutions for private and commercial profit, I think they are balancing a very small, narrow, and weak need against the great need of the people of America, the people of the world, and those who suffer from pestilence, flood, disease, and, above, all from war.

What is this society? In 1916 it had about 36,000 members. Today Mr. President, it has 15,000,000 members, and, in addition to that, there are 15,000,000 members of the Junior Red Cross serving these humanitarian purposes from end to end of the country. Thirty million American citizens are using this symbol as an indication of the great work in which they are engaged under a treaty of the United States. Furthermore, Mr. President, the Red Cross has 3,000,000 workers. Are we to say that in striking the balance between those millions who are serving the cause of humanity and a few commercial users we shall strike down the treaty obligation of the United States in order that some commercial purpose may be served.

Oh, Mr. President, the case is even more clear than that. The red cross has been a symbol of humanitarian projects for centuries. It has always been used to indicate those who thought at least that they were serving the cause of humanity. In the American Civil War the red cross was used by Clara Barton long before any commercial use was made of it by any of the present claimants. Clara Barton registered a trade-mark with the Government in the proper manner for the red cross, as the red cross, on an arm band, claiming under oath its use was since 1864. I have in my hand a photostatic copy of the constitution of the American Association for the Relief of Misery on the Battlefield, which was carrying on the work now carried on by the Red Cross, and there again in 1866, 10 years before the constituents whom the Senator from Maryland defends, adopted it, the red cross symbol was being used for humanitarian purposes for the relief of suffering upon the battlefield.

It is true that the American National Red Cross Society was not incorporated until 1900, but it was incorporated to carry out the purposes of a declaration of the nations of the world at Geneva that this symbol should be used by all nations for these specific purposes and the signatories to those conventions undertook to create in their respective countries organizations of this kind to use this symbol. The head of this organization, the American Association for the Relief of Misery on the Battlefield, wrote a letter to the organization set up in Geneva, saying "we are doing our best to comply with the great work that you are carrying on," or words to that effect.

Mr. President, that early treaty at Geneva was ratified by the United States in 1882. A new treaty was made in 1929 which amplified and strengthened the former one, and again the Senate of the United States ratified it. So we have this long history of use from centuries down and then for the specific purpose from 1864 to this hour, and it has gradually been spreading and spreading.

Mr. President, 62 of the nations of the world have adhered to this convention, and we are asked now to say that it is an invasion of private rights.

Mr. President, I should say that the American Red Cross Society actually in its service upon the battlefield and elsewhere does more to support private rights by its war against human suffering than all other private institutions and individuals combined.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not very familiar with this subject, but I endorse what the Senator says concerning the Red Cross and its value to the country and to the world. We ought to do everything we can to promote its best interests and to aid it in the great work it is doing. But I was wondering if in this particular case an amendment could not be properly adopted. As I understand, many years ago some others were using the name "red cross." There were only a few.

Mr. TYDINGS. There were six.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Maryland interposes to say there were

about six. Why could there not be inserted in the bill a provision that anyone who used the name prior to the time when we gave all these powers to the Red Cross, the time to which the Senator has just referred, could be allowed to go into court and establish any loss if he had any, not against the Red Cross but against the Government of the United States, for this is our action. It seems to me that, if we are going to confer greater powers or sole powers on the Red Cross, perhaps we have some obligation to afford relief to private citizens who are injured, if they are injured. I do not know whether they are injured or to what extent they may be injured; I do not know any of them; but I am just wondering if we could not give them a day in court to establish any right which they might have, and, if they could show an injury, then they would have recourse against the Federal Government for the amount of such injury. It seems to me that if the Senator would permit the motion to reconsider to be agreed to, and let such an amendment as that or something similar to it go to conference, where it might be worked out, we could give the fullest powers to the Red Cross to the exclusive use of the Red Cross symbol, but at the same time we could make it absolutely certain that we were not injuring private rights. That is merely a suggestion which I leave with the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad the Senator has asked the question. In the first place, Mr. President, I am speaking for the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and I have no authority from that committee to accept an amendment of the kind suggested, because a similar amendment was discussed in the committee and rejected. My own feeling was that the proposal was probably surplusage, but I did not regard the amendment of sufficient importance to resist it very strongly when the matter was before the Senate on the 19th of January. The Senate of the United States, however, at that time voted down such an amendment. So, Mr. President, I feel that I am bound, so far as I am personally concerned, by these two considerations: First, that the committee does not want the amendment, and, second, that the Senate by its action, shows it does not want it.

There is a more important reason, in my opinion; namely, that any individual, institution, or corporation which deems itself to be injured by reason of the passage of the bill, if it shall become a law, already has the right which it is sought to fortify by this amendment. I feel, therefore, that if we were now to write this amendment into the bill, the bill being an amendment of the charter of the Red Cross, it would be urged before the Court of Claims, perhaps, in some way or other, as an indication that the Senate of the United States believed that there was a damage which should be compensated for.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think that could be worked out in the conference between the two Houses without much difficulty.

The Senator from Wyoming says those concerned already have the right to go into court. If they already have the right, I do not see how putting such a provision in the bill would make very much difference.

I was not present on a previous occasion when the matter was voted on, and I did not recall the amendment having been offered, but, merely as a listener, what is proposed has seemed to me to be the fair thing to do. We do not want to take the rights of any citizen away from him. We want to help the great Red Cross organization in every way possible. At the same time, it seems to me to be a little unfair to take away a citizen's right to a trade-mark without compensating him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee had been present, if he had followed this measure as closely as the members of the subcommittee have followed it, he would realize that only three users of the red cross trade-mark in the United States have established any use prior to 1905. When the act was passed, in 1905, Congress did insert a provision saving the use of the trade-mark by persons or organizations which had been lawfully entitled to use it prior to that date. That concession by Congress has been abused, as the evidence before the committee clearly indicated.

I shall not name the particular concern involved, because that concern now is loyally conducting itself in accordance with the terms of the bill before the Senate, and making all arrangements to cease the use of the red-cross emblem and to use another symbol, but in the telephone directory of the city of New York at the place where the office number of the American Red Cross Society was recorded, almost the entire margin of two pages was used by the manufacturer of a certain commodity under the designation "The Red Cross So and So." The purpose was clearly to capitalize upon the great goodwill the American people have given to the American Red Cross.

So, Mr. President, since the protection of trade-marks is, as all the courts say, an outgrowth of the law of fair competition and for the protection of goodwill, when the Congress of the United States and the Government of the United States have ratified an international treaty twice saying that this symbol shall be the exclusive property of the American Red Cross Society, and the people of the country have built up the good will of that society from end to end of the country, I say we should not again take the chance that there might be an abuse of a concession.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I rise only to interject that the occurrence to which the Senator alludes, about the advertising in the telephone book, had nothing whatever to do with the case of Mr. C. B. Silver.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. C. B. Silver & Co. was one of the three concerns in the United States which used this trade-mark prior to 1882. In fact, their first use of it was in 1871, and it was a registered trade-mark in 1876.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I have not heard all the Senator's argument, but I have listened to a part of it, and I have previously discussed the matter with him. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Suppose one of these users, for example, the user of the red cross emblem referred to by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], showed it would cost him $100,000 to educate the people to a new trade-mark which he would be required to adopt if he continued in business; does not the Senator think it would be fair that the Government compensate him for that cost?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I do not, for the reason which the Senator from Georgia clearly pointed out on the 19th of January, when this matter was under debate for the first time, and which perhaps he may have repeated today publicly. Trade-marks are universally made the subject of depreciation in the tax returns of their users, and the compensation of any user for the expense entailed in advertising is made up by deductions under the tax law.

I think there is a more important answer, however; and this is a fundamental answer. I say that the amendment is asking for relief which already is available. Let me read to the Senator from title 28 of the United States Code, annotated, section 250, which is section 145 of the Judicial Code:

> The Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the following matters:
>
> (1) Claims against United States. First. All claims (except for pensions) founded upon the Constitution of the United States or any law of Congress, upon any regulation of an executive department, upon any contract, express or implied.
>
> Observe—
>
> All claims (except for pensions) founded upon the Constitution of the United States or any law of Congress.

If this bill shall be enacted, it will be a law of Congress, and having been enacted, it will be the basis for a claim in the Court of Claims.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator permit me first to read a little further?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, but before the Senator leaves the code section I wish to comment briefly on it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. A moment ago the Senator said it would be an error, even though we had the right, to put this provision into the law specifically. He says the right already exists, and that if the amendment were inserted it would tend to show the Court of Claims that Congress had some idea that there was dam-

age and therefore the Court of Claims might not view the question judicially.

Now that the amendment has been offered, were the Congress to reject it, likewise it would perhaps be adjudged by the Court of Claims that the amendment providing that those injured might have a day in court having been defeated, the Congress never intended that the Court of Claims should take into consideration any damages an individual might have sustained, because when the question was specifically stated to the very Congress which took the trademark to be a right, they refused to reassert that right of the individual.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not give any credence whatsoever to the statement just made by our distinguished and able friend the Senator from Maryland. We will not bar the Court of Claims from judging the merits.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming again, as I have said previously, that I favor the passage of the bill. I voted for its passage originally, even after the proposed amendment had been defeated. But I think the amendment, the major portion of which I read into the RECORD earlier in the debate, is an entirely proper one. I think there exists an equity, which we ought to recognize, on the part of the commercial users of the red-cross emblem. I think the United States Government owes that duty to the commercial users. The Government recognized that duty when the act of 1905 was passed, in which it was provided that no new company should make use of the emblem. But the United States at that time recognized the right and privilege which the users of the emblem were at that time exercising.

I see in this matter purely an equitable proposition, without regard to whether or not technically a trademark is a property right, without regard to whether there may now be on the statute books as the Senator from Wyoming has said, a law under which an aggrieved concern might go before the Court of Claims. Frankly I doubt the right of an aggrieved concern to go before the Court of Claims in the circumstances that would exist after the passage of this measure.

Mr. President, I believe it is the duty and responsibility of the Government to protect those who throughout the years have built up their goodwill and their trade, and have contributed throughout that time their proportionate share of the taxes to the Government for its upkeep. I believe it is bad business for the United States Government to destroy men who are in business. Suppose the situation of a man being put completely out of business because of the loss of his trade-mark. Let us say he does not have the $100,000 to which I referred a moment ago in assuming a hypothetical case, with which to reestablish himself in business under a new trade-mark. The Senator from Maryland earlier in the debate referred to the sale of a trademark known as the Maxwell House Coffee trade-mark. That coffee was originally manufactured in Nashville, Tenn., by Cheek & Co., and it was sold, as I understood at the time, and as the Senator stated, for about $42,000,000. How long would it take to reestablish that coffee in the minds of the people as a commodity or product they wanted to purchase, under the name of Johnson House Coffee? The parallel which I am undertaking to draw is a perfectly fair one. The company could not reestablish the coffee in the minds of the people for $100,000. The largest user of the red cross emblem, as I understand, is the firm of Johnson & Johnson.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me interrupt the Senator from Tennessee to say that in this debate we have already given the three users of the emblem considerably more than $100,000 worth of advertising.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no.

Mr. STEWART. Probably we have; but what substitute name or emblem is to be used in connection with the product? We have not advertised any new name in connection with the product.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill to which the Senator from Tennessee has given indication of adherence provides the time for transition.

Mr. STEWART. The period of transition, as I understand, is 9 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is 6 years.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose a concern does not have the money necessary to convert? I am assuming such a case to exist.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, it does not exist, because there are only two cases involved, and they are the case of Johnson & Johnson, which, as I can demonstrate, is abandoning the use of the red cross on some of its material, and the tomato concern from Havre de Grace, Md.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not a tomato concern, a food concern.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon; a canning concern.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill which the Senator from Wyoming advocates, and I am also in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland. I think the amendment is equitable, right, and just.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by reading a few words from the case of Pocono Pines Assembly Hotels Co. against The United States, which is reported in 73 Court of Claims Reports, at page 447. I read from page 491. In the decision the court calls attention to the fact that there are two sections of the code, referring to the code of the Court of Claims, which might have a bearing in the particular case. One is section 145, which the court construed, and the other is section 151. Section 145, the section I have already read, provides specifically that the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction of a claim against the United States arising under a law of the United States. Section 151, however, is another statute which refers to the right of Congress to refer claims to the Court of Claims. This is what the court said in construing the two sections:

> Under the first part of section 151 of the code the Government does not consent to be sued in a court, but expressly makes such claims subject to its final legislative action; in the class of cases under the proviso of sections 145 and 151 of the code the Government does expressly consent to be sued, divest itself pro tanto of its sovereign rights of immunity from suit, and independent of legislative action or appeal to Congress affords the citizen a lawful right to have his claims against the Government adjudicated in the same manner and under the same laws applying with equal force to both the citizen and his Government.

The plain language of the code has been interpreted and confirmed by the action of the Court of Claims—that is, the right to go into the Court of Claims and establish any damages, if they exist. That right is already protected by law; and I here specifically declare that so far as I am concerned, and I am sure I speak also for the Judiciary Committee, there is not the slightest intention by any of this debate to indicate that in declining to approve the amendment which the Senator from Maryland desires, we are foreclosing the power or authority of the court under the existing law to pass upon the merits of a case. So, Mr. President, I hope when the matter comes to a vote the Senate will reassert the position it took on the 19th of January, and decline to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I can add nothing to the splendid remarks made by the able senior Senator from Wyoming, who was chairman of the subcommittee which considered the proposed legislation. But I should like at this time to read a few of the remarks made by the late Senator Van Nuys, whose memory we all cherish, and whose judgment in connection with the proposed legislation while a Member of this body was valued by everyone.

When this bill was formerly under consideration, and when the able senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] at that time was urging his amendment, the late Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana, rose and was recognized. The following discussion occurred:

> Mr. VAN NUYS. I understood the Senator from Maryland to say that the Silver concern had registered the trade-mark in 1876.
>
> Mr. TYDINGS. I said they had used the trade-mark since 1876, and it was registered as soon as the trade-mark laws permitted it to be registered thereafter, and long before, in either case, the Government of the United States took any official action with respect to the Red Cross Society.
>
> Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, that is just as wrong as the facts can be. I read from a letter recently sent me by H. J. Hughes, general counsel of the American National Red Cross.
>
> Mr. TYDINGS. Very well, show me where I am wrong and I shall be glad to admit it.
>
> Mr. VAN NUYS. The trade-mark now being used by the Silver company was registered as a trade-mark March 6, 1906. I read from the letter:
>
> "The registration statement under oath declares—"
>
> And here is where the 1876 comes in—
>
> "1. The trade-mark has been continuously used in the business since 1876."

A little later in the colloquy the following occurred:

Mr. VAN NUYS. I continue to read from the letter:

"It is to be noted that the first claimed use starts in 1876, 12 years after the Treaty of Geneva——"

Mr. TYDINGS. To which the United States was not a party.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Will the Senator please permit me to continue?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, I will; but I want the Senate to know the whole situation.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator has had his opportunity. I continue to read——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator now permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to complete my remarks.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand that, but the Senator is now making—and is doing so inadvertently, I am sure—an incorrect statement.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am reading from the RECORD.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is reading from a colloquy between the late Senator Van Nuys and myself.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. In that colloquy the late Senator Van Nuys said the treaty of Geneva was adopted—when?

Mr. McFARLAND. It was adopted in 1882.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; it was adopted in 1860; was it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In 1862, the convention was made. It was ratified by the United States in 1882.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thought the convention was made in 1860. I said the United States was not a party to the treaty when it was made, but the Senator would never allow that statement to go into the RECORD. Whatever was adopted in Switzerland, we were not a party to.

Mr. McFARLAND. It must also be borne in mind that the company in which the Senator from Maryland is interested did not register its trade-mark until many years after the treaty was ratified.

Mr. TYDINGS. When was the trade-mark law passed? How could the trade-mark be registered until the Government passed the trade-mark law?

Mr. McFARLAND. A little later I will have a few words to say about the trade-mark law.

Mr. TYDINGS. Do not say that they should have registered their trade-mark before the law permitting the registration of trade-marks was passed. I only want accuracy; that is all.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator will have accuracy, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the RECORD of January 19, 1944. It is rather difficult to get an opportunity to read, when the Senator from Maryland is talking. The late Senator Van Nuys read the following from a letter written by the general counsel of the American National Red Cross:

"Twelve years after the Treaty of Geneva, and from 10 to 12 years after the use of the red cross emblem by the United States Sanitary Commission in Civil War days, and by the kindred society, the American Association for the Relief of Misery on the Battlefield."

These associations were the forerunners of the American Red Cross Society as incorporated. So the statement that the red cross had not been used by the Red Cross Society——

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say that.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Or its predecessor——

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say that.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TYDINGS. I said the Red Cross received no official sanction by the Government of the United States until 1905, and I stand on that statement.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is the date of its incorporation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. VAN NUYS. But its predecessor, the two associations which I just mentioned, for years and years used the red cross as an emblem, and the emblem would not have been worth 5 cents to Mr. Silver, of Havre de Grace, Md., if it had not been for the long history of charity and humanitarianism built up around this traditional symbol.

Those are the remarks, Mr. President, made upon this subject by the late Senator Van Nuys, chairman of the Judiciary Committee at the time when this legislation was under consideration, and a man whom all of us recognized as being fair. From some of the remarks which have been made here today, one would think the Red Cross was going to receive a great deal of benefit, that the organization which was to receive the benefit of this legislation was some private corporation. That is not true.

What is a trade-mark? A trade-mark is an emblem by which goods may be recognized as those of the owner. The emblem is not the goods themselves. Does a red cross trade-mark in any way signify the ownership of the goods which we have been informed are marketed by these companies? No. The benefit comes, as has been pointed out, from the goodwill which has been developed over long years of service by the Red Cross Society, which started before any of these corporations or organizations came into existence or used their trade-marks. The Red Cross has nothing to do with the bandages manufactured and sold by Johnson & Johnson. When bandages with the trade-mark of Johnson & Johnson are placed on the market, what do the purchasers think? They think the Red Cross to which you and I contribute has something to do with the production of those bandages. That is why such corporations do not want to give up the use of the red cross trade-mark. There is where the advantages accrue. One would think the American National Red Cross is being tried here. What is the American National Red Cross? It is the people of the United States who contribute their dollars for the protection of the boys across the seas.

In this proposed legislation provision has been made for ample time to allow those who have used such trade-marks to change them, so that their products may be known by a proper brand. Subsequently the goods of such concerns will not be recognized as having the endorsement of the American National Red Cross.

Mr. President, representatives of the Red Cross came before the Committee on the Judiciary and asked for this legislation. They did so because they said that in the event this country was raided, we could not expect enemy nations to respect Red Cross trains or Red Cross units or headquarters, inasmuch as articles bearing the red cross sign were being produced for commercial usage and the red cross is placed on top of many of their buildings.

Mr. President, I say it is time to correct the situation now before damage occurs. The Senator from Maryland can introduce legislation to recompense the corporation he has in mind any time it is damaged. Certainly it is a strange situation to say that the Congress of the United States must recognize a damage before it exists.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not vote to reconsider this important legislation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I served on the committee which studied the Red Cross bill, and I feel that I should state for the RECORD why I am opposed to the Tydings amendment, which is now under consideration, or any other amendment which would create a property right or a right of action for private or commercial use, as a trade-mark in commerce, of the Red Cross contemplated by the Geneva convention.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that no private enterprise ever could or ever did acquire any property right in this distinctive emblem adopted by international agreement. That agreement has extended to 63 nations. The mark, in which these gentlemen claim to have some property right, has become of such public interest and represents such humane activity that it would be absolutely against the interest of humanity if it could be possible for any business enterprise to appropriate the mark and sell its goods on the misleading representation that somehow or other it has the sanction of the Red Cross, or has the quality of humaneness of the Red Cross, or that it serves in any way to relieve the sufferings of wounded and sick soldiers on the battlefields, or that it serves other humane purposes, such as rescue in times of disaster, fire, flood, or earthquake. I say that it is unbelievable that anyone should recognize a right in a private enterprise, be it a corporation or an individual, to acquire any exclusive property in the mark of the American National Red Cross.

What I have just said is based on the question of right and wrong. It is on the basis of morals. But beyond that, there is the law to consider. There are many decisions, some of them decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, which have settled the principle that no such mark as that, which belongs to society, can be appropriated by any individual member of society as a distinctive badge of his own.

In this case it happens that this is a society which has the recognition of all the civilized nations in the world. Considerations of due process of law and recognition of the rights of property are not tested here, as they are in other cases.

The application of the sections of our Constitution to rights and wrongs, con-

tracts and property, made with respect to laws which are the result of conventions between nations is wholly different from the application of the Constitution to other laws, which govern the affairs of our own people within our own boundaries.

Indeed, Mr. President, the right, the power, and the duty to enter into relations with our neighbor nations do not grow out of the Constitution. To be sure, our forefathers vested in the Federal Government—that is, in the Union—the power to conduct political relations among nations, and removed it entirely from the several States which had theretofore possessed and exercised that international power. But our forefathers, by the Constitution, did not vest in the Federal Government a single ounce of power to conduct negotiations and treaties which are necessary to the existence, the prosperity, the vigor, and the health of the Nation. Those powers existed just as soon as an entity among the family of nations was created. The moment there became a nation known as the United States of America, it had all the power which was necessary to protect itself in any manner, and to develop its welfare as one of the member nations which enjoy international law. It did not acquire that power by grant of its citizens.

One of the clearest statements, I believe, on the point is to be found in United States against Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation and others, although there are many other cases which announce this principle. It is a fundamental principle having to do with the political powers of this country—that is, having to do with that thing which we call sovereignty or nationality. Of course, both the words "sovereignty" and "nationality" are greatly abused words these days. This is Mr. Justice Sutherland speaking for the Court:

> It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties—

And that is in particular what we are talking about here—

> to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality. * * * The power to acquire territory by discovery and occupation (*Jones* v. *U. S.*, 137 U. S. 202, 212), the power to expel undesirable aliens (*Fong Yue Ting* v. *U. S.*, 149 U. S. 698, 705 et seq.), the power to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense (*Altman & Co.* v. *U. S.*, 224 U. S. 583, 600, 601; Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, 2d ed., p. 102 and note 1), none of which is expressly affirmed by the Constitution, nevertheless exists inseparable from the conception of nationality. This the Court recognized, and in each of the cases cited found the warrant for its conclusions not in the provisions of the Constitution, but in the law of nations.

Mr. President, while in the midst of war, when we have to exercise war powers in order to win the war, we are awakening to the fact that there are laws which command us other than those which are expressed and enumerated in our Constitution.

What I am undertaking to say is that this treaty, agreed upon in 1864 by some of the nations of the world, and subsequently assented to by the United States, created an emblem of mercy not for gain, not for commerce, not for competition, not to build up a goodwill to sell at so much percent gain, but an emblem that would be recognized by the armies of both sides engaged in combat, an emblem which would inspire the faith, philanthropy, and benevolence of all merciful people of the world.

Probably there is nowhere in our civilization outside of our churches an emblem which carries more sacred faith to the people than does that of the Red Cross, which was established by a convention of 63 nations. To think that any private enterprise can acquire a property right in that emblem is utterly ridiculous.

I assert that on moral grounds and on legal grounds there is no property right in the emblem outside the American National Red Cross. But if there were a property right in that emblem outside the American National Red Cross why should we be confronted with this amendment? If there were really any legal right to the use of the emblem this amendment would have no place here at all; for whatever legal right there is in a trade-mark rests upon the common law. It is an award of fairness and of equity by society to the man whose genius has created an artificial thing of beauty or of other striking characteristics which will attract the people and assure them that when it is applied to a certain product it represents that product and nothing else. In making such award, society is not making a grant to the individual. Society is protecting itself against fraud, against competition with those who would imitate the goods and palm off on society an inferior article solely by stealing the trade-mark of the bona fide and good article.

Mr. President, I am persuaded by the evidence which came before our committee that the American National Red Cross and its predecessors in title, that is the societies having other names but doing the same sacred work, have used the red-cross emblem since 1864. They have used it on arm bands, on headgear, on flags, on hospital buildings, and upon every convenient article which could inform the opposing forces on the field of battle that here is a humanitarian organization which is helping both sides. A person who is found wounded, no matter what his affiliation may be, is taken care of by the Red Cross. The object of the emblem was to avoid shooting down nurses, doctors, and all those who contribute so greatly to the saving of human life and to the ending of the misery caused by war.

Of course, the extension of the activity of the Red Cross throughout the world has taken that emblem to many other places, and has involved a greatly diverse use in the application of it. But whatever else it may be, it is unselfish, it is benevolent, and it is for the benefit of the human race—not physically alone, but morally.

If any man in this country has a legal title to any property right in that emblem, Mr. President, he does not need a statute of Congress for his protection. He can defend himself completely the moment the Red Cross or the Government of the United States institutes a prosecution or seeks an injunction, or any other process to prevent his further use of the red cross emblem.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If what the Senator says is sound, why do we need the proposed legislation to prevent the use of the red cross emblem in commercial activities? If the Red Cross has priority in its use of the emblem, why does it not bring suit for infringement and stop the use of it by anyone but itself?

Mr. AUSTIN. I asked that very question of another lawyer. I believe it was the first question which I asked, namely, "Why do you come to us? Why do you not go into the courts? You have ample redress in the courts." The answer is simply that the Red Cross will not engage voluntarily in litigation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I point out to the Senator that the red cross emblem as a device may be used legally by a man manufacturing buttons, by another man manufacturing shoes, and by another man manufacturing beds. There can be envisioned hundreds of cases of the red cross in commercial life being a proper and legal trade-mark without any infringement one upon the other because the lines would not compete.

The red cross has never been used by the Red Cross Society except in a humanitarian way, as the Senator has so eloquently pointed out, but that does not give them the exclusive right to use it or to stop its use in any other legitimate field.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's suggestion let me refer to the flag of our country. The United States Government, its officers, its armies and navies do not use the United States flag for business purposes, for gain, or in competition with private individuals who are using it on buttons and on other things which they manufacture and sell for profit. Yet no man can acquire any legal right to the mark of the flag of the United States, and neither can anyone acquire a right to the flag of any State of the Union to be used on buttons or anything else in commerce. Such emblems have a character that belongs to society; they belong to the public, and it is against public policy and against public welfare to permit the appropriation by private enterprise of any of these emblems that have to do with a matter which is so near to the patriotic impulses and the general welfare of the people.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that contention be true, then why this legislation at all? Why not stop the use of the red cross?

Mr. AUSTIN. I have answered that and I think the answer I gave was a complete one—namely, that the Red Cross will not engage in all the different litigations that would have to extend all over the United States to suppress the use of the red cross. It will not do it; but it comes to Congress, which is supposed to represent the public policy of the United States, and says to Congress, "Will you please carry out the promise of the United States? To be sure you ratified the Geneva Convention in 1882 but that is not sufficient. You also in 1929 made a promise that you, the United States Government, would stop the use by others of this emblem of the Red Cross."

That was an obligation of the great Government of the United States in conjunction with 63 other governments. That is why when the time comes, as it has today, it is the duty of Congress—and there is no escaping it; it is an obligation that is far above any suggestion of damages, no matter should there be a legal right to damages because of this legislation—to consider first the execution of that international pledge.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has said that the Treaty of Geneva, which was made in 1864 when the United States was not represented as a party, was ratified in 1882. That is correct. But prior to 1882 before our Government took official cognizance of the status of the Red Cross as a humanitarian and welfare organization three concerns in America were using in bona fide fashion the red cross as a symbol of their brands. What the Senator has said, in my judgment, applies to all those who used the red cross symbol subsequent to 1882, but I do not think it can be questioned that until official action was taken by our Government those who adopted the red cross as their trade-mark and symbol before 1882 were well within their legal rights in doing so, and that subsequent action by the Government cannot deprive them of those rights except by due process of law.

Mr. AUSTIN. I disagree wholly with the Senator, and the reasons are those which in part, I have stated. I will state now a further reason. If they were to rely merely on the question of competition and priority of use, they would not have a leg to stand on. Not one of them has the priority of use over the Red Cross when we take into consideration the successive users by the predecessors of the present Red Cross.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. AUSTIN. Just a moment until I finish, and then I shall yield to the Senator. I have a statement which came before the committee. I shall not read it all, but merely a short extract from it:

> The American Red Cross, or its predecessor societies, have used the emblem since August 22, 1864, the time of the ratification of the first Geneva convention. In trademark No. 30428, registered July 27, 1898, Clara Barton, then president of the American National Red Cross, certified that the emblem had been continuously used by it since August 22, 1864.

So that if we are going to stand upon the theory that this is a type of emblem as to which there can be competition, that it is a kind of mark that can be appropriated by private individuals, I say that they are all in arrears. I think that is an answer, and not merely a response.

Mr. President, I think I have said all I wish to say. I am trying to make clear that, in my opinion, the Congress first is bound to carry out the treaty; second, that the Congress is not bound, and ought not to be bound as a matter of public policy, to recognize a property right in the red cross emblem by anybody else than the Red Cross Society since the adoption of the treaty of 1864; and third, that it makes no difference at all that the United States did not become a party of that treaty until 1882. The existence of the Red Cross in 1864 as the result of a treaty among other nations, recognized by our own citizen, Clara Barton, who applied this mark to her arm in the form of a band as a badge of her humanitarian service in the Civil War, as it was by other societies predecessors to the Red Cross before that time, makes it perfectly clear to me that we would be doing something odd, something strange—as I recall the Senator from Michigan called it "cockeyed" not long ago when we had this matter before us—if we undertook to adopt an amendment which would really create a right where none exists, a right in the emblem of the Red Cross. I cannot subscribe to that, and so I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to say to my eloquent and able friend and colleague from Vermont that, as I analyze his address, he has laid down a set of conditions by which he hopes to support his case, and then in reaching his conclusion has abandoned the conditions on which his case is predicated.

The Senator says it is true there was a Geneva Convention of August 22, 1864, which adopted the red cross as a symbol, and he concedes that the United States was not a party to that convention. Later, the Senator says, in 1882, the United States did adopt the convention by treaty. Still later, he admits, in 1905, the Congress of the United States took formal action, as a government, to recognize for the first time an organization called the American Red Cross. Prior to that hour the Government of the United States never recognized the American Red Cross formally. If I am wrong in that, I stand to be corrected.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me a moment, it is merely a question of date. I think that Clara Barton had a charter——

Mr. TYDINGS. I am talking about the Government of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am referring to the Government of the United States. I think it is fair to say that the District of Columbia being under the jurisdiction of the Congress, and obtaining its laws from Congress, a charter of the Red Cross taken under the general incorporation law for the District of Columbia passed by Congress is recognition. That is my claim. The record shows that the present American Red Cross, first organized by act of Congress in 1900, succeeded by the terms of its congressional charter to all the rights of the Red Cross Society which Clara Barton incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia in 1881.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct in his dates.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me add, further, if it does not interrupt the Senator, that it was a continuation of the earlier Red Cross Society founded in 1866.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out to the Senator the lapse in the continuity of the American Red Cross as he described it so eloquently in his address.

First, the Senator now admits that the first Federal statute incorporating the American National Red Cross was passed, to be exact, on June 6, 1900. Up to that good hour the Red Cross organization, as a governmental agency; had no more standing than the Potomac Electric Power Co., which is also incorporated under the laws of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, under the same incorporation laws under which the American Red Cross was incorporated, and to call the Potomac Electric Power Co. an arm or agency of the Government of the United States would be totally erroneous. So, to call the American Red Cross at that time, which was incorporated under the same statute, an arm of this Government is to be equally erroneous.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. If I stated at any time in my remarks, today or before this, that the Red Cross Society was an arm of the United States Government, it was an inadvertence. I am not aware of ever having made that statement. My opinion is that it is not.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. He left us all under the impression that because of the treaty, the Red Cross had been a sort of a governmental child all the way through, and I first wanted to clear the atmosphere of the idea that the Government had any form of connection with the American Red Cross Society before 1900, and the Senator says I am correct in that respect.

While the Senator was speaking he was kind enough to yield to me to say that the red cross emblem is used by the American Red Cross Society today, and it is a badge of honor, it is a badge of humanitarianism, a badge of brotherly love, a badge of civilization. Humanitarian service is the field of its operation.

Elsewhere the red cross emblem is a badge for shoes, or a badge for milk, or a badge for clothing, or a badge for furniture. There is no conflict at all, and the point of my argument is that in order for the right to use the red cross symbol to be legal, the right must be continuous, it must be uninterrupted, it must be in the line for which it is used.

whether it be humanitarianism, or shoes, or ships. Otherwise it lapses, the court says. It must be used like a muscle in order to possess it.

Mr. President, where does that take us? The American Red Cross never used its label in any other direction except in the field of humanitarianism. Therefore, there was no legal conflict in its use in any other field. Property rights have been developed and built up in other fields, which now, in a broader and more enlightened day, we are asked to strike down with one fell swoop.

So, when the Senator says that there was an infringement of the trade-mark, that is not accurate, for if there had been an infringement of the red cross trade-mark, the Red Cross Society could have put one of these companies out of business, and that would have served notice on all the others.

I will tell the Senator why the Red Cross has never brought any action in any court of law to stop these companies, who come by the right legally, from using the red cross as an emblem. It is because it cannot do so. One cannot use the red cross for one purpose only and stop someone else from using the same trade-mark for another purpose. The decisions of the Supreme Court by the dozens are to that effect. One can protect only his own particular line of goods. Today there are Red Cross shoes, there is Red Cross food, there are Red Cross medical supplies, and so on.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not think the Senator is recognizing the exception to the rule, and the exception applies to just such emblems as we are discussing here today. Of course, the most notable examples are those which governments use.

In the case of *Halter* v. *Nebraska* (205 U. S., 34)—and I have no doubt the Senator is acquainted with the decision—the court dealt with a statute which was the outgrowth of the treaty relating to migratory birds. In the course of the opinion appears the following:

> It is familiar law that even the privileges of citizenship and the rights inherent in personal liberty are subject, in their enjoyment, to such reasonable restraints as may be required for the general good.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. The opinion proceeds:

> Nor can we hold that anyone has a right of property which is violated by such an enactment as the one in question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Including the red cross.

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. I include that because "anyone" means "everyone."

Mr. AUSTIN. That is not in the opinion. I have not finished the reading. I continue to read as follows:

> If it be said that there is a right of property in the intangible thing upon which a representation of the flag has been placed, the answer is that such representation—which in itself cannot belong, as property, to an individual—has been placed on such a thing in violation of law and subject to the power of government to prohibit its use for purposes of advertising.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator went over that, and I am not arguing about the flag.

Mr. AUSTIN. But there are other illustrations.

Mr. TYDINGS. The flag, however, in my opinion, does not furnish an argument which is on all fours with the red-cross emblem.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wanted the Senator to understand that I take the position that the emblem of the Red Cross is in the same class or category as flags of nations, of towns, of regiments, and so on. It is an emblem representing an organization which is of sufficient importance to place the emblem into the category of flags.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not agree with that statement, but even if it were so, the flag is as old as the country, but the Red Cross is only as old as the first congressional statute, which was passed in 1900.

Let me state briefly the chronology of the red cross to show the Senate what I mean.

Beginning at least as early as the eleventh century, the red cross became a permanent and familiar symbol in Christian countries, and since 1189 has been a national emblem of England.

On August 22, 1864, the Geneva Convention adopted "a red cross on a white ground" as its symbol. The United States was not represented.

In 1866 there was appointed the Bellows committee, which had "an ephemeral existence," and dissolved in 1872 without taking action.

In 1869 Miss Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross Society, first heard of the Geneva Convention.

From 1872 to 1905 numerous firms—of which not more than a dozen are still in existence and using the mark—adopted as a trade-mark the historic symbol of the red cross or the words "red cross" or both. And at least three present users, or their predecessors, started use prior to 1881. Canepa Co., of Chicago, in 1872 adopted the symbol on macaroni and has been using this trade-mark on its product continuously ever since—70 long years. Seabury & Johnson, predecessor of Johnson & Johnson, started using the historic symbol in 1879. Charles B. Silver & Son claim continuous use since 1876.

In 1881 an American committee formed by Miss Barton in 1877 incorporated under the name "The American Association of the Red Cross."

This is the point: Five years before the American Red Cross Society was first incorporated Charles B. Silver & Son were in business and using the red cross symbol all over America. The organizations which existed before the American Red Cross were nebulous. They were bound together by no law, no rule, no incorporation. Nothing existed except the name. The point that clinched the argument was made in connection with the first act of Congress. Miss Mabel Boardman, one of the finest citizens of this Republic, and for 40 or 50 years the head of the Red Cross in this city and in the Nation, in testimony given before a committee, which I quoted awhile back, said the users of the red cross emblem before the American Red Cross Society was incorporated had a valid right to it, and they could be exempted from the provisions of that act, and Congress in its very first act said that it should not prevent those persons who had been using the red cross heretofore, before the American Red Cross Society was formed, from continuing its use. It is with respect to one of those individuals that I say now, "If you are going to take it away after by direct language having let him use it for all these years, at least give him a day in court."

Mr. President, why was it that in the first act of Congress the users of the red cross emblem were not prevented from using it further? Why was it that in the first act creating the Red Cross by congressional statute words were inserted to the effect that "this act shall not apply to those now legally in possession of red cross trade-marks, who had them years prior to the incorporation of this society in 1881"? It was because then and there the officials of the Red Cross Society, testifying before a congressional committee, said they thought it was only fair and right to do so. In my humble judgment the Congress then and there by exempting the prior users of the red cross gave them legal clearance to continue its use, and they have done so up to this hour, but now in 1944 Congress proposes to take that right away from them, after Congress has by its official and express sanction given the use of the red cross trade-mark to those who had that trade-mark long before the American Red Cross Society was incorporated.

Mr. President, I do not believe the bill before the Senate is constitutional. I love the Red Cross as much as anyone can love it. I like its purpose. I am a contributor to the Red Cross. I would do anything I could to aid its welfare. I think it is one of the finest organizations in the world. But simply because that is so it is not entitled to take the smallest advantage of any person who, standing before us as a free citizen of this country, is entitled to a square deal and the right to possess whatever he has won honestly and within the laws of our own country.

We should not overplay the humanitarian side of this matter and lose sight of the real merit of the case, even though it be the poorest citizen of this great Republic whose rights are involved. Democracy does not consist of giving protection to large and powerful groups. It consists in the willingness of the Government to go to the side of the most humble citizen in our whole land and to see to it that he receives the same consideration and justice that the most powerful may receive.

I am speaking for one little man only, in a little country town. Whatever the Congress does, it will not result in making me any worse off or better off. It will not help or hurt my political career. It will not benefit or hinder me in any way of which I can conceive. I am here expending of my energy and fighting this battle, because I believe it to be my duty

to see to it that no man, black or white, rich or poor, high or low, shall have his rights confiscated by legislative fiat, by the Senate of the United States, no matter how worthy the motive behind the proposed action may be.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am willing to withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum if the Senator from Connecticut wishes me to do so.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has stated that he is willing to withhold his previous suggestion of the absence of a quorum. So far as I am concerned, that is an agreeable course.

I wish the RECORD to show simply that I am opposed to the motion to reconsider. In that connection I submit a few of the reasons which, it seems to me, justify our refusal to reconsider our previous action on Senate bill 469.

Mr. President, in the first place a suggestion has been made that we would be denying someone of just compensation if we gave to the American Red Cross the exclusive use of this symbol. Let it be made perfectly clear that we are not taking anyone's business away from him, we are not condemning his property and converting it to public use. No condemnation of that sort is involved.

Quite the contrary, Mr. President, the fact remains, and it is the law, and the Senator from Maryland has correctly stated it insofar as he has defined the status of a trade-mark, that one of the functions of a trade-mark is to identify the source from which a particular article comes, to the end that the producer of the item may protect the product, so identified, in the marts of trade against improper competition.

Thus, Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland would certainly be bound to admit that there could be no assignment by the C. B. Silver Co., of Havre de Grace, Md., of its ownership of its trade-mark unless it transferred its business or the goodwill of the business to which that mark is attached and with which the Silver Co. business has heretofore been identified. Thus, Mr. President, if a person in an adjoining community were to set up some competitive line of canned goods and were also to attempt to market them under the name and term "C. B. Silver Red Cross Canned Goods," if that be the correct designation of the name, the constituent for whom the Senator from Maryland so eloquently pleads, as the law now stands, could properly go into court, could properly invoke injunctive relief, and could otherwise seek to protect himself against the improper competition of the businessman in the adjoining community.

But, Mr. President, if the Congress of the United States, acting properly, says that neither Mr. Silver nor the man in the adjoining community may use that mark at all, neither gains an unfair advantage over the other, and consequently no competitive status is destroyed. When we protect the American Red Cross in the use henceforth of the red cross symbol, we are not denying to Mr. Silver any remedy whatever. Quite the contrary, Mr. President, we actually say in this bill that he will be permitted to use the symbol over the next 3 years, provided he actually had a lawful use prior to 1905. We also say that his jobber and distributor may distribute. We even say that until 1950 the retailer may dispose of the goods on his shelves.

So during the period in question, Mr. Silver, or anybody who might take from him if he were to make an assignment of his whole business, including the trade-mark, would be completely protected; and from 1950 forward there would be no need for it, because no competitor could use the C. B. Silver red cross mark anyway. Is not that a fact?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why give him 3 years, if there is no loss?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, we take account of the fact that there have been bona fide users. We have always done so. We say that there are those who have goods on their shelves; there are manufacturers who have tooled up their plants to produce given items; we say that there are legitimate distributors and wholesalers who have invested their money, and whose inventories would be affected. We say that there are retailers who have goods on their shelves which the public may buy, at least until 1950. So, in the interest of protecting all those whose capital is thus invested in inventories upon which the red cross as a trade-mark would be used as a symbol or emblem, we say in the bill that there will be no commercial stigma attached, and no violation of our penal statutes would follow, if within the permitted period they dispose of the goods on hand.

Actually, Mr. President, since we proceed under the treaty, there is no legal reason why we could not tomorrow extinguish the use of the mark by anyone. The fact remains that we are eminently fair to those people in taking the position we take.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know whether the Senator was present this morning, but I read a long list of Supreme Court decisions, all to the effect that trademarks were property. I also referred to a great many sales of trade-marks, some for as much as $40,000,000. I showed that the Coca-Cola Co. had in excess of $4,000,000 of assets in one of its statements, and had $34,000,000 worth of trade-mark goodwill. The stock of that company is selling on the basis of the goodwill built up. I likewise showed that if the Coca-Cola name were changed to Berry Cola, all of the goodwill built up would be lost. It would be necessary to build all over again the goodwill for the product.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] stated that the reason the 3-year provision was made was to allow users of the symbol to build up another trade-mark in place of the one taken away, and that it would be harsh to take it away overnight, because they would lose their business, but if they had two trade-marks simultaneously so that they could make the transition, the loss would be reduced to a minimum. Therefore, I do not believe the Senator from Connecticut, well meaning though I know him to be, is accurate in what he says when he maintains that a trade-mark can be taken away overnight without loss to the person who for many years has been doing business behind that trademark.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I did not say that it would not be harsh. I did not say that it could be done without loss. I would not have the Senator from Maryland think me that naive, and I would not have him ascribe such statements to me. Of course there is no question that there would be loss. All I said was that, as a matter of law, if we have the right to act at all, we may act tomorrow as well as 3 years, 6 years, or 9 years hence. There is no question about that. I pointed out that the Committee on the Judiciary was simply trying to tide over those who, in fact, had established lawful use of the red cross as a symbol prior to 1905. That much we do. That is all we do. But even so, we condition our grant of permissive use upon three factors, all of which appear on page 4, lines 3 to 13 of the bill, one of them being that any legitimate user who seeks to convert must set forth the new trade name, and will thereafter be permitted to insert, if he does set forth the new trade name, "Formerly Red Cross," thus identifying his product and giving it continuity in the marts of trade.

So far as the matter of compensation to C. B. Silver Co. or any other user prior to 1905 is concerned, it is in no way whatever contingent upon any claim, as has been set forth here, that we are taking away a property right as such, which, by way of condemnation or otherwise in the name of the United States Government, entitles that individual to compensation. That is simply not so.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. One thing is perfectly obvious, in my opinion, and that is that we do not have to give anything to the Red Cross. The Red Cross now has the emblem.

Mr. DANAHER. There is no question about that. I think it is clearly established. I will go further and say that if there never were a Red Cross Society until tomorrow, and if we should thereupon incorporate one and, having incorporated it, should enter into a treaty among 30, 40, or 50 nations, under the terms of which we might agree to protect the emblem which we give it, I do not care how many prior users there might be, if there were any hitherto utilizing the red cross as a trade-mark, we still would have the power so to act. Those who adopt a contrary view, let me say to the Senator from Vermont, completely fail to regard the fact that when

the Congress acts with the Executive in making a treaty, we participate in law-making upon a completely different ground than when we exercise purely legislative powers. In this particular case, the legislative branch and the executive branch, through their joint treaty-making powers, actually did enter into a treaty which would protect this emblem.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understood the Senator a moment ago, it seems to me that he stated a rather novel proposition of law, namely, that if there had been no Red Cross before, and we were to create one tomorrow, even though there were 50 bona fide users of the symbol who had used it for 50 years, we could provide that hereafter they could not use it. I will concede that that is true as an abstract proposition, provided that at the same time those who legally used it heretofore were compensated for the loss of their property. The mere making of a treaty does not take from a citizen any fundamental right guaranteed to him by the Constitution. In fact, we can adopt no treaty which transcends the Constitution. If we could, we could use the treaty-making power to amend the Constitution of the United States. The Senator will remember that the only way by which the Constitution can be amended is provided for in the Constitution itself. We may adopt treaties which modify certain things, which we have heretofore done but, in my opinion, we cannot adopt a treaty which fundamentally alters the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad the Senator added "in my opinion," because his statement sets him somewhat at variance with the Supreme Court, which has held otherwise.

The fifth and the fourteenth amendments are in nowise involved in this instance, if we, in the performance of our treaty-making powers, choose constitutionally, as we are permitted to do, to disregard both.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not arguing that point with the Senator. The point I am trying to bring out is that if the Red Cross were created tonight, and if the red cross trade-mark, used by 40 persons, could no longer be used in the future the treaty could be adopted. It would be a good treaty, but that would not permit the Government to take property without due process of law. That provision would still be in the Constitution.

Mr. DANAHER. Does not the Senator see that that is exactly the point at which he comes so close to being right, and then veers off each time he gets there? He says that the Government would be taking property without compensation.

Mr. TYDINGS. For the public good.

Mr. DANAHER. The Government is taking the property of no one, with or without compensation. The Government is simply saying that pursuant to a political duty upon which our country has now engaged, through the proper constitutional methods, we in the United States, through domestic law, will execute the political duty which we hitherto assumed. That is what we say, and that is all we are doing. There is no taking by the Government of the property of anyone.

Mr. TYDINGS. What the Senator is saying is simply this: If we make a treaty with foreign nations providing that every twentieth house in America shall be leveled to the ground and if the Senate in its wisdom ratifies the treaty it will be the law of the land under the treaty-making powers of our Congress. With that, I agree. However, at the same time the Government, in carrying out that treaty, will have to compensate out of the Federal Treasury the twentieth house owner whenever the house is leveled, or else at the time of the leveling the citizen may obtain an injunction, or pursue whatever legal methods will stop the Government from actually taking possession of the property until the citizen is compensated. That is not what the Senator is saying. He is saying that if we make a treaty to level every twentieth house, the Government can level every twentieth house and pay nobody anything for the property.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let the RECORD show that the last three or four hundred words have been uttered by the Senator from Maryland. That is not what the Senator from Connecticut has been saying. It is what the Senator from Maryland says. It is what he would put into my mouth, but which I refuse to accept as being what I have said. I do not make any claim that we have a right to take every twentieth house, with or without compensation, or that we may adopt any such treaty as the one to which the Senator has referred, or ratify it, or so act in any guise whatever. I make no such claim; not only that, but there is no analogy whatever between the ridiculous hypothesis which the Senator from Maryland would create and then call an anomaly and the present situation confronting us. There is no such anomaly on the facts.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think there is an anomaly at all. I think it is a similar rather than an anomalous case. The Senator has said that we could adopt a treaty and take away the property right of all those red cross trade-mark owners without compensation to them, and I see no difference between that situation and adopting another treaty providing for the leveling of every twentieth house without any compensation to be paid to its owner.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, once again the Senator from Maryland has said that by a treaty we are trying to take away the property rights of users of the red cross emblem. That is exactly what I say we are not doing. The Senator from Maryland argues that, not I.

Mr. TYDINGS. What are we doing then?

Mr. DANAHER. All we are doing is implementing through legislative act a treaty which we are bound to implement when, pursuant to proper constitutional and political action of this Government, we bound ourselves.

Mr. TYDINGS. What happens? What would be the result?

Mr. DANAHER. As a result we say that Mr. C. B. Silver, of somewhere in Maryland, who once was able to protect himself in the courts of Maryland against competition if anyone other than he put out canned pears or fruits under the red cross label, will no longer have to protect himself, because we say that neither Mr. Silver nor his competitor may use the red cross, and therefore he has lost nothing.

Mr. TYDINGS. He has not even lost his trade-mark, has he?

Mr. DANAHER. He has lost nothing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has he lost his trade-mark?

Mr. DANAHER. He has lost his use in court of a basis upon which to establish unfair competition should there be any.

Mr. TYDINGS. I asked the Senator the specific question, Has he lost his trade-mark?

Mr. DANAHER. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. Can he still use it after the enactment of the proposed legislation?

Mr. DANAHER. He may use it during the period which the Congress designates.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I ask the Senator if Mr. Silver will have lost his existing trade-mark at the end of 3 years.

Mr. DANAHER. On July 1, 1950, he will no longer be allowed to use it in the marts of trade, but that does not in any way involve a loss of the trade-mark.

Mr. TYDINGS. But he will have lost his trade-mark in 3 years.

Mr. DANAHER. Oh, yes; he will have lost his trade-mark so far as manufacturing is concerned. He cannot manufacture under it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it worth anything?

Mr. DANAHER. Not a nickel.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is not worth a cent?

Mr. DANAHER. It is not worth a nickel.

Mr. TYDINGS. It has no value?

Mr. DANAHER. It is not worth a nickel.

Mr. TYDINGS. Did the Senator hear me read a long list of trade-mark sale values earlier in the day?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why was so much paid for those trade-marks?

Mr. DANAHER. Why was $300,000,000 paid only recently for the stocks in a whisky-distillery business? Because the purchasers obtained the assets, the goodwill, and also the trade name.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and the goodwill; what is "goodwill"?

Mr. DANAHER. We may adopt the definition once used by Justice Holmes, that it is the disposition of a satisfied customer to return to the place where he has been well treated.

Mr. TYDINGS. The trade-mark would show where the customer obtained his goods, and the Senator would move a man's place of business, theoretically, or take away his trade-mark so that all his goods would be destroyed, and then say that he had not lost anything.

Mr. DANAHER. No; the trade-mark which designates the place of origin, or the source of goods, is designed through common law and statute law to protect the user against fraud or the owner of goods against unlawful competition, and we step in and say in effect, "We will protect you against unlawful competition or any other type of competition resulting through the use of the red cross as a trade-mark, and you have lost nothing."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the argument proceeding on the theory that we have by treaty agreed to enact this legislation?

Mr. DANAHER. We have by treaty given the International Red Cross a distinctive status; and all nations signatory to the treaty, in terms—the exact language is not available to me——

Mr. FERGUSON. I have it before me.

Mr. DANAHER. In terms, agreed to recommend to the legislatures of each of the signatory states the adoption of legislation which will protect the status about which we have agreed.

Mr. FERGUSON. The exact language of the treaty is as follows:

> The governments of the high contracting parties whose legislation may not now be adequate shall take or shall recommend to their legislatures such measures as may be necessary at all times:
>
> (a) to prevent the use by private persons or by societies other than those upon which this convention confers the right thereto, of the emblem or of the name of the red cross or Geneva cross, as well as any other sign or designation constituting an imitation thereof, whether for commercial or other purposes.

So, do not the contracting parties perform their duties when they recommend to their legislative bodies that the Red Cross emblem be protected?

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator has just read the words "shall take or shall recommend," has he not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator consider that language to be an agreement that the Congress shall enact the proposed law?

Mr. DANAHER. I know, and so does the Senator from Michigan, that no prior Congress, including the one of 1929, had the power to bind us in 1944 to take any particular or specific action or even to adopt the very language of the bill itself. The Senator knows that and I know it. However, we are certainly bound to do everything we possibly can do, and to take whatever action is necessary in order to accomplish the objectives with reference to which our international good faith is pledged under the language of the treaty.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Connecticut has no idea that the Department of State and the Chief Executive employed that language to fool anyone, has he?

Mr. DANAHER. If that were the case, the words would be weasel words.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, we did not do that as a great Nation.

Mr. DANAHER. I say to the Senator from Vermont—and I thank him for emphasizing the point—that we bound ourselves to take the necessary action, whatever it should be, and whatever the words may be, to accomplish the objective toward which we bound our international good faith. We can be satisfied with no less.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am anxious to get back to the question of not taking anything away from the Silver Co. in Maryland. I want to support the Red Cross, and I should be glad if we could reach some equitable and just basis to permit the Red Cross the exclusive use of this emblem.

Mr. DANAHER. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the object of the bill. I do not believe that any Senator would be justified in casting his vote to deprive a citizen of Maryland of a property right which he has in a trade-mark without due process of law, or without making some arrangement for him to receive just compensation for whatever value the trade-mark may have. I do not believe we should deny him a day in court so that he may assert or present his claim to a court of law. If we made a treaty by which we have obligated ourselves to enact a law, and without the enactment of the law this man would keep this trade-mark and whatever value it may have and he used it prior to the time we recognized the red cross as a national emblem, then it belongs to him and he has a right to use it. I am willing to take it away from him in the interest of humanity and justice, but I am not willing to take it away from him if we impose upon him and cause him to suffer loss and then deny him an opportunity to go into a court of law and have the court say whether or not he has been deprived of his property without due process of law. What does my friend from Connecticut say about that?

Mr. DANAHER. Suppose tomorrow the Senator from Kentucky and I were to incorporate for the manufacture of Chandler Shoes, that we made an excellent grade of shoes, and let us say, for present purposes we fixed a price of $7 a pair on the Chandler shoes, and advertised them, and people thought they were pretty good shoes; certainly the Senator from Kentucky would think that once we established the lawful use of a well-known mark to which goodwill attaches, no other competitor could use lawfully our agreed upon trade-mark of Chandler Shoes. We could register that trade-mark with our Government authorities if we wished to register it. We would not have to do it; we could acquire a right at common law to the exclusive use of the name "Chandler Shoes." Now along comes a prospective customer who says to us, "Will you sell me the trade-mark 'Chandler Shoes', merely the trade-mark. I do not want your place of business; I do not want your machinery, I do not want your industrial plant or your sales staff or your advertising-copy writers; I want none of them; all I want is the name 'Chandler Shoes'." Does the Senator understand that we could lawfully through our company dispose of the trade-mark "Chandler Shoes" without the goodwill adhering thereto, or without disposing of the assets of the business?

Mr. CHANDLER. Trade-marks have been sold, I understand, as property.

Mr. DANAHER. Does not the Senator recognize that we would have to transfer all the assets out of which the goodwill attached to the trade-mark derives?

Mr. CHANDLER. If we wanted to make more shoes we could later make more shoes and call them by some other name.

Mr. DANAHER. I am trying to establish in the mind of the Senator that there is a common misapprehension as to the status of a trade-mark. It is necesssary to assign with the trade-mark the assets of the business, or its inventory and goodwill, to go with the trade-mark, to give the latter the value which the Senator from Maryland would build up in the minds of the people by telling us that Coca-Cola sold its trade name and all its business for $42,000,000 or whatever the price was. I do not know as to that. What I am trying to make plain to the Senator is that the real value is derived not merely from the trade-mark; many times it stems from the very existence and being of one man, who is the brains and chief asset of the business, irrespective of the trade-mark. The name actually does mean a very great deal. I agree to that, and I agree also that a valid trade-mark protects the owners, the Senator from Kentucky and me in our hypothetical case, against the unlawful competition of the Senator from Tennessee, who might, if he chose, fraudulently try to participate in the goodwill we had built up. Then we could go into court and sue him, enjoin him, and recover damages from him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. DANAHER. So I say to the Senator from Kentucky that we must draw the line at that point. That is exactly where so many here have failed to draw the line, and that is why it is that the Senator from Maryland can make his arguments sound so plausible to a good many of our colleagues. We on the committee who have had to live with this question for many months recognize very well that the way we brought the bill out is the only way properly to accomplish the objective we are all willing to establish and wish to accomplish.

I now yield to our honest competitor with an inferior line.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I understand what the Senator says it is that a trade-mark by itself has no value.

Mr. DANAHER. That is right.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator let me give him a concrete example?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Several years ago we had prohibition. Before prohibition came there was a distiller in Tennessee by the name of Jack Daniels, who made "Jack Daniels" Cascade sour-mash liquor which obtained a great reputation. He left in his will the distillery and the trade-mark he had established for this liquor to his nephew, a very fine gentle-

man, elderly now, by the name of Lem Motlow. Prohibition came, and after it had been in force for a number of years and seemed destined to last for a great many years, as it was in the Constitution—for there was not very much controversy about it at that time—he came to Washington with his lawyer, Mr. Seth Walker, and said that a gentleman in New York had taken over the name of "Jack Daniels" and was making a liquor illegally under the name of "Jack Daniels," was selling an enormous quantity of it, and that this other man had no right to the name "Jack Daniels."

There was then in existence a liquor board that had control of such matters—I have forgotten its name—and Mr. Motlow asked me if I would introduce him and his lawyer to the Board. I did so, although I was a prohibitionist and although I did not drink at all and never have in my life. We went down to the Board. Jack Daniels distillery had long since passed out. Its liquors had all been sold and drunk; it had no property rights of any kind under heaven, except the alleged property right of the trade-mark "Jack Daniels" liquor. The Board heard the argument very carefully. I also heard it. Mr. Walker made a fine argument. The same argument was made by the New York people that the Senator is making that prohibition had wiped out the distillery and the stock on hand, had destroyed the value of the trade-mark, and there was nothing to quarrel about.

The Board held differently. The Board upheld Mr. Motlow, and his right to use the name "Jack Daniels" liquor. What has been the result? Prohibition has been repealed, and I suppose Mr. Motlow, under his exclusive trade-mark to "Jack Daniels" liquor, has become one of the wealthiest men in my State since the prohibition law was repealed. Therefore, when the Senator says that a trade-mark has no value, he says something that I cannot understand at all. Indeed, I know to the contrary, and I have given a concrete case in evidence of my position.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Tennessee ought to recall that what I did say was that it may not be disposed of separately from the business, or goodwill.

Mr. McKELLAR. This was entirely separate; there was nothing else at stake; the business had gone; the distillery was used as a cow barn; the law had done away with it, and the distillery itself had almost rotted down. I myself saw it at one time, and somebody said, "There is the old distillery of Jack Daniels." All the property rights had gone. There was but one thing at stake, and that was the trade-mark. The law had prohibited the manufacture and sale of liquor. The distillery had gone out of use entirely. But the name was held to be of value and to be the property of Lem Motlow, and the result has been, as I have said, that Lem Motlow, since the prohibition law has been repealed, has made perhaps a million dollars out of that one trade-mark.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out to the Senator that there might have been 15 users attempting to take over a name in a period like that, and give it use, and give it validity, and go out and advertise and build goodwill around it. By the same token, let me point out, names are taken over, like Old Overholt, Old Fitzgerald, perhaps Kentucky Pride, or other names we see advertised. All during prohibition there were great stocks of that kind of stuff in bond, and even though it could not be legally sold in the general market, it was withdrawable under permit, and under prescription, and in that sort of way. So that the names did retain value, even though there was not the use in competition as is true of ordinary commodities in commerce.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The situation detailed by the Senator from Tennessee was repeated over and over again in my section, and that is why I had the definite impression that a name was of value, even though there were no property, and the distilleries were in ruins. In many cases there were no stocks on hand at all, yet the names were fought for and carefully kept, and one dared not use the name of one of those distilleries, because if he did, someone would take him to court and establish the right to the name.

I am exceedingly interested in this matter. I do not wish to vote to deprive the man referred to by the Senator from Maryland of his trade-mark. I am willing to do it, but not unless I am certain that I leave him the right to go to court and have damages assessed if there be any, and the chance for him to get whatever value and return there may be for his labor, especially when we consider that he has been in the business all these years, since 1876, as I understand was the case of the man from Maryland.

Mr. DANAHER. The natural desire of the Senator from Kentucky is correct, and I thank him for what he has said.

Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and I wish to conclude by saying merely that I think the motion to reconsider should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Eastland	Overton
Austin	Ellender	Radcliffe
Bailey	Ferguson	Revercomb
Ball	George	Robertson
Bankhead	Gerry	Russell
Barkley	Gillette	Shipstead
Bilbo	Green	Smith
Brewster	Hawkes	Stewart
Brooks	Holman	Taft
Buck	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Butler	McClellan	Tydings
Byrd	McFarland	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wagner
Chandler	Maloney	Weeks
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wherry
Connally	Murdock	Wiley
Cordon	Nye	Willis
Danaher	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 469) was passed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the motion to reconsider, which is pending, is agreed to, I understand the bill then is open to amendment, or any motion which may be made in connection with the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill technically would not be open to amendment, if the motion to reconsider is agreed to by the Senate, until the vote by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time was also reconsidered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the pending question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote on the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am not clear that I understood adequately what the Chair held. Is the parliamentary status that if we wish to reconsider our previous action in bringing the bill thus far along through its parliamentary stages, the proper vote is "yea," and if we wish to proceed to adopt the bill without amendment, the vote is "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I announce that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present and voting. I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present and voting. I vote "nay."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent attending the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present and voting.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. NYE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays, 38, as follows:

YEAS—28

Aiken	Eastland	Robertson
Bailey	George	Russell
Ball	Gillette	Smith
Brooks	Hawkes	Stewart
Buck	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	McKellar	Tydings
Byrd	Nye	Weeks
Chandler	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Radcliffe	
Clark, Mo.	Revercomb	

NAYS—38

Andrews	Ellender	O'Mahoney
Austin	Ferguson	Overton
Bankhead	Gerry	Shipstead
Barkley	Green	Taft
Bilbo	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Burton	La Follette	Vandenberg
Butler	McClellan	Wagner
Caraway	McFarland	Wherry
Connally	Maloney	Wiley
Cordon	Maybank	Willis
Danaher	Mead	Wilson
Downey	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—30

Bone	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Capper	Kilgore	Scrugham
Chavez	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Davis	Lucas	Tobey
Glass	McCarran	Truman
Guffey	Millikin	Wallgren
Gurney	Moore	Walsh, Mass.
Hatch	Murray	Walsh, N. J.
Hayden	Pepper	White

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has called my attention to what appears to have been a mistake made during consideration of this measure. I shall ask him to make an announcement regarding it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be amended in section 4 by striking out the word "or" and inserting the word "and", so that the section which is to be limited will read "Made and colored in imitation of the red cross", instead of "Made or colored."

That amendment was made in one place in the bill which was before the Senate, but by accident was omitted in another place. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be so amended before being transmitted again to the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I do not doubt that the Senator's purpose is entirely good, but the Senate has just declined to reconsider the bill. The House could make any necessary amendments by way of corrections, I should think. If we reconsider the bill, it is reconsidered.

Mr. TAFT. However, after a bill has been passed, I do not think it is beyond the power of the Senate by unanimous consent to make a minor corrective amendment which does not in any way change the action of the Senate theretofore taken.

Mr. CONNALLY. But in order to do that, the Senate must reconsider the bill by unanimous consent.

Mr. TAFT. I do not wish to ask for reconsideration of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will withdraw his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas object?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am endeavoring to have the Senator from Ohio withdraw his request.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Texas will object if I do not withdraw my request, I withdraw it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio withdraws his request.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4559, the Navy Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is it intended to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill this afternoon, or is it intended merely to make the bill the order of business for the next session of the Senate?

Mr. OVERTON. I desire to have the bill made the unfinished business, and to have it taken up tomorrow without delay.

However, before we proceed any further, I wish to say that I hope to have a record vote on the bill, for certain reasons which I shall explain tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to state that I hope there will be a fair attendance at the session of the Senate tomorrow, and that we can proceed without unnecessary interruptions or addresses to the consideration of this bill. I desire to ask for a record vote. Tomorrow some important hearings are scheduled on the river and harbor bill, and I should like to have the Senate conclude consideration of the Navy Department appropriation bill as speedily as possible. It is very necessary that the Congress act upon it without delay.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope there will be a fair attendance of Senators at the session of the Senate tomorrow, and that we can proceed to dispose of the bill promptly, under all the circumstances.

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF JUNE 7, 1924—FOREST PERPETUATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 45) to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566), which was, on page 2, line 6, after the word "act", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the appropriation under this authorization shall not exceed $6,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, $7,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and $8,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am authorized by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House. The amendment is satisfactory to the proponents of the bill. Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nomination of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert J. Carson, to be ensign.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the postmaster nominations.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Malcolm F. Schoeffel, to be rear admiral, for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gordon Rowe, to be commodore, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Fleet Air, Quonset Point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of nominations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 25, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 24 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

S. Pinkney Tuck, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Portugal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Paul R. Leake, of Woodland, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif. (Reappointment.)

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Ohio, vice Leo Calvin Crawford, term expired.

Joseph F. Deeb, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Deeb is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 24, 1944.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Harold K. Claypool, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio, vice Charles H. Sisson, deceased.

William M. Lindsay, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas. (Mr. Lindsay is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 12, 1944.)

George A. Wright, of Montana, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana, vice William W. Crawford, recess appointment expired August 5, 1939.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Hugh Mullan, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 5, 1944.

First Lt. Joseph Davis Lea, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 14, 1944.

First Lt. Vince Moseley, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 25, 1944.

First Lt. William Richard Corcoran, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 31, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Herman James Lambert, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 13, 1944.

Lt. Col. James Barrett Mockbee, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 22, 1944.

Lt. Col. Page Purnell Albert Chesser, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 29, 1944.

To be major

Capt. H. Beecher Dierdorff, Dental Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 27, 1944.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William Clarence Williams, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from May 6, 1944.

CHAPLAINS

To be captains

Chaplain (First Lt.) Kenneth Malcolm Sowers, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from May 8, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Walton Garrett Sugg, Jr., United States Army (temporary major), with rank from May 15, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Michael Hughes, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from May 23, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Verne Henry Warner, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from May 23, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE A CONSUL GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

J. Rives Childs

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Philip D. Sprouse
Francis L. Spalding
Walter C. Dowling
Max Waldo Bishop
John L. Bankhead
L. Randolph Higgs

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be a rear admiral, to rank from July 15, 1943

Malcolm F. Schoeffel

To be a commodore, to continue while serving as commander Fleet Air, Quonset Point

Gordon Rowe

COAST GUARD

TO BE ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM DATE OF OATH

Robert J. Carson

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Myrtle B. Stark, Boxholm.
Marie Dougherty, Dougherty.
Cyrus V. Nordblom, Harcourt.
Ida Kelly, Harpers Ferry.
Albert N. Wendel, Meservey.
Richard E. Russell, Mingo.
William Bowers, Runnells.

LOUISIANA

Lucie L. Dugas, Bellerose.
Beatrice J. Jacobs, Edgard.
Willie Pennington Foster, Georgetown.
Raoul Meche, Krotz Springs.
Cyprien D. Trahan, Maurice.
Elsie L. Goings, Mount Hermon.
DeLuke Thibodeaux, Morse.
Ermina M. Serpas, St. Bernard.

MARYLAND

Amos H. Wyatt, Marydel.

MONTANA

August Cor, Black Eagle.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mary A. Willey, Fremont.

NORTH CAROLINA

Katie E. Kellihan, Cerro Gordo.
Blanche W. Poole, McAdenville.

OKLAHOMA

G. Ben Grigsby, Sapulpa.

WASHINGTON

Harry C. Egbert, Easton.
Nancy J. Stidham, Mossyrock.
Sydney Moon, Pacific Beach.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit of the Most High, we pray Thee that however dark and terrible may be the need and however harsh and repellent may be the sins of men, enable us to possess our souls in patience and in the midst of contradictions seek Thy guidance. Allow the might of our immortal souls to arise above all things evil and claim Thee as our cup and our everlasting portion. Bless us with thoughtful minds and with tenderness of heart, which spring from the spirit of our Master and always help us to regard the good and beautiful with enthusiasm and the bad with abhorrence.

We are grateful, dear Lord, for the countless number of our citizens who wear no badge of honor or distinction, yet are among God's choicest children. By their quiet, zealous devotion to duty they inspire others to believe in the highest ideals known to man; for these living forces which make for sound and stable government we give Thee thanks. With their loyalty they surround us with their unheralded ministries. Forbid that we should ever fail or neglect them. The lilies of the field, the mountain slopes of Galilee, and the bathing sunshine of Olivet belong to them who are the sons and daughters of the Good Samaritan. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 20, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to post-war planning.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1743. An act to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes and grasses required in the war-food-production program; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 248) entitled "An act for the relief of Louis Courcil," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 544) entitled "An act for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1313) entitled "An act for the relief of Delores Lewis," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ROBERTSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1411) entitled "An act for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1412) entitled "An act for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2625) entitled "An act for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2928) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes,' approved August 14, 1935, as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3390) entitled "An act for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3538) entitled "An act for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 176) entitled "An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney," and accompanying papers.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committe on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Department of War.
6. Office for Emergency Management.
7. Office of Price Administration.
8. War Food Administration.
9. War Manpower Commission.

THE LATE WILLIAM CARDINAL O'CONNELL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, William Cardinal O'Connell, archbishop of Boston, priest for threescore years, bishop for over 42 years, member of the Sacred College of Cardinals for 33 years, has passed to his reward. The soul of a simple man, a great statesman, and militant spiritual leader rests in peace. America as a Nation, Massachusetts as his State, Boston as the seat of his episcopate, mourning his death, are humanly better for his life.

Born not in luxury or wealth, raised by poor, sincere and God-loving parents, Cardinal O'Connell rose by force of character and strength of intellect to become the dean of the Catholic hierarchy in America and one of the outstanding churchmen of history. He was by nature a leader among men. Honored by the supreme pontiffs who saw so clearly in him throughout the years qualities of the disciples of Christ, Cardinal O'Connell through his large experiences in international contacts and affairs was likewise signally recognized by the rulers of foreign nations. Of personal charm, keen insight in matters of state, and unequaled foresight in church problems, he was universally democratic in his approach to the solution of controversial issues and ever unyielding in his adherence to the teachings of Catholicism in thought and act. He was truly a leader of his church. He was ever mindful of the humble beginning of his position and his fame.

Cardinal O'Connell never failed to thank God for his success.

A most powerful force for good has been lost in the passing of this eminent prelate. History will appraise his greatness.

Churchman and American, Cardinal O'Connell never hesitated to speak when in his judgment occasion demanded. He was courageous. His memoirs are replete with vigorous denial of irreligious tendencies and un-American doctrine at times when the person and theory attacked were basking in the sun of popular acclaim.

He hated intolerance and bigotry—whether found within or without the ranks of his spiritual flock. Experienced throughout his life in the solving of racial and religious antipathies, he was ever eager to bring those of different faiths into a closer understanding of their separate differences and into a more intimate unison with God. The opponents of intolerance have lost a vigorous advocate and faithful friend.

No American ever guided more priests of God along sound, spiritual pathways and no prelate ever taught through the doctrines instilled in his spiritual family more true love of America than Cardinal O'Connell. Wherever he traveled, whatever the nation of his residence, the nationality of his birth and the flag of his country were for him and through him an inspiration for greatness and good. Protector of America, servant of God, he was a noble patriot and brilliant spiritual leader. His spiritual leadership knew no confines. His life and teachings as an American will remain a powerful and lasting monument to his wisdom and ideals.

Cardinal O'Connell was more than a noted prelate. He was an international figure of power, never to be forgotten and always to be conjured with whenever assailants of Americanism and Catholicism appeared armored for attack. His influence in the cause of good government and national unity was immeasurable. The citizens of Massachusetts have lost a first line and a last bastion of courageous defense against fascism, nazi-ism, and communism, and all other isms which would rear an ugly head against the foundations of our Government. His life exemplified vigorous and vigilant Americanism under God. He believed in America. The hills of Boston are studded with monuments of Catholic churches, convents, colleges, and schools, built through his undying industry and executive genius. Cardinal O'Connell is at rest—but the influence of his tireless and undying devotion to church and state will remain for those who follow—an inspiration and an ideal.

Brilliant pen may trace his history and eloquent voice portray his life, but when all is said and written the shadow of his life in Boston will ever remain a guardian of the faith, morals, and welfare of her citizens.

William Cardinal O'Connell by his life clearly earned the title of "A Great Churchman and a Great American."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my esteemed friend, Cardinal O'Connell, is a great shock to me and gives me a great feeling of deep personal loss.

For many years His Eminence has been one of the great spiritual leaders, not only of our Nation but of the entire Christian world. His ideals, moral leadership, tolerance, churchmanship, and love of God and country have been of enormous value in the conduct and direction of the United States during the most difficult years in the life of our Nation. A firm believer in America and its institutions, he was a militant advocate of the preservation of the American way of life. His resourcefulness, his wisdom, his strength of character, his spiritual inspiration have provided the light and courage and hope for millions of men and women. Like a star from above, he has lighted the path of their destiny. He has spoken a word here, given a hand there, and performed many deeds to lighten the burdens of his fellow men.

Born in my home community of Lowell, Cardinal O'Connell has been a valued friend over many years. This friendship has been a very fine possession.

Our community and our Commonwealth have lost a friend, a cherished son, a distinguished citizen, a godly gentleman.

Our country has lost one of its most eminent, most respected, most revered patriots.

The Christian world has lost one of its noble leaders.

Men and women everywhere have lost Cardinal O'Connell, but his qualities, deeds, and inspirations shall live forever.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the conclusion of the business which would have precedence, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRESERVING UNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the New York Times of yesterday that the Secretary of the Navy endeavored to impress the country with the necessity to preserve unity. That was a most important suggestion. There is a condition developing in America which is threatening our unity which calls for the wisest and most tolerant and the most determined effort on the part of the people of this country if we are to avoid serious interracial conflict. It is a job that has got to be done. Not only is the strength, the solidarity of the country to a definite degree menaced by this thing which is being done at a time when we are at war, but it threatens the success of an experiment which we are attempting in this country which has never before succeeded; that of trying to have two substantially dissimilar races live side by side in large numbers in the same communities.

I will not have time, of course, to discuss this matter now, but I have asked and received unanimous consent that I may discuss it more in detail on Thursday of this week. I feel sure I will not add by what I say anything to the difficulties which now obtain. I hope I may be able to render some public service.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlemen from Texas has expired.

SIMPLIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX RETURNS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax and that for the purpose of such report the provisions of clause 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House—the so-called Ramseyer rule—be waived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 20 minutes after the disposition of business before the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE WILLIAM CARDINAL O'CONNELL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, again I regret my inability to adequately express my profound sorrow at the passing of William Cardinal O'Connell, archbishop of Boston, spiritual sovereign of more than 1,000,000 Massachusetts Catholics, New England's first and only prince of the Church of Rome, and one of two cardinals of the United States.

Cardinal O'Connell was a thorough, genuine, Christian gentleman, ever motivated by charity for all as brothers, tolerance for all that was not baneful or iniquitous, and justice in all things, large and small.

How much better the world would be if all, regardless of religious beliefs, would follow this altruistic, inspiring example.

When Cardinal O'Connell was 17 years of age he heard in his soul the voice of God calling him to lead a life that would tend to perfection. He heard in his soul the same divine voice that had spoken in Judea and Galilee; the divine voice that had said to the young man:

He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me. And everybody that hath left house, or brethren, or sister, or

father, or mother, or lands, for My Name's sake shall receive a hundredfold, and shall possess life everlasting.

That voice did not speak in vain. Young O'Connell obeyed it, but not without struggle and sacrifice. All progress in Christian perfection supposes self-denial, and therefore the answer to that divine vocation required self-denial.

That boy loved home, parents, brothers, and sisters, and he was loved in return. His first sacrifice was to leave them. He bound himself to follow Christ all the days of his life in voluntary poverty, in perpetual chastity, and in entire obedience.

No American loved his country more than Cardinal O'Connell and none with greater intelligence and with better will served America and the world. In him love of country followed love of God, and praiseworthily he served them both. Love of God made him a true patriot, alert and determined to guard our liberties. He was an internationalist with charity for all men as brothers. In love of country he was intolerant of whatever he saw as a menace to the heritage of freedom to us by the sacrifices of our founders and forefathers.

After a full and rich life of 84 years, 60 years in God's priesthood, 42 years a bishop and successor to the Apostles, 33 years a cardinal and member of the papal senate, his gallant soul rests in peace.

Not a few beyond his own fraternal association will unite with those in it lamenting that we shall see him here no more, and yet with them will rejoice that his words and influence are still among us, calling men from the wilderness of sin to the nurture of righteousness, and the ways of wisdom, which are peace, and which lead to the triumph of eternal glory.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a letter from the regional director of the Farm Security Administration and the report of Farm Security Administration activities in region No. 2, including the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENNETT of Michigan and Mr. BENNETT of Missouri were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address by the mayor of Knoxville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix, and include therein an editorial from the Watertown Times, on the passing of Jesse S. Cottrell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday following the regular order of business and any other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, after the disposition of all other business on the Speaker's desk tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed under special order for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, following the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow I may proceed for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow following the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include copies of a letter addressed to the President and certain memoranda which have to do with the far eastern supply of military equipment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Manchester Union of Manchester, N. H.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times of April 18, which I think will be of interest to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short statement by Miss Billie Maye Runyard of Antioch, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank R. Kent, about some of the false arguments concerning lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NIGHT CLUB MORTALITY

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MCKENZIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MABEL SOULE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 513) for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mabel S Soule, wife of Paul Soule, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Paul Soule.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances and to include excerpts from two addresses.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday of this week, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Mr. Roland Alston entitled "Secretaries Want Legal Status."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the chamber of commerce of Creston.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EQUALIZING PAY OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1757) to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," for immediate consideration. I may state that this Senate bill is similar to H. R. 4347, carrying the same title which has been reported by the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain what this does? As I understand the bill, it increases salaries of the officers of the fire department. Is that all?

Mr. RANDOLPH. This legislation, I may say to the distinguished minority leader, equalizes the pay of certain officers of the fire department, to bring them in line with the pay now given similar officers of the Metropolitan Police Department.

On the day when we considered this measure previously in the House the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, stated he believed that the Appropriations Committee would desire more time to study the proposal. The Chairman of the District Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] and the gentleman from Nebraska gave their attention to the bill during the intervening time and and they tell me they have no objections to its passage. The bill likewise is recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill has nothing to do with privates on the two departments?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In this instance we are attempting only to equalize the pay of certain officers of the fire department, to bring them up to the salaries now paid similar officers in the police department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How does the pay of the individual private in the two departments compare?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They are equal. We are seeking only to remove these discrepancies which now appear.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I should like to say that I held this bill up previously for the reason that we wanted to see how much money was involved. We members of the Subcommittee on District Appropriations wanted to review the amount as it was related to the regular appropriations. We have found that it will cost $47,000 additional, plus $17,000 for retirement. After reviewing it we agreed to the equalization of pay of these positions. We have no objection to the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand, this bill was reported out unanimously and it also has the approval of the District Commissioners.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true; and it has previously passed the Senate. It was passed unanimously in that body.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are these increases in salaries flat increases or will these men also receive the war overtime in addition?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They will get the war overtime in addition. This simply adjusts the basic salaries.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman believe it necessary for them to get both the increase and the war overtime?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe it is only proper that the basic salaries be the same.

Mr. CASE. The same as what?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I mean that these three categories in the Fire Department be paid exactly the same as the three similar categories in the Police Department. That is what we are attempting to do in this legislation. It has been shown to the District of Columbia Committees of both the Senate and the House that there is this disparity between officers in the grades of captain, lieutenant, and sergeant. We are simply trying to equalize the disparity.

Mr. CASE. Is the disparity caused by reason of the basic statute or by reason of the war overtime?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is caused by the basic statute.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this pertains particularly to captains, lieutenants, and sergeants in the Fire Department.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is the work in these categories in the Fire Department the same as that of similar categories in the Police Department? In other words is the degree of responsibility the same?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say that the departmental rules require the hazards of the Fire Department to be shared by all regardless of rank. These men are compelled to subject themselves to contagious diseases; they crawl through filth; they work under all kinds of danger and in all kinds of weather.

Mr SMITH of Ohio. What about responsibility?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Personally I feel that the responsibility is perhaps greater for members of the Fire Department in these categories than even in the Police Department. I am not attempting to draw that distinction but I believe their work is highly important because the safety of all property is involved. A conflagration which may begin in a small way may spread over a large area. We know that on this very last Sunday, yesterday, there was a fire in the District of Columbia which almost cost the lives of several persons. The men whom we are attempting to help by this legislation have a definite responsibility in connection with any such danger in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The pay of all members of the Police and Fire Departments is the same with the exception of the officers we are considering in this bill; is that right?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; these three categories.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am not in position to say that this is exactly a controversial measure, but I do say there are a few attachments to it which could reasonably be considered controversial, at least by some Members. I am not going to object in the sense of objecting to the bill itself, but I would suggest that the bill be called up at another time when the Members of the House are here. We have an agreement here not to take up controversial measures. I am not even saying this is a controversial measure but I am saying it might be. I suggest that it be carried over until some future time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, of course I want to cooperate with the leadership of the House and with the Members, but I can see no good purpose in having it considered on a third occasion. We have considered it once before, at the request of members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], representing the majority and minority and it was laid over until today that they might study the measure because they have a responsibility to the District Committee as well as to the legislative committee. It seems to me when the House District Committee and when the Senate District Committee have both unanimously passed a measure, and when the Senate has taken an unanimous vote in favor of the proposal, it is hardly fair, I may say to the gentleman from Ohio, that we be asked to bring the measure in a third time before the membership of this body.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not want to impose on the gentleman from West Virginia, Chairman of the District of Columbia Committee or unduly consume any of the time of the Congress in the future, but there has been some question raised in this matter by certain citizens of the District of Columbia. I am not going to object.

Mr. ROWE. Is the gentleman raising a question as to the responsibility that he mentioned awhile ago?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Not necessarily that alone.

Mr. ROWE. May I say that I have served as a chairman of a similar committee in the town in which I live and we have determined insofar as insurance rates are concerned that the premium rates are identically the same for the firemen as for the policemen. The firemen have probably a greater responsibility for the reason they are not desk workers but work on the job. They go out and suffer the hazards of the fire and are in direct contact with the operation. It is not fair to the men in the fire department, after this has been deferred twice, that the pay to which they are entitled should be deferred or that the

bill should be deferred any longer, I am a member of the District Committee, I have listened to the testimony given in the hearings and I think this is justifiable. We should give them the allowance and should have long ago.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two tables, one taken from the Senate hearings and a table composed of certain appropriations for certain purposes which I have received from the House Appropriations Committee, together with excerpts from certain commerce reports. I may say that neither of the tables are long. Certainly the one on the commerce end of the matter will be short.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, supplementing what has been said by the able chairman of the District of Columbia Legislative Committee, both the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], ranking minority member of the District of Columbia Appropriations Committee, and myself, subsequent to previous consideration of this bill looked over the matters in connection with it and are satisfied as to the bona fideness and the merit of the bill. I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved July 1, 1930 (46 Stat. 839), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be as follows: Chief engineer, $8,000; deputy chief engineers, $5,000 each; battalion chief engineers, $4,500 each; fire marshal, $5,000; deputy fire marshal, $3,600; inspectors, $2,460 each; captains, $3,600 each; lieutenants, $3,050 each; sergeants, $2,750 each; superintendent of machinery, $5,000; assistant superintendent of machinery, $3,600; pilots, $2,600 each; marine engineers, $2,600 each; assistant marine engineers, $2,460 each; marine firemen, $2,100 each; privates, a basic salary of $1,900 per year, with an annual increase of $100 in salary for 5 years, or until the maximum salary of $2,400 is reached. All original appointments of privates shall be made at the basic salary of $1,900 per year, and the first year of service shall be probationary."

This act shall become effective on the first day of the month following the month in which approved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION OF PROPERTY FROM JUDICIAL PROCESS, ASSIGNMENT OF SALARY OR WAGES AND THE ADVANCE PAYMENT OF SALARY OR WAGES FOR PURPOSE OF PREVENTING ATTACHMENT OR GARNISHMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2116) to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to exemption of property from judicial process, the assignment of salary or wages, and the advance payment of salary or wages for the purpose of preventing attachment or garnishment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give us just a slight explanation of this bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. This legislation should be explained to the membership of the House and I am going to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], who was a member of the subcommittee in charge of this matter, to take a few minutes to give an explicit statement in reference to the bill and to offer a committee amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, since 1901 for the head of families the statutes of the District of Columbia provided that there shall be exempt from garnishment the sum of $50 per month. In view of the increased living costs it has been deemed that this is insufficient to satisfactorily care for a family and it is proposed that the exemption be increased from $50 to $125 per month.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that all the bill does?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Except the bill provides that the employer may not pay the wages of the employee in advance in order to avoid garnishment of wages.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1105 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 15 401), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1105. (a) The following property, being the property of the head of a family or householder residing in the District of Columbia, or of a person who earns the major portion of his livelihood in the District of Columbia, being the head of a family or householder, regardless of his place of residence, shall be free and exempt from distraint, attachment, levy, or seizure and sale on execution or decree of any court in the District.

"First. All wearing apparel provided for all persons within the household, being members of the immediate family of the household, not in excess of $300 per person.

"Second. All beds, bedding, household furniture and furnishings, sewing machines, radios, stoves, cooking utensils, not exceeding $300 in value.

"Third. Provisions for 3 months' support, whether provided or growing.

"Fourth. Fuel for 3 months.

"Fifth. Mechanics' tools and implements of the debtor's trade or business amount to $200 in value, with $200 worth of stock or materials for carrying on the business or trade of the debtor. This exemption shall also apply to merchants.

"Sixth. The library, office furniture, and implements of a professional man or artist, to the value of $300.

"Seventh. One horse or mule; one cart, wagon, or dray and harness, or one automobile or motor-controlled vehicle not exceeding $500 in value if used principally by the debtor in his trade or business.

"Eighth. All family pictures; and all the family library, not exceeding in value $400.

"(b) Such exemptions shall be valid when the property is in transitu the same as if at rest; but no property named and exempted in this section shall be exempted from attachment or execution for any debt due for the wages of servants, common laborers, or clerks, except the wearing apparel, beds, and bedding and household furniture for the debtor and family.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the person who is the principal provider for the family shall be deemed to be the head thereof."

SEC. 2. Section 1107 of such act approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 15 403), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1107. (a) The earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, not otherwise exempted, not to exceed $125 each month, of any person residing in the District of Columbia, or of any person who earns the major portions of his or her livelihood in the District of Columbia, regardless of place of residence who provides the principal support of a family, for 2 months next preceding the issuing of any writ or process against him, from any court or officer of and in said District, shall be exempt from attachment, levy, seizure, or sale upon such process, and the same shall not be seized, levied on, taken, reached, or sold by attachment, execution, or any other process or proceedings of any court, judge, or other officer of and in said District: *Provided, however*, That where husband and wife are living together, and both are employed, the aggregate of the earnings or salaries of the husband and wife shall be the amount which shall be determinative of the exemption of the earnings of either in cases arising ex contractu.

"(b) The earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, not otherwise exempted, not to exceed $60 each month for 2 months preceding the date of attachment of all persons residing in the District of Columbia, or of persons who earn the major portions of their livelihood in the District of Columbia, regardless of place of residence, who do not provide for the support of a family, shall be entitled to like exemption from attachment, levy, seizure, or sale. All wearing apparel belonging to such persons, not exceeding $300 in value, and mechanic's tools not exceeding $200 in value, shall also be exempt."

SEC. 3. Chapter 27 of such act approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, title 15, ch. 4), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1108. A notice of claim of exemption, or motion to quash attachment or other process against exempt property or money, may be filed in the office of the clerk of the court either by the debtor, his wife, or a

garnishee, and thereupon the court, after due notice, shall promptly act upon the notice, motion, or other claim of exemption."

SEC. 4. Chapter 11 of such act approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 28, ch. 25), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 435. (a) Every contract attempting or purporting to transfer or assign salary or wages to be earned by the debtor after the date of such contract, shall, if made in the District of Columbia, be invalid and contrary to public policy and unenforceable, and if made outside the District of Columbia, be unenforceable in any court within the District of Columbia.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person in the District of Columbia to demand or receive from such debtor any assignment of salary or wages to be thereafter earned by such debtor, or to notify any employer that he holds an assignment of such salary or wages. Any person violating this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $200 or by imprisonment for not more than 60 days. Prosecutions under this subsection shall be upon information filed in the criminal branch of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or one of his assistants."

SEC. 5. Section 456 of such act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 16 312), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after "456.", and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any employer to pay salary or wages to an employee in advance of the time the same shall be due and payable, for the purpose of avoiding or preventing an attachment or garnishment against the earnings or salary of such employee, and such advance payment, as to the attaching creditor, shall be void: *Provided*, That after the service of one writ of attachment or garnishment on a judgment against an employer, any payment of salary or earnings thereafter before the time when said salary or earnings are due and payable, made within a period of 6 months after the date of service of said writ or before the earlier satisfaction of such judgment, whichever is the earlier, shall as to such attaching creditor be presumed to be in violation of this subsection and shall cast upon the said employer the burden of proving that such advance payment or payments were not for the purpose of avoiding the attachment of such salary or earnings."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "(D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 15 401)."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "District", insert "of Columbia."

Page 2, line 18, strike out the word "amount" and insert "amounting."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "(D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 15 403)."

Page 4, line 6, after the word "District:", strike out the balance of line 6 and all of lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, however, That where husband and wife are living together, the aggregate of the earnings, salaries, insurance, annuities, and pension or retirement payments of the husband and wife shall be the amount which shall be determinative of the exemption of either in cases arising ex contractu.

Page 5, line 2, strike out lines 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Page 5, line 7, strike out "Sec. 1108" and insert "(c)."

Page 5, line 10, strike out the word "wife" and insert "spouse."

Page 5, line 13, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 5, line 14, strike out "(D. C. Code, 1940 edition, title 28, ch. 25)."

Page 5, line 17, strike out "435" and insert 434–A."

Page 6, line 11, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 6, line 12, strike out "(D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 16 312)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: Page 3, line 20, after the word "exceed", strike out "$125" and insert in lieu thereof "$100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE LATE ARTHUR P. LAMNECK

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the death of a former Member of this body, Hon. Arthur P. Lamneck. He dropped dead yesterday while working in his Victory garden. He served in Congress from my district, the Twelfth District of Ohio, for 8 years, from 1930 to 1938.

Mr. Lamneck was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and contributed valuable service to his country and to his district by reason of his work in this House. While we were of opposite political faith, we saw eye to eye on many public questions, and I always felt that he was a friend of mine. He had a long and active career as a businessman and in public life. His family and his community have suffered a great loss in his sudden and tragic death. I know that his many friends here will regret his passing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague in his expression of regret on the passing of our old friend. He and I were members of the Committee on Ways and Means for a number of years. I respected him profoundly as a sincere, honorable legislator. His passing on constitutes a personal loss to me, because a close feeling of friendship existed between us.

I join with our distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] in expressing my keen regret in the passing on of this fine character.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with Mr. Lamneck, about whom the gentlemen have spoken. He was a real statesman, a genuine patriot, and a great American. In his passing the country has lost one of its great men.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I share the statements made by the gentlemen who have just spoken as to their pleasant relationships as Members of the House with Arthur P. Lamneck. I also share with him the responsibility of the study of certain legislation while he was a Member of this body.

After his retirement he came to West Virginia with certain other gentlemen and engaged in coal mining in the county from which I come. It was my privilege then to make certain contacts for him. I was delighted, on that second occasion, to come in contact with Arthur P. Lamneck. I shall miss him.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words in reference to the passing of Arthur P. Lamneck. He made a great impression in this House. He served here during the time when his party was in power, and by sheer strength of his character his colleagues on his side elevated him to a place on the Committee on Ways and Means. He served with me on the Committee on Ways and Means, and I want to say for him that he surely showed a natural insight in financial matters that was surprising.

Incidentally, I might say, his son was here at the time and had a position in connection with the official work of this House, and he, too, was a very popular young man. Arthur P. Lamneck made a very wonderful impression while he was here in Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief but extraordinarily beautiful and powerful message written by the son of a citizen of West Virginia, resident in this city.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], over the Columbia Broadcasting System last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Judge Emery. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost of inserting this address is $138. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the cost, that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address recently made by Admiral Ernest J. King.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Daily Times entitled "The People Approve Lend-Lease."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

"JEEPS"

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post on the subject of jeeps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this editorial deals with the question of who discovered the jeep, and my purpose in addressing the House at this time on the subject is to point out that while there is a campaign on to find out who discovered the jeep or who will probably make a jeep after the war, the Federal Trade Commission is pursuing a punitive expedition on the subject of trying to find out whether somebody may manufacture a jeep during the war, in the face of the fact that the War Production Board has prohibited the manufacture of any jeep except for military purposes. At the same time that the war plants in Toledo are advertising and seeking the employment of 5,000 women, the investigators of the Federal Trade Commission in their bureaucratic effort are holding investigations, subpenaing witnesses, and otherwise interfering with workers in that area where they need 5,000 additional women employees. The executive agencies ought to be required to secure permission of the War and Navy Departments before tying up workers in war plants to be investigated on such a subject. Not long ago the Department of Justice adopted the policy to defer the trial of prosecutions for violations of the antitrust laws, which is probably more important than discovering who made the jeep. From the record it would appear the Willys-Overland Co. developed the jeep, and I trust someone will tell it to the Federal Trade Commission.

The Washington Post is to be congratulated on its editorial and the Federal Trade Commission should mend its ways or the Congress will undoubtedly take appropriate action to prevent further interference with war production.

JEEPERS!

Some notion of why there is a big manpower crisis in the United States is to be obtained from the announcement that the Federal Trade Commission is marshaling its lawyers for combat with the lawyers of the Willys-Overland Motor Co. over the burning issue of who, if anybody, owns the word "jeep." The case will be opened in Toledo, Ohio, and later the hearings will be transferred to Washington. Throughout this period of litigation innumerable witnesses will no doubt be diverted from their normal occupations and dozens of stenographers will be employed in the work of taking depositions and affidavits in a case which, so far as the interests of the war program are concerned, could more appropriately and sensibly be determined by rolling dice or tossing a nickel.

The whole point of the controversy, as far as it has any point, is that, thanks to the efficiency and popularity of the vehicle, and to its introduction by the armed forces into all parts of the world, the name "jeep" has acquired an extraordinary commercial prestige, comparable to that of such trade names as aspirin or kodak or vaseline. Of course, if any corporation could acquire exclusive rights to the name, after the war, it would have a value equivalent to several dozen gold mines. But for the present jeeps are being produced, according to Army specifications, by several automobile manufacturing concerns for war purposes only.

As to the origin of the monosyllable, there appears to be neither mystery nor controversy. It first appeared as the generic name of an amiable and exotic creature of indeterminate sex, introduced about the middle of the 1930's into what was then a highly popular comic cartoon strip. Since it appears to have no etymological relation to any other word in any of the Indo-European languages (unless perhaps "cheep", meaning "a feeble, shrill sound of a young bird or mouse"), it seems a case of pure onomatopoeia. The point that the F. T. C. wants to settle is this: Who was the first to apply the word to the vehicle now ubiquitously employed by the Army?

We should like the F. T. C. to explain why the settlement of this question, important mainly to those who have some financial interest involved, could not have been postponed until the end of the war, for there will be plenty of opportunity to settle it before jeeps can be manufactured commercially for peacetime civilian use. This is by no means the first occasion on which the Government has chosen to complicate the manpower muddle by needless litigation. It was about a year ago—a time when the railroads, struggling under a tremendous burden of transportation, were almost desperate for manpower—that the Department of Justice decided to bring a big trust-busting case against the Pullman company, a case which, as far as we know, is still in litigation.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for 20 minutes today, which is something unusual; in fact, I have not, for years, asked for extra time to address the House. However, I do so because my attention has been called to an editorial in Hearst's Baltimore American of yesterday, which editorial I consider so unfair and so unjustifiable that I cannot but ask that I be permitted to insert it as a part of my remarks, being satisfied that after the people have read this editorial, they will accurately see how far wrong some newspapers can be in charging the Democratic Party with matters of which it is not guilty and with which it is unjustly blamed in this editorial.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to the gentleman speaking, but since that editorial makes a personal attack on a couple of Members in the House, I do not think it ought to go into the RECORD without comment. I do not think it ought to go into the RECORD unless the gentlemen who are attacked have an opportunity to reply to it. I really doubt if it ought to be dignified to that extent. It is part of that high-pressure propaganda that is being used to try to stampede the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation into reporting what they call the G. I. bill, which consists of about four or five bills that were thrown together and hastily passed by the Senate within a short time.

We have held our hearings on the bill. We are in executive session on it now. We had General Hines before us all morning this morning, as well as Saturday morning and Friday morning and I believe Thursday morning. The members of that committee are working diligently to try to iron out the provisions of this measure so as to bring out a bill the House can afford to pass and that will aid and not injure the servicemen of this war.

I really do not feel that these personal attacks made by newspapers should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and given that prominence or publicity and that permanence that such an insertion would give them.

Mr. SABATH. Then for the time being, Mr. Speaker, I shall withhold the request to be allowed to insert the editorial. I fully appreciate that the editorial does attack the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. RANKIN. May I say also to the gentlemar from Illinois that we have about the best membership on the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation we have ever had, both Democrats and Republicans, and they are working on this bill without any regard to party lines, striving, as I said, to iron out the bad features of the bill and bring out a measure that we can all afford to support; so I do not consider it a party measure at all.

Mr. SABATH. In this editorial the Democratic Party is charged with being responsible for holding up and delaying this bill that has been passed by unanimous vote of the Senate. No one can

deny that we have in the other body a working Democratic majority. Unfortunately, that does not exist in the House, because frequently some of our colleagues on this side join with the steel or cement bloc over there and succeed in blocking or forcing through legislation over the so-called Democratic majority.

Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. MAY rose.

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield now. I do not mean this to apply to all of them personally, because I appreciate the many votes they have cast with the Democrats when it came to appropriating needed money since the Pearl Harbor attack for carrying on our war. I know that the country appreciates that, of course. But every once in a while we have that injection of politics from the other side, and sometimes these permissible gibes come; but I hope they will cease, as I have pleaded before, so that no politics will be played while the war is on.

Mr. MAY and Mr. HOFFMAN rose.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, because his name was mentioned in this article.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My name was mentioned a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. SABATH. Yes, frequently, but not in connection with this matter here, because the gentleman happens to be a Republican, and they do not say anything about him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now? He has referred to me personally there.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I think the Democratic Party is able to carry all of the charges that may be made against it, and I am quite sure that another of my colleagues and I will be able to carry the charges that are made against us in this editorial. It is just a repetition of what has been going on in the press for months, particularly that branch of the press known as the Hearst papers. They began on me last December and treated me to a Christmas demonstration by hoping that when I got home to enjoy my Christmas dinner it would make me sick and I could not eat it, because, they said, I had sneaked out of Washington and run away and left the veterans of this country without adequate provision or any provision to keep them from hunger. Now they repeat it in this editorial, a double column on the front page of the Baltimore American of today.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that they give no credit whatever to me or to others who participated in the introduction and passage of that bill. They say that we delayed it unnecessarily, and that it would have passed last year if it had not been for my tactics, which they describe in this way:

> Chairman MAY employed every device of evasion and procrastination known to an experienced and astute politician to prevent the passage of the bill.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as the author of the bill I pushed it as fast as it could be pushed, and finally brought it to the House of Representatives in such form that it was so satisfactory to the House that there was not a single vote cast against it.

All I want to say in response to that editorial is that I do not care what they say about me, but I do say that a lie is a lie, whether it is uttered by an individual or published in a newspaper. What they say about me in this editorial is a plain, unvarnished lie.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has made the statement here that the Democratic Party does not have control of the House. The Democratic Party outnumbers the Republican Party. I am sure the gentleman does not want his statement to remain in the RECORD, because there has never been a greater leader of the majority than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the gentleman from Illinois is not charging him with inefficiency or lack of control, I am sure. Is he?

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think the gentleman ought to take that statement out of his remarks.

Mr. SABATH. Personally, I am satisfied that the gentleman is right as to the ability of the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is a great leader.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure.

Mr. SABATH. Unfortunately, he is unable at times to control the votes of some of the Democrats here who feel unfriendly at times to the administration, to my regret. On the other hand, you have a good leader who is able to force a nearly unanimous vote on any and every proposition where there is some politics involved, and when it would affect the Democratic Party. I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts upon his leadership, but I think he has gone too far. I recall that 3 and 4 years ago we on this side voted in behalf of defense measures in the interest of the preparedness program as urged and recommended by the President and we were charged with being rubber-stamp Members, but of late the Republicans do not say anything about rubber stamps because they are not only rubber stamps, but steel and cement bound as evidenced by their votes in accordance with the dictates of the Republican National Committee.

I would not have touched upon this had the gentleman from Michigan not called my attention to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is a compliment the way the gentleman is putting it.

Mr. SABATH. I like to compliment anyone and give credit to anyone where credit is due. I am giving the Republican Party the credit for the fact that during this session, because of our small majority, which I am sure in the interest and welfare of the country will be increased in the next Congress, we have been unable really to control the activities on this floor, due to the aid that has been given the Republicans by a few Democrats who are unfriendly to the administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I take it you regret your inability.

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield further. I want to proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SABATH. Not now.

Mr. Speaker, after reading this editorial I cannot help but believe that Mr. Hearst has been shamefully imposed upon.

I think he has been misled and misinformed. Though he is against the administration, which I regret, I feel he never would have written this editorial if he had all the facts before him. I hope that, in justice to himself and to his many newspapers, he will rectify and correct this erroneous attack upon the Democratic Party, charging that it has delayed the consideration of this bill.

The fact that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is chairman of a committee having jurisdiction of the bill does not justify Mr. Hearst to charge the delay to the Democratic Party, as a party, because under the rules of the House the chairman and members of a committee to which a bill has been referred have certain rights and privileges which cannot be denied or taken away from them.

It should be known to Mr. Hearst that we were confronted with nearly the same situation on the soldiers' vote bill when the committee to which the bill had been referred, under the leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], with the nearly solid support of the Republican Members serving on the committee, thwarted the efforts of the Democratic majority to pass a real soldiers' vote bill. The Democratic Party should not be held responsible for the action of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, the bill passed by almost unanimous vote in the Senate, where the Democratic Party controls. The fact that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has delayed bringing the bill to the floor, as he states, in order to give it more thorough consideration, does not mean that he should be charged with willfully and deliberately delaying the passage of the bill. He has the right, as I have stated, as a Member of Congress and as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to examine the bill thoroughly to see whether it cannot be improved. I myself believe that the bill should have been passed before this. But I am not going to set myself up above that committee which has been and is considering this bill. I know that the intention is to try to improve the bill, because I know we all are interested, and I know that the Democratic Party, by the Eternal God, is interested in the welfare of the boys who are courageously fighting today on all fronts for the preservation of our form of government, for freedom and liberty. Consequently, I do not know of even two men on this side

who are willing to delay or willfully oppose this proposed legislation. They are all for it. I have talked to many of them; and I hope within a few days the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, will be able to report to the House a bill which will be an improvement of the Senate bill, if that is possible; but I hope that the consideration of it will not be delayed too long, because I have several telegrams from the Illinois Department of the American Legion, patriotic societies, and other organizations urging immediate consideration of the bill and criticizing the delay. In that connection, I have promised and assured the Illinois Department of the American Legion that I would do all in my power to aid in the enactment of this deserving legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have just read the editorial in the Baltimore American to which reference has been made. I serve on the Committee on Military Affairs with our distinguished chairman the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]. I sat with our chairman before Christmas and after Christmas on that committee working on the mustering-out pay bill. I want to say, as one who proposed an alternate plan to the bill that was presented, that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] at no time sought to hold up or impede the progress of the mustering-out pay bill. My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the committee, attended these hearings and showed an active interest in this problem and made a very strong effort to get the bill out of the committee and to the floor of the House even before Christmas. We were unable to do so. When the bill did come out, the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] put the bill through the House and it was most acceptable to everybody. I think the editorial is unfair and unjust and inaccurate. I hope the editor of that paper will retract the editorial.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully agree and thank the gentleman for calling my attention to it. But I have been familiar with the activity of the Committee on Military Affairs and I know that the chairman of the committee worked diligently to bring that legislation before the House.

I am indeed gratified that the law has been passed, and I understand that over 1,000,000 of our servicemen are already receiving the benefits of that legislation by receiving mustering-out pay of from $100 to $300, inclusive, depending upon length and places of service. I hope this legislation which is pending now, and on which this editorial is based, will also pass speedily. I believe in this instance the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is really trying to submit to the House a bill that will be an improvement on the bill that has been passed by the Senate. I believe the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi, and he has repeated it several times, though I do not agree with him many times, which I have a right to do. Yet I hope the gentleman from Mississippi is not delaying consideration because of certain opposition to providing compensation for unemployed veterans. But the delay is unfortunate and I plead with him now to try to expedite the matter so that the bill can be passed without any delay whatsoever.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Illinois read the bill?

Mr. SABATH. I have read it, yes. But I have not studied it as closely as I presume the committee in charge of the bill has studied it. I think it is a bill which will do more good for the rehabilitation, hospitalization, and education of our servicemen and be of real benefit to them. I think it is a good bill and if the gentleman from Mississippi can bring about any improvement and betterment of it, of course, the country and later on, I presume, the servicemen will be grateful to him.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the insertion of the editorial. If the gentleman from Illinois wants to put the editorial in the RECORD I shall not object. I just want to have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I called the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to it. His name appears therein. I have done the same thing with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] because I never take undue advantage of any Member and I am not in the habit of being party to anything that would in any way do an injustice to any Member. If I cannot say anything good about a Member, I will not say anything. That has been my policy. Naturally I take liberties with my Republican friends because they continue and continue and continue to inject politics into these matters when they have promised the country they would go along; and yet they snipe and snipe and snipe.

I have several articles which I want to put in the RECORD, for instance, from two of the Republican candidates for President. Of course, being a candidate for President on the Republican side will not mean anything, because it is a foregone conclusion that the American people recognize and appreciate the wonderful leadership and great services that have been rendered to the country and to the world by our President, and they will again support his candidacy and give him a still greater majority in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, as I have stated before, that not only Mr. Hearst but any other editor, when attention is called to unwarranted charges, will be fair enough to retract such unwarranted and unfair charges. It is my further hope, especially at this crucial time, that they will lay aside their prejudices against the President and the Democratic Party, which has done so much for the country in the last 11 years, and, instead, cooperate and aid in bringing about complete unity and cooperation. Because, after all, Mr. Speaker, the main issue in the heart and mind of every American should be the winning of the war and the ultimate establishment of a lasting peace, which should be of greater consideration than any possible political issue at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert the editorial, so that the people may realize how unfair Mr. Hearst has been.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The editorial referred to is as follows:)

For the shameful failure of Congress to do justice to veterans of World War No. 2, the responsibility belongs solely and inescapably to the Democratic Party.

The first bill designed to give war veterans proper hospitalization and mustering-out pay to stave off hunger and despair was introduced in the Congress last year.

It would have been enacted last year but Chairman A. J. MAY, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, blocked it.

Chairman MAY employed every device of evasion and procrastination known to an experienced and astute politician to prevent the passage of the bill.

And his maneuvers were successful.

Chairman MAY is, of course, an administration Democrat.

Now another administration Democrat, Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, has blocked passage of the second bill designed to do justice to the returning veterans of the war—the Americans Legion's G. I. bill of rights.

Mr. RANKIN is chairman of the House World War Veterans' Committee.

The Senate has passed the bill by unanimous vote.

Mr. RANKIN denied the House the opportunity to pass it before Easter, although a majority of his committee favors the bill.

He said it would be introduced immediately after Easter, but it still is held in his committee.

Now he has announced that the bill must be rewritten which would mean weeks or even months of delay.

In its present form, he says, it would encourage war veterans to loaf and impose on the Government.

If the Democratic Party thinks these patriots are loafers and parasites what does it think of the 3,000,000 useless, worthless bureaucrats it has created to prey upon the country and vote for a fourth term?

Is that the New Deal's estimate, the administration's estimate, the Democratic Party's estimate of the men who are fighting and dying to win the war?

The Democratic Party has shown, through the behavior of its accredited leaders in Congress, a stubborn, cruel, and utterly incomprehensible determination to deny humanity and justice to those who are fighting the war.

The most profligate spender of tax money in all history, this Democratic administration has shown a disposition to economize only at the expense of war veterans.

Let all servicemen and the public generally understand this one thing clearly—

It is not the whole Congress that is denying the veterans of this war their right to proper and helpful treatment, it is the Democratic Party, which, through the Democratic administration leaders it has put in key positions, frustrates every effort of the Congress to enact legislation in the veterans' behalf.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 20 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the Hearst newspapers are making a mountain out of a molehill. In the first place, it has been my hope and it is my hope now, that there be no politics in veterans' legislation.

I presume there is no politics among the boys in the foxholes. I presume there is no politics when it comes to fighting our battles on the European front. As far as I am concerned there is no politics when it comes to working out veterans' legislation.

It is amusing to hear men "whistle by the cemetery" on the soldier's vote bill. The very ones who voted against the bill on the floor of the House and voted against the conference report, thereby voted to deny even airmail service to the men in the armed forces who are now preparing to vote in the coming election. I have no apology to make for standing up for the Constitution of the United States, for the rights of the States and for the rights of the men in the armed forces to vote a complete ballot for everything from President to constable. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] sneeringly suggested the other day they might vote for dog catcher. Well, if there is a contest for dog catcher in process and the name of the candidate is on the ticket, it will be their business as to whether they will vote for that particular official or not.

What I was after was to give the members of our armed forces the opportunity to vote a full, free, and complete ballot in a constitutional election. And I succeeded in doing that and at the same time protected the rights of the States.

Mr. Speaker, many years ago, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was created. Hon. Finis J. Garrett, then Democratic Leader of the House, and one of the most able men who ever occupied that position, asked me to take a place on that committee, which I did. I soon became the ranking minority member. Hon. Royal Johnson, of South Dakota, was chairman. We held up as our pole star the best interests of the servicemen, and tried to prevent the passage of legislation that would do them more harm than good, or bring down upon them the criticism of the country. We are doing the same thing now. To this day I have not heard the word "politics" mentioned in that committee since we have been considering this legislation.

This bill consists of 45 pages. One of the main features of it was lifted out of the Wagner bill, introduced by the Senator from New York, almost verbatim, with a few slight changes. The educational provision was lifted out of a bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. You have one situation in Utah; you have another situation in New York; another in Mississippi. You have an unemployment situation in New York, the home of Senator WAGNER. You have another situation in Iowa, another in Kansas, and another in Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia. We are confronted with conditions that must be taken into consideration when it comes to passing measures of this kind.

There is no particular hurry about this bill. Nobody is suffering as a result of our taking time to go through it thoroughly and try to make of it a sane, sound, and workable measure. We are not going to be stampeded by anyone, by any individual or any set of individuals, or by any element of the press that has seen fit to criticize us for taking our time in going through this measure thoroughly. It was my hope that we might get through with it this week. I do not know whether we can or not. We are not going to unnecessarily delay it. We are going to bring the measure to the floor of the House with reasonable expedition when we get through.

During the time I have been chairman of this committee we have had some very difficult problems before us. We went through the period of the depression. We saw the Economy Act passed. By the way, when men jump on me about veterans' legislation, I would like to turn back to the record and see how they voted on the Economy Act. If the economy program had been carried out there probably would have been no criticism. But when this money was taken away from disabled veterans, and equal amounts, or more, given to men who had never worked or never fought either, some of them in this country probably unlawfully, some of them scheming to overthrow this Government, it, of course, created resentment in the minds of the servicemen, and justly so.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAY. I simply wanted to make a brief statement if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I want to say that the second vote I cast when I came to Congress was against the Economy Act. That was a vote for the veterans. I have never cast a vote since I have been here that I thought was against the best interests of the veterans.

I know the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is subject to the same charge that I am, that of giving careful consideration to the legislation before his committee. We ought to have some consolation in the fact that for the past several years we have been designated by the odious term of "rubber stamp" because we passed legislation speedily. Now, when we come to the time when we are trying to give some of it careful consideration, we are lambasted by the newspapers for delay.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] that as far as veterans' legislation is concerned, he is subject to the same criticism I am. That is, if he has erred at all, he has erred on the side of the veteran. I have never found him opposing liberal legislation in their behalf.

During the last war we heard complaints that men were getting $5 or $10 a day for working in defense plants. Servicemen doing the serving in the infantry, in the artillery, or other branches of the service were receiving $30 a month. We undertook to adjust that compensation by paying them an extra $1 a day for service in this country and $1.25 a day for overseas service. It was not a bonus. It was merely adjustment of their compensation. It took 17 years of bitter fighting to get that compensation paid; and the fight over it injured the cause of the veterans generally.

That was the only war America has yet fought which did not produce a President within 10 years after the war closed.

The War of the Revolution produced three Presidents—George Washington, James Monroe, and Andrew Jackson. They were the only Presidents who served in that conflict.

The War of 1812 resulted in the election of Andrew Jackson.

The Black Hawk War brought forth William Henry Harrison.

The War with Mexico produced Zachary Taylor.

The War between the States produced a half dozen Presidents of the United States, beginning with Grant and coming on down to William McKinley—Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Harrison, and McKinley all served in the War between the States. The War of 1898 produced Theodore Roosevelt. But in the 25 years that have passed since the close of the First World War, we never elected a President of the United States from the ranks of the men who served in that conflict. One of the reasons for that fact has been the great amount of criticism and abuse that was heaped upon the veterans because of our attempt to adjust their compensation and to pay them what they were justly due.

Therefore, 2 years ago, when the soldiers' pay bill came before the House, I had made up my mind to adjust the compensation, to some extent at least, in that bill. I kept my amendment to myself for fear somebody might take it up and make a mistake and get into trouble about it. I wanted the amendment passed. I offered that amendment to raise the pay to $50 a month.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I have received at my office, at various times, reports from certain labor organizations who have claimed credit for sponsoring that $50 a month for the soldiers. One particularly, came from the United Auto Workers, headed by Frankensteen.

Mr. RANKIN. That is one "Frankenstein" that did not get in on this proposition. The C. I. O. has been sending out publicity propaganda to the effect that that organization was responsible for raising the base pay of the men in our armed forces to $50 a month. It did not have any more to do with it than it did with winning the Revolutionary War or the War of 1812. I never heard of the C. I. O. being interested in it until long after the amendment had become law. I fought it through here, where it passed by more than 10 to 1. They took it to

conference, reported it out, and we recommitted it by a vote of 10 to 1, with instructions to the House conferees to stand by the action of the House. They took it up in the Senate, and the Senate adopted a similar instruction by a vote of 58 to 20. Then it was accepted by both Houses and became the law. The C. I. O. had nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with it, except to claim credit for it long after it had become law.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Mississippi will recall, too, that at that particular time it was necessary for me to be present on the floor of the House in order for that conference petition to be adopted.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. MAY. And that I came all the way back from Kentucky here for the purpose of agreeing to it, and did agree to it at the time.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; the idea of criticizing the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] about his attitude toward veterans! He came all the way from Kentucky in order to have this conference report called up in order that it might be agreed to.

This bill contains some educational provisions that are stirring great apprehension on the part of some people. We are hearing from the representatives of the States and the various educational institutions of the country. We want an educational provision we cannot only afford to support but that we can defend.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I was going to express the hope that the genteman would discuss in some detail that portion of the bill. There are two educational features in the bill as it stands at the present time. It is proposed to exclude certain educational institutions from those which veterans may attend.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that we are curing that part of the bill; we are going to cure it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. In view of what the gentleman stated and the facts as I know them to be, there is no justification for charges that the Democrats were responsible for holding this bill up.

Mr. RANKIN. No; it is absolutely stupid to accuse the Democrats of holding this bill up; and it is absolutely stupid to accuse the Republicans of holding it up. That is not what is happening. Democrats and Republicans on that committee are unanimous in the belief that we should go through this bill carefully, because it affects the country not only now but it affects these veterans for perhaps a generation to come.

The bill contains a provision for unemployment compensation ranging from $15 per week for a single man to $25 per week for a man with a wife and two children, this compensation to run for a whole year if the veteran be unemployed that long. A great many people where I come from think that would be extremely demoralizing. That means $60 a month for a single man and $100 a month for a man with a wife and two children. This can best be expressed by an observation a man made to me. It went this way: Here are three men who were in the same battery, or in the same company, in the same platoon even; they had the same service. They come home. One goes back into his old job and decides not to ask for any unemployment compensation but decides to go to work. If he goes to work he gets no compensation. But he goes ahead, struggles along, trying to get his affairs together so he can make a living. The second goes out on the hillside and begins tilling his crops, working in the hot sun probably making $25 a month. They look down and see the third fellow on the bank of a creek fishing. He is unemployed. He gets $100 a month. How long will these two men withstand the inducement?

It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. So far as I am concerned I will be frank with you, I would rather see the base pay of an enlisted man extended to all of them for a given time until they could all have an opportunity to readjust themselves back into their former occupations. I believe we ought not to penalize the man who does work and at the same time offer an inducement to the other fellow not to work.

Mr. ROWE. It would be a discrimination.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. Nobody speaks for the men who are in the service. They will speak for themselves when they come back; and God speed the day. Are we going to drive a wedge between them and create friction and stir a fight among them in advance, between the ones who do go back to work and the ones who do not? Oh! I know they will say these men could not find employment. Some of them, of course, could not; some of them could; but why discriminate? It is the easiest thing in the world not to find employment; I have tried it. When I was a boy and the sun was almost straight up and, as the Negroes used to say, when you could see the monkeys dancing between the rows—the heat waves beating up and down—it was an awfully easy matter for me not to find a job. Unless my father said: "John, get out in the field and go to work," it was very easy not to do so.

The people at home are going to try to see that they do get back into their original work, but do not forget this, and here is the thing I think the C. I. O. is so much interested in: If they can shove them off on to the Federal pay roll then the C. I. O. boys can hold the jobs they are now in. Well, when these boys come back I want them to come back and take over their old jobs and not have to ask the Government for a dole.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I hope to God that none of these boys will find themselves without employment when they come back.

Mr. RANKIN. So do I.

Mr. SABATH. There might nevertheless be a lot of them, honest, industrious men who really could not find employment.

Mr. RANKIN. Exactly. I propose to treat them all alike and not penalize the man who does get work.

My views may not be adopted; I do not know. We have some very able individuals on this committee and I find them very honest and sincere. They are laboring to try to work out a solution to this complex problem. I certainly hope we do not make a mistake and do something that will react to the detriment of the veterans in the years to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Another thing, if this measure goes through in its present form there will be a demand for the Government to pay unemployment compensation to these people who go off defense work, people who are not in the armed services at all. If you doubt that talk to the members of the Committee on Labor and you will find out.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The shop workers have that now.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not talking about what they have now, but they will want the Federal Government to pay it.

Our first duty is to the disabled veterans—the maimed, the blind, the wounded, the sick, the disabled—who come out of this conflict. They are going to need hospitalization; and we are going to see that they get it. They must be taken care of first. When it comes to the men who are not disabled we want to see to it that there is no discrimination, but we want to be careful not to set a precedent for those who are now working in defense industries to come in and demand that they be paid out of the Federal Treasury when this war is over.

Then, besides, we have a Government to look after. We are charged with the responsibility for the Federal Treasury. For my part, I do not sympathize at all with those people who think that this Government will collapse after the war. It must not collapse, and it is our duty to see that its finances are kept as well under control as possible. We are going to have a terrible problem when this war is over. As I said before, when it is over and these boys come home, we want them to come back to the same country and the same institutions they left. We want to make it possible for them to go back into the work they quit, we want to make it possible for them to earn a living and to be assured that they will be able to perpetuate this great Republic with all

its free institutions and its free enterprises.

Mr. SABATH. This bill only applies to the armed forces. It does not apply to the others.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill does not, but there is already a movement on foot to spread the same proposition to the unemployed who will be thrown off the pay rolls of these defense industries when the war closes.

I had a letter from Chicago, too, from a man who said that they had been circulating these petitions and they had got thousands of people to sign them who did not know what they were signing. I received that letter from Chicago this morning. Men wire me from all over the country who do not seem to know what the bill is about; they do not know what is in it, they have never read it, they have never studied it, yet they urge speed, speed, speed, when really there is no need for haste. However, there is need for careful and thorough consideration of this proposition before it is brought to the floor of the House and that is what we are going to give you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In other words, the Members of the House and the people at large may understand that this committee is now functioning. We met on Saturday contrary to the usual practice and the committee will continue in session until it is able to bring before this body a bill for which we need not apologize but one of which we can be proud and one that will in every way possible do full justice to the returning servicemen.

Mr. RANKIN. That is our hope.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would not attempt to put words in the gentleman's mouth, but may I ask him, will this measure perhaps come before the House during the week of May 8 rather than next week?

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot say. If we get through in time we might bring it up next Monday. If we do not bring it up next Monday it will probably be the week of May 8 before it comes to the floor of the House. We are going to give notice, in order that Members may be here. I know there are some primaries next Tuesday, tomorrow a week, and that the men involved in those primaries want to be here to vote on the measure, if possible.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that we have a primary in Indiana next week. I hope the bill will not be brought up during that period of time.

Mr. RANKIN. Next Tuesday?

Mr. SPRINGER. A week from tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. I can almost assure the gentleman from Indiana, the gentlemen from Alabama and the Members from Florida whose primaries come on May 2, I feel rather confident we will not be able to get the measure to the floor of the House before that time. If we do not get it here before that time we will certainly feel justified in carrying it over for a few days in order that those Members may have time to return.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I would like to ask the gentleman whether his plan for bringing the bill to the floor of the House contemplates having the bill reported with the committee amendments in advance of the time for consideration? As the gentleman knows, in connection with a great deal of veterans' legislation there is quite a bit of interest and frequently the bills are put on the Consent Calendar or passed with rather brief debate. There are several provisions in this bill that are well worth study and consideration by the Membership and I hope the bill will not be reported so that we may not be able to tell what the committee amendments are.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that whatever bill we report will be printed and he will have ample opportunity to go over it before it is taken up on the floor of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman it would be a wise plan to introduce what is called a clean bill and the committee amendments be incorporated in a new bill, then the membership will have the bill as it is without having to dig in and see what the amendments are.

Mr. RANKIN. That has been the custom ever since the committee was first organized, and when we come to that point I shall consult the members of the committee, as I have done in connection with all other proposals, as to what course we should pursue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

AMENDMENT OF LUXURY-TAX PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that I have introduced a bill to amend the luxury-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

In the Tenth District of Indiana, and in many of the congressional districts throughout the country, private individuals and many groups and organizations maintain shelves in veterans' homes and hospitals, and replenish them from time to time, with candy, cigarettes, and so forth, for the veterans. The funds of these committees are never large, and it is sometimes a problem to stretch them far enough to fulfill the greatest need in this good work which is being done. On many of the articles there is a tax imposed, and in these days of extremely high taxes this burden adds considerably to the cost of the item.

Mr. Speaker, these same articles can be purchased tax-free by the Veterans' Administration and by the American Red Cross when used for distribution to hospitalized veterans. The Army and Navy can also purchase cigarettes without the tax. But there is no provision in the law whereby private organizations may be relieved of the tax on articles they purchase for distribution to veterans' facilities. If they could do so, then their limited funds would go much further, and they would be able to accomplish much more. This situation has been called to my attention by many committees and organizations at home, and it is safe to say that there are literally thousands of similar committees carrying on an identical program all over our country. The Bureau of Internal Revenue states that these organizations can turn their funds over to the officials of the Veterans' Administration facilities or to the American Red Cross for the specific purpose for which they are intended, and in that manner the articles can be purchased tax-free. But for many and various reasons this proposal would not always be the most suitable arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced contains provisions whereby the patriotic organizations will be permitted to purchase articles for supplying the shelves they maintain in those centers operated by the Government for the care of the veterans without having to pay the Federal tax thereon. The work of the people, groups, and the many and various organizations who are so engaged deserves our recognition, and they should be accorded every consideration in their efforts to do the greatest good with the limited funds at their disposal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the passing of Cardinal O'Connell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WASIELEWSKI (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 1 week, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1743 An act to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes and grasses required in the war-food-production program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res 122. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and of sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan;

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 1542. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O.—3 at the United States Naval Construction Training Center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943;

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy;

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps;

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.; and

S. 1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on April 22, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3257. An act to amend Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 25, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Tuesday, April 25, 1944, at 10:30 a. m. for the consideration of S. 1767.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 25, 1944, in room 1011, New House Office Building, to hold hearings on H. R. 2426.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold an executive hearing at 11 a. m. on H. R. 4350.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a public hearing Wednesday, April 26, on H. R. 2448 and private bills at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Thursday, April 27, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 416 House Office Building, to consider H. R. 2987, a bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2, of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1454. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the eighth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended December 31, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 542); to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

1455. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued report entitled "Electric Power Requirements of Industrial Establishments"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1456. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of February 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1457. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of War Mobilization of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $900,000 (H. Doc. No. 543); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1458. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 30, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on channel from Aransas Pass to Corpus Christi, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 10, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 544); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1459. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 14, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Littlejohn Creek and Calaveras River stream groups, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 545); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1460. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 29, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Chunky Creek, Chickasawhay, and Pascagoula Rivers, Miss., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1461. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 25, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Grand Marais Harbor, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1462. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 22, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Santa Isabel Creek, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1463. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the period ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1464. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1465. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of J. Fletcher Lankton and John N. Ziegele against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

1466. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement in duplicate of costs, cancelations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects, compiled as of June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1467. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending June 30, 1944, for the bureaus and offices of this Department; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4646. A bill to provide for the simplification of the individual income tax; without amendment (Rept. No. 1365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies pursuant to House Resolution 102 submitting the fifth intermediate report (Rept. No. 1366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 513. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses to Mabel Soule, wife of Paul Soule, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1367). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 30 submitting interim report (Rept. No. 1368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); without amendment (Rept. No. 1369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 735. A bill to confer to certain persons who served in a civilian capacity under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4108. A bill relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1371). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4109. A bill to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to receiving of stolen public property; with amendment (Rept. No. 1372). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4517. A bill to remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 3998. A bill authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions; without amendment (Rept. 1374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4647. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 23), as amended by the Stabilization Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 765), to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive prices; salary and wage rises; price, salary, and wage dislocations; inflationary tendencies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4648. A bill to extend the Federal Aid and Highway Acts to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4649. A bill to provide regular furlough periods for members of the armed forces on duty overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 4650. A bill to furnish conscientious objectors a special form of honorable discharge from the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4651. A bill to amend subsection (e) of section 2000, subchapter A, chapter 15, title 26, of the Internal Revenue Code, known as the luxury tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 514. Resolution to investigate the meat and food industries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 515. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1336, current session, being the fifth intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, House of Representatives, submitted pursuant to House Resolution 102; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Municipal Assembly of San Sebastian, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman McGEHEE's resolution, requesting the immediate removal from office of Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell and the appointment of a new Governor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Hatillo, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman McGEHEE's resolution, requesting the immediate removal from office of Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Vieques, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution, requesting the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico and the appointment of a new Governor; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Camuy, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman McGEHEE's resolution, requesting the removal of Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Orocovis, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman McGEHEE's resolution, demanding the immediate removal of Rexford G. Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico and the appointment of a new Governor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4652. A bill for the relief of Frank Lore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4653. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Calogeras; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4654. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Tusow; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 4655. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Justine Englert Dolan and the legal guardian of Frederick S. Englert, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 4656. A bill granting a pension to Mary Quirk; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5537. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Andrew Maguire and others, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5538. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Josephine McMahon and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5539. Also, petition of Mrs. W. Heide, Jr., and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5540. Also, petition of Julia Fillo and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5541. Also, petition of J. J. Openlander and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5542. Also, petition of A. S. Preusch and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5543. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution submitted by Inez Watson, clerk, House of Representatives, of Columbia, S. C., requesting the Office of Price Administration not to release price ceilings on watermelons until further hearings are held; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5544. Also, resolution submitted by Inez Watson, clerk, House of Representatives, of Columbia, S. C., memorializing the National Congress to pass World War No. 2 bill of rights; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5545. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of sundry residents of Liscomb and Marshall County, Iowa, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5546. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 3, West Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 109 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504), providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5547. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition submitted by John R. Beehn, secretary, West Salem Chapter, No. 11, American War Dads, West Salem, Ill., and signed by 41 members and citizens of that community supporting various bills now pending before the Congress

for the benefit and welfare of those now in the armed forces; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5548. By Mr. JUDD: Petition of over 100 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., and vicinity, opposing passage of House bill 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5549. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council of San Francisco, regarding Government employing persons inducted into the land and naval forces of the United States for purposes other than outlined in Selective Service Act in order that they may be properly trained; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5550. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of R. W. Ballard, director of Hull House, Chicago, Ill., and 2,740 other persons residing in the city of Chicago, respectfully petitioning Congress to reenact the price-control law, and the authority extended to control prices and rent ceilings and to stabilize wages; and thus prevent a run-away inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5551. By Mr. WILLEY: Six petitions of various and sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, favoring the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all being, at noontide, which is Thy gracious dawn, we would join the undaunted pilgrims of the ages whose God is our salvation; we would be of that innumerable company who in darkness drear have found in Thee the one true light. In the dusty caravan of another day's journey over trackless sands we would pause at this altar our fathers builded and where burns the sacred fire, that we may keep the bright torch of truth and faith aflame amid the thick gloom that shuts us in. May that truth make us free from the prejudices which blind our eyes to the things which are excellent, across the false barriers of race and creed. May that faith lead us on as a pillar of cloud and of fire to the shining city of human brotherhood, whose ways are peace, whose citizenship rests only on character and its laws on human good.

In these days of destiny, into Thy hands we commit our feeble endeavors to lead the Nation toward the beckoning towers of that city which haunts our dreams; for its luring plan is Thine, and the strength to labor while it is called day is Thine, and unless the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it. Under the Master Builder make us strong to endure, that we faint not nor fear. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 24, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1757) to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia."

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2116) to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to exemption of property from judicial process, the assignment of salary or wages, and the advance payment of salary or wages for the purpose of preventing attachment or garnishment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF REGISTRANTS DEFERRED FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS BY SELECTIVE SERVICE BOARDS

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the registrants deferred as of January 15, 1944, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Alien Property Custodian and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

ANNIVERSARY OF ENACTMENT OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION—PETITIONS

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying that appropriate reference be made in Congress on May 3, the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution in 1791, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present petitions for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 169 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama	52
Michigan	21
Minnesota	68
Montana	20
New Jersey	1
North Carolina	2
Pennsylvania	1
Texas	3
Vermont	1
Total	169

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 2,364 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

California	95
Colorado	31
Delaware	35
Florida	90
Illinois	410
Maine	113
Maryland	28
Michigan	12
Minnesota	665
Montana	23
Nebraska	114
New Jersey	3
New York	191
North Carolina	2
Ohio	5
Pennsylvania	396
Rhode Island	21
South Dakota	2
Texas	66
Vermont	41
Washington	21
Total	2,364

AMERICA'S HEROES' HONOR DAY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an interesting letter from E. R. Davis, of Eugene, Oreg., setting forth the plan to have July 4 accepted as America's Heroes' Honor Day. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE, OREG., *April 15, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Fourth of July is our only American Independence Day, and it seems of late years we have forgotten this great nationally American-created day, what it stands for, and what its principles mean to the native- and foreign-born. It is recognized as just another holiday, but its background is formed by the great American individuals who fought, sacrificed life and liberty that this day would be ours to enjoy its traditions and principles of an independent country, home, friendship, liberty, and a free life.

Let us not forget today the millions of Americans fighting the bloodiest war of all time, which they are doing so that we may still have a glorious Fourth of July and an American Independence Day.

We would appreciate your kindness in giving the following subject your consideration, and should it meet with your approval, your support of same would insure its success, and tend to bring our great natal day nearer to the hearts and minds of the American people. It would create a renewed interest and pay a great tribute to our fighting forces and leaders, both past and present, honoring them, our people, and our Nation.

May I suggest that we make this Fourth of July 1944 a national honor day to honor our courageous fighting forces all over the world and to our own traditional independence by asking every American to wear a little distinguishing ribbon or flower, showing our love, respect, and individual appreciation and support for all of our service men and women, their country, and the principles they are fighting for.

This distinguishing honor can be displayed by wearing a 3-inch ribbon or a flower on the lapel of the coat or shirt; also, it would be very appropriate for women to wear a flower in their hair on the left side. Color should be red, white, or blue; and in the case of an individual who has lost a loved one or a friend in the service, a small black ribbon displayed with a white attached would be very appropriate.

The various designs, bows, or straight ribbon should be selected and prepared at home to suit the individual's taste; but everybody should display the flower or ribbon on the Fourth of July.

This suggestion can be nationally inaugurated by the endorsement of the President of the United States, the Governors of the States, fraternal and patriotic organizations, newspapers, magazines, and radio commentators by asking the people to participate in this most patriotic and honorable gesture.

You know it took great soldiers, leaders, and statesmen to give us this Independence Day. Again great men and women are in this global war to preserve this great Independence Day.

Very sincerely yours,

E. R. DAVIS, *Sponsor.*

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTIONS OF REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ST. LAWRENCE COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and ask to have referred to the appropriate committee resolutions favoring the St. Lawrence Seaway adopted by the Republican county committee and the Board of Supervisors of St. Lawrence County, N. Y.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PRESENTED AT MEETING OF THE ST. LAWRENCE REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE, HELD IN CANTON, N. Y., APRIL 6, 1944

Whereas the Maker of the Universe has placed in our locality certain resources, the most important of which are the potentialities of the St. Lawrence River and the deposits of minerals of the finest quality; and

Whereas the development of these resources, either now or in the post-war period, will have a stabilizing effect not only on the State of New York but on the whole northeastern section of the United States; and

Whereas this is a feasible project and will furnish employment for many people during the readjustment period after the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this St. Lawrence County Committee be recorded as being vitally interested in the immediate development of the St. Lawrence River, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators of the United States and to our New York State Republican Committee.

Resolution 8

Whereas the American portion of the international section of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project lies wholly within the bounds of the county of St. Lawrence in the State of New York; and

Whereas our St. Lawrence County people have constantly before them the magnificent spectacle of the mighty St. Lawrence rushing past them to the sea, unharnessed and mostly unused; a tragic spectacle of waste during this period of needed conservation of our natural resources and their best adaptation to the uses and needs of us all; and

Whereas it has been with much satisfaction that we have learned of the unanimous adoption (March 15–16, 1944) by our New York State Legislature of the concurrent resolution favoring prompt development of the St. Lawrence River power resources; and

Whereas all the people of the county of St. Lawrence are first, last, and always for the development of the St. Lawrence River at the first opportune time, which time we believe to be in the coming years of post-war reconstruction; and

Whereas the Aiken bill (U. S. Senate bill 1385) authorizes such development at such time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of St. Lawrence County urges the passage of the Aiken bill (S. 1385) and respectfully petitions the chairman and members of the Commerce Committee's subcommittee now having it in charge to take prompt and favorable action thereon; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators JOHN H. OVERTON, GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, JAMES M. MEAD, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, and HAROLD H. BURTON, chairman and members of the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee; also to Senator Robert F. Wagner, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Congressman Clarence E. Kilburn, and to Senator George D. Aiken, sponsor of the bill.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT—ADDITIONAL COPIES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 283, providing for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of the committee print of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning of the Senate, dealing with post-war highway construction and the Federal Government's responsibility and part in that field. The report was prepared by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] who is a member of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning of the Senate. The demand for copies of this report has been most unusual. The cost for an additional 1,000 copies is estimated at $246.19. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 283), submitted by Mr. GEORGE on April 24, 1944, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That 1,000 additional copies of the committee print of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning of the Senate, relative to the role of the Federal Government in highway development, being an analysis of the needs and proposals for post-war action, shall be printed for the use of said committee.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 24, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan;

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O–3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943;

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy;

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps;

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.; and

S. 1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

James W. Lauderdale, of the District of Columbia, to be People's Counsel, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry citizens and a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 1866) to provide monetary benefits for certain enlisted men of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard discharged for service-connected disabilities, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2116) to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to exemption of property from judicial process, the assignment of salary or wages, and the advance payment of salary or wages for the purpose of preventing attachment or garnishment, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

INVESTIGATION AS TO ADEQUACY OF THE TELEGRAPH SERVICE

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 285), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Whereas the telegraph industry is a vital cog in the machinery of our national production for war; and

Whereas the domestic telegraph industry has not met the service standards found by the Board of War Communications to be essential "for the national defense and security and for the successful prosecution of the war"; and

Whereas the inadequate service rendered by the telegraph industry threatens our Nation's ability to produce and move the matériel of war with the required speed and efficiency; and

Whereas the telegraph industry has now made application to the Board of War Communications for revocation of the prohibition against handling nonessential greeting and congratulatory telegrams, which prohibition by eliminating millions of nonessential messages yearly succeeded in clearing the wires for war traffic; and

Whereas such a request represents a serious lack of responsibility on the part of the telegraph monopoly toward its wartime obligations to the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the present state of telegraph service with a view to determining its adequacy for the war effort and the reasons why the telegraph company petitioned the Board of War Communications for permission to add additional and unnecessary strains upon our domestic telegraph system. Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL AID TO RUSSIA—SHIPMENT OF SEED TO MOSCOW

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an exhibition showing American agricultural aid to Russia under the auspices of Russian War Relief. The exhibition, sponsored jointly by Russian War Relief and the Department of Agriculture, opens this week in the patio at the Agricultural Building — Administration — and will probably be continued through May 10, from 9:30 a. m. until 5:30 p. m.

In the Wheat Belt, particularly in the high plains, our American farmers always have taken a great interest in Russian agriculture. Our best winter wheat was developed from a strain brought to Kansas and other States in the Wheat Belt from Russia. It is particularly pleasant to me to know that among the shipments of goods to Russia from the United States, there have gone 4,400,000 pounds of seeds for replanting the devastated areas of our Russian friends and Allies. I am sure the exihibit will prove interesting, and I hope also helpful in cementing the friendship of the Russian and American peoples. The more we know of each other, and the better our mutual understanding, the better the prospects for development of a peaceful civilization, succeeding what we have today. I hope my colleagues, and many others, will take occasion to visit this exhibition; I believe it will be worth while.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a radiogram dated February 29, 1944, from Mr. Alexander Perevezentsev, the senior agronomist of the Soviet Agriculture Department, Moscow, telling of the excellent results from seeds sent in 1943 to Moscow through the American organization, Russian War Relief.

There being no objection, the radiogram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last year the American organization, Russian War Relief, sent the Soviet Union a large consignment of various kinds of seed. Part of the consignment, chiefly vegetable seed, was sent to Moscow. What was their subsequent history?

Spring of 1943 wasn't easy. Hundreds of thousands of Moscow citizens took spades and broke many thousands of acres of ground around Moscow and even in the city itself to increase the winter supply of greens and vegetables. Enough potato seed was mustered for these victory gardens, but there was a drastic shortage of vegetable seed. You may imagine our joy when a gift of seed arrived from America. The people of Moscow were determined to extract the utmost benefit from this fraternal aid sent by our American friends. Among seed received were three kinds of carrot—Danvers, Oxheart, and Empire. Early Wonder table beet, Golden Acre cabbage, Table turnip, Icicle radish, and three varieties of beans.

It wasn't without agitation that we unpacked these first seed parcels which made the long and difficult wartime ocean journey. There was some anxiety as to how they'd stood the trip. However, our first glance at the contents reassured us. The seed was clean and the packing excellent. There was no time to waste, for the sowing season was already well advanced. Some seed, such as onion and cabbage, had to be sown without preliminary tests so that a full report of their behavior on Moscow soil cannot be given.

But most seed was put through preliminary laboratory tests with these results. Purity was extraordinarily high. The rate of growth was, respectively, 65, 61, 84, and 98 percent. Sprouting was 75, 74, 79, and 98 percent. By accepted Russian standards, this is first class, particularly for imported seed. It is noteworthy that no harmful ingredients such as weed seed, disease spores, and the like were found in any parcels.

Dense and even sprouting of seed sown in Moscow victory gardens and the food farms of Moscow industrial plants showed that the Moscow seed control station, which made these tests in its laboratories, hadn't erred in its valuation.

I personally tested beet and radish in my own garden. Early Wonder beet is, indeed, a wonder. I sowed it of necessity late in May, but in the fall results weren't inferior to those obtained from seed planted a fortnight earlier. I must mention the tender taste of this beet and its fine cooking qualities. Icicle radish also was distinguished by its lusciousness and flavor, which weren't lost even when sown in the middle of August and gathered at the end of September, when the first frosts had already come.

A high opinion of American seed is also expressed by all other agronomists with whom I had occasion to speak on the subject. Their opinion is valuable because it is based on cultivation on a field scale and not in small plots. I can illustrate this by some written comments I received.

Ivan Orekhov, agronomist of the greenery board of the Moscow Soviet, obtained a yield of 12 tons per acre of Danvers carrots on the board's farm even though not all measures of cultivation, such as storing qualities of Danvers, entitles it to a high place. Yield of the Empire variety was average, but its taste was excellent owing to its high sugar content, and its fine orange color delights the eye.

Orekhov, like myself, sowed Early Wonder beet at the end of May, and the results he obtained equaled mine. A fine crop of 13 tons of this beet per acre was secured on the farm of the water and drainage board of the Moscow Soviet, their agronomist, Vasily Zolotaryov, reports.

High opinion has also been expressed of Golden Acre cabbage. V. Shevpelyuk, agronomist on the farm of the city health department, reports a yield of 15 tons per acre. This cabbage keeps well in a fresh state throughout the winter. A crop of 10 tons per acre of Danvers carrot was obtained on this same farm.

Beans generally don't ripen around Moscow owing to climatic conditions. But Nikolai Drozhin, of the heat and power department of the Moscow Soviet, sowed all four American varieties and obtained a fully ripe seed of the Goldenhill variety. He sowed 1 pound, from which he obtained 60 pounds of seed, which was nearly twice as big as that which he planted. He failed to get ripe seed from other varieties, but all the same his crop was big with large pods and soft shells.

In the spring of 1943 Moscow victory gardeners sowed about 14 tons of American vegetable seed, which represents about 40 percent of the total sown. As you see, aid given by our overseas friends was considerable, and we're deeply grateful.

We will try to make some return. A number of experimental stations and individual experimenters are interested in American seed varieties. We will continue our work on them this spring, and we presume that by means of crop breeding and selection we will succeed in obtaining new varieties. Undoubtedly most valuable of them will in due course recross the ocean to add to the seed varieties of our American friends who have given us such sterling aid in our time of need.

USE OF WATERS OF THE MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a double editorial which appeared in the Miles City (Mont.) Daily Star of April 9, 1944, under the caption of "The Jesse James boys ride yet—not again." The Post-Dispatch editorial is answered by the Miles City Star during

which considerable light is thrown on the controversy over the use of western water for navigation versus irrigation.

The editorial deals with a controversy over the waters of the Missouri River, a controversy which revolves about two major issues: First, whether the limited waters of the upper reaches and tributaries of that stream, and in fact of all western streams, shall be used locally for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes in the arid and semiarid States, or for maintaining a navigation channel in the lower reaches of the stream; second, whether the Federal Government is to assume complete domination of the western streams and sell water to the States, municipalities, and water users generally, as proposed in a bill now before the House, or whether the Western States through which the streams flow are to have something to say concerning the appropriation and use of their waters.

The controversy involves a principle that affects the streams of all Western States. I believe that the editorial reflects the sentiment of a vast majority of the people throughout the 17 arid and semiarid States of the West.

I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JESSE JAMES BOYS RIDE YET—NOT AGAIN

If memory serves us correctly they laid Jesse James away down in Missouri, after an end had been put to his banditry. Since that time the Missourians have used the final hide-out of Jesse to lure tourists into the State where they may gape in awe and wonderment at what could hardly be called the shrine of a saint. Not that the Missouri boys who got to Hollywood haven't tried to make Jesse a saint. They did a right smart job of it in the moving-picture industry, but most of the rest of us still held our nose and said: "No dice!"

Jesse was a piker alongside of the twentieth century James boys who want to make off with the waters of the Missouri River Basin, for their private game of "float my boats and I'll float yours." We leave it to you if this is not correct, after you have read the following editorial reprinted from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 18. However, before giving you the editorial we pause long enough to pay our respects to the writer who concocted it. The only picture that we can conjure up of him is that he has long ears, a long face, a tail and cries hee-haw in a loud voice. For no other kind of a person would display such complete ignorance of the subject of irrigation and its relation to the future development of the Missouri River Basin.

We will now let you read the Selfishness That Defeats Itself editorial, the work of the above-described writer. Then we will let you have a bit of really factual information that didn't come out of a haymow, or wherever it is that those things with long ears and hee-haw voices get their alleged information.

The editorial:

"SELFISHNESS THAT DEFEATS ITSELF

"The Missouri River plan of the Army engineers, which came before the House Flood Control Committee this week, is of its highest importance to the people of the Missouri River Valley for the very reason that it is not a flood control plan or an irrigation plan, or a power development plan, or a navigation plan, but a plan of river development taking in all these fields in which a great river can be made of maximum service.

"Members of Congress representing States on the upper portion of the river have already given notice that they intend to put their small sectional interests first and to demand priority on the water of the Missouri River for irrigation.

"It is not enough to say that this sort of view is small and selfish. The view is not even intelligently selfish. It is just as destructive of the local selfish interests which it seeks to serve as of the larger interest which it deliberately attacks.

"As long as the waters of the Missouri River are not controlled, water that should be available for irrigation in the dry season when it is needed on the land is going to continue to be wasted in disastrous floods during wet seasons.

"If and when the Missouri River is controlled, the use of its waters will be augmented for the purpose of irrigation as well as for the purposes of flood control, navigation, and power.

"The people of the Missouri Valley who depend upon irrigation from the Missouri River and its tributaries should acquaint themselves with the facts. If their representatives in Congress oppose the development of the Missouri River for all purposes on the grounds that they are upholding local irrigation interests, they are ignorantly and unintentionally, but, at the same time, actively, performing just about the worst possible service for the interests of local irrigation."

Now, then, let us get down to some of the "brass tacks" in this situation. There is a lay-out that plays all ends against the middle in congressional circles year in and year out, administration after administration, in one of the juiciest pieces of pork-barrel rolling that any nation has ever known. Its ramifactions are so extensive and of such long standing that it would take volumes to record even a slight history of what has come to be known as the rivers and harbors bill. However, the interest on the seacoasts who want harbors dredged get together with the interests on the inland waterways who want some kind of Government subsidized transportation for their own private business, and between them they put over the rivers and harbors bill in every Congress. It has got to be so enveloping in its scope that they now call it the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. Webster says that an omnibus is "a large heavy public conveyance," and we understand why they applied the word "omnibus" to the rivers and harbors bill.

The rest of the United States—and there is a considerable portion of it yet that has not been "omnibused" into the rivers and harbors "omnibus"—hasn't much idea of what goes on under the guise of this so-called legislation. If it knew the size of the pipe line this organized lay-out has into the Public Treasury, it would stop fighting the war abroad and turn its attention to the army of blood suckers who operate under the "omnibus bill."

It has been a juicy, indolent life all these years for those who have been engaged in rivers and harbors work. But it appears they are either running out of places from which to get the juice or else it has been so lucrative, they want to extend their activities to other fields. Whichever it is makes little difference, because these predatory interests of the Mississippi and lower Missouri River Basins have already extended their tentacles into the life blood of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming. And that point is where we propose to stand up and fight to retain the God-given waters of the treams of Montana, at least long enough to use them for the irrigation of our arid lands. We do not propose to have another disaster year like 1934 in Montana because the Jesse James boys of the Mississippi and lower Missouri want to "run off our water." There was a way of dealing with fellows in the old days who "run off our cattle." We may have to resort to some such method again to keep the Jesse James' of St. Louis from running off with the last natural resource that we have. The so-called Pick plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin is nothing more or less than a legalized Jesse James' plundering expedition into Montana for the stream flow of our rivers. The boys of South Dakota can follow the flesh pots of the downstream schemers if they want to but we are not going to do so. When they wake up it will be too late to find out that something that could make their State agriculturally great, has been taken from them forever. Then they can go out and sail their empty boats down into Iowa and bring back what Iowa wants to sell them. Iowa will say thanks and send back for more empty boats.

To show you the cunning and ruthlessness of the river folks, we quote in a following editorial, from a letter of protest sent to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch by Floyd O. Hagie, secretary of the National Reclamation Association. You will see that Mr. Hagie spent considerable time running down the hidden cats and dogs in this omnibus river and harbor bill and when you get through reading his comments, you will see what a complete steal of the stream flow of Montana and Wyoming, the omnibus legislation proposes. It is unbelievable that any set of United States Congressmen would lend themselves to such devilishness. Maybe they have been hoodwinked, but if they have it is high time they got the blinkers off their eyes and took a look at what is going on right under their noses. It is because of this steal that we propose to the States of Montana and Wyoming, that they employ every device known to the legal mind—and there are a lot of them—to block this unprecedented highway robbery of our irrigation water.

It has been recorded that the States of Nebraska and Kansas spent 20 years in court, wrangling over the waters of the Republican River. If that is what the St. Louis pirates want, then the State of Montana can well afford to take the next 20 years out of the "march of time" and at least protect our rights that way. By the end of 20 years, the Jesse James boys of the twentieth century may have been laid away in another unhallowed grave for the tourists to gape at, as was the original Jesse. In those 20 years the offspring of the modern James' may get enough religion under their hides that they will give up the idea of plundering the countryside—be it for dollars or river water. Then after those legal devices have been exhausted we can still resort to the vigilante doctrine for the protection of our property. Once before the Territory of Montana was ignored by the high and mighty powers in Washington, but it found ways and means of cleaning up the poachers who encroached on its fair lands. Now again we are being ignored by a parcel of water-borne transportation poachers who propose to move in on us and make off with our property. We think the State of Montana will again become vigilante-minded if this idea is promoted with regard to the waters of the streams of our State.

At any rate we are going to protect that natural resource to the last obstructionist tactic that we can devise, and so serve notice on the Jesse James boys on the downstream States.

When Floyd Hagie, previously referred to, got through poking through the musty records of Congress he unearthed some mighty interesting facts, which he took time out to set forth for the misinformed editorial writer of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The following editorial is part of what Floyd Hagie said to the "hee-haw" boy on the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. We suggest you take time out to read it.

WHAT FLOYD O. HAGIE FOUND OUT

Mr. Hagie, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association, wrote a letter under date of March 15, to the publisher

of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch protesting the inferences and statements of the article quoted in the foregoing editorial. In part, Mr. Hagie said: "There is not, to my knowledge, any dispute now over the Missouri River development program which is outlined in the House flood-control bill. The dispute is over lines 11, 12, and 13 on page 21 of the omnibus river and harbor bill (H. R. 3961) which was reported out without formal hearings. The three lines read as follows:

"Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth: House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress."

The above is harmless language, to which no one could take offense until it is coupled up with the congressional committee report on H. R. 3961, which carried the following language:

"MISSOURI RIVER, SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH (H. DOC. 214, 76TH CONG.)

"Recommends the adoption of a project for Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth to provide for a channel of 9-foot depth and width not less than 300 feet to be obtained by revetment of banks, construction of permeable dikes to contract and stabilize the waterway, cut-offs to eliminate long bends, closing of minor channels, removal of snags, and dredging as required, at an estimated construction cost of $6,000,000 in addition to the amounts previously authorized, and with no increase in the annual maintenance of $4,500,000.

"Completion of the authorized project for regulating works and operation of the Fort Peck Reservoir to maintain a low-water flow of 32,000 cubic feet per second at Kansas City will assure a navigable depth of 6 feet below Sioux City, with a depth of 9 feet available intermittently over four-fifths of the entire distance. At this additional cost, relatively small in comparison with that already incurred under the 6-foot project, and at no increase in annual maintenance costs, necessary extensions of some of the controlling works can be made that will assure a minimum depth of 9 feet throughout. A substantial commerce is already developing on the partially completed 6-foot channel, with indications of steady increase as general economic conditions improve. The savings in transportation charges on the additional commerce that would be attracted to an assured 9-foot depth, savings from elimination of the cost of transshipment of freight to and from points on the connecting deeper channels, and the reduced operating costs resulting from movements in deeper waters are ample justification of the additional expenditure required to carry the improvement to the same standards as are authorized for the other major waterways of the Mississippi system."

Once the three lines in the bill were discovered and fully interpreted by the two paragraphs quoted above it was natural that the representatives of the upper Basin States would inquire into the matter further. Finally representatives of the upper Basin States, whom your editorial accuses of giving "notice that they intend to put their interests first and to demand priority on the water of the Missouri River for irrigation," were able to locate one of the few remaining copies of House Document No. 214. This House Document leads to another similar document and finally the Upper Basin representative finds himself staring in blank amazement at the following paragraphs from House Documents that are all a part of law once they are referred to in a bill which passes Congress, and these documents are all referred to in one way or another:

"Page 199, paragraph 495, House Document 238, Seventy-third Congress:

" 'The results of the study contained in appendix XI indicate that a channel of between 8 and 9 feet can be obtained, by the present method of open-channel regulation, in the section from Kansas City to Hermann, with a discharge of 35,000 second-feet at Kansas City. * * *' "

"Page 242, paragraph 673, House Document 238, Seventy-third Congress:

" 'Several methods for the provision of a greater depth than 6 feet for future navigation have been given consideration. A navigable channel of between 8 and 9 feet in depth could be obtained by the method of open-channel regulation described in paragraph 666, with a discharge of 30,000 second-feet at Yankton. This discharge could be maintained by enlarging the Fort Peck Reservoir to a capacity of 17,000,000 acre-feet, which would involve a total cost of $84,155,000.' " (Remember, this was by the Seventy-third Congress, before the Fort Peck Dam was built.)

A prior claim for navigation of 30,000 cubic second-feet at Yankton, S. Dak., or of 35,000 cubic second-feet at Kansas City, then, of course, immediately aroused the curiosity of the upper basin representative as to just what the total annual yield of the Missouri River would be if all the floodwater were considered. He turns to the United States Geological Survey for these figures and he finds that the total annual yield for the last 14 years is only 32,520 cubic second-feet at Kansas City. In other words, the 9-foot channel which the downstream navigation interests were thus attempting to lay prior claim to through three innocent-looking lines in the river and harbor bill would actually have average flow of the Missouri River for the last dedicated for all time more than the total 14 years.

"Everyone is agreed that the Missouri River must be controlled, harnessed, and put to work for the area. The dispute now is over the lower basin interests attempting through the river and harbor bill to dedicate in perpetuity the entire remaining flow of the river to navigation and such other uses as do not interfere therewith, but primarily in the lower area of the basin.

"If the floodwaters of the upper Missouri were stored higher up on the stream and used to irrigate 4,400,000 acres of irrigable land which is available, most of that water would return to the stream and would still be available for power development and for navigation. Once it is dedicated to navigation, the upstream use for irrigation is wholly out of the picture for all time to come. But it can be used over and over again if you start its use in the upper basin."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WEEKS BEFORE NEW BEDFORD POST, NO. 1, AMERICAN LEGION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Let Us Here Highly Resolve," delivered by Senator WEEKS, before the New Bedford Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the post, April 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NECESSITY FOR NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article entitled "A Military Necessity," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of April 25, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FACTS ABOUT THE AUTHOR OF "UNDER COVER"—ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article entitled "Uncovering Under Cover: The Real Facts About the Smear Book's Odd Author," written by John T. Flynn and published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF THE C. I. O.

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article entitled "Hillman Rallies Midwest's C. I. O."; published in the magazine PM of September 20, 1943; and an Associated Press dispatch dated Chicago, January 24, 1944, under the heading "C. I. O. Actionists Seek Isolationists' Defeat," which appear in the Appendix.]

EVALUATING THE COTTON CROP—EDITORIAL FROM THE STATE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Evaluating the Cotton Crop," from The State for April 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Davis	Overton
Andrews	Downey	Radcliffe
Austin	Eastland	Revercomb
Bailey	Ellender	Robertson
Ball	Ferguson	Russell
Bankhead	George	Shipstead
Barkley	Gerry	Smith
Bilbo	Green	Stewart
Brewster	Hawkes	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Bushfield	La Follette	Vandenberg
Butler	McClellan	Wagner
Byrd	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	McKellar	Weeks
Caraway	Maloney	Wheeler
Chandler	Maybank	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Mead	White
Clark, Mo.	Murdock	Wiley
Connally	Nye	Wilson
Cordon	O'Daniel	
Danaher	O'Mahoney	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida

[Mr. PEPPER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Navy Department appropriation bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations represents a rather unusual action on the part of the committee. We usually add to the sum total of the appropriations in the bill which we submit to the Senate. In this instance we have recommended a reduction in the sum total. It is true it is not very much of a reduction, being somewhat in excess of $2,400,000.

The Senate committee made diligent inquiry into different phases of the bill as passed by the House, and in the light of the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget. The Navy Department expressed its satisfaction with the items of appropriation as passed by the House, and asked for no increases. We, therefore, confined our investigation to determining whether or not there should be any decrease, with the result that we found it was necessary to recommend a reduction of only $2,400,000, in round figures.

The House committee made a very thorough investigation of the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and devoted considerable time to the hearings on the bill, and as a result the House reduced the estimates proposed by the Bureau of the Budget, in cash appropriations and authorizations, by a net of a little more than $800,000,000.

Still, the amount of the bill is colossal. It is over $32,600,000,000. It represents the largest Navy Department appropriation bill in the history of this country, and the largest navy appropriation or allocation of funds in the history of any country in any one year.

I think the bill represents the peak of appropriations that will be necessary for the Navy, because we have succeeded so far with our objectives, toward the construction of combatant and other ships, and of aircraft, guns, munitions, and all equipment, that the probability is that from now on, although the war in which we are engaged may last considerably longer than is anticipated, there will be a reduction in the annual appropriations for the Navy Department.

This bill, with its stupendous outlay, represents, in a sense, a victory drive on the part of the Congress of the United States in this tremendous war effort. It is an assurance to our allies of our continued, intensive cooperation, and it is also a warning to the enemies of the Republic that Uncle Sam is no laggard in this grim business of war.

I should like to say to the Senators that I hope that after the amendments to the bill shall have been considered and when final vote is to be taken on the bill they will remain in the Chamber because I think it would be proper that we take a yea and nay vote, a record vote, unanimously supporting the bill, in order that we may demonstrate that the Congress of the United States is undivided in its purpose to bring the war to a victorious conclusion as speedily as possible. I hope, I am confident, there will not be a single vote cast against the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator tell me in a general way how much of the $32,000,000,000 is for construction and replacement on the one hand, and how much is for maintenance on the other?

Mr. OVERTON. I can, and shall be happy to do so. The bill carries a sum somewhat in excess of $8,000,000,000 for new ship construction. It carries for new shore construction a little more than $1,700,000,000. For the Navy personnel it carries an appropriation of $6,228,000,000. For the maintenance and operation of the fleet it carries $5,714,000,000. For the Marine Corps it carries $1,143,000,000, and for the Coast Guard over $438,000,000. Those are the major items of the bill. In addition the bill provides for new aircraft procurement of over 24,000 aircraft.

The bill also provides for the construction of some 20,000 additional landing craft. We have today about 20,000 landing craft, and we are providing for doubling that number. The reason for doing so is that this new venture in modern warfare is very essential. The landing craft have accomplished wonderful things in connection with the conduct of the war. As Senators will recall, in World War No. 1 we had to fight in only 1 theater of war, and that was confined to the Continent of Europe. We landed our forces on friendly soil, and they were received with open arms. But in this war, on the European Continent we have to land our troops on hostile shores and in the face of enemy guns. In the broad Pacific we have had to land our troops against the Japs who were entrenched on the different islands and islets and atolls in that almost limitless expanse of water. Had it not been for the operation of these landing craft it would have been impossible to accomplish what we have already accomplished.

I wish to state further in connection with these landing craft that they are manned by young men, many of them in their teens, who a short while ago were thumbing their lessons and studying for examinations in our high schools and colleges and academies. They are today performing wonderful acts of heroism, because they are the vanguards and the spearheads in the landing of the armed forces of the United States in the different theaters of war.

Mr. President, I had the honor, as chairman of the subcommittee handling the Navy Department appropriation bill, to report the first bill brought in after Pearl Harbor, in January 1942. The year prior to that the annual appropriation bill was something over $3,000,000,000. The bill I reported in January 1942 on behalf of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, came a little after the Pearl Harbor disaster and aggregated more than $23,000,000,000, an increase of some $20,000,000,000. Since then we have been reporting bills in excess of $23,000,000,000, gradually adding to the annual appropriations made for the Navy, until today we have reached the stupendous and peak sum of over thirty-two and one-half billion dollars.

Since July 1940, which was the beginning of the emergency period, there has been appropriated for the Navy, in round figures, $94,000,000,000. Sixty-five percent of that $94,000,000,000 has been translated into ships and planes, into guns, into munitions, into supplies, into air bases, into naval facilities, and everything necessary to strengthen our Navy and make it the powerful force it is today.

What was necessary for us to do? We had to construct and repair shipyards, munition plants, and factories. We had to overhaul the existing shipyards, munition plants, and factories, rebuild them and convert them, and build new and additional ones.

I think the United States has in the short period of 3 years, accomplished marvels in building up its naval force. There are today 966,000 men and women employed alone in the building and repairing of our ships. Back of them there are in subsidiary manufacturing plants at least twice that number, so we have some 3,000,000 men and women now engaged directly and indirectly in the building and repairing of our ships.

Our monthly tonnage production today is twice the annual output in ships 3 years ago. I repeat that statement for emphasis. Today we are building monthly more ships than the annual output 3 years ago, in fact the monthly output today is twice the annual output of 3 years ago.

I wish to make a further statement, and I do so by authority. By the end of 1945 the combatant strength of our Navy will be as great as the combatant strength of the combined navies of all the rest of the world. With our incomplete Navy, I think we have so far accomplished a great deal. We can recall how during the early days of the war the enemy's submarines were sinking our merchantmen along the Atlantic coast and along the South American coast, and how air-raid warnings were being sounded on the Pacific coast. We have had to guard the lines of communication along the Atlantic seaboard, along the Pacific seaboard, along the South American coasts, and along the North American shores. Furthermore, we have had to guard and protect the life line of

ships carrying supplies and troops across the Atlantic, and we have had to overcome the submarine menace. In addition to all that, we have driven the Japs out of the Aleutian Islands. We have made Hawaii safe from further assault. We have gradually carried our offensive operations across the Pacific, until we are now in the southwest Pacific, and are landing troops along the northern shores of New Guinea; and the day is not so very far distant when the American Fleet will loom above the horizons of the home islands of Japan. Mr. President, those are some of the things we have accomplished with our Navy.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has been giving a very excellent account of what we are doing in building up our Navy, and with which I think every Senator is in hearty accord. I was a Member of the Senate during the last war, when we also built a large navy. After the war was over, if I recall aright, under the terms of a disarmament agreement 19 of our commissioned battleships, 7 of our new battleships in process of construction, and 4 of our new battle cruisers in process of construction were scrapped or sunk. I merely wish to express to the Senator from Louisiana and to all other Senators the hope that such a thing will never happen again. Our Navy will never be used except as a matter of right and for the best interests of the world, in my judgment. I do not believe we shall ever use it for aggressive purposes. We should never again sink our Navy, or any part of it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his contribution, and I wish to say that I very earnestly join him in the expression of the hope to which he has just given utterance. I think it would be a tragedy, Mr. President, for us to repeat the error we committed following World War No. 1.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. As an example of the value even of old ships, let me point out that the destroyers we had in the last World War, and which we put out of commission but kept, have been tremendously valuable in this war.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, Mr. President; the Senator is entirely correct in that observation. I wish to say further that the 11 new battleships or battle cruisers in process of construction, some nearly completed, which we scrapped or sank after the last war were the largest or among the largest and best battleships in all the world, and they would have been of enormous service to us in this war if they had not been scrapped or sunk at that time.

Mr. GERRY. I think the Senator will recollect that we turned two of them into aircraft carriers, and those we have used in this war.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to join both Senators in the statements they have made. When this war is over, I am quite sure the American Navy will not only be by far the strongest navy in the world but will come out of this war the unconquered and unconquerable master of the seas. I believe a tremendously powerful navy is very necessary if we are to maintain our security in the future. We may depend upon propaganda, and it may serve a very useful purpose; but we can remember that the high ideals expressed by Woodrow Wilson were for the most part thrown into the trash heap. We might depend upon peace treaties entered into with different nations, but we know that time and again such treaties have been torn into scraps. We might depend upon alliances, offensive and defensive, into which we might enter, but they may be ignored and violated in the future, as they have been in the past.

What we have to depend upon for the very purposes mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee, not for the purpose of aggression, but for the purpose of preserving our own rights, our commerce upon the high seas, our offshore bases, for the purpose of maintaining our security, and, to go further, as did the Senator from Tennessee, for the purpose of maintaining and preserving the peace of the world, is our powerful Navy. I think the United States of America should retain and maintain after the war every combatant ship it has and should have afloat upon the high seas the world's greatest armada.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. CONNALLY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee, who first asked to be recognized, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say that I agree with all the Senator from Louisiana has so well said. At the same time I desire to reiterate that I am not one of those, and that this country is not one of those countries, that want to take the properties or the lands or the possessions of other nations. I hope we may always take that position of not being an aggressor. We do not want the property of other nations at all. But for defensive purposes, for the purpose of keeping the peace, for the purpose of saving to this Nation the untold billions of dollars that must be paid out because of war, I think it is absolutely necessary for us to keep the Navy that we have built solely for the purpose of protecting the rights and the peace of the world.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, allow me to say that I have always been what is termed a "big navy man." I have always felt that the security of this Republic largely depends upon our having a navy large enough to challenge any other naval power on either of the oceans which wash our shores. As we approach the settlement, I hope, of this war at some time or other, and as we approach the study of international peace arrangements, to which the Committee on Foreign Relations is now devoting much of its attention, I wish to say that regardless of whether we join such an organization or whether we do not, I personally feel that it is imperative that this Nation maintain a strong Navy after this war in order to preserve our security at home and in order to aid in whatever movement may take place to suppress aggression, invasion, and conquest by the barbaric characters that have forced us into the present war. We must maintain a strong Navy, regardless of the problems which may face us in the future. I congratulate the Senator for his very statesmanlike position on this subject.

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the Senator. Let me add that I think the voice of American diplomacy and the voice of America at the peace table after this war is over will be effectively heard as loudly as its guns can roar.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, not only in view of the splendid statement made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, but in view of the very enormous appropriation which is being made in this bill—in my opinion an appropriation made to show the determination of this country not only to win the war, but to preserve the peace of the world so far as it is humanly possible for us to do so—I sincerely hope that the Senator will ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the bill, which provides the largest appropriation ever made by any nation in the history of the world. I sincerely hope that every Senator who is in the city will be present and vote for the bill, to show, or aid in showing, the determination of this Nation in regard to its Navy.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, with that preliminary statement, I ask that the committee amendments be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary—Miscellaneous expenses," on page 3, line 25, after the words "in all", to strike out "$42,841,933" and insert "$42,437,298."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval emergency fund," on page 4, line 17, after the word "available", to insert "until June 30, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of naval personnel—training, education, and welfare, Navy", on page 8, line 3, after the word "for", to strike out "$34,000,000" and insert "$33,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 14, after the name "Navy", to strike out "$70,316,000" and insert "$69,316,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Yards and Docks—Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks", on page 24, line 15, after the

words "purchase of", to strike out "motortruck chassis with station-wagon type bodies and"; and on page 25, line 2, after the word "projects", to insert "maintained and operated as such by the Navy Department and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marine Corps—Pay, Marine Corps", on page 33, line 8, after the word "year", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 5, after the words "In all", to strike out "$475,286,000" and insert "$474,286,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Coast Guard," on page 40, line 3, after the word "purchase", to insert "(for replacement only)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—General provisions," on page 54, line 23, after the word "projects", to insert "which are maintained and operated as such by the Navy Department and"; and on page 55, line 6, after the words "and all", to insert "unobligated."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer four amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I shall make a brief explanation of each amendment for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

NAVAL PROCUREMENT FUND

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon request of the Secretary of the Navy, to transfer $1,000,000 from the naval emergency fund (17X0300) to the naval procurement fund (Public Law 653 approved July 3, 1942), and advances by check or warrant and reimbursements to the naval procurement fund from naval appropriations may be made on the basis of the estimated costs of a project without further accounting distribution of expenditures to the individual appropriations involved.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I believe that each of these legislative amendments should have some explanation. In order that the explanation may appear in the RECORD, therefore, I shall explain each amendment as it comes up.

The first amendment is in reference to the naval procurement fund.

In Public Law 653, approved July 3, 1942, Congress enacted an authorization bill to establish a naval procurement fund, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, in substance this amendment does nothing but transfer $1,000,000 from one Navy Department fund to another Navy Department fund.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Among other things the act states that there was established under the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts the Naval Procurement fund, and there was authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as might be necessary to accomplish the purpose of the act, and the expenditures therefrom for matériel, personal, and contractual services would be made under such regulations as the Secretary might prescribe, that no expenditure would be incurred which was not properly chargeable to available funds under naval appropriations, and that the procurement fund would be promptly reimbursed for such expenditures. Provision was also made for putting money in the fund as advances against work ordered. No funds were ever appropriated to capitalize the fund and the Department has up to this time been proceeding by making advances into the fund.

The Comptroller recently made a decision to the effect, among other things, that since no appropriation had ever been made to the fund to implement the act, in his view it was not proper to proceed with procurement under the fund or to accept advances therein until the authorization act had been implemented by an appropriation. He further stated that advances placed therein would have no longer availability than that of the appropriation from which made.

In order to implement the authorization act it is proposed to transfer, as capital for the fund, from the naval emergency fund—17X0300—to the naval procurement fund $1,000,000, which will answer the objection of the Comptroller that no appropriation had ever been made under the fund. Funds are available in the naval emergency fund, of which, under normal conditions about $12,000,000 would lapse on June 30, 1944, if provisions now in the bill we are considering were enacted.

In addition, the Department requests that advances and reimbursements to the procurement fund from naval appropriations be made on the basis of the estimated cost of the project without further accounting distribution of expenditures to the individual appropriations involved.

This carries out the procedure which the Department has been following since Public Law 653 was enacted in July 1942. The two major objects which are being so handled are the operation of the naval torpedo station in Alexandria and the naval ordnance plant at Centerline, Mich., which procedure avoids the setting up of elaborate cost-accounting systems and the employment of numbers of persons in the plants to keep records daily of the labor and material charges to the individual appropriations from which advances were made for torpedoes or ordnance, such as ordnance and ordnance stores; armor, armament, and ammunition; and emergency construction. The Bureau of Ordnance will keep expenditure records on the operation of the plant, but it will not be necessary for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts to maintain specific ledgers showing appropriation debits from month to month as the work proceeds. It is particularly desirable that, in wartime, accounting of the Navy Department be reduced, and this will save manpower and cost to the United States without detriment or loss of efficiency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 4, after the word "diem", it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided,* That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to sell the tract of land of approximately 532.4 acres, in Cleveland County, Okla., commonly known as Moore Field, and more particularly described in, and acquired through, a declaration of taking executed by the Under Secretary of the Navy and filed in the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, and judgment entered thereon, in the proceedings in such court entitled 'United States of America, petitioner, against 532.4 Acres of Land, More or Less, in Cleveland County, Okla., and Mrs. J. R. Holliday, and Others, defendants, No. 1120—Civil,' and to execute and deliver a deed, or deeds, to the person, or persons, or their heirs or assigns, from whom the original holdings were acquired: *Provided further,* That the sale price for such land shall be a sum sufficient to cover the original purchase price and any sums expended by the Navy Department upon such land or arising out of the use and occupancy thereof by the Navy Department: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to make rules and regulations necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this section."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of that amendment and a statement of the facts.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I can very briefly explain the amendment, and then I will yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] the author of the amendment, to make a fuller explanation.

At Moore Field, in Oklahoma, condemnation proceedings were instituted against certain farmers by the Federal Government to condemn land owned by them for the purpose of building an airport. I take it that the Federal Government would not have desired, nor would it have had the authority, to condemn land except for such purpose, or some purpose for which it had legislative authority. It could not simply have condemned the land without having some particular purpose in view. That purpose was the building of an airport. That happened last year. Immediately after the condemnation judgment had been entered oil was discovered adjacent to the condemned land, and derricks were built all around it, so that the land could not be utilized for an airport. Therefore the Navy Department concluded to abandon the site as an airport.

The question is simply this: Will the Federal Government undertake to profit at the expense of the farmers whose

lands were taken away from them without their consent, and condemn the lands for a purpose for which the Federal Government is not to use them, or will the Government permit the return of the lands to the original owners?

The Committee on Appropriations took the position that under those circumstances the Federal Government should not undertake to profit at the expense of those landowners, and that it should provide for the return of the land to the original owners at the price paid by the Government, plus the cost of the improvements which the Federal Government had placed thereon.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is pending before the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, and before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, an authorization in reference to this subject. The chairman of the House committee has informed me that he has designated Thursday of this week for the holding of a hearing on it.

The facts, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, are that the Navy purchased for a naval airfield certain tracts of land in Oklahoma. It purchased the land for approximately $20,000, and built a runway costing $120,000, making a total expenditure of approximately $150,000. After the purchase was made and the runway was built, oil was discovered on adjoining property.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Massachusetts has spoken of this transaction as a purchase. As a matter of fact, was it not a condemnation by the Federal Government?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes; and the Federal Government owns the property in fee. I think there is no question about that.

Later, after the discovery of oil had been made in adjoining territory, the owners whose lands had been taken by the Government felt that they had received or would receive an unsatisfactory price for the land, which undoubtedly—I believe it is so agreed—contains oil.

There is a great deal to be said in favor of those owners who received a small price for their land which turned out to contain valuable oil deposits. However, the point made by the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee and by the members of his committee, is that by the adoption of the proposed amendment a very bad precedent would be established if when the Government purchased land for any Army or naval purpose, and thereafter deposits of oil or other minerals were discovered in the land, the Government would be called upon to sell the property to the former owners at the price originally paid them by the Government, plus whatever cost may have been involved for improvements on the land, and lose control and possession of the land. In other words, there is a feeling on the part of those who object to this proposal that it would establish a bad precedent. It is believed that by the establishment of such a precedent, when the Government obtains possession of property, and later develops it, and in an adjoining territory oil or other valuable deposits are discovered, the sale or transaction can be undone.

I know how interested the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is in this matter, and, in fact, at his request I introduced a bill on the subject which is now pending. Hearings have not yet been held on the bill by the House committee or by the Senate committee.

It seems to me—and I hope the Senator from Louisiana will acquiesce—that this amendment should not be agreed to at this time, and that the matter should await hearings by the respective committees. There is a feeling of sympathy for those owners, but the point has been stressed by Members of the House committee in particular who have studied the matter—the Senate Naval Affairs Committee has not yet studied it—that by the adoption of the proposal before us no purchase by the Government would be stable and secure if in the future it should be discovered that in the bowels of the earth under the land purchased by the Government there was something of value which was not known, had not been heard of, or discovered, at the time of the sale. Those are the views of the Members of the House Committee on Naval Affairs. As I have stated, the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate has not yet held hearings on the subject.

It seems to me that it would be agreeable to the Senator from Oklahoma and to the Senator from Louisiana to have the matter first thrashed out in hearings held by the committees to which I have referred. If they agree to the position taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee, this amendment could be inserted in a deficiency bill which will be before the Senate in a few weeks.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say about the matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In addition to the statements made by the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill [Mr. OVERTON], and by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts], I desire to make a brief statement for the record.

This is a case where the Government is not being called upon to pay out money. It is a case where an amendment provides that the Government is to receive approximately $150,000. The facts are as follows:

When the war began the Navy Department saw fit to locate a rather large naval base at Norman, Okla. At Norman is the site of the State university, which is located some 20 miles south of Oklahoma City. In connection with the naval establishment or naval base at that point, it was thought advisable to secure an adjacent access airfield for training purposes. Representatives of the Navy Department went out northwest of Norman and selected a site consisting of about 532.34 acres, and proceeded to condemn the land for an access airplane landing and training field. The farmers who owned the land did not desire to sell, and refused to sell. The Navy Department then ordered the district attorney at Oklahoma City to prepare a declaration of taking, and the declaration was prepared and signed by James Forrestal, Acting Secretary of the Navy.

The first paragraph of the petition is entitled "Declaration of Taking." The Navy Department went into court under condemnation proceedings and took the land and the farmers were ejected from the property.

I exhibit to the Senate a picture of one of the farms that is embraced in this area. The picture shows the land to be prairie and level. It shows the farm of a Mr. and Mrs. Taylor, one of the farms taken by condemnation. The picture shows a modest house, a rather large barn, and some smaller outbuildings. The improvements are similar to those found on other land in that section of the State.

I next exhibit to the Senate a picture of Mr. and Mrs. Taylor, the owners of this property. They are standing in front of their former home. Mr. Taylor has on a pair of what are called union-alls, which are overalls of a certain variety, and wears a colored work shirt. Mrs. Taylor has on what appears to be a gingham dress and an apron and what is known in that section of the country as a sunbonnet. They are like the average countryfolk who live in my State of Oklahoma.

I next exhibit to the Senate a picture of that area. Shortly after the land was taken over the first or discovery oil well was drilled. This shows the oil well located within one-half mile of the Taylor farm. It shows the oil derrick which is about 100 feet high; it shows an oil tank that might be 30 or 40 feet high. Immediately after the oil was discovered other locations were made and derricks were constructed around the land.

There are three tracts of land in this property, but I am giving the information with respect to the Taylor tract. All three are similar. Shortly after the land was taken other oil derricks were constructed. The moment oil was struck in this area the Navy Department knew enough about oil to realize that very shortly there would be derricks all around the 500 acres of land.

Inasmuch as the land is to be used as a training field for beginner pilots, the Department knew that it would not be a safe place for the training of youngsters for flying. So the Navy Department abandoned the use of this tract as an airfield. Before the abandonment was made, however, the Navy had cleared the land, leveled it off, and by the use of tractors and bulldozers made some runways, and put some gravel on some of it, at an expense of about $120,000. So the Navy Department has invested in this

tract the original cost of some $46,000 plus whatever they spent for improvement purposes, the total being about $150,000.

The land was taken for an airfield. It it not being used for an airfield; it has not been used for an airfield and will not and cannot be so used.

I exhibit to the Senate a copy of the petition of condemnation. In my State of Oklahoma the State constitution provides that land taken for public purposes can be used only for the purposes for which it was condemned. The provision of my State constitution reads as follows:

> The fee of land taken by common carriers for right-of-way, without the consent of the owner, shall remain in such owners subject only to the use for which it was taken.

In this particular case I do not care to raise that issue because, when the Navy Department stopped using this land and said it would not use it any more, the Secretary of the Navy prepared a letter with respect to this land. Inasmuch as this letter is self-explanatory, I send it to the desk and ask permission that it may be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, November 13, 1943.

As I told the committee the other day, we purchased a tract of 532 acres of land near Moore, Okla., for which we paid a total of $46,431.60. This was designed for an auxiliary airfield, and we started at once the work of putting the field in condition for such use, spending to date about $150,000. All of the land was taken by process of condemnation. Subsequent to our purchase of the land a very big oil well was opened up within a half mile of our land and there are indications that a considerable field of oil exists in this area.

Immediately we were offered, by one of the oil companies, $250,000 in cash, plus a royalty of one-sixteenth, which the oil company estimated would give us $500,000 more. Of course, instead of accepting the first offer made, I immediately dispatched an expert to the scene to get some accurate information on which I could depend.

I have been thinking about this since, and I am wondering if it is fair and equitable for the Government to exercise its power to condemn and thus become possessed of certain lands, which otherwise would have remained in the hands of the private owners, and then take advantage of a discovery of oil in adjoining territory and profit by the transaction. These people did not want to sell their lands. We made them sell. If they had not sold, they would themselves have benefited by the discovery of oil beneath the surface. Query: Should the Government, under these circumstances, proceed to take a big profit through the sale of the lands—a profit that otherwise would go to the owners whose title we had compelled them to yield to us?

The Government is not in the oil speculation business. The lands were bought for an airfield and not for speculative purposes. The use of the land for an airfield is no longer possible because it will be surrounded by oil derricks. Under these circumstances, would it not be equitable and just to return the land to the people whom we disposed, providing they recoup the Government by repaying the money we paid for the land, plus the money we have expended in improvements which now must be abandoned?

FRANK KNOX.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, after the letter was prepared, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives, H. R. 3748, being a bill to authorize and direct the sale of Moore Airfield. In order that the RECORD may be complete, I ask permission to have the bill printed, following the reading of the letter from the Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (H. R. 3748) to authorize and direct the sale of Moore Airfield is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to sell the tract of land of approximately 532.4 acres, in Cleveland County, Okla., commonly known as Moore Field, and more particularly described in, and acquired through, a declaration of taking executed by the Under Secretary of the Navy and filed in the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, and judgment entered thereon, in the proceedings in such court entitled "United States of America, petitioner, against 532.4 Acres of Land, More or Less, in Cleveland County, Okla., and Mrs. J. R. Holliday, and Others, defendants, numbered 1120–Civil."

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Navy shall determine the total of expenditures which have been made, or will be made from appropriations of the Navy Department in planning, acquiring, establishing, and improving Moore Field (except the payments deposited with the court in the proceedings for its acquisition) and of reconveying such field, and of transporting any improvements whose removal is feasible, to a field to be established in lieu of Moore Field. From the amount so determined there shall be deducted such amount as he determines to be the value of the improvements whose removal is feasible. Determination of such amounts and such balance shall be conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any other Federal official or agency.

(b) The Secretary shall thereupon notify each of the several individuals who were determined by the court and in the proceedings referred to in section 1 hereof to have been the owners of the three tracts that such former owner or owners of the respective tracts will be reconveyed such tract if within 60 days of the date of the mailing of such notice such owner or owners shall pay him an amount equal to (1) the total of the payments made by the United States into such court with respect to such tract and (2) an amount equal to the same proportion of the balance determined under subsection (a) of this section as the acreage of such tract bears to the total acreage of the three tracts.

(c) Upon compliance with the terms of such notice by such former owner or owners of any such tract, the Secretary shall execute a deed reconveying such tract to such former owner, or jointly to such former owners.

SEC. 3. In case the former owner or owners of any such tract fail to comply with the terms of such notice, the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to otherwise sell such tract. Provisions of section 1 of the Forty-ninth Statutes, 885, as amended (40 U. S. C. 304A), after clause (b) thereof, relating to the sale of real property by the Commissioner of Public Works, except the provision requiring approval by the Federal Works Administrator, shall be applicable to the authority of the Secretary to sell under this section, and to the methods and terms and procedure he shall follow with respect to such sale.

SEC. 4. The proceeds of the sales hereby authorized shall be used to reimburse appropriations out of which expenditures have or will be made with respect to Moore Field, including expenses in connection with such sale, and the balance shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the owners of these farms had these lands taken from them without their consent. The fact is that one of these tracts is a part of an estate now in the process of being settled. It is also true, as I am advised, that proper service was not secured in this particular case. If my information is correct the proceedings in this case will have to be started all over again. That is in relation to one of the tracts. With respect to one of the other tracts, Mr. and Mrs. Taylor have appealed to the circuit court. So if the circuit court should reverse the decision of the district court and send back the Taylor case and if the court should grant a new trial in the estate case then the whole thing would be back where it was; and when the trial is held, if that should happen, the owners will have a chance to prove what this land is worth. At that time, in all probability, the court and the jury will award these owners what the land is worth and such procedure will force the Navy Department to put up a large sum of money to protect the property if they want to keep the land. Of course, I do not think that will happen; I do not think they will do that, in view of the letter which the Secretary of the Navy has written.

Mr. President, at this very moment the Government has about all the oil troubles on its hands that it can consider. There is a situation in Canada, where the War Department has expended some $135,000,000 in developing oil.

The second situation is at Elk Hills in California. There is a third situation brewing at Saudi Arabia.

I do not think, therefore, that our Government would be justified in holding the lands, even if it could hold them, and speculate upon them, at the expense of persons who have lived there for all these years.

I hope the Senate will accept the amendment and send it to conference.

I do not think a precedent should be set which would be embarrassing, in a case in which the Government, having taken a piece of land for an airfield, decided later it would not use it for an airfield, and then, when the Government had a chance to get back the total amount paid these farmers, refused to do so. The fact is the farmers have not accepted the money, it is in the hands of the court, they have not taken the money because in one case the matter is on appeal, and in the other case no proper service was had, so that the court must grant a new trial. So in this case the Government is paying out no money whatever, it is losing no land it needs, and is to receive back all the money paid for and expended upon the land in question.

As I stated, at the present time one case is on appeal, and the other case is before the court on a motion for a new trial, and while no one can foretell what the court will do, it is my judgment, from what I know about the cases, that in the one case a new trial will be granted, and in the other case the circuit court may send the case back for a new trial. The whole matter is in litigation, and the amendment now proposed would settle the litigation, would put the land back into the hands of its original owners, on condition that they pay not only what they have received, or what has been placed in the hands of the court for them, but will pay back all the Navy has expended in improving and developing the land.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator think it would be well to establish the precedent of turning lands back to the original owners where possible when the Government gets through using them? There is much land that has been turned over to the United States, and the owners forced to leave their homes and go elsewhere. It is true the Government paid for the land, but such an owner may not be able to reestablish a home somewhere else, and when the Government gets ready to sell the land, or quit using it for the use for which it was purchased, it seems to me the original owner should have the first opportunity of purchasing the land.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I might suggest that the Committee on Small Business, I believe it is, has prepared and has introduced a bill proposing to give original owners preference in securing such land by purchase after the Government ceases to use it for the purpose for which it was originally required.

Mr. President, I have stated the facts I desired to place in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a very brief word about the amendment. I very much hope it will be accepted by the Senate, because, in my opinion, every equitable consideration rests with the original owners of such property as that referred to. They parted with their title, not voluntarily, but under the compulsion of condemnation proceedings instituted by the Government. The land was taken by the Government for a well-known and very definite purpose. It was to be an airfield, where air training might be carried on. It is now perfectly clear that because of conditions for which the original owners are in no way responsible, the land has become wholly unsuited for the purpose to which the Government intended to put it when the Government acquired title.

It seems to me that in all the circumstances of this case, the Government should not profit at the expense of the persons concerned, who were the original owners, and who, as I say, involuntarily parted with their titles. If there is any profit for anyone, it should go to the original owners. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I must agree that this is a very unusual case, and has an exceptionally sympathetic appeal. I felt, however, that the record should be clear, especially in view of the position of the House Naval Affairs Committee. I do not intend to press for a record vote, especially in view of the fact that the House committee will have a chance to have a hearing on the bill before the conferees decide about this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 13, after the word "equipment" and before the period, it is proposed to insert "*Provided further*, That no part of these funds shall be used for the construction of new naval facilities or the enlargement of existing naval facilities in the continental United States unless the Secretary of the Navy first determines that no existing facilities, publicly or privately owned, are, or can be made, available for the purposes to be served at a cost deemed reasonable by him."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this amendment is to the same effect as one which was placed in the appropriation bill under the head of Public Works on page 26, line 13, as reported to the House and was designed to prevent duplication of facilities in the continental United States. When the 1945 naval bill was being considered on the floor of the House, a point of order was made on the ground that the proviso was legislative in character, and the point of order was sustained. The committee has shortened the language of the proviso, but the Navy feels that the amendment is in the interest of economy and imposes no unfair restriction upon the operation of the Navy Department and, as a matter of fact, no objection was entertained by the Navy to the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

DEFENSE AID

SEC. 120. Subject to authorization by other law for the rendering of defense aid, information, and services, the authority contained in section 103 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, is hereby extended to and made applicable to the appropriations for the naval service made subsequent to such act and contained in this act without any increase in the amount limitation fixed in such section: *Provided*, That "information and services," authorized to be rendered by the act of March 11, 1941 (Public, 11), need not be connected with the procurement or disposition of any defense article.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not think there will be any controversy at all about this amendment, but I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a justification of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE AID

The basic Lend-Lease Authorization Act (the act of March 11, 1941) authorized the President to sell, transfer the title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of to any government whose defense the President considered vital to the defense of the United States, any defense article, information, or service. The value of articles to be so disposed of under this original act, from funds appropriated before its enactment, was limited to $1,300,000,000. Congress subsequently placed limitations on the value of defense articles which could be transferred from appropriations made subsequent to the approval of the act, and this limitation in the case of the Navy (insofar as it pertained to materials procured from funds appropriated to the Navy Department since March 11, 1941, which limitation was contained in section 103 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1943) was specifically placed at $3,000,000,000, as follows:

"That the total value of defense articles (other than ships), information, and services heretofore or hereafter disposed of under this authority shall not exceed $3,000,000,000."

Limitations of this character are also imposed on the total value of transfers of articles procured with War Department funds and with defense-aid funds.

The original defense aid authorization act of March 11, 1941, expired on June 30, 1943, and was subsequently renewed by Public Law 9, of March 11, 1943, under which latter act the authorization would have expired on June 30, 1944. The authorization for the renewal of this act to June 30, 1945, as contained in H. R. 4254, has been passed by the House of Representatives. In the last 2 years the Navy has carried at the rear of the appropriation act a section which permitted the transfer of articles, information, and services within the $3,000,000,000 limitation imposed by Congress. This, of course, is exclusive of ships transferred, which can only be leased and, therefore, would be subject to return after the war.

This year the Bureau of the Budget removed from the act funds set up in various appropriations for filling defense-aid requisitions for the fiscal year 1945 in the amount of $829,485,000, but they did leave in the submittal to Congress approved by the President the defense-aid clause permitting transfers within the $3,000,000,000 limitation. The House deleted this transfer provision, because at the time they acted on the Navy bill the House had not extended the duration of the basic Defense Aid Act. The Department has requested that additional language be placed in front of the section and that the section be reinstated, so that it will read as follows:

"Subject to authorization by other law for the rendering of defense aid, information, and services, the authority contained in section 103 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, is hereby extended to and made applicable to the appropriations for the naval service made subsequent to such act and contained in this act without any increase in the amount limitation fixed in such section: *Provided*, That information and services authorized to be rendered by the act of March 11, 1941 (Public, No. 11) need not be connected with the procurement or disposition of any defense article."

This section is so worded that unless the renewal of the authorization act becomes law,

no transfers can be made by the Navy Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. OVERTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Davis	Radcliffe
Andrews	Downey	Revercomb
Austin	Ellender	Robertson
Bailey	Ferguson	Russell
Ball	George	Shipstead
Bankhead	Gerry	Smith
Barkley	Green	Stewart
Bilbo	Hawkes	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Buck	La Follette	Vandenberg
Bushfield	McClellan	Wagner
Butler	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Byrd	McKellar	Weeks
Capper	Maloney	Wherry
Caraway	Maybank	White
Chandler	Mead	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Wilson
Cordon	O'Daniel	
Danaher	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the final passage of the bill I wish to express to the members of the Committee on Appropriations my personal appreciation and the appreciation of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs for the cooperation they have extended to our committee, and for the generous and sympathetic way in which they have treated the request of the Navy Department. The committee's patient, long, and thorough study of the naval proposal has been most impressive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of House bill 4559. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. RADCLIFFE (when Mr. TYDINGS' name was called). I announce that my colleague from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. Were he present he would vote "yea."

Mr. NYE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Knowing that if present he would vote as I have voted, I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if present he would vote as I have voted; so I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the affirmative). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am informed that if present he would vote as I have voted; so I permit my vote to stand.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ANDREWS. I announce that my colleague from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is necessarily absent from the Senate. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am instructed to announce that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. HILL] would, if present, vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent from the Senate on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained in various Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

I am advised that all the Senators whose absences I have announced, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are unavoidably absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—61

Aiken	Davis	Radcliffe
Andrews	Downey	Revercomb
Austin	Ellender	Robertson
Bailey	Ferguson	Russell
Ball	George	Shipstead
Bankhead	Gerry	Smith
Barkley	Green	Stewart
Bilbo	Hawkes	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Buck	La Follette	Vandenberg
Bushfield	McClellan	Wagner
Butler	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Byrd	McKellar	Weeks
Capper	Maloney	Wherry
Caraway	Maybank	White
Chandler	Mead	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Wilson
Cordon	O'Daniel	
Danaher	Overton	

NOT VOTING—35

Bone	Hill	Reed
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Chavez	Kilgore	Scrugham
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Lucas	Tobey
Eastland	McCarran	Truman
Gillette	Millikin	Tydings
Glass	Moore	Wallgren
Guffey	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Gurney	Murray	Wheeler
Hatch	O'Mahoney	Willis
Hayden	Pepper	

So the bill H. R. 4559 was passed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. BROOKS conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERSONAL STATEMENT ABOUT A LYING HUMAN SKUNK

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, since I entered the Chamber today I have been shown an article in what is called the Washington Merry-Go-Round, by one Drew Pearson a so-called columnist. I wish to read from that article and comment upon it.

Pearson says:

For 32 long years—

He puts "long" in capitals.

For 32 long years in Congress blustery, Mountaineer KENNETH MCKELLAR—

I digress long enough to say that I do not know Pearson; but really he is an ignorant ass, is he not? [Laughter.] I was not born in the mountains. I never lived in a mountain country in my life; and yet this ignorant, blundering, lying ass, who makes his living by lying on Senators and other public men, seems to think there is something discreditable about mountains, or about be-

ing born in the mountains, and he uses that term for want of something else false to say. The truth is that it is not a dishonor to be a mountaineer. I have no objection to being called a mountaineer. Some of the grandest men I have ever known came from the mountains of our country. Only a blatant jackanapes would have made a point of that.

I continue:

The senatorial gentleman from Tennessee has been famous for two things—his temper and his patronage.

Mr. President, I have a temper, a mild one ordinarily, but which can be aroused to some extent by three things. The first is dishonesty in a man, especially in an official; the second is corruption in anyone; and the third is just plain lying which is the principal element in Pearson's life. If ever there was an opportunity for my temper to be aroused by plain lying, it would be aroused by the plain lying of this so-called Washington columnist, I believe he is called. He is just an ignorant liar, a pusillanimous liar, a peewee liar, and he is a paid liar. I understand he and Lilienthal are great friends. They are two of a kind. What is fitter than two liars standing up for each other.

His further statement is that I am famous for my patronage. That is simply a willful, deliberate, malicious newspaperman's lie, out of the whole cloth. That is all it is.

I read more of the article:

When it comes to temper, the Senator from Tennessee surpasses any other man on Capitol Hill.

No one could tell about that, because that is a matter of opinion, on which probably no two persons would agree. It may be that I have a temper. As I have said, so far as I can recall, my temper is aroused by only three things—dishonesty, corruption, and lying. I do not object to having a little temper against those three things. Lying, such as Pearson's is the most despicable of all lying—lying for money.

I read on:

Most of his colleagues remain in awe of McKELLAR's lashing tongue; some even in fear.

That is a willful, deliberate, malicious lie, out of the whole cloth. If any Senator stands in awe of me for any reason, I do not know it. Let me say to Senators that if any of them do, I hope they will not do so, because I am not that kind of a man. There is surely no reason for it. I have never heard of such a thing. The only thing I can say about that statement is that it is an absolute falsehood. If any Senator does, let him speak out and I will apologize.

Listen to this. Of all the remarkable statements that have been made about me in this article, this one is the most false, most damnable, most outrageous, the most colossal lie I have ever read about myself or anyone else:

They remember the occasion when McKELLAR pulled a knife and charged a colleague on the Senate floor until he was disarmed.

Just think of it. I see before me more than a majority of the Senate. Every Senator listening to me is a witness to this damnable falsehood. Any Senator who ever served with me knows it is a lie. If any Senator present ever saw me pull a knife on anyone, or ever heard of my pulling a knife on anyone, I hope he will rise and relate the circumstances. I say that that statement is a willful, deliberate, malicious, dishonest, intensely cowardly, low, degrading, filthy lie, out of the whole cloth. I never pulled a knife on any person in my life. Not only have I never pulled a knife on any Senator, but I have never pulled a knife on anyone in my entire history. This falsely charges me with a felony. Every newspaper which has published this falsehood is guilty of a libel.

Not long ago this so-called columnist, this character assassin, undertook to assassinate the character of President Roosevelt. The President was compelled to denounce him. I believe he undertook to assassinate the character of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and I think the Senator from Kentucky paid his respects to him in no uncertain terms. He made a similar attack on Senator CLARK of Missouri, and on Senator GEORGE. Pearson makes his living by making sensational, lying statements about men in high office—and I regard Members of the Senate as men in high office. He actually makes his living that filthy way. He ought to have the contempt of every honest man. Think of a newspaper, also, which would so degrade itself as to permit one of its columnists to make a living by lying about Members of the Senate. If the paper has any self-respect, it will discharge him and will apologize for publishing his lies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. Notwithstanding my temper, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can bear witness to the fact that the Senator was never intemperate with me.

The Senator was recalling the distinguished men who have been libeled by Mr. Pearson. I wonder if the Senator remembers the fact that on one occasion General MacArthur sued Mr. Pearson for libel.

Mr. McKELLAR. I had not recalled that circumstance. I know General MacArthur. He is one of the finest characters and one of the best men I know. He is worth ten thousand million—I do not know how many that is, but he is worth ten thousand million Drew Pearsons.

I know Drew Pearson only by reputation. I do not know him personally. If he were to poke his head in the door, or if he were in the Press Gallery, I would not know him. If he happens to be there, I do not know which one he is. I hope he is there, because I want him to hear what kind of an infamous, dirty, low-down, mean, lying scoundrel he is, and I think everyone else believes he is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Outside of that he is all right. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. My friend from Kentucky suggests that outside of that he is all right. Maybe. I rather doubt that, from what I hear of him, but I do not know. Recalling the names of other Senators he has lied about, I think, perhaps, he is taking us one by one, starting with the front row here.

The other day I had a peculiar experience. I was in the chair as Presiding Officer at the time, and I was reading an article in which another columnist had attacked me. I had been careful to prepare a statement of what I was going to say about that columnist. I had never heard of him before. If I had ever seen his column in the paper, I had overlooked it. What he said was quite severe. However, I did not wish to be severe about it with him. I saw the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] walk into the Chamber. Knowing what a splendid character he is, how conservative he is, how careful and prudent he is, my first thought was to call him up to the chair and show him the article, and ask him whether he thought what it stated was appropriate to be stated under the circumstances. Then I had another thought, that perhaps, being as conservative as he was, he might suggest that I had better not refer to it on the floor. So I did not do so. Two days later I heard him speak on Drew Pearson. Why, I could have insulted with impunity the columnist who attacked me, because the Senator from Georgia was very much stronger in his statements concerning Pearson than I could have ever been with respect to the other man to whom I have referred. Pearson's lies about Senator GEORGE were monstrous. His lies about Senator CLARK of Missouri were just as outrageous. His lies about Senator TYDINGS were monstrous. They do not make better men than BENNETT CLARK, Senator GEORGE, and Senator TYDINGS.

However, I wish to read:

They remember the occasion when McKELLAR pulled a knife.

Has any Senator ever heard of me pulling a knife on anyone? If any has, I wish he would speak up. I am honest about it. I shall not hold it against such Senator. I assure him of that, so that I may ask if any Senator ever heard of me pulling a knife on anyone. I take it by their silence that they have not. I never heard of the report until I read it in this article. When a man is a natural-born liar, a liar during his manhood and all the time, a congenital liar, a liar by profession, a liar for a living, a liar in the attempt to amuse, or to be as he thinks smart, a liar in the daytime, and a liar in the nighttime it is remarkable how he can lie. [Laughter.] This article is a very fine bit of evidence of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe there is a definition for that sort of a liar. He is called a revolving liar.

Mr. McKELLAR. A revolving liar! It suits Pearson exactly! A revolving

mirror recording his lies on every side as it revolves around. [Laughter.]

I read further:

They also know the vengeance MCKELLAR can wreak on any colleague who opposes him.

I again ask my colleagues if I have ever undertaken to wreak vengeance on a single one of them? If I have, I did not know it, and therefore I want to apologize to them for doing so. I certainly never did it knowingly. So far as I know I have never refused to help a brother Senator where it was possible for me to help him. I never dreamed of wreaking vengeance on a Senator, I would abhor such an act. I would go a thousand times out of my way to help a Senator and would not attempt to wreak vengeance on anyone.

But listen to this egregious liar, this revolving liar. [Laughter.]

For the gentleman from Tennessee is acting chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee, where he can kill the pet projects of Senators who oppose him.

Well, I never heard of such a thing! However, since this lying brute has brought up the subject, I wish to ask my friends if any of them have ever heard of my attempting to kill their projects? I do not ask any of them to speak up unless they want to. I shall be glad to have them do so if any of them have anything to say about it. Did I ever kill a pet project of any Senator, be he Democrat, Republican, or Independent? I never did such a thing in my life. My whole life here brands that as a lie. It is just a plain Drew Pearson lie. I continue reading:

Probably it is partly the fear of MCKELLAR'S hillbilly vengeance that has caused the Tennessean to win the first important round of his battle to turn the Tennessee Valley Authority into a MCKELLAR empire.

He speaks of me as a hillbilly. He was too ignorant to understand it, but he was paying me a compliment. Sergeant York of the last war was a hillbilly soldier and what a great soldier was he! I am glad to be named in his company.

But what a ridiculous statement to make, that a man 75 years old would be trying to get an empire at his time of life. Why, it is so asinine that it cannot be believed. I may not know just what this conceited ass means by his use of the word "hillbilly."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is what he has said about Cordell Hull.

Mr. CHANDLER. It has something to do with mountain music.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; I forgot to say that this man—what is his name?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Pearson.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; Pearson. [Laughter.] This man Pearson not only denounced such splendid statesmen and outstanding Americans as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and others, but he actually denounced in the same way the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and others who served with Mr. Hull. I served with Mr. Hull in the House and in the Senate. I have known him intimately for 33 years, and there is not a straighter or more honest man in the world. If hillbilly was also applied to him, it could not mean anything else but commendation when applied to me.

Then Pearson goes on to talk about my years. I read:

The 75-year-old Tennessean, during the past several years, has seen to it that members of his own family got lush rewards from the patronage gravy. Highest paid of them is Brother Hugh C. McKellar, who draws down $7,000 a year as postmaster at Memphis.

I would not be talking about my family except for this ignorant ass who is undertaking to introduce the subject here, and I take pleasure in telling Senators how my brother happens to be postmaster. Of course, I am not telling Pearson, because he would not care what I said about it. He would denounce me just the same, because he is a paid liar. But I want my brother Senators to know that this younger brother of mine, Hugh C. McKellar, took a civil-service examination approximately 30 or 40 years ago. I do not know how long ago it was, but it was so long ago that I have forgotten just how long. He took the examination for work in the Post Office Department and worked in the Post Office Department as a subordinate as faithfully as any youngster ever did. He is a man of honor and integrity. He is a man of fine sense. He was promoted from time to time in the civil service, and after having served for many years in the civil service—I do not know how many years he served—during a Republican administration he was promoted to assistant postmaster. He was assistant postmaster when Mr. Roosevelt became President in 1932, and as assistant postmaster he was promoted to the office of postmaster. He earned the promotion on his own merits by his attention to duty, and by his honesty and integrity. That is that. If it means anything to this ignorant simpleton, who makes his living by lying about other persons, very well.

I now come to the following language:

Another brother, Don McKellar, is the Senator's secretary in Washington and draws from the taxpayers the not insignificant salary of $4,500 a year.

That statement is true. It is the only true statement Pearson has made in this article, or at least the only true statement I have been able to find in his article. I may find another one later on. However, up to this point it is the only true statement that I have been able to find, namely, that I have a brother who is my private secretary. As I have said, that is true. He is one of the best secretaries any Senator could have. I would not swap him for any other secretary of whom I know. He has been of incalculable benefit to me in carrying out the duties of my office. I am not in the slightest ashamed of him or his appointment by me. If I had to do it over again I would do the same, notwithstanding the statement of this revolving paid liar. I would appoint him tomorrow, and I would not hesitate for a moment in doing so. So this revolving liar is wrong about that.

Finally Mrs. Don McKellar is also on the public pay roll, drawing $2,800 as assistant clerk of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, of which MCKELLAR is chairman.

This young lady was a member of my office force many years ago. She became a member of it not long after I came here when she was not married. She worked for me, I do not recall how long, but for several years before she was married to my brother. After their marriage they both were retained. I saw no reason to discharge them because they married. That is that. Of course that would make no difference to this revolving, constitutional, unmitigated, infamous liar, this low-lived, double-crossing, dishonest, corrupt scoundrel, who claims to be a columnist. He is not a columnist. He is a monumentalist. That is, a monumental liar. I think, however, Senators will understand what I have said, and will know my statement to be true.

Then follows a lie in parentheses, and he says:

(MCKELLAR is stronger in regard to patronage than any other Senator)—

I wish to say that my colleagues must be a very weak lot of Senators if they have not any more patronage than I have and if they do not exercise any more authority along that line than I do, because mine is exceedingly small.

Here is the reason given for the statement:

Since he's not only chairman of the Post Office Committee but also acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee as a result of Senator GLASS' illness.

Well, I am acting chairman of the committee while Senator GLASS is ill. I regret his illness more than I can say. Senator GLASS, as we all know, is one of the grandest characters who ever sat in this body. He made a wonderful chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He is my devoted friend, and I have nothing but the kindest and best wishes for him. I hope his health may be restored, and he may soon return to continue his duties as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I am frank to say that under the Senate rules, being the next member of the committee in line, I have had to do a very large portion of the work; but I want to say of all my colleagues who serve on the Appropriations Committee in this time of war that no set of men in this Congress or any other Congress or in any other legislative body in the world have ever done a greater work than have they. While I am acting chairman in the absence of Senator GLASS, they have all helped in such a splendid way that I have nothing but the highest praise for every one of them. They have measured up a thousand percent to the responsibilities devolving upon them.

At this point Mr. President, let me inquire if it is not remarkable that this knave—and I am using very mild language—this ignorant, designing fellow, trying to do something for his friend Lilienthal, and probably being paid for it; it sounds as if he were being paid for it—should have gone into my family history and left out the most important

part about my kinfolks. All my colleagues know that I am a bachelor and have no son. I have several nephews though. Every nephew I have, except one, who is too old—a middle-aged man who served in the last war but is not serving in this one—is working for the Government. That was left out by this lying knave. Why? This unmitigated and deceitful ass left it out with a purpose. One of my nephews, Judson McKellar, has been for 2 years and 7 months in the South Pacific. He enlisted as a private and is now captain of a machine-gun company in the marines and has been fighting for his country in the South Pacific. He has a wonderful record and I am exceedingly proud of him.

Another nephew, Clinton McKellar, is in the Navy and has been assigned to the Pacific area. He has been fighting there since the Second World War began. He was in the Battle of Midway and, for a minor officer in the Navy, took a very active hand in that battle.

Another nephew, Douglas McKellar, is in England, a captain in command of a heavy bomber, a position which he attained through his own efforts. This one has been decorated for bravery. He is now a major. I am proud of him. He was named for me. Three of these nephews of mine fighting for their country never even told me their plans in joining the armed forces. One of them did tell me. The nephew who is captain of a heavy bomber has bombed almost every city in western Europe, but that is nothing to Pearson. A fourth nephew, Robert McKellar, is on his way to England at this time.

All that this blackguard left out. Why? Because it did not suit his purpose of blackguardism, and mention of them, of their bravery and devotion to country would not fit in his plans, would not advertise him as he desires to advertise himself.

This lying columnist continues:

Not content with this gravy grab, however, McKELLAR now has one of the biggest patronage schemes in the United States of America awaiting approval by the House of Representatives. He has bulldozed—

Bulldozed!—

through the Senate a proviso in the Tennessee Valley appropriations bill whereby all T. V. A. employees paid more than $4,500 a year would be subject to Senate confirmation.

This is another piece of crass ignorance. That provision does not apply to the T. V. A. alone; it applies to all agencies of the Government. As I recall, the provision inserted in the recent appropriation bill was the third time that it has been adopted by the committee, and has passed the Senate each time by a very large majority. It is nothing new. It merely would enforce the Federal Constitution. Yet this columnist says that I "bulldozed" the Senate. I am sure my colleagues will bear me out in the statement that I have not bulldozed any of them to vote for a measure at any time, and while on the floor in argument I may argue vigorously, if any Senator thinks that I am ever trying to use bulldozing tactics, I beg him to tell me and to denounce me for doing it, as gentlemen would, but not in the manner of this so-called columnist, who is one of the most outrageous blackguards and liars the world has ever seen.

I read further from his column:

This is just another way of saying McKELLAR himself henceforth would pick all T. V. A. officials drawing more than $4,500 a year "———" if the bill finally receives House blessing.

Of course, everyone knows it would not mean anything of the kind. I desire not to pick any of the officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The greatest mistake I ever made was in picking the one or helping to pick Lilienthal the one in whose favor this ass is writing. His article proves it. The United States Government through Lilienthal may be paying for it. Evidently he has formed a coalition with this other great liar, Lilienthal. As my colleagues know, birds of a feather will flock together. Lilienthal himself, as shown by the record, has falsified dozens of times while testifying before our committee. Apparently he has got another liar to come along and help defend him in his lies.

I read on:

The power of Senate confirmation is tremendous and gives a Senator from the State affected the virtual veto of any appointee to whom he may have personal objections.

Mr. President, the T. V. A. is not a State matter. Several States are involved. A whole area is involved. I would have no right, any more than any other Senator, to pick people for jobs that apply to this organization. It is ridiculous, it is silly, it is asinine. It is worse. It is just a crooked statement of a crook who is trying to help another crook.

Again I read—

Other Senators don't especially inquire what those objections are, but gang together to preserve their long-cherished system of keeping a throttle-hold on patronage.

I am now speaking for all my colleagues, as well as myself. This man is just an egregious liar, and this is an egregious lie, out of the whole cloth. There is nothing but lying from beginning to end. His lying friend, Lilienthal, has gotten him, no doubt, to publish this lie about me, and that is why it is here in this paper. He says:

McKELLAR makes no bones about admitting his political motives.

This is a patent lie.

Did I ever make any admission here about my having political motives regarding matters of legislation? I was not conscious of it at the time, if I did, and this is just another one of his infamous, deliberate, willful, asinine lies, because I have never admitted any such thing, and when he says so he is lying about it.

Again I read:

He tells friends that it is necessary to bring T. V. A. personnel under his thumb in order to control David Lilienthal.

You all are my friends. Did I ever tell one of you that that was my purpose in this matter? I never have, and never expect to, because it is not the truth, and this man is simply lying about it.

He tells friends that it is necessary to bring T. V. A. personnel under his thumb in order to control David Lilienthal, T. V. A. Chairman, who long has refused to knuckle under to McKELLAR.

Of all the deliberate lies that is one of the worst. I do not see Mr. Smith, the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, on the floor at this time. He heard Lilienthal in the committee room a few days ago groveling, pleading, begging me to believe he is my friend, and what occurred there wholly contradicts this particular falsehood of this writer. Again he says:

The gentleman from Tennessee is more evasive when it comes to his cutthroat provision which would require all T. V. A. income to go back to the Treasury and be voted out again by Congress.

Mr. President, that is a lie, a willful, deliberate, malicious, low, groveling, infamous lie. There is not a word of truth in it. I have not been evasive about anything. I am not an evasive man. I have urged the adoption of my amendment, and it was adopted by the Senate for entirely different reasons from those given here. I have not done anything of the kind here charged. Listen to this argument, which is worthy of—I do not believe I will use the comparison I had in mind, but this is the only argument in the article.

This—

That is, requiring the T. V. A. to pay their receipts back into the Treasury—

This is the equivalent of forcing the Pennsylvania Railroad or Standard Oil to pay all their rail receipts or gasoline sales into the Treasury, then awaiting an act of Congress to decide what railroad equipment could be bought or what pipe line could be repaired with their own money.

What an argument! What a comparison! That is nonsense. That is not reasoning worthy of a 7-year-old child. If one of the Senate pages sitting before me were to write an argument like that, I would be ashamed of him. I think any one of them could write a better argument or give a better reason for any action he took than could this man—I keep forgetting his name. A Senator sitting near me says it is Pearson. Yes, it is Pearson, Drew Pearson. By the way, is that a false name, or is that his real name? Does anyone here know? Is he like a movie actor, who takes another name? Drew Pearson sounds very movie like. I wonder whether that is his real name. Was he born under that name? I wonder about that. However that may be, it is not a matter of much moment.

The article continues:

Actually, the General Accounting Office, which is an arm of Congress, gives T. V. A. funds a strict scrutiny every year and could far better detect any irregularity. But this makes no difference to McKELLAR, who wants the frozen-funds provision in the bill in order to augment his plans for the McKELLAR empire in Tennessee.

Mr. President, that is laughable. I cannot be serious at that, because the only thing I have in Tennessee is the love and affection of some of its citizens, and I hope quite a large number. They have been kinder to me than I ever deserved. I have never gotten any of them as

friends by patronage. Patronage has been the worst asset I have ever had. It causes more trouble. Instead of being an asset, it is a liability. The only thing I have, which this man Lilienthal and now his confederate, Pearson, have been very assiduously, through the newspapers, at the instigation of and probably by reason of money paid by Lilienthal, trying to take away from me is the good will and the esteem of the people back home in Tennessee; and that applies not only to Democrats, but it applies to a great many Republicans, for I believe the Republican part of the State is almost as strong for me as is the Democratic part of the State, and I am very proud of that fact.

I try to be honest with my constituents, I try to be straightforward, I do not undertake to lie to them, I tell them the truth, and I serve them. I serve them and serve the people of the United States to the best of my ability. And that is true notwithstanding these lying statements of this man Pearson and his client Lilienthal. Do any of my colleagues know Pearson? Is he short-haired, or long-haired? Is he young, or is he old? Is he a lady's man? Is he an American? Or is he a Jap or German parading under an American name? What sort of person is this man whom the great Washington Post pays a salary? All the papers which pay for and publish the articles of this lying blackguard should cancel their contracts. Surely they did not buy a set of lies from him. All which have published them have published a libel *per se* on me. What kind of a man is he who assumes to abuse and traduce and lie about public men, who tries to destroy the character of any person, in the Senate or out of the Senate; who tries to destroy the President of the United States; who tries to destroy our great Secretary of State, a man who has performed such a splendid service; who tries to destroy such fine men as BENNETT CLARK, and WALTER GEORGE, and ALBEN BARKLEY, and MILLARD TYDINGS, and various other Senators? If I have left anyone out, let me know. I expect he will get to all of you before long.

Mr. WHERRY. Will not the Senator include his colleague and me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will include my good friends KENNETH WHERRY, and TOM STEWART, of my own State.

Gentlemen, I am not angry, I am just sorry that this great Nation of ours, this Nation of honest men, this Nation of Americans, has within its borders any person so low and despicable, so corrupt, so dishonorable, so groveling, so desirous of injuring the character and the accomplishments of his fellow men, as this low-born, low-lived, corrupt, and dishonest Drew Pearson.

Mr. President, if that is an exhibition of temper, Pearson will have to stand it. If that has any connection with patronage, Pearson will have to make the most of it. Whether it comes under one head or comes under the other, he will have to stand it.

Mr. President, I hope my fellow Senators will not think I am the kind of man that this low-life skunk says I am. Do Senators all know what a skunk is? He is sometimes known as a polecat. The skunk has an odor which is just as savory as this literary odor which is sprayed out over public men by this other skunk whom we allow to sit in the press gallery. We allow him to sit in the gallery and lie about Senators whom he sees, but whom he does not know. The animal called a skunk cannot change his smell. This human skunk cannot change his smell. He will always be just a skunk.

Mr. President, if I have been guilty of exhibition of temper, I hope Senators will forgive me.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I cannot add anything of value to what my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee has already said. In fact, I would give a great deal if I had the ability to lay it on as he has in the last few minutes. With respect to the article which appeared in a morning newspaper, most of which my colleague read, I wish to say that, of course, it is not true. The article has been denounced in words which were selected a great deal more carefully and used a great deal more effectively than I am able to use words.

Publication of the article will not hurt my colleague a particle by reason of his honesty and integrity, attributes which are well known both among his colleagues in the Senate and back home in Tennessee.

In the second place, the article will not hurt my colleague because I do not think this man Pearson has the ability to slander anyone. One must be honest before one can slander another, and one must be able to tell something which at least approaches the truth.

I also wish to say that this effort at gratuitous abuse of my colleague will not be noticed in the least degree by the people of Tennessee. If the result of the article could be tested by a political measuring rod, I should say that, in my honest judgment, it will not affect one single, solitary vote in Tennessee. My colleague's reputation for honesty and integrity has already been established.

Pearson in his article referred to members of my colleague's family. His brother, the postmaster at Memphis, is as fine a man as ever lived, and the people of that city want him as postmaster. That is why he is there. My colleague's brother Don, who is also his secretary, as my colleague has already said, is as efficient a secretary as there is on Capitol Hill. He is a man of unusual ability, well qualified to serve as secretary in any Senator's office. He is capable of holding high and important positions. His wife likewise is a capable woman, who as my colleague has said, worked in his office long before her marriage to my colleague's brother. They fully earn the money which is paid to them by the United States Government. The effort at calumny on the part of Pearson, as I see it, is a complete and flat failure.

I wish to speak of another thing. The expression "hillbilly" is used in the article, and is hurled as a sort of epithet, as though it might reflect upon someone who has lived or who lives in the hill country. I live in a hill country, as do many other Members of the Senate. The hill country has produced men like Cordell Hull. The hill country has produced men like Douglas MacArthur, whose name is known in every home in America. The hill country produced Sgt. Alvin York. Abraham Lincoln came from the hill country, as has just been suggested to me. Many other able and outstanding Americans have come from the hill country. I do not see any reason for referring to a man as a hillbilly simply in an effort to subject him to some sort of ridicule or abuse.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Sergeant York was called a hillbilly, was he not?

Mr. STEWART. Yes. I referred to Sergeant York a moment ago.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was called from the Chamber temporarily, and did not hear the Senator's statement. There was nothing in the way of opprobrium or contempt meant by anyone who called Sergeant York a hillbilly.

Mr. STEWART. Hillbillies, as I understand, are very acceptable in the Army. They make very good soldiers.

Mr. President, at New Orleans, this country was saved from invasion when General Jackson, himself a hillbilly, with hillbilly riflemen from the Senator's State of Kentucky, and from North Carolina, and from Tennessee, met and defeated General Pakenham in the War of 1812. Hillbillies as defenders of our country were not scorned then. I do not know what kind of "billy" Mr. Pearson is.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to make another remark, if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. A hillbilly will not lie or steal. If you mistreat him, he may kill you, but he will not lie or steal.

Mr. STEWART. As a class, hillbillies are just as good as those of any other class. The expression is used by this man Pearson no doubt in an effort, as I have already said, to reflect upon persons who live in the hill country. Possibly he wants an inference to be drawn from that expression that the individuals referred to are ignorant, that they are illiterate, that they belong to a class who should not be entitled to the rights and privileges which those who live in other sections of the country are permitted to enjoy. Perhaps some other kind of reflection is meant to be cast upon them. Just what a writer means when using the expression hillbilly I do not know and do not understand. Some writers refer to an individual who comes from the hill country as a hillbilly. As a matter of fact, I do not think my colleague ever lived in the hill country or in the mountain section of Tennessee. He once lived in a part of the hill country of Alabama. Be that as it may, he now lives in Tennessee. A part of Tennessee is hill country, as is a part of Alabama. What is wrong about a man who lives in the hill country? In what way is he different from one who lives in the prairie country? I do not understand why any sort of reflection should be cast upon one who comes from the hill country. Does the writer of the article think it better that the hill country were not populated?

The hill country of Tennessee, of Kentucky, of Virginia, and North Carolina, and generally throughout that section, was settled principally by what we call today the Anglo-Saxons, many of them from the hills of Scotland, and they have left their mark upon this Nation. Today, even though many of them have not had the advantages and the opportunities afforded to individuals in other sections, more blessed perhaps than the hill sections, the so-called hillbillies are patriotic citizens, and their integrity and honesty is above reproach. They ought not to be referred to in such a manner as to imply that there is something corrupt about being hillbillies or living in the hill country.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. They can make a living without publishing all over the country unconfirmed rumors and smear gossip about their fellow men, too; can they not?

Mr. STEWART. In that section of the country most of them that I have ever heard of do not do any gossiping more than once. [Laughter.] They have a cure for it there.

They make good citizens. Today, upon the battle fronts and in the far-flung sections of the world, there are boys looking down the barrels of American-made guns who are hillbillies, such as this man Pearson would have people think are not fit to be referred to as decent American citizens. They are at the front earning the $50 a month which the Government pays them and they are fighting for what? For the right of free speech, for the right of Drew Pearson to call the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] a hillbilly; and they are carrying their part of the load. There is not a county in my State of Tennessee—I do not mean to reflect on any other State in the Union—for my statement applies to every county in all other States of the Union—which, under the draft laws, has failed to supply its quota of men for the armed forces. Not a county in Tennessee has failed to supply its quota of soldiers and sailors fighting in this war. I resent the use of the term hillbilly as an implication that a man living in the hills is dishonest or that there is something corrupt about him because he lives in the hills and can be called a hillbilly. I have an idea also there are many other kinds of billies besides hillbillies, some of whom possibly may have brought upon themselves the unenviable distinction of being referred to with propriety in a manner a great deal less complimentary than that in which Pearson has undertaken to refer to those who were born in a section of the country they love, where the hills are high.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the people of the United States should know that while the hillbillies of Kentucky and Tennessee were on the battlefields of Guadalcanal, in the Solomons, and in New Georgia, some of these smear columnists were on the beaches of Miami and Nassau.

Mr. STEWART. Of course, Mr. President, I do not know what particular beach this columnist or any other columnist was on, because I have no information about that; but I do know that the people who live in the hill sections of Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas, and Missouri, in the central area of this country, as well as the people who live in any other part of our country, are not to be slandered and picked out as an object of criticism because they live in the hills.

I have said more than I intended to say. I merely wish to add my humble endorsement to what my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee has had to say, and to state to the Senate that he is not any smaller in stature in Tennessee, by reason of this article, than he is here today in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, it is difficult to resist the urge to take part in this discussion. After the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and others have called these fellows these "revolving" names, I should like to join that company. I say that I prefer to go along with them, and that they have expressed my opinion of these fellows who want to have their right to say about you whatever they please, although the same right they have to say anything they want about you does not give you any right to say anything at all in defense of yourself. They holler about freedom and liberty, but they use the freedom of the press to circulate what they know are false rumors and lies, in the effort to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives. It is all a part of a plot to destroy representative government in the United States. If you say anything about them, you are a bad fellow; but they can say anything they want to say about you.

I wish to call the Senate's attention to an incident which occurred the other day and which I fear may have been generally overlooked. There is a boy from my State known as "Jumping Joe" Clifton. Joe Clifton, from Paducah, Ky., is one of my personal friends, and I have admired him ever since he was a youngster in college. He went to the University of Kentucky, and later graduated from the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The other day a task force made a raid on Sabang, in the Sumatra and Java area of the Indian Ocean. While that fight was in progress, the Japs shot down one of our planes. That was the plane flown by Lt. Dale Christian "Klondike" Klahn, of Laramie, Wyo., the home State of my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. Klahn had been flying as the group commander's wing for about 2 years.

"Jumping Joe" ordered 12 of the Hellcat fighters to fly over this lone fighter plane as it started its downward plunge from 20,000 or 25,000 feet into the Indian Ocean. Air Group Commander Clifton spread the alarm back to the carrier and to the other members of the task force. He said he was not certain that he was coherent, because he was bawling. What he tried to call over the radio was, "'Klondike' is down about 2 miles northeast of Sabang Air Field." The whole squadron offered to stay there to protect this lone flyer—which was quite a lesson to the Japanese who hold life so cheaply. But the squadron commander thought it best not to risk the entire squadron. So he let 12 of the Hellcat fighter planes spread a star-spangled umbrella over this lone flyer; and as the plane went down in flames, the fellow who flew the left wing implored "Klondike" to get out, and actually stood up in his plane and held his hands over head, making signs which mean to bail out. But Klahn kept on flying. Soon there was a gasoline explosion, and the plane turned over, heading for the water. Out of the puff of smoke popped "Klondike." His parachute blossomed out just a few yards over the water. When he landed in the water he broke out a life raft, stood up, and semaphored.

Then the Japanese coastal guns opened fire, and their fire was accurate. A British submarine which had surfaced received Clifton's call to go to Klondike's aid. As it neared Klahn, he jumped out of his life raft and started swimming toward the submarine. The Japanese coastal guns continued their fire. The 12 Hellcat fighters attacked a Japanese destroyer which was nearby, and also attacked Japanese aircraft warming up on a nearby airfield. When our fighters ran out of ammunition, they simply made threatening runs. Those fighter-plane pilots risked their lives for 90 minutes, but stayed there to save the life of this boy from Wyoming. The British submarine moved in, in the face of the fire from the 6-inch Japanese coastal guns. The shells were falling close around the submarine, but at the last moment the crew dragged Klahn aboard and closed the hatches of the submarine, and it made a crash dive to safety.

All these fellows read the Psalms before they go into battle. They were at Midway, they were at the battle of Coral Sea. They have been in New Georgia, they have been off the coast of New Guinea. They have made an outstanding record.

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

I want to pay tribute today to Air Group Commander Clifton who was heartbroken when his friend whom he had known for 2 years was shot down over enemy territory. Clifton and the others of his squadron risked their lives for an hour and a half, and saved the life of that boy from Wyoming. That sort of spirit, that sort of estimate of the value of one American life, is what is going such a long way toward bringing victory to American arms. God bless every one of those boys as they read their Psalms before they go into battle, and as they continue to be with Him, and save even the least of one of these. As our Saviour said:

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the remarks made by my colleague about Air Group Commander Joe Clifton. Joe Clifton was reared in the town where I lived. I have known him all his life. He went to Annapolis as a student at the Naval Academy, from which he was graduated in 1930. Following that he went to Pensacola, Fla., and took a course in naval aviation, and has been in that branch of the naval service ever since. He is a great man. He comes from a fine family. As a boy he was taught all the fundamental things that make America worth while, not only from the standpoint of patriotism, but from the standpoint of religion. He is clean and high-minded. I share, with my colleague and all the people of Kentucky, especially those in western Kentucky, and more particularly those in my own home city, the pride which they all feel in the exploits of Joe Clifton, the commander of the squadron referred to by my colleague.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I had intended to ask for the present consideration of House bill 4278, a bill to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases and for other purposes. It is called an omnibus bill. It would make legal certain practices which have been appropriated for heretofore without any statutory authority. The House gathered together a number of items which had been ruled out on points of order in the House, and placed them in a bill. That is the bill to which I refer.

I have consulted with the majority leader, and he requests that I ask that the bill be made the unfinished business, to go over until Friday.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, anticipating the request of the Senator from South Carolina, I have made such inquires as I could among the minority members of the committee. I find that there may be some controversy over the bill, but I have no objection to its being made the unfinished business, with the understanding that it will not be taken up until Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAMS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, disastrous floods have long been a problem of major importance in the United States. Even as I speak, great floods are raging throughout a number of the larger river valleys in the very heart of this Nation, causing untold damage, destruction, and human misery.

There is little doubt that this body will soon be called upon to consider further legislation with respect to flood-control programs in various sections throughout the country, and I believe that now is an appropriate time to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the city of Johnstown in Pennsylvania, which has been remembered as the flood city ever since that tragic day of May 31, 1889, has, by reason of the appropriations made by Congress, the studies conducted by the United States Army Engineers, and the flood-control projects completed in that area, become known as flood-free Johnstown—a good place to live, to work, to do business.

Very recently I had the unique privilege of attending a city-wide celebration which marked the completion of the $8,670,000 project which, according to the United States Army Engineers, has conquered the flood menace which has periodically disrupted the life of this community for many years past.

I well remember as a youngster the periodic inundations which came to my own community of Sharon, Pa. Twice each year—in the early spring and in the late fall—the now placid and controlled Shenango, which rose in the Pymatuning swamps, would overflow its banks, flooding the lowlands and partially immersing the numerous settlements throughout the valley.

During those times my companions and I would row about the community on a raft; or, if the flood came in the late fall, the water which flowed over into the lowlands would freeze during the nights of low temperature, and we would enjoy many hours of skating on the hard and vast surfaces.

Little did we realize then the tragic tolls which these floods exacted in the damaging of property and the destruction of human life.

Today I am pleased to relate that the Pymatuning swamps have been converted into a huge man-made lake in which potential floodwaters are stored and from which a regulated waterflow is maintained in the channel of the Shenango—thus assuring a full and regular year-round supply of water to all the communities throughout the valley.

These conditions of today represent a happy contrast to the conditions of alternate flood and drought which prevailed in this valley not so many years ago. This great improvement has been wrought with the completion of but a single flood-control project.

Only recently the Congress of the United States took proper action to combat the menace of floods which has claimed property damages of untold millions of dollars and many hundreds of human lives.

The flood-control projects which have been approved by the Congress have cost many hundred millions of dollars, but already they have paid for themselves many times over. And as the years go by the savings made by those outlays of funds will be repaid to the people and to the Nation many hundreds of times.

The results of the past two decades have shown conclusively that flood control can be established, even in the most dangerous areas.

There has been organized in the city of Johnstown the Flood-Free Johnstown Observance Committee, which is comprised of a number of outstanding citizens in that community who, by reason of the remarkable achievements realized in their own city, have devoted themselves to the endorsement of flood control projects throughout the Nation.

In connection with this matter the committee at Johnstown has undertaken a comprehensive study of the entire flood-control question, and the action which has been taken and which is contemplated to overcome this menace in various parts of the country.

The study which this committee has made is, in my opinion, a most penetrating, encouraging, and enlightening one, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the statement of facts developed by this committee placed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with certain tables and graphs which the committee has developed, showing the status of various flood-control projects throughout the Nation, both accomplished and proposed.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY

With the advent of spring, together with melting snows and April showers, there come to us the annual reports of high waters and floods in different parts of the country, accompanied by the usual distress and mental anguish, property loss, and interrupted business and industry. All of this is bad enough in peacetime, but very disturbing in days of war making.

What the loss of life and material damages will be this year has yet to be estimated, but in the spring of 1943 the United States Army Engineers estimate that the tangible damages were in excess of $153,000,000. A break-down of these figures by major river basins is as follows:

	Area inundated in acres	Reported deaths	Estimated damages
Missouri River Basin	2,478,000	11	$47,382,000
Illinois River Basin	480,000	11	14,758,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	465,000	15	27,517,000
Wabash River Basin	918,000	10	23,016,000
White River Basin	1,005,000	1	5,350,000
St. Francis River Basin	86,500	0	50,000
Arkansas River Basin	1,447,750	23	52,760,200
Red River Basin	239,200	0	2,234,000
Total	7,119,450	71	153,067,200

There follows a copy of a tabulation prepared by the Weather Bureau of the United States Department of Commerce furnishing information on the loss of life and property in the United States from floods which have occurred during he years 1924–40, inclusive.

RECORDED FLOODS SINCE 1543

Of course, flocds are nothing new in this country. History tells us that floods and their resultant damages were reported during the first expeditions made by white man into the interior of our country. The explorer De Soto is credited with the discovery of the Mississippi River in 1541, and the historian of that exploration wrote of the great flood on that river in 1543. In 1684 La Salle found

the Mississippi River out of its bank. From the earliest times people have been keenly interested in flood control. The first levee at New Orleans was constructed in 1717, and 10 years later the Governor boasted that it was a mile long and 18 feet wide. It is human nature to intensify the possibility of flood destruction, as is evident from the damages wrought by every flood. It is natural to build homes and develop industry at the river's edge so as to benefit most by water-borne transportation, to have ample water for household and industrial uses, or in agricultural areas to cultivate the rich bottom lands. Even when it is obvious to owners that their property will be injured by the river in time of flood, such knowledge does not seem to prevent development of such property, since flood damage is, of course, problematical and a future possibility, whereas the benefits to be derived from being close to a river are very real and in the present.

As you probably know, flood-control activities in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River and in the Sacramento River Valley, Calif., have been under way by the United States Army Engineers for a considerable length of time. It was not, however, until the enactment of the first national flood-control legislation in the act of June 22, 1936 (Public Law No. 738, 74th Cong.), that Congress officially recognized the menace to national welfare resulting from destructive floods upon the rivers of the United States, upsetting orderly progress and causing loss of life and property and impairing and obstructing navigation, highways, railroads, and other channels of commerce between the States. That act, therefore, established for the first time the general policy that flood control on navigable waters and their tributaries is a proper activity of the Federal Government in cooperation with States, political subdivisions thereof, and responsible localities, and that the Federal Government should improve or participate in the improvement of navigable waters or their tributaries for flood-control purposes if such projects are economically justified and if the lives and social security of people are otherwise adversely affected. Congress, in the act of 1936, further recognized two distinct methods of flood control, namely, the reduction of runoff from land areas for the purpose of preventing soil erosion, which is the direct responsibility of the Department of Agriculture, and the regulation of flow or protection against the flow of water in rivers and their tributaries by means of engineering works, which is the direct responsibility of the War Department.

FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORIZED

The Flood Control Act of 1936 authorized the construction of some 270 flood-control projects throughout the United States and provided for an expenditure of $310,000,000 for the execution of those projects. Since the enactment of the 1936 act, practically every succeeding Congress has passed one or more acts providing for additional improvements on rivers and their tributaries for flood control. Subsequent amendatory and supplementary general flood-control acts were approved on August 28, 1937 (Public Law No. 406, 75th Cong.), June 28, 1938 (Public Law No. 761, 75th Cong.) August 11, 1939 (Public Law No. 396, 76th Cong.), August 18, 1941 (Public Law No. 228, 77th Cong.). The flood-control acts usually contain two principal sections: one authorizes works for improvement of named streams or at specific localities along such streams in accordance with the recommendations of the Department as contained in reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War; the other authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made of certain streams or at designated localities along streams in the interest of developing desirable and economically justified projects for flood control. In accordance with directives from Congress, as contained in the 1936 act and subsequent legislation, the War Department has been authorized to investigate more than 500 streams throughout the United States in the interest of flood control and allied water uses. These investigations have shown that damages occur from overflow of any stream, the severity of the damages depending, of course, upon the factors involved, including the topographical, meteorological, hydrological and other conditions prevailing within the areas studied. The War Department's recommendations to Congress for flood control, resulting from authorized investigations, are based upon careful engineering and economic surveys of all the factors involved, including full consideration of the views of Federal, State, local, and other interests, secured at public hearings and otherwise.

The five general flood control acts mentioned in the preceding paragraph, together with the legislation applying to the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers projects, provide authorizations totaling over $1,600,000,000 for the construction of nearly 500 projects widely dispersed throughout the United States. Up to June 30, 1943, funds in the total amount of approximately $1,080,000,000 had been provided by Congress for the prosecution of this flood-control program. In addition to these authorizations Congress has approved general comprehensive plans covering most of the important river basins of the country and including many additional projects for flood control, hydroelectric power, and allied water uses. All of the projects authorized by Congress are parts of comprehensive coordinated plans for the river basins of the Nation to provide desirable and economical flood protection and allied benefits for a large number of centers of industry and population and for many thousands of acres of rich agricultural lands. The details of individual projects under the jurisdiction of the War Department, including those for flood control, are set forth in the annual report of the Chief of Engineers, which is printed each year. Although the annual report for the year 1942 is restricted and not available for public distribution, the annual report for the year 1941 and for previous years may be consulted in any public library designated to receive Government publications. The Congressional Library has in its files copies of the annual report of the Chief of Engineers for the year 1941 and previous years. You will, of course, understand the reason behind the general policy of the Department in not publishing the latest available detailed information on public works under its jurisdiction which has as its primary objective the protection of the principal facilities throughout the entire country.

As you probably know, in accordance with a directive issued by the War Production Board in October 1942, all civil works construction, including the War Department's flood-control program, has been curtailed, except for a few projects determined as essential to the war effort.

GREAT FLOOD-CONTROL PLANS PROJECTED

Under authority already granted by Congress, the War Department is now preparing designs and plans for the completion of projects curtailed by the War Production Board order and for other projects heretofore authorized in order that they may be ready for actual construction as soon as the war is over. The potential flood-control program is now estimated at over $2,600,000,000, of which $1,810,500,000 is the estimated cost of projects that have been approved by Congress and $789,500,000 is the estimated cost of new projects contained in survey and review reports. The future progress on the advance planning for flood control is dependent, of course, on the appropriation of funds for this work and on authorization of additional flood-control improvements recommended in reports of the War Department to Congress. A copy of a tabulation showing the potential construction program for flood control divided into the engineering divisions of the War Department for the entire country follows for your convenient reference.

Although a report of flood damages at individual communities throughout the United States would be very voluminous, it is possible to give examples of damages caused in certain areas of the country by disastrous floods. The great flood in the Ohio River Basin of 1937 caused damages throughout the middle and lower Ohio Valley, estimated at $400,000,000, drove 500,000 people from their homes, paralyzed industry and communications, and resulted in loss of human life and in interruption of ordinary development that is impossible to evaluate. Three major floods have occurred in recent years in the Connecticut River Basin. These floods took place in November 1927, March 1936, and September 1938, causing total direct damages estimated at $75,600,000 and indirect damages estimated at $68,700,000 and resulting in the loss of a total of 28 human lives. The most recent disastrous floods in the United States occurred in the spring of 1943, inundating areas throughout the Middle West and Southwest portions of the country, resulting in tangible damages in excess of $153,000,000, flooding of more than 7,100,000 acres of land, and causing the loss of 71 lives.

The local channel improvement work for the now famous flood-protection project at Johnstown, Pa., was accomplished by the War Department under authority provided by the Flood Control Act of 1936 as amended. By the end of the year 1943 the Department had completed some 145 local protection and reservoir projects throughout the United States. Examples of this type of work are the levee and flood wall projects along the Connecticut, Susquehanna, and Ohio Rivers; the levees along the Wabash, Illinois, Upper Mississippi, and Columbia Rivers; flood-control reservoirs in most of the important river basins of the country; and the major channel-improvement project at Los Angeles, Calif. As stated above, the details of these separate projects are contained in the annual report of the Chief of Engineers.

1936 FLOODS PROVOKED ACTION

It took the terrible flood disasters of 1936 to focus the attention of the Congress on the problem of flood control and prevention. Some measure of flood control has been established in certain areas since the enactment of this national flood-control legislation, but unfortunately the demands of a world war have forced the postponement of the greater part of the program suggested by the United States Army Engineers.

However, the possibilities of a Nation-wide flood-control program, as demonstrated by some of the completed projects which were carried through despite the war conditions in view of the protection afforded to war industry, should prompt the consideration of flood-prevention measures for many communities as one of the first items in the post-war plans to provide employment for millions of returning servicemen.

With particular reference to the newly completed river-channel flood-prevention project at Johnstown, Pa., that city held a community-wide celebration to observe the completion of the $8,670,000 project, which the United States Army Engineers say make it flood-free Johnstown.

A committee of over 400 citizens, representing a wide cross section of community life, launched an observance to appropriately express appreciation to all who contributed to the wonderful flood-control project, and at the same time also inform the outside world that Johnstown is now flood-free, and a good place to live, to work, to do business.

As a feature of the observance program, most of the 108,465 people living within 3 miles of city hall have been prevailed upon to write to their friends and relatives all over the United States about the good fortune of the city. This is part of the effort

to remove the flood-city stigma from Johnstown as a result of the great flood of May 31, 1889, caused by the bursting of the South Fork Dam, which had been a feeder for the old Pennsylvania Canal. This flood has been featured over the past half century in books and stories, exhibits, motion pictures, etc. As the head of the Advertising Federation of America recently remarked in New York, "Noah and Johnstown made floods famous." The flood of 1889 is still a vivid memory in the minds of many old-time residents of that community.

IF JOHNSTOWN CAN DO IT—SO CAN OTHERS

The endeavor of this soft-coal and steel community in the scenic mountains of Pennsylvania to establish in the minds of the world community that it is now flood-free Johnstown is most commendable. It is entirely a volunteer effort and has revived city pride and spirit, and brought about a united front for coordinated cooperation that has not been witnessed there in years.

The Johnstown promotion program also seems to have struck a responsive chord all over the Nation. News stories and editorials about Johnstown have appeared in hundreds of papers published in every State in the Union, in scores of magazines and trade publications, many records of radio broadcasts, and commendatory letters by the hundreds. Johnstown servicemen in all parts of the world have been cheered by the news of their home town's good fortune. An ordnance Army camp paper at Camp Santa Anita, Calif., commented, "Johnstown men in the service can now keep their minds on the war—there will be no more floods back home."

However, the news of the Johnstown good fortune has also tended to focus attention on flood-control measures, and many localities subject to damaging floods at intervals are now investigating the possibilities of control and prevention. At Allentown, Pa., a conference was recently held to determine what might be done in the Lehigh River Valley to avert floods such as the one of May 22, 1942. The survey reports submitted indicated a loss of $15,000,000 on above date to Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, and other neighboring towns. The engineers of the Bethlehem Steel Co. plant at Bethlehem reported flood damages of $7,000,000 to their steel works alone, and loss of production because of the floodwaters at $6,240,000. The worst blow to Allentown was the removal of an $850,000 mill from that community because of recurring floods, with a loss of employment for 700 men and a million-dollar pay roll. The mill property was sold as junk for $65,000.

The Johnstown flood-control improvement, which is one of the best in the country according to the United States Army Engineers, is the result of the exhaustive hydraulic test experiments by the United States Army Engineers at the United States Waterways Experiment Station at Vicksburg, Miss. It was determined by these tests that the best method to pursue at Johnstown was the deepening, widening, and realinement of the river channels. Engineers from many cities are now visiting Johnstown to observe the finished product. Dry dams above the city were at first considered, but had to be abandoned on account of certain conditions; demonstrating that each situation presents its own peculiar problem. By cutting through a mountain ridge on the outskirts of Johnstown the Bethlehem Steel Co. has diverted the flow of the Little Conemaugh River, and has reclaimed over a mile of valley for furnace slag fill purposes. Later the made land can be utilized for additional steel mills or railroad yards. Large acreages of level land for industrial purposes and adjacent to railroad tracks constitute a problem in mountain country.

HARNESS THE WATERS TO ADVANTAGE

Flood-control plans should be given first consideration in the post-war economy. Such improvements do not take away local control, and provide lasting good. Flood-control improvements will in turn result in a demand for many products of the mines, steel mills, cement plants, machinery, motor vehicles, tires, oil and gas. Much surplus Army equipment and manpower could be utilized for various periods of time.

Flood-protection works will result in the reclamation of much swamp and lowlands, inundated at intervals, that could be utilized for park purposes, farm lands, or industrial sites. It will beautify river banks and improve the appearances of many communities. The peace of mind and feeling of security engendered cannot be measured.

Control of our waters by dry and impounding dams will also provide for irrigation in some sections, good water for drinking and industrial purposes, and help solve many erosion problems in various sections. It will also contribute to recreational facilities.

Good soft water is one of the greatest assets of Pennsylvania, and should be utilized to a greater advantage. There is no reason why large metropolitan areas should not enjoy good drinking water brought to them by pipe lines from the impounding dams near the headwaters of pure mountain streams or from watersheds far back in the wild mountain areas.

There are many instances of water being harnessed to advantage. We can do much to remove the terrible fear of floods. Johnstown and other communities have proved object lessons. May other communities profit by their experiences.

Potential post-war-program projects approved by Congress

Division	Estimated cost of projects for which plans will be available by June 30, 1944	Estimated cost of projects for which plans will be available after June 30, 1944	Other projects for which plans have not as yet been initiated	Economically justified projects contained in Survey or Review Reports	Total
New England	$6,600,000	$54,400,000	$41,000,000	$9,200,000	$111,200,000
North Atlantic	13,000,000	10,200,000	7,900,000	4,800,000	35,900,000
Middle Atlantic	300,000		700,000	70,000,000	71,000,000
South Atlantic	6,000,000	8,200,000		35,200,000	49,400,000
Lower Mississippi	6,200,000	13,300,000	201,500,000		221,000,000
Southwestern	31,000,000	198,400,000	76,600,000	39,000,000	345,000,000
Upper Mississippi Valley	2,100,000	9,000,000	63,900,000	2,800,000	77,800,000
Ohio River	73,500,000	178,000,000	340,500,000	82,000,000	674,000,000
Missouri River	10,500,000	68,000,000	104,500,000	481,000,000	664,000,000
Great Lakes	1,200,000	900,000	16,100,000	4,500,000	22,700,000
Pacific	14,600,000	135,800,000	116,000,000	61,000,000	328,000,000
Totals	165,000,000	676,300,000	969,200,000	789,500,000	2,600,000,000

Loss of life and property in the United States from floods, 1924–40

[Weather Bureau of the U. S. Department of Commerce]

Year	January		February		March		April		May		June		July	
	Property	Life	Property	Life	Property	Life	Property	Life	Property	Life	Property	Life	Property	Life
1924		0	$41,020	0	$7,005,115	5	$211,900	2	$1,035,000	0	$2,549,500	11	$80,000	0
1925	$3,614,200	2	141,150	0	72,500	0		0	65,000	6	3,980,000	14	140,035	0
1926	19,370	0	600,000	0	76,900	0	293,450	0		0	[1]	1	55,200	0
1927	2,625,830	8	1,866,845	0	407,350	0	283,207,381	232	7,566,000	95	1,125,400	0	241,166	0
1928	3,900	0	9,450	0	758,300	0	1,168,100	0	105,000	0	12,296,251	1	13,339,475	0
1929	121,600	0	2,963,775	0	21,947,171	47	1,936,600	0	15,668,160	5	10,268,241	5	4,938,750	32
1930	7,110,455	0	6,665	0	145,700	0	300	0	5,021,050	14	3,042,455	0	244,000	0
1931		0	30,000	0	572,000	0		0	8,000	0	13,000	0	1,215,000	0
1932	1,206,620	0		0	164,855	0	372,825	0	1,552,135	0	1,244,850	0	1,626,850	0
1933	308,115	0	86,546	0	2,007,890	1	2,709,155	4	10,785,210	4	2,650,480	4	1,116,500	0
1934	5,001,650	45	8,500	0	706,090	0	1,692,600	34		0	899,200	0	178,000	0
1935	345,435	0	1,250	0	2,176,548	4	2,698,480	5	16,905,722	40	63,195,989	110	30,930,340	52
1936	341,150	0	2,107,185	6	145,935,550	24	124,742,760	82	1,117,750	6	123,950	0	2,427,690	20
1937	[2] 411,481,015	65	[2] 7,690,647	75	61,885	0	4,523,717	0	2,626,560	0	5,429,175	0	125,300	2
1938	260,250	0	3,711,704	2	27,819,128	86	3,008,372	0	12,402,340	0	3,624,256	68	10,372,865	9
1939	3,000	0	1,657,280	4	737,675	0	1,981,701	0	36,800	0	4,271,100	1	1,725,000	78
1940	57,500	0	7,245,704	0	1,047,906	2	2,184,825	0	437,643	0	2,790,150	12	5,313,755	0
Total	432,500,090	120	28,167,721	87	211,642,363	169	430,732,166	359	75,330,370	170	117,503,997	217	74,090,226	193
Average	25,441,182	7	1,656,925	5	12,449,551	10	25,337,186	21	4,431,198	10	6,912,000	13	4,358,249	11

[1] Unknown.

[2] Based principally on data furnished by the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army.

Loss of life and property in the United States from floods, 1924–40—Continued

Year	August		September		October		November		December		Total	
	Property	Life	Property	Life	Property	Life	Property	Life	Property	Life	Property	Life
1924	$4,500,000	9		0	$1,482,510	0	$66,700	0	$8,000	0	$16,979,745	27
1925	275,000	0	$1,170,500	14	380,000	0	83,650	0		0	9,922,035	36
1926	7,000	0	7,729,402	6	12,699,150	6	135,100	0	1,854,177	3	23,469,749	16
1927	3,460,450	0		0	1,627,000	0	45,093,400	88	437,600	0	347,658,422	423
1928	9,272,488	3	4,047,200	5		0	3,567,600	6	46,000	0	44,613,564	15
1929	130,375	0	92,000	0	9,378,830	0	556,856	0	76,650	0	68,099,002	89
1930	250,500	0		0	29,000	0		0		0	15,850,125	14
1931	201,000	0	2,000	0	1,300	0	744,900	0	22,775	0	2,809,975	0
1932	763,200	0	2,665,600	11	335,165	0	3,200	0	359,935	0	10,295,235	11
1933	6,516,078	2	489,200	0	10,000	0		0	10,000,000	16	36,679,474	33
1934	321,500	9	84,200	0	27,650	0	1,287,470	0	154,500	0	10,361,360	88
1935	158,750	5	7,551,157	0	2,691,000	0	61,550	0	2,517,100	8	129,231,321	224
1936	205,000	0	5,045,900	4	378,075	0	118,450	0	5,800	0	282,549,260	142
1937	760,000	0	140,200	0	256,280	0	97,850	0	7,546,900	0	440,739,529	142
1938	232,375	8	39,640,905	17	2,550	0	5,000	0	19,900	0	101,099,645	180
1939	3,408,300	0	12,950	0		0		0		0	13,833,806	83
1940	18,853,000	40	2,135,000	6	88,000	0	95,300	0	217,700	0	40,466,483	60
Total	49,315,016	76	70,806,214	63	29,386,510	6	51,917,080	94	23,267,037	27	1,594,658,730	1,583
Average	2,900,883	4	4,165,071	4	1,728,618	1	3,053,942	6	1,368,649	2	93,803,455	93

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I am sure that this statement and these materials will prove of utmost value to my colleagues and all those who are sincerely interested in the achievements and accomplishments of flood-control projects in the United States.

Mr. President, as one who vividly recalls the great tragedy which came to the city of Johnstown on May 31, 1889, it gives me deep and sincere pleasure to join with the citizens of that community—many of whom were my friends even at that far distant date—in commemorating the demise of "Johnstown, City of Floods," and the birth of "Flood Free Johnstown—a good place to live, to work, and to do business."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the United States Public Health Service, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Executive Calendar, which contains the nominations of only a few postmasters, be considered and that the nominations be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, April 28, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the regular corps of the United States Public Health Service:

SENIOR SURGEON TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE APRIL 2, 1944

Lloyd D. Felton

SURGEON TO BE SENIOR SURGEON EFFECTIVE JUNE 16, 1944

Erval Richard Coffey

DENTAL SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR DENTAL SURGEONS EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1944

Fritz R. Jackson
James Fitzgerald Lewis
Oscar Mikkelsen

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Cleo Snyder, Cataldo.
Sibyl O. Rudisill, Star.

MINNESOTA

Arnold R. Krogh, Spring Grove.

OKLAHOMA

Elsie J. Britton, Turley.

OREGON

Eugene Bedell, Alsea.

TENNESSEE

Robert W. Simmons, Jr., Sharon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven and earth, in deep and dark necessities where every form of wealth and station fails, we praise Thee for Thy unsearchable riches which are sufficient and complete. To know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge is an ideal to be realized, a vision to be actualized, wherein, by Thy marvelous power, the poorest child may enter into contentment and rest. Keep the generous currents of our hearts in motion, not by absence of contest but by the assurance of victory; not by the absence of the hill but by the rest and beauty of the valley.

Thou hast prepared us a table in the presence of our enemies; O fill us with a deep and an initial love and bearing toward all the timeless virtues of our Republic with such angle of vision that we may survey everything from the standpoint of the rights of the human soul. Deliver us from all cardinal weaknesses which easily break down public confidence and invoke the spirit of disunity and disloyalty. Enable us to turn Thy counsel into life and walk boldly in Thy appointed way. Our eyes are anxious eyes until our boys come home; for their sakes may we meet with courage the demands of a united Nation, sealed by their sacrifice which is winning its way into a richer inheritance of religious and political freedom. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 469. An act to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the emblem and name of the Red Cross.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566).

AUSTIN L. TIERNEY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate which was read by the Clerk:

APRIL 21, 1944.

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill

(S. 176) entitled "An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney," and accompanying papers.

Attest:

———— ————,

Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, first, to revise and extend my remarks, and, second, to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a eulogy to His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell which appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR DISCHARGED VETERANS 38 YEARS OF AGE OR OVER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am filing today a bill to grant mustering-out pay to discharged veterans of 38 years or over.

In the feverish atmosphere of wartime Washington, the Congress is often required to legislate in haste in order to meet and solve emergency conditions.

Such was the case with the mustering-out-pay bill, passed to remedy the adjustment problems of veterans of this war who have left the service.

The Congress realized that these men and women must have a nest egg to tide them over the difficult period when they are changing from a military to a civilian way of life.

In framing legislation to give the veteran some financial assistance during this transitional period, the Congress discriminated against the man or woman who happened to be 38 years of age or over.

For the bill excluded from its benefits those who voluntarily left the service to take up private employment. This referred to those whom the Army and Navy considered to be over age.

By this discrimination, it placed these veterans in the same category as those who were dishonorably discharged.

Some 200,000 veterans belonging to the over-age group deeply resent this classification.

These men were drafted for service in exactly the same manner as younger men. They were obliged to go through the vigorous routine of training at an age when such physical exertions were doubly difficult. No exceptions were made. They had to keep up with 20-year-olds as they drilled and hiked and went through combat training.

It was then that the Army and Navy discovered that these men had passed their physical prime and they were allowed to leave the service.

Yet, in the mustering-out-pay bill as it now stands, they are being penalized for the extra service they gave to their country when it called—and they answered.

Such treatment is a denial of the fundamental American doctrine of fair play. It separates veteran from veteran when they all gave, in the honorable fellowship of service.

This situation, uncorrected, will establish a faulty precedent in the approach to veterans' problems as a whole.

I believe that we should let the millions of veterans still in service know that we intend to fulfill our responsibilities to them. The genuine way to do this is to let them know that; whereas we may distinguish between types of service, domestic or combat; and may graduate the pay on the basis of the time spent in service—we will never exclude service itself, on any pretext.

The amendment I offer to the mustering-out-pay bill will strike out the discriminatory clause and bring veterans over 38 within the benefits of this bill—where they belong.

The American Legion in its fair and farsighted policy to help, not only the veterans of the First World War but of this conflict as well, will certainly support this amendment.

It stands foursquare on the principle that honorable service is the only criteria that makes a man or a woman a veteran.

Let us clearly establish this—once and for all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests, one to extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD a copy of a radio address I gave last Friday, and, second, to include a letter and other correspondence from Henry Matt, a member of the Flathead Tribal Council.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous consent requests, first to extend my own remarks on the death of William Cardinal O'Connell and to insert short excerpts from the daily papers and a copy of the letter of the President; and second, to insert a radio address delivered by former Postmaster General Farley; and third to extend in the RECORD the radio address by Walter Winchell, delivered on April 2, over Station WJZ, over a Nation-wide hook-up, which is a sort of reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in the first place I do not think it would do justice to the memory of William Cardinal O'Connell or be a proper treatment of our friend, Jim Farley, to extend remarks with reference to them in the same RECORD with a lot of Walter Winchell's scavenger attacks on Members of Congress.

I do not know whether the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has had an opportunity to see the statement or not, but I do know that a few weeks ago Members of Congress, including some very high-ranking members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, demanded that Walter Winchell either get out of uniform or get into the war. Instead of getting into the war he got out of uniform and went on the radio and denounced Congress as the "House of Reprehensibles."

So far as I am concerned, Walter Winchell's smear speeches or his scavenger broadcasts are not going into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I say with all deference to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi would withhold that objection just for a moment. This broadcast has to do with Mr. Winchell's record in the Navy.

Mr. RANKIN. I know what it has to do with.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is sort of a reply to the broadcast of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] of the week before.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, it was an attack upon the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I am not going to agree to Walter Winchell's broadcasts going into this RECORD at this time, or at any time hereafter.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think, as a matter of fairness, it should be permitted. This is only a reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has objected to the last request of the gentleman from New York. Without objection, the first two requests of the gentleman from New York are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may be permitted to extend his remarks under the title "Are We Going To Keep Our Promises to C. A. A.-W. T. S. Men?"; and second, that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may be permitted to extend his remarks under the title "President Roosevelt Called Upon To Aid Strawberry Farmers Against Unfair Ceiling Prices."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Frank R. Kent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a program which was presented to the agricultural committee of the Republican Party at Chicago by the Farmers' National Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WHAT CAN BE DONE FOR THE AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the one question that this Congress has not solved is the Indian question, and unless Congress determines to settle this matter, we may expect to drift along for another 50 years, as we have for the last 75, leaving Father Time to wear out the Indians and thus avoid the just claims which the Indians have against this Government.

There are some fundamental facts in this Indian question that are established beyond all dispute, and these facts are:

First. The Indian tribes were in possession of this country when the white men landed, and the early maps which we ourselves made show the approximate location of these tribes. If there is anything to the principle of the right of occupancy, then the Indians had rights which any civilized country was bound to recognize.

Second. We dispossessed the Indians and occupied the lands we wanted regardless of the wishes of the Indians. To be sure, we made treaties, but the Indians were ignorant of our language and our ways. Those treaties invariably were signed by Indians under a misapprehension of what was in the language of the treaty. In many instances positive advantage was taken of the Indians. When the treaty with the Sioux in Minnesota was made, a clause was slipped in providing that if the Government paid the interest on the claim for land taken from the Indians and kept up those payments for 20 years, the principal of the debt would be extinguished. When this matter was brought to the attention of the courts, the matter was decided against the Indians because the courts held the Indians were presumed to know what they had signed. No more sorrowful poem was ever written than Longfellow's Evangeline. Every liberty-loving American rebels against the driving out of a whole community from their ancestral home, to shift where they would on the earth's surface.

How many times have we repeated the scenes in Evangeline in our handling of the Indians of America? Did not we drive them from their homes in most every State and herd them first in an area west of the Mississippi River and finally in Indian Territory? Not satisfied with this, we changed our minds and opened up Indian Territory to white settlements and finally admitted that area into the Union as Oklahoma.

Before these Indians moved to that area west of the Mississippi River, the Government entered into agreements with them to pay them for their lands and find them suitable homes elsewhere. Some of the Indians moved voluntarily, believing in the good faith of the Government; others, who doubted the word of the Government, were ejected by force.

Most every treaty ever made by the Government with Indians was broken by the Government. A few glaring examples will prove this statement. In 1868 the Government made a solemn treaty with the Sioux at Fort Rice, Dakota Territory, agreeing with the Indians that that domain west of the Missouri River extending from Nebraska to the Canadian line and westward to the Rocky Mountains, was henceforth to be Indian country. The Indians gave up their right to lands east of the Missouri, except reservations, and took up their residence in the new Indian country. In 1874 gold was discovered in the Black Hills, a part of this Indian country, and the white population moved in. Railroads entered the territory and the whole area was appropriated, regardless of the Fort Rice Treaty. The Indians claimed damages for their gold taken and for their land taken, but after years of litigation the courts determined that the Indians had not established their claim. To this day the Sioux Indians have not received a cent for their gold or for their land.

The worst part of the situation is that the Indians were put under guardianship, and the Government became their guardian. Under all rules of common law and statutory law, a high degree of good faith and a fair dealing is demanded of any guardian, but so far the guardian has escaped all responsibility.

This situation has been going on for years. Those Indians who attempt to sue the Government must secure an act of Congress giving them the right to go before the Court of Claims to establish their rights, but everyone knows that the Court of Claims has only such jurisdiction of the matter as is specifically conferred by the wording of the act, called a jurisdictional bill.

Time after time the Indians have been denied relief in the Court of Claims because the jurisdictional act was not broad enough to cover all the facts involved. It takes years to even secure a jurisdictional act, and years more to amend it. When a case is presented it takes years to try it, and if the Indians by accident do establish their claim, their guardian fires at them with another weapon—the Government sets up set-offs or counterclaims. Usually these set-offs are enough to cover all the Indians have coming and in some cases, like the California case, the set-offs exceed the claim, so that while on paper the Indians win their suit, they have actually lost it and their claim has been extinguished altogether and they still owe the Government.

From time to time we have appointed committees to visit the Indians and find out their condition. Sometimes the Senate and sometimes the House make such a demonstration. A few years ago the Senate appointed such a committee headed by Senator Lynn J. Frazier, of North Dakota. This committee visited every Indian reservation in the United States and took testimony. When the report was reduced to print there were 29 volumes. This report was filed and nothing further was done. We have had an endless number of these investigations, and nothing was accomplished after voluminous reports were prepared and filed. Another fact to remember is that should Indians ever recover on their claim, the expense of these investigation committees will be charged to the Indians.

In 1934 Congress passed the Wheeler-Howard Act, supported ably by the senior Senator from Montana. Now the senior Senator wants the bill repealed. What was the reason for the bill in the first place? If there was any reason for it, what is the reason, why is a repeal now asked?

There are some Indians who are in favor of the work now being done under this act, and there are perhaps an equal number who do not want anything to do with the work done under the act. It does not require any investigation to establish this fact.

Those who oppose the act say they have no objection to other Indians embracing the act and collectively acting for themselves, but they do not want the Government to use any part of their tribal funds in any such venture. These Indians are strictly individual Indians who want their own home and want to carry on as ordinary citizens in their own businesses.

This should settle the matter, and the Government should not use any fund belonging to all of the Indians in a venture which other Indians do not want. Let those who want the act come in with their own money, and let those who do not want the act stay out with their own money. The attempt to force this act on all Indians has created bad blood and ill-feeling and generally has disrupted the peace and quiet of more than one reservation.

All outstanding claims of Indians against the Government should be rounded up and finally settled. If properly handled this business could be completed in 5 years, and then the final guardianship of the American Indians could be released.

I caused a plank of this kind to be presented to the Republican National Convention 4 years ago, and it was accepted in this language:

> We pledge an immediate and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and Indian citizenship of the Nation.

Others caused the same thing to be submitted to the Democratic Convention, and it was accepted in this language:

> We favor and pledge the enactment of legislation creating an Indian Claims Commission for the special purpose of entertaining and investigating claims presented by Indian groups, bands, and tribes, in order that our Indian citizens may have their claims against the Government considered, adjusted, and finally settled at the earliest possible date.

After these two great conventions nad acted I was hopeful that we would finally solve the Indian question and be able to abolish the Indian Bureau and free the American Indians in the next 5 years. But, lo and behold, 4 years have passed, and neither the Republicans nor the Democrats have made any attempt to carry out those pledges. A Claims Commission bill has been prepared by the gentleman from Montana, Congressman O'CONNOR, but he has been unable to secure the support of his own party to carry this measure through. The Republicans, being in the minority, have less blame resting with them for the failure to carry out the platform pledge.

I see no other way to finally settle this Indian question than to establish a

Claims Commission and finally dispose of all claims against the Government, without requiring any jurisdictional bill. When the claims are settled, dissolve the Indian Bureau, and permit the Indians to take their proper place among other citizens of their State with all the rights, privileges, responsibilities, and duties of any other citizen. If there are sections of the United States where it is necessary to maintain a guardianship over Indians, make that the exception, but do not hold all Indians down to the condition of a helpless ward.

The following cases should be examined if there is any member in this Congress who believes that the Indians have been fairly and justly treated:

The Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewas, pending jurisdictional bill.

The Gros Ventres, Mandan, and Aricara, pending jurisdictional bill.

The Sioux case concerning the Black Hills, claim pending.

The Wahpeton, Sisseton Sioux, pending jurisdictional bill.

The California Indians, recovery for land, claim pending.

The Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, pending jurisdictional bill.

The Oregon Band of Ute Indians, pending jurisdictional bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Judge William H. Wadhams before the New York State Agricultural Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday on a world monetary plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include a radio address by Mr. Millard W. Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, April 28, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and such other business as may come before the House, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials, one from the New York Times of April 24, 1944, and one from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., of April 24, 1944, eulogizing the late Cardinal O'Connell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address which I gave.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FURLOUGHS FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has never been my policy to try to interfere with the military, and with the authorities that are running this war. However, I have maintained that the voice of Congress reflects the wishes of the people, and that Congress, as this direct voice, should have the power to make recommendations to the military. I have therefore introduced a bill which provides for a 45-day furlough every 18 months for members of the armed forces if, in the opinion of the Secretary of War such action is practicable with the prosecution of the war efforts.

An increasing number of service men and women are rounding out a year and a half overseas' duty. It seems to me they have the right to look forward to a period of respite and rest from the rigors of foreign climes and warfare if the possibility arises. Their families want to see them and they want to see their families. A great many soldiers have become fathers since they left and have never seen their children.

There is a definite need, then, for a furlough period at the end of 18 months, for everybody, provided the military authorities are certain, as individual cases are reviewed, that no impairment of the war program is brought about.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on rehabilitation of soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter and a resolution from the Central Labor Council, A. F. of L., Santa Monica, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROOKS was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Star with reference to the late Cardinal O'Connell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF HEALTH ACTIVITIES OF LABOR DEPARTMENT TO UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. As there is no legislative program, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Mr. Harold L. Breinding, of the Veterans' Administration, on the employment of the handicapped.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., PERMANENT CHAIRMAN, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the two-party political system is an integral part of the practical set-up, conduct, and operation of our constitutional government. I am a great believer in the two-party system because I think it serves the best interests of our people, in that the party placed in power, either in State or Federal Government—and by "power" I mean entrusted by the people with the conduct of government—has a responsibility definitely placed upon it.

In the near future there will be conventions of the two major political parties of our country, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. No matter how much we may disagree on issues and policies which each party stands for, responsible members of both parties respect the other party, its purposes, and its functions, and its position in our Government and the importance that the two major parties play in the successful and practical operation of our Government.

Each and every Member of the House is pleased when a Member of our own body is signally honored by his own party. Speaking as an individual and also as a Democrat, I rise to make the few references I am making on this occasion, to congratulate the Republican Party, and to express a feeling of pride on the part of the Democratic Members

of the House in the selection of our distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] as permanent chairman of the coming Republican National Convention.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE LATE GEORGE MORRIS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on last night one of the most beloved and most influential members of the press gallery, as far as my section of the country is concerned, suddenly passed away—Mr. George Morris of the Commercial Appeal.

In the discharge of our arduous duties and in the grind we go through we often overlook the fact that the men in the press gallery endure a similar grind and invariably suffer as much punishment and also invariably enjoy the same lack of public credit.

It is difficult, indeed, for me to speak with reference to George Morris, because he was one of the best friends I ever had. He was one of the best writers who has been in the press gallery since I have been a Member of Congress.

He was an ardent patriot, a man of deep and strong convictions. He believed in the American system of government; he believed in the Constitution of the United States; he believed in those great fundamental principles on which our system is based.

George Morris will be missed by the people of Mississippi; he will be missed by the people of his own State of Tennessee, as well as the people of other States.

In his passing America has lost one of her greatest patriots and the press has lost one of its outstanding disciples.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from Mississippi in expressing my deep and sincere regret over the death of George Morris. During a period of more than 14 years I served as a newspaperman in Tennessee and knew him intimately, both personally and professionally.

I join the gentleman from Mississippi in saying that his death is an irreparable loss for the profession of journalism in that area of the United States. He was a man who brought to that profession all of the fine qualities of reporting, of discernment, of analysis, and of good faith.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE AND PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege and a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I arise to a question of personal privilege and to a question of the privilege of the House and offer a resolution, which I will send to the Clerk's desk upon the conclusion of my statement, if recognized.

April 20, 1944, under permission granted, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] inserted in the daily RECORD, pages A2032–A2033, a statement by the author of Under Cover.

In paragraph 13 of that statement it is charged that the Representative from the Fourth Michigan District echoed in the House a typical Fascist lie.

That statement reflects upon the integrity and patriotism of the Representative from the Fourth Michigan District in his official capacity.

Other Members of Congress are mentioned by name in various paragraphs of the statement, and in paragraph 10 three Democratic Members of the other body are mentioned by name, which is a violation of the rules of the House and raises a question of the privilege of the House.

The article as a whole tends to repeat the charges made in the book, Under Cover.

On the third page of that book is this statement:

UNDER COVER

My 4 years in the Nazi underworld of America—the amazing revelation of how Axis agents and our enemies within are now plotting to destroy the United States.

The book mentions by name 20 Senators, 41 Members of the House, and, by insinuation and innuendo, attempts to create the impression that many of those so named are disloyal, unpatriotic, and seek the overthrow of the Government.

Many of the statements in the book are false, and the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this statement by Derounian, under his alias of John Roy Carlson, tends to give weight to those charges, to detract from the statements of any and all who have attempted to show the falsity of the conclusions reached by the author.

The article, beginning with the words "Statement of John Roy Carlson" and ending with the words "John Roy Carlson", as found on pages A2032–A2033 of the daily RECORD of April 20, 1944, should be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the statement in the RECORD which makes charges against the gentleman from Michigan amounts to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Personally, I have not read the book. Speaking for myself only, I make this statement: That there is no justification for impugning the patriotism of any Member of this House. I may question the judgment of others and others may question my judgment, but I want the gentleman from Michigan and all other Members to know that every Member of this House is a loyal, patriotic American citizen and any charges questioning the motives of any Member are vigorously resented by all of us. I make this expression in my own right, in justice to my own conscience. I have disagreed with the gentleman from Michigan on many occasions and I expect the gentleman from Michigan and I will disagree in the future, but under no condition at any time have I felt, nor do I think anyone else is, justified in impugning the patriotism of the gentleman from Michigan or the patriotism of any other Member of this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. The seriousness of the situation grows out of the fact that repeatedly, not only by one man but by several, over the air and through the press the Congress as a whole has been charged with having within its membership saboteurs, seditionists, Representatives who were disloyal. This House so far has failed to call those responsible for those charges to account. Throughout the country there are people, conscientious, sincere citizens, who because those charges have not been officially investigated and answered are inclined to believe there is someone in this Congress who is disloyal.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In just a moment. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts. I know of no disloyal man or woman in this body, but until those statements are laid before a committee of Congress and those accusers are given the opportunity under oath either to substantiate or withdraw those charges, they will continue to be repeated, there will continue to be disunity, there will continue to be a suspicion in the minds of some of our citizens that here in the Halls of Congress are harbored Members who are not supporting the war, Members who are disloyal. That hideous thing should end. If, after a full and a fair hearing, after every opportunity to be heard has been given those who make those charges, it then appears that there is anyone here who is disloyal in the slightest degree that Member should be expelled from this body forthwith.

If after full opportunity to be heard the man or men who have made that charge are unable to produce proof to justify it, he and they, yes, each one of them, should be forced to admit under oath that the charge is without foundation; that he is a falsifier.

Let me give you an illustration of the unfair method by which some of these charges are made.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman referred to some Member from Pennsylvania putting a scurrilous article in the RECORD. What Member from Pennsylvania was that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will come to that later.

Mr. RANKIN. We want to know the name of any man who will stick that stuff in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no quarrel with the gentleman, I have no quarrel with any Member, and if the gentleman will let me proceed in my own way I will appreciate it. I have been accused of following the gentleman, the Republican Party has been accused of following the gentleman from Mississippi, and for once I would like to proceed in my own way. Let us do it that way.

Let me return to the example of the procedure used by the author of Under Cover. Because I am familiar with the references made to me I will use one as an illustration.

On page 471 of Under Cover the author writes:

> Reports have long been rife that the "research" for many of HOFFMAN'S speeches and even some of the speeches themselves were written by Joseph P. Kamp.

Now there is no evidence that either Kamp who is vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, a nonpolitical, nonprofit corporation founded in 1919, and devoted to the purpose of maintaining constitutional government, promoting patriotism, or the league itself, has ever been engaged in any subversive or, for that matter, improper or unethical practices. But in Under Cover an effort is made to smirch both.

Then the further effort is made to discredit me by connecting my name with that of Kamp, whose name has been connected with that of still another person.

Let me repeat this quotation from Under Cover:

> Reports have long been rife that the "research" for many of HOFFMAN'S speeches and even some of the speeches themselves were written by Joseph P. Kamp.

Do you get the significance of that? The author does not say that Kamp did my research work, he does not charge that Kamp writes or ever wrote my speeches or a speech. He makes what may or may not be a truthful statement. Perhaps there have been such reports; I do not know. There may be reports that such has been the case but I never heard of any such reports until I read of them in Under Cover. Possibly following the method of a certain radio commentator, the author first started the story, then quotes it later as a foundation for the rumor. The inference created by the quoted statement is without foundation. That inference is that Kamp did research work for me, that some of my speeches were written by him. Both inferences are without foundation. It may be true that there are reports that Kamp did this, that, or the other thing, but, as a matter of fact, Kamp never did any research work for me. He never wrote a speech nor a word of a speech for me. In fact, I know of no one either in the House or outside the House who would be willing to be charged as the author of any of my speeches. You see the method used. "I heard that the maid or the cook said that the iceman said," and so forth. Maybe they did, but the iceman did not have any foundation for his charge.

Getting back to the matter to which the gentleman from Mississippi referred. On the 20th the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and I am sorry he is not here today, asked and received unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by John Roy Carlson. There is no such man as John Roy Carlson. That is an alias or a pen name for the author of a book. You will find the extension on pages A2032 and A2033 of the daily RECORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania then extended the statement of John Roy Carlson in which, contrary to the rules of the House, the names of three of the Democratic Members of the other body are mentioned in an attempt of the author to associate himself in a favorable light with the Members of the other body, following in reverse his method used in his book. He also makes certain charges against Members of the House, naming them.

My point is this: The Congress is kicked around enough, the individual Members of the House are kicked around enough, by radio commentators, by columnists, and others so that we ought to be able to restrain ourselves from making false charges about each other. Let the outsiders make those charges if they must be made. If some Member of the House does something which is reprehensible, and on one occasion over the air it was charged that this is the "House of Reprehensibles," then let the House take action and discipline that Member; but let us not insert in the RECORD statements made by third persons which reflect not upon the ability, the judgment, or the good sense of Members of the House, but upon their patriotism, and their loyalty to this country in this time of war.

It is my purpose to offer a resolution, which I will send to the Clerk's desk, asking that these remarks be withdrawn. The resolution does not state "withdrawn," but states that it be refererd to the Committee on Rules. I hope that committee will follow the course which has sometimes been followed heretofore, namely, that the gentleman who inserted the remarks will be asked, and there is nothing wrong in that nor critical in that, for I realize that at times I have extended remarks in which I violated the rules by thoughtlessly inserting the name of some Senator, to request the House to grant by unanimous consent to withdraw the whole of the Carlson statement. If the gentleman fails to do that, then the matter be given further consideration by the Committee on Rules; because I wish to announce here and now that hereafter on no occasion is a Member of this House going to get unanimous consent while I am on the floor to insert the letters or statements of any third person which charge any Member of this House, either directly or indirectly, with being disloyal. That is not only an insult to the Members of the House, to the House as a whole, but it is an insult to the intelligence and the loyalty of the people of the district from which the Member so charged comes. We have no right to question either the good judgment or the loyalty of 300,000 or 400,000 people who after a campaign in which the record of the candidate is made clear send their choice as their Representative to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the resolution to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 516).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the statement found on pages A2032 and A2033 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1944, beginning with the words, "Statement of John Roy Carlson," and ending with the words, "John Roy Carlson," be stricken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules for such action as it may deem proper.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, of course I shall support the resolution. I would support it if it did not mention the name of a single Senator, for the simple reason I am not willing for any Member of this House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD vicious and personal attacks on Members of this body.

Besides, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] explained to you the other day that the majority, or a large portion, of that book Under Cover was stolen from reports of the Dies committee, that these smear tactics, mentioning the names of Senators and Representatives in Congress were put in there for the purpose of selling the book. He also explained to you that this man who calls himself Carlson, the alleged author of that book, who has changed his name seven times, was circulating subversive literature among our soldiers prior to the time of the Pearl Harbor disaster.

How in the name of God the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] could ever find it in his conscience to insert that stuff in the RECORD, after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] made these revelations here on the floor of the House in reference to the man, I cannot understand.

Again, Mr. Speaker, may I say that a Member of this House has no right to attack a Senator by name, nor has he the right to insert anything in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that reflects on a Senator.

That is the rule of comity between the Houses. It is pretty much disregarded at the other end of the Capitol. A Senator from the State of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] the other day inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a broadcast made by a little Communist by the name of Frank Kingdon up in New Jersey, one of the most vicious, scurrilous attacks on the Members of the House of Representatives that you can imagine, and yet a man by the name of GUFFEY inserted it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do not know how long the Senate is going to sleep on this proposition and decline to observe the rules of

comity, but so far as the House is concerned, we propose to see that those rules are upheld, and that this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not going to be a common carrier for the scurrilous attacks of this loathsome, alien Communist on the Members of the United States Congress in either body; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the resolution, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair trusts the gentleman will not do that, because there is a matter in this resolution that is conflicting.

Mr. RANKIN. I withhold the motion for the time being.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that I may withdraw the resolution on condition that I be permitted to reword it and offer it again later in the day.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, is it required that a motion to strike this matter from the RECORD be in writing? As I understand, it can be done orally.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to demand that any motion to strike from the RECORD be put in writing. The gentleman withdraws the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Temporarily.

The SPEAKER. He withdraws the resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include an editorial from the Montgomery County Standard, and in the other to include a petition of the Farmers of Upper Montgomery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, in the hope that it may be of value to the House, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD tables showing the Treasury Department estimates of the number of civilian income recipients incurring regular net income tax, and Victory tax, under the Revenue Act of 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the golden wedding anniversary of Dr. and Mrs. Stellhorn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Frank Kent which appeared in the Chicago Sun entitled "For a Clean Sweep of Anti-Ally Nonsense."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the time allotted to my colleague [Mr. SAUTHOFF], I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FREE AMMUNITION AT MILITARY FUNERALS

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the various war veteran organizations are called upon for many services to those who have served in the armed forces.

Among the most important is the conducting of military funerals for those patriots who have borne arms for our country.

Besides providing personnel for such honors, ammunition is needed. It is hard to secure and in addition these war veterans are asked to pay for such ammunition. At the present time, all war veteran organizations must pay the Government for ammunition used at military funerals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our Government at least owes these war veterans the ammunition for a firing squad, and I have introduced a resolution that the War Department provide free ammunition for such purposes.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 516), as follows:

Resolved, That the statement found on pages A2032 and A2033 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1944, beginning with the words, "Statement of John Roy Carlson," and ending with the words, "John Roy Carlson," be given consideration by the Committee on Rules: Be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules for such action as it may deem proper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. It is a privileged resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but anything that goes to the Committee on Rules is not a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Michigan on the theory that it is a privileged resolution, and holds that it is a privileged resolution. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman to offer it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. It would also be privileged for any Member to move to strike this material from the RECORD at any time, I understand.

The SPEAKER. If he is recognized for that purpose; yes.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as I heard this resolution read, it directs the Committee on Rules to give consideration. That is very unusual.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that it requests the Committee on Rules to give consideration.

Mr. MICHENER. I understand the Committee on Rules was directed. If the House has authority to direct the Committee on Rules to proceed to do a certain thing, then the Committee on Rules must proceed at once to do that thing. That would be doing violence to all of the rules of the House and all the precedents.

The SPEAKER. This resolution provides that it shall be given consideration by the Committee on Rules, and then provides that it shall be referred to the Committee on Rules. That is all it does.

Mr. MICHENER. Then, I take it, the first part is surplusage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not compose the resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, if I may make an observation, I am not greatly alarmed by the statement of my colleague from Michigan. I think the Committee on Rules is the servant of the House and not the master. Any time the House wants to order the Committee on Rules to do anything, that is its privilege. I think it is an erroneous impression that the Committee on Rules is the master of the House.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order, the matter has been referred to the Committee on Rules, and a motion to reconsider has been laid on the table.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it seems to me that if this thing could be held up he would probably agree to strike this matter from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. It is being held up by being referred to the Committee on Rules.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MONOPOLY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one large American corporation runs advertisements in the magazines purporting to give a picture of the way in which men and women in the armed services think of America as they go about their business of upholding her cause in this war. One sentence in this

advertisement describes them as thinking of home "where they can help build a new America and a new and finer world than they have ever known." The advertisement concludes with this injunction to the rest of us: "Keep it for them the way they see it now."

Now just what does that mean? Certainly it means an America in which the average man can look forward hopefully to developing his talents and abilities and to finding a job and real opportunity for the use of those talents and abilities. It does not mean an America dominated by a handful of huge financial and industrial concerns capable of wielding a power of economic life and death over the rank and file of citizens. And we must remember, must we not, that the men who are on the point of some day crossing to the European Continent to engage in the greatest military struggle of all time, will when they return home again belong to the great rank and file. Precious few of them will have "positions" ready and waiting for them with the 24 mighty financial concerns which dominate the monetary system of this Nation, or the somewhat larger number of nonfinancial corporations which are in a position to so largely control production and distribution of the necessities of life.

And so, as we think about their future, as well as our own, the lowering problem of monopoly has got to concern us.

The Sunday issue of the Washington Star contains an article on the editorial page which summarizes 10 indictments of monopoly found, on the basis of exhaustive study, by the Temporary National Economic Committee headed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The 10 indictments are as follows:

First. The monopolist limits his output to the quantity that the market will take at the established price.

Second. Monopoly affords the consumer no protection against extortion.

Third. Monopoly affords the worker no protection against low wages and long hours; his only protection lies in organization for collective bargaining, with the strike threat in the background.

Fourth. Monopoly inflicts no penalty on inefficiency.

Fifth. Monopoly is not conducive to economic progress. Though the monopolist may invent new materials, methods, and machines, he is reluctant to use them if they will compel him to scrap existing equipment.

Sixth. Monopoly prevents the full utilization of productive capacity.

Seventh. Monopoly obstructs adjustment to economic change and thus contributes to general industrial instability.

Eighth. Monopoly impedes the raising of the general plane of living; this because, in ways set out above, it makes the total output of goods and services less than it otherwise would be.

Ninth. Monopoly contributes to inequality in the distribution of income. The monopolist is under no compulsion to pass on to labor or to consumers the gains resulting from improvements in technology.

Tenth. And, finally, monopoly threatens the existence of free enterprise and representative government.

Side by side with that article there was another one to which I hope to refer at greater length in another speech and which contained certain paragraphs stating that it is now being whispered in certain quarters in Washington, New York, and maybe even Chicago, that, after all, the attempt begun by President Theodore Roosevelt to break the power of the trusts in America was all a mistake and that the time has come when we must accept the fact that only the hugest combinations of financial and industrial power can expect to survive in the modern world.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I agree with those 10 indictments of monopoly. I think they are absolutely true. However, I personally am wondering whether we have more to fear from private monopoly or from Government monopoly. I have always been worried about private monopoly, but in the last few years I am beginning to worry about Government monopoly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand the gentleman's point. I believe that any concentration of great power, wherever it takes place, is a threat to democracy and to human liberty. The burden of my speech here today is going to be very largely this, and I was coming to that very point, that wherever you have the establishment of a private monopoly in any important field of human life there are only two remedies for that situation to which you can resort, and one of them is an assertion of the public interest through some public action. I believe there is another possible remedy, and that is through cooperatives built up by the people themselves in order to try to compete against monopoly through cooperation. I prefer the second method, so far as it can be effective. But where free enterprise has already been destroyed then arises the real necessity for governmental action and the danger of the thing the gentleman expresses himself as being afraid of.

Therefore my appeal and the reason for asking for this time to make this speech is that I think that we must take vigorous action to prevent the growing power of monopoly. We cannot do much about it now during the war, I know, but I think we have to recognize the fact that in the post-war period we have to deal with that problem as our No. 1 domestic danger.

Unless we are prepared to do that, we shall be compelled to go in for greater and greater degrees of governmental control to protect the public interest. I personally would go so far as to say that when you have a situation where there is a monopoly in existence in a field that is absolutely essential to human welfare, it is the duty of Government to take action.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Knowing that the full and complete exercise of free enterprise eventually militates against the less capable, I am wondering what the gentleman thinks about free enterprise as compared to some of the things he has suggested on this floor, such as cooperatives. I mean, just what station does the gentleman believe free enterprise should enjoy?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think free enterprise should enjoy the maximum possible station in the economic life of the United States so long as it is really free and observes fair competitive methods. By that I mean to say that wherever through enforcement of the antitrust laws and through a vigorous protection of people's right to engage in business it is possible to protect the freedom of enterprise, that should be the rule and that should be the thing that dominates our economic life. Of course, there are some fields such as public utilities where free competition just won't work. There a different answer is called for as I shall explain later on. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. ROWE. Yes; it does.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Again in a recent issue of Newsweek magazine I read where leading pharmaceutical manufacturers in the United States, fearful of post-war competition, are turning to plans for the formation of patent pools and other monopolistic devices which might put them in a position similar to that which I. G. Farbenindustrie has occupied in Germany for a number of years.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to address the House on this subject of monopoly, for I am convinced that America stands today at the crossroads. And while I should like to postpone speaking on a subject of this kind, I cannot feel that I would be doing right if I did so. The main theme of what I have to say is this: Monopoly cannot eat its cake and have it too. It cannot demand freedom from governmental control in the name of the free enterprise which monopoly itself by its very existence destroys. As I said in a recent speech on the proposed Arabian pipe line, either there must be truly free enterprise, or we must, in frank fashion, adopt the policies which Britain has adopted and attempt to defend the public interest either by public-ownership yardsticks or by some form of public participation with monopoly in its imperial and essentially public domain.

The British Government owns half the stock of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. The British people have, over the past 30 years, received in dividends on this investment five times the original amount of that investment. If there has got to be monopoly, then the people must share in its benefits. Of course, there are ways to avoid government participation in monopolies.

Vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws is the better way. Keeping the door of opportunity open to small-scale enterprises is a move in accord with American traditions. But if we are to be told that this way cannot be taken and that monopoly must be accepted, then we must be clear in our minds what the requirements of democracy and justice are under those circumstances.

In this speech I shall outline some of the facts of recent history about the growth of monopoly in America, and appeal for forthright congressional action in the light of those facts. For fundamental to all things is the freedom of the people, and no definition of free enterprise which merely means the freedom of industrial and financial giants to prey at will upon their smaller competitors without governmental interference can ever stand justified before the bar of American public opinion. No monopoly is either free enterprise or private enterprise or individual initiative. Once monopoly is established it becomes essentially a public concern.

To a greater extent than is commonly realized we are now fashioning the molds into which the world of the days after this war will be poured. The policies which we allow to come into being now while the war is still in progress, the actions we now take, will inevitably have influence on the kind of world in which our children will live. There are many things which in the nature of the present circumstances we cannot do. We cannot interfere with maximum production for the war. On the contrary whatever is necessary to be sacrificed for that purpose must be done. But the time is already long overdue when we should most seriously consider the increasing power of domestic monopoly and even of international cartels in the economic structure. There are two reasons for this. The first is that monopoly has proven a far more serious obstacle to all-out war production than any except those in the very inner circle of the war program realize. True, progress has been made and bottlenecks have been broken in many instances, be it said to their credit, by men who have come into Government service straight out of some of the biggest monopoly corporations in the country. On the other hand, the power of monopoly not only remains, but has unquestionably been greatly strengthened as result of war conditions and the necessities of war production.

Present economic development will inevitably determine post-war economic development to a considerable extent. Therefore it behooves us to take careful thought with regard to the future and chart our present and post-war course with a view to avoiding that greatest of all dangers to free democratic institutions, namely, closely held private monopoly power. Throughout the years America has prided herself on being a land of opportunity, a land of enterprise, a land where men with ideas could put those ideas into effect, build prosperous businesses both large and small, increase the supply of available goods and benefit their country thereby. The growth of monopoly power, particularly if it has international connections, spells the doom of such an America. I say these things because the whole purpose of monopoly is to gain a sufficiently great degree of control over production in order to bring about control of the supply of a product. The purpose of such control of supply in turn is in order to be able to maintain artificial price levels.

The philosophy of scarcity which is inherent in monopoly can have only one result in the long run—impoverishment of the Nation. For full and unlimited production is the only means of increasing real wealth. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I could speak for a long time demonstrating to the House the manner in which international monopoly power was directly responsible for the scarcities which have caused us so much difficulty with regard to rubber, and tin, and steel, and copper, and aluminum. Some of these, indeed, I shall refer to in the course of this speech. I could go further also and show the House how it was that this philosophy of scarcity, restricting production in nation after nation, insisting upon the levying of higher and higher tariff barriers, parceling out world trade and carving up world markets into preserves into which no competitor was allowed to enter—I could show how these things in the period after the First World War laid the groundwork for the present war and were, along with the aggression of the Fascist countries, the cause of this conflict.

MONOPOLY VERSUS THE FARMER

The effects of monopoly fall with especial force upon the farm population of our country. For years Americans have wondered why it was that agriculture received such an unjustly small proportion of the national income. But the reason has never been far to seek. Through the years agriculture has remained predominantly a competitive industry By and large only through the formation of cooperatives have farmers been able to protect themselves against serious declines in prices for their crops at every period of harvest. This has been true because thousands, sometimes millions, of farmers have been marketing the same crop at the same time and because purchasers were therefore in a position to compel farmers to compete with one another in the sale of those crops for lower and lower prices. Meanwhile, item after item which the farmers had to buy—tractors, farm machinery, fertilizer, feed, seed, even processed food products themselves—have had to be paid for at prices fixed by monopolistic control of the market. But for governmental regulation the same thing would have been true of charges for railroad transportation. But for governmental yardsticks, the cost of electricity to the farmer would have been an exorbitant cost exacted from him by the monopolistic power of private utilities.

Selling in a market therefore that was dominated by monopoly power able to take his product at a price which bore no necessary relationship to his cost of production, and buying in a market at prices controlled by the seller, again without regard to real values, it has been inevitable that the farmers of America have failed to obtain their fair share of national income throughout the years. This is the basic reason why farm tenancy has increased as much as it has in America, the basic reason why the Congress attempts from time to time to wrestle with the agricultural problem with so little apparent long-run success.

It is perhaps significant that the very financial agencies—namely—the huge banks and insurance companies, which are the centers of monopoly power in America—are the ones which are most frequently the landlords of the farmers who have lost ownership of their land through the operation of monopoly in our American economy.

In his very able report to the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning of the Senate which is known as Senate Document 106, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] includes a table which compares the total assessed valuation of the 48 States of the Union with the total assets of 34 corporations in this country having assets of a billion dollars or more. It is interesting to note that the total assessed property valuation of the various States amounts altogether to $143,000,000,000 and the total assets of these corporations to more than half that sum, namely $73,000,000,000. There are only 6 States in the Union which have assessed valuation greater than the total assets of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. which amount to $6,000,000,000. Only 10 States have assets greater than the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Chase National Bank, or the Prudential Life Insurance Co., all of which corporations have assets between $4,500,000,000 and $5,000,000,000. The greatest non-financial corporation in the country, second only to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., is the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, controlling assets of almost every conceivable sort, amounting in all to $2,220,000,000. The United States Steel Corporation is close behind with $2,120,000,000. The total combined assessed valuation of the States of Arizona, Idaho, Vermont, Wyoming, Delaware, Montana, and New Mexico fails to equal the assets of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey or the United States Steel Corporation.

I know about those soothing sentences which tell us that after all bigness is no crime, that huge corporations have been responsible for much of the industrial advance which has been made in recent years, that the management of these corporations is becoming more enlightened as time goes on. These ideas have lulled America into inaction long enough. We are right up against the decision which will determine the future course of our country for centuries to come.

Either we are going to hug monopoly to our bosom and run up the white flag and say that the public interest has to be protected in some other way than by the free activity of truly competitive business or else we have to face this problem and do something about it.

WHERE MONOPOLY IS UNAVOIDABLE

There are fields of business where monopoly is inevitable, indeed where it is the only sensible form of organization. These are the fields of public utilities, communications, and to some extent transportation. There is only one answer here, only one way in which the public interest can ultimately be served. That answer is the publicly owned yardstick. Regulation has been tried and found wanting. And while I do not ad-

vocate nor desire that public agencies, Federal, State, or local, take over the entire business in these fields, of natural monopoly, I certainly do desire to see enough of them owned and operated by public bodies to inject, in the only way that it is possible to inject it, the elements of true competition and of abundant supply at the lowest economically sound cost.

There are other fields in which monopoly has already grown so great that one finds it hard to believe that any agency other than the Goverment of the United States can be powerful enough to cope with the situation. One of these industries is oil, about which I have already addressed the House at such length that I do not want to go into it again today, except to reemphasize the absolute necessity of action which can be effective in either protecting the opportunity of truly independent corporations to exist in the oil industry, or else can protect the public interest through government itself.

So far I have been speaking generally about the problem and if I am so deeply concerned about it, as I am, the membership of the House has a right to expect me to have specific and substantial reason for my concern. I can assure you I am not without such reasons.

THE CHEMICAL CARTEL

Only a couple of months ago the Department of Justice filed suit against the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. and the Imperial Chemical Industries of Great Britain for violations of the antitrust laws. In its brief the Department of Justice sets forth evidence of the continued operations of cartels between these two corporations in which up until the very hour of the outbreak of the war the German I. G. Farben was a full if not a senior partner. It is evident that every intention exists to resume this cartel agreement in its full flower as soon as the war shall have ended. And if that happens history will repeat itself, free enterprise will be strangled in the chemical field, a Germany defeated in a military sense will arise again economically not only to rehabilitate her own monopolistic economy but to gain through fellow members of cartels a hold upon the economy of our own country and that of Great Britain. Worst of all, the groundwork for another war is likely to be laid.

In the words of Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge:

> The two corporate defendants, Imperial Chemical Industries and du Pont, represent one of the largest aggregations of wealth and concentrated economic power.

And again:

> The arrangements between these groups if allowed to go undetected and free from the enforcement of domestic laws are nothing but private treaties—as far reaching as any governmental action but free from congressional sanction.

This cartel agreement is, according to the Department of Justice, still in full force and effect. The Department charges that the cartel agreement provides that du Pont and Imperial Chemical Industries shall not compete with one another—that du Pont, Remington Rand Co., and Imperial Chemical shall cooperate to eliminate competition between Remington and Imperial Chemical—that du Pont and Imperial Chemical shall cooperate to eliminate the competition of other companies throughout the world. This agreement affected thousands of products ranging from explosives to paints and varnishes. The assets of du Pont, according to the complaint of the Department of Justice, approximate $1,000,000,000, including the ownership of approximately 23 percent of the stock of the General Motors Corporation.

The cartel agreement further provides, according to the Department of Justice, that if either of the two giant corporations develops any products, these products would be included in the agreement. But most serious of all perhaps in the complaint of the Department of Justice is correspondence between Lord McGowan, the head of Imperial Chemical, and Mr. Lammot du Pont which indicates that neither of these corporations has the slightest intention of permitting governmental action by either the British or the American Government to interfere with their cartel arrangements. This correspondence as quoted in the Department of Justice complaint is worth reproducing here:

In July 1933, Lord McGowan wrote to Lammot du Pont as follows:

> I have warned my people that no fiscal alterations in the U. S. A. must be allowed to affect the interpretation to be placed on our patents and processes agreement, and the working out of the cooperation for which the agreement provides. * * * I find it is a good thing to issue such warnings. * * * so that everything possible is done to ensure that no prospective political or legislative action on the part of governments is permitted to influence relations between du Pont and I. C. I.

To this letter Mr. du Pont replied in part:

> I feel the same. * * * If any legislation or international agreements are brought about which affect these I. C. I.-du Pont relations, I am sure we will be able to adjust ourselves so as to get the continued benefit of our agreement.

In order to control the Argentine market, Imperial Chemical and du Pont organized a company known as Duperial. Through this company competition between Imperial Chemical and du Pont was eliminated so far as Argentina was concerned, and it was agreed that every effort should be made to prevent other American manufacturers from exporting chemical products or manufacturing such products in Argentina. It became apparent, however, that German I. G. Farben was attempting to make arrangements with an Argentine company whereby it might enter the field in that nation. On this point the Department of Justice complaint contains this language:

> To prevent such competitions from developing I. C. I. acting on behalf of itself and du Pont entered into an agreement with I. G. Farben whereby the latter agreed to withdraw from its negotiations with La Celulosa (the Argentine company) in return for a promised participation in any cooperative arrangements made with La Celulosa.

This was in 1938, only 1 year before British and German soldiers began fighting one another on the European continent. In consequence of this agreement a corporation was organized and became known as Electroclor which was in effect given monopoly of the chemical industry in Argentina and also control over paper pulp manufacturing. With the outbreak of the present war, arrangements made to allocate to I. G. Farben a certain percentage of stock in Electroclor were not finally consummated, but the Department of Justice charges that the foreign-relations department of the du Pont Corporation reported to the executive committee on February 9, 1940, as follows:

> The du Pont Co. informed I. G. Farben that they intended to use their good offices after the war to have the I. G. Farben participation restored.

This, it is true, occurred prior to the time that the United States went to war with Germany, but it was less than a year before that time, and it was at a time when the American Congress was passing legislation to aid the nations resisting German aggression.

In 1932, according to the Department of Justice complaint, du Pont and Imperial Chemical entered into a contract dealing with military explosives. This agreement did not deal with either the United States or the British Empire, because under the terms of the cartel agreement the British Empire was reserved exclusively for Imperial Chemical and the United States was reserved exclusively for du Pont already. But under the 1932 agreement sales of military explosives were to be made on behalf of both corporations by means of joint sales organizations. In this connection, Asia was assigned to Imperial Chemical Industries and du Pont received Europe and South America. In pursuance to this agreement, for example, both companies instructed their sales agents in China that it was a matter of indifference which company's products were sold, since there was in effect a sharing of profits between both of the companies.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that I need to expand upon the terrible danger to the peace of mankind which is obviously present in a situation of this sort where private industrial giants divide up the world between them in order that they may share in the profits from the sale of military explosives.

The Department of Justice further charges in its complaint that subsequent to 1930 du Pont and Imperial Chemical entered into various contracts and agreements with the Atlas Powder Co. and the Hercules Powder Co. which provided not only for price fixing but also for the establishment of quotas for these companies so far as the South American market was concerned.

In 1933 Remington Rand joined the cartel and in that year du Pont acquired control of that company.

The Department of Justice specifically states in its complaint as follows:

The combination and conspiracy herein alleged between I. C. I. and du Pont continues to the date of the filing of this complaint.

I have gone into considerable detail about this matter, Mr. Speaker, and it may perhaps seem to the House to have been unnecessary for the reason that I have said nothing which is not already a matter of public record, having been so made by the filing of the suit by the Department of Justice. But I have a particular reason for bringing these matters once again to the attention of the American public as forcibly as I am able to do. For I have little doubt that ever since the filing of this complaint and perhaps at the very moment I am addressing the House of Representatives on this occasion, the most tremendous pressure is being brought to bear upon the Department of Justice of this Government to induce it not to prosecute this case. I have little fear that I am wrong in stating that it is even now being argued that it will be difficult for officials of these huge corporations to carry on the business of supplying certain munitions for the United States and Great Britain if this suit is pressed, or that a thousand and one other reasons will be advanced to try to get the Department to lay off. And the point I want to stress is this: If there be anything to such arguments, then my speech becomes more than ever important to the future of our country. For suppose we should find it to be true that the supply of various types of arms, ammunition, or war matériel for the armed forces of our country is in certain respects so highly concentrated in the hands of one corporation that as a condition for continuing full production of the means of defense of our Nation we must fail to enforce the law, fail indeed to assert the very fundamental principle of democracy which is that no private interest shall stake out a portion of the economy and say to other human beings, citizens of the same country, "You shall not enter here."

Every Member of Congress has at one time or another inveighed against business as usual during the war. Surely then we can get along without cartels as usual, and surely the Department of Justice should prosecute this case with all the vigor at its command.

BANK OF INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENT

Nor can I refrain in this connection from reminding the House that as long ago as March 26, 1943, I pointed out some of the things that were going on in connection with the Bank of International Settlements located at Basle, Switzerland. I pointed out how this international bank which still flourished in spite of the fact that its board of directors was composed on the one hand of the Governor of the Bank of England and certain American financiers and on the other hand of representatives of the German Reichsbank and of other central banks, every one of which is under the control of Hitler's military power at the present. Over 70 percent of the voting stock of the Bank of International Settlements is controlled by Hitler at this moment and yet an American remains president of the institution and "business as usual" is still to a considerable extent being conducted by it, even as American and British Armies are engaged in mortal combat with the armies of Germany.

On that same March 26, 1943, I introduced into the House of Representatives a resolution (H. Res. 188) which read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, either as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make an investigation of the Bank of International Settlements, of Basle, Switzerland, for the purpose of determining the facts regarding the founding of the bank after the First World War, the degree of control exercised over it by Axis Powers, the reasons why an American retains the position as president of the bank, why representatives of United Nations' banking institutions continue as members on the board of directors under present circumstances, and whether or not there exists the possibility of this bank being used to further the designs and purposes of Axis Powers.

(a) The committee shall make a report to the House as soon as practicable after its investigation has been concluded.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned; to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise; to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him.

I once again appeal to the House for consideration of my resolution, and I do so because I see the handwriting on the wall. I see the possibility—nay, the probability—that even now plans are being laid subtly and quietly for the resumption of business according to the cartel pattern as soon as the war shall have ended, and if that happens there is no reason for us to expect that the German, experienced as he is in such matters, will not once again succeed in bringing about through these agreements the artificial limitations on production of the most vital products needed by our own Nation for its defense and for its economic life, just as was done in the years that preceded the present World War.

In this connection I should like to quote here in full a most encouraging letter concerning the Bank for International Settlements which was received by our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] from the Secretary of the Treasury:

This is in reply to your letter of March 6, 1944, enclosing some material from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relating to the Bank for International Settlements.

You will appreciate that I am in a position to comment only on the organization and operation of the Bank for International Settlements. The B. I. S. was organized in 1930 in accordance with the recommendation of the Young report. The original owners of the B. I. S. were the central banks of five European countries, a Japanese bank, and three American banks.

The present head of the B. I. S. is Mr McKittrick. The board of directors includes representatives of Germany, Italy, Japan, and France. I believe the British director may not be serving actively at this time, and I am informed that the Belgian Government does not permit the head of the National Bank of Belgium to serve as a director. The B. I. S. continues to do business with the German Government and the Reichsbank as well as in the occupied countries.

You may be interested in knowing that the B. I. S. has been blocked under our foreign funds control since June 1941. The Treasury is following a stringent policy in connection with applications for licenses on behalf of the B. I. S. to undertake transactions involving funds in the United States.

Sincerely yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

I want especially to call attention to the fact that the B. I. S. has been blocked under foreign funds control by our Government, and to note that our Treasury Department has taken constructive action in this most serious matter.

There are other things, too, Mr. Speaker, specific things that I have to mention.

METALS

Throughout most of the war period our country has suffered from a shortage of the basic metals. Admitting at the outset that a colossal job confronted the War Production Board and all other agencies in stepping up metal production to meet war needs, and admitting likewise that at the present moment the shortage with regard to steel and aluminum and probably copper, has been to a considerable extent overcome, it is nevertheless true that due primarily to monopolistic influences an unnecessary shortage of such metals afflicted our country for many, many months. And it is even more important to observe that the opportunity to give independent and in most instances small-scale businesses a chance to inject healthy competition into the production of these metals has been largely lost in this war period. It is true, of course, that in the early months of war it was necessary to get increased production as quickly as was humanly possible to do, no matter where the orders had to be placed. But there were occasions when decisions had to be made as to where and under what corporation expanded productive capacity should be provided. And there is evidence that in many cases proposals for new processes or proposals advanced by non-inner-circle companies were turned down not because they were no good but partly at least because the source of the proposal was not "right." And it is in my judgment significant that it was not until after the expansion program—that is, the program of construction of new facilities and plant—was definitely at an end that we were suddenly informed that the shortages of basic metals had been overcome.

Meanwhile for lack of steel our farmers have undergone very great hardship indeed due to the consequent lack of farm machinery. This situation in my judg-

ment was directly traceable to the power of monopoly represented by what can be properly called the Steel Trust in guiding the decisions which have been made.

The now-famous Ganno-Dunn report it will be remembered, issued only a short time before Pearl Harbor, lulled us into a false sense of security by telling us that a 90,000,000-ton annual capacity for steel production was quite enough for our needs. Shortly after Pearl Harbor the Steel Division of the War Production Board decided that an extra 10,000,000 tons would be required, and planned for this to be obtained over a 2-, 3-, or 4-year period. But on June 24, 1942, the Steel Branch virtually confessed that it had again underestimated the Nation's needs.

It is at least questionable whether there ever needed to be a shortage of steel in the United States and whether a large part of the terrific problem faced by American agriculture in attempting to get along with inadequate supplies of machinery might have been avoided but for the monopoly point of view. It may be said with perfect truth that it is water under the dam, and that a larger and more important fact is that American industry under the guidance of the War Production Board has produced successfully to meet the war needs. I readily grant all that. But I am speaking today to point to the dangers that confront our country in the future—not to bewail the mistakes of the past. And I am speaking because I know that unless a constructive answer to this problem of monopoly is found we shall have tremendous difficulty indeed in preserving our traditional American democracy into the future. For with regard to steel once again, the story of one particular plant making a certain kind of steel product on the Pacific coast is worth outlining. For 3 years this small company struggled to secure War Production Board approval for the erection of its plant in spite of the fact that it proposed to build it out of scrap material. Approval was finally secured from policy-making officials of the War Production Board when they found that lesser officials who were opponents of the project were forced to admit that their opposition was based solely upon their fear of future competition. This little plant actually produced steel in less than 4 months after approval was granted for its construction.

Most important of all, however, is the fact that we are confronted with the steady depletion of our resources of high-grade iron ore. It is clearly necessary that methods of production capable of using the low-grade ores which are possessed in abundance in practically every portion of our country should be developed and put into effect. But the difficulty seems to be that processes such as the sponge iron process which could make steel out of low-grade ores would mean a decentralization of the steel industry and would make possible the entering of it by a considerable number of small and independent producers. A number of different processes for the production of steel from sponge iron have been proven practical. Our enemies even now are producing vast amounts of steel by this process. But it was only after the most stubborn pressure from Congress that experimental production of sponge iron was authorized and even then it was to Republic Steel, itself a part of the Steel Trust, that money was granted for trying out the so-called Brassert process. A small independent corporation might have stood to make for itself a great name in the industry had it been given a go-ahead signal in trying out sponge iron.

In any case, the important thing in this connection is that if we desire to have real freedom in the economic system of America, effort must be made not to concentrate production in the hands of a few giants nor to prevent the trying out of processes not controlled by those giants, but on the contrary effort must be made to decentralize production, to encourage new processes and above all to bring new and independent blood into this great industry.

From the very beginning I have earnestly opposed the dollar-a-year-man system of manning important Government war agencies. There was a time when 83 officials of the Steel Branch of the War Production Board were dollar-a-year men and practically all of them from the biggest steel companies in the country. It would have cost little more to have paid straight-out salaries to every single person determining Government policy all through this war period and it certainly would have been far better to have thus avoided the situation where in many instances parties with very great and direct interest in these matters have been making the decisions with regard to them.

The aluminum situation is similar to steel. The rough but terribly important facts in this case are that three-fourths of the facilities resulting from expenditure of a vast Government fund of over $600,000,000 which has been devoted to expansion of aluminum plant have been assigned to the Aluminum Co. of America. In the second place, so far aluminum production has been confined to the processes which use bauxite as a base material. The supply of bauxite is mostly located in northern South America. Aluminum Co. of America controls all the patents for the manufacture of aluminum from a bauxite base. It is, however, I think by this time unquestioned among men who know the facts regarding aluminum production that it can be produced from alunite clay, which is found in abundance in the western portion of this country. But we have not gone forward along that line. Instead, through contracts with the R. F. C., Aluminum Corporation of Canada had some $68,000,000 of United States money supplied to it for the construction of the huge Shipshaw Dam and power plant. Repayment of this money was to be obtained only through the purchase of aluminum from Alco's Canadian subsidiary. This has resulted in the laying off of a lot of American workers from aluminum plants in this country, while at the same time the Canadian plant runs full blast.

The power of monopoly, Mr. Speaker, is great. It is too great for the future health of the United States. These are the reasons I am speaking today.

There was a time not many years ago when only 25 percent of American copper production was controlled by the three big copper companies—Anaconda, Kennecott, and Phelps-Dodge. But today more than 85 percent of our production is controlled by these three huge corporations, and in part, at least, this has been due to the policy pursued during the war by dollar-a-year officials, who for so long denied opportunity for the opening up of smaller independent copper mines. Not until after the most terrific pressure had been exerted by congressional committees was this situation remedied.

And now we find that the plant of Basic Magnesium, Inc., at Las Vegas, Nev., a plant whose construction was made possible because of the necessities of the Nation's demands for war and through a vast expenditure of Government funds, has been purchased outright by the Anaconda Copper Co.—the greatest giant in the whole copper field. Some idea of the ramifications of Anaconda's power may be obtained from a mere listing of the offices held by its president, Mr. James R. Hobbins. For in addition to being president of the Anaconda Copper Co., Mr. Hobbins is also president of the Diamond Coal & Coke Co., of the Butte (Mont.) Water Co., of the Andes Copper Mining Co., of the Chile Copper Co., and of the Chile Exploration Co. He is vice president and director of the Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railway. He is a director of the National City Bank of New York, of the Mining Investment Corporation, of the Copper Export Association, of the American Brass Co., of the Anaconda Sales Co., and of the International Smelting & Refining Co.

I have no intention whatever of reflecting upon Mr. Hobbins personally. Indeed, it probably would not matter very much to him even if I did, for his position is, to say the least, a most secure one. But the point is that all throughout the structure of American monopolistic industry, the same situation of interlocking directorates and tremendous personal power by a comparatively few individuals pertains.

I could go on and mention other commodities where similar situations pertain, but it is probably unnecessary.

The key posts in the war agencies of our Government have been largely held by men coming directly from the biggest monopoly corporations of the country. Independent oil-company representatives have been conspicuous by their almost utter absence in the councils of the Petroleum Administration for War. Nor has the situation been so very different in the War Production Board or other agencies.

PUBLIC POLICY SHOULD NOT BE PRIVATELY DETERMINED

It is significant that in the Attorney General's recent report to Congress required under Public Law 603, the so-called Smaller War Plants Corporation Act, which it will be remembered made possible the suspension of the antitrust

laws under certain circumstances, the Attorney General recommended that certain standards of procedure be set up. The first of these standards was the following:

> The avoidance of delegation of functions which should reside exclusively in Government officials to nongovernmental corporations as, for example, enforcement of programs or the determination of policy.

FINANCE, THE MOTHER OF MONOPOLY

It is not in industrial fields alone, Mr. Speaker, that we should be concerned. In my own State of California the Bank of America and its holding company, Transamerica Corporation, already control almost 50 percent of the financial business of the State. At this moment it is seeking to enlarge that control by buying up the stock of the Citizens Bank in Southern California, one of the few remaining strong competitors.

The 24 largest banks in this country controlled approximately one-third of all the financial resources of the Nation in 1936. This concentration of control has been increasing rapidly for the past 2 decades and is still going on. For example, resources of the Chase National Bank in 1936 were reported in Moody's Manual as $2,562,182,000, whereas the same source reported this huge bank's total assets in 1942 as $4,570,000,000.

Referring back to the statistics given earlier in my speech from the report of Senator O'MAHONEY to the Senate Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, I should like to comment further on the stupendous figures there given on the assets of some of the huge financial corporations of the Nation. Not only do those financial corporations own those billions of dollars worth of property today, but they also possess under our present financial system the privilege of creating outright by the stroke of a pen vast amounts of bank deposit money on the basis of their fractional reserves and of using that utterly costless bank deposit money to purchase real property and to make long-term investments anywhere they see fit throughout the United States. This power on the part of the banks of our Nation, in my judgment, lies at the very root of the monopoly problem. And this is one of the reasons that I have continued ever since I first became a Member of Congress to urge that the present monetary system of the Nation be changed so that the power to create money should be restored exclusively to the Congress where, under the Constitution, it belongs.

In the last analysis, finance is the biggest cartel of all.

It will be recalled that only a little while ago the Chase National Bank—assets nearly $5,000,000,000—was indicted by the Federal Grand Jury for its handling of funds for a Dutch refugee by the name of Smit who was conspiring to send industrial diamonds to the Axis nations through a dummy corporation created by him in Panama. The defense of the Chase National Bank in this instance was that the transactions covered by the indictment did take place, but that they occurred prior to Pearl Harbor. However, United States Attorney McNally, of New York, asserted that every one of the charges had continued right to the time the indictment was brought forth early in January.

Nor is this by any means the only instance where vast financial or industrial power has stood in the way of the national interest. Speaking in April 1943 before the American Business Congress in New York City, the Honorable Tom Clark, then head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, said:

> What does the record of monopoly show? I need not labor the point, but I call your attention to the monumental junk heaps of aluminum pots and pans commandeered from the housewives of America, the piles of scrap rubber and old iron now scarring the public squares of our cities; the pleas of our armed forces for binoculars; the enormous difficulties we have experienced in the production of magnesium, electrical equipment, plastics, machine tools, critical chemicals, and vital medicines—all memorials to the role monopoly has played in this war.

SO SOON?

We know, Mr. Speaker, that the British are largely committed to extension of the cartel system. It was last fall that I read in the daily press about a new area agreement whereby the sale of cotton thread in certain portions of Africa had been assigned to British firms instead of American ones and of how the Belgian Congo Purchasing Commission issued a brief statement as follows:

> We are informed by our claimant agency that cotton thread for the Belgian Congo will be procured in the United Kingdom, no allocation for such thread being available for the Congo in the United States.

Neither cotton thread nor the Belgian Congo may seem to be matters of world-shaking significance; but if this agreement represents one of a number of parts in the pattern whereby American and British monopolistic interests are going to start in right now dividing up the markets of the world to the exclusion of their fellow citizens in both countries, then it is time for us to wake up and decide what we are going to do about it.

THIS MUST NOT HAPPEN AGAIN

We know that the largest and mightiest corporations in the United States were part and parcel of that cartel system before this war. We need only look at the record of the Temporary National Economic Commission for ample documentation of the manner in which economic power was concentrated in this country following the First World War. Nor can we be blind to the fact that that concentration of economic power not only in our own country but in other parts of the world led directly to artificial restriction on production, to prevention of abundant production to meet the people's needs and consequently to laying the groundwork of the present conflict. It is not for a repetition of this that Americans are fighting and dying on the battlefields of the world. We must be up in arms about this matter and to the extent that we cannot act now, due to the exigencies of the war, our resolve to act as soon as we can act must become the stronger.

I am quite conscious of the fact that I have not submitted any particularly new facts or material to the House in this speech. Most of what I have said is a matter of public record and a good deal of it is well known to many Members of this body. But it has been my hope that the earnestness of my warning as to our duty in the light of those facts would have effect.

MY OWN RECORD

Way back in the earliest days of the war I introduced a bill which would have prevented the dollar-a-year system of securing personnel for Government agencies and would have required that everyone in a position of policy-making should leave any private pay roll on which he might be carried and be paid exclusively by the Government of the United States in order that his interest might so far as possible be a completely undivided one.

More than once I have pointed out the danger in the monopoly held by the major oil companies and I shall continue to do so, not only as to the oil monopoly but as to others.

I have introduced a number of bills aiming to get at some of the basic problems of concentration of economic power. One of these bills would require the registration with the Department of Justice of every cartel agreement entered into by any American corporation with foreign corporations. Had such a bill been in effect we should have known throughout the years that Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey had agreed with I. G. Farben of Germany that synthetic rubber should not be produced in the United States. We should have known, when in 1939 at Standard's urgent request Farben released it from the absolute commitment, it nevertheless exacted a condition to the effect that Standard would charge 7 cents royalty per pound of anyone manufacturing synthetic rubber by the controlled patented process. Furthermore, were this bill to be passed, it would at least mean that cartel agreements, constituting as they do private treaties by these huge industrial empires, would in the future have to be made in the light of full public knowledge and scrutiny.

I have also introduced a bill, H. R. 3874, whose aim and purpose is frankly to put an end to the monopolistic practice of hoarding patents whereby huge corporations have been in the habit of acquiring control and ownership of very large numbers of patented processes, not for the purpose of making use of such processes or of increasing the supply of needed goods by means of them, but rather for the purpose of preventing competitors from being able to use the patents at all. From a national standpoint the result of such practice has, of course, been to make the Nation poorer, to restrict its supply of vital products, to cause it to pay more for many of the things its people use from day to day. Under the terms of the bill the Government could intervene and become a party for the presentation of evidence and argument upon any question concerning the validity and scope of the patent or its use in restraint of trade.

Very briefly, the bill further provides for the registration with the Department of Justice of every sale, assignment, or conveyance of any patent or any transfer therein and of every agreement relating to a patent. The bill would amend the antitrust laws by making it unlawful action in restraint of trade for the holder of any patent to refuse any reasonable offer to license that patent. Thus under the terms of H. R. 3874 the ingenuity of Americans could not be monopolized for the private gain of one or two huge corporations, but on the contrary the results of that ingenuity would cause an increased flow of new and improved products into the markets of the Nation. And furthermore any company, however, small it might be, which was in a position to make a fair and reasonable offer to license a patented process would stand on a plane of absolute equality with the most gigantic monopolies and would be protected by the Government in that position.

When this war shall finally have been won and, indeed, in some instances even before that glad day comes, we shall be confronted with a situation which will have intimate bearing upon this monopoly problem about which I have been speaking. I refer of course to the Government-owned war plants and facilities and the decisions which will have to be made as to their disposition. The easy path will be to sell these properties to the readiest purchasers, who in most instances will be the biggest monopolistic corporations in the country. In all too many cases those corporations are now operating these plants, but the right thing to do if we really desire a free America in the future is to guard against the disposal of these plants, built with the money of the American taxpayer, in any way which would result in fastening more tenaciously the hold of monopoly upon the industry of the Nation.

As a means of outlining a policy which would be salutary instead of harmful and which would promote true freedom of enterprise, I have prepared a bill which I am introducing today. The text of that bill will speak for itself and I should like to read it at this point to the House:

A bill to prevent monopoly and to promote a high level of production in the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That in the disposal of surplus Government-owned war plants and facilities, the following policies and procedure shall be followed by departments or agencies of government charged with responsibility for such disposal:

(1) In cases where, in the opinion of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, conditions of effective competition exist in the industry in which any plant or facility is to be used, such property shall be disposed of by sale: *Provided, however,* That the Smaller War Plants Corporation shall have the right to exercise a veto power as to any such sale where in its opinion such sale would result in seriously changing the competitive situation in the industry to the disadvantage of small-scale enterprise.

(2) In cases where, in the opinion of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, monopolistic conditions exist in the industry in which any plant or facility would be used then such property shall be disposed of by sale only if it can be sold to such purchaser or purchasers and under such conditions as will in the opinion of the Smaller War Plants Corporation definitely alleviate such monopolistic condition; but wherever the disposal by sale of such plant or facility would result in the opinion of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in aggravating such monopolistic conditions or where the only potential purchaser or purchasers are corporations already exercising monopolistic control in the industry, then until such monopolistic conditions shall have been changed, title to such property shall be retained in the Government and such property shall be leased for operation by private industry at a fair and equitable rental: *Provided,* That all such leases shall contain a clause providing that such lease may be canceled by the Government at any time the plant ceases to be operated at 75 percent or more of capacity, or monopolistic price policies are in the opinion of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice applied to its product.

(3) In cases of plants or facilities suitable only for the manufacture of arms or ammunition of war, title to such property shall in all cases be retained in the Government and such property shall either be maintained as stand-by production capacity or operated directly by the Army or Navy or leased for operation by a private contractor or contractors for the production of munitions for the Army or Navy of the United States.

Some may say that my bill is too drastic and too far reaching. To which, Mr. Speaker, I would only reply that the times call for clear vision and forthright action if the America of tomorrow is to be the kind of America of which promise has been given in the past and which alone can offer hope and opportunity to the men of our country who are today fighting for her on the battlefields of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the text of a bill which I have introduced and the text of a brief letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to our colleague from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], which he has given me permission to include.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 469. An act to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the emblem and name of the Red Cross, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

JOHN ROY CARLSON

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, what I have to say is particularly timely, coming as it does on the heels of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], about John Roy Carlson. My talk was prepared about a week ago, but is very appropriate now as it is in defense, in fact, in praise of, Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Speaker, the Easter recess gave me the opportunity to go about among my constituents, to discuss issues of political importance with them, and to draw them out on the subjects close to their hearts and minds. What I learned is, I believe, of general importance. I have asked for the floor to report on these observations. I cannot say whether what I learned in my district is subject to the same reaction as can be obtained from other congressional districts. I believe, however, that what I learned is fairly typical. And I have no hesitancy in stating that the viewpoints and attitudes which I found deserve to be fully known and widely appreciated.

By and large, I found great satisfaction with the military conduct of the war. My constituents have reacted normally and appropriately to the turn in the tide. I would say, in fact, that they have all come to recognize the merits of the over-all strategy of joining with our allies in the defeat first of Germany, and then of Japan. They knew all along that the choice was a hard one, but they had a justifiable confidence in our Commander in Chief and the joint chiefs of staff. They now accept unreservedly the over-all strategy in this global war. They, as all of us, have been heartened by successes in the European theater of war and in the Pacific and Far East. They see in our military leaders, our President as Commander in Chief, Chief of Staff Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admirals King and Nimitz, Generals Stilwell and MacArthur, and in their fellow military and naval officers, and above all in the large body of Americans now in uniform, worthy links in our American heritage of courage, imagination, and competence. They hope for an early victory, but they are prepared for the difficult and hazardous period that lies ahead no matter what its length. And they know, moreover, that the ultimate victory will not come without its cost to us in blood and anguish, in tears and sorrow.

But just as I found a universal sense of gratification and confidence in our conduct of military affairs, so I found a great and depressing sense of bewilderment, worry, confusion, and pained disappointment at the occurences on the home front and, let me report frankly, at the Washington scene.

Many factors explain this sense of bewilderment and chagrin. For to my constituents, as to all our people, Washington represents something that in its very nature is symbolic of the American people and the American Nation. As such a symbol they look to Washington, to its legislative, executive, and judicial branches to hold high the democratic banner of our way of life, and to bring to our national problems so enormously enlarged because of the war, the serenity of wisdom, the attributes of statesmanship, the selfless devotion that the times call upon us to exhibit. In their stead they find unnecessary conflict and clash; thinly disguised partisanship; the tugs-of-war of excessive political considerations; unworthy passions. Most of all they are gravely disturbed because in their eyes the Congress to which they

normally look for the safeguard of our liberties and institutions does not seem to them to have shown enough awareness and concern for what they regard as one of our great problems; the task of national unity, the avoidance of inner conflicts and the maintenance of harmony among all Americans of all racial and religious groups. They see in such attacks, and in my opinion correctly, a corrosion of the very foundations of our national structure. They see in such attacks, however veiled, however artfully presented, the unleashing of forces which would reduce our great country to a disunited and divided people. They know, moreover, that this is a Presidential election year, and that unless checked, these impulses will have an effect upon our national development that will extend far beyond the politics and circumstances of any one year.

This is not dealing with a figurative fear; this is reality itself.

My district is composed of Americans of numerous origins, of different races and religious beliefs. My constituents have demonstrated, by their daily lives, the essence of living together peacefully and harmoniously. Broad and offensive generalization about groups in the population; careless slurs and innuendos which can be interpreted as directed against one or another group—such things become tinder for social conflagration. They have learned to steer clear of them. They expect this distinguished body to do so with even more scrupulous care.

They fail to understand, for instance, the reasons for and the character of the attack on John Roy Carlson, whose book, Under Cover, has opened the eyes of so many to the existence of subversive propaganda and propagandists in our own midst. They are puzzled that the broad and profound values of the book should be overlooked and indeed thrust aside because of trivialities. They are pained that the essence of the revelations of that book should in any way be obscured by irrelevant considerations about the author as a naturalized American. They wonder what that has to do with the case. They are troubled that divisive lines should be drawn between native-born and naturalized Americans as if that distinction were valid for patriotic service to our country. They wonder how the 10,000,000 Americans in uniform feel about that, and whether they out on the fighting lines are prepared to make the same arbitrary, invidious, and ungracious distinctions between those fighting our Nation's war whose families had the good fortune to come here several generations ago and those who are recent immigrants or descendants of recent immigrants.

And, my constituents tell me, they feel deep down in their hearts that those who raise irrelevant and un-American questions of presumed degrees of citizenship are doing a disservice to this country and an injustice, not only to a man who sought to serve it well as author of a book but to all of us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Obviously a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman withhold that so that we may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw the point of order for the moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already announced the absence of a quorum, and no business is in order.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 26, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Wednesday, April 26, 1944, at 10:30 a. m. for the consideration of S. 1767.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m., Wednesday, April 26, 1944, in room 1011, New House Office Building, to hold hearings on H. R. 2426.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Thursday, April 27, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 416 House Office Building, to consider H. R. 2987, a bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1468. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 30, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mianus River, Conn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937 (H Doc. No. 549); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1469. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report of the registrants deferred as of January 15, 1944, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2542. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 1387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3250. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of Maine; with amendment (Rept. No. 1388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 2782. A bill to grant Government employees who are members of certain military units leaves of absence for periods of active service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TALBOT: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 122. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; without amendment (Rept. No. 1390). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4657. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1268. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky; with amendment (Rept. No. 1376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Vannie Butler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Kirby; without amendment (Rept. No. 1378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2674. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3033. A bill for the relief of Tressie Spring; with amendment (Rept. No. 1380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3464. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3695. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H R. 3753. A bill for the relief of Howard McMillan and Dorothy McMillan, individually and as the legal guardians of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and for Virginia McMillan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3929. A bill for the relief of Katherine Scherer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3976. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Kee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4525. A bill for the relief of M. Grace Murphy, administratrix of the estate of John H. Murphy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 4658 (by request). A bill to authorize the rezoning of certain property in the District of Columbia as a residential area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4659. A bill to authorize the Soil Conservation Service to lend certain equipment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4660. A bill to extend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 4661. A bill amending the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salary and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath Business Committee, and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4662. A bill to amend the second sentence of section 3 of Public Law 110 of the Seventy-eighth Congress (ch. 187, 1st sess.), entitled an act to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4663. A bill to transfer to the Federal Security Administrator and the Public Health Service, respectively, the functions of the Secretary of Labor and the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor with respect to health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio:

H. R. 4664. A bill to furnish sufficient ammunition to conduct military funerals for deceased war veterans of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4665. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Powell townsite, Wyoming, Shoshone Reclamation project, Wyoming, to the University of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 4666. A bill to amend the Carey Act with respect to leasing, for grazing or for oil or gas development, unsettled and unreclaimed portions of land; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4667. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to continue to completion the collecting, editing, and publishing of official papers of the Territories of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4668. A bill to prevent monopoly and to promote a high level of production in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4669. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Cramer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELMER:

H. R. 4670. A bill for the relief of Don Hicks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4671. A bill for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 4672. A bill for the relief of Genevieve Lund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 4673. A bill for the relief of the estate of Joe Manier; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4674. A bill for the relief of the estate of Everette Maxwell, the estate of Redman P. Maddux, Elmer Massa, and Estel Massa; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 4675. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Philomene Paasch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4676. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Emily Hamilton and Mrs. Kay Graziano; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4677. A bill for the relief of A. B. Hass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 4678. A bill for the relief of Cyriel Pequ, also known as Carl Smith; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5552. By Mr. GALLAGHER: Thirty-five petitions of sundry constituents of the First Pennsylvania District, protesting against the enactment of the Bryson prohibition bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5553. Also, 35 petitions of sundry constituents of the First Pennsylvania District, protesting against the enactment of the Bryson prohibition bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5554. Also, 15 petitions of sundry constituents of the First Pennsylvania District, protesting against the enactment of the Bryson prohibition bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5555. Also, 40 petitions of sundry constituents of the First Pennsylvania District, protesting against the enactment of the Bryson prohibition bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5556. By Mr. HERTER: Petition signed by sundry residents of Newton and Auburndale, Mass., favoring favorable action on House bill 2082 to probihit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5557. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of matériel necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5558. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of George M. Thorne and 57 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5559. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Alta Parlor No. 3, Native Daughters of the Golden West, San Francisco, regarding prevention of return of Japanese to Pacific coastal areas until after peace is concluded in the Pacific and their future status is determined; also regarding classification of all Japanese evacuees as prisoners of war, and the return of American prisoners of war held by Japan in exchange for Japanese in America; dated April 17, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Divine Redeemer, we would linger silently and reverently in the presence of our God. Thy law is like unto a challenge, and we beseech Thee to help us make each day a resolution which will give homage to Thy holy precepts. By strong wills and unyielding devotion to the public weal, we would give reverent tribute to the traditions of our democracy. As today is another providence, give us a quiet and a conscious realizing trust that every success launches us upon further pursuit and every failure bids us arise and begin again.

Do Thou so clothe us with a wise and expectant mood that we shall deserve a name from which will spring great, beneficent, and courageous movements. Touch the finer senses of our beings, raising them far above those of pleasure and inaction, and more glorious than personal gain. Enable us to be servants who can endure strain and criticism, who can calm fears and soothe a patient and waiting people. As we walk the road of the stout and loving heart, O put in our breasts the iron of the eternal mountains and the granite of the everlasting hills. Grant that intemperate indulgences may be destroyed and inordinate ambitions forever crucified, and thus renew our pledge of fidelity at the altar of this national shrine. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Shaner, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4559. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WALSH of

Massachusetts, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. BROOKS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you that I have formally resigned as a member of the following committees, due to my election to the Ways and Means Committee: Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Rivers and Harbors, Insular Affairs, Civil Service, Patents, Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Very sincerely yours,
CECIL R. KING,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOHN ROY CARLSON

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday under a special order I was recognized for 20 minutes to deliver a talk which I had prepared in defense and in praise of John Roy Carlson. Unfortunately, and for the first time within my memory, I was taken off the floor in the midst of my speech by a point of no quorum and a motion to adjourn. We all know that during special orders, which follow the legislative program of the day, frequently but few Members are present, but I have never before known a Member to make a point of no quorum in the middle of another Member's speech under a special order as was done to me yesterday by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

I am going to ask at the completion of these remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I may extend in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech I was not allowed to finish yesterday. In that speech no criticism of any Member of the House was intended. I concur in the statement made by the majority leader yesterday. I do not impugn disloyalty or lack of patriotism to any Member of this House. My remarks were intended simply to stop criticism of the racial or religious background of people who attempt to do a service to our country. Many great contributions to the welfare of our country have been made by first or second generation Americans and by members of minority groups. Their patriotism and loyalty should not be questioned, nor should they be subjected to any ridicule or censure here in the House, because they were not fortunate enough to have been born in this great land of ours, or that their ancestors did not settle here generations ago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech I did not finish on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. NORMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by Major General Wilbur given at the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors the other evening, and also an editorial from a South Dakota paper entitled "Privates Are Important."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GOVERNOR BRICKER

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, last night Governor Bricker made what I thought was the finest, most constructive, speech I have heard for a long time.

Laying aside any bias I might have because he is the Governor of my State, I want to recommend this speech to the membership. It is a real statesmanlike document. I feel sure it will meet with the approval of 90 percent of the people of this country. So that it may have wide publicity, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend Governor Bricker's speech in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled "A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to geographical representation on the Supreme Court of the United States." This bill is not an effort to pack or unpack the Supreme Court. It is not a reflection upon the Court as at any time constituted. It seeks rather to give the various political, economic, and geographical areas of this great country proportionate representation upon the Court. To the extent that social and economic theories may influence the opinions of the Justices, all sections of this country should be proportionately represented. My bill provides that hereafter at least 3 members of the Court shall be residents of States west of the Mississippi River, and that at least 2 members of the Court shall be residents of the 10 States commonly referred to as the Old South, with the inclusion of West Virginia.

In due time I expect to present a comprehensive discussion of the many logical reasons why this bill should be enacted into law.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative program of the day and following the other special orders today the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I had a special order to address the House, but before being able to get the floor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] raised a point of order and the House adjourned. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks I would have made yesterday and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein resolutions passed by the Massachusetts House of Representatives on the subject of air transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN]?

There was no objection.

FREEZING THE SALE OF CORN

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent order of the War Food Administration freezing the sale of corn in all of the heavy producing corn counties in central Illinois has produced a dangerous and acute feed famine in 40 counties in southern Illinois which, unless immediate relief can be found, will demoralize the morale of the farmers, poultry and stock growers in this vast section where millions of head of stock and poultry are largely dependent upon these corn counties for feed.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed by long-distance telephone from one feeder who has 375 head of hogs and over 600 head of poultry requiring almost a truckload of corn a day, that he is unable to secure corn and that his stock will starve unless

he can get immediate relief. Thousands of other feeders and farmers find themselves in the same desperate situation.

I am also informed that the farmers are rushing their stock to the East St. Louis stockyards where trucks are backed up for miles waiting to deliver hogs and little pigs which should be kept on the farm and that the stockyards are allowing as many to be delivered as they have capacity to take at the owner's risk.

I am told that the local county committees are waiting for more clarifying orders and directions from Washington; that they are doing the best they can to service the people but are holding out little hope of relief because they are helpless to act under this chaotic and confusing condition.

Undoubtedly this order which freezes the corn in the boundary lines of such counties should be relaxed because it prevents the trucking or shipping of corn to stock growers outside of any of such counties. The order should be modified so that southern Illinois, on the proper showing from agricultural county committees, can go into the corn area and secure such needed corn for the farmers who are caught with this heavy production of livestock which will tide them over until they can be marketed in a regular order in the interest of the food supply of the Nation and the farmers who have been urged by the Government to raise more hogs, cattle, and poultry.

Undoubtedly all of the corn frozen in these big producing counties has not suddenly become necessary to the processing plants in the interest of the war effort.

Something must be done, not only in Illinois, but throughout the Nation, to relieve this most dangerous and acute situation, in the interest of the farmers and the war effort.

The War Food Administration must take cognizance of this desperate situation and immediately, not 10 days from now, provide relief.

Unless it is done millions of head of stock and poultry throughout the Nation may starve or become of no use to the war effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article with reference to the observation of the ninety-second birthday of the Honorable James F. Graham, former Member of Congress from the Twenty-first District of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 517, Rept. No. 1391), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Flood Control, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Lowell Mellett entitled "American People Can Win the Present War Only if Everyone Takes Part in the Struggle," taken from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., April 25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very timely statement that appeared in the Lynn Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article that appeared in the March 17 issue of the Independent Grocer, a publication.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]?

There was no objection.

MASS MURDER OF JEWS MUST END NOW

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I took occasion to comment on the supremely courageous action taken by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in opening the gates of the Eternal City to the Jewish people who fled there seeking refuge from the murderous hordes of Hitler, and I spoke of His Holiness' refusal to give up these people to the German soldiery seeking to assassinate them.

I also took occasion to call attention to the heroic activity of American soldiers of Jewish descent during the course of this world conflict. I enumerated at some length a few but not all of the names of American soldiers of Jewish faith that have been awarded decorations for valor since the outbreak of this war. At that time I spoke of the service and sacrifices by the Jewish people in this country that entitled them to the respect of all their fellow Americans.

My remarks on that occasion were short in contrast with what could have been said. I could have dwelt at length, for example, upon the record of Haym Salomon, who poured money without thought of reward into the coffers of Washington's army, so that the heroes of Valley Forge might be clothed and fed. I could have called attention to many other examples of high heroism and devotion to duty and loyalty to country by these fellow Americans of Jewish faith, but it is unnecessary to multiply examples. The facts are clear and not even a bigot can deny them.

Today, however, I wish to call attention to the shameless, ungodly, beastly persecution of the Jews being undertaken in Germany and the territories which the Nazis dominate. In calling that policy a policy of persecution, I do not do it full justice. It is rather a policy of mass extermination and murder. Hitler and his cohorts have pledged themselves to kill every Jew within the territories they control regardless of age; regardless of sex; regardless of human rights or decency. These statements that I am making sound strong. They sound almost preposterous, but the sad fact is that they are true. The truth is so staggering that it is well-nigh incredible but yet it has been amply documented. For example there was published a book that every American should read called the Black Book of Polish Jewry, an account of the martyrdom of Polish Jewry under the Nazi occupation. This book has the endorsement among others of my friend from New York, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and of other Members of this House, and of the senior Senator from New York.

I could read you passages from this book that would bring tears to your eyes; passages describing starvation, torture, and deliberate massacre; stories telling of the violation of women and the destruction of families; stories so grim as to make a decent individual sick, and accompanied by photographs of dead starved children more horrifying than the stories themselves.

This horrible and tragic attempt to exterminate the Jewish people of Europe is taking place not only in Poland, whose three and a half million Jews have been reduced in number to less than two hundred thousand, but throughout all of Nazi-dominated Europe.

In the Balkan countries, in Greece, in Rumania, in Bulgaria, conditions have been growing steadily worse. Daily the Jews are marched off to concentration camps to forced labor and to death. No picture of this unprecedented persecution could be complete with telling how these unfortunate people have been aided by their compatriots of other religious faiths who have risked the extreme penalty of hiding and attempting to assist their Jewish fellow-countrymen.

In particular, the story of the Greek people has been heroic in this respect. The Greeks with the civilization for which they have been famous from ancient times have seen that the only distinction that is to be made between men is that between good men and bad. They know that any distinction drawn between men of one faith and men of another is superficial and unimportant. Although the Greeks are perhaps the people who have fared worst at the hands of the Nazi oppressors, because of the skill and courage with which they fought back against them, they have not hesitated to do everything in their power to hide and help the Jews being sought after by the Nazi Gestapo. Similarly the Polish patriots fighting in the underground against the Nazi conqueror have held out the hand of brotherhood to the Jews. Nor did the Jews fail them, for with the arms made available to them by the Poles they fought gallant battles in the ghettoes of Warsaw and Bialystok that cost the Germans hundreds, if not thousands of lives.

The oppressed people of Europe have realized that despite the oppression aimed at themselves they must open their arms in fellowship and assistance to the Jews of Europe, who are even worse oppressed than they, for they realize that the battle being fought against the Jews by the Nazis is a battle also aimed at themselves. This is a realization that our country must help and under the far-seeing leadership of President Roosevelt, this country has realized it. The President once again gave evidence of his tremendous stature as a statesman when he said to the world on March 24:

> In one of the blackest crimes of all history—begun by the Nazis in the day of peace and multiplied by them a hundred times in time of war—the wholesale systematic murder of the Jews of Europe goes on unabated every hour. As a result of the events of the last few days hundreds of thousands of Jews, who while living under persecution have at least found a haven from death in Hungary and the Balkans, are now threatened with annihilation as Hitler's forces descend more heavily upon these lands. That these innocent people, who have already survived a decade of Hitler's fury, should perish on the very eve of triumph over the barbarism which their persecution symbolizes, would be a major tragedy.
>
> It is therefore fitting that we should again proclaim our determination that none who participate in these acts of savagery shall go unpunished. The United Nations have made it clear that they will pursue the guilty and deliver them up in order that justice be done. That warning applies not only to the leaders but also to their functionaries and subordinates in Germany and in the satellite countries. All who knowingly take part in the deportation of Jews to their death in Poland or Norwegians and French to their death in Germany are equally guilty with the executioner. All who share the guilt shall share the punishment.
>
> Hitler is committing these crimes against humanity in the name of the German people. I ask every German and every man everywhere under Nazi domination to show the world by his action that in his heart he does not share these insane criminal desires. Let him hide these pursued victims, help them to get over their borders, and do what he can to save them from the Nazi hangman. I ask him also to keep watch, and to record the evidence that will one day be used to convict the guilty.
>
> In the meantime, and until the victory that is now assured is won, the United States will persevere in its efforts to rescue the victims of brutality of the Nazis and the Japs. Insofar as the necessity of military operations permit this Government will use all means at its command to aid the escape of all intended victims of the Nazi and Jap executioner—regardless of race or religion or color. We call upon the free peoples of Europe and Asia temporarily to open their frontiers to all victims of oppression. We shall find havens of refuge for them and we shall find the means for their maintenance and support until the tyrant is driven from their homelands and they may return.
>
> In the name of justice and humanity let all freedom loving people rally to this righteous undertaking.

This Government has rallied to this righteous undertaking. In January of this year the President set up the War Refugee Board composed of the Secretaries of State, War, and Treasury and stated that "It is the policy of this Government to take all measures within its power to rescue the victims of enemy oppression who are in imminent danger of death and otherwise to afford such victims all possible relief and assistance consistent with the successful prosecution of the war." The War Refugee Board is now charged with the responsibility of seeing that the policy thus stated is carried out.

John W. Pehle, a brilliant and energetic young lawyer who already has behind him a splendid record of accomplishment in other fields, has been named as the executive director to put into effect and execute the plans and programs developed and the measures inaugurated by the Board. The Board and its executive director have worked hard and well and they are deserving of the highest praise, but the undertaking still ahead is tremendous. Within Europe today there still survive perhaps two or three million Jews in addition to other refugees. These people are our allies. They are our firm supporters and they are men. Our obligation, not only in the eyes of the world but before the bar of our own conscience is to succor these people.

We have started well by the creation of the War Refugee Board and by calling to the attention of the murderers the fact that their crimes will not go unavenged, but more is needed, much more, and the time is now.

We must act if we wish to accomplish results and we must act with vigor and determination. Our intentions are admirable enough but certainly we must be prepared to do more than enunciate these intentions. If the oppressed Greeks and Poles in the depths of their misery can reach out and befriend these sufferers certainly this Nation with its wealth, resources, and armed might can transform into reality the promise of relief which it has held out.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement issued by the Maritime Commission, and also a radio address by the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

LIMITATION OF OPERATION OF SECTIONS 109 AND 113 OF THE CRIMINAL CODE, AND SECTIONS 361, 365, AND 366 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 122, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law, and for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman at this time, but hereafter Members who intend to ask unanimous consent to take up legislation should confer with the Chair beforehand. The Clerk will report the title of the Senate resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TALBOT]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this seems to be a considerable change in the fundamental law of the land and I think we ought to have it explained either by the gentleman from Connecticut or the chairman of the Judiciary Committee before we agree to it.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather technical resolution and comes about in this manner: The resolution has been authorized by the so-called Petroleum Resources Committee of the Senate of which the senior Senator from Connecticut, Senator MALONEY, is the chairman.

The problem that confronts this special Senate committee is in respect to the proposed employment of one Richard Joyce Smith as its chief counsel. It may be necessary from time to time for this Senate committee to appoint additional counsel. Mr. Smith is a member of a prominent New York City law firm and that law firm has numerous clients, many of whom have tax claims pending against the Federal Government and are or may be involved in various administrative proceedings before Federal agencies which might be construed to be a proceeding, contract, claim, or controversy and in direct violation of section 113 of the Criminal Code.

Sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code provide certain penalties against any person who being an officer of the United States or discharges any official functions thereunder and directly or indirectly receives any compensation therefor.

The Senate committee will in all probability retain additional counsel from time to time, all of whom will be employed on a temporary basis. The proposed exemption by this resolution is merely to limit the broad application of

the penal code against such counsel as may be retained by this special Petroleum Committee of the Senate.

The chairman of the Senate committee has referred this question to the Attorney General and to the Justice Department, and the Attorney General has given Senator MALONEY an informal opinion that an employee of a congressional committee is an officer in the employ of the United States within the meaning of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code. Recently in this House when the Kerr committee was investigating three alleged Communists, it asked permission to retain private counsel and this House at that time under House Resolution 386 passed a resolution similar in form to this present resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand it, this does not repeal any sections of the fundamental law?

Mr. TALBOT. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Or any section of the Federal Code?

Mr. TALBOT. No.

Mr. RANKIN. But merely makes an exception in this particular case?

Mr. TALBOT. That is right. Mr. Smith is a lawyer of high moral character and feels that in order to be protected from any suspicion or cause for suspicion, before he may practice law for this committee and present the facts before this Senate committee he should be given the benefit of relief from these sections of the Criminal Code.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALBOT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I might say that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] conferred with me last week about this matter. I conferred with the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. SUMNERS], and the gentleman from Connecticut conferred with me yesterday about bringing this matter up by unanimous consent. I told the gentleman that I was thoroughly acquainted with the facts of the resolution, and I thought it was one that should be passed as quickly as possible.

Mr. TALBOT. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALBOT. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This is a very simple proposition. It is desired by one of the Senate committees conducting an investigation to employ a lawyer. It is an investigation in regard to oil. All they want is a resolution passed exempting this lawyer from the provisions of the Criminal Code which would prevent him otherwise—at least there is some concern about it—from accepting this employment.

This is an ordinary employment of a lawyer to conduct an investigation for a special committee. On account of the Federal Government being engaged in so many activities, and this lawyer, being a member of a large firm, the question has arisen as to his eligibility for this employment as our distinguished leader and our friend on the Republican side connected with the committee have stated. We of the Committee on the Judiciary cannot find any reason why it ought not to be done. Nobody on the Committee on the Judiciary has suggested any reason why it ought not to be done, and so far as the expressions of the members of the committee are concerned everybody thinks it ought to be done. For that reason we ask unanimous consent that the matter may be disposed of now so that this lawyer may be employed and begin work.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, I merely asked the question of the gentleman from Connecticut in order that he might explain it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALBOT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this resolution, but there must be an understanding in the House that this resolution has nothing whatever to do with the statute law to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has referred. The real purpose, the real thing that justifies the exception here is this attorney, to be affected, is not in the employment of one of the departments of the Government.

There is a lot of difference between employing outside counsel for a specific purpose in an investigation and permitting an attorney employed by the Government in a department engaging in suits against the Government for a period of 2 years after he severs his connection with the Government. The reason is that the employee of the Federal Government, in the departments or in the agencies, gets information that no one else gets, and if he is permitted to practice and handle claims against the Government when he retires, he is apt to retire and immediately revive claims about which he has particular information of a confidential nature obtained while a Government employee.

Mr. TALBOT. I might say in reply to the gentleman from Michigan that I am informed that the present employment here will be from 2 to 4 months, and that the present attorney has himself no claims pending against the United States Government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the committee has taken into consideration in this connection the amendment made to the tax bill that was passed a little while ago with reference to this particular statute, and which has given the Comptroller General so much concern. Was the committee aware of that?

Mr. TALBOT. I think not.

Mr. TABER. If it was not, I do not think the matter should be taken up until the committee has gone into that, because that change in the statute which was made in the tax bill was rather revolutionary. Unless the committee has taken that into consideration, I would feel that this should lie over today.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a minute?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I confess a lack of familiarity with the provisions to which the gentleman refers. The committee, however, felt that in view of the speedy action of the Senate, its desire to get into operation with this special committee, and its determination with reference to the lawyer whom it is to employ, as a matter of comity, in the absence of any reason to the contrary, we ought to let them get under way and be of as much assistance as we can.

Insofar as we know, this resolution, if adopted, will make it possible for this committee to get under way.

I cannot imagine anything that has been enacted in the legislation referred to which would imperil the public interest if this man, who is to have no ordinary connection with the Government, be permitted to go ahead and conduct this investigation.

Mr. TABER. I might say to the gentleman that the Comptroller General feels that that provision in the tax bill practically would repeal the effectiveness of that statute and that he feels it should have very serious consideration.

Frankly, the Comptroller General called this to my attention on Saturday. I have not had an opportunity to go into the legislation and see just what it is. On the other hand, it is of such a serious character, from what the Comptroller General and his assistants told me on Saturday, that I would feel that we ought not to do anything that would recognize that particular part of the amendment and other laws without having them in front of us.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is true, if the general law was repealed, then there would be no law and this legislation would not be necessary.

Mr. TABER. Would not be necessary?

Mr. MICHENER. It would not be necessary. Then I agree with the gentleman from New York, and I am opposed and I am sure the Committee on the Judiciary is opposed to repealing the prohibition waived by this resolution. This proposed law in no way affects that amendment. It is not necessary if the statement of the Comptroller General is accurate. But to remove all doubt, it could hurt nothing, harm nothing, to permit this committee to proceed, and if that law has been repealed, I, for one, am for reenacting it.

Mr. TABER. Well, I am.

Mr. MICHENER. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. TALBOT. I might say to the gentleman from New York that I think the gentleman from Michigan is correct, and all this does is to relieve this particular attorney and such other counsel as may be hired from the burden of this Criminal Code.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit this interruption, this resolution in nowise deals with the subject matter to which the gentleman from New York refers, as I understand his statement. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who is a very careful member of the Committee on the Judiciary, as we all know, has stated that if this resolution is enacted at most it will only be surplusage. If the criminal provisions have been repealed by the provision referred to, I think the Committee on the Judiciary would agree that they ought to be reenacted, but, whether they have been repealed or not, this proposed authorization for the employment of this man necessary to be employed to get this investigation into operation would not be affected one way or the other. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman will yield, the amendment of the general law is not an uncommon thing. On many occasions we have found it necessary to meet specific situations through amendments such as the amendment now under consideration. Is not that a fact?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is a fact. I am not here today—and I know the gentleman from New York would hesitate to do so—to interfere with the progress of an investigation which the Senate has in operation and which is now being held up because of the unwillingness of this lawyer whom they have decided to employ to enter upon that employment facing these provisions. He wants to be released from them, the committee wants him to be released, and the Senate wants him to be released so that they can get into operation. I can assure the gentleman from New York that, insofar as the Committee on the Judiciary is concerned, it would have less disposition than perhaps ordinarily would be true in the House to repeal the provisions to which he referred because those provisions came from that committee after an examination of the conditions that arose after the last war, as the gentleman from New York is well aware.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, adopted March 13, 1944.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I read something in the newspaper this morning where General Patton was shooting off his head about England and the United States ruling the world after the war. As a Member of the House who believes the House does not agree with that sort of proceeding on the part of people connected with the military branch of the Government, or any other branch of the Government, I should like to express very definitely what I believe to be the disapproval of the House of Representatives.

I want to make this other statement. This irresponsible talking ought to be stopped. Many people are talking their heads off about what ought to be done after the war. Think about those things—plan about them—that is all right, but the thing we ought to concentrate on now is winning the war. This talking disease, of course, will not help win this war. It might disturb the good accord between ourselves and our allies.

THE LATE GEORGE MORRIS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved at the death of Mr. George Morris on April 24, a columnist and newspaperman of wide experience and great ability, successful in his field, a man of great attainment.

Mr. Morris was a splendid newspaper representative, a man of great ability, yet above all he was a fine and lovable character, one whose convictions were strong, whose writings evidence strength of character and courage. A man with whom one could agree and be glad to have his support, yet a man with whom men could differ and yet love and respect. George Morris loved his country and constantly strived to improve it. He believed in true constitutional government.

I was fortunate to know Mr. Morris as a friend. I shall always be grateful that I had the privilege of visiting with him at lunch on April 24, the day of his death, to hear again his words of advice to a young Member of Congress given from a full life of experience and success in his chosen field.

Mr. Morris valued and passed on to me and others the tenets of his faith—work and make application of one's energies and abilities, be courageous and independent without fear in fighting for the principles in which one believes. Mr. Speaker, I value highly the commendation which Mr. Morris gave so generously, because knowing him I know it was sincere. I have lost a good friend and the Nation has lost a fine and able character.

Those of us who knew George Morris, and his acquaintances and friends were legion, share the grief of his fine wife and family. He will be sorely missed by all who knew him.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of George Morris, Washington correspondent and a former editor of the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., at his home, Etowah Farm, Harwood, Md., on Monday evening, April 24, was a distinct shock to his many friends and the readers of his editorials and column. I had spoken to him in the Capitol in the late afternoon before he went home for the day. He was in unusually cheerful spirit and apparently improved health. I was particularly pleased that he looked so well, for with his other friends I had been concerned since he had suffered an attack in July 1943.

George Morris, following his graduation from Union University, Jackson, Tenn., was employed in one of the two railway offices in Greenwood, Miss., where I live. The law firm of which I was a member represented the railway company, and I thus came to know George Morris. His friendly disposition and his genial manner made him hosts of friends, and he was easily one of the most popular and promising young men in the progressive city of Greenwood. He attracted the attention of the business and professional leaders of the community, and they were always interested in him and in his work. His prospects for promotion and for a successful railway career were excellent, but his friends knew of his facile pen and of his ambition to write and to edit. After a brief railway career, he engaged in the newspaper business and became connected with the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn. During the First World War he was secretary to the late Senator John K. Shields, Democrat, of Tennessee, and subsequently he was secretary to Gov. Hill McAlister, of Tennessee.

George Morris was associate editor of the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn. Subsequently he returned to the Commercial Appeal, after having been editor of the Memphis News-Scimitar, of Memphis, Tenn. Prior to coming to Washington as the correspondent of the Commercial Appeal in 1936, he was president, editor, and assistant publisher of the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., one of the outstanding newspapers of the South.

George Morris was always keenly interested in public affairs. He was a patriot and a statesman. He loved his

country, and he admired unselfish public service. He returned, as I have stated, to Washington in 1930 as the correspondent of the Commercial Appeal. His column was probably more widely read than any other column in Tennessee, Arkansas, or Mississippi.

George Morris was an accomplished student and a courageous writer. His character was unblemished and his integrity unquestioned. His passing is a distinct loss to the newspaper fraternity and to the many readers of the Commercial Appeal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from today's New York Times entitled "Veteran Rehabilitation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some pertinent information relative to the Congressional Medal awarded to Lieutenant Childers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two respects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the director of the National Americanization Commission of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL PAGES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, we have been reading and hearing a lot lately about juvenile delinquency or juvenile irresponsibility, but one group of young people who are closely connected with this Congress are taking the other avenue. Instead of breaking the laws, they are trying to help break the Axis. I refer to our congressional pages.

I am informed that on May 1 at 8:30 p. m. the congressional pages will sponsor a War bond and stamp dance, to which we are all invited, in the new ball room of the Shoreham Hotel. They will have three booths at which War bonds and stamps will be sold. Music will be furnished by Charles Mayer and his all-girl band, and dancing will be informal.

I congratulate these young men, and hope that the Members will encourage them, because they are doing a very worthy thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are all proud of our pages. They are great youngsters. Their experience here, coming in their formative years, will give them an outlook on life that will be invaluable to them in their journey through life. It will be an inspiration to them and a contribution toward their leading fine, constructive lives. They are a great bunch of youngsters. We all ought to applaud their enthusiasm. I know they have touched me up already. They are around, and they are going to buttonhole us. We ought to make their War bond drive a big success.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on today, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1395), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

QUALIFICATIONS OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire in this special order to review briefly the accomplishments and the qualifications of a great American general, Douglas MacArthur. I do this because the interest of the country has been focused this past 2 weeks upon General MacArthur. Considerable criticism has been leveled at this speaker and the general for the release of the correspondence between us. As I have said before, I assume the entire responsibility for doing this. It is possible that I made a mistake in judgment; time alone will tell. As a surgeon I have frequently found it necessary to make a bold, deep incision to reach the root of the individual's trouble. When the incision healed results were good. Seventy-five percent of the hundreds of letters are favorable. My motives were the best. My earnest desire was to be of the most service to my country and to General MacArthur. I believe it is also a golden opportunity to bring to the country and the Republican Party a vigorous program and name as its candidate for President an outstanding American who by ability and experience will command the confidence of the people in all parties. This is a year when issues will transcend party lines. I have no doubt that both parties will have a vigorous program. I am sure the Republicans will, and I trust they will name as their candidate the strongest man available. The Republican Party is not a one-man party. There are no indispensable men. Because of this fact I have felt it my duty to urge my party to name a great American citizen who, although he is a Republican and the son and grandson of Republicans, has given outstanding service to his country in nonpolitical activities.

General MacArthur combines with his military record outstanding administrative and executive ability. No President has had as much prior to assuming his duties of that office.

The general's grandfather came from Scotland. He was a lawyer in Wisconsin. He was Governor of the State. He served as an associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. He was a Republican.

MacArthur's father was born in Massachusetts, reared in Wisconsin. He became a lieutenant in the Union Army at the age of 17. He was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor and came out of the war a colonel at the age of 20. His father entered the Regular Army after the war as a second lieutenant. He rose to the rank of lieutenant general and commander of our forces in our Philippine Insurrection. He was a Republican.

The general was born in Little Rock, Ark., while his father was stationed there in the Indians wars. His mother is a gracious and charming member of an old Virginia family. He was appointed to West Point from Wisconsin. He graduated at the head of his class and was immediately ordered to the Philippines, where he served under his father, both there and as an observer of the Russo-Japanese War. Theodore Roosevelt appointed him aide-de-camp. He served under General Pershing as commander of the Rainbow Division.

He is the only four-star general ever to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor, which was given to him about 2 years ago. General MacArthur served under President Hoover as Chief of Staff. President Roosevelt continued him in this office, the only time such a precedent has been set. General MacArthur's past experience in Washington has given him a knowledge and insight into all

types of foreign and diplomatic affairs which would make him more valuable in securing for the United States peace terms that would be to the best interest of this country and its citizens. Certainly no other candidate now proposed has had any experience along these lines and undoubtedly would be handicapped because of this inexperience. He is a Republican. You can trace his Republican line unbroken back to Lincoln. The general has a magnetic personality. He is an effective speaker. In all of his active life he has been a leader of men. He instills confidence in his men. He is a born statesman as well as a great soldier. He is a quick thinker with a quiet, courteous, dignified, keen, and penetrating mind.

It is my feeling that here we have a great American, who can well be the candidate of the American people, both the South and the North. He is not a candidate of any political party, though they could both well be honored by his presence upon their ticket. MacArthur is not controlled by any group or clique in this country. He would only be tolerant of the American ideas and ideals. He wants no truck with fascism and nazi-ism, nor those things that would destroy America. He wants not only to win this war but to win a permanent peace. General MacArthur is by life training, character, and principles a statesman of world-wide vision and world cooperation. The isolationists' viewpoint is the reverse of everything MacArthur is fighting for. He believes with the American people that the roots and branches of fascism must be destroyed.

The American people are thinking in simple, honest, and direct terms. They have their menfolk and women in this war. Their homes have been broken up. They are concerned as to how the war has been progressing. They are concerned about the tremendous loss of life in the past and that which may well occur in the invasion and the conquering of the Pacific. The womenfolk, who have sent their men to war, know that there are other dangers behind the battle lines that too frequently threaten the American home. They want to vote for someone who has military experience to be President of the United States. In doing this it will help shorten the war and bring their men back home and thus keep the home ties of America intact.

I am thoroughly convinced that unless the Republican Party can give the American people such a candidate, many of the voters will support the present war administration for another term in order to finish the job. This is illustrated by Robert Hannegan, the national Democratic chairman, in a recent keynote speech in Detroit, when he lashed out against the outstanding Republican Governor in New York. Mr. Hannegan told the story about the bird dog, "which is not full grown or in his prime and hasn't learned much yet," and the old trapper asked, "Do he or don't he?" They are already priming their vocal cords, as evidenced by a song which came to my desk entitled "They Are Either Too Young or Too Old." I presume this refers to the military record of one of the candidates. I will say this to the new dealers, who are attacking this capable Governor, that if he is selected by the delegates at their convention, the Republican Party will be 100 percent behind him. It will be a pleasure for me to take off my coat and go to work. I am further convinced that the new dealers will wonder just what struck them after the elections in November. The people of the country are sick and tired of the bungling on the home front. While I believe he is far more vulnerable than other candidates, he can and will be elected if he receives the nomination.

This administration will not find much ammunition for political attacks on General MacArthur. Their best argument to date has been that he is most needed on the battle front, but this argument is lost already, for many of the new dealers are suggesting that MacArthur be brought home to become Secretary of War. Why should he not be brought home as President and Commander in Chief of all the armed forces? Neither can they build their campaign around the argument that he is not fully acquainted with the war effort on the battle front and the home front.

Even General MacArthur's severest critics or bitterest opponents must admit that the general is preeminently qualified by experience to assume full charge and command of all branches of the Army and Navy. His recent associations with Admiral Halsey in the Pacific operations have given him an insight and knowledge of the use of combined Army and Navy forces, that is probably possessed by no other living man. Certainly this especially qualifies him for the role of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

General MacArthur has been restless since he was ordered out of the Philippines. He is a soldier—an aggressive soldier. Last Saturday, April 22, 1944, he executed a marvelous military performance, when he landed at Hollandia in New Guinea with his troops, encouraging them and seeing that supplies and equipment were properly utilized. The general has needed more materials and airplanes in order to map out his Pacific campaign. He has waited in Australia, waited for help, waited for materials and yet, he has performed near miracles with what little he had.

The general was in command of the Philippines while this New Deal administration was permitting the sale of high octane gasoline and scrap iron to Japan. His army of Filipinos and Americans fought desperately to hold these islands. The hearings before the Military Affairs Committee of the House and Senate bear another evidence—that MacArthur was eternally right when he was fighting for a mechanized army and better officers and more men. He was everlastingly and eternally right when he fought for more fortifications in the Pacific and particularly in the Philippine Islands. His victories in the South Pacific actions, won with small forces and low casualties, are regarded by military men as tactical masterpieces.

Nearly every individual of importance in the Pacific has been called home to conferences or has taken part in the Near East plans of action. I wonder why the administration has ignored consulting this outstanding general. Why has the War Department not seen fit to call him into conferences in planning the Pacific attacks? Has there been politics by the War Department and the administration in purposely ignoring MacArthur?

When General MacArthur was Chief of Staff, he succeeded in 1935 in getting the appropriation of $755,000,000 for rehabilitation of the Army. This was the largest appropriation since 1921. He was derided, smeared, and called a warmonger at that time, but, had his advice been followed, we would have begun this war with an adequate Army. In fact, there might not have been a Second World War for General MacArthur told the House Committee on Military Affairs on April 26, 1933, just 11 years ago this day:

> We muddled through a number of wars. It has been said that had there been a Regular Army of 20,000 men at Bull Run, the Civil War would never have been fought. It was the absence of trained soldiers that produced the crisis. This practically prostrated this Nation for 50 years. It has also been said that had there been in this country 500,000 men under arms at the time that Von Bernstorff reported to the German Government that we would not be able to put that number in France, the old history of the World War would have been different.

Again in the Philippines he was balked in his efforts to build up an army to protect its independence when it was soon to be granted. He was promised funds to do this in 5 years. The funds were not forthcoming. When the war struck, he did his best until ordered to Australia to prepare for its defense. The story of what he has done with so little is one of the proudest pages in military history.

If this country of ours is to remain the home of liberty and the land of free enterprise, there are three things we must do. We must unite in one supreme effort to bring this terrible war to a victorious end at the earliest possible date. We must be willing to cooperate with other nations so inclined, to bring out a just and enduring peace, granting nations the right to work out their own destiny insofar as actions do not threaten the peace of the world. We must preserve in this country the American way of life, cutting away the cancerous growth of bureaucracy that is making our Federal Government the master, and not the servant of the people.

Today we are a people divided into factions. We are not putting our full strength into the war effort. We are afraid of the peace that will follow the war. We fear that our leaders are making entangling alliances without our knowledge. We know that we are being saddled with a government that is bent on regimenting our every activity. The pleas of our high officials and the efforts of the greatest battery of propagandists and press agents ever assembled do not arouse our enthusiasm. All this is a clear indication that the people have lost faith in our leadership.

I believe, however, that a great majority of the people are willing, even anx-

ious, to take the course I have outlined above. They are waiting only for the leadership that will inspire them. The present leadership cannot do it. What does it have to offer in this year of great decision? Only a continuation of our present state. The Democratic Party will either offer us Franklin Roosevelt for another 4 years, or it will present the name of another who will be acceptable to him. If the Democratic Party wins the next election, it will be because no candidate or program has been offered that will give the people hope for better things. When the American people are in doubt, they sit tight.

I have tried to tell the story of a great American. He is a soldier—our greatest living soldier. He is steeped in the traditions of his country. He believes in the wisdom of the people. He firmly believes in the democratic processes that have brought this country to its present high state. He is not identified with any faction or section. Because he believes in the democratic processes he could be trusted to return to the people the wartime powers that have been granted to the Executive. He could be trusted to end the domination that the Executive has assumed over the legislative and judicial branches of our Government.

Because of its importance in this world the United States can no longer play the role of isolationist. On the other hand, it cannot presume to tell other peoples the kind of government they must have. By remaining strong with an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force, it can join with other nations in preventing any country from threatening the peace of the world. It can help to bind up the wounds, feed the hungry, and help the worthy to help themselves. It can do its greatest work by treating its neighbors unselfishly and setting an example of how free peoples can live. It must be sure that when it speaks the world will listen. It cannot do this if it again becomes weak. Although he has not stated his views on foreign relations, this is the attitude I am sure the general would take.

The next President must be fearless, honest, and have the ability to cut through the unbelievable red tape and confusion which has now fastened itself upon our body politic. That is the reason I have suggested one term for the General. With a Vice President like Governor Griswold, of Nebraska, Governor Dewey, or Governor Bricker, this country would be in sane, sound hands. The Vice President would be ready to assume the Presidency after the General's one term as President.

The Republican Party has a duty to perform greater than it has had in many years. It must present a definite program. It must nominate as its candidate for the Presidency a man of the highest ability and broadest experience. Unless it does so, it may lose the chance to return this country to the paths of democracy. Fortunately it can offer a program and it can offer such a man. That man is Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. I have been listening with very great interest to the gentleman's remarks in which he says that General MacArthur is our greatest, most able, and most successful general. Would it not be well now to urge the House to use its influence to have weapons, men, tanks, and airplanes sent to General MacArthur? For 2 years I have advocated that upon the floor of this House. I understand that only about 10 percent of American weapons are being sent to the far Pacific. We have the greatest general, the most successful general in the war out there. He himself is asking for these weapons. Should we not, in Congress raise our voice and use whatever influence we have to urge upon those who have the responsibility to send these weapons immediately to General MacArthur so that he cannot just hop from one island to the other, but conquer the Philippines and attack Japan?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think he is absolutely right. If General MacArthur has the airplanes and war materials he will shorten the war in the Pacific. He certainly knows the war in the Pacific.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair). The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the Coast Guard and include therein an article written by Mr. Kensil Bell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED ARMY AVIATION ACADEMY

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing for the establishment of an Army Aviation Academy on land acquired by the Federal Government for war purposes in the State of New Mexico. The bill provides for the operation of the school in conjunction with the Military Academy at West Point, or independently of the Military Academy, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, and under his control and supervision.

It is the intent of the bill that such an academy for the training of commissioned officers in the air branch of the service be established in New Mexico. I do not know that it is proper for me to state publicly how many hundreds of thousands of acres of land have been acquired by the Federal Government in that State for use in the training of men for the air service; or that it is proper for me to describe to you in detail what may be considered as one of the largest and finest of air bases in the country and which is located in New Mexico. But the fact is that our Government has today in its own name vast facilities in that State which may be utilized without too much additional cost in the post-war period for the finest air training schools in the country.

Whether in purchasing such properties and in developing the air-base facilities it has there, the Government intended to use them in the future for such purposes, I do not know; but such training of men and officers for the air forces will be necessary and the Government could not have found a more ideal area. Day after day, and month after month, the year round, the weather is perfect for flying. Within short distances waste lands are available for permanent use as bomb and practice ranges, and which may be utilized for that purpose without injury to the State.

New Mexico by the very nature of things cannot have maximum industrial development. Yet its record in the war is such that it deserves the greatest consideration in locating post-war public works and institutions. With its well-trained National Guard, with its own military institute at Roswell—one of the finest in the United States—and with its prompt response for volunteers in the Army and Navy in every war, New Mexico has shown a spirit which should be recognized by the Nation and rewarded by something more tangible than praise.

New Mexico wants to enter a serious bid for such an air academy and for air schools after the war.

And may I say also that when such an aviation academy is established, I do not know of anything more fitting and proper than that it be dedicated to the heroic stand of our boys at Bataan, and as a perpetual memorial for the brave men who fell there.

May I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for permitting me to make these few remarks ahead of his special order address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE QUESTION OF PALESTINE

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, the clock of destiny is tolling the knell of Hitler and his followers. Every day we read in the press that each hour the reckoning is drawing closer. What will happen when that hour strikes? Probably confusion, chaos, and revolution, with everyone pointing the finger of guilt at everyone else, with the accusation, "It's his fault." But in the midst of all this effort to avoid any guilt, we can be almost positive that the Nazis will blame the Jews for the misfortunes of the people and attempt to stir up more bitterness and hatred so as to wreak vengeance on these unhappy people. What can we do about it?

LET US REVIEW THE RECORD

Following the First World War, the British Government pledged itself to the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. Before that

declaration was made, Great Britain secured the approval of the United States of America. Subsequently, the Allied Supreme Council allotted the mandate for Palestine to Great Britain to put the above resolution into effect.

Nineteen years later, the British Government issued the Palestine white paper, putting a stoppage on Jewish immigration into Palestine after March 1944, with other limitations. From all that I have learned on the subject, the British white paper was issued without the knowledge or consent of the United States Government. This, in my judgment, is a direct repudiation of her contractual obligation, and this country should not permit such a repudiation without our knowledge and consent, for if we sit silently by without a protest on our part, then we must be deemed to acquiesce in this repudiation and therefore consent to it. I do not find anywhere that the President, the State Department, or the Congress has made any such declaration.

I cannot help but feel that the Government of the United States, as well as the Government of Great Britain, is directly responsible for the lives of these unfortunate people, and that therefore in the name of common decency and humanity, we should vigorously pursue a policy aiming at first, a strict adherence to the Palestine mandate, and second, the protection, insofar as it is at all humanly possible, of the Jewish people situated in lands occupied by the Nazis.

All of us are convinced, even though we have not been eye witnesses, of the terrors and horrors visited upon these helpless people and no one can doubt but what the near future will mean an increase in brutality, starvation, and extermination. Surely we can use our good offices and solicit the aid of neutral countries in seeking to remove these people before the last unholy catastrophe befalls them. I cannot understand why the Committee on Foreign Relations has not made a more persistent effort to extend a helping hand to those who are so sorely distressed. I appreciate that our Foreign Relations Committee always falls back on that well-known apology, "Our allies do not think that this is the proper time." What they really mean is that the British Government objects, and the committee bows to that objection. Why should it?

The United States is a free and powerful Nation and ought to have a foreign policy of its own. When do we expect to grow up? Must we always be led about by the hand and look to Britain for our foreign policy?

For several years the question of feeding the starving children of Europe has been before our committee but it has taken no action. For months the Palestine question has been before our committee but no action has been taken. We are told that Britain objects. Let it be said to our shame and disgrace that the objections of Britain did not stop Turkey from aiding the starving people of Greece. Why then should it stop us? I think it is high time we stood on our own feet and declared our own principles and ceased having a foreign policy where the tail wags the dog.

Two of my warmest friends are Judge and Mrs. S. B. Schein, of the city of Madison, Wis. They have prepared for me a memorandum on the Palestine subject. Judge Schein is an able lawyer, and Mrs. Schein is a woman of culture and refinement and exceptional learning. This memorandum has been prepared in a straightforward, concise, and understandable manner, and I feel deeply indebted to Judge and Mrs. Schein for the privilege of having the benefit of their studies and research on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend this memorandum at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The memorandum referred to follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE BRITISH WHITE PAPER OF 1939

1. THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

On November 2, 1917, the British Government, in a statement known as the Balfour declaration, pledged itself to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. Before the declaration was made, Great Britain sought and secured the approval of the United States of America. (Mr. Lloyd George, Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, November 17, 1930; vol. 245, No. 15, p. 78.)

The declaration reads as follows:

"His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

At that time Lord Balfour was His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

2. WISCONSIN RESOLUTION

On June 17, 1919, the Wisconsin Legislature unanimously adopted a resolution introduced by Senator Anton Kuckuk (Shawano) favoring the establishment of a Jewish state as "essential to the millions of people who have been faithful and loyal subjects of several nations of which they are citizens and have been for centuries oppressed, through racial prejudice, and left without a parent country."

A similar resolution was adopted in most States of the Union about that time.

3. THE MANDATE FOR PALESTINE

On April 25, 1920, at San Remo, Italy, the Allied Supreme Council allotted the mandate for Palestine to Great Britain for the express purpose of putting the Balfour declaration into effect. (Resolution adopted by the principal Allied Powers at the conference of Supreme Council for the Allied Nations at San Remo.)

Article 6 of the mandate states:

"The administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in cooperation with the Jewish agency referred to in article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including state lands and waste lands not required for public purposes."

Article 4 of the mandate refers to "An appropriate Jewish agency * * * a public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the administration of Palestine. * * * The Zionist organization * * * shall be recognized as such agency. It shall take steps in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government to secure the cooperation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home."

4. EXCERPTS FROM THE CHURCHILL MEMORANDUM OF JUNE 3, 1922

"When it is asked what is meant by the Jewish national home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a center in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride. But in order that this community may have the best prospects of free development and provide a full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities, it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance.

"That is the reason why it is necessary that the existence of a Jewish national home in Palestine should be internationally guaranteed, and that it should be formally recognized to rest upon ancient historic connection.

"For the fulfillment of this policy it is necessary that the Jewish community in Palestine should be able to increase its numbers by immigration. This immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals."

With reference to the "absorptive capacity" of Palestine, our experience in the past 25 years has abundantly established the fact that with new Jewish immigration, new industries have been created and developed, more waste land put under cultivation, and, in general, such immigration has brought greater prosperity to that country. Experience is a great teacher, and we know of no reason why the opening of the doors for wider Jewish immigration should not correspondingly result in greater advancement and prosperity to that country. There is still much to be done to bring Palestine to its full capacity in the various fields of worth-while achievement.

5. JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FAVORING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL HOME FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected."

(Adopted by Congress on June 30, 1922, and signed by President Harding on September 21, 1922.)

Treaty series, No. 728, convention between the United States and Great Britain, rights in Palestine:

Signed at London, December 3, 1924.

Ratification advised by the Senate, February 20, 1925.

Ratified by the President, March 2, 1925.

Ratified by Great Britain, March 18, 1925.

Ratifications exchanged at London, December 3, 1925.

Proclaimed December 5, 1925.

It is clear that the assent of America as one of the Allied and Associated Powers was regarded as necessary for the validity of the administration of Palestine by Great Britain, and that America, for her part, had not relinquished the right to a voice in the dispo-

sition of Palestine to which as an Associated Power she was entitled.

In this connection let me add that there were fifty-odd governments, including the United States and Great Britain, that were parties to and signatories of this mandate.

6. JEWISH ACHIEVEMENTS THAT FOLLOWED AS A RESULT OF THE BALFOUR DECLARATION AND THE MANDATE

Pursuant to the pronouncements contained in the Balfour Declaration and the conventions contained in the mandate, the Jewish people the world over—Zionist and non-Zionist alike—have poured millions of dollars into Palestine; have converted a waste land into a garden spot; have cleared the swamps and have eliminated malaria and other tropical diseases; have established health centers and hospitals for all the people of Palestine; have practically wiped out the dread eye disease, trachoma, so prevalent in that part of the world. The following table may be of interest to you:

Facts about Palestine in 1917 and today

	1917	1942
Jewish population	56,000	550,000.
Agricultural settlements	43	250.
Land owned by Jews	400,000 dunams [1]	1,500,000 dunams.
Number of Jews living on farm settlements.	12,000	150,000.
Jews engaged in industry	10,000	160,000.
Tel Aviv	A small suburb	All-Jewish city of 200,000.
Emek or Valley of Jezreel	Swampland	Dotted with many Jewish settlements.
Health	Country infected with diseases	A healthful country.
Harbors	Ships had to anchor far from shores of of Haifa and Jaffa.	Modern harbor at Haifa. Also new port at Tel Aviv.
Light and power	Candles and oil lamps	Light and power from Ruttenberg electrical power stations.
Dead Sea	Useless body of water	Rich source of potash and other valuable chemicals.
Hebrew University	A dream	Great center of learning.
Jewish school pupils	10,000	85,000.
Government	Cruel Turkish rulers of former Ottoman Empire.	British administration. Self-government of Jews in internal matters.

[1] A dunam of land is equivalent to ¼ of an acre.

It may be of interest to you that Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee a few days ago, in his endorsement of the resolution calling for free Jewish immigration into Palestine, stated:

"We are particularly proud of the outstanding achievements of Jewish labor in Palestine. We believe that the progress of the Jewish national home should be permitted to continue unimpeded and unimpaired, particularly in view of the tragic plight of hundreds of thousands of Jews in Europe, and the necessity of providing for them a place of resettlement and rehabilitation after the war."

William Green, president of the A. F. of L., is also on record in favor of the foregoing resolution.

7. TEXT OF BRITISH WHITE PAPER ON PALESTINE ISSUED MAY 17, 1939

In May 1939 the British Government issued the Palestine white paper. Essentially it was a capitulation to Arab demands to put an end to the Jewish national home. It provided for (1) total stoppage of Jewish immigration into Palestine after March 1944; (2) rigorous restrictions on land purchases by Jews; (3) the ultimate establishment of an independent Palestine state, in which Jews should constitute not more than one-third of the population.

In the parliamentary debate in the House of Commons prior to the issuance of the white paper, on November 24, 1938, Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, Secretary of State for the Colonies, is quoted as saying:

"The Arabs cannot say that the Jews are driving them out of the country. If not a single Jew had come to Palestine after 1918, I believe that the Arab population of Palestine today would still have been round about 600,000 (instead of over 1,000,000, as at present), at which it had been stable under the Turkish rule. It is because the Jews, who have come to Palestine, bringing modern health services and other advantages that Arab men and women, who would have been dead, are alive today; that Arab children, who would never have drawn breath, have been born and grow strong."

The Permanent Mandates Commission at its last meeting before the present war at Geneva June 8–29, 1939, held the white paper to be inconsistent with Britain's obligations under the mandate.

In Parliament, House of Commons official report, May 23, 1939, Mr. Winston Churchill, supported by Mr. Amory, Sir Archibald Sinclair, and Mr. Herbert Morrison (all of them now members of the British Government), denounced the white paper as "a breach and a repudiation" of Britain's pledges and prophesied that it could not stand. Mr. Churchill is quoted as saying on that occasion: "The provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in 5 years' time by the decision of an Arab majority * * * is a plain breach of a solemn obligation. * * * This pledge of a home of refuge, of an asylum, was not made to the Jews in Palestine but to the Jews outside of Palestine, to that vast, unhappy mass of scattered, persecuted, wandering Jews whose intense, unchanging, unconquerable desire has been for a national home. * * * Now there is the breach, there is the violation of the pledge, there is the abandonment of the Balfour Declaration; there is the end of the vision, of the hope, of the dream. * * * Yesterday the minister responsible descanted eloquently in glowing passages upon the magnificent work which the Jewish colonists have done. They have made the desert bloom. They have started a score of thriving industries. * * * They have founded a great city on a barren shore. They have harnessed the Jordan and spread its electricity throughout the land. So far from being persecuted, the Arabs have crowded into the country and multiplied till their population has increased more than even all world Jewry could lift up the Jewish population. Now we are asked to decree that all this is to stop, and all this is to come to an end. We are now asked to submit—and this is what rankles with me—to an agitation which is fed with foreign money and ceaselessly inflamed by Nazi and by Fascist propaganda."

Furthermore, the white paper provides that the neighboring Arab states not mentioned in the mandate are, under certain circumstances, to be consulted during the transformation of Palestine from a mandated territory to an independent state. On the other hand, it completely ignores the Jewish agency, which has been the Jewish body advising and cooperating with the Palestinian administration, in accordance with the mandate.

8. LIMITATION OF LAND PURCHASE UNDER THE WHITE PAPER

The white paper provides that the high commissioner for Palestine be given powers to regulate and prohibit the transfer of land to Jews. On this basis of authority, the Palestine land transfer regulations of February 28, 1940, were issued.

In these regulations, Palestine was divided into three zones:

Zone A. About 63.1 percent of the total area, transfer of land by an Arab to a Jew is altogether prohibited.

Zone B. About 31.8 percent of the total area, land transfers from Arabs to Jews may be allowed under special circumstances but only at the discretion of the high commissioner.

Zone C. The so-called free zone, about 5.1 percent of the total area—only in this zone do land transfers remain unrestricted.

According to the land-transfer regulations, Jews, even those who are citizens of Palestine, will not be allowed to buy land in nearly 95 percent of the total area of the country. Others, whether they are citizens of Palestine or foreigners, retain unrestricted purchase rights.

The mandate, in article 15, states that "no discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion, or language. No person should be excluded from Palestine on the ground of his religious belief."

In providing for the cessation of Jewish immigration, and in barring the Jews from land purchases in large areas of Palestine, the white paper is not only inconsistent with the mandate's terms, but would make Palestine a country in which Jews are discriminated against on the basis of race or religion.

We hold that the discrimination against Jews as such with respect to land ownership and immigration is wrong in principle and a violation of the legal duty of the mandatory.

9. PALESTINIAN JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PRESENT WAR

The information contained in this paragraph No. 9 was taken from the recent book by Pierre van Paassen, The Forgotten Ally.

Referring to the war in Africa when Rommel was at the gates of Egypt, Rommel "never had more than 200,000 men under his command in Africa. Until Montgomery took over from Auchinleck, the British, Mr. Churchill declared, had at no time more than 45,000 men on the African front. Of these 45,000, a quarter were Jews. Not until the joint Anglo-American landing in Morocco and Algeria did the British have more men and material in the north Africa-near eastern theater of war than their German adversary. The battle for Egypt and the Suez Canal was won by Bernard Montgomery before American troops set foot on Africa's shore. It was the British Eighth Army that turned the tide. In that army and supporting that army were 30,000 Jewish volunteers and 200,000 Palestinian industrial workers and farmers" (p. 229).

"Jewish industries, large and small alike, and Jewish agriculture in Palestine supplied the British armies with bandages, pharmaceutical articles, ether, sulfanilamide, benzoic acid, nicotinic acid, vitamin B complex, ascorbic acid (vitamin C), insulin, alkaloids, microscopic stains; further precision instruments, tobacco, 135,000 pairs of boots per month, fruit, vegetables, wheat, wine, X-ray apparatus, 25,000 tons of cement per month, soap, chocolate, spare parts for automobiles and trucks, sandbags, timber, tents, linen uniforms, and busses taken from the Palestinian transportation system" (p. 232).

"Palestinian Jews lugged the oil and gasoline from Haifa and Mosul across the Syrian and the Sinaian Deserts to Montgomery's mechanized forces.

"Palestine furnished to the British armies in Libya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Somaliland, thousands of doctors, nurses, and dentists. It placed the great Hadassah Medical Center in Jerusalem at the disposal of the Empire" (p. 234).

"The elaborately organized British Information Service in the United States could have pointed to Palestine, a country under British mandate, whose Jews did fight, where out of a Jewish population of half a million, 137,000 registered for service the moment war broke out, and whose Jewish inhabitants fought to the full extent they were permitted to fight" (p. 237).

10. NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL

On February 13, 1944, the following editorial appeared in the New York Times:

"The presence of our troops and supply depots in the Near East and our vital concern in peace and order in this strategic area give us a greater right to urge that the white paper should now be abrogated. At the time it was published this newspaper opposed the rigid limitation on the flow of immigrants into Palestine as unjust and unacceptable, and everything that has happened since confirms and strengthens that opinion. The increasingly desperate state of those of Jewish faith in Europe has made it more than ever evident that in these tragic years the doors of any place of refuge, instead of being closed to a crack, should have been opened wider.

"On the future political status of Palestine there is room for wide and deep divergences of view," the editorial continues. "This question remains, and promises to remain for a long time to come, one of the most complex and highly charged problems for post-war statesmanship. But it is significant that Jews and non-Jews, no matter how much they differ on this point, stand solidly in support of that part of the current congressional resolution that advocates American initiative in seeking to obtain the resumption of immigration. The hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee reveal general agreement on the justice and necessity of removing the white paper ban. This is a fair reflection of public opinion in this country. The final settlement of the Palestine problem fits into the framework of the general peace. It depends on the code of justice and security the victors are able to establish. Meantime there can be no question that humanity and a sense of reality demand that the arbitrary ban should be lifted and immigration should be permitted on the most generous terms possible."

11. CONCLUSION

It is our position that the white paper is a complete repudiation of the promise of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the commitments contained in the mandate of 1922. It is axiomatic to state that when two people enter into a contract, neither of the contracting parties should arbitrarily repudiate that contract. The United States Government is a party to this contract (the mandate), and Great Britain should not be permitted arbitrarily to repudiate the obligations contained therein.

In this connection it is only fair to bring to your attention that this white paper reduces the Jewish immigration to almost nothing but it leaves the doors of Palestine wide open to Arab or any other immigration. Anybody who calls this paper white must be color-blind. It was conceived in the rankest discrimination and dedicated to the proposition that those Jews living in war-torn Europe, who have nowhere else to go when this war is over, should not live. Such a paper, so conceived and so dedicated, should not be countenanced by the civilized world.

Dated at Madison, Wis., February 15, 1944.

SAMUEL B. SCHEIN.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. What the able gentleman from Wisconsin has been saying is absolutely true. I remember that when Prime Minister Churchill was here last May I asked him why it was not possible to get food to the starving women and children of Europe. His reply was that for every ton of food the Allies might send in the Germans would reduce their shipments of food into such countries by an equal amount, which was no answer at all.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. And it was very effectively answered by Dr. Kirchner, the Quaker, who had charge of that particular subject.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was coming to that. It was Dr. Kirchner who answered that statement and demolished it utterly. For some years unfortunately we have leaned too much on Britain in formulating our foreign policies. Whenever anything comes up of interest between nations the first question is: How will Britain react? I was in Europe as a delegate to the Oslo Conference shortly before this war broke out. I remember how Britain and France urged Poland to hold out after Josef Beck had reached an agreement that was fairly satisfactory to both the Poles and the Germans. Those who objected to the agreement, among them this country through William C. Bullitt, who was hopping from place to place like a flea at that time trying to stir up trouble, the Poles were assured that if they would repudiate the agreement they would get all the help necessary to withstand an invasion from Germany. We all know how well that promise was kept.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I was very much interested in the gentleman's speech in favor of action by the Congress of the United States to promote immigration into Palestine by doing away with restrictions under the white paper. I feel that a resolution along those lines should be passed by the Congress, not necessarily putting us on record in favor of a Jewish commonwealth, for that is a matter for the people over there, and there are many in America who think that if we endorsed a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine we might be involved in some future war. There is, however, no reason why the Committee on Foreign Affairs should not meet and pass a resolution upholding the Balfour resolution—upholding the resolution I myself introduced and that was passed by Congress in 1922 in favor of a homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine, and denouncing the white paper, and insisting on the right of the persecuted and hounded Jewish people of central Europe to enter Palestine. I believe such a resolution could be adopted.

In view of the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] so ably discussed the British attitude, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] just emphasized it, I should like to call the attention of the House to a statement made by the British Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, today, to the effect that he would not permit the British Empire to cede any of its islands off our coast to the United States, even at the request of our Congress.

I raise that issue now because one of our generals, Gen. George S. Patton, in a most irresponsible manner yesterday stated that the purpose of the United States is to rule the world. No one in the Congress that I know of wants to rule the world. We do not want to rule China or India or Burma or Europe or any other country. We might like to own these islands off our eastern coast and have them for our own permanent security and protection in case of future wars and also some of the islands we have captured from Japan, but that is as far as we would like to go. Instead of ruling the world we now find we cannot even get these British islands off our eastern coast when we have saved England and the British Empire in their darkest moment from invasion and destruction.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Let me add along that very line for those who believe as General Patton does, and his remarks were ill-considered at this particular time, and we should start out with an alliance with Great Britain, following out his suggestion, then why in self-defense would not Russia, Germany, China, and Japan unite to protect themselves? At once you create two spheres of influence, one against the other, and they will be getting ready for the next world war. I do not want any part of that.

Mr. FISH. In fairness to General Patton, and I am absolutely opposed to his unfortunate and ill-advised statement, he did, it appears, include Russia—the United States, Great Britain, and Russia.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. You cannot take up some of these great powers and leave out others.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is unfortunate that any highly placed official connected with this Government should give utterance to such a childish statement as General Patton did in London on yesterday.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Which could only create suspicion in the minds of others.

Mr. KNUTSON. Not only that, but it fortifies rather the will to fight to the bitter end on the part of our opponents.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; there may be some truth to that statement too.

Mr. KNUTSON. If General Patton's statement were the first of its kind that had been made, we could overlook it, but other officials have told us what they are going to do to the countries that are fighting as soon as the war is over, and, of course, their leaders use those statements as propaganda to keep the people fighting to the bitter end.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is correct, and, of course, they are a lot of lies.

Mr. KNUTSON. Exactly. Such statements serve only one purpose, and that is to prolong the war.

Mr. FISH. I was going to make the same observation. It impairs the war effort.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Our boys do not want to fight to rule the world. They want to win the war and come home. They do not want to continue fighting after we have won the war in order to rule the world or to divide it in three parts, like ancient Gaul, between Great Britain, Russia, and the United States.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is right. They want to get back home and their folks want them back home and we want to help them get home.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In connection with this colloquy I think it is very important to read the full statement made by Secretary Hull on Easter Sunday evening, because I believe in that language you will find a considerable amount of justification for General Patton having made the statement which he did make.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Well, I feel that Secretary Hull made a rather good statement. I read it and I have confidence that Secretary Hull has no disposition to create spheres of influence or to set up two forces, one against the other, which will only mean another war. We all know that. We are realistic enough and have sufficient knowledge of world affairs to appreciate the fact that no one is going to give up anything if they can help it except Uncle Sam, who has always been generous, who has always done more than his part in world affairs and will continue to do so. This Congress has shown that by the passage of appropriations for the United Nations relief and rehabilitation agency and also appropriations for lend-lease. We are in hearty accord for cooperation with the nations of the world, but we do not believe in setting up these spheres of influence which will only mean another war and perhaps the wiping out of another generation. We are opposed to that, and I think I can say that the majority of the Members of this House are opposed to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today in order to bring to the attention of the Members of the House another phase of this war, the matter of food production. I do this because of the fact that one organization happens to be located in the State of Wisconsin. The headquarters of this organization is Fond du Lac, Wis., and its members are scattered all over the State. The general manager of this organization, Mr. William O. Perdue, has been in Washington several days trying to show the situation that really exists at this time in the business of milk production. This particular organization is known as the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, and may I say it is not a manufacturing cooperative. It is a bargaining cooperative, and by that I mean to say that they do not make any dairy products whatsoever. Their function is to act as a bargaining agency for their members. Their milk goes largely into condensing factories, but they also have within their membership farmers whose milk goes to cheese factories.

This is not a partisan question in any way because this organization has some twelve or thirteen thousand members. They belong to all the farm organizations in our State and the members belong to all political parties. This organization has been in existence for about 15 years. One of the originators of the organization was a man by the name of Tom O'Conner. He happens to live in my home county, Manawa. I have followed the development of the organization probably closer than the average farm organization or farm cooperative, and I have seen it grow from a very few members to the twelve or thirteen thousand members that it now has scattered all over the State.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from devoting a minute to this man, Mr. Conner. He has spent day after day, year after year working to build up this organization. I may also state that if he had spent as much time and effort for a commercial organization he would have received two or three times as much as he ever received from this organization for his efforts. He lives on a family-sized farm and has operated it for many years. He has never approached the work of this organization from a partisan standpoint. I have talked with him dozens of times and I can say to you today that as far as he is concerned I have never heard him even for a half minute devote his attention to politics. I know he has put his whole life into this organization.

The president of the cooperative is a man by the name of Melvin Mason, of Whitewater, Wis. He lives in the district represented by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF], on a 100-acre farm. He has the average kind of a herd, 15 to 18 cows, and he represents the real family-sized farm. When you realize these twelve or thirteen thousand members produce a billion one hundred million pounds, of milk annually, they would be averaged-sized farms or else they would produce more than the billion one hundred million pounds with their membership of twelve or thirteen thousand members.

I think in all fairness I should say I know that Mr. DILWEG and Mr. SAUTHOFF and Mr. HULL, regardless of party, have been confronted with this problem week after week and month after month, and that they realize just as much the seriousness of the situation as I do myself. I do not want anyone to feel that they have not been out in the forefront. The only reason I might have been a little bit more active is that I happen to be on the Committee on Agriculture.

I want to read a letter from Mr. William O. Perdue, general manager, as I know of no better way to present the facts to my colleagues.

The letter is as follows:

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE,
Fond du Lac, Wis., April 20, 1944.

To Wisconsin Senators and Representatives:

DEAR SIRS: About a year ago the Office of Price Administration granted a price increase to the evaporated industry. The price in Wisconsin was fixed at $4.10 per case. At that time the O. P. A. claimed the proper price to producers should be $2.46 per hundredweight. However, the buyers of evaporated milk were paying farmers $2.60 per hundredweight. Consequently, the evaporated industry people claimed to be paying 14 cents per hundredweight more than they could afford and as a result they have continuously tried to obtain relief by way of an increase in their ceiling price to the extent of 15 cents per hundredweight but to no avail.

Last September our cooperative negotiated with the evaporated industry for an increase of 15 cents per hundredweight. This brought the price to producers in Wisconsin for evaporated milk to $2.75 per hundredweight.

I have had many people connected with the evaporated, cheese, butter-powder industry inform me that the War Food Administration was very much displeased when the price for evaporated milk increased from $2.60 per hundredweight to $2.75 per hundredweight. It was the feeling of these people that the War Food Administration was concerned about a possible disparity between evaporated milk and other dairy product farm prices.

In March of 1944 the War Food Administration increased the feed subsidy from 35 cents per hundredweight to 50 cents per hundredweight. This increase amounts to 15 cents per hundredweight. (The exact amount the evaporated people had asked for by way of increased ceiling prices.) This increase was contrary to a public announcement made February 2, 1944. This announcement said, "For the spring and summer months it was indicated that it would be the Administrator's intention to continue the general dairy payments at seasonally lower rates during the time the pastures are more productive."

Figuratively speaking, the buyers of evaporated milk were told, "We (the Government) will increase subsidies 15 cents, and you (the evaporated industry) can decrease producer prices 15 cents per hundredweight." Consequently the evaporated industry decreased their buying price to producers effective March 15, 10 cents per hundredweight, and members of the industry have informed me that a further reduction of 5 cents per hundredweight will be put into effect April 1. Thus as the Government increased the subsidy 15 cents, the buyers decreased the producer price 15 cents, and if the War Food Administration carries out the intent of the news release of February 2, 1944, to decrease subsidies seasonally, the subsidies will be reduced 15–30 cents per hundredweight by June 1. Therefore, the Wisconsin farmers will have received 45 cents per hundredweight less for their milk by June. This is the reward they are to receive for carrying out the request of the War Food Administration, announced February 2, 1944, "* * * and

further expressed the hope that in the interim dairy farmers would continue to produce and market the milk that is so essential for the war effort."

You will recall that in January of 1942 I sent you quite a lengthy report about the dairy situation in Wisconsin. This letter, which went to all of our congressional delegation, reviewed the chaos which took place in 1942 when our prices dropped from $2.25 per hundredweight to $1.725 per hundredweight. This 53-cent per hundredweight reduction of price of July 1942 came upon the heels of a solemn pledge on the part of our Federal Government that they would maintain farm prices in return for maximum production. Our farmers delivered an all-time record milk production and were rewarded with a breach of promise and a reduction of 53 cents per hundredweight.

Every man connected with agriculture in the State of Wisconsin conducted farm meetings night after night to aid in obtaining an increase of milk production in 1942. Now, in the face of all of this disappointment, our organization during the fall of 1943 again conducted one of the most extensive campaigns to increase milk production in the history of our cooperative. We enlisted the aid of every county agricultural agent in our territory. We employed the full-time services of one of the best county agricultural agents in Wisconsin to devote his entire time in assisting farm people to improve their production methods and to make more milk more efficiently.

On the 15th of March we had just completed a series of over 100 farm meetings which started in December. Our production so far for 1944 is running 6 to 10 percent higher than in 1943. We promised our farm people that their prices would be more or less stabilized, and now when they have again broken all production records they are faced with a situation similar to 1942 and they are alarmed that they will be in a worse position than the egg producers of our country.

As I have indicated to you on several occasions our cooperative is unalterably opposed to subsidies on milk in lieu of a fair price at the market place. However, we have not been able to have our wishes granted and if subsidies are to be paid we feel that they should be maintained in such a manner that they would enhance milk production rather than retard it. Our cooperative in 1943 sold more milk to manufacturing plants than the total sales of 11 States in the Union. The State of Wisconsin produced more milk in 1943 than the combined total of 25 States in the Union. Yet these 25 States will receive on the basis of present subsidy plans ranging from 50 to 80 cents per hundredweight on milk, $81,000,000 as compared to Wisconsin with $66,000,000.

I believe our milk-production problem should be rightly divided into two divisions: (1) The problems of maintaining a sufficient supply of milk to take care of civilian needs; and (2) the problem of maintaining or increasing the supply of milk for the war effort.

There is no rhyme or reason to pay milk subsidies up to 80 cents per hundredweight for one problem and give less importance both in consideration and money to the other problem. If we are to maintain the production needs for our war efforts surely we cannot reach any increase in milk production for the war effort in States which have been receiving up to 80 cents per hundredweight.

On the other hand, Wisconsin has all the natural potential possibilities of not only maintaining but increasing production for the war effort, and it seems to me that the farmers of Wisconsin should be paid just as much to produce milk for the war effort as farmers of any other State which produces milk for civilian needs alone.

If the present plan is carried out and our prices are to be reduced to an ultimate of 45 cents per hundredweight, I believe that the farm people of America will have reason to lose faith in their Federal Government's pledges. I believe that any such action would tend to break the morale of the farm people and cause them to reduce rapidly the size of their herds. They cannot continue to take the gamble of producing milk on a program that is announced from month to month. They must have a long-time program—one that will give them an opportunity to plan for 12 to 18 months ahead of time. Otherwise, I do not believe we are going to have enough milk to meet anywhere our demands for 1944 and 1945.

I respectfully urge that you use your influence to bring about a clearer, sounder understanding of what the Government's policy is going to be for at least a period of 1 year in advance.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Truly yours,

WILLIAM O. PERDUE,
General Manager,
Pure Milk Products Cooperative.

I just want to say to my colleagues who are here today, as far as price is concerned, I think every one of us do not care to spend too much time on this price business, only in its relation to getting the production. I think that the average one of us, or every one of us as far as that is concerned, realizes the seriousness of the situation in the world today. We know what some particular person may get for a quart of milk, is not the question involved. The question is not whether it be 3 cents or 8 cents or 17 cents. The question is that we cannot lose sight of the fact that price has something to do with the amount of food that is going to be available in order to carry on this war.

Note this statement in the letter:

For the spring and summer months it was indicated that it would be the Administrator's intention to continue the general dairy payments at seasonally lower rates during the time the pastures are more productive,

In other words, we just had an increase in subsidy of 15 cents a hundred. We can expect a decrease. Here is what is causing the difficulty. On the 15th of March these condensing factories reduced the price to the producer 10 cents a hundred, and since that time another 5 cents. The producers did not find out about it, most of them, until they received their checks on the 15th of April. In other, words, this subsidy, on the basis of it—I know that is not exactly the right statement to make—but on the face of it, the processor is obtaining the 15-cent subsidy. The processor naturally must profit by that 15 cents a hundred, so I say, Who benefited from that increase in subsidy if it was not the processor of the milk?

In other words, the way Mr. Perdue put it is this:

Figuratively speaking, the buyers of evaporated milk were told, "We (the Government) will increase subsidies 15 cents and you (the evaporated industry) can decrease producer prices 15 cents per hundredweight." Consequently, the evaporated industry decreased their buying price to producers effective March 15, 10 cents per hundredweight.

And, later, 5 cents reduction in price was made, as I have just said.

In 1942, Mr. Perdue sent all Members of Congress from Wisconsin a letter with a report of the situation in that State. He called our attention to the chaotic condition that resulted out there as a result of the fact that due to the "historical background"—that is what they want to use it on—after they had gone out and made promises to the producers they allowed these processors to pay as much as 53 cents a hundred less than they had been promised.

There is no one that can tell me they did not promise it to them, because I was at a meeting. I heard that promise made. I wondered when they were promising it who was going to fulfill the promise. I did not know, so I did not make any comments on it; I just wondered where they were going to get that job done.

We may be a little on edge at times, but as far as anything relating to this war is concerned my observation has been, after spending 2 months with Wisconsin farmers last summer, regardless of the things we are doing in Washington, they are still going to try to milk those cows. In Wisconsin they are going to make every effort to furnish the food to win this war.

In the spring of 1942 the F. D. A. arbitrarily cut the price of cheese 3 cents a pound; took it from 23 right back to 20 cents, without any explanation except they were getting so much of it they did not know what to do with it. A few months later they were begging for cheese.

On the 1st of December they set up a base price of 23¼ and they gave them 3¾ cents subsidy without ever asking the cheese industry at all, without having any hearings or asking them whether they wanted it or not, and that is probably the reason there has been so much opposition, because it was not properly explained to them at that time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has the fluid milk value in Wisconsin increased since the subsidy program was put into operation, or has it decreased?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The arguments about subsidies have not been helpful to increase in milk production.

Again referring to Mr. Perdue's letter. Mr. Perdue corrected the 6 to 10 percent increase of his members in milk production over 1943. The later official figures of the organization show 5.4 percent increase over a year ago, and I think that that should be corrected.

But in that connection I call your attention to the fact that the State of Wisconsin shows between 1 and 2 percent the first 3 months of 1944 over 1943, whereas the members of this organization showed definitely 5.4 percent. The United States was showing a gradual decline.

We promised our farm people that their prices would be more or less stabilized and now when they have again broken all production records they are faced with a situation similar to 1942 and they are alarmed that they will be in a worse position than the egg producers of our country.

I take it for granted everyone is familiar with the egg situation. If they are not, it is because they have not been

reading their mail, I am sure, because I know that most of the Members who come from the rural sections have had plenty of letters about egg prices ever since the 1st of December.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to my colleague from California that I appreciate this. There is nothing involved in this as far as I am personally concerned, but I know as well as that I am here today that this is something that is of interest to every Member of this House, just as much the man from the consuming sections as the man from the producing sections.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I hope the gentleman will try to give us some idea as to why these things are being done to the dairy industry, the setting of prices at a figure which is known to be less than the cost, and so on.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DILWEG. I did not get the import of the statement of the gentleman from California that they were not getting cost. The gentleman did not want to leave that impression?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] and I found last summer—at least I can speak for myself, that I did not hear any word about price all summer. The nearest I came to hearing about the price was that they would say, "Well, Reid, you want to hold that feed price down or we will have to have more for our milk," just as if I were running the departments down here.

Mr. DILWEG. The thing I am really interested in is, Has the gentleman a solution?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. DILWEG. Is the gentleman going to touch on it before we finish here today?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If I have time enough; yes; because one thing I never do is offer criticisms if I do not have any cure for the disease, because otherwise it is just idle chatter.

Mr. DILWEG. I realize that my colleague from Wisconsin is very nonpartisan on this matter, as we all are. We have all cooperated and attempted to clear up a lot of doubt in the minds of our farmers. I realize that the cooperation on this matter has been 100 percent from all Members from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG], has already tried to iron this out in his own committee and has called the attention of the War Food Administrator to the problem of what must be done now, because if we do not do it now it will be too late.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am informed by reliable authority that approximately 20 percent of the income of the dairy farmers now is received by way of subsidies. Does the gentleman think there is anything to the rumor that we hear that between now and November the subsidies will be increased on the excuse that the dairy farmers must have more in order to increase their production?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is not the way I have heard it. The way I have heard it, they are going to cut the subsidies down now and then bring the subsidies up about the 1st of November. But I do not want to get into that. I cannot answer as to what is going to happen in the future. As to this subsidy question, as I tried to say on this floor many months ago, regardless of the attitude you take on it, I never yet have seen how you can have support prices without making provision of money to pay the subsidies. I have not changed my position on that. But the subsidy question should be settled once and for all, so that we may have a time table running not a month, or 2 months, or 3 months, or be worrying about this election that may be worrying some people, as to what the subsidies are going to be at that time. After our conference yesterday with Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator—and I think Mr. Purdue brought that out very plainly to him—if I got anything from the conference it was that Mr. Jones is going to have a timetable that extends for several months, so that it will just kind of fix it so no one will be worrying about what it happens to be on November 7.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman think there would be any controversy over subsidies if it were not for there being a Presidential election this year?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to get into a discussion of the subsidy today. There is something in connection with this milk subsidy I do want to discuss because it was brought out at that meeting.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does not the gentleman agree with me in the observation of the fact that the agricultural people of America are too intelligent to be fooled politically by any easing up of restrictions or any added benefits just prior to an election? You cannot fool them, can you?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to answer the question, because that has nothing to do with this problem today. I want to point out once more that there is no politics as far as our membership is concerned. It is something that is of importance not only to the State of Wisconsin but to the whole country. I never yet have stood up here and tried to ask for anything for my district or the State of Wisconsin that did not apply right straight across the board.

This is the point I want to present in that connection. The problem of maintaining a sufficient supply of milk to take care of war and civilian needs must be a long-time program. That is what Mr. Perdue says in his letter:

> Every production problem should be rightly divided into two divisions, the problem of maintaining a sufficient supply of milk to take care of the civilian needs and the problem of maintaining or increasing the supply of milk for the war effort.

I want to spend a minute explaining what I think he means by that. I think every person can see that the two problems change. For example, when the soldiers are in camps in this country, naturally there will be a bigger consumption of fluid milk, but as they go different places around the world the demand is going to change over into condensed milk, or evaporated milk, as they call it here in Washington. There is where we lead up to this change in subsidies.

I have a chart here for the country. It looks like a Chinese puzzle, showing that in one State they pay a 50-cent subsidy where the milk goes to war, and an 80-cent subsidy where it goes for domestic consumption. That is one recommendation this organization has made, that that subsidy go right straight across the board, and not pay subsidies that have 60-percent variation in them.

I call your attention to that for this reason. According to the press release, they have asked for 16,000,000 cases of evaporated milk for the next 4 months. That is pretty well up to what is to be produced the next 4 months. As I remember it, they used only some 14,000,000 cases all last year. That is something to be thinking about. Here is a State that produces a third of the condensed milk of the Nation, and here you come along on the 15th of March and say, "We are just going to drop you down now 15 cents." I am sure that people in responsible positions do not realize how some little things affect production much more than they ever anticipated at the time they issue the statement.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman spoke about the promises that were made to the producers of cheese in Wisconsin and how these promises were not kept by the Government. In my district I have a good many cheese factories. A good many of those factories have been compelled to close their doors and go out of business. I wonder if there is a connection between the fact that the condenseries are doing such a great amount of business and the production of fluid milk has increased so considerably, and the fact that the cheese factories in this country are going out of business.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As the cheese factories close the producer in

most cases can send his milk to a condensing factory. While some 200 cheese factories are reported to be already closed in Wisconsin, the condensed milk production up to this time has also shown a decline. This indicates that more milk has found its way to the fluid milk markets as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] has brought out on former occasions.

That may be because of the fact they have allowed the amount that goes into the fluid milk to be sold at a much higher price than the ceiling which has been placed on cheese would allow it to be. To answer further, you cannot be sure about these promises. I say this in all kindness. I said to Marvin Jones yesterday, I have been your friend for over 5 years. I want you to change this situation while you can still change it. The people out in the States think their whole life is being laid out for them right here in Washington, and they think if you can put a ceiling on a certain product it is pretty hard to make them believe that you cannot fix the floor on the milk going into manufactured dairy products. "We cannot do anything about this" is going to be a poor answer. "They have taken off 15 cents. We cannot help it if they take more off." I am not going to place the responsibility on Mr. Jones' doorstep as to what has happened. His responsibility is to change it. But I would just like to have any Member tell me that the man who is out there producing that milk will not put it on Mr. Jones' doorstep and at the doorstep of the people of his organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes to answer a question which was asked of me, and which I did not have time to answer, with reference to subsidies in connection with the production of milk.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am making a parliamentary inquiry, perhaps, more than a point of order. I make the point of order that the ruling has been heretofore when there were subsequent speakers, such a request was not in order. That was the ruling of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] when he was in the chair on two occasions. I do not care anything about it, but I would like to have a policy on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has asked for unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes with the knowledge of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who has a special order and who is in the Chamber.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it in order for a Member who has a special order to ask for an extension of his time when there are subsequent special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A unanimous consent request, under such circumstances, is in order.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the remarks to be made by my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I may be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I did not have sufficient time to answer inquiries that were made before and I want to make every effort to do so. One question brought up was in reference to the matter of floors and commitments that have been made. I want to quote from the Farm Journal of May 1944:

> 1. How dependable are price floors? The low prices you are getting for eggs may hold the answer. If this can happen at a critical period in the war, beware of post-war programs that can only succeed if the Government prevents price declines.
>
> 2. The Government is now paying for its tactics of last fall, which many farmers called an outright breach of faith.

I think that is the answer. It is right and fair for any Government agency to fulfill the commitments made to producers. These farmers are interested in producing food to win the war and we all realize the necessity for so doing.

I also call attention to the question as to the influence of subsidies on production. I have a chart in my hand here which shows the monthly production of milk for every month since 1934. If you will look at this chart you will find that in 1940 we increased production of milk by 2,700,000,000 pounds over the year 1939. In 1941 the peak in increasing the production of milk in the United States took place. In that year we increased the production over the year 1940 by 5,988,000,000 pounds. The increase in 1942 over 1941 was 3,700,000,000 pounds, but in 1943 we dropped below the 1942 production by 1,100,000,000 pounds.

Let me call your attention to the President's message to Congress in September 1942. The President in his message to Congress at that time said:

> The greatest danger is in dairy products, which are, as you know, most important items in the American diet.

That message had a marked influence on future milk production. You will find, if you look at this table, that following that statement certain results happened. In 1942 there was a gradual increase in production of milk over the year before or 1941 while the milk production of the last 3 months of 1942 was only about equal to the last 3 months of 1941.

A question was asked here about subsidies and their influence on production. These arguments started about a year ago. The national production of milk was just exactly the same during July 1943 as it was in July 1942, or 11,765,000,000 pounds. If you will look at this table you will see that during practically every month for the rest of the year we lost 200,000,000 pounds a month, or a total of 1,093,000,000 pounds less milk during the last 5 months of the year 1943. Increasing the feed subsidy, beginning in August, and up until March 1944, has not shown production up to the year previous, but in March 1944 the national production was about the same as the 1943 March production. Mr. William Perdue, the general manager of the Pure Milk Products Corporation, was formerly a Federal milk administrator. He is well grounded in his background as far as putting on a constructive food program having to do with milk is concerned.

I want to give you the recommendations as a result of the conference held with Marvin Jones yesterday, and attended by practically all the Wisconsin Members of the House and both Senators.

First. Put the milk subsidy straight across the board. No one yet has ever offered any reason in the world why one should be 80 cents and another 50 cents, and justified that procedure.

Second. Put this all under a long-term program and be sure that the promises made will be fulfilled.

Third. Put a floor on milk going into all manufactured dairy products.

Fourth. If condensed-milk production is to be maintained let the O. P. A. raise the ceiling 15 cents, but immediately restore the 15 cents per hundredweight taken off the farmers' milk checks.

Fifth. Have someone in authority begin to realize that milk for war purposes is entitled to more consideration than milk for civilian use.

Sixth. Let us not hear so much about historic background where it has been the custom to reduce the price to the producer at the time of this greatest production. This can be only a racket to help the few at the expense of the many.

They say normally milk goes down in price in the spring. Yes, but these are not normal times. We are paying a subsidy of 50 to 80 cents per hundredweight to increase milk production this very minute, so what is the sense of anyone anywhere trying to deceive the farmers into thinking that because milk went down this season of the year in the past that it is any excuse for reducing the price at this time. Someone had better be thinking this one through.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very brief article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three different matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the other special orders today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SENATE BIPARTISAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR PLANNING AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspapers reported the first meeting between Secretary of State Cordell Hull and the newly created bipartisan Senate Advisory Committee on Post-War Planning and Foreign Policy. I want, first of all, to say it is gratifying to me to learn that after 28 months of fighting we are at long last getting down to the actual business of mapping out our post-war relations with other nations and establishing our peace aims. I think it is high time that we begin taking the American public into our confidence on this important point. I am glad that yesterday's meeting marks a first small step in a very commendable direction.

However, the failure of this Post-War Planning and Foreign-Policy Committee to include any representation of Members of the House of Representatives disturbs me considerably. I think it is rivaled in its unfortunate uniqueness only by the fact that nobody coming from the area west of the Missouri River in the United States has been included on this Post-War Planning Committee.

We find ourselves in the unique situation whereby the entire western section of America, not only the Pacific coast area, but the Rocky Mountain area and the Western Plains area, that great segment of America lying west of the Missouri River, much of it vitally interested in the problems related to the Orient and the Pacific, has no representation on the committee. I think that is a serious oversight, and I am greatly surprised that western Senators and Representatives have not forcefully brought that to the attention of the Secretary of State.

I sincerely hope that grievous oversight will be immediately corrected and I propose it be corrected by including with the eight Members of the other body, eight Members of the House of Representatives, that is, four Republicans and four Democrats, and that in that representation the Pacific Coast area and the western section of this country receive liberal representation. I think it is time to bring California and the rest of the Pacific Coast back into the Union. Let me read a list of States represented by the Members of the other body. They are Texas, Georgia, Kentucky, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, Maine, and Vermont. You will notice the westernmost State which is represented is Iowa.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I want to say before yielding that I think very good judgment was used, however, in selecting the personnel of the Senate committee. I think they are a splendid group of foreign-policy advisers and I am only sorry that some representation was not given to the western section of the country.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. Phillips.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, how was the committee appointed? Was it appointed by the Senate or by the Secretary of State?

Mr. MUNDT. It was appointed by the Senate with the advice, I presume, and counsel, of the Secretary of State.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate particularly what was said with reference to representation on this committee from the House of Representatives. The gentleman knows that more than 2 years ago I introduced a resolution calling for House participation in the ratification of treaties. That subject now is in the news considerably. I wonder if the gentleman is in a position to state his own attitude with reference to a constitutional amendment bringing the House of Representatives in on this tremendously important job of treaty-making?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have in mind delivering a full-dress speech on that very subject sometime during the present session of Congress. I do not want to get into that matter at this particular time because I want to discuss and emphasize the importance of bringing the House of Representatives into the picture on this particular aspect of the foreign-policy planning program of the administration.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. You will find in the two sections of the Nation which you refer to—that is, east and west of the Missouri River—two entirely different schools of thought relative to international affairs, which would make it all the more important that both sections of the Nation be included in these discussions.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is correct. I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that on January 6, 1943, which was the opening day of the seventy-eighth session of Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 28, which was for the purpose of creating a strictly nonpartisan commission to advise with the State Department on the formulation of peace aims and foreign policy. My resolution provided for the selection of eight Senators and eight Representatives and eight members of the executive department and eight outstanding citizens from private life, representative of all geographical sections of the country and of labor, industry, agriculture, and the professions. My resolution provided also that this commission be balanced evenly between the two major parties.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman upon the introduction of that resolution because I believe it was something which was very forward-looking and something which is now recognized as being of great worth. In view of the fact that the peace tables in the past have had a preponderance of politicians, I wonder if, in the term "professions," you might have contemplated that the churches of the world would be recognized in this preliminary conference and that some representation from the clergy be placed upon that commission.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman offers a very splendid suggestion. It has been my thought all along that if people from private life would be included, as my resolution contemplates, certainly the clergy of this country should find some representation. I think that in the long pull a better understanding and practice of the tenets of religion will be very helpful in the maintenance of a permanent peace.

It has been impossible to get any congressional action on House Joint Resolution No. 28. Consequently I am doubly grateful that Secretary Hull has at long last taken the matter into his own hands and has taken this first small step in the direction of the creation of this type of commission. He has now gone precisely one-quarter of the way. I now ask that he expand this committee to include eight House Members, and I believe he will then see the wisdom of further expanding it to include the further representation provided in House Joint Resolution No. 28, so that members of the clergy, representatives of labor, representatives of business interests, members from all geographic sections and political segments will have an opportunity to be heard in the councils which take place in the formation of our foreign policy.

In detouring the House of Representatives, this present advisory committee is detouring the American people, since the House of Representatives is the one body of Congress most directly in touch with the thoughts of its constituents.

TOO FEW MEN WITH TOO MUCH POWER OVER TOO MANY

I realize it is dangerous to engage in superlatives, but if we are to engage in that hazardous pastime today, I would say that the greatest single evil in the war is the fact that too few men exercise too much control over the destiny of too many people. I think that is an evil we should endeavor to correct and curb in America. One way to correct it and curb it is to bring into the formation of foreign policy and the establishment of peace aims, representatives not alone of the other body but representatives of the House of Representatives and of the citizenry at large.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman also feel that too many of those to whom you have just referred are idealists rather than realists?

Mr. MUNDT. Some of the fellows who are exercising tremendous control over

the destiny of a lot of people in foreign lands I would hate to classify as idealists. If they are idealists, their ideals are certainly abominable. I am afraid some of them are very bloody realists, indeed, and I use the word "bloody" in the American sense and not the English slang sense when I refer to that.

The Roosevelt administration has given us many lists of noble objectives and many declarations of pretty principles, but it has been studiously secretive up to this time in telling us the machinery and the methods by which it hopes to attain those objectives.

As I said last night in a discussion with three of my distinguished colleagues of the House on the American Forum of the Air broadcast, there is a distinction between policy and principle. Policy is defined by all dictionaries as meaning a course of action, or a plan of action. Consequently, in the establishment of foreign policies we are thinking of a plan of action by which we are going to deal with other countries, in maintaining certain standards necessary for human happiness, for security, and for peace.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Does the gentleman recall that on the 1st of April I introduced what later was referred to as House Concurrent Resolution No. 77, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that specifically asked for information with respect to the machinery that was to be established to maintain an enduring peace, and that the committee made an adverse report on that last Thurday? However, the Secretary of State, in a letter to the committee, indicated that the speech over the radio on April 9, was somewhat in line with the request made in that resolution. However, I still consider that as being indefinite and incomplete.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; and the gentleman is not alone in his attitude that the Secretary's statement on Easter Sunday, admirable though it was, expressive of high American ideals though it was, was definitely not a discourse on policy, because policy is a course of action, not a cataloging of noble objectives and the listing of high ideals.

I might call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the current issue of Time magazine, published April 24, on page 18, contains a rather disturbing as well as significant statement. Under the heading "No confidence," Time magazine says:

> Throughout most of three terms the administration has enjoyed overwhelming press support for its foreign policy. This may have been because of understanding, misunderstanding, or indifference. But coincident with a lively interest in the subject, press approval of administration foreign policy has declined faster than stocks in a Wall Street crash—from 80-percent support to 20 percent.

And it refers to an accompanying chart also found on page 18:

> As recorded by the Twohey Analysis of Newspaper Opinion, the chief objections are:
>
> The United States-British failure to clarify a policy toward Europe in general and Russia in particular—a situation which gives a depressing and confusing flavor to postwar talks.
>
> The Roosevelt policy toward France and DeGaulle. The press has strongly disapproved the subjection of a post-invasion regime of France to General Eisenhower's arbitrary decisions.
>
> Censorship. The press heartily approved Palmer Hoyt's suggestion for a Senate investigation of censorship.

To those reasons might well be added the fact that the American people themselves mingle a good deal of realism with their idealism. They recognize that ideals will not work unless we do, and that ideals will not be implemented without some machinery, some methodology for bringing them into actual being. The time has come, as we stand with millions of our men in England, equipped with billions of dollars of material, on the alert for the mightiest battle in history, to make the ideology clear, to give them the great moral ideals upon which to fight, to sustain them in their suffering, and to discourage the resistance of our enemies, once it has been made clear. That is an important attribute in psychological warfare.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion as to his conclusion of the complete exposition of a foreign policy on the part of the United States and any nation with whom it might choose to work, as to whether or not that would deteriorate or affect in a bad way the military effectiveness of our armed forces?

Mr. MUNDT. I might answer that by referring to the colloquy which took place on the floor earlier today regarding the amazing statement of General Patton, the latest volunteer addition to the spokesmen for the State Department, and suggesting that it would depend on the kind of foreign policy which we work out. I, personally, am very sorry that General Patton, who has only recently emerged from one rather unfortunate situation involving the slapping of a single soldier, has now taken up the business of slapping the faces of all our associates in the United Nations, with the sole exception of England. Because to tell our allies and associates that after the war undoubtedly Britain and America will rule the world cannot be very comforting reading to China and to Russia and to Norway and to France, and to Denmark, and all of the other good friends whom we have associated with us in this war. I believe that perhaps generals had better discontinue their proclamations of foreign policy, and that the State Department should accelerate its counsel with Members of the Senate and the House, and members of the American public, so as to bring into being and understanding a foreign policy which generals and privates and citizens alike, both at home and abroad, will recognize as the established American policy.

Mr. ROWE. It is with reference to the conclusions formed by Members of the Congress and the State Department in determining what is the foreign policy of this country and its complete exposition to which I referred. Do you think the exposition of that sort of foreign policy would seriously affect our military effectiveness in this war?

Mr. MUNDT. I think that the exposition of a foreign policy grown out of American heritage and American concepts would greatly enhance the military effort. It could make a very significant contribution toward our victory. It would tend to discourage our enemies; it would encourage our soldiers and give them something definite for which to fight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, if I may follow the estimable example of the gentleman who preceded me, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman that there are two other special orders. If there is no objection on the part of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from South Dakota may proceed.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. There has been no hesitancy on the part of our allies in this war to express themselves definitely insofar as policy is concerned.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Everyone knows where Russia stands; she has made her position clear at all times. There is no misunderstanding about what Churchill says or where England stands. Ours is the only indefinite foreign policy.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct. There is no obscurity in the opinions expressed by Stalin and Churchill, and their statements give no comfort to the enemy. We know what Stalin is for; we know what Churchill is for; but everyone both at home and abroad is confused and perplexed about what America stands for. From all appearances our relations with other countries seem to be based upon a sickening series of compromising reactions to the proposals of others rather than upon a courageous statement of constructive proposals based upon American ideals and founded in American heritage. It is not enough that we redefine our aims and reexamine the definitions of objectives contained in the Atlantic Charter and other declarations every time Moscow or London expresses some territorial aspiration. We should have a definite set of American objectives and a program of American policies to present to our wartime associates. We have been good listeners on foreign policy for long enough; the time has come to demonstrate a little American leadership in shaping the form of the world to follow this war.

We apparently have been largely content to voice our approval or disapprov-

al—and it is usually our reluctant but recurring approval—to suggestions from Moscow, from Italy, from north Africa, or from London rather than exerting the influential might of the logic and judgment of this great Republic upon our allies. This not only deprives a very sick world of the ministrations of its best doctor—good old doctor Uncle Sam—but it sets up a highly dangerous precedent. If we today are content to approve actions originating in Moscow or London without weighing them against established American ideals and standards, it follows that after the war we shall continue only to supply the ditto marks and the underscoring while the sentence structure and the significant language will be written in the other capitals of the world. It is my conviction, contrariwise, that the world needs the benefit of American concepts and American ideals and it is our duty to crystallize them into the working outlines of a definite foreign policy.

The United States has already frittered away much of its bargaining power. Russia and England and all the rest are less likely to listen to our proposals today than they were a year ago. After victory has been won, our bargaining position will be even weaker. If our influence is to be exerted, the hour is already late and the sands of the hourglass are running fast away. We have little if any more time to lose. Our peace aims, our war objectives, our plans for the postwar world and the outlines at least of an accepted and acceptable American foreign policy should now be made crystal clear. Verily, our generals and our admirals have been far outdistancing our diplomats and statesmen in achieving the objectives of this war. This may or may not be caused by the fact the President has delegated his military powers to experienced military men while he has made no such wise delegation of powers to others on the fixing of a foreign policy. It is hoped that the creation of the Senate bipartisan advisory committee will now be followed by the creation of a similar committee in the House and by action along the line of the other recommendations contained in House Joint Resolution 28.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I should like to make this observation at this point if the gentleman will yield, to substantiate the gentleman's conclusions. It has not been long since 29 Members of the House sent an appeal to the Secretary of State asking definite questions with reference to unconditional surrender and what we are fighting for. As a result of that we received an answer on the 29th day of March 1944 referring us to a speech made by the Honorable Secretary of State in July of 1942. This is the sort of answer we get to a direct question to some of the high Government officials. They refer back to something that has been said that has no immediate effect upon the conditions that we are confronted with from month to month or even from day to day.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Let me emphasize, if I may at the risk even of appearing repetitious, that the recital of glittering goals and noble objectives and estimable attitudes and ideals is not the statement of a working or workable foreign policy because it gives no indication of how we are to reach those goals. Policy is the device which we use to attain the goal we have in mind.

The Atlantic Charter sets up some goals, but it hangs in the air unsupported by a policy which would help us attain those noble goals. I think the time has come to take the black magician's cover off of the peace aims and the foreign policy of this administration. The citizens of this country in and out of the armed services are entitled to know what is being planned, what is to follow the unconditional surrender of our enemies. That is the thing we want to know. Just as there is a time to send troops to war so also there is a time to demobilize them and bring them back home. By developing and declaring our objectives now and by devising a policy for observing the peace we shall best be able to know at what time Americans can look forward to the homeward trip of their soldier sons.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. This statement may be elementary, but it appears to me that the gentleman's line of reasoning is substantiated by the teachings of Jesus Christ. Christ gave us a declaration of objectives which could be attained, but He also proceeded to define and set forth principles of policy whereby we might attain or at least strive to attain those objectives. It seems to me this line of procedure may be apropos the present discussion.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his observation. It is far from elementary. It brings to mind a statement made a day or two ago by an eminent American, Mr. Clarence K. Streit. He said:

> For lack of vision the people perish, and first of all our sons.

I think that is true. In a time like this if we do not set up the definite objectives, if we do not work out our definite foreign policy and peace aims, the first to perish are the sons in uniform.

But I am getting a little bit away from my major thesis at the moment, which is to take the House of Representatives into the councils now going on in this country from the standpoint of the creation and the crystallization of foreign policy. May I point out that the House has had a leading part to play all through this whole perplexing period of international relations, both prior to the war and since? The Fulbright resolution, if you please, preceded a somewhat similar resolution in the other body. The House was the first to act. Lend-lease was first passed by the House of Representatives. The House again was the first to act. U. N. R. R. A. was first presented to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, first considered by the House, first approved here. The House again was the first to act. And so it has been on other pieces of legislation.

At the moment the House Committee on Foreign Affairs of which I am happy to be a very humble member, is considering legislation dealing with the international fixing of the stability of the currency of the world. We have a bill at the moment introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY]. We are also considering a different approach to the problem which has been presented by Secretary Morgenthau. Again the House is likely to be the first to take action in this case. Why then not include the House, the House which lives so close to the people, the House which reflects so accurately the attitude and ideals of the people, the House which has control of the purse, the House which passes first the laws on taxation? Why not include it in the councils which are being held to arrange a workable foreign policy?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman has raised two questions which interest me very much: First, the matter of foreign policy, and I am inclined to agree with the gentleman there; then he referred to General Patton's making certain statements in which he offended some of our allies. If we had a foreign policy, how would that stop General Patton or anyone else from making statements and doing things similar to what he has done which in my judgment were not proper for a man in his position to do? It is his business to carry on the war and not make political statements. That goes for other generals, too.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman from New York for raising that question. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that if we had a clear-cut foreign policy which everybody understood which would not only be given to the people at home but to our associates on our side in the war and which even our enemies could understand, then there would be no reason in the world for a general's misstating American foreign policy, or anybody else, for that matter. I do not think Secretary Hull believes that after the war England and America are going to police and patrol the world. I hope he does not. I do not believe that is the Roosevelt idea. I do not know for whom General Patton speaks; but there would be no excuse for such hyperbole if we had a declaration of American foreign policy which people could understand.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not believe there is any excuse or justification for his making that statement at the present time.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree there was no valid reason for him to make it at the present time, but there would be less, there would be none at all, if we had a declared American foreign policy. Until we work out a definite foreign policy certainly generals should not discuss it in the countries of our associates in this war.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. If I understand the gentleman correctly he is criticizing specific means and methods.

Mr. MUNDT. No. I am criticizing the lack of specific means and methods.

Mr. McMURRAY. Has the gentleman any concrete suggestions that he would like to give us to mull over and think about?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I have, but I hesitate to do the thing for which I criticized General Patton. I am someday going to make a speech on specific methods, however, if we do not shortly receive some definite statement of policy from the administration, from the Secretary of State, or from the President whose job it is to initiate them. If they continue to becloud our policy in intellectual fog, then I, in my humble manner, shall violate the principles which I have set up for all of us. However, until that time comes, I do not believe individual Members of Congress, any more than our generals, can be very helpful by proposing specific programs of foreign policy.

Mr. McMURRAY. But the gentleman remembers very well that 25 years ago one of the greatest objections raised to specific methods was the actions of the President of that day, and I was just wondering if it would not be a fine thing if we in the Congress did perhaps state our suggestions so that the Department of State and the President of the United States could have our ideas when they were formulating their own.

Mr. MUNDT. That is precisely the reason why I am asking Secretary Hull to supplement his present committee by the addition of eight Members of the House, four Republicans and four Democrats, in order that we may have the proper means through which to voice our opinions. I am very much afraid this administration is making the Wilson mistake all over again of failing to take the Congress and the country into its confidence.

Mr. McMURRAY. May I say that I agree with the gentleman's specific objective?

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech which I made at the united Jewish appeal real estate dinner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNJUST COURT MARTIAL OF CERTAIN POLISH SOLDIERS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon the Polish Government in exile to remove certain officers in the Polish Army who are responsible for the court martial of 30 Jewish soldiers. It was stated, and the reason given for the court martial, was that these Jewish soldiers have left the Polish Army to join the British Army where they will be given a chance to fight our enemies. If we consider the motives that prompted hundreds of Jewish soldiers to apply for transfers to the British forces we must admit the justification for their request. Any reasonable, self-respecting man, regardless of religious faith, would do likewise if confronted with a situation such as has developed in some parts of the Polish Army. No self-respecting person can be expected to live and fraternize with people who cheer the wanton murder of his coreligionists and who threaten to kill him as soon as they get a chance—who admire our enemy and belittle our allies.

I have no complaint with reference to the rank and file of the Polish people. They have suffered greatly along with the Jewish people in Poland. The people of Polish descent in this country are fine, outstanding citizens and loyal Americans. I am sure they too resent the anti-Semitic antics of some Polish officers which led to the court martial in England recently of 30 Jewish boys who refused to continue to serve in an outfit whose officers seemed to have accepted the Nazi and Fascist doctrines which we are supposed to be fighting. The officers who are responsible for this condition of disunity have been specifically named by these soldiers, when they requested a transfer to British troops where they will be able to concentrate on fighting our enemies instead of having to defend themselves against their so-called comrades-in-arms.

The testimony entered by Jewish soldiers in the court martial, and this has been released by Tom Driberg, independent member of the House of Commons, quoted a Polish captain, Lupa Mielmiczuk, as expressing a high regard for Hitler in front of his soldiers because Hitler is murdering the Jews. The captain declared that "this is not the end as yet."

This is one specific charge that was made and proven, and no soldier can be blamed for refusing to serve under the command of an officer of such low mentality.

Another officer, Captain Hrekowski, is quoted as warning a Jewish soldier under his command, "The time will yet come for the Jews."

Even harsher expressions were cited as coming from two corporals. Lance Corporal Nowakowsky, it was said, told Jewish soldiers: "I beat Jews in Poland before the war, and we'll beat them upon my return to Poland if any of them are still left there."

A Polish corporal named Rozensky is quoted as having stated publicly in his barracks, "I would like to kill five Jews, three Communists, and two Ukrainians."

According to the testimony, another corporal, Czeslaw Kaczgorow, second in command of a platoon, refused to take any steps against a private, Jan Lis, who, in the presence of many soldiers, told a Jew, "I killed Jews in Poland and shall kill you, too, on the first possible occasion."

JEERING VERSES

Anti-Jewish verses ridiculing the Jewish people and their religion were constantly sung by a Polish bombardier, Ratajczyk, who molested Jewish soldiers, it was stated in the testimony.

When asked by a Jewish lawyer to stop his anti-Semitic activities, he is said to have replied, "You dirty Jew. If we were not here I would have finished with you long ago."

Other testimony states that after the first group of Jewish soldiers left the Polish Army to join the British units, the situation became even worse for the remaining Jews.

Polish soldiers, it is stated, whispered among themselves that when the second front was opened their first act would be to murder "any Jews that are still left in the Polish units."

In my judgment disunity in our armed forces, whether it is in America, Poland, or Yugoslavia, where men are fighting a common enemy, is disgraceful and a source of grave danger to the Allied Nations. It is a powerful weapon in undermining the morale of the many men who are fighting and dying for the cause of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot express myself in too strong a manner in denouncing such rabble rousers within our own ranks and, in pleading for unity of the Allied Nations and among the soldiers who are fighting a common enemy, if anyone deserves to be court-martialed, it would seem to me they would be the officers and men who have let their bigotry and intolerance turn them into tools of our enemy—the people who by their Nazi-like behavior have sown mistrust and enmity among our own forces.

The situation created by the anti-semitism in the Polish Army is not consistent with the principles for which this war is being fought by all the decent, liberty-loving people of the world. I, as one member of Congress, feel that it is just as much a part of my responsibility to call this disgraceful and dangerous situation to the attention of the American people and to the governments in exile who are part of the Allied Nations.

I think that any soldier in the Polish Army, whether he be Jew, Catholic, or protestant, who was told by his commanding officer and fellow soldiers that Hitler was right in killing all the people he had slaughtered because they were Jews or Catholics or protestants, or whatever the excuse may have been, and that they would prefer killing some of our Allies—any soldier who has any intellectual integrity and any understanding of the underlying causes and principles of this war would rather face a court martial than serve under such an officer and with such "comrades."

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this country and our State Department and our War Department ought to take judicial notice of what is going on in the Polish Army and send word to them that we in America do not sympathize with the court martial of the men who prefer to join the British Army, to fight our common enemy, instead of being abused by some so-called allies who are in sympathy with our enemies.

This is not just one people's fight against an aggressor—it is a fight for survival of civilization. No general, no officer or man within our ranks should be permitted to serve our enemies by creating disunity among our fighting men who are ready and willing to give their lives to destroy the hatred and intolerance which brought the world to the brink of destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the records should be examined carefully, and proper steps taken to prevent recurrence of such incidents.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I commend the gentleman from New York on his statement. When he says as one Congressman that it should be called to our attention, I agree with him in toto.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am very grateful to the gentleman for his contribution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUFFETT (at the request of Mr. CURTIS), for 1 week, on account of public business.

To Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio, for April 27 and 28, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signatures to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566); and

S. 1757. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 27, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Thursday, April 27, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of S. 1767.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m. Thursday, April 27, 1944, in room 1011, New House Office Building, to hold hearings on H. R. 2426.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Thursday, April 27, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 416 House Office Building, to consider H. R. 2987, a bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1470. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $89,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, to remain available until expended, for the War Department for flood control, general (H. Doc. No. 551); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1471. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a draft of a proposed provision and a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $3,350,000 pertaining to an appropriation for the Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year 1945, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (H. Doc., No. 552); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1472. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $258,700, for the Department of Labor, for the fiscal year 1945, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 553); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1473. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $740,000 (H. Doc. No. 554); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1474. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1945, involving an increase of $750,069, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 555); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1475. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of San Luis Rey River, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1476. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1477. A letter from the Alien Property Custodian, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the period ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1478. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for lump-sum payments for accumulated leave due to Government officers and employees at death or upon separation from the service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1479. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a copy of the information furnished the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of making a determination of the Veterans' Administration personnel requirements for the fourth quarter of the 1944 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 517. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4485, a bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1391). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4349. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1392). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4446. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees within the Office of Scientific Research and Development from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1393). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4468. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the War Department from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1394). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4679. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 1475. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 1725. A bill to authorize heads of departments and agencies to delegate to subordinates the authority to employ persons for duty in departments or the field service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 2224. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, to certain employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 4680. A bill to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURCHILL of New York:

H. R. 4681. A bill to reduce the tax on admissions to cabarets, roof gardens, and similar entertainments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 4682. A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to geographical representation on the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4683. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 4684. A bill to extend certain benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act to employees with not less than 5 years' service who are voluntarily separated from the service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4685. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a military aviation academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 4686. A bill establishing the methods of advancement for post-office employees in the field service but not to be construed as supplanting any civil-service regulations already in effect; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 4687. A bill relating to issuance of postal notes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4688. A bill to make a token payment to members of selective-service boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 266 (by request). Joint resolution to amend section 124 (f) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to amortization of emergency facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 518. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the decree of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in re James B. Dunn; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 519. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by the special committee authorized by House Resolution 518; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 520. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to provide for three chaplains instead of the present one; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Sabana Grande, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman McGEHEE's resolution to remove from office Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 4689. A bill for the relief of Vonnie Jones, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 4690. A bill granting a pension to Joseph J. Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 4691. A bill for the relief of the Plainview-Rover School District No. 7 of Yell County, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 4692. A bill for the relief of B. H. Matthies; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5560. By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5561. By Mr. FULMER: Senate resolution submitted by James H. Fowles, clerk of the South Carolina Senate, Columbia, S. C., memorializing the National Congress to pass World War No. 2 bill of rights; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5562. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 19 residents of Beaver Falls, Pa., favoring the establishment of a Christian world order; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5563. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 5, Vestal, N. Y., and signed by 76 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furlough for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5564. By Mr. LANE: Resolution adopted April 18, 1944, by the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, urging improved and additional air-line service for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5565. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition submitted by Shirley Rich, Mortar Board Chapter, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, and signed by 1,275 members of the Mortar Board Chapters of the United States relative to the policies which they believe should be included in the peace settlement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5566. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Joint Council of Postal Groups, San Francisco, urging that Congress enact a time-and-one-half-pay-for-overtime bill for all postal employees, based on a 253-day work year; dated March 28, 1944; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5567. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, the Bar Association of Baltimore City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition of all legislation which would repeal our dual system of government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5568. Also, petition of the secretary, Carthage Chamber of Commerce, Carthage, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to international air policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the Good Shepherd who leadest those who trust Thee beside still waters and into green pastures, cleanse us from the love and power of sin. We pray for an affection that will not grieve nor betray, which accomplishes works of mercy wherever the entrancing finger of our Master directs. We praise Thee that there is no freedom like unfettered thoughts which can melt hateful intolerance and cause the beautiful ministries of brotherhood.

We bless Thee for Thy holy name, infinite in love and mighty in everlasting strength. May it fill us with joy and gladness and keep us secure from the temptations and tribulations of this changing life. Thou who didst span Sinai with a rainbow and replaced the storm by the dove of peace, proclaim Thy message to a scoffing world, living in spiritual poverty. O let Heaven's richest gifts be expressed in our unattained estates and releases the appalling hands of despotic masters that the great inheritance of the Kingdom of God may be realized.

"He who will suffer God to guide him,
And trusteth Him in all his ways,
Shall ever know that God's beside him
In hours of trial and evil days."

In the name of Him who was rich, yet for our sakes became poor. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on the Swiss-cheese industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on the policy of the Farmers Union of America on post-war matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

INDIAN CLAIMS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, both old parties, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, at their last conventions adopted a plank calling for the immediate payment of all outstanding Indian claims. The Democratic side of this House, through the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], introduced such a bill, but it did not seem to meet with favor. I want to do all I can to carry out the pledges of my own party. Today I am introducing a claims bill that will take care of the situation and carry out the promise made by the Republicans in the last election. I will demand action on this bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post on the subject of tax simplification, and also an editorial from the Washington News on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Montgomery Ward mail-order catalog has many uses. I hate to think of the size and the contents of the next Montgomery Ward catalog after the Government master minds get through with it.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today offering a resolution to appoint a committee of this House of seven Members to investigate with respect to the seizure by the United States on April 26, 1944, of the property of Montgomery Ward & Co., merchandising house, which the Attorney General of the United States claims to be a war industry.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MYERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. There is legislation to be considered and there will probably be votes.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

JESSE L. McCOY—A ONE-MAN ARSENAL OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Jesse L. McCoy, of Springfield, Ill., who is making a vital and unusual contribution to the American war effort by giving refitted daggers to our soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Mr. McCoy, who served with the American forces in France in World War No. 1, has become a veritable one-man arsenal of democracy in World War No. 2 by fitting out and donating these daggers to our service personnel. You may wonder how Mr. McCoy has been able to obtain the steel to make more than 4,900 of these daggers in the last 18 months—every one of which has been given free of charge to a man in uniform and every one of them a deadly and useful weapon.

The steel comes from old and discarded swords, some of which have been relics of other wars, and many of which have been used at one time in fraternal organizations as part of the lodge rituals. So heavy has been the demand that the source of local supply has been long since exhausted. Mr. McCoy needs hundreds of these old swords if he is to continue to fashion these weapons of victory, which have been so useful that in some instances they have saved the lives of heroic Americans in hand-to-hand combat with Japanese in the South Pacific theater of war.

In the event any of my colleagues know where any of these old and outmoded swords are available, I respectfully suggest the present owners be advised of Mr. McCoy's activities. I know they will want to cooperate by donating them to him.

I might add that Mr. McCoy produces these weapons of defense—and victory—during his spare time, after working hours in Springfield, where he is employed by the Orpheum Theater. His home address is 2155 East Capitol Avenue.

He should be aided and encouraged in his magnificent work. His contribution in the war effort is all the more praiseworthy when it is understood that Mr. McCoy receives no personal remuneration for the thousands of daggers he has already made and distributed so that America's triumph can attain early realization. Give a sword and save a life.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, some days ago Heywood Belton, who was appointed to the Capitol Police force by our late and lamented friend and colleague, Thomas Cullen, composed a touching poem in his memory, which was a splendid tribute to our departed friend. It was my purpose to insert this poem in the RECORD, but the manuscript was lost somewhere between the New House Office Building and the Capitol on Tuesday. It is for the purpose of asking anyone who found the manuscript to kindly return it to me that I have taken the floor. In this connection I want to compliment former Officer Belton on his effort and to commend him for his loyalty to our departed colleague.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the completion of business on the Speaker's table, I may have permission to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Portland Oregonian regarding the works and acts of the late Senator Charles L. McNary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] blames Montgomery Ward for the present situation. The President had no authority to seize that plant. The War Board had no authority to issue the order requiring the signature to the proposed contract order. Ward's is neither a war contractor nor a war plant. It is not engaged in war activities nor in the activities which aid in the prosecution of the war any more than is a farmer or a businessman. In a lesser degree, everything we do has to do with the war effort. Everyone is engaged in the war effort in a way. But it is not the intent of the law that a civilian plant, industry, or business can be taken over by the President.

The authority of the War Labor Board has been challenged here in the district court by Montgomery Ward and it pleads that the court has no jurisdiction because, mark you, it admits it has no power to enforce its order. This procedure of seizing a commercial enterprise smacks too much of dictatorship.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an editorial in today's Star on this very point, setting forth clearly the underlying reason why it was necessary to do what has been done by the Government.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FRANK KINGDON

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the heat of debate the other day, one Frank Kingdon was called a Communist. I am intimately acquainted with Mr. Kingdon and in all fairness I proclaim him a distinguished educator, a former college president, and as patriotic a gentleman as any man in the House. There is not a grain of communism that resides in him. He is a firm believer in the system of private initiative and enterprise, the American democratic system. He needs no defense from me. His works and words speak for themselves. No name calling can detract from his fine reputation as scholar, author, and radio commentator. His recent book, That Man in the White House, has blazed a new trail and quickened American thought on true liberalism.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, listening to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] proclaim that Frank Kingdon is not a Communist, reminds me of the old story of the pot denying that the kettle is black.

People who know Frank Kingdon's record say that he is a Communist, and anybody who has read his scurrilous attacks on the Congress of the United States is forced to the conclusion that he is not a patriotic American.

I have read his book called That Man in the White House, and, in my opinion, it is calculated to do President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party infinitely more harm than good. His support is like the kiss of death. I saw the stuff that he spouted over the radio, and I saw some of it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I repeat that in my opinion he is a Communist and is doing everything he can to smear and destroy the Congress of the United States, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be divided equally between the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4679, the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, 1944, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before entering upon a detailed discussion of the bill, I would like to preface my remarks by calling your attention to several matters of general interest in connection therewith.

First, let me pay tribute to the splendid cooperation on the part of all members of the subcommittee having the bill in charge. Without such cooperation it would have been impossible to present to you a bill which is well balanced and at the same time economical, and which we believe will meet with the approval of all Members. It is no exaggeration to state that we were in unanimous agreement on substantially every item in the bill. In only one or two instances and on relatively unimportant matters was there any division of opinion whatever. For that reason, I want to take this occasion to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], the gentleman from California, [Mr. CARTER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The subcommittee, of which I have the honor of being chairman, held daily hearings on the bill, meeting both morning and afternoon for a period of 4 weeks. We heard representatives from all the bureaus, boards, and commissions provided for under the Interior Department, including such wartime activities as the Office of Fishery Coordination for War and the Solid Fuels Administration for War. All told, there are 24 such agencies, and we heard representatives from each of them, a total of approximately 90 witnesses. In addition, 1 Member of the United States Senate, 24 Members of the House, and a number of representatives of outside organizations were heard.

It is significant to note that only one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee urged a reduction in appropriations.

Many Members of Congress make long speeches about economy, but when some of them appeared before our committee, in every instance save one, they asked for additional appropriations. In fact all but 1 of the 115 or more witnesses who appeared before our committee asked for increased appropriations.

Had our committee approved all their requests we would have added many millions to the total of the bill, instead of drastic reductions in each of the agencies over which the committee has jurisdiction, the details of which I will be pleased to give to you a little later.

Members will recall that when the annual Interior bill was reported to the floor of this House a year ago that the committee was able to make the most drastic reductions in the bill ever made by the committee in its entire existence. Heads of some of the departments and agencies affected complained bitterly that they could not continue to function in anything like an efficient manner because of the operation this committee had performed on their activities. Members of this committee who have the responsibility felt that the time was long past due for such an operation and that the patient would show real signs of improvement after being given definite and rather drastic surgical treatment. The facts speak for themselves as to whether or not the Interior Department was ruined by this committee a year ago.

REVENUES OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Members of the committee and others will be interested to hear something about the revenues taken in by the Interior Department as a result of its operations. It will also be good news to the American taxpayer that the revenues of the Department are more nearly equal to their appropriations than any department of Government with the possible exception of the Post Office Department. Figures submitted to the committee during hearings on the bill show that actual revenues—excluding trust funds—for the fiscal year 1943 amounted to $51,655,060, the estimated revenues for the fiscal year 1944 are $60,090,220, and the estimates for the fiscal year 1945 indicates revenues amounting to $66,642,075. If we include trust funds the total revenues for the Department for the next fiscal year will approach $80,000,000.

The above figures represent a most favorable showing as contrasted with the so-called depression years. For example, revenues accruing to the Department from all general and special funds in 1931 were $13,839,682, in 1932 the total amounted to $10,485,644, and in 1933 the total revenues dropped to $9,356,678; in 1934, $9,094,925; and in 1935, $10,437,570. Since 1935 revenues of the Department have increased materially year by year.

The primary reason for the tremendous increase, as many Members will

realize, is due to the development of great power and reclamation projects in the far West which are supplying millions of dollars' worth of power annually to facilities engaged in manufacturing war materials. It is estimated that during the fiscal year 1945, the sale of power by the Bonneville Power Administration, which includes power generated at Bonneville Dam and the Grand Coulee Dam, will total $24,826,900. Revenues from Boulder Dam and related projects are estimated to be $7,512,700. Members who served in the House when these and other projects were under consideration will recall very distinctly how difficult it was to secure appropriations to start these and other great power projects. Organized propaganda was carried on to defeat bills authorizing the construction as well as actual appropriations for the beginning of construction of the projects. Members were deluged with letters by the thousand bewailing the fact that the Government was entering competition with private business and would soon drive all private companies out of business. Congress was also told in no uncertain tones that no market could possibly be found for the power proposed to be generated at Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and other great power projects; that Congress was appropriating funds to create what is commonly known as white elephants. And yet, one shudders to think what our situation would be in the war effort if there were no T. V. A., Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and other Federal power projects. It is estimated that power generated at these great Federal projects has been used and is therefore responsible for the manufacture of 62 percent of the aluminum produced for the war effort. If we add other metals produced the amount would be increased tremendously. Suffice it to say that we are playing a most important part in the war effort by supplying power and water without which vast quantities of war materials and millions of dollars worth of agricultural products would not be available to the prosecution of the war.

CRITICISM OF DEFERMENT POLICY

I next want to discuss the deferment policy of the Department of the Interior. In my judgment this is the most critical thing this committee has said about the Department, and the Department is deserving of considerable criticism because of that policy.

It has been found that of the 6,996 employees in the Department, 2,200 have received occupational deferments, and that of the latter, 2,073 were deferred at the specific request of the Department. This report is of February 15 last. I am glad to say that since that time Mr. Edgar Puryear has taken over the job of handling these deferments. Members of this Congress know who Edgar Puryear is. He is one of the most efficient men in all the Government service. He has an entirely different viewpoint, and he tells me over the telephone and he is submitting a memorandum to me which I will put in the RECORD, showing that since he took over the job as chairman of the review board last February very few have been deferred, and that this situation is being cleaned up in the Interior Department and other agencies of Government. As the gentleman knows, this committee has seriously criticized the past deferment policy of this Department and has insisted that the matter be cleaned up immediately.

Our committee feels that there are very few or any people holding white-collar jobs in any of the departments of Government who are indispensable. Therefore, we are glad to know that Mr. Edgar Puryear is cleaning up this job in a very satisfactory manner.

The memorandum from Mr. Puryear is as follows:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
REVIEW COMMITTEE ON DEFERMENT
OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1944.

HON. JED JOHNSON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: This is with further reference to our conversation of yesterday regarding draft deferments recommended for the Interior Department by this committee.

As you perhaps know, the review committee of which I am chairman was appointed February 1, 1944, and reference to the number of deferments recommended for the Interior Department was, I assume, the action of the previous committee. For your information, please be advised that my committee has only recommended the 6 months' deferment of 73 persons in the Interior Department.

May I further add that deferments recommended by the previous committee are now being post audited.

I desire to express my appreciation for the courtesy you have extended me in making this explanation.

With every good wish and kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
EDGAR F. PURYEAR, *Chairman.*

Summary of action by review committee on deferment of Government employees subsequent to Feb. 1, 1944.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Key positions approved:	
Principal scientific illustrators (maps and diagrams for Army)	3
Soil scientists (studies for Army operations)	3
Range supervisors (forestry and grazing)	8
Senior range examiner (forestry and grazing)	1
Regional geographer (Java, etc.)	1
Regional geographer (Japan, etc.)	1
Regional geographer (Greece, etc.)	1
Linguists (military mapping)	2
Total	20

The attention of the committee was called to the fact that 27 young men between the ages of 18 and 20 had received occupational deferments. I am sure I voice the sentiment of a majority of the committee in saying that in a great majority of cases these young men, 27 of them between the ages of 18 and 20, and many of them holding white-collar jobs, could be replaced without taking any serious chance of losing the war. I am glad to say in this connection I have just been advised that of the 27 young men between 18 and 20 years of age to which I have referred, 6 have entered the Army or resigned and that the Department has notified draft boards, in connection with the remaining 21, that it has withdrawn its requests for deferment.

With the growing shortage of manpower throughout the United States and the drafting of many pre-Pearl Harbor fathers in every community in the land, it is deeply to be regretted that so many deferments have been requested for some single men as well as married men with no children, holding positions in the Department which the committee considers not to be essential. The committee has endeavored to impress upon the heads of bureaus that this situation must be eliminated without undue delay.

Earlier in my remarks I mentioned a communication I had received from my good friend, Mr. Puryear, Chairman of the Review Committee on Deferments of Government Employees of the War Manpower Commission, that I have inserted as a part of my remarks. I have also received a copy of a communication addressed to the gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee, signed by the Secretary of the Interior, in which he takes serious exception to the committee report on this bill and says that it contains statements concerning military deferment of personnel of that Department that are grossly unfair.

The Secretary gives the number of those for whom deferments are asked in the Geological Survey as 754, the Bureau of Reclamation as 315, the Bureau of Mines as 560, the Bonneville and Southwestern Power Administrations as 252, and even the Fish and Wildlife Service has deferments of 97. He rehashes some of the things said in his statement before the committee, but in no instance does he justify his appeal and his caustic assertion that the committee is unfair. At any rate, the committee is already getting results. And I repeat that the deferment policy of the Department of the Interior since Pearl Harbor is not a credit to the Department, to the Secretary, or to the heads of bureaus whom, I am ashamed to say, have recommended more than 2,000 deferments.

TELEPHONE CALLS AND TELEGRAMS RESTRICTED

Another matter which I want to bring to your attention has to do with the indiscriminate use of the long-distance telephone and the sending of many unnecessary telegrams and cablegrams in the transaction of departmental business. The committee is advised that during the fiscal year 1943 expenditures for long-distance tolls amounted to $161,000 and that $90,000 was expended for telegrams and cablegrams. The committee feels that such expenditures for these purposes are inexcusable and indefensible and should be drastically checked, and that substantial reductions in these items would be a real contribution to the war effort, by relieving the overloaded communication services.

To accomplish this it has inserted in the bill a new section limiting the use of funds for telephone tolls to $25,000 and has also placed a limitation of $25,000 on the amount available for telegrams and cablegrams.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Considering the drastic reductions made in the various bureaus and agencies of the Interior Department a year ago and the economies resulting therefrom, your committee feels that you will be especially interested in further reductions which the committee has recommended in the pending measure. In this connection permit me to now refer to reductions recommended by the committee under the Budget estimates and the 1944 appropriations. When the country is at war a committee reporting a bill containing any nonwar activities is in the position of having to justify them or showing substantial reductions in many items. I am glad to say that this committee reporting this bill can do both.

Here are some facts and figures that speak for themselves:

The committee considered budget estimates totaling $96,824,207.

The committee recommends appropriations totaling $87,762,580.

The amount recommended is a reduction under the 1944 appropriation of $26,279,496.

The bill shows a reduction under the Budget estimates of $9,151,627, or 9½ percent.

The reduction under the 1944 appropriation is 23 percent.

The reduction of $9,151,627 in the Budget estimates represents a very substantial cut in practically every activity. In no case has the committee recommended that the appropriations for any organization unit be increased and in only one instance has an individual item been increased above the estimates, and in that case the committee was in unanimous agreement that it was an emergency.

VALUABLE SERVICES OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATORS

As most Members will recall, this House has made funds available to the Appropriations Committee for use in connection with special surveys, investigations, and audits of the executive departments by experts selected for their efficiency in that type of work. The Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations has made full use of this service and is glad to report that it has secured very satisfactory results. The investigations have enabled our committee to effect considerable savings, and we believe they have also aided materially in offering ways and means of increasing the efficiency of several agencies in the Department. I will refer a little later to some of their recommendations which have been adopted by the committee.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In denying all funds for new positions in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, we have cut the Budget estimates by a total of $89,580. While the committee did not adopt a rigid policy of refusing all new positions requested throughout the estimates, it has refused such requests except in most urgent cases, and the committee did not feel that any of the positions requested for this office came within that classification.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. May I inquire whether provision is made for the salary of the additional assistant secretary which was authorized by the Congress only about 6 weeks ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No provision was made for that because the committee happens to know there are several administrative positions vacant in the Department and the committee did not have sufficient evidence to believe that this position would be justified notwithstanding the fact the Congress authorized such an appropriation. I know there are some who come before the committees and say when they present an authorization bill, "This is only an authorization; it is up to the Appropriations Committee to make the appropriation." Then just as soon as that authorization is made they come to the floor and say to members of the Appropriations Committee: "Now that Congress authorized the money it is your solemn duty to make the appropriation. Why do you not do it?" they inquire. We did not do it because we did not feel they actually needed another assistant.

Mr. MOTT. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that as far as I can recollect no such assertion was made here, that this was only an authorization for the purpose of getting the authorization bill passed. The gentleman from Oklahoma will remember that it was very thoroughly debated and that even the Speaker himself took the floor in support of the bill. I am unable to understand why in the face of that consideration the Appropriations Committee felt as though they should economize in the case of this position. I think they should economize but not to the extent of going against the direct authorization of the Congress which in the House at least was very thoroughly considered and thoroughly debated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's observation, but the committee heard the evidence. There was considerable discussion about the need for an additional assistant and the committee after hearing all the evidence was unanimous, both Republicans and Democrats, that we could win this war without allowing this additional assistant.

The bill will be read for amendment in a little while. The gentleman is privileged, as he knows, to offer such amendment. If the House wants to adopt it, it will have the opportunity to do so; but I may say to the gentleman from Oregon that as far as I am concerned I shall oppose it. As the RECORD will disclose, I voted against the authorization bill to which he refers. I believed then as now, that it is not essential. In view of the fact there are literally hundreds of vacancies now in this Department and the further fact that some administrative personnel, including a former Member of Congress, have resigned or been laid off because they simply could not find work for them—and I refer to responsible $5,000 jobs that are vacant at this time—the committee felt justified in its action. Simply because there has been an authorization, it is not absolutely incumbent upon me as a member of the Appropriations Committee to make the money available. I do not agree with such a policy or philosophy of Government.

Mr. MOTT. I did not say it was incumbent; I said I thought it was justifiable. I shall follow the gentleman's suggestion—I had intended to offer an amendment, anyway—and offer an amendment making provision for this assistant secretary which the House decided was needed. On the other hand, I wish to congratulate the gentleman for the other cuts he has made. I think he could well have made more; and, speaking of amendments, when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, I am also going to offer an amendment to provide that no part of the money appropriated in this bill shall be used to pay the salaries of employees in the Interior Department who have been deferred for occupational reasons and as requested by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee has proved results there. Mr. Puryear, who has charge of that job now, is doing a very good piece of work, as heretofore explained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I prefer not to yield further until I have finished my remarks. At that time I will be glad to yield myself additional time if necessary to answer inquiries.

The committee has denied funds proposed for new positions.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The committee has denied funds proposed for new positions in the Office of the Solicitor. Two of these positions are actually established and are being paid from funds contributed by other bureaus in the Department. The positions are a consul at large in Alaska and his assistant. In denying these two positions the committee wishes to express disapproval of the practice which has grown up in many departments of establishing new and high-salaried positions without congressional authorization, and confronting the Congress later with the request that appropriations be provided in the regular way to pay the salaries of such positions.

DIVISION OF TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

The committee has recommended a reduction of $43,420 in the estimate of $159,000 for this activity. Of this decrease, $33,420 was for new personnel, which we felt was not justified in view of the manpower shortage. We have made a further reduction of $10,000 in funds intended for use in connection with planning for Puerto Rico. The committee is not in accord with much of the planning for this Territory as put

into effect by the present Governor, and believes that funds for additional planning should not be provided. I am advised that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], an able and sincere member of the committee, will have something to say on this subject later on.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is being provided for on a maintenance and operation basis in this bill. Funds for this purpose are provided from an unobligated balance of construction money heretofore appropriated, the carry-over into the next fiscal year amounting to about $24,969,330. Of this latter sum it is estimated that $6,935,000 will be used for construction work, funds for this work being available on approval of the War Production Board and without further action by Congress.

SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

Due to the impending coal shortage and to the necessity for this agency continuing some of the statistical work heretofore performed by the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department, which is no longer in existence, the work of this activity has greatly increased in the past few months and additional funds recommended are justified on that basis. In testifying before the committee on the subject of a coal shortage during the year beginning April 1, 1944, the able Deputy Administrator, Mr. C. J. Potter, advised us that it is estimated there will be a deficit of about 20,000,000 tons of bituminous and 5,000,000 tons of anthracite. Although the Deputy Administrator has been on the job only a few months, he demonstrated clearly that he has brought a vast amount of knowledge to the Solid Fuels Administration, that his agency is well organized, and he is proving to be a splendid administrator.

This agency is engaged in the conservation, distribution, and utilization of solid fuels. We feel that it is performing an important service in the war effort and that sufficient funds should be provided for its efficient operation. The amount recommended by the committee is $4,669,200, which is a reduction of $355,800 in the Budget estimate. In view of the fact this agency now has 548 vacancies out of a total authorized strength of 1,465, we feel that it will be impossible to recruit and maintain the additional personnel requested and that no hardship will result from the reduction we have made.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Southwestern Power Administration is engaged in the distribution and sale of power developed at the Grand River Dam in Oklahoma, the Denison Dam in Texas, and the Norfork Dam projects. Of the three projects, the Grand River project is the only one now generating and distributing power. It is estimated that power will be available for distribution from the Denison Dam in June and the Norfork Dam in July of the present year. Funds in the bill are for distribution and sale of power at the Denison and Norfork Dams, the Grand River project being operated from revenues from the sale of power. We are providing $140,000 for operation of these projects, which is a reduction of $10,000 in the Budget estimate.

The committee is of the opinion that the accomplishments of this agency under the efficient guidance of its administrator, Mr. Douglas G. Wright, has been of definite assistance to the war effort. The part he and his organization has played in the integration of power in the Southwest, both private and public, has been a remarkable achievement.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

The committee has recommended small reductions in a number of items for the Land Office, which is justified as reflecting the need for economy in nonwar activities. Vacant positions and the inability to secure replacements should enable this Office to absorb these reductions without serious hardships. The total amount recommended is $2,388,400. This agency has made an excellent record in the collection of revenue, the estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to $9,758,066.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Before discussing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs I would like to take a moment to tell you a little of the part Indians are playing in the war. There are 23,000 Indians serving with the armed forces. They come from a total Indian population of less than half a million men, women, and children. Last year I referred to Indians who have served with distinction in the Army and Navy. I have previously referred to Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, an Osage Indian who commanded the armed forces in Hawaii and who was the first American general to be killed in action. Only recently a new Indian warrior was added to the list. I refer to Lt. Ernest Childers, the hero of Salerno, who comes from Broken Arrow, Okla. This week the Oklahoma Delegation in Congress had the honor of entertaining him and others at luncheon in the Speaker's dining room. All of you have heard of Lieutenant Childers' heroism which led to the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Of course, there are a great many Indians of other tribes from other States who are distinguishing themselves to the country they love during these dark and perilous hours.

In addition to front-line service the Indians of this country have produced and sold food sufficient to sustain for 1 year 200,000 soldiers. Their production of beef cattle and sheep totaled almost $13,000,000 in 1942.

These are only a few of the contributions to which Indians of the various tribes have reason to point with pride.

I would now like to refer to the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the direction of the present Commissioner.

As heretofore indicated the committee had occasion to have a special investigation made of the administration of the affairs of this Bureau. This investigation was very helpful and enlightening. Among other things, the report of the investigation disclosed that:

First. The Office of Indian Affairs was able to furnish only statistics regarding reallocations in the departmental service by reason of the decentralization of personnel records previously mentioned.

Furthermore, records were not maintained to make readily available the number of promotions and would require the detailed analysis of over 11,000 personnel cards.

Second. The various superintendents of Indian offices throughout the country were practically autonomous. The central office appeared to have very little control over their activities and were not too well informed as to what was being done in the field. It appeared to be a definite lack of accurate statistics even to the extent of knowledge as to actually how many Indians were under the jurisdiction of the Office of Indian Affairs. Without such statistics, it would appear the officials of the Office of Indian Affairs were probably making decisions and conducting the business of their respective offices on a rule-of-thumb basis which might or might not be accurate.

Permit me now to call your attention to our committee report stating, in substance, that the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs is conscientious and has a desire to improve conditions among the Indians, but that in addition to being a weak administrator, he has many impractical ideas and is often unfortunate in the selection of supervisory personnel. I am certain I voice the sentiment of all members of the committee in stating that the Office of Indian Affairs needs a thorough overhauling and reorganization with a view to securing greater administrative efficiency and control with the resultant economies which will necessarily follow.

WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL AID TO INDIANS

While we are on the subject of Indians, let me refer to legislation introduced in another body which would have the effect of withdrawing Federal aid to Indians. Such legislation would throw all Indians, old and young, on their own resources. Many tribes are seriously disturbed over the situation.

While the Committee on Appropriations does not have jurisdiction over legislative matters, I am sure I express the unanimous sentiment of the committee that such proposals are visionary, impractical and short-sighted, and that it has confidence no such program will be enacted into law by this Congress or in the near future.

In recommending total appropriations of $28,451,777 for the Indian Service we have made a reduction of $971,560 in the Budget estimates.

The major reductions are—

Industrial assistance has been cut $93,500.

Funds refused for National Indian Institute.

Members will note by examining the committee report, that funds were denied for the so-called National Indian Institute, which was created by an Executive order following the ratification

of a treaty by the Congress. However, Congress has not made any specific appropriation for this Institute, which, apparently was established for the purpose of aiding and improving conditions among Indians in Mexico and the South American republics. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs appeared before the committee this year as well previously and made a fervent and enthusiastic appeal for funds in this connection. However, the committee was not convinced that the Institute should be set up as a permanent item as the Commissioner apparently is intent upon doing, and therefore denied the request. The Commissioner appeared to be more interested in the welfare of Indians in Mexico and South America than in Indians in the United States.

Education items have been reduced $225,850.

There has been a very definite reduction in the number of Indian students particularly in the upper classes who have taken jobs of one kind or another in the war program, and we do not believe the reduction recommended will result in children being deprived of educational opportunities. Moreover, the committee feels that Indian children should be encouraged to attend public schools wherever it is possible and practicable for them to do so.

Items for support and administration of Indians have been reduced by $393,600. In this connection, we have denied all funds for new positions and have effected a further general cut of $75,000 in the belief that the manpower shortage will be so acute during the next fiscal year that many vacancies will exist which will permit the Indian Bureau to absorb the cut without difficulty. The estimate for rehabilitation and relief of Indians amounting to $700,000 has been cut to $500,000. If relief appropriations for Indians are ever to be reduced this is the time to make reductions. The committee, however, recognizes the fact that there are still a considerable number of old, dependent, landless, and homeless Indians who must continue to rely on this item for sustenance, and, therefore, have made $500,000 available for this purpose.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The 1943 food production on the western irrigation projects served by the Bureau is outstanding. From the 4,000,000 acres of land under cultivation on 44 projects in 15 Western States came fifty-three and one-half million bushels of potatoes, four and one-half million bushels of beans, and three and three-fourth million tons of alfalfa. The potato production I have mentioned would feed 25,000,000 persons for a year, and the beans would meet the annual requirements of 57,000,000 persons.

The committee is strongly of the opinion that hereafter all new reclamation projects should be financed with money appropriated from the reclamation fund. Estimates submitted to the committee during hearings on the bill show that at the end of the fiscal year 1945 there will be a balance in the reclamation fund of $30,306,460. The committee believes that a return to the former practice of securing all reclamation construction money from funds deposited in the reclamation fund is a desirable goal, and that as repayments of construction costs on existing projects increase, the charge against the general fund should diminish and finally disappear.

The committee is of the opinion that the attention of the Interior Department should be called to the fact that the primary purpose of the reclamation law and the establishment of the Bureau of Reclamation is and always has been the the construction of reclamation projects, with hydroelectric power a secondary and incidental consideration. Although the Department may have strayed from this policy in some instances in recent years, I personally feel that under the able leadership of Commissioner Bashore, the Reclamation Service is now and will continue to play an important part in winning the war, by assisting in producing the food essential to feeding our gallant men on the many far-flung fronts of the earth.

The bill includes $13,783,200 for operation and maintenance, continuation of construction, investigations, and other expenses in connection with the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. In addition, unobligated balances totaling in excess of $42,000,000 will be available for continuation of construction as stop-work orders are lifted by the War Production Board, making a total of approximately $54,000,000 available for construction purposes during the fiscal year 1945.

At the time of hearings on the bill the War Production Board had cleared 22 reclamation projects and since that time I am advised that the stop order against the Lugert-Altus project in Oklahoma has been removed in order that it may do its part in producing food for the war effort. Inasmuch as the Lugert-Altus project is the only one actually under construction in my State, our citizens will be interested to know that the bill carries $545,000 for the project and that an unobligated balance of $750,000 will also be available, making a total of $1,295,000 for this project.

The bill includes $250,000 for preliminary work in connection with a new project in Idaho known as the Palisades project. The project will ultimately cost $24,092,000. We have recommended that actual construction be deferred.

We have eliminated $1,000,000 contained in the Budget estimates for the Kings River project in California, intended to provide for preliminary work. The committee was advised during hearings by responsible representatives of the water users in that area that they did not want the project, so we have left it out of the bill. I understand that a pending flood-control bill authorizes construction of certain features of the project as a flood-control measure.

We have also reduced a total of $2,280,000 for surveys and investigations by $1,005,000. We understand the Department now has on hand detailed field reports on projects estimated to cost in excess of $525,000,000, so there is no need to recommend a large increase over current year appropriations.

The committee has recommended an appropriation of $1,420,000 for continuation of construction of water-conservation projects. The amount recommended, together with the unobligated balance of $4,346,383, estimated to be on hand on June 30, 1944, will provide a total of $5,766,383 for work during the fiscal year 1945. The committee calls attention to the fact that there are 56 water utility conservation projects either approved or in process of being approved. One of the outstanding projects in this group, which is now under consideration by the War Food Administration, is the Canton project in Oklahoma. This project is one which can be constructed to produce food for war at an early date with the use of a minimum quantity of critical materials.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The next Bureau I would like to refer to is the Geological Survey. We have recommended a total cut of only $94,810 in this activity. We have made few reductions in this Bureau because, with the possible exception of the Bureau of Mines, its work is more closely related to the war effort than any other bureau in the Department. The work that it has performed in the mapping of strategic areas, the location of deposits of strategic and critical minerals, and the development of petroleum reserves have all added to the successful prosecution of the war.

BUREAU OF MINES

I doubt that anyone will question the statement that the Bureau of Mines is contributing more to the war effort than any other Bureau in the Department. It has performed an important part in locating new ore reserves and it has also carried on research and experimental work in the development of these discoveries. It has developed improvements in the methods of producing chromium manganese, and other war metals and significant discoveries have been passed on for use in connection with the war effort. Exploratory, laboratory, and pilot-plant work has produced important results in connection with nonmetallics. At Amarillo, Tex., and from a newer plant recently completed, the Bureau has increased the production of helium 25 times since 1941 and is now producing all the helium required by the Army and Navy. The Bureau has likewise contributed to the production of high-test gasoline and other petroleum products and is assisting the Solid Fuels Administration for War in the work of that office.

In recommending a total appropriation of $12,726,855 for this Bureau we have effected a reduction of $452,870 in the Budget estimates. The 2 major cuts are in the coal mine inspection service, where an increase of $331,380 was requested for 45 additional mine inspectors and for other related work; and a reduction of $100,000 in the estimate of $3,000,000 for investigations of deposits of critical materials. We have allowed $100,000 of the proposed increase for the employment of additional inspectors for

the coal mine inspection service on the theory that this valuable inspection work should not be expanded too rapidly in wartime; and we have taken into consideration the fact that $8,740,765 has been heretofore appropriated for the investigation of strategic minerals, in recommending the reduction of $100,000 in that item.

Funds are provided in the bill for the second successive year in connection with work of secondary recovery of oil. Surveys have recently been made in the States of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Illinois, and the committee is advised that reports on specific projects may be expected during the next fiscal year, in order that operators may benefit by these experiences.

The committee questioned the Bureau of Mines officials at length concerning the Franklin, Pa., laboratory, where research work in connection with the secondary recovery of oil is being conducted. We also listened to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] on the general subject and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] regarding the Franklin laboratory. We were told by departmental officials that a request was being presented to the Bureau of the Budget for an estimate of about $800,000 for this general purpose, of which about $50,000 would be spent at Franklin. Up to this date the estimate has not been received and we have not felt justified in inserting funds in the bill until the matter has been worked out by the Bureau of Mines and the Budget Bureau. I understand that a number of estimates for this Bureau are under consideration and will be sent to the other end of the Capitol in time for consideration by that body. If that happens there will be an opportunity to give the matter consideration in conference.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I am very much interested, as the gentleman knows, having appeared before his subcommittee, in the secondary recovery of oil. I requested $40,000 as an appropriation for a laboratory in Franklin, Pa. As the gentleman realizes, there are about 133,000 of these stripper wells in the Pennsylvania area. Lubricating oil is absolutely invaluable and practically indispensable to this war. I would like an explanation as to just why that item is not in this appropriation bill. I am not criticizing because I know there must be a reason for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] did appear before our committee and did make a very able presentation of the matter and impressed the committee that this money ought to be expended. Members of the committee got in touch with the Budget and we also heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] regarding the Franklin laboratory. We were told by Department officials that the request was being presented to the Bureau of the Budget for an estimate of about $800,000, if I recall correctly, for this general purpose, of which $50,000 would be spent at Franklin. Up to this time the estimate has not been received and we have not felt justified in inserting this in the bill until the matter has been worked out by the Bureau of Mines and the Budget Bureau. I understand that a number of estimates for this Bureau are under consideration at this time. The committee felt, under the circumstances, it would probably be better to wait until the Budget estimate arrived.

Mr. REED of New York. Then throughout this bill it is your policy to include no item that has not been recommended by the Budget; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would say that is generally correct. It does not mean that we could not make, and have not in the past, at least, made exceptions to the rule, but on an item of $800,000, where the committee did not have the information it had requested either from the Bureau of Mines or from the Bureau of the Budget, the committee felt it would be better to wait until the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of the Budget decided on a program. We did not know whether they needed $800,000 or $1,800,000.

Mr. REED of New York. That is for the whole country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes. So, considering the information we had, we did not feel justified in inserting this item in the bill without a Budget request, or without a detailed report from the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. REED of New York. I realize that the gentleman cannot predict ahead what will happen in the Senate when the bill gets over there, but would it be his opinion, if the recommendation does come up from the Bureau of the Budget prior to the consideration of the bill in the Senate, that it might be included in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman mean prior to the time it comes to the Senate?

Mr. REED of New York. No. You will be through with this. But I say the Senate could take action if that recommendation came up, could it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I assure the gentleman that if this Budget estimate is approved and if the Senate should put the item in the bill, this committee will certainly give it very careful and sympathetic consideration. I cannot speak more definitely for the entire committee.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish to thank the gentleman for his explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Before yielding for further questions, I would like to conclude my statement. I want to discuss next the National Park Service. The Park Service has been cut in all 25 percent. The Park Service is doing a great job as far as convalescent soldiers are concerned. I would like to discuss that at great length, but I feel I would be trespassing on other Members' time if I did that.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

In considering estimates for this activity we took into account the fact that drastic reductions have been made in Park Service appropriations for the past 2 years. While it is true that the number of visitors and other activities in the national parks has dropped off drastically in the past 2 years, it is necessary to keep a minimum force to protect the parks and the investment the Government has in them. However, we have made substantial reductions during the past 2 years, the total cut since Pearl Harbor amounting to approximately 23 percent. We have made a further reduction in the pending bill which will bring the total cut since Pearl Harbor to about 25 percent.

During hearings on the bill we discussed with the Director and his staff the use of facilities in the national parks for convalescent soldiers and sailors. As many of you know, the magnificent hotel facilities in Yosemite Park are now being used as a naval hospital rehabilitation project. We were advised that negotiations are under way with military authorities for the use of more facilities in other park areas. We have urged the Park Service to do everything in their power to cooperate with the military and naval people in this connection.

Under a special act the executive branch has authority to designate certain areas as national historic sites or monuments. In many instances the Congress is called upon, at a later date, to provide funds for operation and protection. At the present time there are 21 such areas. We are opposed to the designation of additional areas as historic sites or parks during the war period and recommend discontinuance of the exercise of the authority contained in the act above referred to until after the cessation of hostilities.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

We have recommended a total of $5,828,350 for this Service which is $319,140 less than the 1944 appropriation and $534,950 less than the Budget estimates. Like the preceding item which I have just discussed, this activity has been cut substantially during the last 2 years. Many of the projects which have suffered reductions are for worthy purposes and I hope some of them can be restored after the war. Several of the somewhat substantial reductions we have recommended are as follows:

Fishery industries	$65,000
Biological investigations	50,000
Control of predatory animals	50,000
Protection of migratory birds	25,000
Maintenance of mammal and bird reservations	76,000
Federal aid in wildlife restoration	200,000

As I have said, many of these are worthy items. However, we have felt obligated to cut and slash wherever it would not hurt the war effort and we feel the cuts I have just mentioned come within that classification.

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

The bill includes appropriations for the salary of the Governor and secretary of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii,

and for their expenses, as well as for certain expenses of the Territorial legislatures, which meet next year.

In connection with the Virgin Islands, we have again left out funds for the salary of the Government secretary. As many of you know, we eliminated the salary of that position last year because we did not believe the occupant of the job should be retained in office. The Department sought to have the salary restored this year, but we feel that under existing conditions funds for this position should be withheld.

The first question several Members have asked me is, Have you included the salary for one Robert Morss Lovett? The answer is "No." We have eliminated that position. I understand that he is on another job.

We have also withheld funds for continuation of the operation of the agricultural experiment station in the Virgin Islands. As presently operated, we feel that the station is not serving the best interests of all the people. We believe that the station would operate more efficiently under new administrative control. It has been suggested that the Agriculture Department, which formerly had charge of the station, could place it on a more efficient and effective basis.

Mr. Chairman, in summing up the accomplishments of the committee, we have again made drastic cuts in each of the 24 agencies of Government contained in the bill. Many of the requests for new positions were backed by reports of overworked offices, long hours, and a huge backlog of departmental business. Under ordinary conditions the committee might have felt justified in granting some requests for additional help. But these are not ordinary times, and the committee feels that it would rather be criticized for being too economy-minded, too hard-boiled, and too drastic in its reductions than to be charged with making appropriations for a single position in Government that is not proven to be actually essential.

In cutting appropriations 9½ percent below the Budget estimates and 23 percent below the 1944 appropriations, the committee presents you a bill that you can vote for without apologizing to your constituents, to your conscience, or to any of the departments of Government for having thus supported it. Let me assure you that the appropriations made are ample for the continuation in an efficient manner of every agency and department of Government concerned. Next year I predict the revenues of the Interior Department will continue to grow, as we have seen them grow from a mere $9,000,000 in 1933 to more than $66,000,000 for the next fiscal year. We are glad to be able to present you a bill for a department of Government with all of its mistakes and shortcomings, many of which we have frankly pointed out, that is producing revenues to the Treasury comparable to the appropriations made for the maintenance of the entire department.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman that the Bureau of Mines has done a great piece of war work. How does the appropriation for this further work compare this year with that of the preceding years?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that it compares favorably with preceding years. We have made several reductions, amounting in all to $452,870. These reductions were made primarily in nonwar activities.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I expect to find in the hearings, then, a complete statement of what the Bureau of Mines has recommended?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. In my remarks of today you will find that statement also.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is it reasonable to assume that your distinguished subcommittee gave its imprimatur of approval to the construction, under the auspices of the Petroleum Resources Corporation, of which Mr. Ickes is the head, of the Saudi-Arabian pipe line? Can that be assumed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not know how that could be assumed. We asked him some questions about it. I do not know of any member of the committee who has made any statement, either publicly or for the RECORD, about it. I think if the gentleman will read the questions that the chairman of the subcommittee asked him he can assume that he did not approve of that proposal.

Mr. CELLER. I noticed that, and I approve the questions, but I wonder whether we can assume likewise that, because of possible imperialistic difficulties that might result, the building of that pipe line might not be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. So far as our committee is concerned, I would not say it was in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us whether or not there is provided in this bill an automobile for the use of the Secretary?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe that is correct. Each year the Department has asked for a number of automobiles and this year we have made fewer available, because of the rubber and gas shortage and for other reasons, than we have ever made.

Mr. TABER. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact that the Secretary also has an automobile at his personal disposal from the Petroleum Administration for War?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe that is also correct.

Mr. TABER. That means he has two automobiles available as against one for each of the other Cabinet officers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not sure what the other Cabinet officers have.

Mr. TABER. I have been reading some language on page 6 that intrigues me. It has to do with the contingent expenses of the Office of the Secretary and the bureaus and offices of the Department, except as otherwise provided, including furniture, carpets, ice, lumber, hardware, dry goods, advertising, and so forth. I am wondering what they are doing buying dry goods and all that kind of service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. These are miscellaneous items used for packing purposes, preparation of charts, and for a great many other purposes. Of course, the Department of the Interior is a tremendous agency, and it is carrying on a vast business, most of which has direct connection with the war effort.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman has informed us of the automobiles for the use of the Secretary. Can he inform us as to the number of automobiles for the use of the Department, if any, other than those for the personal use of the Secretary?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think the distinguished gentleman will find that information in the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I wish to pay the highest compliment possible to our able chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JED JOHNSON]. He has endeared himself in the hearts of every member of the committee by his untiring efforts and the fine manner in which he carries on the deliberations of the committee, as well as by his constant insistence that every dollar that goes into this bill be necessary and be spent in a manner beneficial to the welfare of our country.

I also wish to pay compliment to the other members of the committee, on both the majority and minority sides. We worked long hours, days, and weeks in sitting and listening to testimony and questioning the witnesses who came before our committee asking for appropriations. As the chairman has said, there were some who came before our committee asking for appropriations and that appropriations be increased, but only one asked that they be reduced in his particular district. However, we do not want the idea to go out to the people that it was only Congressmen who were asking for these increases. However, a number of Congressmen did come before the committee and ask that certain projects be approved and certain moneys be appropriated for projects in their district, which is quite normal procedure of course.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. While the gentleman is throwing bouquets, permit me to compliment the committee and the gentleman from Iowa, upon the splendid work done in the preparation of this most important bill.

This particular bill at times has been called a pork-barrel appropriation bill. Its nature is such that it can very easily carry unnecessary appropriations. The committee this year has certainly done a worthwhile job. To those Members who go through these bills and look them over in an effort to reduce expenses, the bill has been sort of a disappointment because I think the committee has cut wherever cuts should be made. I think the country is entitled to know that this committee has had the courage to do a good job and has done it, and has realized that essential things only should be appropriated for at this time. While the gentleman from Iowa has not had long service on the committee, he has already established a reputation for sound economy.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I may say that the committee have been very careful in not appropriating money for things that were not necessary, as far as it was within their power to get the needed facts. Of course, there are times when we do not have the necessary information.

However, I am glad to report that we took advantage of the investigating staff which has been furnished by the Congress and which the Committee on Appropriations has in charge. This investigating staff was quite helpful. I am only sorry that we do not have an investigating staff that works year in and year out. The men we did have worked only 3 or 4 weeks, but I am sure the work they did and the information they brought to the committee has been beneficial to the taxpayers of this Nation. So I say that their work was good, but we just do not have enough of it.

The Interior Department has requested more money for 1945 in the regular administrative branches of the Department than it did for last year. In fact, it asked for more money and more manpower in almost every branch of the Department, which was not pleasing to the committee. For that reason the committee did not feel at this time that it could be justified in giving the Department of the Interior more manpower and the right to expend more dollars on things that are not necessary, that are not war needs. So the committee took it upon itself to make reductions in almost every branch of the Interior Department. I am sure we can defend every cut we have made.

We were not at all pleased with the record the Department has made in the matter of deferments. They have asked for 2,073 occupational deferments. If you will read the hearings you will note that the committee used plain language in suggesting changes in this respect. As the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], has told us this morning that we have made progress in that direction, I am sure the Congress and the country will be surprised to know that deferments have been requested for 27 young men between the ages of 18 and 21 in the mapping service. The committee took action to ascertain just why these boys had been deferred; since that time 6 of them, I understand, have now gone into the service, and the Department has refrained from asking that any of them be deferred in the future. So they have been taken off the list of requests for deferments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

You will note we cut this bill $9,151,627 below the Budget estimate. There still remains in the bill $87,672,580. The estimated revenues for the Department in the year 1945 will be $66,642,075. That is a difference of some $21,000,000 which the taxpayers of the Nation will be called upon to pay. It has been my contention that if the Department of the Interior were run as economically as it should be and if the Government would receive the proper compensation for the power which is generated by the power plants owned by the Government, the Department of the Interior could be made a great deal more self-supporting. As one member of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of appropriations for the Department of the Interior I am going to try to see to it that people in one section of the Nation are not charged for part of the power used in other sections of the country where Government power is made available below cost. We should charge enough for this power so as to be fair to private enterprise and, further, so that the price charged will produce such revenue as the Government should receive from these power projects. At least, I am sure I am one of the members of the subcommittee who is going to insist that the rate on power is placed where it should be.

Relative to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, we are spending in this bill $28,451,777. I am not going to say a great deal about that except to say as a result of the hearings which we held and the questions which the committee asked of the Bureau members, I for one have come to the conclusion that a rather thorough housecleaning is needed in the Bureau of Indian Affairs from top to bottom and the committee has already started that move. You will note from the hearings that we made certain recommendations and before those recommendations could be carried out by the Congress a resignation was effected which clears up at least one bad problem which existed in one of our States.

In relation to all the power projects which the Government owns, the Boulder Dam project is the ideal set-up. It was set up under a plan which has been working most satisfactorily.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

There is no controversy in any manner, shape, or form between those who use the power or the farmers who receive the water from the Boulder Dam. It is paying its way. The indebtedness of the project is being paid on schedule. I hope every project which the Government enters into, or projects which we have at the present time, will finally be placed under the same kind of rules, regulations, and administration as the Boulder Dam project has and is now operating under so very successfully.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I may say to the gentleman, we in that area concur heartily with what he says regarding the excellent program and the way the Boulder Dam project is working out and the Boulder Dam compact. But I also wish to call to his attention—not by way of controversy—the fact that another Department of Government, the State Department, has now stepped in and, in spite of the contracts let under the Boulder Dam compact, is proposing to give away part of that water upon which the area depends, which is involved in the Mexican treaty which is now being considered by the Senate Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I hope that he will give the committee more information about that matter. Certainly we do not want that project bothered out there, because it is operating in the finest manner possible.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was interested in what the gentleman said with regard to the Indian Bureau. Being a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs and having a great many Indians in my own State, I, too, am interested in the whole proposition. Will the gentleman from Iowa indicate what he has found with regard to Indian schools and Indian education?

Mr. JENSEN. The committee went into that thoroughly. We have been quite liberal in appropriating for Indian schools. There is one thing the committee is going to insist on and that is Indian children shall have the opportunity to go to public schools and where they can go to such schools they should attend them. We find, in many areas, the Indian Bureau is encouraging Indian children not to go to the public schools. We want to get away from that. What did the gentleman have in mind particularly?

Mr. MURDOCK. I was thinking about the Navajo Reservation, which is so vast. There it is not practical to send Indians to public schools. Many of the Navajo young men who ought to be in the armed forces, are debarred from service because of illiteracy and the Army itself is carrying on a training program which ought to have been done years ago by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. Of course, our committee cannot do much about that. That would come under the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I understand that the Department of the Interior has been setting up regional offices all over the country and that those offices are breaking down whatever of really effective organization there might be in these territories. What would the gentleman say about that?

Mr. JENSEN. I would rather speak about that a little later when I have more time if the gentleman would not mind. The gentleman has touched upon a subject which would require a longer time than I have right now to properly develop that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a milestone in the history of the major supply bills. It carries the heaviest retrenchment ever made in the annual appropriations for the Interior Department. It is in every sense of the word an economy measure. It provides for a reduction of 23 percent under the cost of operating the Department during the current year. And the cuts are so carefully considered and imposed that the reductions will not materially interfere with the efficient administration of the various agencies for which it provides. Of course, reductions in appropriations cannot be made without giving rise to protests and criticism—and sometimes recrimination—but the bill speaks for itself.

I congratulate Chairman JOHNSON and his committee on the admirable way in which the bill has been prepared and presented. It is a bill in keeping with the needs of the times—economical, adequate, and patriotic. Mr. JOHNSON has the advantage of many years of experience in the preparation of appropriation bills. In my opinion, he has a wider knowledge and a more intimate and sympathetic acquaintance with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Grazing Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the National Park Service, and their special needs, than any man who has ever served in the House of Representatives. It is due largely to his efficient management that the bill has been reported to the House without amendment, and is now on its way to final passage after a brief 2-hour debate, the most expeditious consideration ever accorded this bill in the last 20 years.

A notable feature of the preparation of the bill has been the service rendered by the research staff of the Committee on Appropriations. As the gentleman from Oklahoma, Chairman JOHNSON, explained in his opening speech, the data compiled by the staff made possible the elimination of all conflicting and overlapping activities and the saving of millions of dollars. It is the first time the service of the staff has been enlisted in the formulation of the bill and the results are both practical and gratifying.

And now, may I digress for a mild criticism of the manner in which the unanimous Consent Calendar was considered last week, April 18. As usual, the defect is not inherent in the procedure of the House but in the manner of its administration. The Consent Calendar is one of the most useful of all the rules of the House. It offers opportunities for the consideration of bills of a minor character which otherwise would be to a large extent impossible if the ordinary procedure had to be followed. But the usefulness of the rule—if not its preservation—depends on the meticulous care with which it is guarded. The rule is susceptible of grave abuses, and if bills of doubtful merit are allowed to pass without preliminary examination, it will be necessary for Members to object to all bills offered on the calendar in order to insure rejection of such a measure as was permitted to pass unchallenged when the calendar was last called.

Six Members are delegated to examine the bills filed for the Consent Calendar, three from each side of the aisle. They are carefully selected and are men of exceptional qualifications. Knowing that these six men are on guard, the Members of the House who have pressing duties elsewhere can leave the Chamber secure in the conviction that no objectionable legislation will be considered.

But evidently that assumption is not well founded for on April 18, 1944, as reported at page 3533 of the RECORD, one of the most reprehensible bills ever filed in the House was allowed to pass by unanimous consent without a word from any of the six watch dogs supposed to be on guard.

It was House Resolution 139, referring to the Court of Claims, a bill which has been before this House for 10 years. It is a bill to deprive the Smithsonian Institution of valuable property and is a bill utterly without legal or moral merit. Eight times it has been introduced in the last three or four Congresses and eight times it has been considered and rejected by committees of the House and Senate. The late Senator Robinson, at the time majority leader in the Senate, read into the RECORD a statement by the then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Hughes, to the effect that the claim was fraudulent. And yet the bill was allowed to pass without inquiry or notice of any kind to the Smithsonian Institution or the Members who represent it here in the House.

It is incredible and incomprehensible that the six Members charged with the protection of the calendar should have permitted such a measure to go through. And the fact that a bill of such notorious record in the archives of the House should have been permitted to pass without notice to those concerned and without debate of any kind, shakes confidence in the efficacy of consent procedure.

It is too late to remedy this grave injustice, which will involve both inconvenience and expense to one of the notable philanthropic institutions of the Nation, but I trust we may expect a more careful scrutiny of the calendar in the future and at least notice of the clearing of a bill which has been repeatedly rejected by both Houses of Congress over a period of 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] to yield because I wanted to say to him that the people of my State appreciate very much the visit he made to them and the careful and conscientious way in which he handled his work on the committee.

I want at this time to say a word or two about the draft-deferment situation in the Department of the Interior, which seemed to catch the newspaper headlines yesterday. Of course, I am no apologist for the Department of the Interior, but I do know that all through the Western States the Department of the Interior has been performing very essential service. I assume that it has been so working over the rest of the Nation. Therefore, when I saw the newspaper stories I called the Department and tried to find out something about what the situation actually was.

There seem to be in the Department some 6,696 men of military age. Of that number 2,073 actually are deferred by authorized request at this time. One hundred and forty-eight in addition to that have been deferred without request from the Department of the Interior.

I recognize that seems like quite a few, but practically all of those are in professional, technical, or specialized positions. There are 754 in the Geological Survey. If my reports from the Department of the Interior are any criterion, these have been doing an essential work. I have already seen a number of the geological reports or surveys that have been made of critical and essential metals and materials, by those men traveling through the Western States. I suggest to this House that a great deal of tremendously vital information has been compiled and that this country has been able to meet many of its critical situations in minerals and metals because these men have discovered and made available to the war effort a number of new minerals that we did not know the United States actually possessed.

There are 560 men in the Bureau of Mines. Those are tied directly to the Geological Survey, because the Bureau of Mines has been making studies of manganese, of aluminum, of fluorspar, and many other forms of minerals all through the Western States, not only the Western States but through a great number of other States.

There are 315 deferments in the Bureau of Reclamation. We have felt that food is very essential and that these reclamation projects tied in directly with the war effort by providing food for fighting men.

There are 101 on the Alaskan Railroad. It is my understanding that work on that railroad is difficult and that it is very hard to find people willing to move there under those circumstances. Those who go are principally engineers, geologists, chemists, metallurgists, and helium-plant operators. There is a small number in the lower-age brackets.

There was some discussion about those lower-age brackets and someone pointed out that people had been deferred as essential workers in the lower-age brackets. I think the difficulty was that the Department of the Interior went to the War Manpower Commission and listed positions, and the War Manpower Commission came back and said that 3,409 positions in the Department were approved as key positions. They did not pass upon the particular individual that happened to be occupying the position. They passed upon positions as a whole. The result was that when the Department came down to find the actual person in a job, sometimes that person was in the lower-age group.

But, of the group under 26 years of age, 97 percent of all those people under 26 years of age are in technical jobs. That is, of those who were deferred and who were under 26, 97 percent of them were in technical jobs of map-making in the Geological Survey, under a section where the work is being directed and paid for by the War Department. Under normal circumstances those people would be working in the Pentagon Building or some other area directly connected with War Department activity and nobody then would raise any question about it. But, it happens that the Interior Department has map-making facilities, and the War Department has asked the Department of the Interior to handle this task for them. The Department has had to recruit from the schools and colleges of this country young men who are trained in photometric measurements. Their job consists in receiving negatives which represent pictures taken by pilots in flight over combat zones. They develop those negatives and make a map out of them and have that map available to the pilots of other airplanes operating over that combat zone within the course of a few days, usually not to exceed 3 days.

I submit that is a type of work that might be done inside the War Department just as well and be called a war effort. The mere fact that it happened to be done in the Interior Department should not be held against that Department.

There are some deferred clerks, 28 in all, 9 of these deferred by local boards without the request of the Department. There are 3 of these people in helium plants doing vital war work, and I think that should be taken into consideration. All in all, the true picture is not bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co.'s office and store in Chicago by the military upon order of President Roosevelt is a high-handed procedure and marks the culmination of a series of arbitrary, dictatorial, and illegal actions that marks a new high in official lawlessness.

Montgomery Ward is engaged in retail merchandising, hence is not subject to the provisions of emergency powers granted the President. Montgomery Ward's contract with C. I. O. had expired. Mr. Avery, chairman of the board, contended that a majority of the employees objected to being any longer represented by C. I. O. and asked for a referendum of the workers to determine what the majority preference really is. He and his company stand ready to abide by the results of such referendum.

This controversy is of the greatest importance to all our people. If President Roosevelt can seize Montgomery Ward & Co., he can seize any private business in America. The time has come for Congress to step in and protect our people in the rights they are supposed to enjoy under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; hence my resolution to create a special investigating committee by the House of Representatives. This Gestapo business has already gone much too far.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I will include a paid advertisement which appeared in a Washington paper recently:

MONTGOMERY WARD'S REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

MR. PRESIDENT: We have your telegram of April 23, 1944.

Ward's welcomes the suggestion that an election be held at an early date to determine the employees' choice of representation. The question whether the union represents a majority of the employees in Ward's mail order house and store in Chicago has been pending since November 16, 1943. Ward's has repeatedly urged a prompt determination of this question, and has publicly announced a readiness to recognize the union when proof of its representation is presented. Although over 5 months have elapsed since the question arose, the union has refused to show that it is the majority choice of the employees by either a card check or an election.

Ward's will continue to observe the wages, hours, and related terms of employment as they were before the expiration of the former contract. Ward's has made no change in any of these conditions since December 8, 1942, and could not do so under the wage stabilization law without prior governmental approval.

Your assertion that the strike is interfering with the distribution of essential goods is based upon misinformation. On April 13 the United States post office, presumably acting on orders from Washington, removed its 70 employees from the mail order house. For more than 30 years the Post Office had maintained this department for the purpose of handling parcel-post shipments to Ward's customers. On April 17, the United States Post Office refused to deliver to Ward's incoming parcels from customers on which postage had been fully paid. Despite the assistance given to the strike by the United States Post Office, Ward's store has been open for business during the usual hours each day since the strike began and Ward's is up to date in the filling of mail orders.

Although Ward's welcomes an early election, Ward's cannot, under the law, grant special privileges to the union pending the election, to grant maintenance of union membership before the election is held, as the War Labor Board has ordered, would not only violate the employees' fundamental liberty of free choice but it would also permit the union to demand the discharge of all the employees who have resigned from the union since December 8, 1943. Compliance with the Board's order would thus make a mockery of the democratic right of employees to choose their bargaining representatives freely and without interference.

By ordering the retroactive reinstatement of maintenance of membership, the War Labor Board has demonstrated its utterly unfair character, and its complete disregard of the command of Congress that its orders conform to the National Labor Relations Act.

Ward's experience with the War Labor Board over a period of 2 years has convinced Ward's that the Board is a means by which special privileges are granted to labor unions. The union members of the War Labor Board are men chosen for leadership by the unions, and have actually advanced the interests of the unions. The so-called public members have consistently joined with the union members to support the demands of organized labor. The so-called industry members are committed to a policy of supporting the majority vote of the union members and the union-dominated public members.

The War Labor Board has always claimed that its orders are law and must be obeyed; it has coerced innumerable employers into acceptance of its orders by threatening the seizure of their businesses.

When Ward's brought suit to have the Board's orders declared illegal, the Board asked the courts to dismiss the case. In direct contradiction to its previous claims of power, the Board's plea to the court was that its orders were not "legally binding," but were only "advice" which Ward's need not accept. The purpose of this plea was to deny Ward's a trial before the courts. The issues raised by Ward's case against the War Labor Board are judicial questions which under the Constitution only the courts may decide. The War Labor Board, by asking you to force Ward's to comply with its order while seeking to deprive Ward's of an opportunity for a hearing in the courts has demonstrated its lack of respect for our Constitution and the fundamental rights which the Constitution guarantees.

Your assertion that if Ward's does not accept your direction you will take further action, has been construed by the press to threaten the seizure of Ward's plant and business.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees to the people the protection of those fundamental rights without which there can be no liberty under the Constitution. Congress is the sole lawmaking authority. Neither the President of the United States nor any other official has the legal right to seize any business or property either in time of peace or in time of war unless Congress has expressly given him the power to do so.

Congress has given the President no power to seize the nonwar business of Montgomery Ward. Any seizure of Ward's plant or business would be in complete disregard of the Constitution which the President is sworn to uphold and defend.

Ward's has violated no law nor denied to the union any privilege to which it is legally entitled.

Respectfully,

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.,
SEWELL AVERY, *Chairman*.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, some time ago, the House passed House Joint Resolution 159, Seventy-eighth Congress, which authorized a subcommittee of the Committee on Insular Affairs to make an investigation of the social, economic, and political conditions in Puerto Rico. I am informed by the

clerk of the committee that the first report of that subcommittee was today filed with the Speaker and I assume it will be made a House document and will be made available to all Members of Congress and the public who are interested in further familiarizing themselves with the social, economic, and political program which is now being carried on in Puerto Rico under the governorship of Mr. Rexford Tugwell, and insofar as the insular government is concerned under what might be termed the political leadership of Señor Muños Marín, of San Juan, P. R. I simply call the attention of the House to the fact that this report has been filed and will make no further comment because the report speaks for itself and has the signatures of most, if not all, the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, of all the proposals for "free rides" that have ever appeared in Congresss, to my mind the most unfortunate is that involved in the so-called Cannon bill, H. R. 3693, which requires the Treasury to purchase space in newspapers for the promotion of War bond sales. The cost will be $25,000,000 to $30,000,000. I always hesitate to differ with our friend, CLARENCE CANNON, most worthy Representative from Missouri. But I cannot in this instance travel along with him.

Private industry has always provided suitable advertising in publications to "needle" the public into the purchase of War bonds. There is no charge to the public. There is no need for this bill, unless we wish to throw down the drain twenty-five to thirty million dollars.

This bill involves an out and out subsidy to so-called small dailies, as well as weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers. A great many of those who were yelling for this "pap" are in all likelihood those who are complaining like stuffed pigs against consumer subsidies in order to prevent runaway markets and panic buying and to stabilize prices to consumers.

This Cannon bill and its companion Bankhead bill in the Senate is a small-town newspaper drive on Congress to get money to which these publications are not entitled. We all love the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] but I fear in this instance he suffers a "lapse from grace."

It is interesting to note that the National Editorial Association is one of the sponsors of this campaign. It syndicates editorials for these small-town publications. It has set up an affiliate known as the Newspaper Advertising Service, Inc. It handles advertising for these publications at a commission of 8⅓ percent. The Newspaper Advertising Service, Inc., through the Cannon bill and its companion bill, the Bankhead bill, demands upward of one-half the sums appropriated for the purchase of advertising space for weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly and monthly newspapers, but that the Secretary of the Treasury must, in placing its bond ads, cooperate with "recognized existing nonprofit national newspaper publisher associations," including, "one representing only weekly newspapers." It would appear that the National Editorial Association is the only representative association that would answer the designation contained in the bill, to wit: "One representing only weekly newspapers." Therefore, the National Editorial Association would have handed to it on a silver platter an 8½-percent commission on upward of twelve and one-half to fifteen million dollars worth of space purchased by the Treasury in its weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers. Eight and one-half percent would total over $1,000,000, which would fit nicely and snugly in the pockets of the National Editorial Association, which is most vociferous in demanding favorable action on the bill.

This small-town newspaper "pap" is a direful threat to freedom of the press. Beyond peradventure of a doubt, the Treasury with this vast amount of money at its disposal could command and undoubtedly influence editorial policies of the favored publications. For the purpose of carrying out the advertising program, the Secretary of Agriculture, the War Food Administrator, the Price Administrator, and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission are likewise given fingers in the pie. They would have something to say in the parceling out of the "pap" and the "spoils." The temptation on the part of its officers, honest, loyal, and sincere as they may be, to direct and fashion the type of criticism appearing in its weeklies, would be most tempting.

It would take the wisdom of an Athena to determine a fair allocation of the advertisements. The whole business bristles with all manner and kinds of difficulties and the bill strikes a dangerous note and should be defeated.

Thousands of display advertisements appear in the papers all over the country, paid for by private industry. There is no need for the Government to pay for that which merchants, manufacturers, department stores, railroads, and public entities cheerfully and patriotically donate.

The Government is constantly advertising and spending considerable sums of money to make the Nation war conscious and to build up war morale. The War Department, the Navy Department participate in these advertising campaigns. Both large and small newspapers benefit. There is no need for more expenditures.

Private industries and private corporations have done a splendid job in their advertising of War bonds and in their campaign to make the Nation war conscious. They have rendered yeoman service in all the War Loan drives. The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof. All the bond drives so far have been oversubscribed. Why make belated changes in the process that has been eminently successful? Government-sponsored drives paid for by Government funds would not create a greater war support or martial spirit; would not develop greater sales power for bonds.

On the contrary this wasteful subvention must seriously jeopardize the voluntary program of private cooperative advertising that has contributed so much to the several successful drives for sale of War bonds. This fine cooperative method might have to be scrapped. You cannot have the Government pay some and not others. You must pay all or none at all. Is it not wasteful and inane to pay some when the vast majority, as at present, willingly come forward and defray, in truly patriotic manner, expenses for huge advertising campaigns?

Secretary Morgenthau has vigorously opposed the scheme and adds:

> At the Senate hearings on the bill it was indicated that firms advertising bonds can, as a result, take certain credits on their tax liabilities which are not otherwise available. This is untrue. Under present regulations a firm is permitted to regard a reasonable amount of advertising, if this has been its custom in the past, as legitimate business expense. Advertising used to promote War bonds represents conversion of publications or billboard space, or radio time, which the advertiser would use otherwise to promote his products or to keep his trade name alive during the war. It cannot be said, therefore, that the Treasury is paying for bond advertising even indirectly.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I believe the gentleman will admit however, regardless of how he speaks about the bill, that the country editors of our country have supported the bond drives and made a wonderful contribution to their success in their districts and localities. There will be additional War bond sales.

Mr. CELLER. There is no need for this bill because War bond sales have always reached quota and gone over quota. You cannot treat newspapers differently; you cannot say to one group of newspapers that we will give them subventions and say to another group that we will not give aid to them; you have got to treat all alike. You have got to give subventions to all or to none because it would be, according to the American system, highly unfair to discriminate in favor of one group as against another.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact we are giving the magazines and newspapers now between $125,000,000 and $130,000,000 a year as a subsidy on the second- and third-class mail privileges?

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Insular Affairs has held extensive hearings on the social and economic situation in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and has reported a bill to the House of Representatives. This bill does not properly provide the necessary

relief from the present deplorable social and economic conditions in the islands. We should take whatever action is necessary to build a humanitarian social structure and a sound economy in both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The military and naval importance of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to our national defense cannot be overemphasized. Situated about 1,000 miles east of Key West with their southern shores bathed by the waters of the Caribbean Sea and their northern and eastern beaches in the Atlantic Ocean, the Army quickly took steps to use them at the outbreak of the war. This brought temporary employment to a large part of the population, but the Army has now completed its work and has been gradually slackening up in its civilian employment.

When Puerto Rico came under the American flag in December 1898, following the close of the Spanish-American War, it had a population of about 900,000, but since that time the number of its inhabitants has increased to more than 1,800,000, or more than double. Today it is one of the most thickly populated areas in the Western Hemisphere with some 544 persons per square mile compared with 44 persons per square mile for the entire United States.

Puerto Rico is essentially an agricultural country. Almost its entire population is engaged in agriculture and allied industries. Only 26,711 persons were employed in manufacturing industries of Puerto Rico in the year 1939. However, its limited area for agricultural production and its dense population make it necessary to import an abnormal amount of food. Puerto Rico's principal crop is sugarcane, and its principal industry is sugar refining, in peacetime years. Coffee, tobacco, and fruits are also grown in limited areas, but peacetime importation of civilian goods before the war amounted to some 100,000 tons per month, or more than a million tons of shipping per annum.

The social and economic conditions now existing in these islands are such as should make every American mother and father heartsick. The war has accentuated this situation. Lack of shipping space has placed the normal economy of the islands in a strait jacket gradually stifling the people through actual hunger and starvation. It is known that children have been seen scavenging among garbage cans for food for which to sustain their bodies. Young girls in their early teen ages are selling their very souls in order to secure money with which to buy necessities of life. The already poor social conditions in the islands are made more tragic as the result of the poor economic situation of the people.

Many studies have been made of the distribution of income in Puerto Rico. In 1942–43 the Works Progress Administration made a survey of some 2,000 families and estimated that the average annual income per family of 5.5 members was $341; and that each family averaged 1.58 wage earners. Based on an investigation by the National Resources Planning Board, it was estimated that in the years 1941–42 the annual average income of wage earners was $187. The official statistician for the Puerto Rican Government thought this figure was too high. It is reported that in 1937–38 three-fifths of the laborers worked from 8 to 43 weeks during the year. The average annual earnings per worker was $102.34. The annual income of families was on the average of $171.29 and the annual income per capita was $28.71, or 8 cents per person per day for all the necessities of life. Four-fifths of the weekly income was spent on food.

The whole social problem is further complicated by the illiteracy rampant in the islands. In Puerto Rico fully one-third of the entire population is classed as illiterate. Of the total number of children entering the schools in 1931–32, only 23 percent completed the eighth grade and only 5 percent finished their high-school education. Such conditions as this cannot be permitted to continue under the American flag.

Lack of sanitation and hospital facilities plays another important part in destroying social morale. The Governor of the Virgin Islands testified before the Committee on Insular Affairs that at St. Thomas there was a single, old dilapidated hospital with only 60 beds, lacking in facilities even for private consultations. Persons suffering with all manner of venereal diseases are herded together in a single room, while medical examinations and interrogations were going on at the same time in the same room. Psychopathic cases are grouped together in another single-roomed structure, with no facilities for proper supervision, particularly during the night hours. This has brought about a deplorable state of affairs which we cannot countenance.

Examination of the statistics available seems to indicate that only one industry has been materially benefited by war conditions. The United States internal revenue tax on alcoholic beverages shipped to the United States in 1940 totaled three and one-half million dollars for the entire year. This has steadily increased until in the single month of December 1943 this tax amounted to more than $6,000,000, or almost twice as much in a single month as for the entire year 1940. Certainly, if it has been possible to ship rum into the United States, it has been equally possible to ship sugar and molasses, particularly when molasses is so sorely needed in the manufacture of alcohol for war purposes. Such huge quantities of molasses accumulated in Puerto Rico during the fall months of 1943 that I am informed storage facilities were not available and it was necessary to store it in open ditches in the fields. All this was going on at a time when badly needed grains for cattle and poultry feeding in the United States were and still are being diverted to the manufacture of alcohol.

Congress should take immediate steps to build a sound social and economic structure in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. These huge sums received from alcoholic-beverage taxes should be returned to the islands in the form of appropriations for a public-works program that will give permanency to the social, industrial, and commercial development of the islands. Roads should be built, schools should be constructed, the island fisheries should be developed and expanded with necessary cold-storage facilities also being built; sewerage and drainage systems should be installed, modern hospital facilities and institutions for carrying on humanitarian work in elevating standards of living should be made available. Much of the materials for such a public-works program is already available in the islands, the labor is available, and the needs of the people are so great that they demand our immediate attention.

Political abuses have grown up to such an extent that we should make such amendments to the organic law as will eliminate waste and duplication. Legislative action is necessary to insure economy in administration and the elimination of graft and political favoritism. It has been testified before our committee that one example of this political chicanery is well illustrated in the case of the janitor of a school. He spends 2 or 3 hours daily attending to his duties, being paid $100 per month, while the school teacher of the same school is paid only $75 per month. Puerto Rico, about 100 miles long and 35 miles wide, is divided into more than 70 political subdivisions. This engenders and encourages political strife. It increases taxation, not only on the poor people of the islands, but it stifles the development of industry. The islands must be rid of this problem by our action.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, it is my desire, in this time, to speak on one particular branch of this measure. However, at the very outset I wish to compliment the subcommittee for the work it has done on this bill. The reduction made in the total appropriation is illuminating, and is in entire accord with the views of the people at home. The people want economy in government—and, during this frightful war, they want more and more of economy in our government. They want our Government to practice economy just as they are compelled to practice economy in their everyday lives. Anything short of this policy will not suffice.

I wish, also, to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for the vast amount of work he has done on this measure, and for the care and caution he has observed in making appropriations under this particular measure. The very fact that a reduction of more than $26,000,000 has been accomplished under the appropriation for last year is evidence of the fine service that has been rendered by our colleague, and those associated with him on the subcommittee which has handled this measure.

Mr. Chairman, the particular point to which I desire to refer, is the question of military deferments of personnel in the Department of the Interior. I was greatly disappointed when I read the report submitted with this measure, because it shows that in this particular department of Government there are 6,696

male employees between the ages of 18 and 37 years of age. The point that has caused great disappointment on my part is that 2,221 of that number have received occupational deferments from Army service in this war, and the fact, and I presume it is a fact because it is shown in the report accompanying this measure, that 2,073 of those deferred from service in the Army were so deferred at the specific request of the Department is very disappointing. Those employees who have been deferred are not indispensable, I am certain. Many of them are holding mere clerical jobs, and their places can easily be taken by men or women who are unfit physically for military service, or by those who are over age for military service. The people of this country dislike to learn of any department of our Government asking for deferments for the men who are employed therein. We are engaged in a frightful war. We must win this war. Every man, who is strong and healthy, and who is employed in some department of our Government and who is deferred from service in this war because he is so employed, merely means that some keyman in some defense plant, or some farm boy or some farmer who is producing the necessary food for our victory, must respond and go serve in place and instead of the deferred Government employee. This is entirely unfair, and this is a policy that the people disapprove of. They want fair treatment—that is all. But they do not want their boys in their own communities drafted and taken into the Army—taken away from their jobs at which they are producing either food or munitions of war—simply because some boy working in the Government has been deferred and kept on his job, which many others who are unable to fight can easily fill.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot subscribe to that policy whereby any of the departments of our Government can seek and secure deferments for their employees, so they may be kept on their job. If that rule should obtain, generally, we could never secure an army for our defense in time of war. The manpower situation in Indiana, and throughout every State, is critical. The men and boys from our great factories, mills, and plants, have been largely taken. They are wearing the uniform of our country and they are following our flag. Their Government did not seek their deferment—and those in charge of our governmental policies did not seek to keep them working and producing, but to the contrary our Government drafted them and took them away from their jobs. They were, in large part, producing. These Government employees do not produce anything that is essential in time of war. They simply absorb the resources of our Nation. Quite recently men, with large families, have been taken into the service. I had reported to me, very recently, the fact that one man, who was married and with eight children living, had been drafted and taken into the service. He was a farmer and he was producing food. Yet he was drafted and taken into the service. No agency of Government attempted to secure his deferment, and this man—true American that he is—did not try to hide behind the skirts of his Government in order to avoid serving his country in time of war. When we analyze the cost to the Government of this soldier—with his own meager compensation, his food, and his clothing and equipment, but when we add to this the allotment to the wife and eight children this staggering amount means much to our Nation. If an entire army should be so composed, or if any considerable part of it should be so constituted, the cost would be staggering. The resources of the Nation would be sapped away. And may I say that many of those men in the Department of the Interior who have been deferred from service are single men and without dependents.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that I am greatly alarmed, and I am disappointed, because this particular department has intervened and has secured the deferment of 2,073 men from military service. That means that 2,073 other men—farmers, machinists, lathe men, men working in the plants and mills, men engaged in business—will have to go into the service to fill the places which would otherwise have been taken by those boys who were deferred. This is tragic in the extreme. Each man should take his place in this war, who is physically able to do so, regardless of his employment in some Government agency. If any deferments should be granted those should go to the men and boys who are producing—producing the food, and those who are producing the munitions of war.

As we go forward in this war—and we have gone forward for quite a period of time—the people of this country have come to realize that we have a long and a hard path to travel. We must reduce the cost of war, and those in charge of every agency of government must cut down and materially reduce their spending of money in their departments. Every nonessential item which costs money must be entirely eliminated. We must get down to the one question of winning this war, and we must win it as quickly as possible—we must save the lives of our men and boys insofar as it is possible to do so. But let the Government employee take his place with all the others in our effort to win this victory.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

THE MIDWEST IS WATCHING, MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the whole Midwest is disturbed by the seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant by the administration. Public Law No. 89, under which the President presumes to act, does not give him any authority to seize a plant unless it is a war plant or there is involved a war contract or subcontract. The Smith committee, anticipating this action because there have been indications of it before, held hearings, and a bill—H. R. 4647—was introduced April 24 by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, which, if passed by the House, will take care of this situation.

This bill would amend the act in two particulars. It would provide, first, that the War Labor Board shall not issue an order calling for action of the kind here directed until the National Labor Relations Board, acting under the Wagner Act, has called an election and a bargaining agent has been determined in the good old American way, that is, by virtue of an election. The second amendment provides that a challenged order shall not be enforced until the court has determined whether or not the order is valid, another good old American way of settling disputes, not by strikes, not by use of the armed forces, but by settlement through judicial decision, to which all would yield.

The President of the United States ordered the Army to seize, and the Army seized, and now has possession of, the offices, the stores, and the business of Montgomery Ward & Co. in the city of Chicago.

Acting under the orders of the President, soldiers who either enlisted or were conscripted to carry the "four freedoms," including the right to do business throughout the world, picked up Mr. Sewell Avery, chairman of the board of Montgomery Ward & Co. and, by force, removed him from his office, from the business place of Montgomery Ward & Co., where he had a right to be.

Never before in the history of our country has so arbitrary, so unjustifiable a use of Executive power been exercised to deprive a citizen of his legal rights.

The people of this country, especially those of the great Midwest, are watching this administration and they want to know whether the un-American, unconstitutional seizure of Ward's business was the act of a sick man who is now said to be attempting to regain his health, or whether it was the act of "the power behind the throne."

To many of us it appears to be an act of the administration looking toward the appeasement of a radical labor group which has pledged its resources and its political support to the President.

To some of us it appears to be the carrying out of a bargain between the administration and the C. I. O.'s committee for political action, which boasts a war fund, for political purposes, of $2,000,000.

Why did the President or the power behind the throne, some member of the palace guard, order the seizure of the Ward plants? Let me give you the facts; then form your own conclusion.

More than a year ago Ward's, when ordered by the President to comply with an order of the War Labor Board, entered into a contract with the C. I. O., which was acting as the bargaining agent for its employee members working at Ward's.

That contract contained a maintenance-of-membership clause under which members of the union had a stated period to resign from the union. If they did not resign, then for the life of the contract they were required to remain members in good standing, pay all dues and assessments, obey the rules and reg-

ulations of the union. If they did not, Ward's was forced to discharge them.

Not all employees of Ward's—in fact, Ward insists a majority never willingly belonged to the union. That contract expired in December of 1943.

The only authority which any union has to act as bargaining agent for the employees of a company comes from the National Labor Relations Act, sometimes known as the Wagner law. That act provides that employees shall have the right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

The only legal way that a union can become such representative is through an election where, on vote of the employees, it is selected to represent the employees.

Ever since last November, Ward's has been asking the National Labor Relations Board to hold an election to determine whether its employees wished to be represented by the C. I. O. The Board has refused to hold such an election.

When the C. I. O. demanded that the contract, which expired on December 8, 1943, be renewed, Ward's refused to do so, stating that it would continue to observe the wages, hours, and related terms of employment, as contained in the expired contract, but insisted that before it enter into another contract an election be held—and that is the American way of deciding issues—and that it be determined whether the employees desired to be represented by the C. I. O.

Ward's stated that, if the C. I. O. was selected at such election, it would bargain with it. Was that fair?

But the C. I. O., perhaps fearful of the result of such an election, in any event, apparently relying upon the support of the administration, as exerted through the War Labor Board, went on strike, threw picket lines around the Ward offices in Chicago.

The Chicago police restrained the pickets from using violence against employees desiring to enter the plant and continue at their jobs. The strike failed. Ward's continued to do business.

But the C. I. O. was not satisfied. So in stepped the War Labor Board and ordered Ward's to sign a new contract. Ward's refused. Then the War Labor Board certified the case to the President and the President ordered the Army to, and it did, take over the business.

The War Labor Board had no authority to order Ward's to enter into a contract containing a security-of-membership clause. The Board assumed to act under Public Law No. 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. That act gives the Board authority, when there is a labor dispute in a war industry, to decide the dispute, provided its order is "fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case"; and provided also that the order shall conform to the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, neither the closed shop nor any form of a closed shop can legally be forced upon an employer or his employees. In fact, the National Labor Relations Act makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to in any way suggest that his employees should or should not join or remain a member of a union.

Nevertheless, the War Labor Board ordered Ward's to sign a contract containing a security-of-membership clause, under which employees who belonged to the union would have a limited time to resign; and if they did not do so, they must thereafter—for the duration of the contract—remain members of and pay all the dues and assessments levied by the union. If they did not pay such assessments, they might be expelled from the union, and, under the contract, if so expelled, the company would be forced to discharge them—throw them out of their jobs.

Now the significance of the President's action is disclosed when we remember that the C. I. O. has endorsed the President for a fourth term; when we recall that the C. I. O. Committee for Political Action has a campaign fund of $2,000,000 and that it is engaged throughout this country in an active campaign to reelect the President.

Do not forget that many of the affiliates of the C. I. O. have levied a political assessment of $1 upon its members. Beyond question, C. I. O. will attempt, sooner or later, to compel the employees of Ward's—each and every one of them who belongs to the union—to pay a dollar into the campaign fund which is to be used to reelect President Roosevelt, who issued the present order, and Senators and Congressmen pledged to his support.

Why talk about appeasement? Is the President not appeasing the C. I. O., his political ally in the campaign now being carried on for a fourth term? Will not this order in effect compel citizens of the United States to contribute to a campaign fund which is to be used for his own political advancement and for the advancement of his political friends?

Has the War Labor Board not ordered Ward's to violate the National Labor Relations Act by forcing some of its employees, in order to hold their jobs, to pay the dues and assessments which may be levied by the C. I. O.?

If anyone has the idea that this case does not affect him, let him stop and consider. The administration gives as its reason for the taking over of the plant that Ward's is engaged in activities which contribute to the prosecution of the war.

It is not engaged in either manufacturing, selling, or transporting munitions of war as such. It is doing an ordinary civilian business. It is quite true, as stated by some administration spokesmen, that it supplies the machinery to farmers who are engaged in producing food for the war. It is equally true that every implement dealer, every hardware dealer, is also engaged—in a much smaller degree—in furnishing materials to the farmer. The farmer himself is producing food for the armed forces, for our allies, as well as for the civilian population.

In a sense, each and every one of us who does any useful work is engaged in business which aids in the prosecution of the war. If the reasoning of the administration in this case be followed to its logical conclusion, then every business in the United States, no matter how small, any farm in the United States, could be taken over by Executive order.

Such a result is absurd and no such power was granted to the President by Public Law 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The President bases his action upon the order of the War Labor Board. That Board had no authority to require Ward's to enter into a contract containing a security-of-membership clause. The Board had no authority to enforce its order.

Ward's has brought an action in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, challenging the validity of the Board's order, and the Board, answering in court, contends that the court has no jurisdiction to determine the validity of the order and admits that it has no authority to enforce that order.

So the President, coming to the rescue of the Board and to the aid of the union, which is his political ally, notwithstanding the fact that Ward's is neither a war contractor nor a war plant—one of which it must be to come within the terms of the act which authorizes seizure of plants—uses the armed forces of the United States to deprive citizens of their property; to force citizens to grant special favors to the affiliate of an organization which has pledged him its political support in the coming election.

On November 14, 1941, the President promised employees that—

> The Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass legislation ordering, a so-called closed shop.

Then, talking face to face with John L. Lewis, the President said the Government would never compel employees to join a union by Government decree. That, he said, "would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor."

Yet, by his present order against Ward's, enforced by the rifles and the bayonets of the Army, the President is forcing the employees of Ward's to continue as members of the C. I. O., to pay not only their regular dues and assessments but, if it be levied, a political assessment of $1 each.

The people of the Midwest are watching; they are waiting. They are patient and they are long-suffering. They have paid exorbitant taxes without complaint. They have given liberally of their money to the Red Cross, to the purchase of war stamps and war bonds. They have sent their daughters and their sons by the million to fight on foreign soil, although the President once promised them that those sons never should be so sent.

With grief in their hearts, they face the fact that hundreds of thousands of their loved ones may suffer and die in the coming invasion. They face the future with courage. But they are determined that the freedom for which their sons are fighting shall not be taken from them here at home; that, when those who survive this war return, they will find here a constitutional government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, it has been my observation that two appropriation bills usually encounter great difficulties in this Chamber; that is to say, the Interior bill and the Agricultural bill. It happens that both of those bills are of vital interest to my constituents, and that is why I am sorry when I see cuts made, unless such cuts are absolutely necessary. I acknowledge the fact that we must make cuts in these war days, but I fear some have been pretty extreme in this measure. I want to say to the chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend from Oklahoma, that in his zeal to protect the Treasury he often, as in this bill, cuts too deeply. I know of no subcommittee chairman who makes a clearer record for economy by cutting under the Budget estimates.

There are certain omissions from this bill which I have noted. Four minutes will not permit me to enumerate all of them, so let me begin with this one. Some time ago we passed a measure here which authorized an additional assistant for the Secretary of the Interior because it was thought the Secretary's load was increasing and the onerous duties of his office demanded it. Now, I do not find any provision for an appropriation for such an assistant. I do not know whether I should complain of this particular omission from this bill, as it may be taken care of otherwise, but it is one of several omissions.

Last July the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] and several other Congressmen and I, together with several Senators, went down to see Donald Nelson. We said to him: There are many projects for food production and irrigation projects on Indian lands and some others nearly completed, and if we could only get the stop order lifted and the green light given, these nearly finished projects could be completed and food production on them could begin at once. Soon after that Donald Nelson of the War Production Board, on the advice of the Food Administrator and others, did lift the stop order on 13 of those projects. However, the necessary money has not yet been appropriated for all of them, even the small amount necessary.

I have in mind one which I believe and hope is included in this bill on page 34, line 21, if I read it aright. On the Salt River Indian Reservation near my home there are 3,000 acres of good land as level as this floor, now growing desert vegetation. It has a canal flowing alongside of it, with good laterals already provided. Ninety percent of the entire expense to put this land in final and proper condition has been expended and yet in this case the other 10 percent has been slowly furnished. I have contended that these Pima Indians, the best farmers of the Indian race in our entire country, could produce great quantities of food on that land. I know there is more than the 3,000 acres the Indian Bureau asked to treat there and I am wondering why it has not been subjugated according to the terms of the matter as we presented it a year ago to Donald Nelson. However, I do congratulate the committee on this degree of favorable action.

My friend from Iowa speaks of education. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I feel he is right in regard to education of Indian children generally, that they should have the benefits of our public schools where practical, but I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that with a great reservation like the Navajo Reservation, larger than most all of the New England States, it would be impossible for the Navajo children to go to the public schools. We are far from the point where we can call upon the public schools of the States to furnish Indian education.

Mr. JENSEN. I want the gentleman to know that the committee took that into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, we in the West are greatly interested in this bill (H. R. 4679) now under consideration, which provides appropriations for the Department of the Interior. First of all I want to compliment the subcommittee of this great Committee on Appropriations which visited us last summer and gave us an opportunity to show them the work that is being carried on under the Department of the Interior by the appropriations this committee has been making from time to time. The committee was very gracious and gave us as much of their time as was possible, and we were happy, indeed, to have that opportunity.

As you know, this bill covers a variety of activities that are of great importance to the Nation as a whole, particularly, of course, to the West, but they are important to the Nation in this time of war because in the West we have these large projects, such as Bonneville and Grand Coulee, producing hydroelectric power which is going directly into the war effort. I may say if it had not been for those great power projects being fully constructed and ready to go forward and do their part in the war effort, we would have been, indeed, greatly crippled in carrying on the defense of this country and the prosecution of the war. We are producing in that area alone some 30 percent of the aluminum which is needed in the construction of the airships which are bringing victory to us on foreign fields.

There is very little in controversy today, however, with reference to the appropriations for these great projects. For the Bonneville Administration there have been some cuts made by the committee. I want to commend the committee for their wise consideration of the various projects which came under their consideration. They have made some very substantial cuts. Some, of course, may appear to those of us who are interested in the projects involved to be rather severe and possibly not justified to the full extent that the committee made, but I do know that the committee has been very diligent. They have given fair consideration to all of us who appeared before them, and I am sure the cuts that they made, in their own judgment, at least, were justified, and I am inclined to believe that they were.

I want to call to your attention briefly, however, the appropriation which is made for the Bonneville Administration, appearing on page 9 of the bill. There is made available there a sum not to exceed $3,686,540 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Bonneville power transmission system for the fiscal year 1945 for expenses of marketing and operation of tranmission facilities and administration costs.

This, as you will note, is not a new appropriation. It is merely making available moneys that were heretofore appropriated. There is also included an item of $24,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia. You will note in the report of the committee, on page 6, that these recommendations are discussed in some detail and the reasons for the disallowances made by the committee are set forth.

There was one item of $254,000, a supplemental item, which was requested as a last-minute appropriation for this Department to take care of the loss in power development which probably will come to pass by reason of cut-backs which are now taking place in the production of certain supplies for our war effort.

As the war is proceeding now in high tension there are certain developments of war activities which heretofore required a vast amount of material which are being cut back by reason of the completing of those particular projects for the supplying of that material, by reason of the change in conditions overseas requiring different types of material. So the Budget Bureau at the last moment sent up this suplemental item of $254,000, which was disallowed by the committee because they thought there was not available at that time proper justification for it. I will discuss it later in my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, to present a clear understanding of the Bonneville appropriation, now under consideration, it will be necessary to separate the two estimates included in the total Budget. If this is not done it will be impossible to act with understanding, namely, first, operating and maintenance expenses appearing in printed budget; and second, the supplemental amendatory marketing estimate.

The regular operating and maintenance item totaling $3,734,000 was sent up to Congress by the President in January. It is the submission detailed out in the printed Budget. It must be remembered that this represents operating expenses alone. Last month the President also sent up a supplemental amendatory marketing estimate totaling $254,000, which I will discuss after placing the operating budget in its true prospective, and discussing the contention that there is an increase in operating expenses between 1944 and 1945.

THE MYSTERY LOAD

By the time this estimate reaches the Senate, the so-called mystery load will go into operation. I have designated it the "mystery load" as military secrecy

prohibits any detailed discussion. I think I can say with propriety that it represents a new weapon of warfare, developed by new manufacturing processes that will turn large volumes of electricity into the most important projectile yet developed. Purposely, so I understand, all reference to this load was deleted from the hearings. From my own knowledge I estimate that it will consume more power than presently used in the environs of Portland, representing a population of around half million.

The nature of this new manufacturing process is such that any impairment in the continuity of electric service may prove disastrous. Therefore this House should approach any curtailment of operating expenses with great caution. Any small possible cut in the operating expense, through any floor amendment, will not, in my opinion, justify this House in assuming such a risk in the critical period of this war, with the information now available. There may be some very minor items in this operating estimate, which further factual evidence would show as contrary to my thinking. These have not been brought out in the record, but I do know the highly significant characteristics of the mystery load and the consequences of curtailing continuity of service. Therefore I consider it my duty to call this to the attention of this House, where for military reasons so little is known about the so-called mystery load. Remember that this is a new load which was not in operation the major part of the fiscal year 1944.

A careful study of the Budget estimates will remove any misconceptions regarding the indicated, but nonactual, increases in operating expenses. The operating estimate now before the House does not represent new funds but rather the earmarking of previous construction appropriations, for the specific purpose of what has been called in the hearings Operation and maintenance.

OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSE BUDGET

For brevity I will call this the regular O. and M. budget. It is regular in every use of this word. It was submitted in the regular course, and its regular functional use has been detailed in the hearings.

It is evident that confusion has arisen from considering only the language covering the operation limitation in the regular 1944 fiscal year act, and the one now before this House. If the component figures and the physical set-up of confidential war loads, as given in the detailed justification submitted to the committee last year and this year, had been analyzed in the light of laws passed by Congress between the two dates, this confusion would disappear.

Let me initially emphasize one highly important point that must not be left out of this consideration. Under instruction from Congress the 1944 estimate was submitted on one basis, while the 1945 estimate was submitted on an entirely different set-up. The principal cause for the different requirements in the last 2 years was the enactment of Public Law 49 by this Congress. This I will explain after making a general statement.

If the 1944 and 1945 estimates are analyzed on an actual comparable base it will be found that there is no actual increase in expenses, but rather a different method of presenting the bookkeeping entries, resulting from a change in law, and previously appropriating for a separate item outside of the 1944 limitation.

The $3,270,000 operating estimate included in the act covering the fiscal year 1944 did not include any overtime requirements, as Public Law 49 had not been passed when the Budget estimate was submitted to and considered by Congress. The partial requirements of this act for the year 1944 were later covered by a blanket deficiency bill, and do not appear in the $3,270,000 item written into the language of the 1944 act. From inquiry I find that Bonneville in the year 1944 met this requirement from savings from previous years, which carried a continuing provision in the enacted law.

In addition there is another item which does not appear in the 1944 limitation and that is purchase of power and the lease of facilities. As was pointed out before the committee, Bonneville is tied in to a vast power pool. To avoid duplicating facilities and thus wasting critical materials, the Federal agency leases private and State public transmission facilities. This item costs in round numbers $241,000 per year. The amounts previously appropriated for this service were handled as a separate item in 1944 and for some reason, unknown to me, were not included in the 1944 limitation, although to conform to the basic act passed by Congress in 1937 it should have been included within the 1944 operating expense limitation. Funds were actually spent in 1944 for such service. Evidently this oversight was corrected in the 1945 estimate. If the principal differences I have briefly pointed out are put into balance-sheet form it will be found that the alleged claim of operating increases over 1944 evaporates. Actually there is a saving.

BALANCE SHEET SHOWING

In order to clarify this, I have worked out from the committee hearings the following actual balance sheet, connecting the 1944 and 1945 budget estimates:

Operating limitation included in the 1944 act	$3,270,000
Power purchase and facility lease, covered by a separate item outside the limitation in 1944	241,000
Overtime allowances, fiscal year 1945 according to Public Law 49	326,146
Total indicated but not actual increases	567,146
Subtotal	3,837,146
Savings, 1945 over 1944:	
Personal services less $120 miscellaneous expense	81,730
Savings in elimination of positions	21,416
Total savings 1945 over 1944	103,146
1945 estimate after considering above	3,734,000

This later figure represents the estimated limitation submitted with the 1945 Budget.

All of these figures were taken from actual submissions to the committee, and can be found in the record. My only contribution in this connection is bringing them together for a quick, accurate demonstration. The explanation of the above $241,000 and $326,146 items can be found in the printed hearings, and I will not take the time of this House to elaborate further. The detailed break-down on a true comparative actual basis is also in the hearings, and tie in with the brief summarizing balance sheet that I have presented.

OPERATING EFFICIENCY

In January of this year the Northwestern Federal Power System established a new record. In this month the Grand Coulee plant turned out more than 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which was transmitted over the Bonneville network, to war loads and private and public systems. This represents the largest output from any single plant in the history of the industry. Therefore we must realize that we are dealing with volumes of power not usually encountered. Under the 1945 regular estimates this will be handled at a much higher efficiency than in 1944.

To demonstrate such a general statement I will present a few facts for your consideration.

All of the previously proposed units in the two plants are now in operation. The last units went on the line in the two plants within this quarter. Therefore this capacity was not fully available in the entire fiscal year of 1944, but will be in 1945. Yet the over-all operating expense will be lower in 1945 than in 1944.

Within this year the salable capacity of the two plants increased from around 700,000 kilowatts to 1,300,000 kilowatts rated capacity, which is being worked at an overload of from 10 to 20 percent. This represents an increase of 90 percent, which will be fully effective in 1945. Such an increase of power capacity, of course, requires a corresponding increase in line and substation capacities, but, as I have shown, these increases will be handled without any actual increase in regular operating expenses.

The revenues in previous years, compared with estimated 1945 revenues, under fairly static expenses, is another available yardstick to measure comparative efficiency. The revenue figures presented to the committee, and taken from the record, are as follows, given on a fiscal-year basis:

1940	$367,507
1941	1,911,896
1942	5,271,068
1943	12,226,559
1944 (estimated for balance of year)	19,950,900
1945 (estimated for entire year)	24,826,900

Mr. Chairman I call attention to the following testimony in the hearings, pages 238, 239, showing the revenues from Bonneville and Grand Coulee for the years 1943, 1944, and 1945:

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to know what revenues you are now receiving annually from Grand Coulee and Bonneville, and what

you estimate your revenues will be for the next fiscal year. Do you have that?

Mr. MARLETT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. You have an estimation for the next several years?

Mr. MARLETT. Our revenues for the current fiscal year, 1945.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is that, Bonneville?

Mr. MARLETT. I am sorry—1944. Revenues of Bonneville Power Administration, which covers the output of both Grand Coulee and Bonneville, are estimated at $19,950,900.

Mr. JOHNSON. That covers both projects?

Mr. MARLETT. Both projects.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is the revenues for 1944?

Mr. MARLETT. Yes, sir. That is the estimate for the current year, the fiscal year 1944.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now, what did you actually receive for 1943?

Mr. MARLETT. Our actual revenues for 1943 were $12,226,569.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now, do you have an estimate for 1945?

Mr. MARLETT. Yes. Our estimate for 1945 is $24,826,900.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you have an estimate any further in advance?

Mr. MARLETT. Not beyond 1945.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will they be above or below, or will that be the peak?

Mr. MARLETT. That will probably be the peak inasmuch as we do not have any additional generators going in at the present time. All generators will be in by 1945. We believe additional generators should be under construction now, but they are not.

Dr. RAVER. It depends upon the war, I think, the length of the war.

Mr. MARLETT. It is subject to that, of course.

These figures speak louder than any inferential generalizations. These revenues, under the 1937 act, are deposited with the Treasury, and the project each year has to come to Congress for appropriations to cover operating expenses. The record also shows that the project after considering all items chargeable to interest, amortization, depreciation, operating expenses, and the in-and-out cost of the two Shasta units is making a substantial profit for the Federal Government. These operating expenses are all paid from revenues.

HANDLING THE REGULAR SUBMISSION

The facts that I have presented justify the statement that it is contrary to the best public interest and the prosecution of the war for this House to cut the Bonneville operating budget at this time. The regular submission should be considered apart from any marketing expenses.

UTILIZATION OF COLUMBIA RIVER POWER

Mr. Chairman, on numerous occasions I have presented factual evidence of the colossal contribution to the war effort resulting from the foresight of Congress and the House Committee on Appropriations in early providing power facilities on the Columbia River. We must remember that the high-strength, low-weight metals and chemicals used in our airship, tank, and ship program are nothing but frozen kilowatts. To be specific, I might say that out of the frozen kilowatts of the Columbia have come the following contributions to the war effort, during the past year:

Sufficient aluminum to produce 75,000 fighter planes or 37,000 bombers, or about one-third of the entire air program, annual production rate.

Power and welding heat to produce 240 ships.

Ferrochrome in sufficient quantities to produce the armor for 30,000 heavy tanks.

Acetylene needed for welding and cutting the steel going into 220 ships.

Sufficient ferrosilicon to deoxidize 2,600,000 tons of steel, which represents the steel going into over 100,000 tanks.

Additional ferrosilicon for the production of 56,000,000 pounds of magnesium, which represents 11,000,000 incendiary bombs.

In addition to these actual contributions, I might say that during this year will come another major war contribution which for military reasons I cannot discuss, as much as I would like to.

The low cost of this delivered power is also a sizable factor resulting in saving the taxpayers over $200,000,000 on the cost of metals during the past fiscal year.

I have demonstrated this saving in my presentation before the committee. Furthermore, the two Columbia River plants have saved the situation for most of the industries located on private power lines in the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Utah. These Federal power plants pumped into the private power systems in excess of a billion kilowatt-hours of energy per annum to make good deficiencies resulting from increased war demands. This was accomplished by overloading the generators at Bonneville and Grand Coulee, up to 18 percent of their rating.

Nowhere in this country have such sizable contributions been made with such a small amount of manpower.

When the accurate history of this production is written, the foresight of a small group in Congress will stand out in large perspective. To those of us who know, the foresight of the House Appropriations Committee was remarkable. At no place in the entire war program has greater wisdom been shown.

The House has still an opportunity to exercise further foresight in the bill now before us.

Nearly 2 years before Pearl Harbor, I presented to this House an analysis of the contributions low-cost Federal power could make both in war and peace. The war has accentuated the analysis I made in 1940.

This Nation must be prepared to shift sixteen to twenty million men from war to peacetime employment. The material that I have accumulated, as I stated before the committee, indicates that unless we concentrate on programing the utilization of our resources we will find that around 75 percent of ex-service men and women will be looking for jobs immediately after demobilization.

The Administration has sent up an amending Budget estimate of $254,000 to start such a program. I hope that this House will see the import of the provisions for marketing, included in the bill and not curtail such a meritorious effort. Involved in this present proposal is immediate employment for at least 75,000 returning veterans, and long range possibilities for at least 125,000 veterans.

The amount of money involved is small compared with the benefits accruing. As I have stated before on this floor, preparedness is based on the exercise of vision. As early as 1937 this House caught the vision as to what could be accomplished through the use of the Columbia River power. Let us continue to exercise this vision through the postwar period.

SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT

This supplemental budget was disallowed by the committee because of the lack of supporting data sufficient to satisfy the committee at this time as to its necessity. I want to discuss it briefly.

In this House I have on numerous occasions outlined procedures necessary to insure the proper utilization of Columbia River power. About the time that I initially outlined the proper course to achieve this objective, the State granges of Oregon and Washington independently took up a study of this subject and later offered policy suggestions. These suggestions fitted into the outline I originally proposed on this floor long before Pearl Harbor.

Because of widespread public interest in the two States, the delegations have also closely followed such proposals, and in this effort I have been acting as chairman of this informal group. Therefore I have had long and close contact with this subject matter, and offer the following explanatory remarks, which I have checked against the record in order to secure the utmost accuracy.

At the time the regular supply budget for 1945 was prepared the administration issued instructions to the effect that submissions should be based on the assumption that the war will be continued through the fiscal year 1945. Such instructions carried with them the understanding that the status quo of war industry would continue through 1945, and accordingly no items to insure such continuance were included in the $3,734,000 submission.

The ink had hardly dried on the printed budget, which was based on such a status quo, when W. P. B. announced their policy of production cut-backs. This is a long story, but I will condense the recital to a few sentences. Since the first of the year certain forces in the war agencies have been continuously trying to cut-back aluminum production in the Northwest, when the over-all costs in these plants, including freight, to the Federal Government is much less than from plants in every other section of the country.

The reason for such cut-backs is the excess inventory occasioned by importation of Shipshaw metal at double the total Northwestern cost. Such a procedure will cost the taxpayers $60,000,000 additional per year. Nevertheless, the

cut-back efforts continue. When the elimination of the status quo was demonstrated, the Bonneville agency asked for supplementary Budget hearings. This request was granted, and then Bonneville submitted an estimate of around $550,000. This estimate was submitted with the tacit understanding that no post-war items were included. After screening by the Budget Bureau, on the basis of availability of manpower, the President sent up for the consideration of Congress a supplemental marketing estimate in the amount of $254,000, as a suggested amendment to the regular supply bill. This is strictly a marketing allowance, aimed to alleviate revenue loss resulting from cut-backs.

USE OF THE MARKETING FUNDS

The Bonneville Administration is now carrying the war risk on all war industrial power sales, on a present Federal power investment of $325,000,000. Congress should give the Administration the tools to continue such use, first in the war effort and later under decreasing requirements of the terminal stages of the war. This constitutes unemployment insurance. These marketing funds will be used to commercially demonstrate the feasibility of new war and industrial power uses. Eighteen different projects for use extension have been submitted to the committee, and I need not duplicate these descriptions. An examination of these projects shows that no project contains post-war plans or a duplication of work performed by other agencies.

MARKETING JUSTIFICATION

Such a function is recognized by State laws as a necessary adjunct to private utility operations and is included universally in all private rate bases. The private electric industry in the country spends annually around 3 percent of its gross revenues for such activities. The Bonneville marketing estimate, now before you, represents 1.02 percent of Bonneville's annual revenues, or one-third of what private companies normally spend, without facing cut-backs affecting large blocks of power.

The denial of this supplementary marketing estimate transfers the responsibility for continued use and revenue accruals from the Administration to Congress. Does Congress desire to assume this responsibility?

I am certain that Congress wants to afford every opportunity for an early return of this Federal investment. Congress or the Administration cannot afford to permit this power to flow unused to the sea. The supplemental appropriation is to be used only to develop new outlets when and if necessary and to replace revenue loss from cut-back.

This, in my opinion, affords sufficient justification for favorable consideration of the supplemental estimate.

Mr. Chairman, the Bonneville Power Administration is a war agency responsible for maintaining a flow of electric energy to the war plants of the Pacific Northwest. Eighty-five percent of the power generated at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams which now supply more than half of the total power from all sources in Oregon and Washington, is being supplied directly to 5 aluminum plants, 1 magnesium-reduction plant, 1 aluminum-rolling mill, 2 shipyards, and 14 military or naval establishments.

The system of transmission lines and substations constructed and operated by the Administration extends over an area of approximately 100,000 square miles, and consists of 52 major substations on 2,500 circuit miles of transmission lines—additional substations and lines are now under construction to meet demands of war activities and will increase these figures as projects are completed. These include additional facilities for service to the Hanford Engineering Works near Pasco, Wash., and a 183-mile line from Grand Coulee Dam to the Puget Sound area scheduled for completion in the fall of 1944.

The annual power revenues of the Administration have risen steadily from five and a quarter millions of dollars in 1942 to twelve and a quarter millions in 1943, and indications are that revenues from power in each of the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 will be well in excess of $20,000,000. The flow of power supplying the needs of war industries in March 1944 amounted to 838,377,404 kilowatt-hours, a rate in excess of 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. Bills rendered for these power sales in just the month of March 1944 totaled $2,100,000.

The revenues produced by the sale of this tremendous volume of power will create a net income of approximately $6,000,000 for fiscal year 1944, over and above all operating expenses, and interest and depreciation charges on power facilities. These costs include those applicable to Bonneville Dam, operated by the Corps of Engineers, United States War Department, those applicable to Grand Coulee Dam, operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Department of the Interior, as well as those applicable to the transmission system of the Bonneville Power Administration. In other words, the approximately $6,000,000 net income for the fiscal year is after all power costs—generation, transmission, and marketing—and will bring the Administration's accrued earned surplus, after covering all operating costs of the early developmental years, to more than $7,500,000 on June 30, 1944. The net income for the fiscal year 1945 is expected to add well in excess of $6,000,000 to this accrued earned surplus.

The Administration's budget estimates for 1945 cover the direct operating costs of the agency. These include the maintenance of lines, substations, and building, which is performed by unclassified hourly rate personnel in the field, the operation of substations and the dispatching of power over the entire system, the promotion and execution of new power-sales contracts, and the general engineering and administrative work.

For the fiscal year 1945 these estimated requirements of the Administration are $3,734,000, which compares with more than $20,000,000 in estimated revenues for 1945 and over $6,000,000 net income after covering these and all other power costs.

The Administration's operating budget for the fiscal year 1944 was $3,270,000. The apparent increase of $464,000 includes two new and special items which were not in the 1944 Budget; namely, the fund from which power purchases and lease of transmission facilities will be paid, and the costs of overtime to annual employees.

ITEM I. PURCHASE OF POWER AND LEASE OF TRANSMISSION FACILITIES

In 1942 an appropriation amounting to $250,000 was made available to the Administration to cover costs of power purchased and lease of transmission facilities in the normal conduct of its business as an operating utility. This fund was included in its construction appropriation. In its 1945 Budget an estimate of $241,000 has been included to replenish this fund, which will have been exhausted by the end of 1944, but it is included in the operating Budget, since the Federal Power Commission's accounting system, which the Administration is required by law to follow, designates this type of expense as an operating item.

ITEM II. COSTS OF OVERTIME UNDER PUBLIC LAW 49

The second new item included in the 1945 estimates is the amount of $326,146 to cover overtime paid to annual employees under Public Law 49. This requirement was not provided for under the 1944 budget of $3,270,000.

Employment and labor policies of the Administration include application of the Civil Service Classification Act with regard to its annually paid employees, and the maintenance of prevailing wage standards and conditions of employment with regard to all hourly employees. At the time Public Law 49 became effective and a standard 48-hour workweek was adopted for annual employees, it was necessary to assign hourly employees to a comparable workweek involving the payment of overtime rates for work in excess of 40 hours. Periodical wage adjustments are made by the Administration to keep abreast of the prevailing wage standards of its operating area. As a matter of fact, a wage adjustment now being considered will result in an increase of operating expense to the extent of possibly $70,000 per year. In accordance with its past practice the Administration will make every effort to absorb extraordinary costs without requesting deficiency appropriations, and it is hoped that the wage adjustment can be offset by economy measures to be effected during the fiscal year. However, the system additions completed prior to and during the fiscal year 1944, will be operated on a wartime basis for the entire fiscal year 1945, and factors which contributed to the absorption of overtime costs in 1944 will no longer be

available to apply against these additional overtime costs in 1945. Continuous supervision is exercised over operating unit costs, and the Administration has been successful in steadily lowering its operating costs.

The added special items of expense—overtime costs, costs of purchased power, and lease of transmission facilities—provided for under the limitation for operation and maintenance during the fiscal year 1945 total in excess of $550,000, whereas the amount of the Administration's Budget request has been increased over the 1944 Budget only to the extent of $464,000.

In submitting its 1945 Budget estimates, which provide for continuing its important contribution to the production of war supplies, I believe, the Administration recognized that under war conditions it has a direct responsibility for maintaining an uninterrupted flow of power to its war industry and Military Establishment customers. I submit, Mr. Chairman, in view of this necessity, as well as the comparison of its revenues with its operating expenses, demonstrating that the Federal investment is more than paying out on a business basis, no reduction in the 1945 Budget estimates should be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MEND PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, within a few weeks now we, the direct representatives of the people—their only voice here in Congress, are going to be called upon to extend the O. P. A. Price Control Act. What we do in further improving the act will benefit not only the merchants we represent, but will also add to the convenience of the people they serve. What we fail in our duty to do in compelling those who administer the act to use practical common sense in their rules and regulations will continue to work hardships on both the merchants and their customers.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House well remember the fight we had a year ago in writing into the act the amendments which drove out of the organization hundreds of visionary and impractical dreamers, university professors, and bright young lawyers who, bloated with their new-found power with no practical experience, were driving the businessmen to despair and wrecking the organization. We made, then, a great contribution to price control. There is work to be done again and we must unite our strength and further improve the act and eradicate from it many grievous abuses.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see this done in the interest of the little businessmen in my district and the Nation as well as for the people they serve.

The little businessman who has not been driven out of business—and there are many who have been—has been hard hit. He and his business must be saved if we are to preserve distribution and free enterprise. They are the ceaseless, throbbing dynamo and the bedrock foundation of community interest and free enterprise. No group of men on the home front has carried the torch of victory in this war with greater energy or firmer step.

They have led the bond drives—the scrap drives. They have bought bonds to the limit, and in peacetime as well as in war, they have helped to maintain the churches and schools and have led, all the time in the civic and cultural efforts for the benefit of their respective communities.

Businessmen in my district have been harassed and persecuted by some of the regulation in the administration of the Price Control Act. In the extension of this act its purposes should be clarified and in order to stop such abuses there should be written into the act, by amendments, certain definite prohibitions to stop them.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out one abusive regulation well known to the retail trade known as the highest price line. In my district recently some merchants, who were supposed to have violated this price line, were brought before an O. P. A. panel, asked to sign up that they had violated this O. P. A. regulation, and were informed that they should make restitution, either to the customer or to the Federal Treasury.

The complaint was that they had sold ladies' coats above higher than the frozen price of 1942, which was $27.50. The merchants admit that in order to supply the demand of their customers, who would go to the big cities to buy if they did not, they felt they were within the law and their rights if they bought more expensive garments, which cost $39.50 wholesale, as long as they marked these up for retail at the regulation percentage mark-up. This they admit they did—not knowing they were violating the O. P. A. regulation.

The inspectors came along the other day and rudely awakened them. They were informed that, after signing up, they had violated the O. P. A. rule, they should contact all customers who had purchased garments and refund the difference between $27.50 and the merchandise sold of the better quality up to $50. Failing to locate the customer they should go through their records and in such instances mail these amounts to the Federal Treasury.

Now—get this point—please. They were not to mail the difference between $39.50 and $50 or more, according to the retail price, but that they were to mail the difference between $27.50 and $50, notwithstanding that all the garments sold cost the merchant, at wholesale, $39.50. In fairness to the O. P. A. organization here in Washington there has been some temporary relief granted in some of these cases, but it is only temporary and the merchants from coast to coast will be harassed and probably prosecuted unless the O. P. A. repeals this ruling or that the Congress writes into the law a definite prohibition against such practices to protect the little businessman of this country.

In this case if the merchant makes refunds he is ruined with the people of his community who would not understand and brand him as a profiteer. If he fails to do so he can, under their regulations, be prosecuted so he has no relief—no way to turn—because he is barred from going into a regular constituted court of equity.

I submit, first, that the Office of Price Administration does not have the right, under the act, to issue such an order; secondly, that the O. P. A. should nullify and revoke the order, and third, that an amendment should be written into the act definitely stopping, in the future, such an unfair practice and policy.

I want to call to your attention a few amendments that the Illinois Federation of Retail Merchants, after giving a great deal of study and based on practical wisdom that has come out of over 2 years' experience, have recommended should be written into the act. These men want to see price control succeed. They want to help to prevent inflation. There are no more patriotic men left on the home front. They want to be practical and helpful. Please give their recommendations your serious consideration and support.

1. EXTENSION OF THE ACT

First. They recommend the act be extended for only 1 year.

2. CHANGES IN BUSINESS PRACTICES AND THE HIGHEST-PRICE-LINE LIMITATION

The highest-price-line limitation which I have discussed should be prohibited and there should be a bar against compelling changes in business practice unless these changes are clearly for the purpose of correcting circumvention or evasion of the act. This section has been abused by compelling the merchant to make a great many changes which were and are not necessary. The Illinois Federation of Retail Merchants suggests the following amendments to cope with both these questions as follows:

Proposed Amendment: Section 2 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended to read as follows: "The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to correct circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act. In the event that any regulation or order shall require changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, the Administrator, in any proceeding in which the validity of such regula-

tion or order is challenged, shall have the burden of establishing affirmatively the necessity for the regulation or order to prevent circumvention or evasion. Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the administrator to issue any regulation or order which does not allow all sellers to compete freely in all commodities available for sale. Any rule, regulation, directive, order, or highest-price-line limitation heretofore made, issued or promulgated, inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as amended, is hereby declared discontinued and of no further effect."

3. CLASSIFICATION OF STORES

The following proposed amendment would prevent the classification of chain and independent stores which is grossly unfair, unnecessary and which is now opposed by both independent and chain stores:

Proposed amendment: Section 2 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by adding to the first sentence thereof the following: ", *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize any classification or differentiation in the maximum price or prices which may be fixed for any commodity or commodities among competing sellers of the same or similar products."

4. EMERGENCY COURT

The following amendment would repeal the O. P. A. Court of Appeals and permit the merchant to adjudicate his litigation in the circuit court of appeals in his district:

Proposed amendment: Section 204 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby repealed. All pending cases before the Emergency Court of Appeals shall be forthwith transferred, without prejudice to the rights of any party to such action, to the circuit court of appeals of the circuit in which the plaintiff has its principal place of business or to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as the plaintiff may elect, for further proceedings. All future proceedings under Section 204 (a) shall likewise be brought in such circuit court of appeals, or in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as the plaintiff may elect.

5. WILLFUL AND NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS

Recent decisions of courts have held that consumers, who can prove that they have been overcharged, are entitled to $50 or three times the amount of the overcharge if that amount is greater. Many of these suits have been brought as a result of innocent violations, or misinterpretations of orders establishing price ceilings. Some appear to have been brought in a deliberate effort to trap the merchant. Courts before whom such charges are brought should be vested with the discretion to award or withhold the $50 verdict, depending on the circumstances.

Proposed amendment: Section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(f) It shall be an adequate defense to any suit or action brought under subsections (a), (e), or (f) section (2) of this section if the defendant proves that the violation of the regulation, order, or price schedule prescribing a maximum price or maximum prices was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurence of the violation."

6. PROFIT CONTROL

This proposed amendment is an attempt to keep O. P. A. on the beam, so to speak; that is, to confine the administration to price control rather than to profit control, which latter power was not given to the O. P. A. but which is the prerogative of Congress. In many instances O. P. A. has taken the control of profits into their own hands without legal right or congressional authority.

Proposed amendment: Section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by adding to the first sentence thereof the following: ", but it is not the intention of Congress that this act be used for the purpose of profit control, as such."

Mr. Chairman, to accomplish these beneficial corrections in the present act it will require the united efforts of the Members of Congress who want to see price control succeed in a legal and in an American way. It is apparent that these amendments, if they are to prevail, will have to be written in on the floor of the House. It is for this reason that I discuss this subject today and suggest your thoughtful consideration. Illinois merchants believe these safeguarding amendments are fair and just, will improve the act, and meet the general approval of the small and big businessmen of the Nation.

May I close by suggesting it is the purpose of a committee now making a study of the oil situation of the Nation to also attempt to write into the bill an amendment that will provide for the increase of the price of crude oil which is now bringing the producers only 60 percent of its value. This and other inequities I have pointed out can and should be corrected by the proper amendments.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, there is one matter in this bill that I think I ought to call to the attention of the Congress, and that is the matter of Indian courts. In some sections of the country, I think all of them with the possible exception of Oklahoma, the Indian Bureau has established by some method unknown to me a regular system of Indian courts. They have an Indian code. I do not know where they got the code unless they wrote it up here in Washington; but they have every crime described. They have their courts set up in the country and the Indians are judges.

I notice in this bill that they want to increase the salaries of these judges. I think the total amount of money paid to these judges is about $16,000 annually. The trouble is that there was never any authority granted by Congress to establish an Indian court in the first place.

The way this court was established and the code written was that they went back through the years and found some Executive orders and some orders issued by the Indian Bureau in the Department of the Interior, and gathered up all of these documents and made a code out of them. Now they have a code established, and I would say that in dimensions it is about 2 inches thick and about 6 by 10.

The trouble in our territory, North Dakota, is that we have State courts and we have Federal courts. I handled all the Indian cases for the Federal courts for a number of years, and there was no case involving the Indian country where the Federal Government refused to act. The State courts are open and doing business.

In the State of Oklahoma there is no attempt to force this Indian code on the Indians of Oklahoma, and one-fourth of all the Indian population of the United States is in that State.

In my State just a few months ago an Indian held a party. He was told that his family would be under quarantine for diphtheria or some such thing, but he did not pay much attention to that and had his party just the same. So he was brought into the Indian court and fined all that he made last summer. There does not seem to be any appeal from this court.

I think this is a matter Congress ought to look into. I do not think you can do it in this appropriation bill, but I can tell you that you are appropriating money to maintain this kind of court.

The second proposition I wish to present to you is that under the Wheeler-Howard Act a new deal was started for the Indians. It was presented by the senior Senator from Montana, who was very interested in establishing this new deal for the Indians.

Now the same Senator is very anxious to repeal it. If there was any reason to establish it in the first place, my question is, What is the reason for abandoning it now? The trouble is, this new deal is causing a lot of trouble among Indians. Those who do not want to receive the benefits of this great system say, "Let the other Indians go into the program if they want to, but we want to stay out." There are individual Indians who believe in their own home and in their own individual way of life. The fact is they have just about the same attitude of mind as I have. I like to run my own business as far as I can without interference from my neighbor and at the same time support my country. These Indians who do not want to come in are getting the worst of it because they have a tribal fund and the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is using that tribal money which belongs to these Indians who do not want to have anything to do with that system, to perpetuate that very system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the least this Congress can do is to amend the Wheeler-Howard Act so that if an Indian does not want to come in, he can stay out. Let the Indian come in with his own money if he wants to come in, and let the Indian stay out

who wants to stay out; but at the same time, let his money stay out. Do not permit his money or his tribal funds to be used to put over a program which he does not want to take part in. It is creating so much dissension among the Indian families where we had peace for 50 years until this came along. Their program of handling cattle has been good; that is, their program of going into a common enterprise in the raising of cattle. It is just about the same thing we have done on Indian lands for the past 50 years of grazing the cattle in common and then in the fall we ship them out and divide the money. But we have our individual interest in those cattle. Our brand is on those cattle. My neighbor may ship my cattle with my brand on them, but I get the pay for those cattle. But there are a lot of Indians, just as there used to be years ago, who do not know anything about the title to land. All the Indian knew was the right to occupy the land and when he quit occupying it, it was common property for anybody else. These Indians all over North Dakota have pieces of property which belong to them and upon which they live. They occupy the land. They are learning how to farm and they are learning how to produce cattle and they do not want the title of this land taken away from them and put into a common enterprise. They want to retain the fruits of their individual efforts and their individua gains. I think the sooner Congress amends that act to permit some Indians to go in if they want to and other Indians to stay out if they want to stay out and keep their funds separate, the sooner we will have peace established on these Indian reservations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the report of the committee which accompanies this bill makes a reference, on page 10, to the Sherman Institute, which is situated at Riverside in California. Since the testimony on this school in detail did not get into the transcript, I think that perhaps I should make a very brief comment on the situation there. For example, the report reduces the appropriation on the basis that the number of students in the school has been reduced from 450 to 400. I suspect that the number 450 in itself is a reduction from the number of students who would represent a maximum number or even an average number in normal times. Therefore, I think it should be stated in the record we are making this afternoon that the reason there is not a greater number of students now is because of the number of the boys who would otherwise be there, as well as of girls, who have entered the armed services or who have entered war industries.

I have the figures and records concerning these boys and girls and the training that they have been given in this particular school has been a matter of very material help in the war effort. After the war is over there is going to be a problem before this committee, and presumably before the Committee on Indian Affairs, as to what shall be done with these schools and what shall be done about the future of that type of education which has been furnished the Indian in the past. I think we should also state in the record this afternoon that when the war is over and the Indians who are serving in the armed forces and similar services are discharged, there will come for them, as for other groups of American citizens, a very real need for rehabilitation. In discussions recently with representatives of the Bureau of Indian Affairs I find it is the desire of that Bureau to use the very excellent facilities which exist at Sherman Institute for rehabilitation. I say that since the report of the committee, which accompanies the bill, specifically mentions this school by name, we should at least put in the record at this point a statement regarding the present use of the school, the very great services it has already rendered, and the service it can render in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For personal services in the District of Columbia and other necessary expenses, $95,000, including not to exceed $3,500 for printing and binding.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have now reached the portion of this bill that has to do with the Bureau of Reclamation. In the report of the committee I read certain language which I would like to read to the House:

Another fundamental question on which the committee wishes to express an opinion is that having to do with the sale of power developed in connection with reclamation projects and distributed in a competitive market. The committee believes that under present circumstances this practice is unsound and unfair, and that the construction of transmission lines, substations, etc., result in taking much valuable property off the tax rolls, to the detriment of the tax structures of many communities.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to that for a couple of minutes. I cannot read that language any other way than having it mean that the committee is saying that when money is spent on a reclamation project and the development of power is incident thereto, that that power resulting from falling water—and if anything in the world is the gift of God that is—shall not be sold in a market where any private utility has preempted that market beforehand. Such a doctrine is certainly not going to pass unchallenged as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I agree with the gentleman, because while I approved of the bill as a whole, I did not approve of that part of it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much. I was sure he felt that way. If that is what this report means, I cannot remain silent; I flatly and completely disagree with it.

It is not true that every community in America, because some public utility has heretofore served it at possibly high rates, has to be doomed to continue to pay those high rates forever and a day, even though money is expended on a public power development which might make possible a reduction of those rates. To say that is to attempt to stop dead the hope of our people for a progressively higher standard of living and lower costs of agricultural and other production.

In the second place, the fight that some of us have carried on has been for the further development of the Central Valley project, whereby there might have been constructed transmission lines so that the sale of this power, made possible by the expenditure of many millions of dollars of public funds at Shasta Dam, might have been handled in the most economical, possible way. We have wanted that power sold in such a way as to have brought it as cheaply as possible to the people who would use it; in such a way as to have yielded the best revenue to the Government. Without a transmission line outlet so that there can be more than one possible customer such a realization is impossible.

I am not offering an amendment. I know it would be useless to try to do so in the present temper of the Congress. But I do want to point out that once you spend public money to build a dam where there is going to be the development of power, the only sensible thing to do is to make that a coordinated and rounded development and enable yourself to sell that power in such a way as to give the maximum possible benefit to the people.

Furthermore, the cost to farmers for water in connection with this project is going to be reduced to the extent that power revenues are increased. And power revenues will never be increased by selling it all to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. at the dam, nor by increasing rates so as to avoid competition with that huge concern or any other one.

The report states further:

It is the consensus of the committee that in establishing power rates for the sale of project power, the Department and other Federal agencies concerned should take these factors into consideration and that the additional sums received through increased rates should be applied to payments in lieu of taxes where justified, and in reimbursing the Government for the construction costs of the power and irrigation features of such projects.

Let me thrice underline the words "through increased rates."

Revenues should of course be used where possible for payment in lieu of

taxes. They should of course be used for retiring the cost of construction. But the right way to increase revenues is not by increasing rates so as not to compete with the rate structure of private utilities. On the contrary the way to increase revenues is to reduce rates where economically feasible and to induce greatly increased volume of consumption, and a little bit later on this very report refers to the Tennessee Valley Authority and points out that the T. V. A. is going to pay $2,155,000 in lieu of taxes to States and counties in that area. Why? Because T. V. A. reduced its rates in order that people all through that area, not only farm consumers and city home consumers, but industrial and commercial establishments and everybody else, could greatly increase their consumption of electricity; and in accordance with the old fundamental principle of economics that volume production at low rates will bring more revenue in the long run than smaller production at high rates the T. V. A. has reached today the position to which the committee points with pride.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It has been possible by a reduction of those rates and increasing consumption to put the thing on a basis where they have a sound project and where it is possible not only to serve the people at rates which are commensurate with the real cost of the electric energy but also to make those payments in lieu of taxes, which I am, of course, strongly in favor of.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. There would be no chance for the people to get away from high costs unless they had a chance to be relieved through this method.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly; in other words, this report seems to me to be a complete repudiation of the whole use of a public power project as a yardstick to determine what the real cost ought to be. In my own section of the country the City of Los Angeles is served by the Los Angeles Bureau of Water and Power, a publicly owned agency. Right side by side with that agency and in the area I happen to represent, the Southern California Edison Co. serves us. The Southern California Edison Co. has not been driven out of business, but it does furnish electricity at rates that are comparable to those charged by the Los Angeles Bureau of Water and Power, and those rates have been reduced about eleven times since Boulder Dam was built, and they ought to have been reduced eleven times. So ought other rates in other sections to be reduced insofar as they can be.

It seems to me that this program for increased rates in order that they may reduce taxes in a community is going the sales tax one better; in other words you charge all the farmers, all the consumers, and everybody else in a community an increased cost for electricity and then you reduce taxes. I do not want high taxes any more than anyone else, but if you follow this idea out to its logical conclusion, you would make the rates for electricity in Los Angeles high enough to relieve every piece of exceedingly valuable property in the center of that city of any tax payments at all, and it would be done at the expense of every little consumer of electricity in the place.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Can the gentleman tell me whether the price at which Central Valley power is being sold at the present time is comparable with the price of electric energy in Los Angeles?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know whether the rates are exactly comparable or not. I doubt it. But Central Valley power from Shasta Dam is only beginning to be made available. And that power is to be sold en bloc, the whole output to one purchaser, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. There is where the trouble lies.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that in my respectful opinion the recommendation of the committee with regard to this matter would, if carried out, mean that wherever a private utility has staked its claim against the falling water which God gave to all the people, then in that case no public power project should sell power in competition with that private utility or reduce rates below those already established by the power company, no matter if those rates are far higher than can be economically justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to remind the Members that when the Central Valley project in the State of California was proposed, the people, especially of northern California, were told time and time again that the completion of the power features of the project would enable them to enjoy a considerable reduction in their power bills. The Central Valley project was to be constructed for the people. At the time we were practically assured that power would not be sold to a private agency; but now that about $150,000,000 has been spent on the northern end of the project we find it has changed from what was intended in the beginning to be a project to bring water to the parched lands of the San Joaquin Valley, into a power project pure and simple. To date not one shovelful of dirt has been removed to provide the canals to bring the water to the farmers.

What has happened? We have heard the Secretary of the Interior say time and time again on the radio, to public gatherings, and we have read statements he has made in the press, to the effect that the people of the State of California would receive cheap power. Last year just at the time when it seemed that power would be made available to the people in the State of California, as had been promised, all of the power generated at the northern end of that project was contracted to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. up to and including 1949. So the picture we have now is that a project that was set up originally to bring water to the San Joaquin Valley has been turned into a power project with all the power contracted to one company. It has been misrepresented to the people by the Secretary. As many members of the Committee on Appropriations know only too well, over $20,000,000 has been spent for the Friant Dam. Through that dam there goes to waste today water to the extent of 900,000 acre-feet a year, and not one dollar has been spent to excavate and open the canals that are so badly needed at the present time in the State of California to bring the relief the project was set up to afford. So the truth has not been told to the people at all. It was supposed to be a project, first, to bring water to the San Joaquin Valley. We got nothing. Then the people were told they would get cheap power, but after the Federal Government has spent its money in building the power projects the Secretary of the Interior sells it to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

What are we, the people most concerned, to do? As I have said before, I now repeat, partly why I am a Member of Congress is to see what I could do to bring water to the people of the San Joaquin Valley. At present we have a drought in that area threatening to starve our livestock. They will soon be starving unless they are moved out of there. Because of the maze of rules and regulations, those people who had hoped for relief have received none; they have received only misrepresentation and promises.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that because of war priorities the material is not available to complete the project?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will answer the gentleman by saying that no material is needed to excavate the 160 miles of canal that must be constructed first. Moving dirt requires no steel, requires no material; and the equipment is available in the San Joaquin Valley. My associates and I have furnished the War Production Board, the War Food Administrator, and the War Manpower Commission complete lists of the equipment that is available; and the contractors, 14 of them, sent telegrams and letters assuring that they had manpower available to do the work. They need only 250 men for a period of 8 or 9 months for this excavation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But there is a priority of materials in that section; the gentleman knows that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

For continuation of construction of the following projects and for general investigations and administrative expenses in not to exceed the following amounts, respectively, to be expended from the general fund of the Treasury in the same manner and for the same objects of expenditures as specified for projects included hereinbefore in this act under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation" under the heading "Administrative provisions and limitations," but without regard to the amounts of the limitations therein set forth, to be immediately available, to remain available until expended, and to be reimbursable under the reclamation law:

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask a question or two in order that we might have the RECORD show what the facts are. I inquire in reference to the water conservation and utilization projects found on page 65 of the bill, wherein we appropriate $1,420,000, and I would like to ask if there has been any money heretofore appropriated that will be available for expenditure in addition to this amount?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. How much?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will turn to page 15 of the report he will find that there is an unobligated balance of $4,346,383 for such purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. And this bill continues to make that available?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. The limitation of expenditures appearing in the bill, lines 7 to 11, inclusive, page 59, does not apply to these small water conservation projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No. This limitation applies to projects provided in the bill to be paid from the reclamation fund. The projects to which the gentleman refers are appropriated from general fund money and, therefore, will not be affected by this limitation at all.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the committee continued the language in this bill providing that prisoners of war and other internees in the country may be used for the construction of much needed water projects. The continuation of prisoner of war camps in this country is costing the taxpayers a great deal of money and it is only just, fair, and sound that these prisoners be used for worth-while construction work. We do not have much food in this country. The recent order freezing corn on the farms in some 125 counties in the United States indicates that we have a most serious problem in reference to available corn. We need more of all these products and I hope that before many months have elapsed these war prisoners may be used on some of these potential food projects which under the Case-Wheeler Act might be started by using war prisoners, thus saving the taxpayers a great deal of money especially at this time when we are so pressed for food.

The Clerk read as follows:

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For the construction of water conservation and utilization projects and small reservoirs, including not to exceed $140,000 for surveys, investigations, and administrative expenses in connection therewith (of which not to exceed $22,500 shall be available for personal services in District of Columbia), all as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590y, 590z), $1,420,000.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE:

Page 65, line 8, strike out "$140,000" and insert "$120,000."

Page 65, line 12, strike out "$1,420,000" and insert "$1,400,000: *Provided*, That any funds appropriated to and unexpended by the Department of Agriculture for carrying out functions assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture by the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, are hereby transferred to the Department of the Interior together with the functions which the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to perform."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered is designed to facilitate the work of the Department of the Interior in promoting water conservation and utilization projects under the terms of the original act of August 11, 1939, as amended, and particularly as amended by the act of October 14, 1940, by consolidating in the Bureau of Reclamation work that is now divided between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

Under the present law the Secretary of the Interior is required to make a finding of feasibility on certain bases, then the law states in section 3:

In connection with each such investigation, report and finding, the Secretary—

That is the Secretary of the Interior—

shall consult with the Secretary of Agriculture regarding participation in the proposed project by the Department of Agriculture under the authority of sections 5 and 6 and the Secretary—

That is the Secretary of the Interior—

shall also transmit to the President a report by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President on the participation, if any, proposed by the Department of Agriculture.

Section 3 is the section which details various steps, at least seven different things, on which the finding of the Secretary of the Interior must be based and on which he must consult the Secretary of Agriculture. Each report and each consultation consumes time, labor, and money.

In the language I have just quoted the Secretary of the Interior is required to consult with the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the very many provisions in sections 5 and 6 with regard to cooperative agreements, arranging for the settlement of the project, extension of guidance of the settlers, acquisition of land, arrangement for improvement of the land, subjugation of the land, and so forth.

In actual operation, Mr. Chairman, we have found that this has operated to delay and slow up the program of these projects. The effect of my amendment is directed to require a saving of $20,000 in the investigation which would be more than saved by the elimination of this double passing back and forth; and in addition to that, on the basis of my talks with those who are administering the act, I am convinced that it would mean more as far as the welfare of the country is concerned in effectively pushing forward the program.

The Bureau of Reclamation, with regard to the large, regular reclamation projects, does all of these things that here we have divided between two different agencies for handling with respect to these very small water conservation and utilization projects. Obviously, if the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, can handle all these matters with regard to the large irrigation projects, it is a much simpler thing for them to handle the same problems with respect to these very small projects.

The amendment will save time, money, and personnel for the Government, Mr. Chairman, and on that basis I urge its adoption.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is author of the original legislation which he now proposes to amend and in view of the fact that the gentleman is very much interested, deeply concerned, and very familiar with this legislation, taken in connection with the statement he has just made that it will facilitate the expenditure of these funds, the committee does not feel that it should make a point of order against the amendment and will not oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], for whom the committee has such high regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized, during the fiscal year 1945, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated from funds appropriated to the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee paid high tribute to the work of the Bureau of Mines throughout our war effort. I join him in that deserved tribute, coming as I do from a great mining State, I have appreciated what needed to be done for mining and what mining could mean

to our Nation at war in this age of mechanization. A few minutes ago I criticized the meagerness of this appropriation measure in certain respects, but I want to praise the committee for all that portion of the bill pertaining to the Bureau of Mines from page 70 to page 85. Now this is more nearly what we have been struggling for for years, even before the present World War began.

The language of the bill speaks for itself. It is but a continuation of the generous support we have lately given the Bureau of Mines when we commissioned these scientific men to go forth and find what we have in the earth within our own borders, and to show us how we can put the strategic and critical minerals and metals to the greatest possible use. Undoubtedly we shall go far into the age of lighter metals following the war as we have done during it. That phase of development is justly stressed. I confess I have been a little discouraged in what I regarded as the inadequate encouragement given the small mine operators during the war. But this promotion of the mining industry in its newest phases through the Bureau of Mines is partial compensation. Even the new fuels have not been overlooked, though I am somewhat disappointed that our latest authorization is not carried out in this appropriation.

It will be recalled that some weeks ago the House passed a bill authorizing the appropriation of $30,000,000 to establish pilot plants and develop the "know how" of transforming coal, shale, and other substances into liquid fuel. A subcommittee of the House Mines and Mining Committee, headed by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and of which I am also glad to be a member, urged the passage of this measure both as a wartime measure and as a needed post-war requirement. During the first week of this month the President signed this measure and it became law. I know, of course, that that was too late for this subcommittee to implement the act by an appropriation in the bill before us now. But I do feel that such an appropriation for that purpose would have rounded out quite properly the whole appropriation for the Bureau of Mines contained in the bill before us. We are entering upon a new age of science in regard to the utilization of wealth taken as raw material from the earth and the Bureau of Mines is admirably fitted to point the way, which fact is recognized by these appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

For salaries of the Governor and employees incident to the execution of the acts of March 3, 1917 (48 U. S. C. 1391), and June 22, 1936 (48 U. S. C. 1405v), traveling expenses of officers and employees, repair, preservation, and care of Federal buildings and furniture, purchase of equipment, stationery, lights, water, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed $4,000 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, fuel, ice, and electricity necessary in the operation of Government House at St. Thomas and Government House at St. Croix, $208,375: *Provided*, That the executive assistant to the Governor shall be appointed by and with the approval of the Governor.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proviso beginning on line 24, page 102, and ending on line 2 of page 103 of the bill, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. Appropriations available for expenses of travel of officers and employees of the Department shall be available for traveling expenses of new appointees from Seattle, Wash., or from any point within Alaska, to their posts of duty in Alaska, and return.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been debating whether or not I should say anything with reference to the power situation, but, compelled by what I believe to be my duty, I want to say that I am very much disturbed about the situation in the Pacific Northwest. Take, for instance, the Central Valley Authority. The farmers out there a few years ago decided they wanted to irrigate their arid lands, and they created what was known as the Central Valley Authority.

Since then—the original estimate of that Authority being about $170,000,000—the Government has been requested to advance the necessary funds to construct the project and there has been spent over $150,000,000, and not one acre of ground has been irrigated to this very moment. They must spend millions more in order to finish the project. Since then, municipality after municipality has abandoned its power facilities in order to use public power and thereby they have lost the revenues from those activities. The original purpose for creating the Central Valley Authority was not to generate and sell power but to irrigate the lands of central California. Power facilities were added to assist the farmers and other landowners in paying the cost of water and in this way the project was made economically feasible. However, now they propose to sell the power for as little as possible in place of getting enough out of it to assist those water users in defraying the cost of irrigation.

I want to tell you gentlemen in the Pacific Northwest, a few years from now you will be coming to Congress and saying, "You ought to help us with our State, county, and municipal governments; you ought to help us with our schools, because this project has taken away our tax money." Rates should be established sufficiently high to reimburse your county, district, and State taxes lost, in order to be fair with private enterprise.

I am saying to you now that the time has come for you to exert yourselves and first of all try to save private enterprise; secondly, try to save the tax structure of your counties and your States, because if I am in Congress I propose to charge you then on that future day with what I am charging you now, and that is, if you want to have public power, have it and charge rates sufficiently high as to raise revenues to replace your tax losses. No other course than that will be sufficient. I am saying to you gentlemen you are going to face a real problem out there, and I want to say to the Central Valley Authority water users to take some concurring charge of their project. I am not willing to vote millions of dollars out of the Federal Treasury, if you please, gentlemen of the committee, in order that a great project should be constructed, one that challenges the imagination of all human beings everywhere, one that brings water to the Central Valley Authority where they need it—and, at the same time ruin the tax structures of your State and counties, cities and school districts. Loss of revenues from destroyed revenue-producing projects must be replaced or you must suffer, also this project should not be used to destroy any character of private enterprise. Force reasonable rates, yes, but not to destroy.

Your desert or arid land needs water. Give your land plenty of water and certainly that section of California shall be the garden spot of your State. I am saying to you that we ought to see to it that water is supplied, because we are going to call upon the citizens of California to pay this money back, and if you do not get enough power revenue out of your power activities in order to help pay for the water rights, you are not going to be able to take care of the assessments that necessarily will come and this would be harmful to your section and detrimental to reclamation throughout the Nation. You must obtain a considerable sum out of your power revenues in order to make the repayment to the Federal Government.

I am expecting you to help run that project, and I am expecting you to pay every dollar that is properly chargeable to power and water into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago my attention was called to a situation in my State where the Department of Agriculture was sending people about to secure from the farmers answers to certain questions. At that time I spoke of it on the floor of the House.

I have here a questionnaire from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, and I want to read it to you:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Budget Bureau No. 40-4414
Approval expires 6-30-44

Date _____ Sched. No. _____

Interviewer _____ Community _____

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

A. GENERAL DATA

A—

H—

1. Name _____

2. Residence _____ B—

3. Household Composition:

Given name	Sex	Relation to head	Marital status	Age	Schooling completed	Major source of cash earnings and percent of total earnings		Employer or place of business
						Occupation	%	
(1)		Head						
(2)								
(3)								
(4)								
(5)								
(6)								
(7)								E—
(8)								F—

4. Birthplace of head _____ 5. Wife _____

6. Birthplace of father of head _____ 7. Ethnic group _____

8. Year of arrival in community (of head) _____ (No. of yrs. ____) C-

9. Last previous residence _____ I-

10. Number of California towns you have lived in since 1935 _____

11. Number of towns outside California you have lived in since 1935 _____

12. Give acreage for 3 major crops: (1) _____ a. (2) _____ a.
(3) _____ a. Total acreage _____ (A.-E. size _____)

Tenure _____ (Type of farm _____) G- D-

13. How many separate jobs have you held since 1935 _____

14. What do you consider your home town _____

15. Does this neighborhood go by a special name _____ What _____

Just listen to this silly stuff:

B. MEMBERSHIPS

1. Church and/or Sunday school membership:

Household member	Name of church	Place	Frequency of attendance	Status	Earlier affiliation	J

(Total members _____; total attenders _____; percent churchgoers _____)

2. Did any member of your family change denominations upon coming to this town, or since you have been here _____ 3. If so, what was former affiliation (indicate in last column of question 1).

4. Do you attend church more or less frequently now than before the change _____

5. Club memberships (check through list of clubs and ask for any additional ones):

Household member	Name of club	Meeting place	Frequency of attendance	Office	K

(Total memberships _____; memberships per person _____)

6. What informal activities did members of your family participate in?

Type of activity	Number of participations per year for each family member								Total members	Total events
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
(a) School functions										
(b) Card parties										
(c) Picnics										
(d) Dances										
(e) Movies										
(f) Community affairs										
Total										

7. Do you have a small group of close friends? ---- Number in group ----
8. Where do they live? ----
19. What do they do? ----
10. Do they all belong to one church or club? ---- What one? ----
11. List families with whom you visited regularly in 1943 and in 1940 (if different) and whom you consider your more intimate friends:

Name	Occupation or tenure	Related	Ethnic group	Number visits in—		Residence	Year
				Their home	Your home		

(1943: Total families visited---- Total visits paid----)
(1940: Total families visited---- Total visits paid----)

12. Do you do more or less visiting now than in 1940? ----
Why? ----

C. ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION

Econ. Part. Index: /

1. Where did you regularly purchase or obtain the following before gasoline rationing was instituted:

Commodity or service	Firm	Community	Coding	
			Firm	Community
Groceries				
Men's clothes				
Women's clothes				
Gas and oil				
Farm machinery				
Feed and seed				
Banking				
Doctor				
Movies				
Newspapers				

(Total local ---- Total resp. ----; total in com. ---- total resp. ----)

2. Where do you go to hire labor ----
2a. Where do you go to find work ----
3. Did you have vegetable garden in 1943 ---- in 1941 ----
4. Did you keep chickens in 1943 ---- in 1941 ----
5. Did you have a cow in 1943 ---- in 1941 ----

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask whether the cow was dry or not?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have not come to that yet. Wait a minute. Then they ask this:

6 Approximately what was your family income in 1943 (check one):

Under $750	----
$751–$1,250	----
$1,251–$1,750	----
$1,751–$2,250	----
$2,251–$2,750	----
$2,751–$3,250	----
$3,251–$4,250	----
$4,251–$5,250	----
$5,251–$11,000	----
Over $11,000	----

These investigators are going out into the agricultural communities with a lot of these silly, asinine questions, when the farmers are trying to produce foodstuffs despite the shortage in manpower, when part of their help has been taken away from them.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman should say that the snooper that did this is being paid $212 a month and $5.60 a day for the expenses of his car, and he is promised that that bureau of the Department of Agriculture will see that he gets the necessary gasoline, in spite of the fact that the farmers cannot get gasoline.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is correct. And I thank him for his contribution.

Now listen to the rest of these questions:

Schedule No. ----
Code value: ----

D. Socio-economic status (enter or encircle proper answer):

1. Construction: Brick, stucco, painted frame, unpainted frame, other ---- ----
2. Number of rooms ---- (rooms per person ----) ----
3. Water piped in house: Yes; No ---- ----
4. Lighting: Electric, gas, pressure, other ---- ----
5. Refrigeration: Mechanical, ice, other, or none ---- ----
6. Radio: Yes; No ---- ----
7. Telephone: Yes; No ---- ----
8. Automobile: Yes; No. Make ----; year ---- ----
9. Characterize premises of home by one of following: ----
   a. Well kept with decorative planting.
   b. Some decorative planting has been done.
   c. No planting, but neat and clean.
   d. Littered and dirty premises.
10. Characterize exterior of house by one of following: ----
    a. Neat and well painted.
    b. Old, dirty, or scaling paint.
    c. No paint or stain.
11. Characterize interior of house by one of following: ----
    a. Decorated with carpets and curtains, all in good order.
    b. Poorly decorated, but neat and clean.
    c. Untidy interior.
    d. Extremely dirty.

(Church membership of head ----) ---- ----
(Church membership of wife ----) ---- ----
(Education of head ----)-- ----
(Education of wife ----)-- ----

Total (L/L index) ---- ----

Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, now, this country is at war. We hear talk about the shortage of paper, about the shortage of manpower, about the shortage of tires and gasoline; yet many people are on the pay roll, going around and taking up the time of people who have something else to do besides giving answers to these silly questions. The taxpayers are paying for all this. I just do not like it, and I wonder how long Congress is going to sit around here without putting a stop to this foolishness.

Secretary Ickes, through the Bureau of Reclamation, is paying the Bureau of

Agricultural Economics $70,000 of taxpayers' money in connection with the Central Valley project. I trust and pray that that money is not being wasted in the manner that their activities show here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very timely remarks of the gentleman from California. For months and months I have said that I have been fed up with these insane, ridiculous, inexcusable questionnaires that have been sent out not by the Department of the Interior but by the Department of Agriculture and other departments. I think the time is long past due when we should put a stop to such asinine questionnaires, which are an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

I call attention to the fact that this questionnaire was sent out by another department. If anybody knows of any such foolish questionnaire that is sent out by the Department of the Interior, I would appreciate it if he would call the attention of this committee to it. We have tried to eliminate that practice. There has been too much of it in this Department. We have eliminated some of these questionnaires, and we hope to eliminate many more before we get through.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, but he is also a part of the general committee. May I hope that he will see to it that when the agricultural appropriation bill comes up there will be a provision in the bill preventing such tomfoolery?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for this next year has already gone through. I have repeatedly called attention to these foolish and impractical questionnaires, and I repeat that the time is long past due when there ought to be a stop put to it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD where the reading of the provision for the Bureau of Mines was concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have just listened to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] bewail the fact that private enterprise may not survive. We just heard the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT], and also a member of the committee which has charge of the bill we are considering, condemn in no uncertain terms a prying, inquisitorial, unjustifiable questionnaire that is being put out by an agency of the Government. This morning, through the press and over the radio, our attention was called to the fact that private enterprise is on the way out, if this administration has its way. When the second greatest mail-order concern in the Nation is taken over and deprived of the privilege of doing business, and the only apparent purpose is to aid a labor union, it is time that Congress does something about it. We are responsible for the destruction of free enterprise, of civil liberties, if we let this administration continue on its arbitrary drive for dictatorial power. Some have wondered just why the President should have issued this order, if he did issue it. Some have wondered why the Army and armed men with guns should go into the office of Montgomery Ward & Co. and carry the president of the company out and put him in the street as did two soldiers of the Army today while acting on instructions from Attorney General Biddle. Perhaps I have in my hand an indication of the solution. It may be that the move is wholly political. That the President is willing the C. I. O. shall coerce working men and women until they become dues-paying members. As you will recall, the War Labor Board issued an order that the company should sign a contract with the maintenance-of-membership clause in it. That meant and means, if the company signed, that all those in the company's employ who belong to the C. I. O. must continue therein for another year and must comply with all of the union rules and actions, pay all union dues and assessments. Here is a copy of a bill put out by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, Cleveland Industrial Union Council C. I. O., 1000 Walnut Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. It indicates the course that is being followed there and which undoubtedly will be followed in Chicago. The top of that circular reads as follows:

THE C. I. O. DOLLAR CAMPAIGN FOR POLITICAL ACTION

THE CAMPAIGN

One dollar contribution to the political action fund by every C. I. O. member.

There are some 5,000 Montgomery Ward employees who are eligible for C. I. O. membership. It has in all some 78,000 employees. Let me continue reading. This is a goal set by the Cleveland C. I. O. in this one union:

Fifty thousand dollars as financial goal to be raised in a lively 3-month drive.

Each C. I. O. local union has been assigned a quota of contributions in proportion to size of membership.

Prizes to local unions that fulfill their goals first.

Then in another bill:

THE C. I. O. DOLLAR CAMPAIGN

It takes money to put up a real fight. The Cleveland C. I. O. Political Action Committee has a plan for financing. Here it is:

The plan—$1 from each.

Each C. I. O. member is being called upon to pitch in a buck. As a receipt each contributor will be given a swell lapel button, showing he did his part.

The political action buttons will soon be in your shop. Have your dollar ready.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is there anything in that leaflet, or does the gentleman know of his own knowledge whether these members are compelled to contribute a dollar; or is it not a fact that this contribution is a voluntary contribution?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is supposed to be voluntary, just as joining the union is voluntary when they have a picket line around the plant. It is voluntary as paying dues is voluntary. You know how that works when a dues-paying picket line is thrown around a plant. You either pay or you get out of the union, and under the contract with the employer where there is a maintenance-of-membership clause if you do not pay you lose your job. In one union of which I have knowledge C. I. O. men have assessed against them an extra dollar. Some 300 union men of the C. I. O are ready to lay their regular monthly assessment of $1.50 right on the line. Under the union rule the union will not accept the $1.50 monthly dues until the employees pay the dollar political assessment. The result is that unless each union man comes across with a dollar for the political fund which is to be used to aid in the reelection of the President, he may be out of the union and out of a job. From the foregoing can any inference be drawn as to the reason for the effort to force Ward's into a contract with the union?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not use the 5 minutes, but I think that the RECORD should be clear on the matter of these contributions to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. These contributions are purely voluntary. A union member has a perfect right to contribute or not to contribute. No union member is forced to contribute and when the gentleman from Michigan refers to these voluntary contributions as "dues," then I am compelled to state that he certainly is beclouding the issue and is leaving the record most confused and misleading.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why it is that the C. I. O. union in the 1900 Corporation of Benton Harbor will not accept the monthly dues until the members pay this dollar assessment?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am sure if the gentleman checks that information which he has now given us he will find it is not correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It was given to me by a member of the union within the week.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Again I say, if the gentleman checks that information he will find that it is not correct. All of these contributions are voluntary. Just as unions appeal to their memberships for contributions to the Red Cross national war fund and other charitable causes, labor has a right to ask for voluntary contributions from its membership in order to protect its rights and defend labor against its enemies in the political field. Business does it, finance does it. Every enterprise in America does it. Why do you complain when labor seeks voluntary contributions from its membership for political purposes? Labor has a right to organize. Labor has a right to engage in political action. Labor is now doing it. Labor will continue its political action. It does so as its constitutional and democratic right. No amount of speeches, misinformation, or distortion will stop labor's political activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by forces or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer a corrective amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 105, line 9, strike out the word "forces" and insert the word "force."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. This act may be cited as the "Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945."

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOTT: On page 107, after section 10, insert a new section, numbered section 11, as follows:

"SEC. 11. No part of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salary of any male person between the ages of 18 and 30 years who is physically and mentally qualified for military duty, as shown by his selective-service classification, and who has been deferred from military duty, either at his own request or the request of the Secretary of the Interior, for reasons other than dependency or as necessary to war production, and who, 30 days after the approval of this act, still retains such deferment."

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman. I have examined this thoroughly, and the gentleman will find no language in the amendment except pure language of limitation. If the gentleman can point out where there is any language except language of limitation I would like to hear what it is.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Should that not be in the paragraph that contains the appropriation?

Mr. MOTT. It should not be. This is at the end of the bill which appropriates money in every paragraph. It is the only logical place where such an amendment could be placed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DELANEY). The Chair is ready to rule. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment is a limitation, and the point of order is overruled.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, ever since the war began we have been reading about the unwarranted deferments of Government employees within military age, who are physically qualified for military duty, and who have no dependents. We have read the recent reports of the Military Affairs Subcommittee which disclosed that most of these improper deferments were made at the request of the heads of the various executive departments and agencies of the Government, and that the practice was prevalent in nearly all of them.

In regard to the Interior Department, the practice there, in my opinion, has been exceptionally obnoxious. The Secretary of the Interior, you will remember, on a number of occasions, according to the reports, has stated that he had not been asking for enough deferments; that he intended to ask for more. I believe every Member of this body was shocked to read the report of the Committee on Appropriations when it presented this Interior Department appropriation bill to the House yesterday. You have all read what it has to say about deferments in that Department. I just want to read one line of it now.

Statistics set forth on pages 8 to 11, part 1 of the hearings, show that as of February 15, 1944, there were 6,696 male employees 18 to 37 years of age, holding positions in the Department; that of this number, 2,221 had received occupational deferments, and that of this latter figure 2,073 were deferred at the specific request of the Department. The report goes on to say that the committee condemns this practice and that it has endeavored to impress upon the heads of bureaus that this situation must be eliminated without undue delay.

I call your attention to the fact, however, that the report does not propose that the Congress do anything about it. I propose that we shall do something about it, and I propose that we do it now. That is the purpose of my amendment.

The amendment I have offered is a very mild one. It will harm no employee who is legitimately entitled to deferment, but it will effectively stop the practice of deferring those who are not entitled to it. It simply provides that "no part of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salary of any male persons between the ages of 18 and 30 years who is physically and mentally qualified for military duty, as shown by his selective-service classification, and who has been deferred from military duty, either at his own request or the request of the Secretary of the Interior, for reasons other than dependency or as necessary to war production, and who, 30 days after the approval of this act, still retains that deferment."

This is a fair and a very direct method of curing a disgraceful and unfair practice which has been carried on not only by the head of this Department but by the heads of a number of other executive agencies of the Government. This is the only way, Mr. Chairman, by which we can do it, because we know from past experience, from reports of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, that the heads of these executive agencies never will do it on their own account. They may have extended some promises to the Committee on Appropriations, as the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma has said, but my opinion is that those promises will not be carried out, and that this is the only effective way to compel the heads of these departments and executive agencies to heed the spirit of the Selective Service Act, which is to afford fair and equal treatment to everyone who is subject to the clear provisions of that act.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman's amendment is timely and good and necessary, and I shall be pleased to support it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman does not want to incorporate in his amendment those technical duties, such as those engaged in the mapping division?

Mr. MOTT. No. That would clearly be classified as war production. The Mapping Division makes the maps which the Army uses, and my amendment specifically excepts those engaged in war production in the Interior Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think our committee went pretty strong in pouring it on the Department because of its laxity in this matter.

Mr. MOTT. I have already congratulated the gentleman for pouring it on in his committee report. I think he did a fine job, but he poured it on rhetorically, while in this amendment I am endeavoring to pour it on legislatively.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am wondering if it is not pouring it on too much. I am of the opinion that the gentleman's amendment would go far enough to include geologists—and I am so advised—engineers, technicians, chemists, doctors, scientists in the Bureau of Mines who are not actually in war production, but who are doing something that is very important in developing the war program.

Mr. MOTT. The work of chemists, doctors, scientists, and other technicians in the Bureau of Mines doing work necessary for the prosecution of the war has already been classified as work in war production. It is exempted as such by the language of my amendment. There is no question about that classification.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does not the gentleman think there is some question as to how much irreplaceability has been accumulated by the age of 26 in these people? Does not the gentleman think they can be spared?

Mr. MOTT. They can be spared, and they are certainly not irreplaceable. According to the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee here on the floor today, there are hundreds of physically fit young men within the draft age and without dependents down in the Interior Department who are performing little or no useful work at all. They should be in uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no knowledge about the deferment situation in the Department of the Interior, but I have a very strong conviction that this is not the right way to legislate. We have a Committee on Military Affairs which is dealing with this question now. It is within their jurisdiction and we ought to leave it there, because we do not know anything about the details of it and this is not the way to legislate. It is not going to help this Congress to adopt such proposals as this as riders on appropriation bills. That is why the country criticizes us so much, because we take snap judgment about things which cause us to have emotional feelings.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. The last time I was in the Navy Department they had fine, strapping Marines acting as messenger boys down there. Why not clean up that agency before tacking riders onto this appropriation bill about things we have not had any chance to go into?

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. May I inquire whether the gentleman saw any fine, strapping young fellows in civilian clothes?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not know. There may be some down there. I think, no doubt, there are some in every agency of the Government.

Mr. MOTT. Not in the Navy Department.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, I am not so sure about that. The departments all make mistakes. But this is not the way to cure it. We have a committee that has jurisdiction over the matter. They have been investigating it. They ought to bring in legislation and we ought to have the courage to vote to tell the Selective Service what to do about it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman speaks about snap judgment. This matter of deferments in Government departments has been bothering the Congress and has been disturbing to the American people and even the armed forces, and our military leaders for a long time, not only this year but last year. Certainly if the gentleman thinks we have been taking snap judgment, I want to say we have been going into this thing quite thoroughly. The Military Affairs Committee has handed the Appropriation Committee a list of deferments in the Department of the Interior and it does not look very good.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Then why does not the Military Affairs Committee bring in legislation as an amendment to the Selective Service Act, to reach that problem? It is within their jurisdiction. It is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman tell me how that might be reached in a bill from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. They could say you should not defer anybody between the ages of 18 and 30, just as you do in your amendment.

Mr. MOTT. The selective-service law does not say that. The selective-service law provides for the deferment of many people between those ages; those mentally and physically not qualified and those with a sufficient number of dependents. This amendment simply attacks that practice in the Interior Department, of deferring physically and mentally qualified young men without any dependents, and without any use in war production.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; the gentleman by his limitation is doing just this: The Congress passed the Selective Service Act; they put it within the power of the draft boards to make deferments on proper representations made to them. The Congress did that. Now the gentleman says by limitation "notwithstanding the fact that the board has deferred you, because you are a Federal employee working in the Department of the Interior, we are going to overrule your board which passed judgment in accordance with the law that Congress provided." If that makes any sense, I cannot see it.

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman know anything about the pressure that is brought on the selective-service boards when a request for a deferment on occupational grounds comes in from an executive officer in one of these departments?

Mr. RAMSPECK. They certainly do not have to grant it if in their judgment it should not be granted, because the law gives them that specific authority.

Mr. MOTT. The law may give them that specific authority, but great weight is given to a request made by a Cabinet Member. The gentleman does not doubt that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Oh, no; but they ought not to be deferred if in the judgment of the draft board the facts do not warrant it. The gentleman by his amendment would overrule the judgment of the draft board and say to the man that we will put him in the Army notwithstanding the fact that the board exercised its authority under the law as we enacted it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. As a member of the subcommittee that brought in this bill I have gone along with the language in the report; but is it not a fact that if we adopt the amendment now pending we would repeal a law that the Military Affairs Committee has already reported to this House and that we have passed?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. NORRELL. Because that committee gave these departments the right to make these requests, and gave the draft boards the right to defer men. This amendment would repeal that provision of the basic law as it applies to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct, and that is exactly what I am objecting to. I am perfectly willing to put all the able-bodied people in the country in the Army. I voted for the Selective Service Act. If the gentleman from Oregon wants to make a rule that nobody between 18 and 30 who works for the Government shall be deferred and will make it a part of the selective service procedure, all right; but let us not make fish of one and fowl of another; and let us quit this wrong practice of trying to legislate on appropriation bills by riders adopted without proper consideration and which are not general in their application.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. CASE. On the point the gentleman just mentioned, it seems to me the gentleman is confusing the idea. We are not trying to legislate here, we are not trying to change the basic law; we are merely saying that the people of the country are tired of having the taxpayers' money used to pay able-bodied men for running around doing these things.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman from South Dakota is entirely too smart

to make a statement like that, if he will only think about it.

Mr. CASE. We are not talking about whether a man should be deferred or should not be deferred; we are merely saying that public money is not going to be used to pay their salaries.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman knows that the effect is to overrule the action of the local boards charged with responsibility under an act this Congress passed and directed them to execute.

Mr. CASE. It does not overrule them unless it cancels deferments, and the action proposed does not cancel deferments.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is equivalent to saying that a man discharged from employment is not deprived of income because he can get another job. Maybe he can and maybe he cannot; he has first got to get a release from the Government or his employer. But the point I want to make is that I think we ought to change the rule; there ought not to be any limitation in an appropriation bill except where you can show that you are saving some money; otherwise you are simply evading the rule against legislation on appropriation bills by making it in the form of a limitation. In this instance the amendment changes the Selective Service System and it is made to apply to the employees of one department of the Government only.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is because the head of that Department claims special privileges.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that the public and the country criticize this Congress for more than anything else is when we fail to stand up and meet our responsibilities when they come before us. Right here we have a situation where 2,073 men have been deferred at the request of the Interior Department. Their deferment was so questionable and so doubtful that the Military Affairs Committee which has been investigating this situation referred these names to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which was going into the question of an appropriation for the Interior Department. That committee asked questions of the Interior Department about it, and after they were through they wrote this report:

> The committee is disappointed in the showing made by the Department in this connection and is of the opinion that such persons now holding white-collar jobs could in a great majority of cases be replaced without detriment to the war effort. With the growing shortage of manpower throughout the United States and the drafting of many pre-Pearl Harbor fathers in every community in the land, it is deeply to be regretted that so many deferments have been requested for some single men as well as married men with no children holding positions in the Department which the committee considers not to be essential.

We have run into a case where there has been grave abuse on the finding of the committee of this opportunity to request deferments under the Selective Service Act.

Is the Congress of the United States going to dodge and duck its responsibility? Or is it going to stand up to the rack and pass this amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Oregon? I am in hopes that we will stand up and do our duty at this point.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment. I do not believe there is a single case where an injustice will result. I do not believe there are any geologists, chemists, or physicians in the employ of this Department under the age of 30 years whose deferment can be justified.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Why does not the gentleman leave it for the appropriate committee to report legislation if they feel it ought to be done?

Mr. TABER. Because it has been notorious for a long time and nothing has been done.

There is only one way this situation can be reached. The deferment of those who are on the Federal pay roll is a growing scandal; it is something that makes worse feeling among the boys called to serve than anything else we have had.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say in answer to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that I believe the committee would have brought out some legislation had it not been for the fact that we were reasonably assured that action was being taken to eliminate these deferments, and that many of these men were going into the service. In the age group 18 to 21 seven were recently taken into the service, and from the age group 21 to 26 several were taken also.

Mr. TABER. If we pass this amendment the Department will meet its responsibility and cease to ask for the deferment of those who ought to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, although I am granted the right or privilege to do so, I do not concern myself with general legislation unless Alaska is involved. This amendment, while general in its scope, does affect a number of citizens of Alaska and it does affect the operations of the Government in Alaska, therefore I think I ought to invite the attention of the House to the situation which will confront us in the Territory if the pending amendment is agreed to.

We have in Alaska a Government institution known as the Alaska Railroad. It is owned and operated by the United States Government. I have just inquired as to the situation with reference to employees of the Alaska Railroad and I understand that a hundred and some odd are deferred from military service. They are among the number deferred because they are engaged in operating the Alaska Railroad.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Those are exempted.

Mr. DIMOND. I am not so sure about that. I do not know whether they are exempt or not under the language of the amendment. While I have the highest regard and respect for the gentleman from Oregon, I fear that they will be included.

Mr. MOTT. The operation of a railroad in the Territory is war production.

Mr. DIMOND. I do not know whether it is or not. I do want to say, however, if you take these 100 or more men who are employed by the Alaska Railroad and who are now deferred, and they are drawn into the military service, it will merely mean that men will have to be taken from the Army to operate the Alaska Railroad.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. When I have finished this thought. In fact, there was such a shortage of employees on the Alaska Railroad at one time that something like a thousand soldiers were taken out of the Army and assigned to service on the Alaska Railroad. They are working there now. Therefore, I suggest it would be highly unwise to take a few civilians who may be eligible for military service, put them in uniform, then take an equivalent number out of the Army and set them to work on the Alaska Railroad. If an employee of the Alaska Railroad is engaged in hauling supplies for the Army he may be considered to be in war work, but if at other periods of time he is engaged in hauling supplies for civilians, no one knows whether he will then be held to be engaged in war work. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. My question is this: If the employees of Montgomery Ward & Co., the clerks in that establishment, are engaged in war production, does not the gentleman think the engineers and other railroad operators ought to be?

Mr. DIMOND. I am not going to get involved in this Montgomery Ward controversy, because it has nothing to do with the subject I am discussing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman thinks they should be exempt because the railroad might be classified as war production. If these clerks in Montgomery Ward & Co. are engaged in war production certainly your engineers and trainmen will have to be.

Mr. DIMOND. I do not know whether they will be or not. I do not know how far this amendment will go.

Another incident was brought to my attention recently that compels me to speak here today. We have an agency in the country known as the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which does survey work on land and water. The Navy has wanted the Coast and Geodetic Survey to do work in Alaska and that agency

intended to do the work for the Navy, but before the Coast and Geodetic Survey could get the work started, a considerable number of its employees were drawn into the military service, and so the whole work was stopped temporarily until other men may be recruited, if they can be recruited, to carry on the work. This is hard, dangerous work to do, and you cannot take old men, and put them at such jobs. It is necessary to have young, vigorous, active men who can meet this responsibility.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Would this amendment affect the teachers in the schools of Alaska, the male teachers and doctors in your schools and hospitals in Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. I am fearful it might as to some of them. The gentleman knows that the work the teachers of Alaska are doing is helpful in the war effort.

Who is now able to state with any degree of certainty the construction that will be placed on the words "war work" or "war production"? Who will make the final decision? Congress will not be able to make the decision and perhaps the Department, which is now under attack, will feel constrained to hold that none of the employees are really doing war work because they are not employed by the War Department or the Navy Department. If the final decision is left to the Comptroller General of the United States, is anyone able to forecast with assurance just what that judgment will be? So far as the war effort in the Territory of Alaska is concerned, it is likely to be impeded rather than advanced by the adoption of the proposed amendment. Our local boards and appeal boards in Alaska can be depended upon to do justice under the law in all cases of requested deferment, nor is there the slightest reason to suspect that any selective-service official in the Territory will for a moment be influenced by any unfair or unjust demand made by any Government department or official. So far as I am aware, no such demand has been made. Moreover, in principle this proposed amendment, which amounts to indirect piecemeal amendment by limitation to the selective-service law is completely repugnant to the recognized canons of legislative procedure, as has been so ably pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. The proposal is both wrong in principle and likely to be hurtful in operation. I suggest that the amendment should not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the published statements in the newspapers of Washington and the statements that Mr. Ickes made with reference to his insistence on deferment of employees of that Department, and because I have traveled by the Interior Department at times when these bright-eyed young employees were coming out of the building, and this applies also to some of the other Departments of our Government, I try to reconcile what I observe in Washington with what I observe in my own State; when I go back to my district and see a farm upon which an old couple of some 60, 65, or 68 years, trying to operate 160 to 200 acres, with their last son having been taken from that farm, I cannot but favor the pending amendment. When I go back to my home town, it is like a deserted community, with scarcely a man there under the age of 35 years; when I have seen married men, the heads of business, with 3 or 4 little babies in the house, being drafted and their business having to be sold or closed up until their return, I have very little solicitude for whether or not Mr. Ickes is going to be slightly inconvenienced by the war.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached the point in some of our selective service thinking where it is a national scandal as to deferments here in the Nation's Capital. We see young men who have no reason under the sun for being deferred who are deferred, young men able physically, and I hope mentally, able to serve in the Army. I see no reason why we should not do something about it. I want to tell the members of the committee frankly that one of the things that burns most deeply at home is the very fact that the people at home know of these mysterious deferments for these young men here in Washington, and they compare that condition with the condition they are undergoing, trying their patriotic best to carry on their job out there, even though practically every living person under the age of 35 years has been taken from their own homes, their community, or their business. Under such circumstances I do not have a great deal of sympathy about whether or not this is the orderly way of doing it. I say it is time for Congress to do something and, therefore, I am heartily in favor of and will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of calling attention to a bill which I introduced today. The purpose of the bill is to transfer the General Land Office, United States Geological Survey, and Bureau of Mines, all of the Department of the Interior to a city in the Rocky Mountain area. In my opinion, this should have been done a long time ago.

I was impressed with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill. He stated that while many Members of Congress advocated curtailment of expenditures, that practically every Member that appeared before the committee had advocated an increase in appropriations. I might state to my colleague from Oklahoma that in my opinion the bill which I introduced would not only make the administration of these departments more economical but more efficient as well.

The great bulk of the business of the General Land Office, the Geological Survey, and the Bureau of Mines comes from the public-land States of the West. The people of the West having business with these departments are obliged to travel 2,000 miles or more to take up matters with the various departments. During the course of a year thousands of people are obliged to travel thousands of miles, costing considerable money and time, to take up matters with these agencies of government. By the same token, it is necessary for many officials and employees of these departments to travel to the West in order to investigate matters in connection with their departments. It goes without saying that if these departments were centrally located in the western area that they could render far better service to the people having business with them. The nearer we can bring the Government to the people, the better will be the Government. The centralization of Government in this city has had a bad effect on the people of the country, and by the same token the decentralization of these departments would be a move in the right direction. The location of the general offices nearer to the scene of operations is not only good judgment but sound business as well. Some of the major oil companies operating in the Western States not only have their general offices located in that area but have executive vice presidents in charge, with general authority to act. If it is good business for private enterprise to operate in this fashion, it strikes me that it would be just as good for an agency of the Government. I hope that you will study the bill and give it your support.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a moment to say, as I have indicated to the author of this amendment, that I think all of us are in sympathy with what he has in mind, but our committee has already done something about it. We have done so much about it that the Department of the Interior is attempting to correct the situation.

I am advised that if this amendment is adopted it will force geologists who are doing some valuable work into the Army; that it will require engineers who are helping to construct reclamation projects where we are trying to produce more food for the country into the Army. It will force physicians who are working

in Indian hospitals out of that service, and it would put chemists and scientists in the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey into military service.

For the reasons I have given and because a real effort is being made to straighten out the situation I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Mott amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wanted to object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is a little late. A motion to reconsider has already been laid on the table.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I received from the American Legion and a resolution attached thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on today I have introduced a short bill to amend section 191 of title 30 of the United States Code, making provision for the distribution and disposition of moneys received by the United States under the Mineral Leasing Acts, and I wish to call the bill especially to the attention of my distinguished colleagues from California, Colorado, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

The purpose of the bill is twofold. First, to increase the amount payable back to these States from mineral lease revenues from 37½ to 50 percent; and, second, to require the use of these moneys for educational purposes only. The law as it now stands permits the use of the moneys for educational purposes and for the construction of roads. California, New Mexico, and Wyoming receive by far the largest portion of these revenues because of the fact that mineral lease lands are located largely in these States. New Mexico, and I am informed California, devote all of those revenues for educational purposes, and Wyoming devotes at least 59 percent of them for education. I am informed that North Dakota also devotes all of its mineral-lease revenue for that purpose, and Utah devotes at least 90 percent thereof for education.

Every 2 years, however, the legislature of the State may without notice divert those funds from the schools and the parents and teachers have to be constantly on the alert at every session of the legislature. Our experience in New Mexico has been that these quarrels about the use of those moneys are not conducive to the best interests of the schools or the public welfare. Previously in New Mexico some of these funds had been indirectly diverted to the general fund of the State. At the last session of the legislature, I am happy to say, Gov. John J. Dempsey, a former and distinguished member of this body, recommended legislation assigning those funds to the schools, and the legislature, unanimously I believe, adopted his recommendation.

We have always felt that these funds should be devoted solely to that purpose. Give the people education sufficient to make of them self-reliant citizens, and they in time will produce the means a hundredfold necessary for construction of roads and the development of the State.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] be permitted to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a request of Stanley Switlik, president of the Switlik Parachute Co., of New Jersey, a letter to me from him dated April 18, 1944, and a copy of a wire he sent to Drew Pearson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD, and that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] may include in his remarks made today a statement by Montgomery Ward.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of inquiring as to the program for next week. Can the acting majority leader tell us what the program for next week will be?

Mr. RAMSPECK. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. I understand there are no suspensions.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, individual bills only, and Senate bill 156 will be brought up, which is a bill with reference to judges who have retired or who will retire hereafter. There is 1 hour of general debate on that bill.

On Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday the tax simplification bill will be considered.

That is the program for next week.

Mr. MICHENER. The vote on the tax simplification bill will come on Friday?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my understanding.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman will yield, as I understand, the judges' retirement bill will come up under a rule and be followed by 1 hour of debate. Is that correct?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. The rule makes the consideration of the bill in order.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RACE RELATIONS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently the Secretary of the Navy, in a public statement sought to impress upon us the imperative necessity of guarding our national solidarity as we move toward the real test of our strength to win this war. He emphasized that our real danger, our only danger, is that we may weaken internally and within the Allied international structure. He put his finger on the point of danger.

I am taking this time to try to impress upon the people of this country, especially upon the leaders both of the white and colored races to whom the people of these races will listen, the fact that we are rapidly moving in this country toward a serious crisis in the relationship between the white and the colored races and doing that at a time when we are at war. All the signs of the times support this conclusion. I do not know anybody who doubts it.

I am certain that I speak without racial prejudice in this matter. I speak to the people of this country of this thing now because it is a matter so important, so dangerous to the solidarity of the country, to the happiness of the two races and even to the possibility of their continuing to live in large numbers in the same communities. It challenges the most serious, deliberate, just, consideration of everybody; a candid, factual, examination. I am persuaded that this danger can be averted, but only if we appreciate its existence, recognize its causes, and the fundamental difficulties which confront the two races, especially in those communities where they are living side by side in large numbers.

While the difficulties and dangers developing are more far-reaching in those States where the colored race lives in the larger numbers, the danger is no longer localized. Everywhere one sees evidences and hears expressions of opinion and judgment, and recitation of personal experiences, showing conclusively the existence of general interracial antagonism and the general dangerous trend to which I have referred, and the rapidity of the movement all over the country.

I appreciate the difficulties of the situation with which we must deal. I do not excuse white people at all for their share in this general responsibility. Some of them have rendered a great disservice to the country, and especially to the colored people of this country, in arousing their antagonism, racial prejudices, and doing all they can to provoke acts and attitudes which inevitably will react to their hurt. White people who inflame members of their own race do a disservice also.

In the Southern States, due to the interracial friendship—strong personal friendships—violent general interracial conflicts have up to this time been practically unknown. Colored people have not done violent things there to members of the white race because they are white, and white people have not done violent things to members of the black race because they are black. But white and black people of the South are not blind to this danger. They dread that the stress which is rapidly being increased may reach the point when it will exceed the ability of the sane, thoughtful leaders in the communities, black and white, to control, that the situation will get out of hand, and the blind, hideous, merciless passions of race hatred, such as recently swept through sections of a great northern city, will sweep through our communities and destroy the attitude of friendship and sympathetic concern which makes the residence of the two races in the same communities possible. People ignorant of what they were dealing with, irresponsible people—vicious, some of them, I fear—have been sowing the seed of interracial hate and disunity in this country at these times when we are at war, and they have gone unscourged by the lash of public condemnation. I want to make it clear I do not claim the white people are doing all they ought to do in this picture.

Practical people, with common sense, recognize that we are trying an experiment in this country which has never before succeeded in the history of the world—that of trying to have two basically dissimilar races live together in large numbers in the same communities. The historical background with regard to this interracial relationship produces both difficulties and elements of advantage. While the progress in adjusting their difficulties, which are fundamental, has not advanced as rapidly as some people might desire, there can be no question that before this dangerous development was brought about we were moving definitely and consistently toward better interracial relationship. That is the important thing. We were progressing as a result of natural adjustment made by white and colored people themselves, undisturbed and unretarded by the influences of outside interference. How rapidly natural adjustment among the races living together can take place nobody can forejudge. It is certain, however, that is the only adjustment which can endure. Nobody can question that statement. And neither will any informed person question the statement that the movement is now in the opposite direction. The lines of interracial cleavage are becoming broader and deeper and more dangerous.

I want to repeat that I am not attempting to justify attitudes. I am trying to state them, without regard to whether or not they are justified, because this situation has to be dealt with factually and realistically.

It may be thought by some people that I am prompted to make this statement because of the recent decision of the Supreme Court with regard to the Democratic primaries in Texas. Long before that decision was rendered this condition to which I refer was developing. Shortsighted, reckless people were sowing the seed of interracial discord and danger, deepening and widening the lines of interracial cleavage, accentuating racial antagonism and prejudice, and arresting the natural processes of interracial adjustment. This decision of the Supreme Court, however, without regard to the question of constitutional basis, did interpose a Federal power as against local policy and local judgment of the members of the Democratic Party of that State, and intensified the then already existing strain in our interracial relationship to which I am referring. Its immediate results and the results of that which probably will follow will add to the difficulty to which I have referred. The Federal power and the activities of these outside people attempting to put a prohibition on the opportunity of the white people to segregate themselves if they want to in places of residence, of work, and in their political party organizations will not help the situation which I am discussing.

This is one of them. Where there is a small number of a race different from the more established race living in a community, apparently there is no racial reaction. But when large numbers of the race which differs from that which constitutes the more established race come into the community, there seems to develop a sort of instinctive racial reaction, a definite development of racial entities, the forerunner of racial conflict unless wise, sane people of both races recognize the fact, and develop a policy with that fact in consideration, which makes possible their living together with the minimum of racial irritation and conflict.

All my life I have lived in the South. I have studied this matter. I have many friends among the colored race. I know who will suffer most if this trend is not arrested before it reaches a climax. These outsiders have been having a big time, apparently believing they were dealing only with the South, but they were sowing the seeds of racial conflict throughout the land.

They are doing a serious, dangerous thing in this country. Of course, every-

thing is not right. As stated, I do not exempt the white people in these communities from responsibility. I want to be fair in this matter. Colored people in our section of the country are getting better schools, better opportunities, better attention, better recognition. That is the direction of movement. Colored people are making their own contribution toward these results, working with their white neighbors. Maybe these results are not coming as fast as many would wish; but the progress made is supported by the purpose and approval of the people in the community which gives assurance of further progress. This antagonism and racial hatred being engendered perils the whole program.

People who live in these communities can talk plainly with each other, and there is no resentment. Long before I came to Congress I began to use what influence I had to suppress the crime of lynching. It is a crime which can be protected against only by the communities in which the danger develops. I recall that in 1937 a very bad lynching took place in one of the Southern States. I sent this telegram to the Governor of the State:

If the press reports are even approximately correct and they seem to be these lynchings both with regard to lynchers and the officers involved were as dastardly a crime as cowardice could devise and brutality execute. It is the sort of thing which makes it hard for us who are here trying to protect the governmental sovereignty of the States. It will be effectively seized upon as a demonstration of the inability of the States to govern. As one Southern man to another I hope I will not be considered impertinent by stating candidly my own reaction and that is that the State cannot escape this reflection upon its governmental capacity, in fact cannot escape in effect becoming an accessory after the fact unless it is able to and does bring these lynchers and officers to speedy and adequate punishment.

The entire telegram was not printed in the papers. I got several denunciatory letters from the South. I recall one in particular. The writer lived in Memphis. Among other things, he said I could not go down South and repeat what I had said. I replied to him that I was the son of a Confederate soldier; that I had lived all my life in the South; that I expected to make a speech very soon in the capital of the State where this lynching had occurred. He replied very promptly, apologizing for what he had written, explaining that he thought I was from Pennsylvania.

I have not attempted an analytical discussion of this matter, the difficulties of which are rooted in fundamental racial differences increased in some respects and lessened in others by the comparatively recent relationship of master and servant. That relationship insured protection against many of the white man's vices and established an intimacy of contact from which a primitive people could learn with a rapidity not possible under any other relationship. It established a mutual interest and affection which the violence of the War between the States and the subsequent experience of reconstruction weakened but could not disestablish. History affords no parallel in progress in so short a time as these people have made. What the future holds no one can judge. No one can doubt, however, that this present rapidly increasing racial antagonism casts a mighty dark shadow over the possibilities of that future and imperils the solidarity and weakens the strength of the Nation at a time when we are poised for the great invasion where the issues of the centuries are to be decided.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I realize that the gentleman is speaking with much feeling on the subject. I believe I would be unfaithful to the views I entertain if I remained silent in this Chamber without taking issue with the opinions that the gentleman has so strongly expressed. The gentleman is very apprehensive over unrest in certain sections of the country. May I say to the gentleman that as long as any group of people in a democracy or anywhere in this world are deprived of the right to vote, are segregated, Jim Crowed, discriminated against, and treated as second-class citizens, so long will there be unrest; so long will those conditions cause unrest, and what is more, those conditions are intolerable as long as we remain a democracy.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think the gentleman is illustrating what I have been talking about. We are at war. The gentleman and the people who hold his views, not recognizing the situation that obtains, not recognizing that these people are making progress under cooperation with the people among whom they have lived, have been going out into the country and preaching hatred of their white neighbors to these colored people, until a condition is developing in the country of interracial hatred and conflict; unwilling to permit the natural processes of adjustment which are in progress.

I grant you, and I grant anybody, that they do not have everything they need or ought to have, but the big point is they are progressing in better schools, better living conditions, and the whole thing is improving. The gentleman and his crowd are doing the very thing that will destroy the possibilities of cooperation between these races, and casting a black shadow over the whole picture I am just as honest about that as I can be.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman be good enough to yield again?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does the gentleman believe that continuing to deprive the people of their right to vote is going to ameliorate the condition and bring about better racial conditions?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to answer that?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wonder what section the gentleman is referring to. I do not know of it and he does not know of it, because it does not happen to be true, where anyone is deprived of the right to vote.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think we all have a very good idea of the poll tax, and we all have knowledge of the white primary law, which deprives people of their democratic rights. That condition certainly does not make for better racial relations.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I say to the gentleman from New York, he and his crowd have gone down there and preached to these people that if a husky, able-bodied man, white or black, is required to pay a poll tax, make a couple of dollars' contribution to the expenses of our Government under which he lives and upon which he depends for protection, roads, schools, and everything else, before he can sit in the councils of the Government that he is having a great injustice done to him. The tax, of course, is to be paid by people both white and black. He is preaching that an able-bodied man in this country, a democracy, a government of the people, supported by public tax, ought to have a free Government ride, and that if he does not get it, there is something wrong being done to him by the white people. That is a hurtful thing to the citizen. He could not belong to a lodge, or club, or the C. I. O. and vote for the officers without paying something for its support. That is exactly the point. A democracy is a government of the people. There is no king. There is no hereditary governor. If a man joins a lodge or labor organization, he pays something to support it, does he not? I am not defending the poll tax. I am not saying a word about the poll tax. I am saying something about the hurt done the self-respect of any able-bodied person by making him believe that if he is not permitted to have a free governmental ride a great injustice is done to him. That does not make for good citizenship in a democracy. That is my honest conviction of the hurt which the gentleman and his crowd are doing by moving out from New York in the attempted take-over.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a release from the National Geographic Society of Washington relative to flood-free Johnstown, Pa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about the merits or demerits of the wage controversy connected with Montgomery Ward & Co. However, I know of no power that the President of the United States has been given by Congress to seize a nonwar American business concern, nor of any power he has under the Constitution of the United States to do so. The Congress and the American people are entitled to know if we are still operating

under a government by law and the Constitution or by individuals, Executive orders and directives.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I hope the chairman of that committee [Mr. SABATH], who comes from Chicago, in the State of Illinois, will call the committee together tomorrow or Saturday, or, at the latest, Monday, to consider the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Chicago, Ill. [Mr. DEWEY], to appoint a committee to ascertain the facts. The Congress and the American people are entitled to know all the facts; and once we have them, then we will know what legislative action to take in order to protect the interest of sovereign American citizens whose property has been seized by the President under Executive order and without due process of law.

If the Rules Committee is not called in session, I shall urge the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]—and I hope he will do so, if he thinks it advisable—to appoint a half dozen or ten nonpartisan and impartial distinguished lawyers in the country to study this legal and constitutional problem and submit their report back to him so that he can present it to the House as to the exact powers of the President to seize nonwar business firms. This seizure of private property and private enterprise by Executive order raises an important and serious issue that places in jeopardy the constitutional rights of all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to make a statement and to introduce a House joint resolution, in view of the announcement of the War Department that it is planned to bring back the bodies of American war dead from foreign battlefields for burial in the national cemeteries. I introduced today a resolution, similar to the one I sponsored after World War No. 1, to return the body of an unknown American warrior killed in battle in Europe, Africa, Asia, or on the islands of the Pacific Ocean for burial in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater. My original resolution was the first I introduced on entering Congress, and was the last bill signed by President Woodrow Wilson on March 4, 1921.

The burial took place on Armistice Day, November 11, 1921. Among those who attended were President Harding, Secretary of War Weeks, the Congress, Marshal Foch, General Pershing, and numerous foreign generals and diplomats. I believe it would be fitting to bury the unknown American warrior killed in battle in World War No. 2 in an identical tomb in Arlington Memorial Amphitheater alongside the Unknown Soldier of World War No. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD at this point the resolution I am now introducing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

Joint resolution providing for the transportation to this country of the body of an unknown American warrior killed in battle in Europe, Africa, Asia, or on the islands of the Pacific Ocean, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies at the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, Arlington, Va.

Resolved, etc., That the War Department be directed to bring the body of an unknown American warrior who was killed in battle in Europe, Africa, Asia, or on the islands of the Pacific Ocean, to this country for burial at Memorial Amphitheater, Arlington, Va., in an identical tomb to that of the Unknown Soldier of the World War No. 1 as soon as necessary arrangements can be made after the war is ended.

The selection and care of the body will be in charge of the War Department, and the body so selected will be the only unidentified one brought to this country.

The utmost impartiality will be observed in selecting the body, which will be done by noncommissioned officers of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, detailed for that purpose under the immediate supervision of general officers of the respective services.

The body, typifying the spirit and sacrifice of the American Nation in the war, will receive the highest honors from all Government officials.

The body of the unknown American warrior will be brought to Washington for appropriate ceremonies at the Arlington National Cemetery, under escort of naval units commensurate with the dignity and majesty of the occasion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

TAXING PROFITS MADE BY AMERICANS UNDER LEND-LEASE PROGRAMS IN MEXICO

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mexico must be a very interesting place these days. From returning visitors for several years we have been hearing about the fun, hunting, fishing, and relaxation to be found in and around Mexico City, on the beaches of Acapulco, and in various other locations in Mexico. A recent pictorial display in Life magazine portrays some of the gay life in Mexico City where it is to be noted the night-club guests all wear the formal evening clothes as were worn in the swankier places in this country in prewar days. It is noted that liquor seems to be plentiful, reasonably priced, and far from being rationed. Seemingly there is no shortage of even liquors made in the United States itself.

However, there is a much more serious side to some of the sights which cause an observant tourist to ponder. A good friend of mine who is a nationally known engineer and contractor recently returned from a 6-weeks' tour of Mexico and gave me some very interesting observations which I shall pass on to you.

He reported that there are many European refugees moving into Mexico and constructing many very beautiful mansions ranging in cost from roughly $50,000 to well over a quarter of a million dollars. Not only are many refugees entering Mexico in person but many refugee dollars are returning to Mexico in ever-increasing volume. By refugee dollars, I mean money that flowed out of Mexico during its more troublesome days of the past and is now returning to Mexico in its later days of greater stability and security.

Seemingly there is no lack of building materials nor is there any shortage of capable labor for these private construction projects. The most interesting observation, however, was that most of these homes are being lavishly equipped with electric refrigerators, electric stoves, vacuum cleaners, radios, and other electric appurtenances, to say nothing of elaborate plumbing fixtures, all of which are coming into Mexico from the United States at a time when you and I can go without. For instance, as we well know, the second quarter directive of the W. P. B. authorizes the manufacture of 50,000 cast-iron enamel bathtubs allocated to several leading manufacturers in the United States. Their distribution and disposition under this directive is a small percentage for defense housing within the United States, but the balance is for lend-lease. These under lend-lease are readily obtainable in Mexico while presumably you and I can revert to using the old galvanized washtub before the kitchen range, if we are fortunate in finding either.

My friend saw some very interesting Americans, seemingly enjoying the Mexican climate, Mexican horse races and bull fights, and the Mexican hilarity, and not a few of them seemingly enjoying a veritable bonanza of recently acquired wealth—wealth which they are accumulating in unbelievable amounts through the offices of our good-neighbor policy and our lend-lease program. My friend noticed a great many beautiful shining new 1942 model Cadillacs and Lincoln continental convertibles bearing licenses from many States within the United States. He specifically noticed many licenses from New York, California, and from our own State of Michigan, and also many from the Nation's Capital—Washington, D. C. It was rather surprising to my friend because it was his understanding, as it is mine, that according to the stringent regulations laid down by the O. P. A., 1942 cars are frozen and their sales tremendously restricted to only those who can show the greatest need therefor. Also, we recall that our gasoline rations were recently drastically reduced in the Midwest and yet seemingly these cars have found their way to Mexico—with or without gasoline—whether on thin air or through the use of what we are told is a greatly overtaxed rail transportation system. In

any event, it is my understanding that these 1942 cars are not to be taken out of the United States without State Department authority; and so it would seem rather difficult for some of those politicians, some of those United States contractors and engineers whom my friend saw and with whom he talked personally to justify to the O. P. A. their foreign use of those cars. Furthermore, at the border one may, if he wishes, remove and check his own tires and travel in Mexico on rented American-made tires furnished Mexico under lend-lease.

But as I have previously said, my friend was most interested in the veritable bonanza of wealth being accumulated by Americans who are participating in the expenditure of lend-lease funds on a multitude of so-called good-neighbor projects, large and small. They have a great racket in obtaining high engineering fees in exchange for political influence in obtaining lend-lease funds.

For instance, one of the major projects seems to be the rehabilitation of the Mexican railroad system. Before we built the Panama Canal there was a short line transcontinental Mexican railroad running from Puerto Mexico on the Atlantic to Salina Cruz on the Pacific shore. Prior to 1910 this road did a flourishing transcontinental business transferring cargoes from the Atlantic to ships on the Pacific. With the opening of the Canal, however, naturally the business of this railroad declined to almost nothing. Had the Panama Canal suffered any serious damage during this war, complete justification could have been found for immediate modernizing of this railroad but why wait until the war is 4 years old when we have officially and repeatedly proclaimed the absence of any serious danger of bombing the Canal, to start now on a project to rehabilitate and double track this road. And that is not all. Under lend-lease they now propose to build a railroad from the very lowest extremity of Mexico in the Yucatan Peninsula to connect up with this road. Again the present security of the Canal hardly justifies this expenditure. But that is not all, up in the upper part of Mexico it is proposed under lend-lease to build another transcontinental Mexican railroad paralleling existing and competing United States lines, which road will run largely through completely arid territory and having no strategic or other value to the United States. Still another railroad completion is in sight under lend-lease funds. At the turn of the century a Methodist minister by the name of Stillwell conceived and promoted the construction of a railroad from Sweetwater, Tex., through the Mexican states of Chihuahua, Sonora, Sinaloa, to Topolobampa on the Gulf of California on the Pacific. There was at that time in existence a railroad in the United States running from Chicago through Kansas City to Sweetwater. This projected road would be 500 miles shorter from Chicago or Kansas City to Topolobampo than over any of our transcontinental lines and so Stillwell and his backers thought they had a worth-while project forty-odd years ago and they did actually construct the north and south portions of this road, but when they came to the tough central portion through the Sierra Madre Mountains, Stillwell's backers suddenly withdrew their funds and the road has remained uncompleted to this day. Reverend Stillwell later wrote a book titled for his former backers whom he then called the Wolves of Wall Street. Now, we understand, after forty-odd years, Lend-Lease is to finance the money for the completion of this road to place it in competition, as in the case of these other roads which I have mentioned, with our own rail lines, the stockholders of which, loyal Americans, are being taxed to pay these lend-lease bills.

Another ambitious good-neighbor plan to be paid for under lend-lease has now reached the advanced rumor stage. This program would involve the construction of a huge so-called flood-control and hydroelectric development for the El Fuerte Valley which is in the southern part of the aforementioned railroad territory. There is no doubt that many of our New Deal friends would love nothing better than to construct this project, whether there is a real need for it or not, because there are tremendous profits to be reaped by the contractors.

My friend was especially interested in the activities of some of our former Michigan New Deal politicians who, having been soundly voted out of office at the last general election, now seem to be doing very handsomely for themselves in the expenditure of lend-lease funds in Mexico. They are said to be busily engaged in the design and construction of highways, which would fit in with their own extensive past experience. Undoubtedly they can do a creditable job in this field of endeavor and undoubtedly they will be well paid for their efforts. They are also said to be engaged in the construction of airports and air-raid shelters. Airports, of course, undoubtedly represent a sound investment for Mexico, not only for post-war air travel, but likewise also for the use of the hundreds and perhaps thousands of our latest military aircraft which we are sending down into Mexico along with countless numbers of tanks, half-tracks, and other automotive and mechanized war equipment which we are furnishing the Mexican Army, also under lend-lease.

What I cannot understand, however, is the justification of the expenditure of American dollars under lend-lease funds for the construction of air-raid shelters. My friend saw these under construction in remote sections of Mexico City and where the density of population was very light indeed. Again I repeat, why we should be wasting our funds for the expenditure of air-raid shelters at this late stage of the war when our armies are on the offensive on all fronts, where we have repeatedly assured our public that the danger of air raids in this country is far remote, where we have even disbanded our air-raid warning service and lastly, where we have recently reduced our augmented security forces at such tremedously vital targets as the Panama Canal and the Sault Ste. Marie Locks, is beyond my comprehension. One can only believe that when new and more fanciful ways are discovered for the waste of the taxpayers' money, there will always be those in Washington who can think up ways to pull the plug.

Now, all of this would not be so bad if our good-neighbor policy were actually bearing fruit, but what was the attitude noticed by my friends among the Mexican people themselves? First of all, he noticed a rather famous New York subway engineer, a not too recent immigrant from Russia, who now claims to be losing money building a tunnel in Puebla on lend-lease funds. Of course, it would be difficult for any legitimate contractor to make money while sitting in Ciro's famous night club surrounded by a bevy of attractive senoritas and demanding attention of four or five waiters while other patrons are trying to be waited upon. Uncouth tactics such as these only add to the Mexicans' dislike for the Americano; and yet this case is but one of many which my friend saw where a similar feeling is being created by other than a truly representative American. I wonder if this reported loss of money could be for the purpose of evading taxes rightfully due the United States. I am also reminded that we are in need of tunnel contractors and their equipment within the continental United States during this present period of extreme shortage. But, of course, the average Mexican, and certainly the peon or the Mexican commoner, does not visit Ciro's to see such disgusting activities.

Our extreme lend-lease generosity under our good-neighbor policy is wholly unappreciated by the average Mexican. To properly gage the extent of their appreciation, if any, one has but to walk along the streets of Mexico City and observe the courtesies extended by the average Mexican to the American tourist. Mexicans may be walking two or three abreast along their narrow sidewalks, which, incidentally, are in a deplorable condition and on which they house their refuse or garbage cans under steel covers which are bent or rusted through; yet the Mexicans for whom we are so generous will not give way, but, instead, seemingly take delight in crowding the American tourist into the street providing the American will take it in good grace. Likewise it was reported most interesting to get the average Mexican into an earnest and sincere conversation and then hear what he thinks about our generosity.

Again the peon, who comprises by far the greatest percentage of the population of Mexico, is paying three times as much for his corn that he uses to make his tortillas—bread—as he did prior to the war. We are not to blame for this as it is wholly a domestic problem; yet the fault is placed at our doorstep because of a sugar shortage that is definitely the fault of a comparatively few people of the United States. Through some means that we are at the present moment unacquainted with, the Mexican sugar output was so split up that the minimum requirements for the Mexican nation were retained and the balance of the sugar sold for the purpose of making sirup to be exported to our country. This resulted in a shortage to the peon, who had to buy day by day whereas his more wealthy neighbor could buy in quantities.

Can a remedy be found? Of course there can. In the first place, it seems to me that we should be very much more circumspect not only in our dealings in our good-neighbor policy but certainly should be much more careful in our allocation of lend-lease funds. If it were made plain that lend-lease means exactly that, and that these funds would have to be repaid, then I believe some of our recipients would be much less anxious to obtain loans for any expenditures that are not completely justified and self-liquidating. Secondly, if we are to prevent the wholesale grab of exorbitant profits or fees or charges for engineering or construction contractor talent by American citizens operating abroad as in Mexico under lend-lease funds, then it would seem only fair that these recipients of lend-lease—as for instance in this case of Mexico—should agree in advance to permit officials of our Treasury to examine all books of such bona fide or pseudo foreign corporations, financed by lend-lease funds, whose American citizen stockholders and officials have transacted business in these countries and to permit the United States of America to attach any funds or property for the payment of taxes properly owing to Uncle Sam by these citizens or former citizens of the United States. After all, what these internationally minded gentry are doing is simply slipping quietly out of the United States to make huge profits, fees, or commissions or salaries from these foreign corporations and salt that money away outside of the United States and free from taxation within the United States. There is no way at the present time that the United States tax collector can put his finger on them, and such a program, it seems to me, would be surely as reasonable as our present renegotiation policy or the arbitrary rulings effected by our Internal Revenue Department upon loyal patriotic citizens of the United States, who still believe this is the greatest country in the world and remain here in productive and constructive work during our greatest national crisis.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 28, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Friday, April 28, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of S. 1767.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m. Friday, April 28, 1944, in room 1011, New House Office Building, to hold hearings on H. R. 2426.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1480. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending June 30, 1944, for the bureaus and offices of this Department; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1481. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend certain articles of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BELL: Committee on Insular Affairs. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 159. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Insular Affairs to investigate the political, economic, and social conditions in Puerto Rico; with amendment (Rept. No. 1399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 4623. A bill to authorize the use of space in the old post-office building in Portland, Oreg., by the State of Oregon for its use as a museum for relics from the battleship *Oregon*, together with all other historical documents, objects, and relics of Oregon and the Old Oregon Country held by the State for public display; with amendment (Rept. No. 1400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4102. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; with amendment (Rept. No. 1401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1402. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. NEWSOME: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4054. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1403). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McKENZIE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4687. A bill relating to issuance of postal notes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3604. A bill authorizing the appointment of chaplains as general officers of the Army of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4680. A bill to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public, No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944; with amendment (Rept. No. 1406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 4693. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4694. A bill to transfer the General Land Office, the United States Geological Survey, and the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior to a city in the Rocky Mountain area; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 4695. A bill to provide credit for the purpose of reestablishment in civilian employment those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 4696. A bill to amend section 167 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to trusts for maintenance or support of certain beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 4697. A bill providing for the appointment of a United States Commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4698. A bill to amend the Mineral Lands Leasing Act approved February 25, 1920 (ch. 85, 41 Sta. 437); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4699. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4700. A bill to amend section 7 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4701. A bill to amend section 113 (a) (20) of the Internal Revenue Code by providing that the acquiring corporation and the railroad corporation or corporations whose property was acquired shall be deemed to be the same taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution to terminate the effectiveness of the act of January 20, 1942, which established daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. Res. 521. Resolution creating a select committee to make an investigation relating to the seizure by the United States, on April 26, 1944, of property of Montgomery Ward & Co.; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Moca, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman McGEHEE's resolution, requesting the removal from office of Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Board of Commissioners of San Juan, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution requesting the immediate removal of Rexford G. Tugwell from the governorship of Puerto Rico and the appointment of a new governor; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Catano, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution, demanding the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Dorado, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution asking the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Penuelas, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Congressman McGEHEE's resolution demanding the immediate removal from the office of the present Governor of Puerto Rico, Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4702. A bill for the relief of Carroll I. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 4703. A bill for the relief of the estate of Annie Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4704. A bill for the relief of Hilda M. Crouch; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4705. A bill for the relief of Columbus M. Spencer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4706. A bill for the relief of Ernest A. Wild; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4707. A bill for the relief of J. Fletcher Lankton and John N. Ziegele; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5569. By Mr BARRETT: Petition of Rev. S. C. Ryland and 17 other citizens of Gillette, Wyo., urging consideration and support for the passage of House bill No. 2082, suspending the alcoholic beverage traffic for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5570. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the G. Fayette Staples Post Auxiliary, No. 57, American Legion, Old Orchard Beach, Maine, for the passage of the veterans' omnibus bill as a small payment of the debt owed to the men who are offering their lives in defense of our country; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5571. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 6, seventh ward, Binghamton, N. Y., and signed by 102 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5572. By Mr. KENNEDY: Petition of the Fourteenth Assembly District of Republican Club of New York City, advocating the amendment of article II, section 2, paragraph 2, of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5573. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5574. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of Mrs. Bertha H. Harrington and 94 other citizens of Charleston, W. Va., urging the enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5575. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, favoring improved and additional airline service for Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5576. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary-treasurer, Southern University Conference, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the education of returning veterans; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of truth and beauty, for the glory of the garden, for trees and flowers, winding lanes and fragrant meadows, and for the feathered loveliness of winged songsters: God of all nature, we give Thee thanks.

For a part and place on the side of the angels in this raging struggle against the powers of darkness and the principalities of evil: God of all truth, we give Thee thanks.

For the valiant armies of youth gaily and gladly, yet with stern resolve, offering their lives to enthrone liberty, decency, and justice; for all physicians and nurses in hospitals so near the searing battle fronts, with strain taxing human endurance, striving to meet appalling need: O Thou God of freedom, we bless Thy name.

For those in overrun countries who meet tyranny with unblinking eyes of defiance rather than bow the knee to the debasing Baal: Thou God of unconquered souls, we give Thee thanks.

For every sign through the darkness of these dread days of the daybreak whose welcome dawn shall yet surely bathe the strained faces of waiting millions when the glad cry will echo, Life again! Joy again! Light again! Home again! in a world saved from savagery to liberty in a bright tomorrow: We give Thee thanks, O God of our hope and our salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, April 25, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 22, 1944:

S. 1028. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia.

On April 24, 1944:

S. 866. An act to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

On April 26, 1944:

S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan;

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O–3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943;

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy;

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps;

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.; and

S. 1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 176) for the relief of Austin L. Tierney.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566); and

S. 1757. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE (S. Doc. No. 186)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $50,000 for the Department of State, fiscal year 1945, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (3), Navy, and Agriculture (2); War Manpower Commission, Office for Emergency Management, and Selective Service System which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Two memorials of the Senate of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Memorial on the preservation of home industries

"To the President and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Agreement should be unanimous that this Nation's No. 1 policy, at this time, is the winning of the war at the earliest possible moment, that lives may be saved, the freedom we so highly prize insured, and economic and social dislocation minimized.

"It is the paramount duty of every loyal citizen to cheerfully make any necessary sacrifice, to cheerfully endure any inconvenience imposed by the exigencies of the existing emergency.

"Nevertheless, while never losing sight of the above primary objectives, it is also of great importance to give consideration to the present and future effects of the disruption of industries essential to the welfare and happiness of the people and the prosperity of communities, States, and the Nation, and in all possible cases to alleviate conditions which tend to their destruction.

"Two of Arizona's major industries are mining and cattle raising. With respect to these vital industries upon which so much depends, both in peace and war, the facts are: (1) That many mining properties, even properties containing minerals essential to the war effort, are idle, their plants closed, their organizations disrupted, their taxpaying ability reduced to zero, although certain fixed expenses must still be met; (2) that many thousands of cattle fit and ready for use as food are roaming the ranges, an expense rather than an asset to their owners, for the reason that under existing regulations they cannot be consumed locally, although beef is shipped in from packing plants far distant from Arizona, to the further aggravation of the transportation problem.

"Furthermore, with respect to the particular industries cited, similar commodities are being imported in large quantities from other countries.

"There is no intention, in calling attention to this situation, to criticize the so-called good-neighbor policy, but neither is it assumed that this policy, which commends itself to all thoughtful American citizens, contemplates the destruction or crippling of this Nation's industries or the impoverishment of its citizens.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"1. That immediate consideration be given to modification of the policy and the alteration of regulations which have the effect of discontinuing mining operations while essential metals susceptible of being produced at home are procured from abroad, and which prevents the marketing of cattle feeding on Arizona's ranges while processed meats are being shipped to many communities well able to supply all local needs."

"Senate Memorial 3

"Memorial requesting the coordination of regulations affecting the production and availability of beef

"To the President and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The United States Government, through its several agencies charged with the direction and management of phases of the war effort, has consistently and repeatedly appealed to the Nation's producers to redouble their efforts in the production of essential foodstuffs, to the end that this country's fighting men may be well fed, the resources of the armed forces of the Allies supplemented, aid extended to ravaged and impoverished peoples, and adequate subsistence provided for citizens and residents of the United States fighting the war on the home front.

"This appeal has with particular emphasis been directed to producers of meat, since it is well understood that meat is a principal and indispensable part of the American diet.

"The Government's call has met with prompt and wholehearted response, and all previous records for the production of staple articles of food have been eclipsed.

"Despite the efforts which have been put forth and the success, so far as production is concerned, which has attended them, it is an indisputable fact, inconsistent and incongruous as it may seem, that with respect to certain commodities, and conspicuously so with respect to beef, a definite shortage exists throughout the Nation.

"With the ranges overpopulated by a record increase of 12,000,000 head of beef cattle, the markets are illy supplied with beef, and citizens possessed of necessary ration points are unable to have their legitimate wants supplied.

"This undesirable condition reaches not only the consumer, but as well vitally affects the producer, who has done all within his power to meet the responsibility placed upon him by his Government. His ranges are overcrowded with cattle he cannot sell, to the injury of the ranges, and his breeding stock is becoming overaged.

"These conditions, serious alike to the consumer and the producer, are due, it is felt, to lack of coordination of the policies and regulations of the several governmental agencies whose orders affect the cattle industry, and the failure of certain of such agencies to comprehend the nature of the problems involved. To the consumer, ration points for beef have little value when the beef cannot be found in the markets, although there is an abundance of cattle on the range to meet their demands. To the producer, an increase in herds serves little purpose when he cannot sell his cattle. The packer cannot buy beyond his quota, and therefore is unable adequately to supply the markets.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, earnestly requests:

"1. That immediate steps be taken to place in the hands of a single agency all questions affecting the production, distribution and sale of meat for food.

"2. That such agency be composed of representatives of consumers, producers, and the Government."

A memorial of the Senate of Arizona; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Memorial 1

"Memorial praying Congress to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The expansion of civil aeronautics superinduced by the war, and the corollary demand for competent air pilots, will be multiplied in all its phases upon the return of peace activities.

"Without the stimulating effect of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 the need for civilian pilots could not have been met. Without a continuation of the benefits of this act a tremendous shortage of pilots will occur, and a lucrative and useful field of employment will be denied many thousands of men.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress pass S. 1432 or H. R. 4079, extending the life of the Civilian Pilot Training Act to July 1, 1949.

"Adopted by the senate, March 13, 1944.

"Approved by the Governor, March 14, 1944.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state, March 14, 1944."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress of the United States of America to increase the amounts of grants to States for old-age assistance

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Whereas under the acts of Congress now in effect providing for payments to the States for old-age assistance, the amount contributed to the States is limited to one-half of the total of the sums expended during each quarter as old-age assistance, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual as exceeds $40; and such limitation discourages the States from assuming an unequal share of the expenditures by providing for maximum payments to individuals of more than $40 per month; and

"Whereas it is recognized by the United States Government and the several departments thereof that the cost of living has greatly increased since the enactment of old-age assistance legislation by the Congress, and the amount presently contributed by the United States does not take into consideration such increased cost of living, and the needy aged will suffer as a result thereof; and

"Whereas the dislocation of the civilian population during the present war, caused by the migration of a large segment of the population from their home States to other States, has and will place an undue and unequal burden on certain States, including the State of Arizona, to the advantage of other States; and

"Whereas the mild winters and excellent climatic conditions in Arizona and other Southwestern States has induced and will continue to induce large numbers of people to leave their home States and remove to Arizona and such other Southwestern States in their latter years of life in order to qualify for old-age assistance; and

"Whereas old-age assistance is, therefore, essentially a national and Federal problem which should be wholly provided for by the National Government: Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress of the United States of America speedily enact such legislation as

"(1) will recognize that old-age assistance should be wholly assumed by the National Government and provide that all amounts paid to aged needy individuals shall be paid by the National Government; or as

"(2) will provide for payment to the States of an amount for old-age assistance equal to one-half of the total of all sums expended during any quarter up to the maximum amount provided by the law of each State, respectively, to be paid to any individual.

"Adopted by the senate, March 14, 1944.

"Adopted by the house, March 16, 1944.

"Approved by the Governor, March 17, 1944.

"Filed in the office of secretary of state, March 18, 1944."

A memorial of the Senate of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Memorial 4

"Memorial relating to the regulation of the insurance business

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Bills are now pending in Congress (H. R. 3269, H. R. 3270, and S. 1362) to affirm the intent of Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remains within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business. The bills in question are designed to leave the regulation of the business of insurance with the several States.

"The State of Arizona receives from its insurance premium tax law, and from fees for the licensing of insurance companies and insurance agents, an average, based on the revenue during the last 5 years, of more than a quarter of a million dollars annually, such proceeds during the year 1943 amounting to $305,643.74.

"Insurance business in this State is highly competitive. There are at present authorized to do business 143 stock fire companies, 7 mutual fire companies, 1 reciprocal fire company, 31 stock life insurance companies, 8 mutual life insurance companies, 89 miscellaneous stock companies, 10 miscellaneous mutual companies, and 3 miscellaneous reciprocal companies. In the year 1943, 4,627 individual insurance agents were licensed.

"A large portion of the premium tax collected from fire insurance companies is set aside under the law for the benefit of the firemen's pension fund.

"Fire insurance rates are determined primarily by local conditions, particularly the availability of water supply, fire fighting equipment, and the efficiency of fire departments, all matters peculiarly within the jurisdiction of State and local agencies.

"By developing safety factors under State regulation, the fire insurance rates in Arizona were reduced 53.6 percent between the years 1926 and 1942.

"Should the regulation of insurance companies be withdrawn from the States such action would result in (a) the loss of a large amount of revenue now paid to the State of Arizona, requiring an increase in taxes upon other properties to supply such deficiency; (b) further encroachment by the Federal Government on the prerogatives of the State and the withdrawing from State regulation of a matter which can most practically be regulated by State and local agencies; (c) placing under Federal regulation the business and means of livelihood of at least 4,627 citizens of Arizona now actively engaged in the insurance business; (d) destruction of the premium and rate structure built up over the years by competitive methods, which has resulted in a decrease in fire insurance rates in this State of 53.6 percent.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress speedily enact the bills H. R. 3269, H. R. 3270, and S. 1362."

A concurrent memorial of the Legislature of Arizona; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Concurrent Memorial 1

"Concurrent memorial requesting Congress to enact the proposed bill of rights for men and women in the armed services

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"There are now approximately 10,000,000 persons in the armed forces of the United States.

"The Nation owes these men and women an eternal debt of gratitude, a debt which can never fully be repaid, but the Government can, however inadequately, evidence its appreciation of their services by making the transition period less difficult.

"It is therefore incumbent upon the Nation to make some provision for these service men and women

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring, urgently requests:

"1. That the Congress of the United States promptly enact S. 1617, by Senator CLARK and others, and H. R. 3917, by Representative RANKIN and others, which embody the program of the American Legion, known as the bill of rights for men and women now in the armed services.

"Passed by the house, March 15, 1944.

"Passed by the senate, March 16, 1944.

"Approved by the Governor, March 20, 1944.

"Filed by the secretary of state, March 20, 1944."

Petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the Office of Price Administration, and also for an immediate roll-back of prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions adopted by Santa Monica Bay District Central Labor Council, of Santa Monica, Calif., and the National Maritime Union of America, of Charleston, S. C., favoring the adoption of measures to establish a Nation-wide broadcast of congressional proceedings to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Arizona; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Memorial relating to the removal of temporary war housing in Arizona to rural areas

"To the Congress of the United States and to the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Arizona:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"A large number of temporary housing units have been constructed in many localities in Arizona and are being administered by the Federal Public Housing Authority in connection with war activities in ths State.

"When such war activities are terminated, continued operation of such housing in these localities by the Federal Public Housing Authority will depress the real-estate market and have a detrimental effect upon private home-building enterprise.

"There exists in certain rural areas in the State a distinct need for improved housing facilities for farmers with small incomes and for farm labor.

"Removal of such housing administered by the Federal Public Housing Authority to such rural areas and availability thereof to such farmers and farm labor through the media of authorized local authorities would be in the interest of the State and of the Federal Government.

"It is a matter of State concern that the removal and disposition of the temporary housing constructed and administered by the Federal Public Housing Authority for war purposes be effected in a manner designed to protect private enterprise and to effectuate the public purpose of making such housing available to such farmers and farm labor within this State.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress authorize the removal of such housing, when no longer essential to the war effort, through the medium of, or by sale or other disposition to, the State of Arizona or to appropriate local public agencies in the State of Arizona, for the purpose of making such housing available to farmers of small income and to farm labor in the State of Arizona, who are in need of improved housing facilities.

"Passed by the house, March 15, 1944.

"Passed by the senate, March 15, 1944.

"Approved by the Governor, March 17, 1944."

(The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.)

VETERANS' BENEFITS—RESOLUTION BY AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Maryland, relating to Senate bill 1767, the so-called G. I. bill of rights. I request that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The department commander, the grande chef de gare, five department vice commanders, and the commanders, adjutants, and membership chairmen of 101 posts of the Department of Maryland, assembled at the War Memorial Building, Baltimore, Md., on Sunday, April 23, 1944, for the annual membership round-up, respectfully request Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the Veterans' Legislation Committee, to immediately report the G. I. bill of rights—Senate 1767—to the House floor, and any controversial sections be submitted to the Members of the House so that this bill may be enacted into law before May 30, 1944, as a tribute to the memory of all the men and women who have given their lives for the preservation of our country, and further that a copy be sent to the senior Senator from Maryland, the Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS; and the senior Representative of the Maryland delegation, the Honorable THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CONTROL OF MISSOURI RIVER FLOODS—RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the city council of Omaha, Nebr.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF OMAHA COUNCIL CHAMBER,
Omaha, Nebr., April 18, 1944.

Whereas during the last few days, Omaha and the surrounding territory, on both sides of the Missouri River, has witnessed the return of destructive spring floods; and

Whereas many thousands of acres of valuable productive land and many homes have been inundated by this catastrophe, and millions of dollars needlessly lost; and

Whereas to permit the continuance of such great waste, with the consequent great reduction in crop production during this period of world conflict and food shortages, cannot but seriously retard America's conduct of the global war in which we are now engaged; and

Whereas a definite and effective plan, known as the Pick plan, for the control of the Missouri River has been adopted and laid before Congress for its approval, and for the allotment of funds for the work it advised; and

Whereas further delay in placing such plan into effect would be neither economically sound nor patriotically wise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Omaha, That it is the sense of the City Council of the City of Omaha that the Congress of the United States should approve this plan with amendments to provide for immediate flood control without further delay, allot the necessary funds therefor, and order the immediate commencement of flood-control work thereunder, so that the needless destruction of farms and other properties can be brought to an early and definite end; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and he is hereby, ordered and directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to all Nebraska Senators and Congressmen and to such others of adjoining States as may seem advisable.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original document now on file in the city clerk's office.

M. J. DINEEN, Jr.,
City Clerk.

LIMITATIONS ON THE SALE, TRANSPORTATION, AND USE OF CORN

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference copy of a letter addressed by Harry B. Coffee, president of the Union Stock Yards Co., of Omaha, to Hon. Chester Bowles, Director of Price Administration, together with a resolution adopted by livestock feeders of the Omaha, Nebr., market territory.

There being no objection, the letter, together with the resolution, were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION STOCK YARDS CO.,
OF OMAHA, LTD.,
Omaha, Nebr., April 26, 1944.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Director of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed resolution expresses the sentiment of the livestock producers in this area on the "corn freeze" order which is disrupting and congesting the livestock markets and is causing further confusion and discouragement among the livestock producers.

Livestock feeders in the restricted area are unable to purchase corn necessary to complete their feeding operations. Others who have cattle and lambs contracted to put in their feedlots, find their contracts for corn have been canceled by the order and they are left in a serious dilemma.

What is to be done with the thousands of thin cattle and lambs that must go to the feed lots to be fattened before they are slaughtered? The principal meat-producing area in America is now confronted with an order that will drastically curtail meat production.

It would have been a simple matter to secure the necessary corn supply for the designated essential corn processors. The O. P. A. could allow the designated processors to pay a couple of cents premium per bushel in the open market for their corn. This would keep them supplied with available corn from surplus areas. The O. P. A. permitted California for more than 60 days this winter to pay a premium that drained this area of millions of bushels of corn. No one could object to this plan which would facilitate the movement of corn to the essential war industries.

The present W. F. A. Order No. 98 disrupts the entire economy in the restricted area and will seriously retard meat production. Under existing regulations the feed lots are being emptied and a beef shortage is certain within the next 60 days.

Hoping you will use your influence to correct this situation, I am,

Yours sincerely,

HARRY B. COFFEE,
President.

While livestock feeders of the Middle West are cognizant of the need for corn in the Nation's essential war industries, and they are desirous of seeing that such necessary supplies are obtained immediately, at the same time they feel that all commercial corn-producing areas should contribute their proportionate share of those supplies.

War Food Administration Order No. 98, Limitations on Sale, Transportation, and Use of Corn, requires, except as provided in the order, that all corn in the 125 designated counties be sold to the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The 125 designated counties represent the largest meat-producing counties in the United States.

The provisions of this order not only will curtail the continued production of meat, it will require the immediate marketing of livestock, due to the inability of feeders to secure needed supplies of corn, because the livestock feeder will be unable to compete with the Commodity Credit Corporation in the purchase of corn: Therefore be it

Resolved—

1. That War Food Administration Order No. 98, entitled "Limitations on the Sale, Transportation, and Use of Corn," be amended to provide that all commercial corn-producing counties be placed on the same basis as the 125 restricted counties and called upon to share in the contribution to the essential commercial corn processors.

2. That livestock feeders in the restricted area be accorded a priority on corn second only to the processors of essential war materials, and that the permits issued by the county A. A. A. committees to livestock feeders be acceptable for the purchase of corn held by elevators for the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the same basis as purchases are made by the corn processors.

3. That a reasonable percentage of the corn delivered to the elevators for the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation be set aside to meet the immediate essential needs of the livestock feeders in the restricted area.

4. That corn from the essential meat-producing area be drawn upon only after every effort has been made to obtain supplies nearest the location of the essential corn processors.

5. That so long as it is available wheat be used in the production of alcohol.

6. That this W. F. A. Order No. 98 be repealed just as soon as necessary supplies of corn to be used by the essential industries have been obtained.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 873. A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 808); and

S. 1081. A bill to add certain lands to the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge; without amendment (Rept. No. 809).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 2105. A bill extending the time for repayment and authorizing increase of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 810).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Indian Affairs;

H. R. 2143. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 811).

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 198. A bill to amend further section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 812);

S. 1481. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 813);

H. R. 4292. A bill to amend section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 814); and

H. R. 4320. A bill relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service; with amendments (Rept. No. 815).

By Mr. MEAD, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1705. A bill to provide night differential for certain employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 816).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1419. A bill to authorize collectors of internal revenue to receive cashier's checks of certain banking institutions in payment for revenue stamps; with amendments (Rept. No. 817).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 267. A bill relating to marriage and divorce among members of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians; with an amendment (Rept. No. 823);

S. 338. A bill for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; without amendment (Rept. No. 818);

S. 845. A bill to define the exterior boundaries of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation in Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 826);

S. 1240. A bill to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.); with amendments (Rept. No. 824);

S. 1580. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the nonreservation Indian boarding school known as Sherman Institute, California; without amendment (Rept. No. 819);

S. 1597. A bill to amend section 1, act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 703), for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Grand Coulee Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 827);

S. 1710. A bill to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian; without amendment (Rept. No. 820);

S. 1847. A bill to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 821);

S. 1848. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 825); and

H. R. 329. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 822).

S. Res. 243. Resolution further continuing the authority for a general survey of the condition of Indians in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 828), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1501. A bill for the relief of the Rau Motor Sales Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 831);

S. 1605. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego and Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva; with amendments (Rept. No. 830);

S. 1731. A bill for the relief of Helen Halverson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 829); and

H. R. 2711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Maag; with an amendment (Rept. No. 834).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel, Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel; without amendment (Rept. No. 833);

H. R. 2303. A bill for the relief of O. W. James; with an amendment (Rept. No. 835); and

H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of Ruth Coe; without amendment (Rept. No. 832).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

Philip M. Klutznick, of Nebraska, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency vice Herbert Emmerich.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr., of New York, N. Y., to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury, in place of Randolph E. Paul, resigned;

Edgar Bernard Brossard, of Utah, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1950 (reappointment);

George J. Schoeneman, of Newport, R. I., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill an existing vacancy;

Joseph P. Marcelle, of Brooklyn, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of New York, in place of Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., resigned;

Austin J. Mahoney, of Rochester, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y. (reappointment);

Martin O. Bement, of Buffalo, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y. (reappointment);

Paul R. Leake, of Woodland, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif. (reappointment); and

Sundry officers for promotion in the regular corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Brian S. Odem, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas, vice Douglas W. McGregor, resigned;

William R. Smith, Jr., of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas;

Edward M. Curran, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia;

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4 of Alaska, vice Ralph J. Rivers, resigned; and

George A. Wright, of Montana, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana, vice William W. Crawford, recess appointment expired August 5, 1939.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1867. A bill relating to the management and administration of national-forest grazing lands; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1868 (by request). A bill relative to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1869. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. WHEELER introduced Senate bill 1870, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1871. A bill for the relief of the Cherokee Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ORDER OF INDUCTION UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the order of induction by age groups of certain men who have children, and for other purposes.

I also ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1870) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the order of induction by age groups of certain men who have children, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (m) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(m) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (b), under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, on the basis of the best inventory information available to him at the time of allocating calls, without affecting the usual regular and orderly flow of the Nation's manpower into the armed forces as required for service therein, and in accordance with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with the other provisions of this act, registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations (1) in such a manner that registrants, regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged, who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces, and (2) in the case of registrants who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date, and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, in such a manner that such registrants who had attained the age of 26 years on May 1, 1944, will be inducted after the induction of such registrants who had not attained the age of 26 years on May 1, 1944, who are not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder, who are available for induction, and who are acceptable to the land and naval forces. No registrant who was married prior to December 8, 1941, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, who has a child or children under 18 years of age, and who had attained the age of 30 years on May 1, 1944, shall hereafter, without his consent, be inducted for training or service under this act. The term 'child' as used in this section means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild, adopted child, foster child, or a person who is in the relationship of child to the registrant, who became such prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than 18 years of age or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, who is unmarried, and with whom the registrant has maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home since December 7, 1941, or since the date of birth if such date of birth is later than December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no individuals shall be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions, except pursuant to a requisition by the land or naval forces for persons in needed medical, professional, and specialist categories."

SEC. 2. In any general demobilization or release from active duty of persons in the active military and naval service the military and naval forces shall follow a general policy, insofar as practicable and compatible with military operations, of discharging or relieving from active duty persons who have children with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship, before discharging or releasing other persons from active duty.

Mr. WHEELER. In connection with the bill I have just introduced I wish to call attention to one of a great many editorials which have appeared recently. An editorial appeared in the New York Sun on Monday, April 24, from which I read the following:

IT IS TIME TO PUT AN END TO MUDDLE OF THE DRAFT

"Where do you stand in the draft?"

"I don't know—I haven't seen a paper in the last 3 hours."

This current joke has the twin elements of humor: truth, blended with exaggeration. It is plain truth that for millions of men, for their families, for their employers, the draft today spells uncertainty. Men subject to it may know or think they know what their present status is, but they do not know

what it will be 3 weeks from now or 3 months from now. They do not know whether the regulations which take Joe Jones into service on Monday will apply to Fred Brown on Wednesday or not.

Almost any man across whose tomorrow lies a question mark will testify that he can stand anything better than uncertainty. He asks no ironclad guaranty of the future, but only reasonable assurance that he will be able to plan a little ahead.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT IS TIME TO PUT AN END TO MUDDLE OF THE DRAFT

"Where do you stand in the draft?"

"I don't know, I haven't seen a paper in the last 3 hours."

This current joke has the twin elements of humor—truth blended with exaggeration. It is plain truth that for millions of men, for their families, for their employers, the draft today spells uncertainty. Men subject to it may know or think they know what their present status is, but they do not know what it will be 3 weeks from now or 3 months from now. They do not know whether the regulations which take Joe Jones into service on Monday will apply to Fred Brown on Wednesday or not.

Almost any man across whose tomorrow lies a question mark will testify that he can stand anything better than uncertainty. He asks no ironclad guaranty of the future, but only reasonable assurance that he will be able to plan a little ahead.

Whether operating at its best or at its worst, selective service has undergone many changes since September 16, 1940, when the President put his signature to the original act. In the summer of 1940 two courses were open. One was to follow the European system of calling up classes for training and service; that is, putting all physically fit men of 20 or 21 or 22 into uniform. The other was to follow the American pattern of 1917–18, under which all men in broad age groups were liable to service. Time was thought to be lacking to follow the first course. Following the second course through periods when war was unlikely, then probable, then a reality, has produced a great variety of changes, some of them highly contradictory.

The original bill—not the original law—provided for registration of all males from 18 to 65, with those from 21 to 45 subject to call to the armed forces, and with quotas for the age groups from 21 to 31, 31 to 38, and 38 to 45, a sort of selective service by proportional representation. Though this militarily inept idea never was written into law, it needs to be kept in mind. Bone slivers sometimes work through the jaw long after a tooth has been pulled; the notion of the democratic distribution of military service among all age groups, though never written into law, has plagued the operation of selective service down to the present time.

The 1940 law, as enacted, provided the broad basis for selective service, then limited to those from 21 to 35. Since then there have been five principal changes by law: Repeal of the limitations on where and how long inducted men could serve; amendment of the law to provide for registration of all males from 18 to 65 and for the training and service of those from 20 to 45; the blanket deferment of farmers and farm workers who met certain conditions; setting up, through the Allotment and Allowance Act, of seven classes of registrants, to be drawn upon in order; and extension of the draft to those 18 and 19 years old.

Such a summary statement of the changes in the text of the statute is too simple, for the law is merely the basis on which selective service has operated. It would be necessary to study the voluminous and frequently amended regulations of the Selective Service System, the decisions of appeal agents, the course of action of thousands of local draft boards to know the full story of the changes in selective service. Some changes have been compelled by action of Congress. Some have come because of changes in the course and character of the war. Others have come from the War Manpower Commission or the Selective Service System, acting on their own authority. A few have come from draft boards operating in a vacuum.

After all these changes Selective Service still has not shaken down enough to end uncertainty. Of late, in fact, the rate of changes in policy seems to have been stepped up.

Can this uncertainty be ended, if not for all men subject to the draft, then for most of them? There have been various answers to this question, but they have been unofficial. For example, it is said that if you are under 22 you have practically no chance of deferment; if you are between 22 and 26, your chances of deferment are slight; if you are between 26 and 29, you will probably not be called soon; if you are over 29, the chances are slim that you will be called this year. Such statements are informed guesses, at the best, based on the fact that the latest turn the draft policy has taken has been the fruit of the Army's demand for young men for combat duty and replacement of combat troops. This latest turn has been attributed by some to alterations in high military policy between 1940 and 1944; that is, the emphasis in 1940 was on armored forces and air power, whereas now it has swung back to infantry, with the need for young men imperative.

If this is correct, if the draft is to take younger men at the expense of occupational deferment, whether in industry or agriculture, then it ought to be possible to provide reasonable certainty about the future for a large proportion of men not subject to immediate call. Reasonable certainty is all that they ask.

The Army has shown that it can make its estimates with considerable accuracy. The Navy knows pretty closely how many men it will need over the next months. Selective Service officials know how many men are available in the various age groups and how many of them can be expected to be physically acceptable. That service also knows how many men are deferred for occupational reasons, how many because of dependents, how many on both accounts.

Is there the basis for a long-range policy in all this accumulated knowledge and experience? It would seem so. Senator TAFT has suggested that it be formulated by agreement among all the agencies concerned. There is one agency with a big concern not easy to bring into any conference or meeting of minds and that is Congress. It would be easy to adopt a long-range policy without changing the law as it stands, for the law is relatively flexible. But it would be impossible to carry out a long-range policy if the effects of the policy were to lead Congress into constant efforts to amend the law. If the service agencies and others concerned reach an agreement on policy that promises reasonable certainty for a reasonable time, that policy, except in an emergency, ought not to be disturbed by Congress or anybody else.

Part of the story of the draft is the story of how to reconcile the irreconcilable. We have had to grow and harvest more food than ever before; we have had to produce and ship more munitions than ever before in our history; we have had to build and man the biggest Navy ever; we have had to raise and train and equip an Army of unprecedented size; we have had to provide the goods and services for lend-lease operations of tremendous magnitude. We have had to do all this with our original human resources. We could appropriate billions of dollars, but we could not appropriate 10,000,000 men for the armed forces, or millions of new workers for arms plants, or thousands of new farmers. We had to do with what we had.

Granted all that, it is late in the day to be making over selective service every 15 minutes. It is late in the day to pull men one way on Tuesday and another way on Thursday. The whole country is angry over this confusion. It is demanding that an end be put to the mess and muddle into which the draft has fallen—an end to the off-again, on-again, gone-again phase of selective service. Now is the time to adopt some clear policy and to stick to it for more than 2 weeks

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to say that my reason for introducing the bill is the uncertainty which exists in the country with reference to the draft. It will be recalled that when I introduced another bill dealing with the same subject a little more than a year ago I suggested that my reason for introducing it was to clear up the existing uncertainty. A substitute bill for the bill which I introduced was passed, and the statement was made at that time that passage of the measure would undoubtedly clear up the existing uncertainty.

Today, Mr. President, there is more confusion and more uncertainty in this country with respect to the draft law and the manpower situation than has existed at any time. In my judgment the uncertainty is leading toward a breaking down of the morale of the country.

The statement is now generally being made that the Army does not want men over 30 years of age. My bill provides that in the case of men under 26 years of age the Army shall first take men subject to draft who are not fathers; that married men between the ages of 26 and 30 shall not be inducted until after the induction of those less than 26 years of age; and that the Army shall defer all married men over 30 years of age who have children and who are living with their families.

I have been informed from various sources that the Army will probably not take men who are over 30 years of age unless something unforeseen shall happen. It seems to me that Congress should say definitely that the Army shall not take fathers. If fathers are taken it naturally results in breaking up the home. Unless definite provision is made with respect to fathers they will be left in complete uncertainty as to their position under the conditions which exist at the present time. If at a later time it becomes necessary to take fathers, the Congress of the United States can promptly pass legislation which would change the status of fathers, and I should be one of the first to join in changing the provision with respect to fathers if it becomes essential that they be taken. In the meantime something should be done now to make definite and positive provision, so that the uncertainty may be done away with as well as the confusion which now exists, so that our people may know where they stand from day to day.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1945, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Civil Service Committee, I wish to ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 522) providing for separation from the classified civil service of persons absent from their official duties for certain periods, which has heretofore been reported to the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], be withdrawn from the calendar and recommitted to the committee for its further consideration. I may say that I have asked the agreement of the Senator from Tennessee to this effect, and he has no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, my attention was diverted and I did not hear what the request was. Will the Senator repeat it?

Mr. DOWNEY. A bill of rather minor importance was reported by the Civil Service Committee several days ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. Because of certain aspects which were not thoroughly understood by the committee, the committee has asked me to request unanimous consent that the bill be withdrawn from the calendar and recommitted to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill is withdrawn from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 461) to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.) as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 78th Cong.), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF BEAVER AND MAHONING RIVERS, PENNSYLVANIA AND OHIO—AMENDMENT

Mr. BURTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES—AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4414) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 45, line 10, after the first semicolon, insert the following: "for payment of compensation in lieu of leave of absence to employees and former employees, or in the case of those who have died or become incompeten since June 30, 1932, to their legal representatives, for leave of absence earned during the fiscal year 1932 which has not been taken and for which they have not otherwise been compensated, such payment to be at a rate equal to the rate of compensation of the employee during the time in which such leave was earned."

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] be excused from further service on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and

That the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] be assigned to service on the following committees: Commerce, Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, the Library, and Post Offices and Post Roads.

AMERICA CAN DO BETTER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America Can Do Better," delivered by him before the Ohio Federation of Republican Women at Columbus, Ohio, April 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him for May 3, Poland's national holiday, the anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESENTATION OF GOLD MEDAL AWARD TO MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK BY NEW YORK SOUTHERN SOCIETY

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the record of the fifty-eighth annual dinner of the New York Southern Society, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on December 3, 1943, and the annual meeting of the society at the University Club, New York City, on April 16, 1943, at which a gold medal was presented to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, which appear in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY SICKNESS INSURANCE—EDITORIAL FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sauce for the Goose," discussing the question of compulsory sickness insurance, published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA AT WAR ON THE FARM FRONT—ARTICLE BY SELDEN MENEFEE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "America at War," by Selden Menefee, having to do with the farm situation, written and published in the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY VINCENTE LOMBARDO TOLEDANO ON AIMS OF LATIN NATIONS

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 25, 1944, containing a statement by Vincente Lombardo Toledano, made to the International Labor Organization in session at Philadelphia, dealing with the aims of Latin nations, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA BALLOT ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the result of Commonwealth Club of California ballot on international relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY — ARTICLE BY PICO CORTES

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article in regard to the Inter-American Highway, written by Pico Cortes and published in the Naples Record, Ontario County, N. Y., of April 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS IN SELIGMAN MEMORIAL LIBRARY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding historical documents available at the Seligman Memorial Library, Columbia University, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF INFANTRY—ADDRESS BY BRIGADIER GENERAL WILBUR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Brig. Gen. William H. Wilbur at the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., on April 22, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SGT. CHARLES "COMMANDO" KELLY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, Monday, April 24, and Tuesday, April 25, 1944, were memorable days in the history of the city of Pittsburgh and the State of Pennsylvania, for on the former date Sgt. Charles E. "Commando" Kelly, the one-man army, came home from the wars, and the latter date, designated as Commando Kelly Day, was marked by a community-wide celebration in the city of Pittsburgh.

The daring exploits of "Commando" Kelly at the Salerno beachhead in Italy are well known. For his courage and bravery in that action Sergeant Kelly was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor—1 of 15 living men who have received that coveted medal during the present war.

The account of "Commando" Kelly's heroism—although he would not call it that—is best told in his own words. I therefore ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks excerpts from an article which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 25, which recounts in the sergeant's own words the events and actions for which he was cited.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the excerpts will be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts are as follows:

Sergeant Kelly began his story with the landing of the Thirty-sixth Division on the Salerno Beach September 9.

"We had no artillery cover and the infantry pushed those boys in like nothing was in front of them. Those boys slipped out in front of tanks with automatic rifles and tried to stop them."

YANKS STOP THEM

"The Germans would come with their tanks and armored cars and our boys would lay waiting for them, then jump out and throw hand grenades. They stopped a lot of them, too. Those Germans were scared. I saw some of them jump out with their hands up and some of them actually shot themselves before they'd be captured

"We sent out patrols and finally found where the Germans actually were. It was 22 miles away."

"So," went on the sergeant in the most matter-of-fact way imaginable, "we marched those 22 miles, and the next morning we attacked the hill where the Germans were dug in.

"Somehow I seemed to get out in front—just sticking my neck out, I guess. We rushed the machine-gun nests and cleaned them out and reached the top of the hill. That night I went out and found a bivouac area where the Germans were gathered and came back and reported. So they sent me back again and I got back that time, too, with my report."

But the third time Kelly went back to check up on the German movements he and a group of men were cut off. They opened fire on the Germans with automatic rifles and the Germans began to drop.

GOES FOR AMMUNITION

And there in Kelly's story is revealed the temperament that wins congressional medals.

"I had a lot of fun watchir g them," he reported and he wasn't trying to be funny either.

"We were running out of ammunition but the boys decided to stay. Then finally we did run out of ammunition entirely and we had to withdraw to our company lines until we got more ammunition.

"The Germans attacked and we dropped them as they came. The German casualties were at least 8 to 1 of ours. But our ammunition got to running low again and I volunteered tc get some."

"So I got it," is the way Kelly dismissed the whole thing and then jumped his story ahead to—

"The third time I went after ammunition I didn't get back. I got stuck."

Back at the ammunition dump Kelly and the men there were ordered to carry all the ammunition to a house nearby. The Germans were advancing. Then came some more of the Kelly idea of fun. "Everything was fine, I had a pair of good field glasses and could see the Germans a long way off. We all had a lot of fun. We had plenty of everything. I burned out four machine guns. Then I picked a bazooka and fired that awhile.

"Then I went outside and came on a 37-millimeter gun. I'd never fired one of those things before but all you have to do is ask yourself 'How does it go?' Then you just start pushing things and all of a sudden you touch something and off it goes."

GOES BACK TO HOUSE

Whatever it was that Kelly touched on that 37-millimeter antitank gun it stopped the Germans for a time. Apparently not wanting to miss any of his own peculiar idea of fun Kelly went back into the beleaguered house. That's when he got into the mortar shell tossing tournament that the whole country has been reading about.

"I found a lot of 60-millimeter mortar shells laying on the floor. I figured that if I could set one of them off it would at least scare the Germans. I started to tap it on the window sill and the pin fell out and I threw it.

"Well, those shells stopped them."

"How many mortar shells did you throw?" one of the newspapermen wanted to know.

"Oh, there must have been about 15 of them I imagine—and I kept on heaving them until I ran out."

"How far could you throw them?" was the next question.

"It was three stories up where I was and there was a 50-foot drop into a gully where the Germans were, so I guess I could get 'em across almost 50 yards."

"Any idea how much ammunition you shot away?" another newspaperman wanted to know.

"Well, I fired 3,000 rounds in an hour," returned the lad from Shawano Street. "I just kept pouring it out. I know I used up four cases of bullets in 4 or 5 hours there."

HE LEARNED THE HARD WAY

"Did you know anything about firearms before you went into the service?" was another question.

"I had very little experience," said Kelly, earnestly. "What I know I picked up in the Army—and most of it after I got into action."

"How many different types of weapons did you use in the 48 hours you were penned up in that house?" another interviewer wanted to know.

"I fired every weapon the infantry uses," said Kelly: "Browning automatics, light machine guns, water-cooled machine guns, bazookas, and that 37-millimeter gun I told you about.

"You don't have to know anything about them," he assured his listeners reassuringly. "Just keep on pushing them around and they'll shoot.

"But the ruined house was becoming too hot for the handful of doughboys left, and they decided to get out. A couple of patrols failed to get through."

Kelly volunteered to stick and cover the withdrawal of his detail.

"I stayed there fighting for a while until the fellows got away, and then I sneaked down in the cellar and out the back way and got out into the streets.

"I ran into a lot of fellows. You just didn't know who was who. I passed Germans that didn't pay any attention to me." Part of that night Kelly spent in a ditch.

"When I woke up there were Germans all around me—most of them wounded and calling for aqua. I kept on going and finally ran into another regiment that was withdrawing, and I went with them. Then I went back to my own regiment, and the first thing they sent me out on another patrol. Well, I came back from that one, too, and after that we went back to get reorganized."

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, that indeed is such action as we in America are proud to honor. But even more impressive to me was the sincere, humble attitude of this hero who, though he had been raised in one of the less palatial districts of the city, turned his back upon the luxury of a $55-a-day suite in one of Pittsburgh's principal hotels with these words: "This home was good enough for my mom, Mr. Mayor, and it's good enough for me."

Thus this young man, a justly celebrated hero in the eyes of the Nation, went home with "mom"—"mom" who has given five other sons to the services of America; "mom" whose two other boys are ready and willing to join forces with their brothers in the common cause.

This hero of the hour showed himself to be a real American and a real man when he turned his back upon luxury and acclaim to return with his family to the old home on Shawano Street, where "mom" had given him and his brothers a proper start in the journey of life.

Mr. President, the real measure of any man is the love and attachment which he feels for his mother and his home. "Commando" Kelly has met that measure with full merit. There is no palace in all the world that can approach the splendor and the spirit which prevails in the Kelly home on Pittsburgh's north side today.

The fine example which this young man has set both at home and abroad has gladdened and made proud the heart of every American. "Commando" Kelly has proved himself worthy of the homage of the Nation and the love of a splendid mother.

SALES OF WAR STAMPS AND BONDS BY SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about the activities of the pages of the Senate, as well as those of the other House, in the sale of War bonds and stamps. It may not be known to most of us that for some time these young men have been very active in this direction. As a matter of fact, they have already sold several thousands of dollars' worth of War bonds and stamps. I refer particularly to the pages in this Chamber, whom we see before us, and who, we are told, have cooperated with the House pages, who have also sold a great many thousand dollars' worth of War bonds and stamps.

Mr. President, I wish to compliment the young men, and invite attention to the fact that in furtherance of their activities an informal dance has been planned. Perhaps most of us already have received an invitation to the dance which will be held at 8 o'clock on Monday evening next, in the new ballroom of the Shoreham Hotel. I understand that everyone is invited to attend. The purpose of the dance is to further the sale of War bonds and stamps. I am told there will be present an all-girl orchestra, and possibly music will be also supplied by the Air Corps Band. There will be booths at which War bonds and stamps will be on sale.

I think the activity is a patriotic one, and that the young men are entitled to a word of praise being said about them because of the work which they have been doing. I hope we will do all we can to back them up.

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement and I shall be particularly obliged if I may have the attention of the able majority leader in connection with what I am about to say.

The Senate Military Affairs Committee this morning voted unanimously to report to the Senate next Monday Senate bill 1718, which deals with a formula for the swift and conclusive termination of war contracts and the clearance of war plants. This action was taken on a unanimous report from the Murray

subcommittee headed by the able junior Senator from Montana who has rendered yeoman service to this desperately important cause. The proposed legislation partially originates in the special committee of the Senate headed by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Planning, of which I am a member. It has the unanimous support of that committee; it has the united support of all the procurement departments of the Government; it has the support of Mr. Baruch, who has led in the consideration of this matter in behalf of the executive department; it now has the unanimous support of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. President, there is nothing so important to the economic life of the United States as that this proposed legislation shall be immediately concluded in the Senate and then acted upon in the House. Involved in it is the whole post-war economic life of the Nation. Contingent upon it is our successful transition from war economy to peace economy. War contracts in the billions of dollars are being terminated already. War contracts in the hundreds of billions of dollars will be terminated from coast to coast when the incalculably precious hour of armistice arrives. Unless we are prepared in advance for that climax, and its aftermath, we shall face economic confusion and economic chaos in America The preparation cannot longer be delayed. Every hour of delay from now on, as Mr. Baruch put it to me himself this week, invites staggering adventures in adversity; whereas adequate and effective congressional action, before it is too late, will cut the demobilization and reconversion hazard to a minimum and will hasten the ultimate day of a great and stable peace prosperity. Fifty million post-war jobs are involved in what I am saying. Eighty percent of the annual national income is involved. We can have the greatest panic in history; or we can, with but a brief transition interlude, have the greatest peacetime prosperity in our history. The choice, in the first instance, hangs upon congressional action; and time is now the essence of this action.

We have been dealing with this problem for about 9 months, in committee hearings, and in the discussion of various legislative formulas, in various committees of both the House and the Senate. It has involved essential and indispensable exploration. American industry has patiently cooperated in these long labors. But now the time has come when we must have action, because the time has arrived when those whom we intend to hold responsible for operating private enterprise on a basis that shall restore us to economic stability and full employment in post-war days must have, without further delay, the dependable knowledge as to what the congressional formula and the congressional attitude will be. They can do nothing until we act.

The most controversial phase of the demobilization and reconversion problem in respect to war contracts is the question of the disposal of surplus property. We have deliberately eliminated that phase of the problem from this immediate legislation, for the very good reason that there should be practically no controversy regarding the formula in respect to contract termination and plant clearance. In other words, we are putting first things first; we are asking present action at the point where it should be easiest to get. We are striving to get underway. Therefore, having eliminated the most controversial phase of the matter, and postponed its consideration until after the consideration of the present legislative proposal shall be concluded, I respectfully submit that the legislation respecting contract termination and plant clearance should have immediate right-of-way in the Senate.

I repeat that upon the effective answer by Congress to the question involved literally depend 50,000,000 post-war jobs, literally depends the success with which we meet the post-war economic impact, literally depends the economic life of this country.

It is in a wholly unpolitical way that I add to this statement that in a conference of Republican Senators this morning we unanimously agreed that we would join in the request that Senate bill 1718 shall have immediate right-of-way in the Senate, and I very respectfully present the request to the able majority leader, in the hope that in behalf of the proposed legislation, which has the united support of the George committee, the Military Affairs Committee, the procurement officers of the Government, and Mr. Baruch himself, some way may be found next week, without fail, to conclude action on the proposed legislation on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. No member of the Committee on Military Affairs has so far mentioned this matter to me, or indicated when the committee would like to have the bill taken up. I do not know as yet when the report will actually be made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It will be made Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might say that it had been contemplated that the Senate would recess today until Tuesday. There is now pending a bill, which is the unfinished business, which should not take long, but on which I understand the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the minority leader, will request that no vote be taken today. That would take it over until next week. I do not know that there is any appropriation bill which is urgent. Therefore I can assure the Senator, so far as I am concerned, that early next week, it may be following the pending order, we may be able to take up the bill to which he refers.

Mr. McKELLAR. There will not be an appropriation bill considered on Tuesday.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his helpful statement. I think perhaps I should apologize for "jumping the gun" in respect to the proposed legislation. It just happens that I come from the No. 1 war production area of the United States, and therefore I also come from the No. 1 area in which the terrific post-war reconversion problem is of paramount importance. It is only because I have had definite and specific evidence, time and time again, in the last few weeks, that there is a serious hazard to the country and its ultimate welfare in every additional hour that we delay in respect to the legislation, that I have presumed to make this advance statement.

I wish to include in the statement my compliments and respects to the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, which has cooperated magnificently this week in bringing the matter to a swift committee conclusion.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may ask the Senator to yield further——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself am a member of the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, along with the Senator from Michigan, and we all know that that committee has worked diligently for months on this whole problem, and the proposal to which he has called attention is a part of the program we must enact into law. It may be the most urgent and immediate problem, others being required to await a little further development and a little more information.

This problem is very important, and the Committee on Post-War Planning so considered it, and reported its recommendation, and actually framed a bill, which was introduced and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

I realize the importance of disposing of the matter, in order that facilities of all kinds which are to be discontinued, and contract holders who have rights growing out of the war, may know as soon as possible what their rights are. So that I think we should dispose of the proposed legislation, and I am sure we can do it early next week.

Mr. REVERCOMB rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the majority leader, and I am about to yield to the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], who, I should like to say in the course of yielding, is a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs which has just made this favorable disposition of Senate bill 1718, to which I have referred. I express my personal thanks to the Senator from West Virginia for aiding in the expedition of the action on the bill. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the able Senator from Michigan. As a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, composed of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and myself, I wish to urge that the bill be brought on for consideration by the Senate as quickly as possible. I am delighted this morning to hear the majority leader consent to that being done, stating that he will aid in it being accomplished.

After listening to evidence on this subject for several months I know how much such legislation is needed in order to continue the industries of this country

in operation. It is the first definite, progressive, positive step in furnishing work to men not only during the post-war period but at this time, now, when the reconversion from war industry to peace industry is beginning to get under way. The bill was reported by the subcommittee to the Committee on Military Affairs, and by the Committee on Military Affairs this morning unanimously ordered to be reported to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Committee on Military Affairs add any substantial amendments to the bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am advised it did not add anything substantial.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have concluded the statement I desired to make. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for what he has said. I wish to be sure that the RECORD shows my appreciation for the cooperation of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who was chairman of the subcommittee, and who has joined in this utterly essential effort to conclude this task before it is too late.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might further say that, so far as I now know, there is no reason why the bill cannot follow the pending unfinished business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I sat in the meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs this morning, and ordering the bill under discussion to be reported we added an admonition recommending expedition in the consideration of the subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. Expedition is absolutely essential. I cannot overemphasize that point.

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the remarks I made previously today, and immediately following them, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to me from President Alvan Macauley, of the Automotive Council for War Production.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTOMOTIVE COUNCIL
FOR WAR PRODUCTION,
Detroit, Mich., April 22, 1944.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: Your conclusions on contract-termination legislation now pending before Congress will vitally affect post-war employment. The reconversion period and unemployment will be long or short and great or small depending upon the action taken by Congress. The contract-termination and reconversion obstacles facing the automotive industry emphasize the need for early legislative action in order that "ground rules" may be known well in advance of the general termination at the end of the war in either major theater.

Employment in the manufacture, distribution, and use of motor vehicles directly affects every section of the country. Before the war, one out of every seven of the Nation's workers was dependent for his employment upon the automotive industry, its suppliers, and highway transport. Even though the reemployment of all of these workers may not depend directly upon prompt solutions of the above problems, this ratio indicates their far-reaching importance.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,
ALVAN MACAULEY,
President.

THE SEIZURE BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to read the following:

In modern war the maintenance of a healthy, orderly, and stable civilian economy is essential to successful military effort. Even in the absence of section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act, therefore, I believe that by the exercise of the aggregate of your powers as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, you could lawfully take possession of and operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., if you found it necessary to do so to prevent injury to the country's war effort.

Mr. President, what I have just read to the Senate is from the opinion of Attorney General Biddle upon which President Roosevelt undertook the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago.

Mr. President, I shall not attempt to justify the claims or the counterclaims made by all sides involved in this issue, but I do say that the interpretation the President has derived from the Attorney General's opinion and assertion of the right of Government to subject every individual and every private enterprise, big or small, to Federal influence is of a nature no American heretofore could understand.

From the President's interpretation of Mr. Biddle's opinion, Mr. President, it is not too extreme to suggest that were the manner in which you and I tended our Victory gardens not in accord with the methods endorsed by the Chief Executive he could construe our activities as presenting an injury to the country's war effort and accordingly seize our very back yards and make them subject to governmental operation. The fact that troops, which in simple language means force, were employed to effect the President's order, presents a situation which is unpleasantly similar to the actions taken by the governments of our enemies.

Are there no courts existing in our country which can review the legality of the decisions handed down by governmental bureaus, particularly when such decisions affect industry not engaged in the processing or production of war materials. Under the influence of wartime emergency, have we transferred all our civil rights to the Chief Executive? If the legality of the President's action is sustained, Congress, representing the people, must, in my judgment, by law provide some definitions, some limitations to the powers which are entrusted to the President, in order that the Bill of Rights guaranteed to the American people may be enforced. In this direction Congress should not act hastily, thereby endangering the national interest. Those powers which the President actually needs for furtherance of the war effort, he should have and should retain; but those he does not need should be returned to the people; and we should clarify the situation so that action such as taken by the President in the Montgomery Ward case cannot be repeated. If the President's authority is to be construed in the manner in which the Attorney General has construed it in the Montgomery Ward case, the President could have troops move in and seize every corner drug store and grocery store in this Nation and any kind of business or a Victory garden in a man's back yard. It is time the voice of Congress was raised in protest against this sort of action in the American Nation today. The time to call a halt is now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire that the President could move in and take every corner drug store and Victory garden is so utterly ridiculous that it falls of its own weight or lack of weight, as the case may be.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not going to enter into a debate as to the legality of the Montgomery Ward seizure, any more than I am going to enter into a debate as to the legality of the seizure of the Ken-Rad plant, at Owensboro, in my State, which is now before the Federal court in a proceeding brought by that company to test the legality of that action. I do not believe its legality can be tested in the Senate or by the Congress

I do not know all the facts leading up to the seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant. If I were to take the testimony of an editorial in an outstanding daily newspaper a few days ago, it might be possible to draw an invidious distinction between the attitude of Montgomery Ward & Co. toward its employees as compared to the attitude of Sears, Roebuck & Co. toward its employees, in the same city of Chicago and in other places throughout the country.

I regret as much as anyone could possibly regret the necessity for taking over industrial plants, whether such necessity grows out of obstinacy on the part of management or obstinacy on the part of employees or any other element composing the set-up of any company in this country. But it is certainly fantastic to compare the taking over of a great plant such as the Montgomery Ward plant, which distributes good all over the United States and in various parts of the world, to the taking over of a Victory garden or a corner drug store. Congress has passed this law. Congress itself no doubt was as uncertain as to its scope and authority as administrative officers are or as Army officers may be or as the courts themselves may be until it has finally been determined in some way by the highest court in the land exactly what we meant by the Smith-Connally Act, by the Second War Powers Act, and by any other act under which the President exercises jurisdiction or under his constitutional power as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

The point I wish to make is that we cannot determine on the floor of the Senate the legality of actions which are taken by the President in pursuance of a law which we ourselves have enacted, and I do not think we can make any

contribution to the solution of the problem by taking advantage of an individual, isolated situation growing out of an unfortunate controversy between management and employees, and trying to determine it here, either as a matter of law or as a matter of politics, as the case may be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has referred to the Smith-Connally Act. I wish to say to the Senator that I do not think the Attorney General predicated his opinion upon any language or clauses in the so-called Connally-Smith strike bill, because that measure, as I recall it—I hold a copy of it in my hand, but I do not now have time to read it all—relates only to plants furnishing war materials, as such. I think the Attorney General's opinion was predicated on a broader basis, on some general war powers act which the Congress has passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I mentioned the Smith-Connally Act because in the newspapers there has been published an interpretation that the exercise of this power was more or less a combined exercising of authority growing out of the Smith-Connally Act, the Second War Powers Act, and perhaps one or two other acts which Congress has passed, authorizing the President to take over plants under certain conditions.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Texas is entirely mistaken. Three-quarters of the Attorney General's opinion is based on the Smith-Connally Act. The Smith-Connally Act reads in part as follows:

> The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith.

The Attorney General has held that because Montgomery Ward manufactures three or four articles, among the thousands of articles it sells, therefore it is engaged in the manufacture of articles referred to in the Smith-Connally Act, and that its whole distributing facilities may be taken over. I do not raise the question whether that conclusion is legal or illegal; but that, in part, is the basis for the Attorney General's opinion. I should like to deal further, in my own time, with the other question which was raised by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have said all I have to say on this matter; I am sorry I was provoked to say this much.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Were the manufacturing facilities operated by Montgomery Ward & Co. used in producing commodities for the war effort?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not understand that they were. I have not read the entire opinion, and I do not desire at this time to argue the legality of the question whether the President could take over the Montgomery Ward plant under the provisions of the Smith-Connally Act. I merely wished to make clear, in reply to the statement of the Senator from Texas, that the Smith-Connally Act is the main ground for the opinion of the Attorney General. Regardless of the law, I certainly do not think it was the intention of the Congress to permit the taking over of a great distributing, merchandising enterprise under that law. Whether it is legal or illegal, I do not at the moment purport to say.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Ohio, and I state further, Mr. President, that under the Smith-Connally Act, I cannot see one scintilla of authority to take over any distributing system or any mercantile business in this country. I know it was not the intent of Congress to pass such a measure. If the President has the power to take over Montgomery Ward, then he has the power to take over a grocery store or a butcher shop in any hamlet in the United States.

Mr. TAFT. It seems so to me.

Mr. President, the Attorney General, having based his opinion primarily on the Smith-Connally Act, then goes on, in addition to the matter quoted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to say:

> It is not necessary, however, to rely solely upon the provisions of section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. As Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President possesses an aggregate of powers that are derived from the Constitution—

In other words, we cannot take them away from him—

> and from various statutes enacted by the Congress for the purpose of carrying on the war.
>
> The Constitution lays upon the President the duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." The Constitution also places upon the President the responsibility and invests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. In time of war when the existence of the Nation is at stake, this aggregate of powers includes authority to take reasonable steps to prevent Nation-wide labor disturbances that threaten to interfere seriously with the conduct of the war. The fact that the initial impact of these disturbances is on the production or distribution of essential civilian goods is not a reason for denying the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the power to take steps to protect the Nation's war effort.

These are the words read by the Senator from New Hampshire:

> In modern war the maintenance of a healthy, orderly, and stable civilian economy is essential to successful military effort. The Congress has recognized this fact by enacting such statutes as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1943; the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes"; the small business mobilization law of June 11, 1942; and the War Labor Disputes Act. Even in the absence of section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act, therefore, I believe that by the exercise of the aggregate of your powers as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, you could lawfully take possession of and operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., if you found it necessary to do so to prevent injury to the country's war effort.

If that is good law, Mr. President, there is nothing the President cannot do. He can find anything relating to the civilian economy to be in the interest of the war effort. That means anything relating to you and to me. He can take over not only a distributing facility such as Montgomery Ward & Co., but, as has been said, he can take over every grocery store in the United States. He can take over every man in the United States without any Selective Service Act or any other provision by Congress for the drafting of men.

There is no such law. There is no such principle in the Constitution of the United States. The President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, but that fact does not give him one additional power over any civilian, except in territories where the Army and Navy are actually operating in the course of their normal functions as Army and Navy.

So, Mr. President, I think the protest made by the Senator from New Hampshire is amply justified. If we admit the validity of any such principle, Congress might just as well go home and let the President run the United States and every feature of it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In line with the Senator's observations, I wish to read two sentences from a very able and restrained analysis of this whole situation in the editorial columns of the New York Times of this morning. Speaking of the Attorney General's argument regarding the President's general over-all war powers, the editorial states:

> This is tantamount to declaring that the President in wartime can do practically anything if in his own judgment it is necessary "to prevent injury to the country's war effort." No one who is concerned about civil liberties and constitutional process will easily accept so sweeping a claim as this of wartime powers for the President.

Mr. President, I wish to make that last sentence my own. Entirely regardless of any other consideration, and without respect to the merits or demerits of the intrinsic labor dispute involved at this point, I do not see how anyone who is concerned about civil liberties and constitutional process can easily accept so sweeping a claim of wartime powers for the President of the United States as this, and so sweeping a demonstration of the use of the armed power of the Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I fully agree. Before I take my seat, I desire to make it clear that I do not wish to express an opinion on the legality of seizing this plant under the Smith-Connally Act, and I do not care what the courts may finally decide on that question. After all, this is a question of policy. Was it a wise policy for the President, under the circumstances? In wartime we must grant vast powers to the President of the United States; but it is not intended because we grant such powers that they shall be exercised unless it is absolutely required by the circumstances which were in mind when the statute was enacted. I certainly question the policy of taking this plant, no matter what the law may finally be determined to be, or what the courts may decide. No matter what emergency might arise, it seems to me that the President could have permitted the legality of this procedure to be submitted to a court before using soldiers to take over an entire civilian enterprise and throw the president of the enterprise out on the sidewalk in front of the building.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we can debate endlessly about what any President in wartime may do without specific authority of Congress, and it is a very interesting study to go back over the years and make comparisons of what Presidents have done during wartime. The Constitution provides that the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it. It has been the opinion of lawyers generally that that means that Congress itself could suspend it by an act. But during the Civil War President Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus without an act of Congress. He also, in a measure, suspended freedom of speech, and freedom of the press, and it was necessary for the Congress, in the autumn of 1861, to enact retroactive legislation legalizing all the orders and proclamations which President Lincoln had issued since the preceding 4th of March.

Mr. TAFT. The writ of habeas corpus was suspended in the State of Maryland, where there was practically a state of insurrection. It was practically in the war area. That action was held to be illegal by the Chief Justice of the United States in a very courageous opinion. The general opinion since that time is that it was undoubtedly an illegal act for the President to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, and that only Congress could do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. Congress subsequently legalized the action.

Mr. BARKLEY. It legalized retroactively the orders which had been issued. President Lincoln acted under his powers as President and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in that war, which was, of course, a very unfortunate domestic controversy between two sections of the country. He felt that he had the authority to do so. No one who knows the history of Abraham Lincoln and admires him as I have always admired him would for a moment suggest that Lincoln did anything that he did not think he had the power to do. Later it developed that he did not have such power. The courts held that he did not have it, and later Congress legalized what he had done illegally.

So there is nothing new about Presidents, in time of war, exercising authority, even without an act of Congress, which courts may subsequently declare to be illegal.

As to the question of policy involved, that is a matter about which men may have an honest difference of opinion. To form an intelligent opinion about it is necessary for us to know, for example, what it is that Montgomery Ward & Co. manufactures. I do not know. It is necessary to know the relationship of what it does, not only in manufacture, but also in distribution in a Nation-wide fashion of the things which it either makes or buys from others, to other concerns in the country which are engaged in the manufacture and distribution of materials. It is also necessary to know the comparative labor relations existing in that company and in other companies which are involved.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the Executive order and the opinion of the Attorney General, in order to throw light on the whole procedure. The Attorney General discusses the things which are manufactured, and claims that some of them are of direct interest in the war effort. It seems to me that the object sought could have been obtained by seizing the manufacturing plant, without seizing the distribution facilities, which represent 90 percent of the entire business, and are not covered by the Smith-Connally Act.

There being no objection, the order and opinion were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER

Whereas after investigation I find and proclaim that there are existing and threatened interruptions of the operations of the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., located in Chicago, Ill., as a result of labor disturbances arising from the failure of Montgomery Ward & Co. to comply with directive orders of the National War Labor Board; that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by these interruptions; and that the exercise, as hereinafter specified, of the powers vested in me is necessary to insure, in the interest of the war effort, the operation of these plants and facilities and of other plants and facilities which are threatened to be affected by the said labor disturbances:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, it is hereby directed as follows:

1. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed, through and with the aid of any persons or instrumentalities that he may designate, to take possession of the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., located in Chicago, Ill., including the mail-order house, the retail store, and the Schwinn warehouse, together with any real or personal property and other assets used in connection with the operation thereof, and to operate or to arrange for the operation of the plants and facilities in any manner that he deems necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, and to do all things necessary or incidental thereto. The Secretary of Commerce is further authorized to exercise any contractual or other rights of the company and to take any other steps that he deems necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this order.

2. The Secretary of Commerce shall operate the plants and facilities of the company under the terms and conditions of the directive orders of the National War Labor Board dated January 15, 1944, and April 5, 1944.

3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to take any action that he may deem necessary or desirable to provide protection for the plants and facilities and for all persons employed or seeking employment therein.

4. Upon the request of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of War shall take any action that may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Commerce to carry out the provisions and purposes of this order.

5. Possession, control, or operation of any plant or facility, or part thereof, taken under this order shall be terminated by the Secretary of Commerce within 60 days after he determines that the productive efficiency of the plant, facility, or parts thereof prevailing prior to the existing and threatened interruptions of production, referred to in the recitals of this order, has been restored.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1944.*

BIDDLE'S OPINION

APRIL 22, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My opinion has been requested on the legality of a proposed Executive order directing the Secretary of Commerce to take possession of and to operate certain plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago, Ill., in which a strike is now in progress. From information received from other agencies and departments of the Government I understand that the relevant facts are as follows:

Montgomery Ward is an Illinois corporation with its principal place of business in Chicago, Ill. It is engaged in selling commodities by mail order and at retail, and in manufacturing certain of the commodities that it sells. In the fiscal year 1943 the company's gross sales amounted to $634,276,000. It is one of the two largest mail-order houses in the United States.

The more important items of merchandise that the company handles include automobile supplies, building materials, farm machinery, equipment and supplies, including repair parts; heating apparatus, plumbing supplies, electrical supplies, clothing and shoes, drugs, furniture, hardware, home furnishings, dry goods, and tiles.

The company's plants and facilities in Chicago, Ill., include a warehouse, a mail-order division, and a retail store. It also operates mail-order establishments in 8 other States and retail stores in each of the other 47 States. The total number of the retail stores is in excess of 600. The company employs approximately 70,000 persons. No exact information as to the number of its customers is available, but it is conservatively estimated that they number in the millions.

The company owns four factories which manufacture paints, varnish, fencing, and part of the farm equipment and supplies sold by the company. The paint factory is located at Chicago Heights, Ill. Other commodities distributed by the company are bought by it directly from manufacturers.

SAYS FACTORY IS IN WAR WORK

At the present time Hummer Manufacturing Co., a division of Montgomery Ward & Co., located at Springfield, Ill., is engaged in making carburetors, propellers and gun mounts for military aircraft. Hummer Manufacturing Co., also makes farm supplies and machinery, including repair parts. Other divisions of Montgomery Ward & Co., are engaged in making or distributing other goods that are essential to the maintenance of the war economy.

The company is an important distributor of general farm supplies and of farm machinery, such as corn and cotton planters, deep and shallow well systems, soil pulverizers, hay loaders, and poultry and farm equipment. Approximately 75 percent of the mail-order customers of the company are farmers, engaged in the production of essential agricultural commodities, who live in areas where they must depend upon mail-order houses for many necessary articles.

Government agencies have recognized the importance of the company to our war economy. The War Production Board has granted the company priority ratings for the materials it uses in the manufacture of commodities such as farm pumps, cream separators, paint, work clothing, wire and chain, that the Board regards as essential to the war effort. The War Production Board has also assigned preference ratings to Montgomery Ward to enable it to buy from manufacturers other goods, for example, farm equipment, tools and supplies of various kinds, that are required for essential civilian uses.

Since April 1942, the Chicago branch of the company has filed with the War Production Board approximately 36,000 applications for preference ratings of this kind. Because of the scarcity of paper and paper products, it is impossible to obtain shipping containers without a preference rating from the War Production Board. Montgomery Ward has been given preference ratings to enable it to buy containers for packaging merchandise to fill mail orders.

Furthermore, the War Production Board has given Montgomery Ward & Co. a preference rating for maintenance, repair, and operating supplies which enables the company to get supplies that would otherwise be unobtainable. Because of the company's importance to the war economy, the Office of Defense Transportation has granted certificates of war necessity for approximately 45 trucks that are either owner or operated by the company in various areas of the country.

REVIEWS LABOR DISPUTES

For a number of years the company has been engaged in disputes with its employees. Since, labor controversies in the company's plants in St. Paul, Minn.; Kansas City, Mo.; and Portland, Oreg., have led to four proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board. In each of the cases the National Labor Relations Board found that the company had engaged in unfair labor practices and entered orders directing the company to cease its illegal activities.

In three of the cases the orders of the National Labor Relations Board were affirmed in whole or in part by circuit courts of appeals. In the other case, the first order made by the National Labor Relations Board having been set aside by a circuit court of appeals, the Board, after rehearing, entered a second order which directed the company to reinstate certain discharged employees and to cease unfair labor practices. The company did not appeal from this order.

Since 1940 the company has been engaged in a dispute with its employees in Chicago. The issues have been: (1) The right of the United States Mail Order, Warehouse, and Retail Employees Union of the United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America to represent the employees for purposes of collective bargaining, and (2) the terms and conditions of the agreements between the company and the union, particularly those relating to union security, arbitration of employee grievances and seniority.

The issues as to the representation of different units of the company's employees were determined by two certifications by the National Labor Relations Board, one made on August 26, 1940, the other on February 28, 1942, and by voluntary recognition of the unions made by the company on April 27, 1942, and May 18, 1942. In the proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board which resulted in the certification dated February 28, 1942, the Board found that the company had been guilty of unfair labor practices in its plant in Chicago.

On June 2, 1942, the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to Executive Order 9017, dated January 12, 1942, certified to the War Labor Board a dispute between the certified union and the company over those terms and conditions of the collective bargaining agreement that related to union security, arbitration of employee grievances, and seniority.

The company then took the position that it would never agree to include in the contract any provisions for arbitration of employee grievances, seniority, or union security. The company also objected to the jurisdiction of the Board. After a hearing, the public, industry, and labor members of the Board, on June 29, 1942, unanimously decided that the dispute, if not peacefully settled, might interfere with the effective prosecution of the war, and that the dispute therefore fell within the Board's jurisdiction.

A panel composed of representatives of industry, labor, and the public heard the case for the Board and issued a unanimous report in two parts. The first part, dated August 31, 1942, dealt with the question of wages. On September 5, 1942, the Board unanimously adopted this part of the panel report and incorporated its recommendations in a directive order of the Board. The company voluntarily accepted this order.

The second part of the panel report, dated October 18, 1942, dealt with the questions of union security, arbitration of employee grievances, and seniority. On November 5, 1942, the Board, following the recommendations contained in part 2 of the report, unanimously directed the company to include provisions for union security, arbitration, and seniority in its agreement with the union. In a letter to the Board, dated November 13, 1942, the company rejected this order but stated that if the President of the United States as Commander in Chief directed the company to respect the order it would respectfully obey. On November 18, 1942, you wrote a letter to the president of the company directing the company to comply with the Board's order of November 5, 1942. Thereafter the company stated that it would comply with this direction and on December 8, 1942, the agreement became effective. Under the Board's order, the agreement was to remain in force for 1 year.

Prior to the expiration of the contract on December 8, 1943, the company notified the union that upon the termination of the contract it would not recognize the union or negotiate a renewal of the agreement. The company took this position on the ground that despite the prior certification by the National Labor Relations Board, the union no longer represented a majority of the employees in the warehouse and retail store, the two major bargaining units designated by the National Labor Relations Board. On December 6, 1943, the ensuing labor dispute was certified to the National War Labor Board by the Secretary of Labor and the United States Conciliation Service pursuant to the War Labor Disputes Act, which had become law on June 25, 1943.

RULING BY WAR LABOR BOARD

A public hearing was held before the National War Labor Board on December 16, 1943. On January 13, 1944, the Board directed that the terms and conditions of the contract should be extended without change for a period of 30 days, provided that the union should within that time commence a proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board for a determination of the representation question.

The Board further directed that if the union did begin such a proceeding the terms and conditions of the contract should continue to govern the relations between the parties until the issues as to the right of representation had been determined or until further order of the National War Labor Board. Thereafter the union complied with the Board's order by commencing a proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board, but the company refused to extend the contract or to comply with its provisions.

After a hearing on March 29, 1944, the National War Labor Board directed the company to restore the status quo by complying with the order of January 13, 1944, and to maintain the status quo thereafter until the issue as to representation had been finally determined. The company has refused to accept this order.

Repeated efforts by the War Labor Board to persuade the company to maintain the status quo in Chicago so that the issue of representation could be decided in a peaceful and orderly way failed, and on April 12, 1944, the union called a strike in the Chicago plant. Approximately 5,500 persons are employed in the plant, and it is estimated that the greater part of these employees are now on strike. The National War Labor Board states that there is substantial and immediate danger that this labor disturbance will spread to other plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., including those of Hummer Manufacturing Co., which is now engaged in making parts for military aircraft.

The Board also reports that there is a real and present danger that the disturbance will spread to the plants and facilities of other companies, both in the Chicago area and elsewhere, that are engaged in producing essential civilian and military goods. Local unions in Chicago in many of the important war plants have voted to support the Montgomery Ward employees who are on strike.

OTHER UNIONS BACK STRIKERS

The National Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs and Helpers, of the American Federation of Labor, in Chicago, are refusing to make deliveries to, or to take shipments from, Montgomery Ward & Co. Various affiliates of the railway brotherhoods have refused to handle deliveries to, or shipments from, Montgomery Ward & Co.

The National War Labor Board has issued four other orders involving labor disputes arising in the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward in Oakland, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; Denver, Colo.; Detroit, Mich.; and Jamaica, N. Y., and in the plant and facilities of Hummer Manufacturing Co. at Springfield, Ill. The company has refused to accept or to comply with any of these orders.

The War Labor Board states that the company's repeated refusals to accept the orders of the Board and the recurring disputes between the company and its employees threaten to impair or to break down the machinery for the peaceful and orderly adjustment of wartime labor disputes established by the Congress in the War Labor Disputes Act.

By a unanimous vote of its members, the National War Labor Board has referred this matter to you for appropriate action. In the letter of reference, dated April 13, 1944, Mr. Davis, the chairman of the Board, stated that the repercussions of the situation in Chicago "may have a serious effect on the war effort."

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CONCLUSIONS

In my opinion the facts that have been summarized justify the following conclusions:

1. Montgomery Ward & Co. is engaged in activities of a kind that are essential to the maintenance of our war economy. An interruption or stoppage of the company's activities would have a serious adverse effect upon the war effort.

2. There is a real and present danger that the labor dispute that is now interrupting the operations of the plants and facilities of the company in Chicago may extend throughout the Nation and interrupt the operations of other plants and facilities of the company. There is an equally real and present danger that the disputes will breed other labor controversies that will interrupt the operations of plants and facilities of other companies, both in the Chicago area and elsewhere, that are engaged in making or distributing goods or performing services that are essential to the war effort.

3. There is now no reason to expect that the disputes between the company and its employees in Chicago and elsewhere in the United States will be settled promptly and peacefully either by agreement or by the machinery that Congress has set up in the War Labor Disputes Act.

The basic legal question is whether you have the authority to take possession of and to operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago in order to prevent a serious interference with the war effort. Section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act (Public Law 89, 78th Cong.) provides in part as follows:

The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith.

SAYS PRESIDENT HAS THE POWER

Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility whenever the President finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant, mine, or facility as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance, that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant, mine, or facility in the interest of the war effort.

On the basis of the facts that have been summarized, and the conclusions that those facts justify, it is my opinion, first, that the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward are the kind of plants and facilities whose seizure is authorized by section 3 and, second, that you may properly make the findings required by section 3 as a condition precedent to the exercise of the power that it confers. I believe, therefore, that section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act authorizes you to take possession of and to operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co.

It is not necessary, however, to rely solely upon the provisions of section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. As Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President possesses an aggregate of powers that are derived from the Constitution and from various statutes enacted by the Congress for the purpose of carrying on the war.

The Constitution lays upon the President the duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." The Constitution also places upon the President the responsibility and invests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. In time of war when the existence of the Nation is at stake, this aggregate of powers includes authority to take reasonable steps to prevent Nation-wide labor disturbances that threaten to interfere seriously with the conduct of the war. The fact that the initial impact of these disturbances is on the production or distribution of essential civilian goods is not a reason for denying the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the power to take steps to protect the Nation's war effort.

OTHER LAWS ARE MENTIONED

In modern war the maintenance of a healthy, orderly, and stable civilian economy is essential to successful military effort. The Congress has recognized this fact by enacting such statutes as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1943; the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes"; the small business mobilization law of June 11, 1942; and the War Labor Disputes Act. Even in the absence of section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act, therefore, I believe that by the exercise of the aggregate of your powers as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, you could lawfully take possesion of and operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., if you found it necessary to do so to prevent injury to the country's war effort.

I conclude that in the circumstances of this case section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act and your constitutional and statutory powers as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy, considered either separately or together, authorize you to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take possession of and to operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., in Chicago, Ill.

The proposed Executive order, presented by the Chairman of the National Labor Board and forwarded for my consideration by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has my approval as to form and legality.

Respectfully yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion which has taken place concerning the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co., I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Montgomery Ward," appearing in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTGOMERY WARD

(By Mark Sullivan)

MEANING OF SEIZURE

For understanding the Montgomery Ward case, turn completely away from that case for a moment—we shall come back to it later. Turn to a wholly different case involving the same principle.

In July last year there was a controversy between coal mine owners and Mr. John L. Lewis as head of the United Mine Workers. The controversy went before the War Labor Board. The Board dictated provisions of a contract. Then the Board ordered the mine owners and Mr. Lewis to sign the contract.

The mine owners signed, wrote their names on the contract. They, like other employers ordered by the Labor Board to sign contracts, feared to refuse. They feared what the administration might do to them and they feared to be in the position of delaying production of coal in wartime. (This is the common attitude and practice of employers ordered by the Labor Board to sign and carry out one of its contracts—until the present case of Montgomery Ward.)

But Mr. Lewis refused to sign. Nor did he refuse silently—he publicly and flagrantly defied the Board, excoriated its contract—one of his words was "infamous."

Thereupon the Labor Board passed the case up to President Roosevelt (just as in the present Montgomery Ward case). The Board asked the President to compel Mr. Lewis to sign, to "comply fully" with the Board's order. A few days later, at a press conference, Mr. Roosevelt was asked whether he would compel Mr. Lewis to sign. The President replied that he would not, because he could not. In a spirit touched with petulance he asked the newsmen what was he supposed to do—write Mr. Lewis a nice note on pink paper?

So, Mr. Lewis was not compelled to sign. Further, nothing was done to him for refusing. Mr. Lewis just refused to sign, and that was that. The country learned that when one party to a labor controversy, the labor union, refuses to sign a contract ordered by the Labor Board, nothing happens.

Now for the Montgomery Ward case. The immediate issue here is not whether the company shall sign a contract stipulated by the Labor Board—but whether it shall continue such a contract after it has expired. As such, the Ward case involves the same principle as the Lewis case. Actually the two cases are identical not only in principle but in circumstances. Review very briefly the history of the Ward case:

In November 1942 the Ward Co. was involved in a controversy with a union (C. I. O.). The Labor Board, following its usual practice, ordered the company to sign a contract with the union containing provisions stipulated by the Labor Board. The Ward Co. refused. Thereupon the Labor Board, again following its usual practice, passed the case up to President Roosevelt, asking him to make the company comply.

President Roosevelt, in this case, said nothing about writing a nice note on pink paper. Instead, he wrote the most formidable document a President can sign. In part it read: "As Commander in Chief in time of war * * * I direct Montgomery Ward & Co. to comply without further delay."

Under this compulsion from the President, the Ward company signed. The contract took effect, for the specified period, 1 year. On expiration of the contract last December, Ward did not continue it. The company could have done this on the simple ground that there was no longer any contract. But the company added a special reason—that the union no longer had a majority of the company's employees.

The union appealed to the Labor Board. The Labor Board ordered the Ward Co. to continue the contract (and at the same time directed that an election be held to determine whether the union still had a majority of the employees).

The Ward Co. declined to obey the Labor Board's order, declined to continue the contract. Out of this refusal, after various developments, came the present seizure of the Ward Co.

The seizure has many meanings, which go to the deeps of government and law, of the rights of citizens of the country's social and economic structure. Of them all, only one can be made clear in the space here available. This is: The administration has one practice for one group of citizens, labor unions and their leaders; a different prac-

tice for another group of citizens, the employers.

In weighing the significance of this seizure, it would be a tragic mistake to be misled by the fact that it happens in the field of labor relations, or that the victim of the seizure is a corporation. What is emerging, if it goes on, is assertion of the right of Government to put compulsions, of a kind and degree hitherto supposed to be impossible in America, upon any citizen, in any area of life.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the issue in this matter is now squarely in the courts. As has already been stated, the contention of the Government is that there is statutory authority for the step which has been taken. As has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Attorney General has cited the Smith-Connally law as such authority. Secondly, that irrespective of the statute, the President has wartime power to do what he has done in the Montgomery Ward matter.

I agree with the statements made on the floor of the Senate that there is nothing in the Smith-Connally law, or at least that it was not the intention of the Senators who voted for it, that it should contain anything which would authorize the Executive to exercise the power which he has exercised in the present instance.

I have stated that the matter is now in the courts. In view of that fact, I hesitate giving my opinion on the subject. I feel that the question is in a place where it can be decided without partisanship, and in an atmosphere where reason and justice prevail.

Mr. President, there is only one reason which causes me to take the floor today. The people of the country are very much concerned. Naturally, not having a legal background, in reading the various editorials in the press and comments over the radio, they are concerned about the meaning of this step which has been taken.

I have been asked, as several other Senators have already stated they have been asked, What does this mean? As children, the people read in their history books that when certain conditions exist martial law may be declared, and then the powers of the courts and of the legislature are temporarily superseded. They have also read in the newspapers only recently of a courageous judge in Hawaii who said that the civil rights and liberties of the people exist in wartime as well as in peacetime.

Many Senators have received telegrams about the situation. They have been asked, in effect, Where do you stand? My purpose is to say to them, "The courts have jurisdiction. Let us have faith in the courts."

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio that it would have been better procedure for the President to place the matter in the courts without resorting to this drastic exemplification of authority. People do not like such action. It does not make for good morale. Small and big business are much concerned.

The editorial which has been placed in the RECORD by my distinguished colleague from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] written by Mark Sullivan, in which Mr. Sullivan interprets the meaning of the seizure of Montgomery Ward, I shall not ask to have included in my remarks because it is already in the RECORD. However, it is very illustrative of the reason why the people are upset, why they cannot comprehend that when there exists a situation involving one segment of our society the President will act in one way, and when it involves another segment of our society he will act in exactly the opposite way. This is serious.

The American people remember Pearl Harbor. They remember the lesson which they learned. The Nation was asleep and not alert. The people also remember that it was only a few years ago that great nations like Germany and other countries were asleep to the moving tidal wave of fascism. And, Mr. President, fascism does not come overnight. It is a political disease in which men get the complex that they, and only they, have power.

In our system of government, since the days when the founding fathers framed the Constitution, thank God, we have had a system of checks and balances. In 1938, the year in which I was elected to the Senate, there were only 15 Republican Members of this body. In that year 8 more came to the Senate. However, we lived through a period of so-called yes men of executive control, a period when the Executive was dominant. Then a political revolution took place, the people awoke. Now, there are 37 Republicans in the Senate. This meant that the people of this country wanted the whole idea, the fundamental concept of checks and balances, to remain in operation in order that liberty might be preserved.

My own personal opinion is that even if it should be held—and this is a time of war, and sometimes courts go pretty far—that the President had the authority to act as he has, on either of the grounds urged, it was a mistake of the Executive to seize the property of Montgomery Ward under the guise that the seizure was necessary to prevent injury to the war effort. I am satisfied that the first contention that the statute gives the authority is an absolute misinterpretation of the legislative intent. I ask, Mr. President, is it not strange that the very group which opposed the Smith-Connally bill now contends for a lopsided interpretation of this kind?

I repeat, it is well that the legal questions will be determined in the courts, and I hope the determination will be made in an atmosphere which will be free from partisanship and prejudice and also free from war hysteria. I believe that the courts will hold that under present conditions in this country, when we have even ceased to have blackouts, when we no longer need to fear bombing, the courts will hold there is no power in the President to seize private plants distributing civilian goods merely because he has an opinion that if he did not seize them it would injure the war effort. No; there must be something more. However, I repeat, that is a question for the courts to decide.

I desire to read a paragraph or two from an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, which is along somewhat different lines from the article by Mark Sullivan. The writer of the editorial says:

The Attorney General's assumption that the President might exercise the power of seizure without any legislative authorization will give rise to even more violent dissent. For if the President can seize private plants distributing civilian goods whenever, in his judgment, the seizure becomes necessary to prevent injury to the war effort, he might conceivably take over the whole of private industry without so much as asking for congressional approval. One wonders why, if this is the President's notion of his general wartime authority, he bothers to ask Congress for any specific authority.

The extension of the powers of the President that would be made possible by acceptance of the sweeping Biddle opinion may well alarm Americans who do not believe that any emergency confers dictatorial powers on the President.

If this matter were not in the courts I would make an extended legal argument on that proposition, but all through my years I have felt that when a matter is in court it is time for the average citizen to keep his mouth shut so that the court may dispassionately approach the problem. There is, however, a little different situation now. We are the legislative body that passed a certain law, which the Attorney General claims has given the power which is now being exercised, although there is not a Member of the Senate who would take the floor and state that it was the intent of the Smith-Connally Act to give the President such power.

The people expect this body to remain on guard. There must be no usurpation of power by the executive or any other branch of our Government. The dangers to our liberties are from within as well as from without.

INVESTIGATION OF SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the use of military forces to seize the retail stores of Montgomery Ward & Co. and forcibly eject their chairman will cause grave concern to millions of Americans. It has ominous implications which should receive a very quickened public interest even at this time when the attention of the country is overwhelmingly concerned with our military operations abroad.

The Attorney General of the United States flew to Chicago to assume personal command of the armed forces, which he utilized to enforce his demands upon the business operations of Montgomery Ward & Co. He personally directed the soldiers to enter the office of the chairman and to remove the person of the 69-year-old chairman from his own office by physical force. He then directed the soldiers to seize all the books and other property of Montgomery Ward, using the military forces of the United States Government, if such need were necessary.

For the first time in the history of our country we witnessed the spectacle of the Attorney General of the United States acting as a generalissimo in personal charge of military forces to seize a non-war business operation.

The Montgomery Ward organization is engaged in the operation of retail stores. It is not a war industry. It does not come within the purview of the only law, the Smith-Connally Act, passed by Congress authorizing the seizure of plant, mine, or facility, equipped for the manufacture, production or mining of any articles necessary for the war.

If Mr. Biddle can use the armed forces to seize the nonwar business of Montgomery Ward without the approval of either Congress or the courts, he can seize any plant or business operation, using the same military power whenever such person or a business does something to displease him, or does not immediately obey a directive of one of the numerous bureaus of the Federal Government.

Have we reached a state in this country that the directives of a Federal bureau can be enforced at the point of the bayonet? If the directives of the War Labor Board can be so enforced on a nonwar business operation, then so can the directives issued by the Office of Price Administration, the War Production Board, and the dozens of other Government agencies, with the result that the constitutional right of the citizens of America to adjudication of their rights in the proper court of law will be denied to them.

In this instance, Mr. Biddle assumed the position of both the judge and the prosecutor. Are we coming to a Gestapo in this country? Does Francis Biddle cherish the ambition to be an American Himmler?

Our boys enlisted and were drafted to fight the Japs and the Germans. They did not enlist to enter the office of businessmen throughout the country and drag these men from their businesses by physical force and thus violate the very principles of freedom at home for which our sons are fighting and dying abroad to preserve.

The American people are shocked by this unwarranted use of military power.

I do not at this time attempt to reach a decision in the controversy between the management of Montgomery Ward and the War Labor Board, but these facts are clear to me:

First. Montgomery Ward is engaged in a nonwar business operation. It is true that it furnishes through its mail-order department and retail stores farming implements and other things that have a connection with the successful prosecution of the war but, in answer to this, Mr. Sewell Avery says that, notwithstanding the strike and the removal on April 13 of the post-office employees from the mail-order house of Montgomery Ward, where they had been stationed for 30 years, the company is up to date in the filling of all mail orders.

If Montgomery Ward is engaged in a war business, then a vast majority of all the business in America is likewise so engaged, as hardly any business operation does not have some contact, in one way or another, with the operation of the war.

No imperative need has so far been shown for such extraordinary action as that taken by the Attorney General of the United States in using military forces to seize a business operation which can very properly be classed as nonwar, and in which there has been little loss, if any, of equipment necessary to prosecute the war. What reason, then, actuated the Attorney General of the United States in leaving his duties at Washington and going to Chicago in a spectacular air trip to take charge of the military forces that ejected the chairman of the board of Montgomery Ward? What reason had he to refuse to refer this case to the arbitration of the courts so that under our constitutional procedure it could be determined whether the War Labor Board was right or Montgomery Ward was right?

If he succeeds in thus usurping the power of both Congress and the courts, will he then use the military forces to compel compliance with all the directives of the various other bureaus of the Government?

Today the American people are in the hands of a centralized and entrenched bureaucracy such as America has never before known. It is imperative, so as to preserve our freedoms, that we safeguard the rights of the individual citizens to appeal to the courts, and require that differences that may occur between the citizen and any bureau of the Government shall not be settled by military force, but shall be determined by the Congress and the courts.

It is very pertinent, in this connection, to contrast the action of the Attorney General in taking personal command of troops of the United States in order to eject the chairman of the board of Montgomery Ward from his office and to take possession of all its properties, books, and equipment, with the attitude of the President of the United States, the Attorney General, and all branches of the Government toward the most arrogant labor leader America ever produced, who three times successfully defied his Government in time of war, John L. Lewis.

Generalissimo Biddle did not lead an invading army into the office of John Lewis. In fact, so far as I have observed, not one word of condemnation has been uttered by him of the fact that John Lewis instituted strikes, which occasioned the loss of more than 40,000,000 tons of coal, which is the most basic industry of all in producing military equipment. Neither has the President at any time condemned John Lewis by name for his strike actions. To the contrary, although John Lewis, in the time of the most desperate peril that has ever faced our country, deliberately incited the coal miners to strike and cease producing coal, he not only was not even verbally reprimanded, he was not only not prosecuted, but he was rewarded by having the Government surrender to his demands. I expect to show later on the floor of the Senate that both directly, and by subterfuge, John Lewis obtained more for the members of his union than he actually first requested, and did so because the administration, from the President down, did not have the political courage to do those things that could have been done to compel the continuation of coal production.

On February 11, 1944, I wrote to Mr. Biddle, asking him the question which appears in the following letter:

The Honorable FRANCIS BIDDLE,
The Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Smith-Connally War Labor Disputes Act provides that: "It shall be unlawful for any person to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person, to interfere, by lock-out strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility" seized by the Government. Such a person is subject, under the Smith-Connally Act, to a "fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

On November 1, 1943, at 6 o'clock, the Government seized the bituminous coal mines, yet the strike continued for some days thereafter.

Was an investigation made by the Department of Justice or by any other branch of the Government, to your knowledge, to determine whether or not John L. Lewis was guilty of encouraging or instigating this strike, slow-down, or interruption of work in the mines seized by the Government? Was a decision made by the Department of Justice that John Lewis was innocent of a violation of the Smith-Connally Act?

Mr. Biddle waited for nearly a month, and on March 9 replied as follows:

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has discovered no evidence which indicates that Mr. John L. Lewis, or any of the other international officers of the United Mine Workers, has violated section 6 of the War Labor Disputes Act.

Mr. Biddle evaded my question as to whether or not the Department of Justice had conducted an investigation to determine whether John Lewis was innocent of the violation of the Smith-Connally Act and his reply was so worded as to indicate that an investigation was not actually made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I shall have more to say about this, Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate in the next few days, but I do want to emphasize that the action taken by the Attorney General in using military forces in this instance presents to the Congress a fundamental question which we must meet face to face, namely, if Congress permits any official of this Government to disregard the courts and to use military force to compel acquiescence in the directives of various bureaus, then we have failed to perform our oath to preserve the Constitution of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a statement which has been issued by Mr. Sewell Avery, chairman of Montgomery Ward & Co.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTGOMERY WARD'S REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President: We have your telegram of April 23, 1944.

Ward's welcomes the suggestion that an election be held at an early date to determine the employees' choice of representation. The question whether the union represents a majority of the employees in Ward's mail order house and store in Chicago has been pending since November 16, 1943. Ward's

has repeatedly urged a prompt determination of this question, and has publicly announced a readiness to recognize the union when proof of its representation is presented. Although over 5 months have elapsed since the question arose, the union has refused to show that it is the majority choice of the employees by either a card check or an election.

Ward's will continue to observe the wages, hours, and related terms of employment as they were before the expiration of the former contract. Ward's has made no change in any of these conditions since December 8, 1942, and could not do so under the wage stabilization law without prior governmental approval.

Your assertion that the strike is interfering with the distribution of essential goods is based upon misinformation. On April 13, the United States Post Office, presumably acting on orders from Washington, removed its 70 employees from the mail order house. For more than 30 years the post office had maintained this department for the purpose of handling parcel post shipments to Ward's customers. On April 17 the United States Post Office refused to deliver to Ward's incoming parcels from customers on which postage had been fully paid. Despite the assistance given to the strike by the United States Post Office, Ward's store has been open for business during the usual hours each day since the strike began and Ward's is up to date in the filling of mail orders.

Although Ward's welcomes an early election, Ward's cannot, under the law, grant special privileges to the union pending the election. To grant maintenance-of-union membership before the election is held, as the War Labor Board has ordered, would not only violate the employees' fundamental liberty of free choice but it would also permit the union to demand the discharge of all the employees who have resigned from the union since December 8, 1943. Compliance with the Board's order would thus make a mockery of the democratic right of employees to choose their bargaining representatives freely and without interference.

By ordering the retroactive reinstatement of maintenance of membership, the War Labor Board has demonstrated its utterly unfair character, and its complete disregard of the command of Congress that its orders conform to the National Labor Relations Act.

Ward's experience with the War Labor Board over a period of 2 years has convinced Ward's that the Board is a means by which special privileges are granted to labor unions. The union members of the War Labor Board are men chosen for leadership of the unions, and have actually advanced the interests of the unions. The so-called public members have consistently joined with the union members to support the demands of organized labor. The so-called industry members are committeed to a policy of supporting the majority vote of the union members and the union-dominated public members.

The War Labor Board has always claimed that its orders are law and must be obeyed. It has coerced innumerable employers into acceptance of its order by threatening the seizure of their businesses.

When Ward's brought suit to have the Board's orders declared illegal, the Board asked the courts to dismiss the case. In direct contradiction to its previous claims of power, the Board's plea to the court was that its orders were not legally binding, but were only advice which Ward's need not accept. The purpose of this plea was to deny Ward's a trial before the courts. The issues raised by Ward's case against the War Labor Board are judicial questions which, under the Constitution, only courts may decide. The War Labor Board, by asking you to force Ward's to comply with its order while seeking to deprive Ward's of an opportunity for a hearing in the courts, has demonstrated its lack of respect for our Constitution and the fundamental rights which the Constitution guarantees.

Your assertion that, if Ward's does not accept your direction, you will take further action, has been construed by the press to threaten the seizure of Ward's plant and business.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees to the people the protection of those fundamental rights without which there can be no liberty. Under the Constitution, Congress is the sole law-making authority. Neither the President of the United States nor any other official has the legal right to seize any business or property either in time of peace or in time of war unless Congress has expressly given him the power to do so.

Congress has given the President no power to seize the nonwar business of Montgomery Ward. Any seizure of Ward's plant or business would be in complete disregard of the Constitution which the President is sworn to uphold and defend.

Ward's has violated no law nor denied to the union any privilege to which it is legally entitled.

Respectfully,

MONTGOMERY WARD & Co.,
SEWELL AVERY, *Chairman.*

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution requesting that this matter be promptly investigated by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I ask that the resolution be read by the clerk, and lie on the table.

Mr. CHANDLER. Before the resolution is read, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. This is not the first instance of the use of the military power to take over plants. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that very recently troops moved in and took over the plants of the Ken-Rad Corporation at Owensboro and Bowling Green, Ky. There might have been some excuse, or the Government might have thought it had some excuse, for taking over those plants, because they were making articles for the Army and the Navy. But they were at peak production, and there were under consideration two plans for increasing the pay of the employees. When the plan submitted by the man in charge of the plants, the employer, was turned down, and he said he would not obey the order issued by the Board, the troops moved in, and since they moved in and actually took charge of the operations of the plants without any authority of law and without submitting the question to the courts, production has fallen off. Instead of accomplishing anything, the war effort has really been retarded as a result of taking over the plants.

Mr. BYRD. That is not quite so bad as the present instance, because Montgomery Ward is a nonwar industry.

Mr. CHANDLER. But it shows the disposition to take over plants if the management do not obey a ruling of the War Labor Board, and obey it promptly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The clerk will read the resolution submitted by the Senator from Virginia.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 286) as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the action of the Attorney General of the United States in seizing the plant of Montgomery Ward & Co., in forcibly removing the chairman of its board of directors from the premises, and in the use of military force in connection therewith, with a view to ascertaining whether such action was warranted and authorized under the laws of the United States.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpœna or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Virginia will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for his remarks on the floor of the Senate today and for submitting the resolution authorizing the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, or a subcommittee thereof, to make a thorough and immediate investigation of the action which has transpired in the seizing and taking over of the business establishment of Montgomery Ward & Co. There is serious concern throughout the Nation today over this unprecedented incident. The Attorney General contends that it was done under authority of legislation enacted by the present session of Congress.

I am sure that no Senator, in voting for the Smith-Connally Act, intended that any such authority be conferred as has been invoked in the Montgomery Ward case, nor interpreted its provisions as they are now construed by the Attorney General of the United States. I think this situation poses a question which goes to the very fundamentals of a system of government which guarantees liberty to the individual citizen, and the Congress has a definite responsibility in connection with this problem.

Mr. President, I wish to announce my support of the resolution just submitted by the Senator from Virginia. I believe the Senate should promptly adopt it. It is true that the issue has been thrown into the courts, but long and exhaustive court procedure necessary to a final conclusion will not enable the Congress to acquaint itself with facts and information it may need in meeting its immediate responsibility. The people have a right to know and they want to know now what extreme rights and powers the Congress has delegated or what authority is being abused or usurped in this extraordinary conduct of Government.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my

remarks a telegram which I have received from a large number of citizens in my State on this question.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Taking over private business not engaged in manufacturing or distributing war material by the President not authorized by act of Congress or the Constitution is pure dictatorship. We demand immediate legislation curbing the assumption of power by the War Labor Board and the President before it is too late.

Verne McMillen, Sid B. Readding, E. E. George, Thos. S. Buzbee, John W. Atkinson, Edward L. Wright, W. Henry Rector, June P. Wooten, Henry E. Spitzberg, Wallace Davis, C. E. Higgins, Arthur B. Coon, D. G. Iliff, Cecil A. Gibson, J. C. Lewis, Edwin W. Pickthorne, Lawson L. Delony, Fred Holder, L. D. Patty, R. E. Weaver, Jr., Drew Bowers, Paul E. Speirer, Claude S. Hall, R. L. Powell, Miriam Watkins, A. L. Barber, Roy Donham, L. E. Scott, J. C. Buchanan, Terrell Marshall, E. R. Parham, E. A. Vogel, A. S. Buzbee, A. C. Brown, W. A. Nickerson, Cooper Jacoway, Frank J. Willis, J. Hugh Wharton, R. M. Traylor, A. C. Proctor, Warren Baldwin, Glenn M. Motley, Albert J. Heyden, S. Lasker Ehrman, Guy B. Reeves, N. C. Withrow, J. A. Watkins, Ben Q. Adams, Earl W. Frazier, O. D. Longstreth, Arthur E. Frankel, F. A. Sweeney, Lela L. Bentley, W. F. Scott, H. W. Houston, Dorothy S. Yates, John W. Newman, Frank Pace, E. L. Carter, John M. Harrison, Taylor Roberts, Fred Rogers, P. A. Lasley, Curtis L. Finch, M. F. T. Hanna, Edwin M. Williams, E. C. Curtis, J. H. Martin, R. E. Williams, M. A. Matlock, Grover T. Owens, Geo. S. Wittenberg, W. N. Stannus, J. M. Gunn, John S. Gatewood, F. D. Watkins, M. V. Moody, J. Fred Jones, Gloria Minkin, H. P. Hadfield, N. R. Overstreet, E. L. Gradys, P. Scott.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I join the junior Senator from Arkansas in commending the distinguished Senator from Virginia for his courageous speech today, and for the resolution which he submitted providing for an investigation by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate of the action of the Attorney General of the United States in taking over the plant and business of Montgomery Ward & Co. When that resolution reaches the floor of the Senate I expect to support it.

As I understand, section 3 of the Smith-Connally Act is the principal legal authority upon which the Attorney General acted. I cannot see that he has any authority under that act, or the Presidential war powers, to take over a private mercantile business which is not engaged in the war effort. Section 3 of that act provides as follows:

The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith.

There is no dispute, under the facts, that Montgomery Ward & Co. is not a manufacturing "plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of articles or materials" for the war effort, but is a general mercantile business engaged in supplying goods by mail order for the civilian needs of the United States. I cannot see one scintilla of justification in the act for the authority which has been assumed.

The people of this country are rightfully stirred up as a result of this action, and I certainly hope the Senate will speedily adopt the resolution authorizing the investigation. The people of the United States today look to and expect the Congress to take action to protect the fundamental liberties of the American people and to protect our system of Government. As I see it, the fundamentals of American liberty are involved in this issue.

I am shocked and amazed not only at the opinion of the Attorney General, but at his unheard-of action in seeking to administer the order and directing the troops. This is contrary to my conception of his duties, and is an unrivaled precedent to establish. The investigation will be fairly conducted by a Senate committee. I hope it will speedily be launched.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, we have just witnessed in this Nation a tragic and disgraceful performance which most Americans would have said only a few short years ago "could not have happened here." But it has happened, and the head of a reputable retail store has been forcibly carried out of his place of business by our brave soldier boys who joined the Army under General Marshall to put Hitler out, but some of whom have wound up under "Generalissimo" Biddle by putting Sewell Avery out. This grandstand play was made by "Gen." Francis Biddle, and its enactment has all the earmarks of imitating the generalissimo and his Gestapo of some foreign dictatorial government. Thus the raid that has been carried on by the New Deal dynasty against private enterprise in this Nation for about 11 years has reached its logical conclusion, and I am sure that the Communists, labor-leader racketeers, bureaucrats, and New Deal bigheads are very happy about the whole detestable debacle.

Immediately prior to my becoming a United States Senator, I was Governor of Texas, and during my terms of office as Governor, Texas enacted labor legislation which has kept that State practically free of strikes while strikes have been running rampant in other States and seriously retarding the war effort and costing the lives of many of our brave men on foreign battlefields. When I came to the Senate August 4, 1941, I immediately introduced the same bill which had been enacted in Texas.

Since then I have introduced several other bills, the effect of which if they had been passed would have prevented this disgraceful performance; but the Senate has not seen fit to agree with me on these bills, and the committees to which the bills were referred have failed even to report them to the Senate. The reason I introduced these bills was because it seemed to me that the Congress and the President during the reign of the New Deal had turned this Government over to a gang of labor-leader racketeers, and the purpose of my bills was to recover our Government from this gang, and return it to the people. I hope this sad incident at Chicago will arouse the Members of both Houses of Congress to the point where they will take action that will curb the racketeering of labor leaders, and if the bills I have introduced will not do the job, I hope some Senator will write stronger bills and bring them to the floor of this Senate.

While this Chicago incident is alarming, distasteful, and disgraceful to a Nation that claims to practice democracy, yet it seems clear to me that it is only the natural result of unsound legislation that has been passed by this New Deal administration during the past 11 years. In other words, it is only the reaping of that which has been sown right here in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the close of my remarks copies of several telegrams which I have received about the seizure of the Montgomery Ward & Co. retail store in Chicago, together with copies of the eight bills which I have introduced in the Senate and which are still slumbering peacefully in some committee. These telegrams express the attitude of many of our citizens, and there are thousands of others who feel the same way about this matter. I again urge the committees of this Senate which have my bills to bring them to the floor of the Senate for consideration. I am fully convinced that these bills cannot be passed by this Congress as it is presently composed, but I should like to put these honest constructive bills before this body once and have a yea-and-nay vote before the general election so that the people may know just how each Senator stands on these basic problems. This Chicago incident is only part of the havoc that has been inflicted upon the great rank and file of the people of this Nation during the 11-year reign of the New Deal gang. It will take several generations of sacrifice and suffering under sane administrations for us to ever get back to our American form of democracy as bequeathed to us by our wise forefathers in the Constitution of the United States of America.

I am certainly glad that election time is not far off, and I sincerely hope that the people of this Nation will go to the polls this year with "blood in their eyes" and determined to conduct a thorough housecleaning in Washington from the cellar to the attic and at the same time elect men and women to Congress who will pledge themselves in advance to support my Resolution No. 86 which pro-

vides for limiting the tenure of office to 6 years for every elected official in the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government.

There being no objection, the telegrams and bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *April 28, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

Between Eleanor and her Negroes Franklin and his C. I. O. has driven us Republican.

F. E. NICHOLS.
ROBERT A. HUMBLE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:

The action of the President in taking possession of Montgomery Ward & Co. is an outrage, a violation of the Constitution, and a C. I. O.-lation of the law. If this action is legal the President can take possession of any merchant's property or for that matter of any business in the United States. I hope you as a Senator from this great State will protest.

R. E. WOOD,
Sears, Roebuck, Chicago.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 28, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:

Trust you will use your influence for congressional action stopping Government seizure of private nonwar business.

R. E. WILLSON,
San Antonio, Tex.

TYLER, TEX., *April 28, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:

Seizure o. Ward plant in Chicago in violation of principles for which we are fighting. Your support of congressional investigation is requested.

JOHN R. CAMPBELL.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *April 28, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

The Government handling of the Montgomery Ward case is disturbing too many of your constituents. Do you agree with this un-American procedure; if not is there anything that you can do about it?

J. M. DYSART.

TEXARKANA, ARK., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It may interest you to know I have sent following telegram to all Texas and Arkansas Members of Congress: "If it is legal for Roosevelt by force to turn Wards over to C. I. O., who made it legal and what do they intend to do to remedy situation?" We know your attitude and approve. It will interest you to know that at meeting of more than a hundred Texarkana businessmen last night Mayor William V. Brown announced you are only present Member of Congress he will vote for again. Much applause. Brown served seven terms as city attorney and is now beginning his sixth term as mayor. Being elected this time without opposition, and is politically wise.

HENRY HUMPHREY GAZETTE.

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

The third term did enough damage to the Democratic Party. Fourth term of dictatorship will put an end to our party and everything else that is dear to the American people.

W. F. MCCOLLUM.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Presidential action Montgomery Ward matter is the most dangerous move since the Constitution of the United States was written. We are expecting you to do something about it and quickly.

N. H. WHITE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Am vigorously opposed to seizure of Montgomery Ward by the Government. Hope you feel likewise and that you make your feelings known in no uncertain terms.

FRANK PATTON,
San Antonio Laundry.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Honorable W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to register my protest against the Government action in the Montgomery Ward case in Chicago.

RUTH B. ZANT.

LONGVIEW, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please use all your influence to save country from terroristic methods of War Labor Board and Attorney General as exemplified in Montgomery Ward case. If procedure that case upheld we have lost war if we win it.

ELIZABETH L. LEE.
LOUIS F. HART.
MRS. MIKE ANGLIN.
RUTH SUTTON CASWELL.
REBECCA MARINA CAMERON.
R. A. JOHNS.
B. A. BARRETT.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to register my protest against the Government action in the Montgomery Ward case in Chicago.

JERE H. CASON.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am terrified at the report in today's press of the action of our Government in the C. I. O.-Montgomery Ward controversy. I am sure our representatives will not let it pass without challenge of the strongest kind and want to add my appeal to you to use your great influence to correct this situation and prevent a recurrence ever in the future.

T. D. ANDERSON.

HOUSTON, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Roosevelt's seizure of Montgomery Ward is the most high-handed piece of dictatorship ever forced upon the American people. The voters of Texas look to you as their representative to fight this outrageous unconstitutional seizure of lawfully conducted private industry. I am a foreman in a shipyard and I know how the average man feels about this sort of thing.

W. B. OSBORN.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have discussed the unwarranted and wholly un-American procedure in the taking over of Montgomery Ward & Co., a retail and nonwar producing concern by power-crazed officials pretending to execute the laws of our Government with approximately 25 of my closest friends and business associates, and without one dissenting voice they thought it was the most contemptible C. I. O. labor-baiting move that has been foisted upon the American Public. Each one has requested I wire you their protest against such high-handed procedure and request that you join any move for a thorough and far-reaching investigation that will eventually gain enough momentum that will create such an outburst of public disgust and disapproval that our Congress will take such steps to assert itself, and revoke the unlicensed and unconstitutional action taken by the power-crazed White House officials. Please advise me at once your attitude and intentions.

E. E. FARROW.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Feel Montgomery Ward & Co. case being tyrannically handled. How do you stand on this action?

H. D. SIMMONS,
Fort Worth, Tex.

UVALDE, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Today it is Montgomery Ward. If you do not protest tomorrow inevitably it will be Big Business, Inc.; Middle Size Business, a copartnership; then poor old Joe Doake, doing business under the assumed name of Little Man, sole owner. Come on Senator, say something—do something—the time is now.

SUTTLE & KASSLER,
Attorneys at Law.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please vigorously protest in the name of common decency the seizure by the Army of Montgomery Ward, retail store in Chicago, for the sole purpose of winning its strike for the C. I. O.

J. M. HARRIS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I have been a Democrat for 23 years, have taken the bad with the good in the interest of the party, but this Montgomery Ward outrage on the part of the President and Jesse Jones is more than I can stomach. Have supported you in all of your campaigns but I would like to know what you are going to do about this.

JOHN M. COLEMAN,
San Antonio, Tex.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

The Montgomery Ward seizure looks like going too far.

G. W. MITCHELL.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Vigorously protest the President taking over private business such as Montgomery Ward by use of troops. Such procedure is unthinkable in America and the President should not be permitted to use troops to give aid and comfort to a C. I. O. strike. Such procedure should be stopped immediately.

JOE S. SHELDON.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The seizure of the Montgomery Ward Co. by the President's edict is a disgrace to democracy. If allowed to stand this action is the beginning of the end of free enterprise in this country. We believe Congress should act quickly and effectively in this matter.

RAY LEEMAN,
Executive Vice President, South Texas Chamber of Commerce.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

In our opinion Government taking over Montgomery Ward is unwarranted infringement of rights of individual enterprise. Are relying on you to prevent further similar action.

C. C. LEE,
Executive Secretary, San Antonio Manufacturers Association.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We feel that the action taken by the Government in the case of Montgomery Ward demands immediate investigation by Congress.

H. J. RICHTER,
President, Richter's Bakery.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Seizure of Montgomery Ward Co. over union maintenance contract very alarming to retail business and free enterprise. Please use your good office to correct this situation and let's return to constitutional government and our Bill of Rights.

A. L. BECKER,
Handy Andy, Inc.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Picture on front page of this evening's Dallas Times-Herald is most disgusting exhibition of autocratic powers of Roosevelt administration local populace has ever witnessed. Two soldiers are depicted throwing Sewell Avery out of Montgomery Ward office. Why don't you demand immediate Senate investigation of this whole illegal proceeding. Procedure is most unwarranted usurpation of citizen rights I have ever seen. What are we fighting for; the free American, or are we being ruled by labor unions and the Gestapo? Take action as an elected representative of Texans who can't stomach this last outrage against the rights of every American citizen. If they get away with this in Illinois, they can do the same thing any other place. Warmest regards.

C. ANDRADE.

HOUSTON, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Press reports indicate very clearly the unfairness of the action of the War Labor Board in handling Montgomery Ward's employee situation and numerous others of similar nature; also, the taking over and operation of the properties violate every principle of the Constitution which so many of our young men are making the extreme sacrifice to defend, and there is no evidence that this action on the part of the Board will produce any benefit toward the successful conclusion of this terrible struggle. Therefore, we violently protest the dictatorial action of the War Labor Board and urge that it be made to turn to a policy of fairness to one and all alike or be abolished.

Southern Floral Co.: J. W. Weatherford, president; A. L. Wright, John Hatteberg, Mrs. A. W. Gilbert, H. Purcell, F. A. Weatherford, R. M. Hicks, Jack Dempsey, employees.

HOUSTON, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The executive department claims that the Montgomery Ward outrage against constitutional democratic government was directly authorized by acts of Congress. If Congress is responsible, the mistake should be immediately corrected. If we permit our Government to ignore the Constitution, usurp totalitarian power, and govern us by armed forces, we have surrendered our liberty and our democracy is gone. If our Chief is usurping authority not granted him by Congress and denied him by the Constitution, impeachment proceedings are in order.

JOHN A. DEERING.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

As a voter, I ask that Montgomery Ward be returned to its owner and overpowering of the President's orders to seize this company.

E. J. WRIGHT.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building:

Soldiers with fixed bayonets stood guard at the entrance while a Gestapo squad with cocked rifles went directly to Mr. Avery's office.

W. H. JOHNSEN.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:

I note with alarm the Montgomery Ward situation. Is the C. I. O. or Congress running our country?

E. L. DALTON.

EVANSTON, ILL., *April 26, 1944.*
SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Regarding Montgomery Ward seizure, I implore you take immediate action to restrain this Presidential action. This is nonwar issue. Civil rights and liberty must be protected. The upright citizen's hope lies with Congress.

W. R. WHITELEY.

HOUSTON, TEX., *April 26, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Were alarmed to hear the news that the Government had taken over Montgomery Ward. It would seem that the time has come for Congress to act to protect the constitutional rights of business and to curb the unconstitutional methods of our executive branch.

Loyal supporters,
Mr. and Mrs. J. N. C. CAMERON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 26, 1944.*
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Roosevelt's illegal and unlawful and apparently impeachable act against Montgomery Ward & Co. seems to me to endanger the constitutional rights of all citizens and in my opinion, smacks of fascism, the thing we are supposed to be fighting abroad. Please help rectify situation. Thanks and regards.

E. M. NICHOLS.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 27, 1944.*
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:

If the National Labor Relations Act legally permits the action of the President of the United States in taking over the business of Montgomery Ward & Co., the Congress is directly responsible for a political condition that parallels Hitler's philosophy against which we have declared war and in an effort to destroy this philosophy you are sending our boys overseas. As a citizen I petition you for immediate action toward amending this law to make such a situation impossible. The reported action of the Post Office Department is inexcusable under the laws of our country and must be immediately corrected.

CRUGER T. SMITH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 28, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As a native Texan I vigorously protest Army taking over Montgomery Ward, a retail store, in order to protect C. I. O. Congress should take action.

MARSHALL O. BELL.

DENTON, TEX., *April 28, 1944.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Re President's seizure Ward. If Congress has granted President the arbitrary powers used, Congress is the agent which has destroyed American liberties and the American Bill of Rights. American citizens, the owners of any business, also have constitutional rights which neither Congress nor the President has any right to usurp. It is time to correct the situation.

MORRISON MILLING CO.
E. W. MORRISON,
President.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 28, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

What has happened to Montgomery Ward in Chicago is a disgrace to the Nation, and it is high time that you representing us in Texas did something about it. What are we fighting Hitler for?

GENERAL SUPPLY CO., INC.,
G. B. PRENTISS, *President.*

BAY CITY, TEX., *April 28, 1944.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

The citizens of Bay City and Matagorda County are thoroughly aroused because of the drastic and dictatorial action taken by the Federal Government in confiscating the

property of Montgomery Ward Co. in Chicago. It is the belief of our people that Congress should now take steps to curb the assumed powers of the Executive. As we interpret the action, it was done only for the benefit of the labor unions. If the Government is successful in this case anyone's private business is unsafe in America. We sincerely and earnestly request and even demand that Congress do something now to prevent further encroachment on the civil rights of the American people.

BAY CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By E. O. TAULBEE, *President*.

S. 189

A bill making unlawful the use of force or violence, or threats thereof, to prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person acting in concert with one or more other persons to assemble at or near any place where a labor dispute exists and by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation, or for any person to promote, encourage, or aid any such assemblage at which such force or violence, or threat thereof, is so used. As used in this section, the term "labor dispute" shall have the meaning assigned to it in section 2 (9) of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 3. Any person who violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 2 years.

SEC. 4. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Senate Joint Resolution 4

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to freedom to work

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—FREEDOM TO WORK

"SECTION 1. No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with or resignation from a labor union, or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union; nor shall any corporation or individual or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude from employment members of a labor union, or person who refuse to join a labor union, or because of resignation from a labor union; nor shall any person against his will be compelled to pay dues to any labor organization as a prerequisite to or condition of employment.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

S. 726

A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(6) Nothing in this act shall be construed as preventing the employer om expressing his opinion concerning any matter affecting the relationship between employer and employee. The employer shall be free to state to his employees his opinion and preferences concerning any labor organization, or organizations, seeking to secure the right to represent his employees and such right shall include the right of the employer to free and open discussion of all the issues involved: *Provided*, That the employer in such discussion shall not threaten to deprive his employees of any rights which they have under the law."

S. 727

A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the first sentence of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act as precedes paragraph (1) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer, a labor organization, or an officer, member, or employee of a labor organization, or any other person or persons—."

S. 728

A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (3) of section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided, however*, That the Board shall have no power to order the reinstatement of an employee or order payment of back wages to an employee where the employee has willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any labor dispute or in connection with any effort to organize the employees of said employer; nor shall any employer be required to accept as a collective bargaining agency to represent his employees any person or organization that has willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any labor dispute or in connection with any effort to organize the employees of said employer."

S. 191

A bill relating to the hours of employment, compensation, and conditions of employment of employees engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for such commerce or employed in the performance of any Government contract

Be it enacted, etc., That the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 be amended as follows: At the end of the act, insert the following: "That during the wars in which the United States is engaged no employer shall enter into any contract or arrangement, or enforce or carry out the provisions of any contract or arrangement, which provides that with respect to employees engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for such commerce, or engaged in performing work under any contract with the United States, there shall be any discrimination against any person because he is or is not a member of a labor organization. No employer who violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall, for a period of 2 years after such violation occurs, be eligible to enter into any contract with the United States; and no officer or agency of the United States shall enter into a contract with any such employer during such 2-year period. The Secretary of Labor shall keep the various contracting officers and agencies of the United States informed as to the names of employers who are ineligible by reason of this section to enter into contracts with the United States."

S. 190

A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to overtime pay, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Every employer shall pay to any of his employees who are engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for commerce, compensation at the same rate for all hours worked by such employee during any pay period."

SEC. 2. Until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, (a) no provision of Federal or State law which limits or restricts hours of employment shall be applicable with respect to employees of any contractor who is engaged in the performance of work directly or indirectly necessary for the fulfillment of any contract between such contractor and the United States, and (b) no provision in any contract heretofore or hereafter made with the United States restricting or limiting the hours of employment of employees employed under or in connection with such contract, and no penalty or forfeiture for violation of any such provision shall be enforceable by any officer or agency of the United States.

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936, is amended by adding at the end of the first section thereof the following new paragraph:

"(f) When the wage rates for regular hours of employment have been determined for the purposes of this act, the same hourly wage rates shall apply with respect to all hours worked during any day or workweek or other work period in employment with respect to which wages are determined under this section."

Senate Joint Resolution 86

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President of the United States and Members of Congress to 6 years and imposing limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The term of office of each President of the United States and of each Vice President of the United States elected after the date of this article takes effect shall be 6 years; and no person who shall have served as President or Vice President shall be eligible for election to the office of President or the office of Vice President.

"SEC. 2. No person shall be eligible for election or appointment to the office of Senator or Representative in Congress for any term which, if served by such person, would cause the aggregate service of such person as a Member of either or both the Senate and the House of Representatives to exceed 6 years.

"SEC. 3. Nothing contained in section 1 or section 2 of this article shall be construed to prevent any person who may hold the office of President, Vice President, Senator or Representative in Congress, during the term within which this article is ratified from holding such office for the remainder of such term.

"SEC. 4. No person shall be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States who holds, or who shall have held within 5 years next preceding the date of such appointment, the office of Senator or Representative in Congress or of judge of any court under the authority of the United States, but nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the appointment or assignment of a person who holds the office of judge of a court under the authority of the United States, to the office of judge of any other court under the authority of the United States.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

RETURN TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF GREAT LAKES VESSELS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their repective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
(Per GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.)
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

S. O. BLAND,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
RICHARD J. WELCH,
JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

SERVICES OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION IN THE WAR

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, there have been engaged in the present great conflict many heroic individuals and groups who have not been accorded the praise to which they are entitled.

This is but natural in a war effort so great as the one in which we are engaged. The work which these individuals and groups do may not be so spectacular as that which is done by others, but it is just as valuable and as necessary in winning the final victory.

I have long been an admirer of the medical profession. America owes much to it. It would take more time than is allotted to me adequately to comment upon the subject; suffice it to say that the health and proper medical care of our citizens is one of the most vital of our assets. That is true in peace. It is more so in war.

It is my understanding that at least one-third of the doctors in the United States are in the various branches of our armed services. That enables our men to have the best medical care of any of the armies at war. Wishing to pay tribute to the medical profession for its war efforts, I have made considerable research into the subject. The information I have is derived largely from Army sources. I am certain, however, that the same fine record has been made by those in other services. I have felt that the people at home should have a better knowledge of what is being done for those who are in the armed services. It is largely for this purpose that I speak.

Mr. President, there is no activity in this war which affects so certainly the happiness of our citizens generally after victory, as does the medical care of our soldiers. Whether our boys come home or not will depend largely upon the doctors who have volunteered their services to the Medical Corps. Whether, if the boys return alive, they will be in condition to be useful members of society again will in all likelihood depend upon the medical services rendered under the Army's medical program.

The wounded soldier in this war, thanks to our Army doctors, scientists, and medical administrators, has the best chance of recovery after he reaches an Army hospital of any soldier of any country in any war in history. Less than 3 percent of the wounded who reach hospitals die. And if the soldier reaches an evacuation hospital he has five times the chance of survival that he had in World War No. 1.

Not only is the medical department's program for wounded soldiers an exceptional one, but the Army program of preventive medicine insures that every mother's son will have a chance to maintain far better health in service than he ever had in civilian life. Deaths in the Army from all diseases were 6 per thousand men in 1943. The same rate was maintained in 1942. The rate for the entire civilian population of the United States for 1942 was 9.5 deaths per thousand. Of course, that includes all ages, but it is considered noteworthy that the soldier in the Army has much less chance of dying from disease than those in civil life. More than that, he may return to his peacetime job healthier and stronger physically by reason of the knowledge of healthful living gained while in the service.

Every citizen is entitled to know of the care that is taken to keep our soldiers well, and of the fine medical attention they receive if, unfortunately, they fall sick or are wounded. Friends and relatives may gain much comfort from knowing that in our Army hospitals the soldier receives as good or better professional care than one ordinarily receives in civil life. Our Surgeon General, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, has been one of the most prominent American surgeons since the days of the First World War.

Probably no branch or service of the Government has the record the Army medical department has for close cooperation with other governmental agencies and with the civilian organizations in this field. It maintains close cooperation with the Navy, Selective Service, Veterans' Administration, and with civilian groups through the National Research Council. More than 100 of the Nation's outstanding physicians, surgeons, epidemiologists, and research workers in infectious diseases have been appointed as civilian consultants to the Surgeon General of the Army. One or more of these groups is constantly in the field studying and advising at points where the welfare of our soldiers is threatened, and findings in medicine, surgery, and disease prevention on all fronts are recorded for the mutual benefit of the various theaters of operations and for what will be the ultimate benefit of peacetime civilizations.

Many diseases and many types of wounds that took great toll in World War No. 1 have been so well harnessed or controlled in this war that the occurrence and mortality rates are only small percentages of what they were then. New drugs—sulfanilamides and penicillin—blood plasma, adequate surgery at the front lines, and quick evacuation of our troops have been among the largest contributing factors in reducing disease occurrence and mortality rates. The reduction is also due to the fact that our medical department strives to forestall epidemics of influenza and other diseases rather than stopping them after they are started. All these factors are involved, plus the heroic doctors and nurses and medical department enlisted men.

We hear accounts almost daily of doctors being killed or wounded at the front while treating those who have fallen in battle, of unarmed medical enlisted men losing their lives in seeking to rescue wounded, while bullets are whizzing about, and of nurses kneeling on the muddy ground of treatment stations amidst falling bombs to administer to the seriously wounded. Nurses have lost their lives, too, and the way these gallant women have endured privations, slept on the ground, and worked in the rain is the most noble story of American womanhood.

In treatment of battle casualties striking changes have taken place. Methods have been developed for the successful surgical treatment of wounds of the head, chest, and abdomen which were considered hopeless only two decades ago. The new method of taking surgery to the front lines in this war is paying off in lives saved. This contrasts favorably with the method of the First World War when surgery often had to be delayed for hours until troops could be taken to hospitals in rear areas, according to surgeons who served in both wars and saw both systems in operation. According to the Surgeon General, it is a well-established principle that the sooner treatment can be given the wounded the more successful will be the results. Thus far results have justified the Army's taking surgery to the front lines, with hundreds of highly skilled surgeons, trained technicians, and surgical nurses organized in every theater of operations.

New equipment has been invented for this front-line surgery, including mobile

surgical operating trucks and portable hospital equipment that may be carried on the backs of men through jungles, across icy streams, and up mountain passes.

The importance of blood plasma in saving the lives of men suffering from wounds and shock at the front cannot be overemphasized. It is a tribute to our citizens that donations of blood to provide this lifesaving substance now amount to 100,000 pints a week. This record must be sustained to meet the demand. Dried plasma is now going forward to all theaters and the product is being used on every battle line with unfailing success. I am proud to claim as a fellow citizen of my native State of Arkansas Brig. Gen. Charles C. Hillman, Chief of Professional Service in the Office of the Surgeon General, through whose keen foresight and early initiation of the plasma program the lives of thousands of our American soldiers have been saved.

After front-line surgery, the speed with which these patients may be evacuated accounts, in many cases, for their quick recovery. They are taken to rear hospitals within the theater, by air transport planes or hospital ships, and may be carried home when recovery is to be prolonged. Airplanes fly men out of areas that could not be reached any other way. Hospital ships make it possible to bring home large numbers of the wounded at one time.

Extremities wounds and injuries constitute from two-thirds to three-fourths of all wounds in this war. Land mines have been responsible for increased injuries to soldiers' feet and legs, but there are relatively fewer amputations due to new methods of treatment and improved surgery. There will be amputations incident to this war, but we must remember that many of them are cases that in all probability would have died in the last war for the want of blood plasma, sulfa drugs, and modern surgery.

Five general hospitals to which are assigned surgeons skilled in performing amputations and workmen especially trained in making and fitting artificial limbs, are designated as amputation centers. A special method of performing amputations now produces better results for the fitting of artificial legs and arms than ever before. Much time and thought is spent not only in getting the stump in shape for an artificial leg or arm but in fitting it and in training the soldier to use it. He will be assisted in this by watching other equally unfortunate soldiers who have become proficient at using theirs.

The chief value of the sulfa drugs and of the new drug, penicillin, has been to prevent and fight complicating infection in battle wounds. Research in connection with the use of these drugs is still being carried on, and much more will be learned, especially about penicillin, the medical department reports.

In detecting and curing diseases, the Army Medical Department is going to return healthier men to peacetime living, thus improving the general public health conditions. The greatest case-finding activity ever undertaken is the giving of chest X-ray examinations to men inducted into the Army. This is now Army routine. These tests have been the means of detecting early tuberculosis in the case of thousands of men and women who, not suspecting that they had the disease, might have permitted it to progress to such an extent that it would result in their death and in the infection of many others. The present occurrence of tuberculosis is only one-tenth that of 1918 and 1919. Thus, the Army has done much to stamp out tuberculosis now and in the future.

A million men drafted into the Army who had bad teeth or dental diseases have been made dentally fit by the work of the Army Dental Corps. That number of men is equal to 65 divisions. Without such dental treatment, they would not have been fit to fight. Formerly men with teeth in such condition were rejected by our Army induction boards, but that meant such a loss of manpower that requirements were lowered, and the job of making them dentally fit was put up to the Dental Corps. Thus, the corps is not only rehabilitating men to fight Uncle Sam's battles but it will return home a large percentage of these men in far better physical condition as a result of improved dental health, thus achieving a general improvement in health conditions throughout the land.

The routine immunization of Army men against tetanus, one of the most feared complications of battle injuries during the First World War, has practically eliminated that death-dealing malady in this war. Among 1,252 casualties admitted to an evacuation hospital on Guadalcanal, during some of the operations there, no cases of tetanus developed, and only 1 case of gas gangrene occurred.

In the First World War deaths from pneumonia were 24 for every 100 cases. In this war, the rate is six-tenths of 1 percent. Recoveries are quickened by the use of the sulfa drugs.

The Army's record on meningitis shows amazing progress. The death rate in the First World War was 37 percent. During the past year, it has been between 3 and 5 percent. Now, when troops are threatened with meningitis, they are given sulfadiazine or sulfathiazole to prevent further spread of the disease. In one large camp in this country, it was found that 79 percent of the men had meningitis germs in their throats. This number was reduced in a few days to less than 1 percent by the administration to each individual of three doses of sulfadiazine.

Typhus fever, which has been the insidious fifth column in many countries since wars first began on this earth, is controlled by this powder and by the administration of typhus vaccine, so that in this war the disease is a negligible quantity in the soldier population's sickness records. Not a single death has been attributed to this infection.

The Army has recently set up at the Army and Navy General Hospital, at Hot Springs National Park, Ark., a center for the diagnosis and treatment of arthritis. Studies conducted there will be the source of extensive knowledge for the whole medical profession now and after the war.

The reconditioning program of the Army—a departure from the old method of letting a patient lie in bed, with nothing to employ mind or body—has for its purpose the training of men physically and mentally while they are convalescing, so that they may be returned to duty with troops in fine fettle, and also so that they may be kept profitably occupied while in hospitals. Results show that the program makes for quickened recovery.

Liaison is maintained with the Veterans' Administration, the State vocational rehabilitation agencies, the Federal Security Agency, and the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission in order that the Army program, as arranged for the patient who must be discharged from the service, may be complete.

Three special hospitals have been designated for the treatment of the deaf. While under the care of doctors skilled in the treatment of diseases of the ear, they receive instruction from experienced lip-reading and speech-correction teachers. They have the advantage of acoustic experts, and those who can be improved thereby are fitted with electric hearing aids.

Two hospitals also have been designated for eye surgery and for the special care of the blind while they are in need of hospital attention. Another facility is being set up by the medical department of the Army for the social rehabilitation of the blind of both the Navy and the Army, after the blinded individual no longer requires hospital treatment. At this social rehabilitation center the blinded individual will be taught to attend to his own personal wants, to go about safely on the streets, to read special writing for the blind, and to appreciate the fact that by developing his hearing and sense of touch he can compensate largely for his loss of sight. He will be enabled to develop occupational skills adapted to his previous experience and mental capabilities. Above all, he will be impressed with the fact that, despite his blindness, he is still a useful member of society, and that he can continue his career with pleasure and credit to himself and his associates. Upon discharge from the Army and from the social rehabilitation center for the blind, he will be able to go right ahead with vocational training, if he desires it, which will be provided by the Veterans' Administration.

With this excellent and comprehensive Army medical program, it is only necessary that we have sufficient doctors in the service to make it available to all our soldiers in every instance. It is significant that the rural areas of this land have supplied more of the volunteer doctors and nurses than have the big-city areas. In the rural areas, people are accustomed to pooling neighborly assistance in nursing during periods of illness, and doctors are so much in demand they are often forced to drive long miles into the country at any hour of the night to serve the sick. Yet, these people with

their limited health facilities appear to know how to sacrifice even further to send their doctors and nurses to the war front. Arkansas is proud of its record for furnishing doctors and nurses. My State supplied 200 percent more doctors in 1942 and 1943 than the quota assigned it by the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission. It also gave 113 nurses in 1943, when it was asked for only 22 for both Army and Navy.

Arkansas is also proud of its record of heroes in the medical department. There is General King, who received the Distinguished Service Medal for the speedy organization of medical forces after the attack at Pearl Harbor, and thus saved the lives of an unprecedented number of the wounded, to gain the admiration of the entire medical world. Two privates first class are on the list of medical department heroes. Robert H. McNeeley, ambulance driver at Pearl Harbor, who evacuated the wounded, received the Legion of Merit award; and Robert W. Andrews received the Soldiers' Medal posthumously for diving into the sea in an attempt to save the life of another. I wish to take this occasion to recall the story of the heroism of a Navy Medical Corps officer, Lt. Comdr. Corydon M. Wassell, of Little Rock, Ark. How he gallantly contrived to get a dozen wounded men 50 miles from the Java seacoast to a small vessel, for a safe journey to Australia, is one of the classic annals of this war.

Too much praise of the service Medical Corps officers cannot be given. The man who watches over the health of our troops on the global fronts, accompanies them into battle, and risks his own life to attend them when wounded, must be a man with skill, courage, tact, and judgment of superior degree.

I should like to add briefly, in conclusion, that what I have said in the way of information about the medical care of those in the service is not the whole story of the medical profession in this war. The great number of physicians and nurses called into service has caused a great burden to fall upon those not in the armed services. It has caused long hours of additional labor.

Mr. President, regarding the physicians at home, I should like to quote a part of an editorial which appeared in the Arkansas Democrat, one of the leading newspapers in my State:

A physician, using an advertisement in the Nashville (Ga.) Herald, addresses a message to the people of Berrien and adjoining counties. He tells his neighbors he has broken under the strain of overwork resulting from the shortage of doctors caused by demands from the armed services. After consultation in Atlanta he has been told that he must discontinue his long hours or run the risk of complete impairment of his health. So he says he will limit his labors to 8 hours a day and will be unable to make any residential calls. Instead, his patients must come to the hospital at Nashville, where they will be given temporary treatment by the resident nurses and he will see them during his regular hours. There are two points of interest in this, one of many simple but glorious annals of the country doctor. First, a reminder that the majority of practitioners in the rural districts today are older men. They would like to retire, they say, but their devotion to duty keeps them plugging along doing their best for their patients, hypocritically declaring that there is no sentiment involved.

The second point is that this country doctor cheerfully takes up the routine of an 8-hour day, feeling that it is far too short but the best he can do.

These physicians are meeting the crisis in a wonderful spirit.

Mr. President, I have been glad to pay this well-deserved tribute to the medical profession, and at the same time to give information to those who have relatives and friends among our fighting men, so that they may know the story. I am sure they will be glad to have this information, as I was when I investigated the situation.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS ON THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the routine nominations on the Executive Calendar may be considered and confirmed, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Army which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEATH OF SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FRANK KNOX

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we have all heard with the profoundest grief of the death of the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox. I am sure that not only the Senate but the whole country will be shocked at the news of the untimely and sudden death of our Secretary of the Navy, who during the great war crisis has filled in a magnificent way the position assigned to him by the President of the United States, and, indirectly, by the Senate.

Secretary Knox was a man of outstanding ability, of the sincerest character, and of unimpeachable motives. He served his country in a nonpartisan way, laying aside for the time being any partisan considerations, as so many hundreds of thousands and millions have done in this great war. It is with the deepest of sorrow that I am compelled to announce his death to the Senate. I am sure that I speak the sentiments of all Members of this body, regardless of party, in expressing our great grief over this deplorable loss to our country, and in expressing our profoundest sympathy to his family.

Mr. President, I send forward a resolution which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 287), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Frank Knox, late Secretary of the Navy.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join a committee of the House of Representatives in attending the funeral of the late Secretary of the Navy on behalf of Congress and to take such other action as may be proper in honor of the memory of the deceased and to manifest the respect and appreciation of Congress for his public service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the news which has just been announced reaches us with terrific suddenness and with heavy impact.

Secretary Knox was a native of New England. He was born in the city of Boston. After spending his early years in that section of the country he moved westward, and I believe he went to school and began his active life in the State of Michigan. He was a newspaperman by profession. He published newspapers in the States of New Hampshire and Michigan, and I believe elsewhere, which had a circulation throughout the length and breadth of this land.

Secretary Knox was a forceful character. By his industry, his forthrightness of thought, and his close and diligent attention to every detail of every duty which came before him, he mounted to the very topmost round of his profession.

Perhaps the outstanding characteristic of Secretary Knox's life was a burning, vibrant patriotism. In his early youth he served as a Rough Rider under the command of Theodore Roosevelt. Later, when past what is usually considered military age, he served in the Army of the United States in the First World War, and saw service on the active battle front in France.

Mr. President, in the present war Secretary Knox has rendered service which has exacted of him what I firmly believe to be the utmost measure of devotion which a man can render his country. I believe the arduousness of his duties and the weight of his responsibility so rested upon him as to make a direct contribution to his untimely end.

Secretary Knox was an aggressive character, a fighting character. There is satisfaction in the thought that always he fought for those things which he believed to be right. Always he could be found to be arrayed against those things which he believed to be wrong. He always served without partisanship, and with the highest patriotism.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] in this poor and halting tribute to Secretary Knox. I express to his family assurances of the regard which we had for him during his lifetime, and our deep sympathy to them in his untimely death.

Mr. President, like my colleagues of the Senate, I am deeply shocked and saddened to hear the news of the very untimely death of Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox. For nearly a quarter of a century he has been a personal friend of mine. In his passing I lose a very dear and trusted friend, and the Nation loses an outstanding leader and a great American.

He combined those traits of character which I admire in any individual. He had ability, courage, loyalty, forthright-

ness, and steadfastness. These were manifest throughout his entire career.

Frank Knox was a native of New England. He was born in Boston on January 1, 1874, 70 years ago. He then migrated to the Midwest and lived there during the early period of his life. Later he returned to New England, where he published in my State of New Hampshire a newspaper known as the Manchester Union Leader, one of New England's leading publications. He had a very brilliant record in business, civic affairs, politics, and in the service of his country.

During the Spanish-American War he served as a member of the first regiment of United States Volunteers, which was commonly known as the Rough Riders. In the First World War he entered as a private and rose to the rank of major, serving in the Three Hundred and Third Ammunition Train of the Seventy-eighth Division. He saw active service for a very long period in France and won distinction for his participation in the St. Mihiel drive and the Meuse-Argonne offensive.

In the current war he served his Nation as Secretary of the Navy. He assumed the Secretaryship on July 11, 1940. Under his leadership he saw the Navy grow until it is today the finest sea-fighting force of any nation in the world; it is the most powerful Navy which any nation in the history of the world has ever had. He has seen it in recent months move on and take the offensive against the Japs. I recently talked with him, and he told me about his pride and satisfaction in the success of the Navy in the Pacific.

All of us can thank God that the objective to which he so selflessly dedicated the last years of his life—the building of a strong and powerful Navy—was attained prior to his death. It was Colonel Knox's energy, his vigor, and his vision that contributed to bringing about this result. This achievement, probably as much as any other factor, will shorten the duration of the war. In the building of this Navy he was a part of the team. He never would talk about his achievements, nor would he permit his efforts to be singled out above those of others.

Frank Knox has been an editor, publisher, and businessman. He published newspapers in New Hampshire and Illinois. In my State, his paper was the Manchester Union Leader, an outstanding publication; and in Illinois, the Chicago Daily News, one of the great daily newspapers of the Nation.

He was interested in politics, and he was a distinguished member of the Republican Party. It was my privilege in 1936 to place his name in nomination for Vice President of the United States at the Republican Convention held in Cleveland, and he finally was nominated by a practically unanimous vote as the Vice Presidential candidate of the Republican Party. He did credit to that party as one of its standard bearers.

His first active interest in politics was in 1911 when he became Theodore Roosevelt's preconvention Midwest campaign manager. He was one of the moving spirits of the formation of the Progressive or Bull Moose Party in 1912, having idolized and believed in Theodore Roosevelt from the date of his service under him as a member of the Rough Riders.

Several years before the outbreak of the World War No. 2, he was pointing out the threat of nazi-ism and fascism in the world and urging the preparedness of this country. When the European war finally broke on the horizon, he advocated all possible aid to the Allies.

In 1940 President Roosevelt called him to the service of his country as a member of the Cabinet, and from the date he assumed the duties of the Secretary of the Navy, he laid aside partisan politics and has rendered able and outstanding service in that capacity.

Through the most perilous period in our Nation's and in the world's history, he has guided and directed one of the most important departments in the war effort. Even in the dark days following Pearl Harbor when many a weaker heart was discouraged, he had faith and carried on. He was one of the few who knew how effective the Japanese sneak attack on Pearl Harbor was. He was one of the few who knew that the striking force of our Navy in the Pacific had been seriously crippled, but he did not falter, he responded with the same fearlessness which inspired Americans in other days, and he carried on and he made good.

The American Navy and its status today and the record bear witness to the great value of his able, patriotic, and distinguished public service. He lived through an eventful period of our Nation, a period when history was in the making, and he helped make that history.

He was one of the ablest men of his generation. His integrity, his vision, his honor, his courage were known to all who came in contact with him. He was never touched by the pomp of power. He was human to the end.

In our State of New Hampshire he left his mark. Few men have made the contribution to the civic, business, and public life of our State that he has made.

We shall miss him. His place will be hard to fill. His death was a casualty to the war effort just as truly as if he had been killed on the fighting front.

My heart goes out to Mrs. Knox, a gracious, charming, wonderful lady, who has been his helpmate through the greater period of his life. I am sure I am expressing the sentiments of my colleagues and the people of my State when I extend to her and to other members of the family our sincerest sympathy and deepest solicitude.

This is but my humble tribute to a personal friend and a great American.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee will be appointed at a later time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Secretary of the Navy, I move that the Senate now take a recess until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, May 2, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Lewis Hyde Brereton (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Barney McKinney Giles (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

TO BE PEOPLE'S COUNSEL

James W. Lauderdale

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Donald B. Hubbard	Hedge F. Henn, Jr.
Frank W. Stopinski, Jr.	John C. Pritchett
	Richard C. Andrews
Myron K. Minnick	Wilson B. Baugh, Jr.
William R. Shockley	Robert W. Allen
Edward R. Messer	Frederick R. Korf

POSTMASTERS

WASHINGTON

Bertha M. Symonds, American Lake.
Arnold G. Thorsen, Graham.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

APRIL 28, 1944.

I hereby designate the Honorable JERE COOPER to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose hand hast brought us unto this day, accept our thanksgiving as our prayer is set before Thee as incense. Help us to reverence our high calling and prize our good name, esteeming our time and influence as choice treasures. Enable us to adorn our position by heeding the lessons of Thy grace and providence. We would be free of the restless will and seek the lucid lights of the soul which are exceedingly precious.

Though time creeps on apace and disappointments may come in clusters, we rejoice that the promises which lure our country forward are not shadows of a great desire, but the realities of a glorious future. The hunger and sacrifice of our national life with its great heart is a glow of longing for that wealth which never fails; it flows from the hills of God. O rend and break the heavens with the voice of a righteous Father as the burning bush blazes with Thy holy presence. Bless each of us in our daily life and help us to be quick to receive the admonition of Thy Spirit. Make the common things strange and great and the most familiar duties important. We pray that Thy fatherly care may guard our President; mercifully sustain him in all his labors. Be with our Speaker, our leaders, and all Members. Comfort the sick with songs in the night and shepherd all our family circles and Thine shall be the praise. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

BUREAUCRACY RUN MAD

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the perfectly impractical and unenforceable suggestion of Col. J. M. Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, that civilians seeking to purchase train or bus tickets would be required to sign a slip or declaration to the effect that "This trip for which I am now purchasing tickets is a necessary one," puts it, the suggestion, on a par with some others emanating heretofore from other Government agencies—one, that farmers remove the shoes from their horses at night; two, that the mules furnished tenant farmers be with foal. That domestic animal, like the suggestion itself, can have no pride of ancestry or hope of posterity.

To suggest that those who cannot speak, read, or write English shall be compelled to sign such a declaration is not only an attempt to accomplish the impossible, but is ridiculous, indefensible, and absurd.

The long-suffering public need not be insulted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address made by him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from a New Orleans newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway power project and include therein an address by Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, Minn., delivered at Ogdensburg, N. Y., on April 25, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a certain resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED CANAL FROM OHIO RIVER TO YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see some of my brethren from Pennsylvania present, because I want to address my remarks particularly to them, although I believe it is a matter in which the House as a whole has an interest.

A rivers and harbors bill was recently passed by the House and taken before the Senate. I supported this bill in the House; but in the Senate there has been attached to it a canal project which was rejected by the House and by the committee as uneconomic on several occasions. It is a stub-end canal from the Ohio River to Youngstown, Ohio.

The only possible purpose of this canal is to give the Youngstown steel industry a competitive advantage which it does not now have over the industries of Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Of course, we could not object if the Ohio industry by natural means got a competitive advantage over Pennsylvania and West Virginia, but we do object to it being done by Government subsidy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from a local newspaper on morale.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article published by the Food Field Reporter on April 3, 1943, which refers to a very distinguished citizen of my district and his opinion of the O. P. A. program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Mr. Dewey on Foreign Policy."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PRATT] be given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer under date of April 21, 1944, entitled "Get the City Back on the Air Map."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RULE OR RUIN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, two recent acts show the fixed determination of this administration to impose its will upon the people, regardless of law. The administration has long been determined to impose its orders upon farmers. It insisted they kill little pigs, reduce production, farm its way, limit acreage, sow or plant the kind of seed it directed, sign up with the A. A. A. To compel farmers to do this it made benefit payments, imposed penalties upon the sale of some wheat; more recently refused to permit some farmers to sell corn and, with public money, paid thousands of agents to enforce its orders.

Last week, from a substantial farmer who is also a supervisor of one of the townships in my home county, came a letter stating that, when he applied for gasoline for his tractor, he was told that it was compulsory to first see an A. A. A. committeeman and make application on an A. A. A. blank. Others were told when they asked for farm machinery or deferment of farm labor, to first see the A. A. A. agent. That is not the law. The A. A. A. has no authority whatever over rationing or deferment. The Department here so admits but to date has not complied with any request to issue instructions to its field agents to that effect.

This administration has long been forcing employees into the C. I. O. union. A. F. of L. officials months ago charged the N. L. R. B. with favoring the C. I. O. in the administration of the National Labor Relations Act.

As the result of an Executive order employees have been forced to join and to pay dues to the C. I. O., which in turn boasts of a political-action committee with a campaign fund of more than $2,000,000, and of its support of the fourth term.

Yielding to the request of the President, Montgomery Ward & Co. more than a year ago entered into a contract with the C. I. O. That contract contained a clause which required all employees of Ward's who belonged to the C. I. O. to continue as members in good standing throughout the life of the contract or to resign within a specified number of days.

Before that contract expired on December 8, 1943, Ward's asked for a vote of its employees to determine whether they wished to continue to be members of the C. I. O. and have it bargain for them.

The N. L. R. B. to date has refused to call such an election. Without ascertaining the wishes of the employees, the War Labor Board ordered Ward's to renew the old contract, containing a security-of-membership clause under which all the employees who had been members of the C. I. O. must continue to be members of that union and either pay all dues and assessments and comply with the rules of the company or lose their jobs.

Ward's, speaking for its employees, refused to sign. The President ordered the Army to take possession. At the direction of Attorney General Biddle, soldiers entered the plant and forcibly carried out the 69-year-old president of Ward's and dumped him on the sidewalk. Is that the way to settle a labor dispute?

Weeks ago suit was filed in the District of Columbia to determine the issue. The Government denied the court had jurisdiction.

Congress has passed two laws to settle such disputes—one the Wagner law and the other one the War Labor Disputes Act. The Government refuses to act under the first. It claims to have seized Ward's plant under the latter. But that act does not give the War Labor Board any authority to force workers to remain members of a union or to pay dues or special assessments to a union. Nor does it give the President power to seize any plant or business unless the operator is a war contractor or the plant is a war plant, handling materials required in the prosecution of the war or which may be useful in connection therewith.

If the President can lawfully seize Ward's, he can seize any factory, farm, or store, for, in a sense, everyone is engaged in the production of materials which may aid in the prosecution of the war. The hen which lays the eggs, the cow which gives the milk, the farmer who turns a furrow or sows the seed—all of us who do anything useful—are contributing toward the support of the war. But Congress never intended to give and it did not give the administration any power to seize civilian businesses.

The Army cannot operate Montgomery Ward & Co., as it has already discovered. It has now made application to the court which will ultimately pass upon its authority. That it should have done in the first place, instead of resorting to the law of the fang and the club which the President so vigorously once condemned. The administration can ruin and destroy Ward's; it cannot operate it. The administration should let civilians alone; go back to the job of winning the war.

Heretofore on several occasions months ago from the floor of the House I have called attention to the W. L. B.'s demands made on Ward's and pointed out that trouble was sure to come. Now the trouble is here—right in the lap of Congress. We did not prevent it as we might have done—now we cannot dodge the issue. To show that impatience is general and justified, I am printing herewith an article by David Lawrence and an editorial from the Washington Star, marked "Exhibit A and B."

This morning comes this wire, similar wires having been received by various Members of the House.

Let me read:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 27, 1944.*

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

I am on my way to Washington to see you tomorrow regarding the unlawful seizure of our plant by the Navy. We have been in business as manufacturers for 80 years and have won four Army-Navy E and three Maritime M awards. We cannot get relief from the packed courts and must look to Congress for immediate aid. It appears that a vicious element has seized control of our Government and is going to seize the country's private business.

BERNARD J. LEE,
Vice President, Jenkins Bros.,
Bridgeport, Conn.

That wire expresses a feeling held by many good citizens. The morning papers carry on the front page the picture of another administration victory, this one by Attorney General Biddle. The picture shows two husky soldiers of our Army carrying 69-year-old Sewell Avery, the president and chairman of the board of Montgomery Ward & Co., out of the company's office.

Last night over the radio an announcer stated—and I do not vouch for this, for I do not have complete faith in the things we hear over the air—but, anyway, this announcer said that an official in the War Department here in Washington said that the Army wanted none of this labor dispute; that the Army was not the agency to settle disputes of the kind that are now giving us trouble in Chicago.

But, going back to this picture, here are these two husky youngsters who were either conscripted or volunteered to fight our enemies, the Germans and the Japs, and Biddle is using them to carry an old man out of his office. No wonder they look disgusted. Beyond question those young men dislike the job that they were given to do. But they are in the Army and have no choice. No young man, especially a strong, vigorous young fellow in Army uniform, would ask for the job of carrying an old—and I say this with all due respect, but Mr. Avery is a 69-year-old man—that is my age—out of his place of business just because he will not agree to force his employees to pay tribute to the C. I. O. Certain rights are still guaranteed, merely guaranteed, not given to those who have reached that advanced age.

But here is the Army, this time under the command of Attorney General Biddle, winning a battle on a new front. The picture should be captioned "General Biddle wins great victory."

What should Biddle have done? If Biddle had not shirked his duty, this dispute which is now troubling the Nation, which is now exposing to the Nation the determination of this administration to rule or ruin, would have been ended long, long ago. Montgomery Ward & Co. and Sewell Avery have been fighting this battle, your battle and my battle, the battle of all of those who believe in our form of government, the battle of every single businessman, of every farmer in this country, of every individual who insists upon his right to go on under the Constitution and enjoy the liberties and the privileges which are guaranteed to us by that document. I say that Montgomery Ward & Co., especially 69-year-old Mr. Avery, are fighting our battle. They have been doing it for 2 long years, down here in the District of Columbia and out on the west coast.

Here are some of the pleadings that have been filed in the court here in the District. Page after page, in which Montgomery Ward & Co., employing

remedies which are guaranteed, but because of the administration's action, not available "due process of law," a remedy guaranteed to every citizen, have tried to get a judicial decision, a lawful decision, as to whether or not they were required under the War Disputes Act to sign this contract. Do you know what the Government pleads? The Government in its answer in this case pleads that the court has no jurisdiction. Why? Because it says the War Labor Board, which ordered Montgomery Ward & Co. to sign this contract, a new contract—the old one expired December 8, last—because the War Labor Board says it—the Board—has no way of enforcing its own order. So they say the court should not consider the case.

If the Attorney General of the United States would have had the Department of Justice go in and plead that the order was valid, that the Board had authority to issue it, that it had authority to enforce it, we would have had a decision of the District Court, and then an appeal could have been taken and the United States Supreme Court could have passed upon the issue, and there would have been no occasion for this arbitrary action which has frightened the whole Nation, because had that happened, Montgomery Ward & Co. would have abided by the order of the court. But what Avery is objecting to is this rule of—what was it the President called it—the law of the fang and the club. You remember when he condemned that? He said we must have none of it; that there should be no government by force. Now he is using it. Do you recall that on the 19th day of November, 1941, when the coal strike was on, and standing face to face with John L. Lewis, he said that no man in this country should be forced into a union; not only that the administration would not do it, but he said that Congress would not do it. The Congress has not done it, but the President orders out the Army, the Army that is supposed to fight the Germans and the Japs. He orders them out to enforce an order which his own legal department refuses to defend in the courts established for that purpose.

My contention is that it is time that Congress act on this matter.

Is this gentleman from Connecticut coming down here to Washington to appeal to the administration, to appeal to the President, to appeal to the court? No. He knows that would be futile. He is coming here to appeal to his Representatives, to the representatives of the people, and, in my judgment, it is time that we do something to protect the constitutional government which we swore to uphold.

I know and I anticipate the argument that will be made by New Deal supporters. On this floor will arise Members of the majority party and make the argument that will be made by editors in New Deal papers, by New Deal columnists.

That argument will be that we are in war; that orders issued by the President, who is Commander in Chief, should be obeyed, regardless of their legality. If our civilian population was a part of the armed forces or if we were in the battle area, that argument would be sound. But the President, merely because he is Commander in Chief, because he is President, cannot override the Constitution. He is not greater than the Government itself. He, as Commander in Chief, has no authority over the civilian population.

Even in faraway Hawaii, the courts have held that, inasmuch as there is no immediate danger of invasion, the Army officials in command there cannot suspend civil law nor constitutional government.

When the President, acting either as President or as Commander in Chief, issues an order that a civilian perform some act, that order is without validity if it does not conform to the law of the land.

Our present difficulty grows out of the fact that the President and his advisers have forgotten that this is a Government by law, by constitutional processes—not a Government by a dictator.

The argument that civilians should obey without question the orders of the Commander in Chief or of the President ignores the fact that we have a constitutional Government, assumes that we are under a dictatorship. The assumption that we are under a dictatorship may be true as a matter of fact; it is not true as a matter of law.

The argument that the orders of the President should be unquestionably obeyed overlooks the fact that citizens are given the right of appeal to the courts from any law enacted by Congress, and that, in this instance, the administrative agencies carrying out the policies of the President have refused to submit the validity of the order upon which the President's action is based to the courts—even though the President has appointed the judges who preside over those courts.

Millions of our young men have enlisted or have been conscripted. Hundreds of thousands of our young men will die to maintain the principles of free government in lands thousands of miles from home, while here at home it is argued that constitutional processes, the liberties of the citizen, must be sacrificed in obedience to a Presidential order. No king, no czar, no dictator could ask for more arbitrary power. If that argument prevail, then this war will have been fought in vain.

This Congress is the only agency of the Government which stands between the people and a dictator. This Congress is the only agency of the Government to which the people can look for protection. Let us no longer delay.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I want you to take your own time and talk on it.

EXHIBIT A

"COLOSSAL BLUNDER"—MONTGOMERY WARD SEIZURE SURE TO BRING LAW CHANGE

(By David Lawrence)

If seizure of Montgomery Ward is lawful, then President Roosevelt has the right to seize every newspaper and magazine and every other business which refuses to grant maintenance-of-membership clauses in contracts with labor unions.

The President has made a colossal blunder. It will not only injure him politically, but it will bring about the amendment of the price-control law and the Wage and Salary Stabilization Act so that the powers hitherto exercised will be sharply curtailed.

The episode is most regrettable from the standpoint of the administration because the Attorney General's opinion is worded so as to endeavor to establish the supreme right of the President to act as dictator.

WAR POWERS UNLIMITED

What the Attorney General has said will astound the Nation. It means that there is no constitutional protection any more—the President can do as he pleases. There is no reason now why he cannot order anybody to do as the administration directs and use the flimsy pretext that the war powers he holds give the authority to back him up.

Mr. Biddle's opinion uses the fiction that the Commander in Chief possesses some peculiar war powers. Under the Constitution, he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and has no authority over civilians unless martial law is declared. Civil rights have not been suspended, yet Mr. Biddle claims that the statutes do invest the Commander in Chief with powers to seize plants. He makes the point that Congress, under the Smith-Connally law, authorized seizure of war plants and then goes on to try to prove that Ward's is a part of the war effort. If Congress had intended any such meaning, it would have said so. It could easily have said "any and all plants directly or indirectly related to the war effort." But it used no such broad language.

Mr. Biddle, evidently fearing that the courts might construe the Smith-Connally law not to apply to Ward's, then said it wasn't necessary to invoke just that statute because all the laws relating to war powers gave the President the needed authority. No precedents were cited and no detailed explanation to the Nation was made—it's simply the arbitrary claim of the Attorney General that the law is what he says it is. Opinions from an Attorney General who declines to justify the action taken by citing the basis in law for his action are valueless.

THE CASE AS A PRECEDENT

If the Attorney General is right—namely, that the President in time of war can exercise any authority he wishes, can confiscate property, and use force to eject from his own office the head of a company who asks to be shown the legal authority for such acts—then constitutional rights in America can be said to have vanished.

All over the country and throughout the world the news sooner or later will be transmitted that, in order to help a labor union get a maintenance-of-membership clause, the Roosevelt administration was willing to use troops and take away civil rights granted under the Constitution.

Members of Congress for the most part stand aghast at the action. They have seen their own acts again and again misinterpreted in regulations and Government orders, but not until the Ward case was the full effect brought home to them.

The Constitution says something about seizures. It is in the fourth article of the Bill of Rights, which says:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated."

The newspapers show pictures of Sewell Avery, chairman of Ward's, being forcibly ejected because he asked the Attorney General and the troops for their authority to remove him.

The whole country can understand the issue—and it will be heard from in the election campaign. The administration has made a mistake that may be reflected in protest votes not only from the Middle West

but from other parts of the country next autumn. For it will be asked, "What is the use of winning a war against totalitarianism abroad and succumbing to totalitarianism at home?" And it will be a hard question to answer.

EXHIBIT B

A DANGEROUS DOCTRINE

The legal actions which have been started or are about to be filed in Chicago as an outgrowth of the Government's seizure of the Montgomery Ward mail-order house should result in a long-overdue clarification of the President's powers in a situation of this kind.

Heretofore the Government has invoked every conceivable legal technicality to dodge a court test of its powers to impose settlements in labor disputes. The War Labor Board has contended that its directives are merely advisory, and since it lacks authority to enforce its orders no one has a right to go into court and challenge their validity. This is not compatible with the kind of relationship that ought to exist between the Government and the people, and the decision to abandon these devious tactics should be welcomed by all concerned.

The seizure of the Montgomery Ward establishment at the order of the President and the forcible eviction of Sewell Avery, head of the concern, by soldiers acting at the direction of Mr. Roosevelt's subordinates, rest upon practical as well as legal considerations. It is the latter, however, that are of controlling interest in connection with the litigation now under way.

In taking over the plant, the President acted on the basis of an opinion by Attorney General Biddle that he had lawful authority to do so. A careful reading of the opinion, however, leaves many doubts on this score.

The Attorney General relied in the first instance on the Smith-Connally Act, which empowers the President under certain conditions to seize "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith." It requires a considerable exercise of the imagination to fit the Montgomery Ward mail-order house into this category, and there is excellent reason to believe that Congress in passing the law had no thought that it would be applied to such an establishment.

It also may be inferred that Mr. Biddle has doubts on this score, for his opinion goes on to express the view that, aside from any authority derived through the Smith-Connally Act, the President could lawfully seize the Montgomery Ward plant under "an aggregate of powers" that are "derived from the Constitution and from various (unspecified) statutes enacted by Congress for the purpose of carrying on the war."

Unless it is proposed to abandon constitutional government in time of war, this assertion of vaguely defined power is an exceedingly dangerous doctrine. Where does the President's authority end? If he can seize a man's business and forcibly evict the operating head under his "aggregate of powers," and without regard to specific legislation enacted by Congress to deal with such situations, what protection has any citizen against wanton abuse of power? It is no answer to say that Sewell Avery is a recalcitrant representative of "big business," nor is there any great comfort in the thought that the administration, for reasons best known to itself, has refrained from the use of strong-arm tactics in dealing with similar recalcitrants from such men as John L. Lewis and James C. Petrillo. Political and other considerations may shield the mass of the people from these exercises of asserted power today, but if the assertions are permitted to go unchallenged and unclarified, there can be no effective guaranty of such protection in the future.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Less than 30 minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram from a very distinguished Missourian and a great American by the name of James A. Reed, from Kansas City, Mo. It reads:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *April 28, 1944.*

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,

House Office Building:

The establishment of bayonet rule in Chicago is an alarming manifestation of the dangers by which we are surrounded and with which the future is surcharged. I beg to suggest that it is high time for our Congress to arrest this movement. I scarcely need appeal to you to do your part.

JAMES A. REED.

I hope that every Member of this House, regardless of politics, will do his part in bringing this issue to a quick and proper close. Industry and labor should be treated alike. Equal justice to employer and to employee. We must not lose freedom at home while our men and women are fighting and dying for it everywhere else in the world.

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about the merits of the controversy between Montgomery Ward and the War Labor Board, and I do not want to discuss that. It may have been a mistake for the War Labor Board ever to assume jurisdiction over the case. But the War Labor Board was set up by act of Congress, not initially, but finally. It made the decision in accordance with the practices and procedures laid down in that act. The President of the United States was called on to enforce that decision. It seems to me he had no other course to follow, if we are not going to have chaos in this country, except to enforce the order of the War Labor Board.

Montgomery Ward & Co. had recourse in the courts, and of course the matter will finally be settled there, but as far as I am concerned, as a Member of Congress I cannot endorse the idea that we are going to permit the order of the President of the United States and the Commander in Chief in time of war to be disregarded by any citizen, no matter what his legal rights may be, when he has recourse to the courts. If we are going to follow that procedure, we are going to have chaos here. That is where I think my friends are making a mistake in defending Mr. Avery in this case.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think when we passed the original Connally-Smith antistrike bill that piece of legislation did not comprehend inclusion of retail stores or establishments such as Montgomery Ward; but say that it did, the strange thing is that the orders of the War Labor Board as they pertain to employers are enforced by the President, but when the War Labor Board issues orders against unions or these labor racketeers, those orders are completely overlooked and totally ignored by our Chief Executive. We want fair and impartial administration of the law.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am not going into that question now. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. SHORT. Certainly not, but the gentleman——

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman's side of the aisle when the Connally-Smith bill was before this House resisted the effort to give the President of the United States the right to seize any plant.

Mr. SHORT. No; we did not.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; you did.

Mr. SHORT. I was one of the conferees in that committee and I fought to give him control of both industry and labor. We wanted to see that the sauce that was good for the gander was good for the goose, and that we should treat both industry and labor, employer and employee, alike, without discrimination or favor. That has not been done, and we all know it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. You finally gave him authority in the conference report, but the gentleman surely remembers that the argument here was that we ought not to give that power. It was not in the Harness amendment to the Smith-Connally bill, no power to seize any plant, as I recall it.

Mr. SHORT. Regardless of what we stood for, it is the law, and the gentleman is arguing for a fair, just, and impartial enforcement of the law. That is what we all want.

Mr. RAMSPECK. What I am arguing for is the principle that every citizen must obey the orders of his Government and then take his recourse in the proper manner, but not in the manner which Mr. Avery has taken. That is what I am condemning. I do not know about the merits of it. He may be right as to his legal rights. But he has another method. He took the wrong method. There was nothing left for the President to do but to enforce the order of the Labor Board.

In this connection, only today two Washington newspapers, neither of which could be charged with favoring the President, have editorials on this subject. They are worthy of the careful consideration of all of us.

The Washington Post editorial is as follows:

LAW AND RESPONSIBILITY

In these critical times, especially on the eve of events which will put this war into every household in America, a loyalty to measures which are patently essential to effective prosecution of the war should be

taken for granted. We have in mind disciplinary regulations governing work and prices and production. Certainly strikes involving large bodies of workers are inimical to our war effort, whether these strikes occur in plants making munitions of war or in great distributive establishments, such as Montgomery Ward's Chicago properties. Montgomery Ward, however, has been repeatedly cited for engaging in unfair labor practices which have been an impediment to smooth production. Its disputes with its employees have been frequent. And the evidence strongly indicates that the management is chiefly responsible for the strike that led finally to Government seizure of the company's Chicago properties. The company's hostile attitude, its failure to give full cooperation to Government agencies striving to maintain orderly processes of collective bargaining, thus deserve to be severely condemned.

The seriousness of the interference with our war effort caused by strikes involving the employees of a mail-order house is not, of course, as great as it would be in case of strikes in plants manufacturing war equipment. But it is substantial, as the Attorney General asserts in his opinion sustaining the validity of the Executive order. Furthermore, his opinion emphasizes the danger that the Chicago disturbance might spread to other plants and facilities of the company, as well as "breed controversies" in other companies engaged in essential war work. The Attorney General has, in fact, advanced some very strong arguments to support the contention that the Montgomery Ward strike was a most untimely development which the management should have tried to prevent by all means at its disposal. However, the company management has preferred to press the issue of legality. And on that score it can make out a strong case against the methods followed in forcing it to comply with W. L. B. orders.

The legal questions raised in this case should be considered in an atmosphere free from prejudice. For the issues raised are not confined to labor disputes involving Montgomery Ward or other concerns in the same class. The fundamental issue is whether the President has the authority under statutory law or under the Constitution to take over a plant engaged in the distribution of merchandise to civilians. The Attorney General upholds the validity of the seizure on two grounds: (1) that section 3 of the War Labor Disputes (i. e., the Smith-Connally antistrike) Act gives him necessary authority and (2) that the President's constitutional and statutory powers as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy would warrant the seizure even in the absence of section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act.

The Attorney General's interpretation of the Smith-Connally Act has already been sharply challenged by certain Members of Congress, including Representative Smith. He affirms that the provision permitting seizure of "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any article" used in the war effort was never intended to apply to concerns engaged in retail merchandising. As coauthor of the War Labor Disputes Act Mr. Smith is certainly entitled to express an opinion. Furthermore, the language of the act appears to support his interpretation. Thus the country is again faced by a controversy growing out of the administrative habit of using limited statutes to accomplish purposes not conceived of by their legislative sponsors.

The Attorney General's assumption that the President might exercise the power of seizure without any legislative authorization will give rise to even more violent dissent. For if the President can seize private plants distributing civilian goods whenever, in his judgment, the seizure becomes necessary to prevent injury to the war effort, he might conceivably take over the whole of private industry without so much as asking for congressional approval. One wonders why, if this is the President's notion of his general wartime authority, he bothers to ask Congress for any specific authority.

The extension of the powers of the President that would be made possible by acceptance of the sweeping Biddle opinion may well alarm Americans who do not believe that any emergency confers dictatorial powers on the President. In this particular case, seizure is undoubtedly the surest and quickest way of forcing compliance on a recalcitrant concern. But we have labor legislation—the Wagner Act, in fact—that provides means of bringing pressure to bear upon employers who engage in unfair labor practices. It is by no means clear that the present emergency warranted resort to extreme measures before trying out procedures of unquestioned legality.

The Washington Daily News says:

A PREINVASION DISGRACE

That was a tragic and a disheartening spectacle in Chicago yesterday—a shameful scene on the eve of our greatest effort in this or any war—when the head of a great business, because of his defiance of his Government, had to be physically ejected from his office.

The issues in this controversy may be obscure or complex, but one thing is clear to the average civilian or G. I. who is pouring his dollars or his blood into this war, and that is that neither the Government nor the head of Montgomery Ward should have permitted this affair to come to such a disorderly impasse.

We look with apprehension on what seems to be the greed among war agencies for jurisdiction beyond the bounds of war necessities. It seems to us that there was validity in Mr. Avery's denial of the War Labor Board's authority with respect to Montgomery Ward. We would like to have seen him challenge that authority by orderly process of law. Instead, he chose to flout a wartime order of his Government. By his action he forced the Chief Executive to do the only thing possible under the circumstances, and that was to uphold the integrity and authority of the Government.

It seems to us that the War Labor Board has been as inept as Mr. Avery has been stubborn. We doubt that the Board was on sound ground so far as the fundamental issue was concerned; Montgomery Ward is not a war plant in the sense that a coal mine or a steel plant is.

But the War Labor Board took the position that the company was engaged in war work. Its directive was issued with the authority of the Government, and Mr. Avery's action has been to flout that authority.

If a successful challenge to the authority of W. L. B. is made, except in an orderly and legal procedure, the result is bound to be chaos. The Board has ruled in innumerable cases affecting the economics of the Nation at war. It enunciated the principle of the Little Steel formula, and has sustained it except for the contortions involved in the John L. Lewis case. Its authority and its rulings have been accepted by industry and the public generally. If the authority of this Board is repudiated, or destroyed, the result cannot help but be a complete collapse of the lines which the country at large has united in maintaining against inflation and general economic disaster.

This was a sorry business. It should not have come to this pass. Here is an issue which cannot be settled collar and thigh. The second front should be kept in Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is not a question as to whether the War Labor Board made a proper decision or whether it made an erroneous decision, as was so well suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. If the War Labor Board did make a wrong decision, and Montgomery Ward & Co. refused to obey that order, what would you have the President of the United States do? If this gentleman refuses to obey the legal orders of the Government, would you have the power of the President and all the machinery of the Government break down? Would you have the Government sit back and say, "Yes; we will allow this individual to defy the might of the United States Government"? I can imagine what the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle would be saying if Mr. Avery defied the Government and the Government did nothing about it.

I submit further that there is no instance that I recall where the Government has seized a plant that the representatives of organized labor and organized labor have not obeyed the orders of the Government and gone back to work, showing that organized labor obey the Government even if they think the Government or its proper agencies have made a wrong decision.

So the question at issue is simply whether or not an individual or any organization can defy the Government of the United States during this most critical period in the history of the Nation during this war emergency. That is the line along which this argument should be pursued. I think we are just begging the question to try to discuss whether or not the War Labor Board made a proper decision or whether or not they had authority. The proper place for this question to be settled is in the courts, and both sides have moved to have it settled in the courts. I think Congress should wait until the question is decided according to the Constitution of the United States and the statutes which the Congress itself has passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

FREEZING OF CORN STOCKS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to divert the attention of the House from this very live question which the Members have been discussing and turn to another vast area of confusion over the Nation. I refer to the results of the one-hundred-and-some counties which had corn stocks frozen in all of the principal corn-producing counties of the Nation. I think it is well to raise this question before the Members this afternoon because I know you are going to hear about it very shortly, and you will want to be ready to take action because it will be of the utmost importance to your constituents and to the Nation. For that reason I want to direct your thought to it. You probably do not know, but I will give you an instance of how it affects the district that I come from and 50 counties in southern Illinois. We have been accustomed in that grazing country to go with trucks and other means of quick transportation 50 to 100 miles north to get corn for our livestock. Following the suggestions of the Government, we have increased our production of cattle, hogs, poultry, sheep, and all of the various kinds of livestock. We have been as accustomed to going north for our corn as you would be in your home town of going to the nearest chain or independent store for your groceries. Now we are sealed off. There is no chance for corn to be shipped to us out of any county under the rule, but there is some relief for hardship cases in the county where its corn has been frozen. The result is that unless something is done in our section of the State there will probably be starvation of livestock and a great reduction in the production of poultry and livestock and those products that come from the farm. It is so serious that the trucks are backed up for a mile at the East St. Louis stockyards loaded with livestock, and they have finally reached the point of receiving such stock only at the owner's risk. Thousands of head of little pigs and half-finished stock and young cattle and hogs that should remain on the farms are being dumped on the market, and I have learned this morning that no more stock will be accepted.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. Just before I yield I want to get this telegram into the RECORD to give you some idea of what may be facing you gentlemen in your counties. The reason I bring this to your attention is I have been in touch with Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and I think our only chance to get relief at all will be if we can show the War Food Administrator that we are fast getting into a desperate situation with regard to the production of food to win the war. That the situation is so desperate we must be granted relief. That the order must be relaxed.

Mr. DOUGHTON rose.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to read this telegram and then I will yield to my illustrious friend from North Carolina, head of the Committee on Ways and Means.

This is a telegram from the president of the Farm Bureau of Fayette County in southern Illinois. It reads as follows:

Corn situation Fayette County desperate. Pastures short due to cool weather and overpasturing last fall. Thirty days later than average. Average of 50 farmers daily call at office relative to corn. Fifty percent of these have less than week supply. Embargo on hogs at St. Louis. Farmers forced to take prices below costs on light hogs. Ninety percent of corn purchased by Fayette feeders hauled from frozen area in Shelby County, adjoining Fayette with the most available corn. According to Shelby County farm adviser Shelby definitely a deficit county. Selling corn in 25 and 50 bushel lots only to Shelby County feeders. They are trying to get wheat. Montgomery County same situation. Wheat not as economical as corn for hogs or dairy feed. No wheat in Fayette and none expected for 10 days. Arrival of feed wheat rather indefinite. Local A. A. A. committee helpless to relieve situation. Letter will follow.

J. B. TURNER,
Fayette County Farm Adviser.

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that the matter he is discussing has been giving considerable trouble in North Carolina to the dairymen and those who produce poultry. There was a large delegation here the day before yesterday to see what could be done about this matter. They were very much disturbed and described a very distressing situation that is developing down there now. The millmen and feed producers who process the feed said they were unable to get corn and other feed with which to furnish feed to the dairy people and poultry people. Yesterday I discussed this matter with Economic Stabilization Director Vinson and I was very much relieved after discussing the matter with him. He told me they were fully aware of the situation and they were doing everything possible to relieve it. They thought they would be able to release, perhaps, 75,000,000 to 80,000,000 bushels of corn soon to relieve this distressing condition. They are also trying to work out the diplomatic situation in Argentina by which they hope to get large shipments of corn imported from that country. They are trying also to get feed from Canada and they are doing everything possible in order to relieve this situation. They are fully aware of the situation and of its seriousness and they are doing everything posible to relieve it. After the discussion with him I was very much relieved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield briefly.

Mr. MASON. I just want to ask the question as to how long those 300 hogs belonging to that farmer who petitioned you for relief can live waiting until this relief comes which is promised in the future.

Mr. VURSELL. Answering your question, I had an urgent telephone call from one of the hog feeders in Mount Vernon, Mr. Benoist in my district, in which he said he had 375 head of hogs, 600 chickens, and other livestock, and he said he had less than 3 days' supply and was unable to get feed anywhere and that there was not enough in the town's feed store, a town of 10,000 inhabitants, to feed his own stock and that they would starve unless he got quick relief. Here is a telegram from my County of Marion:

SALEM, ILL.

Congressman C. W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives:

Farmers selling breed sows. Serious feed situation. Eighty percent or more farmers need corn immediately. Embargo on hogs, St. Louis, increases complications. Little Government wheat available. Can't supply poultry needs. Truckers report short supplies outside freeze area. Will last perhaps week or two. Many feeders entirely out.

FRED J. BLACKBURN,
County Farm Adviser, Marion County.

Here is another telegram from Homer Easley and Mr. Oga Meador, from my county, both of whom I know well. The telegram reads as follows:

Urge relief for feeders this area. We have 3 herd of hogs of 250 head each. Must sacrifice account short on corn.

HOMER EASLEY.
OGA MEADOR.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. From one of the sheep-feeding yards at Kansas City, Kans., a telegram came in stating they had 30,000 head of sheep for which they could get no corn feed.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman for this information which indicates the seriousness of the situation Nation-wide. Something must be done before it is too late.

I also want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] for his contribution. I am glad to know he is trying to protect his people and is lending his able influence in an effort to help bring relief to the farmers and stockmen who, without any fault of their own, find themselves in such a distressing situation. We must join our efforts here in Congress to alleviate their distress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Gov. Olin D. Johnston, at Charleston, S. C., on March 31 last.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. Henry E. Bodman,

counsel for Automotive Council for War Production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEED FOR LIVESTOCK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has brought up the question of corn once more. Six months ago I introduced a resolution calling for the raising of the ceiling price of corn, which, as you will recall, was $1.09 last summer, to a fair price. This ceiling was finally raised to $1.14, but all too late. I might just as well have chucked that resolution in the wastebasket for all the action that we got on it from O. P. A. or from any of the other Government agencies.

I submit that my farmers in up-State New York are as bad off, if not worse than the gentleman's farmers are. He is fortunate that he lives within a hundred miles of some of the corn sections. In New York we are going to be in a terrible situation before very long. There is very little feed available in my district, and corn has been getting scarcer and scarcer until the feed dealers inform me that they have no way of getting more.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MASON. You can live within a hundred yards of 10,000 bushels of corn right across the county line and you cannot get it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Very well. Perhaps the gentleman is correct.

I want to apologize for some of the statements that I made last summer, which made me appear to blame the farmers of the Middle West. I know I had several arguments on the floor of the House with some of the gentlemen from Nebraska and Illinois and other places in the Middle West. I want to apologize at this time. I blamed them for holding the corn which the dairy farmers of up-State New York wanted. The fault was then, as it is now, with the Office of Price Administration, and with every other bureaucratic agency of this Government. It is high time the Congress took it upon itself to straighten out the ridiculous confusion that we are now in, which is stymying our farmers, which is hampering food production, and being a drag upon the war effort.

I hope legislation may be passed soon that will straighten out some of these troubles.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman thinks that the present situation might be referred to as organized chaos?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think the gentleman makes an excellent description.

I want to touch on another sore subject and that is the country is going barefooted before very long unless the far West starts slaughtering about 4,000,000 cattle so that the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Corporation can have enough leather to make shoes to shoe the country. The O. P. A. can solve this problem in 2 minutes if it wants to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE NEW DEAL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, awhile back the President announced that the term "New Deal" had outlived its usefulness, and he asked for suggestions as to a name that would be appropriate to take its place. If the time for filing suggestions has not closed, I would like to offer a suggestion for a new name. Just call this the bungler's administration. I doubt if in all the history of the Republic there has been so much bungling and working at cross purposes.

Back in 1932 we were promised a New Deal, and I will say we were given a New Deal with a vengeance.

But to get back to my subject—and I want to talk seriously for a few minutes—a number of letters have come to my desk from merchants who say that they are not able to get woolen and cotton fabrics because the mills are shutting down, as they cannot produce under the ceiling prices that were fixed by O. P. A. back in 1941 or 1942. The gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] a few moments ago spoke more truly than he perhaps realized when he said there is danger of our going barefooted this summer and next winter. Not only will we go barefooted, but it looks as though we will all have to join a nudist colony.

When I get to discussing the foibles of the people down the Avenue, thoughts rush to my mind faster than I can express them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to state to the gentleman that the British Government has 450,000,000 pounds of Australia's wool in this country; that our own Government owns 450,000,000 pounds, and that the supply of wool on hand, particularly foreign wool, is twice as much as we can use up in any one year. Even if the farmers of this country do not shear their sheep this year we will have enough wool to last us for 2 years.

Mr. KNUTSON. My guess is they will have to shear their sheep in order to be ready to be sheared by the tax collector when he calls.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] was calling for 4,000,000 hides, that is about what he is liable to get if this corn-freezing situation gets much worse.

Precisely, the Government freezing corn in 125 counties in the Corn Belt will have disastrous effects. Reports that come to us from East St. Louis, South St. Paul, Kansas City, and other marketing centers are very disquieting. We are told that farmers are marketing immature and unfinished cattle and hogs. Hatcheries have had cancelations of orders for millions of baby chicks because poultry growers cannot get feed. So we are liable to have a serious shortage of beef, pork, poultry, and eggs before next winter. Perhaps that is what they are aiming at. Back 10 or 12 years ago they killed about 6,000,000 pigs so as to equalize the supply and the demand. They destroyed cattle. They plowed under every third row of cotton. That reminds me that the one who displayed the most intelligence in this whole New Deal set-up—and I do not want you people to call them Democrats, because they are not—but of all the statesmen who have come up in this whole mess the ablest is that old white mule down in Texas that refused to walk on the third row of cotton.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I address the membership with trepidation. I am afraid I am not going to be able to follow satisfactorily the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who preceded me, for I have a speech in which I call no one a Communist and no one a Fascist. I have tried very hard to follow the lessons I have learned listening to speeches here in the well of the House, but I cannot find it in me to call Government officials Communists or those who oppose them Fascists.

I should like to take your attention, if I may, from the domestic scene to a very important segment of the international scene. A great deal has been said about our foreign policy or lack of it, and generally when they speak of foreign policy they speak of Europe, but I submit that a foreign policy in the Pacific is even more important.

A great deal has been said in this House and elsewhere concerning an American foreign policy. Usually, in the discussions which follow, only Europe and its problems are mentioned.

Yet the point can be made, and I think sustained, that what America will do in the Pacific after this war is far more important than what America will do in Europe. In Europe, the peoples, the populations, the cultural traits, the psychological attitudes, are well frozen. They

are set; they are solidified. In Europe, after the war, there will be more socialism or less, more nationalism or less, a boundary will be drawn here instead of there. There will be no great population increases; migrations of people will be numbered in the millions, not the hundreds of millions. Scientific advances will continue, but they will come in an orderly progression.

TECHNICAL CHANGES

Asia, on the other hand, is about to take a great leap across the centuries, from medievalism to modernity. The whole character of Asia's people, their attitudes, their psychology, is about to change. Asia will be moving from the hand loom into the age of plastics, without ever going through the conditioning experience of the early industrial revolution. As education and scientific knowledge spread, the Pacific peoples will be moving from rickshas to electronics.

POPULATION CHANGES

Then, too, there will be some startling population changes in the next 20 to 40 years. The population of this planet is roughly two billion, of which one billion live in Asia, excluding Asiatic Russia.

Population curves in most European countries and in the United States and Canada have started to slowly level off. A higher percentage of the people are moving into the older age groups. As Prime Minister Churchill said in his last world-wide broadcast, England may be looking forward to a period of population decline.

But in Asia there is no such trend. In the last 60 years, the population of Asia has doubled. Even more important, the rate of increase has been going up each year. As proper medical care becomes more prevalent, and as the growing and distribution of food becomes more efficient, the rate of Asiatic increase may continue to rise for another generation or so. The only Asiatic nation that shows any indication of leveling off is Japan, and it will not be leveling off for another 50 years or so.

The changes in Europe after this war will be minute, compared to those in Asia and the Pacific. I am afraid that the western nations are not prepared, nor are they preparing for such tremendous changes as will occur. That is why what we do in the Pacific is so desperately important.

PACIFIC AT CROSSROADS

The Orient and the Pacific is still malleable. Its patterns and forms are still fluid. It is our actions, after this war, that will give the Orient the mold in which it will harden.

The oriental nations can grow to power and maturity in an attitude of fear and hate and racial tensions. They can come to believe that what they have achieved has been won from England and the United States, and their advance has been wrested from the Occident, and is not a gift of the Occident.

On the other hand, a stable basis for international cooperation and trade between the oriental and occidental nations can be established. A stable peace in the Pacific can be established. It all depends on the post-war actions of the United Nations. Important as our post-war policy will be in Europe, I submit that it is even more important in the Pacific.

THREE ASSUMPTIONS

Now if we are going to discuss United States policy in the Pacific, we must start with a few assumptions. First of all, we have to assume that the Japanese war will be won. That, I believe, is a safe assumption.

Then we have to assume that the United States will participate in Pacific affairs, with sufficient energy and tenacity to carry out a policy. That assumption is not quite so sure. However, American isolationism is having to retreat before the clear fact that unless we do actively cooperate with the rest of the world, there can be no lasting peace. Our isolationism has mainly been directed at Europe. I think most Americans recognize the necessity for a vigorous participation in the Pacific.

Thirdly, we have to assume that cooperation between the four key powers, Russia, the United States, China, and England, is possible. That assumption is the most shaky of all. Some people say that the differences between a Soviet system and a capitalist system are so great that no cooperation between them is possible. I do not believe that. Some people say that the empires in the Pacific are so important to the home countries that the home countries cannot afford to stop exploiting them. I do not believe that. Some people say that American desires in the Pacific, and China's desires in the Pacific are so mutually antagonistic that they cannot be reconciled. I do not believe that.

I believe that while the United States idea on the Pacific might differ from the Chinese, which may differ from the Russian, nevertheless, Pacific cooperation is so obviously essential to peace, that these differing desires can be worked out. It will be difficult, but not impossible.

FIVE POINTS

With this background, with the assumption that a peace is possible, and with this view of Asia as a great wild yeast ready to startle the world with the rapidity and direction of its growth, I would like to make some suggestions as to an American foreign policy in the Pacific.

These suggestions are strictly from a United States point of view. In a sense, they are selfish, for they are aimed at what I think would be best for this country. In another sense, they are not selfish, because in trying to eliminate those frictions which can cause future antagonism to the United States, we will be making peace in the Pacific more secure for all nations.

I suggest that a United States foreign policy in the Pacific should incorporate, among others, these five points:

STRONG CHINA

The first point, and the most important, is that the United States should work for a strong, unified China, and should become closely allied with this coming great continental power. I want that to be our base policy in Asia—to restore to China its ancient position as the unquestioned leader in its part of the world. That necessitates a change in both Britain's and America's past policy. For previously neither country has spent too much effort in helping China become strong. This idea of a dominant China will meet with considerable opposition both in the United States and in the United Kingdom. Many people are afraid of a strong China.

BALANCE OF POWER

In general they are the people who want us to maintain a balance of power in the Pacific. Their theory is that we should maintain a fairly strong Japan to balance against the growing strength of China. The two countries would oppose each other, tend to neutralize each other, and thus make the United States more secure.

In my opinion, such a policy would be disastrous. It would eventually lead to insecurity, conflict, and war. By trying to use Japan as a lever against China, or China as a lever against Japan, the United States would only gain the enmity of both. I am not in sympathy with the old-fashioned, predatory American industrialist who wants to keep China weak for exploitive purposes. Nor do I fear a strong China as an economic competitor of the United States. A strong China is an economic competitor of the United States. Half a billion paupers are no good as customers. But half a billion people starting to use radios and transparent plastic tooth brushes become a possibility for trade and material advancement.

PACIFIC LIKE ATLANTIC

I want the alliance between the United States and China in the Pacific to be as complete and unquestioned as the alliance between the United States and England in the Atlantic. In the Atlantic, England and the United States stand or fall together. The world knows it. The world knows we are not going to fight each other. That has been one of the greatest assets the United States has had. Only now, I feel, are we starting to realize the great debt we have owed to the British Navy for the last 100 years.

If the world understands that China and the United States will stand or fall together and will not fight each other, then we have a stable basis for a lasting Pacific peace.

This naturally leads us to the question of Russia, for there can be no stable Pacific order unless the United States and Russia can come to some agreement, not necessarily written, but roughly understood by both parties, concerning the future of China and the future of Japan.

RUSSIA VERSUS UNITED STATES

It was only a few years ago that Russia was supporting the Communist armies, and we were supporting Chiang Kai-shek. These two factions were fighting each other with the arms our two countries were supplying them. That is the sort of thing which the two countries should not start again after this war.

And that is going to be the sort of thing most difficult to avoid.

China is arriving on the industrial scene without a set pattern of capitalism or socialism. China today has elements of both, and elements that are purely oriental. It is going to be difficult enough for China to evolve her own economic and political system. If we start supporting one faction in China and Russia starts supporting another, China will never be able to achieve unity.

Even should the United States, England, and Russia have a hands-off policy toward the internal structure of China, it is going to be most difficult for China to rapidly become a stable country. Some shrewd observers feel that even with the best international goodwill, China will face a period of 4 or 5 years of bloody civil war.

MANY REFORMS NEEDED

These observers point out that China needs great agrarian, industrial, and social reforms. The old economy, where wealth drained off into Shanghai and the coast cities, and where the Provinces were periodically swept by famine and flood, will no longer satisfy the people. Yet the Kuomintang, the party of Chiang Kai-shek, which is the ruling party, has shown no inclination to make the concessions to the common people of China necessary to build up that country on a democratic, progressive basis.

Under the Kuomintang, all the harbingers of future trouble exist—suppression of civil rights, concentration camps, inflation, corruption, profiteering. And, of course, as the war nears a successful conclusion, the Kuomintang will fight all the more fiercely to keep down its political opponents and become the totalitarian party of China. One of the reasons these observers predict civil war is because so far, the Kuomintang has not made the distinction between those who are its enemies and those who are simply its opposition

It is my hope however that the governmental base of China can be widened. A nation of almost five hundred million cannot forever be ruled by a few families. The conflicts in China are great, but the pressure for unity is greater. I feel that a few years after this war, China will emerge on some unified path. When it does, it will show a rapidity of growth that will startle the world. I want the United States to be closely allied with this coming giant.

IMPLEMENTATION

To implement this policy of a strong China, I have a few suggestions: When we land on the mainland of Japan, Chinese units should be in all the landings. When the United Nations parade in Tokyo, Chinese units should be in the first place of honor. The Chinese should participate in the invasion and policing of Japan as much as possible, because this war must not have any connotation of a race, or conquering white man's war. It must be shown to Japan that this is a United Nations victory.

In the atrocity courts, which I hope will be set up in Japan, there should be Chinese judges. And in the reeducation process which I hope will begin in Japan, Chinese should be in the highest positions.

The Japanese Navy—or what will be left of it—if anything—should go to China. The Japanese armament factories should be dismantled and sent to China. The Japanese merchant fleet—or what, if any, is left of it—should be transferred to Chinese registry and ownership. That is in line with the second point.

WEAK JAPAN

The second point I suggest for an American policy in the Pacific is a weak Japan.

My attitude is best summed up by the remarks of a radio commentator. He was asked what to do about keeping down post-war Japan. The answer was, "Well, I haven't heard very much news from Carthage lately."

I want our Pacific policy to be crystal clear: Strong China, weak Japan. In proposing this, I am following the doctrines laid down over 500 years ago by Niccolo Machiavelli. If anyone wants to know how to treat Germany or Japan, I commend a reading, or a rereading of Machiavelli's discourses.

In the treatment of enemies, Machiavelli states:

> This is the way the Romans took in the settlement of Latium, which ought to be observed and initiated by all wise princes and states. They gave sentence town by town, according to the nature of their deserts; but in all extremes, without any mediocrity; for some they not only pardoned but loaded them with benefits, made them free of their own city, and gave them many other privileges and exemptions, and thereby secured them not only from rebelling but from ever conspiring again. The rest whom they thought fit to make examples, were brought prisoners to Rome, punished with all kinds of severity, their houses destroyed, their lands confiscated, their persons dispersed, so as it was not possible for them, anyway, to do any mischief for the future. * * *
>
> And things being so, we conclude, according to our proposition in the beginning of our discourse: That upon any great sentence to be given against a people or city that has been formerly free, the surest way is, to waive all moderation, and either to caress or extinguish them. * * * It will be expedient, therefore, whilst they are in amazement, in suspense, to settle their minds one way, either by punishment or pardon.

NO MERCHANT MARINE

To keep Japan from becoming a military menace in the Pacific, is not going to be as difficult as some people think. Here is what I think is a very sensible suggestion. It is simple and direct. For 15 years, put Japan on probation. During that period Japan will not be allowed to have any merchant marine. Japan may maintain some small fishing boats and a few interisland steamers of small tonnage. But that is all. Japan can neither build, own, nor man any merchant freighter or passenger ship. For 15 years the only way a Japanese can go to sea is as a passenger on someone else's boat.

The elimination of Japan as a maritime power will not bring about the hardships that most people suppose. Japan is almost self-supporting. She imports only 10 to 12 percent of her food, and most of that is Korean rice. Japan, if she put the energy and technique which she has squandered in making armaments into the production of foodstuffs, could be self-sufficient.

ECONOMY CAN STAND IT

The startling fact of Japanese economy, and the thing which has made Japan appear so subservient to foreign trade, is that the ruling class of Japan has never made any effort to develop the home market. They kept the standard of living incredibly low so that they could export goods and in turn buy machine tools, oil, and scrap iron. Once the Japanese economy is freed of the burden of armaments, Japan can become self-sufficient and with a higher standard of living than she has enjoyed during the war. I think we can be quite ruthless with the shipping, armament factories, and foreign trade of Japan, because I believe that they have not helped raise the standard of the Japanese people, but only the standard of Japanese armaments.

Taking away all her ships does not mean that we withdraw and leave Japan to her own internal devices. By no means. We must set Japan on the path toward democracy and international cooperation. This brings up the question of the Emperor.

JAPANESE EMPEROR

The Japanese Emperor is unique among the dictators against which we fight, in that he represents a continuity with the past. He does not stand for a repudiation of the previous regimes. He is also unique in being a spiritual leader and the head of his nation's organized religion. He is a god, the head of an organized religious structure that is an essential part of the national structure.

Because of this, some Far East experts want the United Nations to retain the Japanese Emperor as a puppet, after we have captured the country. They say that the Emperor's role is traditionally that of a puppet; when big business ruled Japan, the Emperor was puppet to big business; when the military took over, he became a puppet of the military; and when we take over, there is no reason why he should not be a puppet of ours.

PUBLIC TRIAL

At first this sounds like a good idea. But it is not. I am becoming convinced that we cannot deal with the Japanese within the framework of their fairyland ways of thought. It is rather like trying to reeducate Germany within the structure of the Nazi ideology. You are not getting anywhere if you try to confute an absurdity within the confines of an absurdity.

We should treat the Emperor precisely as we would treat any other responsible leader of a cruel people. His palace should be bombed and when we catch him, he should be publicly tried—preferably before Korean, Chinese, and Philippine judges.

INTELLECTUAL SHOCK

It might be the best thing for the world and for Japan if the Japanese got the intellectual shock of their lives out of this war. We cannot afford to have a nation of 80,000,000 people, strategically located

and technically skillful, still believing in an emperor as god. The best way to get rid of that nonsense is for him to stand public trial and to be judged by the so-called inferior people he tried to enslave.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of California. I yield to the gentleman just for one question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we refuse to permit the Japanese to worship their Emperor, as the gentleman suggests, what becomes of this religious freedom we have been talking about?

Mr. ROGERS of California. Religious freedom does not exist for the Japanese when they use that religious freedom as an instrument against us.

Another absurdity which we should eliminate in this process of education by the introduction of cold reality is this idea that no Japanese ever surrenders or is ever taken prisoner of war. That is a legend perpetrated by generals to keep generals in power. We should put some effort into the elimination of that legend.

PRISONER-OF-WAR LEGEND

I suggest that when the Japanese surrender, as they will, we take every man remaining alive in their Army and Navy and make him a prisoner of war. This is especially important in the case of all the officers. We can release the men after a week or so; the officers we should hold for atrocity trials and release, but slowly. In any case, we must make crystal clear to all Japan that they did surrender, and that, indeed, the whole Japanese Army and Navy was a prisoner of war of the United Nations.

One last suggestion in the treatment of Japan: The political police must be abolished. They should be tried for the atrocities they have committed on their own people. Tens of thousands of Japanese are in concentration camps. Japan is honeycombed with the so-called thought police who ferret out dangerous thoughts. This oriental Gestapo should be eliminated as ruthlessly as the German Gestapo. If we do this, we shall certainly gain good will from the common people of Japan who have suffered at their hands.

EQUALITY OF RACES

The third point is that the United States and the United Nations should issue a declaration embodying the principle of equality for all races and peoples.

This does not mean any nation will have to change its immigration quotas. It does not interfere with the internal affairs, or sovereignty, of any nations at all. But it does mean that we announce that one of the aims, one of the goals, one of the ideals toward which we struggle is this principle of equality of races.

We in the United States say we are working toward democracy. We do not have a perfect democracy, but that does not mean we drop the principle of working toward it. Democracy is an ideal difficult to achieve. The equality of all races is also an ideal, and, also difficult to achieve. But they are both well worth working toward.

This idea of a declaration on equality of races is nothing new. It is in the United States Constitution. It is in our Declaration of Independence. In principle, it is written in most of the laws of most of the democracies of the world. It is implied in the doctrine of the "four freedoms," for which we say we fight.

REFUSED ONCE

A similar declaration was proposed and refused in the peace treaty after the last World War. In the last World War, Japan was our ally. The one thing it worked for, at the peace conference at Versailles, was to have included in the Treaty of Versailles, a clause recognizing the principle of the equality of races.

England, with American acquiescence if not support, refused to put such a clause in. Japan, surging with newly discovered power and pride, was intellectually slapped down, and at a time when such an intellectual slap would sting most. No small amount of the Japanese animus against the United States and Great Britain springs from this and subsequent incidents striking at their race pride.

TWO TREATMENTS

Recently I visited my district in California. In a restaurant in the northern part of the State, I saw a sign, "No orientals or dogs allowed." I submit, gentlemen, that if we are to have peace in the world, such an attitude cannot continue.

Such an attitude is completely unnecessary. On that same trip I also visited Phoenix, Ariz. There in the lobby of the city's finest hotel, I saw scores of young Chinese aviation cadets. Nice-looking young men, neatly dressed in their snappy uniforms. They were being trained at nearby Thunderbird Field, and they were getting along excellently.

It is the attitude of Thunderbird Field even more than the men they train that will bring peace to the Pacific.

The United Nations have issued enough high-sounding phrases, and the United States is always exchanging platitudes and compliments with other countries. I do not see why a statement embodying the principle of the equality of races could not be issued. Race tensions do exist, but if we are to have a stable world order, we must work to diminish them.

SIDE WITH COLONIAL PEOPLES

The fourth suggestion is that when quarrels arise between the imperial powers and their colonies in the Pacific, the United States should not take the side of the imperial powers.

Asia will be in a great ferment after this war. Peoples who heretofore were content to stand aside in docility from now on will start demanding participation in business and government. The situation will lend itself to all sorts of demagogic leaders. All the ancient errors of colonial administration will be pointed out and the corrections made by the newly returning colonial administrators will be howled at as insufficient and insincere.

Colonial problems of the Pacific are innumerable and complex. We may rest assured that the Japanese with their cry of "Asia for the Asiatics" will not have made the lot of the returning colonial administrators any easier. While each colonial power, and each colony controlled by the colonial power presents different problems, a few general things can be pointed out.

GENERAL STATEMENTS

One of them is that in the Pacific we can now look for the start of nationalism—a disease which heretofore has not plagued that area. Another is that the colonial powers are going to find it increasingly difficult to maintain a foothold on the continental mainland of Asia. Those colonies which are on the mainland—India, Burma, the Malay States, and French Indochina—are precisely those in which there has been, and probably will continue to be, the most trouble.

A third general statement is that, of all the colonial questions affecting the Pacific, that of India is the most important—even though India is not on the Pacific itself. The solution, or lack of a solution to the Indian problem, will have a profound effect on China, indeed all over Asia.

In the Pacific, because of its rising nationalism, and because of the upheavals created by Japan, few, if any, of the colonies are going to be satisfied with the old status quo. On the other hand, there is no visible indication that the imperial powers intend to soon release any of their colonies.

Unless some unforeseen correction is applied, I think colonial troubles in the Pacific are inevitable. They will start as soon as the United Nations begin retaking heavily populated areas, and they will continue for years.

During these agitations and in these conflicts, I do not want the United States ever to take the part of the colonial power. The United States has to live in the Pacific and none of the other colonial powers do. We have an excellent reputation. I do not want us to spoil it. It is far more important to the future of the United States to have the good will of the peoples of the Pacific than it is to have the good will of the empires in the Pacific.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's discussion, and while I am emotionally inclined to agree with it, realistically I would like to know how the gentleman proposes to have Russia and Great Britain agree to it.

Mr. ROGERS of California. If the gentleman will permit me to go on to my fifth point, I would like to answer that at the conclusion.

PACIFIC EXPANSION

My fifth suggestion is brief. Hawaii should become a State of the Union, our forty-ninth State, and the United States should take over the Japanese-mandated islands and the Bonin Islands.

For a long time there has been agitation in Hawaii for statehood. Some people objected on the grounds of the large number of Japanese in Hawaii. Out of a total population of 423,000, there are 103,000 Caucasians, 157,000 Japanese. The native-born Japanese on Hawaii have proved their Americanism in this war. The F. B I. reports that there has not been one single act of sabotage committed by a native-born Japanese. The American method of democratic indoctrination works. Today thousands of Japanese are fighting and dying for the United States. The people of Hawaii, of all races, have certainly earned statehood. They should become an integral part of our Union.

MANDATED ISLANDS

I believe most everyone is agreed that the United States should take over the Japanese mandated islands. I think Australia and New Zealand would welcome the United States into the Japanese mandated group because what they want is a security which the United States could give them.

If we take over those islands and the Bonin Islands, and the Chinese take over Formosa and the Riu Kiu group of islands, and if the Russians should take over all of Sakhalin and some of the northern Kurile Islands, Japan will be left pretty well defenseless—and at the same time, we shall be removing practically none of her economic assets.

BASES—NOT COLONIES

When we take over the mandated and the Bonin Islands, we must make their political position absolutely clear. The native population of the mandated islands is roughly 120,000; that of the Bonin Islands 5,000. The Japanese on those islands should be returned to Japan. The natives should become United States citizens, with full rights, the same as the citizens of Puerto Rico. It should be announced that these islands are not colonies. The United States should never take over a colony. These islands are bases. They should be under naval administration, the same as Guam was before the war.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Those are my suggestions of some of the points that a United States policy in the Pacific should embrace. I have purposefully avoided all questions dealing with the setting up of international organizations in the Pacific or elsewhere. When you start speaking of proposed international organizations you are floundering around with vague generalities. At this stage, discussion of the form of international organization must be purely hypothetical. We must await concrete proposals from Russia, China, England, and the United States.

Closely connected with all this is the question of the international regulation of key air bases in the Pacific. Certain islands, notably Hawaii, New Caledonia, and some of the Marianas Island group must be open to the planes of all nations if there is to be much trans-Pacific air travel.

But while these are important questions, and certainly the international organization, if any, is important, I do not think we should forget that most important will be the future direction and development of Russia and China. In looking at the Pacific, Americans are too much inclined to look at the atolls and the oceans. It is not on the atolls, it is on the mainland of Asia that the future of the Pacific will be determined.

OUR CHANCE

We—that is, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, all of South America—we who front on the Pacific, will have a fearful responsibility after this war. We must give indication to the newly developing peoples of Asia that we genuinely want to cooperate with them. We must work to relieve racial tensions, we must refrain from playing oriental politics by pushing one nation against another, we must work to relieve colonial tensions, and we must attempt some over-all scheme of security.

In the Pacific, the age of domination is gone, and the time for cooperation is here. I am afraid that if in the next 20 years we do not set up a friendly Pacific basin, we shall not have another chance to do so for a long time to come.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman tell us the name of the city in northern California where he saw the sign "No orientals or dogs allowed"?

Mr. ROGERS of California. I come from Los Angeles, and I do not feel free to say so; no, sir.

Mr. WELCH. Why slander northern California or any part of California? Why make such a statement unless you are willing to name the city or town?

Mr. ROGERS of California. I will see the gentleman afterward and tell him.

Mr. WELCH. We would like to know it at this time for the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of California. I do not feel that it would be fair to the city, because I do not think it is indicative of the attitude of the city.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman is unfair to the State of California.

Mr. ROGERS of California. No; I am not.

Mr. WELCH. Then tell us the name of the city. You claim you saw a sign reading "No orientals or dogs allowed."

Mr. ROGERS of California. Yes.

Mr. WELCH. You made the statement. Why not tell us the name of the city?

Mr. ROGERS of California. I will tell the gentleman the name of the city in private. I do not want to mention the name of the city in public, because I do not think it is indicative of the attitude of the city or of the State. The whole thing is a quibble. I will tell you later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Governor Dewey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address given by Joseph J. Pietrafesa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FREEZING OF CORN STOCKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

CORN IS AMERICA'S NO. 1 WAR CROP

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, returning for a few moments to the domestic scene so that we can proceed to get the necessary implements of war in order to blast the tar out of the Japs and our other enemies, I want to refer again to the critical corn situation.

I have said on this floor before, and I say it again, that the O. P. A. and the New Deal administration cannot function unless there is a scarcity. I have repeatedly charged that they are more interested in bringing about a scarcity of food production than they are in securing an abundance of necessary things in the food line to carry on the war and to meet civilian requirements.

We had a shortage of corn last year in 1943. Factories and industrial plants were closing down because they could not get corn, and the dairymen and poultry and livestock producers living in various parts of the country came and asked for larger supplies of corn to take care of their livestock. That should have put our agencies in charge of food production on notice of the critical situation that existed a year ago.

What happened? The A. A. A., under the War Food Administration, came out with a restricted corn production in 1943, and they actually paid the farmers to hold down the production of corn rather than to increase the supply. Yes; they paid them good money to hold down corn production, and the farmers last year only produced 96,000,000 acres of corn at a time when, if they had been free, they could have produced at least 500,000,000 bushels more corn than they did, which would have taken care of the industrial and other needs for corn in the country this year.

There is no restriction on corn production this year, but the Department of Agriculture has fixed goals for farmers to reach in the planting of corn and other crops. Farmers should plant approximately 108,000,000 acres of corn in 1944 to meet all the demands. Last year the goals were 96,000,000 acres. The Department in announcing its goal for 1944 in corn production says that the farmers will produce only 100,000,000 acres instead of going the limit. According to the latest figures, the farmers will produce around ninety-nine to one hundred million acres.

I maintain that, due to the present shortage of corn and the need for corn for industrial and war purposes and for feed for livestock, the Department of Agriculture should be out in the front urging the farmers to produce every possible acre of corn that they can produce after meeting their other crop goals. We have the land upon which it should be produced, and they should be urged and encouraged to do so. Furthermore, farmers should be guaranteed an adequate support price to cover cost of production plus a fair profit for corn and other crops, including beef, hogs, dairy, and poultry products.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Incident to what the gentleman has just said, and I feel that he is absolutely correct about it, are there not two factors that must be taken into consideration in reaching this increased production of corn? The first is that they are taking too many men from the farm. It is utterly impossible for the farmers in my part of the country to employ help. They are in competition with war industry, that pays wages far beyond the ability of the farmer to meet in competition. In addition, the ceiling price on corn is too low. I have a pretty well-founded conviction that such corn as is sold is sold above the ceiling price under some subterfuge whereby the farmer can get more money than he is supposed to get for his corn.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The labor situation on the farm in America will be more critical in 1944 than it was last year. I do not know how the farmers are going to get along. It appears that the administration or those who fix the policies in the administration with reference to labor do not appreciate that it takes manpower to produce food. Many of them have the idea that you can turn on a spigot and get milk and that is all there is to it. As a result of it we may face a critical food shortage in this country in the time to come. Certainly the situation which has developed in corn will retard our war effort, because corn is used in more war purposes than any other agricultural commodity, as it is vital for the production of poultry and livestock production.

The gentleman from North Carolina stated that he had talked with Mr. Vinson and with Marvin Jones, who had promised that they would soon have around 80,000,000 bushels of corn to pass out to the people of the country because of the recent War Food order which stated that all farmers in certain commercial corn areas could sell their corn only to the Government. I am satisfied that the Government will get very little corn under that order, for two reasons: In the first place, most farmers do not know what kind of a corn crop they will have this year. They must, therefore, hang on to their surplus corn to feed their livestock and poultry on the farms if a crop should not mature in 1944. So there is little hope that there will be any chance for the gentleman from North Carolina or others to get corn until a new crop is produced.

In conclusion, I want to urge the farmers of the country to plant more corn this year. By so doing, they will make another outstanding contribution for victory.

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes, in order to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question or two.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I understood correctly, earlier this afternoon when we were discussing the Montgomery Ward situation the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] said he thought it was a mistake to do otherwise than comply with the order of the President, regardless of the legal validity of the order. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RAMSPECK. In substance the gentleman is correct. The principle involved is the same as if the gentleman and I had a contest in court and I lost the case in the lower court and the court ordered me to do a specific act. I could not defy that court, I would have to comply and then appeal the case.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is correct in his answer to the hypothetical case he states.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is what I think Mr. Avery should have done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman gives the correct answer to the case he states but that is not the situation which exists in the Ward case. There is a difference. The War Labor Board is not a court, and Montgomery Ward & Co. never has had its day in court, because the Government objected to the court taking jurisdiction. The courts have never been permitted to pass upon the validity of the order issued against Montgomery Ward & Co. What the gentleman's argument amounts to, if I get it correctly and if my logic is sound, is that whenever the President issues an order, regardless of the validity of that order, regardless of whether it is constitutional, the people should go along and obey it. If that is true, then we have a government not under the Constitution, not of law, but by the President.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is putting words in my mouth that I did not utter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be glad to have the gentleman explain it to me. I do not want to put words in his mouth nor to construe his language.

Mr. RAMSPECK. What I mean is that when the President acts in accordance with powers which have been conferred upon him by the Constitution and Congress, then I think it is the duty of the citizen or the corporation or whoever is involved to obey him, and then seek his remedy in a legal way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with that, but in that statement you assume that the order is valid. The legality of the President's order has never been determined. The administration has denied to Ward's the opportunity to have the court pass upon that question.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is what Avery has not done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain extraneous extracts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier in the day and include therein certain quotations from the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HON. FRANK KNOX

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard and been very much shocked by the news of the death of the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox. I know that all the Members of the House will feel a tragic sense of loss in the passing of this great American citizen, who has rendered such valuable service to our country in its trying hours. I do not know any of the details of his death, but I have just been informed by a newspaper representative that he has passed away. I am sure we all join in sympathy to his family, and that we all

feel that the country has suffered a very great loss.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 2, 1944, in room 1011 New House Office Building, to hold hearings on H. R. 2426.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 2, 1944, to resume hearings on black-market gasoline.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, May 4, 1944, at 10 a. m., to consider legislation affecting rates on the special services in the Postal Service. Hearings will be held.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1482. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal the third proviso of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438, 30 U. S. C., sec. 201; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1483. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the Naval Advance Base Depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

1484. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1485. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1944 amounting to $291,900 (H. Doc. No. 558); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1486. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 29, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Kaweah and Tule Rivers, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 559); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1487. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DINGELL. Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2539. A bill to amend section 2901 of the Internal Revenue Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 1407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4708. A bill relating to the labeling of boric acid for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4709. A bill to authorize increases in wages for certain employees of The Alaska Railroad for services rendered from May 1, to September 30, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4710. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 267. Joint resolution providing for the transportation to this country of the body of an unknown American warrior killed in battle in Europe, Africa, Asia, or on the islands of the Pacific Ocean, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies at the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, Arlington, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. Res. 522. Resolution to direct the Committee on Naval Affairs to conduct an investigation with respect to the status of Negro women in relation to the women's uniformed services of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the proposed bill of rights for men and women in the armed services, and others; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4711. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 4712. A bill for the relief of John Duncan McDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4713. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Schlick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4714. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Walter; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5577. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Niagara Falls (N. Y.) Federation of Labor on April 19, favoring repeal of the present 30-percent-amusement tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5578. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 4, tenth ward, Binghamton, N. Y., and signed by 111 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furlough for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5579. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petition favoring the endorsement of Representative R. KNUTSON's legislation for immediate reduction of the 30-percent tax to 10 percent on hotels, night clubs, and cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5580. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the Lions Club of Wellsburg, W. Va., urging that a national policy be adopted by the United States Government through the Civil Aeronautics Board for international air commerce for the post-war period; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5581. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of Bernice Warner, Advance Unit 266, of San Francisco, Calif., and 115 signers, residents of San Francisco, regarding bill of rights for World War No. 2 veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5582. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 25 members of the Pemberton Brothers Post, No. 202, Algonac, Mich., urging enactment of American Legion bill (S. 1716); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of our spirits, unto Thee do we lift our breath in prayer. Thou hast brought good things into our lives; we pray that by wise diligence we may preserve our fair inheritance. Cleanse our minds from all that is excessive, artificial, or unsympathetic, lest they be deeply hurtful. So direct us that we may not faint because of the weakness of human nature; nor deny our possibilities or attempt to lower the pathway of duty. In Thy light, difficulties dwindle, mysteries are solved, and the roots of good motives are enriched.

Deliver our hearts from all their weak affections, from all evil-clinging tendencies, and fill them with love which is more precious than gold, yea, than much fine gold. Purge our faith and by our wills

make us ready for labor; break every yoke of hindrance that binds us to feeble desires; that devotion to duty may impel us to walk as the sons of God, always following the glorious vision of our democracy. Heavenly Father, one who was chivalrous on the field of battle and one who filled a large place in the councils of our country has departed this life; he never dimmed the lamps which glow on the altar of freedom. While the veil hangs dark between, let not the bell be tolled, but sounded forth from the distant hills: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, they rest from their labors and their works do follow them." We praise Thee for the imperishable certainties which sing on forever and foretell the morning of earth's fairest day. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 28, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 287):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Frank Knox, late Secretary of the Navy.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join a committee of the House of Representatives in attending the funeral of the late Secretary of the Navy on behalf of Congress and to take such other action as may be proper in honor of the memory of the deceased and to manifest the respect and appreciation of Congress for his public service.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the President of the Senate had appointed Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WEEKS members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3261) entitled "An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Agriculture (Farm Credit Administration).
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.
5. Office for Emergency Management.
6. Selective Service System.
7. War Manpower Commission.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Consent Calendar today be postponed and that it be in order to call it tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK KNOX

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 523), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Frank Knox, late Secretary of the Navy.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Members of the House be appointed to join a committee of the Senate in attending the funeral of the late Secretary of the Navy on behalf of Congress and to take such other action as may be proper in honor of the memory of the deceased and to manifest the respect and appreciation of Congress for his public service.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee to attend the funeral of the late Honorable Frank Knox: Mr. SABATH of Illinois; Mr. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts; Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts; Mr. VINSON of Georgia; Mr. MAAS of Minnesota; Mr. CHURCH of Illinois; and Mr. MERROW of New Hampshire.

The occupant of the chair has received an invitation and will attend the funeral in addition to the committee just named.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 2, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, May 4, 1944, at 10 a. m., to consider legislation affecting rates on the special services in the Postal Service. Hearings will be held.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1488. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $6,700,000 (H. Doc. No. 560); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1489. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision and a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $22,800,000 pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1945, in the form of amendments to amendments (H. Doc. No. 561); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1490. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $1,584,000, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 562); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1491. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 in the amount of $815,500 for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 563); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4715. A bill to increase the compensation of employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4716. A bill to amend Public Law 89, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, known as the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4717. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, prescribe the jurisdiction of courts in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4718. A bill to supplement the Federal aid, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed rural local roads, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of right-of-way, to cushion the post-war conversion to peacetime economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 4719. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 269. Joint resolution to provide assistance to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged in whole or in part by floods in 1944 in order to enable them to continue farming operations to produce food for the war effort; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 4720. A bill for the relief of Boyd B. Black; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4721. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and gracious Father, even as we hush our feverish spirits in the quiet that hallows every altar of true prayer we are conscious of sounds on the earth and signs in the heavens that quicken all hearts with expectation. In a world where multitudes of Thy children have been plunged into the dark despair of a cruel tyranny which has enslaved peaceful nations we bow in sorrowful pity asking that Thou wilt strengthen our spirits and steel our hands to strike the decisive blow for freedom as the supreme hour of attack draws near. We front defiant and desperate conquerors without care or conscience, whose pagan banners are stained with innocent blood and whose ruthless way is paved with broken bodies, demolished homes, tortured captives, and desecrated treasures of culture and art. Out of the depths of the good earth which is Thine, out of the toiling sweat of patriot warriors in the factories we have builded, out of the sweet young lives from our homes and hearths, against this blatant perversion of all that is human and divine Thou hast commissioned us to forge the thunderbolts of Thy wrath and of Thy day of deliverance.

Through these tense times of preparation Thy grace has made us strong. Before the awaited signal to free a continent and to break the rod of the oppressor in all the earth, we humbly pray for Thy favoring might as we stand at Armageddon and battle for the Lord whose is the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 28, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Frank Knox, late Secretary of the Navy.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SECRETARY KNOX

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on last Saturday I received a telegram from Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin of the State of Connecticut. It reads as follows:

> The people of the State of Connecticut are saddened by the loss of Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy. Will you please express the heartfelt sympathy of the people of our State to his family.

I am certain, Mr. President, that Governor Baldwin voices the feeling of the people of our State. I know that I have been terribly saddened by the death of Secretary Knox. Throughout his entire life he constantly contributed to the welfare of his fellow Americans—and his death came during the period of his greatest contribution. He died with his hand on the helm.

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JONES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 11, 1944.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Taking note of Senator REED'S recent diatribe about me and the R. F. C., and his resolution to have our activities in connection with the Kansas City Southern Railroad investigated, beg to advise that I shall be pleased to furnish the Committee on Interstate Commerce any information in my possession.

As for Senator REED'S statement that Mr. Couch is a political and financial protege of mine, I would advise the Senator that I have no such relationships.

I would also advise the Senator that the R. F. C. is a bipartisan agency and is operated on that basis, and that credit is not extended on political or personal considerations. Furthermore, no loan can be made to a railroad without the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Including equipment trust loans, R. F. C.'s investments in railroad loans have aggregated $1,050,905,675, of which amount $658,241,727 has been paid or sold without recourse, and frequently at a premium. We estimate that there will be no net loss to the Corporation from its investments in railroad loans.

We have a very definite responsibility in making loans to railroads. We are not interested in who owns them, but we are interested in their mangement and financial policy if they come to the R. F. C. for loans. Management is often as much a factor in lending money as the actual security offered, and we have regarded the Kansas City Southern management as good.

Probably doubting the outcome of a proxy contest, Mr. Couch has been persuaded to withdraw from the management, and has been given a long-time employment contract with the road at a very substantial salary, for which he is only required to give advice and counsel upon request, when convenient for him to do so.

The Kansas City Southern, through its subsidiary, the Louisiana & Arkansas Railway, which comprises approximately half the mileage of the system, owes the R. F. C. $1,555,000, and there is a bank loan, guaranteed by the R. F. C., of $245,000—a total of $1,800,000.

In addition, the Kansas City Southern has commitments from the R. F. C. to lend it $6,000,000 and the Louisiana & Arkansas $1,000,000—a total of $7,000,000.

Five million dollars of this amount was to enable the company to buy in its own bonds at a very substantial discount, thus enabling the road to reduce its interest charges and the total amount of its debt; any such purchase to be currently subject to the approval of the R. F. C. and the I. C. C. If these commitments were used, the road's debts to the R. F. C. would be $8,800,000.

The Kansas City Southern's reports as of December 31, 1942, show outstanding bonds of approximately $57,000,000, and the L. & A. of $16,000,000, or a total of approximately $73,000,000. In addition, the two roads had outstanding equipment trust certificates of approximately $4,500,000.

The road has outstanding 210,000 shares of 4-percent preferred stock, on which very little dividends have been paid, or should be paid, until its debt has been greatly reduced, and provision made for refunding the $57,000,000 which matures in or prior to 1950.

Because of this large debt, the ultimate solvency of the Kansas City Southern is not assured, and therefore its common stock has little, if any, sound value.

We think the road has had a conservative financial policy and an aggressive business policy, under the Couch management, and have understood that some of the people interested in getting control of the property at this time want to pay larger dividends than has been the road's policy.

Such a course would not be to the best interests of the property, nor would it be in line with the I. C. C.'s opinion as quoted in its fifty-fifth annual report to Congress, dated November 1, 1941, in which the Commission said in speaking of railroad policy generally:

"It would be a mistake, in the present tide of apparently revived earning power, to ignore the fact that they have a very heavy burden of debt and that it may be a crippling burden in the future, if earnings should radically decline. We have noted with approval that many of the managements are avoiding this mistake and are using the favorable earnings of the present, in one way or another, to reduce fixed charges as rapidly as practicable. While stockholders may on first thought be disposed to object to such a policy, it is the stockholders who will suffer most in the event of future insolvency. They will, we believe, be shortsighted if, by insistence on immediate dividends, they jeopardize the continuance and possible expansion of a program of debt reduction."

Present temporary and abnormal earnings of all railroads, which are due entirely to the war, should be conserved for debt purposes and for delayed maintenance occasioned by the lack of materials and manpower the last few years.

I give you this information to indicate the care with which our loans are made.

In view of Senator REED'S resolution, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, 1944, and his press conference, which had the effect of assisting Mr. Stauffer in his fight to get control of the road, I would appreciate it if you would place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

SENATE SPECIAL SILVER COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. MILLIKIN a member of the Senate Special Silver Committee vice Charles L. McNary, deceased.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE SECRETARY KNOX

The VICE PRESIDENT, under the terms of Senate Resolution 287 unanimously agreed to on the 28th ultimo announced the appointment of the following committee to attend the funeral of the Honorable Frank Knox, late Secretary of the Navy:

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WEEKS.

INVITATION TO ATTEND DEDICATION OF PULASKI HIGHWAY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Hon. John A. Novak, House of Delegates, Annapolis, Md., calling attention to the fact that the people of Maryland are formally designating the Philadelphia Road—U. S. Route No. 40—as Pulaski Highway, in honor of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, and extending an invitation to the Senate to attend the dedication of this highway on May 3, 1944, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon at the city line, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

USE OF INDIAN FUNDS FOR INSURANCE PREMIUMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MINING OF COAL, PHOSPHATE, OIL, ETC., ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the third proviso of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., sec. 201) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

LEGISLATION OF MUNICIPAL COUNCILS, VIRGIN ISLANDS

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Croix, and of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

BUFFALO CREEK WATERSHED (BUFFALO, CAYUGA, AND CAZENOVIA CREEK), NEW YORK

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, report of a survey of the Buffalo Creek watershed, New York (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

FLOOD-CONTROL SURVEY REPORT ON YAZOO RIVER WATERSHED, MISSISSIPPI

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, a report of a survey of the Yazoo River watershed, Mississippi (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of the annual report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System covering operations during the year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Secretary of War, the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, the Director of Office of War Information, and the Acting Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATER AND ACADEMY

A letter from the Secretary of The American National Theater and Academy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of The American National Theater and Academy for the calendar year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the files of the Departments of War and the Navy (2) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of Oil Workers International Union, Local No. 128, of Long Beach, Calif., favoring the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of John E. Birch, of Seattle, Wash., relating to claim against the Government for $500,000 for alleged irreparable personal damages while a member of the United States Army Air Forces; to the Committee on Claims.

A resolution of the Atlantic County Central Labor Union, Atlantic City, N. J., favoring the adoption of measures to broadcast the proceedings of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Worcester, Mass., favoring the reestablishment of Lithuania as a free and independent republic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A resolution of the Senate of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Engrossed Senate Resolution 2

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation so the Nation can return to normal standard time

"Whereas it is the sun and not the laws of man that determines daylight and darkness; and

"Whereas central standard time is sun time on the ninetieth meridian, which runs near East St. Louis; and

"Whereas the ninety-eighth meridian was the dividing line between Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory before statehood, which makes Oklahoma time on the average 32 minutes faster than sun time based on central standard time; and

"Whereas the war time now in force makes Oklahoma time on the average 1 hour and 32 minutes faster than sun time; and

"Whereas such a great difference is disturbing, lessens the number of suitable hours for work, increases the consumption of fuel, causes school children to have to wait in the dark and cold for school busses in wintertime; and

"Whereas war time does not benefit people who live west of the meridian that governs their standard time; that it is much easier to move and act in obedience to the laws of nature than contrary thereto; that practically all war plants run on a 24-hour basis and cannot be benefited by a change from standard time: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma in special session*, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, petitioned and requested to enact proper legislation so the Nation can return to normal standard time; be it further

"*Resolved*, That engrossed copies of this resolution, duly certified, be mailed by the secretary of the senate to our United States Senators and Members of Congress and the President of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate the 18th day of April 1944.

"THEODORE PRUETT,
"Acting President of the Senate."

MEMORIAL TO BENJAMIN HARRISON—NAMING OF NAVAL VESSEL U. S. S. "FORT WAYNE"

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have two very brief resolutions which I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred. One has to do with the naming of a ship after my home city. The other is a resolution of Lost River Chapter of Orange County, Ind., Daughters of the American Revolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on the Library:

PAOLI, IND., *April 26, 1944.*

Hon. SAMUEL JACKSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our last meeting Lost River Chapter, D. A. R., voted on the following resolution:

"Whereas the Orange County Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution favor the plans for a memorial to Benjamin Harrison; and

"Whereas the plans recommended by the Harrison Memorial Commission are sound and fitting for a national memorial; and

"Whereas the completion of this memorial will add to the economic and social stability of vast numbers of people by restoring forest resources and assuring wood-using industries of a permanent supply of raw material; and

"Whereas the development of the recommended memorial will fit into a sound postwar work program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Orange County Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution do unanimously endorse the Harrison Memorial plan and urge all Indiana Members of the United States Congress to press for early national legislation so that the Harrison Memorial plan may be put into effect."

Very truly yours,

ETHEL FARLOW,
Corresponding Secretary.

To the Committee on Naval Affairs:

FORT WAYNE, IND., *April 17, 1944.*

Whereas Local No. 901, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, is a firm believer in patriotism and civic endeavor, we are lending our support to the movement of having a vessel of the United States Navy named after our fair city of Fort Wayne, as suggested by the late Harold R. Bailey, a member of the United States Navy, who gave his life in the service of our country; and

Whereas the members of this union have been actively engaged in producing many items of equipment used by the Navy, we feel a particular pride in our contribution to the war effort and believe our request to be well substantiated by our close interest in the welfare of the Navy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a vessel be named after our city as a fitting memorial to the members of Local No. 901, U. E. R. M. W. A., who have made the supreme sacrifice in the United States Navy, and a tribute to those who are now serving; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy; Hon. Henry Schricker, Governor of the State of Indiana; to the Honorable Senators from Indiana, namely, Raymond Willis and Samuel D. Jackson; to the Honorable George W. Gillie, of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Indiana; to the Honorable Harry Baals, mayor of the city of Fort Wayne; to the family of the late Harold R. Bailey; to the Journal-Gazette and News-Sentinel and a copy for record of Local No. 901, U. E. R. M. W. A.

Yours truly,

SAM C. MCAFEE,
President, Local No. 901, U. E. R. M. W. A.

LETTER FROM COUNCIL 63, POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE, KANSAS CITY, KANS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and appropriately referred, a letter to me from Council 63 of the Polish National Alliance. It is signed by Joseph Ksiazek, president, and Frank Kustra, secretary.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *April 24, 1944.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senator of Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On the 3d of May 1791, the Kingdom of Poland, already reduced by the tripartite partitions, unanimously adopted a new constitution which provided for liberty and equal rights for all men. What other nations and people did with bloodshed, Poland with her long tradition of tolerance, accomplished by peaceful means.

In these critical times, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that this date be commemorated by us in the United States.

The Poles, always ready to support the democratic cause, were again the first to stand against the enemy of freedom. Again they followed their motto "For Your Freedom and for Ours."

Could you, sir, on the 3d of May, call this fact to the attention of the American Senate? It is our duty as Americans to remember an ally who though faced with insurmountable obstacles would rather die than surrender. The Constitution of the 3d of May is another monument that testifies to the democratic spirit of Poland.

Respectfully submitted.

COUNCIL 63 OF THE
POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE,
JOSEPH KSIAZEK, *President,*
FRANK A. KUSTRA, *Secretary.*

RECONVERSION OF INDUSTRIAL PLANTS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter, and resolution, which I have received from Dr. Charles Seymour, chairman of the Post-War Planning Board of the State of Connecticut and president of Yale University.

The resolution was adopted by the Connecticut State Post-War Planning Board on April 26 and relates to the reconversion of industrial plants.

My request includes the printing of the names of the members of the committee on industry and labor, who recommended the adoption of the resolution, and of the Connecticut Post-War Planning Board.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution together with the names of the committee on industry and labor of the Connecticut Post-War Planning Board were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
POST-WAR PLANNING BOARD,
New Haven, Conn., April 27, 1944.

The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: I beg to enclose copy of a resolution which was passed by the Connecticut State Post-War Planning Board at its meeting yesterday upon the recommendation of its committee on industry and labor, requesting that it be forwarded to you for your interest and such help as you may find yourself in a position to give. I need not tell you that we shall be appreciative of whatever you can do to help clear up the situation so that Connecticut can plan its post-war readjustment with greater certainty and wisdom.

With warm personal regards, believe me,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SEYMOUR,
Chairman.

Resolution regarding legislation concerning reconversion of industrial plants

Whereas, under the compulsion of patriotism and through the exercise of vision, courage, resourcefulness and energy, Connecticut industry converted from peacetime to unprecedented wartime production in a shorter period of time than had ever before been accomplished; and

Whereas industry desires to perform equally well in the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy; and

Whereas the first concern of industry is jobs for all, and especially for all of the returning service men and women; and

Whereas industry must have its resources, its working capital, credits, markets, and materials freed for research and development, new equipment, raw materials, pay rolls, and sales, to create these jobs and to establish a sound and lasting prosperity; and

Whereas industry's plans for a return to peacetime production must of necessity be based upon established governmental policies and procedures, some of which cannot be definitely determined without appropriate legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut Post-War Planning Board expresses to the Congress of the United States the belief that prompt action by adequate and appropriate legislation is imperatively needed covering plant clearance; the disposal of Government-owned plants and surplus equipment and supplies; and the prompt and final settlement of terminated war contracts without review except for fraud or collusion.

CONNECTICUT POST-WAR PLANNING BOARD—COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY AND LABOR

Roger E. Gay, president, Bristol Brass Corporation, Bristol, chairman.

Arnold A. Brinkkord, representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, West Haven.

Robert Carroll, vice president, Arrow, Hart & Hegeman Co., Hartford.

Rev. Joseph F. Donnelly, St. Francis Orphan Asylum, Highland Heights, New Haven.

John J. Driscoll, 95 North Main Street, Waterbury.

John J. Egan, 1024 Main Street, Bridgeport.

I. P. Ferris, president, Bridgeport Metal Goods Corporation, Bridgeport.

Alfred C. Fuller, Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, Inc., 436 Capitol Avenue, Hartford.

C. P. Gross 3d, Scovill Manufacturing Co., Waterbury.

E. M. Jack, president, Union Hardware Co., Torrington.

John A. North, president, The Phoenix Insurance Co., Hartford.

Joseph W. Powdrell, Powdrell & Alexander, Inc., Danielson.

R. E. Pritchard, president, The Stanley Works, New Britain.

Amor P. Smith, the Russell Manufacturing Co., Middletown.

MEMBERS OF THE CONNECTICUT POST-WAR PLANNING BOARD

Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, ex officio.

Theodore H. Beard, of Bridgeport, vice president of the Dictaphone Corporation and chairman of the Post-War Planning Committee of the Connecticut Development Commission, vice chairman.

David A. Clarke, of Milford, secretary of the Connecticut Farm Bureau Federation.

John J. Driscoll, of Waterbury, secretary-treasurer of the Connecticut State Industrial Union Council (C. I. O.).

John J. Egan, of Bridgeport, secretary-treasurer of the Connecticut Federation of Labor.

Ashbel G. Gulliver, of New Haven, dean of the Yale University Law School.

Mrs. Lida S. Ives, of Thomaston, national chairman of the home economics department of the National Grange.

Henry R. Luce, of Greenwich, editor of Time, Life, and Fortune magazines.

Dr. James L. McConaughy, of Middletown, national president of United China Relief, former Lieutenant Governor and former president of Wesleyan University.

William J. Pape, of Woodbury, publisher of the Waterbury American and Republican.

Joseph W. Powdrell, of Brooklyn, president of Powdrell & Alexander, Inc., Danielson, manufacturers of curtain fabrics.

Sister Mary Rosa, of West Hartford, dean of St. Joseph's College, secretary.

Dr. Charles Seymour, president of Yale University, chairman.

Igor Sikorsky, of Trumbull, pioneer builder of aircraft and inventor of the helicopter.

Mrs. Richard H. Valentine, of Stafford Springs, housewife.

Albert E. Waugh, of Mansfield, professor of economics at the University of Connecticut.

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 836) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, our committee have under consideration other matters in connection with the post-war planning program, and we were contemplating the advisability of having included in this proposed legislation other important subjects essential in relation to the post-war period; such as unemployment compensation, public works, disposition and utilization of surplus war property, war production cutbacks, resumption of civilian production, and the creation of an over-all planning board to prepare us for full employment after the war.

It was, however, found necessary to report this bill at the earliest possible moment because of exigencies that exist in the country. It seems that approximately $14,000,000,000 of contracts have been terminated up to date, resulting in a very serious situation confronting not only the prime contractors but the great mass of subcontractors who are affected by that situation.

It seems, furthermore, that some contracts have been terminated now for almost a year, and yet the contractors have been unable to secure settlements of their contracts. Therefore, it was deemed by the committee, as I have said, necessary to report this contract-termination bill at the earliest possible moment. While we recognize, of course, the need for other essential legislation which must come as a part of the reconversion program, we feel that we should immediately act on this proposed legislation while the other parts of the program are being studied.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and I issued a statement in this connection which I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR WALTER F. GEORGE, CHAIRMAN SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING, AND SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY, CHAIRMAN WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

It is our mutual conviction that broad legislation to help achieve full employment after the war must be enacted by the present session of Congress. This is essential if our country is to be fully prepared for peace. It is also essential if our Congress is to discharge its proper functions as a policy-making body and assure a full return to democratic governmental processes in the post-war era.

It is our considered judgment that the following legislation should be enacted during the present session:

I. A BROAD POST-WAR ADJUSTMENT BILL

Two bills of this type are now before the Senate Military Affairs Committee: S. 1730 (GEORGE-MURRAY) and S. 1823 (KILGORE). We are now studying a number of revisions that have been suggested during the recent hearings before the Military Affairs Subcommittee. It is hoped that this over-all legislation can be reported to the floor of the Senate in the very near future.

The contemplated over-all legislation includes provisions setting forth specific congressional policies on cut-backs in war production and on the resumption of civilian production. The recent hearings have revealed a state of confusion on these questions that can be corrected only by legislative action.

Other hearings and investigations of the War Contracts Subcommittee have uncovered the fact that there is still a large amount of waste and extravagance under war contracts, particularly cost-plus-fee contracts. This is a problem of fundamental importance to our plans for post-war employment. Curtailing wasteful practices in war production will lower the cost of the war, reduce our debt burden, lead toward more efficiency in conversion to peace and help us achieve the low price levels that are essential to the development of our post-war markets. Although a separate measure on this subject is now before the subcommittee,[1] consideration is being given to achieving the purposes of this resolution through an appropriate section in the general bill.

The problems of surplus war property and the demobilization of veterans and war workers may also be dealt with in the legislation now being studied.

The revised over-all legislation will also spell out in detail the planning functions of the top war mobilization and post-war adjustment agency. This will be done without duplicating or displacing the planning activities of established Federal agencies and without detracting in any fashion from the planning functions of the Congress. Serious consideration will also be given to appropriate representation in an advisory capacity, for industry, labor, agriculture, and the public.

II. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

On April 12, 1944, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, stressed the necessity for legislation providing Federal assistance to the State unemployment compensation system.

We heartily concur in Justice Byrnes' proposal and will shortly submit a jointly sponsored bill embodying this recommendation. In the Senate, the bill will be referred to the Finance Committee, where the chairman will immediately appoint a subcommittee to work toward prompt reporting of the measure to the floor.

III. CONTRACT TERMINATION

The pending contract-termination legislation meets with general approval and should not be delayed any longer. S. 1718 as amended, which is now to be reported out of the Military Affairs Committee, should be passed promptly by the Senate and the House.

[1] Senate Joint Resolution 80, "To prohibit the use of the cost-plus-fixed-fee system of contracting in connection with war contracts," introduced by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 838).

By Mr. AUSTIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1834. A bill to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment," approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314), with respect to the movement, at Government expense, of dependents and household effects of certain military personnel; with amendments (Rept. No. 837).

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1795. A bill to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 839).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1808. A bill to authorize temporary appointment as officers in the Army of the United States of members of the Army Nurse Corps, female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such corps, female dietetic and physical-therapy personnel of the medical department of the Army (exclusive of students and apprentices), and female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such department as female dietetic or physical-therapy personnel, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 840).

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1837. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Hugh A. Shiels, United States Naval Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 841);

S 1838. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions; without amendment (Rept. No. 842);

S. 1839. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters at naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 843);

S. 1840. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 844);

S. 1841. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 845); and

S. 1842. A bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943; without amendmen[t] (Rept. No. 846).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1809. A bill to remove the limitation on the right to command of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army which limits such officers to command in that corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 847).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4254. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 848).

REPORT ON SURVEY OF CONDITIONS AMONG THE INDIANS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 310)

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, submitted a supplemental report, pursuant to Senate Resolution 17, extending Senate Resolution 79, Seventieth Congress, on a survey of conditions among the Indians of the United States, which was ordered to be printed.

MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 276, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 276), submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri, for himself and Mr. GILLETTE, on March 24, 1944, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the present production, means and facilities of production, and plans for future facilities of production for the manufacture of all types of machinery used in the farming industry, including horse- and motor-drawn implements, together with the manufacture of repairs and spare parts for such implements and machinery, and to make inquiry as to resources of supply of materials for such manufacture, and to specifically make investigation of the past, present, and future plans for distribution of farm machinery and the component parts thereof and secure facts as to what portion of the supply of farm machinery has been diverted to uses in areas outside of the United States and its Territories and what policies and plans have been adopted for future foreign distribution of this type of machinery and its parts, and such other inquiries as shall be germane to and pertinent to the development of the facts in the farm-machinery production and distribution industry.

The committee is directed to secure this information for the purpose of use in the preparation and consideration of legislative action to aid the agricultural industry in the Nation.

The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its studies and investigations, together with its recommendation for such legislative action as is indicated.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 273, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The resolution provides for the sum of $3,300 to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate for employment of a special assistant to the Committee on Military Affairs. The resolution provides for a continuance of Senate Resolution 142 agreed to on June 12, 1943. It is apparent that the Appropriations Committee does not want to make a permanent place for this very important employee.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 273), submitted by Mr. REYNOLDS on March 20, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution 142, agreed to June 12, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to employ, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, a special assistant to be paid at the rate of $3,300 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1944.

RICHARD E. HAGAN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 284, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 284), submitted by Mr. BROOKS on April 24, 1944, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Richard E. Hagan, widower of Virginia G. Hagan, late an employee in the office of Senator BROOKS, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

READJUSTMENT IN CIVIL LIFE OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably with an additional amendment Senate Resolution 225. It is a resolution reported by the Committee on Finance asking for $10,000 to carry on public hearings in connection with problems relating to the readjustment in civil life of veterans of World War No. 2. I ask for present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 225), submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri on December 21, 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Finance were on page 1, line 11, after the word "thereof" and the comma, to strike out "may" and insert "is authorized"; on page 2, line 8, after the word "advisable" to strike out "within the limits of such funds as shall be set aside for its use by the Committee on Finance or shall be appropriated to it directly by resolution of the Senate"; and on line 14, after the figures "$10,000," to strike out "in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, or a subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a study of problems relating to the readjustment in civil life of veterans of World War II, particularly as such problems affect their employment or reemployment. The committee, or a subcommittee thereof, may conduct hearings, public or executive, assemble and publish data, analyses, and shall report to the Senate such findings as it may make from time to time, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or a subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to employ such clerical and other assistants; to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was on page 2, line 14, to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR GENERAL SURVEY OF INDIAN CONDITIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 243, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I believe the Senator has stated that the resolution has been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to immediate consideration?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 243) submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on January 24, 1944, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 79, agreed to February 2, 1928, and continued by subsequent resolutions, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, to make a general survey of the

condition of the Indians in the United States, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1872. A bill for the relief of Jack K. Wells, Jr. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1873. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods throughout the Illinois Valley and the Mississippi and other valleys, and for other purposes, and ask that it be immediately appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1874. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1875. A bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 1876, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAYBANK also introduced Senate bill 1877, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1878. A bill to grant additional compensation to certain veterans pursuing vocational training under part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1879. A bill to amend certain articles of the Articles for the Government of the Navy;

S. 1880. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1881. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the Naval Advance Base Depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1882. A bill to increase the compensation of employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1883. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1884. A bill for the relief of John C. Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to reduce the tax on admissions to cabarets, roof gardens, and similar entertainments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution making certain employees of the Senate eligible for retirement; to the Committee on Rules.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE PEE DEE AND OTHER RIVERS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to provide for the construction, maintenance and operation of flood-control and navigation improvements, including dams, reservoirs and allied structures, in the basins of the rivers of the State of South Carolina and the basin of the Pee Dee, and for disposition of surplus electric energy generated, and so forth. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred, and either later today or at the next meeting of the Senate I shall discuss the bill in detail.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1876) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of flood-control and navigation improvements, including dams, reservoirs, and allied structures, in the basins of the rivers in the State of South Carolina and the basin of the Pee Dee and for the disposition of surplus electric energy generated by the Federal flood-control and navigation improvements in the basins of such rivers, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

TRANSFER OF GEORGETOWN COUNTY TO CHARLESTON DIVISION OF EASTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT, S. C.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to transfer Georgetown County, S. C., from the Florence division to the Charleston division of the eastern judicial district of South Carolina, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and acted upon at the convenience of the committee. It has the approval of the bar association and the lawyers of that section of our State.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1877) to transfer Georgetown County, S. C., from the Florence division to the Charleston division of the eastern judicial district of South Carolina, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILGORE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as a tribute of sympathy, friendship, and support to the Polish people on the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas May 3 is celebrated as a Polish national holiday in commemoration of the signing on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution; and

Whereas the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May is symbolic of the ideals of democracy and liberty; and

Whereas Poland is our ally in the present conflict, and is courageously carrying on the fight to preserve such ideals; and

Whereas the people of Poland through centuries of struggle and sacrifice have established unmistakably their place in the family of nations and have demonstrated unquestionably their ability to govern themselves; and

Whereas conditions in Poland today indicate the further violation of its established territorial boundaries and the possible destruction of its sovereignty and its established democratic forms of government; and

Whereas in particular these conditions reflected in these United States of America and elsewhere tend to bring into controversy the war aims of the United Nations, and may constitute an infringement of the basic freedoms for which America fights, thereby weakening the bonds of kinship and amity which bind so many of our people to the people of Poland and threaten to impair the unity of our war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the brave people of Poland on the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, and expresses its sympathy with their aspirations for the restoration of their freedom and independence and views with deepest solicitude and concern these threatening conditions and pledges its assistance to the Polish people to the end that the territorial integrity and political independence of their nation may be preserved and maintained.

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 288), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 198, agreed to February 8, 1942, which authorized the war-contracts subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs to investigate war contracts, termination of war contracts, and related problems, is hereby increased by $10,000.

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL CLERK—COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 289), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 82, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 25, 1943, is amended by inserting, after the second semicolon therein, the following: "to employ during the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress an additional clerk to be paid at the rate of $2,400 per annum."

BENEFITS TO VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—ADDITIONAL COPIES

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 290), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 2,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 146, current session,

entitled "Benefits to Veterans and Their Dependents," being an analysis of rights of all veterans and their dependents to pension or compensation, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

HISTORY OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES (S. DOC. NO. 187)

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have had prepared by the Navy Department, for the use of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and Members of the Congress, and likewise for the information of the public, a detailed history of what are called the naval petroleum reserves and what operations have been undertaken in these reserves up to the present date.

This information begins with 1909, when President Taft, by Executive order, removed certain oil lands from entry by prospectors and private claimants in order to prevent private development on certain public lands. Various Executive orders and legislation that have followed are set forth in this document, and it contains a complete summary of all the information that is available with reference to the naval petroleum reserves.

It will be noted that there have been five periods of administration:

First. The withdrawal order of President Taft in 1909 through the legislation of 1912 and the Executive orders setting aside specific naval reserves.

Second. The second period consists chiefly of litigation and settlement of claims of private claimants, and includes the Leasing Act of February 1920 and the Naval Petroleum Reserves Act of January 4, 1920.

Third. The third period deals with the administration by the Department of the Interior, from the transfer by President Harding in 1921 through the Fall-Doheny transactions, the Sinclair-Fall transactions, the disclosures by the committee headed by Senator Walsh, of Montana, and, finally, the judicial reparation of the Government rights and the return of the reserves to the Navy in 1927.

Fourth. This section deals with the administration of the reserves by the Navy Department, the President Coolidge Oil Commission, and the prolonged effort of the Navy to get appropriate amendments to the act of 1920 in order to clarify its administrative responsibility and authority with respect to the reserves. That period is a history of negotiations with the various interested parties, many hearings before Senate and House committees, ending in the adoption of amendments to the 1920 act in the act of June 30, 1938.

Fifth. This period includes recent history and the Navy's program for the future administration of the reserves, upon which legislation is pending.

I request that this résumé of the history of the naval petroleum reserves be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY FROM THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT OR NEAR NEW ORLEANS, LA., TO CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX. (S. DOC. NO. 188)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in reference to the Intracoastal Waterway from the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex., with a view to determining the advisability of providing an alternate waterway connection with the Mississippi River at or in the vicinity of Algiers, La., and ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SANTEE RIVER PROJECT, NORTH CAROLINA AND SOUTH CAROLINA (S. DOC. NO. 189)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in reference to the Santee River project, in North Carolina and South Carolina, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF CORN SALES IN CERTAIN COUNTIES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Henry L. Graham, Jr., manager of the Wamego (Kans.) Milling Co., pointing out the actual effects of the recent order prohibiting sales of corn in 125 Corn Belt counties except to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

While I have the floor I wish to comment briefly on this action of the War Food Administration, at the request of the War Department and the War Production Board. The War Department says it needs 80,000,000 bushels of corn for industrial uses. The War Department has power to requisition what it needs, and to pay for whatever it requisitions. In my judgment, that is what it should have done. But apparently in order to work out some plan that would avoid the appearance of seizing corn for public use, a roundabout way of reaching the same result was adopted. Corn in these counties can be sold only to the C. C. C., except on special permit through the A. A. A. or the W. F. A. for feeding on farms in the county where grown.

The result has been to deprive feeders outside these corn counties of corn to feed animals on farms and in feeding pens, unless it can be purchased outside these 125 counties in the Corn Belt. But a dealer who brings in corn from some county outside, in order to cover transportation and handling costs, is obliged to sell this corn at prices higher than the ceiling price on local corn, as a result of the two-price corn ceilings order of the O. P. A.-W. F. A. of last winter.

It looks to me, and to most persons in the farm belt, that this is just another case of unnecessary, almost inexcusable, muddling by a group of Government agencies which do not know what they are doing, how they propose to do it, or why it should be done. I ask that the letter from Mr. Graham be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAMEGO MILLING CO.,
Wamego, Kans., April 25, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Events of recent weeks in our territory justify a letter of protest with regard to the general situation, which has been prompted by bungling of the worst sort. Had the administration started out with the intention of putting the farmer completely out of business, they could not have accomplished it in a better manner. The pitiful part of the situation is that we have nothing in sight that would lead us to believe that there will be any change in the near future.

I know of several thousand bushels of corn within a radius of 15 miles of Wamego, which can be bought, but not at the prices established by the Government. These men will not sell their corn for the simple reason that the Government keeps telling how they will raise the price if the farmer refuses to sell at present ceilings. Yesterday they made a new ruling that gives the holders of corn a premium of some 5 cents per bushel but compels them to sell corn only to the Government for the next 60 days. While this ruling is not effective in our territory it is effective in territory from which we have secured our supplies and we are thereby precluded from buying corn for our own territory. As you well know, we serve a large feeding territory in both Wabaunsee and Pottawatomie Counties and we have feeders without any feed going out of business as fast as they can get their stock to market. Our profits on corn are limited to 5 cents per bushel, which is satisfactory and in line with usual mark-up. However, this morning we are hauling corn from Blue Springs, Nebr., a distance of 85 miles, and we paid the seller $1.21 f. o. b. Blue Springs for this corn. We are allowed to add trucking of 10½ cents per bushel and also our profit of 5 cents, which makes this corn cost the feeder $1.36½, and this is white corn. We could buy corn locally at $1.20 or $1.25 and sell it at some 7 cents less than the Nebraska corn will cost. Yesterday a feeder with 65 head of big steers was in here to get feed of any kind and we were unable to furnish him with a pound of feed. He is driving these steers 3 miles and loading out today. We had at least 20 men in our office yesterday afternoon begging for feed for hogs, and without exception they advised that they were getting their hogs to market as soon as they could get transportation. I am not pointing out exceptional cases but merely trying to advise you of a general situation that exists. I called 22 stations yesterday afternoon and was able to buy 200 bushels of white corn. It is now, and has been for the past 6 weeks, impossible to buy a carload of any kind of corn.

The present administration seems to take great delight in pointing out certain groups and making an attempt to cast some reflection on their patriotism. Now, Senator, I believe that you are well informed on the arguments that are being presented and, further, that you know the people of Kansas as well or better than most men in Congress at this time. It would seem that the time had arrived to inform certain gentlemen that residence in a rural community does not prevent straight thinking. The situation has become intolerable, and unless it is changed the people in Kansas will give the administration an exhibition of patriotism that they will not soon forget.

Very truly yours,

HARRY GRAHAM.

DRAFTING OF FARM YOUTH IN KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention of the Senate to a telegram I have received from a number of farmers in Thomas County, Kans. According to their statement 34 out of the 76 class II-C farm youths in that county have been reclassified I-A. They say it will result in closing down more farms in Thomas County, when more food production is going to be required to meet heavy world demands next year.

I have sent this telegram to General Hershey, of Selective Service, asking him to clarify the situation, and also to inform me if the provisions of the so-called Tydings amendment are being followed by local draft boards. So many contradictory statements have come out about how the Conscription Act is being administered that I was unable to answer the senders of this telegram with any degree of certainty.

I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAGE CITY, KANS., *April 29, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chambers:

Thirty-four out of seventy-six of our II-C farm boys in Thomas County have been reclassified I-A. In most cases it is the last boy left on the farms, the rest have been taken. Average Thomas County farms are two- to four-man units. Operator only one left due to long hours, heat and cold, hard dirty work, and no experience; impossible to replace. Thomas County 100 percent agricultural. Draft board composed of one banker, one clothing merchant, one gasoline dealer. Draft board claims reclassification mandatory from Washington. Local war board instructions under latest date show little change in farm classification. What are the facts? Local war board has not been consulted on these reclassifications. Livestock farms will be forced to liquidate and cut other operations drastically. Please see General Hershey and see if this cannot be rectified at once. We think the Tydings amendment should keep our farm boys at class II-C.

W. E. Engelhardt, Oakley; R. F. Farmer, Colby; D. W. Saddler, Halford; Mrs. Lester Saddler, Halford; Joe Cousins, Menlo; Ray Duffy, Menlo; Frank Wilson, Colby; Lloyd E. Sims, Oakley; W. R. Duffey, Oakley, Roy A. Kistler, Colby; Phillips A. Ullrich, Colby; S. A. Kistler, Colby; Oscar W. Nelson, Winona; Geo. L. Theimer, Colby; Guy E. Olson, Colby; Clarence Wagy, Colby; Lewis C. Lewallen, Colby.

THE USE OF EXTERNAL SOVEREIGNTY FOR SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AUSTIN

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Use of External Sovereignty for Security," delivered by him at the annual spring meeting of the Section on Internal and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association, April 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON AT INDIANA DEMOCRATIC EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION BANQUET

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator JACKSON on April 15, 1944, at the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association banquet, Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, Indiana, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE COFFEE TO FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Washington, at the thirty-fourth anniversary dinner of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, on April 22, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLITICAL SITUATION—ADDRESS BY HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, to the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations, at Columbus, Ohio, April 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONTGOMERY WARD SEIZURE—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY LEON HENDERSON

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts relating to the seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant from a radio address delivered by Leon Henrerson on April 29, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE FOURTH TERM—ADDRESS BY J. FRANKLIN CARTER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by J. Franklin Carter before the Cleveland City Club at Cleveland, Ohio, April 29, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPETITIVE BIDDING IN ISSUANCE AND SALE OF RAILROAD SECURITIES — LETTER BY SENATOR SHIPSTEAD

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission dealing with private sale of railroad securities with commissions to bankers, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN INTERNATIONAL COURT AND FOUR SHERIFFS—ARTICLE BY RICHARD S. CHILDS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "An International Court and Four Sheriffs," by Richard S. Childs, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAYMENT IN KIND—EDITORIAL FROM THE SALEM (OREG.) CAPITAL JOURNAL

[Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. HOLMAN) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Payment in Kind," from the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal of April 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MARINE PVT. CARLYLE W. VORACHEK—ARTICLE FROM MINNEAPOLIS MORNING TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Hardy North Dakotan Survives Bomber Crash; 11 Days on Raft," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE FALL OF CORREGIDOR, MAY 6, 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, notwithstanding the relatively intensive and extensive publicity given to the possibility of General MacArthur running for President of the United States, I have ever held to the opinion that he has always been more interested in the reconquest of the Philippine Islands than he would be in placing himself before the American public as a candidate for office. His statement last week, to the effect that he is not a candidate for the high office mentioned, bears witness to my contention.

Saturday will mark the second anniversary of the fall of Corregidor, the last stand of our troops in the Philippine Islands. Due basically to inadequate preparation, Corregidor went the way of Bataan. Our flag came down. It is bad enough that our colors were struck and that American generals, for the first time in the military annals of our great Republic, handed over their swords in token of a major surrender.

The leaders of our troops, and the troops themselves, were not sufficiently informed concerning the psychological disposition of the enemy to know of the brutal treatment that was to mark the next chapter of the heroism which they were destined to manifest. The brutality, the insolence, the insults to which they were subjected is now within the ken of every citizen of these United States. They expected to be treated according to civilized methods, as practiced by humane victors throughout history. As an American, I am convinced that the men of Bataan or Corregidor would never have submitted, but rather would have fought to the death, had they known what was in store for them.

The American people will not forget either Corregidor or Bataan, nor will they soon dismiss from their memory the American boys who bled and died in that far eastern outpost. But eloquent words and fond remembrance are not enough to expect from a grateful people or a grateful Government. Even though tardy by many, many months, we should express our concern in the shipment of more and more supplies and men to the Pacific battle lines.

According to all available information issuing from the War and Navy Departments, we now enjoy superiority in naval craft in the Pacific. From the same source we are informed that our air power in the same area is daily indicated with marked dominance over that of the enemy. We need not turn to the departments of Government directly concerned with our military establishments to know that we have millions of men in every branch of the Military Establishment who are fully armed, fully equipped, and fully trained, but who have not seen any action whatever. According to recent directives issuing from various governmental agencies, either stopping or transferring facilities heretofore applied to the manufacture of war goods, our supplies are little short of abundant.

In view of these circumstances, I see no argument against the possibility of even greater resources being placed at the disposition of our Pacific commanders. It is my counseled, meditated, and marked opinion that, insofar as this war is concerned, the Pacific is more important to us than any other area in the world.

Although recent events point to eventual victory, it is still patent that the pace which we are now maintaining will not suffice to bring about an end of hostilities in the Pacific theater for many years, or, let us say, too many years.

I am sure that our circumstances would permit the allocation of still greater strength in the hands of MacArthur and that this is the only means by which we may expect the hastening of the day of complete victory over the Japanese and, as a consequence, the return of our men to those homes for which they are fighting and dying.

On the 6th of this month the Federated Bataan Organizations will hold their first annual convention in St. Joseph, Mo. One hundred delegates from 20 States will convene to study the problems incident to the safe return of their loved ones from the Philippines. These are the mothers and fathers, the brothers and sisters, the wives, and friends of the boys of Bataan and Corregidor whom I have repeatedly assured of my personal support. As we approach the second anniversary of the fall of Corregidor I again express my firm resolve to bring about as complete a solution as humanly possible of the Philippine debacle.

Judging from the regularity, consistency, and persistency with which I have taken to the floor of the Senate impelled by our Pacific problems, it might appear that the cloth of my concern is being worn threadbare. In spite of the possibility of this impression, my purpose is to continue to speak in this vein until the day when the hundreds upon hundreds of men who were snared in the Japanese ambuscade will be safely returned to the bosom of their people.

LEND-LEASE EXPENDITURES IN MEXICO

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, charges have recently been made in the newspapers concerning lend-lease expenditures in Mexico. I believe that these charges are incorrect. I have had the Senate Appropriations Committee experts furnish me a statement concerning all lend-lease expenditures in Mexico and I give their report.

It will be seen that our entire Government transactions in Mexico for the years 1941, 1942, 1943, and up to April 1 of 1944 total $220,499,652. From this sum must be deducted our purchases in Mexico for that period, totaling $161,023,588. This would leave a total of $59,476,399.

It will also be noted that we constructed land-plane bases in Mexico totaling $16,471,057, which would leave $43,005,342. From this sum must be deducted $11,360,035 because the Export-Import Bank has made loans in Mexico to that extent, and is certain to have these loans repaid; indeed it has already had repaid to it a large proportion of the loans.

The record of this bank all along the line has been remarkable. Deducting this $11,360,035 leaves a balance of $31,645,307.

Another deduction is for advancing for metals, development, operation, equipment, and so forth, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of $10,187,125, which would leave a balance of $21,558,082. Likewise, there must be taken from this sum $2,558,419 for recruitment of farm labor, which would leave $18,999,663.

The other comparatively smaller deductible items mentioned in the report would indicate that the writer for the Associated Press was wholly inaccurate in his published statements.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the figures given by our staff show that the sum of $14,924,799 has been spent by lend-lease during 3¼ years. This aid has been given for ordnance and ordnance stores, aircraft and aeronautical materials, tanks and other vehicles, vessels and other watercraft, miscellaneous military equipment, facilities and equipment, agricultural and industrial commodities, testing, reconditioning, defense articles, services and expenses, all told amounting to $14,924,799, which would average about $4,450,000 a year for the lend-lease aid turned over to the Mexican Government.

Evidently from these figures someone has been misinformed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report from our expert staff, which I hold in my hand.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lend-lease aid (Mar. 11, 1941, through Jan. 31, 1944) and Government expenditures in Mexico (fiscal years 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944 as reflected in reports submitted to Apr. 1, 1944)

Lend-lease aid:	
Ordnance and ordnance stores	$2,632,194
Aircraft and aeronautical materials	9,526,801
Tanks and other vehicles	1,979,582
Vessels and other watercraft	130,000
Miscellaneous military equipment	183,152
Facilities and equipment	22,201
Agricultural and industrial commodities	16,851
Testing, reconditioning, defense articles	427,124
Services and expenses	6,894
Total	14,924,799
Purchases:	
Metals Reserve Company: Antimony, copper, lead, zinc and mercury	113,170,974
Defense Supplies Corporation: Fiber, alcohol, rope, lumber and skins	31,705,471
Rubber Reserve Company: Guayule and gum	2,208,059
Rubber Development Corporation: Guayule, gum and rubber products	4,592,714
United States Commercial Company: Skins, zinc, and foodstuffs	1,841,302
War Food Administration	5,210,048
War Department	1,982,123
War Shipping Administration	309,300
Interior Department	3,597
Total	161,023,583
Construction facilities: War Department (land plane bases)	16,471,057
Current expenses:	
War Food Administration recruitment of farm labor	$2,558,419
Agriculture Department investigation of fruit flies	130,186
Agriculture Department control of pink bollworm	117,066
Agriculture Department rubber program	96,221
Agriculture and War Food general expenses	34,848
Navy Department	714,172
Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs:	
Administrative expenses	434,873
Health and sanitation	87,600
Coordination committees	463,451
	985,924
Other departments	280,828
Total	4,917,664
Loans: [1]	
Export-Import Bank	11,360,035
Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	102,522
Total	11,462,557
Other aid and expenditures:	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation advances for metals, development, operation, equipment, etc	10,187,125
Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, rehabilitation of Mexican railways	1,500,536
Other departments	12,326
Total	11,699,987
Grand total	220,499,652

[1] Included in the loans figure is $3,565,899 which has been repaid.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at this point I desire to read a letter from Mr. Crowley, as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1944.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: In accordance with your request, I am happy to give you the relevant information about our lend-lease aid to Mexico in answer to the statements made by Representative BRADLEY in the House on April 27, 1944.

The facts are that under our lend-lease agreement with the Republic of Mexico, we supply only military items—airplanes, munitions, tanks, and other military vehicles and small watercraft—and industrial equipment for use in arsenals, dock yards, and other facilities used to produce and maintain articles having a military end-use.

The Chief of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Secretary of State approved the military aid scheduled to go to Mexico. Our military experts again approve any transfers of such aid to Mexico before they are made.

From March 1941 to March 1944 about one-twentieth of 1 percent of our lend-lease exports went to Mexico. For this period our exports to Mexico by dollar amount constituted less than $12,000,000. Of this total aircraft accounted for more than 65 percent. Tanks, military vehicles, and other finished munitions constituted most of the balance.

With lend-lease aid definitely limited to military supplies and war-production items, it is obvious that no civilian or commercial aid is included in the program for Mexico. Representative BRADLEY has been greatly mis-

informed in his charges about lend-lease supplies and operations. No cast-iron enamel bathtubs are being sent to Mexico under lend-lease. No railroads or highways are being built or repaired with lend-lease funds. No air-raid shelters for Mexican people are being build by lend-lease. No high-priced Michigan automobiles, or refrigerators, or vacuum cleaners, or any other consumer goods are finding their way across the border under lend-lease operations.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

I take pleasure in submitting these facts for the RECORD.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I doubt that any Member of Congress is unaware of the fact that tomorrow marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, the day on which a historic document was adopted by the Diet of Poland. I mention the matter today, Mr. President, because of the possibility that the Senate may not be in session tomorrow. If for no other reason, although there are many other reasons, the observance of this anniversary interests Americans because the adoption of the Polish Constitution followed so closely the adoption of our own immortal Constitution. The action taken at Philadelphia most certainly had a bearing upon what transpired in Poland, and there is not one among us who does not deeply regret that while we live in complete freedom under our fundamental law, the patriots of Poland have suffered so terribly under the violence which has interrupted the life of the Polish Nation. I occupy a few moments of the time of the Senate today to pay tribute to the Polish Nation and the Polish people.

People of Polish extraction, by the hundreds of thousands, have come under the shield of the American Constitution. These people and their children, with a deep appreciation of the democratic way of life, have contributed much to the United States. Even before the adoption of our Constitution great Polish soldiers joined the American colonists in their struggle for independence. Kosciuszko returned to Poland—and carried with him American ideals. Pulaski died here. We shall never forget them.

In the great wars in which America has participated since that time—and particularly in the First World War, and this one—the sons and the grandsons of men and women born in Poland have been in the vanguard of the American forces. They have earned the great honors which our country confers upon its heroes—and the undying gratitude of their fellow Americans. At this hour Americans of Polish descent, with Americans of every other descent, are up front in every theater of war. They are on every ocean and in the skies and under the sea. Although their devotion is to America, they have saved a place in their hearts for the land of their fathers—and as they fight they pray for the restoration and preservation of Poland.

Mr. President, I am among those who look toward a complete restoration of the Polish Nation—and toward the preservation of the pre-war boundaries of Poland. It was on the soil of that country that our enemies provoked this war. It is within the realm of possibility that on the soil of Poland this war may come to an end. Whenever and wherever the war is ended, I am hopeful that Poland will return "to its own" and to its rightful place among the nations of the world. Poland has never been hesitant in its fight for right and liberty. It would be sad indeed if an attempt were made to deny Poland that which is Poland's.

If time permitted—or I felt there was a need—I would dwell at greater length upon the observance of Polish Constitution Day. I have done the least that I might do, Mr. President, by making this brief statement—a statement which is intended to be a tribute to the sturdy Polish heroes of days gone by—and to those men and women of Polish descent who fight for freedom, and for a return to understanding and peace and justice, and the restoration of the dignity of man all over the world.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 3, will be the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, the first in continental Europe to recognize the political rights of the townsmen and the common people.

In 1791 Poland was partitioned between Germany, Austria, and Russia because she would not surrender to them, but in opposition to them adopted the constitution of May 3 and thus accepted the principles which guaranteed freedom to all her citizens. It is possible that Poland could have escaped partitioning if she had abandoned her ideals of right, justice, and liberty.

In 1939 Poland fell because she valued liberty and honor more than life under foreign rule. She could have protected herself from the dreadful sacrifices and defeats by even superficially conceding to the rule of Nazi dictatorship. Her gallant stand is emblematic of the cause for which the United Nations stand united today in the present conflict.

So this is an appropriate time for us Americans to pay our tribute to that great country, and I wish to do my small part, because I visited Poland 10 years after its resurrection, at the end of the First World War. That visit made a deep impression upon me. It was the fulfillment of a wish of many years to visit that country, whose tragic history had moved me, whose art I had admired, whose people had charmed me, and whose struggles upward I wanted to witness. The occasion was some invitations from Polish friends, and they and their friends gave me every opportunity to see all parts of the country and all phases of Polish life.

I visited the three parts which until the First World War were respectively under German, Austrian, and Russian domination. I went from Poznan on the west to Wilno on the east, and from the high Tatra Mountains on the south to the Baltic Sea on the north. I met all sorts of people—the president in the old Royal Palace Wawel, noble families in their fine old houses, and peasants in their cottages on the farms. I found everywhere cordial hospitality and a personal charm which won my heart. Everywhere was noticeable the extraordinary earnestness of the people in working to rebuild their war-swept and divided land. If there was one thing which impressed me more than anything else it was the very ambitious plans for Poland's rehabilitation, and the great progress already achieved in the short 10 years of its independence.

It was my privilege to be the guest of the President of Poland at the reopening of the palace on the historic Wawel, in Krakow. I shall never forget that beautiful recognition, in halls magnificently restored by public subscription after 100 years of abuse by the Austrians, who used them as soldiers' barracks. It was a great event for all Poland because it served as a symbol of the restoration of Poland itself.

On that occasion there was given me a medal, on the one side of which is a portrait of Washington, and on the other side are the portraits of Pulaski and Kosciusko. It is dedicated to the United States of America. Let it, too, serve as a symbol. If we look at our history, we see Washington the great general, a statesman, a patriot, the Father of his Country, and at first we see him alone. If we study our history a little more closely, we see others who stood at his side, who as soldiers fought with him, who as men of judgment counseled him, who as friends of America and liberty encouraged him. As he was the Father of his Country, so they were the sons of liberty, and none of them were more worthy of our respect and admiration and affectionate remembrance than those two great Poles, the gallant Kosciusko and the young, heroic Pulaski.

As they were the sons of liberty, so the Americans of Polish descent are the sons of liberty of today. We count on them to fight for liberty now, as their predecessors fought for it during our Revolutionary War. Some of the younger men are actually in the present war. The rest who stay at home are contributing to the war effort in every way they can, either themselves or through the officials they elect to represent them.

Today it is sad to recall that visit to Poland and those impressions received there, because Poland now is again under the heel of the conqueror, devastated, and subjugated. On the other hand, it is cheering to recall those experiences because they offer hope for the future. America and Poland are still friends. With America's help Poland will rise again under Franklin D. Roosevelt as she did before under Woodrow Wilson. If the Polish nationality can perform the miracle of enduring under the hardships of partition and suppression by three foreign nations for a century and one-half, it can surely endure these same tragic conditions for the relatively short time we hope this Second

World War will last. As after the ending of the First World War, so after the ending of the Second World War, it is to the interest, not only of Poland, but of the world, that Poland rise again to the status of a great nation. The Polish-Americans, who from ancient Poland have come to this new country of America, will, I know, continue to show that same vision, ability, and energy which created the new Poland after the First World War.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 3, will mark the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland. May 3 is a day dear to the heart of every citizen of Poland, and to every man who knows the worth and honor of human freedom.

Tomorrow will find our relentless war against barbarism and oppression continuing apace, and tomorrow we and our allies should pay high honor to our faithful Polish comrades-in-arms who were the first to defy the monster, Nazi aggression.

No one, I am sure, will ever forget the heroic stand made by the armies and peoples of Poland. No one will discount the tremendous heights of gallantry and courage which were achieved by the indomitable defenders of the bombed and battered city of Warsaw. In all the annals of time, no city has ever been more determinedly or more strongly defended. The defense of Warsaw will live forever—one of the outstanding monuments to the bravery and tenacity of free men.

Though the forces of oppression are bivouacked in the cities and in the towns of Poland, though the citadels of Warsaw, Lwow, and Lublin echo to the conqueror's heel, the battle for Poland does not end. By day and by night the unbroken forces of patriotic Poland strike out against the invader. Indeed, the battle for Poland cannot end until every invader is driven out, and the land of the Vistula is free again.

So, Mr. President, as we reaffirm our faith in the certainty of the inevitable victory, let us pause to pay homage to the stalwart sons of Poland who preferred death to slavery, and who, by their unyielding gallantry, brought untold glory to the name of Poland and to the cause of free men everywhere.

Let us here express the firm resolve that the nation of Poland shall be restored to its full dignity and freedom before another anniversary of its historic Constitution Day has passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 3, is the day which Polish people throughout the world set aside as a national holiday. In common with the other nations of the world who are engaged in fighting the Axis enemies, the Poles view this day as their day of liberation—for it commemorates the signing on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution.

When enacted, the Polish Constitution was one of the great documents of freedom known to man. Polish patriots had made themselves familiar with what the most advanced philosophers of the eighteenth century held to be the rights of man. The imprint of the French and American Revolutions were fresh on their minds.

This knowledge was distilled in the minds of these great men until there evolved a constitution most adapted to the needs of the Polish people.

Though this was a happy milestone on the world's path to freedom, the immediate consequences to the Polish people were tragic. Catherine the Great, sitting on her throne in Russia, feared the Polish germs of enlightenment would infect her own down-trodden masses. The King of Prussia and the Emperor of Austria could not stand idly by and witness a Poland free, independent, and democratic.

These three mighty nations combined their military resources and hurled them at the Polish people. The Poles fought in their traditionally heroic fashion, but the odds were too much. Four years after the signing of the Polish Constitution, the heart of a free Poland ceased beating. Poland no longer existed as an independent nation.

On every May 3 through the centuries that followed, the Polish people never forgot to remind the world that, while the heart of Poland was gone, its soul continued to live.

In 1918, when the Allied Nations of the world were redrawing the map of Europe, they took cognizance of Polish nationalism and restored Poland to the family of nations.

In recent years, a hostile German Army set foot on Polish soil, driving the legitimate Polish Government from its capital. This Government, now functioning in London, is again exhibiting to the world the burning spirit of a free Poland.

We, as one of the three major nations fighting in the United Nations, cannot permit the spirit of a free Poland to escape when, at the peace table, we are confronted with the problems concerning the restoration of that nation.

Mr. President, I think it very appropriate that at this particular time notice should be taken of the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, and that American thoughts should return for the time being to the problems of the Polish people, who are noted for their fight for freedom down through the centuries.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as we sing that beautiful, sacred, prayerful hymn of hope, When the Lights Go On Again All Over the World, we are thinking, too, of that great light, the Constitution of Poland, that temporarily has been blacked out. Tomorrow, May 3, 1944, marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the signing of this great light of freedom, the Polish Constitution. It was originally signed in 1791, not under the pressure of revolution and armed soldiers, but in a peaceful assemblage of King, senators, deputies, ministers, and citizens. It was voluntarily approved amid rejoicing and good will on all sides.

There is no rejoicing in Poland today. Only a firm hope and a fixed determination are to be found there, on this anniversary this year. That hope and that determination to restore the constitutional Poland is shared by the friends of Poland everywhere, and especially in the United States. I know that I am speaking for every Member of the United States Senate when I say this.

A Russian historian, A. Pogodin, professor at Kharkov University in 1911, said:

> Poland's best sons fought to save their country. The Constitution of the 3d of May 1791, created an order of things guaranteeing the rebirth of Poland. Had these reforms been put into effect, Poland would have become a sufficiently strong state. But her neighbors did not permit the Polish commonwealth to strengthen itself in this way. Russia and Prussia—but recently enemies—clasped hands across Poland. The Constitution's supporters, guided by their ardent desire to save their country, knew they were subscribing to it "in an hour fraught with danger to the commonwealth."

Speaking of the Polish Constitution the great English statesman, Burke, said:

> We have seen anarchy and servitude at once removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without trenching on their liberties * * * not one man incurred loss, or suffered degradation. All, from the King to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order, everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder—this unheard of conjunction of wisdom and fortune—not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals or manners; no spoils; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled. The whole was affected with a policy, a discretion, a unanimity such as have never been known before on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men. Happy people, if they know how to proceed as they have begun. Happy prince, worthy to begin with splendor or to close with glory a race of patriots and of kings and to leave a name which every wind to heaven would bear.

A German writer, Friedrich Raumer, said in 1832:

> The Poles gave themselves the constitution of the 3d of May without pillage, murder, bloodshed, or destruction of property. With wisdom, fairness, and measure they united the nicest respect for all personal and property rights that could be preserved, with the extermination of all fundamental evil. An admirable work of this kind deserved the greatest permanence, the highest happiness under the most auspicious conditions. So double responsibility rests on the soiled hands that stained a clean act, on the slanderers who libelled it, on the criminals who destroyed it.

A. Bruce Boswell, an eminent English scholar, in 1919 paid tribute to the 3d of May Polish Constitution in these words:

> It is generally forgotten that, before her fall, Poland completely reformed her Constitution. At one stroke the Poles brought their state up to the level of western Europe. The work was done by a small band of men, and seldom have great ideas so rapidly permeated a community.
>
> The chief ideas of political reform were expounded by Staszyc, a member of the small middle class. These ideas were taken up by Kollontaj, Ignacy Potocki, and others and

culminated in the great 4 years' parliament and the 3d of May constitution of 1791. This great parliament is unique in history, for, at a time when the French noblesse were being forced to give up their rights, the Polish gentry voluntarily renounced their privileges. It is often forgotten that there were two revolutions at this time besides the French Revolution—those in Belgium and Poland. The Polish reformers embodied their ideas in a constitution. The following reforms were passed:

1. The government was divided into an executive, a legislature, and a judiciary. A strong executive was formed by making the monarchy hereditary and increasing its powers The King and the council of ministers were to form a permanent executive body responsible to the Diet.

2. The Dietines lost their power and the Diet became a real independent legislative body. The "liberum veto" and the confederation were both abolished. Thus the idea of the state finally triumphed over provincial separation.

3. The gentry gave up their immunity from taxation, the middle class was enfranchised, and municipal autonomy was restored.

4. The army was increased to 100,000 and heavy taxes were imposed on the gentry.

5 Complete toleration for all religions was confirmed.

6. The peasants were taken under the protection of the law and might make agreements with their masters to pay rent instead of continuing the old system of forced labor.

This constitution was greeted with a chorus of praise all over Europe, its greatest admirers being the Emperor Leopold II and our own Burke, who contrasted its moderation with the excesses of the French revolutionary leaders.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter written to me from Walsenburg, Colo., and signed by Mrs. Mary Socha, Andrew Socha, and Ignatz Waski, and also a letter addressed to me from Chicago and signed by Marya A. Porwit, Jadwiga Karlowicz, and Barbara A. Fisher.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALSENBURG, COLO., *April 13, 1944.*

Senator EDWARD C. JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, as citizens of these United States of America and members of Polish National Alliance Council No. 5, call your attention to the following facts:

On the 3d of May 1791 the Kingdom of Poland, already reduced by the tripartite partitions, unanimously adopted a new constitution which provided for liberty and equal rights for all men. What other nations and people did with bloodshed, Poland, with her long tradition of tolerance, accomplished by peaceful means.

In these critical times, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that this date be commemorated by us in the United States.

The Poles, always ready to support the democratic cause, were again the first to stand against the enemy of freedom. Again they followed their motto: "For your freedom and for ours."

Could you, sir, on the 3d of May, call this fact to the attention of the American Senate? It is our duty as Americans to remember an ally who, though faced with insurmountable obstacles, would rather die than surrender.

The constitution of the 3d of May is another monument that testifies to the democratic spirit of Poland.

Respectfully submitted.

MRS. MARY SOCHA.
ANDREW SOCHA.
IGNATZ WASKI.

POLISH WOMEN'S ALLIANCE OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., April 7, 1944.

The Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The 3d of May is celebrated by all Poles, regardless of where they are, as a national holiday in commemoration of the adoption of a constitution May 3, 1791. Like our own constitution, the Polish constitution of May 3d is a document guaranteeing freedom and democracy to all the peoples of Poland.

In view of the fact that Poland is our true and tried ally in the struggle against the enemies of civilization, and was the first to take up arms unaided against Hitler in spite of overwhelming odds and certain defeat, and continues the gallant fight at tremendous sacrifices, we believe it is fitting that the Congress of the United States express America's friendship for the people of Poland and their exiled government in London through appropriate discussions and resolutions on the floor of the House and Senate on May 3d.

Through such action on the part of our Congress, the people of Poland will again be reassured that their cause is not forgotten and their outlay in sacrifices is not in vain.

The 60,000 members of the Polish Women's Alliance of America will be grateful to you, sir, for any action you may take in originating or supporting such discussions.

Respectfully yours,

MARYA A. PORWIT,
Secretary.
JADWIGA KARLOWICZ,
Editor.
BARBARA A. FISHER,
General Counsel.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have here a very excellent address prepared for presentation to the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who is unavoidably absent today. It is a tribute to our ally and sister republic, Poland, and to the millions of American citizens of Polish birth or descent. The Senator from Indiana had hoped to deliver the address on the floor of the Senate, but is unable to be present today. I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in the last decade of the eighteenth century Poland was for the third time partitioned by three aggressive powers of Europe because she disagreed with their dictates as to her destiny. By adopting the constitution of May 3, 1791, Poland challenged the right and might of her despotic neighbors to control her future as a free and autonomous nation. In the face of powerful opposition and threats of imminent danger to her national independence, Poland boldly reaffirmed her traditional loyalty to the ideals of right, justice, and liberty for all men, regardless of their race and creed, or social and political status.

Although we are today joining with our Polish friends in celebrating their national holiday—the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of Poland's first constitution—our minds naturally revert to a critical era a few years previous to the formation of Poland's constitution, when our own country was waging a bitter struggle for freedom. In the year 1776, there came to this country a Polish general by the name of Kosciusko, a warm personal friend of Benjamin Franklin, who soon after his arrival was commissioned a colonel in our Revolutionary Army. History records that many of our successes in that memorable war were attributed to the leadership and strategic planning of this man. He was an expert engineer and was engaged as chief engineer in constructing the fortifications at West Point, and later became adjutant to General Washington. At the victorious termination of that war, he received the thanks of Congress with the brevet of brigadier general.

Imbued with the same spirit that actuated him in fighting for America's freedom, Kosciuszko returned to his native country of Poland, and took up the battle for the freedom of his own people. He was one of the Polish national leaders in bringing about the adoption of his country's first constitution in 1791. Since that memorable time, enshrined in the heart of every Polish patriot, Poland has annually celebrated May 3 as a national holiday. Today those brave people cannot do just honor to this occasion. Their country is overrun and despoiled by a brutal enemy, her citizens are prostrate, her children dispersed or in concentration camps, while thousands of her sons are fighting under the leadership of our flag.

The ideals and the national interests of Poland and the United States have run in somewhat parallel courses. Her citizens have contributed to the society and the culture of America. Today 10,000,000 of the people of Poland are loyal citizens of the United States, and are contributing to the welfare and safety of our Nation.

We in America are grateful for the assistance given to us in our hour of travail by one of her illustrious sons, and are truly mindful of this day, and of our obligation to Poland. We are shedding precious blood together on world battlefields in an endeavor to preserve ideals of freedom and liberty for all nations of the world that we hold historically in common.

The rights of Poland were invaded again in 1939, and the iron fist of Germany struck on this well-nigh defenseless nation the spark that started the present world conflagration. Her cause is a symbol of that for which we fight. It becomes the duty of Poland's allies to remind the world that Poland was not only the first nation in Europe to write a constitution granting individual rights to all her citizens, but is the personification of what the civilized world fights for today.

Poland's contribution to the war effort of the Allied Nations, and her faithfulness to the ideals of freedom and justice, deserve to be especially emphasized at

this moment, when the specter of appeasement threatens her national existence.

We in America know how to appreciate freedom and we know the meaning of the rights of men, as guaranteed by a constitution born from the tribulations of oppression. We are proud, and have been proud for a century and a half, that the sacrifices, the wounds, the bereavements of the Revolution and birth of our Republic have been significant to ourselves, and we have been able to enforce on other peoples of the world a decent respect for the freedom thus won in toil and tears.

For this we thank our geographic isolation, as well as the determined spirit of our patriotic founding fathers of the Republic, imbued by the same love of freedom possessed by the patriots of Poland.

Situated in a comparatively hard-held corridor, between powerful and warlike peoples, her natural resources a rich prize for covetous conquerors, smaller Poland relies on her spirit, as well as on the vaunted advancement in civilized procedure between nations, to which this war and the previous world conflict are at least nominally dedicated.

Poland and the United States are sister republics, bound together by similar ideals in a world largely populated by nations dedicated to world empire. We have proclaimed in prosecuting two wars in the present century that we fight for principle and not for gain. The proposition to which our Nation is dedicated today is the preservation of ideals, which in private lives are characterized by the spirit of brotherhood, the teachings of Christianity. We have subscribed to the recent promulgation as world tenets of the principles on which our Nation is founded. Some have inadequately stated and described them as the "four freedoms." On this one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of this sister republic, I call attention to the hope which still actuates Christian citizenship in this country as well as in what is left of Poland, the hope that under pressure of world empire we do not throw to the four winds the basic freedoms for which America and Poland were created.

We cannot do less than bring to the nations endeavoring to establish a free world the justice of Poland's demand for her own just place in the new order.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in recognition of the celebration of the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution on the 3d of May, as a tribute to Poland and as an expression of faith in the thousands of patriotic citizens of Indiana who are of Polish ancestry, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very brief excerpt from an article entitled "Poland Fights the Nazi Dragon." The excerpt is entitled "What Poland Has Done for Us." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed, together with the names of the persons who have requested that the tribute be made.

There being no objection, the excerpt, together with the names of those requesting the tribute, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT POLAND HAS DONE FOR US

1. Poland went to war for a principle. She rejected the unethical and unrealistic policy of appeasement, which would have led to world enslavement.

2. Poland was first to fight the German aggressors. In the words of Postmaster General Frank Walker, she is "the mother of the United Nations."

3. By her people's enormous sacrifice and courage, she gave Great Britain and us in America what we needed most: time to realize the danger and prepare.

4. For her lone resistance against terrific odds, Poland paid as no other nation in the world has paid.

Her people were made slaves—35,000,000 of them.

Her wealth was stolen.

Her culture, schools, libraries were destroyed.

Her churches were closed.

Two hundred and sixty thousand soldiers and civilians (including 60,000 in the heroic defense of Warsaw) were killed during the military campaign.

Two million five hundred thousand were executed or died in concentration camps.

One million nine hundred thousand civilians and prisoners of war were made slave laborers in Germany.

One million five hundred thousand were deported to Russia.

Not one but 386 Lidices in Poland—386 villages burned to the ground and all inhabitants killed.

5. Poland did not sign an armistice.

6. Poland is the only country in Europe that did not produce a Quisling.

7. In spite of merciless wholesale persecution, Poland is still fighting, has been fighting since September 1939—almost 5 years—fighting on land, in the air, and on the sea—fighting both at home and in exile.

Poland's armed forces now number fifth among the United Nations—over 200,000 men in the field.

Poles defend the Scottish coast.

Poland has in the Near East an army of over 100,000.

Poland's navy helps convoy munitions to Russia.

Poles participated in the battle of Tobruk, at Narvik, in the evacuation of Dunkerque, in the Tunisian campaign, and in the Sicilian invasion.

Poland's air force played a decisive role in the Battle of Britain, which was the turning point of the war, shooting down one out of every eight enemy aircraft in that battle.

8. The Poles continue to fight in temporarily enslaved Poland.

They force Germans to keep large garrisons there.

They sabotage the German war effort.

They conduct organized warfare against the German invader.

They destroy German supplies and wreck German trains en route to Russia.

Underground Poland circulates over 100 secret newspapers which direct the resistance of the civilian population of Poland.

Every man, woman, and child in Poland is our ally and they will never give up.

This Poland has done for you and me—Poland fights the Nazi dragon.

Miss Bernice Henclewski, South Bend, Ind.; Sophia V. Iwasieczko, Whiting, Ind.; John Kapica, Michigan City, Ind.; Mrs. K. Kaptur, Hammond, Ind.; Mrs. H. Kesak, Hammond, Ind.; Mrs. Sophie Kocot, Hammond, Ind.; John Lass, Michigan City, Ind.; Mr. and Mrs. Glem J. Markonski, South Bend, Ind.; Mrs. Anthony Meleczko, East Chicago, Ind.; Joseph Pasula, St. Albert Society, P. N. A. No. 1456, Michigan City, Ind.; G. W. Pers, St. Casimirs Society, P. N. A. No. 226, Hammond, Ind.; Miss Theda Plocka, South Bend, Ind.; John Rogowski, Polish National Alliance, Group No. 1120, La Porte, Ind.; Miss Sophia Siemion, Gary, Ind.; W. Spychalski, Michigan City, Ind.; Mrs. Alersandra Szezerbowska, Hammond, Ind.; Mrs. Julia Tolpa, Gary, Ind.; Victoria Twasierzko, Whiting, Ind.; Miss Helen Zielenski, Gary, Ind.; Myron Sumedlouski, Gary, Ind.; Michael Karczmarczyk, Gary, Ind.

SEIZURE OF THE MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, few things, if any, have happened during my service in the Senate of the United States that have brought such a spontaneous flood of distressing letters, telegrams and telephone calls from the people in every walk of life in the State of Illinois as has the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co.'s mail order house and the forcible eviction of its president, Sewell Avery, from the offices and property of the company.

This firm has supplied the civilian needs of people of moderate means in the peaceful civilian pursuit of life for more than 70 years. The disgraceful spectacle of the Attorney General of the United States racing to Chicago and ordering Federal troops to invade the premises and evict Mr. Avery has struck a note of shocking horror to the hearts of the people, not only of Illinois but throughout the entire country.

On the eve of what is expected to be the launching of the greatest invasion force in all recorded time, where the gallant sons and fathers of America are to attack the continent of Europe and to put down tyrants and stop the arrogant aggression of despots, to have the Federal troops of this country used to invade a civilian business institution in America has done more than any other thing, in my judgment, to disturb, even destroy, the confidence of the loyal American people in the purposes for which we are making and will make such gigantic and terrific sacrifices in war.

I shall not attempt to discuss the events leading to the controversy between the management of Montgomery Ward and the War Labor Board which resulted in this unwarranted Executive aggression. That issue is now before the Federal court, where it should have been originally, and where Mr. Avery tried his best to have that issue determined. I only wish to discuss the Gestapo tactics used before it was presented to the court. The law under which this disgraceful procedure was undertaken was passed by the Congress, but was in no sense intended to be an all-out grant of power that would destroy the liberties and the protections of the American citizen earned and provided by the sacrifices, not only of our forefathers, but of men and women of the present living generation.

That law provided:

The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States

or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith.

It is notable that the Congress specifically limited this unusual authority in connection with the Government's possession of "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith." It did not provide for the taking of any plant that merely distributes articles that might in some manner be useful to the war effort. If the taking of Montgomery Ward by force at the point of bayonets under military command is authorized and the eviction of those whose responsibility it is to conduct such a business is warranted under any present law, then every little store in America handling rakes, forks, shovels, or even garden seeds, can be declared by this fertile-minded Attorney General to fall within its scope, and the Congress find itself today in the position of having granted power to the executive branch of our Government which may wipe out fundamental protections of our constitutional form of government under which we wage such gigantic war in the name of freedom.

I understand that an investigation has already been undertaken by the Senate Judiciary Committee to determine the legality of Executive orders under which our distressed people have been hampered, hindered, and sorely perplexed.

I urge in addition the passage of the resolution presented by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], which provides as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the action of the Attorney General of the United States in seizing the plant of Montgomery Ward & Co., in forcibly removing the chairman of its board of directors from the premises, and in the use of military force in connection therewith, with a view to ascertaining whether such action was warranted and authorized under the laws of the United States.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

The fact that this controversy is finally before the court and the troops have been withdrawn does not alter the fact that the troops were used. The courts were in session in the first instance, and the Attorney General was armed with the law; and when, in the sincere belief of his rights as a citizen, Mr. Sewell Avery decided not meekly to yield to the ever-growing encroachment of the executive power over the lives and rights of our people, the Attorney General could have immediately presented his case to the Federal court. Instead, he resorted to the arrogant and terrifying tactics of calling the troops, ordering them forcibly to evict the head of the company, and then, in an unusual procedure, at approximately 11 o'clock at night, in a special court session closed to the company representatives, the press, and the people, attended only by the Attorney General and other Federal officials whom he chose to have present, he secured a temporary order against the officers of the company prohibiting interference with his administration of a business devoted to the distribution of civilian goods.

I repeat, nothing has happened in the United States of America since the war began that has so shocked the sense of justice in this free land as this disgraceful performance. For years, all over the world, people have been driven at the point of bayonets, under dictatorial edicts and commands, aided by the use of troops, away from any form of representative government. This movement of the rise and power of dictators has grown until the whole world is engulfed in a terrible and terrific war.

For 10 years in America there has been an ever-growing concentration and entrenchment of executive power. Countless times throughout America the fear has been expressed that our participation in this war would cause a demand for the granting of so many additional unusual powers under the guise of war necessity into the hands of this executive group that they would use them to destroy the remaining liberties of our people. This unfortunate experience has only given added impetus and seeming justification to that growing fear at a time when we need the complete, united effort and patriotic fervor of all of our people to fight this war to a successful conclusion in the cause of American liberty.

The flood of communications of protest that has come to me is a revelation as to the depth of the concern in the minds of the people in every walk of life within the confines of the State I have the honor to represent. One minister of the gospel in a little town far removed from the city of Chicago writes:

I am not interested in the C. I. O. nor Montgomery Ward, but I am interested in the United States, her Constitution, freedom, and rights. Is Congress going to stand by and not do more than talk, or will she act?

This, the most recent demonstration of the usurping of such unwarranted power, has caused the people of our Nation to turn in distress to their Congress, pleading—yes, demanding—that we act as their chosen representatives in their behalf.

The action of Sewell Avery, a distinguished, courageous, loyal, patriotic and devoted American, has not only received the complete appreciation and approval of the officers of his company and the overwhelming majority of the stockholders of his company, but should also receive the overwhelming approval of the stockholders of the great corporate entity of the United States; namely, the citizens of America.

Through the past 10 years too many people have feared and shied away from the tactics employed by a band of wilful men who would drive this Nation into submission through the tactics of smearing them, threatening to indict, or indicting them, and now evicting them at the point of a bayonet, utilizing the armed forces which were intended by the people and their Congress to be utilized to stamp out dictatorship everywhere, not to establish it here in America.

These totalitarian tactics are not justified merely because Montgomery Ward is a big institution. It is a big institution. The people whom it serves number perhaps 30,000,000, but it has the same right to the protection provided by the law of this and as the humblest of the thirty millions who patronize it for civilian goods.

To say that Sewell Avery is a big man is to speak the truth. He has rendered great service to his country by not meekly yielding to the bluster of an executive agent. By demanding his full rights as a free American he has brought to the surface the lurking subterranean menace that has been seeking to destroy the Ship of State upon which 130,000,000 people seek safe voyage through the war, to a greater destiny as a continuing, completely free people.

The people have been willing to make any sacrifice to support the efforts of Congress in raising a vast armed force to fight the Japs and the Germans, but they never intended that this Army should be used to fight and destroy American liberties or American institutions.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize my deep convictions concerning the grave responsibility of Congress in this hour. The people of America are looking to us to stop this gun-point and bayonet enforcement of bureaucratic edicts and directives. They must be stopped. I am fully aware that any proposals made by an individual Member of the Senate in this connection will be referred to the Judiciary Committee. Since that committee has already instigated an investigation of the action of the Attorney General in this case, I urge an immediate and painstaking effort on its part to find the remedy to prevent any recurrence of this disgraceful experience. To this end I will give my continued, unqualified support.

If in its zeal to support the war effort, Congress has enacted any laws under which the action of the Attorney General in his use of Federal troops to evict men whose legal responsibility it is to conduct the affairs of any business distributing civilian goods is declared legal by the Federal court, it is our duty as Members of Congress immediately to review and revise such laws or to so define and limit the authorities granted to the Executive branch that even the most fervent bureaucrat cannot again misinterpret the intention of Congress.

The Judiciary Committee of the Senate has constitutional authority to deal with matters concerning the approval of men who seek to become Federal judges; it has the authority and responsibility to review the qualifications of men who

occupy the high office of Attorney General; and it has the authority now to investigate the legality of Executive orders.

I urge the immediate passage of the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], which will impose a further duty upon the Judiciary Committee to make a complete investigation of the action of the Attorney General of the United States in the seizure at the point of bayonets of this plant of Montgomery Ward & Co., and the use of Federal troops in forcibly ejecting the chairman of the board of directors from its premises. This unwarranted use of fixed bayonets, rather than the use of the processes of our country in the first instance, tears at the very vitals of American liberty.

Mr. President, there are some who counsel that delay would be good to establish a cooling-off period in this present matter. There are times in ordinary controversies when delay has a beneficial effect, but this has gone far beyond the confines of an ordinary controversy. This was a willful substitution of bayonets for the processes provided for in the American courts of justice. There should be no delay on the part of Congress in guaranteeing to the people of this Nation that whether it be in war or peace the civil liberties of this land will be secured.

Rather than delay, sir, the Congress has a duty to act with dispatch to reassure the people of America today that now and throughout the remainder of this war the Congress will truly be the representative of the people and will guard and protect their precious civil rights.

INVESTIGATION OF LEGALITY, ETC., OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may ask to have inserted in the RECORD a resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and in view of the pertinent remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] I invite attention to the fact that Senate Resolution 196 gave authority to the Senate Judiciary Committee or a subcommittee thereof, to examine into the legality, constitutionality, and legislative authority of the various Executive orders to which reference has been made. The chairman of the committee has informed me that his subcommittee is already investigating the acts of the Attorney General in this very important case now being discussed. Authority was given to the Judiciary Committee under the resolution which I hold in my hand and which, as amended, was adopted by the Senate of the United States on March 30, 1944. I ask that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD for the information of the Senate. The resolution was adopted by the Senate with appropriate amendments, giving the authority to which I have referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 196) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is alleged that the people of the United States are apprehensive and disturbed by the directives, rules, and regulations administered by the various Federal governmental bureaus and agencies in the executive department; and

Whereas it is alleged that these rules and regulations have the effect of law; and

Whereas it is alleged that these bureaus and agencies have the power, or assume the power, to punish the violators of their rules and regulations by fine or imprisonment or both; and

Whereas it is alleged that these bureaus and agencies claim to derive their authority to punish violators of these rules and regulations by fine or imprisonment from various Executive orders; and

Whereas it is alleged that during 1933 and subsequent years, during and including 1942, there have been more than 3,500 Executive orders issued by the President and, during and including the same years, there have been approximately 4,300 laws enacted by the Congress and signed by the President; and

Whereas it is alleged that the Government of the United States has gone far in its departure from a government by legislative enactment by Congress to a government by Executive order; and

Whereas it is generally believed this alleged departure from constitutional government has created confusion, waste, and inefficiency in administration of governmental affairs and resentment amongst our people and has retarded the war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be hereby directed to determine the source of constitutional or legislative authority upon which these Executive orders are based, the validity of same, what effect their enforcement has had upon our national economy and our constitutional democracy, and report to the Senate the result of such labors as the committee finds may be helpful in preserving to the Congress its constitutional authority and place in the legislative process.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT AND LIMITATIONS ON SALE OF CORN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my office, I suppose, is no different than the offices of other Senators in the United States Senate in that many letters and wires are being received protesting the inadvertent seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. These correspondents are both indignant and fearful, and justifiably so. I have received wires from all over the State of Nebraska, the contents of which in no uncertain language express the reactions of our Nebraska citizens.

Let me read, at this point, a few of these telegrams:

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 27, 1944.*

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

What is Congress going to do about the autocratic and un-American way of handling the Montgomery Ward retail store situation? We resent such methods.

A. L. JACOBERGER.
J. M. JENSEN.
E. M. MORGAN.
E. W. GWYNNE.
VAUGHAN ———.

This telegram is signed by outstanding citizens of Omaha.

Here is a telegram from a citizen of Grand Island, approximately the center of the State, where Ward serves many of our farmers. It reads as follows:

GRAND ISLAND, NEBR., *April 28, 1944.*

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Does this Montgomery Ward procedure mean complete and final dictatorship? Is not some protest in order or has it gone beyond the point where protest is no longer possible?

The telegram is signed "John W. Lindsay." I know him personally. I assert that he is an outstanding citizen of one of the largest cities of Nebraska.

Here is another telegram:

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 28, 1944.*

Senator WHERRY,
Senator from Nebraska,
Senate Office Building:

The seizure of Montgomery Ward is an outrage. It is a violation of the Constitution. Where does the power of Federal Government end? This case should be taken to the people's Congress. I am not a stockholder of Montgomery Ward.

The telegram is signed "E. H. Erickson."

I read another telegram which I have received:

FREMONT, NEBR., *April 29, 1944.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We vigorously protest against the Federal administration's un-American, unwarranted, and illegal action in Montgomery Ward case, and we call upon you as our elected Representative to take immediate and drastic action to protect the constitutional rights of American citizens.

It is signed by Fremont Wool Co., George R. Sanderson, president.

Here is another telegram from Fred E. Owen, of Paxton & Vierling Iron Works, Omaha, Nebr.:

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 29, 1944.*

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

The disgraceful action of the Federal Government in the Montgomery Ward case should be fully covered by congressional action and definite action taken by Congress to reinstate our constitutional rights and privileges.

FRED E. OWEN,
PAXTON & VIERLING IRON WORKS.

The following telegram came from Omaha, and was signed by E. W. Taylor and others:

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 29, 1944.*
Senator WHERRY:

We demand an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. and prompt congressional action to prevent any future outrage of this character.

E. W. Taylor, F. E. Hovey, W. R. McFarland, C. C. Sadler, J. T. Brownlee, W. G. Spain, V. B. Elseffer, Jewell Bockwitz.

Here is a telegram from Gale Walton, Geneva, Nebr. Geneva is located in an important agricultural territory in which farmers are continually being served by Montgomery Ward & Co. The telegram reads as follows:

GENEVA, NEBR., *April 29, 1944.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

If Congress has given the President power to use the Army to back up his own ideas and policies in regard to private business when no law is broken come on home, we will go fishing.

GALE WALTON.

This telegram is a mandate to Congressmen in Washington from a citizen of Geneva, Nebr.

Here is a telegram from Gibbon, Nebr., the center of a great potato section:

GIBBON, NEBR., *April 27, 1944.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

In regards to the Montgomery Ward plant seizure, we request you to use every effort to uphold the principles of our country's Constitution and stop this unruly dictatorship from Washington. We stand ready to ever assist you.

BUFFALO COUNTY FARM BUREAU.
SHELTON COMMUNITY FARM BUREAU.
SOD TOWN COMMUNITY FARM BUREAU.

I have read these telegrams, and I could read many more. The language of them certainly speaks for itself. If Senators desire to note the real temper of the American people over the controversial seizure of Montgomery Ward, I invite them to note the words used in the telegrams which I have just read: Un-American, dictatorship, outrage, illegal, unwarranted, disgraceful—such are the words of our American citizens. Such is the forceful written language from American citizens' description of the Montgomery Ward seizure.

Some time has elapsed since the seizure of Montgomery Ward by the executive branch of the Government. During that time first-blush indignation has had an opportunity to cool, and we have had time for reflection and sober thinking.

I, personally, am left with the feeling of alarm at the manner in which the Government dispossessed a civilian of his establishment. The disgraceful picture of armed troops being used bodily to carry an American citizen from his office is unpleasant to visualize. It is distasteful and disgraceful.

Why was it necessary to use military force?

Why did the executive branch of our Government call upon troops?

I hold no brief for the War Labor Board or the management of Montgomery Ward. However, I cannot help but read from the body of a letter which was received in my office from a Montgomery Ward Co. employee in Chicago. The portion of that letter which I wish to embody in the RECORD at this time is as follows:

For the past 22 months I have been with Montgomery Ward & Co.

Watching the stuff the W. L. B. has been pushing down our throats, I can't help but write you and tell you how I feel and assure you that 80 percent of Ward's employees feel the same way, despite the fact that you get the union propaganda to the contrary.

A closed shop or maintenance of membership is in direct violation of the rights guaranteed to all United States citizens by the Constitution. I know you would not pay homage for the privilege of earning a living and neither will I, so why does Congress permit such an injustice to continue? You and I and everyone else should be privileged to join any organization of our choosing, but we should not be forced to join if we don't want to.

The "Gestapo Roosevelt" have violated the Constitution and all authority granted him by Congress, in invading and seizing private property not engaged in war work. The Government has repeatedly turned down this company's request for deferments of key people, informing Ward's that they are a nonessential business.

You should see the letters piling in here today from farmers all over the Middle West, telling Ward's what they think of them, and how much they hope the company wins this fight. Telegrams from business executives from all over the country are coming in by the basketful, congratulating Ward's on their courage.

My whole point is this, if Congress permits Roosevelt to get by with this, he can come into your home or mine, and tell us that it is essential to the war effort that we listen to certain radio programs and do not listen to others. It is my understanding that that is the type of thing we are fighting all over the world to get rid of.

May I plead with you and your fellow Senators to take immediate action to rid the American people of this menace and to protect their rights, granted by the Constitution.

Why was it necessary for the executive branch of the Government to take over Montgomery Ward?

Was it because, as Attorney General Biddle is reported to have argued in Chicago, Montgomery Ward was manufacturing and selling overalls and work shoes?

Is that sufficient justification for the executive branch of our Government to order Montgomery Ward seized?

If that is true, then by stretching such a conclusion to the *n*th degree, the executive departments and bureaus of this Government could take over and assume management of manufacturing, distribution, and retailing of all goods in this country.

Is that what the American people want?

Is that what the American people expect of constitutional government, about which we have heard so much here in past weeks and especially since the majority leader made his great speech suggesting that the legislative branch should once again assert its independence and vote its own convictions?

Incidentally, while I am on this subject of the Constiution, I could not help but note in reading Attorney General Biddle's opinion as to the President's authority to seize Montgomery Ward that our Attorney General relied upon the good, old Constitution of the United States. That is remarkable when we think back over the past 12 years of the New Deal administration and remember the lambasting and the pasting our Constitution has taken.

It is significant and startling that this same group who have spent many long years circumventing, tearing down, destroying, flaunting the provisions of our Constitution, now in one of their weaker moments find it necessary to plant both feet on the Constitution of the United States. In the history of the New Deal this is an historical moment.

No matter who the Federal court in Chicago determines is right in this labor dispute, the American people are still asking and are going to continue to ask:

First. Why were troops used?

Second. Where is the authority for taking over Montgomery Ward?

Third. Why did the executive branch of our Government take possession of Montgomery Ward?

Not only are the American people going to ask the foregoing questions, but they are going to ask us, and are already asking in their protests:

First. Is it not about time for Congress to take back unto itself those powers which in the past have been delegated to the executive branch of the Government or at least curtail or clarify them?

Two. Is it not about time for Congress to check the high-handed manner in which executive bureaus and governmental agencies are coercing the activities of the people of this country?

Three. Is it not about time for Congress to exert itself and scrutinize all measures that provide for any delegation of power and authority?

If we do not want to do that then, in the words of my good Nebraska friend, "We might as well go home and go fishing."

This Montgomery Ward seizure, as Members of the Senate know, is not the only incident of high-handedness that has occurred in this country in recent years; but it is the one incident that has come to the people's attention and we have the people's reactions to such methods; such methods must stop in America, whether in time of war or in time of peace.

In the very near future, the Senate will be called upon to extend the life of the Office of Price Administration and when that matter is before the Senate, in the light of the Montgomery Ward seizure, it would be well for us to analyze the authority which we have delegated to this governmental agency. Carefully we should define the provisions of the law and when they are defined and written down, we ought to add a P. S. to every statute and say, "This is what the Congress of the United States means."

If amendatory legislation to curb some of the activities of this agency is not proposed by any committee or Members of this body, I shall offer such legislation.

Mr. President, in line with the development of government by Executive order

and decree, it is well to review the provisions of the War Food Order No. 98, entitled "Limitations on Sale, Transportation, and Use of Corn," which was issued by the War Food Administration, effective April 25, 1944, for a 60-day period.

The provisions of this order froze the sale of corn except as provided in the order, in 125 corn-producing counties in Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, and Indiana. The 125 counties selected are the largest meat-producing counties in the Nation. That is the sad part about the order freezing the corn in the 125 counties, for they produce much of the corn-fed beef that is used for our soldiers abroad as well as for the civilian population.

This order provides that the Commodity Credit will purchase corn for their account to be delivered to processors of essential war materials. The Commodity Credit Corporation under the order can pay certain service charges such as the cost of shelling, transportation, and so forth. The maximum service charge that can be allowed is 5 cents per bushel.

The feeders in these 125 counties can only secure corn when they have in their possession an approved authorization from the county A. A. A. committee, allowing them to purchase and transport corn. The feeder is limited in the price he can pay for corn to prices in effect in the area in which the corn is purchased. I, as a feeder, cannot pay the 5 cents, but the Commodity Credit Corporation can pay the additional 5 cents; yet I have cattle on feed. The feeder is not allowed to pay the service charge that the order authorizes and grants the Commodity Credit authority to pay, which means, as can readily be seen, that the feeder, even though he has the approval of the A. A. A. committee to purchase and transport corn, will not be able to buy corn for his livestock because he cannot pay the price which a Government competing agency can and is authorized to pay. How will I get corn with a differential of 5 cents staring me in the face and the Government as my competitor?

It is my understanding that the various county committees are directed in special instructions—and all of these orders carry special instructions that are not made available to Congress or the general public affected—to restrict further the allocation of corn to feeders and producers. This is what I want livestock men to understand because telegrams are coming to me by the dozen relative to the effect of this corn order. For instance, if a man has on his farm hogs that have reached support weight, the A. A. A. committee will not allocate or authorize him to purchase or transport additional corn, but rather, say to him, "You must market those hogs." (2) The A. A. A. committeeman, if they have a request from a feeder of cattle for a 30-day supply of corn (which is the limitation under the order), will inquire and go to the farmer's feed yard, and determine whether or not the cattle in his feed yard for which he is requesting corn, are of slaughter weight and grade. If so, they will advise, as a matter of fact, direct him, to market this livestock. That is if the cattle do not comply with the grades the farmers will be directed to sell them, and regardless of whether or not they want to sell them, they have no discretion in the matter. They can force him to market it by not allocating him the corn requested. (3) The A. A. A. committee will not allocate any corn or grant an authorization to purchase or transport corn except for livestock already on the farm, and none for livestock that he would use as replacement cattle or for sheep he would like to put into his feed lot. There is always a movement of livestock from the ranch to the feed lots where beef tonnage is produced.

The provisions of the special instructions mean that no cattle will move into the feed lot because the A. A. A. county committees will not allocate corn for the new feeding of cattle.

What does all this amount to? It means just this, that through directives issued by the administrative branch of our Government, the farmer is now told what livestock he can have on his farm, what he is to feed it, how long he can feed it, when it must be marketed, and what price he will receive for it at the time it is marketed. If that is not complete dictatorship over the farmer, I would like to know what other provision the administration wants to write into such a directive. That, to me, seems a dictatorship which far exceeds that which exists in the dictator countries against which we are now waging war.

What has been the effect of this order? All last week, markets were glutted with livestock. Much of the livestock should have been retained on the farm for varying periods. The glut on the livestock markets has lowered the price of cattle on the hoof from 25 cents to, in some instances, $1.50 per hundred. The prices of hogs other than support weight and grade hogs have been lowered from 50 cents to $2 per hundred. Yet we are supposed to have a support price, and the support price is supposed to be paid in the Chicago market. The farmers bring in their hogs on the absolute promise of the administration, and they are breaking that promise to the extent of $2 a hundred, so far as hogs are concerned. Yet we expect the farmers to produce this year.

Lambs from the drought area in California which normally would move into the Corn Belt States, which cannot be slaughtered at this time because of their weight and grade, are glutting the middle western markets because no purchasers can be found—because the farmer is unable to secure the necessary corn to feed the lambs. The same is true in the case of the feeder cattle on the ranges. It means the owners have to take $2 a hundred less, or they cannot even sell them.

All of this has caused tremendous financial sacrifice to the meat producers of this Nation. It is no wonder they are disgusted and say, "We are going to quit."

It has been said, but the statement has not been officially sanctioned, that the processors of corn for essential industries need 80,000,000 bushels of corn. It is my personal opinion, upon investigation, that the need is 50,000,000 bushels rather than 80,000,000.

The reason why they will not state definitely the amount of corn needed is that they have no intent to step out of the corn market at the end of the 60-day period for which this order was originally issued. It is my opinion that at the end of the period it will be extended.

Mr. President, I wish to digress for a moment. It has not been 4 months since I stood in the United States Senate and told Senators exactly what would happen as a result of these narrow feeding operations. I fought my heart out in the Senate one afternoon endeavoring to convince my colleagues that consumer subsidies would not go to the producers, that they would take a dollar to two dollars a hundred off cattle; and that is exactly what has happened. They have taken fully 10 percent off the price of cattle being produced by the farmers in my section of the country.

In my own State of Nebraska, cattle on feed on farms on April 1 of this year numbered 32 percent less than the number a year ago on this same date, and these figures are from the State-Federal bureau of agricultural statistics. I told the Senate farmers would not feed the cattle, and they are not feeding them, and now one-third less cattle are on feed in Nebraska than a year ago the first of April.

I refer again to the statistics of the State-Federal bureau of agricultural statistics. Factors in the reduced feeding operations were higher prices for grain and hay, slightly lower prices for cattle, and the acute labor shortage. Prices received by Nebraska farmers for feed grains in March averaged 21 percent higher and hay prices were 80 percent higher than a year ago, while prices for beef cattle were about 6 percent lower.

In the face of the increased feed costs, both for corn and hay—corn 21 percent higher if it can be obtained, and hay 80 percent higher than a year ago—and in many instances with labor even having tripled in its cost, we say that the farmer should feed his cattle and sell them, not for what he was allowed under the Little Steel formula, but at a loss. He does not get the subsidy, so in reality he is taking $15.75 for the same cattle for which he should be receiving $17.75 a hundred.

In the face of these increased feeding costs, where will the feeder come out, and how many cattle will there be on the feed lot 6 months from now? I say this corn order has completely upset the narrow feed margins already established by other directives, and if the agencies continue to issue directives of this kind, we simply will not have meat to feed our military forces or the civilian population.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator does not mean to infer that this applies only to the feeder, does he? It goes on down the line to the producers of the original animals, so they will be taking a loss.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, and I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Under those conditions, with the high cost of labor, the scarcity of machinery, with the high prices the farmer must pay, and general war conditions, there will be destruction of the animal husbandry industry of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. His remarks are right in line.

Mr. President, if we pick up a newspaper we see that there are embargoes in three or four of the largest hog markets today because of this corn order. Farmers all over the country are forced to sell their hogs and take what price they can get, and they once again have glutted the market, so that it is absolutely demoralized.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. A year ago this spring little pigs sold in Minnesota for $6 and $8. Last fall I could buy them for from 50 cents to a dollar.

Mr. WHERRY. That is absolutely true, and what is true in Minnesota is true in all the cattle-feeding States.

I wish to conclude now. It is true that the Montgomery Ward seizure has brought to our attention an overriding of constitutional processes. My experiences on the Small Business Committee—the chairman of which is the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], for whom I have the highest respect—has shown that this is a question which is reaching into the very economy of America. More than 4,200 directives have been issued. Many of them have upset the business structure, the manufacture, the production and distribution of commodities. The time has arrived when we must consider the extension of the O. P. A. and some of the other agencies. We should see that their activities are curtailed and properly defined, and that the men in those agencies, who are not answerable to the electorate of this country, do not issue directives which will destroy our economy.

Unless Congress does something to eliminate or curtail the issuing of these orders and directives, our whole economy will be so involved that it will be impossible for us to extricate business from Government.

SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, with most of the other people of this country who realized its implications, I was much disturbed at the seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant by Attorney General Biddle, and his use of soldiers to eject from his office, Sewell Avery, chairman of the board, without first handling the case through civil officers.

There may be some disagreement as to all the things we are fighting for in this war, but the substitution of military rule for civil government inside the United States is certainly not one of the things for which we are fighting this war.

But if Mr. Biddle's action was disturbing—as it was—Mr. Biddle's arguments are more than disturbing. I quote from his opinion to the President, as reported in the press:

> Even in the absence of section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act, I believe that by the exercise of the aggregate of your powers as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief you could lawfully take possession of the plant and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. if you found it necessary to prevent injury to the country's war effort.

Mr. President, if that is the law of the Nation today, then the only law we have is the rule of the Chief Executive. He can do anything at his own discretion with the people and their property, so long as in his own opinion it is necessary "to prevent injury to the country's war effort."

That is a most dangerous doctrine, Mr. President. It is not good law; it is not good sense; it is not good public policy. If that is where we have arrived, then, indeed, has rule by men been substituted for government by law, and I do not believe that is what we are fighting for, or that such action is necessary to carry on the war.

Mr. President, judging from my mail, the country is aware of what is going on, and the serious implications of these activities. Letters and telegrams I am receiving—and the number each day is steadily increasing—indicate not only that the people of this country understand where such arbitrary and capricious actions will lead but also that they expect Congress to assert its rights and find a method of putting an end to such actions and such doctrines and policies. I am receiving letters from farmers, from businessmen, from professional men, from ministers of the Gospel, from fathers and mothers, demanding that this race for Executive power be curbed.

And I repeat, these people expect Congress to act in this matter, and to act promptly and effectively. Our people want the Executive to have all powers necessary to win the war, and they expect him to use those powers. But they do not believe that it is necessary to conquer the United States in order to defeat the Axis enemy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a few of the letters and telegrams I have received today complaining of what most of my correspondents feel is a high-handed outrage against the basic law of the land.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA CHAMEER OF COMMERCE,
April 28, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with instructions received from the board of directors of the Topeka Chamber of Commerce at their regular meeting today, I quote you herewith a self-explanatory resolution formally adopted by that body: Be it

"*Resolved,* That we oppose the action of the Federal Government in taking over the property of any person or private corporation when the business of such person or corporation is not directly connected with the war effort."

This resolution is forwarded to you in order that you may be individually informed of this action.

Very truly yours,
JOHN E. DUMARS, *President.*

EMPORIA, KANS., *April 27, 1944.*

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: If the information the newspapers have given in regard to the Montgomery Ward-War Labor Board dispute is correct, then I am completely horrified at the action taken by our Government.

If a company not engaged in war work can be seized by the United States Government, then that same Government could by the same means enter my home and supervise its management. Is that what our boys are fighting for?

If I am correct that the W. L. B. has stepped way out of bounds, then I'm hoping fervently that Congress will assert its power and its right to correct such a situation.

Respectfully,
Mrs. W. M. WAGNER.

MISSION HILLS, KANS., *April 28, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Is Congress going to take it lying down? Are they going to allow bureaucrats to make the laws and the President to carry them out? How long will it be before they move in on our homes?

Sabath says: "We have a Constitution or else we don't. We authorize the draft of boys by the hundreds of thousands and they are more important than one bull-headed person." Well, what does he think they are drafted for—to fight to uphold the kind of freedom that is now being demonstrated in Chicago? Is that the second front we hear so much about. We can get that kind of freedom from the Gestapo.

You Members of Congress were elected to make the laws. When are you going to start earning your salary? The people of this part of Kansas are getting sick of it.

Yours truly,
D. K. STEPHENS.

COPY OF LETTER TO ATTORNEY GENERAL BIDDLE BY THE PASTOR OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SMITH CENTER, KANS.

APRIL 27, 1944.

Attorney General BIDDLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant makes us feel that perhaps Hitler is a gentleman. Why do you not put your application in for a job with Stalin. I understand you are trying to convict 20 or more zealots for disloyalty to the United States and sympathy with nazi-ism. Why do you not indict yourself? None of them are half as dangerous to American democracy as your high-handed methods.

Yours truly,
IRA N. FAUROT.

THE WICHITA WHOLESALE FURNITURE CO.,
April 27, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I think it is time that the Government added a fifth freedom to the four already so widely publicized. After reading about the Government walking into Montgomery Ward's plants in Chicago I think they are going a little too far.

I thought some of these things were what we were supposed to be fighting for, but I guess it is all right for them to happen in Germany, Italy, and Russia. A few years ago

we would have torn our hair out about such an operation, but today we are whipped down so that we dare not open our mouth about anything we do not like.

I may not understand all about such situations, although I do know that all of us have sons that are supposed to be fighting for a certain amount of freedom. Maybe this is not under that category.

Sincerely yours,

L. C. JACKSON.

THE BUHLER MILL & ELEVATOR CO.,
Buhler, Kans., April 28, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: As a common citizen of this great country of ours, I personally appeal to you, as our representative in the United States Senate Chamber, to be instrumental in calling a halt in the Hitlerlike attitudes, as is evidenced by the Government taking over the Montgomery Ward stores in Chicago during this past week upon an Executive order through the War Labor Board.

To my way of thinking this is evidence enough for anybody to realize that there is an element in the administration, and has been during the past 12 years, whose main purpose has been and still is, to kill the American way of living, and in its stead substitute a government such as we are fighting today to exterminate.

There is only one hope as I see it, and that is for the Congress of the United States to see the handwriting on the wall and take action, immediately, without any further delay. Unless Congress does this very thing, there is very little hope that the boys who are now offering their lives on foreign soil will find a find a country fit for them or anybody else to live in when they do come home after the war.

I sincerely trust and hope that Congress will act and that immediately.

Respectfully yours,

C. N. HIEBERT.

SALINA, KANS., *April 28, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Just a few lines to get some very important information in reference to the action taken by some of the super powers (that can't be wrong) in reference to the Montgomery Ward & Co. deal in Chicago.

If we have laws that permit the Government to take over an industry such as the corner merchandise store, there had better be some changes in the laws or some fair interpretations of them.

It seems to me that if the W. P. B., or whatever it is, "gets by" with this, we might just as well call our boys back from Europe and other parts of the world and turn them loose on the source of such things that are not very becoming to a democratic form of government.

Would appreciate your taking a little of your time to explain what authority the W. P. B. has in this case and also what you are doing to prevent such occurrence in the future.

Yours very truly,

L. J. REES.

DRS. NEWMAN & YOUNG CLINIC,
Fort Scott, Kans., April 28, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: I am writing you today in regard to the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co., in Chicago, Ill., by the Government.

I will say if there is any such law in regard to private property, it is high time that Congress repeal that law and write one in such plain language that anyone can understand what it means. I think this is the sentiment among most of the folks around these parts.

Laws by Executive order and public courts operated by the President all over the United States certainly is doing something to this country.

I also want to drop this suggestion: If the farmers are paid enough for their corn so that they can replace it with next year's crop, you would have no trouble getting corn.

Isn't it about time that Congress takes these powers away from the Executive?

Yours very truly,

J. R. NEWMAN, M. D.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 27, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Perhaps I'm not fully advised in the case of the United States Government taking over the Chicago Montgomery Ward & Co. plant on the direct order of our President, but to me the whole affair stinks. If such action isn't dictatorship, I'd surely appreciate a more distinct and understandable definition of the word.

I have no love for Montgomery Ward & Co. and can't remember buying a nickel's worth from them, but they should be entitled to run their own business—or perhaps black figures can't be understood by the New Deal and red will be more appropriate.

Sure these are wartimes, but the little fellow has been bound and gagged a long time, and it now appears that big ones are starting to fall, too. Can't anything be done to restore Congress to power?

Please do not construe this as criticism of your efforts. I'm just getting "red headed"—and who else can I blow off to besides a good Republican?

Respectfully yours,

A. A. TODD.

THE WICHITA DESICCATING CO.,
Wichita, Kans., April 29, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a word to let you know that thousands of your people in Wichita are "burned up" at the action of the President concerning the Montgomery Ward deal, many are wondering if even though we are at war, impeachment should not be the reward of one who fails to defend the Constitution.

Sincerely,

O. J. EASTMAN.

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *April 28, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Government's recent seizure of Montgomery Ward's Chicago plant appears to a lot of us voters as a rotten, high-handed, dirty piece of business. The company was apparently not engaged in war work. Why the W. L. B. and the President should stick their collective necks out in this direction for reasons other than to fight unions' battles for them is hard to understand.

On the basis of this procedure the W. L. B. and the President can take over every place of business in the country if they want to, whether the business is engaged in war work or not. And apparently such seized company would not have recourse at law for a fair trial.

A large section of voters that I know of, don't like this action at all. I trust there will be a congressional investigation of this latest W. L. B. move and that as a result of such investigation W. L. B. will be told by Congress in a specific way what it can and cannot do.

Sincerely,

F. F. KIMBALL.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 30, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

We look astounded upon Montgomery Ward seizure. Congress must vigorously and effectively curb such unwarranted extension of bureaucratic power. Administrators will forever use maximum implied authority granted them not the minimum. Laws passed without restrictions definitely make you responsible for abuses.

KANSAS HOTEL ASSOCIATION,
R. C. MCCORMICK, *President.*

EMPORIA, KANS., *April 28, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I hope the Senate and Congress of the United States will and are doing something about the seizure of the Montgomery Ward & Co. plant. If the mayor of Emporia was to notify me to sign up with the painters union here I would tell him to go to a certain hot place; and I am of the opinion the President has no more authority than the mayor has.

The sooner we clean out the tyrants from the White House the better for our country.

Respectfully,

J. G. FRANKLIN.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 28, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I know you are always glad to hear expressions of opinion from your constituents, as I have written you on other occasions.

I have talked to many of my friends concerning the current controversy of the seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant. They all seem to feel as I do that the seizure is unjustified and illegal. Incidentally, I am not connected with Montgomery Ward in any way and never have been, and do not own one share of stock. In fact, I do not even trade at this store.

However, I feel very strongly that the seizure of private property is unconstitutional, in a case like this where the seized company is not directly engaged in war production. I hope you agree with this opinion and will use your influence to see that justice is done.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID D. FISHBACK.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 28, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The President of the United States has finally used force to seize private property. History would indicate that such a move usually precedes complete dictatorship.

I'm sick at heart to realize that our own country is at the very brink of the thing our armed forces are fighting against. So are millions of other citizens. And what will those returning servicemen think and do if we lose our constitutional form of government?

It's too late now to discuss details and whys and wherefores and who is to blame. The time is here to end the President's abuse of power. It's time for you and your colleagues to take drastic measures to regain the powers delegated to Congress alone. How you do it makes no difference—call it a revolt by Congress, a return to representative government, or government according to the Constitution.

Short of open rebellion the people can do nothing except to act through their Senators and Representatives. Regardless of the ex-

ample set by the President and his followers the people still believe in constitutional procedure. Therefore it's up to you, and I, for one, say "go the limit."

Respectfully yours,

U. A. DENKER.

CONCORDIA, KANS., *April 29, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Although I have been on the verge of writing you before in regard to different things which have come to pass, the matter of Montgomery Ward & Co. is, in my opinion, the most high-handed and dictatorial act of this Government I have ever seen.

It would certainly seem to be time, and in fact long past the time to see that labor unions, the War Labor Board, and others who made this disgraceful action possible are promptly put in their places and to see that the business of this country is allowed to function freely.

If Congress gave these powers it is time they were withdrawn.

I have never seen such general criticism of any situation as there is over this affair.

Yours very truly,

R. M. BAYS.

KANSAS COLOR PRESS,
Lawrence, Kans., April 29, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The seizure of the Montgomery Ward firm in Chicago by Roosevelt, on the flimsiest excuse ever put out by a man in public office, reminds us all again that Congress has just got to see to it that war or no war law must be equal and fair to all in the United States.

In that action in Chicago you have a good idea of what a combination of labor racketeers and politicians inclined to perpetuate themselves in office can do in case they want to and that time is right here when somebody has to see to it that whether a man labors, loafs, or has money invested justice "impartial"—get that quoted word—must be assured us all.

To sheol with any nation or country which builds up one class at the expense of another, refusing justice and a square deal to all concerned! I maintain Congress has to take a hand in this diabolical game as played by Roosevelt under the guise of law and war necessity, for if Congress doesn't see to it that lopsided statutes are eliminated and justice made to prevail then we are in for something awful once this war does end. Personally, I can't express myself capably this afternoon, but maybe in the foregoing you can picture some of the outrage I feel, and I believe I am as patriotic as any American citizen that lives, and, old as I am, I'd try my best to whip the buzzard who says I'm not. But I'm sick and tired of the lousy outfit and their apparent studied design to fasten on America the same style of government of the God-forsaken Europeans and Asiatics—favoritism for one class for political profit and legislation to enrich racketeers at the expense of those who toil and wear their lives out in hard work to live independent, respectable lives.

I hope you of Congress will do something to see that a fair and square deal is ordered for all, regardless of vocation, profession, or what have you. Legalized racketeering is and has been running rampant and it is high time, in my judgment and dozens of others that I have talked with, that a fair shake and a square deal be provided every man in America. Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN ZIMMERMAN.

TOPEKA, KANS., *April 28, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Congress of the United States will have completely abrogated its functions if it fails forthwith to make as a "must" order of business legislation curbing Ogpu or Gestapo incidents such as occurred at Chicago yesterday in the forcible ejection of a member of the management of Montgomery Ward.

Please do not misjudge the rising temper of the average citizen, which is being caused by such flagrant infractions and violations of civil rights and liberties.

Very truly yours,

A. LOUIS SOULE.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The soldiers on distant battlefields must be wondering today what kind of a country this is that they are fighting for.

The seizure of mines by the Government was a necessary action, but I see no logical reason for Mr. Roosevelt to immediately take over the entire company of Montgomery Ward.

If this company is to be considered as a vital war industry then every industry, every small business, every farm might well be in danger, and even the very democracy for which our boys are fighting is in grave danger of being destroyed.

Mr. Roosevelt acted hastily and no doubt believed he was doing the right thing, but no man—no matter how much experience he has had—is always capable of making wise decisions.

As a representative of the people of Kansas for many years you have the respect and confidence of a large group of persons who are ready to back you up in whatever action you deem necessary. Montgomery Ward has always stood for a fair deal. Let's see that it gets one.

Sincerely,

Miss LORNA BROWN.

C. A. KARLAN FURNITURE CO.,
Topeka, Kans., April 28, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

MY DEAR SENATOR: * * * Nothing in recent years has caused such grave concern in business circles as the Montgomery Ward-W. L. B. controversy. At our Rotary luncheon yesterday it was the sole topic of conversation and men gravely admitted that a most serious situation has resulted from granting too much power and authority to those who are using it to further their selfish interests. It is hoped that the courts will quickly decide this case, in all fairness and according to law.

With warmest personal regards and appreciation for the fine service you are rendering, also hoping you are enjoying good health.

Sincerely,

C. A. KARLAN.

If the Government gets away with the Montgomery Ward case, as a veteran of the First World War, I am ashamed of what I fought for, and my son who is now in the Army will feel the same.

HARRY E. BLAISDEL,
Hutchinson, Kans.

APRIL 28, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: What is Congress going to do about the Montgomery Ward seizure? We know you will go right.

Best regards.

Mrs. GEORGE BARCUS,
Chanute, Kans.

APRIL 28, 1944.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything further in regard to the Montgomery Ward case beyond what I said the other day when the matter was injected into the Senatorial situation by the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Inasmuch as the prosecution has now indulged for an hour and a half in presenting its side of the matter, I presume it would not be out of order to present some facts with reference to——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator, but this is the only time I shall yield. I have not yet begun my remarks.

Mr. BRIDGES. There is only one thing I should like to ask the Senator. The other day he made a remark in reply to my statement that if the President could take over the plant of Montgomery Ward & Co. under the general powers which Attorney General Biddle has told the President he possesses, then under the same authority the President could take over any drug store or any corner grocery store or any victory garden in the land. The Senator from Kentucky at that time remarked that those words of mine fell of their own weight, they were so ridiculous. In view of Mr. Biddle's latest statement in Chicago, as reported in the press this morning under the headline in the New York Times "Courts ought to submit to President, is plea by Biddle in Ward case" and in the Washington Post this morning under the headline "No business immune from President's war powers, says Biddle in Chicago," I wonder if quite a different light is not shed on the very dangerous situation which exists. I should like to have the Senator make some reference to these statements of the Attorney General.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will choose my own course in pursuing the very brief remarks I had intended to submit.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it would be well if the Senator were to answer my inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Neither the headlines appearing in the New York Times nor in the Washington Post nor in any other newspaper would change the opinion which I expressed the other day with reference to the Senator's statement before the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, has Mr. Biddle's statement in Chicago changed the Senator's opinion?

Mr. BARKLEY. The part of Mr. Biddle's statement which I read did not contain any such statement as that to which the Senator makes reference.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Kentucky is not up to date, then.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not quite. I do not read all the newspapers which are published in the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator read Mr. Biddle's statement?

Mr. BARKLEY. I usually take home with me to read at night the New York Times, the Baltimore Sun, and the New York Herald Tribune, because I do not have time to read them earlier in the

day. During the day I read the Washington newspapers. I have seen no such headline as that read by the Senator. If there is such a headline, it would have no effect whatever on my opinion.

Mr. BRIDGES. And Mr. Biddle's statement would not change the Senator's opinion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would want to read Mr. Biddle's entire statement as he prepared it before judging by some paragraph that newspapers have picked out for purposes of a headline. We all find the difficulty here when we make a prepared statement that if it receives a headline at all it is something which is grabbed out of the body of the article or speech for the purpose of a headline, and, therefore, I do not govern myself by headlines. But I do not want to become diverted from what I intended to say.

Mr. BRIDGES. I hope the Senator will cover it all.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not going to cover it all. I am simply going to put into the RECORD some observations which seem to me to be entirely pertinent, but not for the purpose of trying the Montgomery Ward case here in the Senate, because I still insist that the legality of the action taken is a matter for the courts and not for the Senate of the United States, and all the investigations which might be ordered because of a frenzied feeling of indignation or for any other reason by any committee of the Senate would have no legal effect upon the action taken by the Attorney General or the President. It was for that reason that it seemed to me wise on the part of the Senate to let the courts pursue the matter and decide the question of legality, but inasmuch as it seems desirable on the part of some to try it here on the floor, I think it might not be out of place to put into the RECORD a few things in regard to it.

I desire to read first an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of last Friday, April 28, entitled "A Persistent Defier of the Government."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not now, Mr. President. Let me finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky refuses to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The editorial is as follows:

The quarrel between Montgomery Ward & Co. and the United States Government has a long history. It is the outcome of a persistent antiadministration policy first formulated by Sewell Avery, chairman of the board of directors, chairman also of the U. S. Gypsum Co., and a director of seven other important Midwest industrial concerns, back in the days of N. R. A. The firm then challenged the minimum wage directives of the National Recovery Act as "illegal and unfair."

The history of the present stalemate dates from Montgomery Ward's refusal to recognize the United Mail Order, Warehouse, and Retail Employees' Union as bargaining agent for its employees. Then began the series of advertisements, signed by Mr. Avery, which in almost every metropolitan newspaper in the country has carried on a long and specious defense of the company's defiance of the National Labor Relations Board, the War Labor Board, the Department of Commerce, the Army, and the President.

The technic of Montgomery Ward's labor baiting has been polite and legalistic, in contrast to the thug and tear-gas antiunionism of a decade ago. But it is nonetheless deadly and nonetheless against the spirit of the Wagner Act, which has translated into law the right of labor to deal with management through collective bargaining agencies of its own choosing. Mr. Avery's method of wearing down the union and then, after a persistent campaign of ignoring it, to claim that it is no longer a representative bargaining group is one that the Supreme Court only recently declared to be in violation of the Wagner Act. The Court upheld the War Labor Board on the point that Montgomery Ward now challenges, and said that in dealings with a union the company has persistently sought to break down, it must first accept the union as bargaining agent and only then, after permitting the union to prove its power of representation, it may join with employees in seeking a new election. But the Court held that the method of first weakening and then persistently challenging the union, as Montgomery Ward has done, is merely an effective way of breaking up unions.

The bitterness of Mr. Avery's antiadministration bias, as well as his determination not to yield an inch to Government regulation, is evidenced in the seizure of the plant under the President's order. It is difficult to see how the President could have acted otherwise. Although orders from the W. L. B. upholding the union and recognition of the expired contract until a new one could be agreed upon are now 3 months old, the company ignored them under its decision that the Board has no right to issue orders but can merely "advise." Under such circumstances a strike was not surprising. The President, recognizing the fact that the strike was occurring in an important industrial region, that it was attracting widespread sympathy from other workers, and that it was interrupting essential civilian services, ordered the union to call off the strike and the company to come to an agreement with the union. The union complied, the company still resisted.

The whole question of the Presidential power to seize plants under such circumstances and of the authority of the War Labor Board to back up its demands is now likely to be aired in court. No fair-minded person can hold any brief for Sewell Avery or for the manner in which the company has challenged both the law of the land and the Presidential authority in wartime. Nevertheless, it seems painfully unfortunate that the Army, in taking over the Ward plant, as it was instructed to do, found it necessary to resort to force to remove Mr. Avery from the building. The order under which he was bodily removed was upheld by Attorney General Biddle, but the Army and the Department of Commerce, with force and the law on their side, might well have avoided personal encounter with a rancorous reactionary and thus have avoided giving him a first-class ticket to martyrdom.

Mr. President, on the 30th of April, in the same newspaper, appeared an editorial entitled "For the Courts, Not Congress, To Decide." I shall not read the editorial, but I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of April 30, 1944]

FOR THE COURTS, NOT CONGRESS, TO DECIDE

It is pretty ironic that Members of the Congress which jammed the Smith-Connally Anti-Strike Act through over President Roosevelt's veto and strong protest start yelling to heaven the moment the act is involved against a conspicuously defiant employer—Montgomery Ward & Co. But even with all the irritation against organized labor which inspired passage of the act, it was not deemed feasible, though some Members of Congress might have liked, to exempt Sewell Avery specifically from its compulsions. So the thing for the congressional shouters to do is to calm down and leave to the courts the question of whether President Roosevelt and Attorney General Biddle have properly applied the law.

The project for a congressional investigation of the seizure of Ward's Chicago facilities is simply silly. Investigation of the only question possibly involved—whether Ward's is what the Smith-Connally Act calls a "plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort"—is already under investigation in the only place it may justly be investigated, that is, in the courts. Though the episode has been attended by the usual loud and tearful farewells to the American way, usurpation of the judicial function by congressional investigating committees would seem to us a far more serious departure from American law and custom than is apparent anywhere so far in the Government's action in the Montgomery Ward case.

As a practical matter, it appears to the Courier-Journal there is no question that Ward's falls into the category of a plant contributing "articles or materials which may be required for the war effort." It deals in many things essential to home-front production, including agricultural implements; it has obtained thousands of priorities from the War Production Board on the ground of this essentialit. it owns a manufacturing plant which certainly would be affected by a strike and is making carburetors, propellers, and gun mounts for military aircraft. Nor can there be left out of consideration the danger mentioned by the War Labor Board, Mr. Biddle, and Mr. Roosevelt, that continued labor troubles at Ward's would spread to other plants.

However, the Courier-Journal's opinion that Ward's is definitely and tangibly contributing to the war effort is no more valuable or important in the circumstances than that of a Member of Congress who thinks otherwise. The issue must be decided by the courts. Mr. Biddle promptly submitted it to the Federal district court at Chicago, and the company's counsel were already preparing to do the same thing when he did so. Mr. Avery still has his rights—and his lawyers—and certainly a disposition to defend those rights, as he sees them, through every avenue open to able corporation attorneys.

Mr. Avery has been battling labor in this way for a long time—the union involved in the present case for 4 bitter years. The record denies that Ward's is prolabor and prounion, as alleged by Mr. Avery, except in his own private conception of those terms. Ward's and other companies under Mr. Avery's influence have been hostile, in the accepted sense of that term, to organized labor for years. It is a shame that he has pursued the quarrel so intransigently in wartime and that he could not continue to deal with the union, even under protest, in consideration of the crucial nature of the days through which we are passing in the world conflict. Surely he could have held in abeyance until peacetime the point on which he stickles so truculently.

The point, be it said, is not altogether invalid. The objection on which he defied the War Labor Board and refused to extend the union contract in Chicago was to its maintenance-of-union-membership clause. This is not the closed shop, as Mr. Avery sometimes calls it, but it undoubtedly may tend to produce the closed shop. Under maintenance of membership, members of a union at the time of the signing of a contract must remain members during the life of the contract. It is a device accepted for wartime by the War Labor Board for the protection of unions from raids by employers or rival unions. Undoubtedly, under stable employment conditions maintenance of union membership would maintain the same union as bargaining agent from one contract to another and probably enable it in time to enforce a closed shop. (It is because of heavy labor turn-over that the Chicago union has lost strength, if it has lost strength, as Mr. Avery alleges.)

The closed shop, especially in the present state of labor regulation where the individual member of many a union is a voiceless man, is a dubious thing, and it is a pity that the war found our labor legislation as far as it is from a just solution of the problems the closed-shop issue prevents. But these problems can't be settled all at once, least of all by Avery methods. It is only fair to concede that back of all his reactionary roaring and seething he has a point, even if wrongly pushed, and also to concede that his defenders who assert that he was given harsher treatment by the Government than his opposite number in labor's ranks, John L. Lewis, make an unfortunately plausible case.

We reprint on this page this morning two articles on the Chicago episode—one a piece from the Nation and the other an editorial from the New York Times—in the interest of public information on the issues involved. Both are largely factual, though presented from very different points of view. But, whatever the point of view, we cannot see how it is possible to differ from the Times' conclusion that "the chairman and directors have not acted wisely from the national standpoint. It is one thing to make one's point; it is another to act in wartime with unnecessary belligerence and defiance."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which I clipped from one of yesterday's newspapers. The article is written by Dorothy Thompson. Miss Thompson is a well-known columnist and correspondent, and is usually credited with knowing something about the facts she discusses. If there is anything wrong with the facts contained in this article by Miss Thompson, I would invite anyone to challenge them. I read from the article:

When Sewell Lee Avery hissed "New Dealer" at Attorney General Biddle, who had entered his office to take over the plant of Montgomery Ward & Co., he seemed to overlook the fact that Mr. Biddle was there under a law that had originated, not in the White House, but in Congress, and had been passed over the President's veto.

No one will dispute that.

I read further from the article:

The Smith-Connally Act had its origin in John L. Lewis' defiance of the War Labor Board. The purpose of the act was to provide a means for enforcing acceptance by both employers and unions of W. L. B. orders. The means prescribed by the law was the "immediate possession" on order of the President, of plants in which either employers or unions failed to accept the rulings of the W. L. B. provided the President finds "after investigation" that "there is an interruption of the operation of such a plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance," and that "the national defense program will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption."

The President has no power to act, unless a dispute which the W. L. B. finds itself unable to settle is referred to him by it. Then he is compelled to attempt to settle it by order, and if this fails, to invoke the procedures defined in the Smith-Connally Act.

Since the Board was established in January 1942, it has settled 6,000 disputes and referred only 17 to the President. Of these 17, 7, including this latest case of Montgomery Ward, arose out of company rejection of rulings, and 10 out of union rejection. Of the 7 plants involved, 2 were held only a few days; 3 have been taken since mid April; 2 are still being operated some months after seizure.

Of the 10 cases involving labor defiance, 4 were settled by the union on a telegram from the President; 6 involved taking possession of the plants; 4 were seized but returned to their owners in a few days; only 2—both coal mines—are still retained by the Government.

There is nothing peculiar to the Montgomery Ward case, and exactly the same lawful procedure was followed. Employees of Montgomery Ward struck when the company refused to extend the contract with the union, which had been certified by the National Labor Relations Board. A similar situation had arisen before, in 1942, when Mr. Avery had also refused to sign a contract. Then he complied upon Presidential order. The contract was for a year. When it expired, Mr. Avery refused to renew. The union went to the W. L. B. which 3 months ago ordered extension of contract with one of the two members representing industry dissenting.

The Board, on appeal, made an exception to usual policy. Montgomery Ward claimed a big labor turn-over since the last election, and that the union no longer represented the workers. The Board ordered extension of contract for 30 days and sent the case to N. L. R. B. for a new election. It has been uniform policy to presume contracts to hold until or unless new elections result in certifying other bargaining agencies.

There was another public hearing, and on April 5, the Board, this time including the former dissenting industrial representative, unanimously demanded that the company comply. Mr. Avery refused. So the case went to the President.

The President then acted as ordered by law.

There is no difference in procedure in this case and the case of the coal mines. The first coal strike occurred before the Smith-Connally Act had been passed. The act was passed in order to provide means of compelling compliance. When Mr. Lewis continued recalcitrant, the President took immediate possession of the mines. The President could not take immediate possession of Mr. Lewis because the act gives him no such power. Mr. Lewis was compelled to arbitrate and he did not get what he had asked for.

It has been suggested by some that in that case the President should have taken bodily possession of Mr. Lewis. Of course, the law did not authorize any such thing; and, besides that, it would not have had any helpful effect or would not have contributed anything whatever to the operation of the mines, if the President had taken bodily possession of Mr. Lewis or had made some other disposition of him.

The article continues, as follows:

Montgomery Ward & Co. denies that the labor disturbance threatens the war effort. The War Labor Board in other instances has ruled that strikes occurring in plants situated in centers of war industry threaten to spread and indirectly affect stable employer-employee relations to war plants. But in this case it is a peculiar attitude for the company to take, since the Chicago house has asked for no less than 36,000 preferential priorities from the War Production Board on the ground that its merchandise was essential to the war effort. A subsidiary company in Springfield, Hummer Manufacturing Co., to which it is presumed the strike would have extended, is directly engaged in the manufacture of gun mounts and airplane parts.

Montgomery Ward has defied the law which is a law of Congress, specifically directing the President's procedure. And what all the yelling is about I cannot understand—unless it is because this is a campaign year, and the dispute is in Chicago.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the article written by Miss Thompson states that the War Labor Board has made an effective decision in some 6,000 different cases?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, Mr. President; the Senator is correct. What Miss Thompson's article states is that the War Labor Board, since its establishment in January 1942, has settled 6,000 disputes, and has referred only 17 disputes to the President. Of the 17, 10 were on account of disturbances created by labor, and 7 were on account of the recalcitrance of employers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator a question. I do not think the article makes the explanation I am trying to obtain. Of the 17 cases which have been referred to the President, can the Senator tell me whether any one of the 17 involved circumstances which square with those in the case of Montgomery Ward & Co.? In other words, in those 17 cases were the plants producing implements of war, or were any of them in the business of distributing implements of war?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, I presume it would be fair to say that in the other plants a larger proportion of the products was used for war purposes than would be true in the Montgomery Ward case, because it is a Nation-wide mail-order house, and last year sold approximately $600,000,000 worth of goods, as I recall the figures, to the people of the United States. In the case of the coal mines, which was one of the 17 cases, of course the production of coal is an essential war facility, in a larger proportion, I should say, than in the case of Montgomery Ward & Co. In the case of the Brewster airplane factory, in New Jersey, Delaware, or wherever it may be, I presume it might be said to be entirely a war production plant. In the case of the Ken-Rad Co., in my own State, under similar circumstances the President took over the plant a couple of weeks ago. It manufactures tubes for the Army and Navy. Such manufacture may include a large proportion of its production, although it probably also produces for civilian consumption. In view of the nature of the business of Montgomery Ward & Co., and the large amount of its sales and distribution, it may be that a smaller proportion of its activity is engaged in war enterprises than in the case

of other companies, although I presume the Hummer Co., which manufactures propellers and gun mounts, is almost exclusively engaged in the production of war material.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the particular store of Montgomery Ward & Co. located in the city of Chicago is simply a distributing agency for war materials, as well as for civilian supplies. I understand that certain auxiliaries of Montgomery Ward & Co. do actually produce implements of war; but so far as the particular store taken over by the Government is concerned it is my understanding that it is solely a distributing agency, and is not engaged in any way in the manufacture of war products.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as the store in Chicago is concerned, I presume it is wholly a distribution center. I do not know whether the company manufactures anything elsewhere and brings it to the distribution point; but it seems from the facts recited in the article which I have just read that it has regarded itself as an essential war activity, because it has requested 36,000 priorities, not only as to employees, but, as was shown in the evidence yesterday before the court in Chicago, it has requested priority as to materials, because it has been producing things which it regarded as essential to the war effort. It based its requests for priority, both as to materials and personnel, upon its status as an essential war industry.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that the article written by Dorothy Thompson and the argument made by her are based upon the fact that the Montgomery Ward & Co. case comes under the Smith-Connally Act, I was anxious to ascertain whether or not any of the 17 cases which have been submitted to the President are on all fours with the Montgomery Ward case.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt if they are what lawyers call on all fours, because I presume that the proportion of business done by Montgomery Ward & Co. in distributing products is larger than the proportion of its business, either directly or through its subsidiaries, in actual war materials.

Mr. LUCAS. Obviously the plant located in Chicago, the place where the controversy is now raging, is strictly a distributing agency, and not a manufacturer.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield in a moment.

In that connection, it might be well to quote the provisions of the Smith-Connally Act, which was not an act of the President, because as Senators will recall, he vetoed it, and it was passed over his veto. I am sure the record will show that some of the Senators who are protesting most loudly because the President took Congress at its word, voted to enact this very law over the veto of the President.

Mr. BYRD and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, the Senator from Kentucky has said that Montgomery Ward has been classified as an essential war industry.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I said it classified itself as an essential war industry.

Mr. BYRD. I have received a telegram from Mr. Sewell Avery in which he says:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 1, 1944.*

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate:

War manpower regulations classify Ward's Chicago activities as not essential or even locally needed. Under Selective Service regulations Ward's mail order and retail business not listed as essential activity. No Chicago employees have been granted deferments as engaged in or necessary to war production. Some keymen, like those of other merchants, have been deferred for limited periods as necessary in the distribution of goods considered necessary for civilian use.

SEWELL AVERY.

Certainly the Selective Service does not regard Montgomery Ward as essential, because there is no provision for deferment of its employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand why it should have made application for 36,000 priorities unless the officials of the company had thought that it was essential to the war effort.

Mr. BYRD. Whatever they may have thought, the Selective Service evidently did not agree with them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me quote some of the provisions of the famous Smith-Connally Act, which was passed over the veto of the President, and under which he is now acting.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when the Senator gets ready to yield, I should like to have him yield to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will ease the Senator's pain by yielding to him now. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. A while ago the Senator said that he did not believe in what the newspapers said, and that what they said made little difference to him; yet he has spent the past half hour reading from newspapers.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is not quoting me correctly. I said I did not make up my mind from reading headlines in the newspapers.

Mr. BRIDGES. Apparently what is written in the newspapers has some influence, provided it is written so as to agree with the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I placed the article in the RECORD for whatever any Senator may think it is worth. If the Senator does not believe that Dorothy Thompson's opinions are worth anything——

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is quite all right. The Senator has a right to his opinion. However, the Senator has not denied the facts stated. If he can deny them, from knowledge of his own, I welcome that denial and proof to the contrary.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe in what the Louisville Courier-Journal has to say?

Mr. BARKLEY. Sometimes I do; and sometimes I do not.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wondered if the Senator always believed what was written in the Louisville Courier-Journal. I remember a recent editorial in that newspaper which condemned the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. The Louisville Courier-Journal, which is a newspaper in the largest city in my State, has the same right to criticize me that it has to criticize anyone else. I have never protested against any criticism that newspaper may have made of me. I have not always agreed that its criticisms were correct, but I have never denied it the right to make them, and I hope I shall never become so thin-skinned that I cannot take criticisms from newspapers, even in my own State, which honestly disagree with any position I may take.

Mr. BRIDGES. When the Senator condemned the newspapers from which I was quoting earlier in the day, he did not mean to condemn what all newspapers report, did he?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is pettifogging. I did not condemn the newspapers from which the Senator read. I simply stated that I had not read them, and that I am not governed by headlines.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the Senator is governed by Dorothy Thompson.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not governed by Dorothy Thompson; but if I had to choose between being governed by her and being governed by the Senator from New Hampshire, I might select Dorothy instead of the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no doubt the Senator would do so. I think she is more his type.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then we have settled that controversy. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the statute under which the President has acted, and which was no doubt voted for over his veto by most, if not all, the Senators who have protested here today because he has acted under it, has some interesting provisions——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield once more.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did Mr. Biddle say in Chicago that he had acted under the Smith-Connally Act?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what he said in Chicago. I was not there, and I have not read his speech. In his letter to the President, he bases his opinion, in part, upon the Smith-Connally Act. If the Senator will read that letter, he will see that that is true.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator likes to be up to date. What Mr. Biddle said before the court would be the latest thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it would be the latest thing; but I should like to see all of it, and not a paragraph or two selected by a newspaper correspondent, which he thinks more important than anything else in the whole speech.

Mr. BRIDGES. All the Senator wishes to demonstrate is that he has a selectivity in newspapers.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I have no selectivity in newspapers. But I do not believe it is fair that I should be required to make up my mind on the basis of newspaper selectivity of paragraphs in an Attorney General's speech before a court,

which lasted probably for an hour or two.

Mr. BRIDGES. So long as the Senator wishes to present a fair case, I should like to present him with a Washington newspaper and a New York newspaper, so that the whole matter may be in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator need not go to that trouble. I can buy a newspaper. I thank the Senator for his generosity, but I have that much money. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, let me proceed. I have already taken up more time than I intended to take.

I read from the provisions of the Smith-Connally Act:

As used in this act——

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, from what is the Senator reading?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am reading section 2 of the Smith-Connally Act, under "Definitions."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is that the Selective Training and Service Act?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I am reading from the Smith-Connally Act, called the War Labor Disputes Act, which was enacted over the President's veto in June 1943:

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any organized group of persons.

(b) The term "war contract" means—

(1) a contract with the United States entered into on behalf of the United States by an officer or employee of the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, or the United States Maritime Commission;

(2) a contract with the United States entered into by the United States pursuant to an act entitled "An act to promote the defense of the United States";

(3) a contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of—

(A) any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

(B) any building, structure or facility;

(C) any machinery, tool, material, supply, article, or commodity; or

(D) any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C);

the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of which by the contractor in question is found by the President as being contracted for in the prosecution of the war.

(c) The term "war contractor" means the person producing, manufacturing, constructing, reconstructing, installing, maintaining, storing, repairing, mining, or transporting under a war contract or a person whose plant, mine, or facility is equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required in the prosecution of the war or which may be useful in connection therewith; but such term shall not include a carrier, as defined in title I of the Railway Labor Act, or a carrier by air subject to title II of such act.

I do not know whether Montgomery Ward & Co. engage in the storage of any articles which are regarded as essential to war. I do not know whether they can be described as transporting articles which are essential to war. I understand "storage" and "transportation" to refer not merely to guns, or even to articles which are manufactured for the purpose of use on a battle front, but it seems to me that anything essential to the war effort, which is being stored or transported, may come under such a definition. It still is the definition of Congress, not the definition of the President.

I read from section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith.

And so forth. Here is section 6:

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever any plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person, to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption, or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

It may have been unfortunate that it was necessary to use several soldiers in ejecting Mr. Avery from the plant and from his office. It was not the first time soldiers were used in the taking over of a plant. We all know that soldiers were sent to some of the mines which were taken over because of a labor strike and because the miners quit work. The soldiers were not required to eject bodily anyone from the mines or to carry anyone out, because the miners, the mine operators, and the owners obeyed the order of the President, and it was not necessary for the soldiers to eject anyone. However, I do not recall hearing any Senator rise in his place to denounce the Government of the United States or the President of the United States, or the Army of the United States when soldiers were sent to the mines of the country to be on guard in connection with the preservation of order and, if necessary, to take possession of the mines which were taken over by the President under the Smith-Connally Act or under any authority conferred upon him by the Selective Service Act, by the Second War Powers Act, or any other act of Congress.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to invite attention of the Senator to a portion of section 3 of Public Law 89, and to section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. I wish to read the following part of the section, which occurs somewhat subsequent to the portion the Senator from Kentucky read:

Provided, That whenever any such plant, mine, or facility has been or is hereafter so taken by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or facility shall be returned to the owners.

After the amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act the language was not confined to the words "strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage," but it also included the words "other cause."

Mr. BARKLEY. I should interpret the words "other cause" as meaning any other cause which might be calculated to interfere with the war effort. However, under the language read by the Senator from Minnesota, the President would have very wide authority and discretion in determining what would be the "other cause" which would justify the taking over of a plant.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If I may say so, it seems to me that the Smith-Connally Act made it possible for the President to take over a plant whenever there was a threat of a strike or other labor controversy.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is undoubtedly true.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is what I thought, and for that reason I voted against the measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not present at the time when the Senate voted to pass the bill, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. But I voted for the Smith-Connally bill, which subsequently was changed by the amendments made to the bill in the other House. I was ill and was not present in the Senate when, after the bill was passed by the two Houses, the conference report was agreed to. If I had been present at the time, I would have voted against the conference report, and subsequently would have voted to sustain the veto of the President.

Mr. President, I rose to state that, despite all the furor which has been created by the Montgomery Ward & Co. case there have been in the past similar situations in which the Army was utilized. No objection ever was made on the floor of the Senate, because they had to do with interruptions of work brought about by labor unions, not by the head of a great commercial organization. I do not know whether that fact has anything to do with the attitude of Senators on the subject; but if we try the case in the Senate, I think that circumstance is at least one worthy of consideration.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to say to the Senate that under a resolution which was adopted some weeks before the Montgomery Ward & Co. case came

into such wide public notice, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary was authorized and directed, and an allocation of funds was made in accordance with the resolution, to make a study of all Executive orders and directives. Under the resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary believed that the public interest in the Montgomery Ward & Co. case demanded that the Committee on the Judiciary take notice of the situation, and proceed at once.

Immediately on the matter being drawn to our attention we sent an investigator to the city of Chicago. Reports have come in from the investigator. The investigator will return to the city of Washington tomorrow. The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary expects to proceed with due expedition to the holding of hearings here in the Capitol, at which representatives of Montgomery Ward, as well as the Department of Justice, and perhaps, also, the War Labor Board, will be asked to come before it. The whole matter will be gone into thoroughly and fearlessly, with the idea of determining whether or not additional legislation or new legislation is necessary. That seems to me to be the function of a congressional investigating body, and we shall proceed along that line and proceed within the next few days, and continue to a conclusion, when we will render a report to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what the Senator has said about that matter. Of course, the resolution to which the Senator alludes was adopted practically without opposition here. It was not adopted for the purpose of rendering any finding or final decision upon the legality of orders and proclamations which have been issued by the President since the 4th of March 1933.

I think we all agree that the function of committees is to provide legislation and recommendations for legislation. No matter what the Judiciary Committee or any other committee might report upon a matter of this kind, it would bind nobody. It would be worth whatever it might be worth in the way of recommendations for legislation to amend existing law or enact legislation where no law is now on the statute books.

The point I made then and the point I make now is that such investigation, no matter what its findings may be, can have no legal effect upon a decision of a court in determining the power of the President.

Mr. McCARRAN. The expression of the Senator is entirely correct; what he says is undoubtedly true; but I may say that in my knowledge nothing has more aroused the American public than has the Montgomery Ward case at this hour in this Nation. The people today are calling for advice as to what their particular status is in their respective private businesses. It seems to me that the Committee on the Judiciary or any other committee, or the Congress itself, or the Senate can well afford to take steps to set the people at rest by some appropriate act. An expression on the floor of the Senate, after a careful and as far as possible a judicial investigation of the whole matter has been brought about, might go far in that direction.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say that I have no objection to the complete and fullest investigation of the whole Montgomery Ward episode. I had no objection to the original resolution under which the Committee on the Judiciary is now acting. I do not care who investigates it or how many investigations are made, so long as an impartial report of the facts and recommendations of the committee may be concerned.

It has been stated here that out of more than 6,000 labor disputes and controversies in the United States since January 1942 the War Labor Board has been able to settle all of them except 17. I do not know whether the Montgomery Ward dispute is among the 17, but there have been only 17 or 18 certified by the War Labor Board to the President. The President has attempted to settle those 17 by issuing an order in most cases for the striking workers to go back to work, and I think that in the majority of cases they have complied. So it seems, in spite of all the publicity and the Nation-wide interest in the Montgomery Ward case, growing out of its large connections and the sale of its commodities to some 30,000,000 people in the United States, that there is no danger of disrupting the ordinary processes of procedure because of 17 or 18 labor disputes, whether in that number the Montgomery Ward case is included.

It so happens that the President took over a plant in my State about 2 weeks ago involving 4,000 employees of the Ken-Rad Tube Co., in Owensboro, Ky. The company immediately went into court to challenge the authority of the President in taking over the plant. In Chicago the Attorney General went into court by obtaining a temporary injunction or restraining order, which is familiar to all lawyers who practice law in the general courts. In one case the company went into court to challenge the authority of the President in taking over the plant, and in the other case the Attorney General, or the Government through him, went into court to restrain the officers of a company from interfering with the Government's operation of the plant. In both cases the court must decide the legality of the action taken.

Because it is now in the courts I have refrained, as a Senator from Kentucky, as Members of the House of Representatives and others have refrained, from discussing that matter, although it is one of wide controversy in my State. Arguments were had before the Federal judge in Kentucky to determine whether the Government had the power to take over the plant. So, it seems to me to be extremely improper and inappropriate for me to discuss a case in my own State which the courts are called upon to settle, either for the purpose of trying to influence the court or for the purpose of trying to obtain some political advantage because of any side I might take or any comment I might make upon the act of the Government in taking over the particular plant.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to read a very brief editorial which I happened to pick up yesterday in the Evening Bulletin of the city of Philadelphia, which I think if I recall rightly is a Republican newspaper; it certainly is not a Democratic newspaper. It may be independent; I am not certain about that; but it certainly is not what the Senator from New Hampshire would scornfully refer to as a New Deal newspaper.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator puts me in that category.

Mr. BARKLEY. At one time or another I get into all categories in my effort to be fair. The editorial, as I have said, appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of yesterday, and the title of it is, "Still a Free People." It reads as follows:

STILL A FREE PEOPLE

Nothing but heat is added to the Montgomery Ward case by rhetorical questions in Congress suggesting that Attorney General Biddle aims to be an American Himmler or that a gestapo is being created. Opinions will differ about the wisdom of proceeding in the way the Government has acted, but our institutions are not in peril of being overthrown.

According to American tradition and practice, the courts are now being asked to decide the legality of the Government's action. The judiciary is independent and is not being terrorized by the Executive. This is the normal democratic approach to a solution of a conflict in interpretation of a law, and it bears no resemblance to procedure in a totalitarian state.

If the court should decide that the Attorney General's broad views of the President's war powers are correct, the right of Congress to change the law remains.

Congress also has the authority to modify provisions of the Wagner Act which, as at present administered, works injustice on employees or promotes the type of dispute which has led to the Montgomery Ward seizure. Since the courts continue to function and the people have the right to select Members of Congress, the overthrow of basic American liberties is not in sight.

That ought to be a consoling editorial, from at least an independent newspaper, to those who see in the Montgomery Ward episode the undermining of all our liberties, the departure of free institutions from the American continent, and the tearing of our Constitution into tatters.

I have concluded what I wished to say, and I therefore yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, in the discussion of the Montgomery Ward & Co. beach head this morning reference was made to the opinion of the Attorney General which was submitted by him to the President. I have obtained a copy of the opinion delivered to the President on the 22d of April 1944 and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 22, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My opinion has been requested on the legality of a proposed Executive order directing the Secretary of Commerce to take possession of and to operate certain plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago, Ill., in which a

strike is now in progress. From information received from other agencies and departments of the Government, I understand that the relevant facts are as follows:

Montgomery Ward is an Illinois corporation with its principal place of business in Chicago, Ill. It is engaged in selling commodities by mail order and at retail and in manufacturing certain of the commodities that it sells. In the fiscal year 1943 the company's gross sales amounted to $634,276,000. It is one of the two largest mail-order houses in the United States. The more important items of merchandise that the company handles include automobile supplies; building materials; farm machinery, equipment and supplies, including repair parts; heating apparatus; plumbing supplies; electrical supplies; clothing and shoes; drugs; furniture; hardware; home furnishings; drygoods and tiles. The company's plants and facilities in Chicago, Ill., include a warehouse, a mail-order division, and a retail store. It also operates mail-order establishments in 8 other States and retail stores in each of the other 47 States. The total number of the retail stores is in excess of 600. The company employs approximately 70,000 persons. No exact information as to the number of its customers is available, but it is conservatively estimated that they number in the millions. The company owns four factories which manufacture paints, varnish, fencing, and part of the farm equipment and supplies sold by the company. The paint factory is located at Chicago Heights, Ill. Other commodities distributed by the company are bought by it directly from manufacturers.

At the present time Hummer Manufacturing Co., a division of Montgomery Ward & Co., located at Springfield, Ill., is engaged in making carburetors, propellers, and gun mounts for military aircraft. Hummer Manufacturing Co. also makes farm supplies and machinery, including repair parts. Other divisions of Montgomery Ward & Co. are engaged in making or distributing other goods that are essential to the maintenance of the war economy. The company is an important distributor of general farm supplies and of farm machinery, such as corn and cotton planters, deep- and shallow-well systems, soil pulverizers, hay loaders, and poultry and farm equipment. Approximately 75 percent of the mail-order customers of the company are farmers, engaged in the production of essential agricultural commodities, who live in areas where they must depend upon mail-order houses for many necessary articles.

Government agencies have recognized the importance of the company to our war economy. The War Production Board has granted the company priority ratings for the materials it uses in the manufacture of commodities such as farm pumps, cream separators, paint, work clothing, wire and chain, that the Board regards as essential to the war effort.

The War Production Board has also assigned preference ratings to Montgomery Ward to enable it to buy from manufacturers other goods, for example, farm equipment, tools, and supplies of various kinds, that are required for essential civilian uses. Since April 1942, the Chicago branch of the company has filed with the War Production Board approximately 36,000 applications for preference ratings of this kind. Because of the scarcity of paper and paper products, it is impossible to obtain shipping containers without a preference rating from the War Production Board. Montgomery Ward has been given preference ratings to enable it to buy containers for packaging merchandise to fill mail orders. Furthermore, the War Production Board has given Montgomery Ward & Co. a preference rating for maintenance, repair, and operating supplies which enables the company to get supplies that would otherwise be unobtainable. Because of the company's importance to the war economy, the Office of Defense Transportation has granted certificates of war necessity for approximately 45 trucks that are either owned or operated by the company in various areas of the country.

For a number of years the company has been engaged in disputes with its employees. Since 1939 labor controversies in the company's plants in St. Paul, Minn.; Kansas City, Mo.; and Portland, Oreg., have led to four proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board. In each of the cases the National Labor Relations Board found that the company had engaged in unfair labor practices and entered orders directing the company to cease its illegal activities. In three of the cases the orders of the National Labor Relations Board were affirmed in whole or in part by circuit courts of appeal. In the other case, the first order made by the National Labor Relations Board having been set aside by a circuit court of appeals, the Board, after rehearing, entered a second order which directed the company to reinstate certain discharged employees and to cease unfair labor practices. The company did not appeal from this order.

Since 1940 the company has been engaged in a dispute with its employees in Chicago. The issues have been: (1) The right of the United Mail Order, Warehouse & Retail Employees Union of the United Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Employees of America to represent the employees for purposes of collective bargaining and (2) the terms and conditions of the agreements between the company and the union, particularly those relating to union security, arbitration of employee grievances, and seniority. The issues as to the representation of different units of the company's employees were determined by two certifications by the National Labor Relations Board, one made on August 26, 1940, the other on February 28, 1942, and by voluntary recognitions of the union made by the company on April 27, 1942, and May 18, 1942. In the proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board which resulted in the certification dated February 28, 1942, the Board found that the company had been guilty of unfair labor practices in its plant in Chicago.

On June 2, 1942, the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to Executive Order 9017, dated January 12, 1942, certified to the War Labor Board a dispute between the certified union and the company over those terms and conditions of the collective-bargaining agreement that related to union security, arbitration of employee grievances, and seniority. The company then took the position that it would never agree to include in the contract any provisions for arbitration of employee grievances, seniority, or union security. The company also objected to the jurisdiction of the Board. After a hearing, the public, industry, and labor members of the Board, on June 29, 1942, unanimously decided that the dispute, if not peacefully settled, might interfere with the effective prosecution of the war, and that the dispute therefore fell within the Board's jurisdiction.

A panel, composed of representatives of industry, labor, and the public, heard the case for the Board and issued a unanimous report in two parts. The first part, dated August 31, 1942, dealt with the question of wages. On September 5, 1942, the Board unanimously adopted this part of the panel report and incorporated its recommendations in a directive order of the Board. The company voluntarily accepted this order.

The second part of the panel report, dated October 18, 1942, dealt with the questions of union security, arbitration of employee grievances, and seniority. On November 5, 1942, the Board, following the recommendations contained in part 2 of the report, unanimously directed the Company to include provisions for union security, arbitration, and seniority in its agreement with the union. In a letter to the Board, dated November 13, 1942, the company rejected this order but stated that if the President of the United States as Commander in Chief directed the company to respect the order, it would respectfully obey. On November 18, 1942, you wrote a letter to the president of the company, directing the company to comply with the Board's order of November 5, 1942. Thereafter, the company stated that it would comply with this direction and on December 8, 1942, the agreement became effective. Under the Board's order the agreement was to remain in force for 1 year.

Prior to the expiration of the contract on December 8, 1943, the company notified the union that upon the termination of the contract it would not recognize the union or negotiate a renewal of the agreement. The company took this position on the ground that despite the prior certification by the National Labor Relations Board, the union no longer represented a majority of the employees in the warehouse and retail store, the two major bargaining units designated by the National Labor Relations Board. On December 6, 1943, the ensuing labor dispute was certified to the National War Labor Board by the Secretary of Labor and the United States Conciliation Service pursuant to the War Labor Disputes Act, which had become law on June 25, 1943.

A public hearing was held before the National War Labor Board on December 16, 1943. On January 13, 1944, the Board directed that the terms and conditions of the contract should be extended without change for a period of 30 days provided that the union should within that time commence a proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board for a determination of the representation question. The Board further directed that if the union did begin such a proceeding, the terms and conditions of the contract should continue to govern the relations between the parties until the issue as to the right of representation had been determined, or until further order of the National War Labor Board. Thereafter, the union complied with the Board's order by commencing a proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board, but the company refused to extend the contract or to comply with its provisions. After a hearing on March 29, 1944, the National War Labor Board directed the company to restore the status quo by complying with the order of January 13, 1944, and to maintain the status quo thereafter until the issue as to representation had been finally determined. The company has refused to accept this order.

Repeated efforts by the War Labor Board to persuade the company to maintain the status quo in Chicago so that the issue of representation could be decided in a peaceful and orderly way failed, and on April 12, 1944, the union called a strike in the Chicago plant. Approximately 5,500 persons are employed in the plant, and it is estimated that the greater part of these employees are now on strike. The National War Labor Board states that there is substantial and immediate danger that this labor disturbance will spread to other plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., including those of Hummer Manufacturing Co. which is now engaged in making parts for military aircraft. The Board also represents that there is a real and present danger that the disturbance will spread to the plants and facilities of other companies, both in the Chicago area and elsewhere, that are engaged in producing essential civilian and military goods. Local unions in Chicago in many of the important war plants have voted to support the Montgomery Ward employees who are on strike. The National Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Helpers of the American Federation of Labor in Chicago are refusing to make deliveries to, or to take

shipments from, Montgomery Ward & Co. Various affiliates of the railway brotherhoods have refused to handle deliveries to, or shipments from, Montgomery Ward & Co.

The National War Labor Board has issued four other orders involving labor disputes arising in the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward in Oakland, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; Denver, Colo.; Detroit, Mich.; and Jamaica, N. Y., and in the plant and facilities of Hummer Manufacturing Co., at Springfield, Ill. The company has refused to accept or to comply with any of these orders.

The War Labor Board states that the company's repeated refusals to accept the orders of the Board and the recurring disputes between the company and its employees threaten to impair or to break down the machinery for the peaceful and orderly adjustment of wartime labor disputes established by the Congress in the War Labor Disputes Act.

By a unanimous vote of its members the National War Labor Board has referred this matter to you for appropriate action. In the letter of reference, dated April 13, 1944, Mr. Davis, the Chairman of the Board, stated that the repercussions of the situation in Chicago may have a serious effect on the war effort.

In my opinion, the facts that have been summarized justify the following conclusions:

1. Montgomery Ward & Co. is engaged in activities of a kind that are essential to the maintenance of our war economy. An interruption or stoppage of the company's activities would have a serious adverse effect upon the war effort.

2. There is a real and present danger that the labor dispute that is now interrupting the operations of the plants and facilities of the company in Chicago may extend throughout the Nation and interrupt the operations of other plants and facilities of the company. There is an equally real and present danger that the dispute will breed other labor controversies that will interrupt the operations of plants and facilities of other companies, both in the Chicago area and elsewhere, that are engaged in making or distributing goods or performing services that are essential to the war effort.

3. There is now no reason to expect that the disputes between the company and its employees in Chicago and elsewhere in the United States will be settled promptly and peacefully either by agreement or by the machinery that Congress has set up in the War Labor Disputes Act.

The basic legal question is whether you have the authority to take possession of and to operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago in order to prevent a serious interference with the war effort. Section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act (Public Law 89, 78th Cong.) provides, in part, as follows:

"The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith. Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility whenever the President finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant, mine, or facility as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance, that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant, mine, or facility in the interest of the war effort."

On the basis of the facts that have been summarized, and the conclusions that those facts justify, it is my opinion, first, that the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward are the kind of plants and facilities whose seizure is authorized by section 3, and, second, that you may properly make the findings required by section 3 as a condition precedent to the exercise of the power that it confers. I believe, therefore, that section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act authorizes you to take possession of and to operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co.

It is not necessary, however, to rely solely upon the provisions of section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. As Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President possesses an aggregate of powers that are derived from the Constitution and from various statutes enacted by the Congress for the purpose of carrying on the war. The Constitution lays upon the President the duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility and invests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. In time of war, when the existence of the Nation is at stake, this aggregate of powers includes authority to take reasonable steps to prevent Nation-wide labor disturbances that threaten to interfere seriously with the conduct of the war. The fact that the initial impact of these disturbances is on the production or distribution of essential civilian goods is not a reason for denying the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the power to take steps to protect the Nation's war effort. In modern war the maintenance of a healthy, orderly, and stable civilian economy is essential to successful military effort. The Congress has recognized this fact by enacting such statutes as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes"; the small business mobilization law of June 11, 1942; and the War Labor Disputes Act. Even in the absence of section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act, therefore, I believe that by the exercise of the aggregate of your powers as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, you could lawfully take possession of and operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. if you found it necessary to do so to prevent injury to the country's war effort.

I conclude that in the circumstances of this case section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act and your constitutional and statutory powers as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy, considered either separately or together, authorize you to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take possession of and to operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago, Ill.

The proposed Executive order, presented by the Chairman of the National War Labor Board and forwarded for my consideration by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has my approval as to form and legality.

Respectfully yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks which I made earlier in the day in regard to the Montgomery Ward & Co. case, the President's message vetoing the Smith-Connally bill, and the yea-and-nay vote on the veto, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the President's message and the yea-and-nay vote thereon were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 796, the so-called war labor disputes bill.

It is not a simple bill, for it covers many subjects. I approve many of the sections; but other sections tend to obscure the issues or to write into war legislation certain extraneous matter which appears to be discriminatory. In the form submitted to me the accomplishment of this avowed purpose—the prevention of strikes in wartime—could well be made more difficult instead of more effective.

Let there be no misunderstanding of the reasons which prompt me to veto this bill at this time.

I am unalterably opposed to strikes in wartime. I do not hesitate to use the powers of government to prevent them.

It is clearly the will of the American people that for the duration of the war all labor disputes be settled by orderly procedures established by law. It is the will of the American people that no war work be interrupted by strike or lock-out.

American labor as well as American business gave their "No strike, no lockout" pledge after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

That pledge has been well kept except in the case of the leaders of the United Mine Workers. For the entire year of 1942, the time lost by strikes averaged only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total man-hours worked. The American people should realize that fact—that ninety-nine and ninety-five one-hundredths percent of the work went forward without strikes, and that only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the work was delayed by strikes. That record has never before been equaled in this country. It is as good or better than the record of any of our allies in wartime.

But laws are often necessary to make a very small minority of people live up to the standards the great majority of people follow. Recently there has been interruption of work in the coal industry, even after it was taken over by the Government. I understand and sympathize with the general purpose of the war disputes bill to make such interruptions clearly unlawful.

The first seven sections of the bill are directed to this objective.

Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the "War Labor Disputes Act."

Section 2 relates to definitions.

Section 3 gives statutory authority to the President to seize war facilities—a power already exercised on several occasions under Executive order or proclamation.

Sections 4 and 5 of the bill provide for maintaining existing terms and conditions of employment except as directed by the War Labor Board.

Section 6 makes it a criminal offense to instigate, direct, or aid a strike in a Government-operated plant or mine.

This would make possible the arrest of a few leaders who would give bond for their appearance at trial. It would assure punishment for those found guilty, and might also have some deterrent effect. But it would not assure continuance of war production in the most critical emergencies.

Section 7 gives the National War Labor Board statutory authority and defines its powers.

Broadly speaking, these sections incorporate into statute the existing machinery for settling labor disputes. The penalties provided by the act do not detract from the moral sanctions of labor's no-strike pledge.

If the bill were limited to these seven sections I would sign it.

But the bill contains other provisions which have no place in legislation to prevent strikes in wartime and which in fact would foment slow-downs and strikes.

I doubt whether the public generally are familiar with these provisions. I doubt whether the Congress had the opportunity fully to appraise the effects of these provisions upon war production.

Section 8 requires the representative of employees of a war contractor to give notice of a labor dispute which threatens seriously to interrupt war production to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board in order to give the employees the opportunity to express themselves by secret ballot whether they will permit such interruption of war production.

It would force a labor leader who is trying to prevent a strike in accordance with his no-strike pledge, to give the notice which would cause the taking of a strike ballot and might actually precipitate a strike.

In wartime we cannot sanction strikes with or without notice.

Section 8 further makes it mandatory that the National Labor Relations Board on the thirtieth day after the giving of the notice take a secret ballot among the employees in the "plants, mines, facilities, bargaining unit, or bargaining units," as the case may be on the question of whether they will stop work. This requirement would open the whole controversy over "bargaining units," a fruitful source of controversy and of bitter jurisdictional strife.

Section 8 ignores completely labor's "no strike" pledge and provides in effect for strike notices and strike ballots. Far from discouraging strikes these provisions would stimulate labor unrest and give Government sanction to strike agitations.

The 30 days allowed before the strike vote is taken under Government auspices might well become a boiling period instead of a cooling period. The thought and energies of the workers would be diverted from war production to vote-getting.

The heads of our military, naval, and production agencies have testified that these provisions are likely to be subversive of the very purpose of the bill—uninterrupted production.

Section 9 of the bill prohibits, for the period of the war, political contributions by labor organizations. This provision obviously has no relevancy to a bill prohibiting strikes during the war in plants operated by the Government or to a War Labor Disputes Act. If there be merit in the prohibition, it should not be confined to wartime, and careful consideration should be given to the appropriateness of extending the prohibition to other nonprofit organizations.

There should be no misunderstanding—I intend to use the powers of government to prevent the interruption of war production by strikes. I shall approve legislation that will truly strengthen the hands of government in dealing with such strikes, and will prevent the defiance of the National War Labor Board's decision.

I recommend that the Selective Service Act be amended so that persons may be inducted into noncombat military service up to the age of 65 years. This will enable us to induct into military service all persons who engage in strikes or stoppages or other interruptions of work in plants in the possession of the United States.

This direct approach is necessary to insure the continuity of war work. The only alternative would be to extend the principle of selective service and make it universal in character.

I recognize that this bill has an entirely praiseworthy purpose to insure full war production But I am convinced that section 8 will produce strikes in vital war plants which otherwise would not occur. Therefore, I could not properly discharge the duties of my office if I were to approve S. 796.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 25, 1943.*

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. OVERTON. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is unavoidably detained because of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who, if present, would vote "yea," is necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as a subcommittee to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who, if present, would vote "yea," are paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], who, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who, if present, would vote "yea," are paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The following Senators would vote "yea," if present:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is absent as a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 25, as follows:

Yeas, 56: Aiken, Andrews, Bankhead, Bilbo, Brewster, Bridges, Brooks, Buck, Butler, Byrd, Capper, Caraway, Chavez, Connally, Eastland, Ferguson, George, Gerry, Gurney, Hatch, Hawkes, Hayden, Hill, Holman, Lodge, McClellan, McKellar, McNary, Maloney, Maybank, Millikin, Moore, O'Daniel, O'Mahoney, Overton, Pepper, Radcliffe, Reed, Revercomb, Reynolds, Robertson, Russell, Smith, Stewart, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tobey, Tydings, Vandenberg, Van Nuys, Wherry, White, Wiley, Willis, Wilson,

Nays, 25: Ball, Bone, Clark of Missouri, Davis, Downey, Green, Guffey, Johnson of Colorado, Kilgore, La Follette, Langer, McCarran, McFarland, Mead, Murdock, Murray, Nye, Scrugham, Shipstead, Thomas of Utah, Truman, Tunnell, Wagner, Walsh, Wheeler.

Not voting, 15: Austin, Bailey, Barbour, Barkley, Burton, Bushfield, Chandler, Clark of Idaho, Danaher, Ellender, Gillette, Glass, Johnson of California, Lucas, Wallgren.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question, more than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND THE CHICAGO & EASTERN ILLINOIS RAILROAD—LETTERS BY HON. JESSE H. JONES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on March 30 the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] submitted Senate Resolution 278, to investigate the alleged improper influence of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Secretary of Commerce with the holders of shares of railroad stock.

This resolution was referred to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, and in turn was referred to the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. Today I received a letter from the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, with respect to the attempted manipulation of the stock of the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad by a party by the name of Boatner.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks the letter which Mr. Jones wrote to me today, and the letter which he wrote to Mr. O'Neal, president of the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad, on October 11, 1943, which speak for themselves.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 30, 1944.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Due to other engagements, it may not be possible for me to attend the hearing which you have scheduled for May 5 with respect to the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad. However, we will be glad to furnish you with any facts or information in connection with our dealings with this or any other railroad to which we lend money.

My attention has been called to certain statements by Mr. Victor Boatner regarding the activities of the R. F. C. and myself in connection with the C. & E. I. Some of his statements are false. His publicity campaign and his appeal to Senator WHEELER seem intended to draw a red herring across his own trail in trying to get control of the C. & E. I. I think it is well known that Mr. Boatner has been making large profits buying and selling securities of this road while serving on the board of directors.

He called to see me early in 1942 and told me that he and some associates, including a brokerage or banking house in New York, had bought a large amount of the common stock of this road from the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad Co., something over 67,000 shares at $1.06 a share, and that he wanted to be elected to the presidency of the road. He solicited my support. He also stated that they had bought some of the preferred stock.

In other words, for a comparatively small amount of money he and his associates were endeavoring to get control of the road, and Mr. Boatner its presidency at a fat salary.

At the stockholders' meeting May 8, 1942, Boatner and his group secured the election of five directors, and it was not long until Mr. Boatner was urging that a dividend of $1 a share be paid on the common stock. This was approximately the cost to them of much of their stock. The board did not vote this dividend, but later declared a dividend of 50 cents a share on the common. There have also been paid four dividends on the preferred

stock, one of 59 cents a share January 15, 1943, one of $1 a share June 15, 1943, one of $1 a share October 15, 1943, and one of $1 a share April 15, 1944.

It is well known that in the past many of our railroads have suffered from exploitation, and speculators are now active in cheap railroad stocks because of the large temporary earnings made possible by the war. These operators will bear watching, particularly with respect to roads which come out of bankruptcy with low fixed charges. Such roads are easy prey for manipulators. There can, of course, be no objection to investors buying cheap stocks, but any movement to manipulate a railroad for the personal profit of its officers or directors should not be allowed, even if it requires legislation to prevent it.

It is well known that the physical properties, i. e., the roadbeds, facilities, and equipment of all railroads have been under a great strain because of the war, and that due to a lack of available materials and the labor shortage, adequate maintenance has not been possible. The C. & E. I. is no exception.

The C. & E. I. was in receivership from May 1913 to January 1922, and in bankruptcy from 1933 to the end of 1940. I am advised that, except for a few switching engines, it has not been able to buy a new locomotive for 20 years.

The record of this road would indicate that it should not only have a sound financial policy, but management that is interested in the ultimate success of the property, and not in speculating in its securities.

The present management of the C. & E. I. is good, and, notwithstanding that it is operating largely with old equipment, it is doing an excellent job in this emergency.

Upon investigation, it will be found that Mr. Boatner has had very little railroad operation experience, and none since 1931. While he was president of a small terminal or switching company at Peoria for several years, his only experience in management of a railroad was less than 2 years as president of the Chicago Great Western, which also went into bankruptcy in 1935 and was reorganized in 1941.

With the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the R. F. C. made a secured loan to the C. & E. I. Railroad of $5,916,500 in 1932. Despite this aid, the road went into bankruptcy the following year.

The plan of reorganization, approved by the United States district court, the I. C. C. and the security holders, required approximately $5,000,000 new cash. The R. F. C. was the only source from which this new money could be had. The plan allowed the R. F. C. $6,262,000 first mortgage bonds for its debt and accumulated interest. In addition, the R. F. C. bought $4,933,000 first mortgage bonds at par, making a total R. F. C. investment in the first mortgage bonds of the road of $11,195,000.

To insure the R. F. C. against loss should it become necessary to sell its bonds at a discount, it received $1,244,000 additional first mortgage bonds and some other collateral.

Bonds aggregating $1,034,000 have been paid, leaving a balance now due the R. F. C. of $10,161,000. The bonds may be called at intervals prior to January 1, 1952, at 105 percent of their face value, from January 1, 1952 to January 1, 1961, at 102 percent of their face value, and after 1961 at 101 percent.

The Federal court and the directors of the road approved the mortgage, and under its terms, Boatner's contention that the road can now legally redeem the whole issue at par is not true.

The plan of reorganization approved by the Federal ccurt and the I. C. C. called for a board of 13 directors, and provided that, as long as the R. F. C. owned as much as $1,000,000 face value of the road's first mortgage bonds, it should be entitled to approve only 3 of the 13 directors, which certainly does not constitute control.

Of the present board, the three directors approved by the R. F. C. are the Honorable Will Hays, former Postmaster General, Mr. Frank Watts, honorary chairman of the First National Bank in St. Louis, and Mr. James Leavell, president of the Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Co., Chicago.

The R. F. C. has been practically the only source of credit for railroads for more than a decade. Its loans are made on a constructive basis, with no fees or underwriting charges. We have a definite responsibility in making loans to railroads, and while we are not interested in who owns them, we are interested in their management and financial policy if they come to the R. F. C. for money. Management is often as much a factor in lending money as the actual security offered.

It is my considered judgment that if Mr. Boatner has been speculating in the stocks or other securities of the C. & E. I. Railroad while serving as one of its directors, as is indicated by the records, he should be disqualified for any position of management in connection with the road. The officers and directors of a railroad represent the holders of all of its stocks and securities, and should not speculate in them or be allowed to speculate in them.

Mr. Boatner's published statements leave the impression that the policy of the R. F. C. is not in the best interests of stockholders of corporations which find it necessary to borrow from it. The facts are exactly to the contrary, and where loan agreements give the R. F. C. responsibility with respect to dividends to stockholders of its borrowers (which is not true in the case of the C. & E. I.), it cooperates with management and does not interpose objection to their payment when consistent with a sound financial policy of the borrower. However, generally speaking, corporations which can only borrow from the Government should not be too free in the payment of dividends.

I enclose copy of my letter of October 11, 1943, to Mr. O'Neal, president of the C. & E. I., copy of which was sent to each of the directors of the road.

I will appreciate your placing this correspondence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

OCTOBER 11, 1943.

Mr. C. T. O'NEAL,
President, Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. O'NEAL: I am advised that at the directors' meeting of the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad Co., September 17, 1943, a motion to declare a dividend on the common stock was offered but failed to carry because of a tie vote, six of the directors present voting against the dividend and six for it. I am further advised that the directors will again consider the subject of a dividend on the common stock at a special meeting to be held October 15.

The directors of the road have the sole responsibility of its management, including the payment of dividends when earnings are sufficient to pay them. However, in view of all the circumstances in connection with this railroad—the fact that it was in receivership from May 1913 to January 1922, and in bankruptcy from April 1933 to January 1941, and that investors in the road's securities took heavy losses—the directors would not be in too big a hurry to pay dividends on the present common stock of the road, when such dividends could only be paid because of unusual earnings due to the war, and which are temporary.

As late as November 1941, the holders of a substantial amount of this common stock bought 67,484 shares of it from the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., at $1.06 a share, and they are now insisting upon a dividend.

The road still has a large debt which should be greatly reduced before any dividends are paid on the common stock.

Do you not think it would be better and to the interest of the road if such funds as can be spared during this period of high earnings are used to retire debt in some fair proportion between its first mortgage and income bonds? I am sure the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would cooperate with you in such a plan.

This course will work to the ultimate benefit of the stockholders.

As you well know, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was the only source of credit available to this railroad for its last reorganization, and if we are to judge the future by the past, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or some other Government agency is apt to be the principal source of credit for railroads in the future, particularly when earnings are lean.

Again, I emphasize that the management of your road is with its directors. My concern is that of one who has lived with troubled railroads for a dozen years and who feels that many of their troubles have come from improvident financing and not from the physical operations of the property.

We should bear in mind the possibility that other forms of transportation will make further inroads on the railroads after the war.

I am sending a copy of this letter to each of your directors.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, House bill 4278 is the unfinished business, and I hope the Senate will now give consideration to the measure.

Mr. GERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Murdock
Austin	Ferguson	Murray
Bailey	George	Overton
Bankhead	Gerry	Radcliffe
Barkley	Gillette	Reed
Bilbo	Green	Reynolds
Brewster	Guffey	Robertson
Bridges	Hatch	Russell
Brooks	Hawkes	Shipstead
Buck	Hayden	Smith
Burton	Jackson	Stewart
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Langer	Tunnell
Chavez	Lucas	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Vandenberg
Connally	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Cordon	McKellar	Weeks
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Maybank	Wherry
Downey	Mead	White
Eastland	Millikin	Wilson

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in considering House bill 4278, I wish to make an explanation. The bill has passed the House. It was sent to the Senate and was referred to our committee. The gentleman from Georgia, Representative PACE, the author of the bill, claimed that it embodied only the items which went out of the appropriation bill in the House on points of order because they were not legally authorized. When the bill came to the Senate, the Senate replaced those items in the bill and made appropriations therefor. The gentleman from Georgia, Representative PACE, asked that the items which went out in the House on points of order be included in the pending bill.

With the exception of certain amendments offered by various Senators, and which have been incorporated in the bill, it seems to me that the only items which are in the bill are those which went out in the House on points of order and were reinstated and appropriated for by the Senate when the appropriation bill came to the Senate.

In view of the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has had charge of the agricultural appropriation bill in the Senate, when it has come over from the House, he is familiar with the various items which have been reinstated and appropriated for. Therefore, I shall ask him to take charge of the bill, except as to the amendments.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from South Carolina a question.

There have been no hearings held on this bill by the Senate committee, have there?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. House bill 4278 is one of the most important bills to come before the Senate in a long time. The distinguished Senator has said that it is an authorization bill. That is true. It authorizes many things which are controversial. It authorizes many things upon which not one single word of testimony has been submitted to show the necessity of the authorization.

Mr. SMITH. But appropriations have been made for those items, and they have been carried in the agriculture appropriation bills the Senate has passed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I agree with the Senator; but if it is not necessary to have an authorization, why bring such a bill before the Senate now?

Mr. SMITH. In order to obviate the loss of time occasioned by points of order in the House, which result in such items being stricken from the appropriation bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina has stated that there have been no hearings on this bill before the Senate committee. There were two meetings of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, both of which I attended. The first meeting was just before the recess, and after a few minutes we adjourned until after the recess. A week ago last Friday, as I recall the date, the committee met again for an hour and 30 minutes. Three amendments to the bill were submitted in the committee. One of them was for the school lunch program; another for the Farm Security Administration; and the third was a tobacco amendment in which the Senator from South Carolina was interested. Those amendments were very briefly discussed by the Senators present. Representative PACE, of North Carolina, appeared before the committee and very briefly explained the bill.

Not a single word of testimony was submitted by anyone showing the need for any of the provisions of the bill. I therefore move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in order that hearings may be held and testimony submitted substantiating the need for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the motion will be promptly voted down. There is absolutely no justification for recommitting the bill to the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If I correctly understood the Senator, he stated that there is no need for a hearing on this bill, one of the most important bills which have come before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my opinion. In this instance there is no need for hearings before the standing Committee of Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. President, because the items embraced in the bill, with one or two exceptions to which I shall refer in a few minutes, have been the subject of lengthy annual hearings before the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, some of them for as long as 50 years. I have before me the hearings on the agricultural appropriation bill which were held by the subcommittee last year. Those hearings lasted for weeks, as they have in prior years—most of these matters have also been discussed on the floor of the Senate at great length on many occasions.

The necessity for the bill grew out of a controversy in the other body between the standing Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Appropriations.

The items which appear in this bill, some of which have been in appropriation bills for 50 years, deal with things which are part of the warp and woof of the agricultural life of the Nation. They are items which are essential to the public health of our people, and affect every American family. There was no need on earth for the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to retrace that ground, when there were literally hundreds of pages of testimony which had been adduced by another committee, and which were available for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to say that appropriations had been carried for all the items which are included in the bill. I was curious to know what necessity there was for the proposed legislation if there has been law on the statute books authorizing such appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been no specific legislation. I will come to that point if the Senator will permit me to proceed for a few minutes.

When the agricultural appropriation bill came to the Senate from the House last year it was nothing but a skeleton. Because of the controversy to which I have referred, the Rules Committee refused to give the Committee on Appropriations a rule. The bill was then riddled on points of order.

I wish to call attention to some of the items which were stricken out on points of order in the House, because of the contention that there was no basic authorization.

One item was for the treatment of tubercular cattle, and the eradication of Bang's disease, to assure a pure source of milk and meat for the people of the Nation. That item had been the subject of congressional consideration and appropriation since 1891, but it was stricken out in the House before the bill came to the Senate, and there is no specific authorization for it in the statutes.

I could enumerate other items in exactly the same category. The work in

the eradication of cattle ticks has been of vital importance to every section of the country; yet there has been no specific legislative authorization for dealing with the cattle tick. Year after year, as the agricultural appropriation bill was presented, there were lengthy hearings upon the appropriation item to show the importance of eradicating the cattle tick. Hearings were held by the Senate committee last year, and the record of those hearings is available to all Members of this body, to show the tremendous importance of this work; and yet there was no specific legislative authorization for the work of eradicating cattle ticks.

The item dealing with hog cholera and related swine diseases has been included in agricultural appropriation bills since 1899, but there was no specific legislative authorization for the Secretary of Agriculture to attempt to assist farmers in dealing with hog cholera and related swine diseases.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I justified in understanding, then, that the proposed legislation is an authorization for appropriations which have been made in the past?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. WHITE. Does it undertake to legalize what has been done heretofore?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not think it is in the nature of an ex post facto law, because when the Congress enacts an appropriation bill, the authorization in the appropriation bill is legislation for 1 year. The purpose of the bill is permanently to define the power of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department in dealing with these questions.

Mr. WHITE. Let me put it this way: As I understand, the bill seeks to make lawful in the future activities for which there has been no specific statutory authority in the past, and to lay the basis for future appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. However, there is considerable controversy on this point, because it has been contended that the broad powers conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture in the act creating the Department in 1862 were sufficient to enable him to do this work. I myself believe that under that language, which instructs him to acquire and diffuse among the people general information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, he would be enabled to carry on a great many of these activities. However, the House of Representatives decided otherwise. We cannot legislate without their cooperation and assistance. Indeed appropriation bills must originate there.

Senators will recall that when the agricultural appropriation bill was before us last year approximately 136 amendments were recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. A great many of those amendments were legislative in nature. Senator after Senator rose and condemned the Committee on Appropriations for attempting to legislate, merely because we were seeking to see that the vital work of this Department was carried on, and that it did not break down in instances in which the work had been in progress for a great number of years.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to obviate that criticism in the future, and clearly to define and limit the power of the Secretary of Agriculture in dealing with these questions.

There are only two new matters in the bill, and I shall refer to them as soon as I have enumerated some of the other items involved in the bill.

Another item relates to scabies in sheep and cattle. That work has been carried on since 1895. If the Senate should recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and endanger the appropriation items, it is possible that this work would be discontinued as of the 1st day of July.

Another item relates to dourine in horses, and emergencies arising out of the existence of contagious and infectious diseases of animals. That has particular reference to the dread hoof-and-mouth disease.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, I believe that a bill of this kind should be passed authorizing a great many things which have previously been done but for which there has been no specific legislative authority. However, when we come to pass an authorization bill, the problem is somewhat different from that in connection with an appropriation bill. In other words, we are permanently granting certain powers to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. I concede that.

Mr. TAFT. For instance, I am somewhat puzzled about the language contained in section 11, page 2, which reads as follows:

> The Secretary of Agriculture, either independently or in cooperation with States or political subdivisions thereof, * * * is authorized to control and eradicate tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals—

And so forth. Authority is there expressed in very general terms. The language is "to control and eradicate." Will the Senator tell me what he thinks a man can do to control and eradicate? Does that language mean that he may step into any farmyard, trespass upon any person's property, and tell him what kind of medicine he shall administer to his cattle? I do not know what it would mean, but when authority is given in such sweeping terms it seems to me that there should be a greater specification of just what may be done to carry out the program. The program is a highly desirable one, of course, and I have risen only to suggest a legal question which I should like to have the Senator explain.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from Ohio knows the difficulties which we would encounter if we were to attempt to spell out all of the activities involved in dealing with each one of these specific diseases of animals or the pests or insects which attack plant life of this country. I think the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to go into different farms and to eliminate diseases in certain areas has been determined judicially in litigation interpreting similar language which has been carried in appropriation bills.

I should like to refer the Senator from Ohio to page 22 of the Agriculture appropriation bill in order to show that the language he has read from is practically the same language included in the agricultural appropriation bill passed by the Senate last year.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Ohio that this provision has been in operation for years. There has been no difficulty in its operation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The language referred to by the Senator appears on page 22 of the current appropriation bill. It reads as follows:

> Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's disease of cattle.

A certain sum is appropriated, and power is given to the Secretary of Agriculture, if it is necessary, to condemn and destroy tubercular cattle, or cattle reacting to the tests for Bang's disease. That is a public-health measure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not objecting at all to the measure. I merely say that when we are asked to authorize somebody to step upon the premises of another person and condemn his property, as well as destroy his animals, I think a wise legislative policy would provide the manner in which it should be done, the remedies which could be provided, and deal generally with the whole problem so that we would not have such a situation that the Secretary of Agriculture might make any regulation he pleases concerning the condemnation of animals.

Mr. RUSSELL. Each year the Congress protects the situation to which the Senator refers in the appropriation bill. When the Congress makes appropriations for each of these items limitations are written into the measure and they have been carried in the bill for a long number of years. They are applicable to each of the diseases for which the appropriation is made. In the pending appropriation bill under the item for Bang's disease and tubercular cattle, language is provided which is a limitation on the power of the Secretary of Agriculture as to the amount which he can pay for diseased animals, and such limitations have been in similar bill for years.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that the limitations should be in the authorization bill and should not depend on someone putting something in or taking it out of the appropriation bill. If we are formally to authorize a program which has never been authorized except by appropriation, it should be spelled out properly with the limitation applying to the particular program. As I have said, I do not think there is anything more important than the proposed program. I am raising only the question as to the form in which to provide the authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator knows, it would be almost impossible to draft a

more detailed authorization for each of these items. The bill would be very much longer than it is, and there would be more confusion than we have now. From my experience in undertaking to handle the agricultural appropriation bill, I think it would be most unwise to attempt to do what the Senator has suggested. For example, if there should be a severe epidemic of hog cholera in a certain area, and the law provided that the Secretary of Agriculture could contribute only one-half of the cost of the serum, it would be necessary to pass an act of Congress to enable him to contribute one-half of the cost of the serum to save the hogs in that community.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. If Congress should put the limitation in an appropriation in June and the disease occurred in October the Secretary would have to come to Congress and get an appropriation. We cannot legislate for an indefinite period.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, but the Senator from Ohio is aware that a deficiency bill comes through this body almost every 2 or 3 months, and by leaving the matter of a specific regulation as to each individual disease, and each type of animal, open to appropriations limitations we would have a much more flexible program, and one which would enable the farmers and the consuming public of the Nation to be more adequately protected than would be possible by providing for the situation line by line in a permanent statute.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to make the general criticism that over and over again we have passed general authorizations, thinking they meant one thing, and the executive departments have found that they meant a great deal more. The moment we abandon our duty of prescribing definitely the principles of the programs to be carried out we then broaden the power of the executive, and lead to the very kinds of abuses of power which are now being critcized throughout the country. That is not so much the fault of the Executive as it is the fault of Congress in writing blank checks for effectuating the programs.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure that the Senator from Ohio would not undertake to compare this proposed legislation with any general grant or delegation of power. Of course, if we are to proceed on the assumption that the people who are to carry out these programs will willfully abuse their power and run over people, stand at their doors and kill their animals, then we can vote against any kind of control and let all the pests and diseases destroy everything. If we do that, we shall perish. We are barely holding our own in the age-old battle between man and the bugs and diseases which threaten our sources of food and clothing. I have heard no charges that the Department has abused its powers in the past.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not suggest anything like that at all. I should like to have the Senator's assurance that he does not think this measure would grant any authority to go beyond the program which has been conducted during the past 5 years under other appropriation bills.

Mr. RUSSELL. With the exception of the amendments with respect to the Rural Electrification plan there is no new power of consequence delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture over and beyond that which was delegated to him year after year in appropriation bills. The Senator from Ohio can be assured of that.

Mr. President, I shall continue to refer to some of the items involved in this bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. If these items are in the appropriation bill why is it now necessary to have a general authorization bill covering them?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, under the rules of both Houses a suspension of the rules is required in order to insert the items each year. The Senator will recall that last year the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] criticized the Committee on Appropriations for bringing in legislative amendments. We are now attempting to cure the situation by suggesting an authorization by statute. This is to give the statutory authorization that we did not have last year, for which we were roundly condemned and criticized on the floor.

Mr. President, some of the other work that is more or less important to the people of this country that is involved in this bill are the funds for the control and prevention of the spread of the Japanese beetle, which has been a very destructive pest. That insect has caused a great damage in this country, but through the fine work that has been done by Dr. Annand and his associates in the Department of Agriculture splendid progress has been made in preventing the spread of the Japanese beetle. Other pests involved in the program are the sweetpotato weevil, the Mexican fruitfly, the citrus canker, the gypsy and brown-tail moth, the Dutch elm disease, the phony peach disease. Barberry eradication is also included. There is nothing of greater importance to the wheat growers of this Nation than the work the Department of Agriculture has done in attempting to eliminate the barberry bush, which is the host plant for the rust that has cost the wheat farmers tens of millions of dollars. There is no specific statutory authority for this work, and the entire appropriation for next year will be in danger if this bill should be sent back to the committee.

There is likewise included the corn borer, which in times past has been very destructive to the corn farmers of the country, but there has never been any specific legislative authority to enable the Secretary to combat it.

There are a number of other items. I might refer to bee-breeding work that has been carried on by the Department of Agriculture. People may scoff at the work the Department has done in dealing with bees, but bee culture and its related activities represent more than a hundred-million-dollar-a-year business for the farmers of this country. There has been no statutory authority for the bee-breeding work of the Department; and if this bill is sent back to the committee, it will endanger that work. If no appropriation can be made, those who are engaging in the work of bee culture will be exposed to great loss.

There are other items which are of tremendous importance. Senators will recall that last year on the floor we had to offer a legislative amendment to attempt to wipe out the inequalities which, due to a shift of the rural population, existed between the several States in the case of funds for experiment stations and for county agents in the Extension Service.

There is no legislative authority for that fund. We offered it from the floor, but the House has resisted an appropriation because there was no legislative authority. Here is an opportunity to get legislative authority for something which the States affected have contended is vitally important to them.

The State that will suffer the largest loss in the Extension Service is the State of Texas which would lose $37,000. Second is the State of South Dakota, which would lose for the Extension Service $27,493, without this legislative authorization. The State of Oklahoma is third; it would lose $23,000. The State of North Dakota would lose $17,783. The State of Nebraska would have taken from its extension fund $22,872.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not want to be placed in a wrong position by the statement of the distinguished Senator about the various items. I may be in favor of all of them when they are properly explained, as the Senator is now doing; but my experience in the Committee on Agriculture was that after a few brief moments in the committee the distinguished chairman of the committee said, "All in favor will signify by saying 'aye.'" I said, "Wait a moment. I should like to ask a few questions"; but the chairman said, "We have not time; all in favor will signify by saying 'aye.'" That is the kind of hearing we had in the committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to say so, I think he is mistaken in saying that I suggested that we did not have time.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If I misquoted the Senator I apologize most humbly.

Mr. SMITH. I think I said that the questions asked were not pertinent.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have the highest esteem for the chairman of the Agricultural Committee. I regard him as my personal friend and he has been very kind to me since I have been in this body. I would not for the world say anything that might be considered a misquotation of what he said. That is the way I thought he expressed himself. At any rate, I wanted answers to some questions. There are many things in this bill, though not the things the distinguished Senator from Georgia is talking about, that need explanation, and I hope we will have an explanation, and

I want to ask him a number of questions before we get through. I do not desire to be placed in the position of appearing to be opposed to the eradication of plant diseases because I am for all such activities.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator from South Dakota that I am not undertaking to misrepresent his position, but I am undertaking to show the importance of this bill in preserving agricultural activities that are vital to farm life and that are now under way. That is all this bill does, with the exceptions that I shall advert to in a few minutes. I am sure the Senator approves many of these items, but all of them will be endangered if the Senate recommits the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As a member of the Agricultural Committee, I should like to say that I do not recall any request for hearings. I ask the chairman of the Agricultural Committee if he had any request for hearings on this bill which he refused?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Not even from the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMITH. No; I had no request for hearings.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me the time to ask for hearings on this bill was 2 or 3 weeks ago rather than to wait until the bill comes on the floor of the Senate and then seek hearings. I hope the motion will not prevail, because, if it does, the effect will be to kill, among appropriations authorized by this bill, the controversial matter of the school-lunch program. If this bill is recommitted, I suppose it would have the effect of killing that program. If anybody wants to kill that program, I say let him come on the floor of the Senate and argue against it, and not try to kill it by the process of recommitting the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to make my position clear. There is no man on this floor who can accuse me of refusing to grant every legitimate request that comes before my committee. No one even intimated that a hearing on the bill was desired. As I recall, everybody appeared to be satisfied. I asked for a vote, and I got a pretty good response. I think the votes were all in the affirmative except one. I merely wish to state that I do not want——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield further; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota, and when this controversy is over I hope Senators will allow me to proceed with my explanation. I shall be very brief.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I want to correct the distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Committee. One of his own party joined against reporting the bill favorably.

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry that the two combined. We have some curious combinations, anyway. This matter was so universally accepted——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. SMITH. I yield the floor if we are going to have that kind of procedure.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will resume my discussion as to the effect of this proposed legislation on the Extension Service. There are a large number of States which, due to a shift of their farm population after the census of 1940, would suffer a considerable reduction in appropriations for the Extension Service unless some substantive legislation were enacted. This is the only substantive legislation of which I have any knowledge which would affect that situation.

Other States include the State of Kansas, a great agricultural State. If this proposed legislation should fail or be recommitted and the delay should cause the defeat of these appropriations through technical or other causes, the State of Kansas would suffer a reduction of $23,078.07 in its extension fund. The State of Iowa would suffer a reduction of $12,874.34. The State of Colorado would suffer a reduction of $12,587.27.

These are funds which are tremendously important to the county agents and to the general scheme of extension service in the States.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am unfamiliar with some of the terms the Senator uses, but I cannot see why a reasonable delay to inquire into the purpose of these provisions would mean a failure of the appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not, if there were reasonable delay. I do not know what the Senator would mean by "reasonable." I do not think there is any necessity on earth for any hearings on the very item I am now discussing—the extension item. We have had the heads of the land-grant colleges before the Committee on Appropriations year after year, and they have testified at great length as to the desirability of these appropriations. Yea, they have stated it would almost break down the county-agent work in their several States if they were not allowed. Yet there has never been enacted any general substantive law. We have gone along from year to year. Last year the House eliminated the item on the floor of the House through a point of order, and it was finally inserted in the Senate only after notice had been given of motion to suspend the rules, and then it took all the power which could be exerted to see that it was finally left in the bill.

This year the House Committee on Appropriations got a rule from the Rules Committee which limited the items in appropriations to the items contained in the bill that is now before the Senate, and if this bill were recommitted I say that in my judgment it would at least endanger some of the items, because we have no way of knowing what other legislation will intervene, or when we would be able to get the bill upon the floor again.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on page 25 of the bill, section 703, appears this language:

> The Department of Agriculture is authorized to erect, alter, and repair such buildings and other public improvements as may be necessary to carry out its authorized work.

I was informed that the Department of Agriculture had in contemplation a very elaborate plan to erect public buildings all over the country, in each county seat. Can the Senator tell me whether or not the purpose of the pending authorization is to permit that to be done?

Mr. RUSSELL. I had not heard any such thing. The purpose of this section in the bill is to place upon the Congress, in connection with each appropriation bill, the responsibility of determining whether or not buildings should be constructed. It is not only an authorization in the nature of a limitation on the powers of the Secretary and the Department of Agriculture, but it leaves in the Congress, in connection with each appropriation bill, the power to determine the amount which shall be appropriated. The Secretary cannot spend any part of an appropriation for permanent buildings unless it is specifically outlined in an appropriation bill, and earmarked for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator aware of any such proposal on the part of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. I had not heard of it, and I am frank to say that I do not believe any such idea exists. I cannot credit the rumor which has reached the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. It was published in the newspapers, and I was informed that such a plan was under advisement, to erect in all the county seats public buildings to house the various activities.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; the Secretary of Agriculture could not construct a building of that nature without specific appropriation by Congress, and I might say that, for my part, I should at this time oppose any such idea. I do not think funds should be appropriated for that purpose now. Under this section no funds can be expended on public buildings unless there is specific authorization in an appropriation bill. So that every Senator will have a chance to vote yea or nay as to any public building proposed to be constructed by the Department of Agriculture. In the agricultural appropriation bill we limit the cost of any structure which may be erected by the Department of Agriculture. There is no power anywhere to expend any of its other appropriations on any such building program.

Mr. President, when the bill reached the Senate committee three amendments were adopted.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the proviso in the provision to which the Senator from Virginia has adverted, which should be read. It is as follows:

> *Provided*, That no building or improvement shall be erected or altered under this authority unless provision is made therefor in the applicable appropriation and the cost thereof is not in excess of limitations prescribed therein.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator read the language in the bill. It bears out what I have stated, that no building could be constructed by the Department of Agriculture unless a specific appropriation were made for that purpose in the agricultural appropriation bill. I do not know of any other department which has a limitation as rigid and binding as that which we are imposing upon the Department of Agriculture in the pending measure.

I wish to call the attention of Senators to some changes proposed in the basic law affecting the Department of Agriculture. The only ones of any consequence are those relating to the Rural Electrification Administration. The Rural Electrification Administration at the present time is authorized to borrow funds at a rate of interest not greater than the average rate of interest that has applied to loans made within the last year on 10-year obligations. That caused the Rural Electrification Administration to have an interest rate running from 2½ percent to around 3 percent, and the flat charge to the R. E. A. cooperatives was 3 percent. The pending bill reduces the interest rate on R. E. A. loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to 1¾ percent, and reduces the interest rate on loans made by the R. E. A. to local cooperatives to 2 percent. Certainly these cooperatives, in view of the splendid record of repayment they have made, are entitled to this better rate of interest.

I wish to point out to Senators that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was specifically authorized by law to borrow funds from the Treasury at 1 percent. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under its basic law, borrows funds from the Treasury at an interest rate of 1 percent, and the provision before us allows the Reconstruction Finance Corporation three-quarters of 1 percent profit over and above the rate they pay the Treasury for the funds.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator be kind enough to explain the provision on pages 17 and 18, where alteration of the law is proposed? The wording is as follows:

> The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

Does not that have the effect of removing any limitations on the amount of money the Administration can spend, except the limitations imposed by the Commitee on Appropriations?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it does. In other words, it eliminates any limitation other than that Congress may put in the appropriation bill for each year.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator please tell us why the committee saw fit to remove the limitation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will tell the Senator what I conceive to be good reasons for the action.

We all know that at the present time the Rural Electrification Administration is building up a huge backlog of requests for service to the farm homes of this country. It is impossible to deal with them during the war period, because of the fact that the wires and other things which go into the construction of a power line are critical materials which the armed forces need. As I have said, the Rural Electrification Administration has a backlog of requests for good, repayable loans, which I think amount to something over $100,000,000 at the present time, and some of the cooperatives are not filing their requests, because they know it would not avail them anything, with the tight condition as to copper and other electrical equipment. So, in order to enable us, when the war shall end, to give impetus to the rural-electrification program, and give employment to our people, this limitation was removed, and the matter was left to the judgment of Congress.

All the wisdom and all the vision of the ages will not perish when this Congress shall be adjourned sine die. Other Congresses will be just as interested in seeing that proper limitations are imposed on the activities of agencies and that the business of the Government is conducted properly, as are the Members of this Congress, and in view of the very unusual situation which exists in the need for rural electrification, these changes were made.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the amortization period of Rural Electrification Administration loans is changed from 25 years, as it is in the existing law, to 35 years, in the bill before us.

That is one of the major changes I desire to call to the attention of the Senate. It is not because of the fact that these rural electric cooperatives that have borrowed these funds need the 35 years to repay present loans. Nearly 1,000 cooperatives have anticipated their repayments, and only a few of them are in arrears on their payments. Most of them have already paid a great many obligations which have not matured. Some have purchased War bonds. The proposed extension from 25 to 35 years is made because of the fact that under existing law there is a limit on the number of farms in each mile that can be served. The more thickly settled areas have largely been reached with electricity. If those who live in the more remote sections are to be reached, it will require a little more time to amortize than at present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the repeal provided in section 504 also raise the limitation on the amount, which is now $40,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does; yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The same thing is done in section 504 as is done in the other section to which reference was made?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; that is correct. The limitation is changed in two places in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. So that whatever is necessary to be done under the authorization will be done by appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, whatever Congress is convinced is necessary.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, appropriations must be made from year to year.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. One more question. I should like to ask about section 303. Has the Senator an explanation to make of the amendment on page 13, section 303?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Nebraska will indulge me I shall reach that as soon as I have cleaned up the matter of rural electrification.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the judgment of the Senator will a study of the record show that 35 years will take care of most of the extreme rural lines that cannot get in under the 25-year program?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will not take care of all cases, but I think it provides a pretty fair compromise. The Association of Rural Electrification Cooperatives wanted 50 years. Some of the departments thought that 25 years was long enough. I think the 35-year period will enable them to reach nearly all the farm homes in this country that they wish to serve.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should also like to ask the Senator if in his judgment he believes that in the future we may be able to reach even more distant rural localities?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that the change will have that effect. Of course this is a tremendous improvement over anything we have had up until now, and it should be a great benefit to the rural users of electric current.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to thank the Senator from Georgia particularly in behalf of our rural population.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know the deep interest the Senator from South Carolina has particularly in the question of rural electrification, and which he had even before he came to the Senate.

Mr. President, I think that briefly covers the changes which have been made in the existing law which relate to the Rural Electrification Administration.

There are two amendments which were suggested by the Senate Committee on Agriculture. One of them is section 303, to which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has just referred, and the other is what is commonly known as the school lunch program. Senators will remember that these items have been the subject of great discussion on the floor of the Senate, as well as in the committees, and I certainly do not think that the opinion of any Senator with respect to either one of these items would have been altered by any hearings, however long extended, that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may have carried on.

Section 303, which relates to what is commonly known as the Farm Security Administration, gives the Farm Security Administration the power to proceed under all the limitations which were added by the Congress last year to the

agricultural appropriation bill. Senators will recall that last year the Congress placed a limitation of $2,500 on the amount that any borrower could borrow from the Farm Security Administration. We provided for the liquidation of all the collective farming projects, and they are now in process of liquidation. But Congress prohibited the making of loans to cooperatives, and otherwise sought to eliminate some of the activities of the Farm Security Administration which had subjected it to considerable criticism in the past. I think I should say here that the Farm Security Administration last year made a magnificent record. It collected $128,720,000, whereas it loaned only $97,000,000.

Mr. President, that bears out the contention that those of us who have supported this program have made here from year to year, that these people, though small farmers, would pay as quickly as anyone else when they were able to pay. The Farm Security Administration is collecting about $1.30 for every dollar that matures. The Administration is collecting many old loans, in some cases loans which practically have been written off the books. The F. S. A. in my judgment is justifying the action of the Senate last year when it took so strong a stand that the Farm Security Administration should carry on in the fiscal year 1944.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator understand that a better record is being made this year than was made last year? As I understand, in my State loans are being repaid at the rate of $2 for every $1 in new loans made. I think that holds more or less true for the whole country.

Mr. RUSSELL. The record is improving from day to day. During the hearings which were held before the Senate Appropriations Committee when dealing with agricultural appropriations week before last it was stated by the Administrator, Mr. Hancock, who made a very profound impression upon the committee, I might say, that as compared to the $1.32 of collections to which I have just referred for every dollar that was loaned, that this year the collections are running as high as $1.70 for every dollar that has been loaned, showing that these poor people are doing their very best, when they have the money, to meet their obligations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The last time we discussed this matter on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Georgia was reminded of the fact that there were several Government agencies loaning money on the same basis, nonrecourse loans, such as the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Farm Security Administration, Emergency Crop and Feed Loans Section, F. C. A., and others. I think the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures in Government shows that there are 20 Government agencies lending money to the farmers. It was my understanding from the Senator from Georgia that because of the manpower situation and the overhead, some progress was being made to streamline these agencies into one, and that the next time this matter came up the chances were that something along that line would be accomplished. Can the Senator tell me and the other Senators present whether anything like that has been done?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I recall the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Georgia last year. I told the Senator that the House Committee on Agriculture had appointed a subcommittee to go into this question. That subcommittee has gone into it rather exhaustively, and out of the hearings it has held has come a bill which has been introduced, the number of which I do not remember, but which is known as the Cooley bill in the House of Representatives. It is not as comprehensive as the Senator would indicate, but it does deal with some five or six of these lending agencies.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they the nonrecourse lending agencies?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know of but one agency which makes nonrecourse loans above the value of crops planted. That agency is the regional agricultural credit corporation.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Farm Security Administration make nonrecourse loans?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The Farm Security Administration makes full faith credit loans to each borrower.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the amount of the outstanding loans of F. S. A. today? Has the amount in total dollar volume of loans decreased or increased?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I have heretofore pointed out on this floor, a great many of these obligations were not made by the Farm Security Administration. Some of them came down from the old State rehabilitation agencies, and some of them came to the Farm Security Administration from the Rural Resettlement Administration, as it was called. The total amount of the principal of all these agencies, not just the Farm Security Administration——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator has the figures for the Farm Security Administration alone?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I do. But I desire to present a full picture. The total amount of the principal of all these agencies, not merely the Farm Security Administration, is approximately $511,420,000. With reference to the Farm Security Administration, I do not have before me the table which I requested, and which was presented by the Administrator. It is my recollection that the figure for rural rehabilitation loans outstanding is $370,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that I checked the figures day before yesterday; and if I got them correctly, approximately $1,825,000,000 has been loaned for all agricultural purposes. Of that one billion eight-hundred-and-some-odd-million dollars, approximately $980,000,000 has been loaned by the small private banks, namely, the country banks and other private banks throughout the country. That leaves nearly 50 percent that is being loaned today through the governmental lending agencies.

It is my feeling and my thought that with the banks so full of money, and with no place to make a loan, it is time for Congress to restrict rather than to broaden any governmental lending agency, especially in view of the fact that it seems that the country is now overproduced. We cannot obtain decent prices for our livestock, and there is a question about obtaining sufficient feed. We have representatives of governmental lending agencies walking over each other's feet, trying to make loans in competition with each other, at a time when the private banks of the country cannot find places to make loans with their money.

I do not mean we should not have the governmental agencies ready at all times to make loans; but I say that if my figures are correct—and I think they are—the governmental lending agencies today are lending nearly as much money, dollar for dollar, as are the private banks throughout the country.

If that be true, in view of the manpower shortage which exists in the United States today, it is time the Congress streamlined these agencies, and had only one agency, rather than half a dozen or more Government agencies fighting each other in their attempts to make loans to the farmers. Furthermore, it was my absolute understanding before the committee which studied agricultural lending agencies that when the need no longer existed, such an agency would fold up. I should like to know what, if anything, has been done with the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. That matter is not dealt with in this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Has some study been made?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but that matter is not gone into in this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. However, I understand that by the pending bill we are making the Farm Security Administration a permanent institution.

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be the effect if the committee amendment be adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Prior to this time the Farm Security Administration has been only a temporary agency, and has come before Congress each year for an appropriation. But under this authorization we would be setting up a permanent agency of the Government. I appreciate that no one is better informed about the matter than is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who knows the agricultural set-up from beginning to end.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I knew the amount loaned by the R. A. C. C. this year, I would state it; but I do not have the exact information before me at this time. I know that agency has made some loans, but I do not know their exact amount.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems to me that if the suggestion made by the Senator from Georgia himself a few months ago were put into effect, namely, to streamline five or six, if not all, of the Government agencies lending money to farmers, and from them to form one agency which would be used to make loans to farmers——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not give the Senator from Nebraska any assurance last year that these lending agencies would be consolidated. I told the Senator a study was being made to that end in the House of Representatives. Such a study was made and, I understand, was pursued very diligently in the House of Representatives, and a bill drawn up on the basis of the study has been introduced.

Of course, I do not entirely agree with the Senator's philosophy on this matter. I think there is a very definite need to have credit available at low rates to all the farmers of the country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, on that point let me say that I did not say we should eliminate all governmental agencies lending money to farmers. I said we should consolidate them. My theory is that the Government should make loans to farmers only when the private banks fail to function in that respect. I cannot see that any relief from lending to farmers by governmental agencies is being obtained today despite the fact that such lending by governmental agencies is unnecessary at this time. It is unnecessary today because interest rates are so favorable, the banks are bursting with money, and the private banks are making only approximately half the agricultural loans. The necessity for a streamlining and consolidation of the governmental lending agencies is all the more necessary in view of the pressing manpower shortage in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that we are undertaking to safeguard the interests of the private banks in connection with this legislation. Last year, after all the agitation, the following language was included in the law; and if the bill passed this year, as recommended by the committee, that language will still be in the law:

> For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made.

In other words, the Farm Security Administration cannot make a loan to a farmer if that farmer can obtain from any other source the needed funds at comparable rates within the area in which he lives.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have in my file letters stating that representatives of these governmental lending agencies are running around the country, competing with each other for loans. Also, the fact that today the Federal agencies lending money to agricultural borrowers have made such loans to farmers on about a dollar-for-dollar basis with loans made to the farmers by private banks indicates the length to which these governmental agencies are going. They are asking for these loans; they are soliciting for them. I think all that is unnecessary. On the basis on which the Senator has put the case, certainly there is no justification for having the governmental lending agencies today loan money dollar for dollar with the private banks, which cannot loan anywhere near all the money they have available.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Nebraska is lumping the amounts for all the governmental lending agencies, including the Federal land bank. The Farm Security Administration had only $67,000,000 last year.

Mr. WHERRY. The ones I am talking about are the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loans in the amount of $54,000,000; livestock loan companies, discounting at Federal intermediate credit banks loans in the amount of $41,000,000; and Farm Security Administration loans of approximately $370,000,000——

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; $370,000,000 is the approximate amount of the outstanding loans made by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator is obliged to be in error. Last year the bill allowed the Farm Security Administration only $67,000,000 for loans.

Mr. WHERRY. How many are in existence, let me ask?

Mr. RUSSELL. Or, approximately $370,000,000 are in existence, but that represents several years' business.

Mr. WHERRY. Approximately $370,000,000 of such loans are outstanding today.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Then such loans were made this year.

Mr. RUSSELL. That amount was not loaned this year. The Senator is wholly in error on that point. The Farm Security Administration could loan only $67,000,000 during the last year.

Mr. WHERRY. A loan which was made a few years ago, and which was renewed this year, is a loan this year, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not all the loans were renewed this year.

Mr. WHERRY. The figures I gave do not include the amounts of loans made by the Federal land bank. The total amount of money loaned by governmental agricultural lending agencies runs into the billions of dollars. But I am using the figures for the five or six Federal lending agencies I have referred to, that are lending money only to farmers, for agricultural purposes. The figures I have cited do not include the amounts of real estate loans made by the Federal land bank and Farm Mortgage Corporation.

Mr. President, if an attempt were made to justify the Farm Security Administration on the basis of need, it is my contention that it could not be so justified today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to reiterate that the Senator from Nebraska is obliged to be in error with respect to the figures he has cited. If he contends that the Farm Security Administration has made $370,000,000 worth of loans this year he is obliged to be in error, because the total amount of money the Congress allowed the Farm Security Administration this year for loans was $67,000,000. The Senator is talking about all the accumulation of outstanding loans made over a period of 6 or 8 years.

Mr. WHERRY. I am talking about the same loans that the private banks of the country are anxious to make, but have not been able to make because they have had to compete with the governmental lending agencies. Regardless of whether the loans were made yesterday or the day before, it is true that that much money is being loaned to the farmers.

Mr. President, I have sent for the detailed figures relative to the amounts of agricultural loans, and I now have them before me. They are as follows:

On June 30, 1943, the amount of agricultural loans outstanding totaled $1,874,000,000; and Government agencies accounted for almost one-half. In detail, this staggering total is made up as follows:

	Millions
Commercial banks	$930
Production credit associations	255
Livestock loan companies, etc., discounting at Federal intermediate credit banks	41
Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation	54
Farm Security Administration	379
Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section, F. C. A.	165
Total	1,874

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is there any precedent, rule, or custom, which requires that testimony must be taken with regard to every item in a bill before the bill can be reported to the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any such rule; and I know of no item with which Senators ought to be more familiar than the one we are now discussing. It has occupied the time of the Senate for 2 or 3 days each year during the past 3 or 4 years.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand the ground for asking that the bill be recommitted to be that there are some items in the bill on which no testimony has been taken. I was wondering if there was any precedent or authority behind that suggestion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I never heard of it. I know that other committees often report bills on which no hearings have been held.

Mr. TUNNELL. When there are hundreds of items in a bill, if testimony must be taken as to each item, it involves endless expense, does it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Undoubtedly the cost of printing the record alone would be tremendous.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In response to some of the remarks made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], let me say that so far as the Farm Security Administration is concerned, it has not been in the position of needing to solicit any clients. As a matter of fact, under the limitation fixed by the Senate in the last appropriation bill, every Farm Security Administration agency of which I know anything—and I know about all of them in the State of Wisconsin—has a backlog of applicants for rehabilitation loans, and such applicants cannot be accommodated because the Congress has not provided a sufficient sum of money to accommodate all those who desire to obtain this type of loan.

In the second place, it is the policy, in conformity with the statute enacted by the Congress, that each client who comes to the Farm Security Administration seeking a rehabilitation loan must demonstrate that he is unable to obtain a loan under comparable terms and conditions from a private lending organization or corporation within his community.

In the State of Wisconsin many of these loans, which have reached the point where the banks regard them as suitable loans, are being refinanced by the banks after the borrower has reached the position where the bank considers him a good risk. That is true in Wisconsin, and I believe it is true throughout the country. In other words, the Farm Security Administration is making these loans only when the applicants cannot obtain them under similar terms from other sources. Then, when a sufficient amount of collateral has been accumulated so that the loans are desired by the banks, it is the affirmative and aggressive policy of the Farm Security Administration to get the banks in the various localities to refinance the loans, and thus release further funds which can be loaned to applicants who are waiting to be accommodated.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe the Senator has correctly stated the policy which prevails in all States of which I have knowledge.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Again I raise the question of the rather curious method by which we are passing an authorization bill. The language of the bill is:

SEC. 303. That all purposes and objects of expenditure which are provided for under the item "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, are hereby authorized for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in the manner, in the detail, and under the conditions, authorities, restrictions, and limitations as are contained in the item referred to, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated and to be otherwise made available such sums as Congress may deem necessary for the purposes of this section.

In other words, we are enacting a statute by incorporating, by reference, a lengthy provision in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1944, as a permanent authorization act. I think that is the poorest kind of draftsmanship for legislation.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, from the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1944, the language under the heading "Loans, grants and rural rehabilitation," so that we may know what law it is we are enacting at this point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator offered that language for printing in the RECORD. I had intended to offer it.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm-debt-adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural-rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $20,000,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, under his supervision, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds: *Provided further*, That during the first 4 months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration may, in his discretion, authorize expenditures from this appropriation at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months.

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 793), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $60,000,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion, or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, in the discretion of the Administrator, for the production of agricultural commodities.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

Mr. TAFT. That authority is rather broad. It would authorize the Secretary, through the War Food Administration, to continue to provide assistance to the farmers. Let me ask the Senator how the Farm Security Administration comes under the War Food Administration. Is this provision being administered entirely by the War Food Administrator?

Mr. RUSSELL. In the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, when the War Food Administration was created, the Farm Security Administration, being one of the finest fields of production for the crops which were needed in the war effort, was put directly under the supervision of the War Food Administrator.

Mr. TAFT. At best, it seems to me to be a temporary provision. I have no great objection to authorizing the continuation of this activity for another year, but I do not think there should be a permanent authorization, referring to another act dealing with the War Food Administration, which is purely a war measure, and which will expire at the end of the war. Would it not be feasible to limit this activity to 1 year's authorization, as the child-feeding program is limited, so that at the end of a year we may make some general provision?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Knowing of the interest of the Senator from Ohio in this subject, I have conferred with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. There was a contest in the committee as to whether this authorization should be made permanent or limited to 1 year. Those who wished to make it permanent were in the majority, and it was so reported. However, in view of the difference of opinion on the subject, I have conferred with the Senator from Georgia. I understand that he has no objection to my offering an amendment if I desire to do so. So I have made an agreement, so far as I can control it—of course, I have no power to control it—to offer an amendment limiting this authorization to 2 years, instead of making it permanent, with the understanding that there will be no further opposition to this program for this year.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my feeling is that there ought to be a complete study of all the rural credit agencies. There ought to be a single bill. I understand that there is such a bill in the House. I do not know what it is. I have not seen it. However, it seems to me that this particular authorization, hanging on to the appropriation bill for 1944, ought to be limited in time. I think it ought to be limited for 1 year. I do not greatly object to 2 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have been heart and soul in support of some of the activities of the Farm Security Administration. However, the Senator from Alabama has been a great leader and champion in this fight. He is one of the coauthors of the Bankhead-Jones Act, which provided for the rehabilitation loans. In view of the studies being made in the House, and the fact that proposed legislation is pending there to consolidate these lending agencies, I shall interpose no objection if the Senator wishes to modify his amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I assume the Senator understands that this is a temporary arrangement, and does not in any way change my attitude as to the very great value of this program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator from Alabama is familiar with it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When the subject is approached by way of permanent legislation, I shall wish to make the program permanent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator referred to the fact that loans to needy individual farmers are made only when they are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates in the areas where such loans are proposed to be made. It seems to me clear that in the authorization bill there is no such limit, because in the first part of the direct appropriation, having nothing to do with the R. F. C., the authorization is:

(1) Farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers.

There is no other restriction whatsoever, and so far as the authorization is concerned, it is a wide-open authorization to make any loan to any needy individual farmer.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is reading from the language which applies to the administrative appropriation. That is for the machinery of administration. If the Senator will go down to where funds are actually provided for loans, he will see that the language to which I have referred is in the bill, and is applicable to all the loans which are made. I shall read from the current act. The Senator is reading from the administrative appropriation item. If he will go down to the third paragraph, he will find this provision, which relates to all the loans:

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $60,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield,

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That applies only to money obtained from the R. F. C. That is one difficulty in attempting to incorporate this language by reference. But it is clear to me that if this is an authorization bill the first four purposes are broadly authorized in general terms, and if Congress appropriates money for them the Secretary may proceed under the first section without relying on the R. F. C. at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will read the language in the first paragraph again he will see that it refers to the administrative part of the program. I read:

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants.

That has to do with the administrative end of it, and the work which is being done.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, I should like to read it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The language reads as follows:

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including—(1), (2), (3), and (4), $20,000,000—

which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. So $20,000,000 is available also for each of (1), (2), (3), and (4) directives. When that is incorporated, as here, in an authorization bill it is perfectly clear that the authorization covers the making of loans to needy farmers without reference to the R. F. C. in unlimited amount and without the restrictions imposed on R. F. C. loans.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been much interested in the argument of the Senator from Ohio. I think he has made a very good argument in favor of his contention.

Mr. TAFT. I do not mind the irregularity for a year or two, but I do not think we should have permanently on the books language which is ambiguous.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator advocate going further and supporting the limitation on R. F. C. loans to needy industries for a certain time?

Mr. TAFT. I am in favor of stopping all R. F. C. loans to industries not later than a year and a half or 2 years following the end of the war. I think the Government is in the loaning business when it should not be. While the Government cannot get out of it at the present moment, and may not be able to get out of it when it is confronted with great conversion problems of the post-war period, I believe that within 2 years after the end of the war we should take the Government out of the business of loaning money.

Mr. AIKEN. Until that is done it seems to me that we should give exactly the same consideration to a man who borrows $150 to fix the roof on his barn as we give to the man who borrows $250,000 in order to keep his factory in operation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we are asked to pass an authorization bill adding a number of ambiguous provisions to the appropriation bill of 1944. It seems that they should be drawn in the form of an appropriation for 1 year, and not for a long-term program of many years. I am satisfied with the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I think before the expiration date, which is 2 years, we should be able to rewrite a fundamentally correct farm-credit bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if this authorization bill does not merely say that the subjects which are covered in the bill are proper subjects for appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Committee on Appropriations expect to go into these various items in detail and determine whether each one of them is

necessary, before appropriations are made?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should not undertake to estimate the number of hours which have been spent by the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations in holding hearings on this item, and conferring and working on it in an attempt to see that every possible safeguard is placed about it.

Mr. McFARLAND. In connection with the various agencies which have been mentioned, in which the making of public loans has taken place, has there been any evidence that private capital has been willing to replace all those loans?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not all of them, I am sure.

Mr. McFARLAND. If there were evidence that private capital was willing to come into those fields and make loans at the rate of interest charged by the Government, would appropriations in connection with those items be asked for?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. If private capital were willing to make the loans, this specific Government agency, the F. S. A., could not make them, because the law provides that loans will be made only to those who cannot obtain funds in the areas in which they live.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator a similar question with regard to page 15 of the bill on which appears language concerning the lunch program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me, I shall come to that point in a moment.

I wish to say with regard to the Farm Security Administration, that, whether it shall be continued for 1 year, or 2 years, we certainly should continue it, because the Government has a very large stake in the program. We have outstanding about $400,000,000 in these loans, and we are collecting them at the rate of $128,000,000 a year.

If we do not have authorization somewhere for the Farm Security Administration, we do not even have any provision to attempt to service those loans and collect them. Certainly some reference should be made to the functions of the Farm Security Administration in this bill so that we can at least make an appropriation in order to insure that what the taxpayers and the Treasury has invested in these loans is fully protected.

In addition, approximately 500,000 farm families are today relying on these loans. An abandonment of the program would cause great chaos and confusion on 500,000 farms of this country and would bring about great loss in the production of food and fiber which are needed in the war effort.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In the State of South Dakota the Farm Security set-up has in the past engaged in a sort of socialized medicine program. Does the Senator know anything about it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have read something about the medical program. I am sorry that I cannot give the Senator all details with regard to it, but I know that there is a cooperative medical program of some kind. I have received no complaint that it was what is called socialized medicine.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is it the expectation of the Senator from Georgia that the medical program provided for in this measure will be a part of the F. S. A., in case we continue it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will be unless some limitation is placed upon the appropriation. The Senator can draw his own conclusions, but for my part I am not going to make any snap judgment on it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In my own State it was a venture operated for profit by a few individuals.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not approve of a program of that kind, but I can see that the Farm Security clients, who are poor people, may not be able to obtain medical attention unless they are permitted to obtain loans for that purpose.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I never heard of a patient in my State unable to get a doctor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator brought out a point about which I should like to ask him. Are these loans paid back?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are all repayable and most of them are being repaid.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is one thing about which not much has been said. We have been talking about money and loans, but not about production. Is it not a fact that a vast production in many areas of the United States today is from small farms?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would merely observe that any excess of labor in this country on the farm is on the small-type farm. The old man may be there and he may have a boy about 14 years of age, and a girl about 12 years of age, and his wife may be able to do a little work. If they have a little farm they can grow more chickens and maintain some extra milk cows. They have the labor. The large producers cannot get the labor to expand. These people have made a perfectly remarkable record in increasing their production.

I had intended to delay any discussion of this question until the appropriation bill came before the Senate, but these people have increased the production of milk, of butter, of pork, and of eggs, and other commodities which the War Food Administration has encouraged, to a much higher degree than have the average farmers in the country who are not under the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the last statement made by the distinguished Senator is correct. The record is full of testimony of the increase in the production of poultry, of hogs, of milk, and of soybeans, by these particular farmers. As a matter of fact, it is a better record than was made by other classes of farmers.

Mr. President, with reference to the question asked by the Senator from South Dakota, I know that if it had not been for the help of the Farm Security Administration in my State in the way of medicine, in many instances in many counties there would not have been medicine for the people. It might have been socialized medicine, or this or that but it was certainly humane and I, for one, want that program to continue.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the statement which has been made about increased production, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point in the RECORD the tables which appear on page 359 of the hearings on the agricultural appropriation bill for the year 1945, showing the increase in the production that has been obtained through Farm Security borrowing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1943 sales of livestock and livestock products by active standard Rural Rehabilitation borrowers who were operating farms in 1942 and 1943

Product	Unit [1]	1943 sales	Increase in sales, 1942 to 1943		Number of active men increased sales will feed for 1 year
			Amount	Percent	
Hogs	Pound	532,361,500	190,172,300	56	1,584,800
Cattle and calves	Pound	432,360,700	130,619,500	43	816,400
Sheep	Pound	62,777,800	14,333,000	30	716,600
Milk	Gallon	571,116,000	87,389,700	18	1,344,500
Chickens	Pound	66,069,700	20,987,900	47	787,000
Eggs	Dozen	126,333,300	30,418,500	32	1,789,300

[1] Pounds are live weight.

1942 and 1943 production of selected crops by 1943 active standard rural rehabilitation borrowers who were operating farms in both years

Crops	Unit	1942 production, amount	1943 production, amount	Percent increase 1942 to 1943
Soybeans	Bushels	3,682,900	5,049,200	37
Peanuts	Pounds	128,236,000	156,776,400	22
Dry beans and black-eyed peas	Pounds	73,176,900	84,185,000	15
Wheat	Bushels	27,946,100	26,950,300	−4
Irish potatoes	Bushels	12,608,200	20,596,800	65
Sweetpotatoes	Bushels	5,225,000	5,972,700	14

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. With reference to the value of this program, I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that no bank in my State will loan to an Indian on an Indian reservation. The Farm Security Administration loaned to Indians on the Standing Rock Reservation, and at Elbow Woods, and the loans were repaid by the Indians even in a greater proportion than the white people have repaid their loans. If this program shall be abolished, it will mean that such Indians can no longer get such loans. Therefore I am supporting the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that concludes the items in the bill, except that having reference to the so-called school lunch program.

Perhaps Senators will recall that when the appropriation bill was on the floor of the Senate last year, it came here after the House had eliminated the school-lunch program. The Senate included the provision in the bill. The House conferees were very reluctant to accept the provision, but finally did accept it, with the statement in the conference report that the program would not be urged in 1945 unless substantive legislation were enacted prior to that date. That goes to show the importance of having some statutory authorization such as we are seeking in the bill before us for the activities of the Department related directly to our people.

The standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has therefore adopted an amendment to the pending bill specifically authorizing a school lunch program for the ensuing fiscal year. If this program is to be had at all, we must have some authorization, because the House has, through the conference report, which the Senate conferees were compelled to agree to, stated the House would not consider the program this year, and it was voted down by a substantial majority on the floor of the House when an effort was made to bring it up this year.

Whatever may be the merits or the demerits of the school lunch program, there is certainly as great need for it this year as there has ever been before. More women are at work in the war plants, more mothers are compelled to work in the fields and around the lots on the farm, and they do not have the time or opportunity to prepare the food the children should have.

I personally think this has been one of the finest and most beneficial programs our country has ever seen. In my State, as well as in other States, I think in all of the States of the Union, there are children who eat practically the same things three times a day, and one of the most staggering indictments of our lack of interest in such a program I have ever seen was presented when large numbers of young men who had lived in their youth upon a diet which was deficient from a nutritional point of view, presented themselves to the selective service boards.

Unfortunately, over my objection, the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry adopted an amendment to the pending bill limiting the program to 1 year. I think we should adopt it permanently, but I am not in a position to offer such an amendment, because the chairman of the committee asked me to handle the bill upon the floor, and I was defeated on the same proposition in the committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what reason was given for limiting the program to 1 year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Two things contributed to the committee's action. Those who oppose any school-lunch program, of course, voted to limit it to 1 year. There was another group who favor some program but who wanted to get some other kind of bill, and have the matter handled in some other way. I did not wish to risk the continuance of the program to the future whims and fancies of Congress, when we could have it provided for at this time, but I was outvoted in the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It might be well to state that it was defeated by a tie vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true; as I recall, the vote in the committee was 7 to 7.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In regard to the school-lunch program, I should like to go back to the beginning and work up to the present time. The Senator is more familiar than I am with the reasons for the school-lunch program. Two reasons were stated at the time the program was started. First, it was to take care of surplus commodities from the farm, and, second, to employ W. P. A. labor. Those were the two reasons assigned for the provision.

Is there any justification for a continuation of this program at this time, when the Department of Agriculture tells us that the nutrition of the people of this country today is 44 percent higher than it was in 1935 and 1936?

Furthermore, here is the selective-service set-up. The distinguished Senator, as I understood him, stated there were many people in this country who were undernourished. I dispute that statement. The Department of Agriculture and some of its fanciful writers made the statement that millions of people were undernourished. That is not true, as is substantiated by the record. There is no better proof in America today of what I am saying than the selective-service system. They have examined fifteen to twenty million men. They have classified the reasons for the rejection of those men from the military service, and I shall refer to what they say about it. Instead of there being many people undernourished, I find in their report that just about 1½ percent are rejected for malnutrition. Those who are rejected for malnutrition, in fact, all the men who have been examined for military service came from the communities whence came the allegedly undernourished children. If there were undernourishment to the extent the Senator has intimated, or the writers of the Department of Agriculture have told us, it would reflect itself in the military service, and it is not shown there.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not here contending that we have any condition of starvation in this country such as that I saw in Calcutta, India, where the authorities were picking up people from the streets in the morning and throwing them on trucks and carrying them outside, burning the corpses of those who starved to death in the streets. Of course I have not contended we have any such condition of starvation as that in this country. But I also have some evidence. The Selective Service examinations, according to a statement I have, show that 3.2 percent of the registrants have had specific nutritional defects, such as beriberi, scurvy, pellagra, malnutrition, night blindness, and undernourishment. Those people were actually suffering from some disease caused by poor dietary conditions.

But in addition over 14 times as many, or 43 percent of these registrants, had defects of eyes, teeth, blood vessels, and other ailments which were partly traceable to nutritional deficiencies. I should like to point out that over 23 percent of 15,251 volunteers reporting to a Red Cross mobile blood donor unit in Chicago were rejected, 14 percent of them because of nutritional anemia. Certainly there are families with large numbers of children in this country that even today, at this time when the national income is greater than it has ever been before, do not have a fully balanced diet. That is not always on account of poverty or lack of funds. In a great many cases it is due to a lack of knowledge and understanding of how to prepare the food. Such knowledge is one of the greatest benefits we have derived from this school-lunch program. Some of the children from some homes have practically the same thing served them three times a day in many sections of the country. They know what an Irish potato is because they have it at home, but they have never seen whipped Irish potatoes or creamed Irish potatoes. They are familiar only with fried Irish potatoes. The school-lunch program has brought about a better understanding of diet and of better food and of better ways of preparing and using foods. It has opened up more avenues for many people of this country than almost any Federal program we have had.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to suggest that perhaps the Selective Service had better get together on the figures furnished. The book I hold in my hand was issued by the Selective Service, and I assume the book from which the Senator is quoting was issued by them. My book says that 1.5 percent were rejected by reason of malnutrition.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not confine my statement to malnutrition. I said 3.2

percent had specific physical defects, such as beriberi.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In the book I have, nothing is attributed to beriberi at all. After beriberi the item is blank. The same is true with respect to scurvy, which the Senator mentioned.

Mr. RUSSELL. I also referred to pellagra and rickets.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Opposite pellagra the figure is one-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Also underweight. I do not think there is any confusion with respect to the figures. The Senator is simply limiting his figures apparently to those who were suffering from lack of food at the time they were examined, and did not take into consideration those who were suffering from rickets, night blindness, pellagra, and other diseases which are directly attributable to malnutrition.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Where were these figures secured?

Mr. RUSSELL. I requested those handling this program to obtain for me any figures they could from Selective Service.

Mr. BYRD. There is a wide discrepancy between the various figures which have been cited.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is, because the figures the Senator referred to related to malnutrition, whereas the figures I gave related to other diseases. There are different classifications involved.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But two of the so-called diseases the Senator mentions are given in the chart I have in my hand, which comes from Selective Service, as not having any effect at all, being simply blank.

One more point, Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will bear with me. The Senator spoke about the children who receive school lunches learning something about food. I agree with the Senator that it is most desirable to teach individuals to eat a better and a more complete diet, but are we to undertake at this time to tell the American people what kind of food they shall eat? Is the Senator prepared to go that far?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I am not prepared to do that.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is the implication to be drawn from the Senator's remarks.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think such an inference can be properly drawn. I certainly think we ought to furnish all the information we possibly can to the American people on proper food for their use. Under the Senator's argument, carried to its last analysis, the Federal Government could furnish information on how to treat a horse for night blindness or any other disease of horses, but could not diffuse information as to the diet of human beings.

I say, Mr. President, that there is a tremendous amount of interest in this program. The Federal Government has some responsibility in connection with this matter. I think it would cause much more confusion than Senators apprehend if this program were to stop now. It had a very small beginning. Today, with the contributions from the States—and the States are required to contribute under this language for expenditures this year—around $40,000,000 of Federal funds are contributed—a total over-all expenditure of $180,000,000 is now being made for school lunches in this country. For every dollar we put up approximately $2 are being contributed by the local school districts or by the State organizations or other sponsors.

I also wish to point out that we have not solved our problems of surpluses in this country. When the War Food Administration picked the 46 different commodities for which they guaranteed prices, they invited some temporary surpluses. We have a temporary surplus of eggs today. We have a temporary surplus of cabbage today. These temporary surpluses will occur from time to time under this tremendous agricultural program we have to insure food and clothing for our people and our armed forces. This outlet through the War Food Administration for the school lunches is one of the most valuable outlets we have. It does not depress the prices the farmer receives. It does not affect market prices. It is not in competition with any other outlet. It serves a most useful purpose in the schools.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did I understand the Senator to say that the program would be $40,000,000 this year?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the limitation is $50,000,000, as I understand. Oh, yes, it will cost about $40,000,000 this year.

Mr. TAFT. But the new appropriation for next year would not be over $50,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it would not be over $50,000,000. The Senator from Ohio is responsible for that limitation this year. It was placed in the bill last year under an amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Has the Senator any information respecting the number of Federal employees on the pay roll engaged in administering the school-lunch program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The number is very small. They are chiefly auditors who check the reports filed by the States as to the disposition of surpluses of agricultural commodities and of the funds that are turned over to the States. It is run in most instances almost entirely by the State departments of education.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have in my hand a booklet published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, called The School Lunch Program and Agricultural Surplus Disposal, in which it speaks of 65,000 workers engaged in administering this program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator must be calling in all of the triple A people, even down to the local committeemen, who do not have the remotest connection with the school-lunch program. There cannot be any large number of employees handling the Federal part of the program.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have a letter from the National School Cafeteria Association addressed to at least some Senators and Representatives, urging the recipients to get after their Members of Congress to put over this program, and I am wondering if there is not a pretty well oiled organization in the Department of Agriculture to put this program through?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not think there is at all. There is interest, because people who have dealt with the program are naturally friendly to it. But none of these funds can be expended within the State by the State for any personal service. The States have to contribute all the personal service. The States have to contribute all the equipment on which the food is prepared and then distributed. The States have to pay out of their funds or school funds for the handling of these local programs in the schools. None of the Federal funds can be expended in the actual handling of the food. The Federal funds are provided only for the payment of those who distribute the food and the auditors to see that the States carry out the agreement, and that there are no sharp practices in the handling of the program.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In view of the fact that this program was initiated to take care of the problem of agricultural surpluses, which does not exist today, what is the purpose of the school program?

Mr. RUSSELL. In the first place, I do not concede that we do not have any agricultural surpluses today. I have received mail from any number of poultry growers in my State in the past 2 months saying that the Federal Government had insisted that they increase their production of eggs, and now that they have increased their production they cannot sell them. There has been recent complaint that the Federal Government had promised them a certain price for their eggs, and that they could not get in the market the amount the Federal Government had promised them. The Federal Government is handling the surplus of eggs today. There is certainly no more valuable food than eggs. Eggs which are being acquired by section 32 funds are being shipped to schools. While this program is usually described in figures, so many millions of dollars, much of that money was in the form of eggs and in the form of cabbage, beans, and other food. In years past when we had the great glut of butter in this country, and butter went down to nearly nothing, this program handled thousands of pounds of butter and sent it to the schools and the children ate it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator in favor of surpluses that drive the farmers' products down to almost nothing?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have always felt that in time of war it is much better to have too much than to

have too little. For my part I would much rather have a surplus of food in this country than run into shortages and have the men that are overseas fighting this war for us be hungry for one moment. I want them to have the finest diet obtainable and plenty of it.

Of course I want the farmer to receive a fair price for his product. He does not do so now in all instances. However, without the support prices for these commodities he would be worse off than he is now. He has undoubtedly suffered as compared to some other groups from the way certain phases have been handled. But the farmer is as anxious to take care of those on the firing line as anyone else and he has made a magnificent contribution to that end.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the very thing I was talking about when I referred to the appropriation for the F. S. A. We have 30 percent more eggs this week than we had a year ago, and the F. S. A. has loaned money to the farmers to enable them to have more hens and to produce more eggs to make greater surpluses to be given away.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is better to have a surplus now than to have a shortage. That is the fundamental difference in my philosophy and that of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I care little what the purpose of establishing this new lunch fund was in the first instance; I do not think it makes any difference why it was first established. The question is, Do we need it now? If the children of the United States, I care not if only one-half of 1 percent or one one-hundredth of 1 percent of them, are undernourished, to that extent I believe the Congress of the United States should feed the undernourished children. If we are going to cut down on appropriations, let us not cut down in this respect.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I think the Senator should distinguish between undernourished and hungry children. We do not have any hungry children; we may have a small number of undernourished children.

Mr. McFARLAND. Whether they are hungry or undernourished we ought to give them the proper food.

Mr. TAFT. Do I understand the Senator to say that if one one-hundredth of 1 percent are undernourished the Federal Government ought to feed the other ninety-nine one-hundredths?

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not make any such statement. I said that, regardless of the percentage who are undernourished, the children should be fed.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; this program takes in everybody who is undernourished and everybody who is healthy, and it feeds those who are undernourished just as it does those who are in health. It is a matter of wise decision, I think, that is all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is in error as to that. The agreement entered into with the State boards of education and with parochial schools that have these programs set forth that they may charge to those who are able to pay, but they cannot charge those who are unable to pay, and in that way Federal money through the whole program is eventually funneled down where it does make lunches available to those who are unable to pay for them.

Mr. TAFT. That may be so, but I do not think that is the case in Ohio. The lunches were financed for all alike and no payment was made.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is as badly mistaken as he ever was in his life. The children pay for those lunches in almost every instance where they are able to pay. There are three different types of luncheons: one toward which the Federal Government contributes 9 cents, a hot lunch in the middle of the day; then a 6-cent lunch, and then the milk program; but all the agreements provide that those who are unable to pay shall not be discriminated against in the schools. In that way the program finally does get down to those who are in need.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have received many letters upon this subject and many people in my State are concerned in regard to the possible elimination of this program. I should like to read an example of the letters which I have received in regard to this subject.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. STEWART. What is the objection to the school-lunch program anyway?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator will have to ask those who are objecting to it.

Mr. STEWART. They have not stated any reason as yet.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know why they object, I do not know why anyone should object to feeding a hungry child.

Mr. President, I have received many letters along the line of the following:

AVONDALE GRAMMAR SCHOOL,
Avondale, Ariz., April 17, 1944.

Hon. ERNEST W. McFARLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been principal of the Avondale School 8 years, which is located in a rural community 18 miles west of Phoenix. Just 2 miles from the Avondale School we have a migratory labor camp which houses about 400 families. Besides these 400 migratory families farmers in the community have provided temporary shelters for hundreds of other farm workers.

In dealing with low-income families we have found it almost necessary to provide some sort of a low-cost nourishing meal for children from these homes.

With Federal assistance for the school-lunch program the Avondale School has been able to provide lunches for about 400 school children daily for the last 5 years.

When we read in the papers such statements as "Federal assistance for the school-lunch program will cease June 30" we begin to wonder just how schools will be able to continue with a satisfactory school-lunch program without this Federal aid.

As principal of the Avondale School and a citizen in a farming community, I wish to solicit your support in the continuance of Federal aid for the school-lunch program. Your support in this worthy Nation-wide program is badly needed.

Very truly yours,

L. F. COOR.

Mr. President, I have many other communications along the same line. I maintain that there is need for this program, and in this time when we have authorized money to U. N. R. R. A. to feed those who are undernourished in other lands, are we going to deny to our own children in the United States needed luncheons?

At the proper time, Mr. President, I expect to offer an amendment to eliminate the restriction to 1 year, because when this program is needed, whether next year or in time to come, I maintain we should provide the money for the purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to recommit the bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I desire at this time to withdraw my motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to recommit is withdrawn. The clerk will state the first committee amendment which appears to be section 303.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, after line 2, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 303. That all purposes and objects of expenditure which are provided for under the item "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, are hereby authorized for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in the manner, in the detail, and under the conditions, authorities, restrictions, and limitations as are contained in the item referred to, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated and to be otherwise made available such sums as Congress may deem necessary for the purposes of this section.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, section 303, lines 7 and 8, page 13, it is proposed to strike out "for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945," and insert in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years 1944–5 and 1945–6."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I desire to offer to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 12, after the word "section" in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of such sums be available for the promotion or aid

of any program of medical care which prevents the patient from having the services of any practitioner of his own choice so long as State laws are complied with."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 304. Public Law 118, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 7, 1943, is hereby amended by the addition of the following: "That farmers' reports of the acreage of flue-cured tobacco planted or harvested in the marketing years 1944–45 shall be considered correct if within one-fifth of an acre or 7 percent, whichever is greater, of the acreage finally determined, but the acreage in excess of that reported shall not be considered as past production in succeeding years."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to know why the amendment is limited to tobacco.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment was offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. He can explain it, perhaps, better than I can.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to know from the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, why, in line 16, the provision with respect to acreage is limited to flue-cured tobacco. The Senator will recall that a short time ago there was an acreage limitation on wheat.

Mr. RUSSELL. Tobacco is the only commodity which is under acreage limitation at the present time. There is no acreage limitation on any commodity except tobacco.

Mr. LANGER. I know that at the present time there is no acreage limitation on any other commodity. However, if we are to extend this provision into 1946 and possibly 1947, I wish to be sure that wheat is also covered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, tobacco is the only commodity which is now under acreage limitation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator knows that the only reason why wheat can be overseeded is because of a directive issued by the Secretary of Agriculture. Wheat farmers are limited by that directive.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, tobacco is the only commodity now under acreage restriction. There may be some question as to the wisdom of the amendment from the standpoint of the tobacco growers. However, no other commodity is now under acreage restriction. Any farmer can plant all the wheat or rice or cotton he wishes to plant. Tobacco is the only commodity now under acreage restriction.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think the Senator will agree that the only reason why farmers are not now limited as to the acreage they may plant in wheat is because of a directive issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, not because of the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may be true. No election as to wheat or cotton was held last year. The amendment will have no effect on wheat because, under the directive of the Secretary of Agriculture, farmers can plant all the wheat they wish to plant.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator say that in 1945 there will be no limitation on the acreage which may be planted in wheat, so far as the Senator can now foresee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not heard of any proposal to limit wheat acreage in 1945. We seem to be faced with a shortage of wheat, especially for feed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, this amendment is offered because under the allotment program the farmers who plant tobacco never have used all their allotments, for fear they might overplant, and be penalized. The amendment provides that if the farmers overplant not more than one-fifth of an acre or 7 percent, whichever is greater, they shall not be penalized; but the amendment would take effect for only 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 13, lines 13 to 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 403. Section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, is hereby further amended by the addition of the following language:

"The funds appropriated by and pursuant to this section may also be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purposes of this program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any States does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reapportion such excess funds to such other States in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further*, That benefits under this section to schools or child-care centers shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof delivered to the school or child-care center as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further*, That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in this section: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 percent of the funds made available under this amendment shall be used to provide food for children in child-care centers.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, such additional amounts for the purposes of this amendment as the Congress may deem necessary."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word "used", in line 18, page 15, down to and including the figures "1945", in line 19, page 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I favor the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment and so voted in committee. This amendment is a rather important one. Do I understand that the amendment has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Chair previously stated that my amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to, and I believe everyone understands what has occurred.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know whether all Senators understood that the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment was to make the school lunch program a permanent matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not understand what happened to the committee amendment as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was adopted, as amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. TAFT. What was that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment was read from the desk, but it is possible that the Senator from Ohio did not hear it distinctly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment was adopted be reconsidered. Am I to understand that the amendment of the Senator from Arizona struck out the date "1945"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Ohio propound his question again?

Mr. TAFT. I wish to know what was the amendment which was adopted to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, in line 18, all after the word "used" was stricken out, down to and including the figures "1945", in line 19, page 15

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment was agreed to be now reconsidered. I do not think the Senate understood the action which was taken.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has not the committee amendment as amended been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, then I move that the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to. [Putting the question.]

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask for a division.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thought the Chair ruled at one time on the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All in favor of agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to will stand.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we have proceeded all day on the theory that we were authorizing the child-feeding program for 1 year, on a temporary basis. That was the proposal made by the committee. That was the basis on which all opposition to the proposal was practically eliminated and the debate on it was eliminated. I think it is an extraordinary procedure for a Senator to submit, at the last moment, an amendment making the program a permanent institution.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is a Senator precluded from offering an amendment merely because the Senator from Ohio has proceeded on the theory that we were going to make the provision for only 1 year?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all; but that has been the assumption.

Mr. McFARLAND. That was not the assumption of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. TAFT. If that was not the assumption, I intend to open the whole debate again. I should like to speak at some length on the subject, because it seems to me we are adopting a policy which is wholly unjustified as a permanent measure by the Constitution of the United States, and one to which I certainly am very strenuously opposed. I made no objection to the continuation of the program for 1 year, because it is now in actual process. There are now pending in committee three bills to establish a permanent program. Under those bills the program is set up in considerable detail. Two of the bills are now pending in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and one in the Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings on the bills are about to begin, if they have not already begun today. Certainly it was not the intention in this bill to provide for the permanent establishment of a program of child feeding, and I do not think the Senate desires that the bill do so. If any such program is to be established there are many restrictions and amendments which should be adopted, in order to work it out in a proper way, if it is to be done at all.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, quite apart from the merits of this matter, namely, whether the amendment to the committee amendment should be incorporated in this legislation, I submit to the Senator from Arizona that there was confusion in the Chamber when his amendment was offered. There was even greater confusion when the vote was taken. I venture the assertion that few Senators now in the Chamber had any appreciation of what the parliamentary situation was at the time when they voted or failed to vote. I simply submit to the Senator from Arizona that he should consent to the reconsideration of this matter, and to its determination upon its merits, as the Senate understands them.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will do so on the condition that we take the vote now, and conclude consideration of the matter.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to say that two bills on the subject of school lunches are now pending before my committee, and I think there is perhaps a third one. Hearings on them have been held or will be held, and the question will be brought before the Senate for permanent settlement.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in answer, I would say that if a bill providing for a permanent program is brought in it will amend the pending legislation. There is no harm in my amendment to the committee amendment. All my amendment would do would be to authorize the Appropriations Committee to appropriate money, if and when, after they have heard the evidence, they find there is need for it. That is all in the world that this authorization does. It does not appropriate the money. If after the Appropriations Committee hears the evidence, it finds, and the Congress finds, that the money is necessary and the appropriation should be made, it will be made. That is all the amendment does. It does not appropriate any money.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think the amendment which was agreed to is a reasonable compromise on the question of future permanent legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I recall, when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had this bill under discussion, a motion was made to incorporate in the bill the amendment which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], which was defeated.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was defeated by a tie vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The committee thought it best to limit the program to 1 year, in view of the fact that we had pending before our committee two bills. I will say to the Senate that we are now holding hearings on those two bills, so as to determine how these funds should be handled in the future.

In view of that fact, my hope is that the Senate will limit this authorization to 1 year only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 15, line 12, as amended, was agreed to. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if we can vote on the question at this time, I am sure the Senator from Arizona has no objection to the amendment being voted upon on its merits.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we can have the vote now and dispose of the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to, may be reconsidered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will not object to that if the Senator will agree that we proceed at once to vote. I do not wish to postpone consideration of the bill indefinitely. If I am in the minority, very well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I will not agree to postpone debate. I propose to discuss the question at as great length as is necessary. If the Senator wishes to give unanimous consent, I do not see that he loses anything, because the same issue will arise on his amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator from Michigan informs me that he did not understand this matter when it was voted upon——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I simply wish to say that I think the Senator from Arizona will lose no rights if the issue is voted upon first-hand instead of second-hand. I am sure the Senator from Arizona would not wish to put himself in the position of denying any Senator the right to be heard upon a subject which he did not understand was being voted upon. I know the Senator from Arizona too well to think that he would take that position.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his generosity

to me. Certainly I do not wish to deny any Senator the privilege of being heard. I should like to have the bill disposed of this afternoon, because it has been pending for some time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I share that wish.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not wish to deprive the Senator from Ohio of the opportunity of discussing the amendment. I will agree to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Without objection, the order for the yeas and nays is rescinded; and, without objection, the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] was agreed to is also reconsidered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the proposal of the committee is to appropriate $50,000,000 a year for the Federal Government to provide school lunches in many thousands of public and private schools throughout the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does it authorize a specific amount?

Mr. TAFT. I mention $50,000,000 because, as a matter of fact, the authorization is unlimited, but the actual appropriation which will be proposed this year will be $50,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is limited by the need found by Congress, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. It is limited, of course, as all authorizations are, by the amount of the appropriation which may be made.

The purpose of this item is:

> To provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine.

The Surplus Commodity Corporation first distributed surplus foods. After a while, when there were no surplus foods, it proceeded to commute the food payments into cash, without any authority whatsoever. Its action was confirmed by Congress in one or two appropriation bills, but in the main it had no authority whatever. The first we heard of it, the Surplus Commodities Corporation had suddenly commuted payments into cash, and was distributing cash to all the individual schools throughout the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator is in error. None of those payments were ever made until the Congress in an appropriation bill, specifically authorized the use of section 32 funds. A vote was had on the question, and the Senator from Ohio offered an amendment which reduced the amount which could be handled in that manner from $60,000,000 to $50,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. That was a year ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that; but no payments were ever made which the Congress did not authorize in an appropriation bill.

Mr. TAFT. That was a year ago. At that time we were told that it had already been done, and that if we did not vote to approve it, a program in full force and operation would be stopped. If my recollection is correct, the Senator admitted last year that the administration had commuted the payments and had made subsidy payments without authority from Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. Reimbursement payments for other than surpluses were made only under specific authority from the Congress. We gave that authority. There was some question about it last year, and the Senator from Ohio raised the question of the amount, and the Senate reduced the amount. The Senator charges the authorities with spending the money illegally. I assert that Congress had given the War Food Administrator the power to do this, and there has been no abuse of statutory power. The program has been more or less patchwork. It grew up like Topsy, through the disposition of the surplus commodities. There have been defects here and there, but I do not admit that it has been in violation of law.

Mr. TAFT. I do not assert that the payments were illegally made since we appropriated money a year ago, but I say that they undertook to make subsidy payments before there was any statutory authority whatsoever. That is history. It is water over the dam. I do not think it is particularly material here, but that is the history of the case.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is very material whether or not the authorities have violated a law of Congress. I do not think they have done so. I believe that the entire program has been carried on in conformity with section 32, as well as the specific authority of the Congress as delegated in the agricultural appropriation act. I do not think there has been any violation of law in this program.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is mistaken. I shall be glad to submit a memorandum later to show the facts.

On the basic question of this program, I cannot understand the basis on which the Federal Government is asked to provide food, or money to pay for lunches of children throughout the United States. The program is not confined to poor children. In practice it may be or it may not be so confined. The authorization is to provide lunches for children in any school in the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to read from a copy of the master agreement which was entered into between the Department of Agriculture and the several States, or the individual schools. This is article 6:

> The sponsoring agency—

That is, the school—

> shall offer meals to all children attending the school or child-care center, and shall serve meals without cost to all children unable to pay. No discrimination or segregation of any sort shall be permitted between paying and nonpaying children.

That is the provision in every one of these contracts. Children who are able to pay may be charged but those who are unable to pay are not charged. I have before me a statement——

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is presumably reading from some agreement, which has no relation whatever to the act. So far as the act is concerned, it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to give food to any children, at any school—public, parochial, or otherwise—which is operated by a nonprofit organization.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am speaking of——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I decline to yield further at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have never declined to yield to the Senator. I was about to read figures from the State of Ohio. The Senator has declined to yield, which he has a right to do.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

However, it is perfectly clear that there is nothing in the authorization which in any way confines the distribution of school lunches. This is a program by which the Federal Government, so far as we can see, and so far as any limitation here is concerned, may pay 100 percent of the cost of the lunch of every school child in the United States, in every county, every city, and every school district in the United States. There is nothing in the Federal Constitution, or in our dual system of government, which authorizes the Federal Government to undertake any such payment, or justifies it in doing so.

We have assisted States in the payment of relief money. It has always been related in some way to the need. This program is in no way related to the need. It is proposed that every child in every school shall receive a free lunch from the Federal Government. That is a necessary implication, and authority for it is given in the bill which we are now asked to pass. It applies to every rich child. The proposal that we shall try to make paupers of some children and say to them in effect, "You cannot pay for your lunch," would be an unfortunate democratic situation if put into effect.

Mr. President, I see no reason whatever for the Federal Government to undertake a program of this character. We might as well give every child in the United States a pair of shoes, to be paid for out of the Federal Treasury. There is no distinction that I can see between that and the school-lunch program which is here proposed. The program has been lobbied all over the United

States. One of the heads of the Department of Agriculture has been stirring up telegrams and has been active in appearing in a double capacity in order to lobby for this particular program. Jessie W. Harris, a division chief in the Department of Agriculture, has been active. She has sent to persons all over the United States her propaganda in favor of this particular measure. She is also president of the Home Economics Association, and appears in her capacity as such while at the same time being paid by the United States Department of Agriculture.

I believe that we have here a program which Congress has never approved and which has no constitutional purpose whatever. I can see some reason, during wartime when mothers and fathers are working, and when it is difficult to provide lunches, for the Federal Government to take an interest in seeing that children receive the benefits of the proposed program. But as a permanent program following the war I cannot see the slightest interest which the Federal Government should have in this kind of activity. I should be willing to go along with a 1-year or a 2-year program.

During the war we have a special situation in which children are not well cared for, and in which parents are not always able to provide for them. Because of the increase in the cost of living many parents are finding it more difficult to provide for their children. However, once the war is over, I can see no reason for providing for this program unless we are to support all the children of the United States.

I think it would be very unfortunate to extend the program beyond the period of the war. I think it is unfortunate that the issue should have been raised in connection with this bill, which involves many other matters of greater importance, and I feel very strongly that the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] should be rejected.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will compromise with the Senator on 2 years.

Mr. TAFT. I am willing to agree to 2 years because I am willing to consider it on a war basis. I accept the proposed compromise of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment so as to read, in line 18 on page 15:

> The funds appropriated by and pursuant to this section may also be used during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945 and 1946—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona, as proposed by him to be modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 18, in the committee amendment, after the word "fiscal," it is proposed to strike out "year" and insert "years"; and in line 19, after "1945," it is proposed to insert "and 1946."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] to the committee amendment beginning in line 17 on page 15.

The modified amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4278) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SMITH. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SMITH, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1718. I wish to have it made the unfinished business, but not considered further at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I promised the office of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who was present a day or two ago, that the bill would not be taken up until he had an opportunity to return, which I understand will be tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. It will not be taken up until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations of postmasters, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harold K. Claypool, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio, vice Charles H. Sisson, deceased;

William M. Lindsay, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas; and

Elwyn R. Shaw, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice Charles Edgar Woodward, deceased.

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Ohio, vice Leo Calvin Crawford, term expired.

By Mr CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Pinkney Tuck, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Egypt; and

R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Portugal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal.

By Mr McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry O. Arend to be United States attorney for division No. 4 of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward M. Curran to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian S. Odem to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William R. Smith, Jr., to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George A. Wright to be United States marshal for the district of Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The legislative clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr., to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edgar Bernard Brossard to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George J. Schoeneman to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip M. Klutznick to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph P. Marcelle to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul R. Leake to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Martin O. Bement to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Austin J. Mahoney to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotion in the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President may be immediately notified of all these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, May 3, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 2 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARIZONA

Jeanette Mae Collins, Dateland, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ARKANSAS

M. Evorie Kirkham, Delight, Ark., in place of G. L. Webb, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Henry I. Hoirup, Bolinas, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Roy A. Smith, Eldridge, Calif., in place of A. E. Schieck, deceased.

Kenneth Baird Haslam, Firebaugh, Calif., in place of F. I. Wyckoff, transferred.

Robert E. Meacham, Hermosa Beach, Calif., in place of M. S. Wick, resigned.

Eva L. Fowler, Kelseyville, Calif., in place of N. C. Fowler, deceased.

Lawrence P. Comerford, Lincoln Acres, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sadie L. Diaz, San Marcos, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Llewellyn B. Peck, Saratoga, Calif., in place of L. C. Puccinelli, resigned.

Wanda L. Stark, Tulelake, Calif., in place of E. M. Taylor, resigned.

COLORADO

Harry R. Boles, Kersey, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CONNECTICUT

Earl E. Sexton, East Lyme, Conn. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1943.

Roland Lester Powe, North Windham, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

DELAWARE

Mary S. Bell, Smyrna, Del., in place of D H. Bell, deceased.

GEORGIA

J. Heard Summerour, Duluth, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth G. Dixon, Girard, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Wilma G. Cook, Parrott, Ga., in place of H. E. Cook, deceased.

IDAHO

Imelda B. Wimer, Cottonwood, Idaho, in place of F. S. Wimer, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Nigel B. Herrin, Cave in Rock, Ill., in place of W. C. Herrin, deceased.

Roll E. Gibbs, Clayton, Ill., in place of C. B. Pevehouse, deceased.

Earl D. Husted, Cornell, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Margaret W. Irish, Farina, Ill., in place of B. J. Donaldson, transferred.

Myrtle Wilkison, Glen Carbon, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary Ruth Shine, Glenwood, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John L. Zimmerman, Hinsdale, Ill., in place of F. M. Rawlings, resigned.

Wendell A. Stotler, Hudson, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary H. Cofey, Maple Park, Ill., in place of L. E. McKelvey, resigned.

Hugh James, Montrose, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James D. Cook, Mulkeytown, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lewis R. Wall, New Douglas, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Albert W. Schurg, Pesotum, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Charles E. Lowry, Philo, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Samuel W. Brown, Ringwood, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jacob H. Michel, West Brooklyn, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

INDIANA

Mary E. Wade, Wilkinson, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

IOWA

George O. Friedrichsen, Alvord, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Anton C. Rank, Buffalo Center, Iowa, in place of H. E. Eiel, deceased.

Emma M. Jochimsen, Callender, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William H Meshek, Dedham, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eva M. Anderson, Fremont, Iowa, in place of G. V. Fellers, resigned.

Ida E. Heffernen, Peosta, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John R. Shebek, Riverside, Iowa, in place of J. P. Quinn, transferred.

Alice B. Dougherty, Sheldon, Iowa, in place of W. J. Hollander, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Charles M. Swim, Frenchburg, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

LOUISIANA

Mathias J. Reuter, Arabi, La., in place of W. F. Roy, Jr., resigned.

MARYLAND

Kenneth L. Toohey, Cresaptown, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rachel S. Rowe, Landover, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William H. Fridinger, Williamsport, Md., in place of N. T. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

MASSACHUSETTS

John J. Lynch, Uxbridge, Mass., in place of C. E. Cook, retired.

MICHIGAN

Clifford B. Dabney, Almont, Mich., in place of R. P. Hallock, retired.

Oswald J. Koch, Ann Arbor, Mich., in place of F. S. Abbott, removed.

Barbara B. Burwell, Baldwin, Mich., in place of A. C. Misteli, retired.

Carleton A. May, Camden, Mich., in place of Kay Rice, resigned.

Arthur Elmore, Hanover, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Roy G. Hubbard, Hastings, Mich., in place of L. F. Maus. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

Minnie H. Nash, Holton, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Claude A. Van Dusen, Jasper, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

D. D. Harris, Lansing, Mich., in place of C. E. Cady, resigned.

William H. Cuthbertson, Ludington, Mich., in place of W. H. Cuthbertson. Incumbents commission expired March 30, 1942.

Verna E. Cameron, Lyons, Mich., in place of E. C. Clements, resigned.

Paul A. Curtis, Middleton, Mich., in place of C. M. Troub, transferred.

Aaron R. Merritt, Mulliken, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bernath S Ernst, Munica, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William M. Flachs, Remus, Mich., in place of K. E. H. Beyer, resigned.

Helen L. Young, Riverdale, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MINNESOTA

Ralph B. Dingmann, Clear Lake, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Cora E. Albright, Lengby, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leonard J. Hintzen, Miltona, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSISSIPPI

Lewis F. Henry, Carthage, Miss., in place of L. F. Henry Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942

Mary S Herron, Courtland, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

J. Wood Sartin, Jayess, Miss., in place of L. E. Rials, transferred.

Virgil L. Harrington, Merigold, Miss., in place of L. R. Park, resigned.

MISSOURI

Edna J. Donaldson, Diamond, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James P. Payne, Gilliam, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Roy W. Moore, Hickman Mills, Mo., in place of Harold S. Bradley, resigned.

Anna M May, Jasper, Mo., in place of J. G. May, resigned.

Ernest A. Hisle, Miami, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Albert R. White, Nelson, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lou A Kaylor, Shelbyville, Mo., in place of Shelby Feely, transferred.

Maude Dahl, Tipton, Mo., in place of D. H. Weber, deceased.

MONTANA

E. Warren Toole, Great Falls, Mont., in place of P. B Snelson, removed.

NEBRASKA

Tim N. Cannon, Juniata, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Austin E Scott, Mitchell, Nebr., in place of H. C. Cope. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edna M. F. Hayward, Londonderry, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur W. Proulx, Somersworth, N. H., in place of N. A. Berube, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Oscar S. Newkirk, Shiloh, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary O'Connor, Woodstown, N. J., in place of Clarence Smith, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Mary J. Kemp, Reserve, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Elizabeth B. Murphy, Beacon, N. Y., in place of J. F. Murphy, deceased.

Gertrude L. Rigaud, Oriskany Falls, N. Y., in place of J F Collins, deceased.

D. L. Palmer, Otego, N. Y., in place of D. L. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George Buechel, Patterson, N. Y., in place of S. E. Austin, deceased.

Margaret T. Kennedy, Salisbury Mills, N Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH CAROLINA

Roland Lemuel Garrett, Elizabeth City, N C., in place of W. T. Culpepper, resigned.

James K. Proctor, Greenville, N C., in place of T. T. Hollingsworth. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1942.

Henry G. Cook, Stokesdale, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mat M Ellington, Summerfield, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OHIO

Helen G. Casenhiser, Clinton, Ohio, in place of C. M. Casenhiser, resigned.

Florence Wilcox, Deerfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur W. Dawson, North Lawrence, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OREGON

Edward E. Vail, Ashland, Oreg., in place of M. W. Grubb, deceased.

Florence Root, Boardman, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edward S. Diehl, Allentown, Pa., in place of G. N. Horlacher, deceased.

Josephine Levi, Cuddy, Pa., in place of Denis Chamboredon, retired.

Sister Regina Francis, Immaculata, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Carmelio R. Augustine, Keiser, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ernie A. Neese, Cottageville, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TENNESSEE

Ethel R. Corum, Jonesboro, Tenn., in place of A. A. Trusler, transferred.

Raymond C. Townsend, Parsons, Tenn., in place of R. C. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1938.

Charles H. Carr, Pocahontas, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Violet T. Duncan, Tyner, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Robert E. Brinkley, Bloomburg, Tex., in place of H. L. Pettit, transferred.

Heinz Ulrich, Burnet, Tex., in place of R. H. Johnson, transferred.

Grover C. Hudson, Corsicana, Tex., in place of A. A. Allison, deceased.

Walter O Cravens, Honey Grove, Tex., in place of H. C. McConnell, transferred.

William D. Wall, Poolville, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

UTAH

William Grogan, Price, Utah, in place of R. F. Walters, resigned.

VIRGINIA

William M Upshur, Jr., Cheriton, Va., in place of J. L. Haley, deceased.

Minnie J. Davis, Church Road, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Oscar M. Buchanan, Kenbridge, Va., in place of J. L. Blackburn, resigned.

Berkeley B Baker, Lovettsville, Va., in place of C. F. Shumaker, deceased.

Charles C. Kenny, Upperville, Va., in place of J. H. Tyler, retired.

WASHINGTON

Mary A. McComb, Everson, Wash., in place of E. H. McComb, deceased.

May L. Hanson, Touchet, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lavon B. Kelly, Zenith, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WEST VIRGINIA

Sadie G. Petty, Chesapeake, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Wade H. Garrett, Clarksburg, W. Va., in place of F. J. Maxwell, resigned.

Willard F Shrewsbury, Crab Orchard, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Virginia C. Canterbury, Kimberly, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frederick B. Cline, Mount Gay, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James E. Akers, North Charleston, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John L. Badzek, Osage, W. Va., in place of L. E. Henderson, failed to qualify.

Oscar S. Conner, Pageton, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Misouri J. Nutter, Prenter, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Evalyn C. Huff, Rand, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Daisy Barker, Rhodell, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clarence J. Powell, Romney, W. Va., in place of J. M. Snarr, resigned.

John H. Shay, Star City, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Starling L. Sinnett, Superior, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George L. Wilcoxon, Tams, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WISCONSIN

Hyacinth S. Gibbs, Argonne, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edgar A. Lubeck, Arpin, Wis., in place of J. F. Loschky, deceased.

Rochelle I. Miller, Bay City, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Theresa J. Keyes, Cobb, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Archie C. D. Dehler, La Valle, Wis., in place of H. L. Blonien, transferred.

Forrest W. Friedel, Milton, Wis., in place of D. A. Holmes, retired.

Doris M. Kading, South Wayne, Wis., in place of R. B. Kessler, resigned.

Avis D. Wandry, Westfield, Wis., in place of H. C. Krentz, not commissioned.

Minor A. Potter, Wild Rose, Wis., in place of T. A. Wiora, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 2 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Harry O. Arend, to be United States attorney for division No. 4 of Alaska.

Edward M. Curran, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

Brian S. Odem, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas.

William R. Smith, Jr., to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

George A. Wright, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr., to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Edgar Bernard Brossard, to be a member for a term expiring June 16, 1950.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George J. Schoeneman, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Philip M. Klutznick, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Joseph P. Marcelle, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of New York.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Paul R. Leake to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

Martin O. Bement to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.

Austin J. Mahoney to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

REGULAR CORPS

To be a medical director, effective April 2, 1944

Lloyd D. Felton

To be a senior surgeon, effective June 16, 1944

Erval Richard Coffey

To be temporary senior dental surgeons, effective April 1, 1944

Fritz R. Jackson
James Fitzgerald Lewis
Oscar Mikkelsen

To be a sanitary engineer director, effective April 2, 1944

Lawrence M. Fisher

To be temporary medical directors, effective April 1, 9144

James A. Crabtree
Lucius F. Badger

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, effective April 1, 1944

Lloyd F. Summers
Martin G. Van Der Schouw
Randolph P. Grimm

POSTMASTERS

NEW JERSEY

Margaret M. Leach, New Monmouth.
Margaret A. Esposito, Sicklerville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John F. McManus, national chaplain, the American Legion, offered the following prayer:

O almighty and eternal God, who has dominion over all nations and peoples, having always compassion on the multitudes, look down with mercy upon us gathered here in the Halls of Congress in our National Capital. Behold the widespread envy and discontent in private and public life because men do not seek first Thy kingdom and justice. Give to us here present and all our brethren in this our country and all other countries and especially to our elected leaders the wisdom and the strength to do Thy holy will in keeping love and respect for all that is decent in capital and labor, in protecting family life from the dangers that surround it, in upholding religious and political liberty, in restoring Thee to our schools of learning, and in preserving all the ideals and principles for which so many of our brethren have made and are making the supreme sacrifice. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD to include a eulogy by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., on the occasion of the funeral of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has ascertained the probable cost for his remarks to be $117. Notwithstanding this, I ask unanimous consent that the extension be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on the subject of the General Accounting Office criticism of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration and to include therein a letter from Admiral Land. The space taken will require about three pages at an estimated cost of $150. Nevertheless, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SIMPLIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX RETURN

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 524) providing for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for the simplification of the individual income-tax returns, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

INVESTIGATION OF SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 521) creating a select committee to make an investigation relating to the seizure by the United States of the property of Montgomery Ward & Co., which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make an investigation with respect to the seizure by the United States, on April 26, 1944, of property of Montgomery Ward & Co.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after any other special orders that have heretofore been entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FIFTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1411) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 515) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1366, current session, being the fifth intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, of the House of Representatives, submitted pursuant to House Resolution 102, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 15,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1366, current session, being the fifth intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, House of Representatives, submitted pursuant to House Resolution 102, be printed for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE POLISH SITUATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include an editorial from this morning's paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LESINSKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a recent radio address delivered by Hon. Charles B. Henderson, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a talk given by the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and, secondly, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the armed service forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the national Catholic publication The Sign entitled, "Soviet Activity in Poland."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders tomorrow, May 3, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an essay written by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement made by my colleague, Hon. HAMILTON FISH, on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, this country of ours must be greatly reassured over the action of my distinguished colleague [Mr. SABATH] in reporting out House Resolution No. 521, of which I am the author, and which provides for the appointment of a select committee to investigate by what authority Montgomery Ward & Co. was taken over by the Government, in which procedure soldiers were employed.

This is a matter that touches the liberties of every one of us. The citizens of this country are aroused, as is shown by the hundreds of letters and telegrams that I have received, coming from every section.

I know Congress will always protect the rights of our fellow citizens and may be depended upon so to do. I request that early action be taken on my resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE INVASION OF EUROPE

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Under Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement made before the Banking and Currency Committee this morning by Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances and in one to include a newspaper article on the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a very serious problem confronts the educational institutions of this country. I trust this House will in the very near future enact the provisions of the bill H. R. 2849, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], which will assist the States in securing the necessary funds to retain their teachers. I am sure that if this bill contains the proper safeguards to insure State control it will have the unanimous endorsement of Congress.

If enacted, this bill would provide $3,000,000 aid to the State of Oklahoma alone.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a poem on the late Frank Knox.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules in reporting the resolution to investigate the seizure of Montgomery Ward has again broken faith with his committee; and, further than that, he has violated a definite promise made to me on yesterday.

This resolution he reported in his own name. The gentleman will remember that his committee determined many months ago that thereafter no resolution from the Committee on Rules would be reported by any member of the committee not favorable to its adoption. The resolution reported is opposed by the gentleman, vigorously opposed by him, and again I say that he has breached his understanding with his committee in reporting it in his name.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], who preceded me, alleged that I have not kept faith with him and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in connection with filing reports and resolutions that I do not favor but which they or either of them favor. I remember that such a proposal was advanced. I do not remember that I made any such agreement, nor have I any recollection that I gave any such assurance; and I remembered that on two different occasions when I designated them to call up resolutions the committee minority was not given opportunity to be heard properly. Therefore, in the interest of protecting the committee minority, whether it be on our side at times or on the other side at times, I myself have continued to present resolutions looking to consideration of bills, to be sure that the committee minority would be properly protected and heard; because I do not believe in taking advantage of the committee minority, of which I was a member for many years. By "committee minority" I mean those on the committee not joining in the majority vote.

As to the resolution that has caused all this fuss, I remind you that it was introduced last Thursday afternoon and, without any notice whatever, came before the Committee on Rules Friday morning after we had concluded consideration of two imperative matters and when we were contemplating going into executive session. This resolution was called up before members of our committee had even had opportunity to read it. Copies of the resolution did not reach the office of the Committee on Rules until after the committee had begun its hearings on Friday morning. At the conclusion of the business for which the committee meeting had been called, and, as I have said, when it was in order to go into executive session, as is the custom, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] insisted and persisted in stentorian tones that we hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] on his resolution immediately.

At that time I naturally opposed the rush act on their part, because I felt that Members should have an opportunity to read and study Mr. DEWEY'S resolution before a hearing was called on it, to say nothing of voting on it.

From all I had noticed, I was under the impression, and I am still under the impression, that this resolution was introduced purely to create a political issue and place the administration in an embarrassing position, especially when the

subject was then pending in a court of competent jurisdiction. I felt that we should not by any legislative action prejudice the case or interfere in any way with the functions of the court. However, last Sunday and Monday I received so much information relative to the untenable position of Montgomery Ward & Co., about all the favors they are receiving and have received at the hands of the very Government they were opposing without justification, that I decided it would be best to probe this whole subject, get all the facts from both sides. It was then I decided to favor the resolution. I introduced it a few minutes ago, as soon as the House convened, and shall call it up as soon as the business of the House will permit. I changed my attitude toward this resolution not to please men and harmonize with occasion, not because, as has been stated by Roosevelt-hating newspapers, I was forced to do so. So far I have been able to withstand any and all pressure and intimidation; I have at all times done what I believed to be in the best interests of the country.

I do very much regret that it became necessary for the Government to take possession of the Montgomery Ward & Co. plant in Chicago, although that act is, of course, only nominal, as everybody knows. I especially regret the fact that the Department of Justice used two Army boys to carry Mr. Avery out of his own office, which action gave opportunity for an unfriendly press to make a big headline. I think it would have been better if the Department of Justice had caused a deputy United States marshal and Assistant Secretary of Commerce Taylor to persuade, if possible, Mr. Avery to leave the plant without the employment of force.

Unfortunately, hereto the country has heard only the Montgomery Ward & Co. side of this story. I am, as I said before, in favor of the country thoroughly hearing both sides.

In this connection I will give you a record of Montgomery Ward & Co.'s obstinate and deliberate refusal to cooperate with the Government, notwithstanding the enormous benefits it has received at the hands of the Government ever since the election of President Roosevelt and the creation of the New Deal. That company would have us believe that it has been very much wronged by the administration, that it has lost money, that it has been illegally interfered with, whereas, up to 1933, during 3 or 4 years, it had lost from $5,000,000 to $8,000,000 each year. Since 1934, or during 10 years, this company has made about $200,000,000. I say $200,000,000. The records show that in 1943 this company made more than $20,000,000 and that notwithstanding a slight increase in pay for its employees due to the agreement of about a year and a half ago. Despite this very favorable financial showing, Montgomery Ward & Co. refused to extend its labor contract for 30 days, which would have avoided a strike. Records disclose that the average wage of a Montgomery Ward & Co. worker is about $25 a week, including high and supervisory forces, and each received, say, an increase of about 10 percent in 3 years, whereas the cost of living has advanced fully 50 percent.

I am now compiling and hope to have completed reasonably soon a statement of the financial structure of Montgomery Ward & Co. I want to show the American people the profits this company has made, the wages it pays, the favors it has received from the Government, the amount of merchandise it has sold to the Government, and its various subsidiaries that are manufacturing that which is essential to a successful prosecution of the war. I shall also give the proceedings of the War Labor Board in this case and the opinion which the Attorney General submitted to the President and upon which the President acted. That opinion shows clearly, beyond any possible successful contradiction, that not only under the Smith-Connally Act but under the Constitution it was the duty of the President to take the action he took in order to avert a strike.

It is beyond my comprehension that corporations and individuals of great wealth, who have made and are making millions under this administration, should set themselves up to create discord and harass and embarrass our overburdened President, who should be allowed to devote all his time to a successful prosecution of the war and keeping the United Nations in complete agreement, in which work the President has been so singularly successful. I have come to believe that those who behave thusly are not only selfish but actually unpatriotic. They are, obviously, biting the hand that feeds them.

I do hope that by the time this RECORD is printed we shall have heard that the Federal court in Chicago has sustained the contentions of the Government on all the questions that have been raised.

In conclusion, let us give fervent thanks to the Lord on high that we have, and I hope we will continue to have, a constitutional, democratic form of government that will be strong enough to resist with complete success all intimidation and coercion and persist in the full and accurate discharge of its duties and responsibilities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POST-WAR ECONOMY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by the Honorable Dwight H. Green, Governor of the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include therein a letter and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article about the war service of the former Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, Mr. King.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., eulogizing the late Honorable Frank Knox.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial by Mr. Bert Andrews appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of April 30.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Cincinnati Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MONTGOMERY WARD SEIZURE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has repented, recanted, or otherwise changed his mind, and has now reported to the House today the Dewey resolution creating a special committee to investigate the recent seizure by the Government of Montgomery Ward & Co. through the use of military force.

This is in line with the action taken by the majority of our Rules Committee last Friday and simply carries out the instructions of the committee. It is hoped the resolution will be called up for House consideration as promptly as possible. The only issue to actually be settled, in passing upon the Dewey resolution, is whether the House should investigate the Government seizure of this private business concern. Personally I believe we should, and that the information obtained from such investigation should be made available to the House as quickly as possible so that the Congress may determine future procedure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to congratulate the House Committee on Rules for its prompt action in reporting out this resolution to investigate the seizure by the President of the property of Montgomery Ward & Co.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from California a few minutes ago in his address to the House made the inquiry, What is the country afraid of? I will tell him what the country is afraid of. They are afraid of despotism, of which force is the parent.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, this seizure took place on Thursday. The following day the committee met, and a majority, consisting of all the Republican members, and all of the independent Democratic members, voted to report the resolution to investigate this action of the President. It will be welcome news to the country in the face of the "smear Congress" campaign which is now going on to know that the present Congress acts so speedily and effectively, and I have no doubt that when the resolution comes up in the House this week it will be adopted by an overwhelming vote.

Now, I want to call attention to a statement made yesterday by the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, as reported in this morning's Washington Post. The statement was in reply to one made by the attorney for Montgomery Ward, who said that if the President had the right to seize the property and business of a retail establishment not engaged in war production, having no contracts with the Government and selling nothing to the Government, then the President had the same right to forcibly seize any corner grocery store in the smallest village in the land.

Mr. Biddle replied that the power of the President in wartime was so great that he could seize any business, whether engaged in war production or not, and that no business whatever was immune from his right to seize it.

Mr. Speaker, the committee will investigate and report to the House the true facts and circumstances under which this particular seizure of Montgomery Ward was made, and whether under those circumstances there was any authority in law or under the Constitution to seize it. The House will then act in accordance with the facts and the law, and will effect the proper remedy.

I have no fear as to what the Congress will do, but I have great fear as to what the President may do if he continues to take the advice of Mr. Biddle, because I believe that the Attorney General's statement that the President in wartime has a right to seize any business, and that no business is immune, is probably the most dangerous, the most alien to our American idea of government, that any responsible public official of the United States has ever made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for another minute because my time was taken up by the interruption of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yielded and his time has expired. The Chair has adopted the rule of not recognizing Members to address the House for 2 minutes.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include what I intended to say had I not been interrupted by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the regular business today and after any previous special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE]?

There was no objection.

LEND-LEASE FUNDS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, I made a speech on the floor of this House in which I leveled certain charges against the use of lend-lease funds in Mexico as reported to me by an engineer and contractor who had just returned from a 6-week visit in Mexico and in whom I have every confidence.

I called this matter to the attention of Senator VANDENBERG, who in turn called it to the attention of Administrator Crowley. Today I am in receipt of a copy of Mr. Crowley's reply to Senator VANDENBERG in which he categorically denies all my charges against Lend-Lease, explaining that the only funds which they have sent to Mexico, in the amount of some $12,000,000, are primarily for military equipment and munitions. I am, of course, perfectly willing to accept Mr. Crowley's explanations and it is probable that Lend-Lease is entirely in the clear on this matter.

The fact remains, however, Mr. Speaker, that the American taxpayers' dollars—millions of them—are being poured into Mexico; publicly repudiated American politicians and American engineers and contractors are being lavishly enriched thereby and I intend to find out and disclose to this House what other governmental agencies are involved in this extravagant waste of the American taxpayers' dollars.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by William J. Neal made at Chicago, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a portion of a report of the A. N. P. A. Committee on Federal Laws at annual convention in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Las Vegas Daily Optic with respect to the desirability and feasibility of establishing an aviation academy on lands owned by the Federal Government within the State of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CARLSON of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Times and other quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that there is a legislative program for this afternoon and a bill to be read under the 5-minute rule. We have adopted the policy of not allowing committees to sit while a bill is being read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that we had nothing but the Consent and Private Calendars today.

The SPEAKER. There is a bill to be considered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF CORN

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, about 3 weeks ago the Government sought to take for its own use a good portion of the corn in some sections of the country. Especially was this true in the western sections of the country. The original order provided for the taking of 35 percent, but it was soon found that would not be sufficient. Then they proceeded to take 60 percent. Now they have ordered that 100 percent be taken. Still its requirements have not been met.

This action of the Government practically amounts to confiscation. The question is now an imminent one as to whether the Government will take the corn on the farms of this Nation. This is of interest not only to the western sections of the country but to the East.

As proof of the interest of easterners, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a message from the Indiana State Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

FLOOD DISASTER IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker the Central West is being devastated by the greatest flood within the memory of man. The tide of water sweeping down the valleys of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers and their tributaries exceeds in height and velocity all official records since 1844—the greatest flood in the last 100 years.

The Missouri River is establishing a new channel at its mouth. The confluence of these two great rivers is being moved 26 miles upstream. A new river is being opened through what was a short time ago inland fields. Through this new avenue water is rushing at the rate of 17 miles per hour. It has engulfed whole sections of the M. K. & T. Railroad and the Burlington Railroad. It has obliterated interstate highways. It has broken the pipe line which runs from Texas to New York which has been carrying the oil without which the New England States would have endured the greatest privation. It is sweeping away the cables carrying electric current from the Keokuk Dam to metropolitan St. Louis and steel towers supporting the transmission lines are at the bottom of the river. It has resisted all efforts to curb the current and hold the levees and railroad embankments and railway cars loaded with rock for revetment have been undermined and rolled into the river. It has destroyed light, telephone communications, and sanitary systems. So rapid has been the rise of the waters that it has been necessary to organize relief to rescue marooned families from farm homes.

The damage is conservatively estimated to be in excess of $20,000,000 and the loss to agricultural production is incalculable. Growing fields, livestock, machinery, fences, houses, barns, and equipment have been swept away overnight and cannot be replaced in time to produce a crop without Federal assistance in the form of both loans, grants, and priorities.

Last year, in order to meet conditions not nearly so acute, resulting from a similar flood which did not even approach the proportions of the floods which are today sweeping the bread basket of the Nation, Congress provided $15,000,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. Out of the $15,000,000, only $2,000,000 was expended and about $1,000,000 has been obligated, leaving approximately $12,000,000 on hand.

There is now pending before the Committee on Appropriations a bill to make the remainder of the appropriation available for loans and grants under the same direction and administration for the same purpose this year.

We invite all those interested to give us the benefit of any suggestions they may care to make in this connection.

In the meantime the cooperation of Members of the House is invited in support of the general flood-control bill which Chairman WHITTINGTON has reported and which is now on the calendar and expected to reach consideration next week. This bill will provide funds for the repair and reconstruction of levees damaged or destroyed by 1944 floods and will supply funds for the purpose for which Congress last year appropriated $10,000,000 to rehabilitate our levee systems following the 1943 floods.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we all sympathize with the people along the Mississippi River in this flood disaster. We have just experienced the greatest flood on the Tombigbee River that has happened since 1892. Yet only a few days ago the House turned down a proposal that would have relieved that situation in the future.

The great bottleneck in our inland waterway transportation system is the swift current of the Mississippi River. By the adoption of the provision for the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway that situation would have been relieved.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman understands that in the bill now pending before the Committee on Appropriations the relief proposed is to be provided for the Tombigbee as well as for the Mississippi and other streams of the national river system?

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that, but I am talking about permanent relief. There is no use going ahead and spending all this money on U. N. R. R. A., on flood control, power dams, and reclamation projects in foreign countries if we are going to deny relief to all the people in the great Mississippi Valley which extends from the Alleghenies to the Rocky Mountains. We are trying to have this provision put back into the bill in the Senate and if we succeed I hope the House will accept it when the bill comes back here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the National Police Academy and to include therein excerpts of certain lectures given there concerning juvenile delinquency, and also a list of Michigan graduates of the academy

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RETURN TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. BLAND submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

A MISTAKEN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Biddle now attempts to justify the seizure of Ward's as having been necessary to prevent an epidemic of strikes throughout the country. The truth is that the strike at Ward's proved ineffective; that loyal employees were working and maintaining the firm's well-known efficient service to its customers.

The strike, as a strike, was a failure. The union had lost its battle. So to the rescue of the union came Attorney General Biddle with the Army.

The administration's purpose, as evidenced by this action and by previous seizures of private industry, seems to be to establish the supremacy of its political friends in charge of unions wherever their policy comes in conflict with private industry.

One result of the plant's seizure by the Army under Biddle was to encourage those who throughout the country may be thinking of the strike as a weapon to force from employers the concessions they desire.

If the purpose of the administration was to prevent strikes, action by the War Labor Board and the N. L. R. B. refusing to deal with striking employees while on strike, would have aided in solving the problem.

Unfortunately it has been the policy of this administration, as has been recently pointed out time and again, to, when there was a strike in any industry, punish not the strikers but the employers by issuing and enforcing by coercion and intimidation orders granting union demands.

The administration's policy will not aid production. It will not end labor disputes; on the contrary, it has all too often lessened production, encouraged would-be strikers, brought about labor disputes.

AMENDMENT TO WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT

The absurdity of the Government's refusal to submit to the courts the question of the validity of the order of the War Labor Board or of the authority of the President to seize Montgomery Ward's is emphasized by the fact that, after the Army, acting under Attorney General Biddle, had, by force, seized the plant and carried Avery out to the sidewalk, Biddle then asked the aid of the civil courts to restrain Avery and 15 of his assistants from interfering with the Army's possession.

If the courts have authority to restrain Avery and other officials of Ward's, why did not Biddle first apply to the courts for aid? Are the administrative agencies so drunk with power that they must flaunt the exercise of it in the face of the citizens who support and pay them?

The seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant by the armed forces of the Nation discloses to the public what many Members of Congress have long known; that is, that we have here a dictatorship by administrative agencies.

Long ago Congress should, by direct enactment, have rebuked administrative agencies for the exercise of unauthorized, arbitrary power which denies to civilians their constitutional rights.

What we need are not more investigations, but direct legislative action which will serve notice, not only upon the administration but upon the courts, that the people are still determined that constitutional government shall continue.

To aid in remedying the situation I have introduced an amendment to the War Labor Disputes Act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a friend.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit this afternoon during the session of the House after the completion of business under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an article written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

EXPEDITING PAYMENT FOR LAND ACQUIRED DURING THE WAR PERIOD

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 919, to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REGULATION WITH REFERENCE TO FERTILIZERS, FEEDS, OR SEEDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3405, making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC LAW 537, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2908, to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 2, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

WAR SHIPPING FIELD SERVICE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 182) to create the War Shipping Field Service.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS FOR THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be a Board of Visitors to visit the United States Merchant Marine Academy each year at such time as the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, may fix. The Board of Visitors shall consist of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, four Senators designated in January of each year by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and four Members of the House of Representatives designated in January of each year by the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. Whenever a member is unable to make the annual visit an alternate may be designated in his stead in the manner hereinabove provided. Each member of the Board and a secretary to the Board shall be reimbursed, out of funds appropriated to the War Shipping Administration, under Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended, for the expenses incurred by him while engaged in duties as a member of the Board, or as secretary.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there shall be appointed in the month immediately following the enactment of this act and in January of each year thereafter, a Board of Visitors to visit the United States Merchant Marine Academy, which shall consist of two Senators and three Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the chairman of the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, having cognizance of legislation pertaining to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, the chairmen of said committees being ex officio members of the Board, and of one Senator and two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively: *Provided*, That whenever a member or an ex officio member is unable to attend the annual meeting as provided in paragraph (b) of this section another member may be appointed in his stead in the manner as herein provided but without restriction as to month of appointment.

"(b) Such Board shall visit the United States Merchant Marine Academy annually on a date to be fixed by the chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. Each member of the Board shall be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for the actual expense incurred by him while engaged upon duties as a member of such Board."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the amendment that is offered meets the objection that was raised that the Speaker and the Vice President had no choice as to members of the Board. The amendment is identical with the amendment under which the Coast Guard Academy operates and gives the right of appointment also to the Speaker and to the Vice President.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is this the Academy that is operated at Kings Point?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2241, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the area embraced within and constituting said monument to its status as part of the Teton National Forest.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3646, to amend section 42 of title VII of the Canal Zone Code.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hesitate to object to this bill because I like the gentleman from Tennessee who introduced it and our fine chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, but I want to call the attention of the Members to what this bill does.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the term of office of the district attorney and the marshal for the Canal Zone from 4 to 8 years.

I hope the House will remember that there will be thousands of capable lawyers returning after the war and that we will need places for them when they return. Some may desire to be United States attorneys or marshals in the Territories and insular possessions. Furthermore, marshals do not need to be lawyers. They may, however, be disabled veterans, and there will be plenty of them able and anxious for such assignment.

Why at this time start this precedent for outlying Territories and possessions by extending the term to 8 years? Does this Congress want to do that?

Yes; this bill is recommended by "Boodle" Biddle, lately referred to as "Gestapo" Biddle, and I think until we find out by our congressional investigation more about his dictatorial practices, recommendations, and Gestapo activity in connection with the Montgomery Ward matter in Chicago this Congress should be reluctant to accept any legislation recommended by him. Attorney General Biddle, on pages 4 and 5 of the report on this measure, is quoted as stating:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1944.

Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for my views relative to a bill (H. R. 3646) to amend section 42 of title 7 of the Canal Zone Code.

The effect of the bill would be to increase the term of office of the district attorney for the Canal Zone and the marshal for the Canal Zone from 4 to 8 years. Prior to 1938, the term of office of the district judge for the Canal Zone, as well as of the district attorney and the marshal, was 4 years. By the act of March 26, 1938 (52 Stat. 118), the term of the district judge was increased to 8 years. The legislation under consideration would effectuate the same result in respect to the district attorney and the marshal, thereby creating a uniform term of 8 years for each of the three officers.

I am of the opinion that the term of office of district judges, United States attorneys, and marshals in the Territories and insular possessions should generally be increased. Conditions in that respect prevailing in the continental United States differ from those in the outlying Territories and possessions. In the continental United States offices of this type are filled by members of the local communities, who after the expiration of their terms can resume their former status in their localities. On the other hand, corresponding offices in the Territories and insular possessions must of necessity frequently be filled by persons selected from the continental United States in view of the lack of sufficient available material in the localities in question. After the expiration of their terms, such officials upon returning to their homes frequently find it difficult to reestablish themselves. The result is that many persons who otherwise would be available for such service are at times reluctant to accept appointments of this kind.

In the Canal Zone there is a peculiar reason for greater permanency in the tenure of local offices than is the case elsewhere. The Canal Zone primarily and very largely is a military center. The Governor of the Canal Zone is a general in the United States Army. The local district attorney and the marshal must necessarily become acquainted with the problems that arise because of the peculiar relations between civil and military authority in the Canal Zone and must be in a position to cooperate appropriately with the military authorities. From this standpoint long tenure of office is highly desirable, as it takes considerable time for a newcomer to familiarize himself with these local problems.

I recommend the enactment of the bill.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget informs me that this legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

That is what the Attorney General said in February. Probably he will later come along and recommend 8-year terms for all marshals. No extraordinary talent is required of district attorneys and marshals sent to the Canal Zone. Many of our returning soldiers will be anxious to go there If the present marshal or the district attorney has done a good job for 4 years, then, on his good record, he can be recommended and returned there for another 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, there are two positions involved in this bill, I understand, one at a salary of $6,500 per annum and the other at $5,500, this the boodle that Biddle is chasing. We all know that he favors longer terms of office and unlimited power. This past week he has advocated unlimited power in the hands of the President in his personal handling of the Montgomery Ward seizure in Chicago. I have made this statement so that the Members will think before they act on this bill by unanimous consent. It is for this reason that I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. In reply to the comment of the gentleman from Illinois, may I say that the bill was not initiated in the Department of Justice. It was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. It was not sent down here by the Department, or requested by it, but Mr. Holtzoff appeared as a witness in response to an invitation from the committee.

Several years ago the term of the district judge was set at 8 years. This bill does not extend the term of anybody. It provides that the term of the marshal and the district attorney may be 8 years, which conforms with the term provided now for the judge.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. If I am not mistaken, I believe I am correct in saying that the incumbent marshal was a soldier in the Army of the United States.

Mr. BLAND. If I may continue, another marshal may be appointed at the expiration of the term of the present marshal, and another district attorney. But in view of the circumstances surrounding the conditions in the Panama Canal Zone which justify the provision for 8 years for the judge, it was thought desirable to provide the same terms for the district attorney and the marshal; also, because of the peculiar relations in the Panama Canal Zone, a narrow strip running through the Republic of Panama, with Costa Rica on one side, and in view of the necessity for these officials having a knowledge of the peculiar conditions, it was thought by the committee to be wise to provide that the term be 8 years.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, there will be additional outlying Territories and possessions to which Attorney General Biddle will ask that this precedent be extended. For the reasons I have stated, this is not a matter that should be taken up at this time on the Consent Calendar. Let us take time to learn a little bit more about our present Attorney General, especially in view of his Gestapo behavior in directing soldiers to seize private property this past week in Chicago. I object to the present consideration of the bill.

RECOGNITION OF CIVILIAN OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES, CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES, ENGAGED IN CONSTRUCTION OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1117, to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

Mr. PRIEST. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia to explain this bill a little more fully for the benefit of the House?

Mr. KEAN. If the gentleman will yield, I note that this bill will cost $10,000,000. For that reason, according to the custom we have over here, I am going to ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice in any case, because it involves too much money to be considered on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. BLAND. Application has been made to the Committee on Rules for a rule for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. KEAN. That is the proper procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CHANGING THE NAME OF "WATCHMAN" IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3688, to change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the classification "watchman" in the Postal Service is hereby abolished, and in lieu thereof there is hereby created the classification of "post-office guard" to perform the same duties and receive the same compensation as laborers.

With the following committee amendment: Page 1, line 5, strike out "to perform the same duties and receive the same compensation as laborers" and insert the following: "to receive the same rights, benefits, and compensation as provided for laborers (now designated "mail handler" pursuant to Public Law 259, 78th Cong., approved March 20, 1944), in the Classification Act of February 28, 1925."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT REGARDING DISPOSITION OF WAR PRIZES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4348, to amend the act approved August 18, 1942, entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes," approved August 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 746, 50 App. U. S. C. 821 ff.), is amended to read as follows: "That the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all prizes captured during the present war if said capture was made by authority of the United States or was adopted and ratified by the President of the United States and the prize was brought into the territorial waters of a cobelligerent or was taken or appropriated for the use of the United States, including jurisdiction of all proceedings for the condemnation of such property taken as prize."

SEC. 2. That section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the period at the end of said section and by inserting in lieu thereof a colon and by adding immediately thereafter the following: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the seized property is taken or appropriated for the use of the United States whether before or after it comes into the custody of the prize court, the prize court is hereby authorized to proceed to adjudication on the basis of an inventory and survey and an appropriate undertaking by the United States to respond for the value of such property without the necessity for either an appraisement or the deposit of the value of the prize with the Treasurer of the United States or any other public depository."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "the present."

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 3. That the title of such act is amended by striking out the words 'the present' therein so that the title, as amended, shall read 'An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during war, and for other purposes.' "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURVEY OF FISHERIES OF THE UNITED STATES BY THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112) authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia, why it is advisable to have this survey at this time when there is a shortage of manpower? It would seem to me it would be much better to do it after the war, when we could employ many of the returning sailors and soldiers. What is the urgency for doing it right now?

Mr. BLAND. May I read to the gentleman the reasons assigned by the Coordinator of Fisheries:

This report would serve many useful purposes. Some of these are as follows: (1)

Outline opportunities of a permanent national fishery policy which would provide for coordinated activity of Federal, State, international, or other fishery organizations in a program for the fisheries designed to extend their benefits to the greatest number of our citizens, both as recreational and commercial pursuits.

There are many other very sound reasons that are stated in this letter of the Coordinator of Fisheries.

I will say there has been information collected in various hearings at times past and much other data assembled which has not been classified which would be helpful in working out a national fisheries program. We have never had such a program and the last work which seemed to make a thorough consideration and study of the fisheries was in 1881 or 1887, I think. There have been numerous hearings before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I happen to be chairman. The fisheries problem, we believe, is going to be one of the greatest problems at the peace table and statistical men are needed to assemble this information which now exists.

Mr. KEAN. You feel it is necessary to do this at this time, so that we may have this information with reference to the fisheries at the time of the peace conference?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; at the peace conference, and not only at the peace conference but to work out a national fisheries program immediately after the war.

Mr. KEAN. I am thoroughly in accord with the objective of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I think that would be justified for that purpose.

Mr. KEAN. I was just asking the question whether at this time, when we are so busy in trying to win the war, we should devote our energy to this matter.

Mr. BLAND. It is not going to disturb those efforts.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas the fishery resources of the United States and its contiguous waters are so varied and so abundant that the fishery industries at the beginning of the Second World War had assumed a world position with respect to the production of fishery commodities, second only to the position occupied by Japan; and

Whereas, despite the magnitude of these fishery resources and the economic importance of the fishing industry, the United States has failed to develop, to utilize, and to conserve her marine and fresh-water fishery resources to the fullest possible extent and to a degree commensurate with the development, utilization, and conservation of the resources of the land; and

Whereas the wartime demands for fishery products as food, for fishery byproducts for industrial uses, and upon the fisheries as a recreational pursuit, far exceed even the most optimistic production estimates; and

Whereas it is in the interest of all of the people of the United States to insure the fullest permanent development, utilization, and protection of the marine fishery resources of the high seas which may be subject to utilization by United States nationals, and of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources within the limits of territorial jurisdiction prosecuted both commerically and recreationally: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a survey of the character, extent, and condition of all of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources and other aquatic resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including high-seas resources in which the United States may have interests or rights; and the economic organization and status of the industry based thereon; such survey is to include but is not to be limited to the following:

(a) The current methods, practices, facilities, and equipment used in producing commercial fishery products.

(b) The methods, practices, facilities, and equipment used in processing, distributing, transporting, marketing, and storing fishery products, including an assessment of measures required for the protection of these perishable commodities.

(c) The methods, practices, facilities, and equipment which may be practicable for expanding the utilization of the existing or potential marine and fresh-water fishery resources, inclusive of recreational fishing.

(d) The laws and regulations that govern the commercial and recreational fisheries.

SEC. 2. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is directed to submit a report to the Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than January 1, 1945, concerning the results of the survey mentioned in the preceding section, and also shall submit recommendations with respect to the following:

(a) New or revised regulations or precautionary measures deemed to be necessary or advisable for the protection, conservation, and management on a sustained-yield basis of the fishery and other renewable marine and fresh-water resources.

(b) New or revised regulations or precautionary measures deemed to be necessary or desirable to insure adequate protection of the fishery and other biological resources from contamination by pollution or other hazards, and to prevent spoilage or deterioration of fishery products; such recommendations to apply to catching, landing, processing, transporting, marketing, or storing fishery products or commodities derived from the fisheries.

(c) The opportunities for, and the advisability of further arrangements for, coordinating fishery administration and management through State fishery compacts with the consent of the Congress (as authorized by art. I, sec. 10, of the Constitution of the United States of America), and opportunities for, and the advisability of, additional coordinated management and administration of, international fisheries.

(d) The means of effecting the maximum utilization, consistent with their continued preservation at an optimum level of productivity, of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources utilized or potentially capable of utilization for commercial and recreational fishing, giving special consideration to methods of managing and increasing the fishery production of interior waters, including artificial impoundments and farm ponds.

(e) New and improved methods of capturing, landing, processing, storing, distributing, and marketing fishery products or commodities, including increasing consumption as food and the industrial utilization of fishery products through public education, or other activities; such recommendations to contemplate the full and cooperative use of the personnel and facilities of appropriate State, Territorial, county, local, or other organizations, as well as those of private and industrial or other organizations and enterprises.

(f) A program of economic stabilization of the fisheries and of Federal, State, or other assistance needed during the post-war period and thereafter to effect orderly development and expansion of the commercial fisheries and allied enterprises, and to secure and provide for the fisheries benefits comparable to those afforded the food production activities and industries dependent upon the lands.

(g) A comprehensive statistical and market-reporting system to provide complete, accurate, and current data on production and fishing intensity in the commercial and recreational fisheries, to facilitate the most efficient utilization of the aquatic resources and the greatest possible benefits and returns therefrom, as well as for the purpose of providing fundamental information on rates of withdrawal in order that the effects of utilization upon the basic resources may always be known.

(h) Special and regular appropriations necessary to establish a national policy and to carry out a program for the optimum utilization of the marine and fresh-water commercial and recreational fishery resources such as may be necessary to accomplish the specific purposes and objectives hereinbefore mentioned, including funds for the publication and dissemination of technical and practical information.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, but not to exceed $20,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4307, to amend the Canal Zone Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (a) of section 93 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That paragraph (a) of section 93 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and adding the following: '*Provided*, That any employee retiring prior to attaining age 60 under the provisions of this paragraph with at least 30 years of service shall receive an immediate annuity having a value equal to the present worth of a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 60 years, computed as provided in section 96 of this title.'"

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of page 1 and down to and including line 5, on page 2, and insert:

"That paragraph (a) of section 93 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Any employee to whom this article applies who shall have attained the age of 55 and rendered at least 25 years of service, of which not less than 15 years shall have been rendered on the Isthmus of Panama, may voluntarily retire on an annuity equivalent in value to the present worth of a deferred annuity beginning at the age at which the employee would otherwise have become eligible for retirement, computed as provided in section 96 of this title, the present worth of said deferred annuity to be determined on the basis of the American Experience Table of Mortality and an interest rate of 4 percent, compounded annually: *Provided*,

That any employee retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 under the provisions of this paragraph with at least 30 years of service shall receive an immediate annuity having a value equal to the present worth of a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 60 years, computed as provided in section 96 of this title.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESCAPES OF PRISONERS OF WAR AND INTERNED ENEMY ALIENS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4108, relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever procures the escape of any prisoner of war held by the United States or any of its allies, or the escape of any person apprehended or interned as an enemy alien by the United States or any of its allies, or advises, connives at, aids, or assists in such escape, or aids, relieves, transports, harbors, conceals, shelters, protects, holds correspondence with, gives intelligence to, or otherwise assists any such prisoner of war or enemy alien, after his escape from custody, knowing him to be such prisoner of war or enemy alien, or attempts to commit or conspires to commit any of the above acts, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both. The provisions of this act shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other provision of law.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the word "protects", strike out the words "holds correspondence with."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUSSELL: On page 2, line 6, after the word "law" and before the period, insert "or treaty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECTION 48 OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4109, to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to receiving of stolen public property.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask a member of the Committee on the Judiciary a question with reference to this bill? I notice it says, "any corporation in which the United States of America is a stockholder." Would there be any possibility that some legal decision might be made that money lent by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to a corporation would be considered to be money lent by a corporation of which the United States is a stockholder? The gentleman understands what I am getting at?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that provision is included because there is no provision of law as it stands today, which makes it punishable to steal property of the United States which they have in a corporation. It is just put in there for the purpose of taking care of that absence of any penal statute.

Mr. KEAN. There would be no danger that if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is completely owned by the United States, should lend money to a bank, which they have done, and something is stolen from the bank, that it would come under this statute?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it would come under the statute.

Mr. KEAN. I do not believe you think this law should cover that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Irrespective of this law, that is my opinion. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] could explain that to you.

Mr. KEAN. Would the following situation come under this law, for example, where the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is lending money to a certain corporation, is there any chance that they would come under this law?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I beg to call to the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey the language on page 2 of this short bill and in that connection I make the explanation that at this time it is considered there is no Federal statute against stealing property which belongs to the United States in process of manufacture in the custody and possession, not of the United States, but of the agency engaged in the conversion of this property which belongs to the United States, and of the things connected with the war effort. It is deemed advisable and it was recommended by the Department of Justice, and the Committee on the Judiciary after careful investigation felt it was legislation which ought to be passed in order to protect the property of the United States which is not in the immediate possession of the United States Government.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman does not feel there is any danger, then, that it will bring some corporation which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is lending money to, under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No, sir; I do not think so, and the committee did not believe so.

Mr. KEAN. As long as the committee and the gentleman are satisfied, I must say I am satisfied.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 48 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1098; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 101) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 48. Whoever shall receive, conceal, or aid in concealing, or shall have or retain in his possession with intent to convert to his own use or gain, any money, property, record, voucher, or valuable thing whatever, of the moneys, goods, chattels, records, or property of the United States, or any branch or department thereof, or any corporation in which the United States of America is a stockholder, or any property which has been or is being made, manufactured, or constructed under contract for the War or Navy Department of the United States, or any ordnance, arms, ammunition, clothing, subsistence, stores, money or other property furnished or to be used for the military or naval service, which has theretofore been embezzled, stolen, or purloined by any other persons, knowing the same to have been so embezzled, stolen, or purloined, shall be punished as prescribed in section 35 (C) of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 82); and such person may be tried either before or after the conviction of the principal offender."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 9, strike out the word "persons" and insert "person."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POST-OFFICE BRANCHES AND STATIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4517, to remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in the report on this bill there is no way of understanding exactly what the provision is that is stricken out. It conflicts with the Ramseyer rule and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. This bill simply provides that during the emergency or during the war and for 6 months thereafter, the Post Office may establish branch offices in towns of less than 1,500 population. The reason for that is where you have camps and different emergency activities it is necessary to put branch offices in those locations. As soon as the war is over, all that is over with, also.

Mr. KEAN. I heartily approve of the bill, but in order to protect the Members of the House, I think these bills should be brought in in accordance with the rules of the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice until the report is corrected and written properly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF REWARDS TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES FOR INVENTIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3998, authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to pay a cash reward for any invention, suggestion, or series of suggestions submitted by one or more employees of the Post Office Department or the Postal Service, which will clearly effect a material economy or increase efficiency in the administration or operation of the Post Office Department or the Postal Service, and which has been adopted for use.

The total amount of rewards made under this act in any one fiscal year shall not exceed $25,000, and the amount so paid for any one invention, suggestion, or series of suggestions shall not exceed $1,000.

Rewards made under this act shall be paid out of the appropriation for the postal activity primarily benefiting, or may be distributed among appropriations for postal activities benefiting, as the Postmaster General may determine. Payments shall be in addition to the regular compensation of the employee receiving the reward. No employee shall be paid a reward under this act until he has properly executed an agreement to the effect that the use by the United States of the invention, suggestion, or series of suggestions made by him shall not form the basis of a further claim of any nature upon the United States by him, his heirs, or assigns.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBAL FUNDS OF MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2085, to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter placed to the credit of the "Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians," in the United States Treasury, shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the tribal council of said tribe and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEEING-EYE DOGS FOR BLIND VETERANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4519, to authorize the Administration of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], the author of the bill, who is unavoidably absent, I wish to submit an amendment. The bill, as written, mentions seeing-eye dogs. The seeing-eye dogs refer only to those dogs which are trained in Morristown, N. J. There are other dogs that are trained in California and other places for the same purpose. So the amendment which I am going to submit to the committee would read "seeing-eye or guide dogs trained for the aid of blind veterans."

Also in line 9, "in becoming adjusted to seeing-eye or guide dogs." It just includes "guide dogs."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this amendment. We will accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LANHAM]. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administrator, and to pay all necessary travel expenses to and from their homes and incurred in becoming adjusted to a seeing-eye dog.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be ncessary, to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: On page 1, line 5, after the word "seeing-eye", strike out "dogs for" and insert "or guide dogs trained for the aid of."

And in line 9, after the word "to", insert "such"; and after "seeing-eye", strike out the word "dog" and insert "or guide dogs."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I have no objection to these amendments. This bill is being passed in order to enable the Veterans' Administration to secure these guide dogs for blind veterans. While there has been some criticism of the amount authorized, there is no requirement that that amount be used, but we merely set a limit of $1,000,000 so that the Veterans' Administration might use as much as necessary in order to provide blind veterans with trained dogs to help them find their way around.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman advise us the approximate cost of these guide dogs?

Mr. RANKIN. A statement was made in the committee as to the cost of the dogs, and my recollection is that it is anywhere up to $1,000 each. These dogs are very, very valuable. They are highly trained and they are reliable and are worth more to a blind person than anything else except a personal guide.

Mr. COLE of New York. There is no question about the value of the dogs, but if the price is $1,000 for each dog, and the authorization is but $1,000,000, then obviously but 1,000 blind veterans can be accommodated, which raises a question in my mind as to how the Veterans' Administration is going to determine which 1,000 of the blind veterans will receive dogs.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman that we had that question under consideration in the committee. It was agreed upon by representatives of the Veterans' Administration and others who are informed on the subject, that this amount would be ample for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS REGULATION NO. 1

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 698, to amend part II, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part II, be amended by adding thereto a new paragraph, numbered paragraph IV, to read as follows:

"IV. For the purposes of paragraph I hereof, as amended, any person who, on or after August 27, 1940, and prior to termination of the present hostilities, has applied or shall hereafter apply for enlistment or enrollment in the active military or naval forces and who was or shall be provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance into such military or naval service, or who was or is selected for service and after reporting pursuant to the call of his local board and prior to rejection, or who after being called in the Federal service as a member of the National Guard but before being enrolled for the Federal service suffered or shall suffer an injury or a disease in line of duty and not the result of his own misconduct, will be considered to have incurred such disability in active military or naval service: *Provided*, That payments of pension under the terms of this paragraph shall not be effective prior to the date of enactment of this amendment."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOSPITALIZATION AND PRIVILEGE OF SOLDIERS' HOMES TO CERTAIN PERSONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 735, to confer to certain persons who served in a civilian capacity under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the author of this bill a question or two.

This bill would confer on certain persons who served in a civilian capacity under the jurisdiction of the quartermaster general during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, the benefit of hospitalization and the privileges of soldiers' homes. I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]

if he has an estimate of the total expense of this hospitalization for these individuals and approximately how many civilians would be involved?

Mr. WELCH. A very small number, due to the fact that it is now 46 years since they served the Government and were honorably discharged.

The gentleman will observe from the bill that only men who served in the Quartermaster Corps and were discharged for disability are eligible. Only a handful of them remain. Some of them do not want hospitalization or medical treatment from the Government. There are a few who desire it. This bill actually passed the House on two former occasions, but was held up due to the closing of the session.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If those men were performing the same duties in the present war, would they be entitled to hospitalization?

Mr. WELCH. They would, and they would be entitled to a pension as well. The men referred to in this bill are not asking for a pension. The few remaining are only asking the right of hospitalization if they desire it, and medical treatment.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. Why is it that the Veterans' Bureau is opposed to this bill?

Mr. WELCH. I cannot answer the question why the Veterans' Bureau is opposed to it. I understood from their letter that they were afraid of setting a precedent.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that these men are now past 70 years of age, on the average. There is only a handful of them. As far as precedents are concerned, members of the committee, or at least the chairman of the committee, felt that if these men were performing the same duties in this war, and became disabled in line of duty as these men were, they would be entitled to hospitalization, and therefore we did not think this would be setting up too violent a precedent, to offer hospitalization or accommodation in soldiers' homes to these few old men who went out and braved the terrors of the deep at the time when we were fighting the Spanish Navy, and rendered service that was absolutely necessary to the war effort, and became disabled in so doing.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly in sympathy with the objectives of this bill, but I fear, perhaps, we may be taking hasty action on this question of precedent. In order to study the matter further, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. PRIEST. I withhold it.

Mr. WELCH. These men come under an entirely different category than the civilians the gentleman has in mind. These men were in the uniform of the United States Government. They manned the guns on the transports and they manned the boats that took the soldiers ashore from the transports. There were no docks in Manila at that time. Many of them lost their lives. Others were wounded. This bill would simply give hospitalization to the few who can prove that they were disabled or wounded at that time.

Mr. Speaker, as stated only a limited number of men who served in the Quartermaster's Corps under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition would be benefited under the provisions of this bill.

Section 1, page 1, line 8, reads as follows:

> And who were discharged for disability incurred in such governmental service in line of duty.

It is safe to say the average age of the men who served in the transport service during the Spanish-American War is 70 and perhaps over.

Shortly after Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish Fleet in Manila Bay, he weighed anchor and left, but before leaving he supplied the native Filipinos with guns and ammunition to protect themselves against the Spanish troops then on the islands. Shortly thereafter the Philippine Insurrection occurred which was followed by the transportation of volunteer troops from this country to the Philippine Islands. Upon the arrival of the transports at Manila, which, at that time, had no wharves or docks, it was necessary to land the soldiers in small boats manned by transport workers. They were fired upon as they approached the shore and, as the records will show, many transport workers lost their lives, others were wounded. It is also a well-known fact transport workers manned the guns on the transports.

Although not regularly enlisted in the Army, these men bared their breasts and for all purposes were a part of the Army. All they are asking for in this bill is just a place where a limited few, who can prove service disability, be given an opportunity to go into one of the many hospitals maintained by the Government for such purposes. They are not asking for a pension.

In the Marine Hospital in San Francisco, a splendid modern building, men employed in the civilian service with good salaries are admitted for hospitalization. Why deny this privilege to a few hundred old men who faithfully served their country?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee, if he will yield——

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. That we have had now 46 years in which to consider this proposition. It has been before the Veterans' Committee several times and has been reported out several times. I do not think any additional information will be obtained by postponing the consideration of it. I hope the gentleman will let it go through.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask the gentleman from California, or the gentleman from Mississippi, during these 46 years since these men were discharged from the service as a result of disability, what hospitalization have they received?

Mr. WELCH. They have received no hospitalization or medical attention from the Government since they performed the service referred to by me.

Mr. RANKIN. Or no compensation, they have not received a dollar from the Government for that service.

Mr. PRIEST. I hope the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Mississippi both understand that my objection came because I was just a little uncertain after reading the letter from the Veterans' Administration as to the wisdom of the precedent.

If the gentleman can assure me and assure the House that this is not setting any dangerous precedent I shall be very glad to withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. So far as the present chairman of the committee is concerned—and I think I can speak for the entire committee—this will not be setting a dangerous precedent.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this certainly is setting a dangerous precedent so far as practice under the Consent Calendar is concerned. This bill does not have the approval of the Government department having jurisdiction over its subject matter. I feel therefore that it is bad practice and a bad precedent for us to pass a bill of this nature by unanimous consent. I consequently ask that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I shall be compelled to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES FOR MILITARY SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2782, to grant Government employees who are members of certain military units leaves of absence for periods of active service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the provisions of section 2, any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government of the United States or any officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia who is a member of a military unit of a State, Territory, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or the Canal Zone organized under the provisions of section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, shall be granted leave of absence

from his duties, without loss of pay, time, or efficiency rating, on all days during which he is engaged in active service as a member of such military unit.

SEC. 2. No officer or employee shall be granted leave of absence under section 1 if, in the opinion of the head of the executive department, independent agency, or department or office of the government of the District of Columbia in which he is employed, he cannot be spared without material interference with his duties, nor shall any such officer or employee be granted leave of absence under section 1 for more than 15 days in any 1 calendar year.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1475, to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] explain the bill briefly?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, this bill would give discretion to the Civil Service Commission in cases where through inadvertence or ignorance a retired employee is reemployed. They cite the case of Earl Carbauh, who, while receiving annuity of $96.50 per month, served under the Government for a period of almost 7 years at a monthly salary of $19.50; in this case, the Seventy-seventh Congress saw the need for remedial legislation and by Private Law 525—approved December 1, 1942—relieved this annuitant from repayment of the annuity otherwise illegally paid.

It is simply to prevent the necessity of private laws where there is equity and justice in not requiring the repayment where a retired employee is reemployed.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is further amended by adding thereto a further paragraph reading as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, there shall be no recovery of annuity payments from any annuitant under this act who, in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission, is without fault and when, in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission, such recovery would be contrary to equity and good conscience."

AUTHORIZING THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES TO DELEGATE TO SUBORDINATES THE AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY PERSONS FOR DUTY IN DEPARTMENTS OR THE FIELD SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1725, to authorize heads of departments and agencies to delegate to subordinates the authority to employ persons for duty in departments or the field service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio and Mr. JENSEN objected.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen give me an opportunity to explain the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I shall not withhold my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

EXTENDING CERTAIN BENEFITS OF THE CANAL ZONE RETIREMENT ACT OF MARCH 2, 1931, AS AMENDED, TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES COVERED BY THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2224, to extend certain benefits of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, to certain employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service is hereby amended so that the civilian employees who served in the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone, Isthmus of Panama, from May 4, 1904, to April 1, 1914, and who were subsequently employed in the classified service of the United States, shall, upon retirement, in addition to the benefits received under this act, be entitled to receive the same benefits for such services rendered, between the above-mentioned dates, as those accorded employees of the Panama Canal permanent organization, who had similar service and who upon retirement receive the additional benefits contained in section 6, paragraph (4), of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931 (Public, No. 781, 78th Cong.), as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS AND COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN PERSONS RECEIVING RETIRED PAY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 771, to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay,

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That where any person authorized to receive military or naval retired pay in accordance with any provision of law would be eligible to receive pension or compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, if he were not on the retired list in the case of Regular Army or Regular Navy personnel, or if he were not in receipt of retired pay in the case of other Army or Navy personnel, he may waive receipt of retired pay and allowances for the purpose of receiving such pension or compensation; and thereafter such person may waive receipt of such pension or compensation for the purpose of receiving retired pay and allowances. To prevent concurrent payments, when waiver of receipt of retired pay and allowances for the purpose of receiving pension or compensation is filed in the War Department or the Navy Department, the department concerned shall notify the Veterans' Administration of the receipt of such waiver and the effective date of the stoppage of retired pay and allowances. Similar report to the War or Navy Department shall be rendered by the Veterans' Administration, when waiver of receipt of pension or compensation is filed in the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of receiving retired pay and allowances.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That any person who is receiving pay pursuant to any provision of law relating to the retirement of persons in the regular military or naval service, and who would be eligible to receive pension or compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration if he were not receiving such retired pay, shall be entitled to receive such pension or compensation upon the filing by such person with the department by which such retired pay is paid of a waiver of so much of his retired pay and allowances as is equal in amount to such pension or compensation. To prevent duplication of payments, the department with which any such waiver is filed shall notify the Veterans' Administration of the receipt of such waiver, the amount waived, and the effective date of the reduction in retired pay."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation from some member of the committee handling this bill as to the meaning of this amendment and as to how far it reaches.

The amendment provides:

That any person who is receiving pay pursuant to any provision of law relating to the retirement of persons in the regular military or naval service, and who would be eligible to receive pension or compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration if he were not receiving such retired pay, shall be entitled to receive such pension or compensation upon the filing by such person with the department by which such retired pay is paid of a waiver of so much of his retired pay and allowances as is equal in amount to such pension or compensation.

My question is, Will such person receive his pension provided he waives so much of his retired pay as does not exceed the pension? Does he get both? Does he get pension and retired pay also?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I do not observe that the author of the bill is present at the moment. He was here a few minutes ago. I cannot answer the gentleman from Kentucky further than to say that the language of the bill seems fairly clear. I observe, however, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, present. Perhaps he can answer the gentleman from Kentucky a little more fully.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. In view of the fact the gentleman from Iowa, who is really the best posted member of the committee on this bill, is not present, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am not expressing opposition to the bill. My desire is only to receive information as to whether he gets both pension and retirement pay or whether he gets one and not the other.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING USE OF SPACE IN OLD POST OFFICE BUILDING IN PORTLAND, OREG., BY THE STATE OF OREGON AS A MUSEUM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4623, to authorize the use of space in the old Post Office Building in Portland, Oreg., by the State of Oregon for its use as a museum for relics from the battleship *Oregon*, together with all other historical documents, objects, and relics of Oregon and the old Oregon country held by the State for public display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to lease, without regard to section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; 40 U. S. C. 303b), for temporary periods and revocable at any time, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be in the public interest, surplus space in the old post-office building at Portland, Oreg., situate on property bounded by southwest Morrison, Yamhill, Fifth, and Sixth Streets, to the State of Oregon, for the use of the Battleship Oregon Commission in storing, housing, and displaying to the public the relics and historical objects from the battleship *Oregon*, together with all other historical objects, and relics of Oregon and the old Oregon country in the custody of the Battleship Oregon Commission: *Provided*, That the activities of the Battleship Oregon Commission, while occupying such space, shall be subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Federal Works Administrator.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "Federal Works Administrator" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioner of Public Buildings."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF POSTAL NOTES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4687, relating to issuance of postal notes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because I believe this is a good bill, but I think the House perhaps would like to have an explanation of the bill, and if the gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, will give us a brief explanation, I would appreciate it.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply provides that we shall have a postal note not to exceed $10 to cost the sender at this time not more than 5 cents. The Postmaster General is given authority, if he finds that the income from the postal note is greater than the expense, to reduce it to not less than 3 cents. If the cost of the postal note is greater than 5 cents, he is given authority to increase it to 6 cents.

This is simply for the purpose of transmitting money through the mail at a very small expense and it is for the general good of the public. We are informed that with this simplification the cost of handling the matter will not exceed 5 cents, in our opinion, which will defray the total cost.

Mr. PRIEST. As I understand then, this would simply take the place of a postal money order up to $10, or not to exceed $10?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. If they prefer to use it that way.

Mr. PRIEST. It would be much simpler and would save a lot of time?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It would be much simpler.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1340; 39 U. S. C. 738), entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes," is amended to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General may authorize postmasters at such offices as he shall designate, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to issue and pay money orders not exceeding $10, to be known as postal notes. Postal notes shall be valid for 2 calendar months from the date of their issue, but thereafter may be paid by the Postmaster General or refund may be made in case of loss, upon evidence satisfactory to him, under such regulations as he may prescribe. Postal notes shall not be negotiable or transferable through endorsement. The Postmaster General is hereby directed in order to promote the service to the public to fix the fees for postal notes at an amount of not less than 3 cents or more than 6 cents, and to reform them within these amounts whenever he shall find that any such fees are too low to insure receipt of revenues adequate to pay the cost of the system or materially higher than necessary to pay the cost thereof."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all of the bill following line 7 and insert the following:

"SEC. 8. The Postmaster General may authorize postmasters at such offices as he shall designate, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to issue and pay money orders not exceeding $10, to be known as postal notes at 5 cents each: *Provided, however*, That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in order to promote the service to the public, to increase or decrease the fees fixed by Congress for postal notes to an amount not less than 3 cents or more than 6 cents, whenever he shall find that such fees are too low to insure the receipt of revenues adequate to pay the cost of the postal-note system or materially higher than necessary to pay the cost thereof: *And provided further*, That he shall be required to report to the Congress revision of any fee at least 60 days prior to its effective date.

"Postal notes shall be valid for 2 calendar months from the date of their issue, but thereafter may be paid by the Postmaster General or refund may be made in case of loss, upon evidence satisfactory to him, under such regulations as he may prescribe. Postal notes shall not be negotiable or transferable through endorsement."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO ACT GRANTING INCREASES IN COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4680, to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public, No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, approved March 24, 1944, be, and the same is hereby, amended by the insertion after the third proviso in section 1 of the following: *"Provided further*, That in the adjustment of compensation for substitute village delivery carriers, incident to the operation of this act, the pay of such substitute village delivery carriers shall not be reduced."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR COMMENCING AND COMPLETING CONSTRUCTION OF A FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS CALCASIEU RIVER AT OR NEAR LAKE CHARLES, LA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4054, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, authorized to be built by the State of Louisiana by an act of Congress approved June 22, 1943, are hereby extended 2 and 4 years, respectively, from June 22, 1944.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of bills eligible for consideration at this time on the Consent Calendar.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say that we have passed the period. If the gentleman will amend his request to address the House for 1 minute, the Chair will recognize him for that purpose.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I raised some question about the bill S. 771. I now have a copy of the committee report. The War Department approves this bill and it is now very clear to me that the bill is all right and, in my judgment, ought to be passed as reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

For instance, if a man is getting $100 retirement pay and is allowed a pension or compensation to the amount of $50, this bill provides he may still draw his pension provided he waives $50 of his retirement pay. He would then get $100 a month and preserve his retirement pay rights, and at the same time assert his right to pension or compensation as a disabled veteran. I think the bill is all right, but the author of the bill is necessarily absent and it may go over until the next calendar day so that he may have an opportunity to be heard on his bill. I favor the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by Judge Moriarity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The next order of business is the call of bills on the Private Calendar, having to do with individual claims. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ESTATE OF IDA LONDINSKY

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar (H. R. 1268) for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to the heirs of Ida Londinsky, who was killed as a result of being struck by a Government-owned truck of the United States Army in New York City, N. Y., on November 18, 1942. The payment of this sum will be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "heirs" and insert in lieu thereof "administrator of the estate."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "States", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Ida Londinsky."

VANNIE BUTLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1919, for the relief of Vannie Butler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vannie Butler, of Alicia, Ark., the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident caused by the negligent operation of a Work Projects Administration's truck near Alicia on or about February 28, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact or collect, withhold or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES W. KIRBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2605, for the relief of Charles W. Kirby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Charles W. Kirby, formerly an employee of the Department of Agriculture and of the Post Office Department, be, and he is hereby, released from any liability to the United States by reason of being carried on the pay roll in two positions, that of postmaster at Browns, Ala., and as a clerk in the Department of Agriculture during the period November 24, 1930, to June 16, 1931. The Comptroller General of the United States has certified that the sum of $411.90 is due the United States from the said Charles W. Kirby under the statute relating to the receiving of more than one salary.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to refund to Charles W. Kirby any amount he shall have refunded to the United States prior to the passage of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2674, for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there any further objection?

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Adolphus M. Holman, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., the sum of $5,846.92, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for property damages and personal injury sustained by him on September 28, 1942, when a car driven by said Adolphus M. Holman was struck by an Army truck of the United States on the highway near Alamogordo, N. Mex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his claim" and insert in lieu thereof "all claims."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRESSIE SPRING

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3033, for the relief of Tressie Spring.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, before we consider this bill, I endeavored to object to consideration of the bill H. R. 2674. During the confusion the Chair did not recognize me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Ohio that, under the rule, two objections are required to bills on the Private Calendar to prevent their consideration.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, then are we still considering H. R. 2674?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No. We have passed that bill. The Chair, having asked if there was any further objection, heard no response. One objection is not sufficient to bills on the Private Calendar to prevent consideration. The House is now considering H. R. 3033.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill H. R. 3033?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Tressie Spring the sum of $8,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her on July 4, 1942, near Boardman, Oreg., when the car in which she was traveling was struck by a United States Army jeep.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Spring", insert "of Portland, Oreg."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,500" and insert in lieu thereof the following "$6,203.79; to pay the sum of $1,012.50 to Mrs. Hazel Stutte, of Portland, Oreg."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "she was" and insert "they were."

Page 2, line 2, after "jeep", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte."

RALPH W. COOLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3464, for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ralph W. Cooley, of Providence, R. I., the sum of $2,000, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred on the 28th day of September 1942, and involved a Government-owned motor vehicle, to wit, Navy truck No. 24080, operated by a member of the United States Naval Reserve.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$931.90."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "his."

At the end of the bill, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS SHEA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3695) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Thomas Shea, late of Cambridge, Mass., the sum of $7,171.53, upon either the making of an assignment of all rights, under, or the filing of a discharge and satisfaction of, a judgment of a like sum rendered in the Third District Court of Eastern Middlesex of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on August 13, 1943, against William A. Leahy, Tewksbury, Mass., the operator of a United States mail truck, in favor of the said James V. Shea as administrator of the estate of Thomas Shea, in a suit for damages arising out of the death of the said Thomas Shea resulting from injuries sustained on June 3, 1940, when he was struck by the said mail truck while it was being operated by the said William A. Leahy in the regular course of his duties. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages arising out of such death.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD McMILLAN AND DOROTHY McMILLAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3753, for the relief of Howard McMillan and Dorothy McMillan, individually and as the legal guardians of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and for Virginia McMillan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard McMillan and Dorothy McMillan, the sum of $83.50, and as legal guardians of Virginia McMillan, a minor, the sum of $2,500, and to Virginia McMillan, the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by them on September 16, 1940, at Emmett, Idaho, when the car in which Dorothy McMillan and Virginia McMillan were traveling was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, and down through the word "truck" on line 5, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the legal guardian of Virginia McMillan, a minor, the sum of $5,000; and to pay the sum of $83.50 to Howard McMillan, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damage sustained as the result of a collision with a Civilian Conservation Corps truck at Emmett, Idaho, on September 16, 1940: *Provided*."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and Howard McMillan."

KATHERINE SCHERER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3929, for the relief of Katherine Scherer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,215, to Mrs. Katherine Scherer, of Chicago, Ill., in full settlement of all claims against the United States (1) as compensation for the death of her son, Albert Scherer, who was killed when struck by a United States mail truck on May 14, 1943; and (2) for reimbursement of funeral expenses incurred by her as the result of such death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES L. KEE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3976, for the relief of Charles L. Kee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles L. Kee, of Portsmouth, Va., the sum of $9,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages arising out of the loss by officers of the United States Navy on June 26, 1920, at Hampton Roads, Va., of an aircraft-planted mine invented by said Charles L. Kee and constructed by him for demonstration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. GRACE MURPHY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4525, for the relief of M. Grace Murphy, administratrix of the estate of John H. Murphy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, to M. Grace Murphy, Boston, Mass., administratrix of the estate of John H. Murphy, deceased, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,964.75 principal and $6,553.47 interest, or a total sum of $11,518.22, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred by the said John H. Murphy, deceased, in connection with the sale to the Government of Poland of certain surplus war materials: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the figures "$4,964.75", strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 8 down to the word "in."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

STATUS OF RETIRED JUDGES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 487 for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 156) relating to the status of retired judges. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] later on.

The resolution before us provides a rule for the consideration of S. 156, a bill relating to the status of retired judges. It is an open rule, allowing 1 hour for general debate, after which the bill will be taken up for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

S. 156 is a simple bill and authorizes the recalling of Federal judges back to service under certain conditions. It comes unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, and I feel it provides for legislation in the right direction. It will not cost the Government any money, but will permit and enable the retired judges, or those who have been disabled, as I understand, to serve the Government without extra pay. There really should not be any objection to any proposal of such legislation. We have a great many judges who are capable of so serving, and I hope the rule will be adopted and the bill will pass.

Personally I am very glad that we still have a judiciary to function in accordance with the Constitution and the laws of the land, and that is really gratifying in view of what I have heard on the floor here during the last few days, listening to some Members questioning the jurisdiction of the courts or suggesting the abrogation of their functions and their authority.

We still continue to have a democratic form of government, and we still have power to legislate, and the executive and judicial branches also have their duties to perform under the Constitution, and I think, on sober thought and reflection, we should not seek to deprive the executive or the judiciary of the powers granted them by the Constitution to function in accordance with the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the executive branch of the Government in the Montgomery Ward matter, about which some of my colleagues are so exercised as to demand impulsive action upon our part, was pursuant to enforcement of a law—the Connally-Smith Act—which this Congress enacted. That act was given full consideration and our approval of it was a token of our intention that it should be enforced. Surely we did not place it upon the statute books as a mere gesture.

Hence, when the executive branch, which we charged with the administration of the act, moves to make it effective against a corporation which defies the authority of the Government of the United States, why should we complain?

On the other hand if the executive branch has overstepped its authority; if it has misinterpreted the intention of this Congress; if its method of procedure is illegal—then surely it is the function of the other coordinate branch, the courts, to set things aright. We may rest assured that their decision will be proper to the circumstances.

This House is not a judicial body and should not, in addition to the arduous task of legislation, take on the duties of rendering opinions in matters pending before the duly-constituted courts of law. As a matter of fact it would seem, however, that those pressing most strongly for action by the House in this matter have already reached their own decision—and have rendered it to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and, with pleasure, yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan who, as a rule, very intelligently and thoroughly explains every rule on any bill that comes before the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the able chairman of the Rules Committee is always generous. This is a technical bill. In order to appreciate the desirability of the proposed amendments to existing law, one must be entirely familiar with that law and its possibilities. Of necessity, it is impossible for all of the Members to be supplied with this information. The lawyers and those familiar with Federal court procedure are naturally those best qualified to judge as to the wisdom of this proposal. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I heartily endorse the bill which this rule makes in order.

In short it is intended to make it easier and surer to administer the Federal courts in a manner best suited to make the courts efficient and to bring justice nearer to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I was not a member of the subcommittee giving special study to this bill. Members of that committee, however, are here present and prepared to explain just how the proposed amendments will change the law. I shall, therefore, not discuss the matter further. Apparently no time is desired on the part

of the Members of the House to discuss the advisability of this rule. I, therefore, announce that on this side of the aisle we shall not use the time allotted to us, and I hope that the rule will be adopted immediately and that the bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 156) relating to the status of retired judges.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 156, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation under consideration will, if adopted, amend existing law in three respects. Under existing law, where an assignment to a district or circuit court is made, it must be made by the senior circuit judge. It was pointed out to the Committee on the Judiciary that there might be instances when the senior circuit judge was ill or for some other reason could not function. In order to meet that situation, existing law is amended by providing that the judicial council may make an assignment when the senior circuit judge is unable to do so.

The second respect in which it is proposed to amend existing law is that the assignment of retired judges is provided for only when they are called upon to sit. The attention of the Committee on the Judiciary was called to the fact that some retired judges have walked into courtrooms and announced that they were ready to function, when there was no need for their services. We felt that in order to prevent a recurrence of embarrassing situations such as arose when that sort of thing occurred, we would make it possible for the retired judge to serve only when called upon to serve either by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States or the senior circuit judge or, when the senior circuit judge was not functioning, by the judicial council.

The third respect in which existing law is amended is with regard to the fixing of the residence of roving judges.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That proposed amendment, as I get it, bars the retired judges from serving unless requested.

Mr. WALTER. It bars a retired judge from serving unless he is assigned by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States or by the senior circuit judge in the circuit in which he was serving at the time of his retirement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That bars all of those judges, then, who have had years of experience and who think they are able to serve, unless they have a request from one of the three whom the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. WALTER. That is correct. May I point out to the gentleman from Michigan this situation where a judge has retired. The facilities for holding court are not available to him. He has to sit in a courtroom that is regularly assigned to some other judge. He has no chambers. Of course, if all the courtrooms are being used by the functioning judges, then he would have to supplant someone.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If what the newspapers say is true, he would have much better facilities than are available down here in this so-called sedition trial. They just have, as I saw there, about 2½ feet of space for the lawyers to put their books and all their papers on. They are all herded in there together.

Mr. WALTER. I think the situation the gentleman is describing is largely the fault of Congress for not providing adequate facilities for holding court in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means down here?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Another thought that has occurred to me is that it has not been very long since we increased the number of judges, yet it seems by the gentleman's argument that there are available judges who might have done this work.

Mr. WALTER. No; there are not available judges that could do this work. There are some who could sit in trials of short duration, and there are some who think they can function. I have in mind a judge who is 85 years old. I am quite certain that if he saw a seat unoccupied he would rush into the courtroom and sit down and ask the clerk to assign the next case to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That may be force of habit.

Mr. WALTER. It is force of habit plus reluctance on the part of the older men to admit that Father Time is running them a very tough race.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Or reluctance to give up power, perhaps, the same as it affects the administration down here.

Mr. WALTER. I am not prepared to discuss that here. There is a place I should like to discuss that matter with the gentleman.

As to these roving judges, there are a number of judges in the United States who have been appointed to serve in more than one district in a State. At the time we provided for these roving judges no consideration was given to the question of their seniority. However, the Committee on the Judiciary felt that Federal judges ought not to feel that it might be desirable to move and change their residence in order to become a senior judge. So we provide in this proposed legislation that a roving judge's seniority shall be fixed by the place of his residence at the time of his appointment.

This measure is designed to plug some pretty obvious leaks that we permitted to exist when the original laws were enacted, and is so simple that I certainly think it ought to be adopted without opposition.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. As I recall the testimony before our committee, there are one or two States where the roving judge claims seniority in two or more different districts for the purpose of controlling patronage in those districts.

Mr. WALTER. That is possible, but it is the sort of thing that I do not believe a Federal judge ought to do. I do not believe he ought to have in mind the possibility of appointing a clerk of the court and other patronage.

Mr. HANCOCK. That is the situation we seek to cure by this particular provision.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know whether we seek to cure it, but I think we seek to prevent it from occurring.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Let me see if I understood the gentleman correctly in connection with the seniority of what are called roving judges. In my State we have a roving judge who serves in all of the three judicial districts. Subsequent to his appointment a judge was appointed in the western district. If I understand this bill correctly, it will make the resident judge the senior judge?

Mr. WALTER. In that particular case it will.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is what I want to be sure about. That is the way I think it should be. I wanted to be sure I understood it.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, the residence of the roving judge at the time of his appointment will govern his seniority. If a judge was appointed subsequent to his appointment in another district—that is, in a district other than in the district in which his residence is—the later judge will be senior in that district.

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes. The roving judge is not a resident of the judicial district I have in mind but has a senior appointment. Subsequently another judge who lives in the district has been appointed. It is my understanding that he will be the senior judge if this bill goes through.

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a very simple one and I see no reason for opposition from any source. If you have the bill before you I will point out the changes made in the existing law so that you can see what is contemplated by this legislation. On page 2, line 10, we have added the words "or judicial council." On page 2, line 11, we have added the words "such senior circuit judge or such judicial council."

In other words, under existing law a retired judge can be called back to duty only by the senior judge.

Under this amendment he may be called back to duty by the senior judge or by the judicial council which is composed, of course, of the circuit judges for that particular circuit. Early in the history of the country the only way a judge could be relieved of his duties was to resign. Some time ago we passed statutes providing for the retirement of district and circuit judges. We later extended that law to cover the Supreme Court. There has always been a question in the minds of some lawyers, let me say, as to the constitutionality of such a procedure, and some question about the status of the judge who was retired. That question, you will recall, was once raised in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, however, declined to consider it. Now, I think it is generally conceded by the legislative branch and by the judicial branch that judges may be retired and may be called upon to perform certain services after their retirement. The purpose of this legislation, that is of the particular amendment which begins on line 9, of page 2, is to make it clear that the judge who has retired and who is in an inactive status, may perform functions as a judge only when called upon by the active judges.

The next important amendment is on line 3, page 21, which has to do with the determination of seniority of a roving judge. It has been explained very well by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and it now settles a question which had a possibility, at least, of giving a little difficulty. It provides simply that a roving judge who is appointed to act in a State covering several districts is to be junior to a judge who has been appointed to perform his duties in one particular district. His seniority, insofar as his own district is concerned, I mean the district in which he lives at the time of his appointment, depends upon the usual rules relating to seniority.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Section 3 of the bill reads, "for the purpose of this act the District of Columbia shall be considered as a judicial circuit." Is the District of Columbia a judicial circuit at the present time?

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, that provision is usually put in these bills. For all practical purposes, it is, yes. That is for the purpose of making it clear that this applies to the District of Columbia as a circuit, just the same as it applies to the seventh or eighth circuit for example. I might say, too, Mr. Chairman, an amendment which has not been mentioned, I believe, will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]; is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. GWYNNE. Sometime ago we passed a law covering in part this same subject, giving the Supreme Court—that is, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court—authority in certain cases to transfer a judge temporarily from one district to another or a circuit judge from one circuit to another when the proper showing could be made of need in that particular district or circuit. The amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to clear up what might amount to a discrepancy between those two provisions if this should become law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 260 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 375), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 260. When any judge of any court of the United States, appointed to hold his office during good behavior, resigns his office after having held a commission or commissions as judge of any such court or courts at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise, and having attained the age of 70 years, he shall, during the residue of his natural life, receive the salary which is payable at the time of his resignation for the office that he held at the time of his resignation. But, instead of resigning, any judge other than a Justice of the Supreme Court, who is qualified to resign under the foregoing provisions, may retire, upon the salary of which he is then in receipt, from regular active service on the bench, and the President shall thereupon be authorized to appoint a successor; but a judge so retiring may nevertheless be called upon by the senior circuit judge or circuit council of that circuit and be by such senior circuit judge or such circuit judicial council authorized to perform such judicial duties in such circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake, or he may be called upon by the Chief Justice and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in any other circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake or he may be called upon either by the presiding judge or senior judge of any other such court and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in such court as such retired judge may be willing to undertake. Any judge who has heretofore retired, or who hereafter retires, under the provisions of this section, may perform judicial duties only when so called and authorized as herein provided.

"In the event any circuit judge, or district judge, having so held a commission or commissions at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise, and having attained the age of 70 years as aforesaid, shall nevertheless remain in office, and not resign or retire as aforesaid, the President, if he finds any such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of mental or physical disability of permanent character, may, when necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional circuit judge of the circuit, or district judge of the district, to which such disabled judge belongs. Any judge who has heretofore retired or who hereafter retires voluntarily under the provisions of this section, or whose mental or physical condition caused the President to appoint an additional judge, shall be held and treated as if junior in commission to the remaining judges of said court, who shall, in the order of the seniority of their respective commissions, exercise such powers and perform such duties as by law may be incident to seniority. In districts where there may be more than one district judge, if the judges or a majority of them cannot agree upon the appointment of officials of the court, to be appointed by such judges, then the senior judge shall have the power to make such appointments: *Provided*, That in determining the seniority of district judges in any State for the purpose of exercising the power of appointing officials of the court, any district judge whose jurisdiction extends over more than one district shall be held and treated as if junior in commission to the other district judges in such State, in all districts except the district of his residence.

"Upon the death, resignation, or retirement of any circuit or district judge, so entitled to resign, following the appointment of any additional judge as provided in this section, the vacancy caused by such death, resignation, or retirement of the said judge so entitled to resign shall not be filled."

SEC. 2. The act of August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1204; U. S. C., title 28, sec. 375b), entitled "An act to extend the privilege of retirement for disability to judges appointed to hold office during good behavior," is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. Any Justice of the Supreme Court who retires or who has retired under the provisions of this act may nevertheless be called upon by the Chief Justice and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties, in any judicial circuit, including those of a circuit justice in such circuit, as such retired Justice may be willing to undertake; a circuit or district judge so retiring or retired may nevertheless be called upon by the senior circuit judge or circuit council of that circuit and be by such senior circuit judge or such circuit council authorized to perform such judicial duties in such circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake, or he may be called upon by the Chief Justice and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in any other circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake; and any judge of any other court of the United States so retiring or retired may be called upon by the presiding judge or senior judge of such court and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in such court as he may be willing to undertake. Any such judge so retiring or retired may perform judicial duties only when so called and authorized as herein provided."

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act the District of Columbia shall be considered as a judicial circuit.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 10, before "council", strike out the word "circuit" and insert the word "judicial."

On page 2, line 11, strike out the word "circuit" after the words "or such."

On page 4, line 3, after the word "residence", insert "at the time of his appointment."

Page 4, line 23, before "council", strike out the word "circuit" and insert "judicial."

Page 4, line 25, before "council", strike out the word "circuit" and insert "judicial."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 2, line 23, after the word "provided", strike out the period and insert ", or as provided by an act approved December 29, 1942, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 156) relating to the status of retired judges, pursuant to House Resolution 487, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, there have appeared in some of the newspapers of the country within recent weeks some very severe attacks upon the Office of War Information. Inasmuch as I know some of the personnel in that office and also know just a little bit about their operations, I was interested enough to make some inquiries. The serious thing about some of these charges and accusations is the fact that they were repeated on the floor of the House by some Members who, I feel, are not fully aware of the facts in the case and I am afraid some of the public has been misinformed as to the true worth of the Office of War Information. Some of these charges reflect a serious disregard of the true functions that the Office of War Information was set up to perform.

I believe if a proper approach were made it would be found that the accusations made were wholly without foundation.

The Director of the Office of War Information has sent a letter to me with respect to some of the accusations made concerning the pamphlet issued by the Office of War Information, which is entitled, "Handbook of the United States of America." I think it important enough because of the method of the attack made upon this special agency of the Government which the Congress has set up, that I should read for the record and for the information of the people of the United States this letter which I received from Director Elmer Davis.

The letter reads as follows:

The Honorable HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EBERHARTER: These are the facts about the Handbook of the United States of America, which has been published by the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information for use of our outposts in neutral and Allied countries outside the Western Hemisphere: The 675 copies already sent out have become a reference source for officials of foreign countries, newspaper editors, commentators, and others asking for facts about the United States at war.

It has been stated on the floor of the House of Representatives, as well as in several newspapers, that the O. W. I. "clearly was ashamed of the book and did not want it to reach the American public." The evidence adduced was a sticker pasted on each copy available here. The sticker reads, "Restricted: This publication is not for distribution in the United States or to American civilian or military personnel overseas."

The reason for the restriction, of course, is the clause inserted into the O. W. I. appropriation bill last year which states "no part of this or any other appropriation shall be expended by the Office of War Information for the preparation or publication of any pamphlet or other literature, except the United States Government Manual, for distribution to the public within the United States."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. With reference to the charges that have been made on the floor of the House, there was a resolution introduced, and hearings have been held on that resolution by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. Since that time I have received a report from Mr. Davis, which unfortunately I have been unable to read, but I have it here, and in the near future I desire to file this report, clarifying all those charges that have been made. I am sure, from a casual résumé of this report, that it will satisfy any fair man that these accusations and charges were not founded on facts.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am very glad the gentleman from Illinois has made that statement, because I feel, as he does, that if the Congress really delves into these accusations it will find they have no foundation in fact whatsoever, and that is the main reason why I am reading this letter into the RECORD, to show to the American public that very often misinformed persons say things which they would not say if they had really delved into the subject with any thoroughness or with open minds.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not understand. Who was it who made these charges? I did not get the individual from the gentleman's statement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I have no desire to accuse any Member of the House of Representatives with making unfounded charges and I have not done so. I have said this, that some of the Members of the Congress, while not making these charges themselves, have reiterated on the floor of the House charges made by other persons who were misinformed. They might have done it merely for the purpose of bringing these matters to the attention of the Congress. I do not agree with that method of doing things, and I think that before anything is said on the floor of the House a proper investigation should be made; because many times things are said here which have no foundation in fact, and the public gets an altogether wrong impression. That is the reason I am reading this letter so that the true facts with reference to this particular Handbook of the United States of America may be brought to the attention of the American people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for one further statement?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman that every Member should make an investigation before he repeats some charge, but I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who stands at my side, to say that some Member had made some unfounded charge. I did not understand who it was.

Mr. SABATH. He may have repeated it. I do not want to mention names.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am not asking for that. The gentleman does not mean that some Member of the House made some unfounded charge here in the well of the House?

Mr. SABATH. Well, in some speech that has been made.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I just read from Mr. Davis' letter:

It has been stated on the floor of the House of Representatives as well as in several newspapers, that the O. W. I. clearly was ashamed of the book and did not want it to reach the American public.

That is one of the main reasons why I am reading this letter. If the gentleman will let me finish reading it, I will be glad to yield if I have any time remaining.

The letter continues:

It does not seem to me quite fair that we should be denounced on the floor of Congress for scrupulously carrying out the mandate of Congress.

The handbook was designed to supplement standard historical works already available for reference at our outposts. Examples from a long list are: The Republic by Charles and Mary Beard; The Growth of the American and the Epic of America by James Truslow Adams. These other reference works supply in full detail from many angles the historical background of our Government and describe its normal peacetime structures. The handbook presents special material on America in the war not otherwise available in convenient form. It is a factual picture of the United States Government and Nation as it is now; not as it was 10 years ago or may be 10 years from now.

The handbook also has been criticized on the ground that in a chronology of United States history, a disproportionate amount of space is devoted to events of the last 10 years. It is interesting to note in this connection, that the World Almanac, in a chronology of important world events, devoted 14 pages to the period from the beginning of the world to 1933 and 10 pages to the period from 1933 to 1943. In other words, the World Almanac covers nearly 6,000 years in 14 pages and takes 10 full pages for the last 10 years.

It has been stated that only two women were mentioned in the handbook's chronology—Miss Jane Addams who received a Nobel prize and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt who went to London in 1942 to study the work of women in the war. Evidently the people who say that not only have not read the handbook, they have not even read the index. Many other American women are mentioned in such subdivisions as those on literature, the theater, art, etc. A few examples are Emily Dickinson, Willa Cather, Edna Ferber, Zona Gale, Mary Beard, Clare Boothe Luce. There are many others.

It has been charged that the handbook devotes a disproportionate amount of space to the executive branch of the Government in relation to the coverage given the legislative branch. The Congressional Directory itself, it might be noted, devotes not a single line to the functions of the Congress and gives nearly 200 pages to a discussion of the functions of executive agencies.

When the handbook reached the O. W. I. outpost in London, a copy was seen by a representative of Hutchinson & Co., one of the largest publishing firms in Great Britain. They liked it well enough to ask if they might publish it at their own expense, to be placed on sale in England. To this the O. W. I. readily agreed. It was put out there at no expense to the American taxpayers, although it was stated on the floor of the House that the O. W. I. "advertised it for sale all over Great Britain in the newspapers."

The London Spectator, in its issue of April 14, says, "This is a book which every editorial library should possess, and by its very factual sobriety does a better job than many more lively impressionistic works have done."

By supplying the O. W. I. outposts with a ready reference work like the handbook, the service has been improved to those foreign citizens who talk and write about the United States of America. The need for many cables and letters between the outposts and the home office has been eliminated.

Though I make no claim for the perfection of its details, I regard it as one of our effective minor jobs. Judging by its usefulness in the countries overseas it was designed to serve, I think it has paid for itself. I have already sent copies to many Members of the Congress who have requested them. I hope they will read the handbook carefully and also will have time to read some of our other publications which have been circulated in hundreds of thousands direct to the public overseas. The handbook has been circulated in hundreds so far, for the most part to professional writers and speakers. But I repeat that these publications are distributed only abroad; we have carefully adhered to the congressional prohibition against any distribution of publications in the United States, except for copies given to Members of the Congress or newspaper reporters who have asked to see it.

Cordially,

ELMER DAVIS, *Director.*

Mr. Speaker, I believe this letter is a complete refutation of any accusations and charges against the Office of War Information with respect to this "Handbook of the United States of America," and I hope the public of the United States of America will come to appreciate the real value of the psychological warfare that is carried on by this branch of the Government in foreign countries, and what a great contribution it is making to the all-over war effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE CONTINUED, EFFICIENT, NONPOLITICAL OPERATION OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY IS VITAL TO THE SUCCESSFUL PROSECUTION OF THE WAR—IT IS OWNED AND OPERATED BY OUR GOVERNMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE NATION

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to discuss the effect of the Senate amendments to the act, H. R. 4070, on the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Tennessee Valley Authority requested no new appropriated funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945. It is estimated that the unobligated balances of $19,262,298 at the beginning of the year plus current receipts of $68,528,882 will be sufficient to finance current obligations of $77,134,882 and a $2,000,000 reduction in funded debt, leaving an unobligated balance of $8,656,298 as of June 30, 1945.

The House left this unobligated balance in the hands of the Authority as a reserve to cover possible resumption of work on deferred projects and for contingencies which may arise in the Authority's wartime construction program.

In the act as passed by the House this year providing funds for fiscal year 1945 the language permitting T. V. A. to deposit its receipts in the Treasury in a special fund is as follows:

> The unexpended balance on June 30, 1944, in the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944," and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1945 (subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended), shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945," to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944."

The Senate amendment struck out this language and then wrote into the act a requirement that all of T. V. A.'s receipts be paid into the "general fund of the Treasury of the United States."

It thus, by implication, repealed the basic act creating T. V. A., which directed the T. V. A. to use its receipts to carry on its operations and to pay into the general fund of the Treasury only the surplus remaining after its obligations were met.

Congress clearly intended that the T V. A. should be managed by its board of directors and not by Congress. Congress clearly intended that the funds derived from the sale of power and chemicals should be used by the Authority in paying its operating costs, the cost of constructing new power facilities, and ultimately to return to the taxpayers of the United States the initial cost of power-generating plants and distribution systems.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is much more than a mere governmental agency. The Tennessee Valley Authority Act erects a corporation, an instrumentality of the United States, to develop by a series of dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries a system of navigation and flood control, and to sell the power created by the dams—*Tennessee Power Co. et al.* v. *T. V. A.* (U. S. Reports, vol. 306, p. 134). The board is also authorized to manufacture and sell fixed nitrogen, fertilizer, and fertilizer ingredients in order to cheapen and improve these products for the farmers.

The creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority grew out of the fact that during the First World War the United States Government built what is known as Wilson Dam, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., and constructed at said point a great plant for the manufacture of nitrates.

For more than 100 years prior to 1933 the Federal Government had considered many projects for the improvement of navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive floodwaters in the Tennessee and Mississippi River Basins.

The board of directors of the corporation is composed of three members, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. All other officials, agents, and employees of the Authority are designated and selected by the board.

No director is permitted to have any financial interest in any public utility corporation engaged in the business of distributing and selling power, nor in any corporation engaged in the manufacture and sale of fertilizer or any ingredient thereof.

The T. V. A. Act in the clearest of terms provides that this great enterprise shall be operated free from political control, free from the spoilsman's domination, with the flexibility of a private corporation.

In the case of Ashwander against the Authority, Mr. Chief Justice Hughes in a masterly opinion reviewed the provisions of the act and upheld the powers of the Tennessee Valley Authority to improve the navigability of the Tennessee River, to control the floodwaters of the Tennessee River and the Mississippi River Basins, and to translate the energy of the falling water of the dams operated by the Authority into electric energy, and to transmit and sell this energy throughout the States of Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Kentucky (*Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S., p. 315)).

All of the duties and powers of the Authority have been discharged by it in a marvelously efficient manner. Its great program has been carried out free from graft, free from waste, and with an eye single to the welfare of the people of this country.

The question, therefore, is not whether or not we shall have the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is an accomplished fact. It is now a going concern. It belongs to the people of the United States. Its continued successful operation, unhampered and unimpeded by crippling amendments is of vital concern to every section of this country.

I have in my hand a copy of the Knoxville News-Sentinel of Friday, April 20, which pictures a skipper and his wife who brought to the Tennessee Valley terminal on the Tennessee River in Knoxville on that day of last month a bargeload of wheat from the West and Northwest, 100 tons of wheat, and they were taking back from east Tennessee a trainload of coal to St. Paul, Minn. In other words, the Tennessee River now is navigable from Knoxville, Tenn., to the Gulf of Mexico and to the upper reaches of the Mississippi River, St. Paul, Minn., and intermediate points, as well as other rivers which run into the Mississippi.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is not an ordinary governmental agency, local in its character. It is a Federal corporation through which the United States Government is rendering indispensable services to all the people of the Nation.

In the Tennessee Valley Authority the United States Government has an investment of $467,796,805.33 as of June 30, 1943.

And I mean by that the physical properties of the Authority which are used to control flood waters, improve navigation, and produce electric energy.

Three hundred fifty-two million, two hundred ninety-five thousand, five hundred seventy-three dollars and ninety-five cents of this represents the Government's power producing and transmission facilities.

The United States Government, through its corporate agency, the Tennessee Valley Authority, is now producing hydroelectric power at the following dams:

First. Wilson Dam, at Muscle Shoals, Ala. This dam was completed before the T. V. A. was created by Congress and was taken over from the United States Army Engineers by the T. V. A. in 1933.

Second. Pickwick Landing Dam, located 207 river miles above the mouth of the Tennessee where it joins the Ohio. Construction of this dam was started by T. V. A. in March 1935 and was completed in June 1938.

Third. Wheeler Dam is located 275 miles above Paducah, Ky. Construction was started by the T. V. A. in November 1933 and completed in November 1936.

Fourth. Guntersville Dam is located 349 miles above the mouth of the Tennessee, within 7 miles of the town of Guntersville, Ala. Construction of this dam was started by T. V. A. in December 1935 and completed in August 1939.

Fifth. Hales Bar Dam is located on the Tennessee River near Chattanooga, Tenn., and was purchased by the Government from the Tennessee Electric Power Co.

Sixth. Chickamauga Dam is on the Tennessee River 7 miles above Chattanooga, Tenn. Its construction was started by T. V. A., January 1936 and was completed in March 1940.

Seventh. Watts Bar Dam, located on the Tennessee 66 miles upstream from Chattanooga, was started by T. V. A. in July 1939 and completed in February 1942.

Eighth. Fort Loudoun Dam, located about a mile upstream from Lenoir City, Tenn., was started by T. V. A. in July 1940 and completed in August 1943.

Ninth. Norris Dam is located on Clinch River 79 miles above its mouth. Its construction was started by T. V. A. in October 1935 and completed in July 1936.

Tenth. Hiawassee Dam, located on the Hiawassee River 76 miles above its mouth, was started by T. V. A. in July 1936 and was completed in May 1940.

Eleventh. Cherokee Dam is located on the Holston River 52 miles above its mouth and construction on it was started by T. V. A. in August 1940 and was completed in April 1942.

Twelfth. Apalachia Dam is located on the Hiawassee River in Cherokee County, N. C. Construction on it was started by T. V. A. in July 1941 and was completed in February 1943.

Thirteenth. Nottely Dam is located on the Nottely River in Union County, Ga. Construction on it was started by T. V. A. in July 1941 and it was completed in January 1942.

Fourteenth. Ocoee No. 3 Dam is located on the Ocoee River in Polk County, Tenn. Construction on it was started by T. V. A. in July 1941 and was completed in April 1943.

Fifteenth. Chatuge Dam is located on a mountain tributary of the Hiawassee River in North Carolina. Construction on it was started in July 1941 and completed in February 1942.

Sixteenth. Douglas Dam is on the French Broad River which joins with the Holston River to form the Tennessee near Knoxville. It is in Sevier County, about 13 miles below Dandridge, Tenn. Construction was started by T. V. A. in February 1942 and completed in February 1943.

Seventeenth. Ocoee No. 1 Dam is located in Tennessee on the Ocoee River. T. V. A. acquired this project in 1939 from the Tennessee Electric Power Co.

Eighteenth. Ocoee No. 2 Dam is located in Tennessee on the Ocoee River, 20 miles above its mouth. T. V. A. acquired this dam in 1939 from the Tennessee Electric Power Co.

Nineteenth. Blue Ridge Dam is located on the Toccoa River, Ga., and was purchased from the Tennessee Electric Power Co.

Twentieth. Great Falls Dam is located on the Caney Fork River at the mouth of the Collins River in Tennessee, and was purchased from the Tennessee Electric Power Co. in 1939.

In addition to these 20 dams at which the Tennessee Valley Authority is now producing electric energy the Authority now has under construction the following dams:

First. Kentucky Dam, which is the only T. V. A. dam located on the Tennessee River in Kentucky, 22.4 miles above the mouth of the river near Gilbertsville. Construction was started by T. V. A. in July 1938.

Second. Fontana Dam, located on the Little Tennessee River 1 mile west of Fontana in western North Carolina. Construction of this dam was started by the T. V. A. in January 1942.

Third. Watauga Dam, located on the Watauga River, which is a tributary of the Holston River, is 8 miles below Butler, Tenn. Construction was started in February 1942 but was halted by order of the War Production Board in order to conserve critical materials.

Fourth. South Holston Dam is located on the south fork of the Holston River in Tennessee. Construction was started by T. V. A. in February 1942 but was halted by order of the War Production Board in order to conserve critical materials.

There are some five or six steam-generating plants. The one at Watts Bar Dam is the most modern steam-generating electric plant in the world. Other electric steam-generating plants owned by the Authority, which it acquired from the power companies whose assets it purchased, require from 2 to 3 pounds of coal to produce a kilowatt-hour of electric energy, whereas at this modern plant constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority each pound of coal used under the boilers of that plant produces from two to three times as much power as is produced in the older and obsolete, you might say, plants.

Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority, during the past fiscal year, generated at its dams and steam-generating plants, and transmitted over its distribution system, and sold to its customers 9,055,577,000 kilowatt-hours of power.

Under the laws of the United States I am not permitted to disclose the number of kilowatt-hours of electricity supplied by the Tennessee Valley Authority to the war agencies which I shall now name. I can state, however, that the T. V. A. furnished electric power in vast quantities to the following enterprises all of which are engaged exclusively in the production of vital war materials: The Aluminum Co. of America, Alcoa, Blount County, Tenn.; American Zinc Co., Mascot, Knox County, Tenn.; Tennessee Copper Co., Copperhill, Polk County, Tenn.; Volunteer Ordnance Works, Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tenn.; Appalachian Mills, Brookside Mills, Electro Manganese Corporation, Fulton Sylphon Co., Knoxville Iron Co., Standard Knitting Mills, Volunteer Portland Cement Co., all of Knoxville, and Clinton Engineer Works, located on a 56,000-acre tract of land in Anderson and Roane Counties, Tenn.

The following Chattanooga war enterprises obtain their electric power from the T. V. A.: Cavalier Corporation, Combustion Engineering Co., Crane Enamelware Co., Dixie Mercerizing Co., Lookout Oil Refining Co., Ross-Mehan Foundries, Signal Mountain Portland Cement Co., Southern-Ferro Alloys Co., Standard-Coosa-Thatcher Co., and Wilson & Co.

And Cleveland Enamel Co., Cleveland, Tenn.; Lenoir Car Works, Lenoir City, Tenn., and Penn-Dixie Cement Co., all obtain their power from the T. V. A.

The truth is we can all remember when people went out to collect pots, pans, and aluminum scrap, when we were confronted with the dangers incident to this war on account of the lack of aluminum for the construction of war planes; but this great aluminum plant at Alcoa, in my district, since the war began has trebled its production. It is making aluminum 50 times as fast as Hitler can make it and this is all due to the fact that the Congress was wiser than it knew when it authorized this great hydroelectric program, which has resulted in the industrialization of that great region which is one of the most vital to the successful and victorious prosecution of the war.

In addition to this, hundreds of smaller manufacturing plants in Tennessee engaged in war production operate with T. V. A. power. Among these is Rohm & Haas Co., of Knoxville, and Southern Chemical Cotton Co., of Chattanooga, that obtain their power from the T. V. A. More than 1,200 cities, towns, and communities receive their power from T. V. A.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Before the gentleman leaves the subject of power and these various plants engaged in war production which he has mentioned in such a complete list, may I ask the gentleman if the revolving fund under which T. V. A. operates should be abolished, as is proposed by the amendment adopted in the Senate, any one of these plants desiring an extension of a power line to carry on greater production would probably have to wait for an appropriation bill which would mean 18 months in some instances?

Mr. JENNINGS. I am coming to that in just a moment.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure the gentleman will. He is making a very fine presentation.

Mr. JENNINGS. The T. V. A. has a surplus from its unexpended funds during the last fiscal year of approximately $19,000,000. The effect of the amendment is to convert those funds back into the Treasury of the United States. If there should be a breakdown somewhere in the 5,700 miles of transmission lines that it employs in distributing this energy, if saboteurs should come and wreck them or wreck the power plants or in some other way should interfere with the operation of the plants, or if there should be a destructive tornado as sometimes sweeps through that section and that should wreck those lines, or if new demands upon the Authority should be made, why, of course, it would be delayed to the extent of the time that it would require the Authority to come to the Congress and ask for an appropriation, and then have a knock down and drag out fight with the author of the amendments over in the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, in naming all of those various war plants, the gentleman did not name anything like all of those that are served throughout that area?

Mr. JENNINGS. There are hundreds of them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Going back, when those plants were being put into operation with a rapidity that has never been equaled anywhere in the world, it would have been impossible for the T. V. A. to have connected up those power lines and to have contracted to give them power had this kind of a law that is now proposed been in effect?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They would have had to come to the Congress, get an authorization in each individual case, get clearance of the Budget, and have the money appropriated before it could have proceeded?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is true. It was the intention, and the clear intention of the Congress, as expressed in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, that it function with all freedom, unimpeded and unhampered, and all the flexibility of a private corporation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the House is indeed grateful to the gentleman for his very clear statement of what is involved in this controversy that has arisen in the other body. As I see it, it is not a question of shall we have a T. V. A., nor is it a question what somebody has done in years gone by, but we are faced with the problem here of a vast enterprise, a vast industry contributing toward the winning of the war and supplying energy to plants that must go on. It is a question of whether or not we are going to restrain and hamper the individuals charged with the running of that enterprise.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman's position is just and sound, and I believe the House will, and I know they should, sustain his position.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am indeed grateful for that comment from my distinguished colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In further answer to the gentleman from Nebraska, is it not a question of an efficient operation of a large concern owned by the people of the United States?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is it exactly. For instance, this is a highly complicated and technical operation. In these dams are great turbine wheels which operate in connection with electrical energy producing equipment, which requires the installation of these machines, and their continued operation requires the work of technicians, men of great skill, in operating the machinery incident to the operation of these dams. It is not a thing for a politician to have control of. It is a thing that must be controlled by the directors of this corporation and these selected and experienced experts.

There are 437 of those highly skilled technicians residing in the State of Tennessee. What a hunting ground for the patronage dispenser that would afford if the naming of those men were committed to the power of any man who has a penchant or desire or disposition to want to name politicians to a public office.

It is for this reason, among other reasons, that we are opposed to putting the operation of this great business concern under the control of men who might be disposed to hamper it or control it or defeat its purpose.

Mr. GORE. In other words, the gentleman takes this position, that it ought to be a business operation and not a political operation?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is right.

It is not a hunting ground for the spoilsman. It is a great business enterprise in which the people of this country have their money invested, and upon the efficient, nonpolitical operation of which depends, to a large extent, our victory in this war.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman not explode one canard that has been passed around? I find some Members are disturbed by the statement that the T. V. A. does not make an accounting to Congress.

Mr. JENNINGS. Oh, that is as far removed from the truth as the east is from the west. Under the law the T. V. A. is required annually to make a full and a detailed report to Congress, and it has done that every year of its existence. In addition to that, its accounts have been audited yearly by accounting firms of national reputation and also by the accountants of the Comptroller General's office.

Mr. GORE. And a special committee was appointed by the Congress to investigate.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is true. Why, it has been put in a mortar, as it were, and pestled. Qualitative and quantitative analyses have been made with care by men who have had scrutinizing eyes and who have had a hostile attitude, and they have never yet been able to put their finger upon a single dropped stitch or single misappropriated penny of money.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure all of the Members of the House are very grateful to the distinguished gentleman from the Second District of Tennessee for his statement, particularly in view of the fact that the gentleman lives in that part of the Tennessee Valley and has ever since the inception of the Tennessee Valley Authority been familiar with every angle of its activity and in a position to observe whether it has done a good job and whether the people are pleased with the kind of operation that goes on down there.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Is it not a part of the T. V. A. Act that a rate shall be charged for the sale of power that will enable the T. V. A. eventually to pay back to the Government every dollar invested in power facilities in the Tennessee Valley, and will it not be impossible to protect the Government's interest in getting that money back if you hamstring it and put amendments on it so that it cannot operate efficiently and economically?

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman is absolutely right. The truth is that the Tennessee Valley Authority is now engaged in building a large dam at Gilbertsville, Ky., on the Tennessee River, just a short distance above where the river flows into the Ohio, and also in completing the Fontana Dam in the mountains of North Carolina, which will be one of the highest dams in the world, costing $70,000,000. When those two dams are completed, assuming that the two smaller dams in upper east Tennessee are not built, the T. V. A. will, in a few years, pay back into the Treasury of the United States the total cost of this entire power investment of the people of this country in that agency.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman means that the T. V. A. will pay that in-

vestment back if it can operate like a business enterprise.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; if it can operate unimpeded by crippling political amendments.

Moreover, the T. V. A. geologists and mining engineers have worked hand in hand with the best-trained and skilled experts in the employ of the Georgia Department of Conservation, and with the experts in the employ of the University of Alabama, the University of Georgia, and the University of Tennessee in the discovery and development of critical war materials. Among those discovered and developed are mica, new coal fields, limestone for use in the production of synthetic rubber, vermiculite for use in deck mats for the Navy, olivine for use in steel production.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. The T. V. A. has rendered valuable service in the development of the production of cheap, improved fertilizer. The benefits derived by the farmers of the country from this work of the Authority are Nation-wide.

I want to call the attention of the Members to this fact that has escaped the attention of a lot of the Members of Congress and of the people of the country.

The 29,869 test demonstration farms using T. V. A. fertilizer and T. V. A. soil-conservation programs are located in the following 28 States: Alabama, 2,674; Arkansas, 288; Georgia, 2,367; Idaho, 14; Illinois, 314; Indiana, 79; Iowa, 210; Kansas, 69; Louisiana, 136; Kentucky, 714; Maryland, 72; Michigan, 676; Minnesota, 207; Mississippi, 747; Missouri, 283; New Mexico, 42; New York, 664; North Carolina, 4,905; Ohio, 258; Oregon, 31; South Carolina, 141; Tennessee, 10,425; Texas, 579; Vermont, 128; Virginia, 3,020; Washington, 52; West Virginia, 228; Wisconsin, 446.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY THROUGH THE OPERATION OF ITS RESERVOIR AND POWER PRODUCTION DAMS HAS MADE A NOTABLE CONTRIBUTION TO FLOOD CONTROL IN THE TENNESSEE AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASINS

In 1927, according to the report of the United States Army engineers, flood waters in the Tennessee and Mississippi River Basins inundated 12,000,000 acres of land, drove 700,000 people from their homes and inflicted damages on the people of the regions affected of more than $220,000,000. The flood-control system of the T. V. A. on the Tennessee River is the best in the United States and since its installation there have been no destructive floods on the Tennessee and those on the Mississippi River have been minimized.

NAVIGATION

The Tennessee River from its mouth at the Ohio to Knoxville, Tenn., has been rendered navigable by the dams and locks constructed on it by the Authority. The grain and other produce of the North and Northwest are now being transported by boat from Milwaukee and other grain markets to Knoxville, Tenn., and other intermediate points on the Tennessee River.

THE TWO AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 4070, THE ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY AND OTHER COVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WILL CRIPPLE AND IRREPARABLY INJURE THE OPERATIONS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR THE ENSUING FISCAL YEAR IN THE GREAT AND INDISPENSABLE CONTRIBUTION IT IS MAKING TO THE WAR EFFORT

Heretofore all income of the Tennessee Valley Authority since it has been earning an income from the production and sale of electric power and chemicals, has been paid by the Authority into the Treasury of the United States and earmarked as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund." And the Authority has been authorized to draw out of the Treasury the moneys in this fund and use them in carrying on its various activities authorized by law. The Senate amendment requires the Authority to pay all of its receipts quarterly into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States. The effect of this amendment is to deprive the Authority of the use of the unexpended balance now in its hands from the previous fiscal year, which this year amounts to approximately $19,000,000. The further effect of this amendment is to require the Tennessee Valley Authority to come to the Congress for an appropriation for money to operate each and every one of its 20 dams and steam plants now in operation, and for the maintenance, patrolling, and repair of its more than 5,700 miles of transmission lines, and for money with which to carry out each and every one of the vital programs in the performance of which it is now engaged.

Bear in mind that the Tennessee Valley Authority is a Government-owned business concern engaged in the production, distribution, and sale of electric power. Do not forget that upon the continuous, efficient, and successful operation of its power generating and distributing system depends the production of aluminum, copper, zinc, ferromanganese, shells, shell casings, explosives, shell fuses, and hundreds of other vital war materials; that upon its continuous, successful, and unimpeded operation depends the economic life and welfare of the more than 20,000,000 people of eight great States of the Union now engaged in the production of food and war materials.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I commend the gentleman on the very fine statement he is making, and ask him if it is not true that if we did not have such undertakings as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Columbia power project, Grand Coulee and Bonneville, the Boulder Dam, and others of that type, we would have had a very, very difficult time meeting our obligations in the war effort.

Mr. JENNINGS. It would have been utterly impossible to have done so.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not also true that these great enterprises are really in the nature of private enterprises in that they are paying their own way and bringing dividends back to the Government?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is true. It is a self-liquidating proposition.

Mr. ANGELL. As the gentleman has said, there is some $19,000,000 left in the reserve fund of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and in the Bonneville Administration we are taking in some $20,000,000 now, and next year will perhaps take in $24,000,000.

Mr. JENNINGS. I thank the gentleman for his constructive contribution. What he has said is true.

If this House agrees to the Senate amendments forbidding the Tennessee Valley Authority the right that it heretofore exercised to use its receipts in carrying on its business, and to give the Senate the power to veto the employment of any person by the Authority whose salary is as much as $4,500 or more, it will be hurtful, even ruinous, to the great program in which the Authority is now engaged. To require the Tennessee Valley Authority to pay all of its receipts into the general fund of the Treasury and not into the Treasury as a special "Tennessee Valley Authority Fund" would be like requiring a corporation to pay its monthly income to its stockholders and then when it needed money to buy materials and carry on its corporate business to go, with hat in hand, to its various stockholders and undertake to get from them the money which it needed.

The governing body of virtually every municipality in the area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority, virtually every civic organization in the area, and every chamber of commerce and every labor organization, has protested and is now protesting the Senate amendments to the bill now before us. The press of the region, with one or two exceptions, is opposed to the amendments. The press of the Nation is outspoken in its condemnation of the effort to hinder, hamstring, and destroy this great governmental project.

There is a strong suspicion, founded upon facts that are becoming more evident day by day, that the crippling amendments of the Senate have the hearty approval of the private power interests of this country, and the private fertilizer interests who would like to see the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is owned by the people of the Nation and which is daily justifying its existence by serving all the people, crippled, if not destroyed.

As the representative of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee in Congress, and as voicing the well nigh unanimous opinions of my people, and the feelings of the people of the entire region, I earnestly urge that my colleagues in this House give careful and thoughtful consideration to these Senate amendments, believing as I do that when you do so you will hesitate long before doing anything that will retard or in any manner cripple the great work of the

Tennessee Valley Authority in furthering our war effort.

TO OPERATE CONTINUOUSLY AND EFFICIENTLY, T. V. A. MUST HAVE THE USE OF ITS INCOME

This year the T. V. A. will pay and retire $2,000,000 of its bonded indebtedness. Tornadoes frequently cause heavy damage in the area served by the T. V. A. Since the war started saboteurs have dynamited its transmission lines.

The seven German spies who were executed came to this country under express orders to wreck the power installations of the T. V. A. and the Alcoa plant of the Aluminum Co. of America in Blount County, Tenn.

If the operation of its dams are stopped, if its more than 5,700 miles of transmission lines need repairs or reconstruction, would you have the war effort halted until Congress could appropriate money for the T. V. A. to make the necessary repairs?

Construction of the Watauga Dam and of the South Holston Dam has been suspended by the War Production Board on account of scarcity of critical materials. If their construction is ordered resumed must there be the delay of coming to Congress for the money necessary to resume work?

The Fontana Dam, costing $70,000,000, is nearing completion, so is the Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky. To make available the power generated at these dams, transmission lines must be constructed. Shall we suffer the delay incident to an appropriation by Congress to build these lines? Is it not better business to permit the T. V. A. to use its income as it has done heretofore and have no delay?

The continued successful, non-political operation of the T. V. A. transcends the personal hatred that any public official may entertain for any officer of the T. V. A. Suffice it to say the accounts of the Authority have been yearly audited by the Comptroller General's office and by auditors of national reputation and in no instance has it ever been shown that a single dollar has been misplaced or improperly expended.

The directors of the Authority are David Lilienthal, a man of great ability, wide experience, and tireless energy; Dr. H. A. Morgan, a former president of the University of Tennessee; and former Senator from Idaho, James P. Pope. They have done and are doing a magnificent job. By their works the people of the country know them, believe in them and trust them, and devoutly and earnestly hope that the Congress will continue to back them in the great service they are rendering to the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

GERMANS HAVE DECLARED WAR OF EXTINCTION ON POLISH CHILDREN

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also that I may address the House for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor quite a number of times calling upon the American people and the people of the Allied Nations to save the victims of Nazi furor. According to figures of recent date over three and a half million Jews were annihilated. Over several hundred thousand Catholics and Protestants were slaughtered by the Hitler regime. Is human life worth anything? Has it any value at all? Judging by our passive behavior in the past it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that human life means nothing and that the cries of the millions of suffering people have not been heard by the Allied Nations and especially by the United States of America. Naturally the uppermost thought in the minds of every American is first to win the war and to win the peace. Naturally the thought uppermost in our minds is to win as quickly as possible and to bring our boys back from the far corners of the world. But is it not just as important to use all the means at our command to save as many victims of Nazi barbarism as can possibly escape? What are we doing to save human life? No concrete action has been taken thus far. It is true that the President has created a board for the purpose of saving refugees. When I speak of refugees, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean Jews alone—I mean all the people who are dominated and persecuted and being destroyed by the Nazis. This board is a good step in the right direction, but a step which should have been taken long ago.

There was some hope some time ago that the doors of Palestine would be opened, but Great Britain has violated its mandate and its trusteeship by refusing to further admit into Palestine, the homeland of the Jews, its own people. In other words, the people of Jewish faith who claim Palestine as their home cannot enter their own home because Great Britain has violated its trust and guardianship of Palestine. So far this country has not offered a helping hand other than the Executive order of the President of the United States, who, I am sure, is trying to do everything he can through his committee to help these persecuted people. With Palestine being closed, the doors of America being closed, and the doors of all the world being closed to a lot of suffering people who still may be saved if we extend to them—and by "we" I mean the United States and other Allied countries—permission to use our countries as a temporary haven until the war is over.

You may recall that on several occasions while discussing on the floor of the House the slaughter of the Jewish people in Poland, I called attention to the fact that the destruction of one minority would undoubtedly be followed by the destruction of other groups.

Having disposed of the unhappy Jewish people of Poland, the Nazis have now turned their attention to Polish children and started a campaign of annihilation against them.

The Polish information center has given some official figures, which show the systematic manner in which the Germans are now seeking to kill as many Polish children as they can possibly destroy.

Over half a million children now face extermination and the way it is done is to make it impossible for the children to be fed by depriving Polish mothers of the necessary ration cards.

As it now stands, even with the existing rationing requirements, the Polish child receives only 15 percent of its needs and the diet which a Polish child obtains is totally lacking in vitamins. But it seems now that the German masters have decided that giving a Polish child even as little as 15 percent is too much.

They have now entered into a campaign by which they seek to kill as many as possible by outright starvation. Some children whom the Germans consider strong enough to labor as German slaves, they permit to live on limited diet, others who are delicate and who may require a diet somewhat above the average are promptly exterminated.

The Germans have made a thorough survey in their own manner as to how many children should be allowed to live and how many should be killed. They established a definite quota for the Polish population, the idea being to always have a German superiority in numbers, so that no matter what happens all regions of Poland would be overrun by Germans and the Germans would thereby obtain an artificial majority over all Central and Eastern Europe.

This is the first time in human history where a nation has deliberately set itself upon a program of thorough extermination of those whom they do not wish to see live.

There were other instances in history where one nation would fight another, but there never was a time until the present when another nation would deliberately seek to reduce the numbers of its potential enemies by resorting to outright well organized extermination of its younger generation.

The Germans covet the country of the Poles and they seek to colonize all of Europe with their own people. If conditions permit, they destroy all the people under their "protection" by outright slaughter. Whenever any welfare organization was established in German occupied territory, it was obliged to take care of German needs first, and all occupied areas were run for the benefit of the German master race and for the destruction of all other racial units on its soil.

They began with the Jews because their number was smallest, but as the German war machine gathered momentum they decided to exterminate all who stood in their way and now they have turned their attention to Polish children.

Of course, we will never have complete statistics as to how many people were actually put to death by the Germans. Only a small portion of the total is sent before a firing squad or is destroyed outright. Most others are permitted to starve to death by the judicious use of ration cards and by the inability to obtain supplies which would give them a chance to maintain life. Many thousands will be

slaughtered without actually being put to death by the Germans. This seems to be the favored method. Healthy children have been kidnaped on their way to school and after being drained of all their blood for blood transfusions for German soldiers some of them were allowed to die and others were sent to slave camps.

Whenever any guerilla fighters in any section occupied by Germany would actively cooperate with the Russian forces who came to liberate such territory the German masters immediately retaliated by killing Polish children. Some of them are sent to concentration camps, where, after a brief stay, they are killed by the use of most modern gas installations. The Germans believe that any Polish child is "only a useless mouth to feed."

I have called attention to this German policy of extermination in many of my speeches both in and out of Congress. I know the conscience of mankind stands aghast at this brutal manner of killing, which the Germans have introduced into Europe, and I believe it is our duty to warn the German people that these mass murders will not go unpunished and that we will have to exact strict justice and a thorough retribution against these cold-blooded murderers who have decided to exterminate every other people of Europe, so that the Germans may live.

It is a systematic campaign of atrocities committed in the hope that in the destruction of so many millions the world is likely to overlook the killing of some thousands. The conscience of mankind, however, will not permit such barbarian acts to go unchallenged. Just as we have protested against the killing of the French, Belgians, Dutchmen, Norwegians, and other people of western Europe, so now we must utter a most solemn protest and our thorough indignation at the killing of Polish children and make it known in no uncertain terms that we shall punish the guilty.

I propose to bring this matter to the attention of both political parties at their conventions. The American people should insist that at the conventions of the Democrats and Republicans a commitment is made by both political parties in their platforms to find ways and means to extend a helping hand to the suffering people who can manage to escape from Nazi tyranny.

The time has come when we must call a spade a spade. The time has come when we must act. The time has come for the churches of every religious denomination to use their power and influence so that we can and will save as many as can be saved. There are still a few million who can be saved if there were only a place to send them. As an illustration, we could take two or four million people and put them in the State of Texas and you would not know they were there. They would not be a burden upon this country or upon the community. There are many States in the West where we could put these people—Christians, Jews, any group of human beings who can be saved—and they would not be a burden upon that community because there are many of us in this country who are willing to guarantee that they will not become a public charge.

Let us do something constructive. Let us do something real for God and for country. We can save human lives if you will open your hearts and ears, and there never was a task more important and more worthy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BULWINKLE, for 3 days, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article which appeared in the Sunday Star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I gave to the graduating class at Williams Field, Ariz., on April 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Roger Babson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after the business of the day and any other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 18, 1944, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (ship construction reserve fund).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1492. A letter from the Secretary, the American National Theater and Academy, transmitting the annual report for 1943 of the American National Theater and Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1493. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1494. A letter from the Director, Office of War Information, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Information covering the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1495. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, setting forth the estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the War Department for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1496. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting report of Federal civilian employment for the month of March 1944, and quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1944 for the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1497. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Yazoo River and watershed in Mississippi, describing an investigation of a program of water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in aid of flood control, made pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 564); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1498. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 16, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Pembina River and tributaries, North Dakota, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 565); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4184. A bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; with amendment (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 524. Resolution for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax; without amendment (Rept. No. 1409). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 521. Resolution creating a select committee to make an investigation relating to the seizure by the United States on April 26, 1944, of property of Montgomery Ward & Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1410). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 515. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1366, current session, being the fifth intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, House of Representatives, submitted pursuant to House Resolution 102; without amendment (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4710. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4722. A bill granting former owners of certain real property acquired by the United States for war purposes certain preferences with respect to repurchase of such property; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 4723. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4724. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 4725. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4726. A bill to regulate the eligibility of war veterans for public housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4727. A bill to amend paragraph (e) of section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4728. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4729. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind"; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 4730. A bill to provide for the payment of grave and gravemarker allowances for veterans' burials; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4731. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 so as to authorize the termination under certain conditions of the payment of monthly family allowances to class A dependents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 4732. A bill to provide an immediate fund for emergency flood-control work made necessary by the 1944 floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 4733. A bill to amend section 514 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4734. A bill to amend certain articles of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 525. Resolution extending the powers of the select committee created to investigate the Farm Security Administration to include the power to investigate the activities of the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation simplifying income-tax return blanks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Mayaguez, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to back up Rexford Guy Tugwell in his post as Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the president, Puerto Rico Chamber of Commerce, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Insular Affairs Committee's report on Puerto Rico's food problem; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4735 (by request). A bill for the relief of Edward J. Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4736. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. L. Klotz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4737. A bill for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5583. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. L. Maule and 72 other citizens of Rochester, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5584. Also, petition of Mary E. Hibbard and 40 other citizens of Los Gatos, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5585. Also, petition of Lily H. Stemple and 71 other citizens of Lake Benton, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5586. Also, petition of Hannah White and 62 other citizens of Greensburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5587. Also, petition of Edna Warden and 78 other citizens of Barboursville, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5588. Also, petition of Harold W. Garrison and 54 other citizens of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5589. Also, petition of Theo Dilley and 60 other citizens of Yankton, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5590. Also, petition of Elva M. Bailey and 81 other citizens of Glen Burnie, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5591. Also, petition of Kate W. Downie and 81 other citizens of Holyoke, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5592. Also, petition of Dr. R. A. Drake and 54 other citizens of Twin Falls, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5593. Also, petition of Raymond Elliott and 107 other citizens of Fairmount, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5594. Also, petition of Dorothea Carlson and 93 other citizens of Manistee, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5595. Also, petition of Roy Leatherman and 69 other citizens of Frederick, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the

manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5596. Also, petition of Carrie Basserman and 108 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5597. Also, petition of Rev. Paul Leeds and 62 other citizens of Kinder, La., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5598. By Mr. FELLOWS: Petition of Rev. H. W. Van Deman, of Damariscotta, Maine, and six others favoring enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5599. Also, petition of Walter G. Leland, of Sangerville, Maine, and 237 others, urging passage of House bill 3971 and Senate bill 1617; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5600. Also, petition of Albert Thibodeau, of Keegan, Maine, and 104 others, with reference to House bill 4384; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5601. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 3, of West Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 88 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furlough for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5602. By Mr. JENSEN: Petition of Mrs. W. F. Masters, W. S. C. S., Methodist Church, and Mrs. J. E. Ely, Woman's Council, Church of Christ, Guthrie Center, Iowa, signed by 100 citizens of Guthrie Center, Iowa, petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5603. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of W. H. Langston, Jr., U. S. Army transport *Brazil*, care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y., favoring unemployment insurance for members of the merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5604. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of Triple Distributors, of Hershey, Pa., concerning House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5605. Also petition of the Steelton Italian Club, of Steelton, Pa., concerning House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5606. Also petition of the Dauphin County Disabled American Veterans Memorial Home Association of Harrisburg, Pa., concerning House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5607. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county chairman, Dodge County Republican Central Committee, Fremont, Nebr., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appreciation of legislation giving all those serving in the armed forces an opportunity to vote a complete ballot; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5608. Also petition of the recording secretary, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, County Board of Queens, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the closing of consulates in Dublin, Ireland, and others; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O eternal God, creator and preserver of all mankind, giver of all spiritual grace, in the golden glory of the risen earth would that the blossoms of the divine grace of meekness, gentleness, charity, and forgiveness shall make the barren wastes of our own lives to bloom as the garden of the Lord. In a blasted earth, where evil stalks in hideous forms, we thank Thee for the lovely things that are as indestructible as sunbeams; the tender ministries of human love; the holy ties of devoted homes; the lilting laughter and clinging trust of little children.

In days when to follow the stern call of duty means to live dangerously, with the wings of our destiny plumed with hazard and unspeakable loss, knowing that the moving finger of each day's record having written returns not to erase one word of it, scorning all selfish aims and ambitions and enduring hardness as good soldiers of the common cause, may we fight the good fight with all our might sustained by the radiant assurance of the joy which comes when the morning breaketh and the shadows flee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, May 2, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); and

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 156) relating to the status of retired judges, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1268. An act for the relief of the estate of Ida Londinsky;

H. R. 1475. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 1919. An act for the relief of Vannie Butler;

H. R. 2085. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians;

H. R. 2224. An act to extend certain benefits of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, to certain employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 2605. An act for the relief of Charles W. Kirby;

H. R. 2674. An act for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman;

H. R. 2782. An act to grant Government employees who are members of certain military units leaves of absence for periods of active service;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley;

H. R. 3688. An act to change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard";

H. R. 3695. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased;

H. R. 3753. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and Howard McMillan;

H. R. 3929. An act for the relief of Katherine Scherer;

H. R. 3976. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kee;

H. R. 3998. An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions;

H. R. 4054. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 4108. An act relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens;

H. R. 4109. An act to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to receiving of stolen public property;

H. R. 4307. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 4348. An act to amend the act approved August 18, 1942, entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4519. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans;

H. R. 4525. An act for the relief of M. Grace Murphy, administratrix of the estate of John H. Murphy;

H. R. 4623. An act to authorize the use of space in the old post-office building in Portland, Oreg., by the State of Oregon for its use as a museum for relics from the battleship *Oregon*, together with all other historical documents, objects, and relics of Oregon and the Old Oregon Country held by the State for public display;

H. R. 4680. An act to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public, No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944; and

H. R. 4687. An act relating to issuance of postal notes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FEBRUARY 1944 REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 130, the twelfth monthly report of the Board covering the month of February 1944 (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS BY SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh bimonthly report of operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board under section 5 of the act approved June 11, 1942 (Public Law 603, 77th Cong.), relating to the Smaller War Plants Corporation, submitted to the Chairman of the Board by the Vice Chairman, War Production Board, and chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution by the Dodge County (Nebr.) Republican Convention expressing appreciation for the enactment by Congress of legislation providing a wartime method of voting by members of the armed forces; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the Women's Society of Christian Service of Hunt's Memorial Methodist Church, Ridgewood, Md., praying for the establishment of a just and durable peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS BY CONFERENCE ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT, OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present to the Senate three resolutions which were adopted at a conference held under the auspices of the Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, April 25, 1944. One of the resolutions requests that the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate give to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project the same prompt and fair public hearing and favorable action as may be accorded to the omnibus river and harbor bill, flood-control bill, and other pending legislation for post-war development.

The other two resolutions commend the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and Governor Dewey of New York for their attitude in regard to the St. Lawrence development.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this conference has assembled to consider the means of furthering the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, as a permanent asset to our national security and to the prosperity and well-being of the people of all parts of our country; and

Whereas it is essential that sound public improvements be authorized by Congress now, in advance of the actual emergencies incident to conversion from war to peace production, if our millions of returning servicemen and war workers are to be spared the blighting effects of idleness and unemployment; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been approved by every engineering board, legislative committee, and international commission which has surveyed this development over the past half century; and

Whereas the President, the Departments of State, War, Navy, Commerce, and Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, the United States Maritime Commission, and numerous other official agencies of our Federal and State Governments have recommended construction of this project, under the terms of the pending Aiken bill, S. 1385; and

Whereas this bill has been referred to the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate after approval of an identical bill by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors by a 2 to 1 vote in the last Congress, after extensive public hearings; and

Whereas the same Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate is about to consider an omnibus rivers and harbors bill, already passed by the House and a flood control bill, authorizing many meritorious multipurpose projects in other parts of the Nation for post-war construction; and

Whereas the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill, with pending amendments, propose to authorize more than $1,500,000,000 for such projects, including $200,000,000 additional for the lower Mississippi and $200,000,000 additional for the Missouri River, and other power and navigation developments in the Southeast, where more than $500,000,000 has already been appropriated to develop the Tennessee River and its tributaries for power, navigation, and other purposes; and

Whereas the net Federal cost to the United States of the entire St. Lawrence seaway project, deducting the cost of New York State's entirely self-liquidating power development, will be substantially less than $200,000,000 according to the official report of the Corps of Engineers, which has completed plans and specifications for the project: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference requests that the Congress of the United States and the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate give to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project the same prompt and fair public hearing and favorable action as may be accorded to the omnibus river and harbor bill, the flood control bill, and other pending legislation for post-war development; and be it further

Resolved, That we call the attention of the Committee on Commerce to the notorious fact that the St. Lawrence River is the major navigation and power resource available for development in the Northeast, and that the direct benefits of the project will extend to industry, agriculture, and all classes of our people in many States over an area reaching hundreds of miles beyond the sites of actual construction; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, junior Senator and the sole representative of the State of New York on the Committee on Commerce, to the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, Senator from Vermont, author of the pending bill, and to all members of the New York delegation in Congress.

Whereas this conference has received a message on the St. Lawrence project from the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, senior Senator from the State of New York in the United States Senate; and

Whereas this message gives unqualified and affirmative support to the Aiken bill, S. 1385, to approve the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, to authorize construction of the State's public power project in the International Rapids section, and to authorize construction of works needed to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas Senator WAGNER has long advocated the improvement of the International Rapids section and has sought to advance and protect New York's interest in this development, under the terms of the pending agreement of 1941; and

Whereas the enactment of the Aiken bill will unquestionably furnish the most direct means of achieving the public benefits which Senator WAGNER envisions, on behalf of the people of the entire State of New York and of the whole Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference strongly endorses the statesmanlike action taken by Senator WAGNER in support of the pending bill, insuring for this constructive, nonpartisan legislation the powerful aid of the senior Senator from the State of New York in the United States Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, and to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, Senator from Vermont, author of the pending bill, and to all Members of the New York delegation in the Congress.

Whereas the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey on March 27, 1940, in a public statement on the development of our natural resources, said: "I favor the St. Lawrence seaway and always have"; and

Whereas on October 10, 1942, he reaffirmed this declaration and clearly indicated, as reported by the New York Times, approval of the entire St. Lawrence project and strongly advocated the development of the power resources of the State by Government; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York on March 15–16, 1944, by a unanimous, nonpartisan vote and with the approval of the Governor, adopted a concurrent resolution recommending prompt measures to develop the resources of the St. Lawrence River, under the inalienable ownership of the people, to meet urgent needs for cheap hydroelectric power in this area; and

Whereas by his farsighted and consistent support of the St. Lawrence project Governor Dewey has contributed greatly to the advancement of this development under a sound program for the beneficial public use of the State's major natural resource: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference heartily commends the progress made in the State of New York in carrying forward this program as an outstanding accomplishment in the public interest; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor, to the Lieutenant Governor, and to the speaker of the assembly.

POLES IN RUSSIA—LETTERS FROM ELEANOR RITCHIE NALLE

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, yesterday I received a very interesting and impressive letter from Eleanor Ritchie Nalle, whose United States address is Somerset post office, Virginia, but the letter is written from London, England. She signs herself in an article written by her to the Manchester Guardian as a member of the American National Red Cross. She encloses in her letter to me a clipping from

the Manchester Guardian of January 15, 1944, being her letter written to that newspaper. In her letter to the newspaper she writes:

From personal interviews with evacuees from Russia's vast isolated districts I know that the sufferings of this group of, roughly, over 600,000 Polish subjects and over 150,000 Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians are not propaganda reports but cold facts.

She suggests that inquiry ought to be made by this legislative body, and I ask that her letter, and the clipping from the Manchester Guardian, be treated in the nature of a petition, and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. In view of the fact that the resolution presented by me yesterday contains my views on the present Polish situation, I shall not take up the further time of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter and clipping were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONDON, ENGLAND, *April 12, 1944.*

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an American citizen caught here in this country since July 1939, I have been much interested in the cause of the Poles, who, as you realize, have suffered as a nation in many ways from this war, probably more than any of the Allied Nations so far, having borne the brunt of Hitler's first full-force attack in Europe.

For some months I have been working personally to help in every way in the tragic situation of the deportee (both Polish and those from the Baltic states) who were taken on a few hours' notice in 1939 by the Soviet Government from their homes and dumped in various isolated districts of vast Russia.

I appeal to you and others of our legislative body on behalf of these suffering peoples now stranded within the territories of one of our most powerful allies. I understand that the present administration has set up with certain of our allies an organization to deal with relief and rehabilitation work in Allied territories as they become liberated. And this organization is known as U. N. R. R. A. I also understand our consulate departments are now under instructions to give help to Allied refugees. Yet I know of no provision so far made by the administration for relief to these Polish and Baltic states subjects in their tragic need now located in Russia.

The enclosed reprints all written by people with access to authentic sources of information describe to some extent the sufferings of these people. I myself am the author of one of the letters published by the Manchester Guardian which is a newspaper of the highest standing in England. I ask you this question. Is it not within the power of the Members of our legislative body to appoint a committee of inquiry to investigate why nothing has been done by our many relief organizations, including the American Red Cross and those newly set up to provide for the relief of those people in Russia whose sufferings are one of the byproducts of this terrible war? Even though the difficulties of transportation are great in Russia, it is certainly practicable to deliver relief materials if war materials are being delivered. As you will note from my published letter it is definitely practicable to get relief to individuals among these people in small packages.

Hoping that you will agree with me that this is a cause deserving of large-scale and prompt relief by our relief agencies and that you will bring this subject into publicity among your colleagues with the idea of rousing their interest and action.

I am,
Sincerely yours,
ELEANOR R. NALLE.

United States address: Hazelhurst Farm, Somerset post office, Virginia.

[From the Manchester Guardian of January 15, 1944]

POLES IN RUSSIA

To the EDITOR OF THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.

SIR: May I be permitted to express my views as an American on the subject of the tragic situation of the enforced exiles from Poland and the Baltic States in Russia?

From personal interviews with evacuees from Russia's vast isolated districts I know that the sufferings of this group of roughly over 600,000 Polish subjects and over 150,000 Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians are not propaganda reports but cold facts. The report that Russian children are also suffering from lack of proper food, clothing, and shelter makes the situation all the more worthy of organized relief on a large scale, and right now before it is too late. Naturally my countrymen, if they fully realized this situation, would ask, "If war materials are going to Russia via Archangel and Teheran, why cannot relief materials, food, clothing, and medical supplies be going via the same routes for the specific purpose of relieving the condition of these exiles and the Russian children?"

Learning on unquestionable authority that the Polish Red Cross in Teheran has a list of individual names and addresses of approximately 200,000 Polish subjects in Russia, it seems logical to suggest that some system be organized on a large scale to send individual packages of food, clothes, etc., to these exiles. The Society of Friends, together with the American Red Cross, might undertake this work, with headquarters at Teheran. The writer considers this method under the conditions would be the only practicable and effective way of dealing with this problem. The public would be interested to know that there is now no international organization whatsoever in Russia for distribution of relief supplies.

Surely our Russian brothers in arms, so industrious in their work and so incredibly brave and persevering in their battles, will cooperate with us, their western allies, in this matter of humanitarian work within their own country.

Yours, etc.,
ELEANOR RITCHIE NALLIE,
Member American National Red Cross.
LONDON, W. 1, *January 9.*

RESTORATION OF STANDARD TIME—RESOLUTION BY KANSAS GRANGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the members of Hawkeye Grange, No. 1050, McPherson County; Highland Grange, No. 1790, and Macon Grange, No. 1794, Harvey County, Kans., urging that standard time be restored. The farmers of the country never have believed in the change to war time; it interferes seriously with many farming operations and with farm life and living. And for myself I fail to see the advantages that were claimed would result from this dislocation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWTON, KANS., *April 21, 1944.*

The Honorable Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of the Hawkeye Grange, No. 1050, in McPherson County; the Highland Grange, No. 1790, and the Macon Grange, No. 1794, in Harvey County, comprising 294 members, at a meeting of the Pomona Grange, voted to kindly ask you to make every effort to revert back to standard time as the war time is very inconvenient for agriculture.

Thanking you kindly, we are
Respectfully,
C. A. TINSLEY, *Master.*
LILLIAN TANGEMAN, *Secretary.*

PERMANENT UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE—RESOLUTIONS FROM KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter embodying resolutions approved by representatives of nearly every college in Kansas, at a post-war conference held in Lawrence, Kans., April 17 and 18, 1943, urging that consideration and adoption of permanent universal military service by Congress be postponed until after the war.

It seems to me that there is considerable merit in such a postponement. As pointed out in an accompanying statement from Dean Paul B. Lawson, college of liberal arts and sciences at the University of Kansas, it is impossible to know what our future military needs will be until we are able to obtain some sort of picture of the post-war world.

Moreover, a program dealing with universal military service will receive better and more sensible consideration after we are through with the emotional stresses and strains of a nation at war.

I agree with these educators also that the returned servicemen should have a say in what kind of a military establishment the United States is to have in peacetime, and, obviously, they can have little if any influence on such legislation while they are overseas in the armed forces. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks the resolutions and statement from Dean Lawson, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the letter embodying resolutions was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
Lawrence, Kans., April 21, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: At a conference on post-war college problems, held at the University of Kansas on April 17 and 18, and to which practically every college in the State sent its key men as representatives, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this conference that no action on any plan for universal military training in peacetime should be taken by the Congress of the United States until after the cessation of hostilities.

"*Resolved further*, That the above resolution be transmitted to the Senators and the Representatives from the State of Kansas."

I was instructed by the conference to transmit this resolution to you with the explanation that the resolution is not to be construed in any way as opposing universal military training. The conference, however, opposed immediate action by the Congress on this question for the following reasons:

1. It is impossible to know what our future military needs will be until the war has ended and until the peace terms give us a clearer picture of post-war world conditions.

2. The wisest provisions for such a radical change in American life as universal military service in peacetime cannot be worked out in a judicious manner under the emotional stresses and strains of a nation at war.

3. There are a number of ways in which a universal military training program can be set up. Some plans might be seriously detrimental both to students and schools, and others need not be a handicap to either. All of these ways should be carefully studied before any one of them is enacted into law.

4. The men in the armed forces should have the opportunity to make their contribution to the thinking on this subject, and we cannot see that there is any need to hurry a decision on such a major question before their return from overseas.

I believe this resolution represents the considered thought of a very large majority, if not all, of the administrators of our Kansas colleges. I am very sure this group would be deeply grateful to you for your careful consideration of the question, and I personally want to thank you for the attention which I know you will give it.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL B. LAWSON, *Dean.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of Oscar Griggs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1886. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Watertown, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1887. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1888. A bill to authcrize suits for benefits claimed to be payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1889. A bill to provide for use and delivery for irrigation purposes of waters stored at Fort Peck Dam, Mont.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution relating to the employment of counsel to the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate investigating certain matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on the Library.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 1268. An act for the relief of the estate of Ida Londinsky;

H. R. 1919. An act for the relief of Vannie Butler;

H. R. 2605. An act for the relief of Charles W. Kirby;

H. R. 2674. An act for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley;

H. R. 3695. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased;

H. R. 3753. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and Howard McMillan;

H. R. 3929. An act for the relief of Katherine Scherer;

H. R. 3976. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kee; and

H. R. 4525. An act for the relief of M. Grace Murphy, administratrix of the estate of John H. Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1475. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 2085. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2224. An act to extend certain benefits of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, to certain employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 4307. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

H. R. 2782. An act to grant Government employees who are members of certain military units leaves of absence for periods of active service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 3688. An act to change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard";

H. R. 3998. An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions;

H. R. 4680. An act to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public, No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944; and

H. R. 4687. An act relating to issuance of postal notes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 4054. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 4103. An act relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens;

H. R. 4109. An act to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to receiving of stolen public property; and

H. R. 4348. An act to amend the Act approved August 18, 1942, entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4519. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4623. An act to authorize the use of space in the old post-office building in Portland, Oreg., by the State of Oregon for its use as a museum for relics from the battleship *Oregon*, together with all other historical documents, objects, and relics of Oregon and the Old Oregon Country held by the State for public display; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

AMENDMENT RELATING TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. MEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4320) relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil-service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.) as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.), which were severally referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

USE OF RAYON AND OTHER SYNTHETIC PRODUCTS AS SUBSTITUTES FOR COTTON AND WOOL

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 291), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the use of rayon and other synthetic products as substitutes for cotton and wool, including the extent of the use of such synthetic products and their effect upon the Nation's economy, the cost, utility, and economy of such synthetic products, the material and manpower required for their production and the effect of using such material and manpower for that purpose, the extent to which and terms upon which Government agencies have encouraged and financed the production of such synthetic products, and such other matters related to such products as the committee deems appropriate. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STATUS OF RETIRED JUDGES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 156) relating to the status of retired judges, which were, on page 2, line 9, to strike out "circuit" and insert "judicial"; on page 2, line 10, to strike out "circuit" where it appears the third time; on page 2, line 22, after "provided", to insert ", or as provided by an act approved December 29, 1942, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in cir-

cuits other than their own' "; on page 4, line 2, after "residence", to insert "at the time of his appointment"; on page 4, line 21, to strike out "circuit" where it appears the second time and insert "judicial"; and on page 4, lines 22 and 23, to strike out "circuit" and insert "judicial."

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, which I think are very desirable.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PLIGHT OF AMERICA'S WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "20,000,000 Forgotten Americans," written by Senator THOMAS of Utah, and published in the American magazine of May 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TAFT IN VOTING FOR THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him regarding his vote for the Connally resolution, together with a copy of the Connally resolution, which appear in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR WORLD ORGANIZATION—ADDRESS BY DAVID DUBINSKY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Post-war World Organization, delivered by David Dubinsky, at the American Federation of Labor Post-war Planning Forum, Hotel Commodore, New York, April 12, 1944 which appears in the Appendix.]

CANDIDACY OF SENATOR LUCAS—EDITORIAL FROM ALTON (ILL.) EVENING TELEGRAPH

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "SCOTT LUCAS Announces for Re-election," from the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph of February 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALL VOTES ARE SOLDIER VOTES—EDITORIAL BY EDWARD LINDSAY

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "All Votes Are Soldier Votes," written by Edward Lindsay, and published in the Decatur Herald-Review of Decatur, Ill., on February 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEND-LEASE SCARECROWS — EDITORIAL FROM THE LEXINGTON (KY.) HERALD

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lend-Lease Scarecrows," published in the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of April 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BILL BAILEY AND THE FOUR PILLARS—ARTICLE BY F. P. McEVOY

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bill Bailey and the Four Pillars," written by F. P. McEvoy, and published in the Reader's Digest of April 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SEIZURE OF THE MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT—EDITORIAL FROM OTTAWA (ILL.) DAILY REPUBLICAN-TIMES

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "By Due Process of Force," published in the April 29, 1944, issue of the Ottawa (Ill.) Daily Republican-Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDITIONAL DETAILS CONCERNING THE ATLANTIC CHARTER CONFERENCE—NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several newspaper articles giving additional details concerning the Atlantic Charter conference, which appear in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, today is the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of a great event in the history of Poland—the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

This historic document was adopted by the freedom-loving people of Poland on May 3, 1791, less than 3 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. The first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a European nation, it resembles our own Constitution in many respects. It recognized the fundamental principle of democracy that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." It guaranteed freedom of religion. It adopted the principle of division of authority among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The Polish people are proud of their constitution. It is an immortal testament to the political genius of a people who during the past 150 years have enjoyed only two decades of national freedom. Their feeling for it has been well expressed by one of their great poets in the following words:

> This law did not emerge from the brain of an isolated sage, from the lips of a few administrators, but was drawn from the heart of the great mass; it is not merely written in black and white, but it still lives in the memory, in the desires of the generations, and it is a living law, rooted in the past, and developing in the future. In the May constitution, the national element, the child of past traditions, is nurtured on the new present-day needs of the Nation. Hence it has been well and justly said that the May constitution is the political testament of the former Poland.

Even while Poland was reaching out toward true democracy, her despotic neighbors were plotting her destruction. In 1795, Poland was overrun by invaders and partitioned out of existence. But the spirit of Polish freedom could neither be conquered nor partitioned. It lived on, and the constitution of 1791 remained its eternal symbol. In the dark days of oppression which followed, the Polish people held fast to their heritage and each year, on May 3, they dedicated themselves anew to the vision of a free Poland.

Their faith was vindicated and their patience rewarded at the close of the last war when Poland was liberated and the Nation was reborn.

A quarter of a century has passed and we are in the midst of a global war. We all remember that fateful day in September 1939 when Hitler launched his unprovoked attack upon Poland. The people of Poland, true to their glorious traditions of freedom and courage, resisted the Nazi aggressor with every resource at their command. The world will never forget the heroic defense of Warsaw in the face of overwhelming odds. But courage and heroism alone could not withstand bombers and tanks. After 4 weeks of desperate resistance Poland fell before the invader.

Poland fell, but the spirit of Poland lives on. Poland's enemies have learned that defeat cannot break the indomitable will of a freedom-loving people. Despite unspeakable suffering, despite the atrocities and horrible tortures which the ruthless Nazis have inflicted upon them, the Polish people fight on. Despite every inducement which Hitler could offer, no traitorous Quisling was found among the people of Poland.

Their answer to Nazi reprisals has been more sabotage and greater resistance. Scores of underground newspapers nourish the spirit of resistance and keep it alive. Polish soldiers, sailors, and airmen are fighting on every front on land, on the seas, and in the skies. The Polish Air Force, which fought so bravely in the battle of Britain, still fights beside the R. A. F. and the American Air Forces, and helps in smashing the roof of Hitler's fortress Europe. Polish soldiers have fought in France, in Norway, in Africa, and in Italy. Here is our own country, over 5,000,000 Americans of Polish extraction are in the forefront of the war effort of the United States.

It is fitting that we should pause on this day to pay a deserved tribute to our great ally, the heroic people of Poland. They can feel assured that Poland will soon live again as a free and independent nation and that the hopes embodied in the constitution of May 3, 1791, are close to fulfillment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks the text of a telegram sent by the President of the United States to the President of Poland on the occasion of the national anniversary of Poland, May 3, 1944. In the telegram, which is addressed to His Excellency, Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, President of the Polish Republic, London, England, the President goes on to say:

> On the occasion of the national anniversary of Poland, I take great pleasure in sending to the Polish people through you my greetings and best wishes in which I am joined by the people of the United States. It is fitting—

The President goes on to say further—

> to recall in this fateful fifth year of the war that it was Poland who first defied the Nazi hordes. The continued resistance of the Polish people against their Nazi oppressors is an inspiration to all. The relentless struggle being carried on by the United Nations will hasten victory and the liberation of all freedom-loving peoples.
>
> FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. President, when the Polish Government concluded its alliance with Great Britain in that hectic spring of 1939, she realized full well the seriousness of her action. True, it was a generous step on the part of the British Government, but it was conceded under the existing circumstances that Britain could not give much effective help in case Poland were attacked by the Nazi military machine. Poland by concluding the

treaty undertook to bear the brunt of the attack, a condition inherent in the terms of the treaty.

This decision on the part of Poland to cast her lot with Great Britain was deeply resented in Berlin, for it caused the Nazi war makers to change their plans of conquest.

Poland, because of her geographical location, and her pledge to Great Britain, was now to become the first to fight. This was indeed a brave decision, when one looks back and considers the disparity in the military forces of the two nations. Other nations fell for the subtle Nazi propaganda, and allied themselves with Hitler's plan of conquest. Still other nations submitted and were overrun but not devastated. There were some who resisted mildly and suffered like penalty. Some few others fought with all they had, and were subject to the cruelties of the enemy army of occupation.

However, Poland was called upon to be the first to feel the impact of the mechanized Nazi machine. She was the first to resist Nazi aggression. Poland not only changed the Nazi plan of world conquest—she gave the world a preview of Hitler's military might; more than that, she gave Britain and France time to prepare for the inevitable.

Poland's courageous determination to fight for principles robbed Hitler of the element of surprise in his plans for the invasion of France and the Low Countries and gave warning to the western nations of Europe to prepare, for they were soon to face similar attack.

Poland stood up bravely fighting it out from September 1 until October 5, the date of the last battle in which regular enemy forces were engaged. After October 5 guerilla warfare continued, and when that died away an effective underground came into being.

These 35 days of major warfare in the autumn of 1939 prevented further Nazi military activities until the summer of 1940. Think of the consequences of a sudden surprise attack on France and England in 1939. Poland prevented such a disastrous event, and by her action many military experts believe saved the day for the United Nations. Both her government and her people fought for us then. It is our simple duty to stand by her now and also when the peace shall be determined.

The Polish war was by no means a pushover for Hitler's mechanized forces. Warsaw held out for 3 weeks, and its losses in killed exceeded the losses sustained by the whole of Great Britain in 3 years of aerial warfare.

On September 30 Modlin capitulated, but only after its supplies and ammunition became exhausted. On October 2 General Kleeberg led his Polish troops in the Battle of Kock against overwhelming Nazi forces. After 3 days of desperate fighting, and with Soviet armored forces encircling his rear, Kleeberg was forced to cease fighting.

Seventeen thousand men, 5,000 horses, besides a large number of cannon, guns, and ammunition, according to Nazi reports, were captured, which gives one an idea of the size of the last army that faced 75 mechanized Nazi divisions operating in Poland.

Poland's losses were terrific. The nation lay in ruins. The Soviet and Nazi forces occupied the country. Poland was partitioned again.

But—and this is all important—the war was not lost to the United Nations in 1939. Although defeated in Poland the war was not over for the Polish military forces. Their navy continued the struggle without a break. The army was in the thick of the Norwegian campaign in early 1940 and later the same year in France. The air force was being absorbed by the R. A. F.

Following the fall of France, the Polish forces made their way to Britain, where they could continue the struggle.

The Carpathian Brigade found its way south through Palestine and fought effectively at Libya and Tobruk.

They never gave up the struggle to regain the freedom of their homeland, and to assure the same privileges to their fellow men.

They traveled as far as around the globe to reenter the contest. They fought in Poland, Norway, France, north Africa, and the Middle East. On land, in the air, and upon the sea, the men of Poland carried on. In the conquered countries throughout Europe they are foremost in sabotage and in underground operations.

According to statistics given out in 1943, Poland's military strength was excelled by only four other nations.

The Polish air force now with the R. A. F. is stronger than it was in 1939. I saw them in action while in England, and was told they fight with reckless abandon so far as their own safety is concerned. "They are absolutely fearless in action," explained one British officer. "We have difficulty holding them in check."

The Polish Navy is also stronger and better equipped than it was before the war began. With the occupation of Poland every Polish ship went to Britain or went down fighting in the attempt.

The Polish Army, once seventh in size in the world, is smaller than in 1939. However, it is fifth in size among the Allies, according to 1943 figures. It is poised for the great invasion, and the world will shortly hear again of its exploits on the battlefields of Europe.

On the anniversary of Poland's Constitution, I review her epic struggle as one of our foremost fighting allies. I commend the courage and sacrifice of her indomitable people, and above all I appeal to the sense of justice of the United Nations to be fair and considerate of her aims and aspirations when victory comes and peace dawns upon a war-wearied world.

We have achieved marvelous results in the conferences held at Moscow, Teheran, and Cairo. We are sustained in our faith that the United Nations can and will continue to work together as a harmonious team.

The communiqué jointly issued by Mr. Molotov, Mr. Eden, and Mr. Hull at Moscow gave us hope for a closer unity among the nations in determining the problems of today and tomorrow. That communiqué said:

> The conference agreed to set up machinery for insuring the closest cooperation between the three governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops.

That was a magnificent statement. It contains unquestionably the keystone upon which the future peace must rest. The closest cooperation between the three most powerful of the United Nations will destroy the attempts of our enemy to divide our people and frustrate our noble enterprise. Again, Mr. President, I appeal to the leadership of the great powers who wage this war to destroy aggression and injustice, to consider Poland's case in the light of the mighty contributions she has and is so heroically continuing to make.

In connection with this subject, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement issued by a group of United States citizens, all of whom were vigorous pioneers in the cause of aid to Russia, all of whom are steadfast in their advocacy of unity among the United Nations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> We believe the time has come when those Americans who regard close cooperation with Soviet Russia as a cornerstone of victory and permanent peace should address a word of appeal to our Russian allies. We speak as individuals who have favored all-out aid to Russia ever since Hitler's unprovoked attack in 1941.
>
> Because of the necessity for tactful avoidance of unnecessary criticism between allies in time of war * * * we have hitherto allowed some things which aroused misgiving to pass in silence. Recent events, however, have convinced us that continued silence will only play into the hands of the isolationists and enemies of aid to Russia. For they are not silent, and every act of the Soviet press or government which can be misunderstood or criticized in America is grist to their mill. * * *
>
> In common with every loyal citizen of the United Nations we welcomed the declarations of Teheran and Moscow, which explicitly reaffirmed the earlier declaration of January 1, 1942, pledging support for the purposes and principles of the Atlantic Charter. * * * And we welcomed especially the joint communiqués issued at Moscow by Mr. Molotov, Mr. Eden, and Mr. Hull, which said:
>
> "The conference agreed to set up machinery for insuring the closest cooperation between the three governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops. * * *"
>
> Because of all this, the apparent determination of the Soviet Government to insist on a unilateral settlement of the Polish problem, without mediation or consent either of Russia's allies or the Polish Government, has come as a shock to American opinion.
>
> The American and British peoples cannot forget that Poland was the first nation to stop Hitler's procession of bloodless victories. The Poles determined to fight even though war meant the temporary conquest and enslavement of Poland, because they believed that the justice of Poland's cause and the loyalty of her allies would insure her resurrection in the end.
>
> They made this decision at a time when Russia thought it necessary to collaborate with Hitler, and yet Poland, after suffering untold agony, is now asked to surrender far

more to Russia than what she refused to give Hitler. For the Curzon line frontier demanded by Russia is close to the Hitler-Stalin line of 1939. It means a loss of 47% of prewar Poland, while it represents a gain of less than 1% for the Soviet Union. The Polish Government has declared its readiness to discuss concessions, but no government, least of all a government in exile, could make such concessions as this without the express consent of the Polish people. * * *

As for the Polish Government in Exile, it is not our concern to pass judgment upon the merits of some of Russia's complaints against it. But it is at least a legitimate Government, supported by the Polish Underground and composed almost entirely of men and parties who opposed the dictatorship of the Polish colonels. * * *

It is for the Polish people and for them alone to decide how far they will recognize the present Government when they are free. In the meantime, if improvements along democratic lines are to be made they cannot be dictated from outside, least of all dictated by one great power which is not now a democracy. For how can we uphold the principle of a strong and independent Poland, to which Russia is committed, if Russia alone is to decide unilaterally what constitutes a democratic Polish Government?

It would make little difference whether a unilateral Russian policy is imposed direct from Moscow or through the Ukrainian or White Russian Soviet Republics. Nor is the problem solved by the proposal to compensate Poland for the loss of much of the country to which she has strong historical and cultural claims by giving her territories to the north and west, where her claims are infinitely less. That would mean two violations of the spirit of the Atlantic Charter instead of one. Whatever is done should be done for the sake of a just and permanent peace—not by robbing Peter to pay Paul.

If, therefore, Russia values America's friendship as we believe she does, she must not use her power to impose either an unjust frontier or a puppet government upon the Polish people. Russia must choose. She can impose her will but she cannot impose it without estranging millions of Americans whose opinions may be decisive in the development of our foreign policy. And Russia will estrange others besides Americans, for what will millions of citizens of the small conquered (and satellite) countries have to hope from an Allied victory if this is how we discharge our obligations to Poland? Such a default would be worth many battalions to Hitler. We hope, therefore, that Russia's immense power will enable her to be generous. * * *

Therefore, in the interest of all the United Nations, we urge the British and American Governments to raise these questions with the Soviet Government, and we ourselves appeal to our Russian allies to take cognizance of the legitimate disquiet of the American people. We ask this not only because it would strengthen our unity in the war and hasten the day of victory, but because it would cement the friendship between the Russian and American peoples in the crucial years to come.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish at this point to commend the two able and distinguished Senators from New York for the fine contributions they have made to the memory of the immortal document that was adopted by the Polish Parliament in 1791. I also wish to add a brief statement to what the two Senators have said.

On May 3, 1791, the Polish Parliament passed the first written democratic constitution for Poland. This constitution provided for liberty and equal rights for all men. One hundred and fifty-three years have come and gone since Poland adopted this declaration of freedom and independence.

Indeed, it is fitting and proper that we in the United States Senate pause briefly on this anniversary and pay tribute to a brave people who, since the memorable 3d day of May 1791 have continued to remember the significance of the reforms found in that imperishable document.

It is sad to know that free Poland in 1795 capitulated through war to her powerful neighbors, and ceased to exist as an independent state until 1918, when a new day dawned, and she again resumed the place that was hers among the nations of the earth.

The Polish love of liberty and democracy was deep-rooted in the Polish people when Adolf Hitler overpowered that nation in 1939. Poland was the first nation to challenge the brutal Nazi force with force. With hopeless defeat staring Poland in the face, that nation chose to fight and die rather than surrender to the enemies of freedom. The democracies of the world and their allies in this tragic struggle will always remember the heroic Poland of 1939.

The countless deaths, the untold suffering, and the unlimited torturing of the Polish people under Nazi rule is nigh unbelievable in a day when civilization is presumed to be on the march, but all this ruthlessness and brutal power has never conquered the spirit of a free people.

Today throughout Poland the underground warriors of liberty are celebrating the founding of the Polish Constitution. Under the greatest of odds, Poland fights on. Her spirit of freedom shall never die. And soon another new day will dawn in Poland. She will rise from her present yoke of Nazi terror and bondage, and in the peaceful days to come she will once again take her place, her rightful place, among the nations of the earth.

FINLAND'S POSITION IN THE WAR

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to say that I agree with everything that has been said on the floor of the Senate concerning the Polish people and their history. But at this time, because there seems to be so much misunderstanding with respect to the position of poor little Finland, I wish to call attention to an article which appeared in the publication The Nineteenth Century and Afterwards, one of the oldest British publications, edited by F. A. Voigt, who has been a close adviser to Lord Vansittart for many years, Under Secretary of the British Foreign Office. Voigt was former editor, I am told, of the very liberal newspaper the Manchester Guardian. It should be remembered that Great Britain has declared war upon Finland, and consequently it is all the more remarkable that the article in question appears in this publication at this time. The article appears in the March 1944 issue of the publication, and the writer of the article has this to say:

It is not true that Finland took advantage of the occasion offered by the German attack on Russia in June 1941 to avenge the defeat she suffered at the hands of the Red Army in the previous year and to recover her lost territories. Finland was not the aggressor—she was, for the second time, the victim of aggression.

Under the treaty of peace which was signed between Finland and Russia on March 13, 1940, the new frontiers were drawn not only to make the defense of the Gulf of Finland and of Leningrad easier but also to render Finland wholly unable to resist renewed invasion. Although Russia had declared herself satisfied with the treaty, she profited by the helplessness to which Finland had been reduced to impinge upon Finnish domestic affairs and Finnish foreign policy. For example, Finland attempted to promote a defensive association of the Nordic countries which, had it come into existence, would have drawn Finland, Norway, and Sweden together against Germany. Under Russian pressure Finland was obliged to desist. The personnel in the Russian Legation at Helsinki and in the Russian consulates throughout Finland was numerous far beyond normal needs, and there was constant interference in Finnish internal affairs. Demands, which had not been made in the peace negotiations, were made when Finland was unable to resist them. Amongst these demands were the demilitarization of the Aaland Isles under Russian control, a preponderant Russian share in the management of the Petsamo nickel mines, the surrender of rolling stock beyond the amount stipulated in the treaty, compensation for goods removed from the ceded areas, the cession of the Vallenkoski Rapids (which were entirely on the Finnish side of the frontier). All Finnish attempts to promote trade with Russia and to promote a better understanding in the realms of science and of letters were rebuffed.

When Mr. Molotov was in Berlin during the month of November 1940, he demanded that Russia have a free hand in Finland. The demand was refused by the German Government. It is not surprising that the Finns, who have little sympathy with the Germans—and still less for national socialism—should have felt some relief.

But when Russia was herself invaded on June 22, 1941, she at once resumed her active hostility to Finland. On that same day the Russians bombed the Aaland Islands and attempted to bomb two Finnish warships. On the 23rd Abo (Turka) was bombed by 24 Russian airplanes. The open city of Willmanstrand was bombed on the same day—so was the Malm airdrome near Helsinki. The Russian Government was asked for an explanation, but gave no answer.

Finland had herself refrained from any offensive action. On the 24th, the Finnish minister in London assured Mr. Eden that Finland would remain on the defensive. But by the 26th, more than 10 Finnish towns had been bombed by the Russians and had suffered heavy casualties. On that day, the President Risto Ryti, broadcast a declaration that Finland would fight.

The Finns had been utterly exhausted by the previous war with Russia and were in no mood for yet another struggle. But it is clear that they feared that their last chance of survival as an independent nation was disappearing. They decided to fight in self-defense for the second time. They limited their military operations to the recovery of the districts that had been wrested from them in the previous year. They did not take part in the offensive against Leningrad—they deny that their guns have bombarded Leningrad.

Had the course of events been foreseen, it is probable that Finland would have refrained from becoming a belligerent at all. The rapid advance of the Germans relieved the Russian pressure on Finland. Subsequent German reverses increased that pressure once more. Finland is entirely dependent upon Germany for grain and cannot make a separate peace with Russia unless she can replace her imports from Germany by

imports from other countries. All Finns want peace—in this respect there is no difference between Finnish parties—and all would accept peace terms that would allow the Finns to survive as an independent nation. What they fear is that Finland will be occupied by the Red Army, that the elite of the country will be deported to Arctic and Asiatic Russia, just as the elite of the Baltic states, of eastern Poland, and of Bessarabia was, and that the country will then be annexed after a spurious plebiscite as the Baltic states and eastern Poland were. Finland's case has been made the more desperate by the general assumption that Finland was the aggressor and that she is a Fascist country. Insofar as her government is autocratic it was made so in a successful attempt to overcome the Lappo movement which bore a certain resemblance to Italian fascism.

If the words "democratic" and "progressive" mean anything, they apply to modern Finland. She has a unique civilization—her achievement in the realms of music, letters, and architecture—as well as of politics and of economics, is outstanding.

Then the writer quotes Prime Minister Churchill, although he does not say whom he is quoting. However, we all recall that the statement is Mr. Churchill's. The quotation reads as follows:

Finland—superb, nay, sublime. * * *

The service rendered by Finland to mankind is magnificent. * * * We cannot tell what the fate of Finland may be, but no more mournful spectacle could be presented to what is left of civilized mankind than that this splendid northern race should be at last worn down and reduced to servitude worse than death.

That statement was made by Mr. Churchill at the time when Russia first attacked Finland. One of the reasons why I call attention to this matter is that Finland is one of the three countries of the world which paid her debts to the United States of America. I have been in Finland, and I know something of the kind of government which existed there a few years ago, and of the progress Finland was making. Considering her background, she made far greater progress than was made by almost any of the other countries.

Our State Department has said Finland should make peace with Russia. Everyone would like to see Finland get out of the war; everyone would like to see Finland make peace; but everyone in this country, I believe, wishes to see Finland become and remain an independent country. Our people do not want to see Finland diminished and overrun by the Russians; they do not want to see Finland communized; they do not want to see Finland ruled by Germany.

At this time I desire to recall the terms of the peace offer which was made to Finland by Russia. First of all, on March 1 Russia asked that the Finns drive the Germans out of Finland by May 1. According to Hanson Baldwin, there are seven divisions of German troops in northern Finland. Stop and consider whether it would be possible for the small Finnish forces to be able to drive the Germans out by May 1, if they wished to do so. The Russians said that if the Finns did not drive the Germans out of Finland by May 1, they would enter Finland and would help the Finns drive out the Germans. Of course, that would mean that the Russian Army would enter Finland and would practically take over the country. In view of the Finns' past experiences with Russia, they were very much afraid that once the Russians entered Finland they would never leave.

Furthermore, the Russians asked for the payment of $600,000,000 in reparations. That sum of money is more than the national income of Finland for 1 year. However, that much money was to be paid over a period of 5 years. The Russians were asking for more than the national income of all of Finland for 1 year, to be paid in 5 years' time. In other words, Mr. President, the conditions which were offered to Finland in connection with the attempt to get her out of the war were impossible.

Mr. President, I think Russia has a great opportunity awaiting her after this war. Unquestionably, she will become one of the most powerful nations in the world. In this country the good feeling toward Russia has grown tremendously in the last few years. But if Russia is going to overrun Finland and take Finland, if she is going to take a big slice of Poland, as has been suggested, and as I have learned from very high authority she is demanding, if she is going to ask for all the Baltics and Balkans and a sphere of influence over Norway and Sweden, then public sentiment in this country will change very rapidly against Russia, after the war, if those are going to be her demands, and if she insists upon them.

On the other hand, if Russia grants to Finland and to the other small countries the rights enumerated under the provisions of article 2 of the Atlantic Charter, and if Russia gives those small countries an opportunity to live, and permits them to have their own kinds of democratic government, then the friendly feeling toward the Russian Government will continue to grow.

However, I certainly feel that our State Department was in error in practically demanding and insisting that the Finnish Government make peace upon the terms which were submitted to her by the Russians. When we consider the history of Finland, our attitude toward Finland, and the attitude presented in this article appearing in the British magazine, The Nineteenth Century and After, notwithstanding the fact that Britain has already declared war on Finland, it seems to me that if any newspaper or magazine in this country attempted to take such a position relative to a country with which we were at war, that publication undoubtedly would be suppressed. All this goes to show that, with reference to some matters, there is more freedom of speech and more freedom of the press in England today than there is in this country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that about 3 days ago in the New York Times there appeared a statement from a New York Times correspondent in Russia. In that statement the correspondent said that great concern was expressed in certain governmental circles in Russia because there is in Washington, today, the legation of a nation which is at war with Russia; and the correspondent implied that in some way that fact indicated lack of faith or cooperation with Russia. That attitude seemed to me to be a very extraordinary one, in view of the fact that the Japanese Legation in Moscow is open, and that Russia is in full cooperation, so to speak, with Japan, and recently made a treaty with her which may or may not assist Japan in the battle against the United States.

I merely wished to add to what the Senator from Montana has said some commendation of the State Department for maintaining relations with Finland, and to express the hope that the State Department will continue to do so. It seems to me that when we are assisting Russia with lend-lease arms which may be used against Finland we have a distinct obligation to confer constantly with Russia and with Finland, and to attempt to work out an amicable solution of the problems existing between those two countries.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much indeed. I remember seeing the same article which he read, which stated that there was a country—apparently the reference was to Finland—whose legation in Washington was still open, notwithstanding the fact that she was at war with Russia, and then recalling the fact that the Japanese Embassy in Moscow is still open, pointing out the cordial relations and the trade existing between the Japanese and the Russians, and then calling upon us perhaps to close the Finnish Legation in Washington.

I called attention to this article simply because of the fact that I commend the State Department for its attitude up to this time in not breaking with Finland, and because of my hope that the State Department will continue to recognize Finland, and also will do what the Senator said, namely, try to bring about a relationship between Russia and Finland which will enable Finland to maintain herself as an independent, progressive, democratic country.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Britain said she went to war to save Poland, but when Germany attacked Poland, Russia entered Poland and took about half of the country. Recently the Prime Minister of Great Britain has been quoted in the debates on the floor of the House of Commons as saying that Russia's claim upon the part of Poland which she took when she divided Poland with Germany is not without reason, and seems to him to be rather just.

Here is Finland. Here are the Balkan countries; and here is eastern Europe. For centuries Poland has been the buffer between the East, Russia, and Germany. The question now is, If Russia is to insist upon borders being revised by war, whether or not the old civilization and culture of Europe shall be saved and allowed to continue? The question is shall Poland, Finland, Norway, be free when the war is over? What about Yugo-

slavia? It is quite well known that Stalin has his agents in the Balkan countries. When he entered Poland he left Russian Communists there to further political propaganda. The question is, shall the independent democratic countries of Finland, Poland, and the Baltic states be allowed to exist, or is the entire European culture to be wiped out?

We have seen in the press lately another instance of agencies which are at work. Through the State Department, Stalin is said to have induced a Catholic priest to obtain passports to go to Russia, ostensibly as an unofficial representative of the Catholic Church. In that position he has been repudiated by proper officials of his Church. He was invited to visit Russia. For what purpose does the Russian Government invite a private citizen to come to Russia and receive whatever information the Russians see fit to give him, unless it is for the purpose of coming back to the United States to carry on propaganda for communism?

It seems to me that we have a great responsibility. We are fighting a war to save democracy. At the same time, are officially to agree to democracy being wiped out in Europe? If we are, are we to assist in establishing a different kind of civilization and culture? Is that what is meant by our war effort? Are we to help destroy the old culture of Europe and establish a new culture from Asia to the Channel and wipe out the old civilization? Certainly the old culture of Europe cannot exist where the culture of the Far East takes its place.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. Of course, what he said was true with respect to the claim that England went to war for the independence of Poland. I call attention to the fact that a few weeks ago in this body I read a statement by the same editor, in the same magazine, to the effect that England went to war for the balance of power in Europe and the balance of power alone. He stated that whoever controlled the Middle East, including the Baltic states, the Balkan countries, and Poland controls Europe, and that England could not permit any country, no matter how democratic it might be or how civilized it might be, or whatever its form of government might be, to control and dominate all of Europe, because of the fact that if that should happen, the British Empire could no longer exist.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Down through the centuries England has fought many wars with Russia to keep Russia out of the Middle East and out of the Orient. Sometimes she has played with Germany and sometimes she has played with Russia against Germany. Her aim has been to keep both of them out of the Middle East. In this she has succeeded.

That problem will still confront us when this war is over. These are things which we must take into consideration when we come to talk about a peace treaty. If we are to have a real peace treaty, it must be a treaty based upon some kind of understanding which will eliminate the questions which arise under the balance of power. Otherwise permanent peace talk is an idle dream.

Europe is still thinking in terms of the balance of power, a fact which our people seem to have overlooked, according to the debates and speeches which I have heard. That problem still remains and must be solved before we can have a real treaty of peace under which peace can be lasting. This is international politics, called diplomacy. It is nothing but politics. War is an instrument of politics; war is continuation of politics; and if our politics continues to be what it has been, there can be no peace so long as war is an instrument of politics.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, many tributes are being paid to Poland today all over the world, for the national holiday of our fighting ally celebrates an event of prime importance to all liberty-loving people everywhere. The Polish Constitution of the 3d of May 1791, ranks with our own Declaration of Independence and with Republican France's Declaration of the Rights of Man, as one of the great democratic events in history.

Liberty flourished and grew strong here in the United States and in France; in Poland liberty was crushed beneath the despotism of the three great autocracies—Prussia, Russia, and Austria—which, at the end of the eighteenth century, feared that the new liberal views expressed in the Polish Constitution would find acceptance in the minds of their own people, so they partitioned Poland and condemned her to 123 years of national extinction.

That Poland survived and rose again after the last war to be one of the most democratic and progressive countries in Europe is surely proof that although the land of a free people may be occupied by an aggressor, nothing can quench the fires of patriotism and the national spirit of an oppressed nation. Now again, after only 20 years of freedom, Poland lies prostrate beneath the heel of German might, and the sacrifices and sufferings of her 35,000,000 people have exceeded those of any other country overrun by Hitler in Europe. But in the short 20 years of freedom vouchsafed her, Poland made really remarkable industrial progress and she did it thanks to the enlightened support, industrial effort, and private enterprise received from the government.

Although foreign capital extended very little help to Poland—she received, I believe, in comparison to her population about 2½ cents for every dollar Germany got—the Polish Government by fostering and directing private enterprise into those channels most likely to bring about national prosperity and a higher standard of living, did remarkably well in transforming her agricultural products into exports easy to ship and easy to store. For instance, the Polish ham quickly won a privileged place on the markets of the world. Their enormous resources in wild game of all sorts enabled the Poles to establish a large canning industry and many people tasted a partridge for the first time out of a Polish can. The finest crayfish eaten in Paris restaurants came from Polish streams. Their cheeses and milk products were remarkable. Their lumber trade grew, they exported furniture. When it came to finding markets abroad and to adapting their products to the taste of foreign purchasers, the Poles set a great example to other nations. That is why in common with many friends of Poland, I look forward with the utmost confidence to the day when Victory has crowned the Allied arms and peace again reigns in Europe. Poland will be one of the first countries to recover, even though as we all know, she has been the one that has suffered most. The Poles are a brave and hardy race. They will make good, and after this war the United Nations, and especially the United States and Great Britain will, I hope, furnish Poland with proper credits and tools of peace, to enable her to restore prosperity and bring well-deserved happiness to the nation which was first to resist unjustified intrusion upon her rights by the Germans. Poland deserves well of America and of all mankind because in my opinion, she has today the respect and admiration of all liberty-loving people throughout the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we have in Michigan many citizens and residents of Polish extraction, as has every other State in the Union. It is but fitting that today I say a few words in the Senate Chamber on this, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution. Its signing followed so closely the signing and taking effect of our Constitution that they both were bold strokes for freedom and self-government by liberty loving people at a critical period in world history.

We have been more fortunate than Poland, but we have found that eternal vigilance has been the price of our liberty. And this will always be true. The people of Poland have found that because of their geographical location, eternal vigilance alone has not been sufficient to maintain their freedom.

While Poland was struggling for her own freedom, her people were willing to cooperate with other nations who had the same desires and a similar outlook. This accounts for the fact that two great national heroes of Poland came to our shores during the Revolution and fought with our soldiers in our struggle for freedom. Count Pulaski gave his life at Savannah in the cause of American liberty. Thaddeus Kosciuszko lived through the Revolution to return to Poland, where he assumed a leading part in the endless struggle of its brave people for the sacred rights of self-government.

Two years after the signing of its constitution Poland, as a geographical entity, disappeared from the map of Europe, through partition of its territory by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. From that time until the end of the First World War, the story of Poland was one of bitter struggle for the survival of its people and the preservation of its nationality, without ever being recognized by the

nations of Europe as an independent state.

Following World War No. 1 the frontiers of Poland were established; the eastern frontier was determined by the Treaty of Riga in 1921, which evidenced the end of the Polish-Russian War. Lenin, then dictator of Russia, described this treaty as "a voluntary and just agreement to stand for all time." The Polish frontiers, after that time, were recognized by the League of Nations and by every other country.

When on September 1, 1939, Hitler's hordes rolled across the Polish frontier at 14 different points, Poland felt the full power of the Nazi blitz, but continued to fight back against insuperable odds until October 5, when defeat at the battle of Kock put an end to her valiant struggle.

Since then the Polish Government has continued to function in exile, and the courageous underground has striven not only to organize and carry on a patriotic resistance against the enemy within her borders, but also to maintain and perpetuate Polish state authorities, departments, and institutions.

Strong and effective Polish units right now are bravely fighting side by side with the soldiers of the United Nations. Polish divisions fought in France and Norway before those countries were subdued. There is a Polish Army in England and another one in the Middle East. The Polish Air Force participated in the Battle of Britain and destroyed at least 195 enemy machines in that battle. Polish sailors helped in the evacuation of Dunkerque and in the sinking of the *Bismarck*. They have to their credit the destruction of a number of Nazi U-boats. Suffering Poland is carrying its full share of the burden of battle, and the ever-increasing opposition against the ruthless aggressor.

The struggle of Poland against Prussia and German aggression has continued for almost a thousand years. The earliest recorded Polish history recounts that in the year 963, German warriors invaded her soil. From that day to this, with a few intervening periods of peace, this brave nation has faced a hopeless struggle against Prussia, often aided by Russia and Austria as well.

Through that millenium of time, the Polish people have retained their racial identity, their love of liberty, and their determination to be free in the family of free nations.

Though Poland was devastated by invaders in the First World War, she made great progress during the 20 years preceding the present war, in reconstruction, in industry, in agriculture, in education, and in cultural life.

Today, in the midst of unparalleled suffering, death and destruction, the Polish people look forward, with courage, faith, and confidence, to the day now not far distant when the invader will be driven from their land and Poland will rise again, reestablishing their government upon the principles of morality, democracy, and international collaboration. Poland claims to have been the first real democracy in Europe. She stands ready now, with determination and set purpose, to do her full share in the restoration and perpetuation of the democratic form of government.

It is fitting today that we here in the Senate salute Poland on this, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the signing of her constitution.

Mr. President, the Atlantic Charter must be more than mere words if Poland, as well as the other small nations of the world, are to become free. We must see to it that the Atlantic Charter and the principles of freedom become for the small nations realities rather than mere words. I know that those who today stand on the Senate floor and speak in behalf of Poland mean that our whole Government should get back of the Atlantic Charter insofar as it stands for the freedom of small nations and the liberty of all their people.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on May 3, 1791, the Polish Constitution was adopted by the people of Poland, and since that time the anniversary of that date has been celebrated annually by the Polish people as their greatest national holiday.

A substantial part of the population of Nebraska is Polish, and in all sections of the State our Polish people will celebrate this holiday.

It is most unfortunate that the people of Poland will not be permitted to celebrate the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution in a normal way, but there will be those throughout the world who have an abiding faith in the Polish people and their constitution and who will in their own hearts commend the Poles for their loyalty and patriotism.

I should like to be numbered among those who have that sympathetic feeling for the Polish people.

Poland's contribution to the war effort of the United Nations has been outstanding. Her faithfulness to the ideals of freedom and justice is valued in terms of highest praise. As the United Nations fight on toward a total victory, may we use not merely idle words, but may we act to keep faith with Poland's dead and with the ideals of freedom and justice for which her people stand.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President I am glad today to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the Polish Nation and the Polish people. So many of their descendants live among us, so many of them have become stalwart and fine American citizens that I think it is entirely proper that we should pause here today to pay tribute to them and to their forebears. As has been stated, on the 3d day of May 1791, the then Kingdom of Poland adopted its constitution. That was only a few years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. I doubt if any country under any government has had the experience the people of Poland have endured through the years that have past. Their history is replete with war and oppression and also with courage and success on their part. Time after time the enemy has attempted to blot them out, and time after time they have arisen, achieved victory, and reestablished their Nation.

They have given to the world so much, not only in examples of courage and strength on the part of their people, but they have given us culture, music, literature, art, and all those things that go to make man's life better and that raise him above the brute kingdom.

Today Poland is again a great battleground. It is a battleground in which we are very much interested; and I express the hope which is in my heart and which I feel is in the hearts of all Americans on this anniversary, that the day is near at hand when Poland will rise again to be a free and strong nation and that she will continue to take her part, a glorious part, in the affairs of the world and mankind.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, in 1939 Poland fell because she valued liberty and honor more than life under foreign rule.

The attention of the people of this Nation is directed to the fact that on this date 153 years ago the people of Poland, by constitution signed on May 3, 1791, accepted the principles which guaranteed freedom and individual rights to all her citizens. The liberum veto and all the intricate and obstructive machinery of the anomalous old system were forever abolished. All invidious class distinctions were forever done away with.

On that great day the new constitution gave the people of Poland full administrative and judicial autonomy as well as parliamentary representation and personal privileges of the gentry, such as possession of land and access to office in the state, were open to all townsmen. Furthermore, on that famous date absolute religious toleration was established.

Poland was the first country in Europe to fight in the present war and to arouse the democratic world from its appeasement stupor. Freemen of the United Nations are today fighting and dying all over the world so that the peoples of conquered nations may be restored to representative government and freedom of worship. The commendable record of the Polish-American citizen is one of which America is proud.

There are 560 parochial schools with 276,286 pupils and 5,395 teachers maintained by this group in the United States. There are three Polish colleges supported by these citizens. A great deal of this educational accomplishment has been promoted by the Kosciuszko Foundation established in December 1925 by a group of public-spirited Polish-Americans. The purpose of the foundation is a living memorial to Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a name which made American history during the Revolutionary War.

In these critical times, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that the 3d of May be commemorated by us in the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in these eloquent speeches about Poland on this important Polish anniversary. My own view is well known. Four weeks ago I spoke at length upon the subject and the text is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I said that if hope for Poland ever dies, hope for all continental democracy will lie in the same grave. Suffice it for today to add that the cause of Poland—typifying the fate of other small nations—needs something more than anniversary speeches on the Senate floor. It needs constant, relentless sponsorship

and fealty in high place. It needs them at Casablanca, and Quebec, and Moscow, and at Teheran, and at other supreme conferences yet to come.

I agree with our State Department that none of us can safely pause in this war to settle post-war boundary lines and that it were better if such controversy were postponed until we have earned the common victory which gives all of us the right to speak. But I also assert that this self-denying ordinance should not be confined to our own United States alone; that we are not required to be the only "silent partner" in these perilous themes; and that when adverse, unilateral declarations upon these subjects are made by others we should never by our official silence seem to consent that we, too, may have forgotten that the United Nations are pledged—

First. To seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise;

Second. To seek no territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned; and

Third. To respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

No, Mr. President; friendly anniversary orations here in the Senate are not enough. While none among us dares make specific promises for the pattern of the post-war world when hard realities shall have been resolved in the light of undisclosed circumstance, yet we can cling tenaciously to this pattern to which our war aims and our peace hopes are dedicated and we can expect our high leadership to unfailingly reassert this pattern whenever it seems to be assailed. If and when silence is broken in another capital, it is no longer enjoined upon our own. Peace opinions do not reside on a one-way street. Except as we faithfully preserve the ideal now, there is small hope for the reality hereafter. I commend this comment to all concerned before it is too late.

Sacrificial Poland has earned this consideration. Poland has paid for it in blood and sweat and tears. This World War No. 2 started in defense of the free Polish Republic. It would be a travesty if it should end in any other destiny.

TRAGEDIES OF WAR—FAILURES ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask the attention of Senators for only a few moments today while I read an article recently published in Time magazine. The article was not written for publication. It was written by a young Navy doctor who, it happens, came from my State, and who I have known practically all his life.

This is one of the most graphic descriptions I have read anywhere of what Time says is "one of the thousands of throat-tightening epilogues that follow the thundering drama of battle."

Everything in the article is real except the name. It was published by Time magazine exactly as written, except that—and I presume for lack of space—some few sentences were omitted. I choose today to read the article exactly as it was written, and I shall also read the letter written by the young surgeon to his sister, whom I have also known for a number of years. This is the descriptive article he sent to his sister:

Here is a farewell I remember. The names aren't real, the place and time somewhere in the memory of a few people.

It was 3 days after the major part of the battle had ended and we were out a few miles from the island patrolling our little sector of ocean, swinging back and forth in huge figures of eight. The noise and colors of battle were gone. The bombing had ceased and the big guns on the ships were silent. Now there was only a little smoke on the island and though we could see occasional puffs from the guns of the one destroyer which was still firing, the sound didn't carry to us. It was altogether quiet. The sun was shining; the sky was a clear blue and even the water was so still that there were only ripples, like it is on a lake at home on a quiet day.

Most of the men not on watch were sprawled around topside trying to relax and cool off in the little breeze the ship's movement made. A few of us were standing by the rail gazing into space and thinking our own thoughts when someone called attention to some objects in the water. We began to watch them.

There were three of them, a hundred yards or more apart, and as we came closer we could see that they were men and that they were dead. They were bobbing up and down in the water with their arms stretched out ridiculously straight and stiff. We could see a V of white undershirt at their neck and the ripples breaking over the toes of their brogans.

The order came down from the bridge to lower away the boat, go to them, determine their identity and, if they were ours, to bring them back to the ship.

They were so horribly bloated and discolored that even their race was indeterminate but the uniform was that of our own men. When we tried to take hold of their arms and legs and lift them up and over into the boat, the skin would slip away in our hands. One of our boys was sick from the odor.

As we got each one in the boat we'd empty his pockets and search for identification. One was named Thomas. He had a canteen on his belt and a map in his pocket, both with that name on it—John Thomas. Wilson, H. W., had an identification tag around his neck. He also had a billfold with a picture of a girl, some foreign coins, a wrist watch, and a bottle opener. The third had a knife and some coins in his pocket, but there was no name. If he ever had an identification tag around his neck, it would have been gone. He had no head or neck. He was, and would continue to be, an unknown—a nobody at all. We put them, one on the other, in the bottom of the boat, covered them with a canvas and started back. It was a long ride back.

Perhaps I should have felt more emotions than I did riding back with them in that boat—a fierce anger at the thing which allows nations and peoples to do this to each other; an urgent personal desire for retaliation; bitterness because they had given their all and reaped this, while some of their more cunning but less conscientious brethren at home were giving nothing and reaping all; horror because of the added indignities they had suffered even after death; sorrow for their parents, for their girls, and for the many people who must grieve and forget as best they can. If I did feel any one of these, I put it aside as being relatively unimportant. These were brave men and they were dead. Bravery and death were linked together in a natural and inevitable sequence. It seemed as simple as that.

We brought them aboard and began preparing them for a proper burial at sea. The men were crowded around in close, curious bunches. They were quiet for once and there was a queer, hard look on their faces.

Each was wrapped in a heavy canvas—it was green, I remember—and weighted with heavy shells from our big guns so that they would stay decently buried. Then the captain came down from the bridge and the ceremony began.

What would you have said, Thomas or Wilson, or nobody at all, had you the words? What reason for being here? What regrets? I think I know. I think the words were said for us long ago in a language simpler than you or I could choose. I will say them for you.

"Here dead lie we because we did not choose
To live and shame the land from which sprung.
Life, to be sure, is nothing much to loose;
But young men think it is, and we were young."

A simple reason. A single profound regret. That's right, isn't it?

I heard the last words of the ritual * * * "we therefore commit these bodies to the deep, to be turned into corruption, looking for the resurrection of the body, when the sea shall give up her dead." * * *

The stretchers tilted. The flags fell away. There were three dull splashes in the water.

So we bade them a long farewell.

Mr. President, that concludes the descriptive article which was sent by this young doctor to his sister.

Now, I shall read the personal letter which he wrote to his sister, and again I read word for word, even at the risk, Mr. President, of giving offense to some of my colleagues in the Senate, but I am sure no offense will be taken by any Member of this body when it is realized that the words this young man wrote to his sister came from one who had observed first hand some of the terrible tragedies of war, and who has thought long and deeply of things about which he has written so freely and frankly and, may I add, eloquently and movingly. This is what the young man wrote to his sister:

I am enclosing my version of an incident which occurred sometime ago. It is my personal reaction to the few hours during which the incident took place, the kind of grief I felt, the emotions I did not feel. I do not intend for it to give the idea that I have not felt such things but rather that when the chips are down they do become unimportant.

Still, to those of us who were not so unfortunate as Thomas or Wilson, those same emotions I could not feel at the time later take on an added significance, too often a bitter significance, because so many of the things we hear from home make all this seem so hopelessly fruitless, so terribly futile.

I wish there were words adequate enough to explain how deeply most of us feel about being out here; how much it means to us to win completely and unequivocally so that our sons and our son's sons, and those of our enemy as well, need not know this again; how much it hurts to be forced to the realization that so many of our hopes are empty.

I wish there were words adequate enough to explain the bitterness, the scorn, the unrest, and the lack of faith most of us have for so many things at home: For the ineffective, fumbling legislature; for all the political devices and stratagems which are so obviously for the gain and glory of a few politicians though clothed in the sanctity of the words, "for the men in the service"; how bitterly we resent the strikes (there is only one question we can ask in regard to them. How would it be with the folks at home if

we did what they are doing; how would it be with them if we let them down as they are letting us down? Sure, we know we're getting nearly all the supplies we need now, that things are going along better, but how can we be 100 percent for something that they're only 75 percent behind at home?); how we must feel about the stupid racial prejudices that are fostered and festered by some of our great democratic Senators while many of the same races they so denounce are out here risking their necks to give those same Senators the right to go on fostering their hatred. (A typical item in this morning's paper: "Senator ———, addressing the State legislature Wednesday, urged the South to uphold racial integrity and renew our faith and allegiance to the color line." What a sordid story lies behind that. What a travesty of the word "democracy"!); how we feel to have even our right to vote fashioned into a political football (Is this merely a tragicomedy we're taking part in? It would seem so. As a point of interest, I've never seen a MacArthur button, a Willkie button, a Roosevelt button, or any other button or political device of any kind. They seem to be worried about that); how much we scorn the little crumbs that are thrown our way, such as the $300 mustering-out pay and all such meaningless tommyrot.

The thing that is important to us is to first win the war and then to set about rehabilitating not only ourselves but the people in India and China and Japan and Germany so that we can live together and call each other friends. It seems to me that that is what we set out to do and even though few of us ever expected to attain that much, it is bitter knowledge indeed to see how infinitely little we are likely to attain at all.

The plain and simple truth is, I'm afraid that we as a people have not yet grown big enough, tolerant enough, wise enough, nor just enough to manage our own affairs with honor and justice, let alone those of the world. We are still trying to delude ourselves with the idea that we are a democracy instead of accepting the truth that we are not and planning ways and means of becoming one some day.

Still, had Thomas or Wilson or I or any of us the same choice to make again, knowing all this, we could not change our decision. We may be denied and shamed by the things which happen at home but we cannot shame ourselves by denying the things we personally believe in.

There the article in Time stops. I read the rest of the letter:

All of which makes me a hell of an idealist and perhaps a damn fool—but that's how it is. Next time I'll be more cheerful. Once in a while I have to unload on someone and this time you're stuck.

Should get in port tomorrow. Hope there will be lots of mail. Will write again later.

Then he adds this postcript:

P. S.—I think I should add, in fairness, that we know that a great many good things are being done, or are being attempted, for us, that many of the things we think are foolish are well meant, that the majority of the people want the same things we want just as badly as we want them. But even that knowledge doesn't help much sometimes.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes.

Mr. TUNNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. With reference to Senate bill 1718, let me say that I understand an effort to dispose of the bill possibly may be made today. At this time I desire to move the postponement of consideration of the bill, and that it be set down for consideration on a day certain, namely, next Wednesday, so as to afford opportunity to study the bill and the amendments. In support of my motion, I should like to have my remarks extended by having printed in the RECORD a letter which I know every Member of the Senate has received. The letter was issued jointly by the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the Railway Labor Executives Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 1, 1944.*

Hon. HARRY TRUMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the Railway Labor Executives Association join together to state clearly and unmistakably their position on the reconversion and contract-termination bills before you. The organizations we represent—12,000,000 active members and 3,000,000 members in the armed services—are unalterably opposed to the passage of any piecemeal legislation to handle the problems of reconversion, with priority given to property legislation. Every consideration of equity and sound economics demands a single integrated piece of legislation which will take care of the human problems of demobilization at the same time that it provides for the security of business enterprise.

We especially regret the voting out at this time by the Senate Military Affairs Committee of the Murray-George contract-termination bill (S. 1718), divorced from legislation dealing with the human side of demobilization, and without any adequate hearings on so serious a problem. Emergency unemployment compensation for demobilized workers and servicemen in the reconversion period is an indispensable part of any over-all legislation and should not be sidetracked to another committee for separate consideration. There is great danger that contract-termination legislation will be passed and the Congress adjourn before any comprehensive legislation is considered to deal adequately with the more pressing human and organizational problems of reconversion. You will agree that every contract terminated means the discharge of workers. Certainly, provision for these workers whose resources must be conserved and fully utilized is at least as important as settling the financial claims of war contractors. We regard this as one of the major legislative issues before the Seventy-eighth Congress.

We wish to stress again, as we have pointed out in our public testimony, that the preponderance of war contractors are in a sufficiently strong position to weather the period of reconversion to peacetime production. The reserves of American industry have never been as high as they are today. American workers, on the contrary, enjoy no such favorable position. When contracts are terminated, the soldiers of production face bleak prospects.

These are essential truths. They become more forcible every day as war-production employment tapers off. The confidence and the full-spirited effort of American workers in military service and in war industries will suffer a severe blow in the midst of war if they feel that their legislators put money settlements of war contracts above and beyond the claims of human beings.

We are united in urging the following programs:

1. There must be no piecemeal legislation such as contract-termination legislation alone. An integrated program of reconversion offers the only means of preventing the chaos that may overwhelm us on the production front in a short time.

2. We stand fully behind the principles of the Kilgore bill, Senate bill 1823, which provides an integrated attack on the problems of reconversion. We urge that the Murray-George bill, S. 1718, be amended to include the Kilgore bill, S. 1823, thus providing a well-rounded program.

3. Such a program must include, in line with War Mobilization Director Byrnes' proposal, special unemployment compensation benefits in the transition period to take care of unemployed workers as well as discharged servicemen.

4. An orderly program for reconversion to civilian production is necessary to achieve maximum production and employment during the reconversion period. Establish an office of war mobilization and adjustment to coordinate all Federal activities during the reconversion period.

5. We favor creation of a national production-employment board, consisting of representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, and the general public, to form an integral part of the office of war mobilization and adjustment.

6. Establish a bureau of programs to review and develop Government programs dealing with reconversion and production, and to encourage the development of private and local programs for increased production and unemployment.

7. Provide adequate protection for, and incentives to, small business in reconverting to peace.

We believe these to be the minimum essentials of a full program which labor can support. Any piecemeal attack on these problems, any effort to put one part of the program ahead of another, will fall far short of what is needed. It will be a severe blow to our economy. It will bring untold hardships to millions of Americans working in war industries and fighting to bring the war to a speedy victory.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.
PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
JULIUS LUHRSEN,
Executive Secretary, Railway Labor Executives Association.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, my purpose in moving for postponement until next Wednesday of consideration of the pending bill is in order to provide an opportunity to study the bill and to be sure that the necessary and requisite amendments to it are made.

Mr. GEORGE. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] has the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Chair entertaining the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order, under rule 22.

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TUNNELL. Madam President, I refuse to yield for that purpose at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware declines to yield.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. TUNNELL. Madam President, the discussion which has taken place today with reference to Poland is a matter of a considerable importance, and one which is of interest, not only to Poland, but to the entire world. Recently, I received from the Polish National Alliance, of Wilmington, Del., a letter which is clothed in such language that I think it should be read at this time. It reads as follows:

POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE,
GROUP NO. 431,
Wilmington, Del., April 27, 1944.

The Honorable JAMES M. TUNNELL,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In 1939, Poland fell because she valued liberty and honor more than life under foreign rule.

In 1791 Poland was partitioned because she would not surrender to the dictates of the three absolute powers, but in opposition to them, by the constitution of the 3d of May, accepted the principles which guaranteed freedom and individual rights to all her citizens. Poland was also the first country in Europe to fight in the present war and to arouse the democratic world from its appeasement stupor. The Poles, always ready to support the democratic cause, were again the first to stand against the enemy of freedom. Again, they followed their motto: "For your freedom and for ours."

In these critical times, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that the date of the 3d of May be commemorated by us in the United States. It is our duty as Americans to remember an ally who, though faced with insurmountable obstacles, would rather die than surrender. The constitution of the 3d of May is another monument that testifies to the democratic spirit of Poland.

Very truly yours,
TEOFIL WISNIEWSKI, *President.*
W. MADEY, *Secretary.*

Madam President, I was interested in the statement made by the Senator from Michigan. What he said is absolutely true. It is not enough for us to deliver orations one day in the year for the benefit of Poland. However, I do not think that is all we are doing. I think the fight is one for democratic principles. In the Atlantic Charter, I notice the following provision:

3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

So, Madam President, the fight for democracy which is being waged throughout the world on the part of America, as well as on the part of the other United Nations, is a fight for Poland, and it is something in addition to orations. The 11,000,000 men and women who at this time are in the armed forces of the United States and their efforts are in addition to orations. The tremendous effort which is being made in America, by which our Navy has been increased from an insignificant one to the greatest Navy the world ever saw, is something in addition to orations. The fight which is being conducted on the various battlefields of the world is not a matter of orations. The 10,000 airplanes we are building each month are not orations, they are an effort to aid in the cause of democracy. All those things show, so it appears to many of us, an effort on the part of those who are interested in democracy, whether that democracy exists in Poland or in the United States of America, and all those efforts are aiding in the fight in which we are engaged, which is referred to as a fight for democracy.

If democracy is successful, Poland will receive her rights; she will be granted her right to govern herself. If democracy is not successful, neither the people of the United States nor the people of Poland will be permitted to govern themselves.

So there is in the world today, on this one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, the greatest effort which has been made at any period in the world's history to sustain the principles for which those people are fighting and for which we are fighting.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BROOKS. Madam President, the 3d of May is a day of memory in the hearts of countless citizens of the United States of America, as well as in the hearts of other people of Polish extraction who reside throughout the world. It is a day of memory that all Americans appreciate and understand, for it commemorates the adoption of a constitution of a nation desiring to be free and to extend the privileges of freedom to common men.

In the hearts of all Americans there is genuine admiration for the celebration of this day by those of our citizens who remember the celebration in Poland of May 3 as a national holiday.

The spirit of Poland and her desire to be free will never die. As a nation she was partitioned three times, and was divided among greedy neighbors; and for more than a century and a quarter she ceased to exist as a nation. But she arose again.

When Poland was reestablished after the last World War, under the terms of the Versailles Treaty, Poland did not become a new nation, but there was merely the restoration of a very old country with new hopes and new ambitions, based on old traditions. Her progress in the spiritual, educational, and material benefits to her people and their contribution to democratic procedures and freedom during the more than 20 years of her subsequent independent existence was exemplified when she rose as the first nation to bare her breast to the steel and stand her ground against the despotic arrogance and military force of the German hordes under Adolf Hitler.

Her contribution to the cause of liberty in the world rose to new heights in those terrific days when she stood alone against the hordes that have finally engulfed in war the liberty-loving people of the world. Poland's contribution at the front and by her underground defiance will always command the admiration of free people everywhere. I join these millions as they celebrate the historic adoption of their constitution in 1791, and I join in their supreme desire that when this war shall end and freedom shall be reestablished, their historic and noble contribution will be recognized, and they again will be established as a free country dedicated to the further march of human liberty.

Mr. WEEKS. Madam President, in the course of the years, to this great melting pot which is the United States, many peoples from many lands have come to make this Nation great. The citizenry of Massachusetts is no exception to this rule. During the course of the years our people have come from all over the civilized world. In our body politic in Massachusetts are several hundred thousand Americans of Polish descent, and today they pause in reverence and affection to recall an anniversary which means much to them and to all who believe in freedom and democratic institutions.

On the 3d of May 1791 the Kingdom of Poland, already reduced by the tripartite partitions, unanimously adopted a new constitution which provided for liberty and equal rights for all men.

In these critical days, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that this date be commemorated by us in the United States. The Poles, always ready to support the democratic cause, were again the first to stand against the enemy of freedom. Again they followed their motto, "For your freedom and for ours."

Madam President, I am happy today, on behalf not only of Massachusetts citizens of Polish descent but on behalf of the Commonwealth and all its citizens, to join in the tribute being paid this day to this vitally important anniversary.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Madam President, under date of April 13, 1944, I received a letter from Mrs. Mary Socha, Andrew Socha, and Ignatz Waski, of Walsenburg, Colo. I should like to read that letter to the Senate.

WALSENBURG, COLO., *April 13, 1944.*

Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, as citizens of these United States of America and members of the Polish National Alliance, Council No. 5, call your attention to the following:

On the 3d of May 1791, the Kingdom of Poland, already reduced by the tripartite partitions, unanimously adopted a new constitution, which provided for liberty and equal rights for all men.

What other nations and people did with bloodshed, Poland with her long tradition of tolerance, accomplished by peaceful means.

In these critical times, when not only Poland, but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that this date be commemorated by us in the United States.

The Poles, always ready to support the democratic cause, were again the first to stand against the enemy of freedom. Again they followed their motto "For your freedom and for ours."

It is our duty as Americans to remember an ally who, though faced with insurmountable obstacles would rather die than surrender.

The constitution of the 3d of May is another monument that testifies to the democratic spirit of Poland.

Respectfully submitted.

MRS. MARY SOCHA.
ANDREW SOCHA.
IGNATZ WASKI.

Madam President, I feel privileged in having the opportunity to read this letter to my colleagues, and to associate myself with its sentiments.

FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, yesterday I introduced a bill in the Senate and stated that I expected to discuss it later in the day; but because of the fact that the agricultural bill was before the Senate, and because I was hopeful that we could complete action on the bill as soon as possible in the interest of the farmers throughout America, I further stated that I would discuss the bill today.

At this time I desire to call attention to the bill introduced to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of flood-control and navigation improvements, including dams, reservoirs, and allied structures, in the basins of certain rivers in the State of South Carolina and the basin of the Pee Dee River, and for the disposition of surplus electric energy generated by the Federal flood-control and navigation improvements in the basins of such rivers.

First, let me say that it is not my desire at the present time to ask for hearings on the bill for the reason that the bill concerns the post-war development of the rivers in South Carolina, as approved by the Army engineers, the Federal Power Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget.

Our people, of course, do not expect any developments that would use any critical materials or manpower until the war is ended and the situation concerning critical materials and manpower is cleared up.

The interest of the people of South Carolina is in winning the war and in the return of those brave Carolinians who are fighting for democracy throughout the world. Those at home are doing their best to aid in every way possible on the home front so that the success of the armed forces may not be delayed.

Madam President, the substance of the bill calls for the development of these rivers by the Army engineers, who have so ably developed the intercoastal waterways and who have so ably built and supervised the construction of many airports, camps, cantonments, and hospitals throughout the United States, some of them within the borders of South Carolina. The question as to whether the Army engineers themselves will eventually do the construction work or whether they will have it done by contract is a matter to be determined. The navigation and flood-control features must be and should be totally supervised by the Army engineers and approved by the Federal Power Commission, according to law. The generation of electric power and the sale of the power must, of course, be determined by the Federal Power Commission, according to law. It has been suggested in the bill that the disposal of the power be under the Department of the Interior.

No doubt, after public hearings, this section will of necessity have to be amended. The amendments which should be adopted will depend upon the public boards that may be created by the laws of the State of South Carolina, in keeping with whatever jurisdiction may be given these public bodies by State law.

At the present time in South Carolina we have rural electrification cooperators in nearly every section.

We have spent millions of dollars since 1932 on this program, and an excellent job has been done, but in my opinion, the program is only in its infancy, and when peace returns no doubt the extension of these lines will reach every area of South Carolina. It is, therefore, my hope that every farm home and every rural building will at least have the opportunity of having electricity. This organization will, of course, be a large consumer of the power to be generated and should be given every consideration in the purchase of power.

Another important public power body in South Carolina is the South Carolina Public Service Authority. However, the jurisdiction of this Authority is limited by State law. Naturally, it should have authority over the power to be generated within the limitation of the State law, according to our State statutes.

Outside the jurisdiction of this Authority several dams are contemplated in the upper section of South Carolina, and I am hopeful that by State law there can be created public bodies which can negotiate with the Interior Department for the use—that is, the sale and distribution—of the electricity on the terms that may be enacted into South Carolina laws.

For many years consideration and thought have been given to the proper creation of these power authorities.

We know in the creation of these authorities it is necessary that they be so constituted as to have a uniform rate of electricity so that one will not cripple the other.

There is one other question that must be considered, and that is the question of taxation. No specific section is devoted exclusively to this problem for the reason that I would prefer the representatives of the sovereign State itself, after hearings, to suggest the best method. It may be that the State would expect a certain refund to each of the counties affected by the removal of taxable property that would be used for the developments. Or perhaps it may be determined that a certain generation tax or sales tax on the power generated would take care of the situation for the various political subdivisions. It is essential, of course, that school districts and other necessary government functions of the State shall not be deprived of their necessary revenue to operate and shall be fully protected.

Madam President, many years ago the first section of this development, costing approximately $50,000,000, was approved by the Congress of the United States. The loan was obtained through the Interior Department, under the Public Works Program, by former Senator Byrnes, and the project developed has literally been a lifesaver for the industries in the immediate area. It was my pleasure at that time to serve as chairman, and well do I know the fight we had through the courts and through the legislature to make possible the realization of the project. Today, Madam President, I am aware that it will be several years before the rivers are completely developed, but I am just as certain that this will eventually be done as I am that the sun will rise tomorrow.

I know it will be a long, hard, up-hill fight, because all those who are opposed to public ownership of power will be most violent against those of us favoring the development of our State. However, Madam President, when the project is completed, South Carolina will again return to the prominence in business and in industry that it once held. The development will bring industry to our State; it will give worth-while jobs to the returning members of the armed forces, and will materially improve our agricultural productivity. It will make every man's home within our borders a better place in which to live.

In conclusion, it shall be my desire to have this project approved, and to have this bill enacted with proper amendments, after extending public hearings.

This bill is in no way intended to affect, and will not affect, the Savannah River or any of its tributaries on which the Clarks Hill development has already been approved, and which development I have supported, and always shall support, as the cheapest and best production power project in the entire Southeast.

Neither does it interfere with the present operation of the South Carolina Public Service Authority.

On yesterday the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, requested that the report on the Santee River by the Chief of the Army engineers be printed as a Senate document. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed as a part of my remarks the report and a memorandum from the Federal Power Commission, together with a letter from the Bureau of the Budget.

There being no objection, the report, memorandum, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1944.

Maj. Gen. E. REYBOLD,
Chief of Engineers,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL REYBOLD: This is in response to your letter dated December 17, 1943, transmitting the reports of the division engineer and of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on the Santee and Congaree Rivers, N. C. and S. C., and requesting the comments of the Commission with respect to these reports.

The Board recommends a general plan for the improvement of the Santee, Congaree, and Broad Rivers in the interests of navigation and power development, and for other purposes, including recreation and incidental flood control. The general plan includes dam and reservoir projects, all with power, at the Clinchfield, Greater Lockhart, Blairs, Frost Shoals, Columbia, and Buckingham Landing sites. The total estimated cost of these improvements is $163,250,000. On the average, the annual generation of electric energy at these projects would aggregate about one and a half billion kilowatt-hours at an average cost of about 4¾ mills per kilowatt-hour.

As a first step in the improvement of these rivers the Board recommends the construction of the Blairs, Frost Shoals, and Columbia developments, together with channel improvements, at an estimated cost of $51,511,000, these projects to be followed by the construction of other units of the development when it is determined that a suitable market for the power exists or is reasonably to be expected in the near future.

The estimates of the Board have been based upon its conclusion that provision should be made to construct, operate, and maintain transmission lines, substations, and facilities and structures appurtenant thereto, as may be found necessary for the transmission, interchange, and sale of the energy, the power to be disposed of under contracts approved by the Federal Power Commission.

By letter, dated May 7, 1941, the Commission transmitted to your Department its comments and conclusions with respect to an earlier report on the development of these rivers. In its letter the Commission expressed its general concurrence with the conclusion in that report that the comprehensive development of these rivers in the interests of navigation, power, and other beneficial purposes is desirable. As a result of studies by its staff, however, the Commission suggested that the height of the Blairs dam be increased by about 30 feet so as to impound water to elevation 340 feet, and that a dam at the Frost Shoals site with water impounded to elevation 230 feet be substituted for the then proposed high-dam Columbia project. As a part of this modification it was also suggested that the existing low-head dam at Columbia on the Broad River near its mouth be redeveloped by raising that dam so as to provide pondage for reregulation of the power plant discharges in the interest of navigation.

The Commission staff has reviewed the recent report of your Department and reports that the plans now proposed include projects at the Blairs and Frost Shoals sites which are in conformity with the above expressed views of the Commission. The staff also reports on the basis of its continued studies that the construction of these two projects as now proposed is desirable; that the new plan for the construction of the Columbia reregulating dam below the confluence of the Saluda and Broad Rivers is in the interest of the best development of the basin; and that projects at the Clinchfield and Buckingham Landing sites, as proposed by the Board, will be desirable units in the plan to develop comprehensively the resources of the Santee Basin. It appears, however, that further consideration should be given to the possibilities for the economic development of the power potentialities in the vicinity of Gaston Shoals and Cherokee Falls, and to modifications in the plans for the Greater Lockhart project.

The plan of the division engineer for Greater Gaston Shoals provides for a high dam downstream from the existing Gaston Shoals station that would submerge the existing plant. The division engineer finds that the costs of such a project would exceed the benefits and he does not recommend its construction. On the basis of its studies, with the limited data available, the Commission staff reports that it appears economically feasible to redevelop the existing Gaston Shoals and Cherokee Falls stations so as to develop the head between the proposed Clinchfield and existing 99 islands projects in two new developments. Under this modification, the Greater Gaston Shoals Dam would be constructed a short distance upstream from the existing Gaston Shoals Dam, with pool at elevation 660; and a new dam would be constructed a short distance upstream from the existing Cherokee Falls Dam, impounding water to elevation 555. On the basis of its preliminary studies the staff estimates the aggregate cost of these two redevelopments, with a total installed capacity of 37,000 kilowatts, at about $13,500,000. The studies indicate that the two projects in this modified plan would have a ratio of benefits to cost of 1.27.

The Greater Lockhart plan of the division engineer contemplates the construction of a high dam above the existing Lockhart station, and changes in the existing Lockhart station. Under this plan full pool elevation would be 510. The existing 99 islands station would be drowned out and heavy flowage damage due to the inundation of highways, railways, industries, and other improvements would result. The staff believes for these reasons that the new dam should be constructed with full pool at elevation 440 instead of 510. Based upon operation at higher load-factor than contemplated by the division engineer the installed capacity at this lesser dam would be about 14,000 kilowatts. Exclusive of the changes that would be made to the existing Lockhart station, the estimate of cost of this modified Greater Lockhart development is about $7,000,000 and the ratio of benefits to cost is about 1.38. The total head that would be developed under either plan would be substantially the same and there would be little if any reduction in energy output under the staff's plan which envisions the maintaining in service of the existing 99 islands station.

Under the plan for stage development of the river, it is to be expected that the Gaston Shoals and Lockhart redevelopments will not be undertaken in the immediate future, and the Commission recommends that consideration and study, in cooperation with its staff, be given to the modifications in the plans of the division engineer along the lines suggested above.

The Commission staff also observes that the plans of the division engineer for power are based upon operation at about 25 percent load factor whereas in its opinion initial installations in this basin should be made for operation at about 50 percent load factor. The staff's studies of the economics of the proposed developments have been made on the basis of this higher load factor.

Based upon its previous consideration of the possibilities for the development of the Santee River Basin, upon a review of the more recent reports of your department, and upon studies by the Commission staff, the Commission believes that the comprehensive development of the Santee, Congaree, and Broad Rivers is desirable and in this connection refers again to its letter, dated May 7, 1941, in which it was concluded that the development should be undertaken.

Subject to such modifications as may prove advisable, after further consideration by your department and the Commission of the alternatives suggested herein for the developments in the vicinity of Gaston Shoals and Lockhart, the Commission is in general accord with the plans of your department for the development of these rivers. The Commission believes that the development should take place on a step-by-step basis and is of the opinion that the Blairs and the Columbia reregulating dam projects should be undertaken first and at such time as the war emergency permits and makes advisable, to be followed by the Clinchfield project, in the interest primarily of additional regulation on the river, and by the Frost Shoals project. The programming for construction of the other projects included in the plan would be predicated upon continuing surveys of power markets and of the possibilities for expanding the use of electric power in the region.

The enabling legislation should contain a provision in substance like that suggested in the Commission's letter of May 7 with respect to benefits received by any power project, not under Federal license, on account of the operation of any development authorized under the act. The language included in H. R. 3961, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, with respect to the proposed Clark Hill reservoir project on the Savannah River appears to protect adequately these interests of the United States.

The Commission will have its staff continue to advise with your engineers in their further detailed studies of the development of this basin.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
Chairman.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF WATER POWER,
April 11, 1944.

MEMORANDUM RE SANTEE AND CONGAREE RIVERS, NORTH AND SOUTH CAROLINA

This memorandum is a brief of the plan and program of development of the Santee and Congaree Rivers as envisaged by the Commission in Chairman Old's letter to Gen. E. Reybold dated April 4, 1944.

The plan is basically similar to that of the War Department as reported by the division engineer on October 6, 1942, with some modifications for obtaining greater utilization of the river resources. In this connection, reference is made to my recent conference with Senator MAYBANK, who expressed interest in the further development of the river resources for the people of South Carolina.

The multiple-purpose development of the Santee River is, in effect, already under way with the completion of the Pinopolis project for navigation, flood control, and power. The plan set forth herein extends the development up river to include the Congaree and its principal tributary, the Broad River. This will extend navigation to Columbia, S. C., and will provide a substantial block of hydroelectric power, as well as incidental benefits to reduce floods and provide for recreational improvements. By the construction of eight dam and reservoir projects, estimated to cost approximately $134,000,000, including power equipment and transmission facilities, there will be provided:

1. A navigable waterway from the Pinopolis Dam to Columbia, with initial depth of waterway 8 feet and, ultimately, 10 feet.

2 The generation of 1,450,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually by the installation of 285,000 kilowatts of generating capacity.

3. Improved electric generation at the existing power plants on the Broad River and at the Pinopolis power plant.

4. Incidental flood control and other benefits.

The total net benefits of the plan are estimated to exceed the cost, with sufficient margin to provide electric energy at a cost lower than by fuel-generated power in this area.

Control of the Santee-Congress and Broad Rivers would be obtained, in the main, by three large reservoirs, the Clinchfield, Blairs, and Buckingham Landing. The Columbia reregulation pond will provide for a steady river flow to make navigation possible prior to the construction of the Buckingham Landing project.

The summary of the projects follows:

Project name	Gross head	Continuous power (kilowatts)	Initial installed capacity (kilowatts)	Ultimate capacity planned for (kilowatts)	Average annual energy (kilowatt-hours)
Clinchfield	140	6,500	25,000	25,000	59,000,000
Greater Gaston	105	10,000	25,000	50,000	120,000,000
Greater Cherokee	35	5,000	12,000	12,000	50,000,000
Greater Lockhart	45	7,000	14,000	14,000	80,000,000
Blairs	80	20,000	54,000	80,000	220,000,000
Frost Shoals	70	22,000	40,000	60,000	245,000,000
Columbia	42	12,000	30,000	40,000	176,000,000
Buckingham Landing	55	38,000	85,000	126,000	500,000,000
Total, 8 new plants	---	120,500	285,000	507,000	1,450,000,000

By this plan the improved regulation of the river flow will provide for the installation of 285,000 kilowatts, of which 253,000 kilowatts would be dependable for interconnected system use at 50-percent load factor. Beyond this, the dependable capacity value at the existing power plants: Ninety-nine Islands, Lockhart, Parr Shoals, and Pinopolis would be increased by 50,000 kilowatts to provide an additional 90,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. Thus the total additional dependable capacity on the river would be 303,000 kilowatts.

Both the War Department and the Federal Power Commission have studied this river for several years with a view to a practical initial program to provide sufficient reservoirs to control the Broad River to a point where the river flow at Columbia will be about 5,000 cubic feet per second to provide navigable depth in the river below Columbia. For this purpose the minimum initial program would include the Blairs reservoir and power plant and a reregulating dam and power plant at Columbia.

The War Department has included the Frost Shoals project for early construction along with Blairs and Columbia. The Commission staff believes that the Clinchfield reservoir should be constructed ahead of Frost Shoals in order to obtain a high degree of river control and to provide benefits along the entire length of the Broad River. Furthermore, it appears that the best over-all economy can be obained by an initial plan consisting of four projects which will cost, with transmission facilities, about $58,000,000. These projects are summarized below in what appears now to be a desirable order of construction. The Clinchfield and Frost Shoals projects would follow Blairs and Columbia as closely as power market and other conditions would warrant.

Project name	Gross head	Continuous power (kilowatts)	Initial installed capacity (kilowatts)	Ultimate capacity planned for (kilowatts)	Average annual energy (kilowatt-hours)
Blairs	80	20,000	54,000	80,000	220,000,000
Columbia	42	10,000	30,000	40,000	176,000,000
Clinchfield	140	6,500	25,000	25,000	59,000,000
Frost Shoals	70	22,000	40,000	60,000	245,000,000
Total, 4 projects	---	58,500	149,000	205,000	700,000,000

These four projects would provide the most economical block of hydroelectric power that can be obtained from the further developments in the Santee and Congaree Rivers. The cost of production would be about 3.9 mills per kilowatt-hour.

It would be possible to construct an initial project at Buckingham Landing to provide for greater navigable depths to Columbia and also navigable waterways to Camden, S. C. If this project were selected initially, the project cost would be about the same as for the combined Blairs, Columbia, Clinchfield, and Frost Shoals projects, which would produce 700,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. In the case of Buckingham Landing there would be generated 500,000,000 kilowatt-hours at a cost of about 4.9 mills per kilowatt-hour.

KENNETH W. ROSS,
Senior Engineer.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will acknowledge your letter of April 17, 1944, transmitting copies of the proposed report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 13, 1944, on the Santee River of North Carolina and South Carolina, with a view to determining the advisability of improving existing conditions for navigation on the Santee and Congaree Rivers so as to provide for navigation to Columbia, S. C., and for the development of hydroelectric power in that vicinity and requesting advice as to the relationship of the proposed report to the program of the President.

A review of this proposed report indicates that the improvements recommended by the Chief of Engineers are in harmony with a long-range plan for the development of the water resources in this drainage basin. If the full benefits of these improvements are to be realized, however, it is obvious that adequate provisions must be made (a) for the transmission and sale of the hydroelectic power developed at the site of the improvements, and (b) for the payment to the United States of reasonable and equitable sums from the owners of existing hydroelectric plants to cover the water-flow regulation benefits accruing to these plants by reason of the operation of the recommended improvements.

The transmission and sale of the hydroelectric power that would be developed at the site of the recommended improvements should be integrated with the operations of other publicly owned hydroelectric power systems in the area, including the existing Santee-Cooper and Buzzards Roost developments and the proposed Clark Hill project. Moreover, if full use is to be made of the available power resources in the Southeastern States, adequate interconnections will be required with other transmission systems. It would appear, therefore, that these power transmission and marketing problems merit further study, and that it, accordingly, would be better to omit any present provision for the construction of transmission lines, except those interconnecting elements of the project, or for the transmission and sale of power, and leave this matter for determination at a later date.

The operation of the recommended power improvements will result in water-flow regulation benefits to certain existing privately owned hydroelectric power plants not licensed by the Federal Power Commission. In his letter of April 11, 1944, to the Chief of Engineers, a copy of which is enclosed with the proposed report, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission takes the position, which would appear appropriate, that the authorizing language for the improvements should include a provision to assure collection by the United States of annual charges from the owners of such unlicensed projects for these water-flow benefits, along the lines of the provisions with respect to the proposed Clark Hill Reservoir project on the Savannah River, as contained in the bill, H. R. 3961, now pending in the Congress.

In addition to what has been said above, I must also advise you that, in the absence of evidence showing that the proposed improvements are necessary to the prosecution of the war, the submission during the present emergency of any estimate of appropriation for construction of the improvements would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Very truly yours,

———— ————,
Director.

CLIFFORD K. BERRYMAN

Mr. DAVIS. Madam President, recently the Pulitzer Prize Committee announced its list of awards for the past year, and among those honored was Clifford Berryman, affectionately known as Cliff, whose outstanding ability as a cartoonist has at long last been accorded the recognition it justly merits.

Cliff Berryman possesses that rare gift of creative artistry which permits him to portray an outstanding event, or to drive home a vital point, with but a few flashes of his magic pen. And in all his trenchant and timely works Clifford Berryman retains a sense of sound restraint and intellectual balance which adds greatly to the appeal and the worthiness of his product. Berryman's works are never marred by blind passion, by sheer partisanship, or by violent personal implications. He is as sound, as well balanced, and as highly regarded as the newspaper he serves.

I have known Mr. Berryman and his work throughout the twenty-odd years which I have spent in Washington, and I am satisfied, both through my personal acquaintance with the man and through my continued observation of his consistently fine work, that he is one of the outstanding representatives of the American free press, and that he is indeed worthy of the recognition and high honor which have come to him.

Madam President, as an indication of the high esteem with which Mr. Berryman is regarded by his colleagues of the press, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, an editorial which appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Post, bearing the plain title "Berryman," and which sets forth in some detail a number of the high lights of Mr. Berryman's outstanding career.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERRYMAN

It was a great pleasure to read that the work of our long-celebrated townsman, Mr. Clifford Berryman, of the Evening Star, has been recognized by the Pulitzer prize committee, though we must say the recognition is rather belated. We feel pretty sure that Mr. Berryman's colleagues of the Star will not take it amiss if we claim for ourselves a slight share of their pride in this honor. After all, Mr. Berryman is one of a rather long list of Post alumni who have distinguished themselves in—well, you must not expect us to say greener pastures, but, at any rate, in other pastures. It was, if we may say so, the Post which rescued Mr. Berryman from the bushel under which he had been hiding in the Drafting Division of the Patent

Office. It was the Post that in 1889 published his first newspaper illustration, and that, you recall, was even longer ago than the first Roosevelt administration; it was, in fact, in the first Cleveland administration. It was in the Post, too, that the teddy bear, probably the most famous and popular of all cartoon symbols, first appeared.

Since then Mr. Berryman has become as much a Washington institution as, say, the Marine Band or the Easter Monday egg rollings. It seems to us that, good as they were to begin with, his cartoons have been quietly improving all these years. The taste for them is, to be sure, an acquired taste, but at least three generations of Washingtonians have acquired it as naturally as they acquire the language. A Berryman cartoon is more likely to provoke a smile or a chuckle than an outright laugh, but this, according to the wise men, is the higher form of humor. Thus, his method is greatly in contrast to the prevailing fashion, which tends toward sharp and acid satire. The Berryman satire is oblique rather than direct and softened by an instinctive kindliness. If he "nothing extenuates," neither does he "set down aught in malice." In other ways, too, as, for example, in his use of the device of the conversational balloon, Mr. Berryman may seem a bit old-fashioned, but to his devotees this is an essential part of his charm, and as for draftsmanship and general technical excellence he has had few peers; offhand, we can think only of the late Winsor McKay and George McManus, neither of whom was very successful with purely political subjects.

FARMING CONDITIONS IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. LANGER. Madam President, I am in receipt of a letter from a very outstanding farm woman in North Dakota. The lady writes concerning some of the problems which are confronted by the women, as well as the men, residing on the farms of this country. The letter coming, as it does, from an outstanding farm lady, it is my opinion that it is worthy of the attention of every Senator. The letter reads:

UNDERWOOD, N. DAK., *April 3, 1944.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I saw in the Minneapolis Journal that the farmer was forbidden to pay more than $200 a month for farm labor. What farmer can pay $200 a month for labor? Also the farmer must board, room, wash, mend, and cart a hired man around with the family, and have a lunch in the field in the afternoon and the coffee pot continually on the stove in case he should come to the house for refreshment between meals. In 1940 wages were from $30 to $40 per month and $2.50 to $3 per day for threshing and harvest; now we pay $6 per day for ordinary labor, putting in crop, haying, or harvesting, for extra help as well as our hired man in harvest. So we have inflation of wages, deflation of prices of what we raise. The Government asked for extra hogs, but made no provision for taking care of the meat. The packers got a subsidy payment and the farmers lost hundreds of dollars. It was a debacle like the killing of the little pigs (see HENRY WALLACE for particulars).

North Dakota is famed for recurrences of droughts, in a bad year we would not net enough to pay our hired help even at $75 per month. The farmer's wife works from dawn 'til dark, the children work. The farmer has no tires for his car, he cannot get repairs for his old machinery and he cannot buy new, only at ruinous prices. He has to be a wizard to keep things going, 5 a. m. 'til 10 or 11 o'clock are his hours, for he must toil alone with what aid he can get from his family and never can count on anything coming in at the end of the year. A crop is ruined so easily in the making. The man who fills a Government contract can pay. He knows the money will be there rain or shine if he fills his part of the contract. We have had 3 good years, we have paid many debts. We still owe on seed and a feed loan partially paid. We must deny ourselves even of things we badly need to buy War bonds and aid the Red Cross. What is in store for the farmer? Should not the farmer receive as much as the workers in war plants? Through proper payment for what he produces. Livestock prices must go up as feed prices raise, do they?

Recently three good farmers were at my son's house and all said, "No hired help for me at present wages and prices. We will do what we can and the rest of the land can lie idle." I am 84 years old and I have seen North Dakota in all phases of agriculture. There have been many failures, few good crops, dust storms and hoppers. My husband is personally acquainted with you. No North Dakota farmer wants charity or relief. We want our work appreciated and paid for. We don't want to raise a lot of hogs with no market for them when meat is rationed. We do not want to produce poultry and eggs with high feed costs and markets so glutted we lose money. What is wrong in Washington that such a state of affairs exists?

I believe you are a friend to the farmers of North Dakota.

Yours very sincerely,

Mrs. C. E. MATTOON.

Madam President, upon receipt of this letter I communicated with Mrs. Mattoon and asked her permission to introduced the letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In my opinion, it is a typical letter that represents what the average farmer's wife thinks about the present conditions of agriculture.

I may add that the farmers' wives were begged a year ago to produce poultry and eggs, with the result, because, apparently, the affairs of the Department of Agriculture were so inefficiently handled that they had to produce them at a loss.

I bring this letter to the attention of the Senate, confident in the belief that those of us who are interested in agriculture will do something to bring to the attention of the Department of Agriculture the present ruinous situation which agriculture is facing.

POLAND IS NOT YET LOST WHILE WE ARE ALIVE

Mr. DANAHER. Madam President, when last fall there came before the Senate Resolution 192, known as the Connally resolution, we had under consideration the nature of possible advice to the Chief Executive with reference to our international situation. The second paragraph of the Connally resolution called upon the United States to take the position that our Nation "cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace."

It seemed to me at the time, that the word "peace" should be given some definite connotation. I offered an amendment to the resolution which would have defined the term "peace" to mean an agreement for peace, an agreement among nations which would be designed to result in a state of tranquillity to be enjoyed by political society.

Clearly, Madam President, unless the minds and the hearts of men shall be equal to an acceptance of the obligations they say they are willing to assume, no pact to be written can be worth the paper upon which it appears. It seemed to me that we should, as a matter of advice, call to the attention of the Chief Executive at least minimum standards upon which we would engage to proceed and whose acceptance the American people would expect from the comrades in arms with whom we were to deal in our agreement for peace.

Thus, Madam President, I sought to have the Senate include in its declared understanding of the term "agreement for peace," provision:

(1) That no signatory nation shall seek aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise;

(2) That no territorial changes shall be permitted which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

(3) That all peoples shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they shall live, particularly to the end that self-government may be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived thereof;

(4) That they will grant to all nations, great or small, victor or vanquished, access on equal terms to the trade and the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

(5) That they will undertake fullest collaboration among all nations in the economic field to the end that they may enjoy improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

There came to our notice, Madam President, the fact that there was being held at Moscow even then a conference among representatives of several of the comrades in arms. In my discussion of the Connally resolution I remarked:

Mr. President, I stop there to point out that, while at Moscow there was agreement on what is to be done with reference to Italy and Austria, nothing was said with reference to Poland, for example. In a State like the State of Connecticut there are literally thousands upon thousands of boys of Polish extraction who have gone into the armed services of the United States and who are fighting all over the world in the firm belief that they are going to help restore the pre-war borders of the homeland of their parents and to restore Poland, the source of the family line of which they are a part; and yet not a word is even so much as suggested as to what is to be done with reference to Poland. It seems to me that any agreement for peace that is to have any foundation in security, justice, and honor is bound necessarily to take into account the situation with reference to Poland.

Madam President, the amendment which I then sought to the Connally resolution would have embodied the principles so succinctly set forth in the Atlantic Charter, upon which we thought we could rely.

We had delivered to us in the Senate on November 1 the confidential release of the State Department dealing with the agenda at the tripartite conference at Moscow, which purported to state the results of the meeting. We know now from our review of the joint declaration issued by the secretaries of the several governments participating at Moscow that there were many questions upon which agreement was not had. I quote from it Madam President, because, in the light of the events which have transpired in the intervening months, new connotations surely must be attributed to

the language which appeared in the State Department release. I quote:

The agenda included all questions submitted for discussion by the three governments.

I pause in my quotation, Madam President, because I am as certain as I stand here that when that release reached us while the Connally resolution was under consideration, the plain intendment of the language in the minds of the Senators present was that the tripartite conference had included all questions which had been raised or were then foreseeable as constituting possible sources of difficulty among the three nations there represented; in the light of what we know has since happened, we may reread that sentence to mean that the agenda included all questions submitted, but only those submitted, for discussion by the three governments.

I recur to the release, and to the paragraph from which I earlier quoted:

Some of the questions called for final decisions, and these were taken.

What were the questions not submitted, or what were those upon which final decision could not be had? We do not know.

On other questions—

I repeat for emphasis—

On other questions—

So that now we are in a second class, obviously—

after discussion, decisions of principle were taken.

So that we may pause now to observe that while agreement was had upon certain questions, as to yet others, "after discussion," only decisions of principle resulted.

These questions were referred for detailed consideration to commissions specially set up for the purpose, or reserved for treatment through diplomatic channels.

Now we come to a third classification:

Other questions again were disposed of by an exchange of views.

They were disposed of by an "exchange of views." Obviously there remained a class of questions upon which the exchange was had, but no agreement reached and no settlement achieved. I think we may fairly conclude that among the questions in the latter class were those involving the Baltic states of Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the contiguous state of Poland.

Before we undertake to evaluate just what happened at Moscow, Madam President, I suggest to my colleagues, in the light of more recent events, that we must some time learn what were the questions raised upon which no agreement could be had. When we know by whom and precisely what questions were raised upon which disagreement followed, then and then only will we be able in sum to adjudge what happened at Moscow. Whatever those questions were, they must have been deeply significant, for we may recall that in a few short weeks, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill flew thousands of miles across the ocean to meet Mr. Stalin at Teheran. Just what were the results of that conference, we do not know.

Certainly the Atlantic Charter, the terms of which we reasonably thought had been made the basis of our national action, has been relegated to a limbo all its own. Mr. Stalin has obviously insisted upon dealing unilaterally with reference to the territories contiguous to Russia. Mr. Churchill has told Parliament that the Atlantic Charter must be revised in the light of "changed conditions." Within the 3 weeks Mr. Hull has told the people of the United States that the principles of the Atlantic Charter comprise "objectives" toward which we must strive.

Madam President, in the light of the fact that the Atlantic Charter had been so firmly and fully relied upon by our citizens, to find our comrades-in-arms abjuring the principles upon which it proceeded, to the point where agreement has not been had, is certainly the cause for concern on the part of the American people. That is the more particularly true when we refer to the Department of State bulletin for January 3, 1942, where we can find the joint declaration by the United Nations which, signed by the representatives of all the nations therein participating, included the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

I mention such things at this time, Madam President, because it seems to me we might against this background pause to ponder our position, particularly as related to Poland. In the words of the title of the Polish national anthem, "Poland is not yet lost while we are alive." And today, on the fifth anniversary of the last free celebration of the 3d day of May, Independence Day in Poland, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "May the Third in Polish History," by Eric Topen, which appears in the April 29, 1944, issue of the splendid weekly, America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY THE THIRD IN POLISH HISTORY

(By Eric Topen)

Every world crisis provokes a deeper study of history. Men become dissatisfied with shallow and short-sighted explanations of the present in terms of the present, and are thus unconsciously impelled to go back to the past, there to seek the source of the current mystery and confusion. Unfortunately, when they do so, they very often become anachronistic. They place themselves in the periods of the past and judge them according to present-day standards. Or else they will make of each country or each century such a separate unit of world history that proportion is lost. In short, they become careless about historical context.

Disastrous as this situation is, there are those who sin even more against history by denying or overlooking the factor of Divine Providence. Many consider history to be nothing else than a series of political, social, and economic changes, with various countries playing their unforeseen parts and then slowly vanishing into time. To them history is just an enigma, and a terrifying one at that. And well it might be terrifying if we did not leave provision for God's Providence in the guidance of man throughout history. It is only, therefore, in the proper historical perspective and the light of God's Providence that we can truly estimate the glory and the value of the event that every Pole remembers on the 3d of May.

What does the 3d of May 1791, represent to the world? To every Pole it may be his chief national holiday, the day of the constitution. To the world, it is another step in the progress of man toward freedom. What the Declaration of Independence represents to an American, and the Magna Carta to an Englishman, the constitution of the 3d of May represents to the Pole. It is his declaration of the rights of man. At the same time it represents the transformation of a medieval Polish state into a modern constitutional monarchy. Tragically enough, however, whereas Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence were given an opportunity to be applied and bear fruit, the Polish Constitution was choked within a few year of its birth by greedy and unscrupulous neighbors. That is one reason why its story is interesting. Why should neighboring powers try to abolish a conservative constitution which favored the rights of man? The answer to this question involves the story of the government and the constitutional procedure in Poland from its earliest times. This is the story which forms the historic background to the events of the 3d of May.

The original Government of Poland consisted of a council of the chief nobles and the higher clergy, wiece, over which the King presided. These nobles, szlachta, were great landowners and cultivated large estates over which they ruled in the manner of princes. Depending on the great lord or noble, there usually were attached to the same estate many petite noblesse, nobles of lesser fortune, who, although the lord's dependents, were theoretically his equals. There was another class of nobles little known among many historians, who could be termed the "middle class" nobles. They generally took very little interest in politics and were content in the quiet management of their own estates.

Yet one and all, the nobility sedulously reserved to itself two privileges, viz, that of bearing arms and that of owning land. Besides these two, there were of course other privileges which were received as favors from the kings. Thus, in 1374, King Louis of Anjou by the Privilege of Kassa exempted the szlachta from virtually all taxes and from all national duties except military service. In 1454, the szlachta, by the Statutes of Nieszawa, obtained from Casimir IV the promise that all laws henceforth would be made only with the approval of the nobles and that no general mobilization would be ordered without their consent.

The wiece in time became the Senate (the Upper House), presided over by the King. The coming of the Lower House represented the growing political consciousness of the petite noblesse. They at first gathered into local diets called dietines, sejmiki, for discussions relevant to the proper management of provincial affairs. Gradually dietines here and there began to send deputies to the King's Council until finally, in 1493, at the Diet of Piotrków, they were all represented. This form of bicameral diet was formally recognized by the statute Nihil Novi in 1505, and henceforth the legislative body consisted of the Senate (formerly the Royal Council), and the Chamber of Deputies (containing the representatives of the dietines).

The General Diet or Sejm thus began in grand style. From its inception it virtually controlled the King by making him dependent upon it for money and military support. Some time later it asserted two peculiar rights: the liberum veto, and the right of confederation. The first was prompted by a desire to have unanimity of consent in regard to any law or project before it could be passed. Henceforth, by a simple utterance of Nie

pozwalam (I do not allow it), any member of the diet in session could blast the law which was proposed and which was pending adoption.

But this veto at the same time dissolved the diet and invalidated all the laws passed during the self-same session. True, while the nobility held to its high ideals, this extraordinary prerogative was never used. The day came, though, in 1652, when a nobleman, perhaps intoxicated with an irrational love of freedom, shrieked nie pozwalam in a session of the diet. That shriek was almost equivalent to a death-knell of orderly procedure in the legislative body. For from that day on to 1764, of the 55 Diets held 48 were dissolved. There was a means of overcoming the liberum veto and this was the second right asserted by the nobility, the right of confederation. According to it, any coterie of nobles could arm itself to put over a favorite law—by force, if necessary.

Such was the growth of this unwritten Polish Constitution under the guidance and protection of the nobility. This might have all been very well, indeed, if the nobility were the only class in Poland. Of course, there were others: The townsmen or the burghers, and the ever-present peasants. At most, the nobility formed 5 to 8 percent of the population, the townsmen accounted for another 15 percent, and the peasants, the remainder, constituted the greater part of the population. But while rights and privileges were accruing to the nobility, the rest of the nation stood waiting. The Polish constitutional development was obviously one-sided The scale was tipping, and the balance was heavy on one side. As a matter of fact, the more rights the nobility received, the fewer obligations they cared to assume. The more rights the nobility acquired, the more they wanted to keep them, regardless of whether or not they were proving themselves disastrous to the welfare of the nation. Many a zealous king tried sincerely to reform this situation and to suppress such anomalous constitutional procedure. John Casimir ominously warned that the state would be annihilated if there was not a reform in head and members of those wielding authority.

Nor was he wrong. Th neighboring powers, especially those who had plans for territorial aggrandizement, were well aware of the pitiable one-sided constitutional growth, and they encouraged its promotion until the life-blood of Poland was sapped. In a secret meeting in 1763, Catherine the Great made a pact with Frederick the Great to protect this death-bearing constitution and to prevent its alteration.

It was to remedy this state of affairs that the Great Diet convened in Warsaw on October 6, 1788. The majority of its members specifically entered it with a desire for constitutional reform. Consequently the diet was in good hands from the beginning. To avoid future bickering, a provision was passed that for this session the majority would rule. To obtain security against aggressors, an alliance was made with Frederick William II of Prussia. Then the committees of deputies began their great work, which took 4 years to complete.

It took a long time; but here the work of centuries had to be reformed as well as the ideas of certain nobles, ideas which were equally old. Finally, after much oratory, after much delay, after much strife, the diet was nearing its end; a new constitution had been drawn up and was ready for adoption. There now remained but one difficulty in sight—the long period of time which it usually takes for a country to adopt a new constitution. Conscious of this, the majority of the patriotic nobles secretly resolved to introduce the constitution and have it adopted the same day. Incidentally, the whole procedure of the diet with regard to the constitution was more or less veiled with secrecy, simply to prevent the neighboring nations from knowing what was taking place, lest they prematurely suffocate it. But by the morning of the third of May, 1791, all Warsaw knew that something was in the air. The galleries of the diet were filled to capacity very early, while, outside, the streets were packed with cheering throngs anxious to see what the Great Diet had in store for them.

The session of the day began seriously. There was a preliminary statement read from the Deputation of Foreign Interests concerning the evil reports of another planned partition of Poland. This, the reader said, was in danger of taking place unless the Poles did something definite—and at once. Ignacy Potocki, the marshal of the diet, asked the King what he would do to save his country. The King, Stanislaus Poniatowski, produced the constitution. It was read aloud and greeted with shouts of approval. But then the objections of reactionaries began. There were some who especially opposed the clause which made the crown hereditary. They felt that their most precious heritage—freedom—would be taken away by this move. In the end, the King and the patriotic majority prevailed. The King, calling the Bishop of Cracow, Felix Paul Turski, had that ecclesiastical dignitary administer to him the oath to the constitution and, to be better seen by the assembled diet in the enactment of this historic role, he stood on a chair and was sworn audibly. What an amazing event in the "age of enlightenment." A king relinquished some of his power, not because he was coerced, but because he understood the meaning of freedom to such an extent that he wanted others to share in it.

Immediately the patriotic nobles, clergy and others, raised their right hands in one accord and swore allegiance to the constitution. Then the King, truly inspired, called on everyone who had taken the oath there with him in the diet to go to the Church of Saint John and repeat it before the altar. A procession formed, consisting of all the senators, all the bishops, most of the deputies, and a tumult of people, and marched with renewed vigor to the palace church. There the elite of the country pledged their lives and honor to uphold the constitution. When the organ sounded the Te Deum, many must have secretly breathed a prayer of thanksgiving to God in gratitude for His continuous providence over the destinies of the country. After the ceremony, a volley of 200 cannons was set off to confirm to the city and the nearby country the completion of the long-sought event.

That evening Warsaw was a city of joy. The rejoicing was spontaneous and buoyant, yet it never went beyond the point of good order, even though it did continue throughout the night. There was much reason for joy. One of the great revolutions of mankind was accomplished without the sacrifice of a drop of blood! It is no wonder, then, that Edmund Burke, that eminent British orator, could call it probably the most pure and defecated public good which ever has been conferred on mankind. This was the 3d of May 1791, a spring day or, better, a harbinger of a second spring for Poland.

An analysis of the articles of the new constitution reveals how thorough it was and how revolutionary. The Catholic religion was reaffirmed to be the religion of the state, but toleration was granted to all other beliefs. The crown was made hereditary in the Saxon line. The government was organized into three parts: Executive (consisting of the King and his council), legislative (composed of the chamber of senators and the chamber of deputies), and judicial. City and town dwellers (burghers) were given rights and allowed to send representatives to the diet. Trade restrictions between the nobleman and the burgher were removed and the middle class was encouraged. Those antiquated privileges, the liberum veto and the right of confederation were abolished. Most revolutionary, perhaps, for those times, was the article which placed the peasant directly under the protection of the government and its law. Henceforth, if any contract was made between the noble and the peasant, both parties were subject to its terms. The millennium of political order and national brotherhood was slowly becoming a reality in Poland.

But the new portentous spring was not allowed to mature into a second summer. It was the age of despots, but what made it worse was that their dominions surrounded Poland. Under these circumstances, what chance had even a 3d of May? The constitution had barely been signed when plans were drawn up for a second partition. Frederick William II, the traitor who had just recently signed a treaty with Poland, and Catherine the Great, the amoral Empress of Russia, could not bear to see the rejuvenation of a country which they had proclaimed to the world to be dead. This time they would make sure that there would be no Poland—forever. And, indeed, when the Russian and Prussian Armies marched into Poland, and the second and third partitions occurred, to many this seemed an accomplished fact.

The fait accompli, however, never achieved the effect which the conquerors expected. How could it? The 3d of May was too great for them. The 3d of May was Poland's answer for all time that she was still very much alive. Years—nay, centuries—later the downtrodden nation could honestly sing in its national anthem, "Jeszcze Polska nie zginela"—"Poland is not yet lost while we are alive." It could always turn to the 3d of May for inspiration in the fight to attain and retain freedom.

This is the story of the constitution of May 3, 1791. These are the facts. Placed in its historical context, it stands as a truly great revolution, and one of the first in eastern Europe. To Divine Providence, to which all things are near and nothing is hidden, must be given the chief gratitude for that day. How wisely It preordained that the constitution should appear at that point of time when it would do the nation the most good. The members of the Great Diet must have been very conscious of this themselves, since one of their first moves after signing the constitution was to order that a special church be built to Divine Providence for His care over the nation. It is to the same Divine Providence that Poland turns again today, praying that, just as He had given it the 3d of May, so now He may give it freedom.

THE SEDITION TRIAL IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, about 2 days ago there was transmitted to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate an instrument entitled "Petition for Redress of Grievances." It was addressed to the chairman of both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees. The matter had to do entirely with a case now in course of trial in the District of Columbia, a case in which we learn from the press, an attempt is being made to empanel a jury. It is generally termed in the press "the sedition case."

Not desiring or deeming it best to deal with the matter individually, but having my own personal views as to the jurisdiction of my committee, or any committee of the Congress, I transmitted the matter to a subcommittee, with the letter which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

MAY 2, 1944.

HON. CARL A. HATCH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: The enclosed instrument, entitled "Petition for Redress of Grievances" came to me in the regular course of the mails today.

The question of jurisdiction or lack of jurisdiction by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate naturally arrests my attention. Moreover, the propriety of any consideration of this matter by the Judiciary Committee concerns me. I feel that the chairman should not act alone on this matter, whatever might be his first impulse in the premises.

I have therefore appointed the following subcommittee to inquire into this matter and report to the full committee as soon as possible: Messrs. HATCH, chairman, EASTLAND, DANAHER.

I have but one copy of the instrument, which is attached hereto. I have transmitted copies of this letter to Senator EASTLAND and Senator DANAHER and I hope you may be able to advise the commmittee at an early date.

Very respectfully,

PAT MCCARRAN.

Mr. McCARRAN. Following that, Mr. President, today the subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary reported to the chairman, and I desire to have the report read, because I think it will enlighten the Senate. It is encompassed in only a few pages, and covers the subject exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 3, 1944.

HON. PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Deeming the matter submitted to us in your letter of yesterday one which requires prompt action, your subcommittee has met and considered the instrument entitled "Petition for Redress of Grievances," purporting to have been submitted to you by one Albert W. Dilling.

This petition relates to Criminal Case No. 73086, now pending before Chief Justice Edward C. Eicher in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. The petition urges "immediately, an official investigation of the conduct of said trial thus far" and that the committee "also immediately designate official representatives to sit in on all future proceedings in said cause, in order that said defendants may henceforth be assured of the fair and impartial trial which the Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee and which has thus far been denied to them."

As indicated in the petition, the trial referred to is known as the sedition trial. Apparently, it has been in progress for some time in the district court and is still in the process of determination. Under these circumstances your committee is unanimously of the opinion that neither the Senate Committee on the Judiciary nor the legislative branch of the Government itself has any present jurisdiction in this matter. It is scarcely necessary to state that the judicial branch of the Government is a separate and independent branch of government. The independence of the judiciary must be maintained. It is a fundamental rule of law of age-old standing that the courts must proceed in the trial and adjudication of cases without let or hindrance from any source, including other branches of the Government.

Your subcommittee is convinced the granting of the request contained in the petition would be an invasion of the powers and prerogatives of the judicial branch of government not contemplated nor warranted by the Constitution or any existing law.

The courts must be left free to function without interference from any source whatever. Freedom of the judicial branch of Government is one of the greatest safeguards and protectors of democratic institutions. Even the appeal to the legislative branch of Government to interfere in the progress of a trial smacks strongly of an attempt to intimidate or influence the court in the discharge of its proper and lawful functions, which cannot be tolerated. The courts, we repeat, must be left free to function in accordance with the established principles of law and justice. If, upon proper showing in the appropriate forum, those principles shall have been found to have been violated or denied the laws of the land provide ample and full opportunity for review and correction. The present trial should follow exactly the same steps and procedure which are followed in all cases. Any departure from established procedure would be injurious to the entire administration of justice.

Your subcommittee, therefore, recommends that the petition be denied.

Very truly yours,

CARL A. HATCH,
Chairman, Subcommittee.
JOHN A. DANAHER,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Members.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to say that I am in full and complete accord with the expressions set forth in the report made by the subcommittee. The members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate do not look with favor, and the present chairman of the committee will never look with favor, on any attempt to bring before that committee or before the Congress matters which belong specifically to and are being dealt with in due course by the courts of the land. The judicial branch of the Government is one branch. The legislative branch is another. So far as the present chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is concerned they should remain distinct and intact.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I should like to state that I join in the sentiment and the language of the report made by the subcommittee. If the executive branch of our Government, as well as the legislative branch, will heed the mandate of the subcommittee, I am sure we will have a better administration of justice and will truly be able to say that we have equal justice under the law as administered by the courts, and not as administered by particular individuals.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FLANNAGAN, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. PACE, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, since a motion has been made to postpone consideration of Senate bill 1718, which yesterday afternoon was made the unfinished business before the Senate, and that motion has not been disposed of, I wish to say a few words on the motion, but before doing so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Austin	George	Reed
Bailey	Gerry	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gillette	Reynolds
Barkley	Green	Robertson
Bilbo	Hatch	Russell
Brewster	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bridges	Hayden	Smith
Brooks	Jackson	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Maybank	Weeks
Cordon	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	Wherry
Davis	Murdock	White
Downey	Murray	Wilson
Eastland	O'Mahoney	
Ellender	Overton	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization conference in Philadelphia, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, yesterday Senate bill 1718 was made the unfinished business and is now properly before the Senate. The bill deals primarily with the settlement of war contracts or claims arising from terminated war contracts.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has made a motion to postpone consideration of the bill until one day next week. The Presiding Officer ruled that the motion is in order, and the motion is now before the Senate.

I sought in every possible way, as did the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the author of the measure, in which I have joined as coauthor, to work out an agreement for postponement of consideration of the bill; but we found it impossible to do so. The Senator from New York has already given notice, and agreement had virtually been reached all around, by the majority leader and by other Senators at interest on both sides of the aisle, to take up the anti-poll-tax bill on next Tuesday. The Senator from West Virginia has moved to postpone consideration of the pending bill until next Wednesday. I merely wish to say to the Senate that if consideration of the pending bill is postponed until next Wednesday, that will mean there will be no legislation on war-contract terminations prior to the recessing of the Senate and the House, assuming that there will be a recess, and probably not until the end of this year.

Unfortunately, the real controversy which has arisen about the bill is that it does not include a great many other things which, of course, should be dealt with by the Congress at the earliest possible moment, to wit, disposal of war plants, disposal of surplus property of all kinds, and the matter of demobilization. It has been insisted that those matters should be dealt with promptly.

The Senate Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning has given a great deal of consideration to the other matters which some Senators are now insisting should be included in the pending bill. But we are not ready or prepared to report to the Senate a bill dealing with certain phases of the other important problems which remain for consideration, and which should be considered at once, on the basis of our definite and final recommendations.

However, two bills which are pending deal with the other related questions which it is insisted should be included in the pending bill. Those other bills, as I recall, are Senate bill 1730, which is pending before the Committee on Military Affairs, and Senate bill 1823, introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I understand that hearings on both those bills are now in progress; and certainly there is every purpose to prepare at the earliest possible moment, and to bring to the floor of the Senate, legislation dealing with the other questions.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I was about to make the observation that those two bills are pending before our subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and that we are now conducting hearings and will continue to conduct hearings until those two bills are properly and fully considered. I also wish to say that during the past several weeks I have been in constant touch with representatives of labor, in an effort to work out a provision for unemployment compensation, to be inserted in the pending bill. But they were unable to prepare one. Both the chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, and I, as chairman of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, were willing to agree to such a provision, if one could be worked out. But we did not receive any until this morning. I received such a provision for the first time this morning. I think it deserves more study, and should not at this time be incorporated as a mere rider to the pending bill.

My committee is willing to continue diligently to conduct the hearings and make the study on the subject of unemployment compensation, because I think it is just as important as, if not more important than, the contract termination bill. I recognize, as I am sure the chairman of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning of the Senate recognizes, that there is an absolute need for this legislation, and that we intend to give it our support when the time comes.

Mr. GEORGE. I am pleased to confirm what the Senator from Montana has said. Bringing forward this bill, dealing only with contract termination and settlement, is not to be taken at all as a statement or a position inconsistent with the further problems of reconversion—human, material, and financial—which must be dealt with and should be dealt with by the Congress at a very early date. However, because of jurisdictional questions in the House and because of the impossibility of getting a general over-all bill through at this time, we have separated the contract termination feature from the original bill, which was prepared by me in part, and by the special committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, and introduced it in this body as a separate bill. It was likewise sent to the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning not being a legislative committee.

Mr. President, if the motion to postpone the pending bill until next week should prevail, it would mean that it would be postponed until after the end of this session, assuming that we are to have a recess about the time of the conventions, or about July 1.

I will not take the responsibility of saying to the businessmen of this country and to the men who work in war plants and in organized industry, that their jobs may be imperiled by holding up legislation on the contract termination features of the bill. The other matters are proper to be considered. They are proper to be considered in connection with contract termination, if it were possible to make any progress by joining other matters with contract termination. However, they can just as well be considered piecemeal, and in the long run they certainly will be dealt with piecemeal, if they are effectively dealt with at all by this Congress, because so many controversial questions will arise with respect to the disposal of war plants and surplus property, severance pay, unemployment insurance, and other related questions which are of very great importance.

The reason for separating the legislation is solely in the interest of obtaining action upon a necessary part of our whole reconversion program, which is most pressing at the moment, and will be most pressing, perhaps, during this year. Certainly there is no disposition to neglect legislation dealing with other matters, which can be offered as amendments to this bill. However, I express the hope now that the Senate will not approve them as amendments to the bill, because in my judgment that would mean loading down the bill, and the certain death of the bill, or at least long delay to the bill in the body at the other end of the Capitol, because of jurisdictional questions which have already arisen with respect to various phases of the problem of reconversion.

I, therefore, hope that, since this is the only opportunity we shall have to bring this bill to a speedy consideration, the motion will not prevail. If by agreement we could have had it set down for next Tuesday, if the Senator from New York, for example, had been willing to agree to that arrangement, both the Senator from Montana and the Senator from California would have agreed to the postponement of the bill. However, we found that we could not obtain such an agreement, and the only course left open to us which is consistent with what we think is the proper disposition of this matter, is to insist upon proceeding. I, therefore, most respectfully ask the Senate to reject the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I am seeking information. If the Senator from Georgia is correct in stating that postponement of action on the bill until next Wednesday

would very likely result in its postponement until the end of the calendar year, I do not understand why the same thing would not be true if we were to postpone action on the related questions, which may not be considered until the end of the year, and perhaps not at all. If the Senator's statement is true of one category, why is it not true of the other?

Mr. GEORGE. Because the Senator knows very well that the poll-tax bill has the right-of-way next week. It will require many days. It might well mean postponement of action on this and related bills until after any recess which the Congress may take. I do not know when we are to have a recess, or how long it will be; but I do know that it would probably mean postponement.

This particular feature has been approved by the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning; by the regular standing committee, the Committee on Military Affairs; and by a special subcommittee of that committee which considered the bill. In addition, it has the approval of all the agencies of the Government. After long labor we have been able to present a bill—although certain amendments may be desirable—which meets the present necessity at this time, that is, of providing some method of quick disposal and settlement of all terminated war contracts.

Mr. GREEN. Do I correctly understand the Senator to take the position that he hopes that this bill will pass now, even if legislation on the related questions is not reached until the end of the year, if at all?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I have taken no such position. We are now at work on the other bills, and they will be brought to the floor as soon as possible.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; but according to the Senator's own statement, is not that an indefinite future?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it is. However, the first step is the settlement of the canceled contracts. I am not willing, by postponing consideration of the bill, to make possible the wholesale loss of jobs in this country because we did not deal with first things first. We have already dealt with other related questions. We have already made provision for all the veterans in the armed services, men and women. We have already taken care of that immediate situation so far as the Senate is concerned. That matter is held up in the House. The pending bill is a proposal merely to consider contract termination and settlement, which is a necessary first step. A large volume of contracts has been canceled.

Mr. GREEN. But would it not be unfortunate if this one element in the situation were disposed of and the other elements were not disposed of?

Mr. GEORGE. They will be disposed of as soon as they can be reached.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; but that is in the indefinite future.

Mr. GEORGE. It is indefinite, because those measures must pass this body and another body. There is a jurisdictional dispute in the House which we must respect. There are disputes among the standing committees of the House. I have the hope that they may be ironed out; but we can never make any progress unless we proceed with that feature of the reconversion program which can be dealt with now, and should be dealt with speedily so as to give the House an opportunity to get it out of the way. It does not stand in the way of the other problems which must have treatment, which are deserving of treatment, and which we are obliged to bring forward at the earliest possible moment. However, we find ourselves in the position where they cannot all be brought forward in one bill with any hope of success.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. In connection with the discussion which is taking place, I should like to observe that I regard both these matters as being of such vital importance that they should be acted upon at the earliest possible opportunity. I do not believe Congress should adjourn until we dispose of the problem of unemployment compensation, as well as the problem of contract termination. It seems to me the problems could be handled very quickly if we should go to work on them, continue with the hearings, and get the contract termination provisions worked out. I think we could dispose of the matter very quickly.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that what the Senator from Montana has said is true. I stand pledged to that course, and I am sure the Senator from Montana stands pledged to it also. It is my judgment that we will make progress more rapidly in the solution of all the reconversion problems—not merely in regard to the cancelation of contracts—if we deal with the matter as we are now proposing to deal with it, rather than by joining it in a general over-all bill, which would certainly run into so many difficulties that we would have very little chance, I believe, of securing action on it in the other House until very late in the year.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator made the statement that one reason for haste in connection with this matter is that he thought there would be a wholesale wave of unemployment. Can the Senator point out to me any part of this bill that amounts to anything except provision for a cash payment on the settlement of a terminated contract, or which would in any way bind contractors to reconvert and work on something else in order to furnish employment?

Mr. GEORGE. The bill deals only with contract termination.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I have stated that frankly, and I have given reasons why it deals only with contract termination. I assert now that experience will demonstrate that if we fail to proceed as rapidly as we can with all the reconversion problems, we will assume a responsibility which at some time during the war period, or at the end of it, we will have to face.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am heartily in agreement with the able Senator from Georgia as to the need for a speedy passage of measures affecting the terminating of contracts and taking care of the entire demobilization period. Complaint was made that nothing had been presented until this morning on the question, for example, of unemployment compensation for men made idle by termination. It is true that nothing was presented in printed form until this morning. It is also true that the bill in question, and which is in controversy, in its present form was not received by Members of the Senate until yesterday afternoon. My main reason for moving for a little time in which to study the bill is that during the little study which I was able to give it last night it was demonstrated to me that some very serious questions would arise as to the advisability of and possible need for amendment of the bill as it now stands, and I think it would be wise to take time to study the bill and ascertain if there are loopholes in it.

For example, under this bill any contract termination, if by agreement, is final, and there is no way of getting around it.

Secondly, one clause of the bill—I am referring particularly to the section with reference to Government agents in connection with contract terminations—relieves the agents from any liability even for gross negligence. Nothing but a charge of fraud can touch them. That would be with reference to a final contract.

I may be in error, but I think we are opening up a set of double gates for another Forbes regime, and I think the Members of this body would like to have a little time in which to study in detail the language of the bill, and also consider my contention that it is not possible to terminate a contract taking care only of machinery without taking care of what runs the machinery.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall add only a word, because of the peculiar situation which in part at least influences me in opposing the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

We all know there are many persons who are interested in the proposed anti-poll-tax legislation, and we have been trying to arrive at an understanding about a day when the anti-poll-tax bill could be taken up, when it would not necessarily interfere with other important legislation. We have tried to agree on a time when it could be disposed of one way or the other without the intervention of other bills causing the matter to be laid aside from time to time.

I have conferred with a number of Senators who favor the anti-poll-tax measure as well as with a number who oppose it. We have tentatively agreed that on next Tuesday, the 9th of May, an attempt will be made to begin the consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill. If the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] shall prevail, of course it will interfere with that program. If that program has to be set aside for the pending bill or any other bill, it is easy to see how the matter might drag along indefinitely, as it did on another occasion, and the Senate indulge in what might turn out to be futile debate, or time be spent on the

measure without a final determination one way or the other.

I suppose that nearly everyone knows that I favor the proposed legislation known as the anti-poll-tax bill. I voted before and will again vote for cloture in order to secure a vote on the bill. However, my attitude on it is of no importance except as my vote is concerned. Unless we obtain cloture we cannot obtain a vote on the bill, and if we cannot obtain a vote on it, the bill cannot be enacted into law. No matter how able the speeches may be, or from what side of the Chamber, or from what Senator they may come, they will not change the vote either on the bill or on the motion for cloture, and it is my feeling that after a reasonable length of time spent in debate an effort should be made to obtain cloture.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator from Kentucky understand that a motion for cloture will lie at the time of the debate on the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, I do not so understand, because that is not the situation. A motion for cloture can only lie with reference to the debate on the bill itself after it has been made the unfinished business. I hope that may be speedily done, because I believe that is the sensible way in which to deal with the problem. It is a very practical parliamentary situation. I think it would be most unfortunate for the Senate to spend a long period of futile time on the bill unless a final vote could be obtained on the bill itself. I mention this because I cannot support the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to postpone further consideration of the pending measure until next Wednesday, which will be the day following the day when we expect to take up the poll-tax measure, and which will be more than a month after the date we had arranged for its consideration to begin.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Would it be satisfactory to the Senator to take it up on next Monday, which will be before the bill to which he has referred comes up? That would give me more time to study it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not in charge of the legislation. I do not know how controversial the Senator's amendment might turn out to be, but, unless we should be able to conclude the legislation on Monday, my feeling about it, in view of the other agreement, is that it would have to go over until after debate on the poll-tax bill had been concluded, and that might create as bad a situation as that which I have just discussed. For this reason I cannot vote for the motion to postpone the legislation until next Wednesday.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that if those who have been urging for weeks the consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill and sought in good conscience to take it up, after the tentative agreement we have entered into, should modify that agreement, I would have no objection to this matter going over, but that is impossible. I can well understand how they cannot afford to do that in view of the fact that for a long time they have been seeking an understanding as to when the measure in which they are interested might be brought up again, and that having been determined, they cannot very well afford to yield on it without subjecting themselves to the charge that they are playing hot and cold with the proposition.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to inquire if it will be possible for the able leader to permit this over-all legislation including the unemployment-compensation bill to follow the poll-tax measure?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, I am as much interested in the rest of this program as anybody possibly can be. I am a member of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee; I participated in the consideration of the bill which we have brought before the Senate, and which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which in turn has acted upon it with some amendments. I am interested in the other phases of legislation dealing with post-war problems as much as if not more than I am in this, although I recognize the importance of the pending measure so that men who have contracts with the Government may know what their rights are and may have them settled in order that they may begin the process of reconversion and begin the process of employment of men who are going to depend upon them for employment not only in the transitory period but permanently when we get back to a peace basis. I am interested in all the human elements of this situation, taking care of the men themselves, making provision for the unemployment, and all of that; but if we wait to consider this matter until the other measures have reached a status where we can take them up, it would not hasten the consideration of those bills at all by 1 day, in my judgment, and it would postpone for an indefinite length of time the consideration of this matter upon which we are ready to pass.

Much as I sympathize with those who have urged that the whole matter be disposed of in one piece of legislation, I feel that that is not the best course to pursue at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. It occurs to me that if we proceed now with the pending bill, the contract-termination bill, and enact it, we could immediately apply ourselves to the other over-all legislation and have it ready by the time the poll-tax bill was out of the way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Getting down to the meat of his question, I will say to the Senator, as a member of the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, that as the Senator from Georgia, the chairman, has already indicated, we are giving consideration to that, and as one member of that committee, I would certainly give my word that we would see to it as rapidly as possible, and if that legislation is ready for submission to the Senate or to the Committee on Military Affairs or to whatever other committee it has to go after it has been reported by the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee, which is not a legislative committee, I shall, of course, cooperate with the managers of that legislation to bring it before the Senate at the very earliest day following the poll-tax bill, or at any other time when it may be brought before the Senate for consideration. I certainly should hate to see it postponed until after any recess for the conventions or any other recess during the summer, and I will exert all my energies to see to it that it is considered prior to any such recess.

Mr. MURRAY. The proposed legislation is now before the Military Affairs Committee and is being handled by a subcommittee of which I am chairman.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is true; but there are certain phases of the question that the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee is considering upon which it might want to make a report and recommendation. I am saying what I am saying as a member of that committee. If the Committee on Military Affairs is ready to report legislation dealing with the other problems in the very near future, I will certainly cooperate with that committee in getting immediate consideration of it by the Senate as soon as it is reported.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am unable to allow the pending motion to come to a vote without a brief statement, because I represent, in part, what is the largest war contract sector of the country, and therefore the sector which confronts the greatest post-war jeopardy in respect to demobilization and reconversion of war industry. I cannot emphasize too strongly the feeling which pervades this great war-production area that from now on every hour of delay in writing the preliminary reconversion formula is an hour which invites serious disaster.

I have the greatest respect for my good friend the able Senator from West Virginia, and, under normal circumstances, I should be anxious to join in the acceptance of any request which he might make in respect to the postponement of legislation. But, Mr. President, this is a matter which, in my humble opinion, cannot be postponed any longer unless Congress is prepared to take the responsibility for what might one day easily become the greatest panic in history in respect to demobilization; whereas, on the other hand, if Congress does lay down the basic formula in time before it is too late there is no reason why the post-war era should not be one of substantially stabilized prosperity.

I have to take the same position that was taken by the able Senator from Georgia. So far as I am concerned, I shed any share of the responsibility for any further delay which may in any respect be responsible for any such tragedy as I have indicated.

I am not speaking merely my own opinion when I use these harsh words. I know of no man in the United States who is a better judge of this economic prospectus than Mr. Bernard Baruch.

Whether we agree with him upon all occasions or not, the fact remains that he is one of the great economic sages of this country, and I am quoting Mr. Baruch, speaking to me within the last few days, when I say that Mr. Baruch believes that every hour from now on on which we delay in starting the process which writes the formula which permits this country to demobilize and reconvert its war contracts is "an hour"—and I quote Mr. Baruch literally—"which invites vast adventures in adversity." I repeat, I want none of that responsibility and I intend to take none.

Mr. President, the problem of demobilization and reconversion does fall into three and probably four general subdivisions. The Senator from West Virginia is quite correct; the pending bill, S. 1718, refers only to the first two of them, the two which are first faced by industry when it has to reconvert, namely, contract termination and plant clearance.

There still remains the question of the disposition of surplus property. There still remains the question of unemployment compensation and of severence pay. I will agree that the latter two, in their time, are just as important to those who are interested in them as are the first two. I will agree that we have not covered the subject adequately or conclusively until we have covered all four. I will agree to join with the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Montana in seeking to proceed through the total program before Congress shall take a recess. But I certainly cannot agree that these first two essential things, contract termination and plant clearance, shall be set aside until there can also be an agreement upon unemployment compensation and surplus-property disposition.

These questions have been before the Senate Committee on Post-war Economic Planning for 9 months. They have been before the Senate Military Affairs Committee for 9 months. If there is any suggestion that there has been a lack of time to explore them or a lack of time to submit amendments, any such suggestion is unwarranted and unjustified.

I started in on the consideration of the total problem with precisely the same viewpoint which the Senator from West Virginia has and precisely the same viewpoint which is expressed in the statement which has been given us on behalf of these labor organizations. I insisted that this problem was one integrated problem and had to be answered all at once. But I came to the point where I was reluctantly driven, and driven irresistably, from that point of view, except as I was willing to wait, perhaps until too late, in order even to make a start in respect to solving the problem.

The problem of contract termination and plant clearance is a relatively noncontroversial problem now that we have finally put it in the form of S. 1718. The proof of that fact is that S. 1718 now has the unanimous support of the Senate Committee on Post-war Planning, the support of the Military Affairs Committee, the support of the Murray subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, the support of the procurement agencies of the Government related to war production, and the support of the Baruch committee.

Mr. President, if it is possible to mobilize any more powerful credentials upon which the Senate of the United States is entitled to rely, I do not know how it could be done. This bill is the bill which we present. We have divided it from these other questions for the reason that surplus-property disposition is highly controversial. Even when Mr. R. T. Thomas, of the C. I. O., testified before the Murray committee this week, he himself said, "We are not yet prepared to testify in detail on the utilization of war property."

We are not ready to legislate upon that subject. We are not ready to legislate upon unemployment insurance. We must legislate upon those subjects, I repeat, before we have concluded our job, and I am prepared to follow through and legislate on them. But, Mr. President, if there is to be an all-or-nothing policy, I very much fear the answer will be nothing, and then the answer will be economic tragedy, and there will be economic tragedy not merely for war contractors. Let no one mistake the ultimate impact of this problem. The jobs of 50,000,000 workers, the jobs of all the returning members of the armed forces, are equally at stake, because it is necessary to swiftly and conclusively terminate these contracts covering 80 percent of our average annual income, it is necessary to physically clear these plants, it is necessary to release private industry to a chance to function in a post-war era, before one single post-war job can be created.

Labor has just as great a stake in the thing about which we are talking this afternoon as has the war contractor, and instead of talking about postponing the consideration of legislation such as S. 1718 until we can perfect an unemployment insurance amendment, instead of talking about delaying legislation for the sake of unemployment insurance, I beg of the Senate to act in the name of employment, which certainly is an objective primary to unemployment, or anything related to it. It is employment that is at stake here this afternoon.

Mr. President, we cannot postpone this thing until next week without jeopardizing the whole program. The able Senator from Kentucky has made it perfectly plain that if we postpone, we collide with the poll-tax schedule. If we postpone to that point, the first thing we know we will have collided with the recess, and the first thing we know we will have collided with an election, and the first thing we know we will be around to a new Congress, and then the first thing we know we will have collided with a post-war crisis and calamity and tragedy for which I refuse to take any responsibility whatever.

Mr. President, I feel deeply upon this subject because, I repeat, I come from an area whose lifeblood depends upon adequate governmental action which must precede the release of private enterprise to do the job which we expect it to do in respect to demobilization and reconversion.

I beg of the Senate not to postpone this matter longer. It has been postponed and postponed and postponed. We have had hearings and hearings and hearings, before multiple committees of both Houses of Congress. The situation does not permit of any further postponement. Time is of the essence. Let us enact S. 1718, which is the result of a total agreement among practically all the agencies and instrumentalities of the Government dealing with this problem. Then let us turn to the problems submitted by the able Senator from West Virginia, and I pledge him my total cooperation, and no recess of the Senate, until action occurs. I pledge him total cooperation in completing this job. But let us not commit the suicidal act of insisting upon all or nothing.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate I wish to oppose the motion for continuance. I sat through the hearings before the special committee, but I wish particularly to call to the attention of the Senate that on April 28 the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, that is, all those members who were present, unanimously voted to report the pending bill favorably, notwithstanding the fact that there are features of the bill to which certain members have objections. Personally, I have objection to certain features of the bill, and, personally, I am very anxious to have Congress pass upon the other questions to which the distinguished Senators who have preceded me have alluded, and to pass upon them at the earliest possible moment.

I think I speak the sentiment of the committee when I say that if I felt that a few days' delay in the consideration of the pending bill would expedite the consideration and passage of bills covering the remaining points which must be covered, that is, the most controversial ones, I should favor the delay. But the committee considered the whole question of time and of procedure, one Senator offered an amendment to the motion to report the bill which involved the subject of time, and called for speed. That unusual procedure in connection with the report of such a bill was adopted. It was the firm conviction of the committee that speed is of the very essence of this matter.

Why is it so, Mr. President? It is so because we are in the way of progress in this war. Those who have the greatest stake in clearing facilities of their unnecessary machinery and their terminal inventories are in some cases those who are interested in speeding the victory, in getting the war carried through to its end at the earliest possible date.

The pending bill is a war measure. It provides authority to take machines out of one factory and put them into another factory where they can be used, after adaptation to the new type of weapon that is necessary, and for the use of finished goods that constitute parts, and for the use of small tools other than machinery affixed to these facilities. In other words, all of us who have an interest in bringing the war to a conclusion at the earliest possible time are interested in taking care of something that is upon

us daily. It is not merely a post-war question, but is upon us daily. I may exaggerate when I say every day, but I mean to say that currently there are terminations of contracts occurring, and there are cut-backs occurring, which leave the Government with the necessity of having to temporize in the handling of the whole question of financing those contracts which are suddenly ended, to take care of the men who are employed at this time, and all the other problems that are pressed upon us currently, and with respect to which we cannot wait. We must go ahead and provide some measure of preparation, and some policies, and some rules governing the great transaction of clearing the way and getting terminal inventories either stored or transferred to someone else who will use them in the war effort, or sold for private use, and thus benefiting the war effort. We cannot wait.

There is one feature about this bill which is limited to termination of contracts and disposal of terminal inventories, which can be considered and passed at the present time, whereas the other questions cannot.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. In a moment I shall yield. Perhaps the distinguished Senator who is now asking to interrupt me may have the answer; but after serving on two committees and hearing presented the interests of labor, the interests of the contractors, and the interests of the Government, I cannot say that I know of a single person who now has a plan for disposal of such surplus properties as these great facilities which have been erected and are now owned by the Government of the United States, or have been financed either in part or in whole by the Government and built by contractors as extensions, or as new plants for the purpose of the war effort. The development of such a plan needs time and study. Therefore is there any reason in the world, except pressure, for postponing the consideration here today of this particular bill which has been carefully worked out and fully considered, and has that great sponsoring to which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has referred? I think it would be unwise from every point of view to postpone the consideration of Senate bill 1718.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, after listening to the very able arguments which have been made, in the interest of saving time in the consideration of the bill I should like at this time to withdraw my motion, and I hope that the able Senators who have discussed the matter have carefully read the amendments which have been prepared and printed and are now on the desk of Senators, so they will be able to vote on the amendments when I offer them to the bill.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I feel impelled to make a brief statement in view of the fact that my name has been referred to in the course of this debate. It would be impossible for me, so far as I am personally concerned, to make any decision whatsoever with reference to the consideration of the so-called poll-tax bill scheduled for next Tuesday. I say that advisedly, Mr. President, because after prolonged conferences in which the majority leader was most considerate and very patient, conferences with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and his associates on that committee, we finally collectively arrived at a decision to take up the bill on Tuesday of next week.

Mr. President, in view of the decision that was reached by a collective group after a series of conferences, it would be impossible for me, without consultation with that group, to make any other arrangement, and I am very happy that the able Senator from West Virginia has withdrawn his motion, and that we will be able to proceed with the consideration of the pending bill.

While I realize the importance of the amendments advanced by the able Senator from West Virginia, I have a keen appreciation of the diligence and the energies expended by the committee headed by the senior Senator from Georgia, and also by the members of the Military Affairs Committee who collaborated in the preparation of the proposed legislation.

But, Mr. President, the bill that will be taken up on Tuesday of next week has been on the calendar for over 20 weeks. It was not taken up before because for a time, at least, it was the opinion of the former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, our deceased colleague, Senator Van Nuys, that it should be set aside until important legislation associated with the war effort had been passed upon, and then, when it was agreeable and when no interference could be anticipated, it should be taken up, thoroughly debated, and finally determined upon.

Now, Mr. President, after a series of conferences, that has been done. Senators who are away have been notified. They are making plans to be here, and it would be unfortunate if there were any change made in that schedule. Above all, Mr. President, it would be impossible for me to make a decision affecting an entire group without summoning that group back into conference again. I am very happy to know that suitable arrangements have been made for the progress of the pending legislation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I presume that the Senator from West Virginia will be allowed to withdraw his motion. If not, I will ask unanimous consent——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has that right, and he has withdrawn his motion.

Mr. GEORGE. I want to express appreciation to the Senator from West Virginia, though he seems not to be in the Chamber at the moment, and again to assure him that there will be no let-up in the work upon the other questions involved in the general reconversion program, or in the full appreciation of the complete importance of every phase of it.

At this time I wish to say, Mr. President, with respect to the pending bill that it really was produced by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I am sure there is no stronger friend of labor in this body or in this country, and no one more interested in providing a cushion for the worker during the period of transition from war to peace, and I am quite sure he will give the same untiring labor and energy to the solution of the other phases of the reconversion problem that he has given to this phase.

I merely wish to point out at this time the fact that the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, of which the distinguished junior Senator from Montana is chairman, worked upon this problem from the beginning, and did so concurrently with the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning. Both as a member and as chairman of that committee, and as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this legislation, and as an ex-officio member—because by invitation he was made such—of the Special Senate Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has performed what I believe to be a magnificent service to the country in advancing our reconversion program thus far.

Mr. President, as a part of my formal statement, I should like to have printed in the RECORD a report on cancelation of war contracts which I submit from the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, particularly the recommendations made to the Committee on Military Affairs on Senate bill 1718; and I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

There being no objection, the report (No. 539, pt. 3) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On February 11, 1944, Senators MURRAY and GEORGE jointly introduced S. 1718, a bill to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes. The bill was referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee and by that committee referred to its War Contracts Subcommittee, composed of Senators MURRAY (chairman), TRUMAN, and REVERCOMB.

The bill resulted from general studies of the subject by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning and by the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee.

At the request of the War Contracts Subcommittee this committee has continued its study of the subject, with special reference to the detailed provisions of S. 1718. The staff of this committee has held many conferences with various interested business groups and with the various contracting agencies, in an effort to reconcile the views of those groups, and secure a bill that gives the greatest recognition to the problems of each of them.

The information gained in all of these conferences and studies has been carefully considered by this committee.

It has concluded, in view of the speed with which contracts are being terminated, and the legal obstacles in the way of their settlement, that it is imperatively necessary that legislation dealing with the subject be passed at the earliest possible moment and that such legislation not await the solution of other problems of demobilization.

The committee has considered many amendments to S. 1718, most of which are merely clarifying, but some of which go to the substance of the bill. The amendments which the committee recommends are shown in the copy of the bill attached to this report as an appendix, the deleted matter being lined out and the new matter being inserted in italics.

The reasons for these suggested changes are as follows:

DEFINITIONS

Section 3: The changes recommended in subsections (b) to (k) are merely clarifying. Subsection (l), dealing with termination inventory, was added for reasons that will more fully appear in the explanation of the changes under section 12. Subsection (m) was added merely to avoid repetition in the body of the bill.

DIRECTOR OF CONTRACT TERMINATION SETTLEMENT

Section 4 (a): It was felt that the activities of the Office of Contract Settlement should be coordinated with other mobilization and demobilization activities and that the most feasible way to do this was to place that office in the Office of War Mobilization.

Sections 4 (b) and (c): Certain functions under the act are made the primary responsibility of the Director and certain others are left the primary responsibility of the contracting agencies. This committee believes that the Director can render the greatest service if he keeps himself entirely free from operational duties and that, wherever operational duties are imposed upon him, he should conduct the operations through established agencies of Government to the greatest extent feasible. This committee is convinced that the mechanics and operations in the settling of contracts, the clearing of plants, and interim financing can best be performed by the contracting agencies themselves and the duties of accomplishing these objectives are imposed primarily on those agencies. In relation to those duties the Director should (*a*) see that uniform standards are laid down for their exercise, (*b*) require the exercise by the agencies of those duties, responsibilities and discretions in proper classes of cases where they might otherwise not be exercised, and (*c*) restrict their exercise by the agencies in proper classes of cases.

The suggested sections (b) and (c) seem to this committee to state more clearly this purpose than section 4 (c) of the original bill. Section 4 (b) of the original bill has been incorporated as a part of 4 (d), to indicate more clearly that it is intended to be a limitation on the employment of personnel by the Director.

As a result of the language of the suggested section 4 (c), references throughout the rest of the bill to "regulations of the Director," "policies prescribed by the Director," etc., are deleted. The language of the suggested section 4 (c) makes repetitive all such references that have been deleted.

SETTLEMENT OF TERMINATION CLAIMS

Section 6 (a): The changes recommended in this subsection are merely for clarification.

Section 6 (b): The change in the first sentence of this subsection is recommended to make it plain that a part of a termination claim may be settled by agreement, without the settlement of the whole. The first change in the second sentence is merely clarifying. The second change in that sentence is made because of the addition of the definition in section 3 (m). The remaining changes, except the deletion of the words "submits to arbitration", are merely clarifying. The reference to arbitration was omitted because of recommendations for changes in the arbitration provision which will be discussed later in this report.

Section 6 (c): This committee felt that 2½ percent per annum, in view of the present money rates, was a more equitable rate of interest. It was felt that the change in the period for the beginning of the payment of interest was more definite and would not penalize contractors who might experience difficulties and delays in getting their claims filed. It also felt that interest should not be paid, in the case of an unsuccessful appeal, where the contractor could have had his money without such appeal. The other changes in this subsection are merely clarifying.

Sections 7 (a) and (b): All the changes in these sections are merely for clarification.

Section 7 (c): This section as originally drawn made the supervision over payments to prime contractors on account of termination claims of subcontractors mandatory. It is not believed that this is necessary or desirable in all cases. The provision is made permissive, having in mind that the Director under the proposed section 4 (b) (3) has the power to make it mandatory.

Section 7 (d): The contracting agencies felt that the problems of group settlement were so complex that the Director should be required to consult with them before assigning claims of one to the other. This provision imposes no limitation on the Director's power and it seemed to the committee a reasonable request. An addition has also been recommended to the section to make it plain that settlements made by one agency of group claims would be binding on all agencies.

Section 7 (e): The first italicized sentence was added to facilitate settlements with subcontractors. It was felt that, if the contracting officer had to ascertain that the total of all payments made to subcontractors and the prime contractor would not exceed the amount which might be due under some limitation in the prime contract, settlement directly with subcontractors would be impossible. Among such limitations are provisions that the total to be paid the prime contractor, under no circumstances, could exceed the contract price, and provisions for set-offs. It is reognized that this policy may result in the Government paying more in settlement than would be paid if all settlements were made through the prime contractor, but the committee believes that in many instances it will be so necessary to settle directly with subcontractors that this risk should be taken.

The second italicized sentence was added to enable the subcontractor to know definitely when he would be dealt with by the contracting agency, so that he could not be shunted back and forth between the prime contractor and the contracting agency, and to prevent the subcontractor's pursuing his common law remedies for additional amounts against the prime contractor, after accepting any benefits that he might derive from direct dealings with the Government.

Section 7 (f): The committee feels that this section should be deleted. As it is written, it makes payments to subcontractors who are deprived of fair compensation through the insolvency, bankruptcy, or default of a prime contractor, entirely permissive, and prescribes no yardstick for the contracting agencies or the Director to determine when and in what circumstances the Congress intends that these payments should be made. If any comparable section is put into the act, the Congress should clearly prescribe the situations and the terms and conditions under which the payments should be made. Much can be said for the proposition that a subcontractor should be protected where, through the exigencies of war, he has been compelled to extend credit to financially weak prime contractors over and above the amount to which good business judgment would indicate the prime contractor was entitled. On the other hand, many subcontractors have sold these financially weak prime contractors at higher prices than they would have received from one in good credit standing. Many have sold them from choice, because of the profits involved. To permit these subcontractors to retain those additional profits or to protect them in cases in which they have sought such business cannot be justified. Unless some means can be found to limit the operation of this section to cases in which the subcontractor has acted solely in the service of his country, it should be deleted entirely.

Section 8: This committee, in its report to the Senate, dated February 9, 1944 (S. Rept. 539, pt. 2), made the following statement:

"The committee recommends the immediate payment of the contract price for all finished goods on hand; the immediate payment of 100 percent of the direct cost of all inventories of raw materials and partially processed goods in the hands of the contractor, and as large a percentage, up to 90 percent, of all other items in the claim as the contracting agency feels will afford the Government reasonable protection.

"Where the detailed ascertainment of the direct cost of inventories is apt to cause delay, the procuring agency should be authorized to make advance payments and partial payments up to 90 percent of the estimated total amount due on terminated contracts and subcontracts or groups thereof, and should be authorized to base the estimates on such certificates of the contractor or on such other evidence as they deem sufficient, or as may be prescribed by the Office of Demobilization."

It has not changed its opinion in this regard. At the same time, it has not been able to ascertain any practicable means of making these recommendations mandatory by legislation.

The original section 8 in subparagraph (b) made mandatory the payment of 90 percent of the amount of the termination claim of a war contractor, after certain deductions. It should be borne in mind that this was not 90 percent of the amount estimated by the contracting agency to be due. It was recognized that, in good conscience, in many cases, advances could not be made merely on the contractor's statement. It was recognized that ability to do this would vary with the type of items included. In 8 (c), the Director was given the power to prescribe the classes of cases in which this would not be mandatory, but he was given no basis for determining when he should exercise this power. The original sections, in effect, held out false hopes of payment without checking, and the committee felt that the benefits to be derived were illusory.

In its report of February 9, this committee recommended that the Director be given power to make this interim financing mandatory upon the contracting agencies and the suggested section 8 (b) follows this recommendation and takes the place of the original sections 8 (b) and (c). The committee believes that the suggested amendments are a more realistic approach to the matter. The Director should understand clearly that it is the intention of the Congress to get money into the hands of contractors within the 30 days provided in section 8 (a) but that the burden is placed upon him to work out methods suited to the variety of cases that will be presented.

The suggested 8 (c) takes the place of the deleted portion of the original 8 (d).

This committee feels that the penalty provided in the original 8 (d) is a necessary corollary to the rather summary methods of financing provided in the preceding subsections of this section. However, it feared that such inflexible provisions would impose a severe obstacle to interim financing and would cause contractors to refrain from requesting it for fear they would not be able to estimate their claims accurately. The

substitute section 8 (c) contemplates that the director would provide for the breaking down of applications into indisputable factual items and items that might well be debatable, possibly paying the first on a certificate of the contractor and making the penalty applicable to that portion of the interim financing. While the power to impose the penalty should remain, it should not be permitted to interfere with proper interim financing.

Section 8 (e): This section was changed to make the use of advance payments for termination expenses merely permissive, rather than mandatory. It was pointed out to the committee that such use might, in some instances, result in the contractor getting more from the Government than the amount to which he would be entitled. This committee cannot foresee what the result might be in any given case if such use were made mandatory.

Section 8 (g): This section is suggested to make it plain that the contracting agencies have the power to make settlements necessary to clean up interim financing problems which may be left after the settlement of the termination claims and to validate any interim financing which has previously been made, and which is not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

All other amendments suggested in section 8 are merely clarifying.

Section 9 (a): An addition is made to this section to make it clear (a) that partial payments may not be final and that where they are not, the provisions for repayment set out in subsection (b) of this section will be preserved, and (b) that there may be partial final settlements.

Section 9 (b): It is suggested that the interest provision should be inserted in this section. The other changes are merely clarifying.

Section 10: The suggested changes in this section are merely clarifying.

Section 11: This committee believes that the original provisions of section 11 went too far in attempting to provide war contractors with notice of termination and that the retention of this section would result in the production of much unnecessary material. The words "to the fullest extent feasible" in subsection (b) (1), which were intended to be limiting, do not in fact limit the operation of this section. If the Government is willing to produce unnecessary goods, it would always be feasible to provide the notice, but providing it, in many instances, would result in 30 days of unnecessary production.

Being completely in accord with the purpose of the section, this committee feels that its suggested substitute is as far as the Congress, as a matter of policy, should go.

Subsection (c) is designed to relieve contractors of the burden of stop orders which are not followed by terminations. The contracting agencies objected very strongly to subdivision (2) of this subsection, but it was believed that the rights given the contractor there would prevent mere inertia on the part of the contracting agencies. On the other hand, if there were any real reason for the cessation without termination, the contracting agencies, under their powers under the Selective Service Act, could prevent the use of this privilege.

REMOVAL AND STORAGE OF MATERIALS

Section 12: The original subsection (b) of this section attempted to set out all of the provisions with reference to removal of materials. The suggested substitute subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) accomplish the following:

(a) provide much more detailed instructions for the exercise of the authority conferred;

(b) provide 60 days instead of 30 days for the removal of the inventories, to meet the views of the contracting agencies as to their ability to act;

(c) make a proper distinction between goods removed that may be allocable to terminated war contracts and those that may be found not to be allocable;

(d) provide the contractor with a prima facie correct inventory of goods removed, in the event the Government does not act expeditiously;

(e) establish the measure of liability of the Government to the contractor for such inventory;

(f) provide for the termination inventories reaching the proper disposal agencies.

Subsection (c) should be stricken as directly contrary provisions are contained in the suggested subsection (e). The committee feels it vitally necessary that the Director should have power to take physical possession of these inventories and channel them into the proper disposal agencies, rather than leaving the power of disposition to the various contracting officers, as is the case today.

Suggested subsection (f) is new. It was inserted because of complaints that the contracting agencies were delaying settlement of termination claims pending the disposal of inventories by the contractor.

Subsection (g) is new. It provides for the removal of Government machinery that may be stored in any privately owned plant. While machinery probably was included in the definition of "materials" used in the original draft, it may become necessary to remove machinery on account of the completion of a contract rather than its termination, and because of the different conditions applicable, it was felt better to separate the provisions.

Suggested subsection (h) was inserted to make perfectly certain that the use of termination inventories for war purposes would not be interfered with.

Suggested subsection (i) was inserted because of the possible inference that the war contractor may be prevented, by this section, from removing termination inventories at his own risk prior to the time provided for a check by the Government.

The original appeals provisions in S. 1718 followed exactly the recommendations of this committee in its report of February 9. Upon further study it was believed that the mandatory submission of claims to arbitrators and umpires scattered throughout the country would result in a great lack of uniformity in settlements and would take more of the time of the personnel of the contracting agencies than could be justified, without corresponding benefits to the war contractors.

Consequently the committee felt that it was better to provide for a larger appeal board and provide for its holding hearings throughout the country, abolishing the provision for umpires and providing for arbitration only by agreement.

In the suggested section 13 (a) the time within which findings were made mandatory was extended from 60 to 90 days. The contracting agencies universally felt that if a shorter time was provided an unnecessarily large number of cases would go to appeal without findings.

It is suggested that subsection (b) be amended to make it clear that appeal could be had where the decision went only to a portion of the claim.

In subsection (b) (2) an amendment is suggested to preserve State court jurisdiction over the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries.

Suggested subsection (c) (1) would permit reviews within the contracting agency—to give higher authority in the contracting agency an opportunity to revise the findings of the contracting officers.

The suggested changes in subsection (c) (2) are merely clarifying.

The suggested changes in subsection (c) (3) are designed to prevent appeals before a fair effort is made to reach a settlement in the agency.

Subsection (d) effectuates the change in the appeal method resulting from the elimination of umpires and mandatory arbitration.

Subsection (e) provides for permissive arbitration in lieu of the mandatory provision which it is suggested be stricken.

It is suggested that subsection (f) be amended to make settlements, under the method provided, between war contractors binding on the United States.

COURT OF CLAIMS

Section 14 was prepared by the Department of Justice. The officials of that Department have promised to submit to the Military Affairs Committee some suggestions for its improvement and, in view of this, this committee expresses no opinion in reference to it.

PERSONAL FINANCIAL LIABILITY

Section 15: The changes in this section are merely clarifying.

THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Section 16: This committee was advised by the staff of the War Contracts Subcommittee that these suggested changes were in accordance with suggestions made to that subcommittee by the Comptroller General. They are satisfactory to this committee.

DEFECTIVE, INFORMAL, AND QUASI CONTRACTS

Section 17: The changes in section 17 (a) were made to make it clear that this section applied only to situations in which there was not a valid contract. Valid contracts are covered by the other sections of the act.

Other changes in this section are merely clarifying.

RECORDS, FORMS, AND REPORTS

Section 18: The purpose of the suggested changes in subsections (a) through (c) are so obvious as not to require explanation.

The suggested substitute section (d) was prepared to meet certain objections of the Department of Justice. The committee understands that it does not meet those objections and that the Department of Justice will wish to make certain other representations to the Military Affairs Committee.

PRESERVATION OF RECORDS; PROSECUTION OF FRAUD

Section 19: This section was prepared by the Department of Justice. Officials of that Department informed this committee that they wished to make certain changes in the section but were not ready to present them to this committee. This committee recommends certain changes which appear in the appendix. The purpose of these changes is obvious and they should be included in any suggestions for change made by the Department of Justice. It is believed that the provision for preserving microfilm copies of records would greatly relieve the burden on war contractors imposed by this section.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 20: The changes made in subsections (a) through (e) are merely clarifying.

Suggested subsection (f) should be added to make it possible for employees of the contracting officers to assist contractors in preparing claims.

OTHER FUNCTIONS OF THE DIRECTOR

Section 21: No changes are suggested in this section.

USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

Section 22: The suggested changes in this section are merely clarifying.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

Section 23 (a): It is suggested that this section be amended to limit any general delegation of authority, except to deputy directors. The suggested amendment permits delegation to department heads, upon such terms and conditions as the Director may prescribe, where it is necessary to the handling of problems peculiar to that agency, but prevents such delegation in the handling of problems common to more than one contracting agency.

APPLICABILITY

Section 24 (a): It is suggested that this section be added to make it clear that settlements once made shall not be reopened for the purpose of applying the sections listed therein.

Subsection (b) should be inserted to prevent any interference with the operation of the lend-lease acts.

Section 25 is suggested to enable the Director to exclude from the provisions of this act contracts performed abroad.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

Section 26: It is felt that this section should be added.

CONCLUSION

This committee believes that consideration has been given to every possible phase of contract termination and that there is no reason for delaying this legislation for further hearings or for any other reason.

It strongly urges careful consideration be given to the amendments herein suggested and that S. 1718, as amended, be favorably reported to the Senate at the earliest possible time.

This recommendation should in nowise be construed as representing any belief on the part of this committee that the settlement of the other problems of reconversion should be delayed. It believes very strongly that the Congress should move forward at the earliest possible moment with the plans for setting up an Office of Demobilization with policies for the disposition of surplus property and plants and the plans for human demobilization. The recommendation that S. 1718 be reported out immediately, without waiting for the fruition of the other plans, is based on the conviction that termination legislation is needed now and legislation on the other subjects must await further consideration and study.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in this connection, I should like to say that, while all the recommendations made by the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning were accepted, in the main the provisions contained in the bill as it came from the Committee on Military Affairs are agreeable, and have the approval, certainly, of myself, as coauthor of the bill, and of all other members of the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning with whom I have had opportunity to confer.

In one respect the provisions of the bill, as originally prepared and recommended by the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, are not followed in the provisions of Senate bill 1718. I refer particularly to the fact that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning recommended that the Director of Contract Settlement be made a member of the War Mobilization Board. The Committee on Military Affairs in its report on the bill has recommended the creation of a separate agency, so as to make the director an independent and separate agent. But substantially no conflict can arise, and that was the reason why the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning made its recommendations. It did so in order to avoid any possibility of conflict; because, of course, the President, who would be authorized to appoint the Director, may appoint the Director who now is engaged in the executive organization with this particular work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two statements, one from the War Department, and the other from the Navy Department, showing the outstanding contracts. In the case of the War Department's statement, both the number and the amount of money involved in such contracts which are subject to cancelation at some period are shown, as well as the corresponding figures for those that have been canceled and have been partially adjusted. I also submit a similar statement from the Navy Department.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY CONTRACTS

Now in effect, approximately 100,000 prime contracts; value, $43,000,000,000; approximately 1,000,000 subcontracts.

Canceled to March 31: 21,774 contracts; uncompleted value, $13,075,452,000.

Settled, 15,917 contracts; without claim, 12,252; uncompleted value, $2,556,530,000; with claim, 3,665; uncompleted value, $1,777,426,000.

Total uncompleted value of settled contracts, $4,333,956,000.

Paid out in settlement, $112,514,000, which is 76.5 percent of the amount claimed.

NAVY CONTRACTS

Value now in effect, $34,000,000,000; of this five billion, cost-plus-fixed-fee; twenty-nine billion, fixed price.

Canceled to March 31: 4,000 contracts; uncompleted value, $4,000,000,000.

Out of 4,000 canceled, only 800 will result in payments; of those 800, 200 are already settled, leaving 600 to be settled.

Settled without claim, 3,200 contracts; with claim, 800 contracts; estimated amount of claims, $120,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask an additional question. Is it not also true that the provisions of the pending bill are in substantial accord with the Baruch-Hancock report dealing with the same subject of the termination of contracts, which report was universally commended throughout the United States?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Ohio is correct. In the Baruch-Hancock report this particular bill was expressly approved.

Now, Mr. President, I gladly yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is the real author of the pending bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. At this time I offer the amendments to Senate bill 1718, which have been printed and furnished to each Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia desire to have the amendments read or to have them printed in full in the RECORD?

Mr. KILGORE. I should prefer to have them printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. KILGORE to the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes, viz: On page 37, after line 9, insert the following:

"TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT AND EXECUTION OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND POST-WAR ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 101. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are—

"(a) To achieve the necessary war production which is indispensable to the speediest victory through the maximum mobilization and utilization of the Nation's natural and industrial resources and of the manpower not in the armed forces, and through the wartime stabilization of the civilian economy;

"(b) To insure that the great momentum of the war mobilization which is bringing victory to our arms will not be lost, but will be reconverted into a peacetime transition program providing for full production, full employment at adequate wages, and full consumption in a steadily expanding civilian economy with rising standards of living for all; and

"(c) To provide for the development of a unified program to secure the foregoing objectives, and the necessary coordination of the activities of the Federal agencies engaged in or concerned with: Production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products; economic stabilization; war production cut-backs; settlement of claims under terminated war contracts; disposition of surplus war property; resumption and expansion of civilian goods production; the training and placement of returning servicemen and civilian workers in war and peacetime industry and agriculture; and other programs affecting war mobilization and peacetime production and employment.

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established the Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment (hereinafter called the Office), at the head of which shall be the Director of War Mobilization and Adjustment. The Director shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"(b) There is hereby established in the Office a Bureau of Programs headed by a Chief, who shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

"(c) The following Administrations are hereby created within the Office of War Mobilization: (1) The Surplus War Property Administration; (2) the Contract Settlement Administration; (3) the Retraining and Reemployment Administration. Each of these Administrations shall be headed by an Administrator, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate; and each shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

"(d) The Director, the Chief of the Bureau of Programs, and the several Administrators, except as herein otherwise provided, may employ and fix the compensation and define the authority and duties of such officers and members, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of

this act. All appointments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of civil-service laws and regulations and Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that expert technical and professional personnel may be employed without regard to these laws and regulations where deemed desirable by the Director, the Chief of the Bureau of Programs, or the several Administrators, as the case may be.

"SEC. 103. (a) It shall be the function of the Director, subject to the direction and control of the President—

"(1) to unify the programs and activities of Federal agencies engaged in or concerned with: Production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products; economic stabilization; war production cut-backs; settlement of claims under terminated war contracts; disposition of surplus war property; resumption and expansion of civilian goods production; the training and placement of returning servicemen and civilian workers in war and peacetime industry and agriculture; and other programs affecting war mobilization and peacetime production and employment; and

"(2) to issue such directives on program, policy, and operations to the Federal agencies as may be necessary to carry out the programs developed and the policies established by the Office under this act. It shall be the duty of all such agencies and departments to execute such directives, and to supply such data and make such progress reports to the Office as the Office may require.

"(b) The Office may perform the functions, exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred on it by this act through such officials and such agencies and in such manner as the Director may determine.

"SEC. 104. It shall be the function of the Chief of the Program Bureau, subject to direction and control of the Director—

"(1) to review the programs of the several Federal agencies which are subject to the direction of the Office and to recommend to the Director such modifications as are deemed necessary to assure fulfillment of the objectives of this act;

"(2) to make periodic progress reports to the Director which shall assess current performance on approved programs;

"(3) to require Government agencies performing functions under this act to prepare such data and reports as are necessary to permit the review of the programs and the making of the progress reports required in this section;

"(4) to evaluate and report on current and projected public and private activities affecting war mobilization and peacetime full production and employment, and survey continuously the necessity for additional programs or legislation as will achieve the objectives of this act. The surveys shall include (without being limited thereto) programs and measures for public works, housing, taxation, industrial and regional development, expansion of foreign trade, social security, and the maintenance of competitive enterprise; and

"(5) to consult and cooperate with State and local governments, industrial, labor, agricultural, and other groups (national and local) concerning the fulfillment of the objectives of the act.

"(b) The Office shall transmit to the Senate and House of Representatives within 3 months after the approval of this act and thereafter at intervals not exceeding 3 months a summary of the progress reports, program reviews, surveys, and legislative and other recommendations prepared by the Bureau.

"SEC. 105 (a) There is hereby created within the Office a National Production-Employment Board (hereinafter called the Board) consisting of three representatives of industry, three representatives of labor, three representatives of agriculture, and three representatives of the consuming public, who shall be appointed by the President: *Provided*, That each member of the Board may designate an alternate to sit and act for him. The Board shall elect a chairman from among its own members and shall, by a majority vote of its members, determine its rules of procedure, except as otherwise defined by this act, and the powers conferred on the Board by this act may be exercised by a majority vote.

"(b) It shall be the general function of the Board, and each member individually, to endeavor to secure maximum cooperation and participation of the American people in war mobilization and post-war adjustment, and to provide the Office with such advice and guidance as the members deem will promote the objectives of this act. The Board and each individual member thereof shall have full access to all data in the Office bearing on the effectiveness and adequacy of war mobilization and post-war adjustment.

"(c) The Chief of the Bureau of Programs shall serve as the executive secretary of the Board. He shall prepare, under the direction of the Board, such reviews of programs, reports, and studies as the Board may request, and for these purposes shall exercise on behalf of the Board the full facilities of the Office and the powers conferred on the Office by this act. The Board may make to the Congress, to the Director, the several administrators of the Office, and to other Federal officials performing functions subject to the direction of the Office, such recommendations relating to legislation, policy, and operations as it may deem necessary to fulfill the purposes of this act. All such recommendations and all reports and studies issued by the Board shall be supplemented by such statements or comments as any individual member may wish included.

"(d) The Director, the several administrators of the Office, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and such other Federal officials performing functions subject to direction by the Office as shall be designated by the Board, shall meet with it at least once a month and shall consult and advise with it on all basic policies and programs which are subject to direction by the Office;

"(e) All Federal agencies performing functions subject to the jurisdiction of the Office shall, with respect to policies, programs, and operations affecting industrial segments or geographical areas, consult and advise with joint councils which shall be representative, in the particular area or industrial segment, of industry, large and small, labor, and wherever appropriate, agriculture. All such industrial segment or area joint councils shall be appointed by the Director, with the advice and consent of the Board.

"(f) All appointments of members or alternates to the Board, and of members of the area and industry to the joint councils, may be made without regard to any of the provisions of law with respect to the appointment and compensation of employees of the United States. Members and alternates of the Board and of the joint advisory councils shall serve without remuneration, except for per diem allowances as shall be prescribed by the Director, not to exceed $25 each day spent in the actual performance of duty, plus necessary traveling and other expenses incurred while so engaged.

"(g) The Office shall provide for the Board an adequate technical and clerical staff which shall serve under its immediate supervision. The Director shall appoint, with the advice and consent of the consumer representatives, a consumer's counsel who shall, together with such staff as he may need, serve under the supervision of the consumer representatives in providing the Board with full information on the effect of current and projected programs and policies on consumer interests.

"TITLE II—WAR PRODUCTION CHANGES AND RECONVERSION

"SEC. 201. Subject to the direction and control of the Office, the Chairman of the War Production Board shall—

"(a) Review the military production programs of the several Federal procurement agencies for the purpose of coordinating such programs and synchronizing curtailments with the resumption of civilian goods production;

"(b) Establish unified policies and programs for the expansion, transfer, and curtailment of military production and for the resumption and expansion of civilian production covering specific products, firms, industry segments, and geographical areas;

"(c) Develop programs for the curtailment of military production and industrial reconversion based upon assumed military developments on stated dates.

"SEC. 202. The Chairman of the War Production Board, or the official to whom he shall delegate the authority and responsibilities set forth in section 201, shall advise and consult with a Production Program and Reconversion Committee, which shall consist of one representative each of the following: War Department, Navy Department, State Department, Maritime Commission, Foreign Economic Administration, War Manpower Commission, Office of Price Administration, Smaller War Plants Corporation, Office of Civilian Requirements, the Vice Chairman for Labor Production and Manpower Requirements, and such other representatives of such Federal agencies as the Chairman of the War Production Board may designate.

"SEC. 203. In order to enable the War Production Board effectively to discharge its responsibilities under this title, each Federal procurement agency shall continuously survey its material and product requirements and shall report to the War Production Board as soon as practicable every projected change in its procurement program, including the award of new contracts and the modification, transfer, or termination of contracts previously awarded. The procurement agencies shall supply such other data as the War Production Board shall require for the purpose of this title. The procurement agencies shall maintain such records and make such reports to the War Production Board as the Board may require to appraise the compliance of the procurement agencies with the programs and policies established by the Board.

"SEC. 204. In formulating programs and policies for war production and reconversion, the War Production Board and the Production Program and Reconversion Committee shall, so far as practicable, give effect to the following objectives:

"(a) Necessary war production for our armed forces and those of our allies shall be expedited and maintained without impairment.

"(b) Curtailments of war production shall be programed so as to permit the utilization without delay of the released manpower and facilities in the production of other war products or civilian goods.

"(c) Resumption and expansion of production of specific civilian items shall, so far as practicable, be in the order of essentiality to the domestic civilian economy and to the needs of reconstruction abroad.

"(d) Subject to the overriding requirements of war production, full consideration shall be given to the production and manpower resources of the industrial segments, geographic areas, and concerns affected by curtailment and reconversion programs. The small business contractor shall not be discriminated against in the termination of contracts because of slightly higher costs of production, nor shall small business concerns, if war contracts are not available to them, be prevented from entering civilian

goods production fields merely because larger concerns in the same fields are still engaged in war production. Resumption of civilian goods programs shall give particular consideration to smaller business concerns, especially in those fields which have been most adversely affected by the necessities of war production.

"SEC. 205. The Chairman of the War Production Board may establish special boards for the purpose of hearing appeals from decisions of the War Production Board with respect to production curtailment and reconversion on the grounds of discrimination.

"TITLE III—DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY

"SEC. 301. It shall be the function of the Administrator of the Surplus War Property Administration (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Administrator and Administration, respectively), subject to the direction and control of the Director—

"(a) To handle and dispose of surplus war property upon such terms as he shall deem necessary, subject to the provisions of this act;

"(b) To have general supervision and direction of the transfer of any surplus war property in the possession of any Government agency to any other Government agency;

"(c) To assign surplus property for disposal by the fewest number of Federal agencies practicable and to centralize in one disposal agency responsibility for the disposal of all property of the same type or class;

"(d) To prescribe regulations and issue directives necessary to provide, so far as practicable, for uniform and wide public notice concerning surplus property available for sale, and for uniform and adequate time intervals between notice and sale so that all interested purchasers, large and small, shall have a fair opportunity to buy; and

"(e) To prescribe regulations and issue directives necessary to effectuate the provisions of this title; and no Government agency shall transfer or dispose of surplus war property in contravention thereof.

"SEC. 302. The Administrator shall regularly advise and consult with a Surplus War Property Committee. The committee shall be composed of one representative each of the State Department, Treasury Department, War Department, Navy Department, Justice Department, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Smaller War Plants Corporation, United States Maritime Commission, War Production Board, Office of Price Administration, Bureau of the Budget, War Food Administration, Federal Works Agency, Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Foreign Economic Administration.

"SEC. 303. Each Government agency shall submit to the Administrator such information and reports with respect to surplus war property in such form and at such times as the Administrator shall direct. When requested by the Administrator, a Government agency shall execute such documents for the transfer of title or for any other purposes or take such steps as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or proper to transfer or dispose of surplus war property or otherwise to carry out the provisions of the act.

"SEC. 304. In formulating regulations and directives governing the handling and disposition of surplus war property, the Administrator and Committee on Surplus War Property shall give effect to the following objectives:

"(a) Aid maximum war production by facilitating the transfer of property which may be surplus in one Government agency to meet the requirements of other Government agencies;

"(b) Promote full production and employment of labor and natural resources in all sections of the country;

"(c) Aid small business concerns to achieve and maintain maximum production and to preserve and strengthen their competitive position in an economy of free enterprise;

"(d) Aid ex-servicemen to establish and maintain their own small business enterprises;

"(e) Avoid economic dislocations resulting from uncontrolled dumping of such surpluses;

"(f) Discourage monopolistic practices and insure fair prices to the consumers;

"(g) Sell such surpluses in such quantities and on such terms as will discourage disposals to speculators or for speculative purposes;

"(h) Establish and develop foreign markets through the programed exports of such surpluses; and

"(i) Obtain the highest return for the Government consistent with the foregoing objectives.

"SEC. 305. The Administrator may perform the functions and exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the Administration by this act by such officials and such agencies and in such manner as the Administrator, subject to the provisions of this act, may determine. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Administration may utilize the services of any other Government agency.

"SEC. 306. Each disposal agency, immediately upon assignment thereto of any surplus property and before undertaking disposal to the public, shall transmit detailed inventories thereof to the Bureau of the Budget, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and the Foreign Economic Administration, which agencies shall have priority in acquiring such surplus for the purposes and in the order and manner following:

"(a) The Bureau of the Budget shall have the right to acquire any surplus property for transfer to any Government agency which needs it. Such transfer shall be made upon such terms and with such charge to the appropriation of the transferee for the value thereof as the Bureau of the Budget shall prescribe in accordance with existing law.

"(b) The Smaller War Plants Corporation, subject to the authority of the Director, shall have the right to acquire any surplus property for sale or other transfer to small business when in its judgment such acquisition is required to carry out the policy of the act to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business.

"(c) The Foreign Economic Administration shall have the right to acquire any surplus property in the United States for sale or other transfer abroad in such quantities as the head of the agency charged with the disposal of such property and the Foreign Economic Administration shall agree upon.

"SEC. 307. The Administrator may prescribe regulations to provide for the disposition of surplus property to States, political subdivisions thereof, and tax-supported institutions as follows:

"(a) Surplus property which has been acquired by the Federal Government for school, classroom, or other educational use may be transferred to the Office of Education in the Federal Security Administration for donation to tax-supported educational institutions.

"(b) Surplus property for which the estimated cost of handling, storage, and sale would exceed the estimated proceeds of commercial sale, may be donated to States, political subdivisions thereof, or tax-supported institutions.

"(c) Any surplus property may be sold or leased to States, political subdivisions thereof, or tax-supported institutions at discounts not to exceed 50 percent of the sale or lease value thereof, as the case may be.

"SEC. 308. (a) Whenever surplus property proposed for sale or other transfer to private interests shall comprise a plant or group of plants or other property representing an original cost to the Government of $1,000,000 or more, the Administrator, before consummating the sale or transfer, shall cause to be published in the Federal Register the terms and other pertinent circumstances of the proposed sale or transfer and shall request the Attorney General to render an opinion in writing whether, in his judgment, the proposed sale or transfer will encourage monopoly or undue concentration of industry or commerce, or restrain competition substantially. If the Attorney General shall find that such proposed sale or transfer will encourage monopoly or undue concentration of industry or commerce, or restrain competition substantially, the Administrator shall not consummate the proposed transfer. If the Attorney General shall fail to render an opinion within 30 days of receipt of a request therefor (or within such additional period not to exceed 60 days which he may specifically request) the Administrator may proceed with the proposed sale or transfer on his own responsibility. The failure of the Attorney General to render an opinion shall not be construed as a bar to prosecution for violation of the antitrust laws.

"(b) Every contract of sale (or other transfer) of the property referred to in subsection (a) shall contain suitable provisions prohibiting subsequent transfers within a period of 3 years next succeeding the effective date of the contract unless such subsequent transfer is approved by the Administrator. Before approving an application for subsequent transfer, the Administrator shall refer the matter to the Attorney General as required in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Every contract for the sale, or lease for 2 years or more, of a plant shall be made upon the condition that the purchaser, lessee, or transferee, and their transferees, if any, shall maintain the plant in substantial operation and production for a period of 2 years next succeeding the effective date of the contract, and that upon breach of such condition, the Government may recover the plant upon return of the consideration due.

"(d) Every agency engaged in the disposition of surplus property shall maintain in each of its disposal offices full records of its inventories of surplus property and of each of the disposal transactions negotiated by such office and shall make such records available for inspection by the public.

"(e) At least 10 days before advertising for bids or posting notice of sale or transfer by other means, every disposal agency shall notify the nearest regional office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation of the proposed terms of disposal specifying the minimum quantities on which bids or offers will be received and the credit terms, if any, for the purpose of permitting the Smaller War Plants Corporation to advise the disposal agency if, in its judgment, the proposed terms discriminate against small-business purchasers.

"SEC. 309. No option to purchase or otherwise acquire Government-owned property which is held by any person shall be honored except in strict conformity with the price and other terms of such option. In the event of failure validly to exercise such an option, the property shall be disposed of in accordance with the applicable provisions of this act.

"SEC. 310. No Government agency shall dispose of any Government-owned plant for the production of aircraft, aircraft parts, synthetic rubber, aluminum, magnesium, or steel, or any Government-owned ship, shipyard, or pipe line, which represents an original cost to the Government of $1,000,000 or more, unless such disposition is required by a valid contract provision in effect upon the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the Administrator may authorize the lease of such surplus property for a term not to exceed 3 years in accordance with the provisions of section 308. The Administrator shall pre-

pare a report on the alternative means of disposal of such property and shall submit such report together with his recommendations to Congress.

"SEC. 311. Except as may be otherwise provided by existing law, all proceeds from the sale or other disposition of surplus property under this act shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 312. The Administrator shall transmit to Congress in January, April, July, and October of each year a report of operations under this act, including regulations, orders, and directives of the Administrator, and summaries of each disposal in which the property involved represented an original cost to the Government of $1,000,000 or more.

"TITLE IV—RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT OF WAR WORKERS AND RETURNING SERVICEMEN

"SEC. 401. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this title are—

"(a) To facilitate the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war;

"(b) To maintain maximum employment in the transition from war to peace time production;

"(c) To provide for the coordination of the demobilization of servicemen with employment opportunities under a policy of demobilizing servicemen as rapidly as the military situation permits;

"(d) To provide necessary training of ex-servicemen and war workers; and

"(e) To provide the necessary economic assistance to returning ex-servicemen and war workers in connection with transfer, training, and reemployment.

"SEC. 402. It shall be the function of the Administrator of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Work Administrator), subject to the discretion and control of the Director, to establish a unified reemployment program covering recruitment, training, transfer, and placement of returning servicemen and workers in war and civilian production. The reemployment program shall include provision for compiling full detail on declining and increasing employment opportunities (by industrial segments, geographic areas, and plants) resulting from curtailment in war production and resumption of civilian production; for placement of workers in appropriate employment; and for interim financing of workers, including returning servicemen, pending placement in accordance with the authority of this title. The Work Administrator shall prescribe regulations and issue directives to Federal agencies necessary to effectuate the objectives of this title and all such Federal agencies shall be governed by these.

"SEC. 403. The Work Administrator shall consult and advise with a Committee on Retraining and Reemployment, consisting of one representative from each of the following: Department of Labor, Veterans' Administration, War Manpower Commission (for the War Manpower Commission and the Federal Security Agency), War Production Board, Selective Service System, Civil Service Commission, War Department, Navy Department, and such other Federal agencies as the Work Administrator may designate.

"SEC. 404. (a) The War Production Board and other agencies having data on production changes and employment opportunities shall furnish the Work Administrator full information on current and projected schedules of military and civilian production in such detail as the Work Administrator shall deem necessary.

"(b) The Director of Selective Service, with the assistance of the War and Navy Departments, shall furnish data on current and projected rates of discharge of servicemen providing such details concerning the servicemen as the Work Administrator may deem necessary and is practicable for the Selective Service and the War and Navy Departments to furnish. It shall be the duty of the War and Navy Departments to anticipate, so far as practicable, the forward programs of demobilization of servicemen, and to cooperate with the Director of the Selective Service System and the Work Administrator in furnishing full data on such demobilization.

"SEC. 405. The Work Administrator may perform the functions and exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred on him by this act through such officials and such agencies and in such manner as the Work Administrator, subject to the provisions of this act, may determine. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Administration may utilize the services of any other Government agency.

"SEC. 406. In order to facilitate the recruitment, training, transfer, and placement of workers and ex-servicemen, the Work Administrator is hereby authorized to pay the cost of transportation of workers and ex-servicemen, including transportation of dependents and household effects, from their last previous residence to new jobs, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Work Administrator: *Provided*, That such transportation allowances shall not exceed the allowances provided for Government employees in the Standard Government Traveling Regulations, as approved by the President.

"SEC. 407. (a) In order to give effect to the objectives of this title the Work Administrator is authorized to provide to any person vocational free education or training, of not more than 6 months of full-time study or its equivalent in part-time study.

"(b) Every person, while he is receiving vocational education or training on a full-time basis, shall be entitled to receive a maintenance allowance at the rate of $50 a month if he has no dependent, $75 if he has one dependent, and $100 if he has two or more dependents. The Work Administrator may provide for maintenance allowances, under such conditions and in such amounts as may be prescribed by regulations, to servicemen and civilian workers receiving education or training on a part-time basis; but no such allowance shall be paid to any person receiving training on the job other than under an approved apprenticeship program.

"(c) The Work Administrator shall from time to time make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various trades, crafts, and professions. He shall make educational and vocational guidance generally available.

"SEC. 408. Section 2 of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. Mustering-out payment for persons eligible under section 1 shall be made in equal monthly installments. The first installment shall be paid at the time of final discharge or ultimate relief from active service, and the remaining installments shall be paid in successive months thereafter. Each installment shall be at the rate of $100 if the member of the armed forces has no dependent, $125 if he has one dependent, and $150 if he has two or more dependents. All persons shall be entitled to two installments plus an additional installment for each year of active service or major fraction thereof. Any person who has served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska shall be entitled to a further additional installment.'

"SEC. 409. (a) Every unemployed person who qualifies under the provisions of section 410 of this act shall, within 1 week after registration with a public employment office designated by the Work Administrator, be entitled to placement in a suitable job or shall be entitled to 'interim placement benefits' whose payment shall be administered in accordance with section 410. Such benefits shall be at the rate of $20 for each week of total unemployment if such person has no dependent, $25 if he has one dependent, $30 if he has two dependents, or $35 if he has three or more dependents: *Provided*, That in the case of a person other than an ex-serviceman, the maximum benefit paid shall not exceed 80 percent of his regular weekly earnings, as defined by the Work Administrator: *Provided further*, That any qualified person shall be entitled to reduced benefits for periods of partial unemployment in such amounts as the Work Administrator shall prescribe on the basis of the approximate proportion borne by such person's partial unemployment to total unemployment: *And provided further*, That no benefits for partial unemployment shall be paid in excess of an amount which when added to the person's earnings during the period of partial unemployment for which paid benefits on account of partial unemployment shall exceed eight-fifths of the benefits he would receive for total unemployment for such period.

"(b) No payment for 'interim placement benefits' shall be made under this title to any person for any period unless (1) he registers with and continues to report to a public employment office, or other agency designated in regulations of the Work Administrator, and (2) he is available for suitable work: *Provided, however*, That the conditions contained in (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not be applicable during periods of illness or disability.

"(c) The Work Administrator shall by regulation prescribe disqualifications, in such cases and under such conditions as he finds will promote the purposes of this act, for leaving suitable work voluntarily and without good cause, for failure to apply for suitable work, and for failure to accept suitable work when offered. No such disqualification shall be for a period of more than five weeks.

"(d) No work shall be deemed suitable for the purposes of this section, and benefits shall not be denied under this act to any otherwise qualified employee for refusing to accept work if—

"(1) the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute;

"(2) the remuneration, hours, or other conditions of work offered are substantially less favorable to the employee than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, or the rate of remuneration is less than the union wage rate, if any, for similar work in the locality;

"(3) as a condition of being employed he would be required to join a company union or to resign from or refrain from joining any bona fide labor organization;

"(4) acceptance of the work would require him to engage in activities in violation of law or which, by reason of their being in violation of reasonable requirements of the constitution, bylaws, or similar regulations of a bona fide labor organization of which he is a member, would subject him to expulsion from such labor organization; or

"(5) acceptance of the work would subject him to loss of substantial seniority rights under any collective-bargaining agreement between a bona fide labor organization and any other employer.

"(e) In determining whether or not any work is suitable for an employee for the purposes of this act, the Work Administrator shall consider, in addition to such other factors as he deems relevant, (1) the current practice, recognized by management and labor with respect to such work; (2) the degree of risk involved to such employee's health, safety, and morals; (3) his physical fitness and prior training; (4) his experience and prior earnings; (5) his length of unemployment and prospects for securing work in

his customary occupation; and (6) the distance of the available work from his residence and from his most recent work.

"(f) For the purposes of this act, no voluntary leaving of work shall be deemed to have been without good cause if the Work Administrator finds that such work would not have been suitable for the purposes of this section of this act.

"(g) No payment shall be made under this section to any person for any period for which he receives vocational education or training allowance under this title.

"(h) Any officer or agency of an employee, or any employee representative, or any employee acting in his own behalf, or any person whether or not of the character hereinbefore defined, who shall willfully fail or refuse to make any report or furnish any information required by the Work Administrator in the administration of this title, or who shall knowingly make or aid in making or cause to be made any false or fraudulent statement or report when a statement or report is required to be made for the purposes of this title, or who shall knowingly make or aid in making or cause to be made any false or fraudulent statement or claim for the purpose of causing benefits or other payment to be made or not to be made under this title, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"(i) Any person who violates any provision of this title, the punishment for which is not otherwise provided, shall be punished for each such violation by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 410. (a) The following shall be eligible for the 'interim placement benefits' prescribed in section 409:

"(1) Any ex-serviceman.

"(2) Any person who within 12 months prior to his first application for such benefits was employed—

"(i) 90 days in a Federal agency;

"(ii) 90 days as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel on the navigable waters of the United States; or

"(iii) 180 days in agricultural labor.

"(3) Any person who at the time of the first application is a 'qualified employee' as defined in section 3 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended.

"(4) Any person who at the time of first application for benefit would be eligible for unemployment compensation by virtue of his or her earnings under the laws of a State, in 'covered employment,' if all other qualifications were waived: *Provided, however,* That such State has arranged with the Work Administrator to pay and administer the 'interim placement benefits' prescribed in this title, either by contract, or through the provisions of State law or through such provision as the State or State unemployment compensation agency may make effective as agent of the Federal Government. For purposes of this subsection 'covered employment' shall include employment subject to the unemployment compensation law of such State and, upon election by such State, to administer any or all of the following classes of employment:

"(i) in establishments of less than eight persons not covered by a State unemployment compensation law;

"(ii) in State and local governmental agencies;

"(iii) in nonprofit organizations; and

"(iv) in domestic work.

"(5) Any person, in a State which has failed within 6 months after the enactment of this act to make an arrangement in accordance with the preceding subsection, with the Work Administrator, and who within 12 months prior to his first application for such benefits had earned not less than $150 in employment covered by title II of the Social Security Act (providing old-age and survivors insurance benefits): *Provided,* That such person's benefits shall be subject to the reduction, in accordance with the regulations of the Work Administrator, on account of any unemployment compensation paid him or payable to him by a State agency for the same period of unemployment.

"(b) Payments of 'interim placement benefits' to persons in categories (1), (2), and (5) shall be made through such agencies as the Work Administrator shall designate, including any Federal agency and any State or State unemployment compensation agency, which has arranged to administer benefits to persons in category (4); payments to persons in category (3) shall be made through the Railroad Retirement Board; and payments to persons in category (4) shall be made through the respective States which have arranged with the Work Administrator to make such payments pursuant to section 410 (a).

"(c) The Work Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such States or State unemployment compensation agencies as administer the payment of benefits under this title pursuant to this section, with respect to such periods as the payment of such benefits is so administered, advances, grants, or reimbursements, equal to all disbursements of benefits pursuant to this title, minus 50 percent of the amount of unemployment benefits that would have been payable had this title not been enacted as determined under the unemployment-compensation law of such State as of the date of the enactment of this act.

"The Railroad Retirement Board shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to the railroad unemployment-insurance accounts in the unemployment trust fund the amounts by which payments by it under this section exceed 50 percent of the amounts which would have been payable under the provisions of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act in effect at the time that this act was approved.

"The Work Administrator shall certify from time to time for payment to a State or State unemployment-compensation agency, or for credit to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Administration fund such amounts as he determines (i) are equal to administrative expenses theretofore reasonably incurred by such State or the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of any of the provisions of this title by arrangement with the Work Administrator, and (ii) have not been included in the basis of any previous certification under this paragraph.

"All persons otherwise eligible in accordance with this title for 'interim placement benefits' shall be eligible during the period beginning 30 days after the day of enactment of this act until 24 months after the cessation of hostilities: *Provided,* That such benefits shall be available to a serviceman discharged from or relieved from service after the termination of hostilities for a period of 24 months following his discharge.

"TITLE V—SETTLEMENT OF TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS

"On page 37 strike out 'Objectives of Act' as now on line 10.

"On page 37, line 11, to page 87, line 9, strike out and substitute as follows: for act, substitute title; for Director, substitute Administrator; for Office of Contract Settlement, substitute Contract Settlement Administration; for Director of Contract Settlement, substitute Administrator of the Contract Settlement Administration; renumber sections 1 to 25 as sections 501 to 525.

"Page 87, after line 9, insert:

"'TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

"'SEC. 601. As used in this act—

"'(a) "Government agency" means any executive department, independent establishment, agency, commission, board, bureau, division, administration, office, service, independent regulatory commission or board, and any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation.

"'(b) "Surplus war property" and "surplus property" means any property, real or personal, including but not limited to plants, facilities, equipment, machines, accessories, parts, assemblies, products, commodities, materials, and supplies in the possession of or controlled by any Government agency, whether new or used, in use or in storage, which are in excess of the needs of such agency or are not required for the performance of the duties and functions of such agency and which are determined, subject to the authority of the Office of War Mobilization, to be surplus by such agency.

"'(c) "Disposal agency" means any Government agency which has been assigned the operating function of disposing of surplus war property by the Administration.

"'(d) "Tax-supported institution" means any scientific, literary, educational, public health, or public welfare institution which is supported in whole or in part through the use of funds derived from taxation by the United States, the District of Columbia, or any State or any political subdivision thereof, any Territory or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision of any such Territory or possession

"'(e) "Disposal" means sale, conditional sale, or lease, for cash, credit, or other property; donation; or any other transfer.

"'(f) "Ex-servicemen" shall include all persons who served in active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and has been relieved or discharged from such active duty on conditions other than dishonorable.

"'(g) The term "State" shall include the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

"'SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

"'SEC. 603. The provisions of this act shall become effective immediately, unless otherwise provided in the act, and unless otherwise provided shall be terminated 24 months after the cessation of hostilities.'

"Page 87, line 11, renumber section 26 to become section 604.

"Page 87, strike out lines 17 and 18, substitute the following:

"'SEC. 605. This act may be cited as the "War Mobilization Adjustment Act of 1944."'

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to establish an Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment and to provide for the development and execution of war mobilization and post-war adjustment programs.'"

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the able Senator from Georgia for his very kind remarks.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to discuss my amendments as soon as possible.

At this time I desire to say that in the amendment which now lies on the desks of Senators, an insertion is to be made relative to the question of compensation. The insertion is to be made on page 31 of the amendments, and reads as follows:

5. Any person, in a State which has failed within 6 months after the enactment of this act to make an arrangement in accordance with the preceding subsection, with the Work Administrator, and who within 12 months prior to his first application for such benefits had earned not less than $150 in employment covered by title II of the Social Security Act (providing old-age and survivors insurance benefits): *Provided,* That such person's benefits shall be subject to the

reduction, in accordance with the regulations of the Work Administrator, on account of any unemployment compensation paid him or payable to him by a State agency for the same period of unemployment.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire at what point on page 31 the insertion just referred to by the Senator from West Virginia is to be made?

Mr. KILGORE. It is to be made after line 16, on page 31, immediately after subsection (iv). The addition is an insertion, not a change. It goes in at the point I have just indicated, and before the following paragraph (b).

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Mexico desire that I yield to him at this time?

Mr. HATCH. No; Mr. President, I withdraw my request that the Senator yield to me at this time. I wished to propound an interrogatory to the Senator from West Virginia, but I shall do so later, after the Senator from Montana has discussed his bill, and when the amendments come up.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the bill has already been fairly well discussed in the preliminary debate which has occurred on the motion made earlier in the day by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and subsequently withdrawn. I desire to say that the bill is one which has originated in the Senate. The bill did not come to the Senate from any of the Government agencies, from the administration, or from any other outside source.

The bill really originated as a result of complaints which the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises began to receive from small corporations engaged in war work, which were being affected by the termination of contracts. As early as June 24, 1943, I introduced a bill entitled "A bill to facilitate the termination of war contracts." That bill was introduced as a result of the many complaints which were coming to the Senate Committee on Small Business. It seems that a great many contracts which involved thousands of subcontractors had been terminated. One contract with the International Harvester Co. involved 2,500 subcontracts. A great many other prime contracts involving large numbers of subcontracts were being terminated. These terminations were vitally affecting the small contractors, because of the absolute need to get their money out of their war work when the contracts were terminated. So they became quite fearful of the prospect of having their money tied up for long periods of time. Many representatives of these small contractors came to our committee and complained that their contracts had been terminated for periods of many months, and that they saw no possibility of getting settlements. They were tied up as a result of the existing laws, which made it impossible for the war agencies to make speedy and equitable settlements of claims.

As a result of that situation, in June 1943 I introduced the first bill on the subject. Later, I was invited by the chairman of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning to sit with his committee for the purpose of cooperating in the study of the post-war program and problems which that committee was considering. I have since cooperated and consulted with that committee throughout the period while we were formulating this legislation, particularly the legislation pertaining to contract termination.

The bill which is before us today has two main principles. The first is speedy and fair settlements for all holders of terminated contracts. The bill undertakes to provide a method whereby those contracts can be terminated and promptly settled by the war agencies, without the need of waiting for an audit by the General Accounting Office, which up to the present time has precluded the Government agencies from making prompt settlements.

The bill undertakes to protect the Government against waste and fraud in making these settlements.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Does that mean that the General Accounting Office will have no further right to investigate claims after they are settled?

Mr. MURRAY. Oh, no. The bill contains very elaborate provisions designed to protect the Government from any danger of fraud, waste, or extravagance in the settlement of claims.

Mr. DAVIS. Does it take away from the Comptroller General any of the power he now has to continue his investigation after settlement has been made?

Mr. MURRAY. Absolutely no. The bill provides first that he shall have the right to investigate settlements with a view of determining whether or not fraud has occurred and whether or not payments have been made in accordance with the terms of the settlement.

The bill also provides that—

(c) The Comptroller General may investigate the settlements completed by each contracting agency for the purpose of reporting to the Congress from time to time on—

(1) whether the settlement methods and procedures employed by such agency are of a kind and type designed to result in expeditious and fair settlements in accordance with and subject to the provisions of this act and the orders and regulations of the Director;

(2) whether such methods and procedures are followed by such agency with care and efficiency; and

(3) whether such methods and procedures adequately protect the interest of the Government.

The bill further provides that—

If in any such report the Comptroller General shall find that the settlement methods and procedures fail to meet the foregoing standards, he shall make suggestions and recommendations to such agency for the improvement of such methods and procedures and to the Congress for any additional legislation needed to carry out the policies of this act. At least 30 days before filing any such report with the Congress, the Comptroller General shall deliver a copy thereof to the agency concerned and the Director, and shall forward to the Congress together with such report any comments of such agency with respect thereto.

The bill also contains this clause:

(d) The jurisdiction of the Comptroller General of the United States shall not be affected by this act except to the extent necessary to give effect to the specific provisions thereof.

So it will be seen that while the bill would prevent the interminable delays which might occur without such legislation, it would nevertheless safeguard the Government in every respect by protecting the Government from fraud, and also by authorizing the Comptroller General to carry on investigations to determine whether or not there was waste, extravagance, or failure efficiently and expeditiously to carry out settlements of contracts. In that respect I think the language of the bill cannot be questioned. I am satisfied that the Comptroller General will recognize that the bill would successfully meet the problem of safeguarding the Government from the danger of fraud or waste in connection with the settlement program.

I have mentioned the two basic principles. The Government would be protected in a fourfold way. The procurement agencies are responsible for making the contracts in the first instance. Being in possession of all the facts they should settle the contracts upon their termination. It would be utterly absurd and ridiculous to create an expanded General Accounting Office for the purpose of conducting the investigations and studies on which to base settlements of contracts. The various Government contracting agencies already have their own auditing personnel. They made the contracts, and they are in possession of all the facts and conditions and are able, with their own organizations, to carry out the investigations and fix the terms of the settlements.

The bill would establish a director of contract settlement, to supervise the activities of the procurement agencies in connection with contract settlements and interim financing. Under the terms of the bill, the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House would maintain continuous surveillance over the operations of the procurement agencies. The bill expressly provides for reports to be made to the Congress from time to time during the progress of the settlement of contracts, so that the Congress will be constantly in touch with what is going on in regard to contract settlement. If it discovers that there is any wastefulness or neglect to carry out the purposes of the law to bring about speedy and prompt settlements, the Congress can enact additional legislation to cover the situation.

The bill also provides a system of interim financing for the holders of contracts, so that as a result of the termination of the contracts they may not be placed in a dangerous financial situation because of their inability to obtain prompt payment for their work. The bill has very carefully worded provisions

in that respect, which were drafted in great detail in consultation with the various procurement offices and with the representatives of corporations having had experience in connection with terminated contracts. In that respect I believe that the bill in its present form is as carefully prepared as could be expected, and I am sure that it will prove satisfactory to the war agencies in carrying out the purposes intended.

The bill also undertakes to require the procurement agencies to give advance notice of contemplated terminations of contracts so as to facilitate the efficient use of materials, manpower, and facilities for war and for civilian purposes.

It also provides a method for the removal and storage of the materials which are left on hand, such as machinery and equipment which may no longer be needed in connection with war production.

The bill also provides that if not removed within 60 days, the contractor may remove and store such property at Government risk and expense.

The bill expressly removes personal financial liability of contracting officers, a matter which is very important in connection with bringing about a speedy settlement of contracts. It seems to me that with $14,000,000,000 worth of contracts already terminated, and with many thousands of small contractors involved, it would be a very serious situation for the country if we failed to provide a quick, fair, and equitable method of settlement of those claims, removal of the inventories on the floors of the contractors, and the removal of the machinery which they no longer need in order to allow them to convert to civilian production.

I believe the bill is very effective in that respect and will enable the contracting officers to make settlements, and place contractors in a position where they may quickly reconvert to civilian production.

The bill contains provisions for the preservation of records made in connection with those settlements so as to facilitate prosecutions for fraud wherever fraud may be discovered.

The bill also sets up very serious penalties for any violations of its provisions. I think that in every way the bill covers every feature that should be covered in a bill of this nature to enable contracts to be speedily settled permitting the concerns involved to return to civilian activities.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question at this point?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. On page 72 of the bill, section 15 (a) provides as follows:

> Whenever any payment is made from Government funds to any war contractor or other person as an advance, partial, or final payment on any termination claim, or pursuant to any loan, guaranty, or agreement for the purchase of any loan, or any commitment in connection therewith, entered into by the Government, no officer or other Government agent authorizing or approving such payment or settlement, or certifying the voucher for such payment, or making the payment in accordance with a duly certified voucher—

Here is the language to which I wish to invite attention—

> shall be personally liable for such payment, in the absence of fraud on his part.

I ask the Senator from Montana if that language does not leave a loophole wide open for a defense, even in a case of gross negligence so long as there is no proof that personal gain was had by the officer? I am not talking about the contractor but about the man who negotiates and puts through the settlement in termination, namely, the representative of the Government. It must be realized that there will be literally thousands of such representatives of the Government. The Ordnance Department alone has about 19 different offices; the Signal Department has a great many; the Navy has under it the various naval districts, and the Quartermaster Corps has many different organizations. The settlements will be made in a particular locality by the agency involved. I am wondering if this proposal would not let the bars down so low that some person could carelessly or negligently, without checking, act wrongfully in connection with the settlements. Would it not be better to use the language "fraud or negligence" or "fraud or gross negligence"?

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator from West Virginia has stated a reasonable apprehension. However, when the Senator considers the situation very carefully I believe he will find that a provision such as he has suggested would so slow up the process of settling the claims as to create a very serious condition throughout the country. Furthermore, the officer who is guilty of gross negligence can be disciplined under the present rules and regulations of the war agencies. He can be removed from office or be prosecuted.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, allow me to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the tool sale at Detroit the officer involved was promoted and transferred. In several other similar cases there have been promotions and transfers. So far, I have been unable to find any instance in which negligence was punished.

Mr. MURRAY. The case to which the Senator has referred was not in connection with the settlement of a contract; it was in connection with an entirely different situation. Furthermore, the Comptroller General has made no objection, such as the Senator raises here, to the language now in the bill. If the Comptroller General, who is vitally interested in protecting the Government from fraud, waste, or extravagance, thought that such a provision as the one suggested by the Senator from West Virginia was necessary, I am sure he would have insisted on it being incorporated in the bill. However, the Comptroller General knows that if such a provision were inserted in the bill at the place suggested by the Senator it would render the bill so impossible of accomplishing the purposes intended that we would have a real crisis in connection with the settlement of these claims.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Senator misunderstood me. I invite his attention to the same page of the bill and specifically with regard to the language under the subheading "The General Accounting Office," which reads as follows:

> Any other provision of law notwithstanding, the function of the General Accounting Office with respect to any termination settlement made, authorized, ratified, or approved by a contracting agency shall be confined to determining, after final settlement, (1) whether the settlement payments to the war contractor were made in accordance with the settlement—

Not whether they were based on the correct figures, but whether they were made in accordance with the terms of the settlement agreed upon, and—

> (2) Whether the records transmitted to it, or other information, warrant a reasonable belief that the settlement was induced by fraud.

So the General Accounting Office apparently has nothing to do except check the amount of the check against the agreement, and with no authority to go behind the agreement to ascertain whether the representations made were accurate, or whether the figures might have been erroneously handled.

Mr. MURRAY. The General Accounting Office has the function, however, of carrying on investigations to determine as to what extent anything like what the Senator has referred to occurred in the process of settling the claims, and to report to the Congress so that if it should be found that any glaring cases of gross negligence or carelessness, which would result in great loss to the Government, had occurred, additional legislation can be enacted to overcome such conditions. However, at the present time it is more important to have legislation, even though there may be some instances of losses through carelessness or negligence, which will make it possible to bring about speedy settlements. It has been found under existing laws and conditions that these contracts are piling up. As I mentioned a few moments ago, I recall the representative of the Stewart-Warner Co. coming to the Small Business Committee offices one day, with officers from the Navy Department, in connection with a contract that had been terminated nearly a year ago which the procurement officers were afraid to settle for fear that the General Accounting Office would hold them individually responsible for having paid money that they should not have paid.

If we are going to have a contract settlement bill at all, we have got to have one that is effective and efficient. We have never had in this country before a situation like that confronting us today. At the end of the last war there were only approximately $4,000,000,000 in contracts terminated. We have already terminated $14,000,000,000 worth of contracts, and, if the war in Europe were to end in a few weeks, we would have $25,000,000,000 more added immediately. So, it can be readily seen what would happen if the country were to be confronted with that situation without legislation which would make it possible for the procure-

ment agencies to carry out expeditious settlements of the various claims.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. I presume the committee has given consideration in connection with the termination of war contracts to the great number of men who will be unemployed after they are terminated.

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly, that phase of the matter has been considered.

Mr. DAVIS. As has already been pointed out by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the committee is going to consider the question of unemployment insurance and all related questions, especially those affecting the men returning from the war.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. The unemployment situation in connection with the termination of war contracts has not as yet developed to a sufficient extent to make it a serious problem. There has been some slight lessening in the numbers employed in war work during the past year, but it is not a serious question at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS. Referring to the discussion between the Senator from Montana and the Senator from West Virginia a few moments ago as to the Comptroller General, I presume the Comptroller General has considered and approved the pending legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. The Comptroller General has gone over the bill very carefully and takes the position that, if we must have contract-termination legislation in order to expedite the settlement of war-contract claims, this proposed legislation carries out that purpose as effectively as could be expected. I will ask that the statement of the Comptroller General be incorporated in the RECORD at this point, and I will read the concluding language as follows:

Finally, Mr. Warren ended his letter with the following statement:

"While as hereinbefore stated, I am still of the view that there should be an independent audit and review of proposed settlements prior to the making of final payments thereunder, nevertheless, I have no objections to offer to the bill S. 1718, except as hereinbefore noted, as it is believed that the provisions of the bill, if properly administered, are adequate to accomplish the announced objective thereof."

I ask that the entire statement of the Comptroller General be printed in the RECORD at this point, starting on page 11 and extending to the middle of page 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

VI. STATEMENT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

On February 15, 1944, the chairman of your War Contracts Subcommittee forwarded S. 1718 to the Honorable Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, and requested his comments on the bill. It was felt that the Comptroller's views on the bill were of great importance not only because he had previously raised the question of whether or not final settlements should be made by the General Accounting Office but because the Comptroller has always evidenced an interest in strengthening the legislative process and in preventing wasteful expenditures that might well serve as a shining example to be followed by other agencies of the Government.

On February 22, 1944, Mr. Warren replied to the chairman's letter, stressing "the need for enactment of appropriate legislation and the formulation by the Congress of the policy and procedure to be followed in the settlement and payment of obligations under war contracts which may be terminated. He also reiterated his belief that final settlements should be made "only after an audit and review of the proposed settlements by an independent agency. However, and especially in the absence of such a provision," stated Mr. Warren, "I am convinced that an independent agency should exercise effective control over the program and it is noted that the bill provides for an independent agency—the Office of Contract Settlement—clothed with supervisory and regulatory authority which should be effective, if properly exercised and administered, to control termination settlements and payments in the various war-contracting agencies and bring uniformity to the program."

Mr. Warren then suggested two amendments. The first amendment eliminates subsection (a) of section 23, which would authorize the Director of Contract Settlement to delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him to the head of any Government agency, and to authorize successive redelegation of such authority and discretion. Mr. Warren pointed out that this provision would allow the Director to delegate all his supervisory powers back to the contracting agencies. The second amendment clarifies section 16 on the role of the General Accounting Office. It eliminates the first sentence in this section and makes it clear that the operations of the General Accounting Office in detecting fraud depend on the adequacy of the records submitted to it. It also maintains th jurisdiction of the Comptroller General except to the extent such jurisdiction is limited by the act.

Both of these amendments are acceptable to your subcommittee.

Finally, Mr. Warren ended his letter with the following statement:

"While as hereinbefore stated, I am still of the view that there should be an independent audit and review of proposed settlements prior to the making of final payments thereunder, nevertheless, if the Congress, as a matter of public policy, should decide otherwise, I have no objections to offer to the bill S. 1718, except as hereinbefore noted, as it is believed that the provisions of the bill, if properly administered, are adequate to accomplish the announced objective thereof."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not think there is any doubt in the world with reference to the absolute necessity of this proposed legislation. The contracting agencies have all studied this bill; the committees that have been working on it have gone into it very carefully; the corporations to be affected by it have had their expert accountants and expert advisers study the bill, and it seems to meet with the general approval of the country. I do not know of any objection that has been urged to the bill as it is now pending before the Senate. There may be some need for clarifying amendments; there may be something that might be added to the bill in some respects, but, so far as the bill is concerned as now worded, it is designed to and will carry out the objective which is sought, and that is to avoid the piling up of contracts and the danger of creating widespread bankruptcy among war contractors because of their inability to get the money out of their contracts.

A question was raised in the early part of the debate with regard to the human problems connected with the subject of reconversion. Of course, as I have already stated, I believe that the human question is quite as vital and quite as important as the property question. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and I are willing to go forward, as we have stated several times, with the preparation of the over-all legislation and with the study of proper measures to provide unemployment compensation in connection with this whole program. Certainly that must be done. It is absolutely necessary that we avoid any serious unemployment conditions developing during the progress of reconversion, and if some unemployment does develop we must be ready with an unemployment compensation system which will take care of the situation. I am confident that legislation of that kind can be prepared very quickly if we go to work at it when this bill is out of the way. The Military Affairs Subcommittee which is now studying those subjects will continue its hearings, and I think with the cooperation of the Senate Post-War Planning Committee, we should be able to report some over-all legislation comprising the objectives which are set forth in the statement issued by the labor organizations demanding a fuller program of reconversion.

I think that that is all I have to say for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, with regard to the amendment I offered I have a few things I should like to say. The amendment does not in any way affect the provisions discussed by the able Senator from Montana, but goes to other phases of the demobilization problem. I should like briefly to call attention to that aspect of the amendment.

In the first place the amendment, in addition to provision for supervising contract termination, sets up a unified agency which will work simultaneously in directing the various agencies as to the four phases of the program. It includes planning, cut-back, and return to civil production. It also contemplates a planning agency for the return to civilian production by the companies whose contracts have been terminated, and provides for the settlement of the terminated contracts, and the training and retraining of displaced war workers and servicemen who come back to seek a place in our civilian economy. It provides unemployment compensation for released workers during the transition period in order to maintain our economy at a high level.

It also seeks to enlist the major groups of our population—industry, agriculture, and labor—in the work of reconversion and demobilization, by securing their active cooperation in the work of the top agencies, and by having them act as channels for the constructive organized efforts of these groups in the making of

programs and policies for the transition to peace. In other words, it provides in the top bracket for an advisory committee, who shall represent not only the three groups I have mentioned, but also the consumer group, in the study of what is necessary properly to return from a war economy to a peace economy.

It sets up a program bureau within the over-all office, with a director of program planning, and a proper advisory council under him, which is tied up with the practical operation of the various war agencies seeking a gradual elimination of wartime governmental control, at the same time encouraging the development of local and regional as well as national programs to continue the momentum of the high wartime production.

My attention was forcefully called to that matter today by a letter I received from a man who is handling manpower in one of our largest centers, who stated that uncontrolled termination of contracts, without supervision and without planning might cause chaos in certain localities, whereas the termination of contracts gradually, and the spreading of termination Nation-wide by careful planning, would have a good effect. Let me give an illustration. The Ordnance Department decides to terminate a contract for gun mounts. Simultaneously the Signal Corps decides to terminate a contract for signal equipment, the Quartermaster Corps decides to terminate a contract they have for equipment, and the Navy terminates a contract for motors. Those 4 terminations could be spread Nation-wide if the matter were well planned, and 1 termination could take place in each of 4 localities, instead of taking place simultaneously in the same locality. If, instead of shutting down one big plant in each of four big centers, there should be shut down four big plants in one big center, possibly from 80,000 to 100,000 people would be made jobless immediately.

The orderly disposition of surplus Federal property is also taken into account, in accordance with general policies laid down by the Congress to safeguard the Public Treasury, to protect small business, and also to increase production employment, rather than leaving the disposal of surplus property to a host of executive agencies, without any policy directives from the Congress.

For instance, recently 5,500 tons of wood screws were offered for sale by one depot. Those are items vitally needed in the civilian economy right now. They would all be grabbed up, quite properly, and would find a place, a helpful place, in the civilian economy without disturbing production anywhere. But the advertising for sale in one bulk lot, by one agency of the Government, of 5,500 tons of wood screws, to be sold to one purchaser under a sealed bid, was an invitation to speculation and an invitation to profiteering at the expense of the civilian economy, and at the expense of the Government.

Another item taken up in the amendment is the question of job placement, training, and increased unemployment benefits, which are provided for mustered-out veterans and released civilian workers during the period of conversion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no information as to how long the Senator desires to pursue his argument on his amendment, but in view of the fact that there are other matters in the bill which might be disposed of this afternoon, I was wondering whether the Senator would be willing that action on the other matters be taken, and his amendment go over until tomorrow, with the understanding that the Senator have the floor when the Senate meets tomorrow.

Mr. KILGORE. With that understanding, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that can be agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. If it is agreed to, I am willing to have other matters taken up.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if that is the understanding, I should like to move to strike out a certain provision which I think has been included in the bill by inadvertence. I refer to section 23, on page 86, beginning with line 12, where the bill provides:

> Nothing in this act shall prevent the Director from exercising any authority conferred upon him by any other statute or Executive order.

It would appear that if we incorporated the words "or Executive order" in the bill it would permit the director to take any Executive order in the future, or one issued in the past, in preference to the provisions of the bill. As I understand, there is no objection to striking out that provision on page 86, lines 12 to 14.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator is asking to have striken from the bill the language at the bottom of page 86, lines 22 to 24.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, lines 12 to 14, which read:

> Nothing in this act shall prevent the Director from exercising any authority conferred upon him by any other statute or Executive order.

"Or Executive order" is the language which should be stricken out.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no objection to that language being stricken out.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think there is any objection to that. I am rather inclined to think that language remained in the bill from the period when it was contemplated placing the Director of Contract Cancelation in the War Mobilization Board itself. Probably it is an explanatory statement. If not, I do not see any real purpose for it, and I see no objection to striking it out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, after consulting with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] I have come to the conclusion that there is a real need for a specific mandate to the Smaller War Plants Corporation to assist small business concerns in preparing themselves for termination, and to advise them on how to obtain interim financing and secure fair settlements. I would therefore like to propose on behalf of myself and the Senator from Ohio, an amendment to section 20 (f), to follow at the end of that subsection, after line 3, on page 84.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 84, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby directed—
>
> (a) to disseminate information among small business concerns with respect to interim financing, termination settlements, removal and storage of termination inventories pursuant to the provisions of this act and the regulations of the director:
>
> (b) to assist small business concerns in connection with the securing of interim financing and the preparation of applications for such interim financing; the effecting of termination settlements; and the removal and storage of termination inventories, in order to assure that small business concerns receive fair and equitable treatment from prime contractors and intermediate subcontractors in connection with the termination of war contracts.

Mr. MURRAY. The purpose of that amendment is to have the Smaller War Plants Corporation, through its personnel, assist small contractors in preparing their claims in connection with the settlement of their contracts, and also in connection with interim financing and other matters, where the small contractors are not equipped with the expert assistants necessary to handle problems of that kind. I see no reason why that should not be done.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I see no objection to that amendment, but does not the Smaller War Plants Corporation have all the authority that is suggested in the proposed amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not think the Corporation would be required to do that work. It has the personnel and has the ability to do it, but I do not think it would be required to do it without the proposed legislation.

Mr. MALONEY. It is pretty generally being done now, is it not?

Mr. MURRAY. The Corporation may render assistance, but, of course, when contracts begin to be terminated in larger volume it may become necessary for the Smaller War Plants Corporation to put additional workers on that kind of work to assist the contractors in preparing their forms.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask this question for information: Does the Senator see wherein the proposed amendment in any way increases the power of the Smaller War Plants Corporation?

Mr. MURRAY. No; it does not.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Who prepares the applications at the present time?

Mr. MURRAY. Who prepares the applications for the small contractors?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. They prepare them themselves, or receive assistance, perhaps, from the procurement agencies to

some extent. I do not know to what extent. As a general rule, I think they have to hire a lawyer or an expert accountant, and it seems to me that with the trained personnel in the Smaller War Plants Corporation who are familiar with the problems it would be a simple matter for them to aid in working out these forms for the smaller concerns.

Mr. LANGER. I take it then it is not the intention in this amendment to set up a vast army of employees located in different areas of the United States to prepare the applications in different sections of the country. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. No; there is no such intention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on page 84 after line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 69, line 9, by striking out the words "by agreement with the other."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 69, in line 9 of the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out the words "by agreement with the other."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, my reason for suggesting the amendment is that the wording of the bill is misleading. In subsection (f) on page 69 we find these words:

> Whenever any dispute exists between any war contractor and a subcontractor regarding any termination claim, either of them—

And then come the words which I propose to strike out by my amendment—

> by agreement with the other—

And then comes the following language—

> may submit the dispute—
>
> (1) to the Appeal Board in accordance with subsection (d) of this section;
>
> (2) to a contracting agency for mediation or arbitration whenever authorized by the agency or required by the Director.

In other words, by leaving in the words "either of them," either party is given the right to appeal, but by the wording as it now stands, without striking out the words "by agreement with the other," it means that appeal can be taken only by agreement between the parties who are in conflict.

Mr. MURRAY. That leaves both parties in the same position. It may be that the contractor would prefer to take his case to the courts and have his rights adjudicated by the courts, instead of taking the appeal. So that this provision was put in the measure expressly for the purpose of giving that privilege to the contractor—the right to go into court with his claim if he does not want to follow the procedure outlined in the bill with regard to appeals to the Board. The subcontractors should be free to sue if they want to do so in the State courts, as they normally would. Any provision allowing appeals by subcontractors without an agreement on the part of the prime contractors would be a one-way proposition. The prime contractor could not prevent the subcontractor from suing in the State court, even if the prime contractor was willing to go to the Appeal Board.

Mr. KILGORE. If that was the intent, Mr. President, it was misleading to me, because I thought from the wording as it now is that either of them could appeal. I cannot see why the wording "may by agreement" was not used here, as it is used in most laws.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I make a statement in answer to the Senator from West Virginia? The Senator from Montana has made a very accurate statement of the purpose. A subcontractor who has not been recognized by the Government has no right to appeal to the Appeal Board. He has a right to go to a court. If the Government recognizes him he has an absolute right to appeal to the Appeal Board or go to court at his election.

But a subcontractor who has no contractual relation with the Government, and who has not been recognized by the Government, can, by agreement with his prime contractor, say, "We will settle the whole thing by going to the Appeal Board". That is why the language "by agreement with the other" is placed in the measure. The Government does not have anything to do with the decision made by the subcontractor and the prime contractor in that respect. If by agreement they decide to go to the Appeal Board they can go to that Board. Of course if the subcontractor has been recognized by the Government he has a right to go to the Appeal Board anyway. But in the other situation, where the prime contractor could not compel the subcontractor to go before the Appeal Board, he might want to go into court, as the Senator from Montana has explained.

Mr. KILGORE. Is there any way the subcontractor can force the United States to recognize him in the event he feels that the prime contractor is not treating him fairly?

Mr. GEORGE. He can go into court.

Mr. KILGORE. He can go into court only against the prime contractor?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. The point is that it leaves to the Government a discretionary power. The Government agencies may recognize certain contractors, but if they elect not to recognize the subcontractors they can automatically exclude them, and force them into expensive litigation in the courts.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, but if the subcontractor and the prime contractor agree, the subcontractor could go before the appeal board.

Mr. KILGORE. The point I am making is that if the Government does not recognize the subcontractor, and if the prime contractor insists on the agreement provided by the language of the committee amendment, there is no way by which the subcontractor can protect himself. He is at the mercy of the prime contractor.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, there is every reason to expect that agreements will be reached between the prime contractors and the subcontractors, because the prime contractors will be assured that the Government will approve of settlements that are made through the appeal to the board, so that it seems to me there would be very few instances where there would be a failure to agree to the appeal.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand, but I have always found that in an eight-line mule team there was always one mule who would buck and balk and that is the reason for my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], on page 69, line 9.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have a few additional amendments to offer. They are in the nature of corrections. The first amendment I offer is on page 48, in line 9. The language "subsection (b)" should be changed to read "subsection (c)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. I offer a further amendment on page 53, in line 9. The word "and" should be changed to read "any."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that is all for the present.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. On page 69, in line 21, the bill reads:

> For the purpose of expediting the adjudication of termination claims, the Court of Claims is authorized to appoint not more than 10 auditors and not more than 20 commissioners in addition to those provided for by the act of February 24, 1925 * * *, as amended by the act of June 23, 1930.

Mr. MURRAY. The Court of Claims has 6 commissioners now, and the bill would authorize the appointment of not more than 20.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator say the Court of Claims has only six auditors at the present time?

Mr. MURRAY. The Court of Claims has no auditors. It has six commissioners.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the language does not specify the amount of the salaries they are to receive. What salaries are to be paid them?

Mr. MURRAY. They will be paid in accordance with the salaries provided for in the act.

Mr. LANGER. What is that provision?

Mr. MURRAY. It is in accordance with the legislation governing the Court of Claims. I do not have the act before me at the moment. But the salaries paid will be in accordance with the existing law.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator happen to know what salaries the commissioners receive?

Mr. MURRAY. No. However, it is absolutely necessary to have these additional commissioners, in the face of the tremendous task which they will have to confront. The provision for the additional commissioners has been requested by the chief justice of the Court of Claims.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to know whether the additional commissioners are to be paid $8,000 a year or $10,000 a year, or just what salaries they will receive.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the commissioners do not receive any high salaries, but I am not familiar with the exact amounts paid them. Can the Senator from Georgia answer that question?

Mr. GEORGE. Is the question relative to the salaries paid to the commissioners of the Court of Claims?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not recall. We can obtain that information in chapter 573 of 46 Statutes 799. But I do not recall the amount of the salaries they are paid.

Mr. MURRAY. I shall endeavor to find that out in a few moments.

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest that that information can be obtained between now and the morning, and can be furnished tomorrow to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think that concludes consideration of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether that concludes consideration of the measure, with the exception of the information requested by the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY subsequently said: Mr. President, in answer to the question raised by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] with reference to the salaries of United States commissioners, I wish to say that I now have before me the provisions of title 28, section 270, of the United States Code Annotated. It provides that—

> Each of said commissioners shall devote all of his time to the duties of his office and receive a salary of $5,000 per annum.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

INVESTIGATION OF SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] wishes to have the Senate consider a resolution dealing with an investigation of the seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant. I have suggested some amendments which I understand are acceptable.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 286.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 286), as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the action of the Attorney General of the United States in seizing the plant of Montgomery Ward & Co., in forcibly removing the chairman of its board of directors from the premises, and in the use of military force in connection therewith, with a view to ascertaining whether such action was warranted and authorized under the laws of the United States.
>
> For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TUNNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I have suggested some amendments which I think will certainly obviate any objection which I had to consideration of the measure if the Senator is willing to have the amendments read. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, have agreed that with these amendments there is no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be left in its present status, but that the author of the resolution, myself, be permitted to modify it by striking out all of the resolution beginning in line 10 on page 1, and continuing down to line 12 on page 2. My reason for making that request is that under the Senate rules a resolution asking for an appropriation for an investigation must be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is the part which the Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent to have eliminated the part providing for an appropriation? I may state for the information of the Senator from Delaware and other Senators that my own view is that the Committee on the Judiciary already has ample jurisdiction to investigate not only the Montgomery Ward case but any other cases arising as a result of an Executive order or proclamation issued by the President. The committee is now proceeding to do so. But the Senator from Virginia has offered the resolution, and I have no objection to it, providing it is made to harmonize with the resolution heretofore offered and agreed to, and under which the Committee on the Judiciary is proceeding. Of course, I would be the last one to wish to have the investigation a one-sided or one-way one. In order that such a situation might be obviated, I had suggested that in line 2 of the resolution, after the word "thereof", the following be inserted:

> For the information of the Senate, and as a basis for any legislation the committee may deem it advisable to recommend.

That language is the language of the original McCarran resolution.

The only reason for investigations by Senate committees is to furnish the Senate information which will operate as a basis for any legislation the committee may recommend.

I have also suggested that in line 7, after the word "therewith", the following language be inserted:

> Together with a full and complete investigation of the facts regarding the policies, relationships, and controversies between Montgomery Ward & Co., and its employees prior to and leading up to the taking over of such plants by the Government of the United States through any of its agencies.

Consequently, Mr. President, under this resolution, the Committee on the Judiciary would not merely investigate the taking over of the plant by the military, but would also investigate the policies, controversies, and relationships between Montgomery Ward & Co. and its employees, leading up to the taking over the plant, so that the investigation would be a real investigation of the conditions leading up to the taking over of the plant, as well as an investigation of the actual taking over of the plant by the military.

In addition, I have suggested as a further amendment that on page 1, in line 7, beginning with the word "with", the language down to and including lines 8 and 9 be stricken out. That is the language which would instruct the committee to report as to the validity of the actual taking over of the plant by the military. That matter is one upon which only the courts can pass. I feel, and the chairman of the committee also has expressed the same view, that it is not the function of the committee to pass on the legality of the action, but that its function is to investigate the facts and bring them to the attention of the Senate.

I have no objection to that sort of an investigation. I think that is the type of investigation which already is authorized and is being conducted by the Committee on the Judiciary. But the suggested amendments make the resolution harmonize with the other one.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President I wish to say that I have gone over the amendments carefully, and I have no objection to them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield to the Senator from Maine in a moment. I have already promised to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, my objection is based on my understanding that the Committee on the Judiciary is going ahead with an investigation. Is the investigation provided for in the resolution a separate one?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, Mr. President; it is not a separate one. In fact, the Committee on the Judiciary already is en-

gaged in that investigation, as I said a while ago. The committee has already proceeded, and has sent a man to Chicago. The resolution simply calls the attention of the Judiciary Committee to the Montgomery Ward case and authorizes it to make the same kind of investigation it is already making in regard to it.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does it simply authorize what it already has authority to do?

Mr. BARKLEY. What it has authority to do in general terms, but without reference to the particular company. That is true.

Mr. TUNNELL. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator has spoken of another resolution, and an investigation and study under it. Does the Senator refer to the Shipstead resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. It is the resolution which was adopted 3 or 4 weeks ago, authorizing the committee to investigate all Executive orders and proclamations issued by the President since March 4, 1933.

Mr. WHITE. The next question I wish to ask is whether the Shipstead resolution would authorize an inquiry into a situation which had arisen subsequent to the passage of the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so. I believe that resolution is continuing authority on the part of the committee, not only as to proclamations and orders issued prior to that date, but those which may come along concurrently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to modify the resolution, beginning after line 9 on page 1, by eliminating lines 10, 11, and 12 on that page, and down to and including line 12 on page 2. As I explained, the purpose is to avoid referring the resolution, under the rules of the Senate, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 1, line 2, after the word "thereof", to insert "for the information of the Senate, and as a basis for any legislation the committee may deem it advisable to recommend".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The amendment was again stated.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe that amendment strengthens the resolution, and I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "therewith", to insert "together with a full and complete investigation of the facts regarding the policies, relationships, and controversies between Montgomery Ward & Co. and its employees prior to and leading up to the taking over of such plants by the Government of the United States through any of its agencies."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have another amendment to offer, on page 1, line 7, after the word "therewith", to strike out "with a view to ascertaining whether such action was warranted and authorized under the laws of the United States."

That language would seek to confer upon the committee jurisdiction to pass upon the validity and legality of the act of taking the plant, which is a matter for the courts and not for a committee of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, with those amendments, I have no objection to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified resolution, as amended.

The modified resolution (S. Res. 286), submitted by Mr. BYRD on April 28, 1944, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, for the information of the Senate, and as a basis for any legislation the committee may deem it advisable to recommend, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the action of the Attorney General of the United States in seizing the plant of Montgomery Ward & Co., in forcibly removing the chairman of its board of directors from the premises, and in the use of military force in connection therewith, together with a full and complete investigation of the facts regarding the policies, relationships, and controversies between Montgomery Ward & Co., and its employees prior to and leading up to the taking over of such plants by the Government of the United States through any of its agencies.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon we attached an amendment to the Agriculture bill providing for a continuation of the school lunch program. I supported and voted for this measure at the request of many school officers, school educators, and teachers in North Dakota and was particularly happy when the bill was amended to provide that the school lunch program should continue through this year, all of 1945, and the first 6 months of 1946 because, presumably, the war will either last that long or we may have bad post-war conditions.

This morning I was pleased by an article in the Christian Science Monitor and I shall ask unanimous consent to have the article made a part of this RECORD.

Certainly if the United States can feed the children of other places all over the world, we can feed those of our own country. The record of the Selective Service Board shows that 1½ percent of those of draft age were turned down because of malnutrition. As long as I am a Member of the Senate I will support any legislation which will keep all of our little children from going hungry, whether they be located in North Dakota, the far West, the deep South, or any other part of the United States. With the largest income, running far, far into the billions more than this country has seen in all its history, there is no excuse for want, misery, suffering, and starvation on the part of little boys and girls who will some day be the citizens of this country to whom posterity will look for the preservation of America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Senate Acts To Salvage School Lunch Program," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, published at Boston, under date of May 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE ACTS TO SALVAGE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

(By Mary Hornaday)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The Senate moved today to salvage and extend even to one-room schools the school-lunch program which the House voted down a few weeks ago.

Senate debate is centering around the Russell bill, which would divide authority for the program between the War Food Administration and the United States Office of Education. Heretofore, the War Food Administration has had complete authority in the distribution of Federal funds for school lunches.

Educators, spearheading their campaign through the United States Office of Education, have been arguing that the program could be reaching more children in a more effective way if local education authorities were given more responsibility in the program. The Office of Education proposed today before a Senate Agriculture subcommittee through Dr. Bess Goodykoontz, Assistant Commissioner of Education, that States be required to match Federal funds dollar for dollar, but this was opposed by the National Education Association, which argued: "Those States least able to match these funds are the ones who need the most, since they have less money and more children."

The House omitted funds for the school-lunch program for the coming year because the program, started by the old Work Projects Administration, has no statutory standing.

About 4,445,000 children in 30,000 schools in the United States are receiving lunches or milk paid for in part by the Food Distribution Administration at the present time. Of these, 12 percent are served free meals, 4 percent are served at less than prevailing charges, and 32 percent are served milk only. The rest of the children pay the prevailing charge even though this is less than cost.

The Office of Education estimates that another 30,000 schools have provided lunches for about 4,000,000 students without Federal monetary aid.

In their search for a proper basis for a permanent school-lunch program, the Senators have considered three bills:

1. The Russell bill would appropriate $65,000,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture for school-lunch food and $3,000,000 to the Office of Education for training of technical and supervisory personnel to operate local programs. The Office of Education funds would have to be matched by the States. Money

from both agencies would be apportioned on a basis of school enrollment to public and nonprofit schools of high-school grades and under on a basis of need.

2. The Smith-Ellender bill would appropriate $50,000,000 to be administered by State departments of education through the United States Office of Education to provide lunches and nutrition instruction to school children. During the first year, the State and local systems would be required to contribute 30 percent of the funds and thereafter half the total expenditures.

3. The Wagner bill would continue the present school-lunch set-up, allowing the War Food Administration to spend $80,000,000 of its funds for this purpose, compared with $50,000,000 this year.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elwyn R. Shaw to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Byron B. Harlan to be United States attorney for the southern district of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William M. Lindsay to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold K. Claypool to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of S. Pinkney Tuck to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of R. Henry Norweb to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, May 4, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

S. Pinkney Tuck to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

R. Henry Norweb to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Elwyn R. Shaw to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Byron B. Harlan to be United States attorney for the southern district of Ohio.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William M. Lindsay to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas.

Harold K. Claypool to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

POSTMASTERS

MISSOURI

Hugh W. Parks, Canalou.
Ida F. Davison, Elkland.
Joseph C. Mosley, Mokane.
Earl A. Banning, Oregon.

TEXAS

William G. Fuchs, Thrall.
Sarah B. Morris, Voth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, by whom light is sown for the righteous and gladness for the upright in heart, we are mindful of Thy gracious promise: "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." From that pride which is the root of evil do Thou spare us, and endow us with that grace which is the beginning of virtue. Without complaint and in the spirit of high privilege we pray that we may bear our responsibilities and perform our whole duty. Thou to whom all power and wisdom belongeth, possess our minds that our procedure may be just and upright.

Heavenly Father, a free country dictates its own destiny; how solemn the thought that the law of liberty becomes supreme and that sentence is pronounced by ourselves. By the power of public opinion, the influence of home, and the law of the state—by these we are to be judged. In our Republic we follow not a path galled by chains that fret and weary the human soul but seek the highway with Thy light like a beacon before our waiting eyes. We pray for a mighty crusade against all giant evils and for those girders of unselfishness which form a human bridge by which the perishing may climb to life and safety. Grant that the consummation of this noble hope may be realized and become a disinfectant in all sections of our broad land. In the name of the Son of Man. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4278. An act to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMITH, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of War.

ERADICATION OF INSECT PESTS, FOREST CONTROL, AND AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly

marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and ask for the appointment of conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FLANNAGAN, COOLEY, PACE, HOPE, and ANTON J. JOHNSON.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON ESTABLISHING POST-OFFICE BRANCHES AND STATIONS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 4517) to remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes that Members will not ask to proceed for 1 minute. We have a special order of 2 hours for today, after which the House will take up consideration of a tax bill.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Speaker to say that I could not speak for 1 minute?

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggested that Members not request time to speak for 1 minute, but the gentleman may submit his request.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LESINSKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this meeting will start at 1:30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent that leaves of absence be granted on May 5 and 6 to Mr. BONNER, of North Carolina, Mr. CAPOZZOLI, of New York, Mr. BRADLEY, of Michigan, Mr. MCWILLIAMS, of Connecticut, Mr. FORAND, of Rhode Island, and me, to attend the meeting of the Board of Visitors of the United States Coast Guard Academy called for that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. OUTLAND, Mr. COFFEE, and Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix.)

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other to include an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. KELLEY, Mr. TALBOT, Mr. MCWILLIAMS, Mr. DEWEY, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. BENNETT of Michigan, Mr. BUFFETT, Mr. HOWELL, Mr. JEFFREY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. DAY, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. BRUMBAUGH, and Mr. TOWE asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Poland Still Lives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Farm Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two places, in one to include a letter from a constituent and in the other a letter from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, together with a petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have just received on the question of school lunches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. GILCHRIST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on account of the absence of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] I ask unanimous consent that he may have permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in view of the great significance of today in the history of Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Dictatorial Practices of the New Deal Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a radio address of Governor Dewey, of New York, and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RODGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Mr. Clarence K. Streit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Polish Constitution Day and also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York [Miss STANLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement of myself with reference to Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Governor Dewey of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Gov. J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, also an address by former Ambassador Bullitt. The cost thereof will be $117, according to letter I have received from the Government Printing Office. I ask unanimouse consent that these addresses may be included notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I offered an extension of my remarks the other day and it was ruled out because it violated the rules of the House. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. CELLER. This is an address delivered by Gov. J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, an old line Democrat of that State, and an address by former Ambassador Bullitt, of Philadelphia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, unless I can get unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address therein recently delivered in New York by my friend Eugene Gary, which would cost, I believe, $156, I shall object.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that request.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, then I make the request that I be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address of Mr. Gary.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] temporarily withdraw his request? The Chair can only entertain one request at a time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address recently made in New York by my friend Eugene Gary, which exceeds the limit as fixed by the rules of the House. I believe the additional cost will be $156. I ask unanimous consent that this may be included notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include the address by Governor McGrath, the additional cost being $117, and that this may be included notwithstanding the additional cost, and an address of former Ambassador Bullitt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] is recognized for 2 hours.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to briefly address the House on this one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the great Polish charter, known to all of the world as the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This historic document like our own great Constitution marks another milestone in human civilization and progress, and was doubtlessly the inspired work of the leaders of that day in Poland.

The lofty purpose of the constitution was to elevate the people to a plane of permanent security and happiness, and moreover, to perpetuate the realm through a virile and a democratic citizenry.

Well, on her way to the goal, Poland was thrice attacked and partitioned, her progress interrupted, but the unquenchable spirit of her people burned without flicker for more than a century until after World War No. 1, when her persecution and suffering was terminated, and she as a rejuvinated, progressive Nation, assumed her rightful place in the world.

Throughout her entire history Poland stood out as a bulwark of freedom, a haven of the oppressed and a defender of Christianity. Unfortunately for the world she fell victim to the conspiring Nazi hordes and today, though helpless in that she has temporarily lost her freedom, she is not without hope. She was not abandoned. Eternal is the hope within her breast which will materialize in the near future when her complete emancipation is brought about by her own and the combined arms of her allies. Poland will march triumphantly with other democratic nations making historic contributions on her journey eternal.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, May 3 stands out in the history of Poland as a memorable date. One hundred and fifty-three years ago, the people of Poland adopted a written constitution; a charter of freedom of the people. The constitution came after centuries of persecution; years of subjection. While Poland was vanquished 4 years later the constitution has never died.

The sparks of liberty have never burned out after years of despair. They still burn brightly and all Poland is looking forward to the day when the Republic of Poland will once more be free; free from the tyranny of the Nazis; free to give freedom, peace, and security to the Polish people.

The Atlantic Charter was hailed as a beacon light for Poland. It gave to the Polish people the belief that with the vanquishing of Hitler, all their own land will be returned to the Polish Government. May that wish be fully realized is the ardent hope of every American.

The history of the Polish people has been tragic but most inspiring. Never have the people of this great race ever hesitated to fight for the cause of freedom. It was the armies of Poland which saved Europe for Christianity by stopping the pagan armies when they threatened to dominate the world. History records many other notable contributions of Poland to the precious cause of liberty.

We in America can never forget that Pulaski and Kosciuszko contributed materially to the winning of our freedom. We do not forget that men of Polish blood have fought in all the battles of the American Republic, and many died for the preservation of our liberties.

We do not forget the scientists, the educators, the artisans, the writers, the professional men, the skilled and unskilled workers of Polish extraction who have worked faithfully to build up and make America a better land.

There is a close bond of sympathy between the American people and the peo-

ple of Poland. This bond has been strengthened as we have read the awful sacrifices of the Polish people in the last few years. On this anniversary of their ancient constitution, we fervently pray that with the coming of victory to the arms of the Allies, it will bring peace, liberty, and happiness to the Polish Republic.

May the Government of the Polish Republic soon be able to function in their own country and rule over the land they love because it is Polish soil. The sympathy of the civilized world is with the heroic, liberty loving Polish people.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate Poland's Constitution Day. Though Poland's Constitution was adopted May 3, 1791, this was not her first venture into the sphere of democratic government. As early as the latter part of the fourteenth century, Poland had elected her kings.

Poland was the first country in Europe to have a written constitution. It came into being after the second partition of Poland and was the fruit of the famous Four Years' Diet, assembled in Warsaw to draw up a new constitution. The nation was in a feverish state, and Europe at large was shaken with political disturbances. The leaders of Poland perceived that social and economic reforms were needed if the country was to survive.

The constitution was drafted on December 18, 1789, but as the sentiment of the Diet was not ready for its acceptance, it was not until May 3, 1791, that it was presented and duly adopted. Unfortunately, the constitution was short lived, for in 1795, Poland was completely deprived of political being by the last partition.

Poland's Constitution was created and adopted in a peaceful manner, even though many of its provisions were considered revolutionary in those times. It provided for freedom of religion. This was nothing new since Poland has been the haven of the oppressed for centuries. Even though Roman Catholicism was declared the religion of the State, yet all forms of worship within the Polish territory were to be tolerated. Class distinctions were obliterated as far as possible. A bridge was thrown over the chasm separating the nobility from the lower classes. Provisions were made for an evolutionary rather than revolutionary transformation of the masses to the state of freemen. Industry was given a free outlet. Every man was free to exercise any trade or profession he pleased. All this was accomplished without violence, without murder, solely through the courage of the Nation. The world acclaimed the high virtue of Polish citizenship, highly esteemed Polish loyalty to principles and Polish unity in trying to preserve national dignity. A constitution like that of the 3d of May could have come only from a united and liberty-loving people. It could emanate only from people possessing political aptitude for self-government.

It has been suggested by historians that one of the principal reasons for Poland's being torn asunder by her despotic neighbors was the great stride she had made in the direction of political freedom and democracy. These despotic monarchs were fearful that this political freedom might prove attractive to the people they ruled.

Recently we witnessed a fourth partition of Poland by Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany—two of the three nations that had participated in the past dismemberments. Soviet Russia has since become our ally and one of the United Nations and renounced her benefits in that partition. Today, however, she has virtually renewed her claim to the lands she took over under the Soviet-German treaties of 1939.

The territory in dispute has belonged to Poland since 1385, when representatives of Poland and Lithuania decided the latter should be dynastically united with Poland by the marriage of the Lithuanian Duke Jagiello with the Polish Queen Jadwiga. At that time most of Ruthenia and the Ukraine, as it is now known, were an integral part of Lithuania. According to Stanislaw Grabski, professor of political economy at the University of Lwow, in his manuscript entitled "The Polish-Soviet Frontier," Lithuania and White Ruthenia adopted the Polish language and in the eighteenth century Lithuania and its White Ruthenian dependencies were incorporated with Poland as closely as is Wales today with England. Thus, these territories had been acquired by Poland, not through conquest, but by the voluntary union with Poland of Lithuania, Ruthenia, or White Russia, and the Ukraine for the purpose of collective security against the Muscovites and the Teutonic Knights.

The Soviets claim that the land they now aspire to was wrongfully taken from them by coercion under the Treaty of Riga. They fail to remember that in September 1918 the Soviet Government published a decree canceling all treaties concerning the partitions of Poland, as well as all subsequent treaties relating to Poland up to 1833. By virtue of this decree Poland was given the right to reclaim all the territories which belonged to her prior to the partition of 1772. However, under the Treaty of Riga, Poland renounced her right to a substantial part, amounting to about 60 percent, of these territories.

It has been the established American policy to support the self-determination of people. The United Nations have bound themselves to the pursuit of this democratic principle by the execution of the Atlantic Charter. Therefore, we, as well as the other participants in the execution of that memorable document, should not recognize any unilateral boundary changes.

Newspaper columnists and commentators speak a great deal about the so-called Curzon line as though it were a boundary set by international agreement and attempt to tie it up with the Treaty of Versailles. The conference of Versailles did not settle the eastern boundaries of Poland, nor was the so-called Curzon line the line of demarcation of Polish and Russian nationalities. The Curzon line was a temporary armistice line suggested by Lord Curzon, then British Foreign Secretary in July 1920, in the hope of stopping Soviet-Polish hostilities. It was rejected by Soviet Russia and on the termination of hostilities, free negotiations between Poland and Soviet Russia resulted in the signing of the Riga Treaty, which finally settled the frontier as it existed on September 1, 1939.

Prior to our participation in the present conflict, our President and the representatives of the State Department set forth on repeated occasions the lofty ideals we as a Nation are interested in securing, to guarantee lasting peace. They stated and restated our belief in the self-determination of all peoples, big and small; that no nation should be allowed to aggrandize itself as a result of this bloodshed. After we had been forced into the war, these aims were reiterated and have been repeatedly endorsed and approved by the people of our country.

The little nations that are our allies in this conflict, particularly those that are now Nazi dominated, are wondering whether we have cast aside our high and lofty ideals of freedom, democracy, and justice and have substituted instead power politics, political expediency, and appeasement. For the policy we have pursued during the past several months seems to be suited more to a personality of a meek and timid Caspar Milquetoast than to a strong and powerful nation of our stature. These people are asking "What are we fighting for? Whither are we going?" This confusion causes only disunity and delays the day of victory. The occupied countries have well organized underground militia. If given something to fight for, they can greatly speed up the day of victory through their cooperation with the invading armies.

The underground forces in Poland, as well as those in other parts of Europe, are ready and willing to give their lives for freedom and liberty. They are fighting for the same cause that their liberty- and freedom-loving forebears had planned and fought for 153 years ago. These descendants of the authors of the Polish Constitution look to us for guidance and assistance just as did their forefathers when they created this memorable historical document. Let us put into execution our foreign policy which we have so fluently expressed on many occasions. Let us exercise resoluteness and firmness in the handling of individual problems as we meet them, thereby demonstrating to the people in Nazi-dominated countries that we are true to our word and sincere in our purpose, that as long as there is a United States the ideals of justice, freedom, and democracy shall be forcefully supported. America's interest is not alone the freedom of Poland and other Nazi-dominated countries but, in a broader sense, the freedom of the world from future wars and the assurance of a lasting peace.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honor and privilege for me,

as an American in whose veins flows the blood of my Polish ancestors, to have this opportunity to stand here as a Member of the greatest legislative body of the world, and pay tribute to the land of my forefathers on this one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, it being adopted on May 3, 1791. For the third consecutive year, the Congress has set aside a portion of its time to celebrate Polish Constitution Day, which is comparable to our own Fourth of July celebration.

The people residing within the boundaries of Poland today, of course, cannot openly celebrate the anniversary of the founding of their constitution, but we can be assured that there will be gatherings of Poles who will secretly celebrate the birthday of the constitution in their homes and other places where the penetrating eye of the ruthless invader will not interfere with their efforts to pay homage to their great charter of liberty.

The very secret of Poland's strength throughout the centuries lies in the fact that when Poland has been confronted with problems and almost unsurmountable barriers, they have had the patience to suffer and endure—and though they have been crushed many times and have had their country partitioned four times, they have never been defeated because in the hearts of every Pole there burns the light of freedom which will never be extinguished as long as a single Pole draws breath. It matters not how many times Poland may be invaded they will never be conquered—and it matters not how many times the Polish Nation may be partitioned and its people taken as slaves in shackles to foreign soil—they will never be conquered. The determination to carry on the fight of Poland is the fervent expression of every Pole in the first words of Poland's national anthem: "Poland is not dead while we live." Thus, the blood that flows through the heart of every Pole is the life fuel that feeds the torch of freedom that will keep alive the spirit of Poland, and, today, in this, the darkest hour of Poland's history, hearts of valiant Poles throb on this, their Constitution Day, and they dream of the day when the symbol of Poland—the white eagle—will again stretch its strong wings over an again liberated land and again shriek its traditional cry of freedom to a reborn nation within its rightful boundaries.

One, to appreciate the grandeur of old Poland, must know its history. Some historians regard it as romantic, but the Polish people of today find nourishment in the history of their great nation and the influence Polish culture has had upon the world. Few people today realize that the territory of Poland one time extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In this day, we hear much about the Russian-Polish boundary controversy, and it is not of general knowledge that it was Poland in yesteryears that prevented the expansion of the Russians to the west, and, indeed, in 1610, just 1 year after the English established the first permanent settlement at Jamestown, Poland actually occupied the Kremlin. Poland believed that in resisting the imperialism of Germany, Russia, Sweden, and Turkey, it was fulfilling a mission of importance, not only to itself, but to the nationalities which it ruled.

Robert H. Lord, the distinguished American historian and chief of the Polish Division of the American Delegation at the Paris Peace Conference, has written:

> The old Polish state was an experiment of a highly original and interesting character. It was a republic both in name and in fact, although nominally it had a king as its first magistrate. It was the largest and most ambitious experiment with a republican form of government that the world has seen since the days of the Romans. Moreover, it was the first experiment on a large scale with a federal republic down to the appearance of the United States. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this republic was the freest state in Europe, the state in which the greatest degree of constitutional, civil, and intellectual liberty prevailed. In an age of religious persecution and chronic religious wars, Poland knew no such troubles; it offered almost complete toleration and an asylum to those fleeing from persecution in all western lands. Like the United States today, Poland was at that time the melting pot of Europe, the haven for the poor and oppressed of all the neighboring countries—Germans, Jews, Czechs, Magyars, Armenians, Tartars, Russians and others. The complications of the nationality problem in Poland today are due in no small measure to the great number of aliens who here found a refuge from political and religious persecution. * * * A great enthusiasm for freedom in almost every branch of life; the principle of the sovereignty of the nation, calling the citizens to participate in the responsibilities of government; the conception of the well-being of society; aversion to absolute monarchy, standing armies and militarism; disinclination to undertake aggressive wars, but a remarkable tendency to form voluntary unions with neighboring peoples—such are some of the hallmarks of the old Polish state, which make it stand out as a unique exception among the rapacious and militaristic monarchies of that age.

The love of freedom has always prevailed in Poland, and 200 years before the English Habeas Corpus Act, Poland guaranteed liberty of the person by the Neminem Captivabimus Act of 1430, as well as personal property rights. No one could be arrested without a warrant from legal authority. Poland, at that time was the greatest power in central Europe and was the bulwark of European civilization at a period when the German Empire was seeking to spread its tentacles throughout central and eastern Europe, and Poland resisted the might of the German Empire, as well as the attacks coming from the east by the forces of Genghis Khan. It was at Lignica in 1241, that Polish troops under Duke Henry the Pious stopped the invasion of western Europe by the Tartar hordes. One often hears the quotation that, "There is nothing new under the sun." It was in this battle that the Tartars used choking vapors that had an effect similar to that of poison gas. The united armies of Poland and Lithuania, in 1410, defeated the Teutonic Order of the Knights of the Cross in the Battle of Grunwald. By that victory the Drang nach Osten was stopped, but that great Polish success was unexploited and it was not before another war of 13 years, which Poland had to fight in the middle of the century, that she could enjoy 300 years of almost uninterrupted peace from the Germany side. The lesson should not be forgotten: Partial or unexploited victories over the Germans, give only short-lived and precarious peace. Poland entered into a union with her northeastern neighbors, Lithuania, in 1385. This union was strengthened by the act of Horodlo—1413—which proclaimed:

> Let those be united to us by love and made equal, who are bound to us by common faith and identical laws and privileges. We pledge our immutable and solemn word never to desert them.

In 1569 the complete union of Poland and Lithuania was achieved by the Act of Lublin, and the Commonwealth of Poland came into being. On the same occasion the constitutional position of the Ruthenian provinces, including Volhynia and Ukraine, as parts of the Commonwealth, was definitely fixed. The principles of this union were virtually those of the United States. Under an elected king and one parliament, local state government existed. Moreover, Poland and Lithuania kept separate armies under separate commanders in chief. Other provinces of the Polish Commonwealth were East Prussia, Livonia, Courland. They enjoyed wide autonomy. Ruthenian and Lithuanian upper classes had the same rights as the Polish gentry. Cracow University was founded in 1364, and in the fifteenth century became the great intellectual center of central-eastern Europe. The father of modern astronomy Mikolaj Kopernik, was its most famous student. Attracting distinguished scholars and thousands of students from many European countries, it prepared the Golden Age of Polish literature and culture. By the Confederation of Warsaw, in 1573, Poland established freedom of conscience and worship at a time when religious persecution was rife. Ever since Poland has been the refuge in Europe of oppressed religious minorities. Already in 1264 the Statute of Kalisz had been granted to the Jews in Poland by Boleslaus the Pious, the only document of its kind in all Europe giving them cultural autonomy and their own coinage. From the fifteenth century onward Jewish religious schools flourished and won world-wide recognition. The Polish King, Jan Sobieski, in 1683, ran the risk of Russian aggression to go to the assistance of Vienna, besieged by the Turks. By his victory, one of the world's decisive battles, Poland saved Europe for Christianity. This is one of the outstanding events in the glorious history of Poland. A Te Deum was sung in the Cathedral of St. Stephen in Vienna, and these words were uttered from the pulpit:

> There was a man sent from God whose name was John.

Later, Poland signed a pact of perpetual friendship with Turkey, the only state that never recognized the partitions of Poland, keeping an empty seat at all diplomatic receptions for the temporarily absent Polish Ambassador. The civilized world owes Poland a debt that can never be repaid, because by preventing the Turkish and Tartar invasions they were

the instrument that saved European civilization, and, incidentally, thus prevented the collapse of the German Empire. Had it not been for Poland at that time Germany would have been erased from the map, and the German race would have been no more. In fact, Germany's very existence was threatened for centuries after that, and had it not been for the constant vigil maintained by the Poles in resisting the onslaughts of the Cossacks, the great Russian Bear would have long ago crushed the German race. The generosity and the arm of protection stretched forth by Poland in those trying times was repaid by the treachery of the German people under Hitler when they invaded the fair plains of Poland early in the dawn of September 1, 1939.

The celebrated Constitution of Poland was adopted by the Diet of Poland on May 3, 1791, 2 years after the Constitution of the United States was adopted. This historic document was the result of deliberations of the Four Years Diet, Poland's great Parliament which sat from 1788 to 1792. The Polish Constitution was a democratic constitution, inspired by the events of the times and shows the influence of both the American and French Revolutions and was brought into being without violence which is in keeping with Poland's historical tradition. The diet of Poland at the time of the adoption of the constitution was composed entirely of the nobility and in the general interest of the people as a whole, the members of the diet renounced many of their traditional privileges. The constitution ratified the rights accorded to the burghers, which class was composed of freemen and the merchants, and they were permitted to hold public offices and to enter the Parliament, which erased the barrier which had heretofore separated the burghers from the nobility. The peasant population under the terms of the constitution were placed under the protection of the Government and they were encouraged and guaranteed the right to enter into individual contracts with the gentry. The constitution also provided for a central administration of affairs and the management of finances. It was a constitution drafted and adopted by patriots for a freedom-loving people and it is the symbol of a nation, though many times invaded, yet has never been conquered. It made many important concessions to the people for which they have ever been grateful, and Constitution Day, May 3, is celebrated by Poles and those of Polish descent throughout the world. In Poland, this day will be celebrated under the ground, in silence and sorrow, and the church bells will not proclaim the anniversary of this celebrated event.

No better commentary on the principles of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May can be given than in the eloquent words of Burke, the great English statesman and orator:

> We have seen anarchy and servitude at once removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without trenching on their liberties * * * not one man incurred loss, or suffered degradation. All, from the King to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order: but in that place and order, everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder—this unheard of conjunction of wisdom and fortune—not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals or manners; no spoils; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled! The whole was affected with a policy, a discretion, a unanimity such as have never been known before on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men. Happy people, if they know how to proceed as they have begun. Happy prince, worthy to begin with splendor or to close with glory a race of patriots and of Kings and to leave a name which every wind to heaven would bear!

The Polish Constitution is to the Polish people their charter of liberty and is comparable to the Magna Carta for the English and the Declaration of Independence for our own beloved America. It is fitting and proper that the Congress of the United States should set aside a portion of its deliberations on this, the great national feast day of the people of Poland, and pay tribute to the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. The people of America have ever been grateful for the services rendered during the dark days of the revolution by the brave Polish patriot, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the father of American cavalry who gave his life for the cause of freedom while leading his troops into action during the Battle of Savannah. Count Pulaski was a tried and trusted friend of our own immortal George Washington, as was Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who likewise served under Washington. General Kosciuszko was a great general and military engineer. It was he who fortified West Point, and it was he who by his courage and unexcelled leadership rendered such an outstanding service to the American cause in the Battle of Saratoga. He fought throughout the American Revolution with honor and distinction and returned to Europe in January of 1793, and endeavored to induce the leaders of the French Revolution to organize a league of republics against the coalitions of sovereigns who were under the leadership of Catherine of Russia. The French monarchy had aided the American Revolution, and despite the fact that the French revolutionists, in December of 1792, publicly offered aid to all peoples who should wish to recover their freedom, France did nothing to save Poland even though it would have been of material assistance to her had she done so. History again repeated itself in 1938 when the World League of Democracies failed to again materialize to check Fascist and Nazi aggressions. General Kosciuszko surprised Europe by driving the Russians out of Warsaw and Vilna in the spring of 1794. He, however, was overwhelmed by superior Russian forces, and the Poles were forced to flee or surrender. Despite the fact that the revolt failed, it did, however, accomplish two results, as it saved the French Republic from the blow that had already been planned by the partitioning powers to be delivered across the Rhine, and it also created a new Polish patriotism among the gentry which continued to burn during the next century. A Polish historian has written:

> It is not too much to say that in those hours of failure and downfall the foundations of a new existence for Poland were laid. The happenings of those days are the first of a series of Poland's protests against the loss of its independence. * * * The Poland of today and tomorrow is essentially the Poland of Kosciuszko and of the makers of the constitution of the 3d of May.

The history of Poland is indeed a glorious one; a history based upon efforts of its people to maintain its freedom and independence. During her first 400 years of existence—from 986 to 1410—when the Battle of Grunwald was fought, Poland's chief enemy was Germany, and her efforts of resistance were principally concentrated against the Germans. For the 150 years following the Battle of Grunwald, Poland was almost continually at war with Russia, followed by more than a century of wars with the Turks who had forced their way into Poland. After the wars between the Poles and the Turks, they became friends, and full harmony existed and continued to exist between Poland and Turkey. Following the Polish-Turkish wars, Poland was again at war with Russia, which concluded with the partitions. In the meantime, the Tartars, Swedes, and Cossacks at intervals attacked Poland, but they were just temporary hostilities and not especially dangerous enemies to Poland. Only the Russians and Germans were Poland's real enemies. It is of interest to note that Poland never fought against Hungary, although both countries had a common frontier, and there has always been a good understanding with the Czechs, apart from occasional disputes at the beginning of her existence. The relationship between Lithuania and Poland was so good that the two countries federated voluntarily and for 500 years formed one state. Poland has always been a sincere friend of France despite the geographical distance, and Poland has never fought against Austria, but on the contrary, even saved her from disaster. It is the normal thing in the crowded European area for countries to quarrel with their neighbors, but Poland has had real strife with only two of hers—Germany and Russia, who have always aimed at conquering and subjugating Poland.

Since 1657 up to September 28, 1939, the boundary lines of Poland has undergone eight distinct changes, and there have been four major partitions of the territory of Poland. As I have heretofore stated, the territory of Poland at one time extended from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, from the countries of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Prussia, and a part of Germany on the Baltic Sea, and Poland as we knew it before 1939. It took in also a part of the territory of Czechoslovakia, as well as Ruthenia, and the Ukraine, and the territory south to the Black Sea. In fact, within the boundaries of the 1657 borders were the great cities of Smolensk, Minsk, and Kiev, which cities and the territory surrounding them came under the control of the Russians by the annexation of 1667, at which time

Prussia also annexed certain parts of East Prussia. The boundaries of 1667 and the territory ceded to Russia was according to the terms of the Treaty of Andruszow, which ended the Polish-Russian War of 1654–67, and after East Prussia ceased to be a fief of Poland in 1657. Poland retained these boundaries until the first partition by Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1772. These three neighbors, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, absolute monarchies, were unwilling to have on their frontiers a free and democratic Poland. The second partition, engineered by Prussia and Russia, occurred in 1793, 21 years after the first partition, and 2 years after the adoption of the Polish Constitution. In this partition of 1793, one of the most critical periods in Poland's history, she was abandoned by both France and Britain, which countries one would suppose would be interested in maintaining liberal institutions. Poland learned a lesson in 1793 when Britain and France abandoned her, that was not forgotten, and that is why Marshal Pilsudski, of Poland, in 1934, decided that Poland could not be tied to either London or Paris. The second partition was soon followed by the third 2 years later, in 1795, which was again engineered by Prussia and Russia, together with Austria. Warsaw was given to Prussia, and Poland completely disappeared from the map of Europe for 123 years. The author of our own Declaration of Independence and the father of the Virginia Bill of Rights, the freedom-loving Jefferson, called the partitions of Poland "A crime"; and the great benefactor, the tried and trusted friend of Poland, Woodrow Wilson, said that the partitions were "one of the great crimes of history." The partitions were also condemned spontaneously by the "people's commissars" of the Communist regime in Moscow in 1919, and they were termed: "Contemptible imperialism."

Poland recovered a part of her territory after the World War, and again took her rightful place among the nations of the world. It was under the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles that Poland was resurrected, and on June 28, 1919, the Versailles Treaty was signed by the immortal Polish statesman, Ignace Paderewski, and Roman Dmowski as the representatives of Poland. In 1920, the Red Army of Russia again attacked Poland and marched as far as the suburbs of Warsaw. The Polish Army, without any assistance from the western powers, defeated the Red Army and single-handed saved western Europe from communism. The Army of Poland was under the leadership of Poland's hero, Marshal Josef Pilsudski, with the immortal Paderewski at the helm of the ship of state, as Premier of Poland. The Battle of Warsaw in this war has been referred to by historians as "The Eighteenth Decisive Battle of the World." The Polish-Russian War was ended by the Treaty of Riga, signed on March 17, 1921. This treaty definitely established Poland's eastern boundaries, and the treaty was a definite compromise as to Poland's territory. In fact, Lenin even offered more territory, but Poland exercised a statesmanlike restraint, and Lenin, the dictator of Russia, called the Treaty of Riga "A voluntary and just agreement to stand for all time." Victorious Poland gave up to Russia two-thirds of the prepartition territories in the east. The Polish frontier included the city of Wilno, which had a population of 94-percent Poles, and the city of Lwow, which had a population of 87 percent Poles. In the settlement of the boundaries Poland nowhere extended her frontiers to that of the eighteenth century, not to speak of the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. Over 1,500,000 Poles were left in Russia and 134,000 Russians were left in Poland. Poland's eastern frontier is the boundary of western civilization, as witnessed by Poland's devotion to Christianity, her architectural styles, peasant costumes, folklore, music, dances, decorative art, and literary taste. Today, we hear quite a bit from Poland's opponents as to the so-called Curzon line, and that ethnographically this so-called Curzon line really constitutes Poland's eastern frontier. This line was proposed in 1920 by Lord Curzon, the then British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, as an armistice line in the Polish-Russian War, which ended victoriously for Poland. Incidentally, this so-called Curzon line was flatly rejected by Russia at the time it was proposed.

The Government of Poland was confronted with a task of reconstruction in 1919, so colossal that it seemed impossible to accomplish. Despite their colossal program of reconstruction and the fact that they were wedged between a vast mass of Germans on one side and a vaster mass of Russians on the other, the reconstruction of Poland had to be carried out simultaneously with the expenditure of an enormous proportion of the national income on military preparations. Under these circumstances, the progress made by the Republic of Poland from 1919 to 1939 was almost miraculous. The greatest desire of every Pole was to live in peace and continue the work of reconstruction, and the Polish Government did all it could in order to preserve the peace of Europe, and refused to be drawn into a hostile attitude toward either Germany or the Soviet Union. In fact, in 1932, the Republic of Poland concluded a pact of nonaggression with the Soviet Union which was renewed in 1934, and bound both Poland and the Soviet Union until December 31, 1945. At the same time—in 1934, the Polish Government also concluded a pact of nonaggression with Germany, which bound both Poland and Germany until January 1944. These pacts of nonaggression were both in force in 1939. It is a known historical fact that Russia has never regarded treaties as more than scraps of paper—Russia broke these nonaggression pacts of 1932 and 1934, as she has ignored and broken her agreements with the United Nations as signatories to the Atlantic Charter.

The fiend, Hitler, first unleashed his barbarous hordes upon the fertile plains of Poland on September 1, 1939—and, though a small nation, and greatly outnumbered, Poland earned the admiration of the entire world by her gallant stand against the most powerful military machine ever assembled up to that time, and, fighting like no other people had ever fought before, they gave ground slowly, and while the Polish Army with its back to the wall was striking back blow for blow against this great military machine, the death blow was administered on September 17, when Russia invaded Poland from the rear and stabbed her in the back. Even though mortally wounded, Polish patriots continued to fight until the death. The people of Poland, and for that matter, the peoples of the entire world, will never forget the heroic defense of Warsaw by its mayor, Stefan Starzynski. The Allies can never repay the debt that they owe this gallant defender because that heroic defense of Warsaw by the Polish legions and civilians delayed the German and Russian hordes and permitted the Allies to regain their balance from the terrific blow that was so cowardly struck at a peaceful nation by the Austrian paperhanger and His Excellency Marshal Joseph Stalin, the dictator of Russia. With the German Army in front of them and the Russian Army in the rear, the collapse was inevitable. The collapse of the Republic of Poland was followed by the Fourth Partition, on September 28, 1939, when Von Ribbentrop went to Moscow and divided the territory of Poland with Commissar Molotov, the then Premier of Russia, and as a result over 14,000,000 Poles and almost one-half of the Polish territory came under the domination of the Russian Government. Hitler, however, later unleashed his treachery on his Russian ally, whose help it was necessary for him to have in order to annex the Polish territory, and as a result Russia became one of our allies and signatory to the Atlantic Charter.

However, before Germany unleashed her military machine upon Russia—in 1940 and 1941—Russia deported more than 2,000,000 Polish citizens to Siberia, and Stalin and Hitler jointly proclaimed the destruction of Polish civilization and lives and the annihilation of the Polish state. Russia conscripted for the Red Army citizens of Poland residing in Polish territory then occupied by the Red Army, and executions, arrests, religious persecutions, forced plebiscites, and unspeakable ill treatment of Polish prisoners of war was the order of the day.

After Russia became one of our allies the Republic of Poland was the first to extend the hand of friendship to her former foe, and on July 30, 1941—only 5 weeks after the German attack—the Russian-Polish treaty was signed at London, providing that the partition of Poland operated by Von Ribbentrop and Molotov was declared null and void, and as a further evidence of sincerity and in the interest of complete harmony, the late General Sikorski, the then Premier of Poland, went to Moscow, and on December 4, 1941, signed with Stalin himself, the Premier of Russia, a declaration pledging both countries to fight together until complete victory is achieved, and committing themselves to neighborly collaboration, friendship, and mutual honest observance of the undertaking they have assumed. In view of all that

Russia had done to Poland it was not easy for General Sikorski to shake hands with Stalin and to enter into such agreements, but he did enter into these agreements because it was for the best interest of the United Nations. But this treaty like all others in the entire history of the Russian Government was also broken. However, Poland and the great General Sikorski kept their promises. General Sikorski has made for himself a niche in modern history that will live until time is no more. He is one of the greatest figures to come out of this Global war, and as time goes on his greatness will increase. After General Sikorski met Stalin and the agreements were concluded, he expressed his admiration for the resistance of the Russian Army and pledged full cooperation with Russia in his speeches and newspaper interviews.

The Polish citizens who had been deported to Siberia and separated from their families—all of them in abject poverty—saw in this settlement between Sikorski and Stalin the first hope of life and liberty—and thousands of these Poles, ragged and barefoot, walked from the Arctic Circle to Kuibyshev in order to enroll in the fighting units. How tragic was their enthusiasm when they learned—along with other Polish citizens—that Russia considered all Poles on Russian territory as Russians, and after months of futile and painful discussions in regard to these matters, the Russian press began to refer to Polish cities, such as Wilno and Lwow, as Russian cities, and Stalin began a diplomatic campaign to obtain the recognition of its annexations in Poland from England and the United States.

It was about that time that the Stalin regime became more embarrassed because of the Polish Government's interest in the Ehrlich-Alter case. Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, two Polish labor leaders, and leaders of the Jewish Social-Democratic Party, were murdered in cold blood by the Russians. For convenience, the Soviets charged them with being German spies. No sane person will ever believe that dastardly Soviet lie that these two labor leaders of Jewish faith were agents of Hitler. Leaders of the great American and British labor organizations insisted upon an explanation as to what had become of them because it was obvious that the real offense of Ehrlich and Alter was in resisting Hitler at a time when Stalin was playing along with him. The publicity given by the American and British press to this brutal murder of these outstanding labor leaders is said to have so enraged Stalin that he actually saw red. The disclosure of the execution of these two labor leaders by the Soviet Government placed Stalin in a bad light, and to offset this, Stalin, instead of supporting General Sikorski's prestige as a Polish statesman who had prepared the way for a lasting Russian-Polish collaboration, tried to undermine Sikorski's prestige and position everywhere and threatened the Sikorski government with the possible creation of a Polish puppet government in Moscow with what would be the first Quisling government in Moscow—and would be the first Quisling government among the United Nations. The great Sikorski refrained from making public the unhappy failure of the Russian-Polish cooperation pact.

The Polish people and the friends of Poland throughout the world, however, were aware of the conditions and the fact that the Polish sacrifices had been in vain and that the hopes for a peaceful cooperation were vanishing. Matters came to a head when the Polish Government asked the International Red Cross to investigate the Katyn massacre. The reaction of the Soviet Government to this request of the Polish Government in exile was in the most brutal style to break off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government and accuse them of even being in collusion with the Axis. The Russian Government should have been the last one to accuse the Polish Government of being in collusion with the Axis. The Polish Government was approached several times by Hitler with a view toward entering into collaboration with him to invade Russia, but each time Hitler was turned down. Talk about being in collusion with Germany—it was Germany and Russia that attacked Poland and divided the territory of Poland, and during the Battle of Britain Polish pilots were dying in the sky over London while Mr. Molotov was wining and dining with Hitler and Von Ribbentrop in Berlin. Lest you forget, it was also about that same time that so-called Americans, taking their orders from Moscow, were picketing the White House objecting to lend-lease. Those tactics were changed overnight when Hitler attacked Russia, and Russia, without supplies, had to look to America for food and vital war equipment. The city of Detroit and the adjacent area is often referred to as the arsenal of democracy, and it is my honor and privilege to represent the largest industrial congressional district in the world, and within my own district many of the tanks, guns, and instruments of war were manufactured and sent to Russia, as well as to our other brave allies.

The matériel provided by lend-lease, which was made by the sweat of American labor, made the Red Army invincible—and without these weapons they would have gone down to defeat—the Red Army would have been nothing but a band of guerrilla fighters. Even Stalin himself recently admitted that it was the matériel from America that turned the tide of battle and without these supplies Russia would have been unable to recapture much of the territory taken by Hitler. I yield to no man for my profound admiration of the fighting spirit of that glorious Russian Army, but in the same breath I yield to no man for my admiration of the abilities of the American soldier who can make as good use as any other fighting man of any implement of war. It is no secret that General MacArthur has been sorely in need of material such as we have sent to Russia to carry on his all-out war against the Japanese. Material such as we have furnished Russia will be needed by General MacArthur before he can free the Philippines of the Japanese invader and hoist the Stars and Stripes over the land of the setting sun.

As the Russian bear became strong and powerful because of the nourishment and material she had received from the United States under lend-lease, she became arrogant in her relations with the Polish Government in exile, and her attitude and position became increasingly difficult to understand—yes; more difficult to understand—because, on August 14, 1941, the Atlantic Charter came into being. This joint declaration—a common program of purposes and principles of the United Nations engaged in a common struggle against the savage and brutal forces of the Axis—in its first three points, to which all signatories subscribed without reservation:

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.
2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

On September 24, 1941, Russia endorsed these objectives. The Polish Government in exile also signed this document, and the Poles took new heart because in the principles of the Atlantic Charter were clear-cut declarations that wrongs would be righted and the crushed and oppressed peoples rescued from domination, and that unilateral settlement of Polish problems would cease. Thus the rebirth of Poland was promised on the deck of a British battleship. Russia, however, has repudiated the principles of the Atlantic Charter on more than one occasion. Great Britain and France went to war with Germany over Poland's territorial integrity, and so long as Russia disavows the principles of the Atlantic Charter there can be no peace in Europe. If Stalin is permitted to have his way in regard to the Russian-Polish boundary controversy and gobble up territory which rightfully belongs to Poland, it will mean that he will gobble up all of the small countries of central, eastern, and northern Europe, which will result in only one thing—a transfer of continental supremacy from Nazi Germany to Soviet Russia. Current events prove without a doubt that Russia's war is not only to repel the German aggressor but is also to consummate her own aggression in relation to a number of smaller, now helpless, nations.

There is no doubt that Russia—ridiculing all concepts of honesty—is deliberately attempting to cripple the Atlantic Charter and deprive it of all its real meaning. This is quite apparent by Russia's announcement in regard to her annexation of the three small Baltic republics—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The annexation of these small states is in direct contradiction of the agreement entered into in Moscow in October of 1943, when Russia made it plain to the world that her troops would enter the territory of these republics for military reasons and after the accomplishment of which she would retire. She has now made it plain that she intends to stay there permanently. It is

rather easy for a powerful nation to invade a smaller one and deprive the smaller nation of territory which is rightfully theirs, but it is not easy to kill the spirit of the subjugated people, and the fires of freedom will be kept alive and the people will eventually, when sufficiently strong, rise up and reclaim their freedom-loving people from time immemorial. That has been the history of territory. Despite the fact that the Russian Government has not renewed diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in Exile, and the Red Army now occupies territories which rightfully belong to Poland, the Polish Government in the spirit of cooperation and harmony, in an official statement issued on January 5, 1944, disclosed that on October 27, 1943, 2 months before Soviet troops actually crossed the Soviet border, it had instructed the Polish underground movement "to continue and to intensify their resistance to the German invaders, to avoid all conflicts with Soviet armies entering Poland in their battle against the Germans, and to enter into cooperation with Soviet commanders in the event of resumption of Polish-Soviet relations. The Polish Government still considers such an arrangement highly desirable."

These instructions have been confirmed in the underground proclamation, issued on November 15, 1943, by the Polish Government's Plenipotentiary in Poland, "To the Inhabitants of the Borderlands," and reprinted in the official underground organ of the Government, Rzeczpospolita Polska, the Polish Republic, on November 20, 1943. This proclamation even contains an appeal urging all Polish citizens—not only members of the underground army—to remember that "the entering Soviet troops are allies of our great allies in the struggle against Germany." In spite of the unjustified invectives contained in the Soviet Government's statement of January 11, 1944, and of the fact that it had ignored the earlier Polish proposal, the Polish Government on January 14, 1944, reiterated its "sincere desire for the Polish-Soviet agreement, and discussion of all outstanding questions." On January 17, 1944, the official press agency of the Soviet Government, Tass, released the Soviet answer, which reads in part:

> It is easy to understand that the Soviet Government is not in a position to enter into official negotiations with a government with which diplomatic relations have been severed.

Subsequently, on January 26, 1944, the Soviet Government even rejected the offer of our American Government for mediation. In so doing, the Soviet Government asserted that "the conditions have not ripened." In spite of the Soviet Union's systematic refusal to enter into an agreement concerning the "rallying of all forces within Poland to help defeat Hitler," the Polish Government went as far as to order its underground army to cooperate with the Soviet military, irrespective of the reestablishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. On February 24, 1944, the commander in chief of the Polish Army disclosed the following information:

> Recently, in connection with the development of the war situation, our underground authorities received orders to approach the entering Red Army with a proposal to cooperate in military operations against the Germans. This approach will establish whether the Soviet Government respects the legal status of emerging Polish civilian and military authorities.

Under the circumstances, there was no reason for the opponents of Poland to say that Poland has not cooperated with the Red Army, as Poland has cooperated in every possible way. It is the Soviet Government that has refused to cooperate with the Polish Government in exile. Governments come and governments go, and the Polish Government certainly will have to undergo changes in the post-war period, but these changes are a Polish affair. It is the inalienable right of every nation to determine its own destiny without outside interference, and certainly Poland, the first to withstand the might of the Hitler war machine, should have that right of determination under the provisions of the Atlantic Charter. The Atlantic Charter will stand or fall on the Polish issue, and as America is a signatory to the Atlantic Charter and the most powerful nation in the world, the nations of the world will learn to trust or distrust the value of the pledge of the United States until the Polish issue will have been solved to the satisfaction of all concerned under the principles as enunciated by the Atlantic Charter. If the Polish issue is not solved satisfactorily, it will, in my opinion, hamper the post-war settlements and drive American public opinion to the side of isolation.

It is not incumbent upon the United States of America, in my opinion, for the sake of diplomacy, to preserve a discreet silence and inaction while a proved friend is being treated outrageously, and Herr Goebbels, the chief of the German propaganda, is proclaiming to the world that both America and Great Britain have abandoned the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The Poles are fighting in every theater of the world for the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and I recently received a letter from a sergeant who is serving in the Polish Army in the Mediterranean area, who feels very strongly about the fact that both the United States and Great Britain have so far not taken a definite stand against Russia in regard to the boundary controversy. However, he states that the soldiers of Poland would fight on to the last man, and even though they perish, they will hold their heads high, and with a clear conscience meet death.

It is indeed apparent to the most casual reader that Russia is apparently determined to do things her own way in both Europe and Asia. Her recent recognition of the Badoglio government of Italy is an example, as well as her refusal to accept the invitation of the United States to arbitrate the Finnish-Russian dispute. It behooves all democratic governments to be on the alert—let none of them again be rocked to sleep in the cradle of appeasement, as appeasement serves only to satisfy temporary appetities, and as soon as the food is devoured, new appetities are certain to arise. The small neutral countries of Europe today are beginning to understand more clearly the stand taken by Michajlowicz, of Yugoslavia. There can never be a Tito in Poland, because the Polish people are united, and no rival government can be set up to the legitimate Polish Government in exile that will find a following.

The Polish Government in exile could receive no finer tribute on this their great national holiday, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of their constitution, than to receive a joint declaration from Great Britain and the United States that both Governments would stand foursquare behind the principles of freedom and democracy and the nonrecognition of territorial acquisition by force as so ably set forth in the Atlantic Charter. It would be both tragic and futile to go through the ordeal of this ruthless Global war and all its sufferings if, after victory, the United Nations were to falter on the subjects of principles so ably set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Polish Independence Day has a deep significance, not only to the Poles, but also to the other conquered countries who now, more than ever, realize the full value of independence. Our own great country has admired the Polish spirit which came into being May 3, 1791, at which time Poland adopted its Constitution which was patterned along the same lines as our own. We in America perhaps have been closer to their ideals and aspirations than any nation because, during the American Revolution when we were struggling to become an independent country, two Poles, Gen. Casimer Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, came to our aid. They left their home to come to America and help our few small colonies gain their freedom and in so doing they aided a Nation wherein today rests the hope of all free men of the world. General Pulaski gave his life for America, but General Kosciusko lived to return to Poland and carried with him American ideals which also became the ideals of his countrymen.

The Polish Constitution was adopted by the Diet of Poland by overwhelming majority 2 years after our Constitution was adopted. The diet at that time was composed almost entirely of the nobility who, in the general interest of the people as a whole, voluntarily renounced many of their former rights. It was a Constitution drafted and adopted by patriots for freedom-loving people and it stands today as a symbol of a nation though many times defeated, yet never conquered. The Polish Charter was inspired by the events of the times reflecting the influence of the American as well as the French Revolution and was brought into existence without violence which is in keeping with Poland's historical tradition. They are a peaceful people.

A few years after the adoption of the constitution, Poland became overrun with greedy aggressors, like those who now

occupy the land, and for over a century, only this constitution held together the hopes of people who lived and worked for the day that Poland would rise again as a free nation. After the Treaty of Versailles, Poland was liberated and again restored to a strong, free state. The ideals and hopes of generations had been realized. They are a grateful people.

A quarter of a century rolled away and since the First World War the forces of tyranny again invaded this peaceful republic. It was on Polish soil that the great conflict which now rages was started. Though a small nation and greatly outnumbered by superior forces, the Polish people arose in rightful indignation to resist one of the greatest war machines ever assembled in the history of the world. The Poles fought with all the courage and gallantry of a people long devoted to freedom. The invaders have left no technique of persuasion or torture untried in their attempt to destroy the spirit of Poland, but the Polish people fight on. Today the enemies of Poland know from past experience they cannot break the Polish spirit which still lives. They are a determined people.

In the Polish underground there exists a complete Polish state, fully organized in all phases of state administration—political, military, social, and economic. There even exists a "shadow parliament" which meets from time to time somewhere in Poland to discuss political issues. The underground resistance in Poland is perhaps the best of its kind in any occupied country. It is not possible at this time to obtain a full picture of the many acts of its resistance which have contributed materially to depleting the resources of the enemy. Guerrilla bands roam the countryside dynamiting and destroying that which might be of value to the enemy. Poland is the one occupied country that has not produced a puppet government, although their country has suffered perhaps more than any of the other unfortunate nations. They are a courageous people.

On other fronts the Polish armed forces have added great military strength to the United Nations. Polish soldiers are courageous and determined fighters and have distinguished themselves in front-line fighting. The Polish Air Force distinguished itself in the Battle of Britain and daily fights beside the American and British Air Forces in our air war against occupied Europe. They are a brave people.

These are very difficult times for Poland, and yet, despite their sufferings, Poles, wherever they may be, are commemorating their independence day, the same as we observe our Independence Day on the 4th of July. This year it has a deeper meaning, for with it is the knowledge that the hour of liberation is near.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my humble tribute to a great nation—a nation who values her honor and liberty more than even life itself. One hundred and fifty-three years ago today the people of Poland enacted a national constitution. It was the first national constitution—the first bill of rights—to be written by a European nation, and each year since that time, while Poland was at peace, its citizens gathered together to celebrate this great national holiday.

This year, with its church bells silent, its streets guarded by German troops, living in fear, in poverty, and on the brink of death through starvation, those Poles who have escaped slaughter at the hands of the Nazi monster are underground, and in silent prayer and sorrow, I am sure, are observing in a quiet way, the anniversary of great Polish Constitution.

In 1791 Poland was partitioned because she would not surrender to the dictates of the three absolute powers Prussia, Austria, and Russia. In 1939 she fell, after 4 weeks of stubborn opposition to Hitler's invaders, because she valued her honor and liberty more than life under foreign rule.

Of her 1939 population of some 35,000,000 souls she lost, perhaps, more than half of them to the aggressor. Yet, to this day, Poland has never produced a national traitor—a Quisling who would sell his people for a few pieces of silver, one who would espouse the cause of the invaders, hoping, thereby, to obtain some personal benefit.

I join, Mr. Speaker, with the nearly 7,000,000 Americans of Polish extraction in this country, in saying to those stanch Christians now remaining in Poland; persevere, the day of victory is close at hand. Because of your brave fight and your unswerving belief in the democratic ideals, justice and right will again prevail and liberty will be restored to you.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG].

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, little can I add to the factual presentation of my colleagues on Polish Constitution Day, but I would be remiss in my duties as Representative of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin, if I did not pay tribute to the 3d of May constitution and to this most important national holiday of the Polish people.

Many loyal Polish-Americans who reside in my district are contributing their all to our Nation's war effort today. To me, the preamble of the constitution of the 3d of May 1791, which indicates the general purpose for which the Polish people ordained and established their constitution, portrays the spirit and determination of the Polish people in their present fight to retain the ideals of democracy and liberty. No greater tribute could I pay to the Polish people than to repeat this preamble:

> Valuing above life and personal happiness the political existence, external independence, and internal freedom of the nation, we have resolved upon the present constitution.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] such time as she may desire.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today marks another tragic anniversary in Poland's history. The Polish people have gone through the agony of seeing their homes destroyed, husbands and wives separated, sons and daughters killed, and even little children forced to become cogs in the Nazi war machine. While we join the people of Poland in paying tribute to their great courage and faith, on this, their anniversary, our hearts go out to them in sympathy.

Perhaps never in the history of civilized man has a greater crime been committed than the Germans' deliberate and systematic brutality during 4 years toward masses of Polish people, and particularly children. Through the children, the Germans strike at the future of the race. By starving, degrading, brutalizing, imprisoning, exiling, and killing the oncoming generation, the Nazis pursue their terrible purpose to reduce the Poles to the slave state. The Nazis have ruled that all Polish children over 12 years of age are liable for labor in Germany. Thousands have already been deported. According to an authentic report, 850 children, some of them tubercular, are laboring at breaking and carrying stones for German fortifications in the Baudienst forced-labor camp near Kielce.

Thousands of wooden crosses on little graves bear dreadful witness to the martyrdom of Poland's children under Hitler's "new order."

No record of bravery in this war is more touching or significant than the resistance of these Polish children, who distribute underground newspapers, work as messengers for patriot troops, even fight with the patriots. By their treatment of children, the Germans reveal their own monstrous inhumanity. This epic of children fighting against the tyrants is the last word on the totality of Polish opposition and is the measure of the German failure in Poland.

God grant that these children will soon be free and that Poland's national holiday may be celebrated next year by uniting families long since parted. The Polish people have been long-suffering, but their faith and courage will be rewarded when, once more, in the not too distant future, Poland will resume the place that was hers among the nations of the world.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the adoption of the document known as the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May, an instrument which ranks as a historic document along with the Magna Carta and the American Constitution, as a bill designed to safeguard the interests, the happiness, and the freedom of its people. A great deal has already been said of the intent and the far-reaching effect of the Polish Constitution, so I shall not go into further treatment of this subject.

I might state in passing on to the subject matter of my discourse that I am

happy in the thought that the inauguration by me of the Polish Constitution Day program of the House of Representatives has become an accepted and an annual event with an ever-growing interest among the Members. The popularity of the program, intended to bring to the mind of America the glory and the greatness of Poland, is established by the ever-increasing number of speakers on these occasions.

The subject of Poland and her welfare as it may bear upon the future peace of the world is something in which we Americans are deeply interested. The errors of the reestablishment of Poland after the last war must not be repeated again. Poland must not only be reestablished and revitalized but she must be made strong and independent with a democratic government which will assure to her all the rights and privileges which we in America hold as God-given and inalienable. For Poland to be independent rather than dependent, for Poland to be made strong rather than weak, for Poland to be made democratic rather than despotic or bureaucratic, she must of necessity have the right to choose her own government in a free and a democratic way. She must be permitted not only to retain every inch of her 1939 territory but she must likewise acquire additional liberated and traditionally Polish territory which has been taken from her by a treacherous and a persistent foe over the centuries.

Poland's boundary should be extended to the west at the expense of the aggressor Germans. Her western boundary should begin at the eastern bank of the Oder River and should run due south from and including the port city of Stettin at its mouth to a point which touches the old Czechoslovakian border. On the western side of the river there should be provided a demilitarized zone for a depth of 50 miles paralleling the Polish and Czechoslovakian littoral and policed at Germany's expense by a Polish-Czechoslovakian Army for a period of at least two generations. All of East Prussia, historically Polish and peopled by a great number of Poles, should promptly revert to a reconstituted Poland. Over and above that the aggressor Germans should be compelled to pay an indemnity sufficient to restore all of the destruction within this unfortunate country. The aggressors should be obliged to pay in addition a punitive indemnity which would permit the Poles to reestablish themselves at or about the level which they might have enjoyed were it not for these periodic and unwarranted incursions by a plunderbund bent on rapine, destruction, plunder, and enslavement of a people whose history antedates in that part of Europe the history of their traditional enemies.

Germany must be made to restore and return all that she has destroyed and stolen even if it takes a hundred years of compulsory labor of her blustering and bloated militarists. If needs be, this element within Germany should be chained to a wheelbarrow and made to return not only the stolen gold, art treasures, and literary works, but also the sacred wares pilfered from the altars and the bells stolen from the churches and shrines of her neighbors. The fiendish and almost inconceivable thievery by the Germans of the fertile top soil of the subjugated countries should make an endless and a timeless parade of wheelbarrows radiating in all directions from Germany as it is being returned to the nations which were so despoiled.

The concessions to be made to Poland in the west should not depend upon the pleasure of the Soviet Government. Poland is entitled to proper recompense without consulting her eastern ally. She expects no more and she is entitled to, no less than the moral and the wholehearted support of Russia in this matter. As to the eastern boundary, the 1939 Polish boundary should be maintained inviolate. It should have been sacred and inviolate. The boundary was protected not only by pre-1939 treaties but also by a post 1939 agreement. It is moreover sustained by history as just and proper. It is Polish historically and to a great extent ethnographically. The greatest single element all through this disputed territory is Polish in language, religion, and custom. There are relatively few Russians to be found in this section. It is incomprehensible to me, as it is to millions of Americans, that Russia would insist upon what she acquired by a direct violation of her pledged word. After administering to Poland what America should remember as the original and the all-important stab in the back—for it was following the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement that Germany attacked Poland and was shortly thereafter similarly treated by her Russian neighbor—to think that today Russia finds fault with the Polish Government in exile when, as a matter of fact, that government ought to object to the unfriendly government at Moscow. Russia seems to have a distorted concept about who is the aggrieved party.

Russia is today treating Poland as an enemy, not as an ally. Russia, in fact, shows a disposition to be more temperate with her outright enemies who attacked her. Certainly Poland, attacked by Russia after a Russian agreement with Germany, and which it must forever be borne in mind precipitated the blood bath for the whole world, cannot now be expected to cede territory to her aggressor neighbor to the east. If there are to be any concessions, and as yet I do not believe that Poland has demanded any, the Soviet Government should be prepared to yield territory and substantial indemnities. The so-called liberation of Poland by the Russian armies is a mockery. Poland would not have needed Russian liberation if it were not for Russian betrayal of not only Poland but all of the Slavic countries. If the demands of the Soviet Government, unjustified and sinful as they are, are forced upon her traduced neighbor, the Polish people will be impoverished to the point of total dependency.

The Poles are a proud and an intelligent people. They do not ask charity. They will not eat humble pie. They naturally will resent such proffers from a country which they cannot trust. Poland will die; she will be obliterated from the face of the earth if needs be, but she will not surrender principle and we in America can understand her attitude. She will live or die as a freeman, not as a slave or satellite. The addition of the disputed Polish Provinces mean everything to Poland and her future. The great bulk of her wealth and of natural resources, such as timber, minerals, and oil, lie to the east. She cannot subsist without them for to her they are indispensable, they mean strength and vitality, freedom and permanence. In area it approximates 50 percent of her 1939 terrain. To Russia, on the other hand, the acquisition of the territory means in depth or in area but a mere fraction of what Russia already possesses, as in this war it was proven that the additional terrain does not mean additional safety for the Soviet. Russia will derive far more benefit economically and from the standpoint of safety by aiding in the reestablishment of a stronger, self-sufficient, and independent Poland than she would by a land grab and the acquisition at the expense of Poland of the natural resources in the disputed area.

If America and Great Britain, and their allies, permit Poland's further despoilment, it will mean for a certainty another war at some time in the future. The Poles will not be subjugated, they will not be enslaved, and Poland some day will live once again. That Poland is the key to the future peace and security of all Europe was proven in this war. Had Poland been sustained and supported, had she been given proper aid within boundaries that were extended to include millions of additional Poles, and had East Prussia been ceded to the newly created Polish Republic, the story might have been entirely different. Even so, the world will forever remember, and we in America will always appreciate and recognize, the fact that Poland was the first to challenge the foe, that she laid down her life to save civilization, Christianity, and perhaps all mankind from German enslavement. This she has done, as history records, on more than one occasion. Concededly she is the bulwark of Christianity and in Europe the keystone in the arch of peace. Poland desires to live in peace and harmony with her neighbors. That includes Russia, her Slavic sister, who has betrayed her into the hands of her enemies, but she cannot do so at the price of servile submission and permanent subjection.

Poland knows only too well that the terms and the conditions offered by Russia mean positive and absolute conversion to Godless Communist despotism. Freedom, independence, and Christianity—these she cannot forsake and these she will not give up even if she must once again become a martyr to the cause for which she fought so valiantly. More than once before she was bruised, battered, and beaten, and her boundaries were rubbed out by a combination of her enemies who could not dominate her, who were jealous of her progress, and she has, like the good Lord whom the people of Poland have served so well and faithfully, risen from her grave and taken her place among the nations of the world.

The proof of Poland's vitality and faithfulness to an ideal, even while she is enslaved and in chains, can be proved in a thousand and one instances in her sorrows and suffering, but practically and particularly in the fact that to date she has not weakened, has not faltered or produced a single Quisling. Similarly she has repudiated the pro-Russian expatriate, Wanda Wasielewskaya. The doubtful and subservient Soviet sympathizers, Prof. Oscar Lange and the Rev. Stanislaus Orlemanski, who soiled his sacerdotal robes of priesthood to kowtow to Stalin and to others who betrayed the Polish people and the Roman Catholic Church into the hands of their enemies.

The unbroken authority of the Polish Government in exile will withstand the sinister and unwarranted challenge of the Communist regime at Moscow. The recognized government of Poland, functioning on English soil, deserves the wholehearted support of the entire civilized world. It is not antagonistic to any other government. It can only be, and positively is, pro-Polish and that is precisely what is wrong with the officials in the eyes of Stalin and Molotov. Russia's desire is to implant within the borders of Poland a pro-Soviet Communist government, subservient to the views and wishes of Moscow, but the average intelligent Pole, wherever he might be found, would prefer martyrdom and death of his country to the sacrifice of an ideal, of a sacred principle.

America, and I trust the world, will understand the noble aspirations of the Poles and, at the proper time, will sustain them. The best evidence of the caliber and character of Poland and her valiant sons and daughters are to be found in the glorious pages of her past history, and more especially, in the brilliant defense of her terrain which was a true symbol of her defense of all that we in this country, in our hearts, hold near and dear, and for which millions of our young men and women have undertaken to bare their breasts to the fire of the same common enemy.

Poland was always an ally of the United States of America. In this role she has never permitted a break. Russia is an ally of the United States today only because she has fallen out with her erstwhile German ally, who with violent treachery turned upon her as the Soviet Government turned upon an unsuspecting and innocent Poland. Were it not for the German attack upon Russia, the Communists here and abroad would still be shouting that this is an imperialist war. Our American people are too intelligent and the world is too well civilized to accept Russian propaganda.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, the history of Poland and of the Polish people is one of the most tragic in all the annals of the ages. It is at the same time one of the most inspiring to all lovers of liberty and believers in the deathless invincibility of the human spirit.

Beset on all sides by powerful and aggressive enemies, torn by racial antagonism, partitioned by its conquerors, and divided by domestic tribal differences, this heroic nation battled its stormy way out of the obscurity of antiquity until on May 3, 1791, its government formulated and adopted a constitution which will stand for all ages and countries as a model.

This Polish bill of rights gave the Polish people a hereditary limited monarchy. It provided for decennial parliaments presided over by responsibile ministries.

It did away with devisive class distinctions. It guaranteed local self-government, political and judicial, to municipalities.

Religious toleration was one of the foundation principles expressed in this most modern of constitutions.

Since that fateful day the Polish Government and people have passed through many grim vicissitudes. At this moment they lie prostrate under the brutal rule of their Nazi conquerors but the spirit of freedom and self-respect still burns unquenched in their unconquerable souls. And when the brutal aggressors are finally crushed, as they will be, Poland will rise again strengthened and glorified by the purging fires of affliction and her people will, I am sure, enter upon a new era of peace, prosperity, and security.

The people and Government of the United States are in duty bound to insist that in the final peace settlement Poland be assured full opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, free from the shadow of outside domination. The millions of Polish people who have made so notable a contribution to this, their adopted country, will, I am sure, give every help within their power as American citizens toward the reestablishment of their kinsmen in the old homeland upon the great liberal principles of the constitution of 1791.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today is truly a proud day for all the freedom-loving peoples of the world, for it marks the anniversary of the establishment, 150 years ago, of the Constitution of Poland. This constitution was not the product of whim or caprice, nor was it the fortunate outcome of happenstance. Its adoption climaxed a struggle that lasted 350 years from the adoption of the Statutes of Nieszawa; a struggle to bring the right of franchise to the peasants—and to break down the evils which had crept into the existing government. It was a struggle to make freedom and justice actualities for all the people of Poland.

From that time to this very minute the people of Poland have never lost sight of their goal of freedom. The sons of Poland who wandered from their mother country have always been in the vanguard wherever freedom has been assailed. Polish heroes fought side by side with the great men of our own land's fight for independence. Poles have fought under freedom's banner in France, in Italy, in Turkey, and in South and Central America.

Once again, in our time, the sons of Poland fight valiantly for that cause. In all this war-weary world—on this earth, darkened as it is by the pall of war—there is no brighter light than the shining star of faith and hope which is the spirit of the Polish people. Rising above their anguish they offer to the world the example of a people in whom the love of freedom never dies, no matter how violent may be the accursed invader who would crush and destroy them.

We in America pay tribute to this great spirit of Poland—for the fact that no son of Poland was found to kiss the foot of the invader in order to curry a few crumbs of favor; for the fact that her sons fought and died rather than surrender; for the fact that her sons still fight to save Europe as their forefathers did of old.

The enemies of Poland in the past have learned by bitter experience that temporary defeat will not quench the fire of freedom which burns in the heart of every Pole. The invader of our day will learn at a terrible price that that fire burns more fiercely today because, in truth, the hopes of Poland are today closer to complete achievement than at any time in history. For, as sure as a just God looks down on Poland in her tatters, her tears and blood, so surely will Poland's reward, among civilized men, be great enough to measure up to the great sacrifice she has lain on the altar of liberty and justice.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, during all of the efforts of the Polish people to establish governmental institutions which would uphold and safeguard the inherent rights of man, no one showed a higher standard of intelligence, more unwavering courage, or made greater sacrifice than did Thaddeus Kosciuszko; no one more truly represented the cause of his people.

He was no mere sword rattler, not a man who gloried in gold braid and dazzling ornaments on his clothes. He was wholeheartedly devoted to the cause of human freedom and, of course, loved his fellow man intensely.

Armstrong, in his Heroes of Defeat, says of Kosciuszko:

> His family was noble but poor. Though of the privileged class, he had cherished from boyhood the most ardent sentiments concerning human rights, his first act on coming of age being the freeing of the serfs on his estates. His examination of history and the misfortunes of his own country had blown into flame his zeal for popular causes. Foreseeing the day when Poland would need the services of all her sons to preserve even a remnant of her soil, he determined upon the career of a soldier.
>
> * * * * *
>
> His zeal for the rights of people brought him at Paris in contact with Silas Deane, the accredited Commissioner of the revolted American Colonies. The young Pole's conversations with Deane determined the offer of his sword to the cause of liberty west of

the Atlantic. In the summer of the memorable revolutionary year 1776 he landed in the western world and tendered his services to the American Commander in Chief. "What can you do?" asked Washington. "Try me and see," answered the Pole.

Pleased with his address, Washington made him his aide, and, in the autumn of the year, Congress gave him the appointment of engineer with the rank of colonel.

Kosciuszko served with the armies both of the North and the South through the entire war, and served with distinction. It was asserted that his "deeds naturalized him as an American."

According to Jefferson, his personal friend, he "rendered General Greene the most important service to the last moment of the war, the ardent and repeated acknowledgments of that officer inducing Congress, in October 1783, to bestow upon him the brevet of brigadier general and to pass a vote declaratory of their high sense of his faithful and meritorious conduct."

Such at the close of the conflict with England with her western colonies had been the record of the Pole—of the Lithuanian who had become an American, the son of ancient Sarmatia, who had won glory fighting for the freedom of the youngest of nations.

As I have said, Kosciuszko was not ostentatious. He was not a show-off. He was unassuming even to the point of humility, and his heart went out to all those who were in distress. Let me quote from the language of Count Orginski, as contained in the Memoires sur la Pologne et les Poles:

From Kosciuszko's tent we passed to a table prepared under some trees. The frugal repast which we made here among about a dozen guests will never be effaced from my memory. The presence of this great man who has excited the admiration of all Europe, who was the terror of his enemies and the idol of the Nation, who, raised to the rank of generalissimo, had no ambition but to serve his country and fight for it, who always preserved an unassuming, affable, and mild demeanor, who never wore any distinguishing mark of the supreme authority with which he was vested, who was content with a suit of coarse gray cloth and whose table was as plainly furnished as that of a subaltern officer, could not fail to awaken in me every sentiment of esteem, admiration, and veneration which I have felt for him at every period of my life.

I quote further from Armstrong in regard to Kosciuszko's last visit to the United States:

Liberated from confinement, his country's prospect blasted, his mind turned to the land where his youth had been glorious. In the summer of 1797 he sailed for the United States. On American soil he was received with enthusiasm that measured his splendid service to the cause of the Revolution. Hundreds of his fellow officers in the memorable struggle yet survived in the vigor of manhood to extend to him affectionate greeting. His paternal friend, Washington, took him by the hand in hospitable welcome on the banks of the Potomac. Congress gave him a life pension and a tract of land in acknowledgment of his aid in the War of Independence. The Society of the Cincinnati hailed him as the chief guest at their reunions. Sympathy and honors were everywhere lavished freely upon him, not only the the voluntary champion of liberty in the New World but as the hero of its fallen fortunes in the old.

It may be said, however, that he lost in his great struggle for the freedom of Poland. I prefer to say with the American poet, Lowell, "There are those who triumph in a losing cause."

Henry George, in his great work entitled "Progress and Poverty" in discussing the age-long struggle for the advancement of truth gave expression to the following most noble sentiment:

For those who recognize justice and would stand for her, success is not the only thing. Success! Why, falsehood has often that to give; and injustice has often that to give. Must not truth and justice have something to give that is their own by proper right—theirs in essence and not by accident? That they have, and that here and now, everyone who has felt their exaltation knows.

The important fact to be remembered in the great struggle made by Kosciusko was that he earnestly and tirelessly worked for the cause he knew to be right. No man can do more.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution in 1791. Although today Poland cannot openly celebrate her great national holiday, I hope the day is not far distant when she will be functioning under a democratic form of government and will be able to commemorate this notable event in her history in an appropriate manner.

I trust this will happen when victory comes to the United States and her allies, at which time the Nazis will be driven out of Polish territory and Poland will regain her long-fought-for independence.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine privilege and an honor to be permitted to join my colleagues in this great legislative body in commemorating the birthday of the Polish Constitution.

On May 3, 1791, just 153 years ago today, Poland became the first country in Europe to have a written democratic constitution. This was but 2 years after the people of our own country blazed the trail and placed upon the pages of history the American Constitution. On July 4 we celebrate our national birthday. May 3 is Poland's national holiday. On that date Poles throughout the world commemorate the signature of its immortal document. That constitution means to all Poles a just freedom. It means to Poles what the Magna Carta means to the English and the American Declaration of Independence means to us. Its immediate consequences were tragic, its lasting influence great. It recognized that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." Like our own Constitution, it accepted the philosophy of the division of authority, setting up executive, legislative, and judicial branches, and, of no less importance, it accepted the principle of religious toleration.

The Polish Constitution brought about a great reform, peaceful in method, revolutionary in effect, and carried out according to law. Its purpose was to preserve the existing regime by improving it, concentrating the moral forces of the nation, and inspiring the building up of Poland's national strength. Seldom, if ever, in human history has so much been accomplished with so little sacrifice. In short, Poland believes in peaceful, democratic revolution, and in this respect there is a natural bond of sympathy between the Polish people everywhere and their American and British allies.

On this occasion, let us not forget our country's debt of gratitude to Pulaski, Kosciusko, and other Polish patriots. Down through the years it has been our privilege to commemorate the lives, the deeds, and the sacrifices of these two great Poles who gave so willingly in order that freedom in its truest sense might be best exemplified in the American cradle of liberty. In the fields of music, literature, and science, Poles and their descendants have always been in the forefront. Their culture and progress has been the envy, if not the fear, of many other countries. The fact that Poland was free, independent, and democratic, has possibly contributed to some of the trials and tribulations through which this heroic country has passed since 1791. A country that always fights tyranny and immoral international agreements is worth while.

Mr. Speaker, for almost 5 years the people of Poland have suffered unspeakable martyrdom and experienced almost unbelievable atrocities under the Nazi yoke. They met the Hitler invasion with determined resistance. They were outnumbered, outequipped, and not prepared for the terrible Nazi blitz. Their spirit, however, was undaunted. Again, they compel the admiration, respect, and applause of the entire civilized world. For months they fought that which they must have known to be a losing battle until the lovers of democracy in the European theater could further prepare for the world-wide assault. Their traditional bravery and military skill will go down in history as determination and action unparalleled.

Today the Polish people and their descendants everywhere are joining with the United Nations in a determination that war-seeking, war-making, and aggressor nations shall be brought to book and that the Polish constitution shall be vitalized. This objective is sure of accomplishment.

There are no Quislings in Poland. There was conviction and a will to die, if necessary, in support of international morality. There has never been complacency in the present conflict so far as our Polish allies are concerned. Their cities have been destroyed, their people maltreated and murdered, yet they have continued to fight for freedom and morality in international affairs.

And, so Mr. Speaker, again the world celebrates the adoption of the Polish Constitution and must guarantee that that constitution will again become an actual and living reality in the land of its adoption. The Poles must be permitted to carry on.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON].

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that we the Members of this law-making body of the world's greatest independent nation should pause today to pay tribute to another nation on the anniversary of its independence day.

I refer to Poland for today marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversay of the date of Poland's independence. We have close ties with Poland. Nearly every school child is familiar with the name of Kosciuszko, a great Polish fighting man who aided in our own fight for independence. He fought then side by side with our ancestors on an American team, joining wholeheartedly in a struggle for liberation, just as today we are fighting side by side with modern Poles on the United Nations team. Today we are continuing the struggle for liberation and one of our war aims is the liberation of Poland from German aggression and tyranny.

Our ties with Poland, however, are not confined alone to the help Kosciuszko gave us in our own fight for liberation and the fact that today we are spilling blood for the liberation of all enslaved peoples, including Poland.

The Polish people have contributed materially to the growth of our own country. Burning with a fierce desire for freedom, Poles emigrated to this country and in the surge forward Polish sweat helped forge our own great country. Polish sweat is helping us forge the tools for liberation now, just as it helped us build a great nation. I represent a district in the great arsenal area of Pittsburgh. Take a look at the roster of workers in any of the plants in this area which are well sprinkled with Polish names. Go to Bridgeport, Conn., another great arsenal, and the same is true there. At Detroit, another of our great arsenals, the work rosters of war plants are more than liberally sprinkled with the names of Americans whose ancestors were Poles. In Chicago, in the packing houses, where meat is packed for shipment to our fighting men and our allies overseas, more Americans of Polish descent are conspicuous by their numbers.

In any walk of American life today we find those of Polish descent taking an active part. Our colleagues in this body who are of Polish descent are held in the highest esteem by all of us. Our sports pages are well sprinkled with the names of leading athletes whose names would not be out of place in the columns of a newspaper published in Warsaw.

I have briefly called attention to these things as a demonstration of how easily Polish immigrants and their sons and daughters have fitted themselves into our American way of life, a way of life which is not strange to any people in whose hearts burn the flame of freedom. Such are the people of Poland, the first to feel the might of the German Wehrmacht. Because this small nation was quickly overrun by the Nazis we are wont to overlook the fact that Poland bitterly contested every inch of ground given up. We should remember that, in the face of overwhelming odds, Poland refused to be bullied by her larger neighbor. The German Army conquered these people, not because of any lack of spirit on the part of the Poles, but because she had more of everything to throw into the fight. We should pay tribute to this fighting spirit. We should pay tribute to the spirit which continues in Poland, where an underground was formed and placed in operation almost before the dust had cleared from the rubble of ruined cities.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise along with my fellow Congressmen to pay tribute on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution, a day which I understand has long been regarded in Poland as an occasion for a national celebration.

The anniversary this year reminds us that Poland was the first country to take up arms in defense against aggressive Nazi Germany. The years since 1939 have been years of suffering and trial for all Poles, of all faiths. Surely, they have learned within that country that their common aspirations for an independent Poland imposes upon the entire population the obligation to secure rights of conscience and freedom of opportunity for all within the country.

Poland has made a real contribution to the war effort of the United Nations from the days of the heroic defense of Warsaw until the present time when the Polish airmen are flying over Germany. The saga of Polish resistance has captured the world's imagination. It is the hope of every friend of Poland that after the war, Poland will set an equally magnificent example of the pursuits of peace, of justice to all within its borders, of friendship and good will and harmony among all those whose task it will be to revive the glory and integrity and pride of Poland.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, in this fifth year of torture and suffering which has been inflicted upon Poland, I think it is fitting that we in the Congress of the United States should pay special tribute in commemoration of the signature on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution. This constitution is one of the world's great charters of freedom, and it is especially significant that this instrument of government should have been adopted at this early date.

My own city of Milwaukee and my own State of Wisconsin contain hundreds of thousands of fine American citizens whose ancestors came here from Poland. Among these people are many dear friends of mine, and I think it is not amiss here, Mr. Speaker, to use this occasion publicly to congratulate the Right Reverend Monsignor R. A. Kielpinski, who has just recently received this new title from His Holiness, Pope Pius XII. Father Kielpinski represents the best type of American citizen even though his own parents lived in Poland, and he himself was born in Europe. He is an outstanding citizen of the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin.

In paying tribute to Father Kielpinski and the many other Americans of Polish descent resident in my own State, we pledge that their cousins in Europe shall be soon freed from the crushing heel of Nazi tyranny and that from the ashes of this conflict will rise again a great Poland to take her proper place in the council of nations. This is the meaning of the Atlantic Charter, a great document which is a logical extension to the entire world of the ideas and sentiments expressed in the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] such time as she may desire.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, today Poles all over the world are celebrating their national holiday. May 3 this year marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the first written democratic constitution to appear on the European Continent. Therefore, for all Europeans, as well as for Poles, this document takes its place beside the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence as one of the greatest declarations of free men for freedom.

Once again this year, as in other years, tributes will be heaped upon Poland, which dared, as early as the eighteenth century, to try democracy. Once again lesser orators and feebler poets will try to match the eloquence of great poets and great orators long dead in praising Polish courage, Polish gallantry, Polish love for freedom. Once again historians and Senators, scholars and Congressmen, leaders of public opinion—and just plain ordinary patriots everywhere will extol Polish names which still strike sparks on the anvil of freedom—Sobieski, Kosciuszko, Pulaski. Their theme will echo Victor Hugo's when he said: "While my own dear France was the missionary of civilization, Poland was its knight."

And once again these distant echoes of fulsome praise, ringing in Polish ears, will be muffled by the iron ring of the invaders' heels on the streets of Poland's conquered cities.

For today again, as often in the past, while Poland is the recipient of the far-off praise and attenuated sympathy of the outside world, she is the immediate victim of vicious aggressors and greedy conquerors. No nation in all the world knows better than Poland the emptiness of such praise and the hollowness of such sympathy. To patriotic Poles all over the world and in Poland much of what will be said of Poland this May 3 must sound suspiciously like an obituary notice. On this May 3 true lovers of freedom will not be those who rise to praise Poland, but those who rise to ask how she may be saved.

Therefore, instead of giving Poland the customary pat on the back on this anniversary, let us Americans discuss a question which, if we will not admit it, confronts us today, will certainly confront us immediately after the shooting stops. This is the so-called Polish boundary question. Let us politicians discuss it, not

as a fine political opportunity to garner a few Polish votes in our own districts, but as a patriotic opportunity to face a problem which concerns not only the Poles and the Russians, but all Europeans and all Americans. For in the question mark that today is the Polish boundary lies the answer to peace in Europe when this war is over.

The post-World War No. 1 boundary of Poland was arrived at after a bitter armed conflict between Poland and Russia which exhausted both countries. During that war the Curzon line was proposed by Great Britain as a temporary boundary until Poland, Finland, the Baltic countries and Russia could arrive at a definite settlement of their frontiers.

Russia rejected this proposal, refused to discuss the question with outside powers, and officially declared that instead of the Curzon line a settlement should be reached which would be "more favorable for the Polish people." Such a settlement was made by the Treaty of Riga, in 1921, a treaty which Russian history books for more than 18 years, indeed until the start of World War No. 2, considered satisfactory to the Soviet Union from a territorial standpoint.

Then in 1939 Germany invaded Poland. On September 17, 1939, Russia, as a passive ally of Hitler, occupied more than one-half of the territory of embattled Poland. Immediately following the Russian occupation there were widespread organized arrests of all anti-Communist or even vaguely suspected elements in eastern Poland. Polish Government officials, persons who belonged to Polish patriotic organizations, persons who had any connection with foreign firms or foreign governments, and, for some reason known only to the Russians, even stamp collectors were arrested with their families and deported en mass to the depths of northern and eastern Russia. It is said that in all 1,500,000 Poles were deported by the Russians, many of them, including an estimated 45,000 children, dying from hunger, disease, and other hardships.

After the Russians had effectively disposed of all suspected anti-Communist elements, they held plebiscites in the occupied sections of Poland, which they had divided into western Byelorussia and western Ukraine.

These newly occupied and thoroughly purged territories were flooded with Russian political agitators who voted under election provisions which granted the franchise to temporary as well as permanent residents. The candidates for the popular assembly from the various districts were selected by the Russians. Among these candidates were Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov and Marshal Voroshilov, according to a Pravda report. However, not all of the Russian candidates for the popular assembly were so well known to the Polish electorate as these two front-line Communists.

The Poles and Ukrainians and Byelorussians who voted in these plebiscites did not have to trouble themselves about the qualifications of the candidates, since there was only one name on each ballot. To cross it off, the voter had to retire behind a screen—a practice which seems to have been vigorously frowned upon by the Russian election officials. While the election was being held, members of the N. K. V. D., the Russian secret police, canvassed the communities to get out the vote. This they did far more persuasively than the most enthusiastic party workers in an American election. Those who had failed to vote were threatened with deportation or other reprisals.

But just to make certain of the results, the cautious Russians themselves appointed the tellers who counted the votes. Neither the Russians nor the Poles were very much surprised when the popular assemblies elected under these circumstances voted at once and unanimously—by a show of hands—for the incorporation of western Byelorussia and western Ukraine into the Soviet Union.

This was the plebiscite conducted on a broad democratic basis to which the Soviet Government alluded in its statement of last January on its relations with Poland.

Twenty-one months and four days after it occupied Poland, Russia was involved in a war with Germany. The next month, Russia, hard pressed by the onrushing Nazis, signed an agreement in London with the late Polish Prime Minister Sikorski in which the Soviet Union renounced its claim to eastern Poland and promised to release all Polish prisoners of the occupation—military and civilian.

But in April, 1943, Russia, no longer so hard pressed, her armies reinforced by Allied lend-lease, abruptly severed diplomatic relations with Poland. The Polish Government had requested the International Red Cross to investigate the disappearance of 8,300 Polish officers who had been taken prisoner by the Russians. The Germans claimed to have discovered their slaughtered bodies.

The Russians insisted that these officers were butchered by the Nazis, but the Polish Government, perhaps undiplomatically but at least patriotically, wanted to know how these officers, captured in 1939 by the Russians, pledged their freedom in 1941, had happened to fall into the hands of the Germans. This question has never been satisfactorily answered by either the Germans or the Soviets. One thing is clear: it provided the Soviet Government with a reason to sever diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in exile in London.

After dropping some resounding hints, which Great Britain and the United States tried hard for some months to ignore in the interests of harmony among the Allies, the Soviet Government candidly expressed its determination to annex Polish territory along the general pattern of the Curzon Line. In Great Britain and the United States the moral and historic justification presented by Russia to explain this seizure is accepted enthusiastically only by American and British Communists and fellow travelers. It is too flagrantly in opposition to the whole spirit and purpose of the Atlantic Charter. In fact, the only possible justification of it is Russia's nationalistic claim to a necessary security sphere. Such nationalistic needs were also expressed by Germany and Japan to explain their own moves toward territorial expansion in middle Europe and on the continent of Asia.

But as things turned out, possession of more than half of Poland in 1941 did not prevent Russia from being invaded and struck almost to the heart by Germany. It did not prevent Moscow from being bombed. Today or tomorrow Russian security will never lie in the erection of a human wall of Poles—or Finns, or Lithuanians, or Estonians, or Latvians—intended to absorb the punishment of Russia's continental enemies. Russia's security in Europe depends on the effective disarmament of Germany for many years to come. To this the United Nations have already pledged themselves. Poland is one of them. In a post-war world of vigorous cooperation between Great Britain, the United States, and the other United Nations to prevent the resurgence of an aggressive Germany, the annexation of Polish territory by the Soviet Union should not be necessary. The very measure of Stalin's faith in the Moscow agreements themselves is the way in which he handles the Polish boundary question.

In the January declaration the Soviet Government stated that it stands for the reestablishment of a strong and independent Poland. But a Poland robbed of about 10,000,000 of her citizens, or nearly one-third of her entire population, even should she seize land from Germany, as Russia suggests, could be neither strong nor independent. She would be a puppet state. Her strings would be manipulated from the Kremlin.

It is plain to all thoughtful Americans that the question of the Polish boundary is not whether after the war we will have a strong and independent Poland or a weak and subservient Poland. It is not a question of the future of the Ukrainians and the Byelorussians, the Poles, and the Russians. It is a question of whether the millions of men of all the United Nations who have died in this second war for democracy and a better world have died in vain. It is a question of whether the Europeans and Americans and British who survive them will be worthy of their sacrifices for a free Europe. Without a free and democratic Poland a free and democratic Europe is impossible. And without a free and democratic Europe World War No. 2 will be lost. And though the shooting may stop when the Germans are militarily beaten, peace will not come. We will have, instead, another long armed armistice which will break out in World War No. 3 inevitably. There can be no peace where causes for war exist. The freedom of Poland will always be a cause of war in Europe.

So this is not a matter to be mediated privately by the strong and victorious Russians, well reinforced with American lend-lease supplies, and the weak and shattered Poles, somewhat less well reinforced by the world's praise and sympathy. It is a question to be settled quietly and calmly across the peace table by all the nations, since the future of each of them will be affected by the final

dispensation of the Polish boundary. Henceforth the security of Russia is of great importance to the whole world. But it must not be purchased at the expense of a neighbor, for to do so is to purchase it at the expense of all the ideals and goals of the United Nations.

Should the fate of Poland and the Baltic states be decided by the loaded dice of nationalistic expediency instead of by the scales of international justice, we will know what the future holds for all of us. We will not then, if we are wise, ask for whom the bell tolls in Poland. It will toll for all of Europe. And for us.

But surely our Government is strong enough and wise enough to persuade our Russian allies that we will work with them so closely and so realistically in shaping the peace that they will have no need to rob their neighbors of liberty in order to safeguard their own. In this effort we will have the valiant aid of the British Government. The great crisis of confidence between ourselves and the Russians is at hand. I pray with all my heart our three mighty nations will see that crisis through, united in friendship and purpose.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRUK] such time as he may require.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, since this House last paid tribute to Polish Constitution Day the prospect that the old, old democracy of Poland will live again in our time has been materially improved. Spiritually the certainty of a Poland restored has persisted throughout the modern trial of the history-old suffering Poles.

It is better for a nation to lose its body than its soul. If the soul dies it cannot be restored, but if it endures a new body will be created for it in the fullness of time.

I am quoting, Mr. Speaker, from a book published during World War No. 1, in which G. P. Gooch, a student of Polish literature, wrote these lines. From this same book I wish to continue with the following:

The Polish state ceased to exist over a century ago. Yet her bitterest enemy would not dare to contend that Poland is dead. Her sons * * * cling tenaciously to the hope that the colossal crime of partition will be undone, and they are resolved that their nation, which played an honorable part in building up the civilization of Christendom, shall once again raise its head and be numbered among the states of Europe. They know that even after a total eclipse the sun shines forth again as brightly as ever.

We in America, the democratic kinsmen of Europe's Poles, those of us who are also of Polish ancestry—we have always retained the conviction through these latter years that Poland, the ancient free Poland, while having lost its territorial body would keep its soul, and that in the fullness of time the soul and the body would be together again in a reincarnation of Polish independence.

More than 2 centuries before England instituted habeas corpus, Poland, in 1430, adopted its law guaranteeing personal immunity.

The first free press was Poland's. When all Europe had either silenced or shackled the press, freedom of the press was a fact in Poland, along with freedom of speech and of worship.

But Poland was a democratic country surrounded by despotic kingdoms which impeded her progress. "Poland fell," said the great Paderewski, "because her neighbors were greedy, unscrupulous, and strong. Poland fell because she was generous, humane, and weak. Poland fell, to tell you the truth, because she had no permanent army to defend her possessions."

The constitution of the 3d of May 1791 was the supreme act of the Polish Nation to safeguard its integrity. The United States had just won the War of Independence and France was being reborn by revolution. Democracy was making its first open stand against autocracy.

That new, stronger Polish Constitution was an epochal document for Poland and for all Europe.

In France—

Said Baron d'Escare—

to gain liberty, they began with anarchy; in Poland the law for person and property was assured, and all this without violence, without murder, solely through the virtue of the courage of the nation which * * * knew how to heal her wounds.

The Poles presented the world with an example of patience, moderation, wisdom, and integrity in popular assembly.

Humanity—

Exclaimed Burke—

must rejoice and glory.

The Polish Nation had risen of its own strength—in the constitution of the 3d of May—to a new and greater charter of human rights, an inspiration then and since to all the oppressed of earth reaching for emancipation.

A History of Poland, recently written by O. Halecki, gives expression to the Polish faith, which is the faith of all freedom-loving peoples everywhere, in these words:

As a nation, Poland is still more grievously afflicted now * * * but infinitely more conscious of her unity and immortality; moreover, she has not ceased to exist as a state, and in the struggle for that existence now she has allies. * * * More clearly than ever before, the Polish cause has again become a great symbol belonging to universal humanity, and its just and final solution the indispensable condition of the victory of right over might and of Christian ethics over a pagan conception of the state, the nation, or the class.

The merely partial realization of these supreme historical ideas after the victory of 1918—partial throughout the whole world, including Poland—led to the fact that the resurrection of Poland and her first reconstruction were followed by the returning wave of destruction.

May God grant that instead of submerging Poland, Europe, and Christian civilization that wave shall be the last to be hurled back, and that future generations, happier than ours, may accomplish a new, this time undisturbed and enduring, work of regeneration.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise both to give Poland a pat on the back and to express the belief that that back will soon rise again.

Mr. Speaker, the Arfa Singing Society of Passaic, N. J., is composed of a group of charming and talented young women of Polish extraction. They are most ably directed by Mr. Edmund Sennert and over a period of years this society has been one of my district's finest institutions. It has contributed to the cultural and patriotic life of our people and has won renown in national contests. I have been privileged to be an honorary member of this organization and, addressing one of its concerts last November, I expressed the hope that it would not be long before the forces of tyranny and aggression would be defeated and world peace and sanity restored. Then, I said, I wanted Arfa to come to Washington to sing its inspiring songs of hope and cheer on the steps of the United States Capitol.

I think of Arfa today, as we in the House pay tribute to Poland on the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of that country's famous constitution, because Arfa's girls are the daughters, the granddaughters, and great-granddaughters of valiant Polish citizens and soldiers, lovers of liberty, who have constantly fought against oppression.

I think too of the thousands of American-Polish boys, domiciled in my district, who are now in America's fighting forces. They derive inspiration from those brave Polish patriots who laid down their lives that there might be an American Constitution protecting the rights of a free people. In June of this year they will be joined by Lt. Raymond Janeczek, my first appointee to West Point, who in his life at the Military Academy has distinguished himself in scholarship, leadership, and athletics.

Not far from the Pulaski Highway connecting the cities of Newark and Jersey City are those other great defense cities of Paterson, Passaic, and Clifton. Here years ago came thousands of substantial immigrants, poor but honest and industrious. They sought work in our factories and farms. They practiced thrift, built homes, schools, and churches. They sang the songs of the old country and they sang the songs of the new country. Today, besides their mighty contribution to the fighting forces, they are buying War bonds and helping to provide the food and construct the instruments of war which will help bring about a victory and peace guaranteeing freedom to Americans, Poles, and liberty-loving people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed by your great tribute to Poland in this House 2 years ago when you said, "Poland's battle today is our battle and our battle is Poland's." With you and all my colleagues I trust the time is near when Poland will rise again.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the splendid addresses made here on the floor of this House on this the great anniversary day of the Polish Nation. There is little that I can add to the much that has been said but I cannot refrain from just a

little word of appreciation. Poland, to all of us here in America, is an example of courage, of patriotism and of friendship. Poles have died for the freedom that is ours. Americans are dying that Poland may once again be free. Let me tell you a little story—a true one!

Some years ago a lovely Polish girl came all the way from Poland to take nurse's training at the Old Lakeside Hospital Training School in Cleveland. She knew the hospital was right on the shore of Lake Erie. She thought of it as a sparkling blue water, rippling up on a sandy shore. But the muddy reality did not daunt her, nor the language, nor the hard work. She wanted to be a nurse, just the finest nurse in all the world—not for herself, but for Poland. She stood high in the class and patients and students alike called her the nurse with the starry eyes. We hated to see her go, for she had brought to us so much of Polish courage, Polish determination, Polish faith. We hope she took with her the certainty that the Lakeside nurses who knew her will never forget the stars that were in her eyes, the strength that was in her hands, the friendship that was in her heart. The golden threads she wove between our two countries cannot be broken.

Women of Poland, I, a woman of America, greet you on this day of remembrance and glory. I await with you the day of your freedom and until that dawn breaks I join you in prayers before the throne of the Most High God to give you and your beloved ones constant courage, unswerving determination, and an unquenchable faith.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, gathered here today are 435 Representatives of the Congress of the United States, we represent the greatest nation in the world of 136,000,000 people, and we stop to pay tribute to a great nation, a nation that has withstood every form of despoliation, of tyranny, and oppression, whose spirit has never been broken so that today it rises in a resurgent spirit one of the great outstanding peoples of the world. I pay tribute to the great Poles in my own district, the men who have made valuable contributions in the steel mills, in the plants, in the industries, who have brought forth in the arsenals of America the munitions that made it possible to carry on this war.

So much for the physical characteristics and the tributes to these men and their character. Today we pay tribute to their valiant spirit. In my own district we have two places named after Casimir Pulaski who gave his life at Savannah. Above and beneath it all is our recognition of the bravery, courage, and determination that Poland will rise again and lead as she has in the past. God grant that every activity, every prayer, every contribution will be now to help Poland achieve her destiny.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEFEVRE] may extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, on this 3d day of May, we pause to observe the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution.

In the constitution of May 3, the Polish nation sees not merely the text of constitutional provisions then given force of law, but the embodiment of great conceptions of fundamental importance. In times of good fortune the constitution is a source of noble pride; in times of difficulty and sorrow it is a consolation and a hope, and above all a source of strength. Always it is a signpost pointing to the future.

The principles of the sovereignty of the nation—"All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people"—were embodied in the constitution. Further, it adopted the principle of the division of authority, establishing three separate and equal authorities—legislative, executive, and judicial. The principle of religious toleration, which had been known in Poland since 1573, was also accepted. In the organization of the Polish Sejm, the May constitution assigned a basic role to the Chamber of Deputies, claiming the elected deputies "the representatives of the entire nation, being the repository of general confidence."

As a further consequence, the constitution introduced the principle of parliamentary responsibility on the part of the ministers.

In laying the foundations for a new, better state system the May 3 constitution did not overlook the question of military power. It laid down that the entire nation, that is, all citizens, were obliged to defend their motherland. The question of mutual relations between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was not ignored. The obligatory force of the constitutional law was extended to both parts of the state which had been united by a factual union since 1569. The constitution declared:

> We decide that, as we have a single, universal, and inseparable governmental law, serving all our state, the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, so we wish to have our common army and treasury united in a single indissoluble national treasury governed by one government.

Relations between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were thus drawn closer by mutual desire. A common, supreme, administrative authority was set up, based on the principle of equality.

The reforms affecting the burgher class consisted of granting this class a number of rights, which they had not previously enjoyed, and which had been the privilege exclusively of the nobility and gentry. The reforms of May 3, 1791, had grown out of Poland's own national tradition and had arisen out of Polish political thought. So it was a native creation, witnessing to the high level of the political and legislative culture of the Polish Nation.

In certain states, the constitution was warmly welcomed by representatives of public opinion. British opinion reacted extremely favorably and with profound sincerity. At a session of Paris Municipal Council on May 24, 1791, Garron de Coulon made a long speech on the Polish Constitution, proposing that the municipality of the capital of France should send greetings to the municipality of Warsaw on the happily accomplished reform. The Pope expressed his sincere and profound good wishes for the constitution. The Swedes also gave it a friendly welcome, comparing it with their own reforms carried out 20 years earlier. In Holland a commemorative medal was struck in honor of the new constitution.

Two fundamental features of the Polish commonwealth state system—the freedom of the individual and the freedom of the nation—constituted not only the main principles of Polish policy during the period of enslavement, but gave the Polish cause a universal character. Wherever the struggle for freedom was fought there Poles were to be found. Fighting for their own freedom, they realized that they were fighting for the ideal of universal freedom.

It is more fitting now, than ever before, to recall and emphasize the importance of the principles embodied in the constitution of the 3d of May. Now, in the most tragic hour of Poland's history, is the time to rightly appraise her contribution to freedom and liberty.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Members of the House of Representatives in conveying greetings to the Polish Nation, on this historic date, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the signing of their constitution; and to the Polish people whose citizens are now scattered all over the world, and who are fighting side by side with the Allies on all fronts of this present world conflict.

On May 3, 1791, Poland, by the adoption of their constitution, stepped into the forefront of the great democracies of the world, giving its people a constitutional form of government. Since the adoption of that historical Polish document, Poland has suffered bloodshed, torture, sacrifice, hunger, and separation of families. Conquest and brutality are not new to the people of Poland. These and many other sufferings have been inflicted upon the Polish people by strong militaristic nations whose aim was to enslave the people and to take their land.

The conquerors have subjected the people of Poland to every imaginable torture, both mental and physical. The Polish people have suffered all of this in their fight for freedom and independence.

Before the present war broke out, the Nazis endeavored to get Poland to collaborate with them in their new order in Europe, but the Polish people wanted peace, and also wanted to live up to their agreements with the other nations. The Nazi rulers wanted the Polish Government to join Germany in an attack on Russia. Poland, because of her nonag-

gression agreement with Russia absolutely refused, and as a result of this refusal, on September 1, 1939, Germany attacked and invaded Poland.

After the invasion and conquest of the country, the Polish soldiers, eager to continue the fight for freedom and against totalitarian government, fled to other countries to join the fighting Allied nations, and to this day, in the fifth year of the war, Poland is still fighting side by side with the armies of the United Nations.

Day by day the Allied nations are showing more and more strength, while the Nazis are weakening and shall eventually collapse. We all hope this great struggle will soon end and that righteousness, freedom, and justice, will be triumphant and that after hostilities have ended, the Allied nations will establish a peace which is based on honesty and justice, and that Poland will emerge from this struggle a reestablished, strong, free, and independent nation. Poland does not covet any other nation's territory. She only wants what rightfully belongs to her.

I am sure that when total victory is achieved and the peace is restored, the Polish Nation whose people have sacrificed so much and who fought so gallantly for the same high ideals as the other freedom-loving nations, will have freedom and independence restored to them, without the loss of any of their land, at the peace conference.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

The history of Poland has been one of the glorious pages of history. The part she has played in the development of the civilized world is likewise a glorious one, in science, the arts, religion. The genius, accomplishments, and leadership of Poland have been outstanding.

Men and women of Polish birth or ancestry have struggled, fought, and died not only for Polish freedom, but for the cause of freedom on the world's battlefields.

In this connection, the names of Pulaski and Kosciuszko as heroes of the Revolutionary War are written indelibly in the pages of American history and America's fight for freedom.

When the hordes of Genghis Khan overran and laid waste to Europe, it was the Polish arms who defeated him and his hordes and saved the Christian peoples of Europe.

On May 3, 1791, the Constitution of Poland was enacted, and this action by Poland won the acclaim of the world for its leadership in democracy and government.

Poland today has been overrun by the Nazi forces. Outnumbered but not outfought, the spirit of Poland lives on in the breasts of the dauntless men, women, and children who have survived the madness of the conqueror.

Poland will and must rise again. It would be idle for us to pay tribute to Poland today if we did not render more than lip service to Poland. It is our duty to insist that the boundaries of Poland be restored to her; that her sovereignty be reestablished; and that Poland with her unconquerable spirit take her appropriate and respected position among the great nations of the earth.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, every fair-minded American sympathizes today with the Polish people on this anniversary. They have been between the devil and the deep sea, in the last few years in particular. They are a sturdy people, with fine sensibility and great courage. Everything possible should be done to perpetuate their nationality.

God bless them and help them to be restored to national life and independence.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as a war-inflamed world seeks to mold its destiny based on principles of liberty and independence and for which ideals our own sons are now giving their lives, it is appropriate that we should devote a part of our proceedings to note the fact, that on this day in 1791, Poland adopted a new constitution providing for liberty and equal rights for all men.

Historians tell us that this was the first written democratic constitution in Europe, establishing the rights of the middle classes and of the peasants. History also records that in 1430, some 200 years before the English Habeas Corpus Act, Poland guaranteed liberty of the person, and in 1573, it established freedom of conscience and worship at a time when religious persecution was rife. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this country was called the freest in Europe, the state in which the greatest degree of constitutional, civic, and intellectual liberty prevailed.

Bowed but unbeaten Poland still fights for these sacred rights and for her freedom against dictators and oppressors. Her valiant men and women, sons and daughters, are striking hard on land and sea, in the air and underground and are making notable contributions to the Allied drive to final victory and peace. Poland's people have been terrorized, her country devastated but her spirit and determination to fight for the cause of human freedom remain uncrushed and unbeatable.

The flame lit by Poland's independence centuries ago has and will continue to flicker wherever liberty and free people meet and it is fitting that we should pledge ourselves to assist immortal Poland in regaining the liberty and independence of a democratic republic to which she has made such great sacrifices.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

POLAND, THE POLISH CONSTITUTION—POLISH-RUSSIAN RELATIONS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the Poles the world over are celebrating their national holiday, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the 3d of May constitution that marked their Nation's spiritual rebirth. The 3d of May 1791 marks Poland's new birth of freedom. It commemorates the Polish Constitution, one of the world's greatest documents of freedom, like Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the American Declaration of Independence.

The feeling of the Polish people for their constitution is perhaps best expressed by their greatest national poet, Adam Mickiewicz:

> This law did not emerge from the brain of an isolated sage, from the lips of a few administrators, but was drawn from the heart of the great mass; it is not merely written in black and white but it still lives in the memory, in the desires, of the generations, and it is a living law, rooted in the past and developing in the future. * * * In the May constitution * * * the national element, the child of past traditions, is nurtured on the new present-day needs of the Nation. Hence it has been well and justly said that the May constitution is the political testament of the former Poland.

The freedom of the individual and the freedom of the Nation, these two fundamental features of Poland, constituted not only the main principles of Polish policy during the period of enslavement, but gave the Polish cause a universal character. Wherever the struggle for freedom was fought, there Poles were to be found.

The May 3 constitution stated, among others, the principle that—"All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." Since 1573 Poland had religious toleration. The constitution restated this principle, as follows:

> For us the same sacred faith enjoins us to love our neighbors; therefore, we should guarantee to all people peace in the faith and government protection, and therefore freedom to all rites and religions in the Polish lands, according to the country's laws.

As a result of the adoption of this constitution, the state system of Poland took on a form different from that of other European states. The disproportion which thus arose between Poland and the other states was bound up with problems of essential state importance. Poland, with a system based on liberty, found herself surrounded by countries governed by absolute monarchs.

The liberals of England and France were loud in their praise of Poland. Sweden and Holland and the Pope all sent messages expressing sincere and profound good wishes.

No such expressions, however, came from the Tsaritsa Catherine II or from the Prussian King Frederick. They took a hostile attitude to the Polish reforms. "The Poles have outdone all the insanities of the Paris National Assembly," the Tsaritsa declared, and dreamed only of the day when she would be able to punish the Poles.

Poland had been previously partitioned in 1772 by her imperialistic, powerful,

and greedy neighbors—Russia, Prussia, and Austria. She was, however, still the third largest state in Europe when 19 years after this partition she proceeded to pass a constitution recognizing the equality of all men and extending religious liberty to all.

In 1793, just 2 years after the adoption of her constitution, Catherine the Great, the Tsaritsa of Russia, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of Austria decreed the death penalty for Poland. They envied Polish culture and progress; they feared that Polish love of liberty and democracy might infect their own subjects. So because Poland was free, independent, and democratic, these greedy and bloodthirsty militarists ordered the second partition of Poland. Poland was doomed. But Kosciusko started the insurrection and resisted the Russian armies until October 24, 1795, when Warsaw capitulated.

So, from then on the Polish people and their great leaders like Kosciusko and Pulaski have continuously fought for freedom and justice in all parts of the world. We can well understand why Poland will always fight tyranny and aggrandizement.

Our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, expressed the American tribute when he said:

> The heroic and determined manner in which the Polish people have struggled and sacrificed in the face of tremendous hardships and deprivations has been an inspiration not only to the people of the United States but to liberty-loving people everywhere.

Poland will always support every lawful expression of international morality, such as the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," and demand that they be strictly adhered to and implemented. In this they are joined by all freedom- and liberty-loving Americans who cherish justice and fairness.

In defense of Poland's freedom and independence, all Poles are united and of a single mind. Nothing can loosen or weaken this unity. All attempts to impose upon Poland a government or a regime from the outside, or to meddle in her internal affairs, to violate her territorial integrity, or to dictate her foreign policy, will always and everywhere meet with unanimous resistance.

FULL JUSTICE FOR POLAND

Poland has scrupulously discharged her obligations in the war against Hitler. There is no Polish Quisling. All collaboration with Germany has been refused. There has never been even any suggestion of contact or any understanding with Hitler. Poland, although the first attacked and subsequently, for the last 4½ years, subjected to every Nazi trick and scheme, threat and cajolery, has nevertheless stood firm and unyielding. Poland's gallant and unswerving fight against German aggression, Poland's immaculate moral and idealogical record, give her the undeniable right to full justice, and to compensation for the incredible sacrifices made by the Polish people in their fight for world freedom.

The sacrifices of the Polish Nation are greater than those of any of her allies. More than one-tenth of the entire Polish Nation have laid down their lives in the fight for freedom.

Poland in a spirit of democracy looks to the world for the realization of her hopes, for Poland is really a test case. We know that without justice to Poland there can be no better world.

TWO LONG CENTURIES OF SUFFERING—POLES ARE BOUNDARY CONSCIOUS

For the past two centuries Poland and her people have been partitioned four times, ravaged, despoiled, murdered, and enslaved by greedy and imperialistic nations. No nation, no people, have suffered so much in the last two centuries. National honor, national integrity, the nation's boundaries, after two centuries of suffering, are sacred things to every Pole—young and old, rich and poor. Two long centuries of Polish tears, prayers, songs of sorrow, have made it so. For two long centuries their women and children were starved and slaughtered, husbands, fathers, and brothers shot and sabered or condemned to prisons for life. Two long centuries of the most cruel and inhuman practices upon a peaceful and agricultural people, of persecution, brutal barbarism and savagery have instilled in every Polish heart a deep consciousness of national honor, national integrity, and that the nation's boundaries be respected.

Why did they fight the powerful Nazi military machine? Why did they not submit to the territorial demands of the Germans? Did they not know defeat was inevitable? Had not all the other nations conceded to German demands?

Yes; the Poles knew all this.

They had to fight—or cease to exist. They chose to fight. It should be plain, that they will not tolerate aggression by anyone.

POLAND A CHRISTIAN NATION—PRACTICED RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Poland is one of the strongest Catholic nations in the world. Her people are deeply religious, and devotedly attached to their churches and clergy. Poland has been referred to as the "Knight among nations." She has been the bulwark of Christianity, religious freedom for all, and the opponent of persecution. She has been faithful to her pledges, promises, and agreements. She was always the haven of refuge for those religiously persecuted.

It was because of this policy that Poland had 7,000,000 Jewish people out of a total European population of 11,000,000 Jews.

Yes; but Poland had pogroms, some will say. This is true. But the first and worst pogroms took place in Czarist Russia, and, although some of the anti-Jewish propaganda did seep over into Poland, the Poles would not tolerate it and quickly stamped it out. Likewise, when the Hitler Nazis started in recent years the new anti-Jewish pogroms the most vicious and devastating that the world has ever witnessed, Poland was likewise flooded with this German propaganda. But the Polish people would not succumb to it. Their religious tolerance is deep and sincere. They respect every individual's right to pray and worship in his own way. That is why more than 60 percent of the entire Jewish population of Europe found a haven of refuge and peace in Poland. Some have accused the Polish clergy and the Catholic Church of practicing intolerance. These statements are viciously false and untrue. The Polish clergy have been the world's greatest preachers of religious tolerance for all faiths, and Poland's record bears this out.

REBIRTH OF THE POLISH ARMED FORCES

Everyone knows today that the Polish Army, defeated in September 1939 by overwhelming mechanical and numerical superiority, did not lay down its arms, did not lose its morale, and did not leave its mother country defenseless. All who avoided capture by the Germans or escaped from prison camps arrived in France by way of Hungary and Rumania. There they entered the army then being rebuilt by Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski.

Six months after the German attack on Poland, General Sikorski had about 100,000 men under arms in France, and Polish aviation was rendering a good account of itself in the dog fights over the front.

The Polish Highland Brigade, under General Szyszko-Bohusz, fought in Norway and distinguished itself at Narvik.

Out of the French collapse Poland salvaged its Government and its Army. Following the reorganization of the Polish Army in Scotland a new Polish Army sprung into being in Russia. The forces which left Russia are now among the new Polish divisions in the Middle East and in Italy.

Mention of the Polish Navy is constantly recurring in Allied communiqués. The part played by the destroyer *Piorun* in the sinking of the *Bismarck*, the successes of Polish submarines, the unceasing work of the Polish naval and merchant vessels are offering endless evidence of Poland's determination to fight on all fronts.

It was that little Polish destroyer, *Piorun*, that was the first to sight and attack the mammoth German warship *Bismarck*. It was likewise this little *Piorun* that first sighted and attacked the giant German warship *Tirpitz*. The courage, bravery, and the fighting spirit of the Polish naval men surpasses all comprehension and has won the stout praise of the American and British seamen. The Polish Navy has now been built up by the Americans and the British to the extent that it has more warships and is more powerful than it was in 1939 when Poland was attacked by the Germans.

It is the Polish Air Force that has really enraptured the hearts and minds of the English people. Their gallant fighting during the German air blitz on London and the English and Scotch cities, was so heroic and so marked with bravery and fearlessness that the praise and gratitude of the British people resounded throughout the British Isles. Those were dark and grim days for the British. The eagerness and fearlessness of the Polish aviators to meet the Hun inspired the British with confidence and deep respect for their Polish allies. The Poles now have an air force of 15 squadrons—larger and stronger than that of Holland, Bel-

gium, Free French, Norway, and Czechoslovakia, all combined. It is the fourth largest Allied air force. The Polish Air Force is now engaged in fighting the enemy every day—side by side with the American and the British. The Polish Air Force has taken continuous participation and has been actively engaged in bombing and fighting the enemy ever since September 1939. This is really some record. One Polish bomber squadron has sunk seven German submarines.

There are more than 30,000 in the Army Corps with the Motorized Division in England. There are two fully equipped Polish Divisions on the Italian front fighting side by side with the French and Canadian divisions and with our American forces.

All told, the Polish armed forces total about 250,000 men and occupy fifth place among the United Nations, ranking after the United States, England, Russia, and China.

The Polish underground is the strongest, most powerful, and the best organized in Europe. Their important work will be revealed to the world later, when information can be revealed without aiding the enemy. This much can be said: They have caused the Germans untold grief, and have continuously hampered and obstructed the smooth operation of the German military organization. They are actively aiding and assisting the Russian armies, and are rendering services of inestimable value. This cooperation has the sanction and approval of the Polish Government in exile.

THE POLISH GOVERNMENT

I met General Sikorski in January 1943 and spent an hour with him discussing Poland and the war. He impressed me as a great statesman and a great leader. Poland certainly suffered a great loss when this great leader was killed in the plane crash last summer. I have also met Vice Premier Kwapinski, who appeared to me to be a very sincere and honest man. I have heard the Polish Government in exile praised warmly as a representative and democratic government, as a delegation representative of the peasants, industrial labor, socialists, Jews, and all of the elements that go to make up the Polish nation. I have also heard the exiled government referred to as undemocratic and unrepresentative and as anti-Russian. Of one thing we may be certain, that the Polish people will never stand for a puppet government, that no Polish government can ever exist that would compromise Polish territory without full agreement and acquiesence of the Polish people.

I do not think it matters much what we think of the Polish Government, or what is said about it. The Polish people in Poland will solve that problem themselves. They shall elect and choose a new government and new officials at their first opportunity. We have only the obligation to see that the Polish people have the opportunity to vote in a free democratic election. The same thing holds true for France, Greece, Yugoslavia, and so forth. Give the people a free election, and I am sure that they will elect a peoples' government.

POLISH LABOR

In discussing Poland, one cannot help but pause and give praise and credit to Polish labor. It was the Polish worker who waged the centuries-old struggle for liberation from the Czarist regime. It was Polish labor that proclaimed its solidarity against violence and inequality, and kept up the bitter struggle for freedom and social justice.

Today, when they are enslaved and fettered by the brutal Nazis, the Polish workers still stand fast with the United Nations until every last one of the hated Nazi invaders and oppressors are driven from Polish soil and the Hitler Huns are completely annihilated.

The coming victory will be labor's victory. The workers of the United States, Great Britain, the working men and women of the occupied countries bear the brunt of the fighting and of resistance. Labor is marching in the forefront of all who fight against nazi-ism and fascism. The victory that will be won by labor will bring stable peace, freedom, and social justice.

This year, May 1, 1944, in Poland, the Polish underground circulated the May Day order:

On May 1 we shall not be out on the streets in order to count our numbers—

It read—

We shall not parade, but we shall take a good look at our friends. In their eyes we shall see the same flaming hatred toward the enemy, the same unquenchable determination to enjoy a new life, the same preparedness for the struggle to come. Every worker is today fully aware of the goals and methods of the struggle he wages in common with the peasant, the white-collar worker, and the intellectual.

The Nazi terror has temporarily muted the voice of Polish labor. Trade-unionism has been abolished. The foe has stolen the Polish workers' May Day, their labor day, and their constitution day—the Polish Fourth of July. They have lost their homesteads. They have been murdered by the hundreds of thousands. They have had their property seized. Hundreds of villages have been burned to the ground. Mass murders and executions that have horrified the civilized world, and the most terrible cruelties have been practiced against the Poles in order to break down their morale.

Yes, all of these things the Nazis have done, but still they have not broken the Poles' will or their spirit.

Polish labor will arise to strike the final blow at their archenemy. The day shall come. It will not be long. Their flag shall fly once more. They shall carry the flag of vengeance, the peoples' wrath.

Polish labor shall lead the reborn Poland to freedom, to justice, to glory. Polish labor shall lead to a unity and understanding with all of their Slav brothers in Europe. Just as the American Slav workers in America have learned to understand each other, to work together, to fight together, united in one cause, and have demonstrated their extreme loyalty to the United States and their profound determination for a United Nations' victory.

THE SLAVS

The Slav people of Europe—the Slav workers, Polish, Czechs, Slovaks, Bulgarians, Macedonians, Ukrainians, Croatians, Serbs, Slovenes, White Russians, Russians, as well as those of the Baltic States—are all united in their cry for freedom and social justice. Their one desire is peace and happiness, freedom to till the soil, to work, and freedom of religious worship. They are not interested in greed or intrigue.

The Slavic workers in America have demonstrated their ability for unity, solidarity and faith, and confidence in one another. We have confidence that their Slav brothers in Europe will likewise demonstrate that deep understanding which can only come by eliminating selfishness, envy, greed, and suspicion of one another.

The Slavs are a valiant and courageous people. They must show wisdom and leadership. Upon them and their actions will depend the future peace of the world. When victory is won they will be charged with a world trust—to keep the peace of Europe.

There are hundreds of thousands of American Slavs in the United States armed forces fighting for the same ends, in complete understanding with one another. The Nazi Huns have shown their hatred for all of the Slavs. For centuries the Huns have conspired against Poland and the Slavish countries to bring about confusion and distrust amongst them. Slavish unity, understanding, and cooperation is the key to future peace of Europe and to the future peace of the world.

"THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG"

My district is made up of every Slav nationality, and I have the honor of being chosen honorary president of the Michigan Slav Congress. There are a few Poles and a few Russians who take the narrow and adamant position that the respective governments and the respective political leaders of their mother country have always been right and faultless, and all wrongs were committed by the other side.

As a Democrat and an American, I cannot subscribe to the old belief that "the king can do no wrong." Everyone makes mistakes and no one is always right. I say that mistakes have been made on both sides and that it is the duty of every Slav to speak up strongly and vehemently when such a mistake is made, because that is the only way that they can preserve Slav unity. The Slavs in America have demonstrated that they can live, work, and fight together in unity and harmony.

They can tell their brothers and cousins in Europe to do likewise and to eliminate controversies and disputes. They should tell them to lay strong foundations for a harmonious post-war world, to eliminate bigotry and intolerance, baseless suspicions, and unreasonable demands. This should be done to insure the unity necessary for speedy victory and post-war harmony.

WHAT DO THE POLISH AND THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE WANT?

The Polish and the Russian people want the same thing that the American people want, namely: Peace, a lasting peace, freedom from fear and want, the right to pray in their own church, and all of those other things that the American people want and that President Roosevelt has so eloquently and clearly outlined to the world.

Neither people want conquest or aggrandizement. The Polish people do not want a puppet government in Warsaw. The Russian people do not want a puppet government in Moscow. The Polish people want a friendly government in Moscow. The Russian people want a friendly government in Warsaw. It is my belief that the will of the Polish and the Russian people will prevail in this respect. The Russian people know that acquisition of Polish land will not give them security. They have had Polish land several times before under the Czars, but that did not bring them peace and security. Lenin, the great Russian statesman, understood this well, and so told his people. It is time for Russian and Polish political leaders to read into the hearts and minds of their own peoples or they shall be removed and discredited. The Polish peasant and the Russian peasant have enjoyed many a glass of vodka together in the past, and they intend to enjoy it more often together in the future.

U. S. S. R. MUST NOT FOLLOW POLICY OF CZARS

This is a new day. This is a new world. The days of kings, and czars, of reactionaries and Fascists, are over. This has been a people's war, and it must be a people's victory. Let the dead past be forgotten. The czars of Russia are no more. The Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia must not follow in the footsteps of the imperialistic czars. Their future is before them—glorious and bright with hands of friendship and appreciation extended by all democratic peoples. I am certain that in order to maintain this respect, to maintain confidence and leadership, to be the instrumentality for human hope, peace, and friendship and leadership in the new world, the Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia realize her obligations and that she must respect the wishes of her smaller neighbors; they must not follow in the footsteps of the czars. To take from Poland the cities of Lwow and Vilna would be like surrendering our cities of Boston and Philadelphia, two of our oldest centers of American culture and learning.

The Polish people, in fact all of the Slav people of Europe, have turned their eyes with hope and confidence toward Russia. Russia must not disappoint them by making unfair demands. Her duty now is that of a mother—to extend the hand of protection and help, to give aid and assistance to the smaller nations and their peoples. This is Russia's greatest opportunity. This, in fact, is her responsibility. This opportunity may not come again for centuries.

Joe Stalin is a great leader. The Russian people are valiant, heroic, and generous. They occcupy today a position in Europe that the people of the United States occupy on the American Continent. Our program is to aid, to assist, to be generous with our sister republics. Russia must provide vision, faith, and inspiration to bring united action among the nations of Europe for the cause of righteousness and human justice. Cannot Russia do this? Will Russia do this? I believe she will. I sincerely hope she will.

AMERICAN PRINCIPLES WILL PREVAIL

We, as Americans under the leadership of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, have shown by words and deeds—yes, by positive action, that our friendship toward Russia is sincere. Out of this bitter struggle, these bloody sacrifices—yes, out of these terrible years of toil and tears, we have cemented a friendship that should be lasting and mutually understanding.

We have again displayed our physical courage on the fields of battle. We have likewise never been lacking in moral courage. Many times before Pearl Harbor and many times since Pearl Harbor, our democratic principles have been stated and restated by our great President and that great Senator, statesman, and Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. The principles are indelible in the lifeblood, the hearts and minds of every American. They are the principles that have made America great, loved and respected. We have the moral courage to state and reaffirm these principles. We shall state and reaffirm these principles because they are right, they are just, and they must prevail.

Oh, I know that certain isolationists, appeasers, and reactionaries have attacked our President and the State Department, ridiculing the "four freedoms," the Atlantic Charter, the program for humanitarian cooperation after the war as just "a lot of pretty words," "just dreams inapplicable to a greedy world," or "you know you can't trust Russia." Well, these wise men of the Hooverian era have been repudiated by the American people time and time again. The American people have faith, courage, and conviction, and most of all, a sincere interest in the future peace and happiness of the world.

Yes, we have today those shrewd Republican politicians who see in Russia's territorial demands a golden political opportunity. An opportunity to embarrass the President, the Secretary of State, the War Department, by viciously attacking Russia, our relations with her, and to create confusion and distrust out of this situation.

CROCODILE TEARS FOR POLAND

The Republicans are wringing their hands and shedding crocodile tears for poor Poland. They are gushing with sympathy and kind words for Poland, and whispering that Roosevelt sold Poland out to Stalin. But that sly political smirk on their faces beguiles their sincerity. They will fool no one—least of all, the Poles.

The Poles will remember! They shall ask: "Where were you in September 1939? Did you protest against the invasion and brutal attack by the Nazis? Did you not say: "Oh, why bother about that little strip of land in Poland, let the Nazis have it?" Yes, in those desperate days, you were so generous that you would have thrown drowning Poland an anchor when she would have gratefully grasped a straw. Did you not oppose and vote against lend-lease, the arming of our merchant marine, the national-defense program, and all the other legislation that Roosevelt proposed to give aid to Poland and the other unfortunate countries and for America's own defense and protection?"

Yes, the Poles remember all of that. The Poles will remember that it was President Roosevelt's voice that rang loud and clear, full of faith and hope and sincere feeling, to the Polish people across the seas. These were not empty words; they were followed with positive action. Yes, my friends, there is no change today. President Roosevelt is still today the greatest friend that Poland has. He has not changed. He has not taken a back seat. He has not sold Poland down the river.

UNITED STATES HAS NO ULTERIOR MOTIVES

We in America know that the eyes of starving Polish men and women, and also those in other Slavish states and countries are turned to the United States. Much depends upon our skilful exercise of an intelligent influence upon international politics. We can play a decisive role in helping the Polish people and the other Slavs to whom we owe a debt of gratitude for their resistance to our common foe—German nazi-ism.

We have no European designs. We have no ulterior motives.

During the last war we had a great Democrat and statesman, President Woodrow Wilson, but an isolationist Congress let him down.

This time we are blessed with the greatest leader and humanitarian in our history, our President, our Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt. We have confidence in our President. We have faith in his honesty, integrity, and sense of right and justice. He will not fail the Polish people. He will not fail the Slavs. We can repose our faith, our trust, our confidence in him.

I firmly believe that the American people will back him up in all of his decisions, and the isolationists in Congress shall not dominate the peace conference.

Under the terms of the Atlantic Charter, the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have announced a basic policy for the democracies of the world. It called for the establishment of "a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." This policy was immediately accepted with great enthusiasm by the people of the United States as a policy and an expression solidly and fundamentally American. It was the American Monroe Doctrine applied for the protection of the small and weak nations of the world. Later, on January 1, 1942, the United Nations in a joint declaration signed at Washington, subscribed to a common program to carry out these principles.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

We Americans know that we are fighting to beat Hitler, to beat the Nazis, to beat the Japs. We know that we are fighting to beat back a berserk Germany, to beat back the Nazi and Jap militarists, and to keep them from dominating the world. We also know that we are fighting for much more than this. We must win a constructive and durable peace in Europe and in the world. This tragic war must be followed by long years of peace and not only by an uneasy truce, bickerings, and suspicions which will end soon in another war.

WIN THE WAR COMES FIRST

It may now appear that we have only a policy of expediency. We have been accused of supporting discredited kings, of supporting a status quo which many Europeans hate as much as they hate the Nazis. We are accused of ignoring the social revolution by which all of Europe was torn through the thirties. I have heard all of these accusations, and so have the American people. But the enemy shall not confuse us. We will not be dissuaded from our purposes.

We know that No. 1 on our list is win the war. The War Department is charged with this responsibility. That is their job. The War Department thinks and acts in terms of divisions. To inactivate several enemy divisions here, to convert several divisions from opposition to cooperation. To obtain the services of the French and Italian Fleets. To do the various things necessary to bring about the defeat of the enemy as quickly as possible, that is our No. 1 task, and the War Department and the Navy Department are charged with that responsibility. Will the Army and Navy hold a conference on foreign policy, the Atlantic Charter, or the "four freedoms" before they act? Certainly not. They have only one job to do, and that is to win the war. Because of military necessity, the State Department must at times appear in an awkward position. It is true that the State Department has had to step aside at times for the military. We admit these things, but we also know the reasons. The American principles of right and justice may at times appear dormant, but they are not dead. Who is there so naive as to believe that the War Department has usurped the powers of the State Department? Who is there who thinks that the State Department is out of business, and that the "four freedoms," the Atlantic Charter, and all of the fundamental principles and doctrines of the American people have been forsaken and forgotten?

I, for one, have faith in my country and in our great President and our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. I have faith in the American people and in the Congress of the United States. These principles will be restated and reaffirmed strongly and vigorously, and let no one have any doubt about it.

MY CONFERENCES WITH PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND SECRETARY OF STATE, CORDELL HULL

During the past year it has been my privilege to have had two conferences with the President of the United States, and two conferences with Secretary of State Cordell Hull and the State Department. We discussed Poland—the Polish question—most thoroughly and at great length. As a result of these discussions, I can state definitely and positively that Poland and her people have no greater friends in the whole world than these two men. I can state definitely and positively that our Government acknowledges no unilateral agreements, nor does it intend to acknowledge any unilateral agreements. I can state definitely and positively that there are no secret agreements as to Poland and her boundaries. I am convinced that the malicious propaganda that has been let loose against the President of the United States is primarily aimed to defeat him in the elections next November. The following quotations from Cordell Hull are still the policy of our Government, and it is my firm and positive belief that they will remain so.

Quoting from Cordell Hull's speech to the Congress of the United States on November 18, 1943, after his return from Moscow:

> There were other problems, such, for example, as questions relating to boundaries, which must by their very nature, be left in abeyance until the termination of hostilities.

And again from Cordell Hull's speech of April 9, 1944:

> The President has said, neither he nor I have made or will make any secret agreement or commitment, political or financial.

And again from the same speech:

> The Atlantic Charter was proclaimed by the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain in August 1941. Then by the Declaration of the United Nations of January 1, 1942, these nations adopted the principles of the Atlantic Charter, agreed to devote all their resources to the winning of the war, and pledged themselves not to conclude a separate armistice or peace with their common enemies.

PASSIONS, BITTERNESS, MUST NOT PREVAIL

I have tried to present this subject objectively, without rancor, without bitterness, without recriminations. Passions cannot prevail and must not be allowed to control our words and actions. The world has too much at stake today. The enemy is gambling on a break-down of Allied unity. They are staking everything on a negotiated peace. This could only come as a result of a break-down in the friendly relationships within the United Nations. This we must guard against, or we will face the German military forces again in another 20 years.

CONCLUSION

On this anniversary of the Polish Constitution, let us review the contribution of the Poles for an Allied victory. Let us discuss the future of the Polish Nation and its people. The scale has tipped heavily in favor of the United Nations, of which Poland is a part. The sands are running very low for the German would-be world conquerors. At this very moment the Nazi ex-supermen are being bombed to high heaven by Allied squadrons, in whose ranks number many Polish bombers and fighters. Russia's great victories on the eastern front—everything points to a victory and that soon the devastated and tortured people of Poland will be free again. It must be said clearly and forcefully, however, that victory for Poland and the Polish people is only as near and as certain as victory for all of the United Nations. Hitler and his satellites are far from finished. The toughest fighting for America, our own country, and for Poland is still ahead. The success of this fighting will depend entirely upon the continued concord and unity of the United Nations and their coordinated blows at the common enemy.

Looking at the future, we see too that a secure and stable world is possibly only through the continued concord and cooperation of the United Nations—cooperation in the peace to come as firm as in the winning of the war. Poland's future and Russia's future are inextricably bound up with the future of America and all of the United Nations.

Many of America's best sons, of Poland's best sons, and of Russia's best sons have already fallen, and many more will yet fall. Deep, deliberate, cool, and honest-thinking, sincere, and temperate action is demanded from all of us. A spirit of cooperation, understanding, and friendly relations must be preserved for the sake of humanity—for a future of glorious and lasting peace for the world.

The millions of valiant soldiers and the millions of civilians must not have died in vain. The sacrifices made in attaining our victory are too great. As Americans, we want to do everything for victory, and continued unity of the United Nations in fighting the Axis must be preserved.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, what we say here in commemoration of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution will not now reach the enslaved people of that great country who are permitted to read and to hear only that which their Nazi oppressors permit. But no words of ours are necessary for the people of Poland to know that the people of America are their true friends and confidently look to the day when Poland will again be free. Speaking more eloquently than the choicest words and sonorous phrases is the almost daily roar of American bombers over Europe and the thunder of bombs dropped on the factories and railroads of Hitler's tottering fortress. The people of Poland know that the hour of liberation is not far distant. In that hour men everywhere, of every race, creed, and color will rise in freedom's cause to strike down the tyrants. A new Poland will be born. Her constitution of May 3, 1791, will live anew.

We are not unmindful of the contribution made by sons of Poland in our war for independence. Notable among them was General Pulaski, who gave his life in the Battle of Savannah, and General Kosciuszko, who rendered distinguished service as a volunteer in the army of

George Washington. Thomas Jefferson wrote of General Kosciuszko:

He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known, and of that liberty which is to go to all, and not to the few and rich alone.

Those same words could be applied to the people of Poland as a whole. Without pillage, murder, or violence they established their constitution, setting up a republican form of government, and it has continued to live, even to this day, notwithstanding the partitioning of the country, between three monarchs—the Tsarists of Russia, King of Prussia, and Emperor of Austria—and notwithstanding the 5 years of Nazi rule. The Polish Constitution continues to live because it embodies the fundamental principles of individual liberty and those principles are inscribed forever on the hearts of the Polish people, which no amount of torture, no amount of suffering and no amount of bloodshed will ever erase.

The spirit of the Polish Constitution as an immortal document is best expressed by language of the document itself. In the preamble will be found the following:

Prizing more than life, and every personal consideration, the political existence, external independence, and internal liberty of the nation, whose care is entrusted to us; desirous, moreover, to deserve the blessing and gratitude, not only of our contemporaries, but also of future generations; for the sake of the public good, for securing our liberty, and maintaining our kingdom and our possessions; in order to exert our natural rights with zeal and firmness, we do solemnly establish the present constitution.

The importance of individual freedom to the Pole is expressed in the following provision from the constitution:

We publish and proclaim a perfect and entire liberty to all people, either who may be newly come to settle, or those who, having emigrated, would return to their native country; and we declare most solemnly, that any person coming into Poland, from whatever part of the world or returning from abroad, as soon as he sets his foot on the territory of the republic, becomes free and at liberty to exercise his industry, wherever and in whatever manner he pleases, to settle either in towns or villages, to farm, and rent lands and houses, on tenures and contracts, for as long a term as may be agreed on; with liberty to remain, or to remove, after having fulfilled the obligations he may have voluntarily entered into.

The Polish Constitution set up three distinct branches of Government: legislative power in the States assembled, executive power in the King and council of inspection, and judicial power. A provision of primary significance is article V which declares:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the State, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation.

While the constitution expressly states than an effectual executive power is necessary, it is important to note that it specifically stipulates:

This executive power cannot assume the right of making laws or of their interpretation.

One can well imagine how the Polish people react to the bigotry and intolerance of the Nazi rule when he finds that the Poles had written such provisions as the following into their historic constitution:

The same holy religion commands us to love our neighbors; we therefore owe to all people of whatever persuasion peace in matters of faith and the protection of government; consequently, we assure to all persuasions and religions freedom and liberty according to the laws of the country and in all dominions of the republic.

Truly, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, is an immortal document. It expresses the will of a great people who love liberty more than life. It expresses their hope and gives them courage. Such a spirit will never die. A new Poland will be born. The hour is not far distant when all men may be free.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as I have been sitting here this afternoon listening to the many tributes to the Poland that was, to the Poland that is today, and to the Poland which every individual of Polish blood and every other reasonable citizen hopes she will again become, I was reminded of those days a quarter of a century ago when I was privileged to twice visit the recreated and reconstituted Poland.

My two visits to that wonderful country, Mr. Speaker, were made during the winter of 1919–20. In order to visualize or realize the distressing conditions existing there at that time, one must remember the fact that continuously during World War No. 1 Poland was the battleground between the Russians and the Germans. Their warring legions fought back and forth across the country time and again, and as each retreating army abandoned its position, it either carried with it or destroyed everything that could in the slightest degree contribute to sustaining human life.

On each trip to Poland, I traveled from Paris to Warsaw, and this route took me through what must be the most fertile section of that fine country. Everywhere comfortable farmhouses and other buildings, some of them destroyed as the result of battles fought in those areas, indicated that once happy prosperous people had populated the entire country. Every morsel of food for man or animal had been taken or destroyed. Not an animal or other sign of life appeared on these farms. Naturally the people were forced into the cities, because it was there only that necessary relief could be extended. In Warsaw, the beautiful capital of the country, bread lines were everywhere; suffering was almost universal. Women and children hurrying along barefooted in the snow was not an uncommon sight. It was a time such as to challenge the fortitude of the most courageous. The Polish people met that challenge in the way only a great people could meet so serious a situation.

My business in Warsaw was with the Polish Government. I had the distinct privilege of meeting and discussing the future of Poland with the great Paderewski who personally, during these trying times, turned over to the relief organizations something like $7,000,000 of his life's earnings for the relief of the poor. I met other great members of the race and their approach to the problems which confronted the country, and to their personal responsibilities in connection therewith, was such as to be an everlasting credit to them and to their race. They were not downcast; their heads were up; the spirit of hope and determination to once more create among the family of nations another Poland such as had in the past ranked high in the family of nations, was plainly evident.

In the years that have passed since then, the hopes, the ambitions, the aspirations of those fine patriots were fully realized. During those few short years, under the leadership of the great members of their race, they acquired success, responsibility, affluence, and standing in the world second to none.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shocking thing that in this supposedly civilized world of ours, a people whose one desire is to live at peace with all the world, and who conduct themselves in a way which should permit them to do this, can be destroyed, as Poland was recently destroyed, because of the mad ambitions of an individual. What the future holds for Poland is a question that is near to the hearts of many other than those of Polish blood. I speak of those who have lived among members of the race in this country.

We are fortunate to have within our borders millions of citizens of Polish extraction. They are among the most loyal and most desirable of our citizens. There is an old saying that when a man becomes a home owner he becomes a good citizen. This is based in part upon the theory that when a man becomes a property owner he thereby becomes deeply interested in the laws which protect private citizens in their ownership of property, and it then naturally follows that he becomes interested in and observant of all laws.

Always there is inherent in the heart of every good citizen a love of home. We who live in communities in which our Polish immigrants have settled learned of the deep love of home inherent in every Polish heart. Poles came to the community in which I live. They were hard-working, thrifty and saved their money for the day when they could make their first payment on a home. How successful they have been down the years is best illustrated by something one of the fine Polish priests of my community told me at one time when I was discussing with him the fine homes of our Polish citizens. He said that there was not a family living in a rented house within 11 blocks of his church. I know of no other section of my home city or any other city where such a condition exists.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I am hoping the day is not far distant when the people of Poland will once more find themselves in posses-

sion of their country under conditions which will enable them to govern themselves and exercise the freedom and happiness which come only to those who are masters of their own destiny. I hope also that there will emerge from that peace conference a Poland which down the centuries may live as an independent, respected, and highly honored member of the great family of nations.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Constitution of Poland. As such it means as much to the 35,339,000 people of that country as our Constitution means to us, and I want to congratulate the people of Poland for their undying spirit in their struggle to preserve that constitution.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, at this point I include a speech I made in Shenandoah, Pa., April 23, 1944, at the forty-fifth anniversary of the Polish Beneficial Association.

Many of you who attended the Polish-American Citizens' League dinner at Pottsville, Pa., on October 23, 1942, will recall my remarks on Poland when I said:

Poland fights on—the cause of Poland is the cause of free men and women everywhere. The magnificent, tragic heroism of the Polish peoples for the cause of the United Nations has brought sober admiration from every corner of a liberty-loving world. As your own Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorsky said:

"Poland was the first country to take up arms against German aggression." It was the Polish armies, he pointed out, who drew the German forces from the western to the eastern front in September 1939, thus deflecting the Nazi juggernaut at a crucial moment.

"How different," he notes, "would have been the trend of the war if Hitler, instead of attacking Poland first, had launched the attack directly on France and Great Britain."

Yes; Poland was the first to resist the barbaric Nazi aggressor. Poland and her valiant people will forever be held up as an example and a symbol of the determination of free peoples everywhere to fight to the bitter end for their right to live as they wish to live—without dictation from a foreign tyrant.

Poland had little opportunity to fight back. Organized resistance of her armed forces was soon destroyed. Yet Poland still fights on. Untold numbers of Poles continue to fight today in the front lines of the United Nations.

I need not review the horrors of the Nazi invasion of Poland. Too familiar are the outrages visited upon the innocent Poles by the contemptible Germans. I can only pay humble tribute, with millions of my fellow Americans, to the spirit of the Polish people which prompts them to fight on—without question of the outcome—to the day when the tide will turn.

We know of the appalling poverty that has gripped Poland since the Germans first began to strip that country of its resources, its manpower, and its intellect. Prices are incomprehensible to us in this land of plenty. Polish ration cards do not grant a fraction of the amount of food required to keep a person at sustenance levels. But even the quantities permitted by the ration cards are not available. Yet, the Polish people fight on. They fight on and endure though they are hollow-cheeked, sunken-eyed, and emaciated. The torment of hunger is written on every face.

Yes, the Poles fight on. And Poland will continue to fight on. Poland will be fighting—still fighting—on that not-too-distant day when the United Nations will vanquish the enemy and achieve a glorious and triumphant victory. On that day the people of Poland, like the people of all the United Nations, will bear one thought foremost in their minds. They will demand that the peace which follows the fighting—that the peace which follows the sacrifice, the misery, the suffering, the privation, and the tortures of war—shall be a complete and a lasting peace.

The Polish people, like the people of all the United Nations, are determined that this shall be the last war. They are determined that the German monster shall never again rise to challenge the peace of this world. They are determined that those forces in Europe which have turned the Continent into a bloody quagmire once every generation shall be forever destroyed. They are determined that no aggressor shall ever again plunge peace-loving people into the senseless holocaust of war.

The Polish people were the first to fight; they have never ceased to fight; they will continue to fight until the last ounce of resistance has been crushed out of their souls. Their spirit gives pride to the hearts of their fellow countrymen in every portion of the world. Their heroism and their sacrifices serve as beacons to the determination of every single Pole in America, that each shall give of his utmost to this war which must be won for liberty's sake. I am confident of the place which every single one of you is fulfilling in our war activities, and I am confident that with the unswerving devotion of every American like yourself—this war will be won for the Allies. The cause of Poland is the cause of freemen everywhere.

Those remarks are as apropos today as they were 18 months ago even though time marches on.

Much has happened since October 23, 1942; a great deal of water has run over the dam, as the popular saying goes. But likewise, a great deal happened before October 23, 1942, as far as Poland is concerned, namely the invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939, by Germany.

Then, on July 23, 1940, less than 1 year later, the American State Department declared:

The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

That was sound and, I might say, brave in 1940. It is sound and brave in 1944, and it should be sound and brave and right when peace comes again to the world. And since we said it in 1940, and so committed ourselves, we should say it again so that none may misunderstand us.

Then on August 14, 1941, we saw the birth of the now famous Atlantic Charter. This was endorsed by the United States, England, Russia, in fact by all the United Nations, including Poland.

No one with any sense of human principles has any quarrel with the Atlantic Charter. Its passages are wonderful and its high ideals sublime. Listen, while I read the first three points of the Atlantic Charter, which I think is so apropos to the Polish question:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Today, these "purposes and principles" mean much to Poland, or they mean nothing at all to anybody.

Then came Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. We, in all America knew full well the meaning of that day. At least we knew it as your Representatives in the Congress of the United States when we voted a declaration of war on December 8, 1941. Before this date we were obliged to change from a neutral country to one which was asked and gave material aid to those already in deadly conflict, after Pearl Harbor—our men and boys. We have given billions of dollars worth of material to our allies—every one of them. It has been worth all we gave, as events are now proving.

But our war is something more than the military defeat of Hitler and Hirohito. That would be only temporary victory if that were all we won. We are fighting for the rights of all small nations as well as for the defeat of Germany and Japan. We are fighting for Polish freedom as well as the freedom of the United States, England, Russia, or China. Every one of these great powers have understood this fully; there should not be any doubt about it. It is written, as a matter of fact, into our standard lend-lease agreements, mutually subscribing to the common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter.

Fit those specifications to Poland, my fellow Americans, and all will be well—no aggression, a just and enduring peace. Withhold them from Poland, and from the other victimized nations in this tragic war, and we shall find that we have merely won another Versailles, then another Munich, and then another world war.

As Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, said recently:

The record is clear. The future is not. Our promises are clear. Our prospectus is not. Our American foreign policy of today is sound when it puts American military victory in this war ahead of every other consideration. Beyond that point, our American foreign policy, as of today, is vague and often mystifying generally. Frankly, it is largely locked up in the White House—across from which Kosciusko still dominates LaFayette Square. The poet rightly said of him:

"Hope, for a season, bade the world farewell,
And Freedom shrieked, as Kosciusko fell."

As we think of Poland, of its brave American heroes exemplified by Pulaski and Kosciusko, and of its brave soldiers and sailors fighting in the war on freedom's side, we can say that America today stands behind it, as America stands behind every nation with justice on its side.

As I have repeatedly stated, "Poland fights on; the cause of Poland is the cause of free men and women everywhere."

Yes; unconditional surrender, victory in this war, must bring a just and lasting peace to men and women everywhere. That is the hope and prayer of our boys on the far-flung battle fronts; we cannot, we will not, let them down. God grant that victory will soon be achieved and that our fighting men will return to their loved ones and that their sacrifices will not have been in vain.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

FREEDOM FOR POLAND

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, all liberty-loving Americans join today in the celebration commemorating the adoption of a constitution by Poland on May 3, 1791. The Polish Constitution was patterned after the Constitution of the United States, as it guaranteed freedom and democracy for the people of Poland.

For more than 150 years Poland has been our true and tried ally in the struggle against the enemies of civilization. Polish patriots were amongst the world leaders to help our forefathers establish a free America on this continent. Millions of immigrants came from Poland to the United States during the past century to enjoy the blessings of freedom as American citizens, and to take an important part in building these United States into the world's greatest republic. The contributions made by them and their descendants to the culture and progress of our country is indelibly written on the pages of American history.

The people of Poland were the first to take up arms against the Nazi hordes, and they continue to fight in spite of overwhelming odds to make their homeland free. Poland, as a great nation, will live again to enjoy the blessings of its constitution and to take her place amongst the great republics of the world.

The tragic world struggle of today will not end until dictators and tyrants have been destroyed and freedom restored to Poland and other enslaved countries throughout the world.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, it is not only fitting but proper for us to pay tribute to those Polish patriots of yesterday and today—many of whom today celebrate their Nation's former independence under ground—an independence which was founded upon a written constitution adopted at almost the same time as ours. Today, I am sure, these freedom-loving Poles, past and present, are with us in spirit—a sprit of freedom that must never die, at home or abroad.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, of the 7,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, too few for my liking have yet chosen to establish their homes in the district I represent, although one of the counties of my district bears the proud name of Stanislaus, a name near and dear to that heroic people. But notwithstanding this, I wish to join in paying a tribute to the gallant people of Poland on this their national day, for they were the first to fight, they have never stopped fighting, and they have suffered more than any other country occupied by the German hordes.

And as my words cannot be interpreted as an effort to please Polish constituents, of whom I have all too few, I want to say in all impartiality that it would be a tragedy if the border dispute between great and powerful Russia and brave but weaker Poland, were settled on any other basis than that which is just and right.

Are the United States, Great Britain, and Russia going to act in accordance with their loud and incessant promises of political morality, or are they not? In 1941 Soviet Russia signed an agreement with the Polish Government in London, an agreement in which the British Government participated, saying that all treaties between Russia and Germany relative to Poland were invalid. The British and American Governments both declared that they would recognize no territorial changes made in Poland since August 31, 1939. In other words the three great powers are pledged to restore the frontiers of the Republic of Poland, exactly as they were at the time of Hitler's unprovoked aggression.

The Polish-Russian question is a test case. The least that the civilized world can ask is that we do not follow the example of our enemies, and allow it to be settled by might over right. If as a result of a bilateral negotiation Poland is willing to cede some part of the Polish Ukraine to Russia in exchange for East Prussia and a broader access to the sea, if the great powers are willing to consent to this, to which I for one see no objection, then the matter can be settled in a spirit of friendly adjustment and complete unity restored among the United Nations. That is the only way the matter can be settled if the great powers are going to keep the faith.

Especially is the word of Great Britain engaged, for in the treaty between Great Britain and Russia, establishing their alliance for a score of years, both powers declared that "they will act in accordance with the two principles of not seeking territorial aggrandizement for themselves, and of noninterference in the affairs of other states." By this explicit assurance Russia renounced all claims to Polish soil.

In the same British-Russian treaty both powers adhered to the Atlantic Charter, which states that the signatories desire to see no territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, and wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those forcibly deprived of them. And only the other day the British Foreign Secretary told the House of Commons that the Polish people will redeem their own freedom. That remains our pledge.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that that pledge will be kept to the letter and in the spirit in which it was given, and that our gallant ally Poland will be restored to full independence within her own frontiers; that she may be restored to her rightful position as a strong, free, and glorious state, one whose national holiday, the anniversary of the adoption of its constitution, shall be honored and respected throughout the world.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, 2 years after the Constitution of the United States went into operation—a constitution providing for a government "of, by, and for the people"—Poland, following the example of the United States, adopted a constitution recognizing the rights of the common people, the first of its kind in the whole of Europe. The Polish Constitution, adopted May 3, 1791, gave form and force to the same principles of democracy that are contained in our Constitution, and made those principles applicable to the people of Poland.

In September 1939, when the principles of democracy were again under fire, with powerful warlike nations immediately adjoining her on the east and west, Poland had the courage to line up in support of the democratic principles for which the United Nations fight today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, therefore, it is both fitting and proper that the Congress of the United States on this occasion pay tribute to the heroic part Poland has played and is playing in the present war; that we review again the important contribution Kosciusko and Pulaski made in our own fight for freedom; that we recognize the fact that the spirit of those great Polish heroes and patriots of the past still animates the lives of the present-day Poles who are fighting side by side with our boys against the tyranny of present-day dictators; and that we today give to the Polish Government in exile renewed assurances of our support for, and interest in, a free and independent Poland as a part of post-war Europe.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, today marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791. All the world knows of the French Revolution, which through blood and terror brought the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity for the French people. Too few realize that at the same time Poland, with her long tradition of tolerance, was accomplishing the same results by peaceful means, only to have them overthrown by the final partition which put the Polish people under the rule of the absolute monarchs of the three neighboring countries. In 1919, all Americans who knew of her glorious history rejoiced to see Poland restored as a free and independent nation; and in the 20 years of peace she had shown her capacity for self-rule and her devotion

to the principles of constitutional government.

In 1939, she was again the first to stand against the enemies of freedom. For the last 5 years she has observed this, her national holiday, under the yoke of foreign oppression. Let us send to our Polish brethren today the message that we are not forgetful of the long and honorable friendship between the American and the Polish people, and that we look forward with them to the day when the White Eagle shall again fly over a restored and liberated Poland.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] 5 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of a great event in history. It was 153 years ago, May 3, 1791, that the Polish people adopted a new constitution. Under the terms of this great document a republican form of government was established. It is a significant fact and one worthy of recognition that two peoples, one in America and the other in far-distant Poland, should each at about the same time, establish a representative form of government under a new constitution.

The preamble of the Polish Constitution clearly and unmistakably expresses the motivating force that gave birth to this remarkable and immortal document. Let us examine some of its provisions. Here is its preamble:

Persuaded that our common fate depends entirely upon the establishing and rendering perfect a national constitution; convinced by a long train of experience of many defects in our government, and willing to profit by the present circumstances of Europe, and by the favorable moment which has restored us to ourselves; free from the disgraceful shackles of foreign influence; prizing more than life, and every personal consideration, the political existence, external independence, and internal liberty of the nation, whose care is entrusted to us; desirous, moreover, to deserve the blessing and gratitude, not only of our contemporaries, but also of future generations; for the sake of the public good, for securing our liberty, and maintaining our kingdom and our possessions; in order to exert our natural rights with zeal and firmness, we do solemnly establish the present constitution, which we declare wholly inviolable in every part, till such period as shall be prescribed by law, when the nation, if it should think fit, and deem necessary, may alter by its express will such articles therein as shall be found inadequate. And this present constitution shall be the standard of all laws and statutes for the future diets.

What did the Polish people say in their new constitution as to the form of government they were establishing and the powers to be exercised by those chosen to administer it? Under article V of the Polish Constitution the people declared that:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the presevation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation. Three distinct powers shall compose the government of the Polish nation, according to the present constitution; viz:

1. Legislative power in the States assembled.

2. Executive power in the King and council of inspection.

3. Judicial power in jurisdiction existing, or to be established.

The philosophy of government discernible throughout this Polish Constitution would lead one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective Constitutions from the same source. We find under article VIII relating to executive power these provisions:

The most perfect government cannot exist or last without an effectual executive power. The happiness of the nation depends on just laws, but the good effects of laws flow only from their execution. Experience has taught us that the neglecting of this essential part of government has overwhelmed Poland with disasters.

And then under this same heading the constitution provides:

This executive power cannot assume the right of making laws, or of their interpretation. It is expressly forbidden to contract public debts; to alter the repartition of the national income, as fixed by the diet; to declare war; to conclude definitely any treaty, or any diplomatic act; it is only allowed to carry on negotiations with foreign courts, and facilitate temporary occurrences, always with reference to the diet.

Throughout this new Polish Constitution runs a philosophy of humanitarianism and tolerance, such as—

We publish and proclaim a perfect and entire liberty to all people, either who may be newly coming to settle, or those who, having emigrated, would return to their native country; and we declare most solemnly, that any person coming into Poland, from whatever part of the world or returning from abroad, as soon as he sets his foot on the territory of the republic, becomes free and at liberty to exercise his industry, wherever and in whatever manner he pleases, to settle either in towns or villages, to farm, and rent lands and houses, on tenures and contracts, for as long a term as may be agreed on; with liberty to remain, or to remove, after having fulfilled the obligations he may have voluntarily entered into.

We find in this Polish Constitution, adopted almost contemporaneously with our own Federal Constitution, rule by majority, secret ballot at public elections, and the language relating to religion that—

The same holy religion commands us to love our neighbors, we therefore owe to all people of whatever persuasion, peace in matters of faith, and the protection of Government; consequently we assure, to all persuasions and religions, freedom and liberty, according to the laws of the country, and in all dominions of the Republic

The tragedy of Poland was that her birth as a nation was so soon followed by her dissolution. Nevertheless, Poland, if only for a brief period of national existence with liberty under law, did quickly develop educational facilities, stimulate an active interest in literature and art. Historians and poets sprang up under the effect of this newborn freedom. It must be kept in mind that new constitution was framed to save Poland from the intrigues of foreign governments, which over a long period of time, had corrupted every election of the Polish people.

Now then, I wish to take a few moments to point out why there has been such a strong bond of affection between the American people and the Polish people. It could not be otherwise in view of the great contribution which was made by noble and heroic Polish patriots who joined in our fight for freedom against the then most powerful military and naval power in the world. There were several distinguished sons of Poland who fought and bled in our war for independence, but I shall confine my remarks to only one of them, although profoundly grateful to all of them.

It was in 1776 that one of these young men from abroad came to America to offer his services in the army of Gen. George Washington. This young man was Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Here was a young man of ancient and noble family, educated in Warsaw, in France, and in England, offering his services in the cause of freedom. It is difficult to measure the extent of such a contribution at such a time to the morale of the struggling, half-starved Colonial Army.

I believe that all of those peoples throughout the world who have been oppressed by the tyranny and intrigue of monarchial governments have taken courage from the unselfish devotion of Washington and Kosciuszko in the cause of freedom.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko was appointed Engineer of Continental Service, October 18, 1776. He was an expert in fortifications, and as such he was employed at Ticonderoga and Mount Independence. He afterwards served with General Schuyler Gates. It was he who selected Moses Creek, 4 miles below Fort Edwards in New York State, as the strategic point at which to check the English Army under General Burgoyne. After the battle of Saratoga, Colonel Kosciuszko was placed in charge of the fortifications at West Point. Later Colonel Kosciuszko was appointed by Washington as an engineer in the Army of the South under General Greene. Colonel Kosciuszko served with distinction throughout the war. On the 13th of October 1783 he was recommended by General Washington for promotion to the rank of Brigadier General, in these words, "for long, faithful and honorable services in the American Army."

Our independence won, Kosciuszko returned to Poland, where, for several years, he lived in retirement. It is safe to assume that he watched with deep interest the development of the American Government, especially the drafting of our Federal Constitution during the year 1787, its ratification in 1788 and its operation after taking effect in 1789. I mention this last date because it was in 1789 when the Polish Diet made Kosciuszko a major general on discovering that foreign powers were plotting to overthrow Poland. Dear to every Polish heart is the brilliant record of General Kosciuszko in the battle of Zielence, June 18, 1792, and again in the battle of Dubienska, which was fought July 17, 1792. It was in the battle of Dubienska that the Polish Army, under the brilliant and fiery leadership of General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, defended an unfortified

post for 6 hours with only 4,000 men, against 15,000 Russians. It has been said that God's prophets have the right-of-way. That they come by divine appointment, that they kindle a torch that centuries cannot quench. There is no doubt that Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko the patriot, came by divine appointment to kindle in the hearts and souls of the Polish people an unquenchable fire of patriotism and love of liberty. What George Washington is to us, Thaddeus Kosciuszko will ever be to the Polish people.

Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to General Gates, February 21, 1798, said of Kosciuszko:

> He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known, and of that liberty which is to go to all, and not to the few and rich alone.

The provisions of the Polish Constitution, and the valor displayed in defense of Poland by General Kosciuszko amply justify the high tribute paid to his character and patriotism by both Washington and Jefferson. It is my firm belief that the life of such a man gives birth to a spirit that is immortal and one that lights an unquenchable flame of patriotism in the hearts of those who aspire to liberty. This flame, lighted in the hearts of the Polish people, has burned steadfastly from 1791 until liberation came to their country a century and a quarter later, at the close of World War No. 1. There is no doubt that through the troubled years to come every Polish boy and girl will prove worthy of the inheritance bequeathed to them by Thaddeus Kosciuszko and other great patriots and heroes of their brave and honored nation.

I would say in conclusion that history tells us that when a regiment of Polish soldiers found in the shrine of Casa-di-Loretto the sword of John Sobieski, the lion-hearted king of Poland, they sent it to Thaddeus Kosciuszko, as the only man living worthy of such an inheritance.

I believe it can be truly said that the hope of enslaved, starved, and bleeding Poland, is that her children throughout the world are at this crucial time proving themselves worthy of the great inheritance bequeathed to them by their ancient and noble champions of liberty.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress representing the American people in this great National Legislative Assembly, we are privileged again to devote special attention to a noble cause and one worthy of our deep admiration, namely, commemoration of the most brilliant epoch in the history of Poland, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution, proclaimed as a "Magna Charta" upon the European Continent on May 3, 1791. This historical document, which in many respects resembles our Declaration of Independence, was adopted by the liberal Polish Diet for the benefit of the freedom-loving people of Poland and, as recorded by the historians, it was to a great extent inspired by the American and the French Revolutions and constituted in reality the first concentrated revolt of an oppressed nation of Europe against the most powerful domination of imperialistic despotism.

Since that time May 3 has been Poland's National Independence Day. It is to Poland what the Fourth of July is to America and what Bastille Day is to France. In connection with this commemoration, permit me to quote what, in 1832, one of Germany's prominent historians, Friedrich Raumer, wrote about the Polish Constitution. He said:

> The Poles give themselves the constitution of the 3d of May without pillage, murder, bloodshed, or destruction of property. With wisdom, fairness, and measure they united the nicest respect for all personal and property rights that could be preserved, with the extermination of all fundamental evil. An admirable work of this kind deserves the greatest permanence, the highest happiness under the most auspicious conditions. So double responsibility rests on the soiled hands that stained a clean act, on the slanderers who libeled it, and on the criminals who destroyed it.

The history of the present global war will demonstrate who were the guilty criminals that stained the clean act of the Polish Constitution, who conducted systematic mass murder of innocent Polish people by the most bestial means, unknown before to the civilized world.

The Russian historian, A. Pogodin, professor at Kharkov University, in 1911 wrote about the Polish Constitution as follows:

> Poland's best sons fought to save their country. The constitution of the 3d of May 1791 created an order of things guaranteeing the rebirth of Poland. Had these reforms been put into effect, Poland would have become a sufficiently strong state. But her neighbors did not permit the Polish Commonwealth to strengthen itself in this way Prussia and Russia—but recently enemies—clasped hands across Poland. The constitution's supporters guided by their ardent desire to save their country, knew they were subscribing to it in an hour fraught with danger to the commonwealth.

It seems appropriate to recognize and perpetuate the memory of the important contribution made by the heroic Polish patriots, Marshals Pulaski and Kosciusko, at the time of our Revolutionary War, and it is also extremely important that in this critical time when the safety of humanity is confronted and disturbed by the most brutal barbarism we concentrate our attention upon serious problems confronting us today, and activate before the world those aspirations that are symbolizing the declaration made by the United Nations in this historical struggle for world democracy and preservation of universal liberties.

To interpret correctly the national tradition and spirit of present-day Poland, nothing seems more appropriate than a true and correct description of Poland's sincere effort and contribution during the past 4 years toward a victory of the United Nations.

The heroic defenders of Warsaw are a living symbol of the courageous determination of Poland. By her sacrifices, by the complete loss of this historical and monumental city of Warsaw, century-old cathedrals, irreplaceable educational institutions, by the sacrifices of millions of innocent victims, all patriotic citizens, who perished in this bloody tragedy because they loved the freedom of their native country more than life in slavery under the Nazi domination, Poland has earned the right to freedom and the right to be honored and assume a foremost place among the world's democratic nations.

September 2, 1939, is destined to live forever in the memory of liberty-loving people of this and future generations; it was the crucial day when the heroic defenders of Warsaw—exhausted, decimated, starving—gave up the fight against the overwhelming forces of Nazi invaders and were compelled to capitulate. This dark day of tragedy of Warsaw was marked as only a beginning in another struggle for Poland's independence. The fall of Warsaw was the danger signal alarming the whole democratic world of the approaching danger of German destructive barbarism.

Despite 4 years of humiliation, persecution, and wholesale slaughtering of millions of innocent people by the bloodthirsty Nazi terrorists, the spirit of Poland did not falter, and today, all over the world, a new Polish Army is being mobilized in preparation for the victorious march toward their beloved fatherland. Poland's act of courage, patriotism, and sacrifices have inspired the democratic people all over the world with new determination and devotion to those immortal ideals upon which the future destiny of humanity and the normal progress of civilization are to be established.

The same principles that were written into the Polish Constitution in 1791 are the guiding spirit in activities and aspirations of national leaders and representatives in the present struggle for Poland's liberation. The proclamation made public by the Polish National Council in London during February 1942, places the same severe responsibility upon the shoulders of the provisional government, entrusting it with the supreme task of formulating a constructive program and purpose by which the future of the Polish Republic may be safeguarded.

In pursuing this program of liberation by direct participation on the side of the United Nations in this war against the common enemy, Poland is defending her rights of self-determination, demanding for herself broad and direct access to the seas as well as frontiers which would fully guarantee her safety and protect the future independence of the Republic.

The provisional Polish Government in exile, in the name of international justice, demands that Germany be held strictly responsible for the present war, the crimes and destruction of human lives and property, and be compelled to render full moral and material satisfaction to those whom she has dastardly wronged. The future political and economic structure of Poland, according to this declaration, will be ultimately decided by the representative parliament of the Polish people when the last accursed Nazi hordes are driven out of the country.

Today, when decisions of international importance in connection with the post-war reconstruction are being made, and new international political and economic problems discussed, many of the United Nations representing continental Europe desire to know the future aims and purposes of Poland. Therefore, it is only proper that the provisional Polish Government make this important declaration, stating to the world its aims and the contemplated internal structure of future Poland. They state in part:

Poland will stand by Christian principles and culture. The Polish Republic will be a democratic republican state and a true national assembly will represent the common will of the people. The Polish Nation unreservedly repudiates all systems of totalitarian government and all forms of dictatorship as contrary to the principles of democracy. Poland will guarantee the rights and liberties of all citizens loyal to the republic, regardless of national, religious, or racial differences. Equality of rights will be assured to the national minorities fulfilling their obligations toward the state.

Full freedom of conscience and expression, of association and assembly will be guaranteed to all. The exercise of justice will be independent of any influence on the part of the state executive authority.

Interpreting this most important part of the declaration made by the Polish provisional government, I fervently hope that when Poland shall attain her freedom and liberty—as she surely will—that this declaration will remain to be a guiding spirit to all responsible leaders who may be entrusted to guide the destiny of Poland and that freedom will become a blessing to all her citizens and people, regardless of their nationality, religious beliefs, or racial origins.

Commemorating this one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the proclamation of the Polish Constitution, we venture to honor the noble traditions of Poland and pay deserved tribute to this gallant nation by sending from this Capital of America to the Polish people everywhere a message of encouragement and assurance that liberty and justice will soon again be restored to a sick world and that Poland once more will enjoy national and international independence and assume her due place of honor among the democratic nations of an enlightened, free world.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, this is the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution, which was adopted in 1791. This has always been an honor day in Poland where it has been celebrated as the greatest national holiday of that great, but at the present, most unhappy country.

It cannot be celebrated in the usual manner in Poland this year, but I am sure that it is being celebrated in the underground with more fervor than ever.

When we are in this great struggle to preserve democratic principles, it is well to remember that it was Poland who adopted the first written constitution, granting individual rights to all of her citizens and that it was Poland who was the first to fight in this war to defend those same principles and to arouse the democratic world from its fool's paradise. It was not England nor France nor Russia who first challenged the sinister aggression of the Nazis, but it remained for Poland to accept the challenge and throw it back in Hitler's face. Without Poland's heroic sacrifice England and France might well have waited until there would never have been a chance to have stopped the Nazis in their mad dream of world conquest. We—all of us who love the democratic principle—owe a debt to Poland which we can never fully pay. The least that we can do is to stand by Poland who voluntarily made the greatest sacrifice of any democratic nation in the world in an effort to stop that aggression that threatened the extinction of all democracy. If we, of all the people in the world, fail to stand by Poland, and fail to keep the pledge of preserving her integrity, then a military victory in the war will be empty indeed for the very principles for which we fought it shall have been dragged in the mire.

The time has come for plain speaking and plain dealing. This question will not wait until the war is over. It must be settled now. Russia is still dependent upon us and could yet be defeated if we were to withdraw that support. Certainly we owe as much to Poland as we do to Russia.

I speak not unkindly of Russia in this matter for we are all allies in a great cause, but now is the time for Russia to demonstrate that she is accepting our assistance to further that cause. Nothing will cost Russia greater ill will in the future than if she ruthlessly disregards the overwhelming sentiments of the people of a friendly America. Russia may defeat the Germans in the battles of this war but she will not have won the war if she loses the confidence and friendship of America over her attitude toward Poland. Demanding fair treatment, Poland will not contribute to disunity. It is the failure to guarantee fair treatment to Poland that will threaten the unity of the United Nations.

The future of the very peace itself makes it imperative that the United States Government now demand a clarification from Russia of her future intentions toward Poland with adequate assurances guaranteeing that Poland's integrity will be respected by Russia.

I call upon the President now to obtain a straightforward, clear-cut, unequivocal statement of the Polish question from Russia and to make this statement known to the world at large. It is a far bigger question than just Poland. It is Poland, yes; but it also involves the future of all other freedom-loving peoples everywhere who have been so ruthlessly conquered by the Axis.

This is what we are fighting for.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, on the 3d of May 1791, after the first partition of Poland, the Polish Parliament passed a constitution inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence. It was the first democratic constitution in Europe establishing the rights of the middle classes and of the peasants. The absolute rulers of Prussia, Austria, and Russia regarded the constitution as a threat to their divine right to rule and hastened to stifle Poland's democracy.

On this day, May 3, the Polish people will again commemorate this notable event in their history—the adoption of this liberal constitution. In consideration of our friendliness and obligations to Poland, it is fitting that we should join our fellow Americans of Polish blood in doing honor to the great traditions of the people of Poland.

Time and time again Poland has been invaded and the people terrorized by armies of occupation, but the Polish people have never forgotten the rights granted to them by the 3d of May constitution. The present war is a struggle for Christian civilization. The people of Poland believe that the post-war organization of the world should be based on a Christian morality, international democracy, and political and economic collaboration.

Polish forces have been fighting ceaselessly in the air, at sea, and on land, side by side with our allies, and there is no front on which Polish blood has not been mingled with the blood of other defenders of freedom.

There is no country in the world where Poles have not contributed to furthering the common cause. The Polish Nation, therefore, is entitled to expect full justice and redress as soon as it is set free from enemy occupation.

In the past Poland has risen as many times as she has fallen and she will rise again to live forever free and independent.

For centuries the Poles have stood guard over western civilization and Christianity and have championed the idea of freedom. For their love of liberty, the Polish people have paid with their bondage. For their love of liberty and their unwillingness to compromise with their enemy, they are now paying with the lives of millions who have been murdered.

The Polish people have fought, are fighting now, and will continue to fight to the last breath against foreign aggression. Millions of Poles dispersed throughout the world are united in spirit with their mother country and with the other nations fighting for their own freedom and for the freedom of the world.

The people of Poland have anchored their faith to the American principle of justice and fair play. They will endure as long as this anchor holds. The dreadful sacrifices they have made command the sympathies of the entire civilized world. Poland will rise again and the Allies should make conclusively certain that she shall not have suffered in vain. The Polish people must be given the opportunity to live a decent, sane, and prosperous life. She must have the freedoms we are all fighting for. Poland will surely live again.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the lifetime of every nation is marked by certain momentous events. From generation to generation significant anniversaries are observed for the great influence wrought upon the course of history and human relations. The Bastille, the Magna Carta, the Fourth of July have a counterpart in every country.

To the Poles there is one date which for over a century and a half retains the highest, the most honored place, and is cherished by the entire Polish element throughout the world with unmatched fervor. It is the 3d of May when they commemorate the adoption of the constitution by the Commonwealth of Poland in 1791, which took place amid general national rejoicing and patriotic enthusiasm.

No active revolution could have effected more profound changes in the national and political pattern of Poland than the enforcement of the constitution. Yet while similar changes in other countries were introduced by means of force and bloodshed, in Poland the most pervading and far-reaching measures were incorporated into civic life without weapons, without mental unrest or social disruption. The sentiments of brotherhood and the harmony of understanding united the whole nation.

Since then, this great historical event is observed annually by the Poles as their official holiday, on which occasion it has become customary to extend felicitations to their nation.

Today, as in former years, the Poles celebrate the national holiday on the 3d of May, notwithstanding the tragic circumstances. Today they cannot eradicate from their consciousness the appalling reality of enemy occupation perpetrated on their mother country for nearly 5 years. They see the Government of Poland exiled. They grieve over the millions of defenseless women and innocent children cast out of their homes, journeying wearily through the wide expanse of Russia and distant Siberia.

First among our allies to offer valiant opposition against Nazi aggression, first to pay a heavy price of blood in defense of freedom, Poland was likewise first to fall victim in the unequal strife against the invaders from the west and the east. But she has not withdrawn from battle. Polish armed forces loyally and faithfully cooperate with the Allies in war activities on land, sea, and in the air. Poland underground fights on effectively with daring determination toward an ultimate victory, with deep faith that justice and law will triumph over brutal force and cynicism in international relations.

With almost 1,000 years of national existence, Poland ranks among the oldest European nations. Varied was her fortune through the centuries. There was a time when she constituted one of the major powers of Europe, when princes and monarchs sought her favor and aid; but at no time has she sought her neighbors' possessions, or sinned by invading and terrorizing their lands. If she grew territorially, it was not through conquest, but as a result of concord with the adjoining countries who freely desired a permanent union with her. For through alliance with Poland they found the realization of the freedom and personal liberties which no other country offered.

The Poles have a deep, natural love of freedom; it is something so vital in their soul that they fight and die for it wherever it is attacked, or where it is to be gained or ransomed at the cost of wounds and blood. Upon the pages of American history their names are honorably recorded for their contribution to the independence of this country. Kosciusko and Pulaski serve not only as a classic evidence, but shall forever remain revered national heroes of Poland and the United States.

Confronted with tremendously adverse and crucial conditions of the present day, the Polish Nation looks expectantly to the magnanimity and democracy of the United States for assistance in the implacable warfare which to the Poles spells restored independence and territorial integrity of their country.

It is, therefore, just and reasonable to assure the people of Poland on the day of their national holiday that the United States shall not fail to extend them friendly support nor relax in vigilance over the execution of justice. Our great and prosperous Republic bears proudly the banner of humane policies. It has drawn universal applause and respect as a decided enemy of injustice and enslavement. It will not, it cannot, add disappointment to the present fate of Poland.

I, as an American of Polish descent, am firmly convinced that the United States will never abandon the code of ethics which made this country an exponent of conceivably highest national morality among the nations of the world.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege for me to join with other Members of this Congress to pay tribute to that great and tragic nation, Poland. Certainly, it is fitting and proper that we should pause to register a gracious compliment to that great nation on this, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

The tributes that have been voiced here are adequate proof that the Members of the Congress of the United States are thoroughly impressed with the thought significant at the present moment that Poland, in the adoption of the constitution of May 3, 1791, subscribing therein to democratic principles, aroused the fears and suspicions of her autocratic neighbors and suffered tripartition at their hands.

In September 1931 when principles of democracy were again at stake, Poland, irrespective of the odds against her, had the courage to discard the prevailing policy of appeasement amongst other nations and proudly proclaimed that, above life itself, she held dear her honor as a nation.

As has been well pointed out, Poland's gallant stand is emblematic of the cause for which the United Nations stand united in the present world conflict. Although Poland today is saddened and crushed by the brutal forces of our enemies, we of the United States stand pledged to defeat her enemies that she may rise again to take her place among the great nations of the world.

I am sure every true American today prays that the next anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution will be celebrated in a world at peace.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, this is 3d of May 1944. One hundred and fifty-three years ago on this day a freedom-loving people across the ocean in Europe, the people of Poland, adopted a constitution. It was largely patterned after our own, which then was only 2 years old. With sincere interest and respect, I join my colleagues in this House of Representatives of the American people in paying tribute and doing honor to a sturdy race and a courageous people for their contribution to progress and betterment of mankind.

We owe much to Polish patriots who suffered and sacrificed in our struggle for independence. The outstanding leadership and service of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Casimir Pulaski, and others will forever shine as a bright page in American history.

The Polish people who chose the United States as their adopted country and their descendants represent one of the most substantial, dependable, and loyal racial elements among our citizenry. They are prudent, hard-working, and self-sustaining people.

The plight and tragedy of Poland in the present world struggle does not pass unnoticed by the people of the United States. In the world to come, after this holocaust of war has passed, may Poland and her people have an honored place among the nations of the earth.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today all over the world, wherever they may be—in exile, in concentration camps, on the battle fronts, or at home awaiting the day of liberation—Polish people are celebrating their Constitution Day, their Fourth of July.

One hundred and fifty-three years ago, in 1791, Poland adopted the first written bill of rights in Europe, giving the people of Poland an opportunity to be free with a chance to live under a form of government selected by themselves with officials of their own choosing.

When the history of this terrible period of dictators, war, and suffering is writ-

ten, the Polish people will fill several chapters. You will recall that it was Great Britain's ultimatum to Hitler in which Hitler was told that if he invaded Poland, Great Britain would declare war and go to Poland's assistance that really set the world afire.

Remembering that bit of recent history, it is unthinkable that we should fail to put down as No. 1 on our list of war aims the restoration of Poland with every inch of her territory restored to her. On that the United Nations should be agreed.

I cannot agree with those who argue that foreign policy should not be discussed at this time. Why not? If our relations with our allies are such that we cannot freely and proudly express our hopes and desires for the post-war era, there is something wrong that should be corrected at once. If our enemies do not approve of our plans, that is just too bad, but who cares?

Some day soon, I hope, delegates from the United States are going to sit around the peace table. Now is the time for the American people to study, to think, and to determine just what we propose to submit to the peace conference. Why not go back to Woodrow Wilson's often-expressed desire for open covenants, openly arrived at, and self-determination for small nations?

In closing, may I express the hope that 1 year from today, when Poland will again celebrate her Independence Day, she will be at peace with the world, secure, with her boundaries intact, and her people happy, prosperous, and content.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], before the Wethersfield Businessmen's and Civic Association annual banquet on April 27 of this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that before these exercises come to a conclusion here today one of my distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts may have an opportunity to be heard on this most important matter. He is a man who has been nominated as Ambassador to Poland, and I refer to Congressman CURLEY, from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, this is May the 3d, but to all people of Polish extraction it has the same meaning as our Fourth of July. For 153 years ago Poland decided that all power must derive from the will of the people. It is unique that Poland, so many thousands of miles away from America, should institute a democratic form of government at the very same time as America did. This fact alone establishes a spiritual kinship between Poland and America which has existed ever since and which will be of mutual assistance to both nations as we face the problems ahead.

To students of Polish history, however, this comes as no surprise. As far back as the year 963 the Poles fought against the German invader, who, even then, was trying to steal other peoples' lands. In 966 the Poles adopted Christianity, and since then have fought and bled and died for the right to their faith, not only for themselves but for the whole western world.

In 1241, under Duke Henry the Pious, they saved Europe from the invading Tartar hordes. Again in 1683 they went to the assistance of Vienna, which was besieged by the Turks. By this victory, one of the decisive battles of world history, Poland protected Christianity from the ravages of the Mohammedan sword. Years later Poland signed a treaty of perpetual friendship with Turkey, the only nation that never recognized the partition of Poland. At all diplomatic receptions Turkey kept an empty seat for the "temporarily absent" Polish Ambassador.

In the eighteenth century Poland entered her period of martyrdom. Three times she was divided up by selfish neighbors, and in the last partition of 1795 Poland disappeared from the map of Europe. Thomas Jefferson called this a crime, and Woodrow Wilson termed this one of the great crimes of history. Even the People's Commissars, meeting in the year 1919 at Moscow, described the partitions of Poland as contemptible imperialism.

For 123 years there was no Polish Nation but there was a Polish spirit which refused to die. Time and again they rose in arms against their oppressors. They fought the good fight for human liberty not only in their own native land but in every nation in the world when the people were trying to throw off the shackles of slavery. In Belgium, Italy, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, the Argentine, Bolivia, and Peru, they fought side by side with men who passionately believed in freedom. And their battle cry was not exclusively for race or nation, it was the rallying, all-embracing call—"For our freedom and for yours."

As far back as the American Revolution, the liberty-loving Poles knew that the only guaranty of freedom for any nation was in the freedom of all nations.

Acting upon that conviction, Poles came to the aid of American pioneers. Two of her great sons have become a part of American tradition, and their names are known and revered by every American. One was General Kosciuszko who came to America, joined the Revolutionary Army as a volunteer and was conspicuous for his bravery in the battles of Saratoga and Yellowsprings. George Washington thought so well of his services that, after the war was over, he appointed him Governor of West Point on the Hudson.

The other was General Pulaski who gave his life for our American freedom at the Battle of Savannah.

Poles fought for freedom in the First World War and in 1920 when Red armies marched as far as the suburbs of Warsaw, Polish armies single-handedly defeated them and again saved western Europe—this time from international communism. Lord D'Abernon called this the eighteenth decisive battle of the world. The Treaty of Riga once more restored Poland to the position of a free and independent nation. Offered even more territory by Lenin, Poland, actuated by a high sense of fair play, refused, whereupon Lenin praised the Treaty of Riga as a voluntary and just agreement to stand for all time.

Then began her astonishing rebirth as a nation. One million seven hundred thousand buildings destroyed during the war had to be rebuilt. But the Poles, with pride in their resurrected nationhood, set to work with a will. In 20 years, she brought 11,000,000 acres of new land under cultivation. One thousand two hundred miles of new railroad track were laid. In 1918, Poland did not have 1 ship, but in 1939 she had more than 500 merchant and passenger vessels traveling the sea lanes of the world. Ninety-one out of every one hundred children attended school. The death rate was decreasing. Social security and labor unionism went forward hand in hand. Reborn Poland was a happy and progressive nation, with no envy of her neighbors.

But the scourge of nazi-ism was secretly preparing to ambush civilization. Once it had gathered its evil might, born of science without a soul, it turned upon its peaceful neighbor. Without a word of warning it struck. The Poles were outnumbered 100 to 1, England and France in accord with their pledge to Poland, declared war on the Nazi aggressors, but they had failed too long to assess the ruthless intentions of Hitler—and now were powerless to give Poland any real assistance. Poland fought alone against the swarms of planes and tanks which assaulted her. Her men and women fought bravely, hopelessly, and died—for all the world to see the armored beast unmasked.

And then Russia, knowing that she too would soon be the victim of German lust for power, struck from the rear in order to put more territory between herself and the Nazis. Caught between two powerful rivals Poland was doomed. Warsaw—the heartbeat of Poland, was ravaged by German bombs. A shocked humanity saw what these madmen in modern dress meant by "the new order." It was simply the tyrant breaking loose again—using flame throwers instead of whips and bombs instead of stones.

Poland the nation died—that we might see the evil menacing the world. Died that America—being in a dream-world isolation—might awaken in time to protect herself.

Warsaw became the symbol of man's resistance to tyranny. Men everywhere fought for time—time in which they might arm themselves against the Nazi menace.

The Gestapo moved into Poland with their methodical tortures. They had conquered the Polish Nation, but they were not satisfied. They meant to murder the Polish spirit. For five years they have sought to crush the mind and soul of Poland—and have failed.

But this is something which the Nazi mentality cannot understand. Some day, in the not too distant future, they will. For the lesson they will learn is

that he who lives by the sword shall die by the sword. That the spirit of man will not tolerate slavery—that the tools of science must be responsible to the religious and ethical ideals of humanity.

Meanwhile, the Nazis occupy Poland. But in Poland they have been unable to win over converts to their creed. There are no traitors in Poland—no Hachas, Quislings, or Lavals.

There is, however, a Polish Government in London, and its agents are active on both sides of the Vistula. There are no factions in Poland, which the Nazis can plan, one against the other. Poland is loyal and united in its resistance. And that resistance is the Polish underground.

That underground runs secret schools and universities for Polish youth; it publishes over 110 newspapers, some with as many as 4 editions a day. In spite of Himmler's terror, these secret newspapers are read by 3,000,000 people, bringing them the truth and informing them that judgment day for the Nazis is just around the corner. This effective underground has courts at which German criminals are brought to justice. In 1943 18 high German officials and over 1,000 Gestapo agents were tried by these courts and executed by the underground. In the field of organized sabotage over 2,000 locomotives were damaged and over 10,000 trucks eliminated. That is the fight going on in Poland today. And when the armies of liberation move into Poland the underground will give them invaluable help by blowing up trains and bridges, blocking roads, destroying supplies, raiding Nazi columns, and making conditions generally unhealthy for the self-styled supermen.

One hundred thousand Polish soldiers fought in France. Most of these were evacuated to England. There they have been increased and trained for the day when Allied Armies cross the channel to crack Hitler's fortress. Others have fought in Norway and Africa. Some are fighting this minute in Russia and Italy. Polish pilots have shot down more than 1,000 planes. The Polish Navy has sent a sizeable number of U-boats to the bottom. And in this country the 4,000,000 people of Polish extraction have given generously of their sons and brothers to the armed services of the United States.

The Nazi terror, in the insolent days of its power, murdered over 3,000,000 Poles. Yet Poland fights on, its spirit unbroken. Its faith, in spite of this agony, now stands on the threshold of vindication. The pillage of church and university, the horrors of the Nazi concentration camps, and the memory of children who have been bled white to give their precious life fluid to wounded Nazi gangsters—these burning memories of loss and suffering and wrongs endured cannot be forgotten. They will give to Polish men and women everywhere and to all of humankind as well the inspiration to hit hard when the day of reckoning comes.

The conscience of mankind owes much to the spirit of the Polish people. With this example, let us go forward through the costly days ahead, united in our determination to crush forever the "Germ" of Nazi barbarism, and to create a new world in which such crimes can never be perpetrated again.

To this end let us here pledge our support as Americans to the cause of Polish independence. Tonight we celebrate its founding. Next year, may we gather together to celebrate its rebirth and offer a toast to its long life.

First the victory, and then the peace. And when the peace is established, Poland knows that she can count on the moral support of the United States to see that justice for Poland becomes a fact.

As D-day approaches—when American and Polish troops, together with our allies, invade Europe, let us at home pray for their success. Let us try to match the efforts of our fighting men by working hard to give them the tools they need in order to win. But, greater than this, let us spiritually rededicate ourselves to the principles for which they fight—and die.

Let us remember that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. That is the fight which you and I who live must make—even unto the end of our days.

Poland has never broken faith with her responsible Christian culture. She has never denied the tradition which gave to the world the music of Chopin and the healing arts of Madame Curie.

We want Poland in the community of nations.

We need her spiritual dignity and courage.

We must have her help as one of the guarantors of the freedom for which she, and we, shoulder to shoulder, now fight.

As comrades in arms let us be even greater comrades in the peace to come.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, it is appropriate that the Congress of the United States pause in its labors and pay tribute to Poland.

This war started in Poland. Much of it has been fought in Poland. No people have suffered more during this war than the people of Poland. As associates of ours in this war for human freedom, it behooves us to guard with zeal the future of Poland.

The Polish people should have an especial place in the hearts of America. For my own part, I was raised in the Hanscom Park neighborhood in Omaha, which included a substantial group of Americans of Polish ancestry, and many happy days in my life have been spent in their company. Moreover, my knowledge of the Polish people has been broadened and strengthened by the great record of Poles who have left their impress on American life and western civilization.

First in this list is Count Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish hero of our Revolutionary War, in whose honor each year we celebrate Pulaski Day on October 11. Close behind him in esteem is Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who likewise was a part of the American forces in that great struggle.

All of us have studied the achievements of Nikolaus Copernicus, astronomer and scientist, a great discoverer of natural laws in the early sixteenth century.

Among the recent great souls to come out of Poland is Henryk Sienkiewicz, a great writer of the late nineteenth century. With an inspired pen he portrayed the struggles of Poland throughout years of conquest and strife. His greatest work, however, was the novel telling of the bravery and devotion of the sainted heroes of the early Christian church, entitled "Quo Vadis." Today, in the world we have the same problems of preserving the spiritual truth that Sienkiewicz wrote about.

With Poland and brave souls everywhere again in suffering and travail, it seems to me that all civilized people concerned about the future of Christianity and the future of civilization should be asking themselves the question that the lowly pilgrim asked St. Peter on the road to Rome, "Quo Vadis."

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the end of the eighteenth century will always be remembered as a period of great progress in human history.

The French Revolution brought for the first time upon the civil world the principles of rights of man, that same principle which our own Declaration of Independence describes as the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

It is so much more remarkable, therefore, that one small country of Europe which had already gone through its first partition when its greedy neighbors divided among themselves portions of its territory, proclaimed the same principles in its own constitution, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

It is, therefore, fitting and proper that the Polish people throughout the world celebrate this day as a day of great rejoicing.

Poland was the first country in eastern Europe which anticipated even our own Constitution in proclaiming these principles of individual liberty which are now considered so essential to human happiness. It is more remarkable that in an era of dictatorships and suppression of rights one little country should have stood out as the champion of human rights. The whole history of Poland has been replete with instances of devotion to human liberty, and while we celebrate today an anniversary of the first Polish Constitution, we cannot forget that Poland is again torn to shreds, divided among its neighbors, overrun by the enemy, with its Government in exile.

Let us on this 3d day of May 1944 hope that very soon Polish liberty will be restored, the Polish Nation brought back to its heritage, and we the people of the United States will rejoice with other freedom-loving nations in the reestablishment of a country which has given the world such a glorious example of its love of freedom, as it did by the constitution of May 3, 1791.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular pleasure for me to join with other friends of the Polish people in celebrating the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Constitution of May 3, 1791, for it so happens that the second husband of my great-great-grandmother was a Polish patriot named Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, who took a prominent part in the adoption of this forward-looking document. In fact, the New International Encyclopedia, published in New York, 1923, characterizes him as the "framer of the Constitution of the third of May." Verification for the characterization of the part which he took as so vital is not possible from a study of the few reference books available in this country, and the many letters which are preserved in our family from Niemcewicz were written at a later date and so do not shed any light on his activities at that time. However, there is no question that he did have a most important part in bringing about this memorable document of Polish history.

Therefore, a brief résumé of the activities of this Polish patriot does not seem to be out of place at this time.

Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz was born in 1757 at Skoki, Lithuania. He came from a noble Lithuanian family. After graduating from cadet school at Warsaw in 1777 he served for a time as adjutant to Prince Czartoryski, commander of the armed forces in Poldolne.

In 1788 he was elected to the Polish diet. He played an important role as a representative and as a playwright, for he was an author as well as a statesman, in preparing public opinion and the diet for the reforms contained in the constitution.

In this critical period immediately preceding the constitution he was an outstanding and active representative; one of the leaders of the general liberal and reformatory movement. His comedy, Return of the Representative, written in 1790, and successfully performed on the Warsaw stage throughout 1790 and 1791, contained artistic propaganda for the principles of the coming reforms. During the years 1790 and 1791 Niemcewicz delivered several speeches in behalf of the peoples rights, which later were incorporated in the May 3 constitution.

Especially strong was his contribution to those clauses of the constitution which aided commoners, for article III of the constitution merely ratified the rights which had been granted to the commoners by an act of the diet passed only a month before, in April 1791. Niemcewicz took a leading role in the campaign for this act, which aimed to grant to the commoners at least some of the privileges hitherto enjoyed by the gentry alone. He delivered a fiery speech in its support in which he said:

> How frequent are the instances when people whom we qualify as those without noble birth have saved and glorified their countries. No one knows the father of Washington or whom Franklin considers to be his grandfather, yet everyone knows and will always know that Washington and Franklin liberated America.

Bernard Newman in his Story of Poland has this to say:

> The constitution of May 3, 1791, is a remarkable document, for it preceded the French Constitution by several months. Nor were rivers of blood necessary to bring it into existence; its details were argued logically and clearly, and such privileges as had to be renounced were renounced voluntarily. A new principle of government was proclaimed. Hitherto the absolute freedom of the privileged citizens had been considered the ideal state; it was now replaced by a wider goal of the common good. But because the constitution opened the door to liberal forces and political freedom, it was doomed from the day of its making.

After the passage of the May 3 constitution, Niemcewicz campaigned for its strict enforcement. Some of the Polish magnates, such as Rzewuski and Potocki, openly opposed the constitution, refused to take the oath of allegiance and fled to Jassy, the Russian military headquarters. Niemcewicz was among the members of the diet who wholeheartedly seconded the motion to punish those who refused to take the oath of allegiance. The diet passed the motion, but it was never enforced. In January 1792, Niemcewicz himself moved to punish those who violated the constitution.

Finally, through pressure from the greedy nations surrounding Poland, he and other patriots who had been the supporters of the May 3 constitution were forced to leave the country. He joined Kosciuszko in 1794 as his adjutant, was wounded and taken prisoner by the Russians with his chief in 1794, at the battle of Maciejowice. He was imprisoned in the fortress of St. Peter and St. Paul, but was not idle during his imprisonment, and while there translated Pope's Rape of the Lock and Gray's Elegy. Released by the Emperor Paul in 1797, he came to the United States with Kosciuszko where he met and married Susan Livingston Kean, the widow of John Kean, my great-great-grandfather. He settled in Elizabethtown, N. J., and became an American citizen. However, in 1807, when the situation in Europe raised the hopes for restoration of Poland, Niemcewicz left his comfortable life in his adopted land and returned to Warsaw. Here he became the secretary of the senate as well as a member of the supreme council of public instruction.

When Poland came under Russia's control he was retained in office by Alexander I, but having taken a most active part in the Russo-Polish War of 1830, was forced into exile. From that time on he took no active part in politics, but devoted himself primarily to the writing of plays and historical poems, many of which, set to music, became very popular. He died in Paris in 1841 and is buried there.

It is fitting and proper that on this day when we are celebrating the events of May 3, 1791, his memory be not forgotten.

In my family's home, which now belongs to my brother, may be found many of his relics and those of Polish history of that time, so that it might be said that since earliest childhood I was surrounded by objects connected with a free Poland. In fact, our family homestead is still named Ursino—the name given to it by Niemcewicz in memory of his ancestral home in far-off Poland.

Today, for the fifth year, this Poland stands under the yoke of a cruel despot. But though the clouds are still dark the light of ultimate victory shines behind them. Poland must and will be free again and stand in its rightful place as one of the great nations of Europe. For 200 years, in spite of partitions, in spite of attempts at suppression, the great spirit of the Polish people has stood firm. Poland has remained a nation even when its component parts were under the heels of the oppressor.

Why, we ask, have these attempts to wipe out Poland not been successful? We only have to look at our friends and neighbors of Polish origin who live among us to understand the strength of the Polish people. Law-abiding, industrious, Americans of Polish descent have made a real contribution to the American scene. What other peoples who immigrated to this country in fairly recent times can point to as many members of their race serving in the House of Representatives; doing their duty here, not as Poles, but as Americans who have fully absorbed the lessons of American history and our common inheritance.

We do not have to go back to Kosciuszko and Pulaski, glorious as were their deeds, to find cause to celebrate this day. We only have to point to our neighbors and friends of this virile race who are justly proud of their ancestry. They add glory to the Polish race and on this special occasion all Americans should join with them in offering a silent prayer that the day be not too far off when that great people in central Europe may again take their rightful place among the nations of the earth.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, no group of people who have come here from other lands have made better citizens of the Nation than those of Polish extraction. In the critical days that are to come, following the peace we are hoping for and all looking for, no group can be counted upon in Europe, in central Europe especially, to do more toward preserving liberty and preserving the peace of the world than the people of Poland. Their old constitution, their old training, will stand them in good stead in the reconstruction days that will follow the peace, and I am glad that that nationality is going to have an opportunity, with the help of those of us who are actively engaged in the war, to establish herself again as a real nation on the continent of Europe.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored on this great Polish national holiday which commemorates the signing on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution, to join with my distinguished senior Senator, DAVID I. WALSH, in presenting a concurrent resolution as a tribute of sympathy, friendship, and support to the Polish people.

The Polish Constitution is a great, immortal and imperishable document, symbolic of the ideals of democracy and liberty. Poland is a noble ally in the present conflict and is courageously carrying on at immeasurable cost the fight to preserve democratic ideals. Through centuries of tragic struggles and sacrifice, the people of Poland have given sure proof, not only of their devotion to the cause of human liberty, but also of their ability to govern themselves. They have established unmistakably their place in the family of nations and their contributions to democracy and liberty fill a glorious page in history. Our own American citizens of Polish descent and their forebears have ever manifested greatest patriotism, loyalty, and devotion to American institutions.

It is entirely fitting then that we should pause to honor Poland and the Polish people today. But, as advocates and practitioners of democracy, we must do more than that. We must give them concrete evidence of our admiration, our appreciation, and our sympathy. We must let them know, a stricken people as they are, beset on all sides by hate and brutal force, that we are ready to hold out the hand of friendship and assistance in this—their greatest hour of peril.

It will avail the Polish people nothing if they throw off the yoke of one conqueror and immediately have the yoke of another placed about their necks. If the principles for which we fight are to be given any practical significance at all, they must be invoked to save the free independent people of the small nations from conquest, political domination, and economic exploitation, as well as from the newer and more subtle forms of unwelcome ideological infiltration and pressure.

The Polish people have paid dearly for their love of liberty. Throughout their glorious history but especially in recent years, they have undergone sufferings, punishments, and persecutions, seldom exceeded in history. But their spirit is still undaunted. They still march bravely by our side and willingly fight and die to advance the cause for which we are fighting.

Let us then, on this, their independence day, send them the message that the American Congress is conscious of their sufferings, appreciative of the common efforts, admiring of their indomitable spirit, and willing to do its part in order to make sure that their autonomy as a free and independent nation may be preserved, that the lot of their suffering people, both at home and in exile, may soon be relieved.

As a part of my remarks I am including two very thoughtful communications from the Manchester Guardian which I am sure cannot fail but to impress the Members of this House with the great present-day needs of our gallant and noble Polish friends. I hope and pray that the day of their liberation is soon at hand, that their exiles may be succored, fed and clothed, and returned to their native land, and that the right of free government of democratic Poland may be preserved in its entirety for all its people and their posterity.

[From The Manchester Guardian of December 23, 1943]

EXILES IN RUSSIA

A letter in our correspondence columns makes a plea which the Russian Government should surely grant. From the beginning of the war in 1939 to the days following Hitler's attack in June 1941, large numbers of men, women, and children caught in the war in eastern Poland and the Baltic States were transferred to the remote and desolate regions of Asiatic and Arctic Russia. The Russo-Polish agreement which followed the German attack promised to bring about the release of the prisoners, relief work among them was allowed, and some children of Polish soldiers were allowed to leave Russia. But since then has come the growing breach between Russia and Poland, until at last relations were completely broken off. Now the lot of the prisoners appears to be hopeless. But that is just what we cannot believe nor Russia intend. Whatever the political difficulties these wretched people, especially the women and children, ought not to suffer. Many of them are the families of men who are fighting among the United Nations—who are, therefore, fighting for Russia herself. It would be convincing evidence of Russia's decision to make genuine friendship the basis of her relations with her allies if she let these exiles go and helped them to new homes.

POLISH EXILES IN RUSSIA

To the EDITOR OF THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.

SIR: May I call the attention of your readers to a great but almost unknown tragedy within the greater tragedy of this war? I refer to about one and a half million men, women, and children who were forcibly removed from their homes in eastern Poland and the Baltic States after the Russian occupation of those territories from 1939 to 1941.

These unfortunate people were transported in cattle trucks hundreds and thousands of miles into the remote and desolate regions of Asiatic and Arctic Russia. Many of them died on the way. The rest were imprisoned or put in labor camps or on collective farms in Kazakstan and elsewhere. Some were forced to work in mines in Karaganda and Kolyma, others along the Trans-Siberian Railway or in brickworks and sawmills in many districts of central Russia. Thousands died from overwork, illness, and undernourishment—particularly the old people and young children. For these deportees were of all ages and classes, including peasants and workers as well as professors, doctors, and lawyers, with their families, who were quite unaccustomed to such hard manual labor in severe climatic conditions.

They were forced to live in overcrowded barracks without sanitation, in stables, earth huts, and even pigsties, without light or heating in many cases. Those who were too old or ill to work usually received no food or money and had to be maintained by their families or friends. Quite small children thus often supported their aged or ailing relatives. The mortality of these children was fearful. Precise figures are unobtainable, but it is estimated that between 25 and 30 percent succumbed out of about 180,000 children deported from Poland and roughly 30,000 from the Baltic States. Many families were broken up and dispersed to different regions—wives were separated from husbands and children from their parents.

After the Russian-Polish agreement in July 1941, the Soviet Government undertook to release all Polish subjects from prisons, labor camps, and places of exile. Their condition improved considerably in 1942 when the Polish Embassy was allowed to organize welfare and relief for them. Money was distributed; over 50 hospitals and infirmaries were opened; about 150 feeding centers and communal kitchens were started, and some 300 schools and orphanages were established which benefited about 15,000 children. Some 2,500 tons of food, clothes, and medical supplies were sent to Russia by the Polish Government, the British, American and Canadian Red Cross, and other allied charities.

But at the beginning of 1943 the Russian authorities closed all welfare establishments and took over the schools and orphanages, where they replaced the Polish staffs by Soviet teachers. This was done despite a proposal of the Polish Government to evacuate 50,000 children to other Allied countries. But the Soviet Government rejected the proposal, although it had previously allowed some 11,000 children of Polish soldiers to be evacuated with their families to Persia in 1942.

Since the severing of Soviet-Polish relations in April of this year no further evacuations have been allowed and no relief has been sent in bulk. The Australian Government is now looking after Polish interests in Russia, but it can give no information concerning the 271,000 Poles still known to be there (including about 80,000 children)—apart from the unknown thousands still in prison, and about 150,000 Baltic deportees of whose fate nothing is known as there is no means of communication with them.

The Soviet Embassy in London vouchsafes no information beyond two "Soviet Monitor" reports last July which described the setting up of a committee in Moscow last June under the People's Commissariat for Education in the R. S. F. S. R. to establish "special children's institutions" and "Polish elementary and secondary schools." But as the majority of Polish teachers were arrested in 1943 for refusing to accept Soviet citizenship it is difficult to see how this program can be carried out. In any case, the children will undoubtedly be brought up as Soviet subjects and thus become lost to their country and their religion.

I have read letters from some of these children describing their education in Communist schools and I have seen photographs of some of them when they reached Persia showing what skeletons they had become. I am aware of the difficulties which would attend a renewed evacuation—the distances are vast and transport scarce and overburdened by wartime traffic. But children are dying, and no one can tell how many will survive this their fourth winter of exile. Surely the families of those Poles who are serving with the Polish and Allied forces should be allowed to leave Russia and join those already settled in Persia, India, and Kenya. Or, if humane and generous persons in Britain and America would adopt some of these children, surely it should be possible to obtain the consent of the Russian authorities to bring their unmerited exile to an end.—Yours, etc.

ELMA DANGERFIELD.

LONDON, W. 1, *December 13.*

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALE].

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, 153 years ago today the Kingdom of Poland, after disillusionment and discouragement, after hard treatment by predatory neighbors, brought forth a constitution. A constitution born in struggle and indomitable spirit—the hard way. A constitution providing, as did our own, liberty and equal rights for all men.

Always turbulent, continually and all too often seized upon by Russians, by Austrians, and by Germans, Poland has not led a happy life. Her people have fought, sometimes openly on the field of battle, sometimes they have fought in darkness underground. For many years prior to 1919 they so fought the Russians. For 5 recent and tragic years they have so fought the Nazis.

Fighting is nothing new to the Poles. But fighting for what? For empire? For conquest? For tyranny? No. It has always been a fight for existence. For the right of the Polish people to survive as Poles. For the right to live their own lives as a free people. For the same right that all of us have fought for, are fighting for, and for which we will continue to fight.

Now is not the time to quibble. Not the time for indecision. Not the time for short-sighted expediency.

It is time for a clear, strong stand on post-war Poland. Not a divided Poland either, not a half Poland, half free and half slave. There must be a whole Poland. There must be a free Poland, an independent Poland, with a Polish Government and Polish boundaries, chosen by the Polish people, not by the Russians, not by the English, nor by the Americans, but chosen by Poles, for Poles.

In this hour of hard decision it is our duty and obligation to give aid and support to a friendly nation, to make certain that Poland will rise again in the future as she has so often risen in the past.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Washington Star, of Monday, May 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, 2 years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, the Diet of Poland adopted a constitution inspired by our own. This constitution was a charter of freedom and democratic rights for the Polish people. It expressed in written form the aspirations of Thaddeus Kosciusko, the young Polish artillery officer who fought so brilliantly at Ticonderoga, Saratoga, West Point, Camden, and Charleston in the cause of American liberty. It was a fitting epitaph to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who shed his life blood on the battlefield at Savannah. It is both fitting and proper that on this May 3, 153 years after the adoption of that memorable document, that we recall our national indebtedness and undying gratitude to these two Polish heroes, when Poland is passing through its most trying ordeal which will determine whether it shall live or die as a nation.

In the district in Illinois that I have the honor to represent there are many people of Polish descent. I feel most confident, therefore, from first-hand experience, that no group has done more to build up our armed forces by contributing its sons and daughters, that no group has surpassed them in buying War bonds, and in producing war materials in the factories. Remembering that the present war began as a result of the totalitarian attack on Poland in September 1939, we must realize that no group could have a keener sense of the issues involved in the present war for freedom from oppression and from enslavement.

Mr. Speaker, may I take a minute and refresh your memory by reading article 3 of the Atlantic Charter, which is as follows:

> Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

When we were presented with the Atlantic Charter by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, we accepted it as a solemn pledge to the cause of a free Poland.

I am now alarmed, however, over the fact that lately there has been a disquieting tendency on the part of the British Government, apparently acquiesced in by the present administration of our own Government, to minimize the solemn obligations in this document. For instance, a few days ago Secretary of State Hull declared that, "The Atlantic Charter is only an expression of fundamental objectives, it does not give solutions." Prime Minister Churchill has made similar statements recently, implying that the Atlantic Charter and its pledges must not be taken too literally. The New York Times of April 23, 1944, has called the Atlantic Charter a set of "lofty ideals of the eighteenth century, utterly outdated in the industrialized world of the twentieth century."

It seems we are witnessing a process of whittling down the purported high purposes we set out to accomplish. Why in the name of heaven did Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt ever bring into existence a document such as the Atlantic Charter if they intended to abandon it on its inception?

On every hand we hear people calling for unity, even to the extent of accusing those of us who dare to ask the President to stand by his word, of being Fascist and aiding Hitler. However, the fact remains that the President could do nothing greater to create unity than to exact a pledge from Stalin now, that he will not interfere in any way in a free election in Poland after the war is over, and that he will not annex a single square mile of Polish territory.

The only reason I can find for the present attitude of our present administration lies in the fact that Roosevelt has already permitted us to be maneuvered into a position where we no longer are able to enforce the principles of the Atlantic Charter, or the purposes for which we are fighting. Whether you realize it or not, Poland is being sold down the river, and every honest thinking person in the world knows it. What a reward for the gallant nation that fought so heroically against the Nazi hordes in 1939, notwithstanding the fact Poland knew at that time she would not win against such impossible odds. But fight she did, and now we stand acquiescently by while Russia grabs that which we went to war to keep from Germany. If the Atlantic Charter ever meant anything, it is high time we give more than lip service to its principles, and let Poland and the other nations overrun by the Axis know they did not fight in vain. If the principles of the Atlantic Charter were sound and practical then, why have they been abandoned?

When the totalitarian legions began to engulf country after country in Europe, the democratic nations called a halt at the borders of Poland. War was declared when the Polish borders were violated. Now again Poland is the acid test of how far democracy is willing to retreat, how much it is willing to surrender for the sake of further suicidal appeasement. Who is being appeased? I leave the answer to you.

While I yield to none in my admiration and appreciation of the exploits of the Russian Army in stemming the hordes of Adolf Hitler, I cannot remain silent when it appears the fundamental principles for which we are fighting are being sacrificed, even though that may mean a criticism of a nation allied with us against Germany. I believe that a policy of frankness rather than kowtowing and appeasement is in order, and that it would be more conducive to a sound relationship with the Soviet Union. I therefore propose to call a spade a spade.

As a Member of Congress who considers that the fate of Poland is as important to the democracies now as it was in September 1939, I feel it my duty to voice on this occasion the criticism of many of my constituents, and of American citizens throughout the country, regarding the present attitude of the Soviet Union toward Poland:

First. The Soviet Government has unilaterally condemned the Polish Government in exile as imperialistic and unrepresentative, despite the fact that that government is recognized by the Allied Nations and it is broadly representative of the Polish people.

Second. The Soviet Government has proposed a unilateral settlement of Polish boundaries without the prior approval or consultation with the Allied Nations and the Polish Government in exile.

Third. The Soviet Government has set up, without the prior approval of the Allied Nations or the Polish Government in exile—in fact as a challenge to the authority of both these latter groups—its own puppet Polish Government known as the Union of Polish Patriots, which is dominated by leading Communists.

Fourth. The Soviet Government has set up a Polish Army, without the prior approval of and as a challenge to the Polish Government in exile and the Allied Nations.

Fifth. Hundreds of thousands of unfortunate Polish men, women, and children have been deported en masse by the Soviet Government to the remote and desolate regions of Asiatic and Arctic Russia.

Sixth. In parts of Russia-occupied Poland, the Soviet Government has conducted so-called plebescites, employing means of totalitarian compulsion in violation of democratic processes.

Seventh. The Soviet Government is, contrary to all public pledges of the Allied Nations, by its various measures fast making a large portion of Poland a vassal state.

Mr. Speaker, my only purpose in airing these matters is to lead to a better understanding. The conditions I have described are not of my making, nor can I assume any responsibility for them. I should be false to my oath, false to my constituents, and guilty of base ingratitude to the memory of Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who gave unstintingly to the cause of American freedom, were I now to keep silent. These statements are made because I believe the people of the United States should be told the truth, to offset the false propaganda emanating from Communist sources.

To illustrate what I mean, let us take the example of the Kosciuszko League. This is a typical example of how the Communists are working in this country among the Polish people in an attempt to obtain their support for Stalin's policies.

Invariably the Communists will use the name of someone loved, respected, and revered by that particular group they want to reach. Examples of this are Communists schools in Chicago and New York, recently renamed the Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson schools respectively. Now among the people in America of Polish descent there has been formed the Kosciuszko League. No one who really has the interest of the Polish people at heart will subscribe to the desecration of this great name in its use by the Communist-inspired Kosciuszko League, which has as its only object the betrayal of Poland to Russia. In truth, every patriotic American resents the use of the name of this great American hero in promoting the Communist cause in the United States.

In proof of my statements I hold in my hand a book being distributed by the Communist Kosciuszko League, composed of articles and speeches by Prof. Oscar Lange, of the University of Chicago, now visiting in Moscow. The entire tenor of these articles is to further the cause of Soviet Russia in Poland. In fact this particular copy was obtained at the Communist Party headquarters in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, another glowing example which illustrates that Joe Stalin will not stop at anything to gain his objective is the fact that he has recently invited to Moscow probably the only Catholic priest in the United States sympathetic to what Stalin is trying to do to Poland. Clearance for this visit was granted by our State Department at the request of the Soviet Embassy. Of course, no one would attach any particular significance to the fact that Oscar Lange and Father Orlemanski happen to be in Moscow together at this very moment to see Joe Stalin.

In discussing this situation of Father Orlemanski, Msgr. Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, sums it up in my opinion rather accurately. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in my speech Father Ready's statement which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, May 1, 1944:

UNITED STATES PRIEST'S VISIT TO STALIN ASSAILED

The news of the arrival of a Catholic priest in Russia made the front pages of our press this week. The news in Russia was likewise phenomenal.

Moscow announced that the purpose of this visit was to study the Polish situation and that of the Polish Army in the U. S. S. R. As a priest, Father Orlemanski would be much more interested, it seems to me, if he were permitted to seek out and to confer with the Polish priests and people enduring since 1939 a cruel exile in Siberia and other parts of the Soviet Union.

But, like other missions to Moscow, this has no religious significance. It is a political burlesque, staged and directed by capable Soviet agents. It is the "phoniest" propaganda that the usually clever-idea men in Russia have palmed off on the United States.

SEEKS FULL EXPLANATION

The incident naturally has aroused a great deal of speculation, and a lot of us who have tried heretofore at the State Department to get worthy priests to Russia would like to know the exact part our own Government had in the performance. It is heartening, certainly, to have the State Department spokesman say the White House had nothing to do with facilitating the passport arrangements, as first widely conjectured in the press.

The implications of arranging a passport for the only priest in the United States—and likely the world—known as a partisan of Soviet policy are serious enough without having the White House accused of stabbing in the back the Poland whose government this Nation recognizes.

The State Department spokesman said a passport was issued because of the request of a friendly government, Russia. That certainly is most interesting. Since Russia now considers the Polish exiles in her territory citizens of the U. S. S. R., will our Government, at the respectful request of millions of citizens, now issue a friendly endorsement for Russian passports for the priests and bishops imprisoned in Russia to come to the United States to enjoy the four freedoms?

It is discouraging to all who seek friendship with Russia to note the Soviet Government's methods of deceit and confusion. All the great peoples joined in the United Nations are fighting for a world of justice and truth and decency. Only one, Russia, stoops to policies and tactics which divide the orderly march of our forces to victory and a better world. If we cannot attain an honest collaboration among allies in the midst of war, we shall approach with misgiving the task of forming a really noble society of nations after the war.

Russian valor and genius can contribute much to that hoped-for society, but only if based on truth and justice and charity. We pray for the peoples of the world to unite and bring about that sort of society. Only the Soviet Government is keeping the Russian people from that world fraternity.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is indeed fitting that we take the time, as we have here today in the House of Representatives, to pay our respects and tribute to the people of such a gallant nation as Poland. By this we are serving notice on the entire world that we, the people of the United States, are proud of the Polish people, the wonderful contribution they have made to the United States, and appreciate beyond words what she has done for freedom and liberty.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as we sit here today in a somewhat blind and benign security, no Angelus rings in Poland. Poland, the land of the white eagle, has a history which extends back into the twilight of fable and legend. Like all great peoples, it has many patriots whose names are unsung and unheralded. You who are not familiar with the Poles and the Polish nation, permit me to name just a few of them. These are names to conjure with: John Sobieski, John Casimir, Pulaski, Kosciuszko, of whom you heard a short while ago, the man of West Point fame, the great novelist Sienkiewicz, Joseph Conrad, Madame Modjeska, and the preeminent Marie Curie.

Poles and Polish descendants are those of whom the poet well spoke.

One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake.

On this one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of Poland's Constitution which you celebrate today, celebrated silently in Poland, where lips are closed, I say to you that you do not celebrate it alone. It is also our anniversary, because your constitution typifies and exemplifies the very thing this Nation stands for. I say to you, and I say to you advisedly, that like the phoenix you shall rise again, you shall again take your proud place among the nations of the world.

Poland, I hail you.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] is absent today on account of a death in his family. He had intended to make some remarks today and he has given me a copy of those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the remarks that he intended to make be included.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks by way of personal contact and through the mail, I have re-

ceived requests from a number of my constitutents asking me to say a word on the floor of the House on May 3, 1944, calling attention of the Members of this distinguished body to the fact that today is the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

On May 3, 1791, the Polish Nation was justified in rejoicing; for the first time in its history it had received from its sovereign and its legislature a constitution which under ordinary circumstances would have provided the surest guaranty of future prosperity. The history of Poland and the Polish people is a long and distinguished record of human achievement.

In my congressional district a substantial percentage of people residing there are either those who were born in Poland or direct descendants of Polish ancestors. People of Polish extraction in Lackawanna County have become leaders in church and State; they have become distinguished and honored members of religious, legal, medical, and other professions. They are a hard-working and thrifty people. Year in and year out they have made sound, solid contributions to public advancement and toward greater public achievement.

It is a pleasure, an honor, a privilege, and a distinction to join with the other Members of this great and distinguished body in paying respects to the Polish people and to their country, and to join in the prayer and the hope that when the proper time comes, a just peace, a just government and a prosperous future will be that of Poland.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me today to join with my colleagues here in the House, with all Poles, and with friends of Poland the world over, in honoring the birthday of the adoption of that truly democratic instrument, the Constitution of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, 153 years ago today, on May 3, 1791, a people inspired, I might say to some extent, by the principles laid down in our Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, and in opposition to the dictates of the three absolute powers, adopted the constitution on the 3rd day of May, thereby proclaiming principles which guaranteed freedom to all her citizens.

By this bold and amazing document, she became the first nation in Europe to have a written democratic constitution.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Poland is our true and tried ally in the struggle against the enemies of civilization. She was the first to take up arms unaided against Hitler in spite of overwhelming odds and certain defeat, and she continues the gallant fight at tremendous sacrifices.

We in America, regardless of original nativity, will wage this war to final victory first and foremost for the freedom, the welfare, and the security of our own country. But we would be totally lacking in vision and common sense if we did not also realize that we are waging this war for a better, a more secure, and a happier world—for justice organized and world wide, for large and small nations alike, for our own sake as well as for the sake of all peoples everywhere.

Let us see that Poland in her traditional garments of freedom and democracy lives on, and we will have gone a long way toward securing for all of the world the justice, security, and freedom which the dignity of the human spirit the world over cries out for and deserves.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Polish people and lovers of liberty throughout the world are today observing the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. Every student of history is familiar with the contribution made by the Polish people for the preservation and perpetuation of civilization. Our hearts go out upon this occasion to the victims who have died because of devotion to faith and loyalty to country, for no people, nor even those of the race of my forebears have suffered more than the Polish people.

Poland enjoyed a government similar to our own for centuries before the establishment of American independence. Poland has suffered not only one partition but many partitions. First by Anne of Austria, second by Catherine of Russia, and third by Prince Frederick William of Prussia; yet through all the persecution and oppression they remained devoted to their faith and loyal to their country. If ever a people, through fortitude, courage, and adherence to ideals, have merited the good will and confidence of the world, it has been the people of Poland. The venerated John Sobieski was called from his retirement to lead a force to raise the siege of Vienna, held by 700,000 Mohammedans and assembled a scanty force of 70,000 which dwindled when the time for assault came to 30,000 yet destroyed the army of the Mohammedans and made possible the preservation of Christian civilization.

Upon the day of the lifting of the siege, he assembled his little army at divine services and, after mass, gave them the rallying cry, the most unselfish ever given to a fighting force in the history of the world. The rallying cry was "Not for our glory, O Lord, but for Thine."

If Poland made no other contribution than that to the world, this alone should have entitled them to the liberty which they so justly deserve.

At the time of the first partition of Poland they were enjoying progress in the arts, sciences, literature, and all that makes for cultural progress of a people, but because they were peaceful and prosperous they were singled out by the ruthless invaders for ruin and misery. Many came to our land in our hour of trial and we have seen fit here in the Capital City of Washington to erect monuments to two of the most outstanding, Kosciuszko and Pulaski. The contribution of these two men was most notable since they were called upon by General Washington to teach the elements of organization and of military tactics to the untrained yeomanry who had rallied for the establishment of the American Republic. By intelligence and thrift and the hardest character of labor the pure womanhood and manhood of Poland have contributed to every section of our common country.

In my own section in New England, the Connecticut Valley, they have taken over the tobacco and onion farms, which our local citizens found it difficult to conduct in a profitable manner and which the Poles by hard labor and intelligence and thrift have made most profitable. In the entire history of America the Polish race has never contributed a traitor to our country and no group has been more patriotic and unselfish in their devotion to the United States of America. Their contribution rather suggests to mind a poem by an unknown authoress which runs:

We have run the gamut of want and woe
Of hunger and pain and dearth
The centuries flood of our tears and blood
Have deluged the plains of earth.

There was never a wine press in all the world
By the feet of our race untrod
Now we claim the price of our sacrifice
From the bar of a watching God.

No better commentary on the principles of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May 1791 can be given than in the eloquent words of Burke, the great English statesman and orator:

"We have seen anarchy and sevitude at once removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without trenching on their liberties—not one man incurred loss, or suffered degradation. All, from the king to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder—this unheard of conjunction of wisdom and fortune—not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals, or manners; no spoils, no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled. The whole was affected with a policy, a discretion, an unanimity such as we have never known before on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men. Happy people, if they know how to proceed as they have begun. Happy prince, worthy to begin with splendor or to close with glory a race of patriots and of kings and to leave a name which every wind to heaven would bear."

The price of sacrifice which the Polish people by their contribution have earned is the privilege of the establishment of the Polish Republic as a free and independent nation. May God in His infinite wisdom and mercy grant to them this boon which they so rightly deserve and have so justly earned.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, today throughout this great land of ours in large cities, in villages and the countryside, American citizens of Polish extraction have turned their thoughts to the country of their forefathers. Although not of Polish extraction thousands of other American citizens are also eagerly hopeful that Poland and the Polish people will again regain their freedom and continue the splendid progress which was interrupted by the war.

When the people of the older countries of the world think of you and me, my fellow citizens, they apply the general

term of American. They do not seem to realize that American when applied to a citizen of the United States does not only mean a national of our country but really means a member of the American race. Over the 175 years of our existence this great land of ours has absorbed and intermingled the blood and with it the customs and traditions of many of the nations of the world. We are really a great composite race. A race that has built, and will always protect, its conception of liberty and the pursuit of happiness on our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

It is because of this mixture of our bloods that we have always taken a decided interest in the well-being of many countries far removed from us, which many of us have never seen nor visited and hence, as I have stated, on this 3d day of May hundreds of thousands of we Americans think of Poland's tragedy and the suffering and misery the Polish people are sustaining. We offer a silent prayer for the recovery of Poland's liberty.

Because I lived in Poland 3 years and took an active part in Polish life, while serving as the financial adviser to the Polish Government, I have a better understanding than many of my fellow Americans of the splendid progress Poland made during the 20 years of the existence of the new Republic of Poland and of the character of the Polish people. I know that they are eagerly awaiting the day when they will recommence their effort which was so outrageously interrupted by invasion.

Sometimes when planning ahead one is apt to stress too much the material factors rather than the spiritual. Buildings, bridges, and factories are apt to represent success and happiness in our mind's eye. In reality no factory will spout smoke, no buildings will rise in a happy land, no bridges will span rivers unless supported on a spiritual quality of patience, neighborliness, and industry. The Polish people have these qualities.

The steadfastness with which they strove to regain their liberties during the 125-year period their country was partitioned can only denote the quality of loyal patience. After this long period of partition it is only human to expect that the Polish people would be very jealous of a hard-won liberty, and be belligerently outspoken when their new-won liberties were challenged. Nevertheless, history relates that the Polish people also have the quality of inspiring friendship.

An incident I like to remember concerns the royal court of the Sultans of Turkey. During those 125 years when Poland no longer existed as a free nation, at every court function in Turkey when the ambassadors of other governments were presented to the Sultan, he would inquire from his Secretary of State, "And where is His Excellency, the Polish Ambassador?" to which came the reply, "He is detained by circumstances over which he has no control." Here one has an incident of a lasting international respect and friendship which might serve as a text for us all.

Poland's remarkable recovery after having been a battlefield for 6 years during the first war is sufficient testimony of the industrious quality of the Polish people. Not only was the rebuilt edifice of Poland attractive but it was placed on a sound economic foundation. The Polish Government kept their budget in balance, maintained a sound currency, and a favorable balance of trade with their neighbors and paid their debts; moreover the spiritual and cultural development kept pace with the other developments in the country.

With such a record it is to be expected that the American race will follow with the keenest interest Poland's future after this terrible war is won. In fact, all of the United Nations of the world have expressed themselves as desiring that all freed peoples be again aided in the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness.

From my point of view, in consideration of our great participation in this war, the extensions we have made of food and munitions to our friends of the United Nations, the United States must have an important voice in final decisions, and I feel sure that the nations united with us, realizing that we are a race and not merely a nationality, will understand our particular interests in certain sections of the world.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join in the celebration of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution. It is appropriate that the Congress of the United States should pause in its deliberations to extend its congratulations and good wishes to the people of Poland.

The Polish people will today celebrate this anniversary under the ground and in secret places. Although it should be a day of rejoicing for them, we find them with heavy hearts and in great sorrow. Let us fervently pray that before another anniversary occurs that these people may be liberated from their bondage and once again occupy their rightful place among the other nations of the world.

Perhaps no other people in the history of the world have won and merited the admiration of other nations as has Poland in the present conflict. They have been the victims of every type of crime and atrocity. However, in the face of persecution and disaster their spirit has not been broken. They fight on today and will continue to resist, to the utmost of their ability, the tyrannical oppression of the Nazi invaders.

When the Polish Constitution was adopted on May 3, 1791, it was the first written bill of rights in Europe. This great document established new guaranties for the rights and freedom of the Polish people. It may be compared with our own Constitution, which was adopted just 2 years earlier.

America and Poland have always been close to each other. We have not forgotten those patriots and heroes who came from Poland to assist America in establishing freedom in this country. A close bond of friendship was formed at that time which has grown with the years. It will endure forever, and we will always find Americans and Poles standing shoulder to shoulder in the battle for human rights and freedom.

I am very proud to represent a large number of Polish people who live in my district. They are among our very best citizens, and have made a most valuable contribution to our war effort. Many are now in the armed forces, and those who remain at home are cooperating in every possible way to bring victory at an early date. I want to pay tribute to them and to all of the Poles who are now residents of the United States. We are happy to have them as our friends and neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, by joining in this celebration today we gain inspiration and courage for ourselves. By our participation we are assuring Polish people everywhere that we are interested in their problems and will assist in their solution. We realize that there are dark clouds hanging over Poland today which threaten her future existence. We are sending our own boys to European soil to free Poland and the other occupied countries. Let us make certain that after the Nazi yoke has been lifted that no other nation is permitted to practice any domination or control over these brave people. There are certain rumors that Poland is to be divided as part of the spoils of war. I sincerely trust that our influence will be used to prevent any such action.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, today in history is Polish Constitution Day and, as we in America bow our heads in solemn tribute to that martyred Nation, may we be inspired by the dauntless courage and glorious past of the Polish people who, down through the centuries, have stood as a guardian of Christianity and a champion of the liberty of men.

The scourge of war, with all its horrors, has again engulfed that beautiful land, and where once the gentle strains of the music of Chopin and Paderewski mingled with the folk songs of a happy people, today rumbling tanks and crashing cannons play a mad symphony of death. Where fields of golden grain once nodded in the gentle zephyrs, today the earth is caked and reddened with the blood of Polish patriots. Patriots who died as guardians of their Nation's liberty and chose death rather than slavery.

The bells of Polish churches no longer summon the faithful to worship. Her once-beautiful cathedrals are rubble. Her factories are destroyed. Her forests are seared and splintered from the fury of battle, as backward across her gentle plains reel the foes of liberty; hurled backward by a mighty avalanche of freemen who are sweeping the hordes of Hitler into oblivion. It was upon these rolling plains that the valiant sons of Poland unflinchingly met the crashing armor of the Hun as he made his first mad sweep to destroy liberty in a world that he has now bathed in blood.

Beneath the clanking tracks of rumbling tanks in timeless sleep rests all that is mortal of those Polish heroes who gave the last full measure of devotion in the battle to save the democracies of the world. The curtain of time has forever closed the portals of their tombs, but so long as time shall be, the record of their heroic deeds shall be woven as a golden thread in the fabric of world history. They were the first to die, the first to oppose the mad Hun who would destroy the world.

As we honor them, let us realize that other madmen have passed in review and that each leave their bloody trails as they stalk across the pages of history. They live a short season; then wither and die. Let us also realize that the spirit of liberty is eternal and that hope shall forever be.

To those Polish people who now find themselves beneath the heel of the oppressor, deliverance is at hand. May I join with that great segment of our population, those sons and daughters of Pulaski and Kosciuszko, those Polish patriots who came to our shores in our Nation's darkest hour, in solemn reverence of the principles for which they fight and for which they die.

To the valiant sons of Poland, whose spirits hover over their beloved nation, you have not died in vain. Your sacrifice shall not be without reward. No peace shall be honorable until your Nation is free and once again the White Eagle of Poland, emblem of liberty and freemen, soars majestically among the nations of the world.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, today there are no independence-day celebrations in Poland, but lovers of freedom the world over pause to pay tribute to brave, persecuted, bleeding Poland on the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of its Constitution, a document of freedom which has been likened by many to the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Rights of Man, and our own American Declaration of Independence. At the same time all lovers of freedom fervently hope that these celebrations in Poland may be resumed in 1945. The period of freedom of Poland, however, was not long-lived for that nation was again dismembered in 1793. In 1918, however, to the everlasting glory of the United States, Poland was reborn again. For a score of years Poland made tremendous strides, and became a land of progress, of culture, and of free government. Schools flourished, and Polish scholars, scientists, inventors, and artists added to the world renown of this tragic nation.

It was the endeavor of Poland in her years of freedom to try to solve the minority problem. While it is true that full equality of national minorities had not been reached in Poland when the war came, Poland had made more progress in this direction than any other nation in Europe, especially in the matter of education where the rights of minorities are most respected.

Article 110 of the Polish Constitution states:

Polish citizens belonging to national minorities or linguistic minorities have, together with other citizens, the right to establish, supervise, and manage, at their own cost, charitable, religious and social establishments as well as schools and other educational establishments and in them to use their own language with complete freedom and to follow the rules of their own religion.

We, in America, owe a great debt of gratitude to Poland in World War No. 2, for that nation was the first to offer resistance to the tide of nazi-ism which threatened to engulf the entire world. Although overrun, conquered, her great buildings destroyed, her people murdered, and carried into other lands in virtual slavery, Poland did her best against a powerful military nation that had been arming itself for destruction while Poland was educating her people for advancement and progress. Poland gave her all in a vain effort to stem the tide of invasion and the world first learned in the Polish invasion the might of the Hitler arms. Her government in exile, Polish heroes are on every battlefield on the side of the allies and they will continue to fight until Hitlerism and Tojoism have been driven from this earth. Then there will arise again a new Poland within her pre-war boundaries.

The constitution of May 3, 1791, was hailed as a great document of freedom by statesmen in many other lands. The brilliant English orator, Edmund Burke, paid this stirring tribute to the Polish Constitution:

We have seen anarchy and servitude at once removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without trenching on their liberties. All, from the King to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder—this unheard-of conjunction of wisdom and fortune—not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery, no outrage; no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals, or manners; no spoils; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled. The whole was effected with a policy, a discretion, an unanimity such as have never been known before on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men. Happy people, if they know how to proceed as they have begun. Happy prince, worthy to begin with splendor or to close with glory a race of patriots and of kings and to leave a name which every wind to heaven would bear.

A great German leader, Frederich Raumer, in 1832 said:

The Poles gave themselves the constitution of the 3d of May without pillage, murder, bloodshed, or destruction of property. With wisdom, fairness, and measure they united the nicest respect for all personal property rights that could be preserved, with the extermination of all fundamental evil. An admirable work of this kind deserved the greatest permanence, the highest happiness under the most auspicious conditions. So double responsibility rests on the soiled hands that stained a clean act, on the slanderers who libeled it, on the criminals who destroyed it.

Then the Russians joined with other nations in hailing the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. For instance, Professor Pogodin, director of the Kharkov University, said in 1911:

Poland's best sons fought to save their country. The constitution of the 3d of May 1791 created an order of things guaranteeing the rebirth of Poland. Had these reforms been put into effect, Poland would have become a sufficiently strong state. But her neighbors did not permit the Polish commonwealth to strengthen itself in this way. Russia and Prussia—but recently enemies—clasped hands across Poland. The constitution's supporters, guided by their ardent desire to save their country, knew they were subscribing to it in an hour fraught with danger to the commonwealth.

In 1919, A. Bruce Boswell, a famous English scholar, wrote as follows:

It is generally forgotten that, before her fall, Poland completely reformed her constitution. At one stroke the Poles brought their state up to the level of western Europe. The work was done by a small band of men, and seldom have great ideas so rapidly permeated a community.

The chief ideas of political reform were expounded by Staszyc, a member of the small middle class. These ideas were taken up by Kollontaj, Ignacy Potocki and others and culminated in the great 4 years' parliament and the 3d of May constitution of 1791. This great parliament is unique in history, for at a time when the French noblesse were being forced to give up their rights, the Polish gentry voluntarily renounced their privileges. It is often forgotten that there were two revolutions at this time besides the French Revolution—those in Belgium and Poland. The Polish reformers embodied their ideas in a constitution. The following reforms were passed:

1. The government was divided into an executive, a legislature, and a judiciary. A strong executive was formed by making the monarchy hereditary and increasing its powers. The king and the council of ministers were to form a permanent executive body responsible to the diet.

2. The dietines lost their power, and the diet became a real independent legislative body. The liberum veto and the confederation were both abolished. Thus the idea of the state finally triumphed over provincial separation.

3. The gentry gave up their immunity from taxation, the middle class was enfranchised, and municipal autonomy was restored.

4. The army was increased to 100,000, and heavy taxes were imposed on the gentry.

5. Complete toleration for all religions was confirmed.

6. The peasants were taken under the protection of the law, and might make agreements with their masters to pay rent instead of continuing the old system of forced labor.

This constitution was greeted with a chorus of praise all over Europe, its greatest admirers being the Emperor Leopold II and our own Burke, who contrasted its moderation with the excesses of the French revolutionary leaders.

A. BRUCE BOSWELL
(In Poland and the Poles (1919)).

The United States of America is deeply indebted to brave Poland for its contribution to our well-being. It is particularly indebted to Poland for the millions of its citizens who came to this country to help build it into the greatest nation of all times. That same fervor for freedom, that same resistance to persecution, and that same determination to

develop, which characterized the Poles through the ages, has been a dominant factor in the growth and development of our great Nation.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, how fitting to read this morning in the Washington Herald the headline "Mass to honor Poland's Day." The Polish Ambassador, Jan Ciechanowski, will be present at that mass to commemorate the founding of the ideals of their great country, in celebration of the one-hundred-and-fifty-third year.

Mr. Speaker, all over the civilized world, wherever people of Polish extraction shall gather today, you will find those faithful, faithful to the precepts they learned at their mother's knee, at the sacrifice of the mass, petitioning the God of petitions to whom they are no stranger, and asking that He receive their prayers in this hour of trial.

Mr. Speaker, for them I hope the words of Alfred Lord Tennyson will again be true:

> More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] such time as he may require.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the heroic people of Poland on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. The fact that her constitution is similar to that of the United States has caused us to have a deeper interest in Poland and her Government.

Poland has been among the leading countries of Europe in her contribution to the world in art, in music, in science, and in other activities that help to make the world a better place in which to live. Her people have always been deeply religious, industrious, and loyal to their country and their government. Today we salute the Polish people for having withstood the devastation of their country and the cruelties that have been imposed upon them. And yet they have the will to win. Poland will win, and upon the ruins caused by the ravages of war she will rebuild and will again become one of the leading nations in the world to come. We hope this anniversary may be the dawning of a new day in Poland and that within a year to come Poland may be freed again and that she may celebrate the adoption of her constitution in her homeland under a restored, representative, constitutional government.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] such time as he may require.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, Polish Constitution Day on this 3d of May stirs the hearts of all patriotic Americans with emotions of deepest sympathy. The people of the United States and the people of Poland have always had much in common. They are bound together by strong and unusual ties.

In the democratic revolutions of the twilight years of the eighteenth century, the Americans and the Poles took their place in world history as twin representatives of a new philosophy of government embodied in constitutional freedom. When American Revolutionary patriots adopted the first written constitution in the Western Hemisphere in 1789, Polish statesmen were already at work on a written constitution for Poland, adopted 2 years later, and constituting the first in Continental Europe.

The people of the United States are indebted for much of their inspiration and heritage to the centuries of devotional and sacrificial dedication of the Polish people to the principles of freedom.

Poland's Magna Carta dates from 1454. In 1683 Poland and her illustrious Jan Sobieski with his Polish warriors stood as the Thermopylae that prevented the crescent of Mohammed from supplanting the cross of Christ above the churches of Europe. In the travail of our own terrific 7-year struggle for freedom, Poland gave her sons and blood to establish our Republic. The mere mention of Gen. Casimir Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, to whom we have erected monuments in the Nation's Capital cause emotions of eternal gratitude and praise. Pulaski enriched the soil in which the American tree of freedom was to grow by giving his lifeblood in the battle of Savannah, while Kosciuszko returned to his native Poland to continue the fight for freedom, only to die in exile at the hands of neighboring despots who feared that freedom.

Since that time for a century and a half, hundreds of thousands of Poles have come to this country. Together, with that of their offspring, their great and valuable contribution to our industrial and cultural life have helped immeasurably to make this the greatest and best country on the earth.

It is tragic that in this great sacrificial love of liberty for others which she has always exemplified, Poland was destined, through environment, to be denied the fruition of this noble, exalted and spiritual ideal for herself.

It is tragic that within 5 years of the adoption of her constitution, Poland became the victim of partition by greedy and powerful nations to the east and the west of her, a thrall from which, although she kept the lamp of liberty burning, she was unable to release herself for over a hundred years.

It is tragic that although at the end of that period which culminated in World War No. 1 and a liberated Poland through the Treaty of Versailles, she should again be the first to suffer the crushing impact of World War No. 2 after only two decades of freedom. One score of years in which the spirit of liberty, justice, and republicanism had burst forth in a bloom which proved to the world what the Polish people could accomplish in a peaceful environment, and then she again had to sacrifice herself as the saviour of others.

When the Nazi hordes hurled their overwhelming armed might against Europe, Poland, the first to be attacked in September 1939, although foredoomed to bloody defeat, fought gloriously to complete prostration, seeking time for her allies to arm. Again she had been attacked from front and rear by powerful nations who partitioned the spoils between them.

Once more the irony of the fate of Polish struggle for freedom was demonstrated when barely a year later the Hun, having broken faith with and attacked Poland's eastern neighbor, was stopped dead in his tracks before Moscow. This, together with America's entry into the war, all within 24 hours, was the turning of the tide of war for the Axis Powers. But immediately this brought on a tiny cloud of fear from Poland's eastern horizon, a cloud which has assumed darker proportions and is now the only threat to Poland's restoration to a place in the sun of liberty and independence.

The world and especially the United States owes a debt to Poland. That debt is being repaid in part by the certain destruction of the Nazi gangsters who have ravished her and their removal forever from Polish soil. But there is also the obligation to remove the cloud which hangs over Poland from the east by using the good offices of the American people and American leadership that justice, liberty, and happiness may be established for the Polish people as their heritage in common with other liberty-loving peoples of the world.

The American people are resolved that Poland shall again be a free and independent nation; shall assume an honored and rightful place in the family of nations, a place to which she is entitled by virtue of her glorious history.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] such time as he may require.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, there are very few Members here who have the privilege and honor of representing more people of Polish descent than I. In my district, people from Poland, coming as they did a generation ago, have contributed to the building of a mighty shoe industry and all the other industries of my locality. Today I wish to join with the other Members in the House in saying that my admiration knows no bounds for the Polish people and their accomplishments throughout the entire world. Pincered as they have been for centuries among powerful nations, the Germans on the one side, the Russians on the other, it is amazing to me how they have survived. It took strong and sturdy and vigilant people like the Poles to write their constitution, to produce their nation, and to survive through all the centuries of persecution, of warfare, and of ravages, as they have done.

We Americans must pay tribute to the Poles and give them the consideration they deserve after the war has been won. When the representatives gather around the peace table it is my solemn hope that they will place Poland in that rightful situation in world affairs which she so justly deserves. Poland's borders must remain inviolate, and must be guaran-

teed in the future that she will be protected from powerful aggressors and invaders.

Guarantee the borders of Poland for her people and you will insure the peace of Europe forever.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] such time as he may require.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. DINGELL]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY.]

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in these expressions of good will to the Polish nation, and to those of Polish blood in the United States on this the anniversary of the adoption of the constitution of 1791.

The history of Poland has been a tragic one. It was the valor of the Poles and the might of Polish armies in the seventeenth century that drove back the infidel from the gates of Vienna and saved Christianity for Europe. But in the next century those powers which had profited so much by Polish valor joined, and partitioned Poland in the first partition. Democratic ideals were developing in Poland and these powers feared that the desire for greater liberty, which was being manifested by the people of Poland, would spread to populations of other countries. Two years after the adoption of the constitution of 1791 those same powers, Germany, Austria, and Russia, joined in the second partitioning of Poland. Two years later, in 1795 there was a third partition, and the liberty of Poland was finally lost. At the close of the First World War Poland was again constituted as a nation and it appears that her tragic history is being repeated in her martyrdom today. In 1939 she bore the brunt of the fury of the Nazi attack, in addition to which on her eastern borders she felt the might of Russia. Between those two powers she was crushed. Today we in America cannot pick up a casualty list without seeing the name of some boy whose very name signifies his Polish ancestry and Polish heritage. They are fighting for the "four freedoms" and they have the right to expect that the principles contained therein will be applied to Poland.

I know that the Ambassadors of our allies, those gentlemen who are so keen to sense public opinion in America, are always very diligent in forwarding a report of that public opinion to their chancelleries in their own countries. I hope they give due attention to what is said today in the Congress of the United States. Poland throughout her history has been the victim of the ingratitude of those for whom she has made sacrifices and she has been exploited by those who have profited by the heroism of her sons. America's Allies, I know, will be impressed by our Government with the need for full justice to Poland at the peace conference. I hope that those who are united with us in this struggle will also unite with us in granting justice to the people of Poland in return for the sacrifices they have made. I trust that it will be realized by our allies, including Russia, that the sentiments expressed here today are not merely perfunctory addresses but the sincere views of Members of the Congress of the United States.

I hope that these expressions made in the Congress of the United States will be reported accurately by the Russian Ambassador to his principal in Moscow, so that it may be known in Moscow that the representatives of the American people have decided views upon what consideration is due to Poland at the peace conference. We hope that they will take them, too, not only as individual expressions but as an indication of what the sentiment of the American people is for the people of Poland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ].

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the first written democratic constitution in Europe—the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. This date not only commemorates a great event in the history of progress of mankind and of its continuous struggle for liberty and justice, but also serves as a reminder to our generation that nothing is really new in human history. Indeed the same forces of despotism that the constitution of May 3 was set to prevent from overrunning democratic Poland, are again at play today. Prussia and Russia, two powerful empires neighboring with eighteenth century Poland, could not allow a liberal and democratic nation to live and prosper between them, lest it would become a menace to their own systems of despotism through simple example and penetration. Consequently, they decided to use all possible measures at their disposal to undermine, conquer from within, and finally to dismember the Polish Republic. The constitution of May 3 was a cry of protest of all the progressive and patriotic forces in Poland against those eighteenth century fifth columns sent into Poland in masses by both Russia and Prussia. It was also proof of the vitality and spiritual stamina of the Polish people of those days, who after years of political license and exaggerated liberalism succeeded to arouse the nation to courageous and determined action.

The partitions of Poland took place not because Poland was in a state of political decay but, on the contrary, because of a spiritual rebirth of the nation that took place in spite of the penetration and activity of Prussian and Russian fifth columns of those days, and even in spite of the enormous Russian Army. The constitution of May 3 is vivid proof of this historical truth, voted and promulgated 9 years after the first partition and 2 years before the second. Unfortunately the constitution never saw the light of practical execution, being stifled by the partitioning powers and stamped out by Russian and Prussian bayonets before it could have the chance to prove its effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, history does indeed repeat itself. The same powers motivated by the same impulses which in the eighteenth century were bent on the destruction of Poland are operating today in the modern shape of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Both have unleashed the present war through a joint attempt to wipe Poland again from the map of the world. And although they themselves today are engaged in a mortal clash, Germany and Russia are still in agreement to have Poland cease existing and her people exterminated. Thus governments and regimes pass, but ambitions and policies imbedded throughout ages seem to follow the same consistent pattern. What was true one and one-half centuries ago is true today. The rule of freedom and democratic civilization in eastern Europe depends on the existence of a strong, sovereign, and undiminished in her territories, Poland, which her neighbors want to subjugate.

Let us be realistic and see these facts in an honest, practical manner rather than give the appearance of weakness by assuming a smug temporarily convenient attitude for which we shall pay a thousandfold.

Even after her first partition Poland was still one of the largest states in Europe, but she was in grave danger. Surrounded by despotic neighbors that were growing ever more powerful and coveted her destruction, Poland indulged in the most liberal parliamentary system in Europe that paralyzed her power of resistance and made foreign penetration easier. The vote of one single deputy, the so-called liberum veto, could defeat any measure considered by the entire parliament.

The army was too small and Poland's enemies saw to it that no larger budget for defense was voted. The situation was crying for reform, especially in view of the fact that a long time plot against the Polish state was already in the making. In 1720, 52 years before the first partition, Peter the Great of Russia and Frederick, Wilhelm the First of Prussia, signed an agreement pledging mutual support for the preservation of weakness in Poland and the prevention of any reforms. This was the nucleus of a joint anti-Polish policy that was to bring about later the partitions and to make the subjugation of Poland the chief factor in German and Russian policy in eastern Europe up to the present time.

Those were some of the conditions existing prior to the enactment of the constitution of May 3.

The first organized resistance against Russian armed intervention in Polish domestic affairs and also the birth of a new spirit that was to lead the nation to action, was a movement started by Casimir Pulaski in 1768. This was the same Pulaski who later became a hero of the American war for Independence and who died in the Battle of Savannah. But even miracles of Pulaski's courage could not prevent his defeat by overwhelming Russian forces. His action only prompted

the joint decision of Russia, Prussia and Austria to accomplish what was long their objective—the first partition of Poland. But Pulaski's move set the spark for a new fire that was to awaken the entire nation and lead her to constructive action. Thus it has been said that Pulaski was the godfather of the May 3 constitution.

The spirit of reform in Poland was somewhat linked with the then modern ideas prevailing in France. Only in Poland it was not an action against absolutist monarchy as in France, but on the contrary it was a move to curtail the excessive liberalism weakening the country. To be sure, as far as social problems were concerned, the granting of equality and justice to all citizens was a trend that ran in close parallel to the movement in France. Once again in this respect Poland proved to have associated herself with and followed the currents of thought of western Europe, remaining completely alien to the evolution of despotic imperialism and absolutism being on the rise both in Russia and Prussia. The difference between the situations in France and Poland at that time was that, whereas the masses of France suffered from too much power in the hands of a despotic executive, the rank and file of the Polish people suffered from the inability of their parliament to function due to the liberal parliamentary procedure.

As a forerunner of the May 3 constitution reforms was the establishment of the so-called commission on education by the parliament in 1773, the first ministry of education in Europe. Its aim was to raise the standard of education and thus make young Poles better aware of their duties toward their homeland. The spirit of reform was growing rapidly except that each measure had to be taken by circumvention and tactful strategy because Russia and Prussia threatened with armed intervention in case the Parliament would attempt any strong positive action. When a plan for the abolishment of the one-vote veto was devised in 1766, the Russian ambassador placed the parliament in jeopardy of Russian military action. During the same session three patriotic deputies were kidnaped by Russian officers and deported to Siberia. This was the first deportation of political prisoners from Poland to Russia, that was to be followed by hundreds of thousands in later years and to be climaxed by the deportation of one and one-half million Polish citizens for extermination to Asiatic Russia in this war.

Thus the reforms were to be introduced through custom, and as in the case of the one-vote veto, liberum veto, they began disappearing by themselves, with no parliamentary session being broken up for many years even before the adoption of the May 3 constitution. Also, the emancipation of peasants, a great innovation in those days in Europe, was gradually approached, and political equality to the urban population in some cities granted. Finally the opportunity for positive action appeared when relations between Russia and Prussia became temporarily strained after the death of Frederick the Great and while the Russian armies were far away from Poland engaged in the Russo-Turkish War. Thus Poland found herself in a period of respite from enemy threats. On October 7, 1788, an extraordinary session of the Parliament was was called for the purpose of preparing a progressive constitution encompassing all necessary reforms. This so-called Four Years Parliament ended by adopting on May 3, 1791, the new constitution, to which the king and all deputies pledged allegiance on the same day. At the same time a measure was adopted against foreign plotting, the seat of which was then in the residence of the Russian Ambassador in Warsaw. This was accomplished at a time when the wave of public opinion was too strong, and even the threat of Russian power could not stop it. Of course, while all this was taking place in Poland, the war with Turkey was terminated, and Russian troops were on their way back from the battlegrounds of that war.

The constitution of May 3 only prompted the second partition of Poland. Catherine the Great, who worried about the rebirth of the Polish spirit and the new strength arising in the Nation, decided to act quickly. Russian troops invaded Poland under the guise of protection against the Jacobin revolutionary movement personified in the democratic May 3 constitution. In January 1793 the second partition was signed by Russia and Prussia, and the constitution really never saw the light of day.

The constitution of May 3 was far ahead of its time as far as a political system was concerned. It was a parallel to the French Revolution, but was reached through evolution and without bloodshed. No better commentary on the principles of the constitution can be given than in the eloquent words of Burke, the great English statesman and orator who said: "We have seen anarchy and servitude at once removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without treading on their liberties—not one man incurred loss, or suffered degradation. All, from the king to the day laborer, were improved in their conditions. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order, everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder—this unheard of conjunction of wisdom and fortune—not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage, no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals, or manners; no spoils; no confiscation; no citizens beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled. The whole was effected with a policy, a discretion, and unanimity such as have never been known before on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of true and genuine rights and interests of men." Indeed the constitution of May 3 not only introduced necessary reforms to the welfare and defense of the Polish Nation, but was a shining star of democracy and order based on law in Europe. What a contrast with the despotic trends prevailing then in Russia and Prussia, where force and aggression meant law, as they mean today.

The May 3 constitution was crushed by the imperialistic Powers that did not want the light of freedom to live in their vicinity. But the spirit of the Constitution remained alive, and lead many generations of Poles to battle for liberty, not only of their own country, but of all nations where freedom was at stake. Thaddeus Gosciusko was the one who organized the first insurrection in defense of the constitution and against the partitions. His armies crushed, he was imprisoned by the Russian Tsar. He and Pulaski were the two heroes from Poland to whom America owed a debt of gratitude for their gallant fight for the independence of the Union. This debt was paid during the last war when an American volunteer squadron flew to Poland and took part in the defense of the Polish city of Lwow in the early days of Poland's newly reconquered independence. The graves of American heroes of this Kosciuszko squadron are, together with graves of the brave sons of Lwow, sealing an everlasting bondage of fighters for freedom. Lwow is the very city Soviet Russia now claims as her own property.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new in history. The same battle the Poles were waging in the eighteenth century continues today. It is the battle for the right of democratic form of government and freedom in eastern Europe. The same enemies who worked so hard in the old days to prevent a renaissance of Poland and who tried to kill the May 3d constitution and the Polish Nation itself, are attempting to accomplish the murder again. Prussia of Frederick the Great is just replaced by the horrors of Nazi Germany and Russia of Catherine the Great by the Soviet Union. The stake is the same, for Poland and for the entire civilized world. Are law and justice going to prevail or are sinister forces of aggression and rape to take again the lead in world affairs? If the latter is the case, it makes no difference whoever is the aggressor—ally or foe—we shall have fought this war in vain.

Thus I will say to those who suggest a Russian protection or sphere of influence over Poland and eastern Europe that this is exactly the very thing the Poles and their neighbors were fighting against 150 years ago. And what Russia demands today is the fifth partition of Poland. It is our choice to either declare ourselves on the side of liberty and justice, as our forefathers the true fighters for liberty were, or shall we betray our own heritage and aline ourselves with a despot who wants to extinguish the Polish independence. Modern Germany and Russia respectively want Polish territory not for self defense, but as in the times of the constitution of May 3, as a bridge for further conquests. The Polish partitions sealed the fate of eastern Europe changing it into colonial territory for over 100 years with free nations exploited for the benefit of the powerful despots. Only with these territories enslaved and under their control can Germany or Russia become the masters of Europe and some day threaten us again with their power. What will happen to Poland today will happen tomorrow to entire Europe and later to us. If Europe is to be given away to one dominant power under con-

trol, the third world war can be considered a certainty. There is only one justice and one law, and the world cannot be run by two different systems—one of liberty and law on the one hand, and one of force and oppression on the other. There cannot be liberty in western Europe and slavery in eastern Europe. The Polish case is clear and clean. It defies doubt or equivocation. The Polish people for over 4 years have been fighting united in defense of their rights and territories, and present as a convincing argument for their cause over 3,000,000 dead, mostly tortured to death, in defense of liberty and a gallant army, navy, and air force fighting at our side, besides millions deported to Germany and Soviet Russia. Should Poland be given away to a foreign domination or emerge from this war with amputated territories, we would be striving for a world of chaos and not of order.

Generations of Poles who fought for liberty, and especially the millions of victims of Nazi and Soviet aggression on Poland in this war, challenge our conscience, demanding that justice be given to their homeland. Underwriting a fifth partition of Poland, which Soviet Russia is demanding today, or watching silently as it is being prepared by our allies for it, bears the same responsibility. Inaction at a time when essential principles of democracy and justice are challenged, is coresponsibility. Pontius Pilate only washed his hands at the sight of Christ's crucifixion, but he was cursed by posterity in the same way as Christ's murderers. Do we want to earn a similar reputation for ourselves among free nations after this war?

The American people are already aroused by the policy of appeasement and expediency our Government has plunged into vis-a-vis Russia. They cannot understand why, while fighting a war for the liberation of Europe, we are conducting, at the same time, a policy against Europe. Abandoning Poland, the Baltic States, Yugoslavia and other nations of eastern Europe to Soviet mercy is tantamount to the pronouncement of a death sentence on those nations; to an extinction of our civilization in those areas. Combating one evil in Hitler's Germany, we are allowing in the meantime another evil to grow strong with our help. At this anniversary of the Polish May 3 Constitution, let us pause and see clearly whether we are on the side of the nation we honor today, or on the side of those forces who tried to kill that constitution and murdered its authors. Are we on the side of strong, sovereign and secure within her legitimate boundaries, democratic Poland, or for the plans of her age-old despotic oppressors. Mr. Speaker, by our silence with respect to the question precipitated upon the world by the spokesmen for the Soviet Union pronouncing their designs upon Polish territory, are we not approving an anti-Polish policy which was in effect in Russia for over 200 years? While Great Britain is already laying the foundation for her future attitude toward the Polish question as announced by Mr. Churchill in his speech of February 22, we are quiet although we know that the treaty of alliance between Poland and Great Britain of August 25, 1939, declares that it is up to the respective government to define when the independence of its country is threatened. The Polish government and Polish public opinion emphasized many times that Russian territorial demands are a menace to Polish independence. We are saying nothing while Great Britain is violating her promise to Poland.

Any alliance is made for the mutual defense of respective interests. This includes the sovereignty and territories of an attacked country. Hitler demanded less territory from Poland than does Stalin, and Poland decided to fight. Great Britain came to the aid of Poland in this fight. Are not the British obligations and our obligations with respect to Polish territory the same now as they were then?

The Russians have entered Polish territory in pursuit of the enemy, but not as a civilized nation respecting the sovereignty of the legal owner of these territories. Mr. Speaker, when we landed upon Tarawa, the British flag was raised on that soil; when we occupied Africa, we promised that the occupation was only temporary and that it was to remain legal French soil; when we stepped upon the soil of Italy, we proclaimed that we were liberating Italy for the Italian. But before crossing the legitimate Polish boundary in pursuit of the enemy, the Soviets announced that it is not Polish soil, but that they will be taking back genuine Russian territories. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that one of our allies is allowed to annex land of another without consulting us or the injured ally? Is one rule of conduct to be applied to us and another to our allies? What is our foreign policy with respect to Europe?

Mr. Speaker, as the present war is progressing and as events are developing, we are beginning to see many disturbing things. You remember the events leading up to the present war. You remember the strong attitude of our country before and for some time after we became engaged in this war. Every action, every move on our part, was positive. We scorned any suggestion that we might become involved with those whose purposes were not clear. We were determined in our conduct. Many people, yes, many people in this country adopted and followed the leadership so splendidly assumed by it. There was implicit trust in the judgment of this leadership. There was the acceptance as a fact that this leadership had full knowledge and utmost skill in international matters.

All of our promises and our hopes were crowned by the adoption of the splendid principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter. Then suddenly for no apparent reason all of these high ideals were abandoned. The weak are being left to the mercy of the strong. Promises, policies, and treaties were strewn to the four winds. Russia wants to destroy Poland, and what do we offer Poland as help? We offer mediation. Mediation between an aggressor and his victim. Mediation between the robber and the robbed. Indeed we go further, we even allow the Soviet influence to reach within our midst and to avail itself of the use of such individuals as Orlemanski and Lange for their own purpose by receiving them in Moscow, where they might be well trained for a number of weeks and then returned here to spread the doctrines of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to retain the confidence of the American people in its leadership; if we are to command the respect of the world; then we must return to the principles founded upon the noble ideals that we believed in at the time we became engaged in this war. If we believe in justice in the world and a true desire for lasting peace these beliefs and desires must be translated into action now.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield for me to submit three unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. I yield.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] may extend his own remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the Towarzystwo Krolowy Wandy, a Polish group of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., to speak in Congress today, in celebration of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution. In compliance with the request, contained in the following letters, I have prepared some remarks to be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to be delivered by me over the local radio, WGNY, Newburgh, N. Y., in my own district, on May 3, where I will be at that time:

ST. JOHN'S SOCIETY,
ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH,
Florida, N. Y., April 26, 1944.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: What the Fourth of July is to an American and the 14th of July to a Frenchman, that is the 3d of May to a Pole. It is Poland's national holiday, commemorative of the first written democratic constitution in Europe passed by the Polish Parliament in 1791.

One hundred and fifty-three years ago, on May 3, in the face of hostile aggression and greed of totalitarian monarchies, Poland had the courage to proclaim the ideals of right, justice, and liberty to all her citizens.

Since September 1939 and up to the present day the Polish Nation is fighting undaunted alongside the United Nations for these ideals for all peoples of the world.

It is with trepidation that we witness some persons in high stations who would compromise these principles for the benefit of a powerful, totalitarian ally.

As American citizens, we request that you emphasize the example of Poland's stand for righteousness, justice, and liberty of yore and its corresponding stand today.

Very truly yours,

Rev. VINCENT J. RAITH,
Chaplain.
JOSEPH WIMCZYK, *Polgc.*
ANTON S. FELCZAK,
Vice President.
ADAM KOWALZYK,
Recording Secretary.
STANLEY WANZYK,
Financial Secretary.
GEORGE PAWLICZAK,
Treasurer.

TOWARZYSTWO KROLOWY WANDY,
Poughkeepsie, N. Y., April 20, 1944.
Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On May 3 the Polish Nation throughout the world will celebrate the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of Poland's Constitution in 1791 (the first written "bill of rights" in Europe). In Poland the day will be celebrated under the ground, in silence and sorrow.

But it occurred to us that if you, dear Congressman, would say a few words about this Poland's day at the session of the House on that day and induce some of your colleagues to do likewise, the day would become a glorious triumphy for our faithful ally, although in Poland lips will be closed and church bells will be silent. Words pronounced by the American people's representatives on the free soil for Poland's great ally will ring all over the world as a glowing tribute to that heroic nation.

We should be very happy if you would consider our suggestion and let us know what you think of it.

Respectfully submitted.

KLEMENTYNA GONTAC,
President.
ANNA SOFKI, *Secretary.*
MARIA LIS, *Treasurer.*

GMINA 169 ZWIAZKU
NARODOWEGO POLSKIEGO,
Poughkeepsie, N. Y., April 19, 1944.
Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On the 3d of May 1791 the Kingdom of Poland, already reduced by the tripartite partitions, unanimously adopted a new constitution which provided for liberty and equal rights for all men. What other nations and people did with bloodshed, Poland, with her long tradition of tolerance, accomplished by peaceful means.

In these critical times, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that this date be commemorated by us in the United States.

The Poles, always ready to support the democratic cause, were again the first to stand against the enemy of freedom. Again they followed their motto, "For your freedom and for ours."

Could you, sir, on the 3d of May, call this fact to the attention of the American Congress? It is our duty as Americans to remember an ally who though faced with insurmountable obstacles would rather die than surrender. The constitution of the 3d of May is another monument that testifies to the democratic spirit of Poland.

Respectfully submitted.

VINCENT KUKLIN,
President.
LEON RAMUS,
Secretary.

POLISH-AMERICAN CITIZEN'S
CLUB, GROUP OF 368 OF THE
POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE, INC.,
Poughkeepsie, N. Y., April 28, 1944.
Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On the 3d of May 1791, the Kingdom of Poland, already reduced by the tripartite partitions, unanimously adopted a new constitution which provided for liberty and equal rights for all men. What other nations and people did with bloodshed, Poland with her long tradition of tolerance, accomplished by peaceful means.

In these critical times, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that this date be commemorated by us in the United States.

The Poles, always ready to support the democratic cause, were again the first to stand against the enemy of freedom. Again they followed their motto, "For Your Freedom and for Ours."

Could you, sir, on the 3d of May, call this fact to the attention of the Congressmen? It is our duty as Americans to remember an ally who though faced with insurmountable obstacles would rather die than surrender. The constitution of the 3d of May is another monument that testifies to the democratic spirit of Poland.

Respectfully submitted.

VINCENT KUKLIN,
President.

I want to take this occasion, on the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution, including the first bill of rights in Europe, to extend my congratulations and best wishes to the war-stricken, heroic people of Poland and to millions of patriotic and industrious American citizens of Polish origin in this country.

Poland must be preserved as a free and independent nation, otherwise the war against aggressor nations will have been fought in vain and all the fine and noble phrases and diplomatic notes at the outset of the war in Europe in 1939 will be meaningless and scraps of paper.

The creation of greater Poland was largely the work of Woodrow Wilson and the American delegates. It would indeed be a travesty if it should lose its territories and be again partitioned with the consent and approval of the present administration. That it will undergo a fifth partition is obvious, if our State Department remains silent while the deed is being done and turns its head away in order not to see the sacrifice of its own creation.

The responsibility is ours, along with Great Britain and France, as we are partners and Allies in this war against aggression. Long live a free and independent Poland, with its rightful prewar boundaries intact. May it continue to be a great and powerful democratic nation under constitutional government providing freedom, liberty, and pursuit of happiness for all races and creeds. May its people prosper and long enjoy the blessings of peace, after their harrowing sacrifice in the most ruinous and terrible war in modern history.

The Polish people must be left free to choose their own government, and that government must not enter into any deals to sacrifice Polish territory in return for East Prussia, which is all German. If it does, it will mean inevitably a war of liberation in another 20 or 25 years, and Poland will again be the fighting cockpit of Europe.

No people are more entitled to a square deal as a result of World War No. 2 than the long-suffering and war-ravaged people of Poland. We Americans are mindful of the fact that Great Britain and France declared war on Germany when its armies invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, and gave as their reasons for declaring war that they proposed to preserve the territorial integrity and independence of Poland. The gallant Polish Army fought until it was cut to pieces and Poland overrun by the might of the mechanized Nazi armies. Since then Poland has been a conquered nation, enduring for 5 years the agonies of hunger, disease, terror and enslavement. The treatment of the Polish people has been brutal and oppressive, and the persecution of the Jews in Poland has amounted almost to extermination.

Certainly the survivors of the German and Russian occupation are not only entitled to the sympathies of the American people, but of their moral support in trying to preserve their territorial integrity and national independence.

What has become of the Atlantic Charter's pre-war pledge to small and large democracies, including Poland and the Baltic and the Balkan Nations? Is the Atlantic Charter lost, strayed, or stolen, dead or a living corpse? Where is it and what does it mean today toward protecting the national sovereignty and independence of the occupied democratic nations in Europe and permitting them to choose their own government?

What a ghastly tragedy it would be if, after the specific promises and pledges given to the Polish people by Great Britain and France who were applauded for their altruism and unselfish motives by the American people, if Poland were again to be partitioned.

It seems unthinkable that after 5 tragic years of persecution and slavery Poland would be dismembered as if she were a vanquished and enemy Nation. If Poland is forced, against its will, to surrender one-third of its territory to Soviet Russia, it would be merely sowing the seeds of a future war. The Polish people are traditionally a proud and warlike race, and have refused to yield in any way to Nazi terror. They will never surrender any of their territory willingly to Soviet Russia any more than the British could be expected to liquidate their own empire.

In view of the fact that both Great Britain and France guaranteed to uphold the territorial integrity of Poland at the outbreak of the war, the restoration of Poland's independence and its territorial integrity should be one of its main objectives. Just imagine what the reaction would be if Great Britain, France, and the United States were asked to give up one-third of their territory.

I am opposed to a fifth partition of Poland, particularly as the preservation of the territorial integrity of Poland was the origin of the European war. A new partition of Poland would repudiate the very aims, purposes, and high ideals for which the European war was fought. If this evil deed is done, then hundreds of thousands of patriotic Poles will have died in vain and millions of Poles will have endured the misery, human slavery, and starvation of a conquered nation only forced at the point of a bayonet to surrender one-third of its pre-war territory.

I hope that we in America will not become a party to any peace that will partition Poland and turn one-third of its provinces over to Soviet Russia. Millions of Americans of Polish origin, many of whose sons are fighting gallantly in our armed forces, would rightly feel, if Poland is dispoiled and carved up at the peace table, that they have been deceived

and their sons' lives sacrificed along with pre-war pledges.

Long live a free and independent Poland under constitutional government, with liberty, democracy, and justice for all.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOUGLAS] may extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, Poland, an independent republic formally constituted on March 22, 1921, has a history which other countries might well envy. Although she has had time and again to fight to protect her liberties and is still fighting against oppression, her people can well be proud of her history.

Many of her sons have distinguished themselves in both the civil and military fields, and the United States owes much to those Polish patriots who came to this country during our Revolutionary War and helped General Washington win the fight for our independence. The names of Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and many other Polish heroes will live long in our memories as men who loved liberty and were willing to give their all in order to protect it.

Several million Poles reside in the United States, many of whom have been here for generations. They are among the finest of our citizens and, while they preserve their language and customs, as a body they are loyal and faithful to their adopted country. The best evidence of this is the fact that many of them are now serving in our armed forces.

Therefore, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I take this opportunity on this 3d day of May 1944, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, to add my word of tribute to a great country and a great people.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] may extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high privilege to be permitted to say these few words of tribute to the good people of Poland and to the Americans of Polish ancestry on this the one hundred fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

This charter of liberty, adopted by the Polish people on May 3, 1791, was the first written constitution adopted on the Continent of Europe. It served as an inspiration and a hope for the peoples of many lands. Further than that, Mr. Speaker, we can never forget the contribution which those two great Polish leaders, Kosciuszko and Pulaski, made to the winning of our own freedom.

As a special tribute to the work of General Pulaski, we have for many years remembered October 11 as Pulaski Day. As in previous years, during my service in Congress, I did this year introduce House Joint Resolution 261, authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1944, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Although many times partitioned and overrun, the love of freedom still burns in the hearts of the Polish people. They have made a magnanimous contribution to the cause of freedom and as protectors of Christianity. Today the men and women of Poland carry on the fight against dictatorship and aggression. They are fighting under every flag of the United Nations. For more than 4½ years the people of Poland have suffered under the heel of the aggressor, but there still burns that determination and that zeal which will once again make them happy and free.

The Atlantic Charter was hailed by the people of Poland and the Americans of Polish descent as a hope for the future. It gave to them the encouragement and the belief that once again their homeland would be restored and that Poland will rise again. We pray with them that their hopes may be fully realized.

Mr. Speaker, in the district which I have the honor to represent we have many thousands of Americans of Polish descent. They are making their full contribution and more toward the winning of this war. They do this, not as Poles, but as Americans—as patriotic, god-fearing people who are sending their sons and their very all to bring this war to an early and successful end. We salute them and their families on this glorious day in Poland's history.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad of the opportunity to join with my colleagues on this occasion in making some comment in reference to the anniversary of the adoption of a constitution by Poland in 1791.

The dividing line between slavery and human rights is a constitution. Men cease to be chattels and become human beings when they have a voice in the Government of the country where they live, the right to vote and other benefits and advantages which free people enjoy.

We have many Polish people in the United States of America, and they are among our very finest citizens. I am indeed happy to be able to pay this tribute to the valiant people of Poland on their great national holiday in celebration of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, which is comparable to our Fourth of July celebration.

I am pleased as a Representative in Congress from the great State of Minnesota to pay this tribute to Poland and Americans of Polish descent, because they are among the finest people we have in Minnesota. They are Americans whose forefathers came from the fertile plains of Poland.

These Americans of Polish descent are businessmen, bankers, and farmers and they are thrifty, honest, and law-abiding citizens, whose zeal and patriotism for the American Constitution is unexcelled as through their veins flows the blood of their freedom-loving Polish forefathers.

POLISH CONSTITUTION OF MAY 3

On this day of May 3, when we all pay tribute to gallant Poland of the past and of the present, I would like to stress one particular point, namely, that Americans and Poles have much in common. They have fought for freedom and for its preservation in the past, and they are fighting for it now. They did not limit themselves to the thought of their own liberty and their own country. Today they are shedding their blood side by side on all battle fronts of the world, so as to make the world safe for democracy. They love liberty and the possession of individual rights guaranteed to them by their constitutions. To this love of liberty must be added the love of God; time and again through the ages their histories have proven it.

Wherever liberty and justice were at stake, the sons of Poland have been found. The contributions of Kosciuszko and Pulaski are so well known to all Americans that it is superfluous to recall them in detail.

Poland's territories once again have been conquered, but its military defeat only served to strengthen its love for freedom and its undaunted national spirit. The people of Poland, whether at home or abroad, are either actually engaged in fighting the enemy or preparing themselves to do so at the earliest opportunity, which now seems to be just around the corner. Poles have an indomitable determination to preserve their independence, a will to fight for it, a capacity to suffer and endure hardships which no enemy can crush. During the present war the struggle of the Polish nation for liberty cost Poland millions of victims—still she fights on, and will continue to do so until the enemy is destroyed and oppressed nations freed once more.

Though the people of Warsaw are not allowed to congregate on this May 3, their national holiday, you may rest assured that they will gladly risk their lives to attend the gatherings in churches, in homes, in various hiding places or in the woods in order to commemorate their constitution, for the light of freedom cannot be extinguished among those whose souls are free.

The Polish Constitution signed in 1791, 2 years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, was an event of general human significance and created a system founded on modern conceptions. It was based on the principle that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people. The constitution introduced reforms to the advantage of the middle class and the peasants. They were granted a number of rights which they did not previously possess and which had been the exclusive privilege of the nobility and the gentry. They were permitted to acquire landed property. On the other hand the nobility were granted the right to engage in trade and industry without losing

their status of nobles. Thus was removed the obstacle to the fusion of the two classes which had existed for several centuries. This Polish Constitution was created by patriots for a freedom-loving people, and it is the symbol of a nation which though many times defeated was never conquered.

We are all familiar with Poland's great contributions to the world's culture and civilization. We cannot help but admire the work of people like Mikolaj Kopernik, Marie Curie-Sklodowska, Henryk Sienkiewicz, Fryderyk Chopin, Ignace Paderewski, and innumerable others.

As to the contribution of Poles to our own American life, numerous examples should be cited. Dr. Kurciusz founded the first high school in the United States, while Leopold Boech founded the first technical university. Olbracht Zaborowski was one of the first judges on the territory of New Jersey. Wlodzimierz Krzyzanowski was the first Governor of Alaska. Four hundred Polish settlers helped to lay the foundation for the United States of America in Jamestown. Five thousand Poles fought in the American Civil War.

As to the present war, who has not heard about the glorious deeds of the Polish Air Force in England and their participation in the Battle of Britain? The Polish Navy has been fighting alongside the United Nations navies since the outbreak of the present war. In the Middle East, a Polish force of 75,000 men fully trained and equipped is ready for action. The soldiers of the Polish Carpathian Division are now fighting the bloody Italian battle side by side with their comrades from other United Nations. And so, in the underground, on the ground, in the air and on the sea Poland fights on. On this third of May let us pay tribute to its people.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] and others for the splendid observance of this anniversary date of the signing of the Polish Constitution. Poland has shown her friendship for America in many ways. I am sure that the American people sympathize most sincerely with the Polish people in this the most crucial period in their history. The Polish are a liberty loving people. They know what liberty and freedom mean. We Americans, and all of us in Congress send them our most cordial felicitations on this great day.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, today, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of Poland's Constitution, it is proper and fitting that the House of Representatives pay tribute to a heroic people.

Since the dawn of our history America and Poland have been bound by ties of similar ideals and aspirations. Many men of the Polish race have given their lives to make America a land of freedom. Poland's great national holiday is being celebrated today and is proof that the love of liberty, humanity, equality, and a deep sense of democracy are inherent in this great race. The Polish people have always been in the forefront, and aside from the fields of music, literature, and science, one could recite name after name of those who have been leaders in their chosen fields of endeavor. Wherever Polish people are found, here or abroad, they are united in a firm hope that their gallant Nation will rise again and become a free and independent state, worthy of their great past.

It is gratifying to me today to join with many Members of this House in sending greetings to the people and pleading to them our sincere prayers that Poland will again be free. Poland is resolved that when this war is ended they will be free and independent and enjoy the full freedom for a heritage. Poland will live and take her place among the leading nations of the world.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, this 3d day of May is a sacred day in the history of Poland, as it was on this day, May 3, 1791, that the Poles adopted a liberal constitution. This constitution, like our own only 2 years older, represents a genuine landmark in the long struggle of mankind to achieve free institutions. Today, with Poland in the cruelest of bondage, it is particularly fitting that we commemorate the great past and look hopefully forward to the future of the people of Poland freed by her sons and by the United Nations which are her allies.

Others better qualified than I will testify to the glorious history of that freedom-loving people who helped in the establishment of our own Republic, and fought in the Old World to free Belgium, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Turkey, and in the New for a free Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela. We all remember very vividly that day of infamy, now almost 5 years ago, when Hitler's legions made their incredible and unprovoked descent upon Polish scil. From that day to this, murder has stalked the Continent of Europe.

As a lawyer, I rejoice that despite all this violence under which the whole Continent of Europe has writhed in misery, the minds of the cultured Polish people continue to be on law and the things of the intellect. The third Polish faculty in Britain opened on April 24, in Oxford. It owed its existence to the initiative of Polish lawyers, to the support of the Polish Government, and the generous help of the heads of the oldest university in the United Kingdom. President Raczkiewicz, Prime Minister Mikolajczyk, and members of the Polish Government were present at the celebration which took place in an atmosphere of sincere Anglo-Polish friendship. When the idea of opening the faculty was first initiated Minister Kaczynski formed an organizational committee to which he invited all Polish law professors now in England. Stefan Glaser, professor of Polish criminal law, was chosen dean of this faculty. The Vice Chancelor of Oxford University, Sir David Ross, and the dean of the law faculty supported the Polish initiative.

The Polish law faculty has full Polish academic rights. President Raczkiewicz gave Professor Glaser the right of directorship and of giving out diplomas at graduation. Polish professors will be lecturers. In case of absence of Polish professors, British professors will take over, also lecturing on English law and social teachings. The program is identical with that of the Polish University but the first term will be shortened owing to exceptional circumstances. The term begins on April 28. Most students were present at the opening ceremony. There are about 50 of them, but it is expected that their number will rise to 70, including some women. The costs of the course are covered by the Polish Ministry of Education, and it is free to the students.

The opening ceremony in the famous Sheldonian Theater was inaugurated by an address by the vice chancellor, Sir David Ross, who praised Polish courage, saying that Polish forces as well as a Polish underground continue to fight the enemy, and reminding his listeners that Poland has been suffering longer than any other country, that history never saw any country carry such burdens. German persecution of Polish educational life resulted in the closing of all universities. He spoke about the great Polish scientists, Copernicus, Marie Curie, and said that Polish spirit remained unbroken. The Polish Government made the right decision when it opened the medicine faculty at Edinburgh, and was just as right in opening at Oxford the Polish law faculty, whose object will be to prepare workers for the Polish administration. Sir David emphasized the fact that the arrival of foreign students at an English university enhanced friendship and mutual understanding, and closed by saying that he was hopefully looking to the day when the ruined Polish universities would be rebuilt.

Prime Minister Mikolajczyk, addressing the law faculty only last Thursday night, April 27, said:

> It will be necessary after the war to teach the generation depraved by the Nazi doctrine both Christian ethics and law, but it will have to be a law conforming with the English conception of justice, so different from the German—a law conforming with the divine justice of Christian morals freely accepted by the people and not imposed by force. We will have to do away entirely with the German doctrine of law based on force and violence, law which can be imposed both on the citizens of one's country and on other nations without regard to religion or ethics. The Germans used to justify by what they called "law" their acts of robbery and murder, thus desecrating the very idea of law and justice. After the war we will have to

restore the law to its former glory and universal respect, cleansing it of all that might be left of the doctrine of "might is right" turning it to the service of the democratic ideal of justice and respect for individual rights of human beings. The United Nations will be faced after the war with the gigantic task of building new laws, founded on stronger and wider principles than before and inspired by ethical considerations and the idea of free consent. I trust that Polish legal thought may also make contribution to this great work for mankind's welfare.

As I had, myself, the honor to be at one time a student at Oxford University, I take particular pride in the realization that this ancient home of intellectual freedom is true to its own tradition, nurturing a Polish University in its own gray quadrangles which symbolize the mystical union between the past of England and her future.

I am glad also to call the attention of the House to the fact that the University of Maine in my own State has had on its faculty a distinguished professor of the University of Cracow. Upon such fraternities of scholarship we must rest the hope of better days to come.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, today, upon this one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, my pride in the contribution which the Polish people have made to the development of this country, impels me to say a few words about these people.

We have Members of Polish extraction upon both sides of the House of Representatives. Their record in the House, as well as the record of the great number of people of Polish descent throughout the country, proves that they are in the vanguard of every movement to foster democracy in this country. Many of the sons and daughters of Poland are serving this country in the field of battle, fighting for that democracy which all the peoples of the Allied Nations hope to attain at the end of this war.

Their sacrifices have earned for them the commendation of every champion of democracy.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

POLAND'S FREEDOM

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is my desire to give expression about the greatest virtue of Free Poland on this 3d day of May, for which time has been set aside in the House under special order to commemorate the Polish Constitution.

Since the inception of man in God's image, who was possessed of consciousness and intellect, the progress of the human race has been dependent upon his complete freedom in the exercise of these faculties.

The pathway of human progress has been rough. In those times when it showed an upward trend in the moral and spiritual development of man, an absolute analysis would indicate it was the freedom of man that made this progress possible.

In the dark days of our own Nation when the fundamental principle was being written into the Constitution that all just powers shall be derived from the consent of the governed, so too was Poland as a nation contemporary in that same effort. Poland, situated as it was between strong monarchies, suffered from aggression and partition as a result. It is indeed important that its spirit, responsible for the founding of its Constitution wherein all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people, has not suffered in proportion to the lands and the Nation. It is my profound conviction that the spirit responsible for the Constitution has in all probability been enhanced through this suffering.

There will come a day when this beacon light of a free people may indeed illuminate the way for those people who have been aggressors against Poland in the past.

I am further convinced that the great United States can not rest in the security of its freedom so long as a nation like Poland suffers through its absence.

Of all the great issues involved in this war, the one most promiment in my mind is that complete freedom and the right of its own progress shall be restored in the fullest measure to the great nation of Poland and her people.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMERICA PAYS TRIBUTE TO THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy indeed to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to one of the great nations of the world, Poland, in its celebration of its one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of its independence under its constitution. It will thus be seen that this great people in the Old World has for over a century and a half been plodding the same road with us in holding up to the world the torch of freedom. Through its long and eventful history this great nation has stood steadfastly in support of liberty and the freedom of its people to be the masters of themselves. It is true that through this long period of a century and a half the Polish people have been viciously attacked, overrun by invading hordes of neighboring countries, and their liberties taken from them, but never have they hesitated to stand adamant in defense of their freedom and their country.

We in America owe much to this stanch liberty-loving nation. Many of the citizens of America are sprung from Polish stock and the blood of America has been enriched by the virile liberty-loving people of this great nation overseas.

Once again Poland is suffering under the heel of the invader. The great heart of America goes out to them in their hour of trial. I beseech you, my colleagues, to join with me in formulating a program that will ultimately result in restoring to Poland the liberty for which she has fought so many times and which she prizes so highly. When the smoke of the battles of this World War shall have cleared away and the representatives of the Allied Nations sit in victory around the peace table may we not hope that Poland will be restored to her full sovereign rights under her constitution, so that she may stand through the centuries that are to follow, fighting with her head erect for liberty not alone for her own people but for all the peoples of the world.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include the following editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of today:

POLAND'S 3D OF MAY

Today is the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of one of the most extraordinary political innovations in history. On May 3, 1791, a great nation suddenly and bloodlessly transformed its entire political structure, undoing errors that had caused repeated national disasters and replacing an antiquated govermental structure with one which, even today, might be considered progressive and enlightened in character.

This amazing transformation was the constitution of the 3d of May. By it Poland freed itself of an antiquated constitutional system that had become unworkable and had reduced the most powerful state of eastern Europe in medieval times to impotence and semianarchy. This new constitution converted Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy, with ministerial responsibility and parliaments elected on a broad franchise. All invidious class distinctions were abolished, religious toleration was established, and every citizen was declared equal before the law. This forward-looking achievement was hailed by contemporary political students everywhere as a model of wisdom and moderation.

Unfortunately, it came too late. Poland's tragedy was that, in an age when the rest of continental Europe was tending toward centralized despotism, from the France of Louis XIV to the Russia of Peter the Great, Poland was becoming an easy-going, decentralized "republic" or "commonwealth" wherein the nobles and gentry held the purse-strings, dominated and wrangled in the legislature and reduced the executive to a cipher. This political impotence had led to repeated foreign aggressions, culminating in the first partition of 1772, whereby Poland's neighbors, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, each sliced off large portions of the country.

This grim warning inspired a patriotic revival and a series of reform measures which culminated in the constitution of 1791. Unhappily, the very measure of this success precipitated the ultimate catastrophe. The alarm of Poland's despotic neighbors at the prospect of a reformed and regenerated Poland was heightened by fear of the French revolution, which had already broken out. Quick action was decided on in Saint Petersburg, Berlin, and Vienna to scotch the Polish danger and assure the garnering of the prospective spoils. So the new Poland was overwhelmed and the country itself disappeared from the map with two more partitions in the years 1793 and 1795, not to regain its independence until after World War No. 1.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], may extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, the first in continental Europe to recognize the political rights of the common people. The significance of the Polish Constitution is more impressive today than ever before. The fact that Poland subscribed to these democratic principles at that time, aroused the suspicions of her autocratic neighbors and for the time being the Polish people suffered hardships because of the principles embodied in their constitution.

We recall that in 1939 when these high principles were at stake Poland with the odds against her had the courage to disregard the prevailing policy of appeasement amongst other nations, and proclaimed to the world—"That above life itself she held dearer her honor as a nation."

History will record how Poland set an example for the United Nations later on to follow.

I have thousands of Polish families in my congressional district. I am proud to count them among my friends and companions. They bring honor to any community where they choose to live. Many of our outstanding lawyers, doctors, merchants, businessmen, bankers are Polish boys of the second or third generation in this country.

In checking up the volunteers that went to our armed services before Pearl Harbor, I find that in my congressional district, the Polish boys were among the top-ranking groups—that is, the percent of Polish boys that enlisted was very high. It is nothing unusual to find Polish families having, three, four, or five boys in the service.

I look forward to seeing a great Polish country taking its place among the nations of the earth once more and this time we hope she will not be disturbed for centuries to come.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Government of our Nation and our Constitution stands before the court of the nations of the world on this day which marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the constitution of Poland and says reverently and sincerely, "Poland, we salute you." Mindful of the tragic fate of millions of her people, conscious of our flaming fight for the resuscitation of the world ideal of freedom of individual pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness, proud of our friendship for the great nation of Pulaski, Kosciuszko, Paderewski, Madame Curie, and myriad others of Polish character and greatness, the American people suffer with Poland in her suffering, but enjoy the same intractable, unbreakable will to drive from this earth forever the tyrannical monsters who, in September of 1939 with satanic power and inhuman destruction, drove across the Polish border singing their hymns of hate. Then, as today, America grieves with Poland.

America and Poland enjoy reciprocal faith in their national effort to regain for mankind the spirit of Christianity for which Poland has so grievously suffered and bled. The symbol of the Cross is the reality of her national crucifixion between the enemies of peace on earth. Humbly America accepts the privilege of sharing the burden of this war along sorrowful roadways to the glory of a world at peace when the fruition of American and Polish national hopes will be realized. Americans and Poles, stirred by the similarity of idealism, protesting Christian militant vengeance upon international murderers today as in the centuries past, join hands in solemn unison, to prevent world enslavement under tyranny and to release the bloody bands of crushing despots from the subjugated peoples of the world. May the God of Justice guide us as nations in our war for all humanity.

For 5 long years of the present global conflict Poland has been buffeted and bruised, plundered and pillaged, robbed and destroyed—but Poland has never lost face or spirit or heart. And once again she will arise from the ashes of enemy fires to that triumph which is only possible through the force of the fortitude and character of the brave people of Poland. Men and women of Poland may die as sacrifices to the grandeur of future peace, but the strength of the Polish national will to live, will print indelibly on the heart of the world, that her sacrifice were not in vain. Christianity with Polish help will conquer today and tomorrow hordes of barbarism whenever the gates of hell let loose such creatures of despotic death.

May 3, 1944, marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland—her Independence Day. Previously I have spoken from this floor in commemoration of the anniversary of this day of days for the Polish people. Then as now tribute, eloquent and deserved, was paid the people of Poland, not only for their magnificent battles for their home and hopes, but for the immeasurable contribution men and women of Poland have bequeathed to the stability of the world and the greatness of America. Ever a brave, liberty and religious loving people, their influence in the industrial, financial and cultural development of our Nation has been an inspirational example for the men and women and children of America. The roaring guns pounding against Warsaw were answered in echo by American reverberations of sadness and sympathy for Poland. The heartstrings of our Nation were quickened by the courageous defense of that citadel into a determination irresolute that Polish sovereignty as a free and independent nation among the nations of the world will be reestablished and maintained. The picture of the mechanized army of the Hun overriding the defenseless plains of that peace-loving country remain fresh in our minds and the unequal forces of destruction which override the quiet homeland of the Poles have left only the conviction in our hearts that the desecration of Poland shall be avenged. Perhaps, on previous occasion, when we have joined as we do today in this evidence of mutual respect and admiration for the country of Poland, a salutation from all Americans, irrespective of racial origin or religious convictions, we have overindulged in wishful thinking as to the time of the redemption of Poland. Tomorrow has ticked away by seconds into years. Our thoughts then were, however, as sincere and sure as our present-day knowledge that the hour of Polish deliverance is at hand.

America approaches invasion day with faith and courageous trepidation. We know that only the blood of our sons will wash the scourge of nazi-ism and totalitarianism and communism from this earth. We know also American blood will purify the peace—and in the purification the tired war-torn world will find rejuvenation and rest. Then will Poland and America again clasp fervent hands in the victorious consummation of the greatest human struggle of all time for the ideals which have their source in God Himself and in the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of Poland which we honor in memory here today.

Tragically, the history of Poland reminds mankind of the ever-recurring destruction of the innocent when the forces of false gods array themselves against religion and a true philosophy of life. The wars, and repeated onslaughts which have razed and rerazed Poland, have taught the lesson of the futility of war as the mechanism for arbitration of international dispute or the means of satiating greed and rapacious desire for power. What more fervent prayer could pass human lip than the aspiration that mankind has learned the lesson—war does not pay. Poland today, her colleges and schools in shambles, her churches in ruins, her literature and her music but sweet memory of yesterday, stands as a preeminent example of the cruelty of force and the barbarism of war. May the mind of America comprehend the teaching of this holocaust and the will of America be strengthened never to weaken that it may never happen again.

Down through the ages, men of Poland and America have struggled for the safeguarding of the inalienable rights of the individual to live in peace with his neighbor. Governments of both Nations were conceived as the instrumentalities through which happiness by common effort might be victorious over misery and suffering. Poland and America have recognized the sacredness of the individual and have sought to live under a system of life by consent of the living. Tyranny, even benevolent, has been shunned. Faith in man has woven its national imprint into Polish and American character. Poland and America believe in men and women. Upon this belief rests free government, the prime objective of the hopes of mankind in their

continuing struggle for happiness. Poland has recognized this principle of life of freemen, and in her sorrowing way has developed nobility and dynamic zeal for good. Poland has recognized that the preservation of individual liberty is the price of social security. Poland has never forgotten God.

America is fighting to the death for the very ideals which have made Poland great, and having learned from Poland the basic causes of her greatness as a nation, America today, when liberty in Poland is nonexistent and freedom from slavery, a mockery, pledges Poland the reburnishing of her national shield to shine again in the sunlight of international amity. The day approaches when Poland and America will be together once more in a victory of justice under God, where children will live and laugh and parents be sure and proud of the sanctity of home, the foundation of society.

Poland, we salute you.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members so desiring may extend their own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have devoted 2 hours of this day, when the tax bill is to be taken up by the House, should demonstrate to the country and to the world the high regard in which the Congress of the United States holds the Polish people, not only those in our own midst but also those who live in their native land and who are now undergoing all of the vicissitudes incident to a barbaric war.

Grave problems will confront the Polish people and in their hour of travail we must remember that the brave Poles under John Sobreski saved Christendom at Vienna, and later gave to us some of her bravest sons when we were fighting with our backs to the wall against British tyranny.

Minnesota is proud of her sons and daughters of Polish origin. They are a fine industrious, thrifty and God-fearing people who have contributed greatly to the development of our great State and country.

Americans of all religious and political beliefs are determined that in the peace that is to be written Poland will not be sacrificed to international greed and cupidity. Poland is our friend and we must be her friend in her hour of despair.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the year 1791 was historic. George Washington was giving direction to the affairs of this Nation. The Second Congress under our own Constitution was patiently laboring to give subsistence and sound pattern to our own Government. Notable men sat in that Congress. In the Senate one found James Monroe, Aaron Burr, Roger Sherman, Oliver Ellsworth, and men of like statue who were devoting themselves to the great experience in human freedom.

In this body there served such men as Jonathan Trumbull, Abraham Baldwin, William Pinckney, Fisher Ames, Frederick Muhlenberg, and James Madison.

That year was historic in another sense. It was the year in which the Bill of Rights became a part of our Constitution. That constituted a testament of freedom and a salute to the robustness and virility of the people of a young Nation who set such high store on the meaning of freedom and representative government. It was a historic year for still another reason. It was the year in which Poland launched its constitution. Today we observe the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of that event.

For more than a century and a half that great yet humble country has undergone the pain and tragedy of partition, dismemberment, and invasion.

There is, however, a quality of the spirit that can resist all the shocks of time. The spirit of Poland could not be dismembered. The spiritual virility of its people could not be destroyed. The traditions of the Polish people could not be partitioned. Their determination in the cause of freedom could not be dimmed or diminished.

That great spirit has persisted from then until now. It is as fresh and vital in 1944 as it was in 1791. It is this vital spirit which is the foundation of greatness, the cohesive force of freedom and the light of assurance to freemen everywhere.

How timely and inspiring that today we join in the fellowship of Polish patriots in all corners of the earth as the commemorate of the day that will yet mark their independence and cause the sunlight of the new freedom to shine upon them.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, a period is being used today in the House of Representatives in commemoration of an event of historic importance that occurred 153 years ago. So important was the event to those immediately involved that it is celebrated year after year in various nations of the world where the Polish people and their ancestors have emigrated to establish new homes.

That millions of Polish descent consider this day to be the national holiday of their mother country, and that they continue to honor it by appropriate observances here and elsewhere, is most remarkable. For Poland existed as an independent state under its constitution of May 3, 1791, only 4 years, after which it ceased to exist as such. Then for 123 years the Polish people were under the rule of others. Not until 1921, after the First World War, did Poland rise again under a constitution of her own choice. Then, after an independent existence of about 18 years, she was again invaded and overwhelmed by the forces of neighboring countries.

These facts emphasize the lesson which the Polish people have impressed upon the liberty-loving nations of the earth. Only the unquenchable spirit of liberty and the desire for freedom that a century of foreign domination could not take away, can explain the exercises of this day and the significance of the third of May to the Polish people everywhere.

If history in appraising the past has correctly informed us that we are indebted to ancient Rome for our law; to ancient Greece for much of our culture, and to early Palestine for our religion, is it too much to assert that we are indebted to the people of Polish blood for an example of fidelity to the principles of government under a written constitution that remains unparalleled in all the annals of mankind? Were there no other contributions that could be mentioned, if Polish blood had been spilled in no other worthy cause, this alone would entitle Poland to our everlasting gratitude and praise.

But this contribution, significant as it is, by no means stands alone. The history of many countries including our own contains the names of Polish patriots who participated in the struggles for liberty. In our own cause, Polish talents were expended and Polish blood was shed.

We must not forget that first day of September in 1939 when the Hitler forces attacked their Polish neighbor without any declaration of war. We must not forget the overwhelming power that was hurled against a liberty-loving people that desired to live in peace with their neighbors. That people treasured so greatly the independent existence which they had so briefly enjoyed that they were unwilling to surrender it without a struggle even when resistance seemed hopeless.

When we consider this brave people, let us not forget the tragic price that has been paid for their resistance. It is not pleasant to read about the loss of possessions; the separation and deportation of families and the cruel murder of millions of defenseless people. The world will recoil in horror at the recital when it can be fully told. Nor must we forget the valuable time for preparation that was allowed to the present Allied Nations by the resistance of Poland.

There are features so tragic in the history of the Polish people that we marvel at their continued devotion to the ideals and beliefs expressed in their constitution of 1791. Four times their country was partitioned by conquering and neighboring nations Four times were the boundaries changed and the inhabitants placed under the domination of different rulers and peoples. And now after the crowning tragedy when the country had begun to function again under a constitution, after the murder and deportation of many of its people, it continues to resist and continues to cherish the hope of liberty and independent existence.

It is difficult to imagine a parallel case in modern history. It is difficult to point to a nation with a history more tragic and it is difficult to find a people who are fighting the enemy more desperately from day to day in this present conflict. Poles are fighting on many fronts of this war. They are fearless sailors and

intrepid fighters in the air. They are on foot with the infantry and on horse with the cavalry. Everywhere they make their presence known—spurred to deeds of valor by their love of country and by burning hatred of a foe that has shown no mercy to their kinsmen and that has despoiled their homeland of its products and its treasures.

With their tradition of liberty, it is not strange that the Poles who have come to our country have become owners of property, believers in stability, and stanch upholders of our Federal Constitution. These attributes can be observed among the Polish population of Delaware, where almost their first objective is the ownership of a home. Once acquired, their homes are maintained with great care and pride.

Our own Constitution is the great unifying force in our country today. It will live only as long as it has popular support. May our devotion to its principles be as constant and unyielding as the shining example which the Polish people have shown to us and to the world.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying my tribute to the Polish Nation and the Polish people. If any nation has been tried in the fire of suffering and found true that nation is Poland. Her people were the first to feel the Nazi scourge; and probably the Nazi heel has been heavier upon Poland than upon any other part of Europe. The extent of her suffering therefore should be the measure of the honor which we pay to the Polish Nation on this anniversary of the formation of her constitution on May 3, 1791. May Poland's day of deliverance come soon, and may the deep religious spirit of her people, the cooperatives which have been formed among the people to meet their economic needs, and the stalwart nationhood which has held the Polish people together through the trials of the centuries be the means of building for the future of her children a happier Poland than the past has ever seen.

THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is peculiarly appropriate that we express, today, our admiration for the Polish people, and that we renew our expressions of sympathy and understanding for those of that great race who are today—but only today, as time runs—under the heel of the German invader.

Today is celebrated the occasion of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, adopted but a few years after our own. May 3, 1791, was a great day for the Poles, as it always will be. The Polish Constitution was a charter of freedom, of liberty. While physical liberty is today submerged in Poland, this is but of temporary moment. But the Polish Constitution, its vital spirit, lives, and Poles, everywhere are strengthened and invigorated in the hope, the certainty, rather, that under a free and independent Poland they will carry forward their great record of accomplishment.

I want to take this occasion to pay homage to Poland, to pay tribute to her great people. Let them be brave, for they will emerge from their present oppression and again take a great part in the family of nations.

And it is appropriate, I think, that I bring to the notice of the Members of the House the proclamation by Governor Dewey, of New York, on the commemoration of May 3 as a great day in Polish history. It is as follows:

For almost 6 years the people of Poland have suffered an appalling martyrdom under the heel of the Nazis. When their country was invaded they resisted against overwhelming odds with a valor which has compelled the admiration and respect of the entire civilized world.

As part of the United Nations the fighting men of Poland have fought with their traditional bravery and military skill in the same cause as the armed forces of the United States. On the home front men and women of Polish origin are working hard and making great sacrifices to support the war effort of our country.

On May 3 the Polish people will commemorate a notable event in their history—the adoption of a liberal constitution in 1791. In consideration of all these facts it is fitting that we should join our fellow Americans of Polish blood in doing honor to the great traditions of the people of Poland.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, hereby proclaim May 3 as Poland Day, and I urge all the citizens of New York State to display the flag of Poland side by side with our own national emblem to show our sympathy and comradeship.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol, in the city of Albany, this 14th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1944.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] PAUL E. LOCKWOOD,
Secretary to the Governor.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1944, marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of one of the immortal and imperishable documents of all history; it was on May 3, 1791, that the Polish Constitution was signed, and thus became the first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a European nation, in that it recognized the fundamental and basic principle of democracy that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." The Polish Constitution expressed a guaranty of freedom of religion and provided for a division of authority among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government, thus paralleling the Constitution of the United States, which had come into being less than 3 years prior to the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

Sorrowfully, history records that no expression of a freedom-loving people has ever been subjected to more severe and cruel tests than has this great Polish document, which through a period of 153 years of trial, frustration, and defeat still glows like a torch aflame in the long, dark night of oppression and heartbreaking disappointment, ever a challenge to its enemies, whose most vicious and demoniacal efforts have failed to extinguish it, and always an inspiration to the brave and indomitable people of Poland, who for generations have clung to it, ever hopeful of realizing its objectives and enjoying its blessings.

The spirit of Polish freedom can neither be conquered nor partitioned out of existence—over and over again have Poland's enemies learned that unspeakable suffering, cruel and horrible atrocities, or sustained and crushing defeat cannot break the brave and determined will of a freedom-loving people—Poland today, true to her great traditions, fights on toward freedom.

Again in 1939 Poland made her choice on the side of freedom—while other nations submitted without resistance to the conquest of Hitler and the march of the Nazi hordes over Europe, no Quislings were found in Poland; instead her brave people chose to be the first to stand up and fight against the impact of the mechanized military Nazi machine—the first to engage it in battle, courageously sacrificing the blood of its people against hopeless military odds but definitely placing the initial obstacle in the path of the Nazi iron military monster and thus forcing the altering of the ambitious cut and dried plans of Hitler and his gangsters for a territorial grab without resistance or sacrifice of German blood. Poland's losses were appalling, her sufferings immeasurable, the Nation lay in ruins—Poland was partitioned again—but Poland's sons are still fighting inside and outside of Poland. Her Navy continued in the struggle, and today actively fighting in the ground and air forces of the United Nations are Poland's sons, while in all of German occupied Europe there is no more effective underground operating against the enemy than that of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, Poland has won her place at the peace table; if there is to be a just and lasting world peace the claims, objectives, and aspirations of Poland must be recognized. World peace plans must contain not only a guaranty of the freedom and integrity of Poland as an independent nation but, because of her geographical position, a perpetual shield of active and effective protection against the future aggression of her rights or the invasion of her territory.

We as Americans, having achieved the blessings of independence, liberty, and freedom, thoroughly understand and appreciate the aims of Poland. As Americans we salute the Polish people.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX BILL OF 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 524, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the

individual income tax, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

This rule makes in order H. R. 4646, which is a bill to simplify income-tax returns, and is, I believe, favored by all. The rule provides for 2 days' general debate, to be confined to the bill, committee amendments only, and, after debate shall have been concluded, the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule. In other words, this is exactly the kind of rule under which the last tax bill came to the floor. The proposed legislation when enacted will accomplish these objectives:

First. To relieve the great majority of taxpayers from the necessity of computing their income tax.

Second. To reduce the number of tax computations.

Third. To simplify the return form.

Fourth. To decrease the number of persons required to file declarations of estimated tax.

Fifth. To eliminate some of the difficulties and uncertainties in the making of estimates required for declarations.

It is a closed rule. The Committee on Rules, including myself, has been against closed rules, but in this instance we have before us a bill that I am pleased to say has been unanimously reported by the great Ways and Means Committee, which is something, indeed, unusual; moreover, we all know from painful experience that it is impossible to consider a tax bill under a rule that permits other than committee amendments. Consequently I feel that after mature deliberation by the legislative committee this must be a sound bill, especially in view of the fact that not a single member of that committee has objected to any of its provisions and we have, for the first time that I recall, a unanimous report from the Committee on Ways and Means on a tax bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman speaks about the question of a closed rule. Has it not been the habit and the custom of this great committee, to which the gentleman refers, to bring in closed rules on its bills?

Mr. SABATH. No; the gentleman is mistaken, with the exception of tax bills.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I say, on tax bills.

Mr. SABATH. Yes. The Committee on Rules, after hearing the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the ranking majority member of that committee, and minority members of that committee, including Mr. KNUTSON, came to the conclusion that it could not do other than bring in a closed rule. One Member—the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]—spoke before our committee against a closed rule. All members of the legislative committee heard by the Committee on Rules joined in a request for a closed rule. Generally, I do not favor closed rules, but in considering a tax bill that is the only rule that is workable. We older Members have, with pain and dissatisfaction, witnessed unsuccessful efforts to write a tax bill on the floor of the House. Such a bill, if subjected to amendments, other than those of the committee, would conflict and injuriously affect the general revenue code. After hearing committee witnesses and reading the splendid committee report I unhesitatingly came to the conclusion that no Member, without having been present in the deliberations of the Committee on Ways and Means, would be in a position to improve and make this a better bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Were there open hearings held on this bill so that Members could appear in open session and be heard? I understand that these hearings were in executive session. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SABATH. There was no objection to that procedure by the minority members of that committee. I know some of these gentleman who are members of the Committee on Ways and Means, especially the ranking member of the minority, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], and I know that he would be the very first one who would object to any bill unless he was satisfied that it deserved the favorable consideration and the vote of the membership of the House; and he joined with the majority in the request for a closed rule. We do not hear any complaint by any member of the legislative committee. That is very convincing with me.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman from Illinois think that the last tax bill the House considered could have been improved had the House been able to amend it?

Mr. SABATH. I doubt it very much. It has been my experience during all the years I have served here that it is impossible to write a satisfactory tax bill on the floor of the House. We have created these committees, and the members of them are supposed to be experts and give due consideration to all relevant factors and to the requests of all interested in proposed legislation. I feel that a Member who was not present at the committee deliberations and did not have the benefit of the information that came to that committee, despite the fact that he is sincere and honest in believing that some changes should properly be made in the bill, would not be in a better position than that great committee, composed of so many outstanding Members of the House, to know what should be carried in the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. It might be proper at this point to call attention to the fact that we had no request for hearings on this bill. The demand for simplification was so great that we thought the committee was justified in going ahead and working with its various staffs the Internal Revenue, the Treasury, and its own staff, to bring out a bill that really would simplify the tax structure and would be generally agreeable to the country.

Answering the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN], he was not here back in 1933, I think, when his party took control of the House—or was it earlier?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is referring to the 1932 act, I believe.

Mr. KNUTSON. The 1932 act; yes. Then the majority, the party that had just come into control, had been denouncing the gag rules of the Republicans so long that they felt the only thing they could do was to bring the revenue bill into the House under an open rule. The House proceeded to rewrite the bill, and it was necessary to send the bill back to the committee. From that time on, the gentleman's own party has embraced the doctrine that gag rules are necessary in the consideration of revenue bills.

Mr. SABATH. As I have stated, this rule gives the Committee on Ways and Means the right to offer any amendment. I presume any gentleman who is familiar with the bill and who might have in mind that the bill should be changed or improved in some way, has a right to take it up with the committee, and that committee, as in the past, will be ready to accord the gentleman a hearing and, if they find his proposal is meritorious, will no doubt offer an amendment to cure a defect in the bill, if such there be.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. McLEAN. I see that the resolution provides that general debate shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 days. Can the gentleman give me the definition of the Committee on Rules as to what consitutes a day?

Mr. SABATH. The entire legislative day. I know what the gentleman has in mind. I presume he has in mind that we have taken up 2 hours today under a special order of the House.

Mr. McLEAN. Two hours and a half.

Mr. SABATH. I understand that in case demand is made for additional debate of 2 hours the Committee on Ways and Means will ask for an additional 2

hours after the 2 days have been consumed by debate. However, there is not very much demand for time because this is a unanimous committee report.

Mr. McLEAN. May I ask the chairman of the committee if that is a correct statement?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I understand from the chairman that he has received very few requests for time up to now. Several members of the committee have indicated they would be glad to speak in explanation of the bill, but he has received very few requests for time in general debate.

Mr. SABATH. Everybody will receive as much time as he desires, as I understand.

Mr. McLEAN. The statement of the gentleman from Tennessee hardly answers my inquiry. It is this: If there is a demand for time, indicating that it will be necessary to carry the debate over to allow for the 2 hours and 30 minutes that have been used today, will it be agreeable to the managers of the bill to do so?

Mr. COOPER. I feel sure that I can speak for the members of the committee on this side, including our distinguished chairman, by saying that if there are sufficient requests for time to require more than the balance of this day and tomorrow, a request will be made to extend the general debate for a reasonable time on Friday to make up for the time that was taken up under the special order today. I understand that that would be agreeable to the leadership of the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We first discussed with the leadership of the House as to when we would bring up this bill and the amount of time that would probably be required for general debate. As far as I know, it was not known to me or to the members of the committee generally that the special order set for today would take up 2 hours. It was supposed we would have 2 full days for debate. As chairman of the committee, however, I may say that if more time is needed in addition to tomorrow, although very few requests for time have been made so far, and I have received practically none, I shall be glad to cooperate and do everything I can to extend the time so that each Member may have an opportunity to speak on the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. I notice what the gentleman said about being sure that if someone had a proposal in reference to this bill the committee would hear him. Is it not true that this bill was reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means without any public hearings?

Mr. SABATH. That has already been answered. No requests to be heard were received by the committee, as I understand. The legislative committee thoroughly heard the Treasury representatives and the representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. There was perfect harmony in framing this bill. In view of the fact that the minority, which looks after the interests of all Members on its side, has unanimously agreed on this bill, I am satisfied that it had the best interests of the country at heart, the same as did the majority Members when they reported this bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. There were no requests for any public hearings on this bill, as far as I understand, and I have been informed that no requests were received for anybody to be heard. There was a universal and overwhelming sentiment throughout the country for simplification of income taxes. That is all this bill deals with. I cannot conceive that anybody would be opposed to the simplification of income taxes, and that is all that is involved in this bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. We are not discussing the bill at this time, as I understand. The only point that is before the Congress is, Shall we take up this tax bill under the rule. Apparently the only controversial thing at the moment, at least, is the question of time. As stated by its chairman, the Committee on Rules gave all the time, and more, that was asked for by the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Ways and Means assures the House at this time that if additional time other than provided for in the rule is asked for by the Members, it will insist upon that additional time. Under those circumstances why can we not proceed?

Mr. SABATH. That is my opinion. I have explained that, but not as thoroughly as has the gentleman from Michigan. I agree with his statement. There is actually no opposition to the bill, because, as the gentleman from Tennessee stated, it is a simplification of the income-tax returns which the entire Nation demands. I myself on the floor of this House some 5 or 6 weeks ago urged the Committee on Ways and Means to grant such relief to our taxpayers. I am very much pleased with the bill that they have brought in so promptly in answer to the need and want of the Nation. In this case, the legislative committee maintained its enviable reputation for wisdom, speed, and accuracy.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It has been generally understood that there has been such a Nation-wide demand for simplification of individual income tax that nobody would doubt but what the committee would have given every opportunity to be heard if anybody wanted to be heard. We did not have a single request of any sort that the chairman knows anything about, to have open hearings or for any one to be heard on the subject. The work was to such a large extent technical and the work had to be done by assiduous study by the committee with its staff of experts. There was no demand and no justification that we saw to have open hearings. Of course, if there had been any request or any justification, there would have been open hearings, or if we had been called upon to conduct a public hearing we would have done so if there had been any demand or any reason for it.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for the explanation. I wish to say, in conclusion, if every Member could read the splendid report of the committee, I know he would come to the ready conclusion that the committee deserves a vote of confidence and the thanks of the House for the splendid manner in which it has handled this imperative, intricate subject.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the bill and the changes in the existing law will be intelligently explained by the chairman and the members representing the minority of the Ways and Means Committee. Only one request came to me for an open rule which was from a philanthropic organization, representing religious, educational, charitable, and other agencies. The organization suggested an amendment to the bill which would provide for larger exemptions for religious and charitable institutions. Accompanying their letter request was a chart comparing the increase in the taxes on corporations and businesses in general but, unfortunately, contributions to these religious, charitable, and educational institutions have not increased. However, I feel that relief for these institutions has been provided in the bill because the tax exemption will be on the gross instead of net incomes.

Surely we are all in accord in rendering aid to education, religious, and charitable institutions. There is not one among us that can deny the benefits that will ensue to mankind in teaching justice, humanity, and charity which all, regardless of denominational affiliations, teach brotherly love. If there was ever a time for this profoundest of teachings, it is the present, and while the representatives of these institutions may not have obtained all that they have sought, I think in view of conditions the Committee on Ways and Means has liberalized, as I have stated before, the deductions permissible for those deserving and noble purposes.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROWE. I understand that by the broadening of the privilege of deducting for religious and charitable institutions you can combine both in the normal and in the surtax where before you only got it in the net-income tax.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; it was on the net income. This is on gross income which might be double the amount that they were receiving or people were credited

with on the donations for charitable purposes. Of course, in the appeal which was sent to me, and perhaps to others, it was pointed out that the incomes of the American people, including corporations, have increased tremendously in the last 10 years. Naturally, I could not deny it. That is a patent fact. The country is prosperous and nearly everyone's income has been increased. Profits for the corporations have increased.

With this provision in the bill it will be possible for all well-intentioned, public-spirited persons to contribute more liberally than they have heretofore. I hope that such will be done.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Am I to understand, then, from what has just been said, that the measure which this rule makes in order does not materially take from or add to the total tax collected, but merely applies to the manner of making income-tax returns?

Mr. SABATH. That is about all; and it simplifies and eliminates unnecessary complications in reporting. There is a change in manner of allowing exemptions for dependents. The per capita exemption is uniformly $500, which favors those of large families. It would, though, militate against a man and wife without children in that it would make their exemption $1,000 instead of $1,200, as at present. This is covered at the bottom of page 1 of the committee report. The only ones who would be injuriously affected by the simplified returns are accountants and tax lawyers. This act will simplify income-tax reporting and the small taxpayers will not be obliged to employ professional help to make tax returns. So the bill is really a splendid one and deserves the support of everybody.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. In justice to the auditors and attorneys of the country and the accountants, I want to say that as far as I know all of these groups, I believe, were very much in favor of simplification of the tax structure. So I would not want the gentleman's statement to the effect that auditors may complain about the simplification of the tax structure to stand unchallenged in the record. I think all the accountants would agree to that.

Mr. SABATH. We have many honest accountants and tax attorneys. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Which is a good thing.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I believe the gentleman qualified his position by saying, "If there would be any who would object it would be they."

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a memorandum from the International Association of Milk Dealers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, when history is properly recorded I am certain that no committee of either body will rank higher than the faithful Committee on Ways and Means. Without question, the great majority of the citizens of the United States appreciate the ability, earnestness and courage of its entire membership. All of us are aware of the long and faithful hours of work that the members of this committee give in order to lessen as much as possible the burdens of the taxpayers of our Nation. In my opinion, and I am certain that all agree with me, few have ever served in this body who have ranked in ability, perseverance and trustworthiness with the able Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, our respected and revered colleague from North Carolina, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

Like all of you, I have received hundreds of letters urging the adoption of legislation designed to make more simple our tax structure. In my opinion H. R. 4646 will do a great deal toward this accomplishment.

H. R. 4646 has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Ways and Means. It has the approval of the Treasury Department as well as the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Rules Committee reports it unanimously. The rule is the usual one providing for 2 days of general debate.

This bill is confined to the simplification of the individual income tax. It has the following objectives:

First. To relieve the great majority of taxpayers from the necessity of computing their income tax.

Second. To reduce the number of tax computations.

Third. To simplify the tax-return form.

Fourth. To decrease the number of persons required to file declarations of estimated tax.

Fifth. To eliminate some of the difficulties and uncertainties in the making of estimates required for declarations.

I feel this bill is most deserving and should unanimously pass this body.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill brought to the floor by the great Ways and Means Committee of the House is designed to simplify income tax returns. Of course, the House is in favor of such legislation. We ought to have it. The American taxpayers demand it. There was no occasion as I see it for the complicated, intricate tax reports that have been required.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been reasonable and fair to the Members of the House and to people generally for the committee to have permitted open hearings on this legislation. After all, if it is sound legislation there should not be anything so sacred about it but that it could be subjected to open discussion. As a matter of fact only recently I asked on the floor of this House that such hearings be granted.

Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence in the membership of this great committee, but I do call attention to the fact that the Ways and Means Committee of the House has asked that this bill be brought to the floor under what is known as a "gag rule." No Member under this rule is permitted to offer an amendment even if he wants to do so. I hardly think this is fair. Of course the members of the committee tell us that since this is a bill just to simplify tax returns there should be no necessity and no time for offering amendments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair about this proposition, but I do call your attention to the fact that this House has heretofore followed the advice of the Ways and Means Committee with respect to various tax bills that have been submitted in the past few years. Those bills were brought in under "gag" rules, and we were placed in the position of voting them either up or down—no chance to offer amendments, so we voted for those measures because, of course, it was necessary that we raise the funds so much needed for carrying on the prosecution of the war and for the expenses of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not complaining about the raising of taxes, but, after all, the complicated tax bills we have heretofore voted through the House, and which were so highly recommended, came to the floor under "gag" rules I have mentioned. They are the measures that got us into a lot of difficulty and required the use of confusing and complicated tax reports that baffled efficient lawyers and tax experts. In considering these tax bills the House has sort of followed the Ways and Means Committee up the hill, and now we seem to be following the committee down again. Taxpayers have had about all they could do to take care of their business and to carry on their ordinary affairs without being confused and confounded with unnecessary complicated reports. Then to make matters even more inconvenient many of our taxpayers are required to make returns not just once a year but additional estimates three or four times a year.

Mr. Speaker, no one doubts the necessity of giving taxpayers a chance to pay taxes assessed against them without being harassed and without a lot of unnecessary, complicated reports. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to simplify returns, why wait for a year? Let us begin now.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished Member from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wonder if the trouble has not been in these other bills that got us into so much trouble.

the committee was following formulas laid down by the Treasury Department, and this time the Ways and Means Committee perhaps has written its own bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Very likely that is correct, but if they saw fit to follow those formulas which were sent down by some agency and brought that before the House, and we went along, that is our responsibility. I appreciate that. The thing to which I am calling attention is that we did follow the Ways and Means Committee through all these complications I have mentioned. Now they tell us they have brought in a measure to simplify those things. Well and good. But there ought not to be anything so sacred about this but what the public could be heard if they so desired. If the Ways and Means Committee ever suggested a willingness for the public to be heard on this measure, I never heard of it. The committee held executive sessions a great deal of the time during the past 3 months, but invited only witnesses they wanted. Newspaper reporters were not even permitted to attend the hearings. If it were a measure that should be highly confidential, that would be different. But this is one subject in which the public is most deeply interested and entitled to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is true, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has stated, that no public hearings were held on this particular measure. However, I think the RECORD should show at this point that the committee as a whole and the individual members received scores of letters from tax accountants, tax lawyers, and other people who are highly versed in tax questions, all of them making helpful suggestions. A number of these suggestions were incorporated in the measure that has been presented to the House. I, for one, feel sure that we could not have accomplished anything more in the way of simplification if we had held public hearings from this time until Christmas.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. JENKINS. I think it might be well if the gentleman would acquaint the membership with this fact, that outside of the tax experts, these certified public accountants are probably more interested in tax legislation than any other group of people. A special effort was made to contact their national organizations and they did send a representative to meet with the experts who worked with this committee on several occasions. They had every opportunity to present their views with reference to this most important matter.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. In the preparation of this measure the committee had the help of the best minds of the country and I think their contributions are reflected in the measure before us, which is easily a milestone in American taxation, or legislation affecting taxation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement about having the best minds in the preparation of this particular measure, but, did not the gentleman's committee have what was considered the best minds in preparing the other measures which they presented last year and the year before that?

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, the gentleman knows that in the past 12 years we have had 17 tax bills. We have had to slap one on top of the other until the whole structure resembled a stack of buckwheat cakes. There has not been any time to work on simplification. As soon as we got through with one bill we started working on another revenue measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill will pass the House. It contains some features that are commendable. I think, in fact I know, that that group of complainants who represent a number of religious, educational, and charitable institutions are not satisfied with this bill. It cannot be said that there were any public hearings with reference to this bill. It is true that representatives of some of our churches, colleges, and other organizations made a request of the Ways and Means Committee for an opportunity to be heard. It is true that request was denied. I am not here to challenge any committee on what they think should be done. However, it is not a true statement to say that there was no demand on the part of anyone to be heard with reference to this bill. There was a demand for public hearings and it was denied. As a matter of fact, those institutions depending upon contributions will be worse off under this bill than they are at the present time.

The references that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] made to the bill in reference to contributions does not affect the point involved. The objection is that the individual who gives a substantial sum from his wages to religion and charity has the same amount withheld from his wages as the individual who gives nothing. The objection of the churches, colleges, hospitals, and orphanages under this bill is that everybody, regardless of whether they give a nickel, is entitled to a blanket deduction. That has not been taken care of in this bill and those people were denied a hearing before the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like to say to the gentleman that what he has told the House is absolutely true. It is very important. I want him to carry back to those he has so ably represented this assurance, that the committee did give this matter very serious consideration. They presented the same proposition the gentleman presents here now. It was not included, for after it was all balanced up and we had the advice of the experts——

Mr. CURTIS. If I may interrupt, let me say that no one appeared before the gentleman's committee in regard to that, but they did make a request.

Mr. JENKINS. Just a minute. Several people came before the committee, I mean of the experts who gave careful consideration to the gentleman's proposition; and I want the gentleman to feel that his organization regardless of what he might think about it because he might not know all the facts and the groups he speaks for—that their case was ably presented by members of the committee who felt as he does about the matter, but when it was weighed up, when it was balanced out in the minds of the members and those who must make this thing work, it was deemed best not to do it at this time. That does not mean they have been precluded, that the door has been shut against them, and it does not mean that the subject has been resolved against them at all.

Mr. CURTIS. But here is what it does mean, it means that after these people made their requests and these so-called experts appeared in opposition to it, the Council on Taxes and Philanthrophy asked that there might be a public hearing where they might hear what the experts had to say and make an answer to the experts. This was denied by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Nebraska 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not stand here representing any charitable institution or any colleges, or any charitable group, or anyone else. I am speaking in my own right.

I submit this is a public matter. I feel that whenever we suggest a tax structure that works against the interest of those splendid institutions we have hurt the United States. The minute we cripple these institutions we invite a Federal subsidy to every college, every orphanage, and every other institution of that nature, and we have then started on the road toward totalitarianism. My complaint against the committe is that they did not bring their experts into a public hearing to state their objections openly and permit those objections to be answered.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly the gentleman does not take the position that he and his associates have not been heard.

I recall the gentleman came before our committee with some associates.

Mr. CURTIS. I was not before the gentleman's committee on this bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. We gave the gentleman all the time he wanted. The personnel of the committee has not changed, with one or two exceptions. The gentleman, therefore, would have talked to the same people that he talked to last summer.

Mr. CURTIS. We did not get before the committee in reference to this bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman got before the committee when we had the preceding bill up for consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. At that time there was no movement under way to fix it so that 30,000,000 taxpayers would not file a return; there was no movement under way at that time to grant a blanket deduction to everyone. This proposition has never been heard by the committee in connection with the pending bill in open hearings.

Last year we were told that the relief sought should be in connection with an administrative bill, not a revenue bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill that will come before us upon the adoption of this rule is not only popular with the members of our committee who have unanmiously endorsed it and recommended it; it is not only popular with the Members of the House with whom I have discussed it—with the exception of the gentleman from Nebraska who has just spoken—but this bill is going to be popular with the taxpayers of the Nation because it gives relief where relief is needed.

The only phase of the bill that apparently is misunderstood is that section of the bill permitting the 10 percent automatic deduction for those who may wish to avail themselves of that in lieu of enumerating the deductions for charity, interest, taxes, and so forth, as permitted by general law. There are some who think we have repealed the provisions of present law which authorize deductions for charity running up to 15 percent. We have not done so. Any man who gives up to 15 percent of his income and is willing to enumerate his gifts as required by present law can get that deduction from his adjusted gross income.

When we had the previous bill up and were proposing to give in the interest in simplification a 6 percent automatic deduction in lieu of the enumerated deductions for charities and otherwise, there was some opposition at that time to that proposition, and it is my recollection that the gentleman from Nebraska and others who thought as he did were heard before our committee on the point. This year notwithstanding the records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue indicated that the average of gifts to charity was 2½ percent, we provided an automatic deduction for those who wished to take it of 10 percent.

To our great surprise, we heard from the gentleman from Nebraska and from a large group throughout the Nation that we were planning to do something that would greatly handicap gifts to charities; so after we had voted to make it 10 percent for those who wished to file that type of return we then voted to open the subject again, and the gentleman from Nebraska and the group for whom he was speaking were given four separate hearings by the joint group of our experts. Each member of the committee got dozens of letters. I reckon I had several hundred. I do not know why they picked on me so, but word got out over the country in some way or other that I was the chief malefactor or something; anyway they singled me out for special attention and I got a lot of letters, all of which I read. We could not do what we were asked to do and still do the job of simplification that was needed. We knew it, our experts knew it, and those advocating no automatic deduction knew it but they said it was better, more to the public interest, not to simplify than to have an automatic deduction which might—and I yet do not see how—but which might curtail gifts to charities.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. But the gentleman referred to me several times.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is right; I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am objecting to the principle of the thing, not the amount of the flat deduction.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did not the gentleman appear before the Rules Committee and say that 10 percent was too much?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not recall that I did.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The papers quoted the gentleman as saying that it was an outrageous amount.

Mr. CURTIS. I object to a blanket deduction at all. That is not the way to handle it; as between two taxpayers it is unfair.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We gave every consideration to the viewpoint of the gentleman from Nebraska and to those who thought as he did, but we found it absolutely impossible to work out this simplification plan on any basis other than what we used; and we have every reason to believe that the fears of the gentleman from Nebraska that we will throw a damper upon charitable gifts will prove to be unfounded.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4646, to provide for simplification of the income tax.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4646, with Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed glad, and I am sure our committee is, that the Committee on Rules has unanimously reported the resolution providing for consideration of the pending bill, and especially do I appreciate the very laudatory words spoken by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], a member of the Committee on Rules, with reference to the Committee on Ways and Means and its chairman.

The pending bill, H. R. 4646, was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and I believe, if fully understood, at least I trust it will receive the unanimous approval of the membership of the House.

As is well known to all, there has been much complaint about the complications of income tax, especially with reference to individuals. Our committee began its work on simplification as soon as the 1943 tax bill was disposed of.

In the writing of this bill there has been no sign of partisanship in our committee. The minority members of the committee have worked wholeheartedly with the majority in a sincere effort to solve this problem, and they are entitled to the same credit and commendation for their efforts in this connection as the majority. In addition, we have been given valuable assistance by our own staff, the Treasury staff, and the staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. There has never been a bill before our committee in which the entire membership of our committee, our staff, the Treasury staff, and the staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue have worked so harmoniously.

Existing complicated conditions in our tax laws which this bill will largely correct have been brought about because of the greatly increased revenue needs of the Government in recent years, especially since our country entered into the war.

In the process of levying higher and still higher taxes, it became necessary to provide more and more relief provisions so as not to completely liquidate or overburden many taxpayers and thus destroy our domestic economy and source of future revenues. The net result has been the enactment of several revenue acts, each superimposed upon the then existing law, thereby greatly increasing the complexities which now confront and confuse taxpayers, especially the millions of new taxpayers only recently made subject to the income tax. Thus by increasing the number of taxpayers from about 5,000,000 in 1939 to over 50,000,000 at the present time, 45,000,000 new or additional taxpayers have been created. Accordingly it was found that a system which was designed to apply to about 5,000,000, became unduly burdensome and complicated when applied to the great mass of new taxpayers making an increase in the tax burden of individuals from $1,029,000,000 to over $17,000,000,000.

It will also be remembered that Congress enacted the current Tax Payment Act of 1943. This act, which many taxpayers doubtless favored in the belief that they would be forgiven a full year's tax liability, further complicated the tax

return forms and placed additional burdens upon the taxpayers. This was especially true with respect to the returns filed on March 15 of this year, when the transition from the old to the new method of collection required additional computations with respect to the unforgiven or unabated portion of the 1942 liability.

The bill is so designed that 30,000,000 taxpayers subject to withholding will be relieved of the necessity of filing a regular income-tax return. These 30,000,000 taxpayers are those with incomes under $5,000 and who have less than $100 of income not subject to withholding. Under the present law these taxpayers are given a receipt by their employers showing the wages paid during the year and the amount of tax withheld. It is contemplated under this bill that the employee can list his other income, if any, and the number of his dependents on the back of this receipt and send it to the collector in lieu of a regular return. The collector will compute the tax for him. If any additional tax is due he will get a bill from the collector and have at least 30 days to make payment. In case he has overpaid his tax he will get a refund. He will have no additional tax to pay in most cases since the amount his employer withholds from his wages will cover his entire tax liability.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. That is all the income-tax returns they will have to make?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is all they will have to do, and it will thus relieve 30,000,000 who are now confused by the complicated tax returns that it is necessary for them to make. If we had done nothing else in this bill and stopped right there and had merely saved these 30,000,000 taxpayers, whose chief income is from salaries and wages, from the complexity and difficulty and complication of having to make out income-tax returns, I think that the time would have been well occupied.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is there any provision made whereby the taxpayer can have the benefit where he loses all or part of these receipts that you are talking about?

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, there would be no difference in that respect than what is pending under the present law. That is covered by a regulation of the Treasury Department; in other words, they want the evidence of the amount of money that has been withheld from this wage-earner's wages.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know of any reason why he could not get a duplicate receipt from his employer.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I assume that the employer keeps books and he could easily obtain a duplicate receipt.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That could be taken care of by regulation.

Mr. COOPER. That is provided for by regulation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. All right.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Approximately 10,000,000 taxpayers of those who will be required to file a regular return, will not have to compute their tax, but may take their tax from a simple one-page tax table which will be on the return form. Some, such as farmers and businessmen, will use the business income schedules to get the benefit of their business deductions and if their income, after business deductions, is less than $5,000, they will be able to take their tax from the tax table in lieu of being required to make actual tax computations.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do I understand, though, that those 30,000,000 taxpayers the gentleman has mentioned will have to make the usual returns in January or March of next year, under this bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. They will not. All they will have to do is to send in this receipt furnished them by their employer, and on the back of the same answer three or four simple questions. The collector will figure out their taxes. If they have not paid the full amount due, if the amount withheld has not been sufficient, they will be sent a bill and given 30 days in which to pay the bill, and if they have overpaid their tax, a refund will be made.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I am getting at, will these 30,000,000 taxpayers be in the same shape, as far as making returns is concerned, at the end of this year as they were in 1943?

Mr. DOUGHTON. They will just be in the shape that they will be until the end of time. They will not have anything else to do.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In other words, their situation is not changed until January 1945, so far as the collection of taxes is concerned?

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman from Kansas remembers the receipt he received from the Sergeant at Arms for the amount of money withheld from his salary.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. COOPER. A receipt similar to that is issued by every employer in this country to every employee from whose wages or salary amounts have been withheld.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is being done now.

Mr. COOPER. All the taxpayer has to do is to take the receipt that is issued to him by his employer and turn it over on the back and answer about three or four simple questions, and sign it and mail it to the collector of internal revenue, and that is his return.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So he will have to make a return.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; this receipt takes the place of his return.

Mr. COOPER. That is his return.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. From now on; is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. Beginning January 1 of this year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Beginning January 1 when?

Mr. COOPER. This year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. 1944?

Mr. COOPER. Beginning January 1, 1944, after December 31 of this year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, the gentleman, I know, is familiar with the withholding tables which will show that part of it to be paid.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The withholding table, though, does not withhold taxes that will be withheld after this law goes into effect; is that not correct?

Mr. COOPER. The 1944 return will be filed in 1945.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So they will file returns for 1944.

Mr. COOPER. They will file this receipt.

Mr. REES of Kansas. File a receipt and make a report.

Mr. COOPER. No, they do not have to make a report. When they file this receipt, answering the few questions on the back, that is the return.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The receipt takes the place of the return, and he has satisfied the law when he files such receipt with the collector sometime between January and March 15, the due date of his final return.

Mr. REES of Kansas. One more question. These returns that are being required, that is, not returns, but reports, estimates, or whatever you call them——

Mr. DOUGHTON. You mean declarations of estimated tax which are required to be made by taxpayers whose tax liability is not satisfied through withholding?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We made them in April, and we make them in June and October and December.

Mr. DOUGHTON. These declarations were made on April 15 this year because the Commissioner extended the time for filing them from March 15 to April 15.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But this bill will not affect our being required to make those declarations for the remainder of this year, will it?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Under the bill, as under existing law, except in the case of farmers, a declaration of estimated tax is required to be made on or before March 15. You can correct that declaration under existing law either in June or September or in December. Under the bill, you can correct the estimate in June, September, or January. If you are satisfied with your estimate made in March you do not have to amend it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So we will have to continue to make these estimates the balance of this year.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; unless you want to correct your estimate. After you have corrected your estimate you make your payment, and your first estimate will do. You need not make any other estimate at all unless you have reason to change and correct your estimate.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Anyone who has an income over $5,000, or if he gets an income of more than $100 outside of his

salary, will have to make those estimates, will he not?

Mr. DOUGHTON. If he has more than $100 from sources not subject to withholding, an estimate is required; and if he has less than $100 from sources not subject to withholding, he is not required to make a declaration of estimated tax unless his income exceeds $5,000, if single, and $5,500 if married, plus $500 for each dependent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Right on through the year.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He is only required to make one estimate, but he can correct the amount if he wants to.

Mr. COOPER. I think the important point that the gentleman from Kansas should bear in mind is that when a man makes his declaration of his estimated tax——

Mr. REES of Kansas. In April.

Mr. COOPER. March 15. There was a blanket extension of 1 month, which made it April 15. When he makes that declaration of his estimated tax on March 15, as long as he is satisfied with it he does not have to do anything else. He does have the right to revise that estimate if he wants to on June 15 and on September 15, and under this bill on the following January 15, but if he is still satisfied with the estimate that he made on March 15, he does not have to file any other estimate during the year.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He can let that go until March 15 of next year if he so elects, and then he makes a final return and payment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But if he is in the brokerage business or livestock business, or farm business, or some other business like that, then he will have to continue to make estimates.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He will not have to unless he finds he is too far out of line. If he finds that he has estimated too much or paid too much he can correct his estimate. But if he is satisfied that his first estimate is not too large, he can go on with his quarterly payments based upon his first estimate under existing law. Farmers do not have to file a declaration of estimated tax until December 15 under existing law. The bill gives farmers until January 15 after the close of their year to file a declaration of their estimated tax. However, if they file their final return by January 15 following the close of the taxable year, they will not, under the bill, be required to make any estimate.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does that situation change in this bill for 1945, or are we going to continue to do that same sort of thing under this bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The bill permits farmers and others to take advantage of its provisions with respect to their final estimate or final return for 1944, to be made in 1945.

Mr. COOPER. If the distinguished gentleman from Kansas will turn to page 2 of the report, under No. 7, he will receive very valuable information on the very point on which he is seeking information.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I shall not decline to yield, because the chairman of the committee should furnish any information he can about the bill, but I believe that if I may be permitted to conclude my prepared statement I shall cover most of the questions that may be raised.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman described the procedure for the wage earner who filed his receipt and said that if he owed any more money the collector would figure it out and bill him for it, and he would have to pay it in 30 days.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the procedure if he has overpaid his taxes?

Mr. DOUGHTON. He will get a refund. The collector figures out the tax on the basis of the information furnished on the withholding receipt.

Mr. CURTIS. Who makes the refund, the collector or the Treasury?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The collector. It will be made by the collector to whom he sends his receipt.

Only 10,000,000 will be required or will choose to compute their tax. This covers those taxpayers with incomes, after business deductions, of over $5,000, and those under $5,000 who choose to itemize their actual nonbusiness deductions in lieu of using the table. Taxpayers with incomes of more than $5,000, in computing their tax, may choose to take a flat standard deduction of $500 in lieu of their nonbusiness deductions. In all cases the return form will be much simpler than that required under the existing law.

It is estimated that under existing law there are about 16,000,000 out of the 50,000,000 taxpayers, who are required to make declarations of estimated tax. This includes businessmen, farmers, agricultural labor and those whose income subject to withholding is more than $2,700 in the case of a single person and $3,500 in the case of a married person, and whose income not subject to withholding exceeds $100.

Under the bill, there will be 4,000,000 fewer persons required to make estimates. If they do not have more than $100 from sources not subject to withholding they will only be required to make a declaration of their estimated tax if their income is over $5,000 if single, or $5,500 is married, plus an additional $500 for each dependent.

There has been considerable complaint over the difficulties in making estimates. This is particularly true with reference to the farmer, businessman, and professional man. While under the existing law an estimate made on March 15 may be revised in June, September, and December, the taxpayer may be subject to penalty if his last declaration underestimates his tax by more than 20 percent.

A farmer is not required to make a declaration of estimated tax under existing law until December 15. Under the bill the farmer will not be required to make any estimate at all if he files his final return on income for the preceding year, by January 15. If he does not desire to make a final return and payment on January 15, he may file his final return on March 15.

The bill further simplifies and liberalizes existing law with respect to charitable contributions. This subject was given most careful study and consideration by your committee, as we recognized the splendid work being performed by religious, charitable, and educational institutions, many of which are dependent upon contributions for their existence. I know I express the viewpoint and desire of the entire membership in stating that we are anxious to do everything possible to aid and assist in the continuation of such splendid work. Under existing law it is difficult for taxpayers to determine the amount of their deductible contributions to charities. They must first determine their net income without any allowance for charitable contributions. These total contributions cannot exceed 15 percent of their net income thus computed. They are then required to again compute their net income, with the charitable deductions included. The bill amends existing law so that the existing 15 percent limitation for contributions shall be 15 percent of the taxpayer's gross income instead of the existing 15 percent of net income. This has the effect of increasing and simplifying the allowance for charitable contributions, and enables the taxpayer to compute the same without first having to compute his net income. The bill not only simplifies the computations for those making charitable contributions, but also enables them to make larger contributions, free of tax, than under the existing law.

The committee carefully considered a proposal to grant an additional exemption from withholding for those persons who signified their intention to contribute, or who were regular contributors to religious, charitable, or other organizations. We found this to be impractical of administration, and would seriously jeopardize the revenue and place upon the employer an additional burden he could ill afford under present manpower conditions. It would also make difficult, if not impossible, the use of the withholding tables which are computed on the basis of the standard deduction allowance. We were also advised that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to properly check and determine whether such contemplated contributions had, in fact, been made and the fear was expressed that such a provision would inevitably lead to great abuse and fraud.

There are some who fear that the allowance of the 10-percent standard deduction, which in no case can exceed $500, will have an adverse effect on taxpayers' contributions to charitable organizations. I do not share such fears, as I do not believe that the great mass of contributors do so for the purpose of securing a tax reduction, but because of the worthy causes such contributions advance. Moreover if total deductions are in excess of 10 percent of their income they are permitted to itemize these deductions and thereby get the benefit of the larger amount. It may be true that some taxpayers in the larger income levels consider the tax-saving effect of contributions, but the flat allowance of a

maximum of $500 will in no way deter or influence them in connection with making contributions from a tax-savings standpoint.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand the statement that has been made here, and I should like to have it confirmed by the chairman if it is a fact, the average contribution is about 2½ percent, and has been. This provides for a 10-percent deduction.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes, a 10-percent standard deduction allowance if the income is less than $5,000. However, this standard deduction allowance, which is secured by using the tax table in the law, covers not only charitable deductions, but other personal deductions such as medical expenses, taxes on a home, interest on a personal loan, and the like. If his income is $5,000 or more, he is allowed as standard deduction of $500. Nobody is forced to take the standard deduction. If their actual deductions, including charitable contributions, exceed their standard deductions, they can take their actual deductions.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Where the income is above $5,000, what is he allowed as a deduction?

Mr. DOUGHTON. He can either take the standard deduction of $500, which would be 10 percent of $5,000, or he can take his actual deductions.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The full amount he has been giving heretofore?

Mr. DOUGHTON. So far as the charitable deduction is concerned he can take up to 15 percent of his gross income, if he itemizes his deductions. Under existing law he is limited to 15 percent of his net income.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I agree with the gentleman that it appears that you have liberalized it rather than restricted it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I am afraid the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky might have the impression that we are allowing a 10-percent deduction under this bill for charitable contributions. This 10 percent must include taxes, interest, charitable contributions, and other deductible items. I am fearful that the gentleman was getting the idea that we had increased it from 2½ percent to 10 percent.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It includes all deductions.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the total income is $5,000 or less, you allow $500 clear.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the total income is $5,000 or less he can get a standard deduction of approximately 10 percent of his gross income by using the tax table, or he can take his actual deductions.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If it is above $5,000, then you include provision for that in the tax return?

Mr. DOUGHTON. He can take a standard deduction of $500 or his actual deductions if greater than the standard deduction of $500.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If it is above $5,000?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He can take the $500 deduction or itemize the actual contributions?

Mr. DOUGHTON. He can take the actual deductions that he would be allowed to take under the law; yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is as I understand it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He is not denied that privilege at all.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee.

Mr. JENKINS. This bill does not, under any circumstances, prevent anybody from filing a return and make any contribution that he pleases. Of course, it will not be considered under the present law, and it will not be under the law we will pass now, over 15 percent. But as the distinguished chairman says, and I think it will be agreed to by all, this ninth point in the report is very clear. It reads as follows:

> The existing law has been amended with respect to deductions for charitable contributions so as to allow up to 15 percent of the adjusted gross income.

That is just what the chairman said.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Now it is on net income.

Mr. JENKINS. But this makes it 15 percent of the adjusted gross income. The report reads further as follows, "in lieu of the present law limit of 15 percent of net income." Before it was 15 percent of net, and now it will be 15 percent of the gross under the new law.

Mr. DOUGHTON. And the taxpayer can give more than he can under the present law.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. "Gross income" simply means income after deduction?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. There are several fundamental changes, and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], a member of the Committee on Rules, was kind enough to mention some of the fundamental changes which I will repeat. It has been necessary to amend several provisions of existing law to carry out the simplification program.

Among the most important are the following:

First. The bill repeals the Victory tax, and thus makes possible the use of a single tax base.

Second. A new normal tax is imposed upon the net income of every individual in excess of $500. This normal tax is necessary in order to retain as taxpayers 11,000,000 persons now subject only to the Victory tax. Your committee felt these individuals should continue to pay a small tax and thus contribute to the war effort.

Third. The existing normal tax is integrated with the surtax. For surtax purposes, a uniform exemption of $500 is allowed per person, that is, the taxpayer is allowed $500 for himself, $500 for his spouse, and $500 for each dependent.

Fourth. Another change of existing law made by the pending bill has to do with dependents. The bill allows a $500 exemption for each dependent instead of $350 allowed under existing law. The definition of dependency is changed by eliminating the 18-year-age limit and the requirement that those over 18 years of age must be mentally or physically incapable of self-support. The bill substitutes the concept that a dependent is anyone for whom the taxpayer furnishes over half the support, provided the person is closely related to the taxpayer, and does not have a gross income in excess of $500. Under the bill, all persons with gross incomes of $500 and over are classed as taxpayers and may not be claimed as dependents by any other taxpayer.

The existing law with respect to dependents' income is amended by the bill. For many years, the law has required the earnings of an unemancipated child to be reported with the income of the parent. Since the law as to emancipation is determined by, and varies according to the States, it has been extremely difficult to determine whether such earnings are includible in the parent's income, and has been practically nonenforceable of administration. While it is true that a semblance of enforcement might be possible in the case of withholding on such earnings, the committee felt that such earnings not in excess of $500 should not be required to be included in the parent's income. To require the inclusion of such income by the parent, would lead to endless confusion and practically defeat all efforts to simplify the individual income tax. One need only to consider the plight of a taxpayer endeavoring to estimate the earnings of his minor child during the summer vacation, and the estimated deductions to which he might be entitled in earning such income in the form of depreciation and repairs on his lawn mower used in mowing the neighbors' lawns, to reach the conclusion that such income should not be required to be reported by the parent, and that where amounts have been withheld from a minor child where no final tax liability exists, such amounts should be refunded.

Fifth. Another complication under present law is the itemizing of small amount of deductions from various sources. The bill extends the policy, now used on the short form, of allowing taxpayers to take a standard amount of nonbusiness deductions in lieu of describing their actual deductions. All taxpayers with less than $5,000 can, by using the withholding receipt or the tax table, receive approximately 10-percent deductions. All taxpayers with income of over $5,000 can use a standard deduction of $500. Any taxpayer may, if he chooses, itemize his actual deductions to take advantage of a greater amount. Taxpayers with certain business deductions may take those separately before taking the standard deduction.

Sixth. The new withholding tables, which under the terms of the bill will

become effective on January 1, 1945, are designed to withhold as nearly the actual amount of final tax liability as possible from those taxpayers with incomes of $5,000 or less derived solely from wages subject to withholding. The present law attempts to withhold the full tax only up to $3,000. These tables are constructed on the basis of much narrower wage brackets than existing withholding tables. This will bring about more accuracy by narrowing the differential in amounts withheld between adjacent wage brackets.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would like to get this straight. Is it not a fact that the withholding of taxes from incomes does not change until January 1945?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct. You see, we could not make the change this year. It would have caused hardships upon the employer as well as the Government in preparing new forms. Moreover, about half of the year will be gone when this bill becomes law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So under this bill then there will be no difference in the withholding of wages or salaries until January 1, 1945?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct, January 1, 1945.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then after January 1, 1945, the withholding in practically all cases will be increased?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Withholding will be increased in some cases but the tax will not be increased. There is one thing that I want to make clear, about which there has been a considerable misunderstanding. We withhold the tax as a means of collecting the tax. It is not a tax at all. This bill will come nearer withholding the present amount of tax than will the present law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman means, I believe, that the amount of taxes collected from the individual, the amount withheld, will be greater after January 1, 1945.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The amount withheld—but the total tax will not be greater.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is that because we have not withheld under the 1943 tax law a sufficient amount?

Mr. DOUGHTON. We have not withheld enough.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So we are going to wait until January 1945 before we begin withholding more?

Mr. DOUGHTON. We have to, because we did not know when this bill would become law and unless it became law before January 1 next, it would unduly burden the employer, as well as the Government and the taxpayer.

Mr. KNUTSON. And then, of course, there was an election coming on and that is another reason.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The total amount of tax collected from the individual taxpayer will be approximately the same as under the present law. Under this bill, it is estimated we will collect about $60,000,000 less, but the number of taxpayers and the total amount collected will be approximately the same.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How do they make up for that difference?

Mr. DOUGHTON. We just lose it. However, that is only about three-tenths of 1 percent. Out of $17,000,000,000, if you will make the calculation you will find that $60,000,000 is only about three-tenths of 1 percent of $17,000,000,000. That is as near as we could come to it. We had to make some adjustments and we made just as few as possible. We set out to relieve the taxpayers from complicated returns, and we think we have succeeded reasonably well.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If the increased withholding does not begin until January 1945, then our people will still have to make out the complicated returns on March 15 of next year? This bill will not simplify the tax return?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No. The new law will apply to the final returns they make in 1945 for 1944.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. But, what I am inquiring about——

Mr. DOUGHTON. The new law will apply to 1944 except the withholding.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Perhaps I did not make my question as plain as I wanted to. Will this law that we are now considering eliminate the complicated forms for the next income-tax return, which will be returnable on March 15, 1945, or will we have to wait until March 15, 1946, to get relief?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, no; they will not have to wait until March 15, 1946, they will be relieved of filing complicated forms next March 1945.

A new simplified tax table is provided which may be used by taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes under $5,000, regardless of the source of their income. Under the present law, the use of the short-cut tax table in ascertaining tax liability is limited to those whose gross income is derived solely from salaries, wages, bonuses, commissions, dividends, interest and annuities and not in excess of $3,000. The new tax table in the bill is so constructed as to allow the taxpayer a standard deduction of approximately 10 percent of his gross income and its use is optional with the taxpayer. This change in existing law will allow a greater number of taxpayers to use the simple tax table and make unnecessary any computation of their tax liability.

Eight. Under the bill, the limitation with respect to deduction for medical expenses is made applicable to the taxpayer's gross income instead of net income. This results in slightly reducing the medical expense allowance, but is believed justified in the interest of simplification.

Further studies are being given, not only with respect to still greater simplification of the individual income tax, but also to the corporate tax provisions of existing law, and I am hopeful that additional simplification will be achieved as a result of our continued studies.

In conclusion, I repeat what I said at the outset of my remarks—that this bill was unanimously reported to the House by the committee and, in my opinion, merits the unanimous approval of the membership of the House, for the reason that it relieves 30,000,000 taxpayers from the necessity of filing regular income-tax returns, or computing their tax liability. Ten million of the remaining 20,000,000 taxpayers will no longer be required to compute their tax, as the same can be determined from a simple one-page tax table. It further merits your approval for the reason that it will relieve an additional 4,000,000 taxpayers from the necessity of making declarations of estimated tax, and simplifies and removes much of the present uncertainty and difficulty confronting those who still will be required to make such estimates. The bill makes other changes in existing law which greatly simplify and benefit not only the taxpayer but also the administration of the individual income tax.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman. I want to be as helpful as I can in having our bill understood.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate that. As I understand this bill which I have before me, the rates are increased, are they not?

Mr. DOUGHTON. In some cases, where necessary for simplification. In other cases, the tax burden has been reduced.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But they are increased according to the items that appear on page 3 of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. You are looking at the increases in surtax rates. It should be borne in mind that the old normal tax of 6 percent was merged with the new surtax.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Those increases take effect as of January 1, 1944, is that correct?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct. The gentleman understands the bill pretty well. He is a student of taxation matters.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But you will not collect any more from the taxpayer's salary check than you are collecting now, until the end of 1944?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So that at the end of 1944 the individual will owe more tax, of course, than you have collected under his salary, but you will, as a matter of fact, increase those taxpayers' taxes, will you not?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Some taxpayers will pay a little more, others a little less.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But I mean the fact is, you will have increased their taxes?

Mr. DOUGHTON. A man with more than two dependents will pay less on account of the increase in the dependency allowance from $350 to $500. The more dependents a man has, the more his expenses are. The man with fewer dependents can pay a little more taxes.

If you will look at the burden tables in the report I think you will understand this matter more clearly. The chairman endeavored to get a copy of the report into the hands of each Member, and when we get through with this discussion if any of you do not understand this bill before we vote on it, or have any difficulty in understanding it, or if you

are losing any sleep about it, I suggest you study the report. Because it is one of the clearest reports that has ever been presented.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But the chairman has given all of his time and his energy now for several weeks and, of course, is familiar with the bill. I want to get this information direct from the chairman.

One thing further: At the end of a year all of these taxpayers, salaried men and women, will find that the entire amount of their taxes have not been deducted from their earnings.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, yes; that is withheld.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not for 1944; they will still owe more taxes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Some will and some will not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In full by the amount withheld?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Where there is under-withholding, additional taxes will be due.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think we ought to clear this up. The withholding is not a tax; it is merely a method of collecting the tax.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That has been an erroneous impression in the minds of a lot of people; it is not a tax, it is merely a method of collecting tax.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate that. The next thing is that certain taxes are actually increased.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In some cases, and in other cases decreased.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman understands the increases that are made here for dependents, does he not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. They are increased from $350 under the present law to $500. In order to make up for that, slight adjustments had to be made here and there in the rate schedules.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So that rate schedules have been changed in some instances?

Mr. COOPER. In some instances there have been some slight changes. For instance, the first surtax bracket is increased by 1 percent. In the next four or five brackets there is no change at all, then in the next few brackets a change of 1 percent and so on. There had to be some slight adjustment in order to provide for the simplification that it attempted by this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The thing I want brought to the attention of the House is that some slight changes have been made in the tax rates. I am not saying they should not be made, but that ought to be explained. There have been some adjustments in that respect.

Mr. COOPER. That is fully covered in the report.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is all set out clearly in the report.

The gentleman will see from page 8 of the report where the tax has been reduced. Where there is a minus sign, it indicates that the taxes are less. In another part of the report the gentleman will find where there have been increases. The over-all loss in revenue of approximately $60,000,000 is a very negligible part of the $17,000,000,000; it was as close as we could come to it and provide simplification.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The next thing I want brought out, although it may be repetition, is that after January 1 the amount of withholding from salaried incomes will be increased.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I should like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Kansas the fact that if he will simply pick up the report he will see from pages 8 to 18 tables showing the amount of increase or decrease for almost every conceivable amount of income. It shows increases or decreases as low as one or two dollars. If the gentleman will only look at the report, he will get all that information in respect to any salary increase or decrease, and he will see from the comparative tables instances where there has been scarcely any change.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The report states the following in regard to a dependent:

> It is required that the dependent be related to the taxpayer within one of the following relationships: Child, the descendants of such child; a stepchild; a brother, sister, or brother or sister by the half-blood, stepbrother, or stepsister; parent or grandparent; a stepfather or stepmother; a niece or nephew; an uncle or aunt; a son-in-law, daughter-in-law, father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law, or sister-in-law. For the purpose of determining whether any of the foregoing relationships exist a legally adopted child is considered as a child by blood.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then also there has been a change in the deduction for husband and wife from $1,200 to $1,000.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is right; it has been fixed at $500 each, and $500 for each dependent.

Mr. KNUTSON. For the sake of the record at this point it should be noted that under existing law exemption ceases when a child becomes 18 years of age.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Providing it is a normal child and not helpless; but under this bill the dependency allowance goes on as long as the taxpayer pays more than half the expense.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is no time limit. If the taxpayer pays more than half of the child's upkeep and the dependent does not earn over $500 a year.

Mr. COOPER. When the dependent becomes a taxpayer himself; but as long as a taxpayer contributes more than half of the support of a dependent he may still deduct for the dependent.

Mr. DOUGHTON. And if it is less than $500 per annum.

Mr. KNUTSON. And the parent may continue the deduction as long as the children are in college.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 54 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure everybody appreciates that any tax bill is a complicated matter. This tax bill is no exception. When tax bills are presented I really feel good that the membership will take it upon itself to ask questions. I have never seen anybody yet who has had the temerity to stand before this House and proclaim himself a tax expert, for there are so many things about taxes that no one man will claim to know all about; and when I say that I mean the most astute tax man in this Congress has something to learn about every tax problem. Some contingency may arise of which he has never heard. For instance, our distinguished chairman for nearly an hour presented his views on this tax bill, and I think most eloquently and most accurately, but, in spite of all that, it has been brought to my mind that some things in connection with the discussion are not yet very clear. But I am not going to despair about that, because I doubt if one taxpayer in a million ever looks at the tax law when he makes up his return. He does not have access to the tax laws, and if he did, they are so complicated he could not do much with them. He has to depend almost altogether upon the tax blanks that are sent to him by the collector. The preparation of these tax blanks is the problem of the Treasury. That work has been very complicated; there is no question about it. Tax blanks have been so complicated that the average American citizen could not understand them. It was really pathetic 3 weeks before the 15th of March to see literally hundreds and thousands of taxpayers standing in line for hours here in Washington waiting an opportunity to consult some official of the Treasury to determine what their tax would be. That was the case all over the United States. Lawyers in little towns like the one I come from practically closed shop for 3 weeks before the 15th of March and did almost nothing but fill out income-tax returns. That is not a compliment to this Congress. At the same time I do not want to criticize this Congress because we cannot justly criticize the Congress. We would not be justified in criticizing the Congress. Why? Because in the last 10 years—we have heard about it so much—we have been in an emergency of one kind or another nearly all the time, and it is true that we have been in some emergencies. We are in one now. In those 12 years we have had 17 new tax bills, one superimposed upon another—not all alike, many different. We have had, for instance, family exemptions changed three or four different times in the last 12 years. There have been so many changes that the taxpayer has been hampered and pestered well nigh unto death.

The public sentiment became so distinct, so strong, and so certain about the 15th of last March that we, the Members of the Congress, were given a mandate to do something, and we have tried to do it in this bill. In this bill, as you know, we do not take into consideration the cor-

porations. All we deal with in this bill is personal income tax. Some of these days we are going to bring to the House for consideration a simplification bill covering corporations. I do not know who can live through an ordeal like that will be, but eventualy we are going to have to come to it.

There were some members of our committee, and I was one, who thought we should not tackle this matter piecemeal, that we should revamp the tax structure in its entirety from the beginning because there are such things as fundamental principles of taxation. Taxation is a real science; it is not guesswork; but when you patch it up 17 times in 11 years, sometimes you do feel that it is sort of patchwork. I think we should go to work and spend 3 or 4 months with experts, with outside help, giving everybody a chance to come in, and revamp the whole tax structure. But what would be the result? We would in effect be recodifying the tax laws, and anyone who has had any experience in the recodification of laws knows that it is a terrific task. The committee, after consideration, decided that the best we could do would be to bring in a bill which would result in simplification to as many as soon as possible. I dare say that anyone who will read the committee report, anyone who will look into the matter carefully, will come to the conclusion that we have done a pretty good job when you consider the time consumed in the effort.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. In connection with what the gentleman is saying, about 6 weeks ago I introduced a joint resolution to set up a commission of 15 experts, outsiders, to make a study of the whole tax system along the same line as was done in Great Britain several years ago; then have them report back to the Congress as early in January next as possible. Their report would in part serve as a basis for permanent tax simplification and reform.

Mr. JENKINS. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota is to be complimented for his effort in that respect. There is no question but that all over the United States, especially in the business stratum of the Nation, the people are alive and alert to this matter of rebuilding the tax structure of the Nation. For instance, our Republican leader, the minority leader of this House, has appointed a committee of Members from the Republican side to give study to this matter. Upon this committee he has placed the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. This committee is at work. The people of our country will support just tax measures drawn to deal fairly with all classes of the people.

There is another reason why on the 15th of March last or about the 15th of March there was so much unrest in the country. That was due to the fact that we had put into effect the withholding tax. The withholding tax made millions of taxpayers who had never been taxpayers before. When we passed a law providing for a withholding tax we took a most colossal step into a new field. A more colossal step than that has never been taken in this country for a long time, so far as taxation is concerned. But it has been productive of more revenue going into the Treasury of the United States than anyone ever anticipated. A few days ago we secured some figures from the Treasury which indicated that in the first three-quarters of the present fiscal year we have taken in over $12,000,000,000 directly from withholding. Up to that time many people escaped taxation, not willfully, maliciously, and illegally, but the tax structure was such that they were not brought within the purview of the law. This withholding tax came down upon their heads and about the 15th of March it was a rather disconcerting thing to many people, many of whom have not gotten over it yet.

In addition, there was the Victory tax. We passed the Victory tax as an emergency matter. It had been passed only a short time when we found we had to amend it because complaints were heard that some people were able to reduce their Victory tax more than others by reason of credits for insurance and so forth. We finally came to the conclusion we should repeal it, and in this law we do repeal the Victory tax.

When we passed the Victory tax, here is what we did. We yielded to a demand in the country that there were a lot of people who were not paying any taxes at all. We were yielding to the demand that there were many people in the lower brackets who would be willing to pay a small tax. We therefore levied the Victory tax, which was a low-base tax. It applied to earnings above $624 per year. The Victory tax applied to every man or woman or child who earned more than $624 a year.

Now, we come forward and we make a gesture of doing a thing that I think ought to be done, and I dare say you will agree with me. Have you not been worried about the difference between the normal tax and the surtax? When we came along and passed the Victory tax, that made three different bases, a Victory-tax base, normal-tax base, and surtax base. They tell us that we cannot very well build up a tax structure that will throw these three bases together into one. I had been hoping that we might evolve a plan by which we could have just one base, everybody to start from one base; but they say we cannot do that very well, and when I say "they," I mean the experts of the country. Not only our experts and the Treasury experts, but other experts outside say that if we do that we are going to relieve from taxation 11 or 12 million people who are now paying taxes and who are making no strenuous objections to it. So I say when we consider the clamor that prevailed all over the country back about March 15 last, we can easily appreciate that there was some excuse for it.

As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said, there is another factor to be taken into consideration. Up to about 4 years ago there were only about 4,000,000 people who paid income taxes. You will remember that the income tax is not an old tax. Every person here was old enough to have voted for the sixteenth amendment in 1913. Up to that time we did not have such a thing as a Federal income tax. However, since that time it has grown in financial importance so that I should say today that $9 out of every $10 the Government spends come from the income-tax collections. It has developed into a gigantic structure. What are we going to do about it? We will never give it up. We cannot. It has been abused many times, but if we lay under it a scientific foundation, as we will be able to, we will build up a scientific superstructure that will be a guide to us and it will be a fine system out of which the Government can get revenue easier than any other, and then all of this trouble will be at an end, because, as the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said, we will release effectively 30,000,000 of these 50,000,000 taxpayers from the burdens of the complexities that come from filling out difficult tax forms. The list has grown, as I have said, from 4,000,000 to 50,000,000, and we will bring a measure of freedom to 30,000,000 with one stroke. I would not have you think that it will be as easy as a stroke of a pen, but it will gradually be effective. However, it is going to take a little time, but we will have to do it and we will do it.

How will we do it? This bill does it for the 30,000,000 to which I have referred. That is the list of those against whom the withholding tax is levied. The employer withholds from the wages of the employee in an amount equal to the taxes of the 30,000,000 taxpayers. The employers know how much they earn and they deduct a certain percentage provided by law. That is sent to the Treasury. The employer gives the man a receipt. Now, why should that man on the 15th of March be worried about what his tax is going to be? Why can we not give him a little receipt and enable him to satisfy his taxes without too much trouble? That is exactly what we are going to do in this bill. We are going to give him a little receipt. His employer will give it to him. On the front of it will be written his name, the amount he earns and the amount deducted. On the back of it there will be some spaces for him to fill in. In one of those spaces he will insert the number of his dependents and give certain other information, such as the total of any outside money he may have earned in addition to his salary or wages. That is put on the list. When that goes to the collector, the collector will have his auditors go over it and in due season that man will get a notice that he paid too much or too little. This law will apply to 1944 incomes. It is going to be no great hardship, because whenever the taxpayer puts the facts on the back of that little piece of paper, the collector will do the job for him and he will not have to stand in line. When we take 30,000,000 out of the line we will have done not only a humane thing but we will have done a thing that will be fiscally to the advantage of the Government of the United States.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How does your employer make allowance, say, for the exemption on account of a wife or children or dependents when he takes out the tax; I mean, under this new bill?

Mr. JENKINS. Here is the way that is done. There is the table that has been prepared, and in that table there is a line for the number of exemptions, and there is a line for the amount he earns, and that table will have taken into consideration all these factors.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The table is a part of the bill?

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. So the employer operates under this table?

Mr. JENKINS. Absolutely. In some cases, if a wage earner is not satisfied with it, he can make his own computation, and he can go to work and employ an accountant to help him, or he might be able to do it himself and take his own deductions, and at the end of the computation he might have made a dollar or lost a dollar. Regardless of whether the employer makes this check the employer will have gone ahead and withheld from his wages.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under the present law a person paying his Federal income tax is allowed to deduct the taxes he pays to either the county, the State, or the city, such as real-estate taxes, and other things. What is to be done with them in that situation under this bill?

Mr. JENKINS. A lump-sum allowance is made. A 10-percent allowance is made in that case. If he wants to take that 10-percent allowance he may do so under this table. If he does not want to do that, if he wants to claim more, a different situation will arise. Take the case of a man who is employed and makes, say, $200 a month as a railroad man. He has a couple of houses he rents out here. He will put in on his income the amount he received in rent and he will be entitled to take out the taxes, and so forth, and if he is not satisfied with that lump-sum amount given him he can go to work, take his taxes out, and other deductions out; but when he does that he cannot come under the table.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman made reference to 10 percent and 15 percent.

Mr. JENKINS. I mean a man is permitted under the present law deductions for charities up to 15 percent of his net income.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. For charities?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, out of his net income.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This tax proposition, does that go into the 15 percent, too?

Mr. JENKINS. No; that is another proposition.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why did the gentleman use that 10 percent? Did he misspeak himself or what?

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand it, that is a deduction of 10 percent not of the gross income and not of the net income, but of what they call the adjusted net income. In the case of a man who makes nothing but a salary, there is no such thing as adjusted net income, because it only applies to businessmen.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does that 10 percent refer to the deductions for charity?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; the 10 percent includes charitable contributions; but if his actual deductions, including his charitable contributions, exceed the 10-percent allowance, he may choose to take his actual deductions instead of his 10-percent allowance.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You can accept that.

Mr. JENKINS. He can accept it if he wants to.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If his salary is up to $5,000.

Mr. JENKINS. He can do so if he wishes. If he does not, he can make his own return, but if he chooses to go outside of the table, he must itemize his deductions.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. So the workingman must make his return according to this table here or he does not have the benefit of this. If he goes outside of that, having a house to rent, and so on, he must make a regular return.

Mr. JENKINS. If his income is less than $5,000, that is, if his earnings and his other income are less than $5,000, and he doesn't choose to use the tax table he must itemize his deductions.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He is no longer under this table then?

Mr. JENKINS. No.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. It seems to me there is considerable confusion about this 15-percent exemption for contributions. This law does not in any way change the existing law as far as the 15-percent deduction allowable for contributions is concerned. It does this, however: It sets up a standard deduction which, if a taxpayer takes advantage of it and it is used under withholding, he is allowed 10 percent or not in excess of $500 for a standard deduction, which must consist of contributions to charitable and religious organizations, interest, and other items. A taxpayer does not have to take advantage of it, but if he does and uses this form, he must, of course, have his wages withheld on that basis.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not also true that there is no way under this bill that an individual can reduce the amount of taxes to be withheld from his pay check by reason of contributions or other deductions?

Mr. JENKINS. That is right, except to the extent that such contributions are included in the 10-percent allowance upon which the withholding tables are based.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How soon will this taxpayer get back any amount that he overpaid? I understand he is to be repaid through the collectors' offices of the several States.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know exactly. We have been informed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue that it will be made as soon as reasonably possible.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Because some times when the Government owes you money, you have a long road to travel.

Mr. JENKINS. Every time you ask that question it brings a smile, because every man who has had experience with the tax department knows they are not as anxious to return as they are to collect, and that has been our experience. They promise to do better on these small refunds, for the refunds are made by the collector.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I commend the Committee on Ways and Means for their diligence in bringing in this tax bill seeking to simplify the income-tax return.

The inquiry I wish to make is this: What is the primary purpose of the bill other than that? Are you seeking to eliminate returns from a large number of individuals who have a refund coming to them instead of owing the Government money? Is that the primary purpose?

Mr. JENKINS. No; these are just incidents. This matter of refunding money is just an incident.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Then this bill will eliminate in many cases the necessity for filing the return?

Mr. JENKINS. It will for 30,000,000 taxpayers; any man whose income is altogether wages or salary subject to withholding.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It eliminates the necessity of the return completely.

Mr. JENKINS. Except this, that I tell you. This little slip that he will get from his employer will show how much he has earned and how much has been withheld, and the employee will fill out two or three simple questions on the back of the slip and send it back to the collector.

We had a good deal of discussion in the committee about whether we would abandon this altogether and just leave the man to his employer and the Government, but we decided that would not be fair to the man—the taxpayer—because the employer might not make a correct report. The employer might find it sometimes to his advantage not to make a correct report. We require the 30,000,000 to file these receipts for their own benefit.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In other words, you are reducing the amount that is going to be withheld.

Mr. JENKINS. No; we do not touch that.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In other words, then, you are increasing the tax rate; is that it?

Mr. JENKINS. No.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is very obvious now under the 20-percent withholding

that they are paying too much money in many cases and they are getting refunds back from the Government, which is an unnecessary burden on the Government. There is nothing gained by it.

Mr. JENKINS. I think I can answer that question. I think many of these refunds now are coming to the unemancipated children who earned a little money working in the factories where these taxes were deducted and the Treasury has decided to make refunds to them.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I received some complaints from constituents who were rather substantial businessmen, complaining about the delay in obtaining refunds.

Mr. JENKINS. No doubt that is true, because this matter of refunds is a slow process.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Is not this what it amounts to? There is nothing to be gained by compelling a large group of taxpayers to go through the formality of filing returns and then applying for refunds? Why not arrive at some conclusion or rate which would obviate the necessity of that? Is that what you are trying to do here?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, that is what we are trying to do, because we are putting in the law a table, a table that will control any salary or wage earner under $5,000. Three thousand dollars is the law now, and $5,000 will be the law after this bill becomes a law.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In other words, the amount withheld will be exactly the amount of tax he owes the Government?

Mr. JENKINS. Exactly. That is supposed to be exactly right. If it is not right, that is the reason we give him the chance to find out. For instance, here is a man who is working for 2 or 3 employers in the course of a year. Maybe he works for 10 different people in the course of a year. That fellow is going to have a little trouble, because one man will say, "Well, I paid him so much." He has gone. He has lost his address. This man will have to scratch around and see that he gets his proper receipts and have them all filed. But a man who works steadily for 1 employer the whole year through, I dare say that out of the 30,000,000 very few of them will have any trouble, because the Treasury is going to be guided by the same table as the employer.

An employee may say, "Well, I forgot to list the proper number of my dependents," and he can prove that he did. Suppose he reported that he had two dependants when as a fact he had three. This is a clear mistake. That man ought to have a chance to correct that. If too much has been withheld against him, he ought to have a chance for his refund.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I should like to go back for a moment to the question the gentleman from Kansas raised, that this does not go into effect until the first of 1945; in other words, we will have to repeat next year the same performance we saw this year. We will have several million people filing returns next year.

Mr. JENKINS. No; this will apply.

Mr. CHENOWETH. This withholding will be the same this year as last year, they will pay too much money and then have a refund coming from the Government.

Mr. JENKINS. At least 30,000,000 who earn $5,000 or less will have complete relief from filing complicated returns.

Mr. CHENOWETH. But that will not go into effect until the first of next year?

Mr. JENKINS. It applies to this year's taxes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. But you are not changing the amount withheld?

Mr. JENKINS. The new withholding table is not in effect until January 1, 1945. But the relief from making complicated returns is applicable to 1944 returns filed in 1945.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is not the reason for that that the withholding would be the equivalent of the normal tax and the surtax that ordinarily would apply if there were no withholding tax?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; so far as taxpayers in the first two surtax brackets are concerned.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Those under three thousand will not be affected by this?

Mr. JENKINS. This will be for their benefit, too.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think the refunds are going mostly to those under three thousand.

Mr. JENKINS. Does the gentleman mean now?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. As I said before, I think a lot of that has come about because of a misunderstanding with reference to the earning capacity of unemancipated children, and men entering the armed services, and working part time, and dependents becoming taxpayers.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am not talking about children; I am talking about individuals, adults, who are earning amounts where the amount withheld has been too much and the Government has to make this refund. It entails a large amount of bookkeeping, and I do not see the necessity for it. I thought you would correct that here.

Mr. JENKINS. We have attempted to correct that by trying to make the withholding tables approximate the correct tax liability of taxpayers of salaries of $5,000 or less.

Mr. CHENOWETH. He is going to make a return of what he made this year?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; but not the big, bulky return. He will have the withholding receipts which I have previously referred to.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The refund principle will not be changed, then, until a year from the first of the coming year?

Mr. JENKINS. There is no refund principle about it. It is a matter of right. If a man pays too much, the Treasury must refund as soon as it can.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The same thing will happen this year that happened last year, because the law will not take effect until the first of 1945.

Mr. JENKINS. No; I say that this will relieve a lot of that.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I hope so.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; it will; there is no question about it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am not clear as to just how that is going to be done.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does not this take care of the tax for 1944?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When this receipt is made out next year, it will deal with the taxes the man has paid in 1944?

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is the same situation as this year.

Mr. JENKINS. No, not quite. I am afraid our minds have not met on this yet.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Before we leave these refunds, it should be mentioned, I think, that we have tried to adjust more closely the withholding to the actual tax in this new bill. We had some fairly wide bracket variations in the 1942 act. The withholding will not be changed during 1944. We are still withholding under the Revenue Act of 1942. Therefore, these adjustments will have to be made up to January 1, but from that date on the withholding should be fairly accurate.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That was the point I had in mind, that there would be no change in the picture until after January 1, 1945.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is true. There will be a different method of filing tax returns. As the gentleman from Ohio has stated, this W–2 form can and will be filed after January 1. When this employee receives the W–2 statement from his employer, that will contain the amount of wages he has received. He will write on the back of that receipt his name, and the number of his dependents, and send that to the Collector of Internal Revenue. The Collector will figure the tax, write him a note, and say that his taxes were so many dollars either overwithheld or underwithheld. They will make the adjustment. But after this tax gets into operation, the withholding should be fairly accurate.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Does the gentleman believe, then, that the large number of unnecessary returns will be eliminated next year?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The large number of complicated returns will certainly be eliminated, because these 30,000,000 are going to use this W–2 form next year.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They will not make a return, then, unless the collector tells them they owe some money?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The collector will figure their tax for them next year.

Mr. JENKINS. As the gentleman from Kansas says, there are some considerations that we must not overlook. During this year of 1944 we are going to have a change in what we have heretofore called the marital exemptions. They are going to be changed, and they are going to be changed very materially in some cases.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I think we should state to the gentleman from Colorado that this question of refunds bothered the members of the committee a great deal, but we finally decided that in the process of changing the withholding rates and graduating the withholding, and so forth, we would make a great mistake to place that change into effect during the middle of the year 1944, and we thought it was advisable to defer that change until the 1st of January, so that those who had refunds coming from overpayment of taxes through withholding in 1943 will more than likely have those refunds for the tax year 1944.

Mr. JENKINS. In that connection, I think we were given some assurance by the Treasury that they would put on an extra staff and get that accomplished.

Mr. MILLS. They will make the refunds much more quickly than they are doing this year.

Mr. CHENOWETH. But I understand the returns will have to be made, which makes the refunds necessary.

Mr. MILLS. The returns the gentleman has in mind will not have to be made, it is the W–2 return that will be filed by the wage earner after January 1, 1945. He will not make any computation of his tax, as he has had to do in the past.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the observation of the gentleman.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I was much interested in these W–2 returns which the employee receives from the employer. We will have 30,000,000 taxpayers who receive these particular W–2 forms. The collector of internal revenue advises me that they estimated that this year they would have 80,000,000 of those because of employees' working in different places, but their estimates were low. They are going to have 90,000,000 this year of these W–2 forms, which shows somewhat the burden we have placed on the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not want to be facetious, but the other evening I heard a radio commentator state that the Committee on Ways and Means was planning on increasing the exemptions for dependents so that the American families would be increased. Can the gentleman comment on that, or have you considered it, or is it necessary?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know whether that is a question of eugenics or sociology, or manpower, or national policy, but it is hardly a question of taxation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel that the number of infants can be increased in this country if you grant larger exemptions for the additional number of children in the family?

Mr. JENKINS. Of course, I think childbirth could easily be increased in this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This commentator said they were doing that over in Germany. I do not feel that we necessarily have to adopt a German system in order to increase our population in this country.

Mr. JENKINS. To be serious, I will say that was given no consideration by the committee.

Let me pass to one other matter, and then I will conclude. There is another new departure in this bill which I think deserves consideration. That is the departure that changes the family status and the family exemption. Heretofore we have had what we call family exemptions, built around the family hearthstone, and we have allowed special encouragement by way of exemptions to those who keep families together, the heads of families, and so forth. But we do away with that. I do not know whether it is the best thing or not because the family is the basis of American life. The figures indicate that this new plan is probably a better plan from the standpoint of increased revenues. The plan adopted in this bill is this: We are going to change the definition of "taxpayer." Everybody is going to be a taxpayer who has a net income of $500 or more. It makes no difference how old one is or where he is or what his circumstances are. There he stands. If he earns more than $500, he is a taxpayer. If he is an unemancipated boy of 14 or 15 years of age and if he works and makes over $500 a year, he is a taxpayer. He has been elevated to the dignified role of a taxpayer. He has got to pay his taxes. He is amenable to the same law and the same restrictions in that respect as his parents are. Heretofore many a boy has made money and the parents have taken it and failed to account for it as a part of their income. Instead of pressing the parent to account for the earnings of the child, we have decided we are going to put the child on his own feet if he makes more than $500 a year and make him a taxpayer. If he makes less than $500, we just leave that go. We are not going to hold the parents responsible for that. It has been decided that is the best policy.

What else are we going to do? Instead of saying we have family exemptions we say we have "exemptions." Instead of the father saying "I have an exemption for myself and an exemption for my wife, and an exemption for my child," he says, "I have three exemptions." They stand out financially, they are measured in dollars, each one of them is worth $500. Whenever that is done, of course, a man with a large family, with a large number of these exemptions, will naturally pay less taxes in the long run than the man who is a single man or a married man without any children.

I will say that of two of the cardinal principles of this whole bill, one of them is the fact that we provide an easy system by which the man who works can pay his tax without being compelled to stand in the long line waiting a chance to get the assistance of a tax official to assist him make out his tax return. And we provide a system by which family life will be maintained without a man having to be squeamish about it. For instance, here is an old couple with a daughter who has stood by them and worked and has kept them together. She has kept the family together. Under the present law they are not entitled to an exemption for that person, because she is over 18 years of age. Why should they not have an exemption? She keeps that family unit together. In this law we propose to give them that exemption. This law will provide an exemption, regardless of age.

Let me recapitulate the principal features of this bill:

First. It brings great relief from complexities to 30,000,000 taxpayers who are primarily wage earners or salary earners earning up to $5,000.

Second. It brings relief to 10,000,000 taxpayers whose earnings and other income taken together does not exceed $5,000.

Third. It provides that every person, regardless of age who earns $500 or more per year is a taxpayer.

Fourth. That exemptions are changed to $500 for husband, $500 for the wife, $500 for each dependent child or person dependent on the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this bill, while not perfect, will go a long way toward providing the simplification that the people are demanding.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, "I have lived, sir, a long time," said the venerable Franklin at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention, "and the longer I live, the more convincing proof I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?" In keeping with that fundamental belief of a Christian Nation, the churches of America plan to make the day when our boys assault Fortress Europe a day of prayer for their safe deliverance. In the calm assurance that those prayers will be answered. I would like to see some suitable day designated as a national holiday to commemorate those who gave their lives in World War No. 2 that others might live, and to be annually celebrated on a par with the

day our ancestors declared their independence. I would like to see the Congress adopt a recent suggestion of the War Department that a national cemetery be established in every State in the Union as an honored and sacred resting place for those who, like the young men of Athens "gave their bodies to the Commonwealth". And in order that those heroes may receive, as Pericles said of the men of Athens, "each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchres, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by", I would like to see our Nation adopt a national flower which in the springtime may be found blooming in all of those naticnal cemeteries—flowers that are reborn on what may be the anniversary of invasion day and be a yearly reminder of the fact that the bodies of those who sleep beneath them will some day rise again to become as incorruptible as their souls.

The flowering dogwood is not only a typical American flowering tree or shrub, but one or more of the 16 species of Cornus is to be found in every State of the Union. The white flowering dogwood is to be found only in this country. All over the world where people love, admire and cherish trees, their attention has been attracted to the dogwoods of America. There is an old legend, dating back to the earliest missionary work of the Jesuit Priests among the Shawnee Indians, to the effect that the story of the crucifixion impressed the Shawnees strongly, but they had not torn away from their age-old belief that their own gods had exclusive control over the trees and shrubs and herbs and could do with them as they pleased. When Christ was about to be crucified, their legend runs, the Indian gods were very angry and decreed that the wood of no tree that they had created should be used for this purpose. Paying no attention at all to the gods, the people took the wood of the dogwood tree and fashioned the cross of it. The dogwood made no protest—its wood did not settle as fast as it was hung, it did not rot and fall away. For this offense the Shawnee gods turned the dogwood from a tall, erect tree into a small, tortured one which should bear the cross forever afterward in its bloom. The flower's four white bracts are the cross, the notches in them show where the nails were driven through the Saviour's hands and the stain at the notch is His blood.

More than half a century ago the patriotic citizens of the State of Pennsylvania made the hallowed ground of Valley Forge a State park to the memory of George Washington and his Revolutionary soldiers who won for us our independence and our freedom. Realizing that no prettier or more appropriate flower or flowering shrub could be had to beautify the park than the native white flowering dogwood which grew there, the landscaping and beautification of the park area were built around the dogwood as the central theme. One of the dogwood trees standing a short distance west of Valley Forge chapel, and now over 90 years of age, has been pronounced by artists and nature lovers to be one of the most beautiful trees in the world when in the month of May its dark and rugged limbs appear to be supporting a heavy snowfall against a rich background of verdant blue grass. Subsequent plantings of this beautiful tree in the Valley Forge State Park have developed it into such a unique beauty spot that each year, prior to the present war, more than half a million people made a pilgrimage to Valley Forge to view what many regard as the greatest flower show in America and to do homage to the memory of distinguished heroes.

Numerous bills have been introduced in the Congress to honor and to provide in a material way for those who survive the present struggle to make safe for future generations the rich heritage bequeathed to us by the men of Valley Forge. I have introduced today a bill to honor the memory of those who fall in the struggle. That bill designates the white flowering American dogwood as our national flower, with the hope that it will be used, as indicated above, to make of each national cemetery hereafter established a beauty spot comparable to that of Valley Forge. The hardness of the wood of those dogwood trees will symbolize for us the irrefragable spirit of the youth of America that stormed the portals of Fortress Europe, and met undaunted a salute from the arsenals of hell. The white petals of the flowering dogwood will symbolize for us the purity of their cause in which the ideals of a freedom-loving Christian people triumphed over the barbaric dogmas of a brutal dictator; while their soft and natural beauty will glide into the darker musings of a sorrowing heart and convey the comforting message, "He rests in peace."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4646, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under special order, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] has 1 hour to speak today. That was an error. The assignment should have been for Wednesday of next week. I ask unanimous consent that it be assigned for Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PRATT] be allowed to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial from the Dallas News, commending the record made by Secretary Hull.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert an editorial from Il Progresso, an Italian newspaper, in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROGERS of California (at the request of Mr. RAMSPECK) for 2 weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON) for 3 days, on account of official business.

INVESTIGATION OF SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the resolution providing for the investigation of the Montgomery Ward matter will be taken up on Friday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman state what time Friday? Will it be taken up the first thing or after the disposition of the tax bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I presume it would be the first order of business on Friday.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 10 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2987, a bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 18, 1944, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (ship construction reserve fund).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1499. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin

Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1500. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1501. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Thirtieth Annual Report, prepared by direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, covering operations during the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1502. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1503. A letter from the Secretary of War, dated April 6, 1944, advising that, in accordance with a recent decision of the War Department General Staff, the confidential classification accompanying the letter of the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on March 29, 1943, has been removed, and that there is no longer any objection to the printing of the letter of the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on March 29, 1943, including an interim report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 27, 1941, together with accompanying papers, submitting surveys and studies of the Hungry Horse Dam, Mont., made under authority of section 7, of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, which was then referred to the Committee on Flood Control; to the Committee on Printing.

1504. A letter from the Secretary of War, dated April 6, 1944, advising that, in accordance with a recent decision of the War Department General Staff, the confidential classification accompanying the letter of the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on March 29, 1943, has been removed, and that there is no longer any objection to the printing of the letter of the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on November 26, 1942, including an interim report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 27, 1941, together with accompanying papers, submitting surveys and studies of the Cheat River and tributaries, West Virginia, made under authority of section 7, of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, which was then referred to the Committee on Flood Control; to the Committee on Printing.

1505. A letter from the Secretary of War, dated April 6, 1944, advising that, in accordance with a recent decision of the War Department General Staff, the confidential classification accompanying the letter of the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on March 29, 1943, has been removed, and that there is no longer any objection to the printing of the letter of the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on March 29, 1943, including an interim report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 27, 1941, together with accompanying papers, submitting surveys and studies of Youghiogheny River, Pa. and Md., made under authority of section 7 of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, which was then referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; to the Committee on Printing.

1506. A letter from the Chairman, War production Board, transmitting the Eleventh Report on the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1507. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the transportation to their homes of persons discharged from the naval service because of under age at the time of enlistment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURCH of Virginia: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4517. A bill to remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1373, pt. II). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 or rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4483) granting an increase of pension to Harrison H. Bradford, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4738. A bill to repeal the automobile-use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4739. A bill to further amend the act approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 4740. A bill to designate the white flowering American dogwood as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4741. A bill to provide for water-pollution control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4742. A bill to provide for Federal assistance in the maintenance, expansion, and operation of school-lunch and school-milk programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARE:

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution for a tribute of sympathy, friendship, and support to the Polish people on the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 526. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4710, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the president, Mayaguez Chamber of Commerce, Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve Insular Affairs Committee's report, which recommends restoration of trade to normal commercial channels; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4743. A bill granting an increase of pension to Belle C. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 4744. A bill for the relief of the Lubell Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 4745. A bill for the relief of S. Carl Wolfskill; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4746. A bill for the relief of Harry D. Koons; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

5609. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, demanding that the Civil Aeronautics Board grant additional certificates of convenience and necessity to competing transcontinental air lines that will give to Massachusetts through trunk-line routes direct to important cities throughout the country without the necessity of changing at New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5610. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the school committee of the city of Somerville, Mass., relative to the necessity for the continuation of the school-lunch program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5611. Also, resolution of members of the Somerville Chapter 27 of the Disabled American Veterans, opposing the so-called G. I. bill of rights; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5612. Also, resolution of members of Malden Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, opposing the so-called G. I. bill of rights; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5613. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 4, tenth ward, Binghamton, N. Y., and signed by 99 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furlough for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5614. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Jennie E. Hovey and others, of Howell County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, refresh our souls and restore our faith as in all the bewilderment of the world's fiery strife our burdened hearts seek the quiet sanctuary of Thy healing presence. By the mute arms of white crosses stretched in alien lands, hallowed by the wordless courage of our fallen sons, by the invincible legions of the dauntless offering their young strength and the full cup of the joyous years to be, to rid their world and ours from the black plague of a pagan cult, comes Thy solemn summons to discipline, to toil, and to ceaseless prayer, for we, too, are soldiers arrayed against the common foe. Thou only art our strong tower and sure defense amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. Though the air be tremulous with anguish and anxiety, yet will we not fear. Though a host encamp against us, in this will we be confident: Thou makest the devices of the wicked of none effect. The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of His heart to all generations.

Keep our goals clear, our hearts pure, our spirits courageous, as we never turn our backs but march breast forward. In the name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 3, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); and

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces on March 31, 1944, in active training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 92 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration

LEGISLATION ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, VERGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions adopted by the twenty-fourth annual conference of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners at Phoenix, Ariz., as follows:

A resolution protesting against the practices and activities of the Department of the Interior and Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, Nevada-California, with respect to hunting, fishing, and trapping upon the public domain on custodial lands;

A resolution favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Federal-Aid and Wildlife Restoration Act so as to remove present restrictions against the use of funds thereunder for maintenance and operation of projects completed under its provisions;

A resolution opposing any relaxation of the sanitary embargo on the importation of meat and meat products from countries where the foot-and-mouth disease is epidemic; and

A resolution favoring certain regulations with reference to the migratory waterfowl season of 1944-45; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution favoring removal by the Office of Price Administration of ceiling prices on beaver pelts and the pelts of fur-bearing predatory animals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution condemning the practice of certain localities of using lakes and streams for sewage disposal and urging the inclusion of projects for adequate facilities therefor in post-war program planning; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution relating to the conservation and restoration of fish and wildlife on Indian reservations and suggesting certain provisions to be embodied in legislation for its regulation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A resolution protesting against the creation by Executive order of the Jackson Hole Monument in the State of Wyoming and favoring the enactment of House bill 2241 to rescind the order;

A resolution favoring the enactment of legislation to provide that the reduction of overstock of all fish, game, and wildlife in national-park areas shall be reserved to public hunting and fishing by permits under jurisdiction of the States concerned;

A resolution protesting against the acquirement by any Federal agency of additional lands in Western States except with specific approval of the legislature of the State concerned, with reservations of the right of public hunting, fishing, and trapping under State jurisdiction; and

A resolution relating to provision by the United States Reclamation Service of screens and other devices for the protection of fish in waters upon which irrigation, power, and industrial development projects have been or shall be constructed; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Leo J. Hoff, secretary-treasurer of Barbers Local No. 185, of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 1700) to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DEVELOPMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, JEFFERSON COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present, and ask to have appropriately referred, a resolution in favor of the development of the St. Lawrence River which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Jefferson County, N. Y., on May 1, 1944.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 35

Resolution re development of the St. Lawrence River

Whereas Jefferson County is vitally interested in the development of the resources of New York State and especially in the development of northern New York; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River and the power available in the said river will tend to promote the welfare of the citizens and residents of the State and county; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York by unanimous vote adopted a resolution declaring that this State urgently desires that the St. Lawrence River be developed to furnish low-cost power to millions of power users engaged in industry, agricultural and commercial pursuits; and

Whereas the Aikin bill, S. 1385, providing for the development of the St. Lawrence River, has been introduced in Congress and is being considered by the Senate Committee on Commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors hereby declares its approval of the project and petitions the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to initiate and complete the development of the St. Lawrence River; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board be instructed herewith, to send certified copies of this resolution to the Senate Committee on Commerce and to such other officials and persons connected with the proposed legislation as he may deem proper.

WORLD INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION; APPEAL OF COMMISSION ON A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred an appeal sent by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace to the President and the Congress to take action immediately to set up a world international organization in conformity with the Moscow agreement.

This appeal is signed by 1,251 clergymen and laymen throughout the country.

There being no objection, the appeal was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT, THE CONGRESS, AND THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

We, the undersigned, believe that the time is at hand when a concrete beginning should be made to realize the Moscow Declaration and Connally resolution which recognized "the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization. * * *" We need now at least the nucleus of such a general international organization in order to promote unity of political and diplomatic decision by the principal United Nations and consistency with such aspects of the moral law as have been proclaimed by the Atlantic Charter and other declarations of the United Nations.

If, however, international organization is to serve its purpose of achieving just and durable peace, it must from the beginning be planned to become universal in membership and curative and creative in purpose.

We subscribe wholeheartedly to the affirmation, "six pillars of peace," of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, instituted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, that not only must there be the political framework for a continuing collaboration of the United Nations, but that such collaboration should, as quickly as possible, be universal. We also believe, with that commission, that the international organization which is established should have not merely the task of seeking physical security but responsibility to deal regularly with conditions which contain the seeds of future war. It should be designed to seek the change of treaty conditions which may develop to be unjust and provocative of war; to bring within the scope of international agreement those economic and financial acts of nations which have widespread international repercussions; to promote the attainment of autonomy as a genuine goal for dependent peoples; and to assure for people everywhere a regime of religious and intellectual liberty.

We appeal to the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States to work vigorously for practical steps which will initiate such an organization.

INTEREST RATE ON FARM LOANS—RESOLUTION BY KANSAS FEDERATION OF NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Kansas Federation of National Farm Loan Associations at Wichita, Kans., taking a stand in favor of the reduction of the rate of interest on Land Bank Commissioner loans to 4 percent, including new loans made by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it hereby resolved, That the Kansas Federation of National Farm Loan Associations at its regular board of directors' meeting held in Wichita, Kans., on March 21, 1944, have adopted the following resolution which is of the effect that all Land Bank Commissioner loans should be reduced to 4 percent and new loans made by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation should be made at that rate of interest effective June 30, 1944.

E. S. PARSONS,
President.

Attest:

PAUL MANN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION BY KANSAS CITY SYNOD OF EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred a resolution adopted at the annual spring meeting of the Kansas City synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, at Kansas City, Kans., on April 18–20, 1944.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the number of men who would be exempted, except for the recent action of the Selective Service System, which stops deferment of pretheological students after July 1, 1944, is relatively insignificant to the total number of men involved; and

Whereas such action threatens the effective functioning of the church in maintaining the moral and spiritual health of the Nation by cutting off the source of future leadership; and

Whereas such action discriminates against the uninterrupted flow of men into the calling of the ministry (as against the Government program assuring such for other professions); and

Whereas such action in practice becomes very discriminating against the churches of protestantism:

Kansas City synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, representing churches and pastors in Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma, in annual session at Kansas City, Kans., April 18–20, vigorously protests such action of the Selective Service Commission of recent date and respectfully insists upon such an amendment of the regulation that will remove these injustices and restore to the church the possibility of preparing an adequate number of young men for the ministry.

Dr. D. C. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Kansas City Synod.

RESOLUTIONS BY LIEUTENANT RICHARD S. ROSS CHAPTER 3, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR—VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and appropriately referred, a resolution by the Lieutenant Richard S. Ross Chapter 3, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Topeka, Kans., signed by Carl Adolphson, commander, requesting favorable attention to H. R. 3356, H. R. 3377, and S. 1733.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS
OF THE WORLD WAR,
Topeka, Kans., April 27, 1944.

Hon. CLYDE REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the members of the Lieutenant Richard S. Ross Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, located in Topeka, Kans., have noted with much apprehension that, although H. R. 3356, to provide for an increase of 15 percent in all compensation and pension payments of disabled veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, plus other benefits, and H. R. 3377, in effect to provide for an increase in the pension payments made to war veterans handicapped by permanent and total non-service-connected disabilities from $40 to $50 per month, were passed by the House of Representatives last November, they have since then been reposing before the Senate Committee on Finance; and

Whereas although that committee saw fit to give the right-of-way to the so-called G. I. bill of rights, to provide that the Veterans' Administration, on top of its fast-expanding responsibilities for service-disabled veterans and their dependents, should be further overloaded with the administration of proposed benefits primarily for able-bodied veterans and their dependents, but has so far failed to give consideration to the other above-mentioned bills before such committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Lieutenant Richard S. Ross Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, That we hereby call upon the members of the United States Senate Finance Committee, through our respective Senators, promptly to give favorable consideration to those legislative bills before such committee, designed to provide badly needed additional benefits for service-disabled veterans and their dependents, particularly as to H. R. 3356 and H. R. 3377, above-mentioned, and of S. 1733, in effect to provide that service-disabled veterans of this country shall receive the same dependency allowances as provided by Canada for its service-disabled veterans; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the United States Senate from the State of Kansas and to newspapers of this community.

CARL ADOLPHSON,
Commander.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred a resolution by the Lieutenant Richard S. Ross Chapter 3, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Topeka, Kans., signed by Carl Adolphson, commander, concerning the administration of the so-called G. I. bill of rights.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS
OF THE WORLD WAR,
Topeka, Kans., April 27, 1944.

Hon. CLYDE REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the members of the Richard S. Ross Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, located at Topeka, Kans., have noted with much concern the fact that the right-of-way has been given by congressional committees to the so-called G. I. bill of rights primarily to provide certain post-war assistance to able-bodied veterans and their dependents; and

Whereas we are fearful that if the Veterans' Administration is further overloaded by being required to administer proposed benefits for able-bodied veterans its efficiency will be impaired and its services to and benefits for disabled veterans and their dependents will eventually be jeopardized; and

Whereas we are fearful that if the Veterans' Administration is given the responsibility of administering post-war adjust-

ments for able-bodied veterans, the cost thereof, in addition to the increasing costs of benefits for disabled veterans and their dependents, will sooner or later cause much misunderstanding on the part of the public, and may well jeopardize existing and proposed legislation on behalf of service-disabled veterans and their dependents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Richard S. Ross Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, That the Members of Congress from the State of Kansas be requested to voice their opinions strongly against the proposal in the so-called G. I. bill of rights (S. 1767) whereby the Veterans' Administration would be designated as the Federal agency to extend post-war adjustments for able-bodied veterans, and to insist that other Federal agencies, with appropriate experience backgrounds, be so delegated so that any such post-war adjustments as may be awarded to able-bodied veterans by Congress will not jeopardize existing and proposed benefits for service-disabled veterans and their dependents; be it further

Resolved, That Members of Congress from Kansas be reminded that there are several legislative bills before Congress, to provide badly needed additional benefits for war service-disabled veterans and their dependents, to the end that war service-disabled veterans may be enabled to provide a decent standard of living for themselves and their dependents, and to pursue the American way of life for which they fought and sacrificed their health or a part of their bodies, and that such Congressmen be further reminded that first things should be done first; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the House of Representatives and of the United States Senate from the State of Kansas and to the newspapers of this community.

CARL ADOLPHSON,
Commander.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3403. A bill to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian homelands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 849).

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1173. A bill to suspend, as respects vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels of the United States, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to settle and pay claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage and salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 850);

S. 1880. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 851); and

S. 1831. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 852).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On May 1, 1944:

S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566); and

S. 1757. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia."

On May 3, 1944:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report, which was ordered to lie on the table:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

At the end of said amendment, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That postmasters of the first-, second-, and third-classes, and post office inspectors, shall be on duty not less than forty-eight hours per week, and shall be paid for the additional eight hours, as additional pay for working such additional time, as follows:

"Those whose salaries are over $5,000 and not over $7,999, 5 percent of their regular peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are over $4,000 and not over $5,000, 10 percent of their regular peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are over $2,000 and not over $4,000, 15 percent of their peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are $2,000, or under, 20 percent of their peacetime salaries: *Provided further*, That no postmaster whose peacetime compensation is $8,000, or over, shall receive any additional compensation for such overtime work."

And the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

T. G. BURCH,
TOM MURRAY,
GEORGE D. O'BRIEN,
FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 1890. A bill to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal benefits and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the control and the eradication of noxious weeds; to conserve and protect the agricultural resources of the several States and of the United States; to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain rules and regulations and prescribe conditions; to raise revenue; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1891. A bill for the relief of W. S. Burleson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indians Affairs.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also introduced Senate bill 1892, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1893. A bill to provide for the establishment of an Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1894. A bill to provide for the transportation to their homes of persons discharged from the Naval service because of underage at time of enlistment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

POST-WAR SPENDING—STABILIZATION OF THE BOND MARKET

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to invite the attention of the Senate to conditions which should be considered and acted upon by the Congress. According to the Treasury estimate, as reported by Dun & Bradstreet, the gross national debt at the end of 1944 will be $206,000,000,000. Should the war last through 1945, the debt will be larger. So at the end of the war there is certain to be a vast reservoir of purchasing power concentrated in the hands of the people. As soon as the war is over the people will wish to reinvest a large part of their savings. So there is certain to be a large amount of bonds offered for sale, and unless some plan is adopted to stabilize the market, there may be so many bonds offered for sale that the open-market price may fall, to the injury of the public generally.

While my State of Oklahoma is not recognized as a major financial center, yet we shall have over $1,000,000,000 of savings to spend after the war. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an Associated Press dispatch dated April 5, outlining the nature of the bonds concentrated in the banks of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMANS WILL HAVE BILLION TO SPEND AFTER WAR

NORMAN, April 5.—As the bureau of business research at the University of Oklahoma figures it, Oklahoma will enter the post-war period with a billion dollars available for consumption goods.

The figures are as of June 1943, and do not take into account additional millions accumulated by Oklahomans since.

The calculations were made by Dr. Charles F. Dailey, associate professor of economics and head of the bureau.

Here's the way he arrived at the huge aggregate:

Federal Reserve bank reports set the total of demand and time deposits for insured banks in Oklahoma at $556,000,000.

Government savings bonds, series E, F, and G, amounted to about $250,000,000 more.

Treasury reports show the per capita money in circulation at $142, or a total of $18,500,000, if each Oklahoman has his share.

Other Government bonds held in the State, postal savings, and time deposits not previously counted, figured with the above, make the grand total around $1,000,000,000.

There might be a catch to it, though, Dr. Dailey said.

"There are economists who see the great national debt and high tax as counterbalancing much of this potential buying power," he stated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, after the war, if great numbers of holders of Government bonds desire to sell, it is obvious that there will be a shortage of buyers; and if such a thing should happen, the price of bonds will be driven down to dangerous levels. No good purpose would be served by speculating as to what might happen in such an eventuality.

Having this situation under consideration, on March 15 last I introduced a very brief bill in the Senate proposing to authorize banks to carry such bonds at par, without respect to the current market price. While to date neither the Treasury Department, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, nor the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has reported on the bill, Senate bill 1769, I have received a number of letters from bank officials and others with respect to the proposal. Without exception the letters received up to this time have been favorable to the purpose of the measure.

Pursuant to the sentiments expressed and suggestions made in the communications received, I have broadened the original bill so as to include savings and loan associations. In addition to providing that the banks and certain other financial institutions may at all times be permitted to carry and report their bond holdings at par, I have added section 2 to the bill. Section 2 reads as follows:

SEC. 2. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to purchase or accept for credit any such bonds, notes, or certificates of indebtedness tendered by their member banks, at not less than the par value thereof plus any accrued interest thereon: *Provided*, That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall make rules and regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this section.

Typical of the letters received in support of the bill, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a communication from Mr. H. C. Brunt, president of the Union National Bank, located at Chandler, Okla.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNION NATIONAL BANK,
Chandler, Okla., April 24, 1944.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Gen. Roy Hoffman has called my attention to Senate bill No. 1769, introduced by you and having reference to maintaining the book value of United States bonds in the hands of banks, trust companies, and insurance companies.

I believe your bill is very timely and at the same time a very wise provision, and should be enacted into law.

While I understand the practice of the Comptroller's department, in the matter of banks, is in keeping with the provisions of your bill and has been for some time, yet that is only a regulation, and the banks and other companies should have the assurance of being protected by law.

In my opinion, if you could get this into a provision of law, within the next 30 days, it would have a stimulating effect on the bond drive that is scheduled for June.

And in addition, why should not the Government seek, by law, regulation, and any other means, to maintain the par value of its own obligations, against the market value that may be influenced by gambling propensities?

The bond buyer can be encouraged to become a permanent investor, if he has the assurance that means are provided whereby he is protected to a par basis.

The funds of banks, trust companies, and insurance companies, are all alike in that they are trust funds, and protection to them is also protection to their customers.

Hope you have good luck with your bill.

Very truly,

H. C. BRUNT, *President.*

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a new bill carrying the amendment just suggested. I also ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1892) to authorize the carrying of obligations of the United States, owned by banks, trust companies, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies, at their par value, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the market value of any interest-bearing bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness, which is a direct obligation of the United States, or which is fully guaranteed by the United States as to principal and interest, and which is owned by a banking institution, a trust company, a savings and loan association, or any other institution authorized by the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, to receive deposits of money, or an insurance company, is less than the par value thereof, such bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness shall be deemed, for the purposes of any requirement of Federal law or regulation, to have a value equal to the par value thereof plus any accrued interest thereon.

SEC. 2. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to purchase or accept for credit any such bonds, notes, or certificates of indebtedness tendered by their member banks at not less than the par value thereof plus any accrued interest thereon: *Provided*, That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall make rules and regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this section.

FEEDING OF CHILDREN IN NAZI-DOMINATED EUROPE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, both branches of Congress have approved overwhelmingly resolutions to allow the shipment of food for child feeding in certain portions of Nazi-dominated Europe. These children should have been fed, and could have been fed, months ago, as some of the children of Greece have been fed from outside sources.

May I express the sincere hope that Prime Minister Winston Churchill, of Britain, will allow our State Department to carry out the express will of Congress and the American people so that all these children may receive food, even though it is too late to save the lives of many who could have been saved if we had adopted a less inhumane policy earlier in the war.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter and the accompanying statement, Save Europe's Children, I have just received from Howard E. Kershner, chairman of the Temporary Council on Food for Europe's Children, of which Herbert Hoover is a member.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPORARY COUNCIL ON FOOD FOR
EUROPE'S CHILDREN,
New York, N. Y., April 29, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We are most grateful to every Member of the Senate and House for the unanimous passage of Senate Resolution 100 and House Resolution 221, both of which urge child feeding in Nazi-dominated Europe. Experience has shown how it can be done without aiding the enemy and with great benefit to our friends and allies who endure every form of torture to help us in the struggle against the common foe. Strategy and humanity unite in urging immediate action.

The vision and wisdom of the Senators and Congressmen in this instance show high statesmanship and encourages one to believe that free, intelligent democratic government will not perish from the earth.

In view of the unanimous action of both Houses of Congress and the overwhelming expression of public opinion, it is difficult to believe that action to save these children will be postponed. Evidence of public approval is also very strong in England, and the governments of the exiled countries continue their urgent pleas for their children.

The approach of invasion emphasizes the importance of sending food before communication becomes increasingly difficult. When we call upon our tortured allies for a last effort against the foe, we will want them to have the solid encouragement of a little food for their children—the most effective form of propaganda.

If the mercy ships with food from South America, Africa, and, if need be, a little of what we waste, are not started promptly we trust that you and your fellow Senators and Congressmen will find some way to implement the action already taken in the passage of the resolutions.

With congratulations and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD E. KERSHNER.

SAVE EUROPE'S CHILDREN

(By Howard E. Kershner)

By unanimous vote on February 15, 1944, the United States Senate has asked the administration to send food to Europe's starving children.

On April 17, by unanimous action, the House of Representatives made the same request.

A Nation-wide Gallup poll on February 11, shows 3 votes for feeding to 1 opposed.

Most of the leading daily papers and periodicals of the United States have urged child feeding in strongly worded editorials.

Organized labor has demanded that the children be saved.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has long supported child-feeding proposals.

The Catholic archbishops and bishops have urged it.

The Rabbinical Assembly of America has approved it.

Societies, lodges, clubs, organizations, and churches have passed innumerable resolutions of approval.

Hundreds of thousands have signed petitions.

Half a million or more have written letters to Washington urging the administration to take immediate action to save the children.

Almost every medium by which public opinion is gaged shows that an overwhelming majority of Americans want the children in Nazi-dominated Europe to be fed.

Support for child feeding in Europe is almost as impressive in Great Britain as in the United States.

Church leaders of all denominations led by the Archbishop of Canterbury have long pled for it. Labor leaders have urged it. Quantities of editorials have appeared in leading British publications. Many stirring speeches have been made in both Houses of Parliament demanding that food be sent to the children.

The governments in exile supported by their military leaders have pled that help be sent to their children. They are as anxious to win the war and drive the enemy out of their countries as we are. They would not ask for help if they believed it would prolong the war. They think it would promote our war effort. They are a part of the United Nations group. What right have Britain and America to ignore their opinions and their desperate pleas for their children?

Experience in Greece and France has shown that the children can be saved without aiding the enemy.

The Germans do not take any food going to Greece and did not take any of the food formerly sent to France.

The Germans did not reduce the ration cards of the children helped.

By requiring each child fed to consume its full portion of local food before it is given a supplement of imported food it is certain that no equivalent was left over as a result of these operations by which the Germans could profit even indirectly.

Not a single ship available for the war effort would be used. The food would go in neutral ships.

It would not cost the American people a single dollar. Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France—the only countries which can now be reached—have funds of their own, more than sufficient, to pay for the operation.

No food needed for ourselves would be used. According to a statement by War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, we are still wasting several times as much food as it is proposed to send to these children. Sweden has asked permission to send food to Belgium and the Belgian Congo has done likewise. There is food in South America, especially Venezuela which has important quantities of cocoa and fish for sale. Spain has olive oil. Other surpluses are available.

Every month we send through the blockade about 50 pounds of food and other relief supplies to each British and American prisoner of war and civilian internee yet we deny a Norwegian, Belgian, Dutch, or French soldier fighting with our forces permission to use his own funds to send food to his starving wife and children at home. How can we send food through the blockade to our own but deny it to those who fight valiantly against the common enemy? Prisoners of war, whom we rightly feed, work in the German war effort yet we starve the children who could not possibly assist the war effort of the enemy.

Hitler knows he has lost this war but if we allow him to destroy the surrounding peoples he hopes for a better opportunity a generation hence. As quoted by William Philip Simms, General von Stulpnagel, Nazi commander in the Paris area, says:

"What does a temporary defeat matter if, through the destruction of people and material wealth in enemy countries we are able to secure a margin of economic and demographic superiority even greater than before?"

And Marshal von Rundstedt says:

"One of our great mistakes in the First World War was to spare the lives of civilians in enemy countries. We Germans must number at least twice the population of our neighbors. Therefore we shall be compelled to destroy at least one-third of the population of all adjacent territories. We can best achieve this through systematic malnutrition—in the end far superior to machine guns * * * starvation works more effectively especially amongst the young."

We will win the war but lose the peace if we allow the peoples who share our ideals to be destroyed.

One way to defeat Hitler is to keep him from destroying the freedom-loving peoples of Europe.

If we do not do this our boys will fight the next war alone. The armies that would help us will not have been born or will be too subnormal mentally and physically to be effective.

Hitler boasts that the Nazis are a superior race. They are becoming so—those who eat are superior to those who starve. By feeding the children of those who fight for us we would give them courage and strength to fight harder and so shorten the war.

In the face of this accumulated evidence that the judgment and conscience of mankind wants these children saved it is certainly in order to ask, "Mr. President, what are we waiting for?"

The Constitution charges the President, through the State Department and as advised by the Senate with the responsibility for foreign affairs. Child feeding is a question of high policy. The President must meet the issue—he cannot avoid it by saying it is a military question. Even if it be such, the Constitution makes him our highest military authority and chief strategist. He is the Commander in Chief. He must decide. By doing nothing he is deciding the question in the negative but he is certainly not escaping the responsibility for having made that decision. If it be a military question why are are pleas of military men of the occupied countries ignored? Be it remembered that among those who have urged child feeding are Generals Pershing, Dawes, Disque, and Theodore Roosevelt, Jr.; Admirals Pratt and Byrd; Past Commanders of the American Legion Hayes, Murphy, and MacNider. The latter was also a former Assistant Secretary of War.

Neither can the President escape the responsibility by pointing to the objections of the British Government. Turkey did not take "no" for an answer in the case of Greece and started her relief ships with food across the Aegean Sea. Now the British, American, and Canadian Governments help in feeding the Greek people.

The United States is contributing a full share to the war effort. For 3 years we have acquiesced in British Government policy. One good turn deserves another and we have the right to ask Britain to consider our views on the matter especially when our views are also those of the occupied countries themselves and of a considerable part of the British people. The stakes are so large—a whole generation of children of the democratic nations of Europe—that we have no right longer to stultify our convictions and forsake our impressive record of humanitarian action.

Strategy and humanity both require that the children be fed. Mr. President, it is your move.

AVERY'S PRIVATE WAR—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Avery's Private War," written by Marquis Childs and published in the Washington Post of May 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AFTERMATH OF THE WAR—ADDRESS BY CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Happens After the War," by Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, published by the International Latex Corporation, Dover, Del., which appears in the Appendix.]

HATERS OF THE PRESIDENT—EDITORIALS FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "They Hate the President Worse Than Hitler: No. 1," published in the Philadelphia Record of April 25, 1944, and an editorial entitled "They Hate the President Worse Than Hitler: No. 2," published in the Philadelphia Record of May 2, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

OPERATIONS AND METHODS OF O. P. A.—LETTER FROM JUDGE C. E. ENGER

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Clifford E. Enger, of Austin, Minn., president of the Minnesota Municipal Judges Association, relative to regulations and directives of O. P. A., which appears in the Appendix.]

FEEDING OF CHILDREN IN NAZI-DOMINATED EUROPE

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of the feeding of children in Nazi-dominated Europe, addressed by Howard E. Kershner to Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, and also a letter addressed by Mr. Kershner to the President of the United States, which appear in the Appendix.]

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], which the Chair understands has been stated.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I appreciated the arguments offered yesterday by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and other Senators on the question of enacting legislation to terminate the war contracts speedily and expeditiously as the need for such termination arises. I feel that the entire Senate, in fact the entire Congress, realizes the need for an orderly demobilization of the resources of this Nation as soon as the war reaches the stage that will permit such a demobilization; but I cannot say, Mr. President, that I agree that we must pass in such haste, without complete consideration by the Members of this body, a bill that would turn sums of money over in contract termination payments to the owners of factories and plants that have

operated to produce war materials without adequate planning as to the way in which the contracts shall be terminated and the order in which they shall be terminated.

It is a well-known fact that we do not have merely one plant making plane engines; we have great numbers of such plants, and these plants do not make complete engines, but under them are thousands of others making parts. We do not have merely one plant making planes. We have such plants scattered all over the country. The same is true of other forms of war material.

An ill-advised and ill-planned termination of contracts, without some central control to consider which plants can be terminated in the interest of the economy of the Nation and for the best interest of the people, may cause wholesale termination in one locality and no terminations in others. It may cause wholesale unemployment in one locality and a demand for labor in others. It may cause new wholesale migrations of defense workers, of which there has already been far too much. It may squeeze out the small man without taking care of his employees. It may terminate a contract with ample damages for the termination but with no assurance of reconversion of the plant to peacetime pursuits to employ any people whatsoever. Therefore, it is my present belief, as it has been my belief for some time, that if we consider merely one segment of the program of reconversion and leave out a central planning agency, leave out central direction, leave out central control, we will face just that situation, because, under the bill as framed, even the contracts are not terminated by any central authority. There is no agency in Washington that tells the Government departments and agencies how they shall allocate the terminations.

The War Department alone in its Services of Supply has seven different procurement agencies. These, in turn, are divided into districts, and each district headquarters will arrange its own terminations, just as it has its own contract service.

Up to the present time, one of the most severe criticisms we have encountered in the conduct of procurement has been ill-advised contract placements. I well remember one city in my State which is a perfect example. It is a small city and, strange to say, although West Virginia does not have 1 inch of coast line, ocean-going ships have been built in that city. The Navy suddenly decided to double, in fact, almost treble, the shipbuilding facilities of that small city, and without conference with the Navy, the Army decided to put in a munitions plant there. The city was overcrowded. Some 3,000 additional houses were built, and then, all of a sudden, both contracts were terminated simultaneously. The increased work for the shipyard was stopped, and the munitions factory was shut down. The shutting down of one of them would not have hurt the city so much, but the shutting down of two of them almost wrecked the economy of that city. The same thing can happen on a larger scale in other places. For instance, if all the airplane contracts in Los Angeles should be terminated simultaneously, the domestic economy of Los Angeles would be very nearly wrecked. But consider what would happen if at the same time the Maritime Commission should terminate the shipyard contracts there. With no planning for conversion, this could happen.

The purpose of my amendment is to take care of this situation. The first thing this Government needs is centralized control of these terminations. It is not possible, with safety to the Nation, to terminate a contract for the building of ships merely by paying damages to the plant owner, and by storing the machinery which he does not need, and taking out the partially finished material from the plant. There is other material in the plant, human material, material which must have some way of getting to other work, or some way of living until other work can be procured. Contract termination cannot be complete until all facilities of the plant are measured, and adequate arrangements made for the disposal and the handling of those facilities, including the human beings who have been working in the plant.

For that reason, title I of my proposed amendment sets up a central overall agency, sets up an administrator of mobilization and conversion for peace, giving to him an advisory board representing all segments of our economic structure so that he will not be without advice from the people. Even the consumer is included in that set-up.

In my amendment there is also provision for a planned program of reconversion and termination, so that the plants are not to be closed without consideration of the effect on the domestic economy. All the contracts are not to be terminated in one locality simultaneously, so that the roads leading from that locality will be filled with people with their worldly possessions in push carts as soon as the money they have saved is spent.

We know that the war is not over. In fact, it is just going into its most serious stage. But unfortunately war has changed. Material that was badly needed last week has become obsolete. Plants which made it must be converted to making other material. Therefore we must now go into the matter of planning the orderly conversion of this vast war industry we have built up into a peacetime industry.

Only recently we sought to get some more automobiles, and the plants naturally did not want to proceed with part-time production, quite logically, and declined to go into automobile production until they were permitted to go into full automobile production. The fact that we needed even part-time automobile production was plain evidence as to the need of the civilian economy for the civilian products.

Conversion, if properly planned, if properly organized, if properly worked out, can be handled in the interests of the entire Nation.

There is much talk of future unemployment. There is no need for unemployment after the war if the civilian economy is adequately taken care of and if the conversion is planned. We must not permit individual planners to proceed, each planning in his own way, without a central plan, as we are considering now permitting a great number, probably three or four thousand, to terminate contracts by payment of liquidated damages for the termination, by removal of unfinished products, and by removal and storage of machinery, without taking care of the needs of the human part of the plant. The man who operates a machine is just as much a part of the plant as the machine he operates, just as much as the walls and the roof of the plant, because without him the plant cannot exist. If we terminate without planning for him, without a central plan for the entire program, we will have a termination which will lead us into the chaos we are seeking to avoid.

Yesterday it was urged that these contracts must be terminated in order that labor might not be without jobs, but I ask, what provision do we have that guarantees that the termination money will be used to keep the plants running on a converted status? We have nothing except the satisfaction of, let us say, liquidated damages for the breach of a contract by us, which breach is made necessary in the public welfare. There is no guarantee, when we terminate a contract under the existing bill as amended, that the plant which will go into civilian industry will produce anything.

Legislation hastily passed usually brings headaches. As was said yesterday, when an effort is made to get a bill involving some fifty billion or sixty billion dollars through a legislative body, with only a few hours, at the most, to study its probable effects, it may be expected to engender a headache.

The pending bill has been held up as guaranteeing to small business the right to continue operations, as helping them with the termination of their contracts. Yet in the bill itself there is denied to them the right to appeal unless the Government grants that right or takes the business over, and that is at the discretion of the man who terminates the contract.

So, as we now stand, we have a termination bill before the Senate whose sole purpose is to permit the speedy termination and liquidation of the assets of the prime contractors, to permit them to liquidate with their subcontractors, or the Government may assume responsibility, relieve the prime contractor of his liabilities to his subcontractors, and proceed to liquidate the claims itself.

There is not a single provision in the bill which would compel anyone to convert to production if he did not wish to, even if he felt it was not appropriate for him. There is not a single provision in the bill providing any method of allocating the termination, any method of deciding whether an airplane plant in one town shall be discontinued and in another town another plant shall continue, whether an engine factory in one town shall be discontinued, and not in another town,

We had an illustration of that in the case of a plant which formerly had been making radio tubes, a company which had two plants, one in one State and one in another. The company decided not to make any more tubes in the plant in one State. They did not decide to convert the plant, although the other plant they owned was in a highly congested No. 1 manpower area.

Instead they decided to force the movement of some 700 employees from an uncrowded area into a crowded area, rather than move a few carloads of machinery from a crowded area into an uncrowded area where they could take better care of their employees, and in fact to produce a radio tube more cheaply than it could have been produced in the crowded area. Wage rates in the crowded area were high; living costs were much higher; it was impossible to find room. It took some 2 months to convince that corporation that it was more economical to move a little machinery than it was to force a migration of 700 individuals.

With central direction and control the question of surplus property, the disposal of the surpluses in the contracted plants, the disposal of the manpower, can all be considered when the decisions are reached as to which plants shall be discontinued. Without centralized control each separate bureau will decide what plants it wants to terminate, and its officials in the field will decide that termination. If they suddenly decide that, shall we say, Chicago is not a desirable site for a plant producing for the Navy, they will terminate its contract.

At the same time the air service may decide that it will shut down an engine plant there, the ordnance department may shut down a plant which makes gun mounts, and the Quartermaster Corps may shut down some plant which is making uniforms. What will be the result? We simply will have turmoil in Chicago, with people trying to find a way to get out. The plants are shut down. The contractor in each plant has been satisfied. He has been paid his liquidated damages. His plant is in the process of being cleared; money has been paid to take care of the clearing of that plant, but due to the lack of centralized control there is chaos in the community.

Mr. President, it seems to me that with the experience of the past to guide us, we would do well, before passing legislation on the subject, to establish adequate controls, to set up a central agency. We know how hard it is to superimpose the controls after an agency is established. We know that difficulty in business, in government, and everywhere else, because we are a highly competitive nation, a nation which lives and moves and has its being by competition. We are proud of our individual accomplishments. We are proud of our companies and of our plants. With this highly competitive life that we lead, and with those in Government agencies following the same trend that the same kind of people in business follow, it is very likely that we will get a disjointed and poorly balanced process of terminating contracts without study being made of national needs, without a carefully prepared program based upon full knowledge. It is absolutely necessary in the passage of termination-of-contract legislation, first to set up central authority to coordinate the activities of the entire demobilization, or mobilization and conversion picture, in the form of an administrator of mobilization and conversion. Second, to give to that administrator the advice and the experience of representatives of all phases of our economy in the form of an advisory committee. Third, to furnish him with a planning agency which can study these matters and advise him as to a national plan, not the plans of individual departments and agencies, but on one plan—one plan which is Nationwide in scope. Unless we establish a planning agency and create an over-all director of demobilization, when we set up termination machinery, there is the danger of confusion arising from the existence of many plans.

My amendment does not in any way amend or seek to change the terms of termination in the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. It adds to it additional titles, titles which I feel are vital to the proper operation of the bill. They are not items in conflict with the bill, they are not items which detract from it, but rather they add to it.

For that reason, Mr. President, I strongly feel the Senate should seriously consider the amendment, that the Senate should look at termination not as a mere satisfaction of, shall we say, plant ownership, which is what the pending bill does, not simply to satisfy the financial needs of the plant owners, not simply to get rid of contracts which have been entered into and which the changing stages of war have made unnecessary, or which peace will totally wipe out.

Senators will remember that after the last war we had a very small problem of termination, but it waxed rather large in the public eye because of some of the ways in which it was handled by divergent groups and divergent agencies. This time the problem is much more vast. Where after the last war a small sum was involved, the proponents of the pending termination-of-contracts bill insist that at this time it will run into $50,000,000,000 or $60,000,000,000.

Fifty billion dollars or sixty billion dollars of the taxpayers' money properly used and properly safeguarded and properly planned for will maintain the economy of the United States, will wipe out the necessity of relief which may otherwise have to go to people who will be thrown out of jobs. It will result in a proper replacement of our population where that population belongs, and proper return of the individuals to the place where their best efforts can be used in building up and reestablishing the competitive economy of the United States, of which we have been so proud. It will assist in bringing back those who have been forced by the needs of our production to leave their homes and go into congested areas.

In brief, Mr. President, my amendment, in title I, sets forth the objectives. It gives to the Director the necessary power to meet his problems. It provides for other officers, the contract settlement or termination directors, the program planning directors, and fixes their powers. If we adopt the amendment we shall have a planned demobilization. If we fail to adopt the amendment we shall go into an unplanned contract termination, we shall go into a situation which we have no assurance will provide, in the shortest possible time, the needed civilian articles which our people are crying for, because there are no guaranties provided. We enter upon a program under which we may have vast unemployment in certain sections, and enforced migration to other sections where employment may be sought, but with no assurances that employment may be had.

Senators ask why this matter is so urgent at the present time. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] yesterday very ably called the attention of the Senate to one matter which I wish to stress a little in closing. Yesterday when I asked that action on the bill be delayed until next week to afford an opportunity to study the various phases of the bill and the subject, and to study the amendments, it was urged that unless the bill were taken up and passed immediately, it would be impossible to pass it later, because of the legislative calendar. At the same time it was stated also that all the things about which I am talking would be taken up immediately after the passage of the bill. If it is impossible, because of the legislative calendar, to take any more time for the consideration of those matters, the only conclusion I can draw is that the proponents now seek only contract termination this year, with no centralized control, no planning, no program, but merely the handing out of money to prime contractors who have already made fixed fees for contracts, many of them operating Government plants.

Therefore, if we are to take the arguments adduced yesterday, and if we are to consider them as sound, the only purpose right now is this: "Let us get the money for the prime contractors, and then let us wait until next year"—if the arguments are correct—"before we take care of any planning"—but after it had become too late to plan.

We cannot plan a battle after it is fought. We cannot plan a national program after chaos has resulted from the lack of planning. The planning must be done in advance. The controls must be set up in advance. We must provide in advance for the centralized handling. Various phases of the program might produce chaos, if there were lack of planning to handle the situation in the proper way. But with proper handling, if we would just permit that to be done—and it would take only a short time to bring that about, if everyone would cooperate—we would have that system functioning for the best interests of the national economy.

To state the matter in terms of an experience which many of us have had, I

ask whether we shall retain 3,000 or 4,000 counsel to settle our contractual differences, or whether we shall compromise our losses with the prime contractors, each on his own basis, without providing for anything else. If we do so, then "termination" becomes only the payment of liquidated damages for breach of contract. But as "termination" has been held up to the people of the country and to the small businessmen—and I have heard the small businessman spoken of a great deal—it is not merely the liquidation of damages but it is the conversion of a war industry into a peace industry, as the changing steps of war permit. It is the gradual conversion of our population from a war economy to a peace economy—not in great jumps and jerks, spotted all over the country, not with a tremendous amount of suffering involved, not with the turning back into unskilled labor, with no opportunity for training, of workers who have been partially trained in industry on repetitive work, not by merely disposing of a lot of products, but by planned progression carefully worked out, by converting each plant or its workers as its products become obsolescent or unnecessary to some other phase of the war effort.

That is the purpose of the amendment. In other words, the purpose of the amendment is to make the termination a complete one, not a liquidation of damages for breach of contract.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to read into the RECORD the following release which shows the interest of the farmers in the proposed amendment. The release was issued by the National Farmers Union. The heading reads as follows:

The following telegram has been sent by the National Farmers Union, President James G. Patton, in support of the Kilgore amendment (S. 1823) to the Murray-George contract termination bill (S. 1718).

The release then lists the Senators to whom the telegram has been sent. The list includes a large part of the membership of the Senate.

The telegram is as follows:

Strongly urge you to support amendment to contract termination bill (S. 1718) incorporating amended Kilgore bill (S. 1823). We, concurring with three labor organizations, feel that enactment of contract termination alone will make much more difficult consideration and acceptance of other vital phases of conversion from wartime production for abundance to peacetime production for abundance. Three phases, contract termination, conversion including the use of Government-owned war plants, facilities, and materials, and unemployment compensation for veterans and civilian workers should be dealt with in a single bill.

Working farm families can have markets for their products at fair prices only if we as a people fully use all human and material resources to achieve full employment and full consumption. The issue is production for abundance and peace, under a publicly sanctioned program, or production for scarcity, privately arranged and publicly policed. We urge you to vote for the Kilgore amendment which will provide a beginning in production for abundance with less regimentation than would be necessary to maintain scarcity with chronic unemployment and a heavy relief load that would sap our strength as taxpayers, producers, and consumers.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

Mr. President, this telegram has come from an organization which is not seeking unemployment compensation for its workers. It is endeavoring to make sure that the national economy is kept in balance, in order that the farmers may sell their products. Their product is food. Their interest is in the sale of food to the American people. They well remember the days when the farmers of the Middle West were burning grain. At that time the coal miners of my State could not mine coal because the western farmers who could not sell their grain had no money with which to buy coal. Consequently, when the miners could not mine the coal, they were unable to buy grain to eat.

The telegram comes from a farmers' organization which asks for nothing except a balanced economy in this country, and which believes that mere contract termination will not be enough. That organization knows, as was patently shown yesterday, that if the legislative program is as has been stated by the proponents of the bill, it probably will be impossible to get any of these matters handled until next year. It realizes that by that time the situation will be so badly out of balance that the farmers—and I mean by that the dirt farmers; they are the ones who really produce—will find it impossible to operate properly.

I should like to read into the RECORD an item published in Labor's Monthly Survey, of the American Federation of Labor, for May 1944:

A. F. OF L. ENDORSES PRINCIPLES OF KILGORE BILL

Provision for the interests of business is an urgent need. But we consider that human rights are more important than property rights. We believe that the future of this country and of the world depends on human beings and on their welfare. For these reasons the A. F. of L. has endorsed the general principles of the Kilgore bill, S. 1823, the only bill which provides for the needs of all groups in the economy and which makes it possible for these groups jointly to function in a coordinated effort for full production and employment. It is the only bill which implements the A. F. of L. policies as outlined in the A. F. of L. post-war plan. It is based on an understanding that neither industry nor agriculture can survive without the sustained purchasing power of workers fully employed at adequate wages; that those who are willing and able to work are entitled to jobs at adequate wages, or if unemployed through no fault of theirs, they are entitled to adequate unemployment compensation for the period of the emergency; that they are entitled to payment of transportation for themselves and their dependents to new jobs; that they should have opportunities for further education or retraining. The bill further provides for the needs of industry in the disposition of Government-owned goods and plants, policies regarding cutbacks and priorities for the allocation of materials with special emphasis on the interests of small business.

The bill creates an office of war mobilization and adjustment to coordinate all Federal activities with a view to maximum war mobilization and full production and employment now, during the reconversion and in peacetime. It provides for a director and for a national production-employment board consisting of representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, and the consuming public. It also establishes joint industry-labor councils for particular industries and areas, which are to be set up by the director in consultation with the board. Officials of the office and other Federal officials concerned with war mobilization and post-war adjustment are to consult regularly with the board and with the industry-labor councils. If the features of this bill are incorporated in the Murray bill, S. 1718, there will be balanced protection for all.

We anticipate that with the best of plans, there will be at least 11,000,000 unemployed during the reconversion period. The length of time of their unemployment will depend on the speed of reconversion and will vary from a few weeks to many months. Many workers are in congested war areas where there will be no post-war jobs for them. They will need information as to available jobs, possibly retraining, and funds to pay their transportation costs to their new jobs.

It is a national responsibility to take care of a national emergency. Neither the State unemployment compensation laws nor the present United States Employment Service are adequate now to handle the gigantic task ahead in helping workers to find jobs or to tide them over the period of unemployment. We are, therefore, urging: (1) A national employment service; (2) Emergency unemployment compensation for 2 years and a national system thereafter. We point out that our armed forces are not professional soldiers but returning civilian workers. We urge that their demobilization be timed so they can get jobs at once.

The phase of transportation alone is of vital importance in contract termination. When a plant employing 20,000 workers is closed, the services of the workers may be badly needed elsewhere. If they could be picked up by the Employment Service and taken to a new job and put to work, that would be far better than having them remain and stagnate in the town where the original plant was located, hoping against hope and listening to rumors from day to day to the effect that the plant is to resume operations tomorrow. Without planning, that is the very thing we shall be up against.

With all these considerations in view, I believe it is incumbent upon the Senate to study carefully this amendment and the necessity for establishing over-all controls which are so necessary to handling contract terminations. I strongly urge the Senate seriously to consider the amendment to Senate bill 1718, and, if possible, let us put through the entire bill. Let us take care of the over-all plan, and not merely seek to pay liquidated damages to plant owners.

Mr. KILGORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have added to the remarks I made a short time ago the statement which I send to the desk, made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], on the subject about which I spoke.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The so-called Murray-George bill is now before the Senate. It provides for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts and for speeding reconversion of war production to civilian production as war conditions permit. I am glad that this measure is now before the Senate, because I

believe that is is essential that the question of contract termination be thoroughly discussed and promptly acted upon. Intelligent consideration and speedy action are imperative if the job of reconversion is to be accomplished without seriously injuring our complicated economic system. Only by such an approach can we breach the gap between maximum war production and employment, and full employment and production in the post-war world.

We know that the period between the cancelation of war contracts and the full resumption of civilian activities will be a most difficult one. But we also know that the resources of this country in materials, manpower, plant facilities, and purchasing power are sufficient to create and sustain an economy of a higher and better type than that which we enjoyed before the war. However, we can only create prosperity if we are equal to the tasks that confront us.

The return to peacetime operations will require many adjustments. Many of these will have to be determined by the Congress, and the task of the Government will be to determine the standards by which business is to operate in such a way that businessmen will know where they stand. Much, too, will depend upon the courage and ability of leadership in labor. The great gains which labor has made must not be imperiled. In this connection, our outstanding labor leaders have voiced their opposition to piecemeal legislation to handle the problems of reconversion, with priority given to property legislation. These leaders have outlined their own program to protect war workers against unemployment during demobilization. Such protection is vital to the welfare of the Nation.

Many millions are engaged in manufacturing and mining operations. Any failure to provide work for even a small fraction of these will have the most serious consequences if it should continue for any appreciable period. Congress must determine that the aftermath of this war shall not be a depression in which our returning soldiers and our war workers will be without employment.

In studying and discussing the Murray-George bill, I strongly urge my colleagues to proceed at once to consider and pass comprehensive legislation dealing with our important national production and employment problems in the transition from war to peace.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77), to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there shall be appointed in the month immediately following the enactment of this act and in January of each year thereafter, a Board of Visitors to visit the United States Merchant Marine Academy, which shall consist of two Senators and three Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the chairman of the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, having cognizance of legislation pertaining to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, the chairmen of said committees being ex officio members of the Board, and of one Senator and two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively: *Provided*, That whenever a member or an ex officio member is unable to attend the annual meeting as provided in paragraph (b) of this section another member may be appointed in his stead in the manner as herein provided but without restriction as to month of appointment.

(b) Such Board shall visit the United States Merchant Marine Academy annually on a date to be fixed by the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. Each member of the Board shall be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for the actual expense incurred by him while engaged upon duties as a member of such Board.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment. The difference between the Senate action and the House action is very slight. The object is to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and that object would be accomplished by the House amendment. The difference relates entirely to the number to be appointed. As passed by the Senate, the joint resolution provided for the appointment of four Senators, in addition to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, the four Senators to be designated by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce. The House amendment provides for the appointment of two Senators by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce and one by the Vice President, with a similar method of appointing Members from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, in discussing the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co.'s business by the Federal Government, I wish to state that I fully concur in and endorse the statements made by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], in his speech before the United States Senate last Tuesday, May 2.

The Montgomery Ward seizure by the Government simply focuses the attention of the people on the great issue which, in my opinion, involves the very essence of constitutional guaranties of American liberty.

I sat on the National War Labor Board as one of the original appointees of President Roosevelt, and served for a number of months as an industry member of that Board. I can say without qualification that every industry member on that Board, then and since, has recognized that the successful prosecution of the war to victory is the one outstanding objective of all patriotic Americans.

I was opposed to enforced maintenance of union membership then, as I am now, on the ground that there is nothing in the law which gives any Government agency the right to force a man to stay in a union, continue as a member, pay dues and assessments which are ofttimes levied in arbitrary fashion, and to do all this as a condition precedent to his having the right to work and earn a living.

The honest, patriotic American working men and women are vitally and unfavorably affected by such an order as that issued in the Montgomery Ward case, which is an infringement and destruction of their constitutional rights as free Americans.

The working people of this Nation should realize that the same bayonets that are used at the direction of the Chief Executive illegally to seize private property can now or at another time be used to seize the property of the unions, the officials of the unions, and even to herd the working people of the Nation into submission to the will of some man or Government agency, contrary to the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens of the Republic.

The President himself said, when he failed successfully to solve the coal strike situation, "You cannot mine coal with bayonets." I invite attention to the fact that a business cannot be successfully conducted with bayonets.

To my mind the whole Montgomery Ward issue has been much beclouded in discussing what maintenance of union membership means, and to becloud the issue further there has been injected the point that when the National War Labor Board issues an order for maintenance of union membership it gives a 15-day so-called escape clause, which permits any member of the union at that time to withdraw within 15 days without losing his right to work.

I ask any American who knows anything about the operations of organized labor unions, if he were in the union and the Government became more or less the partner of the union in organizing and forcing membership upon the working people, would he feel safe in going to and coming from his work if he availed himself of this 15-day escape clause?

If he does not know the answer, let him ask any honest American workingman who has faced this situation, and he will explain that it would be a most uncomfortable, if not a dangerous, procedure. Let him ask the workingman's family, who sit up nights waiting for him to come home. I know whereof I speak because I have received letters from wives and daughters of workingmen who have tried this process of freeing themselves from membership in the union.

The real issue in this case is that the administration wished to impose its will upon Montgomery Ward, and I believe any fair-minded American who will analyze the facts will agree that this is so.

Back in November 1943, when the Montgomery Ward collective-bargaining contract was about to expire, the National War Labor Board, by the simple raising of a hand, could have arranged for an election involving only a few thousand employees at Chicago. That election could have been held, and within a very few days it could have been definitely known and determined whether the C. I. O., serving as collective-bargaining agent, was supported by a majority of the employees of Montgomery Ward & Co. in accord with the requirements under the law.

The whole case is as simple as that, regardless of the various issues thrown into it by the National War Labor Board, the Attorney General, or any other Government agency.

Mr. Avery and his associates were clearly within their rights in asking for an election to determine the correct bargaining agency under the law. If they had substantial reason to doubt that the

C. I. O. held a majority of the employees in its membership, they were clearly bound by duty under the law to determine the fact.

No employer has the right, under the law, to bargain with any minority group regarding wages, hours, and conditions of employment for all his employees.

The people of the United States are not interested in the complicated issues involved in this case, but they want to know that their Government is not becoming the partner of either labor or capital when there is a dispute between them.

The people want to know that we are not creating dictatorship at home while we are sending millions of our men abroad to destroy it.

The people realize that the principle involved in this case can easily lead to invoking the same principle against the smallest business in the United States if it suits the will of those who seek to intimidate the American people into submission.

The people want to know that our Government agencies are interested in settling disputes rather than creating quarrels which lead to disunity at a time when we need absolute unity in order to win the war.

They want to know that when the Government can settle a case, such as the Montgomery Ward case, by one simple order to hold an election, it will be done.

The people also want to know that Congress will review the powers which have been given to the Chief Executive in the interest of the successful prosecution of the war. If Congress finds that it has given power which validates such an act as took place in Chicago in the use of the Army to seize private property, rather than resort to the due process of law prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, then Congress will pass a clear, unmistakable law which will preserve constitutional guaranties in such a way as not to interfere with the successful winning of the war.

For this reason I was strongly in favor of and supported the resolution offered by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], which calls for a full and complete investigation of the whole situation with the expectation that the Congress will correct any excess grant of powers which it may have given.

I hope the Chief Executive of this Nation and other agencies of government will recognize that the Constitution of the United States is what the American people are fighting to preserve and that it is the duty of each of us to settle, in an American and legal way, promptly and amicably, differences that may arise.

We must avoid the creation of unnecessary quarrels and disturbances. Both labor and ownership should remember that voluntary cooperation is the foundation of Americanism and that victories obtained today through the use of unfair methods may turn out to be the disastrous defeats of tomorrow.

When we speak of preserving the Constitution of the United States, we must always remember that its preservation involves the prior preservation of the independence of the three branches of the Government. When Mr. Biddle states, "The court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive," he is virtually saying that we should disregard the independence of the three branches of the Government and that the court should be subservient to the will of the Chief Executive.

I assert that Attorney General Biddle's statement, which I have just quoted, is one of the most amazing statements which have come to the American people from the present administration.

Thomas Jefferson left a great admonition with the American people when he said, "Speak not to me of trusting officials. Let them be bound by the chains of the Constitution. We have no other protection."

Woodrow Wilson, who was our war President during the First World War, stated, "The history of a free people is the history of limitations on government."

It is the duty of the President of the United States to protect, preserve, and defend the Constitution of the United States, not only as to acts of the people outside the administration, but the very acts of the administration itself.

I think the American people will submit to any hardships and suffering necessary to win the war. But I think they are tired of being told that any question on their part as to what is necessary is proof of lack of patriotism. A healthy functioning and cooperative civilian economy is just as necessary as armed forces for the winning of the war. Unnecessary restrictions which disrupt a strong civilian economy are a direct injury to the war effort. The questions involved in this issue transcend all party lines and partisan politics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and at the conclusion thereof, a letter written to me by Mr. Thomas Roy Jones, a former industry member of the National War Labor Board, and now president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, which is composed of large and small business throughout the State of New Jersey.

I may add that the State of New Jersey held first place in production of war materials at the beginning of the war and now ranks among the first five States of the Union in its productive contribution of vital and necessary war materials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will be printed in the RECORD.

(The letter is as follows:)

MAY 2, 1944.

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AL: You and I have been industry members of the National War Labor Board and therefore are in an especially good position to realize why New Jersey businessmen are so concerned with the implications in the taking over of Montgomery Ward. We hope Congress will investigate this matter fully and that the serious issues raised will be settled on the basis of fundamental principles.

We believe Congress should conduct a thorough inquiry into every aspect of the Ward case. Have Federal agencies exceeded the scope of their authority in the procedure followed by them? The situation in our judgment calls for a definition of the Federal Government's war powers in clear and simple terms which cannot be misunderstood.

The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce has been deluged with letters and inquiries since the Montgomery Ward seizure. These indicate the tremendous interest in our State in this unprecedented action.

New Jersey businessmen are deeply disturbed by the argument made in Federal court on Monday by Attorney General Biddle in his efforts to justify the Montgomery Ward action. Mr. Biddle's statement that "the court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive" is a peremptory demand by the national administration that the courts surrender their constitutional function.

Under the procedure which the Attorney General seeks to justify, no business, group, or individual activity, war or nonwar, is beyond seizure by administration agencies. This is a dangerous philosophy and very properly is causing deep concern throughout the entire country.

Congress should take immediate steps to prevent abuse of wartime powers. Here in America, we are not willing to see constitutional processes and civil rights swept away and abrogated in dictatorial fashion.

We believe that in the seizure of the Montgomery Ward property the Federal Government has raised issues which must now be settled by Congress on the basis of fundamental principles. This is essential if the rights of business and labor and the welfare of every American citizen are to be protected.

1. Shall any one employer or employee be compelled to recognize a union as bargaining agent for all employees until it has been proven by legal election that the union which claims to represent the majority of the workers has such a majority of members in good standing?

2. Is governmentally enforced maintenance of union membership a legal and an American proceeding?

3. Is the President empowered to seize an industry, not directly engaged in war production, for the purpose of enforcing the decisions of the War Labor Board which was created to prevent industrial stoppages and slow-downs in war industries?

When the National War Labor Board orders maintenance of union membership, as it has in the Montgomery Ward and many other cases, it means that any person who is a member as of a specified date, or thereafter becomes a member of the labor organization involved, must maintain his membership in that union in order to hold his job. This includes the payment of dues and assessments and compliance with the union rules. The union, under such a War Labor Board order, can require the employer to fire from his job any employee for violation of any of the union rules. This places in the hands of union officials the power of dictatorship over the lives of free American workmen.

1. We believe in the right of labor to organize, to bargain collectively by lawfully established processes, and to strike lawfully in peacetimes.

We believe in the right of each American to choose voluntarily whether he wishes to join or not to join or remain a member of any labor organization. In like manner we believe that each American has the right to decide for himself whether he shall be or remain a member of any church, fraternal organization, society, political party, or any other lawful group. The withdrawal or the

suspension of the rights of any person to join or not to join a private organization imperils the individual's rights with respect to choice of membership in any other organization.

2. We believe that there must be equal justice for labor, management, and ownership. These three vital factors in American life must function together under voluntary cooperation, with full respect for law and order, with due regard for the rights of each group, and with particular regard for the rights of the general public.

3. We believe that it is un-American and unnecessary for the successful prosecution of the war, and a violation of the liberties of any person to force him to remain in a labor union and pay dues in order to work and earn a living.

4. We believe that labor has the same deep interest as management and ownership in avoiding unnecessary and improper seizure of property by the Government. All should remember that the same army that is used to seize business property can be used to seize union officials and the property of the union members.

5 The President of the United States has said, "You cannot mine coal with bayonets." By the same token, you cannot conduct American business with bayonets.

6. We believe that government must not become the partner of any one group—labor or business, and in all the disputes that arise, government must maintain strict impartiality in the administration of the law as established by the Congress representing the people. The administrators of government must keep themselves free from the charge of influence from pressure groups, or of political expediency.

We recommend that Congress should decide whether the President and the National War Labor Board have acted within or beyond the scope of their authority in the procedure which they have followed. The Congress should decide promptly whether such authority is required for the successful prosecution of the war. We believe the American people expect their representatives in Congress to define the war powers of the Chief Executive in simple and clear terms which cannot be misunderstood by the Chief Executive or the Government agencies. This should be done by the enactment of laws which can be clearly construed by our courts in wartime as well as peacetime, and in accordance with constitutional guarantees.

We recommend that Congress promptly review the powers it has granted for the purpose of prosecuting the war and where excessive and unnecessary power has been granted, that it should be withdrawn.

We further recommend that new legislation be enacted without delay to prevent abuses and unnecessary restrictions of the people's rights by anyone.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS ROY JONES,
President.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have listened with close attention to the remarks made by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and I wish to say that I am in full agreement with his statement that it is absolutely essential that the human side of the problem of reconversion shall be considered in connection with the total problem. I wish to say also that I am in full accord with the statement setting forth a program of required legislation issued by the labor organizations of the country which was printed in the RECORD yesterday. It would be absolutely unthinkable to pass contract-termination legislation without following it with an over-all program for reconversion. It is unfortunate we did not have the over-all legislation ready at the time when the contract-termination bill was prepared. It was the original intention, indeed, it was the fixed policy of the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning of the Senate, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to have all this legislation combined in one bill, but it was found impossible to have the other legislation prepared at the time the contract-termination bill was finally prepared and ready for consideration by the Senate. That legislation was urgent because of the volume of contract terminations. It was only on that account that the contract-termination feature of the program was divorced from the over-all legislation. The Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning through its chairman [Mr. GEORGE] has promised that it will immediately give consideration to the other proposed legislation and will take every step necessary to have it enacted at the earliest possible moment.

My committee also has been working on the same problem, and recently I sent an identical letter to various labor groups and also to industry, asking them for their recommendations with reference to the problem of unemployment. I wish to introduce that letter into the RECORD at this point, and to call attention to the fact we are beginning now to receive letters from industry answering that communication.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
April 27, 1944.

Various industry and labor groups have requested that provision be made for dismissal wages to be paid to workmen rendered unemployed on account of termination of war contracts, and that employers be reimbursed by the Government for any such payments.

In this connection several requests have been received to include a provision to that effect in S. 1718, the contract-termination bill introduced by Senator GEORGE and myself. In answer to those requests, my staff prepared and distributed some time ago a preliminary draft of a dismissal-wage provision for insertion into S. 1718.

After careful consideration of the comments received on the staff proposal for dismissal wages, I have come to the conclusion that the medium of dismissal wages is inadequate for the purpose of providing financial aid to those who will become unemployed as a result of war-contract termination. I believe that the only satisfactory way of coping with that problem is through unemployment compensation. It is my opinion that it will be necessary for the Federal Government to assist the States in providing more adequate unemployment compensation and to strengthen the financial resources of State unemployment funds. I have come to this conclusion for the following reasons:

1. The problem of unemployment resulting from war-contract termination is one of the Nation's many war problems. In part at least, therefore, the cost of coping with that problem ought to be considered a cost of the war and, like other war costs, be paid from the United States Treasury. Without Federal aid, however, the increased burden would have to be borne by State unemployment funds, and many employers may have to be taxed more heavily under experience-rating provisions in order to meet increased drain on the State funds.

2. To a large extent, unemployment compensation during the period of reconversion should be considered in the nature of a stand-by wage payable while many plants are being reconverted to peacetime production. Under many present State plans, unemployment compensation is inadequate in amount and duration for this purpose. Without adequate stand-by wages many employers would be compelled to continue workmen on their pay rolls at their own expense, although having no work for them, in order to maintain their labor force in readiness when reconversion is completed. Many employers—especially those operating with limited financial resources—will be financially unable to bear such an additional reconversion expense, and such employers should not be placed at a competitive disadvantage by comparison with employers who can afford this expense.

3. Adequate unemployment compensation is essential for the maintenance of the purchasing power of the masses of our people during any period of large-scale unemployment. Without maintaining mass purchasing power, civilian production may be discouraged because sufficient markets may be lacking.

In support of these views I would like to refer you to a recent speech by Mr. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, given before the Academy of Political Science, entitled "Preparation for Peace on the Home Front." After discussing the inadequacy of dismissal wages, he stated as follows:

"The existing State unemployment insurance laws were framed to meet local conditions of temporary unemployment and are not adequate to deal with the Nation-wide problem of reemployment. Demobilization must be regarded as a national problem and its costs as part of the costs of the war.

"I think the most constructive approach to this problem is to supplement existing State unemployment benefits to the extent necessary to give workers, during the transition from war to peace, suitable unemployment benefits to be prescribed in a Federal demobilization law."

I am giving consideration to two plans:

1. The Federal Government would pay one-half of the unemployment compensation paid under State unemployment-compensation laws. This proposal would not provide for any Federal standards as to amount or duration of benefits and would leave all action with respect to liberalization of present unemployment benefits to the initiative of the States. For that reason it might not bring about the desired results. However, if the States wished to act, the money would be available.

2. Under the second plan, Federal financial aid to any State would be conditioned upon the State meeting certain Federal standards as to amount, duration, coverage, etc., of unemployment benefits. Any State which would meet the standards established by Congress could elect to receive Federal financial aid in either of the two following ways:

(a) Fifty percent Federal reimbursement for all unemployment-benefit payments made by the State; or

(b) One hundred percent Federal reimbursement for unemployment payments in

excess of those which would otherwise have been paid under State law.

I should greatly appreciate your comments on the proposed program of emergency Federal financial aid to State unemployment funds and the two preliminary plans suggested for carrying out such a program.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have here a letter from Mr. J. Tyson Stokes, vice president, legal department, of the Baldwin Locomotive Works. I shall ask that his letter be printed in the RECORD, but first I wish to call attention to two sentences in the letter of Mr. Stokes. He says:

I heartily agree with your conclusion that the only satisfactory way to cope with this problem is through unemployment compensation.

* * * * *

This question of unemployment during reconversion is so essentially one of national economic policy that the cost of Federal aid to the States should, I think, be borne by all of the taxpayers to the same extent that all of the taxpayers bear the cost of war.

I ask that the entire letter of Mr. Stokes be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BALDWIN LOCOMOTIVE WORKS,
Philadelphia, May 1, 1944.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have read with interest your letter of April 27 in regard to S. 1718 and the question of dismissal wages to be paid to workmen who become unemployed as a result of the termination of war contracts.

I heartily agree with your conclusion that the only satisfactory way to cope with this problem is through unemployment compensation and that it would not be practical or possible to provide for dismissal wages in legislation dealing only with the termination of war contracts.

With respect to the two alternative plans referred to in your letter, I should prefer to see the adoption of plan (1) because I am one of those who feel that matters of this kind should be handled as far as possible by the several States rather than through the Federal Government. At least, I think the States should have the opportunity to cope with the problem and that the Federal assistance under plan (1) should be all that is necessary to initiate activity on the part of each State. I suppose that whether one prefers plan (1) or plan (2) depends largely on one's personal political philosophy.

As to the method of reimbursing the States, I believe that either the 50-percent reimbursement under A or the 100-percent reimbursement under B would be satisfactory. The important thing, in my opinion, so far as Federal reimbursement is concerned is to see that the burden of this charge on the Government falls on all of the taxpayers in the country rather than on particular employers whose experience rating under the State laws may involve larger contributions than other employers whose experience rating is more favorable. This question of employment during the reconversion period is so essentially one of national economic policy that the cost of Federal aid to the States should, I think, be borne by all of the taxpayers to the same extent that all of the taxpayers bear the cost of war.

Very truly yours,

J. TYSON STOKES,
Vice President, Legal Department.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to state further, Mr. President, that at a hearing before the Military Affairs Subcommittee today in which Members of the House of Representatives participated, General Hines testified on the human aspects of demobilization and post-war adjustment.

I asked General Hines if he could submit specified recommendations within 2 weeks. The general stated that he would do so within 2 weeks—after discussing the matter with the President and with Mr. Justice Byrnes.

From the scope of the subjects covered in the testimony I am confidently looking forward to recommendations from General Hines covering the following subjects:

First. The rate of demobilization from the armed services.

Second. The question of treating veterans and war workers on an equal basis.

Third. Unemployment compensation for workers and veterans.

Fourth. Education and retraining.

Fifth. Transportation back home.

Mr. President, I think that is all I have to say at this time.

Mr. KILGORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Overton
Austin	Ellender	Radcliffe
Bailey	Ferguson	Reed
Ball	George	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gerry	Reynolds
Bark'ey	Gillette	Robertson
Bilbo	Guffey	Russell
Brewster	Hatch	Shipstead
Bridges	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Mead	Weeks
Cordon	Millikin	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	White
Davis	Murray	Wilson
Downey	O'Mahoney	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is absent attending a funeral.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask for a division.

Mr. LANGER. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the question on which the Senate is voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia to Senate bill 1718. The Senator from West Virginia has asked for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAVIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to Senate bill 1718, that if I had had an opportunity to vote on the amendment I would have voted for it.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show the same statement on my own behalf as has been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry which I feel can be answered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], with respect to an amendment which we discussed, which is proposed to be offered on page 83, in subsection (f) of section 20. That amendment to the committee amendment has not been offered, and if it is appropriate to offer it at this time I should like to do so.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 20, subsection (f) on page 83, line 23, it is proposed to strike out the words "If the officer or employee receives therefor no benefit or compensation of any kind, directly or indirectly, from any war contractor," and insert in lieu thereof the word "any."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1718) was passed.

Mr. MURRAY subsequently said: Mr. President, I am gratified by the speed with which the Senate has acted on Senate bill 1718 today. I believe that this handling of the termination of war contracts problems shows that Congress is capable of coping with the other intricate problems of our economic readjustment after the war. However, Congress will not have discharged its responsibilities by the mere passage of Senate bill 1718. The bill contains general policy statements, and makes it the responsibility of the contracting agencies and the director to carry out those policies. The two principal policies of the bill are to assure fair settlements and adequate interim financing to all war contractors, whether they be prime contractors or subcontractors, and to protect the interests of the Government in connection therewith. There is, of course, danger that those policies may not be carried out or, more specifically, that inadequate attention may be paid to subcontractors in connection with settlements and interim financing, and that extravagant and wasteful settlements may be made. Senate bill 1718 specifically provides in Section 2 that the "appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall study each report submitted to the Congress under this act and shall otherwise maintain continuous surveillance of the Government agencies under the act." This responsibility on the part of Congress to see to it that the policies laid down by the Congress are carried out is a serious one, and it must be discharged properly if the power of Congress in our democratic system of government is to be maintained.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE ACT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4254 to extend for 1 year the provisions of the lend-lease legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to make one inquiry, if I may, of the Senator from Tennessee. Will the Senator from Texas yield for that purpose?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understood that the Senator from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, had a group of experts working on the lend-lease matter, and that we were about to receive a report on the general operations of lend-lease. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee intended to present the report before or during the period of consideration of the lend-lease measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct with respect to the report. I will say that there is a call for a meeting at 1:45 p. m., today, of the subcommittee which considered this matter. The Senator from New Hampshire is a member of that subcommittee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is also to be a meeting of the full Appropriations Committee at 2 o'clock this afternoon. Unless objection is made, I am going to anticipate by making a brief statement with respect to lend-lease and I shall ask that when the report comes in it may be made a part of my remarks. Is that satisfactory to the Senator from Texas and other Senators? If so, I shall make the statement now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was my understanding that the bill would not come up for consideration until the report, to which the Senator from Tennessee has just referred, was made public.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be made public after 2 o'clock today.

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator from Texas desire to take up the lend-lease bill—now?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have already moved that the Senate proceed to consider the bill, so that it may be made the pending business. I ask the Chair whether action has been taken on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion made by the Senator from Texas is still pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. The motion to proceed to consideration of the lend-lease measure is pending.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was hopeful that consideration of the bill would be postponed until some of us had had time to study the report which is to be submitted by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt that the Senator from Texas would be willing that that be done, but I should like to submit the report at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that it is my purpose, if the Senate agrees to my motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, to request the Senator from Tennessee to make the report which he has in mind, and then, after a very brief statement by me as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate will probably recess until tomorrow, so as to give Senators an opportunity to peruse the report which the Senator from Tennessee will present.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is satsfactory to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was about to say that I shall ask that the report be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and printed as a Senate document, so everyone can understand exactly what has been done under lend-lease.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Texas know whether or not the Truman committee has completed its report on the lend-lease proposal?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot at the moment say about that. I can ascertain whether it has been completed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was under the impression that that report would also be forthcoming before the question of renewing lend-lease legislation would be taken up by the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I want to be sure I understand the program. I have understood from some conversation which has taken place in the Chamber that we would proceed now with the lend-lease bill, with the understanding that it would not be disposed of today, but would go over until tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. And that at the conclusion of the consideration of the bill tomorrow the Senate would then recess until Tuesday.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the program as I understand it, that we proceed a short time today on the lend-lease bill, and then recess until tomorrow, and that tomorrow, when the consideration of the bill is completed, the Senate will then recess until Tuesday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Before voting on the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. We will vote on the lend-lease measure probably tomorrow, but I mean in the course of things we would then recess from Friday until Tuesday.

I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4254.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense

of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will wait a moment before he proceeds with his statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate has favorably reported House bill 4254, submitted Report No. 848 to accompany the bill, and requests favorable consideration of the bill by the Senate. The bill simply provides for an extension for 1 year of the so-called lend-lease legislation, except that it carries an amendment which was not incorporated in former enactments. The House inserted this provision as an amendment to section 3 (b) of the act:

Provided, however, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic policy, post-war military policy, or any post-war policy involving international relations except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

That is a safeguard which the House inserted in the bill, and to which the Senate committee agreed.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Tennessee, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has given very thorough consideration to the operations of lend-lease in connection with appropriations for that activity, I yield the floor at this time to him in order that he may give the Senate a picture of the situation, and in order that the report may be printed in the RECORD tonight for the information of Senators in their consideration of the bill. It is not my purpose to insist upon a vote on the bill today.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there was one point in the statement made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to which I should like to invite his attention at this time. After indicating that in the language adopted by the House of Representatives there appeared a proviso, the Senator explained that its insertion is designed to insure against having the President in a final settlement commit us to certain obligations which are mentioned. It becomes clear, upon reading, that the limitation upon the President's authority to act is prospective, when one refers to the words "incur any obligations on the part of the United States"; so that in any "final settlement," as the proviso reads, the President, under the authority of this particular paragraph, would have no power to incur any obligations with respect to post-war economic policy, and so forth. I think the Senator will agree with me in my understanding that the provision is prospective in application when it is considered with reference to the word "incur." Is that not correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. The language is—

In any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations.

I assume that what is meant is that during the processes of administration of this act there will be temporary arrangements for settling certain things, but that under all the master agreements there must be, in the ultimate accounting and reckoning, a final settlement. Certainly as to that the President will not be authorized to incur or assume obligations on the part of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. I agree with the construction the Senator has placed on that language; and, so far as the word "incur" is concerned, that applies prospectively, entirely.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think so.

Mr. DANAHER. But between now and the date of any final settlement it is assumedly, at least, possible that the President might wish to enter into certain obligations. Therefore, I dare say, the draftsmen used the word "assume," in the language "assume or incur," in the sense of limiting any commitment the President might make between now and the date of the final settlement. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in the main I agree with the Senator; and yet I am prepared to take the position that this language applying to the final settlement would have the effect, according to my theory, of vacating any temporary or tentative agreements which might have been made prior to the final settlement, because the final settlement will constitute the definitive terms upon which the whole program will be discontinued.

Mr. DANAHER. So that even though some unauthorized operations might now be undertaken, at the time of final settlement the President would not look to this section as the basis for binding action; is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee desire to have the absence of a quorum suggested?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I believe not. I wish to make a statement at this time, because I have a committee meeting scheduled for quarter to 2 this afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say that I hope all Members of the Senate will give attention to what the Senator from Tennessee has to say about this matter; because this bill is merely an authorization, as the others have been; and, of course, the actual appropriations have to be passed on by the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee has made a very careful investigation and examination of the reports on the lend-lease operations, and Senators probably will derive a better understanding from what the Senator from Tennessee is about to say than from any other source.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I wish to say to the Senate that about 4 months ago, as Senators will recall, the Senate Appropriations Committee borrowed five men from certain of the departments for the purpose of making expert examinations of certain questions of great importance which came before the Congress. One of the most important of those was lend-lease. This committee was put in charge of it some time ago.

On November 26, 1943, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies submitted to the staff of the Committee on Appropriations a request for as much information about lend-lease as it was possible to obtain. The report which will be filed a little later, is in answer to the request for information made at that time.

The investigation was made upon a suggestion by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], a member of the committee, in May 1943, to Mr. Stettinius. The Senator from Maryland has collaborated with the auditors in arranging this information in the best possible form so that it may be easily understood. Mr. Stettinius was then the Administrator of Lend-Lease, and since that time has been appointed Assistant Secretary of State. Mr. Leo T. Crowley has been appointed the Administrator of Lend-Lease, and is now the Administrator.

I wish to say that our staff has met with the fullest and most cordial cooperation and assistance from all departments and agencies concerned, including the interdepartmental committee, and I am very much pleased with the nature and value of the work of the expert staff of the Committee on Appropriations. We tried it out. As Senators know, the Appropriations Committee has only four clerical assistants, all told; namely, one stenographer, one clerk, and two expert clerks—Mr. Smith, the secretary of the committee, and Mr. Tolbert, the assistant secretary. An immense amount of work has devolved upon them during this war. This staff has been of great assistance to the regular clerical force of the committee. I do not suppose any clerks of any committee have been busier than have the clerks of the Appropriations Committee, and I take pleasure in saying that in my judgment this staff has done excellent work.

Exhibit 10 to the report of the committee investigators, which will be filed a little later, will show that lend-lease aid amounts to $21,794,237,819.

Let me read that figure again.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Once is enough for me. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a very large amount of aid.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does that include transfers from the War Department, the United States Army, or the United States Navy, in the field, or does it represent straight appropriations?

Mr. McKELLAR. It represents lend-lease aid entirely. There were other expenditures, and our staff has reported the amounts of such expenditures, which I shall give to the Senate in a moment. If the Senator is in doubt about any matter, I hope he will interrupt again.

These amounts are divided as follows: The British Empire has received in lend-lease aid $15,640,479,250, out of a total of $21,000,000,000 plus. Russia has received

$4,161,422,010; China, $418,296,436; Latin America, $158,537,916; other countries, $582,891,622. General aid, given in various ways and amounts, aggregated $832,610,585. This general expense includes moneys expended for production facilities in the United States, storage and distribution services, and general expenses, which together with the other amounts, aggregate a total of $21,794,237,819.

To repeat, the British Empire received a little more than fifteen and a half billion dollars, and Russia received $4,161,422,010. However, it must be explained to the Senate that there were other items expended in foreign countries which our committee has examined and reported upon. We have made loans through the Export-Import Bank, and there were other loans made which will be referred to hereafter. We have made loans aggregating $854,423,225. We made a grant of an insignificent sum of $31,985. There were investments of $4,099,362. We have constructed facilities in various countries amounting to $1,465,842,209. We purchased goods in other countries—and I hope Senators will keep this in mind—amounting to $4,172,856,091.

The current expenses of all these transactions amount to $1,638,872,746, and other aid and expenditures aggregated $432,323,922, or a grand total in loans, investments, purchases, and in several other ways which I have just enumerated, of $30,362,687,362.

I am reading from notes, something that I do not often do, because I wish to be very accurate about the figures, and I thank Senators for listening to the notes rather than what I might say about it.

Of this expenditure, approximately $19,700,297,674 has gone to Great Britain and her Empire; $4,214,921,449 has gone to Russia; $2,327,378,789 has gone to Latin-America.

It will be recalled that last winter quite a controversy arose following a visit to Central and South America by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. Upon his return it was claimed that $6,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 had been expended in South America. I then showed that there had been expended during the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943 the sum of $1,483,373,000, and that during the fiscal year 1944 approximately $1,000,000,000 additional would be expended.

It will be seen from these figures that the exact amount expended in Latin-America was $2,327,378,789, as was demonstrated last winter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does that include such things as the Army building airports in Brazil, Cuba, and so forth?

Mr. McKELLAR. It does.

Mr. TAFT. Does it include also strictly Army expenditures?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; Army and Navy expenditures. It includes all moneys expended by Lend-Lease and by other authorities having the power to expend. I am now talking about the $30,000,000,000, the over-all sum, which includes the Army, the Navy, the Foreign Economic Administration——

Mr. TAFT. Does it include loans made by the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. McKELLAR. It includes all loans made by the Export-Import Bank, and it includes all moneys expended and all purchases made. The Senator may recall that a few moments ago I particularly emphasized that we had made purchases in foreign countries amounting to more than $4,000,000,000.

For obvious reasons, the committee has not reported the amounts going to each Central or South American country, but the committee has the figures, and any Senator may see them at any time. I think I should say that Brazil received a larger amount than did any other South American country. There were two reasons for that. At that time it was felt that the West Coast of Africa, especially the port of Dakar, would fall into the hands of the Germans, and it was feared that Germany might undertake an invasion of this hemisphere by that route, it being only about 1,800 miles from the nearest coast of Brazil. Therefore considerable sums were expended in Brazil to aid her in protecting her coasts from German invasion. As I recall the amount, it was about $100,000,000. A considerable sum was also expended for the production of rubber, and for this reason I am giving the total amount expended in Brazil. The total amount expended in Brazil up to date is $427,742,152, of which $1,536,227 was lend-lease expenditure.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that the Army and Navy expended a very considerable sum in Brazil, looking to a possible invasion of this hemisphere because of the expected German occupation of west Africa. That was not carried through, and nothing happened. Those expenditures, of course, have ceased.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell us whether the figures as to Brazil include commitments for future advances for such projects as the development of steel plants? I have understood that there were such commitments. I presume these figures represent only actual expenditures.

Mr. McKELLAR. These are only actual expenditures. As I have already stated, considerable funds have also been expended in experiments looking to the production of rubber. Senators will recall that our supply of rubber from the East Indies, where we obtained most of our rubber, was cut off, and an attempt was made to promote the production of rubber.

It will also be recalled that Argentina has never joined the Allies, and that no lend-lease assistance whatever was given to her, as the record will show.

In a moment I shall give a summary of the investigators' report. I refer to page 29. The summary covers from March 11, 1941, to March 31, 1944, and Government expenditures abroad for the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for that portion of the fiscal year 1944 for which different agencies had figures available ranging from 4 to 8 months. The report shows a total figure of approximately $30,000,000,000, distributed as follows:

Lend-lease aid	$21,794,237,819
Loans	854,423,225
Grants	31,985
Investments	4,099,362
Construction of facilities	1,465,842,209
Purchases	4,172,856,091
Current expenses	1,638,872,748
Other aid	432,323,923
Total	30,362,687,362

Distributions were made geographically as follows:

British Empire	$19,700,297,674
Russia	4,214,921,449
Latin America	2,327,378,789
China	920,349,451
Other countries	3,199,739,999

Or a total of $30,362,687,362.

Mr. President, I have the committee recommendations which I wish to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, but I will not read them. I ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. What does the Senator mean by committee recommendations? The committee has not met as yet.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I know that. My statement is predicated on the action which will be taken by the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that before we agree to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee, the committee should meet and pass upon these matters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I withdraw the request for the present, until after the committee has met and acted.

I doubt whether the war could be successfully conducted in any other way than through the lend-lease program. From the facts presented to our committee I believe that the program has been faithfully, honestly, and efficiently carried out. I believe the program should be continued, and I hope the bill will be passed.

At this time I ask that all members of the Appropriations Committee retire and meet, and pass upon the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the preliminary report of the committee investigators to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on lend-lease aid and Government expenditures abroad, and I also ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The report was ordered to be printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. No. 190), and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON LEND-LEASE AID

MAY 1, 1944.

The CHAIRMAN,
Subcommittee on Deficiencies,
Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Under date of November 22, 1943, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies directed that the following data be secured:

"1. By countries, all lend-lease aid given by the United States.

"2. By countries, all lend-lease aid furnished the United States.

"3. We will want to know in reasonable detail what the aid contained in propositions 1 and 2 consists of.

"4. We want to know the extent of purchases and for which made, by countries, of the Bureau of Economic Warfare.

"5. We want to know the expenditures and purposes for which made, by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

"6. We want to know the expenditures and the purposes by countries made by the R. F. C. and all branches thereof.

"7. We want to know what the purchases or loans were by foreign countries made by the Export and Import Bank.

"8. We want to know the expenditures made by the Army and by the Navy in foreign countries and the purposes for which expended.

"9. We want to know the expenditures by foreign countries made to our Army or Navy other than by lend-lease in reverse for use of our Army and Navy.

"10. Finally, we want a master set of books showing by countries what each has received under any agency of our Government and we want to know by countries what we have received from any agency of any other government. Finally, again we want a superbalance sheet which shows these totals by countries in dealings direct and indirect of our expenditures and theirs in any and all foreign fields."

It will be seen from the very nature thereof that the assignment is a continuing one, the ultimate aim of which is to develop a record of lend-lease aid and expenditures abroad that will be of material benefit to the committee on Appropriations and to the Congress at the time hostilities have ceased and settlements between the nations are undertaken. It is felt advisable, however, at this time to submit a preliminary report to the committee setting forth the progress that has been made, the difficulties that have been encountered, and the steps that are being taken ultimately to furnish the information desired.

GENERAL

After a study of the Lend-Lease Act and the various appropriations made thereunder, a letter was addressed to the various departments and agencies of the Government involved calling for the submission of reports setting forth the following information:

1. Lend-lease aid—to be shown under the various heads of the Lend-Lease Act, namely: Ordnance and ordnance stores; aircraft and aeronautical material; tanks and other vehicles; vessels and other watercraft; miscellaneous military equipment; facilities and equipment; agricultural, industrial, and other commodities; testing, reconditioning, etc., of defense articles; services and expenses; administrative expenses.

2. Loans.

3. Grants.

4. Investments.

5. Construction of facilities.

6. Purchases.

7. Current expenses of United States Government agencies.

8. Any other aid furnished to or expenditures made in or for the benefit of a foreign country, but not included in any of the above categories.

9. The amounts of aid, expenditures, contributions, etc., made by other countries for the benefit of the United States or for the joint benefit of the United States and the foreign country, in the prosecution of the war, this report to cover the same period and be set up in the same manner and detail as the one showing the aid, etc., furnished by the United States.

Shortly after sending out this letter, in contacting the Foreign Economic Administration and other agencies it was learned that there was in existence an Interdepartmental Committee to Study Recording and Reporting of Lend-Lease Transactions and Government Expenditures Abroad. This interdepartmental committee was the outgrowth of the suggestion by Senator TYDINGS, made during the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations in May 1943 to Mr. Stettinius, then Administrator of Lend-Lease, of the necessity and advisability for having some central agency through which all aid and expenditures abroad could be coordinated and from which records periodic statements for the benefit of the Congress could be prepared. At the suggestion of Mr. Stettinius the study was undertaken by the Bureau of the Budget, with representatives from the State Department, Treasury Department, War Department, Navy Department, and Foreign Economic Administration comprising the committee. The function of the interdepartmental committee was to appraise the methods of accounting and reporting, and to make recommendations for desirable improvements therein; it was not called upon to produce dollar figures or even estimates of foreign transactions.

When the representatives of the Appropriations Committee learned of the existence of the interdepartmental committee, it was realized that there would be duplication of effort to the extent of the study of the methods of accounting and reporting. Accordingly, to avoid this duplication of effort, and at the same time to take advantage of the work accomplished and time spent by the interdepartmental committee—comprised of men thoroughly familiar with all phases of aid being rendered and expenditures made—contact was made with the chairman of the committee. It was learned that the interdepartmental committee had completed its work and was in the process of writing its report and, in a fine spirit of cooperation, your representatives were invited to sit in on several of its meetings. As a result of the discussions at these meetings, and others with the chairman of the committee, the report of the interdepartmental committee was submitted to the Appropriations Committee by letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to Senator MCKELLAR, acting chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, dated March 11, 1944.

The principal recommendations of the interdepartmental committee were:

1. That early action be taken in designating an agency as a clearinghouse for all records and reports concerning international transactions.

2. That each agency involved in international transactions designate a liaison office for contact with the clearinghouse.

The more important of the specific recommendations made by the committee are set forth on pages 15, 16, and 17 of its report.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEARINGHOUSE

In line with the recommendation of the interdepartmental committee, the President, in a letter addressed to the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration, under date of April 7, 1944, directed him to establish such a clearinghouse in the Foreign Economic Administration, under a director to be appointed by him. The functions of the clearinghouse include:

"1. To develop, in cooperation with the other agencies concerned, such forms and procedures as will assure the necessary information on our transactions relative to foreign areas.

"2. Where more than one agency is involved, to collaborate with the agencies of whom information is requested in furnishing such information within, of course, the limits of security requirements.

"Information to be covered by this arrangement should include, particularly, transactions on account of international aid, relief in liberated areas, procurement abroad, loans and financial aid, and all other Government outlays and expenditures abroad and receipts from abroad, and also inventory information concerning military and nonmilitary installations, improvements, and stock piles abroad."

The President further stated that it would seem advisable to establish an advisory interdepartmental committee to assist the director, which committee might, among others, include representatives of the Department of State, Department of the Treasury, War Department, Department of the Navy, Department of Commerce, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. (A copy of the President's letter is attached hereto, marked "Exhibit I.")

Furthering the spirit of cooperation which has been exhibited by officials of the Foreign Economic Administration, Mr. Crowley, under date of April 15, 1944, addressed a letter to Senator MCKELLAR, advising him of the action of the President and requested that a representative of the investigative staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee be named to serve on the advisory committee. (A copy of this letter is marked "Exhibit II.")

With the findings of the interdepartmental committee thus made available to the Appropriations Committee, the staff centered its efforts on securing reports showing the value of aid rendered and the amount of expenditures abroad. The original reports called for were to be submitted as of October 31, 1943, with monthly reports thereafter. For several of the agencies, particularly the War and Navy Departments, the reports to October 31, 1943, have been the only ones received. This, of course, is due to the delay in information reaching them from all parts of the world. For other agencies reports have been received up to and including February 29, 1944.

For the purpose of this report, comments will be made on each of the items set forth in the memorandum of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, with tabulated statements attached to show the details. In this connection the attention of the committee is respectfully invited to the requests of the War and Navy Departments that, for reasons of military security, the figures furnished herein be kept secret. It is also the desire of the Foreign Economic Administration that the break-down of lend-lease aid by countries be kept confidential; and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs likewise requests that the country-by-country break-down of the expenditures of his office be kept confidential.

APPROPRIATIONS

Lend-lease appropriations made to the President total $24,683,629,000. Of this amount a total of $22,576,626.477.54 has been allocated to various departments and agencies of the Government, leaving an unallocated balance as of February 29, 1944, of $2,107,002,522.46. Of the amount allocated, the sum of $18,748,927,285.53 has been obligated by the departments and agencies to which allocated, leaving an unobligated balance of $3,827,699,192.01. The available funds (unallocated and unobligated) as of February 29, 1944, therefore amounted to $5,934,701,714.47. (A statement showing the status of the lend-lease appropriations is attached, marked "Exhibit III.")

In addition to the lend-lease appropriations made to the President, transfers from

appropriations made to the War and Navy Departments and to the Maritime Commission have been authorized to the extent of $35,970,000,000. In reports of lend-lease aid furnished, however, no distinction is made as to the appropriations under which the items were procured or transferred.

In addition to the foregoing, Congress has with certain limitations authorized the leasing of ships of the Navy and merchant ships constructed with funds appropriated to the Maritime Commission, without any numerical limitation as to the dollar value or the number of such ships which may be so leased.

DIRECT LEND-LEASE

Lend-lease aid to January 31, 1944, amounted to $21,794,737,819. Of this total, $20,961,627,234 represented actual transfers to lend-lease countries, including items totaling $549,487,264 consigned to United States commanding generals for subsequent transfer in the field. The remainder of $832,610,585 covered charges not allocated to the lend-lease countries, as follows:

Production facilities in the United States	$604,993,000
Storage and distribution services and facilities in the United States	94,584,566
Transportation charges, supplies, and materials for vessels, ferrying of aircraft expenses, miscellaneous and contingent expenses	99,813,019
Administrative expenses	33,220,000
Total	832,610,585

The figure of $20,961,627,234, representing actual transfers to lend-lease countries, is distributed as follows:

Ordnance and ordnance stores	$2,546,442,101
Aircraft and aeronautical material	3,854,473,980
Tanks and other vehicles	3,047,854,819
Vessels and other watercraft	3,346,058,940
Miscellaneous military equipment	834,920,143
Facilities and equipment	540,144,111
Agricultural, industrial, and other commodities	5,410,118,412
Testing, reconditioning, etc., defense articles	511,035,784
Services and expenses	321,091,680
Consigned to commanding generals for subsequent transfer	549,487,264
Total	20,961,627,234

From a geographical standpoint, the distribution is:

British Empire	$15,640,479,250
Russia	4,161,422,010
China	418,296,436
South American republics	136,944,906
Mexico and Central American republics	17,440,208
Caribbean area	4,152,802
Other countries	582,891,622
Total	20,961,627,234

(A table showing a further distribution of these figures is attached as exhibit IV.)

In this connection it is felt advisable to bring to the attention of the committee comments made by the Foreign Economic Administration, the War Department, and the Navy Department, as follows:

"FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION

"An important limitation exists in the figures for the United Kingdom in that they are not broken down to show retransfers to the dominions and colonies. In the early days of the lend-lease program it was agreed that all requests for goods or services for the British Empire would be made on United Kingdom requisitions. This was done to insure that all possible materials would be furnished from within the Empire before lend-lease aid was requested, to permit the greatest flexibility in the distribution of all materials from within the Empire in accordance with the shifting strategy of modern war, and for other military reasons. Consequently, our records were set up on this basis and it is not possible at this time to determine from the total goods transferred the value of retransfers by the United Kingdom to the dominions and colonies. We have, however, the basic records from which this information can be obtained.

"The need for this information has been recognized, however, and we are proceeding with the work of breaking down the transfer data as rapidly as possible. It is a sizable job and several months will be required to complete it. As a stopgap, to serve until the distribution of United Kingdom transfers have been completed, we have furnished a break-down of lend-lease exports to the constituent parts of the British Commonwealth. There is a close relationship between goods exported and goods transferred and it is believed that the exports data will provide a satisfactory indication of the destination of goods transferred until such time as the compilation of retransfers has been completed.

"WAR DEPARTMENT

"(a) Some duplication exists between the amounts reported monthly to the Foreign Economic Administration by the War Department for lend-lease aid and the expenditures reported in paragraph 7 of this submission for the reason that supplies purchased in foreign countries may be transferred to the foreign government as lend-lease aid. The amount of this duplication cannot be determined.

"(b) Aid furnished by overseas theaters is valued by the theater and the accuracy of such values cannot be verified in the War Department as the condition of the items transferred is not known. Reports are not complete on this aid furnished.

"(c) Diversions to United States Army use of lend-lease war material by theater commanders have not been eliminated from transfers reported to the Foreign Economic Administration. Reports received from theaters were incomplete and not priced. Those data have been returned to the field for completion and evaluation.

"NAVY DEPARTMENT

"The following comments on reports of transfers are pertinent. Transfers are not reported until the transaction is complete, and all documents, including a receipt signed by an agent of the foreign government, has been received in the Navy Department.

"Services rendered are reported as a transfer when it is possible to identify them with a foreign requisition. Where it is not possible to identify a service with a specific foreign requisition, as for example, freight charges on miscellaneous lend-lease material, the expenditure is handled in one of two ways, i. e.,

"(a) If made from an allocation of funds to the Navy from lend-lease appropriations to the President, it is reported to F. E. A. as a lend-lease expenditure under category 9 of the allocation without reference to nation; or

"(b) If made from a naval appropriation it is reported as an expenditure from that appropriation for the purpose of the appropriation without reference to lend-lease, and no report is made to F. E. A.

"No attempt has been made to assign production facilities to specific foreign nations, they are all considered as United States facilities, and in most cases are used by the United States as well as for the nation whose requisition may have prompted their initiation. The cost-of-production facilities, when financed from allocations from lend-lease appropriations to the President, is reported to F. E. A. as an expenditure against category 6 of the allocation, without reference to foreign nation. No report is made to F. E. A. when such facilities are financed from regular naval appropriations. With the exceptions dealt with herein in section No. 4, all such facilities, however financed, are in the United States.

"No attempt has been made to evaluate information imparted under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act and no report has been made to F. E. A.

"In addition to the exceptions in reports to F. E. A. noted in the foregoing, there are other minor exceptions. For example, in determining inspection, handling administrative and like costs which are incurred in dealing with lend-lease activities it is usually not possible effectively to segregate and prorate the lend-lease portion from the regular Navy portion. Such costs have therefore been absorbed by the naval appropriations.

"The valuations of transfers reported to F. E. A. and of expenditures of allocations of lend-lease funds from appropriations made to the President have been based on costs as determined by contract or purchase price or by actual expenditures from the allocations made. It is clear that in view of the exceptions cited above, this is not the true cost. Given time and effort a close approximation to the true cost might be made."

REVERSE LEND-LEASE

The problem of reporting and valuing reverse lend-lease aid constitutes one of the most difficult and complex problems with which the United States Government is faced in its program of mutual aid with foreign governments.

As of March 15, 1944, reciprocal aid was reported as follows:

Country	Source of information	End date of report	Amount
United Kingdom:			
In United Kingdom	United Kingdom Government	Dec. 31, 1943	[1] $1,366,170,000
In areas outside British Isles	do	do	160,000,000
Australia	Australian Government	do	362,365,000
New Zealand	New Zealand Government	do	91,886,000
India	U. S. Army and W. S. A.	do	116,251,000
South Africa	Union Government	June 30, 1943	145,000
Belgian Congo	Army	Nov. 30, 1943	284,000
French North and West Africa	Army, Navy, W. S. A. (estimated)	Jan. 1, 1944	30,600,000
New Caledonia	New Caledonian Government	Mar. 14, 1943	315,000
French Equatorial Africa	Army	Aug. 31, 1943	50,000
Netherlands in Surinam	do	Oct. 31, 1943	85,000
Russia	Russian Government	Sept. 30, 1943	1,000,000
Total			2,129,151,000

[1] Does not include raw materials other than benzol.

It must be borne in mind that the above figures represent estimates, and are not final.

The reporting of reciprocal aid has been difficult. Originally, the Army and Navy required its overseas commanders to report the aid received in detail, as well as the value thereof, determined either on the basis of values furnished by foreign governments or, alternatively, estimates by United States military or naval personnel. As the volume of reciprocal aid increased, this reporting requirement became a very heavy burden. In the case of the United Kingdom, particularly, the British Government stated that it could not individually price "issue vouchers" covering goods provided to our forces, inasmuch as its accounting system was not established on such a basis that individual prices could readily be determined, and the manpower which would be required to determine such individual prices could not be spared from more important tasks contributing directly to the prosecution of the war.

Faced with the lack of any indication of costs from the British Government in the great majority of items being obtained, our forces concluded that a separate pricing or estimating of value by them would call for a large staff of price analysts whose services could not be spared from the war effort. Moreover, it was felt that even a large force of price analysts would face grave difficulties in arriving at fair estimates of value, due to the dissimilarity of foreign and United States items, the great variety of items involved, etc.

Accordingly, in October 1942, the instructions to our forces overseas with respect to the reporting and valuation of reciprocal aid were revised to permit the recording of aid in terms of a description of items received, in order to permit subsequent evaluation in Washington when that became necessary. Any values furnished by foreign governments, however, were to continue to be reported to Washington. Many reports of this nature have been received and are on file in the Foreign Economic Administration, but up to the present time no action has been taken to evaluate them, as it is felt that any evaluation at the present time would be purely arbirary and subject to receipt of further information from foreign governments which may not be available until after the war.

As public interest in reverse lend-lease increased during subsequent months, and because of the desire of the Congress and interested Government agencies to obtain, if possible, some monetary measurement of the volume and scope of reciprocal aid, it became apparent that some attempt would have to be made to arrive at a reasonable compromise. Therefore, in June and August 1943, the Army and Navy issued instructions to their overseas commanders requiring that reciprocal aid be reported in the following manner:

1. Values would be requested from responsible foreign government representatives, the values so received representing unilateral estimates by the foreign government to which the United States Government does not necessarily agree;

2. Any values received from foreign government representatives would not be disputed, but would be reviewed by United States military and naval personnel; and if they were not in agreement with the valuations furnished by foreign governments, they were to submit their own estimate of value for the information of the United States Government; and

3. In the absence of any values furnished by foreign governments, United States military and naval personnel were to arrive at their own estimate of value based upon local cost, market value, or any other reasonable basis.

Simultaneously, negotiations were entered into with the British Government with a view to inducing it to alter its policy on the reporting of reverse lend-lease aid which it has supplied. As a result of these negotiations, the British issued on November 11, 1943, a white paper indicating an estimate (stated to be incomplete) of their out-of-pocket expenditures up to June 30, 1943, in furnishing reciprocal aid to the United States forces. The British Government agreed further that it would thereafter provide quarterly statements of its expenditures for reciprocal aid rendered to United States forces in the United Kingdom. These statements were to reflect approximately 50 major categories and more than 300 subcategories of goods and services. This statement was not to be based in each case on individual prices, which it was stated were not available, but was to be prepared from the figures currently available under the British accounting system and was to represent the best estimates possible by the British Government of the reciprocal aid extended by them to United States forces.

It has been agreed that the reports described will be accepted as unilateral estimates of the British Government, and that the American Government will not be deemed either to agree to them or to be committed by them. While it has been agreed that itemized pricing of individual items may represent an unwarranted expenditure of manpower at this time, the United States Government has reserved the right to request that the British Government supply itemized prices at a later date when the required expenditure of manpower would not interfere with the war effort.

Except for shipping services, the British Government's statements apply only to supplies furnished and services rendered within the United Kingdom. In addition, the United Kingdom is extending aid to American forces from its colonies in various parts of the world. Full and complete records of the value of the aid transferred in these areas may never be available, particularly for transfers which have occurred during combat. Insofar as the records are available, reports containing monetary expenditures are now being prepared by the British Government. In the meantime, reports are being made by United States forces in those areas.

The Governments of Australia and New Zealand are also periodically making available statements of the cost to them of providing reverse land-lease assistance. The problems of reporting encountered in these areas are not so great as in the United Kingdom. For example, in New Zealand all United States supply functions have been centralized in a Joint Purchasing Board on which the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are represented. When goods or services are obtained, the armed forces certify their receipt and pass the vouchers back to the appropriate New Zealand Government department for payment, and such records then provide a statement of expenditures made. In the case of works projects constructed for us by the New Zealand Government, however, there are the difficulties encountered in assessing post-war values and in allocating expenditures for works jointly constructed by American and foreign forces.

In all other areas records of reverse lend-lease received are obtained from the armed forces. Until July 1943, these reports usually were confined to physical descriptions in quantities of goods and services received, to provide a basis for subsequent valuation if such should be necessary. Since July 1943, however, our forces have been endeavoring to obtain estimates of expenditures for all aid received. While these estimates will be of considerable assistance in the future determination of lend-lease benefits, they do not represent a statement by the foreign government of its costs, and provide only a unilateral estimate by United States military or naval personnel operating under difficult conditions.

The need for uniformity in the reporting and valuation of reciprocal aid has been recognized by the armed forces. Because of the complexities of the problem, particularly in combat areas, it has not yet been possible to arrive at a system which is entirely uniform or acceptable. Efforts are constantly being made, however, to improve both the system used and the reports submitted.

A comment by the Navy Department on reciprocal aid would be of interest to the committee:

"The Navy Department reports to the F. E. A. (formerly the Lend-Lease Administration) monthly all reverse lend-lease or reciprocal aid which has been reported. Reports of such reciprocal aid to the Navy Department are admittedly deficient for various reasons. Vigorous steps have been and are being taken to correct this deficiency and these steps are showing results. Some of the reasons why such reports have not been adequate are as follows: Much of the reciprocal aid has been received on the active fighting fronts where the commanding officers have neither the time nor the facilities to maintain the necessary records and to render the corresponding reports. Reciprocal aid has never been distinctly defined and conceptions of what constitutes reciprocal aid and what constitutes joint military operations vary considerably. Some reciprocal aid is difficult if not impossible to evaluate in terms of dollars. The United Kingdom has been very reluctant to place a price on any reciprocal aid, although the aid has been offered freely. In cases where no value or cost is assigned by the foreign government, but quantities and the nature of services have been reported, it is impossible for the Navy Department to assign any significant valuation. Not only do questions of exchange arise, but it is impossible for our officers to estimate the real cost to the foreign government. Furthermore, even if the approximate cost to the foreign government were known, the question arises as to whether that is the real value, or whether it should be the corresponding value of a similar article or service in this country or if supplied from this country. Because of these difficulties the instructions have been changed several times.

"At present the instructions require our officers to demand a price figure from the foreign government and to submit that figure, together with his own comment, if any. If no price can be obtained from the foreign government, our officers are instructed to submit their own best estimate, together with information as to upon what the estimate was based and the rate of exchange used. Obviously none of these methods of evaluation is entirely satisfactory, but the method by which the foreign government states the cost to it of the aid rendered appears to be the most desirable and is comparable to our own method of evaluating direct lend-lease. Reports on this basis are now being regularly received from Australia and New Zealand and the British Admiralty is being urged to adopt a similar policy."

There is much to be done to develop adequate information on reverse lend-lease. The final story, however, will not be possible until after the cessation of hostilities.

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

The Economic Defense Board was established by Executive Order 8839 under date of July 30, 1941, for the purpose of developing and coordinating policies, plans, and programs designed to protect and strengthen the international economic relations of the United States in the interest of national defense. The name was changed to the Board of Economic Warfare by Executive Order 8982, dated December 17, 1941. Executive Order 9361 of July 15, 1943, established within the Office for Emergency Management an Office of Economic Warfare, and the Director as-

sumed the functions, powers, and duties of the Board of Economic Warfare, which was terminated by the same order. By Executive Order 9380 of September 25, 1943, the Office of Economic Warfare was consolidated into the Foreign Economic Administration, established by the same order.

The Board of Economic Warfare as such made no purchases. However, upon directives from the War Production Board for the procurement of strategic materials it conducted preliminary negotiations and issued directives to subsidiary corporations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to execute contracts that would provide the necessary materials and supplies.

As a result of Executive Orders 9361 and 9385, all foreign procurement contracts then in existence were transferred to the Foreign Economic Administration and are being processed through the United States Commercial Company. Likewise, all new foreign procurement contracts are being negotiated in the name of that company.

The purchases are made through the subsidiary corporations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and are incorporated in the figures reported for those organizations.

COORDINATOR OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs was set up by order of the Council of National Defense on August 16, 1940, and by Executive Order 8840 of July 30, 1941, was established within the Office for Emergency Management, for the purpose, among others, of furthering the national defense and strengthening the bonds between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Expenditures are made from direct appropriations and transfers or allocations from the Office for Emergency Management and the Emergency Fund for the President. No lend-lease funds are involved.

Expenditures made in Latin-American countries to December 31, 1943, amounted to $24,038,243, as follows (see statement attached as exhibit V):

Loans	$363,818
Grants	31,985
Health and sanitation	9,535,605
Food supply	2,407,797
Coordination committees	3,739,986
Transportation	1,500,536
Newsprint shipping subsidy	428,383
Emergency operations	1,379,162
Technical and other assistance (including administrative expenses)	4,650,971
Total	24,038,243

A brief statement on each of the larger items follows:

Loans: There have been only two loan agreements, both of which involve financing of the purchase of equipment. The amounts of the agreements total $649,187 and $360,803, respectively. Advances have totaled $102,522 and $261,296, respectively. Repayments totaling $18,959.02 have been made under the first agreement.

Health and sanitation: The objectives of these programs are (a) to improve health conditions in strategic areas particularly with relation to the requirements of our armed forces and those of our other American allies; (b) to make possible increased production of strategic materials in areas where bad health conditions exist; (c) to raise the general standard of public health practices; and (d) to demonstrate, by carrying out an action program beneficial to all classes of people, that this Government is vitally interested in the welfare of the peoples of the other American republics, thereby helping to obtain an effective realization of this Government's program of hemisphere solidarity. The programs include malaria control, environmental sanitation, improvement of water supply, construction of sewage systems, construction and equipping of hospitals and health centers, control of plague, leprosy, and communicable diseases, medical care of migrants and workers engaged in the production of strategic materials, and the training of doctors, sanitary engineers, hospital administrators, nurses, and other national personnel.

Food supply: The objectives are (a) to stimulate the production of foodstuffs in areas where the demand for food has been increased because of large concentrations of troops and war vessels; (b) to provide sufficient quantities of foodstuffs for workers engaged in the procurement of strategic materials; and (c) to produce foodstuffs in areas which could no longer be supplied by shipments from other areas because of the absence of sufficient shipping. These programs involve technical assistance for the increase and improvement of production of foodstuffs and fiber products; procurement and distribution of supplies and equipment, such as hand tools, insecticides and fungicides, seed and plants; improvement of storage and processing facilities; development of irrigation; and training in practical agricultural methods.

Coordination committees: The expenditures under this head represent funds made available to committees located in the other American republics which have been organized by United States citizens of long residence in those countries. They work in close relationship with the Office of the Coordinator and the United States embassies and consulates in carrying out an information program the purpose of which is to spread a wider knowledge of this country in the other Americas. They arrange for the distribution of visual and press materials, for local radio programs, for the distribution of nontheatrical motion-picture films, and for small projects in the educational field.

Transportation: The expenditures reported under this category relate to the obligations assumed under notes exchanged on November 18, 1942, between the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico, whereby it was agreed that both nations would collaborate in the rehabilitation of certain key lines of the Mexican National Railways. United States Government agencies had purchased in Mexico large quantities of strategic materials needed for direct war use. Conditions had so affected off-shore shipping that the Mexican National Railways were called upon to transport all of these vitally needed materials, as well as supplies and equipment shipped from the United States to war installations south of Mexico. The resulting traffic burden greatly exceeded peacetime traffic loads and many changes and improvements were essential to continued operation of the railways. Each government agreed to furnish a proportionate part of the material and equipment required, the Mexican Government and the Mexican National Railways agreed to direct their operating facilities toward the fullest realization of the rehabilitation program, while the United States Government further agreed to furnish necessary technical assistance (trained mechanical, track, and transportation technicians).

The United States Railway Mission in Mexico was created to implement this agreement. Although both governments agreed to contribute material and equipment, the major contribution by the United States has been in technical assistance. Continued contribution by the Mission will consist largely of technical advice and supervision of various educational programs designed to impart knowledge and understanding of modern practices in railroad operation and maintenance to the Mexican officials and employees.

Newsprint shipping subsidy: These expenditures apply to payments made to carriers for the difference between the established rate for newsprint and the rate at which the carriers would agree to ship newsprint to the other American republics. The ocean freight rate was reduced in 1940 to $9.84 per ton by the United States Government. With the outbreak of war and the consequent scarcity of shipping space, the available space was naturally utilized for commodities carrying higher rates. While the requirement for Central and South America is only about 2 percent of United States consumption, the situation, due to the lack of shipping, was relatively much more serious. It was to the interest of this country to help keep friendly newspapers in business. The most satisfactory method seemed to be the payment of a shipping subsidy to bring newsprint up on a level with other commodities. This method was chosen, rather than an increase in the shipping rate, because of the economic condition of the newspapers, which had already been severely hit by the drop in advertising revenue due to the war.

Emergency operations: Expenditures under this category relate to the following:

1. Payments under a contract with the Ecuadorian Development Corporation for the rehabilitation of the province of El Oro which was devastated during the Peruvian-Ecuadorian boundary dispute. The program was developed under the direction of the Department of State and the Office of the Coordinator with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, and covers such work as construction, repair and extension of dispensaries and hospitals, renovation, and reclamation projects to facilitate shipping operations, and agricultural programs.

2. A program to alleviate a serious unemployment situation in Honduras created by the cessation of banana exports due to the lack of shipping during the latter part of 1942. The program, arranged by the Department of State and the Office of the Coordinator, in cooperation with the Honduran Government, upon the urgent request of the United States Embassy in Honduras, covered the repair and reconstruction of sections of the highway between Potrerillos and the Lake Yojea area. The objectives were to provide immediately useful employment for temporarily unemployed laborers, to contribute to the improvement of existing means of interocean transportation, and to materially benefit agricultural and other activities in the interior of the country.

Technical and other assistance (including administrative expenses): These expenditures apply in general to personnel of the Office of the Coordinator and its corporations stationed outside of the United States who render technical assistance, advice, and aid as required under the cooperative agreements or notes between this Government and the local governments for health and sanitation, food supply, emergency operations, and transportation programs, regardless of whether or not such programs are carried out directly or through cooperative services established within the framework of the local governments.

In addition to the expenditures made in Latin America, additional expenditures have been made in the United States for similar purposes; a brief break-down thereof being as follows:

Grants:	
Trade and commercial	$963,017
Educational, scientific, and cultural	929,225
United States activities	532,575
Research	145,455
Health and sanitation	6,840
Food supply	30,100
General miscellaneous	35,830
Total	2,643,042

Current expenses:	
Administrative expenses	$7,290,474
Confidential	400,000
Trade and commercial	610,000
Motion pictures	3,595,000
Press	2,875,000
Radio	4,341,000
Educational, scientific, and cultural	301,000
United States activities	380,000
Research	155,000
Health and sanitation	110,000
General	75,000
Total	20,132,474
Transportation	300,000
Newsprint shipping subsidy	926,267
Grand total	24,001,783

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (AND SUBSIDIARY OR AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS)

The report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation covers the activities of the Corporation itself and those of the following corporations: Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, Defense Plant Corporation, Rubber Reserve Corporation, Rubber Development Corporation, United States Commercial Company.

For the last two corporations listed the reports were submitted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in its capacity as fiscal agent.

Total expenditures made by the listed corporations for the fiscal years 1941, 1942, 1943, and for 8 months of the fiscal year 1944, totaled $2,795,324,542.13, as follows:

Loans [1]	$406,518,105.59
Investments	4,099,362.35
Construction of facilities	44,662,669.71
Purchases	2,174,019,517.93
Current expenses	3,810,543.06
Other aid or expenditures [2]	162,214,343.49
Total	2,795,324,542.13

[1] Repayments on loans have been made in the amount of $61,895,437.61, leaving the outstanding loan balance as $344,622,667.98.

[2] Represents principally advance payments on contracts and will ultimately be transferred to one or more of the other categories listed above.

From a geographical standpoint, the expenditures were made as follows:

British Empire	$1,054,355,021.38
Latin America	1,236,921,865.88
French	30,003,736.42
Netherlands	158,315,238.50
Portugal	21,593,521.45
Other countries	294,135,158.50
Total	2,795,324,542.13

(A chart showing a break-down of the above expenditures is attached as "Exhibit VI.")

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The Export-Import Bank of Washington was created in 1934 for the purpose of aiding in the financing and facilitating of exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States and other countries. It is authorized to have $700,000,000 of loans outstanding at any one time. The Congress increased the limit from $200,000,000 to the present $700,000,000 in September of 1940 to enable the bank to make loans to assist in the development of the resources, the stabilization of the economies and the orderly marketing of the products of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Although its operations in behalf of our foreign trade have been world-wide, circumstances have restricted them since the war almost entirely to the Western Hemisphere and particularly to the making of such loans as will develop resources vital to the war effort.

A summary of the operations of the bank since its creation on February 12, 1934, through March 31, 1944, is as follows:

Commitments	$1,185,763,080.10
Commitments canceled or expired	330,879,004.09
Net commitments	854,884,076.01
Commitments not yet disbursed	407,253,763.80
Amount disbursed	447,630,312.21
Amount repaid	233,755,432.58
Amount of loans outstanding	213,874,879.63

On a geographical basis the outstanding loans are as follows:

Latin America	$105,433,890.26
North America	12,350,000.00
Africa	65,000.00
Asia	56,877,839.24
Europe	27,363,445.95
Other countries	11,784,704.18
Total	213,874,879.63

There is attached hereto, as exhibit VII, a statement showing the loans and commitments by countries, the details of which by individual loans are on file in the Appropriations Committee.

There is, of course, the possibility that some loans may not be collected in full. The history of the bank's operations, however, indicate that uncollectible items will be in an almost negligible amount as compared with its operations, and that it will consistently show a profit. The bank has experienced only three defaults since the beginning of its operations in 1934, as follows:

One related to a balance of $3,491.96 due from a Polish textile firm which had purchased raw cotton from a United States exporter. Against this account a reserve has been set up.

A second, which was in the amount of $46,530.46, resulted from the impossibility of converting Spanish pesetas into dollars during and immediately following the civil war in Spain. That account was subsequently liquidated in full, both principal and interest.

The third account, in the amount of $178,725.24, is overdue from a United States import firm now arranging a composition of creditors, but it is believed that collateral held by the bank is sufficient to effect eventually full repayment or, at least, a substantial liquidation.

Operations of the bank to March 31, 1944, have resulted in a profit of $32,572,628.19 after the payment of all administrative expenses and the establishment of a reserve for contingencies. Out of such profit the bank has paid dividends on its preferred stock to June 30, 1943, in a total amount of $13,075,178.04, leaving a net undivided profit in the bank of $19,497,450.15.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Expenditures abroad as reported by the War Department as of October 31, 1943, total $3,094,350,294, as follows:

Location	Construction of facilities	Purchases	Current expenses	Total
British Empire	$593,783,367	$695,618,989	$609,013,094	$1,898,415,450
Latin America	141,542,706	29,529,641	16,698,502	187,770,849
Netherlands	12,517,000	5,338,000	16,556,681	24,411,681
French	3,458,964			3,458,964
Other countries	143,804,831	1,605,339	824,883,180	970,293,350
Total	895,106,868	732,091,969	1,467,151,457	3,094,350,294

These figures represent the best available information and must be considered to be on the conservative side, as no attempt has been made by the War Department for the purpose of this first report to secure information from overseas theaters. The Department is frank in stating that, due to its far-flung activities and the need to eliminate reporting from overseas theater commanders as much as possible, there are gaps in the information on the records. Steps are constantly being taken, however, to improve the records and reports, and it is expected that as future reports are submitted additional information will be available. (A more detailed breakdown of the above expenditures appears in the chart attached hereto, marked "Exhibit VIII.")

In addition to the expenditures reported above, there follows a statement of supplies distributed to civilians in liberated areas by the Allied Military Government. This statement is based on information available in this country and no break-down by recipient countries is available at this time. The statement is made as of December 22, 1943. The dollar values represent costs to the War Department delivered at a War Department depot, and do not include transportation to the port, loading costs, ocean shipping, and other handling charges. The report does not include aid furnished by theater commanders from United States Army stocks, as data on such aid are not available in the continental United States. No determination has been made of the extent to which the recipient countries will reimburse the United States for supplies of this type furnished to them.

Expenditures made for supplies and A. M. G. distribution to civilians in liberated areas, Dec. 22, 1943 [1]

Item	Value of items contracted for	Values of deliveries made against contracts plus value of items taken from Army stocks to fill requisitions
Food	$11,944,722	$14,913,425
Hard fuels (coal) [2]	1,045,312	1,045,312
Medical supplies	11,251,936	7,304,534
Miscellaneous	579,140	919,656
Petroleum products	(3)	(3)
Sanitary supplies	6,572,055	2,007,766
Total	31,793,165	26,190,693

[1] Dollar value shown reflects only those expenditures made for the specific purpose of civilian supplies. It is known, however, that certain materials have been transferred from Army stocks in the theater and used for civilian purposes. Although the theater commander has been instructed to report transfers of this nature, specific information is not available at this time.

[2] This coal was procured to supply Italy, Sardinia, and Sicily. However, the United Kingdom has been supplying the coal, and the coal procured in this country (except for about 20,000 tons withdrawn to meet an emergency caused by the strike and not yet replaced) has been held in reserve for emergencies. It should be noted further that the coal now being supplied to Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia is used to supply both military and civilian needs. It is almost impossible to distinguish between these needs.

[3] Petroleum for civilian use is issued from military stocks in the theater, and no information is available at this time as to how much petroleum has been used for civilian purposes. However, originally, $11,454,309 worth of petroleum products were estimated as a requirement for Italy, Sardinia, Sicily, and north Africa to last for a period of 12 months.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Expenditures abroad as reported by the Navy Department as of October 31, 1943, total $565,570,999, as follows:

Location	Construction of facilities	Current expenses	Total
British Empire	$253,209,600	$84,615,120	$337,924,720
Latin America	20,486,874	42,274,626	62,761,500
Netherlands	2,425,200	135,660	2,560,860
French	13,368,450	1,156,144	14,524,594
Other countries	2,518,640	8,361,109	10,879,749
Southwest Pacific	136,885,000	34,576	136,919,576
Total	428,993,864	136,577,135	565,570,999

(A more detailed break-down of these expenditures appears in the chart attached hereto, marked "Exhibit X.")

These figures are very conservative, as will be seen from the following comments of the Navy Department:

"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"(a) While some of the items of construction may be regarded as more or less permanent, that is so only where it was essential in order to fulfill its war purpose. The policy of making all facilities of the most temporary nature possible has been rigidly followed.

"(b) The attached list describes locations in only general terms and is not specific as to actual installations. This is primarily for reasons of military security, but also because of the shifting nature of the picture. For example, much of the base material shipped to Australia never arrived, due to loss en route or diversion. On the other hand, much of it was never intended to stay in Australia, but was sent there only en route elsewhere. No rigid conclusions should therefore be drawn concerning expenditures shown against any individual nation, as they may not be at all significant.

"(c) These figures are only approximate, as in many cases the actual expenditures are not definitely known. Not included and not obtainable are the amounts expended in theaters of war for local labor or local purchases of material unless expended by a disbursing officer stationed on shore (i. e., not in a ship or Marine Corps organization unit). The value of labor and subsistence of the naval construction battalions is also not included.

"PURCHASES AND CURRENT EXPENSES

"(a) It is impossible to include expenditures by disbursing officers on board ship by country without examining every voucher. The vouchers run into the millions. The accounts are kept by ship; not by where the ship may have been. The same is true of the Coast Guard. It is also true of the Marine Corps, whose accounts are kept by organization, without reference to where the organization may be. The net effect of omitting these figures, while problematical, is probably small. Ships and organizations do spend some of their pay abroad; they do buy some supplies abroad; they do hire some civilians abroad. However, a large part of the military pay is sent home or spent on board or in canteens, etc., and most of the supplies are shipped out from the United States or furnished locally under reciprocal aid.

"(b) Navy disbursing officers are required to report quarterly and are allowed 20 days after the close of the quarter to prepare and mail their returns Under these conditions, with disbursing officers all over the world, and with communications hampered by a global war, the record is never reasonably complete under 6 months and may be not wholly complete after 1 year. For that reason, in the following table, all figures for the fiscal year 1944 are estimates only, and those for the fiscal year 1943 may be amended. Scattered reports, for different quarters, are arriving constantly at the Navy Department, and a monthly compilation would show some change in the figures each month. It is clear, however, that substantial changes will be indicated only quarterly or less frequently."

SUMMARY

There is submitted as exhibit X a consolidated summary of lend-lease aid from March 11, 1941, through March 31, 1944, and Government expenditures abroad for the fiscal years 1941, 1942, 1943, and for that portion of the fiscal year 1944 for which the different agencies had figures available, ranging from 4 to 8 months. It shows a total figure of $30,362,687,362, distributed as follows:

Lend-lease aid	$21,794,237,819
Loans	854,423,225
Grants	31,985
Investments	4,099,362
Construction of facilities	1,465,842,209
Purchases	4,172,856,091
Current expenses	1,638,872,748
Other aid	432,323,923
Total	30,362,687,362

Geographically, the distribution is:

British Empire	$19,700,297,674
Russia	4,214,921,449
Latin America	2,327,378,789
China	920,349,451
Other countries and general	3,199,739,999
Total	30,362,687,362

RECOMMENDATIONS

The statement, particularly as regards expenditures abroad, is not complete, and the amounts are no doubt understated, but it is the best that could be prepared from available information. It demonstrates the need for a central agency to coordinate all efforts to secure definite and reliable information of this nature for the Congress, and shows that to secure such information will require considerable time and labor.

The President has answered the question of the central agency by directing, in accordance with the recommendation of the interdepartmental committee, that a clearinghouse be established in the Foreign Economic Administration. Not only is this action endorsed, but it is strongly recommended that it begin to function without delay, so that at the earliest possible date complete and detailed reports may be made to the Appropriations Committee and to the Senate on a quarterly basis.

It is further recommended that the Appropriations Committee agree to the request of the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration that a representative of the investigative staff of the Appropriations Committee serve on the advisory interdepartmental committee which will assist the director of the clearinghouse. In this way, not only will the desires of the Appropriations Committee be kept currently before the advisory committee and the director of the clearinghouse, but also the committee will be kept currently informed as to the progress being made by the clearinghouse.

Finally, the reports submitted fully justify the findings of the interdepartmental committee, and their recommendations are specifically endorsed and passed on for the earnest consideration of the advisory interdepartmental committee to assist the director of the clearinghouse. These recommendations are:

"LEND-LEASE AND REVERSE LEND-LEASE

"1. That the agencies devise means of reducing to a minimum the time lag which now exists between the actual transfer of goods and services and the recording and reporting of such transactions.

"2. That in the future all transfers be recorded not only to the account of the government which originally receipted for the materials or services; but, also, so far as possible to the account of the government which is the ultimate recipient; and that the lend-lease governments be requested to render a cumulative statement of all retransfers made to date with provision for periodic statements in the future.

"3. That the Foreign Economic Administration, with the advice and approval of the agencies concerned, develop greater uniformity in the statistical reporting of all lend-lease transactions, involving

"(a) a standardized classification system for use in the operating agencies to account for all commodities and all types of transactions; and

"(b) a revision in the procedures for reporting statistics to bring about a uniform presentation of all data in terms of dollars as well as units.

"4. That, in recording lend-lease transactions, procuring agencies should take the following steps under general principles approved by the Foreign Economic Administration:

"(a) The establishment wherever possible of standard prices for articles to be transferred; and

"(b) for items of a nature not susceptible of standard pricing, establishment of a standard formula to arrive at prices which will include all elements of cost.

"5. That no attempt be made at this time to reprice past transactions, as the effort involved would not justify the results to be obtained.

"6. That the present system of reporting losses be extended to include items under United States accountability, intended for transfer on arrival overseas, which are lost at sea; and that efforts be made to improve reports of losses incurred in transit within the United States.

"7. That the present inventory reports submitted by procuring agencies to the Foreign Economic Administration be put on a uniform basis; that the inventory records be extended, either by the procuring agencies or War Shipping Administration, to give complete reports of inventory in transit, in terms of dollars as well as weights; and that uniform inventories of lend-lease goods held by United States agencies overseas be required on a periodic basis.

"8. That so far as possible uniform reporting principles be developed by United States agencies in the major areas in which reverse lend-lease is received, in order that reports when submitted may be more comparable and consistent, and uniformity of reporting forms and classification and valuation principles may be achieved.

"9. That the Foreign Economic Administration, with advice and approval of the agencies concerned, devise a standardized formula for use by the operating agencies in assessing and recording repossession charges; and that repossession accounts be revised to include all expenses incurred by the United States in cases where the foreign government is responsible for cancelation of contract.

"10. That the present system of recording, reporting, and billing reimbursable lend-lease transactions be revised by the Foreign Economic Administration to provide for a uniform method of recording and reporting and uniform principles for billing foreign governments; and that for billing purposes, procuring agencies whose records are now unsatisfactory be required to submit revised cumulative statements of reimbursable lend-lease transactions.

"11. That provision be made to obtain from foreign governments current records showing location and use of certain durable goods received from the United States, and that on cessation of hostilities an inventory record

be rendered of all consumable and semiconsumable items on hand received from the United States. (See also recommendation 17.)

"12. That no attempt be made to evaluate defense information transmitted to or by foreign governments, but that a strict accounting be maintained of information involving patent rights.

"MILITARY BASES AND MILITARY INSTALLATIONS ABROAD

"13. Although the present records do not give complete data concerning expenditures made for the construction or equipment of bases, the committee recommended—

"That no major changes pertaining to financial recording and reporting of installations abroad be required of the War and Navy Departments during the war because a revision that would yield the information desired would require too great an additional accounting burden for military personnel, both in the field and in Washington.

"14. That the War and Navy Departments establish statistical and appraisal inventories of installations abroad similar to those already initiated by the Foreign Projects Unit of the Army Air Forces.

"INVESTMENT IN PRODUCTIVE FACILITIES RELATED TO THE PROCUREMENT OF FOOD AND MATERIALS ABROAD

"15. That where master accounts are maintained in Washington with the supporting detail in field offices, regular periodic accountings and reconciliations from the field be required.

"INVESTMENT IN OTHER INSTALLATIONS OR PRODUCTIVE FACILITIES ABROAD

"16. That there be established a list of items to be regarded as durable goods.

"17. That an inventory of certain durable goods transferred to foreign countries be compiled from the records now available in all agencies. (For transfer of items under lend-lease arrangements, see recommendation 11.)

"PROCUREMENT OF FOOD AND MATERIALS ABROAD

"18. That the procuring agencies be required to install and maintain records which will make readily available commodity purchase data in commodity units and dollar value by time period, by commodity, and by country of commodity origin.

"LOANS AND FINANCIAL AID TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND PRIVATE ENTITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

"The committee found the present records on loans to foreign governments and private entities, and the statements of financial aid rendered to foreign governments, to be adequate and no changes were recommended.

"It was the consensus of the committee that economic information concerning governmental cash expenditures abroad was of sufficient current and future importance to require the preparation of separate periodic reports. The committee therefore recommended:

"19. That arrangements be made to have each department, establishment, or agency of the Federal Government, including Government corporations, which makes cash expenditures abroad prepare quarterly reports of all such expenditures for submittal to a central agency.

"20. That the proposed reports segregate expenditures under predetermined classifications for each country by character and purpose, and by a limited object classification."

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN F. FEENEY,
HAROLD E. MERRICK,
THOMAS J. SCOTT,
EARL W. COOPER,
Investigative Staff.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee for his discussion of this matter. It seems to me that in view of his statement, which will be published in the RECORD tonight, and in view of the fact that we shall have a session of the Senate tomorrow, it is desirable now to recess until tomorrow in order that Senators may have ample opportunity in the meantime to study the report. I do not apprehend any long involved debate on the question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Texas moves a recess, was it the Senator's intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business?

Mr. CONNALLY. If there is an executive calendar, I think it should be disposed of.

AUSTIN L. TIERNEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives returning to the Senate in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 176) for the relief of Austin L. Tierney, together with the accompanying papers; and also the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 176, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Private Law No. 99, Seventy-fourth Congress, be, and the same is, amended to read as follows:

"That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Austin L. Tierney, who served as a fireman third class, United States Navy, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States as a fireman third class, on April 25, 1918: *Provided*, That no compensation, pension, or other benefits except mileage at the time of discharge, 4 months' active service pay lost after absence from duty, and adjusted compensation benefits shall be held to accrue to Austin L. Tierney by reason of this act for any period prior to its passage."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this bill was returned from the other House upon request by the Senate after the Senate had appointed conferees to meet with conferees to be appointed by the House to consider the amendment which the House had adopted to the bill.

I have heretofore given notice that I would move a reconsideration of the former action of the Senate. I now move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it disagreed to the House amendment and asked a conference with the House thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I now move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 5, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 7th day of June 1944:

Homer George Anderson
Richard Paul Arlander
John Moore Austin
Richard Lawrence Bailey, Jr.
Frank Barnett, Jr.
Carl Blanchett
Robert Coward Boardman
William Henry Boswell
Peter Seelye Branson
Alfred William Brass
William Henry Brinkmeyer
Bernard Stanley Brown
James Wood Carroll
Parker Olin Chapman
Garth Dalmayne Clizbe
Clyde Clavius Coffindaffer
Henry Paine Crawford, Jr.
Donald Brian Crews
Charles Mitchell Daniel
Harold Leroy Davison
John MacNeil Dempsey, Jr.
John Augustine Devlin, Jr.
Harley Earl Dilcher
Sumner Raymond Dolber
Robert John Donovan
John Michael Dorsey
James Harold Durfee
Clarence Raymond Easter
Albert Bradbury Ellerman
Joseph Knowles Everton
John Joseph Fehrenbacher
Arthur Andre Fontaine
Louis Randolph Ford, Jr.
John Brawley Freeman

William Elliott Fuller, Jr.
Carroll Hitchcock George
Harold Kirksey Goodbread
Richard William Goode
Herbert Richard Harris
James Leonard Harrison
Gordon Fairland Hempton
Robert Fisher Henderson
Frederick William Hermes, Jr.
James Arthur Hodgman
Julian Elliott Johansen
Robert Durrell Johnson
Harry New Jones II.
Kenneth Howard Langenbeck
John Burtan Lape, Jr.
Elmer Maurice Lipsey
Richard Suppes Lodge
Paul Alan Lutz
Worley Berry Lynn
James Thomas Maher
William Lothridge Martin
Andrew Mazzotta
John David McCann
Albert Joseph McCullough
Milton Lee McGregor
Edward Duncan Middleton, Jr.
Joseph Anthony Montagna
James Edward Murphy
William Emmet Murphy
Earl Asa Parker, Jr.
Raymond Grant Parks, Jr.
Paul Reed Peak, Jr.
Paul Powers Perez
Lilbourn Amos Pharris, Jr.
Robert Carlton Phillips
Vance King Randle, Jr.
Theodore Charles Rapalus
David Harold Rasmussen
Ricardo Allen Ratti
Don Richard Rodgers
Donald Henry Rollert
Paul Thomas Ryan
Marion Gardiner Shrode, Jr.
Harrison Ballard Smith.
Neilus Andrew Spears, Jr.
Raymond Benner Starbuck
Jeremiah Milton Stark
Richard Stoner Strickler
George Francis Thometz, Jr.
Wesley Matthew Thorsson
John Bollyard Wade
George Warren Wagner
William Hamilton Wallace
George Alfred Warren
David Anderson Webb
William Leroy Weiss, Jr.
George Herbert Weller
George Earnest Williams
Ellsworth Albin Winnette
Andrew Wakefield Wofford
Virgil Nourse Woolfolk, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

TENNESSEE

Ethel R. Corum, Jonesboro.
Raymond C. Townsend, Parsons.
Charles H. Carr, Pocahontas.
Violet T. Duncan, Tyner.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as our land is buttressed by the holy dead and the noble living, forbid that we should think in terms of fear or failure. Continue to strengthen our faith in that day when the towers and bulwarks of freedom shall flare their banners over the ruins of a vanishing night. We pray that America may get right with God if she is to deserve and abide in the deathless joys of peace and good will.

Let our people understand that the saddest heart is that which serves its country without the recompense of gratitude. Scarred with many a battle, welted with many a hardship, lamed with many a march, deliver us from leaden messages which are empty of meaning to our brave soldiers who have fought and won a good fight. As we think of those who have given and lost so much in the tragedy of war, O hush all our complainings and give us a richer and fuller life dedicated to the mission of the Man of Galilee. O God, hold us from all disorders and violations among ourselves and from factions which threaten well-ordered society, that our national life may be a benediction and a haven for those who have served and saved us. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 156. An act relating to the status of retired judges.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an outline of the policies and objectives of the disabled American veterans; and also I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of Polish freedom.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a memorandum on Polish freedom.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report on Jewish agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JEWISH MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been giving a great deal of thought, as I am sure many of us must have, to the possible mistreatment of American soldiers who are prisoners of the Nazis in Germany. Knowing the racial theories of the Nazis, and the treatment accorded to civilians because they were not members of the "master race," I have wondered what treatment our Jewish soldiers were receiving. I accordingly asked the Secretary of State for information on this subject. Let me read just one paragraph of the letter I received from Secretary of State Hull:

> The Department is exercising special vigilance to prevent discrimination by the German authorities against American prisoners of war upon a racial or religious basis and it has not so far obtained evidence establishing that such discrimination exists.

I am happy to receive this assurance, and trust that our State Department will remain eternally vigilant in its desire to guard against mistreatment of our boys in uniform because they are of different religious, or have different racial, backgrounds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include in the Appendix of the RECORD the correspondence which I have had with Secretary Hull on this question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has just been called home because his father has taken a turn for the worse. His father has been ill for some time. Because of this, I ask, in his behalf, that he may be granted an indefinite leave of absence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial which appeared in the Lynn Daily Item of May 2.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of international air transportation taken from the Wall Street Journal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A MONUMENT TO THE MOTHERS OF AMERICA

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. Cox addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FIGHT PAY FOR FIGHTING MEN

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and that they may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEISS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by an assembly of Americans of Polish extraction gathered in Buffalo, N. Y., April 30, 1944, in celebration of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRUK]?

There was no objecton.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of being a member of the Board of Visitors of the United States Coast Guard Academy which meets in New London, Conn., on Saturday of this week; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may have a leave of absence for tomorrow and Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] has obtained leave of absence for all members of that Board.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I did not know that. Then I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say that the chairman of the gentleman's committee contacted me 2 weeks ago in reference to that matter and I may say for the RECORD that any Member who is away on that visit is absent on official business. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], advised myself as majority leader several weeks ago of the contemplated visit.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

MY VOTE ON THE TAX BILL AND RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE THE MONTGOMERY WARD SEIZURE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, being honored by being a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, I shall be absent tomorrow and Saturday, but I want the RECORD to show that if I were present tomorrow and if a vote on the pending simplified tax bill is taken I would certainly vote for that measure. A simplification of our tax measures is long overdue. I say also that if the Montgomery Ward matter comes before the House tomorrow and if I were present I would vote in favor of that very much-needed inquiry. I have no doubt both measures will pass overwhelmingly—were there the slightest doubt in my mind to the contrary I would perforce remain on the floor to cast my affirmative votes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Mark Sullivan on executive authority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KNUTSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make on the bill H. R. 4646, and to include therein any excerpts I may desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Friday, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of the new rationing policy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make today on the bill, H. R. 4646, and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN]?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, relative to the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], I wish to go on record as favoring that resolution. The same law that affords protection against unlawful seizure of the property of Montgomery Ward & Co. by the use of the armed forces of the country also protects the home of the humblest citizen in this land against unlawful search and seizure. The Bill of Rights covers the citizen all over with the armor of the law.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that an investigation should be made, but since a Senate committee is now investigating this matter, would it be wise, in the gentleman's opinion, to have two investigations?

Mr. JENNINGS. I think so.

Mr. RANKIN. Or should the Senate committee do it?

Mr. JENNINGS. I think the Members of this House as the Representatives of the people and as the closest to the people should conduct an investigation, because if we are going to breach the constitutional protections of the liberties and rights of the people in one respect it can be done in all respects. You cannot go half way over Niagara. The Constitution was written and adopted in a period of danger and to meet all emergencies both of peace and war. It was made for officers and people alike. There must be no suspension of it, no nullification by anyone, high or low, and especially none by those who have been chosen and sworn to uphold, protect, and defend it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make

today on the tax bill, H. R. 4646, and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Post of Monday, April 17, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I note by the Washington papers that the rationing of food is probably at an end in this country. It is indeed a good thing that elections come around once in a while because at that time the feelings of the people at large are usually very keenly felt. I predict that inasmuch as the majority vote to be cast in the coming election will be cast by women, they will be privileged again to buy nylon hose within the next 2 or 3 months.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein brief statements by my colleagues [Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. MONRONEY], and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TAX SIMPLIFICATION BILL

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, since I unfortunately have to go back to Wisconsin I will not be present when the tax-simplification bill comes to a vote. I want, however, Mr. Speaker, to make a record here that I am in favor of this bill, this being, in my humble opinion, the only good tax bill that the Seventy-eighth Congress has dealt with. I want, for the first time, to record myself as being in favor of it.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, General Biddle, under the orders of the Commander in Chief, who is also a candidate for a fourth term, used a part of the Army to seize the civilian business of Montgomery Ward & Co. Under his direction, men who were conscripted and who enlisted to establish civil liberties throughout the world, disregarding his civil rights by force carried Sewell Avery, 69-year-old executive of Ward's, out of his office and deposited him on the sidewalk.

All of this came about because Ward's refused to renew an expired contract with the C. I. O. which contained a security-of-membership clause. The purpose of the seizure was to force Ward's to renew the contract with C. I. O. which contained a security-of-membership clause under which all of the employees of Ward's who now belong to the C. I. O. would be required to remain therein as members in good standing for a year from December 8, last.

Once that contract was signed, if C. I. O. followed the course which it has followed in other cities, the employees of Ward's who are members of the C .I. O. would be required to contribute a dollar each to the political action committee of the C. I. O., which has officially announced that its purpose is to reelect as President Commander in Chief Roosevelt, who ordered the seizure of this plant, and Congressmen and Senators who will support his administration.

This seizure of a civilian business is a novel and a new way of collecting campaign contributions.

To prohibit this vicious practice, the carrying out of this corrupt procedure to influence elections, an amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act was today introduced by me.

It is my hope that it will be considered at the same time as the bill which the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS] earlier said he proposed to introduce to extend special privileges to labor organizations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the life of the Reverend Stanislaw Iciek.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

THE THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 49, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BURCH of Virginia submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees," and for other purposes, approved August 14, 1935, as amended.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LESINSKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OMNIBUS VETERANS' BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who are interested in the proposition I desire to report that the omnibus veterans' bill was voted out by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on yesterday. We did not make it a perfect bill, but I am satisfied we improved it at least 100 percent.

A great many Members have asked when this measure would come up for consideration. It will probably take today and tomorrow to write the report; therefore, we cannot get it before the House under a rule before Wednesday of next week. I say this in order that those Members who have primaries on next Tuesday may understand that this measure will not be taken up before Wednesday.

We are asking for an open rule. Some people shudder at that because of the tendency on the part of Congressmen to try to amend veterans' legislation. But if the time has come when the Members of the House of Representatives do not have the stamina, the intelligence, and the courage to legislate intelligently on veterans' matters, then I say we have reached the limit in the decadence of representative government.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX BILL OF 1944

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further

consideration of the bill, H. R. 4646, to provide for simplification of the income tax.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4646, with Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, after the masterful presentation of the tax simplification bill which was made in this House yesterday by our esteemed friend and colleague, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the equally able discussion of the measure by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], anything I might say regarding the details of this bill would be gilding the lily.

I re-read the remarks of these gentlemen in the RECORD only this morning and I must say that if any Member will do likewise he should have no trouble at all in understanding the nature of this bill and its effect upon the taxpaying public. In addition we have filed a committee report which gives a short, straight-to-the-point explanation of the changes in the existing law made by this bill. It is written in language that even a plain and humble person like myself can understand.

Furthermore, I can foresee how grateful some 30,000,000 taxpayers are going to be when they find out they no longer have to figure out in advance a hypothetical tax on a theoretical income. I can foresee how thankful these same 30,000,000 taxpayers will be when they discover that the money withheld from their salaries and wages comes within a few dollars of satisfying their tax liability. In addition to the millions of taxpayers who will be relieved of all the present detailed computations and worries over their tax liabilities, there will be another 20,000,000 individuals whose return forms will be greatly simplified because of the simplified requirements we propose to write into the Internal Revenue Code. I know of only one class of taxpayer who will be hurt by this bill and that is the large and active group of tax advisers who set up shop every spring and levy a tax of their own on millions of taxpayers in the lower brackets.

But the taxpayer alone will not benefit from this simplification bill. The Government also stands to profit by the simplified tax-collection system by the use of simplified forms and the new and more accurate tax-liabilities tables which will be in use. No statistical proof is needed to demonstrate the easing up of the load on the Treasury Department and Bureau of Internal Revenue that will follow, as a matter of course, from the adoption of this bill.

Those who say that the burden of determining the tax liability of some 30,000,000 taxpayers will be too great for the Treasury Department are wrong. I am told that a moderate-sized staff of examiners in each collector's office can perform this job easily and rapidly, because the only requirement is a check of the taxpayer's income figure and a glance at the tax-liability tables to determine the tax. The taxpayer's report, on a simple withholding receipt which he will file on March 15, if he is on a calendar year basis, will contain, in addition to the information filled in by his employer, a statement of his other income, and the number of his dependents. The calculation of his taxable income can be made quickly, the tax determined immediately, and a bill mailed out to the taxpayer the same day.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to these general benefits I would like to point out one or two specific provisions of this bill which were not discussed at much length yesterday, and which I feel should be brought to the attention of the House. The first pertains to the effect of this bill upon the farmers, the small businessmen, and merchants in rural communities and upon the millions of professional men and women whose incomes are not entirely derived from salaries and wages, but in many cases are received from the sale of farm produce or from fees and other charges for personal service and are not subject to withholding.

As you know, under the existing law, many thousands of people in this category are required to file a declaration of estimated tax, based upon an estimated income, but by the very nature of their employment they cannot forecast their earnings with any degree of certainly. If they are farmers, they have no way of knowing in advance how much of their products they will sell and do not even know what the price will be. They cannot foresee catastrophes of nature that may wipe them out overnight. Or, if they are professional workers, they cannot tell in advance what personal services they will be called upon to perform.

This situation has brought scores of complaints in the form of letters to my office and I am sure every Member of this House has received many similar objections.

In drafting this bill we had this large group of taxpayers in mind when we provided, on page 29, line 19, that although they would be required to file declarations of estimated tax, based upon estimated income, the final declaration could be filed 2 weeks after the taxable year had expired. In the case of a taxpayer on a calendar-year basis, therefore, he would be given until January 15 of the next year to file his final declaration but if he found himself in a position at that time to do so, he could file his final return on that date. If he were not able to file a final return at that time, he would be given until March 15 following the calendar year to file his complete return.

Another very important feature of this bill, and one which in my judgment will greatly simplify the income-tax problem for small businessmen and merchants in rural communities, is the provision on page 33 of the bill at line 21. This provision reduces from 80 percent to 66⅔ percent, the amount of income derived by a taxpayer from farming, in order to qualify as a farmer.

This provision will probably not benefit millions of taxpayers, but it will certainly help many thousands who derive a substantial income from farming but have never been able to qualify as farmers for tax-declaration purposes, and who were therefore held down to somewhat more stringent rules regarding declarations of estimated tax.

Mr. Chairman, I could go through this bill, section by section, pointing out its advantages, benefits, improvements, and refinements, but that is not necessary because these details are fully explained in our report. We have written a tax simplification bill. It is only a simplification bill, but a mighty important one. In all my experience with tax bills I have never seen one that required less explaining than does this one, to make its provisions understood. Our report on the bill tells the whole story.

There is only one thing in this measure—just one technical detail which seems to have been misunderstood. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to its effect upon contributions to charitable institutions or religious groups and churches. This feature of the bill was discussed yesterday, and I believe the uncertainties were largely dissipated for those who heard the discussion. The importance of this matter, however, compels me to add a brief statement on the subject for the benefit of those who may not have been here yesterday, or may still entertain some misgivings about the status of charitable gifts.

In the first place, the difficulty arose over the interpretation of the so-called standard deductions which cover a taxpayer's deductible medical expense, his contributions to charity, his interest payments, his taxes on his home, and similar items of a personal or nonbusiness nature. The bill provides him with a standard deduction amounting to approximately 10 percent of his adjusted gross income, if it is below $5,000, and a standard deduction of $500 if his adjusted gross income exceeds $5,000. This standard deduction is like a box of a certain size, into which he can pack all his deductions for medical expense, charitable gifts, and other similar expenses. If that box is not big enough to hold them all, a bigger container is furnished under this bill in the provision that allows him to itemize these expenditures and take deductions for them up to the full limits which the law allows.

Certain newspaper comments on the bill appearing last week gave the impression, inadvertently no doubt, that these standard deductions were all a taxpayer would be allowed, and that no matter how much he gave to charitable institutions, he would not get more than a 10-percent deduction, if he were in the under-five-thousand class, or more than $500 if he were in the over-five-thousand class. The idea got around that no matter how much a taxpayer gave to charity, his deductions for this purpose would somehow be limited to these ceilings.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, this is not true. By referring to page 24 of the report, one will see that these standard deductions are offered simply as a convenience to those taxpayers who do not

ordinarily make large contributions to charity, who do not ordinarily have large interest payments, or more than average medical expenses or similar costs which the law says are not subject to tax. The law simply assumes that a taxpayer will have at least the average expenditures for these items and gives him these standard deductions to cover them, which he is not bound to take if his actual deductions for these purposes exceed the limits of the standard deductions.

We do not say, "This is all you will be allowed for such expenses." No. We simply say to the taxpayer, especially those in the lower brackets, "As a means of simplifying your tax problem, we take it for granted you gave an average amount to charity and had average medical expenses last year, so we are giving you the benefit of a standard deduction to eliminate the necessity for your itemizing all your charitable contributions and other expenses.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly, yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is 10 percent, is it not?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; the standard deduction is approximately 10 percent where the taxpayer's income is below $5,000. If actual deductions are greater than 10 percent the taxpayer can take the actual deductions by itemizing them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And when you get above $5,000?

Mr. KNUTSON. You get a flat $500 standard deduction.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You can get a flat $500 deduction?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Or you can itemize your deductions in lieu of taking the standard deduction.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Or you can itemize them?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is in lieu of the standard deduction.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You can itemize the contributions and get up to 15 percent, can you not?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is right; you can itemize them.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The charitable deductions are allowed up to 15 percent of the taxpayer's gross income, if he itemizes them.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is 15 percent of the gross income. It used to be 15 percent of the net income. This gives the taxpayer an opportunity to get a larger allowance.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You mean your "gross net income"?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I mean "gross income" without any deduction or, in other words, before any nonbusiness deductions have been taken.

These standard deductions, Mr. Chairman, are very fair because they are based upon statistics of income which show that among the under 5,000 group of taxpayers, only 2½ to 3 percent of his income is given to charitable institutions or churches and that approximately 5 percent of his income is devoted to medical expenses, interest payments, taxes, and similar expenditures, making a total of roughly 8 percent of his income for all such purposes. We have given him the benefit of any doubts and allowed this group of taxpayers approximately 10 percent for deductions of this nature.

In this bill we have given approximately 10-percent allowance for these different items that I have enumerated. The records of the Internal Revenue Bureau show that the average nonbusiness deductions per taxpayer is 8 percent, so there is a gain of 2 percent right there, so far as the taxpayer is concerned.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What allowance would a person have if he gave $500,000 to one or more colleges or churches? What allowance would he get?

Mr. KNUTSON. He would be allowed up to 15 percent on the gross income. If he were in a trade or business, he would be allowed 15 percent of his gross income less his business expenses.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is 15 percent on the gross?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He can give it all if he wants to, but he can only get credit up to 15 percent of his gross income.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is right; there is no limit on what he can give, but he can only get an allowance of 15 percent of his gross income.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is no inhibition in the bill. He can give every dime of it if he wants to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and some undoubtedly will.

If his actual deductions for such so-called personal expenditures exceeds the limits of the standard deduction, this bill does not in any way prevent such a taxpayer from exercising the option allowed to him under the bill, of taking the actual deductions in whatever amounts they may be up to the full limits which the law allows. In the case of charitable gifts, the full limit allowed by this bill is greater, not less than it was before, because the limit is based on 15 percent of the gross income instead of 15 percent of the net income which the existing law allows.

It is my sincere hope, therefore, that since through inadvertence or possibly haste in the preparation of a news report current misapprehensions arose over the effect of this bill on charitable contributions; that the institutions involved, and the people who open their hearts and purses to them, will no longer be concerned about the possible loss of contributions insofar as this bill is concerned. I can only say to them they have no cause to worry.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this tax-simplification bill is another landmark in tax legislation. Its passage will do more to inspire confidence among taxpayers in our ability to write understandable tax laws than any speech on the subject or any promises that may be made of further improvements in our tax structure. The old familiar words, "By their deeds ye shall know them," will provide the taxpayers with a rule for measuring the degree of our sincerity in attempting to place taxation on a solid foundation after we have passed this bill.

The unanimous support which this bill has received up to this time is one of the most encouraging signs I have seen that tax legislation can be free of party politics if we are determined to make it so. There is no other field of legislation that demands the same meticulous attention to technical details. We have made some mistakes in the past, Mr. Chairman, and we will make occasional mistakes in the future, but I say, most of these mistakes have been made because we thought tax legislation could be handled solely from the standpoint of broad policies and that technical details were not important. But they are important, Mr. Chairman, and they will be more important in the future.

Now we have a chance to pass a tax bill that is greatly simplified in its approach to one phase of income-tax legislation. If it passes by a big majority vote in the House, it will do more than simplify income-tax procedures for millions of taxpayers, it will tell them that this Congress is fully aware of its responsibilities to the people of this country. But I hope to see it passed unanimously, Mr. Chairman, in order to prove, once and for all, that we can deliver a sane and intelligent piece of tax legislation, planned, designed and constructed for the benefit of all groups of individual income taxpayers. We owe it to them and we owe it to ourselves to make our vote on this bill unanimous.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H. R. 4646, provides for the simplification of individual income tax. I believe it may be stated with confidence that this bill provides the greatest degree of income-tax simplification and relieves the taxpayer of more difficulty and trouble in making his return than any program ever provided in the history of this or any other country in the world.

It is not a revenue measure in the usual sense of the term, but is a tax-simplification bill. It accomplishes these purposes without substantially changing the number of taxpayers, and it is estimated that approximately the same amount of revenue will be yielded as under existing law.

I am happy to join with the others who have pointed out the fact that this bill is presented by your committee with its unanimous approval. It also has the unanimous approval of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the staff of the Treasury Department, and the staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

It comes here as a product of the united effort of all of these staffs and your Committee on Ways and Means. It is the belief of your committee that this bill will accomplish these very desirable objectives:

It will relieve a great majority of taxpayers from the necessity of computing their income tax.

It will reduce the number of tax computations.

It will simplify the return form.

It will decrease the number of persons required to file declarations of estimated tax under the pay-as-you-go system, and

it will eliminate some of the difficulties and uncertainties in the making of estimates required for declarations.

We now have about 50,000,000 people required to file individual income tax returns. This number may be divided roughly into 3 groups, for the purpose of considering the benefits provided in this bill. For the first group, embracing about 30,000,000 taxpayers, an extremely simplified method is provided. Individuals whose gross income is less than $5,000 and whose income from sources other than wages subject to withholding do not exceed $100, may, at their option, have their tax determined by the collector, if their income is received from certain sources. To be entitled to this option, their entire income must be derived from dividends, interest, and compensation for personal services. This is the form known as W–2. Employers are required to furnish their employees a receipt showing the amount withheld from their wages. The employee takes this receipt and turns it over and answers about 3 or 4 questions listed on the back, and signs it and mails it to his collector, and this is his tax return. He does not have to send any money with it. The collector determines his tax and if he has overpaid he mails him a refund, and if he has underpaid he mails him a bill for the amount he owes, which he is required to pay within 30 days.

It might be helpful to illustrate at this point an application of this form W–2. Form W–2 is now in use as a receipt, required by law to be issued by the employer to the employee. The employer must issue such a receipt for the amount withheld from the employee's wages, either when the employee quits the employment of that employer, or at the end of the year. I exhibit here a copy of the form W–2. You will observe that it is about the size of an ordinary bank check. That receipt is issued by the employer to the employee, showing the amount withheld from his wages. The employee then turns it over on the back and answers these simple questions. These may not be exactly the questions that will be finally used. This was a sample form that was made up by the Bureau for our use in the committee.

First, he will list the persons who receive more than half of their support from him during 1944, for whom an exemption is claimed. Question 1:

Enter your name in the first space. Include wife or husband if separate returns are not filed.

He simply lists his name, his wife's name, and the names of his dependents there. Question 2:

Enter the number of receipts received by you.

That is if he has worked for more than one employer during the year, has received more than one of these receipts he attaches all of them. Question 3:

Enter here total salaries and wages shown on receipts received by you listed in item 1 above.

Question 4:

Enter total dividends, interest, or wages not subject to withholding received during 1944 by you listed in item 1 above.

Then he simply signs his name and mails the form to the collector and that is his tax return. The collector then determines his tax. If the amount withheld is more than his tax, he will secure a refund. On the other hand, if it is shown that he owes additional tax, he is mailed a bill and required to pay such additional tax within 30 days.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Will there be anything on the back of this receipt in addition to the four questions the gentleman has read asking the taxpayer to set forth the amount of his claimed deductions, including contributions?

Mr. COOPER. No; there will not be any question of that kind.

Mr. CURTIS. There will be nothing on this form to show the amount of the contributions he has made?

Mr. COOPER. Nothing definitely of that type. The standard deductions are, of course, figured in the tables used by the employer when he withholds from the employee's wages or salaries, and they include charitable contributions.

Mr. CURTIS. How then will he make his claim for a refund if he has made contributions over and above the standard deduction?

Mr. COOPER. He does not use this form but uses the other form if he wants to itemize his deductions.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Are these annual receipts or are they furnished monthly or weekly?

Mr. COOPER. Under the law, and the present law is not changed in that respect, an employer is required to issue to his employee a receipt showing the amount of money withheld from his wages. He is required to give that receipt to an employee when the employee quits his employment, or at the end of the year.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. That answers my question; it is annual.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So, if I understand it, this receipt takes the place of a tax return.

Mr. COOPER. This is the tax return.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then while we talk about 30,000,000 people who will not need to file the long-form tax return it really means that a great many more than 30,000,000 returns will be filed, because an employee might be employed in two or three or a half-dozen places during the year.

Mr. COOPER. As I stated in the beginning, about 50,000,000 people are now required to file income tax returns. Of this 50,000,000, 30,000,000 will be able to use this short form, W–2, if they want to; it is optional with them. If they want to use the longer form and calculate their own tax they will have a right to do it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Otherwise the employee will mail these receipts to the collector's office; is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. The taxpayer receives this receipt from his employer, answers the three or four simple questions on the reverse side, signs it, and mails it to the collector of his district. Then the collector determines the tax due. If the amount withheld is more than the taxpayer owes, the collector promptly mails him a refund. If the collector determines that the amount withheld is not sufficient to pay the tax he then mails the taxpayer a bill and the latter has 30 days within which to pay.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And when does the employer give these receipts to his employees?

Mr. COOPER. The same as under present law—at the close of the year or upon termination of employment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In other words, the taxpayer is expected to keep these receipts until the end of the year and file them all at the same time; is that the understanding?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, yes; he files all his receipts together. But bear in mind he fills out the three or four questions on the back of only one receipt but he attaches to that any other receipts he may have received during the year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. When do we begin using this W–2 form the gentleman described?

Mr. COOPER. It will be used in lieu of the final 1944 income-tax returns and filed between January and March 15, 1945.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This form then is being used at the present time?

Mr. COOPER. The form W–2 is now being used as a receipt from the employer to the employee; but under the provisions of this bill, in addition to being a receipt it will carry these three or four questions on the back that the taxpayer may answer and sign, and that constitutes his tax return.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the question I am asking. When do we begin answering those questions?

Mr. COOPER. Any time from January 1 to March 15 of the following year, the regular time for filing tax returns. It may be filed any time from January 1 to March 15.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Tennessee has described the questions which appear on the back of these receipts. They are being used now, but will not be filed until after January of 1945; is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. He will fill those questions out on the back of the receipt and send it to the collector between January 1 and March 15 of the following year.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. With pleasure.

Mr. MICHENER. This return certainly is very understandable as explained by the gentleman from Tennessee. Am I correct in assuming that all schedules giving the detailed information as to how the amounts arrived at embodied in this return are eliminated?

Mr. COOPER. I am not sure that I quite understand the gentleman. Does the gentleman mean the usual informa-

tion that accompanies an ordinary income-tax return?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; in the case of the ordinary income-tax return today the front page is a recapitulation of information detailed by the taxpayer in schedules on the other pages of the return in which the taxpayer explains how he arrives at the amount he enters on the first page. Those schedules serve as a check to show whether or not the taxpayer is complying strictly with the law.

Mr. COOPER. That is all eliminated as far as this form W–2 is concerned. This is all the taxpayer receives; this is all the taxpayer uses. All he has to do is to state to the collector what his income not subject to withholding has been and his dependency status. The collector then figures the tax; the taxpayer does not do any figuring at all.

Mr. MICHENER. If I may interrupt at that point, the collector does the arithmetic, he figures it up, but the taxpayer submits a statement showing, for instance, so much for wages, so much for dividends, so much for interest, but there is no check up so far as the Government is concerned as to the correctness of the figures used by the taxpayer in making the totals which appear on this slip.

Mr. COOPER. But the return is made under the usual penalty for perjury. If a man includes some item that challenges the attention of the collector, a deputy collector can go out and investigate it just as he does now.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what I am getting at. Under existing law, there is a check.

Mr. COOPER. But the return is made under the penalty of perjury just as under the present law.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the answer.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. It has always been the rule under the income-tax law that the taxpayer is responsible for his return under penalty of perjury.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. That is true here?

Mr. COOPER. That is true. There is no change in that respect.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. This amended bill does not obviate the necessity for the employers filing the information return, does it?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, no.

Mr. KEOGH. In response to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, the collector has that information against which he can compare the amount shown on the receipt?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman will bear in mind the employer figures out the amount that must be withheld from the wages of the employee by the use of the withholding tables provided in the law. He figures out the amount that is to be withheld from the employee and he withholds that amount. He makes his own record and remits that amount withheld to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. He issues the employee a receipt showing the amount that has been withheld from wages during the year or if the employee quits before the end of the year at the time the employment ceases.

Mr. KEOGH. My point is that the collector will be in position to determine whether the receipt filed by the taxpayer includes all his earnings by comparing that receipt with information returns filed by the employer?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; to a great extent that check can be made there.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman be good enough to yield to me for one further question?

Mr. COOPER. With pleasure.

Mr. KEOGH. Does the gentleman have any knowledge or information as to whether there will be any increase in the administrative cost for the collector's computing the tax of those taxpayers who qualify and elect to file that short form?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. There will have to be some increase in the administrative expense. Obviously when the collector undertakes to determine the tax for these 30,000,000 taxpayers, it will require some personnel and some expense to perform that work.

Mr. KEOGH. But it should not be so great, in view of the fact that the collector presently audits those returns anyway?

Mr. COOPER. It is thought by the committee that the additional expense will not be very great and that whatever it amounts to, it is well spent in the interest of simplification.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The employee of a company, of course, must give to the company information as to his dependents?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. The employee must answer questions to his employer that are necessary for the employer to know how much to withhold from his wages. There is no change in the present law in that respect.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And the employer on top of that then gives to this person the 10 percent, or whatever it is, this standard exemption, does he not?

Mr. COOPER. That is all figured in the tables used by the employer in determining how much to withhold.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I know the gentleman will pardon me for this statement, but I have to leave town this afternoon on important business and will necessarily be absent tomorrow.

I am in favor of this simplified income-tax return and if there were a roll call and I were present I would vote for it; however, as I stated, I will not be present tomorrow. I also understand that the Montgomery Ward investigation resolution is coming up tomorrow. I am in favor of that resolution and if present I would vote for it. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman one or two questions, but before doing so, may I say I have a very high regard for the views and the intimate knowledge and insight into tax legislation held by the gentleman from Tennessee, just as I do for the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is much too liberal in his reference to me, but I appreciate it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to also compliment him and through the gentleman compliment the entire Committee on Ways and Means for bringing forth a measure which has the unanimous support of that committee. I think this bill should have the unanimous support of the membership of the House. My question: I have found nothing in these last few momentous years that has so stirred and embittered the American people as have the complexities of the tax return used on the form last March 15. Can the gentleman explain to me why there were these complexities in form 1040? Was it a deliberate bureaucratic attempt to bedevil the American taxpayer or was it a necessary complexity in meeting the requirements of the law?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman may rest assured that the form required to be executed by the taxpayers of this country was not any attempt on the part of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to cause the taxpayers any unnecessary trouble or difficulty. There was not a question included in that form that was not in accordance with law. The principle reason for the complications in the return filed by the people on last March 15 to a great extent was because of the bill passed last year. It was understood by everybody that during the transition period from the old system to the new system there would be more complexities involved than had ever been known before.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has answered my second question in part. We have heard it said that there have been 17 tax laws passed in about a dozen years which lends itself to these complexities. Does this complexity, which has been so obnoxious to the American people last March, hinge upon all of these 17 tax enactments, or is it the result of one particular recent enactment?

Mr. COOPER. I think there were more complications because of the bill passed last year than any other.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman. This will help to keep the record straight.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The complications were caused in part by the Victory tax as well as the carry-over from 1942.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. The Victory tax added considerable complications and, of course, that is repealed in this bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. It has been called to my attention in several instances recently that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is having difficulty getting the forms printed and out to the taxpayers in time. In cases of that sort it would seem to me that some arrangement should be made to protect the taxpayer. I know of some instances where the forms especially in reference to the estimates arrived in a whole State only a few days before they were due.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. BROOKS. Is there anything in this law which will protect the taxpayers in the event the Bureau of Internal Revenue is not able to get the forms out timely?

Mr. COOPER. I understand the gentleman's question. I must try to move along because I do not want to consume too much time, other Members wanting to speak. Of course, the reason for the difficulty this year was because of the lateness of the passage of the last tax bill. However, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue granted a general extension of 30 days for the filing of declarations of estimated tax.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. He may intend to cover this later in his statement.

Mr. COOPER. I am certainly trying to get to some other points.

Mr. KEOGH. I appreciate that. Would the gentleman be good enough in connection with that to explain to us the theory underlying the change with respect to exemptions allowed the spouses and whether it is the gentleman's thought that the proposed change will in effect compel the filing of joint returns by husband and wife?

Mr. COOPER. There is nothing in the bill which will have the effect of compelling joint returns.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. During the year 1944 we will have the same deductions as for 1943 so far as the taxpayer's check is concerned, provided he has not changed his marital status; is that not correct?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is referring to withholding?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The changes that are made in the tax laws wherein you do change the amount of taxes to be collected either by exemption or otherwise, will not come about then until 1945; is that correct? The adjustment is made in January 1945?

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will turn to page 2 of the bill, he will see "except as otherwise expressly provided, the amendments made by this part shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1943."

That means January 1, 1944. The new withholding tables in this bill take effect January 1, 1945, obviously, for this reason. This is the fifth month of this year. You cannot withhold now on wages already paid an employee during the last 4 months, so you can only make your new withholding effective at some future date. For the convenience of employers and all concerned, it was thought best to have the new withholding tables take effect on January 1, 1945.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So the amount to be collected from the taxpayer's check then will be just the same for this year, but after January 1, 1945, we will collect a larger amount from the taxpayers' checks.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is partially correct. The withholding will be greater for some, and less for others after the new withholding tables go into effect.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Although the same amount of taxes will be collected for 1944 as for 1945.

Mr. COOPER. Substantially the same.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; substantially the same, except you would collect the difference after the 1st of January 1945.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman will bear in mind something that we tried to emphasize several times, and there still seems to be some confusion about it. The withholding is not a tax. It is just a method of collecting the tax that the taxpayer owes, whether you collect it by withholding or any other method. Withholding is simply a method of collecting the tax that the taxpayer owes under the revenue law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I wanted to get across was that the taxpayer would not know the difference until January 1 so far as payments are concerned.

Mr. COOPER. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the explanation I have endeavored to give shows the use of this form W-2. This is the simple method provided for 30,000,000 taxpayers.

The second group, embracing about 10,000,000 taxpayers, whose income is from sources not subject to withholding, will set forth their income on a tax form and determine their tax, if they so desire, from a tax table shown on the form. It will be much simpler than the present so-called short form.

The third group, embracing about 10,000,000 taxpayers, principally with the higher incomes and involving more complication, will make out a form which will be simpler than the present form 1040.

I might take a moment to illustrate that. For the second group that I have mentioned, embracing about 10,000,000, they will simply take this form of 1 page with 10 questions on it, fill that out, use this table to determine the amount of the tax, sign it, and send it in. The businessman will use the tax schedules to itemize his business deductions.

For the last group of 10,000,000 they will make out this form here on this sheet and will find that they will have to answer some of the questions appearing on the back of it. That covers substantially the last 20,000,000 taxpayers, and then the 30,000,000 who use the simple W-2 form takes care of the 50,000,000 income taxpayers we have.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is saying—and I think it should be emphasized at this point—that of the 50,000,000 taxpayers, 40,000,000, either through the use of the W-2 form or the form just demonstrated by the gentleman, will not have to make any tax computation whatsoever.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, thus it will be seen that simplification is provided for all individual income taxpayers, and for 30,000,000 of the 50,000,000 an extremely simple method is provided. The bill provides for normal tax purposes an exemption of $500. For surtax purposes there is allowed a per capita exemption of $500 per person—that is, $500 for the taxpayer, $500 for his spouse, and $500 for each dependent.

A dependent is defined as, and really means, anyone for whom the taxpayer furnishes over half of the support, provided the person is closely related to the taxpayer, and is not himself required to file a return.

As I stated a moment ago, the Victory tax is repealed. The present normal tax and the surtax are combined. A new normal tax of 3 percent on each person whose net income exceeds $500 is provided in the bill.

I have already mentioned that new tables of withholding are provided in the bill to take effect January 1, 1945.

In closing, I want to again emphasize the two special benefits that are provided in this bill for the farmers of this country. One is that the definition is changed. Under the present law a person must receive 80 percent or more of his gross income from agriculture in order to qualify as a farmer. This bill changes that to two-thirds or 66⅔ percent.

The next point in the interest of the farmer is that under the present law a farmer is required to file a declaration of his estimated tax by December 15, and must estimate within at least two-thirds of his tax, in order to avoid penalty, unless he uses last year's income. Under the bill the date of December 15 is

changed to January 15, so that on January 15 a farmer may make his final return for the previous calendar year and not have to file any declaration of estimated tax. If he finds that he is not prepared to pay his full tax on January 15 he can then file his estimate, and then will have until March 15 to file his regular income-tax return and pay the remainder of his tax.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In the case of a married man whose wife has no income whatever, is he still entitled to take as an exemption $1,000?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But he cannot take $1,000 on the 3-percent normal tax, can he?

Mr. COOPER. No; that is for the surtax.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. On the surtax he has $1,000?

Mr. COOPER. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As I understood from going through the report, if a man's wife does have certain income, then the normal-tax exemption is increased by the amount of that income up to a total of $500.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. Take this as an illustration. Say the taxpayer is a man. He is entitled to $500 exemption for normal tax. Assume that his wife had $300 of income. Then the exemption is increased from $500 to $800 for normal-tax purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It seems to me that that is not altogether equitable. In one case we have a man trying to support a family on his own income alone, and his exemption is less than would be the case with a family that has two incomes.

Mr. COOPER. After all, the wife had the $300 income, and she would be entitled to $500 exemption if her income exceeded the $500.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I see. In other words, it really reduces the exemption that would otherwise have been given in a case like that.

Mr. COOPER. It does. It has the effect of reducing it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not understand that. I am much obliged.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think the committee before the bill comes back to the House, at least, ought to provide some relief from the penalties in the case of farmers filing too late this year, for this reason: In my district there was a great difference of opinion among the various accountants and the district and county revenue officials as to whether a man was a farmer, having 80 percent of his income within that provision. As a consequence, we even had farm laborers on the big farms being penalized for their income taxes. It was very widespread. I think the committee should provide relief from that penalty in this House before the bill is finally voted on.

Mr. COOPER. We appreciate the suggestion of the gentlewoman. In the revenue bill of 1943 we amended the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate the penalty for failure to file a declaration of estimated tax where the delay was due to a reasonable cause and not to willful neglect. I do not believe any Government official in the case you put would hold that the delay was not due to a reasonable cause. This relief is continued under the bill. Moreover, under the bill, for 1944 and subsequent years, an individual has to receive only two-thirds of his income from farming in order to qualify as a farmer.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that the illustration he has given to the gentleman from California conversely would impel a married couple, the spouse of which earns more than $500, to file a joint return?

Mr. COOPER. Where both spouses earn over $500 there would be no advantage, and certainly no compulsion, to file a joint return.

Mr. KEOGH. Is it not true that but recently the gentleman's own committee rejected the proposal to compel the filing of joint returns?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct and this bill does not compel the filing of joint returns.

Mr. KEOGH. Does the gentleman maintain that, practically speaking, the filing of joint returns is one of those things that ought to be done?

Mr. COOPER. That was not considered in this bill.

Let me point out one thing further. If there is any slight advantage provided for anybody under this system, it is in the interest of the taxpayers with a large number of dependents, in other words, the large families of the country.

I believe this bill is worthy of the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN.]

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is in response to public demand. It is true that it came from the committee by unanimous vote. I voted to report it, but not with a great deal of enthusiasm. The country is demanding relief, and, because there is some good in the bill, I am prepared to give it my support to send it on its way to the Senate where, after having been subjected to the spotlights of pitiless publicity, it may emerge with some improvements. So many tax bills had been passed in a short period of time that taxpayers had not been able to keep abreast of the amount owed or the method of payment. Seventeen tax bills had been passed in 12 years, and many of these were enacted late in the taxable year and were made retroactive. Confusion with resentment and demand for definiteness and simplification resulted.

The committee began its consideration of the problem with a declaration of its purpose to simplify the tax laws without substantially changing the number of taxpayers or the revenue yield under existing law. The public had a right to infer—and I believe it was understood—that only the machinery of administration would be affected. What we have here is a bill with a double aspect. It provides simplification and it also affects the revenue. In my opinion a very substantial increase in the personal income taxes will result from its enactment.

As to simplification, it does not go far enough. We now have three taxes—a normal tax, a surtax, and the Victory tax. The bill would abolish the Victory tax and continue the normal tax and surtax. Under the bill we have two taxes instead of three, except for those who elect to come under what is designated as Supplement "T." Supplement "T" provides a single tax for those whose income is under $5,000. The consolidation of the normal tax with the surtax would provide further simplification.

Of course, we know the truth to be that a nominal normal tax is continued, having in mind the tax-exempt securities issued by the Government. These securities, according to their terms, are exempt from normal taxes but are subject to surtaxes, and the combination of the normal with the surtax could leave the income of these securities free of tax. So some sort of a normal tax must, therefore, be maintained.

Students of the income tax agree with Professor Blakey who says in his book The Federal Income Tax, published as recently as 1940:

> There seems to be little or no excuse for maintaining a double system of rates and distinguishing between a normal tax and a surtax on individuals. Only 4 of the 34 States having income taxes have such a combination, and most of these result in patchwork rather than in systematic schedules of rates.

The history of the surtax is political. The purpose of it was to put persons of large income in a class where they could be subjected to separate treatment and made to pay larger taxes. This idea was developed early in the life of the income tax. The surtax is being used for that purpose today. For those who believe in that philosophy the same results can be accomplished by the system of graduated rates. No satisfactory answer has been given to the query as to why if such a system can be provided for those with incomes under $5,000 a single tax cannot be provided for the rest. The problem of the tax-exempt securities is not without its solution to accomplish this purpose. Such securities have not been issued for some time, many have been liquidated, and a careful study of the matter may develop the fact that the loss of revenue might not be too much of

a price for the Government to pay for the resulting simplification of its tax-collection machinery. Also, the possibility of complying with the law of uniformity by placing the surtax on incomes from particular classes of property might be explored.

However, the simplification under the pending bill—as far as it goes—is beneficial. The practice of withholding taxes out of employees' pay is still in the experimental stage. The machinery herein provided is better than anything we have had thus far, and reflects the benefits resulting from past experience. It will probably serve all right in wartime, but what the reaction will be under peacetime conditions is problematical. The Government is now in competition with many other agencies enjoying the privilege of putting their hands into the pay envelopes of a worker. I am familiar with one industry which makes 22 deductions. These include union dues, social security, bond purchases, hospitalization, and various items for charitable and social purposes.

Some pay checks have so many squares for noting deductions for various items that they look like a card for matching numbers in a bingo game. When the system begins to touch the pride of the American wage earner its success is doubtful. It might be well to give some thought to what could happen if the "take home pay" becomes the lesser part of a man's earnings and, also, if there is not the possibility of the practice inviting demands for increased wages.

My purpose is not to argue against the imposition of further taxes nor against the need of additional revenue in the light of the world cataclysm in which we are now involved—the most expensive war the world has ever known. It is to point out the devices used in increasing taxes of which the public should be informed.

My charge is that advantage is being taken of this opportunity to enact a revenue bill to help put the personal income taxes up to where the administration wants them. Such an effort is untimely.

In the spring of 1942 the Treasury made a demand for additional taxes of $10,500,000,000. Of this amount $6,500,000,000 was to come from personal income taxes. The Ways and Means Committee reached the conclusion that the amount was beyond the ability of the people to pay, and on May 18, 1943, in a report accompanying H. R. 3687 said:

> It is believed that so far as the individual income tax is concerned we are approaching the point of diminishing returns. Few persons realize that under existing law with the carry-over of the 1942 tax required to be paid in 1944 and 1945 no individual—no matter how high his income—will have more than $25,000, assuming his income remained constant and his uncancelled tax is paid out of current income.

After setting up some tables to illustrate the point, the report went on to say:

> These figures do not include the State income-tax burden. It should be noted, in addition, that these figures do not include social-security taxes or Federal or State excise and sales taxes, or State property taxes, all of which makes the direct income tax burdensome.

This was the considered judgment of the Committee on Ways and Means in November 1943, and, as a result, only nominal increases were provided in the revenue act of that year. But the earned-income credit was abolished and resulted in an increased burden on the individual taxpayer.

The administration did not agree with the sentiments expressed in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means. The failure to assess $6,500,000,000 additional revenue from personal income taxes excited the ire of the administration. It resulted in the veto of the measure which brought about the now historic Barkley incident. The political ramifications of that volcanic eruption brought about early efforts toward reconciliation. These efforts culminated at a luncheon attended by the Secretary of the Treasury; Chairman GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee; and Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Committee on Ways and Means. After the meeting the Secretary of the Treasury announced that all differences had been reconciled, and that the administration would be satisfied for the time being with the simplification of the tax laws. So the Committee on Ways and Means proceeded to "provide simplification without substantially changing the number of taxpayers or the revenue yield under existing law."

Nevertheless, the temptation to inject revenue features into this measure was difficult to resist. We are told that the enactment of this measure will cause a loss of $60,000,000 to the Treasury. With this sentiment I cannot agree. The yield from every recent enactment has been far in excess of the estimates. This is particularly true under the pay-as-you-go withholding plan. The marked increase in collections as shown by a comparable statement in the recent report of the Collector of Internal Revenue would indicate this:

Receipts for period of July 1, 1942, to Mar. 31, 1943	
Personal income tax collected	$3,621,536,284.81
Personal income tax withheld	1,824,754.66
Total personal income taxes	3,623,361,039.47
Receipts for comparable period July 1, 1943, to Mar. 31, 1944	
Personal income tax collected	$7,433,431,794.24
Personal income tax withheld	5,435,649,735.89
Total personal income taxes	12,869,081,530.13
1943 collections	3,623,361,039.47
Increase for 9 months of the fiscal year 1944	9,245,720,490.66

It is said for the bill that in order to bring about the benefits of simplification the Government will sacrifice $60,000,000 in revenue. It is represented that by eliminating the Victory tax and substituting therefor a normal tax of 3 percent on net incomes in excess of an exemption of $500 there will be lost $240,000,000; that by substituting new surtax rates there will be a gain of $490,000,000. In other words, in making the transition from the three existing taxes to two, and increasing surtax rates there will be a net gain of $250,000,000. Losses are estimated of $290,000,000 in the changes of dependents and deductions of $370,000,000, and a gain is anticipated of $300,000,000 in the change in personal exemption. My analysis indicates a much larger gain from the increased surtax rates and, consequently, in the over-all picture. I assume as correct the Treasury's estimate of loss by the elimination of the Victory tax at $250,000,000.

I have estimated the increase in each surtax bracket, making generous allowance in favor of the Government, and multiplied them by the number of taxpayers there are in each bracket, according to Treasury estimates, and I find an increase upward of $580,124, as against $490,000,000 estimated by the Treasury. This estimate covers only 41,000,000 taxpayers and does not include some additional amount that will be received from 11,000,000 Victory-tax payers with incomes above $500 who will be covered into the new system. It is apparent that not only will there be no loss of revenue but, in the name of simplification, there will be an increase of revenue upward of $200,000,000, with a margin for error between $200,000,000 and $400,000,000. In reaching this conclusion I have assumed as correct the Treasury estimate of loss in the category of dependents and the new standard deduction for charities, and so forth, as well as the loss due to the elimination of the Victory tax, as stated above.

Bear in mind also the provision you will find on the second page of the bill which reads "except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this part shall be applicable with respect to the taxable years beginning after December 31, 1943." The effect of this provision is to make the new surtax rates effective as of January 1, 1944. And this in spite of a declaration made by the committee that there would be no more retroactive tax laws adopted. Consequently, many people who have filed an estimate of their anticipated tax for 1944 will find themselves above their estimates when the day of reckoning comes on March 1, 1945.

The new withholding provisions do not become effective until January 1, 1945. Why should it be necessary to alter the tax rates and exemptions calculated to implement the system a year in advance?

A comparison of individual surtax rate schedules (with normal tax included) under Revenue Act of 1943, with the surtax schedule under the pending bill, together with rates of increase

Under pending bill		Present law	Percent of increase
If the surtax net income is:	The surtax shall be:		
Not over $2,000	20 percent of the surtax net income.	19 percent	1
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$400, plus 22 percent of excess over $2,000.	$380 plus 22 percent	0
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$840, plus 26 percent of excess over $4,000.	$820 plus 26 percent	0
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,360, plus 30 percent of excess over $6,000.	$1,340 plus 30 percent	0
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,960, plus 34 percent of excess $8,000.	$1,940 plus 34 percent	0
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$2,640, plus 38 percent of excess over $10,000.	$2,620 plus 38 percent	0
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$3,400, plus 43 percent of excess over $12,000.	$3,380 plus 42 percent	1
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$4,260 plus 47 percent of excess over $14,000.	$4,220 plus 46 percent	1
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$5,200 plus 50 percent of excess over $16,000.	$5,140 plus 49 percent	1
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$6,200 plus 53 percent of excess over $18,000.	$6,120 plus 52 percent	1
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$7,260 plus 56 percent of excess over $20,000.	$7,160 plus 55 percent	1
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$8,380 plus 59 percent of excess over $22,000.	$8,260 plus 58 percent	1
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	$10,740 plus 62 percent of excess over $26,000.	$10,580 plus 61 percent	1
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	$14,460 plus 65 precent of excess over $32,000.	$14,240 plus 64 percent	1
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	$18,360 plus 69 percent of excess over $38,000.	$18,080 plus 67 percent	2
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$22,500, plus 72 percent of excess over $44,000.	$22,100, plus 69 percent	3
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$26,820, plus 75 percent of excess over $50,000.	$26,240, plus 72 percent	3
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$34,320, plus 78 percent of excess over $60,000.	$33,440, plus 75 percent	3
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	$42,120, plus 81 percent of excess over $70,000.	$40,940, plus 78 percent	3
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	$50,220, plus 84 percent of excess over $80,000.	$48,740, plus 81 percent	3
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	$58,620, plus 87 percent of excess over $90,000.	$56,840, plus 83 percent	4
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	$67,320, plus 89 percent of excess over $100,000.	$65,140, plus 85 percent	4
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000	$111,820, plus 90 percent of excess $150,000.	$107,640, plus 87 percent	3
Over $200,000	$156,820, plus 91 percent of excess over $200,000."	$151,140, plus 88 percent	3

The estimates of the Treasury are that by reducing the exemption for married people from $1,200 to $1,000, there will be an increase of $300,000,000. This manipulation will be much more favorable to the Government. Reducing the exemptions has always been a favorite device to increase taxes. It increases the taxable income in all brackets, falling most generously on the higher brackets—where the taxable income is subject to the higher rates. It is, therefore, fair to assume that there will be an increase of revenue in this item far greater than the $300,000,000 estimated.

There will be a further increase by the change in the use of personal exemption. Heretofore it has been permissible for a married couple to use the total exemption as was most advantageous. The entire amount could be used by either spouse. That is no longer possible. It may be divided equally between them if they are using separate returns. It can be used jointly in filing a joint return. As a result of either method many married couples will find themselves in higher brackets paying larger taxes.

The matter of change in exemptions for dependents has received much publicity. The Government estimates a loss of $290,000,000 in this item. In order to determine the loss or gain with any degree of certainty the number of dependents in the various categories allowed under the bill must be known. While I am satisfied that the loss will not be as large as claimed by the Treasury, I accept the estimate as a guess just as good as I could make myself, and assume it to be correct. The same is true as to the estimated loss from the 10-percent flat allowance under the so-called standard deduction. This is one feature of the bill that will aid in simplification. Much can be said for it. It will result in inequalities, and there is fear that charitable contributions may be affected by it. However, it will aid in the collection at the source under supplement T and should be given a trial.

Further indication of increase is found in the burden tables furnished the committee by the Treasury Department. These tables show that with few exceptions all single persons will suffer an increase; all married persons without dependents will suffer an increase; all married persons with one dependent will suffer an increase. Beyond that there will be some slight reductions.

It is difficult to reconcile how taxes can be so uniformly increased in these categories with the contention of the Treasury that there will be a reduction in revenue by the enactment of the bill.

Whenever a manipulation with rates in a tax bill begins with lowering exemptions and increasing rates it is fair to assume that an increase in yield is being planned, especially when the burden tables show an anticipated increase.

I am not able or willing to conjecture what the revenue yield will be. That would be as impossible as our recent experiences have been. All of the estimates made for recent enactments have been exceeded, but the revenue yield from this bill will be substantial and I believe a simplification measure could be developed without manipulation and some of the changes in the exemptions and rates carried in the pending bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 4646, has been very thoroughly and very well explained by those who have preceded me. There remains little, if anything, that I can add to what already has been said in the way of explanation.

However, I do want to take a little time to pay tribute to the chairman of our committee and to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, who have worked so hard, so diligently, and so cooperatively in getting out this bill which, to my mind, is a real simplification bill.

All of us have heard criticism from all walks of life because of the complicated returns which we had to fill out. The truth of the matter is that the returns were complicated, but it was not so much the return that scared the people. Rather, it was the fact that they had to collect figures, most of them having done no bookkeeping during the year. Really, that is where the trouble lay at that moment.

I am happy, indeed, that we were able to bring to the floor the type of bill that H. R. 4646 is. That bill reflects the unanimous opinion not only of the committee but also of the staffs, as you have been told before, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the staff of the Treasury Department, and the staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It reflects a unanimous opinion that this is a real progressive measure, a real step in the line of simplification.

I am extremely happy that my colleagues saw fit to incorporate in this bill the principles that I had outlined in a bill which I presented last January (H. R. 4087) to eliminate the necessity for filing returns by those people whose total income-tax liability was withheld at the source. In view of the fact that I had dropped a bill into the hopper last January containing those principles, and now to see it enacted into law really pleases me very much.

A question arose during our deliberations as to whether or not there should be some kind of return filed by each of those individuals with the internal-revenue collector.

As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] explained so well a few moments ago, the form W–2 will now be the return for some 30,000,000 taxpayers. One question that arose was as to what check

might be had on employers, perhaps few in number, but those unscrupulous employers who would not report to the Bureau of Internal Revenue the amount withheld as taxes from their employees. It was thought that by compelling the individual to submit the form W–2 the Treasury would have a check on the employer. In this same connection there also arose the question that the individual sending in form W–2 given to him by the employer at the end of the year, showing the amount of his earnings and the amount deducted for taxes, would have no receipt that he could keep. It was then decided that the employer in issuing form W–2 should issue it in duplicate so that the original could be mailed to the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the duplicate held by the individual as his receipt to show in the future if he were called upon to do so. That provision was not incorporated in the bill; you will find in the bill nothing at all relative to the issuance of duplicate receipts. The law authorizes the Bureau of Internal Revenue to issue regulations and it is my understanding that regulations providing for duplicate W–2's will be issued. In fact, the matter was brought up in committee this morning, and the Treasury Department assured us that this will be done.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say I always listen to the gentleman from Rhode Island because he never fails to have something of intellectual importance to give the Members of this House.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman is very kind.

Mr. BROOKS. I am concerned with this complicated set-up we have had in the past. Our people have been worried by the fact that oftentimes the forms were mailed to them at a late date. For instance, I have in mind a case in Louisiana where forms arrived in the hands of the taxpayers only 3 or 4 days before they had to be filed. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue tells me of other States which suffered a similar experience. The taxpayer is confronted by complicated forms, and in addition by the fact that he has a very limited time in which to fill out the forms. I wonder if the gentleman has discussed that matter with the Bureau of Internal Revenue and what reaction they have had.

Mr. FORAND. I shall be pleased to pass on to the gentleman the information I have on the subject. It is true that during the last year because of numerous changes brought about by our tax bills it was very difficult for the Bureau of Internal Revenue to get out their forms on time. One instance of that was the estimate of earnings for the ensuing year that was supposed to be filed last March 15.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue granted a blanket extension of time to April 15. We all realize, and I have been informed by the Treasury Department that this is so, that the Government Printing Office during these war days is working overtime; it is being pressed very hard, and it has been necessary in many instances to allocate the printing of forms, not only forms for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but for other departments of the Government as well, to commercial printing establishments. There has been difficulty in getting the forms, but in view of the fact that this bill is being passed at such an early date in the year I am satisfied the Bureau will continue its effort and that there will be no more trouble in the way of delay.

Mr. BROOKS. One more question: The gentleman then feels that if the Bureau of Internal Revenue cannot get the forms out in time the appropriate remedy would be for the Commissioner to grant a blanket deferment to the taxpayers to give them a reasonable time within which to furnish the information.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman is correct, and I am quite sure that would be done.

Mr. Chairman, because I have been appointed by the Speaker as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., I shall not be here tomorrow. The annual meeting of the Board has been called for Saturday, and it is necessary for the Board to leave here tomorrow, but I want the RECORD to show that I am absolutely in favor of the passage of this simplification bill, which I believe will prove to be a godsend to all the taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

The Chair would like to state that the gentleman from Minnesota has consumed 1 hour and 24 minutes, the gentleman from North Carolina 1 hour and 54 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I checked up, but can only make it 188 minutes on our side. I do not, of course, want to take issue with the judicial register.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been so well discussed and so well analyzed that I do not expect to devote more than a few minutes to a discussion of certain sections and to the effect of the administration of this legislation. We are all, of course, greatly pleased that the Ways and Means Committee has brought out this bill, and we feel sure the House will adopt it and thereby bring about a simplified tax return. Our citizens are demanding it. Congress is acting in response to public sentiment.

Of course, the tax-return forms should be made more simple. These forms, however, are not the seat of the problem. They are just its surface expression.

There cannot be simplification of tax returns unless we simplify the taxes. It would be very nice, indeed, if it were possible to cross out a few lines and rearrange the tax-return forms, but the task is not so delightfully simple as that. If, however, one realizes that these forms are merely a means to an end and the end is really represented by the requirements of the tax laws, we get back nearer to the seat of the difficulty.

The tax-return forms are complicated because the tax laws are complicated. We have entirely too many taxes, interpretations, explanations, and modifications. They have been accumulated step by step over the years. They are not there because of a reasonable and systematic effort to create a tax system. They are there because of the process of addition and subtraction. They have arisen chiefly as the result of emotional pressures and, of course, under the drive of certain prejudices and fallacies which fevers of public opinion have imposed upon the tax structure from time to time. If we really are concerned about simplification because the tax forms seem complicated, I point out that the few sheets of paper represented by the tax forms are not the culprits. These are merely symptoms of deep-seated diseases. Unfortunately we are not called upon to confront just one disease, but a complication of diseases. So unless a great many people are prepared to revise some of their notions and fancies about taxation in a very fundamental way, they might just as well resign themselves to the continuance of a great deal of confusion. We are trying to take one step toward simplification in the bill.

The only way to simplify is to simplify.

We are responding now to public demand for a simplified tax return. Congress should keep in mind that the revenue bills we have enacted during the past few years have placed a great burden on business and industry. In my opinion it will be a matter of only months or a few years at most before we are going to hear from the business and industry of this Nation in regard to the administrative burden we have placed on them. By this bill we take care of the simplification of personal income-tax returns to a large degree, but we must keep in mind that the basis of this simplification is the W–2 return. This means we have placed on business and industry the general burden of collecting the personal income taxes of at least 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 taxpayers. Business and industry have gladly shared this burden during the war period, but I am wondering if after we return to normal peacetime pursuits we are not going to have to analyze the situation again and see if we cannot simplify and correlate tax collection for business and industry. A thorough study and analysis of the large number of returns required from business and industry just about shocks one.

Business and industry are required to make returns it seems like most every day in the year for some type of tax—Federal, State, or local. A number of organizations have distributed tax calendars for Federal tax collections. I happen to have one of them here and it is interesting to note that during the month of January there are 4 days set aside for certain tax collections or reports that must be filed by industry. That is for Federal taxes. In addition to that they have the State and local taxes which in a number of instances increases this more than two or three times. In February we have 3 days, in March we have 9 days in which a busi-

nessman or employer must make some sort of return to the Federal Treasury for tax purposes; in April we have 4 days, May is a very small one, with only 1, according to this calendar; in June we have 4, in July we have 6; August is another good month with only 1; September 4, October 4, November 5, and December 7.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the total number of days on which industry must file tax returns out of the 365?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I may say to the gentleman that I did not total these, but when I began to make a study of the burden that we have placed upon business and industry of this Nation in connection with the last few revenue acts I can see that the Congress will have to meet this issue sooner or later.

We must remember there are a number of forms that must be filled out, not only for Federal taxes but for State and local taxes. We have got to coordinate these. There are some suggestions I want to make and I recommend them to the Congress for study and trust they will have early consideration. These changes would materially aid simplification of withholding.

NECESSARY FILING-TIME CHANGES FOR SIMPLIFICATION OF WITHHOLDING

Several changes should be made in the requirements for filing certain tax returns with the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

First. Form W–2, employees' receipt: Time for delivering to employees should be changed from January 31 to February 15.

It is important to note that under H. R. 4646 it is proposed to make use of this receipt as the tax return of certain individuals. However, it is important that there be a specific provision in the law which prevents the issuance of regulations that may require the employer to give more than one copy of the receipt to the employee.

Second. Form W–1, employers' return of income tax withheld on wages; form W–2, duplicate employees' receipt; form W–3, reconciliation of quarterly returns: The time for filing form W–1 for the last quarter only, W–2—duplicate—and W–3, together with the date of payment of amounts withheld for the final month of the year, should be changed from January 31 to February 28.

REASONS

Time allowances under existing regulations are not sufficient because of—

First. Manpower shortage.

Second. Necessity of first securing salary stabilization approvals which often takes more than 30 days.

Third. Necessity of first securing War Labor Board approvals which often takes more than 30 days.

Fourth. Inability to secure accounting machines.

Fifth. Necessity for compiling social security and State unemployment insurance returns for all States in which a company operates.

Sixth. Necessity of taking year-end inventory at about the same time, in January.

Seventh. Closing of books and preparation of financial statements in January.

Eighth. Companies with many stores, offices, and branches widely dispersed over the Nation require more than 1 month's time to assemble returns.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I think the gentleman is discussing a very important phase of taxation. In reference to these declarations that we are called upon to make, they lay heavier upon the small businessman, the unprepared businessman, just as the gentleman indicated, the man who has not the auditors, who has not a vast number of office assistants. That is the man who suffers the most. May I say that the gentleman deserves a lot of credit for having been so anxious in advancing in the committee the proposition of moving the date up to January 15, because December 15 is a date just at the Christmas holidays when the little businessman is the busiest and many businessmen suffered because they did not make their declarations. I want to publicly thank the gentleman for his effort in that respect.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I want to say something with reference to the filing of declarations that are mentioned in this bill. It is a great improvement over existing law.

Mr. DONDERO. In answer to what the gentleman from Ohio has said, it is my information that 200,000 small business concerns have vanished in this country in 12 months.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I want to discuss the changed method of filing declarations in this bill. The filing of declarations was a new thing in the Revenue Act of 1942. We had not had any experience with it theretofore and we found that the December date is a most confusing date because the taxpayer had to estimate within a reasonable amount his taxes for the year and make a payment thereon or be subjected to a penalty. This bill moves the December 15 date up to January 15. In other words this last payment is after the first of the year and it is especially beneficial to the small businessmen, to those who are uncertain as to their income, and the farmers. No one needs to file a final estimated return now until January 15 or after the first of the year. Farmers need not file any estimated returns during the year unless they want to. If they file an estimated return on January 15 and pay two-thirds of their tax, that takes care of the tax liability for that past year or until the final payment, which must be made on March 15. If they want to they can pay their final and full tax liability for the previous year on January 15. The small businessman can do the same and any taxpayer, of course, can complete the filing of his return on the 15th day of January. If he needs additional time he has until March 15 as under existing law. This is a great improvement and will eliminate a lot of confusion, dissatisfaction, and irritation with the present tax law.

Mr. Chairman, I am greatly pleased that our committee has reported this bill to the House. It is especially pleasing to me, as I introduced a bill earlier in the year, H. R. 4040, for the simplification of personal income-tax returns. This bill contained several provisions of the bill before us today.

My measure was based on the suggestions outlined in my January 3 statement, and is offered simply as a basis for discussion, and not with the idea that it is the last word on the subject. It would bring about the following salutary changes:

First. Provides for only one tax on personal incomes, with a single base and a single set of rates and exemptions, through merger of the Victory tax with the regular income tax.

Second. Eliminate the necessity of filing returns in the case of persons whose tax liability is substantially withhheld at the source, but permit returns to be filed at the taxpayer's option. This would benefit 30,000,000 taxpayers and in general cover those who are not now required to file declaration of estimated tax.

Third. Permit the use of the short form of return by taxpayers with up to $5,000 gross income. Limit is $3,000 in present law.

Fourth. Bring about drastic simplification of both the short form and the long form of return.

Fifth. Give taxpayers until January 15 following the close of the taxable year in which to file an amended declaration of their estimated tax and thereby avoid penalty for any underestimate. This will eliminate the guessing contest in the present law which has resulted in so much irritation and confusion.

I want to discuss very briefly another matter that is going to be before the Congress. We have just started tax simplification. We have taken only the easiest part of it. We have dealt only with the personal-income tax. We still have corporation taxes to deal with. We also have estate and gift taxes and any on who has studied these various problems of taxation realize how complicated they are.

The expression that "Like Topsy, it just grew" certainly is applicable to our Federal tax structure. The complications of our Federal tax structure, with its resulant overlappings of State and local tax laws, demand immediate attention. One has only to study the complications of our present tax laws to convince himself of the correctness of this statement. The soundness of our tax policy and its effect on national welfare can legitimately be questioned. Groups and individuals are now urging Congress to clarify and simplify our national tax structure. Early this year, the Ways and Means Committee responded to the demand of our citizens who began clamouring for a simplified tax return. There is no doubt in my mind but what our early action on this legislation was the result of this popular demand. We have

dealt with one relatively small and simple aspect of the tax problem, namely, the personal-income tax. Despite the unanimity of purpose on the part of the committee, I think I am safe in stating that it was a most difficult job. My services on the committee lead me to believe that it would be practically impossible for our committee to devote sufficient time and thought to simplify our entire tax structure. Changes will be required in basic law before we can effectively correlate Federal, State, and local taxes.

First, our Nation should have a definite tax policy which will remain unchanged for a considerable length of time. Second, we should have a revision and rewriting of our complicated tax structure which would eliminate the thousands of cross-references. The time to act on this problem is now. Since January 1, a number of Members of the House have introduced bills providing for the establishment of a Federal tax commission or tax study group. On January 10 of this year, I introduced House Joint Resolution 211. This resolution declares the policy of the Congress in respect of internal-revenue legislation to simplify the Federal tax system; to establish a long-range, integrated tax policy for present and post-war needs; to raise the necessary revenue with the least possible burden on individuals and business enterprises and with the greatest possible incentive to capital investment; to base Federal taxes upon the principle of ability to pay insofar as possible to alleviate hardships and inequities in taxation; to reduce double taxation by coordinating the Federal tax system with those of State and local governments; to prevent tax evasion and avoidance; and to make such other changes as will generally improve the internal-revenue system.

The joint resolution contemplates that the commission to conduct the study will consist of 15 members, of whom 4 members—2 from each party—will be chosen from members of the Senate Finance Committee; 4 members—2 from each party—chosen from the Ways and Means Committee of the House; 7 members—of whom none shall hold any Government office and none shall be engaged in activities of any political party—representing, respectively, agriculture, labor, business and industry, taxpayers and consumers, tax accountants, tax lawyers, and tax economists. The commission would be obligated to make a report to the Congress not later than September 15, 1944, and all authority conferred by the resolution would terminate 1 year from the date of enactment.

If Congress does not deem it advisable to enact legislation authorizing the establishment of a Federal tax commission, then I believe they should adopt the suggestion offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. The gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman KNUTSON, introduced House Joint Resolution 233, which authorizes and directs the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue taxation to appoint an advisory council, the council membership to be selected from agriculture, labor, business, industry, individual taxpayers, consumers, tax accountants, tax lawyers, tax economists, and other activities having a direct interest in or practical experience with tax laws and their administration. This temporary advisory council would be appointed by the chairman of the joint congressional committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman. This council would serve in conjunction with the present joint staff, which is now assisting the Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee. We have an excellent staff, headed by Colin Stam, but I think it would be helpful to the committees and the joint staff to bring in men who have daily contacts with these problems in the business field. The adoption of either of these resolutions would serve as a first necessary step toward the accomplishment of a much-needed income-tax reform.

The American Institute of Accountants are enthusiastically endorsing these proposals.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In this simplification bill is there any adjusted rate that shifts the burden, as the gentleman suggests might happen in the pending tax bill?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Of course, when you start simplifying taxes you take away some of the relief provisions. In the Revenue Act of 1933 we removed the earned-income credit. That was an additional direct charge on an individual's taxes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman say the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means will not mean a substantial increase in the taxes to be paid by the taxpayers of the country as compared with the present law?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The joint staff committee tells us this bill will produce $60,000,000 less in revenue than under existing law but there will be a shift of tax burdens among individual taxpayers.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will that be reflected in any substantial increase for any segment of taxpayers?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Well, that depends upon what the gentleman calls substantial. There are some shifts. I have the burden table here, for instance. I might mention in passing that single persons and married persons with no dependents are the ones who generally receive the increases, not in all cases, but generally speaking. A married man with no dependents and an income of $1,200, has a present tax of $21, and under the present proposal it will be $61. I do not know whether the gentleman calls that a substantial increase or not.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What about the people, say, in the middle-income brackets from $3,000 up to seven, eight, and nine thousand, or thereabouts? The greatest burden is placed on the so-called middle classes who are living on a certain economic basis, who find it quite difficult to meet their obligations, send their children to school, and to carry even the mortgages on the homes and properties that they had prepared for, say, when they acquired these homes.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The staff of the joint committee has prepared a table which I have here, and I am going to insert it in the RECORD. The gentleman mentioned $3,000. This table is on a weekly wage rate, and at $60 per week the present rate of withholding for a single person is $10.60. Under the bill before the House today the withholding for a single person will be $10.60; no change. The present law for a married person is $8.20 per week. Under this bill it will be $8.50 per week. The present law for a married person with two dependents is $5.80 per week. Under this bill it is $4.60 per week.

Comparison of withholding rates under present law with H. R. 4646

Weekly wage	Single person		Married person			
			No dependents		2 dependents	
	Present law	H. R. 4646	Present law	H. R. 4646	Present law	H. R. 4646
$15	$1.10	$1.00	$0.20	$0.10	$0.20	$0.10
$20	2.10	2.00	.30	.30	.30	.30
$25	3.10	3.10	.70	1.10	.50	.40
$30	4.60	4.10	2.20	2.20	.70	.50
$40	6.60	6.20	4.20	4.20	1.80	.80
$50	8.60	8.20	6.20	6.30	3.80	2.50
$60	10.60	10.60	8.20	8.50	5.80	4.60
$70	12.60	12.80	10.20	10.70	7.80	6.70
$80	14.60	15.10	12.20	12.90	9.80	8.80
$90	16.60	17.30	14.20	15.20	11.80	11.00
$100	18.60	19.90	16.20	17.80	13.80	13.50
$110	20.60	22.10	18.20	20.00	15.80	15.80
$120	22.60	24.40	20.20	22.30	17.80	18.00
$130	24.60	26.60	22.20	24.50	19.80	20.30
$140	26.60	28.90	24.20	26.80	21.80	22.50
$150	28.60	31.70	26.20	29.60	23.80	25.40
$160	30.60	34.00	28.20	31.80	25.80	27.60
$170	32.60	36.20	30.20	34.10	27.80	29.90
$180	34.60	38.50	32.20	36.30	29.80	32.10
$190	36.60	40.70	34.20	38.60	31.80	34.40

Source: Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, May 4, 1944.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Permit me to call to the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], pages 8, 9, and 10, and so on, over to page 17 of the committee report. He will find there on those pages tables which point out the difference in the tax burden between the Revenue Act of 1943 and the committee bill as we propose it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to those tables, and in further respect to the inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts, it is true, for instance, as disclosed in table 7 on page 14 of the committee report, that this bill does provide an increase in the incomes of all married persons with no dependents, with incomes between $525 and $1,000,000. Without exception, there is an increase as disclosed by this table.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But in that connection, while I regret that increase, it is fair to say that that increase is a comparison between this bill and the Revenue Act of 1943, on which act we will never pay any taxes, because that tax would be superseded by this bill, which will make the comparison between 1942 and this bill rather than this bill and the 1943 act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman from Mississippi is absolutely correct. It is a little ironical that despite all the fuss and contention we had with the Revenue Act of 1943, this act completely supersedes that, and as far as the personal-income taxes are concerned, it never will be in effect.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the gentleman and the other members of the committee ought to be congratulated on the date of January 15, but in that respect let me ask the gentleman this question: Assuming that a taxpayer whose income in previous years has been substantially two-thirds or more from farming suffers a disaster such as now obtains in your area and the Missouri Valley so that his agricultural income may be absolutely destroyed, and he is following that procedure and not filing a return, will he be penalized?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. No.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What if it develops he has no agricultural income, whereas heretofore he has had two-thirds of his income from agriculture?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I certainly would think not, because it is not the intention of this committee and it is not the intention of this Congress to penalize anyone who can show that through disaster of some type, especially in agricultural areas, he had no income when he estimated two-thirds or more from farming.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the fair basis for that estimate would be his income for previous years?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Surely no income-tax collector would penalize him for failing to have an income the previous year.

Mr. KNUTSON. He has until the 15th of March to make a final return if he wishes to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I grant you that; what I had in mind was penalizing him for failing to file an estimated return if it developed that two-thirds of his income was not from agriculture.

Mr. KNUTSON. We threw all the safeguards around agriculture that we could.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I wanted to make assurance doubly sure.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Every effort was made to clarify some of these very controversial problems and some that were very irritating to the taxpayer in this last year.

Last year, the year 1943, in which we filed final returns on March 15, 1944, the returns were very complicated. We had this transition from a year's liability to a current tax system. But more than that, we had the Victory tax, and that is one tax that did add a large number of these complications. Therefore, I feel that our committee has done the best it could under the circumstances. As time goes by and there is an opportunity to further simplify the taxes, I think we can do it by increasing the exemptions without greatly changing the tax structure, and I hope we have adopted a program here that may be continued for years with changes as to deductions and exemptions only.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman not admit that you have added to the burdens of the businessman now when he takes care of this paper work and, therefore, due to shortage of manpower now, should not your committee, without waiting a year, but now, cut down that manpower by simplifying the tax filing and these papers and other things necessary that these businessmen are called upon to file?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] that earlier in my discussion I went into that quite at length in regard to the increased number of returns.

Mr. CHURCH. I thought you said it might be a whole year before you reached that point, and therefore I want to urge upon your committee that you would save the manpower of this Nation if you could get at that simplification for businessmen sooner than a year from now.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I am in accord with the gentleman, but I realize what a large job it is to get into some of these problems and how difficult they are to work out. I would not want anyone to get too optimistic about getting an immediate change of the law. It is something that we will have to do, and the sooner we do it the better it will be for the taxpayer and the country as a whole. As a matter of fact, we want to get our tax structure and our tax returns on a basis so that it will not be an unbearable burden on business and industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal recently about the Bill of Rights. We, who come from the city of Philadelphia have been for a long time concerned over a continuing process whereby it would appear that the activities of the Federal Government have had the effect of putting more and more government into Philadelphia and taking more and more business out of it. For example, we have had the S. E. C. sent up there. That makes more Government agencies in the city and we are glad to be their host. But at the same time they took away from us all of our airport facilities. We have had some recent examples of that to which I wish to return.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. If the gentleman would be good enough to cooperate with me, we would like to get the Securities and Exchange Commission in New York City, where it belongs.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman could give us some real honest-to-god working business organization to contribute prosperity to the city, I think we might be able to make a trade.

We have so much government, and we are losing so much business, that I am very much afraid if the process keeps up, the third city in the Nation will be converted into a way station or tank town, and I am most anxious that that shall not happen.

I spoke of the Bill of Rights. What Philadelphia has to complain of is a veritable "bill of wrongs." I am going to recite some of the items of our bill of wrongs. I do not know whether it is because we are the only one of the large cities in the Nation which does not have what I might call an affinity with the present administration or not. I do not know whether it is because Philadelphia is a Republican city, enduring as best it may the "slings and arrows of outrageous fate" which have borne down upon the country in general and upon Philadelphia in particular. But I do know we are feeling the pinch. I am going to tell you some of the things that have happened to Philadelphia.

In the first place, since early in December of 1943, Philadelphia is the only city I know of in the country of any substantial size which does not have an airport or air facilities. No air mail comes into Philadelphia, with the exception of one very small line operating an inadequate emergency temporary service. No passengers come into Philadelphia by air. No air parcel post and no air-cargo service comes into Philadelphia. No direct connection is made at Philadelphia for air service. We did have remote connection with the city of Allentown, but then it seems that the planes came into Allentown and scared the farmers' chickens, and they got an injunction in the local courts, and now we do not even have the plane-service connection with Allentown, so that we have to go to Newark or Washington or Harrisburg to make any plane connections.

The greatest disadvantage of this absence of air-mail, air-cargo, and air-passenger facilities has been to the war plants of Philadelphia. We have been put to very great disadvantage in the transfer of materials and personnel required in the war effort. We have been put to great disadvantage in bringing into Philadelphia precision parts on very

important contracts, and in bringing in binders on insurance policies essential in war-contract transactions, and we have a great insurance business, but particularly we have suffered as to the precision parts and essential materials needed in a hurry. We are unable to get these parts, which come from Detroit or some other city, and which we need, and which if we do not get promptly will hold up an entire assembly line or an entire factory.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman ever stop to think that perhaps it was because Philadelphia was such a typically American city, and that there the Government had some of its foundations and many things that reminded people of Americanism, and that this administration did not want anyone to become contaminated?

Mr. SCOTT. As to its being an American city, I agree heartily with the gentleman. As a matter of fact, we tried to get a little shelter for the Liberty Bell, but when the Republicans introduced it we could not get it. One day, about a year later, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came in to get a shelter for the Liberty Bell and had their pictures taken with a priority from the administration down here. With great fanfare it was announced that the Liberty Bell at last was going to have an air-raid shelter. We have not got it yet, but they got their pictures in the paper.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Carrying one step further the thought expressed by the gentleman from Michigan, is it not just possible that the administration is prejudiced against Philadelphia because it happens to be the home of the Attorney General?

Mr. SCOTT. That is an interesting thought. Perhaps I shall have something to say tomorrow on the rise and fall of Philadelphia lawyers, one of whom I have had the privilege of being for the past 22 years. I think that tomorrow I may like to talk about Mr. Biddle and what he has done to the good name of Philadelphia lawyers. But for the moment let me tell you that since the early part of December I have not been able to find out who is responsible for closing that airport. Neither have the other Members of the congressional delegation, as far as I know, and neither has the mayor of Philadelphia nor the director of public works, both of whom have worked very zealously, indeed, to try to get that airport restored.

When I go to the Civil Aeronautics Board—and I want to say that they have given us a great deal of courtesy and a great deal of very earnest cooperation—I, nevertheless, cannot find out who is holding it up. When I go to the Interdepartmental Air Traffic Control Board, I cannot find out who is holding it up. When I go to the War Department, I cannot find out who is holding it up, although I suspect some. When I go to the Navy Department, they say—and I think properly—that it is primarily a War Department matter.

It is my conviction and the conviction of most of the people with whom I have talked in Philadelphia and Washington that there is no reason whatever why airport service should not be restored at the municipal airport in Philadelphia and why that service should not be restored promptly, without pussyfooting excuses, alibis, and delays, and a general break-down of the administrative procedure, all of which have deprived the people of Philadelphia of these very much needed airport facilities.

We have had meetings. They are having a meeting on it today, and they had one yesterday. I do not know how many meetings they have had. They have held test flights. I know what the hazard is which has delayed the operation of this airport. I have seen it from the air and on the ground. But I must say that all the Government agencies concerned with this matter appear to have been more in the air than on the ground through all these proceedings. But, air or ground, I cannot see why, under proper regulations issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, we should not have an airport.

That is No. 1 on our "bill of wrongs."

Another is the loss of our shipping facilities. It is probably your impression that Philadelphia today is a great shipping center. I say to you that, aside from certain lend-lease Government shipping, certain shipping to our allies, and certain military shipping, we today have no shipping lines to any country in the world except Spain, Portugal, and Switzerland. Yes, Switzerland, which gets certain things from Philadelphia by way of Portugal. This is a city which once had air-line connections with all of the nations and all of the principal ports of the world. Today our shipping lines have been transferred to territory which, I might say, has an affinity with the administration, territory where the vote, perhaps, goes a little bit more favorably, territory where there is need to help and not to punish.

I may add that one of our great shipping lines, the West African Line, was taken down South and has been kept down there. It was removed there under the device or perhaps for the sound reason that the submarine menace at that time required the transfer of that shipping line. It has never come back, and I have been unable to get any assurance from anybody that it is coming back, except a vague, general promise that after the war they hope to restore all the shipping services.

That is only one story. We have lost other shipping to New Orleans. We have lost it to other ports around the country. We do not envy our sister cities' good luck. We hope they will be very busy after the war. But we do wonder why the discrimination against Philadelphia and why we have lost the shipping facilities in a city which ever since its founding by William Penn has been known as a seaport city, one of whose principal industries has been its shipping.

Then again, another item which I think I should like to add to our "bill of wrongs" has been the consistent discrimination in rail rate territory which has resulted through various rulings and regulations, so that today it is more profitable for shippers in territories adjacent to Philadelphia to ship through New York or Baltimore, thus operating to the disadvantage of Philadelphia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. We in Philadelphia suffer from this rail rate and territorial discrimination on the rail travel. In addition, we recently had to sustain at the hands of this House certain restrictions upon our municipal income. I hope that when the other body gets a chance at that particular measure it will undo the wrong which has been done and will see that Philadelphia retains the right to receive the municipal income to which it is entitled and which it needs in order to carry on the municipal government. I notice that no administration measure ever takes a whack at the municipal income of New York or Chicago.

In addition to which I am informed that we may lose the Naval Home of Philadelphia, located at Twenty-fourth and Fitzwater Streets, which has been there for more than 100 years. With the establishment of veterans' facilities in various other parts of the country, I should like to know why the city of Philadelphia should be deprived of this home, which has been there for more than 100 years, for aged seamen of other wars as well as prospectively for seamen of this war?

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. TIBBOTT. In fairness to the statement of the gentlemen, the recent naval appropriation bill, I am informed by the clerk of the committee, appropriated $328,900 for the United States Naval Home in Philadelphia. However, there was a reduced item of $39,900 for repairs and alterations and alteration projects for the present only. That can be found in the hearings at page 204.

Mr. SCOTT. I am very glad to have the gentleman's information. I would like to add that I requested him to get up-to-date information for me, and I appreciate very much that he did. It is my understanding that they plan to close the home at the end of the fiscal year included in the appropriation referred to.

In addition to these items in our bill of wrongs, I would like to mention a bill of my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GALLAGHER], whose district is in Philadelphia, for the improvement of the grounds and area around Independence Hall, in his district. It has been suggested to me that it is unfortunate for Independence Hall and for the city of Philadelphia that one of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle introduced this bill for the im-

provement and for the setting up of a mall and landscaping around Independence Hall. I am told it would have been better and that its prospects of success would have been increased had it been introduced by some of our brethren on the other side of the aisle. I hope that is not so. But I can only say the bill has not come out of the committee, and nothing has been done about the bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GALLAGHER]; and the proposal as to Independence Hall sleeps as soundly as I sometimes suspect the cause of liberty now sleeps along some sections of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The most recent outrage to which our city has been subjected, and this one I believe to be entirely political, has been the removal or the contemplated removal within the month of a plant for the installation of certain mobile units in Army trucks. We have 1,500 skilled workmen in Philadelphia who were working on the equipping of mobile units for Army trucks. That number has been reduced recently to 800. We are now advised that this industry is to be removed from Philadelphia on the ground that it is not needed. But we learn at the same time that they remove this industry from Philadelphia they plan to open an identical unit making the same equipment for Navy and Coast Guard in what I may call a politically doubtful border State, where, so far as we know, none of the skilled workmen are available who can do the same work on which Philadelphia workmen are being thrown out of employment. Why is this mobile unit to be shut up in Philadelphia, while a similar one is being opened up in this border State, in spite of the existence of projects for more than 4,000 of these mobile units which cannot be filled in Philadelphia if you close the Philadelphia plant?

Well, it is being closed up so that you can get the business out of Philadelphia and bring some more Government in. They plan to enlarge the post office in Philadelphia and take on about 3,500 or 4,000 additional employees, all of whom will be political and all of whom will be brought in here just before the elections in November and all of whom are expected to be duly grateful to their benefactors, the Post Office Department, which as you know and agree, is as truly political as any department in the Government today. The plan to install an overseas mail unit is supposedly to speed delivery of mail and parcels overseas. It is reported that the cost will be about $800,000.

It is ironical that they expect faster delivery by removing this unit farther away from points of embarkation to the only city which lacks air-mail facilities for bringing the mail and parcels in and getting them out. And this at a cost of $800,000, when they cannot manage to find even $200,000 to finish an airport for us, after spending $1,900,000, and leaving it partially finished.

Verily, the Government moves in a mysterious way its blunders to perform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not disposed to discuss the bill, though I do want to say for the benefit of the Members, that the bill under consideration is the result of a very arduous effort on the part of the membership, has considerable merit, and is the best that could be accomplished under pressing circumstances. I want to stress for the membership of the Committee of the Whole what I have repeated time and again in the Committee on Ways and Means, that you cannot simplify the tax form; in other words, the return blank without materially modifying the basic law. Our income-tax laws are the result of a cumulative demand of our people as reflected by the membership of this House over a long period of time. In response to these demands we have made a lot of indentations, niches, notches, cliches, ruts, and grooves and other indentations, so to speak, to exclude or to relieve or to exempt certain classes of taxpayers under certain circumstances. To simplify the return to the maximum possible extent you would have to alter very materially the existing cumulative tax law which has been built up over a period of many years. I think it is timely for me to say now, too, and I say it without rancor, although I was not for it at any time, that one of the things that added so much complication and so many additional returns and so many reports and estimates, was that provision which the majority in this House voted for. That is the recent "pay-as-you-go" forgiveness bill. And in due time, when forgiveness reaches full flower, and when the concessions under the law run their course our tax-return form will adjust itself automatically, simplifications will follow as the result of the natural adjustment to the new law. When the 2-year period during which time you pay 12½ percent per annum of the 25 percent of the tax which was not forgiven will have elapsed that will add further simplifications. So with that, plus the effort of the committee, at this time I think we have arrived at that point where the tax law has been simplified about as much as possible without now going into the actual laws which exist on the statute books and altering them from top to bottom. Even in the consideration of the limited bill of simplification which is now presented, we found it necessary in order to attain the objective to make slight concessions to the taxpayers in some brackets and to make corresponding upward adjustments in other brackets. This had to be done in order that there be no loss in the total revenue of the Treasury; we had no choice but to make corresponding slight adjustments in certain brackets. To date there has been no opposition to the bill. The committee is unanimous in its support and I look for an almost unanimous approval on the part of the House. I think all in all a fairly good job was done, and, if there is to be any further demand for simplification, then you will have to agree to a material alteration of existing law and if you want a real basic-tax simplification, you are going to have to abolish all exemptions and all concessions provided for in the existing statutes.

I do not think this House will ever go to that extent. So we are going to have to be satisfied with this. Extreme demands for simplification will force some scheme of taxation, such as is commonly known as the gross income tax, with no exemptions or concessions with a schedule of simple percentage taxes to bring in about the same amount of revenue. I am not advocating that because I believe we ought to make some exceptions and exemptions for certain classes of taxpayers, as, for instance, the man with the large family.

I am happy in the fact that we have at long last made provision to give increased and permanent exemptions for dependents, regardless of their age, that is, under certain circumstances. Many worthy taxpayers have been carrying a burden for years from which they now can expect some relief.

I do not believe the bill needs any defense at my hands and I am not going to impose on the membership of the committee any further in my discussion. I hope that the expression of the Committee of the Whole House will be such that we may get well nigh a unanimous vote for this simplification. There is nothing partisan in it. As I said before, it has the unanimous approval of both the majority and the minority. It is a composite bill. It is the joint effort, the cooperative effort of the entire committee, and I think it deserves the support of the House as it already has received the commendation and support of the press throughout the Nation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, if there is anyone in this convocation who is laboring under the notion that the enactment of the bill we now have under consideration will bring about perfection in simplification, he is simply sucking at an opium pipe, indulging a very beautiful dream.

As one who did not vote for the previous tax bills, the ones which brought about all this confusion and these complications, against which the people protest so earnestly, I occupy the comfortable position of one who is under no obligation to rush to the defense of the legislation under consideration. To me it is no lifesaver. Under the circumstances it would seem that I can in good grace speak quite frankly, perhaps, in a critical vein. At least I have no reason for whistling in the dark, so to speak.

I am going to vote for this bill because it does contain some very good features. Despite what I have said, the bill is not all bad. While it does point toward simplification, it does, however, fall far short of that which the people had hoped for. But all this notwithstanding, the bill will serve its intended purpose. As I contemplate the ridiculous position the Rumlites have got us into, I am reminded of these delayed-action bombs that we

read about, those bombs that are being dropped on the enemy, and in some instances, by the enemy upon us. This bill might be referred to as the delayed-disillusionment bill. It will delay the disillusionment of the people until after a certain very important date has rolled by—November 7, I think it is.

After the election and when the people get around to figuring out their income tax for 1945 they will find that much of the simplification which has been referred to in this debate with such enthusiasm was more or less synthetic. Then when they contemplate how valient was the Ways and Means Committee effort to simplify that which is essentially a very complicated tax muddle, and for the first time are made to realize how far short of the target their mighty shells have fallen, some unsympathetic soul is bound to rise up and say something about love's labor lost.

There are certain fundamental reasons why no bill, this bill or any other, just cannot make our badly muddled tax system simple. Things that are essentially complicated do not lend themselves to simplification. So despite all of the presumptions that are being indulged in, despite all of the fancy formulas that have been devised, in the end we are going to find old John Doe Taxpayer right back where he started from—making out complicated tax returns unless he is willing to subject himself to being overcharged, "robbed," as the old saying goes.

One of the difficulties, one of the obstacles to simplification, arises out of this so-called standard deduction which is made available to those persons who have an income not exceeding $5,000 a year. That standard deduction is the result of a review of all the tax returns back through the years, from which an average has been struck. They have found out that the average deduction, deductions made by people of this classification, is something less than 10 percent of their total income. So, if you are willing to accept an average deduction, use that instead of your actual deductions, then, of course, you can avoid the necessity of filing an income-tax return. But since it is an average, half of the people whom its affects are benefited and half of the people whom it affects are compelled to suffer a detriment. That is the way you arrive at averages. You take the higher figures and the lower figures and add them together and divide by the number of figures that you added, and that gives you the average.

That average of less than 10 percent can be broken down, and when broken down it reveals that in building up an average of 10 percent, there was included therein an average of 2½ percent which represents donations to church, charities, and educational institutions; 2½ percent, or something like that, which represents the deduction which is allowed for interest paid on debts; another 4 or 5 percent is the deduction which is allowed for taxes paid to other taxing bodies.

If a man is willing to accept those break-downs you can depend upon it as a certainty, he is on the undergroup that is benefited. He is on the underside of the average. He is the man who did not donate a nickel to a church or charity or educational institutions, but he will nevertheless want to grab the deduction of 2½ percent. He is the man who did not pay a nickel in the form of other taxes to any other taxing agencies but he will be on the gravy wagon, never fear. He takes all the deductions that are not nailed down—and, why should he not? The law allows them.

Just think of it. Under this proposal, this presumptive deduction, atheists who hate the church, who do not believe in God, who despise everything the church is doing, are going to be given credit for having donated to churches to the extent of 2½ percent of their total income.

On the other hand, the God-fearing man, the man who loves his church, who finds great satisfaction in supporting religion, who probably donates 10 or 15 percent of his total income will only be allowed to take the same deduction which the donation-withholding atheist will get. How about the tither, the man who gives to his church 10 percent of his total income? Are you going to give him credit for his tithe? Not at all; he is knocked down to the 2½ percent you force upon the atheist, the man who despises all that sort of thing. This is the ridiculous situation the bill would create: When a man does in fact pay out more than the 10 percent allowed under the standard deductions, when a man does in fact pay more than the percentage allowed in interest on debts, than that which is allowed for church or charity or educational institutions than is allowed he is going to have to disregard his so-called standard deduction and file a detailed report in order to get the benefit of the actual deductions to which he is in justice entitled.

Do you not see therefore how this is going to work out? It means that 15,000,000 people in the United States will get the benefit of 10 percent of deductions to which they are not entitled, and that the other 15,000,000 who are actually entitled to more, if they do not use this standard deduction, are going to be cut down to 10 percent although, the deductions to which they are entitled greatly exceed 10 percent. The result of it is that the something-for-nothing boys will take the 10 percent allowed for deductions but the rest are going to have to file returns the same as they used to.

So let us hear no more about 30,000,000 taxpayers being relieved of the necessity of filing income-tax returns. That may be a good statement to make until after the election is over next November, but when they get around to January 15, when they start figuring out their income-tax returns for 1945 the people are going to suddenly discover—15,000,000 of that 30,000,000—that they have been cheated by this fancy scheme and to avoid that loss they are going to have to come in just as they use to in the old days and file a detailed income-tax return.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Has there been any attempt to break down the average to ascertain what proportion of the 30,000,000 is above and what proportion is below the 10 percent as the general average?

Mr. GEARHART. It hits right square in the middle. It is an average calculation.

Mr. ROWE. Not necessarily.

Mr. GEARHART. It might not average the number of taxpayers exactly in two equal groups but the average deductions would hit square in the middle. Is that not true?

Mr. ROWE. I would agree with the gentleman's assumption as a premise for an argument, but I was wondering if an attempt had been made to ascertain what the actual proportions were.

Mr. GEARHART. I doubt if that can be ascertained accurately for the reason that we do not know how many people are actually donating to charities nor the rate; we do not know how many people are donating to educational institutions nor the rate; so we can only approximate that.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. The result would be less revenue for the Treasury and fewer gifts to charity.

Mr. GEARHART. There is no doubt about it, there certainly will be less revenue to the Treasury because half the taxpayers in round figures will be granted deductions in excess of that which they are morally or actually entitled to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I believe the Treasury figures show that the average of contributions is about 8 percent. We are giving them 10 percent in this bill; that is an addition of 2 percent for the average taxpayer.

Mr. GEARHART. I may be in error, but I think the gentleman from Minnesota is the one in error. This 10 percent is not made up of charitable deductions alone but includes also taxes paid to other agencies and interest paid on debts.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not specify; I said that deductions would average about 8 percent according to the figures which were submitted to the committee.

Mr. GEARHART. I was given to understand by our own expert, in whom I have a very profound confidence, that the 10 percent can be broken down and was broken down, and that it represents about 3½ percent for charitable donations, 3½ percent for something else, and 3 or 4 percent for a third element. It represents, using the opposite approach, a build-up to a little less than 10 percent, but we have allowed the full 10 percent in order to indulge in round figures.

The other thing to which I wish to advert before I leave this floor is the so-called declarations. I have made the statement many times heretofore and I think it is well worth repeating here.

that you cannot make a pay-as-you-go-before-you-know-what-you-owe system work simply. When Mr. Ruml convinced the country that we needed this pay-as-you-go system he compelled us to give up a system which was based upon pay as you go when you know what you owe.

In order to get ourselves in a current basis which everybody thought was so essential we had to go on this new basis of paying as we go before we know what we owe. Out of this arises all the complications with which we are struggling today and which will never be wiped out until we do one more thing, a thing about which I regret even the necessity of giving thought to, and that is, skipping another year so that we can go back to that time-honored system that has worked so well in the past of pay as you go when you know what you owe.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that it is with a degree of presumption that one not a member of the great Committee on Ways and Means should undertake to address this Committee. I am impelled to do so, however, for a number of reasons. First, however, I wish to pay my compliments to that committee for the type of bill it has reported out now and which is pending before us, as well as the types of bills that have been reported out since 1939. Any person in any way conscious of the difficulties of legislative drafting knows what an improvement it has been to have enacted into law the Internal Revenue Code around and within which all future revenue acts may be drafted. Further, when one contemplates that the average revenue bill is a finely balanced mechanism, one can more readily understand why such bills should come to this floor under "closed" rules. I dare say there may be some mental reservation however with respect to the necessity for a closed rule on a bill of this type, procedural as it principally is. However, since we are considering it under such a resolution and since no amendment is possible except those offered by the committee, I must take this time to submit to the Committee on Ways and Means and to this Committee of the Whole an amendment which I think should properly be included in any bill designed to simplify our income-tax structure. The amendment I would propose is one that would add the following language at the end of subparagraph (B) of paragraph 2 of subdivision (b) of section 22:

> Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, there shall be excluded from the gross income the first $1,020 in the aggregate for each year of all retirement pension annuity payments included but not limited to payment under the old age survivors insurance law received during the taxable year by a retired employee.

Mr. Chairman, I am therefore impelled to take this time to plead with you the cause of the superannuated employee retired after long and faithful service under a retirement system to which he and his employer, whether the employer be a private company, State, or municipality, contributes. Those are the forgotten people in this so-called simplified procedure.

In order that I may be a bit specific let me, if I may be permitted, confine my remarks to the situation in which the retired civil-service employee of the city of New York finds himself. As of March 1944, there were 35,203 such employees, of which upward of 34,000 received $2,500 a year or less. Up to the enactment of the Public Salary Act the annuity received by a retired employee was not subject to the income tax. Subsequent to the enactment of that Public Salary Act the Internal Revenue Bureau, with some doubt, in my mind at least, as to their power to do so, ruled that the annuities received by such employees were subject to taxation.

Where does that leave that group today and where will they be left after the enactment of this bill? They are not subject to the withholding tax provisions of the revenue act as it now stands or as it will stand, so they cannot file the W–2 form. They must file at least the Form 1040. How do they compute their tax? They must figure through which one of three periods of their retired life they are passing.

The first is that period during which their annuity represents a return of their personal contribution and during that period under the present law those payments received by them are exempt, except that in their gross income they must include an arbitrary figure computed at 3 percent of the gross amount of their contributions. The second phase of their retired life is that period from the time they have received their personal contribution to the end of what was their life expectancy when they retired. During that period the Internal Revenue Bureau, in my opinion, arbitrarily, imposes upon them a tax and the least amount of tax that is imposed is 22 percent. The third period of a retired employee's retired life is that period which he survives beyond his expected life expectancy and there are about 50 percent of those who retire who live beyond their expectancy as of the date of retirement. During that period they are receiving by way of annuity the sums that have been accumulated as a result of the prior death of the other 50 percent and during that period, too, they are presently subjected to taxation. Why should that be so?

It is admitted by everybody that pensions are an integral part of our social-insurance program. We have recognized in our laws that payments in the nature of social insurance should be and are expressly exempt from income taxation. We have specifically provided in our social-security law that the old-age payments received by annuitants up to the maximum of $85 a month or $1,020 a year are exempt from income taxation. The Railroad Retirement Act specifically provides that the pensions received by employees under the provisions of that act are exempt from taxation. We have provided further that the pay of retired Regular Army officers who have retired as a result of disability shall not be subject to income taxation. We have provided further that lump-sum payments to beneficiaries of insurance under the Social Security Act will be exempt from taxation. Payments made to soldiers' widows, workmen's compensation awards, and insurance benefits are also exempt under existing law.

We have done that, yet we are today forgetting that increasing number of people who after many years of long and faithful service to their employers must be subject to taxation.

In the city of New York, the average pension received by a retired employee for superannuation is $1,280 a year. In order for one under that system to be eligible for a pension of $1,250 a year, assuming his maximum salary to be $2,500 he must approach the age of 60 and he must have at least 30 years of service. If his annuity is subject to the income tax rates presently prevailing, it will be necessary for him, in order to net $1,250 a year, to receive a pension of $1,450. What is the effect of that? It will be necessary for that employee then 60 years of age to continue in service for a period just short of 6 years. Six years longer will he have to work than he expected and 6 years longer will a young person be denied employment.

I submit that that is a denial of the very bases upon which pensions are predicated. Further, with respect to the return to the retired employee of any sum in excess of his own personal contribution, I submit that that excess should not be treated any worse than an inheritance. We might very well consider that the receipt by the retired employee of a sum in excess of his own personal contribution is, in fact, a participation by him in an inheritance fund created by him and his fellow employees. What tax do we impose upon an inheritance? We exempt it up to $60,000 but that which is analogous to it, namely, a retirement annuity paid out of a fund accumulated by the employee and the employer, in the case of a retired employee who is single, is taxed after he receives the first $600. I say to you, and I submit to you very respectfully, that any bill which is intended to simplify our income tax returns, any bill that is intended to adjust the equities between or among the classes of taxpayers, falls short of its objective if it overlooks that growing band of decent, honest, industrious and hard-working Americans who because of having been able to look forward to a small pension after years of service can now look forward to a diminution of that pension by reason of our failure to recognize the equities of the situation.

The taxation of retired employees' annuities, in my opinion, cannot be justified on any ground at all; cannot be justified on the basis of the revenue which it yields; cannot be justified on the basis of the economic effects upon the community. It cannot be justified, I repeat, in any manner at all.

I certainly hope and I sincerely trust that this great committee of ours, in

which we all can and must and do have the highest degree of confidence, will give serious consideration to the situation in which these people find themselves. Let that committee submit tomorrow at the proper time the amendment that I suggest, and it will thus completely eliminate from our tax structure a class that was never intended to be included, for with the $1,020 exemption which I propose, the same as the Social Security Act provides, together with the personal exemption of those retired employees, they will not be within the tax group. I think that if we do that we will know that we have further contributed to the building up of our social-security system, and we will certainly not be acting prejudicially to those who long before there was any system of Federal social security had provided themselves for their old age by joining and becoming members of an established retirement system. I certainly hope that this committee will do that. I know that all retired employees join with me in the hope that justice in their case will be done.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] such time as he may desire.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, this so-called simplified tax bill, H. R. 4646, is confined to individual income-tax returns, rates, and definitions. I believe it is quite correct to say that the provisions of the 1943 revenue bill, so far as it relates to individual rates, has been scrapped, and in its place under H. R. 4646 a new system of rates are applied to the incomes of individuals, both normal and surtax rates. I mention this because too frequent reference on the floor or in the committee report as to the existing law and its rates may be confusing rather than clarifying to the average taxpayer.

Previous individual income-tax rates, and procedure under the provisions of the revenue laws enacted during the past 12 years should have no place in this proposed simplification plan. It is the retention and constant repetition of old moth-eaten provisions and criss-cross references that have confused and bewildered the taxpaying public. These confusing provisions and cross references may be necessary for the tax lawyers and tax experts who have a vested interest in tax terminology, but what each particular taxpayer desires is a few clearly stated questions on a tax-return form so that when the questions are answered the amount of his tax liability can be easily ascertained.

I believe that when the provisions of H. R. 4646 are translated into the tax forms, it will be found that a large proportion of the tax-paying population will be relieved of the confusion heretofore resulting from the many technical requirements, bewildering definitions, and labyrinthian questionnaires.

It is no small achievement to frame a simplification measure that under the first year of its operation will, as the report states, "relieve approximately 30,000,000 taxpayers of the necessity for computing their tax"—see page 3, paragraph (1) of the committee report. That in itself takes care of a very substantial segment of the income taxpaying public.

I do not regard this as a perfect simplification bill but for the time spent in trying to overcome the effect of piling one tax bill upon another, sometimes as many as two or three a year over more than a decade, it cannot be simplified to the extent that the public has a right to demand. I do not say this in criticism of the committee or of the experts from the joint committee, the Treasury, or the Bureau of Internal Revenue because all have, I believe, done their level best within the time available for this important work. What I wish to point out is that as the number of taxpayers constantly increase and the tax burden—as a result of the war and wild and reckless expenditures for nonessential purposes—piles up, it requires the efforts of all patriotic organizations, tax lawyers, tax experts, and the general public to assist in removing the perplexities of the taxpayers resulting from the technicalities that bewilder and confuse them.

One group of 30,000,000 taxpayers, with whom this bill deals, will be required to answer a few very simple questions on the reverse side of the withholding tax receipt furnished to them by their employers. These 30,000,000 individuals are those whose gross income is less than $5,000 and whose income from sources other than wages subject to withholding does not exceed $100. They may at their option have their tax determined by the collector, if their income is received from certain sources. To be entitled to this option, their entire income must be derived from dividends, interest, and compensation for personal services. It is contemplated that the form to be used for this purpose, in lieu of the regular tax return, will be the withholding tax receipt furnished by their employer. The collector of internal revenue will figure the tax and then he will bill the taxpayer for the sum due. The taxpayer will have 30 days within which to pay his tax. If a refund is due for excess withholding, the taxpayer will receive a refund.

Then we have the taxpayers who determine their own tax, who are clearly classified in the report, as follows:

TAXPAYERS WHO DETERMINE THEIR OWN TAX

All other taxpayers, including those with gross incomes of more than $100 from sources not subject to withholding and those whose gross income is $5,000 or more, are required to determine their own tax.

These taxpayers are of three general types:

(a) Taxpayers whose adjusted gross income (generally, gross income less business deductions) is under $5,000 and whose other deductions do not exceed 10 percent of such adjusted gross income.

Such a taxpayer if he uses the short-cut method of ascertaining his tax, by reading the tax from the simple one-page tax table on the basis of his adjusted gross income, will be automatically allowed a standard deduction of approximately 10 percent of his adjusted gross income. The standard deduction is in lieu of the nonbusiness deductions and certain credits against net income and against tax. The tax table and some examples illustrating its use will be found in table A in the appendix.

(b) Taxpayers with adjusted gross income of $5,000 or more whose nonbusiness deductions do not exceed $500.

In the case of such a taxpayer, the standard deduction is $500. Thus he is not required to itemize and substantiate his nonbusiness deductions. As in the case of a taxpayer whose adjusted gross income is less than $5,000, the standard deduction is in lieu of nonbusiness deductions and certain credits against net income and against tax.

(c) Taxpayers with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000 whose nonbusiness deductions are in excess of 10 percent of their adjusted gross income, and taxpayers with adjusted gross income of $5,000 and over, whose actual nonbusiness deductions are in excess of $500.

These taxpayers in order to secure the full benefit of their nonbusiness deductions and of their various credits against net income and tax, are required to list them as at present and compute the tax; but the computation of the tax will be considerably simpler than under present law.

It is estimated that not more than one-fifth of all taxpayers will fall within groups "b" or "c" and thus find it necessary or desirable to compute their tax.

I shall not take the time of the House to discuss those provisions of simplification which have been so clearly and ably presented by those who have already spoken on the bill. It is my intention when the bill is finally enacted into law to analyze it by the question-and-answer method, as I have tried to do with previous bills.

There is one approach that has been made toward simplification that may be of interest to the Members. I mention it to show that not only the experts did their best to simplify, but the man in the street was called in to pass on proposed forms. This psychological approach to the tax simplification problem has been very helpful. I may say the test was preponderantly in favor of the plan now before the House.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of this public test of the 1943 law was to find that the "definitions" were the cause of much of the taxpayers' confusion. Among the definitions of which the average taxpayer, according to the survey, complained was the "definition of dependent, especially in its exclusion of the nonworking wife." "Head of family" definition was not clear to the average taxpayer. Then, too, the survey of the man on the street showed that the "footnotes" had a tendency to be ignored, leading to error. It was also discovered by this novel approach to the simplification problem that those called upon to fill out a tax return for the first time, of whom there were millions, had, in many instances, an ingrained fear of filling out a printed form of any kind.

I believe the bill before us, H. R. 4646, has clarified definitions, eliminated others, and, furthermore, that it has gone a long way toward relieving the individual income taxpayers from the confusion mentioned.

The provisions of the bill are effective for 1944 and subsequent years, with the following exceptions:

(a) The withholding provisions of the new bill do not become effective until January 1, 1945.

(b) New withholding certificates are not required until December 1, 1944, in order to put the new withholding certificates into effect.

(c) The provisions of the bill give the employer an opportunity to give effect to changes in status of employees occurring after July 1, 1944, with respect to wages paid during the calendar year 1944. Under the existing law, such changes in status could only be given effect as of the beginning of the next year.

(d) Under existing law, if an individual's income from sources not subject to withholding is less than $100, a declaration of estimated tax is not required unless his income is $2,700 in the case of a single man, and $3,500 in the case of a married man. These requirements as to declarations are continued during 1944. For 1945 and subsequent years, such a person is not required to make declarations of estimated tax unless his income exceeds $5,000 if single, $5,500 if married, plus $500 for each dependent.

I cannot let go unchallenged some statements that have been made here by men for whom I have the highest regard. There was a great and we might say bitter fight here over the so-called modification of the Ruml plan. One thing the public knows, no matter what is said on the floor of the House, and that is that had the plan been carried out as prepared by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] it would have cleared the atmosphere. This unforgiven portion that the opponents of the Carlson plan hung on to like grim death has added to the taxes and the confusion of the people.

The other proposition was the Victory tax. When you compromise with a principle it always raises difficulties. This Victory tax was just simply a side-stepping of a sales tax; it was not put in the tax law by the House. The result has been a series of bewildering complications in the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The part of the Ruml plan that was adopted by the House acted as a 12½-percent increase for the years 1944 and 1945.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes. The gentleman knows that we fought for hours and hours in conference and did our best to try to clear the atmosphere and get rid of it all and have a clean slate. If we could have done that, there would have been none of this confusion.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman also knows that if we had adopted the full plan 100 percent, the Treasury would not have lost a nickel.

Mr. REED of New York. Everybody knows that, we would not have lost a cent as time went on.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman suggested that a public test was made, I assume, to try out some of the proposals in this measure.

Mr. REED of New York. There were several proposals to which the tests were applied.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the only chance the public had to be heard on this bill?

Mr. REED of New York. They had a very thorough chance. The committee wanted to get this work done as quickly as they could. It was a job for experts, based upon the returns and the criticisms that had came from the public to the Treasury and to the Internal Revenue Bureau. If you had permitted 5,000 witnesses to come here, they would not have presented a single thing to this committee, in my judgment, that those three departments did not already have in their files. The tests made confirmed the truth of this observation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has stated that this measure will simplify and take care of a lot of problems that we got into by adopting previous measures. It must be admitted, however, that it is going to create a greater burden on the employers in the way of keeping accounts for the employees, as my colleague the gentleman from Kansas has suggested.

Mr. REED of New York. In view of the time we had to work, I think that is the price that had to be paid for simplification. I do not see any other answer to it myself. Some price has to be paid to have this simplified so that the average man can have a break.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But we are shifting a good deal more work onto the employer by the passage of this bill.

Mr. REED of New York. I think that is true. Of course, that will probably bear a little more on the smaller employer than on the big one, who has a large bookkeeping set-up and all the mechanical devices necessary to take care of payroll deductions which the laws require.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. On the point raised by the gentleman from Kansas, if there is an increased burden on the employer, and there is under the graduated plan of withholding, it results from the increased number of employees from whose wages the employer must withhold the tax.

Mr. REED of New York. I believe all of us are apt to forget this. I think the Members of the House must appreciate by this time the terrific burden that has been carried by the 25 members of the Committee on Ways and Means. Perhaps these remarks would come with a little more grace from somebody else, but I am well aware of what the members of the committee have had to face. I have not had a chance to get home, not even for 1 day, for almost a year. It just could not be done without neglecting my work. The members have to stay on the job long, grueling hours. The most remarkable thing is the way our good chairman stands up under the strain. It is a hard task. You have to take very good physical care of yourself to stand the strain of working out these tax bills. We have been in almost constant session on revenue bills and these are not the only pieces of legislation we have had to handle. In a period of practically 10 years, this is the eighteenth revenue measure, so-called, revenue or simplification or whatever you want to call it, that we have handled. All of these measures require an infinite amount of study and exploration in order not to do injustice to this group or that group. It is hard to realize the full extent of that responsibility unless you were to be on the committee and hear these tax experts who come before the committee to tell their technical story. It has been a hard, terrific job. I think we have done a fairly good job. I think it is going to help many millions of taxpayers.

Think of it. We had only 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 individual income taxpayers a few years ago, and today there are over 50,000,000. Just think of the mechanical work of handling any such load as that, all these 50,000,000 returns. Here we are putting the load of figuring the taxes of 30,000,000 people on the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I think the Government with the aid of the Ways and Means Committee is really trying at this time to do a satisfactory job.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to state that I think the Congress and the country is indebted to the gentleman from New York for the very fine work that he has done on past tax bills in working out the question-and-answer booklet or pamphlet of information, which has been most helpful to everyone.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks. I have really enjoyed doing it, because I have always received great cooperation and help from all of the members of the Ways and Means Committee and from members of all committees of the House. It helps me, because I get to understand the law much better by going through it by question and answer.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, would like to add words of appreciation for the very fine and wonderful work and honest presentation of the facts by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. It has been very helpful. He has been an indefatigable worker and has rendered great assistance.

Mr. REED of New York. I appreciate the gentlewoman's remarks very much.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Ways and Means brings to you a bill, H. R. 4646, in answer to the widespread demand and need for simplification of the individual income-tax returns. The committee and experts have labored long hours per day from

February 9 last to prepare this version of simplification.

It was decided that the method contained in this bill is the only practical one for accomplishing the purpose under certain objectives of the committee.

The bill relieves the great majority of taxpayers from the necessity of computing income tax, simplifies the returns of the remaining taxpayers, reduces the number of persons required to file declarations of estimated tax, and eliminates some uncertainties and difficulties in making required estimates of tax.

The taxpaying problems of farmers are reduced by moving the date for filing the estimate backward from December 15 to January 15. As a result a farmer as defined by the bill is permitted to receive all his income for a calendar year before he is called upon to think of his tax for that year.

The same change will be of great benefit to small businessmen since they can, under the bill, correct the original estimate after the business year has closed and an opportunity has been afforded to learn what has actually happened to the business of the taxpayer.

I am proud of the work done by the committee. The taxpayers, when they see the new forms that will result from this bill, will be highly thankful to the Congress for its action.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, the so-called tax-simplification bill that is now being considered is the result of the conscientious efforts of many who have given serious study to the problem of simplification.

The purpose has been to make changes in the law that would be practicable and would be reflected in the simplification of tax returns and, at the same time, not reduce the aggregate income to the Federal Government.

The need by the Federal Government for funds has increased tremendously as the years have gone by and has now reached the stage where it is very necessary that we must maintain a high credit. Therefore, income must not be permitted to lag too far behind expenditures. To do this you can see that taxes must continue high, and to many, I fear, they are now just short of confiscation. With high expenditures to continue and no diminution in sight, we can expect heavy taxes for a long time; and so that this tax load can be borne it is very evident that our recourse lies entirely with our ability to maintain our national income at a high level.

Today, with taxes for the Federal, State, county, and cities, plus the contributions for charity and public organizations, the aggregate has passed one-third of the national income, or, in other words, a little over 33⅓ cents out of every dollar received is going for taxes. With this great need for increased income it has been found necessary that the personal exemptions be lowered so more taxpayers could participate in the contribution to their Government. This has been done, and brought in millions of new taxpayers, and to these many taxpayers the making out of a tax return is something new and most difficult.

As persons' incomes are derived from many sources, it has been necessary that the laws be so written that they will apply to all cases. This multiplicity of provisions in the laws, of course, has added much confusion to the taxpayers' efforts to obtain a clear understanding of the law, and is very perplexing to him when the time for making out the return arrives. It is to this subject that the committee addressed itself seriously, and I do believe has made many substantial and fundamental improvements in the tax structure that will be very helpful to the taxpayer when making out his return.

If this proposed legislation, as now considered, is approved, I am sure that it will remove vexatious moments from a great number of taxpayers' minds when computing their returns.

Personal exemptions instead of having three different base figures which require three separate calculations in arriving at taxes due, has been set at one figure of $500 for the husband, $500 for the wife, and $500 for each dependent. This has simplified the calculation very materially. Where the husband and wife lose a little in the exemption, the dependent increases some—in addition, thereto, the dependent has been redefined, the age is not a barrier—if a child is a dependent, no matter what the age, the exemption will be $500. This has been sought after by many who have children going to school over the age of 18.

The Victory tax and the earned-income credit have both been abolished. The amount of the income from the Victory tax has been continued by an adjustment in the normal tax. Including these changes, the tax burden has had very little change. However, there are some brackets that will show a small increase, and others a slight decrease, while still others will remain about the same.

Again, a very worth-while change has been made in that an estimated 30,000,000 taxpayers will not have to file any return at all. These taxpayers who come in the classification of having their employer withhold their taxes will receive a certificate at the end of the year from the employer indicating the deductions for the year, which certificate the employee will sign and send to the collector of internal revenue where it will be adjusted up or down if need be, and the collector will so advise the taxpayer.

Another improvement that will facilitate many taxpayers is the scale by which taxpayers whose incomes were from certain sources and did not exceed $3,000, could file a short-form return and refer to a schedule of rates applying to the bracket for the specific income, and at a glance determine the amount of tax. This phase of the law has been changed to include those with incomes up to and not exceeding $5,000.

There are other changes such as treating a farmer a bit more liberally in his definition and declarations, and some other provisions in the bill that have made slight corrections that are going to be most beneficial. There is no reason why this work of simplification should not receive continued attention so that changes can be made whenever it is found that they would be of benefit.

It may also be well that some studies would be given to the corporation tax structure, as well as the estate and gift tax structures. It would seem to me that in the past number of years, the tax demands and changes in these three branches of income have been such that changes could be found that would materially make for simplicity and economy both to the taxpayer and the Federal Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, it has been said here that the country was demanding tax simplification. That is true. The demand was just and the people are entitled to relief. However, the fact that there is a demand for simplification does not mean that the people are demanding that justice be sacrificed for the sake of simplification in our tax structure. It is true, the people are demanding that they file fewer income-tax returns and reports and that these reports be understandable. It is not true that any great numbers of people have demanded that they file no income tax returns at all.

Serious trouble arises when we attempt that. It is attempted in this bill. It may be in the interest of simplification to treat people in herds rather than as individuals, but it is neither just, fair, nor honest and it violates all the sacred principles involving the rights of an individual. The country will rejoice over the fact that fewer tax returns are to be made. By and large, they will welcome and approve the improvements that the committee has made with respect to individual and family allowances. This has been simplified by making the allowance for a family of four, four times what it is for one, or twice what it is for a family of two, or one-half what it is for a family of eight.

The people will approve of the repeal of the Victory tax. The people will approve of the combining in the returns of the surtax and normal tax, so that the computing of the tax will be easier. There are other features, all of which have been ably discussed on this floor.

Many members of the Committee on Ways and Means have been very sympathetic to the problem of religious, educational, and charitable institutions which are dependent upon contributions. These same committee members have been anxious to help the individual taxpayer who is a contributor to these institutions. I would especially mention the gentleman from California, the Honorable BERTRAND GEARHART. He has been a ready and willing exponent for the cause of tax-exempt contributions. He is the coauthor of a bill which the gentleman and I introduced dealing with this subject. He has made valuable suggestions, and in spite of the heavy load of other official duties and other details of the tax

program, he has rendered a valuable service in this cause.

I am not satisfied with, nor do I approve of the way that the pending bill handles the deductions for contributions to educational, religious, and charitable institutions. Throughout the history of the income-tax law in the United States an individual's income, if he gives it away for the public good is exempt from taxation—that is, up to 15 percent of his income. It has been the basic policy in America that our tax program is one that considers a gift to the U. S. O., the Red Cross, a children's home, a hospital, a home for the aged, a college, a mission, a church, or any other institution rendering service and mercy, an expenditure for the public good, and, therefore, exempt from taxation.

The matter of deductions for charitable contributions became a problem with the adoption of the withholding tax. Under the withholding tax the money is withheld for the tax gatherer before the wage earner ever receives it. For the years 1943 and 1944 no widespread harm will come to contributors in seeking their reductions, because for the most part the withholdings for those 2 years will not cover the total tax due. The pending measure accentuates the problem. We have before us a proposal which provides that for possibly 30,000,000 people their entire tax bill will be handled through the withholding. They will file no return at all.

Let us consider how the subject of contributions is treated in the pending bill with respect to that group. The bill provides that every wage earner whose income is less than $5,000 shall have a blanket deduction of 10 percent as a matter of right. This includes interest and taxes and contributions. Those earning over $5,000 are entitled to a flat deduction of $500. This means, in effect, that the individual who gives nothing, receives a deduction for it. The same individual may not pay any interest or State taxes either. This bill, when carried into effect, means that the individual who gives a portion of his hard-earned money in contributions will have the same amount of taxes withheld from his wages as if he had given nothing. May I cite a few illustrations?

Mr. A and Mr. B have the same number of dependents. They both are wage earners, drawing $3,000 a year. Mr. A gives $300 to religion and charity. Mr. B gives nothing. Under this bill, the same amount of taxes are withheld from their wages. Had Mr. A, instead of working hard and giving his money away for the public good, been guilty of absenteeism and had stayed away from his job, so that his earnings were only $2,700 instead of $3,000, the amount of taxes taken out of his wages would have been lessened.

We will take another example. Two individuals are employed in the same defense plant. They make $4,800 a year each. One is a drifter. He pays no local or State taxes, pays no interest, and contributes nothing. Under this bill, he gets a 10-percent blanket deduction. The other individual belongs to a church that pays a tithe. He contributes $480 a year to religious institutions. Suppose that he is buying a home and he is paying interest of $200 a year and that his taxes are $200 a year. He has total deductions of $880. Yet the same amount of taxes are taken out of his pay check as the individual who earns the $4,800 and has no deductions. Is there anyone in America who approves such an injustice in the name of simplification? Now, it is true that these wage earners whose deductions run more than 10 percent may at the end of the year file a return and ask for a refund. That is unfair. It puts them in a position that they must pay taxes on exempt income, then file a claim for a refund and wait.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Washington News from March of this year. It is entitled "Lucky 16,000,000 to Get Rebates on Income Tax." It quotes Commissioner Joseph D. Nunan, of the Internal Revenue Bureau, as saying, "We expect that 16,000,000 taxpayers will be entitled to rebates and we hope to make every refund by November." There has been talk here on the floor about a prompt refund. We have only had the withholding tax in effect for less than a year and already there are 16,000,000 people expecting a refund.

With the passage of this bill and the increased withholding therein set forth, the job of making refunds will indeed be a happy sight to those bureaucrats in Washington who love to see bureaus grow and grow. In the meantime, those poor, unfortunate individuals known as taxpayers, wait and wait and wait.

The pending bill has aroused the concern of millions of people and countless organizations throughout America. The United Stewardship Council, representing 21 denominations and 24,000,000 Protestant Church members, countless individual churches and clergymen, the Council on Taxes and Philanthropy, a number of Catholic churches and organizations, the American Association of Colleges, and innumerable people have protested this bill. I could quote at length from letters from educators, clergymen, and other churchmen, but that is not necessary. I want to read to you what one of Nebraska's outstanding lawyers has to say about this. It is the Honorable Paul F. Good, former attorney general of Nebraska. Speaking of the provisions of this bill, he said:

> This is a radical departure from previous practice, which allowed such deductions only when the contributions were actually made. In effect, this completely abolishes deductions for church and charitable contributions, since it is a valid abatement to everyone regardless of whether or not the contributions have actually been made.

Permit me to quote from a very recent article by George E. Sokolsky, that well-known writer and exponent of rugged individualism and genuine Americanism:

> There is no sounder income-tax loss than charity. For it is a total gain. The great colleges of this country have suffered financial depredations during this war and are in danger of becoming State institutions, which would be a national calamity of the first order.

The case of the institutions dependent upon contributions and the case of the individual who contributes to those institutions have been presented to the Treasury Department on several different occasions. Conferences have been had with many of the so-called technical experts connected with the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Nationally known citizens, such as Bishop Edwin H. Hughes, of the Methodist Church, Dr. Guy E. Snavely, of the Association of American Colleges, and Dr. Charles Vickrey, of the Golden Rule Foundation, have carried this case directly to Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury. They also conferred with Randolph Paul and other officials serving under Mr. Morgenthau. The answer of this administration to the request of these people has been "No." This administration, which has piled taxes upon taxes upon the shoulders of the American people, has chosen for all practical purposes to disregard the principle that that portion of a man's wages that he gives away up to 15 percent should not be touched by the tax gatherer. Can it be possible that the master minds behind the scenes who determine the policy for the Treasury Department and all other branches of government want to cripple all of these worth-while institutions so that they must come to the Federal Government for a subsidy?

This administration must take the responsibility for this very unjust blow to millions of taxpayers. The administration spokesmen have jumped from one argument to another in opposition to any move to give consideration whereby the wage earner who made heavy contributions would have less taxes taken from his pay envelope. They have shouted "administrative difficulties" without being specific. Do the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department exist to serve the taxpayers or do the taxpayers exist to serve these bureaus? They have produced all sorts of phony arguments, among them that the employers of the country were opposed to such a thing. Yet many employers were urging that relief be granted along this line.

In a letter dated January 22, 1944, the general counsel of the Treasury Department says that to permit a smaller withholding to be made because an individual gives to charity is a matter that cannot be handled where pay rolls are made out by mechanical means. This argument was taken up with the manufacturers of calculating machines and check-writing machines. These concerns say that that contention is not true; that they do make deductions for bond drives, union dues, social security, the withholding tax and other items; and that these machines could handle a tax plan where credits were given for contributions made.

The fact of the matter is that this administration has deliberately chosen to treat all wage earners alike, so far as their contributions are concerned. This administration, whose philosophy is a Government subsidy for everyone in this country and around the world, is placing

many splendid institutions in a condition where they might be receptive of a Government subsidy. This New Deal administration which is nourished and fostered in the philosophy of big government and little individuals is marching along with a tax bill that treats American wage earners in herds and not as individuals.

Every time the representatives of educational, religious, and charitable institutions have presented their case to the Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee, the Treasury Department, speaking for the administration, has appeared on the scene and blocked all efforts to grant any relief. It is un-American. It is totalitarian. It is discriminatory. For several generations, the American people will be slaves of the Government to pay the taxes made necessary by reason of the debts of the Roosevelt administration. Throughout many, many years to come, humble wage earners will have to work one-fourth of each day for the Government before they get to earn anything for themselves and their loved ones. Wage earners in the higher bracket will have to work until noon for the Government tax gatherers before they can start to earn for themselves and their families. Individuals in the high-income bracket will have to labor until the day is almost done for the tax gatherer and then a short while for themselves. This autocratic, ruthless, top-heavy, bureaucratic institution, known as the New Deal, is not satisfied then. They want to withhold a tax on exempt income that is given to the churches, the colleges, the hospitals, the orphanages, the Red Cross organizations, and every other institution that makes life better.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I am a little perplexed. I take it that the gentleman does not object to the provision in the bill wherein the tithe or 10 percent is granted to the one making contribution to religious or charitable institutions, nor does he object to that part of the bill where he is permitted to file an additional return, claiming more if he gives it?

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is in error as to what is in the bill. I object to any blanket or average deduction. I object to treating people in herds rather than as individuals. The only just way to do this is to give a man the deductions to which he is entitled, no more and no less.

Mr. ROWE. I am sure if the gentleman is aware of the fact that I am trying to seek information he will not preclude any equation I may present.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. ROWE. If an individual can file a return claiming anything in addition to the 10 percent which is prescribed within the bill, it then resolves itself to an individual privilege, does it not?

Mr. CURTIS. No, not if he is a wage earner, because there is nothing he can do to keep the tax gatherer from taking the same amount of money out of his pay check month after month, regardless of how much he contributes, regardless of how much local taxes he pays, regardless of how much interest he has to pay. He has no control over the amount of money that the tax gatherer takes away before he gets it.

Mr. ROWE. The principal objection of the gentleman is that a person who does not make a contribution is afforded something in excess of relief over the man who does make a contribution?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. A blanket deduction does no one any good. It is just like you had a club of a hundred members and they are going to assess dues to pay the expenses, and they start out by giving everybody credit for a dollar. It would be of no value.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, on Friday and Saturday of this week, May 5 and 6, I shall be compelled to be absent attending the meeting of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, at New London, Conn. I wish to announce that if I were present I should vote for the tax-simplification bill and also for House Resolution 521, creating a select committee to make an investigation relating to the seizure by the United States on April 26, 1944, of property of Montgomery Ward & Co. I shall be unavoidably absent for the reasons stated.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I, too, join with other Members on both sides of the aisle in commending the membership of the Ways and Means Committee for the efforts they have made in the preparation and submitting of the legislation we are considering today. I am sure this is evidenced by the fact that there has been little opposition manifested with respect to the intent of this legislation. There is no doubt that the taxpayers of this country are not only desirous of having a more simple method for computing their taxes—they are entitled to it. I hope this legislation will provide the relief the sponsors of the bill believe it will do.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the House that the entanglements and confusion that came about on this tax situation were the result of legislation that was passed by this Congress. I am not blaming anyone for it, but that legislation was approved by the Ways and Means Committee and we followed the suggestion of that committee and supported it. We are now trying to untangle some of that confusion.

Mr. Chairman, I still think that the democratic way of handling such important legislation is to at least permit open hearings. Let it be known that public hearings will be held and give a reasonable time during which individuals and groups may have a chance to appear and express their views. It would be a healthy thing for the country, as well as for the committee and for the Congress. That is the reason I insisted on yesterday that we should not follow a process of holding executive sessions on a bill and then bring the legislation to the floor of the House under a gag rule whereby we are required to either vote up or down. Since nearly all tax bills come to the floor of the House under a gag rule, the least that could be done is to give the public a chance to be heard.

If the majority of the membership believe certain amendments are good, they will stand. If not, they will vote them down. As I remember the statement of the distinguished chairman of our committee on the floor yesterday, and I do not quote his words exactly, but as I remembered he said, "There was really no justification for having open hearings on the bill." I think that is the statement, or at least the meaning of it.

Mr. Chairman, again let me say that I hope this bill will prove to be as equitable and fair as it is believed to be by this committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In just a moment I shall be pleased to. So as a matter of fairness it seems to me the thing to have done was to hold open hearings and let Members like the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and others holding similar views have the right to be heard on this legislation.

Now I shall be pleased to yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee who has given this bill careful study and who supports this legislation without any amendments. I have the greatest respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman. I think what the chairman said on yesterday was that there had been no demand for hearings.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe that is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is a big difference between demand and justification.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understood him to say there was such a demand for simplification of the tax laws that there was no justification for open hearings.

That is the way I understood it. In any event all sessions of the committee were executive sessions. I cannot see the justification for such procedure on this kind of legislation.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the reporter got that wrong; I sat here and heard him.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I believe it ought to be explained that it does not change the situation for the farmer very much for this year except he will file the final declaration for the year on January 15 following the end of the year instead of December 15.

Mr. Chairman, the great majority of people are willing and want to pay their fair share of taxes. It is one of the least

things we can do in times like these. But there are a lot of people who are deeply concerned with respect to the manner in which a lot of this tax money is being used and spent. So long as it goes for the war effort, no one criticizes, but when a lot of it goes for a lot of unnecessary expenditures, there is just cause for complaint.

Mr. Chairman, I want to include a copy of a telegram I received today from the chairman of the Council on Taxes and Philanthropy that expresses the views of that organization with regard to this legislation:

MAY 4, 1944.

Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

New York papers this morning give excellent reports of your protest against undemocratic gag rule in formulation, drafting, presentation, and consideration of H. R. 4646. Our council on taxes and philanthropy commends highly the statesmanship and basic principles of both the withholding tax and a well considered constructive simplification but extreme streamlined simplification railroaded from the offices of the tax collectors in the Treasury through the executive sessions of the Ways and Means Committee and sent to the House of Representatives under gag rule can do inestimable harm possibly to our national revenue but almost certainly to our privately supported philanthropic institutions and to our boasted democratic principles of government.

Congressman DOUGHTON is quoted in this morning's New York Herald Tribune as saying, "There was such a demand for simplification of the tax law that there was no justification for open hearings."

There was a very definite repeated request for hearings, which request was denied. Gag rule was applied to amendments. Why such haste and steamroller methods when bill cannot become effective until after January 1, 1945? A bill with average deduction tables prepared largely for convenience of tax collectors considered only in executive sessions of the committee and presented to the House under gag rule, prohibiting amendments, will not be accepted complacently by 50,000,000 taxpayers and voters.

Moreover, many churches, colleges, hospitals, orphanages, homes for aged, and other privately supported institutions will not be able to continue their full measure of basic service to the people with financial losses inevitably resulting from the present operation of the withholding tax combined with flagrant inconsistencies and injustices hidden from the observance of the public in the illogical if not inadequate averaged deductions in the withholding tables. The easy, stock answer, that any individual may fill out the longer form does not satisfy. This bill is designed to encourage the largest possible number estimated at 30,000,000 to use the short form. Any experienced man knows that only a negligible percent of this vast 30,000,000 are in routine operation and have the initiative and courage voluntarily to secure and fill out the longer form.

The Committee on Ways and Means and House of Representatives may find it far wiser, cheaper, and more statesmanlike and constructive to postpone immediate action and listen to the public before voting rather than face general dissatisfactior and the necessity of costly revision after heavy losses have been encouraged.

We again respectfully request and urge that action on H. R. 4646 to become effective January 1, 1945, be deferred until the committee can listen to representatives of taxpayers who are also contributors to our indispensable, privately supported, religious, educational, and welfare institutions.

COUNCIL ON TAXES AND PHILANTHROPY,
GUY E. SNAVLY, *Chairman.*

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this simplified form of tax return and shall give this bill my support. This is the third tax bill to be offered us by the Ways and Means Committee during the Seventy-eighth Congress. I voted against the first two tax bills offered and passed in this Congress not because they were heavy tax measures, for if they had been differently drawn I might have voted for them even though they collected more taxes from our people. In fact, this committee offered the House a bill early in 1943 which I think we should have accepted, as it contained needed withholding features and provided a logical and fair plan for getting taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Let me say that I have voted for—if my memory serves me right—every tax bill offered by the Ways and Means Committee and enacted into law by the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses. I sincerely felt that the tax bill on which we spent so much time last year up until its passage in July was unwise in the form in which it was passed, and I sincerely felt that the tax bill passed in this session of the Seventy-eighth Congress this year was inadequate in the form in which is was passed. Therefore I voted against both, but I think this measure before us now will help greatly to remove some of the bad features of the bill passed in the summer of 1943.

It was to clear the record and place blame where it rightfully belongs that I asked certain questions of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] earlier today. I feel that the complicated tax form which so disturbed taxpayers last March was a necessary outgrowth and accompaniment of the tax bill which was passed in 1943, and for that reason this simplification measure is a correction of that mistake. I have had many of my friends say to me, "I do not object to the amount of taxes I am called on to pay, but I do object to the complexity of that form required to be filled out." Now, I assume that my friends are sincere, that they do recognize the need of heavy tax burdens now in the midst of this most terrible and expensive of all wars. I think it most unfortunate that we were driven to such a pass in the summer of 1943 that we enacted a law which caused this distress. I want to relieve that mental distress by this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the composite judgment of both Democrats and Republicans and represents a conscientious and nonpartisan effort on their part to afford relief to the millions of taxpayers of this country who have been perplexed, bewildered, and well-nigh beside themselves in their effort to fill out their income-tax forms gotten up by the so-called experts in the Treasury Department of the Federal Government here in Washington.

Not long ago I was addressing a mass meeting of citizens in my district and a man arose. I thought it was his intention to heckle me, but he was really in quest of information. He asked: "Can you tell me why it is that a man of ordinary intelligence cannot make out his income-tax return without almost losing his mind?"

"Well," I said, "I think it is due to the fact that there are so-called tax experts in the Treasury Department who if you gave them a setting of eggs to be hatched would scramble the eggs before they put them under the hen."

It does not help us to weep over the fact that we are in the fix in which we find ourselves. It reminds me of a story. A group of men were talking, among them a colored man. The colored man finally used the expression "the status quo." One of the other fellows said: "Sam, I knew you were a man of intelligence, fairly well read, but it never occurred to me that you understood Latin. Just what do you mean by the status quo?" He answered: "That means the fix we's in."

Now, we are in a fix. When this war began we owed $61,000,000,000. We shall shortly be compelled to raise the debt limit to $260,000,000,000. The Federal Government will take from the taxpayers this year $42,000,000,000, but we cannot carry on the Federal Government, we cannot meet the demands and requests of the people in the communities of the country or fight this war without the payment of taxes. Nobody likes the idea of paying a tax. We do not get clothes, food, or shelter out of taxes, but we get the protection and the facilities of Government. Only the savage pays no taxes. The more highly civilized a people are, the more complicated and diverse the activities of Government, the more demands people make upon their Government, the greater is the necessity for the payment of taxes.

And I wish to pause here to pay my tribute to the distinguished chairman of this great committee. To my mind he is one of the finest embodiments of unfettered, devoted, patriotic Americanism I have ever met in my life; he is full of years and full of honors. He is rich in the esteem and affections of the Members of this House. All the able and distinguished members of this committee have earned and enjoy the confidence of their colleagues. Theirs is not a spectacular work; they must deal with dry and complicated figures, they must deal with, they must wrestle with the complicated questions of the economics of

the country, with all the diverse and perplexing factors that enter into the question of the formulation of a tax measure.

I feel that this bill is a long step toward relieving the people of this country from burdensome detail, a relief they have long been denied. It simplifies in large measure the making out of income-tax returns. It removes from the shoulders of 30,000,000 Federal taxpayers the onerous duty of leaving their places of work where they earn a livelihood and standing in the long lines that we have seen at the Federal buildings in our home cities, when they were undertaking to make out their tax returns. There they stood, away from their place of employment, away from the farm, away from the shop, away from the office, away from the place where they earn their daily bread. This bill relieves 30,000,000 of our people from this necessity of going and standing in long lines like that. Their tax is computed upon what has been withheld by their employers, and that is a great relief. The report admirably summarizes the accomplishments of this measure.

First, it is to relieve the great majority of taxpayers from the necessity of computing their income tax; second, it is to reduce the number of tax computations, third, to simplify the return form; fourth, to decrease the number of persons required to file declarations of estimated tax; fifth, to eliminate some of the difficulties and uncertainties in the making of estimates required for declarations. The bill accomplishes these objects without substantially changing the number of taxpayers or the revenue yield under existing law.

These are all aims devoutly to be wished and I compliment the committee on having reached this goal. We have here a simplified method in providing for the making of tax returns. I think the farmers of the country will appreciate it.

Nobody loves to pay a tax. It is a painful duty. For every right with which a citizen is clothed, he is burdened with a corresponding duty. Rights and duties go hand in hand in this world. May I not say to the taxpayer who finds it hard to pay his or her taxes, bear in mind that we are selling to the people of this country billions of its interest-bearing bonds for the payment of which we pledge the value of every dollar's worth of property in this country. There is just one way a government can have an income and that is to obtain it through taxes paid by its citizens. These bonds must be paid when they mature and the interest as it accrues upon them must be met. There is no Government official who can reach up in the thin air and pull down from nowhere money. It must come from the people. May I say to the taxpayer who is worried about parting with his tax dollars that the parting with his tax dollar is not comparable in any degree to the sacrifice which our fighting forces make, as they fight, suffer, and die all over the world. We invest our money in the security and defense of our Government in return for a tax receipt, and in return for the manifold blessings that it gives us, has given us, and will give us in years to come. Just think of the sacrifice a soldier, a sailor or a marine makes who invests his life in the defense of our country. When you think about that and when you think about the fact that in your tax dollar you take your stand if not beside him certainly behind him, you do that which insures victory and the liberty of our people. I would rather pay a thousand dollars in taxes, I would rather pay the last farthing that I possess on this earth, than to pay one red cent to Hirohito or to Hitler. That is the proper view to take about taxation. That is the proper spirit in which to approach this question and I believe our people in every walk of life, the businessman, the farmer, the laborer, all of our people take that attitude. I do not like to think of dividing our people into classes. I deplore the fact that we have class consciousness in this country and class hatred, because we are all Americans working and fighting in a common cause.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE].

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, the remarks made by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means indicates pretty much the attitude of the House toward the work the committee has done. He said "remarks made by some gentlemen start with great praise for the committee and end up with implied criticism."

It occurred to me this afternoon as various gentlemen spoke how great the petition was that came to my office from the people I serve in the Fourteenth District of Ohio. This petition asked that immediate consideration and attention be given to cutting down the great number of returns that have to be made as well as the complex type of those returns in connection with individual income taxes. I experienced some joy here today to know that the petition from my people is being answered.

Another thought came to me during the address made by my distinguished friend from the State of New York [Mr. KEOGH], who spoke about exemptions for those who are on annuities. I believe he approaches the matter from the wrong angle. If we admit there are annuities for which exemption should be made, we then admit as a society that the annuities themselves are inadequate. When we start exempting anyone from the rule of taxation we begin to erect the fulcrums by which the law eventually becomes a failure. I would rather think, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] expressed himself, that the payment of a tax goes even beyond a duty. It is a rich privilege. What I pay by way of tax toward this country is my claim upon a part of it as an estate. If I neglect or evade that, of course, I cannot make such claim. No beneficiary of an annuity, with true conscience of his rich estate in America, wants to do less.

I attempted to ask a few questions of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] about this matter of exempting payments made to charitable and religious organizations, and the other tax amounts that each person pays. It seems to me that the question comes down to a focal point in his logic that the gentleman was not complaining about the rights under the law. The man who makes tithe to the church is permitted to have a total of 10 percent or as much more as he may validly claim. The fault, as the gentleman sees it, is the law does not force the man who makes no contributions and gets 10-percent exemption, to make his contribution to the religious and charitable institutions.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I certainly did not intend to leave any such idea. Far be it from me to suggest to anybody to make a contribution to anything. What I said was that I opposed a blanket deduction that treated all people alike. I object to this bill because the wage earner who contributes heavily cannot get the amount of taxes withheld from his wages reduced a cent because of those contributions.

Mr. ROWE. I concur, but the logical conclusion from what you say is that the gentleman does not complain about one who gives, but about the one who doesn't and still gets his 10 percent. The gentleman cited the fact that a man might stay out of work as an absentee and reduce his annual income by $300, and that man was afforded a reduction in his tax the same as the fellow who did contribute to the church and did not get credit for the full amount.

Mr. CURTIS. If he cuts down his earnings by reason of absenteeism at the same time he cuts down the amount of taxes he has to pay.

Mr. ROWE. Yes, if he is under the $3,000 annual income, but he certainly loses a good portion of his daily wage for the time lost and has less money to pay his tax.

Mr. CURTIS. An individual who stays there and works and does not indulge in absenteeism but gives his wages away does not get his income tax reduced at all.

Mr. ROWE. Is he punished as a result? I would like to commend the committee on this tax bill, and may I say further that I always look with great respect upon the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. If we make the broad exemption about which the gentleman complains both to the man who tithes to the church, educational institution, and pays his other regular taxes, and also the same exemption to the person who does not contribute, it seems to me we have done the constructive thing.

I feel the committee has done this because they want to encourage that man who has never or does not now make contributions, to start doing it.

Next, it seems to me if there could be divine advice coming to this body by a power beyond that of human reason, it would be to give all the chance to support

his church and charities by making the exemption general rather than saying to them, "If you do not give you shall be punished by not having the exemption." This function is for the individual and his conscience, and not for the Congress of the United States.

I think the provisions are broad in their concept. I think it is a splendid job, and it certainly does answer the people who have been petitioning me to get some relief.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am going to read to the House a tribute delivered by the great Chief Justice Stone of the Supreme Court today to the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, on the anniversary of the birthday of that great jurist. Both of these great Justices sat on many tax cases. I think this tribute is appropriate at this time because a great deal of the tax we are raising today is for the soldiers. I read to you Chief Justice Stone's tribute to the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes:

JUSTICE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES

On this, the anniversary of his birth, I offer my tribute to a great American, whom I had the rare privilege of knowing personally, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes.

Throughout his judicial service of over 49 years, nearly 30 on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, the law, to Justice Holmes, was a living thing, and withal a tool to shape the great ends of justice, always to be adapted to its purpose and its time. He said: "The life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience. * * * The law embodies the story of a nation's development through many centuries, and it cannot be dealt with as if it contained only the axioms and corollaries of a book of mathematics."

But Justice Holmes was more than a great judge—he was a great man. He was a thinker, profound and liberal, in many fields, and always he was typically American. The man who said, "We cannot live our dreams. We are lucky enough if we can give a sample of our best, and if in our hearts we can feel that it has been nobly done," gave in his own life a sample of his best; and it was indeed nobly done. Through four score and 13 years Oliver Wendell Holmes lived a life active and alert, holding fast to his ideals of the law, in which he saw the reflection of life—always true to his deepest convictions.

His friends remember him as a great gentleman and scholar, a man of engaging humor, and a joyous companion.

We remember, too, what was for him an almost sacred memory, that in his youth he had been a soldier, thrice wounded on the field of battle; that he cherished his recollection of the service of our soldiers in the Civil War as a great example of high endeavor and supreme devotion to duty, inspired by a great cause.

His own words, read at his burial in Arlington, come home to us with a new meaning today: "We accept our destiny to work, to fight, to die for ideal aims. At the grave of a hero who has done these things, we end not with sorrow at the inevitable loss, but with the contagion of his courage and with a kind of desperate joy we go back to the fight."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, today I have introduced a House resolution requesting the representative of the United States on the Combined Food Board to make an immediate report to the Congress of the United States, furnishing such detailed information, as is not incompatible with the public interest, of all its activities, policies, and plans, together with such actions, policies, and plans it contemplates putting into effect, and to submit a similar report each quarter thereafter.

Initially the Combined Food Board was set up by Executive order, with two members—United Kingdom and the United States. The idea originally was that there would be a forum only, with no power to force any decisions or take any action. To operate in Washington, using the personnel of the Bureau of Foreign Agricultural Relations and of the British Food Mission in Washington, to work out recommendations, and so forth. Not until about October 1943 was there any change, nor did the C. F. B. become an effective unit in the food-management picture. At that time the President nominated Marvin Jones to become United States member in place of Secretary Wickard, and Roy Hendrickson was named as his alternate; Lieutenant Colonel Olmstead was named as executive secretary.

At that time it was decided to implement and make the Combined Food Board an active over-all factor in the food picture. Prior to that time the recommendations of the Combined Food Board were neither followed in this country nor by Great Britain; in fact, there did not exist an American food policy or position. To ovecome this, under Hendrickson and Olmstead, a Food Requirements and Allocations Committee was set up with membership of all interested Government agencies.

The Combined Food Board recommendations, I am informed, are now heeded and carried out and have the same effect as directives. This places the C. F. B. in the top over-all management of world food supply available to the United Nations. While it is true that no decision can be reached unless it is unanimous, and while it is also true that the food authorities in the respective countries—United States, Great Britain, and Canada—need not follow the recommendations of the C. F. B., there is no record since the reorganization of any instances in which an agreement was not obtained or where the recommendations were not carried out.

The principal weakness of this present set-up lies in the fact that its entire operations are carried on in the dark, the recommendations of the Board or the basis for their decisions are not made public, either to Congress, the industry affected, or the people. Such basic decisions as the use and allocation of shipping space are handled between C. F. B. and the Combined Shipping Adjustment Board, and there likewise everything is in the dark.

In view of the seriousness of the postwar adjustment, not only of production, but of liquidation of surplus and the use of food stocks throughout the world for rehabilitation, it would seem imperative that Congress and the food industry and farmers should be informed and advised as to the policies, plans, and programs of this over-all food-management group.

A situation can arise in the adjustment period following the war where we might find ourselves with our stocks so reduced that we would have nothing for export or world markets in certain commodities our stocks being drawn off through lend-lease and because of armed-force requirements; while in other countries stocks and supplies would be available to world trade, and as a result we would lose good will established through lend-lease and be out of world markets for the time being, which we have spent years in developing. In other words, we would be economically strait-jacketed by restricted supplies from markets that we had developed in years past, while Allied Nations would become competitor nations having adequate supplies for world traffic.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has given its attention and study not only to the Combined Food Board, but to other similarly constituted agencies created by Executive decree in the first half of the year 1942. I am given to understand that similar resolutions will be introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] as to the Combined Shipping Adjustment Board, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] as to the Combined Production and Resources Board, and by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] as to the Combined Raw Materials Board.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who addressed the House on the tax bill may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an article from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein a copy of a telegram I received on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

HISTORY OF THE NORTHWEST FARMERS' STRUGGLE FOR A FAIR AND JUST MARKET

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the history of agriculture is marked by the deeds of courageous farmers who have fought corporate greed and selfishness and who have been joined by those who have abandoned the security of business positions to serve those farmers for what they could afford to give. Such farmers and their loyal allies have often forgotten themselves but never the cause in which they have enlisted.

If there ever was a time when farmers needed a strong voice in Congress it will be on the day peace comes. The enemy is upon them once again, the same old enemy whose avarice and greed has darkened the pages of history. I speak from experience. I have been in this fight for a better day for the farmers of the Northwest for nearly 40 years. I know what a fight that has been. I can remember the day in North Dakota when we were compelled to sell our grain to line elevators only. These line elevators were established on railroad property, and the railroads would not permit the presence of an independent buyer. The line elevators not only did not compete between themselves, but were lined up directly with the railroads, both financially and through overlapping directorships.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad the gentleman has taken the floor today for this purpose. Is the gentleman including in his speech now also a workable program for the farmers, one that could be put into practice in time of peace which would give them the right price in the open market and relieve them from the distress of the surpluses which have been their chief burden in former years, before the war?

Mr. BURDICK. I want to say that I have been in this farm movement in my State ever since I was old enough to do any campaigning, and I never heard the farmers complain about the situation unless they had a substitute all ready to put in the place of it. My remarks will contain a substitute, and that is to handle cooperatively the marketing of their products. It is because they united cooperatively to do their selling that they have been attacked year after year by those who had private control over the marketing of farm products.

For example, years ago we built there a cooperative exchange to handle our grain. As soon as it amounted to anything, there began a series of actions in the courts to cripple this institution, because it was infringing upon the private rights of the grain trade, and they wanted to get rid of it. It was only when they appealed to the Federal Trade Commission, set up by the Wilson administration, that the true light of this whole battle was brought out. The Federal Trade Commission made a full report, giving the detailed and nefarious activities of this great grain exchange in fighting the farmers' cooperatives. I shall include in my remarks the final rule and order of the Commission.

Mr. MURDOCK. I assure the gentleman that I have asked my question in all sincerity and in good faith. I want to learn the truth about what is practical and best for the American farmer.

Mr. BURDICK. I know that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Only recently I have heard great business leaders express concern about farmers and make great promises for them. We who represent the farming areas have seen a lot of bouquets handed to the farmer by the industrialists and a great many promises made to him by campaigners on the political platform, but I find that the farmer for the most part has been the forgotten man. I, with the gentleman, am now looking for a realistic program that will work in time of peace as well as in time of war for the benefit of the farmers and thus for the benefit of the whole country. I look forward with interest to the gentleman's presentation.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his contribution.

The farmers of North Dakota year by year had to battle the elements drought, heat, the plague of hail, disease and insects; they also had to battle outside freebooters and financiers. It was the farmers of North Dakota against these foreign interests. And for nearly 40 years I have stood with these farmers, as a cowpuncher, a farmer, a lawyer, a State legislator, and as a Member of this House of Representatives.

Always it has been a fight for the farmers' right to sell their grain for a fair and decent price, to free themselves from the stranglehold of the private grain trade, and to achieve some semblance of independence and economic freedom. That seems little enough to ask for, but the private grain trade always looked on North Dakota as its own private hunting grounds and posted it with "No tresspassing" signs. They operated with the same high-handed methods as kings, and even invoked the Minnesota Legislature in 1881 to give them "divine rights" to carry on their rackets throughout the spring-wheat States.

When you go through some 40 years of this, and see the same old gang of private grain traders set out again and again to throw the farmers back into economic bondage and chain them to the stone walls of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, you are apt to forget all the academic niceties of flowery speeches. You are not going to waste time mincing words.

When a gangster tries to hold you up or a sharpshooter tries to take away your home through legal trickery, you fight with every weapon at your command. And that is the way the farmers of North Dakota must feel today as the private grain trade sets out to take away the farmers' cooperatives. That is the same old story every time the farmers of my home State have tried to get together to market their own grain and to save some of the big profits that go into the pockets of a handful of grain traders in Minneapolis.

But before I tell you of the latest attack being made on the farmers and their cooperatives, I want to tell you about the long fight made by the farmers of the Northwest for their rights in the Minneapolis Grain Chamber of Commerce and the Duluth Grain Board of Trade. The grain business of North Dakota long has been in the control of these private grain interests, who have a notorious reputation for having thought of nothing but gain for themselves. They have given no thought to the welfare of the farmers of the Northwest, the fruits of whose labor in fact built Minneapolis.

I know what the fight is all about, and I know something about the history and the facts, as do thousands of farmers.

I would like to quote to you a portion of an editorial that appeared in the St. Paul, Minn., Pioneer Press for January 15, 1929. It was titled "Grain Trade Effrontery." Here is what it said:

> The Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, in the person of some 20 of its members, sponsors a page advertisement to announce the opening of the newest and largest unit in its group of buildings. In the course of surveying with pride the growth and might of the Minneapolis wheat and flour market, these grain traders make some remarkable statements.
>
> They say:
>
> "It (the advertisement) is written in recognition of the stupendous achievements of the great army of Northwest farmers that have made the formation and tremendous growth of the chamber of commerce possible.
>
> "The realization that the success of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce is primarily due to the efforts of the agriculturists of the Northwest prompts this acknowledgment.
>
> "This organization, as an asscciation, never sells grain. Its activities have no bearing whatever upon the price of grain."

The farmers of the Northwest grow the grain and dealers of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce market it. The middleman who handles the wheat has become prosperous and builds greater and greater monuments to his success. The producer, who is responsible for all this wealth, has not done so well. Contemplating his mortgages or his foreclosure, the grower of the grain has sometimes complained that the dealer takes the fruit of his labor. It should be the other way around. The rich rewards should go to the producer, who now gets only the leavings.

It is fitting that the chamber of commerce, like any other business, should be prosperous, but how about the prosperity of the agriculturists? That seems to have been left for the last. The dispossessed or struggling ruralist will doubtless make a wry face over these laudations for his unwilling contribution to the greatness of the grain trade. He would prefer less praise and more profit.

The members of the chamber of commerce who print this advertisement must have had their tongues in their cheeks when they declared that their activities have no bearing whatever upon the price of grain. The law of supply and demand is theoretically all powerful, but, as everyone knows and as Government experts investigating the Chicago Board of Trade in 1926 discovered, the natural course of the wheat price sometimes gets encouragement one way or the other. The fluctuations on which the grain traders thrive are often disastrous to the farmer who has frequently called for measures to put the market on a more even keel. No effective limitation, however, has ever been tried, nor have these plans been popular with trading and speculative groups. For the chamber of commerce to wash its hands of all responsibility for price movement is a bit of immaculate absolution.

These gracious acknowledgments would come with better grace if some of the gratitude expressed to the farmers had been manifest during their long, bitter, and unsuccessful campaign for economic justice. The grain trade did its share toward that defeat.

The hard-bitten farmers of North Dakota have been subject to the chiseling of the private grain trade for over 60 years, and it was because of the exploitation of our grain farmers that necessity arose for a cooperative grain marketing system.

It was well over 30 years ago that the farmers organized and built their own cooperative-marketing machinery, known as the Equity Cooperative Exchange. They made a courageous fight, but they had the combined resources of the private grain gang to go up against, and it was just too much. That fight was so vicious that the farmers finally were forced to call in the Federal Trade Commission which had just been established under the progressive Wilson administration, whose investigation, after a period of months, disclosed the vicious practices of the private grain trade and the grain exchanges in the northwest and the Federal Trade Commission issued a cease-and-desist order against the leaders of those grain exchanges to quit lying about our cooperative marketing institution.

The Equity Cooperative Exchange was finally forced to go into receivership. I know something about it. I helped to liquidate the old Equity Cooperative receivership, which settled in full with every creditor and out of which was built a new marketing organization.

The reason that the old Equity Cooperative Exchange was forced to surrender was that throughout its entire history, the Minneapolis grain gang, with its private charter from the State of Minnesota, refused to permit that cooperative the privileges of the trading floor of the Minneapolis Grain Chamber of Commerce, a privilege that was essential to the success of the farmers' marketing organization.

Here are the conclusions of the Federal Trade Commission in the case against the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis, which were released on December 28, 1923.

The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis was ordered to "forever cease and desist"—

From combining and conspiring among themselves or with others, directly or indirectly to interfere with or injure or destroy the business or the reputation of the St. Paul Grain Exchange, or its officers and members, or the Equity Cooperative Exchange, or its officers and stockholders (or other competitors of the respondent chamber and its members) by:

(1) Publishing or causing to be published in any newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, or otherwise, or circulating, or causing to be circulated, orally or otherwise, among the customers or prospective customers of the Members of the St. Paul Grain Exchange, or the public generally, any false or misleading statements concerning the financial standing, the business, or the business methods of the said exchange, its officers, or members, or concerning the said Equity Cooperative Exchange, its officers or stockholders.

(2) Instituting vexatious or unfounded suits either at law or in equity against said Equity Cooperative Exchange with the purpose or intent or with the effect of hindering or obstructing the business of the said Equity Cooperative Exchange or injuring its credit and reputation * * *.

(3) Hindering, obstructing, or preventing any telegraph company or other distributing agent from furnishing continuous or periodical price quotations of grain to the St. Paul Grain Exchange or its members, or to the Equity Cooperative Exchange or its stockholders * * *.

(4) Passing or enforcing any rule or regulation, or enforcing any usage or custom that prohibits or prevents members of the respondent chamber from conducting their business of dealing in grain according to the cooperative method of marketing grain or according to the patronage dividend plan, like or similar to the method or plan adopted by the Equity Cooperative Exchange.

(5) Denying to any duly accredited representatives of any organization or association of farmer grain growers or shippers admission to membership in said respondent chamber with full and equal privileges enjoyed by any or all of its members or by any or all concerns represented by membership in said respondent chamber of commerce, because of the plan or purpose on the part of such organization or association to pay or purpose to pay patronage dividends or to operate or purpose to operate according to the cooperative plan for marketing grain, namely, the plan of returning any portion or all of its earnings or surplus to its patrons or members on the basis of patronage, whether such earnings or surplus is derived from charging patrons or members commissions or otherwise.

If you were a farmer in North Dakota and went through such battles as this to set up your own marketing system, would you now believe the words of the private grain trade, no matter how buttered up they are?

Not if you went through that battle to save your cooperative, you would not. Nor would you if you recalled that just 6 years before, in 1915, the Equity Cooperative Exchange engaged in legal battle with the chamber of commerce. That was a desperate and underhanded attempt by the chamber of commerce gang to show that Equity Cooperative Exchange was insolvent. But the victory for the farmers in the courts at Fargo, in 1915, was a great victory for the cooperative movement. The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis found out not only that the farmers would fight back but that they had the resources and talents with which to fight.

But out of the ruins of this receivership something bigger and stronger came. I know something about that, too, because I was general counsel for the Farmers Union Terminal Association when it was set up. That was in 1925.

The Farmers Union Terminal Association was set up on true cooperative lines. It had an unprecedented growth. Its growth after all that the private grain had done to destroy the old Equity Cooperative Exchange was a demonstration of the faith the farmers had in the philosophy of cooperative marketing.

But the grain gang, the same private gang that now is leading the fight against the farmers and their cooperatives in the State of North Dakota, had a few more treacherous tricks up their sleeves. One of the sharpest was the infamous Elevator M case. You may never have heard of that case, but every farmer in the Northwest has.

This time the grain gang tried a new attack. Instead of filing any charges against the Farmers Union Terminal Association, the charges were aimed at its management and at the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission. There were eight charges filed on September 14, 1931, and one of them stated:

Tampering with wheat inspection samples in substituting No. 1 Dark Northern wheat in the samples in place of No. 2 and No. 3 wheat contained therein, and thus securing a false inspection report upon which false warehouse receipts were issued, which it sold to and borrowed money from the Grain Stabilization Corporation, thus defrauding the taxpayer.

It was in St. Paul, before the Governor of Minnesota, that these charges were made and the hearings were held, but the farmers of North Dakota, the farmers of all the Northwest, were to be the goats.

In his closing argument, the counsel for the Farmers Union Terminal Association declared:

A hearing without parallel in the history of this State has now come to the close.

A fraud — colossal fraud — which has clutched at the throats of the farmers of the Northwest for 50 years, has been dragged out into the light of day.

The chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers of the Nation are now on trial before you.

For years the farmers of this country have been fighting for economic justice and for a marketing system which would protect them

from the unjust and gigantic tribute exacted by the grain gamblers of America. * * *

The chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers have resorted to a campaign of propaganda and falsehood against the Farmers Union Terminal Association and the cooperative movement. * * *

The real purpose was to destroy the cooperative movement and to destroy the faith of the people in the laws which have been enacted for their benefit. The chamber of commerce did not dare bring these proceedings in their own name. * * *

The men and women on the farms, in the factories, and homes of Minnesota can follow with ease the slimy, crooked trail which, like a serpent, runs through all these proceedings.

That trail, Your Excellency, leads to the door of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis.

This proceeding was initiated by the chamber of commerce. It reeks with the perjury and fraud of officials and employees of the chamber of commerce. It has but one purpose and one objective, and that is to destroy the cooperative movement of the Northwest.

After holding public hearings for nearly 2 months, the Governor of Minnesota, a sister State of North Dakota, found that the charges of malfeasance and misfeasance against the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission had not been substantiated and that there was nothing in the record which served to justify any finding of misconduct on the part of the Farmers Union Terminal Association. So that was the end of another attempt by the private grain gang to wreck the farmers' cooperative movement.

Do you wonder, gentlemen, that farmers have a deep distrust of these grain pirates? Even though now they say that they love the farmers and want to help them build their cooperatives. But the farmer knows better than to trust them.

I would like to ask these self-appointed guardians of the farmers of North Dakota if in all their dark and clouded history they ever did a single constructive thing for the farmers of this country. I know a lot of things they did do, but the farmer paid and paid dearly for every one of them.

First of all, I would like to remind you that the grain gang in Minneapolis was directly responsible for the defeat of the McNary-Haugen bill, a bill for which I worked with thousands of farmers and friends of farmers. The Congress of the United States twice passed that bill. Twice President Coolidge vetoed it. Eighty-seven organizations of the Minneapolis grain gang wired President Coolidge to veto the McNary-Haugen bill, and their influence was successful in tipping the scales against Congress and the people.

Agriculture in North Dakota was prostrate for over a decade. But in all that time I never saw any of that grain gang out in North Dakota except to drum up a little business or to foreclose on an elevator or a farm. Otherwise they just camped in their overstuffed chairs and put their feet on their big mahogany desks in the chamber of commerce building. They never lifted a hand to help the farmers.

I know, because I was farming in North Dakota during those depression days. I lived in North Dakota through the drought.

I do not think that any of you have to be reminded what those years were like. When there were crops there were no prices. Then came the years when there were no crops. All agriculture in the Northwest was paralyzed. Farm families were being thrown off the land. Banks and insurance companies were foreclosing right and left.

The Government seemed unable to do anything. So it was that 1932 and 1933 were the years when the hungry and desperate farmers of North Dakota banded together, took into their own hands the means for saving their homes and the homes of their neighbors. They banded together and guarded the farms against foreclosure sales. I will admit that there were none of the niceties of court procedure in saving those farms. They sought a favorable public opinion and got it and the farms were saved. Homes were saved. And the State of North Dakota was saved. No one would dare to gainsay that.

And out of the fight for homes much good came. It brought into sharp focus the plight of the farmers. The Government was compelled to act. It did act. Then came the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the A. A. A., the mortgage moratorium, the Resettlement Administration, and the Farm Security Administration, and much more.

It forced through a program to rehabilitate the farmers of the Northwest, a program to insure that they might at least have enough food to hold body and soul together. No one who is a man would ever condemn that. It was not charity. It was a program to preserve the agricultural economy of the Northwest. What is more, it was a program also to save Main Street in the Northwest.

This aid by their own Government not only saved the family-type farm in the Northwest, but it also kept the merchants in their stores, the bankers in their banks, the doctors and the dentists in their offices. It kept the cash registers of North Dakota and the Northwest ringing. It kept the lights of rural towns and cities burning. Money that went out into the country to help the farmers came into town to be spent for consumer goods.

Between the years of 1933 and 1939 a total of $658,248,218.68 was poured into the five Northwest States of North and South Dakota, Montana, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. North Dakota's share was $199,289,639.56.

This was money spent to put agriculture back on its feet, to return the land to good use, to restore bankrupt farmers to productive farmers. It was a program that worked. And I am proud of what I did, in my small way, to help make this possible.

Now crops are bountiful in North Dakota. For the past several years the Almighty Provider has blessed the State with rain and ideal growing weather. There is an adequate market for crops. Prices are good. The same farmer who 10 years ago was double-crossed by a haywire economic system now for the moment is a free man. The crops he raised and is raising now furnish our Nation and our allies with much of the food and fiber which have kept us from succumbing to the enemy.

In this period of agricultural prosperity the farmers have been building cooperatives. They have started new ones and strengthened old ones. They have learned well the value of cooperatives in giving them some measure of control over their products in the market places.

This same prosperity also has poured gold into the coffers of the grain gang. If there is anything that gets them worried, however, it is to see somebody else have money. They are alarmed over the prosperity of North Dakota's farmers. When farmers are free and independent, and owe no man, then you cannot throw them into economic bondage and have them do your bidding.

So what are the members of this grain gang doing now?

They are taking tax money to fight cooperatives. They are taking money that they otherwise would pay to the Government in taxes to start another battle. They are dipping into their swollen profits to destroy the cooperative movement. They all say they love the cooperatives. But they want them out of business just the same. Their record is proof of that.

They have rigged up an organization that they call the National Tax Economy Association. They call it the N. T. E. A. They are riding criss-cross over the country, sounding the alarm, trying to make Main Street merchants believe that cooperatives are a menace to them.

They say that they are just interested in having cooperatives pay taxes. They say they just want equality. Shades of the old grain buccaneers and pirates of yesterday. They cleverly cover up the fact that cooperatives already pay taxes, just as any other private business. The grain gang can pay the same kind of taxes, and escape any tax on their profits, if they will just eliminate profits. But can you see them doing that? If they will return their big profits to their customers as surplus, like cooperatives do, they will get equality of treatment. But they do not want that.

The president of this T. E. A. party is Ben C. McCabe. His name crops up now and then. He is a grain commission merchant in the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. He is president of the International Elevator Co.

The National Tax Equality Asscciation is the window dressing for far more nefarious plotting. Ben McCabe is the dummy in the store window.

Bennie sends out pamphlets. Here is the kind of stuff the farmers have to read:

Mind you, we aren't against cooperatives. We're for them—we ask only that the same rules of competition apply to them as to us. So don't be disturbed if you are a member of a local cooperative association yourself—a great many of our customers are.

Bennie of the grain gang cries out for equality. Equality, that is all the farmers have ever asked for since the

chamber of commerce started in back in 1883. That was 61 years ago. For 61 years the chamber of commerce has denied the farmer even a look-in at equality. Now the grain gang wants equality.

There was no thought of equality back in 1883 when the chamber of commerce applied to the Legislature of Minnesota and secured a law that conferred upon it remarkable and even amazing powers. This enabling legislation was obtained under the General Laws of Minnesota, 1883, chapter 138. It elevated the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce to the dignity and authority of a trial court, although remaining within the control and observation of its own members. For instance, the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, in arbitrating differences among these members or between a member and an outsider, is authorized to subpena witnesses, and swear them exactly as in a court of the State, and the awards of its tribunal in such cases, when filed with the clerk of the district court, have all the validity and significance of findings by the court itself. Yet all the proceedings of this extraordinary tribunal are conducted in secret; neither side is represented by counsel and nothing concerning the trial except the award is allowed to reach even the district court.

In other words, what the Legislature of Minnesota did back in 1883 was to erect a new judicial tribunal, affecting the public interests but immune from public supervision, and had clothed it with the attributes of the star chamber.

What chance does the farmer have against such a stacked court? And now Ben McCabe cries out for equality.

But, as I have said, the Tax Equality Association is just so much "eyewash."

It is the respectable partner of the firm. Behind the scenes things go on much as they have in the past. I would like to remind you of the conspiracy to throw the old Equity Cooperative Association into bankruptcy, of the efforts to quarantine its operations, of the Elevator M case.

The grain gang always can find a stooge to do its bidding. These lackeys are always around to pick up a few crumbs. They have a nuisance value. The nuisance of a gadfly that takes your mind off your work.

The most recent and most persistent gadfly for the grain gang is one Ray P. Chase. His record consists of putting out smear pamphlets against liberals and cooperatives, of being sued for libel and settling out of court, and serving one term in this House as Congressman from Minnesota. As an individual he is of no consequence. I hold him up merely as a specimen used by the chamber of commerce to attack the cooperative movement and the leaders of the Farmers Union in the State of North Dakota. He is a snooper. His stock in trade is to file complaints in behalf of his clients.

One of Chase's most recent antics was to file a complaint with the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission, charging that the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association was making fraudulent and illegal profits from its grain-marketing operations, and called for revocation of the grain terminal's grain commission merchant's license.

Now, why should Chase show all this concern? He has never farmed. He has never sold a bushel of wheat. He is not a member of the chamber of commerce. He belongs to no cooperative or farm organization. His record in Congress shows that he supported not a single agricultural measure.

I will let the cat out of the bag. I would like to read an article which appeared in the Willmar, Minn., Daily Tribune on the date of April 5, 1944. The editor of that paper is a man by the name of Victor Lawson. He has served many years as a State senator in the Minnesota Legislature, and has an honored record. During his years as a legislator Mr. Lawson observed many things. He was in the State senate at the time of the Elevator M case.

This article lets the cat, and all the cat's kittens, out of the bag. It shows the tie between Chase and some of the grain gang; some of the same members of that gang who were named by the Federal Trade Commission in its cease and desist order were involved in the Elevator M case, and now proudly bear the banner labeled "National Tax Equality Association."

THE STORY OF THE FIGHT ON FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL CO.

(The story printed below is written by a gentleman who is in a position to know whereof he speaks. He is well known to the editor and is not connected with the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Co. We publish it in good faith as a service to the people who should be interested.)

In the latter part of August 1943 five men appeared at the office of the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission in St. Paul and asked the two commissioners present, Frank W. Matson, chairman of the board, and Commissioner N. J. Holmberg, to hear their complaint against the grain marketing practices of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. Commissioner Rollin G. Johnson was out of the city.

In the group were the following grain commission merchants from the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce: B. F. Benson of Benson Quinn Co.; J. A. Bolton, of Atwood Larson Co.; Ben McCabe, of McCabe Bros. Co.; Arthur J. Larson, of Hallet & Cary Co.; accompanied by Herbert F. Horner, attorney, who has offices at 451 Chamber of Commerce Building.

These men did not claim to represent the chamber of commerce in the matter they wanted to discuss with the commissioners but did speak as though their mission had the approval and support of many grain commission merchants operating on the Minneapolis grain exchange.

They charged the Grain Terminal Association with fraud and injustice to the grain interests of the State in the buying, selling, handling, and inspection of grain and asked the commission to investigate and determine if their charges are true.

If evidence is found to substantiate these charges they want the commission to prosecute the Grain Terminal Association for using unfair practices and unfair discrimination in the buying and selling of grain, and take the necessary legal action to stop continuation of such methods and practices. Commissioners Matson and Holmberg said the board would consider the matter and determine if there is sufficient evidence to warrant authorization of an investigation of the Grain Terminal Association's grain sales books and records.

Time passed without the desired investigation being made and Messrs. Benson, Larsen, and Horner again called at the commission's offices on Tuesday, November 16. They were accompanied by A. F. Nelson, of Minnesota Farmers Elevator Association; Frank White, president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau; and Lester F. McCabe, of McCabe Bros. Co.

It is said that among those invited to attend this meeting, but were not present, were: A. C. Remele, of Van Dusen-Harrington Co.; John Brandt, of Land O' Lakes Creameries; W. S. Moscrip, of Twin City Milk Producers Association; J. S. Jones, secretary of Minnesota Farm Bureau; and N. K. Carnes, of Central Cooperative Association. It is said that Frank White was asked to proxy for Messrs. Brandt and Moscrip.

It is hard to conceive that there is any truth in the report that Messrs. Brandt, Moscrip, and Carnes would have any part in promoting the investigation asked for by the grain commission merchants. They have all been active—and still are—in the cooperative movement and are all holding important official positions in cooperative organizations.

The November 16 meeting was held in the large conference room of the commission and lasted about 2 hours. The grain-marketing practices of the Grain Terminal Association were the main topic of conversation. No written or documentary evidence was offered to the commission as proof or to support the charges made.

During the last week in November the commission decided to order investigation of the Grain Terminal Association's grain-sales books and records and selected Leslie J. Burch, an employee in their Minneapolis office, to do the work. He was to receive official authorization and start work Monday, December 6.

In the meantime the commission decided to wait until they consulted Attorney General Burnquist and get his official opinion as to whether or not it is their duty to make such investigation and prosecute if evidence of wrongdoing is found.

The request for the opinion was made Tuesday, December 7, and received by the commission on Monday, January 17, 1944. The opinion contains several pages, but this one paragraph informed the commissioners as to their duty:

"As to whether the cooperative association about which you inquire has failed to comply with the laws enacted for regulation of commission merchants or performed its contract with the members or patrons in a legal and fair manner is, of course, a question of fact to be determined upon proper investigation and hearings before your commission."

On Saturday, January 17, Ray P. Chase, of Anoka, issued a complaint against the commission. He states that he has been informed and verily believes that the commission and some of their employees have known for some time that certain sales practices of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association have resulted in large pecuniary profits to said G. T. A. at the expense of rural grain elevators and grain shippers, but made no effort to compel the discontinuance thereof or to proceed against those who are engaged in or who are responsible therefor.

It is reported that unless the commission proceeds with the investigation and prosecution of the G. T. A., the Chase complaint will be the base for court action against the commissioners.

Publications issued by Mr. Chase in the past prevent him from being classified as a friend of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association or its general manager, M. W. Thatcher. The wording of the Chase

complaint, and the purpose thereof, fit in so closely with the complaint and the desire of the Minneapolis grain commission merchants that there is much reason to think that Chase and the grain commission merchants have formed an alliance for the purpose of "getting" the Grain Terminal Association.

In the St. Paul Dispatch, January 19, M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, denies the charges made in the Chase complaint. He states that G. T. A. operates its business under the supervision of one of the best legal firms in the State. He also stated that all records in G. T. A. offices that have connection with their grain transactions are open and available for inspection by properly authorized officials and employees of the commission. G. T. A. will render full assistance to make such investigation complete.

During the G. T. A.'s 4-day annual meeting in St. Paul during December, Mr. Thatcher told about anticipated attack upon G. T. A. and warned its Farmer Union members to be watchful and vigilant against those who seek to destroy G. T. A. through legal and other methods based upon false stories and lack of facts. He said the attack is caused chiefly through resentment against the success and rapid growth of G. T. A. and other cooperatives.

The commissioners say that the grain commission merchants charges, and those in the Chase complaint, are much like the old Elevator M case. This case came before Gov. Floyd Olson, who dismissed it for lack of incriminating evidence. But the commission has started an investigation and will try to get at the truth of this matter. The commissioners want to be fair to all and not injure any grain commission merchant without cause. They also do not want to become innocent parties in a trade war.

Many reports are circulating about the amount of money the grain commission merchants have—or will—raised to be used in destroying the Grain Terminal Association and these rumors sound very fictitious. Some say the "jackpot" contains $10,000, others $25,000, others $100,000, and will be used during the next few months.

It is also reported that the attack on G. T. A. is a part of a Nation-wide attempt by large fuel, oil, banking, insurance, grain, lumber, and other big business groups to destroy the cooperative movement in this country.

The national anticooperative group is reported to have a "kitty" of over $2,000,000 for use in their endeavor. And the fight will be heard in Congress, in State legislatures, over the radio, published in newspapers and other publications. It will be heard from the public speaker's platform, and will extend into every section of the United States.

It will be a tough fight for survival by the cooperatives but many of them are strong organizations now with rapidly increasing membership and substantial financial backing. They are in much better condition to meet the attack now than would have been the case a few years ago.

That brings us up to date.

I repeat what I told this House 4 years ago:

The organized grain trade of Minneapolis is still at work. They see a chance to weaken the confidence of the farmers of the Northwest in the Farmers Union, and true to form they attack our leaders. This course of action is nothing new—they have been at it for over 40 years. They used to attack the objects and purposes of the organization. Having always failed in that, they now seek the same end by attacking the men who have successfully piloted the farmers' cause. In this they must also fail because their case is built on falsehoods and malicious charges, which time alone will refute. Instead of weakening this farmers' movement, their attack upon its leaders will revive the same old fighting spirit that has held the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis at bay for a quarter of a century, and more—it will revive the fight to mop up the whole nefarious business of grain gambling indulged in by the grain trade. This fight will not end until the farmers of America have a just and open market, ridded of the rats that have gnawed holes in the farmers' grain bin for the last 50 years.

And when I speak thus, I know that any candidate for political office who opposes the grain gang will have to go up against a tremendous slush fund. I know that every effort will be made to defeat him.

But agriculture is in need of a champion, a spokesman. It needs a voice in Congress that will speak, day in and day out, without fail. It needs on the floor of Congress a spokesman such as the late Senator Howell, of Nebraska, who day after day stood almost alone, but day after day took the floor of the Senate to speak for the farmers of this Nation.

To this cause I pledge all my energy, in the hope that the farmers of the Northwest can secure economic freedom and be assured in the post-war period of the security, comfort, and independence that is the American promise to all the world.

It may have been providence, or fate, or just a circumstance of fate, that in 1883, the year that the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce was elevated to the dignity and authority of a court, M. W. Thatcher was born in Indiana, the son of a Granger, a dirt farmer. George Loftus, the leader of the Equity Cooperative Exchange, was the marked man of the grain gang, and every smear and every attack was aimed at him. On his death, Thatcher took up the farmers' fight, and the grain gang turned its big guns on him.

His voice was raised in defense of the cooperatives in the famous Equity battle in Fargo in 1915. He was called in in 1923 to save the Equity. He was called in in 1926 to salvage the Equity, and out of it he built the Farmers Union Terminal Association, with the aid of the farmers of the Northwest. Out of this organization came other farm cooperatives, the Farmers Union Central Exchange and the present Farmers Union G. T. A.

I have been in Washington since 1934 and am proud of the part I played with Mr. Thatcher in fighting for a just and open market. I call attention here to the debt the farmers owe Mr. Tatcher for his untiring efforts in building a tremendous membership in the Farmers Union; for his industry and sagacity in piloting a great grain terminal association; for his fight before Congress for crop insurance; for his fight to maintain the family farm through the creation of the Farm Security Administration; for his fight before Congress to preserve the soil and make better and safer use of our lands; for his fight to band together the farm consumers, who in turn used these profits to rebuild new towns and villages fast disappearing from the prairies. I am proud to have aided Bill Thatcher, in his drive to make a happier farm life in North Dakota and other States of the Northwest.

Let the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis, the National Tax Economy League, Ray P. Chase, and all the other members of the "cooperative assassination" gang do their worst. The farmers of the Northwest have had a taste of independence; they know the fruits of cooperation—thousands of farm homes have been rescued; they have tasted a new life that they never knew before. These farmers will fight to the last ditch, and while the members of the "gang" think they are fighting a few lone men like Bill Tatcher they will learn in due time that they have taken on a fight against every family-type farmer in the great Northwest.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PITTENGER for Friday, May 5, 1944, on account of important business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); and

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 5, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, May 5, 1944, at 10 a. m., for further consideration of legislation affecting rates on the special services in the Postal Service. Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 10 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2987, a bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 18, 1944, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (ship construction reserve fund).

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 25, 1944, at 10 o'clock

a. m., on H. R. 4486, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the clerk by letter.

Witnesses are requested to notify the Clerk by letter at least a day in advance of the hearing of their desire to testify in order that a list of witnesses may be prepared. Written statements for the record from persons other than witnesses should be submitted a day in advance. Amendments to be proposed during the hearing should be submitted to the reporter in duplicate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1508. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 and prior years in the sum of $84,604.88 and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 in the sum of $335,000, amounting in all to $419,604.88, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 567); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1509. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $59,000 (H. Doc. No. 568); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1510. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for indemnities, domestic mail, for the fiscal year 1943 of $150,000, supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945, aggregating $16,257,000, and a provision making available in the fiscal year 1945 the sum of $21,000 of the balance in the 1944 appropriation for salaries, Bureau of Accounts, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 569); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1511. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1944, in the sum of $378,000 (H. Doc. No. 570); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1512. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1937 and 1944, for the Navy Department and naval service, amounting to $781.62 cash, contract authorization for 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft, and contract authorization in the amount of $55,000,000 for ordnance facilities, together with a proposed provision affecting an appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 571); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1513. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, as authorized by the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267), in the amount of $450,000,000, and a proposed provision authorizing the disposition or expenditure by the President of supplies, services, or funds available under the act of March 11, 1941 (22 U. S. C. 411–419), in the amount of $350,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 572); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1514. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 92 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1515. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, and the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to classify a new synthetic drug, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4421. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRANGER: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1618. An act to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education. H R. 3846. A bill to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their separation from service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 4747. A bill to establish an American mothers memorial commission to prepare plans and estimates of costs for the construction in the District of Columbia of a national memorial to the mothers of America; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4748. A bill to amend section 251 of chapter 8 of title 2 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 4749. A bill to permit certain aliens who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during any period of war in which the United States was engaged to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4750. A bill to authorize the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT:

H. J. Res. 272. Joint resolution to reduce the tax on admissions to cabarets, roof gardens, and similar entertainments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution expressing the intent of Congress in legislation relative to wartime seizure of property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. Res. 527. Resolution requesting the United States representative on the Combined Production and Resources Board to furnish certain information with regard to the Board to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. Res. 528. Resolution requesting the United States representative on the Combined Food Board to furnish certain information with regard to the Board to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. Res. 529. Resolution requesting the United States representative on the Combined Shipping Adjustment Board to furnish certain information with regard to the Board to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 530. Resolution requesting the United States representative on the Combined Raw Materials Board to furnish certain information with regard to the Board to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 531. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4421, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Res. 532. Resolution authorizing the Judiciary Committee to prepare a ready-reference list of the powers of the President when acting as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass a law enabling the ceiling prices on fluorspar to be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4751. A bill for the relief of J. T. Melson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 4752. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Quattlebaum; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4753. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Zucker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4754. A bill for the relief of Solomon Schtiernman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4755. A bill for the relief of Morris Zucker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4756. A bill for the relief of Charles Zucker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 4757. A bill for the relief of Mathew Mattas; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5615. By Mr. BARRETT: Petition of Broma L. Nefsy, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and nine other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Moorcroft, Wyo., urging consideration and support for the passage of House bill 2082, suspending the alcoholic beverage traffic for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5616. By Mr. CAPOZZOLI: Petition of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Richmond County Post, 80, to transfer Halloran General Hospital to the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5617. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 283 citizens of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5618. By Mr. ELLISON of Maryland: Petition of Andrew J. Tempel and other sundry citizens of the city of Baltimore and State of Maryland, consisting of 276 sheets, containing over 6,000 signatures, opposing the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, or any other bill of like nature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5619. By Mr. GALE: Petitions signed by 2,740 citizens of Minneapolis and vicinity, opposing House bill 2082 which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5620. By Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania: Petitions signed by 4,000 residents of the Twenty-ninth Congressional District, protesting against the passage of all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5621. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of the City Council of Boston, Mass., favoring passage of House Joint Resolution 117, for national recognition of Patriots' Day on April 19 each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5622. By the SPEAKER: Petition of executive director, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the need for correction of pollution, etc.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5623. Also, petition of the secretary, Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the passage of House bill 2241, and others; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of wisdom, by whom the meek are guided in judgment, Thou hast called us to be fellow workers with Thee. We would face the responsibilities committed to our hands in the daily sense of the eternal. Our strength is unequal to our task. Our insights are not deep enough for the solving of the tangled tragedy of our ailing world. Our weakness and failure cry out for inner enforcement. Before we can help Thee change the world we know that we ourselves must be changed, lest our hostile spirits, our bitter tempers, our selfish hearts may play traitor to the commonwealth of brotherhood to which our lips pay homage.

May no shoddy or selfish workmanship of ours mar the divine mosaic of Thy will which, day by day, our hands may help to fashion. In tense times that tempt to petulance, grant us the grace of patience, remembering always that courtesy is rarer than courage and that a soft answer turneth away wrath. To a world strewn with ashes of destruction, where tears like rivers stream o'er pain-lined faces, where somber robes of grief and loss mark the passing of dismal days, make us the ministers of Thy healing, the channels of Thy grace, that to those who sit in darkness and desolation there may come beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garments of praise for the spirit of heaviness. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 4, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Kentucky; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Resolution 44

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to pass a law enabling the ceiling prices on fluor spar to be increased

"Whereas fluor spar is a vital and necessary one, highly essential in the war effort; and whereas the present ceiling prices on fluor spar are entirely too low to encourage the proper production of this necessary material: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"1. That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky memorializes the Congress of the United States that it, at the earliest possible date, take such action as may be necessary to increase by 10 percent the ceiling price of fluor spar, and to take such additional action as may be necessary to authorize and require the approval of such increase, in order to insure a sufficient supply of fluor spar to meet the war requirements.

"2. Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President and Chief Clerk of the Senate of the United States, the United States Senator from Kentucky, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and the Representative in Congress from Kentucky.

"KENNETH H. TUGGLE,
"President of the Senate.
"HARRY LEE WATERFIELD,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"Attest:
"MARY LOU HEEBBARD,
"Assistant Chief Clerk of Senate.
"Approved March 20, 1944.
"SIMEON WILLIS,
"Governor."

(The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

Also by Mr. BARKLEY:

A resolution of the General Assembly of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 79

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

"Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, That application be and it hereby is made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided,* That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

" 'SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

" 'SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall, however, be subject to the qualification that in the event of a war in which the United States is engaged creating a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power, while the United States is actively engaged in such war, to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

" 'SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall effect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

" 'SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.'

"And be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of

Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"HARRY LEE WATERFIELD,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"KENNETH H. TUGGLE,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"B. L. HARGROVE,
"Chief Clerk of House.

"Approved March 20, 1944.
"SIMEON WILLIS,
"Governor."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, but for and on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who is absent from the Senate today, and who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Finance Committee on Veterans' Legislation, I report favorably House bill 3377 without amendment, House bill 3356 without amendment, and House bill 4519 without amendment, and also Senate bill 1726, introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], reported favorably with amendments—all for the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports will be received and the bills will be placed on the calendar, as will be indicated.

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. CLARK of Missouri), from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1726. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans; with amendments (Rept. No. 853);

H. R. 3356. A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War I and World War II and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War II veterans for benefits under the latter act; without amendment (Rept. No. 854);

H. R. 3377. A bill to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 855); and

H. R. 4519. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 856).

My Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. Res. 282. Resolution providing for an investigation concerning the disclosure of information obtained through censorship; without amendment (Rept. No. 857), and, under the rule the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1758. A bill to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930; with amendments (Rept. No. 858).

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Mr. GILLETTE, by unanimous consent, introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) relating to the employment of counsel to the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate investigating certain matters, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MILLKIN, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NYE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. WILSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

CONSERVATION, CONTROL, AND USE OF WATER RESOURCES OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN (S. DOC. NO. 191)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am authorized by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to ask unanimous consent that there may be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, a report by the Bureau of Reclamation on the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin in the States of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask if I am correct in understanding that the request for printing is made at the direction of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. By the authority and at the request of that committee; yes.

Mr. WHITE. And the request is for the publication of the report with respect to the waters of the Missouri River?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of the Missouri River Basin; yes.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER BEFORE INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA

[Mr. LANGER asked for and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a meeting held under the auspices of the India League of America, at the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., on May 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

IRRIGATION VERSUS NAVIGATION

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Irrigation Versus Navigation," published in the Minneapolis Star-Journal and reprinted in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of May 2, 1944, together with a news article entitled "Missouri River Is Low for May," published in the Bismarck Tribune of May 2, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

MILK FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN—STATEMENT BY DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of milk as part of diet of the noonday lunch for school children, made by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on May 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANPOWER NEEDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Much Manpower?" published in the New York Times of May 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATIONARY TAXATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NORTHWESTERN MILLER

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Inflationary Taxation," published in the Northwestern Miller of May 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS—LETTER FROM GOVERNOR OF MICHIGAN AND RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from the Governor of Michigan, addressed to my colleague and myself, urging the bitter importance of action by Congress as swiftly as possible in respect to the termination of war contracts. Inasmuch as the Senate has already acted in part on the subject by passing Senate bill 1718 yesterday, we have already partially met the Governor's prayer, but I think his statement on behalf of the war-production areas of Michigan should be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of the House of Representatives, where action still remains to be taken before anything conclusive will have occurred.

I read just one sentence from the Governor's letter to indicate that the statements which I myself made in connection with the debate were not exaggerated. He says:

> Unless there is prompt action—without further delay—we may find ourselves overtaken by a climax in tragedy in the great war-production centers of this State.

I am very glad the Senate has already acted, and hope House action will not be long delayed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Governor's letter, together with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, which was approved by the Michigan Legislature, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lansing, May 4, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATORS: I know that you both have been doing everything within your power to hasten essential legislation looking toward the termination of war contracts. But I want to urge that you cannot unduly emphasize the desperate necessity for immediate action, as respects the war production centers of Michigan.

I have heard from many of the men who are responsible for the management of our automotive plants and have just conferred with several of them again. They have done a magnificent job in respect to war production. They are prepared to do the same kind of a job in reconversion to peace production. But they can do nothing until Congress acts on pending reconversion legislation. They are helpless—and so are a million workers—until Congress acts. Executive orders which can be changed every 20 minutes are not

enough. There must be speedy action which deals with this problem by statutory (and conclusive) action.

The long delay in this action—although our automotive spokesmen have repeatedly appeared before various congressional committees on the subject—is not only seriously affecting contemporary morale but it invites a tragic debacle if the war in any major sector should suddenly end. We would have an unemployment situation—and a depression complex—on our hands, beside which the old "bank holiday" was a tea party.

I cannot state too emphatically that there is nothing more important at this moment than the speedy enactment of legislation to deal swiftly, expeditiously, and conclusively with the termination of war contracts and with the similar clearance of plants so that peacetime reconversion can proceed—to be followed with least possible delay by legislation to care for the disposal of surplus property. This problem is already upon us in marked degree. When the war ends, it will present us with a crisis in this area and in other parts of the country, unparalleled since the Civil War, unless an adequate formula is written now.

I realize that several different committees of the House and Senate have been earnestly laboring with this complex problem for many months. I realize that the answers are not simple. I realize that you both have consistently pushed these efforts. But I also realize that unless there is prompt action—without further delay—we may find ourselves overtaken by a climax in tragedy in the great war-production centers of this State.

So I take the liberty of respectfully urging that something with finality be done about this matter at once. There is nothing more that we can do. We are now at the mercy of Congress. We cannot even plan for reconversion until Congress acts. I speak for Michigan in this respect. The situation is no less pressing in other war production States. I beg of you to get action on this legislation before it is too late.

In this same connection, I am attaching a copy of a concurrent resolution approved at the recent extraordinary session of the Michigan Legislature.

Sincerely,

HARRY F. KELLY,
Governor.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide for the prompt settlement of war contracts on termination thereof and for the removal and disposition of Government-owned facilities.

Whereas the manufacturing industry in the State of Michigan has been almost wholly converted to the prosecution of the war; and,

Whereas upon the cessation of hostilities, problems of the most urgent character will arise in connection with the reconversion of manufacturing for peacetime production and the employment of labor in connection therewith; and

Whereas the prompt settlement of war contracts and the removal of governmental supplies, material, and equipment from the manufacturing plants in the shortest possible time is essential to the resumption of peacetime production; and

Whereas unless a solution to these problems is provided for in advance by suitable congressional legislation, serious unemployment will ensue affecting the welfare of the State of Michigan and other sections of the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to provide for the prompt settlement of war contracts on termination thereof and for the removal and disposition of Government-owned facilities, supplies, and materials located within industrial plants so that peacetime production for peacetime employment can be resumed in such plants at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of Congress of the United States representing the State of Michigan.

POSITION OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS BILL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in order to avoid any possibility of mistake or misunderstanding with reference to the position taken by the General Accounting Office or the Comptroller General with respect to Senate bill 1718, which was passed yesterday, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General, and my reply to his letter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 4, 1944.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: During debate in the Senate yesterday on the bill S. 1718, certain statements were made by you, in response to questions of Senators DAVIS and KILGORE, which did not clearly and completely express to the Senate the position I have consistently taken with respect to legislation for a settlement program for war contract termination claims. I know you did not intend and could not have intended to misstate my position or in any way to mislead the Senators as to that position and as to the effectiveness of the role of the General Accounting Office under the provisions of the bill S. 1718. However, I am afraid misunderstanding may have resulted and I feel I would be lacking in frankness and candor if I should fail to invite your attention to this possibility.

In appearances before and reports to your subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and various committees of the House of Representatives I have consistently expressed the belief, with reasons which I tried to make clear, that the General Accounting Office cannot make any truly effective contribution—worth the cost and effort—to the war contract termination settlement program unless it is given authority to review settlements arranged with contractors by the war contracting agencies before such settlements become final, by agreement or otherwise, and before final payment is made. During almost a year I have given this problem frequent and careful consideration. I have discussed it at length with committees of the Congress, with many representatives of the war contracting agencies, and with many representatives of war contractors. Nothing has occurred to shake my confidence in the soundness of this position.

In my report to you, February 22, 1944, on an earlier draft of the bill, S. 1718, I suggested no specific major amendments to the plan of the bill with respect to including provisions for a review of settlements prior to their finality because I was given to understand that your committee had already determined to approve a bill without provision therefor. In the report I made clear my views in that regard but proposed only a few specific amendments to other parts of the bill.

Section 16 (a) and (b) of the pending bill, although it may have the appearance of giving the General Accounting Office a limited role for the detection of fraud actually does not even do that for the reason that there is no assurance that the records made and made available to the General Accounting Office will be adequate to make possible the detection of fraud.

Section 16 (c) of the pending bill, a new subsection, may give the appearance of imposing upon the General Accounting Office a new and effective duty to perform. Actually it would not do so. It would rather serve to limit the general duties and authority of the General Accounting Office which it now has under sections 312 and 313 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 25, 26). I would like, therefore, to urge you to endeavor to have this subsection eliminated from the bill.

I shall appreciate it if you should see fit to ask that this letter be inserted in the RECORD.

With my personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

MAY 5, 1944.

Hon. LINDSAY WARREN,
The Comptroller General.

MY DEAR COMPTROLLER GENERAL: I have your letter of May 4, 1944, inviting my attention to the possibility that the statements made by me on the floor of the Senate during the debate on the bill S. 1718, in respect to the questions of Senators DAVIS and KILGORE, may result in some misunderstanding.

In order to make certain that your position on the bill S. 1718 be stated correctly, I asked that part VI, Statement by the Comptroller General, of the Report of the War Contracts Subcommittee, dated March 20, 1944, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and this passage may be found on page 3915. This passage quotes extensively from your letter addressed to me as chairman of the War Contracts Subcommittee, dated February 22, 1944. In your letter you stated that, while you are still of the view that there should be an independent audit and review of proposed settlements prior to the making of final payment thereunder, nevertheless, "if the Congress, as a matter of public policy, should decide otherwise, I have no objections to offer to the bill S. 1718, except as hereinbefore noted, as it is believed that the provisions of the bill, if properly administered, are adequate to accomplish the announced objective thereof."

A draft of part VI of the report, referred to above, was submitted to you on February 29 with a request for your suggestions for improvements, if it did not "properly reflect the views of your Office." You replied on the same date by letter that "The draft of section submitted fairly and adequately reflects the view of this Office on the matter."

I take it that your position as expressed in your letter of February 22 has remained unchanged.

You further observe that section 16 (a) and (b) of S. 1718 does not give any assurance that the records prepared in connection with contract settlements and made available to the General Accounting Office, will be adequate to make possible the detection of fraud. The bill places the primary responsibility for the prevention and discovery of fraud on the shoulders of the Director of Contract Settlement and the contracting agencies. Section 18 (a) provides specifically that "The Director shall establish policies for such supervision and review within the contracting agencies of termination settlements and interim financing as he deems necessary and appropriate to prevent and detect fraud * * *."

In this connection I would like to refer you also to subsection (c) of section 16, which provides that the "Comptroller Gen-

eral may investigate the settlements completed by each contracting agency for the purpose of reporting to the Congress from time to time on * * *.

"(3) Whether such methods and procedures (or the contracting agencies) adequately protect the interest of the Government."

The adequacy of the records to be prepared by the contracting agencies is an important consideration in connection with the questic whether the interest of the Government is adequately protected. Should you find that such records are inadequate for the purpose of allowing the General Accounting Office to determine, (1) whether the settlement payments were made in accordance with the settlement, and (2) whether the records transmitted to the General Accounting Office, or other information, warrant a reasonable belief that the settlement was induced by fraud, then this fact should be reported to the Congress in accordance with subsection (c) of section 16.

In connection with your observation that section 16 would serve to limit the general duties and authority of the General Accounting Office, which it now has under sections 312 and 313 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, 42 Stat. 25, 26, I would like to state that there was no intention of so limiting the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act.

Section 16 (d) specifically provides that "the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General of the United States shall not be affected by this act except to the extent necessary to give effect to the specific provisions thereof."

I believe strongly that the bill as passed by the Senate is not only in keeping with the Budget and Accounting Act but definitely stresses the fact that the General Accounting Office is indispensable as an effective arm of the Congress in connection with investigations of the care and efficiency of the executive branch of the Government in the administration of this legislation.

In answer to your request, I am asking that your letter be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my reply.

With my expression of esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE ACT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Overton
Austin	Ellender	Radcliffe
Bailey	Ferguson	Reed
Ball	George	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gerry	Reynolds
Barkley	Gillette	Russell
Bilbo	Guffey	Shipstead
Bridges	Hatch	Smith
Brooks	Hawkes	Stewart
Burton	Hayden	Taft
Bushfield	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Weeks
Cordon	Millikin	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	White
Davis	Murray	Wilson
Downey	O'Mahoney	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are members of the committee to visit the Coast Guard Academy, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] if he knows whether there is present any Senator on his side of the aisle who desires to discuss the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. WHITE. I do not know whether any Senator on this side is immediately prepared to do so. However, I understand that a number of Senators on this side of the Chamber desire to talk about the bill, or at least to ask questions about it. I confess that I do not know at the moment of any Senator who is now ready to proceed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yesterday the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] both expressed a desire to go over the matter carefully, and each intimated that he would probably speak on the bill, as the Senator from Maine, who was present, knows. I then voiced the hope that if any Senator wanted the matter to go over until Monday it would go over until Monday so they could have every opportunity to examine the report. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is now in the Chamber. He can answer with respect to what his wishes now are.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the report to which the Senator from Tennessee refers brings to the attention of the Members of the Senate a great deal of new matter in connection with the lend-lease program, and I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that if the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from New Hampshire or any other Senators have in mind to make statements with respect to the matter time should be afforded them to do so.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I agree with that statement entirely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I express the hope that the consideration of the bill will go over until Monday. I am wondering if it would be possible for any of us to look over the data which were furnished to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee substantiating the report which he made to the Senate yesterday?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, indeed, it would be.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to make the same request of the Truman committee. For the past 2 weeks I have consulted with the attorney for the committee, and I was promised a résumé of such action as had been taken up to date by the Truman committee, but up to the moment I have not received that data. For that reason, Mr. President, I hope the consideration of the measure and the vote on it will be postponed until next Monday.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. There is one other matter to which I think reference should be made. Yesterday afternoon, after the Senate recessed, the Committee on Appropriations discussed the report received from its staff, and it will be seen from an examination of the report that the aggregate amount with respect to the Latin American and South American countries was placed in the RECORD, but the individual amounts for each country were withheld. They are, however, available to any Member of the Senate who may care to see and to use them.

The committee thought that that matter ought to be published in the RECORD. It was then brought out that the War and Navy Departments, and possibly the State Department, and the Foreign Economic Administration, might not want the matter published. I was directed to write a letter to the Departments and to state that the committee, by unanimous vote, expressed its desire to put into the RECORD the entire facts, giving the separate figures with respect to each one of

the South and Central American countries, and asking those to whom the letters were addressed if they now had any objection to that being done, although they had already registered their objections with the committee. I have not had time to hear from those to whom the letters were addressed, but I am confident I will. I have men at work on the matter now. The letters went out this morning by special messenger, and I expect to hear during the day. But we will not hear in time.

Of course, that does not bind the committee, and it does not bind the Senate. We have a right to put in the information, anyway. I am merely giving the entire Senate the facts as they are.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, for whatever it may be worth, I express to the Senator from Texas the opinion that a vote could not be had today on the pending bill, even if it were so desired.

Mr. McKELLAR. So I hope the Senator from Texas will agree to let the bill go over until Monday.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, unless some Senator is prepared to proceed with discussion of the bill at this time, and wishes to do so, it is my desire that consideration of the bill go over until Monday.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask a question. Does the Senator consider that lend-lease funds may be used on a project which cannot in all probability be finished in time to be used for war purposes, or whether such funds should be devoted solely to war? I have been somewhat concerned that as we approach the end of the war we will continue to make loans or assignments of materials to foreign governments, really for post-war purposes. I do not think that is the intention of the original act.

As an example, I do not understand that lend-lease funds were to be used for the pipe line from the Mediterranean Sea to Arabia. It is my belief that lend-lease funds should not be so used, because that project is essentially a post-war one. If any money is to be spent abroad for post-war purposes, it should be passed upon by Congress.

Does the Senator feel that the Lend-Lease Act as now written precludes the use of lend-lease money for post-war projects?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I have not reviewed technically and meticulously the language of the original act; but certainly it is my present conception that it was intended to be limited to war activities, and would not include the kind of projects the Senator has in mind.

So far as the pipe line project is concerned, I do not understand there is any proposal to use lend-lease funds for it. The tentative proposal which the committee is now investigating was one for which the Petroleum Reserves Corporation was to secure the funds under the R. F. C., and so on, and so on.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that. I merely wanted the Senator's assurance, if that was his opinion, that the Lend-Lease Act and lend-lease money could not be used for such a purpose and for similar purposes which might be contemplated elsewhere.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to confirm what the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Texas have said. I do not believe that under the Lend-Lease Act any such allocations of money could be made, and I am quite sure they would not be made. But I wish to say further that I agree with the Senator from Ohio in his statement that any funds which are used for any purpose except the prosecution of the war should be passed on by the Congress itself, as a separate matter, and should not be included in lend-lease funds.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator to ask a question.

Mr. LANGER. I noted the Senator's statement about not using any of the lend-lease money for the purpose of transporting oil from Arabia. Can the Senator tell where the money came from that was used to build the oil transport pipe lines operating from the Norman fields in Canada?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; I cannot. I do not think they came from lend-lease funds; I am quite sure they did not.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not that the Canol project?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. All that was done by the War Department, under the supervision of the Service of Supply, headed by General Somervell. I assume the funds were obtained from War Department appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. They were not lend-lease funds, and they do not appear in this account.

Mr. CONNALLY. They were not lend-lease funds.

Mr. LANGER. Does the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations know where the funds which were used for that purpose did come from?

Mr. McKELLAR. Very frankly, I do not. I should like to know.

Mr. CONNALLY. My assumption is that they came from War Department appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it was an extravagance. I have thought so for a long time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? If he is through, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Tennessee know whether any gold or silver has been transferred to other countries under lend-lease?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I can answer that question.

Mr. McKELLAR. But if any has, I should like to know that, too.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senators that in the investigation of the matter with regard to the eastern oil situation it developed that no coin or cash had been advanced under lend-lease, but that there had been furnished some silver bullion in the form of metal, like other metals. However, it developed that the British had reminted some of that silver bullion for use in the Near East and in other parts of the world. That is as far as I am advised regarding the matter.

Mr. President, I hope that Senators who are interested in this matter will give their attention to it between now and Monday. I very much regret to have to consent to the delay, because we are anxious to pass and dispose of the bill. But I am still not disposed to rush Senators into consideration of the matter, when they request additional time to examine the reports made to the Committee on Appropriations, and the supporting data.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to all Senators that, while the specific amounts given to each South American country are not set forth in the RECORD which is on Senators' desks this morning, the clerk of the committee has been instructed to give the data to any Senator who asks for it; and probably it will be published, unless the departments give some good reason which the committee considers sufficient.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does not the Senator ask unanimous consent now to have the data published in the RECORD, for use on Monday?

Mr. McKELLAR. I would rather wait until I hear from the departments. I desire to cooperate with them, if it is possible to do so; and I would rather have their consent. I think that was the attitude of the committee. But the committee was not bound by the departments' preference, and stated that it would not be bound by the attitude of the departments, unless it saw fit to be bound.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE AND REFER TAX BILL DURING RECESS—MEETING OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive the tax simplification bill, which will be messaged over to the Senate during the afternoon, but probably after the adjournment or recess of the Senate, and that the bill be referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to state that

the Finance Committee will meet at 10 o'clock on Monday for consideration of the tax simplification bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported adversely the nomination of Patrick J. McGrath to be postmaster at Bayonne, N. J., with the recommendation that the nomination be not confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. CONNALLY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 8, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

John J. Lynch, Uxbridge.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harry C. Duntley, Carrington.

WEST VIRGINIA

Sadie G. Petty, Chesapeake.
Wade H. Garrett, Clarksburg.
Willard F. Shrewsbury, Cra'o Orchard.
Virginia C. Canterbury, Kimberly.
Frederick B. Cline, Mount Gay.
James E. Akers, North Charleston.
John L. Badzek, Osage.
Oscar S. Conner, Pageton.
Misouri J. Nutter, Prenter.
Evalyn C. Huff, Rand.
Daisy Barker, Rhodell.
Clarence J. Powell, Romney.
John H. Shay, Star City.
Starling L. Sinnett, Superior.
George L. Wilcoxon, Tams.

WISCONSIN

Hyacinth S. Gibbs, Argonne.
Rochelle I. Miller, Bay City.
Theresa J. Keyes, Cobb.
Archie C. D. Dehler, La Valle.
Forrest W. Friedel, Milton.
Doris M. Kading, South Wayne.
Avis D. Wandry, Westfield.
Minor A. Potter, Wild Rose.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, the King eternal, in this day of disquiet and unrest, we await Thy benediction. Our Master and our Lord, Thou who lived and taught in an emancipating ministry of a wonderful hope, whose Bible says: "The wilderness shall become a garden and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose," allow not Thy people to settle down into a benumbing indifference. The black lands of this dreary world, with their intolerable afflictions, shall yet be clothed with abounding fruition and promise. O let the fine flavor of this expectancy fill each day with labors that need not be ashamed.

Every great movement in the annals of this world is the triumph of industry stamped with the images of sincere hearts and honest consciences. We praise Thee that while the night is long, the morning will surely come. Opportunity is ours for stepping into the stream of action as other waters flow on. Shaped and fashioned by our devotion to a righteous cause, help us to make these critical and privileged days memorable by hard work and even drudgery, meeting courageously the vital issues of state. As we escape the boundaries of narrowness and smallness of vision, so can we claim the heritage of the sons of freedom. Dear Lord, we pray for our Commander in Chief that he may feel the undergirding of the everlasting arms. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1718. An act to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 176. An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

THE LATE MRS. ALFRED E. SMITH

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation joins with New York City in paying tribute to one of the most beloved women who ever graced the American scene. Yesterday morning Mrs. Alfred Emanuel Smith died in St. Vincent's Hospital in New York. Mrs. Smith was known not only to the people of New York but to all the citizens of our Nation. She was admired and loved because she embodied the finest things that a woman can have—that is, qualities of a great wife and a splendid mother. While Mrs. Smith was known for her reticence and retirement, despite the immense popularity of her husband, she was always to be found at his side. The vows that she took in St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church—"for richer, for poorer, for better or worse, in sickness and in health, until death do us part"—she kept until the end of her days. Mrs. Smith set for the entire Nation the finest example of happy, contented, and faithful marital life.

To Governor Smith, who is one of the Nation's greatest Americans, the entire country offers its deepest and most sincere condolences. It is the hope of the entire citizenry of the Republic that God will lighten his sorrow as much as it is possible and that the Governor may be spared from any further sorrow for many years to come.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 7 minutes today after the regular business and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the City Council of Boston.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to be made later this afternoon and to include therein certain extracts from departmental officials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Resolution 533, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That DEAN M. GILLESPIE, of Colorado, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Accounts of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the conclusion of the legislative business for the day, and after other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a brief statement by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include two short excerpts of statements by the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WINTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE LATE MRS. ALFRED E. SMITH

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a short editorial as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death on yesterday of Mrs. Alfred E. Smith removes from our midst not only a modest and courageous American wife and gracious friend, but also a typical devoted American mother. Perhaps in her own mind and heart her motherhood constituted her own particular glory that she would wish most to be remembered by.

As May 14, the day we dedicate, all over our fair land, to American mothers and American motherhood, draws near, may I be permitted, here and now, to dedicate, in advance of the event, a moment of that day to the sweet memory of Mrs. Alfred E. Smith, American mother.

The following editorial, which appeared in today's New York Times, sums up in admirable and eloquent fashion the virtues of this lovely lady to whom we pay heartfelt homage.

MRS. ALFRED E. SMITH

It will be 44 years tomorrow since her marriage. The stroke is cruel. The long "bright day is done." The survivor's sole consolation is the deep religious faith and hope that are his as they were his wife's. Because he is the best-beloved citizen of New York, because his wife won the affection of many friends, this is a public sorrow and we may speak of it. The life of these two seems like an idyl of some happier world.

She, too, was a fourth warder, but her parents had moved up to the Bronx. Young Mr. Smith bicycled up there time and again. He was a long time winning her. The wedding journey was to Bath Beach, where they lived for a while. Then they came back from Brooklyn to Madison Street, to Peck Slip. The convent-bred girl washed, ironed, cooked, scrubbed, swept. Mr. Smith began his political career. Thereafter whenever she could, wherever he was speaking, she was in the audience. After his eye had found her he knew, as he said, that "he was all right."

Whatever honors came upon him, to whatever post he was called, she was equal to any duty or fortune. When he was a candidate for President the crowds in the cities which she visited with him gave her a friendly welcome. Whether she was doing her own housework or mistress of that somber palace, the Governor's mansion, she was serene, living for her family, for others, for charity, for her church. In the turbulent stream of events the life of these two together is a gracious remembrance. The presses swarm with novels and romances. In none can be found anything half as pleasant and as touching as the game of cards that Mr. and Mrs. Smith played every night before bedtime.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a copy of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by Mr. George Radin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution from the Whitney County war board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILLIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Maj. Gen. Edward Martin to the Independent Petroleum Association, and an address by J. D. Standiford, of Breckenridge, Tex., to the Independent Petroleum Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Philadelphia Dispatch, which refers to the skill of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a resolution of the City Council of Grinnell, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which will come up shortly does not go far enough. Yesterday at the other end of the Capitol it was amended to include an investigation of the relationship existing between Ward's and its employees. That is all right so far as it goes but we should go further and have the investigation include the relationship existing between the employees and the union, and the union officers, so that we may get the whole picture. The investigation will not give us anything new about the foundation for the seizure which we do not already know, because the Smith committee has already investigated the question as to legality of the order issued by the War Labor Board, on which the order was based. But the Congress should also know how the union gets its members as well as whether the company deals fairly with the employees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the Appendix a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FLOOD CONDITIONS IN THE CENTRAL WEST

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the record of damage and loss resulting from the unprecedented floods in the Central West grows with each report. Already it exceeds all official records for the last 100 years, and final estimates have not been received.

One of the greatest sources of distress is lack of feed for livestock. The livestock has been saved through concentration on the high points in the flooded

area, but all the feed which has not been washed away has been spoiled by prolonged immersion and is unserviceable. Large numbers of livestock of every kind must either be supplied with feed from the outside or must be sold before they are ready for the market, or must be allowed to starve.

County Agent R. A. Langerbacher, of St. Charles County, Mo., one of the inundated counties, estimates that an initial shipment of 20,000 bushels of corn or oats must be promptly provided for his county alone.

In response to inquiries, may I say that the Department of Agriculture has arranged to route Canadian oats direct from Minneapolis to Missouri and Illinois, and is making arrangements for prompt delivery of other feedstuffs to meet the emergency. The Department has also forwarded a favorable report on the pending bill for relief appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget, and we hope to be able to bring the bill up for consideration in the House early next week.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein six short speeches on the subject of air cargo. These speeches exceed the amount allowed, two pages, and I have an estimate from the printer that their insertion will cost $288.75.

Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a clipping from the Centralia Evening Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR VETERANS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. The Committee on Education has had under consideration the bill H. R. 3846, which deals with the post-war educational program for veterans and the present educational program for veterans who have been and will be discharged in the near future.

That bill has been reported. It was reported on May 4, and the report and bill are available at the document room.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Does this bill provide for the contemplated United International Office of Education?

Mr. BARDEN. Oh, no, indeed. We have not wasted our time thinking about a proposition of that kind. This deals with the veteran educational program, and is a real States' rights bill, in fact. I urge that you compare the provisions of this bill with the provisions of the education section of the so-called G. I. bill.

I hope the Members will give it consideration, especially in view of the fact that the subject matter of this bill will be handled next week.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

DRAFTING OF FARM YOUTH

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that is more disturbing to the country today than the fact that every morning we pick up the newspaper and read "the Army will take the farm boys." The next day it denies it. Planting time is here and we farmers ought to know.

I am in the same position as a hundred thousand others. I am ready to plant 60 acres of corn. If my boy has to go to the Army, that is all right, but I ought to know. I could plant that land in soybeans and still raise a crop, but if I plant corn and lose the boy, I will lose the corn, because I have nobody to cultivate it.

The Army should let us know. We cooperated just a little too well it seems last year, raised too much food. Too many take things for granted. Food may be just as scarce 6 months or a year from now as it is plentiful at the present time. I warn the War Department that if it wants the whole world fed then it better let us have a little help.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

RATION POINTS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning we all read in the papers that ration points had gone off a lot of meats. I wonder if the people realize just what has been done.

Ration points have been reduced from 70 to 30 a month approximately, and the points on beef are about the same as they have been; the butter points and the cheese points remain the same. The result is therefore that the people will not get a single thing more than they got before when they had 70 points and lamb and pork were rationed. That is the situation. I hope the people will not be fooled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. TOLAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE MONTGOMERY WARD CASE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE SEIZURE OF PROPERTY OF MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 521.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make an investigation with respect to the seizure by the United States, on April 26, 1944, of property of Montgomery Ward & Co. with a view to determining, among other things, the authority in law for such seizure and whether the opinion of the Attorney General rendered in connection with such seizure discloses adequate grounds for reaching the conclusion that such seizure was authorized by law.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after the word "company" in line 10 strike out the balance of line 10, and line 11, and on page 2 strike out all of lines 1, 2, and 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall of course yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York but I should like to ask the gentleman in all fairness whether he would not agree to divide his 30 minutes between those who are opposed to and those who are in favor of the resolution.

Mr. FISH. May I not suggest to the Chairman of the Committee on Rules that if he feels the resolution requires more time, the proper procedure would be for him to ask unanimous consent for an additional half hour. There is no purpose to cut off debate, I am sure, on this side, but all of my time is taken and I cannot yield any to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us who is opposed to the resolution?

Mr. SABATH. I have several requests from Members who desire to speak against the resolution. On the other hand, of course, I have many requests

from Members who desire to speak for the resolution. My aim, as the gentleman knows, is, as it has always been, to try to divide the time as equally as possible between the majority and the minority, and when I propounded my question I had that purpose in mind.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman himself is in favor of the resolution, is he not?

Mr. SABATH. I am; I am.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the gentleman has very few he knows who are opposed to it.

Mr. SABATH. I have several Members who are opposed to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Illinois could take care of them.

Mr. SABATH. I am trying to, but I want to know whether the gentleman from New York will do likewise.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If there are any on this side who are opposed to it we will try to take care of them.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman from New York take care of them? I know he wants to be as liberal and fair as I am.

Mr. FISH. Let me say I have had no requests against the resolution so far.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. Will this come out of my time, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. It will come out of the gentleman's half hour if the gentleman yields; but the Chair will not take out of the gentleman's time the colloquy between himself, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. SABATH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot, for it will come out of my time and I have too little as it is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when I observed last Friday morning in the Committee on Rule the determined effort of the Republicans and the gentlemen from Georgia and Virginia to force immediate action on this resolution, which had been introduced just the day before, I felt it was intended to be another smear effort; but, after I had obtained information last Saturday and Sunday bearing on the outrageous conduct of Mr. Sewell Avery, his vicious and antagonistic action against the administration ever since 1935 in connection with the N. R. A., I came to the conclusion that a real, thorough, honest-to-god investigation should be had, so that the American people might have the whole truth—the true facts—behind Mr. Avery's refusal to comply with three or four unanimous rulings of the War Labor Board, which is composed of representatives of employers, labor, and of the public—about his deliberate refusal to comply with the requests of the Government representatives, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Taylor and the United States marshal, and his demand to be carried out by soldiers, so he could raise the cry "military force."

The opening gun of the modern Copperhead rebellion has been fired by Sewell Avery in Chicago, and a Chicago journalist has predicted that the picture of Mr. Avery being carried out of his office by soldiers will be the prize Republican campaign document.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the American people should know that we still have a constitutional government, that the laws of our country must be enforced, and that the laws apply even to Mr. Avery himself. When full information is brought to light, I feel that Mr. Avery and those with and behind him will be condemned from one end of the country to the other. Not only under the Constitution but under several acts of Congress the President is empowered and required to act in certain emergency conditions—which acts, I repeat, apply to this great man, Mr. Avery, and Montgomery Ward & Co. also. Should the President refuse to carry out the mandates of the Constitution or the laws of the land, he could be charged with misfeasance, and if he had by inaction permitted a strike to spread—as the strike certainly would have—the Roosevelt and New Deal haters could have demanded his impeachment. These detractors would not stop at anything.

The President had no alternative. He was obliged to act affirmatively. Mr. Avery, as I have stated, refused three or four times to comply with the findings of the War Labor Board—an agency created by an act of Congress. His excuse for refusing to comply with the orders of the Board was that he did not know whether the union maintained a majority of the company's employees in its membership. He was appealed to to extend the employee-employer contract for 30 days so that an election could be held to determine whether a majority of the employees in the company wished to have the C. I. O. negotiate a wage agreement for them with the company in accordance with the law. A 30-day extension of the agreement would have meant but a bagatelle salary outlay compared to the great profits of the company. The record shows that Montgomery Ward & Co. has netted profits in the last 10 years in excess of $200,000,000, after payment of taxes and increases in officers' salaries amounting to more than 100 percent. This profit was made notwithstanding the wages of the employees during the last 7 years, covering which I have the figures, increased only about 15 percent, so that the average wage of each employee, including department heads and other high-paid workers, exclusive of officers, was slightly more than $25 a week. The officers' and directors' salaries have been increased every year since 1935 to date, the total salaries being $292,000 in 1934 and $561,000 in 1944, an increase of nearly 100 percent. Not only that but Mr. Avery during all these years has been drawing an annual salary of $100,000 and, in addition, he and the other officers and directors are recipients of bonuses.

In 1931 Mr. Avery was granted an option on 100,000 shares of common stock of Montgomery Ward & Co. at $11 a share under an arrangement made when he came with the company in November 1941. In December 1934 he exercised his option to the extent of 50,000 shares, and in June 1935 he purchased the remaining 48,000 shares. Today this stock which he acquired at $11 a share has a full value of $43 a share, which means an increase of $3,000,000 in value.

As to Montgomery Ward & Co. itself, it has obtained from the Government more than 36,000 war emergency priorities, and, I am reliably informed, it has obtained many deferments from military service for several of its employees on the ground that they are essential in the war effort, notwithstanding that it claimed that this company does not come under the provisions of the Connally-Smith Act of June 1943. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this company has also sold hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of farm implements, machinery, and even shoes to the Government. It also controls several manufacturing plants which are designated as divisions instead of subsidiaries, one of which is the Hummer Manufacturing Co., presently manufacturing gun mounts and propellers for airplanes, and a plant that manufactures carburetors and other items for war purposes. Montgomery Ward & Co. also has more than 6,000 branches throughout the country upon which hundreds of farmers must depend for their supplies and, I ask, can anyone argue that agriculture is not essential to the prosecution of the war?

Mr. Speaker, having obtained this information I came to the conclusion—not because I was afraid of being defeated due to the actions of some of the reactionaries on our side, or by reason of the fact that the administration has been defeated, I regret, on a number of pieces of proposed important legislation—that it was my duty to obtain for the American people and expose the facts in this matter, which facts have been withheld from them, they having received only one-sided information and much misinformation prejudicial to the administration. After being satisfied that a fair and unbiased investigating committee would be appointed, I felt that in the interest of our country this investigation should be had, firmly believing, I repeat, that when the country has all the facts before it, Mr. Avery and Montgomery Ward & Co. will be condemned for refusal to abide by the decisions and directives of a legally constituted authority—the War Labor Board—and the request of the President—the Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Mr. Avery and his board of directors who are the heads of other unfriendly corporations and lawyers think that this is the right time to fight and defeat labor organizations instead of trying to cooperate with the administration and the country in fighting the real enemies of our Nation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I must keep my pledge with other Members. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain figures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the agility with which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] switches from one position to another incites my admiration. On Monday evening he was violently opposed to the adoption of this resolution, but on Tuesday morning cool repentance came, and he shows up passionately advocating its adoption. For that act I thought well and good, but as for intent I was somewhat in doubt. I thought I smelt a device. Now I know I did. The gentleman, finding that he could neither indefinitely postpone consideration nor defeat the adoption of this resolution, throws himself into the movement, which adds nothing and subtracts nothing. It is like slipping a plugged nickel into a vending machine.

The gentleman is not content with the Government taking the property of Montgomery Ward & Co. from its owners and throwing their president out upon the street, but he would now skin the entire lot and nail their hides upon the door of the War Labor Board or the National Labor Relations Board, or both, as there probably would be hides enough to go all around. Those whose sense of right was outraged by this seizure should vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, what would Thomas Jefferson have said of the sorry spectacle which we are now viewing? Let me tell you in his own words:

> The spirit of 1776 is not dead. It has only been slumbering. The body of the American people is substantially republican. But their virtuous feelings have been played on by some fact with more fiction; they have been the dupes of artful maneuvers and made for a moment to be willing instruments in forging chains for themselves. The lesson we have had will probably be useful to the people at large, by showing to them how capable they are of being made the instruments of their own bondage.
>
> To open the doors of truth and to fortify the habit of testing everything by reason are the most effectual manacles we can rivet on the hands of our successors to prevent their manacling the people with their own consent. Cherish the spirit of our people and keep alive their attention. Do not be too severe upon their errors, but reclaim them by enlightening them. If once they become inattentive to the public affairs, you and I and Congress and assemblies, judges and Governors shall all become wolves.
>
> Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government. The people are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty. It is the manners and spirit of the people which preserve a republic in vigor. A degeneracy of these is a cancer which soon eats to the heart of its laws and constitution.
>
> The general insurrection of the world against its tyrants will ultimately prevail by appointing the object of government to the happiness of the people. If there be a God, and He is just, His day will come. He will never abandon the whole race of man to be eaten up by the leviathans and mammoths of a day.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago Montgomery Ward & Co., of Chicago, was seized by the United States Government and the management of the company forcibly ejected by armed troops. This company is a merchandising business engaged in serving the civilian needs of many of our citizens.

This action has shocked the American people, not only because of the high-handed and arrogant methods employed but because of its similarity to the lawless procedure employed by dictator governments against whose policies all free nations are fighting. In Nazi Germany the people are helpless. Thank God, in these United States this is not true. The people have their Congress. This country is not ruled by men, but by laws.

The Attorney General, acting in behalf of the President of the United States, claims the authority of laws passed by Congress and powers granted in the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The Congress has without doubt given unusual powers to the Chief Executive that America may prosecute the war to the best of its ability, but mark you this, neither the Congress nor the people intended a usurpation of additional authority or the loss of their fundamental liberties.

In defense of his seizure the Attorney General argues that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has a great constitutional reserve of power, and further that no business of any kind is immune from that power.

The founding fathers who wrote the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights had themselves suffered the tyranny of an autocratic king. Is it possible to believe that having led the Thirteen Colonies in revolt against high-handed usurpation of the people's liberty, the founding fathers would have given the same autocratic power even in time of war to any chief executive of a nation for whose complete liberty they had so gallantly fought?

May I ask you, my colleagues, to reread the Constitution and see if you can find any such implied grant of tyrannical powers contained therein?

I introduced House Resolution 521, providing for a committee of seven members, to investigate the emergency war powers laws passed by the Congress. The committee should determine if Congress has unwittingly given unwarranted power to the Chief Executive, and after careful study report its findings back to the Congress with whatever recommendations may be necessary.

I would like to say, not only as author of this resolution but I hope as one of the members of the committee to be set up thereunder, that this investigation should be kept on a high plane. The people are not interested in muckraking but want to know the facts and want to know to what extent their fundamental liberties are in jeopardy. This war is being fought for the principles of liberty.

I hope that this Congress will demonstrate to the citizens of the United States that the people's legislative body is alert to its responsibilities by passing this resolution by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 521 provides for the creation of a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker to investigate the seizure by the United States on April 26, 1944, of the property of Montgomery Ward & Co. Nothing has stirred the American people so deeply since the declaration of war on Germany, Italy, and Japan as the unwarranted seizure of the property of an American citizen, the bodily removal of the chief officer of the company by administrative officers, resorting not to judicial processes but the use of United States troops being trained to support and fight for the very principles of American freedom, here denied. The chief difference between the declaration of war on the Axis and the seizure of Montgomery Ward's is in the former case the American people were 100 percent behind the declaration-of-war action by our Government, while in this instance they are practically 100 percent opposed to the action of our Government.

The executive department of our Government professes to believe that it has the power to make this seizure of private property not engaged in war industry. The great majority of the membership of this body have a different opinion. I say the great majority because there will not be 25 votes against this resolution. We, who favor this resolution, desire a fair investigation. We are determined that if the Chief Executive has the power to strip a private citizen of his property and as the Attorney General assures the court, "There is no property immune," we in turn will strip the Chief Executive of that dictatorial assumption of power, by proper legislation.

I can say to you that we from Illinois are profoundly resentful of the persecution of the citizens of our State by the executive department. Our people are amazed by this unjustifiable action. For many years this administration has been making assaults on people who find themselves honestly opposed to administration policies. We of Illinois are aware of the persecution of the citizens of other States in the past because they could not see eye to eye with certain governmental policies. Now we have the same thing in Illinois because certain individuals are determined to stand upon their civil rights and refuse to abandon them.

I can say to you here and now that there is no greater American than Sewell Avery. Like many other Americans his path has been long and arduous but he traversed the highway with industry,

courage, and high character. He is not a young man. Many of his years were devoted to the public good. He has given unstintedly of the enthusiasm of his youth, the energy of middle life, the wisdom of advanced age. He holds a patriotic devotion to country and home which gives to us who admire him an inspiration for achievement. Like many others he has become a great merchant from a small merchant. Is there no longer opportunity in this country for a small businessman or his son who returns from the service to achieve, or will arbitrary and capricious Executive powers be permitted to rob them of the fruits of their labor? Are our soldiers and sailors fighting, giving their lives for such actions?

For the welfare of our country it is to be hoped that our soldiers and sailors have more confidence in and respect for their Commander in Chief than the President has for the rights guaranteed American citizens by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK], a member of the committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I seldom trespass on the time of the House nor would I do so now but for a feeling that in the consideration of the pending resolution we may be in the neighborhood of something fundamental. In my humble judgment confusion and inefficiency in Government result proportionately to the encroachment by one branch of Government upon the constitutional prerogative of another. Surely the wise and careful establishment of three separate and distinct branches of Government by our Constitution must have been aimed at least in large part at preventing just such confusion and inefficiency.

The pending resolution proposes the appointment of a special committee, authorized and directed to make an investigation with respect to the seizure by the United States, on April 26, 1944, of property of Montgomery Ward & Co., with a view to determining, among other things, the authority in law for such seizure and whether the opinion of the Attorney General rendered in connection with such seizure discloses adequate grounds for reaching the conclusion that such seizure was authorized by law. Investigating the authority in law for such seizure or whether the opinion of the Attorney General discloses adequate grounds for reaching the conclusion that seizure was authorized involves only a question of law. Indeed the only question involved in this entire controversy is whether the seizure was lawful or unlawful. The only thing that could be investigated is the question of whether the Chief Executive was or was not authorized by the Constitution or by law to take the action that he did. This it seems to me is peculiarly the constitutional prerogative of the judicial branch of the Government. In a controversy of this kind it is the province of the courts to find the pertinent facts and construe the law or determine that there is no law authorizing the act complained of. Congress is empowered to legislate. It may enact, amend, and repeal at pleasure, but when it undertakes also to construe the law and to supervise the manner of its execution it is in my judgment stepping out of its own province and doing the very thing for which the other branches of the Government have been so frequently and severely criticized in this Chamber.

I know it is proposed to amend the pending resolution by striking out all of the remainder of the paragraph after the word "company" in line 10 on page 1. But if this amendment is adopted the real purpose and objective of the resolution will not be changed. Everyone knows now that the seizure has been made and something of the circumstances surrounding it. The only question is whether or not it was authorized by law. That is the only question in the mind of the country. There is nothing else to investigate. This question, which is purely one of law, has been presented already to a court of competent jurisdiction, and it has been announced that a decision will be rendered within 3 days from this hour. Laying aside the heat and excitement that has been engendered, it is difficult for me at least to see just why this House should appoint a special committee to investigate a question of law that has already been fully presented and will have been passed upon before such committee could even organize.

THE LABOR DISPUTE

Montgomery Ward & Co. has had trouble with its employees right along. In June 1942, the company and the union could not agree on a collective-bargaining contract. The dispute was certified to the War Labor Board for settlement. After extensive hearings, the Board unanimously decided that the dispute, if not peaceably settled, might interfere with the prosecution of the war. After extensive public hearings, the Board made a unanimous recommendation for settlement. The company complied with part of the recommendations as to wages but refused to comply with the recommendations as to union security, arbitration of employee grievances, and seniority. Throughout the proceeding the company took the position that it would never agree to provisions of this kind. When the President was notified of the company's refusal, he sent a letter calling upon the company to comply with the Board's order. On receipt of the letter Montgomery Ward agreed to a year's contract with the union, incorporating the disputed provisions of the Board's order.

Before the contract expired in December 1943, the company stated that it would not renew the contract or recognize the union. The National War Labor Board immediately commenced hearings and in January of this year directed the company to extend the contract for a period of 30 days, or until the National Labor Relations Board could determine whether the union was the proper bargaining agency. The union agreed to comply with the order but the company refused. A second hearing was held in March and the National War Labor Board, by unanimous vote, again requested the company to comply with the order. The company refused to do so.

Despite repeated efforts the War Labor Board could not persuade the company to preserve the status quo pending an election. On April 12, after the negotiations had broken down, the union called a strike in the Chicago plant. A number of unions voted to support the Montgomery Ward employees. The teamsters' unions and the railway brotherhoods refused to handle deliveries to the company. The Chairman of the National War Labor Board said that there was a grave danger that the labor disturbance would spread to other parts of Montgomery Ward, including the Hummer Manufacturing Co. which makes military aircraft parts, and to other companies in the United States.

The refusal of Montgomery Ward peacefully to settle the labor dispute in Chicago is not an isolated instance. Labor disputes between Montgomery Ward and its employees in five other cities of the United States and in the Hummer Manufacturing Co. have been considered by the War Labor Board. The company has refused to comply with the Board's orders in any of these cases. Furthermore, it should be noted that the company has had a long record of labor difficulties. It has been involved in four proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board in each of which the Board found the company was guilty of unfair labor practices, and in which the Board was sustained by the courts.

It is against this background that the labor dispute in Chicago was certified to the President. Despite the fact that mediation had been unsuccessful, the President attempted once more to secure a peaceful settlement. He called on both parties to comply with the order of the War Labor Board until the issue of union representation could be decided. The union agreed to comply; the company refused.

Bearing the greatest responsibility that ever rested upon human shoulders what under these circumstances should the President of the United States do?

Even before Congress had passed the Labor Disputes Act the coal mines had been seized, not because the owners refused to cooperate but because Mr. Lewis would not. That action was widely applauded by those who now so bitterly criticize. In that instance the property of the owners was seized not because they were recalcitrant but because labor was. In the instance under consideration the facts are just the opposite. Why should seizure in one instance be so completely right and in the other so completely wrong?

The courts had ruled that when a bargaining unit is established by the procedure provided by law it is presumed to continue until the contrary is established by like procedure. But the head of Ward & Co. arrogated unto himself the right to determine and hold that there was no bargaining unit and refused to maintain the existing status until that fact could be determined in the manner provided by law. What should the President have done? The demands of war do not wait upon the

slow processes of the courts, and Congress had pointedly refused to put anything in the War Labor Disputes Act giving legal sanction to the findings or orders of the Board. Suit could not be brought for their enforcement. Resort to Congress in a particular case was equally impractical. Should the President have backed away from this situation and thereby released from the responsibility of helping to maintain a sound economic stability all the great mass of business enterprise not exclusively engaged in war production?

What he did was issue an Executive order in which it is said:

Whereas after investigation I find and proclaim that there are existing and threatened interruptions of the operations of the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., located in Chicago, Ill., as a result of labor disturbances arising from the failure of Montgomery Ward & Co. to comply with directive orders of the National War Labor Board; that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by these interruptions; and that the exercise, as hereinafter specified, of the powers vested in me is necessary to insure, in the interest of the war effort, the operation of these plants and facilities and of other plants and facilities which are threatened to be affected by the said labor disturbances.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, it is hereby directed as follows.

The order then directs temporary seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co.

When the representative of the Secretary of Commerce appeared to take possession of the plant, pursuant to the order of the President, the officers of the company refused to cooperate with the representatives of the Government. Although repeatedly requested to cooperate and to cease interfering with the Government's possession, the officers continued to refuse. The president of the company stated on two occasions to the representative of Mr. Jones that he could be removed only by force. He also stated on a second occasion that eight United States marshals were not adequate force to make him recognize the United States. Only after methods of peaceful persuasion had been exhausted, the Secretary of Commerce requested that troops be supplied to protect the interest of the United States.

Immediately after the United States had taken possession, it took the initiative in bringing the controversy concerning the President's right to seize before the courts, and it has attempted to secure a very speedy determination by the Federal court of the issues involved.

All of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

We had a very solemn hour in this Chamber on the 8th day of December 1941. We were united. There was present then no division and no partisanship. We adopted a very brief resolution which probably has not been read here since. It may not have been read since that day by many of the Members. It is likely that it has not since been read generally and that the significance of its language has been widely overlooked. It might not be hurtful for it to be displayed or read every day in every home and business establishment in America. With your permission, I will read it:

Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

To me that language takes the coat right off my back if needful or essential in the winning of the war, and I have no doubt your feelings are the same. I refrain from referring to things that have been done or are being done and will be done pursuant to the authority of this resolution. But I cannot refrain from suggesting that when the most sacred ties of human relationships may be abruptly ended and life itself exacted in numbers yet unknown, we should not be too squeamish about the quips and cranks of some stubborn industrial baron who has retrieved his fortune and recovered his position under an administration that he hates and out of business resulting in no small measure from this tragic war. Even as I stand here fine Americans are pouring out their lifeblood upon foreign soil because of this resolution. I wonder whether the chief executive of Ward & Co. claims the right to determine arbitrarily for himself whether his firm is exempt from its language as he has in the case of Executive orders and other acts. If not, then he and the resources of the great emporium over which he presides stand already pledged by the Congress of the United States to bring the conflict to a successful termination.

Let me here call attention to the fact that prior to World War No. 1 no declaration of war contained language pledging all the resources of the country. Such language was deemed wise in the declaration of World War No. 1 and in the declaration that I have read, because under modern conditions war cannot be successfully waged without marshalling all of a nation's resources and without sound and dependable economic stability, and I dare to add the suggestion that dependable Nation-wide economic stability is more essential even than material resources themselves. It is exactly here that cooperation has been refused by the firm in question.

Montgomery Ward & Co. is no corner grocery store. In 1943 its sales amounted to well above $600,000,000. Its more than 600 stores and establishments are scattered into every State of the Union and it has around 70,000 employees. It owns 4 factories. To use only one illustration, its division or subsidiary located at Springfield, Ill., in addition to farm supplies and machinery, manufactures carbureters, propellers, and gun mounts for military aircraft. Many other things could be mentioned, but I shall dwell upon this phase further only by calling attention to the fact that this firm has been granted many priorities and preference ratings on essential goods and has received certificates of war necessity for large numbers of trucks in which to move its goods. It is known throughout the land. Its headquarters are located in a center pulsating with war activities and pregnant with possibilities of economic disturbances. Its customers are numbered by the millions. It does business from coast to coast. All in all, it necessarily occupies a position which will exercise a good or a bad influence upon that economic stability admittedly essential in the successful prosecution of modern war.

SUIT BY THE GOVERNMENT

After the seizure the Government was for the first time in position to bring suit in defense of its possession and its right thereto. This it did at the earliest possible moment. Assuming that orders of the War Labor Board are not enforceable in the courts, this is reasonably clear from the language of the War Labor Disputes Act, read in the light of pertinent authorities, and is further demonstrated by the legislative history of that act.

Section 7 provides that upon certification by the United States Conciliation Service that "a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation," or upon the Board's own motion, if in its opinion a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to interference with the war effort, the Board shall conduct a hearing on the merits of the dispute and "decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions—customarily included in collective bargaining agreements—governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board."

The effect of substantially the same language in part III of the Transportation Act of 1920—41 Statutes 456, 469—establishing the United States Railroad Labor Board, was considered by the Supreme Court in *Pennsylvania R. Co.* v. *Labor Board* (261 U. S. 72), and *Pennsylvania Federation* v. *Pennsylvania R. Co.* (267 U. S. 203). That act had set up a method of adjustment of disputes closely resembling that provided by Executive Order 9017 and section 7 of the War Labor Disputes Act. It provided that upon application of a party to a labor dispute which cannot be settled by voluntary negotiation or upon the certification of an adjustment board that it has failed to adjust the dispute or "upon the Railroad Labor Board's own motion if it is of the opinion that the dispute is likely substantially to interrupt commerce," the Railroad Labor Board "shall receive for hearing" and "decide all disputes"; and that the decisions of the Railroad Labor Board "shall establish standards of working conditions which are just and

reasonable." Notwithstanding this language, the Supreme Court in the two cases just cited held that the decisions of the Railroad Labor Board did not affect legal rights, that they depended for enforcement upon public opinion and the voluntary compliance of parties, and that hence no equitable relief could be had either to enjoin or enforce such decisions.

In Pennsylvania Federation against Pennsylvania Railroad Co., the Supreme Court said—Two Hundred and Sixty-seventh United States Reports, at page 216:

> The so-called mandatory language of section 301 might, if that section were accompanied by a penalty for its violation or some other means of compulsion, and there were not the other provisions of the title to help its construction, be given the force of a statutory obligation of the parties to a dispute. There are two sections, 310 and 311, in this title which do furnish instances of judicial compulsion in the matter of securing evidence and the production of records to promote the efficient administration of the functions vested in the Labor Board by the title. And there is section 312, which required that carriers until September 1, 1920, should continue to pay wages not less than those paid March 1, 1920, and fixed a penalty for each violation of this obligation and gave a right to the United States to a civil suit to recover the penalty. But when the other sections of the title are taken as a whole, they may be searched through in vain to find any indication in the mind of Congress or any intimation that the disputants in the controversies to be anticipated were in any way to be forced into compliance with the statute or with the judgments pronounced by the Labor Board, except through the effect of adverse public opinion.

This is substantially the situation with respect to the War Labor Disputes Act. Section 7, too, contains mandatory language; it speaks in terms of "decide" and "order." The section does not, however, provide any penalty for violation of the Board's orders or any other means of compelling obedience to such orders. Other provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act do provide for judicial compulsion. Section 6 imposes criminal penalties for certain acts of interference in Government-operated plants; section 8 creates a cause of action for damages resulting from a refusal to perform certain acts in relation to notice of disputes and strike ballots; section 9 provides criminal penalties for certain political contributions; and section 7 itself provides for judicial enforcement of subpenas. There is nothing in those other sections, taken as a whole or singly, to indicate an intent on the part of Congress that the Board's determinations of labor disputes are to be legally binding on the parties and to fix or alter their legal rights. Indeed, the absence of sanctions in section 7 is in sharp contrast to their presence in sections 6, 8, and 9, and to the provision of section 7 itself for judicial enforcement of subpenas.

The legislative history of section 7 of the War Labor Disputes Act strongly supports the view that Board orders are not enforceable by suit.

It was the original thought of the framers of the War Labor Disputes Act that the Board would be able to carry out its work more effectively if its orders were legally binding and enforceable. Consequently, early drafts of the section conferring statutory authority upon the War Labor Board contained provisions for court enforcement and review of the Board's orders. For example, on May 4, 1943, Senator TAFT offered an amendment providing that the Board's orders should be final and enforceable in suits by the Attorney General. At that time he said:

> It seems to me essential that we get up a system of settling labor disputes. The natural way to do it is to confer power on the National War Labor Board to hear disputes and determine controversies, and then enforce its decisions in such manner as we may provide. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 4, 1943, p. 3898.)

The bill, as reported by the House Judiciary Committee, authorized the Board's Chairman to issue interim stay orders enforceable in court—Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, S. 796, Report No. 440.

The conference committee had reached an agreement to include a provision that the Board's orders should be final and subject to court review on questions of law.

However, on May 9, 1943, shortly before the bill was reported out by the conference committee, William H. Davis, the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, wrote to Senator Van Nuys, a member of the committee. He argued against the inclusion of any provision for enforcement of judicial review of Board decisions and recommended that the Board be permitted to function as it had in the past.

In his letter, Chairman Davis explained the Board's procedure and the success which the Board had had in the handling of disputes on the basis of voluntary compliance. He pointed out that in the 16 months of its existence, the Board had handled 736 labor disputes involving some 3,000,000 workers, and that in only 6 cases had the Board found it necessary to report to the President its inability to obtain voluntary compliance with its orders. Chairman Davis then continued as follows:

> This record of compliance indicates that no legal change in the status of the Board's orders is necessary.
>
> These orders are in reality mere declarations of the equities of each industrial dispute, as determined by a tripartite body in which industry, labor, and the public share equal responsibility; and the appeal of the Board is to the moral obligation of employers and workers to abide by the no-strike, no-lock-out agreement and in conformance therewith to carry out the directives of the tribunal created under that agreement by the Commander in Chief.
>
> Since the bill does not, as we understand it, permit the Board to seek enforcement of its orders in the court, the Board's orders are to remain, as we think they should remain, without specific legal sanctions. This being the case, it would seem to us inconsistent to extend to losing parties the privilege of delaying the outcome by taking the case into court for review * * *.
>
> For all of these reasons, we respectfully submit that for the duration of the war it would be in the best interests of the country to permit the War Labor Board to function as it has in the past 16 months, without the right to apply to the courts for legal sanctions and without being subject to court review of its decisions.

The conference committee acted specifically upon Chairman Davis' recommendation and eliminated from the bill any provision for judicial review. As Senator DANAHER, a dissenting member of the conference committee, stated to the Senate:

> That letter, Mr. President, was read to the conference on Wednesday last. Whatever action had been taken with reference to any appeal or review of action by the War Labor Board on a previous day was thereupon rescinded. Efforts were made to try to have an appeal provision refer only to those cases in which plant seizure actually had occurred. Those efforts were defeated. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1943, p. 5812.)

The conference committee's elimination of any provision for judicial review, which was fully discussed on the floor of Congress, shows the adoption by Congress of the recommendation by Chairman Davis. See, for example, statements of Senator AUSTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 12, 1943, at pages 5723–5724; Senator CONNALLY, at pages 5754–5755 and 5791–5792; Senator DANAHER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1943, at pages 5811–5812. See also, idem, at pages 5794–5795.

Senator DANAHER, in emphasizing his objection to the conference report because of the omission of any provision for judicial review, stated to the Senate:

> Mr. President, when the bill left the Senate, before the House acted, the Members of the Senate who believed that there should not be an interruption of production necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, had taken into account not only the possible seizure, which we would have authorized, but also, Mr. President, the fact that we would have authorized either management or the employees to seek redress of their grievances through the National War Labor Board. We would have authorized the Board to issue subpenas and to bring the respective parties before it. We would have authorized the Board to decide the dispute. We would have authorized an appeal by either side. I say "appeal"; "a petition for review," perhaps, is more apropos. On a question of law only was the decision of the Board to be surveyed or reviewed; but, Mr. President, at least the right of review was preserved in the statute.
>
> Now, Mr. President, for the first time in the history of American industrial relations between employer and employees, both employer and employee, so far as the statute is concerned, are being denied a right of access to the courts of the United States with reference to the subject matter of dispute. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12, 1943, p. 5776.)

Particularly significant is a colloquy which occurred in the course of the Senate debate between Senator THOMAS of Utah and Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the conference committee and coauthor of the War Labor Disputes Act. Senator THOMAS of Utah, apparently under misapprehension as to what the provisions of the conference committee bill were, expressed his fear that the bill provided for recourse to the courts in connection with labor disputes and proceedings before the Board. Senator CONNALLY reassured him—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12, 1943, pages 5754–5755:

> I think I speak for the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Connecticut and also the

Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], although he is not present, when I say that there is no jurisdiction whatever conferred by this bill providing for resort to the United States district court, except the one mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut—

Under section 8, relating to strike notices—

which is merely the right to go there for a civil action for damages, and no jurisdiction whatever is given over labor disputes. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for making that statement, and I hope it will satisfy the lawyers of the country.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure it will.

Thus the legislative history of the War Labor Disputes Act shows in two ways that directive orders of the War Labor Board are not enforceable in the courts. First, there was the specific elimination of provisions for judicial review and enforcement; and second, there was the indicated acceptance of Chairman Davis' request that War Labor Board directive orders remain in the same advisory status as they had previously been under Executive Order 9017.

In this latter connection it may be noted that Judge Coleman of the Maryland District Court and Mr. Justice O'Donoghue of the District of Columbia District Court have both held that orders of the War Labor Board under Executive Order 9017 are advisory only and do not fix or establish legal obligations. *Baltimore Transit Co.* v. *Flynn* (50 F. Supp. 382, D. C., D. Md.); *Employers Group of Motor Freight Carriers et al.* v. *National War Labor Board et al.* (U. S. D. C., District of Columbia). Of course, if there is no legal obligation fixed by a directive order of the Board, there is no basis for enforcement by judicial procedures.

In the Baltimore Transit Co. case Judge Coleman described the nature of the War Labor Board orders under Executive Order 9017 as follows:

We believe in the present case that this is substantially the true status of the Board. It does not exist as a tribunal to determine the legal rights and obligations of employer and employee, or to protect and enforce such rights, but merely to decide how such rights, in the Board's opinion, are to be exercised in the public interest in view of the state of war. Its creation and jurisdiction are not based upon any express statutory authority, in spite of what is said in the preamble of Executive Order No. 9017, creating it. The function of the Board is to give expression of its views of the moral obligation on each side to the controversy, as members of society, to agree upon a basis for cooperation in the public interest. The jurisdiction and power of the Board to direct parties to do what it deems they should do in such interest is not limited by their constitutional or legal right to refuse to do it. There is no constraint upon the parties to do what the Board may decide they should do, except moral constraint. See *Pennsylvania R. Co.* v. *United States Railroad Labor Board* (261 U. S. 72, 43 S. Ct. 278, 67 L. ed. 536); *Pennsylvania Railroad System and Allied Lines Federation* v. *Pennsylvania R. Co.* (267 U. S. 203, 45 S. Ct. 307, 69 L. ed. 574); *Robertson* v. *Railroad Labor Board* (268 U. S. 619, 45 S. Ct. 621, 69 L. ed. 1119). See also *Virginian R. R. Co.* v. *System Federation* (300 U. S. 515, 57 S. Ct. 592, 81 L. ed. 789).

The language of Executive Order 9017 is substantially the same as the language of section 7 of the War Labor Disputes Act. However, it was more difficult for Judge Coleman and Mr. Justice O'Donoghue to reach the result of nonenforceability under Executive Order 9017 than it would have been to reach that result under the War Labor Disputes Act, for Executive Order 9017 was not preceded by a legislative history definitely indicating rejection of court enforceability.

The decision of Judge Druffel in *United States Gypsum Co.* v. *National War Labor Board et al.* (U. S. D. C., District of Columbia), was probably based upon the theory that orders of the War Labor Board under Executive Order 9017 do fix legal rights. His decision made from the bench and without opinion is now pending for review by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals upon the application by the Government for the allowance of a special appeal which was promptly granted by that court. In the case of *Montgomery Ward & Co.* v. *National War Labor Board et al.* (U. S. D. C., District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 21483), Mr. Justice Goldsborough held that War Labor Board directive orders under the War Labor Disputes Act do fix legal rights, and stated by way of dictum that such orders could be enforced in the courts. His opinion, which was delivered orally at the close of argument, shows no analysis of the various provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act, and no consideration of the legislative history of that act and the precedents under Executive Order 9017. The Government has petitioned to the court of appeals for the allowance of a discretionary appeal from Mr. Justice Goldsborough's interlocutory order denying the Government's motion to dismiss. That application is now pending in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DELANEY. I think that in the Committee on Rules the gentleman and I fought side by side in an effort to defeat this rule.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. My statement was only that no other Member was opposing the adoption of the rule by any statement on the floor.

Mr. DELANEY. I wanted to have that correction made.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I observe that some of the proponents of this resolution have made statements which show that in their minds they have arrived at a decision and no matter what the evidence is they will not be convinced that the Government was right. I submit that with this attitude in their minds, some Members have already found that the Government was wrong. Any investigation should be approached with an attitude of first determining the facts and then arriving at a decision.

Mr. CLARK. I want to add this one word further. If the Congress of the United States is going to undertake to investigate every Executive order it may be necessary to issue in the prosecution of this war, you may look for a slowdown far beyond anything the Nation has so far seen.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in considering this resolution we do not have before us any questions as to labor unions, or whether they have been right or wrong in their dealings with Montgomery Ward; neither are we to decide whether Montgomery Ward & Co. and its head, Mr. Avery, have been right or wrong, or whether the War Labor Board should or should not have issued its order, or whether the action taken by it was proper or improper. In fact, we are not even being called upon to pass here and now upon either the propriety or the legality of the action taken by Attorney General Biddle in using the military forces in seizing the Montgomery Ward & Co. plant and ejecting its officials therefrom, although I have my own fixed opinion regarding such action and believe it to have been unconstitutional and un-American.

The only question we actually have before us now is whether the Congress should investigate the whole situation and, based upon the facts obtained from such investigation, take such action as it may deem necessary to protect the interests of the people.

The Congress of the United States is the representative agency of the people of America. The people of America today, I think, almost unanimously desire that this whole situation, and others like it, be investigated. Then if it is determined, after full investigation, or after full review by the courts, that some other legislative action is necessary, or that perhaps even a constitutional amendment should be submitted to the various States, it is our duty and our responsibility, as the Congress, to take that action in the name of the people we represent.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I originally contemplated yielding him 5 minutes, but in view of the fact that he is getting 5 minutes on the other side and I was obliged to yield an additional 2 minutes to another member of the committee, I do not have any more time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain extracts and quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the storm of protest that has been aroused in the country by the seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant has been surprising to some of us in this House who for some time past have been calling attention to the progressive encroachment of the Federal Government through bureaucratic autocracy upon the constitutional rights of citizens. This seizure has aroused so much fear and apprehension on the part of the public that Congress can do no less than conduct a thorough investigation of the law and the facts and, if necessary, spell out into law in plain unequivocal terms limitations and restrictions upon the war powers granted the executive department during the present emergency so that the American people may again rest assured in their rights under the fourth amendment, to be "secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures."

The sudden change of front by some of those who so vigorously opposed this investigation when it was first offered, and the attempt to smear Montgomery Ward & Co. is convincing evidence that there is a deliberate purpose to turn this investigation into a persecution of the victim who has already been deprived of its property by force and under very questionable circumstances. I trust that whatever committee is appointed will not lend itself to that scheme to divert attention from the real facts by blackening the character and smearing the reputation of the business concern that has been the victim of what the country regards as a high-handed and unlawful effort by the Government to compel a private business concern to violate the National Labor Relations Act and deliver its employees into bondage to the C. I. O.

The country wants the facts and only the material facts that led to the seizure, and to know by what authority of law was private property seized by the Government in apparent violation of the constitutional rights of the owners. With that in view, I submit these observations on, first, the facts in the case and, second, on the question of legal authority for the seizure.

It has been charged on the one side and denied on the other that Montgomery Ward is violently antiunion. That has nothing to do with the case. When a citizen has been deprived of his lawful property without due process, it is no defense to assert that he once slapped his mother-in-law, or was accused of being a horse thief. I shall, therefore, not seek to affirm or deny such frivolous accusations.

The following, however, is, I believe, a fairly accurate if brief statement of the facts:

Montgomery Ward in December 1942 was compelled against its will and under duress from the Government to sign a contract with the C. I. O. for 1 year, under which it was required to discharge any employee who was a member of the C. I. O. 15 days after the date of the contract unless he paid the union dues demanded by the union, and the same rule applied to any employee who might thereafter join the union. The employer, in addition, was required to deduct such dues from the wages of the employee, if requested by him, and pay the same to the union. In November 1943, about 6 weeks prior to the expiration of the contract, Montgomery Ward, having reason to believe that the C. I. O. no longer represented a majority of its employees, notified the union in writing that the contract would not be renewed after its termination. The National Labor Relations Act makes it unlawful for Ward's to recognize the C. I. O. union unless it represented a majority of the employees. In a subsequent negotiation with the union, Ward's claimed that in two of the seven units of the company involved in Chicago, the check-off records clearly indicated that the C. I. O. represented less than 20 percent of its employees instead of the 50 percent required by law, and offered to recognize the union in the five other plants and to recognize the union in the other two plants if the National Labor Relations Board should, upon investigation, certify that it actually did represent a majority of the employees.

The union refused this offer, appealed to the War Labor Board, and that Board, some 6 weeks after the expiration of the contract, ordered Ward's to extend the life of the contract and recognize the C. I. O. as the bargaining agent until the National Labor Relations Board should determine by an election whether the C. I. O. actually did represent a majority. Ward's refused to obey this order on the grounds, among others, that to do so would require it to violate the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, and would compel it to discharge all employees who had withdrawn from the union since the contract expired. In the meantime a strike was called which, however, was ineffective in closing the business. I am told that some days before the strike ended, the teamsters' union refused to recognize it any longer and thereafter the movement of goods in and out of Ward's was in nowise interrupted, that all orders of the business were filled, and that at the time of the seizure there was no backlog of unfilled orders. Upon Ward's refusal to comply with the order of the War Labor Board, the President ordered the properties taken over by the Secretary of Commerce. I insert as part of my remarks the telegram of Sewell Avery, president of Ward's, to the President, setting forth his reasons for refusal to comply with the order. None of the branches of Ward's in Chicago are in any way engaged in the mining, manufacture, or production of anything. Their sole business is the sale and distribution of miscellaneous merchandise at retail. Agents of the Secretary of Commerce and the Attorney General of the United States appeared at the office of the president of Ward's and demanded possession of the property and premises, which was refused. They then secured the assistance of the United States marshal, who made a similar demand which was refused. Thereupon, they brought on a contingent of the United States Army and repeated the demands which were again refused, and thereupon a detail of soldiers was ordered to, and did, bodily eject the president of the company from the premises, and deposited him on the sidewalks of Chicago. My information is that there were no casualties as a result of this engagement.

From these facts, it is obvious that the entire controversy and subsequent seizure were wholly the result of the effort of the War Labor Board to force the company to bow to the will and demands of the C. I. O., and had not the remotest connection with the war effort.

Now the questions that the public wants answered are these:

By what authority can the War Labor Board or the President or any other Government official command the United States Army to take private property not in any way directly concerned with the war effort; and further,

If it is lawful to take Ward's retail store, then where do we go from there, and what should be done to protect citizens in the right guaranteed by the fourth amendment to "be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures"?

To answer these questions, we must discuss the extent of the powers of the President in time of war. These powers, whatever they may be, can be derived from only one of two sources. First, the powers given to the President under the Constitution; and second, the powers which Congress, through the enactment of constitutional legislation, has vested in the President during the emergency. I will discuss these powers as briefly as possible in the order mentioned.

What are the powers of the President under the Constitution in time of war? There are only two clauses in the Constitution that would seem to bear upon the subject; namely, section 2 which provides that—

> The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States.

And section 3 which provides that—

> He shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

The provision naming the President as Commander in Chief carries no powers other than those incident to his military authority.

The provision to see that the laws are faithfully executed obviously and plainly has reference to such laws as are passed by the Congress. Whatever these powers may be, they are limited by the later amendments to the Constitution; namely, the fifth amendment, which provides that—

> No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

And the tenth amendment, which provides that—

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

On the other hand, the Constitution, while withholding from the President any broad grant of power in time of war, specifically lodges those powers in the people's Congress. In the Congress is lodged power under the Constitution to—

Provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and to make rules concerning captures on land and water;

To raise and support armies;

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The best summation of Executive power in time of war is contained in the language of the Supreme Court in the famous Milligan case that has been the law in this country since shortly after the Civil War. I quote from that decision:

The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false, for the Government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it, which are necessary to preserve its existence, as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to throw off its just authority.

Press reports indicate that the Attorney General has argued that the President in time of war has a broad reservoir of powers inherent in the office which he occupies. Certainly no support is found for that contention in the provisions of the Constitution quoted. It is much easier to find specious argument that the Executive power is unlimited than to find authority to support such a philosophy. If the President had no power under the Constitution to seize Ward's retail store, then the power, if it exists, must be found in some constitutional act of Congress which clearly clothed him with that power. It has been argued that the power is derived from section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act, commonly known as the Connally-Smith Act. Doubtless the Members of the House and Senate who voted to pass the act over the President's veto have been astonished that the executive departments of the Government should have undertaken to so distort and misconstrue the language of the act as to find authority for the seizure of private property in nowise engaged in the production of supplies for the armed forces. The language in question is as follows:

Section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith. Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility whenever the President finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant, mine, or facility as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance, that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant, mine, or facility in the interest of the war effort."

The language is specific and confines the seizure powers of the President to "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith."

The language further restricts such seizures to where there is an interruption of the operation of such plant, mine, or facility by reason of a labor disturbance that will unduly impede or delay the war effort and only then when it is necessary to exercise the power thus given to insure the operation of the plant, mine, or facility in the interest of the war effort. I do not believe that any mental processes remotely concerned with intellectual honesty could so distort the meaning of plain English as to construe this language to mean that the Congress intended to clothe the executive department of the Government with the power to indiscriminately seize private property not concerned with the war effort for the obvious and only purpose of compelling the owner to accede to the demands of a labor union.

When the Ward controversy first arose, one of the distinguished members of the War Labor Board, perhaps more learned in the law than his colleagues, evidently did not entertain the present views because he was quoted as saying that Ward's operation was not essential to the war effort and, therefore, if it did not comply with the Board's orders, sanctions could be invoked that would compel it to cease operations without loss to the war effort.

Apparently since that time, the shifting sands of legal opinion in the executive department have veered sharply to the left.

Until recent years, it has been a time-honored custom to revert to the debates in Congress to aid in the construction of language which is claimed to be doubtful. Apparently that technique is used in modern times only where the plain language is sought to be diverted to some construction other than that appearing on its face. If those who have been so diligently seeking to find some construction of the Labor Disputes Act to justify seizures of private property would refer to the debates in the Senate where this provision was written, they would be compelled to concede that the law was never intended to authorize the seizure such as has occurred in the Ward case.

The committee hearings in the Senate where the bill originated, the statements in the committee and on the floor by Senator CONNALLY, the author of the provision, and other Members of the Senate, conclusively show the intent of Congress to limit the power of seizure strictly to war plants producing supplies for the armed services. The debates leave no room for doubt or question as to the intent of Congress; that intent is further emphasized by the action of the Senate in striking out from the reasons authorizing the seizure, the words "or other cause."

In order that there may be no doubt in anybody's mind as to the intent of Congress, I quote the following extracts from the RECORD:

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 4, 1943, on page 3883, Senator TAFT said as follows:

The Senator [Mr. DANAHER] has referred to one instance which might be "or other cause." However, is it not true that the President, under the broad language "or other cause," might step into a plant and simply say, "We think we can operate this plant better than you are operating it." Might he not say, "We need more airplanes. We do not like the way you are producing, although you have complied with your contract. We think we can operate the plant better than you can." Would not the language "or other cause" cover an instance of that kind?

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the same day, on page 3884, Senator DANAHER said:

I do not choose to argue the merits of the entire bill. I have not tried to cover the whole subject. I only emphasize to my colleagues that the language of this clause is so broad, having in mind the objectives allegedly sought for in the bill, that to my way of thinking we most assuredly should disapprove the incorporation of any such language in this measure. I therefore ask that the amendment which I have offered be adopted, and that in line 11, on page 2, the words "or other cause" be stricken.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the same day and still on page 3884, Senator CONNALLY said:

The words "or other cause" are what he seeks to strike out. The powers which are provided for by the bill cannot be exercised by the President until he makes that kind of a finding, and the plant has to be one which is equipped and suitable for the production of national defense articles. The fear about making a wholesale attack on property, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio, has no foundation in fact. The seven cases which were cited, and to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred, were all cases in which either the Army or the Navy took over plants, and within a very few days after they were taken over they were returned to their private owners.

On page 3897 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 4, 1943, Senator OVERTON said:

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], on page 2, line 11, to strike out the words "or other cause."

On the roll call the yeas were 41 and the nays were 34—consequently, Mr.

DANAHER's amendment to Mr. CONNALLY's amendment was agreed to.

Testifying before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, under date of November 21, Under Secretary of War Patterson said:

I see nothing drastic in this measure at all. It does, of course, rest upon the foundation of national defense and I dare say the bill would not have been introduced but for the current interruptions which are now going on and have been going on for months in various plants which are vital to the national-defense program.

Again:

It is very clearly confined to the national defense in the national emergency, the equipping of the armed forces.

Again Secretary Patterson said:

Any suggestion that we have some far-reaching plan of taking over private industry of the country is just fantastic.

Again, on page 19 of the hearing, Under Secretary Patterson was quoted as follows:

These plants are plants that, for defense purposes, are serving the Government already. The Army or Navy have the consuming interest, and the ones most vitally concerned in the continued production at the plants.

Immediately thereafter Senator CONNALLY said:

The reason I asked you that question is some industrialists complain and say, "Oh, we do not want to have Government interfering in private business, in socializing these industries, taking over and interfering with private enterprise."

Senator CONNALLY further said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 11, 1943, on page 5720:

Let me say, furthermore, that the cardinal objective, the chief principle, back of the bill from the beginning was not the idea of hunting for some individual in an effort to put him in jail, but the objective was how best we could provide for the continuous operation of plants manufacturing munitions.

* * * Mr. President, I was saying that the cardinal principle of this bill is to keep the plants going.

Senator AUSTIN, on page 5721 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 11, 1943, said:

It is therefore the correct interpretation, I believe, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Texas, that the jurisdiction of the National War Labor Board covers war activities and the settlement of disturbances and disagreements relating to wages and other terms of employment in war enterprises and in the performance of war contracts.

The intent of everybody concerned with the legislation to confine it strictly to seizures of war plants is further emphasized in the House hearings at page 66, where William H. Davis, Chairman of the National War Labor Board, in proposing objections to certain sections of the bill, testified as follows:

With regard to the first items—that is, those which have to do with the operation of plants in the hands of the Government—we were very certain, from our practical, realistic experience, that section 12, which proposed in effect that when the plant was being operated by the Government, the Government officer in charge could deal with the union in making a contract with the union for the Government, would have a disastrous effect if passed, for reasons which perhaps would not occur to one except from actual, practical experience.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that if you are going to take one of these plants over—have the Government take it over—you do it because there is a dispute existing between the management and the employees. The only purpose of the Government's taking it over is to maintain war production until that dispute can be settled—that is, the dispute between the management and the employees—and as soon as that dispute is settled, then the Government wants to return the plant to its owners.

[Telegram]

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 25, 1944.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: We have your telegram of April 23, 1944.

Ward's welcomes the suggestion that an election be held at an early date to determine the employees' choice of representation. The question whether the union represents a majority of the employees in Ward's mail-order house and store in Chicago has been pending since November 16, 1943. Ward's has repeatedly urged a prompt determination of this question, and has publicly announced a readiness to recognize the union when proof of its representation is presented. Although over 5 months have elapsed since the question arose, the union has refused to show that it is the majority choice of the employees by either a card check or an election.

Ward's will continue to observe the wages, hours, and related terms of employment as they were before the expiration of the former contract. Ward's has made no change in any of these conditions since December 8, 1942, and could not do so under the wage-stabilization law without prior governmental approval.

Your assertion that the strike is interfering with the distribution of essential goods is based upon misinformation. On April 13, the United States post office, presumably acting on orders from Washington, removed its 70 employees from the mail-order house. For more than 30 years the post office had maintained this department for the purpose of handling parcel-post shipments to Ward's customers. On April 17, the United States post office refused to deliver to Ward's incoming parcels from customers on which postage had been fully paid. Despite the assistance given to the strike by the United States post office, Ward's store has been open for business during the usual hours each day since the strike began and Ward's is up to date in the filling of mail orders.

Although Ward's welcomes an early election, Ward's cannot, under the law, grant special privileges to the union pending the election. To grant maintenance of union membership before the election is held, as the War Labor Board has ordered, would not only violate the employees' fundamental liberty of free choice but it would also permit the union to demand the discharge of all the employees who have resigned from the union since December 8, 1943. Compliance with the Board's order would thus make a mockery of the democratic right of employees to choose their bargaining representatives freely and without interference.

By ordering the retroactive reinstatement of maintenance of membership, the War Labor Board has demonstrated its utterly unfair character, and its complete disregard of the command of Congress that its orders conform to the National Labor Relations Act.

Ward's experience with the War Labor Board over a period of 2 years has convinced Ward's that the Board is a means by which special privileges are granted to labor unions. The union members of the War Labor Board are men chosen for leadership by the unions, and have actually advanced the interests of the unions. The so-called public members have consistently joined with the union members to support the demands of organized labor. The so-called industry members are committed to a policy of supporting the majority vote of the union members and the union-dominated public members.

The War Labor Board has always claimed that its orders are law and must be obeyed. It has coerced innumerable employers into acceptance of its orders by threatening the seizure of their businesses.

When Ward's brought suit to have the Board's orders declared illegal, the Board asked the courts to dismiss the case. In direct contradiction to its previous claims of power, the Board's plea to the court was that its orders were not legally binding, but were only advice which Ward's need not accept. The purpose of this plea was to deny Ward's a trial before the courts. The issues raised by Ward's case against the War Labor Board are judicial questions which under the Constitution only the courts may decide. The War Labor Board, by asking you to force Ward's to comply with its order while seeking to deprive Ward's of an opportunity for a hearing in the courts, has demonstrated its lack of respect for our Constitution and the fundamental rights which the Constitution guarantees.

Your assertion that, if Ward's does not accept your direction, you will take further action, has been construed by the press to threaten the seizure of Ward's plant and business.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees to the people the protection of those fundamental rights without which there can be no liberty. Under the Constitution, Congress is the sole law-making authority. Neither the President of the United States nor any other official has the legal right to seize any business or property either in time of peace or in time of war unless Congress has expressly given him the power to do so.

Congress has given the President no power to seize the nonwar business of Montgomery Ward. Any seizure of Ward's plant or business would be in complete disregard of the Constitution which the President is sworn to uphold and defend.

Ward's has violated no law nor denied to the union any privilege to which it is legally entitled.

Respectfully,

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.,
SEWELL AVERY, *President.*

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I had intended not to enter into this debate, because it is quite obvious to me that the minds of the Members are pretty well made up and I doubt whether anything I might say would add much. But I cannot resist saying at this point that I do not believe the Congress of the United States in anything that it has done before our involvement in the war or subsequent to our involvement in the war has undertaken to repeal or annul the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States. We could not do that if we wanted to. I say, as our courts have said time and again, that the Constitution covers with the mantle and shield of its protection the rights of the people of this country in war as in peace. No more pernicious doctrine could be urged

than that in the great exigencies which confront this country from time to time, the clear mandate of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights shall be superseded or destroyed. Who is right and who is wrong in respect to the labor controversy is not the essential issue. The essential issue is the procedure and action taken. Martial law had not been declared in Illinois. Illinois and the city of Chicago, Ill., was in no theater of war. I know also that the courts of the State of Illinois and of the United States there located were open and operating. So if it can be contended, although I seriously challenge the contention, that the circumstances were such that legal and lawful action could be taken against Montgomery Ward and its president and officers, then why in heaven's name was not resort had to the civil processes and the courts of the United States open and operating there? If Mr. Avery was subject to eviction, then I take it the courts could so determine. That, to my mind, is the serious question that is involved here.

And to my mind, further, Mr. Biddle, the Attorney General of the United States—and incidentally I assume he represents all the people and not any one person or any one administration—in fact did admit in his view of it that there is a legal remedy when he went into the courts, not before the use of the military might of this country to evict the president of that company from his office in the establishment where he was engaged, but after that eviction took place. After the seizure, the Attorney General went into the courts and obtained a temporary restraining order to restrain Mr. Avery as against the Government from exercising any control or authority. Now, then, if that could be asserted after the seizure, why could it not have been asserted before the seizure? The courts were there. Why did not the Attorney General seek in the courts the remedy that is urged by him as being available in this circumstance instead of enlisting the power and might of the United States Army? Had that been done, and had such a rule been issued by the courts or had such an order been entered by the courts, then there is no question in my mind but what any law-abiding citizen of the land would abide by that order so long as it stood as the order of the court.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is a lawyer of great ability, but even in peacetime when Government agents seize the property of citizens, they seize it first and file a libel suit against it afterward. Even in peacetime and aside from the question of war, the gentleman, I know, as every other lawyer in this Chamber, has gone into court to recover the property of citizens which was alleged to have been wrongfully seized.

Mr. HALLECK. Now I yielded, but I did not yield for a speech.

You say he has gone into court. Certainly he has gone into court. He has obtained the process that is served by the officers of the land, the civil officers of the land to put him in possession of the property if the court so orders, and to my mind it is entirely different from using the military might of the country to seize an establishment and to evict a man from his office and deprive him of his property before any process at all had been filed in the courts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman from North Carolina when he read to you the declaration of war that was passed by this House on December 8, 1941.

Let me say that on December 11, 1941, this House passed a resolution declaring war on Germany which reads as follows:

Whereas the Government of Germany had formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Germany; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

If you pass this resolution today relative to the Montgomery Ward controversy then you should amend the declaration of war against Japan and the declaration of war against Germany to read:

And to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States except those of Montgomery Ward.

That is, in effect, what you are doing here today. The resources of our country, our lives and personal property, are pledged to a successful termination of the global war in which we are engaged, except those of this great corporation.

All citizens have had to make sacrifices; labor has made sacrifices and so has industry. This war has caused the establishment of procedures that we undoubtedly would not have in peacetimes, but labor, industry, and the American people generally know that the important thing is to win the war.

It has been said here today that the Government should have gone to court before it seized the Montgomery Ward plant and taken over the plant through court procedure. Let me tell my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who has been laboring that point that the War Labor Disputes Act contains no provision for court procedure to take over plants. The power is vested solely in the President of the United States. It is not even vested in the War Labor Board, for all that the War Labor Board can do, in the event that its directives are ignored, is to certify the disputes to the President.

When the War Labor Disputes Act passed the House, it was known that we could not follow court procedure in any seizures for the reason that we were so pressed for war material that the slow, tedious processes of the court would not meet the situation. We could not afford, in the midst of war, to let strikes and lock-outs continue while the disputes were being litigated. The factories had to be kept going, the war material had to be produced, regardless of disputes between management and labor and if management and labor could not settle their disputes under the machinery set up by Congress, then we provided that the plants should be taken over and operated by the Government, so as to eliminate any cessation of manufacturing and keep the flow of supplies moving to our troops.

It has been said here today that since the Government started action against Montgomery Ward, after the seizure, it could have done it prior to the seizure. The answer is simple. The pending action of the Government is not for the seizure of the property; it is to restrain the defendants from interfering with the operation of the plant by the United States Government. I venture to say that by the time the case goes through the higher courts, months and perhaps years will have elapsed.

Meanwhile the strike at the plant in Chicago, fomented by the refusal of the Montgomery Ward officials to obey the law, would have spread to the detriment of the war effort. At the time of the seizure, the strike was spreading, deliveries were not being made, the teamsters union and the railroad brotherhoods were refusing to handle Montgomery Ward shipments and unless quick, energetic, and drastic action was taken, no one could tell how far the strike would go.

It is at that emergency action at which this resolution is aimed, an action which this Congress authorized by law and the validity of which it now attacks.

Under our system of government the courts determine the legality of acts. But today this House seeks to supersede the court. The very ones who a few years ago were protesting against packing the Supreme Court by the President are today resorting to procedure that is infinitely worse. I had no sympathy with the proposal to pack the Supreme Court, but I have less regard for this procedure which seeks, by congressional action to bludgeon the Court into a decision not based on the facts, but upon the feelings of this House, to whom the facts are not known. When did this body become a court of appeals? Every time the President of the United States, in the conduct of the war, acts either under his constitutional authority or under powers granted to him by Congress are we to have investigating committees to determine the facts upon which he has acted?

It has been charged here today that private property was forcibly seized by the Government and contrary to law. What are the facts?

The facts are these: The Montgomery Ward & Co., of Chicago, is a great business corporation, doing a half billion dollars of business annually, and employs approximately 75,000 persons. Besides its

retail mail-order business it owns and operates 4 factories that manufacture paint and supply farm equipment, and 1 factory which makes gun mounts, carburetors, and propeller parts.

Is there a doubt in the mind of anyone here that these articles are not essential to the war effort? Day after day I have heard the Members from agricultural districts complain that their constituents could not get sufficient farm equipment. I should like to hear the explanation that they make to their constituents, when it is learned of their sympathy for Montgomery Ward and for Sewell Avery, its president, who forced a strike that impeded the manufacture and delivery of farm equipment.

Can there be any doubt in the mind of anyone here that gun mounts, carburetors, and propeller parts are necessary for the successful prosecution of the war? There is no possible doubt that Montgomery Ward was at the time of its seizure engaged not only in retail merchandising, but in actual war work.

What, then, was to be done when Montgomery Ward precipitated a strike by refusing to obey the order of the War Labor Board that the contract which Montgomery Ward had with the labor union for a year past should be continued in status quo for a period of 30 days until an election could be held to determine whether the union actually was the collective-bargaining agent of the employees.

Not for 30 days would Sewell Avery, president of Montgomery Ward, continue the contract to determine whether the union was the collective-bargaining agent. Not for 30 days—no; not for 1 day. Sewell Avery and Montgomery Ward commenced discharging employees. Sewell Avery and the great Montgomery Ward concern cared not a whit whether the farmers got farm equipment; Sewell Avery and the great Montgomery Ward concern that does a half billion dollars of business a year gave not a thought to our soldiers, sailors, and aviators who needed the gun mounts, carburetors, and propeller parts manufactured by Montgomery Ward, even though these same soldiers, sailors, and aviators were fighting to defend this great country, where Montgomery Ward has made millions of dollars in profit. Look over the dividends declared by Montgomery Ward, and look at the salaries paid to the officers of Montgomery Ward during these war years, and your blood will boil when you think of their unpatriotic—nay, I shall go further and call it treasonable action—in hampering the war effort by forcing a strike.

Mr. Speaker, it is axiomatic that where a state of facts has been established it is presumed to continue until the contrary is proved. The union had been certified as the bargaining agent by the War Labor Board, a contract had been entered into and fulfilled, and when the time came for the renewal of the contract, Montgomery Ward refused to continue to recognize the union. Not only would Montgomery Ward not accept the union which had been certified, but it would not even permit the status quo to remain for 30 days to give the National Labor Relations Board a chance to pass on the point that the employees were no longer represented by the union.

On April 5, 1944, by final directive order, and after two public hearings the industry members joined with the labor and public members in condemning as unfair the action of the company in refusing to continue the status quo of the contract. Montgomery Ward defied the Board; it defied the Congress of the United States, which passed the law under which the Labor Board operates; it defied the President of the United States.

This willful man, Sewell Avery, and his great corporation, Montgomery Ward, thought themselves superior to the law and beyond its pale. The War Labor Disputes Act, in the opinion of Mr. Avery, should only be enforced against labor and not—oh, by no means—against a powerful corporation.

It was only after this open defiance of the Congress, of the War Labor Board which it had established, and of the President of the United States in whom Congress, by specific statute, had placed the power of seizure, that the President issued his directive to Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones to seize the properties of Montgomery Ward.

Secretary Jones issued the necessary instructions to Under Secretary Wayne C. Taylor to execute the order of the President of the United States. Mr. Taylor called upon Avery in the latter's office in Chicago and served him with a certified order of the President of the United States directing him to take possession. With a defiance that is unparalleled and with a contempt for the high office of the United States this willful, domineering man again defied the Government and stated that the United States Government could get possession only by force. He held higher his so-called obligations to the stockholders of Montgomery Ward, upon whose votes he would depend for his position and salary as president of the company, than his obligation to his country in her terrible hour of need, and his obligations as a decent American for the men in service who are fighting to defend that country.

Strange as it may seem there are some who applaud the action of Avery, but I say with deep conviction that no man will be looked upon with greater scorn and contempt by his fellow industrialists when the full facts are known by the American people than this same Sewell Avery.

After Avery's first refusal to recognize the order of the President presented by Mr. Taylor, Secretary Jones instructed Mr. Taylor to obtain the assistance of the United States marshal's office, take possession of the plant, and operate it in the sovereign name of the United States Government. Again Mr. Taylor requested Avery to peaceably surrender possession but he refused again and stated that when he had said he would give up possession only by force he meant actual physical force.

Then it was, after every peaceable effort had been made, that a detail of soldiers took over the plant and forcibly ejected Avery.

When the Government finally got possession, it went into court and obtained a temporary restraining order against Avery, prohibiting him and his assistants from interfering with the operation of the plant by the Government. A hearing had been had and within a few days a decision would be rendered.

Mr. Speaker, what a ridiculous position this House will be in, if we pass this resolution, as certainly the temper of the House indicates, and the court sustains the position of the Government. How much more ridiculous will we look if the circuit court of appeals and the United States Supreme Court affirm the decision of the lower court, as I, as a lawyer, think will be the case.

I voted against the Smith-Connally Act, upon which this seizure is in part based, but the House passed it almost with cries of joy because a majority of its Members thought it shackled labor. They never thought that an industrialist would be so dumb that it would ever be necessary to invoke it against industry. The President vetoed it, but more than two-thirds of the House overrode his veto, gave him against his will the very powers the use of which you now condemn. I voted to sustain the President. I have no regrets, but I confess if I had voted for the Smith-Connally bill, I would have done it with the idea that it applied both to labor and industry.

The veil has been torn from the proponents of the Smith-Connally bill. They now admit, by their actions here today and on the floor of the House since the Montgomery Ward incident arose, that the true reason for that law was to hamstring labor and let industry go scot free.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute simply to answer the statement by the gentleman from New York.

Those of us who voted for war did not vote to do away with the fifth amendment to the Constitution which reads as follows:

> No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Mr. HALLECK. It just so happens there is also in the Constitution a provision that private property shall not be taken without just compensation. I wonder if the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] would urge or argue that by reason of the declaration of war all the constitutional guaranties to every citizen of this country would be taken from him and that his property could be taken without just compensation to him by the Government because we pledged the resources of the country? I never heard anything more ridiculous.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] 3 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the phrase "as able as a Philadelphia lawyer" has an honorable origin and was worthily won. In view of recent events, I should like to go back into the early history of Pennsylvania, and recall to you the history of the man who won for members of

the Philadelphia bar the distinctive title which they have since borne with such pride. It is a story of civil liberties and bears retelling.

In the year 1734 in the then Province of Pennsylvania, there lived a distinguished old gentleman by the name of Andrew Hamilton. In the fullness of his years, he could review a career devoted to the practice of the law and the protection of the rights of the colonists in the busy and growing city founded by William Penn which he called Philadelphia.

In the adjoining colony of New York, things were not going well with the King's henchmen. An obstreperous printer of German birth by the name of John Peter Zenger believed in freedom of speech, which you will recall as one of the "four freedoms." For continuing, in spite of warnings, to publish in a time of emergency, his own views and to assert his belief in the rights of the common man, he incurred the wrath of the royal Governor, Cosby, and was clapped in jail for seditious libel.

Although it grieves me to remind any of my colleagues from the Empire State of this, there could be found no lawyer in the colony of New York willing to undertake the defense of a poor printer against the majesty of the King.

Fortunately for John Peter Zenger, the fame of Andrew Hamilton had spread beyond the boundaries of the city on the Delaware. Friends of the imprisoned man communicated with Hamilton. Andrew Hamilton was old, well past 80, and he was ill. Brushing aside the well-meant advice of his friends, he undertook the long and perilous journey to New York City. It took him 4 days by the post, with frequent changes of carriages. Notwithstanding the arduous journey he entered immediately into the preparation for the trial of John Peter Zenger. At the trial Zenger admitted the publication of the attacks upon the Royal Governor, Andrew Hamilton sought to justify the articles in question by proving the truth as a defense. The Chief Justice said: "You cannot be admitted to give the truth of a libel in evidence." Hamilton turned to the jury and said:

> Then we appeal to you for witnesses of the facts. The jury have a right to determine both the law and the fact and they ought to do so. * * * The question before you is not the cause of a poor printer, nor of New York alone; it is the best cause—the cause of liberty. Every man who prefers freedom to a life of slavery will bless and honor you as men who, by an impartial verdict, lay a noble foundation for securing to ourselves, our posterity, and our neighbors that to which Nature and the honor of our country have given us a right—the liberty of opposing arbitrary power by speaking and writing truth.

That courageous jury, by its verdict of not guilty, reflected the growing belief among the colonists that they had a right to criticize the administrators, and to disagree with them, despite the fact that they were the personal representatives of the King.

Philadelphia lawyers regard Andrew Hamilton as their patron saint, and in the great tradition of his liberalism, courage, and ability, other eminent members of the Philadelphia bar have made national and international reputations for themselves. One cannot catalog them all, but one should mention James Wilson, signer of the Declaration of Independence; and, in later days, Richard C. Dale, John G. Johnson; our own former colleague, James M. Beck; former Senator George Wharton Pepper, and Mr. Justice Owen J. Roberts.

The present Attorney General of the United States is a member of the Philadelphia bar and, if he should not be measured by the yardstick of these eminent Philadelphia lawyers of the past, nevertheless it ought to be said that he had been regarded until recently as a follower of the liberal tradition. It is with pain, therefore, that one must record the Attorney General's recent flight into black reaction. For, unlike Andrew Hamilton who undertook a hazardous journey to plead for the civil rights of a citizen, the Attorney General journeyed recently to Chicago for the purpose of depriving citizens of their rights without due process of law. The employees, upon the expiration of their contract, were entitled, without the interference of armed force, to a free and fair election to determine their bargaining agent.

The Attorney General's gallant use of an Army drafted to fight Germans and Japs, which he sent so boldly into the dangerous beach head of retail merchandising, suggests instruments to his hands. He can have them beat their swords into plowshares to plow under the numbered freedoms of American citizens. He can have them beat their bayonets into pruning hooks to prune away the branches of the tree of liberty.

I have known Attorney General Biddle for 20 years. I have never before heard him argue a case without reliance upon precedent, law, or Constitution. Indeed, it is hardly imaginable that there exists in American law any authority to use armed force to destroy what could have been decided by calling a simple election, thus preserving the rights of all, rather than a part, of the employees. Those who might have preferred a different bargaining agent, whether they be in the minority or in the majority, had certain concrete legal rights which General Biddle brushed aside at the point of a bayonet.

Indeed, I think he had a precedent for the argument before the court in Chicago. It goes a long way back, to Lord Coke. Students of the law are familiar with that process of legal reasoning known as Coke's approach. The eminent and distinguished Lord Coke in handing down a legal opinion often recited Latin maxims in support of his reasoning. He would say: "Or as the Latin hath it" and would then insert a long string of Latin phrases supporting his conclusions. Many years later it was discovered that Lord Coke had not only made up the law but he had made up the Latin maxims at the same time. Coke's approach in the English law may now become known as Biddle's approach in the American law.

The Attorney General evidently drew his arguments from the same source as the authors of the O. W. I. Handbook of the United States of America. In that propaganda effort of Robert Sherwood, Elmer Davis, and their feverish brethren appears this statement on the first page:

> Throughout American history these grants of power have been broadly interpreted by the President and Congress, and this broad interpretation has generally been sustained by the Supreme Court. In effect the National Government in the United States has power to meet national needs and conform to popular will.

By striking out the words "and Congress" you have Attorney General Biddle's argument.

On pages 2 and 3 of the O. W. I. propaganda so extensively spread around the world, will be found elaborate justification to the Attorney General's theory of the great reserve of power in the President which cannot be found in specific form in the Constitution.

The Attorney General's utterly specious argument that there is power in the Executive derived from some source outside of and higher than the Constitution is recognizable for what it is: An argument for the divine right of kings. Long ago, the Attorney General's English forefathers renounced this doctrine and substituted for it a maxim applicable to the Chicago affair: "What no English king has a right to demand, any English citizen has a right to refuse."

Which is to prevail, the Attorney General's bold assertion of a divine right in the ruler or the rule of freedom that "What no American President has a right to demand, an American citizen has a right to refuse"?

There is one way by which Attorney General Biddle can stop his old preceptor, the great liberal, Mr. Justice Holmes, from revolving in his grave. The Attorney General, in belated recognition of the fitness of things, could admit the error of his actions, the fallacy of his arguments. The road on which he is now traveling leads straight to despotism.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to institute a congressional investigation of the act of the President of the United States, Commander in Chief of the armed forces, in taking over the Montgomery Ward plant in the effort to make effective the order of the President, notwithstanding the open and flagrant defiance of that order by the president of that company, is an outrageous proposal, especially when he was obeying an act of Congress. The proposal and public statements made in support of it are most dangerous. They give direct aid and comfort to those who willfully and maliciously defy the Government of this Republic. The question is whether this company or the President and the Congress is going to run the United States.

Instead of proposing to investigate the President's act and the authority upon which that act rests, the Members of Congress would be entitled to greater respect if they proposed to investigate

the gentleman and those in concert with him and back of him who elect to defy the Government in time of war. Such an investigation might well include the utterances and activities of well-known individuals and publicity organs in the city of Chicago who have since the beginning of this war, in season and out, made and published statements calculated to incite just such conduct as that of which Sewell Avery is guilty.

Mr. Speaker, a Senate committee headed by Senator MCCARRAN is making an investigation of this case.

The Select Committee of the House, headed by the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman HOWARD SMITH, has already held lengthy hearings on the matter. Every phase of the case was investigated with the exception of the President's order.

The Chairman of the War Labor Board, William H. Davis, testified under oath, as did all other witnesses who appeared before the committee. The hearings have been transcribed but not as yet printed.

Read what Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, said in the Senate 2 days ago. I quote:

> I should like to say to the Senate that under a resolution which was adopted some weeks before the Montgomery Ward & Co. case came into such wide public notice, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary was authorized and directed, and an allocation of funds was made in accordance with the resolution, to make a study of all Executive orders and directives. Under the resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary believed that the public interest in the Montgomery Ward & Co. case demanded that the Committee on the Judiciary take notice of the situation, and proceed at once.
>
> Immediately on the matter being drawn to our attention we sent an investigator to the city of Chicago. Reports have come in from the investigator. The investigator will return to the city of Washington tomorrow. The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary expects to proceed with due expedition to the holding of hearings here in the Capitol, at which representatives of Montgomery Ward, as well as the Department of Justice, and perhaps, also, the War Labor Board, will be asked to come before it. The whole matter will be gone into thoroughly and fearlessly, with the idea of determining whether or not additional legislation or new legislation is necessary. That seems to me to be the function of a congressional investigating body, and we shall proceed along that line and proceed within the next few days, and continue to a conclusion, when we will render a report to the Senate.

This shows a special committee of the House would duplicate the Senate investigation. Money will be asked to carry on this investigation when the resolution is adopted. Are we justified in wasting public funds to duplicate a Senate investigation? I say no.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no one can deny the statement that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is probably more responsible for this situation than any Member of Congress. It was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] who championed the legislation which ordered the President to enforce the rulings of the War Labor Board. The War Labor Board was charged with certain responsibilities, but the War Labor Board did not receive the power to carry out its decision. That was passed to the President. Why, I do not know unless some might have had an idea that some embarrassing situations would confront the President from time to time. In any event it is clear that the War Labor Board acted under authority granted by the Congress and the President likewise acted under authority granted by the Congress. The President did not want that authority, because as we know, he vetoed the so-called Smith-Connally bill. I voted against the bill, and I voted to sustain the President's veto, but the bill was passed over the veto. That made it a law. The President, in his capacity as Chief Executive, did not refuse to carry out the mandate of the Congress. Now we find the House is asked to pass a resolution to investigate a case which resulted from acts of Congress. If those who were responsible for the act feel now that they did not intend for the President to use the powers in the manner that he had, then why do they not have the nerve to repeal the law rather than be critical of those who carried out their mandate?

Let us take a look at this situation. Responsible officials of this Government are charged with the duty, both by Executive order and by act of Congress, to adjust the relations between employers and employees with respect to wages and working conditions, and to take such steps as may be necessary to prevent stoppages of work. Those officials, the War Labor Board to be specific, made certain findings and rulings, issued certain orders with respect to a dispute between Montgomery Ward & Co. and its employees. The proceedings of the War Labor Board appear to have been conducted in full compliance with the law.

Notwithstanding this fact, the president of Montgomery Ward first ignored and then defied the order of the Board. The Board then turned to the President of the United States for assistance in making its order effective. Thereupon the President backed up the Board by an order directed to this company and its president to comply with the War Labor Board's order. This mandate Sewell Avery, acting for Montgomery Ward & Co., likewise defied.

The President was then confronted with these alternatives—either to let Sewell Avery and his company make good their defiance, or, on the other hand, make good his order.

If the President of the United States, Commander in Chief of the armed forces, had surrendered to Sewell Avery and Montgomery Ward & Co., he would have been branded by the same gentlemen who are now proposing to lend aid and comfort to Sewell Avery as a poltroon and a coward. He would have been gibbeted on the floor of this Congress and throughout the land as unworthy of the trust reposed in him by a great people now suffering the anxieties and agonies of war.

But the President did not back away. He did exactly what he should have done, what the people expected him to do, and what in their hearts these gentlemen who now criticize him knew and know he should have done.

What was the plain duty of Sewell Avery in this situation? It was his duty in the first place, as a good American citizen, to accept the ruling of the War Labor Board and thus make any action on the part of the President unnecessary. Certainly, after the President had issued his order, it was his unquestioned and imperative duty to obey it, and then if he had any question about the legality and validity of the President's order, to test it in court, as any small ordinary individual would have been expected to do and as 99 percent of them in this Republic would have done.

What now is the plain duty of the Congress of the United States? Can anyone doubt that it is our duty as a part of this Government at war to reenforce the executive branch of the Government in its demand that its orders be obeyed unless and until they are set aside by the orderly processes of the courts? That is the place for the investigation of the President's authority. What an unseemly spectacle indeed would the Congress present to the country and to the world if in this crucial hour we should enter upon an inquiry into the validity of the President's action instead of ourselves recognizing the power and authority of the courts to make the inquiry and finally determine the whole question.

Some hope such an investigation as it is proposed that the Congress should make can have but one certain result and that is to cripple the prestige, power, and authority of the executive branch of this Government in time of war.

I charge that this proposal is nothing less than the cheapest, dirtiest kind of politics. If you doubt it watch the Republican vote. It is brought forward for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to destroy the confidence of the people of this country in the leadership of the President of the United States. The prime objective of some is to bring about if possible such a state of public opinion as to accomplish the defeat of the President.

I commend to these gentlemen who persist in playing politics in these fateful days the reading and rereading of the studied and solemn words of George Washington in his Farewell Address when he said this in warning the country of the "baneful effects of the spirit of party":

> It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeebles the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments, occasionally, riots and insurrections; it opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the Government itself, through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

Sewell Avery undertook to defend his outrageous conduct on the ground that his enterprise is not so vital to the war effort as to justify Presidential action with respect to it. This is an amazing position for this gentleman to take. Is

it possible that Sewell Avery would for a moment contend that the closing down of his great business, extending as it does throughout a great part of this Republic and supplying innumerable people with essential and indeed vital materials both for war and for peace activities, would in nowise affect the war effort? He would be the very first to proclaim the contrary.

I am informed by the War Production Board that the Montgomery Ward Corporation has filed between thirty and thirty-six thousand applications for priorities. It is true that the applications did not require the company to say that it was engaged in war activities, but a very large number of the applications clearly indicated that they are.

Some make the claim that the Post Office Department willfully crippled the company by withdrawing 70 clerks assigned to the firm. I brand that statement as a deliberate falsehood. What are the facts? In order to expedite the handling of the large volume of mail of this firm, the Post Office Department made an agreement with Montgomery Ward to sort the mail in their establishment. Seventy clerks assigned would place the mail in sacks, tag them, and then Montgomery Ward trucks under the agreement would take the sacks to the terminal to be placed on mail cars for delivery. When the strike occurred there was no mail to sort, nor trucks to deliver the sacks. The question was whether or not 70 Government employees would loaf or work? The men were ordered back to the post office for duty to be returned to Montgomery Ward when conditions warranted. That is the explanation of the Post Office Department and justification for my statement the charge was a deliberate falsehood.

The saddest aspect of this whole matter is that the head of a great concern, which has served tens and hundreds of thousands of people throughout the land, should so conduct himself as to interfere with the war effort and perhaps lead to the sacrifice of the lives of young men who come from the very homes which Montgomery Ward has served through the years. How can the mothers and fathers who for long years have patronized and respected Montgomery Ward be other than saddened beyond words at this failure on the part of this great company to cooperate with and support their sons who at this moment are on the battle fronts of the world? Instead of thinking so much of what he conceives to be his technical rights as the head of a great concern, Sewell Avery should think solemnly of his obligation to his country and countless fathers and mothers, sons and daughters, of this country, whose patronage through the years has made the success of Montgomery Ward possible.

I venture the prediction that the day is not far distant when he will blush to look into the faces of these good people. Neither Presidential nor court orders should be necessary to bring Sewell Avery into the discharge of his duty as an American citizen. The appeals of the good people whose patronage he has enjoyed ought to be sufficient to do that.

Two outstanding representatives of industry, which means that they were to look after the interest of Montgomery Ward and other employers who had cases before the War Labor Board were the most critical of all in condemning the action of Avery in refusing to abide by the decision of the War Labor Board and the order of the President.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that every one of us dislikes is that the executive branch of the Government found it necessary, in carrying out an act of Congress, to use the armed forces. This was due entirely to the attitude of Avery and other officials of the Montgomery Ward Co. Their defiance of the representative of the Government, the Under Secretary of Commerce, was pronounced from the outset. Not once but on numerous occasions Mr. Avery defied the representatives of the Government, and defied the officer in charge of the command, Major Weber. First he refused to cooperate in any way and later on he said he would not leave the building unless carried out bodily. Major Weber made every attempt to have Mr. Avery walk out of the building with him, without success.

I have, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the affidavit filed by Wayne C. Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce, in the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. It is my purpose to include this as part of my remarks. It follows:

AFFIDAVIT

Wayne C. Taylor, first being duly sworn, on oath deposes and says:

That I am the Under Secretary of Commerce of the United States; that on April 25, 1944, I was directed by the Secretary of Commerce to proceed to Chicago, Ill., and there to take possession of and to operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., located in that city, pursuant to the terms and provisions of an Executive order signed by the President of the United States on April 25, 1944.

I arrived in Chicago the morning of April 26, 1944. Accompanied by Ugo Carusi, Executive Assistant to the Attorney General, I went to the offices of Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., at 619 West Chicago Avenue. We arrived at approximately 11:50 a. m. We proceeded immediately to the offices of Mr. Sewell L. Avery, chairman of the board of Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc. There we met Mr. Avery and his attorneys, Stuart S. Ball and John A. Barr. I explained to Mr. Avery the nature of my mission and presented to him certified copy of the Executive order issued by the President on April 25, 1944, and a copy of the memorandum of the Secretary of Commerce in which he designated me as his representative and operating manager. I then read a statement indicating that I had taken possession of the plants and other properties in Chicago in the name of the Secretary of Commerce for and on behalf of the United States of America. I also delivered to Mr. Avery a letter addressed to him by the Secretary of Commerce. I explained to Mr. Avery that my directions were to ask for his full cooperation as well as that of all the officers and staff of Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., and that for my part I would do everything possible so that the Government operation of these plants would cause as little disruption as possible in their normal operations.

Messrs. Avery, Ball, and Barr stated that they had definitely concluded that the President was without authority to issue the Executive order and hence the Executive order and all action growing out of the Executive order had no legal standing. Therefore, they could not agree that the United States Government was in legal possession of the plant.

We had a somewhat lengthy discussion in which they elaborated their position and during which I attempted to ascertain what further steps should be taken to carry out my instructions in full. Mr. Avery made the very definite statement that he would not surrender possession of the plant inasmuch as he considered that he could not legally do so; as the chief executive of the company, he had certain duties and responsibilities toward the stockholders. In this connection, he indicated that he would never consent to the Government's taking possession of the plant and that, if it wished to obtain possession, it would have to do so by force.

Under the circumstances I told Mr. Avery I wished to obtain further instructions from the Secretary of Commerce. Whereupon Mr. Carusi and I left the general offices of Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., and proceeded to the United States attorney's office in Chicago. I telephoned the Secretary of Commerce and received instructions to ask for the assistance of the United States marshal in posting notices and otherwise carrying out in full my instructions to take possession of and operate the plants and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., in Chicago, Ill.

I then returned to the general offices of Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., accompanied by Mr. Carusi; Mr. John D. Goodloe, special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce; the United States marshal; and eight deputies. We immediately went to the office of Mr. Avery and, in the presence of those who accompanied me and Messrs. Ball and Barr, who were again with Mr. Avery, I explained that the Secretary of Commerce had instructed me to secure assistance from the United States marshal's office and return to the plant, using whatever force was necessary to carry out my instructions, namely, to definitely establish possession of and, on behalf of the United States, to operate such plants until further notice. Mr. Avery's response was much the same as that of the preceding visit, except that he pointed out that at noon when he had said the Government of the United States could get possession of the Montgomery Ward & Co. plant only by force, he had meant actual force in the realistic sense of the word; that no mere showing of force, such as the presence of the marshals, would cause him to recede from his earlier position. He again indicated that he could not recognize me or any of the gentlemen with me as having any lawful authority to issue any instructions to him or any of the employees or officials of Montgomery Ward & Co., or to take any part whatsoever in the operation or management of the affairs of Montgomery Ward & Co.

After telephonic consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Attorney General of the United States, General Davis, who had previously been authorized by the Under Secretary of War to do so, was required to dispatch immediately to the general offices of Montgomery Ward & Co. a sufficient detail of United States Army troops and to see that all instructions issued by me with respect to the taking of possession and the operation of the plants of Montgomery Ward & Co. by the United States were promptly and fully carried out. The detail of troops, consisting of 44 men in charge of Lieutenant Pincura, arrived about 6:45 p. m. Lieutenant Pincura reported to me. After receiving my instructions, we entered Mr. Avery's office. The lieutenant stated that he understood his instructions to be to remove Mr. Avery immediately and otherwise to carry out such instructions as I might give him. Mr. Avery immediately demanded to know if he was being evicted. I corrected the lieutenant in that regard by saying no instructions to remove Mr. Avery had been given by me. Mr. Avery indicated

that it was past his usual time to leave the office and that he would be leaving in a few minutes. A few minutes later he left in company with Messrs. Ball and Barr.

A military guard was immediately established at the main entrance and troops dispatched through the building, with instructions to protect the property and all persons employed or seeking employment therein, and to interfere in no way with anyone entering the building on legitimate business. With the assistance of the troops and representatives of the United States marshal's office, appropriate notices to the effect that the plants were now in the possession of and being operated by the United States were posted at all entrances in the building and at other appropriate places within the building. Lieutenant Pincura was instructed to continue to thus employ a detail of troops on a 24-hour basis and to hold himself ready to carry out such further instructions as I might issue.

After giving the necessary instructions to Lieutenant Pincura, whom I left in charge of the plant, we left the building.

I returned to the main office of Montgomery Ward & Co. at about 7:45 a. m., April 27, 1944, accompanied by the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, his Executive Assistant, Mr. Carusi, Mr. Hugh B. Cox, Assistant Solicitor General of the United States, and Mr. Goodloe. Neither Mr. Avery nor any of the other officials of the company had at that time reported for work. The first one I was able to contact was Mr. H. L. Pearson, vice president and treasurer, who in the presence of the Attorney General, Mr. Carusi, and Mr. Goodloe was asked by me to explain the organizational set-up of the accounting and fiscal operations of the company. I stressed the importance of this in order that appropriate steps might be taken for the purpose of making such changes in the books as would be necessary to show separately the operations of the company during the period of Government operation. Mr. Pearson was explaining the organization of his office and the functions of the general comptroller, mail-order comptroller, and retail comptroller, and their respective staffs, all of which are under his supervision, when Mr. Barr came to the door and advised Mr. Pearson he was wanted on the telephone. When Mr. Pearson returned he stated he had been advised to furnish no information to me or any of my assistants, nor to carry out any instructions that I might issue. He stated that he regarded Mr. Avery as his superior and still in charge of the affairs of Montgomery Ward & Co., and he was receiving his instructions only from or through Mr. Avery. In response to the inquiry of the Attorney General, Mr. Pearson refused to say who had advised him. The Attorney General then specifically asked Mr. Pearson if he would permit accountants, representing Mr. Taylor, who were shortly expected to arrive to examine the books of Montgomery Ward. He stated emphatically he would not do so unless instructed to do so by Mr. Avery.

The next officials of Montgomery Ward & Co. to arrive at the plant, or at least the next ones with whom I was able to communicate, were Messrs. Ball and Barr. Each denied that he had instructed Mr. Pearson not to cooperate with Mr. Taylor or furnish him with any information concerning the books or records. The Attorney General asked them for assurance that they would not instruct Mr. Pearson or any other officer or employee of the company to refuse to cooperate with me or to comply with my instructions. They refused to give any such assurance. About this time the accountants, who had been expected, arrived, and Mr. Pearson again, in their presence, refused Mr. Goodloe's request that they be permitted access to the books and records of Montgomery Ward & Co.

Almost precisely at 10 o'clock Mr. Avery arrived at his office accompanied by Messrs. Barr and Ball. I introduced the Attorney General (Mr. Cox having left before Mr. Avery's arrival). I explained that the Attorney General was there to give me such legal advice and assistance as I might need; that I planned to remain in possession of the plant and facilities and to continue to operate them and would permit no further interference or refusal to comply with my instructions on the part of Mr. Avery or any other officer or employee of the company. Mr. Avery again stated that he considered the Executive order and all the acts taken pursuant thereto as being illegal and denied that the United States Government was in possession of the plant. In response to inquiries, principally by the Attorney General, he stated that he would not comply with my instructions, and that he considered himself as still being in full charge of the plants and facilities of the company. He then specifically refused our request that he call a meeting of his staff so that we might talk with them. He also refused to permit me or my accountants to inspect the books and records. Whereupon I asked Mr. Avery to leave and not return until his attitude had changed. Mr. Avery declined to leave and said he would do so only if he was forced to, and by force he meant if he was actually bodily carried out of the building.

After consultation with the Attorney General, Mr. Taylor instructed Major Weber to remove, or cause to be removed, Mr. Avery from the building and not to permit his return. Major Weber turned to Mr. Avery and said since he must carry out those instructions he hoped Mr. Avery would just walk out with him. Mr. Avery refused to do so and repeated his remark about not leaving unless carried out bodily. At this point several soldiers, at Major Weber's command, carried Mr. Avery from the office and out of the building.

I thereupon sent word by Major Weber to Mr. Clement B. Ryan, president of Montgomery Ward & Co., that I would like to see him at his convenience. Major Weber reported back that Mr. Ryan said he was too busy in a conference, and I sent word back that I would like to see him at his earliest convenience, but, in any event, by 12:30. The word that I received back was that he would not see me at all, notwithstanding the fact that it had been made perfectly clear to him in writing that Mr. Biddle and I wished to talk to him informally, either alone or with such of his staff as he wished to bring, about the steps which should be taken so that the operations of the company might be continued in a normal manner without interruption of deliveries to customers or losses to stockholders; also that his presence in my office was not requested for the purpose of giving him any orders or directions. This attitude on the part of Mr. Ryan was identical with the attitude previously taken by Mr. Avery.

WAYNE C. TAYLOR.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of April A. D. 1944.

[SEAL] CORINNE R. LEVY,
Notary Public.

Mr. FISH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON].

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lively interest and indeed wide apprehension throughout the country on account of the Ward incident, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House that I have today introduced a bill (H. R. 4758) to provide for court review of decisions of the National War Labor Board. I have also attempted in a small way to tighten that part of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, that defines the powers of the President.

Heretofore in the history of our country the Chief Executive has always leaned over backward in his endeavor not to encroach or to even give the appearance of encroachment on the basic rights of the citizens as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. This in spite of the title "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy" which Mr. Biddle adroitly brings into his Montgomery Ward opinion. You may recall that this is not the first instance in late years when the title "Commander in Chief" has been used to bolster and attempt to build up the powers of the Chief Executive. It is conceded that there is some elasticity to the Presidential powers and with a subservient Attorney General the Chief Executive can always find reason or excuses for action if not specific legal statutes as a frame for a formal opinion to sustain it. The Montgomery Ward incident would not be so startling and serious to the country if it had not been another striking incident, yes, perhaps a culminating circumstance of creeping totalitarianism which has characterized the Government for the past decade.

My bill provides prompt court review of War Labor Board decisions. Surely no one can find fault with giving any man his day in court. It seems pertinent to point out to the rank and file of organized labor even though the idea may be scoffed at by some labor leaders that if the President can take over any business or property this certainly does not exclude labor unions. I call your attention to a statement of the Attorney General in which he said and I quote:

> No business or property is immune to a Presidential order.

This conclusion of Mr. Biddle's and this action of the President lead me to this thought: Today the President directs a civil official to use the Army to take over a large mail-order business which has nothing to do directly with the war effort. We should be warned that tomorrow when organized labor or some portion of it has served its political purpose and no longer is needed it too may become the victim of a dispute with the Chief Executive. It would be well for organized labor to recall and remember that Mr. Roosevelt's favorites of today are often visited with wrath tomorrow. He may very well tire some day catering to certain labor leaders and cast them in the same roll as the head of the Chicago mail-order house.

My bill provides and I quote:

> Any party to a labor dispute with respect to which the War Labor Board has rendered a decision who is aggrieved by such decision may obtain a declaration of rights in respect of and an order enjoining the enforcement of such decision in the circuit court of appeals for the circuit in which such party resides or has his principal office or place of business or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in such court within 30 days after the entry of such decision a petition for such declaration and order. The judgment of the court shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The resolution before the House today to investigate the Montgomery Ward seizure can only be of value to the Government as well as to the citizens everywhere because all of the facts on both sides of the question can be summed up in the findings of this investigation. In the meantime I earnestly hope that the Military Affairs Committee, to which my bill has been referred, will give it prompt attention and consideration and report it back to the House. If they will do this promptly I feel sure that this body in an endeavor to preserve the civil rights of the American citizen will pass the bill by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from border to border the country was shocked by the unprecedented and wholly unnecessary use of United States troops to take over a retail store of Montgomery Ward & Co., because the manager of that business refused to recognize the right of the War Labor Board to institute administrative regulations, not statutory law, mind you, and attempt to enforce those administrative regulations while studiously avoiding a hearing in the courts to determine the legal right of the War Labor Board to institute such administrative regulations.

My remarks have no bearing on the question of whether or not the past policies of Montgomery Ward & Co. have or have not been fair to their employees. At this time I wish to discuss certain principles, the first of which is whether, under a vague and unsupported opinion by a supine Attorney General who, apparently, is willing to utilize his high office for political purposes, the President can use the armed forces of this country to take over a retail business not engaged in war work or the national defense except in the most vague and indirect way, if at all.

It naturally follows that if the President can thus take over a big retail business he can likewise take over a little retail business. Under such vague powers as the Attorney General ascribes to him, the President could take over a hamburger stand or a delicatessen store for some asserted violation of an order of some minor official.

If the President can take over any retail business, manifestly he can take over any other organization, because in attempting to justify his action, the Attorney General held that "no business or property is immune to Presidential power in wartime." This language, my friends, is all inclusive. According to this ruling, every citizen engaged in any business is held to be directly or indirectly engaged in the national defense, even though the business is running a peanut stand, a billiard hall, a barber shop, or a beauty parlor. Not even newspapers, regardless of the constitutional provision for a free press could hope to escape the heavy hand of the bureaucratic dictator. Homes and farms constitute property, and under the fantastic interpretation of Attorney General Biddle, a Federal agent can arbitrarily take possession of every farm and every home in the land without regard for "due process of law."

Yes; under this broad and vaguely defined concept of Presidential powers, the President can take over even the labor unions, or any of them he might choose, at any time he might choose. The fact that he is more than friendly with certain labor leaders at this time does not in the least mitigate the danger that exists for labor unions. If the seizure of Montgomery Ward is permitted to stand, then every labor union in the United States of America, every lodge, every other organization, every business, big or little, will continue to operate only by tolerance of the President of the United States or, as he chooses to put it, the Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

Another point which I wish to bring to the attention of the American people is that the President apparently has one brand of justice for Montgomery Ward & Co. and another brand for John L. Lewis. Again I wish to say that this discussion is not intended to apply to the merits or demerits of John L. Lewis' and the coal miners' contentions. It is to point out that apparently the President is willing to use the United States Army to make flesh of one while he is willing to make fowl of somebody else.

Another point which I wish to stress, because I think it is important to the American people and their liberty, is that Montgomery Ward & Co. have long been trying to get the War Labor Board to go to court to determine the validity of its right by administrative order to compel the inclusion of the union-maintenance clause in labor contracts. Certainly the War Labor Board ought not to be afraid, and certainly the unions ought not to be afraid, to go to the courts on this issue, so that it may be decided by due process of law. This ought to be especially true in courts in which the President has appointed 296 of the 316 sitting judges, and especially since he has appointed seven of the nine members of the Supreme Court, where the case eventually will be decided.

I want to discuss still another point. The civil courts are functioning in the United States. At no time have they ceased to function. The proper processes of civil law have not been impeded or obstructed. We are under no condition of invasion which renders the civil courts unable to function even temporarily.

The representatives of the Federal Government, upon refusal of the head of Montgomery Ward, Mr. Avery, to vacate his office, went in with six or eight United States marshals and demanded the possession of the property. The head of Montgomery Ward, wishing to get the issue into court, refused to grant possession. Here was one man in his late sixties refusing to grant eight United States marshals the right to take over his office. He claimed he was protecting the rights and property of his stockholders. Any one of those marshals probably could have thrown Avery over his shoulder and carried him out of the plant without a great deal of effort. It was obvious that any one of them could have taken him by the arm and escorted him from the plant. The fact that they did not do so is a pretty clear indication that the Executive Assistant to the Attorney General, Mr. Carusi, and the United States marshals figured that they did not have the law on their side. It was then that the Attorney General, acting for the President, did something which probably will go down in history as a wanton and mistaken act of dictatorship. He ordered armed troops to go in and take over this retail business.

We must never forget that when the rights of one citizen are violated by force of the Government the rights of every citizen in these United States then and there have also been violated. I think there is no question but that the Montgomery Ward case will become a celebrated one. It already is notorious. It represents a strained interpretation of the Attorney General as to whether a retail business is a war industry. Although the Attorney General has access to the courts every minute of this time, as did the War Labor Board and the President, they refused to follow that orderly and American course and chose the way of force—the way of Hitler and Mussolini.

The only claim put forth by the Attorney General was that if Montgomery Ward could disregard the decision of the War Labor Board and the President's decree, it might influence other industries to do the same. This argument, however, is without force, because most of the war industries have already accepted the decision of the War Labor Board on matters such as maintenance of unions, even though they have accepted the rulings under protest and have disagreed with the basic principles involved.

The impression is fast spreading over the country that there is personal animosity toward Montgomery Ward and that the President used the Army to satisfy that animosity rather than to maintain a basic principle.

The American people will watch this issue in the courts with a great deal of anxiety. If this action of the President is sustained by the courts, it will leave the impression that they are no longer an independent group, but are dominated by the Chief Executive.

So far as business executives and the people generally are concerned, the Montgomery Ward seizure by the Federal Government brings us face to face with the following considerations:

First. Demarcation between war industries and civilian businesses will be virtually eliminated in the executive application of the War Labor Act.

Second. If the courts sustain the Government in this case, the authority of the War Labor Board will be vastly broadened and strengthened.

Third. If the courts sustain Mr. Roosevelt's action in the Montgomery Ward case, all business, big and little, will have to operate in the future under terrorism and the threat of having an armed soldier walk in and take possession.

Fourth. The Federal Government will have gone into the business of supporting certain labor leaders with both the

civil and military power of the United States as against other labor leaders not so popular with the Chief Executive.

The administration fought with everything at its command to prevent the House of Representatives investigating this case, and only ceased its efforts when it became apparent that a revolution in the House was imminent. Every Member thereof must realize that the Bill of Rights is involved, distinctly and completely, in this issue. There is no citizen so obscure in any community in this land that he is not vitally and directly interested in the outcome of this case. If the definition of war work can be stretched, as the Attorney General seeks to stretch it, and if this definition is supported in court, then no further legislation is needed to draft all workers, to prohibit the right to strike, or to deprive any citizen of his civil liberty.

Every American citizen who loves liberty, every father and mother and every brother and sister who has a loved one in the armed forces fighting for liberty, should demand of his or her Representative in the Congress that full and complete investigation of this seizure be made by the Congress, and that the people be given facts.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us should be adopted by the unanimous vote of this House.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein a statement that when the Congress declared war it declared war against Germany and Japan and not against the citizens of the United States as some seem to think.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may extend his own remarks at this point.

There was no objection.

UNLIMITED POWER DANGEROUS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending resolution is to ascertain the legality of the President's recent order.

The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Rules Committee [Mr. SABATH], attempted to justify his support of the President's action by declaring that, under the New Deal, Ward's had made large profits and that it had been a beneficiary of special favors bestowed by the administration. Does the gentleman mean to charge the administration granted special unwarranted favors?

The gentleman's reasons are absurd. Neither justifies the unlawful exercise of arbitrary power.

That Ward's has made money while the administration has been in power is proof rather of exceptional ability than a justification for an unlawful seizure.

Other gentlemen, attempting to justify the use of force by the Army against a private citizen, against a corporation which has not violated a criminal law, cited the declaration of war made on the 8th day of December 1941, and argued that, under the grant of constitutional power to make war, the President was justified not only in the seizure of Ward's, but in the use of any other power which he might choose to exercise against any citizen.

The answer to that argument is that, when this Congress declared war, it declared war against Germany and Japan; it did not declare war against the citizens of the United States; that, while the President is authorized—in fact, required—to do his utmost to defeat Germany and Japan, he has no right to make war—civil war—against citizens of the United States by unconstitutional seizures of their persons or property. The Army is fighting Japs and Germans, not carrying old men out of their offices.

THE RESOLUTION

I shall vote for the pending resolution authorizing an investigation of the seizure of the Montgomery Ward & Co. plant at Chicago, but in my judgment investigation of that seizure, while it may be instructive, does not go far enough.

Yesterday in the other body a somewhat similar resolution was amended by adding a clause authorizing an investigation into the relationship existing between Montgomery Ward & Co. and its employees. That again was but a part of the situation which should be laid before the people. The amendment offered yesterday in the other body should have gone further and authorized an investigation of the relationship between not only employer and the employees but between the employees and the union and its officers.

It is quite true that the committee which investigated the activities of the N. L. R. B. and the special committee more recently authorized to investigate the question as to the legality of the Executive orders issued by administrative departments other than the orders issued by the President, by the War and Navy Departments, have already taken testimony bearing upon the validity of the security-of-membership order issued against Ward's.

There is available to the Members of the House the sworn testimony of Mr. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, of Wayne B. Morse, a member of the Board, and I think other members of the Board and the Board's legal adviser.

The issue as to the legality of the Board's order is a very narrow one. An examination of the testimony of the Chairman of the Board and of others who testified in its behalf will show that the Board takes the broad view that, being authorized by the act to settle labor disputes, any limiting phraseology contained in the act itself is mere surplusage.

On that issue Members of the House need no further information, but information which will disclose the actual methods used by unions in their organizational drives and by employees when elections are about to be conducted will be of great value, of substantial aid to Members of the House.

For that reason the investigation should be broadened as has just been indicated.

PROTECT THE HOME FOLKS

When the British Empire was fighting with its back to the wall, we were told that, unless we came to the rescue, Hitler would win, we would find our own country invaded, our own liberties destroyed.

From the time when we first began to send supplies and munitions of war to England, it was certain that we would be drawn into the conflict and Japan, sensing the situation, thinking she saw an opportunity to catch us when we were elsewhere engaged, jumped Pearl Harbor.

War was declared and, from that day to this, the world has seen a nation united, throwing into the struggle millions of men, mountains of supplies, billions of dollars.

America's resources, America's men, turned the tide of battle and, on the foreign front, it is certain that in the end our fighting men will win.

No matter how complete their victory abroad, no matter how decisive the defeat of our armed forces, unless here at home we preserve the independence of our people, their civil liberties, our institutions and methods of Government, their sacrifice will have been in vain, the battle will have been lost.

Succeeding months have seen an ever-increasing grasp and exercise of power by the administrative branch of the Government. The balance of power which, in a republic, is vital to the very existence of that republic has been destroyed.

A judiciary and a Congress, both of which were designed to, and which should, act to keep within bounds the natural extension of power sought ever by Executives, have failed to perform their constitutional functions, to act promptly, courageously and efficiently.

Unless, at the coming elections, the people elect representatives who have the courage and the determination to restore constitutional Government, this Nation will become the tool, the plaything, of a dictator.

That the people may and will, unless Congress now acts effectively, be either deceived in the choice of, or deprived of, representatives freely chosen is evident to all who care to study the propaganda and the methods which will be used to overthrow by a peaceful revolution our Government.

For months, yes, for years, there has been a steady flow of propaganda all directed to the end of destroying the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives.

Although the people of the district, as a rule, know personally the men they send to represent them in Washington; although, through many a grilling campaign, the faults and the virtues of the candidates for the House and the Senate have been thoroughly canvassed and the people, using the knowledge which they have, have become convinced of the merit of a candidate and chosen him as their representative, the effort to discredit him begins the moment when, in Washington, he exercises independent judgment, refuses to betray his people at the demand of lobbyists and propa-

gandists or to follow the commands of the party in power.

The present administration, it is freely acknowledged, has become a labor administration.

There are many pressure groups which demand special legislation. But labor organizations are the only political group which is no longer content to come to Congress, present issues, and submit them for decision upon their merits. They are determined that only those shall sit in Congress who will do their bidding.

In June of 1942 one of the strongest unions in the country, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, an A. F. of L. affiliate, with 650,000 members, adopted a resolution at its annual convention empowering the union's president, Daniel J. Tobin, to—and I quote—"spend such money as is necessary to acquaint the public, and especially labor, with the records of certain Congressmen" during that year's coming campaign.

At that time its executive board adopted a resolution calling for the defeat in the November elections of congressional candidates whom it describes "as enemies of labor."

The spokesman for the union's executive board announced that "the campaign probably will be directed against a majority of the Republicans in Congress coming up for reelection because most of them have voted consistently against labor, against President Roosevelt."

At that time the union claimed a cash balance in its treasury of $3,000,000, and stated it was the owner of $5,000,000 in War bonds.

More recently the C. I. O. has formed its committee for political action, has publicly announced that it had a war chest of $2,000,000, and was determined to defeat all those who opposed its demands.

Some C. I. O. affiliates have already inaugurated the plan of soliciting voluntary contributions for campaign purposes from their members. No fault could be found with that program if the contributions were actually voluntary. Unfortunately, it has been the practice of both unions to, by coercion and pressure, force would-be employees, those who were employees, to pay initiation fees, monthly dues, and special assessments. There is no reason to believe that the so-called contributions now asked for political purposes will not be enforced by pressure from union officials and organizations.

Based upon past experience, there is justifiable reason for the conclusion that, unless the so-called contributions for political purposes are made, union members will be disciplined, it may be expelled, and, under the terms of closed-shop and security-of-membership clauses, deprived of their means of livelihood.

We all recall that the United States Supreme Court, although one Justice of that Court declared that the practice was nothing but highway robbery, held that the levying of tribute by union officials upon truckloads of food and merchandise entering New York City was not a violation of the national anti-racketeering law because, forsooth, it was a recognized union practice.

This House passed a law—the Hobbs bill—declaring such levying of tribute to be unlawful, but it was buried at the other end of the Capitol and racketeering which, if practiced by other than union men, would be plain highway robbery, still goes on.

This administration, through administrative agencies, has consistently and persistently followed the practice of favoring the C. I. O., forcing employees either into its ranks or the ranks of the A. F. of L.

The presidents of both great labor organizations have, on occasion, charged administrative agencies with unfair, biased, and prejudicial conduct—this when their own particular demands were rejected.

With the A. F. of L. with millions at its command; with the C. I. O. prepared to spend $2,000,000 to influence elections, everyone should be able to see that, unless they are brought to observe the same rules of political morality that all other organizations, that all corporations and all individuals must follow, this shortly will become a government, not of, by, and for the people, but a government by union politicians, with taxes levied, expenditures made, legislation enacted, to protect and advance the interests, and only the interests, of those who belong to labor organizations. If that day comes, we shall have class warfare here in America.

Unless the unions, with their millions of dollars, with their hundreds of thousands of paid political workers, are required to conform to the laws prohibiting corrupt practices, our returning service men and women will find here, not a republic, not a constitutional government, but a dictatorship.

What a dictatorship by labor means was rendered crystal clear when the President last week came to the aid of the union which had lost a strike and used the Army to seize the business of Montgomery Ward & Co. at Chicago.

To remedy the situation, this week an amendment to the War Labor Disputes Act was offered by me, as was an amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act.

This Congress should act without delay to preserve the purity of elections, our constitutional government; to insure the preservation of the freedom and the independence for which our men are fighting.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include quotations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, throughout history it has been true that whenever the subversion of laws begins, the iron fetters appear. Once edicts take the place of laws and the armed forces step in to enforce them, the precedent is established to justify using the armed forces to enter church, business places, industries when and if any of these institutions incur the displeasure of one man arbitrary power or that of an executive board or bureau.

The issue involved in the Montgomery Ward seizure is one of the utmost gravity. A resort to armed force to enter and take over a plant and eject its president at the point of the bayonet raises the question of liberty under law enforced by the courts or tyranny operating under usurpation backed by armed force. The statement made long ago—1790—by one of the fathers of our Federal Constitution, in which he points out the effect on a person living under a weak constitution is worthy of reflection. It was to avoid weakness that the powers to be exercised by those entrusted with power were defined and limited and provisions made against amendment of the supreme law of the land by Congress.

Here is the description of the effect on our citizens of a weak constitution such as our Federal Constitution would become under the construction placed upon the Constitution by Attorney General Biddle:

> A person of a very different description appears in view—pale, trembling, emaciated, faltering in his steps, not daring to look upward, but, with marked anxiety, rolling his eager eyes on every side. Who is he? He is the slave of a bad constitution and a tyrannical government; he is afraid to act or speak or look; he knows that his actions and his words, however guarded, may be construed to be criminal; he knows that even his looks and countenance may be considered as the signs and evidences of treacherous thoughts and treasonable conspiracies; and he knows that the suspicion of his masters, upon any of these points, may be fatal, for he knows that he is at the mercy of those who, upon the slightest suspicion, may seize or hang him—who may do whatever they please with him, and with all those who are dear to him. What effect must this man's situation produce upon his mind and temper? Can his views be great or exalted? No. Such views, instead of being encouraged, would give offense, and he is well aware what would follow. Can openness and candor beam from his soul? No. Such light would be hateful to his masters; it must be extinguished. Can he feel affection for his country, its constitution, or its government? No. His country is his prison, its constitution is his curse, and its government is his rod of oppression held continually over his head. What must this man be? He must be abject, fawning, dastardly, selfish, disingenuous, deceitful, cunning, base—but why proceed in the disgusting detail? He must receive the stamp of servility fully impressed on his person, on his mind, and on his manners. Such are the influences of a constitution, good or bad, upon the political body; such are the influences upon the members of which that body is composed. Surely, then, the first consideration of a state, and its most important duty, is to form that constitution, which will be best in itself, and best adopted to the genius and character and manners of her citizens. Such a constitution will be the basis of her preservation, her happiness, and her perfection.
>
> JAMES WILSON.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the seizure of the Ward plant by the Army at the order of the President should bring clearly to public view how dangerously near our country is to becoming a dictatorship. The people should not overlook the fact that the seizure of private property, such as took place in the Ward case, is almost tantamount to the seizure of persons.

Should the administration be successful in maintaining its position in the Ward case our people should be prepared to expect most anything. The outright seizure of persons and the concentration camp could easily follow. Our people must now rise against tyranny as they have never done before.

This is not what our soldiers are bleeding and dying for. They are fighting to preserve the liberties vouchsafed to us by our forefathers from foreign attack. Our soldiers on the battlefields have entrusted to those of us who remain at home the preservation of those liberties against attack from within our country. We must not fail them.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, nothing has so incensed and outraged our citizens as the recent high-handed seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. by order of the President of the United States. Our people are not only outraged—they are worried—and they have a right to be. If the Executive has sufficient authority under existing law to take over this private property and business he could, under this same authority, take over the property and business of every citizen in this Nation. I contend this action is an abuse of Executive power. It violates the intent of Congress, who gave the President great war power. It smacks of dictatorship and Congress should act at once so as to reestablish the faith of our own citizens in their own Government. No American can read Attorney General Biddle's statement in dealing with this matter without being greatly alarmed. For instance, in his application to the court for an injunction he asserted "No business or property is immune to a Presidential order" and followed with the admonition to the court in relation to its duty with the following statement:

> Particularly in time of war the court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive.

If these statements are the views of the administration in power then I say, Mr. Speaker, we have traveled dangerously far on the road toward totalitarian government. In fact, we have not already traveled far—we are already there. It is just such statements as those uttered by Mr. Biddle that make our people question what we are fighting for.

We are now engaged in the second war within 25 years to make our world safe for democracy. Thousands of our young men gave their lives in the First World War and many more thousands are giving their lives today on the battle fronts in every section of the world. My constituents write me asking why we send our boys to fight on foreign battlefields against the dictatorships of other countries when one is gradually being forced upon us at home. It is a question that merits the serious attention of everyone. The President of the United States has raised this issue and it is now the duty of Congress not only to make an investigation, but to accept the challenge of the executive department of our Government. The issue cannot be side-stepped. It must be met face to face and if I am any judge of sentiment our Congress is going to meet it with the courage of their conviction. This monster of bureaucratic control has been creeping upon our people and our Nation like a paralysis. Its movement must be arrested before our freedom and liberty are destroyed.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein a number of quotations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, if any single event on the home front has disturbed the people of the United States it was the use by the Attorney General of the Army to seize the head offices of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago. And the seizure has not looked any the better for the language and pleadings used by the Attorney General in attempting to justify his action.

Take his statement on the President's powers:

> The President's unquestioned war power extends to any type of business or property that is essential to the prosecution of the war. To wage war successfully and to fulfill his duties as Commander in Chief in time of war, the authority of the President must extend not only to matters of a strictly military nature, but also to all phases of civilian life which contribute in any way to the prosecution of the war. Where the President has found and proclaimed the emergency and need, the courts will not review or, indeed, inquire into the accuracy of the President's findings, or the wisdom, propriety, or prudence of his action.

Section 2, article II, of the Constitution says:

> The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the service of the United States.

"One man is not greater than the Government"—but that applies to the President as well as to Sewell Avery, or to the humblest citizen. There is nothing in the Constitution that makes the President the Commander in Chief of the life and property of private citizens. He could direct the Army to proceed, of course, in time of war, and presumably he could ask the Attorney General to deliver the order for him, but it is not even clear that he did that. In testimony before the House investigating committee, Mr. Biddle hints that he advised the President to use the Army rather than to rely upon getting a court order for execution through the regular officers of the court. The Associated Press report says:

> Representative CLARK, Democrat, of North Carolina brought up the subject by asking Mr. Biddle if he did not think it likely there would have been more chance of some "untoward incident" or disorder in the use of United States marshals.
>
> "That's what I'm afraid of," the Attorney General replied. "Having been a United States attorney, I know the way marshals act, I would not trust a marshal to take over a plant.
>
> "Soldiers removed Mr. Avery much more quietly and sensibly than the marshals would have."

Does this mean that the Attorney General distrusts United States marshals, officers of his own Department of Justice? Just what are the full implications of the Montgomery Ward Affair? Personally I think that Sewell Avery, head of Ward's, behaved in an arrogant manner, certainly an uncooperative manner for wartime, but boys fighting storm troopers abroad may well wonder what they fight for when the Attorney General at home apes totalitarian methods and uses Hitlerian arguments to support his action.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 521 creates a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom the Speaker shall designate as chairman.

The purpose and scope of this resolution is expressed in the following words:

> The committee is authorized and directed to make an investigation with respect to the seizure by the United States on April 26, 1944, of property of Montgomery Ward & Co.

The power and authority of the committee is limited to that one simple but important issue. This investigation does not involve the question of labor or management, and neither does it involve the question of wages, hours, or working conditions. This committee is limited to investigate and report on the facts as to the seizure of this property by the Army, and the committee is directed to report as early as is practicable during the present session of Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as the committee deems advisable.

There is a wide conflict as to the facts and as to the questions of law involved. The administration insists that the President had the constitutional right to order the Army to seize this property. Many others strongly insist that the President had neither the power nor the right to make the seizure. They insist that he violated the Constitution and laws of the Nation and is undertaking to substitute the military authority for the civil authority, and this is a threat to all private enterprise and is likewise a threat to the civil rights of farmers, workers, and other citizens. They insist that while we are fighting for liberty and freedom in other parts of the world, the President and his administration are un-

dertaking to destroy liberty and freedom here at home.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance and of the tremendous interest in the Nation generally in the issues involved, I think that Congress owes a duty to itself and to the Nation, as a whole, to make a fair, complete, and impartial investigation, and we indulge the hope that this committee will be impartial and fair and submit the facts as they are to the Congress and to the country. The Congress and the country are entitled to know the facts. The House is not called upon here to decide who is right or who is wrong in this dispute.

If the President is authorized under the Constitution and the acts of Congress to make this seizure the country ought to know it, and every law-abiding and patriotic citizen should submit to such lawful authority, and if it is deemed wise to amend the law or to limit these powers, the Congress should take appropriate action to do so. On the other hand, if the President, by this seizure, is violating the Constitution and the laws passed by Congress and is undertaking to displace the civil authority with military power, the country ought to know that and the administration and its officers should refrain from such unconstitutional and illegal acts. The farmer, the small and large businessman, and those operating mines, factories, mills, and shops should be protected in their constitutional and legal rights, and labor is quite as much interested in this same protection. If a business can be seized by the Army today without sanction of the Constitution and the laws of the country the labor union may be seized in the same way tomorrow. The Constitution is a shield for all of us, at all times—in peace as well as in war.

Our first and greatest concern is to win the war at the earliest moment possible and each and every one of us should be willing to do all within our power to accomplish that purpose.

I am one of those who believe that we can successfully carry on the war within the framework of our Constitution. We can take no pride in winning the war for liberty and freedom across the sea and lose it here at home for the poor, as well as the rich, for those who have their investments in private enterprise and for those who perform services in private enterprise.

While we are fighting for freedom in other parts of the world, our Government must not do that which will create discord and lessen the faith of our citizens in the stability of our own free institutions here at home.

Believing that this resolution will serve a most useful purpose and bring unity out of discord and will be helpful to the Congress as well as the country, I shall vote for it. It appears that the overwhelming majority in the House will do likewise.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, while I hold no particular brief for mail-order houses, I cannot refrain from expressing my most vigorous resentment over President Roosevelt's seizure last week by military force of the retail business and facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. of Chicago. This concern operates a retail business, and by no stretch of the imagination or any law can it be said that the company is engaged in war production.

The important issues involved in the Montgomery Ward incident go far beyond this particular company. If the President has the power during war emergency to seize this company and operate its business, he can likewise seize any business, whether it be agricultural, professional, banking, retail, wholesale, or manufacturing. The antistrike law gives the President authority to operate war production plants for the Government when such war plants are threatened with stoppage of production because of strikes, or are actually closed down on account of strikes. But there is nothing in the law or Constitution giving Mr. Roosevelt, as President or Commander in Chief, authority to seize an entire retail business or any other establishment engaged primarily in a nonwar activity.

If the Supreme Court holds with the Executive on this important issue, which may happen, no person or company could feel secure in any pursuit. The Bill of Rights would be set aside and this country would be on its way toward socialization of our free economy. Millions of American men and women are now fighting on the battle fronts of the world to forever destroy dictators and the tyranny of rulers. They are fighting and dying to keep America free, and the people of our country are pouring out their resources for the same goal.

I regard the President's seizure of the Chicago company as an unwarranted usurpation of authority, and I am urging Congress to take immediate legislative action to define the power of the Chief Executive so that his acts will be clearly defined by law and in accordance with the Constitution.

Attorney General Biddle, the legal adviser to the President, does not rely on the antistrike law approved by Congress for his authority giving the Chief Executive the power to seize a private nonwar business. He relies on the Constitution as the sole authority for the power of the President to seize any property in time of war. Furthermore, in his argument to the Chicago court, the Attorney General said the courts should not substitute their judgment for that of the President.

The doctrine of an all-powerful Chief Executive is the course which the New Deal has followed for the past 10 years. Such a course is followed by every dictator. The first step is to create "packed" courts to give a semblance of judicial processes, coupled with huge benevolences to the people so a majority will not care or realize that they are losing their freedom, and, finally, a cracking-down process by use of armed force on those who refuse to comply with Executive edicts. This procedure is not in accordance with the philosophy of American Government either in time of peace or war.

The time has come for the people to determine if they are to run the country according to the Constitution or if the Nation's policies and affairs are to be directed along dictatorial lines as advocated by the Attorney General and the C. I. O. I strongly urge the passage of the resolution to investigate the Chicago seizure of a private business by the use of military force, and I sincerely hope that legislation will be approved to definitely safeguard the rights of American citizens under the Constitution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, let us get back to the resolution that is before us. All the Dewey resolution does is to ask for an investigation to ascertain the facts in regard to the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. It has nothing to do with the strike or wage scales or the merits or demerits of the labor controversy. It has nothing to do with the court decision. It has to do only with the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. and to ascertain under what authority, under what statutes, under what provision of the Constitution did the President seize this private business concern. Certainly the Congress has the right to know these facts. Without these facts the Congress cannot legislate intelligently. No action of President Roosevelt is more resented by the American people than using the Army to seize private property not engaged in war work.

If we have unknowingly and unwittingly given the President such tremendous powers, then it is the duty of the Congress to find out the facts and to legislate and restore those powers to the Congress by taking them back from the President. We never meant to set up a one-man Government in the United States patterned on Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin. We never meant to give the President the right through Executive order to seize any private property in the United States that was not a war industry. The people, regardless of party, are incensed at this arbitrary act of a power-hungry administration.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a very simple one to get certain facts and give that information to the Congress so the Congress can legislate immediately to restore representative and constitutional Government in the United States of America. That is the issue and I hope there will be very few Members of Congress who will deny the right of the House of Representatives to get these facts through a proper investigation.

There is no sense in promising to restore freedom to Europe and Asia and lose it at home. If the President has power to take over private business, where did he get that power and is there any limit to it? Under the guise of war emergency the President has assumed to arrogate to himself dictatorial powers. This seizure of private property contrary to the fifth amendment to the Constitution

that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation," smacks of Gestapo and un-American methods. In its essence it is lynch law and terrorism that resembles the high-handed, autocratic actions of foreign dictators.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey as much time as she may desire.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I endorse all that has been said in opposition to this resolution. What I would add to that which was so well said by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], and others, would be to ask each Member who votes for this resolution whether or not his vote is consistent with his vote on the Smith-Connally bill and on the President's veto of it. When it was considered by this body I voted against the Smith-Connally Act and to sustain the President's veto because I considered it a bad bill. However, since it is the law I believe it should be upheld, particularly by its authors and supporters. The action taken in the Montgomery Ward case carried out the provisions of that act, make no mistake about that.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution calling for a special committee to investigate why Sewell Avery failed to comply with a Government order merely adds to the already long list of select committees appointed by the Congress since our Nation declared war, the majority of which are unnecessary, costly, and political. There are a few other men heading large business concerns in this country holding the same personal enmity and hatred against our President and this administration as is held by the head of Montgomery Ward & Co.

On December 7, 1941, this Congress passed a resolution giving our President power to utilize for war purposes the resources of this country, including labor, industry, and agriculture; that resolution included Montgomery Ward & Co., of Chicago, Ill.

Ninety-nine percent of the industrial leaders of America would have cooperated with our Government through its War Labor Board and granted an extension of the old union agreement pending determination of whether or not the union still maintained a majority. Had other industrial leaders in this country assumed the bitter partisan political attitude of Sewell Avery by refusing to cooperate with our Government, our war effort would today be in a turmoil and instead of victory appearing on the horizon our country would be faced with defeat or a long war with the additional loss of thousands of American boys.

Mr. Avery's contention is that his company is not in this war and, therefore, does not have to obey the orders of our Government through the War Labor Board because it is not a war industry. He has spent almost one-half million dollars since Pearl Harbor advertising in newspapers with propaganda defying the authority of our Government through its War Labor Board. This great distributing institution is as much a war industry as the steel mills of our country. It already has applied for almost 40,000 priority applications for strategic war materials.

Mr. Avery's attitude toward his employees is the same as other industrial giants possessed 20 years ago when they fought legislation against the 12-hour day and 7 days per week of bygone years.

Maybe the passage of this resolution will be a help in presenting the true facts of Sewell Avery's brazen defiance of Government authority in a great war emergency like we are now in.

Some radio commentators and some newspapers have maliciously presented untruths to the American people regarding the Government's occupation of this establishment. They are not particularly interested in this specific case; they are interested in discrediting the administration and the War Labor Board, making it ineffective as an instrument to settle industrial grievances during this war crisis.

I firmly believe that if this had not been a Presidential year, Mr. Avery would have gladly cooperated with a peaceable extension of his union contract. Back of Mr. Avery looms the same interests that have fought the development of labor unions, forced long and bitter strikes, refused to sign or recognize agreements, and at times brought industrial and economic turmoil over the last 50 years.

The Avery type politician during wartimes calls our Commander in Chief a dictator ruthlessly exercising unconstitutional powers. Woodrow Wilson was called a dictator in World War No. 1 when he wanted to arm our merchant ships to protect our sailors from the ruthless submarine. He seized the railroads when the necessity of war warranted the seizure.

When Abraham Lincoln faced a similar war emergency he arbitrarily proclaimed a blockade of southern ports—but he saved our Union and our free government.

National necessity motivated Lincoln, Wilson, and today President Roosevelt finds it necessary to take drastic action against a great commercial enterprise because of the bitter personal hatred of its president against organized labor.

I hope the members of this committee make an honest, fair, nonpartisan investigation so as to enlighten misinformed people that our President was acting within the rights given him by a war Congress to bring about a rapid end to this horrible world conflict.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of May 3.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who voted for the Smith-Connally bill have now discovered that they created a Frankenstein. I am not surprised that so many of them are learning for the first time what the legislation really contained. During the debate on that bill the opponents of the measure were effectively gagged by the proponents of the act, who controlled the time. So many substitutes and amendments were introduced during the hysteria which prevailed that it rendered it impossible to intelligently pass upon them. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 3, 1943, will show that I made the statement during the debate on the bill that no Member voting for the legislation actually knew what it contained. It is rather amusing to hear the action taken under the law denounced by the very gentlemen who rode roughshod over all opposition when they passed the legislation. We hear a great deal from these gentlemen about the Constitution and orderly processes, who at the same time are not content to have the orderly judicial processes as provided by the Constitution determine through the courts whether the Government had authority for the action taken at the Montgomery Ward establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for printing in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record, of May 3, which sets forth very plainly what the real issue is and which reveals the powerful interests behind Mr. Avery in his defiance of the Government during wartime, when all the resources of the Nation should be utilized in the prosecution of the war:

THE MEN BEHIND THE MEN BEHIND MR. SEWELL AVERY

There is danger in oversimplification. For example, in the Montgomery Ward case.

To some, the court battle in Chicago is a fight between Sewell Avery and President Roosevelt.

If the issue were actually that simple the dangers in the whole situation would be much less serious than they are.

Avery, however, is only the man out in front. Behind him, sharing full responsibility for Montgomery Ward's defiance of the United States Government, egging Avery on, cheering his obstinacy, are the Ward directors.

A survey of those directors shows that they are but the vanguard of American reaction, which has been waging war on the Government ever since the old deal's errand boys lost control in Washington in 1932.

Just a brief glimpse of the Ward directors and their affiliations will show the ramifications of this "second front" in Chicago.

Start with Avery himself. He is not only head of Ward's, but also head of United States Gypsum Co., a director of United States Steel, of Pullman, Inc. (also involved in labor trouble), Armour & Co., People's Gas, etc.

No. 2 among Ward's directors is George Whitney, president of J. P. Morgan & Co. Whitney also is a director of General Motors, Pullman, Inc., Consolidated Edison, New York Central, Kennecott Copper, and nine other big corporations.

David A. Crawford, another Ward director, is president of Pullman, Inc., and a director of Armour's, American Telephone &

Telegraph, the Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Co., and others.

Donald R. McLennan is board chairman of Marsh & McLennan, insurance brokers; a director of American Sugar Refining, Armour's, the Pennsylvania Railroad, Pullman, Inc., People's Gas, etc., etc.

Percy Eckhart is president of De Soto Securities, board chairman of B. A. Eckhart Milling Co., director in Chicago Title & Trust Co., Armour's, and the A. T. & T.

Silas H. Strawn, chief counsel for Ward's, is the No. 1 corporation lawyer of Chicago.

Charles F. Glore is a director of Studebaker Corporation, Libby, McNeil & Libby, Continental Casualty Corporation, and partner in Glore, Forgan & Co., investment bankers.

Philip R. Clarke is president of the Chicago City National Bank & Trust Co., director of United States Steel, and Pure Oil.

Three directors—Clement D. Ryan, Bert R. Prall, and Harold Pearson—are firm executives, all vice presidents in charge of something-or-other.

So here is a list which represents not only Ward's but the crème de la crème of United States industry.

When men like these cheer Sewell Avery on to defiance of his own Government in wartime, the cheers must necessarily echo in the board rooms of many of the biggest corporations of the country—as indeed they echoed, and were amplified, at the Monday meeting of United States Steel, when a resolution was adopted stating that United States Steel was proud to have Avery on its board.

To keep perspective on the Ward case these facts must be considered. The background they form shows what the case is:

An attempted softening-up operation against home-front liberalism at a time when the Government and the people are devoting their major energies and attention to war against the Axis.

Sewell Avery may be the drum major for the regiment of reaction.

But he must be judged by the men behind him. Even the baton he twirls belongs to United States Steel, while his heart belongs to Gypsum.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the affidavit filed by Mr. Taylor with the Federal court in Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is not a doubt about the law under which this seizure was made. It is admitted on all sides by lawyers that the seizure was made under the provisions of the Smith-Connally bill. I am not responsible for this situation, because I voted "no" on that bill. Those who voted for it are beginning to feel that they are getting the worst of it now, but I am willing to move in and repeal the law that you made a mistake in passing.

You do not need an investigation to determine what authority this Congress gave the President, but the investigation will no doubt determine who voted for this bill and those who opposed it. It will doubtless also determine what is in that bill. Of course, the aim of those who pushed this bill through was to put labor in a strait jacket. Under the act, labor was required to submit its complaints to the War Labor Board. Labor was required to abide by that Board's decision. The employers were also to abide by the findings of this same Board. The first serious case coming up under this Smith-Connally Act is the Montgomery Ward case. Just what the facts are I do not know. The matter is now in court and we will soon find out. It seems peculiar, however, that those who now condemn the President are the very ones who voted him this power. If some of my Republican brethren now feel they made a mistake when they voted for this bill, I will agree right now to give them another chance and vote with them to repeal the act. My opinion is that we should repeal the act at once, but if you want it officially determined that a mistake was made, I will vote for the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this plant was seized by the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. The plant was in possession of the United States Army as such and the Government had the perfect right to eject this individual citizen who defied the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, this individual who also is a member of the boards of many of the most profitable business institutions in this country. He defied the Congress of the United States when he defied the Smith-Connally law. The question is, Should we, as a Congress, attempt to usurp the functions of the executive branch as well as the judicial branch of our Government?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that it is necessary for me to state that, notwithstanding the charges of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], I shall continue to try to live up to the rules of the House and divide the time allotted to the Committee on Rules as evenly and as fairly as is possible. That has been my aim and I shall continue to serve the House to the best of my ability, whether the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Virginia like or dislike it. I am here to perform my duty, and I am going to do so.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will yield, nevertheless the gentleman did breach his agreement with the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SABATH. I have given you 5 minutes and I promised the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] 5 minutes, but I did not have all of it. Furthermore, I asked the gentleman on the other side [Mr. FISH] to allot the gentleman from Virginia some of his 30 minutes, and he agreed to give the gentleman from Virginia 5 more minutes.

Though I am in favor of the resolution, I would not deny the gentleman a few minutes.

If you insist that I have breached faith with the gentleman, make the most of it, as I have done.

These charges of you two gentlemen are not something new to me or the House, and, I repeat, they will not sway me in trying to do the right thing at all times.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired—all time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 300, nays 60, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—300

Abernethy	Cox	Halleck
Allen, Ill.	Cravens	Hancock
Allen, La.	Crawford	Hare
Andersen, H. Carl	Cunningham	Harless, Ariz.
Anderson, Calif.	Curley	Harris, Ark.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Curtis	Hartley
Andresen, August H.	D'Alesandro	Hays
Andrews, Ala.	Davis	Hébert
Andrews, N. Y.	Day	Heidinger
Angell	Dewey	Hendricks
Arends	Dilweg	Herter
Arnold	Dirksen	Hess
Auchincloss	Dondero	Hill
Baldwin, Md.	Doughton	Hoeven
Baldwin, N. Y.	Drewry	Hoffman
Barden	Dworshak	Holifield
Bates, Ky.	Eaton	Holmes, Mass.
Bates, Mass.	Elliott	Holmes, Wash.
Beall	Ellis	Hope
Beckworth	Ellison, Md.	Howell
Bell	Ellsworth	Hull
Bennett, Mich.	Elmer	Izac
Bennett, Mo.	Elston, Ohio	Jeffrey
Bishop	Engel, Mich.	Jenkins
Blackney	Fellows	Jensen
Bolton	Fenton	Johnson, Anton J.
Boren	Fernandez	Johnson, Calvin D.
Boykin	Fish	Johnson, J. Leroy
Brehm	Fisher	Johnson, Luther A.
Brooks	Flannagan	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Brown, Ga.	Folger	Johnson, Okla.
Brown, Ohio	Fulbright	Johnson, Ward
Brumbaugh	Fulmer	Jonkman
Bryson	Gale	Judd
Buffett	Gamble	Kean
Bulwinkle	Gathings	Kearney
Burch, Va.	Gavin	Kefauver
Burdick	Gearhart	Kennedy
Busbey	Gerlach	Kilday
Butler	Gibson	Kinzer
Camp	Gifford	Kleberg
Canfield	Gillespie	Knutson
Carlson, Kans.	Gillette	Kunkel
Carrier	Gillie	Lambertson
Carson, Ohio	Goodwin	Landis
Case	Gore	Lanham
Chapman	Gossett	Larcade
Chenoweth	Graham	LeCompte
Church	Grant, Ala.	LeFevre
Clason	Gregory	Lemke
Clevenger	Griffiths	Lewis
Cole, Mo.	Gross	Luce
Cole, N. Y.	Gwynne	Ludlow
Colmer	Hagen	McConnell
Compton	Hale	McCord
Cooper	Hall, Edwin Arthur	
Costello	Hall, Leonard W.	

McCowen	Powers	Stockman
McGregor	Pratt,	Sullivan
McLean	Joseph M.	Sumner, Ill.
McMillan	Priest	Sumners, Tex.
Maas	Ramey	Sundstrom
Mahon	Ramspeck	Taber
Maloney	Randolph	Talle
Mansfield, Mont.	Rankin	Tarver
	Reece, Tenn.	Taylor
Mansfield, Tex.	Reed, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Martin, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.	Thomas, Tex.
Martin, Mass.	Rees, Kans.	Thomason
Mason	Richards	Tibbott
May	Rivers	Tolan
Merrow	Rizley	Towe
Michener	Robertson	Treadway
Miller, Conn.	Robsion, Ky.	Troutman
Miller, Mo.	Rockwell	Vincent, Ky.
Miller, Nebr.	Rodgers, Pa.	Vinson, Ga.
Miller, Pa.	Rogers, Mass.	Voorhis, Calif.
Mills	Rohrbough	Vorys, Ohio
Monkiewicz	Rowe	Vursell
Mott	Russell	Wadsworth
Mruk	Sabath	Walter
Mundt	Sasscer	Ward
Murdock	Satterfield	Wasielewski
Murray, Tenn.	Schwabe	Welch
Norman	Scott	West
Norrell	Scrivner	Wheichel, Ga.
O'Brien, Ill.	Shafer	Whitten
O'Brien, Mich.	Short	Whittington
O'Brien, N. Y.	Simpson, Ill.	Wickersham
O'Hara	Simpson, Pa.	Wigglesworth
O'Neal	Slaughter	Wiley
Pace	Smith, Maine	Wilson
Patman	Smith, Ohio	Winstead
Patton	Smith, Va.	Winter
Peterson, Ga.	Snyder	Wolcott
Philbin	Sparkman	Wolfenden, Pa.
Phillips	Springer	Wolverton, N. J.
Plocser	Stanley	Woodruff, Mich.
Plumley	Stearns, N. H.	Woodrum, Va.
Ponge	Stefan	Worley
Poulson	Stigler	Zimmerman

NAYS—60

Barry	Fitzpatrick	Marcantonio
Bloom	Ford	Merritt
Bradley, Pa.	Furlong	Myers
Buckley	Gordon	Norton
Burchill, N. Y.	Gorski	O'Toole
Burgin	Granger	Outland
Byrne	Hart	Pfeifer
Cannon, Mo.	Heffernan	Rabaut
Celler	Hoch	Robinson, Utah
Clark	Jackson	Rowan
Cochran	Kee	Sadowski
Coffee	Kelley	Scanlon
Cooley	Keogh	Sheridan
Crosser	King	Somers, N. Y.
Dawson	Klein	Spence
Delaney	Lane	Torrens
Dickstein	Lesinski	Weaver
Dingell	Lynch	Weiss
Eberharter	McCormack	Wene
Fay	Madden	Wright

NOT VOTING—69

Barrett	Hinshaw	Newsome
Bender	Hobbs	O'Connor
Bland	Horan	O'Konski
Bonner	Jarman	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Mich.	Jennings	Pittenger
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Ind.	Pracht,
Capozzoli	Jones	C. Frederick
Carter	Keefe	Price
Chiperfield	Kerr	Rogers, Calif.
Courtney	Kilburn	Rolph
Dies	Kirwan	Sauthoff
Disney	LaFollette	Schiffler
Douglas	Lea	Sheppard
Durham	McGehee	Sikes
Engle, Calif.	McKenzie	Smith, W. Va.
Feighan	McMurray	Smith, Wis.
Fogarty	McWilliams	Starnes, Ala.
Forand	Magnuson	Stevenson
Fuller	Manasco	Stewart
Gallagher	Monroney	Talbot
Grant, Ind.	Morrison, La.	Weichel, Ohio
Green	Morrison, N. C.	White
Harness, Ind.	Murphy	
Harris, Va.	Murray, Wis.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McWilliams for, with Mr. Magnuson against.

Mr. Bland for, with Mr. McMurray against.

Mr. Stevenson for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Bender for, with Mr. Murphy against.

General pairs:

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Pittenger.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Sauthoff.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Manasco with Mr. Schiffler.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. C. Frederick Pracht.

Mr. Forand with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Green with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Newsome with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Rogers of California with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Chiperfield.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX BILL OF 1944

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4646, with Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as read.

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the committee I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOUGHTON: On page 4, line 11, before "Supplement" insert:

"(a) In general."

Page 6, line 4, strike out "a credit" and insert "credits."

Page 7, after line 6, insert:

"(b) Technical amendment: Section 4 (relating to special classes of taxpayers) is amended by striking out subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(l) Individuals with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000.——Supplement T.'"

Page 7, strike out lines 15 and 16, and on pages 7 and 8 renumber the remaining paragraphs in subsection (b).

Page 11, line 8, strike out "or (4)."

Page 11, line 18, strike out "fits" and insert "fit."

Page 11, line 18, after "or", insert "of."

Page 19, after line 20, insert:

"(c) Reduction of credits in case of jeopardy: Section 47 (e) (relating to reduction of certain credits against net income in case of jeopardy) is amended by striking out 'personal exemption and credit for dependents' and inserting in lieu thereof 'normal tax exemption and surtax exemptions'; and by striking out 'the full credits provided' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the full normal tax exemption (in the case of the normal tax) and the full surtax exemptions (in the case of the surtax).'"

Reletter the remaining subsections accordingly.

Page 21, strike out lines 3 to 7, both inclusive, and insert "the surtax exemptions allowed by section 25 (b) (1) (B) and (C) shall not be allowed."

Page 21, strike out lines 21 to 24, both inclusive, and insert "be allowed a normal tax exemption of only $500 and shall not be allowed the surtax exemptions allowed by section 25 (b) (1) (B) and (C)."

Page 27, line 20, after "35", insert "for taxes withheld at source."

Beginning with line 24, on page 31, strike out down to and including line 2, on page 33, and insert:

"'(2) If the declaration is filed after March 15 and not after June 15 of the taxable year, and is not required by section 58 (d) to be filed on or before March 15 of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in three equal installments. The first installment shall be paid at the time of the filing of the declaration, the second on September 15 of the taxable year, and the third on January 15 of the succeeding taxable year.

"'(3) If the declaration is filed after June 15 and not after September 15 of the taxable year, and is not required by section 58 (d) to be filed on or before June 15 of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in two equal installments. The first installment shall be paid at the time of the filing of the declaration, and the second on January 15 of the succeeding taxable year.

"'(4) If the declaration is filed after September 15 of the taxable year, and is not required by section 58 (d) to be filed on or before September 15 of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in full at the time of the filing of the declaration.

"'(5) If the declaration is filed after the time prescribed in section 58 (d) (including cases in which an extension of time for filing the declaration has been granted under section 58 (e)), paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection shall not apply, and there shall be paid at the time of such filing all installments of estimated tax which would have been payable on or before such time if the declaration had been filed within the time prescribed in section 58 (d), and the remaining installments shall be paid at the times at which, and in the amounts in which, they would have been payable if the declaration had been so filed.'"

Page 34, after line 14, insert the following:

"(b) Technical amendment to section 294 (d): The last sentence of section 294 (d) (1) (A) (relating to additions to the tax in case of failure to file declaration of estimated tax) is amended to read as follows: 'For the purposes of this subparagraph the amount and due date of each installment shall be the same as if a declaration had been filed within the time prescribed showing an estimated tax equal to the correct tax reduced by the credits under sections 32 and 35.'"

Page 34, strike out lines 15 to 22 and insert the following:

"(c) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a), insofar as it relates to section 58 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1944.

"(d) Special rule for 1944: The provisions of sections 58 and 59 of such code, as amended by this act, shall be subject to the following modifications with respect to declaration and payment of estimated tax for the calendar year 1944:

"(1) Time for filing declaration: If the requirements of section 58 (a) of such code, without regard to its amendment by this act, are first met before April 1, 1944, the declaration shall be filed on or before April 15, 1944, and if such requirements are first met after March 31, 1944, and before June 2, 1944, the declaration shall be filed on or before June 15, 1944.

"(2) Payment of estimated tax: If the declaration is filed on or before April 15, 1944, then (even though such declaration under existing law or under paragraph (1) of this subsection was not required to be filed before June 15, 1944) the estimated tax shall be paid in four equal installments and at the times provided in section 59 (a) (1) of such code, as amended by this act. If the declaration is filed after April 15, 1944, and not after June 15, 1944 (and is not required by paragraph (1) to be filed on or before April 15), the estimated tax shall be paid in three equal installments and at the times provided in section 59 (a) (2) of such code, as amended by this act. The rule provided in section 59 (a) (5) of such code, as amended by this act, shall apply with respect to declarations filed after the time prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection."

Page 34, line 23, strike out "(c)", and insert in lieu thereof "(e)."

Page 48, line 1, after "tive", insert "(despite the provisions of sec. 21)."

Mr. DOUGHTON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, the amendment makes only such clerical and technical changes in the text of the bill as are necessary to insure that the law, when enacted, will carry out the policies agreed upon by the committee. No policy agreed upon is changed by the amendment.

In view of the highly technical nature of the changes made by the amendment, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax, pursuant to House Resolution 524, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 358, nays 0, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—358

Abernethy	Fay	Lane
Allen, Ill.	Fellows	Lanham
Allen, La.	Fenton	Larcade
Andersen, H. Carl	Fernandez	LeCompte
Anderson, Calif.	Fish	LeFevre
Anderson, N. Mex.	Fisher	Lemke
Andresen, August H.	Fitzpatrick	Lesinski
Andrews, Ala.	Flannagan	Lewis
Andrews, N. Y.	Folger	Luce
Angell	Ford	Ludlow
Arends	Fulbright	Lynch
Arnold	Fulmer	McConnell
Auchincloss	Furlong	McCord
Baldwin, Md.	Gale	McCormack
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gamble	McCowen
Barden	Gathings	McGregor
Barry	Gavin	McKenzie
Bates, Ky.	Gearhart	McLean
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	McMillan
Beall	Gibson	Maas
Bell	Gifford	Madden
Bennett, Mich.	Gilchrist	Mahon
Bennett, Mo.	Gillespie	Maloney
Bishop	Gillette	Mansfield, Tex.
Blackney	Gillie	Marcantonio
Bloom	Gordon	Martin, Iowa
Bolton	Gore	Martin, Mass.
Boren	Gorski	Mason
Boykin	Gossett	Merritt
Bradley, Pa.	Graham	Merrow
Brehm	Granger	Michener
Brooks	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Conn.
Brown, Ga.	Gregory	Miller, Mo.
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Brumbaugh	Gross	Miller, Pa.
Bryson	Gwynne	Mills
Buckley	Hagen	Monkiewicz
Buffett	Hale	Monroney
Bulwinkle	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mott
Burch, Va.	Hall, Leonard W.	Mruk
Burchill, N. Y.	Halleck	Mundt
Burdick	Hancock	Murdock
Burgin	Hare	Murray, Tenn.
Busbey	Harless, Ariz.	Myers
Butler	Harris, Ark.	Norman
Byrne	Harris, Va.	Norrell
Camp	Hart	Norton
Canfield	Hartley	O'Brien, Ill.
Cannon, Mo.	Hays	O'Brien, Mich.
Carlson, Kans.	Hébert	O'Brien, N. Y.
Carrier	Heffernan	O'Hara
Carson, Ohio	Heidinger	O'Neal
Case	Hendricks	O'Toole
Celler	Herter	Outland
Chapman	Hess	Pace
Chenoweth	Hill	Patman
Church	Hoch	Patton
Clark	Hoeven	Peterson, Fla.
Clason	Hoffman	Peterson, Ga.
Clevenger	Holifield	Pfeifer
Cochran	Holmes, Mass.	Phillips
Coffee	Holmes, Wash.	Ploeser
Cole, Mo.	Hope	Plumley
Cole, N. Y.	Howell	Poage
Colmer	Hull	Poulson
Compton	Izac	Powers
Cooley	Jackson	Pratt, Joseph M.
Cooper	Jeffrey	Priest
Costello	Jenkins	Rabaut
Cox	Jensen	Ramey
Cravens	Johnson, Anton J.	Ramspeck
Crawford	Johnson, Calvin D.	Randolph
Crosser	Johnson, Cunningham	Rankin
Curley	Johnson, J. Leroy	Reece, Tenn.
Curtis	Johnson, Luther A.	Reed, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Reed, N. Y.
Davis	Johnson, Okla.	Rees, Kans.
Dawson	Johnson, Ward	Richards
Day	Jonkman	Rivers
Delaney	Judd	Rizley
Dewey	Kean	Robertson
Dickstein	Kearney	Robsion, Ky.
Dilweg	Kee	Rockwell
Dingell	Kefauver	Rodgers, Pa.
Dirksen	Kelley	Rogers, Mass.
Dondero	Kennedy	Rohrbough
Doughton	Keogh	Rowan
Drewry	Kilday	Rowe
Dworshak	King	Russell
Eaton	Kinzer	Sadowski
Eberharter	Kleberg	Sasscer
Elliott	Klein	Satterfield
Ellis	Knutson	Scanlon
Ellison, Md.	Kunkel	Schwabe
Ellsworth	Lambertson	Scott
Elmer	Landis	Scrivner
Elston, Ohio	Larkin	Shafer
Engel, Mich.	Larrabee	Sheridan
Evins	Latham	Short
Fallon	Lea	Simpson, Ill.
Fay	Lemke	Simpson, Pa.
Fellows	Lesinski	Slaughter
Fenton	Lewis	Smith, Maine
Fernandez	Luce	Smith, Ohio
Fish	Ludlow	Smith, Va.
Fisher	Lynch	Snyder
Fitzpatrick	McConnell	Somers, N. Y.
Flannagan	McCord	Sparkman
Folger	McCormack	Spence
Ford	McCowen	Springer
Fulbright	McGregor	Stanley
Fulmer	McKenzie	Stearns, N. H.
Furlong	McLean	Stefan
Gale	McMillan	Stigler
Gamble	Maas	Stockman
Gathings	Madden	Sullivan
Gavin	Mahon	Sumner, Ill.
Gearhart	Maloney	Sumners, Tex.
Gerlach	Mansfield, Tex.	Sundstrom
Gibson	Marcantonio	Taber
Gifford	Martin, Iowa	Talle
Gilchrist	Martin, Mass.	Tarver
Gillespie	Mason	Taylor
Gillette	Merritt	Thomas, N. J.
Gillie	Merrow	Thomas, Tex.
Gordon	Michener	Thomason
Gore	Miller, Conn.	Tibbott
Gorski	Miller, Mo.	Tolan
Gossett	Miller, Nebr.	Torrens
Graham	Miller, Pa.	Towe
Granger	Mills	Treadway
Grant, Ala.	Monkiewicz	Troutman
Gregory	Monroney	Vincent, Ky.
Griffiths	Mott	Vinson, Ga.
Gross	Mruk	Voorhis, Calif.
Gwynne	Mundt	Vorys, Ohio
Hagen	Murdock	Vursell
Hale	Murray, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Myers	Walter
Hall, Leonard W.	Norman	Ward
Halleck	Norrell	Wasielewski
Hancock	Norton	Weaver
Hare	O'Brien, Ill.	Weiss
Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Mich.	Welch
Harris, Ark.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wene
Harris, Va.	O'Hara	West
Hart	O'Neal	Whelchel, Ga.
Hartley	O'Toole	Whitten
Hays	Outland	Whittington
Hébert	Pace	Wickersham
Heffernan	Patman	Wigglesworth
Heidinger	Patton	Willey
Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.	Wilson
Herter	Peterson, Ga.	Winstead
Hess	Pfeifer	Winter
Hill	Phillips	Wolcott
Hoch	Ploeser	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hoeven	Plumley	Wolverton, N. J.
Hoffman	Poage	Woodruff, Mich.
Holifield	Poulson	Woodrum, Va.
Holmes, Mass.	Powers	Worley
Holmes, Wash.	Pratt, Joseph M.	Wright
Hope	Priest	Zimmerman
Howell	Rabaut	
Hull	Ramey	
Izac	Ramspeck	
Jackson	Randolph	
Jeffrey	Rankin	
Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.	
Jensen	Reed, Ill.	
Johnson, Anton J.	Reed, N. Y.	
Johnson, Calvin D.	Rees, Kans.	
Johnson, Cunningham	Richards	
Johnson, J. Leroy	Rivers	
Johnson, Luther A.	Rizley	
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robertson	
Johnson, Okla.	Robsion, Ky.	
Johnson, Ward	Rockwell	
Jonkman	Rodgers, Pa.	
Judd	Rogers, Mass.	
Kean	Rohrbough	
Kearney	Rowan	
Kee	Rowe	
Kefauver	Russell	
Kelley	Sadowski	
Kennedy	Sasscer	
Keogh	Satterfield	
Kilday	Scanlon	
King	Schwabe	
Kinzer	Scott	
Kleberg	Scrivner	
Klein	Shafer	
Knutson	Sheridan	
Kunkel	Short	
Lambertson	Simpson, Ill.	
Landis		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—71

Barrett	Hinshaw	Newsome
Beckworth	Hobbs	O'Connor
Bender	Horan	O'Konski
Bland	Jarman	Pittenger
Bonner	Jennings	Pracht, C. Frederick
Bradley, Mich.	Johnson, Ind.	Price
Cannon, Fla.	Jones	Robinson, Utah
Capozzoli	Keefe	Rogers, Calif.
Carter	Kerr	Rolph
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Sabath
Courtney	Kirwan	Sauthoff
Dies	LaFollette	Schiffler
Disney	Lea	Sheppard
Douglas	McGehee	Sikes
Durham	McMurray	Smith, W. Va.
Engle, Calif.	McWilliams	Smith, Wis.
Feighan	Magnuson	Starnes, Ala.
Fogarty	Manasco	Stevenson
Forand	Mansfield, Mont.	Stewart
Fuller	May	Talbot
Gallagher	Morrison, La.	Weichel, Ohio
Goodwin	Morrison, N. C.	White
Grant, Ind.	Murphy	
Green	Murray, Wis.	
Harness, Ind.		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. McWilliams.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Pittenger.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Forand with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Green with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Talbot.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Manasco with Mr. Schiffler.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. C. Frederick Pracht.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Rogers of California with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Newsome with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. May with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Carter.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. COOPER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which

to revise and extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech I made on May 4 at a meeting in Washington, D. C., under the auspices of the India League of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the resolution passed this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. PFEIFER, Mr. WICKERSHAM, and Mr. PATMAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, on account of the absence of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WENE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

HEARINGS ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILL

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, the date for hearings on the Ramspeck bill, which has been usually referred to as the Federal aid to education bill, was tentatively fixed some time ago to begin on May 8th or 9th, I believe it was the 9th. However, the committee finds itself otherwise engaged to such an extent that it will not be able to begin the hearings on that date, and the date for the start of the hearings will be announced at a later time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Hotel Association of New York City, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a short poem which I wrote entitled "Commando Kelly's Come Home."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today while attempting to determine how several counties in my district could obtain the services of additional farm labor for harvest to relieve the great shortages in their areas and arrived on the floor too late to vote upon the so-called Dewey resolution to investigate the circumstances surrounding the Montgomery-Ward Ward case. If I had been present in time I would have voted to establish a committee to make a complete investigation into all matters involved in this case.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins, a letter from the President to the I. L. O. conference, and a telegram from Secretary Hull to the same conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein S. 284 passed by the Ohio Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial and also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article, and I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the House on last Wednesday in reference to Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TROUTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TROUTMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post under date of May 4.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER]?

There was no objection.

JAPANESE BEING RELOCATED ON EAST COAST

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the occurrence of Pearl Harbor it was determined by the military authority that it was necessary to remove the Japanese residents from the west coast, purely for strategic reasons, and because of military necessity. Now that these Japanese people have been removed from the west coast, we find that the War Relocation Authority is very diligently resettling these same Japanese along the east coast.

On May 10 there will be dedicated a new hostel for Japanese located within the very shadows of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Here are to be placed 800 Japanese, both aliens as well as citizens, and that in spite of the fact that no one definitely can vouch as to the loyalty of these people. Were the situation not such a serious matter, it would be indeed farcical to remove the Japanese from the west coast in order to locate them on the east coast. But it is far from farcical when these Japanese are taken from the vicinity of west coast aircraft plants and shipyards only to be resettled alongside the east coast Brooklyn Navy Yard.

We have not yet entered upon our large-scale invasion of Europe, nor have we shipped all the supplies and equipment to be used in our campaign against Germany. Yet the W. R. A. is lightly gambling with the safety of our convoys and the secrecy of our military movements by deliberately planting these alien and citizen Japanese directly in front of the Brooklyn Navy Yard in spite of the vast area of the city of New York and the countless other places either in the city or elsewhere in the country where they might be located. Despite the protests that have been entered against this latest move on the part of the W. R. A., the Japanese are being moved in. Even Mayor LaGuardia himself has protested this action, but seemingly to no avail. It would appear that only the Army can stop this movement just as the Army originally caused the west coast evacuation. This is not a racial problem but a matter of national security at a time when we should take every precaution possible to assure the success of our war efforts.

In spite of the repeated promises by the War Relocation Authority that no Japanese would be resettled in any area of the country, without first making sure that the community sentiment was not opposed to such settlement, this course has not been followed. Certainly it is not being followed in this instance. Neither was community sentiment properly considered before a similar settlement was made in New Jersey and again in Delaware. There can be and there is no excuse for this evident failure to carry out the promises repeatedly made in this regard. This failure to sound out public sentiment has led to repeated clashes and disturbances which could readily be avoided if the War Relocation Authority fulfilled its promise. The failure to do so is constantly augmenting the antipathy toward these people and is building up a racial prejudice against these Japanese, which could be avoided, if the W. R. A. made sure of public feelings before these settlements are attempted.

It would appear that the transfer of the W. R. A. to the Department of the Interior and the elimination of its independent status is not a sufficient change in administration to remove the shortcomings that have been so frequently demonstrated in its handling of the Japanese problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I just heard the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] with respect to the program of the War Relocation Authority. I did not know that the gentleman intended to speak on the subject today, therefore I am not prepared to make any remarks with respect to the particular program of the War Relocation Authority which he mentioned; however, I do know that the War Relocation Authority has cooperated with every intelligence branch of this Government in seeking to find out whether or not any Japanese who are being relocated are loyal to this country.

I may say that not a single act of espionage or sabotage has been committed by any Japanese-American who has been released by the War Relocation Authority, therefore I do not think we should carry on a campaign of trying to incarcerate people who have not committed any act against the Government of the United States. If we follow that policy with respect to one nationality we should follow it with respect to every other nationality in the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Louis J. Kehoe of Washington, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—may I ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be glad to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

On Monday and Tuesday the flood-control bill will come up for debate. On Wednesday we will take up the bill increasing the debt limit, and I have set aside Wednesday and Thursday for that. I do not know now what time will be allowed for general debate, but I am hopeful that it will not take all of Thursday.

Immediately after that the G. I. bill, the veterans' bill, will be brought up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us how much general debate will be allowed on the so-called G. I. bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry, I am unable to state that because I do not think a rule has been applied for as yet, but it will follow immediately the disposition of the debt-limit bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it intended to have a session next Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If debate should not end on Friday, it would be continued into the next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not the intention to have a session next Saturday.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of obtaining information, is the flood-control bill that is coming in a House bill or a Senate bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. A House bill. It is my impression that it is a bill that was reported by the House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is not a rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE FOR WIVES OF ENLISTED MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 271) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the joint resolution?

Mr. HARE. This, in effect, is a deficiency appropriation of $6,700,000 to supplement the regular appropriation for 1944 made for emergency maternity and infant care for wives and children of enlisted men.

Early last year we appropriated $4,400,000 for this purpose. Subsequently there was a deficiency appropriation of $18,000,000 plus $20,000 for administrative expenses. We are now advised by the Children's Bureau that at the end of April these funds have all been expended except approximately $637,000, and that the estimated amount needed for May and June will be $6,700,000.

This appropriation provides pre-natal medical care for wives of servicemen and for their hospitalization at the time of the birth of a child, including medical treatment of the mother and child subsequent thereto for a period not exceeding 1 year. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I could add more, unless I should attempt to discuss the whole program. The bases on which the appropriations have been made were debated fully and at length this last year when the regular appropriation for 1944 was made. I could say the number of cases provided for from July through December 1943 was a little over 145,000; for January 1944 there were 33,590 cases approved; in February, 36,263; March, 41,091; the estimated number for April being 45,200, with an average cost of approximately $72 per case.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The regular appropriation bill will come along in a few days, making appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for this purpose; is that correct?

Mr. HARE. That is correct. The committee has practically completed its hearings and the gentleman from Michigan—the ranking minority member of the committee—knows we plan to write the bill within the next few days, where we will give every consideration to all the testimony that has been submitted. There will be no change in the administrative program in the administration of this $6,700,000.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 271), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, under the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, namely:

Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care (national defense): For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1944 for grants to States, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, to provide, in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men of the fourth, fifth,

sixth, and seventh grades in the armed forces of the United States under allotments by the Secretary of Labor and plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau, $6,700,000.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION CONTEST—EDWARD T. McEVOY AGAINST HUGH PETERSON

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Elections No. 2, I submit a report on the contested election case of Edward T. McEvoy, contestant, against Hugh Peterson, contestee, from the First Congressional District of the State of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 534), as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of Edward T. McEvoy, contestant, against Hugh Peterson, contestee, First Congressional District of the State of Georgia, be dismissed.

The SPEAKER. The resolution, together with the report, is referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 534, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Dewey resolution voted upon today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

ON THE ISSUE OF GOOD MANAGEMENT CONGRESS CAN BE JUDGED BY ITS DECISION WITH RESPECT TO T. V. A.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, everybody is for good management in government as a matter of principle. It is like being against sin. It is relatively easy to make speeches demanding efficiency, deploring incompetence, and denouncing waste. It is fairly popular to attack the methods of those unhappy bureaucrats who must administer the laws enacted here. But it is only rarely that Members of this House have an opportunity to be recorded on the single question of good management. The issue is not usually presented alone.

We may have such a chance very soon, a chance to show by our answers to the roll call whether we really want the best methods of business management to be applied to Government affairs. No other issue will be involved. We should covet the opportunity. For while any man can make speeches in favor of good administration, the test of a man's devotion to its principles comes when they are under attack. And those principles are under attack today. In 1933 they were adopted as standards for conducting the business of the T. V. A., and that agency has been administered ever since with conspicuous efficiency and skill. Yet every principle of sound management Congress adopted in the act creating T. V. A. is threatened today.

No man can attack the evils of overcentralization, red tape, and remote control if he has voted to remove the management of the T. V. A. power system from the Tennessee Valley to Washington. No man can belabor inefficiency, delay, and waste unless he has risen to defend a system under which a Federal project is carried forward honestly, economically, and with superb success. No man can complain about the unreasonable and vexing way in which some Government agencies carry out their jobs if he has voted to hamstring this one agency whose methods of administration meet with overwhelming favor from the citizens it serves directly. No Congress can on one hand expect an agency to continue to carry out its tasks successfully while on the other hand it withdraws the very tools that agency has found essential to accomplish an unrivaled record of achievement.

Yet that is exactly what is proposed in certain Senate amendments which will be the subject of consideration when the conference committee meets to adjust the differences between the two Houses in the independent offices appropriation bill. And if the House must vote instructions to its Representatives in conference, then we can show where we stand on the issue of good management.

ONE SENATE AMENDMENT WOULD TAKE FROM THE BOARD OF T. V. A. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE SELECTION OF ITS TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES ON THE BASIS OF MERIT ALONE, AND WOULD SUBJECT THEM TO THE PATRONAGE SYSTEM

One of those amendments would require appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate of every one of T. V. A.'s employees who earns more than $4,500 a year. If it were agreed to, the engineers who design and build and operate the dams on the Tennessee and its tributaries would be chosen on the basis of their political desirability, not their technical skill. If this amendment were agreed to, the men who purchase materials, negotiate contracts, establish rates, operate power and fertilizer plants, who determine when water shall be stored and released—all these technicians would have their employment terminated on the 1st of this July if, in the interim, they should fail to win political favor. These men are not policy makers. They are experts and should be chosen only on the basis of their expert skills. They have done a splendid job. It would be calamitous to disrupt the efficient staff now working for the T. V. A. But as this amendment would apply to every agency of Government, and because its disastrous consequences are so widely recognized, I am not going to discuss it in detail. I want to devote the time at my disposal to another amendment which applies to T. V. A. alone.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman that such an amendment would be a very bad amendment to put in the law as it affects T. V. A. It would make T. V. A. a football of politics. Would it not also affect other governmental organizations requiring high technical skill, and thus substitute for scientific men now chosen men of political or mediocre ability?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. As it now stands in the bill, I understand it will affect all of the governmental agencies. Certainly the same arguments that are made against it in the T. V. A. case are applicable in many other cases.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like first of all to say that I am very strongly in support of the gentleman's fine work in defense of this great project which has meant so much to his part of the country. I am sure the people of his district will appreciate his work, too.

May I ask the gentleman this question? We hear a lot of talk here in Congress and elsewhere about trying to get government closer to the people, not to centralize so much in Washington. If I understand the impact of these amendments that were offered in the other body to the T. V. A. appropriation bill, the effect of them would be in precisely the direction of moving a great deal of the control of the T. V. A. right back to Washington, making it more closely held from this Capital than it is now, and to some degree weakening what I think has been one of the best things about the T. V. A., namely, its regional control. The fact that it is an agency in and of and for the part of the country where it is actually located, and decisions are made there, is one of its great virtues.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I greatly appreciate the observation of the distinguished gentleman from California. He has hit the nail on the head squarely. That is exactly what these amendments will do, and that is one principal reason why they would be so disastrous to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I will go into that in greater detail in my speech later on.

ANOTHER SENATE AMENDMENT WOULD REQUIRE THE TAXPAYERS, INSTEAD OF THE CONSUMERS, TO PAY ALL THE COSTS OF THE MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF T. V. A.'S POWER SYSTEM

This is one of those amendments which looks innocent on the surface. It simply requires the board of T. V. A. to pay its gross receipts—all the money it takes in from any source, its power revenues, its receipts from the sale of fertilizer or munitions, and from miscellaneous sources—into the general funds of th. Treasury of the United States every quarter. From a reading of debate in the Senate, it is clear that the sponsor of the amendment regarded the insertion of the word "quarterly" as a concession for his original proposal had required the receipts to be for-

warded as and when collected. That is no concession. It misses the point entirely. As a practical operating question, the interval at which receipts are required to be deposited is not consequential. The point at issue is whether the board of T. V. A. can use its receipts for the expenses of operation. Obviously it cannot at the same time send all its receipts quarterly, or at any other time, and still use any of them. This amendment is just as destructive as its predecessor. For if it were adopted, T. V. A. would be entirely dependent upon annual appropriations by the Congress for money for expenditures needed to maintain its power system as well as all its other operations.

This is a proposal made to order for anyone who wants to confuse the issues involved in obtaining good administration. Wearing a lovely mask, disguised in the attractive features of a measure designed to strengthen the control of Congress, adoption of this amendment would, in fact, make it utterly impossible for T. V. A. to carry out the mandates of the Congress. The question of accountability is not involved. This amendment concerns the problems of management.

THE BOARD OF T. V. A. IS FULLY ACCOUNTABLE TO THE CONGRESS UNDER THE PRESENT STATUTE AND PRESENT PROCEDURES

Of course the board of T. V. A. should be fully accountable to Congress. It is today, and always has been. It is accountable to Congress for doing the specific job assigned in the organic act creating T. V. A. It is accountable to Congress for the use of every penny of public funds received. As a matter of record, every cent of money T. V. A. has used in almost 11 years of operation has been audited by the General Accounting Office, whether that money has been provided by the taxpayers through appropriation, by the consumers of electric energy in the payment of their bills, or through the issuance of bonds. In addition to that examination, since 1938 the books of T. V. A. have been audited by the firm of Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery, whose certificate is attached to the financial report submitted to the Congress every year, a report more detailed and comprehensive than the report of any other agency of government or of any private corporation I have ever examined. Every contract for the sale of power is printed as an appendix to the text. That is genuine accountability.

The amendment proposed does not strengthen accountability in the slightest. On the contrary, it proposes to relieve the board of T. V. A. of responsibility for managing its business operations and to make the Congress itself responsible for every technical and managerial decision in the operation of this power system. If any Member of Congress would rather complain about extravagance than have economy in a Government operation, let him vote for this amendment. If any Member of the Congress would rather attack Government employees than establish conditions which permit them to do a satisfactory job, he should vote for this amendment. If any Member of the Congress believes the way to get good business management is to diffuse responsibility, and to deny the flexibility that is essential to meet changes in conditions of operation, then he should support this amendment. If he believes that every operating decision respecting this great public investment should be thrown into the political arena, this amendment is tailored to his specifications. But every Member of Congress who really wants efficiency in administration, who believes in good management in Government, and favors the adoption of business principles for the conduct of public enterprises, will be counted against it.

I cannot believe there will be a voice lifted to advocate it on this floor. I cannot believe there is any confusion here about the issues involved. Every Member of this House should be proud of the record made by T. V. A., and of the record made by Congress in its relationships with the Authority. For I want to make one thing perfectly clear. The Board and staff of T. V. A. have done a magnificent job in administration. They richly merit the appreciation expressed by almost every citizen in the Tennessee Valley. They deserve the approbation of taxpayers over the whole country for the way they have managed this great public enterprise. But Congress deserves its share of the credit too, for Congress set down the policies for the management of T. V. A. to carry out, and Congress itself established the business principles under which the business operations of the Authority have been conducted. It gave the Board of T. V. A. the modern tools it works with. Without those tools the great achievements in the valley would never have been possible. There should be no misunderstanding on this question. When I say the management of T. V. A. must be free of politics, I am not for a moment suggesting that Congress should not determine the broad questions of public policy involved. Of course it should. And it has. Congress has made every major policy decision affecting T. V. A. The Board of T. V. A. in all its acts has simply carried out the policies we have adopted here.

CONGRESS HAS CHARTED THE COURSE OF T. V. A. FROM THE BEGINNING

It was Congress that determined first of all that the waters of this river should be controlled, that the prosperity of the area and the Nation should be promoted by the creation of a channel for navigation, and that the people of the valley should be protected from the threat of floods. It was Congress that decided these dams should be multipurpose structures, and that all the power the river could develop when its waters were controlled should be used to benefit the people living in the valley. It was Congress that decided to try out a new plan of resource development in this valley, entrusting the total job to a single agency, assigning to T. V. A. responsibility for activities customarily scattered among a dozen different Federal departments. This was a totally new plan of development. In no other river valley has Congress ever determined that all the resources—the water, the soil, the forests, and the minerals—should be seen as a whole, developed together with no lines of artificial jurisdiction to hamper progress.

It was Congress, not the board of T. V. A., which determined to try out an experiment in decentralized administration, and as a result for 11 years the day-to-day decisions in management have been made in the field, close to the people and the problems. The corporate form was deliberately selected because it was the considered judgment of the Congress that this agency of Government should be given sufficient freedom and enough flexibility to meet the business problems it would face in operation. Toward no other Government operation had Congress ever so rigorously marked the line between its own responsibility for policy determinations and the agency's responsibility for management decisions. In no other instance has Congress ever so completely observed the elementary principles of good management, for when major policies were clearly established and objectives specifically defined, then Congress fixed responsibility on the board. The technical decisions were left to management. The T. V. A. could be judged by results.

IN THE T. V. A. CONGRESS MADE CLEAR THAT TECHNICAL DECISIONS WERE TO BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MANAGEMENT

Congress told the board of T. V. A. what it wanted to accomplish in considerable detail. The dams to be constructed had to do three things—create a 9-foot channel for navigation from Knoxville to the mouth of the Tennessee near Paducah in Kentucky, control the river's floods, and at the same time provide electric energy. But the technical decisions required to carry out those plans were not made by Congress. Congress did not determine how high the dams should be, what materials should go into them, or how they should be designed and operated. Those were engineering decisions for which the management of T. V. A. was held responsible.

Likewise Congress laid down policies to cover disposal of the power to be created. The freedom given the Board of T. V. A. in the management of this power system was never freedom to do whatever it might please with the great public investment. It was freedom to select specific ways to make the general policies effective. In the basic act, for example, the board of T. V. A. was directed to give preference in the sale of power to municipalities and to cooperatives. It could sell it at the bus bar to existing utility companies. Congress, however, did not undertake to negotiate the contracts. That was a management responsibility left to the board of T. V. A. In the same way Congress determined the general policy which should be followed with respect to the prices at which electricity should be sold. But it did not fix the rates. That technical question, a matter of engineering and economics, was a subject for managerial decision.

Congress simply made clear what the rates were expected to accomplish. The wider use of electricity on the farms and in the homes of the Tennessee Valley was

one objective to be reached. Repayment of the taxpayers' investment was another. The rates established had to be low enough to encourage the abundant use of electricity by the preferred consumers, but at the same time they had to be high enough to take care of all the costs of maintenance and operation and, in addition, to make a return to the taxpayers of the United States on their investment in power facilities.

Let me read section 14 of the act:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act that, in order, as soon as practicable, to make the power projects self-supporting and self-liquidating, the surplus power shall be sold at rates which, in the opinion of the board, when applied to the normal capacity of the Authority's power facilities, will produce gross revenues in excess of the cost of production of said power and in addition to the statement of the cost of power at each power station as required by section 9 (a) of the Tennessee Valley Act of 1933, the board shall file with each annual report a statement of the total cost of all power generated by it at all power stations during each year, the average cost of such power per kilowatt-hour, the rates at which sold and to whom sold, and copies of all contracts for the sale of power.

To balance the interest of consumer and taxpayer was a job entrusted to the board of T. V A. Congress could judge the management by the results.

The distinction between the responsibility of Congress to determine policies and the responsibility of management to carry them out, so clearly established in 1933, has been adhered to throughout the life of T. V. A. On one occasion Congress decided that the facilities of certain private companies should be purchased and the T. V. A. should not engage in destructive competition. It authorized the issuance of bonds for the acquisition, but Congress did not itself negotiate the purchase agreement. Later Congress determined that T. V. A. should make payments in lieu of taxes to the counties and the States it served. A formula recommended by the board of T. V. A. and by the localities effected was approved, and T. V. A. was directed to return to Congress that the system might be reappraised after a 10-year period.

All this describes the way the Congress from the beginning to this date has applied the principles of modern business management to the T. V. A.

THE USE OF RECEIPTS FOR CURRENT EXPENSES IS AN ESSENTIAL OF T. V. A.'S BUSINESS OPERATIONS

Of course, Congress gave the T. V. A. the right to use the revenues from its power operations to pay the current expenses of those operations. It was more than a right. In section 26, Congress made it an obligation on the Board to use its receipts for three general purposes, and to turn into the Treasury only the surplus remaining after those expenditures were met: First, the operation of its dams and reservoirs; second, the conduct of its business of generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy; and, third, the conduct of its business of manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer materials.

It was never the intention of the Congress that the taxpayers of the country should bear the cost of maintaining and operating this power system. It was not to be a subsidized operation. The system was to be managed in such a way as to be self-supporting and self-liquidating.

THE RIGHT TO USE RECEIPTS IS GENERAL AMONG GOVERNMENT AGENCIES HAVING RESPONSIBILITY FOR BUSINESS OPERATION

In this respect, the right to use its receipts, the T. V. A. is not unique among Government agencies. Government-owned corporations are generally authorized to plow their earnings back into the business with which they are concerned. The R. F. C. and its subsidiaries, the Panama Railroad Company, the Inland Waterways Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, H. O. L. C., F. D. I. C., the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the United States Maritime Commission, although not a corporation—all these are authorized to use their receipts for the conduct of their business operations.

I have examined the various statutory provisions respecting the use of receipts. They vary greatly. Unlike section 26 of the T. V. A. statute, some appear to have very slight restrictions on the purposes to which receipts can be devoted. Some agencies are not required to turn in the surplus remaining at any specified period. There is no reason why the provisions should be the same. The agencies are doing different jobs.

I am not prepared to discuss the wisdom with which these other Government corporations have expended their receipts. I do know what the results have been in the case of T. V. A. I know that by the use of its receipts, T. V. A. has managed its power system with outstanding success. I know that it has been an efficient, economical operation, giving satisfactory service to consumers and fair returns to the taxpayers who are the stockholders. I know that T. V, A. has managed to keep vital war plants going at full blast in the face of difficulties which would have been insurmountable if it did not have the flexibility which is guaranteed by the right to use its receipts.

I know that from September 1939 to December 1941 T. V. A. provided 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours above its contractual commitments to accelerated war production, and there was never an hour of delay. T. V. A. did not have to come to Congress for a deficiency appropriation for the added expenses of these unanticipated power operations. I know that in spite of the worst drought in 60 years, with an incompleted system, with a totally unanticipated load, not a single essential plant in the Tennessee Valley had its war production slowed by a minute because of insufficient power supply. And I have learned enough about the power business of T. V. A. to know that such a record could never be maintained under a system of financing dependent on annual appropriation. Just consider the practical problems involved.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF ATTEMPTING TO FINANCE THE T. V. A. POWER SYSTEM THROUGH ANNUAL SUPPLY BILLS

Appropriation bills are based on estimates prepared almost 2 years in advance of the end of the period the funds must cover. They are designed to fit the needs of traditional Government departments, whose operations are stabilized and whose expenses can be forecast in advance. The expenses of a power system cannot be predicted in advance when that system is a combination of steam and hydro like the T. V. A., with an installed capacity of over 1,400,000 kilowatts of hydro and almost 400,000 kilowatts of steam. No man can yet predict the weather two seasons in advance. And in a combination steam and hydro system, expenditures for power production can vary, and have varied, by over $10,000,000 a year, depending on stream flow. That does not mean that net income varies likewise. Agreements for the sale of power reflect the difference in the cost of its production. The large industrial customers know that, high water or low, they can depend on a certain amount of hydro power at low fixed rates. They know, too, that if an unexpected increase in their demands for power should coincide with low stream flow, the power will be supplied, but they will have to pay more for it than for the power provided in their basic contract because it will be more costly to produce by steam.

So in a dry year, even though the net revenues would not be substantially affected, the costs of generation of the T. V. A. system might soar sharply if coal had to be purchased in large amounts and men had to be hired to run the stand-by steam plants. Congress is not bothered about the weather in the Tennessee Valley under the present system of financing T. V. A.'s power operations set out in section 26 of the act. For T. V. A. uses the receipts from the sale of the power from its steam plants to meet the expenses of its production. Under the system proposed, however, Congress would be absorbed in meteorological problems, for a cloudless sky and an expanding load would send the anxious managers of the T. V. A. power system rushing up to Congress to get money to buy coal for their stand-by steam plants.

T. V. A. KEPT WAR PRODUCTION OPERATING AT CAPACITY BY THE USE OF ITS RECEIPTS IN 1942

If section 26 of the T. V. A. Act had been repealed, as the Senate amendment now proposes; if T. V. A.'s receipts had been paid into the general funds of the Treasury and the Authority had been limited to appropriated funds, fewer weapons for victory would have been produced in the dark days of 1941 and 1942. There is no doubt about it. For months most of the bombers made in the United States were made from aluminum produced in the Tennessee Valley. It was a volume of business unanticipated in advance by the Aluminum Co. of America, the only producer of the metal in this country when accelerated production for defense began, and Alcoa had no

contracts requiring T. V. A. to deliver the vastly increased amounts of power presently demanded.

T. V. A. of course had based its estimated expenditures of the cost of supplying power in accordance with the demand expected under its existing contracts. Under the present system of financing that was no impediment. It was of no great consequence that the demands of 1941 and 1942 had not been foreseen more than a year in advance. For T. V. A. could use its receipts. It kept aluminum production going at full capacity around the clock. Every steam plant in the valley was put into operation. Some of them were old and inefficient; their cost of power production high. But T. V. A. bought coal, hired men, and put power from those plants on the lines. For a while it bought power from neighboring systems for resale to war-production plants. A higher price was charged to recover the higher cost of production. There was no reduction in net income But it was not a question of profit. The problem was production. And production needs were met. The record of that year is magnificent. It will never be forgotten. And it happened because the board of T. V. A. could use its receipts.

THE EFFECT ON WAR PRODUCTION IF T. V. A. HAD HAD TO DEPEND ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR ITS POWER EXPENSES IN FISCAL YEAR 1942

What would have happened to war production if the system proposed by the Senate amendment had been in effect? I suggest that Congress should examine the record before abandoning the present system. This is what the record shows. In November 1940, when the Bureau of the Budget sent the estimates for T. V. A. expenditures in fiscal year 1942 to the House Committee on Appropriations, supporting data showed that T. V. A.'s expenditures for direct power operations were expected to be $7,830,000. If the system of financing proposed in the pending Senate amendment had been in effect, and assuming that Congress had accepted the recommendations of the managers on the job, presumably this sum—$7,830,000—would have been appropriated and would have been available to meet the expenses incident to the operation of this power system in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1941.

The whole world knows how needs for power expanded during that year. The needs were met in the Tennessee Valley, but it cost money to do it. The fiscal report of T. V. A. tells the story. Instead of the estimated figure of $7,830,000 for gross power expenditures, actually $22,139,000 had been spent when the fiscal year was over. All of it had been spent out of receipts. For, of course, power income had increased over the estimates too. Gross power receipts had been estimated at $18,190,000 on the basis of contracts existing when the estimates were prepared. Actually receipts from power operations in the fiscal year 1942 totaled $31,411,000. In spite of the difficulties of operation under such emergency conditions, there was only about a million dollars difference in the net income from power operations estimated in the fall of 1940 and reported when the fiscal year was ended. That difference was due to the fact that the year turned out to be one of the driest of record, and T. V. A.'s net income reflected the reduction in low-cost hydro power supply below that which would have been available in a year of average rainfall.

Think of the difference between the two systems. Under the existing one there was no delay. It was up to management to meet the crisis. Congress could hold the board of T. V. A. responsible for meeting the expanding power requirements of its area. There is no other source of supply. And because Congress permits a business management, the emergency was met. Under the system proposed by the pending amendment, there would have been a steady series of deficiency appropriations. There would have been weeks, even months, of delay. Emergencies could never have been met. There would have been fewer weapons on the fighting fronts. That year gives a perfect demonstration of the efficiency, the responsibility, and the accountability which has resulted from the principles of management Congress has so far adhered to with respect to T. V. A., but which the Senate amendment now proposes to abandon.

FOR EFFICIENT OPERATION THE T. V. A. MUST HAVE THE USE OF ITS RECEIPTS IN PEACE AS WELL AS WAR

This is no time to destroy the efficiency of this business operation. The war is not yet won. T. V. A. must still be free to meet unanticipated power requirements for war production by the use of its receipts. We must not put the management of T. V. A. in a strait jacket, and a strait jacket fitted long in advance of the time it would be effective. We must never do it now or in the future. For we will not be done with the need for good management when the war is ended. Budget and appropriation procedures are just as ill designed for this business operation in peace as in war.

The volume of new power business cannot be estimated almost 2 years in advance with much more certainty than can the weather. And every time the T. V. A. or one of its contracting municipalities takes on a new industry, or when the load of an existing customer substantially increases, it means an added expense for T. V. A., for new transformers, for substations or transmission lines. In the end such business expansion means a profit for the Government. But the expenses come first. Using its receipts T. V. A. can go ahead, assure the towns, the farmers, the businessmen that their power requirements will be met. But if T. V. A. were dependent on appropriations, it would have to come to Congress first to get an appropriation to provide expanding service. The Appropriations Committee would be asked to consider, and the Congress finally to decide, technical engineering questions upon which such operations depend.

THE DAY-BY-DAY DECISIONS RESPECTING POWER OPERATIONS ARE NOT POLITICAL QUESTIONS

Those questions should never be decided by the Congress. They are not political questions in any sense of the word. Those are management decisions, for which Congress should hold the board of T. V. A. responsible. A political question was decided when Congress determined to establish this great public power system. A political question was settled when the facilities of private companies were acquired and T. V. A. became the sole source of power supply for this whole area. Eighty-four municipalities and 45 farm cooperatives which purchase power at wholesale for resale to consumers, 11 great industries, and 10 military establishments which are served directly by the T. V. A. are now dependent wholly upon this integrated system for electric service. The continuity of electric service to these customers is not a question for political debate.

No one would argue that every year the Congress should decide whether a new substation is needed at Chattanooga, at Memphis, or at Huntsville, Ala. No one could contend this House is well equipped to determine what voltage a new line should be or just which facilities are dangerously overloaded. But Congress would have to decide just such technical questions if the Senate amendment were adopted, for decision on expenditures for power maintenance and operation is decision on those questions.

No one would argue that every year the Appropriations Committee should specify just how many dollars should be paid in lieu of taxes to each State and county of the area. Yet this is exactly what would happen under the pending amendment. Every year the basis of decision might vary, and not one of the local political units would know what their revenues would be until the Congress acted. Local public services would be disrupted. Under the present system, they know what payments to expect. They can make their plans.

That local political units should receive payments in lieu of taxes was, of course, a political decision, settled by act of Congress. I have already pointed that out. It was a determination of major public policy. The original T. V. A. statute had a provision on the subject. Through experience it proved to be inadequate. So the board of T. V. A. came to Congress with recommendations for amendment. Behind the recommendations was a long record of conferences between the T. V. A. and local taxing bodies, and with impartial experts in the field of public finance. The able Representative from the Eighth Alabama District [Mr. SPARKMAN] introduced a bill which set up a formula on which tax replacement should be based. It took into consideration the amount of flooded land, the extent of power facilities acquired, the revenues received from power service. His bill was adopted, the formula proposed was accepted for a 10-year period, when the subject will again be subject to congressional review.

Under that amendment the T. V. A. last year paid $1,960,472 to local units

of government. They paid it out of receipts. The consumers of electric energy paid those taxes just as they had always provided the money for the taxes the private power companies paid. They should pay it. Together with the expenses of operation, with provision for depreciation, with adequate return on the investment, the costs of tax replacements should be included in the rates T. V. A. charges for electric service. But the basis on which the taxes are computed should be clear and certain, a part of the T. V. A. statute. It should not be jeopardized or altered every year. The sums paid out to States and counties should not be settled every year in response to the competing importunities of those of us who represent the area affected. They should be fixed as they now are fixed. They should be paid as they now are paid, out of consumers' receipts.

To adopt the proposal of the Senate, to decide all those details in Washington, that would be centralization with a vengence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was very interested in hearing all of the gentleman's presentation, but particularly that part in which he said that the people of the region are up in arms against this proposal. I wonder if the gentleman has seen the full page ads that have been appearing in all of the daily papers, sponsored by the various organizations, such as Chambers of Commerce, various civic clubs, farm organizations, and practically every organization you can think of in that region.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. I have seen them and I am sure that most every Member of the House of Representatives has seen many of them. It certainly speaks well for the record the T. V. A. has made when you see all kinds of business organizations joining all kinds of labor organizations, farm organizations, bankers and grocers, everybody in unanimous opposition to these amendments. They are all against disrupting the kind of service which the T. V. A. has been giving in the area.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the editorial pages have been unanimous in strong denunciation of these proposed amendments, and not only has that been true in that section, but it has been true throughout the United States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is entirely correct. As the gentleman says, it is very remarkable, the uniformity of editorial comment all over the country in opposition to these amendments. They consider that the question is not whether there should be a T. V. A. The T. V. A. is already in existence. The question is now whether it shall remain a successful business enterprise or whether it should be crippled and put in a strait jacket so it may carry on.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate the very fine statement the gentleman is making on this subject. I think he has covered every angle that it is possible to do. In line with what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and my colleague have said about the sentiment, I want to express my appreciation for the fine work that the Power Board in the gentleman's home town of Chattanooga has done in assembling for the information of Members of Congress the editorial comment from all over the United States and binding it together in one volume. I am sure every Member has appreciated that fact. I want to express my own appreciation to the gentleman and to that fine group in his home town who did such an excellent job.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman and also his very valiant effort to prevent the passage of those amendments. What the Power Board in Chattanooga has done is characteristic of the attitude of power boards all over the Tennessee Valley. Farm organizations have joined cooperatives and R. E. A. organizations in bitter condemnation of these amendments, which were put on as a rider in the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will my colleague yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know whether it is true in the gentleman's State or not. I do know it is true in some of the power boards, particularly in my State. When the power-company properties were taken over, practically all of the power-company personnel were taken over also.

Now, most of our power boards are made up of former power company officials, or people who had connection with the power companies. It is quite noticeable that all of these boards are unanimously against these amendments. Not only that, but I know a great many people who are stockholders in the power company in my district who are unanimously opposing these proposals. So it shows that it not only relates to the organizations, to the people, and the merchants in the district where there is nothing but T. V. A., but that good businessmen in all walks of life realize the danger of these proposals.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that as far as I know, the situation he has related about the public power boards taking over the employees of the power company is true all through the valley. It certainly is true in the parts of Tennessee with which I am familiar.

I feel also Mr. Speaker, that the Nation appreciates the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority has during its years of existence, been run on an entirely nonpartisan basis. I am certain that political considerations have never had any influence whatsoever with T. V. A. in the selection of any employee, and no political angle has ever been taken in connection with any decision it has made. I think it would be very disruptive of the benefit this organization is now doing to this section of the country and to the Nation, if the elements of partisanship and political consideration should enter into its operation. That would be the inevitable result if these amendments were adopted.

WHAT SUCH AN AMENDMENT WOULD DO TO THE MANAGEMENT OF T. V. A.

The proposed amendment is a perversion of every principle of sound administration. It would turn the proper policy-making body into a management committee and would deprive the proper management officials of responsibility for results. How long does anyone suppose a private power company could operate under such a ridiculous system? How long could continuity of service be assured if such a company were restricted for operating expenses to a fixed sum appropriated almost 2 years in advance? How long would the record of A. T. & T. hold up if the board of directors had to be convened to provide funds every time a new switchboard was installed—if its expert engineers and managers were reduced to the status of errand boys, unable to make decisions, commitments, or to enter into contracts until the board had acted? If we are going to expect and get good management from this or any other enterprise of Government, Congress itself has got to recognize how good management is achieved.

Good management is achieved by observing the clear line between policy and management just as Congress did in the act creating T. V. A.—by recognizing the difference between political questions and technical problems. Good management is achieved by fixing responsibility and judging results. We have had good management in T. V. A. for 11 years. The question before us is whether we want it in the future. That is the only issue presented. The question before us has nothing to do with theories with respect to the advantages of public versus private power operations. That has been settled so far as T. V. A. is concerned. The only question before us is this: Do we want this business operation to continue to be operated efficiently, honestly, and according to the best business practices?

Consider the practical effect of such an amendment on T. V. A.'s power managers. Consider what would happen if we should agree to the Senate amendment and thereby remove the most compelling incentive to economy and efficiency, the knowledge that revenue must take care of the expenditures, the knowledge that responsibility is fixed, that you are judged by results.

First of all, a prudent management, wanting to assure consumers efficient and continuous service and knowing from experience the spread between estimated and actual expenditures, would come to Congress with swollen estimates. The estimates would not be based, as they now are based, on average conditions with the knowledge that receipts would be available to meet exceptional conditions. They would reflect all the expenditures anticipated if a combination of all the adverse factors which might beset the operation should occur.

A fat contingency item would be required—let us say $15,000,000. Congress would in effect be asked to issue a blank check for that amount. Now blank check appropriations are justified to cover emergency conditions. But no one can argue that they constitute compelling influences toward economy.

The pressure to extravagance would be enormous under such conditions. For each year T. V. A. would be obliged to return whatever money was unexpended on the 1st of July. Actually, as a consumer of electricity, I should say that under an appropriation system of financing the managers ought to be extravagant. They ought to spend that contingency item every year. It would be dangerous to the people of the area if the habit of economy and good management persisted in spite of the temptation to spend while you have it.

Just consider the danger the people would be in. Suppose for a few years a combination of favorable factors and good management should keep expenditures for power operations down. The contingency item would be appropriated each year and each year untouched. Then what would an economy-minded Congress do? There is not any room for argument. They would slash the estimates, accuse the T. V. A. of padding, and appropriate something which appeared in the light of experience to be reasonably adequate to take care of the needs of the power system under favorable conditions. That might be the very year when sleet and hail, tornadoes and ice, would cause breakdowns beyond anticipation. That might be a year of greater drought than ever known before, when power from all the stand-by plants would have to go on the lines to help take care of the demand. That might be the year when Congress was not in session at the moment of the crisis. I want to emphasize that point. During these war years we have become accustomed to fairly continuous sessions. That is not the traditional pattern. Congress normally recesses for extended periods. That pleasant custom might be fatal to the life of this lovely river valley in the situation I have described. For if Congress were not in session, or did not give its immediate attention to the problems of this power system, then the homes and farms and industries of a great area would be without power, without light, some of them without heat. Not because the management of T. V. A. had been incompetent or faithless, but because Congress had assumed responsibility for the details of management of this power system, because the money paid in by consumers had vanished into the general funds of the Treasury and Congress had abandoned its devotion to sound business principles, and had prevented T. V. A. from using its receipts.

T. V. A. IS NOT LIKE A GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT

I have examined all the arguments advanced in favor of this specious proposal. Nowhere has any responsible person suggested that a penny of T. V. A.'s receipts has been devoted to any unauthorized purpose. Congress has had the fullest reports about every transaction. Nowhere is it suggested that this power system is not well managed, that the policies of Congress are not executed faithfully. The burden of the argument in favor of the proposal seems to be, "If the regular departments of the Government can get along on appropriated funds, so can T. V. A." Of course, many of T. V. A.'s activities, similar to the programs of other Government departments, do get along on appropriated funds. They always have, and they always will. It is extremely important to remember that the number of purposes for which T. V. A.'s receipts can be spent is limited in the basic statute. It is the power system of T. V. A. which cannot, and should not, be required to operate on appropriated money, but should live on its receipts.

I have no particular desire for uniformity in Government practice as an end in itself. It seems to me that an amendment to the act creating T. V. A. should be judged by its effect on T. V. A., not its resemblance to the statutory provisions which control the operations of some department of the Government. As a matter of fact, as I have pointed out, section 26, requiring the board of T. V. A. to use its receipts for the costs of operation, is similar to the provisions of other Government agencies having responsibility for business operations. I mentioned that fact simply because the contrary had been stated. I had read in the papers that the sponsor of the Senate amendment mistakenly claimed that T. V. A. was the only agency of the Federal Government which used its receipts for expenditures connected with its operation. If it were the only agency, I should still be for the system. Because I think it is the right system for T. V. A.

It seems totally irrelevant to me to argue that because the Post Office lives on appropriated funds, so can T. V. A. I see no reason why these very dissimilar operations should be compared. They are alike in only two particulars. They are both instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and they both collect money in large amounts from the users of certain of their services.

If the operations of the Post Office are sufficiently predictable to be financed through annual appropriations, I have not the slightest objection to the system. But I submit that no one with the least familiarity with the operation of the T. V. A. power system would make such a comparison, and I submit that no one with the faintest appreciation of the principles of business management adopted in the act creating T. V. A. would suggest that they are comparable with the administrative procedures approved by Congress for any of the traditional Government departments.

This country has the best postal service in the world. But we do not judge by business standards. Long ago this Nation determined that the people of the whole United States should have a postal service which would encourage free communication between every town and region, and that the users of the service should be charged amounts that would defray a portion of the total expenditures. The fact that its receipts are very large does not make the Post Office Department a business operation in the sense that the T. V. A. power system is a business operation, with the users of the service expected to pay all the costs of maintenance and operation and a return on the investment.

If Congress had ever intended to judge the Post Office Department by business standards, comparing revenues to investment, then Congress should have adopted the principles of business management in the Department's organization. If we were going to hold the management of the Post Office Department responsible to pay all its costs of operation, as well as to liquidate the Nation's investment in its facilities, we should have fixed responsibility on that management for costs and for rates, as well as for service. Then we could judge them by business results. Such a plan has never been adopted as a public policy for this important Department of the Government. Until this is done it is grossly unfair to judge the success of the Department's operations by ordinary business standards, as we judge the business operations of the T. V. A.

The Postmaster General cannot be held responsible for the cost of every item and every service required in the operation of the Postal Service. He does not acquire all the land or build the structures needed to house the Department's operation in Washington or in the field. Post-office buildings are constructed by another agency of Government, turned over to the Post Office without charge, and no depreciation is carried on the books of the Department as an expense to be covered by the rates for postal service. Facilities to carry the mail between each of the 42,000 post offices in the United States are provided by various carriers under contract. The Post Office Department does not control the cost of this essential service. The rates paid to the railroads are established by the Interstate Commerce Commission, rates to the air-mail contractors are set by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Contracts with star route carriers alone appear to be negotiated by the Department.

Neither has Congress ever held the Postmaster General solely responsible for the selection of his employees, although their efficiency is a factor in the operating costs of the Department. Some 16,000 are appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The vast majority of the rest are chosen by the Civil Service Commission. Undoubtedly they are all devoted public servants, but we cannot hold the Department wholly accountable for their performance unless it is likewise accountable to Congress for their selection.

Congress itself has approved this diffusion of responsibility through which the costs of the Department are determined. And Congress itself has established the rates through which a portion of the costs of service are expected to be recovered. Certain classes of mail are carried free of charge, other classes well below the costs of service. Those are questions of public policy determined by

the Congress. The Post Office Department is not responsible.

Perhaps this is the best system in the world for the operation of our Postal Service. Perhaps it is entirely right that land should be condemned by the Department of Justice, that buildings should be constructed by the Public Buildings Administration, turned over to the Department without charge, and that the rates at which mail is carried should not reflect depreciation charges. I am not contending that there is anything wrong about having certain costs controlled by the Interstate Commerce Commission and others fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, or the rates which recover a part of those costs fixed by the Congress of the United States. I am not suggesting that more efficient employees could be picked by any different system. I have no word of censure or complaint that testimony before the Committee on Appropriations shows that every year for 23 years, from 1919 to 1943, the total revenues of the Department were smaller than its total expenditures. I am only insisting that we recognize that this is not a business operation in the usual sense of the word. The benefits of the best mail service in the world were not intended to be measured in profits and loss.

Congress established a different policy for the business operation it entrusted to T. V. A. It adopted a different type of management for this business operation. There is no comparison. In the case of T. V. A., Congress told the board what it wanted done. We fixed responsibility. We adopted business principles and therefore it is fair to judge its business operations by the business results.

But I want to make one point clear. It appears that despite the contrast in public policies and principles of management adopted by the Congress with respect to the administration of the Post Office Department and the management of T. V. A., an important similarity in the requirements of their operations has escaped the attention of the sponsor of the Senate amendment.

The business of delivering the mail cannot be accomplished with the use of receipts any more than the delivery of electricity. It is the contractors, not the Post Office Department, which provide facilities to move the mail from office to office, while T. V. A. itself moves power from its generating plants to the cities' gates. In the whole postal operation the problems of the contractors are the only ones remotely resembling the problems confronting a power system. It is the railways, the airplane companies, the star-route carriers, not the Department, that have to get the mail through in spite of break-downs, wrecks, storms, and floods, no matter whether traffic is heavy or light. They are the ones who have to keep their equipment in order. They are the ones who meet emergencies. Trains are kept in operation by the use of the railroads' receipts. Air lines do not come to Congress for an appropriation to provide new equipment when a mail-carrying plane is wrecked. The star-route carrier replaces his worn-out tires without benefit of a deficiency appropriation. They all use their receipts for their expenses of operation. No sound business operation can be limited to the appropriation in advance of fixed sums for the expenses of its operation if there is likely to be any considerable variation in those expenses. The management of any business must have sufficient flexibility to adapt itself to changed conditions. That is axiomatic. And it appears to apply to the delivery of mail just as it does to the delivery of power.

PROVISIONS AFFECTING T. V. A. SHOULD BE JUDGED BY THEIR EFFECT ON T. V. A.—NOT THEIR APPLICATION TO OTHER AGENCIES

I think I should win even if this were an argument to be decided on the basis of a comparison between T. V. A. and the Post Office, because the point is certainly not the technical one of whether the Department itself uses its receipts, but whether the job of delivering the mail requires it. But this is not a debate, with the winner declared on points. The decision to be made is a grave determination of public policy affecting T. V. A. alone. Before Congress strikes at the heart of the principles it once adopted to guide the management of T. V. A., let us consider what has been accomplished so far by adhering to those principles faithfully. The decision ought to rest on an appraisal of how the present statute of T. V. A. has succeeded.

Rivers have been developed before. The only new thing about T. V. A. was that Congress determined this river should be developed under a new plan. I submit to this House that there has never been a record of benefit from similar public investment that matches the benefits T. V. A. has brought to our valley. The difference may lie right in the plan of administration devised in the statute this Senate amendment would in part repeal. The difference may be because under this statute good management was made possible. It may be because Congress eliminated jurisdictional disputes when it gave the total job of resource development to one agency, the T. V. A. It may be because we fixed responsibility on this board to carry out the will of Congress; because we told them to hire their own employees, buy the land, build the dams, purchase the materials, allocate the costs, handle the litigation, negotiate contracts, fix the rates at which their products and services were to be sold, and report the results.

THE PEOPLE OF THE AREA ARE AGAINST THIS PROPOSAL

Congress established T. V. A. that the people might be benefited. They are the ones who will be affected if there is a change in the methods of its operation. They ought to be heard on this question. They are up in arms against this amendment. They know how the present system has worked out. They are delighted with it. No Federal agency in this area has ever had the united support of the people in such abundant measure. They do not want me or any of my colleagues to pick T. V. A.'s employees. They do not want me or any of my colleagues to decide engineering questions. And to my knowledge, not a single Member of the House from the region vitally concerned wants to have that responsibility. We are content with the present system. We are fighting to preserve it.

Someone has already pointed out that in this year of grace, it is a fine example of "man bites dog" when businessmen, labor groups, and farmer unite to defend the record of an agency of the Federal Government, to protect it from attack. That is exactly what is happening throughout the valley. I like especially a full-page paid advertisement in the Tri-Cities Daily, of Limestone County, in the Alabama district so ably represented by my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which recently came in the mail. It is signed by the owners of various private enterprises—a coal company, a dress shop, a grocery store, a drug store, a tailoring establishment. And what is the heading? Simply this fighting admonition: "Congress, stick by your guns."

I can say no more than that. But I do say to all my colleagues: Stand by the principles Congress established in 1933, and has adhered to ever since. Stand by good management. Show you really mean it when you call for efficiency and economy in government administration. Show you mean it when you say you want Federal agencies to be more responsive to the needs of the people as they carry out the policies we determine here. Congress, stick by your guns.

The taxpayers of the country are sending the same earnest message. For they have a stake in our decision. Something over $300,000,000 in public funds has been invested in the power-production facilities of T. V. A. The taxpayers of the whole country deserve to have the enterprise well managed. They want the investment paid back. And it will be paid back, if the present management is continued, if T. V. A. does not become the victim of political control. In fiscal year 1943, T. V. A. power operations showed a net income of over $13,000,000 after all the direct expenses of operation had been paid, after the payment of taxes to States and counties, after allowance for depreciation. It will be more this year. This great public investment in power facilities is going to be liquidated. Consumers of electricity in the Tennessee Valley will do it. But they can do it only if the system is run on sound business principles.

From all over the country, citizens who want honest and efficient management, who believe in the adoption of sound business principles for the Government's business operations are sending us the same message: "Congress, stick by your guns."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution which I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARLESS of Arizona). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARLESS of Arizona). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

IS RATIONING OF FOOD A POLITICAL OR DISCIPLINARY EXPEDIENT?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the surprise move of O. P. A. Administrator Chester Bowles in removing 85 percent of all meat from the ration list late Wednesday of this week brought joy to 130,000,000 American consumers. The removal of ration points will be for an indefinite period, and covers all cuts of pork, veal, lamb, mutton, and all beef except steaks and roasts. Soup meat, hamburger, beef stew, all kinds of variety meats, sausage, cold and canned meats, and even canned fish are to be ration free. This sudden action of placing nearly all meats on the point-free list, coupled with a 25-percent reduction in ration points for butter, and the removal from rationing of shortenings and canned corn and many other processed vegetables, will be gratifying to consumers and food merchants, who no longer will be required to deal in ration-point stamps. It is anticipated that choice beef steaks and roasts will also be stricken from the ration list before November 7 of this year.

For more than a year producers of beef and pork have urged the Office of Price Administration to lift ration restrictions on beef and pork to prevent a glutted market due to a tremendous increase in the supply of cattle and hogs. But this sound advice from experienced producers and processors fell upon deaf and unwilling ears in the O. P. A. Unfortunately, most of the officials in charge of rationing knew nothing about the production, processing and merchandising of meat and other perishable food products. These officials did not want to surrender control over producers and processors, and, more than that, thousands of highly paid O. P. A. ration employees appeared to enjoy their power to discipline consumers and to haul scores of well-meaning and honest businessmen into the O. P. A. kangaroo court to assess penalties for unintentional and minor violations of ration regulations.

While Judge Marvin Jones and his associates in the War Food Administration have been doing their utmost to secure an abundance in production of beef cattle, hogs, lambs, and poultry, and they have done a splendid job in this respect, they have met with little cooperation from the Office of Price Administration and other executive agencies involved in the production, pricing, and distribution of food products. But the O. P. A. could not function under an abundance of food. They needed scarcity to maintain control over the distribution of essential food products, and up to Friday last, April 28, O. P. A. Administrator Bowles said, in discussing the end of meat rationing, "there may be some relief in 1945—with luck—and possible end when the war in Europe is over." Now Mr. Bowles has removed 85 percent of all meat from rationing.

To further show the inconsistency of the O. P. A. Administrator on the need for continued food rationing, I will quote from an article written by Administrator Bowles, appearing in Collier's Magazine, dated May 8, 1944, which was circulated just 5 days before he announced virtual end for the rationing of essential foods. Among other things, Mr. Bowles wrote:

> Termination of rationing, whenever it is, will be attended by many difficulties. The following timetable for rationing's end can be no more than speculation, and its accuracy depends on the needs of our armed forces in battle and on post-war supply and demand. If I were to make a guess, my timetable might be something like this:
>
> PRODUCT AND END OF RATIONING
>
> All products: As soon as possible after the war in the Pacific ends.
>
> Sugar: At the earliest, when the war in Europe is over.
>
> Meat: Some relief in 1945—with luck—and possibly end when the war in Europe is over.
>
> Processed foods: When the war in the Pacific ends.
>
> Passenger tires: Some relief when the war in Europe is over; end of rationing when the war in the Pacific ends.
>
> Gasoline: When the war in the Pacific ends.
>
> Heating oil: Probably not until after next winter.
>
> Commenting on the end for sugar rationing, Mr. Bowles said in his article: "Under the circumstances, it would be my hope that we could be rid of sugar rationing some time before the harvesting of Central Europe's great beet-sugar crop after the end of the war in Europe."
>
> Taking a slap at experienced meat producers and distributors, Mr. Bowles wrote: "In the last few weeks the American public has been handed, from sources outside the Government, diametrically opposed statements about our future meat supply. Some persons have contended there was so much meat that rationing and price control should be scrapped. Others warned of shortages and famine."
>
> Admitting that "meat production last year was at an all-time high," Mr. Bowles said: "Meat rationing will be with us for several months after the end of the war in Europe. Our armed forces will continue to require huge quantities of meat even after the war shifts into the Asiatic area. With luck in the latter part of the war, however, meat rationing may be eased and perhaps entirely eliminated."

Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention that this statement of Mr. Bowles was only made a week ago today. I marvel at the rapidity and ease in which Mr. Bowles can change his views and actions. I recognize that New Deal action has always been geared to proper timing. Can it be that the President and his invisible advisers found it expedient to virtually end all food rationing at this time, only 5 days after Mr. Bowles said it could not end until after the war in Europe was concluded, to remove the odor for the Presidential taking, by military force, of a certain Chicago mail order company? Or was it a New Deal political expediency properly timed to end food rationing a few months before the Presidential election? Political mentors in the New Deal maintain that the people will forget all about any unpleasant experience in less than 6 months.

In spite of the fact that nearly all processed—canned—vegetables are removed from the ration list, Mr. Bowles said in his Collier's article:

> I do not believe we can look forward to any broad slackening of our canned-goods rationing program during the next 12 months. There will be modifications in point values, of course, and I hope that most of them will be on the down side. But it looks to me (as of April 28, 1944) as though we'll be faced with shortages of commercially canned foods in greater or less degree until the war in the Pacific is over.

The reduction in the point value of butter, from 16 ration points to 12, would make it appear that consumers will get more butter, but this is not the case. When Mr. Bowles reduced the number of red ration stamps per individual from 60 to 30 for each four week period, he actually increased the ration point value on butter to 24 points per pound. He also doubled the ration point values for beef steaks and beef roasts. Mr. Bowles had this to say about butter:

> There has been criticism of butter rationing, particularly as some butter stocks have deteriorated. The contention has been made that possibly we ought to distribute less butter to our allies and more to our civilians. Less than 5 percent (approximately 100,000,000 pounds) of our butter goes to Russia. * * * It should be possible to ease up on butter rationing after the war in Europe is over.

It will be of interest to note that the War Food Administration has ordered a set aside of 40 percent in May and 50 percent in June of all butter produced in this country. This butter will be used for the armed forces, lend-lease, and foreign relief needs. The War Food Administration also states, in a report issued on May 1, 1944, that civilian consumption of butter and dairy products for 1944 will be slightly under that of 1943. With reference to meat supplies, the same report disclosed a reduced supply of meat during the second quarter of 1944.

Despite a 20-percent shortage of fish, which approximates 1,000,000,000 pounds, Mr. Bowles has removed canned fish from the rationing list.

Of course, I am pleased that so many essential foods have been put on the free list. This action will transfer the activities of black-market operators and give them specialty lines in beefsteaks, beef roasts, butter, and cheese, and I hope that the large staff of the O. P. A. will now be able to properly enforce their regulations against persons who actually violate the law and engage in black-market operations.

I do not mean to infer that there is anything political in the recent act of Administrator Bowles to virtually abolish all food rationing. Food rationing could have been abolished 6 months ago as it was well known that all warehouses were bulging with meat and processed foods, due to the splendid production effort of farmers and processors. These patriotic Americans wanted to do their share to provide abundantly for the men in the armed forces as well as to take an important part in speedily winning the war. But one begins to wonder as to the consistency of this newly inaugurated policy, when you consider the statement made by Mr. Bowles in the Collier's article of last week to the effect that there would be

little relief in food rationing until the end of the war in Europe.

I am not in the habit of making predictions, but it would not surprise me at all should Mr. Bowles announce between now and November 7 that beefsteak, sugar, butter, canned fruits, gasoline, fuel oil, and automobile tires will also be put on the free list for the benefit of the civilian population. What do you think? Is this an effort to garner support for the New Deal's fourth-term candidate? I will leave the answer to you and the people of the country. Personally, I am convinced that should the New Deal elect its fourth-term candidate on November 7, the O. P. A. will shortly thereafter reinstate and make more drastic all rationing policies to further regiment and socialize the economy of our country. One final question. I would like to know who issued the order to Chester Bowles to virtually discontinue the rationing of all foods. Was this policy ordered by the President, or was it done by the palace guard in the White House? I also want to know if the New Deal is using the rationing and unrationing of essential foods as a political or disciplinary expedient.

It will be of interest to note the livestock population of this country as of January 1, 1944, according to estimates of the Department of Agriculture, to be: 82,200,000 cattle as against the 10-year average of 69,400,000; 83,800,000 hogs as against the 10-year average of 51,600,000; 572,500,000 chickens as against the 10-year average of 424,000,000. These are the largest supplies in the history of the country. In fact, the supply of livestock and poultry is so great that there is not sufficient feed in the country to bring them to maturity. The shortage of feed grains and corn, despite the tremendous crop in 1943, resulted in action by the War Food Administration to place a virtual embargo on the sale and use of corn. The lack of feed for cattle and hogs will force thousands of head prematurely on the market. It is a good thing that Mr. Bowles finally realized a surplus situation which has developed over a period of the last 12 months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS] is recognized for 7 minutes.

REPEAL POLITICAL RESTRICTIONS ON LABOR UNIONS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced in the House of Representatives a measure known as H. R. 4618, a bill to repeal the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act relating to political contributions by labor organizations. The purpose of this measure is to remove from the statute books those provisions of the Smith-Connally Act which restrict the political activities of labor unions.

It has always seemed to me grossly unfair and undemocratic to class labor unions in the same category as national banks and private corporations in these political provisions of the Smith-Connally Act. A labor union is a people's organization, operated on a nonprofit basis for the benefit of its members, and certainly, in this people's war, for the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

Many Members of Congress, including myself, voted against these political restrictions of the Smith-Connally Act at the time this legislation was being considered in the House. I feel that our action in repealing those provisions now will clarify our stand and at the same time remove a dangerous precedent that may lead to further suppression of civil liberties.

It is only fair to organized labor and to Members of Congress who conscientiously believe in the right of labor to organize that we recognize the unusual conditions under which the Smith-Connally Act was passed in the first place. An emergency existed. The Nation was threatened with a stoppage of vital war production in the coal industry. The House did not take the time that normally should have been taken to prevent grave injustice from being done to the great majority of patriotic American labor.

Whether the Smith-Connally Act has prevented strikes or whether in some cases it actually encouraged them is even today a debatable question. But there can be no question that in the political provisions of that act fundamental civil liberties of Americans are endangered. On this point we must agree. On this point we must act now. We must wipe off the statute books those provisions that prevent working people from banding together as they see fit in democratic political activity, supporting those candidates they choose to support and opposing those candidates they choose to oppose.

The preservation of this political right is vital. This political right may be counted among the most fundamental of all the institutions and the principles and the announced aims for which we are fighting this war.

It should never be forgotten that only Fascist and Nazi nations fear the power of democratic organizations. America need have no fear of political activity on the part of any people's organizations. America is fighting a people's war. That is the difference between America and her enemies.

The people of America are tolerant with the mistakes, the delays, the bungling for which Congress or any agency of government may be responsible from time to time, as long as we do the most important job right—as long as we are winning the war—and as long as we correct the mistakes as we go along. But the people of America will not be tolerant, nor should they be, of any unnecessary suppression of their civil liberties or any other act that is not conducive to winning the war, but has the opposite effect.

In asking support of Members of Congress for this measure, I cannot help but compare this bill which I have introduced with other measures which are now or have been pending to remove other restrictions thought by some to be too burdensome to bear. I cannot help but observe that by permitting labor unions once again to exercise their rights in political activity, Congress would in no way be hindering the war effort at home or abroad.

We would in no way be interfering with the stabilization program, the orderly drafting of soldiers, the delivery of military supplies to the war fronts. Instead we would be building the morale of the Nation's workers and assuring them, once more, that this is, after all, a war for freedom, and this will be a peace when men and women shall be free.

As we are well aware, there are those who would repeal the administration's price control and subsidy program. It has been my belief and I will continue to hold that these programs are essential to our war effort. For price control holds down the cost of living. Subsidies are paid to the producers of food in order to keep the retail price of food within the consumer's budget.

These restrictions are essential to a stable economy. These are essential to a continuous flow of supplies to our armed forces. These are essential to winning the war with the least possible delay, the least possible cost in lives. That being the case, it matters comparatively little that the ordinary peacetime freedom to produce with a view to profit alone is not maintained in these times. The sacrifice of that complete freedom must be made in the interest of winning the war.

But the sacrifice of civil liberties, the sacrifice of political liberties of people's organizations—this is not conducive to winning the war. This is not conducive to building the morale of the people nor of guaranteeing a democratic peace.

The speed and the completeness with which we shall win this war are in large measure dependent upon the energetic way we fight this war and the democratic way we organize our forces for peace. If we are to be true to our war aims and not to find that the whole struggle has been in vain, we should be true to those aims every step of the way. To the extent that we are not true to those aims, just to that extent shall we falter, delay, and win half victories.

Those war aims are bound up in the "four freedoms": Freedom of speech and religion—freedom from want and from fear. Those are democratic aims. They call for fighting a democratic war; applying democratic controls; financing in the democratic way; and extending the blessings of democracy in an honest endeavor to strengthen the greatest of all our resources, our human resources, whenever it is possible for us to do so.

This means in specific terms:

Price control, rationing, and subsidies to hold down the cost of living and share those materials that are scarce.

Tax measures that raise adequate funds from sources best able to pay.

Removing the political restrictions, wherever they are found, that deny men and women the right to vote or the right to engage in democratic political activity.

That is my understanding of the kind of war we are fighting and must fight to win the kind of peace we have set for ourselves in our war aims. That is why I will continue to support subsidies to hold down the cost of living; that is why I supported the President in his veto of a totally inadequate revenue bill which

the President justly described as a tax relief bill, for relief not of the needy but of the greedy. That is why I have voted for the antipoll tax bill and will continue to do so.

And above all that is why I ask the support of this body for H. R. 4618, to remove the political restrictions on labor unions contained in the Smith-Connally Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RANDOLPH for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, May 8, 9, and 10, on account of official business.

To Mr. TALBOT, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. KEE, for 10 days, on account of official business.

SETTLEMENT OF TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on contract termination legislation, and to include two letters and a copy of a brief report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I take the time of the Members today to discuss certain aspects of the settlement of terminated war contracts because of the great urgency of the problem.

We all know that yesterday the other body, in a splendid display of nonpartisan concordance, passed the Senate bill S. 1718 unanimously. I had earlier introduced a companion bill as title II of H. R. 4392 "to establish an office of demobilization, to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, prescribe the jurisdiction of courts in connection therewith, and for other purposes." On May 1, because it had been so clearly demonstrated that contract settlement legislation should be dealt with separately, instead of being tied up with other issues such as the office of demobilization, I introduced as a new bill the provisions of S. 1718 as they had been improved upon by the committees up to that date, and added a new provision of fundamental importance which I wish to explain. This bill is H. R. 4717 "to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, prescribe the jurisdiction of courts in connection therewith, and for other purposes."

Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I should like to organize my remarks along the following lines:

First. A brief history of the legislation to date.

Second. The legislative situation in the House, and my attempt through this bill to contribute to the immediate passage of termination legislation.

Third. Basic questions which I am sure the able Members of this body would wish to have discussed.

BRIEF HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

About 10 months ago work was begun on the termination problem because even at that time, the extent of cancelations and cut-backs had seriously jeopardized many small subcontractors, unable financially, to hang on in the face of the great delays which the contracting agencies held were absolutely inevitable in complying with existing law.

It has been my good fortune to be granted the opportunity of serving on the Special Committee of the House on Small Business under the direction of that able Representative, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Working closely with the Senate Small Business Committee, we were called upon, from the very beginning, to study the economic havoc which existing termination procedures were wreaking upon the stability of business enterprise. This study had been the earliest basis for termination legislation and my eventual introduction of the first bill, H. R. 4392, to which I have alluded.

The situation has increased in seriousness and in desperate aggravation to businesses, large and small, as major changes in war requirements have brought the total of terminated contracts into the billions of dollars, involving thousands of contracts, and affecting the solvency of thousands upon thousands of the country's businessmen.

The offset to what has become dangerous delay, and which, were the delay to continue much longer, would certainly spell disaster and doom to a large segment of small businesses of our country, has been that these 10 months have been well spent by committees of both Houses in perfectly splendid nonpartisan exploration of this imposing problem, and have resulted in solutions of the utmost competence in a realm of highly complicated but basic law—the realm of the relationship of the Government, as trustee for all the people, to its property and funds.

Permit me to recall the committee setup in the upper body. Termination has been in the hands of the Subcommittee on War Contracts of the Senate Military Affairs Committee under the chairmanship of that able and tireless defender of the people, the Senator from Montana, Mr. MURRAY. In addition, the problem has also been studied by that outstanding bipartisan group composing the Special Committee on Post-War Planning, under the leadership of Georgia's able and broad-visioned son, Mr. GEORGE.

Here in the House, some of our most expert and also tireless coworkers have been exploring the problem, with the fine accomplishments of the investigations of the standing Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs. Lately the work has had the added benefit of the concern of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. COLMER], and his colleagues from both parties in the Special Post-War Committee. The Small Business Committee, as we know, has been indefatigable in its efforts and results in contributing to the problem. My own committee, the Judiciary, by the referral to it of H. R. 4392, has also addressed itself to the termination problem, and a special subcommittee has been working in close harmony with the two Senate committees. I have the honor and privilege of working on that special subcommittee with my good friend the exceedingly learned and able Representative the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. This subcommittee has the good fortune to be headed by our wise and respected colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS E. WALTER.

Most of us in both Houses, in an effort to avoid the lack of coordination which characterized much of our initial war effort, at first saw the problem of termination as a highly interrelated whole of several major aspects which, it seemed, needed omnibus legislation.

As we probed deeper into the complex, it became apparent that many phases deserved the most thorough analysis and that their own relationships involved them in the broadest and highest fields of national policy respecting both economic survival at home and foreign economic and political relations. We came to see, recently, that one part of the problem was in a more advanced state toward solution than others: that was contract settlement.

We were then on the horns of the dilemma of delaying settlement legislation or offering an utterly inadequate omnibus bill that paid lip service to the goal of coordination without crystallizing the definitive policies of Congress. We realized, however, that the enormousness of the whole problem makes such policy declarations necessary and inescapable. Thus the decision of the Senators, in which my colleagues on the subcommittee and I concur, is that passage of separate legislation on contract settlement be urged with the greatest persuasion we can summon. The other body passed such legislation yesterday, and, as we know, we here now have the matter to deal with.

Let me say that the Senate bill, as it stands, is virtually unique in the support it has commanded, not only from the able legislators of both parties of the other body but from the contracting agencies, from Justice Byrnes' office, and from, within the Office of War Mobilization, the office of Mr. Baruch, from businesses large and small, and from the labor organizations of the country, who, however, the day before Senate passage while praising the bill in its own field urged delay until the omnibus legislation could be worked out. Of the bill itself, that champion of the Government's interests, our respected ex-colleague, Lindsay Warren, wrote in part to the War Contracts Subcommittee, which letter, though lengthy, I ask to be put in the RECORD:

> While as hereinbefore stated, I am still of the view that there should be an independent audit and review of proposed settlements prior to the making of final payments thereunder, nevertheless, I have no objections to offer to the bill S. 1718, except as hereinbefore noted, as it is believed that the provisions of the bill, if properly administered, are adequate to accomplish the announced objective thereof.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen will appreciate that with such unique and almost complete unanimity of support, it would be with exceeding diffidence that I would approach a fundamental alteration of the proposal, and yet, Mr.

Speaker, it was Lindsay Warren's letter and the status of the problem in the House that made me come to the difficult decision that amendment was not only desirable but in all good conscience a necessity.

THE SITUATION IN THE HOUSE

After study which, in care and thoroughness, duplicates the unstinted efforts of the Senate committees, both our Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees, under the leadership of their respected chairmen, have reported bills which are now in the Rules Committee. These bills are virtually opposite in their treatment of the auditing of claims and of the role of the Comptroller General. In discussing my bill in relation to the situation in the House, in a letter I addressed to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] on May 1, I said:

MAY 1, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER,
Chairman, Post-War Economic Policy and Planning Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COLMER: As you know, the problem of war-contract termination has been before the Judiciary Committee since March 13, 1944, at which time I had, after a talk with Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Post-War Planning Committee, introduced H. R. 4392. This bill is the companion measure in the House to the bill (S. 1730) which Senator GEORGE and Senator MURRAY introduced in the Senate on February 22, 1944.

H. R. 4392 has been referred to the subcommittee headed by Representative FRANCIS WALTER, and it is my hope that we will be in a position to report on contract termination to the full committee within a week. To that end, the able Representative of Iowa's Third District, Mr. GWYNNE, and I have for the last 3 weeks been sitting in joint session with Senator MURRAY's War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee and have been listening to many extremely competent witnesses present their views on contract termination and the economic issues involved in the transition from a war to a peace economy.

Today I am introducing in the House as a new bill the provisions of my termination bill, H. R. 4392, with three fundamental changes:

First. Since it is now clearly appreciated that contract termination should be dealt with separately, instead of being tied up with other issues such as the Office of Demobilization, my new bill is limited solely to contract termination settlements.

Second. Since the Murray and George committees in the Senate have made a number of perfecting amendments to the contract-settlement provisions which are embodied in the version of the Senate bill which has now been reported unanimously by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, my new bill embodies these improvements.

Third. My new bill includes new provisions—not in the Senate version—to protect the Government's interest and to prevent wasteful expenditures in the settlement of terminated war contracts, while not impeding rapid settlement in those vast majority of cases where the contractor is a responsible operator.

While these new provisions may not yet be in perfect form, I believe that they present the basis for resolving the conflict between those who put major significance on protecting the Government's interest and those who are mainly concerned with providing quick payments to war contractors.

The first group is very properly concerned over the many instances of manpower waste, laxity, and extravagance that have too often come to light in war production. They properly feel that these instances of laxity and waste, most frequently brought to light by investigating bodies of Congress, are an ominous harbinger of greater scandals to come under irresponsible or careless terminations, and that accordingly, it is Congress' duty to the people to protect the interests of the Government against such possibilities.

The other group holds that termination settlements, if delayed by the time-consuming procedures of detailed audits, would spell the doom, through no fault of their own, for many enterprises and, with their failure, the dissipation of innumerable job opportunities for demobilized veterans and war workers. Particularly acute would be the inability of small business financially to hold on in the absence of payment for the work it has done under terminated contracts. All groups are in sincere agreement that the survival of small business is essential to the survival of the American way for which we are fighting the war.

I submit that the two objectives of both groups are sound and desirable and are by no means irreconcilable.

The group who contends for protection of the Government's interest by seeking to prevent scandalous overpayments would not for a minute hold that the vast majority of the contracting and production which have brought thus far along the way to victory could be stigmatized by any imputation of fraud and deceit. On the other hand, those who contend for speedy settlement must surely realize that the instances of waste and laxity which have come to light may be stark indication of scandalous overpayments on work spoiled and on labor and materials wilfully wasted in hurried settlements of claims asserted by a few unreliable contractors.

Nothing could be more disastrous to the small businesses of the country than for their settlements to be held up by a wave of angry revulsion against all negotiated settlements if evidence comes to light that the interests of the Government had been betrayed because Congress had passed a law optimistically assuming, in spite of its own war-production investigations, that all contractors were worthy of negotiated settlements.

Those who sincerely urge haste in settlements must agree that subsequent evidence of lax or improper payments might at any time, and quickly, jeopardize their whole legislative formulation for quick and fair settlements even after it had become law.

The present impasse between the two contending groups in the House continues, it seems to me, because each believes, with rectitude, that its own principle aim is most significant for the country's interest and therefore should not be sacrificed. I have sought, through my amendments to the Senate bill, to preserve both fundamental aims compatibly, and in keeping with the country's interest. By these amendments those contractors who can reasonably demonstrate to the contracting agencies that their general operations are such as to protect the Government's interest in termination are provided with the extremely effective settlement procedures which our colleagues in both Houses have after great study developed.

My bill is aimed to provide strong incentive for improved operating controls by contractors in the period before the wave of terminations that are to be expected after the successful invasion, so that those who are border line in their housekeeping today will be in greater operating health and efficiency when faced with substantial termination and reversion to peacetime activities.

There is a fierce urgency as the country prepares for the onslaught of invasion and for the terrible tests thereafter that every part of our productive capacity needed to supply the battlefield shall be functioning with increasing efficiency and with decreasing waste of our scarcest resource—industrial manpower.

The very process of conforming to the policy declarations in the bill will necessarily effectuate increased war production through greater efficiency now and in the immediate future, as well as materially reducing waste and extravagance in the settlement of terminated war contracts.

We all recognize, and none more profoundly than you, the country's urgent need for the rapid passage of legislation by which the vast majority of responsible contractors can expect reasonable and rapid settlement of their termination claims. I believe the House is prepared to move rapidly on this propcsition, and the support of this bill by you and your colleagues from both parties in the Post-War Committee would certainly hasten the enactment of this needed legislation.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to reiterate what I wrote to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]:

The two objectives of both groups are sound and desirable and are by no means irreconcilable.

These two objectives—rapid settlements and protection of the Government's interests—are not only reconcilable but, it seems to me, must be the declared policy of the representatives of the people. The economic health or disaster to the Nation is at stake. This truly awesome prospect, however, will not be altered by slogans. Economic health will not be captured in a catch phrase such as "unemployment by audit"; nor will disaster in itself arise because someone coined "sell out by default." Health or disaster will, in a large measure, stem from what actions we take or fail to take in this session.

Thus since the aims of the contending groups are both reconcilable and, indeed, necessitous policy, there need be no conflict between these able contenders in the realm of high policy. So, too, the conflict of means, or mechanisms, evaporates if we but turn our minds and energies to developing the mechanism for the attainment of both objectives. That, Mr. Speaker, is the purpose of my bill. I hope my colleagues on either side of the previous controversy will see that I have taken very seriously the position of each of them and have tried to safeguard it and protect it and have tried to make it coexist compatibly with the other. When the gentlemen in question have had the opportunity to read my bill, I shall look forward to and take just as seriously their sought-for comment and suggestions.

At this point, I should like to tell the gentlemen that I have sent copies of my bill, asking for comment and suggestions, to the heads of all contracting agencies, the Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Commerce, Chairman of the War Production Board, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Chairman of the

Securities and Exchange Commission, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, Chairman and General Manager of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, the Comptroller General, the Attorney General, presiding judge of the Court of Claims, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Demobilization.

Letters including the bill to business groups and labor organizations are now in process, and I am hopeful, especially with the passage by the Senate of S. 1718, of prompt replies.

There shall be no reply which I will entertain more seriously than that of the Comptroller General for it is he, who, we all recognize, is the most authoritative source on questions of protecting the Government's interest. I shall ask permission to include his reply in the RECORD.

BASIC QUESTIONS

I will not take the time of the gentlemen for a detailed treatment of my bill. The report of the Senate Military Affairs Committee which clearly outlines the bill gives an excellent analysis of the measure. This report covers my bill except for a new section, section 4, "Policy of Congress for the protection of the Government's interests" and conforming changes. Permit me simply to discuss the new section, which aims to preserve the Government's interest, while not delaying settlement for the vast majority of contractors.

This section declares that the splendid provisions which have been worked out for rapid settlement contained in the Senate bill will be available to concerns who have done a reasonable job of protecting the interests of the Government and their own, in operating under their war contracts. The determination of that is a simple enough matter, namely, that the contractor can satisfactorily demonstrate that he can account for inventory values, labor costs, and justify his overhead proration. When a contractor cannot do that, and for the life of me I cannot see how he can operate in the business or produce effectively for the war effort if he cannot, then his claim must be audited.

PROTECTION OF THE GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST

I feel confident that the gentlemen would wish me to explain the means by which the Government's interests are protected against wasteful and extravagant overpayments.

To me the major means is afforded by what has been called pretermination planning. The principles of pretermination planning are written into the bill. The Director of Contract Settlement is directed to issue regulations to the contracting agencies, the War Production Board, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation to provide adequate assistance to contractors—prime and sub—to get their houses in shape so that their claims will be reliable. With the end of the war still in the future, we have been granted precious time to improve on contracting situations which the haste of getting war production underway occasioned. Nor will pretermination planning slow up the war effort. On the contrary, anything that helps contractors to operate more efficiently means greater production with less waste of manpower now. Meeting the policy declarations of the bill will improve the operations of many contractors just when, as we face the task of invasion, we need their productive capacity most.

Second. Contractors by demonstrating that they run their affairs so that their claims can be relied on are granted the effective, rapid termination procedures provided in the Senate bill. Here the emphasis is on just regular, decent business housekeeping which we can expect the vast majority of contractors to attend to. To suppose the contrary would be to suppose that the great development of American business over the decades had occurred in a madhouse devoid of the most elementary procedures. We know the facts to be that the stability and productive power of American industry lie in a large measure of its mastering of control techniques—wherein, very often, the small concern has a tighter grasp over its operations than the larger ones.

Third. Companies that do not get themselves into shape where their claims can be relied on must submit their claims to audit.

Fourth. And this along with the first point is basic, the Comptroller General is directed to report to Congress how this section and the rest of the act is being administered. In his overseeing of the operations under section 4, he and only he has the ultimate duty to inform the Congress whether or not our policies for the protection of the Government's interests are being administered. Specifically, this means that the determinations that contractors' claims can be relied upon will be constantly under congressional scrutiny. My contention is that the Comptroller General deserves this independent position and that it should not be compromised by his coming into the operating field and thus subjecting his operations and staff to the necessity of scrutiny. We must not call for independent reporting to Congress on how well its enactments are being carried out by an agency which is engaged in actual operations. I do not yet know the Comptroller General's point of view on the matter. I can only say I am looking forward to his reply to the letter I have sent him soliciting his comments. I want very much to see the utterly independent character of the Comptroller emphasized and strengthened as we prepare for the great wave of final termination.

SPEED OF SETTLEMENT

I would be surprised, since I have had the temerity to use the word "audit," if gentlemen do not inquire: "Haven't you thrown our hopes of rapid settlements out of the window?" Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity I believe and hope that I have made some contribution to even speedier termination settlement. Do not think that, were Congress optimistically to pass a bill based on the assumed reliability of all contractors, the terminating officers, most of whom will be conscientious public servants, will grab a figure out of the air to settle with a contractor who has done a thoroughly bad job. In spite of any such law, conscientious men will not sign their names to pieces of paper that would recklessly disburse the Government's funds. Under any law they will want the facts, the necessary information, for a fair settlement. If a contractor has done a bad job and cannot offer adequate information, conscientious terminating officers will slow down the negotiations until they get needed facts for a sound conclusion or they will resign their Government commissions. The looser the law, the more such men will fear the effects to their reputations and good names.

Therefore, the very fact that a basis of determining that contractors' information can be relied on will speed up settlements.

Those that are border-line now, which means that as a practical matter, in spite of any law, conscientious terminating officers would go slowly with them, are vouchsafed the opportunity and the means of getting into shape.

AUDITING BURDEN DECREASED

Some may ask, "Haven't you injected a great deal of auditing into the picture?" The answer is that the auditing burden to both the Government and the businessmen will be lessened under a forthright administration of the act. The very fact that heretofore there has been no means of validating the reliability of contractors' operations could only mean one thing—cautious, prudent terminating officers would seek termination settlement by cost formula. Without criteria, the tendency could well be toward unnecessary rigidity. The fact that the bill provides simple criteria for determining the reliability of the contractors' operations and further provides tangible aid to assist those needing it to get into shape for termination means that negotiated settlements will have a much stronger basis for acceptability, with a consequent smaller burden of auditing and detailed analysis, than if settlements were made predominantly by cost formula.

THE PLACE OF THE SMALL SUBCONTRACTOR

I would like to remind the gentlemen that when S. 1718 was before the other body Senators MURRAY and TAFT offered a floor amendment further strengthening the position of subcontractors, which was accepted. I am confident that at the proper time the Small Business Committee of the House will sponsor this amendment and such others as they feel will further clarify the will of Congress to protect the position of small business. As H. R. 4717 stands, I feel a contribution has been made in making advisory services for businesses, whether small or not, by which their terminating procedures can be relied upon. This, it seems to me, is definitive aid toward treating directly with subcontractors in termination, which is provided for in the Senate bill, but which I have sought to emphasize.

There are many more questions, I am sure, that could be profitably discussed. It is my hope that the gentlemen of both

sides will offer comments and suggestions for strengthening the legislative program for the effective, healthy termination of war contracts.

I have today received the following communication regarding H. R. 4717 from Senator MURRAY:

MAY 5, 1944.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEFAUVER: I thank you for bringing to my attention H. R. 4717 and your letter to Representative COLMER. I have not had the opportunity to study in detail the few changes you have made in S. 1718, which as you know, passed the Senate yesterday.

I want to compliment you on your lucid treatment of the problem in your letter to Representative COLMER, and to voice my unqualified approval of your basic contention that the objective of the two contending groups in the House—(1) rapid settlement of terminated contracts, and (2) adequate protection of the Government's interests—are sound and desirable and by no means irreconcilable. S. 1718, as it passed the Senate, is based upon this principle, and I assure you that I would not oppose any amendments that serve to weld two objectives more closely together. I have accordingly instructed the staff of the War Contracts Subcommittee to study H. R. 4717 with the careful consideration that any legislation sponsored by you would merit.

I note with further approval that your emphasis appears to be of providing such aid to contractors as will help them in presenting reliable claims. In this connection I call to your attention the amendment adopted in the Senate on May 3, spelling out the responsibility of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to assist small businessmen in the preparation and presentation of their claims.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.

I am confident that we here in the House will speedily bring about the enactment of termination settlement legislation which fully accords with everyone's desire for fair and reasonable settlements, expeditiously consummated within a legislative framework that adequately protects the interests of the Government and the Nation.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 22, 1944.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee,
Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of February 15, 1944, requesting my comments on S. 1718, entitled "A bill to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes," which bill is now pending before your subcommittee.

The objectives of the bill are set forth in section 1 thereof as follows:

"(a) To facilitate maximum war production during the war, and to expedite reconversion from war production to civilian production as war conditions permit.

"(b) To insure to prime contractors and subcontractors, small and large, speedy and equitable final settlement of claims under terminated war contracts, and adequate interim financing until such final settlement.

"(c) To insure uniformity among Government agencies in basic policies and administration with respect to such termination settlements and interim financing.

"(d) to use all practicable methods compatible with the foregoing objectives to prevent improper payments and to detect and prosecute fraud."

To accomplish those objectives the bill provides, generally, for the establishment, as an independent agency, of an office of contract settlement, headed by a director of contract settlement who would be charged with the responsibility of supervising and controlling the war contract termination and settlement program by establishing policies, promulgating regulations, and prescribing methods, records, etc., with respect to war contract termination settlements, appeals therefrom, and interim financing. Subject to such policies, regulations, methods, etc., contracting agencies would be authorized to settle any termination claim under any war contract by agreement with the war contractor or by determination of the amount due on the claim without such agreement, or by any combination of these methods; to allow and pay interest for delays in making final payment of any termination claim; to approve, ratify, authorize, or make termination settlements with subcontractors; and to provide interim financing during the period between termination and settlement of war contracts representing not less than 90 percent of the amount of termination claims. The director would have authority to require Government agencies performing functions under the program to furnish him information and reports regarding terminated contracts, settlements, and interim financing, and he would be required to report quarterly to the Congress on the exercise of his duties and authority under the program, the status of contract terminations, settlements, interim financing, etc. There would be no independent audit of termination claims prior to payment. The General Accounting Office would be authorized to examine records of contracting agencies relating to the settlement of termination claims after the final settlement of such claims for certain limited purposes as provided in section 16 of the bill.

As you know, the matter of settlement of war contracts which may be terminated has received my careful consideration for some time past and I have had occasion to express my views with respect thereto before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Rpresentatives and the War Contract Termination Subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and in various reports. Your particular attention is invited to my report of September 20, 1943, to you as chairman of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, and my reports of October 30, 1943, and January 28, 1944, to you as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs.

There can be no doubt as to the need for enactment of appropriate legislation and the formulation by the Congress of the policy and procedure to be followed in the settlement and payment of obligations under war contracts which may be terminated. In that connection the importance of effecting some payment promptly has been recognized and I have interposed no objection to the enactment of legislation which would make provision for interim financing, the payment of interest on amounts due contractors whose contracts shall have been terminated, and the making of loans to such contractors—my only objection in those respects being as to the amount of the interim financing, the percentage of interest to be paid, and the situations in which loans should be made. Likewise, I see no objection to the similar provisions with respect to such matters in the bill S. 1718 if it be the will of the Congress that the amounts of interim financing and interest payable, and the conditions with respect to loans, should be as provided therein.

In my consideration of the problem of settling terminated war contracts I have consistently urged, as necessary to the adequate protection of the Government's interest, that authority to make final payments under proposed settlements should not rest with the contracting agencies but that such payments should be made only after an audit and review of the proposed settlements by an independent agency. The bill makes no provision for such an independent audit and review prior to final payment and because I believe a settlement program without such a provision will not operate to protect adequately the interests of the Government and the taxpayers I cannot approve the program which enactment of the bill would establish. However, and especially in the absence of such a provision, I am convinced that an independent agency should exercise effective control over the program and it is noted that the bill provides for an independent agency—the Office of Contract Settlement—clothed with supervisory and regulatory authority which should be effective, if properly exercised and administered, to control termination settlements and payments in the various war contracting agencies and bring uniformity to the program. In this respect it is noted that the Director of Contract Settlement would be authorized not only to prescribe the records to be used in connection with settlements and interim financing but, also, to prescribe binding regulations with respect to carrying out the provisions of the bill, payment of interest on terminated claims, methods of determining fair compensation, settlement of subcontractor's claims, interim financing and evidence in support thereof, terms and conditions of financing, appeals, etc.

Section 23 of the bill S. 1718 would authorize the Director to delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him to the head of any Government agency and to authorize successive redelegation of such authority and discretion. I seriously doubt the wisdom of this provision of the bill. Not only is the necessity for such delegation and redelegation not apparent but there can be no doubt that the whole scheme of having supervision and control of the settlement program independent of the contracting agencies would be weakened, if not entirely destroyed—depending on the extent to which the authority to delegate and redelegate be exercised—as complete authority with respect to the settlement of termination claims, interim financing, loans, etc., could be delegated direct to the contracting agencies and the various contracting officers thereof whose action is not subject to appeal except in the interest of the contractors. Consequently, I recommend that subsection (a) of section 23 of the bill be eliminated.

Section 16 of the bill would authorize the General Accounting Office to examine all records of any contracting agency relating to the settlement of any termination claim, after the final settlement of such claim, for the purpose of determining (1) whether the settlement payments to the war contractor were made in accordance with the terms of settlement, and (2) whether such records or other information warrant a reasonable belief that the settlement was induced by fraud. The said section further provides that—

"Whenever the General Accounting Office believes that any settlement was induced by fraud, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report all of the facts relating thereto to the Congress, to the Director, to the Department of Justice, and to the contracting agency concerned, but shall not suspend or withhold, or direct or require any contracting agency to suspend or withhold, by set-off or otherwise, any amounts owing to the war contractor by the United States under such settlement or otherwise, and shall

not suspend credit to any disbursing officer for any disbursements made by him under such settlement. In any such case the contracting agency, on its own initiative, may, or, upon order of the Director, shall, take such action as it deems appropriate to recover or withhold payments to such war contractor."

While I assume it is not so intended this section as now worded might be understood as imposing on the General Accounting Office the responsibility for detecting and reporting frauds although the bill would clearly deprive said Office of any effective means of doing so or of preventing payments induced by fraud. My position consistently has been—as the hearings before the committee will show—that unless the General Accounting Office is to be given an effective part in the contract-termination program it should be expressly relieved of responsibility in connection therewith. Therefore, in order that there may be no doubt in the matter, and to be consistent with other provisions of the bill, I recommend that section 16 be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. (a) Any other provision of law notwithstanding, the function of the General Accounting Office with respect to any termination settlement made, authorized, ratified, or approved by a contracting agency shall be confined to an examination for the purpose of determining (1) whether the settlement payments to the war contractor were made in accordance with the terms of settlement, and (2) whether the records submitted to it or other information warrant a reasonable belief that the settlement was induced by fraud, but the General Accounting Office shall not be charged with the duty or responsibility of detecting fraud in connection with such settlements except as the presence of fraud may be indicated by records transmitted to the General Accounting Office with the termination settlement or with the voucher covering payment thereunder. Whenever the General Accounting Office believes that any settlement was inducted by fraud, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report all of the facts relating thereto to the Congress, to the Director, to the Department of Justice, and to the contracting agency concerned, but shall not suspend or withhold, or direct or require any contracting agency to suspend or withhold, by set-off or otherwise, any amounts owing to the war contractor by the United States under such settlement or otherwise and shall not suspend credit to any disbursing officer for any disbursements made by him under such settlement. In any such case the contracting agency on its own initiative may, or upon order of the Director shall, take such action as it deems appropriate to recover or withhold payments to such war contractor.

"(b) The jurisdiction of the Comptroller General of the United States shall not be affected by this act except to the extent necessary to give effect to the specific provisions thereof."

While as hereinbefore stated, I still am of the view that there should be an independent audit and review of proposed settlements prior to the making of final payments thereunder, nevertheless, if the Congress, as a matter of public policy, should decide otherwise, I have no objections to offer to the bill S. 1718, except as hereinbefore noted, as it is believed that the provisions of the bill, if properly administered, are adequate to accomplish the announced objectives thereof.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1718. An act to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 8, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Daylight Saving Time of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, May 11, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on daylight-saving time bills.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 10 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2987, a bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 18, 1944, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (ship construction reserve fund).

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 25, 1944, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 4486, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the clerk by letter.

Witnesses are requested to notify the Clerk by letter at least a day in advance of the hearing of their desire to testify in order that a list of witnesses may be prepared. Written statements for the record from persons other than witnesses should be submitted a day in advance. Amendments to be proposed during the hearing should be submitted to the reporter in duplicate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1516. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Buffalo Creek watershed in New York describing an investigation of a program of water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in aid of flood control made pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 574); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1517. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; one copy of various legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1518. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 1767. An act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War 2 veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARE: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 271. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 1419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1348. An act to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; with amendment (Rept. No. 1420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4282. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4311. A bill to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 1422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on Elections No. 2. House Resolution 534. Resolution to dismiss election contest of Edward T. McEvoy against Hugh Peterson, First Congressional District of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 3891. A bill to provide night differential for certain employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 521. A bill for the relief of Toby Lena Rosenberg, alias Maria Louisa Nasco, alias Alejandrino Nasco Echegaray; with amendment (Rept. No. 1425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COMPTON:

H. R. 4758. A bill to provide for court review of decisions of the National War Labor Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4759. A bill authorizing the preparation of a medal for presentation to members of the armed forces who participated in the battle for the Philippine Islands in the present war with Japan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4760. A bill to grant temporary commissioned rank to certain male nurses serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4761. A bill to provide for the transportation to their homes of persons discharged from the naval service because of underage at time of enlistment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4762. A bill relating to the flood-control project for the Fresno County stream group in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin, Calif.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 4763. A bill to provide for making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for soil- and water-conservation work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 4764. A bill to provide for making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for soil- and water-conservation work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 4765. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to extend the time for awarding decorations to persons for service in the armed forces in any war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to relieve members of the armed forces of the United Nations of the transportation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. J. Res. 274. Joint resolution requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 4766. A bill for the relief of Warren G. Holdridge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4767. A bill for the relief of the Revere Sugar Refinery; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4768. A bill for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5624. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 4, tenth ward, Binghamton, N. Y., and signed by 111 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504), providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5625. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. Harvey Bechtelheimer and 48 other citizens of Sabetha, Kans., opposing the passage of House bill 3947; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou who art the light behind life's shadows, the love behind life's sorrows, shine in morning splendor upon these darkened lives of ours. We cannot boast of our own might; our flesh is too fragile, our hearts are too evil, our wills are too wayward. In the white light of Thy searching, we pour contempt on all our pride. Coming to this temple of our democracy to pray, we would not catalog the sins of others, we would not exult that we are not as other men. Confessing our own sins, we would pray for Thy forgiveness and Thy cleansing.

We beseech Thee to make us the kind of men, so captured and possessed by Thy vast designs for human brotherhood, that Thou canst trust Thy ageless cause to our willing and eager hands. As the pangs of our brother's pain strike deep into our souls and the problems of these tragic days overwhelm our understanding, we ask only for light enough for the next step, courage enough to face the present duty, truth enough for today's decisions, as into Thy hands we commit our ways. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 5, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 5, 1944, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566);

S. 1757. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the fifth instant,

During the recess of the Senate a message was received from the House of Representatives by the Secretary of the Senate stating that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 271) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and a joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 156. An act relating to the status of retired judges;

S. 176. An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Ellender	Murdock
Bailey	Ferguson	Murray
Ball	George	Nye
Bankhead	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Gillette	Overton
Bilbo	Guffey	Radcliffe
Brewster	Gurney	Reed
Bridges	Hatch	Reynolds
Brooks	Hayden	Russell
Buck	Hill	Shipstead
Burton	Jackson	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Cordon	Maloney	Weeks
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Mead	Wherry
Downey	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INVITATION FOR CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO VISIT THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT—HANSARD REPORT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the private secretary to the Ambassador of Great Britain to Washington, transmitting copies of Hansard containing the debates in both Houses of the British Parliament on the recent invitation extended to Members of Congress, which, with the accompanying official report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CLASSIFICATION OF NEW SYNTHETIC DRUG

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code, the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, and the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to classify a new synthetic drug, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Navy, and Agriculture (4) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

RESOLUTION BY MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY OF MAYAGUEZ, P. R.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Municipal Assembly of Mayaguez, P. R., endorsing the administration of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

NEUTRALITY OF EIRE—MEMORIALS

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask consent to present several memorials containing the names of approximately 10,000 citizens, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the policy of the State Department in regard to the neutrality of Eire. I ask that the body of one of the memorials be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached and that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the memorials were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the body of one of the memorials was ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures, as follows:

The undersigned American citizens, many of whom have immediate relatives in the armed services, respectfully disagree with the policy of our State Department in its effort to force the people of Eire to abandon their neutrality for these reasons:

1. The peoples of the United States of America and of Ireland have maintained a strong and unbroken friendship over our history, and the Irish people still cherish that friendship.

2. Responsible British officials have repeatedly expressed a desire to repossess Ireland, and are not unwilling to use any State Department, ours included, to accomplish that purpose.

3. There is little opportunity for espionage afforded six Nazi-Nipponese representatives in Eire who must be under the constant surveillance of American, Irish, and British secret-service men.

4. In the First World War, Ireland accepted the promises of world leaders, and volunteered an army of 350,000 men—one-tenth of her population—while England was conscripting her army. The Irish dead numbered twice the Belgian dead, yet all promises to small nations were repudiated in Ireland's case.

5. To bring a neutral nation into military association by force of one kind or another is to emulate the Nazi philosophy and bring our war purposes and ideals into disrepute.

We respectfully suggest the immediate application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter to Ireland. This can be done without awaiting final victory or without disturbing our war effort.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. 1782. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 859);

H. R. 3429. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); with an amendment (Rept. No. 860);

H. R. 3476. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath draining district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 861); and

H. R. 3570. A bill to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 862).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 3848. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; without amendment (Rept. No. 863).

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 4, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); and

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 7th day of June 1944.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1895. A bill to provide for making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for soil and water conservation work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies organized under State laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1896 (by request). A bill to authorize the use of funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. TRUMAN):

S. 1897. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 5th instant,

During the last recess of the Senate the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 271) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces was read

twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REDUCTION OF TAX ON CABARETS, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there will be before the Senate shortly House bill 4646, to amend the tax law and to provide for simplification of individual income-tax returns. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill which would provide for a reduction of the tax on cabarets and roof gardens, and the like, from 30 percent, the rate at which it is now fixed, to 10 percent, the rate at which the tax was fixed before the present law was enacted. I ask that the proposed amendment be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, for the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and myself, I ask consent to submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by us jointly to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress) as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, Seventy-seventh Congress). In connection with the amendment I submit a brief statement explaining it, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the statement presented by the Senator from Montana will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

This amendment provides as follows:

Where any court proceeding is brought to obtain compliance by any processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer with, or to prosecute further a violation of any such person of a rule, regulation, or order issued by the Office of Price Administration or any other delegated authority under the act, such person may be permitted to set up the defense, (a) that such rule, regulation, or order does not afford such person a generally fair and equitable operating margin, (b) that its provisions operate to compel changes in the established business practices, cost practices, or methods, or means, or aids to distribution, or (c) that it was issued without advising and consulting with a standing advisory industry committee; or if the rule, regulation, or order relates to rationing, that it (a) does not provide for distribution of the rationed commodity through the usual and established channels of trade, or (b) that it was issued without advising and consulting with a standing advisory industry committee.

If in such case the court finds the defense of said party to be a true one, then this amendment prohibits further use of Federal funds or personnel to continue to enforce, directly or indirectly, compliance with the said rule, regulation, or order involved.

The Emergency Price Control Act at present provides but one recourse from oppressive rules and regulations of the Office of Price Administration. The complaining party must file a protest with the Price Administrator. If the Administrator rules against him, he may then appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals provided for such purposes by the act itself. There is no time limit provided within which the final decision on the protest shall be handed down to the complainant. In the Senate Small Business Committee Buffalo Meat Packer hearing, it was developed that one such case of protest by a Buffalo packer had been pending for more than 9 months.

The United States Supreme Court held in the Albert Yakus case on March 27, 1944, that since Congress had provided the above recourse against oppressive Office of Price Administration regulations, a complainant had no other recourse to the regularly established Federal courts. In the Yakus case, action was brought against Albert Yakus in a Federal district court for violation of an Office of Price Administration regulation. Yakus sought to set up the defense in the Federal District Court that the regulation in question was itself not in accordance with the provisions of the Price Control Act. The Supreme Court denied him the right to set up that or any other defense in the district court because the Congress had provided in the act itself a special court of appeals for this purpose.

Experience with the protest and appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals provided in the act has shown that decision in a pending case may be long delayed. In the meantime, the O. P. A. may enter the district court in a suit of both civil and criminal action. Not until O. P. A. moves in this direction, may the alleged violator get the matter into the Federal district court on his own volition. The proposed amendment does not change that condition. It does provide, however, that when the O. P. A. does move into the Federal district court, the defendant may set up one or all of the defenses I have previously indicated.

In the event the court finds that the defense set up by the defendant is true, this amendment provides that no Federal funds or personnel may continue to be used to enforce that O. P. A. regulation from that time on.

To say that the amendment would in anywise detract from fair and just price control, is in direct denial of the truth. The effect of the amendment will result in absolute and positive care being taken by O. P. A. officials to see that when an O. P. A. regulation is drawn, it definitely is within the provisions of the Price Control Act. That is the only safeguard and assurance to successful Nation-wide price control administration and observance.

If such amendment is not adopted to compel O. P. A. officials to make their regulations in compliance with the act of Congress, and, further, if the O. P. A. continues to write regulations for the meat-packing industry, for example, which O. P. A. officials themselves have admitted repeatedly, do not provide for generally fair and equitable margins for meat packers and processors, there can be but one of two results: Meat packers and processors must liquidate, or endeavor by one means or another through black-market operations to maintain themselves in business. The result of such compulsion will, on the one hand, result in almost absolute monopoly in the meat-packing and processing industry, or, on the other hand, in almost complete break-down of price control itself.

INVITATION FOR CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO VISIT THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the House of Lords of Great Britain, acting through the Lord Chancellor, and the House of Commons of Great Britain, acting through its Speaker, on the 14th day of March 1944 addressed an invitation to the United States Senate and the House of Representatives to send a delegation of the Members of the Senate and the House to visit the British Parliament; and

Whereas the House of Lords by formal resolution on said date extended such invitation in the following resolution: "Moved to resolve, That this House, desiring to promote a closer association between the British Parliament and the Congress of the United States of America, requests the Lord Chancellor on its behalf to invite the Congress of the United States to send a delegation of its Members to visit Parliament at as early a date as may be convenient." (Lord Addison.); and

Whereas the House of Commons on said date adopted the following resolution: "This House, desiring to promote a closer association between the British Parliament and the Congress of the United States, requests Mr. Speaker on its behalf to invite the Congress of the United States to send a delegation of its Members to visit Parliament at as early a date as may be convenient.": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States expresses to the House of Lords and the House of Commons of Great Britain its cordial appreciation for such invitation;

That because of the urgency of official business at this time, it will be impracticable for the Houses of the Congress to accept the invitation and to send a delegation of the Members to Great Britain at present;

That when the exigencies of public business make it possible such invitation will have further consideration by the Houses of Congress.

HARD MONEY (S. DOC. NO. 192)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some time ago Mr. Francis H. Brownell, chairman of the board of directors of the American Smelting & Refining Co., and one of the outstanding authorities of America, if not of the world, on the subject he deals with, published a pamphlet entitled "Hard Money," dealing with the currencies and moneys of the world at the present time and in the post-war period. I ask unanimous consent that the pamphlet may be printed as a Senate document. I may say that I have already discussed the matter with the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, and I believe an estimate of cost has been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the pamphlet will be printed as a Senate document.

RATIONING OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Government, through the War Food Administration, has called upon the farmers of America again to increase their production of foodstuffs. The Government, through Selective Service, tells us that hundreds of thousands of young farmers must be drafted into the armed service. The Government, through the War Production Board, Office of Price Administration, and local war boards, and A. A. A. committees, has severely restricted manufacture and distribution of needed farm machinery.

The farmers are ready to do everything possible to win the war, but if farmers cannot keep their help and are not allowed to get machinery and equipment, how can our Government expect

them to continue increasing food production?

I received a letter this morning which, if the facts are as stated by K. E. Kerbaugh, R. F. D. 2, Hill City, Kans., would indicate a lack of coordination or a lack of common sense in handling the rationing of such farm machinery as is available.

Mr. Kerbaugh lives in Graham County, but so close to the Trego County line that he normally trades in Trego County. He needs a tractor and lister. His dealer tells him the tractor and machinery are ready for him. But he apparently has to get a permit to buy from the Graham County board. This board refuses to allow him to buy from Trego County. He says he is informed that if he gets the tractor the Graham County allotment of 30 tractors will be reduced. But there are 80 applications for tractors in Graham County. I admit I cannot see why the Graham County board cannot wipe out 1 application, 1 tractor, and thereby increase food production. He says he would be able to continue "custom" work for a number of farms if he could replace his old tractor.

I do not know all the facts in this case, of course, but on the basis of Mr. Kerbaugh's letter I should say that if the Government is going to run everybody's business, it ought to do a more intelligent job of it than is being done in handling farm labor and farm machinery.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Mr. Kerbaugh printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HILL CITY, KANS., *May 4, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a small family-size farmer badly in need of a tractor and lister. I am living in Graham County, Kans. Also living in what is considered Trego County trade territory. The Ford Ferguson dealer in Trego County, has notified me 6 months ago that he had the tractor and machinery for me and it is still available. But Graham County has 80 applications but only 30 tractors and won't allow me a permit. They say it would lower their quota if they gave me a permit.

Our present tractor has been overhauled and repaired by mechanics several times and hasn't given satisfactory results at any time.

What is the fate of the family-size farmer? Is he to step down and out and let the big farmer that has the machinery take over and see the buildings tore down and moved off. Or is there some way to solve my problem.

If I had a new tractor I would have time for several hundred acres of custom work. But if I've got to quit I'm looking for a better paying job than being a farm laborer.

Sincerely yours,

K. E. KERBAUGH.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE ON THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a convention held at Milwaukee, Wis., May 6 and 7, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the formation of the Progressive Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON PRESERVATION OF JEWISH PEOPLE OF EUROPE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on April 29, 1944, at a rally sponsored by the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS ON CONSERVATION BY HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Conservation: A Sound Basis for Future Greatness, delivered by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, before the annual North American Wildlife Conference, at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill., April 25, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. MARION E. MARTIN BEFORE THE MAINE STATE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Marion E. Martin, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee, before the Maine State Republican Convention in Bangor, Maine, on Friday, April 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY D. BURNS DOUGLAS TO CONVOCATION BANQUET, FORT WAYNE VALLEY A. A. S. R.

[Mr. JACKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. D. Burns Douglas, judge of Allen Superior Court No. 2, Allen County, Ind., before the 1944 spring convocation banquet, Fort Wayne Valley A. A. S. R. Friday, April 28, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIS GUIDANCE AND PROTECTION—ARTICLE BY FRENCH QUINN

[Mr. JACKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "His Guidance and Protection," by French Quinn, published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette, and reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECLAMATION IS THE BEST FLOOD CONTROL—EDITORIALS FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the subject of irrigation as a means of flood control, which appear in the Appendix.]

SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the undermining of public morale in time of war, when everyone is fighting for victory against our Axis enemies, is not patriotic.

The seizure of the Montgomery Ward properties and subsequent events have brought to light some demoralizing facts—demoralizing, I am sure, to the men who had no choice but carry out orders.

While American soldiers and marines were dying in Italy and in the South Pacific, while airmen were being shot down over Germany, while Navy officers and blue jackets were suffering exposure on the high seas and carrying the battle to the Japs, other soldiers were humiliated by obeying orders to rush the Montgomery Ward offices in Chicago on the orders of the Attorney General and forcibly ejecting the aged president of the plant and then standing guard over a concern that was finally occupied by court order.

Protected by the courts, the United States marshal ordinarily is expected to enforce the injunctions of the court; but not in Chicago, for again on the orders of Attorney General Biddle, G-men, who, like soldiers, obey orders, arrested a Montgomery Ward official for tearing down a Government poster. I say acting on orders, because I know the record of the Army and the F. B. I. well enough to know that only by virtue of a command from higher authority would either service permit their men to be used in such a manner.

The record of J. Edgar Hoover and his organization is such that they would never enter into such activities, nor would General Marshall permit such use of his troops as occurred at Montgomery Ward without very compelling and specific commands from higher authority. Even though distasteful, neither the Army nor the F. B. I. would shirk their duty. They would do their job as best they could.

After the arrest of the Chicago official, the first stories that came from this new battle front at Montgomery Ward's said that the F. B. I. arrested, fingerprinted, and handcuffed the defendant before taking him before the United States commissioner. From inquiries I have made, it would appear that this was not correct. As a matter of fact, some of the news stories have since pointed this out. The arrested official of Montgomery Ward & Co. was taken before the Federal prosecuting attorney in Chicago by the F. B. I. Here their duty was discharged. The arrested defendant was fingerprinted and handcuffed by the United States marshal who took over the prosecutor's office.

A furor has resulted from the use of troops and the F. B. I. I say that it was a shame that these two services had to be employed by Attorney General Biddle and higher authority. I hope this is not a precedent. Both the Army and the F. B. I. are powerless to protect themselves. They had orders to obey. I hope that the American people will let themselves be heard and that their protests will reach the ears of Mr. Biddle and the President, so that never again will soldiers and G-men be demoralized by being forced to carry out an obnoxious assignment—an assignment they were never intended to execute. What will the men in the armed services who are on the fighting fronts, or the G-men who are on the trail of spies, saboteurs, and criminals, and who are all overworked and have a man-sized job to do, think when they have their forces dissipated by carrying out assignment of marshals? I, for one, resent the criticism that has been directed at the Army and the F. B. I. for doing their duty. I hope they will not be humiliated by such tasks in the future.

But there is another consideration which we must not overlook—the demoralizing effect. Our Army is only as good as the people who support it. The same is true of the F. B. I. If I can judge from the flow of mail, both the

Army and the F. B. I. have suffered in prestige as a result of doing their duty in line with orders from higher authority—not because of what they did but because of someone else's mistakes.

The marshal's office, manned by Chicagoans, was the responsible Federal agency that should have done the job after the court saw fit to grant the injunction. The troops and G-men should not be forced to suffer because officials in policy-making positions, such as the Attorney General, called upon them.

This Nation has a duty to support its armed forces who have fought the enemies abroad so courageously, and the F. B. I., which has fought the enemies in this country so nobly. We need them for the future, so we should see to it that they are not misused again.

I have dealt with the use of the United States Army and the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Montgomery Ward seizure. Entirely aside from this, I now want to speak about another matter.

Let me call attention to one other situation relating to the Montgomery Ward battle front. The other day, according to the New York Times, acting upon the direct request of the White House, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor adopted a vigorous statement supporting the administration's action in the Montgomery Ward case; but by a divided vote. I personally do not know whether or not the representative mentioned in the New York Times was actually from the White House, but he was someone representing the administration. It is rather interesting to me to note that it was felt necessary to send a representative of the administration to stir up in the executive council of the American Federation of Labor support for the action in Chicago. It is pretty deplorable when we reach that level, the level of stirring up artificial support.

It is too solemn a moment in American history, it seems to me, for agents of the Commander in Chief or the administration to go about sowing division and political dissension among those who loyally maintain the home front. After all, Mr. President, this is not a New Deal war. This is an American war. Across the sea men are fighting in the American way. The boys over there are not offering up their lives for the New Deal. They are offering up their lives for America. In my judgment it was reprehensible to send representatives of the administration to develop support in the executive council of the American Federation of Labor; and I am very glad to see that not all of the members of the council bowed to the will of the administration lobby at the executive council meeting. Certain members of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor had the courage to stand up and be counted against the proposal. That is an indication to me that we have some independence left in America. Mr. William Hutcheson, the able president of the International Brotherhood of Carpenters, had the courage to stand up in opposition to this administration lobby and was joined by Mr. Bugniazet and Mr. Woll who also had the courage of their convictions and who stood up at the meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor and placed their Americanism ahead of any partisan bias on this issue.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE ACT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on last Thursday, and also on last Friday, I requested that the consideration of House bill 4254 be postponed until today, so as to give Senators an opportunity to study the report which was filed by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], pertaining to lend-lease aid and Government expenditures abroad. Since Friday I have been studying the report very diligently and very carefully. I have also called on Mr. Feeney, who heads the investigative staff of the Appropriations Committee for some information in reference to how lease-lend is administered abroad and I want to say that all the data I have examined has shed no more light on the subject than the data I received last October, and in previous months. The report is vague and indefinite and deals mostly with recommendations that should have been the order of the day for the past 2 years. The situation of lease-lend in reverse is still shrouded in darkness and its full operation is still kept in secrecy. I believe it is incumbent on the members of the Appropriations Committee to look into the situation and to make every effort to determine what our country is receiving by way of reverse lend-lease and to set a definite policy as to what may be charged by our allies in reverse lend-lease.

I am not contending that while the war is being waged we ought to receive from Great Britain, from Russia, and from others of our allies a return in kind of the natural resources we are now dissipating because I realize that labor shortage and shipping facilities would not warrant such a course. It strikes me, however, very forceably, that we should have some definite understanding now as to what our allies, particularly Great Britain, can charge for reverse lend-lease rather than have a misunderstanding when the war ends.

In the last few months Mr. Churchill has made speeches before the House of Commons which indicate, to my way of thinking, that the British are now preparing to handle their Empire activities as in the past, in other words, they contemplate carrying on their business after the war as it prevailed before the war, and obtain advantages from the various British Commonwealths and their colonies, to our disadvantage. In a speech made by him on November 9, 1943, delivered at the mayor's luncheon in London, he said:

> Last year, in 1942, I thought it right to say that I did not consider it any part of my duty to liquidate the British Empire. I do not conceal from you that I hold the same opinion today.

Again he is quoted in the New York Times of April 22, 1944, in a news item by E. C. Daniel, with a London date line, April 21, 1944. The news item is as follows:

> LONDON, April 21.—Prime Minister Churchill, who declared in 1942 that he had not become the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, asserted today that even in the drafting of the Atlantic Charter he had sought to safeguard the Empire's commercial system.
>
> However, he said in an address to the House of Commons that there would be in the future a world structure for "all generous and free asscciations of a special character," such as the British Empire's political and commercial alliance.
>
> Both a world order to keep peace and the great federal organization of the British Empire, he asserted, "may be so fashioned as to be but parts of one tremendous whole."
>
> Standing before the House as a living example of the bulldog breed of empire builders and defenders, Mr. Churchill neither deprecated the empire nor apologized for it, but rather explored the possibilities of perpetuating and strengthening it. His speech concluded a 2-day debate on Empire policy intended as guidance for the government in the forthcoming conference of Dominion Prime Ministers here.
>
> EMPIRE ISSUES AIRED
>
> Although unable to commit the government to any policy in advance of that meeting, Mr. Churchill joined in the general airing of Empire problems, one of which he described as that of making the Empire more closely knit and "at the same time more closely associated with the United States."
>
> Taking cognizance of fears that the policy of Empire trade preference might have been sacrificed to an understanding with the United States, Mr. Churchill disclosed that it was he who had asked for insertion of the words "with due respect for their existing obligations" in the Atlantic Charter.
>
> Those words appear in the fourth principle of the charter pledging Britain and the United States to endeavor, with all due respect for their existing obligations, "to further the enjoyment by all States" of equal access to trade and raw materials. The qualifying words, said Prime Minister Churchill, were expressly intended to retain for Britain the "fullest possible rights and liberties over the question of imperial preference."

Mr. President, I have stated on several occasions that our Government has furnished as much as 70 percent of all the oil which is being used to run the war. We are depleting our precious iron and copper mines. We have drained our Treasury, and we are piling up our debt load in astronomical figures. If Mr. Churchill and the people of Britain are to assume the attitude disclosed by the article I have just read, I fear that when judgment day comes, when a settlement is called for, there will be serious objection from them with respect to giving back to us some of the God-given natural resources which we as a Nation are forced to utilize in order to carry on this war.

Mr. President, on June 25, 1942, I addressed the Senate and in the course of my remarks made the following statement:

> Mr. President, I admire Mr. Churchill. He is a great political leader. Judging from press reports, I have no doubt that he will be given a vote of confidence when he returns to England. In the past he has been able to win over his people by sheer oratory. I will

never forget his speech of February 15, 1942, when Singapore fell. He lamented its fall, but consoled his people when he said:

"The first and greatest of events is that the United States is now unitedly and wholeheartedly in the war with us. The other day I crossed the Atlantic again to see President Roosevelt. This time we met not only as friends but as comrades standing side by side and shoulder to shoulder in a battle for dear life and dearer honor in the common cause and against the common foe.

"When I survey and compute the power of the United States, and its vast resources, and feel that they are now in it with us, with the British Commonwealth of Nations, all together, however long it lasts, till death or victory, I cannot believe there is any other fact in the whole world which can compare with that. That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass."

In other words, we have lost the Battle of Singapore, said Mr. Churchill, but I have won the battle of making the United States an active participant in this war on our side.

There is no doubt in my mind why Mr. Churchill was so anxious to get us into this war. He worked for it, as he said, and now it has come to pass. He was aware of our potential natural resources and he felt that once we were in he could depend on us to carry on without a let-up. It was a case of maneuvering himself into a position where he could make it possible to let George do it, and I do not mean King George of England. As I said then, and I repeat now, we have given unstintingly in this war—we are spending at the rate of over ninety billions annually, 14 percent of which is expended annually for lend-lease operations—and unless the Congress takes hold now and tries to make sure that the British Empire bargains with us now to restore to us after the war some of the many millions of tons of natural resources of every kind which are now being dissipated, we may find ourselves unable to carry on war in the future in defense of our own country.

Some of us have been advocating that the British should deed to us in perpetuity certain bases in the Atlantic. It will be recalled that soon after the destroyers-for-bases deal was made—I advocated that, instead of our Government's receiving a 99-year lease on the bases, we should get them in perpetuity. Three or four months ago a subcommittee of the House of Representatives' Committee on Naval Affairs visited those bases and advocated that such a policy should be adopted now while the war is going on. But when that matter came to the attention of the British people Mr. Churchill said, as appears in an article headed London, April 26, 1944, published in the New York Times of Thursday, April 27, 1944:

Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons today there was not the "slightest question of any cession of British territories" in the leasing in September 1940 of bases to the United States in exchange for 50 American destroyers.

Rhys Davies, Labor member, called attention to a recommendation of a Naval Affairs Subcommittee of the House of Representatives at Washington for study of the idea that the United States obtain permanent possession of the military bases.

Mr. Churchill replied that the Commons might "rest assured there have been no developments calling for review by the Government or the House of the existing position in this matter, which remains unchanged."

The 1940 agreement between the two countries provides that there shall be no change of sovereignty in the bases, which were leased to the United States for 99 years.

Mr. President, in addition to the suggestion that we obtain those Atlantic bases in perpetuity, I have advocated that when the war is over that our Government should be given the right by our allies to select in the Pacific and in the Atlantic, if we see fit to do so, such bases as we may have built in order to fight this war. In fact we should be allowed to establish other bases to the end that such bases may be used for our protection and to help keep the peace of the world. In the space of 25 years our great Nation has been called upon to save the world on two occasions. We have fought and we are now fighting, not as conquerors, but as saviors of liberty and we should be afforded an opportunity to make it possible for the world to live in peace. Since our aims are so noble, our allies should trust us and not hesitate to make such bases available to us. I believe that such a policy should be settled now, not after the war; and I urge the Committee on Appropriations to study this matter and to have it in mind when further appropriations are made to help our allies.

I have turned over to the Truman committee all information that I had on the subject of lease-lend in reverse. I obtained some very valuable information from a major in the Quartermaster Corps, who was stationed in England, and who told me that he desired to appear before the Truman committee or before any other committee, so that the American people could find out how lease-lend is operating in Great Britain. What I have asked in the past and what I am asking now is that any reverse lease-lend aid be something real, something tangible, something that will be useful. This major said that some of our soldiers were being housed in English castles that were repaired and put in order by the English and all expenses were in turn charged to us by way of reverse lend-lease. He further stated that many commodities that were sent to the English under lease-lend were in turn sold to our soldiers for cash and the cash found its way in the British Treasury. He further stated that lease-lend gasoline was sold by the British and the cash also found its way in the British Treasury and all we got was an I O U.

Mr. President, as I pointed out in two speeches before the Senate, one on March 5, 1941, and another on October 12, 1943, statements such as this were made by the Lend-Lease Administrator, who was then Mr. Stettinius:

It is impossible to measure in dollars either the cost to the British or the value to us, for example, of British engineering and designs of weapons based upon 2 years of combat experience gained before we entered the war. All this has been freely made available to us in the production of planes, tanks, and other weapons in our own factories and for our own forces. No estimate can be made of the number of American lives that have been saved by equipping our forces with those improved weapons.

In my speech on October 12, 1943, after quoting the foregoing statement, I said:

Just stop and think of that. The great British Government proposes to offset lend-lease aid by engineering experience. I say to the Senate and to the British people that if they seek to offset lend-lease aid in such a manner, they ought to hang their heads in shame.

I repeat that statement today.

Mr. President, unless a policy is established now, after the war we may find ourselves in debt to some of our allies if they are permitted to charge for such services as I have just indicated. They are contemplating a charge on capital investments made by them in building roads, air fields, and the like, some of which our boys use in fighting this war. I say that unless our Government establishes a policy now, it might be too late, when the war ends, for us to recoup what is justly due us.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. My understanding is—and I have received the information from Army officers—that in the lend-lease operations in north Africa we have turned over trucks, machinery, and other things to the British, and that they were used not by us, but by the British, in obtaining good will for themselves in north Africa. However, I understand that since that has been made known, and taken up with the President, he has said that he would insist that in the future all lend-lease in north Africa be handled by Americans rather than the British. I was delighted to hear it. However, it is difficult for me to understand why the British were permitted, in the first place, to use lend-lease goods for the purpose of giving them to the Arabs, or lending them to the Arabs or other people for the purpose of obtaining good will for the British. If the goods are furnished by us, they ought to be given in our name. I have seen some statements to the effect that that was not being done, but I happen to know, from a very respectable authority, that it was being done, and that recently the President has said that in the future the operations should be handled by Americans.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my understanding that the policy has been changed since last November. My purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and the country is with the hope that the British people will see the light. The British should realize that this is not our war and that we are giving our all for their preservation.

As I indicated in my speech on October 12, 1943, Americans generally believed that when we gave 50 destroyers to Great Britain, we were obtaining land in order to build 7 bases. Investigation showed that that was not the case. All we acquired was the right to use the water and the free air surrounding certain British possessions. After this matter was brought to the attention

of the country 6 or 8 months ago, the British people saw the light, and they paid over to us the amount of money expended by us in acquiring land for the 7 bases. The amount involved was not large. It was only $6,200,000; but that much was saved.

What I am attempting to do now is bring this matter to the attention of the people of this country and of the Appropriations Committee, and to urge the committee to establish a policy now as to what can be charged by our Allies in reverse lease-lend, instead of waiting until after the war and getting into a dispute over it. I hesitate to repeat my purpose so often and my hope is that the Appropriation Committee of the Senate will make "action" its byword when considering further lend-lease appropriations. We can easily establish a policy; and I believe that such a course will be conducive to much better relations when the war is over.

Mr. President, I do not care to take any more of the time of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from two speeches made by me before this body, under date of March 5, 1941, and October 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. ELLENDER. * * * Mr. President, I did not oppose the Lend-Lease Act. I thought it was necessary. Not only did I favor its adoption but I have supported every appropriation made to carry out its purposes, and I am in favor of its continuation. However, what has puzzled me regarding its operation is my inability to obtain information which I deem pertinent, giving a clear picture of how it is administered. We are given to understand that some of the countries which receive aid under its provisions furnish us goods and services in return, but when an effort is made to determine what it is that we receive in return, the information is not available. I believe that I express the views of the Senate, as well as those of the American people, when I say that it would be far better for us to have an understanding now of what our allies will be permitted to charge us on lend-lease in reverse, than to have a misunderstanding of the matter when peace comes.

On March 5, 1941, when the lend-lease bill was being considered by the Senate, I made this suggestion to the President, and I think it will bear repetition:

"It is hoped that the President, in the exercise of those powers—" that is, lend-lease powers given to him—"will take into consideration the vast resources of the British Empire and other countries now engaged in war on its side before extending them too much credit to carry on their war.

"I have made a study of the debts of England and the various British possessions now engaged in war with her. I have before me a statement which is very interesting, and I believe the information it contains should be taken into consideration when the pocketbook of Uncle Sam is being opened, as it were, in order to help the British.

"Our country, including its possessions, has an area of 3,738,395 square miles. Its total population is 150,450,560. The public debt of the United States up to September 30, 1940, was $44,214,604,746."

I will omit further reading in regard to a comparison of debts, because I propose to discuss the subject in detail when I present to the Senate the statement to which I have referred.

"Further, Mr. President—"

Again quoting from my speech of March 5, 1941:

"I hope all that is now being done by the British possessions will be continued after the passage of this bill, to the same extent, if not greater, than now prevails. In other words, after we pass this bill I do not want the British possessions to assume that Uncle Sam is going to do all the work and furnish all of the materials needed.

"Under the pending bill the President has the power to trade, exchange, or barter all kinds and quantities of property. It is to be hoped that he will exercise—and I am confident he will—that power so that we will receive some form of compensation for our property, rather than make outright gifts to those who will benefit."

That statement was made, as I have said, on March 5, 1941.

"I submitted figures showing the areas of the various countries. The British Empire is almost four times larger than the United States in area. Likewise, we know that our country is entirely dependent on British and Dutch possessions for rubber, tin, and a few other natural resources that are essential to us; and in making these trades I hope the President will bear these facts in mind and obtain for us vast quantities of these natural resources. I may further add in that connection that the President may look into the feasibility of obtaining permanent bases in the Atlantic from the British rather than 99-year leases. I am not advocating the acquisition of any of the islands involved, but complete sovereignty and ownership in perpetuity of those portions of the islands or mainland as may be necessary to properly establish our bases.

* * * * *

"Today, sad to say, our great country may be penalized because it has industrial advantages unequaled by those of any other nation in the world. Because of the ingenuity of our people, we have become the arsenal of democracy. In the meantime let us not forget that our natural resources are being depleted, and we should demand for our finished products some of the rich natural resources of Great Britain and her allies."

Mr. President, I have merely cited a portion of that speech as a further reminder to the President and his advisers that it is while the war is in progress that he should make every effort to replenish from abroad our God-given natural resources which are now being utilized in such large quantity in this great war.

Mr. President, since the operation of lend-lease, I have made every effort possible to obtain from the Administrator information as to how lease-lend operates, whether or not it is a one-way street, as has been suggested, or whether we are receiving any value in return for what we send to our allies.

I wish to say at this point that I do not expect all our allies to be able at this time to return, either in kind or otherwise, what we are now giving them. Take, for instance, China. I know that China cannot do it; we have heard and read of her poverty. I feel confident also that Russia at this time cannot possibly make any return in kind or otherwise. She has her hands full fighting Germany, and I know that America is proud of her matchless victories on the battlefields of Europe. I predict that when the history of this war is written, Russia's legions will be given credit for saving world democracy and freedom.

Mr. President, I believe that facts and figures have been submitted to this Senate not only in recent weeks, but months ago, which show that Great Britain could to some extent relieve or lighten our burden by returning to us in kind or in some substantial way such materials as we are furnishing her under lease-lend. Furthermore, I believe sincerely that now, while the war is on, as I have just indicated, we ought to have such an understanding. There is no earthly reason why we should not have an agreement, that we are to obtain from Great Britain concessions for bauxite from her rich mines in British Guiana. There is no reason why we should not be granted concessions for tin, for rubber, and last, but not least, for oil.

It has been brought to the attention of the Senate that this country has been furnishing about 70 percent of the oil which is now being used by our allies, and we hear, to our amazement, that the British have vast oil reserves in Iran and that big British-owned refineries are running but 60 percent of their capacity. Why should the United States send oil and octane gas across the seas when both could be obtained not far from the actual theaters of war?

Yesterday morning I telephoned the Lend-Lease Administrator. I was referred to one of the experts, and I again asked how the lend-lease operated in Australia. Much has been said here about Australia. The answer was that neither the British nor the Australians had a sufficient number of men on hand to make the compilations; in other words, that they were short of labor to render such services. Lease-lend has been on the statute books now for over 2¾ years, and it strikes me that the American people are entitled to know how lease-lend is being operated. It will be recalled that some members of the Australian Government contend that their country has furnished us with as much as she has received from us. In other words, the accounts are about in balance.

Mr. BRIDGES. * * * But I do believe, as the Senator from Louisiana is attempting to tell the Senate, that the country is entitled to know what is going on today in lend-lease. I believe the strongest point the Senator has made today is this: When we give to any country equipment or supplies under lend-lease, which they in turn sell to their civilian population, for which they receive cash from their own people, can anyone in the Senate offer one legitimate reason why that money should be placed in their own treasury and spent for their own purposes and not be returned to the United States? That is one of the loopholes in lend-lease that should be corrected in the interest of justice to the United States and our citizens.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. Does either the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from New Hampshire have any proof of the last statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. I received it from the Lend-Lease Administrator, of course.

Mr. HATCH. That other countries receiving lend-lease from us were selling lend-lease articles to their own citizens?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I will read from the record a statement made by me early in 1943 with respect to the matter. I cannot find the statement at the moment, but, as I recall, I said that shiploads of milk, of cheese, of powdered eggs, and the like are sent to Great Britain, for which the United States receives an I O U. The British Government sells the merchandise to the wholesalers in Great Britain, the wholesalers sell it to the retailers, and the retailers to the consuming public. What really happens is that the British Government receives the cost of the goods from the wholesalers and puts it into the treasury. No doubt, profits are made on which income taxes are collected by the British Government, and I am almost certain that ad valorem taxes are also collected in like manner.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator from Louisiana was present in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when I or some other Senator asked the question of Mr. Stettinius, I think it was, or some representative of the Lend-Lease Administration, and the answer was very frankly made that the British Government was selling the goods, and the money received for the sale of the goods was going into the British Exchequer. There was no question about it at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. I made statements regarding this on the Senate floor on two occasions at least. I was present at the meeting to which the Senator from Montana referred and recall the incident.

Mr. WHEELER. When Mr. Stettinius appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, he very frankly admitted that that was true. There was no question about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Now, Mr. President, I desire to read a little more from the RECORD and then I will conclude with lease-lend:

"Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was discussing the pending bill for a continuation of the Lend-Lease Act, in behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I asked him some questions with a view of attempting to clarify a few of the issues involved. As I stated then, I repeat, I voted for lease-lend and I expect to vote for a continuation of lease-lend. I believe that it should be made plain to the American people how lease-lend operates—just how it is proposed to pay us back for the advances made. I have been trying to obtain an answer to the questions for the past 6 or 8 months, and I am still in the dark.

"I am informed that the way some of lease-lend works—

—"I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] that this is the quotation I was looking for a while ago—

"is in the following manner: A cargo of pork, canned fruits, dried eggs, and other products is shipped to the British Government for the purpose of feeding its civilian population. Those products are turned over to an agency of the British Government. The British agency pays nothing for them to our Government but sells them to the merchants in the British Isles, and in turn the merchants sell the goods to the people of the British Isles, thereby enabling the merchants to maintain themselves in business. No doubt, some appreciable income accrues to the merchants upon which the British Government receives taxes and other income. If that be true, I would be interested to find out to what extent is lease-lend operated in such a manner."

Since that time I have tried to obtain that information, but I understand that the statistics are not available, and that England cannot furnish the information because of shortage of labor to compile such figures.

"Let it not be shrouded in darkness. The people are entitled to know if this is an outright donation or if they are being kidded into believing that they can expect to be repaid in kind or otherwise.

"If we are to receive value, let our allies make it real. Let us be shown that they mean business. * * * While this war is continuing we should obtain absolute sovereignty over the bases that we acquired from England some time ago in return for 50 destroyers. Let us make lease-lend work to that end. I advocated such a proposition almost 1 year ago, and I doubt if anything has been done to this moment. Other bases could be acquired in like manner. In that connection why not obtain sovereign rights over some of the air bases we are building in the Pacific and other parts of the world? On the other hand what about the millions of tons of our natural resources that are being sent abroad? Why could not some agreement be entered into now whereby our Government could in some way have returned to it some of the millions of tons of steel it is sending abroad? How about oil; why not make provisions for its return after the war? How about rubber and tin? Are we going to be forced to pay to Britishers, after the war, tremendous sums for rubber and tin as we did after the First World War? It strikes me that while this war is on, while we are giving our all, while we are dissipating our God-given natural resources, we should make every effort to obtain, in kind, those irreplaceable resources. Let some agreement be made now, to make available to us after the war, iron ore, tin, manganese, bauxite, oil, and other resources that are now being used in large quantities. We must and should replenish those resources.

"Mr. President, I advocated a similar proposal 2 years ago, when the original bill was before us. I had hoped that something would be done in that direction here now. The British Commonwealth has many times the natural resources the United States possesses, and I contend that now is the time for us to have a clear-cut understanding of how we are to obtain in kind some of our God-given resources which are now being extravagantly dissipated. Let us obtain if possible, in sovereignty, some of the rich bauxite mines owned by the British, some of the rich tin deposits owned by the British and the Dutch; in fact, sovereignty over some of the rich natural deposits owned by our allies and which are now idle. Let us bargain now while the war is on and not wait until the war is over. I would like to discuss this subject more in detail."

Mr. President, I cite that reference to the Senate merely to show that some of us were not asleep, and that I believe we have made valid suggestions to those administering lend-lease, but somehow they have not been followed. It is my contention that a discussion of this kind probably will lead England to do in regard to other matters what she did in respect to the 50-destroyer deal. It will be recalled that when the British were given 50 destroyers in trade for 7 bases, some of us on the Committee on Naval Affairs * * * investigated to find out some of the details in regard to that deal. When an investigation was made, what did we find? We found that our Government had simply acquired water and air, and that we had to go down in our jeans and pay out as much as $6,200,000 in order to acquire land upon which to build the bases. I have no doubt that the discussions we had in the past brought the English to their senses; and 2 months ago we were paid for the amount the United States put up to buy the land for those bases.

By the same token, I want to bring to their attention many other things. I am pleading for an understanding now, so that we shall not have a misunderstanding around the peace table.

One of the puzzling answers was in regard to the valuation of reciprocal aid. How to evaluate services, and so forth, seems to have been the troublemaker for the Lease-Lend Administrator. This was his reply:

"While we have kept records of reciprocal lend-lease aid received from all countries, it has not been practicable thus far to make evaluation in dollars and cents of the amount of this aid. However, we are endeavoring to obtain from the foreign governments a statement of the costs to them, in terms of their own currency, of the aid which they have given us. The Australian Government has already indicated that it spent approximately £61,000,000—which would be about $196,000,000 of our money—for reverse lease-lend up to June 30, 1943."

I had asked for a statement, but all I received was the amount. Upon further investigation from some of the experts in lease-lend I am told that a large amount of this $196,000,000 which the Australian Government has charged against us is for the money spent by the Australian Government to build roads and airports throughout Australia for the defense of Australia, and for the rent of large airports scattered throughout Australia, and also for the use of docks in Australia. Just think, Senators. Here we are, sending our blood, our money, and everything else to defend Australia, and we are charged rent for the use of bases and the cost of building ports and roads in order to defend Australia.

Before the war the debt of Australia was five-billion-and-some-odd-million dollars. Now it is about $200,000,000 less than it was. According to the figures I have, she owes less now than she did before the war. Probably our great country could pay all of its debts if we could get from all our allies material which we could sell for value and put the purchase price in our pockets.

Let me read further:

"The problem of evaluation is, however, a very difficult one. The reciprocal aid received by us consists of thousands of individual transactions occurring in all parts of the world under the most diverse circumstances. To place values on individual items, or even to arrive at values in terms of general categories, is a vast undertaking. Moreover, there are many types of reciprocal aid that are of such an intangible character that it is impossible to value them."

Listen to this, Senators:

"It is impossible to measure in dollars either the cost to the British or the value to us, for example, of British engineering and designs of weapons based upon 2 years of combat experience gained before we entered the war. All this has been freely made available to us in the production of planes, tanks, and other weapons in our own factories and for our own forces. No estimate can be made of the number of American lives that have been saved by equipping our forces with those improved weapons."

Just stop and think of that. The great British Government proposes to offset lend-lease aid by engineering experience.

I say to the Senate and to the British people that if they seek to offset lease-lend aid in such a manner they ought to hang their heads in shame.

"Another difficulty is involved in expressing a 'value' in terms of dollars."

Hundreds of those airplanes upon which these gadgets are used are in lend-lease. There is no doubt that they utilized many gadgets for which we were responsible.

I am wondering to what extent they charge us or give us credit for that by way of compensation. I am confident that our people are not thinking of charging the British for such services.

Listen to this, Senators:

"A list, prepared by the Office of Economic Warfare, indicating the volume of public purchases and private commercial imports from lease-lend countries during the year 1942, is enclosed. With respect to the British Empire, the over-all financial condition of the Empire has thus far required that these purchases be for cash. Our purchases of bauxite from British Guiana, for example, have been cash transactions for this reason."

Think of it, Senators. What about our financial condition? If such a policy is to continue, the American people should know it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I wonder if he will yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator stated that in his opinion it would be a very simple matter, if the problem which he has been discussing were brought to the attention of the Appropriations Committee, to determine a policy to meet the condition to which he has been referring. I wonder how the Senator determines that the Appropriations Committee could adopt a policy outside the framework of the definitive provisions which Congress has laid down in the Lend-Lease Act delegating authority to the executive department?

Mr. ELLENDER. We hold the purse strings.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. It seems to me that we could make it pretty hot for someone if what we suggest were not carried through. I realize that the lend-lease operations are in the hands of the Executive. As I stated to the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] a while ago, I understand that in November the President issued certain orders making it possible for us to handle lend-lease goods in north Africa. If it had not been for the fact that some of us raised the question, such goods might still be handled as they have been handled in the past; that is, through the British. The recipients of such aid were under the impression that the British were their benefactors, instead of the United States.

At the moment, because of considerations of secrecy, I am unable to inform the Senate as to the contents of some of the documents which I saw in the past 2 or 3 days. However, those documents confirm much of the allegations made by me and brought to the attention of the Senate since 1941; in fact, every time lease-lend has been under consideration. In my judgment, charges in reverse lend-lease are being made against us by some of our allies which are unconscionable. It would be the same if the Senator's home should catch fire and I were to go to the fire and help him put it out and he charged me for the use of hose. What I am contending is that if we are to have lend-lease in reverse let us not "kid" ourselves into believing that it should be anything except real. Let us make it real. That is what I am pleading for. Let us not permit our allies, no matter who they may be, to say, in effect, after the war, "Now, your soldiers have caused much destruction in a town in Italy," let us say, "and the damages will be charged to you in reverse lend-lease." I do not know whether it is true, but I understand that with regard to the Solomon Islands and various other British possessions in the Pacific there has been charged to us considerable destruction which has taken place there. In other words, what I want to do is to say now that we do not think it fair, square, or honest to charge such items in reverse lend-lease.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. What prompted my first question was the Senator's assertion that the Appropriations Committee should adopt a policy which would correct the situation to which he has referred. In the original Lend-Lease Act the following language is found:

> The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

Under that delegated authority, and the fact that the President in the exercise of his sound discretion has made a contract with any nation under terms which I have read, as would seem proper, no matter whether they seem to the Senator or to me to be improper, how can the Appropriations Committee be heard to question the wisdom or the unwisdom of such a contract?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have already said, Congress holds the purse strings. I am not now advocating that we should discontinue lend-lease. Although I have spoken against the administration of lend-lease, I have always voted for it, because I am of opinion it is necessary. The Senator knows that to be true. When the lend-lease law was first put upon the statute books all that we were supposed to do was to give our allies material. They said, "Give us the material; we have the men." That was the situation then. As I pointed out in a speech which I made some time ago, several hundred thousand British soldiers were on the British coast waiting for an event which never happened. I predicted then that there would be no move by those British soldiers until the American soldiers went to the British Isles and helped them.

I believe it was the distinguished Senator from Colorado who raised his voice some time ago as to what the percentage of American soldiers and British soldiers would be in the "big push" which is going to take place within a short while. My guess is that many more American soldiers than British will take part in that activity.

Mr. President, I repeat that I have always voted for lend-lease, and I expect to vote for it again. I believe that lend-lease is necessary. I have merely called this matter to the attention of Congress, and to the Appropriations Committee in particular, so that before further appropriations are made we may investigate the question of how lend-lease works in reverse. Let us call the representatives of the British and of our other allies to explain why the charges which I have indicated, and which are unconscionable for any country to make in reverse lend-lease, should be made.

I have already cited the case of Australia. We have spent millions of dollars to build airports and roads in Australia, and some members of the Australian Government are now claiming that the accounts are about even, that they have done as much for us as we have done for them. However, in arriving at their figures, I am told that they are charging us for the use of roads in Australia, and for the use of existing airports there in order to save their country. I assert that if charges of that nature are to be made in reverse lend-lease, we should know it now.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, because of certain testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to refer to one phase of the pending bill. I have in mind the proviso on page 2 of the bill, reading as follows:

> *Provided, however,* That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic policy, post-war military policy, or any post-war policy involving international relations except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

Mr. President, at the time the subject of lend-lease was before the Senate 1 year ago the Foreign Relations Committee definitely and specifically challenged certain things which were being done in the master agreements which were made between the United States and its lend-lease debtors. The committee found that in article VII of those master agreements there was an exchange of commitments which promised and pledged that in the ultimate settlement of lend-lease accounts provision should be made "to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers," and so forth.

Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee came to the unanimous conclusion 1 year ago—and there was no partisan difference of opinion on the subject as the committee was a unit on it—that by no stretch of the imagination is the executive branch of the Government entitled to commit the Government upon its own exclusive responsibility "to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers."

Regardless of what the aspect of the barriers may be, and without respect to the validity of that objective, it is perfectly clear that the sole initial power to deal with any such subjects does not rest in the Executive, but rests exclusively, under the Constitution, in the Congress of the United States.

Therefore, the Foreign Relations Committee in its report 1 year ago said:

> The committee believes that there is no authority in the Lend-Lease Act to warrant any general post-war commitments or post-war policies in agreements made under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act.

Mr. President, when the administrators of lend-lease came before the Foreign Relations Committee this year I was curious to find out how much attention had been paid to the clear mandate of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which subsequently had the endorsement of the Senate at least to the extent that it never confronted any dissent. I read from a few questions and answers:

> Senator VANDENBERG. Are you still writing the same master agreements, in the same

language, which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee criticized a year ago so appropriately?

Mr. Cox. —

Speaking for the Lend-Lease Administration—

I would say "Yes." I do not think there have been any substantial number of master agreements since that time, if any. We can check that, however.

Senator VANDENBERG. But, if any?

Mr. Cox. They would be in the same language.

In spite of the fact that the Congress itself had deliberately and specifically notified the executive authorities, the lend-lease authorities, and the negotiating authorities of this country that they could have no authority under the Constitution to include any such pledges as they have written into article 7 of the master agreements under the Lend-Lease Act.

I continue reading from the testimony:

Senator VANDENBERG. Obviously, the Wadsworth proviso is aimed at the same thing the Foreign Relations Committee was talking about in its last report?

Mr. Cox. I think so, although it is limited to the post-war economic, military, or international policy that is tied in with any settlements that are made.

Senator VANDENBERG. But you would have to pay more attention to this than you do to the committee's report of a year ago?

Mr. Cox. I would think so.

In other words, Mr. President, the effort of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of the Senate itself to be rather polite in their disagreement with the executive authorities was a total failure. The constitutional opinion of the committee and the Senate apparently carried no weight at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Therefore, it became necessary to write into the bill the proviso to which I have referred.

In emphasizing the matter, I voice the hope that the authority of Congress as expressed in a statute may succeed in being more effective than the constitutional opinion of the Senate as expressed in a committee report; and I express the belief that the proviso which is now in the pending extension act not only prohibits the President from writing into his lend-lease agreements any obligation which primarily rests within the constitutional jurisdiction, but that it also is intended to confine lend-lease absolutely to the military operation of this war that it does not extend it 1 minute or $1 into the post-war period.

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, with relation to what has been said by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] I desire to observe that, while the bill as reported to the Senate adopts the provision carried in the House bill, indicating that no commitments are to be made by the Executive other than the express ones authorized by the law, yet I do not think that under the Constitution the President can make any commitments with relation to the post-war era that in any way affect the constitutional powers of the two Houses of Congress. The President might agree, whether in lend-lease or in any other way, that we would reduce our tariff or change our tariff, but that in no sense under our Constitution would be a commitment of the Government; the Congress would have to act in any event. So I do not regard it as absolutely imperative that the amendment be carried in order to effectuate that purpose, although it is a good expression of our policy and our attitude, and I favored the inclusion of the amendment in the pending bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I completely agree with the able Senator's analysis factually. Of course, the President cannot exceed his constitutional authority and ultimately "get away with it." But I am suggesting that any pretense or suggestion that he might be able to do so in respect to suggestions made to others of the United Nations may invite an ultimate disillusionment which would not make for post-war amity and that it is far better—and I know the Senator is in agreement with me regarding the basics facts—that the situation should be totally clear and not muddled.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I stated a moment ago to the Senator from Michigan, I favored the inclusion of the House amendment and still adhere to that position, although I wanted to make it clear that by what we have done heretofore we had in nowise compromised the constitutional power of the Houses of Congress, whatever the President may have done or promised to do in any of these master agreements.

Mr. President, one general statement and then I shall yield back the floor to the Senator from Illinois. Of course, the lend-lease policy and all agreements under it contemplate the aid of the war; they contemplate military action. As one who originally voted for the lend-lease, I do not think that we ever intended lend-lease to serve any purpose except to aid in the military operations in carrying on the war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment. I am sure that there has been extravagance and I am sure that there have been things done which probably we would ot approve, but it is impossbile for the Congress to keep its fingers on every expenditure and every transaction in a vast military campaign that involves almost the entire world. I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am in complete agreement with the Senator's statement that lend-lease is a war measure. In its original enactment, even before we got into the war, it was a war measure according to the Senator's description of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Colorado; I am always glad to find myself in agreement with the eminent Senator. There is no use to blind ourselves even though we passed the act before we actually got into the war. I do not suppose anybody was naive enough not to know that it was passed to aid the war against the Axis Powers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know the able Senator from Texas appreciates that many of us would like to offer amendments of a restrictive nature to confine the expenditure of lend-lease money to the war purposes and that we are desisting from that for the very obvious reason that if that course were followed too strictly it might do more harm than good. But I think it is the universal sentiment of all the Members of this body with whom I have talked, and perhaps the Members of the body at the other end of the corridor, now that the more or less preliminary phases of the war have been brought under control, that is insofar as they pertain to nonbelligerent countries, it is the hope that from now on this expenditure will be directed with greater singleness of purpose to the agencies and countries that need it most to help shorten the war, and that our excursions into finance by other branches of the Government with other countries will be reduced to the irreducible minimum; because, after all, there is going to be an aftermath. When the final accounting is made we must pay the bill; and from now on the lend-lease money ought to be expended with a singleness of purpose, to shorten and win the war, and for no other incidental reason whatsoever.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am not in disagreement with the observations of the eminent Senator from Maryland. As I stated a moment ago, this act was initiated as a war measure and its activities ought to be confined to those necessary military operations that promote the prosecution of the war. Personally, I very much hope to see expenditures under lend-lease curtailed. Most of the installations and great expenditures in the prosecution of the war have already been brought about, the money has already been expended, and from now on the purposes for which funds under lend-lease are to be expended should be limited to absolutely necessary military operations.

I wish to say that I have taken upon myself somewhat of the responsibility of discussing this matter with the present Administrator of the lend-lease fund, and I have impressed upon him the necessity of doing the very thing concerning which I have been commenting. I have conveyed to him what I believe to be the views of the Congress, that, while we are going along with lend-lease, while we are not going to surrender our policy of standing by this measure, we still want the funds administered in the best possible way and the most economical way, and that its purposes are to be confined to carrying on the war, and the funds are not to be squandered in all sorts of fantastic schemes and plans which visionaries might think up, and which

impractical men might put into operation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that I am in entire accord with the views which have been expressed by the distinguished Senator from Texas. Yesterday or this morning I gave out a statement which is printed in an article in the Evening Star of today. The headline reads:

McKELLAR voices hope for sharp curtailing of lease-lend outlays.

Urges "tapering off" as Congress weighs plea for $3,500,000,000.

I shall not read the article, but I call the attention of Senators to it, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McKELLAR VOICES HOPE FOR SHARP CURTAILING OF LEASE-LEND OUTLAYS—URGES TAPERING OFF AS CONGRESS WEIGHS PLEA FOR $3,500,000,000

Senator McKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, acting chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, called today for a substantial tapering off in lease-lend appropriations.

Senator McKELLAR'S statement came as the administration asked Congress for approximately $3,500,000,000 in new lease-lend money for the year starting July 1. That sum, combined with unexpended balances from previous appropriations, would be included in a tentative 1945 lease-lend budget of about $7,188,893,000.

The current year's budget was approximately $8,400,000,000, of which $6,273,629,000 was a new appropriation voted in 1943. A total of $24,683,000,000 has been appropriated since the war-aid program started in 1941.

As the Senate resumed consideration of the House approved bill to continue lease-lend for another year, Senator McKELLAR told a reporter that he considered the program vitally essential but he hoped peak requirements had passed.

"I hope that there will be a substantial tapering off in these expenditures from now on," Senator McKELLAR said. "The United States has certainly been enormously generous in our aid to our allies."

Senator McKELLAR said he believed the bulk of costly war and defense installations constructed throughout the world has been completed, and that some other forms of aid might now be less in demand.

Administration leaders hoped for a final vote in the Senate today on the extension bill, with overwhelming passage assured. The bill merely continues lend-lease authority, with the appropriation to be considered later.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, last Friday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] called attention to the lend-leasing of silver bullion. I took the matter up immediately with Mr. Crowley, and I have a letter from him which I desire to read at this point, since it is short. It read as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1944.

The Honorable KENNETH McKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: I am pleased to furnish you the information you requested concerning the lend-leasing of silver to the United Kingdom.

We have lend-leased to the United Kingdom a total of approximately 30,075,000 fine troy ounces of silver. The United Kingdom has agreed to return an equivalent amount of silver to the United States after the end of the war.

One-third of the silver lend-leased to the United Kingdom has been required in the construction of aircraft fuselages, in the armaments and ship-construction industries, and for other war-production purposes. Two-thirds of the silver has been required for essential coinage purposes in the United Kingdom and British colonies and protectorates, in which military activity and the presence of large numbers of troops, including American troops, has made a larger supply of coinage necessary. This silver has been minted in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has received no silver under lend-lease for transfer to sovereign third countries such as Saudi Arabia.

These lend-lease silver transactions with the United Kingdom have been discussed with and informally approved by the Senate Special Silver Committee, which is kept advised of all lend-lease silver transactions.

Sincerely yours,

LEO CROWLEY.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. It should be added, if the Senator from Tennessee did not find it covered in the letter, that those in charge of lend-lease testified that the silver was supplied under contract to return the identical number of pounds and ounces of silver.

Mr. McKELLAR. The letter so states.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator from Illinois will yield, does the Senator from Tennessee read the letter as saying that no lend-lease silver has gone to Saudi Arabia?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall read the sentence again:

The United Kingdom has received no silver under lend-lease for transfer to sovereign third countries such as Saudi Arabia.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has not?

Mr. McKELLAR. I repeat the langauge:

The United Kingdom has received no silver under lend-lease for transfer to sovereign third countries such as Saudi Arabia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Who signs the letter?

Mr. McKELLAR. Leo T. Crowley.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, the language used may be so general that it can be pleaded as an excuse for the failure to disclose all the facts, but the facts are that 5,000,000 ounces of American silver have been coined for Saudi Arabia, in the form of Arabian coinage, under lend-lease, half of it minted in England and half of it minted here.

Mr. McKELLAR. I myself am not familiar with the matter, nor have I seen the testimony Mr. Crowley gave before the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the letter is rather amazing in what it does not tell as well as in what it does.

Mr. McKELLAR. He says "for transfer." It evidently was done without the consent of our authorities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, no; and lest I be misunderstood, let me say that Mr. Crowley's organization has been perfectly frank in giving all this information to me. He does not attempt to refuse the disclosure of any of it, and that is why I am rather astounded that the statement occurs in the letter which the Senator has read.

Mr. McKELLAR. In view of the questions asked by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] last Friday, I believe it was, I made inquiry immediately, and this letter is the reply.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not perfectly obvious, from the facts which have been presented to our committee, that instead of these negatives, we should have an affirmative statement? I think that technically this statement may be correct, that the particular transaction to which the Senator from Michigan alludes will probably be defined as our having advanced the silver directly to Saudi Arabia, and simply used the service of Britain and India in minting certain of the coins. Thus it may not have been furnished to Britain under lease-lend, but was perhaps furnished directly to Saudi Arabia under lease-lend, but with the assistance of the British.

However, this does not cover other transactions in which the question of advancing lend-lease funds and materials very definitely could not receive a similar negative. I think a full statement of the transactions referred to, and perhaps some others, should be furnished to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure that the Lend-Lease Administration will furnish the facts to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. BREWSTER. I fully concur that Mr. Crowley is perfectly frank.

Mr. McKELLAR. He is very frank, and I am quite sure he will furnish the information he has, as he has tried to do at this time.

I am principally interested in our not furnishing any lend-lease except where it is needed absolutely for war purposes, and I hope that the amounts which we are called upon to furnish will grow less from now on. Certainly they should. It seems to me we have given tremendous aid to our allies all along the line, as shown by the report that was filed here Saturday.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Lest there be any misunderstanding about the nature of my interrogatory, I wish to make it plain that Mr. Crowley, upon my request, gave me what the Senator from Maine would call a totally affirmative description of his transactions in silver with Saudi Arabia. I think it might be of interest to the Senate to know that, while much of the silver was minted for Saudi Arabia in Britain and in India, lend-lease took pains to have even that coinage delivered to the American Minister in Arabia, so that Arabia could have no misunderstanding about the source of the silver in the coins. The only reason why I rose was that the information re-

garding Saudi Arabia seems to be totally different from the statement being read by the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very glad the Senator interrupted and gave the facts.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think the discussion which has just taken place indicates the necessity for a continuous effort on the part of the experts who have been engaged by the Appropriations Committee to dig out all the facts concerning lend-lease appropriations. I wish to pay my tribute to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] for their activity in carrying out what I think is the unanimous will of the Appropriations Committee in digging out the facts which have been submitted to us today and which were submitted to us on Thursday of last week, but the report submitted to the Senate is what it says on its face—it is still a preliminary report of the committee investigators and the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, we are considering one of the most vital measures confronting the American people when we undertake to extend the life of the Lend-Lease Act. While the bill purports to extend the life of this unprecedented and unusual authority for 1 year, it actually extends until 1949 the time for the fulfillment of any contract or agreement entered into within that 1 year.

In all the history of representative government there has never been any law enacted that places in the hands of one man the opportunity to dispose of so much of the resources of a free nation to any other nation as he chooses and on the terms he alone determines to be sufficient.

To date, under this law, we have appropriated $24,683,629,000. Of this vast sum, actual transfer of $20,961,627,234 has been made.

In addition to the amount appropriated, the Congress has provided funds and authority to transfer $35,970,000,000 in goods and service through the War and Navy Departments. In addition, the Maritime Commission has loaned $2,000,000,000 worth of ships—Pages 53–64, Report to Congress on Lend-Lease; page 3578, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

When we consider this total amount of approximately $63,000,000,000, which has been estimated to be approximately one-fifth of our entire national wealth, we get a clearer picture of the magnitude of this bill which places so much of the wealth and production of our country into the hands and discretion of the President.

This increases in significance when we read the law which provides—

> The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

Under this provision the President has the absolute right to forgive completely each and every obligation or debt, or obligation arising out of or in connection with any or all lend-lease transactions. The true import of this manifested itself in the preliminary print of the eleventh report to Congress dated August 25, 1943. In his initial letter transmitting his report the President said:

> The Congress in passing the Lend-Lease Act made it plain that the United States wants no new war debts to jeopardize the coming peace. Victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid.

Because of the immediate criticism, this language was deleted from the transmittal letter. However, the fact that it was originally employed is notice to the Congress that it should be ever on the alert as the guardian of the people's money and future welfare.

It is reported that the President has presently asked for an additional $3,450,570,000 for lend-lease expenditures up to July 1 of this year. If this amount is granted, it will bring the total under the Lend-Lease Act to $28,134,199,000 and the grand total to $66,104,199,000. If this is all used, and it may be under the severe fighting ahead, it will mean a lend-lease debt of approximately $500 for every man, woman, and child in America, including our men and women who are away fighting this war. They will face this debt when they return.

I realize that we can never measure the cost of war in dollars. The great sacrifice is in human life, suffering, and blood. I know that from personal experience. However, in addition to the human sacrifice, the cost of the war to America thus far is estimated to be $180,000,000,000, or approximately a debt of $1,500 for every man, woman, and child, including our gallant troops, who are presently fighting at the outer defenses of vicious enemies across both the Atlantic and the Pacific.

I realize it is comparatively easy to appropriate money for lend-lease and leave the responsibility for the future in someone else's hands, but someone must pay this lend-lease bill, and if the President follows the language and intent expressed in his original letter of transmittal to the Congress in 1943, the American people will carry the entire burden.

When the lend-lease bill was passed, it was represented that it was to permit the President to provide defense articles, information, and service to any nation whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

I am sure the Congress intended to grant the President broad powers to administer such law and to grant lend-lease benefits where it could be of direct benefit in the winning of the war. However, I do not believe that the Congress intended to grant the President absolute authority completely to discharge every receiving nation of every obligation and debt arising in connection with the operation of lend-lease money and property. I do not believe that Congress ever intended that lend-lease funds or benefits were to be used to be of direct benefit to improve the economic or political status of any other country after the war.

It was reported in the discussion held in the House that it had been disclosed before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in executive session that there were some 15 or more secret agreements entered into, principally with South American countries. Since the terms and conditions of these secret agreements—if there be such—are not known to the Members of Congress generally, it places a double responsibility on the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, under whose jurisdiction this bill is presented to the Senate for favorable consideration. There is an added importance attached to this matter in light of the recent controversy in the Senate concerning the amount which we have expended in South America, especially since the State Department and the Foreign Economic Administration requested that no disclosure be made regarding the amounts that were reported to us as having been advanced to each South American country.

I doubt if there has ever been such a vast expenditure of public funds having such a far-reaching effect on not only the war effort, but the consequent shaping of things to come after the war, in such a loose manner. This fact has given rise to the use of the term "loose-lend," and a growing fear that some people are racing to give away the resources and substance of America far beyond the purely military needs.

The facts are that Congress does not know to what extent this has been done. This is caused by the multitude of agencies participating and the utter lack of central accounting. Even the Congress could not find the facts, except in the most general terms.

On November 22, 1943, 18 months after the passage of the original bill, the Appropriations Committee, after repeated futile attempts to ascertain the facts concerning lend-lease, finally secured the services of four experts to dig out the true facts. After approximately 6 months of diligent search, the Appropriations Committee received a preliminary and incomplete report the day before this bill was presented for renewal. This report disclosed the distribution of $30,362,687,362 of lend-lease funds—pages 29 and 30, report—and a total of reverse lend-lease amounting to $2,129,151,000. These reverse lend-lease figures are largely estimates, because of our inability to get some foreign countries, particularly the British, to fix the value on the articles and services made available to us. It does, however, show the general ratio of lend-lease to be 15 to 1, in addition to the maintenance of our vast Army, Navy, and Air Force on five continents and seven seas.

As we review the facts of lend-lease and our war effort, we can appraise the responsibility of Congress. If we allow the impression to go out that after we have provided these vast sums of money, property, resources, stores of property, and supplies, the recipient countries owe

us nothing, either they or our own people will be sadly disillusioned and it will only add to confusion and chaos in our post-war problems and relations.

For that reason, I believe it very wise for the Senate to concur in the action of the House amending section (B) of section 3 of the Lend-Lease Act, which amendment provides:

Provided, however, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic policy, post-war military policy, or any post-war policy involving international relations except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

The whole problem of lease-lend and mutual aid for war is a gigantic task. The plans for post-war may be equally as great and as difficult. The conduct of the war is an Executive task, but the post-war plans are a responsibility jointly between the Executive and the Congress. It is our duty to keep constantly abreast of the facts as we continue to pour out the substance and resources of America.

Interest in bases, both naval and air, guarding the approaches to America is of vital concern today to all our people. Interest in the natural resources of which we are entirely deficient or in the resources which we are depleting in the cause of humanity is of growing concern throughout America. This lease-lend activity has such a far-reaching effect, not only in winning the war, but in laying foundations for post-war collaboration. It is the duty of the Senate, particularly, to demand all of the facts constantly, and it is also the duty of America to make known our aims regarding our permanent bases and access to national resources essential to our security and prosperity. Now is the time to discuss them. The 99-year leases on bases are not adequate. We are not a 99-year country. We should have permanent title to them.

This lend-lease undertaking has expanded to such a degree that it no longer constitutes simply a war measure. Its provisions and the procedure under it will inevitably have some treaty-making significance. When the original lend-lease bill was before us, I opposed it on the grounds that it would lead us into war, and was in effect a declaration of war. Several of its most ardent advocates have since admitted that it did just that.

I did not oppose helping Great Britain or anyone else. I was willing to make an outright grant to them. I maintain that this lend-lease procedure will eventually extend directly into the post-war treaty-making policy and post-war collaboration. In fairness to both our own people and our allies, we should make know our aims, and should frankly start negotiations for permanent rights in bases and access to resources that will bring the most fruitful participation in any future cooperation abroad, and will increase our solidarity and strength at home.

Mr. President, I do not oppose the continuance of any necessary lease-lend at this time. I would not withhold any necessary element of support from our gallant troops or our allies. I do protest the continued expenditure of billions of America's substance without having the Congress have all the facts, so that it may constantly determine that these expenditures are a direct aid in the winning of the war. I do protest the continuous pouring out of America's resources without a more definite presentation of our future national interest.

Of the 30,000,000,000 thus far transferred, Great Britain has received over 19,100,000,000, and Russia has thus far received over 4,200,000,000. Great Britain has been very forcibly represented by Mr. Churchill in outlining her future imperialistic protection and Russia has been equally forcibly represented by Mr. Stalin in indicating the future policy of Russia in Europe, the Atlantic Charter notwithstanding.

The American people are willing to make any sacrifice necessary to secure a total victory in war. However, they are anxious to know that their interests are to be equally safeguarded and made secure.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Beginning at the bottom of page 12 of the report on lend-lease aid, and continuing on page 13, I find a paragraph containing the following statement:

Grants—educational, scientific, and cultural.

Am I to understand that in the countries of which we take control, we are setting up schools?

Mr. BROOKS. This is all a part of the Latin-American expenditures, and I cannot tell the Senator the exact facts concerning the data. I understand they are exhibiting movies, distributing literature, and holding classes and debating societies. I do not know whether they have gone so far as to set up schools.

Mr. LANGER. I noticed that in Italy, some time ago, a professor from the University of Minnesota was in charge of some schools. Can the Senator tell me about that?

Mr. BROOKS. I am not informed as to that.

Mr. CONNALLY. In respect to the statement made by the Senater from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] with regard to the desirability of having the United States secure permanent bases, I wish to say that I certainly favor the acquisition by the United States of permanent bases in both the Atlantic and the Pacific for military and naval purposes. However, these matters cannot be adjusted all at once. They are certainly in the interest of our Nation, and I favor having this Government take the necessary steps at the proper time to secure permanent bases for aviation purposes, for naval purposes, and for military purposes in both the Atlantic and the Pacific, for the necessary defense of this Nation and for the preservation of the peace of the world.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in the light of the discussion this afternoon regarding the proviso on page 2, I should like to suggest a brief amendment, which I ask the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to consider. In the proviso on page 2, we say:

Provided, however, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic policy, post-war military policy or any post-war policy involving international relations except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

I am sure that we all mean that we are undertaking to prohibit such commitments at any time, not only in the final settlement, but also in any prior settlement, or in any prior contracts or agreements. Since the bill we are passing would authorize agreements and maintain their validity until July 1, 1948, we are authorizing contracts which ought to come within the purview of the prohibition on page 2.

Therefore, in order to make the purpose perfectly clear, I am moving to strike out in line 7, on page 2, of the bill, the words "in any final settlement," so that the prohibition in the paragraph will apply to any arrangements which may be made in respect to those obligations. I am sure that is the real intent of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is my view that this amendment is not at all necessary, but I have no objection to it. The agreements contemplating the temporary exchange of commodities, services, and materials under the Lend-Lease Act, all provide for a final accounting and a final adjustment. My own view is that the final adjustment would be retroactive, and would apply to the whole prior scope and field of whatever transactions may have taken place. However, in view of the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan and others, if there is any objection to the present language of the bill I have no disposition to oppose the amendment. I am willing that it be adopted and allowed to go to conference.

I wish to reiterate what I said a while ago; namely, that, according to my view, neither the Executive nor anyone else may enter into any binding agreement which invades the constitutional authority of either House of the Congress unless the agreement is subsequently ratified under the constitutional processes by the Senate of the United States. I believe that fears to the contrary are unfounded. However, in order to grant the Senator from Michigan and other Senators freedom from fear, I agree to his suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, before a vote is taken upon the amendment I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a question, if I may, with reference to his understanding of the amendment.

In one of the reports which have been submitted to the Congress there appears a copy of the Russian master agreement, in article 7 of which one may read the following:

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in return for aid furnished under the act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutual advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the basic principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.

At an early convenient date conversations shall be begun between the two Governments with a view to determining in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded governments.

That same provision also occurs in the master agreement between the United States of America and the United Kingdom. So if we turn to section 3, subsection (b) of the act of March 11, 1941, which empowered the President to prescribe the terms and conditions for aid, I ask the Senator from Texas what, in his judgment, will be the effect upon the authorization we there gave the President, and exercised by him as stated in the article which I just read, if we strike from the pending bill, H. R. 4254, the words appearing on page 2, line 7, namely, "in any final settlement." Will we be detracting from the power hitherto given to the President in that respect, to agree in the particulars covered by article 7 of the Russian master agreement?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that, according to my view, we have never given the President any power to make binding commitments with respect to any of the matters to which the Senator refers, all of them being subordinate to the authority and power of the Congress.

The Senator has referred to economic matters. If he means tariffs, for instance, certainly the President could not make any agreement with Russia, or with any other nation, which would bind the Government of the United States with respect to some particular tariff arrangement, because the House of Representatives, under the Constitution, is given the primary responsibility of initiating legislation of that character, and the concurrence of the Senate is, of course, necessary. I do not believe we have ever given the President that power. As I said a while ago, I have no objection to the proposed amendment because I believe it is contemplated even in the language which the Senator read. The language goes on to say, in effect, that at an appropriate time negotiations shall be begun looking to the effectuation of those objectives. Such language is really a contradiction of any assumption that any arrangement has been in fact made. The language is a mere promise that these are our objectives, and that at some time in the future we shall begin to negotiate in order to effectuate them. It shows to my mind that there has been no attempt made to make any definite or binding commitments with respect to any of these matters.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In section 3, subsection (b) of the Lend-Lease Act of March 11, 1941, we find the following language:

The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory.

It clearly follows that the President will prescribe some terms and conditions, and he was thus authorized, I assume, to agree to the terms of the Russian master agreement which I earlier quoted.

Now, one of the provisions in the Russian master agreement is that "in the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden the commerce between the two countries," and so forth. So, clearly, it was contemplated that certain minima were not to be disturbed in any final settlement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Any what?

Mr. DANAHER. Minima.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, we have had a great many minimas around the Senate recently.

Mr. DANAHER. Now, let us return to the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. We have prescribed in article 7 of the Russian master agreement certain basic principles upon which final determination shall proceed, as I read it, and I am wondering if we will be imposing a further limitation upon the power of the President to enter into any such agreement if we strike out the words "in any final settlement."

Mr. CONNALLY. It seems to me it might be well to strike out "final" and say "in any settlement." I suggest that to the Senator from Michigan.

Now let me say that the authorization to the President in the original act to determine conditions upon which aid would be extended to nations at war with whom we are affiliated must come within the general framework of this act. The framework of this act contemplated the prosecution of this war, and the limitations on the President must be in conformity with the general over-all purpose. We cannot by inference say that the President was given power to make conditions that transcended the objective of the bill. I think that is an elementary proposition of law. His power must be within the scope of the purposes and objectives of the measure. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. DANAHER. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator came to the floor of the Senate this afternoon I discussed at some length the very question to which he now adverts. The language in article 7 of the master agreement has been the subject of my attention for more than a year. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the precise language which he read from the Russian agreement and the British agreement was the subject of the following comment 1 year ago by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when it recommended the passage of the Lend-Lease Extension Act:

The committee believes that there is no authority in the Lend-Lease Act to warrant any general post-war commitments or post-war policies in agreements made under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act.

Unfortunately, as I indicated earlier in the afternoon, the Lend-Lease Administration paid no particular attention, as they admitted in their testimony, to that injunction which we filed 1 year ago. So this year the Foreign Relations Committee in reporting the bill not only reiterates what was said 1 year ago but adds:

The committee desires to emphatically reaffirm the principle stated in the foregoing excerpt. If there is any necessity for Congress to formally declare its adherence to these principles in order to insure their recognition, the committee believes that the proviso added by section 2 of the House bill adequately takes care of the situation.

In other words, it is the unanimous opinion, without regard to party, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year and this that the language used in the master agreements which the able Senator from Connecticut has quoted was without any constitutional validity whatsoever. They can have no authority whatever because they totally transcend the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress of the United States. The effort of the House, apparently, in adding this proviso is to assert the general principle. It is all very well to assert it in the language suggested by the House and assert it with respect to the final settlements. I am asking that that phrase be eliminated so as to broaden the provision, certainly not to restrict the provision, because I do not want these infirmities permitted with congressional sanction in any settlements or agreements that may be made by the executive department of the Government in respect to lend-lease any more than I would want them permitted in the final settlements.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan, and will say further that I concur in the

objective he seeks and the reasoning which impels his statement. I think that the House is doing no more and the Senator from Michigan would wish to do no less in preserving the prerogatives of Congress than Mr. Churchill told Parliament he was doing for Great Britain when the Atlantic Charter was entered into. He said within the fortnight to the Parliament that he urged the President to agree with him at their meeting when the Atlantic Charter was agreed upon that there be inserted the words "with due respect for their existing obligations." This was done.

Mr. Churchill argued further in closing the debate:

> They are limiting words, and they were inserted for the express purpose of retaining to this House and to the Dominions the fullest possible right and liberties over the question of imperial preference.

So, Mr. President, the objective that the Senator from Michigan seeks to achieve has my hearty approval, and, so long as we are in accord that we are thus preserving in the Congress full participation in whatever final settlement there may be, I am quite satisfied.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, over the week end I tried to study the hearings of the House committee and also the report which was submitted by the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I must confess that I am at a loss to understand the discrepancies which appear between the hearings of the House committee and the report which was submitted by the acting chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. First let me say that I want this war won just as soon as it can be won. I want to accomplish as much as we can with our money and materials rather than with the blood of our courageous men and women. I do not, however, want to see our raw materials and the hours of toil of our folks at home squandered; and some of the things we hear today about lend-lease gives us cause to demand that some information be furnished our people on this all-important phase of our warfare. The American people are most generous, but they ought to be assured that their money is being spent judiciously.

I have not had time to go through carefully the entire hearings on the lend-lease extension bill. It may be that the committee has learned more in executive sessions than can be divulged in the printed record, but in glancing through the report I find that Mr. Crowley says:

> Reverse lend-lease consists of goods, services, and information provided to the United States by our allies without payment by us. (P. 141, House hearings.)

If it is actually reverse lend-lease then I would say it is something we had already paid for by supplying lend-lease in the first place, not something we get without payment, as Mr. Crowley would try to make us believe.

I see in the report a listing of some $2,000,000,000 as reverse lend-lease from the British Commonwealth through December 1943. Then I see a footnote that says:

> Does not include the value of strategic raw materials, commodities, and foodstuffs shipped to the United States under reverse lend-lease, other than benzol.

From Mr. Crowley's definition of reverse lend-lease, I would say that the $2,000,000,000 in reverse lend-lease which was listed in the report was for benzol, services, and information. I believe we should know how much of that $2,000,000,000 was for services, what those services may have been, and how much of it was for information.

Among the many unsatisfactory practices of the Lend-Lease Administration is that of assisting in the procurement of so-called strategic supplies from nations that are the beneficiaries of lend-lease aid.

We are not paid in cash or in any other way for the aid we extend to them, and yet when we obtain metals and other strategic war materials from those same countries we pay cash on the barrelhead instead of crediting their lend-lease account for whatever the amount may be.

That certainly is not reverse lend-lease, and seems to indicate quite clearly that for all practical purposes the administration is proceeding on the theory that Congress intended lend-lease to operate as a one-way street and that supplies furnished foreign countries were to be considered as gifts.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to read an editorial which appeared in the Spokane Spokesman-Review of March 10, 1944. This was put in the record of the hearings before the House committee, and would indicate that the administrators of lend-lease agreed with it.

> The lend-lease authority, which would terminate in June if not renewed by act of Congress, undoubtedly will be extended for another period. It is so completely the basis for reciprocal allied collaboration that if it were permitted to expire, joint effort in every theater of the war might be disrupted.
>
> However, Congress properly is studying the manner in which it is operated and the policies under which it is directed. These are matters that may well prove subject to debate even though the basic plan of mutual assistance is not disturbed.
>
> "Lend-lease" is something of a misnomer, for lending and leasing implies a contractual obligation to repay in kind or cash for value received.

That is what we were told it was to be when we first passed the measure. The article continues:

> It was devised as a method of giving material aid to our allies out of our abundance as our most effective contribution to the common war effort while preparing our armed forces to take their full part.
>
> This aid was given, not lent or leased in the sense that it would result in building up another structure of debt that might plague relations between this country and our allies after this war as the Allied debt to us did after World War No. 1. It did not contemplate reciprocal aid when the occasion or opportunity for it should arise. The giving of that reciprocal aid depended upon the ability, the willingness, and good faith of the recipients of lend-lease, rather than upon a documented bond.
>
> This reciprocal aid, called "reverse lend-lease," has been and is being given and is attaining important proportions, though the money value of what this country receives can never be expected to balance the value of what has been and yet will be given. Since that was not the underlying consideration, it is not an issue so far as what has been done up to this stage of the war.
>
> But the question of more nearly balancing mutual assistance in the future operations of lend-lease may be a policy issue that Congress will want decided in extending the life of the Authority.

Mr. President, I deplore the fact that when those connected with the Lend-Lease Administration came before the committees to discuss the extension of the life of lend-lease and the appropriations, they said we should not expect the other countries to pay back the money. What are we saying to Russia, in effect, when some of these officials come to Congress and say, "They have been given this and given that, and we should not expect them to pay it back"? We are telling them in advance that whatever we may give them they need not pay back. Certainly we are giving away billions upon billions upon billions of dollars of the production of American labor, and war products, and saying to the world, "We do not expect you to pay back." Certainly the American people are very generous, as I stated a moment ago, but they want to know for what the money is being expended, how it is being expended, and whether or not it is being wasted.

In going over some of the figures on lend-lease, it would seem we have several discrepancies which should be accounted for. We are being asked for additional lend-lease appropriations this year, and I believe we should know now just how much of the various funds Congress has already appropriated have not been expended. We should also determine just how much of these funds have been expended and in what manner. I have read portions of both the House hearings and the Senate hearings, and some figures do not seem to jibe. Let me quote from page 74 of the House hearings, where Mr. Cox, of Lend-Lease, answers Representative JONKMAN relative to appropriations and expenditures. Mr. JONKMAN questioned amount of lend-lease, said it was sixty or seventy billion dollars. I read:

> Mr. Cox. There have been appropriations totaling $24,683,000,000 directly to the President for lend-lease aid; there have also been appropriations to the War and Navy Departments and Maritime Commission which specifically provide that supplies up to a certain stated total amount can be transferred under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act. * * * A stated amount of $35,000,000,000. If you * * * add these two figures together you will get, as you say, some $60,000,000,000.
>
> The twenty billion figure of lend-lease is 14 percent of our total war expenditures, and that includes lend-lease coming from all sources, whether from direct appropriation or appropriation to the Navy, the Army, or the Maritime Commission.

I want Senators to bear in mind that he says that $20,000,000,000 is the amount coming from all sources, not just from the $24,000,000,000, but from all sources.

Mr. Cox proceeded:

> What is included is what was actually turned over to our allies since the beginning of the program to January 1, 1944, and that is approximately $20,000,000,000 of supplies and services.

The Congress in the War, Navy, and Maritime appropriations conferred power to transfer munitions and supplies up to the amount of $35,000,000,000, if it was decided in accordance with the determinations of the combined chiefs of staff and the Munitions Assignment Board that supplies should be turned over to our allies. * * *

Now actually probably about $4,000,000,000 worth of supplies in a total of $20,000,000,000 have come out of direct appropriations to the War, Navy, and Maritime Commission, but there has not been $60,000,000,000. If you want to make it accurate, you have authority to go up to approximately $60,000,000,000 of appropriations, but as an actual fact the transfer authority has not been used up to that point. It has been used with the appropriations administered by the F. E. A. up to the point of $20,000,000,000, and that takes you up to January 1. * * *

Mr. JONKMAN. My question was whether all lend-lease articles are included in the $20,000,000,000 or whether we have lend-lease amounting to $60,000,000,000 or $70,000,000,000.

Mr. Cox. Mr. Jonkman, everything transferred under lend-lease is included in the $20,000,000,000.

Mr. JONKMAN. That answers my question. That actually has not been lend-leased so when they say $60,000,000,000 or $70,000,000,000; it is wrong?

Mr. Cox. That is the total amount which was authorized to be spent for lend-lease purposes but actually only $20,000,000,000 has been spent.

On page 168 of the House hearings I find the following statement of the former Secretary of the Navy, Colonel Knox:

Total lend-lease aid provided by the Navy Department in the period from March 11, 1941, through December 31, 1943, amounted to $3,018,527,595. This amount is, of course, included in the total figure of lend-lease aid of nearly $20,000,000,000 provided to the committee by Foreign Economic Administrator Crowley.

On page 197 of the House report I find the total lend-lease appropriations to the President listed as $24,683,629,000, and transfers authorized from other appropriations listed as $35,970,000,000, or a grand total that may be used in lend-lease to our allies of $60,653,629,000.

On page 198 of the same report I find the following:

In addition to the foregoing, Congress has with certain limitations authorized the leasing of ships of the Navy and merchant ships constructed with funds appropriated to the Maritime Commission without any numerical limitation as to the dollar value or the number of such ships which may be so leased. (See for example, Public Law 1, 78th Cong., approved Feb. 19, 1943, and Public Law 11, 78th Cong., approved Mar. 18, 1943.)

Under the transfer authority about $5,000,000,000 of transfers have actually been made, representing one-fourth of total lend-lease aid. Since planes, guns, ships, and other munitions of war are now furnished from appropriations other than those to the President, and since the ratio of munitions to total aid has been increasing, the proportion of lend-lease aid which comes from appropriations to the War and Navy Departments is growing.

This would indicate that of the $20,000,000,000 of lend-lease included in the House report, only $15,000,000,000 came from what is known as lend-lease funds, while $5,000,000,000 was from transfers of other appropriations. It has to be that, unless the figures which were furnished to the committee, and by Mr. Cox in his testimony and his statement, were in error.

In checking these figures with those given us by the acting chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 4, I find, according to his figures, we must have given away in lend-lease an additional $10,000,000,000 in the first 4 months of this year.

I believe it would be well for us to have all these appropriations under one single heading so it would be an easier matter for Congress and the people to know what is actually happening. This is particularly true when we consider that some of our people believe lend-lease will help materially in our writing the peace, as is shown by the colloquy between members of the committee and Mr. Stettinius, Under Secretary of State, which is to be found on page 40 of the House hearing.

Mr. President, let me read on page 4000 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 4, from the preliminary report on lend-lease aid, dated May 1, 1944, addressed to Chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate:

APPROPRIATIONS

Lend-lease appropriations made to the President total $24,683,629,000. Of this amount a total of $22,576,626,477.54 has been allocated to various departments and agencies of the Government, leaving an unallocated balance as of February 29, 1944, of $2,107,002,522.46. Of the amount allocated, the sum of $18,748,927,285.53 has been obligated by the departments and agencies to which allocated, leaving an unobligated balance of $3,827,699,192.01. The available funds (unallocated and unobligated) as of February 29, 1944, therefore amounted to $5,934,701,714.47.

In addition to the lend-lease appropriations made to the President, transfers from appropriations made to the War and Navy Departments and to the Maritime Commission have been authorized to the extent of $35,970,000,000. In reports of lend-lease aid furnished, however, no distinction is made as to the appropriations under which the items were procured or transferred.

In addition to the foregoing, Congress has with certain limitations authorized the leasing of ships of the Navy and merchant ships constructed with funds appropriated to the Maritime Commission, without any numerical limitation as to the dollar value or the number of such ships which may be so leased.

I believe our people would like to know what the actual amount is that has been expended for lend-lease. When Senators read the figures which were given before the House committee, and then read the report presented to the Senate by the Senator from Tennessee, they will see the discrepancies which exist between the two sets of figures. It may be that in their testimony before the House committee the witnesses did not mean what they said, but I am taking what is printed in the hearings as being what was stated by the witnesses to be the truth. When we take the testimony given before the House committee and the items placed in the RECORD later, and compare it all with what was contained in the report submitted to the Senate last week, I challenge Senators to determine from the two sets of figures how much money has been spent, because we find one thing stated in one breath and another thing in the next breath. Then more appropriations are requested under lend-lease, when $35,000,000,000, has already been authorized, $5,000,000,000 of which has been turned over to lend-lease. At least $30,000,000,000 is unaccounted for, so far as the Congress knows, still available to be used for lend-lease. How has that money been used, if it has been used at all? Has the $30,000,000,000 which is left of the $35,000,000,000 been allocated? Has it been spent? What has become of it?

The acting chairman of our Appropriations Committee says the actual amount expended in lend-lease is $30,362,687,362. Then he tells us that—

it must be explained to the Senate that there were other items expended in foreign countries which our committee has examined and reported upon. We have made loans through the Export-Import Bank, and there were other loans made which will be referred to hereafter.

We purchased goods in other countries—and I hope Senators will keep this in mind—amounting to $4,172,856,091.

These are only actual expenditures. As I have already stated, considerable funds have been expended in experiments looking to the production of rubber.

Mr. President, I find listed the sums loaned through the Export-Import Bank and the amount of goods purchased from other countries. I do not find any fund for rubber experiments and wonder if this appears in the $30,000,000,000.

I should like to know if the $30,000,000,000 is for material and services already delivered, or does it include orders on our books and in the process of manufacture?

This $30,362,687,362, when subtracted from the grand total of $60,653,629,000 that may be used for lend-lease, leaves a balance of $30,290,941,638 which has been appropriated for lend-lease purposes but has not yet been charged to any of our allies. I would like to know how much of this fund is already covered by commitments we have made to others?

Mr. President, how much of our lend-lease fund is going to aid O. W. I.? I do not like to repeat rumors, but individuals who have come to me have told me, "When O. W. I. does not have funds lend-lease funds are readily made available to it." We ought to know whether or not that is so.

I may say to the Senate that I was told by one who was with our forces in north Africa recently, that the rate for electric power was 1.9 cents per kilowatt-hour. Yet when the O. W. I. proceeded to establish large broadcasting stations the rate went to 25 cents per kilowatt-hour. A compromise was worked out, and we are paying 22½ cents per kilowatt-hour, supposedly from lend-lease funds. I think we should be told the truth about such stories. Mr. President, the one who gave me the information may be mistaken, but he was in north Africa recently and was helping to do the work of establishing the stations.

I learned from the statement given out by Mr. Crowley that up to January of this year we had shipped 7,800 planes to the Soviet Union from the United States. I learned also that we have supplied our Russian Allies with more than

740,000 tons of aviation gasoline and other petroleum products. We have sent them 4,700 tanks, 100,000 submachine guns, 170,000 trucks, 33,000 jeeps, and some 25,000 other military vehicles. In addition we have sent them 1,350,000 tons of steel, 384,000 tons of lighter metals, and 145,000 tons of refinery equipment for the manufacture of gasoline inside Russia itself.

Then there is an item of $400,000,000 worth of industrial equipment. That $400,000,000 represents a good many hours of the American workingman's toil right here on the home front. How much of it is machinery that will be used to compete with America when this war is won?

How much of it will not be used or even uncrated until the war is over?

I have been told by manufacturers in the United States, whom I have no reason to disbelieve, that they are shipping quantities of machinery and equipment to Russia which is to be used, not during the war, but after the war.

How many of the planes and tanks and trucks we send to Russia will be returned to us to be used to fight Japan when the European war comes to a close? Have we made any agreements to get this equipment to the Japanese fighting front from Russia?

I was told not long ago by a very high ranking Army officer that in Egypt the English pound could be had for 2 American dollars. It now takes 4 American dollars to purchase elsewhere 1 English pound. A member of the House of Commons in London recently said that by the conclusion of the war an English pound would be worth 8 American dollars. What is the cause of this? Is it the giving away of our wealth under terms of lend-lease? That is something we must know before it is too late.

Mr. Churchill indicated in a speech in London that no bases are to be given the United States for longer than the 99 years under the present lease. That is not long, we must remember, in the life of a country. Even the islands of the Pacific that have been drenched with the blood of American boys, where American material and money have gone to build new air fields, are immediately turned over to the Dutch, the British, or the French. In fact, I read not long ago that the French billed us for two cocoanut palm trees for every one our men had chopped down, because they claimed that for every palm tree chopped down another one died of a broken heart.

It would appear that for the protection of our American people in future generations yet to come it is time for Congress to make sure that those directing our war activities become as realistic in their dealing, in their trading of American dollars, American material—yes—and the protection of American lives, as have been our allies of their own country's interests.

I believe it is only right and proper that at this time, when we are considering extension of the Lend-Lease Act, we in Congress secure for our people a statement on American lend-lease policy, so we may know how the hard-earned tax dollars of our people are spent.

It may be that some of these questions were asked and answered in committee, but not printed in the record. We should have answers to all of them.

Only a short time ago we in the United States Senate voted on U. N. R. R. A. When we read the record of the discussion which occurred before the House committee, we find that a question was asked about when U. N. R. R. A. was to commence and when lend-lease was to end. I challenge anyone to read the record and find in it a satisfactory explanation of that point. The funds are so intermingled that we do not know when one should begin and the other should end. The American people are entitled to know these facts. The Congress of the United States should see to it that the American dollars which are being spent are properly protected, not turned over to various persons to be spent willy-nilly at their own discretion.

We were told that a commission of all participating nations was to administer the U. N. R. R. A. funds. Lately we have heard that in the countries of eastern Europe, not a committee, but the Russian Army alone, will administer and take credit for supplying these funds and the aid they give.

A short time ago, when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] had the floor, I called attention to the fact that an Army officer said to me that when he was in Egypt our lend-lease material was used by the British to obtain special favors for the British themselves, and that he had taken up the matter, and it had been taken up with the President, and that now the assurance was that in the future our lend-lease material would be handled by Americans. I was very grateful to learn of that fact. However, why should it ever have been turned over to them in the first place, to let them use it for that purpose?

The American people are asking who it is who administers both the funds and the materials of lend-lease. How many other agencies, besides the Lend-Lease Administration, request or receive United States funds, materials, or food for foreign consumption or use? That question may have been asked, but it seems to me Congress should know whether any of it is being requested, for use overseas, by the Red Cross, the Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Board, the Office of Inter-American Affairs, the Board of Economic Warfare, the War Department, the Navy Department, A. M. G. O. T., or U. N. R. R. A. Our people should know what is the total amount of all the money the American people are supplying for these purposes, and whether there is being extended any lend-lease aid for which no Congressional appropriations specifically provide.

Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that we are in the war, and that we must extend the life of the Lend-Lease Act. But certainly before we appropriate any more money we should have specific knowledge about how much money is left in the $35,000,000,000 fund. We should know where the money is going, to whom it is going, and whether it is being turned over to some other departments or agencies. If we, as Members of the United States Senate, do not obtain such information, we shall not be doing our sworn duty to our constituents, the American people.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was not in the Chamber earlier in the day, so I do not know whether the Senator from Montana previously referred to the fact that during the past week it was announced that a 50,000,000-pound loan has been made by Great Britain to China. Has the Senator made reference to that fact?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I have not.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has there been any explanation how such a transaction can take place under the hypothesis of lend-lease? The loan was announced as one which had been previously arranged for, but apparently it had been laid aside. Suddenly it was announced, last week, that Britain was loaning 50,000,000 pounds to China.

I think the good will of China is of the highest importance to our country. As I understand the theory of lend-lease, we are advancing money to various countries because they are not able to pay for all the things they require in the prosecution of the war. Lend-lease may well be justified for that purpose. However, if that is the theory of lend-lease, how is a debtor of our country unable to pay us, but able to lend 50,000,000 pounds to China?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am unable to answer that question. However, a moment ago I called attention to the fact that an Army officer who had been in north Africa told me that when he was there he bought British pounds for two American dollars, that today the British pound is worth four American dollars, and that a member of the British Parliament stated, on the floor of the House of Commons, that after the war the British pound will be worth eight American dollars.

What is the reason for that? Is it not because of the fact that under lend-lease we are pouring out so much of our materials, our raw materials, and our money that our money will be depreciated in terms of British pounds?

Mr. BREWSTER. Of course, Mr. President, the intricacies of international exchange are sometimes unfathomable. I know it has been testified before our committees that in connection with certain agreements and concessions which American companies have obtained it has been stipulated that they are to be settled in sterling—which meant, as the witnesses testified, that in the event of the creation of a sterling bloc, it would be necessary for those companies to transfer to British status, because they would be unable to continue under American allegiance and control, because of the effect of the exchange situation upon their operations. I take it that is another phase of the same problem the Sen-

ator has discussed, and about which we must learn.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. BREWSTER. I hope someone will undertake to clarify the reasoning as to why a country which is unable to pay to us the billions of dollars it has borrowed from us is able to loan 50,000,000 pounds to China.

I have supported lend-lease, and shall continue to do so, and I believe it is a necessary policy. But at the same time I believe we should have an understanding as to what extent our advances are being made use of for the cultivation of good will among others whose relationships to us are becoming of more and more vital importance.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Congress should place under the control of only one agency all our money which is being sent to other countries. Instead of putting $35,000,000,000 under one organization, $25,000,000,000 under another organization, and more money to be spent in foreign countries under a third organization, with many of the organizations overlapping in their functions, and with many of them disagreeing with one another, and spending money in confusion, certainly there should be some central body which will oversee the spending of every dollar which leaves the United States.

Mr. President, when I speak of lend-lease, I am not criticizing the British. I do not blame the British. Some persons have said I dislike the English. On the contrary, I greatly admire them. I think they are a smart people. They know so much more about international commerce, international finance, and international trade than we do, that we are babes in the wood. I greatly admire them, because I admire smart people. They are smarter than we are when it comes to international affairs, because they have lived on that little island, and to a large extent they have had to live by their wits. They have had to know all about such problems, while we have had this vast territory in which to expand, and we have not had to learn about such problems, and we do not know much about them today. I blame the American people for permitting some of these things to go on in the loose, disjointed way in which they have proceeded. The people of this country are beginning to wake up to that fact, and they are going to hold the Congress responsible.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I wish to supplement some of the questions which the distinguished Senator from Montana asked a moment ago. I hold in my hand the fourteenth report to Congress on lend-lease operations. I turn to page 8, on which this statement is made:

> Total lend-lease aid from the beginning of the program in March 1941 to December 31, 1943, amounted to $19,986,000,000.

On page 53 of the same report I find the total amount of lend-lease appropriations for the President to be $24,683,629,000, and the total amount of transfers authorized from other appropriations to be $35,970,000,000, as the Senator stated a moment ago, or a total of about $60,000,000,000.

On page 56 of the same report I find the total amount of lend-lease exports to all countries to be $15,578,383,000. But that is not all. On last Friday the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] stated that the total amount of lease-lend was about $36,000,000,000.

Turning again to the hearings before the House committee on the same subject, I find Mr. Cox, to whom the Senator referred, testifying as follows:

> The CHAIRMAN. Then we have already agreed to this, have we—we have already spent $35,000,000,000?
>
> Mr. Cox. No; we have turned over about $22,000,000,000 worth of aid and obligated approximately the same amount.
>
> Senator VANDENBERG. Is that for the period of 3 years?
>
> Mr. Cox. The aid rendered up to the 1st of March was about $22,000,000,000, and the amount of funds obligated is approximately the same amount—that is, $22,0000,000,000.

That makes a total of $44,000,000,000.

I wish to join with the Senator from Montana in asking someone to get these figures together, or get those who are responsible for the figures together, so that we can agree on what has been paid out, what has been obligated, and what the President still has in his hands. If any of these figures is correct, approximately $30,000,000,000 is still left in the President's hands which he has not spent or obligated. If the figures are not correct, what are the correct figures? I think the Senate is entitled to that information.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. The Senator has stated exactly the way I feel about it. If we take the hearings before the House committee and read what Mr. Cox says in one place, and read the figures in another place, we then ask ourselves, "Why can we not get these people together? How much have the Army and Navy spent? How much has the Maritime Commission spent, and how much has it given away? How much has the Army given away in lend-lease, and how much is left unexpended, if there is anything left, and if there is not, what has become of it?" These question involve more than merely a few dollars. When $60,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' hard-earned money is taken, they are entitled to know where it has gone and how it has been expended.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to one other matter while I am on my feet. Lately in Washington we have been hearing statements by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and many others to the effect that we ought to have a National Service Act, and that everyone ought to be included under it. We are told that we must have a National Service Act because we must draft men for labor, since we are short of labor.

Let us see what Australia did. I read a Reuters dispatch from Canberra, dated May 4:

> AUSSIE ARMY DROPS 44,000
>
> CANBERRA, May 4.—Francis M. Forde, acting Prime Minister and Minister for the Army, announced today that discharges from the Australian fighting forces, munition and aircraft works, and the Allied works council in the last 6 months number 68,500.
>
> Of these, 44,000 were from the army, 12,000 from munition and aircraft works, and 12,500 from the Allied works council.
>
> The 44,000 from the army covered normal discharges as special releases for industry. Except for a small proportion of service personnel discharged for medical reasons, the discharges would increase the civil employment pool, Forde said.

Australia is discharging men from its airplane factories and from the army, while we are constantly saying that we must have a draft of all the men and women in the United States. Because of the conflicting statements which have been made about fathers, about men over 30 years of age, and so forth, the other day I introduced a bill on the subject. One day we are told that everyone up to 30 years of age must be drafted. The next day we are told that only those under 26 will be taken. The following day we are told that everyone over 30 is to be taken.

When we enacted an amendment to the law a short time ago we were told that that would end the confusion. There is more confusion in the country today with reference to the draft situation than at almost any other time since the war began. We have no definite policy. No man in this country who is over 26 years of age, whether he be married or single, can make any plans of any kind. He is left in confusion from day to day. No one wants to hire him, because of the uncertainty as to whether or not he is to be taken into the service.

Mr. President, I do not know who is responsible for the confusion with reference to the lend-lease figures which have been given to the committees of Congress, but I do know that those in the departments who are responsible for the figures should get together and furnish the Congress and the people of the country some concrete, honest, truthful information as to what is becoming of the taxpayers' dollars which are being expended every day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Brooks	Chavez
Bailey	Buck	Connally
Ball	Burton	Cordon
Bankhead	Bushfield	Danaher
Barkley	Butler	Davis
Bilbo	Byrd	Downey
Brewster	Capper	Eastland
Bridges	Caraway	Ellender

Ferguson	McClellan	Smith
George	McFarland	Stewart
Gerry	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Gillette	Maloney	Tunnell
Guffey	Maybank	Tydings
Gurney	Mead	Vandenberg
Hatch	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Hayden	Murdock	Weeks
Hill	Murray	Wheeler
Jackson	Nye	Wherry
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	White
La Follette	Overton	Wilson
Langer	Radcliffe	
McCarran	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that, if present, he would vote as I intend to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I am informed that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McCARRAN (when Mr. SCRUGHAM's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BURTON (when Mr. TAFT's name was called). The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if present and voting he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am allowed to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. MEAD. My colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is unavoidably absent on official business. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

I am advised that if present and voting, all of the Senators whose absences I have announced above, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent. All these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—63

Austin	Downey	Mead
Bailey	Eastland	Millikin
Ball	Ellender	Murdock
Bankhead	Ferguson	Murray
Barkley	George	Nye
Bilbo	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Gillette	Overton
Bridges	Guffey	Radcliffe
Brooks	Gurney	Russell
Buck	Hatch	Smith
Burton	Hayden	Stewart
Bushfield	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Jackson	Tunnell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Capper	La Follette	Vandenberg
Caraway	McCarran	Walsh, Mass.
Chavez	McClellan	Weeks
Connally	McFarland	Wheeler
Cordon	McKellar	Wherry
Danaher	Maloney	White
Davis	Maybank	Wilson

NAYS—1

Langer

NOT VOTING—32

Aiken	Kilgore	Taft
Andrews	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Moore	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	O'Daniel	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Pepper	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Reed	Wagner
Glass	Revercomb	Wallgren
Green	Reynolds	Walsh, N. J.
Hawkes	Robertson	Wiley
Holman	Scrugham	Willis
Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead	

So the bill (H. R. 4254) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STARNES of ALABAMA, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. CASE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

OPERATION ON SUNDAYS AND HOLIDAYS OF INTERNATIONAL BRIDGES AND TUNNELS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I desire to present a unanimous-consent request in respect to Senate bill 1758, which is the last bill on the calendar and which deals with a pressing emergency situation on the international boundaries both north and south.

Under a recent decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called Myers case, the international bridges and tunnels and ferries both on the Mexican border and on the Canadian border can operate on Sundays and holidays only if the facilities themselves provide full payment for the overtime schedule of the customs inspectors. It is impossible for most of these facilities to pay the extra charges in the first instance, but, more fundamentally, the Treasury Department concedes—and all logic supports the conclusion—that, of course, the payment of customs inspectors on these international facilities is a Government obligation.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] on March 7 introduced Senate bill 1758 to take care of this situation. The Senate Finance Committee on May 5 unanimously reported the bill. The bill does this: First, it accepts for the Government the obligation of paying overtime to customs inspectors on international bridges, tunnels, and ferries on Sundays and holidays, an obligation which the Treasury freely concedes belongs to the Government. Second, it certifies to these customs officials the rates of pay which are required under the Supreme Court decision in the Myers case. Third, it calls upon the Bureau of the Budget within 90 days to make a report to the Congress respecting the readjustment of the entire base pay and overtime pay schedules of the customs system so that all discriminations may be eliminated.

Except as the bill is passed, Mr. President, before next Sunday there will be a closing of additional bridges and tun-

nels on Sunday and holidays—some bridges were closed last Sunday—and as a result the inconvenience to the public will be very great. This bill meets the situation in all its aspects. It has the total approval of the Senate Finance Committee, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am familiar with the bill. As the Senator states, it was unanimously voted to be reported by the committee. I have no objection to its consideration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1758) to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Finance were, on page 2, line 4, after the word "baggage", to strike out "passengers"; in the same line, before the word "persons", to strike out "other"; in line 6, before the word "on", to strike out "or"; in the same line, after the word "foot", to insert "or by other means"; in line 7, after the word "such", to strike out "highway"; in the same line, after the word "At", to strike out "designated"; in line 8, after the word "entry", to insert "and customs stations"; in line 9, after the word "baggage", to strike out "passengers"; in the same line, before the word "persons" to strike out "other"; in line 10, before the word "on", to strike out "or"; in line 11, after the word "foot", to insert "or by other means"; in the same line, after the word "any", to strike out "highway"; in line 17, after the word "as", to strike out "may" and insert "the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion may determine to"; in line 19, after the word "the", to strike out "prompt"; in line 20, after the word "baggage", to strike out "passengers"; in the same line, after the word "or", to strike out "other"; in line 22, after the word "be", to strike out "entitled to rates of" and insert "paid"; in line 23, after the word "compensation", to strike out "fixed on the same basis as in the case of customs officers and employees assigned to duty in connection with lading or unlading of vessels or cargo at night or on Sunday or a holiday" and insert "in accordance with existing law as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court in the case of the *United States* v. *Howard C. Myers* (320 U. S. 561)"; in line 8, after the word "such", to strike out "highway"; in line 9, after the word "tunnel", to insert "or"; in the same line, after the word "ferry", to strike out "motor vehicle, or trolley car" " and insert "or other person. As used in this section, the term 'ferry' shall mean a passenger service operated with the use of vessels which arrive in the United States on regular schedules at intervals of at least once each hour during any period in which customs service is to be furnished without reimbursement as above provided" "; on page 3, after line 15, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the extra compensation of customs officers and employees heretofore assigned to the performance of inspectional services in connection with traffic over toll bridges, through toll tunnels, or on ferries within the definition of the term "ferry" in section 1 of this act on Sundays or holidays prior to the date of the enactment of this act, which is payable on the basis prescribed by the said section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, as amended, shall be payable by the United States without reimbursement by the applicants for such services or any other person. Any reimbursement heretofore collected or compensation made payable without reimbursement by this section shall be refunded. The necessary moneys to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury.

And on page 4, after line 6, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is hereby directed to cause an investigation to be made and to report his recommendations to the Congress on or before the expiration of 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act concerning differences between the compensation of customs officers and employees performing inspectional work and the compensation of other Federal employees performing comparable work under comparable circumstances, and to include in such report recommendations for the equalization of any differences found in such manner as will eliminate any necessity for the assignment of individual customs officers or employees to work regularly on 7 days in any week. He shall also include in such report recommendations with respect to the establishment of pay differentials for customs officers and employees who are required to work at night or on Sundays and holidays in performance of the work to which they are regularly assigned.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, sec. 1451), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the provisions of this section, sections 450 and 452 of this act, and the provisions of section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, sec. 267), insofar as such section 5 requires payment of compensation by the master, owner, agent, or consignee of a vessel or conveyance, shall not apply to the owner, operator, or agent of a bridge, tunnel, or ferry between the United States and Canada or between the United States and Mexico, nor to the lading or unlading of merchandise, baggage, or persons arriving in or departing from the United States by motor vehicle, trolley car, on foot, or by other means upon, over, or through any such bridge, tunnel, or ferry. At ports of entry and customs stations where any merchandise, baggage, or persons shall arrive in or depart from the United States by motor vehicle, trolley car, on foot, or by other means upon, over, or through any bridge, tunnel, or ferry between the United States and Canada or between the United States and Mexico, the collector, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, shall assign customs officers and employees to duty at such times during the 24 hours of each day, including Sundays and holidays, as the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion may determine to be necessary to facilitate the inspection and passage of such merchandise, baggage, or persons. Officers and employees assigned to such duty at night or on Sunday or a holiday shall be paid compensation in accordance with existing law as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court in the case of the *United States* v. *Howard C. Myers* (320 U. S. 561); but all compensation payable to such customs officers and employees shall be paid by the United States without requiring any license, bond, obligation, financial undertaking, or payment in connection therewith on the part of any owner, operator, or agent of any such bridge, tunnel, or ferry, or other person. As used in this section, the term 'ferry' shall mean a passenger service operated with the use of vessels which arrive in the United States on regular schedules at intervals of at least once each hour during any period in which customs service is to be furnished without reimbursement as above provided."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the extra compensation of customs officers and employees heretofore assigned to the performance of inspectional services in connection with traffic over toll bridges, through toll tunnels, or on ferries within the definition of the term "ferry" in section 1 of this act on Sundays or holidays prior to the date of the enactment of this act, which is payable on the basis prescribed by the said section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, as amended, shall be payable by the United States without reimbursement by the applicants for such services or any other person. Any reimbursement heretofore collected or compensation made payable without reimbursement by this section shall be refunded. The necessary moneys to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 3. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is hereby directed to cause an investigation to be made and to report his recommendations to the Congress on or before the expiration of 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act concerning differences between the compensation of customs officers and employees performing inspectional work and the compensation of other Federal employees performing comparable work under comparable circumstances, and to include in such report recommendations for the equalization of any differences found in such manner as will eliminate any necessity for the assignment of individual customs officers or employees to work regularly on 7 days in any week. He shall also include in such report recommendations with respect to the establishment of pay differentials for customs officers and employees who are required to work at nights or on Sundays and holidays in performance of the work to which they are regularly assigned.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes."

RETURN OF THE PRESIDENT FROM SOJOURN IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, today throughout the United States the newspapers carry the report of the safe return to Washington of President Roosevelt after an extended visit in South Carolina. As the junior Senator from South Carolina, speaking for the people of our State, I wish to say that I know they were very proud to have the President in

South Carolina for some 30 days, and are glad that his health is better. Our people feel very much honored that so many important war conferences were held within the confines of our State.

South Carolina, which is participating 100 percent in the all-out war effort, has been signally honored by the extended visit of the President, and by the President there participating in important conferences, from which much good will come. I repeat, our people are delighted to know that the President has regained his health and has returned to Washington to carry on his work.

EXAMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 1565) relating to the appointment of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no postmaster at an office of the fourth class shall be required, in the event such office is advanced to the third class, to pass any competitive or noncompetitive examination as a condition to appointment or service as postmaster at the office so advanced; and no postmaster at an office of the third class shall be required, in the event such office is relegated to the fourth class, to pass any competitive or noncompetitive examination as a condition to appointment or service as postmaster at the office so relegated.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am not sure what the bill provides. It applies to one who is already a postmaster?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Third class or fourth class?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. And it removes the necessity of examination?

Mr. McKELLAR. A second examination. I have an amendment to the bill which I wish to offer, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the word "relegated" at the end of the bill it is proposed to strike out the period, and insert a semicolon, and the words, "and any postmaster or acting postmaster of the fourth or third class who has passed a civil-service examination at any time and has given service satisfactory to the Department may be reappointed without further civil-service examination."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the executive calendar, on which there is an adverse report, and it is not desired that it be taken up this afternoon. Therefore, there will be no necessity for an executive session. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Miss Kathleen Molesworth, of Texas, for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, from Foreign Service officer of class 8 to Foreign Service officer of class 7, effective as of November 16, 1943.

Tyler Thompson, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Admiral Aubrey W. Fitch, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of December 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Create in us clean hearts, O God, and renew a right spirit within us; cast us not away from Thy presence and take not Thy holy spirit from us. Thou who hast commanded the light to shine out of darkness, shine in our hearts that we may give knowledge and understanding to those who fail to lay up wisdom in their hearts. As our immortal souls pulse with the spirit of the uncreated God, grant that we may feel more and more the claims of sacrificial service. We pray not only for a world fit for man but for man fit for the world.

Thou who didst rule the swellings of Jordan, who walked amid the loneliness of the wilderness and tasted the sharpness of death, lay Thy hand upon us, abounding in life and power. Through patience and watchfulness, help us to discern the possibilities of our lot and cultivate the discipline of a full, absorbing life. Blended with an earnest purpose, we would discourage the blinding and belittling influence of materialism, which implies nothing great in heroism of patriotism. Struggling amid the gapes which threaten to swallow the soul of the world, O gather up its tragic, raveled ends and make them whole again. We ask it in the name of Him by whom we can attain to the larger life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 5, 1944, was read and approved.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—1945

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and it is not my purpose to object, but may I say there are at least three amendments in this bill as it comes back from the Senate that are without doubt subject to a point of order because they are legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law. The amendments not only apply to appropriations in this bill but to other bills and acts.

One of them is the T. V. A. amendment; the other is an amendment requiring confirmation by the Senate of appointment of all employees drawing over $4,500 a year; and the third is an amendment that would enable all the gangsters in the country to get advance notice when an enforcement officer is in the vicinity, as it requires the officers to have a large Government sign on their automobile. That is all right for official cars but not cars of enforcement officers.

I want to express the hope, and I am sure the gentleman from Virginia will agree because he has been very kind in the past, that the conferees will not include any of the amendments in the conference report because if they did I would have to make a point of order against them. I hope they will return those items to the House so that we can have a separate vote on them and let the House determine whether it is going to permit such obnoxious amendments to be added to an appropriation bill by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia if this is the appropriation bill in which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is interested in being present before it is sent to conference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman from Massachusetts is the ranking minority member; he is present. I do not know about the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from New York spoke to me about a bill. I do not know whether this is the one or not. However, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] tells me it is not, so I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is under the impression that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said he wanted to be present on the floor when this bill is sent to conference.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Which one is this?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] states that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is satisfied to have this bill go to conference.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] the items he mentions, I think, are legislation on an appropriation bill, and could not be included in the conference report; therefore would have to come back for a separate vote. Even if they were not, I would bring them back for a separate vote.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following Members as conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. WOODRUM of Virginia, FITZPATRICK, STARNES of Alabama, HENDRICKS, WIGGLESWORTH, DIRKSEN, and CASE.

RETURN OF CERTAIN VESSELS TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

S. O. BLAND,
ROBERT RAMSPECK
(By S. O. BLAND),
RICHARD J. WELCH,
JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG
(Per GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE),
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment numbered 1: The House bill in prescribing the procedure for the return of vessels to the former owner provides for return upon conditions, including repayment of the compensation paid the former owner less such allowances as the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, may deem reasonable to cover cost of reconditioning and to compensate for use of the vessel by the United States. The Senate amendment substitutes for the word "compensate" the term "pay just compensation to." The Senate recedes. This leaves the matter of determining compensation for use of the vessel when title is restored to the owner to preliminary negotiation and the setting of amounts by the Administrator which he deems reasonable to cover settlement for use. The existing law relating to return of fishing vessels is designed and intended to operate in the interest of expeditious restoration of vessels to their former owners when this can be accomplished on a reasonable financial basis, particularly in the economic interest of restoring vessels to their peacetime employment when no longer needed by the Government. Such restorations should take place without hindrance by reason of any technicalities which may be involved in any reference to just compensation under these particular circumstances.

Amendment numbered 2: The Senate amendment adds a proviso to the provisions of section 2 (relating to the allowance referred to in the preceding paragraph) that calls for a compulsory arbitration as to the amount of the allowance for use of the vessel. The Senate recedes on this amendment restoring the House language with full discretion and authority in the Administrator to fix the allowance for the use. A mandatory provision for arbitration would not be in the interest of expeditious restoration of vessels to their former owners, and in practice instead of protecting the Government might very well result in undue allowances for the use of the vessel, and in the return of vessels at an expense to the Government entirely out of line with the economic and public interests involved in the return.

Amendment numbered 3: The Senate amendment struck out the provision in section 2 of the House bill making the determination of allowances (both as to reconditioning and use) by the Administrator final notwithstanding any other provision of law. The Senate recedes on this amendment restoring the House language. This is in accord with the discretionary and supplementary character of the whole legislation as embodied in the House bill and in the interest of expeditious restoration of vessels to their former owners when the basic policy of the law calls for such restoration. The former owner has under section 3 of the bill the opportunity to come in and bid at a public sale of the vessel in a case where he has not seen fit to make satisfactory arrangements for, or waives any right to, the return of the vessel.

S. O. BLAND,
ROBERT RAMSPECK
(By S. O. BLAND),
RICHARD J. WELCH,
JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has receded as to all of its amendments, and this restores the language used in the House bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill is now exactly the same as it passed the House?

Mr. BLAND. It is.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 535) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 550 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Civil Service, not to exceed $50,000 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums made available during the Seventy-eighth Congress for conducting the studies and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman from Missouri how much has already been appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. COCHRAN. There was appropriated heretofore around $30,000. There is about $200 left. I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], the chairman, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] appeared before the Committee on Accounts and made statements justifying the additional expenditure. They pointed out the following as the most important and significant accomplishments of the House Civil Service Investigating Committee:

This committee was established in the fall of 1942 and it began to function actively in January 1943. At that time it was pointed out that the various Government departments and agencies had been increasing their personnel at the rate of about 100,000 employees a month. Almost immediately thereafter, appointments began to decrease and within a few months new appointments were reduced about one-half of the peak. It is generally accepted that had it not been for the operations and impact of the committee there would have been added to

the Federal pay roll at least 350,000 additional employees which probably would have increased the Federal pay roll by $700,000,000.

Soon after it started operations the committee came into possession of certain facts indicating that the War Department was requesting needless items in its 1944 fiscal year budget. A thorough inquiry was made with the result that the House Appropriations Subcommittee was notified and items aggregating $127,000,000 were disallowed.

Within a period of 3 months largely due to the efforts of the committee, an actual reduction of 145,000 civilians was effected by the War Department. The saving in this instance is estimated to be $290,000,000.

As a result of an investigation now being concluded by the committee, an agreement has been secured from the department heads concerned, to reduce the expenditures of one agency by a minimum of $2,935,228 on personnel alone; and an additional $689,204 for other expenses, making a total savings in this instance of $3,624,432.

A recent survey of one section of the Civil Service Commission itself resulted in reconsideration of additional requested personnel totaling $525,000, and moving and other expenses which may have totaled $50,000. One section of Navy on which a spot check was made yielded an immediate savings of $18,000 to $20,000 on reclassification of positions alone; another survey now in process indicates a reduction of 50 percent in the section of the agency selected for test with a saving of $165,000 in that section alone and the current investigation of this agency will probably result in great savings in personnel expense.

Up to the present time the committee has confined its activities solely to Washington. In this area, however, is found only about 7 percent of the total number of Government employees; the other 93 percent of Federal workers are employed in field offices. It is the committee's objective now to extend its activities to the field, particularly in cities such as New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and others where large concentrations of Federal employees are to be found.

It is the opinion of the House Civil Service Committee that there is a great deal of work to do in the field and that they have only scratched the surface in the studies they have conducted in Washington which has brought about great reductions in the number of employees on Federal pay rolls with corresponding savings.

The Committee on Accounts, recognizing the desirability of continuing the work and extending it to the field, unanimously approved additional funds in the amount of $50,000 for the House Civil Service Investigating Committee. This is one-half the figure requested by the gentleman from Georgia.

The committee has confined past activities to Washington and now they are going in the field.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are they going to do traveling around the country?

Mr. COCHRAN. They are going out into the field to try to find out if the various offices are overmanned and if they are being conducted on an efficient basis.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will they know anything about it after they go there?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this resolution appointing the committee was passed by the House, and your Committee on Accounts is only your agent. We held a hearing and we brought in this resolution, feeling that the House wanted this committee to function, and it cannot function unless it has funds. I am not going to predict what any committee of this House is going to do. The gentleman knows I opposed any number of special committees.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the House ought to know what they are going to do in the field.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], chairman of the committee, to make a statement.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that 93 percent of the 2,800,000 employees now on the Federal pay roll, civilian employees, are located outside of Washington. So far, the committee's investigation, with two exceptions, has been confined to the District of Columbia. We feel that we can save some money by having some investigators stationed in points like New York and Chicago and San Francisco, places of that sort, where there are heavy concentrations of Federal employees, and also by visiting installations where a lot of Federal employees are located, such as Dayton, Ohio, for instance, where there are fifty to sixty thousand employees.

We feel that we have saved the Government a lot of money in this investigation. To give the gentleman one illustration, in the Civil Service Commission itself, where they had prepared a plan for an additional 300 employees, and the moving of the Commission's Retirement Division offices to larger quarters, by following the suggestions made by our staff they did not hire the 300 employees, which would have cost half a million dollars a year. They did not move, which would have cost $50,000. They doubled the output of the Retirement Division by following our suggestions, without additional employees.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think you could probably remove one-fourth of those employees on the Government pay roll if the committee functioned efficiently.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] who is the ranking member, can assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that the committee is functioning and that it is doing good work. We have not spent very much money. We have spent a little over $30,000 in more than a year, and I believe it is money well spent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How many investigators are you going to put to work?

Mr. RAMSPECK. With the funds that have been given us by the Committee on Accounts, I would say probably 10 could be employed and used effectively.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are they political appointees or are they civil-service employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; not political employees at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wondered if the committee was going to take its own medicine about it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think the committee is, and I believe the members on the gentleman's side will assure him that we are not playing politics with these men.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. COCHRAN. I will yield to the gentleman for a brief observation.

Mr. MAY. I am reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman cannot reserve the right to object. This is a privileged resolution, and I control the time, 1 hour, under the rule.

Mr. MAY. I do not expect to object. I simply wanted to advise the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee, that the Committee on Military Affairs has made a complete and thorough investigation of some 3,000 employees in the War Department. We have all of that information available, and I simply call his attention to that to emphasize the bad practice, as I regard it, of duplicating effort around here by different committees, as we have now some 6 or 7 committees dealing with the same subject in reference to war contracts and sales of surplus property.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Kentucky only confirms the statement that I have made on the floor time and again in respect to select committees and the operation of legislative committees where special authority has been granted as a result of resolutions passed by the House. Recently I published in the RECORD a list of the special committees and special jurisdiction granted legislative committees in the House and the Senate. At that time there were 68. That was only a few days ago, but now there are at least one-half dozen more in the House and the Senate, including the resolution that you passed Friday providing for a select committee of the House to investigate Montgomery Ward. A committee of the Senate had already started on that investigation and had its employees in Chicago. They have this matter under consideration in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate at the very moment. Sufficient time has not elapsed since the passage of the resolution to enable the Speaker to appoint the committee authorized by the House. If you will just stop passing resolutions for special investigations, it will not be necessary for the Committee on Accounts to appropriate money to make the investigation. That will be very pleasing to me.

Mr. MAY. I think it ought to be stopped.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas for a question.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I wonder if I understood the gentleman's figures correctly, that there are 2,800,000 Federal employees, outside of Washington, in the United States.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; the total is 2,800,000, including those in Washington.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York for a question.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman says there are about 3,000,000 governmental employees. How many does the gentleman think we can properly get rid of and still maintain a high degree of efficiency in the Federal service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I would not attempt to answer that question offhand. There are about 2,000,000 of the 2,800,000 who are employed by the War and Navy Departments. I would be reluctant to make a snap judgment on what the War and Navy Departments need. I do think there can still be a considerable reduction, however. We have gotten a net reduction of about 200,000 in the total employment since the 1st of last July, and 140,000 of those came out of the War Department, the Army Service Forces alone. I commend General Somervell and the War Department on that reduction.

Mr. FISH. Can we get rid of about 800,000 more, making a cut of about 1,000,000 altogether?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I doubt if we can unless the War and Navy Departments can transfer some of their manufacturing processes to private employers.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman does not want to limit it entirely to the War and Navy Departments?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; not at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. That 2,800,000 includes all the employees in the navy yards; does it not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are engaged in building and repairing ships and doing other work in connection with the war?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. This also applies to employees in the arsenals of the War Department.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman advise the House as to the approximate number employed by the Army and the Navy in these necessary war activities?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not have the figures at hand to give an exact breakdown, but I think there are about 1,600,000 who are directly engaged in war activities in the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for an observation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There are people who think that some of these war activities are overmanned.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I agree with the gentleman. That is one reason we want to make this further investigation.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, I think there is a lot to that. My purpose was to show, however, that these 2,800,000 are not all employed in offices. There is an honest but erroneous impression to that effect.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The vast majority of them are not. They are engaged in manufacturing processes and repairing and servicing planes, automobiles, trucks, and things of that sort.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that some of the Members seem to be taking some interest in the amount of money that is being spent for these investigations. I hope they will continue to do so. It will please me to see some of the resolutions I am compelled to bring in as chairman of the Committee on Accounts voted down. Some of the committees simply duplicating investigations should be discontinued and the only way you can stop this duplication is for the House as a whole to refuse to give them any additional funds.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech on Great Britain and post-war civil aviation, and further to extend my remarks and include an editorial on dangerous curves.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAPLAINS AS GENERAL OFFICERS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3604) authorizing the appointment of chaplains as general officers of the Army of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain this bill to the House?

Mr. KILDAY. This bill would permit the designation of the Chief of Chaplains of the Army as a major general, and also permit the appointment of other chaplains to general rank. Some time before the declaration of war but after the expansion of the Army, we passed here a bill which permitted the designation of the Chief of Chaplains as a brigadier general. At the time of Pearl Harbor there were approximately 1,500 chaplains in the Army. At this time there are approximately 7,000 of them in the Army.

It was not the thought of the Committee on Military Affairs at the time that bill was reported that it would limit the Chief of Chaplains to a brigadier generalship, but that he would come under the general provisions of the National Defense Act, under which general officers may be appointed in time of war without reference to the number of authorizations. However, it now develops that the opinion exists that because of the fact we have specifically designated the Chief of Chaplains as a brigadier general, it would not be possible for the one holding that position to hold a higher rank than brigadier general. This is a limitation that we did not intend to place on the law at the time it was adopted, and this bill would cure the present defect in that regard.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand there are about 7,500 chaplains in that branch of the service.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. I said 7,000. It is approximately that. The gentleman says 7,500. The number may have increased since I received my information.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is only one general officer?

Mr. KILDAY. There is one brigadier general at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. This will permit the appointment of other general officers, which this service should receive?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. I believe we would all agree that if there is one outstanding job that is being done by the military and naval services, it is in the chaplains' branch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the present national emergency and for 6 months after the termination thereof, the President shall be authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, chaplains as general officers of the Army of the United States in such numbers and grades as may be recommended by the Secretary of War.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, the President shall be authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the Chief of Chaplains to the temporary rank of major general, and chaplains as temporary general officers not above the grade of major general in such numbers as may be recommended by the Secretary of War. All officers so appointed shall be commissioned in the Army of the United States and shall receive the pay and allowances of the grade to which temporarily appointed: *Provided*, That any appointment made under the provisions of this act may be vacated at any time by the President, and, if not sooner vacated, shall continue during the present war and 6 months thereafter."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "Authorizing the appointment of the Chief of Chaplains to the temporary rank of major general, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a press release from the Tennessee Bureau of Aeronautics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday dealing with West Point, and further to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday dealing with the Montgomery Ward investigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein brief excerpts from an address delivered by Gilbert Montague before the Institute on Post-war Reconstruction, New York University, on the subject of the cartel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, ever since the world began, men have turned to God for guidance when they realize their greatest needs. Never have they been disappointed. He has been pointed to as a mighty fortress by the great spiritual leaders of all time. He gives us strength for our bodies, rest for our weary spirits, and peace to our troubled minds. He can and will give us strength, grace, and courage to carry on now. His Son said the earnest prayer of a righteous man availeth much. Holy Writ records many incidents of mighty things accomplished by the united prayers and efforts of the people.

Apparently D-day is drawing nigh, and the hour of invasion may be any hour. Many communities have set aside the invasion hour to assemble in their churches to implore divine guidance and strength of arms to accomplish an early victory and bring about a lasting peace. Inasmuch as the Nation rightfully looks to this House for leadership, I am today introducing a resolution for the House to take appropriate action when the news of the invasion comes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution passed by the Senate of the State of Ohio entitled "Provided, That the State of Ohio Be Recognized in the Naming of a Street in the Nation's Capital and the Naming of a Battleship in Her Honor."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith an editorial in the Mansfield News Journal relative to the Beaver-Mahoning Canal proposal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. RAMEY] be allowed to extend his remarks on absentee voting by citizens of the State of Ohio, notwithstanding that the cost of printing is $260.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his own remarks in two instances and in each case include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on American fascism by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from this morning's paper dealing with the island of Guam.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Des Moines Association of Accident and Health Underwriters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address which I made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to add thereto a letter written to me by the Mechanicville Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which recently appeared in the Los Angeles Times, entitled "The Truth About Liberty Ships."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial published in the Worcester Evening Gazette, captioned "Whose attorney is Mr. Biddle?"

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a paragraph from a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including therein a resolution from the American-Italian Democratic Club.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein testimony given by Commissioner Harry W. Bashore before the Committee of the Senate, with reference to H. R. 3961.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CAPT. ROBERT S. JOHNSON, NEW ACE OF ACES

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to extend my remarks by including therein excerpts

from an Associated Press dispatch from London.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have just been handed an Associated Press dispatch from London announcing that Capt. Robert S. Johnson, of Lawton, Okla., a Thunderbolt pilot, today shot down 2 additional enemy planes over Germany, making 27 which he has bagged in all. Thus Robert S. Johnson has become the first American ace in the European theater to break Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker's combat record of 26 kills in the First World War.

I have known Capt. Robert S. Johnson since he was a small boy. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. L. B. Johnson, of Lawton, Okla., one of the well-known families in my State. He has resided at Lawton all his life. I knew him as a high-school boy, when he was president of the student council; as a member of the football squad and boxing team at the Cameron State Agricultural College at Lawton. Captain Johnson is married and is 24 years of age.

The new ace of aces is a fine, clean, wholesome, Christian gentleman whose personal life and conduct could well be emulated by every youth in the Nation.

It will be recalled that only a few days ago Lt. Ernest Childers, of Broken Arrow, Okla., after receiving the Congressional Medal of Honor, lunched with the Oklahoma delegation here in the Capitol, at which time many Members of Congress had the honor of meeting him. Not many months ago Lieutenant Colonel Kegleman, of El Reno, Okla., then a captain, electrified the world with his daring feats. So Oklahoma is "going to town" in the war effort.

We hope that not too far in the distant future that Capt. Robert S. Johnson, who for some time has been eligible to come back to the United States, but has refused thus far to take his leave, will also return to his family and other loved ones and friends, and that I shall have the honor and pleasure of introducing him to Members of this body and others in the Nation's Capital.

Today's new's dispatch, with reference to Captain Johnson, follows:

FROM A UNITED STATES FIGHTER BASE IN ENGLAND, May 8.—Capt. Robert S. Johnson, Lawton, Okla., a Thunderbolt pilot, shot down 2 enemy planes over Germany today to boost his total to 27—all bagged in the air—and became the first American ace in the European theater to break Capt. Edward Rickenbacker's combat record of 26 aircraft kills in the First World War.

Johnson thus tied the record set in the Southwest Pacific theater by Maj. Ricard I. Bong, 23, Poplar, Wis.

In the European theater Capt. Don Gentile, Piqua, Ohio, now home on leave, holds the present record of enemy planes destroyed by an American pilot with a toal score of 30, of which 7 were destroyed on the ground.

Johnson, a stubby, blond youngster, who asked for 25 additional hours of combat duty after completing his regular tour, and Major Bong are the only Americans bettering Rickenbacker's mark strictly in air combat.

Bong, a Lightning pilot, was the first to break that record, although Maj. Gregory Boyington, Okanogan, Wash., now missing, and marine Maj. Joe Foss, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., who is not now on active flying duty, had equaled Rickenbacker's 26 in their careers in the Pacific area.

Bong also has nine probables which went down smoking, but were not seen to crash, and thus have not been tallied as planes destroyed.

Johnson, who is 24 years old, had brought his score to 25 by mid-April, including 6 planes downed over Berlin. The location of his kills today was not disclosed immediately.

He is regarded as a cool, deadly pilot, and is confident but not cocky about his flying ability.

He once remarked that a fighter pilot needed good eyes and a good neck to survive, and "if you haven't these, you're a goner."

Johnson first flew solo in a plane when he was only 14 years old and obtained a civilian pilot license in 1939. He was a carpenter and woodworker before joining the Army.

He was an amateur boxer also—he weighs 165 pounds—and likes to talk in boxing terms. He disagrees with those who say that the enemy air force is destroyed or weakened to a point of defeat, for "this thing is like a 15-round fight, and in my opinion, we still have 13 rounds to go."

"Any time you underestimate an opponent," he said recently, "you are going to get knocked on your backsides."

Young Johnson has been shot up three times and his fellow flyers credit his courage and flying skill with keeping him alive.

He thinks that Nazi pilots are "no better or no worse than American," but believes they lack initiative.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to address the House tomorrow for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the regular business and any orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert therewith a newspaper article and some observations thereon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement made by me at a press conference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a letter and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have not taken up much of the time of the House to discuss the Senate amendments restricting the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority. But since that proposition has gone to conference, I want to appeal to the House conferees not to agree to any amendment which would hamstring the T. V. A. in any way.

I was coauthor of the bill that created the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have fought its battles from the very beginning. It has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times. It has brought new life to a great section of the country, reduced light and power rates to their proper levels, and furnished a yardstick for the rest of the Nation. From the T. V. A. has sprung our rural electrification program which has spread through the Nation, and brought to the farmers of the country the greatest benefits they have ever enjoyed.

In the T. V. A. area today there are more war materials being produced perhaps than in any other area in the world.

The T. V. A. is contributing more to the war effort than almost any other institution under the shining sun.

It would be a serious mistake to adopt amendments that would hamstring or cripple the T. V. A., especially at this time when it is carrying out the greatest program ever developed for the betterment of mankind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what the Tennessee Valley Authority has made a marked contribution for the betterment not only of the area it is serving but of the entire country. I can remember when the bill establishing that Authority was up, the main cry against it was that it constituted socialism. Many people, in good faith, made that cry and entertained that fear. It is just the contrary. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been an incentive for the production and development of private industry. It has done a real job and has served a real purpose and it has a tremendous future in which it can make even greater contributions than it has in the past for the development of the free enterprise that America stands for, a free enterprise not of 50 years ago, but a free enterprise consistent with the economic conditions that exist today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent Mr. COMPTON and Mr. GATHINGS received permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RESERVATIONS FOR RESERVOIRS, LEVEES, AND FLOOD WALLS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 517, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Flood Control, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

I now yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule which comes before the House with the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Rules makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485)—the flood-control bill. I shall not attempt at this time, in discussing the rule, to go into the merits of the bill itself, leaving that for the Flood Control Committee; but I would like to briefly discuss the rule and the underlying principles back of the consideration of this flood-control bill.

This is an open rule. The bill for which the rule provides, comes to the House in the established way and in accord with the policy of the House. It has been, and is customary for a flood-control bill to be presented authorizing the Chief of Engineers to make a survey and to determine the value of any flood-control project. In determining the value of any flood-control project the primary consideration has been the value of the project. That is to say, no project has been considered as worthy of adoption if the cost exceeds the benefits. Thereafter, matters of this kind are referred to the district engineer, the man on the ground. If it receives a favorable report from him it goes to the division engineer. Eventually it goes to the Board of Rivers and Harbors in Washington, where it is reviewed by the Chief of Engineers, and if it is approved by the Chief of Engineers, the report is then filed with Congress and referred to the Committee on Flood Control, which procedure has been followed in this case.

After extensive hearings the Flood Control Committee has reported the bill to the House. The bill is one of the most comprehensive, if not the most comprehensive flood-control measure reported to the House up to this date. It seeks in and by its terms to provide a comprehensive plan and program of flood relief and to provide among other things, a reservoir of worth while, worthy projects for consideration after the war, to provide worth-while improvements, and at the same time to provide employment.

Prior to 1936 the flood-control policy of the Congress was for the most part, limited to the Mississippi and the Sacramento Rivers. In 1936, as the membership will remember, a general policy was adopted by the Congress and a Nation-wide bill was reported. In 1937 another bill was reported which was confined, for the most part, to the lower Ohio River. In 1938 another comprehensive, Nation-wide flood-control bill was reported, and in 1941 the last flood-control bill was passed by the Congress, the 1941 bill being the last bill passed before the consideration of the bill which comes before the House today.

In approving the 1941 bill, the President stated that he would make no recommendations for the carrying out of the provisions authorized in the 1941 bill during the war. The same policy, of course, will be followed with respect to the present bill, with one or two slight exceptions. The purpose of H. R. 4485 is to provide essential authorization which will make possible the immediate consideration of proper and timely appropriation measures when the stress and strain of the war is out of the way.

It will be noted that the rule makes reference to the fact that all points of order against the bill are waived. Those are of very slight importance, but for the information of the House I call attention to page 4, line 21. The words "heretofore or," appearing thereat, refer to appropriations which would be subject to a point of order if the rule did not specifically waive the point. In substance, the bill provides that any funds on hand, heretofore appropriated, may be used, even during the war, solely for the purpose of making preliminary plans and investigations, compiling specifications, and matters of that kind. In other words, if any Member should introduce a bill to determine whether or not a flood-control improvement should be made in his district, the funds would be available to make the investigation, and for no other purpose.

On the very last page of the bill, page 30, there is also an exception, which might be subject to a point of order, which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture can use up to $100,000 in any one year, out of moneys heretofore appropriated, to take care of emergency damage. That is to say, particularly in the western part of the country it frequently happens that, with the heavy rains, great landslides, boulders, and what not come down and endanger towns and traffic. This section provides that the Secretary of Agriculture can make emergency repairs up to but not exceeding $100,000 in any one year.

I do not think there is any controversy about the rule, and, as I stated before, it comes to the House with the unanimous endorsement of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extends my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER] who has just spoken. He made a very able presentation. He is a new member of the Rules Committee, and evidently he has made a thorough study of the bill before the House and has presented the facts in a very concise and able manner.

Mr. Speaker, there was no opposition to this bill, H. R. 4485, in the Rules Committee. It is a bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and other purposes. As was so well pointed out, it waives certain points of order.

This bill provides an authorization of $800,000,000 for flood control. That is the basic reason given for the items in the bill, but funds may be used under provisions of the bill for navigation, reclamation, and irrigation projects.

Prior to 1938 the States were trying to carry out through State compacts, flood-control supervision. Now, since we adopted the law of 1938, the Federal Government puts up all the money—100 percent, to control floods.

Mr. Speaker, there is very little in this bill in behalf of the great Empire State of New York. I could find very few items that affect New York at all. I have, however, received a letter from a constituent of mine in regard to a project in Vermont, which letter I desire to read. I call this particular project to the attention of the membership and hope it will be thoroughly discussed. I am not familiar with it but certain charges are made in the letter and I believe the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] probably has full knowledge of the facts and will present them to the House in due course.

This letter is dated May 6, 1944, and is addressed to me by a constituent, Mr. D. W. DeWitt, of Walton, N. Y. The letter reads as follows:

WALTON SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Walton, N. Y., May 6, 1944.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note by the papers that H. R. 4485 will come up for a vote probably next week. I am very much opposed to the Williamsville (Vt.) project which is included in this bill and I want you to use your efforts to have this eliminated from the bill.

I used to live in Newfane and Brattleboro, Vt., and I know just what this project is going to mean to the entire West River Valley. It would not be so bad if this was simply a flood-control project and they planned to construct a dry dam which have been most successful in the territory around Montpelier, Vt. This is not a flood-control project at all but a power project which the administration is trying to put over on the people of southeastern Vermont. It is one

of the biggest frauds which I have ever seen sponsored in the guise of flood control.

I hope that I may have your assurance that you will do everything you can to have the Williamsville project eliminated.

Very truly yours,

D. W. DEWITT.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all familiar with this project. This bill is supposed to be a flood-control bill and not a power-project bill. I hope the gentleman from Vermont, the very distinguished Representative [Mr. PLUMLEY], will in his time explain this project. I have no knowledge of the facts except as contained in the letter which states specifically that it is not a flood-control project but a power project.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ additional minutes.

I feel therefore that it is only fair the House should have all the facts before it acts on the bill and this particular project. Mr. Speaker, I am merely calling the attention of the membership on both sides of the House as well as the committee to the fact that if it is a power and not a flood-control project and is opposed by the people of that district it should be stricken from the bill.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the House with a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I shall undertake to discuss this measure in my time under general debate rather than under the rule.

Mr. FISH. Could the gentleman from Vermont tell me whether this opposition by one of my constituents is warranted, and as to whether it is a power project or flood-control project?

Mr. PLUMLEY. The opposition is warranted.

Mr. FISH. That is all I wanted to know; therefore, if opposition is warranted I hope the House will consider this particular project seriously.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to add also that I believe the opposition is warranted.

Mr. FISH. The statement of both these distinguished Members of the House support the contention of my constituent. I trust therefore at the proper time that a fight will be made on it and all the facts presented.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CLASON. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the proviso on page 1 of the bill, Connecticut River Basin, on the question of whether or not there should be any power in this dam at the Williamsville site. A proviso was put right in there that neither this authorization nor previous authorizations shall be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Williamsville site; in other words, in order to have power the height of the dam would have to be increased by 75 feet. The committee after hearing the witnesses decided to eliminate power from this site and therefore put in this provision for the specific purpose that they cannot have the 75 additional feet of height on that dam. Power therefore is eliminated and the dam will be constructed for flood control only.

Mr. FISH. I hope the gentleman is correct, but I suppose that will be debated upon the floor at the proper time and that the House will then decide what it should do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, practically every district in the State of New York has at one time or another in the past been threatened and ravaged by floods. My district, which is at the confluence of the Susquehanna and the Chenango Rivers is certainly one outstanding example of this. Every once in a while the Chenango River gets on a rampage and comes down at a terrific rate from its source and, meeting the Susquehanna River, produces a bad situation to the people in my particular area.

The Whitney Point Dam project which was instituted about 10 years ago did a great deal to remedy the trouble at the junction of the Chenango and Susquehanna Rivers. This plan, however, and unfortunately, harnesses only the Chenango River because it takes several tributaries of the Chenango and checks their flow. It does not improve the Susquehanna menace however. Although flood walls were erected at Binghamton, which is at the junction of these two rivers, they have done little good. A few miles farther down the river at Johnson City, Endicott, and Vestal the lowlands along the banks of the Susquehanna are still flooded every year with a great deal of accompanying property damage in the central and greater Endicott area on the one side of the Susquehanna and in the Vestal area on the other. I will say also that no substantial remedy has ever been offered by the Army engineers for whatever happens in this area during floodtime. For that reason I am thinking very seriously of asking for additional funds in this bill when the proper time comes, funds to improve this Endicott area which is so greatly in need of some sort of remedy.

I should say in passing that the Whitney Point Dam project previously referred to has been of much value to the vicinity of my home city of Binghamton but it has not helped farther down the river. There are various theories which the Army engineers should consider putting into practice. One of them is dredging, which local flood-control groups advocate.

A great deal of the sediment of the Susquehanna and Chenango piles up at points around the Endicott area and has formed islands. It has caused the regular overflowing of the Susquehanna in these places and inundating lowlands where valuable property is located. Unfortunately to date nothing has been done to remedy the difficulty. I have talked with several of the Army engineers about this matter. I personally believe, which belief is shared by many of the residents in that area, that dredging could be done effectively.

It costs money to do dredging and it costs money to build flood walls. For these reasons it will require extra money in this bill for Endicott and vicinity to accomplish any degree of effective protection from the Susquehanna River. I ask the House and the committee to give careful consideration to the matter because the people of this area have suffered year after year. It is not a question of suffering every 5 or 10 years, it is a case of suffering every single year when the Susquehanna overflows its banks at that point and a lot of property is damaged.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute. Will he yield to me?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question because he represents part of the district today that had been assigned to me. Does this flood-control measure in any way affect Delaware County which is now a part of my district, formerly a part of the gentleman's district?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The Susquehanna rises in Oswego County. It comes down and flows through Chenango County. It does not strike Delaware County at any appreciable point except around the village of Sidney, where some steps have been taken, I think, with effect. The Delaware River is the principal river in the county the gentleman refers to. The Susquehanna River is limited to mainly Otsego, Chenango, and Broome Counties in New York State and that area is affected more than any other point. It is my sincere hope that something will be done about it right away for the sake of the people of Johnson City, Endicott, Vestal, and that vicinity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we should proceed rather cautiously in respect to bills of this nature. The thing which is disturbing the American people and this Congress as much as anything else is the effect of a possible $300,000,000,000 debt on our post-war economy. We are in no position today to say whether we need $810,000,000 of construction for the purpose of taking up the slack caused by unemployment or $80,000,000,000. This Congress should keep itself in a position where it can legislate for the post-war period when we reach it. There is a formula to which many

subscribe that national income has a certain relationship to the construction of durable goods. It has been said that the construction of durable goods is about 16 percent of national income, and if we maintain a national income of between one hundred and twenty-five and one hundred and thirty-five billion dollars, public works being a part of durable goods construction, then we must gage this post-war economy and our national income upon the amount which we authorize for the durable-goods industries, including public construction, no more, understand, then is necessary to create the base upon which our post-war economy can build a structure to maintain a national income sufficient to carry this great burden.

I call your attention to the fact that the passage of this bill will invite other proposals similar to this. Wednesday morning the Roads Committee meets in executive session to determine the advisability of reporting an authorization for $3,000,000,000 for construction of roads and highways for our post-war needs. The Roads Committee has studied this for weeks and months, yet we do not know what the needs in the post-war world are going to be; so it is rather embarrassing to have these bills come in here at a time when the post-war economic condition is as nebulous as it is at the present time. These are more or less commitments. If the project is instituted, if the planning is done, if the surveys are made, then, of course, we are morally bound to appropriate the money for the construction of them.

I want to call your attention also to the fact that this bill provides not only for flood control but provides that under the authority of this act all of these authorizations may be used to develop power projects. These authorizations may be used also to construct, maintain, and operate recreation facilities, conservation facilities, and other facilities which, of course, is so all-embracive, and is not restrictive in any manner, that the authorization in this bill could be used for construction of anything which the War Department determines to be a facility. The only limitation upon these facilities is that they must be advantageous to the interests of the United States and we have absolutely nothing to say in this bill as to whether they shall be considered in the interest of the United States or not.

We are expected to adopt this bill on the premise also that it is necessary for the national security. If these projects are essential to the national security then they should be constructed immediately and not after the war.

The bill goe on further to say that we should construct these projects so that we will have an adequate reservoir of useful, worthy public works for the post-war construction program. We do not know at the present time whether this bill will be ample. We do not know anything about our post-war period. For these reasons I come to you with the thought that if you pass this bill, you will have a $3,000,000,000 bill reported out of a committee for the post-war construction of highways. You may expect another bill providing billions for irrigation and other projects. We must take the responsibility because this country is broke today and the people of this country are looking for retrenchment in nonessential expenditures.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that this rule making in order a bill authorizing the expenditure of over $800,000,000 for flood control to protect localities and sections in nearly every State of the Union from floods and which also carries large sums for river improvements, the constructions of basins and dams, I have not heard a single gentleman rise on the other side to oppose this tremendous expenditure or to criticize what they generally delight in terming "bureaucratic administration" for authorizing the expenditures of most of these funds in States for purposes which up to a few years ago they were obliged to finance themselves. Strangely, I have not heard opposition voiced by those Members who generally criticize that too much money is being spent by the Government and that the proposed authorizations of these large expenditures will be in violation of States' rights. This reminds me of the great fight years ago on Muscle Shoals when the gentlemen on the other side and some on this side, including the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], insisted upon and urged the sale of that great project to Henry Ford or other private interests; and I recall even up to 3 or 4 years ago that some of you criticized and found fault whenever an appropriation was proposed for the improvement or enlargement of that great project. I observed a very fine editorial appearing in the Chicago Times of yesterday, May 7, entitled "Green Is the Valley" with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I am sure it will be most interesting and enlightening to the membership and the country. I insert it at this point as part of my remarks, as follows:

GREEN IS THE VALLEY

By now it is conceded even by those who violently opposed it that the Tennessee Valley Authority—T. V. A.—is a boon to the Nation at least with respect to the war effort.

This is chiefly because of the tremendous quantity of electricity, desperately needed for war work, that T. V. A. has made available.

In the production of aluminum alone, T. V. A. may almost be said to have justified the investment. The manufacture of aluminum is largely a question of electricity, and aluminum means airplanes for victory. Without T. V. A. airplane production would have been considerably impeded. Its power also makes possible the manufacture of explosives, chemicals, and other munitions, all helping the Nation to take the offensive in the war.

But in the 11 years since its authorization by Congress, as one of the major accomplishments of the Roosevelt administration, T. V. A. has done far more than merely convert the power of the Tennessee River into electricity. It has begun a physical, industrial, and even social regeneration of a great region of the Nation, the valley of the Tennessee that lies in seven States. All of it lies within the American pattern.

"INFLATION"—OF MEN'S LIVES—IS WELCOME

It is a project that expands the way of living for people. For T. V. A. has brought new vitality to a region where life was mainly drab and hard, a reflection of wasteful and inadequate use of natural resources. It has contributed functions by which Americans may more successfully enjoy the pursuit of happiness.

This is made plain by David E. Lilienthal, formerly a Chicago lawyer, now Chairman of the Authority, in a dramatic new book, T. V. A.—Democracy on the March.

Here are some of the things that T. V. A. is and has done, which will be news to those who consider it solely in terms of hydroelectric power:

It has brought new industries—privately operated—to the Valley, heretofore almost wholly agricultural. These mean initiative, jobs, and security which thousands of the inhabitants of the region never knew before.

It is a great agricultural project. It has stepped up production, through relating use of land to the development of the river, through soil treatment, and by the large-scale "demonstration farming," showing how to get the most out of the land without destroying its fertility. Land in the region that was once barren and scrawny is now productive and green. Bringing electricity to the farms has helped.

T. V. A. is a great conservation project—as American as Teddy Roosevelt. It carries on reforestation and a continuous battle against soil erosion. It is a flood-control project. Not only does the river serve the people now; it has lost its ability to go on rampages that almost annually destroyed lives and property.

It is a transportation project, providing cheaper and quicker navigation of the river. It is a recreation project. A region without natural lakes now has many man-made lakes, which have opened a new world of sport for the people. A large-scale fishing industry is a byproduct of the lakes. Thousands of acres along the river shore are devoted to public parks.

PEOPLE AND LAND PART OF A UNITY

These things are transforming the valley physically, but their real meaning, as Mr. Lilienthal emphasizes, is their effect on human beings. People live on and from the land. Rivers are a part of a natural unity, which includes the people. As he says, "Everywhere what happens to the land, the forests and the water determines what happens to the people."

What has happened to the Tennessee Valley, he shows, has increased the incomes of the people, helped them get better homes, improved their health, expanded their cultural interests, eased their lives. An Alabama newspaper summed up the real change, however, with this:

"We can write of great dams * * * of the building of home-grown industry and of electricity at last coming to the farms of thousands. * * * Yet the significant advance has been made in the thinking of a people. They are no longer afraid. They have caught the vision of their own powers."

T. V. A. is democracy on the march—toward a better life based on intelligent, imaginative effort. It gives a glimpse of what can be done when science and technology are used to cooperate with and also to control nature to make it serve mankind. Its duplication in other valleys, not only in America but in other parts of the world, may well help solve some of the problems which have prevented global peace.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FISH] stated a few minutes ago that his great State does not derive any benefit or aid under the provisions of the proposed bill. May I call his attention to pages 10, 31, 32, and 33 of the

report which shows the many projects authorized in his State.

Mr. FISH. They are very small projects. You put them all together and you have half a project.

Mr. SABATH. I think the committee gave New York everything which was needed and to which it was entitled.

Yes, we have been spending millions in Nebraska and other Middle Western States to relieve Dust Bowl sufferers and to protect against future dust storms and it is unfortunate that the memories of some of the Members are so short that they do not recollect the benefits and help given to other sections of the country which, of course, required expenditures.

Instead of acknowledging and being grateful for the spending of this money in the interests of the States and certain areas, I observe a continuous harping on the part of some members coming from the benefited regions that money appropriated by the Government has been expended by bureaucrats for unnecessary or questioned purposes and never give credit for the good that has been done and for the prosperity that has been brought to the Nation. In past years whenever a river and harbor bill or flood control bill was passed it was generally referred to as a "pork-barrel measure" and I must admit that they were generally enacted under a "pork barrel" administration. Under President Roosevelt, as is known, such appropriations have been eliminated and today before any appropriations for these improvements are voted a favorable report and recommendation are made by the Corps of Engineers. While they are not 100 percent right in their recommendations, nevertheless they give painstaking and conscientious study before reporting on the advisability of authorizing an appropriation for a project and not until they are satisfied that it is necessary and will be helpful and beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 or 10 years the Government has been spending money to relieve unemployment, to help business and for various purposes to bring prosperity back to the Nation. Appropriations of moneys have been made by the Government for projects in States that should have been properly borne by the States themselves, but I have failed to see any Member rise to object that the rights of the States were being infringed upon or to object to the Government expending money for needed safeguards as this bill provides.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I just could not sit here and listen to the gentleman's statement to the effect that State rights had not been violated, because to do that would be to violate my conscience. I do not care to make too much of an argument about it, but nevertheless, when certain States of this Nation enter into compacts, and for purely political and partisan reasons they are absolutely ignored, it is nothing else than a violation.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to say that my State is not receiving a great deal through this bill, and I am not complaining because I believe the committee has been extremely fair.

DEBT LIMIT BILL

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that beginning on Wednesday next it may be in order to consider the bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the debt limit of the United States; that there shall be not to exceed 4 hours of debate, to be confined to the bill, and to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by Will Kennedy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RESERVOIRS, LEVEES, AND WALLS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] 3 minutes.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, when we were considering the so-called simplification tax bill on last Thursday I pointed out that personal income taxes for the first 9 months of this fiscal year amounted to upward of $12,000,000,000. Of course, there will be a material increase in addition to that when the collections for the balance of the fiscal year are added. I made the charge that the pending bill was a revenue bill. Since that time I have verified some of my observations and am convinced more than ever that the so-called simplification bill is a revenue bill. It will provide new revenue from the personal income taxes upward of $2,000,000,000 as against a loss claimed by its proponents of $60,000,000.

By reducing the personal exemption of approximately 20,000,000 taxpayers—the figure is official—by $200 each there will be created additional taxable income of $4,000,000,000. Taxed at the minimum rate of 20 percent surtax and 3 percent normal tax, this increased taxable income will produce $920,000,000. The Treasury admits $300,000,000. This item will be further increased by the limitations placed on the use of this exemption.

By increasing the surtax rates there will result additional revenue of at least $750,000,000.

These estimates are conservative; also, they do not take into consideration any income from those whose taxes will be increased by reason of the reduction of the personal exemption placing them in the higher brackets, nor do they include any surtax income from those of the 9,000,000 Victory taxpayers who have never paid surtaxes before, but who will now be included in that category.

These new rates and adjustments will apply to income for the current calendar year. The bill makes them retroactive to January 1, 1944. The withholding features which the above manipulations are intended to implement are not effective until January 1, 1945. Hence all receipts for 1944 will be velvet.

The claim is that increases in the surtax rates and reduction in personal exemptions are necessary incident to simplification to offset increases in dependents' allowances of $290,000,000, losses by reason of the integration of the Victory tax of $240,000,000, and losses created by the standard deduction allowance amounting to $370,000,000. Accepting the figures as correct and making ample allowance, the new revenue under this bill will exceed $2,000,000,000. Additional revenue will be realized from the potentialities of the devices created by the bill.

This is in strong contrast with the claim that the Treasury by reason of the adoption of the bill in its present form will suffer a loss of $60,000,000.

It is also significant to note the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury before the Committee on Ways and Means when he was seeking $6,500,000,000 of additional revenue. He recommended the repeal of the Victory tax, the lowering of the personal exemptions, increased rates, and the repeal of the earned-income credit. The pattern at that time, when the Secretary of the Treasury was seeking an increase in taxes of $6,500,000,000, is very similar to that incorporated in the simplification bill. In the first instance the plea was for more revenue. Now, it is for simplification without substantially changing the number of taxpayers or the revenue yield under existing law.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP] 3 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi River Commission says that with the great Mississippi River levee system rapidly approaching completion, the control of the meander of the river has become the most urgent and difficult problem confronting those responsible for the safety of the valley and the maintenance of free, easy, and unobstructed navigation.

This, I am sure, you will find on page 13 of the report. It tells about the district which I represent at the present time being under water.

It is estimated that a million and a half acres of land are flooded by the Mississippi and its brim-full tributaries, the Illinois and Missouri Rivers.

From the Gorham, Jacob, and Minert sections of southern Illinois over 1,100 people were moved without the loss of a single life. When the levee broke around Ware and Wolf Lake, the people were evacuated without loss of life. Many had already moved from their homes and livestock had been transferred to places of safety.

It is expected that farmers will be afraid to plant another crop this year as the lowlands will probably flood again later.

I bring to your attention that these particular levees and dams were repaired last year. This is the largest flood they have had in that area in the past 100 years.

This piece of legislation is imperative to these people who need and deserve assistance.

I also want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of this House and the American people the grand job being done by the United States Coast Guard, the Federal troops, State militia, and the civilian volunteers. A word of commendation should also go to the American Red Cross and the Salvation Army for their fine work.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, while it is ordinarily considered that a bill of this type, on flood control, is a bill of expenditures, I think we can just as correctly discuss this legislation as though it were in fact a revenue bill, because flood control is a means both of saving expenditures to this Republic and, due to the fact that so many multiple-purpose dams are being built and provided, of increasing the revenue which this country can later collect in the form of taxes.

Before discussing this legislation any further, however, I wish to pay my personal respects to the splendid House Committee on Flood Control. I have frequently during the past 4 or 5 years been before that committee as a witness or sat in the committee room as a "kibitzer" watching it function. I know of no committee, although the House of Representatives is blessed by many hard-working, intelligent, and able committees, which approaches its work more systematically and painstakingly than the Committee on Flood Control. I know of no committee chairman who is more sincere, more courageous, and better informed on the responsibilities presented to his particular group than the amiable but very determined gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. I think this House can go far in accepting the recommendations of a committee and a committee chairman who habitually down through the years have approached their work with this systematic and statesmanlike attitude.

In discussing H. R. 4485, as a Representative from the First District of the State of South Dakota, I am naturally interested particularly in the project which deals with the Missouri River, which flows through my State all the way from north to south. But as a Member of the House of Representatives I am equally interested in the other projects, because this bill is of tremendous value to the country as a whole.

I have spent some time studying not only the specific proposals for the Missouri River, which begin on page 12 of the bill, but the other proposals encompassed in the entire omnibus flood-control bill. It seems to me we should keep clearly in mind that when we deal with a flood-control measure of this kind we are not simply orating about post-war planning but are actually engaging in specific and tangible post-war planning. Here is something tangible, here is something practicable, here is a post-war engineering program of river improvement which, if authorized, as I hope it will be in this legislation, will enable this country to get busy immediately after the war to take up the slack of unemployment and to correct some of the serious evils which have been plaguing this Republic since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure we all have high regard for the gentleman's opinion. I wonder if he feels that the provision on page 2, line 24, where authorization is given to the Chief of Engineers under the supervision of the Secretary of War to construct, maintain, and operate recreation, conservation, and other facilities, is a change from the present law.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; that is an amendment, and a very commendable one, written into this legislation and showing a growing tendency on the part of this Government to give additional consideration to conservation. It is my hope that the policy outlined in section 3 of the bill which emphasizes the opportunities for sound conservation developments will hereafter be included in all river-control legislation.

I want to say at this point that, unlike the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who seems somewhat worried about that provision, to me that is a very commendable policy, because as we conserve our natural resources, as we make available new recreational areas, as we learn to cooperate more intelligently with Nature and her great resources, we contribute not only to the health and to the happiness of this Republic but to its prosperity and to its wealth as well.

In dealing with flood control we are engaging in the challenging business of taking a destructive force, which destroys wealth and kills people and robs homes of their livelihood, and making it a constructive force. I know of nothing which should appeal more to the Members of this legislative body than an opportunity to change destructive forces into constructive powers. We do that in harnessing floods and utilizing the waters for constructive purposes.

I do not at all share the worry of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], that this is a dangerous piece of legislation. It seems to me it is very wise and economically sound post-war planning. It is the type of legislation to which this Congress should speedily devote itself not only in the field of water utilization and flood control but in other aspects of the great economic problem confronting this country. I am happy that this committee has brought before us something we can actually do now from the standpoint of meeting the post-war problems confronting this country.

I do agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], however, that we are facing some terrifically challenging financial problems after this war. I want to pursue that problem a little bit further. I would say to the gentleman, How do you meet a financial problem as a Government? You cannot repudiate your debts. We do not want to meet them by inflation. Consequently, we have to raise the tax money either by increasing the tax schedules or by expanding the base of taxation. This legislation gives us an opportunity to extend the base of taxation. It enables us to meet this problem by broadening the base of taxation so that present revenue schedules will raise an increased amount of money for the Federal Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you, sincerely. We have been advised by experts who have examined all of this evidence that the creation alone of the flood-control and irrigation projects proposed along the Missouri River, starting on page 12, will add a forty-ninth State to the Union, a forty-ninth State to help pay the taxes, a forty-ninth State to help take up the lag of employment, a forty-ninth State to assume its share of the great burden of debt which this country is going to have after the war. That, if you please, is wise economy. That, if you please, is why I say this could be considered a revenue bill, because these multiple-purpose dams not only eliminate the annual expenditures now caused in order to correct the damages of floods, but they in turn can be used with very little additional expense to generate power with which we can turn the wheels of industry. They can be used to make navigation available where navigation is feasible and necessary. They can be used—and I emphasize this because it is the most important of all—to provide irrigation in a great section of the agricultural Midwest which now has short crops in some seasons and no crops in others because of a lack of water. By using the water held back from the floods to irrigate these semiarid sections we are in turn making an economic contribution to this Republic by giving the farmers of that area the crops, the livestock, and the production necessary to assume their proper burden of taxation.

So I commend to this body the adoption of this rule and the passage of this legislation in the shape and the form recommended by the members of the Committee on Flood Control, who have given it such careful and analytical study.

In conclusion let me say a few words about the section of H. R. 4485 dealing with the Missouri River Basin. It is found beginning on page 12. It provides for the authorization of $200,000,000 for the initial construction on a plan of improvement of the Missouri River area for flood control, irrigation, power

development, navigation, and other purposes substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. It happens that I have been attending meetings and discussing plans for flood control and river improvement on the Missouri River since 1929. Last summer, in company with Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota; Col. Lewis A. Pick, of the United States Army engineers; Mr. W. G. Sloan, engineer with the Bureau of Reclamation; and others, I visited all eight States of the Missouri River area. From out of these years of study and work and this series of meetings I can tell you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that this program has the overwhelming support of the people of the eight States comprising the Missouri Valley area.

On the 1st of May the Bureau of Reclamation made a report to Congress comprising a comprehensive engineering study of the water resources of this same area. I have this report in my office. I have devoted many hours to its study and to discussing its provisions with various engineers, with many of my colleagues, and with representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Corps of Engineers. It gives me genuine gratification to report that the points on which the studies of the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Corps of Army Engineers complement and reinforce each other are far and away in excess of any points on which they are in conflict. In fact, the differences are so very minor that it is now apparent that a coordinated program of water utilization and river improvement can be developed between these two agencies which will provide the optimum benefits to the people living in this great Missouri River Valley.

Both the officials of the War Department and of the Bureau of Reclamation have shown a commendable willingness to sit down together in order to reconcile their studies and recommendations to each other. The Army engineers have agreed to build the dams high enough to impound water sufficient for irrigation and where this is desirable only the limitation of engineering science and topography will hold down the size of the dams for which a justifiable case can be constructed on sound economic grounds in connection with irrigation projects.

We in South Dakota are interested in all of the multiple purposes for which dams are built. We are interested in flood control because portions of our rich agricultural lands and some of our cities have been damaged by inundation through floods. In 1943 these floods on the Missouri River, which I would have you remember, is the longest river in the United States, caused a direct damage of $47,382,000. Indirect damages were even higher so that a $100,000,000 flood loss is a conservative figure to describe the costs of floods to this Republic last year along the Missouri River alone. This year this area is once again being seriously flooded.

We in South Dakota are interested in hydroelectric power. An abundance of cheap power will help electrify our farms and bring industries out to our State to process the raw materials with which we are so providentially blessed. We have the world's largest deposits of manganese in South Dakota. We have large undeveloped coal fields. We have timber. We have the richest gold mine in the world. We raise vast quantities of livestock and grains. For all of these reasons the citizens of South Dakota are vitally interested in the possibilities of abundant hydroelectric power.

For the same reasons that we are interested in power, we are interested in river navigation. Wherever river navigation is feasible and economically sound it finds ready supporters in South Dakota. Many of our products are of the type known as heavy commodities and anything which reduces transportation charges adds to the income of our citizens as shippers and reduces the costs of the heavy nonperishable supplies which we purchase.

Finally, and most emphatically, South Dakotans are interested in irrigation. Growing out of the river-development program outlined in House Document 475 and the May 1 report of the Bureau of Reclamation there now beckons to us one of the greatest and most profitable irrigation opportunities in this country. A proposed irrigation project near Huron, S. Dak., is one of the largest ever engineered by the Bureau of Reclamation. It encompasses some of the richest soil in this Republic. It envisages making available a regulated and consistent supply of moisture which will add greatly to the farm products available to this country and to the world. From the water impounded behind dams erected for flood control can come the source supply needed to fill irrigation ditches and bring moisture to hundreds of thousands of parched acres.

Because of his interest in irrigation, Governor Sharpe of South Dakota who more than any other one man has spearheaded the crusade to inaugurate a scientific program of river controls on the Missouri River, suggested when he appeared before the Flood Control Committee of the House on February 16 of this year that language could be written into the flood-control bill which would protect irrigation interests in the upper portions of the river valley. I am glad to report to the House that these reservations are incorporated in H. R. 4485. I refer this House to the language found on page 24 of the report and which in turn appears on pages 12 and 13 of the bill itself. I quote:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of that now authorized by existing law: *And provided further*, That portions of the storage authorized for the main stem of the river shall be placed on tributaries if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for silt control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial use without impairment of flood control below Sioux City and without increasing the authorized limit of cost.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4485 has been carefully designed to control floods and curtail their devastating ravages. It has been designed with equal care to provide for the constructive utilization of the water which now rages madly down the valley bringing death and destruction in its wake. It deserves the support of this House and the country. I hope the rule bringing it before us for action will be speedily adopted and that the legislation, itself, can be made a part of the laws of this land as a significant step in prudent and productive post-war planning.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may extend his own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RESERVATIONS FOR RESERVOIRS, LEVEES, AND FLOOD WALLS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and for other purposes, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, while national flood control appropriations except in emergencies to protect war plants have been discontinued for the duration, the losses in lives and property in the floods of 1943 and in the existing floods of 1944 in the midcontinental area have focused public attention not only upon the necessity of renewing flood control appropriations but upon the importance of extending and enlarging flood control authorizations.

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee on Flood Control conducted hearings during the month of June 1943, and an emergency appropriation of $10,000,000 was authorized and made for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood

control works threatened or destroyed by recent floods. These floods were widespread and the entire appropriation was expended.

A major flood is now in progress along the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries including the Missouri and the Illinois. The Chief of Engineers has visited the flood-stricken area and is making an estimate of the loss and damages and of the amounts required to repair flood control works which were constructed largely by the local interests so that crops for 1944 may be protected. The committee now plans to report speedily a separate authorization for the immediate emergency repairs.

COMPREHENSIVE AUTHORIZATIONS

H. R. 4485 was unanimously reported by the Committee on Flood Control after exhaustive public hearings in June 1943 and in February 1944, for authorizations in all of the principal river basins of the United States for construction following the war. A comprehensive report accompanies the bill, and the hearings in two volumes are available to Congress and the country.

FLOODS

Floods have harassed man in all ages and in all countries in both war and peace. The Chinese found it necessary to control the floods along the great rivers of the Celestial Empire from the earliest times. The records of floods in China extend over a period of 4,000 years. The levees along Chinese rivers were first constructed while Europe was still a wilderness. Some of China's greatest legendary heroes are her engineers. One of them is Li Ping. A beautiful temple has been erected to his memory. There is inscribed in letters of gold at the entrance of the temple his command: "Dig the bed deep and keep the banks low."

The Egyptians constructed dikes and reservoirs in the early dawn of history. Menes was the first king of the first dynasty. Some authorities place his reign about 4,000 years before Christ. Others place it 5,000 years before the Christian era. His flood-control project, according to the Greek historian Herodotus, appears to be the first undertaking of its kind on record. Levees were constructed to protect the ancient city of Memphis. Dams were built to provide water for the arid lands. Lake Moeris, a huge reservoir constructed by the Pharaohs of the twelfth dynasty, was accounted one of the seven wonders of the world.

Four thousand years ago the Egyptians built a canal 100 miles long to connect the waters of the Nile and the Red Sea. Canals were constructed in other countries in ancient times. The 1,200-mile Grand Canal of China, begun 2,500 years ago, is still the world's longest canal.

While ancient Egypt was struggling to regulate the waters of the Nile, Babylon controlled the waters of the Tigris and Euphrates. Elaborate canals and ditches were built to supplement the works of nature by Babylon 4,500 years before Christ.

The Romans maintained the ancient Egyptian flood-control and river works so efficiently after Egypt came under the dominion of Rome, that Egypt was the chief granery and one of the richest provinces of the Roman Empire. The structures built by the Egyptians are the oldest in history. The Great Pyramids, marvels of engineering, were constructed 5,000 years ago. "All things fear time, but time fears the Pyramids."

The longer one lives, the more one is impressed by the close connection between ancient and modern times. In both the ancient and modern worlds, engineers have played a chief part in all civilizations. When we think of flood control, we think of great engineers and great public works. Engineers made marvelous contributions to the civilizations of antiquity. They have left their monuments in systems of canals in the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys in great reservoirs like the Fayum in the upper Nile, in the Pyramids of ancient Egypt, in the Great Walls of China, and in aqueducts and highways of the Roman Empire. Herodotus tells us of the great works of the architect Rhoecus of Samos as he speaks of his marvelous reservoir works and of the great temple of Herah. An aqueduct was constructed by King Hezekiah to supply the city of Jerusalem long before Christ.

As civilization in all countries advanced, man attempted to improve and control rivers. Sometimes he undertook to control the ravages of disastrous floods by keeping the high waters within the banks and between the levees supplementing the banks. Again he utilized diversions and constructed floodways. At other times he stored the excess waters in rainy seasons for use in time of scarcity. Dams were constructed to detain the flood waters to prevent the overflow of the valleys.

Floods are not more frequent than formerly. There were floods long before De Soto discovered the Mississippi and long before the Ohio Valley was settled. Deforestation has little to do with the frequency of floods. Soil erosion has been going on through the ages; it is responsible for the alluvial valleys of the United States. There is nothing new about dust storms. They have occurred in the United States and other countries for centuries, but man's mistreatment of the soil has multiplied both soil erosion and dust storms.

Rivers are among Nature's best contributions to the progress of man. But man must supplement nature. Impediments to navigation must be removed. Canals must be constructed, channels must be deepened, harbors must be kept open, and barriers must be removed. Transportation by water is the cheapest form of transportation, and the denser the population the greater the need for cheap transportation.

Rivers have always contributed to the advancement of mankind. The lack of navigable rivers has hindered the development of many countries. Cities in ancient and modern times located along the great rivers have grown and prospered. What would London be without the Thames? What would New York be without the Hudson? What would St. Louis be without the Mississippi? While rivers are among Nature's greatest contributions, they must be improved, they must be controlled.

I know of no history that does not deal much with rivers. I know of no legend or fable that does not include rivers. There is a charm and majesty about rivers. As the ocean awes with its resistless power, so the river thrills and delights. The river is the most human and most companionable of all inanimate objects; it has a voice of its own; it is full of good fellowship and of delightful companionship. It can be friendly and helpful or it can be threatening and destructive; it can be gay or it can be grave.

A drop of water could tell a wonderful story. It has made the long journey from the river to the ocean millions and millions of times. It has been lifted by the blazing sun from the sea or gulf, carried by the wind and storm across the plains, the hills, the valleys, and the mountains to fall as rain or snow and to join other billions of drops of water to form the little brook that ultimately finds its way into the great river that flows ever onward to the sea.

METHODS TESTED AND APPROVED

The history of floods in the United States and other countries is well known. They are not more frequent, as I have stated, but because of the advance in civilization, the destruction is greater. The forces of nature have been constant through the centuries. The time for argument and disputation with respect to the methods of solving flood problems has passed. Man cannot prevent floods but he can control them. He cannot prevent nor can he change the amount of rainfall, but he can alter the rate at which it will run off. He cannot prevent, nor can he change the amount of snowfall, but he can delay the snow by dense foliage and by other means from reaching the ground, and he can hinder the snow when it has reached the ground from being converted into rapid run-off. He can check the ravages of disastrous floods by keeping high waters within the banks and between levees supplementing the banks. He can hold back the rains and the snows by dams along the tributaries of the headwaters. He can detain the floods by larger dams below the headwaters. He can supplement the levees by diversion and floodways. He can straighten the channels and thus hasten the discharge.

The United States leads the world in engineering structures. Fort Peck, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dams will each impound larger volumes of water than the far-famed Assuan Dam in the upper stretches of the Nile. The Panama Canal is the greatest artificial waterway ever built by the hand of man. The levees along the lower Mississippi River have required more than three times the excavation of the Panama Canal and they are the most massive structures in the history of mankind. Unparalleled progress in flood control has

been made in the United States. The improvements began along the lower Mississippi River. More progress in the control of floods has been made in the United States in the past 15 years than in the preceding 150 years, and probably more progress has been made in flood control in the past 15 years than in the preceding 1,500 years. We now know that floods cannot be prevented, but we know they can be controlled. The works along the lower Mississippi River were primarily in aid of navigation until the great flood of 1927.

The Flood Control Act of 1928 first proclaimed that flood control was a national problem. A national policy for flood control was first adopted in 1936. The policy and the program initiated by the act of 1936 have been extended by subsequent acts of Congress, including the acts of 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1941. The country and the Congress are in agreement that the planning and execution of flood-control projects should be a function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and that the investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention should be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture.

Prior to the act of 1936 flood control had obtained only along the lower Mississippi River and along the Sacramento River primarily in aid of navigation. The bill now under consideration reaffirms the policy proclaimed in the act of 1936. The bill constitutes legislative planning for post-war construction. It introduces certain modifications in the policy of national flood control, especially with respect to administrative procedure which will aid in carrying out the national flood-control program.

The works along the lower Mississippi River were tested in 1937, and the floods of 1943 and 1944 in the lower Mississippi Valley prove that Old Man River has been bridled and harnessed. The local protective works along the Ohio River were tested as they withstood the floods in the fall and winter of 1942. All factors of safety have been utilized. Levees, flood walls, reservoirs, cut-offs, spillways, channel improvements, and diversions have been authorized and constructed. The methods have been tested. The policy is sound. There is a reason for the success of the program. All planning and all construction are under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, who are the outstanding flood-control engineers of this or any other country and of this or any other age. Since 1936 substantially $1,000,000,000 for national flood control for projects outside the lower Mississippi Valley has been authorized. Works have been approved in all the principal drainage basins of the United States. The Flood Control Acts of 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1941 approved works at an estimated cost of some $2,500,000,000, but only partial authorizations for less than $1,000,000,000 for the initiation and construction of the more important works were made. Congress has manifested foresight. The additional authorizations aggregating $810,000,000 in the pending bill will provide for construction of flood-control works in all the river basins of the United States.

ENGINEERS AND RIVERS

In time of war engineers have always constructed the weapons of destruction. They build the tanks, the airplanes, the battleships, and the structures essential for the advance of the armies. No profession has contributed more to the progress of mankind than the engineers.

Rivers have served man in the past. They have molded peoples, and they have contributed to progress. In the future, as in the past, rivers will make nations great.

Rivers interest me. They fascinate me. They have always influenced the course of civilization. They have a character all their own. They flow through the years and through the lands, and they flow across civilization. They make history. They bring life, and they bring destruction. They are the friends or they may be the enemies of man. Man himself makes the final choice.

Rivers are just as important in peace as in war. The great Russian and German battles have been fought over the Don, the Donets, and the Dnieper Rivers. The most famous campaigns of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant were along the Tennessee and the Mississippi Rivers. Rivers influence the course of war, but they influence the course of peace no less than war.

There are small rivers that are just as important as large rivers. There are small men who are just as great as large men. Important rivers, like important men, are not always large in size. Many of the most important rivers in the world are comparatively small, while the names of others much larger are seldom heard.

Of all rivers, the Mississippi is the most marvelous. Below the Missouri its waters are muddy. South of Cairo it flows into the Gulf of Mexico through the alluvial valley. The valley averages from 20 to 80 miles in width. Above the mouth of the Missouri its waters are green. There are beautiful palisades and wonderful limestone cliffs that tower far above the green waters. In the upper stretches the Falls of St. Anthony are not only beautiful but they are renowned in song and story. The Indians spoke of the Mississippi as the "Big River." When we think of the Mississippi River, we think of power and of glory. It is not only the longest but it is the greatest navigable river in all the world. It loses none of its interest and its fascination as it travels toward the sea.

The accomplishments of the United States Corps of Engineers have been characterized by initiative and courage. Experiments as well as studies have been utilized. The cut-offs that have shortened the lower Mississippi River between Helena and Baton Rouge substantially 138 miles, tested as they have been by actual floods, are among the monumental engineering achievements of the world.

NOT FINAL NOR STATIC

Flood control, like science, knows no finality. The adopted projects are flexible and can be expanded. All works, as authorized, will be utilized in the program of expansion. Flood control is neither final nor static. As new problems arise, new solutions will be found.

FLOOD CONTROL AND CONSERVATION NOT SYNONYMOUS

Power advocates and conservationists often foster projects under the guise of flood control. Water is the most valuable of our natural resources. It should be utilized for the benefit of man. It should not be wasted nor polluted. There is a place for soil conservation. There is a place for reforestation. Power must be developed. However, soil conservation and reforestation supplement but do not supplant flood-control works. Water uses and water conservation should be provided, where feasible, in the construction of dams. Power should be developed wherever practicable in the building of dams, but the public should be advised whether the works are primarily for power or primarily for flood control. They should be informed that there is a difference between flood control, and soil conservation, and reforestation. They know that floods obtained in the United States before the white man cut a tree or plowed a furrow. They know that a full reservoir is essential for the development of power, but they also know that an empty reservoir is essential for the storage of floodwaters. There is a place, however, for the multiple-purpose reservoir. Provision wherever practicable and economical can be made in the first instance for the storage of water for the development of power, but additional provision where required should be made for floods. All existing flood-control acts provide that penstocks in reservoirs shall be installed by the engineers where there are probabilities that power may be developed. The methods of flood control contemplate that floodwaters shall serve and not destroy man.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Pardon me, in just a few minutes.

POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. Chairman, we hear a great deal about post-war planning. We heard much of planning during the great depression that followed the crash of 1929. Much of the proposed planning is too theoretical. It is impractical. Too many professional planners cover too much territory, so to speak. They embrace too many activities, with the result that there is no definite information for legislation for specific improvements that are urgently demanded and that are entirely practical. Many of the so-called related activities are only remotely connected with the important activities. Confusion results. There is delay. Only tried and tested methods should be used. The jurisdiction of the Federal agencies for both planning and construction of the

works has been definitely settled. Congress and the country are agreed that both the planning and execution of flood-control projects should be under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

PUBLIC WORKS

Total war must be followed by total peace. Of course, the immediate task is to win the war, but when the war is won, when war production stops, and when our armed forces are demobilized, serious unemployment problems will arise. Wishful thinking is not sound planning. Careful study, more careful planning, and immediate preparation are essential. Prompt action now is imperative to provide for economic conditions then.

PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION

There is a place for private as well as public construction. There is a definite field for each. Private construction includes housing, utilities, railways, and industrial construction. Private construction, like public construction, has been curtailed during the war. There will be an accumulated demand in the post-war period.

There are local public works that should be promoted and financed by the city, by the county, and by the State. Local sanitation, hospitals, and additional school structures will be needed in the post-war program. Victory is our chief objective, but true patriotism transcends war. Public works will be required following the war. There must be adequate planning now not only for peace following the war but for employment following the war. Otherwise the objectives of our armed forces will have been in vain. There is no place for the dole or work-relief program. They would only add to the economic ills following war. Public works contemplate long-range planning. They should be provided now for construction then. They must be fully planned if they are to be federally financed.

Many projects have been proposed under the guise of public works, but every proposal should be studied and tested. They should meet the requirements of sound public works. First, the project should have practical utility. Second, it should be economically sound. Third, it should be of the type that cannot compete with any facilities that can be provided through private enterprise. Federal public works should not conflict with private works and local public works.

Flood-control projects constructed in one State often benefit another State. Flood-control works are national in scope. They meet the Federal test. I know of no more satisfactory public works than flood-control improvements.

STUDIES

All of the principal rivers of the United States have been studied or surveyed by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. Reports have been submitted to Congress. Levees, flood walls, and reservoirs have been constructed. Local protective works along the Connecticut and reservoirs along the tributaries of the Connecticut have been constructed in New England. Authorized flood-control works have been constructed by the Corps of Engineers from Hartford, Conn., to Los Angeles, Calif., and from Seattle, Wash., to Jacksonville, Fla.

BACKLOG

We recall the depression following World War No. 1. We are apprehensive of another debacle following the present war. It is difficult to arm. It is more difficult to disarm. Post-war unemployment will be a major national problem. While we are defending our freedom and our way of life, we must not fail to take stock of the problem of unemployment which we must face when the war is over.

We must profit by the experience of 1920. We must profit by the experience of 1930. A reservoir of projects must be adopted. Backlogs should be provided and they should be real backlogs. Many wasteful and extravagant activities to provide employment were adopted in 1933. Haste and speed were imperative. There was hunger in the land. Unemployment was widespread. There must be no repetition of waste and extravagance. There are Federal activities and there are public works that will promote the general welfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The bill under consideration provides flood-control authorizations to increase the backlog of sound projects and to enlarge the reservoir of useful public works following the war. After all, the real problems of war never come until the war is over. Peace is really more difficult than war.

APPROVAL BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The system for studying and investigating flood-control projects is most efficient. The Chief of Engineers has the final say. Under his supervision is the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington. In the field there is the division engineer. Under his supervision is the district engineer. All problems and projects are carefully studied and surveyed by the district engineer in the field. Their reports are reviewed by the division engineer. The reports and recommendations of the division engineers are reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and finally before submission to Congress, the reports are examined and either approved or disapproved by the Chief of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers represents the country and the Public Treasury. The pending bill contains no projects that has not been favorably considered by the Corps of Engineers and recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

DOMINANT INTERESTS

The Committee on Flood Control has adhered to the policy of reporting bills and reporting projects where the dominant interest is flood control. It often appears that navigation, irrigation, or power is involved. Provision is made for their development. Differences of opinion in executive departments as to the dominant interests respecting a few of the projects included in the bill exist. All interests were heard, and only those projects where the preponderance of the testimony showed that flood control was paramount are contained in the pending bill.

The Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, contained all of the projects approved by the committee on which favorable reports had been submitted by the Chief of Engineers. Since the act of 1941, a number of reports on surveys authorized by Congress have been completed and reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and reports on flood-control projects with favorable recommendations have been submitted to Congress. The bill provides for additional authorizations for the prosecution of approved comprehensive plans, and it authorizes a number of individual projects which have been found economically feasible and desirable. It continues the procedure of authorizing additional surveys and examinations for flood control and finally authorizes the sum of $810,000,000 to be appropriated for post-war construction.

RESERVOIRS

Flood control is a national problem, and while local works are required in many cases, local works are not effective in other cases. In the case of reservoirs, it is most difficult to determine and to distribute among local interests the costs of construction. Moreover, reservoirs in one State detain waters that flood another State. Floods know no State lines. Reservoirs were authorized under the act of 1936, but they were not constructed except in some parts of the far West where there were no valleys and where the areas were largely canyon and without much value. Reservoirs were authorized along the tributaries of the Ohio, but they were not constructed because in many cases they did not benefit or protect from floods the areas in the States where they were located below the dams. The protection extended to other States. In some cases navigation was involved.

The country insisted that levees and flood walls alone would not do the job. Engineers maintained that the waters must be detained at the source and that reservoirs only would be effectitve. I repeat to emphasize that experience demonstrated that such reservoirs can only be constructed throughout the country upon the Federal Government's assuming the costs of easements and construction. The principle of local contribution otherwise obtains. Along all rivers the local interests are required to furnish the rights-of-way for levees and flood walls and to maintain the projects after completion. If the policy of the Government paying the costs of the rights-of-way for levees were abandoned, flood control would be irretrievably set back.

Again, under the guise of States' rights but in reality voicing the policy of the Power Trusts, there are those who object and oppose the construction of reservoirs for flood control where those reservoirs contain power possibilities. The opposition is without merit. Water is our

most valuable resource. If floodwaters can be detained and if provision could be made economically for the development of power for the benefit of all the people in the area where they are located, a Federal policy that prevented the development of such power would be short-sighted. It would not be in the public or the national interest. It is passing strange that those who oppose the Federal Government's developing power and disposing of it to the people in the area where produced, giving to public institutions the refusal of the power with provision for compensating from the proceeds of power sold, the State and local jurisdictions for taxes that might otherwise be levied against private interests advocate construction by the power interests. At the same time those who oppose the Government's developing and disposing of power so produced advocate reservoirs for the generation of power by private institutions. I know of no more effective prevention of monopolistic power rates than Federal projects that we have as a yardstick where they are justified in the river basins of the United States.

We have heard a great deal about reservoirs. We have heard about reservoirs being authorized and constructed in one State and we have heard that the beautiful valleys and farms in certain other States have been destroyed. It is time for a little careful thinking. Congress authorized a number of reservoirs in the upper Ohio in 1936, and it authorized reservoirs in every part of the United States to supplement the levees the diversions, and the floodways but except in the far West where the rights-of-way and the easements had no values in canyon countries, there were no reservoirs for flood control constructed until in 1938 when the construction of reservoirs was authorized at Federal expense.

There is a reason for that. It is difficult to apportion among the citizens along the Ohio River the benefits that will accrue to them by the construction of reservoirs along the tributaries of the Allegheny and the Monongahela, but they are in the interest of the national welfare. It is difficult to ascertain and by State compact or otherwise distribute in all fairness among the cities and the communities of the lower Connecticut River the benefits that will accrue from the construction of reservoirs in New Hampshire and in Vermont, yet I have heard some friends say, and they almost shed crocodile tears as they say it, that reservoirs will destroy the beautiful valleys in the magnificent Green Mountains and White Mountains.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object to that because we have not shed any crocodile tears.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say in all fairness, and I respect the gentleman's opinion, that in those States there can be no projects for the development of power by utility companies that do not destroy the valleys in the same way. If we are going to shed tears—and I gladly withdraw the term "crocodile" because I have too high a regard for the gentleman and I would not hurt the gentleman's feelings for anything in the world—if we are concerned, so vitally concerned, with respect to reservoirs and flood control, we might equally be concerned when those same valleys and the same areas are destroyed by projects that develop power where high dams are essential for the development of that power, by utility companies.

Mr. Chairman, it must be kept in mind that while the Federal Government underwrites the cost of easements and rights-of-way and of reservoirs and all projects in all river basins throughout the United States, the Federal Government requires the local interest to provide for the rights-of-way for local levees and local protective works. That rule is universal and that yardstick obtains in all parts of the country. I know of no more effective prevention where flood control can be provided by reservoirs soundly and adequately, and personally I know of no reason why, if there can be developed at those reservoirs power for the benefit of the people in the area where reservoirs are located to give them a yardstick in order to ascertain if the power companies and the utilities are charging them a fair price, we should not provide for this development. Moreover, if down in Alabama and Tennessee the T. V. A. can pay to those States a part of the income from T. V. A. to supplement the loss of taxes if those projects were under private development, I know of no reason why that cannot be done elsewhere.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RECLAMATION

It is a source of satisfaction to me that there has always been cooperation between the advocates of flood control, rivers and harbors, and reclamation. The utilization of our natural resources has been promoted by all. Unfortunately there is rivalry not only among groups but in governmental departments. There is room enough in this broad land of ours for all activities to utilize water for the progress of man. There is no real occasion for rivalry or conflict. Those who promote discord and those who undertake to drive a wedge between the advocates of flood control and reclamation are rendering both interests a distinct disservice.

Much is said about the appropriation of waters and about rights of States to the uses of water. The Committee on Flood Control has been most careful to recommend no project and to include no provision in the pending bill that would in any way retard reclamation. As I have indicated, no project has been reported unless the dominant interest is flood control. The committee went out of its way. It invited the Commissioner of Reclamation to appear before the committee. It invited those who shared his views and his fears to submit their argument to the committee. Careful consideration was given to the views of all. The States have no power of appropriation or power of use that is not accorded to them under the Constitution. While the State control of waters is subordinate to the jurisdiction of the United States under the Constitution, as decided in the case of *United States* v. *Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Co.* (174 U. S. 690), *United States* v. *Appalachian Power Co.—the New River case*—(311 U. S. 377), and *Oklahoma* v. *Atkinson*—the *Red River case*—(313 U. S. 556), and while the paramount right under the commerce clause of the Constitution is in the Federal Government, in every way even to the extent of stretching the Constitution, the Federal Government has cooperated with the arid States and has promoted and aided reclamation. The Committee on Flood Control gave most careful consideration to the recommendations of the Commissioner of Reclamation as to legislative provisions. Section 6 is included in the bill to protect and to promote reclamation. There is no occasion for quibbling. Reclamation projects constructed will be under the control and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield myself 10 additional minutes in order to answer any questions that may be asked.

The Committee on Flood Control is not unaware of the fact that some friends of reclamation were disturbed about the Missouri River Basin project contained in the bill. All reasonable safeguards to show that it is the intent and purpose of the authorization to recognize existing rights are contained in the bill. In fact, the committee has leaned over backward in an effort to cooperate with the Bureau of Reclamation. With repeated floods, especially from Sioux City to St. Louis, there can be no question but what the dominant interest along the Missouri River Basin is flood control.

I repeat to emphasize that reservoirs along the main stem of the river above Sioux City will not provide for any waters except waters that empty into the main river from the tributaries, and I repeat also to emphasize that there is nothing in the bill to prevent the water on the tributaries from being utilized for the development of the arid lands before and after it reaches the main stem of the Missouri River. The people who suffer from devastating floods will be more than pleased if the waters are not only utilized but detained at their source.

The Kings River and Kern River projects in the bill were recommended by the Chief of Engineers. His reports were submitted as required by acts of Congress. The Bureau of Reclamation also investigated and reported on these rivers. The testimony discloses that the Bureau is anxious to be authorized to construct the works along these rivers. Fundamentally the Bureau of Reclamation is concerned with the development of public lands. Along Kings and Kern Rivers there is no public lands. There are no Federal reclamation projects. The people in these valleys have constructed and operated their own reclamation projects and they oppose the supervision of their projects by the Bureau of Reclamation or by any other Federal agency. I commend the people of the valley for providing for their own needs to cultivate their lands rather than coming to Congress to do for them what they can better do for themselves. The committee held repeated hearings. With one

accord, the citizens of both valleys advocated the project as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in preference to the project as recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation. The committee felt that flood control was dominant and provision is made not only for flood control but for proper development of power that can be utilized in the area in which it is generated.

The proposed projects will in nowise interfere with the operation of the so-called Central Valley Authority. Any works along these valleys or in the Sacramento Valley supplement the proposed works in the Central Valley. The people are entitled to a voice in the Federal agency under which they work and live. The Committee on Flood Control followed not only the engineering recommendations of both the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation but gave consideration to the views of the citizens of these two splendid valleys who throughout the years have made large expenditures to protect their lives and property from floods and have constructed their own irrigation and reclamation works without Federal contribution or supervision.

NO CONFLICT

The validity of the Central Valley Authority of the Bonneville Dam, of the Grand Coulee Dam, and of the Fort Peck Dam rests upon the commerce clause of the Constitution. All of these projects were finally authorized in river and harbor legislation. The Grand Coulee and the Central Valley Authority are being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, but they were authorized in river and harbor bills under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

There is no real conflict between navigation, flood control, and irrigation. The Supreme Court in the *Arizona case* (295 U. S. 174), held that Congress could authorize a dam across the Colorado River without regard to the jurisdiction of an adjoining State in respect of the appropriation, use, and distribution of its equitable share of water. While navigation is paramount, reclamation uses are important.

There is no occasion for the West to be apprehensive. I favor the utilization of waters within the States for domestic uses and for irrigation. I want to protect the citizens of other parts of the country in their riparian privileges and in the enjoyment of their ripari n rights. All such rights whether in the West or elsewhere along the navigable rivers are subordinate to improvements in the discretion of Congress for flood control and navigation. The rights of the West are safeguarded in the bill. The Western States are protected in the continued utilization of the water resources under existing law. No existing law whether State or Federal is valid unless it is constitutional. Quibbling, misinterpreting, or misrepresenting with respect to existing legislation, whether State or Federal, can only hurt the cause or reclamation. Flood-control projects in the West have been constructed along the Sacramento River and other streams for years. No conflict with respect to the domestic use of water, or the use of water for irrigation has arisen.

ANALYSIS BY SECTIONS

There is a careful analysis of the bill by sections in the comprehensive report submitted by the committee. The membership of the House would do well to read the complete report. Each project is described and justified. No project is included unless the benefits exceed the costs under findings of the Chief of Engineers.

If a man is to produce in factories along the rivers and if man is to cultivate the fertile valleys, his life and property must be protected. Citizens cannot live in peace or contribute to the national welfare unless they are secure in life and property. Agriculture cannct succeed and industry cannot afford to venture where overflows occur periodically without security.

I should like to make a brief analysis of the bill at this point.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has made a very interesting statement on this very pressing and important subject. I think the gentleman stated that in the last 15 years we have made greater progress in flood control programs than we made in the last 150 years of our history. I believe that was the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is my view, yes; whether I be right or wrong.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I want to say to the Members of the House and to the country that the gentleman from Mississippi is too modest to tell us the part he has played in this remarkable program. The gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, has been responsible for this farsighted, comprehensive program that has saved our country millions of dollars from flood disasters. For 4 years I had the privilege of working with the distinguished chairman of this committee and have personal knowledge of his industry, clear thinking, and deep insight into the problems of flood control. I remember the time, Mr. Chairman, when he and a few others started to advocate the idea that the important thing to do in the control of floods was to build reservoirs and impound the waters at their sources. He was a leader and pioneer in that line of thought, and today we are beginning to see the beneficial effects of a workable, national, and comprehensive flood-control program. The country owes you, sir, a great debt of gratitude.

I desire also to commend the gentleman's committee not only for the hard work they have done on this bill but for the great program they have offered the country now and in the years to come.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I think that the Members of the House generally share the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Missouri.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question with respect to the power that may be authorized under this bill. Some time ago the gentleman made a speech in which he said that flood-control bills did not authorize the installation of generators or generating equipment but that penstocks might be included in an authorization or in the construction of a project if recommended by the Federal Power Commission. Is there any change in that situation or is there any change proposed by this bill? In other words, will it require separate legislation before any power generators can be installed in any construction proposed to be authorized?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman's question is very pertinent. The answer is, "No." Soundly, when a project, a reservoir, or a dam is built for flood control, if it appears that there are possibilities for the development of power the flood control acts, beginning with 1938, have required that a penstock be installed if recommended by the Federal Power Commission and by the Chief of Engineers, but no provision is made for the installation of facilities for the generation of power, in the flood control bills.

I should like to say in this connection that with respect to the dam in southern Vermont mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] that dam is authorized under existing legislation. It is my view that there is no provision for the development of a power dam there, that it would increase the price of the original authorization two or three times, until Congress authorized it. I will say that Congress has not authorized the dam for the development of power. As pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], this bill specifically states that at this point in Vermont the dam shall be only for flood control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I join my colleagues in the tribute that has been paid to our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Flood Control on the work he has done and the interest he has taken in this legislation.

The program that has just been discussed has to do with post-war planning. A number of us in the Middle West are very deeply concerned with respect to the damage that has just come about by reason of the floods in the Middle West, especially. Will the chairman of the committee give us some idea as to what we may expect in the way of legislation to take care of that situation in the immediate future?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That was the first statement I made when I began my remarks. I stated that the committee had requested the Chief of Engineers to

look into this matter, and he has gone out personally and has instructed the district and division engineers to investigate, so that when we come before you, as we expect to, with a recommendation for an emergency appropriation to repair those damages caused by one of the major floods in the history of the country, we shall have something definite on which to base a recommendation to Congress. I trust that we shall be able to submit a recommendation in the next few days.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to ask this question for the record. Referring to section 1 of the bill, which provides that the investigation shall be under the Secretary of War and the Department of Agriculture, it is not the intention of the committee, is it, that this would prevent the Bureau of Reclamation from continuing the type of investigations they are now authorized to make under existing law?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all. On the contrary, the investigation as far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned is limited to such matters as watersheds and measures of run-offs. It is the language that has been employed in all previous flood-control bills, beginning in 1936.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. Do I correctly understand that the money that will be appropriated as the result of this bill will be for repair and not for any new projects which will have to do with the control of the waters in the future?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This bill deals with new projects.

Mr. BISHOP. The old bill carried money for these repairs.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is no money at all here for emergency repairs. Last year Congress appropriated $10,000,000, and that was exhausted. I stated that for the repair of works in Illinois, Missouri, and other States, made necessary by the recent floods, we had asked the chief of engineers to give us a report. We intend to submit a report, of course, to provide for any repairs to existing works that may be necessary. It will be something definite.

Mr. BISHOP. That will continue immediately if this bill goes through?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. This pending bill has to do with post-war construction.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In connection with the statement the gentleman made to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] a few minutes ago about these emergency repairs, the gentleman stated that that bill might come up within the next few days. Is there any date on which the gentleman might fix that time, so that we might tell the people at home when this might be contemplated?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The floods are still in progress. They are at that peak where nothing could be done presently. It is soggy and boggy out there. Before the committee makes a recommendation to Congress, we want to have the facts and figures on which to make the recommendation. They acted promptly a year ago. I think they will act as promptly as the circumstances permit.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. On page 25 and the following pages I see listed here a number of items. I know of one that ought to be listed here but is not so listed. What are the steps necessary to get a worthy project listed as these are?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. For investigation? If the gentleman will submit to the committee the name of the project, we will take it up with the Chief of Engineers. If it has not been investigated and the Chief of Engineers thinks it should be investigated, we will provide for it. That may be done in this bill or in a resolution adopted by the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. This has already been investigated by the Army engineers and reported on.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will give me the name of the project, I shall be glad to give him an answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I now want to make an analysis of the bill. If you have the bill before you, it might be helpful, if you follow me.

The first section of the bill reaffirms the existing law, as I stated to the gentleman from Nebraska. It inserts there "channel and major drainage improvements," because channel improvements are sometimes essential in flood control.

Section 2 of the bill is identical with existing law. It relates to the policy regarding the requirements of local contributions, and makes those requirements applicable to the projects authorized in this bill.

With respect to recreational facilities, in section 3, under the policy that has been adopted frequently at reservoirs, authorizing a small pool, it provides for recreation, for swimming, or for fishing. People may come there as they do at other lakes who would like to have reservations for recreation. Section 3 authorizes the Secretary of War to lease or sell for longer than 5 years the lands there if people want to build small cottages on any of the lands bordering these lakes or pools. The word "facility" means and should be construed to mean that if in the selling of those leases for the building of cottages it is necessary to put in a highway or road, that facility will be authorized.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. What is the gentleman's interpretation of the language in line 25, in section 3, which relates to other facilities thereat advantageous to the interests of the United States?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am glad the gentleman referred to this. The word "thereat" is important. As I stated a moment ago, it embraces the matter of constructing a local road to get around to those lands that may be sold to people for the purpose of building cottages or having a place there to fish in the pool. It has nothing on earth to do with reclamation or with power.

Section 4 provides that if there is a town or a city or a municipality that needs an additional water supply—and water is just as essential for human beings as it is for crops—the Chief of Engineers shall have the right to provide that that water shall be used there for the purpose of supplying the needs of man. It strikes me that that provision is a power that now obtains under the reclamation law. If it obtains under the reclamation law, I know of no good reason why it should not obtain in the existing bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Will the gentleman define the word "surplus" used in section 4 in referring to surplus water? In the West we have the doctrine of appropriation, for all water in a stream is appropriated. I anticipate a flood-control project where that water would be stored temporarily. It would not be surplus water. It is appropriated for irrigation purposes. The gentleman does not mean to interfere with any appropriated water?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. I would think that this had primary reference to reservoirs for flood control. My general judgment, in answer to the gentleman's question, is that practically all of that water is surplus, and that may be disposed of, if the reservoir is for flood control.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman please explain what is meant by the words in line 12, "any reservoir in control of the War Department." What I am aiming at is, does this mean all reservoirs built under this law will be managed or operated by the War Department?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Except where otherwise provided. That is true except where otherwise provided. This language here means, all reservoirs authorized for flood control that I know anything about, primarily are under the control of the War Department.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I am thinking of one reservoir we built, or rather, which the city I live in built. You are going to enlarge that dam and make the

reservoir larger. Will the city management that pertains there now be supplanted by the War Department management?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a fair question. Whenever the city, county, and State decides that they want Federal cooperation, as a general rule that city and that county or that State will sacrifice local supervision, because it is the universal policy for Uncle Sam to follow the dollar that he invests by giving his agents, the representatives of the entire people, supervision of the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, section 5 merely gives the Chief Engineer as the representative of the Government, supervision over reservoirs that the Government has built for flood control.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question in connection with section 5, which gives the Chief of Engineers supervision over reservoirs. Of course, under the law, the Tennessee Valley Authority dams are operated for multiple purposes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is going into that question I rather hate to ask for additional time and wish that the gentleman would reserve that question for a moment, if he will.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will yield in just a moment. I would ask the gentleman to reserve his question.

Section 5 gives supervision of operation for flood control and navigation to the Chief of Engineers.

Section 6 speaks for itself in an effort to lean over backward, and gives to the Secretary of the Interior power of handling reclamation and the disposal of reclamation waters provided by the projects authorized in this bill.

Section 7 authorizes the adoption of projects named in the bill, extending from the Connecticut Valley in New England to Los Angeles and from Portland to Florida in practically every river basin in the United States. The next section of the bill authorizes preliminary examination and surveys on streams that have not been reported.

Then this bill authorizes soil-conservation projects that have been reported to the committee by the Department of Agriculture, and authorizes the reappropriation of the balance of $10,000,000 that has been used in this work, and makes provision for temporary repairs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, and I want to yield to the gentleman from Vermont, but I hesitate to ask for additional time. But may I ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] what is his question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It seems to me these dams on the Tennessee River under the Tennessee Valley Authority should be excluded from the supervision of the Secretary of War.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They may be and they may not be, but personally I think if the Tennessee Valley Authority was authorized and sustained by the Supreme Court, primarily for the development and improvement of navigation and flood control, that the Chief of Engineers, the representative of the Government, should have something to do with its utilization to provide for flood control. I will come to that later and discuss it under the 5-minute rule, if necessary.

I now yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman define what is meant by the words "construction of a high dam" on page 5, line 19?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am glad to do that if the gentleman desires.

My construction of that is it does not provide for construction of a power dam in Vermont at Williamsville, but only for a flood-control dam as contemplated by the act of 1938.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Am I to understand that no penstock will be installed?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That would depend upon the views of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission, but it does not provide for the generation of power.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to say that the two principal authorizations in the bill under consideration are for the Missouri River Basin and for the lower Mississippi River. There are authorizations of $200,000,000 in each. The authorizations are fully explained in the report of the committee. I now return to the analysis of the bill by sections:

SECTION 1. POLICY

Section 1 is similar to existing law, and clarifies the language contained in the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and subsequent acts to show clearly that flood control shall be construed to include channel and major drainage improvements. It reaffirms the declaration of policy respecting flood control and provides for investigation, planning, and prosecution by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army of flood control and allied works, and investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention by the Department of Agriculture.

SECTION 2. LOCAL COOPERATION

Section 2 is identical with existing law. It restates the policy regarding requirements of local cooperation.

SECTION 3. RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

To date the Corps of Engineers has placed in operation some 42 dam and reservoir projects widely dispersed throughout the United States. A large number of these reservoirs present opportunities for recreational development of widespread interest and benefit at very little cost. At the present time there is no authority to expend the small amounts of funds needed to make the recreation and conservation values at these reservoirs fully available. This committee is of the opinion that where practicable, without reducing flood-control benefits, projects should be fully utilized to provide recreational facilities for the benefit of the general public.

Section 3 authorizes the Chief of Engineers to construct, maintain, and operate recreation and conservation facilities such as roads or to permit the construction, maintenance, or operation of such facilities, and it would authorize the Secretary of War to grant leases of lands, structures, or facilities in the reservoir areas for such periods and upon such terms as he may deem reasonable. Existing law, applicable to flood-control works, limits the period of the lease of physical property to a maximum of 5 years. The committee feels that such a limitation on the length of leases for the development of recreational areas at flood-control reservoirs would not be in the public interest and recommends the removal of this restriction with respect to leases of Federal property at reservoirs for recreational facilities. This section also provides that all moneys received for such leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SECTION 4. SALE OF STORED WATER

Recently in the development of plans for reservoirs, there have been several requests for the purchase of water for municipal and industrial purposes. Under existing law, the War Department is authorized to modify plans for any reservoir authorized by Congress to provide additional storage capacity for domestic water supply or other conservation storage, provided that the cost of such increased storage is contributed by local agencies. In several cases small communities have experienced difficulty in providing the large lump-sum contributions prior to construction required by existing law, and have expressed a desire to purchase stored water at a unit price per million gallons. In several other cases requests have been received for the purchase of stored water after a dam and reservoir project has been completed. The committee, believing that full beneficial use should be made of all Federal projects, is of the opinion that the Secretary of War should be authorized to sell to States, municipalities, private concerns, or individuals at such prices and on such terms as he may deem reasonable, surplus water that may be available at any reservoir under the control of the War Department.

Suitable language has been written into the bill to accomplish this purpose; all moneys received from such sales to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

OPERATION OF MULTIPLE-PURPOSE RESERVOIRS—SECTION 5. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR OPERATION OF FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION STORAGE

The committee believes that recent experiences in the operation of multiple-purpose reservoirs during major floods has demonstrated that to assure the expected flood-control benefits reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds provided on the basis of flood-

control benefits should have their flood-control features operated under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

The bill, therefore, provides that it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes and requires that the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations.

SECTION 6. RESPONSIBILITY FOR OPERATION OF IRRIGATION STORAGE

The construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs is in the public interest. Sound public policy requires not only that flood-control storage be under the supervision of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers but also that storage for the reclamation of arid lands be under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

The committee recognizes that good administration demands that projects be built by the agency having the dominant interest with suitable provisions for safeguarding the interests of other agencies. Accordingly the bill provides that whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War can be consistently used for reclamation of arid lands it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe regulations for the use of the storage available for such purposes, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulation. Such amounts as the Secretary of the Interior may deem reasonable shall be charged for the use of such stored water; the moneys received to be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

SECTION 7. AUTHORIZATION

Section 7 adopts and authorizes the improvements, as set forth in the bill, for post-war construction with provisions for the preparation of necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work during the war.

I refer again to the report of the committee which describes in detail all of the projects authorized and the supporting reasons. These projects include all parts of our common country.

SECTION 8. PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS AND SURVEYS

Section 8 of the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements and protection from floods aggravated by or due to tidal effect, at the localities designated in said section; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil erosion prevention on the watersheds of these same localities.

This section is similar to examination and survey sections contained in the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and subsequent acts and it clarifies the language contained in those acts to show definitely that the words "flood control" shall be construed to include channel and major drainage improvements. In accordance with its usual policy, the Flood Control Committee has included in this section the streams and areas in all bills for examinations and surveys which have been introduced since the last general flood-control act.

SECTION 9. AUTHORIZATION IN THE BILL

The general flood-control legislation enacted between 1936 and 1941, inclusive, has provided authorizations totaling $965,000,000 for the construction of 460 reservoirs and local flood-protection projects. Of these, 185 projects have been substantially completed and 46 more projects were in various stages of construction when suspended in order to conserve materials, equipment, and manpower for the war effort. Details of the present status of the authorized flood-control program are contained in the tabulations on pages 50 and 51 of the report.

The committee wishes to emphasize that this is a post-war bill to assist in attaining two very worthy post-war objectives, to wit: Orderly adjustment from war to peace and protection of lives and property from the ravages of floods. This bill proposes to approve 112 worthy flood-control projects recommended by the Chief of Engineers and to increase the authorizations for flood-control construction in the amount of $810,000,000. This authorization added to the amounts remaining available from prior legislation will provide a large working balance for numerous projects well distributed across the Nation and diversified as to type between large dams, concrete flood walls, channel improvements, earth levees, and combinations of these types. The greatest concentration of work is in the populous areas where hazards are most serious and where post-war adjustment will be most severe.

The progress of carrying out these authorizations will be determined by Congress through control of the amounts appropriated for flood-control work. The committee has been assured by the Chief of Engineers that the Corps of Engineers is ready and able to embark on a very large program of flood-control construction subject only to the availability of authorization and appropriations. At the rate of appropriations before the war emergency this bill will provide for about 6 years of construction. If post-war appropriations are larger, there will be consequent speeding up of work. The committee believes that enactment of this bill is an essential element in preparation for a large public-works program of worthy and carefully conceived projects and it strongly recommends speedy action on the bill.

SECTION 10. PROJECTS RECOMMENDED BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Section 10 authorizes the prosecution of measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention by the Department of Agriculture on eight watersheds on which that Department has made surveys pursuant to the acts of 1936 and 1938 and for which projects have been reported favorably by the Secretary of Agriculture. These projects, as provided by law, have been reviewed by and correlated with the plans of the Corps of Engineers.

The works of improvement included in these eight projects will afford substantial reductions in the damages suffered from the frequent small and medium-sized floods that occur on headwater tributary streams generally upstream from works planned by the Corps of Engineers. They will also reduce greatly the quantity of erosion debris deposited in stream channels and reservoirs and upon flood plains. In addition, important benefits will accrue to the owners and operators of lands, upon which the measures will be applied, in the form of increased yields of crops and forest products, and increased productivity of pasture due to reduction in erosion and improvement in density and quality of vegetative cover.

The works proposed on these eight projects will provide a valuable complement to structures on waterways that have been or are likely to be built by the Corps of Engineers.

SECTION 11. REAUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Section 11 reauthorizes the balance of the appropriation of $10,000,000, previously authorized in the fact of June 28, 1938, for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for the improvement of watersheds during the post-war period.

SECTION 12. EMERGENCY WORK BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Section 12 of this bill amends section 7 of the act of June 28, 1938. This amendment would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake emergency measures on denuded watersheds to prevent hazards due to flash floods and destructive erosion that follow the loss of protective cover by forest fires or other catastrophes, especially in areas of steep slopes and erodible soils. Such emergency measures would be authorized without, in every case, having to wait for specific authorization to the Corps of Engineers for engineering structures on the waterways concerned. A limitation of $100,000 a year is imposed.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes, and I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table in Document 724.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Flood Control has had under consideration for several months the preparation of an omnibus flood-control bill to be presented at this session. Hearings commenced on February 1 after the groundwork for proper consideration of various projects had been laid. The hearings have proceeded from day to day until all of the projects

upon which the Corps of Engineers have made reports to Congress have been considered.

I wish to pay personal tribute at this time to the gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, chairman of the Flood Control Committee. During all the 8 years that I have served in Congress, I have been a member of this committee. The gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman WHITTINGTON, has been the chairman during the entire period. From my own observation and experience, I would range the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman WHITTINGTON, as outstanding among all chairmen of committees. He has a thorough knowledge of flood-control conditions and projects throughout the Nation. He has a particularly happy way of handling witnesses so that each one knows that he is receiving the close personal attention of the committee. At the same time the hearings proceed in a very orderly manner and with dispatch. Furthermore, the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman WHITTINGTON, has gained the complete confidence of all members of the committee, who appreciate his many personal kindnesses to each of them, while at the same time granting to every Member of Congress the same consideration given to a member of the committee. I am sure that all members of the committee will be in full accord with me in my statement that our chairman is held not only in the highest regard by them as a congressional leader, but is also looked upon as a close personal friend by every member of the committee.

This bill provides for the construction of important flood-control projects in every section of the United States in the post-war period. They will provide work for many thousands of men and women during a period of 5 years. It therefore is of great importance not only in furnishing permanent public works for flood protection greatly needed throughout the country but also in providing a backlog of worth-while jobs during the difficult period of transition from war to peace.

The bill calls for the expenditure of more than $800,000,000. Each of the many projects contained in it has been recommended by the Army engineers. In each case the annual benefits accruing to the people of the United States will exceed the annual costs. The completion of these projects will be of untold benefit to the Nation in preventing recurring annual losses of lives and property. It is interesting to consider the advantages to be derived in each river basin. Since other Congressmen plan to speak about projects in their sections of the country, I will confine my remarks to New England. The gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman WHITTINGTON, has given us such a fine general statement of our national flood-control needs that little more can be added on the over-all program. In the Connecticut River Basin, in which I live, we have had 3 recent major floods in 1927, 1936, and 1938. These 3 tremendous floods caused direct losses of $75,622,000, and indirect losses of $68,712,000—a grand total loss of $144,334,000. In addition, 28 lives have been lost. Other lesser floods have added millions of dollars to the losses incurred in the basin during the past 25 years. Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut have suffered heavily from the ravages of the Connecticut River. Today it is one of the few basins of comparable size in the United States to be without adequate flood protection.

Following the great flood of 1927 the United States engineers were authorized by Congress to determine the best methods for solving the flood problems created by the Connecticut River. They studied the values of some 275 sites for reservoirs. They submitted their conclusions and a comprehensive flood-control plan, which was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1938. It provided for a system of 20 flood-control reservoirs with local protective works at 7 localities along the Connecticut River. The reservoirs will control 2,752 square miles, almost 25 percent of the drainage area of the river.

The average annual flood-control benefits of the system are estimated to be $3,874,000, and the average annual flood control costs $2,898,400. In other words, the comprehensive plan when fully carried out will save the residents of the valley about $1,000,000 a year in money and much more in sorrow and actual suffering. This system of reservoirs will decrease the stage of the maximum flood of record at Hartford about 6 feet and about 5½ feet at Springfield. The 1938 Flood Control Act contains a provision that the entire cost of the reservoirs in this program will be borne by the Federal Government and that the localities benefited must share in the cost of the local protective works.

Five of the flood-control reservoirs are planned for Massachusetts, 5 for New Hampshire, and 10 for Vermont. To date, 3 of the 20 have been constructed: Surry Mountain Dam on the Ashuelot River north of Keene, N. H.; Birch Hill Dam on the Millers River near South Royalston, Mass.; and Knightsville Dam in the town of Huntington on the Westfield River in western Massachusetts. Dikes and flood walls with attendant drainage and pumping facilities have been or will be constructed at 7 localities.

Local protective works have been constructed at Northampton, Holyoke, Chicopee, Springfield, and West Springfield in Massachusetts, and at Hartford and East Hartford in Connecticut. Under the act of 1938 the total cost to the United States of the 20 reservoirs and the 7 local protective works was estimated at $46,359,000, consisting of $34,835,000 for the reservoirs and $11,524,000 for the protective works. Later modifications in the original plans increased the cost of the reservoirs to $57,460,000 and of the protective works to $17,000,000. These modifications were authorized by the act of 1941. Additional local protective works at Holyoke, Springfield, West Springfield, and Winsted, Conn., have been authorized at a cost to the United States of $1,070,000 out of a total cost of $1,185,000.

General features and estimates of cost of the approved plan for reservoirs with modifications now considered desirable are as follows:

Reference No.	Reservoir	Stream	Drainage area (square miles)	Capacity (acre-feet)	Costs		
					Flood control	Adaptations for power	Total flood control plus adaptations
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	Knightville	Westfield	164	39,300	$2,318,000	$433,000	$2,751,000
2	West Brookfield	Chicopee (Quaboag)	106	33,200	2,317,000	----------	2,317,000
3	Barre Falls	Chicopee (Ware)	57	24,200	965,000	----------	965,000
4	Tully	Millers (Tully)	50	22,150	665,000	94,000	759,000
5	Birch Hill	Millers	175	49,200	3,005,000	----------	3,005,000
6	Honey Hill	Ashuelot (South Branch)	70	26,200	1,935,000	----------	1,935,000
7	Surry Mountain	Ashuelot	100	32,500	1,620,000	----------	1,620,000
8	Claremont	Sugar	245	78,400	5,160,000	----------	5,160,000
9	West Canaan	Mascoma	80	34,100	2,240,000	280,000	2,520,000
10	Sugar Hill	Ammonoosuc	246	91,600	6,530,000	----------	6,530,000
11	Williamsville	West	400	150,000	5,960,000	320,000	6,280,000
12	Cambridgeport	Saxtons	58	21,600	1,975,000	----------	1,975,000
13	Brockway	Williams	101	32,300	2,944,000	----------	2,944,000
14	North Springfield	Black	[1] 102	33,400	2,018,000	----------	2,018,000
15	Ludlow	do	56	23,900	1,741,000	459,000	2,200,000
16	North Hartland	Ottauquechee	222	71,100	3,630,000	----------	3,630,000
17	South Tunbridge	White (First Branch)	102	32,600	2,275,000	----------	2,275,000
18	Gaysville	White	226	84,300	4,080,000	705,000	4,785,000
19	Union Village	Ompompanoosuc	126	30,200	1,944,000	432,000	2,376,000
20	Victory	Passumpsic (Moose)	66	28,200	1,023,000	392,000	1,415,000
	Total		2,752	939,950	54,345,000	3,115,000	57,460,000

[1] Exclusive of drainage area above Ludlow.

The total cost of the program to the United States, as now estimated, will be $57,460,000 for reservoirs and $18,070,000 for local protective works, or a total of $75,530,000. It is probable that the final cost will be somewhat in excess of that amount. If this bill becomes law, there will have been authorized for appropriation to carry out most of the program approximately $70,000,000.

One of the reservoirs in the system will be located on West River near Williamsville, Vt. The Federal Power Commission has recommended that it be constructed to provide for both flood control and power development. The committee was advised that such a reservoir with power generating facilities would cost about $29,100,000. If developed for flood-control purposes only it is esti-

mated to cost $6,280,000. For flood-control purposes only a low dam would be built, while a high dam, with an increase of 82 feet in height, would be necessary for both flood control and power development. Witnesses from Vermont opposed the construction of a dam at this site which would include power development while asserting that the people of Vermont would not oppose the construction of flood-control reservoirs without power facilities within that State. The committee decided that it would be best to construct the reservoirs without power development in accordance with the above table of reservoirs as set forth in Document No. 724 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session. The bill, H. R. 4485, therefore contains the explicit provisions that neither this authorization nor previous authorizations shall be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Williamsville site. The objection of the people of Vermont has been fully taken care of by this proviso.

In other words, the committee has taken any authorization for appropriation for power at the Williamsville site out of the bill. In order to have power it would cost $29,100,000. We have so worded the bill that it will only result in the expenditure of $6,280,000 at the site, for flood-control purposes only.

Further than that, as far as the dam on the West River is concerned, that is the most important tributary of the Connecticut River. It drains an area 60 percent greater than any other tributary. Engineers tell us it is the most important site for a dam in the entire system for the Connecticut River. I feel that the people of all four States will believe that the committee has acted wisely and fairly in asking for an authorization for flood-control purposes only, for this dam to be built on the West River, and that the Congress has acted fairly in meeting the wishes of the people of Vermont in not authorizing the expenditure of any money for power in these Vermont dams.

It is well to note that if this flood-control program had been carried out 25 years ago it would have effected savings of more than twice its estimated cost during that period. Already real savings have been effected by the construction of the 3 reservoirs now in operation and the 7 local protective works. The authorization in this bill, together with sums already authorized to be appropriated in existing laws, will complete all authorized local protective works and 16 additional reservoirs. Only 1 reservoir in New Hampshire will require additional authorization for funds in the future. An adequate, comprehensive flood-control system for the Connecticut River Basin will have been provided by the Federal Government. Protection greatly needed for the very important agricultural and industrial communities of 4 States will have been secured throughout the length of the valley of the Connecticut River, the great river of New England. As one who was a member of the Flood Control Committee of the House when this splendid program of the United States engineers was considered and reported favorably, it has been particularly gratifying to me to see successive Congresses enact into laws the legislation necessary to bring the system to completion. It will bring results beneficial to the entire Nation.

I believe this bill, H. R. 4485, contains many projects of incalculable benefit to the American people. I urge its passage.

As it stands today, our flood-control bills of 1938 and 1941 have resulted in a change in the position of Congress, the Federal Government, on the question of how to handle expenditures for flood control purposes in reservoirs and local protective works. Before 1938 the States, where a river went through more than one State, used to combine in compacts and try to arrange between themselves some sort of a program for building reservoirs which would be adequate. I doubt if in any single river basin in the United States any such compact was ever agreed upon and finally constructed.

You who were here in 1938 will recall that we had a considerable struggle over the Connecticut River compact. I led the fight, as far as I could, for the adoption of the Connecticut River compact, which had been entered into by New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. You will recall that a considerable majority of the Congress decided that they did not feel that was the way to handle such situations, and they passed a bill in 1938 which provided that thereafter the Federal Government shall pay 100 percent of the cost of flood-control reservoirs which are built on any navigable rivers. I think if we are going to change our position at this time it should be done in connection with some other bill.

This bill today does not provide for the adoption of any comprehensive program or any program for construction in the Connecticut River Basin. Everything to be built there, local protective works and all reservoirs, is already authorized for construction under the act of 1938, as modified by the act of 1941. Therefore, any change in connection with the program today with reference to construction of any particular dam would be a change back to what was in existence prior to 1938. I do not believe that is the intent of Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice on the bottom of page 2, and at the top of page 3 of the bill, language very similar to the language which was contained in the recent river and harbor bill, which the House struck out. It is a wide delegation of power to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers "To construct, operate, and maintain recreational facilities and other facilities."

Does the gentleman believe that Congress should go on record and grant that wide delegation of power?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman from Michigan, I may say that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] covered that quite thoroughly in his address both at the very start and later in answer to questions that were directed to him. The words "other facilities" do not apply to power or anything of that sort; they apply merely as to roads and other accessories. They do not apply and have not applied in the past to the construction of facilities like power conservation or reclamation, and they have no meaning like that in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason for asking the question is that the people of the United States feel that Congress should take back to itself some of its prerogatives. They feel that the Congress should legislate rather than delegate powers, and I feel that we may convey an impression to the country that we are delegating more power.

Mr. CLASON. That was not the intention of the committee at the time of the adoption of that provision.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not wish to project myself too much into this situation, but the gentleman's reference to what the attorney general of the State of Vermont said leads me to inquire what constitutes a high dam.

Mr. CLASON. I believe that is testified to on page 723 of the hearings where General Robins was testifying and the Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] was doing the interrogating. From the hearings I quote the following:

> The CHAIRMAN. Is this figure of $27,000,000 or $28,000,000 one that includes the estimated cost of that dam when and if it were raised and constructed now for power, as well as an installation of something like $6,000,000 or $8,000,000 for power facilities?
>
> General ROBINS. That $29,000,000 includes raising the dam about 82 feet, building a powerhouse, and installing all power machinery.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. In this area where the dam is located—what is the type of country, the terrain there with respect to being arable?
>
> Colonel GOETHALS. Taking the high dam, the classification of lands in the flooded area is 76 percent wooded land, 14 percent agriculture, 6 percent pasture, 2 percent urban, and 2 percent swamps.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. And the entire acreage required for that reservoir would be how much?
>
> Colonel GOETHALS. For the high dam, 5,430 acres, and for the low dam, 2,460 acres.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. For the $19,000,000 dam, 2,460 acres. Is that true or not?

The high dam mentioned there, and as Colonel Goethals explained it, is the power dam of 82 additional feet. The low dam is used for flood control. The wording of the amendment as it was put in the bill was prepared by the Army engineers to make certain that this dam would be used for flood control and not for power.

Mr. PLUMLEY. But does not the gentleman know just as well as I do that comprehensively you have delegated the power and the authority to the Army

engineers to determine what shall constitute a high dam or a low dam irrespective of what they may say to the gentleman's committee in those minutes to which the gentleman refers? I call the gentleman's attention to page 705 of the hearings.

Mr. CLASON. I am afraid the gentleman overlooks Document 724, adopted in 1938, as modified in 1941. It expressly states, and it was adopted by the Congress, what kind of a dam shall be constructed at Williamsville on the West River:

Drainage area, 400 square miles; capacity, 150,000 acre-feet; flood-control cost, $5,960,000, plus adaptations for power, $320,000, meaning the pen stock; a total of $6,280,000.

That is the program which Congress has adopted, and it does not include the high dam to which the gentleman has been referring.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Nevertheless, I want to put this in the RECORD. The gentleman's recollection of what the Army engineers asked for is not my recollection. My recollection is that the act to which the gentleman referred authorized the Chief of Engineers to make any modifications that might be found to be justifiable in his discretion.

Mr. CLASON. But he would have to do it within the $6,280,000, because that would be all the money available.

Mr. PLUMLEY. But all he would have to do would be to come back to Congress and ask for more money.

Mr. CLASON. That would require a change in the law which certainly is not contained in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve on the Flood Control Committee continuously since I first came to Congress in January 1939. I have attended practically all of the hearings conducted by that committee throughout these years. I consider it both a privilege and an opportunity to work with the very able, efficient, and fair chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON. I have a high regard and esteem for the Army engineers with whom we have worked. I consider them public servants of the first order.

This omnibus flood-control bill is the first flood-control bill that we have had before the House of Representatives since the act of 1941. Due to the necessities of war, all flood-control construction has been suspended with the exception of a minimum amount of temporary and emergency work. This bill contains the authorization for many flood-control projects throughout the United States. Every project contained in this bill has the approval of the district engineer, the division engineer, the Board of Review of Rivers and Harbors, and the Chief of Engineers.

This bill is a compromise. It must be so. Any legislation, national in scope, usually is the result of compromise. Flood control plans and their allied plans, including irrigation, power development, and other features bring forth complicating interests, community and sectional interests, differences between industries, differences of individual opinion, both of the layman and the expert, and sometimes departmental differences and jealousies. If we waited to iron out all of these things before we advanced the bill in the Congress of the United States for needed public works on our rivers, there just never would be any legislation and, consequently, no construction at all. The committee has done that which they thought wisest and best in the handling of not one difficult problem, but many difficult problems, in every section of the United States.

It is true that the works authorized in this bill are for the post-war period. I want to make my position clear, however, in regard to that. I am not supporting any of these projects because they will produce employment in the post-war days. The works programs of the thirties were a failure so far as bringing about reemployment. We exhausted both the alphabet and the Federal Treasury with works programs, but we ended up with more people hunting a real job than we started with. We ended up with local, State, and National Governments spending more for relief than they did when the works programs were started. There were some very fine public works constructed during these works programs, including some fine irrigation projects, but a works program for the sake of working in a hope that it will relieve unemployment is a proven failure. I am supporting this bill, because it represents needed public works. It will bring flood relief to distressed areas and save valuable land and other property. It will save human lives. It will provide additional irrigation, which will add to the productiveness of our country.

I come from a part of the United States where water means life. Adequate water for the crops is the difference between prosperity and poverty. Because I believe that these projects are in the public good and are worth while in themselves, I support this bill.

The bill has a number of important features. This bill lays down the principle that all reservoirs constructed with Federal funds, which have storage space available for flood control, shall be operated under the regulations of the War Department. This is common sense. It is absolutely necessary if we are going to protect the property and the life of the people in the flooded areas. There must be a central agency operating the reservoirs. Likewise, this bill provides that whenever any reservoir is being operated by the War Department, it is found that there is available water for irrigating farm lands, that the Bureau of Reclamation, through the Secretary of the Interior, shall prescribe the rules and regulations for the operation of that part of the storage that is available for irrigation. In other words, it gives the Bureau of Reclamation jurisdiction over the irrigation features of the reservoirs and the distribution systems. I think this is sound and advisable. I am told by individuals in the Bureau of Reclamation that it is a definite gain for them and a step forward.

I want to direct my remarks now in reference to the Missouri River Basin. The bill before us has in it the first substantial authorization for that area. The Missouri River Basin represents one-sixth of the area of the United States. In that area you will find a great deal of the finest and best agricultural land in the world. The Missouri River Basin includes a great portion of Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado, and all of the State of Nebraska. The State of Nebraska is the only State lying entirely within the basin of the Missouri River. This area is a great breadbasket for the entire world. In the basin can be found great industrial and manufacturing cities. It is indeed the great heart of America.

Although the Missouri Valley has always been subject to severe floods very little flood-control work has ever been authorized for that great territory. Compared to the flood-control program in other parts of the United States, the Missouri River Basin has been exceedingly neglected. In the years gone by there have been a few flood-control works constructed at various local points, but with the exception of the local protection constructed at the Kansas Cities, the other works have been small and of minor nature.

In the Flood Control Act of 1938 there was an authorization for an appropriation of $9,000,000 for a basin-wide flood-control program. This authorization has been used on the Kanapolis reservoir in the State of Kansas. Three years later, in 1941, there was an additional authorization of $7,000,000, which was earmarked for the initial construction of the Harlan County Reservoir on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska. The Republican Valley had suffered a loss, running into millions and millions of dollars in property damage and in destruction to farm lands. From the standpoint of the loss of human life by reason of flood, the Republican River has suffered greater than most any other river in the United States. I will have more to say about the details of the flood problem on the Republican River a little later in my remarks.

The main stem of the Missouri River suffers from annual floods, sometimes more than one flood per year. Exceedingly valuable farm land is annually flooded. The destruction in the cities along the river has been considerable. It has tied up transportation systems and created havoc in that territory. In the spring of 1943, a disastrous flood occurred. Following that flood, the Congress of the United States appropriated $10,000,000 for temporary emergency flood-control work, $3,000,000 of which was set aside for the Missouri River. The division engineer at Omaha, Lewis A. Pick, then a colonel but now a brigadier general, appeared before our committee and outlined the problem in this great Missouri River Basin. It was evident that a satisfactory solution to the flood problem would have to include bank protection in the way of levees and dikes on

the main stream and in addition thereto a series of reservoirs and dams on the tributaries to hold this great flow of water at flood time.

Following the flood-control hearings of 1943, as a member of the Committee on Flood Control, I introduced a resolution for myself and a number of the interested Congressmen from the valley, asking that a further report be made by the Army engineers with respect to flood control along the main stem of the Missouri River. That resolution was as follows:

RESOLUTION BY REPRESENTATIVE CARL T. CURTIS, OF NEBRASKA

(Introduced May 6, 1943)

Resolved by the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act approved June 13, 1902, be, and is hereby requested to review the reports on the Missouri River contained in House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, and House Document No. 821, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, with a view to determining whether any modification should be made therein at this time with respect to flood control along the main stem of the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to its mouth.

The foregoing resolution was duly approved by the Committee on Flood Control, and, pursuant to said resolution, the Secretary of War transmitted the flood-control plan, known as the Pick plan, embodied in House Document 475, to the Congress of the United States on February 28, 1944. The bill before us approves the plan set forth in House Document 475 and authorizes an appropriation of $200,000,000 for the partial accomplishment thereof.

Along the Missouri River, between Sioux City, Iowa, and Rulo, Nebr., there are about 926,000 acres of land in the valley of the Missouri River, which would be protected from flooding after construction of the plan proposed in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. The proposed work consists of levees supplemented by reservoirs above Sioux City, Iowa. At present there are numerous local levees which have been constructed by local interests to provide some measure of protection from floods for a part of the area. These levees have not been planned with an over-all view of the flood-protection problem, and are inadequate to provide protection except from minor floods.

During the flood of April 1943, nearly all of the existing levees along the Missouri River failed and 200,000 acres of agricultural land protected by these levees were flooded. Following this flood the engineering department, in the reach between Sioux City, Iowa, and Rulo, Nebr., repaired about 75 levees and assisted in the repair of many more levees, at a cost of nearly $600,000. However, during the flood which occurred this April 1944, about 35 levees again failed. It appears futile to continue to spend large sums of money for the replacement of these levees, which are inadequate to provide protection to this valuable agricultural land.

In the reach between Sioux City, Iowa, and Rulo, Nebr., the proposed levees would have a total length of about 300 miles. They would consist of earth fill with a 10-foot top width, riverside sloped 1 on 3, landside sloped 1 on 5, and would average about 12 feet in height. These levees would not in themselves provide complete protection and it is impracticable to construct higher levees because the cost of necessary features to prevent sand boils, which would endanger the safety of the levees, would be excessive. However, if reservoirs are constructed upstream from Sioux City, with appropriate reservation for flood-control storage, and are properly operated, floods can be reduced to the magnitude which can be safely passed by the proposed levees. Seven such reservoirs are proposed for construction above Sioux City.

The levees would be constructed in units, each unit made independent of other units by tying it back to the bluff or high ground adjacent to tributary streams. Many miles of railroads and highways and numerous small municipalities, as well as thousands of acres of agricultural land, would therefore receive full flood protection by the construction and operation of the proposed plan. In addition, the larger industrial cities of Sioux City and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr., would receive full flood protection by the strengthening and raising of flood-protection works at those localities.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote from the hearings of our Committee:

Mr. CURTIS. Now, Colonel, I want to inquire just a little bit about the protection on the main stem of the river so far as farm land is concerned. I am referring, for instance, to between Omaha and Rulo on the west side of the river.

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. What sort of protection will that provide for your agricultural land; almost entirely levees?

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir. The actual protection itself will be by levees. Of course the effectiveness of those levees is greatly increased by the upstream reservoirs.

Mr. CURTIS. But the local protection will constitute levees.

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

Mr. CURTIS. Do you think the problem of the water getting back of the levees and not draining out will be taken care of when this is completed?

Colonel REBER. You mean from rainfall, sir? Theoretically, there should be no water overflow, or river water, behind the levees.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that heretofore there has been some overflow, or else it is because the local works were not adequate.

Colonel REBER. That is true. A large number of the local levees were overtopped or breached last year. I have forgotten the exact number, but it ran up into 200 and some.

Mr. CURTIS. Are there any Federal levees on the Missouri River on the west side between Omaha and Rulo?

Colonel REBER. No, sir; not between Omaha and Rulo.

Mr. CURTIS. The ones you are going to construct you anticipate will not be overtopped?

Colonel REBER. Absolutely not overtopped, sir.

This Pick plan for the Missouri River Basin is primarily a flood-control plan. It does provide, however, for multiple-purpose reservoirs on the tributaries and in the upper portions of the river. These multiple-purpose reservoirs will be so constructed as to provide for the maximum amount of storage of water for irrigation. A great portion of the Missouri River Basin is semiarid in nature and the expansion of irrigation is absolutely essential to the future prosperity of that great region.

Much has been said, and some of it of a controversial nature, in reference to navigation. Authorization for navigation work with the exception of the lower Mississippi does not come within the jurisdiction of this Committee on Flood Control. That is handled by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and the item calling for a 9-foot channel on the Missouri River is a part of the bill reported out by that other committee. It has passed the House and is now before the Senate. The approval of the Pick plan does not add or detract from the navigation issue.

At this point I want to quote from the hearings before our committee the testimony of Col. Miles A. Reber, former division engineer at Omaha. His testimony is as follows:

Mr. CURTIS. Colonel Reber, as you understand, another committee has jurisdiction of the authorization of navigation works.

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to ask this question: Would these recommendations (the Pick plan) be approximately the same if they proceeded to make a 9-foot channel, or leave it a 6-foot channel; that is, the recommendation in the report that is on its way to this committee?

Colonel REBER. As I understand the recommendations and the report which is to come to this committee, Mr. CURTIS, they are for the general over-all development of the entire Missouri Basin, including flood control, reclamation, navigation, and power, but with special reference to flood control from Sioux City to the mouth.

In response to the resolution of this committee, I believe that the recommendations which are contained in this report would remain substantially the same, because the question presented to the Corps of Engineers by that resolution was to solve the flood-control problem. As I shall later show, to solve the flood-control problem between Sioux City and the mouth involves the use of multiple-purpose reservoirs upstream.

Mr. CURTIS. Your proposal for reservoirs would remain the same, regardless of what might happen to this item in another bill before another committee?

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir; as I understand it.

Mr. CURTIS. Is that also true as to your proposal for levees and appurtenances and bank work from Sioux City down?

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir.

I am not going to go into detail as to just what the Pick plan will do in all of the States in the Missouri River Basin. No doubt the gentlemen representing those States, both north and south of Nebraska, will cover that part of the recommendations to the satisfaction of all. I do believe that the Pick plan will bring about a much-needed and long-overdue flood-control system to protect the farms and towns and cities along the east edge of Nebraska. Therefore, I wish to turn my attention to one of the principal tributaries, to wit, the Republican River, which involves a considerable portion of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

The Republican River and its tributaries is an important factor in eastern Colorado, northwestern Kansas, and southwestern Nebraska. It is a river that has a constant flood problem. The worst flood of record was in 1935. This cost the lives of 110 people. The property damage was enormous. It has been estimated that there was a million dollars of property damage to railroads alone. Considerable farm land was materially damaged and it will take many years to build it back.

The Legislature of Nebraska has memorialized Congress for flood protection and irrigation development in the Republican River and its tributaries. They have designated it as Nebraska's problem No. 1. That is indeed not an exaggeration.

Also every year since 1935, a portion of the Republican River Basin has suffered from floods, bank erosion and other like problems have been more serious because of the damage to the channel by reason of the 1935 flood.

A year or two ago, I was visiting with a farmer whose land was adjacent to the Republican River. He asked me to come see it. When we were yet some distance from the river, we stopped to listen. You could hear his farm falling into the river—fine, rich, black soil being washed away because of an unconquered flood problem.

The 1938 Flood Control Act carried no authorization for the Republican River which would affect that portion of the river which suffered most severely in the 1935 flood. It did authorize a large reservoir costing in excess of $20,000,000 near the mouth of the Republican River at Milford, Kans. That reservoir has never been constructed and in a subsequent review of the flood-control plans for the Kansas River system of which the Republican is a part, the Army engineers determined that a site in Harlan County, Nebr., approximately 3 miles east of Republican City, would be a better site for an on-river dam on the Republican River than at Milford. The Chief of Engineers, therefore, recommended construction of the Harlan County Dam with a then-estimated reservoir capacity of 1,008,000 acre-feet. This would provide practically the same amount of flood protection for the Kansas cities as would the reservoir at Milford. In addition, it would bring flood protection to four cities in Nebraska and considerable territory in Kansas, which the Milford Reservoir would not have protected. This Harlan County Dam and reservoir would have also provided water for irrigation over a considerable territory in Nebraska and in Kansas. We needed the irrigation and this added water would mean increased prosperity throughout a great portion of the Republican Valley Basin.

In 1940, there was no general Flood Control Act. The Harlan County Dam was authorized in the act of 1941. The Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives reported out an omnibus bill which carried an item approving the plans for the Harlan County Dam and authorizing a further $7,000,000 for the Missouri Basin, which was to be earmarked for the initial construction of the dam in Harlan County. On two different occasions, the Congress has appropriated money for the preparation of the detailed plans for this dam in Harlan County.

Because of the stoppage of all flood-control work by reason of the war, no actual construction has been started at this site. It is safe to assume, however, that had it not been for the war, Harlan County Dam would now be under construction. The so-called Pick plan for the development of the entire Missouri River Basin reiterates the Army's intention to build Harlan County Dam. In fact, it is one of the principal reservoirs in the greater plan.

The people of Nebraska, and particularly the Republican Valley, were glad when the Army engineers recommended the Harlan County Dam. That did not solve the entire problem. It did not give flood protection on any of the tributaries of the Republican River nor on the main stream west of the reservoir site.

Following the announcement in 1940 of the recommendation of the Army engineers to build the Harlan County Dam, I requested the assistance of the Office of the Chief of Engineers in the preparation of a resolution which would call for further studies west of the Harlan County Dam without in any way prejudicing or interfering with the plans to build the Harlan County Dam. As a result, I introduced the following resolution, which was duly approved by the Committee on Flood Contro' of the House of Representatives:

RESOLUTION BY REPRESENTATIVE CARL T. CURTIS, OF NEBRASKA

Resolved by the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives of the United States, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under the provisions of the River and Harbor Act approved June 13, 1902, be, and is hereby, requested to review the report on the Kansas River and tributaries contained in House Document No. 195, Seventy-third Congress, second session, with a view to determining whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are desirable at the present time with respect to the Republican River and its tributaries west of the Harlan County Dam site.

The so-called Pick plan, which the bill now before the Congress adopts and approves, carries the recommendations of the Army arising out of that resurvey of the west end of the Republican River and its tributaries. The Pick plan recommends five multiple purpose reservoirs on the upper Republican River and tributaries in addition, of course, to the Harlan County reservoir.

The reservoirs located on the tributaries of the Republican River, upstream of the Harlan County dam site, are the Medicine Creek Reservoir on a stream of the same name, Red Willow Reservoir on Red Willow Creek, Enders Reservoir on Frenchman Creek, Beecher Island Reservoir on the Arikaree River, and Hale Reservoir on the South Fork of the Republican River. These reservoirs are proposed for multiple-purpose use. In addition to the capacity required for flood control, storage capacity would be available for storing excess water for conservation purposes, principally irrigation. No definite capacities for the reservoirs or allocations of water to separate uses have been assigned at this time. Studies of these factors by both the War Department and the Bureau of Reclamation are still in progress.

The approximate heights and tentative gross storage capacities of the reservoirs are as follows:

	Approximate height (feet)	Approximate gross storage (acre-feet)
Medicine Creek	85	47,900
Red Willow	87	46,800
Enders	117	93,200
Beecher Island	120	72,200
Hale	90	96,400

The proposed reservoirs would control all floods on these tributaries originating above the dam site. They would supplement the Harlan County Reservoir in providing complete control of the largest flood of record at the Harlan County site, and would reduce Kansas River and some Missouri River floods.

The irrigable lands have not been defined, pending final studies by the Bureau of Reclamation. Tentative capacities for conservation use were based on available data on irrigable areas downstream from the dam site and studies of run-off of the various streams at the dam site.

The proposed plan is subject to modification as conditions warrant or as a result of further studies now being prosecuted and to be prosecuted in the future. If an alternate site for a reservoir would be more desirable from a conservation standpoint and provide essentially the same control of floods, and be as feasible from an engineering standpoint, the location of the reservoir could be changed.

I am not unmindful of the very fine work that the Bureau of Reclamation has done in the arid and semiarid West. I have always supported the Bureau of Reclamation and I expect to continue to do so. We hope that out of these plans for multiple-purpose reservoirs in the Republican Valley that the Bureau will be able to bring water to just as many farms as it is possible to do. The Bureau of Reclamation has been studying and surveying the Republican Valley. They have issued a report on the Republican Valley which contains many fine things. It is the belief of both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers that the plans of both the Army and the Bureau for the Republican Valley can be correlated to the end that the greatest amount of good can come to the greatest number of people.

We have two great problems in the Republican Valley, to wit: Drought and floods. Both problems must be solved. In the letter of H. W. Bashore, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, bearing date of December 17, 1943, attached to and made a part of House Document 475, the Bureau agrees that the authorized and proposed reservoirs on the Republican River would provide adequate flood control in that area.

In connection with the working together of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to conquer the problems of drought and flood in the Republican Valley, I wish to quote from the hearings before our committee, as follows:

Mr. CURTIS. And as you told the chairman, you recognized the need for irrigation in that territory that will be served by that (Harlan County) dam, and which will be integrated into your plan?

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, in reference to the five additional dams above the Harlan County Dam on the Republican River, is there a flood problem there?

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir; there is a real flood problem there.

Mr. CURTIS. In their major flood of 1935, where did the loss of life occur, generally; east or west of Harlan County?

Colonel REBER. Generally, in a great measure, above the Harlan County Dam.

Mr. CURTIS. And to take care of that loss of life and property—and incidentally, the loss of life exceeded 100—is the purpose of your proposed 5 dams that you have enumerated.

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir; plus water for reclamation purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. Now, it is also true that the rainfall in that area is not adequate for the best farming without irrigation; is that not true?

Colonel REBER. I believe that is correct, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. The soil is good and irrigation farming is successfully accomplished in that general area.

Colonel REBER. From what I have seen—and I am not an expert on soil, sir—but from what I have seen that is generally so accepted.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. Now, these five tributary dams on the Republican, like the Harlan County Dam, will be so constructed and planned to provide for the greatest amount of irrigation possible.

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir. The plan is flexible and subject to change, and is being studied concurrently by both the Bureau of Reclamation and ourselves.

Mr. CURTIS. And that cooperation with the Bureau, we can expect that not only in planning but in construction and in operation.

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

Mr. CURTIS. Now, this entire Missouri River Basin plan runs into considerable money, and, as the report states, it has about four phases in it; is that not true?

Colonel REBER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it anticipated that it would take a number of years to complete all of that?

Colonel REBER. Very definitely.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, suppose that in view of the fact that it is going to take many years, that some other agency, or specifically the Bureau of Reclamation, would be in a position and ready and willing to start to build one of the smaller dams on the upstream of the Republican before it was reached by the War Department, would the approval of this basin report prevent it from happening?

Colonel REBER. No, sir; in no way.

The report of the Army engineers, as embodied in House Document 475, which has been referred to as the Pick plan, is submitted by the Army as a flexible plan, designed with the thought that all problems, controversies, and differencies among localities, agencies, and individuals cannot be solved in advance, that by cooperation and coordination of effort between the agencies, needed changes can be made in the future.

In that connection, I wish to again quote from the hearings before our committee, from the testimony of the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Bashore, which is as follows:

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Bashore, the problem of flood control in a region all of which has ample rainfall is a problem that is ordinarily not referred to the Bureau of Reclamation; is that not true?

Mr. BASHORE. That is right. Where it is east of the one-hundredth meridian.

Mr. CURTIS. And the major portion of your work heretofore has been in the extreme arid and at least semiarid regions, has it not?

Mr. BASHORE. That is right, sir. That is the only authorization we have.

Mr. CURTIS. And while the problem of flood control exists there, the major problem usually is to provide water for agriculture and domestic purposes; is that right?

Mr. BASHORE. Yes; that is the major problem.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, in the Missouri River Basin you have a merger of those two areas—(1) where there is ample rainfall and no need or desire for irrigation and still a flood-control problem, and then (2) it runs into the area of arid and semiarid regions where the need is great for irrigation; is that not true?

Mr. BASHORE. That is true, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. Do you feel that such an area can be continued to be handled by the two separate agencies through the means of cooperating together, or what is your idea on that? Do you think the Missouri River Basin should be handled to the exclusion of one agency or the other?

Mr. BASHORE. No; I do not. I think it should be handled by the two agencies.

Mr. CURTIS. It is sort of a twilight zone between the two problems in its extreme, is it not?

Mr. BASHORE. That is right.

On May 1 the Bureau of Reclamation submitted to the President their report on the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin. This report deals with the irrigation possibilities and carries proposals for the Republican River, as well as all the other tributaries of the Missouri River. This report has now been released and it is being printed as Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. As stated previous in my remarks, that report contains many fine things for the Great Plains country.

I wish particularly to call attention to a paragraph in the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to the President of the United States, bearing date of May 1, 1944, which was the letter of transmittal of the report to the President. The paragraph I refer to is as follows:

The construction proposed in this report would be complementary, for the most part, to that recently suggested by the Secretary of War for flood control on the Missouri River. The two plans, while not identical, apparently can be successfully coordinated.

The letter from the Bureau of the Budget, which is a part of House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, on the so-called Pick plan, suggested that the Pick plan be delayed and that action be taken later. However, I wish to point out a more recent statement of the Director of the Budget. In a letter from Mr. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Budget, to the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman WILL M. WHITTINGTON, of the Committee on Flood Control, dated April 27, 1944, Mr. Smith said:

My letters of February 16, 1944, to the Secretary of War and to Representative MCCORMACK, both of which I understand were considered by your committee, express my views on the Missouri River project which is included in the bill on page 12, line 9. While I am sorry to learn that the committee has deemed it advisable to include these projects, I presume that the opening language of section 7 will allow sufficient time before the actual initiation of construction on any of the projects to permit completion of the necessary related investigations and initiation of any supplemental legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make my position clear. The thing I desire most is a construction program on our rivers which will best serve the people of Nebraska. I want the people of eastern Nebraska to be protected from the devastating floods on the Missouri River. I want the people in the Republican Valley to have a development program that will overcome their two great problems, to wit, floods and drought.

I sincerely hope that all Government agencies can and will work together so that soon after the war, the program of flood control and irrigation can become a reality and serve the greatest number of people possible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of the Missouri River plan and of the entire omnibus flood-control bill now before us—H. R. 4485. It is not a perfect bill, but it is a good bill. It calls for public works which are greatly needed and, in my opinion, are for the public good.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman from Nebraska is a recognized authority on irrigation law. He comes from an irrigation State. I would like to ask a question or two in order to clear up a couple of paragraphs here. The first is in respect to section 4 where the Secretary of War is authorized to sell surplus water. What is the gentleman's observation as to surplus water? In our area all water has been appropriated, including floodwaters. They will be temporarily captured and placed in reserve, but would not be subject to sale. They belong to the appropriators who have already complied with statutes in appropriating it.

Mr. CURTIS. It would be my opinion that water appropriated for irrigation is not surplus water. It is further my opinion that section 4 does not deal with irrigation. It means the sale of water for other purposes, principally to municipalities.

I call attention to the fact that there is a specific section dealing with irrigation regulations and that is section 6 which is a later section in the bill. This would indicate to me that section 4 would not be controlling in reference to irrigation waters.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The reason I asked is this: The gentleman knows there

has been some difference of opinion as to Federal and State rights in the control of water. The States of Nebraska and Colorado have been involved in some litigation over water flowing in interstate streams. The State of Colorado, along with other irrigation States, is jealous to preserve the doctrine of State rights in the control of their water. These appropriators have gone into State courts and have appropriated this water, including the floodwaters. The gentleman does not contend, and it is not the attitude of his committee, that that water is subject to sale?

Mr. CURTIS. Not under section 4; no. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the Bureau of Reclamation is distinctly a western institution. The Bureau of Reclamation recognizes the principle of the consumptive and beneficial use of water and of the water user. The thing that we have done in this bill is to state that in any reservoir where there is storage space available for irrigating farm lands that the regulation of that shall be turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation, which is a concession on the part of the Army. It is a definite gain on the part of the Bureau, and I believe the Bureau of Reclamation can be trusted to recognize both State rights and the individual rights of the owners of the water.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Would the gentleman say that any clarifying language is needed in section 4 to establish the doctrine which he has announced here in making a distinction as to the western users of water where the doctrine of appropriation exists, that does not prevail in the East?

Mr. CURTIS. The committee worked on this language. It may be that we did not use the choicest words there are in the dictionary. May I ask the chairman of the committee if he will not agree with me in this statement in order that we might show legislative intent, that it was not our intention to include the sale of water for irrigation purposes under section 4, that that dealt with other uses of water?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely; and I may say, furthermore, as the gentleman has already stated, under the language used, and the intent of the committee, there is no effort made for the curtailment of water there for irrigation. My recollection is that under the reclamation acts, and in the distribution of water under those acts, the Secretary of the Interior has the power to do in reclamations districts just what the Chief of Engineers would have to power to do in reservoir districts. This is to make comparable the powers exercised by the Director of Reclamation and the engineers, and would apply only to waters that were surplus and not needed for irrigation or other purposes.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that the interpretation feared by the gentleman from Colorado is prevented by the precise language of section 6 which says that where water can be consistently used for reclamation of arid lands it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe regulations, and so forth. In other words, where reclamation of arid lands is concerned, section 6 precisely makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Interior and takes it away from the Secretary of War.

Mr. CURTIS. May I add that as long as we have federally constructed reservoirs there will be Federal control. We have stated in this bill that control with reference to the available space for irrigation water shall be exercised by the Bureau of Reclamation. I believe that the Bureau of Reclamation, being a western agency, being committed to the doctrine of consumptive and beneficial use of water, and in view of its past record covering protection of State rights and the protection of the water rights of the individual, will exercise its authority judicially and that that is the very best we can do.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman from Nebraska will yield further, because I think there should not be any uncertainty, in addition to his statement and in addition to the suggestion made by the gentleman from South Dakota that this is not applicable to irrigation, it would be well to keep in mind the fundamental purpose of this provision. If there is a municipality that wants water for human consumption, that municipality can pay the cost of raising that reservoir in order to provide that additional water. Of course, that puts a burden on the municipality or the local interest that they are frequently unable to bear. In order to provide for human consumption in these projects that are primarily flood control, and to eliminate the diffculty that obtains in reference to the inability of the local interest to supply the money, this provision is put in. I think there need not be any fear that the intent of the committee as well as the language of the bill would not make it applicable to irrigation. If it were, irrigation would be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Do I understand the provisions of section 6 are retroactive to include projects which have now been constructed and completed? Does this change existing law with reference to projects already in operation? The word "hereafter" is used to start the paragraph and I am not clear as to what the intent of the paragraph is.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish at the outset to compliment the chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the House because he is deserving of a compliment for the splendid manner in which he has conducted the affairs of his committee ever since he has been its chairman.

When I came to Congress the Flood Control Committee was a new committee and was struggling for its existence. In the early days this committee clashed quite frequently with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors over matters of jurisdiction of legislation. The Rivers and Harbors Committee is one of the older committees of the House and most of the legislation that is now considered by the Flood Control Committee was formerly considered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The control of the rivers and harbors of the Nation by the Government has been increasing in many ways. Because of this increase of business and increase of activities the work of both of these committees has increased very much in the last 20 years.

The gentleman from Mississippi the chairman of the Flood Control Committee [Mr. WHITTINGTON], by his ability and industry, was able to compose the differences of jurisdiction with the result that he now has a committee that does a great amount of work and a committee that has the confidence and respect of the House.

I expect to support this legislation for several reasons. One reason is that in our post-war activities we will be looking for public projects of worth and merit which will give employment to idle men and at the same time which will benefit future conditions. The W. P. A., although a worth-while institution in some respects, was frequently called upon to do unnecessary work which had little if any permanent value. Most of the projects named in this bill will be of great benefit to the community in which they are located and also to the country generally.

There are other reasons that I can assign why I should support this legislation. I hope that when the time comes to construct these projects that the most worthy projects will be taken first and that the least worthy projects will be taken last. I feel sure that the Army Engineers will not permit money to be wasted on unnecessary projects and I also have confidence in our Appropriation Committee that that Committee will not recommend appropriations for useless projects.

There is one project in this bill that will be of great benefit to the State of Ohio and to a portion of the district I have the honor to represent. I refer to the Burr-Oak Dam project.

While the Burr-Oak Dam project in this legislation calls for an authorization of $400,000 on the part of the Government, the amount to be supplied by local contribution is $295,000. The Government expenditure will be justified by the fact that this project is a flood-control project. There is no navigation considered in this project. The expenditure by the local authorities of $295,000 will be justified by the benefit that this lake, which is to be constructed by reason of the construction of a dam, will furnish a water supply for that community. Heretofore as was brought out in the hearings there has been a great dearth of water in that section at certain seasons of the year. Some mines located in that section have been compelled to haul water in railroad tank cars in dry seasons. It is intended that this water supply will relieve that situation and that it will also benefit the community in many other ways.

As I have heretofore stated, I hope this legislation passes the House.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these 5 minutes to discuss very briefly the section of this bill relating to the Connecticut River Basin. I do that for the reason that there seems to be a little misunderstanding up in that part of the country as to just what it is proposed to do under this bill, and particularly at the Williamsville site. It was brought out during the hearings that the Army engineers had under consideration a plan for building a high dam at Williamsville, Vt., a dam 300 feet high and 1,200 feet wide, that was going to impound approximately 440,000 acre-feet of water. Quite naturally the people in that part of the country objected to that type of a dam and reservoir, particularly when it was brought out in response to a question directed to the Army engineers that 119,000 acre-feet was for flood control and 320,000 acre-feet for possible future power draw-down and for dead storage.

During this boom period when all of the defense industries in that area have been working 24 hours a day, the private utilities were able not only to meet the needs but to prepare well ahead of any anticipated need for electrical energy in that region.

The committee very wisely has written a proviso into this section relating to the Connecticut River Basin, which reads as follows:

Provided, That neither this authorization nor previous authorizations shall be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Williamsville site.

I do not think there need be any concern that this dam and reservoir will be any larger than is absolutely necessary for a flood-control reservoir. The passage of this bill should be a source of great satisfaction to my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. For the past several years, as a member of the Committee on Flood Control, he has worked day and night to try to bring about the completion of the program adopted in 1938 to give flood protection to the people of the Connecticut River Valley.

It is my understanding that with the $30,000,000 authorization carried in this bill practically all of the approved flood-control reservoirs will be completed under this authorization, which will mean taking another 4 feet off of any future flood in the Connecticut River Valley. More than $11,000,000 have already been spent in Hartford and East Hartford in building dikes, preparing for future floods. The city of Hartford has spent between five and six million dollars of city money to add another 4 feet to the top of the dikes as built by the Army engineers. With that local protective work now 90-percent completed, and with the funds carried in this bill, I believe we can safely assume that the people of the Connecticut River Valley have the maximum amount of flood protection that it is possible to provide. I am glad that flood protection is going to be provided to the people in that valley without too great a cost to our friends and neighbors in Vermont.

The question has been raised regarding the language found on page 2 of the bill, line 25, the last line on page 2, and I wonder if I may ask the chairman of the committee if there would be any objection to striking out simply the words "other facilities." In other words, I know of no opposition to providing for recreation and conservation, but it does seem to some, in view of some things that have happened in the past, that it might be wiser to eliminate the language "other facilities."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no question about it, as Mr. CLASON, the ranking member of the committee, and I have already stated, the word "facilities" there applies to facilities for recreation only.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I see.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That has no reference to power or to reclamation. I am inclined to believe we will be able to satisfy the gentleman before we have concluded, because if necessary the committee may offer a modifying amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The word of the chairman of the committee is satisfactory to me.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In other words, "facilities" applies only to recreation and not to power or to reclamation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is satisfactory, I am sure.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the treatment accorded me by the Committee on Flood Control was most gracious, although I was viewed with some suspicion, if not with alarm, and was more or less persona non grata because of certain ideas I entertain with respect to matters in hand. The chairman and the ranking member are my personal friends of long intimacies and some battles in which we have joined.

I dislike, therefore, to have to take a position in disagreement with my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], for whom I have admiration and respect, but I have to, and so I am opposed to the bill as it stands. There is no man more intellectual nor more deliberately able to sustain his position than the chairman. That is what I am up against. I am nevertheless against the governmental policy under and by virtue of which this law, by virtue of the bill under consideration, will operate. I am opposed to totalitarianism. Really, I doubt if my friends know how far they have gone.

As for me, I do not believe the Federal Government should have undertaken or should continue to undertake to centralize in itself the control of matters, if and when and because the States by compacts entered into between and among themselves have demonstrated they can satisfactorily control and direct the matters which are intimately and principally their own concern. Disagreement makes horse races, they say.

Mr. Chairman, despite any suggestion to the contrary, I am for flood control. So are the people whom I have the honor to represent, uncontrovertibly, as evidenced by the compacts which have heretofore been entered into by them.

They, the people, are even more interested and concerned than I am, if possible, which I deny, because they have been the victims, as I have been, of the lack of the very thing, protection, which ought to be provided against a flood and which was attempted to be provided by a program of compacts which the New England States entered into, which was disregarded. Your turn will be next.

I am opposed to the policy and the program evidenced by this bill which assumes to disregard my area, you will be next, and to try to centralize and to federalize and to control the rain drops, the fog, and the dew. This administration overleaps itself in its vaulting ambition to socialize, to wreck individualism, free enterprise, and free government by the enactment of legislation in disregard of what the States or the people may do to save themselves.

As an American I do not approve the idea or the theory that the Federal Government should undertake to control those things so certainly, completely, and intimately the concern of the people of the States as are the air and the land and the water, till the people show incompetency to take care of themselves. If we are to remain a democracy, the Federal Government should neither offer help, nor undertake to control the matters peculiarly the people's rights, unless and until the people have demonstrated their inability so to do or have exhausted every method in their own interest and behalf, for any other program spells the end of this democracy of Jefferson. Else we are an aristocratic autocracy of totalitarian puppets.

So far as flood control is concerned, it has been well said that our attempts, centralized and federalized, to try to beat nature and nature's god, are foolishly futile. God save us for the day is at hand, based on our own greed and lust for temporary power and to our own dishonor.

After all these years of experimentation we are realizing at great cost what we have done to this great country of ours. We are now undertaking to stop our damnable work by installing dams to catch dirt and silt in order to make deserts, to stop floods. How silly. What a joke. It is a most asinine proposition. We pay the bills. It involves the spending of more millions, amounting to trillions in the end, the penalty we pay for our shortsightedness, the cost of which cannot be comprehended by anybody unless possessed of an astronomical mind. Why continue to be so foolish? Why do we go haywire when a little common sense would salt and savor the salad. Does not somebody have it, or do votes for reelection count so much against your self respect? You will have to live with yourself forever. What an awful thing to contemplate in

view of your votes for votes. God save the State.

Of course, we should have started long ago to stop denuding and stripping our forests, making the Dust Bowl what it was and will be again if the greed of man controls. You cannot beat God. God knows you cannot stop floods by dams—you cannot beat Nature or Nature's God, no matter how smart you are. They tell me that even today the floods which are covering this country are chargeable more to the narrowing of channels by the initiation of Army engineers and to the building of dams and dikes by men so foolish as we are to think we can correct our fundamental error than to anything else except the original proposition that man can stop God. How foolish and what an expense!

The fact is that those wise persons who favored and fathered flood control, as such, never anticipated nor contemplated that the octopian tentacles of a Federal Government would ever be permitted to wind themselves about and be permitted to attempt to choke the life out of the States, which are the people. Nevertheless, whether the people know it or realize it or not, that day is here. It has happened and is glorified.

The States of Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Connecticut once upon a time entered into a satisfactory and sufficient compact with respect to flood control to conserve, preserve, and save themselves.

The legislatures of the several States ratified that compact. The people undertook to raise the revenue to cover the expenses involved in an effort to accomplish flood control by taxing themselves. The compact was submitted to the Senate of the United States. It declined to recognize it or the right of the States to legislate in their own interests, notwithstanding the fact that the States had entered into this compact and that the people through their legislatures had spoken. God save liberty.

It was an outrageous, high-handed act, indefensible and un-American, if I may use that word respectfully, this crucification of the States, for it was born of a snap political partisan trick, beneath the dignity of those who offered the amendment to the bill on the floor of that august tribunal at the other end of this corridor. It was done in the orgy of the heyday of those who, intoxicated by an exaggerated idea of their own magnitude and political power, were about, they thought, to take over the world, everything that is on top of or under the ground, the fish in the seas, and the fowls of the air. And everything else mentioned in Genesis.

Gradually, slowly, but eventually, the people will undertake to recapture all those things which Congress as a rubber stamp gave away foolishly and that the people who think this is a good Government to live in so long as they can live off it were willing to have given away. It is about time to stop that program before there is nothing left.

This compact between these several New England States, which followed the statute as to how a compact should be made and entered into and how it should be submitted, was agreed to. Some of these gentlemen around here from these several States adjoining mine were members of the legislatures of their several States at the time they sought to save States' rights. Special sessions of those legislatures were called to consider this compact. The State of Massachusetts and others held special sessions, if I am not incorrect. I have forgotten what the name is that they have for that kind of a special session—in Massachusetts, emergent, I think—but my attention was attracted to it at one time. Anyway, it was an emergency session, so called by the Governor, to consider this compact. The compact to prevent floods was omnipresent and important there as elsewhere.

We had all agreed to care for the whole situation as far as the New England area was concerned. We did not ask the Federal Government to intervene. We were ready to pay the price, the bills; offered to do it; the bids were allotted. The amounts which the several States should pay were apportioned to the several States. Those compacts were signed by the officials of the several States and transmitted to Congress. The Congress eventually absolutely ignored the right of the States to have anything to say about their own business, or the right of the people who elect the Members of Congress, who were ready to pay the bill to take care of an opportunity to preserve to them their life, liberty, property, and pursuit of happiness. What a high-handed procedure.

On the afternoon of July 6, 1937—

Says the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1938—

in the office of the Governor of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the authorized representatives of four sovereign States met for the purpose of executing on behalf of their respective States compacts providing for the control of destructive floodwaters of two of the largest river systems of the New England States. Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont had reached a satisfactory agreement respecting the basin of the Connecticut River, a problem common to the four States; while Massachusetts and New Hampshire, who, for geographical reasons, were the only States interested, had similarly solved the question of flood control on the Merrimack.

It was in many respects a historic occasion.

Some very distinguished gentlemen, one or two of whom are here before me today, were present to deny it.

Four highly individualistic States, each justly jealous of its own sovereignty, had, nevertheless, composed any differences of opinion which might otherwise have been fatal to such a program, and the way was clear, but for the mere matter of approval by Congress—

Which it never had.

Since my friend and colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] was present at that meeting—I later learned he was not present at that meeting, yet was the godfather, as appears from the record—and still was an interested progenitor and coparent of the compacts, he can take no exception to my insistence that the program with respect to the Williamsville Dam should be dispensed with, and postponed for now. How do we know what a low dam means? Strike out "high"? What is "low"?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I value the gentleman's opinion. Let me ask him this question. If we eliminate the restriction contained in this bill, would it not militate against the very view on which the gentleman is insisting, because under the language of 1938 it might be maintained that the Chief of Engineers had the right to build a high dam, and we have undertaken to protect Vermont by saying that he shall not be permitted to construct a high dam.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I am going to try to undertake to take all the worry out of the gentleman's mind tomorrow by striking out that word "high." Then it will leave it that under this bill as written they cannot do anything unless we know what is meant by striking out "high."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That would stymie the whole program.

Mr. PLUMLEY. No. I have been asked to offer an amendment to strike all after the word "eleven" to the word "nineteen," but I have declined to do that because I said I will not be a party to stymieing the whole program in the valley. I will, however, be a party to and I do insist that by the very language of this bill which you have brought in here you have shown no emergency, no occasion, no necessity for action at present. You will strike out "high," you say. I ask you what is "low." Therefore, until further consideration may be given this matter of so great importance to these States, which were ready and willing to and did enter into a compact, no damage can be done to anybody by striking out that word "high" until I know from the engineers, to whom the Congress would delegate its authority, what it will do if permitted to exercise the authority heretofore granted. We are for flood control. We have proved it. We have agreed to it. That does not mean that we propose to be drowned, devastated, or destroyed by delegated authority. I know you too well to think you would wish us to buy a "pig in a poke." I shall have to oppose the generality on the proposition, however generous it may appear to be.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then would it be necessary if we eliminate this limitation in the bill?

Mr. PLUMLEY. If you strike out that word "high."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That would eliminate the reconstruction altogether. That would leave the law just as it is.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Not as I have written my amendment, I hope.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree with what the gentleman said as to the

desirability of adopting the compacts, but as a practical matter we have not been permitted to operate under the compact. Congress refuses to ratify it. The Supreme Court, which is the last word, says the Federal Government has the right to go into your State and mine and to go into these dams and build them if they want to. After doing so, are you going to deny the people of that locality in Vermont and Connecticut whatever flood protection we can give them? I hope the day comes when that act is repealed.

Mr. PLUMLEY. That is right. Now you have said it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Wherever a river goes through State lands, as long as every State on the river banks is willing to sign the compact, they shall have the right to do so if they want to and the State that tries to stop them shall be estopped.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY] 5 minutes.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, it was not my purpose to enter into a discussion of this bill, because a person coming from an eastern city is not supposed to be familiar with the problems of the West, which afflict the entire country. But I will say that journeying through Arkansas in 1928, I witnessed the ravages of a flood in the Mississippi Valley. I saw houses on stilts or logs or poles with all of the top soil washed away and with nothing but blue clay remaining for a distance of more than 100 miles. I called a conference in 1930, composed of 22 leading economists of Massachusetts, representing 22 universities and colleges, to consider the problem of flood control and as to how it affected the entire Nation. I learned for the first time that the Mississippi River with its tributaries affect 38 of the 48 States of the Union. It was estimated by competent authorities that the loss through soil erosion in a single year represented an average of $250,000,000. I then learned that it would be possible to effect a saving of $250,000,000 annually in the fuel supply of New England, providing there was adequate flood control. So we made a recommendation to one of the candidates for the Presidency in 1932 that he include in his program $2,000,000,000 for flood control in the United States. I had occasion to talk to the President of the United States some 8 months ago and I asked him how he was getting along on the program and was informed by him that we had already expended about $3,500,000,000 upon the flood-control program and in all probability it would represent an expenditure, before completion, of $5,000,000,000.

We can quibble as we see fit about interference with States' rights or its effect upon individual communities, but the fact remains that there is no State or group of States that would be willing to undertake a capital expenditure of $5,000,000,000 to settle a problem of this character. When you stop and consider the possibilities of adequate flood control in the Mississippi Valley you have some realization of the enormity of the problem. You are actually giving the United States of America a third coast line, an interior coast line, if you will, by controlling the flood waters in the Mississippi Valley. We had an example recently within the last 2 years since our participation in World War No. 2. They constructed boats at Cleveland and sent those boats down the Mississippi River on their own power. They were destroyers and submarines. The Mississippi River had a mean depth of from 1 to 6 feet when flood control started. I am informed by the engineers it now has a depth of from 6 to 9 feet and within 10 years if the present liberal policy is pursued, it will have from 9 to 15 feet. We, for many years, have followed the same policies that have been in vogue in China for more than 2,000 years along the Yangtze Kiang and the Hwang Ho Rivers of building dikes whenever there was a flood. Finally they got so they had to build dikes 1,500 feet in height. The flood waters came along and washed topsoil into the bed of the river. As the bed of the river ascended it was necessary to raise the dikes. For the first time in the history of fighting floods and flood waters in America, we have adopted a new system by the establishment of these water reservoirs and these water basins for the storage of flood waters in time of flood.

By permitting the Mississippi River to scour its own bed we do away with the necessity for the erection of dikes and we increase the depth of the river so as to make it navigable its entire length.

Abraham Lincoln is authority for the statement that no nation can exist one-half slave and one-half free, and any individual who has given any study to the long, sad story of bank failures in the agricultural sections and of almost annual floods in the Mississippi River area must realize that this Nation can never enjoy any measure of prosperity so long as one-fourth of the entire Nation, represented by the agriculturists, are walking in the shadow of adversity. The possibility, through the expenditure of $5,000,000,000 for the development of an inland empire in the heart of this Nation, is too important for any individual to overlook.

PERIODS OF DEPRESSION

We have our periods of depression in the world. Lloyd George is authority for the statement that they had one in every 2½-year period in the last hundred years in Great Britain. We in America have had one in about every 5-year period in the last half century. In about every 2- or 3-year period they have had an overflow in the Mississippi Valley—an overflow that could have been prevented through a generous expenditure of public money. When we realize that this one great artery for transportation at the lowest possible rate of freight of every character—the Mississippi taps with tributaries 38 States of the Union—we have some realization of the importance of that project to the entire Nation.

I would propose the expenditure of $5,000,000,000 in the Mississippi area, the creation of great reservoirs or water basins to hold the supply in time of flood and to release it in time of drought; the creation of hydroelectric generating plants at the entrance to those water basins on the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Arkansas, the Red, the Ohio, the Colorado, and the other tributary branches; the development and the manufacture of that hydroelectric energy at less than one-half a cent per kilowatt-hour and its distribution at that price to the individual in that section of America and the possibility of 12 months' navigation would do more to add to the prosperity of the American farmer and every American than any single investment that this Nation of ours might make.

WHAT PROPOSAL WOULD MEAN

It would mean the absorption at the present time and for the next 2 years of the basic materials iron, steel, cement; of electrical energy-developing machinery; it would mean the Westinghouse, the General Electric, and all the leading electric companies here in the East working on a 24-hour schedule for the next 2 years. Through direct water transportation, it would be possible to invade the markets of the world that America must develop for her existence.

The future of America lies in the invasion of the Orient—the markets of India and China—and South America. The continuous navigation of the Mississippi River, with a water freight rate of 30 to 40 cents a ton as against a rail rate of $1.80 a ton, with direct water connection, by way of the Panama Canal, to the Orient and South America, would result in creation of an inland waterway in the heart of America.

It would add more to the prosperity and wealth of the American Nation in the next 25 years than the Louisiana Purchase did since it was added to America.

There is no reason why these great opportunities, not only for the solution of the present industrial problem but the future prosperity of America, should be permitted to lie idle.

NO TIME FOR HESITATION

We did not hesitate during the World Wars to loan to the European nations, and yet we hesitate when the welfare of America is concerned. Thirty-eight States of the Nation tapped by the Mississippi and its tributaries; settlement of the flood question.

The production from that wonderful alluvial soil along the banks of the Mississippi, Ohio, Colorado, Missouri, Arkansas, and the Red; the possibility of direct water communication. I confess I never had any realization of how immense it was until we had a coal famine here in 1915. Out in Pennsylvania every time they get an accumulation of slag and slate they arrange a strike and then they unload the slag and slate on us for coal—at $20 a ton as against the customary price of $15 a ton. We had one of these strikes in 1915 and the price of coal advanced to about $18 a ton. Then we received here for the first time coal from Kentucky. It was not anthracite, but it was a high-grade bituminous coal with a low ash content but with a higher heat unit than any anthracite we ever

used. Why do we not get it here all the time? Because the freight rate from Kentucky to Boston is $5.80 a ton. With a water rate of 80 cents to $1 a ton, they could undersell Pennsylvania anthracite and then make more money upon the coal handled than in any previous time in the history of Kentucky.

The hauling of cotton and cereals over the Rocky Mountains to Seattle, Portland, Oreg., Los Angeles, and San Francisco for shipment to the Orient when the Mississippi and its tributaries affords a direct route via the Panama Canal is an indictment of our intelligence.

FAVORS $5,000,000,000 EXPENDITURES

I am in favor, although living in a State far removed from the agricultural regions, of the immediate expenditure by the United States of America of $5,000,000,000 to settle for all time the question of flood control and make possible the development at the lowest possible cost of electrical energy; and to give America control of the cheapest character of water transportation; and to enhance the value of our investment in the Panama Canal; and to develop in the heart of America an inland empire, within the territory of which every progressive, forward-looking leader of the industrial life of the world would find it necessary within 5 years to locate a plant and take advantage of cheap water transportation and the lowest electrical cost to be found anywhere in the world.

The farmer's problem is the problem of every individual in America, and when it is settled, in God's name, let it be settled right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] 7 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am very much impressed by the national benefits that will accrue from the adoption of the act and the extension of the present flood-control program, but I trust I may be pardoned if I venture a reference to its particular impact upon the Upper Ohio River Basin, from which area I come, and a portion of which I have the honor to represent.

As you all know, the Ohio Valley, drained by the Allegheny and the Monongahela and the Ohio Rivers and their tributaries is one of the greatest industrial regions of the United States. I do not think it would be possible for us to carry on our great production program if we did not have the steel that comes from the mills of Pittsburgh and West Virginia, and Ohio. In 1936 and 1937, that entire region was inundated, the commercial and manufacturing area of Pittsburgh was completely under water, and industries farther down the river in Ohio and West Virginia were closed. Due to the topography of the country the mills in Pittsburgh and in the remainder of the valley, are constructed at a very slight elevation above the river banks. Since that time six dams have been built above Pittsburgh, on the tributaries of the Ohio River. In 1942, after we were in the war, it was due to the construction of these six dams that another flood was prevented in Pittsburgh, in Ohio, down to Wheeling, W. Va., that great industrial region, which would otherwise have been put out of operation. Had that occurred the heaviest concentration of the steel industry in the United States would have been rendered largely useless during the period of flood, and of the repair of the flood's ravages, and vital supplies of steel and its products would have been lost to the United States.

These reservoirs, according to the information I have, reduced the crest stage at Pittsburgh by 3 feet and prevented property damage estimated at over $15,000,000. In Ohio and West Virginia property damage to the extent of $14,000,000 was likewise saved. These reservoirs cost $38,250,000 and in 1 year they prevented the occurrence of damage estimated at $29,000,000, thus practically paying in 1 year for their construction.

The present bill authorizes the appropriation of a further sum of $70,000,000 for flood-control projects to be constructed in the headwaters and tributaries of the Ohio River. There is one in the Chadakoin River area in New York. The Chadakoin River empties into Conewango Creek, and finally finds its way to the Alleghany and the Ohio. There is a project erected on the Cheat River in West Virginia which is estimated by the engineers to reduce the flood stages at Pittsburgh in the event of any maximum flood of reasonable expectancy, as much as an additional 1.4 feet.

There are also further improvements in the Youghiogheny River Basin, which now flows into the Monongahela and thus into the Ohio, and improvements near Latrobe, on the Loyalhanna Creek, whose waters also find their way into the Ohio. All of these undoubtedly will have some additional effect on reducing the flood stage at Pittsburgh and farther down the valley. I do not believe in the unreasonable or unwarranted extension of Federal power and the deprivation of the States of the power which they rightfully should have. But I cannot possibly see how projects of this magnitude, which involve not one, but many States, can be at all handled by the States in a practical manner. For example, two projects to which I have referred which affect the entire Ohio Valley, originate in its headwaters, one of them in West Virginia, and the other in New York. It would be obviously unfair to ask the States which have no direct or considerable benefit to be received from these projects, where the projects are for the benefit of States farther down the river—indeed for the entire Ohio Valley and for the ultimate benefit of the Mississippi Valley—to be asked to pay for such projects themselves. The Federal Government cannot afford to wait while the States join together in some possible compact in order to perform these public works which are for the general and immediate interest of the country at large.

I wish to compliment the committee for their very painstaking and conscientious study of this great problem. I wish also to compliment our very efficient office of Army engineers. I think they are doing a splendid service for the country. I also suggest that projects such as have been outlined here should be constructed as one of our first post-war works.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to say that the so-called State-compact theory of flood control failed because, among other things, one State could block it completely, and thus block flood control throughout the Nation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am thankful for the gentleman's observation. To me that is obvious. This is a matter of national magnitude, and I feel, must be handled in a program with a national scope.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Has the gentleman seen the cartoon by Fitspatrick which appeared in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of April 30, which merely shows a landscape with a river starting as a trickle and coming down in a terrible flood at the bottom, with everything submerged except the top of a telephone pole and one lone citizen on the roof top of a floating house, and below the cartoon this caption: "While the States disagree on a program"?

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman. The observation and the idea of the cartoonist is relevant and very pointed, and illustrates better than anything I can say the inadequacy of State action upon this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, about the only thing that gives me a feeling of comfort in regard to the message I have is when I look at Watts' painting of Hope. There she sits at the apex of the universe, playing on a harp of a thousand strings, all of which have been broken save one. And I am strumming on that one string.

This Congress, under Public Law No. 138, enacted legislation to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods and for other purposes. I find it applies to every place but the vicinity of Toledo, Ohio, and the Lake Erie region.

After our flood disaster of 1943, where something like 300 people were made homeless by the lake flowing over the dikes, I was hopeful that emergency act would take care of us.

I was advised by the legal department that it did not apply. It applied everywhere but to us, but nothing for the fathers and mothers of the veterans in the Lake Erie district. A flood only happens in rivers and in certain geographical centers. Surely the Loan Disaster Corporation would take care of us, they could lend the money, but not for the building of dikes. I was referred to Colonel Goethals, who sent some Army engineers

there. They estimated that it would require $110,000 to make these necessary and urgent repairs and he approved it. After the report was returned the legal department said, "No. Public Law No. 138 does not take care of it."

Then we received the usual word, "refer, refer, refer." Have any of you Members ever been referred? Most of you went home during that recess period of last summer but I remained on the job here to take care of the flood sufferers. I was referred to this department, that department, and the other department. With shoe leather worn out, I walked, and walked, and was referred and referred, and I heard other words, "overall—broad view," until I almost reached the place where in my sleep I heard "If pi equals X you extract the cube root and then you get the philosophy that you are not taken care of because you are a minority man."

So in distress I prayed, "God Almighty, cannot the flood sufferers of our region be taken care of? Does it only go to the rivers?"

This year my colleague in the Senate, Senator TAFT, introduced S. 1536, which is now before the Senate Committee on Commerce. I hope that something happens there; one hearing has been held on the bill, but there is delay. They have suggested that perhaps it can be passed and attached to this bill. In the meantime, two other floods have occurred. Originally, the $110,000 would have taken care of it. It was not done. Another flood occurred that increased the cost of needed repairs to $265,000. Just the other day there was another flood. Still they say it is not a flood. Plainly a stitch in time would have saved nine.

What is a flood? The dictionary states that it is "a body of water rising, swelling, and overflowing land not otherwise so covered." Anyway, the dikes went and we have our floods.

The other day I talked to the man who wants to be Governor of Ohio. He said: "Congressman, don't give up; be an optimist. My uncle, 98, recently married a lady 96, and they are hunting for a home located near a schoolhouse."

I am in sadness, however. I voted for nearly $2,000,000,000 to relieve suffering in other lands; I voted for every measure connected with the war effort. I ask only a little bit, yet I am met with the response: "It does not apply; it does not apply." I hope to offer an amendment tomorrow. Will you help me? Will you please have a heart and not use the words "it does not apply"? In God's name, think of those men, most of them fathers of soldiers, and their families that are without homes. We have gone to the Housing Authority. They will take care of migrants, but if a person happens to live along the shores of Lake Erie there seemingly is no relief. Even if you have no immediate interest in our troubles, in God's name, be just, be generous. That is my message.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio yields back 4 minutes.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TROUTMAN].

Mr. TROUTMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the Committee authorizes the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and for other purposes. The enactment of this bill will continue the national flood-control policy and program initiated by the act of 1936 and extended by subsequent acts of Congress.

In approving the Flood Control Act of 1941, the President directed that no new flood-control projects should be undertaken unless they were of direct importance to the defense of the Nation. Since the declaration of war the demands of construction, and the shortage of critical materials, equipment, and labor have forced the stoppage of numerous projects which could not command sufficiently high priority ratings to secure the materials needed for their construction.

The present bill constitutes legislative planning for post-war construction. We already have an enormous backlog of flood-control projects which have been authorized in previous acts but which have not been put into execution because of the necessities of war.

The Congress and the country recognize flood disaster in this country as one of the major problems affecting the welfare and security of the entire Nation. The enormous loss of life and property caused by floods calls for some systematic program of flood control. Scarcely any section of our country has been immune from these disasters. It is, therefore, essential to undertake the preparation of detailed plans to cope with this great force of Nature. From an economic standpoint, a reserve of worth-while projects which can be initiated immediately following the war should provide a great deal of employment for workers made idle by the closing of war plants. This bill includes many meritorious flood-control improvements. The lives and property of our citizens who live in the fertile valleys of our rivers must be protected. They must have a sense of security if they are going to live in peace and build permanent homes. Moreover, the flood areas must be made so secure from flood that industry will be willing to venture into the area.

This bill contains additional authorizations for some very necessary projects in my home State of Pennsylvania. There are many flood-control projects which have already been authorized but which have not been built, due to the stoppage order of the Chief Executive. It cannot be urged too strenuously that many of these projects should be in complete readiness to be executed as soon as war conditions permit. Many of these projects are so essential that they should be undertaken even before the cessation of hostilities and just as soon as manpower and materials are available. I refer particularly to the project on the Susquehanna River at Sunbury, Pa., which provides for a system of levees and pumps which will materially lessen the danger of disastrous floods. The Sunbury area is engaged in much war work and other manufacturing activities and is an important railway and transportation center as well. There are many other worth-while projects in the other river valleys of the State which should be given prompt attention. While the most recent devastating flood in the Susquehanna River Valley occurred in 1936, yet since that time floods, and the danger of floods, have occurred quite frequently. The great flood of 1936 throughout the Susquehanna Basin caused damages estimated at $67,000,000. In the Ohio River Basin, in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, flood-control projects, already completed, have reduced the crest stage by several feet. The present bill calls for additional improvements which should materially protect the highly industrialized Pittsburgh area. While the need for adequate flood protection is widely recognized, yet there is a constant danger of using flood control as a guise for promoting projects for other purposes. It has been the policy of the Committee on Flood Control to recommend only such projects as will provide primarily for protection against floods and the generation of electricity and other purposes have been given secondary consideration.

It should be the policy of Congress to place each project under the test as to whether or not the primary objective is the control of floods. There is at least one project in the bill which provides for improvements which will have very limited use in the control of floods but is primarily a hydroelectric project. I refer particularly to the improvement in the Youghiogheny River Basin. This river traverses land underlaid with some of the finest coal deposits in the world and in this area electricity can be generated by steam economically. It is doubtful whether such an improvement, involving such an enormous sum of public funds, should be authorized, particularly in a flood-control bill.

While we are almost unanimously committed to the virtues of a flood-control program, we should not let it become the instrumentality by which Federal agencies assume control of water rights which properly belong to the State and its citizens. Prior to 1933, Federal control extended only to navigable waters actually used in interstate commerce. A new test of navigability, however, has been established in a series of recent cases. The Court has ruled that an unnavigable portion of a stream and its unnavigable tributaries may in law become navigable because they maintain the navigability of the lower portion. It should not be forgotten that the primary rights in water rests in the States, and while a program of Federal aid in controlling floodwaters is highly desirable, yet it should not form the basis of a usurpation of the rights of the several States. Federal projects should only be undertaken in complete cooperation with the State and local governments. Too often has the humitarian appeal for the control of floods been used to camouflage the real purpose of those who advocate a strong centralization of powers in the Federal Government.

While practically all of the projects in the pending bill are primarily for flood control and make the bill worthy of the favorable consideration of the House,

nevertheless, it is imperative that due caution be exercised so that no authorization shall include projects which are only remotely connected with the subject of flood control.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be one of the speakers who is not for this bill. I have every respect for the chairman who brought this legislation in and I am with him on most things, but because we are friends, because I admire him, is no reason under the sun why I should agree with him if his philosophy and mine disagree. I want to call your attention to a few of the outstanding things that are going to be done in this bill, and I am referring to the rivers that have their sources west of the 97th parallel.

This bill first authorizes a comprehensive scheme of improvements in the Missouri River under the direction of the Secretary of War. Second, it authorizes the Secretary of War to construct and maintain canals and takes possession—I presume it could not mean anything else—of the irrigation systems that we now have working under Government control in the Bureau of Reclamation. Third, it authorizes the Secretary of War to sell to States, municipalities, private concerns, and individuals at such prices and on such terms as it may deem reasonable—what are they going to sell back to us? The water that we who live out west of the 97th parallel thought we had a right to use, water we thought God Almighty put there for us to use. But now we have got to turn it over to the Government and buy it back. Fourth, it provides that hereafter whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War any dam or reservoir project operated under his direction can be consistently used for reclamation of arid lands it will be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe the rules and regulations and the price of water.

This comprehensive plan that was developed on the Missouri River includes, of course, flood control and navigation. These in themselves, flood control and navigation, are national in scope and fall within the commerce clause of the Constitution. The matter of navigation is one of Federal control. There is no argument on that at all. But through this Federal control of transportation and flood control they have added on these other elements in this bill.

I am against this bill as it now stands and unless some very important amendments are made, I will vote "No" on final passage.

Judge Stone has given the best analysis of this bill that I have seen. He says:

1. It authorizes a comprehensive scheme of improvements in the Missouri River, under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, not only for flood control and navigation, but for irrigation, power development, and other purposes.

2. It authorizes the Secretary of War to construct, maintain, and operate conservation facilities at dams under the control of the War Department. Section 3 granting this authority seems to be broad enough to permit the Corps of Engineers to construct, maintain, and operate the necessary canals and other facilities to utilize stored water for irrigation purposes.

3. It authorizes the Secretary of War to sell to States, municipalities, private concerns, or individuals, at such prices and on such terms as he may deem reasonable for domestic and industrial uses, surplus water that may be available at any reservoir under the control of the War Department; and provides that all moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

4. It provides that hereafter, whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War any dam and reservoir project operated under his direction can be consistently used for reclamation of arid lands, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe regulations for the use of the storage available for such purposes and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations. The same provision specifies such charges for the use of stored water, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem reasonable, the receipts therefrom to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

We have gotten along pretty well since 1902—42 years—under the reclamation system that we have in the West that you want to change today if you can do it; but I intend to point out here before you do it what is going to happen if this bill passes.

If this bill passes you are going to wipe out the Reclamation Bureau in just one vote and hereafter all irrigation in the West will be under the direct control of the Army engineers. The Reclamation Bureau has worked with the States; they have worked with North Dakota and other States; and the use of water is regulated by the States. Many of you Members have been very jealous about the encroachment of the Federal Government on States' rights but here in one vote you are going to wipe out all the authority that the States ever had on the question of the use of water and you are going to lodge it right back with the Federal Government under the pretense that you are operating under the authority of the commerce clause.

But you say, "We have amended it; we have amended it so it will not do any damage." Let me read you the amendment:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of that now authorized by law.

Had you put an amendment in the bill subjecting the use of this water for navigation to the right of the States in the arid West to use that water for irrigation, or if you would put irrigation on an equal level, it would have been at least fair; but here you say they cannot use any water except such as is authorized by law. What law do you have reference to? If it is a State law, that is, of course, wiped out, because this is a Federal law; in other words, what you are doing here this afternoon and tomorrow is changing the entire system of the United States and embarking the Government on a new policy in the use of water. It passes from State control, from control of the Reclamation Bureau into Federal control under the Army engineers of the United States.

Judge Stone's opinion on the effect of this amendment seems too clear for argument. It reads:

This amendment does not protect the existing and potential uses of water for irrigation, and does not clearly state the intention of the Chief of Engineers. It can constitute no reassurance whatsoever to residents in the Upper Missouri Basin

First. When it is said that by the authorized words no demand for water is made "over that now authorized by existing law," the question is asked, "What law?" Under the theory of this authorization bill, the demand for water for navigation and to carry out the plan of the Corps of Engineers would be exercised under the commerce clause. This means, then, that the paramount and controlling law would be the Federal Constitution. It follows that in any case where there is a conflict between the constitutional power and the State laws the term "existing law" offers no protection to water rights for irrigation, domestic, and industrial purposes under State laws.

Second. Existing law does not specifically define the quantitative demands that may be made upon water resources of the Missouri Basin for present or future navigation projects in any comprehensive plan.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that the meaning of that amendment must be considered in relation to its origin. That proviso does not pertain to recapture for the States above Sioux City water rights which had previously been appropriated by law to use below Sioux City. It does provide that nothing in this act shall be construed to establish any new rights for water used below Sioux City beyond those that are now authorized by law. As the debate on the river and harbor bill clearly showed, the uses of water below Sioux City that are presently authorized by law are the water required for a 6-foot channel and the Fort Peck Reservoir. These are already established by law. This proviso is to the effect that nothing contained in this bill shall give any new water rights below Sioux City.

Mr. BURDICK. Let us suppose this situation arises: It is admitted on all sides and admitted in this report that there is a shortage of water in the Missouri River at times. Let us suppose we pass this bill and the Army engineers use a certain amount of water for navigation. We want to use some of it for irrigation, but they say: "You cannot do that now because we need it for transportation on the river." Which law is going to prevail in a situation of that kind? Do you think this amendment—I understand the gentleman from South Dakota offered it—does the gentleman think this amendment will protect us in the use of that water where we need it?

Mr. CASE. I have never maintained that this proviso recaptured anything which had been given to water users below Sioux City by prior law. I have always contended that this was the minimum that we should have, that we should make clear that any legislation we are passing now establishes no new priorities below Sioux City. The gentle-

man realizes that the Fort Peck Act, which was passed in 1933, dedicated Fort Peck to navigate and to power.

My understanding of the pending bill and the meaning of the Chief of Engineers' letter, which is made law by reference in the paragraph on the Missouri River, provides that Fort Peck water shall be progressively made available for irrigation by relief as substitute storage is created. In that respect we are recapturing for irrigation some waters that had previously been dedicated to navigation.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is satisfied as he stands here this afternoon that this amendment will protect the people of the West in the use of water for irrigation regardless of the condition of the river?

Mr. CASE. I am satisfied it will protect the people of the Northwest against any new uses below Sioux City. I am not satisfied that it recaptures anything that we previously gave away.

Mr. BURDICK. What is the gentleman's answer to this new innovation here, the destruction of the Department of Reclamation?

Mr. CASE. I would not concede this destroys the Bureau of Reclamation because I know by the testimony before the Flood Control Committee and by specific statements made over the signature of the Chief of Engineers and by the provisions of House Document No. 475, which is referred to in the Missouri River paragraph, that it is contemplated the Bureau of Reclamation shall operate all reclamation that may grow out of the storage or main stem, and most specifically that the Bureau of Reclamation shall develop as much irrigation as it wants to on any of the tributaries or branches of the Missouri River and that the Army engineers care nothing about it. If the gentleman desires, I can read the specific paragraph from a letter from the Chief of Engineers I received within the last week which specifically states that the Army engineers have always contemplated that this program shall be supplemented by the Bureau of Reclamation with a works program for irrigation.

Mr. BURDICK. Now, if it is satisfactory to the gentleman, I will make a few feeble remarks of my own.

Mr. CASE. I desire to express my appreciation of the gentleman's courtesy. The gentleman was asking as to the interpretation of some language.

Mr. BURDICK. I assure the gentleman I will not ask him anything more because he does not seem to know when to put in a period.

Mr. CASE. That is because of the gentleman's courtesy and generosity.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, if all that is true why do you want to act so hurriedly on this bill? The Reclamation Bureau has worked 5 years on a study of this situation. That report is finished but not yet printed. You have an overall plan for the development of the Missouri River. Now, why not let the Bureau of Reclamation come in and show us the findings? You will not wait for them, you want to get this done right away. Of course, if you want to pass this kind of a bill giving title to all water over to the Government, then turn around and buy the water back from the Government, why I would not wait for any report either. I would go ahead and do it right away. I challenge anyone here to deny the fact that in this bill you are going to substitute a new scheme in place of the Bureau of Reclamation and the water we use we are going to buy this time. We have not had to buy it before.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I respectfully state again that it is not the intent of the committee nor is it the purport of the language to do anything except to recognize the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with reclamation projects. I beg leave to differ with the gentleman, to put it mildly, that there is anything else in the law. If the gentleman will permit me to say, in all reclamation projects the people who get the water pay for the use of it. The money goes to the distribution channels or somewhere else. There is nothing new in that way.

Mr. BURDICK. If the Army engineers are going to build canals and distribute water, they are going to have water to distribute, are they not?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say there is no language in here that authorizes them to build canals. That is left entirely to the Secretary of the Interior. The Army engineers have nothing on earth to do with it and there is no language authorizing them to construct canals.

Mr. BURDICK. Your whole scheme of river development anticipates that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Anticipates what?

Mr. BURDICK. The building of canals.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If they are to be built, they will be built by the Secretary of the Interior, not by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. BURDICK. But the Department of Reclamation can go out and do that?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is intended here to recognize their function.

Mr. BURDICK. They can function but they cannot function without water, unless they can get the water from the Army engineers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This language in section 6 is intended to recognize and to provide for a coordination in the recognition of reclamation by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers is not going to do a thing on earth except to make the water there available to them, when there is water for reclamation.

Mr. BURDICK. There are years now and then when the Missouri River is low. At the present moment the river is lower at Bismarck, N. Dak., our capital, than at any time during the last 30 years. It is at the low mark. Suppose we have a situation like that up in North Dakota and we wanted to use some of that water for irrigation, but you need it for navigation, which is going to control, irrigation or navigation, under this act?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman addresses that question to me I may say that the navigation provisions are in the river and harbor bill now pending in the Senate. That has previously been considered by the House. This has to do with the regulation of floods and these people down here where they are suffering now from floods, I am sure, would be delighted for you to keep all the water you could up there and to get all you can. That is what they want you to do.

Mr. BURDICK. If the bill goes through it means that we have divested every one of the 17 arid Western and semi-arid Western States of their power over waters of that area, and have turned the title to all waters gathered on the western plains to the United States, and hereafter if we are to be permitted to use any of these waters we shall have to get permission from the Department of the Interior and the Army engineers, and above all we shall have to pay cash for what water we get. That is a simple and effective way of stripping the States of the power under State laws; it is a simple way of making people pay for water which the Almighty sent to the people of the arid West. This committee may be in a mood to do this, but I have lived on the western plains long enough to know the value of water, and I do not propose to set the Government up in the cold-drink business and pay cash for a drink of water. The people all through the country are complaining about the weakness of Congress in passing laws that consolidate Federal powers and destroy State rights. The President is charged daily with wanting more power, but here in this case the President cannot be charged with wanting to strip the States of their power over water in the States, but it is Congress and no one else who is responsible for this immense consolidation of Federal power.

It is Congress that says today that hereafter we, in the arid West, will have to pay cash for what water we must have to maintain life. No more drastic and far-reaching power over the people was ever attempted by any Congress. When Congress gets down to controlling the necessities of life—a thing which we must have in order to live—it is a step in nationalization that no President in 150 years has ever asked for.

Judge Stone makes this important observation on the bill:

> This provision would be applicable to areas west of the ninety-seventh meridian, where water heretofore has been appropriated and distributed for domestic and industrial purposes under the provisions of State law. In the 17 reclamation States when water is conserved through storage in a reservoir, it is subject to control under the State laws. Here, however, we find a new and startling Federal policy. The Corps of Engineers, having been authorized under the commerce clause to work out a plan of comprehensive development and to construct and operate projects in accordance with such plan, is apparently considered to have conserved water which thereby becomes the property and subject to the control of the United States. This water, then, under the provision of H. R. 4485, may be made available to States in the West or to legal subdivisions of those States, if such States and legal subdivisions

are willing to pay the United States a rental price for it. The Western States which heretofore have controlled the appropriation and distribution of water resources for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes on the theory that such resources belong to the public subject to control under State laws, must under this bill recognize in such waters the property of the United States and pay for it if it is used by such States or their citizens.

This is a radical departure from the reclamation law of 1902, as amended. Under this law the Secretary of the Interior was directed to acquire water for reclamation projects in the West which was used for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes, in conformity with the provisions of State law. The Federal Government financed such projects under a provision for repayment of the investment by the Government. This control under State laws has been upheld repeatedly by the Supreme Court and the Congress of the United States. The Congress is now asked to reverse this policy so far as flood-control projects constructed by the War Department are concerned, and to initiate an entirely new one whereby the Government will sell to the States the benefits of their water resources.

SECTION 6. REGULATIONS FOR THE USE OF STORAGE AVAILABLE FOR RECLAMATION OF ARID LANDS

Section 6, page 3, of H. R. 4485, provides that whenever, in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, any dam and reservoir operated under the direction of the Secretary of War can be consistently used for reclamation of arid lands, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe regulations for the use of the storage available for such purpose, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations. This provision further sets out that such rates as the Secretary of the Interior may deem reasonable shall be charged for the use of such stored water used for the irrigation of arid lands.

This, indeed, is an amazing innovation and change in Federal policy. Since this provision refers to the reclamation of arid lands, its application is confined to river basins having their sources west of the ninety-seventh meridian. It is in that area where reclamation is essential to present and potential agricultural development.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12½ minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, at the time the gentleman from North Dakota was leaving the floor I believe he had something he wanted to add. In view of the generosity he displayed toward me I yield to him at this time.

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; I want to make a speech.

Mr. CASE. Of course, I am not going to yield all of my time to the gentleman. If he does not find a period sooner than I did, I may find it necessary to advise him that I cannot yield further.

Mr. BURDICK. On reconsideration, I have finally decided to let the gentleman speak a few minutes himself.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from North Dakota raised a question about the allocation of water for navigation. As the Chairman very correctly stated, that is an item that appears in the river and harbor bill. It is not before the House at all in this bill. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from South Dakota to a portion of the testimony of Colonel Reber that I have inserted in the RECORD wherein he states that the plan for flood control, the so-called Pick plan in the Missouri River Basin, would be substantially the same regardless of how the issue in the river and harbor bill might be determined.

Mr. CASE. That is true, and it should be kept in mind during the debate on this bill. Mr. Chairman, during discussion on the bill this afternoon it has seemed there was perhaps a little confusion—I am sure there is confusion in the minds of people generally—as to the difference between an authorization and an appropriation for flood-control projects. One of the speakers referred to this bill as carrying funds for a certain project. Actually this bill does not carry funds for any project. It does not make any appropriation. It merely establishes an authorization under which appropriations may or may not be made later.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that was myself and I intended to correct that statement.

Mr. CASE. I did not think it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but in any event it seems well to make the record clear that in this bill we only set up an authorization for projects. Whether a dollar will ever be appropriated for any of these projects depends upon future legislation. Those appropriations may never equal the authorizations. They cannot exceed them except new authorizations are made.

The annual appropriation bill for the civil functions of the War Department is the bill that carries the appropriations for the authorized projects. In that annual civil functions bill we carry appropriations for authorized flood-control projects under several different heads. Some are for construction, some for plans and specifications, some for emergency repairs, and some for maintenance of completed works. We do the same with respect to authorized rivers and harbors projects.

So, let it be kept in mind that not a dollar is appropriated by the bill before us. This merely sets up an authorization for appropriations, but the actual appropriations are made by Congress in months and years to come, and then only after a presentation of specific works or units under these authorizations.

The Corps of Engineers will make up estimates annually of the projects on which they can usefully spend funds in an ensuing year. These will be examined and sifted by the Bureau of the Budget. Then the President will submit to the Appropriations Committee the estimates for the projects approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Appropriations Committee will examine them further, and the appropriations bill will come to the House with funds for the projects it has approved. Then the House will have a chance to approve or reject, curtail or increase, but all within the limit of authorizations carried in the basic authorization bill now before us. And of course when the House completes its action, the appropriations bill goes to the Senate.

I mention these steps to remind us all, and to make clear to those who may read the RECORD, that passage of a flood-control bill to authorize appropriations up to a certain amount is not a guaranty that certain projects will be built, and especially to make clear that abundant opportunity will be given for correlating any program herein proposed with other programs. Specifically, in the case of the program proposed herein for the Missouri River, when appropriations are made there will be an opportunity to insure that there is no overlapping and no duplication and no contradiction in projects with those of any other agency.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. If the chairman of the committee is correct that this bill has nothing to do with the distribution of water, why was this proviso put in on page 12, line 20?

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of that now authorized by existing law.

Consequently, the chairman, at least, must be mistaken. He does not fully comprehend what this bill means, and if his suggestions are sincere, why object to putting amendments in this bill that will allay our apprehension of what he is attempting to do?

Mr. CASE. Probably that question should be answered by the chairman, but it would appear to me that the proviso makes clear and positive that nothing in the bill distributes any new water rights on the Missouri below Sioux City and that nothing is even to be construed as doing so.

It says as plainly as can be that nothing in the act is to be construed as giving to water users below Sioux City any water to which they are not entitled by prior authorizations. It distributes nothing to them. It reserves for use above Sioux City the water not previously authorized for projects below Sioux City but makes no distribution of this reservation, leaving that for allocation by agreement among interested parties as reservoirs are constructed from time to time and storage becomes available for distribution.

FLOODS ARE NATIONAL ENEMIES

Mr. Chairman, it is fit and proper that Congress consider this bill at this time. Floods are an enemy of the country in peace and in war. A week ago today the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, took the floor and gave one of the most graphic statements of the national character of the flood problem on the Missouri River that I have ever heard. I read from the RECORD of May 2:

The Central West is being devastated by the greatest flood within the memory of man. The tide of water sweeping down the valleys of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers and their tributaries exceeds in height and

velocity all official records since 1844—the greatest flood in the last 100 years.

It will be recalled, Mr. Chairman, that a year ago last March the Missouri River was in high flood. At that time we thought it was terrible. I remember comparing its destruction later with that wrought by brave bombers who invaded Germany and blasted holes in two great dams to engulf war plants of the enemy. Here in America 2,000,000 acres of farm lands were put under water. Factories producing war-goods in Kansas City were put out of commission.

I was going west to meet Army and reclamation engineers at Pierre, S. Dak., for a conference with our Governor Sharpe on this very flood problem. I tried to fly to Omaha, but at Chicago they told me the Omaha airport was under water and would be out of use for 6 weeks.

My trip was not particularly important, but I ask you to estimate what value Hitler would have thought it would be to him if he could have sent bombers to America to knock out war factories at Kansas City and the airport at Omaha.

When the battle of the 1943 flood on the Missouri was over, the Chief of Engineers determined that more than $47,000,000 worth of direct damage had been done. He testified before the Appropriations Committee this spring that $3,014,000 was spent in fighting the flood and repairing broken levees, and that when it was done we had no new protection. That means the Missouri floods last year alone cost over $50,000,000 and nothing to show for it except waste and destruction.

That was last year. Some men said it will not happen again for years and years. But it has. This year not the Omaha but the Kansas City airport was put under water, taking out of use that important air transportation center for a critical period of time. Let me read again from the statement by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], made just a week ago:

> The Missouri River is establishing a new channel at its mouth. The confluence of these two great rivers is being moved 26 miles upstream. A new river is being opened through what was a short time ago inland fields. Through this new avenue water is rushing at the rate of 17 miles per hour. It has engulfed whole sections of the M. K. & T. Railroad and the Burlington Railroad. It has obliterated interstate highways. It has broken the pipe line which runs from Texas to New York, which has been carrying the oil without which the New England States would have endured the greatest privation. It is sweeping away the cables carrying electric current from the Keokuk Dam to metropolitan St. Louis, and steel towers supporting the transmission lines are at the bottom of the river. It has resisted all efforts to curb the current and hold the levees and railroad embankments and railway cars loaded with rock for revetment have been undermined and rolled into the river. It has destroyed light, telephone communications, and sanitary systems. So rapid has been the rise of the waters that it has been necessary to organize relief to rescue marooned families from farm homes.
>
> The damage is conservatively estimated to be in excess of $20,000,000, and the loss to agricultural production is incalculable. Growing fields, livestock, machinery, fences, houses, barns, and equipment have been swept away overnight and cannot be replaced in time to produce a crop without Federal assistance in the form of both loans, grants, and priorities.

Every sentence of the gentleman's statement tells the interstate character, the national character of the flood problem.

So, Mr. Chairman, when we discuss a program to stop such destruction we are attacking an enemy of the country. Over the weekend much was made of the bombing of the Pescara Dam in Italy because of the damage the resulting flood would do to our enemy on that front. That was proper, and a good job. And when we in the House of Representatives take steps to end the floods on the Missouri River, when we here authorize the preparation of plans to stop this destruction for all time in the Missouri and other river basins of the country, we are doing a proper and important job.

AND DROUGHTS, TOO

The floods, however, are only one side of the problem we attack. The other is drought.

Up in the Northwest, in the States of Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, our interest in the Missouri does not stem so much from the damage by the floods as it does from the tragic fact that the water which creates so much havoc below Sioux City would be a lifesaver to us above Sioux City if it were stored in reservoirs so that we could use it when we need it.

Drought, too, is a national problem.

In the years from 1933 to 1937, the Federal Government expended $56,000,000 on loans, grants, and work relief in seven North Dakota counties, all because of drought. In 1937, more than 73 percent of the population of Williams County was dependent on relief. Just across the river in the lower Yellowstone irrigation district, the relief load represented less than 5 percent of the population.

In other words, where water had been stored for use in dry years, the relief load of the Federal Government was far below the national average; in an adjoining county where the floodwaters had not been stored, the relief load was far above the national average—less than 5 percent of the people on relief where floodwaters had been stored; more than 73 percent where Old Man Flood and Old Man Drought ran on together.

THIS BILL TACKLES BOTH

The program proposed in the bill before us includes a program to end floods on the Missouri River for all time to come. Col. Lewis A. Pick, now General Pick, who was the division engineer who worked out the plan proposed, said that it is designed to put the entire flow of the Missouri River above Sioux City under control. And, realizing that the national problem did not end with simply stopping the floods, he proposed that the reservoirs be built for multiple purposes. He proposed that the waters when stored be made available for the several uses to which they might properly be applied.

That is why the language of the bill on page 12 carries these words:

> plan of improvement for flood control, irrigation, power development, navigation and other purposes, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

Discussion that has already taken place on the floor indicates how the committee proposes that waters stored under the plan proposed are to be made available to States, municipalities, and individuals for recreational, agricultural, industrial, and other beneficial use, and how water will also be made available for irrigation under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, shall prescribe, presumably in accord with Federal reclamation practice and laws.

The Bureau of Reclamation has been working in the valley of the upper Missouri for at least 5 years. The first person I ever heard describe a detailed proposal for a comprehensive development of the water resources of the basin was Mr. W. G. Sloan, chief of the field investigation force in the Denver office of the Bureau, and now assistant regional director at Billings.

I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that the report of the Bureau of Reclamation for application of the water proposed to be stored in the Army engineers' plan might have been completed last year and coordinated with the report embodied in the bill before us. The trip to Pierre, that I mentioned earlier, was made with that purpose in mind. Many other conferences were held on the subject. For one reason or another, however, principally a shortage of personnel, I believe, the report of the Bureau of Reclamation was not completed until a few days ago.

I have studied that report, as I have that of the Army engineers. The one supplements the other in a splendid way. Personally, I wish that both of them might be authorized at this time. There seem to be only two questions at issue, or two different points of view.

MAXIMUM FLOOD VERSUS MAXIMUM DROUGHT

One of them concerns the amount of water that can be depended upon, or, to put it another way, the amount of flood that has to be handled. The job of the Army engineers is to provide for the maximum flood; the concern of the Bureau of Reclamation is to have water to last through the longest drougth or dry cycle. And looked at from this angle, it would seem that both agencies should want, and I believe they do want, the maximum possible storage on both the main stem and the tributaries of the Missouri.

The best way to get at the size of the problem is to study the records of water run-off. In flood control, obviously, the dams must be placed below the area where the water accumulates, from rain or melting snow and ice. Moreover, the nearer the reservoirs can be placed to the areas of greatest possible damage, the more certain the protection that can be given.

In 1943, the Chief of Engineers advises me, the big March flood came principally from sudden rain and melting snow in the plains of eastern Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. The

figures are: From Wyoming 230,000 acre-feet; from Montana 1,800,000 acre-feet, from North Dakota, 1,700,000 acre-feet; from South Dakota 1,000,000 acre-feet. The dam at Fort Peck stopped 495,000 acre-feet that would otherwise have gone into the flood and would have raised its crest at Omaha by 2.3 feet, covering a great part of the city of Council Bluffs.

A great deal of the trouble in this year's flood, way down in Missouri, was caused by the huge amount of water that came from the melting of the heaviest blanket of snow that the northwestern part of South Dakota has ever had. I saw part of it, a month ago today, Mr. Chairman, flooding the valleys of the grand and Moreau Rivers, in South Dakota, washing out all the approaches to bridges from the headwaters of the Grand to its confluence with the Missouri, across 250 miles of northern South Dakota.

So, as I have said, an approach to the problem calls for an understanding of the volume of water with which we are dealing. And at this point, it is appropriate to insert the official tables showing the run-off on the Missouri River for as long as records are available. By permission of the House, I insert the table:

Annual run-off of Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers

Water-year ending Sept. 30	Yellowstone River intake, Montana	Missouri River, Fort Peck, Mont.	Missouri River, Williston, Mont. (near Montana-North Dakota line)	Missouri River, Mobridge, S. Dak (near North Dakota-South Dakota line)	Missouri River, Yankton, S. Dak. (near South Dakota-Nebraska line)
	Acre-feet	*Acre-feet*	*Acre-feet*	*Acre-feet*	*Acre-feet*
1898	7,923,000	9,840,000	19,432,000	21,526,000	25,114,000
1899	9,757,000	10,777,000	22,501,000	23,887,000	26,192,000
1900	8,005,000	8,273,000	17,718,000	18,897,000	22,808,000
1901	6,598,000	7,257,000	14,917,000	15,949,000	19,192,000
1902	5,135,000	6,942,000	13,175,000	15,247,000	19,376,000
1903	8,415,000	7,647,000	17,315,000	18,955,000	23,974,000
1904	11,681,000	8,314,000	21,217,000	22,059,000	25,633,000
1905	8,695,000	6,451,000	14,905,000	16,756,000	21,470,000
1906	9,936,000	6,478,000	17,693,000	19,657,000	24,147,000
1907	12,805,000	10,961,000	25,204,000	27,772,000	32,603,000
1908	11,808,000	12,389,000	25,257,000	26,739,000	29,672,000
1909	13,043,000	11,843,000	26,354,000	28,530,000	32,374,000
1910	9,032,000	7,276,000	17,030,000	18,561,000	21,375,000
1911	9,660,000	7,581,000	18,111,000	18,982,000	20,835,000
1912	12,883,000	8,972,000	23,019,000	25,814,000	30,527,000
1913	12,200,000	10,569,000	24,172,000	25,732,000	28,051,000
1914	10,000,000	8,085,000	19,553,000	22,407,000	25,255,000
1915	10,000,000	8,925,000	20,103,000	22,378,000	32,274,000
1916	12,000,000	11,118,000	25,480,000	27,862,000	31,243,000
1917	13,800,000	12,643,000	28,080,000	29,253,000	32,321,000
1918	12,900,000	7,909,000	22,012,000	23,960,000	26,868,000
1919	5,530,000	4,662,000	10,776,000	11,740,000	13,419,000
1920	10,700,000	7,447,000	19,518,000	21,557,000	27,585,000
1921	9,270,000	7,007,000	17,566,000	18,727,000	21,287,000
1922	8,530,000	7,179,000	16,498,000	18,742,000	23,248,000
1923	9,356,000	7,126,000	17,499,000	19,626,000	25,647,000
1924	15,400,000	6,133,000	23,097,000	24,981,000	27,367,000
1925	12,800,000	7,358,000	21,653,000	23,341,000	26,226,000
1926	9,530,000	6,469,000	16,671,000	17,931,000	20,494,000
1927	13,600,000	10,922,000	25,828,000	28,339,000	35,483,000
1928	12,300,000	9,588,000	23,262,000	25,484,000	28,759,000
The following 14 years are the years that, used alone, show an "average" run-off per year of only 16,000,000 acre-feet:					
1929	10,400,000	5,648,000	16,900,000	19,443,000	24,321,000
1930	8,310,000	4,998,000	14,100,000	15,387,000	18,025,000
1931	6,080,000	3,937,000	9,620,000	9,443,000	11,212,000
1932	8,560,000	5,157,000	14,000,000	15,501,000	18,500,000
1933	8,280,000	5,316,000	14,200,000	14,853,000	17,600,000
1934	4,388,000	4,912,000	9,925,000	9,946,000	11,450,000
1935	6,908,000	4,120,000	11,390,000	11,950,000	14,206,000
1936	6,572,000	4,129,000	11,120,000	11,380,000	13,110,000
1937	6,958,000	3,397,000	10,460,000	11,540,000	13,780,000
1938	8,910,000	6,293,000	16,163,000	17,099,000	18,956,000
1939	6,525,000	5,284,000	13,342,000	14,616,000	16,375,000
1940	5,233,000	3,852,000	9,848,000	10,309,000	11,569,000
1941	7,275,000	3,684,000	11,239,000	12,421,000	14,440,000
1942	9,970,000	7,676,000	17,915,000	19,707,000	25,232,000
1943	13,322,000	9,609,000	24,905,000	29,204,000	30,683,000
1898–1943 (46 years):					
Mean	9,590,000	7,420,000	18,100,000	19,700,000	23,050,000
Maximum	15,400,000	12,600,000	28,100,000	29,300,000	35,500,000
Minimum	4,390,000	3,400,000	9,620,000	9,440,000	11,200,700

There has been some confusion about the various proposals for handling the waters of the Missouri Basin, Mr. Chairman, and that has grown out of the figures that have been used. The fears that have been expressed in behalf of reclamation have rested upon using the flow of the river for the 14-year period from 1929 to 1942, inclusive. During that period of time the average annual run-off at a point between Yankton and Sioux City has been just under 16,000,000 acre-feet of water per year. However, the record over a longer period of time, from the time that records have been kept from 1898 to 1943, inclusive, shows that the mean annual flow on the river is 23,050,000 acre-feet; in other words, 7,000,000 acre-feet more per year. That alone is enough to meet the estimated annual consumptive demand for the 4,500,000 acres of land that is susceptible to irrigation, if it is stored.

The proposal of the Army engineers is that the maximum possible storage be created in order that the water of the wettest years be carried over into the dry years and in order that there be enough vacant storage to take care of the floods as they come. In that 14-year period upon which the fears have been built, there were only 2 years where the annual flow exceeded 20,000,000 acre-feet; but in the 31 years prior to those 14 years there were only 3 years in which the flow was less than 20,000,000 acre-feet, and 28 of the 31 years had flows of from 20,000,000 up to 35,000,000 acre-feet. In the dry 14-year period, there were 3 years in which there was only 11,000,000 acre-feet, 2 of only 13,000,000 acre-feet, and 2 of only 14,000,000 acre-feet, and only 2, as I have said, where there was more than 20,000,000 acre-feet. But in the prior 31 years there was only 1 year out of 31 where the flow was as little as 13,000,000 acre-feet, 2 were 19,000,000 acre-feet plus, and the others were all more than 20,000,000 acre-feet. The table over the long period speaks for itself, Mr. Chairman and should be carefully studied. There must be maximum storage to handle the maximum run-off and save it to get the maximum benefit in the dry cycles.

COORDINATING THE TWO REPORTS

The question of coordinating the report of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to the program of works proposed, Mr. Chairman, is also one to which I have addressed myself. It has been understood by everyone who attended the committee hearings or who has read the Chief of Engineers' recommendations that the Army engineers have expected that the Bureau of Reclamation should propose a program of works to utilize for irrigation all the water for which suitable lands could be found.

That is further confirmed by this paragraph in a letter by the Chief of Engineers, dated May 3, 1944, which says:

> The Department's (War) plan for the Missouri River Basin has always contemplated that the Bureau of Reclamation would construct upstream projects for storage and distribution of irrigation water.

The occasion for that statement was my submission to the Chief of Engineers of a copy of a letter I presented to the Bureau of the Budget on the 29th of April 1944. This letter attempted to analyze the situation with respect to the reports by the two agencies, the Army engineer's report being officially before the Congress and embodied in the bill now before us, and the Reclamation report being in Washington but not then formally transmitted to the Congress. It was submitted last Friday and is now being printed as Senate Document No. 191.

Under permission granted by the House, I insert my letter to the Director of the Budget at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1944.

Re Missouri River.

The Honorable HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: At the time Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, chairman of the Nine States

Committee, and I met with you prior to the hearings of the House Committee on Flood Control, you expressed the conviction that the great post-war job that would rehabilitate the economic life of the Nation would be the harnessing of our rivers and development of our water resources. You expressed a very definite interest in proposals for the Missouri River Basin. You also expressed the hope, as you did in your subsequent letter to the Chief of Engineers, that the proposals of the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation might be intergrated.

That hope, it seems to me, can now be realized. The Bureau of Reclamation has completed its study and prepared recommendations. The Rules Committee of the House of Representatives has granted a rule for consideration of H. R. 4485, the bill reported by the Committee on Flood Control, embracing an authorization to start on the plan of control substantially in accord with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers which, in itself, was described as "a broad framework" and purposely flexible to permit adaptation and modification.

Action at this time is urgent. Last year the floods of the Missouri caused direct damages totaling more than $47,000,000 and cost the Treasury an additional $3,014,000 for repairs that did not give one bit of new protection. This year, the Missouri is in flood again. Last year, Omaha's airport was under water for weeks. This year it is Kansas City's. Both years, more than a million acres of farmlands were inundated and hundreds of thousands of acres taken out of production of needed war foods.

We can have action at this time if we go ahead with the phases on which the engineers (Army) and the Bureau of Reclamation are in agreement. In every field of human endeavor progress is made by concentrating upon and starting with points in agreement. Time and developments frequently bring the solutions to the points not originally in agreement. I am reasonably familiar with the details of the proposals by both the Army engineers and Reclamation. A brief review will show that the works and program on which they are in areement offer abundant opportunity for both agencies to get under way as scon as conditions permit. I am venturing to suggest a course of action for consideration. First, however, a quick review of what is proposed:

1. On the tributaries: There is no disagreement on works proposed for the tributaries of the Missouri. The Bureau of Reclamation suggests many more reservoirs than the Army engineers, naturally, since the latter's recommendations were made primarily in response to a resolution requesting a program for controlling floods below Sioux City. The letter of the Chief of Engineers, which by reference is made law, if H. R. 4485 becomes law as written, very definitely makes provision for additional reservoirs on the tributaries and further suggests the principle that construction and operation of tributary reservoirs should be by the agency with the dominant interest. The same principle is enunciated by the Commissioner of Reclamation. And the flexibility urged by both agencies, coupled with agreement on the principle of dominant interest for construction and operation, offer a complete solution to tributary questions.

It may be said in passing that the program of construction on the tributaries probably offers more immediate relief from flood problems and water-use problems for people over a wider area than do the proposals for storage on the main stem of the river, although the latter may serve a greater total number of people in cities along the river. In mentioning this, I do so merely to make the point that the works proposed and made possibly by the program for work on the tributaries is sufficiently important to justify getting action started now.

2. On the main stem: Here the problem breaks down into natural divisions which lead to a natural solution.

a. Randalls Island Dam: No disagreement. Both agencies recommend a dam at this point. Reclamation estimates capacity at 5,100,000 acre-feet; the Army at 6,000,000. Whether the latter is a round figure or whether there is a slight difference in measurements or in proposed elevations is immaterial unless the latter should cover a portion of the fall proposed by reclamation for a power dam at Big Bend, several miles upstream. If any question on that point, it would be resolved by the recommendations of the Federal Power Commission in the very nature of things under existing law. Hence, there is no reason why the Randalls Island Dam should not have the go-ahead the same as the tributary program.

b. Oahe to Bismarck: This stretch of the river is proposed to be covered by storage under both plans, Army and Reclamation. The sole question is whether it is to be done by one high dam at Oahe or by one dam there, somewhat lower, and by a second dam at Oak Creek upstream. Obviously if it is done by the one high dam the reservoir capacity will be greater, since it will have the benefit of the greater depth in the downstream portion below Oak Creek. The Army engineers want storage, the more the better, to accomplish the greatest possible carryover of water from wet cycles to dry. Hence, if engineering considerations permit the high dam, the Army engineers will want that built just as much or more than does Reclamation.

The controlling engineering considerations, I believe, will be found to be the presence of satisfactory footings for the higher and, hence, heavier dam; the presence of satisfactory shoulders for abutments and spillway, if any, due to the surface presence of granite boulders and glacial drift; the feasibility of raising the highway and railroad bridges just below the Oak Creek site, which would be at the tail of the Oahe Reservoir if built to the low design. These, obviously, are matters on which engineering facts and not desires or opinions will necessarily control. Since both plans want a dam at Oahe, and since both agencies want the maximum possible storage, and since the high dam can be built under both plans, and obviously will be built if conditions permit, there is no disagreement on this sector. The high dam is clearly authorized under the language of H. R. 4485 if conditions cited permit the high dam to be built.

So, here again, there is agreement, and the authorizations should be made to permit this to get under way.

c. Gavins Point and Big Bend: These are two small dams, one above and one below Randalls Island. Neither of them conflict with anything else, and since one is proposed by the Army and one by Reclamation, why not authorize them both?

Gavin's Point would have only about 200,000 acre-feet storage, but the Army wants it for regulating purposes. Since the Army, under any plan, will have the job of regulation, and since Gavin's Point is about 100 river miles nearer the critical flood area at Sioux City, and since it is far downstream from any of Reclamation's irrigation projects, the natural solution is to let the Army's proposal stand. It will interfere with nothing else and it gives some more storage.

Big Bend would provide a little storage, too; not much because Reclamation proposes it primarily to take advantage of a freak bend in the river where cutting across a three-fourth-mile neck will give the benefit of a 21-foot fall and plus the proposed dam height create a substantial amount of firm power. Here again, this interferes with nothing. And since its construction would depend upon the development of power markets and need as determined sometime in the future by the Federal Power Commission, the natural solution is to let the Bureau's proposal stand and be authorized. It adds potential benefits to the over-all plan.

d. Garrison and the North Dakota Souris diversion: Here is the one area of substantial disagreement in the two plans. The Army engineers want the large storage that can be created by a high dam at Garrison, N. Dak., some 19,000,000 acre-feet. Such a reservoir would flood a great deal of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, cover the Buford-Trenton irrigation project only recently completed, and prevent some proposed irrigation along the main stem of the river. Hence, the objections by Reclamation.

On the other hand, the Bureau of Reclamation wishes to divert a great deal of water from the Missouri River Basin over into the Souris Basin, and there to irrigate about a million acres in another watershed. Now whether that should be done eventually, I certainly do not know and have no basis for an opinion. It is proposed to do this by extending the canals that would be built to utilize water stored in the Fort Peck Dam, now constructed.

Both Army engineers and Reclamation propose to put some water into the Devils Lake area and then to carry it into the James River to insure a flow of that stream for the benefit of the farmers and municipal water users, having in mind that the James is a part of the Missouri Basin and that its flow returns to the Missouri. The Souris and the Cheyenne flow north into Canada eventually, although I believe it is possible from an engineering standpoint to devise works that would return any excess flow back to the Missouri.

Whichever plan is right on this point, it is not necessary to determine at this time. Certainly it is not necessary to hold up all the good and beneficial projects for the tributaries in Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, until this problem of Garrison or Souris is settled. Nor is it necessary to permit floods to continue in their maximum of damage and destruction because all the other reservoirs on the main stem are held up to see what happens to Garrison.

The natural solution to this situation is to authorize the balance of the programs proposed and let this matter receive further study.

As the mechanics to accomplish what I have suggested, the following procedure might be followed:

1. Let the Reclamation report be transmitted to the Speaker by a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, incorporating a letter of recommendations by the Commissioner of Reclamation, proposing, in effect, that the program of the Bureau be approved and authorized substantially as recommended except as to the Souris diversion in North Dakota, and that a limitation be placed in the proposed authorization for the Army engineers against initiating construction of the Garrison Dam until further study by the agencies concerned produces an agreement between them and with the people of North Dakota, and that appropriations be authorized to commence the initial construction program set forth in the report.

2. A report so transmitted, and recommended by you, should be construed by the Speaker as a favorable report and as such would normally be ordered printed, given a House document number, and referred to an appropriate committee.

3. The assignment of a House document number makes the report identifiable for legislative purposes and immediate action would be accomplished if an amendment were accepted to the Missouri River paragraph in H. R. 4485, now pending, worded, perhaps, substantially as follows:

"Provided further, That of the amount above authorized to be appropriated $——— is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the prosecution of the integrated initial construction program of water storage and utilization recommended by the Commissioner of Reclamation in House Document No. —, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session: *And provided further,* That none of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be expended by the Secretary of War for construction of the proposed Garrison Reservoir nor by the Secretary of the Interior for construction of the proposed North Dakota division of the Missouri-Souris project pending further study and report to Congress on both projects by both agencies."

If both agencies and yourself should agree upon such a course, I believe that the Committee on Flood Control would authorize its chairman to offer such an amendment in behalf of the committee and that should insure its acceptance.

Such an amendment need not increase the total authorization of the flood-control bill. The bill proposes an authorization of $200,000,000 against the existing Missouri flood-control authorizations of $145,000,000 (against which $16,000,000 has been authorized to be appropriated) and the new authorizations proposed for $481,000,000. The Army engineers' report suggested $130,000,000 for the first phase of construction on the new program, I believe. That could be provided with $20,000,000 in mind for additional work on the old program and still leave $50,000,000 which could be authorized to initiate the Bureau's construction program. It should be kept in mind, of course, that the reclamation program will be substantially advanced by some of the main stem storage and especially by the release of Fort Peck for irrigation as substitute storage is built.

The program would then be under way. It will mark an epoch in the development and growth of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative in Congress,
Second South Dakota District.

It will be noted that my suggestion was that the Budget Director clear the Reclamation report for transmission to Congress with the recommendation that the initial construction program of tributary dams and of distribution works for the irrigation water on tributaries and main stem be authorized, except that funds be held up for the Souris section in North Dakota in Reclamation's plan and the Garrison Dam in the Army's plan.

I left copies of this letter with the Commissioner of Reclamation and also with the Chief of Engineers. From the latter I have a letter of comment, from which the paragraph above was quoted, and, with the permission of the House, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, May 3, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: Reference is made to your recent call at this Office, at which time you left a copy of your letter to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, dated April 29, 1944, regarding the development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin. In accordance with your request made at that time and in subsequent conversations with this office, the following comments are furnished with respect to your letter to the Budget.

The Department considers that the Garrison Reservoir is essential to the plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, that it should have high priority in the order of construction of the several features of that plan, and that it cannot be eliminated or deferred without largely nullifying the benefits expected from the plan as a whole. The conclusions as to its essentiality and priority of construction are based on the following considerations:

1. The plan proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation which eliminates the Garrison Reservoir would decrease by more than 10,000,000 acre-feet the storage on the main stream of the Missouri River in North and South Dakota as proposed in the report of this Department.

As the levees along the Missouri River below Sioux City recommended by the Department are established at the maximum practicable height, their effectiveness and safety require adequate reservoir control upstream from Sioux City.

Main-stem reservoirs are most effective from the standpoint of flood control below Sioux City, and since the high dam at the Garrison site provides over two-fifths of all the main-stem storage of the War Department plan it cannot be eliminated without sacrificing flood-control benefits contemplated in that plan.

2. It is fundamental in the best use of the water of the Missouri River Basin that as much cyclic storage as possible be attained in order to conserve the stream flow as completely as possible and to prevent wastage of water during wet periods.

The high dam at Garrison makes possible a large amount of carry-over storage for irrigation diversions in that region and for stream-flow regulation.

In addition, the maximum potentialities of the other main-stem sites should also be developed if practicable from engineering and economic standpoints.

3. The Garrison project has a large silt storage reserve in which silt can be stored for many years without impairment of the reservoir's effectiveness for flood control and water conservation.

Adequate silt storage cannot be provided at any other site.

If the reservoirs below Garrison are built prior to the construction of Garrison, the silt that will collect in those downstream projects will greatly reduce their effective capacity for useful purposes.

4. The Garrison project will furnish water, by gravity flow and supplementary pumping, for irrigating large areas of irrigable land in North and South Dakota and for increasing the water supply in the Devils Lake and James River areas.

It will also be possible to pump from the Garrison Reservoir into the Souris River area if it should be desired to irrigate land in that vicinity in the future.

The land that can be irrigated from the Garrison Reservoir exceeds by many times the small amount of irrigable land inundated by the reservoir pool.

Moreover, the large amount of fertile bottom lands along the lower river that will receive substantial flood protection from Garrison and other main-stem reservoirs also exceeds by many times the land taken out of possible productive use by inundation in reservoirs.

5. Any lowering of the Garrison pool would increase the cost of pumping to the irrigable areas in the Devils Lake and James River regions and would also increase the cost of the dam because of the excessive spillway excavation that would be required.

6. Before Fort Peck Reservoir can be used for irrigation, as has been proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, equivalent storage must be provided at downstream sites for the benefit of navigation. In my opinion a large part of the substitute storage must be placed at the Garrison site.

7. The plan of the Bureau of Reclamation proposes a high dam at the Oahe site in place of the Oak Creek and lower Oahe projects proposed in the Department's plan, and the Bureau considers the high Oahe project as a substitute for the Garrison Reservoir.

At the present time there is not sufficient information available on the Oahe site to assure the engineering feasibility of constructing a high dam.

If the feasibility is proven by detailed investigations, it would certainly be wise to construct the largest practicable reservoir at this location, but the Oahe Reservoir cannot be substituted for the Garrison, Oak Creek, and lower Oahe projects without loss of a major part of the benefits contemplated from the latter three projects.

In summary, the Garrison Reservoir will make a material contribution toward the early flood protection of thousands of acres of rich bottom lands and important cities on the lower Missouri River; will greatly increase the cyclic storage in the Missouri Basin for all water uses; will provide substantial silt capacity; will make available water for irrigation of many times the irrigable land inundated by the reservoir, as well as for domestic water supply in the Dakotas; will be constructed upon a site that has been definitely determined as suitable for a high dam and where a low dam would be unwise because of increased spillway and pumping costs; and will be the earliest means of furnishing the substitute storage that will permit the use of Fort Peck water for irrigation and reclamation purposes.

The Department's plan for the Missouri River Basin has always contemplated that the Bureau of Reclamation would construct upstream projects for storage and distribution of irrigation water. I can see no objection to authorization at this time of such projects to supplement the authorization for this Department's work as now included in the flood-control bill provided that the plan of the Department is not restricted and that money ceilings applicable to the projects authorized and recommended are not curtailed.

Very truly yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General,
Chief of Engineers.

Before that letter was received, in an informal discussion of the matter with the Army engineers, I asked them about the possibility of reducing the height of the Garrison Dam. On that point, the following radiogram was received from the division engineer, General Crawford, relayed through the office of the Chief of Engineers here in Washington:

MISSOURI RIVER DIVISION,
Omaha, Nebr., May 2.

Retelpcon., Beard to Slichter, May 2, relative to height and capacity of Garrison Reservoir. Presently proposed height of Garrison Dam 210 feet above stream bed and capacity at normal water-surface elevation 1,850 is 23,000,000 acre-feet according to reservoir survey completed subsequent to submission of the division engineer's report on Missouri River. Irrigable area at downstream end of proposed Nesson irrigation project is about elevation 1,800. To prevent flooding this land by reservoir would require lowering of normal pool to elevation 1,790. This would reduce the height of dam to 150 feet and the reservoir capacity to about 7,000,000 acre-feet and completely destroy usefulness of the Garrison Reservoir as a multiple-purpose project.

CRAWFORD.

PLANS SUPPLEMENT EACH OTHER

In the face of the information and engineer's opinion set forth in the letter and this statement, I have concluded not to offer any amendment at this time to propose the joint authorization, realizing that it can still be done in the Senate if that is deemed wise. Or, it may be concluded by all interested that a separate authorization bill for the Reclamation's part in the program will be best.

It will be clear, however, from this record, that there is no objection by the Army engineers to the program of Reclamation for handling irrigation water and for constructing and operating irrigation works.

There is no basic conflict between the two programs. One supplements the other and—speaking from the national viewpoint—neither solves the national problem without the other.

The situation is accurately described by Budget Director Smith in a letter which, I understand, he has addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, under date of April 27, 1944, which says:

> The opening language of section 7 will allow sufficient time before the actual initiation of construction of any of the projects to permit completion of the necessary related investigations and initiation of any supplemental legislation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I desire to repeat what I said in my letter to the Director of the Budget.

In every field of human endeavor progress is made by concentrating upon and starting with the points in agreement. Time and developments frequently being solutions to points not originally in agreement. Action at this time is urgent.

We can have action at this time. There is no disagreement on works proposed for the tributaries. There is no substantial disagreement on the dams proposed for the main stem of the river except as to Garrison, and on this the letter of the Chief of Engineers states the situation. Its construction will be the earliest means of furnishing substitute storage that will permit the use of Fort Peck water for irrigation and reclamation purposes in both Montana and North Dakota. And, as the Chief of Engineers says:

> The maximum potentialities of the other main stem sites should also be developed if practicable from engineering and economic standpoints—

Including the Oahe, of which he specifically says:

> If the feasibility is proven by detailed investigations, it would certainly be wise to construct the largest practicable reservoir at this location.

Authorization of the Army's program at this time is basic. It should be supplemented with an authorization for the program proposed by Reclamation. The maximum possible storage of water should be constructed on the main stem and also on the tributaries. Floods will be stopped on the lower Missouri and protection will be given the upper basin against prolonged drought.

The inauguration of this program for the Missouri Valley, Mr. Chairman, will mark an epoch in the development and growth of the United States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor and urge the passage of this bill. The great flood that originated on the upper Missouri—one of the largest and most destructive floods in our country's history—that has just passed down the Missouri Valley and is now passing down the lower Mississippi to the Gulf, emphasizes the dire necessity and importance of passing this legislation at this time.

The tragedy of the whole situation is that we did not take action sooner. The present flood disaster, and the one we suffered in 1943, have not only brought severe suffering, misery, and irreparable damage to our civilian population in these flooded areas, but they have seriously impaired our war effort at one of the most critical times in our Nation's history.

Our flood-control program in recent years, to which I made reference earlier in this debate, has demonstrated to a certainty that we can control the floods on our great rivers as we have successfully done on the lower Mississippi, and protect the food basket of our Nation in the years to come.

The people of the Tenth Congressional District of Missouri, which I have the honor to represent, are vitally interested in the flood-control program authorized by this bill, commonly referred to as the "Pick plan." I have carefully read the two-volume report of the hearings held on this bill, and I am convinced that if this bill is passed and the program authorized by it is carried out, the Missouri River Valley and the upper Mississippi Valley will never again suffer the flood disasters of this and last year.

I refer to the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers because they are the streams that provoke concern for the people in my section of the State of Missouri. The Mississippi River flanks the eastern boundary of the Tenth Congressional District of Missouri which extends from Cape Girardeau County south to the Arkansas line. That part of our district south of Cape Girardeau County is known as the alluvial or delta section of the valley, and is embraced in that stretch of the river known as the lower Mississippi. That portion of our district did not suffer greatly from the flood of 1943 or the flood that is now raging past our borders, thanks for the splendid job our Army engineers have done for the lower Mississippi.

In Cape Girardeau, however, the people did not fare so well in 1943 and during the passing of this present flood, which caused great damage to extensive farm lands and to homes, business houses, and industries in the beautiful and progressive city of Cape Girardeau.

Mr. Chairman, what has been done by this Government for the lower Mississippi Valley can be done for the rich Missouri Valley and other tributary streams of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, and the time has come when we can no longer afford to hazard these rich valleys and the progressive, enterprising cities located therein to the harrowing experiences through which they have just passed. The improvements proposed and authorized by this bill are economically justified by our Army engineers, and to longer delay these improvements would be to pursue a policy of penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. Chairman, if I had time today I would like to discuss the importance of navigation on the Mississippi River and its tributaries to our future security and prosperity. During the progress of this war we all know the important role our inland waterways have played in transporting goods and materials necessary for out civilian needs and for the war effort. But for these great arteries of commerce our transportation facilities would have been overtaxed and unable to meet the needs demanded of them. I do, however, call your attention to the very able and timely statement of the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman WHITTINGTON, on this phase of the program provided for in this bill.

We should pass this bill without delay and clear the way for a program which will bring security, protection, and prosperity to the people in these great valleys. I am glad to take this occasion to again express my appreciation of the splendid leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman WHITTINGTON, has given our country in working out a comprehensive flood-control program and for the faithful, constructive work of the Committee on Flood Control, upon which committee I had the honor to serve with the chairman for 4 years.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the flood-control bill now before the House includes provisions for eight soil-conservation projects in flood-control watershed areas, one of which happens to be in the district I represent. Those projects are supported by comprehensive surveys made by the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture. They are made to integrate with and to implement established flood-control projects already authorized, and, as required by law, have been reviewed by and correlated with the plans of the Corps of Engineers.

Since soil-conservation practices are recognized as having a direct and important relationship to the problem of flood control, I should like to discuss that particular phase of the legislation before us.

When we realize that there are in this country today 2,000 reservoirs, some large and some small, that are completely filled with silt that has been washed down from the upstream watersheds, coupled with the fact that other thousands of reservoirs are being filled that way as time goes on, the importance of trying to control that silt at its source becomes self-evident.

It is the problem of scientific soil-conservation practices to prevent as much of that waste of soil and water as possible. In that way, such practices

contribute directly to the solution of the problems of flood control and flood prevention.

As a matter of fact, on some of the smaller streams the Soil Conservation Service has been able to completely solve the flood-water problem which had previously existed. Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, head of the Soil Conservation Service, with his very able assistant, Mr. J. C. Dykes, have in recent years directed many very interesting and successful surveys and experiments which serve to show the influence that certain soil conserving practices may have on the ultimate problem of flood control.

When Dr. Bennett appeared before our committee, he told an interesting and true story of how, by the use of scientific soil-conservation practices, floods have been prevented on a stream in the State of Washington. There have been no overflows in the South Palouse River there for the past 7 years, whereas before the conservation job was carried out over a large watershed area above the town of Pullman, that stream overflowed each year. That stream, like thousands of others over the country, had been going dry in late summer each year for 25 years. During that time an occasional flood would cause the stream to overflow, and on occasions the floodwaters caused considerable property damage in the business section of the town of Pullman.

But the farmers in the watershed area cooperated in a variety of conservation-work practices. At first, 10,000 acres, subject to severe erosion, were planted in water-holding and soil-building vegetation, including grasses and legumes. In addition, much land was terraced and contour cultivation was put into use. Much of the overgrazing was deferred.

That combined activity on the part of those farmers has changed that stream from practically a dead stream, in late summer, to a perennially flowing stream for 7 successive years. During those 7 years the South Palouse has not gone over its banks, and this year for the seventh successive year it has continued to run all through the summer, according to Dr. Bennett.

Other examples were cited, but this example serves to illustrate what can be done with this type of work in the way of helping to prevent rather than controlling floodwaters. What was accomplished in the cooperative effort at Pullman can and should be undertaken in hundreds of localities.

Mr. Chairman, we need to give more and more attention to the importance of going back up to where the water falls as rain and there working with nature, instead of against her, and there retaining and using the maximum possible amount of that rainfall and making of it a blessing instead of a curse.

We build dams and dikes in the lower streams, as indeed we must do, but because we do not do more, in an effort to retain more of the rainfall at its source, nature rebels against us. The floodwaters sweep with all their fury against the man-built dams and tremendous damage often results from the overflows.

To be sure, soil-conservation practices at their best will not solve the flood problems. But we should not be content with just building dams and dikes. We should go up those streams and examine the terrain and determine why so much of the rainfall is escaping from the area where it falls and why so much of the topsoil is being washed downstream.

Mr. Chairman, at this point and while I am on the general subject, I want to briefly discuss the value of our soil from the standpoint of our national wealth and how for 300 years we have been abusing and misusing much of it.

We have around 2,000,000,000 acres of land in this country. That soil certainly constitutes our most irreplaceable and important natural resource. It is the most indispensable natural resource that we have any control over. It is too valuable to be wasted if that waste can be prevented. All through history the strength and character of a people have gone up or down with the soil. The worth of land is in the few inches of topsoil that it has taken nature thousands of years to build up. Once that topsoil is washed away and gone it is gone forever. A nation with poor soil is a poor nation. We simply cannot afford not to hold on to that soil to the limit of our ability.

Because we have not been careful in the past and have often indulged in overgrazing, over-cropping and misuse of our lands, erosion of the soil by wind and water has cut deeply into its natural value and productivity, and to that extent has effected the wealth and economic security of the entire Nation.

Already, Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that the topsoil has been stripped from 282,000,000 acres, which is about 15 percent of our land area. And that same soil is being daily blown and washed from 775,000,000 other acres.

About 3,000,000,000 tons of topsoil are washed or blown away each year. That soil if spread 12 inches thick would cover one and one-half million acres every 12 months, as Dr. Bennett has pointed out.

Every year about half a million acres of land are being ruined or vary seriously damaged by wind and water erosion brought on by improper land-use practices.

We have left in this country about 462,000,000 acres of really good farmland, of which 342,000,000 acres are now under cultivation. Of that 342,000,000 acres now being tilled, only 62,000,000 acres are not subject to erosion and, therefore, do not need constant care and treatment.

There is much consolation in the fact that in recent years farmers and ranchmen have become quite conscious of the problem I have described. The Federal Government first entered this field of activity in 1929 and since then much progress has been made.

As evidence of that progress, Mr. Chairman, I might point out that there are today 1,000 soil-conservation districts in 45 States, each district being organized as a governmental unit and operated and controlled by local citizens. Those districts include 570,000,000 acres, and 2,563,695 farms and ranches participate.

But much remains to be done. Indeed, it has been estimated that 90 percent of the job remains to be done. In the United States there are, according to the S. C. S., 200,000,000 gullies caused by erosion that are deep enough to prevent agricultural machines from crossing, and which were not here when the land was in its virgin condition.

Mr. Chairman, no nation can be strong and rich long without a productive soil. We as an intelligent people simply cannot afford to go on losing our most precious and valuable resource. Much progress has been made in conservation practices and the future is encouraging. But in my judgment the subject is so important that it needs to be emphasized.

We build guns and planes and tanks for defense against our foreign enemies. In our own country, flood control, through dams, dikes, levies, and sound soil conservation, constitute our best defense against internal weakness and insecurity.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill, H. R. 4485, to be one of the most important pieces of legislation that will come before this House for a long time. The benefits and protections carried in this bill will be of benefit throughout all the United States.

My State of California has a number of flood conditions, although generally speaking, when one speaks of California, the question is asked, "Why, does it ever rain there?" Because California lies along the coast line and has a high mountain area, there are tremendous storms at short intervals, and on many occasions great damage is done throughout the whole State, from the northern end to the southern end. So the committee, after 2 years of extensive hearings, with testimony being offered by various groups coming from California, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Army Engineers, have tried to place in these bills the projects in California that would be considered to be flood-control projects. Among them are the following:

The San Diego River Basin project is authorized at an estimated cost of $370,000.

Ventura River Basin, $1,600,000.

Santa Ana River Basin, $10,000,000.

Los Angeles-San Gabriel Basin and Ballona Creek, $25,000,000.

Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin, $46,056,000, of which amount the expenditure of $15,000,000 is authorized in this bill.

The San Joaquin River contains several projects:

Kern River, $6,800,000.

Kaweah and Tule Rivers, in the San Joaquin Valley, in accordance with the recommendations of the Army engineers, $4,600,000.

There is authorized $19,700,000 for the project for flood control and other purposes for the Kings River in California, which destroys in flood years 125,000 acres or more at a time on account of the tremendous run-off.

There is authorized for local flood protection on various streams in the Merced County stream group $1,300,000.

On the Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries there is authorized to be expended $8,000,000.

The program on the Los Angeles River watershed is authorized, at a cost of $8,380,000.

Over $90,000,000 of construction is authorized in this bill for the State of California. There are one or two other stream groups that were not included in this bill owing to the fact that reports were not available on them at the time the bill was being drafted, but after this bill passes the House we intend to see that amendments with regard to them are offered in the Senate, rather than offer the amendments to the bill at this time.

During the many days we sat in hearings in the past 2 years on these matters, every opportunity was given everyone who wanted to appear before the committee. The effort was to take care of the desires and needs of everybody. At the same time, inasmuch as this is a post-war bill, I, speaking as one member of the Committee on Flood Control, feel that just as soon as manpower is available, construction should start on all these flood-control items throughout the United States. Hardly a week goes by but that you read in the paper of destruction caused by floods, so I think this is one of the emergencies of our Nation. I do not look at this expenditure as money wasted. I think it will return to the Federal Government many, many times more than the amount of money carried in this authorization bill for flood control throughout the United States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I had in mind offering an amendment some place in the latter part of the bill to include one flood-control item vitally needed in northern Arizona. I refer to a proposed levee on the Little Colorado at Holbrook, Ariz. Like the gentleman from California, we did not have a complete report on this project, so I am hopeful that it may be added in the Senate if proper clearance is had. It is a meritorious item which would not run into such a large appropriation as some in our neighboring State.

The Little Colorado is a very treacherous stream. Early settlers along it showed great courage in trying to handle it. Of late years disastrous floods have occurred at Holbrook and loss of life has occurred there. It seems to me that it is of such a vital need at this moment that its construction should not be delayed.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Arizona, who is very well acquainted with the courageous spirit of the pioneers who settled along that river.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. The gentleman says that there has been considerable loss of life and property on that river. Does the gentleman know why nothing has been done heretofore on that project?

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me say that much has been done on this project, but it is not seen because it has not been carried to completion. This is one of a half dozen streams in Arizona we got surveyed some years ago. I will not have time to answer the question fully, but I may say that the Army engineers have surveyed the Little Colorado and have made their recommendations. In this particular case the matter was sent to the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as the Bureau of the Budget, and their reply has been somewhat delayed. Just a moment ago I spoke to the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Bashore, over the phone, and he pointed out to me that while there were some possible reclamation projects along this stream, both above and below, those reclamation projects would in nowise interfere with the building of a levee for the protection of the town of Holbrook. Of course, I feel that in due course his report will be favorable. I hope to hurry it along.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will say to the gentleman that the reason his project was not included is that no report had been submitted to the Congress and referred to the committee covering that project. It is to the credit of all the projects that the Bureau of Reclamation has the privilege of reviewing and criticizing any report on flood control, just as indicated by the gentleman's conference with the Commissioner, so that Congress can have the benefit of the views of both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to hear the chairman say that and to know that it is the practice. In the intermountain region the control of streams for irrigation is most vital and should have first consideration.

There are other projects such as the building of a dam on the Bill Williams at the Alamo site which should be authorized in this bill but it does involve reclamation. I might mention others, such as a dam on the San Pedro, at the old Charleston site badly needed for several reasons besides flood control. I hope that all of these meritorious flood-control projects can be finally and totally approved. Of course, I will say further to my colleague from Arizona, they must be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its approval, and that follows in point of time the surveys made by the Army Engineers.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I used to be a member of the Committee on Flood Control and I would like to join with the other Members who have paid tribute to the chairman of that committee for the efficiency with which he conducts it and the job he has done generally in connection with this very important field of legislation. In this bill there are included certain items which have a very vital bearing on the welfare of my own section of the United States. Those items are on page 19 of the bill, the Santa Ana River Basin and the Los Angeles-San Gabriel Basin in California. As I understand it, these items will provide for the continuance of the flood-control programs already begun in that area as soon as possible. I only wish it were possible at this moment to complete at least one structure there, namely, the Santa Fe Dam, so that its potentiality for reducing flood hazards could be realized at the present time instead of it being left in a stage of partial completion. I earnestly ask all possible help from other Members in making possible the installation of gates on that dam and its completion as soon as possible because it affects vitally the lives of many people. The only purpose of my asking for this time, however, was to express and urge support for the necessity of this flood-control program and to say that in Southern California, although our rivers do not exactly provide sufficient water for large steamers to come up to inland points, there are times when our flood danger is very, very great indeed, because we have large populations living right at the foot of a very steep mountain range and they are subject to flash floods which in their destructive character are quite as bad as floods afflicting other parts of the Nation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman remarked quite truly that flood control is a national problem and that while types of floods may differ, they occur in every part of our common country, as he has indicated, and it may not be generally known, the Government of the United States has probably expended more to protect the Los Angeles area than almost any other area of this size anywhere in the United States, and deservedly so, because the population and property to be protected out there are concentrated.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am much obliged to the gentleman from Mississippi. I had hoped he would add that last remark, because naturally some of us feel there is unusual justification for the protection of that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the words "flood control" as used in section 1 of the act of June 22, 1936, shall be construed to include channel and major drainage improvements, and that hereafter Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and Federal investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department

of Agriculture under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, except as otherwise provided by act of Congress.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4485, had come to no resolution thereon.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 521, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee to Investigate the Seizure by the United States, on April 26, 1944, of property of Montgomery Ward & Co., the following Members of the House: Mr. RAMSPECK, the chairman, Mr. CLARK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. DEWEY, Mr. ELSTON of Ohio, and Mr. CURTIS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON] may have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials, one from the Pike County Republican and the other from the Calhoun News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Mark Sullivan in the Washington Post of Monday, May 8.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD, with permission to include a copy of a telegram which he sent to Mr. William Davis, Chairman of the National War Labor Board.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield back the 15 minutes which were granted him under special orders for today and that he be granted 15 minutes tomorrow at the conclusion of the last special order now on the record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein certain excerpts and quotations and other material.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee this afternoon and to include therein certain tables, letters, and other data relative to the projects under discussion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend in the Appendix of the RECORD Public Law No. 138 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and, following that, an article from the Toledo Blade, of Toledo, Ohio, under the heading "No flood at Reno."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PETROLEUM AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Sunday Star for April 23 there appeared a very excellent article on the editorial page written by Richard L. Stokes. It was entitled "Near East Oil Pot Boils." In the course of this article, Mr. Stokes, in discussing various attitudes toward the proposed near eastern pipe line, wrote the following significant paragraphs:

> Another school of opinion contributed the notion that the day has come when the American people will have to reconsider some ancient terms of opprobrium, such as "imperialism," "dollar diplomacy," and "cartelism." As an instance of a reform that backfired, these observers cite Theodore Roosevelt's trust-busting of Standard Oil.
>
> According to their view, his "big stick" broke up the only American unit capable of holding its own in the savage jungle of international competition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say in the first place that I for one do not believe that the day has come when the American people have to abandon the hope that our economic life can be carried on under circumstances offering hope and opportunity to the small man, free of the domination of a handful of giant financial and industrial corporations. But I cannot blind myself to the fact that Mr. Stokes is probably correct that the school of opinion which he outlines is present in our country and possibly gaining strength and influence. I suppose a time of war like the present inevitably has that result.

The first thing I have to say today therefore in introducing a speech upon the question of oil is that there are certain very far-reaching implications involved for the future of our governmental policy, should the school of opinion to which Mr. Stokes refers have its way. Other nations have passed through this same stage of development. Particularly has Great Britain done so. Britain's solution has been, roughly, to accept monopolies and then to do the next best thing, namely, to assert the essential public interest in any field of industry which is monopolized by having the government itself either exercise stringent regulation or actually purchase an interest in the enterprise. The latter method has been adopted by the British with regard to companies owning rich oil resources outside of the British Empire. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., the largest of all these enterprises, has for the last 30 years had a majority of its stock owned by the British Government. In turn the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. owns approximately a quarter of the stock of the Iraq Petroleum Co. which controls a number of important oil fields in the Near East. The British Government's original investment in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. has increased thirteenfold in value. Dividends at an average rate of 15 percent yer year have been realized, and the original investment has been returned to the British people five times over. These figures are too significant to be overlooked. Corresponding action by the American Government in case we must throw up the sponge in attempting to escape the shackles of monopoly upon our industries would have a very significant effect so far as the repayment of our huge national debt is concerned.

More important still, however, is the question of economic power during the next 50 years. In my judgment, people who say that our Government should underwrite all the risks and pay the costs of the most hazardous parts of these undertakings, which certainly the Middle Eastern pipe line is, are really advocating that the American people must underwrite private interests around the world and put those private interests in a position without governmental interference to sell the product at cartel-controlled prices if they desire to do so, but that, at the same time, the American people shall derive no economic benefit and, more important, shall be stopped from effectively enforcing policies as to the disposition of the product which would make for international peace and accord with the basic principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Either there must be true freedom of enterprise without monopolistic control, either the philosophy that comes down to us from Theodore Roosevelt must be made to live in our country, or else we must recognize our duty as representatives of the people to prevent the fate of the Nation from being determined by the special interests of a few gigantic corporations.

PRIVATE DETERMINATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

On February 2, 1944, the Petroleum Industry War Council came out with an official statement demanding the abolition of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation on the ground that its activities might lead to Government participation in the oil business. The Council published the findings of its national policy committee, which describes itself as "a 16-man committee of oil company executives established at the suggestion of the Petroleum Administrator for War to design a road map of the principles upon which the Government might formulate a sound national policy for both domestic and foreign usage." This committee is completely dominated by the major oil companies, but it is frankly setting out to determine what Government policy as to oil is to be both now and in the fu-

ture, in spite of the fact that there is not a single public official serving on it.

The Council as of January 1, 1944, consisted of 73 members, 47 of whom were executives of the major oil and natural-gas companies. The members may be grouped as follows:

Major oil-company executives	42
Major natural-gas company executives	5
Trade association executives	12
Cooperative oil company president	1
Independent producers and refiners	13
Total	73

The Council has 33 standing committees, with a total of 311 members, 225 of whom are officers or employees of the major oil companies. Not a single Government employee is on any committee.

The Petroleum Industry War Council, however, is not alone in its opposition to Government participation in the oil business. There are Members of Congress who at present are very much exorcised along the same lines, and an investigation has been inaugurated in another body of the Congress in an attempt to determine the extent, if any, to which the Petroleum Reserves Corporation is invading the domain of the private oil companies.

Meanwhile, however, there are those who are worried about the degree to which the major oil companies are getting into and controlling the Government's business.

The whole Nation is at present deeply concerned about its supplies of petroleum products. It is altogether right and proper that we should be concerned, for at the present stage of technological development, oil is indeed the lifeblood of military operations as well as of manifold peacetime human activities. For this reason the entire petroleum business has become increasingly an industry affected with the public interest and, therefore, the continuous and steady growth of private monopoly power which has taken place in this industry, is cause for more profound concern than would be the case as to almost any other industry in our whole Nation. It is obvious, too, that oil in the ground—as distinguished from petroleum products—is a gift of God to all the people and can hardly be said to have been created by any other agent, not even by the Standard Oil Co. itself.

Oil we must and will have. But the rules of the game as to how, must be determined by Congress; and administration of those rules must be placed in the hands of people serving the country and not the major oil companies. The Members of Congress will certainly be very far from discharging their duty to the people if they permit national policy to be dictated exclusively by parties at interest in the matter, under the cloak of Government authority. We in Congress will fail in our duty if we do not assert in every way within our power the public interest of all the American people in the oil problem.

It is quite impossible for anyone, least of all 1 struggling Member of Congress like myself, to deal with this vast subject in all its ramifications in 1 speech, 2 speeches, or 100 speeches. Particularly is this true since it is more difficult to obtain information regarding the oil industry than is the case with any other industry in the whole Nation. This is due to several causes: First, because the industry itself is held in so tight a monopolistic control; second, because in the past 20 years the major integrated companies have succeeded in swallowing up so large a percentage of the formerly independent companies and producers; third, because the really independent petroleum geologists have now become almost nonexistent; and, fourth, most important of all, because there is no public agency or department of the Government which at the present time is doing anything like an effective job of obtaining and making available to the American people accurate and dependable facts about our petroleum reserves or the products resulting therefrom. Indeed, the majority of those charged with this duty are still on the pay rolls of the major oil companies; though they at the same time determine governmental action with regard to their own industry. For this situation I blame governmental policy more than I do the major oil companies. It is natural for those companies to reach for all the power they can get. But it is inexcusable for Government officials to let them do it.

I am going to speak today, Mr. Speaker, primarily about the problem of oil supplies, about the basic reasons for the oil shortage, and about the fact that all of us having a public responsibility to the people of the United States are in desperate need of far more dependable information in this field than is at present available to us. I am not going to be afraid to speak my mind nor to state certain facts as nearly as I have been able to determine them. It is more important that the American people be aroused about the oil situation in this country than it is for me to wait until I am positive that I am 100-percent right rather than perhaps 98-percent correct as to the technical details of my speech. As to the broad principles I shall lay down, I have no fear of successful contradiction from anyone whose first and only concern is the welfare of the people of the United States.

THE PRICE PROBLEM: CRUDE PRODUCER VERSUS MAJOR INTEGRATED COMPANY

Now, why do we have an oil shortage, if we do? We were told here in the House not long ago that the sole and only reason for the existence of an oil shortage in the face of the present unprecedented demand for petroleum was the fact that the price of oil was not high enough. We were told this in spite of the fact that as to all of the major companies and all those independent companies reporting to the Securities and Exchange Commission earnings after taxes during the past year have been the highest on record with the possible exception of the year 1942. It is quite true that some of the smaller companies, particularly those who are not engaged in refining or pipe-line transportation or which actually are independent of control by the majors, have had a hard time and are in need of higher prices. That they should have, in my judgment, just as Judge Vinson himself stated when he requested the office of the Petroleum Administration for War many months ago to prepare a program which would give to smaller producers, stripper-well operators, and wildcatters a higher price per barrel. Nothing, however, has been done up to this good hour by the Petroleum Administration for War along this line. Why no such action has been taken I, of course, do not know, though it requires no great intellectual ability to be able to see the importance to the major oil companies of having hard-pressed crude producers, stripper-well operators, and wildcatters as a front for their demand for general increases in prices.

I have, Mr. Speaker, introduced a bill to try to correct this situation, the text of which I ask to include with my remarks herewith.

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the policy of the Congress to secure the maximum production of petroleum for the duration of the war to the end that both the war and civilian requirements for petroleum products may be met.

SEC. 2. The Office of Price Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are hereby directed jointly to devise and put into effect programs for—

(a) The discovery of new oil fields.

(b) The sustaining or increasing production of oil from so-called stripper wells.

(c) The prevention of shutting in of oil wells because of operating losses.

SEC. 3. To encourage the exploration for new oil fields as provided in section 2 (a) the Office of Price Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall jointly prepare and put into effect a loan program to be financed by the latter within the following general outline: The Government to advance the money for drilling on unproven oil lands, under suitable contract whereby if oil is discovered the Government will be paid back twice the investment at the rate of one-eighth of the production of oil from any well, and whereby if no oil is discovered the Government will cancel the loan.

SEC. 4. To aid in sustaining present production of oil, or to increase the production of oil as provided in section 2 (b) the Office of Price Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall jointly prepare and put into effect a subsidy program to be financed by the latter within the following general outline: The Government will guarantee any stripper-well operator that for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, upon the signing of a suitable contract, such stripper-well operator, in consideration of a guarantee of maximum production of oil, will guarantee stripper-well operators and operators of wells that would otherwise operate at a loss, a return of their cost of operation plus 5 cents per barrel profit. Proper accounting systems shall be provided and any difference between the ceiling price received by the operator and the cost plus 5 cents per barrel shall be paid as a subsidy.

SEC. 5. To prevent the shutting in of oil wells other than stripper wells because of losses on the part of the operators, as provided in section 2 (c) the Office of Price Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall jointly prepare and put into effect a subsidy program to be financed by the latter within the following general outline: The Government will guarantee to any oil-well operator, as limited and described herein, that for the duration of the war, in consideration of a guaranty of maximum production of oil, will receive a return of his cost of operation plus 5 cents per barrel profit. Proper accounting systems shall be provided and any difference between the ceiling price received and the cost of production plus 5 cents per barrel shall be paid as a subsidy. No subsidy shall be paid until a

formal agreement has been entered into between the Government and the operator.

SEC. 6. Applicants for loans or subsidies under this act must be citizens of the United States or corporations or associations owned or controlled by citizens of the United States.

SEC. 7. No integrated oil company may directly or indirectly be granted a loan, subsidy, or assistance under this act. For the purposes of this act an integrated oil company is one that engaged in any three or more of the four functions of producing, transporting, refining, or marketing petroleum.

It will be noted that under the terms of this bill a real impetus could be given to oil discoveries since it would be possible for a competent wildcatter to secure a loan from the Government as to which the Government would receive twice its investment back in case oil was discovered, but which would be canceled on the other hand if no oil was discovered. In addition, the bill would make it possible for stripper wells to continue in operation without loss and for the same to be true of high-cost crude producers.

On the other hand, there is abundant evidence that the oil industry as a whole is very far from needing a general across-the-board increase. Figures have recently been given us by the companies themselves on their earnings for the year 1943. Tidewater-Associated, for example, has reported earnings for 1943 in total amount of $14,902,000 after all charges including Federal taxes and a reserve of $2,500,000 for contingencies had been allowed. And this compares with earnings of $10,663,000 in the year previous. Furthermore, this $14,902,000 of earnings by Tidewater-Associated was realized on a total volume of business of $206,000,000—an increase of approximately 33⅓ percent over business done in 1942. The approximate $15,000,000 of earnings constitutes an amount of money equal to approximately one-sixth of the total current assets of the corporation which are stated as being $93,720,000.

As to the Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, a full-page advertisement appearing in many newspapers in the country on Wednesday, April 26, sets forth the facts that the consolidated net earnings of it and its subsidiaries amounted for the year 1943 to $121,327,000, while the earnings of Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, alone were $61,514,000. Apparently this, the largest of all the major oil companies, is doing right well financially during this war period. Its total sales amounted to $1,302,000,000, so that its profits, after taxes, amounted to almost 10 percent on sales.

I am glad that Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, furnished us with these figures of their 1943 earnings because they are not included in the table which I am inserting with my remarks in just a moment.

I should like to point out that the figures of the earnings of the Standard Oil Co. of California have just come to my attention in their annual report. I happened to be a small stockholder in that company.

The Standard Oil Co. of California shows earnings of $36,000,000 after allowances for plant wear and tear of $34,000,000, provision for contingencies $8,000,000; payment of taxes $28,000,000. Those earnings are $6,000,000 greater than those of last year. That same thing holds true with regard to most of the major oil companies whose figures I have seen.

As further evidence of the general situation in the oil industry, I submit the following table of earnings of the oil industry for the first 9 months of 1942 and the first 9 months of 1943. It should be noted that these figures do not represent earnings for the entire year, but for three-fourths of the year, and that they are the earnings after deductions for depreciation, depletion, taxes, and all expenses. I ask unanimous consent to insert this table at this point in my remarks:

Net earnings of oil companies after deduction of depreciation, depletion, taxes, etc.

[Period, Jan. 1 to Sept. 30]

Company	1943		1942	
	Amount	Per share	Amount	Per share
H. F. Wilcox Oil & Gas Co.[1]	$198,114	$0.45	$126,753	$0.28
National Oil Products Co.[2]	326,132	1.51	428,959	1.99
Barnsdall Oil Co.[1]	2,674,000	1.20	1,953,000	.88
Transwestern Oil Co.[1]	679,092	------	535,327	------
Darby Oil Co.[1]	767,000	2.18	511,814	1.46
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.[3]	8,923,000	1.13	7,466,000	.90
Hancock Oil & Refining Co.[4]	265,353	1.18	150,826	.67
Standard Oil Co. of Ohio[3]	3,525,000	4.07	4,294,000	5.08
Houston Oil Co.[1]	1,368,000	.88	906,533	.44
Atlantic Refining Co.[3]	5,393,000	1.86	1,522,000	.40
Standard Oil Co. of California [3]	26,019,000	2.00	21,455,000	1.65
National Supply Co.[5]	3,867,000	8.45	2,248,000	3.66
Lion Oil Refining Co.[4]	1,095,000	2.52	655,201	1.51
Richfield Oil Corporation [3]	2,389,000	.60	2,045,000	.51
Mid Continent Oil Corporation [7]	4,820,119	2.59	4,794,060	2.58
Ohio Oil Co.[3]	10,604,000	1.60	9,244,000	1.28
Continental Oil Co.[3]	10,453,000	2.23	9,249,000	1.97
Phillips Petroleum Co.[4]	10,939,000	2.38	10,481,000	2.36
Shell Union Oil Corporation [3]	18,209,000	1.35	11,769,000	.90
Skelly Oil Co.[3]	3,864,000	3.93	3,927,000	4.00
Eason Oil Co.[4]	51,968	------	66,330	------
Deep Rock Oil Corporation [3]	1,078,576	2.70	934,173	------
Seaboard Oil Co. of Delaware [6]	453,392	.34	342,065	.28
Union Oil Co. of California [3]	5,386,411	1.15	4,474,265	.96
Universal Consolidated Oil Co.[1]	151,432	.81	86,903	.47
Derby Oil & Refining Co.[1]	836,859	1.06	504,960	.56
Republic Petroleum Corporation [1]	103,096	.28	3,389	nil
Empire Gas & Fuel Co.[1]	8,329,994	------	5,242,346	------
Honolulu Oil Corporation [1]	2,247,039	2.40	1,124,815	1.20
Pacific Western Oil Corporation [1]	128,517	.13	162,210	.16
Plymouth Oil Co.[1]	1,659,494	1.59	1,239,034	1.20
Quaker State Oil & Refining Co.[7]	818,516	.88	1,014,782	1.09
Root Petroleum Co.[4]	323,340	.88	225,751	.59
Texas Co.[3]	29,110,467	2.67	26,458,117	2.43
Texas Gulf Producing Co.[1]	304,879	.34	278,332	.31
Margay Oil Corporation [1]	250,397	1.67	255,266	1.70
Mission Corporation [3]	955,572	.69	801,931	.58
National Refining Co.[8]	------	------	------	------

[1] Crude production and sales only.
[2] Small marketing company in East.
[3] Major integrated company.
[4] Independent integrated company.
[5] Principal business is supplying oil-producing machinery.
[6] Owned by major oil companies. Principally oil production. 3-month period only, ending Sept. 30.
[7] Independent lubricant manufacturer and distributor
[8] Independent refining company with practically no crude production. Per share earnings on basis of preferred stock, on which unpaid accumulations existed.

POWER OF INTEGRATED COMPANIES

Neither these figures nor anything else about the oil industry in the United States can be understood unless two fundamental facts are borne in mind. The first of these is the fundamental difference between the economic position of the producer of crude oil, who has no connection with refining, transportation, distribution, or ultimate sales on the one hand, and the integrated company on the other. The integrated major companies not only produce oil but also own vast networks of oil pipe lines, operate their own refineries, and distribute and sell to the ultimate consumer the refined products, largely through their own filling-station outlets. The independent crude producer, on the other hand, can have no market for his oil at all—indeed he cannot even get rid of his oil except in unusual cases—without selling it to one of the major companies. This is the first factor which has given the majors so great a stranglehold over the independents. If the problem of the few remaining independent refiners could be met somehow the best possible answer to the price problem would be a higher price for crude oil with no increase in the price of refined products.

The second great fact is the tremendous importance of oil pipe lines, concerning which I will have more to say a little later. Here, however, it should be pointed out with greatest emphasis that it has been pipe-line ownership which throughout the years has been the most important single factor in placing the independent crude producer at the mercy of the major companies and giving the major companies, which likewise own the pipe lines, the complete whip hand in the industry. As will be discussed later, even the United States Government has dismally failed to do anything effective to relieve the independent crude-oil producer in this situation.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have here a clipping from the Los Angeles Times which states that in the year just past reserves amounting to 1,174,000 barrels have been newly discovered in the United States. While this is not enough, and while further discoveries are decidedly called for, it is nevertheless, significant that in spite of all of the handicaps due to the steel shortage existing through most of the year, artificial restrictions on drilling imposed by the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War and the alleged low prices for oil, there were discovered in the United States in the one year, 1943, petroleum reserves amounting to considerably more than the total amount of oil which we are told our armed forces may receive over a long period of time from the Saudi Arabia field as a result of the construction of a pipe line clear across Arabia from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea.

BASIC CAUSE OF OIL SHORTAGE

The reason for the oil shortage is not price alone or even principally, Mr. Speaker, though as I have said in the case of some smaller nonintegrated companies price is undoubtedly one factor. There are a good many other reasons about which I will not have time to speak,

but the one reason which is all-important is the fact that throughout the years it has been the settled policy of the major oil companies of America to restrict production so far as they were able to do, to freeze out competition, to destroy every man who attempted to operate in the petroleum industry in a really independent fashion, whether he might be a producer, a refiner, a cooperative, or a humble but well-trained and intelligent independent petroleum engineer.

There can be no doubt of the importance of our developing foreign sources for oil, but it is well for us to do it with our eyes open and to develop them as near home as we possibly can. Speaking before the National Stripper Well Association on October 25, 1943, Mr. Ernest O. Thompson, railroad commissioner of the State of Texas, submitted a table of present and potential production of various foreign oil fields of the world which table, together with his speech, was reprinted in the November 1 issue of the Oil Weekly. Mr. Thompson's table reads as follows:

World production outside United States available to the Allies

	Potential barrels per day	Present production, barrels per day
Bahrein	25,000	15,233
Egypt	25,000	25,000
India	8,700	8,700
Iran	466,400	226,378
Iraq	100,000	71,000
Saudi Arabia	150,000	13,132
United Kingdom	2,700	2,700
Total, Eastern Hemisphere	777,800	362,143
Bolivia	2,000	800
Brazil	730	219
Colombia	76,000	15,769
Ecuador	8,000	6,096
Mexico	119,000	76,422
Peru	39,800	37,750
Trinidad	68,000	60,000
Venezuela	769,805	432,190
Total, Western Hemisphere	1,083,035	629,246
Grand total	1,860,835	991,389

Mr. Speaker, all I ask the House to do is to compare these figures with the present production in the United States—something in excess of four and one-half million barrels per day—to bring this matter into some perspective. It is true the figures do not give indication of what are called ultimate reserves, which are another and perhaps somewhat different story. It is important also to bear in mind that production in certain of these relatively underdeveloped areas is based upon the drilling of only a fraction as many wells as have been drilled in the United States. The comparison must be considered in the light of these qualifications.

But it is only too apparent that the major oil companies themselves have in the past believed, or at any rate said they believed, that we have "too much" oil. Vast quantities of it, in fact, were sold to Japan, almost down to the very day of Pearl Harbor, and in the years before the war it was the settled policy of the major oil companies, especially on the west coast, to export at least enough domestically produced oil to keep the market "tight" and prevent supply ever catching up with demand. No one seemed particularly worried about the exhaustion of our reserves at that time. In my own State of California major oil company propaganda, all through the 1920's and 1930's, was to the effect that California alone possessed such vast oil reserves that a daily production in excess of 2,000,000 barrels was possible. The purpose of such propaganda was obvious. It was put out in order to discourage independent exploration or the investment of money in independent oil-producing enterprise, and in this the propaganda was outstandingly successful, for during the two decades before the war one independent company after another fell into the hands of major integrated companies. Today we find, however, from the very same sources who once claimed that production of 2,000,000 barrels per day was possible, the outcry that the present rate of production in our State, running at the rate of approximately 800,000 barrels per day, is ruining our oil resources.

Of course, one reason why State potentials of future production were in the past fixed as high as they were was because of the almost universal practice of crude-oil producers, big and little alike, of shutting down the flow of their wells to a very great degree just prior to the time of testing and then during the test running the pumps for all they were worth so as to make a big showing. Nevertheless, it has apparently been an integral part of the policy of certain of the big major oil companies either not to drill exploratory wells at all, or else seldom or never to complete them. In this manner they were able to give the impression that there was little or no oil in a certain structure, thus to depress the prices of the land and the value of the leases and to discourage development by independents. Several hundred dry wildcat wells were drilled in the two decades just prior to 1938 by one major company and 150 such wells by another one without a single important discovery being brought to light.

Almost all the important discoveries of oil fields in America have been made by independent wildcatters, not by the major companies. Independent petroleum engineers with long records of successful operation have been telling us all along that there is no question but that it is a deliberate policy on the part of the majors to drill dry wells, fail to drill them deep enough, or simply leave promising fields undeveloped for lack of capital in order the better to control supplies. Meanwhile, during these years when unsuccessful wildcat wells were being drilled by the majors and field after field discredited in this manner, vast quantities of potential oil land were being bought up by the majors. Some 300,000 acres of such land have been acquired outright and over 2,000,000 acres brought under lease by the Standard Oil Co. of California alone up to this date. And that is a far smaller figure than would apply to Standard of New Jersey and several other of the major companies. Nor is the end to this extension of land ownership by any means in sight.

An example of this sort of operation is to be found in the case of Florida. In 1940 a test well was drilled in the Everglades section of Florida by the Peninsular Oil & Refining Co. In May of that year, this test well was capped and a report given out that it was a dry hole. Nevertheless, the Peninsular Oil & Refining Co. took out leases on over a million acres of land within approximately 8 months after the capping of this well. Shortly thereafter the Peninsular Oil & Refining Co. was taken over in its entirety by the Humble Oil & Refining Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. By 1942 a total of 3,605,000 acres of Florida land was under lease by various major oil companies, almost half of which was held by the Humble Oil & Refining Co. alone. Nothing whatsoever was done, however, to develop any of these leases. Meanwhile, testimony by officials of the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator and the American Petroleum Institute before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Lands, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, was to the effect that there was no oil production in Florida and little to be expected.

During the course of the same hearings in the fall of 1942, Dr. F. H. Lahee, of Dallas, Tex., vice chairman of the American Petroleum Institute, indicated that the possibility of oil production in Florida of any great consequence was unlikely.

Nevertheless, once most of Florida's potential oil lands were under lease to the major oil companies, other things began to happen and within the past 4 or 5 months there have been numerous successful wells brought in in various parts of that State, accompanied by reports, apparently substantial, of the likelihood of large-scale production in the future.

For years there has been discussion regarding the likelihood of considerable oil development both on the east side and the west side of the Sacramento Valley in California, and some years ago wells were drilled in the area by some of the major oil companies, only to be promptly capped with no report given out of what they contained. Efforts of independent owners of potential oil land in this area to secure drilling by the majors has proved completely unsuccessful and I have in my possession considerable documentary evidence of some of the efforts made to secure development of these structures and the complete lack of success of such efforts. Just what underlies these lands I do not know, but the major oil companies—notably Standard—do control vast leases in that area, and one cannot help wondering what would happen if some of the independent holders agreed to sell out instead of trying to get their own lands developed on a royalty basis.

MAJORS CONTROL LION'S SHARE OF RESERVES

On page 1412 of part IV of the hearings of the O'Mahoney subcommittee of the Senate Public Lands Committee to which I have already referred, there is included a table showing that whereas in

1939 the major oil companies controlled 52 percent of the proven crude oil reserves of the United States, by 1942 the majors had obtained control of 70 percent of the proven crude oil reserves of the United States.

The major oil companies of this country either own outright or have under lease a total of 48,920,000 undeveloped acres of potential oil-producing lands compared to 3,763,000 producing acres. Since these companies are paying either rent or taxes on all these undeveloped acres, it is reasonable to suppose that they must believe they are of some value to them, either for future production by their own company, or to prevent production by somebody else. I ask consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert a table showing the producing acres and the undeveloped acres held by the major oil companies.

Crude oil acreage

Company	Producing acres	Undeveloped acres	Source
The Atlantic Refining Co	36,482	1,050,223	TNEC.
Barnsdall Oil Co	78,013	470,260	SS.
Cities Service Co	36,176	271,447	TNEC.
Consolidated Oil Corporation	170,000	3,000,000	SS.
Continental Oil Co	111,290	1,444,238	SS.
Gulf Oil Corporation	845,362	6,561,924	TNEC.
Houston Oil Co. of Texas	39,501	88,836	SS.
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corporation	34,432	737,641	SS.
Ohio Oil Co	272,529	1,385,000	SS.
Phillips Petroleum Co	110,037	1,801,083	SS.
Pure Oil Co	289,930	1,063,529	SS.
Shell Union Oil Corporation	139,221	1,793,480	SS.
Skelly Oil Co	128,982	759,797	TNEC.
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	116,475	7,370,677	SS.
Standard Oil Co. of California	96,263	1,027,128	SS.
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	*228,000*	*9,536,000*	SS.
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana	74,251	3,040,807	SS.
The Texas Co	840,475	6,488,641	SS.
Tide Water Associated Oil Co	99,154	753,112	SS.
Union Oil Co. of California	17,315	277,136	SS.
Total	3,763,878	48,920,559	

These figures are taken either from the Standard-Poors Corporation Service annual reports or in four cases from the records of the Temporary National Economic Committee record. The figures do not tell the whole story as of today. During the past year the oil-trade papers have been carrying news items concerning further acquisitions of our natural resource by these same companies, and purchases have been at fantastic prices. Twenty-eight million dollars for oil rights in 96,000 acres of oil lands from one company alone; $500,000 for 12 producing wells; $9,500,000 for a one-fourth interest in an oil pool in Texas. I could recite to you several score of these transactions, all happening while recent demands for a crude oil price increase were at their height. Furthermore in areas where the majors have already gotten control of potential oil lands they are beginning to lease for 10 years instead of the formerly prevailing 5-year periods, all of which simply means increasing monopoly and monopoly that restricts development.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS ABOUT OUR RESERVES? ONLY THE MAJORS KNOW

The tragedy of this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that only the oil companies themselves have any accurate idea as to what underlies these undeveloped acres. No Government agency is checking for the benefit of the American people the statements which the oil companies themselves may make. Nor is any Government agency at present trying to put itself into position to do that.

If no other point in my whole speech is given any attention, I most earnestly hope that it will, at least, have the effect of bringing about action on the part of a truly governmental body consisting of experts working for the American people, and for them alone, to determine the facts with regard to the oil reserves of America and give those facts to the people.

In fact, the Petroleum Administration for War no longer has any reserves division at all. It once did have one, but even then it concerned itself almost wholly with foreign oil, and it has more recently been merged with the Foreign Production Division. In other words, the Petroleum Administration for War, even with its heavy population of major oil company executives, does not bother its head to determine in any independent fashion the real facts about oil reserves in the United States. The fact is that for many years figures on reserves compiled by the major companies themselves have simply been adopted by governmental agencies.

Let us look for a moment at the estimates of oil reserves which have been made through the years in order to indicate how wrong these estimates have been in the past and to attempt to shed what light we can on present-day similar estimates.

It is possible, of course, that present estimates of available oil reserves in the United States might be correct; and certainly, as I have previously stated, we should bend every reasonable effort toward assuring our country of supplies of oil from outside the United States. There is, however, a very long and illuminating history with regard to estimates of oil reserves in the United States which certainly gives added force to my statement that one of the outstanding needs of America in this hour is a Government agency to get at the facts regarding the oil industry in a completely independent manner and without regard to the influence of the major oil companies.

In the hearings of the Temporary National Economic Committee, part 14A, page 7704, there is a table showing estimates of proven reserves of oil in the United States in comparison to the production which has actually taken place since the estimate was made. From this table we find that in 1921 the American Association of Petroleum Geologists estimated that this country had a reserve of 9,000,000,000 barrels of oil. Total production, however, from 1921 to 1939 has amounted to almost 16,000,000,000 barrels, or nearly twice the amount of oil which it was estimated that we had altogether in 1921. In 1924 the Geological Survey estimated that we had 13,250,000,000 barrels of reserves, but between 1924 and 1939 we have produced approximately 14,000,000,000 barrels. In 1925 the American Petroleum Institute estimated that our reserves were only 5,000,000,000 barrels, but between 1925 and 1939 we produced in the neighborhood of 13,000,000,000 barrels of oil, or more than two and one-half times the total estimate of reserves in 1925.

By 1932 estimates of reserves made by the Federal Oil Conservation Board had been increased to 10,000,000,000 barrels. Between 1932 and 1939 approximately 7,000,000,000 barrels of that amount were produced, which should have left us only 3,000,000,000 in 1939 and none at all today, if the estimates were right. In 1935 the American Petroleum Institute estimated we had reserves of approximately 12,000,000,000 barrels. Between 1935 and 1939 alone we produced 5,000,000,000 barrels of oil, which, if the estimates were correct, would have left us only 7,000,000,000 barrels of oil remaining.

It will be seen that none of these estimates could possibly have been anywhere near correct when I point out that heavy oil production has continued right along each year, and particularly since the war began, and still reserve estimates of the American Petroleum Institute at the present time are that we have approximately 20,000,000,000 barrels of known reserves in the United States.

In 1939 the Humble Oil & Refining Co., a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), estimated our reserves at 17,000,000,000 barrels. Since 1939 we have produced approximately 6,000,000,000 barrels of oil which, if the Humble Oil & Refining Co. estimate of 1939 were correct, would leave us with only 11,000,000,000 barrels. However, present estimates are to the effect that we have 20,000,000,000 barrels of reserves.

I give these figures not because I think they are authoritative, but because I think they are not authoritative. I believe it is perfectly evident that on the one hand inadequate knowledge has been had in the past, and the same situation probably pertains today. In the second place I want to reemphasize the crying need of an independent governmental investigation entirely divorced from an investigation by the oil companies themselves, into this whole matter. The American people have a right to know as nearly as it is possible for them to know what their oil reserves are, and they ought not to be at the mercy of figures which can be juggled for the purpose of trying to make a case on the one hand against independent developments of oil, while on the other hand attempting to frighten the Nation into believing that it is necessary for us to make far-reaching

commitments in the far corners of the earth in order to obtain petroleum in the future. I would remind the House once again of the 48,000,000 acres controlled by the major oil companies of the country which are as yet undeveloped. Perhaps we have got to go to Arabia and to northern Canada after oil, and I would be the last to criticize military authorities for making absolutely certain that an abundant supply of oil will be available to us. But first of all, I would personally like to know the truth as to what our own resources actually are and I cannot believe we know the situation with any degree of accuracy today. Furthermore, the only way I think we can find it out is to remove the stranglehold of the oil monopoly from the independent geologists and from the agencies of the United States Government itself and I would add, to provide governmental financial assistance to experienced oil prospectors, as my own bill previously referred to would do.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT LEASE HOARDING?

It may be that after a careful study legislation, Federal or State, will be deemed necessary to prevent the hoarding of oil leases to the tune of nearly 50,000,000 acres. If an oil company thinks well enough of land to lease it for development they should be required to so develop it or else to release it to others who would prospect. The public is entitled to find a way to end this monopoly of all possible oil lands and to have them at least explored if not developed.

HOPE IN ALASKA

At long last Army and Navy have undertaken to investigate the oil resources of Alaska. A competent Navy party has already been dispatched to the far northern field just below Point Barrow. The gentleman from California, Congressman NORRIS POULSON, has been asserting for a considerable time that there is no doubt of the very great extent of oil reserves in that area. Those who have visited the area confirm this. In any case it would seem a job long overdue for us to find out what oil our own Alaska holds. For certainly Alaskan sources are to be preferred either to Canadian developments by, and largely for, Standard of New Jersey or the Arabian adventure.

ELK HILLS

It is significant, I think, Mr. Speaker, that at the very time when we are being told that we must seek foreign sources for oil, and that our own reserves are being seriously depleted, a loud outcry is being made by the oil monopoly, that the Standard Oil Co. of California should be allowed by the Navy to produce more oil from the Elk Hills naval reserve. But were Standard permitted to step up production in that field, the effect upon the Navy's reserve might be disastrous. As our colleague, Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, said on April 13 and as I have said many times before the House and elsewhere, the only solution of this Elk Hills problem, if we are really concerned about American oil reserves, and if we are really eager to protect the military future of our country, is for the holdings of the Standard Oil Co. to be purchased at a fair valuation so that the entire Elk Hills field will be the property of the United States Navy. Then, and only then, can that field be managed with a view to the best long-range interest of our Nation as a whole.

MORE ABOUT RESERVES

To add to the confusion on this question of oil reserves in the United States we find that in the January 1944 issue of the Journal of Marketing, Mr. C. L. Burrill, an official of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, in an article entitled, "Petroleum—Present and Future," states his opinion that there is no danger of our running out of liquid fuel resources since the widely circulated figures purporting to show that we have only about 14 years additional supply of oil take no account of oil as yet undiscovered. Mr. Burrill also points out the as yet unexplored possibility of production of liquid fuel from hydrocarbons. Here we have exactly the opposite point of view being expressed from that of those who have told us so loudly and vigorously that we were about to run out of oil. Furthermore, only a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Wallace Pratt, Standard of New Jersey geologist, told the Oil Heat Institute that world supplies of oil would last 300 years. And we do know that the possibility of producing oil from coal, shale, and farm products has already been demonstrated, and that in all probability successful production by this method only awaits some scientific work in the reduction of costs.

Indeed, passage of the Randolph bill by the House and Senate recently may well in the future be regarded as one of the most forward-looking steps ever taken by an American Congress. For under the terms of that bill full-scale experimental work will be undertaken in the production of liquid fuels from coal shale and farms products. Furthermore, under this legislation it is provided that any processes which may be proven practical and therefore which may be patented, shall be handled in such fashion that those patents will always be freely available to any person asking to employ them. This means that monopoly interests will not be able to control the processes developed, nor to prevent the abundant production by independent concerns of liquid fuels from coal shale or farm products in the future.

While it does not give a complete picture by any means, I have taken the trouble to investigate some of the stock-listing applications of certain oil companies in order to try to compare them with the predictions regarding the early date at which America is alleged to be threatened with running out of oil. The following table will be interesting in this connection:

Proven reserves indicated on stock listing applications

Oil companies:	*Barrels*
Skelly Oil Co	208,000,000
Superior Oil Co	130,000,000
Shell Oil Co	683,000,000
Union Oil Co	295,000,000
Pure Oil Co	400,000,000
Total	1,716,000,000

Thus it will be seen that these 5 oil companies alone state on their stock-listing applications that they have approximately one and three-quarter billion barrels of proven reserves. The Gulf Oil Corporation reports in Moody's for 1943, page 2738, its own holdings of 1,076,000,000 barrels of net proven oil reserves in the United States as of the end of 1942. And in March of 1940 the Texas Co. estimated its proven net reserves to be 1,046,000,000 barrels—Moody 1943, page 1439.

It would be interesting to get together similar figures as to all oil companies in the country and compare what they have to say when they are listing stock for sale on one hand, with their point of view when they are interested in Government investments in pipe lines in various parts of the world.

Another fact, which it seems to me should be pointed out to the House, is this: Anyone naturally would have expected that under this program of control of oil output by the office of the Petroleum Administration for War, we would have found a sharp increase in production called for since the United States had war forced upon it. However, this did not turn out to be the case. Pearl Harbor took place on December 7, 1941. In the month of December the total production recommended by the office of the Petroleum Administration for War was 4,139,000 barrels daily output. In the following month the recommended production was almost exactly the same, but in February it was reduced by 137,000 barrels per day. In March it was reduced again, this time by 5,000 barrels per day. In April it was again reduced by some 340,000 barrels of daily production. In May the reduction was almost 200,000 barrels per day. Not until June of 1942 did the office of Petroleum Administration for War recommend increased oil production, and it was not until February of 1943 that the recommended production was as great as that which had taken place in December of 1941. All these figures are from the monthly publications of the Petroleum Administration for War.

It is hard to understand why our country was to produce less oil after war had broken out than it had been producing before. It would seem logical that under the impact of war we would have done everything possible to increase production. I made inquiry of the Petroleum Administration for War as to why this reduced production should have been called for by that agency, and in the interest of fairness I ask consent to include at this point with my remarks the full text of the letter which I received from Acting Administrator Ralph K. Davies:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1944.

HON. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. VOORHIS: This is in response to your letter of February 12 requesting an explanation of the fact that the petroleum production rates for the United States certified by this office for a number of months following Pearl Harbor were less than in December 1941.

It is true that the certified oil production rates decreased successively from January

1942 through May 1942, and that in no month until August 1943 did the total certified crude oil production rate for the United States equal or exceed the quantity produced during December 1941. It is recognized that the decrease in certified production was made in spite of increasing demands for crude oil and products and of actual shortages of these commodities in some areas of the country. The causes of this apparently anomalous situation and the reasons for our action can best be explained by briefly reviewing the petroleum supply and demand situation which existed prior to Pearl Harbor, as compared with that following our entry into the war.

Records show that during the year 1941 an average of 1,160,000 barrels daily of crude oil and finished products were furnished the eastern seaboard by tanker transportation from the Gulf Coast. Supplementing this supply from domestic sources by tanker, approximately 34,000 barrels daily of crude oil and products moved east by rail, 54,000 barrels daily by pipe line, and 30,000 barrels daily by barge. During this same period imports of crude oil and products to the east coast from South America amounted to about 250,000 barrels daily. Thus, under pre-war conditions, the eastern seaboard was dependent upon tanker transportation for over 92 percent of its petroleum supply, out of which nearly 76 percent came from domestic sources in the Southwestern States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, and Texas.

Following Pearl Harbor it became necessary to divert most of the tanker fleet previously in service between the Gulf Coast and the eastern seaboard to direct military services, and in addition, many tankers were sunk through submarine action. As a result, it became necessary to restrict production in the Southwest to the extent that the tanker transportation outlet from that area diminished, until such time as increased overland transportation could be substituted to move the crude oil and products required in the east.

To make up for the loss of tanker transportation, rail and barge movements to the eastern seaboard were increased as rapidly and as greatly as possible. This program actually was begun prior to Pearl Harbor to offset the tanker diversions that had been made in 1941, and in anticipation of the serious transportation problem that was to develop soon after our entry into the war. In cooperation with the railroads, we were able to increase rail movements of petroleum to the eastern seaboard to about 600,000 barrels daily by midyear 1942 and ultimately a peak of about 1,000,000 barrels daily was reached in 1943 in contrast to the normal 30,000 to 40,000 barrels daily.

The increased volumes of petroleum moved by rail and barge were still considerably short of the quantity required and previously moved by tanker to the east coast. Accordingly, a widespread program of rearranging and augmenting existing pipe-line facilities and of building new facilities from the Southwest and the Midcontinent to the east coast was concurrently carried out. Of principal importance in the program was the "Big Inch" pipe line from Longview, Tex., to Philadelphia and New York, which was placed in operation in January 1943, and the subsequent construction of the "Little Big Inch" from Beaumont, Tex., to the same destinations which is now just getting into operation. All of these moves to increase overland petroleum transportation as a substitute for the loss of transportation by water involved widespread and far-reaching rearrangement of petroleum industry and railroad operations and facilities and a large amount of construction.

The practice of certifying petroleum production rates to the States was inaugurated for the obviously necessary purpose of coordinating the supply of crude petroleum with the rapid and serious changes in transportation brought on by war and also with available storage facilities, as well as with important alterations in refining operations which have been required to produce the tremendously increased quantities of aviation gasoline and other petroleum war products. The certified production rates have been increased as rapidly as additional overland transportation could be provided to offset the loss of tanker transportation. As the southwestern producing States were those primarily affected from the standpoint of loss of tanker transportation outlet, the principal adjustments in production rates have been confined to that area.

Although not greatly affected by the transportation problem, production in the Midcontinent area (Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, and Oklahoma) has decreased gradually from a figure of about 1,200,000 barrels daily in December 1941 to about 980,000 barrels daily at present. This is a result of the natural depletion of the fields in that area, and our certifications to the States involved have had to be reduced commensurately with the decline in productive capacity. In California, petroleum production has been increased from about 680,000 barrels daily in December 1941 to an expected production of about 880,000 barrels daily this month. That State is now producing virtually at its full capacity.

I trust that the foregoing will serve to provide you with a satisfactory answer to your inquiry. I can assure you that every effort has been made and is being made by this agency to increase petroleum productive capacity throughout the United States in order to assure a sufficient and sustained supply to meet the greatly increased and expanding essential petroleum requirements of the war program.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH K. DAVIES,
Acting Petroleum Administrator for War.

Mr. Davis' explanation seems logical enough, but it is a matter of record ascertained by the subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee which investigated the oil situation and which was headed by our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], that the chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission came before Mr. Ickes and plead with him that his State be allowed to increase its daily production over and above the amount allowed it by the Office of Petroleum Administration for War. To quote from the committee report:

The chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission testified that his commission had advocated that the Petroleum Administration for War permit a gradual increase in Texas production in order to build up a petroleum stock pile for increased war needs. His advice was ignored, and the stock pile was never built up.

The report of the committee continues by pointing out that—

Some months later Texas was called upon by the Petroleum Administration for War to produce more oil for immediate use. The commission immediately revised its production schedules to meet the demand.

Other competent witnesses testified that not only in Texas but in other States, production could be easily increased without any danger of creating underground physical waste.

P. A. W. RULE LIMITS PRODUCTION

Certain it is that one reason why more oil is not available to the United States from its production at the present time is because of the restrictions imposed by the office of Petroleum Administration for War. The 40-acre limitation upon drilling has been one of the most important factors in this regard and has operated definitely in favor of the major companies with huge land holdings and harmed the interest of the small, independent companies whose land holdings have been, of course, very minor compared to those of the major companies. It is significant, for example, that in the State of Mississippi 292 wells were drilled in 1941, of which 219 turned out to be producing wells. As a result of this drilling 48,000,000 barrels of new reserves were proven. On the other hand, in the year 1942, when Government restriction had been imposed, only 17 new wells were drilled in the whole State of Mississippi.

To quote the Rivers committee report:

It has been the policy of the Petroleum Administration for War to issue over-all regulations concerning the spacing of wells. Such regulations have generally specified that only one well be drilled to each 40 acres of land surface. Geologists, State officials, and producers testified that these regulations could not be made to apply alike to the entire Nation. They pointed out that in some strata one well may be required for only 5 acres, while in others one well may be adequate to pump the oil from 40 acres. In Mississippi, it was testified by the State oil and gas supervisor that the 40-acre spacing rule of the Petroleum Administration for War would not have permitted efficient withdrawal of oil from the sands of his State, which in some places are 100 feet thick and will accommodate one well to every 5 or 10 acres without any waste whatever. In some areas, witnesses testified that the 40-acre spacing rule prevents the drilling of wells to each of the various producing sands which exist below the surface; thus, where seven producing sands might exist below the surface only one sand may be tapped under the PAO–11 order.

In addition to this well-spacing restriction I might point out that the budding Mississippi field was further held back by consistent refusal of the Petroleum Administrator to give it a pipeline outlet. We have plenty of pipe for Arabia, but none for Mississippi.

Finally, in connection with this matter of estimated reserves in the United States, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks at this point a table of crude-oil production and estimates of reserves, and would invite the attention of the Members to a comparison between the figures of total production which has taken place since a certain estimate was made with the estimate in question. This will clearly reveal how far from accurate past estimates have been and should lead us to earnestly attempt to ferret out the truth of this whole situation as nearly as we can.

Crude oil production and estimates of reserves

(Thousands of barrels)

Period or year	Production during year or period	Cumulative production since 1859	Estimates of proven reserves	Estimated by—
1859–99	939, 984	939, 984		Standard Statistics, Inc.
1900	63, 621	1, 003, 605	2, 356, 000	Do.
1901	69, 389	1, 072, 994		
1902	88, 767	1, 161, 761		
1903	100, 461	1, 262, 222		
1904	117, 081	1, 379, 303		
1905	134, 717	1, 514, 020	3, 546, 000	Do.
1906	126, 494	1, 640, 514		
1907	166, 095	1, 806, 609		
1908	178, 527	1, 985, 136		
1909	183, 171	2, 168, 307		
1910	209, 557	2, 366, 864	4, 057, 000	Do.
1911	220, 449	2, 598, 313		
1912	222, 935	2, 821, 248		
1913	248, 446	3, 069, 694		
1914	265, 763	3, 335, 457	6, 000, 000	Ralph Arnold.
1915	281, 104	3, 616, 561	7, 500, 000	U. S. Geological Survey.
			5, 318, 000	Standard Statistics, Inc.
1916	300, 767	3, 917, 328		
1917	335, 316	4, 252, 644		
1918	355, 928	4, 608, 572		
1919	378, 367	4, 986, 939		
1920	442, 929	5, 429, 868	6, 430, 000	Do.
1921	472, 183	5, 902, 051	9, 000, 000	U. S. Geological Survey and American Association of Petroleum Geologists.
1922	557, 531	6, 459, 582		
1923	732, 407	7, 191, 989		
1924	713, 940	7, 905, 929	13, 250, 000	U. S. Geological Survey.
1925	763, 743	8, 669, 672	7, 290, 000	Standard Statistics, Inc.
			5, 000, 000	American Petroleum Institute.
1926	770, 874	9, 440, 546	4, 500, 000	Federal Oil Conservation Board.
1927	901, 129	10, 341, 675		
1928	901, 474	11, 243, 149		
1929	1, 007, 323	12, 250, 472		
1930	898, 011	13, 148, 483		
1931	851, 081	13, 999, 564		
1932	785, 159	14, 784, 723	10, 000, 000	Do.
1933	905, 656	15, 690, 379	12, 000, 000	V. R. Garfias of H. L. Doherty Co.
1934	908, 065	16, 598, 444	10, 638, 000	Petroleum Administrative Board.
			13, 250, 000	U. S. Geological Survey.
1935	996, 596	17, 595, 040	10, 763, 000	Petroleum Administrative Board.
			12, 177, 000	American Petroleum Institute.
			10, 575, 000	V. R. Garfias and R. V. Whetsel.
1936	1, 099, 687	18, 694, 727	12, 992, 000	Baker (Oil Weekly).
			12, 400, 000	"The Lamp," Standard Oil Co. (N. J.).
			12, 904, 000	Oil and Gas Journal.
1937	1, 279, 160	19, 973, 887	15, 507, 000	American Petroleum Institute.
			15, 000, 000	J. Elmer Thomas, American Association of Petroleum Geologists.
			15, 856, 000	American Petroleum Institute.
1938	1, 214, 355	21, 188, 242	12, 909, 000	A. McCoy (Oil Weekly).
			13, 976, 000	Oil and Gas Journal.
			14, 352, 000	Do.
1939	1, 264, 962	22, 453, 204	17, 348, 000	American Petroleum Institute.
			17, 505, 000	H. C. Weiss, Humble Oil & Refining Co.
			19, 687, 339	Oil and Gas Journal.
1940	1, 351, 847	23, 805, 051	18, 483, 000	American Petroleum Institute.
			20, 099, 258	Oil and Gas Journal.
1941	1, 404, 182	25, 209, 233	19, 024, 515	American Petroleum Institute.
			20, 299, 000	Oil and Gas Journal.
1942	1, 400, 000	26, 609, 233	19, 589, 295	American Petroleum Institute.
			20, 082, 793	Do.
1943	1, 502, 000	28, 111, 233	20, 675, 899	Oil and Gas Journal.

COMMON-CARRIER PIPE LINES NEEDED

It is at least an open question whether the oil reserves of the United States may not be vastly greater than present estimates would indicate. And it is certain that consideration should be given the construction of common-carrier pipe lines in the United States at the same time that we are undertaking huge pipeline construction projects in other parts of the world. As I have already observed more than once in this speech, it is important above all things that the dead hand of monopoly should be removed from this great industry.

With this idea in mind, the subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee recommended that there be constructed a pipe line from the vicinity of Houston, Tex., along the Gulf and eastern coast to the vicinity of Norfolk, Va. The committee recommended its construction and had these significant words to say:

To be of maximum usefulness and effectiveness to the petroleum industry as a whole and to the people, the pipe line should be operated as a true common carrier. It should be available to all producers and refiners of petroleum on an equal basis, and should not be controlled by any oil company or group of companies.

The committee also recommended the construction of other pipe lines to provide for the better distribution of oil to the east coast as well as in the Pacific Northwest. Were petroleum pipe lines, as true common carriers, constructed in the proper places in the United States, it might indeed have a great effect upon the general petroleum situation in our country. For one of the ways in which the major oil companies have exercised effective control over the industry and frozen out competition has been by their control of pipe lines.

PIPE-LINE OWNERSHIP: KEY TO MONOPOLY POWER

Indeed, in a complaint against the American Petroleum Institute filed on September 30, 1940, by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, it is alleged that:

Defendants, controlling pipe-line gathering systems leading from producing wells to the defendants' crude-oil trunk pipe lines, are jointly and individually following the practice of compelling independent producers, who have no other practical means of transportation to competitive markets, to sell crude oil to the defendants at the well rather than permitting them to use such lines on a common-carrier basis and reach those markets in which they might sell their production. Defendants thereby gain control of the crude oil produced by such independent producers.

It will be remembered also that this whole pipe-line question has a rather lurid history, and one in some respects difficult, indeed, to comprehend. On September 30, 1940, the Department of Justice instituted in the district courts of the United States 3 test suits against the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, the Philips Pipeline Co., and the Great Lakes Pipeline Co., to determine whether or not the huge dividends paid to the major oil company owners of the pipe lines were not in truth and in fact in the nature of rebates disguised as dividends and, therefore, violations of the Elkins Act, which

forbids the "giving, granting, accepting, or receiving of rebates by any means or device whatsoever", in connection with the operation of petroleum pipe lines. The majors owned—and of course still do—the pipe lines, shipped over them almost exclusively, and kept the charges so high the independent producer could not readily use them. Enormous profits have accrued to the major companies from these pipe lines and they have been the key to the major company monopoly control over the industry. More money has been made out of the pipe lines than any other branch of the industry proportionate to investment. And major company ownership has been the means of compelling crude producers to sell to the majors all their oil on the majors' terms.

There was a time when it appeared that these cases might be dropped altogether, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], with my own full cooperation and support, introduced a resolution into the House on August 21 calling for an investigation into the possible abandonment of these suits by the Government. In connection with that matter, Congressman COFFEE and I both issued public statements, pointing out the danger to the economy of this country which would result if these suits against the major oil companies for the exercise of monopolistic practices in connection with pipe-line ownership were dropped. At that time the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice had recommended that the Attorney General of the United States authorize the commencement of a comprehensive civil suit against all 22 major oil companies and subsidiaries for violations of the Elkins Act in connection with pipe-line ownership. The Elkins Act was passed by Congress in 1903 and has been repeatedly upheld by the Supreme Court.

The suit was not dropped by the Justice Department, Mr. Speaker, and there can be no doubt that the Government had an open-and-shut case against the major oil companies in connection with this litigation. What did happen is perhaps best described by a Member of the other body, Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, in a statement which he made in the Senate on January 6, 1942:

> Last summer there were instituted by the Department of Justice some test suits against the major oil companies for recovery of the triple penalty for violation of the Elkins Act. Those suits were held in abeyance until the 23d of December, when there were filed in the courts here in the District of Columbia suits against the major oil companies for the recovery of substantially $1,500,000,000 as the triple penalty for violation of the Elkins Act; and the Department of Justice attorneys who had been preparing the cases had reached the conclusion that they had a dead open-and-shut case.
>
> On the 23d of December these cases were filed, but at the same time there was filed a consent decree which limited the amount of recovery after the 1st of January for violation of the Elkins Act to 7 percent on the invested capital, as determined by the filings with the Interstate Commerce Commission. It was provided, however, that in addition to the 7 percent, any additional profits would be paid into a fund which could be utilized by the owner-operators for such physical expansion as they saw fit to engage in or to expend money for; but there were waived on the part of the Government the penalties of $1,500,000,000, for which we had a dead open-and-shut case. This was done at a time when we are trying to collect money for the national defense effort. It costs $21 a month to pay a private in the Army—$252 a year. An Army of 6,000,000 men could be paid for a year with the amount the Government threw away.

On April 23, 1942, Congressman COFFEE, author of the resolution to which I have just referred, spoke at length in the House about these pipe-line cases. He pointed out how on the very day that the consent decree was entered into with the oil companies, 18 major oil companies which owned pipe lines were made parties to the suit. In other words, this was done only a few hours before the decision in the nature of a consent decree was entered. The Government thus stayed its own hand against the collection of fines which might have run as high as $3,000,000,000 and as pointed out by Senator GILLETTE in his statement; gained nothing by the consent decree except to force the companies to use the excessive dividends for physical expansion rather than for some other purpose.

Just why this pipe-line case was disposed of in this manner; just why the 18 additional companies were allowed to come in as defendants at the last minute, I have never been able to understand. The Federal judge who was requested to sign the decree suggested publicly that the settlement probably came about because the Government was moved by the Christmas spirit. It was my opinion, and it is my opinion now, that the thanks of the country are due to our colleague [Mr. COFFEE], and Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, for having brought this matter to our attention. But that does not particularly help the present situation. The fact that a consent decree was entered into is certainly evidence that the oil companies did not believe they could beat the Government case. But the net result of the whole matter was to leave the petroleum industry in practically the same position it had been in before with regard to the operation of the major oil companies who use pipe-line ownership as a means of monopolistic control over any independent company which may raise its head.

OIL MONOPOLY AT WORK

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take just two or three brief glances at the operation of monopoly in the oil industry, after which I will return to a few brief observations on the pipe lines which are a current topic of so much discussion.

I have spoken in the House on the subject of Emergency Tankers, Inc. I think reference to this corporation is pertinent to my remarks today. Emergency Tankers, Inc., in wholly owned by the major oil companies. To it has been turned over a large fleet of tankers by the War Shipping Administration under a broad charter which permits this corporation to do almost anything it wants to along the line of shipping oil. The tankers belong to the United States Government. They were turned over to the group of major oil companies on the ground that only those companies had the necessary "know how" to operate them. Let us not be deceived about this alleged lack of "know how" on the part of the Government in operating tankers or ships. We haven't yet had to sublet the operation of the Navy to Standard Oil and our Navy is doing right well.

On the west coast a similar group known as West Coast Tankers has been organized with the Standard Oil Co. of California in a controlling position owning 60 percent of the stock. The Government says the companies can operate the tankers. There are no regulations as to fees or profits which have been stipulated and though the War Shipping Administration assumes direction of the voyages and arranges for the movements of the tankers to a certain extent, it does so under instructions from the Petroleum Administration for War, where, according to the records of the Aiken subcommittee of the Senate Agricultural Committee, an official of one of the major oil companies actually makes the decisions.

One question which naturally arises is as to what is going to happen to these tankers after the war. It is a well-known fact that the major oil companies have been alarmed because too many tankers have been constructed during the war period, and they do not know what the results will be upon their monopolistic control of oil exports and imports. They do not want to leave the tankers in the hands of the Government, but above all things, they do not want any of the independent oil companies to get their hands on them. This, no doubt, explains why when certain independent oil companies attempted to purchase stock in Emergency Tankers, Inc., they were refused that privilege. And it is perhaps significant that the reply to their application came to them from 26 Broadway, New York, which is the head office of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. The Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, a cooperative wholly owned by the farmers of Pennsylvania, and one of the largest purchasers of oil products in that area was denied the opportunity to purchase stock in Emergency Tankers, Inc. The same fate met an application from the Grange League Federation Cooperative, with headquarters in Buffalo, N. Y. The G. L. F. will be recognized as probably the largest single farmer-owned cooperative in the United States, and it handles millions of dollars worth of petroleum products each year for its members. But it was not able to purchase any stock in Emergency Tankers, Inc., because after all it is not a major oil company.

Again, under the Petroleum Administration for War, a tremendous number of committees have been established, all composed of executives of oil companies and all of them dominated by representatives of the major oil companies. The latest directory published by an oil trade paper lists 155 such industry committees. These industry committees are the ones which are today making the real decisions as to what is going to be done with regard to the petroleum industry in the United States, and indeed in the

whole world. I have previously addressed the House on the subject of the Foreign Operations Committee at some length and will not have much to say about it today. I only point out that under Directive 65 of the Petroleum Administration for War, an oil producer is unable to sell oil to a cooperative and have the cooperative actually receive the oil unless the industry committee says so.

PATENT POOL

In the field of the production of high-octane motor fuel and high-octance aviation gasoline, there is in existence a patent pool known as the catalyst refining agreement, under the complete control of certain of the major companies. This patent pool controls all but three of the processes for the manufacture of high-octane gasoline, and it is virtually impossible for independent refiners to enter the field successfully without payment of exorbitant royalties. No one is able to find out about the royalties actually charged for aviation gasoline inasmuch as the facts about it are held under secrecy by the Petroleum Administration for War. An average independent refiner would have to pay royalties amounting in the neighborhood of $250 per day to the patent pool if he sells aviation gasoline to the Government and considerably more than that if he sold it elsewhere. The major oil companies which are members of this patent pool, of course, do not have to pay royalties at all.

SUSPENSION OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Congress has itself contributed in some measure to this situation, for the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act, Public Law 603, provided for the antitrust laws to be suspended upon issuance of certificates by the Chairman of the War Production Board. Such certificates can be issued even over the protest of the Department of Justice if the Chairman of the War Production Board sees fit. They are issued upon application of certain Government agencies, including among others the Petroleum Administration for War.

When in the summer of 1943 a number of farm cooperatives in the east coast area complained to a committee of the Senate that they were not able to secure supplies of oil products with which to supply their farmer members, an investigation was made by the Antitrust Division. Representatives of these farm cooperatives charged that certain oil companies were attempting to put cooperatives out of business. When the Antitrust Division attempted to investigate the situation, they found that the activities of which the cooperatives were complaining were being engaged in either by employees of the office of the Petroleum Administration for War, or else by employees of oil companies who were members of the various industry committees, operating under directives put out by the office of the Petroleum Administration for War. These directives had been certified by the Chairman of the War Production Board in line with the provisions under Public Law 603, so that it was impossible for representatives of the Antitrust Division to investigate these activities under the powers of the antitrust laws.

The farm cooperatives, however, devoted as they are to the consumer interests of their farmer members, have proven a continuous thorn in the side of attempts to impose cartel conditions on the industry. A short time ago one of the largest of these farm cooperatives filed application to import into the east coast area a considerable quantity of gasoline from suppliers who had the gasoline all ready to ship and specifically set aside for this purpose. After much effort which finally brought them to Washington itself, the permits were issued to this farm cooperative. But when on the next day they informed their supplier that they wished to take delivery of the gasoline, the supplier told them that they had just been directed by the Petroleum Administration for War to sell the gasoline held for the farm cooperative to the Army and Navy. The farm cooperative thereupon threatened suit and at that point P. A. W. backed down and saw to it that they were able to import this gasoline from outside district No. 1.

This whole story in my judgment reflects the effort of certain officials in P. A. W. to restrict the farm cooperatives to the distribution they had in 1941 and to compel the farmers to go to the major oil companies for their gasoline.

The Naval Affairs Subcommittee points out in its report that independent oil operators coming before the subcommittee "frequently and bitterly criticized the domination of P. A. W. by major oil company representatives in the absence of substantial representation of independents." The committee refers to "the Petroleum Administration for War's indifference to the destiny of the independent industry which has continually suffered from Petroleum Administration for War orders." Witnesses before the subcommittee testified to what they termed "the passing of the independent producer."

While it is true that the War Production Board certifications are considered to be essential for the prosecution of the war, it is at least questionable whether the authority contained in Public Law 603 has not been very greatly extended to include many dubious and doubtful regulations which when judged objectively could not be considered to be either directly or indirectly essential to the war program. True independents in the oil industry believe that a great many of the regulations—orders or directives issued by the Petroleum Administration for War and carrying the W. P. B. certification—have been conceived, prepared, and written by the petroleum industry committees for the purpose of preserving their control, and that in many cases it was the preservation of control which prompted their taking advantage of the provisions of Public Law 603 rather than any action contributory to the war program.

In any case we should know by now that monopolies or cartels—using the more polite word "control" to describe their programs—will for the duration of their existence impede if not completely eliminate the chance of independent segments of the industry to survive. It is not necessary to keep a cartel in operation for very long until all those not in the plan are stifled and smothered out.

The major petroleum industry groups in collaboration with P. A. W. say that these controls are necessary to winning the war. But is this always true? One independent oil man has written me as follows:

> A case in point is the allocation directive now in existence along the east coast in the 17 States and the District of Columbia comprising P. A. W. District No. 1. Only those companies in the little inner circle operating under the directive are permitted to bring petroleum products from the Midwest and Southwest to the east coast. Independents are denied this right, and therefore forced against their will to depend upon the large major companies for supply at prices in excess of what they would have to pay if they were to buy and transport the products themselves from independent refineries. By this action the independent refineries lose their normal markets. They are no longer permitted to sell petroleum to the independent jobbers and distributors. They then must depend upon the major integrated companies to purchase from them their refinery output. Once these markets are lost the independent refiner is forever a dupe of the major companies because he is dependent solely upon them not only for getting rid of his output, but under other rules promulgated by P. A. W. and the big companies, the independent refiner is forced to depend more and more upon the bigger companies for crude supply.

If the major companies with the protection of the Government are able to keep these regulations in force even for the duration of the war they will have become so entrenched and will have beaten down the independents in the industry to such submission that even after the war, whether by Government protection or not, they will continue and further develop their monopolistic cartel.

TIME FOR DECISION

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted, in my judgment, with nothing less than the question as to whether the major oil companies of the United States are going to continue to be more powerful than the Government itself. There are only two ways in which that question can be clearly answered—one is by the restoration of truly competitive conditions in the oil industry after the war. This is going to be a tremendous undertaking. I think it might be done. Whether or not it will be depends upon a number of factors, some of which I shall discuss in a moment. The only other solution available is for the Government itself to protect the public interest of the American people by means of Government ownership of pipe lines, making them true common carriers, or governmental direct action in some other way.

The oil monopoly cannot eat its cake and have it too. It cannot expect to dominate the Office of the Petroleum Administration for War, or a corresponding peacetime agency and effectively prevent not only competition from independent companies, but even the independents' acquisition of knowledge about petroleum reserves—it cannot expect to do these things on the one hand without subjecting itself to a demand from the people throughout the United States and

in the Halls of Congress for direct governmental action in setting up yardsticks for the control of the industry. Either competition has got to prevail from the oil well to the gasoline pump, or else there has got to be a considerable degree of public ownership.

In announcing the deal for the construction of the pipe line across Arabia from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea, Petroleum Administrator Ickes stressed more than once the fact that the policy of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, of which he is President, is to aid private oil business, and that the Government had no intention to getting into the oil business, but that, to quote him:

> On the contrary, its purpose is to promote the private oil industry of the Nation, and to further the interest of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to see the interests of the people of the United States put ahead even of the promotion of the private oil industry, and I still hope and believe that this is possible.

On the other hand we have the announcement of the Petroleum Industry War Council dated January 16, which reads as follows:

> The committee will begin its study immediately in preparation for the development of a recommendation for a Government policy fundamentally designed to promote the developing and securing of crude oil reserves and petroleum products the world over in a combined program of war preparedness and maximum peacetime progress of petroleum.
>
> The creation of the committee grew out of a suggestion by Petroleum Administrator for War Harold L. Ickes, and because of the need for a national oil policy. It marks the first time in the history of the petroleum industry that a group to study national oil policy has been set up under Government auspices.
>
> P. A. W. Administrator Ickes, in suggesting that the petroleum industry establish such a committee, emphasized that work should begin now on the development of a program which would enable the Nation at all times and under all conditions to have sufficient oil within its own area to take care of its requirements until, if necessary, it could turn to foreign sources for oil, or to adequate production of synthetic substitutes.

It may be asked here, for one thing, why we should get so excited about developing an international oil policy when we have yet to establish a domestic one.

It is apparent that although Mr. Ickes feels called upon to assure the private oil industry that the Government will not assert the public interest to any great extent in their private domain, the major oil companies have no hesitation about stressing again and again the importance of their work in determining a policy for the Government. The Petroleum Industry War Council is a group of 73 individuals—officials of the oil companies of the country—completely dominated by the major oil monopoly, who determine public policy for the country and make no bones about the matter. It was conditions of this sort, no doubt, which the Attorney General was pointing to when in his report to Congress of January 8, made pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 603, which, it will be remembered, is the section that authorizes suspension of the antitrust laws, he recommended as follows: That in the consideration of war programs, certain standards should be set up, the first of which should be "the avoidance of the delegation of functions which should reside exclusively in Government officials, to nongovernmental groups as, for example, the enforcement of programs or the determination of policy."

PIPE LINES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Now, in recent weeks much publicity has been given to two pipe lines. The first of these is the pipe line from the oil fields at the mouth of the Mackenzie River in Canada to the refineries constructed in the northwestern portion of Canada at White Horse. This is the now famous Canol project, initiated, understandably enough, by the War Department in the early days of the war when it appeared altogether possible that we might have to fight Japan in Alaska. I am not here today to criticize the military for having done everything within their power to assure our armed forces of readily available supplies of gasoline and other petroleum products. I am not even going to criticize the War Department if a considerable amount of money was spent in such an effort. I do most decidedly criticize the way this project was carried through after ample warning of its impracticability had been given by responsible members of the War Department staff. I believe the refinery could far better have been located in Alaska on United States soil. And the question I do want to raise is, "What is the Government buying with its money?"

One answer is that it was buying national protection, but assuming that everyone is in the war together, it appears to me that even in providing for national defense, we should not have situations where the expenditure of vast amounts of Government money means on the one hand only a huge out-of-the-pocket expenditure for the people of the United States, and, on the other hand, that huge financial advantages will accrue to powerful private interests as the result of the expenditure of that money. The only question I want to ask about Canol is, "What did we buy?" Well, we bought a pipe line and refineries, the future fate of which is still uncertain, though I believe negotiations are being carried on which will probably put our country in a better position with regard to them. The thing we did not buy, however, and over which we obtained no control whatsoever, is the oil or any part of the oil in the Mackenzie Delta field.

There is only one company operating in that field. It is called Imperial Oil, Ltd. Imperial Oil, Ltd., belongs 70 percent to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, an American corporation with total assets exceeding $2,000,000,000 and the largest single one of all the major oil companies. Whatever else may happen, at least it is true that a vast amount of public money has been spent the result of which is to open up an oil field whose potentialities are only beginning to become apparent, where all the leases are in the hands of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey through its subsidiary, the Imperial Oil, Ltd.

The one problem in connection with that oil field was that of transportation. The pipe-line construction was the outstanding expense and outstanding risk. That expense and that risk the United States Government took. Unless something can be done to change the situation, the benefit from that risk-taking enterprise on the part of the United State will accrue to the largest major oil company in the world, adding to its monopolistic control and putting the people of this Nation and other nations elsewhere as well—not to mention the pioneers of our own Territory of Alaska—in a further position of dependence upon it.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The one all-important point in this whole world-wide oil question is the control of oil. For the investment of public money in the Canol project the United States should certainly have acquired some degree of control over the oil to be developed there, and some right to share in the profits which, in all probability, will accrue after the war from the oil development which the American people's money made possible.

Within the past few days announcement has come from the War Department of an agreement between our Government, the Canadian Government, and the Imperial Oil Co., under terms of which the opportunity of the United States to purchase oil from the Imperial Oil Co. both during the war and afterward has been stipulated. The oil will be purchased up to a total of 30,000,000 barrels, or one-half of the recoverable reserve, whichever is smaller at a price originally computed at 20 cents above the costs of production. Since the margin of profit in this field is undoubtedly going to be very, very great indeed, even this 20-cent margin probably will provide a reduced price to the United States. In addition, the Imperial Oil Co. agreed to knock off another 5 cents from the price and to apply that 5 cents per barrel reduction against the purchase from the United States of certain equipment belonging to the United States connected with the Canol project. Although this does give to our country a greater assurance of an oil supply from Canada and probably at a somewhat reduced price, we nevertheless must pay the Imperial Oil Co. 20 cents more than its total cost for all this oil, they are placed in a position of even more complete control, and so far as I am able to determine, the situation with regard to the pipe line and refineries is still substantially as before, with the Canadian Government having the first option to purchase this pipe line and refineries, private companies having the second option, and the United States coming in thereafter for consideration only if an international commission decides we shall.

With regard to the much discussed pipe line across Arabia, intimation has recently been made of possible changes in the plans first announced with regard to this. Reported statements by Mr. Ickes and others would seem to indicate

that opposition to the agreement as originally set forth has borne some fruit, that some consideration is being given to the tremendous importance of the most careful handling of this whole near eastern situation from the point of view of future international peace, and that the United States Government may yet be put in a position to insist upon the purusit of policies with regard to middle eastern oil which will really make for peace in the future instead of generating a new source of internation friction. It is too early to judge as yet, but it is earnestly to be hoped that those who vigorously opposed the originally announced agreement with regard to this Arabian pipe line might yet accomplish two major purposes. First, that whatever plans are finally consummated will include provision whereby the United States as a nation can prevent cartel control and insist upon policies being pursued with regard to the production, use, sale, and disposition of this oil which will meet the needs of the peoples of the world and make for peace. And second, that in consideration of any expenditure of America's money and particularly in consideration of any commitments made by the United States, in this far-off section of the world, the American people themselves may gain a real degree of financial benefit which can, so far as I can see, only come through their having a share in ownership and hence in the profits of the enterprise which, all admit, will almost certainly be very considerable, indeed.

I cannot leave this subject, however, without touching once again on some of the objectionable features of the agreement, between the Government and certain major oil companies for the construction of this pipe line as that agreement was set forth some weeks ago.

This pipe line is estimated to cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $150,000,000, but it is doubtful if anyone has the slightest idea what the actual cost of the undertaking will be. The undertaking is at least as hazardous, difficult, and uncertain as was the construction of the Panama Canal. The agreement provided for the Government to build the pipe line and, I guess, retain ownership of it. The fact is, however, that only four or five of our most powerful major oil companies are in a position to benefit from the construction of this pipe line, since they own the leases on the oil which will flow through it. It is true that the Government would obtain an option to purchase up to a billion barrels of oil during the next 50 years. It is also true that the Government would receive a 25-percent discount under the posted price for oil either in Arabia or the United States, whichever is less.

Anybody who knows about the history of posted prices, particularly anyone who has studied the way in which those posted prices have been manipulated by the major oil companies at Kettleman Hills, Calif., and elsewhere, will realize it is rather an uncertain reed to depend upon.

It is important to remember that in the agreement for the construction of the Arabian pipe line, there was included a specific clause which states that companies involved will not be called upon to act in any way out of harmony with any cartel agreements into which they may have entered. Here again, as in the case of the Canol project, the significant thing is that public money is proposed to be used in tremendous amounts to take the major risk with regard to a huge oil development project without acquiring any right, title, or interest in the basic resource, which is the oil itself. In neither of these cases has the proposed or actual expenditure of all this public money modified in the slightest degree the monopolistic control of oil reserves held by these major companies. On the contrary, the construction of these pipe lines will increase vastly the economic power and monopolistic control of the major companies, for it will open up for them these vast resources of oil which they have not opened up with their own capital, and, in the case of Arabia in particular, this will mean a commitment by the Government to protect its pipe line and hence a commitment to protect possibly even by force the oil of the American companies. Whether new developments in this matter have changed this situation appreciably, we cannot yet tell. I hope and pray they may do so.

Here again my main complaint is summed up in the question, "What is the Government buying with its money?" And if the answer to that is given that the Government is buying national defense, then I would reply that I agree we must buy national defense in every way we can, but that in this case it appears to me we are in great danger of buying national insecurity and possibly even war. It is obvious that foreign sources of oil can have value to us at a time of international danger only if we are ready and able to secure them in a military sense, and the Middle East is a long, long way from the United States and, unless basic changes are made in the agreement as set forth, our Government will in all likelihood find itself endorsing an oil cartel over which it will have no control whatsoever.

Anyway it does not seem to me reasonable, just because our country is in jeopardy, for it to become necessary that world-wide arrangements be made which will cost the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, but which will through the years benefit one, two, or three major oil companies, and add to their strangle hold over the resources of the world without giving the American people or their Government any corresponding financial or economic advantage. The basic significance of these two pipe lines is that the Government is induced to pay for the riskiest, most difficult part of the job now while the war is on, and while we are under war restrictions and dangers without the Government gaining, up to date at least, any control over the basic resources or changing the monopoly situation a bit for the benefit and protection of the people. The game seems to be to get the Government to finance as much as possible but never to own anything except possibly a pipe line which is so located that only one or two major oil companies can take advantage of it in any way. And if it be said that we must put ourselves in a position to "compete with the British," then I refer back to what I said at the very beginning of this speech about what the British policy has been with respect to governmental participation in the spoils of oil.

It might be pointed out that at least as far as the Arabian pipe line is concerned, it is inconceivable that it can possibly be completed before this war has passed into history. I am reliably informed, furthermore, that it will cost in all probability, at least 85 cents a barrel to transport the oil from the Arabian field to the United States, so that what we would really be doing under the terms of the announced agreement is paying $150,000,000 for a pipe line in order to be able to get oil at 55 cents more a barrel than it can be purchased for here in the United States, even allowing for the 25-percent discount.

WHAT ABOUT MEXICO?

Furthermore, sources of supply in the Western Hemisphere have not only been neglected but obstacles have actually been erected in the way of those supplies being secured to meet present great needs of our own country for oil products. Mexico has not been averse to dealing with American companies providing they were companies which had a reputation of not trying to run the governments of whole nations. One independent American company is at this very moment importing very large amounts of fuel oil for household heating use and other oil products from Mexico. And this company is able to look forward to the very great possibility that considerable supplies of gasoline will be forthcoming from Mexico providing importations into the United States of heavy oil products, such as fuel oil and bunker oil, can be stepped up to a sufficient extent to relieve storage capacity in Mexico and thus make possible increased use of refining facilities. Both Mexico and the American company are anxious to step up the amounts of imports into the United States and those imports are coming in in Mexico's own tankers, and do not therefore draw upon American shipping. Every obstacle has been placed in the way, however, by certain P. A. W. officials against this importation from Mexico. Attempts have even been made to try to get the State Department to shut off these shipments. Such attempts originated from an official of the major oil company which has itself through the years supplied the major portion of the southeastern section of this country with its fuel oil. The State Department, be it said to its credit, flatly refused to cooperate in this little effort to use a Government position to further private competitive advantage of a major company.

The Mexican Government was then requested by P. A. W. to increase shipments to Cuba, and efforts were made to get the Navy to purchase certain oil products in Mexico, which, however, at the time, at least, the Navy apparently

did not need. In short, instead of developing the potential supplies of petroleum and petroleum products in Mexico, exactly the opposite effort has been put forth, and, I am convinced, for the reason that the majors do not control the Mexican source of supply.

And so, in answer to the statement of Secretary Ickes that he hopes his announcement will quiet fears that the Government is going into the oil business in competition with private companies, I would say that my fear is that the major oil companies are going into the Government in competition with the American people.

"BASIC OBJECTIVES" OF THE MONOPOLY

It will be recalled that the foreign operations committee of the Petroleum Administration for War has recommended that an international oil compact be negotiated with the following obectives: (a) Efficient and orderly development of the world's oil resources; (b) prudent conservation of the world's oil resources; (c) equitable distribution of oil to the peoples of all nations; and (d) avoidance of national restrictions imposed as artificial aids to the production of synthetic or substitute products.

These objectives are reminiscent of the domestic interstate compact under which the Petroleum Administration for War has taken the right to issue the so-called forecasts of production which have actually become controlling orders. This, I take it, is what is meant by points (a) and (b) of the recommendations for the international oil compact. Point (c) if we may judge at all by experience, means "equitable distribution" for the major oil companies in accordance with their own schedules, such as are now reflected in the directives of the Petroleum Administration for War. Point (d) is obviously a masterpiece of clever and deceptive phraseology. A careful reading of it will reveal that what is really meant is that any encouragement given to the production of synthetic or substitute liquid fuels or other products competing with the products of the major oil companies is to be regarded as a national restriction in the path of the oil monopoly. The major oil companies own the oil reserves, but their control of the supply of vital liquid fuels would be broken if other sources, such as synthetics, were to be developed. And when such a proposal is projected onto an international plane we can get some idea of the danger of the monopolistic situation about which I am speaking today.

IT DEPENDS ON WHERE THE PIPE LINES ARE

Against the story of the pipe line in northern Canada and the pipe line in Arabia, let me ask the House whether or not Members are aware of the fact that at the meetings of the Petroleum Industry War Council in recent months, there has been considerable discussion of the abandonment of one of the so-called Big Inch pipe lines which have recently been built from Texas to the east coast and upon the construction of which so much dependence for the solution of our petroleum supplies problem has been placed. I have endeavored to secure copies of the minutes of the Petroleum Industry War Council, but have been informed that these were confidential and could not be furnished to a Member of Congress. I could understand that better were it not for the fact that the Petroleum Industry War Council is taking the position as to which I have just quoted them—that their job is to determine oil policy for the Government of the United States.

Nevertheless, I am certain of the fact that abandonment of Big Inch pipe lines is being discussed by the Petroleum Industry War Council so that we have the situation of the Government going out and building huge pipe lines in the far corners of the earth in places where one or two major oil companies will be able to use these pipe lines as a means of transportation, whereas at the same time there is talk in the inner sanctum of the oil industry about the abandonment of the pipe line running through the most populous area of the United States, which is at the present time a controlling key to the solution of the problem of petroleum supplies in our country. Why should this be? Well, the answer is that the Big Inch pipe line belongs to the Defense Plant Corporation and as everybody knows, patriotic Members of Congress will attempt to insist that it continue in public ownership to be a common carrier for oil for all oil companies, big and little alike, in the future. I doubt very much that this reason would be publicly given, but I am as confident as I can be why the abandonment of the Big Inch is being discussed. These are thing about which it is important for us to be informed. I refer once again to the report of the Subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee of this House, in which they recommended the construction of a pipe line and emphasized the importance of it always remaining a true common carrier, and I ask that Members refer once again to the remarks I made a few moments ago with regard to the manner in which the major oil companies have used their ownership of pipe lines as one of the principle methods of freezing out competition.

So far, Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt primarily on the conditions involving the fundamental source of petroleum products; namely, crude oil. Before I close, it is important not to overlook another and very vital part of the over-all petroleum situation. I have reference to the distribution of finished petroleum products from refineries through the chain of distribution down to and including the individual consumer. Before the war there were two types of distribution: On the one hand the large major companies who controlled their own crude and refineries and distributed through their own terminal and plant facilities and in many cases even through their own leased or owned retail service stations. Some of these companies also sold petroleum products under a branded contract to jobbers. A relatively small amount was sold unbranded to other distributors such as jobbers. On the other hand there were a great number of independent refineries who sold the principal part of their output to distributors and jobbers with very little of this amount sold under a branded contract. There was thus some freedom in the market, and a measure of competition existed. At least such independent or distributor was obligated to develop his own supply sources.

But with the coming of the war and all of its concurrent problems tankers which normally serve the highly industrial and heavily populated east-coast area were diverted to war use or unfortunately lost to submarine action. It was very obvious that substitute transportation had to be developed and facilities of the various companies pooled for greater efficiency in operation. However, the small group of executives from the major oil companies who were chosen to serve as committee members on the petroleum industry advisory committees conceived, apparently without any real consultation with any of the independent segments of the industry, a plan which took shape in the form of a P. A. W. directive, No. 59. This regulation was certified by the Chairman of the War Production Board regardless of the opinions of the Department of Justice and provided a magna carta for the participating members without any fear whatsoever of prosecution under the antitrust laws. Early in the stages of the shortage of the east coast this action may well have been justified as an expedient essential for a period to the prosecution of the war. However, since its issuance in September 1942, the group controlling it, which are the same major oil-company people I have mentioned many times who are on the committees and on P. A. W.'s staff, have endeavored to further strengthen their plan. It might be well to note that the preamble to the directive as it was written in September 1942 stated "to alleviate the critical shortage of transportation facilities." It is now, however, pretty clear that the alleviation of a critical shortage of transportation is not the primary factor of consideration, but, instead, the real reason must be looked for elsewhere.

The Petroleum Administrator himself has stated that transportation is not the major problem alone along the east coast. His press statements have been to the effect that we face first and foremost a shortage of crude oil further affected by an overburdened transportation. The petroleum situation is very much the same throughout the entire United States today. A severe cut in gasoline rations has just been imposed on the west coast. And yet there is in effect in 17 States of our country an allocation program which has the earmarks of a cartel. At this very moment high officials in P. A. W. are reported to be drafting similar plans to be put into effect in the other P. A. W. districts throughout the balance of the country.

Mr. Speaker, we have a rationing program. The responsibility for rationing of gasoline rests with the Office of Price Administration, yet P. A. W. would install one of their own plans of rationing by allocation at the source. In effect we would have dual rationing. Today on the east coast, although a dealer or distributor may have ration coupons, he frequently cannot purchase

gasoline from his usual supplier. It would appear that there should be either one plan or the other. I for one cannot see how this body could ever endorse the allocation idea of P. A. W. since, as it has functioned on the east coast, there has been action amounting to the setting up of embargoes against the procurement of petroleum products by independents in the industry from sources outside of the east coast. I know of one independent company which through ingenuity and sheer perseverance has been able to develop supply sources both within and without our country and has brought those finished petroleum products by the millions of gallons to the east coast. At this very moment, however, the Petroleum Administration for War is endeavoring by devious means to shut off this supply by going to the source, for the simple reason that this particular independent does not choose to become a party to the major oil company's cartel plan.

Please bear in mind that this plan known as directive 59 does not compel anyone to participate. It is merely a "may," not a "must" regulation. And this independent of whom I speak has done all this without the aid of Government subsidy or assistance. The major companies on the other hand are protected by petroleum compensatory regulation No. 1 which guarantees them full reimbursement through Government subsidy on all excess costs of transportation over and above what their normal costs used to be. One need only to look at their financial statements to see that they have not suffered. As a matter of fact the Texas Co., whose Vice President, H. W. Dodge, is now the P. A. W. director for this east coast district, shows net earnings of $7,829,796 more after taxes and reserves in the year 1943 than in 1942. It is illuminating to compare the Texas Co.'s increase in profits with those of some independent jobber who has lost 50 percent of his business and is now operating in the red.

SUMMARY

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at great length and I am now practically through, but before I take my seat, I shall try to summarize the principal points which I have made.

First. We have inadequate knowledge of the real situation with regard to oil reserves in the United States. We ought to know the quantity of this great natural resource. We ought to be finding out what underlies the 48,000,000 acres of undeveloped land now held in fee or under lease by the major oil companies. We ought to be finding out these facts independent of the oil companies themselves; to be finding out through a Government agency completely divorced from these huge corporations and serving exclusively the public's interest.

Second. We should recognize that the basic reason for the oil shortage in the United States is the policy pursued by the major oil companies through the years. That policy has been one of discouraging independent investment or exploration, at the same time doing everything possible to control and reduce production in order to be able to maintain artificially high prices and to increase monopolistic control. To these policies pursued by the majors, we can principally trace our difficulties with regard to petroleum today.

Third. The shackles of monopoly must be removed from the independent companies and especially the independent geologists and engineers. I recognize this as a herculean job and do not presume to give a complete prescription as to how it can be accomplished in this speech today. True facts will help and so will a change in the whole situation with regard to pipe lines, so that every one of them will be made, by public ownership if necessary, a common carrier in order to put all companies and all crude oil producers on an equitable basis.

Fourth. The determination of Government policy must be carried on by people who are Government officials and Government officials alone. I want to emphasize again the fact that the industry committees of the Petroleum Administration for War which decides that action is to be taken and the form of action to be taken by public officials are dominated by men who are either present or recent officials of the major oil companies. As of June 1943 there were over 100 men in the Petroleum Administration for War who were on the pay rolls of one or another of the major oil companies. The Attorney General's recommendation against the delegation of functions, which should reside with Government officials, to nongovernmental groups ought to be insisted upon.

Fifth. Independent oil companies should have far more representation in the Petroleum Administration for War than they have at present. The consumer, the farmer, laborer, and the great mass of the public should be represented. Artificial limitations imposed upon production by the Petroleum Administration for War ought to be approved by people who are interested in the restoration of competition in this industry as well as by people who are interested in monopoly.

Finally, if the Government is to be expected to spend hundreds of millions of dollars upon pipe lines, to commit itself to the protection of those pipe lines on the other side of the world, then the people of the country have a right to share in the control of and the benefits to be derived from the oil itself. If the United States Government can build and own a pipe line in a foreign country, it is hard to see why it cannot also have a right to at least partial ownership of the petroleum and petroleum products. The British Government owns a substantial interest in the Royal Dutch Shell and a 50-percent interest in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. Britain has thus recognized the fact that monopoly exists in the oil industry and has set about doing the only thing that can be done to protect the public interest once monopoly is an accomplished fact. Many foreign governments control their foreign oil resources. If we are going to spend public money to help establish the monopoly of oil in the hands of private corporations all over the world, then, Mr. Speaker, the American people have a right to protect their general public interest in the only way they can protect it namely, by actually getting something for their money by acquiring ownership and control of at least a portion of the oil. Oil in the ground is a gift of God to all American people. But I believe there is a sharp distinction between the mineral resources as such, on the one hand, and the business of getting it out of the ground and refining it into the finished product, on the other. I believe that the principles of basic right and justice should dictate that at least a share in the ownership of mineral resources should vest in the people of the Nation, whereas the business of mining and refining them and bringing them into use should be the field of a truly free private industry.

It is my earnest hope that America is not going to fall victim to a process of world cartelization in the post-war period. It is my earnest hope that we can restore conditions of healthy competition. Whether this can be done in the oil industry, I do not know. It may be that the oil monopoly has grown so powerful that no agency, except the United States Government itself, can cope with it, and if this is true, then the time has passed when talk about the oil business as an essentially private business can have any real meaning. For if there is any product in the whole world as to which the public interest of the American people is vitally affected, that product is petroleum. Private monopoly and democracy cannot live together. Either the monopoly must be broken so that the people generally can engage freely in the business, or else Government must enter the field, not only to take the risk and pay the bills, but also to benefit in the financial gain thereof, even in ownership, particularly where an exhaustible natural resource is involved.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therewith certain tables, the full text of a letter from Mr. Davies, Deputy Administrator of the Petroleum Administration for War, and the text of a short bill which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the legislative program of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OVERSIMPLIFICATION

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, like every Member of this body, when I first came to the House, I took an oath, a solemn oath, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. From that time to now I have tried to the best of my ability to live up to both the spirit and the letter of that oath. Where we in this

House have differed from time to time, I have not only acknowledged honest differences in interpretation and in opinion, I want you all to know that I have more than appreciated the same understanding that has been granted me from both sides of this body.

As I have conceived my duty, I have followed the tenets of my own party, and I have, as have you, tried faithfully to represent the best interests of the citizens of my own part of the country at all times. However—let me repeat—however, the days are upon us where we, all of us, have the most solemn duty of all; that duty, Mr. Speaker, is the duty of representing the Republic of the United States, at home and abroad, during the crisis with which that Republic is faced.

Mr. Speaker, recently there occurred a most remarkable thing. A Justice of the Supreme Court of this land, Mr. Felix Frankfurter, made the following statement. I quote:

> The notion that because the words of a statute are plain, its meaning also is plain, is merely pernicious oversimplification.

Let me repeat:

> The notion that because the words of a statute are plain, its meaning also is plain, is merely pernicious oversimplification.

I would like you all to bear those words in mind—for this is not a political speech, it is a speech on government.

A few years ago, Mr. Speaker, a great privately owned and operated automobile company instituted a national advertising campaign. That campaign was judged the most successful advertising campaign launched, up to that time. The company was the Dodge Motor Co. The advertisements, in every type of medium from billboards to newspapers, stressed one word, and one word only, at a time. Of all the one-word releases, one sticks out in my memory. That was the word "dependability."

Was that oversimplification? If so, it was a success.

On the 17th of September 1787 the founding fathers of this Republic completed their deliberations that brought forth the Constitution of the United States of America. Look at it. Note the clear, concise, even beautiful language. In its even simplicity it evoked the praise of Gladstone, whose words you all know.

Was that oversimplification? If so, it worked.

Was the division of this Government into the three independent branches of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial oversimplification? If so, curious that it should work so well, curious that it should result in the great, abiding happiness of our people, over 160 years; a happiness, Mr. Speaker, that has never, in the entire history of the civilized world, been so great among such a number of people.

If, however, I were called upon to define the acme of pernicious oversimplification, Mr. Speaker, I would say that, in government, it is dictatorship. It is certainly simplification, and it is certainly pernicious.

Now let us bring this thing and what it means to ourselves here in this House, and through this House to the American people whom we have been chosen to represent, and to the Constitution of this Republic that we have solemnly sworn to defend and to uphold.

Do we think for one moment that we can, in America, live in the midst of an admittedly world-wide revolt and revolution and not be called upon to give our own American answer to this thing? Do we, as Members or as citizens, or do our American people back home believe that we, for one moment, can witness these events all over the world and not expect them to come to our shores at all? I for one think not.

Mr. Speaker, in 1789, in 1848, in 1904, in 1918, in 1932—to mention but partial sequence—the peoples of the political divisions called countries, abroad, have risen in protest against the heritages of the Middle Ages, against the fetters that have held them in relative bondage down to the present day.

Do we think, in America, that we can admit hundreds of thousands of these people without at the same time allowing to come in the virus of this disease; this disease which is a protest against conditions that they knew abroad and which many of them have not been here long enough to know that we had solved?

Our Constitution, Mr. Speaker, this American Constitution, gave to all of us, and to those newly come among us, what humanity had been so long striving for. It gave us independent, individual freedom.

If this be pernicious oversimplification, then I am guilty of it. I plead guilty and I shall stand in my own defense.

Now let us look into this matter.

In what to us is the foreign field, we have sent 5,000,000 of our boys and girls. As Members of this House, and as American citizens, do we for one moment believe that these men have gone abroad to bring to, and to perpetuate among, the peoples of foreign lands what are called four freedoms? I do not.

I would not give one fraction of one freedom on this, our American soil, to bring all of the freedoms there may be, to peoples all over the world. Our forefathers fought for the freedom to which we were born; we have no less the duty to preserve it.

Perhaps that is pernicious oversimplification, but I do not believe it is. The Atlantic Charter gave to each nation, large and small, the right of determining its own shape and form of government. By Mr. Churchill's recent speech in Commons he, at least, appears to believe that this is really oversimplification. He may be right. But we, Mr. Speaker, are one of those nations so stipulated in that Atlantic Charter. I intend, to the best of my ability, to see to it that we, we Americans of this Republic, do not lose the right of exercising our own self-determination. Mr. Speaker, it is of no use, it is of no earthly use, to employ but words, words, words. We must translate these words to action. And by legislative action I mean to reduce those words to the issues, the issues that they represent. And while problems may be complex, issues never are.

Let us go back for a moment.

A limited emergency was declared in America, in 1933. For months and months, and then for year after year, we in this body were told, were cajoled, were retold, that we must rise and support emergency measures that came from a firm hand as our national need.

Then the limited emergency became the unlimited emergency, and that, in turn, became war. And the tone, the pitch, and the tenor of that theme was ever the same. You know it as well as I. The country knows it, my constituents know it, your constituents know it. Only one thing has changed—that is the tempo. It has grown ever faster, ever more insistent.

Has not the surrender of our own, our legislative, constitutional powers, resulted in the very pernicious oversimplification of which Mr. Justice Frankfurter has so recently made plaint? I think so. But this is a very different type of oversimplification than the one I am speaking of, the one I intend to defend.

Let me tell you briefly what I mean.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of talk, of confusion, of debate, on just what is our foreign policy. There is a great deal of talk, of confusion, and of debate on just what is our domestic policy. We, as a nation, are going to change our form of government or we are not. We are going to preserve the heritage that is America, or we are going to bow to the world-wide voice of protest, and change that American form of government to something that is alien, something allegedly new. I, for one—and I have mentioned some of these things before—will grant to any man the right that I demand, no less, for myself and mine. I, now—not when this war is over—now, right now, want to see our boys and girls return to the same, progressive American home that they have left to serve. If there are those—and I believe there are—who would change that America, that Republic, that Government, into something different, something they allege is new, I want to know about it. I demand that those who wish to change it tell me what it is they have in mind. I demand that they, as well as I, "stand up and be counted," and that they tell me just what it is that they propose. I will tell them what I propose, right here and now: The immediate return, not after the war, but now, of the three-branch system of the American Republic to which we were born.

They say our people are complacent. Complacent? Complacent, hell! What is wrong with our people, if anything at all is, is that they do not know where they are headed. They do not know abroad, because they have not been told, in language they can understand. And I am one of those I mean. They do not know at home, because they have not been told. And they have not seen, either. As a matter of fact, and every Member of this body knows it, what they

have seen bewilders them. And millions of them, myself included, do not like it.

On our farms, in our homes, in our industry, in all our economic life, there used to be a peace, and a comfort, and a bright hope for the years to come, a future for the sons and the daughters that were growing up. Is there now? Is there?

They are talking about "jobs for returning veterans." We are as one on this, just as we were one on the question of votes for those men while they are abroad. But jobs? Where is the happiness that we and our citizenry should be looking forward to, for those boys and girls when they come home? Where is it?

Sir, we are told that the greatest question raised by letters coming in from all the varied fronts is that of strikes in industry here at home. How can this be accident? How can it? When we have, our men and our women in America, made this fantastic miracle of production and output, this almost miracle of strikeless weeks—a record not equaled by Britain or any other country in this war. What is the matter with a country that has such a fantastic record, a record to be proud of forever, made by free men and women who should know how proud of them we are for it? Can they, and industry, and our farms, and the men and boys who will return, can these American citizens of our land look forward to days and years of happiness and of content, when the very basis of such are being steadily swept away?

If this be the atmosphere, and it is, what is to be in store for us when this present "unlimited emergency" is gone?

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, there can be but one answer. There are, I believe, two possibilities. Upon our actions today and tomorrow, and next week, and next month, depends which of the two it shall be.

Possibility 1: The elected Representatives of our American people will continue to bow before the dictum of this "ever normal emergency" and to surrender to an ever-growing branch of the executive those powers that were entrusted to us under the Constitution of the United States. Under that theorem we have seen agency superimposed upon agency, decree follow decree, interpretation following interpretation. We have seen this legislative body become at times a body of negation and of investigation. We have seen the case just the other day, where again we are called upon to investigate a matter after the thing had happened. We are asked, in other words, to find out and to discover if or whether we gave such powers to this "perniciously oversimplified" regime. We are faced, Mr. Speaker, with an issue that was an issue 3 long years and more ago; an "issue," Mr. Speaker, that is an incident today. It does not matter whether that firm was Montgomery Ward, or whether it was Smith and Jones. What does matter is that the predictable and the predicted event has now taken place.

An event, Mr. Speaker, that brought into play the use of men in our own armed forces, men who are within our country by the accident of the call abroad, men who are in their uniform every bit as much to preserve the America which is theirs as are those on the beaches of Guadalcanal. What must they think, those men who entered this plant? What must others think as they contemplate the next move, the next incident, of a pattern of things that is unintelligible under our Constitution? If this be the pattern of things to come, I call upon those who advocate it to stand up and be counted. And to tell us what it is. Then we will let our people decide. This is possibility No. 1.

Possibility No. 2: This possibility is far easier to define—for we had this possibility as a national policy, as a national government, and in our national structure for 160 years. That possibility, Mr. Speaker, is forthright, intelligent, progressive American constitutional government, in the form of a republic and in accord with the humanity of the Bill of Rights. That is possibility No. 2.

Let me elaborate a little on this subject.

On Friday evening, one of the Washington papers carried a large advertisement. The body of that ad was not pertinent to this discussion. Two things, however, caught the eye. One was the picture of an American soldier. The other, Mr. Speaker, was three words in large type. Those three words, my colleagues, were "jobs or revolution."

Jobs or revolution. Think, for a moment what those words mean. Here we are in a global war abroad, a physical war that, admittedly, has but reached the point of the beginning of its ferocity, as far as our own men are concerned. In the Pacific, we are but on the veriest fringe of what has been described on the floor of this House as "our war." And on Friday evening, the 5th of May, 1944, a large advertisement already appears with a scarehead asking, "Jobs or revolution." Think on that, gentlemen; think on what assuredly lies behind.

We hear a great deal about reconstruction. We hear a lot of plans, of the activities of a hundred agencies, governmental and private, all making blueprints for what they call the post-war era of reconstruction. There are schemes for highways, for projects of this kind, for projects of that kind. There are projects, it seems, for almost everything under the sun. And there are projects for almost every people, and every government—both permanent and quondam—under the sun, except, except Mr. Speaker, for the pattern of the Government of the United States of America.

The opponents of this constitutional republic of ours, the advocates and the apologists for some form of government that they are as vague and as evasive about as legal longhairs and as nameful and nameless ones can make it, point their unerring finger of scorn and of ridicule at those among us who honor that human government that was ours so long. They say you cannot "go back." Who in hell wants to go back? A society that does not go forward is a stagnant society, and you know it as well as do I. But if the framers of our American Constitution did not foresee the future which is our today—maybe they made not the slightest attempt to foresee it—they did provide for it. And I am one who came to this body because I wanted to come here; I took the oath of office because I wanted to take that oath; and I intend to uphold and to defend my American Constitution because I believe in it. I make no claim for uniqueness in this. I know full well that every Member of this body feels the same. My point is, fellow Members, that the time has come to heed the words, words, words that are being uttered all over this country of ours. It is time, I believe, to heed these men and women who are saying that Congress is the last bulwark of defense between the people who used to be sovereign, and an executive bureaucracy that has been, that is, and that gives every indication of continuing to multiply by division—like the unicellular plants from which communism has so aptly taken its cue—it is time to heed, I repeat, these American men and these American women. For, fellow Members, the solution to the American problem of progressive and of human government lies not in the three words of "jobs or revolution"—it lies within the simple, the almost beautifully simple words of the Constitution of the United States.

And if that is "pernicious oversimplification," make the most of it.

Now, I want to point out something that many of you, without doubt, have often noticed. I refer to the type of protests that come in to us from all over the country. And I want to, for just a moment, pause to say to you that, as I am from a cattle section, a great many of my own visits and my own correspondence deal with cattle and all the allied industries. What I want to stress in this part of my talk, is that I considered it a part of my job here, during other days, to honestly and as adequately as possible, represent the interests of the section which sent me to this body. Now, however, we are in different days. How different, we all know. And the visits and the telegrams and the letters which I now receive come to me from the same cattle country as before. They reach the same Representative of them and of their interests as they did before. Again to paraphrase, I take my words from Patrick Henry: "I am a Marylander no longer; I am a Texan no longer; I am a Vermonter no longer—I am an American."

Mr. Speaker, I receive these protests and these complaints now, not as a Texan alone—consciously proud as I am of my State—but as an American. And it is the pattern of these things I want to ask you to look at with me today.

Have there been protests, fellow Members, or privations? Have there been complaints of suffering? Of sacrifice? If so, I have not received many of them; no.

But there have been protests, thousands upon thousands of them. Men

and women have come here to Washington—you have met them, talked with them, worked on behalf of their affairs, as have I. What, then, has been the nature of their complaint? There is the point I am making; there is where we bring in the essence of this address. There we bring in the very nexus of this affair, the conflict, within America, between something they do not tell us what, and the clear simplicity of our former Constitutional Republic which it is our plain and sworn duty to preserve.

Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, what has been the all but universal theme of these voices from the American people we hear so often and so clearly? You know, and I know—we all know—that this theme has been one of bewilderment, of confusion and, finally, oftentimes of despair.

And why is this? Why should this be true?

We Americans, fellow Members, are not a despairing people. But we are a very human people. And what is more, our forefathers bequeathed to us—for us to preserve and to, in turn, bequeath to our descendants—a government whose very essence and concept was the absolute supreme in all the history of the world.

Let me reverently say again, "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul."

That is what I meant when I said a few minutes ago that I would not surrender one single iota of American, human freedom for all the 4, or 8, or 108 freedoms that we might bring "everywhere in our time." And if that is "oversimplification," I stand upon it. My countercharge, if any, would be that it is certainly not the "pernicious oversimplification" of which, apparently, our people stand accused.

That, too, is what I mean when I say that the Atlantic Charter may be a good line on which to hang the yellow flag of quarantine, but my charter, our charter, was a compact—a compact signed on a little ship called the *Mayflower*. You can see it not many steps from where we are. That charter, Mr. Speaker, led unerringly to the Constitution of the United States. And that Constitution, fellow Members, we have all taken our solemn oath to uphold.

Maybe I make the thing too clear-cut. I am a simple man, and I come from simple people. I am not employed to cloak in legal verbosity, or either in philosophical fulminations, the purpose and the intent of the law. I, like you, am only employed to make those laws. And I had always thought that laws should be simple and clear and forthright and understandable. Perhaps I am to learn differently. If so, I charge those who would change the form, and the intent, and the personality of this, our American Government, to "stand up and be counted," and to let me, and you, and our American people who have sent us here see just what it is they have planned, are planning, and appear to continue to plan for us. Against that, we will have an issue. And upon that issue I am willing that our people decide.

I will be perfectly frank with you, though I am going to employ an approach that may give an impression of the unrealistic. May I assure you, however, that it is very realistic, indeed. The analogy comes from Gustav Lebon.

The legions of American dead, the legions of human dead, Mr. Speaker, have bequeathed to me, and to us, far more than the mere implements and institutions of government; far more than the mere symbols that are these marble halls of Washington. Ever present in the background of my thoughts, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, are the moving, half-seen shades of that "rabble in arms" who march in shadowy array from the green mountains of Vermont to the towering heights of Quebec; who felled the trees and dammed the creeks below Crown Point; who captured Burgoyne at Saratoga. They are the legions who wintered at Valley Forge and one of them carried the taut-pulled drum on which Thomas Paine wrote his thoughts in the Crisis. They are the legions who stood at the surrender at Yorktown.

The legions of American dead, the legions of human dead, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, are the legions who trekked across the rolling, midwest plains, and from their midst I see Cody, Hickok, Marshall, Bridger. In the trailing dust of their pioneer march I see the ghostly array of the covered wagons, long-lined by day, circled and compact by night.

Among them are the shades of Jean Lafitte; among them are those who fell at San Jacinto. And there are the shades of the blue and the gray.

Their heritage to me, Mr. Speaker, was a flag I shall always try to honor—a flag that shall ever remain the symbol of their ideal.

I trust you will pardon my saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am neither lost in the dreamland of fancy, nor am I for a moment diverting from the theme upon which I am now speaking. For good government, Mr. Speaker, is no more the reality of a people than are these marbled halls of the Capitol of our Nation; and no more the reality of a people than is the Constitution which brought its possibility into being.

For these, Mr. Speaker, are the stately manifestations of the ideal that lies within.

The constant is the ideal. Read Lin Yutang's Between Tears and Laughter. Let me say it again, the constant is the ideal.

I have been elected, sir, to this body to represent the people of my constituency. In this representative assembly I will stay just so long as I adequately interpret the interest and the well-being of those people.

As I have said before, in this crisis with which our Republic is faced, I conceive it to be my duty—and my privilege—to as best I may, represent not only the citizens of my community, but the entire body politic of the American people of this, our American land.

Were an earthquake to destroy these buildings in Washington, here, were some calamity to befall that razed them to the ground, we could rebuild them—if we would. Because our ideal would have remained.

But when you crush, defame, slander, vilify, scorn, bypass, or otherwise demolish the ideal of our human, American people, the spirit of our people is broken. Not in a hundred years, to paraphrase our immortal American, Webster, could we rebuild the temple so destroyed. That temple, fellow Members, that is far more beautiful—though it is more fragile—than any ever erected during the golden days of Pericles, or by any architect of the Taj Mahal. That invisible temple of an ideal, the ideal, Mr. Speaker, of freeman and freewoman.

Were that temple, once so visible because so new, now beclouded by a vision no longer ours—were that temple to crumble, not for a hundred years, nor for yet more, would the human world again be lit by the ethereal beauty of the American ideal. It is American, my fellow Members, because here on this continent we gave it birth. It is the human ideal of all the world. From the builders of the Tower of Babel; from the slave-driven fellaheen of the pyramids of the Ptolemies; from the edict of Diocletian; from the musings of Mencius and of Kong-Fu-Tze and of Gautama Buddha—humanity, humanity, fellow Members, has striven for that goal.

On the fields of Runnymede they got their first real hope; in 1688 their hope grew. But always, always, those in power strove to tear down, to wear away, to return the masses to the state where they had always been. Then, in the fresh, clean air of a new continent, the men and the women who came to be called Americans brought forth a new kind of government.

A government that, for the first time in all of history, put the ideal of world-wide humanity into one single, legal document. That document, fellow Members, was the Constitution of the United States.

And men whose names have gone down in the pages of history have spoken well of that document; men and women by the countless thousands have fought to preserve that document. Countless millions over this world have fought for the ideal finally expressed in that document.

And many of these same men whose names have gone down in history, whose names are linked with those who have recognized that document for what it was, have had other things to say. They have warned us. Macaulay, Brice, and Burke, Lincoln, Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, Paine. Their names are many. And they, Mr. Speaker, are names to conjure with. What have they said? I will repeat for you what they have said. They have said that if this great American, human document, and all that it implies, were ever to be destroyed, it would be destroyed from within. They have, further, said something even more important, something that we should take to our thoughts and never, in these days, for a moment let it out of our American minds.

This is what they have said. They have said, Mr. Speaker, that there were those who would never cease until they had un-

dermined, destroyed, bypassed, circumvented, or otherwise maneuvered it to its own negation and destruction. That is what they have said.

If this be oversimplification, Mr. Speaker, then I am guilty of the charge. But I want to repeat my countercharge. I state that those who are scorning, ridiculing, bypassing, and otherwise bringing to naught the greatest document of the people on the face of this earth, I charge that they, themselves, not I, are guilty of the pernicious part of the oversimplification. And I defy them, here and now, to tell me, to tell us, to tell the Members of the other body, and to tell the people of my America, what it is that they intend.

This may all be accident. But I do not believe it is. It may be done in colossal ignorance, but if it is, my charge will be enough. It is all too much of a pattern, and the pattern is all too much on one side. I, and you, have seen the pillars of our great and human Constitution crack; you have seen them sway. And this, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, is precisely what I mean when I say, and say again, I would not exchange one single, solitary iota of the freedom which we possessed, for all the alleged number of freedoms which we might thereby bring to the people of the rest of the world. We cannot help those people by sacrificing ourselves, part of that for which they are so blindly striving.

We cannot purchase a part of the whole by surrendering a part of that whole ourselves.

Good government, gentlemen and colleagues, is the expression of our national, American ideal. To some that may be oversimplification; to me it is assuredly not perniciously so.

It is not easy, as you know, to sit here, or in committee, to discuss the pros and cons of legislation. It is not easy to determine how much of what, and when, is to go where. But we have chosen our career. No one forced it upon us. It is up to us to discharge our public trust.

But, difficult as that may seem at times—and it is—it is infinitely more so to carry with us the thread, the tiny, intangible thread, of that American, human ideal that we have been all unconsciously, at times, sent here to preserve.

I am nearing my conclusion, Mr. Speaker. I want to here give two short illustrations of the pattern which the nameless ones will not define.

The first illustration is the incident of Montgomery Ward. I will not amplify at this time; it is fresh in all our memories. But I want to parallel it with a recent decision of the Supreme Court of this land. That decision, if you will remember, laid down the dictum that certain building employees in New York City and in Philadelphia, because the tenants of those buildings were engaged in interstate commerce, were, they themselves, so engaged. A third parallel is the case of a milk dealer in the city of Chicago. It was determined that, though the milk was entirely produced in the State of Illinois, delivered and consumed in the State of Illinois, because it was in competition with milk from out of that State, it was subject to the rules and regulations of interstate commerce.

Where, one asks, is this thing to end? If this is not pernicious oversimplification I do not know what it is.

My second illustration brings in the foreign field. There has very recently been brought to my attention a circular, and displayed prominently on that circular is what is called the United Nations flag. It has four vertical bars on a field of white. The bars are, oddly enough, red. In the circular itself there appears one item to which I take exception. That item states we are to give that flag, that United Nations flag, mind you, the same respect and attention which we rightly pay to the Stars and Stripes. Mr. Speaker, there is no flag on God's green earth that I have, that I do, or that I will ever give the same respect that I do to the flag of the United States of America. That is my flag. And it will always be my flag.

Perhaps this, too, is oversimplification. I would suggest, however, that it is, rather this one-flag, one-world thing that is the pernicious oversimplification to which we have so often referred.

Mr. Speaker, here is a sentence from a letter I have received on the 22d of April. I quote:

> But when they (our citizens) view the hopelessness of the internal picture, they are completely discouraged and disillusioned. As I said before, those who can think know about the frightful thing that is happening and even the fact we are making progress toward winning the war does little to relieve their heartsickness and fear for the future of their loved ones.

Listen to those words, fellow Members. Hopelessness, discouraged, disillusioned, heartsickness. You have all received letters like this. They, and you all know it, do not come from any one class of our people. They come from every kind and type of man and woman in the land. They are a cross section of our kind. They are you and they are me.

Mr. Speaker, on the 6th of April 1938 we were debating on what was called the reorganization bill. On page 6407 of the RECORD you will find my words at that time. Let me quote:

> We have the sworn duty to keep such powers as we have under the Constitution, and I repeat that we, the Congress, have not the right to surrender those rights in the interest of those whom we represent and in the interest of the traditions represented by that flag, the Stars and Stripes.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker and fellow Representatives of our American people, let us look forward to our work, to our duty, and to our privilege. Let us bear these things in mind. Let us evoke again the Battle Hymn of the Republic and let us stand firm and united, that these United States of America shall, for the happiness of our people and for the beacon light of the world, be once again "the land of the free and the home of the brave," and that our America—U. S. A.—shall never become the land of the bound and the home of the 'fraid.

Let me thank you for your attention.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced, his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 156. An act relating to the status of retired judges;

S. 176. An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney, and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 10 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2987, a bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on House Joint Resolution 138, granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of New York and the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations concerning the settlement of the boundary line between said States at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 4215, relating to custodial service employees of the Postal Service. Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Daylight Savings Time of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, May 11, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on daylight-savings time bills.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on S. 1272 to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations, at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, May 12, 1944, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 18, 1944, at 10

a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (ship construction reserve fund).

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 25, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4486, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the Clerk by letter.

Witnesses are requested to notify the Clerk by letter at least a day in advance of the hearing of their desire to testify in order that a list of witnesses may be prepared. Written statements for the record from persons other than witnesses should be submitted a day in advance. Amendments to be proposed during the hearing should be submitted to the reporter in duplicate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1519. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved June 11, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1520. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation for administrative expenses of the Foreign Economic Administration, administrative expenses of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for defense aid for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 566); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1521. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $16,000, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 575); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1522. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1945, in the sum of $596,000 (H. Doc. No. 576); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 535. Resolution providing for the payment of the further expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1426). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1708. A bill for the relief of Perley M. Silver; without amendment (Rept. No. 1427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4654) for the relief of Charles F. Tusow and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4769. A bill to impose certain restrictions upon the taking possession of business enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4770 (by request). A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4771 (by request). A bill to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Fish and Wildlife Service should develop the fish industry of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Miss STANLEY:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution to merge the Senate and House committees created by Senate Resolution 286 and House Resolution 521 for the purpose of investigating the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 536. Resolution providing for an hour of prayer on D-day; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 537. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1767; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 4772. A bill for the relief of Murray W. Moran; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Missouri:

H. R. 4773. A bill for the relief of W. T. Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 4774. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Saldana Agosto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 4775. A bill for the relief of Jeannette D. Christie; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5626. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Associated Industries of New York State, Inc., protesting against the enactment of House bills 4576 and 4580 for the purpose of reestablishing a National Bituminous Coal Commission, the office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5627. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, requesting the President, the Secretary of State, and Members of Congress to petition Great Britain to remove at once certain political boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5628. Also, petition of the Cambridge Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, protesting against certain phases of the so-called GI bill of rights, Senate bill 1767; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5629. By Mr. DAY: Petitions signed by numerous citizens, relatives, and friends of the Japanese war prisoners, supporting House Joint Resolution 252 and House Joint Resolution 253, introduced by Representative JESSIE SUMNER; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5630. Also, resolution adopted by the Women's League for Political Education, of Chicago, Ill., urging that hearings be held on House Joint Resolution 252 and House Joint Resolution 253, introduced by Representative JESSIE SUMNER; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5631. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of many residents of Waterloo and Cedar Falls, Iowa, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, providing for wartime prohibition of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5632. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of R. D. Samuelson, manager, Olsburg Farmers Union Co-op Association, and 30 housewives of that community, urging that something be done to relieve the situation in the shortage of dress materials, such as cottons and rayons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5633. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution from Department of New Hampshire, Women's Relief Corps, supporting measures which will implement the following ideals: Give reasonable and just representation of nations at the peace table; guarantee collaboration with other nations in establishing and maintaining a permanent peace; form a Federation of Nations, banded together for the purpose of mutual helpfulness, promoting just trade agreements, policing the high seas against destructive under-the-sea crafts, and inhibiting aggressor nations that are strong if and when they make an assault on the weaker nations; give to all American citizens of legal voting age the right of franchise wherever found; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1944

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art found of all those who with true faith and hearty repentance turn unto Thee, we would join our voices with Thy servant across the long years as our hearts cry: "My soul waiteth for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning; I say, more than they that watch for the morning. I wait for the Lord, my soul doth wait, and in His word do I hope." The clamor and confusion of an earth in ever-increasing turmoil thunders constantly in our ears. Within our own hearts there is a deep weariness and an aching unrest: There is no refuge but in Thee. While the tempest still is high we seek the peace of Thy presence and of Thy power, not that we may escape the world but that, with our weakness harnessed to Thy strength, we may face life with all its stark and stern realities, finding, as those who have become partners of Thy nature have always found, that Thy yoke is easy and Thy burden is light. So may drab duty faithfully performed lead our feet in paths of righteousness and service.

May Thy truth, as we follow its gleam, unloose the shackles of our heart and mind, making us free and fearless. Shepherd us beyond these present plains of peril to the hills of enduring peace and to the eternal fold where we may lie down in safety and go in and out freely for evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 8, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3604) authorizing the appointment of the Chief of Chaplains to the temporary rank of major general, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Barkley	Buck
Austin	Bilbo	Bushfield
Bailey	Brewster	Butler
Ball	Bridges	Byrd
Bankhead	Brooks	Capper
Caraway	Jackson	Reynolds
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Russell
Connally	Langer	Shipstead
Cordon	McCarran	Smith
Danaher	McClellan	Stewart
Davis	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Downey	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Maloney	Tunnell
Ellender	Maybank	Tydings
Ferguson	Mead	Vandenberg
George	Millikin	Wagner
Gerry	Murdock	Walsh, Mass.
Gillette	Murray	Walsh, N. J.
Gurney	Nye	Weeks
Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Hawkes	Overton	Wherry
Hayden	Radcliffe	White
Hill	Reed	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1826. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), relating to the exportation of certain commodities, and to continue said act in effect; with amendments (Rept. No. 865).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. Res. 288. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for the investigation of war contracts termination; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1451. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861; without amendment (Rept. No. 866); and

S. 1593. A bill for the relief of the heirs and assigns of Widow Cesaire De Blanc; without amendment (Rept. No. 867).

GRANTS TO STATES FOR EMERGENCY MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably House Joint Resolution 271 making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces, and I submit a report (No. 864) thereon.

The joint resolution reads:

Resolved, etc., That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, under the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, namely:

Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care (national defense): For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1944 for grants to States, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, to provide, in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades in the armed forces of the United States under allotments by the Secretary of Labor and plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau, $6,700,000.

I ask unanimous consent that I may make the report at this time, and I ask for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report will be received.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have here a letter from the Secretary of Labor showing that it is absolutely necessary that the joint resolution be passed at once, and full information is given in the report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the information may be given in the report, but I have not yet seen the report, and I expect others have not seen it. Will the Senator, himself, give a somewhat fuller explanation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the letter of the Secretary of Labor will show the necessity for the enactment of the joint resolution. It reads:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, May 6, 1944.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Deficiency Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: The Department has found it necessary to submit a supplemental estimate for the fiscal year 1944 to carry on the emergency maternity and infant-care program of the Children's Bureau. The need for the additional funds is due to the number of applications received for benefits under this program, which have far exceeded previous estimates. Yesterday the House passed House Joint Resolution 271, approving a supplemental appropriation for $6,700,000 which is needed to meet payments

to the States for the months of May and June.

In view of the fact that several States have laws which prohibit State officials from incurring obligations unless funds are on hand in the State treasury, it is essential that this resolution be acted upon as quickly as possible.

I am enclosing for your information and use six copies of the justification presented to the House Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

The report shows that in the State of Maine there are 194 cases in which such a grant is needed at present. In Illinois there are 2,350; in Indiana, 1,200; in Oklahoma, 917; and so on. I think this is a most worthy matter, and that the joint resolution should be passed at once. I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. WHITE. I take it this is a need which is most general throughout the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. In every State in the Union, and in the Territories as well.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 271) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENEFITS TO VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—ADDITIONAL COPIES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 290, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 290) submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri on May 2, 1944, as follows:

Resolved, That 2,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 146, current session, entitled "Benefits to Veterans and Their Dependents," being an analysis of rights of all veterans and their dependents to pension or compensation, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

NOMINATION REPORTED OF CLARENCE L. FORSLING, OF UTAH, TO BE DIRECTOR OF GRAZING

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire at this time to file a favorable report from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys on the nomination of Clarence L. Forsling to be Director of Grazing. I desire to make a very brief statement in reference to the nomination.

The open public-land States of this country are exceedingly interested in the head of the Grazing Division, because the open public lands constitute the basis for our livestock industry in the public-land States, so when the nomination came to the Senate from the President it was the subject of much discussion by the members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. This morning a second hearing was held at which Mr. Forsling came before us and answered certain specific questions put to him.

In the administration of the open public domain under the Taylor Grazing Act we have what is known as advisory boards. Those advisory boards are elected from among the users of the open public domain. They are cattlemen, sheepmen, or the owners and grazers of livestock on the open public domain. The law amendatory of the Taylor Grazing Act makes provision for the election of advisory board members.

It is the belief of those who use the open public domain for stock-raising purposes that the Interior Department should have consulted with the advisory boards, or at least with some considerable number of the users of the open public domain, who are very much interested in the open public domain, before the President, on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, appointed the Director of Grazing. So certain users of the open public domain and members of advisory boards made recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior of an experienced man who has had a wide and extended experience in the administration of the open public domain. The recommendation was not looked upon with favor, but Mr. Forsling was recommended, and eventually his nomination came to the Senate for consideration.

The Committee on Public Lands and Surveys is today filing its recommendation that Mr. Forsling's nomination be confirmed, but the members of the committee desire to say that in the future we believe it would be for the best interests of the open public domain, consisting of nearly 1,000,000,000 acres of land, if the Department of the Interior, in keeping with the democratic spirit which we believe should prevail in its administration, would consult with those who are interested in the use of the open public domain from a standpoint of producing food and fiber for the Nation.

We think that perhaps Mr. Forsling, after he has taken office and has become accustomed to its duties, will go forward with the administration of the grazing division, but we believe it would have been much preferable had someone been selected who has had experience in grazing and in the administration of the open public domain.

Mr. Forsling is undoubtedly one of the finest men in the country. He has a splendid reputation, and has had considerable experience in the past, but not in this particular line of work. So the members of the committee wish to say to the Department that if someone had been selected who was known to the hundreds of thousands who use and occupy the open public domain, someone who had had experience in this line of work, the Nation would have profited by the recommendation. On the other hand, the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys does not believe at this time that it would be well to hold up the nomination, but rather recommends confirmation of the nomination, and files its favorable report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, and without objection, the report will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Was the report made by the committee this morning?

Mr. McCARRAN. The report is now being made by me on behalf of the committee.

Mr. WHITE. Committee action was taken this morning?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; committee action was taken this morning.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator from Nevada asking for immediate consideration of the nomination?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am asking for nothing more than the opportunity to make a statement and to file the favorable report on the nomination for the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I think it should be said for the RECORD that at the committee meeting this morning the views advanced now by the able Senator from Nevada were thoroughly stated to Mr. Forsling, and in his answers to the questions propounded he expressed his own complete concurrence with the views which the Senator from Nevada has just set forth.

In addition to that, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, was also present and also expressed his concurrence with those views. Both Mr. Chapman and Mr. Forsling assured our committee they would carry out the general policy which the Senator from Nevada has explained now on the floor of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1898. A bill to amend section 99 of the Judicial Code, as amended, so as to change the term of the District Court for the District of North Dakota at Minot, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1899. A bill for the relief of Alfred Files; and

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Bertha L. Tatrault; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 1901. A bill authorizing the appointment of an officer of the Sanitary Corps as Assistant to the Surgeon General of the Army with the rank of brigadier general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. HATCH (by request) introduced Senate bill 1902, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

MINING OF COAL, PHOSPHATE, OIL, ETC., ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the third proviso of

section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," and so forth. I request that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior relating to the matter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be appropriately referred and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1902) to repeal the third proviso of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438, 30 U. S. C., sec. 201), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The letter presented by Mr. HATCH is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1944.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I enclose herewith the draft of a proposed bill to repeal the third proviso of section 2 of the act entitled "An Act to Promote the Mining of Coal, Phosphate, Oil, Oil Shale, Gas, and Sodium on the Public Domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438, 30 U. S. C., sec. 201).

The third proviso of section 2 provides that no lease of coal under the act shall be approved or issued until after notice of the proposed lease, or offering for lease, has been given for 30 days in a newspaper of general circulation in the county in which the lands or deposits are situated.

The provision requiring notice to be given by publication before any coal lease shall issue is unique in that no such requirement is made preliminary to the issuance of any other mineral lease, including coal leases in Alaska.

It has always been the custom of this Department to give what is considered to be adequate notice, usually 30 days, of the offer of lands for oil and gas lease by public auction or by sealed bids, but in some cases, for example, where the property to be leased was being depleted or taken by others through drainage, it has been found advisable to publish notice for less than 30 days in an effort to reduce the loss that was being suffered by the Government. At present there is an urgent demand for the production of coal which probably will continue for the duration of the war. Even thereafter conditions may arise that will require expeditious action sufficient to justify a shorter period of publication of notice of the offer of lands for coal lease.

The provision is unfair to permittees who acquire preference rights to leases by reason of discovery. They are required to pay a much higher rate of royalty on coal mined under their permits than they have to pay under leases and the requirement delays the issuance of leases, thereby imposing an unnecessary burden on the permittee. Besides, the fact that the permittee necessarily conducted mining operations on the land, in order to qualify as a leseee, is notice to adverse claimants of his claim to the land.

The apparent reason for the provision was to protect the interest of those who had initiated claims under sections 2, 3, and 4 of the coal act of March 3, 1873 (Rev. Stat. secs. 2348, 2349, 2350, 30 U. S. C., secs. 72, 73, 74). According to the provisions of that act, any qualified person who had opened or improved a coal mine on public land was permitted to present his claim to the Register of the proper land district within 60 days from the date of actual possession and the commencement of improvements on the land, by the filing of a declaratory statement therefor, and he was allowed 1 year from date of filing his claim to prove his right and pay for the land. After the passage of the leasing act of February 25, 1920, supra, this Department limited to 2 years following the date of the act the period in which such claims could be asserted. There is now no more reason for the requirement as to coal than there would be as to any other mineral subject to lease.

The proposed amendment, if adopted, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a lease for lands known to contain valuable deposits of coal under the same conditions as prevail with respect to other minerals subject to lease under the leasing laws, including the Alaska coal leasing act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 48 U. S. C., secs. 432–445, 446–452), as amended February 21, 1944 (Public Law 231, 78th Cong.).

It is requested that the proposed bill be submitted to the Senate for appropriate action.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ABE FORTAS,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3604) authorizing the appointment of the Chief of Chaplains to the temporary rank of major general, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT: FALMOUTH HARBOR, MASS.

Mr. WEEKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.), as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.), which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING OIL- AND GAS-PRODUCING INDIAN LANDS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 292), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with a view to determining (1) the names of the owners of all oil-well and gas-producing lands in the United States and Alaska, where such lands now are or formerly were designated as Indian lands, (2) what suits involving the ownership of any such lands or interests therein are now pending in the State and Federal courts, and (3) what measures have been adopted by agencies and representatives of the United States to ascertain its present or potential interests in such lands and what action has been taken to protect the interests of the United States in such lands. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MINN. AND N. DAK. (S. DOC. NO. 193)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on a review of reports on the Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak., with a view to flood control on the Sheyenne River.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY AT THOMAS JEFFERSON DINNER, NEW YORK, N. Y.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator BARKLEY at the Thomas Jefferson dinner, Commodore Hotel, New York City, on May 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ROBERT E. HANNEGAN AT THOMAS JEFFERSON DINNER, NEW YORK, N. Y.

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, chairman, Democratic National Committee, at the Thomas Jefferson dinner, Hotel Commodore, New York City, on May 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN BEFORE MISSOURI DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TRUMAN before the Democratic State convention at Jefferson City, Mo., on May 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

DIGEST OF LEGISLATION ENACTED BY SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a digest of the legislation enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress in its first session, beginning January 6, 1943, and ending December 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THE NEW DEAL?

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "What's the Matter With the New Deal?" which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CITIZEN AND HIS GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Citizen and His Government," delivered by Hon. George E. Stringfellow, of West Orange, N. J., before the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans, on April 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATUS OF PRETHEOLOGICAL STUDENTS IN THE DRAFT

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Essential Is the Church?" from the Christian-Evangelist for May 10, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EVIDENCE OF PROFITEERING—EDITORIAL FROM WILLIAMS COUNTY FARMER'S PRESS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Evidence of Huge Profiteering," published in the Williams County (N. Dak.) Farmer's Press of March 30, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON LEND-LEASE AID MADE BY INVESTIGATIVE STAFF OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week I was necessarily out of the city In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, on page 3999, will be found a statement by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], when presenting the report made by the investigators of the Senate Appropriations Committee with respect to lend-lease and other funds handled by the Committee on Appropriations. I have spoken to the Senator about the statement and I think he is perfectly willing that the impression given by him in it shall be corrected. In submitting the figures the Senator from Tennessee said:

> It will be recalled that last winter quite a controversy arose following a visit to Central and South America by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. Upon his return it was claimed that $6,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 had been expended in South America.

Mr. President, I think everyone knows that I never made the statement that $6,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 had been so expended. In just one or two lines of the report which I filed on January 20, last, I referred to the documents which were submitted at that time as listing the expenditures, the commitments, and the extensions of credits covering a 3-year period. The figures as submitted and reported by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee the other day, instead of disproving the statement I made at the time, simply lend approval or proof to the fact that the report I made was correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be reported by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the motion of the Senator from Nevada preclude any debate on the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does during the morning hour.

Mr. CONNALLY. So that those of us who protest and deplore the disruption of the war effort by legislation of this kind cannot express any views on it in debate; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not subject to debate during the morning hour.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada. [Putting the question.]

The "ayes" appear to have it. The "ayes" have it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. What was the ruling of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the vociferousness of the minority did not overcome their lack of numbers, so the motion is agreed to, and the bill is before the Senate, and is open to debate.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election of national officers.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or the Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote in such primary or other election. No State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision shall levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting in such primary or other election, and any such tax shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or other election.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office by requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives and any such requirement shall be invalid and void.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the cover of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I intend to indulge in but a brief explanation of this very contentious bill. This bill has been before the Congress for several years. It has been passed by the House of Representatives by a substantial vote. It has been reported to the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary by a vote of 12 to 6. A very comprehensive explanation of the bill is made in the report on it.

It would, indeed, be out of line for me at this time to take up the time of the Senate to any great extent in an explanation of the bill. There are States in the Union which have for nearly all their history required as a prerequisite to voting for Members of Congress and for the President and Vice President the payment of taxes. This country is a democracy. The right to vote is a part of the democratic privilege, guaranteed to every citizen of the United States. Under a democracy, no citizen should be denied the privilege of casting his vote for the head or heads of his government. To deny that privilege is to deny that this country is a democracy. To say to one man that because he has money he may vote, and to say to another man that because he does not have money he may not vote, is to preclude the idea of equality before the law. We would be putting our democracy on the basis of wealth, and of wealth alone. To say to an officer who is to serve his government, "You can be elected only by the votes of the wealthy or the votes of those who have money to pay a certain fee," is to say to the public officials of this country that they serve only those who have wealth, who have money to pay a fee for the right to vote. That was not the contemplation or in the contemplation of those who wrote the Constitution which is basic to this country. If we read their expressions aright, we believe it was in their contemplation that every citizen of this country should have the right to express himself at the ballot box on the question of who shall be his servants in the public place and bear the responsibility of public office.

To say that the poll tax, collected as a prerequisite for voting, is only a small sum of money, perhaps in some instances only $1, or in others only $3, and that anyone who has the right to vote should be able to pay that small sum of money, is no answer to the question because a dollar may be as much to one man as a million dollars may be to another. To say that a man shall be denied the right to cast his vote for a public officer because he does not have a dollar is to place

a premium on wealth, a premium on the one who has the dollar, and is to deny a great privilege to the man who does not have the dollar. What is more, and even worse, it is to say that a part of this Nation, a part of the population of this country, shall not have the right to express themselves in the matter of selecting their public servants, especially those who sit in this body and represent not only the sovereign States in their sovereign capacity, but also a great Nation and a great people, growing and becoming greater as the hours go by.

Mr. President, the court of last resort of this country has said that the payment of a poll tax or money is not to be a prerequisite for voting for Members of the House of Representatives or for Senators. So, it should not be a prerequisite to the selection of a President or the casting of a vote for President. To say otherwise is to deny that this is a democracy. When we deny that, we put ourselves in the position where those who are chosen to serve may recognize the fact that they represent, not all the people, but only a selected few.

As I have already stated, I shall not take up the time of the Senate on a question which has been debated at length, and probably will be debated at much greater length.

Mr. President, in the Judiciary Committee I cast my vote for this bill. I shall vote for the bill if it is brought to a vote on the floor of the Senate. With that in mind, and knowing that the bill is to be discussed quite at length, I submit the matter by way of an opening statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is presented with a remarkable spectacle. We are involved in a globe-shaking war. The Congress and the administration are supposed to be devoting their efforts—and when I say "their efforts" I mean all their efforts—toward the preparation for and prosecution of this war. In that effort nothing is more vital than unity and harmony and the morale of the 137,000,000 people who inhabit this Republic. It is proposed that the Senate halt in its efforts today in the prosecution of the war, and, instead of hunting down our enemies, the Axis, instead of running down the followers of Hitler and hunting down Japanese enemies, it is proposed that we shall go out—not we but those who propose the bill—with a political net in an effort to ensnare a handful of votes.

I believe that I speak the truth when I say that this is simply a political gesture, under the urgings of certain minority groups. I have no hesitation in naming them, if any Senator wishes me to name them. Under the lashing whips of threats that unless the Senate passes the bill, Senators who fail to vote for it will be punished at the polls, we are to be coerced into violating the most sacred traditions of this body. We are to be forced to repudiate the Constitution of the United States itself, which we are sworn when we enter this body to uphold.

When a Senator is elected to serve in this Chamber we do not ask what kind of clothes he wears. We do not ask whether he has a long-tailed coat or a short one. We do not prescribe any conditions as to what he shall eat, what he shall wear, or what he shall say. The first condition that the Senate imposes is that he shall proceed to the desk of the Vice President and take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

That oath has no qualifications. There can be no mental reservations. A Senator who takes it cannot say, "I will support and defend those parts of the Constitution which I like, and will seek, by statute, to repudiate, mutilate, and destroy those parts of the Constitution which I do not like." No, Mr. President. That obligation is all embracing. It means every line of the Constitution. It does not simply mean mouth-filling campaign pronouncements in favor of the Constitution of the United States, with the intention to rise on the floor of the Senate and through a statute attempt to repeal the most sacred and solemn provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I deplore at this time taking up the time of the Senate in resisting the dragging into this Chamber what may be called a sectional bill, a measure which, as the Senator from Nevada has said, is very controversial, a measure calculated to arouse the passions—their prejudices are already aroused—of Senators, and from this central point to spread those prejudices and passions among the people of the United States at this crucial period.

Mr. President, I know that there are those who wish to isolate some of us. I remind Senators and others who are pressing this measure that the War between the States was supposed to have ended at Appomattox, and by the legislation which was subsequently enacted by Congress with relation to those issues.

The forefathers of those of us who come from a certain section were devoted to the land where they were born and which they loved. They had the courage and the hardihood to trust to their own gallantry and to the edges of their swords the issues involved. When defeat came, like honorable men they laid down their arms, and then for many bitter years struggled with the problems which faced them. Their fortunes were scattered and gone. Their plantations were grown up in weeds, and their homes were destroyed. They took up the burden, and they and those who followed them have borne it during all these years. From time to time the tongue of slander and the threats of prejudiced minds are leveled against our people. I am told that in certain sections it is very popular, in political years, to denounce some of us who come from other sections, in order to ingratiate the author of such sentiments with a few voters in his own constituency.

Mr. President, when the Constitutional Convention met at Philadelphia in 1787, it set up a Federal Government. One of the arms of the legislative branch of that Government was the House of Representatives. The other arm of the legislative branch was the Senate. Neither body had any existence until the Convention adopted those provisions and embedded them in the Constitution of the United States. That was the governmental act which created this Union. It was created by the people, through their representatives. The action of the people's representatives was ratified by the people in the most solemn manner, in various conventions of the States, until the requisite number had ratified the Constitution.

In setting up the legislative structure, the House of Representatives and the Senate, it was necessary that the methods of creation should be set forth in the Constitution. The first article of the Constitution, the primary article, relates to the representation of the people themselves in the Congress of the United States, which the makers thought ought to be put at the very threshold of the Federal Government and placed in the very forefront of representation of the people.

What does section 1 of article I state? This was where they entered upon the program. The question was, What shall the character of the body be? Section 1 of article I states:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

In that language was the general statement that those bodies should exist. But how should they be created and exist? How should membership in them be generated? I will read from section 2. I ask that Senators, even those who are hostile to our position, even those who have pledged, perhaps, in their campaigns or otherwise that they will vote for this bill, will listen, not to my voice, but to the voice of Benjamin Franklin, to the voice of George Washington, to the voice of James Madison, and to the voice of James Wilson. I hope also that Republican Senators will listen to the voice of Alexander Hamilton, who sat in that Convention. I hope that all Senators will listen to the words of all the great and brilliant men who adorned the Convention at Philadelphia by their presence. In effect, this is what Benjamin Franklin may have said:

> Yesterday I received about 30 letters from certain organizations of the C. I. O.
>
> Wait a minute, Mr. Benjamin Franklin; you mean you have heard from an organization which has made certain demands?
>
> Yes; I received about 30 letters, so I will probably have to revise my first inclination.

But after old Ben had heard from all the demanders, from all the seekers of votes, from all the utterers of threats, and from all those who made insinuations as to what they would do to Ben if he did not vote right, the members of the Convention adopted certain language, and I will read what was the sublimated judgment of them all. I invite Senators to listen to these words which were inspired, and which have come ringing down to us through the corridors of 150 years. They have come down to us with the veneration of a great people. They have come down to us with blood and tears all over them, blood and tears which have been shed in the defense and in the maintenance of the rights which were

guaranteed. And what about these wise old men? Were they patriotic? Oh, no, they were just a bunch of ward politicians. They were meeting in the domino room back of a beer saloon. They were telling what they were going to do and how they would gather in the votes in the coming election. I read what they said, not in the domino room, but in the great old temple of justice, wisdom, and patriotism in Philadelphia. Here is what they said about the House of Representatives.

The House of Representatives shall—

"Shall"; they did not say "may." They did not say "if the Congress wants to." They did not say as a little group under compulsion, under the goad of losing a little handful of votes, "Oh, Mr. President, for God's sake do not let us lose any votes." They said:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of—

I should be very glad if the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] would pay heed. He is the author of this bill. He embodies it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I am not the author of the bill. It is a House bill. However, I am a supporter of the bill, and I am listening to the words of my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. Of all of what the Senator said, the last line is the most satisfactory to the Senator from Texas. The Senator from New York has disclaimed that he is the author of the bill. I did not mean to charge him with being the author of the bill, but he is the mover of it on the floor.

Mr. MEAD. I merely meant to correct the Senator, because I was sure that the Senator would wish to be corrected if he was stating an inaccuracy.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. However, who was the author of the bill in the other House?

Mr. MEAD. There were several, perhaps.

Mr. CONNALLY. MARCANTONIO was one.

Mr. MEAD. And there were several others.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have always had very cordial relations with the Senator from New York. I served with him in the other House for a number of years, and I have also served with him in the Senate for some time. All of that but deepens my grief and multiplies my agony because of his error and contumacy against what is right.

Now, Mr. President, what about the House of Representatives? MARCANTONIO! The rules of the Senate as to comity between the two bodies of the Congress prohibit me from discussing any individual Members of the House. However, I cannot forget the part a similar name played in Roman history.

I continue to read from section 2 of article I of the Constitution:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States—

That does not mean New York, for example, by itself. It means the several States. It means all the States. The people of all the States have a right to choose Members of the Congress.

I continue reading:

and the electors in each State—

It says, "electors in each State"—meaning every State.

shall—

Another "shall." It does not say "may"; it does not state "may be." It does not state what the caucus of some political organization may dictate. It states:

shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The language is, "of the State legislature" and "shall have." It is an absolute constitutional requirement, under the Federal Constitution, that every man who desires to vote for a Representative in Congress must possess the qualifications prescribed by the State in which he lives for those who vote for members of the most numerous branch of his legislature. That is an absolute compulsion of the Constitution. Yet, Mr. President, the pending bill proposes only, insofar as it affects voting for the President, Vice President, Representatives, and Senators, that the payment of the poll tax shall not be held to be a qualification. In other words, under this bill, if it should be enacted, we would have the situation of one voting requirement for Senators and Representatives, and another voting requirement for the members of the State legislatures. But can that be done under the Constitution? The Constitution says that the qualifications shall be the same.

I do not disagree, of course, that, as the Constitution created Congress, it could have provided qualifications for Members of Congress different from the qualifications provided by the States. The framers of the Constitution, if they had so desired, could have set out in the Constitution itself the qualifications for voters for Representatives in Congress and for Senators. Certainly they could; and that is a very important point, because that exact point was brought forward in the Convention and the Convention voted against it. It voted down the proposal that the Constitution, the Federal Government itself, should fix the qualifications and, instead, set up the rule that the qualifications should be the same as those for electors of members of the State legislature.

Why do I make that statement? If Senators will consult Elliott's debates on the Constitution in the Constitutional Convention they will find—as I recall it is in volume 5—that Mr. Gouverneur Morris, of New York, made the identical proposition in the Convention that the Federal Government should fix the qualifications of electors for Members of Congress. What happened? After debate pro and con Mr. Gouverneur Morris' view was voted down, and the language quoted was adopted.

If this were a matter that had not been discussed, if it had simply been glossed over an ingenious mind might claim that some other clause of the Constitution applied or that this question was not definitely settled by this particular provision; but it must be remembered that the attention of the Convention was directed to this exact point. They were not talking about caucuses in the back yard somewhere; they were not talking about a National Democratic executive committee or a Republican quarrel between Dewey and Willkie, or the fourth term, or anything of that sort; they were talking about a fundamental law for the life of the new Republic they were setting up. The whole question was carefully considered by the Convention and decided by the Convention. James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, was a delegate. Where are the Senators from Pennsylvania? I want them to hear the voice of James Wilson, a great lawyer, a great constitutionalist, one of the outstanding men of the revolutionary history of the United States, wise old James Wilson, of Pennsylvania. James Wilson called to the attention of the Convention the impossibility of having one set of qualifications for the electors of State officers and another set for the electors of Federal officers.

I wish I could make ring through the forests and the coal mines and over the rails of the Pennsylvania System throughout the State of Pennsylvania the voice of James Wilson, the voice of the man whose dust sleeps quietly under the sod, but whose example and whose patriotism and whose wisdom will live till long after the rails of the Pennsylvania System shall have deteriorated into rust and dust, and gone into the limbo of things that were.

I shall quote what James Wilson said. He did not say this on the stump. He was not in ward 3 haranguing the crowd and saying "Come on boys and let us do this"; he was not speaking in a small meeting somewhere to see how many members of the club would take the oath to go down the line for what the boss told them to do, but he said this in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. Says Mr. Wilson:

It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same persons at the same time to vote for representatives in the State legislature and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature.

In other words, he knew that the wise thing to do was to make a single qualification for Representatives in the Congress and representatives in the State legislature; and that is what the Convention did. They heard James Wilson and they heeded James Wilson, even though some persons from Pennsylvania now neither hear him nor heed him.

This statement of Mr. Wilson was made while the motion of Gouverneur Morris, of New York, was pending. Mr. Morris was a distinguished, able, and capable man, but he had a tendency toward the reactionary or conservative view of things. In these days he would not be classed as what is called a liberal. Of course this is a liberal measure—very liberal with the Constitution. Just give a piece of it away every time 4 voters come and ask that it be done,

when 15 or 20 persons who can vote and are willing to vote can get together and induce somebody to offer a bill or a constitutional amendment. Of course, the sponsors may forget it as soon as they offer it, but they will respond and say, "Oh, yes; we are for you; we are liberal." Yes; they are liberal with everybody's money, liberal with everybody's time, liberal with the Constitution, and liberal with everything except what affects them.

This statement was made by Mr. Wilson while the Convention was considering the contention of Gouverneur Morris, of New York, that the States should not be permitted to fix the qualifications of voters, but that such qualifications should be fixed by the Constitution. That was the issue. It was clear-cut; it was debated: it centered on that identical point at the very threshold of the Constitution. Gouverneur Morris made the matter very clear, as he was capable of doing.

He argued against the adoption of article I, section 2, which is the section and article we are talking about, which gives the States the right to fix the qualifications. This is how Madison reported the argument of Gouverneur Morris:

> Another objection against the clause as it stands is that it makes the qualifications of the National Legislature dependent upon the will of the States, which he thought not proper.

That was Gouverneur Morris opposing this provision in the Constitution. He knew what it meant. He knew what centered in that one clause and nowhere else in the Constitution was a standard by which qualifications of electors for Members of the Congress were determined. I know there are Senators who say, "Oh, no; that is not the place. Go to another clause of the Constitution where there is a general provision that must govern." How can a general, nebulous sort of a clause govern an explicit, plain, unequivocal, direct statement on that particular point and no other point? When we are considering a particular point, an individual matter, the provisions relating to it govern, and not a general, flamboyant, campaign-speaking sort of a clause.

There was the whole issue in the Convention. Gouverneur Morris was arguing against section 2 of article I, and his argument was that it should be changed because it made the qualifications of members of the National Legislature dependent upon the will of the States. The Constitutional Convention heard Gouverneur Morris' argument, but rejected it. Poor old Gouverneur! He understood what he was trying to do, but some of the Senators here now know so much more clearly than Gouverneur Morris what he did not try to do.

It would be a joy to witness that Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, if we could introduce into it some of the Senators who advance some of these wild-eyed, flamboyant, fantastic, mucilaginous propositions. I should like to see them sitting by the side of Benjamin Franklin, or James Madison, or Alexander Hamilton. Would it not be interesting to see one of them put his arm around Benjamin Franklin and say, "Ben, we are going to have a ward meeting out here tonight, and we would be glad if you would come." Do you know what old Ben would say to them? I know, but I cannot say it, under the Rules of the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, let us see what the Constitution makers had in mind. It is a familiar rule of construction that language contained in a legal or legislative document of any kind is to be given the meaning and the understanding and the definition that would be applied to the language at the time of the adoption of the particular document or the particular piece of legislation. So the Constitution of the United States speaks as of the date and the time of its adoption.

What was the condition of the 13 States as to voting? Where was the power, under the organization of the States, to select representatives in the State legislatures, and State officers? It was somewhere; it was not just a nebulous cloud floating around. It had a lodgment somewhere, and that lodgment was in each individual State.

Prior to the adoption of the Constitution, and even prior to the Articles of Confederation, each State of the original galaxy of States had the unqualified, the unlimited, the unweakened power and authority to lay down the standards as to how its public servants should be chosen, both in the administrative end of the Government and in the legislature. No one could question that. I assume no Senator will now question that right and that power. Every State has the unlimited and unquestioned power to decide the qualifications or the conditions or the restrictions or the limitations upon those who should vote in that State for public officers.

Let us see what happened. Was that changed by the Constitution of the United States? No. I turn to amendment No. 10 of the Constitution. Senators should read that amendment at stated periods. I know many take pills at certain periods, many take vitamins every morning or afternoon, they put a plaster on their back when they get rheumatism at certain times, and that is fine; it is good for their physical system; but for their mental system, for their intellectual system, for their ethical system, for the condition of their character it is good to take a few lessons and to look back over the years now and then.

Amendment No. 10 was adopted in the first Congress after the convention. It will be remembered that Virginia reluctantly adhered to the Constitution. The votes necessary for ratification were secured only by the tacit agreement that an effort would be made in the first session of the Congress to secure the adoption of what subsequently became known as the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments. Through that agreement the votes were secured and Virginia voted for ratification. So the tenth amendment is practically contemporaneous with the Constitution; it is practically a part of the original instrument. I quote:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

So those rights which the States possessed prior to the adoption of the Constitution still inhere in them unless the Constitution of the United States somewhere has prohibited or modified those powers. I challenge any Senator to show that section 2 of article I of the Constitution has ever been modified, or until the pending bill was presented, when any effort was ever made to modify it by statute or otherwise. So the power the States had originally still inheres in them.

Now let us see what the Convention knew at the time of the adoption of the Constitution about the practices in the various States. I call to the minds of Senators the fact that when the Convention adopted this provision it knew that already, at that time, many of the States had requirements for voting which demanded the payment of property taxes before citizens could vote. Other States required the possession of land in the form of freeholds. Others required that if one did not have any land he must have an estate of so many pounds. Those were requirements, antecedent to the right to vote, and when the Constitution was adopted and the language I have quoted was incorporated in it, the makers of the Constitution knew what it meant. They lived in the respective States, they came from all the States they represented, they were not ignorant men; they knew what were the requirements in their respective States with reference to voting. Many of them had helped to make the structure of those States. So when they sat in the Constitutional Convention and wrote this document, and put that language into it, they were conscious, they had not negative knowledge, but positive knowledge, that many of the States had already on their statute books and in their constitutions requirements as to the ownership of property, the payment of taxes, or the holding of real estate. They already knew that those things were in the Constitution and statutes of the States. So when they adopted section 2 of article I, they meant identically what they knew, that in Virginia or in Pennsylvania, if a man presented himself as a voter for a Member of Congress, he was required to have the same qualifications that obtained in his State. If a State's requirement was that he must own land, then he could not vote for a Representative in the Congress of the United States unless he owned land. If the requirement of the State was that he should have 50 pounds in money before he could vote for a member of the legislature, then he had to have 50 pounds of an estate in order to vote for a Member of Congress. If the requirement of the State was that he must pay a property tax in some required amount before he could vote for a member of the legislature of the State, under this constitutional provision he had to observe the same requisite and the same qualification that obtained in the case of the State.

I regret that some Senators are not present. I want to remind some of

them furthermore of the things that transpired at that particular time. I want to point out some of the States that had voting requirements at the time the Constitutional Convention adopted this provision.

New Hampshire, good old New Hampshire, had a poll-tax requirement at the time the Federal Constitution was adopted. I think New Hampshire adopted its State constitution in 1784. The members of the Constitutional Convention, when they wrote this language, had before them, of course, the various constitutions of the several States, as I have heretofore suggested. They knew, they had in their consciousness the fact that New Hampshire as early as 1784 had in its constitution a requirement for the payment of a poll tax, so that when the Federal Constitution, written in 1787, had inserted in it the language of section 2 of article I, its framers knew that at that very moment New Hampshire had a poll-tax requirement which authorized the election officers of that State to insist that every man who voted for Representative in Congress must possess the qualification of having paid his poll tax.

Massachusetts is a great old Commonwealth. It has performed nobly in the history of the Republic. It had a gallant career in the days of the Colonies and a brilliant record in the War of the Revolution. I do not decry public characters or States because they believe contrary to what I believe. I hope the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will not leave the Chamber. I want him to be advised that in 1780 Massachusetts in its constitution required that before a citizen could vote he had to possess a freehold, he had to own land.

The Constitution of the State of Massachusetts was adopted in 1780. I assume it was still the Constitution of Massachusetts when the Constitutional Convention adopted section 2 of article I, which said, in effect, that the provision contained in the Massachusetts Constitution, whether we like it or do not, shall be respected, because the framers wanted to leave to the people of the States the matter of determining the qualifications of voters for Representatives in Congress. Massachusetts is not to be reflected upon because of that provision in its constitution. The people of Massachusetts were simply exercising their constitutional and their sovereign right to have the kind of government which they desired, and to provide for voters the requirements which they sanctioned. They were not asking Congress to tell them what to do. Massachusetts is a wise old State. Massachusetts is an intellectual State. Massachusetts is a literary State. Its people did not wait to be told by some politician in Washington, egged on by the necessity of gathering in each straggling voter, how they should write their constitution, how they should set up standards for those who vote. The Constitutional Convention in 1787 knew what had been happening in Massachusetts.

I come now to New York. I am glad the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is present. I want him to listen to what I am about to say. I have no hope that MARCANTONIO will hear it or that MARCANTONIO will pay any attention to it if he does hear it, but I know that the Senator from New York is an earnest, sincere, and able representative of his people, and I feel sure that he wants to know the truth. I have so felt all the years I have served with him in the House and in the Senate. It may be that the Senator has not reflected on these facts.

The State of New York in 1777, during the fires of the Revolution, while Washington's armies and the British armies were struggling in that cataclysmic conflict, had time to place a requirement in its constitution, that a voter had to have a freehold, he had to own land as a qualification for voting. Who determined that? The people of New York determined it under their own authority and under their own constitution. They did not come to Washington and ask the Congress to prescribe their standards. I regret to see the Senator from New York now coming to Washington and asking that Congress legislate for his State of New York and for some of the other States. Of course, his main objective is not New York. Of course, the votes are in New York, but the victims are in some other place. The votes are in New York, but the victims are beyond its jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I want it to go down in this solemn record that New York in 1777 required as a condition for a man to vote that he be either a freeholder or a taxpayer of New York or Albany. If he did not have any land, and lived in the city, he had to be a taxpayer, yes, a property taxpayer; not the payer of a trifling dollar and a quarter or one dollar in the form of a poll tax, but he must pay tax on property. That was the provision in the New York Constitution, and that was New York's business. New York had a perfect right to abolish that provision whenever it got in the frame of mind which justified it in so doing. The other States of the Union have the same right as New York. They have the same right to abolish the poll-tax provision or change it or modify it when they feel justified in so doing. New York did not ask Washington to wipe the provision off the books of New York. The people of New York did it themselves. Other States in the Union, if not punished, if not coerced, if not browbeaten, if not discriminated against, if not isolated, if the proposal is not brought out every 4 years or every 2 years, just before the election, and chased around the Senate Chamber in order to make a holiday for candidates in other States, will in the course of time abolish the poll-tax requirement. Personally, I have no attachment to the poll tax, as such. When it was submitted originally in my State, I voted against the levying of a poll tax.

That is not the question before the Senate, Mr. President. The question is, Where is the authority to determine qualifications under the Constitution? That is what we are fighting for. We are fighting to maintain the integrity of the States under the Constitution. We are fighting to maintain the right and the freedom of the several commonwealths in the future to do just what many of the other States have done in the past. If it was right for them to do it in the past according to their own motions and according to their own standards, why is it not right for us in the years to come to consult our own will and our own pleasure, without the stimulating influence of gentlemen who want to reform us and improve us and modify us and adjust us to their way of thinking?

The Spanish inquisition was a system under which certain of the Spanish authorities wished to modernize all those who did not agree with them. They wanted to instill high and mighty purposes in the minds of all those who did not agree with them. So they put the victims on the rack, and tightened it up, and pulled their ears, and twisted their noses, and punished their toes.

Mr. President, that is the kind of political inquisition under which we are put. Because some State in the Union, such as my own State of Texas, does not conduct its affairs as the State of New York thinks it should conduct them, these crusaders, these Sir Galahads, mount their steeds and come down into Texas to modify us, and to Christianize us, and to liberalize us, and to modernize us, and to intelligence-ize us. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, we do not think it is right. We do not think it is just. We do not think it is in accordance with the proper concept of the Constitution and the traditional political equality of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator from Texas did not desire to leave the impression that this bill affects only the eight States in which payment of a poll tax is now required as a prerequisite to exercising the right of suffrage. Of course, if the United States has the right to say that a State cannot levy a poll tax, the United States has the right to prescribe any rule or regulation affecting the election of Federal officials. Whereas today the victim on the rack might be Texas, tomorrow it might be any other State. We would have a Federal clerk presiding over the enforcement of a Federal law, to be enforced, if necessary, at the point of a Federal bayonet. Such a system could eventually eliminate the States as subdivisions of government, and could vest in the centralized Government in Washington not only the power to prescribe the rights and qualifications of a voter but the power to count those votes. When that day comes, democracy will, indeed, be dead in this country.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia. Of course he is correct. If the Congress has the power by statute to prescribe a qualification with respect to whether a voter shall pay a poll tax or shall not pay one, although the payment of a poll tax is required by State law, the Congress then has the power to prescribe any other qualification. If the Congress desired to do so, it could prescribe as a qualification that no one under 25 years of age

should vote, notwithstanding the generally recognized rule that voters shall be 21 years of age. The Congress could require that no State should impose a literacy test as to voting. If the Congress should see fit to do so, it could abolish the registration systems in the States, or could provide that the States should have certain kinds of registration certificates.

I wish to say to Senators on the other side of the aisle, as has been suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that if the Congress can prescribe the qualifications of voters in the several States, and if there is a great centralized government in Washington possessing the military authority and the power to enforce throughout the States the qualifications the Congress may set, it is conceivable that sooner or later there might be a government absolutely dictating at the point of the sword to the governments in the States and the centralized Government itself in Washington.

Let me tell Senators that, to my mind, the Senate of the United States, the forum in which I am now speaking, so long as we keep it clean, so long as we keep it in the good graces and in the honest esteem and in the high respect of the people of the United States, is the stronghold and the citadel of the liberties and the freedom of the people of the United States. But whenever the people of the United States come to believe that the Senate is merely a political club, a social gathering, whenever they come to believe that the Senate of the United States is indifferent to the maintenance of the Constitution—and when I say "maintenance of the Constitution," I mean not alone maintenance of its forms, but maintenance of its spirit and maintenance of its great power, inherent in our conception of the Constitution in the Government—whenever the people fail to hold us in that high esteem, the function of the Senate will decline, and the great service it can render to the people of the United States will shrivel into insignificant proportions. I thank the eminent junior Senator from Georgia for recalling and directing my attention specifically to that particular aspect of the matter.

I plead today with Senators to respect the Constitution. If there is any doubt about a constitutional clause, let us give that old instrument the benefit of it. We have our criminal courts. In every criminal court in the land the doctrine is that one who is charged with violation of high and solemn statutes—a criminal, or perhaps a culprit—must be given the benefit of the doubt. Why cannot the old Constitution be given the benefit of the doubt? For 150 years it has never been questioned that article I, section 2, of the Constitution means what it says, and means what we construe it to say. All through the reconstruction debates, Mr. President, when passion ran high, when the waves of passion enveloped the Senate, when the fire of prejudice flowed through the Chambers of this Capitol, and embraced the House of Representatives, when passionate political considerations dominated these two Chambers, never once in any of the debates over any of those measures was it pretended that Congress had the power to fix the qualifications, except that on one occasion Charles Sumner suggested that the States could not refuse to allow colored people to vote, but he said that otherwise the States had the power to prescribe the qualifications for voting. But Mr. Sumner's was the lone voice. A little later, I shall refer briefly to some of those debates, and shall show what Members of the Congress said and what they thought.

Mr. President, these were not the only States which had requirements as to voting when the convention was in session. What about the good old State of New Jersey, whose soil, and the snows upon that soil, were stained by the blood of Washington's soldiers as they trod across it in the bitter rigors of winter on their way to Valley Forge? What did New Jersey do about it? New Jersey was a free and sovereign State before the Constitution was adopted. It had an existence. It had a life. It had a conscience, and an intelligence. In 1776 New Jersey adopted a requirement that a man, in order to vote, should possess an estate of £50. That was not Congress speaking. That was the people of New Jersey. That was the law of New Jersey at the time the Constitution was adopted.

The makers of the Constitution had in mind that New Jersey had that sort of a law, and they placed in the Constitution section 2 of article I, which provided that in the future, as in the past, New Jersey should determine the qualifications of the electors in that State.

I have already referred to Pennsylvania. In 1776 Pennsylvania had a requirement that before a man could vote for a member of the legislature he must have paid a tax. He must have been a taxpayer. I assume that means a property taxpayer. James Wilson, who spoke for Pennsylvania in the Constitutional Convention, knew what his State had done. He knew what was on the statute books, so he pointed out in the debate that there must be a single standard of qualification, and that the qualification should be that prescribed by the State for the most numerous branch of the legislature.

The good old State of Maryland, rich in tradition, and near the very gates of the Capital, required that a voter for a member of the State legislature should be a freeholder of 50 acres of land or the possessor of £50. That was the Maryland requirement at the time the Convention was considering this provision. Maryland provided that no one could vote in Maryland for a member of the legislature unless he owned at least 50 acres of land or had £50 in money. That fact was known to the makers of the Constitution. They had it in mind when they adopted section 2 of article I.

Mr. President, how can we avoid these historical incidents? How can we now, for the sake of expediency, violate a great fundamental canon of the Constitution simply for the temporary purpose of gathering a few votes? I remind Senators—if there be such—who are interested in garnering a few votes that their reward will be temporary. The same groups will come to them again and again, if they accede to their demands in this instance, and when this incident shall have passed into history they will be back knocking at the doors of Senators and saying, "Here is another measure, Senator, that we demand that you procure for us," or "Here is another measure, Senator, that we demand that you defeat for us."

Let me say to Senators that they had better enjoy this thing while they can. It is simply a forerunner. When Senators once hold out their arms to be shackled by special groups, or put their necks into the yoke of servitude, when they allow themselves to be embraced by these fair-speaking special groups of voters, they are surrendering their freedom as Senators. They are surrendering the freedom of their States. They are surrendering their own proper functions and duties as servants, not of a group, but of all the people—not servants of their States alone, but of every man and woman in the United States. Mr. President, I am proud of my own Commonwealth, but I believe that Members of this body should represent not only their own States but, in a more lofty sense, the people of the entire United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKHEAD in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I apprehended that the Senator did not intend to continue with his historical discussion of the conditions with respect to voting in the several States at the time the Constitution was ratified. I should like to point out that in my own State of Georgia, in the days when it was a Crown colony, a poll tax of 2 shillings and 6 pence was required of any voter before he could vote for a representative in the Colonial Assembly. The poll tax has been in existence in my State from colonial days. It was in the first Constitution, in 1777. We were accepted into the Union when the Constitution was ratified without any question being raised as to the poll tax.

Mr. CONNALLY. Some of the Senators who are pushing this bill were not present at that time, however.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. But some able men were there who knew what the Constitution meant.

I was about to point out some further history of the movement. In the trying reconstruction days, when we had our reconstruction legislature, composed, to the extent of 85 or 90 percent, of those who had recently been liberated from slavery, the poll tax was placed in the State constitution of 1867, and has continued to this day in our State constitution. I do not favor the poll tax as a method of raising revenue. I think it is outmoded, but it should be abolished by the States. It cannot be reached in this unconstitutional manner.

The Senator was speaking of where this movement had originated. I have made a little study of the history of the movement to abolish the poll tax. So far as

I am able to determine, the first time it was ever seriously contended by any living human being that a State poll tax could be abolished by a simple statute enacted by Congress was in the platform of the Communist Party in either 1924 or 1928. So far as I am advised, no person had ever seriously contended that a poll tax could be abolished by statute until the Communist Party espoused that principle in its platform in either 1924 or 1928; I am not sure which year.

I was impressed by reading a newspaper article to the effect that the distinguished Senator from New York had stated that whether or not the effort to cram this bill down our throats was successful, he thought it would help in placing such a plank in the platforms of the national political parties this year. If such a plank is adopted, it will mean that that much of the original platform of the Communist Party has been adopted by the party which might include it as a plank this year.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. I was about to refer to the record of Georgia. I had not reached that point in the list. At the time of the Constitutional Convention Georgia had a law prescribing the qualifications of voters. Before I come to Georgia, let me say that the makers of the Constitution had before them the case of North Carolina. By the act of 1776 it was provided that a voter should be a freeholder or a taxpayer. The Constitution makers knew, when they wrote section 2 of article I, that that was the requirement in North Carolina; and they meant by section 2 of article I that North Carolina would continue to have that power and authority. South Carolina and Georgia had similar requirements for voting in their State constitutions. I am glad that the Senator from Georgia pointed out that in the case of Georgia there was a poll tax coming down from the days of the Crown colony.

Any Senator who wishes to verify these statements as to poll taxes and other taxes in various States can obtain a copy of the report on the bill containing the minority views. On the last pages of the report he will find a tabulation showing the various States and the requirements which they imposed.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake to follow through with all the various States that have had these requirements. It seems to me that I have supplied a sufficient number to convince any Senator that the makers of the Constitution were not ignorant of these provisions, but that they were cognizant of them, and that, in the writing of what they knew about the qualificational requirements in the various States, they deliberately adopted the language set forth in section 2 of article I of the Constitution.

Mr. President, what does this bill undertake to do? I wish to read various portions of it. The bill is a proposed statute. It is not a constitution. The bill has never been adopted by the people of the United States in conventions called for the purpose of amending the Constitution. The people of the country can originate amendments to the Constitution. They do not have to wait until Congress submits a constitutional amendment. The Constitution provides methods by which the people themselves may initiate amendments to the Constitution. H. R. 7 is a bill. It ought to be entitled "A bill to repeal section 2 of article I of the Constitution." That would be speaking the truth. That would be frank. That would be candor. That would be courage. That would be plain common sense. That would be telling the truth. But now, what does it do? It does not do that. It tries to climb upon your back porch while you are sitting out on the front porch watching the cars go by.

I invite Senators to listen to the following language of this proposed act:

> That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or the Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

Mr. President, this is a palpable attempt by statute to say what certain provisions of the Constitution mean. If this Congress or any other Congress can, by legislative edict, say what a clause in the Constitution means or does not mean, then it can take over the Constitution entirely, and at any time we can say that the tenth amendment does not mean what it says, but we can say by statute it means something else. If we can construe the Constitution by an act of Congress, and determine that it means something contrary to its plain implication, then we can wipe out the Constitution by attacking one clause today, by attacking another clause tomorrow, or by striking down some other provision next week or next month, and thereby absolutely strike down the Constitution and the things it guarantees.

Congress is not a court for the purpose of construing the meaning of the language of the Constitution. In the process of adopting legislation we, of course, have to determine in our own minds what we think is our power. We ought never to transcend the power which we think we possess, because, after all, the final authority for determining what the Constitution means is the judicial branch of the Government. If the judicial branch of the Government decides that the language means something which we do not want it to mean, then it is our duty to have the Constitution amended, not by statute, but by a constitutional amendment, so that it will mean what we want it to mean. We cannot do that by a statute. If we could, we could turn to another part of the Constitution which says, "when vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies," and contend that the language shall not be construed to mean issuing writs of election until 2 years thereafter.

It is true that that is an extreme case of exaggeration, but it is necessary to give an extreme example of exaggeration in order to convey the point to reluctant minds which shy at each passing shadow as a horse shies at a dog under a bridge. No, Mr. President, we cannot change the Constitution by statute.

What does the bill provide? It provides that the prerequisite of a poll tax for voting or registering to vote shall not be held to be a qualification, when everyone knows that it is a qualification. It was a qualification in the 13 States before the Constitution was adopted. It was held to be a qualification by the men who wrote the Constitution. Yet, someone now comes along and says that those old men and young men in the Convention did not know what they were talking about, that the qualification does not now exist at all; and that those men merely thought it was a qualification.

The men who organized the 13 States had those provisions as to qualifications in their State constitutions, but by this bill we would in effect say, "We are sorry for those old fellows; they are outmoded; they are not modern; they are not liberal. They did not know what qualifications were. It has been 150 years since they lived, and they could not have known what qualifications were." So we moderns, we liberals, come along and say that a qualification is not a qualification, that a horse is not a horse but is a zebra.

We are all familiar with the picture which has the inscription underneath, "This is a horse," or "This is a cow." The name underneath the picture does not determine whether it is a horse or not a horse, a cow or not a cow. If it is a horse we know the characteristics of a horse. If it is a cow we know its characteristics. We know whether it is a horse or a cow not by what is written under the picture, but by the picture of the animal itself. In this case the Constitution of the United States sets forth where the power resides. We cannot take it away by a little statutory enactment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Texas is making a powerful argument on the constitutional question which is here involved. I know the Constitution of the United States is no longer very popular in some quarters, but I think Senators should hear this debate. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it shall not be invoked against me in making another speech, I will give consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that it be not counted against the Senator's speech.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, I also think the Senator from

Texas is making a very fine constitutional argument; but I believe that the rules of the Senate should prevail, notwithstanding the fact that the Senator from Texas is making the speech, or that any other Senator may be making it. If the rules should intervene——

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not yield any further, Mr. President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is the first time, to my knowledge, that the question has been raised here in more than a year. Of course, if the Senator from Utah wishes to be captious about it, I will withdraw my request.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly a Senator should not be called captious when he merely asks that the rules of the Senate prevail regardless of who is making a speech.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate has certain rules that are never invoked except on certain occasions, and this seems to be one of those bills on which the rule is invoked. The point of no quorum is made here time after time, and, except when some sectional measure of this kind is before the Senate, the question raised by the Senator from Utah is not raised at all.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not having been a Member of the Senate so long as my distinguished friend from Georgia, I do not know when the Senate rules are invoked and when they are not; but my idea of rules is that they should prevail at all times. What is the use of having rules if they are invoked at times and at other times thrown out the window? All I ask is that we proceed under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. The absence of a quorum has been suggested in the Senate time after time since the Senator from Utah has been a Member of this body during the course of discussion by Senators, and no question of the rule has been raised about the Senator speaking losing the floor.

Mr. MURDOCK. I withdraw my objection, Mr. President, if that is the way the Senate is to carry on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will announce that the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived and there being no unfinished business, the consideration of the pending bill, under the precedents of the Senate, will continue.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under the situation I will not ask that the roll be called.

Mr. MURDOCK. I withdraw my objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Connally
Austin	Buck	Cordon
Bailey	Bushfield	Danaher
Ball	Butler	Davis
Bankhead	Byrd	Downey
Barkley	Capper	Eastland
Bilbo	Caraway	Ellender
Brewster	Chavez	Ferguson
Bridges	Clark, Mo.	George
Gerry	Maloney	Smith
Gillette	Maybank	Stewart
Gurney	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Hatch	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Hawkes	Murdock	Tunnell
Hayden	Murray	Tydings
Hill	Nye	Vandenberg
Jackson	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Walsh, Mass.
La Follette	Radcliffe	Walsh, N. J.
Langer	Reed	Weeks
McCarran	Reynolds	Wheeler
McClellan	Robertson	Wherry
McFarland	Russell	White
McKellar	Shipstead	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope no other Senator will suggest the absence of a quorum. I have no disposition whatever to consume any time in useless motions and quorum calls. I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], however, was trying to give the Senator from Texas a few minutes of rest, and that his suggestion of the absence of a quorum was not made with any purpose of causing delay or obstruction. The Senator from Texas has had no lunch, no nourishment.

Mr. President, I think I have already adequately pointed out the provisions in the various State constitutions with regard to qualifications for voting which existed prior to the Convention of 1787, and, furthermore, what was in the minds of the makers of the Constitution of 1787, when they adopted section 2 of article I of the Constitution. But Mr. President, there are advocates of the pending measure who base their support of it upon section 4 of article I, which refers to an altogether different matter. Some Senators in their anxiety to twist and expand the terms of the Constitution so that it may fit their minds and their wishes, insist, not with the fire of conviction, but with a timorous argument, the product of exigency, the product of timeservingness, that section 4 of article I of the Constitution authorizes the enactment of the pending bill. It is as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof—

There is nothing so far that authorizes anything.

> But the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Mr. President, such an absolutely ridiculous contention has but to be referred to in order to dispel it and erase it, for the simple reason that section 4 is a part of article I. Section 2, which precedes section 4, definitely vests the power to determine the qualifications of electors for Members of the House of Representatives in the several legislatures. Do Senators think that the members of the Constitutional Convention would have voted specifically to adopt that provision, after full and genuine debate, and then two sections thereafter have completely nullified their action and destroyed it by inserting section 4? Some Senators claim to believe that because section 4 states that the Congress may at any time by law make or alter regulations with respect to times, places, and manner—and that is all—it gives the Congress authority to fix qualifications, whereas the Constitutional Convention, when dealing with that question and that question alone when it was dealing with the great specific personal question of qualifications, in section 2, set forth clearly what it had in mind, after the most full and complete debate in the Constitutional Convention itself. I say, Senators, that these generalizations about the times, places, and manner of holding elections have nothing on earth to do with the qualification of electors.

Oh, but some Senator may say, "Well, that is simply the Senator from Texas talking." But I have a better authority than the Senator from Texas. I have an authority as good as the Senator from New York [Mr MEAD], and that is making a considerable statement. I have the authority of Joseph Story, author of the Commentaries upon the Constitution of the United States. Mr. Justice Story, who sat upon the Supreme Court of the United States, before he ascended to that high station had enjoyed great distinction in the State from which he came, for legal learning. What does Mr. Justice Story say? I have the volume before me in which his statement appears. It is true it is an old book. It is a little dusty. It is true it is not modern. It was not printed yesterday. It does not have all over it the smearing of so-called modern life. Some people would not call it liberal enough. But, after all, while it is old, while it is musty, it comes down to us covered all over with the great character, the great mind of Mr. Justice Story. Here is what Mr. Justice Story said in speaking of this clause of the Constitution:

> There is no pretense to say that the power of the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share in the representation in Congress, nor can it be said with correctness—

But, Mr. President, it can be said with error; it can be said by disregarding and misleading. But Mr. Justice Story said:

> nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can in any way alter the rights or qualifications of voters.

Mr. President, I beg Senators to heed the words of Mr. Justice Story, rather than the petitions and demands which they receive through the mails from some of the little groups that pluck your coat and pull you aside, to whisper in your ear about what they will do for you or what they will do against you in the coming primaries or the general election unless you "bend the pregnant hinges of the knee" to their pretensions and to their claims. I choose the words of Mr. Justice Story rather than the flannel-mouthed pretensions of some of the groups that will desert you tomorrow whenever you desert the fealty you take to their cause. They will desert you on the next demand they make, unless you comply with it. When you enlist in their army, you do not enlist for 1 or 2 years. You enlist for the duration, and they will fix the duration. Whenever you bend the knee to these demanding groups;

whenever you surrender your own freedom of mind and of action, you are surrendering it for all the years to come, because they will turn upon you with the dagger whenever you cease to do their bidding or whenever you cease to be obeisant to their commands.

Mr. President, I have read what Mr. Justice Story said. I commend his words to all Members of the Senate. I shall not weary Senators by reading long and abstruse quotations from the lawbooks. There is plenty of law in the lawbooks, but what good does the law in the lawbooks do if a Senator does not observe it? It is written in the Constitution, on paper, but unless it is written upon the consciences of Senators, unless it is chiseled upon the granite of their characters, the Constitution does not amount to much. We may write things upon a piece of parchment; we may have golden seals and great pinwheels of ribbons and sealing wax engraved in flaming letters of light, but, Mr. President, unless the things there written are fortified in the hearts, in the consciences, and in the intelligence of Senators, they are of no avail.

Mr. President, I think this opinion of Mr. Justice Story and the observance of that principle by the Congress of the United States for 150 years, during which it was never attempted to invoke any such authority under article I, section 4, of the Constitution, should settle forever the pretense that there is any basis whatever in section 4 for the action which is proposed.

But, Mr. President, there are those who advocate this bill who say that the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution affords a basis upon which this political structure can be erected, that it forms a foundation upon which this attractive little establishment may be based, flying the colors of a group, of a faction, of a handful of voters, against the welfare of all the people of the United States. When the fourteenth amendment was before the Congress it was drafted in its final form by a joint committee of the two Houses consisting of 15 members. Let me say, Mr. President, at the expense, perhaps, of reiteration, that at no time in all that bitter period of reconstruction legislation, in all that nightmare of horrors for the people of my section of the Republic—people whose forefathers had shed their blood in the War of the Revolution, in the War of 1812, who had marched across the parched deserts of Mexico and planted their flag upon Chapultepec—at no time during the Reconstruction era, when men from that section, who had shed their own blood and spent their own wealth in support of their convictions, were humiliated and bedeviled and marched with bayonets plunging in their ribs, did any of those men, during all those dark Reconstruction days, suffer from attack by any Northern Senator or any Northern Member of the House of Representatives or anyone else in a proposal in the Senate or in the House of Representatives that the fourteenth amendment gave any power or any sanction to the assertion by the Congress of the right to prescribe the qualifications of voters.

Mr. President, I am not relying upon backstairs comment for what I say. I am not relying upon things told me in the cloakroom. I am not relying upon petitions which may have been sent to me by the members of someone's political club. I am speaking according to the record. I hold a part of it in my hand.

Who were some of the men who constituted that committee of 15? The chairman of the Senate group was Senator William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine. I am sorry the Senators from Maine are not now present in the Chamber. Whatever the other Members of the Senate may do, I feel certain that the Senators from Maine will respect and revere the memory of William Pitt Fessenden, who was a Member of the Senate, and later was Secretary of the Treasury under Abraham Lincoln's administration. When Senator Fessenden became ill, the duties of the chairmanship fell to Jacob M. Howard, of Michigan. I regret that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is not now present. I am glad to observe that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is present. However high may be the eminence of those two Senators today, I would remind them that in the past Michigan has had many other distinguished Senators, some of whom were Democrats, and more of whom were Republicans. I commend to them what Howard of Michigan said, not in a campaign speech, not at a party caucus, but on the floor of the Senate itself.

John Harris of New York was a member of that committee. James W. Grimes, of Iowa, was also a member. Grimes of Iowa, voting against the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, showed his courage and unshakable devotion to the Constitution.

Reverdy Johnson of Maryland was a member of that committee. The name of Reverdy Johnson conjures up recollections of some of the finest and noblest traditions of the Democratic Party. He was the lone Democratic member of this group of Senators. Reverdy Johnson was a great lawyer, a strong character, and an eloquent champion of any cause that enlisted his sympathy and support.

Who were the members of the committee from the House who framed the fourteenth amendment? Roscoe Conkling of New York was one of them. Whether anyone likes Roscoe Conkling, or whether he disagrees with him, he must admit that Roscoe Conkling was a strong, outstanding character. He was a great man, and a great lawyer. I never think of Roscoe Conkling without thinking of what he said to a committee of Republicans in 1884, when Mr. Blaine was a candidate for President of the United States. It will be remembered that Blaine and Conkling had their first feud while they were Members of the House of Representatives. It is related that Blaine offended Conkling by referring to him as having a turkey-gobbler strut. As the years went on, that passionate opposition to each other grew. Finally Conkling, misunderstanding the political temper of his people, and in a fit of anger against Garfield, resigned from the Senate, expecting that the Legislature of New York would reelect him. The Legislature of New York did not reelect him, so he located in New York, where he enjoyed a large and very prosperous practice.

Finally the Republicans nominated Blaine for President of the United States. Conkling had been the absolute dictator of the politics of the State of New York. The leaders decided that unless they could get Conkling to speak out in at least two speeches they would lose the State of New York. So they appointed a committee to wait on Mr. Conkling. The committee waited upon him in his office. They laid before him the question. They said, "Senator, we implore you to make two speeches in behalf of Mr. Blaine, who is a candidate for President." He replied, "Gentlemen, I am very sorry, but I am not in the criminal practice."

I relate that simply to illustrate the brilliance of his mind. I do not vouch for the accuracy of the statement, but I cite it to show that Conkling was a great and brilliant man.

What other Members of the House were on that committee? There were George M. Boutwell, of Massachusetts; Henry T. Blow, of Missouri; and John A. Bingham, of Ohio. Bingham was the author of the first section of the fourteenth amendment. Also there were Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont; E. B. Washburne, of Illinois, and others.

What happened? They first considered two separate resolutions, one for the first section and one for the second, but on final consideration they consolidated the two resolutions and presented them in the form of the fourteenth amendment. The first one was drafted by John Bingham. This is what Mr. Bingham said in presenting his first section. I want Senators to listen to what Bingham said, not what I say. He was one of the authors of the fourteenth amendment. If there be any Senator so easy of delusion, so anxious to be misled, as to believe that he can hang this bill on some point of the fourteenth amendment, let him answer what Bingham, who wrote the fourteenth amendment, said:

> This amendment takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it. The amendment does not give, as the section shows, the power to Congress of regulating suffrage in the several States.

That is the language of one of the authors of the fourteenth amendment. That is what I fling into the faces of those who would now assert that they can find something in the fourteenth amendment upon which to hang their specious pretense of constitutionality for this bill.

That is not all. One section of the fourteenth amendment reduces the representation of the States in case they deny to any person the right of suffrage. The fourteenth amendment by its very terms shows that this bill is unconstitutional, because that amendment imposes a penalty upon States which refuse to admit certain sections of their people to suffrage. It says to the States,

"You have authority, and have always had authority under the Constitution, to prescribe the qualifications of voters; but if you exercise that power so as to cut down the fair representation of your State, the Congress will, as a penalty, not seek to regulate your suffrage at all, but will take steps to cut down the number of Representatives you may have in the Congress." That is all the fourteenth amendment accomplishes in that respect. That is all it was intended to accomplish. Instead of furnishing support for this bill, it is a reaffirmation and a confirmation of the fact that the States have the right to regulate their suffrage in any way they see fit.

This is what Bingham said about the second section. This is the same Mr. Bingham, from the same State of Ohio, a Member of the same Congress. This is Bingham speaking. This is not Nick Nickonius, from the establishment on the corner, talking to his Representative or Senator, or Nick Alessandro, with four votes in his pocket. This is Bingham, who wrote the fourteenth amendment, speaking:

The second section excludes—

What does "exclude" mean? Does it mean to take in? Does it mean to fold to one's bosom? Does it mean to put in one's pocket? "Exclude" means exclude.

I hope newspapermen will not hesitate to print the truth about this bill. They are very handy with their pencils when some minor sensation occurs. But this is a great fundamental question which reaches every citizen of this Republic. I hope the press will give those of us who are resisting the bill a fair report before the country. We are standing here upon principle and fighting this thing on the basis of right and wrong. We are maintaining our rights under the Constitution of the United States. We are trying to do so in a dignified, high-minded way. The people of the United States ought to know that unless the old Constitution is preserved—not a part of it, not sections of it, but all of it as it was written, until it is changed as the Constitution provides—their liberties and the liberties of their sons, their son's sons, and their sons' sons' sons will be imperiled.

Bingham said:

The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law.

The authors of this amendment are telling the Congress and the country that under it there is no pretense to assert that Congress can regulate suffrage in the States.

In the Senate the matter was discussed by Senator Howard. Senators in those days talked as they talk in these days. Some of them talked much more wisely than we sometimes hear Senators talk today. However, Senator Howard, of Michigan—I want the Senator from Michigan to remember that. Senator Howard took the place of Senator Fessenden, who was ill. He discussed the first section. Who ought to have known what this meant? Should not the men who wrote it have known? Should not the men who thought of it, who met in a committee of 15, who voted, shaped, and designed it, have known what it meant? Or should it have been someone else who came fresh from a ward meeting and said, "We need a thousand votes, boys. All right, bring out the old Constitution and we will chisel off a piece of it." [Laughter.]

Here is what Senator Howard said on May 23, as appears at page 3165:

The first section of the proposed amendment—

Listen to this—

does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting.

Do not tinker with suffrage. It does not say who shall vote and who shall not vote. I continue reading:

The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive social law.

That is what the Senator from Michigan said was meant by the fourteenth amendment. He said that it did not mean nor pretend to mean that it undertook to regulate the qualifications of the voters in the States.

Senator Howard said something further. He was the chairman of the Senate end of that committee. Here is what he said:

This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all.

That is the language of Senator Howard, of Michigan, who helped write the fourteenth amendment.

I quote further:

Nor does it recognize, much less secure, the right of suffrage to the colored race.

Mr. President, I wish to say that this is not a colored and white fight at all. In my State the regulation applies to white persons as well as colored. Many white people are indifferent to voting. Senators have talked about great sections of people being prevented from voting because they did not pay a poll tax. I ask them to consider their own States, and they will observe from the election returns, as compared with the census returns, that only a percentage of the voters, after all, vote in some of the States. Why? Because of indifference; because voters are absent from home, or are engaged in doing something else. Some voters stay at home and take no interest in politics. I have heard persons brag, "I don't take any interest in politics," and they thought it was something to be applauded. They thought they were high and mighty. They would say, "I do not approve of politics." Of course, that kind of a citizen has no place in America, and should not be allowed to enjoy its blessings and benefits without asserting and exercising his responsibilities as a citizen.

Allow me to return to Senator Howard. I think he should be consulted. I read further from his remarks:

It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right.

That was Senator Howard speaking when he presented the fourteenth amendment. He said:

It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States—

Which was an admission that it had always been in the power of the States. Nobody had ever amended it or brought it into dispute, and the fourteenth amendment did not change it.

Senator Howard spoke a little while longer. He said:

We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage. It is the theory of the Constitution—

Meaning the theory of the Constitution about leaving to the States the right to regulate suffrage. Some modern gentlemen, after taking a hypodermic of some kind of so-called liberalism, communism, politicalism, or some other sort of ism, do not believe that the statement of Senator Howard represented the theory of the Constitution. Senator Howard said that it was the theory of the Constitution. He was speaking at a time when he was surrounded by passion and prejudice, when the smoke and fire of that tremendous period would consume a weak and wobbly-kneed statesman. However, Howard was not influenced by the situation. He stood up and told the truth. He said what he meant, and he meant what he said. I repeat what Howard said:

We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed—

Always possessed—

of regulating the right of suffrage.

If they had always possessed it up until the fourteenth amendment was adopted, when was it changed? I challenge Senators who are in favor of this bill to show where it was ever changed by the voice of the people of the United States. Where was the Constitution ever amended under the constitutional forms which are required? Oh, it cannot be amended by whispers in a back room. The Constitution of the United States cannot be amended alone by wishful thinking. The Constitution makers knew that there were persons who would want to see the Constitution amended by such methods, and in effect they said, "Now, in order to overcome that, we shall prescribe how the Constitution shall be amended." The amendment must be submitted by two-thirds of the two Houses of Congress, and then ratified by three-fourths of the States. Or, if the States wish to originate amendments, they may do so by calling conventions in the various States, adopting proposed amendments, and requiring a national convention, and so forth, to consider the amendments, or submit the matter to Congress.

I again revert to Senator Howard. He said:

It is the theory of the Constitution that that right has never been taken from them—

That is, the right of the States to control suffrage. That is important. But the following is still more important:

No endeavor has ever been made to take it from them—

Is not that important? Here was Howard drafting the fourteenth amendment, and saying that never theretofore had any effort been made anywhere in the Union to take the power of controlling suffrage away from the States. He said that the fourteenth amendment did not pretend to do so and did not do so.

I quote him further:

And the theory of this whole amendment—

Speaking of the fourteenth amendment—

is to leave the power of regulating the suffrage with the people or legislatures of the States and not to assume to regulate it by any clause of the Constitution of the United States.

How could that language be made plainer? How could the English tongue fashion a sentence to convey more succinctly and accurately a meaning that men can understand? If it were blazoned forth upon the market place it could not be plainer than Senator Howard made it—

and the theory of this whole amendment—

I want Senators who are now absent to consider this. It is a bad habit for Senators not to listen to the other side. When I used to practice law I always listened to my opponent because if I did not I knew he would probably defeat me, and he defeated me sometimes when I did listen. I think Senators ought to stay here and listen to both sides of this question. You cannot go out and stick your head in the sand, Mr. Senator. This record is going to be here, and you ought to want to know the truth, not a part of the truth, but all the truth.

One more quotation from Senator Howard and I shall not refer to him further:

And the theory of this whole amendment is to leave the power of regulating the suffrage with the people or legislatures of the States, and not to assume to regulate it by any clause—

Not only by this clause but by any other clause—

of the Constitution of the United States.

That is pretty plain language.

Mr. President, other Senators spoke on that subject. When the discussion began on the second section of the fourteenth amendment Senator Fessenden had returned to his duties, and he made this statement in a colloquy with Senator Sumner, as I recall, in 1866:

The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please.

"As they please." That is the language of William Pitt Fessenden, a great and honorable and able Senator from the State of Maine, and afterward Secretary of the Treasury for Abraham Lincoln.

The Constitution does not limit them. The Constitution, in terms, gives us no power.

The Constitution gives the Federal Government no power.

It leaves to the States, as everybody knows—

Where are the Senators that do not know that? Look under the desks; are they there? Go yonder to the cloakrooms; are they there? Fessenden said:

It leaves to the States, as everybody knows—

Of course he is not living now, and does not know about the present generation.

It leaves to the States, as everybody knows, the perfect authority to regulate this matter of suffrage to suit themselves.

How could language stand out with a greater light? How could it be more graphic? It was not necessary to use an adjective, but he used one—"perfect authority." There are no defects in the authority, no weak places, no cracks, no holes.

The perfect authority to regulate this matter of suffrage to suit themselves.

To suit whom? To suit themselves, not a Senator living in a distant State. It is not necessary to suit him; it is not necessary to get a directive from New York or Pennsylvania; but the people of the State have the power to regulate the suffrage to suit themselves. That is the view of William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine.

Then he refers to the penalty provision of the second section. I do not know that it is necessary to quote that, but I shall do so:

It says to all the people of the United States, "You shall be represented in Congress, but, as we fear you may be governed by narrow views, as we fear you will do injustice to a portion of the people under your charge, * * * we say to you that you shall not have political power any further than you show by your actions that you are disposed to let our charges participate in it."

In other words, you can regulate suffrage any way you please, but if you willfully and maliciously exclude large sections of people through prejudice of race, color, or something of that kind, then your representation shall be reduced. That is all that means.

I referred a while ago to Reverdy Johnson. One can always refer to Reverdy Johnson with pride; one can always refer to him with knowledge that what he said had a foundation in the law and in the Constitution or in the rich experience of a useful and long life. His voice was heard in the Supreme Court, for he was one of the most brilliant of the great galaxy that practiced before that Court. He pointed out, in discussing this suffrage matter, that there were only six Northern States then that allowed the colored men to vote. I am not urging this on the ground of color at all. It is more fundamental than color, but he was pointing out in the course of the debate that even at that time only six States in the North permitted colored men to vote.

What further does he say? Here is what Reverdy Johnson says:

I suppose that even the honorable Member from Massachusetts—

He was referring to Senator Sumner—

will not deny that it was for Massachusetts to regulate her suffrage before 1789, and, if it was, she has the power still—

She has the power still—

unless she has agreed to part with it by devolving it upon the General Government. Is there a word in the Constitution that intimates such a purpose. Who at that time in 1787 denied that the State was clothed with the power of prescribing the qualifications for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? * * *

The State and nobody else.

Then he cited the Federalist, which used to be a pretty good bible, written by Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Madison and by John Jay, as I recall the third name. He then cited the Federalist.

The right of choosing the allotted number in each State is to be exercised by such part of the inhabitants as the State itself may designate.

That is the electors.

Words could not have been adopted more obviously leading to the conclusion that, in the opinion of the writers of the Federalist, the States were to have the sole right of regulating the suffrage.

What did Senator Hendricks, of Indiana, think about it? Senator Hendricks says:

I ask the Senators the question: Have the States, under the Constitution, the right to control the elective franchise? Does any Senator question that?

Hendricks challenged them; he said, "Does any Senator question that?"

The Senator from Massachusetts does. He thinks that Congress may control the right of suffrage in the State, but it has not been a question of dispute whether the State had control of the elective franchise.

It had never been the subject of dispute.

It is absolutely perfect.

That is what Senator Hendricks said—the right of the State to control the suffrage "is absolutely perfect." Talk about 98½ percent pure, I believe some soap advertises that it is 98½ percent pure. If this right is "absolute and perfect," it has a better percentage of perfection than has that soap, for it is 100 percent perfect; the right of the State is absolute and perfect; it has no defects in it; no blurs, no blemishes, no warts, or cracks, or any other thing to disfigure it. It is absolute and perfect, says Senator Hendricks.

Then Senator Sumner rose—as he frequently did—and denied the right of the State to deny the Negro suffrage. But he went on to say that the State had entire control over the right of suffrage, and could deny it by reason of conditions of age, residence, character, education, property, and the payment of taxes, but he claimed it could not be applicable to color. In other words, he was maneuvered into a position where he admitted that the States could say how old one had to be, could prescribe educational qualifications, could prescribe possession of property as a qualification, could do everything on earth fixing the qualifications, except as to color. We are not concerned in this debate about color. We are concerned as to whether we are going to leave this power where we found it. When we took our oaths to uphold the Constitution of the United States, this clause was in the Constitution. Who took it out? If it has been taken out, it

has been purloined, it has been abstracted in the night, when no watchman was on the tower. It is still there, and these old fathers said it was still there.

Then Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, spoke. His portrait hangs in the room of the Vice President at this moment. Senator Wilson, who was Vice President of the United States later, said in the debate:

> The men who framed the Constitution made those State constitutions. * * * They well knew what the qualifications were. Every State constitution provides for electors, prescribes the qualification for suffrage. The laws of the States provided for qualifications of electors. Every State, from the adoption of the State constitution to this hour, has claimed the authority and exercised it to settle the questions pertaining to suffrage.

Listen to Senator Wilson:

> They never supposed that the Federal Government had the power to change it.

Those men were unfortunate. They did not have the opportunity to consult some of the groups which are now so rampant. If they had, they might have thought, "Well, we had better consider this again." But Wilson says they never supposed, there was never a supposition, never any dream, never any suggestion by anyone, that the Federal Government had the power to change it.

> They never gave that power and they never intended to give that power.

That was Senator Wilson of Massachusetts speaking, saying that the States had never given that power to the Federal Government, that they had never intended to give it, that they had not given it. The Constitution stands now in that respect in the identical language in which it stood when Wilson made that statement.

Senator Fessenden said one other thing:

> If I understand the Constitution at all, it has always been considered that the clause which I have read—

Which is the second section of article I, about which we are talking—

> acknowledged the right of the States to regulate the question of suffrage. I do not think it has ever been disputed.

He had not lived in modern times. Poor old Fessenden died a benighted man. He passed away amidst the shadows of ignorance and did not know anything about modern life. He said he did not think it had ever been disputed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator's voice probably needs a little rest, or I would not interrupt him. I have been exceedingly interested in the able argument the Senator has made. The question which arises in my mind is whether the Senator is proceeding on the theory that the States reserved the right to fix the qualifications for electors participating in elections of Representatives of the United States, or did the States delegate that power to the Federal Government, and does the Constitution fix the qualifications?

Mr. CONNALLY. Before the Constitution was adopted, there was no Congress of the United States, of course. The Constitution created the House of Representatives. When it created the House of Representatives, it had the utmost and the widest authority to prescribe the qualifications as to how the Members should be elected or chosen, whether by the people or by the legislatures. It might have provided that the legislatures should elect Representatives, as it did in the case of Senators. So it was up to the Constitution.

Then the Constitution, in section 2 of article I, provided that—

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

When the founding fathers adopted that clause, they made it a Federal qualification. In other words, under the Federal Constitution a man who proposes to vote for Representatives in Congress must have the same qualifications as those provided by the State for its most numerous branch of the legislature. That is one reason why the pending bill is so ridiculous. If that be true, if the qualifications have to be the same, then the proposal that one qualification shall exist for the right to vote for a Member of the Congress and another qualification shall exist as to a member of a State legislature furnishes an absolute paradox, because the Constitution requires that they be the same.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment. If that can be changed by prescribing the qualifications of those who vote for Representatives, it would seem that we should go still further and make that a requisite for the State legislature. If we can do that, we can prescribe the right of suffrage for State officers, perhaps, and all other officers within a State, and when that shall have been done, the ruin of the States will be complete; there will be a consolidation of power here in Washington which would rival that of Augustus, the first Roman Emperor, who gathered into his hands during a period of years the power of one cabinet position after another, a new power here and another power there, until in his imperial person there walked the streets of Rome the Roman Empire itself. Whenever the power to regulate suffrage in a State is turned over to the Central Government, the power as to how suffrage can be controlled, who may vote and who may not vote, a long step has been taken toward the destruction of this Republic.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I follow the Senator correctly, he does not take the position that the States reserved the power to fix the qualifications?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, the States had that power. They had never given up that power.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I am trying to get at. I should like to have the Senator take one position or the other.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have taken one position, and it ought to be clear to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I correctly follow the Senator, it is clear. The Senator from Texas always makes himself clear, and if there is any difficulty on the part of another Senator it is that Senator's fault, and not the fault of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. But if I have correctly followed the Senator, his position is that the States in the Constitution delegated the power of fixing the qualifications of voters to the Federal Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I did not say that; because the States had nothing on earth to do with Congress until Congress was created. The States functioned individually until Congress was created.

Mr. MURDOCK. We are now talking about the Constitution, and the Senator from Texas is depending largely on section 2 of article I, which provides definitely that the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress shall be the same as those of electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. So we do have the authority in the Constitution for fixing the qualifications of electors under the delegation of authority from the States. The States therefore did not reserve that power; they placed the provision in the Constitution, and so the Constitution itself fixes the qualifications of voters. If that is the case—and I think the Senator from Texas has very ably expounded the theory that the power was delegated and not reserved—then it is rather difficult for me to follow much of the language which has been quoted from distinguished Senators with respect to the fourteenth amendment, wherein many of them, if I have correctly followed the quotations given, seem to have taken the position that the States had the right to fix qualifications of voters in the beginning, and they reserved that right, that they never gave it up.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think I can illustrate that point. The Senator confuses somewhat the right of the States to provide the standards of voting for their electors. Prior to the Constitutional Convention, of course, there was no Congress. The States had no right or power to prescribe anything with respect to Congress, because no Congress existed. I think it is fundamental that the Constitutional Convention, when it created Congress—Congress being the creature of the Constitution—had the power, if it wanted to, to prescribe how the Members of the Congress should be elected, and it did. But instead of writing out on a piece of paper, "We prescribe the following," and so forth, they adopted the expedient of saying, "All the States of the Union already have their own systems for voting, and their qualifications for voting, some of them different, and each one according to the wishes of the people of the particular State. Instead of irritating and annoying all the people of the States by

overriding and overruling their own preferences for suffrage, we will adopt a standard which may be one thing in one State and another thing in another State, and that is that those who vote for Members of Congress shall possess the same qualifications that the States prescribe with respect to voting for members of the State legislature."

That State qualification becomes for that purpose the Federal qualification. I will say to the Senator frankly that it is a compelling qualification; that clause when it confers the power carries with it the command that the qualification must be the same.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct. I agree thoroughly with the statement the Senator has now made. I think he demonstrates clearly that the power of fixing the qualifications of the electors was delegated as we now find it in the Constitution. But it was not reserved to the States. So many of the statements which were made in the debate, to which the Senator from Texas refers, wherein Senators took the position that the States possessed the right to fix voting qualifications, and that they reserved that right, do not support the position which the Senator from Texas takes when he refers to the qualifications being fixed in the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think I can clear that point in a moment. What the Senator from Texas meant was that the States had never parted with their authority and their freedom to determine the qualifications of the electors of members of their legislatures. Then when the Federal Government came in, and it was provided in the Constitution that the Federal qualifications for voting shall be the same as those fixed by the States, for all intents and purposes the State requirements or qualifications become Federal requirements or qualifications. The qualifications are a varying standard. The standard may be one thing in one State and another thing in another State.

Let us assume that Congress should pass a bill providing restrictions with respect to individuals over 7 feet tall. Someone may say, "How are we going to know the standard with respect to 7 feet?" We here do not know what it is, but at the Bureau of Standards there is a Federal standard as to 7 feet, and if anyone has any doubt, determination of what 7 feet is must be provided by the standard which is in the Bureau of Standards. So that in adopting the standard all the Constitution says, whether it be South Carolina, or Maine, or California, or Pennsylvania, when it comes to qualifications for electors they shall have the same standards, the same 7-foot yardstick, as the State requires for electors for members of its legislature.

They cannot have merely any kind of qualifications, but must have the same qualifications as are possesesd by the electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wanted to state that whatever it may be called, that constitutional provision was adopted by the Constitutional Convention, and it has never been changed.

Mr. CONNALLY. It has never been questioned before.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has never been questioned and never been changed. Whatever view might be taken—suppose the view of the Senator from Utah were taken—makes no difference, because the provision cannot be changed except by constitutional amendment. It cannot be changed by an act of Congress. It can be changed only by the method prescribed by the Constitution itself for changing provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have not attempted this afternoon to express my views at all. I did want to be sure that I understood the views of the Senator from Texas, and I think now I understand them. He has again ably expounded not only the theory but the fact that the States did delegate to the Federal Government the power to fix the qualifications in the Constitution, and they were fixed, and they were fixed as the Senator has ably pointed out, by saying to each of the States, "The qualifications for electors for the House of Representatives shall be the same as they are in Texas, in New York, in Pennsylvania, for electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature in the State."

In my opinion it is a delegation of power that cannot be questioned, and in my opinion, the qualifications are fixed in the Constitution. To find out what they are specifically in each State, what must be done? We must, of course, go to that State and find out what they are. My only purpose in rising today is to have that point made clear, and I think it is now clear; at least the Senator from Texas and I agree that the qualifications are fixed in the Constitution, and when we want to find out what the qualifications are in Utah, we go to the laws of Utah. If we want to find out what they are in Texas we go to the laws of Texas. So that it was a delegation of the power to the Federal Government to fix that qualification, and they fixed it in the Constitution itself.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I think the Senator is probably quibbling over the question whether there was delegation or nondelegation. Of course, the States had no power to affect the right of suffrage in voting for Representatives until the Constitution was adopted. The States ratified the Constitution which was promulgated by the Convention, and to that extent they ratified the provision regarding the rights of the States to fix the qualifications of voters for Representatives in Congress. They did that, and they ratified the provision that the States should have the right to fix for their electors the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. For instance, if tomorrow the State of Utah should decide that people 18 years of age and over could vote for members of the legislature they could do so, and we could not say a word about it. If Utah wanted to have men and boys 18 years of age and over vote for Representatives in Congress, Utah would have a right to make such a provision.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us turn it around.

Mr. CONNALLY. I prefer not to turn it around. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. But let us turn it around. Instead of increasing the number of voters for members of the legislature in my State suppose the legislature should say that no one who had not attained the age of 80 years could vote. As a result, nine-tenths of the people of Utah would be disfranchised. If that occurred, I ask the Senator, under the Constitution of the United States which says that every State shall have a republican form of government, what would happen to a law which would disfranchise nine-tenths of the people of a State?

Mr. CONNALLY. That illustration is fantastic.

Mr. MURDOCK. No; it is not.

Mr. CONNALLY. It certainly is fantastic, Mr. President; for so long as the Senator from Utah is running loose in Utah, there is no chance of disfranchising nine-tenths of the voters in Utah. If any such thing were attempted, the desert in Utah—and there is a lot of it—would simply roll with clouds of dust. Under the Senator's theory, could not those 18 years and older vote for Members of Congress?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a further question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to have the Senator answer my question first. I am talking to him. He has interrogated me a great deal. I should like to know what his answer is to my question. In Utah, could not the minimum age of voters be raised to 25 years?

Mr. MURDOCK. It could.

Mr. CONNALLY. And could not all persons under 25 years of age be denied the right to vote for Representatives in Congress?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. Could Congress require Utah to change that qualification, if Utah should adopt it?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I will reserve my question.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, the Senator is making a very serious argument. I know that when it comes to making certain exchanges on the floor of the Senate, there is no one who can keep abreast of the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. When the Senator refers to my remarks as being fantastic, of course I agree that when I suggested that a State might provide that the age of voters shall be 80 years, that may be

fantastic. But the question is how far a State can go in respect to limiting the number of voters. In my opinion, which differs from that of many of the proponents of the bill—and I say this very seriously—no State has the power arbitrarily to adopt a qualification which will disfranchise so great a segment of its population that the republican form of government guaranteed under the Constitution is destroyed. In my opinion, one of the most important questions before the Congress is the one based on the provision of the Constitution by which every State is guaranteed a republican form of government, as well as the constitutional clause, which has been greatly stressed this afternoon by the Senator from Texas, that in fixing the qualifications for voters, the States can proceed up to the point of destroying the republican form of government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator's question is answered in the second section of the fourteenth amendment:

> Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State—

And, of course, now, that includes females—

> being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced.

If the Legislature of Utah were to fix the age of voters as 80 years of age, then instead of having two Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Utah, there would be approximately one-tenth of a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me, so that I may answer the question propounded by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will permit the Senator to proceed. Of course I desire to conclude. I am very tired.

Mr. MURDOCK. I know, and that is why I rose awhile ago—to see if I could not give the Senator a rest.

The Senator from Tennessee has referred to the constitutional provision which has been referred to by the Senator from Texas, which provides a penalty for abridging the right of suffrage. If the Senator from Tennessee takes the position that it is the exclusive right of Congress to remedy such a situation, my answer probably would be that I agree with him. But in my opinion it is not the exclusive remedy; there is another one.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is the only remedy that is stated in the Constitution. When both the Senator from Utah and I first came to the Senate, we went to the desk and raised our right hands—at least, I held up my right hand, and I presume the Senator held up his right hand—and swore before Almighty God that we would uphold and defend this very Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Mr. MURDOCK. But the Senator from Tennessee seems to stress one part of the Constitution——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I would, but I have not the floor.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is my opinion that the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee stresses one provision of the Constitution but wholly ignores another one. He stresses the provision that the people of the State shall elect the Representatives in Congress from the State, but ignores the provision that the Federal Government shall guarantee to each State a republican form of government. If it is possible to have a republican form of government at a time when nine-tenths of the people of a State are disfranchised, I do not know what republican government is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me, so that I may answer the question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply say to the Senator from Utah that for 130 years, I believe, instead of having as electors for United States Senators only persons over 80 years of age—and such a requirement would very greatly reduce the number of electors—the States had as electors for United States Senators only members of the State legislatures—a very small group of citizens, and I imagine less than one-tenth of 1 percent or perhaps less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the electors. That very small group of electors, the members of the State legislatures, elected the Senators from each State. Our States had a republican form of government then, just as we hope to keep the Government a republican form of government now. That provision of the Constitution has been changed by constitutional amendment. If a bill were presented here providing for an amendment to the Constitution, that would be another matter. But the pending bill is an attempt to violate the Constitution of the United States by act of Congress; and I say that under the oath I took, I cannot agree to do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to answer my distinguished friend from Tennessee——

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the answer will be brief.

Mr. MURDOCK. The answer is simply that we have only to go behind the legislature, and to recall the participation of the legislatures in those elections. Of course, the States had a right to provide in the original Constitution that representatives in Congress should be elected in a certain way, for instance, by the legislatures of the States. But the point I make is that no State has a right to adopt a qualification which will destroy the republican form of government.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, Mr. President, no one is attacking the constitutional provision guaranteeing a republican form of government. If it is said that some person is not permitted to vote because he does not pay a poll tax, and therefore that is not free government and not a republican form of government, I wish to say that we have to go back to the old Constitutional Convention again. The same men who wrote the provision that every State should be guaranteed a republican form of government also wrote the requirement as to voting. They knew that Virginia had a law requiring a voter to hold so much land or pay so much taxes. They knew that Pennsylvania had a law which required the payment of taxes. They knew that Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and other States had similar laws. They did not regard the existence of those laws as the denial of a republican form of government.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude as briefly as I can. Awhile ago the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] spoke of raising the age limit. Others have been thinking about that. In the case of *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wallace 162), the distinction between the rights of a citizen of the United States and the rights of a citizen of a State with regard to voting was referred to and explained by Chief Justice Waite. Chief Justice Waite was not a resident of my State. He was not a constituent of mine. He was not influenced by any of my views. What did he say? He said that the—

> fact that the right of voting could not grow out of citizenship alone was clear when you considered who was a citizen of the United States; everybody born here was a citizen of the United States and, therefore, if voting depended on citizenship every child, every woman, every pauper, every criminal, every person born here would have the right to vote.

That is somewhat akin to the doctrine of the Senator from Utah. That would be a republican form of government in the flesh. Everybody would vote. Little Johnnie, 2 years old, would have the right to vote. He would not know anything about it, but he would have the right to vote.

So there is nowhere any inherent constitutional right of a person to vote. Suffrage is a creature of the law of the sovereignty where it is exercised. So far as I know, that principle has never been questioned in any respectable forum.

Chief Justice Waite continued:

> Certainly, if the courts can consider any question settled, this is one. For nearly 90 years the people have acted upon the idea that the Constitution, when it conferred citizenship, did not necessarily confer the right of suffrage.

Mr. President, I do not want Senators to confuse the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. The fourteenth amendment penalty clause against our section was cured by the fifteenth amendment, which gave the right to all citizens to vote, so the fourteenth amendment has largely been abrogated.

What else did Chief Justice Waite say?

> Before the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, it was possible for a State to exclude

a man from voting because of his race, color, or otherwise.

* * * * *

Before its adoption, this could be done. It was then as much within the power of the States to exclude citizens of the United States from voting on account of race and so forth as it was on account of age, property, or education.

Mr. President, I could weary the Senate longer, but I shall not undertake to do so. Let me say that to our minds this matter is one of the most serious import. If we are to lay down the doctrine that constitutional provisions can be modified or construed—and there is no difference between modifying a thing and construing it if it is construed in the way in which we wish to modify it—if the Congress can construe or modify the Constitution of the United States by violating its plain provisions, and can undertake to regulate suffrage by denying the right of a State to levy a poll tax or impose any similar provision, then Congress has the power to prescribe any other qualification it may see fit to prescribe. It not only has the right of prohibition or denial, requiring that voters shall possess certain qualifications, but it has the affirmative power to require the States to impose certain conditions or requirements with respect to suffrage within the States. In effect, it would amount to a delivery by the States to the Federal Government of the control of suffrage, the very root, the very foundation, the very subsoil of liberty and free government itself. Suffrage ought to be left within the control of the people of the sovereignty which is affected.

Mr. President, we are earnest. We are anxious with regard to this question. I wish to refer to one further point, and then I shall have concluded. It is suggested that under the device of a motion for cloture our voices are to be stilled, and that debate is to be limited; that this forum in the Senate, which for 150 years has been the most distinguished place of debate on the whole globe, is no longer to enjoy freedom of debate, freedom of discussion.

Mr. President, let me say to Senators that the Senate of the United States is the only place in all our vast governmental machinery where freedom of discussion and freedom of debate is preserved. If we do our duty to our country, it will continue to be preserved. One cannot go into one of the Government departments and talk to a Cabinet member under unlimited debate. The Cabinet member can close the door and tell him to go whenever he wishes to do so. One cannot go into the White House and have unlimited debate. A policeman will throw him out on his ear when he starts with unlimited debate. Even our coordinate branch, the House of Representatives, has rules respecting debate, forcing bills through after 1 day's consideration, limiting the time to 5 minutes, and sometimes even precluding the opportunity of offering amendments. If Senators want that kind of government, that kind of rule, they should vote for cloture. If Senators want freedom of debate in the Senate, let them not tie their hands in shackles which will never come off.

O Mr. President, it is said, "We want orderly discussion and then a vote." The doctrine of cloture originated before the adoption of the so-called lame-duck amendment. Many Senators thought that because the short session of Congress expired on the 4th of March, two or three Senators could get together and, by filibustering, defeat a measure at the end of a session. However, since the abolition of the short term of Congress ending on the 4th of March, the Senate has the whole year in which to debate. There is no occasion for shutting off debate. There is no occasion for throttling free speech.

Mr. President, did any cause ever suffer because too much light was thrown upon it? If it did, it was a bad cause. Did any public question ever have too much information disseminated regarding it? If it did, the cause was a bad cause. A good cause, a noble cause, or a sound bill can stand long debate. It can stand contest. It can stand discussion. Error, which hides in dark places, and specious claims, which make their appearance in bad causes, can be exposed by free debate, and by turning on the light of full discussion.

Mr. President, I beg Senators not to vote for this bill. The advantage to be gained by voting for it would be only temporary. The bill is simply an expedient in order to obtain a little victory this fall in the district of some Senator who may say, "God knows, I need these few votes." But shall we surrender one of the fundamental traditions of this body merely for the sake of such a temporary advantage? When I say "this body," I really mean the whole Government of the United States. Instead, a Senator should say, "For the sake of a little temporary handful of votes, which I scorn, I will not vote to violate the Constitution by voting for this bill; I will not vote to violate the great principles of freedom of discussion and freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States."

Mr. President, when I first became a candidate for the Senate one of the planks in my platform was that I would not vote to restrict the freedom of debate in this body. Another plank was that I favored lifting the ban of secrecy on executive sessions, because I was willing that the people of the United States should know what I thought, what I said, and how I voted. I believe that every Member of the Senate feels the same as I do in that respect.

So, Mr. President, with all the earnestness which I can command, I admonish Senators that this question is a solemn one. We are in the midst of a solemn hour. The world is upside down. Warring nations are struggling at each other's throats with marching armies and thundering cannon. All the machinery of government is in turmoil and chaos. Goverments are being overturned. Conquerors with drawn swords are standing over the prostrate forms of their victims. Constitutions have been destroyed and governments have been wiped out. Is this the proper time for the United States to abandon its customs and its precedents, which have lived for 150 years? Is this the right time for us to slacken our hold upon the great fundamentals of free government and legislative institutions? Mr. President, this is not the time. Let us stand as firmly as the granite in the hills. Let us stand as firmly as that Roman sentinel stood when Pompeii was crashing down around his ears, and he was covered by the lava from Mount Vesuvius. Let us stand for the principles which have been entrusted to us by the people. The Constitution of the United States places in our hands the preservation of the things which are dear to the people of America. If that were all, if they were simply dear to the people, I would have no compunctions. Those principles are not only dear to the people of the United States, but are necessary to them. If free government is to be preserved we must preserve it in the Senate of the United States. What kind of an example would we set for the lawless elements of the land, what kind of an example would we be to those who are reckless with institutions of government if we should allow the knowledge to go out to the world that by means of a little statute—a little statute—I repeat, in order to obtain a little hand full of scurvy votes for our own individual benefit, we had violated the Constitution of the United States?

In order to accomplish the purpose sought, and accomplish it speedily, in order to quiet the voice which we do not wish to hear, and in order to calm a conscience which we fear may break down in its indignation against our decision, it is proposed that we impose cloture and say that there shall no longer be freedom of debate in this Chamber.

Mr. President, I solemnly and earnestly beseech my fellow Senators not to vote to throw cloture around our necks. Tomorrow it may be their necks. I warn Republican Senators that minorities will always be here. Some day they may appeal to us to save them from the hangman's noose, and when they do I shall stand by their side. I shall stand by their side because I do not believe in cutting off freedom of debate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I invite the Senator's attention to what the American Federation of Labor, one of the great labor organizations, once had to say about shutting off debate, or enforcing cloture in the United States Senate.

A few years ago the then Vice President of the United States attempted to secure the adoption of a rule which would have abolished free speech in the United States Senate, and the American Federation of Labor not only condemned the whole idea of the proposed rule, but also the whole idea of cloture. Its statement was as follows:

For several months the Vice President of the United States has conducted an agitation for the purpose of abolishing free speech in the United States Senate, the only forum in the world where cloture does not exist and where Members can prevent the passage of reactionary legislation.

The railroad industry, the great oil industry, and other great industries in the United States, want to make it possible for a handful of men in the United States Senate to control all legislation. It is a vicious idea, a

vicious purpose to which the Vice President of the United States has loaned himself.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, it is true that those who today may advocate the imposition of cloture in order to cut off debate may tomorrow be the victims of it, as the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out in the statement of the American Federation of Labor which he read.

In one particular case, when Mr. Dawes was Vice President and wanted to streamline the Senate rules, some Senators spoke out against cloture because they could look down the roadway and foresee its dangers to their own cause. That situation may be true with respect to any group or interest of the citizenship of the United States. Senators should not delude themselves by believing that temporary victory in securing a few votes will prove of benefit in after years. It has been suggested that Dr. Guillotine, who invented the guillotine, was himself guillotined by the guillotine. [Laughter.]

Let me remind Senators who want cloture, thereby cutting off debate, that their time may come later; and when it does come they will be crying out for aid. If I am here I shall come to their aid, even though they may be cruel to those of us who are now opposing cloture.

Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate not to violate the noble traditions of this body, and not to restrict the Senate in its usefulness. Do not make of this body merely a rubber stamp by which to carry out some program.

Let it remain a great forum beside which the forum in Rome, beside which the forum in which Pericles spoke, will suffer by comparison. It has been in the past the greatest forum on the earth. It is up to us as to whether it shall continue to be that kind of a forum, or whether it shall shrivel and weaken and become atrophied into merely another bureau.

Ah, Mr. President, do not choke us, do not throw around us the cloak of silence. Give us a chance out in the open. With our own swords we are willing to fight, and we are going to fight. If you fear us, you need not meet us. We shall be willing in the open flood of public discussion to lay bare our cause before the people of the United States. We beg of you not to throttle us, not to throttle the truth, not to throttle the right.

Then, Mr. President, we implore you not to violate the Constitution by the passage of a puny, sickly little statute, which it is proposed to set up by the side of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, we have lived under the Constitution of the United States for 150 years. Our forefathers have shed their blood on battlefields to maintain it, and to sustain it. Some of our boys today are wearing the uniform of the Army and Navy far out yonder in the Pacific or on the battlefields in Europe—to do what? To maintain a Constitution that the Senate can change whenever it wants to? No. To preserve a Constitution which anybody can spit on when he gets ready, if it will offer him a few votes? No. That is not what they are fighting for. They are fighting to preserve the Constitution that was sanctioned at Philadelphia and under which we have lived in all the trying periods and all the dark years as well as the bright years that have rolled around over the hoary old head of mother earth from that hour until this. We shall cling to it; we shall defend it, perhaps not with swords in our hands, but the votes in our hands are more powerful than swords to preserve the Constitution here in the Senate. They are more powerful than swords because swords depend purely upon numbers. What we do depends upon our intelligence and our integrity and our character and our adherence to the oaths we took and our courage to maintain the eternal truths of the Constitution and free government.

Mr. BAILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to withdraw the suggestion for the time being.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I withdraw it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not going to call for a quorum, but unofficially, I am going to ask that absent Senators be requested to come into the Chamber, for I think they should be present to hear the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. He will make an able exposition of the matter under discussion, and I hope that Senators will be requested to come into the Chamber.

Personally, Mr. President, I very much wish the Senate would recess until tomorrow at this point, but I do not care to press the matter.

Mr. BAILEY. It would be very agreeable to me if the Senate would recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor. If those in charge of the pending bill desire to make a motion to recess, the present occupant of the chair will be glad to entertain it.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Otherwise, the Senator from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate is not likely to remain in session much longer this afternoon. I shall undertake to speak briefly and be ready to take my seat whenever any Senator wishes to interrupt me for the purpose of making a motion to recess.

I wish first of all to express my lasting and really inexpressible gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] for his very able, exhaustive—I mean exhaustive in the sense that he exhausted the subject—and eloquent address in opposition to the pending proposed legislation. I consider it a fortunate thing for myself that I am associated here with so lofty and so able a man and so worthy a Senator as the senior Senator from Texas. Of course I must confess to some sense of embarrassment in undertaking to follow one so eloquent and one who has so thoroughly covered this great subject, leaving practically nothing to be said and nothing to be desired.

I should like to say also that I wonder in the depths of my soul whether this proposed legislation should be brought here under the existing circumstances. I wonder what sort of picture we paint in the minds of our own people, of our sons and their mothers, and of all the nations of the earth, while we engage in a debate about a bill such as that before us, in the hour when the whole world is in the Garden of Gethsemane.

We all know that at any moment the news may come that our country's sons will be ordered to cross the water into France, or Belgium, or Holland, or Norway, or Greece—we do not know where—millions of them, thousands not to return. They will be carrying in their hands all the hopes of this country, all its pride, and all its love. We sent them. I voted to send them, Mr. President, and you voted to send them. We felt that we must. We felt that there was no other way; that we were responsible. They undertake to save us, and all the generations which are to come, paying in our behalf, in the great words of one of the greatest of Presidents, "the last full measure of devotion," while we engage here in the discussion of a miserable assault on the Constitution of the United States. I say that with all due respect and with no intention to offend. We did not bring this matter here. If there is blame, the blame rests upon those who did. If there is offense, I again quote that great President when he exclaimed in his second inaugural:

> Woe unto the world because of offenses; * * * but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh.

The responsibility for bringing the proposed legislation before the Senate, and for the necessity of discussion in an hour like this, is not upon us.

Mr. President, I am entering upon the discussion out of a profound sense of duty—a duty to my oath to support, to maintain, to defend the Constitution of the United States against its enemies, domestic and foreign, and I may justify myself to some extent by saying that while American boys are fighting in behalf of their country and may at this very hour be crossing the channel, never to return, at least it can be said of me that I stood here and spoke my heart out in behalf of the Constitution, from which the Government draws its life, without which it could not live.

Mr. President, that brings me to a further point, and I wonder how I can state it without offense; yet I do not intend any. I do not think this proposal is brought here by Members of the Congress, and I exonerate every one of them. I do not think this debate is thrust upon us willfully by Senators; and I observe the proponents are not debating the measure, and most of them are absent, I think for good reason, and I would

not complain of their absenting themselves under circumstances of this sort.

It is my judgment, Mr. President, that what is going on here today is the consequence of very dreadful things going on in the United States of America. I think the assault on the Constitution of the United States is not primarily here, but is primarily in certain pressure groups, with a direct purpose. I know whence my petitions come, I know whence the letters come urging me to support the proposed legislation, and I do not hesitate to say in the Senate that they are coming from two sources. One is the committee of the C. I. O. for political action, and they get their cue justly and appropriately from the Communist Party, which they represent in American life. The first and only political party in the United States to push the abolition of the poll-tax payment qualification was and is the Communist Party. They had a reason for it, but I shall not go into the reason.

Their heirs and assigns at the present moment in this country are the political action committee of the C. I. O., headed by Sidney Hillman, the Russian Bolshevik, who had his experience under Lenin, and proposes to profit by it here. I have their paper here, their campaign sheet. Very appropriately, the title is printed in red. I have also the report of the investigation of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, Union Calendar of the House of Representatives No. 443, and very recently filed. I say to Senators that whatever they may think about the reports from the Dies committee, here is a report which every Member of the Congress should read. Here is a report which will inform Senators as to what is going on in this year, which, in my judgment, and which in the fears of my heart, I consider the year of decision in America. Next year, too late; the year after, altogether too late; this year, scarcely in time. These people have their organization, their executive committee, and their propaganda committee, according to this report, largely made up of Communists. Their names are given, their affiliations are stated, and their plans are disclosed. What do they propose to do? They are going down to South Carolina—I call this to the attention of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]—at this moment and organizing for the purpose of infiltrating into the Democratic Party, of throwing the Senator from South Carolina out of power, and of throwing out of power any other man who believes in the American system of government, or any man who is faithful to the Constitution. They are operating in North Carolina. The paper I have in my hand reports to me from the words of their southern representative, Mr. George A. Mitchell, P. A. C. director of the southeastern region, that registration drives are under way in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and Florida, and that they have already registered more than 50,000 voters, and they give the registration dates and the expiration dates in order that everyone may be informed.

Of course, this is not confined to the South. Here are reports from Renton in Washington, San Diego, Oakland and Los Angeles in California, and from other States throughout the Union. They have 14 regions, with 14 regional leaders, and, according to their latest report, their initial contribution for the expense of this conspiracy against the American system is $750,000. That is the initial contribution, and heaven only knows how much more it will be.

Who is the head of it? I take it that Senators are thoroughly familiar with what happened to the American Labor Party about 5 or 6 weeks ago. That party was a creature of the Democratic Party, and we all know about that, but I am not going into it. It was created, though, for the purpose of carrying New York, and I think it was created in good faith. But we went too far. We put ourselves in the hands of the leftists, and the leftists captured the party, turned it over to their leader, Sidney Hillman, and Dean Alfange, who was a rightist leader, and their candidate for Governor, has denounced them. There is no question whatever about their being Communists. There is no question about the plan being precisely the same plan under which the great Government and great land of Russia was taken over. There is no doubt that it is going on. And they bring this thing forward here demanding it day after day from my constituents, innocent and perfectly harmless people, deceived by talk about poll taxes, when I know, and I am telling them, that the question here is not the question of poll taxes, but the question of the integrity of the Constitution and the disposition of the Congress and the American political parties to respect it. That is the size of it. That is what I am dealing with, and I intend to meet them, to meet them here, and to meet them on the hustings, and to meet them wherever else they may challenge the Constitution of the United States and the character of the American Republic.

I may say about the matter in passing that I could not possibly have any interest in a poll-tax controversy. I have lived in North Carolina now threescore years and ten and one, and I know something of its history. I was there when we had a poll-tax qualification. It is the most singular thing to me that there should be riotous or sentimental talk and agitation on that subject. The fundamental constitution of North Carolina required a man to pay all his taxes before he voted, and there was not any Negro question then. That was in 1775, and I took pains to read the old constitution the other day.

I like to think about the monument we have in North Carolina, and we have had it for 30 years, at the spot where Sherman dictated his terms, so generous that he was charged with throwing the victory away in the day of triumph, and so charged here in the United States Senate. Johnston signed in behalf of all the Confederate States except the State of Virginia. Lee surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia, but Johnston surrendered the Confederate Armies, and Sherman made way for the admission of the States into the Union. There where that great event occurred is a granite monument of two columns, and an arch uniting the two columns, and on the arch is engraven the one word "Unity." I speak in that spirit. I am not going to raise any sectional question here today. I am not going to raise any racial question here today. I am going to talk about the constitutional question, and I may talk a little about the political question before I conclude.

I want now to take the time to say something about Sherman. I read his life 4 or 5 years ago. I know he has been held up to the South as a great monster charged with burning in your State of South Carolina, Senator, and all that sort of thing. The terms of peace dictated by Sherman to Johnston were given to Sherman and Grant by Abraham Lincoln at Fortress Monroe in the month of January 1865, and the terms were generous. I remember what they were. Johnston's army and the Confederate Army were told to lay down their arms. The southern people were told to recognize the force and effect of the Emancipation Proclamation and come back into the Union. I take it that Senators know that those terms were so generous that a committee was appointed in the Senate to investigate Sherman, and General Grant, who was at Petersburg, went to my home city of Raleigh to straighten things out and after looking the situation over, and reading the terms, and seeing that they were the terms which Lincoln had advised at Fortress Monroe, said:

> General Sherman, you have made only one mistake. You permitted Johnston to sign first. It looks like he dictated the terms.

That was the only change made.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator like to suspend now?

Mr. BAILEY. I simply wish to get to this point, and then I shall yield.

Mr. President, what I am driving at is the fact that our State was under the direction of Federal troops in 1868, and General Canby, wearing the uniform of our country—not a Confederate, but a Federal—was in charge. He called the constitutional convention. Our people wrote a constitution. It was written in large measure by Albion Tourgee, who had come from the North, I think from Indiana, and who is known to fame as the author of A Fool's Errand. That constitution provided that no one in North Carolina could vote except upon the payment of a poll tax. Certainly no race question was raised by those men. They went there to do everything they could do for our colored friends. Certainly that was not any southern matter. That was the action of a legislature which was known as the "carpetbag legislature." I do not wish to offend my friends on the other side, but it is proper to point out that it was a Republican legislature. That legislature gave us that constitution. It was a good constitution. We changed it in some degree in 1875, but we did not strike out the poll-tax provision.

I will tell the Senate something that will interest Senators very much. I was on the constitution commission in 1914 to prepare amendments to the constitution. We had carried over from the reconstruction constitution the expression describing the Civil War as the War of the Rebellion. I took part in drafting an amendment to strike out the words "War of the Rebellion," and to insert the words "War between the States." The people of North Carolina voted down that amendment. They preferred to call the war the War of the Rebellion. I think that action was very much like them. They did not object to calling the war the War of the Rebellion.

However, in the year 1920 we did submit an amendment to the vote of our people. It was submitted by a Democratic legislature, at the instance of a Democratic Governor, the late Governor Bickett. When it was submitted, a vote was taken. The people voted to strike out the poll-tax qualification. We were not thinking then about the colored people. I like to call them "colored people," but if they want me to call them Negroes, I shall call them Negroes; I do not wish to offend. We were not thinking about white supremacy then, either. I was there; I was in that campaign. Democrats and Republicans joined in striking out the poll-tax qualification, in the year 1920, 24 years ago. I think the legislature was 90 percent Democratic. In the election the question was not one between Democrats and Republicans. The question was just one of the Constitution. The cry of "Negro" and the cry of "white supremacy" were never heard. I think those facts may throw some light on the situation.

Men are now saying that the passage of this bill may jeopardize white supremacy. It may, in their States; I will not dispute that fact with them. But it did not jeopardize it in North Carolina. We have had six elections since then. I have been elected to the Senate three times since then. It never gave me any trouble. It did not make any trouble between the races there. So, as I have thought about this question, I have been inclined to think that I could dismiss from my mind the race question, except for the fact that there are at least two, and probably more, associations or organizations in this country engaged in the miserable, professional business of agitating the Negro race. One of them, the best known of them all, is the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People. That institution is back of this legislation. Perhaps they do not know any better. I will not say as to that. But they are willing to assault the Constitution of the United States in order to stir up both the whites and the colored, the Caucasian and the Negro races in North Carolina, and the Communists are appealing to the Negroes throughout the South. They wish to get rid of the poll-tax qualification, because they have visions of leading hordes of ignorant people to the polls, and voting them to suit themselves.

Mr. President, but for those considerations I would be content on this occasion to argue altogether the constitutional question, notwithstanding that my friend the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has thoroughly covered it. But if I continue my remarks on tomorrow, I not only expect to deal with the constitutional question, but I also expect to deal with the political aspects of this assault on the Constitution and this conspiracy against the Democratic Party and our country. That is what I consider it. We intend to stop them, if we can, in the South. I hope they may be stopped in the North.

Sometimes I think about our Constitution and the patience of us southern Democrats, and I wonder whether the agitators of 3,000,000 Negroes in the North are more influential than the leaders of 30,000,000 white people in the South. I hear that this whole proceeding is to be followed by an effort in the Republican Party Convention in June and in the Democratic Party Convention in July to have each political party join in this assault on the Constitution.

I make no threats, but I shall simply say that when Sidney Hillman and the Communist crew in the name of the C. I. O. come into the doors or the windows of the party in which my father and I lived and served, I will go out. I intend that the Democratic Party shall be democratic and shall be faithful to the Constitution. When my party becomes a vehicle for the destruction of the Constitution of the United States, my choice is made. I am with the Constitution. I will keep my oath, and I will die in decency and self-respect.

Mr. President, I look upon this proposal as an invitation to the Congress to strike down the Constitution and to assert its power, notwithstanding the plain language of the instrument itself and the repeated decisions of the Supreme Court. I look upon it as the precursor of a situation, first in the Republican National Convention, and next in the Democratic National Convention, in which the delegates will either have to stand up and say that they support a political platform which negatives, overrides, and overthrows the Constitution of the United States, or will have to stand and fight to the bitter end.

Mr. President, I have spoken for about 35 minutes. It is now 20 minutes to 5.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator, I hope the Senate may take a recess at this time. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the recess, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] be permitted to continue his remarks tomorrow without any intervening points of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Several officers for temporary appointment as general officers in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Public Lands an Surveys:

Clarence L. Forsling, of Utah, to be Director of Grazing, vice Richard H. Rutledge, resigned.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTER NOMINATION PASSED OVER—ADVERSE REPORT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Patrick J. McGrath to be postmaster at Bayonne, N. J., which nomination had been adversely reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS—FAVORABLE REPORTS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the remaining nominations of postmasters, favorably reported, be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations favorably reported are confirmed en bloc.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, these are the nominations of the graduating class. I ask that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Coast Guard nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 9, 1944:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Lorne G. Taylor to be aide, with relative rank of ensign, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM APRIL 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Alfred Schrieber Balsam, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Howard Donnelly, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Nicholas Robinson, Infantry (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Thomas James Hanley, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Jacob John Gerhardt, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Leo Andrew Walton, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM APRIL 21, 1944

Lt. Col. Ralph Pittman Cousins, Air Corps (temporary major general).

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM MAY 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Finley, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Vernon Edwin Prichard, Field Artillery (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Adlai Howard Gilkeson, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Richard Carlton Stickney, Infantry (temporary colonel).

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 7th day of June 1944:

Kenneth V. Adams
Paul A. Adams
Will M. Adams, Jr.
Homer R. Adrianse
Dickson W. Alderton
Claude M. Alexander, Jr.
Richard G. Alexander
John K. Allison
Paul F. Allmendinger
Vincent J. Anania
Vernon F. Anderson
Henry O. Anson, Jr.
Keith J. Arthur
Theodore C. Ashley
George H. Asman
Curtis Atherton
Wilton L. Atkinson
Robert B. Atwell
Robert R. Axelson
Dean L. Axene
Henry L. Bagby
Edwin C. Bain, Jr.
Edward McN. Bain
John H. Baldwin, Jr.
Robert B. Baldwin
Frank J. Barber
Willis C. Barnes
William E. Barnes
Robert C. Barnhart, Jr.
Robert G. Barnhart
Forrest O. Barr
Ernest R. Barrett
John C. Barron
David C. Barry
Searle J. Barry
Joe A. Barton
Wade R. Bascom
John T. Batte
Horace L. Bayless
John T. Beahan
Robert B. Bear
William J. Beardsley
Clark L. Beck
Merlin D. Becker
Louis M. Beckstead
Peter G. Beierl
Lloyd F. Bell
William S. Benson 2d
William A. Berger
Alf E. Bergesen
Clifford P. Bermann
Douglas C. Berry
Fred T. Berry
Norman B. Bessac
Alfred C. Bessette
Guy "A" Best
Robert B. Billings
Rudolph V. Biordi
Raymond H. Bitney, Jr.
Carvel H. Blair
Bernard E. Blankenbush, Jr.
Clark O. Bloom
Robert C. Blount
Frederick E. Blum
Howard E. Blum
James K. Boak
John P. Bock
John H. Boelens
Joseph F. Bolger, Jr.
William G. J. Bolger
Joseph E. Bonds
Willard R. Bonwit
James T. Boone
Frederick W. Botts, Jr.
Charles S. Bowcock, Jr.
William A. Bowes
Roland T. E. Bowler, Jr.
James F. Bradley, Jr.
Peter R. Braginton
Joseph P. Brantley, Jr.
Toria J. Bratten, Jr.
James F. Braun
Charles N. Brennecke
Fred E. Brenner, Jr.
Robert W. Brightman
Arthur B. Bristow, Jr.
William DeR. Brotherton, Jr.
Burton J. Brown
George C. Brown, Jr.
John E. Brown, Jr.
John W. Brown 4th
LaVerne W. Brown, Jr.
Willis I. Brown
Earl L. Bruner
Clarence R. Bryan
Joseph S. Bryan, Jr.
Olney J. Bryant
Tom A. Bryce
William L. Bryson
Aubrey L. Buck, Jr.
Robert M. Buck
Howard Bucknell 3d
Nicholas Burde, Jr.
Paul F. Burdett
Boyd B. Burnquist
Leonard "M" Bush
Thomas A. Bush, Jr.
Samuel T. Bussey
Charles S. Byrne
John K. Cabaniss
John D. Callahan
Steven W. Callaway, Jr.
Joseph M. Camp
Richard J. Campbell
William R. Campbell, Jr.
Edward S. Caple, Jr.
Eugene S. Captain
Donald B. Carpenter
William Carrier, Jr.
John A. Carroll
Creston W. Cathcart
William F. Chaires
Kenneth W. Chambers
Albert B. Channell
John W. Chapman
John R. Chappell
John M. Charles
William R. Chester
Edward A. Christofferson, Jr.
Louis G. Chrysler, Jr.
Frank W. Church 2d
Robert J. Clancey
Paul Clapp
Daniel C. Clements
Frank F. Clifford, Jr.
Robert A. Close
Calvin H. Cobb, Jr.
Jesse B. Cobb
James T. Cockrill 2d
George W. Cogswell
William W. Coldwell
John C. Cole, Jr.
James O. Cole
Warren R. Colegrove
Edward P. Coleman
Malcolm S Collin
Joseph Colton
Ted H. Colvin
Edward W. Conklin
Wiley V. Conover
Paul V Converse
Langdon A. Cook, Jr.
Richard J. Cooke
Samuel M. Cooley, Jr.
Alfred Copeland
Frank B. Correia
Robert O Coulthard
William D. Counts
John W. Cox
Lyle A. Cox
"W" Loron Cranney, Jr.
William B. Crawley
William P. Crenshaw
Michael J. Crimmins
Frederick B. Crow
Lawrence R. Crum
John P. Cullen
Robert M. Cummins
Bruce A. Cunningham
Robert G. Curley
Thomas J. Curley, Jr.
Donald C. Curran
Donald P. Curtis
Robert H. Curtis
John J. Daly
Allen M. Dame
Royal T. Daniel, Jr.
Scott C. Daubin
Hubbell Y. Davidson
Harry Davis
Roy G. Davis
Shethar Davis
James H. Dawley, Jr.
Benjamin H. Dean
Benton W. Decker, Jr.
Walter Dedrick
John A. DeGrazier
Robert J. Delaney
Walter S. DeLany, Jr.
Robert Delgado
Phaon B. Derr, Jr.
Benjamin T. Dibble
Walter N. Dietzen, Jr.
John M. Dinwiddie
Anthony J. DiVito
Raymond E. Dix
Eugene F. Dmuchowski
Joseph J. Doak, Jr.
Robert D. Dobbin
Charles E. W. Dobbs
Rodney H. Dobson
Charles F. Donaghy
Robert D. Donavan
Gerard A. Donohue
Robert M. Donovan
Edward H. Doolin, Jr.
Robert W. Dosien
William A. Doubt
Robert G. Douglas
Addison H. Douglass
Harry B. Doyle, Jr.
Sherman F. Drake
John Duff, Jr.
Albert R. Dunn
Walter H. Dunnican
Richard J. Dzikowski
John C. Eakin
Howard D. Earl
John D. Eaton
William G. Eaton, Jr.
Ralph H. Eder
Donald B. Edge
Leroy S. Edmonds
Robert A. Eidson
Charles J. Elkins, Jr.
Vernon H. Ellenberger
Ralph E. Ellenbrand
Edward M. Elliott
Paul M. Elliott, Jr.
George F. Ellis, Jr.
Richard H. Engelmann
Harry A. Englehart, Jr.
George P. Eppes
Philip M. Erickson, Jr.
George A. Eriksen
Kenneth B. Erken Brack, Jr.
Morris A Esmiol, Jr.
George G. Evans
Orville C. Everhart, Jr.
Frank W. Ewald
Robert H. Ewing
James M. Faddis
Charles F. Fadeley
John L. Faig
Robert F. Falardeau
William E. Fannin
Crumpton Farrell
Franklyn E. Farris
Richard C. Fay
Robert W. Ferrin
Theodore R. Fick
Lee B. Findly
George T. Finnegan, Jr
Lowell F. Fitch
George L. Fitchett
Jack S. Flanagan
James B. Fleming
William J. Flynn
Bernard B. Forbes, Jr.
Madison W. Forman, Jr
John J. Forrest
James W. Forrester
Robert M. Fortson, Jr.
Vincent F. H. Foster
George R. Froyd
Marius Fuselier, Jr.
George H. Gaffney
Philroy C. Gale, Jr.
James G. Gallemore
Nelson J. Gambrill
George S. Gatter
Grady R. Gay
James R. Gayle
Gilbert C. Gayler
Anson D. Geiger
Walter R. Gerich
John R. Gilbert
John T. Gilfillan, Jr.
John A. Gillcrist
John F. Gillooly
Francis M. Gilman 2d
Allen J. Gilmore
Jules H. Gleberman
John J. Glynn
Walter H. Godshall
Frederick S. Gore
Samuel G. Gorsline, Jr.
Calvin R. Gossett
Patrick W. Gowan
Charles F. Grad
William A. Graham
William L. Graham
Eugene A. Gralla
William A. Gray
Dewitt A. Graybill
Robert B. Greeley
James R. Green
Valentine Grey
Thomas P. Griest
Gordon Griffin, Jr.
John L. Griffin, Jr.
George P. Griffith
Carl W. Gronemann, Jr.
Daniel F. Groth
Frank L. Haines
John B. Haines
Robert R. Hale
Donald W. Hall
Edward A. Hall
Harold W Hall
James J. Hall
Arthur Halsted, Jr.
James W. Hamburg
George A. Hamilton
John G. Hammer
Patrick "J" Hannifin
Jens B. Hansen
Wilmer E. Hansen
George K. Harding
Richard Hardy
George M. D. Hart
Harvey C. Hartzel
Phillip S. Harward
Harrison F. Hassenplug
Edward E. Hastings 2d
Robert S. Hayes
Robert V. Hayes
William B. Hayler
George M Hecker
Arthur D. Heinze
Stephen W. Heller
James I. Hemphill
William B. Henderson
William G. Henderson
James B. Hennegan
Josiah Henson
Everett W. Herman
Robert W. Herrick
Richard D. Hertzig
John D. Hicks
Joseph H. Hildebrand
Donald P. Hill
Edward T. Hill
John F. Hill
Ralph A. Hilson
Donald O. Hineman
Arnold J. Hirsch
Stanley M. Hirsch
Milton J. Hirshberg
Edward G. Hoch
Richard S. Hodsdon
Julian F. Hoedtke
Harold Hoffer
Donald P. Hoffmann
Robert A. Hogsed
William H. Hoover
Gordon R. Hopwood
John P. Horgan, Jr.
John O. Horn
Larry E. Horner
Allen R. Howard, Jr.
George M. Howard
William B. Huckabee
William B. Huckenpoehler, Jr.
George H. Hughey, Jr.
Hillis D. Hume
Jo A. Humes
Paul K. Hunt
Clifford E. Hunter
Peter A. Hustad, Jr.
James T. Ingram
Lee V. Irvin, Jr.
Cameron Ives
Thomas K. Ives
Grover C. Jackson
Lamb D. Jameson
Charles W. Jarvis
William Jenkins, Jr.
George O. Jennings
Pierce A. Jensen, Jr.
Charles D. Jewell, Jr.
Gerald M. Johnson
Howard T. Johnson
John R. Johnson
John V. Johnson
Theodore L. Johnson
Ted S. Johnson
William H. Johnson, Jr.
Philip D. Johnston, Jr.
Roe H. Johnston
Thomas W. Johnston
Roy K. Jones, 2d
Raymond C. Jordan
Richard E. Jortberg
Charles R. Joyce
Alexander Julian, Jr.
John F. Kalina
Michael J Kane
Robert I. Kasten
Robert T. Kavanagh
Robert L. Kays
Arthur K Keevil
Frederick J. Kelley
James W. Kelley
Merrill E. Kelly, Jr.
Donald W. Kennedy
James S. Kennedy
Alex A. Kerr
Claude E. Kerr
Richard J. Kessler
John D. Kidd
Loyd J. Kiernan, Jr.
Keith W Kimball
Ernest J. King, Jr.
Evans P. K. King
John J. King
Stanley R. King
William A. Kinnaman
Robert Kirk
William C. Kistler
Francis T. Kleber
William H. Kmetz
Victor R. Knick
Robert M. Knowles
John T. Knudsen
Irving H. Knudson, Jr.
David Kraushaar
James A. Krecek
David A. Kribs, Jr.
George R. Kritzer
Lloyd E. Kuhnmuench
John F. Kurfess
Edward F. Ladd
Foster M. Lalor, Jr.
Burris D. LaMar
Frederick H. Lamartin, Jr.
Harold M. Lamb
Benjamin J. Lampert
Douglas E. Landreth
William D. Lane

Allan T. Larkins, Jr.
Miles B. Larson
Robert J. Lauer
Hallett T. Lawrence
James K. Lawrence
Walter E. Lawson, Jr.
Morris H. Lax
Stephen L. Layton
Eben Leavitt, Jr.
Paul M. Leavy, Jr.
Julien J. LeBourgeois
Richard H. Lee
Bertram M. Leecraft, Jr.
Arthur E. Levy
David P. Levy
Albert C. Lewis
William Charles Lewis
William Clarence Lewis
William L. Lewis
Clifford R. Linker
Ralph G. Lipfert
Floyd K. Lissy
Clifford C. Lockwood
Richard D. Loel
Edward H. Loftin, Jr.
Donald J. Logie
Jack London, Jr.
John N. Longfield
David M. Longton
John E. Losure
John C. Loveday
Hugh H. Lowery
John A. Lusby
Luke D. J. Lynch
Thomas C. Lynch
Thomas H. Lyons
Clarence L. MacEwan, Jr.
William J. MacGuire
Robert B. Mack
Douglas S. Mackay
Thomas W. Madigan
Eugene Mahan
Jack M. Manherz
Robert B. Manley
David C. Manning
Frank H. Markle, Jr.
De n K. Marquardt
Albert R. Marschall
Drexel R. Martin
Ronald L. Martin
Joseph O. Marzluff
Eugene M. Masica
Hugh C. Mason
James C. Masters, Jr.
James C. Matheson
Robert E. May
Alan G. Mayer
Bill W. Mayer
Henry T. Mayo 2d
John K. McAdams
Edward F. McCartan
Robert T. P. McCarthy
James M. McCaskill
Wesley J. McClaren
Stephen H. McClintic
Richard M. McCool, Jr
Stanley R. McCord
Robert D. McCrary
William L. McCulloch
Robert J. McDevitt
Lewin S. McDonald, Jr.
Evan J. McDowell
William V. McGalliard
William J. McGarry, Jr.
Douglas E. McIntyre
John F. McLain
William H. McLaughlin, Jr.
John T. McMenamin
Thomas McNiff, Jr.
Howard D. McPike
Thomas M. McQuilling
Alvin L. Meints
Robert H. Merrick, Jr.
Joe L. Midgett
Harry L. Milhan
William W. K. Miller, Jr.
Mason DeM. Milliken
Herbert F. Mills, Jr.
Jerry McG. Mills
Cleo N. Mitchell, Jr.
Sidney Mogiewer
James W. Montgomery
Albert C. Moore
Charles K. Moore
Joseph E. Moore 3d
Robert F. Moore
Joe P. Moorer
Edward H. Morgan
Clyde O. Morrison
John W. Morrow
Cornelius F. Moul
Harold C. Moynelo, Jr.
Walter W. Mulbry, Jr.
John Mullen, Jr.
Roger H. Mullins
Karl O. Munninger
Theodore E. Munson
Hugh D. Murphree
Robert J. Murphy
Thomas A. Murphy
Mervin R. Myhra
James W Nance
Anthony A. Natoniewski
Spencer K. Neale
Wayne S. Nelson
Franklin H. Nepo
Richard Neudorffer
Robert G. Newby
Harry Newman
Grant A. Nisbet
William T. Noll
John R. North
Hassell L. Norton
Paul L. Nuschke
Henry N. Oates
James A. O'Brien
Rufus L. Oden
Lyle D. Oder
Herbert L. Ogier, Jr.
Daniel A. Oliver, Jr.
Raymond B. Oliver
Alfred R. Olsen, Jr.
James M. O'Malley
James F. O'Neil
Warren H. O'Neil
Maurice C. Orbeton, Jr.
Gerald G. O'Rourke
George A. O'Shea, Jr.
Ellsworth M. Ostrom, Jr.
Francis A. Packer, Jr.
Morris A. Packer
John B. Padgett, Jr.
Alexander A. Padis
William P. Page
Gregory Panawek
John F. Paolantonio
Everett A. Parke
Robert L. Parker
Jack A. Pate
David H. Paul
Leonard R. Pavelka
John E. Pearce, Jr.
Scott E. Peck, Jr.
George P. Peed
Peter R. Perkins
Chester N. Perry, Jr.
Emmett K. Perryman, Jr.
John V. Peters
Christian C. Petersen
Forrest S. Petersen
Willard F. Petrat
Charles T. Phillips, Jr.
Frank R. Pinto, Jr.
John J. Pirro
William G. Pledger
Bruce W. Plomasen
Donald T. Poe
Robert R. Polk
Thomas H. Polk
Herbert "R" Poorman
John R. Potter
Cheves B. Powell
Jack M. Pressler
John M. Prewitt
John N. Price
Howard W. Prier
Charles Priest, Jr.
Randell H. Prothro
Gene H. Pryor
Paul B. Puckett
Robert W. Puddicombe
Paul V. Purkrabek
Woodford M. Rand
Craig E. Randall
Gordon T. Randall
Beverley Randolph
Bruce H. Rankin
James M. Ravenel
Frank T. Rawlings, Jr.
Elbert S. Rawls, Jr.
Paul G. Rea
Arthur G. Red
Edward T. Redden
John H Reed
Wallace M Regets
James A. Reid
Alexander K. Rentschler
Gerald F. Rester
Robert D. Reynolds
Thomas C. Reynolds, Jr.
John W. Rhinesmith
Donald R. Richards
James R. Richardson
John F. Riley
Ralph R. Riley
William F. J. Riordan
Farrell E. Roberts
Edward J. Robeson 3d
Donald E. Rockwell, Jr.
William C. Roeder
Benjamin C. Rogers, Jr.
Sam Rorex, Jr.
Walter S. Rose
Charles E. Roth, Jr.
Edmund C. Rowan, Jr.
Russell J. Rowson
Bryce E. Royalty
Richard E. Rumble
Max R. Rush
Leroy L. Ryan, Jr.
Emil Saroch, Jr.
David McK. Saunders
Alfred A. Sawyer
Robert A. Scherrer
Louis B. Schmeltzer
Thomas G. Schofield
John W. Schriever, Jr.
Joseph H. Schroeder
Quinley R. Schulz
Joseph E. Schwager
Walter W. Schwartz, Jr.
Louis G. Sclaris
Henry H. Searls, Jr.
Frank A. Seelaus
Milton W. Seiler
Samuel W. Selfridge, Jr.
William "H" Sells
Floyd B. Sessions
Cameron Sevier, Jr.
Wilson M. Shafer, Jr.
Larry E. Shaffer, Jr.
John C. Shaw
Robert J. Shaw
Francis L. Sheahen
Joseph F. Sheehan
Doniphan B. Shelton
Alan B. Shepard, Jr.
William B. Shepard, Jr.
Robert O. Sherman
Richard M. Shively, Jr.
Clayton H. Shoemaker
Grover C. Shropshire
Paul N. Shulman
William P. Shuman, Jr.
Philip R Shutt
William A. Siegrist
Henderson G. Silliman
Lawrence T. Simmelink
Foster N. Simonsen
Wilbur N. Sims
Henderson "E" Six
Allan P. Slaff
James A. Smith
John McC. Smith
Lawrence N. Smith
Martin H. Snead
Baird Snyder, Jr.
Joseph E. Snyder, Jr.
Joseph M. Snyder, Jr.
Charles G. Sobel
Arnold P. Sorenson
Dale S. Soulek
Eugene H. Spangler
John B. Spencer, Jr.
Franklynn R. Sperberg
Phillip E. Sperry
William B. Sprague
Robert F. Stanton
Charles E. Starns, Jr.
Beverly deP. Staser
Harry A. Stebner, Jr.
George P. Steele 2d.
Robert D. Steele
Lucius E. Steere 3d.
Ralph W. Stell, Jr.
Henry E. Stephens
Clarence B. Stephenson
William B. Stephenson
William V. Steuteville
William W. Stevens
Earle L. Stewart
William S. Stewart 3d.
Wayne D. Stinnett
Graydon T Stout
James A. Strand
William W. Strong
William C. Sturgeon 2d.
Tom E. Sulick
John L. Sullivan, Jr.
George W. Summers
Gustav F. Swainson, Jr.
Chandler E. Swallow, Jr.
John A. Swank
Robert A. Swensen
Robert J. Tartre
Arnett B. Taylor
Harold A. Taylor
Lewis J. Taylor, Jr.
Thaddeus M. Taylor
Warren Taylor
Walter N. Temple
Richard E. Tenney
Homer B. Thomas, Jr.
Max E. Thompson
Robert C. Thomsen
Walker G. Thorsby
James G. Townsley
Wilbur C. Trautman, Jr.
William J. Traynor
Mark G. Tremaine
Harold J. Trueblood
Milton "J" Turner
Edward B. Uhler
Frederick A. Ulam, Jr.
Howard J. Ursettie
Thomas F. Utegaard
Sumner A. Vale
Merton D. Van Orden
Willis B. Van Oss
Victor M. Vissering, Jr.
Ralph L. Volk, Jr
Merrill E. Wagner
Theodore A. Wagner, Jr.
John R. Walker 3d.
Luther B. Wallace
Eslie D. Walls
John L. Walters
David E. Ward
Allen S. Waters
Robert M. Waters
Ernest A. Watkins
Fred C. Watson
Robert H. Watson, Jr.
Marion S. Webb, Jr.
George H. Webster
Harold A. Webster, Jr.
John F. Wester
Blair H. Wetzel
Felix H. Wheeler
James H. Wheeler, Jr.
James J. Whetton
Edward C. White
John D. White
William H. White, Jr.
Charles E. Whiteside
John W. Wicks
Hiram E. Widener, Jr.
James R. Wiggins
Lawrence A. Wilder
Tracy H. Wilder, Jr.
John R. Wilhelm
Harlan D. Williams
John P. Williams
Lawrence E. Williams, Jr.
Robert B. Williams
Robert D. Williams
William A. Williams
William C. Williams
Dick G. Wilson
Edward P. Wilson, Jr.
Joe R. Wilson
Robert G. Wilson
Ronald O. Wilson
Kenneth W. Wingate
John P. Wise
Forwood C. Wiser, Jr.
Chester E. Wood
Robert C. Wood
George C. Woolley
Joseph A. Wooten, Jr.
Sydney J. Wynne, Jr.
Rice P. York
Ben W. Young
Robert D. Young
Frank B. Zanazzi, Jr.
Lando W. Zech, Jr.
William T. Zeigler
Edward F. Zenisk
Donald H. Ziebell
Daniel M. Zinn

The following-named midshipmen to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 7th day of June 1944:

Raymond H. Bates
Edward E. Beasley
William S. Berkshire, Jr.
Keith W. Bexten
Sherman W. Blandin, Jr.
John J. Bock
Harold Boswell
Richard K. M. Bridges, Jr.
Zack F. Brown, Jr.
Edward L. Cochrane, Jr.
William W. Collier
James J. Conlin, Jr.
Clarence A. Creel
Philip Crosby
Hugh L. Culbreath, Jr.
Oscar N. Dale
Maurice P. Donnelly
Robert J. Fabrizio
William P. Ferguson
Charles A. Gardner, Jr.
Elmon A. Geneste, Jr.
Robert W. Hanwell
William L. Harritt
James I. Hightower, Jr.
Earle F. James
Louie B. Knudsen, Jr.
Charles E. Kridle
John W. Lipscomb, Jr.
Kenneth W. Longnecker
Harry R. Luebbe
Lester G. Maxwell
Gerald J. Patton
Henry A. R. Peyton
Robert C. Porter
Howard L. Rezner
Rodney Rose
Edward S. Ruete
Robert A. Schauffler
Samuel R. Simpson, Jr.
Frank L. Spillman, Jr.
Alfred J. Staubitz
David H. Weaver
Joe J. Wilcox
Ben C. Williams, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of June 1944:

Walker G. Bennett 2d
Albert W. Blackburn
Donald H. Brooks
Henry L. Claterbos
William P Cosgrove
John W. Cummins
Robert N. Davis
Arthur C. Day
William F Doehler
Eugene B. Fallon
Thomas E. Gleason
Conrad S. Grove, Jr.
Frederic A. Hale, Jr.
Joseph F. Holzbauer
Burton L. Lucas, Jr.
Charles E. McBride
Joseph J. McGuire
Roy H Miller
Charles D. Mize
George J O'Shea
Marion E. Price
Palmer H Rixey
Horton E. Roeder
James M. Sherwood
William R Skinner
Arthur L. Snyder
Lawrence V. M. Wickham
Lloyd K. Wyatt, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 9, 1944:

COAST GUARD

TO BE ENSIGNS, TO RANK FROM JUNE 7, 1944

Homer George Anderson
Richard Paul Arlander
John Moore Austin
Richard Lawrence Bailey, Jr.

Frank Barnett, Jr.
Carl Blanchett
Robert Coward Boardman
William Henry Boswell
Peter Seelye Branson
Alfred William Brass
William Henry Brinkmeyer
Bernard Stanley Brown
James Wood Carroll
Parker Olin Chapman
Garth Dalmayne Clizbe
Clyde Clavius Coffindaffer
Henry Paine Crawford, Jr.
Donald Brian Crews
Charles Mitchell Daniel
Harold Leroy Davison
John Mac Neil Dempsey, Jr.
John Augustine Devlin, Jr.
Harley Earl Dilcher
Sumner Raymond Dolber
Robert John Donovan
John Michael Dorsey
James Harold Durfee
Clarence Raymond Easter
Albert Bradbury Ellerman
Joseph Knowles Everton
John Joseph Fehrenbacher
Arthur Andre Fontaine
Louis Randolph Ford, Jr.
John Bradley Freeman
William Elliott Fuller, Jr.
Carroll Hitchcock George
Harold Kirksey Goodbread
Richard William Goode
Herbert Richard Harris
James Leonard Harrison
Gordon Fairland Hempton
Robert Fisher Henderson
Frederick William Hermes, Jr.
James Arthur Hodgman
Julian Elliott Johansen
Robert Durrell Johnson
Harry New Jones 2d
Kenneth Howard Langenbeck
John Burton Lape, Jr.
Elmer Maurice Lipsey
Richard Suppes Lodge
Paul Alan Lutz
Worley Berry Lynn
James Thomas Maher
William Lothridge Martin
Andrew Mazzotta
John David McCann
Albert Joseph McCullough
Milton Lee McGregor
Edward Duncan Middleton, Jr.
Joseph Anthony Montagna
James Edward Murphy
William Emmet Murphy
Earl Asa Parker, Jr.
Raymond Grant Parks, Jr.
Paul Reed Peak, Jr.
Paul Powers Perez
Lilbourn Amos Pharris, Jr.
Robert Carlton Phillips
Vance King Randle, Jr.
Theodore Charles Rapalus
David Harold Rasmussen
Ricardo Allen Ratti
Don Richard Rodgers
Donald Henry Rollert
Paul Thomas Ryan
Marion Gardiner Shrode, Jr.
Harrison Ballard Smith
Neilus Andrew Spears, Jr.
Raymond Benner Starbuck
Jeremiah Milton Stark
Richard Stoner Strickler
George Francis Thometz, Jr.
Wesley Matthew Thorsson
John Bollyard Wade
George Warren Wagner
William Hamilton Wallace
George Alfred Warren
David Anderson Webb
William Leroy Weiss, Jr.
George Herbert Weller
George Earnest Williams
Ellsworth Albin Winnette
Andrew Wakefield Wofford
Virgil Nourse Woolfolk, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Jeanette Mae Collins, Dateland.

CALIFORNIA

Roy A. Smith, Eldridge.
Kenneth Baird Haslam, Firebaugh.
Robert E. Meacham, Hermosa Beach.
Eva L. Fowler, Kelseyville.
Lawrence P. Comerford, Lincoln Acres.
Sadie L. Diaz, San Marcos.
Llewellyn B. Peck, Saratoga.
Wanda L. Stark, Tulelake.

DELAWARE

Mary S. Bell, Smyrna.

GEORGIA

J. Heard Summerour, Duluth.
Ruth G. Dixon, Girard.
Wilma G. Cook, Parrott.

ILLINOIS

Nigel B. Herrin, Cave in Rock.
Roll E. Gibbs, Clayton.
Earl D. Husted, Cornell.
Margaret W. Irish, Farina.
Myrtle Wilkison, Glen Carbon.
Mary Ruth Shine, Glenwood.
John L. Zimmerman, Hinsdale.
Wendell A. Stotler, Hudson.
Mary H. Cofey, Maple Park.
Hugh James, Montrose.
James D. Cook, Mulkeytown.
Lewis R. Wall, New Douglas.
Albert W. Schurg, Pesotum.
Charles E. Lowry, Philo.
Samuel W. Brown, Ringwood.
Jacob H. Michel, West Brooklyn.

INDIANA

Mary E. Wade, Wilkinson.

IOWA

George O. Friedrichsen, Alvord.
Anton C. Rank, Buffalo Center.
Emma M. Jochimsen, Callender.
William H. Meshek, Dedham.
Eva M. Anderson, Fremont.
Ida E. Heffernen, Peosta.
John R. Shebek, Riverside.
Alice B. Dougherty, Sheldon.

MINNESOTA

Ralph B. Dingmann, Clear Lake.
Cora E. Albright, Lengby.
Leonard J. Hintzen, Miltona.

MISSISSIPPI

Lewis F. Henry, Carthage.
Mary S. Herron, Courtland.
J. Wood Sartin, Jayess.
Virgil L. Harrington, Merigold.

MONTANA

E. Warren Toole, Great Falls.

NEBRASKA

Tim N. Cannon, Juniata.
Austin E. Scott, Mitchell.

NEW MEXICO

Mary J. Kemp, Reserve.

NEW YORK

Gertrude L. Rigaud, Oriskany Falls.
D. L. Palmer, Otego.
George Buechel, Patterson.
Margaret T. Kennedy, Salisbury Mills.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ernie A. Neese, Cottageville.

VIRGINIA

William M. Upshur, Jr., Cheriton.
Minnie J. Davis, Church Road.
Oscar M. Buchanan, Kenbridge.
Berkeley B. Baker, Lovettsville.
Charles C. Kenny, Upperville.

WASHINGTON

Helen G. Anderson, Union.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose all-enfolding love and mercy hold and guide through every eclipse of life, give us minds intent on pleasing Thee. As our station marks us with distinct obligation, we pray for help to weigh all questions by the rule of love and righteousness. Let the windows of our minds be "broad inward"—judging and watching ourselves lest our courage be presumption and our honesty expediency. Wait, O Father, at the doors of our hearts that the vision of our Master may direct us to the uttermost.

O Divine One, build in us an ideal like unto Thine, so generous, free of evil tendencies which would render us careless of the responsibilities of our vocation. We pray that the Congress may vindicate the sanctity and justice of humanity and make democratic form of government honorable, and strengthen the hands of all true patriots throughout this appealing world. If the sword and fire must come, let them cut the bonds of oppression and iniquity; allow not a passion of unrestrained enthusiasm to rise in the soul of the public. O keep in our memory the age-old truth that all men are brothers, the sinners and the sinned against; binding up the wounds, rather than kindling the fires of war; let our administration of the peace not be in wrath and revenge but allied with broad and wise understanding. In the name of Him who hath dealt bountifully with us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters; and

H. R. 4254. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1758. An act to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Govern-

ment," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.

MORE FOOD WASTE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1565) relating to the appointment of postmasters, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 11, after "relegated", insert "; and any postmaster or acting postmaster of the fourth or third class who has passed a civil-service examination at any time and has given service satisfactory to the Department may be reappointed without further civil-service examination."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform us as to the nature of this amendment?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It is a clarifying amendment to H. R. 1565.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How does it clarify it?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. We passed a bill here by which a postmaster of the third class, if his office is relegated to the fourth class, might be appointed by the Postmaster General without taking a reexamination; also, if the office is advanced from the fourth to the third class, he would be exempt from a civil-service examination. The Senate decided it was necessary that this matter be clarified.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This simply means that in a shift from one class to another a new examination is not required?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It is not required if they have passed a civil-service examination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the Rhode Island General Assembly a few days ago adopted a model soldiers' vote bill. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a digest of the legislation prepared by the chairman of the board of elections.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a review of the book entitled "T. V. A.—Democracy on the March."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago in this House we voted to discontinue Federal assistance to the school-lunch program throughout this Nation. I believed at that time, and I still believe, that this action was most unfortunate. Throughout America there are thousands upon thousands of school children who are underfed, and to whom the school-lunch program, inadequate as it was in many instances, was truly the bright spot in the day. Despite the general rise in our national income, thousands of families have relatively less than ever before, and the need for Federal aid to States and communities to continue the school-lunch program is as great, if not greater, than it has ever been. Because many mothers are employed in war industries, an increasing number of children are coming to school with an inadequate breakfast and without any provision whatsoever for lunch or with one that has been poorly selected. Transportation, rationing, and other wartime difficulties have complicated the problem still further. Without financial aid from the Federal Government, comparatively few schools can provide noon lunches for all children needing them.

Not only from my own congressional district but from all over the country have been coming earnest requests that legislation be enacted to provide for an adequate school-lunch program as an integral part of the services of our school system. Parent-teacher associations, community councils, and many other organizations vitally interested in the health of our future citizens are urging such action. To this end I am introducing today into this House a bill designed to meet this need, one which I hope will not only provide for a continued lunch program, but one which will be administratively sound from an educational standpoint. I earnestly request that my colleagues study this proposed bill, and sincerely hope that it will meet with speedy, favorable action on the part of this body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me before the American Federation of Physically Handicapped last January in Buffalo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I made last Friday night over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers have carried the story in the recent issues that General Hershey, the head of the Selective Service System, has again changed the rule regarding the induction of our men and boys into the Army. These rules and regulations have been changed so often, and without any regard to the welfare of the boys, that no one can keep pace with what those rules and regulations are. Our boys, subject to the draft, are unable to know what their status is. They cannot plan for the future. They are kept in constant confusion regarding their plans.

I am confident these men and boys, who are subject to the draft, would be unable to keep up with the sudden changes if they would purchase and read a morning, noon, and night edition of the daily papers. This constant changing of the regulations regarding the drafting of our boys should be stopped. A reasonable rule should be established and it should be retained. Our boys are entitled to know in advance what is in

store for them in the future. Under this plan of constantly changing the rules, they are kept in a state of uncertainty and in utter confusion. They should not be continued. Our boys are entitled to know what their fate is without confusion and uncertainty entering into their problem. It is high time to inject some good sound policies into the rules of the Selective Service System.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief survey of a recent election poll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials on the Montgomery Ward case.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

THE ARABIAN PIPE LINE—A PROPOSED VENTURE INTO IMPERIALISM

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the service activities of the Disabled American Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the president of the National Fire Protection Association in Philadelphia on May 8.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection?

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Constantine Brown entitled "This Changing World," that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 6, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE LATE THOMAS H. BALL

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House the passing on yesterday of a distinguished Texan, a former Member of this House, Col. Thomas H. Ball, of Houston. Colonel Ball was 85 years old when he passed away. He lived a long and useful life. Not only has the State of Texas lost one of its outstanding citizens but the Nation has suffered a loss. Colonel Ball served in the House from 1897 to 1903. This short sketch of his life indicates his outstanding and various talents:

Thomas Henry Ball, a Representative from Texas; born in Huntsville, Walker County, Tex., January 14, 1859; attended private schools and was graduated from Austin College, Sherman, Tex., in 1876; studied law at the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, Va.; was admitted to the bar in 1886, and commenced practice in Huntsville, Tex.; mayor of Huntsville, 1887-93; chairman of the Democratic executive committee of Walker County, 1884-96; delegate to all State conventions from 1886 to 1924 with three exceptions; delegate to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago in 1892, and at New York City in 1924; elected as a Democrat to the Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh, and Fifty-eighth Congresses and served from March 4, 1897, to November 16, 1903, when he resigned; resumed the practice of his profession; general counsel for the State council of defense during the World War; was employed as general counsel for the port commission of the Houston harbor and ship channel, and was a resident of Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I intend to make today excerpts from two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RESERVOIRS, LEVEES, AND FLOOD WALLS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill H. R. 4485, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this act, except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the War Department of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the required cooperation will be furnished.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, there is a growing conviction among a large part of our population, as well as a good many Members of Congress, that the administration is playing politics with food. Either this is true or a top-heavy bureaucracy is responsible for the delays that have taken place in removing canned vegetables and meats from rationing.

During last December and January it is reported that both the Office of Price Administration and a large trade association made a careful survey of the quantities of home-canned goods on pantry shelves and the quantities on the retailers' shelves throughout the country. It was known at that time that cannery warehouses were filled to overflowing with last year's packs, particularly of canned vegetables. There is no known reason why rationing of these canned goods should not have been discontinued at that time.

Similarly, governmental authorities knew many months ago just what the supply situation of livestock was. So far as I have been able to ascertain, there has been no marked change in the supply situation of livestock between January 1 and the present time. On the contrary, information I have been able to obtain indicates that January slaughtering was at its peak. The question naturally arises, Why was meat rationing not

lifted at that time? It should have been done.

An article appearing in Collier's magazine of May 6, 1944, written by Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, raises a very peculiar situation. This article was published a week after the order was issued removing most meats and canned vegetables from rationing. In this article Mr. Bowles stated that there would be some relief of meat rationing "in 1945—with luck—and possibly end when the war in Europe is over," and that rationing of processed foods would not cease until "the war in the Pacific ends." Yet 1 week before his statement appeared he issued an order removing most meats and canned vegetables from all rationing restrictions. The Office of Price Administration should completely remove all ration restrictions on steaks and roasts of beef now. It should have been done last January.

Let me ask what can be the reason for these inconsistent statements and these inconsistent orders. Is it possible that Mr. Bowles is only a figurehead and that there is a hidden power to which he must respond? If so, who is it and what is it? This is convincing proof that someone is responsible for playing politics with our food supply.

Several months ago the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee advocated openly and publicly that the administration of all food activities should be centered in one administrative agency.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. I am glad to yield to my colleague and neighbor.

Mr. BREHM. I feel confident that if the gentleman's suggestion had been followed and the food authority had been put under one head that there would not now be spoiling so many thousand pounds of butter, cheese, and other food. I trust that those responsible for the food administration may yet follow the suggestions of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman's observation is very timely and quite in point.

The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives agreed with the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee and reported favorably a bill which had been introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina, Representative FULMER, who is the chairman of that committee. The sentiment of the country was then, and is now, overwhelmingly favorable to the enactment of this legislation. The legislation would have been enacted except for administration opposition.

I am informed that the War Food Administration release of May 4 indicates that it did not even know that these items were to be eliminated from the ration list on May 1. Where is the hidden power in Government that is responsible for playing politics with our food supply?

In other words, on May there came out a release from the War Food Administration which indicated that the Administration knew nothing about an order that had been issued on the 1st of May. So I repeat there can be no question but that this whole food program is being administered by some organization or individual or power which is anonymous and which issues orders to Mr. Bowles and Mr. Jones.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman called the attention of the House to the situation with reference to Mr. Jones of the War Food Administration. The President has been away for 4 weeks and I am just wondering who directed Mr. Bowles to remove 85 percent of meat from the ration list and to take these other things off the list?

Mr. JENKINS. In answer to the gentleman's question, I say I wish I knew. I hope these remarks of mine will bring an answer from somebody connected actively with the Food Administration. I see that Cecil B. Dickson, a prominent news reporter, in an article appearing in the Hartford (Conn.) Times of a day or two ago says the action of President Roosevelt in ordering Chester Bowles, the Director of Price Administration, to remove all meat except beefsteaks and beef roasts from rationing was considered a master stroke by inside New Dealers.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. In order to fully utilize dam and reservoir areas under the control of the War Department, the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate recreation, conservation, and other facilities thereat advantageous to the interests of the United States, or to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities. The Secretary of War is authorized to grant leases of lands, structures, or facilities in said areas for such periods and upon such terms as he may deem reasonable. All moneys received for such leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On pages 2 and 3, strike out all of section 3, and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"SEC. 3. The Chief of Engineers under the supervision of the Secretary of War, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate park and recreational facilities in reservoir areas under control of the War Department, and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities. The Secretary of War is authorized to grant leases of lands, structures, or facilities in reservoir areas for such periods and upon such terms as he may deem reasonable: *Provided*, That licenses to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies for the use of areas suitable for public park and recreational purposes may be granted without monetary consideration when the Secretary of War determines such action to be in the public interest. All moneys received for leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, during the course of general debate, a number of questions were asked with respect to the meaning of section 3, and particularly with respect to the meaning of the word "facilities" in line 25 of section 3. In response to the questions asked, as well as in response to some apprehensions manifested, it was stated by the committee that the purpose of section 3 was to authorize the Chief of Engineers in and around the pools, the permanent pools that are provided in reservoirs authorized for flood control, to make leases for recreational purposes only. It is in order to remove any apprehensions with respect to reclamation or power in connection with the word "facilities" and in order to make more certain that it is the purpose of section 3 only to authorize the Chief of Engineers to provide for recreational facilities that this amendment is offered as a substitute for section 3. I may say in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that under existing law the Secretary of War is authorized to make leases for 5 years, but that in many cases citizens who came to these lakes or these permanent pools would like to have longer leases for any residences or any places of abode they established along the lakes. This substitute is intended more definitely to limit the purpose for which the original section 3 of this bill was intended.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Does the amendment as offered by the committee drop the word "conservation" altogether? My reason for asking that is I understood the word "conservation" is in there to make possible the establishment of wildlife refuges and things of that character for the conservation of property and wildlife.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is fair to say this substitute does eliminate the word "conservation." I personally can see no objection to its inclusion after "recreation," because that might be applicable in some cases. But the primary meaning of the section was for recreation, as stated.

Mr. CASE. I wonder if the chairman would feel free to modify the amendment to that extent to put in the words "wildlife conservation" after "recreation"?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to keep faith with the committee. I submitted this amendment to the committee and I was authorized by the committee to submit this as a substitute. Frankly I would say with respect to the wildlife feature that my thought is, with all deference, that these particular pools, from my observation and from my inspection, are really lakes, and those lakes provide for recreation and fishing facilities. It might be, it is possible, the gentleman may know more about the wildlife problem than I do, but it might be that the restrictions with

respect to wildlife propagation might impair the recreational facilities. Personally I trust that the gentleman will think about that matter and I trust he will appreciate my position. I am not in a position to accept that amendment. My thought is this, further, that if after a further consideration of any and all the projects here it appears that you would like to provide for wildlife conservation and it could be done properly, that it might be embraced in another body. I have gone as far as I am authorized to go.

Mr. CASE. If I may comment just a bit further, the Izaak Walton League, with national headquarters in Chicago, did adopt a resolution which was rather critical of this bill on the ground that it feared some of these reservoirs would destroy wildlife.

The answer that some of us individually have made, and the answer of the chapters of the organization in my State which they have made in their endorsement of the bill has been that section 3, so far from destroying wildlife, is a means of protecting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. In that case it was suggested that the Fish and Wildlife Service could cooperate with the War Department through the language in section 3, to propagate fish, establish pools or bayous where feed might be planted for migratory waterfowl, and things of that sort. I would be a little disappointed if I felt that the amendment destroyed that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. While I am not as much of a sportsman as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and others who live in that State, I would say that the language "recreational" ought to embrace the aims and purposes of the Izaak Walton League. It may be that this language would be susceptible to the interpretation that the gentleman has in mind. I would not say that it would not be correct, in proper cases. But, I would say that for the present it is intended for recreation and park facilities, but I think the language is broad enough to embrace what the gentleman had in mind if the Secretary of War so agreed.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say we would get the money for the reservoirs authorized in this bill from the same source that we got the money when we authorized the building of some 13 of the finest reservoirs for flood-control purposes that I know of in the United States, in the great Commonwealth of Ohio. I know of no finer recreational facilities than some of those that have been constructed in those reservoirs that were constructed along the Muskingum River in Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Where did you get that money?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We got it from the taxpayers of the United States, money that the taxpayers wanted expended to protect their lives and their property.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Did you get it from the taxpayers or is it still to come from the taxpayers?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It might be both, if that will satisfy the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of War is authorized to sell to States, municipalities, private concerns, or individuals, at such prices and on such terms as he may deem reasonable, for domestic and industrial uses surplus water that may be available at any reservoir under the control of the War Department. All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein certain documents.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a bill providing for the deportation of Japanese aliens immediately upon the conclusion of hostilities between the United States and Japan. The bill is short, and I am going to read it to you:

A bill providing for the deportation of Japanese aliens

Be it enacted etc.—

SECTION 1. All persons in the United States who on the 7th day of December 1941 were subjects of the Government of Japan and who became enemy aliens by reason of the declaration of war between the United States and Japan, are hereby defined and declared to be undesirable aliens and subject to deportation under the statutes of the United States providing for the deportation of undesirable aliens.

SEC. 2. Within 30 days after the approval of this act the Attorney General of the United States shall proceed to prepare warrants for the deportation of all undesirable aliens as defined in section 1 of this act. Such warrants shall be executed and such aliens deported immediately upon the cessation of hostilities between the United States and Japan.

SEC. 3. No undesirable alien as defined in this act, who has been interned as an enemy alien in the United States, shall be released from internment except for the purpose of deportation under warrant as herein provided.

SEC. 4. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

I venture to say that if a poll should be taken today of all the people in the United States to determine whether they desired to permit alien Japanese to remain in the United States after the conclusion of hostilities, the verdict would be at least 90 percent against allowing them to remain. On the Pacific coast, I would say that the verdict would be almost 100 percent for their deportation after the war.

The blood of our sons who were murdered at Pearl Harbor, and tortured and starved on Bataan and Corregidor, the thousands who have met death in the Solomons, the Marshalls, the Gilberts, on Attu, and other theaters of operation in the Pacific, cry out against this barbarous nation and the barbarous nationals who comprise it. I believe the people of this Nation do not want the aliens of that nation to remain in the United States when the war is over.

That being the case, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me obvious that appropriate legislation on the subject should be enacted now, because unless legislation of this kind is enacted during the war it will very likely never be enacted at all. That is the reason I have introduced this bill now, while the people are still free from the propaganda which will beset them after the war.

You all recall what happened after the First World War. There was an avalanche of propaganda, of manufactured sentimentalism throughout the United States which was deliberately calculated to make the people believe that those who had so recently been our enemies had become our brothers immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, and that they could never be persuaded by their leader to wage war on us again.

To such an extent did this propaganda go, and such effect did it have, that it even persuaded the people of the United States almost immediately after the close of World War No. 1 to scrap their Navy and to neglect the defenses of their own country. The same propaganda will be launched again after this war.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that this bill has to do only with Japanese aliens in this country. It does not have to do with Japanese born in the United States, who by virtue of their birth are citizens of this country. That is an entirely different phase of the Japanese problem, and one which must be handled separately and in a different way.

That phase of the question, I may say, is now being studied, and in due course an equitable and constitutional solution of the problem will be reached and presented to the Congress. That phase involves the loyalty of certain individual American citizens born of Japanese parentage, and presents a most important and vital constitutional question. No American desires to harm another American, simply because he was born of Japanese parentage, provided he is in fact, a loyal American, and no American will harm him. But the disloyalty of a vast number of Japanese-Americans has been so completely demonstrated during this war that the question as to them must be faced and must be solved—and it will be solved by just and proper legislation within the four corners of our Constitution.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, the question of the Japanese alien remaining in this country after the war is here now for solution. There is no constitutional question involved here. There is no question of injustice. The people af-

fected by this bill are highly undesirable enemy aliens. They came here solely by our sufferance. That sufferance is exhausted. We want them here no longer. We propose to send them back where they came from at the earliest practicable moment.

I trust very much that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will proceed to the immediate consideration of this bill so that it may be reported to the House and voted upon at this session of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Amend section 4 at line 15, page 3 by adding the following: "*Provided, however,* That, in the case of any reservoir located west of the 97th meridian, the right to the use of waters for such purposes shall be established, and the repayment of costs allocated thereto shall be provided for, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Reclamation laws."

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, section 4 of this bill authorizes the Secretary of War to sell for domestic and industrial uses surplus water available at any reservoir under his control. There is no requirement in the section that the right to use such water for domestic and industrial purposes shall be established in conformity with local law, nor does there seem to be any such requirement elsewhere in Federal statutes relating to projects under the control of the Secretary of War. Uses for domestic and industrial purposes are ones that under the system of water law prevailing in the Western States have validity only to the extent that they are established or recognized under the provisions of the law of the place of use. They are in this regard like the right to make beneficial consumptive use of water for irrigation.

Section 6, as amended here today, in dealing with irrigation rights is intended to provide for the establishment of those rights in conformity with the requirements of the Federal Reclamation law. That law provides for proceeding in conformity with State laws for the establishment of the right to use water for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto.

As a matter of principle, I believe that similar conformity should have been required in connection with the sale of rights to use water for domestic and industrial purposes under section 4 of this bill. As the section now stands, the exercise of authority under it, if unchallenged, will amount to an assertion by the Federal Government of a claim of ownership to water for domestic and industrial purposes, without regard to local law. Even though the reservoir by which such surplus waters are developed are constructed and operated under the constitutional power of the Federal Government, the assertion of ownership of such surplus waters for domestic and industrial purposes would be an assertion that Western States would and should regard as prejudicial to their claims of jurisdiction with respect to waters arising in their States. The possibility of such assertions could have been avoided by a relatively short amendment requiring the establishment of rights for such purposes in conformity with local law, in the manner provided in the Federal reclamation law. I have not pressed harder for such an amendment because so far as the Western States are concerned, I am not aware of any instance where surplus waters will be available for disposition under section 4. If I am wrong in this, this section, as a matter of principle, requires amendment.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept the amendment offered by the Congressman from Utah, and also the ones the committee will offer to section 6. These amendments do not interfere with flood control in the slightest. Their purpose is to tie the reclamation part of the bill to the reclamation laws as we now have them.

In the Colorado Legislature, where I served for many terms spanning a period of 25 years, we had a custom by which, when a bill had multiple purposes, it was referred in turn to each of the committees specializing on each purpose. In other words, had this bill been before our legislature the flood-control committee would have prepared the part having to do with flood control as they have done. Then it would have been rereferred to the irrigation and reclamation committee for preparation of the purposes having to do with the disposal of the so-called surpluses of water stored in these dams and reservoirs. This latter committee, of which I am a member, would have considered only the part of the bill having to do with the disposal of water for irrigation and domestic and industrial uses. The result would have been generally what we are trying to accomplish by these amendments, namely, to make no innovations or changes in our fundamental reclamation laws, but to tie this new program to these present laws that have been developed over the past 50 years.

In the States west of the ninety-seventh meridian, water is necessary for the growing of crops as well as for domestic and industrial uses. Men fought over it in the early days and only after years of litigation and trouble have the States in cooperation with the Department of the Interior worked out a satisfactory program. Let us not start a new program that will make trouble, misunderstanding, and serious legal difficulties. These amendments do not affect flood control and will generally satisfy our western water users.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated yesterday, the purpose of section 4 in no way involves reclamation. With all deference to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], the amendment is utterly inapplicable and out of place at this point.

Under existing law if a reservoir is authorized and if there is a lack of water for human consumption or for the necessary enterprises in the area the local people are authorized to supplement the cost of that reservoir where the water table, for instance, is low and share by putting up money in the first instance in the case of the construction of the reservoir. It happens in many cases that there is a need, as the War Department has reported to the committee, for water for human consumption because of the drying up of wells. If that need occurs in Ohio, or if that need occurs in Massachusetts, or in any other State, instead of requiring the local people in the first instance where there is inability in many cases to issue bonds and to incur large indebtedness to share in the construction of that reservoir, the purpose of section 4 is to enable the Government, the Secretary of War, and the Chief of Engineers to make a disposition of water there for human consumption or for any proper industrial use. It strikes me, with all deference and in all kindness, that the amendment offered by my friend is utterly inapplicable and would defeat the very purpose for which section 4 is intended. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if it be proper to provide for the storing of waters for reclamation to grow crops in the arid West, with which I am in sympathy, it ought to be all the more in order to provide for the storing of waters for human consumption.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Hereafter, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to interrogate the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the committee, on the intent and purpose of this provision.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman from Mississippi will be glad to answer his colleague in any way he can.

Mr. RANKIN. We are somewhat disturbed as to whether or not this provision will interfere with the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority under existing law.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I answer my colleague by saying most emphatically it will not and should not interfere with the proper operation of T. V. A., and with the gentleman's permission I will proceed to make this statement: The purpose of section 5 is to coordinate reservoirs that should properly

be coordinated, to provide for flood control and for navigation.

I call the attention of my colleague to the fact that that language has nothing on earth to do with the development of power. It has to do only with and I quote: "flood control and navigation." In the Ohio Valley, along the Ohio River, the United States in addition to financing the Tennessee Valley Authority for the construction of dams and reservoirs for flood control for navigation, but in all fairness and in all candor primarily for power, has constructed other reservoirs along other tributaries of the Ohio River for flood control. If those reservoirs on the tributaries of the Ohio, including the Kentucky Dam, the greatest and biggest of all the T. V. A. dams, is to function for flood control that dam and those supplemental dams must be coordinated with the dams along the Allegheny River, along the Monongahela River, along the Kanawah River, along the Muskingum River, and other tributaries. It is essential for the proper coordination of all dams whether along the Tennessee, whether along the Cumberland, or whether along the Ohio or any of the tributaries to be under one central authority that shall have the final say as to how those reservoirs and those dams shall function for flood control. There is nothing whatever in this bill that interferes with the proper power development of the T. V. A.

I supported the T. V. A. and I know the attacks that were made upon it in the Congress. The T. V. A., as the gentleman from Mississippi, if I may presume to say so, must agree—the T. V. A. has been approved by the Supreme Court because of the development of navigation and flood control under the commerce clause of the Constitution. If it be the real purpose of the T. V. A. to provide for flood control then the T. V. A. ought to be coordinated with the other reservoir projects and other flood-control projects; and that is solely the purpose of this provision.

Mr. RANKIN. I was coauthor of the bill creating the T. V. A. We went into all those questions before the bill was ever introduced. The three main purposes were to improve navigation, to control floods, and to produce power. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the Gilbertsville Dam was constructed largely for flood control. That dam was constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority. The dams on the Tennessee are coordinated, they are all linked together, they are operated, may I say, through the powerhouse of the T. V. A.; and I do not want you to take away from the T. V. A. any of the jurisdiction over the operation of those dams and reservoirs.

Is it the gentleman's interpretation of this bill that its provisions would interfere with the authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority to operate those locks and dams and control the reservoirs on the Tennessee River?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is one of the purposes for which the authorization exists, to provide for their operation as authorized by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. It is a great pity that when those dams were built on the Ohio River they did not set up an authority to harness that great wealth of hydroelectric power that is roaring down the Ohio, all the way down from the Allegheny Mountains to Cairo and now going to waste. We took time by the forelock and did save the power on the Tennessee. In doing so for the first time we provided a 9-foot channel from the mouth of the Tennessee to Knoxville and at the same time controlled floods on the Tennessee, and for the first time provided a system whereby we could check or hold back sufficient water to have a tremendous influence on floods south of Cairo on the Mississippi River. What I want to avoid is having any law passed today that interferes with the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority to control that river, as the jurisdiction now stands. What I want to know is whether or not it is the opinion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] that this bill will change existing law in that respect.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This will not change existing law in any respect except to make effective existing law to provide for flood control. As the gentleman asserts, one of the main arguments, as he now reminds us, for the T. V. A. was that it would afford flood control on the Ohio and Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Here is what the bill is likely to do: When two distinct authorities are given the right to interfere it is likely to cause conflict that would be to the detriment both of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the flood sufferers on the lower Ohio, the lower Mississippi, and the Tennessee. For that reason I wish the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] would leave that provision out or else accept an amendment to clarify the matter and show that it is not intended to interfere with the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am wondering if section 5 means that the Secretary of War can prescribe regulations for all reservoirs built throughout the country either wholly or in part with Federal funds? Does that cover the reservoirs which have been created and put under the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If I may be permitted to answer, most emphatically no, because it says that it is for flood control or navigation.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It says "all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, I answered the gentleman's question. It would be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use or storage of water available for flood control or navigation. It limits the authority to flood control and navigation and has nothing to do with reclamation or power——

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. In the gentleman's opinion these authorities as they are established, and particularly that of the Tennessee Valley, should remain unimpaired in any region where applicable?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I think they should remain unimpaired. The T. V. A. is doing the greatest job in connection with the production of power, flood control, the improvement of navigation, soil conservation, and so forth of any agency of this Government. I am afraid if the pending bill is passed in its present form it is going to impair that efficiency and greatly injure the Tennessee Valley Authority. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I hope the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] will accept.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 3, line 21, after the word "regulations", strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "except as otherwise provided by existing law."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, that is all we ask, that it will simply protect the Tennessee Valley Authority from interference and will leave the T. V. A. in control of the Tennessee River as the present law provides, and I hope my colleague from Mississippi will accept this amendment, because it is absolutely necessary to clarify the situation and to avoid a conflict that might prove disastrous.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee will accept this amendment, because if it is not included in the bill it may very seriously interfere with the war effort and, of course, none of us want to do that. I call the attention of the Members to the fact that some of the dams on the Tennessee River which are operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority have recently been built for the expressed purpose of producing power for the manufacture of munitions, especially aluminum. The Cherokee, Douglas, and several of the other dams were built primarily for power, and they are charged 100 percent to power operation.

It is quite apparent that if the Corps of Engineers is going to be able to say, "You let all of the water out of this dam," and the Tennessee Valley Authority in the meantime has entered into contracts with the Aluminum Co. of America, and with the Reynolds Metal Works, and with other war plants up and down the valley to furnish a certain amount of electricity, for which these dams were built, T. V. A. cannot carry out those contracts. T. V. A. cannot meet its obligations in order to produce aluminum if there is going to be any likelihood of the water being released at those dams so the generators cannot be operated. I want to say as a Member from one city in the Tennessee Valley which did have a serious threat of flood and still has a threat, that the Tennessee Valley Authority, by

operating its dams for a multiple purpose, navigation, flood control, and the generation of electricity, has been able to take care of the entire flood-control problem on the Tennessee River with the exception of Chattanooga where it is agreed that in order to be fully protected we are going to have to build certain protective works. It has been proven as a scientific fact that they can successfully operate their dams for the purpose of navigation, flood control, and the generation of electricity. We are satisfied that they are doing the best they can for the protection of Chattanooga where the only flood menace now exists.

Mr. Chairman, if the Corps of Engineers is going to be given authority to operate these dams you might as well turn the whole Tennessee Valley Authority over to them. You cannot have the T. V. A. making contracts to supply electricity and at the same time have somebody else say how much water you can hold in the dams for that purpose. You cannot work under that kind of divided authority.

I hope that the gentleman from Mississippi will say that it is not intended to change existing law insofar as the operation of these dams by the T. V. A. is concerned because it would be ruinous to our war effort to have a diffusion of responsibility.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman in his approval of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and with the gentleman's statement concerning it. The very fact that dams are built for a multiple purpose shows there are other reasons for such dams besides flood control. I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will cover the situation and safeguard those other uses.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. I maintain that the big problem at this time is the operation of these dams that were built for the purpose of supplying electricity in order to keep the aluminum production going at full pace. We have some dams down there in connection with which there was no flood control or navigation considered. The appropriations were to build the dams to produce power or electricity and those dams cannot be turned over to the operation of the Corps of Engineers unless we are going to hamper the war effort.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In the last great flood even though we did not have the Gilbertsville Dam finished, the Tennessee Valley saved Cairo, Ill. By using those dams and coordinating them according to the system they worked out there were held back the floodwaters of the Tennessee River.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is right and in this last flood the Tennessee Valley Authority prevented substantial damage to Chattanooga by a decision there to let a certain cofferdam be washed out at the Kentucky dam project. They are doing the very best they can to control floods by the way they are operating those dams and at the same time supply the great amount of power and electricity that is needed and unless they can continue to do that the war effort in the valley is going to suffer greatly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The danger to which the gentleman refers is not so much in that to which he refers as it is in the fact that under this bill discretion is granted and delegated to the Army engineers, and if I remember my law correctly, unless you can show fraud in the man to whom the power to use discretion has been granted he cannot be challenged for what he undertakes to do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. The point I make is that you cannot have a divided authority as to how much water you are going to let out of the dams to produce electricity. We have to have that electricity for the Aluminum Co. and for the Reynolds Metal Works which are making more aluminum for bombers than all the rest of the Nation combined. The dams must continue to be operated under the T. V. A. regulations.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will clarify this particular section so that the law as it exists at the present time and as applicable to the T. V. A., the Columbia River, the Grand River, and others, will not be disturbed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know about the others. It is my opinion that this amendment is necessary. This matter was settled in the T. V. A. Act and all we want to do is to keep the program as it was provided in the T. V. A. Act.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a very comprehensive bill, embodying the data, experience, and research of more than 100 years. The purpose of the bill is the solution of one of the most pressing problems confronting the Nation today. It has been admirably handled and I hope that everyone interested in the legislation and the purpose it seeks to serve has read or will read carefully the speech which the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], delivered on yesterday.

It is a literary classic. It is a contribution to the history of our times. It marks a step forward in flood-control engineering. Naturally, I am particularly interested in the application of the proposed legislation to the Missouri River Basin.

The Missouri is the longest river on the North American Continent. It is approximately 2,500 miles in length and carries a flow of water unpredictable in volume and velocity. It drains an area of half a million square miles. In that area is included almost every mineral resource, timber resource, and agricultural resource which the Nation produces or the world could desire.

But Sir Walter Scott's couplet applies here with particular aptitude:

O, it is excellent to have a giant's strength;
But it is tyrannous to use it like a giant.

This great river and benefactor of mankind possesses a potential strength which untowardly exerted at flood renders it a ravaging giant of destruction and devastation. For the last 3 years it has been more destructive in my immediate section of the country than ever before in the memory of this generation, and has reached a higher crest and inundated wider areas than in any recorded rise since 1844, a hundred years ago. It follows that there is great interest in this bill in my immediate section, and throughout the Central West. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee one or two questions. It is my understanding that the bill in no way affects the proposition to establish a 9-foot channel in the Missouri River?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not. No navigation project is embraced in this bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri And it in no way affects any proposal for the development of power?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There are no facilities and no power projects authorized in this bill. The general law will obtain. If a reservoir is authorized and if the Federal Power Commission thinks that a penstock should be installed, and the Secretary of War agrees with it, there will be a penstock installed in the reservoir. But no power project is authorized in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. That is according to the law passed in 1938?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I say that is under existing law.

In further answer to the gentleman's question, we have repeatedly stated during the debate that no project, reservoir, or dam, or other improvement is embraced in this bill unless it is primarily for flood control. If power can be developed as an incident, or if reclamation can be provided, they are cared for in the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And third, while our primary interest is in flood control, our immediate concern in the next few weeks is relief from the disastrous consequences of the present flood now devastating the Missouri Valley.

It is my understanding that at the request of the chairman, a survey is now

being made by the Board of Engineers of the flood situation, and as soon as that report is available a bill will be brought in to provide for emergency relief in the repair, replacement, relocation, and raising of levees in the stricken areas. Pending control of floodwaters, provision must be made for their restraint in this rich agricultural section. May I inquire when the gentleman expects a report?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We hope to get it in in the next few days. The initial statement that I made in opening the debate on this bill was that we requested the Board to give us the facts on which to base the emergency bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And it is the intention of the gentleman and the committee to act immediately upon receipt of that information?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is. We have so stated.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Are there any other gentlemen besides the gentleman from North Dakota who would like to be heard? If there are no others, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I just rise to ask this question of both gentlemen from Mississippi. My first question is directed to the chairman of the committee and to the gentleman who was the author of the T. V. A. Section 5 reads:

Hereafter, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds—

My question is this: If this bill goes through, then, so far as flood control and navigation are concerned, the reservoirs of the T. V. A. will be under the jurisdiction of the Army engineers; is that not correct?

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I fear.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman addressed that question to me I will answer unhesitatingly, "No; it is not under the supervision or jurisdiction of the engineers." This language of the section does not change the control nor does it change the operation of the T. V. A. authority. I shall undertake to go into the matter more in detail when I have the privilege. It merely has to do with seeing regulations are made for any storage that is provided in the reservoirs, and nothing more or less, for flood control and control.

Mr. RANKIN. That function is already vested in the Tennessee Valley Authority, just as it is vested in the Department of the Interior at Grand Coulee and at Fort Peck in the Army engineers.

Mr. BURDICK. When this language says that all reservoirs shall be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War that includes all reservoirs, the T. V. A. as well as everything else.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Where is the language that it shall be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War? It is not in section 5.

Mr. BURDICK. Here is the language. I do not have much education, but I think I can read English:

Hereafter, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs—

Are you not walking right into a situation where you take that control away from the T. V. A.?—

constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations.

If that does not mean what it says, I do not understand English.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It means that the T. V. A. shall operate in accordance with those regulations for flood control.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it mean that the Army engineers or that someone else has jurisdiction to tell the T. V. A. what to do?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield back the balance of my time. I just wanted to ask this question and no one seems to be able to answer it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota as to his definition of this particular section. The way it is now worded, it gives the Secretary of War the authority to prescribe regulations covering all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds.

Mr. BURDICK. I am glad the gentleman can read English also.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask whether a reservoir built for an irrigation project must be regulated solely for flood control?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will yield, that is not involved in this provision of the bill at all. If they are erected wholly for reclamation, there is no flood control and no navigation.

Mr. MURDOCK. The point I wish to make is that dams for irrigation may have a flood-control use and a navigation implication.

Mr. BURDICK. I started this row, and you can all get in.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the gentleman is correct in saying that it does not affect the T. V. A., then does the gentleman see any harm in saying "otherwise as provided by law"? It seems to me that would clarify it.

Mr. BURDICK. Unless you put some restriction in there and leave the T. V. A. alone in the work it is doing in flood control and navigation and power, I will vote "no," and I know other Members will do the same thing.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is an amendment pending which will clarify the matter entirely.

Mr. BURDICK. I think so.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have read section 5 carefully and I think I know the purpose at which it is aimed. I take this time merely to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to the legislative intent with respect to the language used. It seems to me that as it is worded it would cover all flood-control and navigation projects which have been constructed in whole or in part with Federal funds. What I want to ask the chairman of the committee is this: Is it the intention of this section, and is it so worded, in the gentleman's opinion, as to apply to reservoirs that have already been constructed with public funds, and put them under the control of the Army engineers? As I read the section, it covers all flood control and navigation projects. It is limited to that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; it does not cover all projects, but go ahead with the question you would like to propound.

Mr. CRAVENS. It is limited to projects in the construction of which Federal funds have been used. What I am asking the gentleman, and I think this language covers it and I merely want to be sure about it, is this: Is it broad enough to include the reservoirs and dams heretofore constructed for those purposes, so as to give the Army engineers control over their operation as well as those that may be constructed in the future under the authorization of this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would answer in the affirmative. I suppose that is the reason for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. The T. V. A. operates reservoirs that have heretofore been constructed.

Mr. CRAVENS. This will cover, for instance, the Pensacola, Grand River Dam in Oklahoma?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It will, and that is one of the purposes of the section.

Mr. CRAVENS. I thought this was broad enough to do it, but as a result of the disastrous experience we have had there I wanted to know that the operating authority contained in section 5 would be applicable to that project.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The acceptance of my amendment would clarify the entire situation. If this bill is passed in its present form, it is likely to disturb every one of these projects that have been constructed throughout the country.

Mr. CRAVENS. I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. I am

talking about a different proposition entirely.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The language in section 5, as I read it, very clearly states that the Secretary of War shall prescribe regulations for the use of "storage available for flood control or navigation" and "all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds," and that the "project shall be operated in accordance with such regulations." If that does not include all reservoirs constructed with Federal funds for the purpose of flood control and navigation, then the language of the section means something with which the legislative intent does not comply.

Mr. CRAVENS. The purpose of my inquiry was to be assured that the language in section 5 was intended to and does provide that the Army engineers may regulate the operation of reservoirs even though they are already built. That it does not apply to the future projects only.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It would not if the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] were adopted.

Mr. GORE. Then does the gentleman accept the amendment?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota

Mr. LEMKE. I note that the gentleman has asked the chairman what this language means. Member after Member has asked what the intention is. May I ask the gentleman whether we are going to be governed by the language of the bill or whether, when the bill is passed, we shall have to look into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find out what the gentleman from Mississippi meant or intended to do?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will yield, I want it understood that I answered the question of the gentleman from Arkansas by saying this section embraced the Grand River Authority, and the gentleman knows why it should be embraced. I answered him further by saying that if the amendment of my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PANKIN] were adopted, it would embrace the Grand River Authority, and the Grand River Authority should be regulated as provided in this section.

Mr. CRAVENS. What I am particularly interested in and the reason I asked the question is that we have had some very disastrous experiences with the operation of certain flood-control projects. What we thought were flood-control projects turned out to be something else as a result of the activities of agencies of the Government other than the Army engineers. All I want to find out is this: I think the language is broad enough—and I wanted the chairman's corroboration of my construction of it—that the Army engineers by this language will have the right to regulate projects already constructed, and will not be limited by this language to those that may be constructed in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman explain the effect of the words "Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes"?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will undertake to do so.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee I have been asked to accept the amendment whose purpose is to except the T. V. A. from the operations of section 5. I have responded frankly that I am unable to accede to that request. The amendment and the substance of the amendment have been carefully considered by the Committee on Flood Control, and the committee decided not to accept the amendment. A number of my friends from Tennessee and one from Alabama have asked me if I would be agreeable to accepting a similar amendment. I have answered them frankly that in my judgment their fears or apprehensions were without substantial foundation.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS] who has just taken his seat referred to the project that gave to our committee the inspiration for this section. A project was authorized known as the Grand River Authority in Oklahoma. It involved the construction and operation of the Pensacola Dam. Reports were made on that project and in those reports it was understood that a certain amount of space in the Grand River Dam should be reserved for flood control. In the flood of 1943, last year, they had the most disastrous flood in the Arkansas Valley in the vicinity of the Grand River Authority. It developed in the hearings conducted by the Committee on Flood Control that that authority in its ambition and desire to develop power had not reserved the storage required by the report of the Army engineers for flood control.

It appears to the committee that the country should know the facts. That authorization was made because in that reservoir there was to be reserved space for flood control. It was not reserved. It was not under the supervision of the Secretary of War. He could not make the regulation. All he could do was ask for the space.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing on earth in this provision that interferes with the war effort. It will not affect a single dam that has been referred to by my friend from Tennessee where provision is made for flood control. The dams that are constructed primarily for power will not be involved. Why? Some of the dams are constructed for power and for flood control. This amendment simply provides that the T. V. A., the Grand River Authority, or any other authority shall so operate those dams and those authorities that the regulations of the Secretary of War asking for the use of the space paid for by the people of the United States in those dams for flood control shall in the event of flood be available for flood control. Can there be any objection to that?

I am aware that unfortunately governmental agencies make claims from time to time that cannot be substantiated. I remember that in 1937 they had the greatest flood in the history of the Ohio Valley at Cincinnati and Louisville. From one end of the river to the other, they had the greatest flood, the highest flood, in the history of that valley. The spokesman for the Tennessee Valley Authority rushed in to the public print and said, substantially, "The Tennessee Valley Authority has saved the Tennessee Valley. While the Ohio Valley is being overflowed, the Tennessee Valley is suffering from no flood."

The fact of the matter was, and I so stated repeatedly, that in the Tennessee Valley that year along the Tennessee River and its tributaries there were no maximum floods. If there were floods along the tributaries of any major river in the United States at the same time, no reservoirs, no flood-control works, no levees would protect the people. There would be another Noah's flood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for the additional 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, to be more to the point, in 1937 when overnight, almost, the Ohio River rose some 50 feet at Cincinnati, Paducah, the gage at Johnsonville in the Tennessee Valley, the gage at Chattanooga, the gage at Knoxville, showed conclusively that there was no major flood in the Tennessee Valley. The great Ohio flood came from the Miami and other valleys than the Tennessee Valley. There were rains and there was high water in the Tennessee Valley, but there was no major or maximum flood comparable to the floods in the Miami and other tributaries of the Ohio River.

In my judgment, with all due respect, and while I have supported the Tennessee Valley Authority, the claim that the Tennessee Valley Authority saved Cairo, the claim that the Tennessee Valley Authority materially reduced the floods of the Ohio River in 1937, is utterly without merit. The thing that saved Cairo was the flood walls built there to an elevation of 60 feet and the New Madrid Floodway under the Flood Control Act of 1928. I have no personal interest in this proposition. I submitted the amendment to the committee. The Chief of Engineers will not supervise or operate anybody's T. V. A. dam. The Chief of Engineers will not supervise or operate anybody's authority. The language is that it shall be the duty of the

Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation. There is not a word about power. The authorities will continue to operate the dams, but there will be one person charged with the responsibility of operating the dams for flood control. There will be no divided authority.

If there is nothing in the reservoir that was built anywhere, at Pickwick or elsewhere, for flood control, that section would not be applicable. At all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part from Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes, reserving to power every foot of water that was intended for power, the operation of such projects shall be in accordance with the regulations. It does not say "operation by the Secretary of War." It does not say "operation by the Chief of Engineers." It says "operation," by whom? By the authority that is charged with law, and by law with the operation. This section provides that there shall be coordination in the operation of all reservoirs on all of the tributaries when there is a flood in the Ohio Valley. It also requires the coordination under one person with the final say on all of the tributaries of the Arkansas when there is a flood in that valley. This section applies only if there is space reserved in those dams made for the storage of flood waters. And the Secretary of War, to protect the people and the property in those valleys, shall make regulations, and those regulations should be enforced for the utilization of those waters for flood control so that there may not be a repetition of the deaths and destruction in the Grand River Authority of 1943.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman has made a very good point, it seems to me, that this section 5 should apply to certain projects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, what is the question of the gentleman, please?

Mr. GORE. It is my intention to offer an amendment only to except the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In my judgment, may I say to the Members of the House, as a friend and supporter of the Tennessee Valley Authority, giving them due credit for the magnificent war production, there is not a thing in this section 5 which will interfere in anywise with the proper operation or with the authority of those charged with the responsibility for power development. It will merely guarantee that the Authority do what the Grand River Authority did not do in Oklahoma in 1937, and that they will reserve what is to be required by the regulations of the Army engineers and that the T. V. A. reservoirs will coordinate with the reservoirs along the Muskingum, and the reservoirs along the Miami and other tributaries of the Ohio, and while there are no authorities, there are reservoirs, along the tributaries of the Ohio where power is being developed, especially in projects begun under the National Industrial Recovery Act.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to ask this question: Is it not true that the authority of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations is limited to regulations for the storage for flood control only?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely, and for navigation. He is just asking that the storage which the people of the United States provided in those dams shall be reserved for flood control if it is needed to protect the lives and property of the people.

Under leave to extend, as I stated, none of the dams authorized in the pending bill provide primarily for the generation and distribution of power. The dominant interest in all of the dams is flood control. Such has been the case in previous flood-control bills. There are some dams authorized where power is incidental. In such cases where the report so states, provision is made for power, but there is no provision generally for power in the reservoirs authorized. I recall that in some of the flood-control dams provision is made for power to provide for utilization in reclamation. This is true with respect to dams in the Kings and Kern Rivers, but I repeat that there is no provision in the bill generally for the establishment of power facilities and for the distribution of power. In all cases it will be necessary for Congress in the future to make distribution and to provide facilities for the sale and distribution of any power that may be generated at any of the dams. There is provision for power in a few of the large dams along the tributaries of the Ohio, but the authorizations in the pending bill will not provide for the completion of these reservoirs, in my judgment, where power may be generated, and it will be necessary for Congress to make provision in the future for power facilities and distributions. I repeat that where power is incidental, flood control being the dominant interest, there are in some reservoirs provisions for generating power, but there is no provision for the distribution and sale of power. In responding to questions, I made the statement that there was no provision in any of the reservoirs for the generation of power. I made that statement having in mind that there were no reservoirs authorized in the bill primarily for power. In a few of the reservoirs, as in the case in reclamation reservoirs, there is a provision for the generation of power, but in no reservoir is there any provision for the distribution and sale of power, and I repeat that before such sale and distribution can be made, it will be necessary to obtain further congressional authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—yeas 18, nays 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 3, line 21, after the word "regulation", strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "except as otherwise provided in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to be technical, but it strikes me, in all fairness, that is exactly the amendment, not exactly, but substantially word for word, the amendment we just voted on.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, let us thresh out the point of order now if there is going to be a point of order raised.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky reserved the point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has been recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry, if the gentleman from Tennessee will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COCHRAN. Did not the reservation of the point of order come too late? The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] withdrew the point of order, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that another Member, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], reserved the point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; but not until after the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, the able and distinguished chairman of the committee, it seems to me, made a good case that some projects not constructed under the supervision of the Army engineers should be brought under their supervision by the operation of section 5, but in no way did it appear to me that he made a case, or that a case had been made or can be made, that the Tennessee Valley Authority should be brought under the supervision of the Army engineers. The gentleman from Mississippi says "wherever the water is to be used for navigation or flood control." Mr. Chairman, you cannot use the same water for

flood control and navigation and then take it in a bucket and bring it back above the dam and use it for power. These dams and this whole system is an integrated multiple-purpose system. The reservoirs are used for flood control; yes. To provide navigation; yes. And also for generation of power. It is not comparable to a dam that is constructed strictly and solely for one of the three purposes. In those dams this water and these reservoirs are used for all three purposes and to give supervision over flood control and navigation to one authority and then give to another authority control over generation of power is a futile proposition, because one agency will have control over the water for two purposes, while another agency would have control over the same water for a third purpose. It just does not work out that way. Water over the dam for whatever purpose is water over the dam.

This House, a great many times, has seen the trouble we encounter whenever we give divided authority. Here is a great river valley that is being utilized to the satisfaction of Congress. Here is an agency that is providing flood control and navigation in an admirable way, and at the same time using the same water for the generation of power. The T. V. A. is an agency created by Congress. Now, without due consideration of its effect upon this great agency, we are about to adopt a bill which does very vitally affect it.

I hope that, even though the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is not empowered by his committee to accept this amendment, the committee will not resist to the last degree the adoption of the amendment, which would exclude from the act that which has not been given due and proper consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky withdraw the point of order?

Mr. MAY. No, Mr. Chairman; I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Kentucky. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. MAY. The point of order is that the same subject has been dealt with in a previous amendment which was voted upon by the Committee just a few moments ago.

Section 5 of the act, to which the amendment is offered, provides:

> That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes, and the operation of any such projects shall be in accordance with such regulations.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would preclude the Secretary of War from providing regulations as to those reservoirs or areas devoted to flood control on the Tennessee River.

In addition to the fact that it has already been passed upon, it is legislation which would amend by indirection an act of Congress and the general law on the subject.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Upon the point that the amendment is identical with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi provided that section 5 should apply "except as otherwise provided by law." The amendment which I have offered provides "except as provided in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act." I would point out to the Chair one instance where the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] would be applicable and where the amendment which I have offered would not be applicable. For instance, the Columbia River. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi would except that, whereas the amendment which I have offered would only except the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. One is general in its application while the other is specific.

As to the further point of order suggested by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] that this is legislation which would repeal existing law, I would suggest that that is the very purpose of the bill and of section 5, to which the amendment is offered. Therefore, this does not constitute a sustainable point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BULWINKLE). The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] provided "except as otherwise provided by existing law." The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is general in its character and applies to all projects. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] referred specifically to that which was provided in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, many Members probably voted against my amendment because it was too broad. I hope they will support this amendment, and I hope my colleague, the chairman of the committee, will accept it.

Whenever you turn over the operation of the dams on the Tennessee River to any other agency, to that extent you cripple the greatest project of its kind ever developed on this earth. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] spoke about the floods on the Ohio River in 1937, and contend that holding back the water in the Tennessee did not affect them. If you go back, you will find that the water came within a very few inches of going over the levee at Cairo, Ill., and it was discussed in the press and over the radio at the time, and I thought was generally understood. If it had not been for the coordination of those dams and the holding back of that water on the Tennessee River, the Ohio River would have gone over the dam and flooded the city of Cairo, Ill.

The gentleman spoke about the great floods on the Ohio. Of course, we regret those floods and we regret floods anywhere, but if they had taken time by the forelock on the Ohio River, as they did on the Tennessee, and had built the same kind of dams, we would not only have been able to promote navigation, we would have been able to produce ten or twelve billion kilowatt-hours of electricity every year that is now going to waste on the Ohio River, and we also would have been able to more adequately control floods on that stream for local purposes, and hold back the floodwater from the Mississippi River.

Now, suppose you get someone in control of this system who is at loggerheads with the Tennessee Valley Authority, and they decide to open up the dams on the Tennessee in advance and let all that water out; then suppose the rains fail in the Tennessee Valley area. That is not at all beyond the realm of possibility. Such procedure would vastly injure the entire Tennessee Valley area.

The dams on the Tennessee are all controlled now from a central station. They keep in touch with the water on every tributary. They know when the floods are coming and by the pressing of a button or speaking over one microphone they can instruct them how to regulate the flow of the stream and how to control it to the best advantage. If you take that authority away from T. V. A. and place it under somebody else, you will do the Tennessee Valley Authority irreparable injury, in my opinion, and you will not have improved the flood control on the Mississippi River and the Ohio River, or any other river, and will have injured it as far as the Tennessee is concerned.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment in all fairness, if I may be permitted to say that, is a reflection on the T. V. A. It provides that this shall not apply to the T. V. A. In other words, it authorizes the T. V. A. to commit a fraud on those dams where there is space reserved for flood control. It says to them, "If that space is necessary it shall be applicable everywhere else in the United States except on the T. V. A." I do not have that opinion of the T. V. A. I do not want to authorize them to violate a mandate of Congress.

I do not want to authorize them to perpetrate a fraud by saying to them that the space in the reservoir provided in the construction for flood control should not be utilized.

In all fairness and in all deference this amendment is worse than the other. I am the friend of the Tennessee Valley Authority; I have supported it; I would not want to do anything to interfere with its operation. All on earth this section does is to direct that when there is a flood and the Secretary of War, speaking for the Chief of Army Engineers, states

that they need space up there and they make a regulation, the T. V. A. in its operation will provide for it only when there is a flood; and that is the only time they need the space.

Finally, the authors of the amendment are right. A divided authority over a responsibility often means no authority. A divided authority meant the misuse last year of flood space in the reservoir at Pensacola on the Arkansas River. A divided authority now between the Secretary of War, who could only ask for the space reserved for flood control, and the T. V. A., might mean the loss of life and the destruction of property.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me ask the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee if it is not a fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority has so operated these dams as to make all necessary contributions to flood control in the past?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer the gentleman by saying that I know of no guide for the future except the experience of the past. I am not going to discriminate and say that one authority is a saint and another is a sinner.

Mr. JENNINGS. But I am asking the gentleman a practical question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The only flood we have had since the Tennessee Valley Authority was established was in 1937 and there were no great floods on the gentleman's river or in the Tennessee Valley, that year.

Mr. JENNINGS. I have asked the gentleman——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered the gentleman's question by saying there has been no great, or maximum flood on the Tennessee River since the T. V. A. was authorized.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority has these dams for three purposes: The improvement of navigation, the control of floodwaters, and the production of power and that as a result of power operations it is now under contract——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And nothing on earth——

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me finish my question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. JENNINGS. With 1,200 municipalities and over 200 war plants depending on the Tennessee production of power——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman's question is fair; I know what he is referring to. There is nothing on earth——

Mr. JENNINGS. Should we under these circumstances run the risk of a power shortage or failure by the injection of some other agency into the control of waters of this area?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Dealing with the development of power, in the section; but there was a provision as I recall in the 1941 act for a levee at Chattanooga on the Tennessee River in the vicinity of Union Station. That levee was made some 15 or 18 feet for a mile or so on the theory that the reservoirs would operate above it for flood control. That flood control was provided by the act establishing the T. V. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 26, noes 65.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 4, line 6, strike out the words "stored water" and insert in lieu thereof the word "storage."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a perfecting amendment. Its purpose is to do just what the committee has asserted and just what the committee has reported in the bill. The section under consideration provides that where there is water for reclamation of arid lands in any reservoir and provision therefor that the distribution of the water shall be by the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of Reclamation will handle the distribution; there was a criticism that this language, which is substantially the reclamation law, undertook to change existing law and required the beneficiaries of reclamation to pay for water. This language in here is the language of the Reclamation Act and they pay only for storage.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 4, line 2, after the word "regulation", insert the following: "Under existing reclamation law."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, some of the friends and spokesmen for reclamation were critical of the language in the bill. It was asserted that where provision was made in a reservoir where there was water for reclamation that the Commissioner of Reclamation should have the power to prescribe regulations ad libitum without regard to existing law. This is merely a perfecting amendment. This amendment provides that these regulations shall be under existing reclamation law. It is a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. Hereafter, whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War can be consistently used for reclamation of arid lands, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe regulations for the use of the storage available for such purpose, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations. Such rates, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem reasonable, shall be charged for the use of said stored water; the moneys received to be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 4, line 8, after the word "receipts", strike out the period, insert a colon and add: *"Provided,* That this section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation district."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment and the committee authorized submission of the amendment after this set of facts was brought to its attention: At one or two reservoirs at least provisio is made for the water for lands that are not presently under the Director of Reclamation in districts where the local interests have constructed their own canals and their own distribution system. The purpose of this amendment is to limit the provisions of this act so that they shall not apply to districts with canals and distribution facilities that have already been paid for and constructed by local interests.

It is a perfecting amendment in the interest of reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive flood waters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of the national security and with a view toward providing an adequate reservoir of useful and worthy public works for the post-war construction program, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided,* that the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted during the war, with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a post-war program of construction: *Provided further,* That when the existing critical situation with respect to materials, equipment, and manpower no longer exists, and in any event not later than immediately following the cessation of hostilities in the present war, the projects herein authorized shall be initiated as expeditiously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements and shall be prosecuted vigorously during the period of post-war reconversion: *And provided further,* That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $30,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the Con-

necticut River Basin: *Provided*, That neither this authorization nor previous authorizations shall be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Williamsville site.

THAMES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for the Thames River Basin at an estimated cost of $7,200,000.

HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

The project for the Thomaston Reservoir on the Naugatuck River, for flood control in the Housatonic River Basin, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 338, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $5,151,000.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The project authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide for local protection works on the Susquehanna River at Harrisburg, Pa., is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 702, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $2,227,000.

The project for flood protection at Tyrone, Pa., on the Little Juniata River, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 702, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $1,392,000.

The plan for flood control in southern New York and eastern Pennsylvania authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, as modified by the act of August 18, 1941, is hereby further modified to include the South Plymouth and Genegantslet Reservoirs on tributaries of the Chenango River substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 702, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated additional cost of $4,755,000.

The plan for the Raystown Reservoir on the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River, Pa., for flood control and other purposes, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 702, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment thereof.

MOBILE RIVER BASIN—ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the Allatoona Reservoir on the Etowah River, Ga., approved in the act of August 18, 1941, at an estimated cost of $14,400,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent acts of Congress, is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 509, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and, as modified, is hereby adopted and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums previously authorized, $200,000,000 for the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in said document.

The project for flood control on the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Ark. and La., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 151, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $5,013,000.

The project for flood control on the Big Sunflower, Little Sunflower, Hushpuckena, and Quiver Rivers and their tributaries, and on Hull Brake-Mill Creek Canal, Bogue Phalia, Ditchlow Bayou, Deer Creek, and Steele Bayou, Miss., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 516, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $3,752,000.

The project for flood protection in the backwater area of the Yazoo River authorized in the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, is hereby amended to authorize the Chief of Engineers, in his discretion, to include improvements for the protection of the Satartia area at an estimated additional cost of $1,061,000 or, in his discretion, to include improvements for the protection of the Satartia area plus its extension at an estimated additional cost of $1,952,000.

RED-OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for the Little Missouri River in Arkansas, at an estimated cost of $3,800,000.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $35,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the Arkansas River Basin.

The projects for local flood protection on the Arkansas River are hereby modified and authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 447, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated additional cost of $10,299,400.

The project on tributaries of the Fountaine Que Bouille River for flood protection at Colorado Springs, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 186, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $500,000.

The project on Purgatoire River for local flood protection at Trinidad, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 387, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $909,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $45,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the White River Basin.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Upper Mississippi River Basin.

The project authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, for local flood protection on the Mississippi River at the Ste. Genevieve Levee District No. 1, Missouri, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 727, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $141,000.

The project on the Mississippi River for local flood protection at Sabula, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 328, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $25,000.

The project on the Galena River, for local flood protection at Galena, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 336, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $300,000.

The project for flood control on the Illinois River is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 692, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $111,500.

The project on Elk Creek and Turkey River for local flood protection at Elkport, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineeers in House Document No. 700, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $13,000.

RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN

The projects for flood control for Red Lake River, Minn., including Clearwater River, Minn., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 345, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $902,940.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by subsequent acts, as hereby expanded to include the plan of improvement for flood control, irrigation, power development, navigation, and other purposes, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; and as expanded is approved; and, in addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of the comprehensive plan as modified and expanded: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of that now authorized by existing law: *And provided further*, That portions of the storage authorized for the main stem of the river shall be placed on tributaries if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for silt control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial use without impairment of flood control below Sioux City and without increasing the authorized limit of cost.

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo., is hereby modified and extended to provide for improvement substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 342, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated additional cost for the modified project of $8,445,000.

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for Cherry Creek and tributaries, Colorado, at an estimated cost of $7,500,000.

The project on Knife River for local flood control at Beulah, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 252, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $26,100.

The project on Knife River for local flood control at Hazen, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 252, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $6,600.

The project on Milk River adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide local flood protection at Harlem, Mont., is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers

in Senate Document No. 103, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $21,100.

The project on Milk River for local flood protection at Havre, Mont., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 103, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $313,100.

The project on Boyer River for local flood control on East Fork of Boyer River at Denison, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 254, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $17,830.

The project on Nishnabotna River for local flood control at Hamburg, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $236,000.

The project on Bear Creek for local flood protection at Morrison, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 356, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $220,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $70,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the Ohio River Basin, including the following projects in tributary basins, namely:

The local flood protection works in the Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River area, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 685, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $135,500;

The local flood protection works at Dillonvale and Adena on Short Creek, Ohio, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 889, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $158,200;

The local flood protection works at Taylorsville on Salt River, Ky., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $129,350;

The local flood-protection works at Latrobe on Loyalhanna Creek, Pa., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 444, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $112,500;

The Burr Oak Reservoir on the Hocking River, Ohio, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 762, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $400,000;

The Rowlesburg Reservoir on the Cheat River, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in the report submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War on November 26, 1942, at an estimated cost of $29,230,000; and

The improvement in the Youghiogheny River Basin, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in a report submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War on March 29, 1943, at an estimated cost of $37,970,000.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for the Panther Mountain Reservoir on Moose River, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 405, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $600,000.

The project for flood control on Chittenango Creek and tributaries, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 625, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $111,000.

The projects for flood control on Owasco Inlet and Outlet, Montville and Dry Creeks, State Ditch, and Crane Brook, N. Y., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 815, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $64,200.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TEX.

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for the North Concho River, Tex., at an estimated cost of $4,800,000.

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for Pecan Bayou, Tex., at an estimated cost of $1,560,000.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of Whitney Reservoir in accordance with the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for the Brazos River Basin, at an estimated cost of $15,000,000.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project on Willow Creek for local flood protection at Creede, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 104, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $68,500.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The project on the San Diego River for local flood protection at San Diego, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 635, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $370,000.

VENTURA RIVER BASIN

The projects on the Ventura River and tributaries for local flood protection at Ventura and Ojai, Calif., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 323, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $1,600,000.

SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the prosecution of the projects approved in the act of June 22, 1936, as modified by the act of June 28, 1938, for the Santa Ana River Basin and for the protection of Orange County, Calif., including the projects on Lytle and Cajon Creeks for local flood protection at San Bernardino and Colton, Calif., in accordance with the recommendations contained in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 11, 1944.

LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL BASIN AND BALLONA CREEK

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and Ballona Creek, Calif.

SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

Sacramento River

The projects for the control of floods and other purposes on the Sacramento River, Calif., adopted by the acts approved March 1, 1917, May 15, 1928, August 26, 1937, and August 18, 1941, are hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated February 7, 1944, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, at an estimated cost of $46,056,000; and, in addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $15,000,000 for the prosecution of the modified projects: *Provided*, That this modification of the project shall not be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Table Mountain site.

San Joaquin River

The project for the Isabella Reservoir on the Kern River for flood control and other purposes in the San Joaquin Valley, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated January 26, 1944, contained in House Document No. —, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $6,800,000.

The plan for the Terminus and Success Reservoirs on the Kaweah and Tule Rivers for flood control and other purposes in the San Joaquin Valley, Calif., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized $4,600,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the plan.

The project for flood control and other purposes for the Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans contained in House Document No. 630, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable at an estimated cost of $19,700,000: *Provided*, That the conditions of local cooperation specified in said document shall not apply: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall make arrangements for payment to the United States by the State or other responsible agency, either in lump sum or annual installments, for conservation storage when used: *Provided further*, That the division of costs between flood control and irrigation and other water uses shall be determined by the Secretary of War on the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the War Department, and the local organizations.

The plan of improvement for local flood protection on various streams in the Merced County stream group in the San Joaquin Valley is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 473, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $1,300,000.

The plan of improvement for flood control and other purposes on the Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries, including Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Flood Control Committee Document No. 2, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized $8,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the plan.

COQUILLE RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Coquille River, Oreg., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 620, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $143,000.

NEHALEM RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Nehalem River, Oreg., is hereby authorized

substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 621, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $23,000.

WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $20,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Willamette River Basin, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The projects on the Snake River for local flood protection at Heise, Roberts, and Weiser, Idaho, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 452, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $743,000.

The projects on the Palouse River and tributaries for local flood protection at Pullman and Colfax, Wash., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 888, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $478,000.

The project on Alkali Canyon for local flood protection at Arlington, Oreg., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 631, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $118,000.

WILLAPA RIVER BASIN

The project on the Willapa River for local flood protection at Raymond, Wash., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 701, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $127,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 5, strike out all of line 2 after the word "herein" and all of lines 3 and 4 and all of line 5, including the word "reconversion" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the Committee permit me to say that the language stricken out on page 5 of the bill is as follows:

Shall be initiated as expeditiously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements and shall be prosecuted vigorously during the period of post-war reconversion.

The Director of the Budget suggested in lieu of that language the language of the amendment that I have sent to the Clerk's desk. I think it means the same thing and the committee is agreeable to the language suggested by the Director of the Budget rather than the language of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment in exactly the same language on page 27 of the bill where this language I have directed attention to occurs again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 27, strike out all of line 9 after the word "herein" and all of lines 10, 11, and 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the identical language is stricken and the same language substituted as in the previous amendment, applicable to page 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have one further committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 20, line 11, strike out the period after the word "site" and add the following words: "But shall authorize only the low level project to approximately the elevation of 400 feet above mean sea level, said low level dam to be built on a foundation sufficient for such dam and not on a foundation for future construction of a higher dam."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this proviso has reference to a project along the Sacramento River. The present proviso in the bill is in the following language:

Provided, That this modification of the project shall not be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Table Mountain site.

The language that I have submitted in the amendment proposed is the language that the Member from that district involved, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has suggested, which the Corps of Engineers has approved. It means exactly the same as the language in the bill and the committee has no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Page 5, at the end of line 10, insert:

"In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the rivers of the Nation through the construction of works of improvement, for navigation or flood control, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control; to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes, of the waters of the Nation's rivers; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with the appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users.

"In conformity with this policy, any works of improvement for navigation or flood control herein or hereafter authorized for construction by the Chief of Engineers under the supervision of the Secretary of War affecting the use of waters in the rivers of the Nation shall be governed by the following provisions and conditions:

"(a) Works herein authorized shall not be undertaken until an investigation and a report thereon have been made and approved by the Congress, as provided in (b), in any case where the Governor of any State in which the works or any part thereof are located or in which arise any of the waters which are required therefor, files a written objection thereto with the Secretary of War within 3 months after the date of this act.

"(b) Such works hereafter authorized for construction shall not be undertaken until after the making of an investigation, and the submission to and approval by the Congress of a report as provided in this paragraph. The investigation and report shall be made to the end, among other things, of providing for the coordination of plans for the construction and operation of the proposed works with other plans for the use of waters that would be affected thereby. In conformity with this requirement, the Secretary of War is hereby directed to investigate such proposed works for navigation or flood control in cooperation with the State or States in which the works or any part thereof are to be located and in which arise any of the waters that would be required therefor, and, in the case of works that might require the use of waters arising west of the ninety-seventh meridian, in cooperation also with the Secretary of the Interior. Reports based on such cooperative investigations, to be submitted to the Congress, shall set out therein, among other things, the relationship between the construction and operation of the proposed works and the plans of the various States respecting the affected waters, the views and recommendations of the affected States with respect to the proposed works; and in the case of investigations made in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, the relationship between the construction and the operation of the proposed works and existing and potential beneficial consumptive uses of waters west of the ninety-seventh meridian, and between plans developed or being developed by the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of the arid lands and purposes incidental thereto, and the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with particular reference to these matters. Such reports shall be effective only when approved by the Congress."

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendment as read. This amendment admittedly is somewhat long. My remarks on it are going to be appreciably more brief. Under the circumstances the amendment, in order to cover the ground, has to be long, but in reality there is nothing complex or involved about it. Its purpose, clearly stated in the first paragraph, is to protect the States against developments within their borders, which would be detrimental to them. The amendment does not provide—and I want to emphasize this—that any State can permanently block a necessary project. Neither does it create unnecessary delay in the case of future authorizations as provided in section (b). The procedure would be essentially no different from that which is now followed. The time involved would be no greater. Even in the case of section (a), works included in the present authorization, there is no question of construction beginning until after the close of the war, and there is no reason

for any objection to the delay that might be involved.

The amendment simply makes mandatory that proposed projects shall be examined by the Secretary of War in cooperation with the State or States affected, and in the case of waters west of the ninety-seventh meridian in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior. It thus makes certain that in all cases the position of the State or States with reference to construction and operation of a project shall come officially before Congress in the Army engineers' reports. Whereas the facts are sometimes brought before the Army engineers, they recognize the States' right to be heard in these matters, and so long as we continue to be a Federal Government, composed of 48 States, it preserves to the individual State the rights to which its self-respect and dignity entitle it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is this not the same language that was stricken out of the river and harbor bill, or similar to an amendment that was rejected in the House when the river and harbor bill was under consideration?

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I do not have the text of that amendment before me.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have very high regard for the gentleman who offered this amendment, but I do not believe the proposed language should be written into the flood control law of the land. I do not think that it could be charged that I am one who disregards local and State rights in reference to water. As a matter of fact, when the rivers and harbors bill was before the House I spoke in favor of the amendment and voted for all of the amendments to give priority to the rights of the local irrigators and users of water.

However, in the amendment that is before us now we have a different proposition. As I understand this amendment, it would mean that every project we have authorized today by this act would have to be resurveyed, another report brought back to the Congress, and then Congress would have to authorize it again; more surveys, more reports, more waiting, more expense.

There are rivers in the country that have had very serious flood-control problems, where the damages run into the millions of dollars and cost hundreds of lives. For year after year they have had surveys and resurveys and meetings and pep meetings and surveys and more surveys, and the people are tired of it. There is not a project here which does not have the approval of the district engineer, the division engineer, the Board of Review of Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers. To enact a provision in this bill that says we propose to authorize some work and that this authorization does not count until you have another survey, another report back to Congress and another act of Congress, is rather confusing. It is unfair to the people who will be benefited by this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the course of those surveys by the district engineers and the United States Army engineers Corps, public hearings are held, not only locally, but here in Washington, and an opportunity is afforded to anyone who desires to present his views; is that not correct?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

I am very much in accord with the objective of the amendment to grant every possible consideration to local interests. I am very much in accord with the idea that State authorities should be consulted in these matters, but I do not believe that we can win the respect of the country by making our procedure more cumbersome and say that we are going to have two acts of Congress to authorize what we say we are authorizing today.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

There are a number of projects in this authorization bill which are located in the State of Oregon, and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Flood Control and his colleagues on their wisdom and foresight in including these projects in the bill. Several of those Oregon projects are in my own congressional district, and I confess to a certain degree of personal satisfaction in the generous treatment they have received from the committee because all of those projects were initiated by myself, as the Representative in Congress from that district, and all of them had their origin in the resolution which I introduced providing for the initial surveys.

The Willamette River Basin flood-control project when completed will be one of the most comprehensive flood control projects in the entire world. It will not only stop the disastrous floods in the valley but it will also irrigate the entire area through which that great river flows.

This is the third authorization made by the Congress for this great project, which has been declared by the Army engineers to be one of the most perfect multi-purpose projects of its kind in the United States, and one of the most beneficial.

Since I introduced the resolution authorizing the first survey several years ago the project has expanded in scope beyond the original expectations of either the engineers or the people in the Willamette Valley who will benefit most directly by it. Already there has been authorized for the project $22,300,000, most of which has been appropriated and spent in construction. This bill authorizes $20,000,000 more, and I am glad to note that the committee recommends the expenditure of that additional amount immediately following the close of the war. This project has been given a very high post-war priority and it distinctly merits it.

Both for the information of my colleagues and of the people of the Willamette Valley, who are so vitally interested in this project, I should like to read here a portion of the committee's report, showing the scope of the project and the progress which has been made to date.

The Willamette River is formed by the Coast and Middle Forks, which join a few miles above Eugene, Oreg. The river then flows north 189 miles to enter the Columbia River 99 miles above its mouth. The Willamette Basin lies between the Cascade Range on the east and the coast range on the west. The mountainous areas, which comprise a large part of the basin, are characteristically rugged and generally covered by forests. The valley floor proper is a broad alluvial plain through which the main stream and the lower sections of its tributaries flow in winding courses. The basin has a drainage area of 11,200 square miles. The population is approximately 650,000, engaged in farming and forestry and the processing of those products. The farm lands in the valley are very fertile and are intensely cultivated.

Floods in the basin may be expected from November through April and major floods occur in the period from late November to early February. Flood damages to farm lands and communities are very heavy. The most recent flood in this area occurred in the period between December 31, 1942, and January 4, 1943, when the stage at Albany exceeded bankfull stage by 13.6 feet and an area of 342,300 acres was inundated, causing damage estimated at $5,708,000.

Congress authorized bank-protection works at several localities in the basin in the Flood Control Act of 1936 and in the act of June 28, 1938, approved the general comprehensive plan for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in the Willamette River Basin as set forth in House Document No. 544, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, and authorized $11,300,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of that plan. The Flood Control Act of 1941 authorized an additional appropriation of $11,000,000 for the prosecution of this comprehensive plan. With authorization of funds thus far provided by Congress the War Department has completed most of the bank-protection works along the Willamette, Clackamas, Molalla, and Santiam Rivers, and the Fern Ridge and Cottage Grove Reservoirs. The preparation of detailed plans for four other reservoirs in the approved plan is well under way.

The committee recognizes the importance of carrying forward the flood-protection works in the Willamette River Basin to an early completion and it believes that the sum of $20,000,000 should be authorized at this time in order that this important work may continue immediately following the cessation of hostilities.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein data contained in the committee's report on this project, a part of which I have just read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did the gentleman say that there were certain projects the surveys of which had not been completed, and which were not included because the surveys were not completed?

Mr. MOTT. No; I did not say that. I said there were a number of authorized Oregon projects in the bill, and I was calling particular attention to one of the major ones in western Oregon, in the first district of that State, which I have the honor to represent. The survey for this particular project was completed more than 5 years ago and the construction has been under way for 4 years. Surveys for the other Oregon project were completed more recently, but they have all been completed, and approved.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS], the author of the pending amendment, and I want to be kindly disposed when he asked him if his amendment did not embrace matters that were defeated on the floor of the House during the consideration of the river and harbor bill a few weeks ago. The gentleman very frankly responded that he was not aware. If the question had been asked him just what his amendment embraced and who was responsible for it, I think he might have answered in a similar way and said that he did not know, because whether he knows it or not, this amendment is contradictory, and would destroy flood control.

There would not be any flood control or reclamation or other projects under the proposed amendment. Somebody has imposed on the gentleman, I say with all due deference, and there have been cooked up into one amendment offered by him a lot of the unfounded fears that have been conjured up by some of the people in the far West with respect to reclamation.

For instance, there is a provision here that one law shall apply east of the ninety-seventh meridian and another west of the ninety-seventh meridian. Whether the gentleman knows it or not, under the Constitution of the United States the same law must apply everywhere where the facts are identical, because the Constitution is applicable both east and west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

Again, the gentleman says that all of the projects that are approved in this bill shall be referred to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the other services, when in truth and in fact, whether the gentleman knows it or not, under the regulations of the President of the United States, the Director of the Budget now directs that before any recommendations can be submitted by the Chief of Engineers or by the Secretary of War they must be referred to the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, and other agencies of the Government that may be interested. So there would be a case of going up the hill again after we have already made the trip down. All of those precautions are provided for in the existing Budget requirements.

Moreover, with respect to the doctrine of the appropriation of waters west of the ninety-seventh meridian, permit me to say that there are flood-control projects in this bill for the protection of the city of Los Angeles, with 1,500,000 people. There are projects in this bill west of the ninety-seventh meridian for the protection of the people of the Sacramento Valley, where the Congress of the United States has been making flood-control appropriations since 1917.

There are items in this bill for the protection of the magnificent valleys of the Kings and Kern Rivers, where the people for more than 75 years have constructed their own local protective works, where millions of dollars have been invested in local protection works. Yet under the gentleman's amendment, all of these matters would be thrown into the ash-can and hereafter they shall be under the supervision of the Commissioner of Reclamation, if those responsible and fostering the gentleman's amendment have their way.

Again, this bill provides for magnificent flood-control projects in the State of Oregon in the Willamette Valley, one of the most magnificent valleys and one of the best flood-control projects in the United States. All projects are now referred, and properly so, for comment to the Director of Reclamation and the Federal Power Commission, under the direction of the President of the United States, before they are transmitted to the Congress. The Director of the Budget requires that all comments and all criticism of every project be embraced in the reports.

Mr. Chairman, whether the gentleman knows it or not, one of the best projects in this bill is for the protection of New England. I give it to you as my deliberate judgment, and I know something of every river in the United States—mark my words, I measure my statement when I say there is more nearly complete protection for the Connecticut Valley in New England in this bill than for any other part of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLUMLEY: On page 5, line 18, after the article "a", strike out the word "high."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, since I arrived on the floor I have received a telegram concerning which I wish to make a comment or two, and it will take me more than 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I used up a lot of time yesterday undertaking to define my position with respect to this bill. I shall not take much time now.

I stated the reasons why I proposed to offer this amendment.

Personally and officially I am opposed to any dam at the proposed Williamsville site such as is contemplated. There is no exigency, no emergency, no hurry, which necessitates action at this time in the Connecticut River Valley area.

It may be that the so-called program now calls for a dam at the Williamsville site. This is not conclusive of the need therefor.

Competent engineers advise me that there are other ways to accomplish the necessary flood control without disrupting the program or destroying so much property, or interfering with so many lives as does the proposed establishment of the Williamsville Dam. Even a low dam, whatever that is or may be, for its height and its definition is left to the discretion of the Army engineers.

You see, Mr. Chairman, this low dam destroys 4 cemeteries, one of 50 graves, one of 300 graves, another of 300 graves, and the fourth of 200 graves, a total of 850 graves. Some of them are of men who were at Westminster, Vt., where the first blood of the Revolution was shed.

It is to be 460 feet above mean sea level, and 180 feet high from the foundation. It will flood 2,700 acres destroying two villages, namely, West Dummerston and Harmonyville, where incidentally, there is everything but harmony with respect to the prospect of its destruction.

Some 144 buildings will be inundated including schools and churches.

So I am opposed to the plan as proposed. You would be, did it involve the people of your district.

It is true the compacts are out of the window, but even the Federal Government should show some respect for States which evidenced their desire to contract to establish flood control and did compact so to do.

Since it is a matter of record that there are other plans which do not involve destruction and devastation but afford ample protection for flood control, I insist that neither the authorization in this bill, nor previous authorizations should be construed to authorize the construction of any dam at the Williamsville site, and therefore, to accomplish this purpose the bill should be amended as I suggest: On page 5, line 18, by striking out the word "high." The proviso will then read:

Provided, That neither this authorization, nor previous authorizations, shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam at the Williamsville site.

This should be done in order that more complete and full and ample consideration and further hearings may be had, and that the rights and interests of the several States involved and affected may be taken into consideration more completely and fully protected.

The excuse and justification offered for Federal interference is based on the argument that States will not enter into compacts. The States involved in this controversy did enter into a compact; therefore, that argument falls flat. They agreed; they legislated; they made a compact "out of the window." They are nevertheless entitled to be heard before sentence is pronounced and they are dictatorially executed on a Federal altar.

I desire to read a telegram I have just received:

SPRINGFIELD, VT., *May 8, 1944.*

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Am informed it is reported I stated before Flood Control Committee in House of Representatives that Vermont would be satisfied with a dam on West River if power potentialities were eliminated. Such report entirely erroneous, if alleged to be a quotation, it is incorrect. We urge such flood-control construction as will safeguard persons and property along lower Connecticut River and at same time preserve and not destroy West River Valley. I request you carry this message to the House. What is a high dam?

ALBAN J. PARKER,
State of Vermont Attorney General.

The attorney general opposed the construction of any dam at the Williamsville site. He favored, instead, a number of small dams in that basin, which would give equal or a greater amount of flood-control storage for the benefit of the lower Connecticut River Valley area, and would give the West River Valley area flood protection also, while not destroying its essential character.

The attorney general spoke officially for the State.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to participate in any civil war in New England and I regret the necessity of rising in opposition to the amendment of my colleague from Vermont. As a matter of fact, the striking out of the word "high" in the proviso inserted in this bill, as suggested by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], would leave the proviso reading, "neither this authorization nor previous authorizations shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam at the Williamsville site."

I want to call attention to the fact that the proposed dam at the Williamsville site is one of 20 approved by the Army engineers and approved by Congress. Three of these reservoirs have been built and money is authorized in this bill for the other 17 reservoirs. There is no more reason why Congress should say there shall not be a flood-control reservoir at Williamsville than we should say there shall not be a flood-control reservoir at any other town in Vermont. Congress cannot pick the site for these flood-control reservoirs. We have got to leave that to the Army engineers. I think when the committee added this proviso eliminating the high dam at Williamsville, they assured the people of Vermont that there would be no more land flooded than was absolutely necessary to carry out their plan of flood control, and for flood control alone. I concurred in the statements made before the Committee on Flood Control by the distinguished attorney general from Vermont and I am so quoted in the record. If this bill provided funds as had been contemplated for erecting a $29,000,000 dam and reservoir at Williamsville, I would be fighting side by side with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] to strike that item from the bill. But so long as the Williamsville Dam and Reservoir is nothing more than a flood-control dam and reservoir like the other 19 reservoirs, I do not believe the amendment should be adopted. We continue to leave the decisions as to the location of these flood-control reservoirs with the Army engineers.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it perhaps will be interesting to the members of the committee to know that there have been 3 major floods on the Connecticut River in the last 17 years; in 1927, 1936, and 1938. Those 3 floods took 28 lives and caused property loss to the extent of $144,000,000. These floods come too frequently. Each year we suffer damages amounting on the average, according to the Army engineers, to more than $3,800,000 in the Connecticut Valley. Even in those years when we have only spring freshets, our losses run into hundreds of thousands of dollars, due to damage done in smaller agricultural and industrial towns. In order to offset these great losses which have occurred, as I say, in the past 17 years, the Army engineers have come forward with a program of local protective works at 7 cities and towns and for the construction of 20 reservoirs. These are small reservoirs. Of these 20 reservoirs, the largest is the reservoir to which this amendment is directed. The total number of square miles drained by the tributaries whose waters would be impounded in the 20 reservoirs is about 2,500. This reservoir alone represents 400 square miles or about one-sixth of the entire program. It is all important to the people of Hartford, Springfield, and Holyoke, and of all the cities and towns in Massachusetts and Connecticut, as well as in New Hampshire and in Vermont, which lie on the Connecticut River, that this dam remain in the program. The Army engineers have told us time and time again it is the most important dam that we have. If we go through with this program, for which the Government has already appropriated or authorized the expenditure of $40,000,000, to leave out this dam would be like the boy in Holland with the dike. You would have a complete, beautiful dike, but you would have a hole in it, and no one would be plugging the hole. The result would be we would suffer huge losses along this river, regardless of how much we had expended on the other 19 dams.

For that reason I feel that this committee, knowing these facts and of these losses of over $144,000,000 in the 17 years in 3 separate floods, plus the loss of 28 lives, will not want to stand in the way of the recommendations of the Army engineers. Only yesterday the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] stated he wanted it distinctly understood that he is all for flood control, and his constituents are incontrovertibly for flood control. This is a chance for him to prove it, because this is the most important flood-control reservoir that there would be in the entire Connecticut Valley. Yesterday a former Governor of Massachusetts, our colleague, who knows about what has been going on in our New England States, said that the compacts to which the gentleman from Vermont referred in his speech, cannot possibly be carried out between the several States. In other words, about $5,000,000,000 may have to be used in order to have complete flood control in this country. In those basins which lie in more than one State, as the Governor stated yesterday, you cannot expect the States to take on any such burden. The compacts in New England which were referred to and which were voted down and rejected by this body back in 1938, provided for only eight small dams, and they included power. Power has been taken out of this dam in order to meet the objections of the people of Vermont. All we ask for is a low dam for flood-control purposes only. The reservoir will be in a valley where 76 percent of the land is wooded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to enter into this very pleasant and interesting Republican dispute from New England, but coming from New England myself, I enter as one who represents a district in that section of the country. It is also pleasing to me, as the author, in 1938, of the 100-percent Federal contribution for flood-control dams, to note my Republican brethren from New England, every one of whom were here at that time, opposed it, that they have seen the light and now support the position that I took then. I see the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] in a nice, pleasant way chastising me by indicating that he was the other way. Well, I cannot challenge him because I have too much affection for him to take issue with him even if my recollection was to the contrary.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to get into this New England pleasantry? I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Would not the gentleman still favor the compact method of the States rather than the method provided in this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman introduced the law under which these authorizations are being made. The gentleman from Massachusetts comes from an area that has no flood problems. But the gentleman from the Boston section of New England, who is now speaking, always thought that the problems of the people of other sections of the coun-

try were the problems of the people of my section, and I am glad to see my New England brethren on the Republican side getting away from their economic provincialism in considering the problems of the people of other sections of the country.

So my purpose in rising was not so much to enter into a Republican dispute of a pleasant nature but, perhaps with a little pride, to refresh the recollection of my Republican brethren from New England when they condemned me as a violator of States' rights in 1938, when the only thing I stood for was that where a river flowed between two or more States—I do not care where they are located, north, east, south, or west—and the people of the area in which the river flowed were affected by floods, loss of life, and loss of property, that was a challenge to the Federal Government and not to the State governments. That was the broad viewpoint I always took, and I am somewhat proud of the fact that the existing law was introduced by myself. I am particularly pleased to note my Republican friends from New England, who were here in 1938—mark you, I say 1938—honestly opposing then after the experience of the past several years has shown that my humble leadership at that time was for the best interests of the country and for the best interests of New England following me now.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Perhaps it is possible that some of the Republican friends from New England know when they are licked, but we do not want to be drowned after that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Correct. Open confession is always good for the soul, according to the old saying. In any event, as I recollect, my friend is excluded from my remarks, as he was not here in 1938.

As far as the amendment is concerned, with this little pleasant exchange refreshing history for the benefit of New England only, I hope the amendment of my friend from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a citizen of the State of Jefferson Davis, standing for State rights from my youth up, I rather hesitate to enter into this controversy with Vermont, because it might serve to remind of the days of '63, when my relatives and some citizens from Vermont had some differences that were adjusted at Vicksburg against Mississippi's better judgment. But I should like to say there is not a Member of the House for whom I entertain a higher personal regard than my good friend the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]. For many years, as a voice crying in the wilderness, there were those of us who defended reservoirs to detain the floodwaters in the hills where they originate, as a contribution to the solution of flood control. Among the first reservoirs for flood control that I ever saw, among the first constructed in the United States, were some reservoirs in the magnificent State of Vermont. I shall never forget a trip I made across the beautiful Green Mountains one afternoon, in driving out from Montpelier. Interested in mountains and streams as I am, I visited among the first flood-control reservoirs constructed east of the Mississippi River for flood control in the State of Vermont. They protected the lands below. As a member of the Committee on Flood Control, I received an inspiration, and we provided for reservoirs in every flood-control act, beginning with the act of 1936.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] if adopted, would be—pardon me for saying it—worse than ridiculous. Under the adopted project for the Connecticut River Basin for the protection of Holyoke, Springfield, Hartford, and the valley up the river, there are some 14 to 19 reservoirs authorized, as I recall, 5 being in the State of New Hampshire—the river dividing those 2 beautiful, magnificent, and fine States—9 of them being in the State of Vermont. The closest of these reservoirs to Massachusetts, as I recall, is the reservoir that the gentleman would strike out of this bill. So they would leave in the act the reservoirs that really occupy other narrow valleys of Vermont farther up the State. It is really most unsound to contemplate the elimination of one reservoir near the boundary of Massachusetts, and there are several in Massachusetts, one or two of which have already been constructed, as I recall, just to strike out one reservoir that is farthest away from most of the people in Vermont. In my judgment, the $30,000,000 authorized in this bill for the further protection of the valley would be jeopardized, because the millions of money spent for the construction of levees and flood walls at Springfield, Hartford, Holyoke, and other cities was all expended and the heights of flood walls and levees were fixed in consideration of the benefits of the reservoirs that were to be constructed above.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that there is no more generous flood-control project in the United States, none any more nearly completely provided for, than that along the Connecticut River, in the flood-control acts, beginning with the act of 1936, and perfected in the pending bill.

With all deference, I trust that the amendment of my friend the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] in the interest of flood control in New England, will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: On page 6, line 16, after the amount strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following: "And is further modified to include flood-control work and structures in the greater Endicott-Vestal-Johnson City area on the Susquehanna River at cost not exceeding $500,000."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, the distinguished chairman of the committee and several of his colleagues made a trip into up-State New York and examined flood damage done by the Chenango and Susquehanna Rivers. They found and they recommended that a great deal of trouble could be saved the people up there by the building of the Whitney Point Dam project.

Unfortunately, as I said in my remarks on the floor yesterday, this only accomplished half what it should have accomplished. It saved the city of Binghamton, which is at the confluence of the Chenango and Susquehanna Rivers. The steps taken in flood-control work at that junction and in the Whitney Point Dam project did save the city of Binghamton itself from serious future flood ravages. Unfortunately, it did little or nothing for the municipalities of Johnson City, Endicott, and the village of Vestal, a few miles below, on the Susquehanna River. In fact, the construction of flood walls on the southern bank of the Susquehanna, in the city of Binghamton, may even have aggravated the situation further down, because as time passed, more and more sediment collected along the banks of the Susquehanna down near greater Endicott, and throughout the Vestal area.

Every year thousands of people are flooded out of the lowlands on each side of the Susquehanna as it courses down through Johnson City, Willow Point, Broad Acres, Vestal, and through the Greater Endicott area. For this reason I submit to the House that this job has been only partly done. Nearly as many people are affected in these areas—and the distinguished Chairman is familiar with that section—as there are in the city of Binghamton. I hope the House will give serious consideration to further and additional flood-control work being done in the very near future by the Army engineers on those few miles beyond the confluence of the Chenango and the Susquehanna Rivers. Those people living in areas below the junction are just as much entitled to have their properties protected against floods as the good people in my own home city of Binghamton are. I am very happy about and satisfied with the work which the committee and the Army engineers have done in my home section. Nevertheless, I believe that the Army engineers owe it to the people of the municipalities farther down the river to see to it either that the river is dredged at Vestal and vicinity or that constructive and substantial flood walls are erected at these points so that floods will not in the future ravage and damage the properties of the people down there.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Did the gentleman appear before the committee on this project?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have appeared before the committee and I will say in all deference to the good chairman that he gave me a very sympathetic hearing. I have also talked with General Reber who at that time was in charge of the Army Engineer Corps. They have all been sympathetic with my proposal.

If this amendment is adopted it will provide that those sections and those municipalities be added to the sections that have already been mentioned in this bill and that no steps can be taken until the provisions of this legislation have applied to them, they to be subject also to such other legislation as should apply. Let me point out that no objections have been voiced by the Army engineers to this project so far as I know. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted and I ask the favorable consideration of the Committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall not take the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in opposing this amendment permit me to say that we are most sympathetic with the situation at Binghamton. The project was adopted for the vicinity of Binghamton. If the project is to be extended to other areas will not the gentleman permit me to suggest that he will have to ask the committee to pass a resolution, ask that the project be reviewed, and ask for a report so the project could be submitted by the committee?

Under the gentleman's amendment there is nothing said about the local people being required to furnish the rights-of-way or to maintain the project when constructed; and with all the deference to the gentleman, if he wants the protection that has been given to Binghamton extended the committee will be delighted to do it, but under the rule that obtains any projects in this bill must first be considered by the engineers, reported on, and the report submitted to the committee. Members of Congress have the privilege of following this course; but there is no way in which we can include a project on which there is no report.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will yield, certainly, but I do not want to take up too much of the time of the Committee.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I know the gentleman is sympathetic to the situation. Will he yield for a question?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield for a question; go ahead and propound your question.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman's committee has already brought about flood-control work in the city of Binghamton, and I know the gentleman is just as interested in sections a few miles farther down. I want to ask him if he does not feel that it is just as fair to protect those people down there, 15 miles farther down the Susquehanna, as it is to protect the people in the city of Binghamton?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be pleased to answer the gentleman's question, but I ask the indulgence of the House for intruding on the committee's time. The projects submitted to the committee and approved are contained in the report submitted with this bill, and all the hearings before the committee are available. I repeat again that we have not embraced in the report made by our committee any project unless it has been favorably reported by the Chief of Engineers. In the absence of a report to extend the adopted project in the usual way I know of no reason why an exception should be made.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman recalls, does he not, when I came before his committee 3 or 4 years ago and pointed out this very situation it was as pressing then as it is now. Scarcely a year passes but what this section is inundated, and I say that the construction of flood walls would relieve the condition.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Again I suggest to the gentleman that he come before the committee and ask for a survey; but I trust the gentleman will not hold the committee responsible for statements made to the committee by Members of Congress, including himself, the gentleman from New York, because they are interested in their districts. We are always glad to have their views; but there is a hard and fast procedure that must be followed by everybody in Congress to get a project included in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: On page 12, line 20, strike out the last word "*Provided*" and then strike out all of lines 21, 22, and 23 and strike out the first 5 words in line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the use for navigation and related purposes, in connection with this expanded general comprehensive plan, of those waters of the Missouri River which arise west of the ninety-seventh meridian shall be subordinate to and shall not adversely affect at any time the beneficial consumptive use, west of the ninety-seventh meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that the States in the upper Missouri River Basin shall have preference to their own waters for domestic use and for irrigation. The amendment applies only to the arid lands of the Missouri River Basin west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

I am aware that the chairman of this committee has erroneously stated that unless the amendment applies to the whole of the United States it is unconstitutional. I challenge the correctness of that conclusion and I say to him that it is not unconstitutional, that under the Constitution the Federal Government has power to start in any part of the United States of America in connection with flood control and with navigable streams. I say to him that the only place in the Constitution of the United States where he will find a provision to the effect that the operation of laws must be uniform throughout the Nation is in the bankruptcy clause, naturalization and taxation provisions.

The chairman therefore is mistaken on the constitutional question, absolutely mistaken. The Government of the United States is not limited by any provision of the Constitution from operating in any part of the United States of America. It can make any classification it sees fit to of the subject matter or the location in which it operates.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman believe that proviso a good one which reads: "Nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand on the water resources of the river above Sioux City"? Does not that meet with his approval?

Mr. LEMKE. That does not meet with my approval.

Mr. STEFAN. Would that take care of the gentleman's objection?

Mr. LEMKE. No; it does not because we have to go further in providing water for irrigation in the upper Missouri River Basin. This provision limits us to existing law which is insufficient.

Mr. STEFAN. How about the words "now authorized by existing law"? Would that not satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. LEMKE. That will not satisfy us. Under that provision they can take for navigation every drop of water that we need in dry years for irrigation purposes. We would then be left high and dry without enough water even to give a cow a good drink.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sympathetic with what the gentleman is trying to avoid, but I am wondering if the purpose of his amendment is not disposed of by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]?

Mr. LEMKE. No, it is not, because that is a State-right matter. We are here dealing with a particular question in a particular project, the Missouri River Basin.

Let me show you why we are not satisfied with the provisions of this bill. I know that the chairman has said that he is interested in irrigation, that he is willing that we should keep all the water for irrigation purposes so as to prevent it from flooding the lower Mississippi Valley. That is exactly what we want to do. We want his cooperation in this effort. We want him to help us to keep the waters needed for irrigation in the upper Missouri Basin. This so that we can have it for domestic use and in order to build up our ground-water level again, that has fallen 52 feet in the last 50 or 75 years.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Section 4 says that the Secretary of War is authorized to sell for domestic and industrial use the surplus water. That must mean there is some water to be kept back and we are going to get the surplus water, if any.

Mr. LEMKE. That is correct, but there will be no surplus water and I wish to give you the facts right now in connection with that. For instance, under existing law they could take 16,800,000 acre-feet a year, whereas we have only 11,600,000 acre-feet in dry years in the Missouri River Basin. That is the difference in our conclusions and that of the committee. It is for this reason we are objecting to the present existing law, which is a camouflage and a hypocritical pretense to steal all the water in the Missouri River in dry seasons in order to permit a few boats to float down the Mississippi River.

Mr. BURDICK. In a year like that there would be no surplus water?

Mr. LEMKE. There will not be a drop. As a matter of fact, there will be a deficiency in the water supply.

I have no quarrel with the able chairman of the Committee on Flood Control; in fact, I admire his willingness to listen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to cooperate with the chairman on flood control; I am opposed to floods, I am opposed to the devastation caused by floods, but I want him to understand that for every dollar lost through floods we lost a hundred by drought. I want him to know that if he works with us to keep this water which we intend to use for irrigation and other purposes, it will be the best way to prevent floods in the lower Mississippi Valley. That should be his aim and purpose as well as ours.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been rushed in here before we have had an opportunity to get the report of the Bureau of Reclamation and I want to quote now from H. W. Bashore, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation in his report on the Missouri River Basin, which report has just been released. This bill should have waited until that report was released and studied by the members of the committee.

Mr. Bashore in his report states as follows:

> The reclamation plan proposes a total of 90 reservoirs with a combined capacity of 45,700,000 acre-feet, most of the reservoirs on tributaries of the Missouri for use in irrigation, flood control, and power development, but two-thirds of the reservoir capacity on the main stream for use in flood control, aid to navigation, power development, and irrigation.
>
> When fully developed, the plan would provide water for the irrigation of 4,760,400 acres of dry land, and supplemental water for 538,000 acres of land now irrigated but not assured adequate water in years of low run-off. Seventeen power plants, in the completed power system, would supply seasonal power for pumping water for irrigation, and nearly four billion kilowatt-hours of firm power, annually, for domestic, commercial, and industrial uses.
>
> The irrigation of numerous areas scattered widely over the northern Great Plains and over other semiarid sections of the Missouri River Basin would add to an unavoidably precarious dry farm and grazing economy the stabilizing influence of lands with insured crops and high yields.
>
> The droughts of the last decade cost governmental agencies, principally Federal, a total of $1,246,557,087, and these expenditures were inadequate to the needs, since tens of thousands of families nevertheless were forced to migrate from their abandoned homes. These expenditures are roughly equal to the cost of full utilization of the waters of the Missouri River system. While it is not contended that full use of these waters will eliminate drought losses, it will reduce the catastrophic effects and prevent much of the human suffering.

Let us get this project and save the flood waters for the upper Missouri River Basin States in dry years. I realize we are 48 States, but 1 Nation. If that 1 Nation is to be preserved the rights of these 48 States must be respected, even by the Committee on Flood Control and by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I may say that this battle has just begun. This is just a skirmish. We are going to win because justice will prevail in the end. We are not going to take the water from the people in the States where it originated so that some fellow may float a yacht down the lower Mississippi Valley, while the people and their cattle in the upper regions go hungry on account of the lack of food and water.

The chairman of the Committee on Flood Control says that irrigation has nothing to do with this bill. That the bill will not interfere with irrigation. Then why did he put that provision in the bill that we are limited to existing law? If it has nothing to do with it, why have you not the courtesy, as you are so unusually courteous on all occasions, to put in this amendment that can do no harm to the bill?

If it is true that this bill does not interfere with our irrigation projects, why not put this simple little amendment in to allay our apprehensions? I have in my office hundreds of requests from Governors, county commissioners, and from various local communities in which the fear is expressed that this bill will deprive them of the local use of their own waters. Why not allay their apprehensions?

I again beg the chairman of this committee to be courteous enough to that great area to accept this amendment.

I submit the following basic facts to show that with a 6-foot channel there is only enough water left to irrigate approximately 2,778,000 acres, and that with a 9-foot channel there would be no water at all left for irrigation.

Out of 15,768,000 acre-feet mean annual yield at Yankton:

Requirement with 6-foot channel and reservoirs to regulate 20,000[1] by 2 by 240 (navigation period)	9,600,000
Evaporation from reservoirs	1,000,000
Waste to coordinate flood control with navigation	500,000
Release during nonnavigation period for various uses	500,000
Total	11,600,000
15,768,000—11,600,000=4,168,000 acre-feet for upstream domestic, industrial, and irrigation use (for 2,778,000 acres).	
Requirements with 9-foot channel and reservoirs to regulate 30,000 by 2 by 240 (navigation period)	14,800,000
Evaporation	1,000,000
Waste	500,000
Winter release	500,000
Total	16,800,000

[1] 20,000 cubic second-feet converted to acre-feet for the navigation period of 240 days per year.

This permits no irrigation development at all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is unable, due to illness, to be here this afternoon. You all know his interest in irrigation, and I am sure, will well understand his disappointment at not being here.

Mr. Chairman, this House has been hearing a good deal in the past few months about irrigation and what it means to those of us who live in the arid and semiarid parts of the West. It was with a great deal of pleasure that I listened today to our distinguished majority leader speak about the converts to flood control in the New England delegations during the past 7 or 8 years. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I recall during our recent debate on the river and harbor bill the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] getting up and telling us that he had been out in our part of the country, and because of

first-hand information on our needs he thereby became a convert to irrigation and its possibilities.

Mr. Chairman, to those of us who live in the West, water is of the greatest importance. It is our basic natural resource, and everything we do is predicated on its use. We are not unselfish in looking after our own interests in this respect because we know that the wise use of the water which originates in our area will not only benefit us but, in the final analysis, the rest of the country as well. Water is our lifeblood and without it we would wither away and die. This is the fundamental factor to consider when debating bills of the nature now before us.

If we are given the right to develop and use our water resources we can and will contribute not only to our own welfare and future but to that of the Nation as well.

We know that the Congress is becoming better acquainted with the problems which confront us in the arid and semiarid States, and we sincerely hope that careful consideration will be given to our needs. We, of the Rocky Mountain West, come from the largest undeveloped area in our country, but potentially we can become one of the richest areas. We can and we will work hand in hand with the other regions in developing our country, because we want to see the Nation develop on a national scale. If our needs are not considered or, if considered, given only scant attention, not only will we suffer but the rest of the Nation will as well. There is no reason why a sound, well integrated economy cannot be equitably worked out between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation so that the waters of the Missouri and the Yellowstone can be utilized to their fullest extent, first, for domestic purposes, such as irrigation, mining, industrial and municipal uses, and then for flood control and navigation.

We are interested in flood control, especially in the lower reaches of the Missouri Valley Basin, and we believe that through letting us retain control of our waters, building adequate storage facilities, and creating multiple purpose dams where needed, we can facilitate the development of our area and others; we can assist in flood control; and we can thereby bring about a safe and sound development in all sections. We of the West have to fight all the time to retain control of our natural resources. At times it is discouraging because we are so few in number. However, we do have faith in the people's body, the Congress, and we look to you for a square deal and the retention of our rights, especially in the development of this particular commodity, our greatest natural resource, water.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Gladly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I want to say that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has been alert in looking after the interests of his State and all that section of the country known as the intermountain region, together with the great Northwest. Especially do I wish to commend the gentleman for his very effective work in connection with the Hungry Horse Dam in sponsoring that legislation.

I would like to add to what he has already said this, that there is a difference between that part of our country lying west of the ninety-seventh meridian and other sections of the country, not considering the three Pacific States. We have in the intermountain region a different water law.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has properly emphasized that difference with all of its meaning, and I congratulate him and commend him on his remarks and upon his legislative work.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona. We both have the same problems to contend with, because we represent areas somewhat alike. I should also like to call to the attention of the House the fact that my colleague from Arizona has always been of great help to me not only with his sound advice but with his unerring ability to guide legislation along the right path. He is a true son of the West, a real legislator, a sound worker for his State, and a distinct credit to his country. We are fortunate that we have him with us here.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, again the controversy prevails between those representing States on the upper Missouri River and those who represent States on the lower Missouri. We in Missouri are interested in flood control while those of you on the upper river are interested in irrigation.

It seems to me as long as there is to be a controversy between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers, there will undoubtedly be a great delay in advancing the flood-control projects and likewise the benefits sought by the States in the Northwest for the irrigation of their land and for other purposes will be delayed. Some way should be worked out to meet this situation. I am not in favor of the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior to dump any disputes that might arise in the lap of the President for final decision. The Congress should be big enough to meet this situation. We have placed enough responsibility on the President as it is and, further, he would be the one that would be subject to criticism no matter what his decision might be.

Mr. Chairman, it was nearly 20 years ago that I cast a vote on a flood-control bill where there was a controversial issue involved. The gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Sears, offered an amendment authorizing the construction of reservoirs in connection with flood-control projects. That was a very bitter issue at the time. I supported the amendment, which was defeated by 10 votes. I had a reason for supporting that amendment. It so happened that in 1913 I came across the country on the first Pennsylvania train that was operated after the terrific floods that caused so much damage in the State of Ohio, especially in Dayton, Columbus, and other cities. The train entered Columbus on a temporary track. Homes, bridges, farmhouses, and barns were upside down. The railroad tracks were a twisted mass of steel. Bridges were destroyed. From Columbus it was necessary to leave the main road and go north about 95 miles, the tracks being under water half of the way. We finally connected up with the northern branch of the road and were able to proceed to Washington, arriving many hours late. Some years thereafter I drove from St. Louis to Washington, and I passed over 2 tremendous flood-control dams. These 2 dams were constructed to prevent a recurrence of that disaster. Three additional dams were also constructed, making 5 in all, and as I recall it the engineer was a Dr. Morgan, who later had something to do with the construction of dams in the Tennessee Valley. It is my understanding that since those dams were constructed and floodwaters are stored, there has never been a disastrous flood in that area in Ohio. If that be true, I felt if it could be done in Ohio it could be done in other parts of the country. We have spent hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to control floods. Year by year they continue; in fact, in the flood in the Missouri and Mississippi Valley the past few weeks it was more disastrous than any flood that ever occurred in that area. As I say, we want flood control for the Missouri Valley and those of you in the Northwest want irrigation. There must be a way we can get together, and the sooner the better for all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I have just read two editorials on this subject, one in the St. Louis Star-Times of May 3 and the other in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 7. Under the permission granted me, I include these editorials:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of May 3, 1944]

IT CAN BE DONE IN THE MISSOURI VALLEY

Visited at one and the same time by the worst flood in a century and by David Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, St. Louis today dreams of an M. V. A.—a vast Missouri River authority to control floods, irrigate the plains, promote waterborne commerce, and develop electric power for a rich inland empire.

It is a brave dream. But the danger is that it may ebb with the flood. The T. V. A. did not spring full-blown from some wishful thinker's brow. It is the result of 25 years of hard work and hard fighting—fighting that goes on even now in Washington.

Just as the Missouri is four times as long as the Tennessee, so are the difficulties to be overcome in the realization of an M. V. A. enormously greater than those that stood in the way of T. V. A. There were at least some links of common interest that held people in the Tennessee Valley together. But what do we people in St. Louis have in common with the people who live in the foothills of the Rockies where Red Rock Creek, the Beaver Head, and the Jefferson come together to

form the second longest river of the continent? Or, for that matter, how much do we have in common with the wheat farmers of the Dakotas and the corn growers of Nebraska and Iowa?

Unfortunately, there are no romantic stern-wheelers playing a song on their whistles that is known up and down this great valley. Along this slash of water across the prairies there is very little of the familiarity which existed, in Mark Twain's day, between St. Louis and Memphis, Natchez, and New Orleans. But what potentialities there are in the cultivation of such an acquaintance.

Today Montana is not concerned about floods, and Missouri does not give a whoop about irrigation. But what gold could be minted from this valley of ours if it were realized up and down the whole length of the river that a single Government-sponsored agency could not only control floods and provide water for irrigation ditches, but could also bring electric power plants and the industries that go with them, a really navigable channel and the trade that goes with it.

So long as sectional interests work only for what they want, the river will continue to flow through a long tunnel of "pork barrels," but if ever all of us in this valley learn to pool our desires and to make one organization responsible for the satisfaction of all of them, then Montana's sorry drift toward depopulation will be reversed and Missouri's rich black earth will no longer be flushed into the Gulf.

As David Lilienthal said, the technical problems of this transformation are not beyond the resourcefulness of the engineers. But first there must be a common determination to set the engineers to work for a common purpose. This calls for men of vision up and down the valley. The Tennessee had its Senator Norris—paradoxically a man from the valley of the Missouri—who worked and preached until the dream of T. V. A. was an actuality. We need hundreds of Norrises—businessmen and farmers and ranchers and public officials fired with the dream of an M. V. A., men determined to explain and to plead, to organize and to fight until their dream, too, is a reality.

The Army engineers have a plan on which the technical structure of an M. V. A. can be built just as soon as the war's demands abate and men and material are available for work. But nothing will come of the plan until people up and down the valley join in the common cause. When they do, it will become apparent that the great wealth which this valley has already yielded is as nothing to what it offers its people.

With the floodwaters lapping at the terminal tracks and covering thousands and thousands of acres of farm land, St. Louis and Missouri are challenged to light a torch, to take the lead in a great movement not only for the control but also for the full exploitation of the Missouri. The only question is the old one:

Will the desire go up and go down with the flood?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 7, 1944]

ONE RIVER PLAN IS THE NEED

The United States Army engineers' Pick plan for development of the Missouri River is scheduled to come up in the House tomorrow, and with it will come an opportunity for the upper and lower valley States to put an end to their bickering and to demonstrate that they can at last begin to work together.

The plan, in its present form at least, is not acceptable to the upper valley, which believes, with good reason, that in the context of other legislation it is prejudicial to irrigation. The basis of the controversy is the Army engineers' attempt to have Congress allot to navigation a fixed amount of water equal to the greater part of the river's annual flow in the last 10 years.

The irrigation States very sensibly are determined not to stand peaceably by and see navigation priorities put on water of which they are entitled to some part for irrigation.

They have proposed various protective measures, the latest of which is a suggestion by Secretary Ickes that Congress lay down the law that irrigation shall be paramount to every other interest in the use of Missouri River water.

The objection to this is that it would work the same unfairness on flood control and navigation that it is intended to prevent from being worked on irrigation. To be specific, what would happen if, in the face of a flood descending the river, the Army engineers wanted to release water from storage in order to make reservoir space available for containing the flood, while the Reclamation Bureau wanted to keep the reservoirs full because to do so would keep irrigation interests paramount?

Secretary Ickes would have the President resolve any such dispute. The fault in this suggestion, of course, is that a moment when disaster impends is no moment for arguing what to do about it. If argument continues long enough, nothing can be done about it.

As a general rule, it would be proper for Congress to declare flood control, irrigation, and navigation to rank in importance in that order; but legislation should leave enough latitude for engineers to operate the system flexibly and in the best interests as they appear at the moment of decision.

Is it not becoming obvious that two or more antagonistic agencies—the Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau—cannot develop this valley without sacrifice of its total resources, even though they declared an armed truce? Is it not plain that only harm will be produced if either the upper or the lower valley attempts to force some plan upon the other? We shall get somewhere only when we agree on one plan for all of us and one organization to which all will be willing to entrust their interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in this bill the Committee on Flood Control reports a project with reference to the Missouri River that is to cost $200,000,000. That is a very substantial outlay and it ought to be examined with some caution. It will apply to a river that starts about 17 miles above St. Louis and runs a course across the country to the southwestern section of Montana for a distance of nearly 2,500 miles. It is really a monumental water course. It drains something more than half a million square miles of this country, and it is proposed in this bill to make provision for an over-all comprehensive project which will include channel straightening and improvements and reservoirs and other works to provide, first for navigation; second, for irrigation; third, for power; and fourth, for flood control. They do not run particularly in that order, but that is the over-all plan for which $200,000,000 are to be expended.

Now come the folks from this area, where water is a priceless commodity, and say that before we take away all their water for navigation purposes to sustain a barge or a vessel that may haul commodities, we believe that preference should be given to beneficial consumptive uses.

What are those uses? First, domestic. That is fundamental; that involves drinking water; that involves water for livestock; that appeals to an instinct of self-preservation, and navigation must necessarily be subordinated to that.

Second, they want to have preference for municipal purposes. There is not a soul in this body who would deny a village or a town the necessary water in preference to navigation. That is all they ask for in this amendment. They want preference to be given to irrigation because that is vital to the sustenance of life out there. Without water there can be no vegetables, no produce of the soil, nothing with which to sustain life. It is just a matter of common sense, and you cannot argue with that kind of fundamental need.

They want preference for water for mining. Look at the first section of this bill, and what does it say? It sets up a reservoir of projects for the post-war period. For what purpose? Manifestly to make jobs. That is what it does. If a mine cannot get water preference for continued operation, you destroy jobs. Does that not make sense? They want preference also for industrial uses—meaning for their factories and their mining plants and similar purposes. That means jobs. This bill is dedicated, among other things, to making jobs in the post-war period. Would you destroy them now by not giving them a preference for this water? What difference does it make if you have a sufficient channel to float a battleship, if the produce of the soil and the contents of factories and the livelihood and self-preservation that are involved here are not first given preference?

There is ample precedent for it. Back in 1902, we began placing a very comprehensive reclamation act on the books. We have added to it every year. Read the language of those acts. What does the language say? The water users shall have preference. That is the essence of the reclamation law, and it has been regarded as good gospel for more than two generations. The law was drafted by experts who had some knowledge of the West and of its essential needs.

Before us is an amendment. What does it say? It says in effect that west of the ninety-seventh meridian, preference shall be given to water for drinking purposes, for livestock, for irrigation, to keep factories going, as well as all those other things that generate commerce, and that navigation and commerce shall come last. Certainly that ought to appeal to every good instinct and to the common sense of Members of this House, and that is why I am for it. Recently I had first-hand opportunity to appreciate what water really means in that country. That is why I am for that amendment.

The Members of the House from those western spaces have expressed a sustained concern about this matter. You will remember the effort which was made some weeks ago to have similar language incorporated in the rivers and harbors bill. Their efforts are not dictated by selfishness or provincial interests. They know as no other person

can know, from a lifetime of experience what water means and they seek assurance that the basic daily needs of their people will not be neglected and that navigation shall be subordinated to their essential needs. Is that asking too much?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was not listed among those requesting recognition at the time debate was limited.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I did not know there was a limitation.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. I was one of those who rose to be assigned some time. Is it possible for me to assign my time to the gentleman from Nevada?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment to this bill (H. R. 4485) offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE]. As a Member at large from Nevada, a typical arid-land State west of the ninety-seventh meridian, I feel that this Congress, by express inhibition incorporated into this bill, should terminate the executive and judicial legislation which is aimed at the destruction of the rights of the people to the use of flowing waters for irrigation and reclamation.

The only title the Federal Government has to control flowing waters springs from clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, giving to Congress the power—

> To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

That power has been exercised in the improvement of navigable streams in the interest of interstate commerce and the public safety. It has never been expressly extended in any statute to the control of any innavigable stream. An innavigable stream, by the force of the term itself, cannot serve commerce whether interstate or local.

Under the riparian doctrine or the appropriation doctrine and under both doctrines combined, from the time of the Louisiana cession in 1803 and the Guadalupe-Hidalgo cession in 1848 and the admission of Nevada in 1864, governments never claimed the corpus of the water at all or the right to the use of water, except as subordinate to the right of the people, to use it for agricultural, domestic, and power purposes. When Congress passed the Reclamation Act it provided that the Interior Department should conform to State laws in acquiring water rights to be held in trust for the use of settlers.

The abuse sought to be checked here is of modern origin. In the beginning navigability was defined as navigability in fact. But now it has been stretched to cover streams potentially navigable or formerly navigable, or to cover all the miscellaneous tributaries, headwaters, and creeks that might conceivably augment the firm or seasonal flow of a river capable of carrying commerce. Under recent decisions the definition of navigability has been so whittled away as to constitute a menace to all the rest of the public who make use of flowing waters for agricultural purposes. If this goes on farms may be dried up and farmers wiped out in aid of a mythical river-steamboat trade so remote that its smoke will never come within a hundred miles of the farmers' homes.

Mr. Chairman, we in the arid-land States do not oppose commerce, although, outside of the railways, the highways, and the air transport, we see very little of it west of the ninety-seventh meridian. What we ask is protection of irrigation and reclamation which has built up the West under rights and customs, enjoyed and followed under the riparian and appropriation doctrines. We want protection through a positive statutory inhibition, against a definition of navigable waters that has no basis in any statute thus far enacted. It seems to me that when it comes to definitions, Congress should be the fountainhead—not the victim.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, time has been limited on this amendment and I shall have no opportunity to speak on it, but I agree with the gentleman from Nevada in his support of the Lemke amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota is the amendment that was offered by him to the river and harbor bill, applicable to that bill with respect to navigation, and it was defeated by the House. The substance of the amendment was embraced, as I have already pointed out, in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]. With all due deference, the amendment has no place in the pending bill.

The language of the amendment is:

> *Provided*, That the use for navigation and related purposes in connection with this expanded general comprehensive plan.

The amendment was offered to the river and harbor bill and was considered by the House, and that very amendment is now offered to this flood control bill.

I am in sympathy with reclamation. This amendment gives my friends from the West an opportunity to proclaim anew their devotion to reclamation on all occasions. They have the privilege of doing that. But in all kindness, this amendment has no place in this bill.

Something has been said about the report of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Chief of Engineers submitted this report. There was a major flood not once, not twice, but three times last year in the Missouri River. My good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] just returned from out West, made the same address and the same speech, and you know many good speeches can be made just as applicable to one point in a bill as to another. He spoke on this amendment with respect to navigation. The House did not agree with him. But with all due kindness, the people along the Missouri River from Sioux City to its mouth suffered last year not one flood but three floods, and today they are suffering one of the greatest floods in their history.

This project has been considered carefully. We began hearings on the Pick plan in May 1943, and we did not report this bill until March 29, 1944. Moreover, I say this bill provides for the expenditure of some $200,000,000, and the entire Pick plan will cost something like $475,000,000 or $500,000,000.

Under this plan the pressing projects are the ones that are essential for flood control. They will have no reference to any reservoir where there is a drought. I sympathize with the drought sufferers. We want the waters to stay up there to eliminate droughts. The purpose is to provide for flood control and for the storage of those waters in the main stem of the river above Sioux City, when they come, to prevent them from overflowing the valley from Sioux City to the south.

Under the authorization of $200,000,000 every possible safeguard is thrown around the reservoirs. There can be no argument about the right to use the waters on the tributaries of the Missouri because the dams cannot hold water on the main stem unless they empty from the tributaries into the main stem.

The committee embraced in the bill every possible precaution. I read from the bill:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of that now authorized by existing law.

Moreover, as I pointed out in presenting this bill on yesterday, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the commerce clause of the Constitution controls with respect to the waters, and wherever there is a conflict with State laws the Constitution must control.

The bill further provides in an effort to be more than doubly fair, in an effort to lean over to cooperate with Reclamation:

> That portions of the storage authorized for the main stem of the river shall be placed on tributaries if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for silt control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial use without impairment of flood control below Sioux City and without increasing the authorized limit of cost.

The undisputed testimony before the Committee on Flood Control in May 1943, and since then, during the hearings, was to the effect that if it had not been for the Fort Peck Reservoir the floods at Omaha, the floods at Sioux City, the floods at Kansas City and below would have been much higher. I respectfully submit that if the doctrine that reservoirs can detain and hold back flood

waters is to obtain in the United States along the Ohio and its tributaries and along the Connecticut River and its tributaries, that doctrine ought to obtain along the Missouri River to protect the people of that great basin, including the States of North Dakota and South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, and other States, to get the protection accruing from reservoirs for flood control that is accorded under other flood-control projects adopted by the Congress of the United States.

Let me say in conclusion, I did not make the point of order and did not insist on it because, while the substance of this bill has been defeated by the House during the consideration of the river and harbor bill and defeated by the House today, and I read from the amendment offered by the gentleman from New England, which I referred to in my remarks, "And in the case of works that might require the use of waters rising west of the ninety-seventh meridian in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior," there are flood-control projects in the Sacramento Valley, in the Willamette Valley, and there are flood-control projects along the Columbia River and along other rivers in the West, west of the ninety-seventh meridian, and in my judgment, the amendment is not applicable. This plan is fundamentally flood control and not navigation, and every possible use of the water is safeguarded under the provisions of this bill because the bill declares in no uncertain language that the right to the water along all the tributaries of the Missouri River shall be recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman certainly knows this amendment would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I told you I had withdrawn the point of order, but I say this amendment was defeated. How many times does an amendment have to be defeated before it will be no longer offered? That was the only point I had in making reference to it.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], the author of the amendment.

Mr. LEMKE. Why do you not accept our amendment? Why do you wish to limit us to the excess waters under the existing law, which I have pointed out to you and which your committee knows, under the committee bill would be no water at all in dry years?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Your colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], spoke yesterday about there being a drought out there. We can do a lot, but Congress cannot make it rain. It cannot make the snows come down. The only way North Dakota is going to be relieved of drought—and other Western States—is for the snows to fall and for the rains to descend. What we want you to do is to keep those waters, whether they be from the snow or the rain, along the tributaries to relieve that area and prevent the flooding of the valleys below.

Mr. LEMKE. Why do you not adopt our amendment? That is exactly what we want to do.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have great respect for the gentleman.

Mr. LEMKE. If you agree with us, why do you not adopt the amendment?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have carefully considered the gentleman's amendment with all its ramifications, but it is not applicable to every bill that comes along. It has been defeated once in the consideration of the river and harbor bill a few weeks ago and has been defeated substantially by the House today in defeating the Stearns amendment, and I think it should be withdrawn.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It is true that Congress cannot make the rain or snow, but Congress can build reservoirs up there, not only to help irrigation, but to reclaim land and to help control floods down in the valley.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is nothing on earth in this bill that will prevent the Bureau of Reclamation building reservoirs in addition to those authorized in this bill, if approved and appropriated for by Congress. But it will take $175,000,000 of the $200,000,000 herein authorized to provide levees to be constructed to protect the Missouri River Valley from Sioux City down to its mouth.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. It has no place in a flood-control bill. Rather, let us look at some facts pertaining to the Missouri River.

The Missouri River Basin embraces approximately one-sixth of the total area of the United States. Between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth of the Missouri River there are about 1,800,000 acres of land subject to flooding at extreme stages. Most of this area is under cultivation at the present time and includes some of the most fertile and productive land in the world. The principal crops grown are corn, wheat, barley, rye, oats, alfalfa, and garden produce. Although the land is highly productive floods on the Missouri River have always constituted a serious hazard to farming. Previous to the construction of river improvement works the land was not only subject to floods but to damage by bank erosion and cut-offs. The threat from bank erosion and cut-offs has now been removed by the river stabilization works but the flood hazard still remains. The principal cities subject to flooding are Kansas City, Mo., Kansas City, Kans., Council Bluffs, Iowa, Omaha, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa. In addition to these cities there are over 50 smaller municipalities which are already or partially vulnerable to floods along the main stem of the Missouri River. At Sioux City, Iowa, a city of over 80,000 population, a portion of the business district is subject to flooding and also a large part of the stockyards, railroad facilities, and some manufacturing and industrial establishments.

In the upper part of the river the highest flood of record was caused by the March rise in 1881. Practically the entire area from bluff to bluff was inundated from Sioux City, Iowa, to St. Joseph, Mo., and the river was above flood stage all the way to the mouth. In addition to the damage caused by the water itself, there was a great deal of damage done by the cutting and crushing action of huge cakes of ice as they were swept down stream. This flood caused millions of dollars of damage.

In the lower part of the river the highest flood of record was caused by the June rise in 1844. This flood also produced stages in the upper part of the river approaching those of the 1881 flood. Reliable records of the damage caused by this flood are not available. The next highest flood of record in the lower part of the river was caused by the June rise in 1903. This flood paralyzed commerce, industry, and communications for weeks and caused millions of dollars of damage at the Kansas Citys alone. The total direct damage during this flood between Sioux City and the mouth was over $10,000,000.

In addition to the floods of 1844, 1881, and 1903 there have been many other severe floods between Sioux City and the mouth, such as those which occurred during 1908, 1909, 1915, 1927, 1935, 1942, and 1943. In fact, there is flooding of some consequence practically every year on the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth.

The floods of 1943 inundated about 1,000,000 acres of land, of which about 200,000 acres were flooded for the second time. On about 600,000 acres the flooding prevented the production of the normal crop, and on about 300,000 acres it may require from 1 to 3 years before the land can be placed into full normal crop production. Highways and railroads in the river valley suffered heavily. Practically every agricultural levee between Sioux City and the mouth was either overtopped, breached, or otherwise seriously damaged. These floods of 1943 caused damage of about $35,000,000 along the main stem of the river between Sioux City and the mouth.

The amount expended under provisions of section 5 of the 1941 Flood Control Act amounted to approximately $300,000. All this effort and expense was nullified by the 1943 floods. In addition, the engineer department expended over $800,000 for rescue and emergency work during the 1943 floods. The estimated cost of restoring the levees damaged during these floods to their original degree of protection is approximately $1,800,000.

In an attempt to provide flood protection for their lands local interests have constructed levees and drainage works throughout the breach from Sioux City to the mouth at an estimated expenditure in excess of $20,000,000. However, the levees are generally inadequate to protect against any except the minor floods and have not been constructed in accordance with any unified correlated plan. These local interests are anxious

to secure a much greater degree of protection than they now have but are convinced that the problem is of such magnitude that the burden must be assumed by the Federal Government. Although a considerable increase in the amount of protection now afforded can be provided by levees it is impracticable to provide complete protection against all past floods by levees alone.

There is no question but that additional flood protection for the Missouri Valley Basin is needed and justified and the general comprehensive plan for flood control as proposed by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army would seem to be the solution. The plan proposed would provide for a series of levees and appurtenant works along both sides of the Missouri River from Sioux City to the mouth, supplemented by the presently authorized reservoirs in Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri and additional multiple-purpose reservoirs. By these proposed improvements not only would large flood damages be prevented along the Missouri River and its tributaries and the Mississippi River but also floodwater would be retained for their best uses for all purposes, including irrigation, navigation, power, domestic and sanitary purposes, wildlife, and recreation. Considering the large benefits of tangible nature and special intangibles as the saving of human lives, the alleviation of suffering, stabilization of economic life of the valley, and encouragement of industrial and civic developments, the Army engineers have concluded that the plan herein proposed is entirely justified. In this connection it may be stated that the proposal is for a progressive improvement to be undertaken by steps as conditions warrant and the availability of funds permits.

Recurrence of floods as above enumerated and the occurrence of still larger floods are to be anticipated unless preventative measures are undertaken. The flood problem is a serious one and the large expenditures to remedy it are justified.

We are asking you to protect the bread basket of the world from the ravages of floods. In these days when we are stressing food production, the protection of food-production centers must be given serious consideration. The total value of the area subject to floods between Sioux City and the mouth of the river, including all fixed and movable property, has been estimated to be about $1,000,000,000. One large flood or a series of floods might well wipe out this entire investment. More important than the consideration of monetary values is the fact that adequate flood protection would mean the saving of lives and the alleviation of human suffering. We should all be interested in securing this sound development program which is based upon the safeguarding of the interests of all of the people of the Missouri River Basin.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEMKE) there were—yeas 47, nays 50.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. WHITTINGTON and Mr. LEMKE to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—yeas 52, nays 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be heard at this point and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FLOOD CONTROL AND DRAINAGE IN LOUISIANA

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I had occasion to take this floor and urge adoption of the rule to bring H. R. 4485 before this House for consideration. Today I want to speak for the bill the passage of which has become one of the most urgent and important pieces of legislation in the interest of the safety, welfare, and development of the lower Mississippi Valley yet proposed.

Many people think of flood control only in the terms of levees or dikes built along the banks of streams in the hope of controlling the floodwaters that come in the spring. For more than a century now the people of the lowlands have resorted to levees in their attempt to control the waters that inundate their lands at floodtime. The first levees were constructed by the individual landowner and calculated to protect the most important fields of his plantation or farm from the encroachment of backwater or the flooding of local streams in times of excessive rainfall. These levees were makeshift and patchwork and, while partially effective, did not protect the lands from inundation in the years when the floodwaters from the upper reaches of the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Valleys came in such volume that they could not be contained in the river channel.

Gradually the farmers and landowners began to band together and help one another build community levees that were calculated to relieve several tracts of land. From this was evolved the local levee districts that built levees along the low banks of streams in an effort to hold the water back from their particular section. The fellow up above dumped his water on the man below, or the man below might in times of great danger resort to the extreme of cutting the levee above, below or across the river at whatever point seemed to him to offer the best prospect of keeping the water off of his particular section. Naturally chaos and animosities were rampant. Finally the States and their political subdivisions took an interest and brought some semblance of order and cooperation. However, the problem was not yet solved. The floods still came and they still do. However, with the better order that came with the recognition of the problem as being one that effected the economy and welfare of entire States better engineering was applied, studies of vast comprehension were undertaken until finally it was recognized that the matter was not one for just local communities or even the States, but that it affected the welfare, health and the economy of the entire Nation. Floods bring with them not merely the inundation of a vast area in the lowlands; they bring death by drowning to the populace, to the livestock, the poultry, to the wild life of the areas affected, but they also bring the destruction of homes, barns and buildings that are either washed away or covered with water that does untold damage. Floodwaters when in torrent from crevasses cause, in some cases, erosion and the complete destruction of once-fertile fields, in others a deposit of silt and muck may render those fields sour and impossible of cultivation for several years depending on how long the water stood on the fields and the type of silt or muck deposited.

To speed the flow of the waters and make it possible for the streams to handle the vast volume, it became apparent that drainage was also an integral part of flood control. River and bayou channels had to be widened, deepened, straightened, and cleared of debris and obstructions giving the floodwaters a right-of-way, so to speak, in order that they would not spread out over the banks of the streams and either inundate or so saturate the land that it would be impossible of cultivation and use.

This bill, H. R. 4485, is calculated to make provisions for these things. The Army engineers, the Mississippi River Commission, and the Flood Control Committee of this House have done an extensive and magnificent job of study and preparation. They have prepared a bill that is nonsectional and nonpolitical. They have made a comprehensive study of the major needs of the Nation as a whole and have tried to incorporate those needs into one omnibus bill and now ask this House to approve of their labors. We should do so, even if some of the details are not just as much as we would like. We should bear in mind that these proposals are a bit of vitally needed postwar planning laying a pattern of drainage, reclamation, and flood control that will give homes and employment to thousands upon thousands of our men and women now in the armed forces and in war industries, and at the same time adding millions upon millions of dollars to the value and productiveness of our lands.

Why, in my own district, the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana, there is a drainage provision that will reclaim and restore to productiveness several million acres of the finest, richest soil on earth—land that has a topsoil, not of 6 or 8 inches but of 6 to 10 feet, in a climate that is incomparable for year-round cultivation of fruits, vegetables, and produce. The provision for the clearing, straightening, deepening, and widening of the Boeuf, the Tensas, the Black, and Ouachita Rivers, and of Colwar Creek, Big Creek, and Bayou Lafourche and Bayou Macon, a project that is estimated to cost the Government but $5,013,000, should bring many times that sum to the people in the productiveness of the reclaimed lands each year. The fact that the water from local rains and backwater can run off quickly will

permit the soil to be rid of its water saturation and permit the farmer to get into his fields many weeks earlier, all of which is an untold benefit. However, not only are these benefits accruing to the farmer and landowner but also, by draining off the local waters and permitting the streams to return to normal levels, the land will be much drier and both the land and the streams will be able to take care of far greater volumes of flood waters when they come.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that flood control and drainage are one and inseparable. To have adequate flood control we must also have adequate and efficient drainage. This bill makes the first provision for steps in that direction, and I urge the passage of this bill, which provides $5,013,000 for the above-named streams and further provides a sum of $3,800,000 for the Red-Ouachita River Basin, a total of $8,813,000 for north Louisiana to help prevent the further preventable loss of life and the loss of property due to floods.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I addressed myself to this bill and someone enthusiastically acclaimed the benefits which were being received by the upper Ohio Valley as the result of this flood-control program. Now there is one aspect of it that disturbs me. However, if the chairman of the committee would be good enough to listen to my question, he might be able to explain it. Yesterday my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. TROUTMAN] addressed himself to the power aspect of these dams that are going to be constructed along the Youghiogheny River.

Also, my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] took up the matter with me, and he also expressed his concern. I see before me the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] who is in the coal business himself and who has a great many coal miners working in his district.

I am not taking the position that I am opposed to waterpower, because I am not in all instances, but I feel where coal is available in great quantities and handy, it is quite possible that power can be obtained just as cheaply, if not more so, from coal in our neighborhood than from waterpower.

I am told by the chairman of the committee that this is not a power project and that, although penstocks are constructed in these dams, in order for any power to be used or any machinery or equipment installed to obtain power from these dams, further legislation must be obtained from the Congress. It is on that understanding, which I would like the gentleman from Mississippi to confirm now, that I intend to support this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In response to the gentleman's question I will state that is the policy that was announced in the presentation of this bill. The dams are primarily for flood control. In some cases power is authorized incidentally; there is no provision for the sale and distribution. The policy obtains, not only in the gentleman's area along the Ohio River and its tributaries, but elsewhere in the country. It is the conviction of this committee that these projects, if they are to be used for the sale and distribution of power, are to be passed on by the Congress later. There is provision for the generation of power in a few of the projects, but it is incidental and there is no provision for distribution facilities in any of the projects.

Mr. WRIGHT. And I would like to ask the gentleman this question, Is it not correct, then, that if these projects are to be used for any power or if any generation equipment is installed, further legislation by the Congress will be necessary?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have so stated. Where power is provided to any extent in or along the tributaries of the Ohio, I believe further authorizations will have to be made before any power is generated, or in my opinion all the authorization will be used for projects in which there is no power.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask to proceed out of order for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, stated that the simplification bill, passed by the House on last Thursday, will raise an additional $2,000,000,000 of revenue, and at the same time he released a copy of his statement to the press. I felt it my duty to prepare for the press a complete answer to the charges made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN]. In view of the fact that the House passed the simplification bill without a single dissenting vote, including the vote of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN], I feel it my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

Both the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury Department agree that the estimate in our committee report is correct. The bill will result in a loss of revenue amounting to approximately $60,000,000 instead of a gain of $2,000,000,000.

The changes made by the bill on exemptions, rates, deductions, definitions of dependents all affect the revenue. Some changes result in increases of revenue and some result in revenue decreases. The net result is estimated to be a loss of $60,000,000.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] has confused and misused the figures upon which his estimates are based. The change in the definition of dependents would alone result in a revenue loss of $290,000,000, but he neglects to figure the loss which would result from increasing the dependent credit from $350 to $500. This is an increase of $150 for each dependent, and there are 20,000,000 dependents. His calculation that the tax base will be increased by $4,000,000,000 neglects this important increase in the amount of dependent allowances.

For estimates we must rely upon the information supplied by our actuaries. Neither the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] nor I know all the details. All of our actuaries agree on the revenue effects of the bill as given in the committee's report.

I do know, however, that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] is wrong when he implies that many of the 9,000,000 Victory taxpayers will be subject to surtax under the simplification bill. Actually about the same number, or even fewer, taxpayers will be subject to the surtax. I also know that he is wrong again when he talks about "velvet" when speaking of the tax receipts for 1944. According to the estimates of our actuaries, the taxes for 1944 will be $60,000,000 less, not $2,000,000,000 more, than under present law.

I trust that nobody will believe that a responsible committee of the House would attempt to deceive the membership of the House or the American people. We would be deceiving the Members of the House and the public if the gentleman from New Jersey were right. Mr. MCLEAN'S premises being wrong, his conclusions must necessarily be wrong.

The statement of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] is such an unwarranted attack upon the intelligence of our committee and upon the capabilities of our actuaries that I feel that I cannot let it go unchallenged.

Mr. GAVIN. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 16, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following: "That the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes, approved in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, for the Ohio River Basin, is hereby modified to include the construction of flood-control works for the protection of Ridgway, Johnsonburg, St. Marys, and Brockway and vicinity in the State of Pennsylvania."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand the amendment is an extension of an existing adopted project, and that amendment has been prepared by the Office of the Chief of Engineers, and he submitted a statement that it is authorized as an extension of an existing project on which we have conducted hearings.

Mr. GAVIN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have not had an opportunity to present it to the committee, but I will say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned I see no objection to the amendment, under those circumstances, because it is merely an extension of an adopted project, heretofore approved by the committee and Congress.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I rest my case and offer no statement on my amendment as I do not wish to take up

the time of the membership of the House, and ask that action be taken on the amendment immediately.

I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for the excellence of his work on this flood-control legislation. He has earned and deserves the hearty commendation of the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Page 11, line 12, after the word "in", insert "Plan B"; and in line 13, page 11, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$2,623,500."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, one cannot long sit in the House of Representatives without an appreciation that we are truly the greatest deliberative body in the democracy of the world. Here we meet on common ground to give expression to the needs and will of our people. To adequately fulfill our duties we at times individually come into conflict one with the other, because the problems of the people we represent so greatly differ. We have heard the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] state today that the greatest problem confronting his people was lack of water. I come before you emphasizing the fact that the most vital problem immediately confronting the people of Galena, Ill., which is my residence, is too much water at not infrequent times.

Galena, Ill., has been the scene of devastating floods for over a century. During the past hundred years rushing and uncontrolled waters have rushed down upon its citizens over 15 times, bringing consternation, destruction, and death. Citizens have witnessed the business district in complete shambles. Business houses which were built for the generations have been compelled to close their doors forever. Manufacturing establishments which have given work to many, have had their stocks and machinery ruined, depriving employees of gainful employment for long periods of time. Galena, one of Illinois oldest cities possessing many historic shrines including General Grant's home, mecca of hundreds of thousands of tourists from throughout the world was until today uncertain of its future. I say today, because the flood bill now before us carries an authorization of $300,000 to remedy disastrous flood conditions in Galena. It is needless for me to say that I am gratified with this degree of consideration because it at least recognizes a situation upon which I have worked untiringly for over 10 years. Those of you who have flood problems in your district know the work involved in order to obtain the necessary legislation.

Sincerely I express appreciation of the aid and assistance given me by the various members of the Flood Committee and the Corps of Engineers. Only this morning the chairman of the committee permitted me to appear before his committee and the Chief of Engineers, regarding the amendment which I have just offered. During my many years in Congress I have refrained from offering many amendments. I have held in most instances that the various committees after extensive hearings are in a better position to judge the facts. However, in this particular case I sincerely believe that I am the better judge. I have lived in that locality practically my entire life. During all those years I have studied this problem which is so vital to the entire community. I know, as no one else here knows, the compelling needs. That is the reason for this amendment.

In keeping with an act of Congress, the Army engineers made a final survey of the Galena River for the purpose of submitting plans to remedy the situation. In 1940 the engineers reported several plans. They recommended plan A, which provides for the construction of a system of levees and flood walls with sewer drains and pumping plant, the removal of certain obstructive bridges, and the enlargement and improvement of the channel, the estimated cost to be $418,000, of which the city of Galena should assume $118,000. That is the plan embraced in this bill. To me it is definitely insufficient, and that is the reason that I have offered this amendment.

In addition to plan A the Army engineers also submitted plan B. This B plan is without question the more efficacious. It provides for retention reservoirs at a cost of $2,623,500, of which the United States will pay $2,502,300 and local interests $121,200. I emphasize that this is the most satisfactory plan because, according to the engineers' report under plan A, and I quote from the report:

It will be noted that plan A does not protect the privately owned Westwick foundry on the point of land at the junction of Galena River and Hughlett Branch, or the plant of the Galena Manufacturing Co., on the east bank of the main stream, just below Madison Street; nor will it prevent the inundation during major floods of certain small residential areas along the east bank of the river and on the west bank below Spring Street.

To me a job half done is not done at all. It requires a great deal of time and expense for the engineers to become located. When they are located is it not sensible they complete the job? To provide protection for part of the community and leave the rest unguarded seems impractical to me, and, I am sure, to you. The two factories which are given no protection under plan A are of paramount importance to the workers and to the community. They are the two largest factories in Joe Daviess County. The livelihood of many depends upon the noninterruption of work in these plants. For years these factories have borne the brunt of many floods. Now that we have recognized the need for protection in the locality why not give to all the needed protection? Why leave with some the everlasting fear of destruction? I ask you to vote for my amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if there are any other bona fide amendments to this section?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to this section.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized on the amendment at this time and had hoped I might continue for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee, and the gentleman from Illinois to be recognized for 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me implement the observations made by my good friend and fellow colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] in support of this amendment. He seeks additional funds to carry on an alternative plan which has been prepared by the Board of Engineers. I think the whole thing can be described as a small river that begins in Wisconsin and comes down through northern Illinois and has a confluence with another stream about 4 miles above the city of Galena. It has some historic value, because it was once the home of General Grant. In the flood of 1927, and I think in a subsequent flood, the hardware store which was operated by General Grant long ago was probably under 6 or 7 feet of water.

The War Department engineers recognize the necessity for a flood-control plan; so they submit two, one called A and the other called B. Plan A can be carried out for about $423,000; plan B would cost $2,500,000 or $2,600,000; so we have our choice. The district engineer, the division engineer, and the board have finally reached a general accord on the proposal that was set forth in plan A to provide for the expenditure of $300,000, a portion of which shall be raised locally.

The difficulty with this plan is that according to their own statement it will afford only partial relief, that there will no doubt be some measure of flood control benefit to that area. But listen to this very interesting statement from the report of the Board of Engineers itself:

The proposed improvements would afford protection against floods considerably larger than in past records but would not protect against rare floods that may occur; and the possibilities of inundation of the protected area must be contemplated.

To me that is a rather curious statement. It in essence says that we propose to spend $300,000 but you folks out at Galena must remember that there may come floods and the inundation of your town must be contemplated. Why spend any money if there is the possibility of a rare flood—and we have had several "rare" floods out there in the last 20 years, but there will be an inundation of that town all over again.

It would appear of doubtful wisdom to spend sufficient funds in order to give only partial protection to the industrial area of that town, to take care of the

two industries that are now outside of the proposed flood protection in plan A which has been recommended by the engineers. The reason they ascribe is this: They say the benefits to be derived from the larger plan will not be commensurate with the burdens or the expenditures that will be made; and yet there is a possibility that after we spend this money, the area may still be inundated, as contemplated by those sentences from the engineers' report itself. I have no quarrel whatsoever with the formula which the engineers use in setting up a project, namely that the benefits to be derived shall be commensurate with the expenditures to be made. Doubtless, there will be benefits in proportion to the amount recommended in this measure. But it will be a partial flood control job. That is conceded in the report on this project. It will not include two industries located there. It is therefore fair to ask whether it shall be a piecemeal job. It would seem like an unwise investment unless provision is made for complete protection.

Here is the Galena Manufacturing Co.; here is another industry; they are set out on a spit of land and we cannot include them in the protection. Yet of the entire estimated damages against which future protection is to be provided, 35 percent is industrial damage.

The proposal made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] calls for putting into effect a plan already explored by the War Department which is called plan B, instead of plan A. It will cost more money, but it will ultimately give complete protection to the Galena River Basin and to the city of Galena. It would appear to me that would be a rather wise expenditure even though it is substantially above the amount recommended in this authorization.

I sincerely hope and I commend to you the amendment that is now on the desk and trust it will be adopted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Chairman, it is a fundamental thing in flood control that the benefits must exceed the cost, otherwise the Federal Government would be justified, as it has in some cases, in buying the town and moving it up the hill. It has done that in Illinois.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and I know he is greatly interested, covers a report submitted in 1941. It has been before the Congress and the committee for nearly 2 years. The committee considered the report, adopting the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, and it provided for the plan that he recommended. He recommended that plan B embraced in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois be not adopted because, as he said, the cost of that plan would be twice the amount of the benefits, as I recall.

Mr. Chairman, if we propose to make an exception in one case, you let the bars down and you crucify the sound, fundamental principles of flood control, whether it be in Illinois or Mississippi. In all fairness, I may say that I brought this amendment before the committee today and we point out to you now as we pointed out then to my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], that this amendment would adopt plan B, costing about $2,600,000, according to the report, and the amendment only authorizes $400,000, which is absolutely contradictory.

I sympathize with the situation. The committee leaned over backward to help. The language of the committee is as follows:

> is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document 336, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $300,000. Under this language while the local interests would not be relieved from making the contribution and giving the assurances required, if the cost of the project was actually $400,000 or $418,000, the project would be authorized inasmuch as the term "estimated cost" is sufficient to care for the actual cost.

The committee considered this amendment. We submitted it to the Chief of Engineers. He said that at the time he submitted his report in 1941 these two factories were not engaged in war work. He further said that in the event it now develops that it would be economically possible and economically justified to extend the works, under the discretion given to him, and if the cost would not exceed the benefits, he could do it under the language of the act which authorizes substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, which recommendations adopted by the committee require the local interests to contribute, maintain, and give the assurances contained in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in said document, as provided in the bill. I appeal to my very good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I may say I have been in sympathy with the program to conserve public expenditures and to reduce the high cost of government and to eliminate all waste and extravagance. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] have now asked us to include a project where the cost, according to our report and hearings, exceeds the benefits.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why, we do not quarrel with the benefits.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Your question, please.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do not quarrel with the benefits theory at all. It is only that if these two plants are kept out, additional work will have to be done later on, and perhaps it will cost more than we are asking for at the present time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has covered that in his statement and I say in all fairness to the other Members of the House that the language of this authorization is broad enough so that if the gentleman and the Government through the Chief of Engineers, representing the people, find that he would be justified in substantially completing this project in order to protect those industries, those two manufacturing plants and a small residential area, he would be justified in making an extension without the amendment, or an additional authorization, provided the local interests made the contributions and furnished the assurances contained in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in said report, and as required in the bill.

In all fairness and equity I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes prevailed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Page 11, line 13, after the word "of", strike out "$300,000" and insert "$418,000."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the need for the adoption of the amendment which I have now offered is most necessary and urgent. You have just rejected my other amendment which would have raised the authorization for flood relief for the Galena River from $300,000 to $2,623,500. This present amendment raises the authorization from $300,000 to $418,000. I say that the adoption of this amendment is of great importance because under plan A which now stands by reason of your rejection of plan B, the cost of construction is $418,000, of which the United States is to pay $300,000 and the local community $118,000. According to the report of the engineers' investigation, it is disclosed that the city of Galena has a bonded indebtedness of $93,700, which is only $5,684.40 less than the legal maximum fixed by the Illinois Constitution of 1870. Therefore, it is obvious that even should plan A, which authorizes but a $300,000 contribution by the Federal Government, become a law, no construction would result because the local community could not bond themselves for the additional $118,000. The Army engineers report the great need of this flood construction; the Committee on Flood Control has reported favorably upon it. I assure you personally it is greatly needed. Without the adoption of this amendment it could not be possible. I ask you to vote for this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment substitutes $418,000 for $300,000. That is a distinction without a difference, because its estimated cost is $300,000. If it costs $200,000 under that estimate why the project will be constructed and if it costs $350,000 it will be constructed. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection, and I have conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] on this amendment and he has no objection. The estimated cost of $300,000 in the bill

is to cover the estimated cost of the project as recommended by the Chief of Engineers. It does not include protection for the two manufacturing industries or for a small residential area, as I recall. As stated, if the Chief of Engineers now finds that the cost of protecting these two factories and the other area will not exceed the cost of construction under the language of the bill without an additional authorization provided the local interests made the contributions and gave the assurances for maintenance and as otherwise required by the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers even though the estimated cost of the project as approved or as extended actually exceeded $300,000, it could be constructed. So I repeat that under the discretion the matter of the estimated cost is not hard and fast. It will probably cost $418,000 for the Federal works if the project is extended, provided the local contributions and assurances required in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers are furnished by the local interests. By substituting $418,000 for $300,000, no waiver is made of the local contributions required in the bill and in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON: On page 20, following the heading "San Joaquin River", in line 12, insert the following paragraph:

"The project for Farmington Reservoir on Littlejohn Creek, enlargement of Hogan Reservoir on Calaveras River, and related protection works is authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 545, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $3,868,200."

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the reason I am offering this amendment is that the project has been approved by all governmental agencies involved. There have been full and complete hearings on the matter, and the only reason it was not incorporated in the bill is because the report has not actually been printed. The hearings will be found in volume 1, pages 313 and 383, and in volume 2, pages 597, 599, and 603. The amendment was prepared by the Army engineers. Every single department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Reclamation Service, everyone concerned, has approved the report, which is House Document 545, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

I think I am justified in asking you to approve this amendment and include it in the bill. My people come here in good grace. We have spent over $2,000,000 of our own money—that is, the little city of Stockton—in flood-control work along the Calaveras River. We have spent over a quarter of a million dollars in maintenance and operation, and the Government engineers have made a study of this project and determined that to have complete flood control for the city of Stockton and the surrounding area, these two streams should be controlled as set out in the report. It seems to me that is a very reasonable request to make of the committee.

I want to thank the chairman and the committee most heartily for their very courteous attention to me and the opportunity they afforded me and my constituents to be heard before the committee. But we have complied with the spirit of the law. The only obstruction that I can see to this amendment is the fact that we have not technically had the document printed and lying on the Speaker's desk. The document is referred to in the amendment and, as I say, every single governmental step required and the acquiescence of every single governmental agency required has been obtained.

I respectfully suggest if you put it in this bill and there was anything wrong or anything should slip, that can be taken out over on the Senate side. As I say, I know that every requirement, every approval, every survey, every report to make it effective and to comply with the rules of the House has been complied with, and I most respectfully and urgently request the committee to adopt this amendment and place it in the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I feel most sympathetic with the project of my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. Under the general rule, the committee did not hear Members of Congress unless the project had been favorably reported. In all fairness, there had been a delay in reporting some projects in California, and while this project had not been submitted to the Congress, in an effort to help our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] we permitted him to testify.

If you will turn to the hearings you will find that I said to him that we had gone out of our way. We heard his testimony, and we were not following the usual course. We said to him at the time, in substance: "Until and unless the report is transmitted to the Congress, until and unless we have the engineers to analyze that report, to the satisfaction of the committee, the project cannot be included in the bill."

Now the report has been submitted to the Congress. It has not come to the committee. We have not conducted the same analytical hearing on that that we have conducted on other projects, inasmuch as the report has not been printed as yet.

In addition to that let me say to the gentleman from California that since this bill was reported, other projects have been reported to the Congress, and we have said to others of our friends: "The only way that your project can be included in the bill is for you to go before the Committee on Commerce in the Senate, where they will have the report, where the report can be analyzed and hearings can be conducted, and your project, if recommended by the Chief of Engineers, will be included, we are sure, in the Senate."

If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, there will be a dozen other projects discriminated against. With all kindness, let me suggest to the gentleman that he withdraw his amendment. If he goes before the Senate Committee on Commerce and the committee includes his amendment, I think the conference committee would be justified in insisting that the amendment be agreed to. Unless that is done, there is nothing for this committee and the House to do except insist upon the rule that the gentleman should take the same course as all other Members of Congress and as all other projects have taken.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the chairman say for the record that he is willing to support this amendment in the Senate if the document is printed?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have already stated, in all fairness—and I usually do what I say—that if this amendment is included in the Senate, and if the recommendation for the project is favorably reported by the Chief of Engineers and I am on the conference committee, I think it should be agreed to. As stated, I suggest that the amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a fine spirit and I enjoy it a lot.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

PROVISOS IN MISSOURI RIVER PROJECT

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, during the debate several references have been made to the provisos that appear in the paragraph on pages 12 and 13 that deal with the Missouri River Basin project. Several have referred to the proviso at line 20, which reads:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of that now authorized by existing law.

And I desire to direct attention to the additional proviso that follows in line 24, which reads:

And provided further, That portions of the storage authorized for the main stem of the river shall be placed on tributaries if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for silt control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial use without impairment of flood control below Sioux City and without increasing the authorized limit of cost.

In view of the importance which those provisos will have in the prosecution of this project, it may be well to give the history of their incorporation in the bill. They were proposed by me in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, during the executive sessions of that committee when they were working

on the draft of the bill following the public hearings, in February.

The amendments were proposed in the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1944.

The Honorable WILL W. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman, Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WHITTINGTON: Reflection upon the various points of view and suggestions made with reference to the report of the Army engineers proposing a system of flood control on the Missouri River leads me to submit a couple of amendments which might be useful in the nature of provisos.

The first is designed to place in the legislation, where it will be plainly apparent to all who read the law, the flexibility of the Army engineers' proposals, stressed in the letter of the Chief of Engineers. It would read:

"*Provided,* That whenever it shall appear that flood and silt control above Sioux City can be increased thereby or more water be made more readily available for agricultural and industrial use without impairment of flood control below Sioux City and without increasing the authorized limit of cost, the Chief of Engineers shall place on tributaries, at sites to be selected after consultation with other Federal agencies concerned, portions of the storage proposed in the division engineer's plan for the main stem."

Such an amendment, or addition to the customary reference to the appropriate House document, would simply emphasize the flexibility and express the thought of Congress that where the benefits from the project could be increased by a certain modification, it should be done.

The other amendment is designed to allay any fears that any part of the engineers' proposals would injure water rights above Sioux City. It is the language accepted by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for placing their bill in connection with the Missouri River channel project. It reads:

"*Provided further,* That nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of those now authorized by existing law."

This does not go as far as the amendment sought by many western Members in setting forth a priority of use, but it does effectively guard against any loss of rights now existing.

Your usual thoughtful and valued consideration will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative in Congress,
Second South Dakota District.

I discussed the proposals briefly with the chairman of the committee, as he will recall, and left the letter with him. Subsequently I discussed them with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], a member of the committee. A day or two later I was informally advised by both of them that the suggestions had been favorably received by the committee and probably would be incorporated in the bill. Naturally, then, I was pleased when the bill was introduced on the 27th of March, 1944, to see them incorporated in the language of the provisos previously cited. This word on their origin is given for whatever value it may have in the operation of the statute when the bill becomes law.

My concern on these points, particularly on the desirability of recognizing storage on the tributaries as valuable in any plan of flood control for the Missouri River Basin had been previously expressed to the Chief of Engineers by letter, November 22, 1944, and in a series of conferences with members of his staff.

In the letter and in the conferences I pointed out storage possibilities on several of the tributaries in North Dakota and South Dakota particularly on such rivers as the Little Missouri, Knife, Cannonball, Heart, Grand, Moreau, Cheyenne, White, and others. I also called attention to problems that would be created by the flooding of Indian lands at several points along the main stem of the river.

I was particularly concerned that provision be made for later coordination with whatever recommendations might come from the Bureau of Reclamation. Accordingly, I ventured to suggest that the letter of recommendations by the Chief of Engineers carry appropriate language to make clear that the suggested mainstem reservoirs might be modified as to site and size to permit coordination with recommendations by other agencies and to meet conditions that might develop as the work progressed, that it authorize placing storage on tributaries, and that it also establish authority to make complete reimbursement by payment to individual Indians and Indian tribes for any lands flooded and property injured or by the location and construction or relocation and reconstruction of works and facilities.

The following reply was received:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, November 26, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: Reference is made to your letter of November 22, 1943, in which you present several suggestions for possible development of the proposed projects on the main stem of the Missouri River and its tributaries with a view to obtaining the maximum benefits from the expenditure of Federal funds in the development of the Missouri River Basin for flood control and allied water uses. Your letter also contains a suggestion that the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Missouri River investigation include a recommendation for appropriate authority pertaining to the acquisition of Indian lands needed for the proposed reservoirs and the reimbursement for or the relocation of the interests of the Indians.

May I thank you for these helpful suggestions, and also for the constructive comments which you have made in your several recent conferences with the Department's representatives. I may assure you that your views as expressed in your letter of November 22 will be fully considered in the preparation of the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

The Chief of Engineers did give consideration to the suggestions as is evidenced by the language in paragraphs 10 to 14, inclusive, in his letter of recommendations that appears in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, which by reference in the bill before us, becomes the law when the bill is approved.

For convenient reference, the paragraphs mentioned are inserted at this point:

10. The amount of storage in the mainstem reservoirs and the location and size of these reservoirs is of vital importance to the ultimate development of the entire basin. I am convinced in the light of all information now available that the plan of the division engineer and the Board provides a flexible basis for securing that storage and obtaining the full multiple-purpose use of the waters of the Missouri Valley. The plan contemplates further expansion with a view to solving the flood and other problems in the upper tributary basins. Many of these solutions will doubtless be accomplished through the construction, by appropriate agencies, of additional multiple-purpose reservoirs on those tributaries and headwater streams.

11. The Department recognizes waterflow retardation, soil-erosion prevention, and production of hydroelectric power as important parts of the Missouri Basin program. The generation of power, in multiple-purpose projects now authorized for flood control and in those proposed in the expanded plan of development, is a definite part of the recommended program. Plans for the production, transmission, and sale of hydroelectric power should be worked out with the cooperation of the Federal Power Commission. Installation of power facilities so as to meet the economic needs of the Missouri Basin should be approved from time to time by the Secretary of War upon recommendations by the Federal Power Commission and the Chief of Engineers.

12. The proposed reservoirs will inundate Indian lands at several points. The estimates submitted on the over-all cost of the projects include funds to cover the cost of taking such lands and buildings, including relocation of burial grounds. It is to be understood, therefore, that approval of this plan includes authority for the Indians through their tribal councils, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to convey and relinquish such property to the United States, and authority for the Secretary of War to enter into appropriate agreements with the Secretary of the Interior and the Indian tribes concerned for the payment of the fair value of the property taken or for the contribution of a sum approximating such value toward locating or constructing or toward relocating or reconstructing buildings, works, facilities, or water projects in the vicinity of the Missouri River or its tributaries.

13. In summary, I believe that the expanded plan of development for the Missouri River Basin as recommended by the division engineer and the Board, establishes a broad framework for comprehensive basinwide improvements that will derive the maximum benefits from the full multiple-purpose use of the water resources of that basin. That plan is flexible in that it proposes sufficient latitude to permit such modifications thereof and changes therein as may be found advisable, and it should be augmented by appropriate work of other agencies duly constituted by law to perform such work. Thus there are no problems of water use that cannot be satisfactorily solved with the full cooperation of all water-use agencies as the over-all plan of improvement is placed under construction.

14. This comprehensive plan should be approved now and at least the first phase of development authorized to be prosecuted in the same manner as that prescribed by existing law for similar comprehensive plans for large river basins. Approval at this time will permit details to be worked out through coordination and cooperation with all other

agencies concerned and will enable working plans to be prepared so that construction can be initiated expeditiously and prosecuted with efficiency and dispatch throughout the post-war period.

This account of the origin of the provisos that appear in the paragraph in the bill is given, Mr. Chairman, in order to establish the legislative intent of them and to buttress and give force to the possibilities for progressive coordination with the programs of other Federal agencies in the Missouri River Basin, including the construction of reservoirs on tributaries as well as the main stem of the river.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the proposal under consideration for the Missouri River watershed I want to pay my respects to the committee and its distinguished chairman. This I can do with propriety and actual knowledge as it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Flood Control Committee in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. First, I wish to state that the Congress and the Nation are extremely fortunate in having the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] as chairman. My personal opinion is that no individual in or out of Congress is so familiar with and sympathetic to the disastrous and overwhelming problems caused by water run-off. This great committee, under his leadership, has formulated a plan for a comprehensive control of the water run-off in every section of the Nation. Benefits will continue to accrue from this program for generations to come.

It is not my intention to enter into a discussion of the very excellent report submitted as a comprehensive plan for development of the Missouri River Basin. I do wish to state that it is with great satisfaction that I have read the report and the letters from the Chief of Engineers, the Commissioners of Irrigation, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Agriculture.

The Missouri River Basin is the only large watershed in the Nation on which Congress has not authorized a comprehensive plan for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and an expanded domestic use of the water run-off. The future prosperity of this large section of the Nation will be largely determined by the use of this great natural resource.

The report submitted by the Chief of Engineers recommends a program of impounding the water run-off in vast sections of this area through multiple-type reservoirs. These reservoirs would have the beneficial effect of protecting areas downstream from floods, store water for local irrigation, furnish electric power in some areas, be of great benefit to the wildlife of the section, and furnish recreational areas that are badly needed. The multiple-purpose reservoir developments would accrue benefits to the rural communities in this section which is in the arid and semiarid region.

During the testimony before the committee on the entire watershed by Col. Miles A. Reber it was brought out that the entire program was flexible and the final construction of it would be through a coordinated policy approved by the Federal, State, and local areas. Personally, I am interested in the program as proposed for the Kansas River and its tributaries. The report mentions that the Kanopolis Reservoir will be completed as soon as material and labor can be released from war production. The Harlan Reservoir has congressional authorization. Plans for its construction have been completed and further authorization for funds are included in this proposal. This means that this project would be given a green light at the earliest opportunity. Smaller reservoirs are being recommended on the tributary streams in Kansas and Nebraska. A project at Kirwin, Kans., has been under study for several years and the plans are now receiving final consideration in the Bureau of Reclamation office at Denver, and also before the Director of the War Food Administration. Every effort is being made for the economic justification of it as a project which fits into the Department's program for increased food production. Studies are being made and reports will soon be available on the project at Cedar Bluffs on the Smoky Hill.

All of these projects, plus others that are being studied on the Kansas River, will furnish great protection from floods, furnish water for irrigation, improve the rural conditions in the areas affected, and be of general economic benefit to the Nation.

During the hearings before the Flood Control Committee the State was fortunate to have as its representatives Hon. Joe R. Beeler, of Jewell County, who was the personal representative of Andrew J. Schoeppel, Governor of the State; George S. Knapp, State water-resources engineer; and Dr. E. Porter Ahrens, State director of the National Reclamation Association, who represented the Republican River at the hearings. These gentlemen expressed approval of the plan submitted by the Army engineers and ably presented the views of Kansas.

At the conclusion of the war, thousands of young men will be returning to Kansas. These young men have served with honor and distinction as representatives of our State on foreign battlefields and in defense industries. They will want to return to their home State and home locality. It will be the duty of the State and Nation to work out a program that will furnish employment for them. The construction program submitted to this committee by the Chief of Engineers would, when completed, furnish great and lasting projects to our State and our Nation. Projects of this type must be given consideration if we are to avoid another leaf-raking program. This program is one of vision and promise. To me it is the beginning of a program that I have personally visualized for years. During my service in Congress I have consistently worked and voted for a comprehensive reservoir-control program for the water run-off in our section of the Nation. Those of us who are familiar with the ravages of floods and droughts could do no less than use our every means for early approval of the proposed plan.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point, and that amendments to any section of this part of the bill be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following-named localities, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on such drainage areas; the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of War may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to the Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Chipola River, Ala. and Fla.; Wacasassa River and its tributaries, Fla., and of adjacent areas in Gilchrist and Levy Counties, Fla.; Oklawaha River and its tributaries, Fla., and of adjacent areas in Alachua and Marion Counties, Fla.; Scajaquada Creek and its tributaries, N. Y.; Buffalo River, Minn.; Wild Rice River, Minn.; Marsh River, Minn.; Sand Hill River, Minn.; Red Lake River, Minn.; Roseau River, Minn.; Snake River, Minn.; Middle River, Minn.; Tamarac River, Minn.; Two Rivers, Minn.; Warroad River and Bull Dog Creek, Minn.; Mississippi River and its tributaries, in the County of Aitkin, Minn.; Apple River, Joe Daviess County, Ill.; Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio; Indian Creek, Ind.

Osage River, Mo. and Kans.

San Rafael Creek and its tributaries, California.

Bayamon and Hondo Rivers and their tributaries, municipality of Bayamon, P. R.

SEC. 9. That the sum of $810,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the improvements herein, the sum of $10,000,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended in equal amounts by the Departments of War and Agriculture for carrying out any examination or survey provided for in this act and any other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by said Departments. The sum of $1,500,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended by the Federal Power Commission for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act or any other acts of

Congress, to be prosecuted by the said Federal Power Commission.

SEC. 10. That the following works of improvement for run-off and water flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention, are hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of the national security and with a view toward an adequate reservoir of useful and worthy public works for the post-war construction program to be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with the plans of the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans and preliminary work may be prosecuted during the war with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such works so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of post-war construction: *Provided further*, That when the existing critical situation with respect to materials, equipment, and manpower, no longer exists and in any event not later than immediately following the cessation of hostilities in the present war, the projects herein authorized shall be initiated as expeditiously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements and shall be prosecuted vigorously during the period of post-war reconversion.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

The program on the Los Angeles River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Under Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 426, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $8,380,000.

TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TEX.

The program on the Trinity River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 708, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $32,000,000.

LITTLE TALLAHATCHIE RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Little Tallahatchie River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 892, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $4,221,000.

COOSA RIVER WATERSHED (ABOVE ROME, GA.)

The program on the Coosa River watershed above Rome, Ga., is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 236, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $1,233,000.

LITTLE SIOUX RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Little Sioux River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 268, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $4,280,000.

POTOMAC RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Potomac River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 269, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $859,000.

COLORADO RIVER WATERSHED (TEXAS)

The program on those portions of the Colorado River watershed included in the watersheds of Pecan Bayou, San Saba River, Brady Creek, and the area tributary to the main stream of the Colorado River below its confluence with the Concho River and above the mouth of Pecan Bayou, is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 270, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $2,693,000.

OUACHITA RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Ouachita River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Under Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 275, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $11,243,000.

SEC. 11. That the balance remaining from the authorization of $10,000,000 provided in section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, for the 5-year period ending June 30, 1944, to correlate the program for the improvement of watersheds by the Department of Agriculture for measures of run-off and water flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds with the program for the improvement of rivers and other waterways by the Department of War is hereby reauthorized to be expended during the post-war period by the Department of Agriculture for the prosecution of the work authorized in section 10 of this act: *Provided*, That not more than 20 percent of the authorization made available herein shall be expended on any one project.

SEC. 12. That section 7 of the act of June 28, 1938, (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), is hereby amended by adding at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized in his discretion to undertake such emergency measures for run-off retardation and soil-erosion prevention as may be needed to safeguard lives and property from floods and the products of erosion on any watershed whenever fire or any other natural element or force has caused a sudden impairment of that watershed: *Provided*, That not to exceed $100,000 out of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the prosecution by the Secretary of Agriculture of works of improvement or measures for run-off and water flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds may be expended during any one fiscal year for such emergency measures."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 20, line 18, after the word "numbered" insert "513."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 25, line 7, after the period, insert "Choctawhatchee River, Fla."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 26, following line 1, insert "Deep Red Run in Tillman County, Okla.; Little Elk Creek, Salt Fork, Elm Creek, Saddle Mountain, Turkey Creek, Okla."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]. While I have not had an opportunity to confer with the Corps of Engineers, my information is that some of those streams have not been surveyed, and if the others have been, it will not be objectionable, so I see no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, all of us here, I am sure, are interested in this measure because of the ultimate benefits to the Nation as a whole. The people of northwestern Minnesota are particularly interested in this bill, H. R. 4485, because its passage will authorize a much-needed and meritorious project in the congressional district I represent. I refer to the flood-control project known as Red Lake River, including Clearwater River of Minnesota.

We also are particularly interested in this bill because it includes authorizations for preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes of 12 other rivers and creeks in northwestern Minnesota. They are Buffalo River, Wild Rice River, Marsh River, Red Lake River, Roseau River, Sand Hill River, Snake River, Middle River, Tamarac River, Two Rivers, Warroad River, and Bull Dog Creek.

The Red Lake-Clearwater project will cost the Federal Government $902,940. It has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers of the War Department as a worthy undertaking. An additional cost of $86,000 will be borne by local agencies.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to take this opportunity to inform the House that not only is the gentleman speaking for himself and the district he has the honor to represent, but all of us from the Minnesota districts. We have examined this thing carefully and are thoroughly in favor of it. The Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers drain one of the richest basins in the world for raising grains and seed crops and a great variety of products which are greatly needed now. This is a very important project which can be finished in a relatively short time so that this land can be brought into production. Its benefits can be made available even before the war is over. So I compliment the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. HAGEN. I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his comments and cordial remarks.

The Secretary of War recommends that this project be started after the war. However, substantial facts have been presented by the Minnesota Department of Conservation, as well as other groups and individuals and myself, showing that this particular project should be undertaken now as an aid in increasing food production for the war effort.

On the occasion of one of my appearances before the House Committee on Flood Control, I discussed the immediate need for the completion of this flood-control project. Just prior to that time Col. George R. Goethals, Chief, Civil

Works Division, office of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, also testified that the results of the project would be highly beneficial.

The Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers periodically overflow their banks and flood some of the most productive farm land in America. The adjacent territory is a well settled farming area of hard-working farmers operating medium-sized farms. Various grains, hay, and other forage crops are grown. Dairying, livestock, and poultry raising are also carried on to an extensive degree.

These floods not only destroy crops but create such personal hardships for the farmers and families in that area that during recent wet years some of them have had to move elsewhere.

According to the report of the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics, farmers and taxpayers in the flood area have suffered a loss of more than $3,384,000 during the years 1919 to 1939. Some of the more recent years have been the worst flood periods.

Record crops have been raised during average years, and some of the drought-stricken sections have had to depend upon their forage and grain crops for livestock feed from the Red Lake-Clearwater area.

Completion of this project now will greatly increase food production for the war effort with a minimum of cost to the Government.

My predecessor in Congress, Representative R. T. Buckler, and I, as his secretary for 8 years, have been actively interested in this project for a long time, and we have received wonderful cooperation from many individuals, committees, and officials in an effort to bring efforts of more than 30 years to a successful culmination.

The passage of this omnibus flood-control bill by the House of Representatives, with the inclusion of the Red Lake-Clearwater River project, marks the furtherest step forward in the long history of this excellent proposal.

In order that my colleagues in the House may be more familiar with this particular project I desire to make a few pertinent remarks concerning it.

Red Lake River, the principal tributary of the Red River of the North, has its source at the outlet of lower Red Lake in the northwestern part of Minnesota, flows generally westward through a meandering course for 196 miles, and empties into the Red River of the North at East Grand Forks, Minn. The drainage area contains 5,711 square miles, of which about 500 square miles are water surface. The principal tributary is Clearwater River, which enters from the south about 90 miles above the mouth of Red Lake River.

The Chief of Engineers has investigated the flood problem on the Red Lake River and its tributaries pursuant to the authority contained in the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and has submitted a report to Congress in which he recommends adoption of a Federal project for the regulation of Red Lake for flood control by the installation of three hand-operated Tainter gates and other appurtenant works and for the rectification, clearing, and enlarging of the channels of Red Lake River and Clearwater River, Minn., at an estimated cost to the United States of $902,940.

The Flood Control Committee believes that the improvements outlined in the report of the Chief of Engineers would provide a reasonably satisfactory solution of the water supply problems in the Red Lake River Basin and the control of floods resulting from direct overflow from streams within the Red Lake River Basin and it has recommended the authorization of the work proposed by the Chief of Engineers.

It now appears that the project will at last be approved by Congress. I sincerely hope that this body will see fit at a later date to appropriate the necessary funds to start work on the project during 1944–45.

Over a long period of time, many public officials, civic-minded citizens, township officials, and farmers have cooperated and expended unselfish efforts to advance this most worthy plan. This authorization and approval by the House today, and the expected passage by the Senate, gives renewed hope to hundreds of farmers and their families in the large area which will be most benefited. I am happy to have had a part in the work of advancing this plan to its present stage of development.

As the Representative in Congress from the Ninth District of Minnesota, I urge and ask the continued cooperation of my constituents and my colleagues here in the House in the next steps forward to ultimate completion of the project.

Now our special efforts must be directed toward the approval of the plan by the Department of Agriculture and the War Department as an emergency wartime effort to increase the food supply.

If the farmers of this area definitely know that their crops will not be destroyed by floods, they will plant and produce a large amount of food and crop products. If we are not able to get the project started as an emergency wartime job, we will ask for funds at the appropriate time to get the project under way immediately after the close of the war.

The fine public spirit of citizens, townsmen, and farmers alike assures me of their continued interest and cooperation in the advancement of this long-pending Red Lake-Clearwater River project.

The victory and the undertaking of this great flood-relief job is in sight. I believe my long experience with it will be helpful. I will continue to do everything within the power and influence of my office as a Member of Congress and to the best of my ability to see it through to completion.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note from an examination of the report accompanying the bill H. R. 4485, page 3, that—

> In approving the Flood Control Act of 1941 the President directed that no new flood-control projects should be undertaken unless they were of direct importance to the defense of the Nation.

I understand further that the projects now being authorized are for post-war construction. On page 10 of the report, in a discussion of the Susquehanna River Basin, I note the following:

> The Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, modified the previous authorization for the Sunbury, Pa., project and the general plan for southern New York and eastern Pennsylvania to include the Lackawanna River.

I also note on page 6 of the bill that further modifications are made to the basic act of June 22, 1936.

When my distinguished predecessor, an able and distinguished Congressman, the late Patrick J. Boland, was a Member of the House, plans were laid for the Stillwater project and for alleviating the flood dangers on the Lackawanna. Recently I took the matter up with the very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Flood Control and he contacted the Army engineers, who in turn reported that they were making a current study, the results of which would be made known in July. I should like to state for the record that when those studies are completed I shall take the matter up with the chairman of the committee and ask for a hearing if a hearing is required at that time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The chairman of the committee and the committee will continue to cooperate with the gentleman, who has been most diligent in behalf of control of the floods along the streams to which he has referred.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: On page 25, between lines 8 and 9 insert the following: "Susquehanna River, in the vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I see no objection to the amendment. The gentleman has adopted the recommendation we made to him earlier in the afternoon.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: On page 26, after line 2, insert "Grand River, S. Dak., Moreau River, S. Dak."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to state whether or not an examination and survey of those two streams has been ordered. I am agreeable to this amendment being included if it is agreeable to the other members of the committee. If we find an examination and survey has been ordered, it

can be eliminated in the Senate or in conference.

Mr. CASE. That is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee with regard to the Marais des Cygnes River in Kansas? On page 26, line 1 of the bill, reference is made to the Osage River, Missouri and Kansas. As a matter of fact and a matter of history, the Osage River starts in Missouri, but the upper part of the Osage was known throughout all our geographies until the last 3 or 4 years as the Marais des Cygnes. May I ask the chairman whether this reference to the "Osage River, Missouri and Kansas," includes the Marais des Cygnes River in Kansas?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If I may answer the question of the gentleman, and I think the House is justified in relying upon his statement that that river is also known by another name, I am sure that the river, no matter what it is known as locally, will be reported on as the Osage River, sometimes called, as the gentleman has pointed out, the Marais des Cygnes. I have in mind that the Arkansas is called Ar-Kansas out in Kansas, but we get a report on the same stream whether it is called Arkansaw or Ar-Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, during the last week the flood waters have just receded from several towns along the Marais des Cygnes, and it has resulted in the second highest flood in the history of the State. So we feel it is quite an important problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

T. V. A. IS NOT A YARDSTICK

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

A few weeks ago this House passed the annual independent offices appropriation bill and sent it to the other end of the Capitol for approval. Amendments that will have a far-reaching effect on the future operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been adopted by the Senate, and the bill is now in conference.

In anticipation of the day that I will be called upon to vote for or against these T. V. A. amendments, I have recently read two very interesting books: one, The Power Industry and the Public Interest, which is a summary of the results of a survey of the relations between the Government and the electric-power industry made under the direction of the trustees of the Twentieth Century Fund. The other book was T. V. A.—Democracy on the March, by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The adoption of the T. V. A. amendments to which I have referred brings the whole subject of the T. V. A. and its future before Congress. Regardless of how we may individually feel as to the wisdom of setting up the T. V. A., we must now accept the fact that the people we represent have an investment of more than $800,000,000 in the Tennessee Valley Authority. As I see it, our problem today is to determine just how we can make the best possible use of the T. V. A. property, and just what we should do to bring about the greatest possible return on this huge investment.

I have my own personal views regarding the wisdom of permitting the Federal Government to embark on the T. V. A. program. Frankly, I cannot help but wonder if we might not have been better off, as a nation, if, instead of spending $800,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority, we had permitted private capital to finance these projects. There are millions of dollars of private capital lying idle in banks scattered all over the country. Money that could have been invested in expanding the private power industry, not only in the Tennessee Valley area but throughout the Nation. However, as far as T. V. A. is concerned, that question has been settled.

Before the House passes on the T. V. A. amendments to the independent offices appropriation bill, there is one ghost that I would like to see laid once and for all. I would like to scotch the yardstick idea that has confused so many people whenever T. V. A. was discussed. If the taxpayers of this Nation are going to endorse and support the program of T. V. A., they have a right to know just what the supporters of T. V. A. have in mind. Was T. V. A. set up to provide a yardstick for the electric-power industry or was it created as part of a great social experiment of developing the national resources of the Tennessee Valley?

Unfortunately, the Federal Power Commission with the sanction of Congress has spent thousands of dollars printing volumes, comparing T. V. A. electrical rates with the rates charged by private utility companies in every city, town, village, and hamlet throughout the United States. Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has filled page after page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with similar comparisons.

The complaint of many supporters of private industry is not with the great social experiment of developing all the national resources of the valley and raising the standard of living. Nor is its resentment directed at the notable practical demonstration which the T. V. A. and the Canadian Hydro have made in proving the large per capita use which the public will make of electricity in the home, provided rates are sufficiently low. It is directed principally against the use of the T. V. A. rate schedules and average per kilowatt-hour prices paid in the territory as a yardstick by which the public may judge the extent of the robbery perpetrated upon them by private industry.

May I, at this time, quote from statements made by men who have supported T. V. A. from its very beginning?

The views of Prof. Martin G. Glaeser, who helped determine the T. V. A. rate schedules in 1933, with respect to the validity of the yardstick have been stated as follows:

> Long ago I had concluded that the yardstick idea is a will-o'-the-wisp which lends itself admirably to propaganda purposes, but the pursuit of which could end only in a bog of discussion, of claim and counterclaim.

Also, on the question of yardstick, I quote from the Twentieth Century Fund report on The Power Industry and the Public Interest:

> The national significance of the T. V. A. experiment in relation to the regulation of power rates by State commissions has been dramatized by the invidious term, "yardstick."
>
> Although, in its early years, the T. V. A. wholesale rate was featured as a yardstick by the T. V. A. and its supporters, that claim has now been abandoned. Conditions of generation differ so widely between a multiple-purpose project and a private plant that equality, or even comparability, of costs cannot be expected. The cost of generation by the T. V. A., no matter what method of allocation is used, cannot be a measure of reasonable costs for any other plant, whether steam or hydroelectric.
>
> Nor has the retail yardstick any more scientific validity. If the wholesaler does not operate on a strictly commercial basis, development costs cannot be readily allocated to the retail distributor. Furthermore, the over-all wholesale-retail costs are no more comparable to those of other utilities than is the wholesale rate itself. Insofar as costs have been shifted or absorbed in expenditures for other purposes, the ability of T. V. A. distributors to show a profit is no proof that their resale rates are reasonable.

Still on the subject of yardsticks, I turn to the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Mr. David E. Lilienthal, who, in his recent book, states:

> The particular rates embodied in the T. V. A. schedule were not to be an absolute standard of precisely what should be charged for electricity anywhere and everywhere in the country, with the implication that any company charging more than the T. V. A. rate was therefore proved an extortionist. The country is far too diverse, conditions are far too varied, for any such oversimplification.

I am sure that my distinguished colleague [Mr. RANKIN] will accept the testimony of the three outstanding authorities I have quoted, and that we will hear no more about the T. V. A. yardstick.

David E. Lilienthal is one of the greatest living authorities on T. V. A. For one I accept his statement that T. V. A. rates should not be used as a yardstick. I have heard the T. V. A. yardstick called a 20-inch yardstick or a rubber yardstick. It is gratifying to learn from such eminent authority that there is no yardstick as far as the T. V. A. is concerned.

I intend to oppose any T. V. A. amendments that might "hamstring" those who are charged with protecting the taxpayers' investment. That statement does not mean that I think the T. V. A. act, in its present form, is perfect. It is my belief that inasmuch as the T. V. A. must continue to operate in competition with private utilities, it should pay all taxes

at the same rate paid by competing private companies. If the consumer of electricity bought from a privately financed power and electric-light company is to pay a sales tax on the amount of his light bill, then certainly those who buy electricity from a T. V. A. Government-financed company should pay a tax at the same rate. In the near future I hope to prepare some figures comparing the taxes paid by T. V. A. and its consumers, with the taxes paid by private electric-light companies and their consumers.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BREHM: On page 25, line 7, after the period in line 7, strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "Hocking River in Hocking County, Ohio."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would say in deference to the gentleman from Ohio, I am sure a report on the Hocking River was authorized. For that reason I suggest the gentleman withdraw his amendment, and if you find or I find it is not authorized, we can ask the Senate to insert it.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, some 3 or 4 weeks ago I talked with the Army engineers' office here in Washington regarding this section of the Hocking River at Rockbridge, Ohio, and its destructive effects upon the farms adjacent thereto, and was informed that they would be pleased to have their engineer make a survey of this area. My amendment authorizes that this action be taken.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of that statement, I have no objection to this stream being included.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I spoke of a project that might be listed on page 25 of this bill and the Chair said if I would name the stream it might be included. I am not quite sure whether it has already been included in a survey. I refer to the Hassayampa River in Arizona. It may have been included in a general survey of the Gila River and its tributaries which is one of those extensive surveys begun some years ago and still in progress. Acting on the suggestion the Chairman has made to several other Members, I would like to take that question up further and see whether a survey has been made on the Hassayampa.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if that be the stream which the gentleman mentioned to me yesterday, I took it up with the Office of the Chief of Engineers and I was advised the report was in process of being submitted. If you find that statement is not absolutely correct with respect to this stream you just mentioned, I suggest you ask for an examination of it to be included in the Senate bill. But I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for that suggestion. He made a similar suggestion to the gentleman from California a moment ago, which I would like also to act upon. As I said yesterday, there is a flood-control situation badly needing action at Holbrock, Ariz., on the Little Colorado which has been looked into and carefully studied by the Army engineers. They have made their complete report some time ago and the only thing left in finishing this report is that it has not cleared the Bureau of the Budget, nor the Bureau of Reclamation. However, I happen to know that the Bureau of Reclamation is favorable to it and would interpose no objection. In the same way, then, I should like to have this referred to the Senate after clearance is had and later possibly to the conferees in regard to this same bill, because the flood hazard at Holbrook is very, very bad. The Army engineers' report is complete up to the point indicated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the remainder of my time on a matter of general policy covered in this measure. We have had a good deal said here today in regard to the implications of this bill, that it does not affect reclamations or power production, because it applies solely to flood control or navigation. The words of the chairman to that effect are reassuring and I am glad to have them. However, I want to point out that years ago in order to inject the Federal Government into the regulation of some of these rivers and justify the expenditure of Federal funds, the constitutional phrase "control of navigation" by Congress has been greatly extended by wide interpretation. I am not so sure but that the Government has erected some flood-control and even some irrigation dams under the guise of affording navigation. If the Chairman is referring specifically to actual navigation as covered by the terms of this bill, its effects may be well and good. If, however, a dam on the river that flows by my door, the Roosevelt Dam, begun in 1906 and finished in 1911, which is also a flood-control dam, but primarily for irrigation, if that dam is to be controlled by an agency other than the Bureau of Reclamation because it has some flood-control possibilities or because it has something to do with navigation actually or impliedly, then, of course, that is something else yet. I want to point out to the chairman of the Flood Control Committee that here is a danger of centralizing too much power in the hands of the War Department in the control of our western rivers.

At the same time, however, I want to say that I have great confidence in the Army engineers. They have done a magnificent job. I want them to continue, but I do not want to centralize control of all of our rivers even in the hands of the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, several days ago, under the influence of misleading statements and a barrage of false propaganda, the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway was eliminated from the rivers and harbors bill in the House by a small majority. Owing to the fact that that project is now pending before the Senate—and it is our hope to have it restored—and owing to the fact that reports and recommendations on flood control on this stream have not been completed by the Army engineers, we find that such an item would not be in order on the pending measure. However, I hope to get it inserted in the Senate.

I wish every Member of the House could see these pictures of the devastating floods on the Tombigbee River, where people have been drowned within the last 2 months, their stock drowned, and their property swept away. If we are going to control floods and legislate generally for the rivers of this country, I should like for it to be done on a more equitable basis. This Tombigbee River cannot be ignored.

Recently the statement was made in the debate here in the House to the effect that the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway had not been approved by the Chief of Army Engineers. The House was led to believe that the Chief of Army Engineers was not in favor of it, when as a matter of fact what the Chief of Army Engineers did was to submit a report of his own Board with the comment that there were certain phases that should be left to the Congress itself. But so far as the engineering feasibility of the project, or the accuracy of the report of the Board of Army Engineers was concerned, he never expressed the slightest doubt.

A few days ago, Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Army Engineers, who was on the Board that made this report, appeared before a Senate committee, and this is what he said:

If we came up here and submitted a report recommending a project for slack water on the Mississippi between Cairo and New Orleans, by building locks and dams on the Mississippi River itself, at an estimated cost of $66,000,000, I think you would all take off your hats and cheer.

Why did he say they would take off their hats and cheer? Because it would cut the cost of up-bound traffic on an average of 50 percent or more, and would benefit everybody on the upper Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Illinois, the Cumberland, and the Tennessee, as well as the entire Great Lakes area.

He says further:

This alternate route on the Tombigbee we are recommending amounts to the same thing, only the locks and dams are to be built on the Tombigbee instead of the Mississippi. There is no greater tangible saving than that which will accrue from use of the Tennessee-Tombigbee route instead of the Mississippi for the upstream traffic. This saving as estimated in House Document 269 is $1,000,000. It is very conservative and should be doubled on account of the increase that has taken place in upstream traffic on the Mississippi River.

This would really be better than a slack-water route up the Mississippi for the reason that it would leave the benefits of the current on the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

General Robins says that even if he were to make an additional report, which some of them have clamored for, he would make the same report that he is making now, that this project is not only feasible, but that it is the only way you can overcome the swift current of the Mississippi for upstream traffic.

It means more to the people of the Mississippi Valley from Pittsburgh, Pa., to New Orleans, La.; from Sioux City, Iowa, to Mobile, Ala.; from St. Paul and Minneapolis, and from Chicago to the Gulf coast than any other development of its kind that has ever been proposed. Yet it was voted down in the House under the influence of false propaganda; and today we find that these floods are destroying the people on that stream, without compensation or without relief. General Robins went on to say:

Taking into account all the changed conditions since the report before the committee was prepared, there is a total tangible saving in sight today of $4,000,000 a year for this project, and the carrying charges on this project are $3,500,000. From the information that is officially available to this committee, there is no question in my mind but that the Tennessee-Tombigbee project is economically sound without considering recreation or national defense or enhanced land values, or any other intangible benefits.

We can go back to the field, make another report, and do all the work over again, and hold hearings, and when the new report comes up before the committee you will have the same old arguments in opposition to the project that you have today. If the committee, if the Congress wants us to make another report, we will be glad to make it. That is the situation as I see it.

Senator OVERTON. You are satisfied that the report that would be submitted would be along the lines you just stated?

General ROBINS. Absolutely, and if this report can be attacked on account of some of the changed conditions since the report was written I do not see why it cannot be defended on account of other changed conditions.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. In a minute. General Robins is one of the ablest men who ever served with the Army engineers; he knows more about this proposition than any other man alive. He is now Assistant Chief of Engineers, on whom the Chief relies for information on this particular proposition.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman in his opening remarks said there were misleading statements made on this floor referring to that project.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman refer to the argument that was presented by me at the time it came up?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman led the House to believe that the Army engineers were not in favor of this project.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman did no such thing at all. The gentleman presented to the House the arguments and statements made by the engineers themselves in their report. May I ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman know of another single river and harbor project ever presented to this House containing the same reasons for its justification as were contained in the Tombigbee River proposition?

Mr. RANKIN. Those justifications were ample at the time the report was made and have increased by leaps and bounds from that day to this. It is now imperative that this great project be constructed.

General Robins himself, who, as I said, was on the Board which made the report, said before the Senate Commerce Committee the other day that if he were to go back and resurvey this traffic, that would not change the physical facts; and that he would make just about the same report he made then and that he is making now, in which he recommended then, and recommends now the construction of this project.

Mr. DONDERO. And on that report this House on four votes rejected that proposition.

Mr. RANKIN. This House was misled to believe that the Chief of Army Engineers was not for it. That was the inference that the gentleman from Michigan left, that the Chief of Army Engineers was not for it. Here is the Assistant Chief of Army Engineers, who was on the Board that made the report, and he not only recommended it but he recommends it now. Why did not the gentleman from Michigan consult General Robins before he launched his attacks and misled so many of his colleagues to vote against this great project that would mean so much to the people they represent, including the people of Michigan?

Mr. DONDERO. But the Chief of Army Engineers said in his letter——

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the gentleman was swept off his feet by misleading propaganda. Certain paid lobbyists have been coming before the committee ever since I have been on it, trying to mislead the committee on this proposition. Now they are trying to mislead the Senate. The gentleman from Michigan could not do the shippers of his own State of Michigan greater harm than to kill this great project. Every time a towboat with the average barge load carried a load of Michigan goods to the Gulf States it would save from $2,405 to $5,448 on every return trip by using this Tombigbee route.

Mr. DONDERO. Then if the Chief of Army Engineers felt as he did when he made that report, that it moved in the direction of speculation in order to justify the proposition——

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, he did not say anything of the kind. He said there were certain questions with reference to the amount of traffic, or the routing of traffic, or questions of policy, that would fall more within the realm of statesmanship. As far as the engineering of the project itself was concerned, it was approved by every man who investigated it; approved by the Board and a member of that Board—Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins—is now Assistant Chief of Engineers. He approved it then, he approves it today, and recommends its construction.

This project has been approved by the President. General Robins further stated that:

There have been a great many extracts read from House Document 269 particularly having to do with the letters of the Tennessee Valley Authority and of the National Resources Committee. I would like to call attention to the fact that after the President got those letters he said—and it is printed in House Document 269—that he is in favor of this project.

Senator BAILEY. The President?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

One railroad lobbyist undertook to show that the proposed locks would be inadequate, and General Robins made him look ridiculous. Here is the general's reply:

General ROBINS. I happened to be a member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors when this project was under consideration, and this same discussion about the locks took place at the Board meeting for several hours, and the question as to whether these locks would have to be made wide enough to correspond with the locks on the lower Tennessee to take care of the traffic that came down the Mississippi River was gone into at length. The Board agreed that the question of the width of the locks should be left open, and in its report recommended locks approximately 75 by 450 feet clear, and put the word "approximately" in so that the adjustment could be made if the locks had to be widened out.

I would like to explain that after a project like this is authorized by the Congress, the first step that the Department takes is to have made what is called a definite project report. In preparing this report the district engineer goes into all engineering questions over again such as dimensions of the locks and all details and dimensions are perfected and the definite project report sent into the Chief's office for approval before the contract drawings and specifications go out. I think the committee may have no concern about whether, if this waterway is authorized and built, the Corps of Engineers will build the locks of the proper size to take care of the potential commerce.

The other day Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, said to General Robins, with reference to this project, "If it is shown to be a profitable institution I am going to be very likely for it." To which General Robins replied, "Senator, I can show you that in 5 minutes."

Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and to the other Members of the House that if this Tennessee-Tombigbee project is finally defeated, it will not only be a great punishment to the people along these streams but it will be a great punishment to the people in Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Kentucky, Mississippi, and in every other State that uses these streams for the transportation of goods, because every toll load of eight barges that goes down has to come back, and when it does, to get back to Cairo, it is

penalized $2,400, the extra cost of fighting the swift current on the Mississippi. If it goes up the Ohio it costs $2,800 extra. If it goes from Mobile, the extra cost is more than that. If it is from Birmingham to Cairo it is more than $5,000.

Here is a statement by Col. P. A. Feringa, of the Army engineers, showing the saving this project would bring to the users of our inland waterways:

COMPARATIVE AVERAGE COSTS OF WATER TRANSPORTATION VIA EXISTING ROUTES AND VIA THE PROPOSED TOMBIGBEE-TENNESSEE WATERWAY

The following computations are based on the average performance of a representative tow of one 1,200-horsepower Diesel towboat and 8 barges of various standard types and dimensions loaded with a typical mixed cargo, at 55 percent load factor, of 3,500 revenue tons, to and from locations previously mentioned:

Over-all cost per hour	$21.25
Average speed of tow in slack water (miles)	5½
Cost per mile in slack water	$3.86
Average current in Mississippi River below Cairo (miles per hour)	2½
Cost per mile against 2½-miles-per hour current	$7.08
Cost per mile with 2½-miles-per-hour current	$2.66
Average lockage time:	
Tennessee-Ohio River section, 30 minutes	$11
Tombigbee section, 45 minutes	$16
Warrior section, 1 hour	$21
New Orleans to Cairo via Mississippi River, 860 miles in slack water (no lockages)	$6,273
New Orleans to Cairo via Tombigbee-Tennessee, 908 miles in slack water, $3,504; 24 lockages, $364	3,868
Saving in cost per trip in favor of Tombigbee route	2,405
New Orleans to Paducah via Mississippi River:	
886 miles against current	6,273
46 miles in slack water	177
2 lockages	22
Total	6,472
New Orleans to Paducah via Tombigbee-Tennessee:	
862 miles in slack water	3,327
22 lockages	342
Total	3,669
Saving in cost per trip in favor of Tombigbee route	2,803
New Orleans to junction of Tombigbee Canal with Tennessee River via Mississippi River:	
886 miles against current	6,273
261 miles in slack water	1,007
4 lockages	44
Total	7,324
New Orleans to junction of Tombigbee Canal with Tennessee River via Tombigbee River:	
647 miles in slack water	2,497
20 lockages	320
Total	2,817
Saving per trip in favor of Tombigbee route	4,507

Similarly the cost comparisons between other points on the inland waterways via the two routes are as follows:

From—	To—	Via Mississippi River			Via Tombigbee River			Saving per trip via Tombigbee River
		Running	Lockages	Total	Running	Lockages	Total	
Mobile	Cairo	$6,875	0	$6,875	$3,221	$364	$3,585	$3,290
	Paducah	7,052	$22	7,074	3,044	342	3,386	3,688
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	7,882	44	7,926	2,214	320	2,534	5,392
Port Birmingham	Cairo	8,458	279	8,737	2,710	579	3,289	5,448
	Paducah	8,635	301	8,936	2,532	557	3,089	5,847
	Tombigbee junction	9,465	323	9,788	1,702	535	2,237	7,551
Demopolis	Cairo	7,763	32	7,795	2,015	332	2,347	5,448
	Paducah	7,940	54	7,994	1,837	310	2,147	5,847
	Tombigbee junction	8,770	76	8,846	1,007	288	1,295	7,551
Columbus	Cairo	8,257	96	8,353	1,521	268	1,789	6,564
	Paducah	8,434	118	8,552	1,343	246	1,589	6,963
	Tombigbee junction	9,264	140	9,404	513	224	737	8,667
Aberdeen	Cairo	8,403	128	8,531	1,375	236	1,611	6,920
	Paducah	8,580	150	8,730	1,197	214	1,411	7,319
	Tombigbee junction	9,410	192	9,602	367	192	559	9,043
Fulton	Cairo	8,546	224	8,770	1,229	140	1,369	7,401
	Paducah	8,726	246	8,972	1,051	118	1,169	7,803
	Tombigbee junction	9,556	268	9,824	221	96	317	9,507

It should be noted that the cost tables have been prepared using the best figures presently available. An average current of 2½ miles per hour against upstream traffic has been set up for the Mississippi, this rate of flow being assumed in the tables to compensate for the necessary double-tripping through the cut-offs and crossing from bank to bank to avoid breasting the full force of adverse currents. Arbitrary time factors for lockages of one-half hour for Ohio River type; three-fourths hour for the proposed Tombigbee type; and 1 hour for Warrior type locks have been used in the absence of any definite figures therefor and lack of time for having test runs. No time was available for field check hence the figures were prepared from composite office data.

Mr. Speaker, in a letter addressed to me under date of November 3, 1943, Colonel Feringa also submitted figures to show the cost per ton-mile of transporting oil by rail, by tankers, by pipe lines, by barges, and by railroads. I quote from that letter as follows:

There is also herewith a table showing comparative costs per ton-mile of tankers, barges, pipe lines, and railroads. These figures were used by the Chief of Engineers in his address at Corpus Christi, Tex., on April 18, 1942, at the dedication of the extension of the Intracoastal Waterway:

	Mills per ton-mile
Rail tank car	8.3
Deep-draft tanker	1.25
Pipe line	3
Barge	2–2.5

And here is a table showing the saving in distances this Tennessee-Tombigbee project would provide:

Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway

WATERWAY DISTANCES TO GULF PORTS

From—	To Gulf at New Orleans via Mississippi River	To Gulf at Mobile via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings	
			Miles	Percent
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,718	1,610	108	6
Chicago	1,398	1,290	108	7½
St. Louis	1,043	935	108	10
Cairo	860	752	108	12½
Hickman	824	788	36	4
Pittsburgh	1,841	1,641	200	11
Cincinnati	1,379	1,179	200	14½
Lousiville	1,236	1,036	200	16
Paducah	906	706	200	22
Chattanooga	1,370	740	630	46
Wilson Dam	1,165	535	630	54
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal	1,121	491	630	56.2

DISTANCES VIA TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY VERSUS EXISTING WATER ROUTES

From—	To—	Distance via present waterways	Distance via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings in miles via Tennessee-Tombigbee	
		Miles	*Miles*	*Miles*	*Percent*
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal.	Fulton, Miss.	1,711	57	1,654	96.7
Do.	Aberdeen, Miss.	1,673	95	1,578	94.3
Do.	Columbus, Miss.	1,635	133	1,502	91.9
Do.	Demopolis, Ala.	1,507	261	1,246	82.7
Do.	Birmingham, Ala.	1,687	441	1,246	73.9

Can you imagine a project by which you could accomplish greater savings in time, distance, and transportation costs with so much ease and so little expense?

But the opposition has attempted to tell you that this project would not aid national defense; when as a matter of fact the Tennessee Valley is producing more war materials than any similar area in America, and this new waterway is badly needed to get the raw materials in and the finished products out.

Here is what General Robins has to say on that subject:

Representative RANKIN. May I ask him a question, Mr. Chairman?

Senator OVERTON. Very well.

Representative RANKIN. On this question of national defense, they have eliminated any benefit for national defense. As a matter of fact, a great deal of our defense work is being done in the Tennessee Valley area, is it not, on the Tennessee River?

General ROBINS. That is right, quite true. Unquestionably if that waterway were in operation today it would be of tremendous value for national defense, but you cannot put a money value on it any more than you can put a value on winning the war.

Representative RANKIN. If we should get into a war in the future, in addition to furnishing a slack waterway for up-bound traffic, should the Mississippi River be closed, this would furnish us an outlet to the sea, would it not?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

Representative RANKIN. And moreover, one that is so protected that it could scarcely be attacked from the sea?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

They talk about there being no increases in defense activities in that area. Do you know that that very book to which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] referred a while ago says that the power used for industries in this war is as great if not greater in the Tennessee Valley area than it is in either Pittsburgh or Boston? Vast amounts of war material are being produced there, and yet they are bottled up for want of this outlet to the sea.

General Robins has shown that this project is not only feasible but that it is necessary to meet the demands of the traffic in that area.

No one has ever questioned its feasibility, but the opposition has critcized and misrepresented it on the grounds of its necessity and its economic justification. General Robins has completely answered those criticisms. He has also shown that it is necessary from a standpoint of national defense, not only now but throughout the generations that are to come. Even if conditions had not changed since this report was made, this project would be more than justified. But conditions have changed, they have greatly changed, and those changes have made the construction of this project more imperative.

Vast volumes of war materials are now being produced along the Tennessee River, and will be even after this war comes to an end. Every intelligent man knows that we must maintain an air force second to none when this war is over, and the materials from which those planes are built are manufactured in the Tennessee Valley. The aluminum from which the planes are manufactured is made there, and the bauxite, the raw material from which that aluminum is made, is shipped in. That bauxite comes from the south, largely from Haiti and South America. Large volumes of it would all pass through this inland waterway, and save this country untold millions of dollars in the years to come.

Besides, one of the greatest oil fields in the world has just been brought in on the lower Tombigbee—on both sides of the river. One well was brought in in southeast Mississippi, the other day, just a few miles from this stream, that produces 1,000 barrels of oil a day. It is said to be the largest oil well ever brought in east of the Mississippi River.

All these changed conditions have increased the necessity for this great project that would save the American people enough in transportation costs to pay for its construction in a few years.

It has been pointed out by the Army Engineers that no project of this kind that has ever been surveyed, investigated, and approved as this one has, but that it has finally been constructed. This one is just as sure to come as the night follows the day. It should be approved now in order that its benefits may be realized at the earliest possible moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that this is a bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and other purposes. It had been my intention to introduce an amendment to provide for relief from damage caused by floods from Lake Erie in the Howard Farms area. Three floods have left over 300 people homeless. I have talked to the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, however, for whom I have the most profound respect, and will not offer that amendment at this time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RAMEY. I shall be most happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to say that the gentleman has been most fair and most cooperative. This project was not reported by the Chief of Engineers under any authorization survey. The gentleman from Ohio on yesterday spoke with respect to the project. He called the committee's attention to the fact that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had introduced a bill and that a report had been made on that bill and that there were hearings in the Senate.

Mr. RAMEY. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I say to the gentleman now as I said to him then that in as much as we have had no recommendation from the Chief of Engineers and no report, yet, if there is a favorable report on the project and it is included in this bill in the other body I think the conferees would be authorized to agree to its being included in the bill. In fact, I think we might make that agreement based on the assumption that there is a favorable report from the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand it, what the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi says amounts to this, that if the gentleman does not press for his amendment now, if Senator TAFT's amendment is placed in this bill in the Senate, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi will not interpose any opposition to the matter in conference.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Mississippi meant exactly what he said and said exactly what he meant, that if there was a favorable report on that bill and if it was included by the other body in the bill that it would occur to me—and I said that to the gentleman previously—that the conferees would be authorized in agreeing to its remaining in the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman gives us that assurance I know he will do exactly that. The point I am trying to lead to is this: That if that is done there should be no reason for the conference committee to come back and say: "We kept something out that was exactly similar to that." There will be nothing like that to interfere.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; on the contrary I stated to the gentleman and to other Members similarly situated that if those projects were recommended the other body would have the right to include them in the bill and then they could be included by the conferees.

Mr. RAMEY. I thank the chairman of the committee for his consideration and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House is a very important one to many sections of the country, especially mine; but right now, Mr. Chairman, I am more interested in getting those dikes and levees on the Missouri River repaired. Every year for the past several years we have had floods on the Missouri River which have torn out the dikes and levees and have flooded many thousands of acres of rich soil and farm land. Right now much land cannot be put into crops because it is covered with water. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he is able to give us a statement as to just when we can expect this emergency flood-control authorization bill to come before the Congress so we can get some action and get repaired those dikes that are now out along the rivers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Understanding that the gentleman directs his inquiry to me, I restate as I have repeatedly stated that we have requested the Chief of Engineers to submit recommendations as to the amounts required for emergency repairs of existing flood-control works damaged or destroyed by floods in the midcontinental area.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman from Mississippi indicate about when we may expect the bill to come before the House?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say this—and without meaning to be presumptuous—I am a member of several committees. I do not know of any committee that has been more prompt in dealing with these emergency matters, giving them prompt attention and reporting on them than the Committee on Flood Control. I trust that the policy that has obtained in the past will obtain in the future.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, up to date but little money has been spent on the Missouri River as compared with the large rivers

of the Nation and I am happy to support a bill which will give us some relief in that very large area of the Missouri River Basin. As I said before, the floods have been devastating and have kept many thousands of acres of the finest land that lies out of doors out of cultivation. The loss has been so great to many of those people along the river that it has been almost unbearable. So I know I voice the sentiment of the people of my district when I say now that some relief is in sight by the passage of this bill. The folks will be very pleased and happy to know that the Congress of the United States has finally gotten around to doing something of a permanent nature instead of just handing out little piecemeals to the people who live along the Missouri River.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I know of no further debate and no further amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 517, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Flood Control.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole awhile ago and to include therein some excerpts from the record of testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 538), as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, the 31st day of May 1944, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials, under the provisions of clause 40–A of rule XI. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave for 60 legislative days to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the life, character, and public service of the deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned: And be it further

Resolved, That the necessary expenses connected with the memorial services herein authorized shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Memorials and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Governor O'Conor at the opening of the Pulaski Highway in Maryland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM and Mr. SHAFER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement on an expression on socialized medicine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of State Control Versus Federal Control of Education of Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, May 17 will be the anniversary of the independence of the Norway that we knew before the war. I ask unanimous consent that on that day after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House on that subject for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the extension of the remarks I made in committee this afternoon I may include a letter from myself to the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper articles and other excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the Honorable C. P. Newton, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mr. Hugh D. Hart.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I do not desire to take this time, but I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order granted me for this afternoon. I covered the subject during debate on the bill just passed and therefore I yield back my special order.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

UNDER THE BANNER OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the invasion on the western front and before the blood of our boys is spilled on foreign soil, I want to call the attention of the American people to the dastardly campaign that has proceeded for many years to gradually kill the faith of our people in their Constitution and to spell America with a little "a." I want to say here and now that this dastardly campaign will not succeed because the American people are awakening to the true danger that confronts them.

Behind all of this is the lowest brand of politics that has ever been inflicted upon the best people that have ever lived on this earth. The methods used are not American; they are European and Asiatic. Before it is too late, I am going to speak plainly and call a spade a spade. It would be criminal negligence to do less.

At the outset, I want to challenge the myth that has been built up around the personality of one man. This myth has been developed to such an extent that there are no longer two major political parties in the United States. Today we are approaching a great national election for President of the United States and we find the contest to be between one man, on the one side, and the Republican Party on the other side. The followers of the one man have long ceased to be the historic Democratic Party. Respect for the two-party system died in the United States when this one man accepted the nomination for a third term and broke off sharply and intentionally with our previous American tradition honored by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson. Millions of Americans were shocked by this brazen departure from the time-honored traditions of a free people. Now comes this same one man seeking a fourth term and this time forsaking our great American traditions and openly flouting the Constitution of the United States. Every manner of subjection and intimidation are being employed until there are few left in the United States who have the courage to stand up and be counted in the fight for American independence and the Constitution of the United States.

There must be some excuse for shedding the blood of our boys. Surely, there must be some object attainable for their sacrifice. They are dying to uphold the American Constitution. They are dying to keep America free as we Americans have learned to know freedom. They are dying in defense of the great free system which has made this the most prosperous Nation in the world, where our people enjoy the highest standard of living that the world has ever seen. Why has some European or Asiatic foreign philosophy penetrated into our midst? Did the doctrine of one world spring from the soil of free America? Have Americans ever been a dependent people?

Mr. Speaker, when the Constitution of the United States was adopted in 1787, no one questioned the independence of the new Nation. Only a few years before, the Declaration of Independence of 1776 was flung as a challenge to the world from the American Colonies.

What has happened to our people to make it necessary to fight once again for that independence? Who are the betrayers of the men of 1776? What foreignisms have penetrated into the very fabric of our free people?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. May I inquire of the gentleman just what foreignisms he is talking about?

Mr. DAY. I am talking about the foreign "isms" such as communism and such kindred types, including class consciousness that is growing here in America. I also call into question this alinement that is being built up in various parts of the country where we find that under the guise of being Democrats it is almost becoming a class conflict.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman object to the United States alinement with Russia for the crushing of a common foe?

Mr. DAY. Not at all, but I object to the injection of communism on this soil.

Mr. GORE. Who is interjecting communism here? Who in a responsible position is injecting communism in this soil?

Mr. DAY. The Communist Party and the fellow travelers.

Mr. GORE. Is that all the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. DAY. Yes; that is what I am talking about, and I am very familiar with it.

Mr. GORE. They are a very small minority party. If that is the bugaboo that the gentleman sees, I fear his alarm is unfounded.

Mr. DAY. No; it is growing in proportions. In the part of the country I come from it has become very serious. We have had a taste of it and it has gotten to the point now where we have to revise fundamental Americanism in order to check this growth.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. What constitutional rights have been taken away from the gentleman or any other American citizen?

Mr. DAY. From me?

Mr. McCORMACK. From any American. What constitutional rights have been taken away from any American?

Mr. DAY. A great many.

Mr. McCORMACK. Name them. Give us a bill of particulars.

Mr. DAY. Well, I could do that if I had time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has 30 minutes. I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 20 minutes longer if he wants to give a bill of particulars.

Mr. DAY. I will be glad to do that when I conclude my remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman ought to give his bill of particulars now.

Mr. DAY. I do not have to do that now.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is propagandizing, making a general statement.

Mr. DAY. I will answer the gentleman when I finish my remarks in detail.

Why should these men in high places apologize for our American birthright?

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. What men in high places have apologized for our American birthright? I would like to know that. I have not heard of them.

Mr. DAY. Why do men in high places apologize for our American birthright and embrace a foreign doctrine known as One World?

Mr. GORE. The gentleman is asking the question for its innuendo and effect. I would like to know from him what men in high authority have apologized for their American birthright.

Mr. DAY. I will answer that question later. Please do not interrupt me again at this point. I will be ready for the gentleman as long as he wants to go.

What has happened to our people that they are urged to adopt the two-flag system instead of honoring Old Glory? What has become of the Star-Spangled Banner?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, who is urging us to adopt a two-flag system?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to be interrupted at this point.

The extent to which the breeding of the foreign philosophy of One World has grown on American soil was graphically brought to my attention the other day, when the chairman of the symbol program subcommittee of the Four Freedoms Committee, United States of America division, came to my office and handed me a pamphlet depicting the United Nations flag of "four freedoms," consisting of four red bars on a field of white. In this pamphlet it is stated as follows:

> Since this flag pays honor to, and represents the flags of your country's allies and friends, it is accorded all the respect due the individual nation's flags. Therefore a good rule to follow is to respect and treat this flag as you would your own.

We have only one flag in the United States, and this is the Stars and Stripes. I quote the following from the United States Code, 1940 edition, title 4, section 1:

> The flag of the United States shall be 13 horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; and the union of the flag shall be 48 stars, white in a blue field.

Section 3 of this same title protects our flag from any disrespect or mutilation and makes it a penal offense for anyone in the District of Columbia to publicly "mutilate, deface, defile or defy, trample upon, or cast contempt, either by word or act, upon any such flag."

I hereby emphatically denounce the two-flag system which calls for honoring of this so-called "four freedoms" flag on an equal basis with the Stars and Stripes. The display of this flag along with Old Glory casts contempt on our national emblem. We cannot have a divided allegiance. This Nation cannot endure half national and half international. As a young man sitting in the gallery of the United States Senate, I recall the stirring words of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, spoken on August 12, 1919, when he said:

> I am anxious as any human being can be to have the United States render every possible service to the civilization and the peace of mankind, but I am certain we can do it best by not putting ourselves in leading strings or subjecting our policies and our sovereignty to other nations. The independence of the United States is not only more precious to ourselves but to the world than any single possession. Look at the United States today. We have made mistakes in the past. We have had shortcomings. We shall make mistakes in the future and fall short of our own best hopes. But nonetheless is there any country today on the face of the earth which can compare with this in ordered liberty, in peace, and in the largest freedom? I feel that I can say this without being accused of undue boastfulness, for it is the simple fact, and in making this treaty and taking on these obligations all that we do is in a spirit of unselfishness and in a desire for the good of mankind. But it is well to remember that we are dealing with nations every one of which has a direct individual interest to serve, and there is grave danger in an unshared idealism. Contrast the United States with any country on the face of the earth today and ask yourself whether the situation of the United States is not the best to be found. I will go as far as anyone in world service, but the first step to world service is the maintenance of the United States. You may call me selfish, if you will, conservative, or reactionary, or use any other harsh adjective you see fit to apply, but an American I was born, an American I have remained all my life. I can never be anything else but an American, and I must think of the United States first, and when I think of the United States first in an arrangement like this I am thinking of what is best for the world, for if the United States fails the best hopes of mankind will fall with it. I have never had but one allegiance—I cannot divide it now. I have loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a league, internationalism, illustrated by the Bolshevik and by the men to whom all countries are alike provided they can make money out of them, is to me repulsive. National I must remain, and in that way I like all other Americans can render the amplest service to the world. The United States is the world's best hope, but if you fetter her in the interests and quarrels of other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe, you will destroy her power for good and endanger her very existence. Leave her to march freely through the centuries to come as in the years that have gone—strong, generous, and confident—she has nobly served mankind. Beware how you trifle with your marvelous inheritance, this great land of ordered liberty, for if we stumble and fall freedom and civilization everywhere will go down in ruin.

Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of O. W. I.'s Handbook of the United States of America, sent to me by Elmer Davis, Director. He states that—

> The handbook gives a factual picture of the United States Government as it is, not as it was 10 years ago or may be 10 years from now.

Under the heading of "Historic American speeches and documents" we find the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter but only the preamble of the Constitution of the United States? What has become of the Constitution? Are we justified in the conclusion that in the last 10 years the Constitution has become so outmoded that it can no longer be included in a list of historic American documents? Right here we can place our finger on what has happened to the people of the United States. The New Deal ignores the Constitution. This handbook, while omitting the Constitution of the United States, includes the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Later on in this discussion I shall examine the last two mentioned historic speeches and documents to see if they are entitled to be included when the Constitution of the United States is left out.

What are the "four freedoms" and how have they stood the test of time? On January 6, 1941, the President in his message to the Congress outlined the "four freedoms" with the following statement:

> This is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation.

Let us see. As outlined by the President, in his own words, he thus defines the "four freedoms":

> The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

This has become entirely misleading. We must now add "except in Poland, Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and the Soviet Union."

The President thus outlines the second freedom:

> The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

Subsequent events revealing the truth have amended this, the second freedom, by adding the words, "except the Soviet Union and those nations which worship other gods than the God known to our Christian faith."

The President thus defines the third freedom:

> The third freedom is from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understanding which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

If this be carried out literally, there would never be freedom from want in the United States, for we are already facing an indebtedness of over $300,000,000,000, and have reached the limit of taxation. Under these conditions we dare not even consider a world W. P. A. to be financed by the taxpayer of the United States.

The President sketches the fourth freedom in these words:

> The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

Judging by recent events and speaking in United States of America terms, this will be a difficult task, because there is more fear in this country at this hour than we have ever known before. If this means a world police force, possessing the only remaining armaments, count the United States out, because, under our Constitution there is no authority to place a world army or world navy in authority supreme over the Army and Navy which Congress must provide for the defense of our people under the plain provisions of the Constitution.

The O. W. I. handbook includes the Atlantic Charter as one of the historic American speeches and documents. It, too, must be amended from the original statement issued by President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill after their conference at sea. The first principle enunciated by them in their own words is as follows:

> First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

We now know that this must be further clarified by a change of position on the part of one Winston Churchill so that it would now read: "except Britain shall have Hong Kong, Singapore, north Africa and the Dutch East Indies."

The second principle of the Atlantic Charter was thus defined on that memorable day in August 1941:

> Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned;

But these great Anglo-Saxon leaders had failed to reckon with a certain dictator by the name of Josef Stalin. This second principle must now be amended by adding these words: "But this does not mean that the Soviet Union shall not ravish Poland, choke the life out of Finland and enslave the Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia."

And what a change was to come over the third principle of the Atlantic Charter which these great statesmen so fervently expressed in these words:

> Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Unkind fate has sadly altered this third principle. There must be appended to it the following: "*Provided, however,* That such states as shall be first occupied by the Soviet Union can bid farewell to free elections, especially, Hungary, the Balkan states and even Italy."

Weighing the future of the United States, how can any responsible Senator or Representative proclaim that this Nation will abide by the decision of any foreign council as to when the American people shall go to war? The American Constitution provides that Congress alone can declare war. How could any constitutional process require Congress

to declare war just because a foreign council says that it must? We cannot yield our sovereignty without overthrowing the Constitution. Is it to be done by ignoring the Constitution? Are we ready for anarchy?

Some Senators and Representatives have generously stated that they would be willing to surrender some part of our sovereignty so that the mandate of the foreign council would be obligatory. This may be awfully nice of them to do this. The hitch is that they have no such power to abdicate and if they did so, they could be impeached. Why not be honest with the American people? Who covets the doubtful reputation of big-hearted internationalism at the expense of their own American people whom they were elected to represent?

There is no constitutional method or constitutional process by which we can yield our American independence or surrender our national sovereignty. Neither can we constitutionally place any world army or world navy or world police force in supreme authority over the Army and Navy which under the Constitution it is the duty of Congress to provide for the defense of the American people. What is the use of twisting words and indulging in shallow phrases about international obligations when every honest and intelligent Senator and Representative knows that so long as the Constitution of the United States exists in its present form, this Nation cannot be lawfully involved or entangled in any manner which will hinder or cripple the express powers of the Congress set forth in the Constitution of the United States?

In the Connally resolution, adopted by the United States Senate, it is stated:

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

The great danger to the Republic in this sort of involvement is that it keeps the American people from getting down to the practical business of looking after our own problems. The conception outlined is probably no more than the traditional cooperation of the United States to secure peace and advance the cause of humanity. Our history is replete with such instances. Under the American Constitution no real loss of sovereignty is possible. The inclusion of the words "constitutional processes" brings in the good old Constitution and the American people and takes out the Roosevelt-Willkie One World. I repeat, the danger lies in the fact that this sort of international preoccupation will keep us from doing our duty in solving the vital problems facing us on the home front after the war is over. We have a very serious class conflict well on the way and millions will soon be crying for good jobs. It would be foolish to spend too much time with One World talk.

The latest development has clarified the situation still more. We have witnessed the Stalin invitation to Father Orlemanski, a Communist fellow traveler, and the righteous indignation of Americans of Polish descent. We dare not even contemplate further divisions of this sort among our people by the intrusion of issues that should never be thrust into our midst. We must keep our minds free to solve America's vital problems that threaten our existence as a Nation of free people.

We cannot tolerate a divided allegiance to keep us from this task. Our cooperation with other nations must be limited by this fact. At all costs, we must preserve American independence and the sovereignty of the United States. To make this doubly certain and to prevent temptation seizing those who ought to know better, I am offering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the following words:

SECTION 1. Neither the President nor the Congress shall have power to surrender the independence of the United States, nor any part of their sovereignty.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The United States has never failed to cooperate with other nations to obtain peace and to advance the cause of humanity anywhere in the world. I appreciate the apprehension and the anxiety of those who fear World War No. 3. To my mind the surest way to become involved in World War No. 3 is to weaken the devotion which is owed by every American citizen to the Constitution of the United States and our beloved Republic. This allegiance has already been weakened to a dangerous point. If our responsible leaders further weaken this devotion and allegiance by dubious internationalistic twistings of the Constitution, the future indignation of the people will be visited upon them and it will be most emphatic.

I have lived many years in this great Republic and came to Washington as a boy of 14, upon the Inaugural Special from Canton, Ohio, with the newly elected President McKinley. My father was his Secretary of State during the Spanish-American War and I have seen men and women appear upon the national scene in one administration and another for a period of over 40 years. My father was appointed Justice of the United States Supreme Court by President Theodore Roosevelt and I served as confidential secretary to Chief Justice Melville Weston Fuller, appointed by Grover Cleveland. I yield to no man in my devotion to and understanding of the Constitution of the United States. It has been a part of my fiber every day of my life and will so continue until the end.

With all due respect to those who favor international entanglements and the diluting of our American independence, I want to say to you, go slow, you are trifling with the only bond of allegiance that holds the diverse people of America together. We are already facing serious class conflict. And there are foreign philosophies extant among our people. Today, they are still all Americans.

What would it profit us to haul down the Stars and Stripes and run up the flag of the "four freedoms" if it kills hope in the breast of the Americans of today and tomorrow, who will come to visit the Capital? How can you ever explain to them what has become of the Stars and Stripes, when you take them to Mount Vernon, Monticello, or Arlington? Who would have the nerve to walk through Statuary Hall and look upon the faces of the great Americans who stand there in their silent presence? Who could ever again ascend the Washington Monument or visit the beautiful memorials to the immortal Lincoln and Jefferson?

Let it never be said that the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress did this to America. Let us be faithful to the words of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge when he said:

I have never had but one allegiance—I cannot divide it now. I have loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a league.

Today the temple stands. Crowds are milling about, false and foreign sounding words are heard in the market place. Where is the faith? Men are waiting for leadership, for a rallying point. It is here—under the banner of the Constitution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, unless there are other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders but the Chair will submit the request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was rather interested to see if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] was going to comply with the statement he made that he would give a bill of particulars as to what constitutional rights have been taken away from any person and also answer the question which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is now in the chair, asked him. I am very sorry that the gentleman from Illinois has made some portions of the speech which he has just delivered. In connection with the future conduct of our country after this war is over, he is entitled to his opinion the same as anyone else, and even where he and I might disagree, I respect his views in disagreement the same as I respect any other person's views. But outside of that, the import of the gentleman's speech, or the result of it, is to tend to bring about misunderstanding and division among our people. Our country is at war and when a nation is at war, its obligation is to do all the things necessary to preserve it. We are faced with the law of self-preservation, politely speaking, and in the plain language of the day, we are faced with the law of the jungle, and nations, like individuals, when faced with the law of the jungle or the law of self-preservation, must respond to the exigencies and necessities of the dangers that confront them, and in the case of a nation, of the era that confronts them.

Mr. DAY. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him at this point?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, go ahead, yes.

Mr. DAY. When you say we are living under the law of the jungle, does that mean the law of the Constitution has been abandoned?

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I say that?

Mr. DAY. That is the way I interpreted it.

Mr. McCORMACK. That just shows how much the gentleman followed what I said. It just shows how irresponsible the gentleman's reasoning is. I said we are responding to the law of the jungle. I did not say we are living under the law of the jungle.

Mr. DAY. Well, perhaps that accounts for some of these departures.

Mr. McCORMACK. The thing about the gentleman from Illinois is that he was wrong before Pearl Harbor and never had the courage to admit he was wrong and never got on the right premise since. I have no argument with a man who honestly disagrees and then gets back on the right course, but the gentleman, since our country entered the war, has never changed his course of conduct. My remarks are confined to the gentleman from Illinois. I want no other Members of the House to think, even remotely, that my remarks have any application to them. The gentleman says, "As one man against the Republican Party." Why, gentlemen, that is the argument of a dictator. That is the argument of one who has a dictatorial state of mind. I am not going to call names—"Hitlerites"—and all of that. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the majority of the American people voted for President Roosevelt and whoever is the next President——

Mr. DAY. Are you in favor of a fourth term?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, is that not a brilliant contribution?

Mr. DAY. Will you answer the question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Whoever is the next President, and I will answer your question in a moment, the gentleman is not going to divert me—whoever is the next President has to receive a majority of the votes of the American people who vote next fall. Now in answer to the gentleman's question let me say this, and I say it with all due respect to those who disagree, and I say it impersonally, that in my opinion the man best qualified to lead our country during the trying days ahead, to more quickly bring about the winning of the war and the winning of the peace, is Franklin Delano Roosevelt. That answers your question. You brought it in. I never intended to bring it up. You brought it up.

Mr. DAY. That clarifies that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; it clarifies your mind, I hope.

Now the gentleman says, "I am an American." Does the gentleman mean to imply by that that nobody else in the United States is an American but the gentleman from Illinois? The gentleman from Illinois has made some rather rash statements, not only today but in the past. He talks about owing allegiance to one flag. Does the gentleman think anybody else does not owe allegiance to the same flag? He talks about his dear father, who was a great man. We have to stand on our own feet. I cannot stand on the reputation of my forebears. I have to stand on what I have made of myself.

Mr. DAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman brought his father's name in. I respect his father.

Mr. DAY. Will the gentleman yield? I stand here——

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no; I do not yield for a speech. Do you want to ask a question?

Mr. DAY. Well, you referred to my comments about my father. I want to say something——

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not yield for that.

Mr. DAY. I stand here——

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not yield for that.

Mr. DAY. I did not think you would.

Mr. McCORMACK. I respect the gentleman's father, but I do not rely upon my forebears to try to strengthen my position. I do not rely upon my forebears to try and strengthen a weak position that I have adopted.

Mr. DAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. There is no use yielding to the gentleman from Illinois, because he makes no contribution. Now, on the question of nationalism, he has a right to be a nationalist. I do not know what a nationalist is. And what is more, I do not know what internationalism is, whatever the gentleman has in mind. But one thing is certain, if I am to infer correctly from what the gentleman from Illinois says, he wants nothing done after this war is over to try and save the next generation of youth, most of whom are unborn today, from undergoing the horrors and rigors and destructiveness of modern warfare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no hesitancy in expressing the opinion that if we had visionary and courageous leadership a little over 20 years ago, the young men who are wearing the uniform today would be living a normal, peaceful life. I served in the last war. Two brothers served in the last war. Four and a half million others did. Eleven million are in this war. Ninety-five percent of the youth wearing the uniform today were not born on Armistice Day 1918. Oh, yes; they talked about the loss of sovereignty and our markets being flooded by products of cheap labor, and they discussed everything, but they failed to discuss one thing. What about the next generation? I see the children of today. Twenty or twenty-five years pass and they are grown up. They are our own flesh and blood. Twenty-odd years ago we fought in a war to end wars. Then when Woodrow Wilson said unless something was done there would be another war, the people did not believe in him and in what he said. Twenty years have passed and we are in another war. Ninety-five percent of these youngsters wearing the uniform were not born on Armistice Day 1918. Unless something is done, unless the United States takes its position as a leader among the nations of the world in a cooperative effort, based upon national interest and in response to the moral law to do something to try to avert a future war, 20 or 25 or 30 years from now the next generation will be engaged in another global war. Is it wrong for some of us to try to stop that? I respect the gentleman's views if he thinks that is wrong.

The gentleman has a right to entertain his views, but if some of us entertain different views, I do not think the gentleman has any right to characterize such persons by calling them names. I respect the gentleman's views in disagreement. But all I know is that in my time we have had two world wars, and that mankind is on a journey of war. Unless something is done by men and women of reason and good will to try to stop that journey of war, the next generation, yet unborn—only tomorrow as far as generations are concerned—will be wearing the uniform, engaged in another war, and they will be the children of girls and boys of today, grandchildren of mothers and fathers who have young men wearing the uniform in this war.

The gentleman speaks about internationalism. I do not call that internationalism. Nobody loves America better than I do. I do not think I have a monopoly on that love. I think a hundred and thirty-three million other Americans, a vast majority of them, love America. Just because some people do not agree with me, I do not believe in calling them names. They are good Americans, the same as I am. Nobody impugns the patriotism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY]. I will defend the gentleman against anyone who undertook to impugn his patriotism. But I certainly challenge his judgment, because I know this much, that if before Pearl Harbor his judgment had prevailed in this body and in the Congress of the United States, when Pearl Harbor happened we would have had to beg for peace, and the probabilities are there would have been no United States of America today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, it is true that I am the son of a very distinguished sire. I have referred to my father here today because of the affection that I bear for him, and because I am proud to be his son. But, when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] speaks about standing on your own feet, may I recall to him that I represent in this body, as Congressman at Large, the great

State of Illinois, with approximately 8,000,000 people; that I have been nominated by the Republican Party in 4 consecutive State-wide campaigns. I have been twice elected to this body, and only on last April, I won the nomination by my largest plurality, over 250,000 more than my opponent.

Maybe I do not stand on my own feet, but if you do not call that feet, what do you call it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE T. V. A. AND THE PUBLIC

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks, like other Members of the House from every section of the country, I have listened with the keenest interest to the speeches of those Members here who represent the great region served by T. V. A.

It is a stirring experience to hear the catalog of benefits the people have enjoyed because the resources of their river and their valley have been developed by the T. V. A. No believer in true democratic principles could stand unmoved before the demonstration of the way in which the management of T. V. A. has won the people's full support. All the people are fighting today to protect the T. V. A. from attack. It is proof enough for me that this great Government program is really meeting the people's needs. It proves that T. V. A. is doing the basic job with which it was entrusted by the Congress.

This is no time to forget the fundamental purpose T. V. A. was created by the Congress to accomplish. All its authorized activities had a single objective. They were to benefit the people. The building of the great multipurpose dams which now control the Tennessee was a spectacular engineering undertaking, but this demonstration of technical brilliance was not an end in itself. The large investment of public funds was authorized in order that the well-being of the people should be advanced. In the same way, the power system created as one function of this great program of unified development was not established just to show that great dams could be designed and operated to serve three purposes together, although that is an exceedingly important demonstration at this moment and the doubting Thomases have been proved in error.

They said that floods could never be controlled by multipurpose structures which at the same time would create a channel for navigation and provide great quantities of power for the people. That is what they said a few years ago. But the valley of the Tennessee in a year of heavy rainfall is entirely safe today, while floods sweep down through other valleys. And at the same time transmission lines crisscross the countryside carrying power from the force of the water the dams hold back. In this river valley the people are safe today. As other river valleys are made safe for men to live in, this pioneering experience on the Tennessee will be immensely valuable. But the T. V. A. plan of river control was not established just to make that point.

The power system of T. V. A. was not established simply to prove that a great public operation could be successful; that men working for their Government could be just as efficient, just as resourceful, and as able as the best men employed by the most efficient private enterprises; or to prove that a public system could be both self-supporting and self-liquidating. I do not mean to underestimate the importance of the demonstration T. V. A. has given on that point either. It is immensely heartening to learn in detail how successful, in the ordinary business sense, this public enterprise has been. By all such standards T. V. A. is a success; but the final test is whether all these triumphs of managers and technicians have met the needs of the people. That they have, abundantly, is the greatest demonstration of all the works of T. V. A.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I want to say to the gentleman from Washington that it certainly is very heartening to us Representatives from the Tennessee Valley to see a gentleman whose district I believe is farthest from the Tennessee Valley of any in the United States rise on the floor of the House and speak on behalf of this great project in the Tennessee Valley. It certainly shows that Members from all parts of the United States appreciate the work the Tennessee Valley Authority has done in the war effort and the contribution it is making to our national economy.

I have had the privilege of knowing ever since the gentleman has been here of his great interest in public power programs of this kind because I have visited with the gentleman in his home State of Washington and have seen Grand Coulee and Bonneville. I know the interest of the gentleman and of the people who live in his district and in his State in this kind of project and of the interest they have in Washington in seeing T. V. A. successful because it has a direct bearing on the success and the future development of similar projects in the gentleman's own State.

I know I speak for the other Representatives from the valley in expressing appreciation for the great interest the gentleman has in the T. V. A. and in defeating these amendments which would hamstring and curtail its operations.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman for his kind statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the distinguished gentleman from Washington but I have been wondering just what if anything this had to do with his district.

I compliment the gentleman for looking at many of these questions not from a State's point of view, although he has had plenty of experience with public power in Washington, but looking at factors such as T. V. A. from the viewpoint of national need. I think we owe the gentleman a good deal of thanks for taking the trouble to make this contribution this afternoon on the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. I cannot refrain from likewise expressing my appreciation for the gentleman's effort and his broad-minded viewpoint. I should like to say to the gentleman from Montana that the residents of the State of Washington and of every State have a direct interest in the outcome of this question, because the people as a whole have invested approximately $750,000,000 in the T. V. A. It is a great going business owned by the people of the Nation. The question involved now is the question of efficient operation, continued efficient operation. With continued efficient operation the T. V. A. will pay back to the people of the United States that which they have invested and in addition bring about great national benefit.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to concur with what the gentleman from Tennessee has already said, but the point I was trying to get over was that the gentleman from Washington was really doing a statesmanlike thing in discussing something which did not apply to his district.

Mr. GORE. As he has consistently done since he has been a Member of this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is true. I know as far as the T. V. A. is concerned the people of the entire country pay for it and the people of the entire country are going to get benefit out of it.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman from Montana. I believe that all of us are trying to be less provincial on economic matters. I realize that the future of T. V. A. is very vital to my country, because we have, as I say, two large hydroelectric power projects, one at Bonneville and one at Grand Coulee, and in my opinion anything that jeopardizes T. V. A. will eventually jeopardize the great power projects in the Pacific Northwest to which I shall refer a little later.

Everyone of us has a responsibility to know just how this has happened. It did not happen by magic. This outpouring of public protest against certain proposals which would change the T. V. A. would never have occurred unless the people knew the answer. The people of the Valley know what the McKellar amendments would do. They would deprive the T. V. A. of the essential tools which permit its power operations to be used as an instrument for their benefit. They would destroy T. V. A.'s managerial efficiency. Their adoption would make operating conditions impossible. They threaten repayment to the taxpayers of the public investment. Those results have never been disputed by any responsible person. But I prefer to put the issue in different terms. The adoption of the McKellar amendments would prevent the T. V. A. from meeting the needs of all the people in the operation of this public power system.

No wonder this struggle has attracted Nation-wide attention. This is not a question of the wisdom of public versus private power developments. For this area that issue was settled by the people years ago through their representatives in Congress, in State and local legislative bodies. This is not just a technical question of financing. You do not find businessmen and farmers and labor groups excited about the details of keeping books, accounting for funds, or the difficulties of preparing estimates of power expenditures in advance. You do not find editorials from coast to coast in financial papers and religious journals unless the issue is deeper than a method of financing. People do not go all out for a revolving fund unless that revolving fund is a symbol of something fundamental. The country is not fooled. They know that if the McKellar amendments were adopted, the ultimate purpose of the T. V. A. power system would be jeopardized. There would be an ever-present danger that it would no longer serve the needs of all the people, that some day it might be run to benefit a special group.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON of Texas). Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I cannot let this hour go by without joining my other colleagues from Tennessee in expressing my appreciation for the very fine logical argument being made by the distinguished gentleman from Washington. I think the summation he is just now giving and perhaps will continue to give to some degree of the evil effects of these amendments, if adopted, is one of the finest I have heard, and I certainly appreciate the manner in which the gentleman is bringing it to the attention of the House.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

I have a particular interest in this question beyond the interest of every citizen to see an honest and efficient governmental agency continued. I have an interest beyond the interest of every Member of Congress to see that policies adopted by the Congress are executed faithfully, and that the money invested in this great enterprise by the taxpayers who are our constituents is ultimately paid back. I want to be counted with Members from the T. V. A. area because some day the welfare of the people of my district may be threatened just as the well-being of the people of the Southeast is in danger today.

I have the honor to represent a district in an area which will some day be served by power generated at great dams constructed by public funds like the dams in the Tennessee Valley. Today almost all the power from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams is going into war production. The problems of the Bonneville Power Administration, the marketing agency for power from both these structures, are not like the problems of T. V. A. The supply of power which they deliver is almost entirely hydro-generated. Our part of the country is rich in this respect. Over 30 percent of all the potential water power in the Nation is in the great Northwest. The technical problems of the Bonneville Power Administration are therefore not the same as the problems facing the T. V. A., where hydro and steam plants are operated together as one system. And, at the present time, our public power system is not a system in the same sense as T. V. A. Power from Bonneville and Coulee is not the sole source of supply for a given area. The people are not wholly dependent on decisions with respect to its disposal for this necessity of modern life as they are in T. V. A.

Some day the power created by the dams on our Northwest rivers will be available for peacetime uses. Today almost every kilowatt of energy from Grand Coulee and from Bonneville is waging war. Without that power our victory would be tragically postponed. The war record of those dams is adequate rebuke to the captious critics who once fought their building and attacked it as a visionary and useless waste of public moneys. Those dams are saving democracy for the people now. But I am looking forward to the day when the power they generate will enrich the people's lives in peace. Our problems will not be precisely the same as those of T. V. A. even then. The climate is different; agriculture and industry are not the same as in the Tennessee Valley. Power costs and rates and uses will not be identical. But the basic problem presented by the pending amendments will be the same, and in one respect the administration of these public power systems must be alike. Both must be operated for the benefit of all the people. They must earn their support. If after 11 years of peacetime operation our western system has done the job for the people living there that the T. V. A. has done for the people in the valley of the Tennessee, I shall be content.

I agree with the analysis my friend, the gentleman from the Third District of Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], presented in his remarks the other day. He suggested that the reason the people had benefited so greatly from the T. V. A. was because the line between political and managerial responsibility was so clearly marked and had been so scrupulously regarded by the Congress and by the management of T. V. A. Put in another way, it might be said because the relationship between the responsibilities of politicians and of experts had been so clearly defined in theory and observed in practice.

Today the fortunes of the world are in the hands of the experts. They are the ones who plan our houses, process our food, move us from place to place, and work toward the end that men can live in comfort and freedom from disease. Their decisions have changed and will change the lives of millions of people. Politicians, or statesmen, if that word has a better sound, can lay down national policies. But experts have got to carry them out. In this modern world there is no graver problem than the one of finding ways through which the politicians and the experts can work in harmony to serve the people. The decisions of the scientists, the engineers, all kinds of specialists, including specialists in management, will determine if the policies we set out really meet the people's needs.

Too many experts practice their expertness with the sole objective of increasing the profits of a single private enterprise. They are not concerned about the people. Too many experts in government whose talents are meant to be devoted to the people as a whole fail because they practice their expertness to accomplish what they think the people need, without much knowledge of what the actual needs may be. That is why some public programs fail to reach their ultimate objective after the politicians have decided policies in the public interest. Too many times the experts fail to make the benefits of such policy decisions really count for all the people. Then the people appeal to the politicians. And we try to decide technical questions on this floor, to settle here the differences between the people and the experts.

There are no differences between them in the Tennessee Valley. There the people and the experts stand united. And with one conspicuous exception, the politicians are standing with them. I want that formula preserved and extended. The men who established the T. V. A., who set up the statute, were Members of the Congress. We call them politicians. The men who build the dams and operate this power system are experts. The men who fix the rates, who determine costs and conditions of service—they are experts, too. The responsible management coordinating all these special skills is a board of experts in that field. Their expertness has met the people's needs and has been devoted to the people's benefit. They have carried out the public policies adopted by the Congress. They have the people's support. I am deeply impressed by it. It seems to be almost unanimous. I get a little weary of hearing pleas on behalf of groups—of being told the businessmen. the farmers, the workingmen are in favor of this or that, as though they were separate institutions, their problems and futures

entirely independent of each other. I am considerably refreshed to hear from the people as a whole, and to know from my mail that there is one area and one Federal program which has united support because all the people have had a share in the benefit.

I want that same record and that same support for the public power system which will someday be established in my own area. When the permanent statute creating our system is adopted I want the line between political and managerial decisions to be just as clearly defined and just as faithfully adhered to as it is in the T. V. A. Politics must keep out of management and management must keep out of politics. And both must work together for the people.

It is preposterous that such a policy adopted by Congress so long ago should be in danger today after 11 years of experience and such a record as T. V. A.'s. It is ridiculous to propose that responsibility for every detail of management in the operation of this power system should be shifted from the region concerned to Washington. It requires a point of view beyond my comprehension to propose that the competent technicians employed by T. V. A. should be relieved of full responsibility for power management, that the Congress should take over the details of operation, and that the experts should try to become politicians themselves in order to hold their jobs. T. V. A. could never meet the changing needs of the people under such a system.

So of course I am opposed to these vicious McKellar amendments, riders to the appropriation bill. The experts and technicians who administer T. V. A. should be chosen for their technical skill, not their loyalty to a political leader. The Members from the area concerned have made their position clear. They are against the amendments. They are for T. V. A. They stand with their people, and that is where I stand. They are opposed, as I am opposed, to the amendment which would deny to T. V. A. the use of its receipts for the expenses of its business operations as the basic act provides.

The people's representatives in Congress want the flexibility of the present system retained, not because of any abstract theory, but because they know how it works. They want an honest, efficient administration of a business enterprise, but I want to emphasize that the point at issue is bigger than that. A business-like administration of a public enterprise is not an end in itself any more than is the building of a dam or a transmission line. They have a common purpose. They are instruments to serve the people. Unless they meet that test, they are wasteful and extravagant, no matter what the books of account disclose.

It is because T. V. A. has served the people that the people support it. When the management of a Government agency, the experts, the Members of this House who represent the region of its operation, and the people who are immediately affected stand united together, that is an invincible combination. The McKellar amendments will be defeated. There is no doubt about it. This is a people's Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE OMNIBUS VETERANS' BILL

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on May 4 the distinguished chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation told the House that the omnibus veterans' bill would be taken up this week, probably Thursday. The people of San Francisco have always been vitally interested in providing for the veterans. Our community is particularly close to the war; San Francisco is the center of all activities in the Pacific theater. From our harbor go forth battleships, cruisers, and naval craft of every description, seeking the enemy in battle. Returning to our shores, these same ships are repaired, reconditioned, and refitted in San Francisco yards. The cruiser *San Francisco* itself, after her memorable battle in the South Pacific, proudly returned to our city for repairs, and this famous fighting ship is again in service. Admiral Callaghan, of San Francisco, who was in charge of this ship, paid the supreme sacrifice while standing on her bridge. His feat adds luster to the long list of American naval heroes.

California was admitted to the Union on September 9, 1850—less than a hundred years ago. Since that time the Golden State has played an impressive role in every war. During the War between the States it was gold, mined in California, which kept solvent the credit of the Federal Government. During the Spanish-American War in 1898, San Francisco was the port of embarkation for all men and supplies bound for Manila and the Philippines. San Francisco shipbuilders built the mighty cruiser *Olympia,* flagship of Admiral Dewey when he entered Manila Bay; they also built the *Oregon,* which rounded Cape Horn to join Admirals Sampson and Schley in destroying the Spanish Fleet off the coast of Cuba. Californians have covered themselves with distinction on every battlefield and in every engagement. No community is more war-conscious at the present time than my home city of San Francisco. Every man, woman, and child is doing his or her utmost to further the war effort, and is giving of himself or herself unstintingly and unhesitatingly, and all San Franciscans desire that the returning veterans receive fair treatment.

Recent figures from the War Department give the totals of the men and women of California in the Army as of December 1943 as follows:

	Male	*Female*
Total Army personnel as of the end of December 1943	407,000	5,530
Total number Army personnel acquired from November 1940 through Dec. 31, 1943	438,500	7,543
Total separation (discharged)	80,628	2,074

Let me repeat the total number who have been discharged: 80,628 men and 2,074 women. It is therefore essential that current legislation be enacted without delay.

Since entering Congress, it has been my privilege to support every measure introduced in behalf of veterans. I am supporting the present G. I. bill. This omnibus bill will give guaranteed loans, education, and other benefits to servicemen; servicewomen will share the same as the men. Special attention will be given to finding suitable jobs for men and women, and an endeavor will be made to see that they are located in positions for which they are best equipped. Those unable to find jobs will get a readjustment allowance. Unquestionably, many openings and many opportunities will develop, because when the Nation returns to a peacetime economy from the present wartime economy, there will be a tremendous need for men and women, and this demand will last for years after the war. Loans will be guaranteed up to a certain amount to buy a home, a farm, or to start a business. Under present proposal, the interest on guaranteed amounts will be paid the first year. These loans will be processed through local agencies. The loans will be secured by the property, and the Government will be subrogated for the amounts guaranteed. While it is proposed that other lenders will have a claim on the property prior to the Government, it is the intention of the Congress that the Government approve the loans so that the veterans will not be imposed upon. As an outcome of this legislation, demand for small farms will probably increase. The demand for small homes should be tremendous, because many single men, upon retiring from the service, will marry and will require not only homes but furnishings and equipment that go with a home. Unquestionably, many schools will be required, because it is expected that the birth rate will increase after the war when men and women settle down. Schooling propositions are also provided for in the bill. A telegram received by me this morning from Donald S. Tresidder, president of Stanford University, reads:

> Respectfully urge that you do everything within your power to effect amendment of omnibus bill retraining of returning servicemen to make certain that selection of institutions and other matters logically relating to local administration is vested in State agencies existing or to be created.

In this connection I understand the Barden bill (H. R. 3846), which provides for State advisory committees, State selection of institutions, administration through State educational agencies, State counseling services for returning veterans, and the use of existing educational agencies and institutions, was considered but not approved by the distinguished Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The Barden bill provides that existing facilities will be used under the direction of the several States. The World War Veterans' Committee assert that the educational provisions of the omnibus bill include all of the good points of the Barden bill. Furthermore, in addition thereto, the G. I. bill eliminates any new or old Government bureau which might be called upon to control veterans by placing the

supervision of this program under the Veterans' Administration.

Schools and colleges throughout the country may expect a real educational boom. Expanded hospitalization should be provided for wounded or ailing veterans. The omnibus bill is quite comprehensive. The indications are that additional legislation may be necessary from year to year to give more complete hospital and health service to veterans and their families.

Sooner or later the Congress will be called upon to determine whether an adjusted-service pay act for those serving in World War No. 2 should be enacted. Several bills of this nature are already pending before the House and the Senate, calling for varying amounts and varying procedures as to payment.

It is time the House should set up a special committee which shall devote its time to the full consideration as to whether an adjusted-service pay act should be enacted and, if so, the amounts which should be paid and the manner in which the payments shall be made. Unless the House proceeds in an orderly fashion to make a study of this nature it is not unlikely that this or a subsequent Congress may be stampeded into passing a bill which would not be equitable either to the servicemen or to the Nation.

There is considerable feeling among the servicemen, their families, and friends that the servicemen are the ones making the greatest sacrifice in the war effort; by reason of their military or naval service they are denied the opportunity of earning high rates of pay in war industry. The thought is being expressed that one way to equalize this matter would be for the Congress to enact an adjusted-service pay act granting a credit of a certain sum of money for each day of service which the serviceman has rendered in either the Army or Navy as an offset to what he might have earned had he remained in civilian life and been employed in war industry. The entire matter is deserving of special study and consideration by a committee of the House.

I am therefore introducing a resolution to provide that a special committee be set up to study adequate compensation for men and women when they are discharged from the service. In the meantime, let us pass the G. I. omnibus bill so as to be fair to G. I. Joe and G. I. Jane.

FREEDOM OF ENTERPRISE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during recent months we have all noted an increasing flow of speeches, articles, and resolutions, the principal tenor of which has been to imply that "freedom of enterprise" is being denied to the American businessman because of too much alleged interference by the Government in the private affairs of business.

It has been my personal observation that the majority of these speeches and other expressions along this line have been couched in very general language, to say the least.

In my capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Small Business I have had occasion to talk or correspond with a number of persons who apparently hold the above view as to too much alleged governmental interference in the affairs of business. I am frank to state that, except in certain minor instances, I have encountered very few of these complainants who were in a position to support their general charge with concrete examples which would stand up under close examination.

Without exception these persons have been quick to admit that it is the duty of the Government to devise and administer measures designed to prevent inflation, to collect the taxes necessary to war and other types of financing, to exercise close supervision and direction over the flow of critical materials so that war and the most essential civilian needs shall be served first, to direct the flow of manpower to both the war industries and the armed services, and, at the same time, to do all of these things with an eye on the national needs of the future so that we may enter the post-war period in as healthy an economic state as it is possible to attain.

The House Committee on Small Business was established for the sole purpose of investigating the problems of small business during wartime and examining all charges from responsible parties which alleged that insufficient consideration of the rights of small business was being afforded to it by the Government. In addition, the committee was later instructed to investigate the need of a sound program for the solution of the post-war problems of small business.

FORUM FOR COMPLAINANTS

The committee has taken cognizance of this tendency on the part of certain individuals and organizations to give voice to their fear that there is too much interference by Government in the affairs of business and feels that the attention of both the public and the Congress should once again be called to the forum which is afforded to these complainants through the medium of the Small Business Committee.

A resolution has just been passed by the committee to which no member of the committee dissented. This resolution not only reaffirms the position of the committee and cites its instructions from the House but also solicits the appearance before the committee of any responsible persons who feel they have just cause for asserting that there now exists too much governmental interference with business during wartime.

CONTROLS SHOULD BE TAKEN OFF SOON AS POSSIBLE

I personally know of no Member of the Congress who desires to see a continuation during peacetime of the majority of the governmental controls which, of necessity, have been imposed upon us all during wartime. I feel that the great majority of our businessmen who have studied the problems of Government know why these controls were imposed and feel that only through them could we attain quick victory and return to peace with the Nation and its individual citizens in a robust and healthy economic condition.

BANNER OF FREE ENTERPRISE

To my way of thinking, many of these persons who cloak their criticisms of this sort under the banner of free enterprise are doing so with their tongues in their cheeks and, if true to their own beliefs, would admit that a certain hypocritical cast governed most of their public expressions of this kind.

ALL OVER BUT THE SHOOTING

Honest criticism, based upon supportable evidence, should be given full consideration and a quick hearing at those points where remedial action can be best secured, but, in wartime, I cannot quietly and gracefully listen too long to unsupported and too general statements of this kind without wondering if they are not truly harmful to the cause of national unity and the fullest prosecution of the war. Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson has summed the present situation up only too well when he said, "It is all over but the shooting." During the months to come, more than ever before, we need to deal in truths and facts and not in innuendoes and criticism of our Government which cannot be substantiated.

INVITATION EXTENDED

I, therefore, wish to publicly extend this invitation to the small businessman constituents of all of our Members, and to do this through the Members, asking that all who feel they have just cause for complaint against the Government for lack of consideration or unfair treatment by the Government to come and lay their complaint before the House Committee on Small Business at any convenient time. In this invitation, I am unanimously supported by all members of this committee. I submit herewith a copy of the resolution just passed by our committee to this effect. The resolution is as follows:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Whereas under House Resolution 18 the Select Committee on Small Business of the House was created to consider the problems of small business and in respect thereto was instructed to investigate—

1. Whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and utilized, and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering such development and utilization;

2. Whether adequate consideration is being given to the needs of small business engaged in nonwar activities, or engaged in the transition from nonwar activities;

3. Whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and

4. The need of a sound program for the solution of the post-war problems of small business.

Whereas under the post-war program every consideration must be given to the advancement of small business enterprises in the interest of their continued growth and prosperity untrammeled by obstacles of any kind from government, big business, or any other

influences, and in order that those who have gone to war may have an opportunity upon their return to engage in business of their own choosing without interference from any source; and

Whereas small business is the essence of individual initiative and the free-enterprise system, and vital to the welfare of the country, employing approximately 98 percent of the number of workers representing small business concerns with less than 100 employees out of about 2,138,300 producers and distributors: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House Committee on Small Business in carrying out the injunction of the House of Representatives proposes to prosecute these instructions to the fullest extent and to that end invites information from, or appearance before this committee, anyone who has facts to present which tend to, or do, show that the free-enterprise system as reflected by small business which has built this country and is paramount to the success and well-being of business in general and small business in particular is being retarded or interfered with in any manner.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Austin American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1758. An act to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3261. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 10 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2987, a bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on House Joint Resolution 138, granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of New York and the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations concerning the settlement of the boundary line between said States at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on S. 1272, to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations, at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, May 12, 1944, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 4215, relating to custodial service employees of the Postal Service. Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Daylight Saving Time of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, May 11, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on daylight-saving time bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 18, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. (Ship construction reserve fund.)

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 25, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4486, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the Clerk by letter.

Witnesses are requested to notify the Clerk by letter at least a day in advance of the hearings of their desire to testify in order that a list of witnesses may be prepared. Written statements for the record from persons other than witnesses should be submitted a day in advance. Amendments to be proposed during the hearing should be submitted to the reporter in duplicate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1523. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision affecting an existing appropriation for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 577); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1524. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $11,600,000, and a draft of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 578); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEARNEY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2448. A bill to provide that nationals of the United States shall not lose their nationality by reason of voting under legal compulsion in a foreign state; with amendment (Rept. No. 1428). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4464. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Select committee of the Committee on Agriculture. Pursuant to House Resolution 119. Resolution investigating the activities of the Farm Security Administration (Rept. No. 1430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VOORHIS of California: Committee on Agriculture. H R. 4404. A bill to transfer Government activities in connection with domestic rabbits to the Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4776. A bill to amend the Transportation Act of 1940 so as to extend for 4 years the life of the Board of Investigation and Research, established by section 301 of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 4777. A bill to assist the States to establish and maintain school-lunch programs; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 4778. A bill to apply title 11 of the act of September 16, 1942, as amended, to employees of the United States who are outside the United States, so as to further facilitate voting by the use of State ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4779. A bill to provide for the deportation of Japanese aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WARD:

H. R. 4780. A bill to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4781. A bill to provide for making available, until expended, sums appropriated pursuant to section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4782. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands of the Tulalip Tribe of Indians, State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4783. A bill to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. J. Res. 275. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to make a study of the question as to whether the Congress should enact an adjusted-service-pay act; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 4784. A bill for the relief of L. T. Gregory; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4785. A bill for the relief of Frederick D. Ballou; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 4786. A bill for the relief of Terrell E. Beckner, committee for Kimball Lee Beckner; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5634. By Mr. GREGORY: Senate Resolution No. 44 of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, regular session, 1944, memorializing Congress to pass a law enabling the ceiling prices on fluor spar to be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5635. By Mr. HALE: Petition of a number of residents of Sagadahoc County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082 in order that there may be greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants, and that men in training camps may be better protected from the effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5636. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 4, tenth ward, Binghamton, N. Y., and signed by 68 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5637. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Heart O' the Hills Post, No. 1480, Legion, Tex., opposing House bill 2820; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5638. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the continuation of the Territorial Papers of the United States to an early conclusion; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal and triumphant Creator, whose holy purposes are beyond defeat, we come in the mystery of intercession seeking Thy righteous will and the enabling strength to do it. We confess that we have remembered and treasured the words of the Master's matchless prayer, "Thy kingdom come," but we have too often forgotten their flaming meaning. The great hope of the kingdom of love has grown dim as hatred and selfishness and man's inhumanity to man have desecrated the earth. Yet we are grateful that in darkest days prophetic souls have marched with Thee, keeping step to the distant music of Thy sure victory. Wherever hatred gives way to love, wherever prejudice is changed to understanding, wherever pain is soothed and ignorance banished, there Thy banners go and Thy truth is marching on.

In spite of mockers by our side, in spite of cunning foes without and fears within our own fickle hearts, by the shining light of Thy presence keep us steadfast on the march to that City of Light whose builder and maker is God. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, May 9, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1565) relating to the appointment of postmasters.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters;

H. R. 3261. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

RESOLUTION BY MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at its annual convention in St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the continuation of publication of the Territorial papers of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 869);

H. R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Paul Barrere; without amendment (Rept. No. 870);

H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 871); and

H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons; without amendment (Rept. No. 872).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1737. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 873).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search; without amendment (Rept. No. 874);

H. R. 2408. A bill for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 875);

H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 876); and

H. R. 2689. A bill for the relief of Pete Paluck; without amendment (Rept. No. 877).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 272. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda, Jesse M. Knowles, and the estate of Lee Stroud; with amendments (Rept. No. 878);

H. R. 1519. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 879); and

H. R. 2855. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Buby; without amendment (Rept. No. 880).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1602. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winnie Left Her Behind, a patent in fee to certain land; without amendment (Rept. No. 881).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution relating to the invitation to the Congress of the United States to send a delegation to visit the British Parliament; without amendment (Rept. No. 868).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1903. A bill for the relief of Steve Barbre; and

S. 1904. A bill for the relief of J. Fletcher Lankton and John N. Ziegele; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1905. A bill for the relief of Captolia Colvin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1906. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nellie L. Fickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1907. A bill declaring a temporary policy with respect to immigration to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. CLARK of Idaho):

S. 1908. A bill to amend section 304 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to permit the disposal to charitable institutions of certain articles of food condemned thereunder; to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.) as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION FOREIGN POLICIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Are Administration Foreign Policies Making More Difficult the Formation of a Post-war Peace Organization of Nations?" delivered by him at Cleveland, May 6, 1944, to the War Veterans' Republican Club of Ohio, together with two editorials commenting on the address, one from the Scripps-Howard papers and one from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which appear in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER POWER AND SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "St. Lawrence River Power and Seaway Development" delivered by Senator AIKEN at Watertown, N. Y., May 5, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOME IN PALESTINE FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TUNNELL before the seventh annual conference of the seaboard region, Mizrachi-Zionist Organization of America, Beth T. Filoh Synagogue, Baltimore, Md., April 30, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR PROFITS AND LEGISLATIVE POLICY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "War Profits and Legislative Policy," written by him and published in the University of Chicago Law Review for April 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUSINESS APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "Business Approach to Government," delivered at Yale University by Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, and published in the Washington Post of May 9, 1944, by the International Latex Corporation, of Dover, Del., which appear in the Appendix.]

RETURN TO THE FARMS OF SERVICEMEN

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release entitled "Servicemen Want To Buy North Dakota Farms" prepared by the Greater North Dakota Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Caledonian-Record of St. Johnsbury, Vt., regarding the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, which appear in the Appendix.]

RESERVED INTERNATIONAL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY PHILIP M. BROWN

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Reserved International Rights" written by Philip Marshall Brown and reprinted from the American Journal of International Law for April 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AWARD OF PULITZER PRIZE TO HENRY J. HASKELL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Mr. Henry J. Haskell, of the Kansas City Star, one of America's ablest editors, recently received the Pulitzer award for outstanding editorial writing during the past year. The bestowal of this honor upon Mr. Haskell is universally approved by the newspapers of the United States. He is recognized by everyone as a truly great editor. I ask unanimous consent to have an announcement of this award printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENT OF WORLD AFFAIRS

Mr. Haskell, editor of the Kansas City Star, as the son of a Congregational missionary assigned to Bulgaria, spent his boyhood in the Balkans and developed an interest in international affairs that has made him a two-time Pulitzer prize winner. He was born in Huntington, Ohio, in 1874 while his parents were in this country on leave.

In 1933 his paper received an award for a series of editorials on national and international topics, written by Mr. Haskell. His comments on the war and related international problems brought the present award.

Back in February 1898, a friend tipped Haskell, then a reporter on the Kansas City World, that there was to be an opening on the Star's telegraph desk. He took the job, just in time to get in on handling the story of the sinking of the *Maine*.

He became editor of the Star in 1928, and as an avocation has written two books on Roman history.

Prior to outbreak of the war he made annual trips to Europe to gather information on the international situation.

SEIZURE OF MONTGOMERY WARD PLANT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during yesterday's session the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] offered for the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the May 5 issue of the Chicago Daily News, written by Phil S. Hanna, in which he reviewed a statement that will appear in the forthcoming issue of the Railroad Workers Journal entitled "The Coming Boomerang." In view of the fact that I had already wired the publisher of this paper for a copy of the editorial for the purpose of inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Senator from New Jersey decided that the Phil Hanna statement and the editorial by Maurice Franks, which Mr. Hanna reviews, ought to appear together. He therefore canceled the request he made yesterday, and I ask unanimous consent that each of these articles be printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following my remarks.

While the newspapers today indicate that the Ward case may have been settled, I think that the views expressed by this very prominent leader in labor should become a part of the permanent RECORD in this case. Mr. Franks evidently believes that the Ward case is the most important labor dispute with which this country has been confronted to date. From the title of his editorial "The Coming Boomerang," he plainly indicates that a most dangerous precedent has been established by our President ordering the seizure of the Ward company without due process of law; a precedent which in time might possibly cause a seizure of labor unions by the Government.

I should like to quote one short paragraph from Mr. Franks' editorial:

No fair-minded person will question the right of our Government to seize any enterprise interfering with the prosecution of the war, providing that this action takes place with the due process of law. But when seizure of enterprise takes place without proper legal procedure, a very dangerous precedent is established.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial by Mr. Franks may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, and that immediately thereafter there may be printed the review of his editorial by Mr. Phil S. Hanna, appearing in the Chicago Daily News of May 5.

There being no objection, the editorial and review were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS—UNION-WARD CASE
(By Phil S. Hanna)

Much has been heard from businessmen about the issues in the Montgomery Ward case, but comparatively little philosophizing has come from the publicists in union labor. Hence a glance at an editorial in the forthcoming issue of the Railroad Workers Journal entitled "The Coming Boomerang" may be of interest.

"No fair-minded person will question the right of our Government to seize any enterprise interfering with the prosecution of the war, provided the action takes place with due process of law," says the writer of the editorial, Maurice Franks, who, besides being editor of the journal, is also national business agent of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc. "But," he continues, "when seizure takes place without proper legal procedure, a very dangerous precedent is established."

UNIONS ALSO ENTERPRISES

"Unions today are also enterprises, some of them in the category of big business, controlling the actual destiny of our war effort. Therefore, it should be obvious to labor and its leaders that if private business, remotely connected to the war effort, can be taken over and managed by the Federal Government, the same can be so with unions."

But the point Mr. Franks stresses is that if, in a situation such as the one at Ward's prior to the decision of the N. L. R. B. to hold an election, the Government had forced the employer to execute a contract without first giving the employees an opportunity to vote, the Government might be compelling the workers to accept bargaining representatives that were not freely chosen.

This leads the editorial to say: "One begins to wonder whether workers really have the right to collective bargaining by means of their own choosing. If the Labor Act (Wagner law) means what its language implies, no governmental board, tribunal, or any individual, no matter how high in authority, has a right to enforce a decision contrary to the intent of this law."

OPEN TO SERIOUS LABOR TROUBLE

"In order for a labor union to be eligible it must definitely prove that it represents 51 percent or better of the employees. But, as has been recently proved in certain decisions handed down, whereby unions with questionable authority and demanding closed-shop contracts have been able through sheer political pull to impose their demands, there is the inevitable reaction of serious labor trouble as in the case of Montgomery Ward & Co.," Franks adds.

But read further: "If a union, without showing proof of majority, can force a company to recognize it as bargaining agent a dastardly condition has been established. For if, at a future date, another union, which actually represents the employee majority but is not in the good graces of the political powers that be, desires to negotiate, it is automatically blocked by a minority labor organization who secured a contract through subterfuge.

"To some labor leaders, especially those benefited by this unfair condition, this may seem wonderful. But let me remind these so-called labor leaders that they are fooling with a very dangerous weapon. If through political favor a union can be backed to the limit whether it be right or wrong—backed up mainly because of political connections—it seems to me this should stand out as evidence to the workers that what the political gods can create the political gods can destroy."

WARNED BY EUROPEAN EVENTS

"It seems to me labor and especially its leaders would wake up to the fact proven in Germany, Italy, France, and other nations that when the political gods favor them to further their own personal political desires they will also favor other groups if it suits their purposes. When organized labor lends itself to a dishonest arrangement it is rapidly heading for oblivion, the same as it has in the countries of Europe.

"When labor leaders jockey a dispute into a position whereby the Federal Government takes over a business through mere Executive order, whether the company be in war work or not, they are helping establish a precedent which very well may become the ruination of the American labor movement. What momentarily seems to be an advantage to organized labor may be nothing more than the coming boomerang."

Words of wisdom, it seems to me.

THE COMING BOOMERANG

Strange things are happening in industry these days. One begins to wonder after studying certain labor decisions, whether or not workers have the right to collective bargaining by means of their own choosing, and in accordance with labor's so-called Magna Charta, the National Labor Relations Act. This law specifically states that workers may join unions of their own choosing, free of coercion.

If the labor act means what its language implies, then no governmental board, tribunal, or any individual, no matter how high in authority in these United States, has a right to enforce a decision contrary to the intent of this law. Either this law is really valid or it is invalid. If the latter be the case, it is about time that some unbiased Federal court declare this law as such. If, on the other hand, the law is really valid, then it can only mean that workers who do not desire unionism as their means of employment representation, have the prerogative of remaining unaffiliated with any labor union in any way, shape, or form and, thereby, cannot be forced into any union contractual arrangement contrary to their personal desire.

To be more specific and to avoid possible misunderstanding, I will amplify by stating that even though 99 percent of the employees within a business establishment desire unionism as their means of representation, the remaining 1 percent not desiring such representation have, in accordance with the intent of the Labor Act, the absolute right to remain ununionized. Whether their independence of unionism be to their best interest or not is beside the question. The point is that the Labor Act guarantees workers the right to join unions of their own choosing.

Coupled to all this, we have been reading in the papers and hearing through radio of instances whereby a minority union group in a business establishment has demanded a closed-shop contract from the employer. This demand can only be interpreted to mean that all employees within this establishment, whether believers in unionism or not, must join the union and pay tribute thereto or be deprived of earning a livelihood. Under the closed-shop contract the employer agrees to discharge all employees who do not become members of the union.

The general interpretation of the Labor Act is that in order for a labor union to be eligible to even negotiate working conditions it must definitely prove it represents better than 51 percent of the employees affected. When a condition of doubt exists, the general practice has been to have all of the employees cast a secret ballot as a definite means of ascertaining the jurisdictional rights of the union in question.

If this plan were carried out in accordance with honest interpretation of the Labor Act, decisions would be more democratic. Unfortunately this is not the case, as has recently been proved in certain decisions handed down, whereby unions with questionable authority, demanding closed-shop contracts have been, through sheer political pull, able to impose their demands upon concerns, with the inevitable reaction of serious labor trouble such as in the case of Montgomery Ward & Co.

If a union, without showing proof of majority representation, can impose upon and force a company to recognize their union as the bargaining agent for all of the employees, then it seems to this writer that a dastardly condition has been established in industry. For if, at a future date another union, actually representing the majority of the employees, but unfortunately not in the good graces of the political powers that be, desires to negotiate contractual arrangements governing working conditions, etc., they are automatically blocked by virtue of the fact that a minority labor organization who through subterfuge secured a contract.

To some labor leaders, and especially those benefited by this unfair and lopsided condition of union representation, this may seem wonderful. But let me remind these so-called labor leaders that they are fooling with a very dangerous weapon because if, through political favor, a union can be backed to the limit whether it be right or wrong, backed up mainly because of political connections, it seems to me this should stand out as evidence to the workers, and particularly to the unions, that what the political gods can create the political gods can destroy.

It seems as though labor and especially its leaders would wake up to the fact which has been proven in Germany, Italy, France, and other nations, that when the political gods favor them to further their own personal political desires they will also favor other groups, including crooked employers, if it so suits their purpose. When organized labor lends itself to a dishonest arrangement it is rapidly heading for oblivion, the same as it has in the countries of Europe.

From the practical side of this picture, labor leaders should be very hesitant in creating unnecessary conditions through their maneuverings which bring on Federal action. When labor leaders jockey a dispute into a position whereby the Federal Government takes over a business enterprise through mere Executive order, whether the company be engaged in war work or not, they are helping establish a precedent which very well may become the ruination of the American labor movement.

No fair-minded person will question the right of our Government to seize any enterprise interfering with the prosecution of the war, providing that this action takes place with due process of law. But when seizure of enterprise takes place without proper legal procedure, a very dangerous precedent is established.

Unions today are also enterprises, some of them in the category of big business, controlling the actual destiny of our war effort. Therefore it should be obvious to labor and its leaders that if private business, remotely connected to the war effort, can be taken over and managed by the Federal Government, the same can be so with unions. And wouldn't that be something? Just imagine the President of the United States declaring the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations or even the Railroad Brotherhoods as instrumentalities against the war effort and against the best interests of this Nation. The President could, and would, replace all officers of the unions from the president on down, with governmental officers. And wouldn't that be something?

You may say: "It can't happen here." Well, it may not under an administration seemingly favorable to organized labor. But remember, a precedent has been definitely established, and also remember that it has already happened in Europe. So what momentarily seems to be advantageous to organized labor may be nothing more than the coming boomerang.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS, *Editor.*

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations and a protocol were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election of national officers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has the floor.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Mahoney
Austin	George	Overton
Bailey	Gerry	Radcliffe
Ball	Gillette	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Gurney	Robertson
Bilbo	Hatch	Russell
Brewster	Hawkes	Shipstead
Brooks	Hayden	Smith
Buck	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Jackson	Taft
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Caraway	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chavez	McFarland	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	Maybank	Weeks
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murdock	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense program.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, we have before us, incident to the pending measure, the general subject of elections and qualifications. An election was held yesterday afternoon in Chicago, the Montgomery Ward-C. I. O. election. The returns came in last night, and I think it appears that the C. I. O. won. Now they are putting up quite a fight here indirectly, by way of their pressure methods, on the subject of elections and primaries.

I wonder what the qualifications were to vote in that election yesterday in Chicago. I think very clearly a disqualification was, to be in any way connected with that company except by being a member of the C. I. O. or an employee. My understanding is that the president of the company not only was not permitted to open his mouth, but no other official of the company was, and when the president of the company undertook to stay on the premises the President of the United States, Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, called out the Army, which carried him down the elevator, not on his own feet, according to the pictures, and dumped him on the street. The president of the company was disqualified for that election. He was the president of the company, but he was disqualified. Yet, C. I. O. members talk about qualifications to vote. They not only disqualified the president of the company, but they carried him from the premises. But there were workers in the Montgomery Ward institution, and they were allowed to vote under the auspices of the C. I. O. and the general labor agitators, and since the election was carried by them, and the policy of maintenance of membership is now established by vote, I think if the company does not establish it now the Army will be called out again, if that is what is needed. I assume that the policy of maintenance of membership is established, and thereafter, unless a worker pays his dues, he will not only be disqualified to vote in a labor contest, a contest between employer and employee, or in a matter of policy in the labor organization, but he will be required to pay his dues in order to make a living. That is going far beyond the mere matter of paying a poll tax as a qualification to vote. A worker has to pay a poll tax to the C. I. O. in such sum as they demand—and they usually demand a dollar or $2 a month—or be thrown out. It is not the right to vote that is at stake there; it is the right to make a living.

Now, think about the hypocrisy, the plain, unvarnished, indefensible, shameless hypocrisy of a labor organization or a political party or an administration of government which raises a great racket here about the requirement of seven or eight States that any able-bodied man should pay a poll tax, a very small sum always, in order to vote, to participate in his government. They raise their hands in protest to heaven at the inequality of that tax, and the imposition of it on the poor, but at the same time with force and arms they bring about a situation in which the humblest man that works for Montgomery Ward, and for many another concern in America, is denied not simply the privilege of voting in the union but denied the privilege of membership, and not only that, but denied the opportunity to make a living. They strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.

Mr. President, I now wish to say something today about the poll tax, as at least not being such an offensive thing as it has been described. I stated yesterday that the State of North Carolina did not require the payment of a poll tax in order that one might vote. It has nothing to do with the voting qualification. But there are eight States that do require the payment of a poll tax.

Now, what is a poll tax? It has been described as a capitation tax, a tax on the head, and that is what the word "poll" means. It is a very ancient tax. I do not suppose there has ever been a country of any consequence in all the history of the world that did not have poll taxes.

A good many States in the American Union have poll taxes. It happens that I was reading old John Smith's very remarkable history of the first settlement in Virginia. He called it the History of Virginia, and I think it was a pretty good history of Virginia up to the time when John quit writing. The first tax they had was a poll tax. They got in straits, the colony or little settlement had to be protected against Indians, they finally had to be protected against starvation and famine, and they imposed a poll tax upon themselves. What for? For mutual aid and mutual protection. It was the largest tax they had. Nobody thought it was a bad tax.

The State of North Carolina has a poll tax. It is limited to $2 a year. It can never be over $2 for State and county purposes. It is limited to $1 additional if one lives in a city. But there are no circumstances in North Carolina under which a man will ever have to pay over $3. That is in the constitution.

Now, what is done in North Carolina with the proceeds of the poll tax? The constitution specifies that one-fourth of it shall be appropriated for relief of the poor, and the other three-fourths shall go for purposes of public education, for maintenance of public schools. A citizen has no right to look at his government as an institution from which he can receive benefits free. The whole theory of government is mutuality I should be willing to pay for what I get. I get protection, and every other man does. I go to sleep at night in the security of what we call the public peace. I have assurance that if my house catches fire, the firemen will come. If some marauder invades the premises, the policemen will come. If there is an epidemic in the town, I will be protected, insofar as the government can protect me, from the contagion. If there should be famine, I can look to my government for some relief, at any rate. My children go to the public schools. I should think it would cost the government at least $30 or $40 a year, and probably more, to pay for the education of a child in the public schools. Our children have the opportunity, if they deserve it, to go to the high schools maintained by the State, and to go to the university or to any of the State colleges, or to learn a trade in the College of Agriculture and Engineering Arts. We have such a college for the colored people; it is called the A. and M. College. And we have a North Carolina college for the colored people, a college of liberal arts, and a college of mechanical arts, and normal

schools, and high schools, and elementary schools.

I should like to talk a little about North Carolina. The children of parents of the Negro race go to school just as long as do the white children. Their schools are just as well heated, and we have actually adopted a plan under which the Negro teachers will be paid precisely the same amount that the white teachers are paid, and that will be brought to pass within 25 months. All the budgets to that end are laid out. So they receive education and public-health protection and police protection and general-welfare protection. Then there ensues a great quarrel because some say that an able-bodied man 21 years of age, and under 50 years of age—that is the rule about the poll tax—should pay $3 for all that. I should think he would be ashamed not to pay it. With respect to the relation of the payment of the tax to the opportunity or privilege of voting, I should think a serious question would be raised as to whether a man is qualified to vote if he is absolutely indisposed to pay the price of a quart of liquor or 8 pounds of tobacco or 2 bushels of wheat for the protection of the State and the maintenance of the commonwealth in peace and in war.

As for the plea of poverty, it has always been the rule that the county commissioners can relieve any man on the ground of poverty or infirmity.

I am saying these things notwithstanding that North Carolina has abolished that qualification.

Now, let us take up another matter. Suppose, Mr. President, you lived in North Carolina and owned a farm, and did not pay your taxes. They would treat you just like the C. I. O. proposes to treat the workers; they would take your farm away from you. Did you ever have your property advertised for taxes? Did you ever wake up in the morning and read in the newspaper that the sheriff had advertised your property, although you had worked 40 years to save your estate, during depression and panic which finally had deprived you of any funds? If that happened, you realized that merely for the failure to be able to pay your taxes, the power of the State was exerted to deprive you of the savings and the value of the efforts of a lifetime of thrift and labor.

Mr. President, all I am saying is that if a man enjoys the benefits of government, and is reasonably able to pay, he should be glad to pay; he should be happy to pay. Certainly, if my Government has the right to take the roof from over my head because I fail to pay taxes—and it has that right; I have seen the advertisements in the newspapers, page after page—it should have some means of collecting a poll tax from a citizen who is unwilling to pay the price of a quart of whisky for the privileges of life in a State.

That is one object of the poll-tax qualification. At least it is said to a man, "If you do not pay your poll tax, you should not vote. If you are not willing to make any contribution for the schools and the police and fire-protection systems and the prevention of the spread of epidemics—if you are unwilling to pay anything—why should anyone be greatly concerned as to whether you vote or do not vote? If you do not have enough interest to pay $3 a year for all those things, although we know you are receiving $50 or $60 worth of them, and you are able to pay, why should anyone be particularly concerned whether you vote?"

I should think a man able to pay should be made to pay. The poll-tax qualification is just the mildest form of inducement. If we did not have that, we might have to garnishee a man's salary or wages; and if he utterly refused to support the State in any way, shape, or form, he might be indicted as a criminal.

So, Mr. President, I take it that the poll-tax qualification is reasonably to be considered as in support of a historic tax, which, so far as I know, has been highly regarded for at least 3,000 years, and obtained in practically every one of our Original States when they were first created. It obtained under Tiberius Caesar, for we remember that on the occasion when Joseph went from Nazareth to Bethlehem, where the world's Redeemer was born in the stable, Joseph was very poor. He could not get a room in the inn or hotel. He and his wife went there, not for the purpose of that great consummation but only to be enrolled to pay a poll tax.

So I can say that from the beginning of the Christian era until now it has been a decent and an equitable thing that an able-bodied man enjoying the benefits of government should pay a poll tax. Let me say that I do not understand that the poll tax was ever imposed upon women, and I do not know of any poll tax which has been imposed upon the aged. I have never heard of a poll tax which was imposed upon a young man under 21 years of age. It seems to me that a poll tax of the character I have described is not unreasonable and is not to be abhorred. If it is not, there should be a means of collecting it, and there should be inducements to paying it.

The mildest form of inducement is the deprivation of the right to vote in an election. It would be considered worse if we had the old garnishee system, which was repudiated, but which obtained for some time. It obtained when I was a young man. It would be worse still if failure to pay were made a crime. We do not like the conception of crime in matters of that sort.

After all, the eight States which have the poll tax at least have a reasonable justification for it, and it is altogether gratuitous to impute to them bad motives, and say that the poll tax is not for the purpose of revenue, as in my State, to relieve the poor and maintain the public schools, but is for the purpose of disfranchising some worthy man.

But even in the worst consideration, the poll tax is not bad compared to what the C. I. O. is putting forward in America. Under the check-off system, the employer is required to deduct the amount of the dues of the worker before the worker ever receives his pay. He is not even given the privilege of paying his dues. They are taken from him by force of law. I suppose if a worker should refuse to pay his union dues the Army would be called upon and he would be dumped out on the street. I am not talking in terms of extravagance. That is not unlike what has happened. That is what may happen again in Chicago.

As I recall, the principle of maintenance of membership in unions was started in the Kearny shipyard strike about 2 years ago. The union members struck and the shipyards were closed. Ships are just as indispensable to this war as are men and arms. The workers struck at a time when we did not know whether we would have enough ships, at a time when our enemies were sinking them at such a rate that it was a serious question whether we could build and launch them as fast as the Germans were sinking them off our coasts. As a part of the terms of peace, as a part of the terms of going back to work for their Government, which was paying the shipyard workers better wages than any similar workers ever received before, the maintenance-of-membership principle was introduced. Their leaders would not permit them to go back to work until the shipyard operators signed a contract to maintain the union membership.

What did that mean? It simply meant that if any worker failed to pay his dues the labor union could turn him out of his job, turn him out on the street to starve, so far as the union was concerned. Yet the same people are raising all sorts of riotous sentiment, assaulting the Constitution of the United States, and holding up the Senate in the supreme hour of conflict, not in protest against the States for depriving a man of his living for failing to pay a poll tax but for simply saying, "If you have the money and are unwilling to pay it, we do not see why you should vote." The States have a right to do that. That right is recognized in the Constitution. It is a reasonable right.

One further word, and I shall move on to the discussion of what I mean by an assault on the Constitution. I wish to return to what I said yesterday and point out that we are face to face with an organized, well-financed, ably led movement by the leftist-wing members of the American Labor Party to capture the Democratic Party by infiltration. They propose to nominate the President for a fourth term, and they are very noisy about it. They propose to defeat any Senator, any Member of the House, or any other candidate for public office who does not bow down to their policy of coercing the workingmen of America, their policy of saying, "If you do not pay, you shall not work." They are saying to Senators that if they do not vote for all manner of extravagant and subversive demands, "We will organize in your State and send you out in the wilderness to starve with the worker who fails to respond to our demands for a $25 initiation fee and a dollar a month dues."

I call that coercion, and I am ashamed of the fact that my Government is a party to it. I will never apologize for it. I will never defend it. I will always oppose it. Such a policy may be written into every political platform, but I will

not run for office on any such platform. It is coercion in a free country. The eight States which have a poll tax do not coerce men into paying a poll tax; yet the same people who are protesting against the policy of the eight States are the chief exponents in America of the coercive collection of labor-union dues from the workers of America. The coercion goes to the point of demanding of the Government itself that we give the labor union the power to turn a man out in the wilderness to starve. We have done it, and we ought to be ashamed of it.

When we are talking about constitutional questions, and raising them, I raise one which is founded on the Bill of Rights. I protest against depriving men of their life, liberty, property, and means of livelihood without due process of law, and at the will of labor bosses. If we carry the thing far enough, and let them operate as they are operating, yielding to them on the ground of political expediency, if a Senator is reelected by following such a course, or if some demagogue runs against a Senator and is elected, further demands will be made. What has been applied to workers will be applied to farmers. John L. Lewis himself has been organizing the dairymen in New York. We shall be asked—and threatened with being turned out of office if we do not comply—to arrange matters so that a farmer will not be able to sell his cotton, tobacco, wheat, or stock unless and until he has paid his initiation fee and his monthly dues to a labor union. The analogy is precise. The worker sells his services. The farmer also sells his services when he sells his cotton. We may call them commodities. When a man puts his lifeblood into his cotton crop, or into any other crop which he produces, it is ultimately represented in services.

I have so far shown the results of the policy of coercion that I do not have to paint a picture of what they are. However, they represent what has taken place in America. On the farms even now sales are limited to certain amounts. If a sale takes place for more than the amount to which it has been limited, a 50-percent penalty is assessed on the farmer. That is just another step toward the final result. An election takes place in Wake County, N. C. That is my county. If a certain number of farmers are organized, all the others must pay dues as well, and if they do not pay dues they cannot sell cotton. That may be a demand which will be made upon them in the course of time.

We go along from day to day, and some of us are afraid to go out into private life. I do not know that I should say much about that. I am too old a man to care much about those problems.

The other day I was reading a speech by Cicero against the Antonines in which he said that he had served the cause of liberty in his youth and that he did not fear to serve it in his old age. He said that he would not take any great credit unto himself for being willing to die in his old age for his country. He was willing to die when he was young, he said, "But now if I die I will lose very little because I do not have much to lose." So I will not set up any standard for myself or any other Senator. But I am saying that in this democracy—no, this is a representative republic. It never was a democracy, and I hope that it never will be one. I should like to be understood about that. A democracy in America is an impossibility. It has been an impossibility in every country, at all times and in every age. Pure democracy means dictatorship. It is impossible for 130,000,000 people to get together and govern a country. It is impossible for 50,000 people to get together and govern the city in which I live. Washington would be perfectly unbearable if the attempt should be made to govern the city by a democracy composed of everyone in the city saying how it should be governed. This Government was founded in the light of history, as a representative democracy in which representatives of the people administer the laws, conduct the business of legislation, and give an account every 2, 4, or 6 years to those who elect them. That form of government is representative democracy. It is American republicanism.

That is what we mean by "the Republic." It is not all that we mean, because our Nation is divided into States not only for the purpose of local self-government, but also for the purposes of diluting the strength of the central government, preventing the spread of its power, and protecting the people against it. However, in a country of this kind—a representative democracy, or a republic—there are temptations. There are temptations to cater to groups like those which are bringing pressure in connection with the pending proposed legislation, and to cater to demands such as those which have been made by labor organizations. Men can rise to power by way of catering. However, those who yield to such temptations should remember that in doing so they lay their self-respect upon the altar of their ambitions, and with their self-respect they surrender their country.

So far as I am concerned, I am at liberty to say much on that point, because if I should be defeated it would not do me much harm. I am willing to meet the challenge now, as I did when I was 21 years of age. So much for that part of the argument.

I shall now go into the matter of direct assault upon the Constitution. That is what the bill is. I shall first read the bill. I have before me both the Constitution and the bill. The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

In the first place, that language runs head-on into the second paragraph of the first article of the Constitution, as to the meaning of which there can be no debate. It reads as follows:

SEC. 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Whatever else may be said about that language, it must be conceded that it is plain. There cannot be two ways about its meaning. If we can debate about it we can debate about anything.

The other thing which we must say about it is that it is the Constitution, and that all the Congresses which ever existed cannot change it. When any Congress undertakes to override the Constitution, flying directly into its face, and when any organization puts on pressure in an attempt to override it, we are bound to look behind the move in order to see the motive. I believe that the motive here is to destroy the Constitution through the Senate and the House of Representatives. If by an act of Congress we can strike down section 2, article I of the Constitution, override and disregard it, and deny what is there expressly set forth, namely, that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature"—if we can argue that way, we can argue any other portion of the Constitution away, we can argue any clause in the Constitution out of it, we can take the Bill of Rights and throw it out the window. If the Congress can defeat the purpose and the express language of the Constitution by an act such as is here proposed, there will be no Constitution, the Congress will be a law unto itself, and God have mercy upon the American people when that happens.

Furthermore, the bill provides—

That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting * * * is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution.

That is an assault upon the judiciary, and it is an assault upon the judicial section of the Constitution, which declares that:

The judicial power shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

If the Congress can define the meaning of a word in the Constitution, it can rewrite the Constitution tomorrow morning, and I do not know but that the gentlemen who are so busy lately with their Committee for Political Action would immediately proceed into the country this year to secure the election of Representatives and Senators who would write the meaning of the Constitution to suit the Committee for Political Action, headed by Sidney Hillman of the American labor union, the C. I. O., and formerly active in the Russian Revolution in the Bolshevik days. He never was a

worker, but always an adventurer, and he is now engaged in his greatest adventure as a member of another party coming into yours and mine, Mr. President, to destroy them.

Now let us go back to the argument. The Congress does write definitions of words in acts. In many of the more important measures we begin by saying, "As used in this act, these words shall mean so and so." That is in order to make clear the intent of the Congress. But here is a word written in the year 1787, nearly 158 years ago; it has been there for almost 16 decades; its meaning has been established in the minds of the American people and the courts every year and every decade and never has been questioned for one moment. It is not in an act of Congress, but in the Constitution. But along comes somebody—I do not know who wrote this bill, and I do not care to call names—and asserts the power of the Congress of the United States to say what anything shall mean within the contemplation of the Constitution.

I am telling you, Mr. President, that the Congress cannot do it, and I am telling you when it is undertaken those who undertake it are either grossly ignorant or are engaged in a deliberate and defiant assault upon the Constitution of the United States and are undertaking to usurp the judicial power of the Supreme Court. Yet, today such a provision is before the Senate; we are considering it, and we have the whole Senate standing still while we consider it.

One of the Senators yesterday raised a question as to whether the Federal Government had the power to go into my State in case of provocation, to establish a republican form of government. Well, the Constitution provides for that. I hope the necessity will never arise, but I will say to the Senate the republican form of government will not be worth 2 cents in America whenever the power of Congress is asserted to define the terms in the Constitution. The definition of those words is reposed in the Supreme Court of the United States. The Congress cannot define them. So there is the second assault.

Then there is another assault in the provision in which those responsible for this bill undertake to apply their doctrine with respect to the election of Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate, to the election of electors in the electoral college. Let us see how that gets in the bill. The first article of the Constitution does say that:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Now let us look at the matter of electing a President and Vice President. Article II, in the second paragraph of section 1 provides:

> Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, but no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector.

What does that say? It does not say electors shall be elected by the people at all. It does not say that there shall be any qualifications whatever for electing electors. It says that each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct. And yet the proposed legislation now before the Senate undertakes to uproot that section of the Constitution and to determine the qualifications of voters notwithstanding the appointing power is exclusively in the States. The State may elect by its legislature. I think it could delegate the power to the Governor. The Constitution says "each State shall appoint." So there is the third assault on the Constitution.

I do not think any act has ever been presented to the Congress that is more conspicuously and glaringly in defiance of the Constitution. I cannot believe that those responsible for this legislation do not understand that. I think they do. I do not think the Committee for Political Action cares a thing on earth about the Constitution. They are after power; they are after controlling the labor of this country and the workers of this country; they are going headlong in that direction, and if they should get the power, the Constitution would disappear and the country with it and the poor misguided people who gave them the power would suffer total loss and destruction.

Mr. President, I wish to speak a little longer on certain cases, but before I get to them, let me say that I happen to have here a very impressive statement which was made in the constitutional convention of North Carolina when the question of ratifying the Constitution of the United States arose. It will be remembered that the State of North Carolina at first, by an overwhelming vote, refused to ratify. They did not like the Constitution, and they did not like it because the Bill of Rights was not in it. They were willing to ratify after the Bill of Rights was promulgated, and George Washington gave assurance that he would have favored including it all the time if he had thought its inclusion was not understood and implied. That was his statement. He was surprised that anyone took for granted we would form a government without the Bill of Rights. He thought we would take over the old English bill of rights. But when the States balked, and Rhode Island hesitated, North Carolina actually voted down the Constitution, notwithstanding the pleas of the delegates who had attended the Convention.

A second convention was called, in 1789, and then, in the clear prospect that the Bill of Rights would be adopted, North Carolina ratified, and became the last of the Thirteen States, or the next to the last, to join the Union. I think Rhode Island claims to have been the last, and I shall not dispute about that.

In the North Carolina convention, when the Federal Constitution was presented, the very question with which we are dealing here today arose, and John Steele, one of the delegates, referring to the matter of electing Representatives in the Congress—Senators not being involved then—made remarks as follows:

> Who are to vote for them?

That is, for the Representatives.

> Every man who has a right to vote for a representative to our legislature will ever have a right to vote for a Representative to the General Government. Does it not expressly provide that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors?

It will be remembered that the shoe was on the other foot in those days. We were afraid the Federal Government would put something over on us. Now it appears some are afraid the States will put something over on the Government.

> The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote.

That is, does not allow the Congress to say who shall vote.

> The Constitution expressly says what the qualifications are which entitle a man to vote for a State representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, or by vote, or by any other way.

That is a very fine interpretation of paragraph 4. Mr. Steele stated the only possible interpretation of sections 2 and 4. His view is confirmed by William R. Davie, who had been a member of the Federal Convention. He was the father of the University of North Carolina, a very eminent and noble man, one of our delegates to the Constitutional Convention.

I have stated the understanding of the State of North Carolina, which I represent as a Senator. I stand on the understanding of my State, and if I did not stand on it, I would be guilty of perfidy to the State of North Carolina, and I would deserve to be thrown out in disgrace.

Furthermore, if this language of the Constitution shall be altered, and a meaning given to "qualifications" which we have no right to give, striking out a qualification which there is no right to strike out, striking down paragraph 2 of article I, the Congress of the United States will be guilty of perfidious conduct toward the States which ratified the Constitution and trusted themselves to the Federal power. It is inconceivable to me that men should lend themselves to anything of that sort. There is involved here something deeper than overriding the Constitution. It is bad faith with the constituent States of the United States.

Mr. President, I shall conclude with a remark or two about two cases. It appears that more or less reliance has been placed on the Classic case, decided by the Supreme Court May 26, 1941, and the subsequent Texas case, Lonnie E. Smith against S. E. Allwright and James E. Linzza, election judges, decided April 3, 1944.

I rather agree with Mr. Warren with respect to the Classic case. If any Senators are in doubt on this subject, I suggest that they get the report of the hearings, which is not long, and read Mr. Warren's statement. Mr. Charles Warren is one of the most eminent lawyers and one of the most eminent public men in America. He is author of The Supreme Court in United States History, and if there is in America a monumental work written by an American, that work is entitled to that description. I think it is regarded as the last word on that great subject.

Mr. Warren is the author of other works. He has spent a lifetime studying Supreme Court decisions and the Constitution. He says that after reading over and over the Classic case from Louisiana, he cannot find one word which suggests anything whatever about the power of the Federal Government over the qualifications of voters who may vote for Members of the House or Members of the Senate. Of course, he did not find anything relating to the qualifications for voting for electors who may be appointed by the States.

It is interesting to note that there has been a great deal of talk about the Negroes, our colored friends, in connection with that case. I have read the case several times; I read it over again this morning. One cannot find anything in that case which relates to the colored people, or, if anyone wishes to call them Negroes, I shall call them Negroes. The case did decide that where a party primary is an integral part of the election machinery—and I think by that is meant, a legalized primary under the State law—the law of the United States with respect to elections applies. That surprised some of the people in the southern section of the country, who thought, in the best of faith, that a legalized primary, notwithstanding it was legalized, was a party affair. But beyond their surprise and disappointment, I do not think it is a very serious matter. We can adjust ourselves to that. We are no more required to have a legalized primary than is South Carolina. If we want our party nominations to be party affairs, the door is open.

I served the Democratic Party in North Carolina many years in the days of conventions, and while I prefer the legalized primary, there is a price we will refuse to pay for them. I once discussed with a famous politician the question of legalized primaries as against conventions. I asked him, "Why are you so opposed to legal primaries?" He said, "BAILEY, the change to legalized primaries will take all the poetry out of politics." So South Carolina is going back to poetry, and we can also.

All the Classic case says is that a legalized primary is an integral part of the election machinery, and therefore every right protected by the Constitution may be invoked by a man who is qualified, but he must be qualified. It does not say anything about what the qualifications are. I understand perfectly what it means. No one can be thrown out of a legalized primary on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. That cannot be done. If he is a Democrat, if he is qualified, all the power of the Federal Government may be brought forth under the Civil Rights Act and the subsequent acts which are cited in the case, and more than the power that is provided in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

I take the view that section 2 of article I of the Constitution does establish the right in a qualified voter to vote for a Member of Congress, and that the Congress may enforce this right. But he must be qualified. What is the language?

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.

The Constitution of the United States says this:

> And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The State can determine the qualifications; the Constitution determines the right, and the Congress enforces the right. I think that is all that is settled in that case.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was very much struck by the statement of the Senator that the meaning of section 2 of article I is so clear and unmistakable that really no reasonable man can misunderstand it. The Senator's statement caused me to compare section 2 with section 1, and in my judgment section 1 is no clearer in its language than section 2. Section 1 provides:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

It would be just as reasonable, for example, to argue that section 1 had some other meaning, that it referred to any Congress that might be assembled, or that someone might want to assemble, as to say that section 2 does not mean exactly what it says. It seems to me they both stand on the same footing and are so clear that no reasonable human minds could reach differing conclusions respecting them.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

I come now, in conclusion, to the Smith case from Texas, a more recent case. That was a case in which the race question was brought out. There was alleged to be a refusal of an election officer to give a ballot or to permit a Negro citizen to cast a ballot in the primary election held June 27, 1940, for nomination of Democratic candidates for the United States Senate and House of Representatives, Governor, and other State officers. The refusal is alleged to have been solely because of the race and color of the proposed voters. This case found its philosophy in the decision in the Classic case. In the Classic case it was held that a legalized primary is an integral part of the election process and, therefore, is subject to the Constitution of the United States—the fourteenth amendment, the fifteenth amendment, section 2 of article I and section 4 of article I. Section 4 of article I provides—and I shall read it in order to be accurate—

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

What reliance on earth can be placed on that language with respect to the qualifications of voters? The Constitution had already declared its will on that subject, and had provided that the qualifications of voters should be the qualifications fixed by the State for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. That means the regulations of the manner of holding the elections. That has never been in dispute in this country for 50 years. That is good law. I never heard any question raised about it. But I must say I am utterly amazed at the quality of a man's thinking, his capacity to reason, who would construe the words "manner of holding elections" to embrace the qualifications of voters, when that has already been written in plain words in the Constitution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I remind the Senator that the seventeenth amendment, having to do with the direct election of Senators, repeats the qualification provision so far as Senators are concerned which the Senator has been discussing and which appears in article I of the Constitution; and, of course, the seventeenth amendment was adopted subsequent to article I, and subsequent to the fourteenth amendment out of which considerable debate has also developed.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado. Of course, by the seventeenth amendment the election of Senators was transferred from the legislatures to the people, and in doing so we used precisely the same language which had been used 134 years before, which had never been challenged during the 134 years, and which had never been subjected to debate or dispute or question. We thought if there was any language concerning which no doubt would ever be raised it was that language; we thought if there was any language that could stand, notwithstanding the fourteenth or fifteenth amendments, it was that language.

I believe I shall conclude now with one word more. The fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution were adopted in the Civil War decade. The southern people, to very large extent, were not permitted to vote on the question of the ratification of those amendments. There were many disabilities. Our States went out of the hands of their people. The other day I noticed that the fourteenth amendment received only 25,000 votes in North Carolina, and the votes in opposition were only 3,000. We all understand about that. So far as I am concerned, I have accepted the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments just as I accept every other part of the Constitution. I have sworn to support it, maintain it, and defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and regardless of whatever may be said about times that are long past. It is 79 years, now, since Robert Lee surrendered to Grant, and it is 79 years since Johnston surrendered to Sherman. Three great wars have occurred since then. I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle and my friends who live across the Mason-Dixon line will not think I am boasting when I say that in those tests of blood our sons have sealed their loyalty, first, in the Spanish-American War. Since then we have had a great World War; and there was no holding back in the South, no holding back in North Carolina. Our men went freely and joyously, with great courage. I think their Confederate fathers must have been proud of them.

Here we are today in the midst of another great war. I think 300,000 young men from North Carolina are in this war. All that occurred in the past has gone. All of it has been wiped out. It is all washed away. I hope we shall never have any more sectional questions in this country. God forbid that we should ever have racial questions, either. On that point I am tempted to say something. I think there are approximately 2,000,000 Negroes in the North and probably twelve or thirteen million of them in the South. It is 80 years, now, since they were freed. The president of the University of North Carolina, Frank Graham, a man whose reputation as a liberal and forward-looking man is unquestioned throughout this country, I think, made a speech the other day at the great institute at Tuskegee, Ala. In that speech he said that in these 80 years the Negroes of the South have achieved greater progress than any other race has ever achieved anywhere, at any time, in any similar period. I think that is true. It is a marvelous thing to think about.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me suggest that the Negroes have achieved that progress under the Constitution of the United States; that their greatest protection in that achievement has been afforded by the maintenance of the Constitution of the United States, and in the achievement of their further progress the Constitution will continue to be their chief protection.

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct, and I thank the Senator for pointing it out. I am very grateful to him for doing so.

Mr. President, the Negroes achieved that great progress because there was something in them. Let us give them all due credit. They have come forward wonderfully. They have good homes and good schools. They are building banking institutions and insurance companies in North Carolina. They are getting along with us perfectly, and will continue to do so, until some sentimental-minded person who knows nothing about them comes down there and gets off a lot of silly guff. I do not blame the Negroes at all about that. I think the progress they have made is due, in part, to the fact that they are in the United States of America, which is the land of opportunity and the land of promise. Their progress also is due to the fact—remember that I am giving them credit, and I also give their country credit—that they lived down there among people who understood them, people who have reason to have an interest in them, and, I rather think, people who got much of their religion from them. It has taken all three factors to bring about the wonderful progress the Negroes have made, and, best of all, they have had law and order under the Constitution of the United States. The men and women are not their friends who lead them to be resentful against the southern people. Those men are not their friends who undertake to lead them in an assault upon the Constitution—the charter of their liberties and their rights, their progress and their hopes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following the address of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], a very able article by Mr. Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Evening Star of yesterday, and which has to do with the pending measure.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Efforts to side-step the Constitution, through congressional laws as well as through administrative acts, have been plentiful in recent years. The attempt to drive the so-called anti-poll-tax bill through the Senate—it has already been passed by the House—is just another case in kind.

The control of elections and the qualifications of the electors are left, by the Constitution, in the hands of the States. Congress and the courts, in the past, have stuck to this interpretation of language which is certainly clear enough. But politics steps in—aided and abetted by pressure groups. It is now proposed, by congressional enactment, which presumably the President will approve, to give the Federal Government the right to say what the qualifications for voting shall be in the States. The proposed flaw would deny the right of the States to levy a poll tax as a voting qualification.

Here is no question as to the wisdom of a poll tax or nonwisdom. It is just a question whether the Federal Government shall control State elections. The States in the past have had property qualifications, educational qualifications, residence qualifications, and poll-tax qualifications for voting. Gradually many of them have been done away with. But always by State action—not by action of the Federal Government. Always the constitutional provisions have been recognized in the past.

The present effort to have the Federal Government impose its will on the States is political. One group, several groups, are putting pressure on Members of Congress by threatening the loss of Negro votes in the Northern and Western States, where the Negro vote may hold the balance of power in close elections. Other groups believe that it would be better, anyway, to have the Federal Government control in elections.

The argument advanced by proponents of the anti-poll-tax bill is that the Federal Government has an inherent right to control elections for Federal office—for President and Vice President—and in elections to the Federal Legislature, the House and Senate. A second argument is made—which seems pretty specious—that the payment of a poll tax is not a qualification, but a regulation, or condition.

Well, if a tax to vote is a regulation, so is a registration requirement and a requirement of 6 months' or a year's residence in a State to vote. The Congress, under such construction, could do away with registration or residence requirements. It might even go further and set up regulations of its own and prohibit citizens of the States from voting unless they conformed.

The second section of article I of the Constitution says, "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This has never been changed. It's the Constitution now. Further, when the Constitution was amended to bring about the popular election of Senators, exactly the same language was used regarding the electors in the States.

The southern Senators have declared their intention of preventing a vote on the anti-poll-tax bill, even if they have to filibuster. One of them, Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, who held the floor in a filibuster against an antilynching bill for 6 days some years ago, is prepared to speak for 100 hours on this poll-tax measure. Others are ready to help talk the measure to death.

The supporters of the anti-poll-tax bill have been able to line up a majority of the Senate to vote for it—but they have failed, according to the polls of sentiment, to get a necessary two-thirds of the Senators to support a cloture resolution. Without cloture the bill cannot be brought to a vote. The prospects are for a week of debate, a vote on cloture, which will fail, and ultimate laying aside of the measure.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I had intended to present for printing in the RECORD the article by Mr. Gould Lincoln to which attention has just been called by the Senator from Georgia. Mr. Lincoln is one of the most distinguished and able publicists in the field of journalism. He is a wise and sound writer, and I commend his views to Senators on both sides of the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The Chair observes that a quorum is not present. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Mahoney
Austin	George	Overton
Bailey	Gerry	Radcliffe
Ball	Gillette	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Gurney	Robertson
Bilbo	Hatch	Russell
Brewster	Hawkes	Shipstead
Brooks	Hayden	Smith
Buck	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Jackson	Taft
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Caraway	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chavez	McFarland	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	Maybank	Weeks
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murdock	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I realize that the Senate has heard a great deal of discussion of this question and that many Senators are absent. However, I wish to discuss the bill, and I hope that my general discussion will be brief.

In the first place, Mr. President, allow me to say that the issue involved here does not raise any question of race. There is nothing in the bill which refers to race, nor is there anything in the so-called poll-tax system, as it exists in any of the States, that is based on race, or involves race, whether Negro, Norwegian, Pole, or any other race. I am very happy that that is true, because the Senate should consider this question on its merits, and without any consideration of extraneous matters such as alleged discrimination, and other allegations which have often been injected into the consideration of the validity of the poll tax as it now exists.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I was reared with the Negro, and partly by him. I have never had any prejudice against the Negro race as a race. Those who have injected the race issue have been those who seek to profit by it in votes upon this bill. In other words, I assert frankly and bluntly that those who would raise or inject the race issue do so solely with the hope of creating prejudice through which to control the votes of the Members of the Senate who are called upon to vote upon this issue.

Mr. President, the issue before us does not in its true sense involve the question of the merits or nonmerits of the poll tax. I am moved to say that personally I have not favored the continuance of the poll-tax system within my own State. Therefore what I shall say, and what conclusions I may draw, will not be influenced one whit by my devotion to the poll-tax system as such.

I think the poll tax should be abolished. I think it is being abolished. I am morally certain, and without a single doubt concerning it, that it should be abolished by the only sovereignty that has any right to create it, or to impose it; namely, the State. The Federal Government has nothing whatever to do with it unless it wishes to interfere with respect to a matter over which it has no jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the two statements which I have just made: First, that personally I do not favor a poll tax as a requisite to voting in primary, general, or special elections. Second, that there is no issue of race and no question of race, color, or creed, involved in this discussion, because the poll tax, for instance, in my own State—using it as an illustration—is univeral in its application to all classes to which it applies.

Prior to 1943—a fact which I shall notice in a moment—every person in my State who was 21 years of age, and who had not reached 60 years of age, was, with certain exceptions, required to pay a poll tax. There was no application of the law with regard to any particular race or color. It applied to all. It was universal in its application. While I am on that point allow me to say that in Georgia, one of the eight States having a poll-tax law, the poll tax is not imposed in order to affect or control the franchise, to inhibit, or in any way to discriminate against any person on account of his race. In fact, we had a poll tax during the time when Georgia was a colony. The colony of Georgia imposed a poll tax before the Constitutional Convention was held. That, be it remembered, was at a time when the Negro did not vote anywhere. Actually, at the date of the passage of the first poll-tax law in Georgia the Negro, free or otherwise, did not vote in a single American State. He certainly did not vote in the State of Georgia. The tax was not imposed, therefore, with a view of controlling suffrage or affecting the right of anyone to vote. From early colonial times down to the present time, in all our laws dealing with the question of suffrage, we have imposed a poll tax. We have provided for its collection, and we have also provided for the distribution of the revenue derived from the levying of the tax.

Subsequent to the Declaration of Independence—as I recall it was in 1777—the poll-tax provision was made a part of the Constitution of the State of Georgia. No Negroes voted. Such a thing as a primary was unheard of. Such a thing as control of suffrage by the imposition of a poll tax in Georgia was undreamed of. We have the tax. Our tax is $1 a year, and it is imposed upon all persons of voting age who have not reached 60 years of age. It is noncumulative. The poll-tax revenues are put into the common-school fund for the support of education in the State.

Last year we adopted a constitutional amendment in Georgia giving the right to vote to all persons who arrive at the age of 18 years. The amendment itself provides that persons between 18 and 21 years of age—the latter the old voting age or majority age—shall not be required to pay a poll tax in order to be entitled to register, and therefore to vote. It is not applicable alone to Negroes or to whites or to Swedes or to Norwegians, but it is applicable to all inhabitants of the State who have resided in the State a required number of months and in the county in which they vote a required number of months.

Georgia had in her law another provision with reference to the payment of taxes, a provision which persisted until some years after I came to the Senate, and that was that, in order for anyone in Georgia to register and vote he must show or be able to show that he had paid all taxes legally due and demandable of him within a certain period of time prior to the date of his registration. Bear in mind that included all taxes. One could not vote if he had not paid all taxes. If he were in default on his property tax or any other tax legally imposed by the State he could not vote, he could not legally register. Of course, the purpose of the requirement was to aid and assist the State in collecting its taxes. When the depression came along the law was changed in the State because many of the best citizens of the State, perhaps the largest property owners, particularly among the farmers with large acreage were unable to pay their taxes because of the extreme depression into which we entered in 1929 and 1930. The law was changed so that the taxpayer was not required to pay any property tax in order to register and vote; but the poll-tax provision which had been in our law since early colonial times and in our Constitution even before the adoption of the Federal Constitution, was continued.

A case was brought up from Georgia several years ago known as the Breedlove case. It is true it involved the right to vote for a State official and a Federal official; but the Court very clearly said that the tax was all right, and the requirement, as an incident to the tax in order to effect its collection, that it be paid before the inhabitant was entitled to register and to vote was likewise all right.

Later on another case came up from Tennessee which involved the clear question of whether or not the poll tax as a requirement for voting was valid in an election for a Federal official, to wit, a Member of the House or the Senate—I have forgotten the facts. That case was decided by the lower court. An effort was made to have it reviewed by the Supreme Court, but the Supreme Court denied even a hearing on it, and followed the logic, the doctrine, and the principles of the decision in the Breedlove case.

I shall not argue at this moment whether any of the later cases have changed or modified those earlier cases further than to say that the Classic case from Louisiana did not deal with the qualifications of electors. There is not a single word in the opinion in that case which shows that that question was even involved. There is some language used along that line, but it did not deal with the question of the qualifications of electors. It did deal with the question of the integration of the primaries into the election system of the State so as to make the primaries a part of the State's election system and the fifteenth amendment applicable to primary elections. Beyond that it did not deal with the

question of the qualifications of electors at all.

Neither, as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina just said in his able address, did the late case involving the validity of the Texas primary law involve any question of the qualifications of electors.

Now, let us look at the matter for a moment without the slightest disposition to resort to legal refinements of any kind, because when anybody wants to vote in accordance with the Constitution, difficulty only arises by reason of efforts to inject legal refinements or serpentine methods of construing and interpreting, without following the plain, obvious, clear, and unmistakable meaning of the Constitution.

Take a look, if you please, Mr. President, at the old Articles of Confederation, which were in effect before we had a Constitution, and in which is found the key to the whole problem. It will be borne in mind that the Act of Confederation of the United States of America grew out of the fact that the delegates of the United States of America in Congress assembled on the 15th of November, in the year 1777, and in the second year of the independence of America, agreed to certain articles of confederation and perpetual union between the several named States of the Union. In article 2 it is said:

> Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which it is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.

If there be added to that language the words "nor prohibited to the several States," we find all there is in the tenth amendment.

Now let us look at the old Articles of the Confederation a little further. By article 5 it is declared:

> For the more convenient management of the general interest of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, in every year, with a power reserved to the State, to recall its delegates, or any of them.

It is true that the Articles of Confederation are not the Constitution and were a rather loose document. The old Articles of the Confederation did not give adequate power as a basis for a strong national government, and they fell apart primarily because the Confederated States did not have the authority and power to collect taxes. They could recommend that the States levy taxes, but they had no way to enforce the recommendation. So there followed the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

Now let us look at that for a moment, and not for the purpose of making a legal argument. In that Convention there were various and conflicting views upon many, many problems which had to be faced by the delegates, and on the question of electing Members of the House of Representatives there were at least three different definite theories. They were fought out in the Convention. For 2 days there was lively debate. Of course, we have not full reports of that Convention, but there is enough in the fragmentary reports which have come down to us, and in contemporary writings, to indicate that there was very lively debate.

There were three different theories, represented by three groups. One group insisted that the qualifications of voters in the States who were qualified to vote for Members of the House of Representatives should be definitely fixed and written into the Constitution, uniform in application among all the States.

The second group insisted that the power should be given directly to the Congress to prescribe the qualifications of electors; in other words, that the naked power should be given to the Congress to prescribe the qualifications of electors, so that the Congress might from time to time determine the qualifications.

The third group was the one which prevailed in the Convention, to wit, those who did not want to prescribe uniform qualifications to be written into the Constitution in terms, did not want the grant of power expressly to the Congress to prescribe qualifications, but they wished the qualifications of the electors to be the same as the qualifications of the electors in the States for members of the most numerous house of the legislative body of the State.

Those were three definite and conflicting views, and for 90 years no one but Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts—and I see my distinguished friend the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] present—and perhaps Thaddeus Stevens ever suggested that anyone had the right to deal with the question of qualifications of voters for Members of the House of Representatives except the States, indeed, that the States themselves could not superadd—I think that arises by implication—to the qualifications of an elector for a Representative in Congress anything beyond what was prescribed as a qualification for electors in the election of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is making a very able address. He just stated that Charles Sumner was the first man who, after the Constitutional Convention, said that the States did not have exclusive authority to define the qualifications of electors, which was true, except that Charles Sumner maintained that any State could fix educational qualifications, or tax qualifications, or any other qualifications for voting, but could not disfranchise a person because of color.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. And because of that, Charles Sumner would have condemned the pending bill.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct; but I am not discussing Sumner seriously, because the wild doctrines of Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens never became American law. They are not grounded in American law, and even among his contemporaries Sumner had no respectful following on the question of interpreting the American Constitution. But what the Senator from Mississippi has said is true as a matter of fact.

Mr. President, it is not possible to imagine that the delegates to the Constitutional Convention ever would have voted for the Constitution as drafted, or that the States would have ratified it, if it had contained a provision like that which it is now insisted should be written into the Constitution itself by interpretation. At that time there was extreme jealousy. At least nine of the States had fixed the qualifications for voters for officers of the States, including members of their legislative bodies. Many of them had property qualifications much more drastic than any poll tax that is levied in any single State, and it is not possible to imagine the adoption or the ratification of the Constitution if what we are now asked to do had been proposed at that time. As a matter of fact, it was not proposed, except in debate, and after 2 days of very sharp debate the third compromise offered was accepted and written into the Constitution, and has ever since been in the Constitution.

On that point, let me stress what the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] had to say about the language of the bill. The Senator from North Carolina correctly pointed out that the bill flies squarely in the face of the Constitution in terms. It is solemnly declared in the text of the bill that—

> The requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting * * * is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections * * * within the meaning of the Constitution.

I ask Senators, and I ask the American public, from what source did this doctrine derive, to wit, the doctrine that the legislative body of the Government has the power to interpret the Constitution, has the power to write language into the Constitution by the passage of legislation? No legislative body, following the English principle of representative government, has or ever has had, so far as I know, power to write language into a written Constitution which is itself declared to be the supreme law of the land, and under which the legislative branch of the Government is organized in matters of legislation

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator from Georgia has just made a statement which should be remembered by every Senator present so long as he remains in the Senate. I think the Senator's statement is absolutely correct. But I wonder if we did not do that very thing the other day when we adopted the Byrd resolution—if we did not then set up a committee of the United States Senate to pass judicially on whether or not the

executive department of the Government had acted within the law in doing what it did at Chicago. I am very happy to have been here this afternoon and to have heard the statement made so eloquently and logically by the Senator from Georgia on the question, as I understand it, of anyone assuming that the Congress of the United States has judicial power to interpret what the legislature of a State has done. I agree thoroughly with the Senator that we have no such power. But it seems in this day and age that the Congress is constantly, as I see the picture, reaching out by way of investigating committees, into the judicial field, and especially did we do so the other day when we adopted the Byrd resolution. If any Senator present doubts that statement, if he will read the resolution he will see that that is exactly what the Senate of the United States, by adopting the resolution, attempted to do. I agree with what the Senator from Georgia has said.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator, but I do not wish to get into a discussion of matters outside the subject before us at this time.

Mr. President, why is what I have said true? It is not only true historically, but it is true necessarily because if by interpreting the Constitution we say that certain things shall not be deemed to be qualifications within the meaning of the Constitution, we can say by interpretation that certain other things shall not be deemed to be qualifications, and that certain things shall be deemed to be qualifications, and on ad infinitum until we shall have completely destroyed the Constitution.

Our Constitution is something different from the constitutions of many other countries. In some instances the constitution of a country is said to be an unwritten constitution. That is so in the case of the English Constitution, as an illustration. In other instances the constitution is said to be merely on a parity with a legislative act. That was true, I believe, of the French Constitution. It could be changed by the legislature. In still other instances a constitution has been nothing more or less than a declaration of public policy. But that is not true in America. The Constitution of 1787, under which we organized this Government, is declared to be the supreme law of the land along with laws passed in pursuance of, that is to say in harmony with that Constitution, and with treaties made by the President and the Senate. So that we have a different system altogether. If in this case we have any warrant for stepping in and saying that we will write the word "reasonable" before "qualifications" we can write in any other words we want to write in. If we can step in and say that certain things shall be deemed to be true within the meaning of the Constitution, or shall not be deemed to be true within the meaning of the Constitution, then with respect to suffrage or any other thing dealt with in the Constitution we can amend the Constitution at will and can destroy it.

It does seem, however, that there is one other thing that the drafters of this bill should not have included in it, to wit, the provision prohibiting the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote for electors for President or Vice President of the United States.

That language flies directly and completely into the very teeth of the Constitution. There is not anywhere in any decision—and I am perfectly willing for any Senator to take the time to examine the decisions if he wishes to do so—any suggestion that the Federal Government can, except as indicated in the Constitution itself, place any restriction upon the power of the State to appoint or to select, as the State wishes, electors for President and for Vice President.

Recently the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] brought to the attention of this body a decision which I did not think we would so soon forget; a decision written by Chief Justice Fuller in 1892. I read from page 1064 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1944:

> The validity of a State law providing for the appointment of electors of President and Vice President having been drawn in question before the highest tribunal of a State, as repugnant to the laws and Constitution of the United States, and that court having decided in favor of its validity, this Court has jurisdiction to review the judgment under Revised Statutes, section 709.

This is what the Court said—I do not wish to read much of it:

> In short, the appointment and mode of appointment of electors belong exclusively to the States under the Constitution of the United States. They are, as remarked by Mr. Justice Gray in *In re Green* (134 U. S. 377, 379), "no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as the electors of Representatives in Congress." Congress is empowered to determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they are to give the votes, which is required to be the same day throughout the United States, but otherwise the power and jurisdiction of the State is exclusive, with the exception of the provisions as to the number of electors and the ineligibility of certain persons, so framed that congressional and Federal influence might be excluded.

Yet, here, Mr. President, is a bald, naked proposal to say that the State shall not select its electors for President and Vice President in a certain way. It is no answer to say that the bill does not undertake to do more than to say that if the State is going to have an election it shall not fix so-and-so as a qualification. If the Congress can restrict the right of the State in any way to appoint its own electors, save as pointed out in the Constitution, it can restrict it otherwise and in other ways. So here is a very definite frontal attack on the Constitution itself, first by transforming the legislative branch of the Government into a judicial organization by adding words textually to the Constitution. How any man—and I say it with all respect—who has taken an oath to support the Constitution can for a moment doubt that that provision in the bill stands without any legal or constitutional basis whatsoever is beyond me. This is not a case of refinement of language. It is simply a case of looking at the facts.

I tried to point out, and I think I did to those who wished to listen, that the language of the tenth amendment is to be found back in the old Articles of Confederation. The precise authority for the electors, certainly under the old Articles of Confederation, was exclusively within a State, and the Constitution follows that provision and follows it very faithfully.

Let us now look at the Constitution without any extensive argument and without any desire to resort to legal refinement or nicety of distinction whatsoever. The people of the United States, through the representatives from the several States, were sitting at Philadelphia in the Constitutional Convention, and they proposed to establish a government. They said that—

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

In the very next section they said in plain and unmistakable language:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

I undertake to say that clearer language or more apt legal phraseology could not be devised by anyone at this time to express more accurately and precisely the third theory which was argued before the Constitutional Convention, and which was finally accepted by the Convention, at least one and possibly two of the other theories upon which the validity of the pending bill must necessarily depend having been rejected.

Now let us look a little further at article I:

> SEC. 4. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Some persons who follow a very circuitous and very dubious method of interpretation say that the power to alter the regulations, times, places, or manner of holding elections modifies or qualifies the exclusive power of the States to determine the qualification of electors for, let us say, Members of the Congress. How could that have been? How could it be supposed that a convention composed of men of the wisdom of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention, after declaring in the second section of article I, in unmistakable language, the qualification of electors, in the fourth section of the same article would have inserted anything which would modify or affect it, or would in any wise qualify it by mere implication? By no possible stretch of the imagination can it be thought, as I view the matter, that any such contention is admissible, if one really is looking at the facts as they are and is not disposed to resort to all sorts of legal refinements in order to justify his position.

But it is said that if that is not true, then the "necessary and proper" clause, which is to carry into execution what was declared to be the constitutional rule in section 2 of article I, implies some right or power to modify the qualifications of electors for Members of the Congress. Certainly that is not permissible. Certainly that cannot be successfully contended. The "necessary and proper" clause and section 4, which I have read, do carry certain powers with respect to the elections, but none of them deals with the qualifications of electors; none of them even squints at the qualifications of electors.

Then let us look a little further. I should like to read all parts of the Constitution in which this question really enters. Passing over, for the time being, the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, which of course are familiar to all Members of the Senate, let us take a brief look at the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution. The seventeenth amendment was, of course, proposed and ratified long after the ratification of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, long after all the debates revolving around the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments had occurred. What does the seventeenth amendment say?

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

That language was used when our people were changing the method of electing Senators, and, very properly, the change was attempted to be made by constitutional amendment.

I continue to read from the amendment:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The amendment goes back and picks up the identical language of section 2 of article I, written in the original Constitution. Can there be any question or doubt that all those who really made the Constitution or had to do with the making of it knew that section 4 of article I did not qualify the terms and words of section 2 of article I, which had just been written, after 2 hard days of debate, by the men who sat in the Convention, and who knew very well that that did not modify the qualification of electors?

So, Mr. President, when the seventeenth amendment was framed, those who drew it up went back to the very language of section 2 of article I, for the most accurate phraseology with which to describe precisely and exactly what they wished to accomplish. I dare say the language is the most precise and exact which could be devised by wise men.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to congratulate the Senator; I think he is making a very strong presentation on the particular question of the effect of the adoption of the seventeenth amendment. I wish to ask him a question in that connection. Is it not true, as a matter of construction, that when a legislative body reenacts a former provision of law it does so in the light of the construction and the manner in which the first one has been handled and viewed by the legislative bodies and the courts, and that in this case up to that time it had never been questioned that that is exactly what it meant?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. CONNALLY. And when it was reenacted by adopting it, that construction was necessarily readopted; was it not?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely correct. That construction was necessarily readopted. We never adopted any of the theories, which I have described as wild, which were advanced by Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Stevens, of Pennsylvania. But their doctrines, let me repeat, never became a part of United States law, so far as the interpretation and construction of the Constitution of the United States are concerned.

We did deal with the question of the qualification of electors in two constitutional amendments. We dealt expressly with that question. Why was there the necessity of doing so, if we already had the power to do so? Mr. President, to ask the question seems to me to answer it. We dealt with the question of the qualification of electors in two separate constitutional amendments, one the fifteenth amendment, in which we provided that—

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

We also dealt with that question in the nineteenth amendment, in which we provided that no one should be denied the privilege of voting on account of sex. Yet some of the reckless leaders of many well-meaning persons in this country talk about the fourteenth amendment as if it were something by which all citizens of the United States are given the right of suffrage, and talk about the right of suffrage as if it were a constitutional right which can be protected by Congress by prescribing what are the qualifications of electors, and by striking down any State law on the subject.

The only times in our whole history when we have dealt with the question of the qualifications of electors have been in connection with the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments. In the seventeenth amendment, which came between the fifteenth and the nineteenth, the identical language was repeated, declaring who were the qualified electors to vote in a congressional election. Yet we are asked to say that in some strange and mysterious way we have the right to add to the language of the Constitution.

I grant—I believe the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] advanced this viewpoint—that there is another provision of the Constitution which guarantees to each State a republican form of government. I am not able to discuss at this moment precisely what that means. There have been few authoritative interpretations of that provision of the Constitution, and very few decisions which deal with it in a very informative way. But whatever that power is, it does not involve the question of suffrage. It does not involve the question of the control of suffrage by the Federal Government. If a State has lost its republican form of government, then under an express constitutional grant to the Congress there is power to restore that constitutional form of government. It has nothing to do with suffrage. It is probebly true that one could imagine an extreme case in which by sapping and mining, the Federal power within a State could be so pared down as to destroy the character of the State government as a republican form of government, so as to bring into existence the express constitutional power to guarantee to each of the States a republican form of government.

Mr. President, when I try to see what my duty is, I simply look at the plain language of the Constitution and follow it through from the second section of the first article, take a look at the fourth section of the same article, at all the necessary and proper clauses in the Constitution, and then at the provision which gives to the States the power to choose their electors for President and Vice President, the States having the exclusive power to choose as they see fit, either by an election, or by authorizing the legislature to elect them. The State might authorize the Governor to appoint them, subject only to the qualifications laid down in the Constitution itself.

When we look at the amendments which have been made to the Constitution, beginning with the fifteenth, which deals expressly and directly with the question of suffrage, and the nineteenth amendment, we see that the sovereign people of this country, acting in the way prescribed in the Constitution, dealt with this very question of suffrage. Then when we look at the seventeenth amendment, which came between the fifteenth and the nineteenth, we find repeated in that amendment precisely the same language as we find in article II of section 1.

It seems to me that there can be no reasonable doubt about the meaning of the Constitution. That would be true, I think, if we had no history of the Constitutional Convention. I think it would be true if we had no decided cases upon the question. I think it would be true if it were a question of first impression, if we were looking at the question frankly and candidly to see exactly what was meant by the second section of article I of the Constitution, where it is expressly declared that the electors for Members of the Congress—and later, by the seventeenth amendment, electors for Members of the Senate—shall have the same qualifications as are required by the State in the election of the most numerous branch of its own legislature.

It seems to me that that should be the end of the whole matter. I am happy to repeat what I said in the beginning. I am not arguing this question as one who believes in the poll tax. My personal position is the other way. However, my State has a declared policy

on this matter. It is exclusively a matter for the State. I am not reading into the poll tax laws of my State any discrimination against any race or any creed, because the law is uniform. It applies to all people who fall in the classes subject to the poll tax. As a matter of fact, at any given time, perhaps more white persons are unable to vote in Georgia because of nonpayment of the poll tax than Negroes who actually have applied for the privilege of voting, or who have offered to vote. But that has nothing to do with this issue. It is not involved here. I have already stated that I would not discuss it.

However, there is one question involved here, beyond the constitutional infirmities, fatal as they are, which I think ought to be discussed. It is a very important question. It has something to do with every American State. If we can add to the qualifications, or intermeddle with the laws of the States which have fixed qualifications within the States to vote for congressional officers, then we are inviting the Federal Government to enter the States and take charge of elections. Let no Senator think that the Federal Government will not do so. Never in the whole history of this Republic have we seen a movement toward a vast and centralized power in Washington at all comparable to what we have seen in the past 10 years. If the pending bill should become a law, and the Supreme Court should sustain it, that would finish the States.

What more intimate, more highly personal matter to the citizens of every State than the right of the citizen to vote under his own laws, for his own officers? Can anyone imagine any single function of a State which is more important to the citizen, that is more to be jealously guarded, than the right to say who shall vote within the State, and what is required of an elector in the State to elect State and county officers, as well as Federal officers?

Mr. President, while I am on the subject, allow me to say that at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, not only had nine States provided for express qualification of electors within the States, not only was the argument which is now advanced in support of this bill never heard in the United States for 90 full years, except with one or two exceptions which have already been noted; and not only have the people of the United States, when dealing with this important question of suffrage of electors, amended the Constitution in the way in which the Constitution itself provided that it could be amended, but the States have always jealously guarded the right to say who is qualified to vote for officers within the State.

Not at this hour is there, nor at any time in the past has there been, any person, even the most extreme zealot, who would destroy the American Constitution, who does now or has dared to assert that the States cannot today prescribe whatever qualifications they wish to prescribe for electors to vote in all State elections for State officers, subject only to the qualification that a person cannot be denied the right to vote merely because of his color, race, or previous condition of servitude, and subject to the further qualification that women cannot be denied the right to vote since the adoption of the nineteenth amendment. Mr. President, that statement belies the pious and infamous arguments which have been advanced by men who have appeared before committees of Congress and insisted that the authority of the Congress to establish qualifications of electors for Federal office within the States is to be found in the fourteenth amendment to the American Constitution. If there is any authority in the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution which gives Congress any right to strike down a qualification which was validly enacted by a State for its own electors in voting for Federal officers, it would apply equally to the qualifications of electors in voting for State officers. Such authority does not derive from the fourteenth amendment. If it derived from the fourteenth amendment, it would be as applicable in one instance as in another. That is why proponents of this measure quibble about it, and talk about the fourth section of article I, and the proper and necessary clauses giving to the Congress the authority to carry into effect the provision of the Constitution to which I have referred.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to refer to the particular point which has been made by the Senator from Georgia, especially while he is discussing the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

Even if that amendment had the effect which the proponents of the pending measure contend, does not the amendment itself negative the contention that Congress may pass legislation of this kind, by pointing out specifically what the penalty for violation of the amendment shall be, namely, a reduction in representation?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe the Senator is entirely correct, because he is referring to the second section of the fourteenth amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, all the debates which were held on the fourteenth amendment show that it was not intended in any way to limit or to restrict the power of the States over suffrage except as provided in section 2 of the fourteenth amendment, which prescribed a remedy if the States should prohibit any persons from voting who were 21 years of age. I think the Senator is entirely correct in his statement.

I was never any more earnest about anything than I am about the point I am attempting to make. Any Senator who votes for this measure, if it shall finally become law without a constitutional amendment dealing specifically with the subject and restricting the language to the subject matter of the amendment, will live to rue the day. There is nothing more intimately and vitally connected with the sovereignty of the State, with the integrity of the home of every citizen within the State, with the peace, happiness, and welfare of every man, woman, and child within the State, than the power of his State to control its own intimate affairs, and to say who shall vote and who shall not vote in its elections for its own officers.

Section 2 of article I is not a grant of power to anybody. It simply sets up a command from the people themselves, through their representatives, to establish a government. It does not grant any power to anybody, so far as the particular question under discussion is concerned. It does not prohibit anything to the States. There may be an implied prohibition that the State cannot superadd to the qualifications of an elector in voting for a Member of Congress something over and beyond what is prescribed for an elector in voting for members of the most numerous branch of his State legislature.

The tenth amendment, which reflects the philosophy of the old Articles of Confederation, while the very heart and soul of our dual system of government, the American system of government, perhaps, as George Washington thought, was not necessary. However, as nearly all the other great leaders of the time believed it to be necessary in order that there could be no doubt about it, in express terms it was provided that nothing not specifically granted to the Federal Government or prohibited to the States shall be held to deprive the States or the people of any of the rights and powers theretofore enjoyed by them. That is the basis of the American system of government. It is not the basis that the Communist Party in America, and all its officers, into whatever party they may have gone, wish to accept as the basis of government. They want a strong central government. They wish to ignore the States. They know that they cannot go into the States and browbeat and coerce men standing in sight of their homes into abandoning and betraying America, but they think they can concentrate their power on the National Legislature, and can bring so much pressure to bear upon it as to force its Members to grant their wishes.

Mr. President, human liberty depends finally and at last upon local self-government, upon government administered by local officials, selected by the people of the community, responsive to public opinion in the community. The farther we travel away from self-government, even local self-government, the farther we travel away from freedom itself.

That is why the O. P. A. is not a very popular agency. It is administered by men who have not been elected by anybody over whom they serve. They have been appointed by the executive branch of the Government, though under an act of the Congress, it is true. I am not criticizing them; but that is why so many of their orders, so many of their rulings, so many of their restrictions are found to be objectionable to a people accustomed to freedom, to a self-governing people. On that subject, Mr. President, allow me to say that the one certain way through which men have lost the right of self-government, or even the

capacity to govern themselves, has been through the neglect to assert and to exercise that right.

So it is by all odds the most important issue that can come before the Congress. And it comes here at a time when we have granted extraordinary powers to other branches of the Government for the necessary and proper prosecution of the greatest war in human history; it comes here under the whip and spur of men of alien philosophy, un-American to the very heart and core; it comes here under the plausible plea that some States are doing what others do not want them to do, and therefore it is sought to have the Federal Congress step in and take those States by the throat and force them to do what it is desired they shall do. This is but the first step toward the complete and absolute centralization at Washington of all power over the people, because when the people of any State lose the power to say who shall vote in their State for sheriff, for member of the legislature, or for any other officer elected by them, whenever that power is circumscribed, save under some great impulse that may spell itself out in an amendment like the fifteenth or the nineteenth amendment, then that State has lost its power to preserve its liberty and the liberty of its citizens and must depend upon a strong central government here in Washington. That is precisely what is here involved. This strange doctrine was not heard of in the Congress until 1924. It comes right out of the communistic doctrine, right out the very campaign literature of the Communists.

I do not quarrel with the fight against the poll tax. I have said that personally I do not favor it. There are only eight States that have it now, and steps are already under way in about three of those States to abolish it. Probably in time it will be abolished, and certainly it will be if the sentiment against it grows throughout the country and in those States, but those States themselves should be left free to prescribe the qualifications of their own electors; and the Constitution in express terms has said that whatever they prescribe as the qualifications of their electors for the most numerous branch of their legislatures shall be the qualifications of the electors in elections for Representatives in Congress and for Senators.

It is not a matter of such tremendous importance whether Georgia or any other State having a poll tax may abolish it; but it is a matter of supreme importance when the right is asserted to be in the Congress of the United States to step within those States and say "We do not like the qualifications you prescribe for your electors and we are going to change them; we are going to add something to them or are going to interpret them; we are going to exercise our prerogative about it." That goes to the root of local self-government; that is a fatal assault upon the dual system of American government, the American system itself; and that at this time under the whip or spur of alien philosophy and alien teaching is the culminating assault upon anything like a constitutional system of government in America.

Mr. President, it ought not to be necessary for any man to stand here and do more than to read the passages from the Constitution which I have read. It ought not to be a question here of whether some of the practices of Indiana are offensive to some of the people in Georgia, or even the majority of them, or whether the practices of Alabama, under her local laws, the laws governing her most intimate and sacred rights and privileges, to wit, her suffrage laws, are pleasing or displeasing to a vast majority of the people of many other American States. That is not the question. The question is whether we are willing to say to every man who comes here, "If you can amend this Constitution, as it provides, all well and good, but you cannot come here and force through the Congress of the United States legislation which will in its effect destroy our very system of government." We have seen too clearly the unmistakable and at times the almost inevitable drift to concentrate power in one branch of this government to be unmindful of what is now implied.

I do not say that that motive actuates everyone who is opposed to the poll tax. I myself do not like it. I do not say that many good men have not reached the conclusion that the poll tax in some States other than their own should be abolished and that are willing to do anything they can to bring that about. But I do warn that this interference and intermeddling, especially under leadership alien and foreign to America, alien and foreign to American philosophy, and alien and foreign to American thought, is one of the most dangerous things that has been presented to the Congress, certainly since I came here.

Mr. President, I express the profound hope, and back of it is a certain confidence, that the American Senate will not take this step, because the inevitable consequence of this step will be to hasten the day when the States and local communities will have lost all power and all control over their legislative bodies and over their own local affairs.

If it is possible to read in the necessary and proper clauses of the Constitution authority to change the plain requirements of section 2 of article I, and of the same language in the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, there can be read in the necessary and proper clause power to do anything that a power-mad, selfish group wishes to do in America.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I realize the difficulties which are encountered in an attempt to follow a man with the ability of the distinguished Senator [Mr. GEORGE] who has just taken his seat. He is an able constitutional lawyer, he is a distinguished Member of this body, and he is one of the most effective debaters in the Senate. But, Mr. President, there is another side to this debate. There are a great many people in the United States who are now denied the right to vote who should have a voice, an advocate, and a champion in this Chamber.

Before I discuss the merits of the pending bill, I wish first of all to compliment and commend the opponents of the measure for their fairness and for the consideration they have accorded the advocates of the bill in permitting it, without obstruction, to be made the pending order of business. I believe that was a gracious gesture, and one which I know is generally appreciated.

I believe I can say for the supporters of the measure that they, too, have been very considerate. Under the leadership of Chairman Van Nuys, this bill was delayed so as not to interfere with vital emergency and war legislation. Careful consideration was given by him and by those interested in the bill to the problems which were pending before the various committees of the Senate. Consideration was also given to the individual Senators who had problems with which they themselves were deeply concerned, and which they wanted to have considered before this matter was made the subject of debate on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, the bill has been very carefully considered. Perhaps no bill in this Congress has received the meticulous consideration and the detailed study accorded the pending bill. True, it has been before the Senate on previous occasions, it has been the subject of exhaustive hearings on previous occasions, but the particular bill now before us, a House bill, was before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate for at least 5 months prior to being reported, and approximately 5 months on the calendar before it was brought up for consideration. During all that time there has been much discussion of the bill and ample opportunity to study it. So it comes before the Senate a well-considered proposal.

The bill was introduced in the House of Representatives at the beginning of this Congress. It is a coalition measure, which resulted from the introduction of at least five bills in the House. Representatives MAGNUSON of Washington; BALDWIN of New York; GAVAGAN of New York; BENDER of Ohio; MARCANTONIO of New York; and DAY of Illinois, introduced bills on this question. They were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for committee consideration, and from the committee came the bill which we are now called upon to consider.

Mr. President, the pending bill is one which deals with a national question, a Federal matter. It has to do with Federal Representatives and their election, as well as the election of President and Vice President of the United States. It has nothing to do with the election of State officials, nor does it in any way interfere in purely State campaigns or elections. It is a national question, a question which deals with a national problem, and one inherent in this Federal set-up of ours.

The bill is not, as has been inferred, the creation of any individual, or the pet object of any particular group.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator whether it has not received the approval and the very active encouragement of the New York State Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, and is it not true that within the last few days a committee from that organization has called on the Senator from New York and urged

him to press and push forward the pending bill in any way he could? Is that not correct? I read a statement in a New York newspaper that that was true. I ask the question of the Senator from New York because I understood the committee was here and called on the Senator. I do not know whether the Senator saw the committee, but the newspaper stated that the Senator had seen the committee. Is not the bill now before the Senate, the bill which is favored by the New York State Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I intended to come to that subject a little later in my speech, but I will say to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, that a great many organizations have endorsed the bill. I do not recall that that particular organization or a representative body of that particular organization called upon me this week. They may have called upon me today. A great many organizations have called upon me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have their names as reported by the newspaper as having called on the Senator, and if the Senator does not object I shall be glad to refresh his memory by giving the names.

Mr. MEAD. No, that would not be necessary. It would not add to the argument I am advancing. A great many organizations representing a great segment of our population have called upon me. It is their right to do so. I am sure the Senator has no objection to their calling upon me.

Mr. McKELLAR. None whatever, but when the Senator from New York was giving the history of the bill——

Mr. MEAD. But I did not get a chance to give the history of the bill, because I had barely started when my distinguished colleague asked me a question which I was later going to deal with and answer.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will. I want to know whether the bill is not favored by the New York State Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax?

Mr. MEAD. If the Senator from Tennessee will exercise a little patience, I express the hope that I will win him over to my side of the argument.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am afraid the Senator is expressing a very forlorn hope. My good friend the Senator from New York is very optimistic.

Mr. MEAD. The mere fact that I have the Senator from Tennessee smiling makes me feel better.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as I was saying, the bill has been carefully considered. It has been before this body and before the House of Representatives on several occasions. It received the emphatic, overwhelming endorsement of the House of Representatives on a number of occasions, and Members from the deep South joined with Members from the North and the West in their enthusisatic advocacy of the bill. These Members came not from any one section of the country but from every section of the United States, and they were not the communistic influences that Senators have been talking about on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. Those who sponsor the bill, I am sure Senators will all admit, are not Communists. Certainly the emphatic vote of the House of Representatives, numbering on one occasion 251, on another occasion 265, on another occasion 286, is, in my judgment, an overwhelming endorsement which ought to impress itself upon the Members of the Senate, or at least cause them to refrain from leaving the impression that the bill grows out of a communistic effort to impose alien ideas upon our Government.

Mr. President, the Gallup poll, conducted in every State in the Union, when it presented two questions, one having to do with the conduct of the filibuster and the other going right to the heart of the issue, "Do you favor the repeal of the poll tax?", resulted in a victory in almost every State in the Union for abolition of the poll tax, and resulted in a similar victory in the deep South when it had an opportunity to go to the people, just as would happen if the pending bill were to have an opportunity to go to the people, and just as it did in the House where it had an opportunity to come to a vote.

Mr. President, the bill was endorsed by a great instrumentality of this body; it was endorsed and approved by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. Who are its members? How are they selected? Are they usually selected because they know nothing of the law? Are the men who serve on the Committees on the Judiciary, who are called upon to pass on legislation, unfamiliar with the Constitution? Are they without knowledge of the law?

Mr. President, if Senators will read the roll of the members of the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and of the House, I am sure they will agree with me that lay Members of this body are absolutely within their rights in accepting guidance from the legal minds that have not once, not twice, but on a number of occasions passed on the constitutionality, so far as they can, so far as their authority permits, of the bill which is now before the Senate. In my judgment, the men who have served 5 years, 10 years, some of them 20 years on the Committee on the Judiciary, have risen to the height where then can rightfully be called legal experts. They may not always be right, but, Mr. President, when they have passed upon a problem on numerous occasions there should at least be doubt in the minds even of those who oppose the measure, and in my judgment we should all be satisfied to pass the question on to the courts, whose duty it is, whose prerogative it is ultimately to decide as to the constitutionality of the measure.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STEWART. The seventeenth amendment to the Constitution requires the election of Members of the Senate to be by vote of the people. That amendment provides in part that the electors in each State—that is, of course, persons who vote for candidates for the Senate—shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The same provision appears in the original Constitution with respect to the election of the Members of the House. Suppose the pending bill, H. R. 7, should be passed, and as the Senator from New York has already stated, would apply to the President, Vice President, and Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; suppose then that in a state such as Tennessee, my State, which has a poll-tax law, that law should not be repealed by the State; suppose that House bill 7 becomes law. When the November election this year comes around, assuming that a Senator were to be elected from Tennessee, and, of course, the Members of the House are to be elected—under the law of Tennessee the electors voting for the most numerous branch of the State legislature would be required to pay a poll tax. If House bill 7 were passed, would there not then be a conflict between the provisions of the law and the Constitution?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am not a lawyer, and, of course, I could not attempt to debate a legal or constitutional question with so distinguished or able a lawyer as my brilliant friend and colleague the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. However, I am sustained in my decision in part by another distinguished lawyer from Tennessee who voted for this bill when it was before the House of Representatives. He said—and I quote from the RECORD:

> This bill can be sustained under three provisions of the Constitution. It can be sustained as constitutional under the fourteenth amendment, first section, which provides that no State shall make or enforce any law that infringes the immunities and privileges of the citizens.

Then he went on to say, among other things:

> The second provision under which this legislation can be sustained as constitutional is under the fourth section of article I of the Constitution, which gives the Congress the reserved right to regulate the time, the place, and the manner of holding elections. As has been stated in many cases, "in the manner" covers a multitude of situations.

I have quoted at random from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from a very able address made in the other House by a very distinguished Representative from the State of Tennessee. Not being a lawyer, I must of necessity look to my colleagues for guidance.

But, Mr. President, as I have said, the Judiciary Committee of the House, the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and all the lawyers who are associated with me have sufficiently sustained me in the thought that the bill was and is constitutional.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I believe the Senator will agree that, of course, that argument is not responsive to the point I have undertaken to make. I read from the seventeenth amendment, which in fact was ratified after the fourteenth amendment was ratified. If there should be any conflict, I assume the provisions of the amendment later adopted would control.

The first point I have undertaken to make is simply that in construing the seventeenth amendment the electors, namely, those in Tennessee, or in any

other State, who vote for Members of the Senate must be qualified according to the provision—

Shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

One of the qualifications in Tennessee is that they must pay their poll tax before they can vote for the members of the State legislature. But if the pending bill is enacted into law, certainly there will be a serious conflict between the provisions of the bill and the constitutional provision. How could voters who have not paid their poll tax, and who therefore cannot vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the Tennessee Legislature, vote for candidates for the Senate? That is the point I was making.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I suppose the constitutional provision with reference to the election of Senators is a restatement of what was provided in the Constitution with reference to the election of Federal officials generally. I presume that amendment, when we consider as a whole the philosophy underlying it, as in the case of the philosophy underlying the nineteenth amendment, is in keeping with the trend of our times; namely, to expand, to become more liberal, to add to the number of those who may vote, and to add to the interest in voting. That very trend, according to statements I have recently read, emanating from the courts, has reached the courts, because their statements and their decisions have been more liberal and more insistent upon a wider participation in suffrage. I wish to congratulate the leaders in the legislative bodies of Tennessee, because within recent years they have endeavored to eliminate the poll tax. In fact, they did so by act of the legislature; but I understand that, unfortunately, the courts held it would have to be done through the medium of a constitutional amendment. In view of the attitude of the State of Tennessee on the question of the poll tax, and its effort to get rid of this obstacle, this barrier, I am sure it would not find any difficulty in summoning the legislature and correcting the situation which my able friend the Senator from Tennessee has brought to the attention of the Senate. If I were a constitutional expert with his knowledge of the Constitution, probably I would be able to prescribe a very brief method of procedure to that end. But, again, I must be sustained by the wholesome attitude taken by the people of Tennessee when they recently repealed the poll tax. In that endeavor I can find hope that this problem will be properly handled or corrected as soon as we pass the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has spoken of the philosophy underlying the nineteenth amendment, and has said it was the trend of our times to expand the suffrage. Is not the fact that the Constitution had to be amended in order to give women the right to vote, conclusive proof that Congress does not have the right to pass the pending bill which would expand the suffrage?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct; in that instance the Constitution was amended. But I am citing a number of instances which have occurred not only in the United States, but also in other nations. Mr. President, in some countries people who do not vote are fined. The trend is altogether different than it was centuries ago, when democracy was an experiment, and when only a few people—and they had practically no knowledge of it—believed it could be successful.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, is it the Senator's argument that a trend over the world and events over the world should change the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. MEAD. Oh, no. I do not believe I contended that. But a trend any place has the power to move men; and, as Jefferson well said, the Constitution is not a static instrument, but it should be changed when the will of men so decides. It is a living instrument, and it grows with the people.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the rights guaranteed by the Constitution are to be changed at the will of men and mankind, what is the Constitution worth? Is not the object of the Constitution to maintain certain fixed rights and certain fixed values?

Mr. MEAD. When I talk about the will of men in this case, I am talking about the will of Americans. If we had a Constitution that the will of the people of America today could not change or alter or modify, then the Constitution would not be the Constitution that our forefathers promised it would be.

Mr. EASTLAND. But does not the Constitution which our forefathers themselves set up provide a method of changing, modifying, or altering it?

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes. Let me point out that some time ago the Congress proposed an amendment to do away with child labor. That amendment is hidden away in the pigeonholes of some of the legislative bodies of the country. But after that the Congress took up the subject and enacted a statute which the Supreme Court held was constitutional. I hold that this measure will follow the same procedure, and receive the approval of the Court.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, I am unable to predict what the Court will do. I will say frankly that I have no confidence in the ability of our present Supreme Court. But the Senator argued that this bill was constitutional under the fourteenth amendment, dealing with the privileges and immunities of citizenship.

Mr. MEAD. Allow me to correct the Senator. I read an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, quoting the statement of a Representative in Congress. I stated that I was not a constitutional expert.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then that is not the Senator's argument?

Mr. MEAD. I was reading from the statement of a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to read from a very noted case in which the Supreme Court of the United States took issue with that doctrine.

Mr. MEAD. I am sure it would only sustain the Senator's present position and leave mine as it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator about an entirely different matter. The Senator is a very vigorous, determined, whole-hearted, whole-souled Democrat. He is very much devoted to his party. I profess the same devotion. I am one of those peculiar men who believe very strongly in the Democratic Party. I have nothing in the world against our Republican friends except a difference of opinion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator does not wish to create the impression that he became that way recently, does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but I am like the Senator from New York; we are both whole-souled, genuine Democrats.

A while ago the Senator was asked if this was a Democratic measure. I understood the Senator to say that it was.

Mr. MEAD. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. I find, from an examination of the Congressional Directory, that Mr. MARCANTONIO, of New York City, is not listed as a Democrat. He is listed as a member of the American Labor Party. He wrote this bill and introduced it. The committee reported it, and the House passed it word for word as Mr. MARCANTONIO wrote it. Therefore it comes here with the support of the American Labor Party. I am wondering whether at this time, during a Presidential campaign, the Senator thinks it is wise, politically, to bring up a controversial measure such as this, raising questions which arouse animosity. Is this a good time politically for Democrats to be taking up an unquestioned labor measure?

I have before me the language of the original bill, and the bill as it passed the House. I have compared the two, word for word. Later I shall place them in the RECORD. This is an American Labor Party bill, and not a Democratic measure at all. The astonishing thing to me is to find my good friend advocating the bill of another party organization. We have been fighting side by side for many years—so long that probably neither of us knows exactly how long it has been. We served in the House together, and we have served in the Senate together. All this time we have been fighting for the principles and policies of our party; and at this late date I find him advocating the bill of another party organization, a measure which is likely to injure the best interests of our own party in a Presidential election year. It seems to me that from the party standpoint, if no other, the Senator might well wait until later, when we can discuss these questions to better advantage from the viewpoint of our own party.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if this were the evil measure which my lovable colleague would lead me to believe it is, I should have a most difficult time consoling myself with the several votes which it received from Tennessee when it was brought upon the floor of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very sorry that any Representative from Tennessee voted for such a bill, which flies in the face of the Constitution. Even Tennesseeans, good people as they are, and good Representatives as they are, sometimes make mistakes. I think the Senator is making a mistake now. This is one occasion when I do not think I am making a mistake. I am so devoted to the Constitution that I do not think we ought to put anything in its way. We ought to stand by it. It has brought America to the position which she now occupies, and we ought to stand by it.

Mr. MEAD. Without referring to the record, I can think of three Tennesseans who, judging from their statements, are sure that the Senator from Tennessee is making a very serious mistake.

Mr. President, with reference to the political sponsorship of this bill, which is questioned by my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, let me reiterate that the bill was introduced in the House by Representative Geyer of California, and subsequently by Representative Magnuson of Washington, Baldwin of New York—no one could ever convict Representative Baldwin of New York of being a Communist or a radical—Day of Illinois, Gavagan of New York, Bender of Ohio, and Marcantonio of New York.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. While the Senator is discussing the influences behind the sponsors of the bill——

Mr. MEAD. I am defending the sponsors. Others have questioned the influences. I have not.

Mr. BILBO. Let me ask the Senator, Is it not a fact that the Communist Party is the first party to go on record in favor of the proposed legislation?

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion that that is not true. I should have to examine the record, but it is my opinion that that statement is not true.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Let me give the Senator the satisfaction of listening to this statement.

President Roosevelt, in his press conference on February 13, 1942, denounced the levying of poll taxes as a practice which has prevented many poor people from voting. He said that all his life he had been opposed to such levies. No one would question the integrity of the statement or the fidelity to the American Constitution of the President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me to reply to that statement, let me say that if the question should arise in Tennessee tomorrow, and I had the privilege of voting for or against the poll tax, I think I would vote against the imposition of a poll tax. But bringing it up in Tennessee is the proper and legal way to get rid of the poll tax. Violating the Federal Constitution is not the way to get rid of the poll tax. The President did not advocate violation of the Constitution in order to carry out his views, and neither do I.

Mr. MEAD. However, the President and the present speaker, and I am referring to myself, are unanimous in their efforts to eliminate the poll tax. I should be very happy to have the Senator go along with me and send the bill to the President, to test him on that point.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is our duty to pass upon proposed legislation. Then, when it reaches the President, let him pass upon it.

Mr. MEAD. Certainly, I believe that the Judiciary Committee of the House and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate have already done a very good job along that line.

As I stated in the beginning, I am not a lawyer. I am certainly not an expert on the Constitution. However, in order to give a brief summation of the record which I read in arriving at a determination as to the constitutionality of the bill, let me refer to the very excellent record which was made before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on October 25 and 26, and November 2, 1943. I shall read from a statement by Joseph A. Padway, general counsel of the American Federation of Labor, before that committee, to give some idea of the support for the bill, which I think differs from the support which has been emphasized in the Senate. Mr. Padway said:

> Before I address myself directly to the constitutionality of H. R. 7, permit me to say that the American Federation of Labor as never before in its history is pressing for the passage of Federal anti-poll-tax legislation.

He points out that the American Federation of Labor has always been in favor of the abolition of the poll tax. He further states:

> I wish to submit for the RECORD two letters of President William Green, dated June 7 and September 14, 1943.

In order to add to what has heretofore been emphasized before the Senate, allow me to read from President Green's letter:

> I hope that not only the officers of affiliated unions but many thousands of individual members affiliated with State federations of labor, central labor unions, and those who are members of Federal labor unions will communicate with their respective United States Senators urging them and appealing to them to vote in favor of H. R. 7, anti-poll-tax legislation. By taking this action you will help us in our fight here to carry out instructions of American Federation of Labor conventions and to bring about the enactment of anti-poll-tax legislation.

The letter is signed "William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor."

I have read the letter because so far there has not been emphasized the support and the sustaining assistance which the American Federation of Labor has rendered in this connection.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be accused of being partisan. This matter is not a partisan one. I do not believe I should alienate any of my good Republican friends by allowing the RECORD to stand with a quotation from the leader of the Democratic Party. If Senators will be patient with me, I shall insert in the RECORD a quotation from one of the leaders of the Republican Party in order to show that both parties are in favor of the proposed legislation, at least so far as the President of one party and the candidate for the Presidency of another party are concerned.

Governor Dewey had an anti-poll-tax plank in his gubernatorial platform, which he approved.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Therefore, Mr. President, I have presented a new name merely to deemphasize the element which has been overemphasized as being the only group which has a copyright on the proposed legislation.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New York has stated that Governor Dewey had an anti-poll-tax plank in his platform. Was that plank put into the platform while Governor Dewey was a candidate for Governor of New York?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Did New York have a poll-tax statute which Governor Dewey was seeking to have repealed?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I cannot tell the Senator from New Mexico what prompted the insertion of the poll-tax plank in the platform of Governor Dewey when he was seeking to be elected as Governor of the State of New York.

Mr. HATCH. If in seeking to be elected as Governor of the State of New York, Mr. Dewey had an anti-poll-tax plank in his platform which would repeal the poll-tax statute in the State of Tennessee, for instance, was he seeking to have New York repeal the poll-tax statute in Tennessee?

Mr. MEAD. It is difficult for me to understand, but an anti-poll-tax plank was in Governor Dewey's platform.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New York quoted with approval Governor Dewey. I was thinking that Governor Dewey was not a candidate for election as Governor of New York State on a platform containing an anti-poll-tax plank which would apply to a repeal of the poll tax in other States. If he had such a purpose he has been somewhat overrated, it seems to me, because ordinarily State officials restrict their activities to their own States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as the Senator from Tennessee has suggested, Governor Dewey perhaps somewhat overrated himself.

Mr. McKELLAR. He was overrating himself, or overrating the vote which he expected to receive as a result of the insertion in his platform of a plank of the nature to which the Senator has made reference.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York about Mr. Padway. Is Mr. Padway a Democrat?

Mr. MEAD. I know nothing about his politics.

Mr. McKELLAR. What about Mr. Hillman? He is one of those who has made a fight for this bill. Mr. MARCANTONIO, a Member of the other House, has also been strongly in favor of the bill. I understand that Mr. Hillman and Mr. MARCANTONIO are members of the Labor Party. The Senator from New York seems to be following their lead in this matter. Am I correct?

Mr. MEAD. I thought that by quoting distinguished American leaders I could win the Senator over to the belief that the desire for the proposed legislation is universal, and that strong segments of all parties favor the pending bill. However, some of the witnesses to whom I have referred unfortunately have not accomplished very much, and so I shall have to rely on the Senator to believe me when I assert that the record in the House and the record from the Judiciary Committee of the Senate would lead me to believe that all parties are interested—not merely one of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, allow me to ask the Senator a plain question. I firmly and earnestly believe the proposed bill to be unconstitutional. Does the Senator believe that under our system of government, after I had walked up to the Vice President's desk, held up my hand to God Almighty and taken an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, I would submit my view concerning the pending matter to a referendum of important men like Mr. Dewey, Mr. Padway, Mr. Marcantonio, and the other gentlemen whom the Senator from New York has cited?

Mr. MEAD. I did not cite them for that purpose. I cited excellent lawyers who are in the other House, and lawyers who are on the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. They were carefully selected for the purpose of passing upon matters of this nature. I cited those men, and also legal arguments which were made at the hearings, as sustaining influences, so far as I am concerned, with regard to the constitutionality of the pending bill. I cited the President, a Governor, leading members of the legislature, and the American Federation of Labor in order to answer the argument made by my distinguished colleague that the Communist influence was the predominating influence back of this bill. I assert that it was not. I say that the Republican influence, the Democratic influence, and the influence of the great common people of America, are the real influences back of this bill. The Gallup poll, which was taken some time ago, indicated that there was widespread interest, even in the Southern States, in the repeal of the poll-tax law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall later refer to the question of leadership in the Southern States by reading an article tomorrow which appeared in the New York Times of last Sunday, as I recall, in which reference was made to the president of the New York State Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax. It is one of the reasons why I desired awhile ago to ask about the delegation which waited upon the Senator. The president of the New York State Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax is a man by the name of Jennings Perry, who is the editor of the Nashville Tennesseean. In the article Mr. Perry said that he represented the views of southern people and that they were not represented by the Representatives and Senators in Congress. I find that Mr. Perry is the president of the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax. In other words, this man whom various people—people from New York principally, but also from other States—have elected the head of the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax is also editor of the Nashville Tennesseean. They have taken a southern man under their wing and they are now quoting him as being the exponent of southern opinion. I wish to say to the Senator that Mr. Perry does not represent the views of the people of my State or the people of my area. I say that such views as he expressed in the New York Times on last Sunday were an outrage upon constitutional government in this country and an outrage upon law and order and decency. He does not represent one one-hundredth percent of the people of Tennessee when he makes that public statement.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I realize by the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Tennessee that he has gone deeper into the subject he advances than I have.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and I shall give the Senator all the details tomorrow.

Mr. MEAD. Therefore we can expect to hear further from the Senator from Tennessee tomorrow, and it will not be necessary for me to go further into that subject.

I said a moment ago that I found support for my views in the hearings and in the record, the record that brought the bill before the Senate after it had gone through the various parliamentary steps. I read from the record a quotation from Mr. James Madison. He said:

> Who are to be the electors of the Federal representatives? Not the rich, more than the poor; not the learned more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, when millions are denied the right to vote, then the electors are not the great body of the people of the United States. I for one want the poor, I want those who cannot pay their poll taxes, I want the humble citizen who is now answering the call to duty to enjoy the privilege of voting.

Alexander Hamilton, Mr. President, made this comment:

> Nothing can be more evident than that exclusive power of regulating elections for the National Government in the hands of State legislatures would leave the existence of the Union entirely in their mercy.

Alexander Hamilton goes on to say:

> They could at any moment annihilate it by neglecting to provide for the choice of persons to administer its affairs.

He goes on to say:

> It is to little purpose that a neglect or omission of this kind would not be likely to take place. The constitutional possibility of the thing without an equivalent for the risk is an unanswerable objection. Nor has any satisfactory reason been yet assigned for incurring that risk.

Mr. President, I referred to trends a little while ago, and I said that ever since the American Republic paved the way for democracy to live and flourish all over the world, because we made good with this experiment in government here in America, the trend has been to be more liberal, to extend the franchise, to excite the interest of all the people in the affairs of the Nation. The Congress recognized its authority regarding the qualifications of electors for Federal officers when it recently enacted, in September 1942, the bill which gave to men in the service the right to vote. That bill contained this provision:

> No person in military service in time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

Mr. President, that shows the developing trend, the trend which was evident when the Congress adopted the nineteenth amendment, an amendment which was very wholesome and should have been adopted even before it finally was added to the Constitution. This trend has been indicated in the action of congressional committees that during a period of years have been making it less difficult, insofar as they could, for the Indians of the Nation to participate in the right of citizenship and the right of franchise. This trend has been indicated by the repeal of the poll tax in many States, in several of which it was repealed because of the corruption that resulted from its application.

So, Mr. President, from 1789 all the way down to 1943, while the democratic experiment was proving itself, the Congress, in response to the will of the people, has been eliminating one obstacle after another so that the masses of our citizens could participate in the basic privileges that go with citizenship.

There was a time in the early history of our country, when democracy had not yet proved itself, when traffic in slaves was still tolerated, when education was costly and not the prerogative of the poor. There were in those days defenders of such impositions as the poll tax, as we know it. But those days are past, those times are gone, and in modern America there is no excuse and no reason offered in support of the poll tax, and no defense, and, I am happy to say, so far as this debate is concerned, no advocate, no champion, no defender, of the poll tax. All are against the poll tax—but.

Mr. President, the radicals who have been discussed in this Chamber by others did not bring the pending bill before us. The reason for the bill, the imposition of the poll tax, creates radicalism, stimulates radicalism, and remains a source of radicalism, and will so remain until all the people of this country are permitted to enjoy the responsibilities of citizenship.

Mr. President, prevent a great segment of our population from enjoying the privileges in which we rightfully participate, and you create discontent. Radicalism is a natural outgrowth where inequality and injustice create discontent. Give the citizens of America, who are denied the right to vote, a share in the responsibility of government, and you rid the country of one of the causes of the radicalism which is held up to us as being the source of the proposed legislation we are now discussing. Penalize the poor man and favor the rich, and you create a caste system in our democracy. I know of no rich man who wants established an order which would create a caste system in our country. If men are illiterate, let us educate them. If they are poor because they are without employment, give them the opportunity which every citizen of our country has a right to enjoy.

Mr. President, we are criticized because we bring forward this measure in time of national emergency. No time is more appropriate. Every country in the world engaged in the present conflict is considering and promising privileges to its citizens, or citizens of countries which they are attempting to influence. For instance, the Japanese are busy conducting psychological warfare among the Burmese, the Indians, and the population of China and of Indochina. They are telling them that when the war is over they will give them the rights of citizenship. The great British Government sent the Cripps commission to India in an attempt to set up a more satisfactory government than the one which now exists there. When the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom met in the middle of the Atlantic they drew up a document which gave hope to the oppressed and the subjugated and the regimented all over the world, including those in our country who have yet to enjoy the right to vote. Who can read the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," or any other declaration enunciated by the leaders of the United Nations of the world, without seeing in them the hope—sometimes the strong hope—that we shall live in a better-ordered world, where all people, rich and poor, will enjoy the dignity of full and complete citizenship?

In this time of emergency, when we want a united citizenship; in this time of an all-out war, when any man, regardless of his race, color, or creed, is good enough to fight, he is good enough, in my judgment, to vote without first of all paying a poll tax. The passage of the pending bill, in keeping with the trend of our time, in harmony with the philosophy of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," will do much to stimulate morale and to sustain our people in the great contest in which they are now willingly making sacrifice.

Again we hear objection founded upon States' rights, and in that category I presume we have all at some time or other been listed as offenders. We have, perhaps, on numerous occasions been accused of invading the rights of States by our support and approval of legislation objectionable to States other than our own. Not long ago those of us from New York assailed those who were sponsoring national prohibition. We held it up as an invasion of the rights of our State. Yet some of those who advocate the enactment of national prohibition, and who favor legislation of that character today, find fault with those of us who would invade their States, as they claim, by insisting that their people shall have the right to participate with us in the election of Federal Representatives in our National Government.

There were even some objections to the adoption of the wholesome suffrage amendment. Again, when agricultural matters were brought before the Senate, or matters pertaining to education or to banking, to say nothing of drinking, men rose and railed against others, so much so that the record is probably a hodgepodge, with Senators for and against according to the objective of the measure under consideration.

Mr. President, the matter of States' rights can be dispensed with if one will read the roll calls in the House and Senate, which show that men all the way from Maine to Texas, and from Washington to Oregon and Florida, in the Senate and in the House, voted for the type of legislation we are now considering.

What has happened? Has the imposition of the tax taken from any segment of our population the right of voting? According to official figures given after the 1940 Presidential election, 71 out of every 100 voted in the States where no poll tax existed, while in the poll-tax States 22 out of each 100 voted. Of course, I realize that there is more reason for that condition than what I am explaining, but it proves that there is a lack of interest in the Presidential election which does not augur well for the well-being of our democracy. There should be excited a greater degree of rivalry and interest, so that a larger number of people would participate in the selection of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and the President of the United States.

Mr. President, a fairer comparison, one with which no one will find fault, I am sure, one which brings out forcefully the good effect of ridding a State of a poll tax, and removing its evil effects is found in two contiguous States, the State of Kentucky and the State of Tennessee.

In Kentucky, where no poll tax exists, 60 out of every 100 persons voted in the last national election for Presidential electors. Next door to the State of Kentucky, in the State of Tennessee, where a wholesome effort was made recently to rid the State of the poll tax, only 31 out of every 100 persons participated in the continuation of our National Government, so far as electing a President, Vice President, and Members of the National Congress are concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator a record of Louisiana in that election?

Mr. MEAD. No; I am sorry to say that I have not.

Mr. ELLENDER. We do not have a poll tax in Louisiana. I think the reason why the number of persons who voted in Tennessee was so low is that Tennessee is mostly Democratic. That is the reason so few persons voted in the Presidential election.

Mr. MEAD. It may be true that Tennessee is mostly Democratic, but it has been a close State on a number of occasions. Tennessee has Republican representation in the House. Kentucky has Republican representation in the House. I gave the results in these two border States, where the colored population is equal. I thought Tennessee and Kentucky would be the best States I could use as examples to point out the benefits which would result from repealing the poll tax, as against the alleged detriment resulting from the repeal of the poll tax. I am sorry I do not have the figures for Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator have any figures for Virginia? Virginia is a border State.

Mr. MEAD. Yes. My understanding is that in Virginia the number of individuals who voted out of every 100 persons was still lower than in Tennessee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume the reason for that is that Virginia, like Tennessee, is mostly Democratic. That is why so few persons take interest in the Presidential election.

Mr. MEAD. I said a while ago that it is unfortunate that so few individuals participate in a national election. I explained that in some of the States a reason could be found. The reason is that which the Senator from Louisiana has just pointed out. Therefore I took Tennessee and Kentucky as illustrations. Both Tennessee and Kentucky have Republican representation in the House. The colored population is equal in both States. Other things also go to make the 2 States the best States to compare and to judge the benefit resulting from the repeal of the poll tax. In Kentucky, which has no poll tax, 60 out of every 100 persons participated in the election. In Tennessee, which has a poll tax, 31 out of every 100 persons participated. It is reported that altogether 10,000,000 individuals in the Southern States eligible to vote did not vote in that general election.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say that in my own State, which has no poll tax, where 650,000 individuals are registered to vote, I doubt, because there is no Republican opposition, if as many as 100,000 will vote in the forthcoming Presidential election. Therefore the comparison which the Senator made is not a fair one.

Mr. MEAD. The comparison between Kentucky and Tennessee I still maintain is the fairest one that can be made.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Oftentimes in Tennessee we do not have Republican opposition in the November election, and the vote in the November election frequently

is less than the vote in the preceding primary. I have just returned to the Senate Chamber and do not know what particular year the Senator from New York has chosen for the purpose of his comparison. I do not know what the issues were which were being decided at the time, nor do I know who the candidates were. I think it is highly important to know the candidates and the issues, because the result in Tennessee goes almost as often one way as it does the other. I believe that is a substantially correct statement.

Mr. MEAD. I am sorry my distinguished colleague was not in the Senate Chamber when I began my statement. I express the hope that when the Senator runs again and again he will have no Republican opposition whatsoever.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator very much. I would be very much more afraid of Democratic opposition in Tennessee than I would of Republican opposition.

Mr. MEAD. I will cover that field also by expressing the hope that the Senator will have no Democratic opposition.

Mr. STEWART. Again I thank the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I shall conclude my statement in a very few minutes. As I said in the beginning, the bill seeks to affect elections for Federal officers. It has to do only with the National Government. It in no wise concerns itself with State elections or with State officials. It deals only with a national question. I again say that this is the appropriate time to pass legislation of this character and to give to the people who have so long been denied it the basic right to vote, a privilege which in my judgment should have been given to them a long time ago.

If we recruit our military personnel, as we do under the Selective Service Act, equally throughout the 48 States, if we call to the colors the children of the rich, and the boys and girls of the poor, if we call those who can pay their poll taxes and those who are without funds, if our boys and girls can wear the colors of the Army or the Navy and other branches of the service, if they are called upon to sacrifice their all for their country, as thousands of them have done and millions of them in the four corners of the world have indicated their willingness to do since the war began—and many hundreds of thousands of them may find themselves in the battle line before this debate is over—then I ask, Mr. President, how can a Member of this body, sustained, protected, and defended as we all are by the heroic sons of every State in the Union, fighting on the beachheads of Europe, preparing for the invasion of the Continent, struggling in the islands of the South Pacific, beating back the foe that would destroy the very form of government we have enjoyed so long, deny to them, or to their people, the right to participate in the forthcoming election, or in the succeeding elections when many of us will be candidates for the positions we now hold?

Mr. President, if we think the matter through, if we realize the sacrifices we are calling upon these boys to make, and which they are making willingly, heroically and patriotically, if we appreciate the benefits which accrue to us because of their sacrifices, we will be eager, we will be enthusiastic, we will be anxious to give them this basic, fundamental, inherent right which, in my judgment, has been denied them and which we have delayed altogether too long to grant them.

So, Mr. President, as one who believes in the bill, as one who supports the bill, and as one who is willing to stay here, to forego the coming recess, if there is any hope of passing the bill—and I believe there is—I plead with my colleagues to join with me so that cloture may be adopted, and then we may be able in short order to call the roll and rid the United States of an injustice and an inequity which have abided with us altogether too long.

MESSAGE FORM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States nominating James V. Forrestal, of New York, to be Secretary of the Navy, vice Frank Knox, deceased, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the movement to abolish the poll tax by act of Congress originated with the Communist Party. Today the Communist Party in the United States, working through the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, working through Sidney Hillman, an alien and an agitator, a man who makes his living stirring up strife and discord in this country, is the moving spirit behind the drive for the passage of the pending bill. The Communist Party, the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and Sidney Hillman care nothing about the Constitution of the United States; in fact, they desire to destroy the Constitution, and to set up a strong central government in the city of Washington, through which they can put over their program to establish a Communist society in the United States.

Mr. President, this afternoon I shall discuss the subject of cloture. An attempt will shortly be made to invoke cloture on further debate on the pending bill. I shall discuss the history of the cloture rule in the Senate of the United States.

Up until late 1806, there was a dispute whether the previous question could be called in the United States Senate. Some authorities thought the previous question could be ordered. Other authorities took exception to that statement, and said that under the rules it could not be ordered. Regardless of whether it could or could not be ordered, at the instance of Aaron Burr, the outgoing Vice President of the United States, in 1806 the rule on which certain Members of the Senate had placed a construction which would permit the previous question to be ordered was repealed. From that time—1806—until the Civil War, there was absolutely free and unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States. Practically every great leader in the history of our country who has known the rules, who has known the procedure, who has known the power and value of the Senate to the United States in our governmental affairs, has said that one of the great safeguards of human liberty, one of the great safeguards of the liberties of the American people was unlimited debate. Those leaders held that it was an added security to the minor groups in this country, and that if we should adopt a precedent of invoking cloture on every measure on which there was long debate in the Senate, we would weaken the security of every minority group in this country, and we would be taking an important step down the road toward the centralization of authority in Washington and the destruction of rights fixed in and guaranteed by the Constitution.

During the period from 1806 to 1917, the Senate of the United States reached the zenith of its power and influence in American Government. During that whole period, except for the period of the Civil War, there was free and unlimited debate in the Senate. During the Civil War a rule was adopted that in secret sessions of the Senate the previous question could be ordered, and debate could be shut off, on war measures which were necessary for the prosecution of the war between the States.

After the Civil War, and until 1917, there was unlimited debate in the Senate. It was recognized that the right of obstruction, when necessary, was a valuable right to preserve our system of government, to preserve the Constitution of the United States, and to protect the interests, the welfare, and the liberties of the American people.

The present cloture rule, an attempt to invoke which will be made in connection with further debate on the pending question, was adopted in 1917. There were curious circumstances which made it possible for the adoption of that rule. In the latter part of February 1917, it was apparent that within a few weeks our country would become engaged in the First World War. President Wilson requested immediate passage by Congress of the armed neutrality bill, a bill by which it would be made possible to arm the merchant ships of this country, in order to protect them from German submarines. There was a filibuster during the last few days of that session, and that bill was defeated. As a result, when the new Congress met in March 1917, the present cloture rule was adopted. But the Senators who sponsored that rule stated, as I shall read from the debates, in a few minutes, that they were in favor of adopting it only because of the imminence of war with Germany; and they further stated that the rule should never be invoked except in time of war, to end debate on a measure which was necessary for the defense of the United States or necessary for the prosecution of the war.

However, Mr. President, before I quote from those debates I shall read what cer-

tain leading statesmen of the United States have had to say with respect to the benefits of unlimited debate in the United States Senate. First, I shall quote from the remarks of Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, a very distinguished former Member of this body:

There was a time in my legislative career when I believed that the absence of a cloture rule in the Senate was criminal neglect, and that we should adopt a system of rules by which business could be conducted; but the logic of my long service and observation has now convinced me that I was wrong in that contention. There is a virtue in unlimited debate, the philosophy of which cannot be detected upon a surface consideration.

Still another Senator, the distinguished Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, said that he had come to the Senate fresh from a great contest in the House, where cloture was invoked, and, as he said "with a very strong prejudice in favor of vigorous and prompt methods of closing debate."

Within a year or two, however, he reached the conclusion that the practice of the Senate was a wise one and the safest system for the country and for the interest of the Government. Free and unlimited debate, and obstruction when it is necessary to protect the Constitution of the United States, have been recognized throughout the history of this Government as legitimate safeguards to the rights of our people.

I wish also to quote from another distinguished American, Daniel Webster, who was not only opposed to a cloture rule in the Senate but opposed to the power in the House of Representatives to move the previous question.

The conditions were that when the resolution to declare war in 1812 was before the House of Representatives there was long debate by the Members of that body from the New England States. They were opposed to that war. The previous question was moved to shut off debate. Daniel Webster, in discussing the question in the Massachusetts Convention of 1820, referred to the rule providing for moving the previous question.

I read from page 272 of Legislative Procedure, by Luce:

New England was bitterly opposed to the war, and the suppression of its spokesmen by the use of the previous question was doubtless in the mind of Daniel Webster when, in the Massachusetts convention of 1820 he adverted upon the rule for the previous question that had been adopted. "If," he said, "there was anything curtailing a just freedom of debate, it was this. As it had sometimes been used, it was certainly an instrument of injustice." For his own part, he presumed it would never be exercised in this body—or not except in extreme cases; otherwise he should himself have hoped to see it stricken out.

That was Daniel Webster, speaking on the rules in the House of Representatives, where further debate can be shut off by moving the previous question.

I quote from another distinguished Member of the United States Senate, the great Senator Benton from the State of Missouri, one of the greatest men who ever held a seat in this body. When an attempt was made to adopt a cloture rule back in the 1840's Senator Benton had this to say:

Thus the firmness of the minority in the Senate—it may be said, their courage, for their intended resistence contemplated any possible extremity—saved the body from degradation, constitutional legislation from suppression, the liberty of speech from extinction, and the honor of republican government from a disgrace to which the people's representatives are not subjected in any monarchy in Europe. The previous question has not been called in the British House of Commons in 100 years—and never in the House of Peers.

Yesterday I quoted from one of the great labor organizations. I shall again place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of the American Federation of Labor when Vice President Dawes attempted to see a stringent cloture rule adopted in the Senate. The American Federation of Labor condemned it, and stated that the right of unlimited debate was a protection to the working people from reactionary legislation. I quote that statement:

For several months the Vice President of the United States—

They were speaking of Vice President Dawes—

has conducted an agitation for the purpose of abolishing free speech in the United States Senate, the only forum in the world where cloture does not exist and where Members can prevent the passage of reactionary legislation. * * *

The railroad industry, the great oil industry, and other great industries in the United States, want to make it possible for a handful of men in the United States Senate to control all legislation. It is a vicious idea, a vicious purpose to which the Vice President of the United States has loaned himself.

Mr. President, the discussion on the pending bill is by no means a filibuster. Long debate and filibustering have obstructed legislation only when it was necessary to protect the Constitution of the United States and the liberties of the people of this country; and, with only one exception, no bill which has been defeated by a filibuster has ever again been presented to the Congress for further consideration. Unlimited debate in the Senate has worked well. Deliberation is the primary function of the Senate, and the rule for unlimited debate has greatly protected the rights of the people of this country.

I wish to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the present rule was adopted, the rule which is now sought to be invoked, or will be sought to be invoked within the next few days. One of the champions of that rule was the great Senator Hardwick, of Georgia. Let me read what he had to say on the subject:

Will we gain anything by putting it in the power of a bare majority of the Senate to shut off debate on the instant, to close the mouths and hush the voices of the representatives of sovereign States on this floor? Will the American Government be stronger if such a course be adopted? I think not. I submit not.

This is a Government of checks and balances, and wisely so—so established, so constructed by our fathers; and, for one, I have not progressed far enough away from their ideas to believe that they wrought poorly, or that we can much improve on them, in the fundamentals at least. I lay down the proposition before this Senate and before the country that today the last citadel of opposition to the Executive will and to the establishment of the Executive as an autocratic authority in this country, clothed with despotic powers, is here in this Chamber and on this floor; and I say to the Senate and to the country: If you chain this Senate, if you bind it, if you put it in the power of a partisan majority at any instant, at any moment, or on any question, to run roughshod over the minority for the time being, and deny to Senators the right to speak on this floor, and deny real debate in this Chamber, you will have destroyed one of the most valuable checks and balances in our Government and you will have made a long step toward the possible establishment of an autocratic and despotic power in this country.

I continue to quote from Senator Hardwick:

Mr. President, there is another reason why the Senate of the United States ought to be slow, indeed, about the adoption of any very radical or any very real cloture, and it is this: This is likewise the one piece of governmental machinery in the American system where "pause" can be said to the majority, where whatever party is in power can be halted temporarily at least, until in a way—unofficialy, of course, and informally—the sense of the public may be taken on any pending question. If the proposition advocated by some Senators is adopted here, and cloture on the majority vote is established in this body, it may be easier for us, my colleagues, on this side, in disposing of party measures; it may be more convenient for us as individuals; it may seem temporarily that as Democrats we will gain some advantage, but I do believe that as Americans we will lose. We may not always be in power. In years past we have been in power but very little; and for years, while I was a Member of the other body at the other end of this building, I saw Democratic minority Senators use these rules to assert the rights of the minority and to hold down a rampant majority in both Houses; and I tell you right now, it is one of the great barriers, one of the great checks under our American system.

Why, majorities are not always right. No, Senators; not at all. We all know that. I have seen many instances in which minorities were right, and even the men who constituted the majority lived to admit it. Now, if that is true, we might just as well be a little careful about entirely stifling a minority, about denying it all voice, about denying it all opportunity to say "Halt" and "Pause" to a partisan majority.

During that debate the great Senator La Follette, the father of the present distinguished Senator from the State of Wisconsin, condemned the whole idea of cloture. I quote from his speech:

Mr. President, believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture that denies free and unlimited debate. Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restriction contained in the pending rule upon this body, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty, you will have broken down one of the greatest weapons against wrong and oppression that the Members of this body possess. This Senate is the only place in our system where, no matter what may be the organized power behind any measure to rush its consideration and to compel its adoption, there is a chance to be heard, where there is opportunity to speak at length, and where, if need be, under the Constitution of our country and the rules as they stand today, the constitutional right is reposed in a

Member of this body to halt a Congress or a session on a piece of legislation which may undermine the liberties of the people and be in violation of the Constitution which Senators have sworn to support.

Mr. President, the organized power, the driving force behind this measure, is the Communist Party, a group of aliens advocating an alien creed, who would attempt to destroy this country. The Senate of the United States today is performing a great service to all the people in every section of the country in maintaining inviolate the Constitution and the rights guaranteed thereby. I quote further from the great Senator La Follette:

When you take that power away from the Members of this body, you let loose in a democracy forces that in the end will be heard elsewhere, if not here.

Mr. President, the hour is late. I could read a great many statements which were made by men in past generations who carried the American Government safely through waves of personal opinion which attempted to encroach upon the Constitution. They all said that the great fundamental safeguard to liberty was the right of unlimited debate in the Senate.

The purpose of the Government is to maintain certain fixed values. The purpose is to act as a balance wheel to curb the forces of numbers and to preserve from destruction the fundamental rights and privileges guaranteed by our system of government to every American citizen regardless of whether he be in the minority or in the majority.

Governments such as ours, Mr. President, are maintained to preserve certain rights and privileges, to maintain and to preserve them from temporary majorities, to maintain and to preserve them against the weight of numbers, and to direct the ship of state on an even and direct course regardless of the temporary ebb and flow of the tides of public opinion which are often mobilized, amplified, intensified, and directed by propaganda from pressure groups, and by alien groups intent upon securing their temporary ends regardless of the long-time effect upon our system of government and the future of our common country.

Mr. President, the right of free and unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States for more than a century has been recognized as one of the great safeguards to liberty, and the preservation and protection of the rights of the people of our country. Like the fixed stars of the heavens to seafaring men, it has comforted, inspired, protected, and led the minorities of our country safely to the haven of a friendly port. It has protected them from the brute mob force of majority government.

Free and unlimited debate has insured American liberty. It is one of the principal reasons for the power of the Senate of the United States in our system of government. It has gained and held throughout the years, through stress and storm, the respect and confidence of the American people in the Senate of the United States. Because of it the Senate more than any other instrument of government, has preserved the American Constitution, has preserved our dual system of government, the prerogatives of the States, and the rights, liberties, and privileges of American citizenship. The preservation, unimpaired, is essential to the maintenance of our system of government and the freedom of the citizen. Through free and unlimited debate, through the rights of obstruction in the Senate, if necessary, this body has done more to preserve unimpaired our freedom than has any other department of government.

We here are asked to tear this rule down, to abolish a safeguard which has protected this country, and to do it at the instance of radical aliens, principally in certain sections of the city of New York, who are determined to tear down our Government, and to enslave, through strong, centralized power, a great part of the people of the United States.

That is all I care to say at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator from Mississippi concluded his remarks——

Mr. EASTLAND. No; but if the Senator desires to recess——

Mr. CONNALLY. Or did the Senator desire to proceed tomorrow?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am not through, but I can speak later. The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is scheduled to speak first tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from Mississippi should speak again it would make two speeches on his part.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is all right.

Mr. CONNALLY. We will reserve that question until tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a protocol, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTER—ADVERSE REPORT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Patrick J. McGrath to be postmaster at Bayonne, N. J., which had been reported adversely.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence L. Forsling to be Director of Grazing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lewis Hyde Brereton to be lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Barney McKinney Giles to be lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elwood Richard Quesada to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 11, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

James V. Forrestal, of New York, to be Secretary of the Navy, vice Frank Knox, deceased.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Kenneth H. McGill to be chief statistician in the Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. (The compensation to be paid Mr. McGill will be $6,500 per annum.)

Louis A. Boening to be assistant State director of selective service for Illinois, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. (Compensation for the office of the assistant State director of selective service for Illinois will be at the rate of $5,600 per annum.)

Frank D. Rash to be State director of selective service for Kentucky, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. (Compensation for the office of the State director of selective service for

Kentucky will be at the rate of $5,600 per annum.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS EFFECTIVE FROM THE DATES INDICATED

Walter S. Mozden, May 19, 1944.
Paul C. Campbell, Jr., June 5, 1944.
Clarence Kooiker, April 3, 1944.
Harold J. Magnuson, May 6, 1944.
Carlton H. Waters, May 6, 1944.
Robert W. Biach, April 21, 1944.
W. Clark Cooper, April 9, 1944.
Jack C. Haldeman, May 15, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. John H. Brown, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of January 1943.

Commodore Lawrence F. Reifsnider, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 6th day of January 1943.

IN THE COAST GUARD

TO BE COMMANDANT

Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, from the 14th day of June 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Clarence L. Forsling to be Director of Grazing.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant generals

Lewis Hyde Brereton
Barney McKinney Giles

To be a major general

Elwood Richard Quesada

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Earl E. Sexton, East Lyme.
Roland Lester Powe, North Windham.

LOUISIANA

Mathias J. Reuter, Arabi.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edna M. F. Hayward, Londonderry.
Arthur W. Proulx, Somersworth.

NORTH CAROLINA

Roland Lemuel Garrett, Elizabeth City.
James K. Proctor, Greenville.
Mat M. Ellington, Summerfield.
Henry G. Cook, Stokesdale.

WASHINGTON

Mary A. McComb, Everson.
May L. Hanson, Touchet.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Peter A. Crumbly, O. F. M., missioner, Franciscan Order, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou art our creator, our ruler, our benevolent father, our refuge, and our strength. Look down with favor upon these, Thy servants, who turn suppliantly to Thee today imploring Thy enlightenment, Thy powerful aid, and Thy blessing.

Thou art the way, the truth, and the life, and hast told us to come to Thee with our problems and hast promised to hear and aid us.

We believe that Thou hast placed men in positions of trust and responsibility—in the guidance and government of Thy people.

Heavenly Father, hear our prayer. Bless and strengthen our President and his coworkers in these days of strife and stress. Enlighten our representatives in this House and in the Senate that they may legislate wisely and courageously. Bless our defenders wherever they may be. Bless all of us so that we may render to Thee the things that are Thine and to our country loyalty and devotion. Send forth Thy spirit to light, to guard, to rule, and guide us that, with humble and sincere reliance on Thy help, we may stand united in brotherly charity and may deserve Thy continued blessing and persevere in Thy love and care, in thanking Thee and praising Thee and Thy divine Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, here and forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a speech delivered by Mrs. Paul Palmer, national secretary of Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at the rural-urban conference, held at the Statler Hotel on May 9, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on three different matters, first, to include an editorial which appeared in the Boston Daily Record; secondly, to include another newspaper item from the Boston Daily Globe; and, third, a telegraph message from Gov. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this afternoon, after the legislative business of the day and following any special orders which have been heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a radio address by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times on the approval of treaties.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a radio address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a resolution on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an address by Mr. F. A. Banks, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by Samuel Grafton, of the New York Post, on the subject of free ports for Europe's refugees.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. C. FREDERICK PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include an editorial and two letters from my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CELEBRATES THE SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS COMPLETION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, this day, May 10, is important in the development of our great western territory, extending from Chicago on to the Pacific coast. Seventy-five years ago today the Union

Pacific Railroad was completed. On July 1, 1862, and July 2, 1864, the Congress of the United States enacted legislation creating a corporation to be known as the Union Pacific Railroad Co., with authority to construct and maintain a railroad and telegraph by which to unite the railroad system of the Eastern States with that of the Pacific coast, particularly California. As shown by the report of the select committee of the House of Representatives, the purpose of the construction of the railroad and telegraph line was to strengthen the bonds of union between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, develop the immense resources of the great central portion of the North American Continent, and create a new route of commerce from the Atlantic and Europe to the Pacific and Asia.

Under this program, the Union Pacific extended its lines westward, and the Central Pacific built eastward from California. It was on May 10, 1869—75 years ago today—that these two great railroad lines joined at Promontory Point, Utah. This was the realization of a dream of Abraham Lincoln, who had with great prophetic vision seen the need of such a transportation system and had advocated the construction thereof. Later, the Oregon Railroad & Navigation Co. constructed a connecting line from Portland, Oreg., eastward to a connection with the Union Pacific Railroad, thus completing the transcontinental line down the famous Columbia River to the sea.

This great railroad system has been the means of developing the immense natural resources, not alone of the great Midwest but of the whole Pacific-coast area. We of the West owe much to the foresight of the men of 75 years ago, who had the vision to plan and to construct this great artery of commerce which has welded our America into a unified whole. It is fitting here today that we pause briefly from our deliberations to commemorate the completion of this great transportation system and to pay homage to the pioneers of that early day, who builded better than they knew.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an article by a former Member, Hon. James L. Whitley, of Rochester.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert in the RECORD a speech I delivered to the National Association of Homebuilders of the United States at the Statler Hotel on May 9.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LYNCH received permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

BIPARTISAN COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein the Gallup poll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MUNDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today the Treasury Department is honoring with a special program and special honorary awards War-bond salesmen, leaders in contests throughout the United States. There are 100 of these men who have won the contest among 16,500 contestants. Among those representing the State of California I have the honor to announce is a citizen from my district, Mr. Allen Martin. He has proven in a contest of 16,500 leaders in the United States that he is the outstanding War-bond salesman in California. I am proud to make this announcement and to say that it is through the contribution of such public-minded citizens that eventual victory will be ours.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. May I suggest Mr. Joseph R. Dennison, from Michigan, is in that same party, and has competed, as has your constituent, and we are proud to announce that also.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two different instances and to include therein newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include three short telegrams, one from the Governor from my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT PROTECTION TO WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF DECEASED WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 539), providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1744) to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1744), to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall be continued not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendments, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

INCREASING THE DEBT LIMIT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the debt limit of the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4464, with Mr. PACE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized for 2 hours and the ranking minority Member is recognized for 2 hours.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H. R. 4464, has for its purpose increasing the authorized borrowing power of the Government from $210,000,000,000 to $240,000,000,000.

This bill was originally introduced carrying an increase of $50,000,000,000, or a total of $260,000,000,000. While the bill was under consideration the Under Secretary of the Treasury appeared in behalf of the bill, explaining the need of the bill, and we finally reached the unanimous decision that $240,000,000,000 would be adequate to carry the Government over to March 31, 1945, in case the war should continue and the present rate of expenditure should continue. This will give time after January 1, 1945, if the war is still in progress and it is necessary for the Government to secure

additional money to finance the war, for the next Congress to take a look at the proposition and see what is necessary, or required, at that time.

The Under Secretary of the Treasury appeared before our committee and stated—and I suppose it is generally known—that it is the purpose of the Treasury Department to start on the 12th of June the Fifth War Loan bond drive. It is imperative that we increase the borrowing power of the Government in order to take care of the additional obligations that would be issued in order to carry out the bond drive.

It is estimated that on June 30 the indebtedness or outstanding obligations of the United States will be $198,000,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, it will be $250,000,000,000. It was thought that an increase of $30,000,000,000 would be sufficient for the present.

It is proposed to start a bond drive to raise $16,000,000,000 additional. Consequently, in order to enable the Treasury Department to successfully proceed with its program, or to sell bonds under the new bond drive, it is not only important but it is necessary that the borrowing power of the United States Government be increased.

It is estimated this year that the deficit will be about $55,000,000,000.

There has never been a war that the United States has waged in which the cost could have been financed out of current revenues. It is a known fact also that 96 cents out of every dollar that the Government expends is for war purposes. We are raising about forty or forty-two billions in current revenue, making it necessary in order to keep the credit of the Government on a sound financial basis to borrow the difference between the amount collected as revenue and the amount expended. I believe everyone realizes that it is absolutely necessary that we do this in order to maintain the credit of the Government and to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to finance the necessary expenditures of the Government.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. How much does the Government expect to raise by this Fifth War Loan?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Sixteen billion dollars.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. And the debt limit is now $210,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; the present obligations amount to $198,000,000,000 which, added to the Fifth War Loan drive, would exceed that amount on June 30, because it is estimated that by that time the debt will be about $214,000,000,000.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. What I wish to learn is why they need another thirty-six billions of debt limit.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Because the Fifth War bond drive would not be the only borrowing that would be necessary. The added debt limit would not carry us through the fiscal year to June 30, 1945. By that time the public debt of the United States will be $250,000,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The chairman will recall that the amount provided in the bill with the amendment as it appears on the face of the bill is estimated to be sufficient to carry us until March 31, 1945. It will mean that if the war continues and war expenditures continue that we shall have to consider increasing the debt limit again sometime shortly after the first of the year.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. In a little less than a year.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is estimated that the debt limit provided by this bill will be sufficient under the present rate of expenditure and the rate anticipated if the war continues, to carry the Government over until March 31, 1945. It probably will be necessary to increase the debt limit again sometime after January 1945, if the war is still in progress, but we think it will not be necessary to increase the debt limit again during this calendar year.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the amount of the national debt at the present time?

Mr. DOUGHTON. At the present time the public debt is something under $190,000,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The present public debt is $185,000,000,000. It is estimated that it will be $235,000,000,000 on December 31, 1944.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina reserves 9 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the House that I shall not take 1 hour.

Those Members who care to take the trouble to make a tabulation can I think more easily follow the figures I am about to give.

Mr. Chairman, the public debt limit as of today is $210,000,000,000, of which there is outstanding $185,000,000,000. This leaves an unused portion of public-debt limit as of today of $25,000,000,000. The bill we have under consideration increases that limit from $210,000,000,000 to $240,000,000,000, providing an increased limit of public debt of $30,000,000,000. If one adds this $30,000,000,000 to the $25,000,000,000 unused and now existing one has a total unemployed borrowing power on the part of the Government amounting to $55,000,000,000.

When the Under Secretary of the Treasury came before the Ways and Means Committee he requested that the debt limit be raised to $260,000,000,000, but your committee thought it would be advisable to break down this figure and see exactly how the requirements would fall. It was finally decided that the debt limit of $240,000,000,000 would be sufficient to carry the Government through until March 31, 1945, prior to which time the Treasury will appear again before the Ways and Means Committee and make another request for an increase of the debt limit if it is needed.

The President under his Budget estimate showed that the public debt would increase by $60,000,000,000 during the fiscal year 1945, that is from June 30 of this year until June 30 of 1945. Nine months, or three-quarters of that period, would bring us to March 31, 1945. Three-quarters of $60,000,000,000 is $45,000,000,000. Subtract that $45,000,000,000 from the debt-borrowing power of the Government of $55,000,000,000 and you will find that the Government will still on March 31, 1945, have an unemployed borrowing power of $10,000,000,000. This of course is a huge sum of money, but it is nothing comparable to the sum originally asked, which was $20,000,000,000 more, which would have given the Treasury an unemployed borrowing power of $30,000,000,000 instead of only the ten which will be allowed them under this bill and which your committee thought was sufficient.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is any money available from the $42,000,000,000 tax receipts coming in that is not committed to the amortization of the present outstanding debt that might be added to the $55,000,000,000 available as assets?

Mr. DEWEY. No. As far as I know, there is no amortization payment liability against the revenue from taxation at the present time. However, I would like to look into that matter further.

Mr. ROWE. I am assuming, of course, that the current obligations that may be committed come from the total revenue of $42,000,000,000 coming in. What I am trying to determine is how much of the $42,000,000,000 is added to amortize the current expenses, or will there be any of that available in liquid assets to add to the available debt resource that we nave of $55,000,000,000 for the coming year?

Mr. DEWEY. Does the gentleman mean amortization of the public debt?

Mr. ROWE. That is right.

Mr. DEWEY. Frankly, I have not looked into that matter for some time, but on some of the earlier outstanding obligations amortization ran. I do not know whether it is being included at the present time or that any large amount of revenue is being employed to amortize the debt. I should think it would be rather difficult to work out amortization of a debt that is growing at the rate our debt is. We have to get the debt stable first, then begin to amortize.

Mr. ROWE. May I make just one observation. I know that all of the First World War soldier bonus certificates that were not converted into some other form of an asset are due in the fiscal year

1945. I presume that some of the liquid income or revenue is committed to meet that obligation if they do not convert into another type of indebtedness.

Mr. DEWEY. I presume they will, but as the Government will be in need of a great amount of money for fighting the present war, it means that the borrowings will increase probably to take care of such requirements.

The public debt has been going up constantly. In 1940 the limit was $45,000,000,000; then, in 1941, the limit was raised from $45,000,000,000 to $59,000,000,000; in 1942, from $59,000,000,000 to $125,000,000,000, and in 1943 the limit was raised from $125,000,000,000 to a limit of $210,000,000,000, where it is today. The debt limit will be increased to $240,000,000,000 under this bill.

An item will probably be presented a little later which will clarify this debt bill somewhat. Heretofore we have always mentioned the debt limit as the face amount. Section 21 of this bill reads:

> The face amount of obligations issued under the authority of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate $240,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

It is very probable that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will offer an amendment to strike out the word "face," and, while I may be a little ahead of the time to mention the committee amendment, I will take the opportunity of doing so, with the permission of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

It has been very seldom in the history of our public debt that we have sold obligations at a discount. It is true that many of the so-called Treasury bills, which are really used by banks more than for any other purpose, have been sold at a slight discount—one-sixteenth of 1 percent, one thirty-second of 1 percent, or one sixty-fourth of 1 percent—but never up to 1 percent.

Latterly and during the present war, we have created savings bonds that have been sold to the people of the country at a discount of 25 percent. We are all familiar with the E bonds. The value of that bond, as sold to the public, is $18.75. If they hold that bond for 10 years, they will get $25 for a Government security that they only paid $18.75 for. Now, that difference of $6.25 represents in the parlance of the Treasury an unearned discount. As you hold the E bond, it becomes a little bit more valuable from year to year, until at the end of 10 years it has a total value of $25.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Really, from a practical standpoint, however, and to the ordinary man on the street, he has invested $18.75 and expects to get the value increased during the 10 years; so his investment is $18.75 plus accrued interest for the 10 years?

Mr. DEWEY. That is exactly correct. This discount really represents interest and for the benefit and convenience of people who have purchased these bonds, instead of their having to go around and collect interest, they can look at a schedule printed on each one of these savings bonds and find out exactly what it is worth at the date they look at the bond or at the date they care to sell it.

Mr. Chairman, according to the way the act has been written, the Treasury has been forced to carry the debt limit at its face amount. In other words, when it sold one of these bonds to the public at $18.75, under the act as passed the Treasury had to carry it at $25, though it had only received $18.75 for the bond. So it was not really a true picture of the public debt. The Treasury realized that and for the benefit of those who are especially interested in the fiscal, monetary, and financial condition of our country, the Treasury produces its daily statement and once a month it puts out in summary statement what is known as the public-debt statement.

On page 6 of this rather complicated document there is given the interest-bearing debt, the public issues, and the United States Savings bonds, giving the various series and kinds, totaling $32,497,754,998. There is a little footnote down here to the effect that that figure is the actual current redemption value of those securities as of May 1, but under the law as it was written the Treasury is forced to consider for debt-limit purposes that $32,000,000,000, not as at the real value of $32,000,000,000, or its redemption value, but at a figure $7,700,000,000 more, which is the interest on that $32,000,000,000 accruing during the next 10 years. Therefore, the committee will offer an amendment to make that slight change in the bill under consideration to the effect that hereafter instead of reading, "The face amount of obligations issued under authority of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate $240,000,000,000," it will read, "The amount of obligations issued under the authority of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate $240,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time," striking out the one word "face," which will make a complete and true picture of the exact debt limit of the country.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. In other words, they will set those up on their books at the price at which they would have to redeem them if the buyer came to the Treasury and asked for the money?

Mr. DEWEY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. By making that change we, in effect, increase the potential borrowing power then by $7,700,000,000.

Mr. DEWEY. That has already been done. That was done in the last Debt Increase Act. It would have been worse had we gone on and done what was suggested, carrying this unearned discount and increasing it over two billions—and some have suggested up to ten billion.

I think that this is a sound way to show what is the actual debt limit. It is the way that the debt is carried in the Treasury public-debt statement. Further, it reflects the real outstanding limit of borrowing power and keeps it in parallel with the figures in the debt statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the pending bill (H. R. 4464) is to increase the debt limit of the United States from the present amount of two hundred and ten billion to two hundred and forty billion. The bill, as introduced, provides for an increase to two hundred and sixty billion.

Some press comment has indicated that the minority members of the committee forced a reduction of the amount, but I am sure they will all bear me out in the statement that I made the motion to reduce the amount from two hundred and sixty billion to two hundred and forty billion, and the Under Secretary of the Treasury, representing the Treasury Department before the committee, agreed to that amendment and that change.

This bill comes before you with the unanimous report of the Committee on Ways and Means. There is no controversy about it. It is recognized by everybody that the present debt limit of two hundred and ten billion has to be increased on account of the enormous cost of the war. The present public debt is one hundred and eighty-five billion. It is estimated that it will be two hundred and thirty-five billion by December 31, 1944. It is estimated that by June 30, 1944, it will be one hundred and ninety-seven billion. It is estimated that by June 30, 1945, it will be two hundred and fifty-eight billion. Therefore, it will be seen that the amount provided in this bill—that is, an increase of the public-debt limit to two hundred and forty billion—will not be sufficient to carry us to the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1945, but it is estimated that the amount of two hundred and forty billion will be sufficient to carry us until March 31, 1945. The result will be, if the war continues and expenditures continue as at present, that the Treasury Department will have to ask the Congress to increase the amount provided here early next year.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman mentioned two figures, one hundred and ninety-seven billion on June 30, 1944, and two hundred and forty billion on

June 30, 1945. Did the gentleman give the present debt?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. The first statement I made was the present public debt, which was one hundred and eighty-five billion.

Mr. REED of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I was engaged in looking at some figures here and I did not hear him make that statement.

Mr. COOPER. That is quite all right. The present public debt is one hundred and eighty-five billion.

It is estimated that the public debt will be $235,000,000,000 by December 31, 1944. The total expenditures for the Government for 1945 are estimated at $98,000,000,000. The war expenditures are estimated at $88,200,000,000 for 1945. War expenditures for the year 1944 are estimated at $88,500,000,000.

It should be borne in mind that 96 cents out of every dollar now being spent by the Federal Government is for this war. Ninety-six cents out of every dollar now being spent by the Federal Government is for the cost of this war. Only the remaining 4 cents out of every dollar is used for all other purposes of the Government.

The Fifth War Loan drive will start on June 12, 1944. This legislation is necessary for this drive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. The Under Secretary of the Treasury has stated that this legislation is imperative for the purpose of this Fifth War Loan drive for $16,000,000,000, which begins on June 12.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is making a very clear statement as to the financial condition of the country. If the gentleman will permit me to make an observation, this debt limit will take care of this Fifth War Loan drive, and perhaps one additional war loan drive, which may come this year before December 31, 1944.

Mr. COOPER. I think the gentleman is correct. The Fifth War Loan drive, which will begin June 12, next month, is for $16,000,000,000. Although I am not advised by the Treasury Department, I presume there may probably have to be another war loan drive this fall some time.

It is my understanding that the increase here provided would be sufficient to take care of the Fifth War Loan drive beginning the 12th of next month, and a subsequent drive, which would be the Sixth War Loan drive, probably some time this fall.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I believe that is the understanding, and I thought it was proper to bring it to the committee's attention.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman.

There have been some questions asked about the redemption of the savings bonds that have been sold. We inquired into that matter during the consideration of this bill. The statement was made by the Under Secretary of the Treasury that we still have 90 cents of every dollar sold in savings bonds. Most redemptions are for the purpose of paying taxes and taking care of cases of illness that arise.

It might also be interesting to remind ourselves of the appropriations that have been made since our war effort began. Congress has appropriated for the Army, for the Navy, and for other war activities up to March 31, 1944, $330,000,000,000. Of this amount $169,000,000,000 has been spent.

The question was also asked during the consideration of the bill about possible waste in connection with war expenditures. The Under Secretary of the Treasury made this statement:

> You cannot increase Federal expenditures from about $9,000,000,000 to $90,000,000,000, as has been done, in such a short time, without some waste, but the Treasury Department feels it is being held to a minimum considering the enormous war effort.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it must be apparent to everybody that the increase of the public-debt limit from the present $210,000,000,000 to the amount provided here of $240,000,000,000 is essential, vital, and imperative. As indicated a moment ago we may reasonably expect that early in the coming year we shall have to come back and ask for a further increase of the debt limit if the war continues and expenditures on the war continue as at present.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the figures recited by the gentleman from Tennessee are staggering. He told you how total appropriations for the war up to March 31, 1944, are practically as much as the total assessed valuation of the entire country. In a sort of left-handed way he sought to excuse and condone the tremendous waste that is going on.

We thought that when W. P. A. was discontinued there would be no more boondoggling, but they had a campaign for the Senate down in Florida a few weeks ago and the administration were very anxious to reelect their man. In order to do so, it was necessary for the Government to take over a toll bridge that runs across Tampa Bay, between St. Petersburg and Tampa. A year ago when there were over 100,000 men in uniform in that area they could not see any need for taking over the bridge, but this year, when those 100,000 men in uniform have been sent abroad and there are very few in training down there, but with an election on, it became imperative to take over the toll bridge. Our share of the cost of that toll bridge is probably about $1,200,000, which is a very considerable amount to pay for the election of a Senator.

The American people would be much happier over this spending if they knew that the money was being spent wisely, honestly, and judiciously, but the thing that disturbs them is that boondoggling is going hand in hand with war spending and there is no sign of abatement.

The gentleman from Tennessee tells us that the administration will probably come back and ask for a further increase in the debt limit this fall. It will not be before the election.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I did not make any such statement as that, and the gentleman knows I did not.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thought the gentleman said that.

Mr. COOPER. I said after the first of the year.

Mr. KNUTSON. I knew it was after the election, anyway.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is so anxious to try to play politics when none has been injected into this discussion that he now disregards the facts.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not injecting politics into it at all, but I am telling a few facts that the gentleman should have told the people about the waste and the squandering. We are spending more on this war effort than Great Britain, Germany, Russia, Italy when she was in the war, and Japan combined by about $20,000,000,000.

I shall delete a part of that. I think I had better. Perhaps what I said may be contrary to the rules of the House, and I do not want to transgress the rules.

I should like to leave this thought with you Members, that the American people, regardless of political affiliations, are looking to Congress to exercise more supervision over spending. Of course, we of the minority are helpless. We do not have the votes to stop any of this waste and have not had for 12 years, but we are willing to cooperate if any considerable bloc on the majority side shows any disposition to put an economy program into effect.

We are fighting this war on a magnificently large scale. We have more lieutenant generals in this war by two or three hundred percent than we had in all the preceding wars of the Republic. It seems to me that the time has come for Congress, and more particularly the committee that is charged with reporting the appropriations, to scrutinize each item in the most careful manner. We should make the various departments coming before us asking for additional funds show the need for such funds. America with all her resources, with all her industrial development, cannot stand indefinitely the spending pace in which we are now indulging. There is a time coming when the sheriff is going to catch up with us if we, the Congress, do not do our duty.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, after listening to the ranking member on the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means, and listening to his discussion about the debt of

the United States, that this bill was reported out unanimously by the committee. The gentleman has spoken about boondoggling, and he has given an instance where he said that the Government has taken over a certain bridge. I did not hear the gentleman say one single word about any vote that he cast against any of the appropriations for the war. The gentleman knows as well as I do that this increase in the debt limit is due entirely to the fact that we are conducting a war, and conducting it successfully. When the gentleman says that there are more lieutenant generals in the Army of the United States than there have ever been in all the history of the country, the gentleman forgets that only yesterday the Government showed that by reason of increments in the Army—in the last 38 months we have increased the Army from 535,000, approximately, to 7,250,000. If the gentleman thinks with that increase in the manpower of the Army in a period of 38 months we can get along with the same number of generals that we had before, I believe that he is woefully mistaken. What we ought to do is cut out the politics when we have these matters of national importance that have to do with the war. It is one thing to come here after a unanimous report and another to criticize the cost of carrying on the war. The fact of the matter is whether we have spent more money in this war than Germany, Japan, and Italy, when it was in the war, by some $10,000,000,000, as the gentleman has said, the fact remains that in this country we have more to defend than they have in the other countries. We should not even hesitate for a minute to spend twice as much money as all the Axis countries combined, because money is not the thing we have to defend or talk about in this country now. What we have to talk about in this country is the winning of the war and getting these boys back. The only way we can do it is to spend money for munitions and those things that are necessary for the winning of the war.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not say Germany, Italy, and Japan, I said, Great Britain, Russia, and Italy, Germany and Japan.

Mr. LYNCH. Still, with Great Britain, Russia, and any other country you have in mind included in your total, even then I will say we have more to defend in this country than all those countries, Allies or Axis, or anyone else. I think the American people are perfectly willing to spend that money so the boys will win the war and get back into civilian life.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Did not the gentleman from Minnesota, like the rest of us, vote for the declaration of war where we pledged all our resources to win the war?

Mr. LYNCH. I presume he did, if I remember correctly, he was one of those who voted for the declaration of war. Now when the Government is endeavoring to carry on that war successfully—and I challenge the gentleman to say that this war is not being conducted successfully—we are now being confronted by the statement that it is costing a great deal of money.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Despite the criticism that has been made of the Army and the number of officers in the Army, I call the attention of the House to the fact that we have the best organized Army that this Nation has ever seen and the best organized Army that the world has ever seen. It is doing a magnificent job. The Army needs the officers that they are now receiving and are now using, and the criticism of the Army for being overstaffed with these officers is unjust and unfair.

Mr. LYNCH. It is not only unjust, but let me say this: The statement was made that anybody could get a commission. I know that anybody cannot get a commission. I know that these men who have gotten commissions for the most part have worked hard for it. I have seen those boys in the camps and in the officers' training schools and in the universities where they have been training, where they get up at 4 o'clock in the morning and go to class from 4 o'clock until 12 o'clock, and in the afternoon they continue their training for their commissions. They are the kind of officers we have in the Army today, men who are trained, men who know what it is all about, men who are giving everything for their country and who have worked for their commissions. They are entitled to have them and they will carry on well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The gentleman knows I never suggested that we should not spend as much money as is necessary to prosecute and speedily win the war. What I object to is the waste that is going on all over. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that only a few days ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the dean of the Democratic side, stated there are 30,000 surplus officers hanging around the cocktail bars of Washington.

There is no division in our anxiety to win the war speedily and decisively. To that we will give every dollar necessary, but I for one do not want to see our boys come back to a country that is bankrupt and unable to provide properly for the disabled, the wounded, and the dependents of those who have worn the uniform of our country.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to speak in reference to two bills concerning which there have been many requests made by Members of the House. One of these bills is H. R. 4269, which is a bill to authorize the Air Forces to grant commissions to certain Civil Aeronautics trainees who have completed certain courses under the instruction of the Air Forces. The other bill is H. R. 3358, which is commonly known as the WASP bill, and which was reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House favorably. It is now pending in the Committee on Rules. We hope it will come to the floor at an early date. I am personally in favor of both of these bills. Mr. Chairman, there has been some uncertainty about the attitude of the War Department in relation to H. R. 4269, and I received a communication from the War Department, office of the Chief of the Air Forces, and I want to read the last two paragraphs of this letter to indicate the attitude of the War Department to clear up any uncertainty that may be in the minds of the Members of the House on this point.

I read from this letter as follows:

> It is apparent that there is some confusion between the two bills—H. R. 4269 pertaining to the commissioning of certain C. A. A. trainees, and H. R. 3358, a bill to militarize the female pilots flying with the Air Forces.
>
> With respect to H. R. 3358, everyone is aware of the fact that General Arnold recently, before the Military Affairs Committee, defended this legislation. There are many who are not familiar with the fact that the Army Air Forces and the War Department are in accord with the provisions of H. R. 4269, providing that it is amended to contain the clause that individuals so commissioned meet the standard physical, mental, and professional requirements established by the Army Air Forces and that the Army Air Forces be the one to decide whether or not they do meet these prescribed requirements. With this amendment there would be no inconsistency in supporting both bills.
>
> Trusting that this information forwarded you with this letter is suitable for your purpose and assuring you it is my pleasure to serve you, I remain,
>
> Most respectfully yours,
>
> CHARLES H. DEERWESTER,
> *Colonel, Air Forces,*
> *Legislative and Liaison Division.*

I am simply reading this into the RECORD, so as to clear up this uncertainty and put the Members of this body on notice as to the attitude of the Air Force with reference to these two pieces of legislation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us what the attitude of the Air Force will be with reference to the physical requirements, whether or

not they will be those required of combat pilots, and whether or not the physical requirements of the women who are sought to be commissioned will be equally as hard as those for the men. As I understand, one of the differences that has arisen has been the fact that they sought to apply to these men the requirements of combat pilots, whereas they were going to take women in on a lower physical requirement and let them do air transport work and flying in this country, and that the men have contended they should do that job just as well with lower physical requirements.

Mr. BROOKS. I am not authorized to speak for the Air Force on that point, but I would feel that the same requirements should be applied equally to every group doing the same kind of service.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I gladly yield to my friend.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to tell the gentleman I am very much in favor of the legislation he is proposing, because it is going to bring a tremendous amount of comfort and relief to thousands of instructors who I believe have been discriminated against. We have had about 9,000 instructors who are instructing in the Air Forces of the Government, in the various schools, who are now writing to Members of Congress. Many of them have written to me about your legislation. Many of them, of course, do not have training in the heavier engine types, but some of them have had up to 2,000 hours of flying as compared with 100 or 200 hours of flying among the women who are being given a better opportunity to continue in the service than the men who have already been serving. I think everything should be done to give them what they were promised originally, that they will remain in the Air Force in some flying activity.

Mr. BROOKS. I agree with the gentleman and I thank him for his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Statements about waste should not be made unless supported by a bill of particulars. That is my opinion. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is a distinguished Member of the House and the Committee on Military Affairs, and I would like to ask the gentleman, whose committee carefully follows war activities, whether or not the gentleman, as a student of military affairs and as an important member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, has seen any evidence of waste in wartime on the part of the War Department which justifies criticism.

Mr. BROOKS. I will answer the majority leader by saying that, of course, war as a whole is waste, but it is necessary waste. However, in every case where it has been pointed out to the members of our committee that there has been any indication of waste, the committee has been most diligent and exacting in going into all criticisms of waste, misspending of funds and other misuses of funds for war purposes, and wherever anything at all worthy of criticism has been found it has been given to Congress, and the public is fully aware of what is going on at the present time. Considering the vast expenditures of money, I think the program is being handled on an efficient basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. The distinguished majority leader has just made a statement implying that there is no waste on the part of the Army or the War Department in the prosecution of the war, and in that he may or may not be correct. I make no comment. However, I would like to point out a proposed plan which would result in a great deal of waste in the city of Philadelphia. It is planned to establish in that city, a post-office annex, employing 4,000 additional workers in a city where there is already a critical manpower shortage, with the active assistance of the War Department, who are removing from Philadelphia, a plant which now employs 800 skilled workers. A plant to install precisely the same equipment is to be opened at the same time in another city where the skilled workmen will not be available. This is to make space available in Philadelphia for the political move planned by the Post Office Department. So the Army is actively assisting in manpower waste, in destroying the usability of 800 skilled workers engaged in a war plant, in order to assist the Post Office, just before election, in planting 4,000 skilled workers at $200 a month, or a pay roll of $800,000 a month, which we in Philadelphia believe is politically inspired and should be located in a city which is not a critical manpower area, and if speed in shipping parcels overseas is the object, it is just silly to locate it in the one big city in the country without an airport in operation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I misunderstood my responsibility as a Member of Congress. I have always thought that to some extent, I was the servant and steward of the people who sent me here. I question whether a person should be open to violent criticism for examining the business conduct of the greatest business in the world, belonging to a free people of 130,000,000. I do not believe a man under oath of office should be subject to criticism for trying to get at the truth about the great Government under which we live. I do not think it is out of harmony with decency and good citizenship and proper representation to even ask once in a while just how much is a billion dollars. I have never been quite able to comprehend it, but some of the economists figure it and say that a billion dollars could be described in this way: If you take a $1,000 bill and place it on the ground and you keep putting on top of that, $1,000 bills, when you reach the height of the Empire State Building in New York City, you will have piled up $1,000,000,000. So, that after all, it is a rather interesting question as to whether we, as Members of Congress, should now and then view with alarm the vast expenditures of money. We make appropriations, and the Ways and Means Committee must find the wherewithal to pay the appropriations, to pay the interest and carrying charges, and to pay on the public debt.

I may be just a little old-fashioned, but it seems to me when we appropriate some $35,000,000 for a building to be used by the Army, after all they are going a little bit to excess when they spend $85,000,000 in the construction of the building. I could go on and describe the number of acres of floor space in that building, but that is not necessary. Everybody here has been in the Pentagon Building.

Much of this debt was not created after we got into the war. Much of the debt was created long before we got into the war, and at a time when we were being assured by all those in power, or who aspired to public office in this administration at least, that we were not going to get into war. It was not going to be necessary to send any soldiers abroad—we might have to furnish a little material; but, of course, conditions have changed. I have for many years been interested in a study of the ever-increasing national debt. We had what we called the National Debt Committee of which I had the honor to be chairman. From time to time our committee made reports to Congress. I have here one of those printed reports issued May 16, 1939. That was before we were really in the war except to this extent: The administration was arming Japan and Mussolini and Hitler for their great drives in the war and was in partnership with them to the extent of suffering and permitting essential war materials to be furnished these dictators. Our boys are still facing the munitions and the planes and the tanks and the guns and the ships that we furnished to our enemies, so that we were in that sense in the war. The irony is that the administration bought gold at premium to enable our enemies to get all of this war material at the expense of the American taxpayers.

As a Member of Congress representing a large district I am concerned in the question of waste. I will vote for any amount, of course, for the cost of the legitimate conduct of the war. I want to get the boys back as quickly as possible. I wish to God I could see, looking into the near future, that they would soon be back here, but personally I cannot see it at the present time. I can also visualize something of the holocaust we shall have to face before any of them can return and, of course, thousands and

hundreds of thousands will never return.

Our debt had doubled before we got into the war; to the amount of about $20,000,000,000.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. I hope the gentleman is not bringing up that fact and bemoaning the fact that the debt was increased by the so-called depression because the Government would not see starving people in America.

Mr. REED of New York. That is a beautiful New Deal theory that I see the gentleman has learned by heart.

Mr. FORAND. Does the gentleman deny it? Does the gentleman deny the truth of it?

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, I deny it. It was nothing in the world but a lot of leaf raking. There was nothing constructive in it.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman believes it is better to let people starve?

Mr. REED of New York. The people never have starved in this country.

Mr. FORAND. Because the Roosevelt administration stepped in and took care of it.

Mr. REED of New York. They have been starving under the New Deal.

Mr. FORAND. No; not under the New Deal, because the New Deal took care of them.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. The ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means mentioned the increase in the number of officers in this war. I inquired of the Library of Congress and received the following interesting information: I found that in the last war we had 1 officer to every 15 men, but in this war we have 1 officer to every 10½ enlisted men, or an increase in officers of 50 percent. And I wish to make this one further observation: We of the minority must be charitable to those of the majority for some of their guilty consciences about the money that is being expended. They had a platform in 1932 that said they were going to cut the cost of government. That sacred covenant was in their platform. They are naturally a little embarrassed about what they did to that sacred covenant.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is right, of course; but here is what I wish to say further. We were warned at that time by Franklin D. Roosevelt that the greatest enemy of free government was loose fiscal policy. What the gentleman referred to, of course, was loose fiscal policy. The country has never seen anything like it and I hope it will never see anything like it again. In my opinion it is just as important for us to save this country for the kind of lives we always have lived as it is to win the war abroad. If the boys fighting over there for all these so-called freedoms come back, only to find they have lost them here at home, then the blood will have been spent in vain. You know money can turn to ashes and so can material goods, but the greatest heritage that we can leave to our children is liberty under law as we have known it under the Constitution of the United States of America. If we can leave that to our children and to the children of these men who are doing the fighting we shall have accomplished something.

We must not forget that the President was absolutely right when he said that free governments have been wrecked by loose fiscal policies. We have had a loose fiscal policy during all these years under this administration. Every dictator in Europe has been brought to power by loose fiscal policies carried to the point of spending and waste and extravagance until the printing press became the god of the people under dictatorships, and money then vanished into nothing; insurance policies, everything vanished into thin air.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIVE YEARS OF OUR GROSS NATIONAL DEBT FROM WASHINGTON TO FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT

(By Roy A. Foulke, Dun & Bradstreet)

President	Year	Gross national debt	Per capita debt	Significant events influencing national debt
George Washington	1789			Years of organization and adjustment.
	1790	$75,880,000	$19.32	
	1791	75,463,000		
	1792	77,227,000		
	1793	80,358,000		
	1794	78,427,000		
	1795	80,747,000		
	1796	83,762,000		
John Adams	1797	82,064,000		
	1798	79,228,000		
	1799	78,408,000		
	1800	82,976,000	15.63	
Thomas Jefferson	1801	83,083,000		War with Tripoli.
	1802	80,712,000		
	1803	77,054,000		
	1804	86,427,000		
	1805	82,312,000		
	1806	75,723,000		Maritime commerce prosperity.
	1807	69,218,000		
	1808	65,196,000		
	1809	57,023,000		Controversies with Great Britain.
	1810	53,173,000	7.35	
James Madison	1811	48,005,000		War of 1812.
	1812	45,209,000		
	1813	55,926,000		
	1814	81,487,000		
	1815	99,833,000		Post-war spending.
	1816	127,334,000		Expanding customs receipts.
	1817	123,491,000		
	1818	103,446,000		Business depression.
	1819	95,529,000		
James Monroe	1820	91,015,000	9.45	
	1821	89,987,000		
	1822	93,546,000		
	1823	90,875,000		
	1824	90,269,000		
	1825	83,788,000		Expanding customs receipts.
John Q. Adams	1826	81,054,000		
	1827	73,987,000		
	1828	67,475,000		
	1829	58,421,000		
Andrew Jackson	1830	48,565,000	3.77	Expanding customs receipts.
	1831	39,123,000		
	1832	24,322,000		
	1833	7,001,000		
	1834	4,760,000		Increasing sale of public lands.
	1835	33,000		
	1836	37,000		
Martin Van Buren	1837	336,000		Panic of 1837.
	1838	3,308,000		
	1839	10,434,000		
William H. Harrison	1840	3,573,000	.21	
John Tyler	1841	5,250,000		Period of nominal public debt.
	1842	13,594,000		
	1843	20,201,000		
	1844	23,461,000		
James K. Polk	1845	15,925,000		
	1846	15,550,000		
	1847	38,826,000		Mexican War.
	1848	47,044,000		
Zachary Taylor	1849	63,061,000		Post-war spending.
	1850	63,452,000	2.30	
Millard Fillmore	1851	68,304,000		
	1852	66,199,000		
Franklin Pierce	1853	59,804,000	2.36	Industrial expansion and prosperity.
	1854	42,243,000	1.62	
	1855	35,588,000	1.32	
	1856	31,974,000	1.15	
James Buchanan	1857	28,701,000	1.01	Panic of 1857.
	1858	44,913,000	1.53	
	1859	58,498,000	1.93	Decreased customs and increase in public improvements.
	1860	64,843,000	2.06	
	1861	90,582,000	2.83	
Abraham Lincoln	1862	524,177,000	16.03	Civil War.
	1863	1,119,773,000	33.56	
	1864	1,815,830,000	53.33	
Andrew Johnson	1865	2,677,929,000	77.07	Post-war spending.
	1866	2,755,763,000	77.69	
	1867	2,650,168,000	73.19	
	1868	2,583,446,000	69.87	
	1869	2,545,110,000	67.41	
	1870	2,436,453,000	63.19	
	1871	2,322,052,000	58.70	
Ulysses S. Grant	1872	2,209,990,000	54.44	26 years of almost unbroken reduction in public debt.
	1873	2,151,210,000	51.62	
	1874	2,159,932,000	50.47	
	1875	2,156,276,000	49.06	
	1876	2,130,845,000	47.21	
	1877	2,107,759,000	45.47	

President	Year	Gross national debt	Per capita debt	Significant events influencing national debt
Rutherford B. Hayes	1878	$2,159,418,000	$45.37	26 years of almost unbroken reduction in public debt.
	1879	2,298,912,000	47.05	
James A. Garfield	1880	2,090,908,000	41.69	
	1881	2,019,285,000	39.35	
Chester A. Arthur	1882	1,856,915,000	35.37	
	1883	1,721,958,000	32.07	
	1884	1,625,307,000	29.60	
	1885	1,578,551,000	28.11	
	1886	1,555,659,000	27.10	
Grover Cleveland	1887	1,465,485,000	24.97	
	1888	1,384,631,000	23.09	
	1889	1,249,470,000	20.39	
Benjamin Harrison	1890	1,122,396,000	17.92	
	1891	1,005,806,000	15.75	
	1892	968,218,000	14.88	
	1893	961,431,000	14.49	
	1894	1,016,897,000	15.04	Decreasing customs receipts.
Grover Cleveland	1895	1,096,913,000	15.91	
	1896	1,222,729,000	17.40	
	1897	1,226,793,000	17.14	
	1898	1,232,743,000	16.90	Spanish-American War.
William McKinley	1899	1,436,700,000	19.33	
	1900	1,263,416,000	16.56	
	1901	1,221,572,000	15.71	
	1902	1,178,031,000	14.89	
	1903	1,159,405,000	14.40	
	1904	1,136,259,000	13.88	
Theodore Roosevelt	1905	1,132,357,000	13.60	
	1906	1,142,522,000	13.50	
	1907	1,147,178,000	13.33	Period of public debt stability.
	1908	1,177,690,000	13.46	
	1909	1,148,315,000	12.91	
	1910	1,146,939,000	12.69	
William H. Taft	1911	1,153,984,000	12.28	
	1912	1,193,838,000	12.48	
	1913	1,193,047,000	12.26	
	1914	1,188,235,000	12.00	
	1915	1,191,264,000	11.83	
	1916	1,225,145,000	11.96	
Woodrow Wilson	1917	2,975,618,000	28.57	World War No. 1.
	1918	12,242,628,000	115.65	
	1919	25,482,034,000	240.09	
	1920	24,297,918,000	228.32	
	1921	23,976,250,000	221.09	
Warren G. Harding	1922	22,964,079,000	208.97	
	1923	22,349,687,000	200.10	
	1924	21,251,120,000	186.86	The great prosperity.
	1925	20,516,272,000	177.82	
Calvin Coolidge	1926	19,643,183,000	167.70	
	1927	18,510,174,000	156.04	
	1928	17,604,290,000	146.69	
	1929	16,931,197,000	139.40	
	1930	16,185,308,000	131.49	The great depression—deficit spending and bootstrap financing.
Herbert Hoover	1931	16,801,485,000	135.37	
	1932	19,487,009,000	155.93	
	1933	22,538,672,000	179.21	
	1934	27,053,085,000	213.65	
	1935	28,701,167,000	225.07	
	1936	33,545,384,000	261.20	
	1937	36,427,091,000	281.82	
	1938	37,167,487,000	285.43	
Franklin D. Roosevelt	1939	40,445,417,000	308.34	
	1940	42,971,043,000	325.66	
	1941	48,978,919,000	368.08	
	1942	72,495,182,000	540.68	
	1943	136,696,000,000	1,007.64	World War No. 2.
	1944	206,000,000,000	1,486.00	
	1944	[1] 240,000,000	1,846.60	

[1] Debt extension.

Debt June 30, 1945, $258,000,000,000; per capita, $1,984.61.

Debt of every family of five in United States of America will be $9,923.05 June 30, 1945.

I am ready to extend the debt limit. Probably it will be extended many times more, but certainly the time has come when the people will expect of their Congress a thorough study into every expenditure that is made by the Government that is not related to the war. It is well enough to stand here on the floor and say that 96 cents out of every dollar is spent in payment of the war effort, but we only have to look about us to see that that is not true. That is just simply a platitude that is repeated over and over again. And so I consider it my responsibility—although I shall support this bill wholeheartedly—as long as I remain in Congress to think of the people at home, not this great, overgrown bureaucracy that has been set up here and that existed long before the beginning of the war was ever thought of by the administration. I am going to scrutinize every expenditure, and I am going to tell my people at home exactly what is being done with their money. Others may take another view if they wish and feel that they own the Government, but they are not representing the people back home when they feel that their job is to spend and get reelected with public funds. One of the greatest dangers in this country today is the money with which the Congress has armed the greatest political propaganda agency in the world. Hitler never had anything like it; no other country has. In one night the agency can blanket millions of people with half-truths, which they have done, looking to elections. That has become a dangerous instrument placed in dangerous hands; and that, with the blank checks that have been given to the administration to use in any way it and the New Deal bureaucrats see fit before elections is gradually undermining our form of government. It is well for us to beware, and I would serve notice on those people who are rather indifferent and who do not care whether they go to the polls or not, that the only instrumentality of free government provided in the Constitution is the ballot. The people better be thinking these days about going to the polls no matter for which party they vote. It is not fair or just to ask the soldiers to go over there and fight for the cause to which it is claimed they are committed; that is, the preservation of free government, and for the people back home to fail to exercise the greatest instrumentality of free government here, which is the ballot. It is the only means by which a free people regain their sovereign powers as free men and women.

A statement was made at one time to the effect that when the educated, industrious, temperate, thrifty citizens are as prompt and zealous and unfailing in duty as the ignorant and venal and mischievous, or when it is clear they cannot be roused to their duty then, but not until then, if ignorance and corruption always carry the day there can be no honest question that this Government has failed.

But let us not be deceived while good men and women sit at home not knowing there is anything to be done nor caring to know, half persuaded that this Republic is a contemptible rule of a mob and secretly longing for some splendid, vigorous despotism, then remember that it is not a government mastered by ignorance, it is a government betrayed by intelligence. It is the intelligent forces in this Government that must step forward and save it, not a demagog shouting his platitudes and his half-truths over the wires of a propaganda agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take any time on this bill. I assumed that the expressions in committee before the bill was approved unanimously, as stated by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], would hold good, that there were no politics in its consideration and that there would be no politics. Personally, I am disappointed in the fact that this debate has finally degenerated into a political battle between the two parties. Naturally it is directed to our side of the aisle, therefore we must stand in defense of what we believe to be the facts. As one Member of the House I resent the injection of politics or personalities into this debate; it is uncalled for and my friend from Minnesota would not want to be charged with taking advantage of the latitude generally allowed to a speaker making an impromptu speech. I do not believe the toll-bridge question has anything to do with the bill before us, but granting for the sake of argument that it did have something to do with it, let us consider waste and unwarranted extravagance at the proper time and place and I will go along with the gentleman. I think that waste of taxpayers' money is something that is worthy of criticism, but as compared with the great

war effort and the tremendous amount of money being legitimately expended, it is hardly worth the mention, and certainly not in connection with a bill of this kind. Those things should be criticized at a time when an appropriation bill is before the House and not in connection with this bill which has to do with the raising of the debt limit, something essential to the Nation's welfare.

The gentleman from Minnesota talked about boondoggling in this war. We have heard a lot of charges about World War No. 1 which after the Republicans gained control were thoroughly investigated. I think there were 101 boards, bureaus and commissions, together with the Army and Navy, that were sifted closely, examined and reexamined. The Republican report was a clear-cut, straight forward declaration that while there was some waste due to haste, there was not 1 cent spent as the result of any conniving or crookedness. I think to a great extent that same thing is going to be true of this war. At least I hope so. I have been as critical as anyone with regard to looseness in the expenditures of the Army and Navy and I am willing to go along with anyone who will legitimately undertake to correct these abuses. Small as they are, they have no place in our war effort if we can prevent them.

But let us just harken back to the last war with which the Republicans had anything to do, and I refer to the Spanish-American War. When you talk about boondoggling, there were more men who died from disease in our camps abroad and at home and from embalmed beef than were actually killed in battle while the administration at that time or those having to do with the prosecution of the war were boondoggling with the lives of our soldiers. So it is better not to cast stones when we live in political glass houses, because these things are indelibly noted in history and you cannot get away from them. You did not prove any such misuse of taxpayers' funds in World War No. 1 and I am sure there will be less comparable basis to assail the administration in the conduct of this war.

Then when you talk about huge expenditures and say that Russia, Germany, Italy, and Japan together have spent less in this war than we have, I ask, So what? The American people ask, So what? The fact of the matter is we are fighting this war with freemen and our production is on the basis of free men and women. We pay 3 to 10 times as much for our buckshot and war service as the workers and soldiers receive in any other comparable country and, in addition to that, it is probably better not to say how cheaply Germany is conducting her bestial war because she has enslaved the people of the subjugated nations who produce her war matériel, and there is, therefore, no basis for comparison.

I do not think such references have any place in this debate. The thing involved here is whether it is necessary to raise the debt limit in order to prosecute this war. On that point we on both sides in the committee are agreed and said that it is necessary. We cannot get away from it. It is one of those things that is a "must" in conscience. It is a patriotic responsibility that we cannot dodge or get away from. We are going to vote to raise the debt limit. I do not see how any man claiming to be a patriot and responsive to the wishes of his constituency can possibly vote against the lifting of the debt limit when he knows, by voting against a lifting of the debt limit, that it will stifle the war effort. Under those circumstances if there is to be a roll call everyone will vote for this bill. I am in favor of the bill, though I shall not press for a roll call because I record myself here and now as voting "aye." For the sake of reference Members may desire a roll call. If it were not for that, or for other personal reasons, I do not think it is even necessary to have a recording of the vote on this bill.

So why bring politics in here; why make attacks on something that is relatively trivial in volume? If it is deserving of criticism, I say criticize it at the proper time, but not during the consideration of this bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of the remarks the gentleman refers to, because I was not in the Chamber at the time they were made. I was interested, however, in what the gentleman had to say about there being no fraud during the First World War. If the gentleman had been in the Congress in the years immediately following the First World War he would have known that I rose in my place on this floor one day and threatened the impeachment of the then Attorney General of the United States if he did not permit the courts of the country to pass upon the claims of the Government against many contractors, an audit of their accounts having shown they had been grossly overpaid by the Government.

I wish to say to my colleague that I am not charging any man in the Government with fraud in connection with any of those overpayments. After the close of the last war the then administration, and very naturally I think, tried to place in the hands of the manufacturers in the country funds with which they could return to their peacetime production. Mistakes were made, of course.

Mr. DINGELL. I would rather the gentleman would ask me a question than make a speech.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I am not trying to embarrass the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I am not fearful of the embarrassment, but this is not a question. It is a rehash of the last war.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. DINGELL. I only yielded for a question.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does the gentleman decline to yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I request the gentleman to proceed with his question. I am waiting to be questioned.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I did not ask the gentleman to yield to me for a question.

Mr. DINGELL. I presumed as much. I think the gentleman can well state his objection to anything I have said in his own time.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I have no objection to what the gentleman said. I am not objecting to that. I am trying to clear the record.

Mr. DINGELL. There is no argument on the fact that the Republican administration went over the conduct of the last war with a fine-toothed comb. There were 101 boards, I believe, and commissions and missions investigated, and, too, the War Department and the Navy Department, and everybody else who had anything to do with the expenditure of a single dollar, and the report was a clear-cut acquittal. The statement, as I recall it in substance, was that while there was undeniably some waste, it was justified, but there was no dishonesty, and I thought that that was all the American people were interested in, aside from winning, about the last war.

The gentleman was not in the Hall when reference was made to politics.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I will say to my friend the gentleman from Michigan, that I had no part in any colloquy that took place here earlier in the day, to which the gentleman is addressing his remarks. All I am trying to do is to set forth the fact that there was a lot of fraud during the First World War on the part of the contractors of the country. I am not charging any collusion on the part of any members of the Regular Establishment of the Army or the Navy, but I will say that an investigation of the conditions at that time did disclose the fact that many men, officers of rather high rank that had come into the Federal military service during the wartime, were guilty of things for which they should have been court-martialed. My authority for that statement is the recent Chief Justice of the United States, Charles E. Hughes.

Mr. DINGELL. With that I find no fault. I state to the gentleman that after this war and during this war we could probably find—and I do not know by what means or method—that there has been some misuse of the public funds in the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. DINGELL. But the references made here on the floor do not specifically refer to any such case. It is a broadgage innuendo which does not amount to anything and which has no place in this forum in connection with this debate.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. If they should have been prosecuted, why did not the gentleman's party do it?

Mr. DINGELL. That is precisely what I was going to say. If my friend the gentleman from Michigan, or my friend the

gentleman from Minnesota know of any specific instances of wrongdoing, I think it is incumbent upon them to bring that matter to the attention of the Attorney General of the United States or to the Provost Marshal or The Adjutant General of the United States Army and point out a case of willful, deliberate squandering of the public funds. I think that then those people will be brought to time, that they will be court-martialed, and the public rights will be preserved.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] 10 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, regardless of whether or not there has been any extravagance and any dishonesty in the present administration of war affairs and other matters, this is a stark fact, that the United States of America owes more money today than any nation ever owed in the history of the world. This is another stark fact, that about 90 percent of this debt has been incurred in the last 11 or 12 years. This is another stark fact that in the 12 years this administration has been in power, every year during peacetimes it has shown a deficit of from one to four billion dollars, and every year during wartimes it has shown a deficit of tens of billions of dollars.

Let us dismiss this proposition of the colossal debt figure. There is no question but that there is gross extravagance now. We have before us for consideration a very serious and important matter, and that is whether we shall increase the debt limitation from $210,000,000,000 to $240,000,000,000.

On the face of this bill I want to call your attention to a change or an amendment that indisputably proves the tendency of this administration. The Treasury of the United States came before the Committee on Ways and Means a day or two ago recommending that we raise the debt limit to two hundred and sixty billion; from two hundred and ten billion to two hundred and sixty billion.

Your Committee on Ways and Means oftentimes is called upon to do things that are not very popular, but on this occasion they did something that was not only popular but righteous. They asked the Treasury of the United States, "Do you really need to have this limitation raised to $260,000,000,000?" By reason of the action of the committee itself the Treasury officers were forced to admit that this large increase was not absolutely necessary, and they agreed to reduce the amount to $240,000,000,000. In other words, the Treasury of the United States, if the committee had sat idly by, would have jumped that debt limit $20,000,000,000 more without any reason or justification. It was not necessary. That is the way they do business. That is an index to their spending character. Harry Hopkins once said that the philosophy of the New Deal was to spend, spend, spend and elect, elect, elect.

There is no question about the fact that they have been extravagant. To their extravagance can be attributed a good percentage of this enormous debt. They have been extravagant in their conduct and more extravagant yet in their vision.

I would like to give the Members a few historical facts that troop into my mind very frequently. I was here in Congress 12 years ago when the New Deal took over. I was here nearly 20 years ago, and I remember when we were considering the colossal debt that followed the last war. We Republicans talked and orated about the debt that followed the last war, for it was a worry as to what to do with it. It seemed to be so colossal. How much was it? Only $27,000,000,000. But that was the greatest debt that any nation ever staggered under up to that time. Twenty-seven billion was enough to scare us nearly to death because our party had always been the party of thrift and economy. But we tackled it and the Republicans for 10 years reduced it $1,000,000,000 each year. Never in the history of our country was the public debt paid off so rapidly as that which was paid from 1920 to 1930.

Then the depression came on. What happened during the first months of the depression has not been publicized much. When the impartial historian writes the history of that period he will give an account of the patriotic, sincere, and devoted attention that Mr. Herbert Hoover gave to that serious problem. I shall not discuss it here, but I should like to do so some other time.

I remember the first legislative action taken during the Hoover administration to stop the depression through employing idle men on public works. Do you know what we did? What we did, we did with some trepidation and we planned a program of public spending that in these days would be laughably small. I voted for it and I thought it was a terribly big undertaking. I voted for $150,000,000 to stop the depression. They said it would do it, $50,000,000 for expenditures here in Washington and $100,000,000 for public works over the Nation. I thought it might do it and I voted accordingly and since then I have voted for a hundred times that much without any appreciable difference in my blood pressure, and so have you. I am talking about millions now, not billions. We voted for it and we thought none of us would ever be reelected because of that terrific expenditure of money. There was no one in the United States that I heard of but one man that I know of who had the temerity to say that it would take $10,000,000,000 to overcome the depression. He was looked upon as a false prophet who was seeking the headlines.

We spent money in those days with some consideration. Today we do not do it that way. It is a sad fact that we have become so careless and we are going to have to answer for this sometime. We find ourselves as did the poet who said:

> Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
> As to be hated needs but to be seen;
> Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

I am going to vote for this bill. Why? Because the Treasury says that we should do so, the Army wants us to do so, and we know that this is not the time to raise any embarrassing situations.

But I remember the first time we increased the debt limitation. I think it was then $27,000,000,000. We had the courage to run it up, I think, to $35,000,000,000. Then we raised it from $35,000,000,000 to $49,000,000,000, and I swore to myself I would never vote for another increase. I said I would never vote to increase that, but I did. I voted to increase it to $65,000,000,000, then I voted to increase it to $125,000,000,000, and I voted to increase it to $210,000,000,000. Now I am going to vote to increase it to $240,000,000,000.

In the name of common sense, when are we going to stop? Does someone want to ask me, "Are you against feeding the starving? Are you against the war?" That is the question that is thrown at those who try to economize. No, I am not against that, of course I am not, and I have never voted against any of those things, but nobody on this floor has the temerity to stand up and attempt to justify the reckless, extravagant expenditures that we see on every hand, let it be for the War Department or the Navy Department, or whatever it might be. Thrift is of the spirit. Extravagance is of the spirit. What the spirit willeth the hand doeth.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. On yesterday or the day before, the committee unanimously reduced the request for a ceiling of $260,000,000,000 to $240,000,000,000, thereby cutting off an amount that represents 75 percent of the total cost of World War No. 1.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; the gentleman is absolutely right. I do not want to claim that the Republicans are entitled to all the credit of making this $20,000,000,000 reduction, but I do say that if it had not been for the Committee on Ways and Means and their experience in handling these financial matters the figure would have remained as advocated by the Treasury, at $260,000,000,000. When they were confronted with the facts and the arguments put up by both the Members on the Republican side and on the other side of the committee, they wilted right down. That is a sample of what we should have been doing for years. We have permitted the greatest bunch of high spenders that ever got together to organize themselves, apparently to change our form of government, by taking from one group without any sense of justice and giving to another without any sense of reason.

I have made this statement on the floor of the House before and I make it now, and I have watched it carefully, that only one time have I heard the word "economy" come out of the mouth of the President of the United States in the last 11 years. He made the people think he was economy-minded before he was elected; but he is not economy-minded now and has never been since he was elected. As a result, we are staggering

under this colossal debt. Nobody, I do not care who he is, can look at this $240,000,000,000 debt and tell us just exactly how to work it out and tell us how we are going to pay it.

A few days ago we asked a representative of the Treasury in our hearings, "How much is the total appraisal of the United States of America?" He said he did not know. I understood him to say an appraisal had not been made for 5 or 6 years, but he thought the understanding was that it was about $300,000,000,000. We now owe as much as every piece of property in the Nation is worth. How are we going to pay it when we add to that the individual debts, the State debts, and the municipal debts, and the county debts of the Nation?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The Census Bureau figures show a tax list of all the property of every kind and character in the United States, and it was a little less than $150,000,000,000.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman. If that is true, then where and how are we going to pay it? How are we ever going to pay this tremendous debt?

You know how we pay public debts. We pay them in just one of three ways. This is academic, and you all know it. We pay debts one of three ways. How? By repudiation, and I hope we will never do that. If we do, our form of government will not long endure. When we repudiate our debt we will not be a self-governing proud Republic any more. Another way is by inflation. If anybody is so unpatriotic as to encourage inflation for the purpose of paying debts, he is a traitor to our form of government.

The next way is what? Taxation. Those of you who will be here in the next Congress and the next Congress and the next Congress are going to have the burden and responsibility of taxing, taxing, taxing eternally, in order that the honor of this Nation may be preserved and that its very perpetuity may be guaranteed.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just preceded me has opened the way for what I want to say, because I am going to talk about what I think has to be done about this national debt.

Thomas Jefferson is frequently quoted and held up before us as being America's greatest political philosopher. I believe him to have been that and I believe him to be that today. I quote certain words of Jefferson and ask you to listen to them:

> I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a money aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government to whom it properly belongs.

It is the last sentence in which I am primarily interested at the moment. Let me repeat it:

> The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government to whom it properly belongs.

In the last year, according to a report of the Federal Reserve Board which I have here, the holdings of the Federal Reserve banks of Government securities of one kind and another increased from $6,188,000,000 to $11,542,000,000. The capital stock of the Federal Reserve banks is approximately $154,000,000 of paid-in capital. They now own $11,542,000,000 of the public debt.

What did they buy it with? They bought it with credit created on their books called reserve bank credit. These credits are created on the books of the Federal Reserve banks, but they are guaranteed by the Government of the United States. These bonds and other Government securities were bought with the credit of the American people, which by act of Congress was given to the privately owned Federal Reserve banks to use.

In the next place, I should like to read you briefly a statement made by Mr. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in speaking before the Ohio Bankers' Association in 1935.

Mr. Eccles said this:

> There is no political or economic power more charged with the general or social interest than the power to increase or decrease the supply of money. If the sovereign authority delegates this power to a particular group or class in the community as it has done in large part in this country, it divests itself of a part of its effective sovereignty. * * * The power to coin money. It was one of the first powers given to the Federal Government by the Constitutional Convention. The development of deposit banking, however, introduced into the economy numerous private agencies which have power to create and destroy money without being recognized as creators or destroyers of money by the Government or the people.

These are not JERRY VOORHIS' words I have given you. They are words of Thomas Jefferson and Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. That is my case in brief.

Seventy billion dollars of the present public debt about which we worry, and properly so, has resulted from the sale—and I put the "sale" in quotes—of interest-bearing public securities of the United States Government to the banking system of this country for new money created in the form of demand deposits on the books of those banks. That seventy billion never should have been national debt at all. Even the men who come back from winning this war will pay interest on that portion of the public debt as well as on that perfectly legitimate portion of the public debt which has resulted because you or I or a corporation or a bank paying with cash that it already had has given up money to the Government as a loan and thereby bought a bond.

Seventy billion dollars of the present public debt has resulted from that kind of transaction whereby the credit of the United States has been drawn upon by private institutions and money has been created upon their books and public bonds bought with it. What do I think should have been done? I introduced a simple bill—other Members have introduced similar bills—to provide that the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks should be purchased by Congress from the member banks who now own that capital stock; that from that time on funds for the purpose of financing the war—over and beyond the amount that could be raised by taxes or real borrowing, where people actually gave up money they already possessed to buy these bonds—any additional amounts necessary could be acquired by sale by the Treasury to the Federal Reserve of non-interest-bearing certificates.

This is a serious matter. I do not share the views of people who say the debt does not make any difference. I know it does. The carrying charges on that debt at the war's end will probably be in excess of $7,000,000,000. True, it is held internally, but it is not going to be held in as diffuse a manner or by nearly as many people as I wish it would be held or as it would have been held had Congress adopted a compulsory-savings program at the beginning of this war. So the debt is important and serious.

But the most important thing about that debt is for the people of this country to come out of this war with an answer to the problem it presents.

What do I think that answer is? First, if we are to even dream of carrying a load like that we have got to have full production and full employment in America. We cannot afford a depression. We cannot afford to fail to have a full home market for the products of our industry and agriculture at full employment. For that full home market and that demand on the part of the people is the one thing that can assure full production and full employment and a high national income and the ability of our country to carry the load. Second, we must have an expanding and dynamic economy, Mr. Chairman. You cannot have one that is merely static. America has never been that way. From year to year our power to produce is going to increase. From year to year our inventors, our businessmen, our workers, and our farmers are going to devise better means of producing wealth.

But according to the present financial system of this Nation the only way in which that increased productive capacity can be matched by an increase in volume of purchasing power in circulation is for somebody, either a private individual or the Government, to go into debt to the banking system of this Nation. Our money supply at present is inextricably tied to debt. As long as that is true we shall suffer from inflation and deflation. As long as it is true Government will be compelled to borrow whenever private borrowing is reduced. I think there is a better way. I know there is a better way. To the extent, and mark me carefully, and only to the

extent that the capacity of this Nation to produce additional wealth grows and there are more goods and services to be exchanged and more business to be done, to that extent a corresponding increase in the volume of money in circulation should be placed to the credit of the American people—not charged to them as debt—by being entered on the books of the Treasury through a monetary agent set up by Congress and charged with the exclusive power to create money in this Nation. At the present time we cannot get the increase in our monetary supply in this way. If we could, the people would know in time of need it was unnecessary for the national interest-bearing public debt to go up. They would know that we could equate our productive capacity with an equivalent buying power on the part of the American people without increasing the public debt, and they would know, even though it took sweat and toil to do it, that they had the answer to debt; that they could beat debt, in the course of time, and that they could beat it, not by overburdening taxation, not by inflation, but by increasing the productive capacity of their country, and by that alone. And as soon as we learn to credit to the Nation that increment in its productive capacity, to call additional money required by economic necessity national credit instead of the national debt, we shall have the answer to the problem. I refer the House once again to my book, Out of Debt, Out of Danger, wherein I have gone into this whole question fully.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. This equation strikes me—from the figures submitted by the gentleman—and I understand there are approximately $11,000,000,000 to the credit of the Federal Reserve at the present time?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the amount of Government securities which the Federal Reserve banks own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROWE. I mean the amount of assets they hold which are Government securities.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. ROWE. That is, on their total capitalization of $155,000,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes, on a capital of $154,000,000.

Mr. ROWE. That is right, that is $155,000,000. And following the war, there will be an increment to the Federal Reserve bank of approximately $255,000,000 annually from a capitalization of $155,000,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Did you figure that at a rate of interest of 2½ percent?

Mr. ROWE. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is too high. On the securities which the Federal Reserve holds, the average rate of interest is less than that because part of those securities are notes and bills, which do not bear as high a rate as the bonds do, you understand. Your figures would be correct, however, for the average holdings of most of the banking system on the $70,000,000,000 figure that I gave. But on the Federal Reserve figures it would be less than the figures the gentleman gives. However, he is in essence perfectly correct, that on a capitalization of some $154,000,000, those banks will earn several times that amount over the war period.

Mr. ROWE. And the reduction of the interest from the point of two and a half will be about $25,000,000 per quarter percent under that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is approximately correct. The Federal Reserve banks now have very substantial surpluses, much greater than their capitalization. It is not the money they are making, however, that concerns me. It is a question of fundamental principle of any government of a people that would be free. The power to create money is equivalent precisely to the power to tax. If I can create money myself I can demand from you a portion of your labor and wealth. Only the sovereign government has the right to do that. And yet not only the Federal Reserve banks but every single commercial bank in the Nation exercise that power today.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not true, sir, that the earning of this money is practically under the control that you set?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; the only reason the Federal Reserve banks have that income is because of their exercise of the essentially governmental power to create money; is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If I had it with me I could read you exactly the words of Mr. Goldenweiser, the Chief of the Research Bureau of the Federal Reserve Board. But I will give them to you in substance. That the resources of the Federal Reserve banks derive in small part from the capital which Congress authorized, but primarily from their power to create and accept deposits. That is the explanation of how $154,000,000 banks can buy $11,000,000,000 of the debt of the American people. It is the whole explanation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. In line with what the gentleman said, that there are three methods of paying this debt, the gentleman said there are more than three methods and one was by way of increasing business. Of course, the gentleman has to admit that increasing business does not assure money getting into the Treasury. There is only one way to get money into the Treasury and that is by taxation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No, the gentleman misunderstood. It is not the only way to get money into the Treasury. Borrowing is another way. I have proposed a third method. Now, I want the private banks to do a private banking business accepting deposits, making loans, and deciding who shall borrow money and who shall not, and who is a good risk and who is not. I want private banks to do that rather than Government agencies. But I do not want private banks to capitalize on the growth of the Nation itself. And what I am appealing for is that to the extent that production of the country increases between 1948 and 1949, let us say by 5 percent, we should thereby as a Nation have the right to a direct credit on the books of our Treasury of 5 percent of the total volume of money previously in circulation in order that we may balance increased production with increased power to consume and may use that credit on the books of the Treasury, of whatever amount it may be, as a means of reducing taxation by a corresponding amount and leaving that money in circulation in the hands of the people.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] for granting me this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am always exceedingly interested in the discussions provoked by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. On a number of occasions I have found myself in substantial agreement with many of the suggestions made from time to time by him. First, he is apprehensive, as I am, about this constantly growing national debt. He realizes, as I do, that there seems to be no way to stop this debt from mounting, if the Nation performs its function in carrying on this war to ultimate victory. His problem is how are we to handle this situation when this war shall end and the Nation is confronted with the necessity for taking care of and servicing a national debt of $300,000,000,000, or more. No one knows what it may ultimately be. There are those individuals who think that that is not a proper subject for conversation. They state that we should just blindly proceed under the theory that we are in war, and as a result, we should not discuss expenditures of money or debt.

I am glad that the gentleman from California, among other Members of this House, who are voting as I am, to provide the funds necessary to carry on this war and the activities of government—and shall continue to do so—is giving concern to the problem that is going to face this country in handling and servicing this debt.

I want to say that I am in accord with that phase of the gentleman's idea: that I can conceive of no way in which this country can service and handle a debt in excess of $300,000,000,000, except as we are able to produce and to sustain for 50 or 75 years, a constantly expanding national income. That presents a task not only for the present but for future generations of Americans. There can be no let-down in effort. A constantly expanding economy is the only sure means of providing a national income that will save our national economy.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Along the very line that the gentleman is discussing, it should be borne in mind that we paid off part of the World War debt at the rate of about a billion dollars a year. If we come out of this war with a $300,000,000,000 debt and if we should pay off $3,000,000,000 a year, it would take us 100 years to pay the debt.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, the gentleman's mathematics is perfectly correct. That simple statement of fact indicates the tremendous problem that faces this Nation. I, for one, am concerned about it. I do not know what we are going to do about it until this war is ended. I do not know how much money it is going to be necessary to expend. I do know, however, that the people of this country are determined to see to it that no expenditures are made that are not necessary. They are willing to sacrifice in order that every necessary expenditure of money is provided for. They know that to do otherwise means that everything we love and hold dear will collapse.

The thing that does bother me in the discussion of the gentleman from California is the constant criticism of the Federal Reserve System and the utilization by the Federal Reserve System of governmental credit which results, according to the statement of the gentleman from California, in an unwarranted and unreasonable profit taken from the borrowers of this country and the business of this country into the pockets of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just want to say that my criticism, fundamentally, is of the law under which the Federal Reserve operates, rather than any implication that somebody in the Federal Reserve is acting in an improper manner. I am criticizing the system.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, I would like to get one or two things cleared up on that issue as long as the gentleman is here. I know the gentleman has given a great deal of study to the matter. I have also given some study to it, and he will correct me if I am in error. The Federal Reserve System is the creature of the Congress of the United States, is it not?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. It exists by virtue of law passed by the Congress of the United States? That is true?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. The Congress of the United States set it up under a Democratic administration—and I am not going into politics, but I think it was set up under Mr. Wilson's administration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It was.

Mr. KEEFE. The administration has always taken great credit for the establishment of the Federal Reserve System. Now, if I am correct in my understanding of the law under which the Federal Reserve System operates, it being a creature of the Government and set up by congressional action, it is possible at any time, is it not, for the Congress of the United States to take from the treasury of the Federal Reserve System all of its profits, if you please, and transfer them to the Treasury of the United States, except the limitation which prescribes the top limit of dividends that may be paid on stock to the member banks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is 6-percent guaranteed dividends.

Mr. KEEFE. Maximum dividends.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And certain surplus which must be accumulated to guarantee that. Now, in case of the liquidation of a bank, the surplus of those banks would revert to the Treasury. I think, however, it should be clear that although the Congress did set up the banks by law, in the words of a great many more distinguished people than myself, the Government owns not one single cent of equity in those banks, of any sort.

Mr. KEEFE. Let that be as it may. With the set-up of the bank, corporate in character, with the stock owned by various member banks, the fact of the matter is that any time this Congress of the United States sees fit to sequester and take possession of the profits realized through the operation of the Federal Reserve System in this country, they may do so. Is that not true?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I suppose it is conceivable, but I do not think the gentleman would want us to step in, with an act of Congress, and in a disorderly manner take action of that kind. My proposal is that it is a much more straightforward proposition to simply purchase the capital stock of the institutions and make them public institutions, as I believe any bank of issue should be.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is entitled to that position, and I am not saying I am in disagreement with him, but the point I want to make clear is that the reaction that goes out to the country from the speeches that the gentleman makes, whether he intends it or not, is that here is a huge octopus, a private corporation, the Federal Reserve Banking System, that is sucking the lifeblood and the profits and the property of the people of this country into their coffers, and using the credit of this country to make profit by providing capital represented by stock in the Federal Reserve System. Now, I say to the gentleman, I think he will admit and concede that other than the guaranteed returns to the member banks upon the stock which they own in the Federal Reserve System of 6 percent, the United States Government itself has the power at any time to take over any profits realized by the Federal Reserve System.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I want to get back to the point of the public debt which I understand is the subject of debate here. Let us assume that we end this war with a public debt in excess of even $250,000,000,000, which is not unlikely. The interest charges and other service charges for maintaining that debt will be several billions.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; six or seven.

Mr. MAY. And after all that there will be the legitimate operating expenses of the Government.

Mr. KEEFE. Three billion dollars more.

Mr. MAY. If we reach the situation where our revenue declines——

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has not told half the story. We have got to take care of the debt. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. Will he tell us how much of an army we are going to maintain in the post-war period? How much of a merchant marine we are going to maintain? How much of a navy we are going to maintain?

Mr. MAY. I am not going to be drawn off into speculation now; I am trying to get down to an intelligent question.

Mr. KEEFE. All right.

Mr. MAY. When the time comes when we are paying interest on this huge debt and maintaining the usual expenses of the Government what kind of fix are we going to be in when our national income declines? What if it happens before the war is over? Then where will we be?

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman that I do not think we are going to be in that kind of fix at all.

Mr. MAY. I am glad the gentleman does not.

Mr. KEEFE. I think you must differentiate between the status of an individual in a situation of that kind and the status of a government as a sovereignty. I do not conceive the fact that this Nation with its resources and inventive genius and capacity to produce is going to fall down unless we as a people fail to meet our responsibilities. You simply cannot service this debt through taxation on an income which is declining. We must maintain a national income of sufficient size in the post-war period so that you can impose upon that income a reasonable tax to produce sufficient money to pay these expenditures.

Mr. MAY. Certainly; that is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. I personally am one of those who have confidence in the people of the United States to accomplish that very task. What are our gallant men and women giving their lives for if at the war's end the Nation were to collapse internally? If I thought otherwise, if I had any doubts, I would want to close the book right now. I do not even like to have those questions asked because they imply in the asking the fear that this country will not meet its obligations. I am one of those who believe that we will and can, under proper leadership, pay our debts and preserve intact the Government we all love——

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to say I agree very much with what the gentleman just said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in these brief minutes that this has been a most wholesome debate. I have been glad to listen to the debate and I have been pleased with the interest of the Members on this floor. It shows that Congress is beginning to consider the debt problem in a very serious manner. To me this is a sign that we are going to study carefully the future expenditures of this Nation, that we are going to begin now to plan for legislation and for financing that will take care of the expenditures of this Government. We have heard several Members on this floor mention the cost of Government following the war. It is none too soon to consider that question. It is easy to talk about a hundred billion dollars national income and the amount of revenue that will be necessary to carry on the regular expenditures of Government—a national income of $125,000,000,000 or $150,000,000,000; but let us do a little studying. If we maintain a national income of $125,000,000,000—and I sincerely hope we can, in fact I feel we must if we are to carry this national load, that is, $42,000,000,000 more than the national income in 1929, which was a boom year; it is $85,000,000,000 more than the national income in 1932, which was a depression year. It is easy to talk about a national income of $125,000,000,000 or $150,000,000,000, but I think we must approach this problem on a sound basis. The average national income for the 10 pre-war years was $59,100,000,000. A national income of $125,000,000,000 for a similar 10-year period would be more than twice that amount annually. We do not need any heat about this discussion, we just need to sit down as practical men, representatives of the people, and begin to ask ourselves where we are going. There is, I regret to say, a philosophy, a school of thought if I may say so, that seems to have put considerable stress on the proposition that the amount or size of the national debt does not make any difference for we owe it to ourselves. Unfortunately I have never entertained that kind of thought. I believe this debt is as much a solemn obligation upon our people and to our people as any debt an individual ever contracted. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and others have mentioned, there are three and possibly five ways—I noticed that the gentleman from Ohio mentioned three—to take care of this debt. He mentioned repudiation, inflation, and repayment. I think we might add to that capital levy, and also we might mention the debasement of the currency. I sincerely hope that as representatives of the people we will not give serious consideration to any method but a repayment of this debt.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I will yield later, Mr. Chairman. In 1932 the national debt was $19,500,000,000; in 1939 it was $41,000,000,000; today it is $185,000,000,000. Mr. Bell, when he appeared before our committee, said it would be $198,000,000,000 on June 30, 1944, and $258,000,000,000 on June 30, 1945.

We are talking about the load our Nation must carry after this war. Let us assume that our national debt is $250,000,000,000. At 2 percent interest that makes an interest carrying charge of $5,000,000,000 a year. This does not sound very large in these days when we push billions around as though they were millions or thousands. It is a lot of money; it is more money than we are spending this year on non-Government expenditures, more money by several times than we voted a few years ago for the entire expenses of the Government, yet that is just interest on the national debt; it does not take into consideration the amortization of this debt. To those people who say: "Oh, we owe this debt to ourselves; it does not make any difference what it is" I say that is sheer nonsense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I say that is just sheer nonsense; in fact I think it is collectivist propaganda, it is an inspired hoax, a sort of soothing sirup to our people, and I sincerely hope that that particular type of philosophy never gets hold of our people. We had better face this problem seriously. It is going to require the courage and conviction of every American citizen who is concerned about maintaining a republican form of government to insist that we do pay this debt and do not fall by the wayside and accept some of these philosophies that are so easy to take; in fact, it is a sort of drunkard's paradise to get into. I have been pleased with this debate. I was pleased when the Ways and Means Committee had the courage to recommend to this House $20,000,000,000 less than the Treasury requested. There is no question but what the limit fixed in this bill is sufficient. I hope this Congress will so vote today.

When we meet these problems let us remember that the history of backward nations is characterized by oppressive taxation that sooner or later destroyed the productive activities of that nation. We are going to have $5,000,000,000 for national debt, $6,000,000,000 for Government expenses including veterans and public works and agriculture, $6,000,000,000 for a two-ocean Navy and Army; that is $17,000,000,000. We will soon be up to eighteen or twenty billions, and it is estimated from fifteen to thirty billions. So it is a problem we have got to face squarely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps there may be an impression in the House here or throughout the country that the Committee on Ways and Means arbitrarily refused to give the Treasury the amount it requested in this debt limitation bill. This is not correct, because the Under Secretary of the Treasury stated to the Committee on Ways and Means that he would be perfectly well satisfied with the debt limitation in this bill at $240,000,000,000. The only reason the Treasury asked for $260,000,000,000 was that it expected a $260,000,000,000 debt limitation to run the Government until June 1945. He said:

> If you make it $240,000,000,000, the only difference will be that the Treasury Department will have to come to you earlier than it otherwise would for a further increase in authorization.

So that it is not correct to assume that the Ways and Means Committee refused the request of the Treasury Department because, as I said before, the Treasury Department was perfectly well satisfied with the $240,000,000,000. The only difference is that, instead of waiting until perhaps June or July to come back to the Congress to ask for a further increase, they will have to come back probably in January or in February.

Of course, it is a very healthy sign that we should consider very seriously the debt limitation, but I want to call attention also to the fact that we are not by our action today increasing the debt of the United States. The debt of the United States Government will only be increased when additional bonds are issued. When the next War bond drive comes, starting on June 12, our debt limit, if the goal of $16,000,000,000 is reached, will be increased by that $16,000,000,000. Probably later in the year there will be the Sixth War Loan drive, when perhaps an additional $16,000,000,000 in bonds will be sold. That is the time we will increase the debt of the United States, not by any action of ours today.

Furthermore, some people may get the impression that we are passing a bill here today making expenditures, which is not correct. The bill does not refer to expenditures in any way whatsoever. It is just a bill to authorize the Treasury of the United States to sell additional bonds and to increase the debt of the United States to a certain limit. The expenditures will not be increased until the Appropriations Committee and the Congress passes legislation authorizing these expenditures.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Is it not a fact that the Government can only issue bonds to take care of obligations created as a result of appropriations made by the Congress?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is not going to spend this money unless the appropriations call for that expenditure. It will not issue the bonds except in response to appropriations made by the Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is right, and that is what I wanted to bring to the attention of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that during the discussion this afternoon some politics crept in. Personally, I thought the matter could be discussed in 1 hour, one-half hour to each side, and all of the features of the bill would be clear to the Members

of the Congress. I call attention to the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the distinguished ranking majority member of that committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], took only 20 minutes between the two of them, during which time they yielded to every Member who desired to ask a question. All phases of this proposal were covered in that 20 minutes. Since that time politics has been injected into the discussion, and that is perhaps one reason why the request was made by the minority members for 4 hours' general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 4464, introduced by Mr. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, increased the debt limit from two hundred and ten billions to two hundred and sixty billions. The Ways and Means Committee amended the bill and fixed the debt limit at two hundred and forty billions. This increase is supposed to meet the borrowing power of the Government until March 31, 1945. Some of our Democratic friends have made much of the cut from two hundred and sixty billions to two hundred and forty billions. I do not take this too seriously. No doubt, early in January 1945 a measure will be brought in that will likely increase the debt limit to two hundred and ninety or three hundred billions. I agree with the statements of a number of Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans, that by the time the war is over our national debt will be three hundred billions or more. The assessed value of all the property of the United States of every kind and character, personal, real, and mixed, according to the records of the Census Bureau, is approximately one hundred and fifty billions. This will mean a national debt of over $2,200 on an average for every man, woman, and child of the 135,000,000 people of this Nation, or $11,000 on an average for each family of 5 of the Nation.

A big debt is a great handicap to the success of any individual and also to any city, county, State, or Nation. I am pleased that the discussion has taken the turn it has today and that we take time out to talk about our national debt. For a number of years now I have heard no responsible official of this administration make any suggestions as to how this tremendous national debt will be paid. This administration constantly asks for more taxes and increases in the national debt, but there have been no suggestions as to how they are to be met. I have said many times during the years that so long as this administration continues in power, in peacetime or in war, that we would see an increase in our national debt and in our taxes every year, and we find that is the situation today. The American people can expect an increase in our debt and an increase of our taxes so long as the New Deal remains in power.

Our boys are doing a wonderful job all over the world in defending our country and our liberties. They must be tremendously interested in this big debt and these heavy taxes. Every month a part of their pay is taken for bonds and their families are buying bonds. I am sure that more than 60,000,000 people in this country have bought bonds and are buying bonds, and many of these are putting them away for that rainy day that will come later in life. Billions of these bonds are now owned and held by the banks, savings associations, and insurance companies. Seventy-five to 80 percent of the loans in our banks are in United States bonds or saving stamps. I can think of no greater calamity to this country than for the Government to repudiate these bonds. If this national debt becomes so large that it cannot be serviced or paid, it will break every bank and insurance company in this Nation, and it will wreck the economy of the Nation. Such a calamity will destroy our economic, social, and political life. Out of that wreck will come what has happened to every other country similarly situated, a dictatorial and a totalitarian government. It would mean the end of private enterprise, constitutional government, our freedom, and the American way of life.

We have been told in reports from the Administration on lend-lease that we had given away approximately twenty-one billions under lend-lease. A committee of the Senate investigating lend-lease recently found out that approximately nine billions more have been handed out by the Army and Navy, making a total that we have given away under the lend-lease of approximately thirty billions. What a tremendous sum of money that is! The records of the Treasury Department show that on the day the armistice was signed, November 11, 1918, after fighting and winning that war, we had spent about twenty-one billions; yet in this war we have already given away thirty billions. We must give reasonable assistance to our allies but we cannot continue to be the Santa Claus for the world. Let us first provide for our own household.

Most of us will soon pass off the scene of action. This tremendous burden will not be ours to bear. This heavy load will be placed on the backs of twelve to fifteen million young men and young women who are fighting heroically and patriotically all over the world in defense of this country and the millions of other younger citizens. Of course, we must do everything possible to win the war. At the same time, we must refuse to spend any dollar that is not necessary to accomplish that paramount purpose. This heavy debt means heavy taxes not merely to the fourth but perhaps to the tenth generation. These debts, of course, will increase the burdens and lessen the opportunities of our defenders and all our people. It threatens the savings of those who are buying bonds and putting them away to provide support in their declining years. It threatens our economic life and the very existence of our Nation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. It might be well at this time to call attention to the fact that a very considerable sum of lend-lease funds has gone to South American countries for road construction, sanitation, and other nonwar purposes. These funds have gone to nations that have not furnished a man, a gun, or ship, or any fighting.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We are now taking from the American people annually for Federal taxes alone some forty-two to forty-four billions. These taxes are paid by the poor widow, the orphan, and the toilers in the shops, mills, factories, mines, on the railroads, and the farms. We have more than fifty million Federal income-tax payers. The income taxes of 30,000,000 of these, wage and small salary earners, are taken out of their pay checks. As President Roosevelt said in 1932, these taxes are being paid out of the sweat and toil of these millions of American citizens, and these toilers and their descendants for the next 100 years or more will have to pay heavy taxes to meet these enormous debts that are being piled up day by day. I am appealing to you today to scrutinize all of the appropriation bills. In the interest of our own people and in order to save our own country we must not continue to open up the Treasury of the United States to all those who make demands on us. This Nation cannot survive if we continue to be the Santa Claus for the world.

A few days ago a distinguished officer in the United States Army who has been in all the theaters of war, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and knows what has been going on and what is going on, and who is a Democrat, said to me:

> Mr. ROBSION, if the American people could see what I have seen around the world, and know the way our country is being imposed upon, it would almost create a rebellion here in the United States.

Let us see to it that every dollar of the bond and tax money of the American people is used to promote the winning of the war.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It seems to me that I recall that one high in the councils of the Nation referred to the dollar mark as a "silly mark." What has the gentleman to say on that subject?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It was reported President Roosevelt made substantially that statement. The President is also reported to have said that we owe this debt or money to ourselves. I wish to remind the President that we owe this money to the millions of our defenders and their families who have bought and hold these bonds. We owe this money to poor widows and orphans—we owe it to forty to fifty million of those who toil and have used part of their wages and salaries to buy bonds—we owe it to all those who have bought and hold these bonds. It is a sacred obligation and this Government must in the future as in the past meet its obli-

gations. It cannot do so, however, if the executive branch and the Congress squander and waste the people's money and pile up such a huge debt as will bring on uncontrolled inflation or repudiation. We have been told today that the people's bond and tax money has not been squandered and wasted. We need only to take the reports of the Senate Truman committee, headed by a distinguished Democrat. What did this committee find and report? They found at least one concern that was pulling down more than 1,700 percent profit on a cost-plus contract.

Mr. KNUTSON. How much?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Seventeen hundred percent. That committee and investigating committees of the House have developed where many business concerns made 100 percent or more of profits. One company was making so much money they had to hand to a stenographer, who was working for perhaps $200 a month or less, a bonus of $39,000. Of course, many bonuses were paid by various concerns in large sums in order to absorb and cover up the tremendous profits they were making off of the Government on these cost-plus contracts. Anyone going into many of these plants can see on every hand how the Government's money is being wasted and thrown away and how our Uncle Sam is being defrauded. Billions of the bond and tax money has been squandered, wasted, and in many instances fraudulently taken. These investigations showed such big profits that many concerns came in and disgorged a lot of these profits. They were too hot to hold. No officials of any nation that I have ever heard about have engaged in such reckless, wanton, waste and extravagance as the present administration in charge of our country.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Is it not a fact that these contracts you have spoken about have been renegotiated and that the Government has saved billions of dollars by reason of these negotiations?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes, that is true; some of them have. The representatives of this administration made these cost-plus contracts. There was no competitive bidding. The disclosures before these investigating committees of the House and Senate led the Congress and the country to demand that these contracts be renegotiated. A lot of them were renegotiated and this renegotiation did save the Nation billions of dollars. These contracts were made by these same squanderers and wasters of the present administration. These contracts should not have been made—these unconscionable profits should not have gone into the hands of the contractors. Many billions were never recovered and will not be recovered.

The President said in his first inaugural address about March 10, 1933, that we must put the financial house of the Nation in order. We must stop paying out more than we are taking in; that many liberal governments had been wrecked on the rocks of a loose fiscal policy. Those were noble words, but soon thereafter the President and his administration set about to tax, squander, and spend, and they had more than doubled our national debt before we got into the war, and they have continued to tax, squander, waste, and spend ever since, and this will go on as long as they remain in power. If the American people desire to put a stop to this policy of wasting and squandering the people's money and increase of taxes they must vote for a change next November. It is now clear that this administration will not, and under their policies cannot institute and carry out a sound fiscal policy for this Nation. Congress must not sit idly by and permit this administration to destroy this country by its loose and irresponsible fiscal policy.

We must not forget that we will have to take care of perhaps 1,500,000 of our disabled defenders, and perhaps that many or more of the dependents of our defenders after the war, and our Nation must be in shape to provide jobs for fifty to sixty million workers, and we must pay the interest on this tremendous debt and at the same time reduce the debt. We must either adopt a more sane fiscal policy for our country or be faced with uncontrolled inflation, repudiation, the overthrow of our form of government, the destruction of private enterprise, and our liberties.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE].

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, being one of the new Members of this Seventy-eighth Congress, and following the line of distinguished gentlemen who have appeared in the Well of the House this afternoon talking on this most important subject, indeed, I feel inadequate to the occasion. But I think it might be well if the thoughts of a new Congressman be reflected to some of you gentlemen who have been here longer than have we.

It seemed that shortly after the discussion started we did get off onto, as we usually do, repartee of politics between one side and another. That can be expected here. It is further evidence of the health that is always existent in a nation such as ours. In that discussion the Army itself was brought forth in defense of what is occurring here in the increase of this debt. May I say, as a new Member, that the Army needs no defense. The Army and the whole military set-up of this country are doing a grand job. No one is more conscious of that than the Members of the Senate and of this House. The superhuman tasks that have been accomplished in a very short time and the marked effect of that effort upon the trend in world affairs today in this catastrophic war in which we are engaged are of great significance and ought to be recognized.

The thing that impresses me is that the legislative body and the administration, through its representative departments, and particularly the Treasury, are coming to the point where they are beginning to consult with each other about the importance of what we are doing here in increasing the debt. That is further evidence of the health and the virility and the strength of this great Nation. We ought to do that more than we have probably.

I could call to the attention of the House many instances, if I so chose, wherein extravagances have been manifest and in effect because the House in its desire has given everything it could to this great Nation in the prosecution of this war. We have been unlimited and unstinted in our willingness to appropriate moneys.

Now we have come to the point where not only the House, and the Congress, but the military and the administration are beginning to take a summary, are beginning to take sum totals of what the eventual effect will be upon the Nation.

The thing that particularly encourages me and stimulates me this afternoon is that we are now drawing the line of demarcation between those things necessary and essential to the successful prosecution of this war and running our Nation and those things which have been cited here as unnecessary, wasteful, and willful extravagances, sometimes even the deliberate giving away of our moneys.

If the very venerable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the members of that committee will continue to scrutinize and talk across the table in friendly terms with the administration, validating each requirement and requisition which is necessary for the prosecution of this war as well as the essential expenditures, and reason them out, I am quite sure they can come before the Congress with the kind of a bill we have here this afternoon, which has the unanimous approval of the entire committee and will probably receive the unanimous approval of the House.

The only thing that concerns me as a new Congressman and as the father of children who will help assume the payment of what we are doing here in the way of increasing our debt, is that the scrutiny shall continue to be exercised to a point and a degree where we shall not permit the malignant spot of waste and extravagance, the direct product of bureaucratic control, to grow into a disease fatal to the body politic of this great free Nation. The whole purpose of trying to reason these things out across the table between the Committee on Ways and Means and the administration, is to then bring here bills for their ratification and enactment by the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the Congress is being asked to raise the debt limit from $210,000,000,000 to $240,000,000,000. In this matter, as all know, the Congress has no choice since the circumstances relating to the war are the controlling factor.

However, there is a matter over which the Congress still has control which is directly related to the public debt. I refer specifically to the position of the gold reserves of the Federal Reserve banks. As is well known, these reserves have been greatly reduced and are being continually reduced at an accelerating

rate of speed. We are on the one hand losing more and more gold, and on the other piling up additional liabilities—burning the gold reserve candle, so to speak—at both ends.

The ratio of total reserves to deposit and Federal Reserve note liabilities combined was around 91 percent at the end of March 1942, 71 percent at the end of March 1943, and on March 22, 1944, stood at 61.3 percent.

It has been estimated by Professor Spahr in Monetary Notes for February 29 that:

If the combined reserve ratio in the Federal Reserve banks declines in the 16 months, following February 23, 1944, at the same rate that it declined during the 16 months preceding that date, it will be down, by June 1945 to the 42 percent of May 1920. That—

He says—

was the cracking point for the System, since at that level in 1920, 8 of the 12 Reserve banks were paying tax penalties for deficiencies in reserves, and the rediscount rate was 6 percent, and a month later 7 percent.

The Treasury's gold stock declined $750,000,000 from the end of February 1943 to the 1st of January 1944. Federal Reserve notes are increasing at the rate of nearly $5,000,000,000 a year.

Foreign deposits in Federal Reserve banks and weekly reporting member banks were $1,524,000,000 on February 24, 1943. By February 23, 1944, they were $2,412,000,000—an increase of $888,000,000. These deposits could, under certain conditions, be largely converted into gold, thus depleting the gold stocks accordingly.

There are numerous other actual and potential drains of our gold reserves. There is the use of Allied military currency; the activity of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; the China agreement; secret shipments of gold and silver to foreign countries; secret accumulations of foreign holdings of dollar balances in the United States, loans to foreign countries by the R. F. C., and so forth. These gold drains could reach an enormous total, possibly billions.

All these factors must be taken into consideration in determining the state of reserves in the near future. That they could have the effect of lowering appreciably the reserve ratio can hardly be doubted, and by as much as this would take place, the ratio would fall below the estimate of Dr. Spahr in the next 15 or 16 months.

Now, the point I wish to bring to the attention of Congress and the country is this: The administration is at this moment proposing to take away from our rapidly depleting gold reserves in the neighborhood of $5,500,000,000 and give it over into the control of an international body. Should that be done, I have estimated that the ratio of reserves would be reduced far below the legal limit.

Would that make any difference to our financial condition and the future value of the dollar? What do you suppose the foreign governments want with our gold? Do you suppose they want it to keep our money and finances strong and healthy? You know better than that. They want it for exactly the same reason that we should keep it ourselves. They want it to place under their depreciating currencies. By as much as the $5,500,000,000 of gold they are scheming to relieve us of gives support to their currencies, our currencies must lose in value.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, here is something which should be of very serious concern to the Congress and all of our people. The Federal debt is intimately related to the gold reserves. Public confidence rests in no small measure upon the adequacy of reserves, and we must not permit anything to happen to it. The administration should desist from pursuing any further the promotion of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme.

We need every ounce of gold we can possibly avail ourselves of to maintain the value of our own currency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Public Debt Act of 1944.

SEC. 2. That section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. The face amount of obligations issued under the authority of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate $260,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out "$260,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$240,000,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DOUGHTON: On page 1, line 6, after the word "The", strike out the word "face."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PACE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the debt limit of the United States, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill, and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made in Committee by inserting some tables with reference to the national debt.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech recently delivered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The SPEAKER. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include an address delivered by Dr. Thomas F. Thornton.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a speech made by Justice Frank Murphy, on May 8, before the national session of the B'nai B'rith war service convention.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. SABATH from the Committee on Rules submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 540, Rept. No. 1435) on the bill S. 1767, to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 1767, an act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2

days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. It shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the text of the committee amendment to H. R. 3846 as a substitute for title II of the committee amendment to S. 1767.

At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] is recognized for 1 hour.

PEACE WITH JUSTICE

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving an enormous amount of mail petitioning me to lend my efforts and influence to a movement that will bring about in some manner an everlasting peace.

No higher aspiration could come from the mind of man. It requires something more than mere expression to achieve everlasting peace. Our love for peace is usually declared in letters and proclamations; our war spirit is expressed in wanton waste of property and in the shedding of blood by our sons. We say we are tolerant, but are we? We say we are willing to be friendly with other peoples, but are we sincere?

We are not doing all we can if we merely profess our desire for peace amidst the world's worst war. I can almost hear and feel the vibrant fervor of the earnest prayers of millions of mothers who are truly in the depths of suffering. Could there be a more sincere profession in the cause of peace than the plaintive petition of these mothers when the idols of their maternal beings are beyond any help that may come from their willingness to sacrifice? Their sons are in the lap of the god of war. They, too, are praying—praying for home and peace. Yes, it will take more than mere avowal to bring peace. We must learn that fear of war is not a true longing for peace. Peace can only sprout, grow, thrive, and live in the rich soil of justice.

No American hoped more ardently for peace than Woodrow Wilson, and yet that impelling desire came out of the cruel crucible of war. As much as he worked for peace, he knew that it could only exist under certain conditions.

He said:

No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property.

It has been 25 years since Wilson returned from a historic mission in Europe. The hopes of devastated peoples in many nations of that Continent were expressed in acclaim for this man because they believed the powers to bring peace were vested in him.

When he left our shores the altruistic will to bring peace of all our people went with him. He had the faith and prayers of the people. He advocated an international system which would perpetuate peace and assure justice and security to every nation, regardless of its material strength. His proposal of the famous 14 points so imbued our enemies with hope that they accepted them as a basis for settlement and peace.

No sooner were the guns quieted and arms laid down, selfishness among the Allied chiefs began to appear. They hesitated in accepting his proposal. It is admitted this proposal did not nor could not contain every provision to preclude the evil force of selfishness from its true purpose. Many leaders believed its acceptance would destroy the advantage of an armed victory. Wilson sold his plan to the European nations with certain reservations and came home to sell it here. His people awaited him with a pronounced degree of skepticism. The newspapers were warning the people of Germany's possible rearmament. Among the Allied Nations the demand for territorial expansion was heard. Japan was already setting the stage for war against the United States and Great Britain before she had broken her alliance with them. Although our President persuaded the nations of Europe to accept his proposal, he had not yet consulted with his people at home. It appears they believed his intention to have his Nation participate in this agreement was an assumption of power in contravention of his earlier pronouncement "all just powers derived from the consent of the governed."

The people's demands to destroy Germany as a world power became vocal. This was not in accord with Wilson's views. He was fearful of his own position since a new Congress was to be elected that year. In his zeal he committed a fatal error. He appealed to the people to elect a Democratic Congress on the ground that a Republican Congress would divide his leadership during a national crisis. The seed of partisan selfishness, neither party guiltless, was sown in the effort to establish a permanent world peace. National selfishness had sprouted at home and abroad. It grew with the virility of fungi to blight the life of the tree of peace.

When Wilson returned to France on December 13, 1918, the elections were over and Europe knew the results. The Democrats were defeated and his prestige began to wane.

National selfishness became more evident among the Allied Nations, and as Wilson opposed them his prestige diminished rapidly. France, Italy, and Japan demanded territorial concessions. Wilson came home with the liberals of Europe believing he had surrendered his principles. The Congress refused his plea for participation in the League of Nations. Resulting circumstances developed greater conflict of purposes on the part of the leading nations, and the stage was set for a bigger war.

Today the blight of devastation and death is spreading itself over the face of the earth in a global war. The stamina of material strength and spirit will again determine the victor and the vanquished. We are approaching preparations for another peace conference.

Present trends indicate Russia, Great Britain, and the United States will be the major powers at the table. China with her glorious record as a peace-loving nation will be there, considered by some in the role of a satellite. She will probably come with the clearest conscience and cleanest hands. At the last peace conference her petition was unanswered. Her representatives were kept outside locked doors through the influence of selfish Japan. If, however, she does not receive justice a barrier to a complete plan for an enduring peace will again be erected.

If any nation, whether friend or foe, large or small, is denied self-expression about conditions under which it shall proceed in the march of human progress, then again we will have failed.

Conquest leads to spiritual death and national oblivion. No trail is clearer than that of the actors on the stage of history who have tried to be conquerors. Their conquests vanish with them into the grave. Why are they who take by force so oblivious to the fate of their kind?

As the plans are discussed for justice and peace by the leading powers, the lesser nations will petition for justice also, and they are entitled to be heard. The crisis will have been passed only when each and every one shall have left the table with the conviction that they had been dealt with fairly and with justice. All of us are desirous of peace, but let us not mistake the ominous signs before us.

There have been many meetings of the great minds and persons upon whom rested the responsibility for leadership in their respective nations. Out of these meetings came many proclamations.

When nations are in grave danger, their leaders can easily expound the virtues of justice for themselves and those against whom they are waging war. When danger diminishes, the leaders weaken in their principles of justice and revert to the theory of everybody for himself and the devil take the hindmost.

The leading nations are apt to moralize and impose rules upon lesser nations and their people, either by armed force or economic pressure. There are very few nations that do not have this fault. Explorations for ways of helping lesser nations by the strong nations are usually subordinated to explorations for their exploitation.

We remember the Hitler-Mussolini declarations about decadent democracies. How unified they seemed in their purpose to eliminate democracies and impose upon us the superrace theory. Japan joined in their cause. They were strong and unified then, but where is that unity now? We are going

to hear much about equal justice from them from now on.

An examination of the unity among the United Nations is not amiss. We see changes in the passing of each day.

Let us closely examine the trends affecting the relationship among the United Nations; and attempt to determine whether the altruism and high motives of our early proclamations are holding to their original purpose.

The salient principles of the Atlantic Charter are enumerated as follows:

1. There is to be no territorial or capital aggrandizement.
2. The will of the people shall be respected before territorial changes are made.
3. The people of any country shall choose their own form of government.
4. Equal access to raw materials and trade of the world by victor and vanquished.
5. Improved economic adjustments, social security, and labor standards.
6. Permanent peace, that nations may be free from fear within their own boundaries, and eliminate the dread of want from the minds of the people.
7. Free use of the seas and air, without hindrance.
8. Disarmament of all nations and lighter taxation.

This charter was formulated by the leaders of two world powers, who, according to present indications, will be among the final authority at the peace table. They have the same high objectives outlined in Wilson's Fourteen Points.

Our people are again skeptical. The vagaries of these great minds and changing conditions of the war itself are aggravating that skepticism.

Like Woodrow Wilson in 1918, these men seem to be surrendering the inferred principles proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter.

Another meeting was held at Cairo, Egypt, at which these two men were in attendance, together with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. There more proclamations were made. Let us examine them to see if the same high-sounding motives still prevail:

It provides for:

1. A resolution to destroy Japan by unrelenting pressure of sea, land, and air warfare.
2. Stripping Japan of all islands in the East Indies which she has occupied since 1914, all land stolen from China, and acquired elsewhere.
3. Restoration of freedom to Korea.
4. The unconditional surrender of Japan.

The deterioration of the high motives of the Atlantic Charter is quite obvious here. The pronouncements are pregnant with ambiguity and meaningless phraseology. Territorial expansion rears its ugly head in the adroit statement, "We agree to rob a robber."

Up to this point a certain great power has been silent concerning justice and peace. Russia has said but one thing—"Invade on the west."

Let us examine the Teheran declarations, which are, briefly, as follows:

1. Complete agreement among the United States, Great Britain, and Russia on common policy.
2. A pledge to work together.
3. To concert their full power to destroy the German forces. Complete agreement on military program and policy.
4. Common understanding to insure military victory.
5. A sure concord among them will win an enduring peace. Peace must command the good will of the peoples of the world. Will banish the terror of war for many generations.
6. Will welcome all nations into the family of democratic nations.
7. Assembled with determination and left as friends.

ROOSEVELT, CHURCHILL, and STALIN.

It remains a mystery to the people of this great Nation, whose property is being wasted and whose blood is being shed, as to what, if anything, was accomplished by this conference. Destruction of a people and a nation is pronounced at the same time an invitation is extended them to join the peaceful democratic nations in lasting peace. No formula for that peace is given, however. It is indeed a far cry from the Atlantic Charter. Representatives of the people are skeptical about what we are fighting for, and what unconditional surrender means, and whether there is concord among the signers.

Over the signature of several Members of Congress a petition was sent to the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, asking him to state, What are we fighting for and what is meant by unconditional surrender?"

On March 29, 1944, the answer was received by the signers of that petition and it is substantially as follows:

We were referred to a speech made by the President on August 25, 1943, in which he said:

> The people of Europe need not fear unconditional surrender.

He promised them supplies and food and further said:

> The people of Axis-controlled areas may be assured that when they agree to unconditional surrender they will not be trading Axis despotism for ruin under the United Nations.

This follows the usual practice of our leaders in government when questions are directed to them concerning the foreign policy of our Nation or as to why our boys are giving their life's blood.

Washington newspapers cite the tendency of our venerable Secretary of State to refer to something nice he has said some time in the past, and about the impotency of nice speeches as a substitute for a sound foreign policy. Mr. Hull referred Members of Congress to a speech he made over the radio on July 23, 1942, in answer to their question about what we are fighting for submitted to him in March 1944.

I have read that speech through. It is a consistent reflection by Mr. Hull on the injustices practiced by our enemies, a declaration about sharing the fight for liberty with Great Britain, and about our altruism as a world benefactor.

The price of war is mounting to a point where the Congress and the people of the United States cannot be satisfied by the mere expressions of these men in high places who are, admittedly by their own answers, hopefully wishing that out of the chaos of this war shall come the light of peace. Among the petitions that come to my office for peace, plans for its achievement are submitted by every type of our citizenry, from the clergy, the businessman, and the theorist.

For the greater part, they merely expound mechanics. Many of them raise the intellectual barrier of national pride for acceptance by attempting to force upon other nations, types of government and plans of agreement to which the peoples of those nations have not yet given their consideration or consent.

The trend of conditions now indicated among the leading powers of the United Nations clearly shows that a true purpose in the cause of peace has not been established. I am somewhat concerned about the fact that at this late day in the war Russia entered into a separate agreement with the Badoglio government in Italy, and also that on the same day she renewed her agreement with Japan for fishing privileges, and agreed to furnish Japan 60,000 tons of oil each year for 5 years following the war. Following whose war? There being no war between Russia and Japan, it must mean Russia's war against Germany. There were no declarations about destroying Japan in the Teheran Conference. Will Russia be furnishing Japan the oil to use in their fight against us?

In 1942, we were told Russia would be our ally in our war in the Pacific. In 1943 we were asked not to talk about Russia helping us in the war with Japan. Now, in 1944, we can assume, according to news reports, that Russia is indirectly helping Japan fight us by continuing to provide an essential food element.

Russia and Japan have been trading with each other since Germany struck at Russia. The exchanges and agreements are made known to the world through news items issued from Moscow, according to the Washington News of March 31, 1944. We give Russia lend-lease materials to fight her enemies and Russia makes food available to sustain Japan in her war against us.

It is not difficult to observe the adroit policy of Germany's sounding out peace terms with both Russia and Great Britain. She is well aware that with defenses prepared in depth by some of the most skillful military engineers, together with land communications over which it is possible to transport troops and war matériel in greater quantities than can possibly be moved by sea, she will try to make our western invasion come at such a terrific cost that the casualties will shake a million homes in our country. Notwithstanding her tremendous loss in the east, she has shortened her lines to a point where the cost there to the Russian people will be equally high. Russian casualties to date are estimated at 16,000,000 in her war with Germany. Compare this with the total casualties of all nations involved in the First World War of 8,538,000.

It appears Russia will have a greater bona fide claim in the cost of the war than any of the United Nations at the conclusion of her war. It also appears that she is playing her cards to make that claim a condition for consideration before there is hope for final peace terms among the leading nations of the world.

We have learned in Italy—at a great expense in men and matériel—what pre-

pared defense means, and still have much to learn. A native of northern Italy, who served in its armed forces during the First World War as an officer and who is now a good American citizen, told me our campaign in Italy can serve no measure of success compared to its cost. If the terrain is considered difficult below Rome, it will be twice as difficult north of it. This logic was substantiated by a general of our fighting forces. He stated in my presence very recently that General Kesselring, who commands defense operations in Italy for the German Army, is accepted as one of the best in the armies of the world.

He said further the people in southern Italy were fed better under German occupation than they are now. That is true because of our difficulty in transportation. He further said Kesselring needs but to retire to the catacomb line north of Rome and another three and one-half million Italians will be dependent upon us for food and comfort. We are being sucked into operations that will seriously tax and may bleed white our economic resources to destroy the morale of our fighting forces on the battle front and our people at home.

It is the hope of Germany that through complacency, encouraged by remarks such as "unconditional surrender" and "our war is surely won," discouragement, and tremendous cost in war casualties, and strife among the United Nations, we will weary in our task, or that our own problem of economic rehabilitation will be as serious as her own. She hopes these things will create an opening for the Axis to make peace with one of the United Nations and thereby drive her wedge to divide us in her preparation for another war. It is my profound conviction that there is no peace to be assured to the people of the United States and the world of a lasting nature unless it is premised on one of three circumstances:

First. That we shall retrogress as a society, through internecine strife and national insolvency, until our estate deteriorates to the point where it equals that of the aborigine or savage. Our estate as free men in this condition would be of little or no value to us or to anyone else. War could not be justified to defend it. This plan, of course, is impossible.

Second. That we are prepared to accept for ourselves, as will all of the other peoples, the simple rules of brotherhood expounded by the lowly Nazarene some 2,000 years ago. This plan has the only true foundation for lasting peace; however, an honest summarization of all history and more especially that of the last century is proof sufficient to discard the hopes of such a formula for the present. To supplement this further, any attempt at its practice by any world power, as evidenced in past history, makes that power most susceptible to attack and probable destruction. If there is logic in remaining a prepared nation in a hostile world to guard our principles of freedom, then it is equally logical to be prepared to defend those principles at all times. This is exactly what we did in 1917 and in 1941. We fought, and are now fighting, a war to defend freedom. This brings us to the last plan.

Third. I am more inclined to believe the solution rests primarily in the full recognition and belief by all our people that the sovereignty of our people in this great Nation surpasses that of any other people on earth. That we can accept our pattern of life as more nearly meeting the absolute requirements for individual moral development and spiritual unfoldment than any other philosophy of government. That we fully realize our great country under its Constitution and Bill of Rights affords a greater latitude of individual freedom than any other among the strong nations of the world.

Montesquieu said:

> Countries are well cultivated, not as they are fertile but as they are free.

I believe the war in which we are now engaged is the turning point for Great Britain if she attempts to stand alone at its conclusion. I have heard her statesmen say so. We owe much to Great Britain, but, likewise, she owes much to us. It has been necessary for the United States to spend huge amounts of money and to spill the blood of her youth on foreign soil twice within a single generation to keep Great Britain from going down. Many of her people believe we got out too cheaply in the first war and question if we were of any help.

The history of Europe for a thousand years has been written with the blood of men slain in war. The insatiable ambition of the nations of Europe to aggrandize themselves and expand their domains is the cause of these wars. Geographical boundaries on that continent change with each generation. None of the major powers are guiltless in these practices. They have acquired control on other continents of the earth, vying for the throne of world mastership. The rights of lesser nations have been disregarded. In this mad race marked by the blood of major wars, Great Britain has played her part. The finger of guilt may even be pointed at our own record, but I believe we have less to answer for than our British cousins.

It has been said that Great Britain has added to her domain an area equal to the total Roman Empire in the past 75 years. She has been forced to maintain her pace as the leading world power since taking it from France. Others would destroy her if she did not. Her people are impoverished by the cost of these wars, and her Parliament is troubled with social reforms to ameliorate their impoverishment.

Our being involved in these wars imposes this same scourge on our own great country and our friendly Canadian neighbors to our north. God knows, if the combined resources of America and the British Empire can withstand the tremendous cost of these wars, there can be no excuse for an impoverished people in either country without war.

Great Britain, our natural coworker for justice, freedom, and permanent peace throughout the world, must cease to exercise authority over other people and other nations. It is because these principles are in practice by nations of the Old World that each succeeding generation of humanity is thrown into the cauldron of costly catastrophic wars. Great Britain, by her colonialism and imperialism, still practices principles that are alien to those of the United States. She must abandon them or lose her place as a world leader. Her most vulnerable weakness is in these practices. It is easy to say that some people of certain nations are not prepared for complete freedom. This is England's statement to the world concerning some people who suffer her rule. I quote from one of her great historians on that subject as follows:

> There is only one cure for evils which newly acquired freedom produces, and that cure is freedom. When a prisoner first leaves his cell he cannot bear the light of day, he is unable to discriminate colors, or recognize faces. The remedy is, to accustom him to the rays of the sun.
>
> The blaze of truth and liberty may at first dazzle and bewilder nations which have become half blind in the house of bondage. But let them gaze on, and they will soon be able to bear it. In a few years men learn to reason. The extreme violence of opinions subsides. Hostile theories correct each other. The scattered elements of truth cease to contend, and begin to coalesce. And at length, a system of justice and order is educed out of the chaos.
>
> Many politicians of our time are in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition that no people ought to be free till they are fit to use their freedom. The maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story, who resolved not to go into the water till he had learned to swim. If men are to wait for liberty till they become wise and good in slavery, they may indeed wait forever. (The Cure is Freedom—Thomas B. Macaulay (1850).)

I believe the time has come for the United States of America to take her place as a leader in world affairs.

We are now the most populous English-speaking Republic on earth. We proceed under the cardinal principle of a free people by the practice of just powers derived from the consent of the governed. It is becoming more evident in the passing of time that we cannot remove ourselves from the rest of the world. We must take our place as a leader with other powers to bring about human progress and permanent peace. The best force at any peace table is pure justice with power to back it up. To gain that power we must associate ourselves with another power or powers. In doing this, however, our people must give their consent. This applies to the consent of any others who may choose to become a part of a real effort to bring peace and understanding to a troubled humanity. We should invite the English-speaking people of the world to share our great estate under principles enunciated in our Constitution wherein the Government derives all of its just powers by the consent of the governed.

By this alliance we can be so powerful that no nation or combination of nations in the entire world can contest our right to provide henceforth freedom for our own and other peoples. We should go further in adjusting our society to maintain the standards of our people on economic, sociological, and spiritual planes

so that their richness can continue to be recognizable by any and all other nations and their troubled peoples.

We should refuse to allow our people to become slaves to capitalistic corporate structures or to our State. Let us make everything subordinate to a free, sovereign individual and see that means are placed at his disposal to live a full and useful life. From the overabundance of our coordinate efforts let us willingly help the lesser nations. Using our national life as an example, let us teach them the true way to peace and progress.

I believe Russia is also anxious for a peaceful world. She is inviting the buffer states and the states of Europe to become a part of the Soviet Republic's sphere of influence. If her efforts in this direction seem oppressive, let us review the Cairo, Casablanca, and Teheran Conferences, and we will see that a similar motive on our part is vividly portrayed there.

Now is the time for the English-speaking peoples of the world to act. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, England, Eire, and the United States should combine their strength under principles enunciated in our Constitution, more especially in the Bill of Rights, in the cause of justice.

There should be no cause for offense on the part of any nation outside of those here mentioned, because it is but the formation of policy. The nature of that policy is not yet known, even to ourselves.

I am introducing a resolution today, for consideration by the House, which will create, if passed, a bipartisan committee of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the State Department, and which will also invite the nations and political entities hereinbefore mentioned to do the same. It is intended by this resolution that the representatives so appointed by the legislative departments of these nations, together with their respective state departments, may meet in an attempt to agree upon a foreign policy among themselves that will leave the door open to any and all other nations which may by the same process choose to become a part of a world movement to bring about justice and permanent peace among all nations. The resolution intends further that this representative group be appointed and prepared to meet before a date fixed within the resolution. This House can do nothing of greater value and importance to resuscitate and sustain the morale and purpose of our Nation in prosecuting the war to a successful conclusion than that of fixing the ultimate objectives for which this costly war is being fought. If there be one thing to which we can point as the reason for failure of the League of Nations at the conclusion of the last war, it is that the representatives of the people and the people were not consulted until after the principles of the League of Nations had been formulated, and, in a greater measure, agreed to. I am thoroughly convinced that if the representatives of the people, and the people themselves, are advised of the procedure and the nature of our agreement with other nations, as we go forward in this attempt, there is less likelihood for its failure than for those agreements which come from behind closed doors and are agreed to by a few people with great power and submitted in full bloom to the representatives of the people who have had nothing to say about them.

Mr. MERROW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I have followed closely the gentleman's discussion, which I think is very fine. I would like to ask if he proposes, after the war is over, an alliance between Great Britain and the United States as a means of preserving the peace of the world? Is that the point?

Mr. ROWE. No; it is not definitely that. It seems to me that one of the difficulties in our international relationships has always been the difference in the diplomatic approach. England, being a leading power and recognized as such, has been one of the obstacles which we will have to overcome. We will have to have a perfect understanding between England and ourselves before we can proceed to establish a basis for a permanent peace predicated on the importance or significance of the individual. The sovereignty of the individual must be above international interests, and this applies to the individuals of the other nations as well as of our own.

Mr. MERROW. The gentleman advocates a closer relationship between the United States and the British Empire in time of peace, then, does he not?

Mr. ROWE. The ultimate objective here, of course, is that the British Empire, together with the United States, shall attempt in this assembly proposed by the resolution to first see if they can reach and conclude on what is to be the foundation for peace predicated on justice. If they accomplish that, there is nothing that will thwart any other nation to become a part of that moving force, nor will it close the door to any other nation that chooses to go forward with human progress on the basis of justice.

Mr. MERROW. I have long been an advocate of an international organization to preserve the peace because I believe that is the only alternative to international anarchy. I am much interested in the gentleman's statement and I wish to find out if he believes that close cooperation between the British Empire and the United States is going to form the nucleus of what will ultimately be a powerful international organization to preserve peace.

Mr. ROWE. That is exactly what I mean. There is nothing with which you can go to the peace table of greater importance than justice as the foundation for peace with the power to back it up.

Mr. MERROW. Then the gentleman is inclined to agree wholeheartedly with Winston Churchill in his speech at Harvard and Mr. Dewey at Mackinac.

Mr. ROWE. I do not know that I am familiar with what they said. I think I have made my position clear, and that is that there will be no hope of peace until the United States and Great Britain and all the other nations, to the least among them, can agree to a plan for procedure toward peace.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have been listening with extreme interest to the profound and brilliant statement the gentleman has made, in which he has encompassed within a few words such a magnificent scope and statement of our situation. Referring to the comment that has just been made, as I understood the gentleman, he proposes something more, something different from a mere diplomatic or military alliance with Great Britain. He proposes an arrangement that will be based upon the consent and the action of the people and the people's representatives, and proposes machinery so that that can be done, and that we will have something that is entirely different and more important and lasting than a treaty. Would that be a fair statement?

Mr. ROWE. Yes. Our position up to this time has been that of the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution in the Senate, and the Fulbright resolution here, which I opposed, incidentally, and I opposed it because it said nothing more than we will agree to an agreement if an agreement can be found.

I want to go a little further than that in an attempt to have our Nation lead the way to peace.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I gather from the gentleman's remarks, he intends to do this without asking this Nation or any other nation that adheres to this plan to surrender its sovereignty?

Mr. ROWE. That is right. There is no occasion for any nation to give up its identity, its sovereignty, or anything else. It is not really a superstructure upon which any shall exercise authority over other nations, but it is the first attempt, in my opinion, wherein representatives of the people from this House, and from the Senate, and from the State Department shall send out printed invitations to the English-speaking nations that this is a real effort to stop the wanton waste of war, and the shedding of tears for generations and centuries to come.

Mr. REED of New York. This is to apply to all nations that have a legislative body?

Mr. ROWE. That is right.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to congratulate the gentleman. I have not had an opportunity to study it deeply, but I think he is making a great effort and he is doing it in the face of facts that you just cannot avoid considering. A great authority who has made a study of the situation shows that peace has been the hope of peoples for several thousand years. Since 1500 B. C. down to the sixties in this century, 8,000 or more peace treaties have been written with the avowed purpose that

they should become permanent. The facts seem to show that the average life of those 8,000 peace treaties has been 2 years. That does not mean that there is no hope for peace.

I was impressed with the gentleman's statement in regard to how the mothers of the country are hoping and praying, and I can visualize what was so beautifully written one time about the long trains that were run to the battlefields of Flanders and around Rheims, carrying the mothers to where they had carted trainloads of bones from the battlefields of the various nations, where the mothers of boys who were slain in the war went there to kneel on those battlefields and pray that war might never come again. They were the mothers of all nations.

Naturally, every mother who goes down into the valley of the shadow of death to bring forth a new citizen to this country and to give the best that she has to bring that boy up a good citizen, and to live a plain, wholesome life, naturally is praying for the very day which you hope to bring about by your resolution. There must be a profound study made by all classes of people to see if out of all of the great holocaust there cannot come some hope for peace in the world. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. ROWE. It is unconscionable that any nation, whether it be a part of the United Nations or of those against whom we fight, does not have a deep desire for permanent peace. No nation can attain this without making a real effort to meet both friend and foe in the postwar years with open mind and willingness to cooperate. We can lead this world to peace. It is agreed that some sacrifices must be made on all sides.

There can be no question but what the world and its people are more completely prepared to make those sacrifices now than ever before. Ask the tens of millions of mothers, fathers, wives, children, and sweethearts, whose loved ones are dying and being maimed for life, all over the world, if they are willing to make that sacrifice. Ask the soldier out on the bloody battlefields of the world whose dream of home tonight will bring the trickle of a smile to his features or a tear from his eye, if he is willing to make that sacrifice.

Ask any sane, self-conscious person, who possesses the milk of human kindness or has compassion in his heart, if he is willing to make these sacrifices.

Lastly, ask yourself—you—who have felt and seen the horrible cost of war in anguish, sorrow, and death from which rises the vengeance to bring other wars, if you are willing to make these sacrifices. These sacrifices must be made in the cause of peace rather than in the cost of war.

To attain peace, I repeat, there can be no arrangements that will preclude any people or any nation from their full right to justice and a like privilege of any other nation in the measured degrees of its progress. The wide differences in standards of living, cultural development, and spiritual freedom are minor problems for intelligent persons to solve. Their solution must be a mandate for the representative assembly; however, all of these minor issues must be subordinated to the major problems that confront the world. The real purpose of the assembly is to approach these major problems with high resolution and great courage to establish a foreign policy that will insure lasting, friendly, international relationships and peace on earth.

Only by the unanimity of purpose on the part of great nations can the gates of freedom be kept ajar and the invitation extended to other nations to join in our sacrifice in the cause of humanity, justice, and peace. In this way, and this alone, can we and other peoples attain the better things to which all men aspire, among which is the one most desirable, a permanent peace.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. A few minutes ago the gentleman mentioned the matter of sovereignty. May I ask the gentleman if he thinks we are ever going to get peace in this world without any limitation of sovereignty on the part of the various nations?

Mr. ROWE. I do not know that I am qualified to express other than my personal opinion, but I think that you lay the first foundation of war, the first foundation of misunderstanding, when you limit individual sovereignty. I think individual sovereignty was predetermined by a power higher than we who assemble here. I think the Supreme Being gave the human being consciousness, and with it the subfaculties of will, choice, and desire, and then in the individual within the consciousness of man he erected the temple of civilization. When you limit that from any source you lay the cause for misunderstanding between individuals which in its expanded form becomes misunderstanding between nations and the cause of wars.

Mr. MERROW. It seems to me that if we are to have peace, which we all hope will come sometime, and it may not come for centuries—it is hard to tell the way we are going at the present time—then somehow the various nations of the world must to some extent limit their sovereignty. It appears to me that as long as every nation retains the right to do just as it pleases regardless of the other nations, we are going to have trouble. That is why I asked that question in reference to sovereignty.

Mr. ROWE. We differ only in this degree, the gentleman speaks about the limitation of sovereignty. He would indicate that the sovereignty of one nation shall not move to a point of great difference to another nation as that there shall not come from these national differences, national misunderstanding.

My conclusion is that rather than limit sovereignty we should expand it. Let us let it grow for its true purpose. In that shall come the growth of understanding, and there will be no occasion for these national differences.

It has been said here by some of the interrogators that for a long time we have attempted peace, and we shall continue attempting peace until the end of man's existence, because peace is that harmony with which we are moved to the higher motives of life. Two forces are still in effect that came here with the consciousness of man, namely, the force of destruction and the force of construction. We are assuming that the march of human progress has been upward out of that chaos wherein it was necessary to make 8,000 treaties in an attempt to have an understanding between human beings. I say the anxiety for peace such as we feel, such as all mothers feel, such as the soldiers feel, such as the people feel not only in this Nation but in every nation, is such that although we understand the authority in the nations we fight does command the people to fight, we know that when those people seek their sanctuary, their prayers are just like the prayers of the Americans and others everywhere, that there shall be peace. That is what all humanity prays for.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On this question of sovereignty, does not the gentleman feel—and I know he has given profound thought and great study to these problems—that there is a good bit of debating in the stratosphere that is not very practical. For instance, as individual citizens we sacrifice our sovereignty by agreeing to be bound by law.

Mr. ROWE. That is right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As individual sovereign nations, we give up the sovereign right to break the law when we say we will comply with international law. Is not that true?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Just one further thought. By that so-called sacrifice of sovereignty, which is no sacrifice at all to a law-abiding citizen——

Mr. ROWE. It is an enhancement of sovereignty.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. We are not surrendering sovereignty, in my judgment, we are regaining sovereignty. In the past 25 years we have twice been forced into wars by other nations of the world. That is, the highest sovereign right, the right to decide when and where we shall go to war, has been taken away from us by the various pressures of other nations. If we would make agreements with other nations, it would not force us into wars unless we wanted to get into them. We would be regaining sovereignty, not losing it.

Mr. ROWE. Yes. I think it is worthwhile noting at this point that of all the nations involved in these wars, both the last one and this one, we in this country agreed that the right of declaring war rests in the representatives of the people, who are a little closer in their feeling for the people. Has it not a marked significance that where the people have the right to express the declaration of war through their representatives they are among the last into the conflict? That is the reason I speak about individual sovereignty, individual sovereignty expressed in a nation. The living

symbol of individual sovereignty is a nation or combination of nations of free sovereign people to choose their plan of peace or war, and that is why I say expand it. If we can bring that to other nations—and I think probably I have referred to the English-speaking nations, particularly Great Britain, as to obtaining, with no exceptions, just what we have ourselves—it is upon this that I would like to lay the foundation, not to restrict or to preclude any other nation from being a part of it but to invite them to enhance and expand this sovereignty about which we are speaking. My hope is that others may see the beacon light to peace from this source.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If we should work out through some such machinery as the gentleman's resolution suggests or otherwise a system by which we lay down in law what the relations would be between nations, the individual citizen of this country would have more of his sovereignty left than if we proceeded by means of unwritten or at least undisclosed agreements between heads of states.

Mr. ROWE. He would have an enriched sovereignty and a full reservation of his constitutional rights.

I have not gone into the resolution. The resolution does nothing more than what I suggested here before. It leaves the door entirely open. All it does is to establish a commission, taking seven Members of this House, five Members of the Senate, and three members from the State Department. It establishes by the passage of this act which is to be considered the first plank in the attempt to find the formula for peace. We do not say nor grant this commission the power to make peace, but when they have agreed, when they can sit across the table and say, "Will you agree to this fact or that fact," then they can bring back to their respective governments from which they come a plan for the duly constituted authorities to accept in the way of international relationship and trade agreements. All this resolution does is nothing more than to first establish the commission. The reason I do this is that the other two moves we have made in attempting to move in this direction of international understanding, namely, the resolution from the Senate and the Fulbright resolution in the House, meant that we said we agreed to agree if someone else would agree. But here the United States, as I have said, would take a leading position in this hope to find peace. We make the initial move, we issue the invitation, and we leave the prerogative with the other nations we ask to cooperate, to say "yes" or "no."

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. If we have an understanding between the United States and the British Empire and finally bring the other nations in so that we have an international organization for the preservation of peace, will not that international organization have to be implemented by force, so that when in the future perhaps another Hitler starts on the rampage he can be stopped at the very beginning of his aggressive acts.

Mr. ROWE. Force will always be necessary to meet force; I must admit that. But it is my profound conviction that if the other nations of the world and their people enjoy and understand the sort of sovereignty that we have here in this country, predicated on the Bill of Rights, which is probably the most advanced so far as individual rights are concerned; if the people have that and truly exercise it, there is not going to be any Hitler that will lead them into a war.

Mr. MERROW. We hope not; but this understanding between the nations, this international organization, has got to have some power to resist aggression, has it not, if we are to get anywhere?

Mr. ROWE. I agree; as long as there are snakes around I am going to carry a club.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

A RESOLUTION TO CURB BUREAUCRACY AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL TRENDS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a comparative statement showing the number of Executive orders issued and the number of public laws enacted in the 10-year period from 1933 to 1942, inclusive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolution providing for an investigation of bureaucracy and unconstitutional trends of government

Whereas the number of alphabetical bureaucratic agencies has outgrown the number of regular departments of government 10 to 1; and

Whereas during recent years the number of Executive orders which have the effect of law has almost equaled the number of laws passed by Congress; and

Whereas there is a widespread belief that the Washington bureaucracy has assumed too dominant a position in our national life and is creating unconstitutional trends which unless corrected may threaten the form and mold of our Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to make a study of the Washington bureaucracy with a view to initiating as soon as may be practicable a program of limitation and liquidation of said bureaucracy and the restoration of government within recognized constitutional bounds.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. The committee is directed to report its findings and conclusions to the House of Representatives before the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The purpose of this resolution is to take the first step to bring our Government back within the bounds of the Constitution and to see that it is kept there.

This resolution does not blame anybody for anything, either directly or by implication. It does not attempt to fix responsibility for anything that has happened up to date. It simply recognizes that a condition and not a theory faces us, that a de facto situation exists in this country wherein bureaucracy is threatening to displace constitutional government; a situation wherein the processes of government are operating in some respects in a manner directly antagonistic to and violative of the limitations of the Constitution. It recognizes that many of these aberrations are due to the exigencies of war and the unusual character of the times through which we have been passing. It further recognizes that the necessary corrective measures for which the Nation is crying can be consummated only if the task is approached in a spirit of cooperation, without criminations and recriminations and free from the sordid dictates of politics.

"Back to the Constitution" has been a rather meaningless cry up to now, recognizing though it does a great national need and an almost universal realization of that need. My hope in offering this resolution is that it will lead to a revivification of interest in the Constitution and to the first practical approach toward a restoration of constitutional processes in their full vigor.

There are two broad ways, as I conceive it, in which the Constitution may be violated, first by a violation of its letter and, second, by a violation of its spirit. Violations of the spirit of the Constitution occur more often than violations of its letter. Very often violations of the spirit veer off into the realm of intangibility, yet they are violations just the same, and should be corrected. A philosophy which assumes that an American citizen is by nature crooked and wayward and that he must be loaded down with interminable bureaucratic orders and directives to make him do the right thing is violative of the spirit of the Constitution, which assumes that Americans are right-minded and honest and that it is their God-given privilege to walk erect as free men. As Americans it is our duty to get back not only to the well-delineated landmarks of the Constitution but also to reconsecrate ourselves anew to an understanding of its spirit. It was Gladstone, I believe, who said that "the American Constitution is, so far as I can see, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

And so I believe it is. And yet how many thoughtless persons there are who are willing to see it dimmed and tarnished, its strength sapped and its vital provisions either weakened or nullified. The greatest boon that could happen to America today would be a genuine ocean-to-ocean "back to the Constitution" movement.

The overshadowing menace to the Constitution today is the bureaucracy that has flowered and bloomed in modern times, especially under the impetus of war conditions. The original concept of the founding fathers was that all of the functions of government should be transacted by the regular departments, of which there are now ten, but

the instrumentalities of government which have grown up outside of the regular departments and which comprise our over-blown bureacracy, number more than 10 times 10. The Office of War Information on June 1, 1943, issued an astonishing list of alphabetical agencies including 99 different abbreviations.

I may add that this is only a partial summary of our alphabetical supergovernment. There are other alphabetical agencies whose names have escaped the professors of nomenclature. There are so many that a friend of mine, undertaking to jest about a solemn matter, told me about a man who was found the other day wandering in the Washington Monument grounds who was so far gone with amnesia that "he could not remember his name or the Commission he belonged to."

A vast majority of these bureaucratic activities were set up, not by laws of Congress, but by Executive orders. Members of the Appropriations Committee who day after day listen as I do to bureau chiefs presenting requests for appropriations, have ears attuned to the usual introductory sentence: "Our office was set up under Executive Order No So-and-So."

Not to hear this familiar opening remark would make it seem to us that there is something unusual about the request.

Students of government will find the evolution of our bureaucracy a very interesting study. The time was when an Executive order was a rarity and the issuance of such an order was something to be talked about. Only on the most infrequent occasions and for very special purposes in those days did Presidents exercise the authority to issue Executive orders. Let us see how this practice has grown. During the 10-year period from 1933 to 1942, inclusive, 3,565 Executive orders were issued and Congress in the same period passed 4,304 public laws. The following table is of interest: Showing the number of Executive orders issued and the number of laws enacted each year during the 10 years mentioned:

	Executive orders issued	*Number of laws enacted*
1933	658	93
1934	472	446
1935	390	482
1936	275	505
1937	257	494
1938	249	425
1939	287	454
1940	309	551
1941	382	397
1942	286	457
Total	3,565	4,304

Executive orders mainly originate in the bureaus and are expressions of bureaucratic minds. They often embody the whims of bureau chiefs. They have the effect of laws. Thus we have an anomalous situation where the bureaus are enacting nearly as many laws as the Congress of the United States, the branch of government that was set up by the Constitution to write the laws of the land.

So numerous have the Executive orders become that some thinking people are beginning to wonder whether the residuum of government which we shall have left if the trend long continues will be a government by laws or a government by Executive order. The fact is that we have been moving ahead with galloping speed toward the creation of a bureaucracy which has about as much resemblance to our original form of government as night has to day.

Many of our people are talking these days about the baneful effects of bureaucracy but talk without acts accomplishes nothing. The resolution I have introduced proposes to do something about it.

There is no politics, whatever, in my resolution and I know of no reason why it should not have the support of every Democratic and every Republican Member of Congress.

The impact of war alone has caused many transformations and maladjustments of government. To correct these maladjustments is the duty of Democrats and Republicans alike. The people look to Congress to hold the Government within the bounds of the Constitution. I think it would be particularly appropriate for the initial corrective step to be taken by the House of Representatives, the body that is traditionally closest to the people. If we adopt this resolution we will be acting in good faith to carry out our obligation to the people.

It proposes a means to start the demobilization of our overgrown bureaucracy and to restore more normal constitutional processes in this country. If we undertake this task in a spirit of mutual respect and understanding, free from politics and criticism, we shall certainly succeed and America will be the beneficiary.

It is high time that thought should be given to the dissolution of our overgrown and dominant bureaucracy and to departures from the Constitution which comprise a threat to the perpetuity of our free government as designed by the founding fathers. We as Americans need to make an introspection to determine whither we are going and to check trends which are threatening to change the form and mold of our Government. Under the directions contained in my resolution there will be three practical approaches to the problem of dissolving our bureaucracy: First, by abolishing agencies that were not needed in the first instance or that have served their purpose; second, by reducing overgrown and overstaffed bureaus to reasonable proportions; and third, by transferring the activities of independent bureaucratic agencies to regular departments where they can be held under better check and control. By applying all three of these methods untold millions of dollars can be saved and the Washington bureaucracy can be reduced to a point where it will cease to be a national menace.

In selecting the House Committee on the Judiciary as the instrumentality to make this all-important investigation and study, pointing the way back to the Constitution, I feel that I have made a happy choice. The country will have the utmost confidence in an investigation conducted under the direction of Judge HATTON W. SUMNERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He is flanked on his committee by able lawyers who are profound students of the Constitution. No man in Congress—nor indeed in the entire country—is better grounded in the fundamentals of our Government than Judge SUMNERS. His courageous statesmanship and his profound knowledge of the law have been demonstrated on many occasions. Above all, his rugged Americanism will be earnest assurance to the country that whatever conclusions his committee may reach will be in harmony with the genius and the spirit of our free American institutions.

MISS MOINA MICHAEL, WORLD-FAMED "POPPY LADY"

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Miss Moina Michael, of Athens, Ga., affectionately known around the globe as the Poppy Lady, passed away at 3 o'clock this morning after a long illness.

The idea of the sale of the memorial poppy for World War No. 1 veterans and their widows and orphans was originated by Miss Michael. She was loved and revered by the American Legion and Auxiliary throughout the land, and more than $125,000,000 have been raised in this Nation alone through her untiring efforts with the sale of the memorial poppy. In many other nations this idea has been used, and in Great Britain more than $50,000,000 have been raised through the year 1939.

This beloved woman gave so much and expected so little. Even as late as March of this year she spent many hours with her needle working on the huge annual Navy poppy anchor, which is launched each year with ceremonies at the United States Naval Academy.

The memorial poppy idea, which sprang from the unselfish heart of a little Georgia woman, will live on. Not only will America, but the people of many other nations of the world, mourn the loss of the "Poppy Lady." Annual Memorial Poppy Day is observed in all the English-speaking countries and many other countries.

The following poem, written by this distinguished lady, was her personal pledge to keep the faith and always to wear a red poppy of Flanders Fields as a sign of remembrance to all who died "In Flanders Fields":

WE SHALL KEEP THE FAITH

Oh! You who sleep in Flanders Fields
Sleep sweet—to rise anew!
We caught the torch you threw
And holding high, we keep the faith
With all who died.

We cherish, too, the poppy red
That grows on fields where valor led;
It seems to signal to the skies
That blood of heroes never dies,
But lends a lustre to the red
Of the flower that blooms above the dead
In Flanders Fields.

And now the Torch and poppy red
We wear in honor of our dead.
Fear not that ye have died for naught:
We'll teach the lesson that ye wrought
In Flanders Fields.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ARKANSAS RIVER VALLEY FLOODS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a perennial problem in the Arkansas River Valley, from which I come, is control of floods. Despite expenditure of many millions of dollars, the problem is still acute—just as it is in other States through which tributaries flow into the Mississippi River.

It is the contrast between the Tennessee Valley and the Arkansas Valley that prompts me to voice opposition to the two Senate amendments to the independent offices appropriation bill which would hamper, perhaps destroy, the efficiency of T. V. A.

There is no point in my reviewing what has already been said on this floor regarding the certain consequences of depriving T. V. A. of the use of its own revenues for its operations and of subjecting its technicians and managers to confirmation by the Senate.

Assuredly I want the Congress to maintain a close and constant contact with T. V. A., as with all the instrumentalities through which it acts; but that does not necessitate throwing hindrances in the way of those entrusted with consummation of the plan which the Congress has approved.

It is significant that those who have led repeated assaults upon bureaucratic direction of public affairs have not included T. V. A. in their general indictment. Members of the Congress are justified in accepting this as a tribute to their legislative skill and judgment.

T. V. A., with a mandate from Congress that carried with it undivided responsibility for a complex managerial and technical job, has succeeded; let us not jeopardize that success.

How well T. V. A. has done its job may be gleaned from a comparison of conditions at this very minute within the Tennessee Valley and within a vast area west of the Mississippi River. Just a few days ago, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] described the disastrous sweep of the floodwaters of the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers—a dreadful picture. News dispatches tell of inundated homes, farms, and business plants, "exploded" levees, general disorganization, gigantic property losses, and incalculable suffering.

Yet, I dare say there has been as much money, probably more, spent for flood control in the flood-stricken territories as has been invested in the Tennessee Valley.

The difference in approach to the problem accounts for the difference in result. In no other instance before T. V. A. was created by the Congress was a great coordinated program undertaken. Here, at last, we got away from the pulling and tugging between rival communities that had different ideas as to where the levee or the dam should be built, and as to whether flood control, navigation, or power development should be the goal. The Congress, instead of haggling over phases and pet projects, told T. V. A. the objectives and gave it the authority to proceed.

T. V. A. was ordered to design, build, and operate a system of dams which would effectively control floodwaters, which would provide a modern navigation channel, which would capture the energy of falling water and turn it into electricity, and which would bring to realization all the advantages—recreational, industrial, and otherwise—which could come from development of an entire river. As matters stand today, the Congress is entitled to share in the credit for T. V. A. accomplishment, but if T. V. A. fails, the Congress is in nowise subject to blame. We have not impeded the program, and we have made clear the general purposes.

Now, let us see how well T. V. A. has performed with respect to flood control. While we read of the floods raging over their banks elsewhere, more than double the normal rainfall in the Tennessee Valley created no hazard to proerty or life.

Ponder these simple facts.

In point of stream flow, the Tennessee is the fourth largest river system in the country. During February, 9.71 inches of rain fell in the valley—214 percent of normal and the greatest precipitation in 54 years; in March, the rainfall total was 8 inches, considerably over a normal 5.4 inches.

But there was no flood damage.

The storage dams on the tributaries and the storage capacity of the mainstream dams caught the excess rains, and held them back from the crest of the flood.

I am informed that on March 30, when the Tennessee reached a stage of 31.6 feet at Chattanooga, a city producing many war products, the waters would have risen more than 6 feet higher and flooded large plants had it not been for the T. V. A. dams.

Important, too, to us west of the Mississippi River is the knowledge that the T. V. A. control is holding back substantial waters from the Tennessee which might otherwise be added to the floods on the Mississippi below Cairo.

It was not always thus with the Tennessee Valley. Its experience prior to 1933 was much like that of other areas constantly menaced by floods. Advocates of particular flood-control schemes vied with proponents of navigation and promoters of power-development plans. The Congress did away with confusion by establishment of T. V. A., and its 10-year "pilot plant" operation holds a lesson to which we cannot afford to be blind. T. V. A. has pioneered the approach to development of our other rivers and their conversion from instrumentalities of destruction to economic assets of vast worth in war and in peace.

That is why I, from the Arkansas Valley, do not want to see T. V. A. hamstrung. Take from it the right—at present the obligation as well—to hire its technical staff on the basis of merit and efficiency and you lift from it a responsibility it should have. Moreover, you hand it a ready-made alibi for failure. It can say, "We would have done the job better, but we could not hire the men we had to have."

And when the Congress undertakes to pass, item by item, upon the expenditures which technicians determine are needed to operate a system of flood control, navigation, and power dams, the T. V. A. is relieved of a major responsibility which the Congress should want T. V. A. to carry. We would be inviting it to say, "Yes, we felt that should be done and we had the money to do it, but you Congressmen did not anticipate the specific emergency which occurred; consequently we are not permitted to do anything about it."

Bring that situation to pass, and T. V. A. will be only a shadow of the magnificent achievement it is today.

Let us not interrupt this demonstration of good management of a river system, this partnership between Government and business—it has truly been a boon to private enterprise in the Tennessee Valley. Let us instead apply the lessons learned from the Tennessee Valley to the Arkansas, the Missouri, and the Mississippi Valleys.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. May I point out to the gentleman that the particular industries he mentioned were engaged, and are now engaged, in vital war production.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD the remarks of Archbishop Edward Mooney, at the conclusion of the pontifical mass he celebrated in Blessed Sacrament Cathedral, Detroit, May 3, to mark the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. I consider them both timely and wise remarks which should be preserved in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders on Thursday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RECONDITIONING OF PATIENTS IN ARMY SERVICE FORCES HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a statement by Col. Augustus Thorndike, M. C., Director of Reconditioning, Office of the Surgeon General, War Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this speech by Colonel Thorndike was presented at the New York Academy of Medicine on the 25th of April 1944. He describes the reconditioning of patients in the Army service hospitals. He states in part as follows:

The objectives of the Army's reconditioning program are to return to duty as many soldier patients as possible, or to return to civilian life the veteran, discharged for disability. Whichsoever fate befalls the soldier patient he will be returned, in better physical condition, better educated, better informed, and oriented—a better individual. The program is so designed that it coordinates all branches of reconditioning in such a manner and with a balanced schedule, so that physical conditioning, educational conditioning, and occupational therapy take their proper place in restoring the soldier patient to health. The program commences while the patient is still a bed patient and proceeds through calculated gradations during his bed and ambulatory convalescence until the patient can march with a full pack for 15 miles. At this capacity for work he is discharged to duty. There is no longer idleness and waste of time in our larger general hospitals. Mind and body are busy every day and gainfully occupied. The patient no longer will gaze at the ceilings and walls. He will be exercising physically those parts of his body not injured or diseased; he will be exercising his mind in completing courses to the credit of his high school diploma or his college degree—his induction into the service having interrupted his education at a vital period; he will further be exercising his mind in studying orientation maps on the progress of the war on all fronts.

I have seen some of this reconditioning work in Army hospitals in different sections of the country. Saturday, together with Mr. Guy Birdsall and Mr. Keogh, of the Disabled American Veterans, I visited the Beltsville camp, Camp Word, and I saw there the physical reconditioning of the men. I should like to tell of an instance which I think is very illuminating. There is one shop there where the men who are being reconditioned are allowed to paint and do work on signs and various other things. Outside of that room is a plaque which they made with nine service stars on it and the names of nine former soldier patients who have already gone back to duty. It shows the splendid patriotic spirit on the part of these men who have already served, some of them in the South Pacific and far-flung battle fronts.

This reconditioning is serving a wonderful purpose for the men who want to continue their education or their training after they are returned to civilian life. The return into the service is not obligatory; they are not forced back into it; they do not reenter it unless they are perfectly willing. I congratulate the Army and the service men and women upon this program.

The Air Corps has the same type of reconditioning service, and I believe the men are extremely grateful for it.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I extend the address by Colonel Thorndike which I mentioned earlier in my remarks:

THE RECONDITIONING OF PATIENTS IN ARMY SERVICE FORCES HOSPITALS

(Presented at the New York Academy of Medicine by Col. Augustus Thorndike, M. C., Director of Reconditioning, office of the Surgeon General, War Department, April 25, 1944)

In discussing convalescence one is certainly impressed at the paucity of medical literature on this subject. Traveling along Pennsylvania Avenue in our National Capital one is impressed with that building in which our national archives are stored. By the steps to the entrance are the grotesque statues depicting the future and the past. Inscribed on the base of these statues are the words "What has past is prologue" and "Study the past." There is little stored in those archives concerning convalescence.

One reviews the history of convalescence and he finds the word is derived from the Latin "convalesco," to grow strong. One finds it absent from the English dictionary until the nineteenth century. One finds that following the Napoleonic War, the Civil War, and the World War each army concerned developed convalescent hospitals or camps; but one finds that between wars military medicine no longer supports such interests. The late Brig. Gen. William S. Thayer, medical consultant to the A. E. F. in 1919, prophesied that military interest in convalescence would disappear within a year of the signed peace, only to be reapplied rather late after the declaration of the next war. Da Costa had preceded him in this opinion, having experienced the post-Civil War era.

At present we find ourselves again vitally concerned with convalescence and the problems of rehabilitation. Again this time the interest is that of the sick and wounded soldier, especially the battle casualty. With a larger force under arms today than ever before, the magnitude of the Army program for convalescent care must be most comprehensive. The Medical Department has accepted this challenge and has put into operation its reconditioning program. The term "reconditioning" has been selected advisedly. The policy of the Medical Department has always been and still is to care for the sick and wounded until the maximum benefit of hospitalization has been attained, and thence depending upon the individual disease, wound, or injury end result, to discharge to duty, to civilian life, or to the Veterans' Administration for further hospital care if required. The Medical Department is not concerned with vocational training; by law the Veterans' Administration is the responsible agency. From a military point of view the use of the word "rehabilitation" has been adopted for the centers now used for the confinement of garrison prisoners. Therefore, reconditioning has been selected for the Army's convalescent training plan. The term "reconstruction" was used in the last war. Reconditioning infers better restoration to full health and vigor.

The objectives of the Army's reconditioning program are to return to duty as many soldier patients as possible, or to return to civilian life the veteran, discharged for disability. Whichsoever fate befalls the soldier patient he will be returned, in better physical condition, better educated, better informed and oriented—a better individual. The program is so designed that it coordinates all branches of reconditioning in such a manner and with a balanced schedule, so that physical conditioning, educational conditioning, and occupational therapy take their proper place in restoring the soldier patient to health. The program commences while the patient is still a bed patient and proceeds through calculated gradations during his bed and ambulatory convalescence until the patient can march with a full pack for 15 miles. At this capacity for work he is discharged to duty. There is no longer idleness and waste of time in our larger general hospitals. Mind and body are busy every day and gainfully occupied. The patient no longer will gaze at the ceilings and walls. He will be exercising physically those parts of his body not injured or diseased; he will be exercising his mind in completing courses to the credit of his high-school diploma or his college degree—his induction into the service having interrupted his education at a vital period; he will further be exercising his mind in studying orientation maps on the progress of the war on all fronts. He will be better informed on the magnitude of this World War and thereby gain increased comprehension of the reasons of why we fight. There will be time for recreational activities involving both mind and body and all diversional enterprises will be supervised by the special service officer and the Red Cross hospital corps assigned to each hospital, and coordinated into the program by the commanding officer. There is nothing more stimulating than to see a well-designed program in operation. The patients, one finds, are interested and among their interests seems to be the desire to learn—to seek after the truth. One of the best elements in this program is panel discussions held by the patients on current topics of interest. Never shall I forget one I listened to, "Which of the following agencies of news dispatch has the greatest influence on public opinion, the newspaper, the radio, or the movie?"

However, physical conditioning takes its part in the schedule. What has been determined on a physiological basis is practical in the reconditioning program. Hospitalization deprives an individual of physical condition. To develop well-coordinated muscle power as well as wind and endurance requires constant physical training. Much of this is lost even to the well-trained athlete or soldier during the usual hospital stay. Conditioning of these patients must commence as soon after the serious acute stage of injury or illness permits sound medical judgment to proceed. Every day lost from this training means another 2 days later if much atrophy is permitted to set in. Why not prevent loss of physical condition during hospitalization insofar as one is able? Every day saved in hospital, saves a day in the noneffective rate of the soldier's field unit; furthermore, it saves a hospital-bed day in addition. Simple calisthenics one considers a dull exercise, but modern advances in physical education have developed physical exercise in its so-called combative type to sound techniques and procedures, developing excellent conditioning. For the purpose of gradation of physical activities the reconditioning program has been divided into four classes. Class 4 is the bed patient, class 3 is the ward ambulant case requiring ward or clinic care, and classes 2 and 1 are those cases undergoing intensive conditioning preparatory to return to duty. The latter two classes discard hospital patient uniform and again become soldiers billeting in barracks or camps outside the area of the hospital wards proper. Professional medical officers, preferably the chiefs of surgical or medical service concerned, or their representatives, follow these patients through to determine the progress and gradation of these patients. A soldier patient cannot be promoted to a class without the medical officer so prescribing. On reaching classes 2 and 1, the soldier is given intensive military training, marches, drills, obstacle course exercise, manual of arms, and indoctrinated in all phases of military training on the post training fields outside the hospital proper. This has proven of value in many instances providing for a better understanding of the basic course that the soldier rushed through after induction. The patients themselves become instructors, gain interest, and maintain standards of soldierly conduct. Disciplinary problems diminish and the will to serve is reestablished. Visual aids in training are used, notably training films, maps, and graphic portfolios. All the time this intensive program is being carried on, scheduled periods for educational conditioning is provided and periods for occupational therapy when prescribed, and diversional and recreational activities are provided.

With this general outline of the reconditioning program one will comprehend that especially trained and qualified personnel is required to carry it out. Schools have been provided to train physical and educational reconditioning officers and enlisted men, as

well as female occupational therapists. Authority has been granted to provide this personnel for all A. S. F. hospitals. With good teaching techniques and qualified personnel this program will accomplish much. It is anticipated that combat-wounded junior officers on a limited duty status will be qualified and assigned as instructors in this program. What could be more stimulating to the soldier patient than to have for an instructor an amputee, one who had done his part and still possessed the will to serve, the will to pass on what knowledge, what skill and tried experience he had gained by contact with the enemy. The 500-bed hospital will have 6 qualified officers and 6 qualified noncommissioned officers on primary duty for this program and in addition to its assigned personnel, the thousand bed 8 qualified officers, and 11 enlisted men; the 1,500, 11 qualified officers and 16 enlisted men, according to authorized manning guides and directives.

The special program designed for the conditioning and social adjustment of the blind and deaf will not be discussed at this time. The Army has a definite program for these special cases and has provided for their care in especially equipped and staffed general hospitals, two for the blind and three for the deaf. Of further special types of cases, the amputee and the neurosis, special general hospitals and training centers with especially qualified staffs have been selected. Thus one can visualize an active period of convalescence for the soldier being reconditioned for full military duty.

The question will be raised concerning the conditioning of the soldier to be discharged to civilian life. It cannot always be determined which patients fall into this category until many of them have been passed through three or four classes. Some of it will be obvious early in their hospitalization that, because of an amputation or other disability, they will return to civilian life. Even in some of these, however, an appeal to the interests may promote sufficient mental activity and ambition that the will to serve out this war may become paramount. The program continues as long as the patient remains in hospital, but when the patient appears before the discharge or retirement board, and the board is reviewed and approved, a brief course in indoctrination pertaining to the duties of citizenship is provided for the veteran. He is contacted by the Veterans' Administration, however, relative to his financial claim and probable needs for vocational training prior to his discharge from hospital.

The full effect and the results of this program cannot be related at this time. This comprehensive plan has too recently been inaugurated and qualified personnel is now being trained. Only when the latter have been assigned to the full extent required will this program be in full bloom. One looks forward to that day in the next few months. Dr. Loring Swaim informed the writer that in the Robert B. Brigham Hospital for arthritis patients a reduction in average period of hospitalization of over 70 percent had been obtained by sound principles of conditioning the bed patient. The British Army has convalescent training of a similar nature in effect for 2 years and in a recently received report of the November 1943 Bulletin of the British Ministry of Health, Lt. Col. Harold Bahne, R. M. C., reports that the period of noneffective fracture rate was reduced 30 percent, and, further, that 82 percent of the cases at a neurosis center were reconditioned and remained "willingly" at duty over a year, or until the date of the report.

In conclusion, one might readily appreciate the importance of reconditioning as it pertains to the utilization of manpower. The plans have been made, the program has been inaugurated, the personnel is being trained and assigned, and the training aids and materials are being supplied. The purpose of the program is directed so as to return the soldier patient to duty better conditioned, better educated, better oriented, and better indoctrinated—in fact, a better soldier.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FULBRIGHT, for 12 days beginning May 15, 1944, on account of official business.

To Mr. CAMP, for a few days, on account of illness.

FLOOD CONTROL ON THE TENNESSEE RIVER

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks three short editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Maj. Phil B. Whittaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters; and

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 11, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Daylight Savings Time of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, May 11, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on daylight-savings-time bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on S. 1272, to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations, at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, May 12, 1944, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 18, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. (Ship-construction reserve fund.)

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 25, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4486, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the Clerk by letter.

Witnesses are requested to notify the Clerk by letter at least a day in advance of the hearings of their desire to testify in order that a list of witnesses may be prepared. Written statements for the record from persons other than witnesses should be submitted a day in advance. Amendments to be proposed during the hearing should be submitted to the reporter in duplicate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1525. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the military and departmental activities of the War Department for the fiscal year 1945, containing estimates of appropriations amounting to $15,676,652,700, and proposed provisions affecting said estimates (H. Doc. No. 580); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1526. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1527. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of $98,000, for the National Housing Agency for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 581); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1528. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1942, in the amount of $6,017.42, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $178,746.12, in all $184,763.54, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 582); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 539. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1744, a bill to provide Government protection to widows and children of de-

ceased World War veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1432). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4215. A bill to extend to the custodial-service employees of the Post Office Department certain benefits applicable to postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 540. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1767, an act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War 2 Veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1435). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARTLEY: Committee on Patents. H. R. 2994. A bill to extend reissued Letters Patent No. 19,023; without amendment (Rept. No. 1433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4787. A bill to regulate the character of discharges from the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4788. A bill to extend for an additional 180 days the period during which certain grains and other products may be imported from foreign countries free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4789. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution to provide for an international conference of representatives of English-speaking nations for the purpose of formulating a comprehensive post-war foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAY:

H. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the preservation of the independence and sovereignty of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to reduce the tax on admissions to cabarets, roof gardens, and similar entertainments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. Res. 541. Resolution providing for an investigation of bureaucracy and unconstitutional trends of government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 542. Resolution to forbid participation by American citizens in forthcoming annual meeting of the Bank for International Settlements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 4790. A bill for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4791. A bill for the relief of Albert E. Severns; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5639. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of Annie Kempkis, secretary-treasurer of Local 211, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., requesting that the proceedings of Congress be broadcast; to the Committee on Rules.

5640. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Paul Brenner, of Randolph, Kans., and 10 other citizens of that community, demanding that all be refunded their penalty money for 1941–42 on excess wheat and opposing a subsidy on any commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5641. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, of San Francisco, relative to hunting, fishing, and trapping upon the public domain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5642. Also, resolution of the Golden Gate Parlor, No. 158, Native Daughters of the Golden West, relating to return of Japanese to Pacific coastal areas; also regarding prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5643. Also, resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, relative to the so-called cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5644. Also, resolution of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, San Francisco, relative to prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5645. Also, resolution of the Cooks, Pastry Cooks, and Assistants, Local No. 44, San Francisco, urging support of Senate bill 1767; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5646. By the SPEAKER: Petition of 1,000,000 citizens, requesting the passage of Senate bill 1767, the bill generally known as the G. I. bill of rights; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5647. Also, petition of the president, Union Republican Progressive Party of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senator WILLIAM LANGER'S bill, granting statehood to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5648. Also, petition of the chairman, Union Republican Progressive Party of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing sympathy over the death of Frank Knox; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5649. Also, petition of the president, Union Republican Progressive Party of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to gratitude to the House subcommittee, known as the Bell subcommittee, which recently investigated the general conditions prevailing in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5650. Also, petition of the president, Union Republican Progressive Party of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to gratitude to the Senate subcommittee, known as the Chavez subcommittee, which recently investigated the economic and social conditions prevailing in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the tender grace of a new morning fresh with the sparkling dew of Thy never-failing mercies, grateful that yet another day is added to the record of our lives, we would dedicate anew to Thee at this our daily altar of devotion our minds, our souls, our strength, as the instruments of Thy loving care for all Thy children. To this shrine of our spirits in patriotism pure and undefiled we would bring our lips to be touched by the burning coals of Thy cleansing, that Thou mayest speak through them; our minds to be illumined with kindling thought that flame for Thee; our wills that they may glow with holy zeal to do Thy will; our eyes that anointed they may see the invisible with the far look of a faith in things that shall abide beyond our earthly years.

"Direct, control, suggest this day
All we design, or do, or say,
That all our powers, with all their might,
In Thy sole glory may unite."

Amen.

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 10, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the debt limit of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Johnson, Colo.
Austin	Cordon	La Follette
Bailey	Danaher	Langer
Ball	Davis	McCarran
Bankhead	Downey	McClellan
Barkley	Eastland	McFarland
Bilbo	Ellender	McKellar
Brewster	George	Maloney
Brooks	Gerry	Maybank
Buck	Gillette	Mead
Bushfield	Guffey	Millikin
Butler	Gurney	Moore
Byrd	Hatch	Murdock
Capper	Hawkes	Nye
Caraway	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Hill	Overton
Clark, Mo.	Jackson	Radcliffe

Reed	Taft	Walsh, N. J.
Reynolds	Thomas, Idaho	Weeks
Robertson	Tunnell	Wheeler
Russell	Tydings	Wherry
Shipstead	Vandenberg	White
Smith	Wagner	Wilson
Stewart	Walsh, Mass.	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE HOG-CORN SITUATION—NOTICE OF AND INVITATION TO MEETING

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the hog situation, which has become not only acute but alarming in the States in which hogs are marketed. I wish also to announce that tomorrow morning at 10:30, in the Senate Indian Affairs Committee hearing room, No. 424, Senate Office Building, a hearing will be conducted not only with respect to the hog situation but the corn-freeze order. The meeting has been called by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and an invitation is extended to everyone who is interested in the problem.

For the information of the Senate I will say that there was a carry-over last night of hogs unsold in the principal markets of the country in excess of 73,000 head. That means they cannot be sold until this morning. The indication of receipts this morning at the principal markets is a total of more than 85,000 head of hogs. Embargoes are being placed upon these markets, and it means that the farmers who have to carry their hogs over until their turn comes to have them sold are losing thousands of dollars because of the shrinkage in weight and the fact that the hogs are outclassed the next day when they are sold in the market.

This situation has developed primarily because of the corn-freeze order, to which I invite attention; and I pray that every Senator from the Middle West, or from any other section of the country which produces hogs and corn, will please accept the invitation extended by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who has devoted a great deal of work and attention to the question, to be present at the meeting which is to be held tomorrow at 10:30, at which will be present the officials who are responsible for the order, and at which an attempt will be made to see if some relief cannot be secured.

We simply must eliminate these embargoes; we simply must eliminate the disorderly marketing of hogs if we are to continue a hog program at all in this country. The situation is alarming; it is serious. I hope that all Senators interested, regardless of party, will take an active interest in the matter and come to the meeting tomorrow at which an attempt will be made to discover whether something can be done in conjunction with the officials responsible for the situation, in order to eliminate this distressing condition.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I may add to what the Senator from Nebraska has said that Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, has expressed his entire willingness to be present tomorrow morning and discuss the question with Senators interested in the corn-hog situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I close by expressing the hope that all Senators who are interested in the hog and corn situation will take advantage of this opportunity at which we can meet with Judge Jones and officials responsible and, if possible, take some steps to amend the order which has caused a congestion of hogs which is resulting in such a demoralizing condition in the markets of our country.

NOTICE OF SHOWING OF MOTION PICTURE OF THE BATTLE FOR NEW BRITAIN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate cordially invites all Members of the Senate, together with their office staffs and families, to attend the showing of a motion picture entitled "The Battle for New Britain," tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 and also at 3:30, in the auditorium of the Congressional Library.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, pursuant to law and as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I appoint the following members of the committee to the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy for 1944:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION OBTAINED THROUGH CENSORSHIP

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 282, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The resolution provides an appropriation to conduct an investigation proposed by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 282), submitted by Mr. REED on April 21, 1944, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the censorship of communications under section 303 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, with particular reference to the use and unauthorized disclosure of information obtained through such censorship. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the resolution, which is reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, would make available to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads funds for the conduct of an investigation voted by that committee,

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. The resolution was previously favorably reported to the Senate by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May

9, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 156. An act relating to the status of retired judges;

S. 176. An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years from June 14, 1944.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Vice Admiral Aubrey W. Fitch, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from December 28, 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

REPORT OF NOMINATION OF BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH C. MEHAFFEY TO BE GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to report favorably the nomination of Brig. Gen. Joseph C. Mehaffey, United States Army, to be Governor of the Panama Canal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, and without objection, the nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1909. A bill to give preference to honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans who themselves are not qualified, in the selection of persons for appointment to governmental positions; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1910. A bill to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939-41 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. WHEELER) introduced Senate bill 1911, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and myself, which deals with the Railroad Retirement Act. In that connection, I desire to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement about the provisions of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred and the statement presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1911) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to repeal subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The statement submitted by Mr. WAGNER is as follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF CHANGES EFFECTED BY THE RAILROAD SOCIAL INSURANCE BILL IN THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTS AND SUBCHAPTER B OF CHAPTER 9 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The railroad social insurance bill consolidates the Railroad Retirement, Railroad Unemployment Insurance, and Carriers Taxing Acts, and the prior service resolution, and amends all of these measures. It is impossible to summarize adequately in brief compass so comprehensive a measure. But in order to indicate their substance, certain of the major changes in existing legislation are here set forth with qualifications and definitions omitted:

1. Coverage:

(a) The Railroad Retirement Board's interpretation of "service in connection" with railroad transportation is made explicit in the bill;

(b) Contractors, independent or otherwise, engaged in operations integrated with those of carriers and susceptible of continuous performance are made employers as are all freight forwarders and hospital associations;

(c) The exclusion of trucking in existing legislation is eliminated;

(d) Railroad subsidiaries which are common carriers by air or water are excluded; and

(e) The authority and rules for segregating employer activities which constitute a minor part of an employing unit are made explicit.

2. Definition of employee: The employment relation provisions in existing legislation are revised to provide that only the following individuals be regarded as having an employment relation:

(i) Employees on bona fide leave of absence on August 29, 1935;

(ii) Employees who have rendered 6 months of service at any time between August 29, 1935, and the enactment of the bill, at least one of which months was before August 29, 1942;

(iii) Employees who because of disability were not recalled, or were unable to return to service after August 29, 1935, or, if they did return, were unable to render the requied number of months of service; and

(iv) Employees who as of August 29, 1935, were absent because of a wrongful discharge.

3. Compensation and years of service:

(a) The term "compensation" is expanded to include—

(i) Payments made to an employee by the employer for any absence; and

(ii) Displacement and coordination allowances.

(b) Wages paid before the normal wage report to the Board will be credited as of the date earned, while subsequent payments will be credited as of the date paid unless the employee requests credit as of the date earned;

(c) Compensation for redcaps for periods of service prior to September 1941 will be credited on the basis of average monthly compensation during the 12 months ending August 31, 1941;

(d) Compensation will be creditable to the end of the year rather than to the end of the month in which age 65 is attained;

(e) Compensation is creditable in any calendar year up to $300 times the number of months of service in the year;

(f) The definition of "years of service" is changed so as to include periods with respect to which payments of the kind described under (a), (b), (c), and (d) were made; and

(g) An employee entitled to credit for service prior to August 29, 1935, may include therein such of it as was rendered to a person not an employer if such service involved the use of standard railroad equipment and was performed by an employer on August 29, 1935.

4. Liberalization of permanent and total disability annuity:

(a) An employee who is permanently and totally disabled for regular employment for hire and who has completed 10 years of service is entitled to an annuity without reduction by reason of being less than 65 years of age;

(b) An employee who has completed 20 years of service or who has attained age 60, who is disabled for his regular occupation, and who, at the time of becoming disabled, is or has recently been connected with the industry, is entitled to an annuity without reduction; and

(c) All reductions in disability annuities, and all compensatory reductions in age annuities payable to persons who have recovered after having been awarded a disability annuity, are eliminated.

5. Minimum annuities: Existing provisions for minimum annuities are eliminated and in place thereof it is specified that employees having 5 years or more of service and who, at the time of retirement, are or recently have been connected with the industry are entitled to receive (i) $3 per month for each year of service; (ii) $50; or (iii) the average monthly compensation, whichever of the three is least.

6. Annuities for surviving dependents of employees, annuitants and pensioners:

(a) The surviving wife of an employee or annuitant who prior to death or retirement had been in employment covered by the bill, or title II of the Social Security Act and the bill, for one-half of the completed calendar quarters after 1936 and before death or retirement, or for at least 40 such quarters is entitled to monthly benefits upon attaining age 65, or so long as she has children, under 18, of the deceased in her care. The basic monthly benefit is based upon application of the Social Security formula (40 percent of the first $50 of average monthly compensation plus 10 percent of the excess over $50 up to $375, the sum of the two preceding being increased by 1 percent for each calendar year in which $200 or more were earned) to the sum of wages under title II of the Social Security Act and one and one-half times the wages under the bill;

(b) Similar benefits are provided for widows of annuitants and pensioners with 10 or more years of service but who do not qualify by reason of no service, or insufficient service, after 1936, the 1-percent increment, however, being omitted;

(c) Monthly benefits are also provided for children, while under 18, of qualified deceased employees and annuitants;

(d) If no widow or child entitled to monthly benefits survives a deceased employee, any surviving dependent parent is entitled to monthly benefits upon attaining age 65;

(e) If no one entitled immediately to monthly benefits survives, a lump sum of

eight times the basic monthly benefit is payable;

(f) The monthly benefit for a widow is three-quarters of the normal monthly amount derived by application of the Social Security formula, and that for a child or parent is one-half the basic monthly benefit; and

(g) Monthly benefits based on the compensation and wages of a single individual may not exceed $120, or twice the basic monthly benefit, or 80 percent of the average monthly wage, whichever of the three is least.

7. Unemployment insurance:

(a) The duration of benefits in a single benefit year is increased from 100 to 130 days; that is, from 21 to 27 weeks of continuous unemployment;

(b) Credit for military service is extended for unemployment insurance base year purposes at the rate of $160 per month; and

(c) Benefits are payable for periods of illness arising from nonoccupational causes (accidental or otherwise) and for periods just preceding and succeeding childbirth at the same rate and for the same number of days as for unemployment.

8. Finances:

(a) Taxes for the support of the railroad retirement system are raised to 5¾ percent each on employees and employers up to January 1, 1946; to 6 percent each in 1946–48; and to 6¼ percent each in 1949 and thereafter;

(b) Unemployment insurance contributions remain unchanged;

(c) All proceeds of the tax are to go automatically into the railroad retirement account from which annual appropriations are to be made for administrative expenses; and

(d) Taxes and contributions are to be collected by the Board.

9. Administration:

(a) An appeals procedure similar to that now available under the unemployment insurance system is made applicable to all benefits administered by the Board;

(b) Appeals from Board decisions lie to the circuit rather than the district courts; and

(c) The scope of judicial review now prescribed in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is made applicable to all cases in the jurisdiction of the Board.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the debt limit of the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHERRY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.) as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.), which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAWKES (for himself and Mr. WALSH of New Jersey) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GURNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"Subsection (b) (2) of section 203 of the Federal Seed Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(C) if in quantities of 20,000 pounds or more per lot and each container has stenciled upon it, or bears a label containing, the lot designation: *Provided*, That the invoice pertaining to such seed bears the various statements required for the respective seeds under section 201 (a) and (b): *And provided further*, That the omission of the various statements required under section 201 (a) and (b) on each container, other than the lot designation, is with the previous knowledge and consent of the consignee.'"

RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MINNESOTA AND NORTH DAKOTA (S. DOC. NO. 193)

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, at the request and suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], I present a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a report dated April 16, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on a review of reports on the Red River of the North, Minnesota and North Dakota, the project having relationship to flood control on the Park River and its tributaries in North Dakota, and ask unanimous consent for its printing as a document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES—STATEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a minority statement relating to the conference report on House bill 2928, to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended.

The conference report was filed in the Senate last Thursday, and at the time of the meeting of the conferees it was agreed that I should have this opportunity to file a minority statement. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. REED was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY STATEMENT RELATING TO CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 2928

It is always pleasant to agree with one's associates. May I say, in the beginning, that this is the first time I have failed to sign a conference report. There are compelling reasons why I do not feel able to do so in this instance.

I regret that my first inability to agree with my associate conferees arises with a bill affecting compensation of postal employees. I served the Post Office Department many years and naturally have a most sympathetic approach to the interests of all postal employees. The reasons which impel my dissent in this case transcend any sentimental attitude toward my past associates.

Consideration of H. R. 2928 by the conferees naturally fell under two headings. The first was overtime; the second was the question of salaries for postmasters.

THE THEORY OF OVERTIME

House bill 2928 was primarily a bill to provide overtime payment for various classes of postal employees, including postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and post-office inspectors. As the bill was passed by the House, it provided overtime for these officials. The Senate amended the bill by striking out overtime payment for postmasters and post-office inspectors. The House refused to concur in the Senate amendment and sent the bill to conference.

I find no fault with a rule that provides compensation based upon hours worked. Such a rule is universal throughout all kinds of business. Once a workweek of a reasonable period is determined as a base, additional time obviously should be paid for.

The fact that provision is made for overtime pay argues a varying period of labor from day to day or week to week on the part of the person who receives the added pay. The established workweek period in the Postal Service is 40 hours, and the fact that overtime payment is provided for service in excess of 40 hours is definitely not to be taken as extending all workweeks to 48 hours. The Post Office Department has emphasized that fact from time to time and has undertaken to restrict overtime payments to such additional hours above 40 as may be found necessary to transact postal business.

It logically follows that the determination of the hours above 40 hours per week to be worked and paid for must be determined by some authority above the person actually performing the work and claiming overtime pay. In the second part of this expression, I shall criticize the Post Office Department, to some extent, for the lack of vigorous administration. But with the principle itself I have no quarrel. If this rule is sound, and I think it is, a man working overtime does not himself determine the extent of the work necessary for which extra pay is to be received.

The Postal Service is made up of some thousands of post offices scattered over the country. Overtime payments are made only in post offices of the first, second, and third classes. There are some 16,907 of these. A postmaster, whose compensation is fixed by law and based entirely upon the volume of business done in second- and third-class offices, and to some extent in offices of the first class, is the agent of the Post Office Department in his particular office and responsible to the Post Office Department for the administration of that office. In other words, he is the executive supervising and directing the work of his office. He is the person who has been designated by the Department to determine the necessity for work above 40 hours per week for the assistant postmaster, clerks, carriers, and other employees of his office. The fact that, to a great extent, postmasters have been derelict in the administration of this duty does not lessen their responsibility.

The postmaster not only determines the time necessary for the various employees of his office to work, but, of course, he determines the application of his own labor. The payment of overtime for employees who work under direction, and according to direction, is universal throughout the business world. Nowhere, so far as I have ever heard, is overtime paid to a man who calculates and computes his own hours of labor. That is a sound

common-sense business rule. Such men are usually called executives or administrators. Postmasters are either or may be both.

There are good, bad, and indifferent postmasters. In my experience I have met hundreds, perhaps thousands of them, and have carried on much official correspondence with them. They average about the same in ability and experience and honesty as does the human race, generally speaking.

To place upon the postmaster the responsibility of determining, not only the overtime necessary for those post-office employees under his supervision, but add to that responsibility the duty of computing his own overtime, which would be the basis of extra pay for him, is neither fair to the postmaster nor to the public service of which he is a part. For some months, it has been reported through the various postmaster organizations that I was the "villain of the piece," that is, the Senator principally responsible for raising some question about the soundness of the policy involved. I have had several hundred letters and telegrams from postmasters all over the country asserting their honesty, integrity, and patriotism. I have questioned none of these things. I have consistently asserted that it is not good practice in either public or private business to place any individual in the position of determining his own pay, based upon a varying number of hours of work he devotes to his job.

I do declare that a substantial majority of postmasters have not carried out the spirit of the law, nor the instructions of the Post Office Department with regard to the overtime provision contained in Public, No. 509 (H. R. 6759). I shall deal with this more extensively later.

In the consideration of this bill in the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee of the Senate, in the first instance, I took this position and the committee finally concluded to amend the bill, omitting first-, second-, and third-class postmasters from the benefits of overtime payments I would not undertake to say that all members of the conference accepted this view as necessarily correct, but at least the conferees concluded to drop the idea of paying overtime to postmasters. They handled the pay factor in a different way. I fear that the conferees' method of handling this item is, perhaps, more dangerous, from a standpoint of sound public policy, than the original plan to pay overtime.

HOW OVERTIME WORKS

Relatively little overtime in the Postal Establishment was paid prior to the passage of Public Law, No. 509 (H. R. 6759), approved March 27, 1942. The workweek of postal employees was fixed at 40 hours. Generally speaking, half holidays on Saturday were granted in first-class post offices and most second-class offices. If the necessary work on Saturday required any employee to work more than 40 hours for that week, he was granted compensatory time off in the following week. (This rule of compensatory time did not apply on the three Saturdays preceding Christmas. Straight overtime could be and was paid for extra Saturday work in that period.)

To meet the unsettlement caused by the breaking out of the war, the Postmaster General, on March 9, 1942, addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House, asking that the law be amended to read as follows:

"That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require it, authorize the payment of overtime for Saturdays in lieu of compensatory time."

This authority was construed to apply to assistant postmasters, clerks, and carriers. Postmasters and post-office inspectors were not included, and received no overtime payment by virtue of this amendment. That omission is principally the cause of the bill now before us, although the provisions of the bill we are considering goes to other classes of employees, more or less limited in number. I have no objection to the bill so far as these other employees are concerned.

In his letter asking for the passage of H. R. 6759, the Postmaster General said:

"By virtue of the law, most postal field employees, approximately 270,000, may not be compelled to work on a Saturday unless they receive the same amount of time off on some day during the following week. This is 'compensatory time.'

"The amendment of such legislation * * * would not increase the cost of postal service to the Nation, since the Saturday-employee replacement cost is practically as great, if not greater."

I have quoted from the letter of the Postmaster General to the Speaker of the House. If his words carry the only meaning which I can read out of them, the actual result is far from the estimate of the results by the Postmaster General. I am advised by the First Assistant Postmaster General that overtime payments and estimates in post offices are as stated below:

Fiscal years:

1942	$10,396,420
*1943	61,003,199
1944	67,557,000
1945 (estimate)	69,777,200

* This figure includes some payments made under S. J. Res. 170. I do not have a basis for separating this sum, but it is relatively unimportant.

These are most astonishing figures. Overtime payments, through the fiscal year 1942, were at the rate of some $10,000,000. In asking for the passage of H. R. 6759, the Postmaster General said the change "would not increase the cost of postal service to the Nation." Surely, the increase of expenditures from $10,000,000 to $67,000,000 in 1944, and an estimate of nearly $70,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945 calls for a complete explanation before further legislation on this subject is passed.

When H. R. 2928 was before the Senate Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, I raised the question of how the result flowing from the passage of H. R. 6759 compared with the expressed views of the Postmaster General. As a result the bill was referred to a subcommittee, of which Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, was chairman. The subcommittee authorized me to investigate with the Post Office Department and obtain the best information available on this point. I have done so. I wish to say here that I found the office of the First Assistant Postmaster General most cooperative and helpful. It has been candid and has gone to much trouble to obtain information which was desired for this purpose. I find that from the very beginning of this more liberal overtime-payment rule, the Department has had difficulty in checking waste and extravagance in the various post offices throughout the country. From time to time the First Assistant Postmaster General has issued instructions and has cautioned postmasters about the administration of this more liberal overtime rule. I have been furnished with copies of letters issued to this end. In May 1943 the First Assistant Postmaster General said:

"In those postal units where a 48-hour workweek is not necessary, there may be authorized such hours in excess of 40 per week as the needs of the service require. Under no circumstances may increased postal facilities of any kind be authorized in any branch of the service merely for the purpose of establishing or continuing a workweek in excess of 40 hours."

The results obtained from this warning to postmasters were not satisfactory. On December 8, 1943, the First Assistant Postmaster General issued another letter. (This was after the Senate committee had called this subject to the attention of the Department.)

"Gross receipts and expenditures for auxiliary hire and overtime, for the September 1943 quarter indicates that some post offices are using more overtime for clerks, carriers, and laborers than is absolutely necessary, and that some offices have increased the hours of these employees to 48 hours a week, whereas previous estimates showed that satisfactory service was being rendered by the use of approximately 44 hours a week. Furthermore, it also appears in numerous instances that supervisors are being paid for overtime on Saturday when they formerly were able to take compensatory time the following week without additional cost to the Department.

"From our study of the estimates and expenditures submitted by postmasters, it is concluded that there is a possibility that the use of overtime is being abused. The percentage of clerical and carrier costs to the gross receipts has increased at many offices.

"The employment of regular employees on a 48-hour-week basis should have resulted in savings in expenditures for auxiliary assistance."

In order to obtain definite information on this point, I asked, on behalf of the subcommittee, that the First Assistant Postmaster General make an inquiry at a number of post offices throughout the country. A comparison was made between the overtime expenditure necessary under the compensatory time rule for the quarter ending March 31, 1942 (the last quarter of operation on the compensatory time basis) and overtime paid regular employees during the quarter ending September 30, 1943. (This was the last full quarter for which figures could be obtained preceding the inquiry.)

The results were startling. Expressed in hours of overtime, overtime service had increased as follows:

Selected second-class post offices

Salary of postmaster	Number of post offices	Total number of auxiliary hours used during quarter in granting compensatory time to regulars incident to Saturday service, quarter ending Mar. 31, 1942	Total number of hours overtime paid regular employees for service on Saturday during quarter ending Sept. 30, 1943	Percentage column 4 is of column 3
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
$3,000	41	9,470	26,095	275.55
$2,900	26	6,716	14,076	209.58
$2,800	10	5,515	12,231	221.77
$2,700	27	3,672	10,341	281.61
$2,600	12	5,489	9,720	177.08
$2,500	10	4,020	6,401	159.22
$2,400	99	2,601	5,089	195.05
Total	225	37,491	83,953	223.90

This information will give the Senate some understanding of the reason for the issuance by the First Assistant Postmaster General of his warning on December 8, 1943, in which he said that more overtime was being used than "is absolutely necessary" and "there is a possibility that the use of overtime is being abused."

The First Assistant Postmaster General was extremely moderate in his statement that "there is a possibility that the use of overtime is being abused." The reports definitely show that the use of overtime is being abused, and outrageously being abused. The expenditures for overtime in the current fiscal year are stated as $67,557,000 as against $10,396,420 in 1942. The estimate for overtime for the next fiscal year is $69,777,200. These are most

extraordinary increases. If these increases are due to faulty administration, either in the Department, or in the thousands of post offices throughout the country, surely the amounts involved are of sufficient importance to warrant the making of a conclusive investigation without delay .

I call special attention to this statement of the First Assistant Postmaster General in his letter of December 8, 1943:

"The employment of regular employees on a 48-hour-week basis should have resulted in savings in expenditures for auxiliary assistance."

The First Assistant Postmaster General was badly and sadly mistaken in his assumption, or he overestimated the competency of the postmasters administering the thousands of post offices in the country.

In the attempt to find the facts in this situation, the First Assistant Postmaster General sent out 2 sets of questionnaires. The first questionnaire was sent to 10 representative post offices in each State amounting to between 400 and 500 offices. Selection of post offices was made by the Post Office Department. The returns on this questionnaire were not very satisfactory. The questionnaire in itself was cumbersome and did not clearly get the information desired. I take a share of responsibility for this failure because this form was prepared after consultation between representatives of the First Assistant Postmaster General's office and myself.

A second questionnaire was sent out to 225 post offices. The second questionnaire was condensed and secured the precise information desired. It was prepared by the office of the First Assistant Postmaster General, which profited by the first unsatisfactory attempt to secure this information.

I have personally examined the returns from both the first and second questionnaires. I have both in my possession now. From this examination, it is apparent that about 75 percent of the postmasters, to whom these questionnaires were sent, had made no effort whatever to hold the overtime down to actual necessities of the Postal Service.

On the contrary, it is apparent that in something like 75 percent of the cases, the passage of H. R. 6759 was taken as a license to increase the pay for virtually all clerks and carriers, including the assistant postmaster, to the full extent of 8 hours overtime per week. In a quarter there are 13 Saturdays. Questionnaire after questionnaire returned shows the assistant postmaster claiming and being paid for 104 hours of overtime in that quarter which is the maximum possible hours. Somewhat comparable increases of overtime were given to clerks and carriers.

Returns from the 225 second-class offices tabulated above show that 37,941 extra hours were used and paid for during the quarter ending March 31, 1942. The same offices used 83,953 hours in the quarter ending September 30, 1943. During the second period 223.9 percent of overtime hours were used and paid for as compared with the quarter in the previous year.

This is an outrageous and inexcusable failure on the part of postmasters. For example:

One Ohio postmaster, with a salary of $3,000, in a town of around 5,000 population, covered his situation with 624 hours of "compensatory time" in 1942 with no "overtime" actually paid for. His gross business actually decreased from 1942 to 1943. He used no "compensatory time" in the 1943 quarter, but 858 hours of "overtime" were actually paid for. The operating cost of salaries for himself, assistant postmaster, and his clerks and carriers increased from 63.4 percent of his gross revenue in 1942 to 87.1 percent in 1943. The increase, stated in money, is the difference between $6,584.79 paid for salaries in the 1942 quarter and $8,346.99 paid for salaries in the 1943 quarter. This is an increase of $1,762.20 for this one office in one quarter. In a year this rate would increase salaries in this office more than $7,000. I think there are other factors involved in this increase, but, at that, gross extravagance is shown in this post office. On the face of this report this postmaster should be removed.

This increase in expenditure was in the face of an actual decrease in gross business.

This is the worst case I found. However, it is not the only case. Many other cases were bad—some of them nearly as bad as this.

The return of these questionnaires showed that only a minority of the postmasters handled their business in a satisfactory way. The postmasters making unsatisfactory reports are greatly in the majority.

From expressions of the First Assistant Postmaster General, this tremendous increase in cost must be attributed to a lack of proper supervision and careful administration by postmasters of the several thousand post offices affected. This is a situation that calls for immediate and thorough investigation by the Postmaster General. Failing such immediate investigation and remedy of this extravagance and waste, the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads should take cognizance of this whole situation and institute an inquiry.

To obtain these facts, expressed in figures, required a considerable amount of work on the part of the Post Office Department, as well as myself. I tried to bring the results to the attention of the conferees. I found that we are primarily legislators, who find it difficult to give the time and effort necessary to examine and understand a situation such as this.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES "BONUS"

Before reaching the question of postmasters' salaries, it is necessary to consider the effect of the operation of Public Law 25 (H. R. 1366), approved April 9, 1943. This passed the House of Representatives on March 15, 1943. (The debate will be found on pp. 2035 to 2047, inclusive, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

In opening the debate, Mr. BURCH of Virginia, chairman of the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, said:

"The increase which this bill provides conforms to the Little Steel formula. The average salary paid postal employees is about $2,000 per annum. The average salary paid R. F. D. carriers is between $2,000 and $2,100 per annum. * * * Something has been said about the cost of this bill. I state to you gentlemen here and now that this bill is worked out so that it practically conforms to the Little Steel formula."

House bill 1366 provided a payment of $300 per annum, for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, to all officers and employees of the Post Office Department in the field services, who were paid on an annual-salary basis. For employees on a piece-work or hourly basis, an increase of 15 percent in their compensation was provided. The clerk-hire allowance for third-class postmasters was increased 15 percent. Provision was made that in no case the increase in compensation or allowance should exceed $300 per annum.

This bill was a recognition of the increase in living costs during the war period and applied to all officers and employees alike. The increase in cost of living is substantially as great to the lowest-paid employee as to the highest-paid official. The passage of this bill was almost unanimous in the House and was unanimous in the Senate.

Chairman BURCH of Virginia estimated that the effect of this bill would be to increase Postal Service operating costs $88,688,000. The latest estimate, furnished me by the Post Office Department, states the increase in cost, due to this law, as $93,927,268 for the fiscal year 1944, and $95,081,687 for the fiscal year 1945. I think that action of the Congress in this regard was only a fair provision for increased living costs of postal officers and employees.

POSTMASTERS' SALARIES

We now come to the question of postmasters' salaries. I asked the First Assistant Postmaster General to give me an estimate of the effect of the proposal by the majority of the conferees on postal expenses. This is stated as follows:

Increase over present salary	
$1,100 to $2,000, 20 percent	$2,885,800
Over $2,000 to $4,000, 15 percent	3,038,100
Over $4,000 to $5,000, 10 percent	59,210
Over $5,000 to under $7,900, 5 percent	29,100
Total	6,012,210

No increase in salary of postmasters is authorized where the salary is $8,000 per annum or above.

I do not doubt the authority of Congress to increase the salaries of postmasters if it so desires. I most emphatically question the wisdom of doing so under all the circumstances. I shall discuss these circumstances.

Generally, the reasons given for increasing compensation to postmasters may be stated as:

A. Increase in their work and responsibilities.

B. Increase in living costs.

C. To some extent, increases in compensation, through payment of overtime, have raised the pay of assistant postmasters and clerks to a higher figure than the salary of the postmaster.

It may be fairly said that, probably, the latter factor has been urged more vigorously by postmasters than any other. I shall discuss these in the order stated.

A. There is no doubt that the work of postmasters has been increased through the addition of nonpostal activities that are being carried on through post offices for the war effort. This is an indeterminate factor, and it is exceedingly hard to appraise its weight and effect. In dealing with this factor it should be recognized that in every community, draft boards, rationing boards, and various other boards and committees are functioning in connection with the war effort. Largely, the work of these boards is being carried on by citizens volunteering to serve without compensation. Every Member of Congress has personal knowledge of these boards and their personnel. In many instances the work of these boards takes a substantial part of the time of a citizen who serves without compensation.

I do not think that the average burden imposed upon the postmaster, because of added nonpostal activities, is any greater than the average duties carried by citizens of his community without compensation. If the Congress is going to increase postmasters' salaries because of this factor, it ought to make provision for every other citizen serving on draft boards, rationing boards, war boards, U. S. O., O. C. D., Red Cross, and a myriad of like activities. Certainly, in this proposal we are discriminating against a multitude of our fellow citizens who give their time to the war effort without any form of money compensation.

B. When we come to the second factor, increase in living costs, it should be recognized that the bonus of $300 per annum allowed to every officer and employee of the Postal Service was intended to take care of this factor. Surley, we are not going to start to make exceptions of postmasters and accord them special treatment.

In this connection, it might be remembered that there is such a thing as a hold-the-line Executive order. That order is based upon the increase in living costs which have occurred since January 1, 1941. The Little Steel formula holds all wage and salary increases to a 15-percent basis.

There is a further factor in this dimension. Employers in private business are not allowed to raise salaries or wages of their employees without permission from the War Labor Board. This rule applies to individuals as well as groups. It has been the cause of much embarrassment to many employers. It is true that the War Labor Board grants permission to raise wages and salaries where justification is shown. Such permission is usually granted to meet the stern necessities of employers in their effort to retain employees as against the higher wages offered in war industries. Permission is also granted by the War Labor Board to correct gross inequities.

There is nothing in the record to indicate that postmasters are entitled to be placed in either of these classifications. If the Congress comes along and increases the salaries of postmasters, principally upon the basis that they want the money, it may be more difficult for the War Labor Board and the Economic Stabilization Director to hold the line.

Personally, I can conceive of no circumstance in the present situation that justifies the Congress in making postmasters a preferred class as against the very numerous classes of citizens who do not share the joys of public office. With all respect for my colleagues of the conference committee, I think they are treading on dangerous ground in what they propose to do in this instance.

C. We all have had pressure from the highly organized employees of the Post Office Department, both individually and through their organizations. Because of my peculiar relation to this question, I think it possible that I have had much more pressure, particularly from individual postmasters and postmaster organizations, than have my colleagues. Much is made of the claim that the assistant postmaster and other subordinates are now receiving higher compensation than the postmaster himself.

This is true to some extent, but the facts are grossly exaggerated. Senator HAYDEN, from the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, carried on an inquiry with the Post Office Department covering this phase. His report was printed as Report No. 788, Calendar No. 795, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. I commend my colleagues of the conference to a careful reading of that report. It was found that there were some cases of the kind—mainly in second-class offices. Even in those cases, the excess of salary for the assistant postmaster, or any clerk, over the postmaster's salary, was insignificant. About 90 percent of the pressure exerted to secure my agreement to including overtime for postmasters in H. R. 2928 was because of this detail.

There is another factor to be considered. Any excess of compensation for subordinates, above the postmaster's compensation, is due in every case to the payment of overtime. This overtime payment could not be made except by the approval of the postmaster. It, perhaps, would not be accurate to say that postmasters approved these overtime payments for their subordinates in the post office for the purpose of making a prima facie showing for an increase in salary for themselves. But, at least it had that effect, and postmasters have certainly pressed, at least with me, that factor to the utmost limit.

However, I want to go to the broader question of the responsibility of postmasters to the Post Office Department, and to the public, in their capacity as the executives administering these thousands of post offices scattered all over the land. Without doubt or hesitation, I state that:

"They have grossly failed to discharge this responsibility. No person with any degree of understanding can consider the information furnished by the First Assistant Postmaster General and read his statement that 'the use of overtime is being abused,' without realizing that here is an important matter entitled to serious and immediate consideration in the public interest. Whatever of abuse and extravagance appears in the administration of this overtime authority, is directly chargeable to the postmasters."

We now come to the astounding proposal to reward public officers, who have been negligent and derelict in their duty, with an increase in salary. It is hard to conceive anything more absurd than this proposition. The waste of public money is indicated, on the reports available, at around $60,000,000 annually. These reports are not as comprehensive as I wish they were. It is entirely possible that reasons other than overtime may be found for a part of this expenditure. I think it is likely that such is the case.

However, no matter what offsetting factor may be found, that will not change the fact that negligence, or incompetency of postmasters, is causing a needless expenditure of public money to be measured in the scores of millions of dollars. Whether that be twenty million, or forty million, or sixty million, is important but not the only important point. The most important thing is that public officers, who have failed in their duty, should be punished and not rewarded.

It is my belief that an immediate and thorough investigation of all the factors discussed herein should be instituted by the Postmaster General and carried through to as early a conclusion as possible. It is my further belief that, pending the result of such an investigation, this legislation should be held in abeyance. It is my quite definite belief that a thorough investigation by the Postmaster General will find negligence and incompetency to an extent that will justify the removal of hundreds, and perhaps thousands of postmasters now holding office. That they should be rewarded for negligence is, to me, fantastic.

POST-OFFICE INSPECTORS

I served many years in the Post Office Department. I was always in the transportation end of postal work, but over the years, I had full and complete opportunities to witness the work of post-office inspectors.

The post-office inspectors are as fine a body of public servants as can be found anywhere. To me, they compare favorably with the F. B. I., Secret Service of the Treasury Department, the Intelligence Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and other similar organizations. They are mostly highly trained, competent, and earnest men. To consider, for a moment, placing a group of men like this on a basis of punching a clock when they go on duty and come off duty, and paying them overtime is ridiculous, and tends to lower the respect in which this body of men is held by their associates in the Postal Service and by the public generally.

If the post-office inspectors are not paid adequate salaries, I stand ready to vote for an increase in their salaries whenever a proper foundation is provided. I feel, very strongly, that an injustice is being done to the postal inspectors, as a body, and to the postal-inspection service, by the proposal here considered. It cheapens them and lowers their prestige in discharging their duties—which is important.

CONCLUSION

Out of a long life of much experience with public service, both National and State, I want to say that I believe the Post Office Department of the United States of America is as efficient a functioning public agency as can be found anywhere in any land. To me, it is easily superior, as a business organization, to any other department of the Government. Nothing that I have said herein is to be taken as indicating any serious impairment of efficiency in the Post Office Department. I do think the Department is open to criticism for lack of vigorous administration upon this particular point. That doesn't lessen the esteem and respect which I hold for the responsible officers of the Post Office Department, nor the admiration I have for the service rendered by the vast body of postal employees.

What I am trying to do is make the Post Office Department more efficient; to reward competency, and to punish and discourage incompetency and waste. This is my only purpose.

CLYDE M. REED.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—ADDRESS BY FRED J. FREESTONE

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, by Fred J. Freestone, delivered at Watertown, N. Y., May 5, 1944, under the auspices of the Watertown Building and Construction Trades Council, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEXICANS IN THE WAR—ARTICLE BY SELDEN MENEFEE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mexicans in the War," by Selden Menefee, from the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE MOINA MICHAEL, FOUNDER OF POPPY DAY—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the late Miss Moina Michael, originator of Poppy Day, published in the New York Times of May 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH AIR POLICY—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "British Air Policy in Line With Ours," and two attached statements, published in the New York Times of May 11, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD, 1943

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, including an estimate of the liabilities created by the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937 as required by subsection (d) of section 15 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1944.*

FOREIGN DECORATIONS, ETC., TENDERED TO RETIRED OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am forwarding, for the consideration of the Congress, a communication from the Secretary of State transmitting a list of those retired officers or employees of the United States for whom the Department of State, under the provisions of the act of January 31, 1881 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 115), is holding decorations, orders, medals, or presents tendered them by foreign governments. The list has been divided into two parts (1) those countries which are cobelligerent or friendly nations and (2) enemy countries. It is believed that the Congress may wish to consider a joint resolution suspending the operation of Public Resolution No. 52 of June 27, 1934, until such time as the international situation would permit wholly objective consideration of such matters, or to consider granting legislation at this time to permit only of distributions of decorations, etc., to the recipients intended by friendly governments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1944.*

[Enclosures: (1) From the Secretary of State; (2) list.]

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election of national officers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun, which is an outstanding journal not only from the standpoint of publishing the news, but because of its attitude on constitutional and public questions, on the 10th of May, in its editorial columns, carried a very informative and illuminating editorial entitled "Up to the States." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UP TO THE STATES

The question on the anti-poll-tax bill, on which debate began yesterday in the Senate, is not whether the poll tax should be discarded as a prerequisite of voting in the eight Southern States where it is still retained. The question is rather whether the Federal Government should assume control of the franchise and by act of Congress override State constitutions and State laws dealing with this matter.

Under our Federal Constitution, these matters are patently under State control. Paragraph 1 of section 1, article I, says that in voting for Members of the House of Representatives "electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." The seventeenth amendment, which provides for popular election of Senators, says that "the electors for Senator in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

What the anti-poll-tax bill proposes to do is to override these stipulations in the fundamental law. The demerits of the poll tax are many and glaring. The more quickly the States which use such taxes as limitations on the suffrage abandon such restrictions, the better. The decision, however, is one for the States to make. For Congress to step in and legislate on such matters is contrary not only to the letter of the Constitution, but also to the good health of our Federal system, under which unity is best achieved, if the Federal authorities have careful regard for the sensibilities and the laws of the States.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Poll Tax Is Opposed." The article was written by Jennings Perry, editor of the Nashville Tennesseean.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL TAX IS OPPOSED—THOSE WHO FAVOR RETENTION HELD UNREPRESENTATIVE OF SOUTH

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Allow me to protest the injustice done the South in C. P. Trussell's report from Washington on the poll-tax issue in the Times of April 16. The injustice is quite too commonplace in the press generally and results from the readiness of correspondents—and of editorial writers—to accept the voices of some southern Congressmen, particularly Senators, as the voice of the South.

The point is pertinent to the poll-tax issue, and should be considered here, that none of these gentlemen ever in his life faced a free electorate and that all of them are in Congress by the votes of only a minor fraction of the people they are supposed to represent.

I note that Mr. Trussell is at some pains to credit the expressions he reports to southern groups and to southern Senators. But I note also that he slips easily, as seems to have become customary, into the next error of quoting the southerners themselves and of allowing their expressions to paint, without condition, the mood of the South.

PROPOSED BY CALIFORNIAN

May I recall that the first anti-poll-tax legislation, from which the present bill directly derives, was introduced in the House by the late Lee Geyer, of California, at the solicitation of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and that the second anti-poll-tax bill was introduced and ardently fought for by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.

May I point out also that this initiative was taken in behalf of millions of southerners, white and black, who no longer have a part in the affairs of their States and Nation, and hence cannot make known their desires or will in the legislative halls. And since the politically voiceless in the South far outnumber those in the South who still manage to exercise the suffrage, it is unfair to them—and to fact—to assume that what a handful of Senators and some others who have no commission from the masses of the people choose to declare reflects "the mood of the South" toward the poll tax, or any other political issue.

In the only Southern State in which the disfranchised have been able to find a voice—Tennessee—repeal of the poll tax by overwhelming vote in the legislature has been compelled, and the fact that the State supreme court, by a 3 to 2 ruling—described in the stinging dissent of Associate Justice Neil as "unknown in the history of English or American jurisprudence"—has held that the legislature could not repeal its own poll-tax act does not mean that the will of the people still is not hard against the abomination, or that the common people of Tennessee are not looking with hope to the Congress for the restoration of their undoubted right to an unfettered suffrage.

DETERMINING FACTOR

Mr. Trussell states that "stanchest supporters of the anti-poll-tax legislation concede that this levy is not necessarily a controlling factor in decisions made at polling places whether a Negro shall or shall not cast a ballot." You hear this exculpation of the vote tax so often from the supporters of the poll tax that you become sick of it. The poll tax is the actual instrument of disfranchisement of millions of citizens in these Southern States, and this disfranchisement has left starveling electorates in which the decisions actually are made by still smaller groups of voters organized by the machines of political bosses or built up by the Senators themselves.

This newspaper made, 2 years ago, a comparison of the votes in Presidential elections in Tennessee and Kentucky over a period of years. These States have equal populations, closely akin in every way. In the past 70 years both States have voted Democratic in all Presidential elections save two.

But Kentucky has no poll tax. The effect of the incidence of the poll tax in Tennessee in 1890 is vividly shown in this survey. As one of the stanchest supporters of anti-poll-tax legislation, this newspaper certainly does not concede that "this levy is not necessarily a controlling factor in decisions made at polling places." It is without question the determining factor in the whole political life of the South.

CONTROL OF ELECTORATES

Again I could ask that it be remembered that the southern Senators who will filibuster against Federal legislation that would enable the masses of the South to vote for President and Vice President and for Representatives in the National Legislature are fighting neither for States' rights nor for white supremacy, but for their own special privilege of running before drastically restricted electorates they know how to control.

Nor is it that they necessarily are afraid of the votes of those now advocating repeal of the poll tax; but rather that they are afraid of democracy, afraid of their fate at the hands of the whole people, who should have back of their scepter of sovereignty—which of a right is without question theirs—the ballot.

And once more, for the sake of reportorial accuracy, may I caution against easy acceptance of the views of a few magnolia-scented Senators as the view of the South. The South will be able to make known its view only when it shall have regained its voice at the polls.

JENNINGS PERRY,
Editor, the Nashville Tennesseean.
NASHVILLE, TENN., *May 4, 1944.*

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from New York, is Mr. Perry the head of the political organization which is advocating the pending poll-tax bill?

Mr. MEAD. I think he is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is he present in Washington lobbying for the bill?

Mr. MEAD. I really do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know whether Mr. Perry is a Communist, or what political affiliation he has?

Mr. MEAD. He being a Tennessean, I would not be apt to know. I imagine he is a Democrat.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator not only has great optimism, as he showed yesterday, but he has wonderful imagination, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] remarks in an aside, if he thinks Mr. Perry is a Democrat. I do not know Mr. Perry, but as I understand, he has been affiliated with the Communist Party for a number of years, and, as I understand further, the National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax is a Communist organization, largely built up in New York, and they have elected Mr. Perry their president because he is supposed to be for their views, and because he is a Communist, and not because he represents the South.

I have read the articles which the Senator is submitting, in which Mr. Perry has set forth his views, and denounced southern Senators. I wish to say that Mr. Perry does not represent the people of Tennessee, nor the people of the South, respecting the question of the poll tax, but that he is merely acting as the head of a Communist committee, and being used by that committee because he happened to have been born in the South.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, after the Senator from Tennessee brought this matter up yesterday I took occasion to make an investigation as to those who were associated with the organization for the repeal of the poll tax. I will have all that information, I hope, late today. I can say, judging by the ones from whom I have already heard, that those connected with the organization form one of the most representative groups that have ever come to my attention.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have their names, and I am going to give their names to the Senate a little later. As to their being a representative group, the people of the United States can pass upon the question, or the Senate can pass upon it. I have that information and will furnish the names. I wish to say that if my information is correct—and the Senator did not answer the question on that point directly yesterday—the same group, possibly with Mr. Perry as its head, has been infesting the Senator's office for several days trying to urge the Senator to make greater speed in passing the pending measure, which most people know to be unconstitutional, and which will be void if it is passed.

Mr. MEAD. I do not believe I have ever met Mr. Perry. He has never spoken to me about the bill. But after what occurred yesterday I made a real effort to become familiar with the people who are associated together in this organization. I received a telegram this morning, which as yet I have not had a chance to answer; but judging from the telegram, I think the Senator from Tennessee and Mr. Perry should get together. The Senator charges Mr. Perry with being a Communist, and Mr. Perry in closing his telegram says:

I think the Senator is a Communist.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh! Well, I have been accused of many things in my life, but I do not believe I have ever before been accused of being a Communist.

Mr. MEAD. I think the Senator and Mr. Perry both are Tennessee Democrats and ought to get together.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will explain to the Senator that on the 13th of May we Democrats had a Jefferson Day banquet in Nashville, Tenn., to raise funds for the campaign. The banquet cost $25 a plate. Neither Mr. Jennings Perry nor Mr. Silliman Evans, who is his employer, had $25 worth of democracy in them, because neither one attended the dinner, and the next day the meeting was ridiculed and denounced in the columns of the newspaper of which Mr. Jennings Perry is the editor. When the Senator says he believes Mr. Perry is a Democrat he must know——

Mr. MEAD. No; I said I thought he was.

Mr. McKELLAR. That Mr. Perry does not have the remotest idea of democracy, and is a Communist editor of a Communist newspaper owned by another Communist from the State of Texas.

Mr. MEAD. I simply said I thought he was a Democrat, being a Tennessean, but perhaps the reason he was not at that dinner is——

Mr. McKELLAR. Not all Tennesseans are Democrats, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. Perhaps the reason he was not at that dinner is that he did not have the money. Many do not have the money to pay the poll tax. Perhaps Mr. Perry did not have the money to go to the dinner.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator may think that is a defense, but the Tennesseean is one of the most prosperous newspapers in the State of Tennessee, and is operated as a Communist newspaper under the false slogan that it is a Democratic paper. It is not a Democratic newspaper, and has not been a Democratic newspaper under its present ownership and under its present editorship. It is a Communist newspaper, pure and simple, fighting the democracy of the State of Tennessee and of the Nation.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator's statement is very revealing, because a very few years ago the Texas delegation recommended the appointment to a high position in the Postal Service of the man who is now the editor of that newspaper.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and he was afterward discharged by a Democratic administration.

Mr. MEAD. No; it occurs to me that he resigned.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, it was under compulsion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have no illusions about my ability at this time to change the views of any Member of this body on the pending question. However, I feel so intensely interested in it, and my convictions are so strong in opposition to this attempted invasion of my State, that I wish at least to make some contribution which possibly may be helpful to others when another program like the present one is presented in resisting and defeating it.

Yesterday a good deal was said about the authorship of the pending bill. It was directly charged by Senators on the floor of the Senate that a man by the name of VITO MARCANTONIO, of New York, was the author of the bill. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] apparently did not want him to have that position, so he insisted that three or four Representatives from the State of New York had introduced the bill. He failed to state an important factor, which is that each of the Representatives introducing the bill mentioned by him did so separately, not in combination or in conjunction with Representative MARCANTONIO. Yesterday I telephoned the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and was informed that Mr. MARCANTONIO was the first one to introduce the bill. There were others who subsequently introduced similar bills, I assume, because the bills appeared to be the same, so the junior Senator from New York stated. I assume that other Members of the House of Representatives—and they were chiefly from the State of New York—wished to follow the leadership of Mr. MARCANTONIO, so they proceeded to obtain copies of his bill and introduced it in their own names.

A little later this same Member of the House of Representatives, who is neither a Democrat nor a Republican—in fact, I do not know what his politics may be—Mr. MARCANTONIO, filed a petition with the Clerk of the House of Representatives to require the committee, under the House rules, to report the bill. When he obtained a sufficient number of signers to the petition of discharge, he made a motion to discharge the Rules Committee and to send the bill to the calendar.

The result of that situation is that it is clearly shown that Mr. MARCANTONIO—and I am not criticizing him; he had the right to do what he did—is the leader of this program, this bill, this measure, this assault, as we call it, upon the Constitution of our country. The thing that is surprising to me is that he found so many men who would follow his leadership on a constitutional question.

Mr. President, it is apparent from a cursory examination of the pending bill that it was not prepared by a skillful lawyer, that its contents did not have very careful or serious consideration by those who are familiar with our Constitution and the history of our country. Why do I say that? Members of the Senate have copies of the bill before them. It begins with the statement—

That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President.

Whoever heard of the voters voting for a President or a Vice President? The bill presupposes that the names of candidates for President and Vice President will be placed on the ballots, and provides that the payment of a poll tax shall not be required as a prerequisite to voting for the candidates for President or Vice President. Then the bill proceeds as follows:

Electors for President or Vice President—

That is all right. Of course, we vote for electors for President and Vice President. Then the bill says:

Or the Senator—

What Senator does the author of the pending bill mean? There may be two

Senators to be elected in the same election, by virtue of a vacancy and by virtue of the expiration of a term. But the author of the bill, evidently without skill either as a lawyer or as a statesman in matters of this kind, provided—

Or the Senator—

Not "a Senator"—

or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at the primaries or other elections for said officers—

Of course, they are officers—

within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner—

The payment of a poll tax is to be regarded as an interference with the manner, which, of course, means mode, procedure, or practice—

of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers.

Mr. President, a Presidential elector is not a national officer. But it is so provided in this strange bill, which proposes a fundamental change in the whole procedure of Federal elections for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress.

I stated that a Presidential elector is not a national officer. I shall read from the opinion in the case of In re Green, in One Hundred and Thirty-fourth United States Reports, page 377, although I shall not read the entire opinion:

The sole function of the Presidential electors is to cast, certify, and transmit the vote of the State for President and Vice President of the Nation. Although the electors are appointed and act under and pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, they are no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators—

The opinion was written before the constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of Senators was ratified by the States—

or the people of the States when acting as electors of Representatives in Congress. Constitution, article I, sections 2 and 3.

Long ago it was adjudicated that Presidential electors were not Federal officials or agents. We know that under the Constitution the States are given the power to choose, select, or appoint electors to serve in the electoral college for the election of President and Vice President; and the Constitution specifically provides that those electors may be selected in any way the State sees fit to select them. They may be elected or appointed.

Many Members in both Houses of Congress are following this great leader, Mr. MARCANTONIO. They have accepted the bill blindly. They have accepted his leadership blindly, without consideration of the provisions of the bill which they are accepting and for which they contemplate voting. The bill defines and describes a Presidential elector as a Federal official, when that office is specifically defined in the Constitution as a State office. The Supreme Court has held that an elector is purely a State official, and not a Federal official.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me take the liberty of reminding the distinguished Senator that for many years the legislatures selected the electors. The selection of electors was not done by popular vote at all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the Constitution, the complete power was in the State legislature.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Undoubtedly. I am glad to have the Senator remind me of the history behind that subject. The legality of the procedure has stood from the foundation of our Constitution. As pointed out by the able Senator, the State has always had the right, in its own way, to elect or choose its Presidential electors.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator will further yield, let me say that I know of no reason why the State legislatures could not continue to appoint the electors if the States should see fit to have them chosen in that way.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true. Under the Constitution, the States have the absolute, unlimited power to choose electors in any way they deem proper.

I invite attention to the fact that even the authors of the bill recognized that Congress had no power under the Constitution to change, add to, or subtract from, any of the qualifications for voters prescribed by the State constitution or State laws. Why do they recognize that fact? Because they make the bill apply only to the election of President and Vice President — erroneously — to electors for President or Vice President—and electors are not Federal officers—or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives.

There is a very inept description of Senators, because the bill says "Senator." If we construe that to mean Senators, making the singular mean the plural, which we would not ordinarily do in construing language as specific as this, then the bill applies only to the election of Members of Congress, who are Federal officials. The President and the Vice President cannot be voted for, so they must go out of the picture. As I have just pointed out, according to a decision of the Supreme Court, Presidential electors are not Federal officers. So there is nothing left for the bill to apply to except "Senator or Member of the House of Representatives."

I do not question the good faith of Senators who are supporting the Marcantonio proposal. However, I doubt if they wish to pass a bill full of legal errors, full of confusion and uncertainty. It can have no application except to Members of the two Houses, thereby bringing about an unintentional deception. The supporters of the bill outside Congress—the Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the organization of the C. I. O., which are the principal supporters of this program—would be exceedingly disappointed if they should succeed in having the bill passed, and then find that, through error, misjudgment, and misunderstanding of the Constitution, their program was limited only to Members of Congress.

In any event, the proponents of the bill recognize that Congress has no power to fix the qualifications of voters for State officials. They recognize that fact by leaving out of the bill all State officials except electors, who are included by mistake. The bill does not include Governors of States. It does not include any State or county officials. We have a dual system of government in this country, with the Federal Government on the one hand and the State and local governments on the other, constituting two elements or prongs of this instrument.

What are we to do if we pass the bill? The names of candidates for Congress cannot be placed on the same ballot with the names of candidates for State and local offices. The States may continue their poll-tax qualifications just as they are, except with respect to voters for candidates for the two branches of Congress, as specified in the bill. When the voter goes to the polling place and calls for a ballot, he cannot vote for State officials on the same ballot with Federal officials, because certainly in all the States where the poll tax is retained, the qualifications of voters will be entirely different. So a situation will be encountered which will necessarily call for two elections, whether on the same day or different days. The names of candidates for Federal offices and the names of candidates for State offices cannot be placed on the same ballot. What are we to do? Are we to have two separate ballot boxes, two registration lists, two sets of managers in the election, and two returning officers? As a common-sense, practical proposition, I do not see how we can do anything else.

It is certain that such a confused situation was never contemplated by the leader of this movement, or by any of his intelligent followers. Evidently they have blindly accepted his leadership, and are now being led into the darkest of constitutional and legal alleys.

Of course, if this bill should become law, and the Federal Government did not wish to continue a situation which would lead to all kinds of confusion in the matter of different qualifications of voters in voting for candidates for other than Federal offices, it would be obliged either to separate the dates for holding elections or the States would doubtless have to do so. Before the eight States now having poll-tax laws would permit Congress to violate the deep and fundamental convictions now existing with reference to qualifications of their voters, they would do what Maine has always done, namely, simply designate a separate and distinct day for the holding of their State elections. Then where would our colored people be? What benefit would they receive under the Marcantonio law? If we held separate elections, they would have to be registered as legal voters under our State law.

They could not vote in the Federal elections unless they were also registered as qualified voters under the State law. If they could do otherwise, there would be no need for the Marcantonio bill.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that people not living in the South do not realize and understand the situation existing in the South with reference to the white and colored races. I submit that very few Members of this body have received any letters or requests from the good colored people of the South asking them to vote for the proposed Marcantonio legislation. Our colored people are satisfied with the election situation as it now exists. Many of them have registered in order to vote. As time passes, it is my humble opinion that more and more colored people will register. I think the matter is one of progress, as it was in connection with the antilynching fight. Year after year during that period there were starry-eyed reformers who, in an unconstitutional way, we insisted, tried to punish southern officials who endeavored to do their duty in murder cases involving colored persons. Finally, as time went on, and as Negroes emerged from a state of barbarism and entered into a state of education and civilization, the horrible crime of lynching in the South disappeared almost entirely.

Mr. President, many of the northern people make a mistake in their thought upon this subject. The mistake is often made by persons of good and sincere intentions. I am not talking about the Marcantonio group. There are many who will realize that this fight is not for the benefit of southern people. Those people can pay their poll tax. Of what significance is the $1.50 which is charged in Alabama? A very prominent merchant in Alabama who was in my office only a few days ago, told me that it was a very common occurrence for colored men to come into his store and spend from $150 to $200 at a time. He told me that he had plead with them to save their money and buy bonds. Oh, no, Mr. President, they want to spend their money now.

Yet there is a group of reformers who think that those men who are working in Government plants and receiving from $8 to $10 a day are unable to eliminate from their purchases one Coca-Cola a day for 30 days, and pay their poll tax. Their pockets are full of money. They are not worrying about the payment of their poll tax. If they paid their poll tax, I submit that it would not necessarily get them on the list of legal voters. So if the pending bill shall be passed, it will not make those persons qualified voters. Something must follow besides the payment of the poll tax. Those persons must possess other qualifications, such as being able to read and write, and read the Constitution in the English language. That requirement, I believe, was established by the great State of Massachusetts. It is still in the law of Massachusetts. I have in my office a pamphlet showing the qualifications for voting required in the different States. A voter in Massachusetts must be literate. He must understand the Constitution in the English language. I recognize that if that requirement were applied to those residing in Mr. MARCANTONIO'S State there would be a very substantial reduction in the number of legal voters in New York City. The problem is possibly peculiar to the city of New York.

Mr. President, some time ago a similar bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by a member of Tammany Hall, and also in the Senate by a member of Tammany Hall. I do not know why someone in the city of New York became so intensely interested in the qualifications of voters in the Southern States. I have also in mind another man who is a Tammanyite. No, on second thought, from what I hear about his politics, I do not believe that Tammany would have him. He is a labor man. He does not subscribe to Democratic doctrine, and does not vote the Democratic ticket ir the way that Tammany would want him to vote it. I am not criticizing Tammany. However, they know that MARCANTONIO, who came to Congress first as a Republican, according to the Congressional Directory of the Seventy-fourth Congress, is not interested in that point. But that is the situation.

Why are the people of New York interested in the proposed legislation as it may affect the Negro? I use the word "Negro" with respect here, just as we do in the South. The term is used in connection with designating a race, just as we use the word "Chinese." I do not use the word with any intention of offense. I am a friend of the Negroes in my State, and they know it. If a Negro is treated fairly, he will swear by the person who so treats him. I have working for me two domestic servants who are Negroes. They have been in my service for approximately 35 or 40 years. They are a man and a woman. They are not married to each other. The woman is my cook. I do not know what I would do without her. She rarely ever misses a day. She is not one of the kind who do not come if it does not suit them. She is married and her husband lives with her. The other man living on my lot has a wife and they are raising two children. I would not, if I could help it, permit anybody to impose on those two Negroes. Everybody in my town knows how highly I regard them. They are Negroes of good character; they are really Christians; they are church attendants; they are good citizens. They feel safe and secure. They are not interested in Mr. MARCANTONIO'S starry-eyed views and his efforts to reform this country from the standpoint of the Negro race.

I want to say another thing. It has reference to the Ku Klux Klan. I do not think MARCANTONIO was in favor of the Ku Klux Klan. I presume ne was not on that side, and I could not very well charge him with being one of them; but when many supporters of this bill in New York City and other northern cities were riding around at night with hoods over their heads and arrayed in the paraphernalia of the hideous Ku Klux Klan, terrorizing the Negroes, oppressing the Jews, and fighting and opposing the religious faith of the Roman Catholics, when it looked in my State as if three-fourths of the people belonged to the Ku Klux Klan and the Negroes were scared nearly to death, and were afraid to go out on the street, I did not follow the Ku Klux Klan. I had too deep a feeling of kindness and sympathy for an oppressed race to take part in that movement; but I did not keep quiet on the subject. On the stump and in the newspapers in Alabama I opposed religious bigotry, and race prejudice and the secret riding around by Ku Kluxers who were putting in terror the people of my State and of Indiana and many other northern States, including, to some extent, New York, in fact, it spread all over the country. I did the best I could to dissolve the Ku Klux Klan. Everybody in Alabama who kept informed as to my attitude on that subject was familiar with my position and my views. Sitting near me is a good old warrior, who the other day made one of the finest speeches I ever heard any man deliver in the Senate. It came from his heart, backed by the intelligence of his great brain and his high character and his outstanding reputation for truth and good citizenship. He did in Texas what I did in Alabama when it was the most unpopular thing that a man could do. My friend here, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] made a straight, courageous, earnest, effective fight against that sort of lawlessness and oppression. And now we are here resisting this move to violate the Constitution of the United States, to destroy States' rights, to interfere in a matter in which those who are back of this effort have no business to interfere, and they are doing an injury by interfering.

A campaign has just been concluded in Alabama in which my colleague [Mr. HILL] was a candidate, and, of course, a successful one. Let me say that the campaign of his political opponent was waged with fierceness and with the circulation of cartoons and pictures. One of them, circulated all over the State, showed my colleague shaking hands with a good old Negro farmer on an occasion when there was a celebration because of his success in connection with the soil-conservation program. Feeling ran very high, and it was largely brought about by the Supreme Court's decision recently rendered. There was brought about, Mr. President, by the agitation of the race question an unusual and remarkable feeling of prejudice against the colored people of the South. I regret it. I hope it will not occur again, but so long as there are men like the sponsors of this bill who do not understand the situation and do not realize that they are doing a great injustice to a race that is making progress and that is satisfied, so long as there are agitators such as those sponsoring a bill like this, waves of strong anti-Negro feeling will recur in the South, as they did in the Ku Klux days. The movement may start in the South, but do not fail to realize that it will spread to the North, the East, and the West when great tides of racial feeling are stirred up. It cannot be controlled, as it was not controlled on a

previous occasion until it grew into a national menace and disgrace. That is what the sponsors of this bill are likely to bring about. They do not realize it, but certainly they are ignorant about the thing. They have been misled. The Negroes in the South have not written to Senators, and my colleagues know that to be so, for the Negroes are not worried about the pending bill.

They have this high tide again rolling against them and they know that propaganda for the enactment of such a bill as this stirs up an element of our people, as has been the case in the last few months. They know that that race feeling is likely to become stronger and stronger as it spreads. I believe that if this bill should be passed—Gold help me, I am confident it will not be passed due to the understanding of a great many intelligent, high-class citizens who live outside the South, many of whom are in this body—but if this bill should pass, from the way they talked in the last election and from the way they feel, the white folks down there will probably organize. They feel that the Federal Government is doing to them again what it did to them in the days of reconstruction; that if this bill passes the Federal Government will take charge of their franchise laws.

There are a number of counties in my State and a number of counties in other States in the South having a very decided majority of colored people. The white people figure if all the Negroes should be put on the registration list—I do not think they would be because they would be kept off on other grounds—but if they should be there is a fear that the courthouse, as was the case in reconstruction days, would again be filled with colored county officials, to wait upon our white people, our women, and our children, when they have to go to the courthouse to transact business which may be necessary. They are apprehensive of that.

Why force such a situation? If you force it now, Senators, I want to tell you we shall go through the Ku Klux Klan era again. I never saw our southern people so aroused. I am 72 years old; but I was not old enough to realize what was going on during the reconstruction period, when my father belonged to the Ku Klux Klan, as all of our Confederates did for self-protection. The original Ku Klux Klan was not like the last one; it was designed to protect white supremacy, protect our women and children against the unlawful northern carpetbaggers who were sent down to the South. Our people are worried and stirred up about this thing; they are highly incensed about it.

Mr. President, since this debate started we have had three of the greatest constitutional arguments I have ever had the privilege to hear. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], a great orator, a man whom we all respect and have confidence in, made one of the most effective appeals ever made in the Senate Chamber. He was speaking for his people. He was speaking for the good people all over this country who do not understand what the pending measure means.

Then there came the great Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], a brilliant mind, with a courage, moral and physical, unsurpassed, a man whose friendship I very deeply value, and I am glad whenever I can have the opportunity of listening to the words of wisdom and eloquence which fall from his lips. He is a conscientious man, one raised in the heart of North Carolina, who knows all about the race problem in the South. Here, with earnestness and eloquence, he protested against this infamous bill, and against the infamous leaders who are trying to press its passage through political influences, and not as a result of any outcry by the Negroes in the South. Those who are pressing for passage of the bill profess to be trying to protect the Negroes. The Negroes do not want them to put their slimy hands on them, and bring them into conflict with the people with whom they have lived in peace and love ever since the days of slavery. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who sits before me, knows how the Negroes feel.

Then came that old Roman, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], not old in years but old in the confidence and respect and admiration of the people who know him and look up to him. We in the South look up to him as a great leader. His colleagues in the Senate regard him as a peerless statesman. He made an effective constitutional argument which left practically nothing for the rest of us to say on the subject.

The young junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] gave us a splendid description and historical account of the cloture rule, which was very helpful.

After these great contributions, almost unequaled in the history of this body, I announced in the beginning of my remarks that I could say nothing that would be of special help to Senators in deciding this question on its merits. In the short span of life ahead of me I never expect to hear three such able, such brilliant, such persuasive, such earnest, such honest speeches, as TOM CONNALLY, JOE BAILEY, and WALTER GEORGE made since this discussion arose.

Now, Mr. President, I shall proceed, and shall conclude in a short time. I shall not go into the constitutional phase of the question before us, because Senators all heard the speeches of the orators to whom I have referred, whose addresses constitute an encyclopedia of law on States' rights, and the rights of the States to control exclusively their franchise laws.

There is a statement at the conclusion of the minority views on the anti-poll-tax bill in October 1942, which would be a sufficient answer to the pending bill if there were no other answers. It was signed by Senators Connally, Austin, and Doxey, and was as follows:

> We believe also, and submit, that the present emergency is not a proper time for the submission of controversial matters, which the instant bill is, particularly because, also, it is an attempt to accomplish an alleged reform by national action at a time when the whole attention and energy of the whole people should be devoted to the war effort and their attention not distracted by an issue such as this.

There is more reason now than there was then for Congress to refrain from stirring up and agitating so-called reform issues which tend to deeply stir the emotions and resentments and the anxieties of large groups of our people.

For more than 150 years the bench and bar and the Congress of this country have agreed that the privilege of voting was exclusively a State function, with the limitations specifically prescribed in the Constitution, and that Congress did not have the power to change by addition or subtraction the qualifications prescribed by the States for voting.

It is exceedingly strange, after so long a period of acquiescence in this fundamental principle of States' rights, and after we get into the most dangerous and trying period of our national history, that some Members of Congress should decide that reforms in our structure of government are desirable. Because they do not like certain provisions in the constitutions of eight States, concerted action is taken to invade the long-respected rights of the States to fix the qualifications of voters without domination or interference by Congress, a purely legislative body, with no power under the Constitution to supervise and alter and amend State constitutions on the subject of franchise.

It is very interesting to note that the bill now under consideration was introduced by a Member of the House of Representatives who is not a member of either of the major political parties, one or the other of which has been dominant in the government of this country since it was founded. This man became the leader of the anti-poll-tax movement, and, strange as it may seem to some of us, has found sufficient followers in both branches of Congress, among Democrats and Republicans, to gravely menace one of the most important principles involved in our dual form of government. Whether that man has grown strong in his leadership because of the trend of the times to destroy the Constitution, is a subject for serious thought. I am sure that he has not grown so powerful as a leader because of the fact that he is a Socialist or possibly a Communist. Other reasons must be found. For the last 10 or 12 years we have heard protests of alarm from various State and national bar associations that our Constitution and constitutional rights were in grave danger. We have heard daily protests from the great editors of this country and from numerous students of constitutional government that unless defenders of the Constitution were on diligent guard, the subject of voting qualifications may become totally irrelevant and that elections themselves may be altogether suspended.

Some years ago when the President of the United States proposed the reorganization of the Supreme Court, commonly called at the time by its opponents the "packing of the Supreme Court," in order to change the viewpoint of the Court on the constitutionality of certain so-called New Deal measures, there arose in this

country a tremendous protest based chiefly on the ground that such action would mean the subordination of the Constitution to the temporary clamor of the multitudes, rather than to stand by the old safeguards and guaranties afforded by our fundamental law. The solid judgment and the matured wisdom of the years behind us finally prevailed and a precedent was not established for increasing the Court from time to time so that the Constitution would be construed to correspond with the wishes of the President and of a majority of the Members of Congress.

We are now confronted with another serious effort to destroy the Constitution and to establish the precedent of Congress changing State constitutions when the election laws, including the qualifications of voters, do not please large groups of voters who either have contrary political interests or social-reform ideals which may be served by disregard by Congress of the Constitution of the United States. One step in disregarding the Constitution leads to another; one success in breaking down the constitutional rights of the States leads to the destruction by successive steps of our dual form of government. There is no more important principle of government than the rights of the separate States to control their elections by their own constitutions and laws.

For some years there has been a trend toward centralized Federal Government. The pending bill proposes the most dangerous step in that direction that has been covered by any bill introduced in Congress for many years. If enacted it will set a precedent for the establishment of a centralized Federal control of all elections. It is so flagrantly in violation of the Constitution of the United States that it may be followed as a precedent, illegal though it may be, for the appointment of election officials, including control of all the machinery of the elections, thereby converting local elections into Federal elections. The bill applies only to the qualifications of voters for President, Vice President, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives. As the bill is confined to changing qualifications for voters for the executive and legislative officials, the next dreamer of stronger centralized government will propose that the Federal Government pay all expenses of the election on the theory that the Government would be in better position to dominate and control the conduct of the election.

The passage of the bill may necessitate the eight Southern States who require the payment of poll tax, and possibly other States, to separate the Federal and State elections. If that should be done, there would be two lists of voters for these separate elections. State officials would make up the list of qualified voters under the State laws. Who will make up the list under the Federal law for fixing separate and distinct qualifications for voters? Who will furnish the equipment and supplies for the Federal elections? No effort has ever been made until very recently to pass legislation which would encourage, if it does not make obligatory, the holding of separate State and Federal elections. Unless there is a very grave need for such legislation, it should not be undertaken at this time.

During the pendency of the measure recently before us to provide means for our armed forces to vote in the general election, long consideration was given in the Senate to the subject of States' rights involved in that legislation. I speak now of the soldiers' vote bill. The committee bill, it will be recalled, contained provisions which undertook to fix the qualifications of voters, although in conflict with provisions in numerous State constitutions. Notwithstanding the sentiment involved in that measure and the desire of every Member of the Senate to provide legal facilities for the soldiers to cast their ballots, there were many Senators who were unwilling to disregard their duty as they understood it to uphold and protect the Constitution even where the appeal to forget it was so strong. The debate proceeded for a number of days and revolved chiefly around the subject of States' rights to fix the qualifications of voters. Practically one-half of the Senators, including numerous Republicans as well as Democrats, voted for the protection of the rights of the States as contained in the Constitution. I feel sure that all the Senators who voted against the Lucas-Green bill on the ground that it infringed on States' rights, will vote against the passage of this anti-poll-tax bill, notwithstanding the pressure of political influences which are appealing to them, without regard to the constitutional questions involved, to vote to abolish the poll tax.

The elimination of the requirement for the payment of poll taxes would not, as some persons seem to think, materially increase the number of Negroes voting in the poll-tax States. In the so-called poll-tax States, the payment of poll tax is only one of the required qualifications for registering as a voter.

CLOTURE

Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks about cloture, and then I shall be through.

Freedom of open, unhampered debate in this body has been the bulwark of protection for minorities against oppressive legislation since the establishment of parliamentary government in America. It is an essential part of the foundation upon which our Government has grown in physical, moral, and spiritual resources and power.

The rule under which debate can be closed under the cloture rule, and the oppressive hand of two-thirds of the Senators used to gag the minority and prevent further resistance of a protesting minority, was never intended to be applied except in cases of dire emergency which involved imminent danger to the welfare and security of the Nation. The miserable pretense contained in the pending bill, whether viewed as a social or economic reform, or as a device to weaken the pillars of constitutional government, should not be permitted to establish a precedent for shaking down the walls of our Constitution. When will the next storm of prejudice or passion or misguided philanthropy attempt to weaken or destroy or punish other groups or sections or races or those of minority religious faiths?

All the Members of this great body came here with full knowledge of the 150-year-old tradition of unlimited debate. That rule has protected the rights of minorities until the evils of hatred and hot passions have subsided; it has prevented the passage of bad legislation; it has aided in preserving the safeguards provided by the Constitution for the protection of the rights of great segments of our people. It has provided time for research and investigation; it has preserved the status quo until light could displace darkness. Surely the requirement of the collection of a measly poll tax—in my State, $1.50 per year to provide additional educational funds—does not in good faith and good conscience justify the proposed departure during our national peril from the long prevailing sound rule that has so consistently governed the business of the Senate all of its days, with a few exceptions. Before voting to use the cloture rule I beg Senators to foresee that such action provides a precedent that will rise to plague us in the turbulent days ahead.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Robertson
Bilbo	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Brooks	Hill	Smith
Buck	Jackson	Stewart
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Langer	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Caraway	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chavez	McFarland	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	Maybank	Weeks
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murdock	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this bill does not in terms provide for the repeal of a constitutional provision, but that is precisely what it would do. In part it provides for the repeal of two constitutional provisions. It is quite an unusual bill in that it undertakes to repeal the Constitution of the United States. That is so clear, and it has been so ably stated by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from

North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and other Senators that it is not necessary to go into the constitutional questions which have already been thoroughly discussed.

I merely wish to state the particular provision of the Constitution which the so-called Marcantonio bill seeks to repeal. It seeks to repeal the second section of article I of the Constitution, which is as follows:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications required for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That provision is perfectly plain. It was adopted about 150 years ago by the Constitutional Convention, and it has been in effect ever since. It has never been questioned until comparatively recently. Not until very recently has anyone ever sought to repeal that provision by a simple act of Congress; and yet that is what it is proposed to do at this time.

I invited the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to be present during my remarks, because I intended to reply to some of the statements which he made yesterday. He does not seem to be present, but I have no doubt he will come into the Chamber in a few minutes. At least I hope he will be present, because I wish to ask him a question or two.

Among other things, he said that the reason for undertaking to repeal a constitutional provision by an act of Congress was that certain trends indicated that we were getting away from the old landmarks, and that while in former years it might have been necessary to repeal the constitutional provision itself, yet we must remember the trends which are now under way.

Mr. President, that position concerning trends is a peculiar one for the Senator from New York to take, because the provision to which I have referred was repeated in the Constitution 126 years after it was first adopted. It was repeated in the seventeenth amendment. By the seventeenth amendment the Congress of the United States undertook to have Senators elected by the people instead of by the State legislatures, and after that was done the people of the United States adopted the constitutional amendment which contains the very same words which are contained in section 2 of article 1 of the original Constitution, namely—

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

So what the Senator from New York and MARCANTONIO are undertaking to do is to repeal a provision placed in the original Constitution and reiterated 126 years later. I digress long enough to say that I believe they are the only ones who are really undertaking to bring about what the bill seeks to accomplish. I do not believe I see any of the other advocates of the measure in the Chamber. There has been very little interest displayed in the measure. Very little attention has been paid to it. However, I repeat that the bill would not only repeal a provision of the Constitution which was adopted in 1789, but its sponsors undertake to repeal another provision of the Constitution appearing in the same words as the first and which was adopted in 1913. In other words, in 1913 the people of the country ratified certain language appearing in section 2 of article 1 of the Constitution 126 years after it had been first adopted.

We have been going along ever since, and the general idea of our Government has been that if it was desired to repeal a constitutional provision the proper procedure was to submit a constitutional amendment to repeal the provision, just as was done in the case of the prohibition law. A prohibition amendment was adopted many years ago, and recently it was repealed. If it is now desired to repeal these two provisions of the Constitution, considering that the dates of their adoption were separated by approximately 126 years, it seems to me that, instead of this proposal being in the form of a bill merely, to be acted upon by Congress, to repeal those two provisions, it should be in the form of a constitutional amendment. In that event the situation would be entirely different. But I ask Senators to remember that what we are called upon to do is to pass a bill repealing two provisions of our National Constitution.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to be present, because I had expected to refer to several statements which he made on the floor. I am sorry he is not here. I have had the clerk telephone him and tell him that I was about to refer to the speech he made yesterday, and ask him to be present. I hope the clerk will telephone him again and ask him to come into the Chamber. I read from the speech which he made on yesterday, and which appears on page 4259 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

President Roosevelt, in his press conference on February 13, 1942, denounced the levying of poll taxes as a practice which has prevented many poor people from voting. He said that all his life he had been opposed to such levies. No one would question the integrity of the statement or the fidelity to the American Constitution of the President.

Of course, no one does question it. The President gave that as his opinion. On yesterday, as I recall, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] stated that his opinion was that if the matter were presented to a vote of the people of his State he would vote for repeal. I am not so sure but that I should do so myself. I am rather inclined to think that it might be well for States to repeal their poll-tax laws, and if the question should arise in my State, I should certainly give it my best attention. As I now look at the matter, I am very favorably inclined toward the repeal of the poll-tax statute. However, it must be done in a constitutional way, not in an unconstitutional way, and not by disregarding the Constitution and everything else that we in this country hold dear. Let us take proper measures to repeal constitutional provisions by constitutional action, and not by legislative action such as is proposed by this bill.

I read a further statement of the Senator from New York, which appears on page 4342 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. MEAD. However, the President and the present Supreme Court are unanimous in their efforts to eliminate the poll tax.

Allow me to read that again.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator speak of the Supreme Court?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read it again:

Mr. MEAD. However, the President and the present Supreme Court are unanimous in their efforts to eliminate the poll tax.

Mr. President, that is the most remarkable statement I have ever heard in this Chamber. I have been a Member of this body for approximately 28 years, and I have never heard such a statement fall from the lips of any other Senator. I cannot imagine how anyone could speak for the Supreme Court in the way that the Senator from New York has spoken for it.

[At this point Mr. McKELLAR yielded to Mr. BARKLEY to present a cloture motion. By request of Mr. BARKLEY, the debate and proceedings which ensued were ordered to be printed in the RECORD following the conclusion of Mr. McKELLAR's speech.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire again to read a statement made by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] appearing on page 4342 of the daily RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator from New York pretend to speak for the Supreme Court?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know.

Mr. CONNALLY. By what authority did he speak for the Supreme Court? He has not come into the Chamber, and I should like to know.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. It is the strangest statement I ever read in the RECORD, so strange that I am calling the attention of the Senate to it again. I read from the RECORD:

Mr. MEAD. However, the President and the present Supreme Court are unanimous in their efforts to eliminate the poll tax.

If that be so, why in the world, instead of introducing and trying to pass a bill here, does not someone merely take a case to the Court and have the Supreme Court, that is so unanimously and so extremely anxious to dispose of the matter, settle it by judicial decree, without coming before the Congress for any legislation? If the statement be correct it seems to me that it would not be at all necessary for Congress to act. I want to defend the Supreme Court. I think the Senator from New York has done the Supreme Court a great injustice. I do not know all the members of the Court; I think I have met them all; I do not know them all intimately, but I cannot see how anyone, even though he may not like the Supreme Court, could ever make a statement such as this.

I am glad to see the Senator from New York is now present. I just read to the

Senate a statement from his speech of yesterday. I will read it again:

Mr. MEAD. However, the President and the present Supreme Court are unanimous in their efforts to eliminate the poll tax.

To my mind that is the most remarkable statement I ever heard uttered in the Senate. I simply cannot understand how the Senator from New York can speak for the entire Supreme Court and about their unanimity. Senators, that Court has to determine under their oaths of office the question of the validity of any act that may be brought before them, and, if the pending bill should be passed and should be brought before the Supreme Court, if the Senator from New York is correct in his statement, what would be the effect upon that lawsuit? It has been a long time since I have tried law cases before courts, but I remember enough about law cases to know that that would be a very serious charge against a court that had to pass upon a law enacted by the Congress and might invalidate the whole proceeding. I am sure my good friend from New York was just letting his excitement run away with him. He could not have meant that the Supreme Court was making a fight like the organization known as the Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, with headquarters at 127 B Street NE. The Supreme Court meets in that vicinity, but I am sure the Supreme Court has not joined that committee in trying to eliminate the poll tax as the statement might seem to indicate. I am utterly astounded at the statement, and I hope the Senator will withdraw the statement in the interest of law and order. That sort of a statement merely shows where we are coming to even by considering this kind of legislation, a bill to repeal two constitutional provisions at one and the same time.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I do not believe that any Senator here, including my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, heard me say what is credited to me in the RECORD. I am placed in a difficult and very embarrassing position because we have the most efficient staff of reporters I have ever come in contact with. Perhaps I should have remained in my office and corrected my speech, but I did not say that "the President and the present Supreme Court are unanimous in their efforts to eliminate the poll tax." I did say that the President spoke out openly and vigorously against the poll tax. I did say that the trend of opinion emanating from the Court indicated that the Court favored a liberalization of the suffrage. I had in mind the primary case which was recently tried by the Supreme Court. I had in mind other cases that are quoted in the hearings before the Judiciary Committee. But, of course, I presume there are times when everyone makes mistakes. This is a mistake. I not only did not say that, but I certainly would not say that the Supreme Court is unanimous on anything which they have not yet been called upon to decide. That statement is a little bit beneath the judgment of a man of ordinary intellect, and I reach up in my ego to assume that I have ordinary intellect.

If the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is building his argument around that statement, he has a good statement around which to build it, but he has a bad argument, because that is not my statement, and I will see to it that it is corrected for the permanent RECORD to read that the President has vigorously spoken out against the poll tax, and that the Supreme Court has been very liberal in its recent decisions, leading me to believe that it would be at least proper for us to refer the bill to them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator repudiates the statement which appears in the RECORD, but I do not know but that the last statement is nearly as bad. In other words, the Senator talks a little later about trends, trends in the courts and trends in the Congress, to disregard the Constitution. I am afraid the Senator's explanation is not much better than the original statement.

Mr. MEAD. Of course, if I am wrong in holding that there is a possibility of it being held constitutional, then there are with me 286 Members of the House, a majority of the House Judiciary Committee, and a majority of the Senator's colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee; so I am in good company. If we had a final vote on the passing of the bill, the Senator would be in the minority. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask the invocation of the rules of the Senate. Many of these propagandists are not content with assaulting us with their telegrams and letters and plucking our coats, but they rise in the gallery and seek to influence the Senate by loud and boisterous demonstrations. I hope the Chair will order the attendants in the galleries to eject them, not simply to caution them, because cautions do not do any good. I shall not insist on that at this time, but if it is repeated, I shall insist on the Presiding Officer ordering those who violate the rules to be excluded from the galleries. They are supposed to come here and have some respect for the Senate, and they are supposed to observe the rules, and the fact that some Senators want to tear up the Constitution gives no right to anyone in the galleries to tear up our rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries to refrain from any demonstration or applause. They are here as guests of the Senate, and as such they will be required to observe the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment, and I shall yield. I am rather sorry the Senator from Texas made the suggestion, because I am about to read some names, and I dare say a number of those whose names I shall read are in the galleries, and so long as they are there, I shall not object to a mere matter of a little applause for the Senator from New York, who is making a valiant but apparently a one-man fight for this committee in the gallery. I do not know but that they should applaud him. I think so. I have no objection at all to their applauding him.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, since I have returned to my seat, several Members of the Senate who sat here all during the debate yesterday told me that while they heard my entire speech, they did not hear me make the statement to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thought I heard it just as it is written by the reporters. That was the way I understood it then, and that is why I marked it in the RECORD. I looked for it in the RECORD this morning, to see if it was as I had heard it yesterday, and I found that it was as I heard it. But the Senator says that was not his statement, and I take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. MEAD. I am sure that if the Senator had heard it yesterday, he would have brought it to my attention, because he brought so many things to my attention that I am sure he would not have omitted that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator made so many errors that it took a very active man to follow him in his errors, and I might have overlooked that one.

Mr. President, I come to another remarkable statement by my distinguished friend from New York, which I shall read. He said:

I referred to trends a little while ago, and I said that ever since the American Republic paved the way for democracy to live and flourish all over the world, because we made good with this experiment in government here in America, the trend has been to be more liberal, to extend the franchise, to excite the interest of all the people in the affairs of the Nation. The Congress recognized its authority regarding the qualifications of electors for Federal officers when it recently enacted, in September 1942, the bill which gave to men in the service the right to vote.

I now wish to say a word or two about trends, and I want to ask the Senator from New York a question, if he will bear with me for a moment.

Speaking of trends, the idea of repealing two constitutional provisions by "trends" is a kind of legislation I cannot understand. Several years ago the prohibition amendment was adopted by the people of this country, and put into the Constitution of the United States. Then there was a strong trend against the prohibition law, but no one introduced a bill to repeal the prohibition amendment by an act of Congress. An amendment to the Constitution was proposed to repeal it, in the good old constitutional way, and it was repealed.

There are now many people in this country who say that there is a great trend to restore prohibition. If some prohibitionist on this floor were to offer a bill to repeal the present prohibition repeal amendment, would the Senator vote for that because there was a trend for it? He would not vote to restore the prohibition amendment because of a trend, I am sure. We cannot follow trends. We have a written Constitution, which has been in effect since 1789, and

the Constitution does not provide for a repeal by Congress on the basis of trends. It provides that a constitutional provision may be repealed in a certain way, by a joint resolution in the Congress of the United States, and resulting approval by three-fourths of the States. Of course, that is the constitutional way, and it is a perfectly simple way. We repealed the prohibition amendment in that way, and surely, if we could repeal that, we could repeal section 2 of article I of the Constitution, if the people were in favor of its repeal. But the Senator will find, before his political career shall have ended—and I hope it may last a long time—that trends do not amount to much, and the loud-mouthed advocates of doing a thing illegally, disregarding the Constitution of the United States, which we are all sworn to uphold and defend and protect against all enemies, foreign and domestic, should not lead any of us to desert the old landmarks.

Mr. MEAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the official reporter who took down the debate yesterday was good enough to come to my desk with his notes, and he explained to me—and these are his words—that if you change "Supreme Court" to "speaker" you will have the correct statement which I made on the floor, which reads as follows:

However, the President—

Meaning the President of the United States—

and the present speaker—

Meaning the junior Senator from New York—

are unanimous in their efforts to eliminate the poll tax.

So if the Senator will substitute the word "speaker" for "Supreme Court," and take the word of the official reporter, it will, I think, prevent or make unnecessary continued discussion.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will not discuss it longer, but I should like, with the permission of the Senate, to ask unanimous consent to ask the reporter, he being present, whether his notes show the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or do they show the Supreme Court?

Mr. MEAD. "The speaker" he tells me.

Mr. McKELLAR. The reporter's notes show "the speaker"?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; and the reporter was good enough to bring them here, and he is here for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, there is only one other difficulty that separates the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee and myself, and that is that there is a difference in our interpretation of the meaning of the word "trend." Of course, I am intelligent enough to know the necessary steps laid down by the Constitution whereby we amend the Constitution. When I talked about trends I referred to trends that create public opinion, trends that have an effect upon the Members of the Senate. If there is a strong trend in the State of Tennessee, we will say, for national prohibition, we might ultimately find the Senator from Tennessee voting for prohibition, either a prohibition amendment or a prohibition law. And so the word "trend" can be used as one wishes; but the Senator cannot impute a meaning which is entirely different from the meaning I had in mind.

And I will say today that there is a trend in Tennessee, and if the people of Tennessee, all the people of Tennessee, the poor people and the rich people of Tennessee, are allowed to vote, they will do what they did on three other occasions, they will vote to give the people of Tennessee a free election in which all the people will be entitled to an opportunity to go to the polls and decide who will be their Senator or their Representative in the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that statement shows how utterly without knowledge the Senator from New York is as to trends in Tennessee. If he is as badly informed respecting trends in New York and trends in other States as he is respecting trends in Tennessee, he does not know anything about the situation at all. I wish to say to him that no State in the Union has freer elections than has Tennessee, or more honest elections, or elections which follow more closely in every way the provision of the Constitution which says that individuals shall vote who have the qualifications of electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, I wish to say another thing to the Senator from New York. He does not know it perhaps, but the Negroes in Tennessee vote when they want to and whenever they conform to the Constitution and laws of Tennessee and the United States.

Mr. MEAD. But Tennessee has a poll tax; does it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a poll tax for some individuals; yes. The legislature has recently determined, as it could, that all soldiers, for instance, between the ages of 21 and 50, colored soldiers as well as white soldiers, can vote without paying the poll tax and without legislation. I am not discussing the question of colored people voting or not voting. I am discussing the question of the Constitution of the United States and our obligation to abide by that Constitution. We have no right to repeal its provisions by ourselves alone.

Mr. President, I want to come to another feature. In last Sunday's New York Times there was published on the editorial page a letter from Jennings Perry, to whom the Senator from New York referred in such glowing terms yesterday as a leader of the South who was opposed to this bill. He is the editor of the Nashville Tennesseean. The letter appears under the title "Poll Tax Is Opposed," with the subtitle "Those Who Favor Retention Held Unrepresentative of South."

Mr. President, I shall read a part of the letter, but ask unanimous consent that the entire letter may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. The letter is addressed "To the editor of the New York Times." It is from Mr. Jennings Perry, editor of the Nashville Tennesseean. Perhaps I had better tell the Senate who Mr. Jennings Perry is. I have the information before me in a letter. I read from the letterhead:

National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. Telephone LIncoln 4820-1. Jennings Perry, chairman; Dr. Will Alexander, vice chairman; Virginia Foster Durr, vice chairman; Catherine Shryver, executive secretary.

Sponsors—

And I shall read a very distinguished list of sponsors—

Eleanor Roosevelt, Mrs. Sherwood Anderson, Hon. Joseph Clark Baldwin, Harry C. Bates, Hon. George Bender, Mary McLeod Bethune, Barry Bingham, Norma E. Boyd, Mrs. Louis D. Brandeis, Rabbi Barnett Brickner, Hon. Arthur Capper, Rufus Clement, William F. Cochran, Dale DeWitt, Thomas H. Eliot, Judge Henry Ellenbogen, Julius Emspak, Marshall Field, Albert J. Fitzgerald, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Hon. Joseph Gavagan, Rev. Francis J. Gilligan, Dr. Frank P. Graham, William Green, Knute Hill, Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, Mordecai Johnson, Paul Kellogg, Attorney General Robert W. Kenney, Bishop Paul Kern, Julius G. Luhrsen, Most Rev. Robert Lucey, Dorothy S. McAllister, Bishop McConnell, Hon. Vito Marcantonio, George Meany, Rev. A. J. Murphy, Philip Murray, Hon. James O'Connor, Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, James Patton, A. Philip Randolph, Emil Rieve, Reid Robinson, Father John A. Ryan, Lt. Comdr. Charles Seely (retired), Bishop D. H. Sims, Donald Ogden Stewart, Euclid Louis Taylor, Rev. John B. Thompson, R. J. Thomas, Dr. C. H. Tobias, Dr. Francis E. Townsend, Oswald Garrison Villard, William Allen White, A. F. Whitney, J. Finley Wilson.

The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: Here is some background material on the big fight coming up this week—May 9—in the Senate when Senator MCCARRAN moves to consider the anti-poll-tax bill, H. R. 7.

We know the opponents of the bill will try to confuse the issues. For this reason our aim has been to hammer away ahead of time at the true issues so that the filibuster will not sidetrack the people.

By the way, Mr. President, I do not know that anyone is trying to conduct a filibuster. If any Member of the Senate is trying to conduct a filibuster, I should like to know who it is. I know the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] was not trying to conduct a filibuster yesterday, because he did not talk long enough. No other Senator has spoken on that side of the question; but some speeches have been made, and we are to have cloture, and we are to vote on it right away.

I read further from the letter:

We hold that this is a question of the Federal right of citizens to vote for their representatives in Government, and in the Senate, a question of majority rule, since a majority of the Senators will vote for H. R. 7 if permitted to.

Thank you for your attention to a matter which has become enormously more important in its setting of a world war for democracy.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. KATHERINE SHRYVER.

Mr. President, now I wish to read from the article or letter by Mr. Jennings Perry. He is the editor of a newspaper, and he has written a communication to the New York Times. It was published in last Sunday's New York Times. It reads as follows:

Allow me to protest the injustice done the South in C. P. Trussell's report from Washington on the poll-tax issue in the Times of April 16. The injustice is quite too commonplace in the press generally and results from the readiness of correspondents—and of editorial writers—to accept the voices of some southern Congressmen, particularly Senators, as the voice of the South.

Mr. President, Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate from the South may be regularly elected, but according to Mr. Jennings Perry they have no right to represent the South or to express the South's opinion. That can be done only by Mr. Jennings Perry, no doubt.

Listen to this:

The point is pertinent to the poll-tax issue, and should be considered here, that none of these gentlemen ever in his life faced a free electorate and that all of them are in Congress by the votes of only a minor fraction of the people they are supposed to represent.

Of course, it would be useless to reply to that statement, because those of us in the South who have had such a hard time to be elected know that the statement is wholly inaccurate. Mr. Jennings Perry would know it, too, if he were to offer himself as a candidate for either a Member of the House of Representatives or Member of the Senate from Tennessee. I dare him to do it. If he does, he will find out that he does not represent the majority opinion of the people of Tennessee, or of any district therein.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. In order that the country may know just how thoroughly representative the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is of the people of Tennessee, from which the writer of the letter hails—and let me say that, of course, I know the Senator from Tennessee is too modest to do it unless I ask him to do it—I wish to ask the Senator to state how many votes he received in his last election, and how thorough his election was on the part of all the people of Tennessee, including the Negroes?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think I received a majority of the votes cast by every class of people in my State, but I am frank to tell the Senator I do not remember the figures.

Mr. BILBO. Did the Senator carry all the counties and districts?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I did, although I am not sure. Perhaps my colleague can furnish that information.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the Senator's majority was tremendously overwhelming. My recollection is that it was 10 or 15 to 1. I do not think any county in Tennessee voted against him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure no county voted against me, and my recollection is that no district did. But it has been 4 years ago, and I am not very clear about the exact figures.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, it is my recollection that the senior Senator from Tennessee did not lose a district in his State.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have seen that statement made in various newspapers; but I myself am not quite sure about it, so I hesitate to say.

Mr. President, I read further from the letter:

I note that Mr. Trussell is at some pains to credit the expressions he reports to "southern groups" and to "southern Senators." But I note also that he slips easily, as seems to have become customary, into the next error of quoting "the southerners themselves" and of allowing their expressions to paint, without condition, "the mood of the South."

PROPOSED BY CALIFORNIAN

May I recall that the first anti-poll-tax legislation, from which the present bill directly derives, was introduced in the House by the late Lee Geyer, of California, at the solicitation of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and that the second anti-poll-tax bill was introduced and ardently fought for by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.

May I point out also that this initiative was taken in behalf of millions of southerners, white and black, who no longer have a part in the affairs of their States and Nation, and hence cannot make known their desires or will in the legislative halls. And since the politically voiceless in the South far outnumber those in the South who still manage to exercise the suffrage, it is unfair to them—and to fact—to assume that what a handful of Senators and some others who have no commission from the masses of the people choose to declare reflects "the mood of the South" toward the poll tax, or any other political issue.

In the only Southern State in which the disfranchised have been able to find a voice—Tennessee—

This poor man did not know that North Carolina and Kentucky have no poll-tax law at all, and that the poll-tax law in Tennessee is largely a figment of the imagination. It has been so modified that it really does not any longer seriously apply.

I continue to read from the letter—

repeal of the poll tax by overwhelming vote in the legislature has been compelled, and the fact that the State supreme court, by a 3 to 2 ruling—described in the stinging dissent of Associate Justice Neil as "unknown in the history of English or American jurisprudence"—has held that the legislature could not repeal it own poll-tax act—

That is another case in which an attempt was made to repeal the Constitution by an act of the legislature—

does not mean that the will of the people still is not hard against the abomination, or that the common people of Tennessee are not looking with hope to the Congress for the restoration of their undoubted right to an unfettered suffrage.

Unfettered suffrage, to this man, would mean to find enough people to vote for him or for his employer, Mr. Silliman Evans, for some office down there that they are both anxious to get.

I read further from the letter:

Mr. Trussell states that "stanchest supporters of the anti-poll-tax legislation concede that this levy is not necessarily a controlling factor in decisions made at polling places whether a Negro shall or shall not cast a ballot.

They cast a ballot in my city of Memphis. They cast a ballot all over the State. They are put on exactly the same terms as white voters in my State; and anyone but an ignoramus would know it.

The poll tax is the actual instrument of disfranchisement of millions of citizens in these Southern States, and this disfranchisement has left starveling electorates in which the decisions actually are made by still smaller groups of voters organized by the machines of political bosses or built up by the Senators themselves.

I have previously asked unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL TAX IS OPPOSED—THOSE WHO FAVOR RETENTION HELD UNREPRESENTATIVE OF SOUTH

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Allow me to protest the injustice done the South in C. P. Trussell's report from Washington on the poll-tax issue in the Times of April 16. The injustice is quite too commonplace in the press generally and results from the readiness of correspondents—and of editorial writers—to accept the voices of some southern Congressmen, particularly Senators, as the voice of the South.

The point is pertinent to the poll-tax issue, and should be considered here, that none of these gentlemen ever in his life faced a free electorate and that all of them are in Congress by the votes of only a minor fraction of the people they are supposed to represent.

I note that Mr. Trussell is at some pains to credit the expressions he reports to southern groups and to southern Senators. But I note also that he slips easily, as seems to have become customary, into the next error of quoting the southerners themselves and of allowing their expressions to paint, without condition, the mood of the South.

PROPOSED BY CALIFORNIAN

May I recall that the first anti-poll-tax legislation, from which the present bill directly derives, was introduced in the House by the late Lee Guyer, of California, at the solicitation of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and that the second anti-poll-tax bill was introduced and ardently fought for by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.

May I point out also that this initiative was taken in behalf of millions of southerners, white and black, who no longer have a part in the affairs of their States and Nation, and hence cannot make known their desires or will in the legislative halls. And since the politically voiceless in the South far outnumber those in the South who still manage to exercise the suffrage, it is unfair to them—and to fact—to assume that what a handful of Senators and some others who have no commission from the masses of the people choose to declare reflects "the mood of the South" toward the poll tax, or any other political issue.

In the only Southern State in which the disfranchised have been able to find a voice—Tennessee—repeal of the poll tax by overwhelming vote in the legislature has been compelled, and the fact that the State supreme court, by a 3-to-2 ruling—described in the stinging dissent of Associate Justice Neil as "unknown in the history of English or American jurisprudence"—has held that the legislature could not repeal its own poll-tax act does not mean that the will of the people still is not hard against

the abomination, or that the common people of Tennessee are not looking with hope to the Congress for the restoration of their undoubted right to an unfettered suffrage.

DETERMINING FACTOR

Mr. Trussell states that "stanchest supporters of the anti-poll-tax legislation concede that this levy is not necessarily a controlling factor in decisions made at polling places whether a Negro shall or shall not cast a ballot." You hear this exculpation of the vote tax so often from the supporters of the poll tax that you become sick of it. The poll tax is the actual instrument of disfranchisement of millions of citizens in these Southern States, and this disfranchisement has left starveling electorates in which the decisions actually are made by still smaller groups of voters organized by the machines of political bosses or built up by the Senators themselves.

This newspaper made, 2 years ago, a comparison of the votes in Presidential elections in Tennessee and Kentucky over a period of years. These States have equal populations, closely akin in every way. In the past 70 years both States have voted Democratic in all Presidential elections save two.

But Kentucky has no poll tax. The effect of the incidence of the poll tax in Tennessee in 1890 is vividly shown in this survey. As one of the stanchest supporters of anti-poll-tax legislation, this newspaper certainly does not concede that "this levy is not necessarily a controlling factor in decisions made at polling places." It is without question the determining factor in the whole political life of the South.

CONTROL OF ELECTORATES

Again I could ask that it be remembered that the southern Senators who will filibuster against Federal legislation that would enable the masses of the South to vote for President and Vice President and for Representatives in the National Legislature are fighting neither for States' rights nor for white supremacy but for their own special privilege of running before drastically restricted electorates they know how to control.

Nor is it that they necessarily are afraid of the votes of those now advocating repeal of the poll tax; but rather that they are afraid of democracy, afraid of their fate at the hands of the whole people, who should have back of their scepter of sovereignty—which of a right is without question theirs—the ballot.

And once more, for the sake of reportorial accuracy, may I caution against easy acceptance of the views of a few magnolia-scented Senators as the view of the South. The South will be able to make known its view only when it shall have regained its voice at the polls.

JENNINGS PERRY,
Editor, the Nashville Tennesseean.
NASHVILLE, TENN., *May 4, 1944.*

Mr. McKELLAR. Two years ago this newspaper was in bankruptcy. The Government owned its stock and bonds. The Government sold it; and it is my understanding that by arrangement the Government furnished the money for Silliman Evans, who had been an employee of the Government, to buy the newspaper. He bought it and has operated it ever since. It is not a Democratic newspaper. It is not a Republican newspaper, I will say to my Republican friends. It is a Communist newspaper, edited by a Communist. Mr. Evans could not possibly edit any newspaper. He is not qualified to edit a newspaper, and he has employed a Communist to edit the newspaper. That Communist editor feels that he is doing his full job when he abuses certain men in Tennessee who hold office and certain others who do not hold office. It is a Communist newspaper.

That fact was never more clearly demonstrated than on the 13th of last month, when the Democrats of Tennessee called a meeting at night. All Democrats were invited to attend a dinner to raise funds to help elect the Democratic ticket. They charged $25 a plate. Neither Mr. Silliman Evans, the owner of the newspaper, who boasts that he is one of the richest men in the country, nor his editor was present. For a little while, until the law was changed, Mr. Evans was so-called editor of a newspaper in Chicago, at $60,000 a year, so it was reported. I refer to the newspaper belonging to Marshall Field. But when the law was changed and Mr. Marshall Field could not use that $60,000 as a credit on his income tax, Evans was discharged, and he has gone back to Nashville to abuse Mr. Crump and me. He abuses us all the time. This Communist editor does the same thing at his behest.

That is what we Democrats have to contend with in Tennessee. The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is helping these two Communists. Perhaps it would be going a long way to say that Mr. Silliman Evans is a Communist. I do not know that he belongs to any party. However, I know that he is not a Democrat, because he abused this Democratic meeting. He did not attend it and did not buy a ticket to it. Neither did Mr. Jennings Perry. That certainly shows that, at any rate, they are not working Democrats. Is a man a Democrat because he owns what he calls a Democratic newspaper—a prosperous Democratic newspaper—and yet is not willing to contribute $25 to the party, especially when he receives a $5 dinner in exchange for it? The truth of the matter is that Mr. Evans and this Communist editor do not represent the South. Mr. Evans is not a Democrat at all.

The people of middle Tennessee have only one morning newspaper. In that section of the State two-thirds or three-fourths of the people are Democrats, and the only morning newspaper they have is this Communist newspaper belonging to Evans and edited by the Communist Jennings Perry.

By the way, Mr. Jennings Perry is a Tennessean. He came from Scotts Hill, in Henderson County. How in the name of God a man from Tennessee, living down there among the free institutions of our State, and having been reared in such surroundings, can become a Communist and associate with the people whom I have described, is more than I can understand. I should like to read what he says. Before I do so, let me say that Mr. Jennings Perry does not represent public opinion in the South. He states, in an article:

Again I could ask that it be remembered that the southern Senators who will filibuster against Federal legislation that would enable the masses of the South to vote for President and Vice President and for Representatives in the National Legislature are fighting neither for State's rights nor for white supremacy, but for their own special privilege of running before drastically restricted electorates they know how to control.

This statement is without foundation in fact. I wish to be very considerate of a man from my own State, even if he is a Communist. I have nothing against Communists, except that I do not agree with them. I am a Democrat, and they are Communists. This man is a Communist, and I do not agree with him.

As to this particular amendment, the question of State's rights and white supremacy does not arise. The only question is, Shall we defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, as the Constitution requires us to do? I maintain that it is our duty to defend it wholly. On a subject of this kind we cannot hold a referendum. We cannot refer this question to the Supreme Court. We cannot refer it to the President, except by passing a bill. We cannot refer this question to the gentleman to whom the Senator from New York yesterday asked us to refer it. We cannot refer a question of conscience to other men to decide.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If we could, would we not be cowards and knaves to do so? It is our duty, our function, and our responsibility.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is exactly correct. We are the chosen representatives of the people; and we should be rank cowards to submit to someone else the question as to what constitutes upholding and defending the Constitution of the United States. We cannot even depend upon advice from newspaper editors. Suppose I were to say, "I will follow a Communist editor in my State on questions of conscience." Would anyone have any respect for me? He himself would have no respect for me. He may have none anyway. I do not know him. But surely he would have no respect for me if I were to turn my conscience over to him. I do not intend to do so. This is a question for each Senator to decide for himself. I believe that I would be violating my oath of office if I were to vote for this Communist bill, brought forth by a Communist and passed by the House exactly as he wrote it.

Yesterday I called attention to the fact that the bill was passed by the House word for word, line for line, with the dotting of "i's" and the crossing of "t's" all the way through just as Mr. MARCANTONIO had written it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I do not believe that my distinguished colleague wishes to refer to everyone who supports the bill as being a Communist. I have before me a list of the Tennessee delegation, and also the roll call in the House of Representatives. There were present nine Members from Tennessee. Five of them voted against the bill, and four of them voted for it, so we have almost an even break.

The Senator would not infer that the Members of the Tennessee delegation who voted for the bill are Communists, would he?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall not make any statement about it.

Mr. MEAD. What is the Senator's opinion?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question, inasmuch as he has asked me about Tennessee. This bill was introduced, fathered, and put forth by the Communists as a body. The author of the bill puts himself down as a labor man. I wish to say now that if ever there was a man in this body who has voted consistently for every possible labor measure, I am he. Senators may verify my statement by examining the RECORD. From my early childhood I made my way by working hard on the farm. I have every sympathy with the man who makes his living by the sweat of his brow. I have tried in every possible way to uphold and defend labor in every one of its activities, when it was humanly possible for me to do so. However, when labor organizations undertake to repeal constitutional provisions of our Constitution by a legislative act, I have to part company with them; I cannot go along with them. I would violate my oath of office if I should do so. I should like to go along with the laboring people all along the line, but I am a free man. I feel that it is my duty to be free and untrammeled in this body, and cast my vote only for what I believe to be right. I have done so for a long time, and I shall continue to do so in the future, notwithstanding what any groups, such as I shall name in a few minutes, have to say about it.

I will say to my friend from New York that perhaps I did him an injustice yesterday when I asked him why he, as a Democrat, was sponsoring with such strenuous activity a bill which had been introduced by a representative of another party, namely, the Labor Party. However, today I have been informed—I do not know whether my information is correct, and I will ask my friend to correct me if I have been misinformed—that the Senator not only received the nomination of the Democrats in New York, but the nomination of the Labor Party of New York as well. Will the Senator explain whether I have been correctly informed?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I should like very much to answer the Senator's question. However, I should like to obtain the Senator's judgment on the Tennessee Members of the other House who voted for the bill. I will say to the Senator that the President of the United States, a former Governor of New York, Herbert Lehman, and the senior Senator from the State of New York [Mr. WAGNER], all received the endorsement of the Labor Party, and the junior Senator from New York was very happy to be included in that very select group.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. If the Senator wishes, I have the names of some of the persons who are on the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax. I am sending for a list of the remainder, and I hope to have it in a few minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall submit a list of names, and I shall be glad to accept the Senator's list when it arrives. I hope the Senator's list will be longer than mine.

Mr. President, I again quote from Mr. Jennings Perry:

> Nor is it that they are necessarily afraid of the votes of those now advocating repeal of the poll tax, but rather that they are afraid of democracy, afraid of their fate at the hands of the whole people, who should have backed their scepter of sovereignty—which of a right is without question theirs—the ballot.

That statement is also without foundation in fact. It is true that Mr. Perry is entirely correct in saying that the ballot in the hands of the people is the most important single part of our constitutional and representative form of government.

The ballot, under the law, whereby all questions can be passed upon by the duly and honestly qualified voters, is an incalculable power for right in the hands of the people. Our Government has been in existence approximately 155 years. It was the beginning of constitutional government in the world, and look at what it has done, first, for our own people, and then for the remainder of the world. For our own people we have established the greatest and best government that was ever established among men—constitutional government. It gives greater freedom, it has brought about greater education, greater knowledge, greater desire for knowledge, and greater information on every subject in the world than can be found perhaps in all other nations combined. It has established the rule of the people against all enemies, foreign and domestic. It has established also the rule of the people against isms, against cranks, against idiosyncrasies, against folly, and against dishonesty and corruption. It established the fact that men and women are able to govern themselves by the ballot under the guidance of law and order, and the Constitution.

Our Constitution has been copied by all the forward-looking nations of the world. They have not always retained their constitutions, but wherever they have retained them they have risen to higher and better things.

We have established the greatest prosperity that was ever known among men. Any man or woman who works in this country today receives the highest wage anyone has ever received in the history of time. Yet workers are complaining about our constitutional Government, and wish to substitute for it the rule of cliques, isms, cranks, and what not.

We have established religious freedom in the highest and best sense. We have established the greatest leadership ever known among men. We have established racial freedom in the highest and best sense. That does not mean that all men and women in this country shall be equal with all other men and women.

Did it ever occur to Senators that God Almighty made the men and women in this world? He did not make them all the same. He did not make them all equal. We cannot overrule God Almighty. We have never been able to do so. Men have tried to do so throughout the centuries, but have not accomplished it. We cannot violate the decrees of God Almighty Himself. We must look at things, not as we would have them, but as they actually are, and we must legislate on that theory.

We have a wonderful government, and it will become greater, stronger, and better all the time if idealists, cranks, and men and women without knowledge of what they are undertaking to do will leave it alone.

Of course, the Constitution is subject to change, and the Constitution points out exactly how it can be changed. The Constitution provides that when conditions arise calling for a change it can be changed by an amendment if the people desire to change it. It does not provide that it can be changed by an act of Congress.

If it is desired to take all power out of the hands of the States and put it wholly in the hands of the Central Government, it can be done under a constitutional measure. It cannot be done under an act of Congress. That fact should be apparent to anyone. It is surprising how many Americans, with all the facilities of education at their command, cannot understand such a simple fact, namely, that we cannot repeal a constitutional provision by an act of Congress.

Again I quote from Mr. Perry:

> And once more, for the sake of reportorial accuracy, may I caution against easy acceptance of the views of a few magnolia-scented Senators as the view of the South.

I do not know who the "magnolia-scented" Senators are or what that means. I am sorry the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Alabama are not present because there are more magnolias along the coasts of their States than anywhere else. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana can enlighten me.

Mr. ELLENDER. The magnolia grows profusely in Louisiana; it is our State flower.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there anything dishonorable about magnolia perfume?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should say not. I do not know of any blossom that has a sweeter perfume.

Mr. McKELLAR. I continue to read from the same writer:

> The South will be able to make known its view only when it shall have regained its voice at the polls.

That means that whenever Mr. Perry can run for office in Tennessee and obtain it. I think it will be a long, long time before he reaches that goal.

Mr. Perry speaks of southern Senators as "magnolia-scented." As the Senator from Louisiana says, magnolia blossoms are very sweetly scented. I do not know what Mr. Perry means by the expression. Of course, he means something bad, but he has not stated in saying that we are "magnolia-scented" Senators. Of course, it is a silly and ridiculous statement. I imagine it is in keeping with communism to use that kind of expression.

I wish to say, however, that this man Perry, as I have said before, is one of my most unrelenting foes. He has written more defamatory articles about me than probably any other man in Tennessee.

I want again to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that recently he wrote the editorial on the soldier's voting law, and sent it to every Senator. That was the bill that I followed my distinguished friend from Arkansas and my distinguished friend from Mississippi in submitting to the Senate, and it finally passed. He wrote a perfectly outrageous editorial about it.

The owner of the newspaper was not the author of the editorial, for the owner of the paper could not have written it. I will say this much for Mr. Perry, that his boss, Mr. Evans, did not have sense enough to write an editorial of that kind but he did have the effrontery to attach his card to a copy of the editorial and send it to me. I answered him by telegram. Mr. Evans never published the telegram. I dare him to do so, and I dare the other man to do so.

Certainly neither democracy nor the southern people are represented by Mr. Jennings Perry or the newspaper of which he is at present editor, the Nashville Tennesseean, owned by one Silliman Evans from Texas.

Mr. Perry is a Tennessean as I said before. If I ever saw him I do not recall it. I imagine he thinks he is a great thinker and writer but he is not a Democrat. He is a Communist, but certainly he is not a Democrat, and the newspaper for which he writes is a Communist newspaper. I again refer to it, and I am going to appeal to the Democrats of Tennessee to establish another Democratic newspaper in middle Tennessee, in that great section of sterling Democrats, that great section that produced such Democrats as Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, Felix Grundy, and hundreds of others. I want to appeal to them to establish a Democratic newspaper, and not be dishonored by a communistic paper such as is being published there now.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the last thing to which I desire to call attention.

As we all know the principal lobby for the Marcantonio poll-tax repeal bill is the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, an organization begun, as I am informed, by the late Representative Geyer, of California, who is supposed to have introduced the first anti-poll-tax bill in the House at the request of the Southern Human Welfare Conference, which was held some years back. The chairman of the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax in the United States is the same Jennings Perry of the Nashville Tennesseean.

Not long ago one of the evening newspapers of New York carried a story that Senator MEAD, floor manager of the Marcantonio bill, was called on by a delegation representing the New York State Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, to press for the enactment of the repeal bill. These delegates, all New Yorkers, are evidently a unit of the organization headed by Mr. Perry. That bill is not a Democratic measure; it has never been recommended by the Democratic Party.

The Senator from New York stated that it is favored by the President of the United States. If ever the President of the United States sent a message asking Congress to enact the poll-tax bill I do not recall it. Will the Senator from New York tell me when such a message came to the Congress?

Mr. MEAD. If I may reply, I said that the President of the United States favors the elimination of the poll tax. I quoted a number of others from the RECORD. I have the RECORD and I will read it to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee if he desires.

Mr. McKELLAR. But there was sent here no message asking the Congress to repeal the poll tax by an act of Congress.

Mr. MEAD. I do not believe anybody has so contended.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator has the President ever said to anyone, to the Senator from New York, or anyone else, that he favored the pending bill?

Mr. MEAD. He certainly has not said so to me; but there is a statement in the record before the Judiciary Committee made by some one of the witnesses to the effect that the President of the United States favored the elimination of the poll tax. There were other statements that went on to show that the Governors of States favored the repeal of the poll tax. I thought I could properly quote from the statements of outstanding Americans I found in the record who favor the repeal of the poll tax.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am nearly through. I will give the Senator in a few moments the names of the ladies and gentlemen who, according to the newspapers—I am merely using the newspapers as my authority; and, if I am wrong, I want to be corrected for I would not want to do the Senator any injustice—have been so active in the anti-poll-tax committee in New York. I shall read the names of those who have been in Washington for some time making very vigorous efforts to push this bill along to a victorious conclusion.

Mr. MEAD. There is nothing unusual in that. It will be remembered that a few years ago there were delegations before Congress pushing the T. V. A. very vigorously. That is a right every American enjoys.

Mr. McKELLAR. Again the Senator is wrong when he talks about the T. V. A. Instead of a committee being here to build dams on the Tennessee River Mr. Lilienthal and Dr. Morgan were both here lobbying against the building of dams, on the ground that the Government was not going to be put in competition with the private power companies. The dams in Tennessee were built by the efforts of the Appropriations Committees and the Congress and not by the lobbyists who were here working against them.

I proceed. Representative Geyer is supposed to have introduced the first anti-poll-tax bill in the House at the request of the Southern Human Welfare Conference. The National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, which coordinates the lobby of the C. I. O. to other labor, church, and Negro groups, according to Perry, is the spokesman for the South. Now Senators will find who is speaking for the South, when Perry speaks for the South, as he did last Sunday.

Recently the Senator from New York, floor manager for the Marcantonio bill, was called upon by a delegation, so a New York newspaper states, representing the New York State Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, to press for enactment of the repeal bill. I wonder if this delegation, all New Yorkers, were representatives of a unit of the organization headed by Mr. Perry. I suppose so, because his name is at the head of the organization. He is chairman of the national organization, as well as of other organizations along that line.

Mr. MEAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am reading from my speech.

Mr. MEAD. It is the Senator's own speech?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I ask southern Senators whether these folks are speaking for them. I wish now to give the names. They are as follows:

Larry Washington, Eighth Avenue, New York City, for the Joint Board of Fur Dressers and Dyers.

Lola Valder, Eighth Avenue, New York City, for the C. I. O. Electrical Workers Union, No. 450, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. Donald W. Struckler, Hollidavenue Congregational Church, New York City, chairman of the Committee for Social Action, New York City.

Seymour Slavin, Brooklyn, for the Marine and Shipbuilders Local No. 13, East New York.

Minnie Mintz, Brooklyn, for the S. C. M. W. A., New York district.

Mrs. J. C. Guggenheimer, East Nineteenth Street, New York City, for the International Labor Defense.

Joseph R. Brodsky, general counsel, International Workers Order.

Mrs. Laine Friedman, Peoples Committee, Coronada (N. Y.) Branch, and North Shore Interracial Interfaith Conference.

John Ray, secretary-treasurer, Chefs and Cooks Local No. 89, New York City.

Dora Shaw, for Local No. 65, Wholesale and Warehouse Workers, C. I. O., New York City.

Maude Jett, National Negro Congress, Lenox Avenue, New York City.

Bert Jemnett, for Laundry Workers Joining Board, Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Irving Gilman, vice president, Newspaper Guild of New York, C. I. O.

Rev. Richard Worford, for the United Christian Council for Democracy.

E. Pauline Myers, assistant administrator, Federal Council of Negro Churches in America.

Mr. President, Mr. Perry is speaking for this committee and those associated with it. He is not speaking for Tennessee. These are his associates.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator

from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are there any leaders from the South in that group?

Mr. McKELLAR. None that I know of. The only one who claims to be a leader—and I have understood the reason for his being a leader—is this man Jennings Perry. He was put in as chairman, and there is some question about his chairmanship. I think someone else claims the real chairmanship. He was merely put in as chairman so they could say to the Congress, especially to the Senate, because the matter is now before the Senate, that this was a leader of white democracy in the South, this Communist, this man who is false to everything to which decent men subscribe, this man who is false to his State, who is false to his section, who is false to democracy, who is not a Democrat, and never has been a Democrat. They are using him to give the impression elsewhere that the South is really for the pending bill. The South is not for the bill. Neither Mr. Perry nor Mr. Evans, one the alleged owner and the other the alleged editor of the Tennesseean, is a representative of the South.

They do not represent what we in Tennessee believe in. They do not represent the Democratic Party. They do not represent Tennessee. They are not affiliated at the present time with the Democratic Party. They are fighting the Democratic Party in their paper. They denounced the Jefferson Day dinner, held in the interest of the Democratic Party in Tennessee. They are exceedingly critical of the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, the principal speech at the Jefferson Day dinner, heretofore spoken of, was made by the distinguished Postmaster General, General Walker, of New York. He made one of the finest speeches I have listened to for a long time. He is a grand man, an upstanding Democrat, an upstanding American, who is fulfilling his duties in the highest and best way. He is running the largest government business organization in all the world. He gets appropriations from the United States Government; and, incidentally, he is not above coming to the Congress to get them. He gets a billion dollars a year in appropriations with which to operate the Post Office Department, and in some ways he is the strangest man I ever knew. General Walker has no compunctions about obtaining receipts, and his receipts amount to $2,000,000 more than his appropriations. Every single dollar of money he receives, amounting to over a billion dollars a year, he pays into the Treasury of the United States. Did I say every dollar? I am mistaken; when one buys a 1-cent postage stamp from any postal official and pays the 1 cent, that 1 cent goes into the Treasury of the United States for general purposes. I take off my hat to a man like General Walker, an honest man, a man who believes in the Constitution and the laws of the country, and stands up for them, and is not ashamed to do it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee a few moments ago discussed the forces and the influences, the pressure groups, and particularly the Communist Party and the C. I. O., which are pushing this measure. I wish to read to the Senator from the Communist Party platform of 1928. This platform was readopted at each of their subsequent conventions. I wish to read it to show what, in addition to the poll tax, was the reason for the assault on the Constitution of the United States which this fight is. The platform first advocates the abolition of the right to private ownership of property in the United States, the destruction of free speech, freedom of the press, and the establishment of a dictatorship in this country. It advocates repeal of the poll tax. Then I will read another section, and all this is in issue in connection with the present controversy. I read demand No. 4:

> Abolition of laws forbidding intermarriage of persons of different races.

There is another reason why these radical, communistic organizations desire the destruction of the American Constitution. They realize that so long as a State is in possession of all its powers which were reserved to it when the Constitution was adopted, there can never be a socialistic or communistic society in America. The Communist Party changed its name in January of this year. I have in my hand, and should like to call it to the attention of Senators, a secret manual which this party has prepared for use in the year 1944, to show how it is acting, and how it is urging the passage of the pending measure, not simply for the purpose of doing away with the poll tax, but to destroy the Constitution and to destroy the ownership of property, and the rights which belong to freemen in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Including the freedom of the press.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and freedom of speech, and the right to own property. If they can destroy the Constitution there is not an insurance policy which is safe in this country.

I read from page 8 of the secret manual:

> The change in name, however, does not denote a change in the Marxist character of the Communist organization in America. As a Marxist political organization, representing the most advanced working-class forces within the country, bound up with the rich historical working class and generally democratic traditions of our own country, with the traditions of the international working class, the Communist organization will continue to exist, develop, and grow to achieve an increasingly honored place in American life. The Communist organization remains the only political organization representing and leading the struggle for socialism, and through the leadership of which the people will realize the aim of socialism. The Communist movement in the United States will continue to devote its energies especially to the strengthening of working-class unity and farmer-labor unity, raising labor's political and organizational consciousness and its responsibilities to the interests of the Nation and our people as a whole. As such an organization, the Communist movement is indispensable to America.

In other words, Mr. President, first, the Communist Party was dissolved, but I am told that its essential philosophy remains, and that it will still wage internal war on America to set up a communistic state.

Then, further, as to the aims of this group, anti-poll-tax legislation is listed among a number of aims, accomplishment of which would destroy this country and which would enslave the American people. How do they say they are going to bring that about? I read from page 18 of the manual:

> For instance, a war-activities committee, an antidiscrimination committee, a legislative and political-action committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is here in the Senate gallery.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; it is here in the Senate gallery. I do not know whether Sidney Hillman is here. But let us consider the aims of the C. I. O. political-action committee. Here is the very resolution which authorized its formation by the C. I. O. executive council, and I am informed that 18 members of that council are Communists and agitators and leaders of the communistic movement in this country. Consider what it stands for, and then consider the list of secret Communist aims in the United States, and word for word and number for number they are identical. Here we have the C. I. O. political-action committee as the principal moving force behind the proposed legislation. It is carrying out the dictates of the Communist Party; it is carrying them out under the leadership of a man who was born in Russia, whose name is an alias, a man going by the name of Hillman, which is a false name, who is attempting to destroy this country—to destroy our system of government—the rights, the privileges, and the liberties which were built here by men who came from the English isles years ago.

Mr. President, that is the moving force behind the proposed legislation. I think the Senate of the United States, in addition to putting its foot down now and stopping this Communist drive by the defeat of this measure, should go also into the question of the finances of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. It is communistic. It is attempting to destroy our Government. We should by all means follow the slimy trail of that money to see for whom the committee is spending it and how it is spending it to destroy our country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, what has been stated so clearly and so excellently by my friend the Senator from Mississippi constitutes in very large part the reason why I am opposed to the bill. The bill is nothing in the world but a Communist bill, gotten up by a Communist and supported by a Communist. I do not mean the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. I must say that I have known the Senator from New York for

many, many years. He is a grand man and a fine character, and I simply hate to see him let the tail wag the dog. I do not mean that in any improper sense, either. It is simply an expression which we use to describe a situation, and the situation which I wish to describe now is, and that is this: The Senator received the nomination of the great Democratic Party, one of the greatest parties that has ever been constituted among men, the greatest, according to my notion, and he was also nominated by an offshoot of the Communist Party, which is the so-called Labor Party, but it does not really represent honest-to-god labor. It represents very largely the party which wants to use labor, or misuse labor. I hope the Senator's experience with this bill will be of value to him. The bill is not going to be passed. A constitutional provision, or two constitutional provisions, cannot be repealed by an act of Congress, however plausibly such action may be argued. It is impossible to do that. Since it has been seen during the debate that the overwhelming thought respecting the bill is that it ought not to pass, I hope the Senator will act accordingly. The Senator has not had a single Senator join him in speaking for the bill. I wonder if I am correct in making that statement. I do not wish to make a statement which is not correct; but, as I recall there has been no other Senator except the Senator from New York who has stood up and spoken for the bill.

Mr. MEAD. There are four on the side of the Senator from Tennessee and two on our side. So far we are only two behind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Who was on the Senator's side?

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Nevada simply presented the bill. He did not argue in favor of it.

Mr. MEAD. He made a very effective appeal for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. He may have appealed for the bill, but he is going to vote against cloture. It does not seem to me that I have heard any argument for the bill or work done for the bill except on the part of the Senator from New York. I admire the Senator's bravery in fighting alone for a measure which undoubtedly he thinks is right. The Senator, though he is not a lawyer, thinks Congress can repeal a constitutional provision. I believe the Senator said he is not a lawyer.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not blame the Senator at all for thinking that he can succeed in having Congress repeal a constitutional provision; but a constitutional provision cannot be repealed by act of Congress. We cannot blame an individual who is not a lawyer for taking such a position. I think the Senator is wrong in his position. Loving the Senator as I do, and we have been friends for twenty-odd years, I hope the Senator will give up what I believe to be an attempt, though a futile attempt, to destroy the Constitution of the United States, which has done labor more good than any instrument ever created by man.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree entirely with the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee in his references to the Senator from New York.

Yesterday the Senator from New York made the argument that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary had studied the bill and had declared it constitutional. Is not that correct?

Mr. MEAD. No, Mr. President; I said a majority of the committee assumed the bill was constitutional.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is right; the Senator said a majority of the committee assumed it was constitutional. But the facts are that a subcommittee really studied the bill and really went to its vitals, so I am informed, and a majority of that subcommittee held that the bill was in the face of the Constitution, and should not be enacted. I was informed to that effect yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Tennessee has made statements about the communistic influences behind this measure, will the Senator not agree with me that the poll tax is not really the issue here, but that the vital issue is the attempt of these organizations to destroy the Constitution of the United States and the rights and privileges guaranteed to all the people of the United States by that instrument?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. The Constitution of the United States is the greatest enemy the Communists have. Can anyone wonder that the Communists want to destroy it? I do not wonder. They do not believe in the Constitution of the United States. They think it is outworn, that it is outdated, that it is not in their interest.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. They do not want it. They want to destroy it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Our system of government makes it impossible to have a communistic government, so long as the rights of the States, as guaranteed in the Constitution, are not violated.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The wish of the Communists is to destroy our Constitution and destroy our system of government, so that they can create a Communist state in America.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the issue behind the present controversy.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what worries me. Of course, there is no question that the bill will not be passed. It will be defeated, and it wil be a godsend to the people of this country to have it defeated. The only thing I am unhappy about is the part played by a man whom I esteem, respect, admire, and like, as I do the distinguished junior Senator from New York, who has made such a manly, single-handed fight for the bill. I wish to say to the junior Senator from New York that if there is a Communist in his State who hereafter does not vote for him, regardless of anything else, he is an ingrate. The Senator has made a noble single-handed fight here. No one has fought for him. The whole Senate at heart is really opposed to him, if I am able to judge.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, let me say that I agree with him in his statements about the Senator from New York. But does not the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee think the Senator from New York has seen the light?

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope so. I will tell the Senator what I am going to do in the future. I am going to use every good office and endeavor of which I am capable to get him to stay with the Democrats, and to leave the Communists out of the picture, when it comes to the attempts of the Communists or others to destroy the Constitution. However, much he may feel grateful to them, I hope he will not let them destroy the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have letters from the State of New York which show that the Communist organizations in various towns in that State are operating as pressure groups to have sent to Senators in Washington letters and telegrams in favor of the pending bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the next day or two, I am going to give those letters to the distinguished junior Senator from New York, so that he can see what is behind this bill, and so that in the days which lie ahead he will join in the effort to protect and preserve the Constitution which makes it possible for him so ably to represent his constituents.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from New York, as we all know and have seen, has made a wonderful fight for the Communists, especially those of his State. I think there probably are more there than anywhere else; at least, those in New York are louder in their protestations. There may not be more of them there; there may be more in other places—for instance, in California, or Illinois, or in Tennessee; but those in other States are not so vociferous as are those in New York. Of course, the committees which have come to Washington, headed by the distinguished Communist editor of the Nashville Tennesseean, have been very loud in their protestations. I think the Senator from New York should be complimented for his zeal and his work in one of the worst causes I have ever known. I hope he will never work so hard in another bad cause.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. My colleague has been very gracious to me, although there was a little irony in his wit.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I intended it as an honest expression. I like the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Tennessee has wished that the entire Communist vote in New York State would be for me, I shall wish for him that, after we pass the bill, and give the right to vote to all the people of Tennessee, including those unable to pay poll taxes, the large percentage of the people who did not vote in Tennessee in 1940—when the President of the United States, the greatest living Democrat, was a candidate for reelection—will join in voting for my good friend the senior Senator from the State of Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that they not only voted for President Roosevelt in 1940, but, confidentially, they are going to vote for him and elect him in 1944. So, regardless of what the percentage may be, they are going to vote for President Roosevelt and are going to elect him again, and he will carry the State of Tennessee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

[During the course of Mr. McKELLAR's speech the following occured, which was ordered to be transposed to this point in the RECORD:]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wished to say that I desire to file a motion for the closing of debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator does not want to close the debate immediately, does he?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I cannot close it now.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes. I should not be particular about it if the debate were closed now. However, I should like to ask the Senator a question when he has finished.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not object to being asked a question when I am discussing the matter in my own right. I think the question would be more appropriate at that time.

Mr. President, under rule XXII, I file a motion for closing debate on House bill 7. Under the rule, 16 signatures of Senators are required. The motion contains the names of 29 Senators.

I ask that my remarks and the filing of the motion be made to appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done; but under rule XXII it is provided that the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Presiding Officer to state the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XXII, when a cloture motion is presented it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to state it to the Senate. If there is no objection, in lieu of action by the Chair the clerk will state the motion to the Senate as a compliance with the rules.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY, ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., JAMES J. DAVIS, WILLIAM LANGER, A. H. VANDENBERG, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, C., WAYLAND BROOKS, HOMER FERGUSON, JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, JAMES M. MEAD, JAMES E. MURRAY, FRANCIS MALONEY, SAMUEL D. JACKSON, ABE MURDOCK, JAMES M. TUNNELL, DAVID I. WALSH, SCOTT LUCAS, ARTHUR CAPPER, ELMER THOMAS, GUY CORDON, ROBERT F. WAGNER, H. M. KILGORE, BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, ROBERT A. TAFT, KENNETH S. WHERRY, THEODORE F. GREEN, ELBERT D. THOMAS, JOSEPH H. BALL, HAROLD H. BURTON.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield further——

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. For the information of the Senate I might observe, in order that the Senate may understand the procedure and govern themselves accordingly, that under the rules the motion has to lie over until the second day on which the Senate is in session after the motion is made. On account of the absence of a number of Senators on Saturday, I have been requested to move that the Senate recess from tomorrow until Monday, so that the Senate will not be in session on Saturday, and, therefore, under the rules the vote on the motion to close debate will come 1 hour from the meeting of the Senate on Monday, which will be 1 o'clock, at which time the Chair is required under the rule to call for a quorum, and then to have a vote taken on the motion without debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for filing the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will not conclude by any stretch of the imagination that I want to close the debate now while he is speaking.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I do not reach any such conclusion.

After the conclusion of Mr. McKELLAR's speech,

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I merely wish to call to the attention of the Senate very briefly a list of fellow travelers—that is, fellow travelers if we will assume, as has been suggested on the floor of the Senate, that everyone who favors the pending bill, who works for the bill, and who supports the bill, is a Communist.

Some Senators have taken the time in this debate to brand this bill as an all-out communistic effort, and to say that no one except Communists is interested in the measure. The way in which they use the term Communist would lead me to believe that they are not trying to have many votes cast in favor of the bill.

So, Mr. President, I thought I would state for the RECORD that on May 24, 1943, a vote on the bill was taken in the House of Representatives. In that vote, 268 Members of the House of Representatives were for the bill. They were not members of the Communist Party; they were Republicans and Democrats, and they included four of the nine Representatives from Tennessee, two of the four being Republicans, and two being Democrats. Two hundred and sixty-eight Members of the House of Representatives voted for the bill, and took the same position I am taking; and one of the Representatives from Tennessee made one of the best speeches which was made for the bill during that debate.

The very next day, 265 Members of the House of Representatives again stood up and supported the bill.

Mr. President, the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax has on its roster the names of some persons who I believe are affiliated with the Republican Party, and some who are affiliated with the Democratic Party. I note on the list, among others, the name of Hon. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York. No one has ever accused him of being a Communist. I find also the name of Harry C. Bates, of the labor movement. Then there is Hon. GEORGE BENDER, a Member of Congress. I have never heard him branded as a Communist.

There is also the name of Mrs. Louis D. Brandeis, the beloved wife of that eminent jurist who passed away only a few years ago.

I notice also the name of a United States Senator. This is a very important announcement, Mr. President. I am sure he would be surprised to know that he is listed among the Communists. I am sorry that he is not present, because he is the only Senator on the list. The lovable ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, is one of the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, which has just been so severely treated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read his name into the RECORD a while ago. The Senator is late.

Mr. MEAD. I thought it would be well to emphasize it.

Then there is Thomas H. Eliot, whose father's name is linked with Harvard University. I presume probably the opponents of the bill would link that university with the Communist effort behind the bill. I do not know.

Then there is Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, one of the great leaders of religious life in this country.

Another name is that of Hon. Joseph Gavagan, a judge in the State of New York.

Lest I be accused of sectional preference, let me read the name of Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina.

As we go down the list, we see the names of Knute Hill, a former Member of Congress; Paul Kellogg; Robert W. Kenney, attorney general of the State of California; and Dorothy S. McAllister, heading the women's division of the Democratic Party. She belongs to the party of Jefferson. We find also the name of Bishop McConnell, one of the leading churchmen of the Methodist

Church; Rev. A. J. Murphy; Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, of the Catholic Church; and Rev. John A. Ryan, of the Catholic University.

There are a number of other names, Mr. President, including that of Mrs. Sherwood Anderson, industrial secretary of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Association. She lives in Virginia. She is very anxious that the poll tax be eliminated.

I call the attention of the Senate again to the fact that 268 Members of the House voted for the bill. Some of the debate would lead us to believe that they are "fellow travelers." They represent States all the way from Oregon to Texas, Tennessee, and Florida. All but a few States are represented. They believed in the justice of this bill. They assumed that it was constitutional, and they sent it to the Senate, where the Judiciary Committee, an agency of the Senate, composed of some of the best legal experts, considered its constitutionality and reported it favorably. I know it will be news to them to know that they reported a Communist bill, a bill which has been before us for years.

Mr. President, the opponents of the bill are not fooling anyone. The technique of associating the bill with the Communist Party will make no votes and few friends for the other side.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator from New York, the sole advocate of the bill present in the Chamber, is not filibustering against the bill. I do not believe he is. I think he is trying, properly and courtecusly, to argue his case. The fact that he has taken a considerable amount of time ought not to be considered—and I do not want it to be considered—as a filibuster against his own bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] intended to be offensive. At any rate, I decline to take offense. But when he spoke of the argument which had been produced to show that the bill is supported by the Communist crowd, he proceeded to say that that argument would not deceive anyone. I feel that I must say something, because I advanced the argument to begin with. I think I was the first to offer it in this debate. Of course, I take it that the Senator knows that I was not seeking to deceive anyone. I had not thought about deceiving anyone. I should be very reluctant to think that the Senator thought I wished to deceive anyone.

What I was doing was telling the truth as I saw it from the evidence. I read some of the evidence in my argument. What is it? The only political party in America which has placed this proposal in its platform is the Communist Party. I stated that, and that is a fact. That is one piece of evidence.

Another piece of evidence of considerable probative weight with me is the simple fact that Mr. Sidney Hillman is the head and front of the agitation throughout this country in behalf of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator object to government of the Communists, by the Communists, and for the Communists?

Mr. BAILEY. In this part of the world I do. I have very great sympathy for the Russian people. I have great admiration for them. If they like communism, I wish them Godspeed. I am supporting them as they defend their country against their enemies and ours. I would not say anything that could possibly offend them or discourage them under these circumstances. My heart is with them as they resist the Axis Powers. If I were as devout a man as I should like to be, my prayers would rise day and night in their behalf. That is the way I feel about it.

I wished to array this little matter as a piece of evidence. It is not a question of deceit. I have never tried to deceive a jury in my life. I have arrayed evidence before juries to prove my case, if possible. I will array the evidence here, and every Senator is a judge. I think the thing required of me is that I shall truthfully state the evidence and my conclusions in all sincerity.

If anyone doubts that Sidney Hillman is the head of the left wing of the Labor Party, I refer him to the junior Senator from New York. He knows all about him. If anyone doubts that the left wing of the amalgamated Labor Party is a communistic wing, made up of communistic men and communistic associations, let him read the latest publication from the Dies committee—the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. I produce that document. It tells the personal story of each of those men. It tells the story of Sidney Hillman. After reading that report I could not question that Sidney Hillman, the head of the Committee for Political Action of the C. I. O., who came from Russia, went back to Russia, armed with their money, during the stages of the Russian revolution when the late Lenin was in power, dealt with him, and then came back here. He went along with the Labor Party, as a Labor Party man, until he gained sufficient power to create a leftist party. Dean Alfange, who was the candidate of the Labor Party for Governor of New York, found it necessary to denounce him in the New York newspapers in a paid advertisement, a copy of which I have on my desk.

Mr. President, I have no desire to deceive anyone, but I am deeply concerned that no one in America shall be deceived by what is taking place. I have no doubt whatever that Sidney Hillman, the head of the C. I. O. committee for political action, and the head of the left wing of the amalgamated Labor Party, is promulgating communism throughout this country, and is undertaking to do it in my part of the country through the Democratic Party through the process of infiltration. He is undertaking to capture our party. I also think he is trying to capture the party throughout the country by generally supporting the Democratic Party. However, he is not a Democrat, he never was a Democrat, and he never claimed to be a Democrat. He claims to be the leftist head of the amalgamated Labor Party of America. A list of his associates is printed in the latest publication of the Dies committee. The distinguished junior Senator from New York may read the list if there is any doubt in his mind about who Sidney Hillman's associates may be.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. I have presented the evidence. I hope the American people will not be deceived by the disposition of the Communist leaders to lie about their plans. They never admit they are Communists. That is one of their processes. They always proceed by indirection.

By way of conclusion, I will also say that I think the process to which I have referred is also the process of practically all the extraordinary organizations. The Senate does not know it. I do not think the American people know it.

I went through the Ku Klux Klan fight in North Carolina. I fought them from the start in 1922, and I fought them until they were whipped. They fought me and I fought them. Finally it fell to me to defend one of their officers who had been charged with embezzlement. I made considerable study of the Ku Klux Klan and, among other things, I learned that its policy was one of deception. Its members had a way of saying that they were not members of the Ku Klux Klan. In order to protect themselves, if any member thought he was going to be asked if he was a member of the Klan he could hand in his resignation, and if he resigned with a proper symbol over his name it would be all well with him in the Klan. The rest of the members would understand, and he would still be a member. However, he would be allowed to say that he was not a member.

No one will come right out in the open and say that he is a Communist. He has to be judged by what he is doing and by his associates. I may tell the Senate that the symbol of membership is in the following initials: I. T. S. U. B. "I hereby offer my resignation as a member of the Ku Klux Klan. I. T. S. U. B."—"In these sacred unfailing bonds." That is what the initials mean.

Mr. President, what I have said may shed a flood of light on water that has gone down the millrace. That is all I have to say.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] has the floor. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New York?

Mrs. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I did not imply that my distinguished colleague from North Carolina had left the impression that there are any Communists in this body, or in any other body. However, if he had been here throughout the debate today he would agree with me that the fire came a little closer, and by reason of the fact that it was directed at certain individuals it was necessary for me——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I wonder if I may ask the Senator if the fire got

close enough today to him to scorch his bonnet?

Mr. MEAD. No, the fire did not get that close, but it did come close to many men who have supported the pending bill, and particularly men and women who are in the Association for the Repeal of the Poll Tax. I felt that I should come to their support because there are many of them whom I know to be outstanding in their professions and their vocations. In addition to the name of Jennings Perry, the editor of the Nashville Tennesseean, who has been discussed at great length, I read the names of Dr. Will Alexander, vice chairman of the organization, a man who comes from North Carolina and who is now with the War Manpower Commission. There is also Virginia Foster Durr, vice chairman of the organization, a native of Birmingham, Ala., and now residing in Virginia. I merely rose to make sure that the fire which came a little closer did not do an injustice to these persons, and in that statement I am sure that the Senator from North Carolina is in agreement.

Mr. BAILEY. No one has said that every person who is in favor of the proposed legislation is a Communist. I made a proposal, and I remember the language of it. I said that I knew the forces of agitation which had come to my office, and I gave the names. Of course, I do not believe the Senator from New York is a Communist. I would not undertake to classify him. I think I would be going too far if I should undertake to do so. But I certainly would not say that I believe he is a Communist.

As to the president of our State university, I think he has pretty good standing in the State of North Carolina as a gentleman, and as a former soldier in the First World War. He is very much of a scholar, and I think he has a good standing in the Democratic Party as a Democrat of the liberal school. I would not suggest that he is a Communist. I do not believe he is. I would not undertake to classify him especially, and I do not think I have any business to do so. I merely say that to pick out a few individuals and attempt to answer the argument which has been made here by saying that they are not Communists does not reach the situation at all. I assert that there are just two sources here—one is the Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, and the other is Sidney Hilman's C. I. O. committee for poltical action. The Senators have the evidence; they can judge for themselves.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, when we came to the United States Senate each of us held up our hand and took an oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States. We did not hold up our hand and take an oath to support and defend any particular group, any particular religion, or any particular class or race, but to defend the Constitution of the United States as it is written. When reading the Constitution we find first the preamble, and then, as the first article of the Constitution, the one dealing with the legislative department.

The legislative department of the Federal Government is placed first as it is the most important. That is why it is dealt with first in the Constitution. The articles dealing with the executive department and with the judicial department follow in their regular order. Of course, they are important; they are of tremendous importance.

The cornerstone of our Government was laid carefully in article I, section 1, which provides:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The Members of those two bodies constitute the personnel of the Congress—the legislative department.

Then arose the question as to whose duty it should be to place Senators and Representatives in position to become the legislative department of the Nation. The second section of article I provides:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

If any citizen desires to know who are qualified to vote for Representatives and Senators in his State, all he has to do is to look at the constitution of his State and the statutes of his State, and he will find the answer. He will not find it anywhere else.

Mr. President, I am opposed now, and will be at all times, to any act which would infringe upon States' rights by fixing qualifications not authorized by the Constitution. If there is a desire to know what valid legislation can be passed, all one has to do is to look at our charter of government, the Constitution, and if it is not provided in the charter, the Congress does not posses the power.

The Constitution of the United States was created by the States. The States and the Colonies existed long before there was a United States. What is provided in the Constitution is purely a delegation of powers by the States, and the States reserved everything they did not delegate to the general government in the Constitution, and it is so stated in the plainest of language.

So it is, Mr. President, that as a Congress we have not the authority to pass an act which would repeal a qualification laid down in State laws as a qualification for one to vote in an election for a member of the lower house of the legislature of a State.

As to whatever effect, if any, the requirement of the payment of a poll tax or the nonrequirement of the payment of a poll tax would have upon the actual operations of voting at the polls, I think that one of the best statements has been made by the very able columnist, Mark Sullivan. He analyzes the question, and I think very ably shows why it is sometimes necessary to engage in what is termed a "filibuster." What I am saying today is not by way of filibuster, because we are today speaking on the merits of the bill itself.

Why should anyone want to take away from the States of the Union the power over suffrage which for all these years has admittedly belonged to them? Chief Justice White, in referring to the fourteenth amendment, said, among other things, that this amendment does not take away from the State governments the power over suffrage. He said, in substance, the fourteenth amendment recognized the possession of the general powers of the State. While the right of suffrage is left to the respective States, our courts have sufficient power to protect against any denial of constitutional rights relative to qualification of voters.

For over a century there has been more bitter debate in Congress over the question of States' rights than any other subject. It even goes as far back as the days of Hamilton and Jefferson. Why at this particular time should there be brought up the question involving States' rights when we know the Congress of the United States has no authority to encroach upon States' rights? If Congress decides to take away the States' rights and determine the qualification of the voters in the several States, it should seek to do so through a constitutional amendment. I, for one, shall oppose to the end Federal control over election machinery of my State and every other State in this Union.

Mr. President, I think the Senate could spend its time far better by considering measures which will help to bring the war to an early and successful conclusion.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Texas State Federation of Labor in 1903, setting out its reasons for fighting against the poll tax.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas the present Texas poll tax violates all the canons of just taxation, inasmuch as it (1) bears equally on men of most unequal ability to pay, (2) is unnecessarily burdensome, (3) must be paid at a time when workers find it most difficult to pay, namely, in midwinter, and (4) has in its penalty of taking away the right to vote, a punishment which is unreasonable and disproportionate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, like the distinguished Senators who have preceded me, I regret that in the midst of war, in the midst of trouble and worry, a measure of this kind should be before the Senate. I am glad that the motion for cloture was filed this afternoon, and I am indeed happy that by next Monday we will have the opportunity to vote on the motion. Therefore, Mr. President, knowing that the opponents of the pending bill will readily win, I am happy to believe that this vote will be the end, and it will not be necessary that any prolonged filibuster be conducted.

The constitutional questions have been ably discussed by distinguished lawyers of this body. It is my purpose for a few moments to discuss the financial aspects of the question which have been raised by the Senator from New York who, I

regret, is not present, and also by members of the Communist Party and others, who claim that the payment of the poll tax denies poor people the right to vote and occasions our small vote in the South.

Let me say, first, that in South Carolina there is no poll tax in the primary and let me say further that not only those Democrats who are able to read and write but, unfortunately, the few who cannot write their names are entered upon the books, and they may vote. It is only necessary for them to go to the polls to do so.

The poll tax applies in a general election. Before discussing it more fully, I desire to read the pertinent article from the constitution of the State of South Carolina:

> There shall be assessed on all taxable polls of the State between the ages of 21 and 60 years, except Confederate soldiers, an annual tax of $1 on each poll. The proceeds of which tax shall be expended for school purposes in the several school districts in which it is collected.

The argument has been made by those desiring to repeal the poll tax that it prevents people from voting. South Carolina has been mentioned in the hearings as being one of the States where only a very small vote is cast in general elections. The agitators and Communists and others who desire to overthrow the Government of the United States through their paid hirelings in Washington and elsewhere would have the people think that the only reason why a small vote is cast is because of the poll tax. This is false and absurd.

Let me say again that the poll tax applies only to those between the ages of 21 and 60, and let me say further, Mr. President, that women are exempted. I think the statistics of South Carolina show the population to be about evenly divided. Therefore, half of those between 21 and 60, women, are able to vote without any poll tax, regardless of who they are.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York suggested that in 1940, the year President Roosevelt ran for reelection, perhaps the people of the South were denied the right of voting. The comptroller general of South Carolina furnished me today figures showing the poll taxes assessed in South Carolina during the past 4 years. They are as follows:

1940	$290,457
1941	294,543
1942	285,131
1943	271,179

Mr. President, at a dollar a poll, that means that 290,000 male individuals between the ages of 21 and 60 paid their poll taxes. Allowing for an equal number of females, we would have nearly 600,000 people eligible to vote. But they did not vote, and the Communists and the C. I. O. agitators from the North know that the reason why they did not vote was not the poll tax, but that they did not take the trouble to go to the polls to vote.

The official declaration in South Carolina covering the election of 1940—and remember again that 290,000 people had paid their poll taxes—showed that the Democratic electors received 95,470 votes, the Jeffersonian Democrats 2,496 votes, one faction of the Republicans received 1,727 votes, and another faction 137 votes.

Mr. President, my thought is that for once and all, in the interest of the good name of my State, that the people of the United States should be told the truth and that is the poll tax has nothing to do with the number of people who vote. In many instances poor people, because of sickness and for other reasons to which I shall refer later, are exempted from paying the poll tax, and no woman has to pay the poll tax; 600,000 could have voted for President Roosevelt, only 95,000 did so.

Mr. President, I wish again to call attention to the numbers paying the poll tax. In 1940, 290,457 paid, and in 1941, 294,543 paid. In other words, when the year was not an election year, more people paid.

I have read the section and the article of the Constitution of South Carolina adopted in 1895, and I now read section 2565 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina for 1932, volume 2:

> There shall be assessed on all taxable polls in this State an annual tax of $1 on each poll, the proceeds of which tax shall be applied solely to educational purposes. All males between the ages of 21 and 60 years, except those incapable of earning a support from being maimed or from any other cause, shall be deemed taxable polls.

In other words, in 1932, if anyone was unable to earn his own support, through being maimed, or for other reasons, he was exempted.

In connection with the part of the section which called attention to the earmarking of the tax for schools, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a table showing how the tax is broken down by counties in the State of South Carolina, for the white and the colored schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

County:	*Poll tax*
Abbeville	$2,949
Aiken	8,167
Allendale	2,089
Anderson	13,421
Bamberg	3,481
Barnwell	4,137
Beaufort	3,103
Berkeley	4,302
Calhoun	2,180
Charleston	8,092
Cherokee	4,605
Chester	6,149
Chesterfield	5,589
Clarendon	4,233
Colleton	4,647
Darlington	17,176
Dillon	4,416
Dorchester	4,399
Edgefield	3,185
Fairfield	3,685
Florence	9,483
Georgetown	4,321
Greenville	18,119
Greenwood	7,892
Hampton	4,299
Horry	8,210
Jasper	1,618
Kershaw	$2,503
Lancaster	4,885
Laurens	7,116
Lee	3,735
Lexington	9,386
McCormick	1,439
Marion	5,120
Marlboro	2,776
Newberry	5,810
Oconee	2,547
Orangeburg	6,414
Pickens	5,542
Richland	18,146
Saluda	3,036
Spartanburg	13,716
Sumter	5,849
Union	3,647
Williamsburg	5,586
York	6,969
Total	271,179

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I could talk at some length on various phases of the question I am discussing, but they have been ably covered, and will be ably covered by those who follow me, so that I believe it to be far from necessary for me to speak further on those points. However, I wish to impress on the Senate and the people of the United States of America once and for all the fact that insofar as the votes cast on election day are concerned, and insofar as those who have the right to vote are concerned, they have nothing in common. No one pays a poll tax except males between the ages of 21 and 60, who are capable of making their own livelihood, and everyone else—the women and others—are entitled to vote without paying any poll tax. Two hundred and ninety thousand paid the tax in 1940. Add to that number several hundred thousand women and others who are exempted, and it will be found that there was a list of eligible voters in South Carolina numbering certainly three-quarters of a million, but less than 100,000 voted. So, again I say, the poll tax has nothing to do with the number of people who vote; it is an issue which has been raised to fool people, to cover up the truth of this alien movement.

Mr. President, I hope that another year we may not be confronted with the absurd argument that a dollar poll tax results in people being denied the right to vote, when the poll tax is earmarked for education, and when more people pay poll taxes than vote, and when the tax is necessary in the collection of revenue for the support of the schools in our State, just as is the road tax for the support of roads. If the poll tax is to be done away with, why is not the road tax abolished? The road tax is paid by some 260,000, the poll tax by approximately 290,000.

Mr. President, I hope the remarks I have made may be of some benefit and may in some way contradict the absurd, farcical, and fanciful statements by those who desire to destroy the Constitution by making people believe that the payment of $1 tax by those who earn their livelihood creates a situation in South Carolina, and in the South generally, which makes it impossible for people to cast their ballots. I shall speak

at length on the bill if by chance it should be further debated after the cloture vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] had something to say about Russian Communists, and what a wonderful record they were making in this war, all of which I endorse. The Russians are making a wonderful record in this war and I feel very proud of that record. Nothing I said in my speech applied to Russian communism. I was speaking of American communism, of American Communists or leftists, and not about Russian Communists. I do not want anyone to believe that anything I have said applied to Russian communism. Their communism is a matter for them alone.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to consume an undue amount of the Senate's time, for I am sincerely anxious that the Senate take definite action on the pending bill at the earliest possible moment.

It is for that reason I have signed a petition calling for cloture, and it is for that reason I shall make my remarks here as brief as possible. But in view of the outstanding importance of this particular bill, I feel that I should make clear my stand on this proposal.

We in America have long prided ourselves on being the outstanding symbol of human liberty and popular government in the history of the world. We have repeatedly held ourselves up as a model political organization, under which all men may participate in the election of their governing officials and in the conduct of public affairs.

This bill is in substance a test as to whether or not we do in fact, as well as in theory, attain the standards of free government which we claim for ourselves.

No democracy, no popular form of government, can function efficiently without the full, effective participation of its citizens in that government. The only effective method of participation in a government as large and as complicated as ours is through the right of suffrage. That right in many cases is the citizen's only vehicle of expression and choice. A denial and abridgment of that right is a denial and abridgment of democracy, and it can be construed in no other light.

It is a lamentable commentary to our system of government, Mr. President, that through the poll tax many millions of our citizens are kept from the polls, and effectively denied the right to participate in their Government.

In a number of States in this Federal Union government is carried on by a minority. Statistics will show that in several States elections are decided by but a small fraction of the total adult population. Thus it is that we have within the confines of this constitutional democracy a system which permits the continued control of the Government by a minority.

Mr. President, this condition contributes nothing to the advancement of human progress and the enrichment of human freedom, either in this country or in any other country in the world.

I recall that a poll-tax provision was once inscribed in the Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania, and there arose in that State a concerted agitation for the removal of that provision. There were those at that time who offered almost the identical arguments that are being offered today in defense of the poll tax.

I am proud to say, Mr. President, that I labored long and continuously to effect the removal of the poll-tax requirement from the Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania, for I believed then as I believe now that no citizen of a democracy should be denied the right to participate in his Government simply because he does not possess a given amount of wealth or property.

The plea is made by many that the amount of the poll tax is in itself a very insignificant item, and that anyone who is sincerely interested in casting his ballot can effectively discharge that small obligation. But the fact remains that in this Nation more than one-third of the families are living below a recognized subsistence level, and that any monetary burden placed upon those families is sufficient to prevent their taking part in the elections.

The conditions of poverty and want are especially common among certain groups of our people, with the result that nearly all the members of these groups are effectively denied any active part in their Government by the poll-tax requirement.

If this property or tax requirement is permitted to stand, it may easily become an even more potent force in restricting and undermining the democratic processes, for if a man can be required to pay $2 he can just as effectively be required to pay $100 or $1,000 for the privilege of casting his ballot. Such restrictive devices lead only to oligarchy and tyranny, and they have no place in a Nation which prides itself on the freedom and capacity of its citizens.

I shall not undertake, Mr. President, to discuss the constitutional features of this particular bill, for admittedly there are those committed both to the support and to the opposition of the bill who are much more capable of exhausting in an intelligent and complete manner the various arguments that might be raised regarding the constitutional aspects of the bill.

But I am convinced, through my own study of the pertinent sections of the Constitution and through my own study of this particular bill, that the bill itself represents nothing more than a proper expression of the powers of Congress and a proper exercise of the authority granted to the legislative branch of the National Government.

And as a Member of this body I am willing to cast my vote for the enactment of the bill, for I sincerely believe it lies within the constitutional grant of powers which has been given to the Congress of the United States to enact it. At the present time this Nation and our allies are engaged in a world-shaking armed conflict against the forces of oppression and barbarism. We have proclaimed our sincere objectives of bringing freedom, dignity, and self-government to all men.

We cannot consistently make these proclamations or attain these ends if we demonstrate to the world that we are unable to secure the same conditions within the confines of our own Nation.

The many millions of American men who are carrying the fight to the enemy, who now stand poised to strike the greatest overseas blow in all history, have been taken indiscriminately from the ranks of those who have and those who have not paid a poll tax.

Those who are fighting and dying in order that freedom and human dignity may prevail in the world against regimentation and slavery are fighting also that the same freedoms may be firmly established and protected within their own Nation. I believe the Government would be faithless to its commitments if we did not take definite action to secure those freedoms here at home.

Throughout the course of this historic struggle the eyes of all men who find themselves in chains or who find their basic freedoms threatened by their enemies, have turned to America in the profound hope that this great Nation would extend its full might and purpose to strike down the forces of darkness and to secure the forces of freedom throughout the world.

We in America have often maintained that ours is a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." The forces against whom we are pitted have maintained that the governments of the world shall be representative of only a part of the people, that they shall be controlled by only a part of the people, and that they shall function for the benefit of only a part of the people.

If, therefore, we permit the continued existence of the poll-tax requirement within the confines of the United States, if we do not strike down this restrictive and undemocratic device, we are in fact subscribing to the very pholosophy against which we have pitted ourselves in this war.

If all men are not permitted to participate in their governments—in the selection of their officers and in the regulation of their public affairs—then truly whatever governments are constituted cannot be "of, for, and by the people." Such governments can only represent, can only serve, and can only be controlled by that limited group of individuals who, through the aid of such devices as the poll tax, are able effectively to deny the basic and fundamental privilege of citizenship to the overwhelming majority of the people within their jurisdiction.

I am hopeful, Mr. President, that in view of the pressing need to demonstrate our sincerity in behalf of human freedom, and in view of the pressing need to make clear to the people of our own Nation that our Government is in fact a democracy, the Congress of the United States will take speedy and effective action in approving the pending bill, and in destroying one of the most pernicious and evil restrictions on this society of freemen that has ever come into existence in all our history.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the Senate will agree that the pending bill has been thoroughly discussed and debated. A number of very eloquent, able, and profound speeches have been made on it. The first was an exceptionally able and eloquent speech by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. After he concluded his remarks, I felt that everything which could be said on the bill had been said.

He was followed by the very able senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who made an exceptionally able speech. The Senator from North Carolina was followed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who spoke, as he always does, with great ability.

The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has this afternoon presented the arguments against the pending bill. I doubt if very much, if anything, can be said in addition to what has already been said.

Mr. President, I myself spoke on September 10, 1942, on the matter of Federal legislation abolishing the State poll taxes. At that time I spoke at some length, and rather extensively, on the subject. Later, on November 21 of that year, I spoke in the Senate on the same subject. I have no desire at this time to repeat what I said in those two previous speeches, or to go back over the many arguments which have been presented on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the bill.

We know that on Monday the vote on cloture will come, the petition for cloture already having been filed today by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I think there is no doubt in the mind of any Senator what the result of that vote will be. The motion for cloture will be defeated. It will, I think, be badly defeated. Under the rules of the Senate, a two-thirds vote is required in order to adopt a motion for cloture. I think a majority of the votes cast on Monday will be against the motion for cloture.

The Senate will not be in session on Saturday. So tomorrow will be the last day when we shall have any debate before the cloture motion is voted on, for I understand that under the rules it must be voted on not later than 1 o'clock on Monday.

In view of the fact that the case has been so ably and so comprehensively presented, I do not wish to delay the Senate at this late hour. I do wish to associate myself in opposition to the pending bill. The people of the State of Alabama, which I have the honor, in part, to represent, not only oppose this bill, they resent it. They feel that the passage of the bill would result in taking from them a very fundamental right which they now have under the Constitution of the United States. They feel that the bill, if enacted into law, would be an attack on the sovereignty of the State of Alabama. They feel that the bill would be an assault on the Constitution of the United States, and that it would strike a terrible blow at the very foundation stones of the dual system of our republican form of government.

Those of us who oppose the bill—many of us, at least—associated ourselves together in solemn and fixed determination that the bill should never pass, if it lay within our power, through any honorable means, to prevent its passage. We resolved that we would use every parliamentary means and every parliamentary device available to us to insure its defeat.

As I said a few moments ago, its defeat now seems certain. We who oppose the bill feel very strongly that we are not only fighting to preserve the rights of our own States but that we are fighting for the rights of all the States. It is not possible, Mr. President, to take a certain right away from one State and not take it away from all the States. It is not possible to assault or impair the sovereignty of one State without assaulting or impairing the sovereignty of all the States.

So we who stand here in opposition to the bill are battling not only for the States which we have the honor to represent, but for the preservation of the rights, the sovereignty, and the constitutional institutions of each and every State in the Republic.

Mr. President, as we know, and as has been brought out time and again during the debate, when the framers of the Constitution wrote the Constitution there was no question about what they intended to do with reference to fixing the qualifications of electors. They wrote in clear and unmistakable language that the fixing of the qualifications of electors should be in the hands of the States; and they did it with the full knowledge that at the time when they wrote the Constitution practically every State in the Union had some property qualification or some tax qualification for an elector, had some property or tax requirement which had to be met before a citizen could enjoy the franchise of the electorate.

The debates in the Constitutional Convention and all contemporary writings which throw light on the proceedings of that Convention lead us inevitably to the conclusion that if the framers of the Constitution had not provided that the fixing of the qualifications of electors should be entirely in the hands of the States, the Constitution never would have been ratified, and our Government, as we have known it for 150 years, would never have come into being. We recall that Patrick Henry, who sounded the tocsin of the Revolutionary War, and George Mason, author of the Virginia Bill of Rights, out of which came the Bill of Rights in our Federal Constitution, both opposed the adoption of the Federal Constitution because they felt that there was too much delegation of power to the new Federal Government which was to be brought into being under the Constitution. All the writings of the time clearly show how jealous the then-existing States were of any new power to be lodged in the new Federal Government.

As has been brought out in the debate, not once, but a number of times, we know that the Constitutional Convention considered and debated the matter of having the Constitution fix the qualifications of voters. After most thorough consideration, section 2 of article I was placed in the Constitution, providing that the fixing of the qualifications of voters should be in the hands of the States.

After the Federal Constitution came into being, after it was agreed to and accepted by everyone that the fixing of the qualifications for electors was solely and entirely in the hands of the States, for 75 years the question was never raised. Surely if it was ever raised it was never raised seriously in the Congress of the United States or anywhere else. For 75 years there was no question that the States, and the States alone, possessed and enjoyed that power. It was not until the time of the great War between the States that the question was raised with any seriousness; and, as the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] so clearly demonstrated in his address on Tuesday, we know that with one exception every Member of the Senate at that time who spoke on the subject declared the proposition that this was a power which was invested solely and entirely in the States. Most of the Senators who spoke were on the committee which drafted the fourteenth amendment. It was a power which the Federal Government did not possess, and which Congress had no right to attempt to exercise in any way. The one Senator who was an exception was the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts at the time, Senator Sumner, and the only point he made was that he thought Congress had the power to legislate with reference to the Negro. If Senator Sumner were here today, and were to take the same position today that he took when the fourteenth amendment was under consideration, he would have to oppose the pending bill.

When the Congress submitted the fourteenth amendment, it confirmed the proposition that the fixing of the qualifications of electors was entirely in the hands of the States. A few years later the Congress again confirmed the proposition when it submitted the fifteenth amendment.

The years passed, and we came to the year 1913, when Congress submitted the amendment for the direct election of United States Senators. In the seventeenth amendment the Congress not only confirmed the proposition, but even placed in the seventeenth amendment the exact language of the original Constitution, providing specifically that the qualifications of electors for the election of Members of this body should be fixed by the States.

A few years later, when the Congress submitted the woman suffrage amendment, the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution, Congress once again confirmed the proposition that the fixing of the qualification of electors was entirely in the hands of the States. Every time the Congress has passed on the question, every time the question has been presented to the Congress in all the 150 years of our history, the Congress has always, without deviation, arrived at the same conclusion, that is, that the language originally written into section 2 of article I of the Constitution meant ex-

actly what it said, and that is that the fixing of the qualifications should be in the hands of the States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator's attention been called to the woman suffrage amendment? If the Congress can say by this bill that the payment of a poll tax shall not be deemed to be a qualification, could it not have said that sex shall not be deemed to be a qualification, and have avoided all the rigmarole necessary in adopting a constitutional amendment?

Mr. HILL. Exactly.

Mr. CONNALLY. No one ever dreamed that Congress could do that. No one ever proposed it. The proponents of the amendment worked for 25 or 30 years on a constitutional amendment in order to enable women to vote.

Mr. HILL. Even the wildest proponents of woman suffrage never once dreamed of suggesting that suffrage be granted by legislative action of Congress. They always attempted to obtain the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, and finally they were successful. They knew, and the wise lawyers who advised them knew—and I think the Senator will agree with me that at that time we all thought we knew—that the only way the Congress could exercise any power with reference to fixing the qualifications of voters was through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, expressly delegating that specific power to the Congress.

As the Constitution was originally written, and as it is today, with a few exceptions, all that power is vested in the States. Congress cannot reach into the States and take from the States any power which the Federal Constitution has placed in the States. The only source of power which can give that authority to the Congress of the United States is the source of all power in this country, that source being the people of the United States. If the people of the United States in their wisdom, after careful consideration, should feel that they wish to grant this power to Congress, of course the people could adopt an amendment to the Federal Constitution granting the power to the Federal Congress. But without some grant of power through an amendment to the Constitution, Congress has no power which it can exercise in this matter. That is the reason why the various amendments had to be adopted. That is the reason why the fourteenth amendment was adopted. That is the reason why the fifteenth amendment was adopted. That is the reason why the woman suffrage amendment was adopted. The Congress had no power to act with reference to the qualifications of electors. That power could come only by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

As the Senator knows, if we had before us a proposal to submit an amendment to the States, or to the people to amend the Constitution, this argument would be an entirely different one. We might doubt the wisdom of such action, we might doubt the timeliness of it, we might doubt whether such a procedure would be good for our Federal system, but none of us would question the constitutionality of it, or the power of Congress to submit such an amendment.

Mr. President, once Congress assumes the power which it is proposed to give to it, once Congress does such violence to the Constitution and enters the field with regard to the qualifications of electors, there is no limit to what it may do. It could narrow the qualifications of voters, or, if it saw fit, it could greatly extend or augment the qualifications. It could do anything it might wish to do. It could even impose a poll tax after it had once entered the field. It could impose any qualifications which were not prohibited by the Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, there can be no question that from the time of the Constitutional Convention, which wrote the Federal Constitution, down to the present day, every time this question has been presented to Congress it has read the clear language of the Constitution, and taken the position that it had no power to enter the field of fixing the qualifications of electors, unless that power were delegated to the Congress by an amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, just as the Congress, from its very beginning down to date, has always affirmed and confirmed the proposition that the fixing of the qualifications of electors was entirely and solely within the power of the States, so the courts of our country have always affirmed and confirmed that proposition.

Various decisions of the courts have been cited during this debate. I shall not go into them at this late hour. We could refer back to the early decisions which were made in the early days of the Government, and bring the decisions down to the more recent ones, such as those made within the past few years in the Classic case and the Pirtle case. All the decisions of the Supreme Court have confirmed the proposition that Congress has no power to enter into the field of fixing qualifications except where such power has been granted by an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, in speaking of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, I wish to refer to only one decision of that Court. Of all its decisions it seems to me that this one sums up best, and presents more poignantly, what is involved in the proposal now before the Senate. The decision to which I refer was handed down by Mr. Chief Justice White in the case of *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S., p. 362). It dealt with the fifteenth amendment. Remember, Senators, that what Mr. Chief Justice White was saying did not apply only to poll-tax States; it did not apply only to Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and Mississippi, for example. It applied also to the State of the Senator from Maine, and to the State of every other Senator. I read from what Chief Justice White had to say on this subject:

> Beyond doubt, the (fourteenth) amendment does not take away from the State governments in any general sense the power over suffrage which has belonged to those governments from the beginning, and without the possession of which power the whole fabric upon which the division of State and National authority under the Constitution and the organization of both governments rest would be without support and both the authority of the Nation and the State would fall to the ground. In fact, the very command of the amendment recognizes the possession of the general power by the State, since the amendment seeks to regulate its exercise as to the particular subject with which it deals.

The proposition could not be more eloquently or more forcefully stated than it was stated by Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mr. President, I feel that in waging the battle against this bill we are not only fighting for the rights of our States but that we are fighting for the preservation of our dual system of government. We are fighting for the preservation of our Federal system. We are fighting to continue the government which we have known, and which has brought us its manifold blessings and benefits for 150 years.

To pass this bill, to open this door, to permit this camel to get his nose under the tent, would be to start on a road which might lead inevitably and inexorably to the destruction of our great Federal system.

Mr. President, we are not only asked by the proponents of this measure to do these things; we are not only asked to take this step, but we are even asked to invoke a cloture rule in order that those things may be accomplished. I believe it was Thomas Jefferson who said that, as between a free government and a free press, he would take a free press. Jefferson knew that so long as the press was free we would have a free government. If there is a freedom in this country as precious to every American citizen as the freedom of the press, it is the freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States.

Majorities do not need protection. Minorities need protection. The whole history of the world—and I shall not go through it, because the hour is late, though I should like to—is the story of the blood and the tears of the minorities down through the ages. After all, the glory of our Government has been the protection of the rights of the minorities under our system. So long as we preserve freedom of debate in this body, no matter who the minority may be, no matter what it might be, no matter what cause it might represent, no matter how weak or impotent it might apparently be, no matter how much power it might have or how much pressure or economic force might be exerted, that minority can be heard here on the floor of the Senate of the United States. There is no way to trample it under foot, there is no way to run roughshod over it without its voice being raised on this floor, without its protest being fully and completely registered here in the Senate of the United States.

So long as freedom of debate lasts in this body, no matter how powerful may be the forces, no matter how great may be the pressure, how insistent the demands behind any measure, that measure cannot be driven through this body post haste, without the right of full debate, without the right of full discussion, without the right to bring out all the facts pertinent to the question involved.

Second only to the proposal to assault the Constitution of the United States, to invade the sovereignty of the States, to rob them of their rights unconstitutionally, is the proposal to invoke cloture, to cut off debate, to put an end to freedom of debate and discussion in this body.

Mr. President, I wish to protest as vigorously as I can against the passage of the pending bill, and I wish to protest as vigorously as I can against the invocation of cloture. I am unalterably opposed to the pending bill; I am unalterably opposed to the invoking of cloture.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, ordinarily we might have an executive session, but there is only one nomination on the calendar, and the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has advised me that he does not want action on that nomination today.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to state that I have no bias or prejudice in respect to the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. It has been understood that we would proceed daily until about 5 o'clock, so unless there is some other matter some Senator wishes to bring before the Senate, it is my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will it be with the understanding that I will have the floor when the Senate reconvenes?

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that will be the case. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor, and I assume he will have the floor tomorrow when the Senate meets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be understood that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow the Senator from Louisiana will have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 12, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 11 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Robert Kendall McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 1949. (Reappointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal One, before the ever-recurring and disheartening arrestments and collapses of this world, Thou art God. Forbid that the irony of events should exhaust our strength and our faith in unconsoled sorrow, unrequited sacrifices, and in uncompensated wrongs; give us grace and power to endure. Remind us, dear Lord, that drinking the bitter cup makes us worthy of the great destiny to which we aspire, crowned with the eternal secrets of the soul.

We pray that our patriotism may breathe the spirit of sacrifice and consecration. Let us strongly set forth a dynamic aversion to any form of blind acceptance of the value of our institutions. We pray that these may challenge the minds of our countrymen from laxity to labor, from unbelief to faith in America's providential mission. O pity all those who fail to understand—with no vision, no new duties kindling the glow of the soul, and with no large purpose looking toward a timeless peace. Warm our affections with a revival of a purer flame until the coarser things of earth no longer attract. With renewed outlook, unseal our eyes that we may look directly upon the things unseen even unto the throne of God.

"Let us live for the cause that lacks assistance,
For the wrongs that need resistance,
For the future in the distance,
For the good that we may do."

In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed joint resolutions and bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 31, 1944:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

On April 1, 1944:

H. R. 3408. An act to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code; and

H. R. 4346. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

On April 3, 1944:

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives;

H. R. 2778. An act to ratify and confirm act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker;

H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker;

H. R. 3362. An act to fix the annual compensation of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 4377. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy.

On April 4, 1944:

H. R. 1216. An act for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Paul B. Lingle;

H. R. 2234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen;

H. R. 2273. An act for the relief of E. C. Fudge;

H. R. 2616. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes;

H. R. 3259. An act to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration;

H. R. 3602. An act to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of C. C. Evensen;

H. R. 3847. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes;

H. R. 3912. An act to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4381. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2337. An act for the relief of John Joseph Defeo.

On April 22, 1944:

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2648. An act for the relief of Avid Evers; and

H. R. 4133. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

On April 24, 1944:

H. R. 3257. An act to amend Subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF PROVISIONS OF WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT RELATING TO POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 4618) to repeal the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act relating to political contributions by labor organizations has been referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised by the Parliamentarian that proper jurisdiction over this bill is in the Judiciary Committee and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

REVISION OF LAWS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the Members of the House that today, tomorrow, and Saturday, in the Attorney General's conference room in the Supreme Court Building, the Committee on the Revision of Laws, and the committee counsel, Charles J. Zinn and John F. X. Finn, of New York, together with the editorial chiefs of the West Publishing Co., Minneapolis, and the Edward Thompson Co., of New York, and the advisory committee consisting of former Judge Floyd Thompson, of Chicago, Justice Justin Miller, of Washington, and former United States Attorney John T. Cahill, of New York, with their consultants, Alexander Holtzoff, of Washington, and George F. Longsdorf, of California, will meet in the Attorney General's conference room of the Supreme Court Building to consider a preliminary draft of the proposed revision of title XVIII of the United States Code on Crimes and Criminal Procedure. William W. Barron, former Chief of Appellate Section, Criminal Division, Department of Justice, is acting as reviser for the two companies. The Members of the House and of the Committee on Revision of the Laws are at liberty and are welcome to attend the sessions which will begin at 10 a. m. each day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter addressed to me by Mr. C. E. Child.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution passed at a meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to include in some remarks I expect to make on the veterans' bill amendments I intend to propose to the bill when it is considered under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the Indiana-Pennsylvania Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Alexandria Daily Town Talk entitled "A Patriotic Congress."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNITED STATES NAVY FOR ADDITIONAL ORDNANCE MANUFACTURING AND PRODUCTION FACILITIES

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 531, Rept. No. 1436), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4421, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on the F. S. A. by the Wisconsin Farmers Union News, and the other request is that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on land grants by David Robertson appearing in the last issue of the Trainmen's magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' AID LEGISLATION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for the excellent job they have done in connection with a very difficult bill, the so-called G. I. bill. However, there is one section of that bill, the educational section, which I cannot altogether agree to. I believe that further consideration and further protection of State rights are needed in the provisions of that section. For that reason, I am going to support what is known as the Barden bill as a substitute for the educational features of the G. I. bill. That comes about as the result of 35 or 40 years of educational experience and in the protection of State control over the educational features of any Federal-aid bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MOTION-PICTURE PREVIEW, THE BATTLE FOR NEW BRITAIN

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the War Department to extend, on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs, an invitation to the membership of the House to attend a preview of the picture known as the Battle for New Britain at the auditorium, Library of Congress, Friday, May 12, 1944, at 2:30 p. m. There is a little note on the memorandum that I think I should read to you:

This picture shows excellent action scenes of combat and supply operations in the opening of the present campaign in New Britain, including landing operations at Arawe and Cape Gloucester.

As the picture requires 54 minutes of running time, two showings will be presented. The second showing will start about 3:30 p. m. Lt. Col. R. R. Presneil, who was in charge of the filming, will be present and give a short talk at both showings on the experiences of his unit.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDING CRAFT

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 526), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4710, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 543), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4184), to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

FEDERAL AID FOR READJUSTMENT IN CIVILIAN LIFE OF WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 540, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 540), as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 1767, an act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. It shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the text of the committee amendment to H. R. 3846 as a substitute for title II of the committee amendment to S. 1767.

At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and r port the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

This rule, Mr. Speaker, makes in order the long-awaited G. I. bill for which we have been patiently waiting, being desirous of doing our part and our share for those brave men who are now engaged in protecting and safeguarding the interests of America in fighting for freedom for our country.

The rule provides for 2 days' general debate. It is an open rule and permits the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule, and makes in order the House bill as a substitute for Senate bill 1767. It also provides that the Barden bill, H. R. 3846, can be offered, as amended, as a substitute for title II, providing for the education of veterans.

I am satisfied that nearly all of you gentlemen are familiar with the Senate bill and also with the House bill that has been reported and which will be considered under this rule. I feel that there are many changes in the House bill that unfortunately are not favored by many Members of this House, and that many Members favor the Senate bill as originally reported, with some minor amendments.

Originally I felt that I should call attention to the changes in the House bill, which differ from those in the Senate bill, but in view of the fact that we are going to have 2 days of general debate, I feel the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will be able to explain these changes and provisions that the House committee has agreed to and that are now before us, and to give reasons for reducing the allowances as carried in the Senate bill. Consequently, I shall not enumerate all the changes that have been made by the House committee in the Senate bill.

However, I want to call attention to some of the changes that I, and I believe a majority of the Members, will disapprove because they reduce the benefits originally provided for in the Senate bill. The most outstanding change is the reduction in the time that a veteran shall receive readjustment allowance while he is out of employment. The time provided in the House bill is for a 26-week period as compared with 52 weeks as carried in the original Senate bill. Another objectionable provision in the House bill is in chapter 8, paragraph (b), which disqualifies any veteran from receiving any allowance if it is found that his unemployment is due to stoppage of work because of labor disputes. There is also a change that will meet opposition in the House with respect to the increase in the interest rate on the loans for which the veterans may apply to build a home or to enter business. The Senate bill provided 3 percent interest on such loans and the House bill provides 6 percent, which I think is manifestly unfair and is in the interest of the bankers and the loan companies.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I am sure the gentleman does not want to leave the wrong impression. The House bill does not make direct loans; it only guarantees certain loans. The House arrived at that 6 percent in order that these loans might be made. If you attempted to force private enterprise, private banks, or private individuals to loan money at 6 percent, it would shut out these boys and they would not get any money at all.

Mr. SABATH. Nevertheless, the rate is increased from 3 to 6 percent, whether the loans are made by private industries or loan companies.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will refer to the bill, he will find that the rate is not to exceed 6 percent. It can go as low as 2 percent, or whatever they can get the money for.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate that. However, for years we have been trying to reduce the rate of interest. With the amount of money available for construction and for business and other purposes in this country at this time, it should not be hard to obtain loans at 3 percent. To put a limit of 6 percent on the loans is a mistake, I think, because I know the bankers, if they are per-

mitted to charge 6 percent, will not loan their money at 3½ or 4 percent, which has been the aim of the Administration.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield further, this merely puts a limit of 6 percent on the rate of interest to be charged.

Mr. SABATH. I realize that.

Mr. RANKIN. These are private loans. If the gentleman from Illinois can show us any way in God's world to make bankers make loans and make private individuals or loan companies make loans at a reduced rate of interest, I shall be glad to have that provision put in the bill.

Mr. SABATH. There are a lot of building and loan associations which have more money than they know what to do with. I know there is a great deal of money in the banks throughout the United States; in fact, in many instances banks have refused to take deposits because they do not know what do do with the money. In view of those conditions, why should we give bankers or loan sharks, in many instances, the right to charge up to 6 percent to these deserving veterans for whom we want to do something, because if that is the limit they will charge the limit. Right here, Mr. Speaker, why should not the bill provide that the Government make these loans? In fact, that is what the bill should provide at a rate not to exceed 3 percent. The Government can do so and should do so. We have advanced money to the farmers at low interest rates, we have guaranteed the loans of home owners, we have loaned money to the railroads, to banks, mortgage companies, industrial and manufacturing establishments, crop and seed loans to farmers, and given parity payments to them. So I ask, Why has not a provision been incorporated in this bill to make loans to our brave defenders who have given their all, through one of the existing Government agencies?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are making loans now to the farmers throughout the country at 3 percent, and I voted for it. If we can afford to give that to the farmers throughout the country, we ought to be able to give it to the boys who are fighting and dying for our country.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is right; he is always right.

Under another provision in the bill the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is given complete jurisdiction over these matters. Although I have utmost confidence in the gentleman—General Hines—now occupying that position, I do not know how long he will remain. Consequently, I think there should have been some provision in the bill whereby the authority and jurisdiction would be shared, perhaps, with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and some other officials, in connection with these important matters that will have to be decided.

Outside of that, this bill is a step in the right direction. I am more than pleased that it is before us and I hope it will shortly pass. So far, no one has lost anything by the careful consideration of the bill on the part of the House committee, because the benefits have not yet accrued. I feel that the House committee has acted carefully and judiciously, having in mind the interest of the country. Nevertheless, in some respects I think there are some provisions in the bill as to which the committee in its desire to safeguard the interests of the country has gone a little too far in imposing restrictions and inserting provisions that might deprive the men, through some minor omission or commission, of the benefits which we intend to grant.

We know from past experience and the gentleman from Mississippi himself knows how the departments have frequently ruled that because of a slight technicality a man or his widow and children have been deprived of benefits. The gentleman himself urged that that should be eliminated, and there is a bill on which a rule has been granted, and which will come up within the next few days, in which we are trying to take care of that so that no injustice is done on account of technicalities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman held that rule in the committee from the 9th of January until a day or two ago before he reported it out. Many of these widows during that time have dragged these children through the depression and paid their expenses without receiving a single dollar as a result of their husbands' services in the last war.

Mr. SABATH. Again the gentleman makes a misstatement, and it must be with the intention of placing the responsibility for delay in holding the rule in committee. I do not recall whether the gentleman has ever made a request for a rule on that bill, but I will not be as unfair as he is. He might have and I shall ask the clerk of the committee to make a careful check whether a request has been made. However, I know that when my attention was called to the bill and I learned that it was to provide benefits for the wives and children of deceased veterans of War No. 1, I immediately ordered it placed on the docket of the Committee on Rules for a hearing at the ensuing meeting. A rule was granted, and I filed the report the following day. When I read the bill I could not quite understand why the gentleman did not ask unanimous consent to have it placed on the unanimous-consent calendar, where, with such placement, a rule would not have been required. I am, indeed, glad that I do not possess the antagonism that the gentleman has so often displayed toward me, because I could, if so bent, point out many matters that would not be pleasing to him. Yes; I know, under the pretense of preserving the Constitution there has been forced upon the country a soldier's vote bill whereby at least one-half of the men and women in the armed services will be deprived of the opportunity to vote.

Only a few minutes ago I tried to excuse the gentleman and his committee for the delay in reporting this bill, and most of the delay was due to the action of the gentleman because he feared that under the Senate bill the veterans would be receiving too much and, therefore, reduced the time for veterans receiving the unemployment allowance from 1 year to 6 months. Yes, and the other provisions that I have pointed out have been amended so that the veterans would receive lesser benefits. However, I will refrain from saying anything more in this respect, except that I hope in the future the gentleman will cease criticizing the Committee on Rules in delaying the consideration of legislation when, in fact, the present Committee on Rules has granted more rules in any given session of Congress than any other Committee on Rules in the history of Congress. At no time have there been so many rules granted to expedite the business of the House as during this Congress. Therefore the charge that the bill has been delayed by the Committee on Rules is manifestly unfair, because it received consideration as has other legislation coming before it for a rule.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. This bill is to take care of everyone in the armed forces—men and women.

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to point out, and I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will take notice, that in going over this bill I find in various places pronouns of the masculine gender are used. This is going to cause a lot of confusion, is it not?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will turn to the end of the bill he will find that "Wherever used in this act, the masculine includes the feminine."

Mr. COCHRAN. I have not got that far.

Mr. SABATH. I think the answer is correct, and the matter is properly taken care of.

In view of the fact that the bill will be thoroughly explained by the gentleman from Mississippi and the members of his committee, who have devoted a great deal of time and study to the bill, I shall not say any more at this time, and yield 5 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am again calling attention to the joint resolution introduced by me last week to erect here in Washington a permanent memorial to the mothers of America.

This resolution provides for the creation of a Mothers Memorial Commission of nine members, three to be appointed by the Speaker, three by the Vice President, and three by the President. It is contemplated that the Government shall furnish a suitable site and meet all promotional and managerial costs. The Commission would be authorized to accept contributions from all sources to help in the execution of the project.

Mr. Speaker, in all this cold and hollow world—this troubled and frustrated world—there is no worship that does not at some time falter, except the worship of mother for her own. It is something that typifies the ceaseless march of the stars and the constancy of the everlasting hills. Upon its face it bears the white seal of heaven and the stamp of the glory of God.

In the whole tragic history of mankind there has appeared no figure so heroic as that of mother. From the bottomless fountain of her deathless love men have drawn the inspiration and courage to meet every crisis.

Upon the loyalty and sacrifices of mother was our Nation founded. Her very soul has given strength to our leaders while her sons were being consumed in the fiery moloch of war. Hear today the voice of mother saying: "I have given my three sons to this terrible war and that is all I have." No artist can give color to such an undying picture and no scultor can form it in chiseled marble. Her ideals do not constitute a creed, a philosophy or doctrine, but is the pure-spun tenuous flow of her immortal soul.

When sickness invades the home mother comes with the speed of the sunlight and with the tenderness of an angel to soothe, to bless, and to save. "The mother of Jesus was there." The mothers are always at the crosses of their children. Who is it that sits with silver hair and worn hands at the hearthstone? Who is the vigil through the long night hours of prayer and patience, rich in soul and in the peace of God? Who, in the face of poverty and discouragement, is stout of heart and speaking the words of comfort? Who is it that sustains man's eternal faith in womankind and upholds all things high? It is the uncalendared saint—the mother—the inspiration of religion, hope, and virtue.

Today we are concerned over the fate of mother's boy who has gone to war. In her anxiety she thinks of his future happiness, success, and even greatness. The long years have been short years as she beholds her boy grown to the strength and manliness of a fine man. But the purple testament of war is opened, and all her plans have come to naught. She lays her pride and hope upon the altar of her country, and the rapt beating of her heart gives response to all that is dear in human life.

In a world so cruel, where thorns lie in every path, it is mother who kisses the cross that smites her heart. Her spirit is an open challenge to all the world. Herein is the intense power of woman—first at the cross and last at the sepulcher. The heaviest burdens fall on the tenderest hearts, yet they shape the world anew. The Master, who counts her tears of suffering in tragedy and in pain, puts His healing hand on her every wound as she breathes out the constancy of her soul.

No State is greater than its mothers; in their hands lies the destiny of the world. If our country is to live and grow, her ideals must become the ideals of our land. Mother and the Nation are inseparable, and in this union there is the foundation upon which we must abide for our glory and perpetuity; in this union we have the sanctities and nobilities of a free and Christian people.

So let us ever seek to pay tribute to her who has been the inspiration of all that is good and great in the being of man. Today we look over our shoulder into the past; over its dizzy heights of fortune and ambition and through the valleys of failure and sorrow. We meditate and recall that mother first formed our hands in prayer and led the way for our wandering feet. Behold the holy face of mother, the first that waited for us and greeted us with a kiss; the face that watched us through our babyhood with unheralded devotion; the face that understood our tears and smiles and never turned away. When gladness came she smiled, and when sorrow sought to blight it clouded and when tears streaked she stooped to help and bless. It is the face that the young remember and the old never forget. It is the face that helps, inspires, and comforts. It is the face on which heavenly sacrifice has written its undying message. About it the poets have sung their enchanging songs and painters have drawn their divine images. It is the most beautiful face in all the world and will be the first to greet us at the gates of heaven.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first I desire to pay tribute to the members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for the many days of diligent study which they have put into this legislation.

No legislation before the present Congress is more strongly supported by the American people than the so-called G. I. bill. It is a measure of justice to the fighting men and women of America. It signifies the American people are determined to provide adequately for the disabled veterans and the dependents of the deceased veterans; that we intend to do our full part as a country in the difficult readjustment from military life to a civilian status.

No one can justly complain of giving liberal treatment to the dependents of the men and women who gave their lives in this war to keep America a free nation. The dependents of the dead heroes must be adequately cared for and given a chance to share in the prosperity that will come as a result of the sacrifices of their loved ones.

When the men are mustered out of the service they must be given a fair chance to rehabilitate themselves in civilian life. The Federal Government can help by making certain no one suffers the pinch of want while the veteran waits for a job. But the Federal Government cannot do the job by itself. It will be the responsibility of American industry and employers of labor to absorb these service men and women into gainful employment where they can, through their own efforts, build for a happy future. The bill properly stresses veterans' preference.

The bill wisely provides loans for the purchase, and construction of homes; buying or leasing farms or business properties and the purchasing of implements and equipment. Many will become owners of homes and farms and small businesses and through such ownership become a bulwark for the American way of life.

Many young men were taken from their studies to participate in the war. These veterans are entitled, if they so desire, to continue their studies and we have arranged to give encouragement through Government assistance.

While the Federal Government assists in the education of its dependents, we must make certain that it does not result in the Federal Government assuming control of education.

It is gratifying that this measure of justice to our servicemen is not partisan in character. It is a unanimous expression from all Americans that men and women, patriotic enough to fight for their country, shall have justice in the peace days.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with the unanimous report of the Committee on Rules. The original Senate bill is completely stricken out and virtually a substitute bill has been written by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Under the rule, it is made practically an original bill for consideration in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot too highly commend the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for bringing before the House the first important post-war bill. For many months, Members of the House have been talking about post-war measures and the importance of enacting that type of legislation immediately. This is the first bill of that character that has come before the House for consideration.

Those of us who served in the Congress just after the First World War will remember there was no particular committee to handle veterans' legislation. It went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and generally nothing was done for the veterans until several years after the war. Thank God, we have learned our lesson, and we do not propose, the Congress on both sides, Republicans and Democrats alike, do not propose that our returning veterans will

be forced to sell apples on the streets in the big cities of the country.

It is a good thing for the country, too, because these veterans know a great deal more than we did after the last war. They are much better educated as to their rights, and I do not believe these veterans would come home and sell apples as they did after the last war, because if that is all they were offered, I believe we would have chaotic and revolutionary conditions in America.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a special tribute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. The veterans have no better friend in the Congress and have not had for a great many years. The gentleman from Mississippi is a great American and devoted to our free institutions, to our American system, and to constitutional government. I have differed with the gentleman from Mississippi many times over racial issues, and probably will in the future, but there is no more useful Member of Congress than the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN, and no greater American. He is dynamic, able, and fearless. Without question he is the most eloquent orator in the House of Representatives, and, in my opinion, is the most effective debater in the entire Congress of the United States. He is to be commended for bringing this legislation before the House, making the Veterans' Administration a war agency. I think they might have gone further and taken the proposal that I offered some 6 months ago in the Congress, to create a Secretary of Veterans' Security, with a Cabinet position. The bill, however, goes to the extent of putting all veterans' interests under one administrator as a war agency, and placing it next to the Army and to the Navy.

It also provides for readjustment allowances—which are the words used instead of unemployment insurance—readjustment allowances of $20 a week for each veteran for a period of 26 weeks. The whole purpose of the bill is to create a square deal for the returning veteran.

When I proposed that there should be a Secretary of Veterans' Security, I did so because I believe, as a result of this war, there will be some 15,000,000, perhaps 16,000,000 servicemen before the war is over. Over a million have already been discharged. If you add those to the last war there will be almost 20,000,000 veterans, all of which will come under the Veterans' Administration. The expenditures will be so large that it is difficult to even approximate the amount. I should say in the first year it would amount to at least $5,000,000,000 and upward, and over a long period of years over $2,000,000,000 a year. Certainly any bureau or agency of the Government that has such vast administrative powers and expenditures of something upward of $2,000,000,000 annually should be headed by a Secretary of Veterans' Security with a place in the Cabinet.

I hope later on that the Committee on Veterans' Legislation will consider my bill and report favorably on it creating a Secretary of Veterans' Security with Cabinet status.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the first important post-war bill to reach the House. Today the Committee on Post-war and Economic Planning, a special House committee, approved—it has not the power to report to the House—but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTERS], a member of the committee, introduced the approved bill today, to terminate contracts which will go to the Committee on the Judiciary. This whole subject matter has been under consideration for at least 3 months by the special committee and its staff. I hope we will get definite action on it before the House recesses within the next 40 days. The House wants to act upon these post-war problems before adjourning for the summer. The Veterans' Legislative Committee has taken the lead today in bringing up for consideration veterans' legislation, and it is perfectly proper that that should have the right-of-way but there are many, many more important post-war problems that will have to be passed upon by the House, and I hope several of them will come up before we recess next month.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Do I understand the gentleman to state that the special committee created by the House to study post-war planning, headed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has agreed on a bill and introduced it and that it is now before the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. FISH. Yes; the special committee agreed on a bill today and issued a report on the bill. The committee has no right to report legislation.

Mr. SABATH. I understand.

Mr. FISH. But a distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] introduced that bill and it will go today to the Committee on the Judiciary. That is the result of months and months of arduous labor, and I think the House will be very well satisfied with the bill.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman understands why I propounded the question. There is a bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs, likewise a bill from the Committee on Military Affairs; then this committee too has been working on it. The Rules Committee is advising them that they should get together and agree on one bill. Since that time the Senate, of course, has acted and sent some kind of a bill over to the House. I hope the bill which has been introduced will eliminate some of the provisions of the Senate bill.

Mr. FISH. All the House is interested in is to have the best possible bill. The bill unanimously approved by the select committee will go to the Committee on the Judiciary. If the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], or the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], or others wish to offer their bills as substitutes they have a perfect right to do so and to appear before the Committee on the Judiciary or before the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in considering the bill that is to come before us today, I want to call the attention of the House to some of our experiences in the early days of veterans' legislation. In those days veterans' legislation went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which had other very important matters before it. It was very difficult to get any action. It was about a year and a half after the war that we created the World War Veterans' Legislative Committee. It might interest the House, in view of a bill introduced by me which passed this week authorizing the expenditure of $1,000,000 to provide seeing-eye or guide dogs for the blinded veterans to know the history of that committee. It came about as a result of a fight I made as a new Member of Congress over a period of 6 or 8 months, because I could not get action on a little bill of mine to increase the pay of attendants for blinded soldiers from $20 to $40, could not even get consideration of it before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. As a result of the refusal to consider bills of this type the House created the veterans' legislative committee. I believe I was the first to introduce a bill to create a separate veterans' legislative committee in the House. Both TOM CONNALLY and Royal Johnson introduced similar bills.

The servicemen of this war have the benefit of an important standing committee headed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. It has functioned properly and faithfully and has brought in this post-war bill for your action. It seeks to provide for a square deal for the veterans of World War No. 2.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I believe the people of my State are pretty much agreed that this bill ought to be passed with the exception of title 2. I have many, many telegrams and letters including telegrams and letters from my Governor and educators in the State of Nebraska. They are very much disturbed over title 2 providing for education of the veterans. They suggest that we substitute the Barden bill for this section. Did the gentleman discuss that matter with his committee?

Mr. FISH. Yes; that has been discussed in the Rules Committee. In the last analysis, of course, that is a matter to be decided by the House. This bill turns the power over to the Veterans' Administrator to select the schools they shall go to.

Mr CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I believe he is mistaken on that point.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Administrator must ask the boards in the various States.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected. The Administrator acts on the recommendation of the board of education, board of regents, or whatever educational authority exists in the various States.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; the educators and Governors of the various States are very

much disturbed over this section as written. They much prefer the provisions of the Barden bill.

Mr. FISH. I feel that it is advisable to wait until we get into the Committee of the Whole before we discuss this matter for there it will be discussed by members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The gentleman must know that the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], is an ardent States' rights man.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree.

Mr. FISH. And he is not going to bring in a bill that definitely violates States' rights. I trust, therefore, that the gentleman and other Members of the House who are interested in this matter will wait until it is presented in the Committee of the Whole by members of the legislative committee. There are very distinctly two sides to this controversial issue.

Mr. STEFAN. I inquired only to see whether the Rules Committee discussed title 2 and the Barden bill along with this one.

Mr. FISH. Yes; we did discuss it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes; but before I yield I want to say that the bill contains a proviso permitting World War veterans to have 1 year of education plus the amount of time they have spent in the service; that is if a veteran has been in the service 3 years he would have his original 1 year plus 3 more years, which would make a total of 4 years in postwar educational institutions. It is a very liberal bill and its provisions I believe are adequate. The question of the rights of States should be discussed and brought up in the Committee of the Whole, if the gentleman does not object.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly I do not object.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I want to point out that the rule specifically provides for the consideration of the Barden bill.

Mr. FISH. It is made in order at the proper time.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; and the House will be given ample opportunity to consider that under the rule.

Mr. FISH. As far as the actual working of the rule is concerned, the rule is wide open. The original bill is made in order, and amendments are in order to the House bill but not to the Senate bill. The Senate bill has been eliminated, and this rule presents a new bill, the House bill, coming in under the Senate title and open to amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the following letter from the national commander of the American Legion, Warren H. Atherton, presents a good résumé of the purposes of this bill and the Legion's views on it:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1944.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This morning the American Legion presented petitions to Congress from a million citizens who urged passage of the Legion's G. I. bill to aid veterans of World War No. 2; many of these petitioners were from your district.

The G. I. bill was introduced 4 months ago at the request of the American Legion. It provides a sound, orderly program of aid to veterans during the transition from military to civil life. The basic elements covered in the proposed law are:

Expansion of Veterans' Administration hospital facilities;

Added provisions for vocational training;

Authority to correct mistakes in discharges from service;

Educational aid;

Down payment loans to veterans for homes, farms, or businesses;

Unemployment insurance for veterans unable to secure employment; and

Veterans' Employment Service.

The Senate adopted S. 1767 on March 24, embodying the above principles.

The House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has favorably reported S. 1767, with amendments. As reported, the bill still embodies the principles we believe necessary to protect and aid discharged veterans of this war and to insure an orderly period of demobilization.

More than a million men and women have already been discharged from the service; there is urgent need for placing most of the bill's provisions in effect now; the bill has had careful study and consideration for 4 months; a long period of debate and consideration of amendments would further delay the application of the bill's remedies to those in immediate need; conceivably the bill might be improved in some slight degree, but we believe that the value of any changes would be doubtful as compared with the present carefully considered and prepared measure.

If you believe as we do that the Legion's G. I. bill will provide equitable treatment for the service men and women of World War No. 2, and security for their future, we urge you to vote for S. 1767 as reported by the House committee; any differences between the bill as adopted by the Senate and reported by the committee can be safely left to adjustment in conference.

Thanking you for your consideration of this letter and for your many past courtesies, we remain

Yours very truly,
WARREN H. ATHERTON,
National Commander.
F. M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director,
National Legislative Committee.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I shall address my remarks entirely to the rule. It is unfortunate that when so technical a bill as S. 1767 comes before the House we get into a discussion of the merits of the bill at a time when we are considering the rule only and not prepared to fully explain in detail the provisions of the bill.

All this rule does is to make in order the Senate bill, commonly known as S. 1767, or the G. I. bill. The procedure under the rule will be this: The Clerk will start to read S. 1767, and after the first section is read, the chairman of the House Veterans' Committee will move to strike out the rest of the Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the House version of the G. I. bill. The House version will then be considered as an original bill under the 5-minute rule. All germane amendments will be in order to that bill. There will be no limitation whatever on germane amendments to the House version of the G. I. bill.

In order to make doubly sure that this can be accomplished, the rule provides that the Barden bill shall be in order as an amendment or a substitute for title II of the House bill. At that time the Barden amendment can be thoroughly discussed, so that it will be thoroughly understood. That is all there is to it.

When the House bill is perfected and, after consideration of the Barden amendment, then there will be a vote on substituting the House bill for the Senate bill. If that is done, the discussion is ended in the Committee of the Whole. If the substitution is voted down, then the Senate bill will be taken up and read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. Let us adopt the rule and then let members of the Veterans' Committee, who are advised, explain the details of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein certain statements and excerpts as well as two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

FOR VETERANS' BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this bill. I am more inclined to the Senate bill than I am the House bill, but I will withhold my decision until I hear the House bill fully explained. If I vote to change the House bill, I will vote to make it stronger instead of weaker.

MOST SINISTER LOBBY EVER ORGANIZED

Mr. Speaker, if we pass bills like this without noticing what is going on elsewhere, it is possible that we will wake up one of these mornings and find our Constitution amended in a way that the debt cannot be paid. I desire to invite your attention to one of the most powerful, one of the most effective, most wealthy, and also the most sordid and most sinister lobby that has ever been organized in the history of the United States of America that is now trying to secure the adoption of a constitutional amendment for the purpose of limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes more than 25 percent or to tax gifts or to tax estates more than 25 percent.

EFFORT MADE TO SLIP THROUGH TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT

They are trying to do it quietly. You probably never heard of this proposal to get the twenty-second amendment to the United States Constitution adopted. I never heard of it until recently, and then I commenced to investigate, and I discovered that 14 States had already adopted it. Now I learn that 16 States have adopted it. This very clever group has devised a plan through which they believe they can by the town-hall method, slip through ar amendment to the Constitution of the United States doing exactly what I have said. That is

the important purpose and immediate objective of that sinister organization.

LOTS OF MONEY RAISED

This organization is headed by Mr. Frank Gannett, of New York, and a former Member of this House, a former Congressman from Indiana, Mr. Samuel Pettengill. They have been going all over the United States getting enormous sums of money, too, under the pretense that they would slip through this constitutional amendment and save these rich taxpayers enormous sums of money. The proof is abundant to that effect. You have not seen anything in the newspapers about it, probably because it has been concealed. A few weeks ago the New Jersey Legislature passed and adopted this proposal, although New Jersey had defeated it in 1939. You have not seen anything in the newspapers about that. It is not their policy to give publicity to it. They want to slip it through. They have devised this plan and through their clever attorneys and experts they have a scheme by operating through article V of the Constitution to get the Constitution amended, if they can, in a way that you will not know it, and before you know it, through the instrumentality of 36 State legislatures, no one State assuming much responsibility.

ARE WE RENDERING LIP SERVICE TO THE VETERANS?

If they are successful in their efforts we are just rendering lip service to the veterans and their dependents. We will not be able to take care of the men who have sacrificed; we will not be able to pay a penny to those who have lost eyes, legs, and arms, and are permanently disabled; we will not be able to pay anything to the widows and to the dependents of those who have given their lives upon the field of battle to save our country in time of war if this sinister organization succeeds in what is known to be its primary objective.

Furthermore, there will be no old-age assistance; there will be no social security. When this war is over we will have a national debt probably in excess of $300,000,000,000. The annual carrying charges for this enormous debt will be a minimum of $7,000,000,000 and probably more nearer $9,000,000,000. That, along with the minimum amount required for the operating expenses of this Government will take up all the tax money that can possibly be raised if this amendment is a part of our Constitution. Nothing will be left for the veterans, their dependents, or the aged. So while we are thinking about the servicemen and taking care of them, we better pay just a little attention to what is going on through this fascistic group, and it is a Fascist group. It is hiring people to run for office all over this country, promising to support them through a liberal contribution of funds, and they have plenty of money for that purpose if the ones agreeing to run will support their Fascist views and turn the country over to the rich.

RICH APPEALED TO

You can imagine how one of these people will go before a group of rich taxpayers and say, "Now, we are going to get this constitutional amendment through which will prevent your paying more than 25-percent income taxes annually." You take a taxpayer who paid $100,000 last year on a $150,000 income. Perhaps the ratio is not exactly right, but for the purpose of this illustration I presume it will suffice. He will take the position, "Why should I not pay $1,000 or $10,000 on this Gannett-Pettengill plan? It is a good risk. I can afford to speculate with a thousand dollars to save maybe $75,000 per year from now on." In that way they are raising barrels of money all over the United States expecting to slip through this amendment which will stop all aid to servicemen, all social security, and all old-age assistance.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I just do not have the time. My time is almost up; it is very limited.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman called them a Fascist group. Why?

FASCIST GROUP

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I called them a Fascist group.

Mr. CHURCH. Why refer to them as a Fascist group?

Mr. PATMAN. Because one of the organizers, promoters, and now one of their most active helpers, spent 2 years in Italy before the war studying fascism, and he is with them today, and he is working with them. Their activities have the brands and earmarks of fascism. You cannot judge it any other way. They want to turn the country over to the rich. If this amendment were to become law, in a few years a few families would own the entire wealth of this Nation. Is that not fascism? Certainly it is a justified charge.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas. He is giving the House and the country very valuable information.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, now, the gentlemen on the Republican side, of course, can laugh about it, as they indicate they would like to, but when you sit idly by and let this United States Constitution be amended that way, and then you can say to the veterans, "Yes; we tried to help you. We wanted to give you thousands of dollars apiece, but we had no way of paying it," why, it will become a very serious matter. When an organization can get up hundreds of thousands of dollars from every section of the United States, and spend it in every section of the United States, it is something that you had better give serious consideration to, because it is a very effective group.

Furthermore, in support of that group, this woman, Vivian Kellems, is out making speeches to repeal the sixteenth amendment and adopt the twenty-second amendment that is being sponsored by the Gannett-Pettengill crowd. She is out making speeches for them—the woman who now refuses to pay her income tax and advises everybody else to refuse to pay their income taxes. She is out making speeches for this proposal which will deny to all veterans, all veterans' widows, all disabled soldiers, all old-age assistance people, one penny in the future, if this sinister amendment becomes the law. Vivian Kellems says in her speeches:

> There is on foot, and well under way, a move to repeal the sixteenth amendment.

Remember now, this crowd first wants to repeal the sixteenth amendment and to set in its place the twenty-second amendment, which would limit the amount the Federal Government could tax our incomes to 25 percent. She says:

> I would repeal the sixteenth amendment. Like grandpaw, in You Can't Take It With You, I do not believe in it.

She is advocating the Gannett-Pettengill twenty-second amendment. This is something, I believe, that should receive immediate attention by this Congress. It is too serious to escape notice. It involves every appropriation that we make. We might just as well not make an appropriation if we are going to permit our United States Constitution to be amended in any such town-hall-meeting fashion as this. They have already gotten, or they are securing, according to their own claims, from one to four thousand influential people in every congressional district in this country that will stand up at the proper time and say "Support the Constitution. Support the Constitution. The Constitution says no taxes over 25 percent. Let us stay by it." In the meantime they are trying to defeat all Members of Congress they believe will interfere with their plans.

Whenever you permit the Gannett-Pettengill amendment to become the twenty-second amendment, you destroy this Government.

MORE ABOUT TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT

I am inserting herewith an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Record, Saturday, April 15, 1944, concerning the proposed twenty-second amendment to the Constitution. It is as follows:

A MILLIONAIRES' AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION?

"The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread."

So observed Anatole France. The same "majestic equality" is behind the proposal of a millionaires' lobby to amend the Constitution of the United States limiting income taxes—on poor and rich alike—to 25 percent.

Under that proposed amendment, a Henry Ford, who now pays about $800,000 taxes on a $1,000,000 income, could not be charged more than $250,000.

And Joe Smith, who now pays perhaps $175 taxes on a $2,000 income, could have his taxes boosted to $500.

You will be surprised—as many have been—to learn that 16 States so far have passed resolutions demanding such a constitutional amendment, including Pennsylvania, and, most recently, New Jersey. Governor Edge signed the Jersey resolution April 5.

Thirty-two States can compel Congress to call a constitutional convention to act on this amendment.

SPONSORED BY NOTORIOUS COMMITTEE

This proposed constitutional amendment is being promoted by the notorious Committee

for Constitutional Government, headed by Frank Gannett.

Under its terms, not only income-tax rates but also inheritance-tax rates would be put under the 25-percent limit, except in wartime.

Effect of the scheme would be to repeal the present income-tax law and destroy its basic principle of levying taxes according to ability to pay.

Should the amendment be adopted: (a) Taxes on big incomes would be slashed; (b) to make up for the decline in Federal income, taxes on lower and middle bracket incomes would have to be increased heavily.

We do not believe this amendment ever can be adopted—if the public is kept aware of what is going on.

But the very fact that 16 States have been swung into line thus far is warning that vigilance in this matter is long overdue.

So far some 250,000 circulars have been distributed by Gannett's committee; it is reported to have a campaign fund of $50,000; it enjoys support of the Hearst press; and it is endorsed by several Members of Congress and, significantly, by many ex-America Firsters.

WHILE SOLDIERS FIGHT FOR THEIR COUNTRY THESE MEN FIGHT FOR THEIR PURSES

Remembering that many voters are away fighting for their country while these men fight for their purses, and that public attention has been fixed on the war—liberals will do well not to underestimate the danger from this movement.

Indeed, some people may be deceived by its surface plausibility, by its pretense of equality.

Not, however, if they remember the days when a reactionary Government in Washington granted poor and rich alike the privilege of selling apples on street corners.

EVEN MORE ABOUT TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT

I am inserting herewith an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Record, Tuesday, May 2, 1944, concerning the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution. It is as follows:

THEY HATE THE PRESIDENT WORSE THAN HITLER: NO. 2

The above is not written in perfect English, but we think you get the idea.

Second portrait in our gallery of Roosevelt-haters is that of Frank Gannett, of Rochester, N. Y., head of the third largest newspaper chain in the country.

Mrs. Gannett once told an amusing story. She was about to give a dinner party and couldn't find flowers in the colors she wanted. So she took what flowers she had in her garden and dusted them with colored chalk powder—until the blooms were in the exact hue desired.

This is how Gannett handles news and information. He takes a fact or an idea, dusts it with the powder of prejudice against the President—and lo, the result is colored precisely as he wants it.

By this device he managed to portray proposed expansion of social security as a New Deal plot to get "itching hands" on the $30,000,000,000 assets of United States life insurance companies. With the same device he argued that the President was dragging the country into war, and he now uses it to claim the President laggard in the war effort.

No matter what Roosevelt does, Frank Gannett gets out his editorial flit gun, sprays prejudice powder—and proves F. D. R. wrong.

Gannett knows all about war. He is waging one. Against the President, of course.

Right now he is in the news for two engagements on this Gannett second front:

(a) His sponsorship of the millionaires' amendment to the income tax law, which would limit rich men's income taxes to 25 percent, and boost the taxes of small wage earners to make up for lost revenue;

(b) His attempt to suppress John Roy Carlson's famous book, Under Cover, a campaign in which the publishers, E. P. Dutton & Co., charged intimidation, and which has had the effect of keeping Carlson's volume No. 2 in the non-fiction popularity list.

But the Gannett hatred of Roosevelt goes way back. It was a hate set deep, like a toad in its hole. In 1930 Gannett charged the President with creating unemployment, and causing hundreds of thousands to lose their homes and businesses. A few months later, with a perfectly straight face, Gannett announced that the year had been so profitable for his papers that all employees of more than a year's service would be paid a bonus.

It was during the Supreme Court fight that Gannett set up his committee for constitutional government, which ever since has whanged the tom-toms of reaction and hate.

WIN WAR BY CUTTING INCOME TAXES

It is this outfit which is now waging Gannett's fight to help the war effort by cutting income taxes. A new publication, Needed Now, tells of its various fights to wrap reactionary greed in the Constitution, of its war against the third term, of its campaign for a $400,000 fund, and its boasts that since 1937 the Gannett propaganda machine has sent out:

Eighty-two million pieces of literature; 760,000 books; more than 10,000 radio transcriptions, 350,000 telegrams, full-page ads in 536 newspapers, and thousands of weekly releases to newspapers.

Gannett, in addition, has sent countless letters to private individuals urging them to bigger and better hatred of the President.

We have looked through them for hatred of Hitler. But mention of the Nazi seldom appears—except for one purpose:

To argue that Roosevelt is imitating Hitler.

What ails Gannett?

Some of his friends say it's astigmatism.

As a Presidential candidate in 1940, he couldn't see the link between democracy—the will of the people—and the reelection of Roosevelt. As a businessman he couldn't see the connection between New Deal recovery and the fact that his own business made $600,000 more in 1938 than it had made in the last G. O. P. year of 1932.

As a citizen he now cannot see why it is atrocious taste and worse patriotism to be doing his fighting against the President and for a cut in income taxes of the rich at a time when Americans are dying on the battlefield that the right of the Gannetts to gripe shall be preserved.

Somebody once pointed out that Gannett was a Democrat until he paid off the first quarter of a million dollars he owed. Then he became a Republican.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some letters on the St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned with the merits or demerits of any constitutional amendment. We in this country believe in free speech and the right of any American citizen to advocate any change in our form of government through a constitutional amendment in the regular and orderly way. That is what Mr. Gannett and Mr. Pettengill have been doing. There are no more loyal, patriotic citizens in this country than Frank Gannett and former Congressman Sam Pettengill, and I want to deny that part of the statement that has just been made that either of these patriotic gentlemen, whom we all know, is connected, directly or indirectly, with any Fascist group in America.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I would like to know what difference there is, as far as Americanism is concerned, between a group that seeks to limit the taxing power of the Federal Government and a group which seeks to confiscate all of the property of the Nation and operate it upon a socialistic basis?

Mr. FISH. Let me say to the gentleman, without going into that issue, that we still live in a free country. All sovereign Americans have a right to their views and to express them, and that is what Mr. Gannett has done, and that is what Sam Pettengill has done. I repeat, there are no better Americans in the country than these two gentlemen and firm supporters of representative and constitutional government. I wish there were more of them for the good of the country and the preservation of American ideals, traditions, and our republican form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the first one of major importance that I, as a freshman Member, have had an opportunity to follow through from its inception to presentation on the floor of the House.

If every member of the public could have had a seat in the committee room and observed the manner in which this committee performed, often in their shirt sleeves, I am sure their faith in our legislative processes would have been justified or restored.

Of course, there were some differences in opinion—but at no time was there any evidence of irritation—at no time did tempers grow short. Individual ideas of each member gave way to the opinion of the majority without any attempt to push through pet proposals.

On the major features the result to be obtained was first determined, then discussion was had upon its effect upon the

veteran and the Nation, and finally the methods best suited to achieve the desired results were carefully considered.

Every member worked long and faithfully, sometimes far into the night, cheerfully sharing the task before them.

Each paragraph, each phrase and—I may even add—each punctuation mark was carefully scrutinized and analyzed, and its effect carefully measured.

Whether the results obtained and reflected in this bill are good is for you to judge.

Incidentally, among the members of the committee you will find one veteran of this conflict, a past national commander of the V. F. W., three past State commanders of the American Legion, other veterans of World War No. 1, and fathers of members of today's armed forces, and one, while not a war veteran, is a veteran of many campaigns on behalf of veterans—the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. Every member has the welfare of present and future veterans close to his heart.

Through all the deliberations we did not lose sight of the fact that our paramount obligation is to those who have and will become disabled—that they must be cared for first and best at any cost—even, if necessary, to the abolition of any or all of the costly measures incorporated in this bill—a cost as yet unknown.

As we visualized our objective as expressed by the leaders of our great veteran organizations, we were to place our returning veterans, as nearly as possible, in the position they would have held had it not been for the incident of their service—service which in many cases has already extended over 3½ years—which may ultimately extend to 5 or 6 years—a period of service that will make readjustment to civil life difficult at best.

These men, as we did 25 years ago, will desire to be free from governmental control and restraint. They will desire to be civilians—free, unfettered, unregimented, self-reliant, courageous—facing the future unafraid.

Hence, it was the express purpose that these men should be freed from red tape—able to go to only one agency for the service to which they are entitled—an agency which has for nearly a quarter of a century dealt with veterans and their problems with full and complete sympathetic understanding. That one agency is the Veterans' Administration.

To help them help themselves to reestablish and readjust themselves has been the aim of this bill as brought to you by your committee.

In many ways this bill is probably more liberal than these soldiers themselves might ask—especially if we, with our productive genius, wisdom, and determination, make it possible for them to realize the dream they have had in fox holes and swamps—of getting a job—buying a radio, car, home—and settling down to a normal, peaceful American life.

This bill, as it now appears before you, has eliminated all overlapping governmental bureaus and agencies with no experience relating to veterans, concentrating all matters within the jurisdiction of the experienced Veterans' Administration, an agency that 25 years ago supervised the education of over 300,000 and will again do so for 1,500,000 disabled men who will come under the supervision of this agency.

Having brought this war to a speedy, victorious end, and having returned these veterans of more than 50 fronts to their homes, this bill will in its major items—

First. Provide education in the school of their choice to those whose education was interrupted, under a plan simple in terms and administration.

Second. Enable them to readjust themselves to their regained position in civil life if by chance they are unable to enjoy continuous employment.

Third. Aid in purchase of a home, farm, or business through local, State, or Federal financial agencies of their choice—earning and going their own way.

This bill is the summation of literally hundreds of measures dealing with the problems of veterans of whom there are already one and one-fourth millions. It is imperfect, as all works of men are imperfect. Hence, our minds are open to constructive suggestions, improvements are welcomed, and we all sincerely hope that the provisions of this bill will be considered with open minds by Members of the House.

Much yet remains to be done before we can celebrate the return of our victorious troops, but this readjustment bill will help them upon their return—their return now or later, to their well-earned reward of a stable, peaceful future as self-reliant, self-supporting citizens of our American communities.

TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is but natural that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] defends Mr. Gannett and Mr. Pettengill, whom the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has pointed out, through the means of organizations which they formed, have been for some time working to bring about the repeal of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution. They have been working secretly in an undercover manner to bring about the adoption of the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution that would limit Congress from imposing more than a 25-percent income tax on the wealthy gentlemen and their corporations. The gentleman from Texas did not charge that they were unpatriotic or disloyal, but he did say that they were Fascists and are pursuing contemptible Fascist aims.

If I am not mistaken, Mr. Gannett is a publisher and at one time aspired to be a candidate for President or Vice President on the Republican ticket—I do not recollect which. Of course I know Mr. Pettengill because I served with him in this House, and I know of his reactionary views and of his desire to serve the Republican interests. Since joining the Republican Party he has been regarded by some of us as a renegade Democrat and this term may be rightly applied when he assumed the treasurership of the Republican National Committee or when he assumed the chairmanship of the Republican National Finance Committee for the purpose of aiding that organization in the matter of the 1942 elections.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Pettengill is not now connected with the Republican National Committee as treasurer.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to the fact he is no longer the treasurer of the Republican National Committee. However, I am certain, as I have stated, that he is now devoting himself to publicity and to the activities for the organization which has been campaigning for the past 2 years to limit the powers of Congress in imposing an income tax not to exceed 25 percent on the income of those in the higher brackets. I am informed that Mr. Pettengill succeeded Mr. Frank Gannett as chairman of the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government, Inc., as of January 21, 1940. This organization was disbanded in April 1941 and was immediately succeeded by a District of Columbia incorporation known as the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., with Mr. Pettengill as chairman and president of the successor organization. Mr. Pettengill is still listed as a member of the board of advisers of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., and it can be assumed that Mr. Pettengill was active in the affairs of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., at the same time that he was holding the post of chairman for the Republican National Finance Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my recollection is right in recalling that a year and a half or 2 years ago this organization under the cloak of being a patriotic society enlisted the cooperation of school children through the medium of essay competitions in justifying their activities by offering prizes for the best compositions on free enterprise and constitutional government. This program undoubtedly served as missionary work in establishing the worthy objects of the organization in the eyes of schools and educational institutions in preparation and to assist in the ultimate purpose of having them later subscribe to the real objective of the organization in obtaining favorable recognition of the 25-percent limitation of income tax.

This organization, as the gentleman from Texas has stated, is collecting tremendous sums of money to carry out the purposes of the organization. I know that very few of the Members here know of these activities. Be that as it may, I do not know as to the arrangements or compensation that Mr. Pettengill is receiving for his work but, undoubtedly, the compensation must be much greater than the very liberal salary he draw from the Republican National Committee. We who have served with him know he is a

very astute and capable gentleman and that he is not doing this work for glory but must be handsomely compensated. I wish it to be understood that engaging in such service does not make him unpatriotic or disloyal and, consequently, the gentleman from Texas should not be criticized. In fact, we who have heard him should commend him for informing us of the activities of the organization which these two gentlemen represent.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the magazine Coronet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials on Free Ports for Refugees, one from the New York Post and the other from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a pamphlet published by the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, including an estimate of the liabilities created by the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937 as required by subsection (d) of section 15 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1944.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RETIRED OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR WHOM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE IS HOLDING DECORATIONS, ORDERS, MEDALS, OR PRESENTS TENDERED THEM BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS (H. DOC. NO. 583)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am forwarding, for the consideration of the Congress, a communication from the Secretary of State transmitting a list of those retired officers or employees of the United States for whom the Department of State under the provisions of the act of January 31, 1881 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 115), is holding decorations, orders, medals, or presents tendered them by foreign governments. The list has been divided into two parts (1) those countries which are cobelligerent or friendly nations and (2) enemy countries. It is believed that the Congress may wish to consider a joint resolution suspending the operation of Public Resolution No. 52 of June 27, 1934, until such time as the international situation would permit wholly objective consideration of such matters, or to consider granting legislation at this time to permit only of distributions of decorations, et cetera, to the recipients intended by friendly governments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1944.*

[Enclosures: 1. From the Secretary of State; 2. List.]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AID FOR THE READJUSTMENT IN CIVILIAN LIFE OF RETURNING WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1767, with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the substitute committee amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The committee substitute amendment is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

TITLE I

CHAPTER I—HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 100. The Veterans' Administration is hereby declared to be an essential war agency and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities, in personnel, equipment, supplies, and material under any laws, Executive orders, and regulations pertaining to priorities, and in appointments of personnel from civil-service registers the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby granted the same authority and discretion as the War and Navy Departments and the United States Public Health Service.

SEC. 101. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Federal Board of Hospitalization are hereby authorized and directed to expedite and complete the construction of additional hospital facilities for war veterans, and to enter into agreements and contracts for the use or transfer of suitable Army and Navy hospitals by the Veterans' Administration after cessation of hostilities or after such institutions are no longer needed by the armed services; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to establish necessary regional offices, suboffices, branch offices, contact units, or other subordinate offices in centers of population where there is no Veterans' Administration facility, or where such a facility is not readily available or accessible: *Provided*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary for the construction of additional hospital facilities.

SEC. 102. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy are hereby granted authority to enter into agreements and contracts for the mutual use or exchange of use of hospital and domiciliary facilities, and such supplies, equipment, and material as may be needed to operate properly such facilities, or for the transfer, without reimbursement of appropriations, of facilities, supplies, equipment, or material necessary and proper for authorized care for veterans, except that at no time shall the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs enter into any agreement which will result in a permanent reduction of Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary beds below the number now established or approved, plus the estimated number required to meet the load of eligibles under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or in any way subordinate or transfer the operation of the Veterans' Administration to any other agency of the Government.

Nothing in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or any other act, shall be construed to prevent the transfer or detail of any commissioned, appointed, or enlisted personnel from the armed forces to the Veterans' Administration subject to agreements between the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs: *Provided*, That no such detail shall be made or extend beyond 6 months after the termination of the war.

SEC. 103. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall have authority to place officials and employees designated by him in such Army and Navy installations as may be deemed advisable for the purpose of adjudicating disability claims of, and giving aid and advice to, members of the Army and Navy who are about to be discharged or released from active service.

SEC. 104. No person shall be discharged or released from active duty in the armed forces until his certificate of discharge or release from active duty and final pay, or a substantial portion thereof, are ready for delivery to him; and no person shall be discharged or released from active service on account of disability until and unless he has executed a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization, to be filed with the Veterans' Administration or has signed a statement that he has had explained to him the right to file such claim: *Provided,* That this section shall not preclude immediate transfer to a veterans' facility for necessary hospital care, nor the discharge of any person who refuses to sign such claim or statement: *And provided further,* That refusal or failure to file a claim shall be without prejudice to any right the veteran may subsequently assert.

Any person entitled to a prosthetic appliance shall be entitled, in addition, to necessary fitting and training, including institutional training, in the use of such appliance, whether in a service or a Veterans' Administration hospital, or by out-patient treatment, including such service under contract.

SEC. 105. No person in the armed forces shall be required by any official thereof to sign a statement of any nature relating to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease or injury he may have, or any other statement against his own interest, and any such statement against his own interest signed at any time, shall be null and void and of no force and effect.

CHAPTER II—AID BY VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 200. (a) That upon certification to the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of paid full-time accredited representatives of the veterans' organizations specified in section 200 of the act of June 29, 1936 (Public Law No. 844, 74th Cong.), and other such national organizations recognized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs thereunder in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized and directed to permit the functioning, in accordance with regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, of such accredited representatives in military or naval installations on shore from which persons are discharged or released from the active military or naval service: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall operate to affect measures of military security now in effect or which may hereafter be placed in effect, nor to prejudice the right of the American Red Cross to recognition under existing statutes.

(b) The necessary regulations shall be promulgated by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy jointly with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accomplish the purpose of this section, and in the preparation of such regulations the national officer of each of such veterans' organizations who is responsible for claims and rehabilitation activities shall be consulted. The commanding officer of each such military or naval installation shall cooperate fully with such authorized representatives in the providing of available space and equipment for such representatives.

CHAPTER III—REVIEWING AUTHORITY

SEC. 300. The discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court martial of any person from the military or naval forces, or the discharge of any such person on the ground that he was a conscientious objector who refused to perform military duty or refused to wear the uniform or otherwise to comply with lawful orders of competent military authority, or as a deserter, or of an officer by the acceptance of his resignation for the good of the service, shall bar all rights of such person, based upon the period of service from which he is so discharged or dismissed under any laws administered by the Veterans Administration: *Provided,* That in the case of any such person, if it be established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that at the time of the commission of the offense such person was insane, he shall not be precluded from benefits to which he is otherwise entitled under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration: *And provided further,* That this section shall not apply to any war risk, Government (converted), or national service life-insurance policy.

SEC. 301. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, after conference with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, are authorized and directed to establish in the War and Navy Departments, respectively, boards of review composed of five members each, whose duties shall be to review, upon the request of a former officer or enlisted man or woman or, if deceased, by the surviving spouse, child, or dependent parent, the type and nature of his discharge or dismissal, except a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court martial. Such review shall be based upon all available records of the service department relating to the person requesting such review, and such other evidence as may be presented by such person. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony either in person or by affidavit and the person requesting review shall be allowed to appear before such board in person or by counsel: *Provided,* That the term "counsel" as used in this section shall be construed to include, among others, accredited representatives of veterans' organizations recognized by the Veterans' Administration under section 200 of the act of June 29, 1936 (Public Law No. 844, 74th Cong.). Such board shall have authority, except in the case of a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court martial, to change, correct, or modify any discharge or dismissal, and to issue a new discharge in accord with the facts presented to the board. The Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy are hereby amended to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to establish such boards of review, the findings thereof to be final subject only to review by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively: *Provided,* That no request for review by such board of a discharge or dismissal under the provisions of this section shall be valid unless filed within 10 years after such discharge or dismissal or after the effective date of this act whichever be the later.

TITLE II

CHAPTER IV—EDUCATION OF VETERANS

SEC. 400. (A) Subsection (f) of section 1, title I, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, added by the act of March 24, 1943 (Public Law No. 16, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Any person who served in the active military or naval forces on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war, shall be entitled to vocational rehabilitation subject to the provisions and limitations of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part VII, or to education or training subject to the provisions and limitations of part VIII hereby added to said regulation."

(B) Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) is hereby amended by adding a new part VIII as follows:

"PART VIII

"1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, who is discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions, shall be entitled to financial assistance to enable him to undertake and pursue a course of education or training as may be elected by him, subject to regulations promulgated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to the authority and within the limitations herein contained: *Provided,* That such course be initiated not later than 2 years after discharge or after the termination of the war, whichever be the later date, and that no such schooling or training shall be afforded beyond 7 years after the termination of the present war: *Provided further,* That he served 90 days or more, or was discharged within such period by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability: *And provided further,* That his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of entrance into such service, or that he requires a refresher or retraining course, in no event to exceed 1 year, to fit him for employment or to practice a profession. Any such person, upon application, shall be afforded a course of education or training or a refresher or retrainer course not to exceed 1 calendar year. Upon satisfactory completion of such course of education or training, except a refresher or retrainer course, a veteran shall, upon application to the Veterans' Administration and subject to the provisions of this title, be entitled to an additional period or periods of continuous instruction not to exceed the time the person was in active service on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, exclusive of (1) the 90 days' qualifying service, and (2) any period he was assigned for education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program or as a cadet at one of the service academies: *Provided,* That in no event shall the total period of education or training exceed 4 years.

"2. A veteran eligible under this part may enroll in any school or institution of his choice, which will accept him, for education or training, and may, for reason satisfactory to the Administrator, change a course or institution: *Provided,* That any course of education or training under this part may be discontinued at any time if it is found by the Administrator that the conduct or progress of the veteran is unsatisfactory: *Provided further,* That the Administrator from time to time shall secure from the appropriate agency of each State, Territory or possession, or of the District of Columbia, a list of all schools or institutions equipped to supply education or training within such jurisdiction, which schools and institutions, and such additional public or private schools or institutions as may be recognized by the Administrator, shall be deemed qualified to enroll eligible veterans approved for education or training under this part.

"3. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part each veteran, upon application, shall be paid a maintenance allowance of $50 per month if without a dependent or dependents, or $75 per month if he have a dependent or dependents: *Provided,* That no maintenance allowance shall be paid for other than full-time enrollment and attendance inclusive of leave as may be authorized under this part: *Provided further,* That any person eligible for the benefit of this part who is also eligible for the benefit of part VII may elect which benefit he desires: *And provided further,* That subsistence allowance hereunder shall not, in the event of such an election, exceed the amount of additional pension otherwise payable were the training under said part VII.

"4. Any person eligible under this part, and within the limitations thereof, may pursue such full- or part-time course or courses as he may elect without maintenance allowance.

"5. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay to the school or institution for each person enrolled in full-time or part-time

courses of education or training under this part the customary cost of the tuition, laboratory fees, books, supplies and equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of any charge for maintenance, as are generally required for successful pursuit and completion of the course in the institution by other students, but such payment shall not exceed $500 for each regular school year: *Provided*, That no expenses for infirmary and medical care other than those included in the customary fees, or for travel, shall be authorized under this part.

"6. No department, agency, or officer of the United States in carrying out the provisions of this part shall exercise any supervision or control whatsoever over any State educational agency or State apprenticeship agency or any educational or training institution.

"7. The authority vested in the Administrator by paragraphs 2, 6, and 7, part VII, Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, with respect to vocational rehabilitation shall be vested in, and may be exercised by him with respect to education or training under this part.

"8. In the event a veteran applies for and receives maintenance benefits under this part and subsequently, for any reason, ceases to receive such benefits and becomes eligible to receive allowances under title V of this act, any benefits received under this part shall be deducted from the total allowances provided in title V of this act."

SEC. 401. Section 3, Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, 'Salaries and expenses, medical and hospital, and compensation and pensions,' shall be available for necessary expenses under part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes thereof. Such expenses may include, subject to regulations issued by the Administrator and in addition to medical care, treatment, hospitalization, and prosthesis, otherwise authorized, such care, treatment, and supplies as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a)."

SEC. 402. Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section 4 to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Any books, supplies, or equipment furnished a trainee or student under part VII or part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) shall be deemed released to him: *Provided*, That if he fail, because of fault on his part, to complete the course of training or education afforded thereunder, he may be required, in the discretion of the Administrator, to return any or all of such books, supplies, or equipment not actually expended or to repay the reasonable value thereof."

SEC. 403. Paragraph 1, part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), (Public Law No. 16, 78th Cong.) is hereby amended by inserting after the word "time" in line 2 the words "on or" and deleting the date "December 6, 1941" and substituting therefor the date "September 16, 1940."

TITLE III—LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

CHAPTER V—GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOANS

SEC. 500. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be eligible for the benefits of this title. Any such veteran may apply within 2 years after separation of the applicant from the military or naval forces, or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is the later date, but in no event more than 6 years after the termination of the war, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the guaranty by the Administrator of not to exceed 50 percent of a loan or loans for any of the purposes specified in sections 501, 502, and 503; provided that the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $1,500. If the Administrator finds that the veteran is eligible for the benefits of this title and that the loan applied for appears practicable, the Administrator shall guarantee the payment of the loan or part thereof as set forth in this title.

(b) Interest for the first year on any loan or part thereof guaranteed by the Administrator shall be paid by the Administrator out of available appropriations. No security for the guaranty of a loan shall be required except the right to be subrogated to the lien rights of the holder of the obligation which is guaranteed.

(c) Loans guaranteed by the Administrator under this title shall be payable under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That loans guaranteed by the Administrator shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding 6 percent per annum and shall be payable in full in not more than 20 years. The Administrator is authorized and directed to guarantee loans to veterans subject to the provisions of this title on approved applications made to persons, firms, associations, and corporations and to governmental agencies and corporations, either State or Federal.

Purchase or construction of homes

SEC. 501. (a) Any application made by a veteran under this title for the guaranty of a loan to be used in purchasing residential property or in constructing a dwelling on unimproved property owned by him to be occupied as his home may be approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs if he finds—

(1) that the proceeds of such loans will be used for payment for such property to be purchased or constructed by the veteran;

(2) that the contemplated terms of payment required in any mortgage to be given in part payment of the purchase price or the construction cost bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and that the nature and condition of the property is such as to be suitable for dwelling purposes; and

(3) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property or the construction cost, including the value of the unimproved lot, does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal.

(b) Any application for the guaranty of a loan under this section for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, or improvements in, or paying delinquent indebtedness, taxes, or special assessments on, residential property owned by the veteran and used by him as a home, may be approved by the Administrator if he finds that the proceeds of such loan will be used for such purpose or purposes.

(c) No first mortgage shall be ineligible for insurance under the National Housing Act, as amended, by reason of the guaranty of any loan made under this title, or by reason of the lien of the Government upon the property securing such guaranty.

(d) The Administrator may designate such agency or agencies as he deems appropriate for determining whether the guaranty of loans should be approved under this section.

Purchase of farms and farm equipment

SEC. 502. (a) Any application made under this title for the guaranty of a loan to be used in purchasing any land, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, or implements, or in repairing, altering, or improving any buildings, to be used in farming operations conducted by the applicant, may be approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs if he finds—

(1) that the proceeds of such loan will be used for payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used in bona fide farming operations conducted by him;

(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

(3) that the ability and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal.

Purchase of business property

SEC. 503. Any application made under this title for the guaranty of a loan to be used in purchasing any business, land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, or tools, to be used by the applicant in pursuing a gainful occupation (other than farming) may be approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs if he finds—

(1) that the proceeds of such loan will be used for payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used by him in the bona fide pursuit of a gainful occupation (other than farming);

(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such occupation;

(3) that the ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such occupation; and

(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal.

SEC. 504. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as are deemed necessary and appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title, and may delegate to a subordinate employee authority to approve loans subject to the provisions of this title and the rules promulgated thereunder.

TITLE IV

CHAPTER VI—EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

SEC. 600. In the enactment of the provisions of this title the Congress declares the intent and purpose that there shall be an effective job-counseling and employment-placement service for veterans, so that preference in placement shall be afforded qualified veterans, and in order to accomplish the foregoing purposes the responsibility for administering Federal aid in the employment of veterans is hereby vested in the Veterans' Administration. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to utilize agencies and facilities of the Federal Government whenever he determines that such utilization is necessary in securing the employment of veterans.

SEC. 601. Effective as of the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act the duties, powers, and functions of the Veterans' Employment Service, War Manpower Commission, under the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 114; 29 U. S. C. 49b), without exception, are hereby transferred to the Veterans' Administration.

Effective as of, but not later than, the date of termination of hostilities in the present war the duties, powers, and functions vested in the Director of Selective Service by subsection (g) of section 8 of the Selective Serv-

ice Act of 1940 (Public Law 783, 76th Cong., approved Sept. 16, 1940, as amended (U. S. C., title 50, sec. 308)), are hereby transferred to the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That the President is hereby authorized to effectuate such transfer of duties, powers, and functions at any time prior to the termination of the present war.

The records, property, and personnel of the Veterans' Employment Service, War Manpower Commission, are hereby transferred to the Veterans' Administration; and upon transfer of duties, powers, and functions vested in the Director of Selective Service as provided herein, the records and property of the Employment Division, Selective Service, shall be transferred to the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 602. In addition to such organization in the central office of the Veterans' Administration as is deemed necessary to administer the provisions of this title, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to appoint and assign to each of the States (the Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia) a veterans' employment representative, who shall be an honorably discharged war veteran and have resided in the State for a period of at least 6 months prior to his appointment, and who shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws, at a compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Each such veterans' employment representative shall be associated with the staff of the public employment service in the State (the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia) to which he has been assigned. He shall be administratively responsible to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the execution of the veterans' placement policies through the public employment service in the State (the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia). In cooperation with the public employment service staff in the State or on his own initiative, he shall—

(a) supervise the registration of veterans or register veterans in local employment offices for suitable types of employment;

(b) assist in securing and maintaining current information as to the various types of available employment in public works and private industry or business;

(c) promote the interest of employers in employing veterans;

(d) maintain regular contact with employers and veterans' organizations with a view of keeping employers advised of veterans available for employment and veterans advised of opportunities for employment;

(e) assist in every possible way in the advancement of employment of veterans; and

(f) see that any laws pertaining to veterans' preferences are enforced, and where possible, persuade employers to give the preference to any veteran who has qualifications equal to those of a nonveteran applicant for employment.

SEC. 603. There may be assigned by the administrative head of the employment service in the State one or more employees of the staffs of local employment service offices, whose services shall be primarily devoted to discharging locally the veterans' employment duties delegated to him by the State office and by the veterans' employment representative, Veterans' Administration, by agreement with the State office.

SEC. 604. Any Federal agency shall upon request furnish the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs such records, statistics, or information as may be necessary or appropriate in administering provisions of this title, and shall cooperate with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in providing employment opportunities for veterans.

SEC. 605. The unexpended balance of funds appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Veterans' Employment Service shall be transferred by the War Manpower Commission to the Veterans' Administration for use in carrying out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 606. The term "veteran" as used in this title shall mean a person who served in the active service of the armed forces during a period of war in which the United States has been or is engaged and who has been discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions.

TITLE V

CHAPTER VII—READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

SEC. 700. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released from active service under honorable conditions after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be entitled, in accordance with the provisions of this title and regulations issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant thereto, to receive a readjustment allowance as provided herein for each week of unemployment, up to 26 weeks, which (1) begins after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the date of enactment thereof, and (2) occurs during the 24-month period after discharge or release: *Provided*, That no such allowance shall be paid for any period for which he receives increased pension under part II of Veterans Regulation 1 (a) or a subsistence allowance under part VIII of such regulation: *Provided further*, That no readjustment allowance shall be payable for any week commencing more than 3 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war.

(b) Such person shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of unemployment if claim is made for such allowance and the Administrator finds with respect to such week that—

(1) the person is residing in the United States at the time of such claim;

(2) the person is completely unemployed, having performed no service and received no wages, or is partially unemployed in that services have been performed for less than a full workweek and the wages for the week are less than the allowance under this title plus $3;

(3) the person is registered with and continues to report to a public employment office, in accordance with its regulations;

(4) the person is able to work and available for suitable work: *Provided*, That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

CHAPTER VIII—DISQUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 800. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 700, a claimant shall be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

(1) he leaves suitable work voluntarily, without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct in the course of employment;

(2) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work to which he has been referred by a public employment office, or to accept suitable work when offered him; or

(3) he, without good cause, does not attend an available free training course as required by regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of this title.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 700, a claimant shall also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week with respect to which it is found that his unemployment is due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a labor dispute at the factory, establishment, or other premises at which he is or was last employed: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply if it is shown that—

(1) he is not participating in or directly interested in the labor dispute which causes the stoppage of work; and

(2) he does not belong to a grade or class of workers of which, immediately before the commencement of the stoppage there were members employed at the premises at which the stoppage occurs, any of whom are participating in or directly interested in the dispute: *Provided, however*, That if in any case separate branches of work, which are commonly conducted as separate business in separate premises, are conducted in separate departments of the same premises, each such department shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be a separate factory, establishment, or other premises.

(c) (1) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions of paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of this section, he shall be disqualified to receive any readjustment allowance for the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and for the three immediately following weeks. In addition, the total number of weeks for which he might otherwise be eligible to receive readjustment allowances shall be reduced by the number of weeks for which the claimant shall have been disqualified.

(2) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, he shall be disqualified to receive any readjustment allowance for the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and for all subsequent weeks until he has had substantially full-time employment for wages for a period of not less than 2 weeks, or, in the event of any subsequent disqualification, for such longer period as the Administrator may prescribe in such case, not to exceed 4 weeks.

(3) In addition to the disqualification prescribed in paragraph (c) (1) above, the Administrator may, in cases of successive disqualifications under the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, impose the disqualifications provided in paragraph (c) (2).

(d) (1) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work or the existence of good cause with respect to a claimant, the conditions and standards prescribed by the unemployment-compensation laws of the State in which he files his claim shall govern.

(2) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work, no work shall be deemed suitable for an individual if—

(A) the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute; or

(B) the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to him than those prevailing for similar work in the locality; or

(C) as a condition of being employed he would be required to join, or to resign from, or to refrain from joining, any labor union or labor organization.

CHAPTER IX—AMOUNT OF ALLOWANCE AND PAYMENT

SEC. 900. (a) The allowance for a week shall be $20 less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3: *Provided*, That where the allowance is not a multiple of $1, it shall be computed to the next highest multiple of $1.

(b) The number of weeks of allowances to which each eligible veteran shall be entitled shall be determined as follows: For each calendar month or major fraction thereof of active service the veteran shall be entitled to 3 weeks of allowances, but in no event to exceed the maximum provided in section 700.

SEC. 901. (a) Readjustment allowances shall be paid at intervals prescribed by the unemployment-compensation law of the State in which the claim was made.

(b) Any allowances remaining unpaid upon the death of a claimant shall not be considered a part of the assets of the estate of the claimant, or liable for the payment of his debts, or subject to any administration of his estate, and the Administrator may make payment thereof to such person or persons he finds most equitably entitled thereto.

SEC. 902. Any veteran who is self-employed in business, agriculture, or other pursuits in which a period of waiting is necessary before productive returns are normally available shall be eligible for the readjustment allowance not to exceed the period provided in this title upon application through the State representative to the Administrator and upon satisfactory showing of substantial (at least 50 percent) lack of normal return by reason of such waiting period.

Such self-employed veteran shall not be required to comply with the provisions of the unemployment-compensation laws of the various States, or be subject to the disqualification provisions hereof, but in lieu thereof shall furnish the Administrator with a statement of income each month.

Payments herein provided shall be made by the Administrator at the time and in the manner other payments are made to veterans by the Administrator.

CHAPTER X—ADJUSTMENT OF DUPLICATE BENEFITS

SEC. 1000. (a) Where an allowance is payable to a claimant under this title and where, for the same period, either an allowance or benefit is received under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law, the amount received or accrued from such other source shall be subtracted from the allowance payable under this title (except that this section shall not apply to pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration); and the resulting allowances, if not a multiple of $1, shall be readjusted to the next higher multiple of $1.

(b) In the event a veteran applies for and receives allowances under this title and subsequently, for any reason, ceases to receive allowances provided herein and becomes eligible to receive benefits under title II of this act, any allowances received under this title shall be deducted from the total allowances provided in title II.

CHAPTER XI—ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 1100. (a) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to administer this title and shall, insofar as possible, utilize existing facilities and services of Federal and State departments or agencies on the basis of mutual agreements with such departments or agencies. Such agreements shall provide for the filing of claims for readjustment allowances with the Administrator through established public employment offices and State unemployment compensation agencies. Such agencies, through agreement, shall also be utilized in the processing, adjustment, and determination of such claims and the payment of such allowances. To facilitate the carrying out of agreements with State departments or agencies and to assist in the discharge of the Administrator's duties under this title, a representative of the Administrator, who shall be an honorably discharged war veteran and have resided in the State for a period of at least 6 months prior to his appointment, shall be located in each participating State department or agency.

(b) The Administrator shall prescribe such rules and regulations and require such records and reports as he may find necessary to carry out the purposes, and consistent with the provisions, of this title.

(c) The Administrator may delegate to any officer or employee of his own or of any cooperating department or agency of any State such of his powers and duties, except that of prescribing rules and regulations, as the Administrator may consider necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of this title.

(d) Allowances paid by the cooperating State agencies shall be repaid upon certification by the Administrator. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, and without the necessity of audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall pay monthly to the departments, agencies, or individuals designated, the amounts so certified.

(e) The Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in advance or otherwise such sums as he estimates to be necessary to compensate any Federal department or agency for its administrative expenses under this title. Such sums shall cover periods of no longer than 6 months.

The Administrator shall also from time to time certify to the Social Security Board such State departments or agencies as may be participating in the administration of this title. Upon such certification the Social Security Board shall, in addition to the amounts certified under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State such amounts as the Board determines to be necessary for the administrative expense of such State under this title the additional amount so certified to be reimbursed out of the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration.

(f) Any money paid to any cooperating agency or person, which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the period covered by such payment or the agreement with such agency or person, be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current appropriation for carrying out the purpose of this title, or, if returned after the expiration of period covered by this title, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 1101. (a) No person designated by the Administrator as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any allowance certified by him under this title.

(b) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated by the Administrator.

SEC. 1102. Any claimant whose claim for an allowance has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal of the State agency. The representative of the Administrator located in each State shall be the final appellate authority in regard to contested claims arising in such State, subject to review by the Administrator.

CHAPTER XII—DECISIONS AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 1200. The authority to issue subpenas and provisions for invoking aid of the courts of the United States in case of disobedience thereto, to make investigations, and to administer oaths, as contained in title III of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2033–34; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 131–133), shall be applicable in the administration of this title.

CHAPTER XIII—PENALTIES

SEC. 1300. Any claimant who knowingly accepts an allowance to which he is not entitled shall be ineligible to receive any further allowance under this title.

SEC. 1301. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any allowance authorized under this title, or for the purpose of causing any allowance to be paid where none is authorized under this title, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any allowance under this title, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such claim, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

CHAPTER XIV—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 1400. As used in this title—

(a) The term "week" means such period or periods of 7 consecutive calendar days as may be prescribed in regulations by the Administrator.

(b) The term "United States" used geographically means the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(c) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(d) The term "wages" means all remuneration for services from whatever sources, including commissions and bonuses and the cash value of all remuneration in any medium other than cash.

TITLE VI

CHAPTER XV—GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1500. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the administrative, definitive, and penal provisions under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and the provisions of Public, No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended (38 U. S. C. 450, 451, 454a, and 456a), shall be for application under this act.

SEC. 1501. Except as otherwise specified the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 1502. Wherever used in this act, unless the context otherwise requires, the singular includes the plural, the masculine includes the feminine, and the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 1503. A discharge or release from active service under honorable conditions shall be a prerequisite to entitlement to veterans' benefits provided by this act or Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended: *Provided*, That, except as to a person dishonorably discharged, benefits to which a person would be entitled but for a discharge under other than honorable conditions shall not be denied if his service was otherwise meritorious, honest, and faithful.

SEC. 1504. The Administrator shall transmit to the Congress annually a report of operations under this act. If the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session, such reports shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

SEC. 1505. In the event there shall hereafter be authorized any allowance in the nature of adjusted compensation, any benefits received by, or paid for, any veteran under this act shall be charged against and deducted from such adjusted compensation; and in the event a veteran has obtained a loan under the terms of this act, the agency disbursing such adjusted compensation shall first pay the unpaid balance and accrued interest due on such loan to the holder of the

evidence of such indebtedness to the extent that the amount of adjusted compensation which may be payable will permit.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is understood that general debate is to continue not to exceed 2 days, and to be equally divided between me and the ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule so states.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. In view of the announcement just made by the chairman, can he advise the House as to when the bill will be read for amendment and when the final vote will come?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that we will not reach a final vote on the bill before next week. My offhand opinion is that it will be Wednesday or Thursday, but I would not like to say definitely until we proceed further.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman means that the bill will be under continuous consideration until next Wednesday or Thursday?

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that the House will not be in session on Saturday. Therefore, we shall probably not complete general debate this week. I believe that Monday is District of Columbia Day. On Tuesday there are several primary elections which Members of the House and probably some members of the committee would like to attend. So it is my intention at the proper time to ask unanimous consent that we skip over Tuesday in order to enable these Members to attend their primaries.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman feels certain the bill will not be read for amendment or voted on this week?

Mr. RANKIN. I am certain of that, and I think I am almost as certain that it will not be voted on or read for amendment before Wednesday.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, originated in the Senate, has been the subject of a great deal of controversy, a great deal of propaganda, and a great deal of unjust criticism inspired by certain interests that seemed to be more interested in putting over their program than they were in looking after the welfare of the veterans of this war.

When this measure came to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am chairman, I announced that we were not going to be stampeded. The committee held ample hearings on the bill, then went into executive session and held executive sessions on it for more than 2 weeks. We worked out a measure that we do not contend is perfect, but I certainly can say that we gave it a great deal more attention than was given it at the other end of the Capitol, where it was passed in 40 minutes in the closing days of a tiresome session.

A great deal of this criticism has been directed at me as chairman of the committee. I have been a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation ever since it was organized, and have been chairman of it for more than 12 years. My pole star has been the welfare of the veterans themselves and the welfare of the country.

We refuse to be stampeded, excited, or dominated by any outside influences that undertook to tell the Congress what to do. You are flooded now with telegrams from all over the country, telling you how to vote on this bill. Not one man out of a thousand who signed those telegrams ever saw a copy of it. Is that intelligent legislation?

On yesterday petitions alleged to have a million signatures on them were brought in here by the truckload and presented with reference to this legislation. We are unable to tell now whether they are in favor of the Senate bill as it came from the Senate or whether they want this measure passed as it was reported by the House committee.

The truth of the business is that not one person out of a hundred who signed those petitions ever saw this bill, not one out of a thousand ever read it, and probably not one out of ten thousand really understood it and understood what changes the House committee has made.

You can get up a petition in this country now for almost anything. That has always been the case. I remember many years ago in one of the towns of the district I represent one fellow offered to bet that he could get a petition signed to hang the best man in town. They had a little difficulty in deciding just who was the best man in town, but they finally agreed on one man who they thought surpassed probably any other man in town from the standpoint of moral, intellectual, and spiritual qualifications. They wrote their petition with a great many "whereases" and "wherefores" and "resolves," and camouflaged away down in the middle its real purpose, to hang this man. They got out and circulated that petition, and practically every person to whom they presented it signed it, and the man who was to be hanged signed it himself. That is just how silly the Congress makes itself when it undertakes to legislate by telegrams and by petition and by resolution coming from people who do not know what is in the legislation.

I have gone through a great many battles on veterans' legislation; I was here when the first adjusted compensation law was passed after the last war. I went through the 17-year battle which it took to get that paid. In 1929, I undertook to raise the presumptive period for World War veterans to 1930. We went through that battle, and I want to pause here to pay my tribute to the American Legion of Pennsylvania because, at that time, it had as its commander, a very splendid young man by the name of Frank Pinola, who lived, I believe, at Wilkes-Barre. That department of the American Legion backed that bill and we put it through the House by a vote of 324 to 49, and through the Senate by 66 to 6, or exactly 11 to 1. Yet I was told that some of the brass hats in the American Legion at that time undertook to punish Mr. Pinola and the Pennsylvania department, for that action.

The measure was vetoed. The veto was sustained by a few votes and then the disability-allowance bill was brought in and passed under a suspension of the rule, without any opportunity to amend and with little opportunity for debate. In a short time clamor came for an economy bill. You know the history of that proposition. In 1933 one of the first bills to pass here was the economy bill. That took away not only some of the benefits under the disability allowance act but it took away some of the benefits of those tuberculosis, cancer, and paralysis victims who were dying in the hospitals of the country. It took away the benefits of a great many men who were suffering from total and permanent disabilities which they had not been able to prove were service-connected. Those boys died and their widows and orphans got nothing. As I said the other day, many of them have dragged their children through the depression; they are widows of men, in my opinion, who contracted their disabilities on the battle fronts, if you please, in the trenches and on the firing line, but who waited too long to make application, or did not know of their physical condition until it was too late, and their widows and orphans were denied any compensation at all unless it could be shown that it was a service-connected disability. Some of those children are now fighting and dying on every battle front on which we are engaged. I opposed the so-called economy bill for that reason and begged that the veterans be left out, at least the ones who were suffering so violently and whose disabilities I felt confident should have been service-connected.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I was wondering if the gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, had offered any invitation to any of these signers of the telegrams or petitions to persuade not only the Members of this Congress but the committee what they should do on this legislation to appear while they were conducting hearings; and if that was done, what was the result?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I would not send out an invitation of that kind, because we have so many hundreds of people who want to come in here and tell the committees of Congress what to do that if we were to broadcast an invitation of that kind and then carry it out, we never would get time to consider the legislation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to observe that the Economy Act about which the gentleman spoke, was the second bill that came before that Congress and it did not even have a number on it, but merely carried the title "A Bill To Maintain the Credit of the United States."

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Our first duty is to the disabled veteran, to the maimed and the blind, and

the wounded and the tubercular, and the other disabled who come out of this war. I want to say to you now, regardless of all the propaganda, regardless of what any brass hats—temporary brass hats, if you please—may attempt to tell me, regardless of all the attacks made on the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation by flannel-mouthed politicians over the country, I am going to continue my fight to see that the disabled men are taken care of first.

This measure came to the committee and it was decided that there were some provisions that would need alterations. For that reason we went into executive session and worked for more than 2 weeks to that end. I want to say to you now that there was no politics in that committee. It is a rather cheap politician who attempts to make political capital out of the physical sufferings of the men who fight the battles of the Nation. The committee wrote this bill. The chairman of that committee did not attempt to dominate, and if he had, he could not have done so. We left every provision of this bill open for the committee to discuss and amend as they saw fit and they have done a remarkably good job with an awfully bad bill to start with. Someone has asked me in the last few minutes what this bill is going to cost. I have tried to find out and I just now got the information, signed May 11, 1944, in a letter which I am going to read to you because it is the only way to get the entire letter into the RECORD. It is from the Veterans' Administration and reads as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 11, 1944.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: Responding to your oral request for an estimate on the bill S. 1767 as reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation May 5, 1944, I desire, first of all, to express a word of caution to the effect that all estimates will depend upon so many at present undeterminable factors that they may be subject to variations either upward or downward. The present unknown factors which will have a determinative effect on the ultimate cost will include, among others, the following:

1. The total number of persons serving in the armed forces during the war period;
2. The length of the war;
3. The future character of the war and rate of discharges; and
4. The post-war economic situation with special reference to opportunities for employment. To the extent that returning veterans can promptly reenter industrial and other pursuits whether employed by self or others, the potential cost will be reduced.

While benefits (other than those of title III) are made available immediately after passage of this act, there will be little cost until after the end of the war, as employment conditions are favorable. Contingent upon the above, the cost may be estimated for each unit of 1,000,000 men in the service—the total may be approximated by multiplication by the estimated number of such units. The estimates are not given by calendar or fiscal years, as potential benefits—limited to specific extent—may be taken over a period of years not extending beyond 7 years after the end of the war. On this basis the estimate will be given for each title of the bill.

TITLE I

HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

It is not believed that this title will result in any increased expenditures either for benefits or administration which will not be offset by the authority contained in sections 101 and 102 for the transfer of facilities and supplies without reimbursement of appropriations.

TITLE II

EDUCATION OF VETERANS

The average cost per person per year is approximately $1,000. Assuming that there may be as much as 20 percent unemployment among returning veterans and that one-half of those unemployed will be eligible for and will seek education or training, it is estimated that the cost (including all expenses and maintenance allowance) for the first year of education or training for the resulting 100,000 per unit of 1,000,000 would approximate $100,000,000.

Dependent upon the length of service, and consequent entitlement to additional training, it may be estimated that recurrent expense not exceeding 3 years will approximate annually one-half of that amount for the first year of training or a total of $150,000,000 making a total of $250,000,000 per unit of 1,000,000 men in service.

ADMINISTRATIVE COST

During the period of the war, there will be no additional administrative cost inasmuch as the responsibilities under this title may be absorbed by the present vocational education machinery of the Veterans' Administration. In the post-war period there will be required additional employees, but the expense will be minimal. This title, as reported by the committee of which you are chairman, does not require the set-up of any additional machinery, either Federal or State, and due to the simple method of administration authorized, the administrative expense will not be material for the entire period.[1]

TITLE III

LOANS FOR VETERANS

Cost of benefits provided

This title provides for the paying out of no Government funds except by way of guaranty not to exceed 50 percent of a loan or loans, and in no event in an aggregate of more than $1,500 per veteran. It seems obvious that failure to repay loans will be contingent in part upon post-war economic conditions. Assuming that loans would be applied for in the maximum amount by 50 percent of the eligible veterans and that 10 percent of the amounts guaranteed would be uncollectible, the cost per unit of 1,000,000 men would approximate $75,000,000.

NOTE.—This would be extended over a period of more than 20 years.

INTEREST

Interest on guaranteed loan or loans is to be paid by the Administrator out of available appropriations at an estimated cost of approximately $45,000,000 (interest 1 year only.)

ADMINISTRATIVE COST

There would be no additional administrative cost until after the end of the war.[1]

TITLE IV

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

Cost of benefits provided

No additional money benefits are specified in this title.

Administrative cost

There should be no additional administrative expense occasioned by the discharge of this function by the Veterans' Administration which would not be incurred by the discharge of such functions through the United States Employment Service or the War Manpower Commission. Careful administration and cooperation will, of course, be necessary to prevent duplication, but ample authority is provided to insure such cooperation.

TITLE V

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

The maximum benefit per person is $520. On the same assumption stated with respect to title II, namely that 200,000 out of each unit of 1,000,000 men in service may be unemployed, that 50 percent would elect education or training and assuming that the remaining 50 percent or 100,000 would be entitled to the maximum benefits provided by this title, the total expense would approximate $52,000,000 (including those eligible but self-employed).

This is not a recurring expenditure, as the period is limited to 26 weeks during a total period of 2 years. Provisions are made both in titles II and V to insure that there will be no duplication of benefits.

ADMINISTRATIVE COST

Additional Federal machinery required will be minimal, inasmuch as most of the functions may be discharged through employment machinery prescribed by title IV, but there will be additional expense of administration by cooperating State and Federal agencies.[1]

TITLE VI

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

This title, among other things, declares the intention of the Congress that in the event there should be in the future, legislation of the nature of an Adjusted Compensation or Adjusted Service Pay Act, expenditures made under this act to or for a veteran shall be a charge against such adjusted service pay, and that any outstanding loan guaranteed for a veteran shall be liquidated to the extent his adjusted service pay will permit.

SUMMARY

Total of the above estimated expenditures per unit of 1,000,000 persons in the service	$434,000,000
Estimated total cost for 10,000,000	4,340,000,000
Estimated total cost for 15,000,000	6,510,000,000

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

If you will turn to title I, you will find that it covers the subject of hospitalization and also declares the Veterans' Administration to be an essential war agency and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities in personnel, equipment, supplies, and material under any laws, Executive orders, and regulations pertaining to priorities, and in appointments of personnel from civil-service registers the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is granted the same authority and discretion as the War and Navy Departments and the United States Public Health Service.

In that section there was a provision for the expenditure of $500,000,000 for

[1] It is difficult to estimate administrative cost. Supervision under the bill is minimal, particularly as to title II—Education. However, based upon Veterans' Administration experience over the period of the last 5 years the ratio of general administrative cost to expenditures for all purposes is 3 percent. On this basis, and it should not be exceeded over the entire period, the cost per unit would be $12,000,000.

hospital construction. We found that would have been a limitation, so that provision was stricken out and it just authorizes such appropriations as may be necessary.

Title II is the subject of education, about which you have heard so much discussion. The average cost, says General Hines, per person per year is approximately $1,000. Assuming that there may be as much as 20 percent of unemployment among returning veterans and that half of those unemployed will be eligible for and will seek educational training it is estimated that the cost, including all expenses and maintenances allowance for the first year of educational training for the resulting 100,000 per unit of 1,000,000 would approximate $100,000,000. That is for the first year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

Dependent upon length of service and consequent entitlement to additional training, it may be estimated that recurring expense, not exceeding 3 years, will approximate annually one-half of that amount for the first year of training, or a total of $150,000,000; making a total of $250,000,000 per unit of 1,000,000 men in service.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. That means per unit of 1,000,000 men?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MASON. And we must multiply by six or seven or whatever the number of units to get the total?

Mr. RANKIN. I think you could safely multiply by 10. That is more easily handled than any other figure you have mentioned, so that would be $2,500,000,000.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Does not the gentleman think you should more safely multiply that by 15, inasmuch as there are over 10,000,000 men in the service now, and there already have been 1,000,000 discharged?

Mr. RANKIN. Probably so. It might be best to split the difference and multiply it by 12. That would be $3,000,000,000.

While we are talking about education I want to remind the Members of this fact: We are getting all kinds of telegrams and messages to appropriate money for this, that, and the other, back in the States. Every State in this Union is better off financially today than the Federal Government. Every county in America is better off, proportionately, financially than the Federal Government. Every municipality is better off than the Federal Government. Every township is better off financially, proportionately, than the Federal Government. So it seems to me that the Federal Government ought to assume only those responsibilities that are necessary and incumbent upon it, because I want to tell you one of the dangers, as I see it in the future, is the probable bankrupt state of the Federal Treasury.

If the Federal Government had been as badly in debt proportionately when the Union was formed as it is today, the Union would never have been formed. There would have been no United States of America, as you and I know it. I am satisfied of that. This Capitol was placed where it is as a result of a compromise between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, with the understanding that the Federal Government would assume certain indebtedness incurred by the various Colonies.

I say to you—I might as well say this at this time—I am apprehensive that unless this Congress—and I am talking to you gentlemen now—in your hands rest the hope of the perpetuity of our form of government and our way of life, you Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. It has been with the consciousness of that responsibility that I have fought through this measure and other measures that have excited the public mind, and especially the minds of Members of the House in the last few months.

Suppose there should come a time in the future, after this war is over and we return to a peaceful state, and certain sections of the country were to say, "We are not going to pay this vast amount of indebtedness." That happened one time. You talk about our secession. The first resolution of secession ever passed in this country was at the Hartford Convention in 1814, during the second war with Great Britain. Delegates from that convention were on their way to Washington with the resolution when they found out the war was over. Suppose that position should be taken later. Suppose those great States to the northeast, from here to Maine, should say, "Well, we are wealthy States. Why should we assume such a stupendous part of this burden? We will go our way."

You know the Civil War did not settle the question of the right of secession. It only settled the power. It only settled the question as to whether or not any section of the country at that time had the power to secede. Suppose that sentiment were to spread abroad, and the people of the great Middle West would say, "Well, we feed and clothe you. If that is your attitude, then we might as well go our way." Then suppose the Pacific Coast States took the same attitude. It would only be a small matter for us to drag out the old Confederate flag and say, "Well, if that is your game, we know how to play it."

That is one of the dangers that I see ahead.

I tell you we have no right to spend money for these boys to pay back when they come home unless it is absolutely necessary. For that reason, we worked and toiled to bring this bill down within the bounds of reason. Bear in mind our first obligation is to the wounded, maimed, the blind, the disabled, the tubercular, the cancerous, and the victims of paralysis, and the other disabled victims of this conflict.

I am not going into the educational feature at this time. It is going to be debated very extensively on this floor. We are going to permit all the debate that is necessary.

We are in favor of maintaining the rights of the States and keeping as many bureaucrats' fingers out of it as we possibly can. In other words, we are legislating for the benefit of the veterans, and not to extend a sprawling bureaucracy over the Nation. But back to this title II: General Hines speaks of the administrative costs, but does not state exactly what they will be. We propose to permit the veteran to select his own school and to make it possible for him to go there, especially the ones who return disabled or the ones whose schooling has been interfered with.

Title III has to do with the subject of loans for the purchase and construction of homes, farms, business, and so forth.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to make this observation: I have been somewhat disturbed by the large number of telegrams which I have received along with other Members of Congress coming from educators and educational groups throughout the country with respect to the educational features of this bill. I wonder if the gentleman does not believe those fears expressed on the part of the educators and the Conference of State Governors arises out of the fact that perhaps they have been sent, or consideration, the wrong bill and have not considered the provisions that are in the bill which is now here pending which goes as far as any bill can go to protect State sovereignty in the matter of education, which we are all concerned about.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Releases that have come to certain members of the committee show that this person who sent the releases had not considered the new bill which had not been reported out at that time.

Mr. KEEFE. They were considering the old bill, as I understand.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Senate bill.

Mr. KEEFE. They considered the Senate bill. If they had considered the provisions of the pending bill, I doubt if they would have made the objections they did.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think they would.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I was told this morning by a gentleman who is not a member of the House but who is familiar with the bill and who lives out in one of the Western States, I believe, that his Governor told him that title II of this bill was bad and the Governor wanted it out. He asked the Governor if he had read it. The Governor said: "Yes; I have." This gentleman asked him: "Let

us see what you have"; and the Governor pulled out the other bill. The gentleman then said: "Wait a minute; you do not have the House bill. Let me read you the provisions of the House committee bill." He did, and the Governor said: "All right; if that is the way it is, it is all right."

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. It reminds me of a story. A man woke up the morning after with a hang-over, grabbed for a mirror, and got the hair brush, looked at it, and called for a barber. He thought he had looked in a mirror. They have not even seen the House bill. Amendments will be offered to this title; it will be modified, but as it stands it is entirely different from the provisions of the Senate bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In connection with what was just brought up by the gentleman from Wisconsin it should be pointed out to the membership that these communications are based upon information received from the Senate bill and not the House bill, and here is the proof: The gentleman from Mississippi will recall that late in the afternoon of May 4 our committee voted to report this bill out, the report itself being made the next day and is dated May 5. The bill was not ready until May 5 or later for anyone to read. The members of the committee did not know themselves how the bill was going to be written or what was to be in it exactly until the evening of May 4; yet I hold in my hand a communication from the American Council on Education which has a statement at the top of it "For release May 5, 1944." It must therefore have been prepared prior to May 5, because it was prepared to be released in the future—for release May 5. This release talks about the Rankin bill, yet they could not have seen it because it was not printed and had not been reported by the committee at the time the American Council on Education sent this announcement.

Mr. RANKIN. And no one could have known what was going to be in it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN I think enough has been said about the ignorance of our Governors. Our State Governors do not usually go off half-cocked. Another thing, I have had some correspondence from Governors who have wired me to send copies of the bill. I have sent copies of both bills as I was very much on the alert to get my bill reported, brought out, and furnished to them.

I want to inform the gentleman that the contents of the bill now under discussion were a matter of common knowledge long before this bill was ever reported out. Protests have come to me and the reason I wanted to send official copies was to know that I was right. Now, I have not promulgated any of the gentleman's propaganda, so far as that is concerned, and I am making no defense for any that has been submitted, but I say that the telegrams that I am receiving clearly state the objection that exist to the bill now under consideration. If the gentleman will wait a few minutes I think I can make that very clear.

Mr. RANKIN. The contents of the committee bill could not have been a matter of common knowledge, because the members of the committee themselves did not know what all the provisions of the bill would be until we reported it out.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] said is true in a good many cases, but there are other cases where it is not. I secured copies of the Veterans' Committee bill last Saturday, May 6, and mailed them to the interested educational authorities in my State in response to their requests, and since then I have received telegrams, some of which I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD of yesterday, May 10. They oppose this bill as it has been reported out.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman understands, of course, that most of the messages I referred to, as a rule, came from organizations outside of the educational field.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Insofar as the reference made by the gentleman from Iowa is concerned, I know of my own knowledge because my own brother was a participant in the conference from which that resolution came. They had before them the bill as it passed the Senate and had no knowledge of the changes made by the House. Later, after the conference adjourned, three of the members of the conference were at my home and had no knowledge of the provisions of this bill. What they had before them was the Senate bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield for one observation?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I think the gentleman is going too far with these Governors.

Mr. RANKIN. The Governors are not on trial; the gentleman from North Carolina is trying the Governors.

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly the Governors are not on trial.

Mr. RANKIN. We are not trying the Governors.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to read a telegram I have received from a committee of Governors. It makes no particular reference to any particular bill:

> While we are in entire sympathy with the Rankin omnibus bill and we are in accord with its general provisions, we hope that title II providing educational opportunities for veterans will be amended so as to make it clearly mandatory to preserve to the States, and educational institutions approved by the States, control of the actual education of our veterans. We ask this because we believe the most fundamental basis of our American way of life is local control of our education facilities. We urge also that provision be made in the Rankin bill to pay fair tuitions to publicly supported institutions as well as private as is approved in title II, part 7, section 7 of the Clark bill.

This is signed by the executive committee of the Governors' Conference: Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts, chairman; John W. Bricker, Ohio; J. Melville Broughton, North Carolina; Dwight H. Green, Illinois; Dwight Griswold, Nebraska; Spessard L. Holland, Florida; Herbert B. Maw, Utah; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; and Earl Warren, California.

There is nothing in that that is not straight Americanism.

Mr. RANKIN. There is the observation, though, that the most alert, effective, and valuable men on this floor do not all come from governorships; and the same thing might be true also in the other body.

The average Member of this House, and especially the members of these committees, knows just as much about this legislation as one of the Governors. Now, I take it to be my duty as a Member of the Congress to vote and legislate as I think the majority of the intelligent people I represent would want me to do if they were here and knew as much about the legislation as I do. The members of this committee know just as much about this proposition as the Governors do. They have gone through it just as thoroughly and they are just as patriotic and just as interested in the people in their States. Let me say again, Mr. Chairman, that I have never served on a committee of finer men and women than the ones who now constitute the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. There were no Democrats, there were no Republicans, but when it came to working for the best interests of the veterans they were all Americans, trying to work out, as I said, a proper solution of a very, very difficult problem.

Mr. CLASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. I wish to refer to page 53 and to the question of determining what schools, public or private, shall be used by the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. What line?

Mr. CLASON. In paragraph 2 at the bottom of page 53 there is a provision that the veteran can pick out any institution he wishes, subject to two provisions. The second provision is that the Administrator from time to time shall secure from the appropriate agency of each State a list of all schools or institutions, then it says, "and such additional public or private schools or institutions as may be recognized by the Administrator."

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. CLASON. As I understand it, the Federal Government through the Veterans' Administration, will be able to determine what schools shall be recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. In the first place, he must recognize all schools that are recommended by the educational authorities of the various States. They must be recognized. Now go on from there.

Mr. CLASON. Then he can add to that list any other schools that he sees fit to add to it?

Mr. RANKIN. Provided it is a school that one of these students wants to go to and the school will accept him.

Mr. CLASON. It says, "and such additional public or private schools or institutions as may be recognized by the Administrator."

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CLASON. Assume that a veteran wishes to take some sort of a course and neither the State group of schools nor the Administrator group provides a school where he can obtain the particular education that he wants. Do I understand that he cannot take that course then?

Mr. RANKIN. If there is another school that does provide it and he wants to go there, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has a right to recognize it for that purpose.

Mr. CLASON. Is he limited to the State in which he resides?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. CLASON. He can go anywhere he wants to within the country?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. CLASON. This would give him practically every institution that has any recognized standing in any State plus some additional ones that the Administrator puts in?

Mr. RANKIN. General Hines came before the committee and discussed this matter and we decided there were a great many men who wanted special training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

And that there might be some school, and I think I could name some schools, that would not be in this accredited list. If a boy wanted to go there to learn how to paint houses, if he wanted to go there to learn how to repair automobiles, if he wanted to go there to learn how to raise chickens or if he wanted to go there to learn any other trade or any other special line of work, we did not think it was right to shut him out and say: "You have to go to Harvard, Yale, or to the University of Mississippi, the University of Alabama, or the University of Iowa." In other words, not all of these men in the Army are high-school graduates. Many of the best soldiers we have ever had never saw a high school, but when they come back home many of them are going to want a training in some particular trade in order to make a living. We went just as far as we could to make that possible. For the life of me, I cannot see the criticism of that provision.

Mr. CLASON. Then there is this other proposition. These large schools that the gentleman just mentioned, such as Harvard, and its school of business education, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, charge tuition fees which cover books and other expenses, such as laboratory, amounting to over $500. As I understand it, the fee of M. I. T. is $600. If the limitation is $500, we are barring these veterans from some of the very best institutions. How would you make up that difference?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if we provide this amount we have done a very good job. A man who is prepared to go to an institution of that kind can probably render himself some aid.

Mr. CLASON. Would he be permitted to use his own resources in addition to that sum?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CLASON. This will be $500 to be applied?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Referring to page 54, where it is stated "which schools and institutions, and such additional public or private schools or institutions as may be recognized by the Administrator." Does that mean that before my boy, when he comes out of the Army, can enter a school, although that school is recognized by the department of education in Ohio, it must get recognition from the Administrator before the boy can go there?

Mr. RANKIN. No. He has to recognize any school that the educational authorities of the State recommend.

Mr. McGREGOR. If my State recommends a school in the State of Ohio, the Administrator must recognize it and allow him to go there?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman made a statement a moment ago about a boy in the service who has never seen a high school. I am particularly interested in that type of boy, with particular reference to the farm boys. I had a time reconciling it with the language in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Whereabouts?

Mr. PACE. Page 52, line 22. It states that his education must have been impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. Education begins, you know, with the primer, with the A B C's.

Mr. PACE. I would like to state this case and get the benefit of the gentleman's opinion. We have a farm boy who due to family conditions has left school at 16, and on the day he volunteered or was inducted he was on the farm working. He was not attending school. Naturally he would like to have an education, but the opportunity never presented itself; in fact, he was farming and had abandoned, we might say, the idea of more education. Can we reach into this language and say that this boy would be covered when in a way his education was not delayed because he was not going to get any more?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. That was discussed in the committee, and we decided he would be covered. A case of that kind would be covered by this bill.

Mr. PACE. Under what particular language in the bill? I am very much interested in it. I hope it is authorized.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, any person is eligible under this act and shall be entitled to financial assistance to enable him to undertake and pursue such a course of training as may be elected by him.

Mr. PACE. I think this is important, and I hope the gentleman will pardon me. It seems to me under the language of the section there that there are only two cases in which a boy could get an education. One is where he needed a refresher course, where he had already got an education before he went into the service, and the other is where his entering the service had delayed or impeded his education. It just struck me that that plain English meant that if a boy had left school to work on a farm or to work in a factory, and he had been doing that for months or for a year or 2, then went into the service, the Administrator could say, "Well, John, your education was not delayed. You quit school."

Mr. RANKIN. How could he say it was not delayed? Every boy who quits and goes to work does not abandon his education. It does not mean that he is through trying to educate himself. How can he say that?

Mr. PACE. Let me ask the gentleman why did he put this language in here then?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. When I get through with this gentleman.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi this question. I believe I follow the gentleman from Georgia's thought in the case of a boy who had, we will say, completed school, but had no funds with which to continue a college career.

Mr. PACE. Let us say he stopped high school at the eighth grade and went to work on a farm or in a factory.

Mr. KEARNEY. He went to work, and then in his own mind intended later on, when he had secured funds, to obtain additional education. I think under this particular section of the bill that man is covered.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, that is why the word "delayed" is put in there, because if it did not apply to men like that, why the word "delayed" would not have been necessary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me it would be better to write a few words into that section to cover the gentleman's idea, because I agree with him it is very important.

Mr. RANKIN. If there is any language that can make it any stronger than it is, we will certainly be glad to hear it when we come under the 5-minute rule. I am glad to know the interest manifested in this debate. I hope you will all stay here.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I just want to say to the gentleman from Georgia that the committee discussed this thoroughly, and we thought that would cover almost any contingency that might arise. If the gentleman does not think it is broad enough I, for one, would be glad to know. We want every man included that should be included.

Mr. PACE. Who wants education.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is what we intended to do.

Mr. PACE. Let us write it that way.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia, who raised that question, that I took a great deal of the committee's time talking about that very same thing, and I took the attitude that society, as a whole, probably might be benefited more by a boy going back to the fourth grade in school in preference to second or third year in college, and this language was put into the bill this way so that it would take care of that particular boy.

I will also say to the gentleman from Georgia that if he can find any language that would make it stronger to meet that situation, I believe the committee would be very glad to receive it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to get the gentleman's opinion on this question. The section under consideration on page 74 refers to "all schools or institutions equipped to supply education or training within such jurisdiction."

I am especially interested in the subject of apprenticeship training. Was the question of the inclusion of apprenticeship training, within the provisions of this section, discussed in the committee?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I to conclude that the language under this section is broad enough to include coverage of an individual who elects to sign a contract of indenture in a plant, where he may receive training within a plant, in industry, under an approved apprenticeship-training program?

Mr. BUSBEY. I might say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that was another one of my pets in the committee. This bill was drawn purposely so that it would take care of apprenticeship training and so that any of these veterans could go into any industry and take an apprenticeship course for which he was receiving a very small pay while he was working at this apprenticeship. That is covered under the unemployment section.

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly the question I raised. That is taken care of by the provision referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. The Veterans' Administration is given the right to recognize such institutions.

Mr. KEEFE. I just wanted the record of the discussion to make that point clear so that there would be no question about it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, on the issue of eligibility, is it not better not to have all this language which is going to require the Veterans' Administration here in Washington to go into the personal history of every one of these three or four million boys to determine in each case whether education or training has been impeded, delayed, or interfered with?

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman not think we had better discuss that under the 5-minute rule and let me proceed with the discussion?

Mr. JUDD. Would it not be better just to say as we do in the Barden bill, "any person who served 6 months or more"—or 90 days if the Committee prefers—"in the active military and naval forces of the United States," and so forth, and thus make it available to every honorably discharged man if he wants it, partly as a reward to him and partly as an investment of the United States in better citizenship? If a boy has had educational training in the Army and subsequently desires to get education he did not previously have, should we not give him this opportunity? I would like to strike the whole limitation out and make the educational benefits available to every man who wishes them and who has the ability to qualify.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman's motion would not be in order at this time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should like to have the gentleman amplify the reason why the Veterans' Administration is given authority to designate a school which is not approved by the State authority.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to give the gentleman one illustration.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the gentleman does not think that the State educational authorities are in a better position to evaluate the quality of the institution within their jurisdiction than the Veterans' Administrator himself?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not say that.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then why should the Veterans' Administrator have that authority?

Mr. RANKIN. There might be some private schools that the public authorities would not want to recognize.

Mr. COLE of New York. Undoubtedly, for a reason.

Mr. RANKIN. For the reason, probably, that they are not patronized by the State.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It might be a matter of prejudice, also.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. You could debar some excellent schools being used by the veterans where the boys could obtain some special kind of education that they wanted to secure.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I just wanted to ask if it is not correct that the State agency, the State board of education, or the superintendent of education, or whatever the State agency is, can designate any school it wants to, or any number of schools.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The only addition in the bill is that the Administrator can add to that list in that very same State, should he find schools like the one the gentleman refers to, or other schools that the State agency has not included. He cannot take from. He can only add to.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right, and recognize those schools that may be competitive, and for that reason excluded from the list by the State educational authority.

This is a States' rights bill, I will tell you, so far as education is concerned. Another thing, we have reduced bureaucracy to the almost irreducible minimum.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state to the gentleman from New York that one of the reasons I wanted that provision in was that back in Illinois I happen to know of one particular high school that was removed from the accredited list only because it did not receive some laboratory equipment that they thought should be in that laboratory, due to delay in the factory. It was taken off the accredited list, and that high school is just as good as any high school that is on the accredited list. When they got the equipment the next year, it was put back on the list. That is just one illustration.

Mr. RANKIN. Here is another reason that actuates me in supporting this provision, and that is the fear that some people get an exalted idea of what education is. They think more about education at the top than building from the bottom. A great many of these boys from my State would like to go back to the agricultural high school in their own community, or to the local public school. We want to be dead sure that if they want to, they are going to have that opportunity in every State in the Union. We did not take away any of the States' authority, but recognized it all.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. Will the gentleman refer to page 53, line 17? It starts out by saying that a veteran may select the institution he wants to go to. That is followed by saying that there shall be eligible for giving this training, schools that are certified by the State educational authorities or which may be selected by the Veterans' Administration. Does that mean that those that are selected by the Veterans' Administration and by the State authorities are eligible and that some other institution which

the veteran may want to go to but which may not have been approved by the Administration or the State authorities is not eligible and he cannot go to that school?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. It has to be recognized by one of them.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have two questions. One is, Do the words "refresher or retraining course" cover medical students who have completed their college course but have not served as interns? In other words, work in a hospital would be covered by the word "refresher"?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Does the gentleman know of any educational institution in this country that is required to report to the various State boards of education the progress made by their individual students, such as is required in the Barden bill for veterans? I cannot for the life of me see why the school should report to the State board of education on the progress veterans are making who are students in their schools, simply because the Federal Government is paying their tuition rather than their paying it out of their own pockets. I think it is unnecessary red tape, setting veterans apart from other students, and, to put it bluntly, certainly has nothing to do with the curriculum and should be no concern of the board of education.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is not referring to this bill?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am referring to the so-called Barden substitute. I wish the chairman would comment on any reason for that, if he knows of any.

Mr. RANKIN. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Connecticut. I have not had the proposition put up to me in exactly that way.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman from Connecticut that that is simply put in there to retain in the State's institutions the same rights and prerogatives that our educational institutions in the States have enjoyed for 150 years. In this bill it is written clearly, in plain language, that the Veterans' Administrator shall pass upon the progress and the conduct of the veteran. Who is in a better position to pass on the progress and conduct of a student in the University of Connecticut, the authorities in that university or the Veterans' Administrator in Washington?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I cannot see why it is any concern of the State Board of Education of the State of Connecticut as to the progress John Smith is making in a private school within the State of Connecticut for which the Federal Government—not the State of Connecticut but the Federal Government—is paying the full tuition. Why does the State come into it at all?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman on that very point that what we were trying to hedge against was the creation of a group of students who ceased to try to learn anything. This small authority belongs in the hands of the Veterans' Administrator. We thought it was a safeguard, a proper safeguard, and I think so yet.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the provisions of the educational section of this bill are so far superior to the old Vocational Training Act of 1918 that there is no comparison.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In the first place, what we are trying to do, as we all conceived the idea, was to put the veteran in as near as possible the place he would have been had it not been for his service. When it gets down to education, what we are actually doing is placing the Government in the place of the parents as far as the payment of the tuition and the subsistence is concerned. So the logical thing is, if it is the Federal Government which is paying the bill, it is the Federal Government that is concerned in the progress that is being made.

I can see merit to some objections that have been raised to this particular provision in that we might modify it to reassure these persons who are solicitous about the schools' determining the grades and the courses. I agree with them perfectly. That could be remedied in line 18 by placing after the words "which will accept" the words "and retain." In other words, the school could then say to the boy, "If you do not make the grades, we will not keep you in school," or "If your conduct is such as is improper for a student of this school to participate in, we will not keep you in school." That leaves it to the school, and that gets rid of one objection.

Then going down to line 23, that could very well be protected so that the Administrator will not have the power which some of you fear he might have, although that fear is unfounded, because this is substantially the same program that was carried out 25 years ago in the administration of the education of veterans under the rehabilitation program. In the vocational training program, each 60 days a representative of the veterans' office went to the school to check up on the progress of the student. You can smile, but I was one of the gentlemen who was fortunate enough to have that very thing done. If in the opinion of the school the grades were falling low enough, the field man would call the student in and say, "Listen, your grades are dropping. They have to be picked up."

So, to keep that clear, so that there can be no misapprehension or misunderstanding, there can be inserted in line 23 after the word "veteran," where it refers to the progress of the veteran, the words "as shown by the records of the institution." That keeps it right back in the schools.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the rehabilitation program after the last war cost approximately $5,500 apiece.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, but that included the $100 maintenance; $135 if the man was married.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman said he was trying to put the Veterans' Administration in the position of the parents. I have been "papa-ed" long enough by departments in Washington. When you talk about sending inspectors around to inspect the college records and to see whether or not this man is making progress, what kind of confusion do you think you would set up in the college?

Mr. SCRIVNER. There would not be any more than there was 25 years ago, when you had the same kind of inspection.

Mr. BARDEN. I am sorry, but that is certainly the thing we are trying to avoid

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let us take this other picture. If the same ratio keeps up in this war as in the other, there will be almost 1,300,000 men eligible for vocational rehabilitation, which will be administered by the Veterans' Administration. Because it was successful 25 years ago, I feel that it will be administered in much the same way it was then, so those people would not be a bother to us. I was in a school where we had 315 of them, and I never heard a single, solitary complaint.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman knows that that was not a program of a size proportionate to the present program.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In that program there were 400,000 who made application and 300,000 who took the training.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman just admitted there would be more than 300,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. BARDEN. That will create a tremendous impact on the educational institutions.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The principle is exactly the same whether you are playing with dollars or dimes.

Mr. BARDEN. How many inspectors out of Washington does the gentleman think it will take to inspect the various institutions in my State?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not think it will take a great number at all, because in each State there will be a representative of the Veterans' Administration. It will not take any more people under the State set-up.

Mr. BARDEN. That is the very respect in which these bills differ.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me answer that. My opinion is that they would not have an inspector at all unless the authorities of the school called for one. When the authorities of the school notify the Veterans' Administration that the Government's money is being wasted on this man, then is the time for the inspector to go and check up.

May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I have worked with the Veterans' Administration a long time and worked with it when that program was in progress. They did a marvelous job. I am sure that under this bill you will not find the public imposed on by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman will answer this question, I think it is also important in connection with this school program that we protect the veteran from some who would racketeer upon this educational feature.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the question?

Mr. O'HARA. The question is, What protection is there particularly in the apprenticeship training of the Veterans' Bureau to protect the serviceman in the establishment of the record? Is there a system of instruction?

Mr. RANKIN. If the Veterans' Administration found that any institution which is not recommended by a State authority was racketeering, all it would have to do would be to withdraw its recognition. Of course, if it is a State school or a school that is recognized by the State and recommended by the State, there might be the combined, I will say, cooperation of the Veterans' Administration and the State authorities. But I cannot think of a State recognizing or recommending a school which would permit racketeering on these boys.

Mr. O'HARA. Just along the point which the gentleman brings up, suppose there is a difference of opinion between the State and the Veterans' Administrator as to whether that is a proper school, whose control is final?

Mr. RANKIN. The State, if the State recommends it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have been very much interested in this bill. I was a member of the Committee on Education of the House in 1919, and I believe there is one other Member of the House who was present when legislation was brought out similar to this. I think this is an improvement over that bill. Experience has taught us many things. But it was of great service to the country and to the veterans. What I would like to inquire is in what part of this bill is there any provision to pass upon the eligibility of a veteran to take any particular course and the feasibility of his taking a certain course?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the eligibility of a man to take a course in a school is determined by the school itself. Suppose I should undertake to enter the University of Mississippi or the State college, no matter who paid the bills, the college authorities would say whether or not I was eligible to enter. So that question would have to be decided by them. But then, if I was ineligible to go there, I might go over to the agricultural high school a few miles away, where I would probably be more eligible, and if I could not go there I might go back down to the primary school or the little community school where I came from and get in there. So the question of eligibility is left up to the school itself.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In administering the law after the other war with reference to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, they had persons who interviewed and talked to the veteran to see whether it could be to his own best interest to take a course in agriculture or to take a course in law or to take a course in mechanics of some sort.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Now, is there anything in this bill that would authorize such a procedure?

Mr. RANKIN. I think that matter would be left up to the student and the school that he entered. Then if he failed or that school, as I said a while ago, should call on the Veterans' Administration to send an inspector to come down and look into this man's record and they found that he was not doing any good there and that he was wasting his money, then that would have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. A lot of these boys who will apply for this training will be young fellows from 18 to 19 years of age and perhaps may not have the judgment to make the proper selection.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. I will say, you are always going to have to take that chance and are always going to be confronted with that situation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did the gentleman say he worked for the Veterans' Bureau after the other war?

Mr. RANKIN. I said the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The Veterans' Administration?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I was even here when the Veterans' Bureau was created. It was the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to begin with.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We passed that act, I believe, in 1919.

Mr. RANKIN. That was before I came here.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did not the gentleman have experience in dealing with that very question and as to how it was handled back under the old act?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; there were a few cases just as the gentleman said there, who were found to be misfits, and of course many of them were eliminated. Some of them quit and went back home to doing the same kind of work they would have done if we had never had a war. The average student in this country, the average boy in this war, is going right back to the community he came from and he is going to go into the very business that he would have gone into if we had not had a war, if he can get into it. Farmer boys from my district will go right back to the farm, the majority of them. For instance, we have an agricultural school in Itawamba County, and they are trying to teach those boys how to do the things they are going to have to do. They recently got a large number of electrical machines in order that they might teach those girls in that county how to use them. Those are the students who want to go back there and learn to do the things they are going to have to do all their lives. For that reason we made this measure just as liberal as we could in permitting them to select a school they want to go to.

One reason I want to give this discretion to the Veterans' Administration is that I am afraid in some States you may have some men who look at education from the top and not from the bottom and who would not approve of these small schools that these men with small means or a small amount of education are going to have to go to, to learn to do the things they are going to have to do to make a living.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JUDD. That, it seems to me, is the place where the distinguished gentleman is departing from his doctrine of States' rights.

Mr. RANKIN. No; it is not.

Mr. JUDD. He says we have to recognize and send veterans if they wish to all the schools which a State department of education recognize, but the Administrator here in Washington may also send them to additional institutions which the State department of education does not recognize or approve, that is, he loses confidence in the ability of each State to determine for itself what educational institutions and standards shall prevail in its borders. This is the place where I differ with this bill more than any other.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has become confused between States' rights and State authorities. There is a difference between standing for States' rights and an idolatrous reverence for men in State office.

Mr. JUDD. But you are transferring control to the men here in Washington.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am not.

Mr. JUDD. You are transferring control to the men here in Washington who can override the States and approve schools which the States have turned down.

Mr. RANKIN. I am doing just exactly what the gentleman from Minnesota would not do. I am making it possible for these boys and these girls to take a course at these small schools which might be considered insignificant and offside and which may not come up to the standard of the high-collared professor who might look at education from the top and not from the bottom.

Mr. JUDD. As a matter of fact, in the bill which some of us prepared in the Committee on Education, it is all spelled out that "approved educational or training institution" includes elementary and secondary schools, business colleges, vocational schools, and so forth, so that the

veteran could not be excluded from even the third or fourth or fifth grade if that was where he belonged or the education he wanted.

Mr. RANKIN. The trouble is there are too many people in this country who are overeducated and under trained now. We are trying to provide a system of training and education so that these young men and young women may fit themselves for the battles of life when they come back from this war.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. As a schoolman I am interested in many points already raised but will turn to a minor one—but still important to Indians and their schools.

As I have said before to the chairman, I want to see to it that the State educational authorities have control over all educational facilities within their borders and not the bureaucrats of Washington. I would like to ask the gentleman a question with reference to section 6, on page 55, of the bill, whether that section would debar Indian veterans from making use of an Indian school, for instance, at Phoenix, Ariz., where there is a good school operated entirely by the Federal Government? Or does that language have reference to any such schools operated by the Federal Government?

Mr. RANKIN. Right there is another question why the Veterans' Administration authority should come in. If the State did recognize the Indian school the Veterans' Administration would, because those Indians would rather go to that Indian school than to try to go to the University of Minnesota. We are trying to bring this down to a practical level.

Mr. JUDD. We have excellent schools of both kinds in Minnesota.

Mr. RANKIN. Do not you gentlemen get the idea you are the only ex-professors in Congress. I taught school. Perhaps I should say I kept school. The first day I ever taught school we had three books, four students, and five dogs. While I do not boast as much as some of the rest of you, I can say we made that school a "howling success."

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to be specific as to the meaning of that language. The gentleman does not believe that the language of this section would debar Indian veterans from attending Indian schools?

Mr. RANKIN. It absolutely would not. In other words, it makes it possible to reach out and recognize these Indian schools. They will be recognized.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I wanted to know for there are several such Indian schools to which Indian veterans may want to return.

Mr. CLASON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CLASON. I would like to see this privilege of getting an education, vocational or college or university, given to all veterans. I would like to know at this point why the provision was put in on page 52, starting with line 21. Was that in the bill after the last war? It seems to me that could be stricken out without injury to the Veterans' Administration or the Government, and might help the veterans to go to school.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think that is a limitation at all.

Mr. CLASON. Why is it in there, then?

Mr. RANKIN. Simply to show the spread. In other words, to include everybody.

Mr. CLASON. Why not leave it out then, and we will know it includes everybody.

Mr. RANKIN. It does include everybody under this bill, but if you cut it out there might be a construction placed on it that would eliminate some of the very people we are trying to take care of.

Mr. CLASON. Then every veteran would be eligible if he served 90 days. By putting that in there you limit it in some way.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, he is recognized now.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I congratulate the gentleman upon his knowledge of this bill and the fine explanation he has made of it. I want to ask him with reference to the provision contained in section 104, page 46, which reads:

> No person shall be discharged or released from active duty in the armed forces until his certificate of discharge or release from active duty and final pay, or a substantial portion thereof, are ready for delivery to him.

I understand the purpose of that provision is so that these men who are discharged will receive promptly what is coming to them.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. But I am wondering whether or not there should not be some flexibility to take care of a case where some emergency might require his discharge without waiting for that. For instance, on account of illness in his family, or on account of a job waiting for him. If the circumstances are such that the man himself desires to be released, should there not be more flexibility in the law?

Mr. RANKIN. Under those conditions he could get a furlough. I think this provision would protect him more than it would embarrass him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield myself 10 more minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The sentence on page 47, if I correctly heard what the gentleman from Texas said, would cover what he had in mind.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That "this section shall not preclude immediate transfer to a veterans' facility for necessary hospital care, nor the discharge of any person who refuses to sign such claim or statement." He might not want to go to a hospital.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He could get out. The bill provides on line 10, "and provided further, that refusal or failure to file a claim shall be without prejudice to any right the veteran may subsequently assert."

I think the veteran is protected there.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I wanted some provision so that if the circumstances were such that the veteran was willing to waive it, the law would not bind him.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Oh, no. The committee inserted that provision for that reason.

Mr. RANKIN. We worked over that provision very carefully.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Referring to line 7, on page 55, there are these words: "regular school year." Veterans, no doubt, will be attending two classes of institutions. One would be the trade school and the other would be the school of higher learning. One has a school year that would run 34 or 36 weeks and the other as much as 48 weeks.

There will be discrimination there unless an explanation is placed on "the regular school year" as to what it constitutes, because some trade schools run as much as 48 weeks as a regular school year, and others would be only 34 weeks. The fee is fixed at a certain amount and the better schools would find themselves limited because of the greater amount of training they were giving.

Mr. MASON. If the gentleman will yield, you will find that the trade schools that have longer school years than the others are usually the cheaper ones.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I beg to disagree with the gentleman because I know of some, particularly the aviation schools, where the longer school years are in the better schools.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I have received a telegram from the State superintendent of schools in my State, and also from the chancellor of the higher educational institutions, telegrams urging that the Barden provision be substituted for section 2. I was wondering if the gentleman has discussed that?

Mr. RANKIN. No. We reserved that for the 5-minute rule. I am going to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] some time a little later, to discuss the provisions of his bill. It is in order for it to be offered as a substitute for this title. When it is offered it will be under discussion under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. ANGELL. This telegram which I assume all my colleagues have received from the executive committee of the Governors' Conference, reads as follows:

> Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> While we are in entire sympathy with the Rankin omnibus bill, and we are in full accord with its general provisions, we hope that title 2, providing educational opportunities for veterans will be amended so as to make it clearly mandatory to preserve to the States and educational institutions, approved by the States, control of the actual education of our veterans. We ask this because we believe the most fundamental basis of our American way

of life is local control of our education facilities. We urge also that provision be made in the Rankin bill to pay fair tuition to publicly supported institutions as well as private as is provided in title 2, part 7, section 7, of the Clark bill.

The Executive Committee of the Governor's Conference: Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts; Chairman John W. Bricker, Ohio; J. Melville Broughton, North Carolina; Dwight H. Green, Illinois; Dwight Griswold, Nebraska; Spessard L. Holland, Florida; Herbert B. Maw, Utah; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; Earl Warren, California.

Mr. RANKIN. To show how great educators' minds run in the same channel, I think we had the same telegram here from the head of some educational authority of a State probably a thousand miles from Oregon. I think it was the same telegram, "verbatim, spellatim, and punctuatim."

Mr. ANGELL. This is a telegram from Governor Saltonstall.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the same telegram that was read a little while ago. I have received exactly the same telegram.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the bill he is proposing now does preserve in the States control over the educational provision?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say I have a similar telegram from the Governor of Arizona.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. Now, if you want to discuss telegrams, I have enough in my office on other phases of the bill to entertain the Congress for the rest of the session.

Now, Mr. Chairman, title III is with reference to the loan features. I am not going to take the time to discuss it now.

Title IV covers the employment of veterans.

Title V, the readjustment allowances for former members of the armed forces who are unemployed.

Title VI covers the subject of general administrative and penal provisions.

This bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule at the close of the general debate, and it will be open for amendment. Practically all the amendments that have been referred to today will be in order.

This bill is not exactly what I wanted, but it is the very best we could get.

Title III, as I said, would cost $75,000,000, and, the interest will cost probably $45,000,000, all told. Title IV is estimated to cost $52,000,000; title V, $52,000,000; title VI, $12,000,000. The total cost of the entire bill is estimated to be $6,510,000,000.

I am going to yield the floor for the time being and permit the other Members to discuss the other titles to this bill. Before I do so, however, I want to express my gratitude publicly to members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for their diligence, their earnestness, and their unquestionable desire to work out a bill that will result in the best interests of the veterans and also the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

At this point I am inserting a statement by General Hines comparing the educational provisions of this bill with the Barden bill.

It reads as follows:

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TITLE II—EDUCATION OF VETERANS—S. 1767, AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND H. R. 3846, "A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THE MERCHANT MARINE AFTER THEIR SEPARATION FROM SERVICE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES," AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For convenience the two bills mentioned in the caption will be designated respectively as the "veterans' bill," inasmuch as it was proposed by veterans' organizations, and the "Barden bill."

I. BASIC PRINCIPLES

The veterans' bill is based upon the principle of affording a direct benefit to veterans with no purpose whatsoever of controlling or building up educational machinery or educational institutions. Inevitably it may be assumed educational institutions may profit indirectly through the Federal Government affording educational and training opportunities as a veterans' benefit.

The principle of the Barden bill is one of building up tremendous educational machinery, both Federal and State, for the avowed purpose of affording educational aid to veterans, but it will be noted that the term used is "war-service person" and, as indicated by the title, this includes other than veterans.

The irreconcilable difference in the two bills in this respect inheres in the fact that the one approaches the question from the point of view of a benefit for veterans, whereas the other is the educators' approach to an educational bill with the veterans and others as the immediate occasion for the proposal.

II. ELEGIBILITY AND CONTROL

The veterans' bill bases eligibility upon criteria recommended by the Chief Executive and length of service and includes those who, having served the prescribed minimal period, had their education or training interrupted, deferred, or interfered with by service in the active military forces, and conditions the length of such education or training upon the length of such active service and the satisfactory progress of the individual pursuing a course of education or training. It not only does not give the Veterans' Administration any control over any school or institution, public or private, but specifically forbids the exercise of any such control. It does require that the veteran apply to the Veterans' Administration and meet certain requirements, thereby accomplishing the one and only purpose for placing this matter of education of veterans in the Veterans' Administration, namely, that there will be one place to which veterans may apply for any veteran benefit afforded by Federal law and one Administrator who may be held responsible by the Congress for the administration of such benefits.

Under the Barden bill any person who served for a minimal period of 6 months is entitled, subject to the approval of the institution and State board, to the equivalent of 3 full school years (it is not quite clear how this could apply to those in apprentice or other training not divided into school years). As indicated, the veteran's rights will be determined by a State board and the Federal Government will pay the bills. Under such conditions there is no apparent reason for placing this matter in the Veterans' Administration as it cannot be held responsible for results.

Under the veterans' bill the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would be required to secure from the appropriate State agency a list of schools or institutions considered by such agency equipped to furnish education or training provided by the bill. Any such school or institution, together with any others added by the Administrator, would be required to be recognized for the purposes of the bill. Any eligible veteran could select any school which would accept him, and any courses which he and the school agree are appropriate for him. The only requirement is that he apply to the Veterans' Administration for determination of eligibility and, of course, continuation of payments of benefits, including maintenance allowance and tuition and fees would be conditioned upon receipt of satisfactory progress reports from the school or institution. The Administrator would be authorized to secure by agreement or contract with State, Federal, or private agencies or institutions availability of additional facilities, if needed.

Under the Barden bill a war-service person may likewise enroll in any approved institution which may accept him, the discontinuance therein to be conditioned upon reports made by the school authorities to a State board. The only authority the Administrator would have would be to pay the bills as certified by such State board.

III. MACHINERY

The veterans' bill authorizes and requires no additional machinery whatsoever, Federal or State.

The Barden bill requires the following additional machinery:

(a) A war service education and training agency in the Veterans' Administration, the director to be appointed by the Chief Executive, after recommendation by and consultation with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the duties of the director of such agency to be prescribed by the President. The director would have authority to appoint all other employees subject only to approval of the Administrator.

(b) An advisory council consisting of the director and 14 other members appointed by the President, representing the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Bureau of Placement of the War Manpower Commission, the Bureau of Training of the War Manpower Commission, the Selective Service System, the United States Office of Education, and 7 representatives of the public, 4 of whom are recognized leaders in the field of education. The purpose of such council would be to counsel and aid the director to formulate general policies and procedures to insure the effective inauguration and operation of the program of education and training provided by the bill, to examine State plans submitted to the director for approval, and to make public necessary information with respect to the needs for general education and for trained personnel in the various trades, crafts, and professions in order that war-service persons may be given proper guidance in the choice of a course of instruction and be furnished such education or training as will improve their opportunities for useful and gainful employment. Subject to the advice of such council and the approval of the Administrator, the director is given authority to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the declared purposes.

Apparently all the product of this machinery would be advisory or hortatory only, inasmuch as section 11 would preclude any supervision or control over any State agency or education or training institution at least

with respect to its personnel, curriculum or methods or materials of instruction, but otherwise full control over not only State or public, but private institutions is purported to be retained in a State board.

(c) Each State will be required to designate or create a State agency for the administration, supervision, and control of the State plan. Every State would be required to submit a State plan for approval of the Director. Such plan would be required to show the provisions providing for appointment of personnel or maintenance of personnel standards, the standards adopted for governing the approval of educational or training institutions, public or private, by the State board. It would provide that no business or other establishment would be approved for apprenticeship training unless it meets certain standards set up by State or Federal laws with respect to requirements as to labor, health, safety, etc. Finally, it would have to provide for the appointment of an advisory committee in each State (some 50 in all) to be broadly representative of the various types of approved education or training institutions in the State to aid and advise the State department of education in the administration of the State plan. (The Barden bill creates such board for the District of Columbia.)

The further requirements upon the State board are:

(a) To establish lists of approved educational and training institutions within the State, public or private, religious or secular.

(b) To review continuously the work of such institutions to determine whether they remain approved.

(c) To determine customary charges of such institutions and to recommend payment of additional fees where the established fees, if any, are not adequate.

(d) To transmit to the Director certifications regarding eligible persons applying for and receiving education and training, together with name of the approved institution being attended, and the names and other data relating to dependents. Thereupon the Director would certify such matters to the Administrator who would be required to pay the bills.

IV. EXPENSES AND BENEFITS PROVIDED

The two bills are identical with respect to the amount of maintenance allowance provided for the person pursuing a course of education or training, and for the payment of necessary tuition and other customary expenses in connection therewith, except as indicated above; that is, the Barden bill provides that the State boards may recommend additional tuition and fees, whereas the veterans' bill authorizes the Administrator, as is now the law with respect to vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans, to arrange by agreement or contract for additional facilities where existing facilities are inadequate.

V. LIMITATION OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY

The veterans' bill forbids the exercise of any supervision or control whatsoever over any State agency or educational or training institution by any department, agency, or officer of the United States.

The Barden bill forbids such supervision or control only as to personnel, curriculum, or methods, or materials of instruction.

The veterans' bill gives no control to any State or State agency or private or religious schools or institutions.

The Barden bill gives the State agencies control over such institutions. This poses for consideration of Congress the question of academic freedom and individual initiative.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The so-called G. I. bill of rights, S. 1767, was thoroughly considered by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and the amended bill reported by the committee I believe improves the measure in many respects.

The bill is one of the most far-reaching measures that has ever come before the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, first, as ranking minority member, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and other members of the committee for their cooperation, their diligence, their patience, and their enthusiasm for bringing a bill to the floor that would be supported by the Congress and that would bring additional benefits, benefits of readjustment and reconditioning to the men who serve so magnificantly in this war. It has been a real pleasure to meet and cooperate with the members of the committee. The chairman gave us full and complete time to discuss the bill and it was a free and open discussion. While I may not have believed in every provision, just as other members did not agree with everything, we finally reached a bill that we thought would be of great benefit to the veterans. It may be that it will have to be amended or changed at a later date, and I shall approve of that if it is found necessary. I feel very strongly that we already should have passed more legislation that would provide added benefits to our service-connected cases and I hope this speedily will be done: An increase in rates of compensation for our battle casualties, our battle injured, and their dependents. I also want to remind the House that many are seriously, very seriously injured while on duty in the United States.

I should like to point out to the committee that the amendments to S. 1767 principally preserve the existing machinery of the States or other agencies; make for easier administration and aid the veteran in securing assistance by having one agency to contact—it will be remembered that after World War I the veteran was at a loss to know where to go for help, and the first step toward consolidation of veterans' activities was the World War Veterans' Act amendment of August 9, 1921, establishing the Veterans' Bureau; will accomplish the purpose of facilitating proper transition of the veteran from military to civilian life in a more direct and simplified manner, which will materially reduce the administrative cost; and will avoid duplication and overlapping of both administration and benefits, and enable the Congress to secure from one source, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, complete reports on operation of the act. The bill in amended form retains many of the provisions of the Senate bill, and is more comparable to the bill as originally introduced in the Senate to accomplish the programs of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The committee considered numerous bills at the beginning of the year and held hearings thereon, although some of the phases included in S. 1767 were not then before the committee because of lack of jurisdiction. Following the passage of S. 1767 by the Senate, public hearings were conducted on S. 1767 and testimony was received from various witnesses, including representatives of service organizations, Members of Congress, and representatives of educational organizations. Immediately following the recess executive sessions were held daily over a period of 3 weeks, afternoon sessions also being conducted with permission of the House. I will briefly describe some of the important changes in the Senate bill made by the amendment reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. A detailed explanation of the various changes is contained in the printed report of the committee, House Report No. 1418, May 5, 1944.

One of the most important provisions under title I of the bill is that it makes the Veterans' Administration a war agency second only to the Army and Navy. It will be of untold value in priorities, untold value in the transfer of hospitals from the Army and the Navy to the Veterans' Administration; the transfer of matériel, and the transfer of personnel such as doctors and nurses for which there is such great need and of which there is such a great shortage in the Veterans' Administration facilities today. The Veterans' Administration has been very much handicapped, they state, by the fact that they have not been a war agency.

I regret personally that the amount of $500,000,000 is removed from the provision authorizing and directing General Hines to build and complete Veterans' Administration facilities, but the committee as a whole decided that the $500,000,000 was a limitation. I was sorry because I firmly believe that it is not a limitation but that on the other hand it would ensure that that amount of money could be spent for the building of hospitals. I should like to see that go back into the bill.

A paragraph in which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] was vitally interested is the one that provides that any person entitled to a prosthetic appliance shall be entitled in addition to necessary fitting and training, including institutional training in the use of such appliance whether in a service, War Veterans' Administration hospital, or by out-patient treatment, including such service under contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a vital amendment in my belief because after the First World War many veterans were discharged from hospitals and Veterans' Administration facilities with improper fitting of artificial arms and legs, appliances that hurt the arms and legs, if you will, of the persons wearing those appliances. Many of them were given these prosthetic appliances but were never properly trained how to use them, never trained to walk and dance and do other

things such as they are being taught to do today in the Army and Air Corps hospitals, and reconditioning centers.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewomen yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is responsible for that provision being in the bill relating to training in the use of prosthetic appliances, training of these boys before they are discharged from the service in the use of these appliances so they will not be thrown out upon the public with these appliances and not know what to do with them. I wish to congratulate the gentlewoman for the steps she took in the interests of the veterans in seeing that this provision was put in the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman and members of the committee very much for their agreeing to the amendment. They were just as much interested finally as I was in having that provision in the bill, because they realized the tremendous value to the veterans of such training. It does not require that the veterans stay in the hospital or the Administration facility in order to learn how to use the appliances. Such veterans can go to a contract hospital such as the Institute for the Crippled in New York; if their homes are near enough they can live at home and go there for treatment and training in the use of such appliances.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Speaking about the Institute for the Crippled in New York, am I correct in understanding that the Army Air Corps has doctors studying in that school and that the Army has now sent some of their doctors there also?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true; and further my understanding is that the Veterans' Administration plans to use that school and will use other schools. They will be of great value in letting the disabled to return to their normal pursuits.

One of the most important provisions of the bill is that the service organizations may have, as they do in veterans' facilities today, a room in the hospital where the men can go and be told about their rights to compensation and benefits to which they are entitled. I met a man in one hospital recently who gave both his arms to his country. He has lost also an eye and, thanks to plastic surgery, a new nose has been made for him. The doctors will try to save the sight of his other eye. That man did not know that under present law he is entitled to training in languages and in other studies in which he is interested. He now knows them and is on the road to a useful and extremely helpful career. He is very much interested in certain problems, and he will be of great value to the country if he can help in their solution. The veterans' organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Order of the Purple Heart are of untold help not only to the veterans but to the legislative bodies of the Congress in suggested benefits for service men and women.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not know whether the committee has ever considered making disability compensations permanent after a number of years or not. I have veterans in my district, as I know the gentlewoman has in hers, and there are veterans in every district, who came out of the last war with diseased lungs, for instance. They have been receiving full compensation. They have been doctoring ever since the war was concluded and have been unable to work. Then the Veterans' Administration comes along and finally makes an examination of this veteran and determines that he is able to work, so they take a certain amount of the compensation away from him after a man has reached the age of 45 or 50 years and is unable to work at any gainful occupation. I am wondering if the committee has ever considered those cases.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The committee has considered those cases, and I hope further legislation will be passed. May I answer more completely the gentleman at a later time? I am going to talk a little about title II. So long as we have had so much discussion on the educational provision on the floor this afternoon I think we should finish that first.

Mr. JENSEN. Would it be possible to offer an amendment to this bill to that effect?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad the gentleman brings that up. There are many amendments I should like to add to this bill for the disabled veterans, but I fear if we add them to this bill we would not get this bill through the Senate promptly. I should prefer, and it is to the disabled veterans' interest, to have those things in another bill, a separate bill just for the disabled veterans and to get this bill through promptly because after all it has been a long time since Pearl Harbor and this legislation should be on the statute books. Canada had such a bill in 1941, and I am anxious for the speedy enactment of this law.

Mr. JENSEN. I am just as anxious to have it passed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am sure the gentleman is. I know of his interest in the veterans.

Mr. Chairman, this bill sets up a board of review in the War and Navy Departments to consider the type and nature of discharge or dismissal and other than sentence by general court martial, and to change, correct, or modify such discharge or dismissal, based upon the facts found, and to issue a new discharge in accordance with the facts. I think this will be a very fine provision because some men are given undesirable discharges, not dishonorable, that they should never have been given. They are given discharges sometimes in error and sometimes for one reason or another, sometimes because the service wants to cut its personnel, and that is an easy way to get a man out; that is, give him a blue discharge. I saw that done in the last World War. This will be an extremely helpful provision and will result in more adequate justice to the veterans.

This section as it passed the Senate has been amended in several respects for clarification purposes but with an added provision in the nature of a statute of limitation.

Under title 1, section 104, pertaining to availability of certificate of discharge, final pay, or substantial portion thereof to be ready for delivery to the veteran or some person on his account preliminary to discharge or release from active duty, there is included a provision that no person shall be discharged or released on account of disability until and unless he has executed a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization to be filed with the Veterans' Administration, or has signed a statement that he has had explained to him his right to file such a claim. It is provided that this particular provision shall not preclude immediate transfer to a veterans' facility for necessary hospital care, nor the discharge of any person who refuses to sign such claim or statement. It is further provided that refusal or failure to file a claim shall be without prejudice to any right the veteran may subsequently assert. A paragraph has also been added to this section that any person entitled to a prosthetic appliance shall be entitled, in addition, to necessary fitting and training, including institutional training, in the use of such appliance, whether in a service of a Veterans' Administration hospital, or by out-patient treatment, including such service under contract.

This title also contains a section providing that no person in the active service shall be required by any officer thereof to sign a statement of any nature relating to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease or injury he may have, or any other statement against his own interest, and that any such statement signed at any time shall be null and void and of no force and effect.

With reference to the recognition of accredited representatives of service organizations to aid and assist persons in the active service, who are about to be discharged or released therefrom, in the preparation and presentation of their claims for benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, amendments have been added to limit the number of organizations and the number and type of representatives and to insure the continuance of legislative authority with respect to the American Red Cross.

Title II is the section having to do with the education of veterans. Section 400 of the Senate bill is completely revised. Under the bill as it passed the Senate it would be necessary to have an outside

educational agency, either in the Veterans' Administration or the Federal Security Agency, and cooperative Federal and State educational machinery to afford educational benefits to the veterans.

I remember in the First World War the great delay in the settlement of veterans' claims and in their securing training because there were so many different departments handling the matter. There was the war-risk insurance. There was a department known as the Federal Board of Vocational Training, and there was the Public Health, and the Pension Office. I am positive that the further centralization of the administration of veterans' benefits will be very advantageous to the veterans. No department is so much interested in the veterans as the Veterans' Administration. It was created for that purpose. And the consolidation of the four departments I mentioned above was a great step forward for the veterans. The Veterans' Administration has all the files, all the information, and all the records having to do with the veterans, and it is very helpful for the veterans and their families to have definite places all over the country marked "Veterans' Administration," where they can go and know that they will receive as speedily as possible and without additional red tape all information and Federal assistance to which they are entitled.

It is the position of the committee that there is no necessity for additional machinery, either State or Federal, and that all that is necessary is to provide for the payment of necessary expenses and a moderate subsistence allowance to allow eligible veterans to attend schools or other institutions of their own choice——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Including apprenticeship and other training, with the simplest form of administration, identical with that established by vocational training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress. I have never heard any college, school, or institution object to the administration of that law, so far as the law itself is concerned, and the States did not object. The States did not feel that it in any way interfered with States' rights.

Under the bill as reported no Federal officer or agency shall exercise any control whatsoever over any State agency or over any school or institution. That is a direct prohibition from interfering with the curriculum of the school or the personnel or anything else done in the school that is legitimate.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentlewoman yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I wonder if the gentlewoman will agree with me that there is a definite advantage in having this educational program under the direct control of the Veterans' Administration, particularly for the reason that the early noticing of symptoms and diagnosis, with especial reference to the neuropsychiatric classifications, is very helpful and it is important that this should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration because he is more likely to keep in touch with them as the symptoms develop than if he was attached to another agency of the Government that had no connection with the Veterans' Administration. In that way they will get a good many cases that show early symptoms that they may not find for 2 or 3 years after the war. In the long run I think it will save us a lot of money.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And I also believe it will save lives.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There is no question about that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Because the Veterans' Administration has the files, the clinical records, and other records. The Veterans' Administration is supposed to be the mother or father of the veterans.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Under the provisions of this bill, would a veteran be entitled to attend a private business school or a commercial business college?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; they will be allowed to do that. That is why the bill is broad as we drew it. While the States give a list of the accredited schools, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may approve some special school or institution in addtion to the list given by the State board of education; if a man wishes to get some special type of training the veteran may be sent to a private school. This bill, in my opinion, is, first of all, a great protection to the veterans in giving them what they want in the way of institutional training and education, and in the second place it is a protection to the States, because there will be much less Federal interference than there will be under the Barden bill. I want to let the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] explain his bill before I complete my remarks on the subject.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. A young man returning from the service, if he so desires, may take a business course in one of the private commercial colleges in the Nation?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. He must apply to or he must see General Hines, or his representative, and if it be approved, the school will be added. And the service man or woman may enroll.

This bill is also a protection not only to the small institutions and private schools but to the larger colleges. Sometimes a government of a State or a commissioner of education may have some prejudice against a large college.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. It also covers trade schools, I presume?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; trade schools and apprenticeship schools.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the committee took into consideration the fact that trade schools are going to spring up all over the country because of the demand for such training. I have talked to a number of veterans who said that when they come back they would like to have an opportunity to attend a trade school for a year and a half or 2 years, to become proficient in the trade.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. Of course, many of them who were in trades before will have to learn of the improvements in the trades and arts that have taken place. Take, for instance, plastics. Many of the men who had a mechanical training before did not have much experience in plastic work. The work in radar is just in its infancy.

Mr. JENSEN. And that is fully provided for in the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, definitely. The committee spent a long time on that. I think that the House made an improvement in the Senate bill in that a man need serve only 3 months in order to be entitled to education and training.

It is the position of the committee that there is no necessity for additional machinery, either State or Federal, and that all that is necessary is to provide for the payment of necessary expenses and a moderate subsistence allowance to enable eligible veterans to attend schools or other institutions of their own choice, including apprenticeship and other training, with the simplest form of administration, identical with that established for vocational training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress. Under the bill, as reported, no Federal officer or agency shall exercise any control whatsoever over any State agency or over any school or institution. At the same time it will not subject private schools and institutions to control or supervision by State educational agencies. The qualifying period of service for eligibility has been changed from 6 months to 90 days. Otherwise length of training depends upon length of service and satisfactory progress in training.

Provision is made mandatory for the Administrator to secure from the appropriate agency of each State, Territory or possession, or the District of Columbia a list of schools or institutions equipped to supply education or training and such schools or institutions, with any additional added by the Administrator, shall be recognized as qualified to enroll eligible veterans for education or training. The amounts of maintenance allowances are identical with those of the Senate bill, with necessary provisions for election between benefits under Public Law 16 and under title II of this act and with limitations to prevent duplication of benefits.

The Administrator will have full authority to utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities, to utilize those of any other governmental

agency as well as those maintained by joint State and Federal contributions, and to provide by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments for such additional training facilities as may be suitable or necessary under the act. This title also contains provision to prevent duplication of benefits under that title and title V on unemployment readjustment allowances. There are other administrative changes effectuated by way of amendment to Senate provisions.

TITLE III. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

This title has been rewritten by the committee on an entirely different principle from that upon which the Senate bill proceeded. As passed by the Senate the Administrator on approval of other Federal agencies could lend to eligible veterans not to exceed $1,000 for required down payment in connection with loans secured through a Federal agency or other lending agency, with no discretion in the Administrator to approve or disapprove the loan. The committee draft places full responsibility in the Administrator but authorizes him to utilize the services of State or Federal agencies. It does not authorize the making of any loan but instead authorizes the Administrator to guarantee not to exceed 50 percent of a loan secured from any person or lending agency with the proviso that the aggregate amount of guaranty of any loan or loans in the case of any individual veteran shall not exceed $1,500. The service requirement for eligibility would be the same as in title II but application for loan may be made only within 2 years after separation from active service or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is later and in no event more than 6 years after such termination. This will restrict loans to the period immediately following termination of the war.

Testimony before the committee indicated that the purposes of the title would largely be defeated by guaranteeing loans during the war, due to restrictions as to priorities, nonavailability of materials, the manpower situation, and other factors including inflationary trends. The interest for the first year on the part of the loan guaranteed by the Administrator shall be paid out of the appropriations made for that purpose. No security for the guaranty is required except the right to be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation guaranteed. The interest rate could not exceed 6 percent per annum and the loan is to be repaid in full in not more than 20 years. Loans may be made by persons, firms, associations, and corporations or governmental agencies or corporations, either State or Federal. The provisions of sections 501, 502, and 503, containing the conditions for approval of loans, are essentially identical with those of the Senate bill. One of the differences is that approval is based upon proper and adequate appraisal rather than for an appraisal to be made by any other Federal agency.

TITLE IV. EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

This title was completely revised by the committee. As it passed the Senate it merely provided that the Administrator would be the chairman of a veterans' placement service board, the other members being the Director of the National Selective Service System and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, or such other official having the responsibility of administering the functions of the United States Employment Service. The committee draft places the entire responsibility on the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the functions to be discharged through cooperation with established employment agencies.

This title would transfer, effective the first day of the month following the date of the enactment of the act, the duties, powers, and functions of the Veterans' Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission to the Veterans' Administration. Likewise, effective as of or not later than the termination of hostilities in the present war, there is transferred to the Veterans' Administration the duties, powers, and functions vested in the Director of Selective Service by subsection (g), section 8 of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended. A proviso is added, giving the Chief Executive authority to effectuate such transfer prior to the termination of the present war. The records, property, and personnel of the Veterans' Employment Service are transferred to the Veterans' Administration and upon transfer of the stated functions of the Director of Selective Service the records and property of the Employment Division, Selective Service, shall be transferred to the Veterans' Administration. Necessary administrative provisions to carry out the foregoing purposes are contained in this title together with a general statement of the duties and responsibilities of veterans' employment representatives to be appointed by the Administrator and assigned to each of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.

TITLE V. READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

This title provides eligibility requirements uniform with that of titles II and III as to service. Readjustment allowances or compensation for each week of unemployment not exceeding 26 are provided, beginning after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the enactment of the act and occurring during the 24-month period subsequent to discharge of the veteran from active service. The allowance prescribed per week shall be $20, less that part of the wages payable for such week which is in excess of $3, with a provision for the nearest multiple of $1. Provisos are added to preclude duplicate allowances under this title and under Public, 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, and title II of this act. It is also provided that no readjustment allowance shall be payable more than 3 years after termination of the war. This title as redrafted by the committee is considered to be more simplified both as to administration and benefits provided. Essentially the qualifications provided by applicable State laws will apply, with added restrictions as to disqualifications, and the administration by the Veterans' Administration will be the most direct possible through State agencies. While in some aspects greater restrictions have been adopted, the plan has been broadened to cover the self-employed during a waiting period of production such as in many agricultural and other productive enterprises. The amendments, it is believed, will remove most, if not all, of the objections seriously urged to the provisions of this title as passed by the Senate. It is assumed that all State agencies will fully cooperate with the Veterans' Administration in assisting the Nation to meet the problem of readjusting its service men and women to the ways of peace.

TITLE VI. GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

This particular title as contained in the Senate bill was adopted with amendments believed essential and tying with the principal titles to the bill. It is designed to insure uniform administrative control to the end that all of these provisions for veterans generally, as well as disabled veterans, will be adequately and satisfactorily administered. Furthermore, the intent of the Congress is declared that benefits provided shall not be accumulative but selective, and that it is the purpose of the present Congress that they shall be deducted from any adjusted compensation or similar adjustment of service pay which may be provided in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi I regret that many Members have left the floor, because there has been quite a bit of discussion about H. R. 3846, which has been generally referred to as the Barden bill. I wanted to have an opportunity to discuss that bill before as many Members as possible, as well as to point out some of the criticisms of the present provisions of Senate 1767.

Let me say this at the outset. When the President signed the bill drafting 18-year-old boys on November 13, 1942, he announced that there would be a study made of ways and means of providing these men with an opportunity for training and education. This is his statement. I quote:

> I am causing a study to be made by a committee of educators, under the auspices of the War and Navy Departments, for the taking of steps to enable young men whose education has been interrupted to resume their schooling and afford equal opportunity for the training and education of other young men of ability after their service in the armed forces has come to an end.

He set about and appointed a committee to make a study of that problem.

The members of that committee were as follows:

Brig. Gen. Frederick H. Osborn, Director, Special Service Division, Army Service Forces, chairman; Capt. Cortlandt C. Baughman, Director of Special Activities, Bureau of Naval Personnel, United States Navy; Rufus C. Harris, president, Tulane University; Dexter M. Keezer, Deputy Administrator, Office of Price Administration; Young B. Smith, dean, Columbia University Law School; John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education.

General Osborn designated as his alternate Col. Francis T. Spaulding, Chief, Education Branch, Special Service Division; Captain Baughman designated as his alternate Lt. Comdr. Ralph A. Sentman, Officer in Charge, Educational Services Section, Bureau of Naval Personnel.

That committee reported to the President and the President sent a copy of that report, together with his message, to the Congress, to the House, and to the Senate, and the Speaker of the House referred that report and the President's message to the House Committee on Education, of which I am chairman. That was last October 27, and from that date until May 4 the Committee on Education has been studying this problem, and only this one problem.

The committee has done a lot of work. I do not think there is a finer committee in the House or one that is more devoted to its duties. I think they are in a position to give some intelligent thought and suggestions on questions of education. I do not say that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is incapable of passing on educational problems, but they had a tremendous problem before them. They had many different sections of the bill. They worked hard. They have done a very credible job, and I want to congratulate the chairman of that committee and compliment the various members on their very keen devotion to duty. There has been an attempt to stir up a fight between possibly the American Legion and the educational people of this country. There is and should not be any fight. Many members of my committee are members of the American Legion. Personally I have been a member for over 20 years. We are all seeking the same objective, and that is the best possible educational program for the veterans now in service. There is no fight over the objective. There is a difference of opinion as to the approach and the manner in which it should be accomplished.

After the Committee on Education had completed its studies and consideration of H. R. 3846, the bill, on May 4, was reported out by the Committee on Education. The committee was conscious of the fact that there was included in the so-called G. I. bill a section dealing with education. I conferred with the chairman of that Committee on Veterans' Affairs and we decided that in view of the fact that we were all intensely interested in the objective sought, it would be probably wise for our committee to present to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation the result of its labors, work, and thought on this subject, and told them to take the bill and insert it in their bill; that we had no pride of authorship, that we were not trying to hold the number, that we did not want any credit for it. So the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the ranking minority member the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and myself went before the Veterans' Committee, and in a brief time we tried to present the bill.

That same afternoon, I understand, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported out the bill without including the title, which the Committee on Education had been dealing with. That is understandable, because they wanted to report the bill out that day, and they did not think much of just turning over and kicking out that section of their bill in 30 minutes. I can understand that. So then there was nothing for us to do except to report our bill to the House and attach to it the report which explains the provisions of the bill.

In dealing with this problem, I trust nothing said by me here will in any way be construed as being personal toward General Hines, the present most excellent Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, for I have the same high regard, trust, and confidence in General Hines that everyone else has who has ever come in contact with him. But in writing Federal legislation I have found from bitter experience that we must write with a view toward getting, at times, less cautious men than the present Administrator, General Hines. For this reason, too much power vested in the position of the Administrator is dangerous and a constant threat not only to the educational institutions of the country but to the liberties of the individual. Unless I do not understand the English language, the language used in title 2 of the G. I. bill gives to the Administrator more power than a good man should want and certainly more than a bad man should have.

There has been some mention here that the General has taken exception, or somebody down in the department has, to two statements contained in the committee report.

I can hardly believe that is true. Nevertheless, the statement referred to quoting from the report is as follows:

> This legislation has recognized the legitimate interests of the Veterans' Administration in a matter so vital to the veterans.

For the life of me, I cannot understand how anyone would object to that language, for certainly if the Veterans' Administration does not have a legitimate interest in the welfare of the veterans it ought to have. I can see no criticism from that source. I certainly see no occasion for any explanation or apology for that statement and I have none to offer. The next statement was:

> The average veteran is more interested in the little red schoolhouse than in a more powerful Veterans' Administration.

If that is not a sound statement, then I do not know how to make one. Certainly I did not imply that General Hines is interested in a powerful Veterans' Administration. I simply said that the average veteran is interested in the preservation of the little red schoolhouse, and I think that is a sound statement. So I see no occasion for the general or anyone else to be stirred up and I am not much concerned; certainly the general did not write the bill, but if he had this report and legislation is a matter pending before Congress and my course will be guided by my best judgment, duty to the veterans and my country. But I do say that certainly no one is charging General Hines with seeking any power or authority or bureaucratic powers. Nobody has ever thought of that in connection with that mild-mannered, modest, fine gentleman. But should he ask for the passage of S. 1767 with such provisions as are now in the bill, then I would say he was calling for too much power.

Title II of S. 1767 is the first real invasion threat to the State's educational fronts and makes the Administrator, whether he likes it or not, everything from big boss to truant officer. Under any scheme to provide education for veterans, the following must be decided by someone: What course is to be taken? What school will be attended? Is the course being successfully pursued? What tuition will be paid the school? How long is the course of training to be?

The G. I. bill—S. 1767—answers the question as to what course is to be taken by providing that it shall be a course selected by the veteran subject to regulations promulgated by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. Give me the power and authority to promulgate and enforce my regulations. That is the thing that has caused us so much headache out of Washington—that very thing.

I call your attention to something that is very, very important, and I hope the gentleman who is going to follow me will give me his attention for a minute because I am intensely interested in some kind of explanation of this. Additional light is thrown on this matter of election by paragraph 7 of S. 1767.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman should have this information. If I understand, our committee will offer an amendment to strike paragraph 7 entirely from the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield, it is my purpose at the proper time to offer a motion to strike out paragraph 7 entirely.

Mr. BARDEN. I may say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I am glad I have smoked him out on the very first paragraph I attack.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman did not smoke me out at all.

Mr. BARDEN. Nobody has said anything about striking it out until now.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I made up my mind to offer an amendment to do that long before we came in here with the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I shall have to talk about the gentleman's bill as it is now written, because about 25 amendments to it, very practical amendments, have already been suggested.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. A moment ago the gentleman was talking about election under part VIII on page 52, and was talking about the regulations the Administrator would prescribe, but he did not read quite far enough. Why did not the gentleman read on and say, "pursuant to the authority and within the limitations herein contained"?

Mr. BARDEN. I am going to give the gentleman some of the limitations herein contained in just a minute. If he will bear with me a few minutes, I will really give him some limitations. Paragraph 7 contains almost unlimited authority. How did it get in the bill and if the bill has been so perfect up to this point what has caused the rush to strike it out? I shall have to discuss this bill as it is now written. It would certainly be unwise for me to take the attitude that the gentleman's amendment will be adopted. If he secures the adoption of that amendment and does not put something in its place, then I would certainly wonder how he is going to run and operate this piece of legislation.

Let me talk about paragraph 7 here. I quote from S. 1767:

> The authority vested in the Administrator by paragraphs 2, 6, and 7, part VII, Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, with respect to vocational rehabilitation, shall be vested in, and may be exercised by, him with respect to education or training under this part.

Now let me read you paragraph 2, a part of this bill, and see how you like this. Yet people wonder why the educational people of this country are disturbed. They would not be worthy of being called educators if they did not get disturbed over this. I am reading a part of S. 1767 as it is now written:

> The Administrator shall have the power to prescribe and provide suitable training to persons included in paragraph 1—

Just stop right there. Many times today has the statement been made here that the Veterans' Administrator under that bill had no authority to "prescribe or direct." He has the power to prescribe and provide, and quoting further—

> and for such purposes may employ such additional personnel and experts as are deemed necessary and may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well, as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution.

This includes the land-grant colleges and the Smith-Hughes colleges. Further quoting:

> In addition, he may by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments provide for such additional training facilities as may be suitable and necessary to accomplish the purposes of this part.

I do not blame the gentleman for wanting to get out from under that. The American people, I am quite sure, are in harmony with most provisions of the G. I. bill. But they do not want any Government-issue education.

If he cannot build his own colleges, if the Administrator cannot prescribe, if he cannot provide, if he cannot direct, if he cannot establish his own facilities, then I do not understand the English language, and I pause for anybody to challenge that interpretation. Then if by your silence you admit that, you admit this is a one-man program, which bypasses the States and their institutions completely.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. Does the gentleman want to challenge that statement?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I want to ask the gentleman, Does the power, under the provision of law which he just read, if conferred upon this Director, give him the opportunity to set up independent and separate machinery for education in the United States?

Mr. BARDEN. He can do almost anything he wants to do.

Mr. MURDOCK. If that is so, then I certainly agree with the gentleman that it would be better to cut it out.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman understands the English language.

Mr. MURDOCK. It would be better to cut it out of the bill if that is so, and I am glad to hear the gentleman from North Carolina say that such is his intention.

Mr. BARDEN. That is not all. I will give you more of the same thing.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I have just been reading section 4 (a) on page 17, the bill of the Committee on Education.

Mr. BARDEN. That is in which bill?

Mr. NORRELL. That is in H. R. 3846.

Mr. BARDEN. What is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. NORRELL. It is on this same point. It provides for the establishment of an advisory council appointed by the President, who would have charge of the education planning and facilities, as I understand it, that the committee bill under present consideration vests in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is one of the most intelligent and ablest men in this House.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. I just cannot understand how you could reach that conclusion. When have you ever seen an advisory committee which, as this is, is purely and simply and strictly an advisory committee, with no authority, no control, and no machinery, to act simply as an advisory committee? Where do you get any authority vested in that?

Mr. NORRELL. I am not asking you about the authority. I am trying to get you to explain to us the difference between your proposal here with reference to the advisory committee and the proposal of the committee bill under consideration with reference to the recommendations of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BARDEN. I can do that briefly. I am sorry you interrupted me here, because that is not exactly in point, but I will give you this explanation. That is an advisory board set up by the President to confer here in Washington with a man who has to act as the umpire, so to speak. The gentleman referred to the Veterans' Administrator being "papa" to the veterans. The veterans do not want to be "papa-ed" any more by bureaus in Washington. The gentleman cannot argue with me about this.

Mr. NORRELL. I would not argue with the gentleman at all.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman understands so clearly the capacity and the authority of a purely and simply advisory committee.

Mr. NORRELL. But if the schools are not supposed to accept the advice of the advisory committee, then why have it?

Mr. BARDEN. They do not advise the schools; they advise the Director here in Washington. The committee did not regard the advisory board as absolutely necessary. We simply thought it advisable and to remove it would not destroy the bill.

Mr. NORRELL. All right. Then the Director in turn advises the schools; does he not?

Mr. BARDEN. No; he does not. We have restricted and confined his activities in this bill. And on the next piece of legislation that I have anything to do with which comes before this House, I am going to restrict and confine and clarify and be very specific as to the authority vested in directors and administrators in Washington City.

Mr. NORRELL. The point I am anxious for the gentleman to explain to us is, Who is supposed, in the final analysis, to accept the advice of this advisory committee?

Mr. BARDEN. The Director and the Administrator, if they want to. If they do not want to they can just tell them, "I am sorry, gentlemen, we just do not agree with you."

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Why have this board at all? Why not leave it as we do to the school and the State, and the student?

Mr. BARDEN. I will tell you in a minute what you leave to the school and to the student. You do not leave him a thing in the world, not a thing in the world. You put the power to direct, the power to pay, the power to select, and the power to control somewhere else besides in the State or student.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Why have this board at all?

Mr. BARDEN. Why have the Congress of the United States? It is a part of our democracy and we thought this way the most democratic.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Please do not evade the question.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman surely is not serious in that comment. I think the gentleman is a very reasonable and very able man. I say the board is to act in an advisory capacity for the simple reason that I believe it will be more acceptable in the minds of the veterans of this country to know that they had a board selected from the various levels of education and from the various departments, the Navy Department and the War Department and from the Selective Service, and those folks that had to do with the initiation of this program and in addition to that they would come from the different regions of the country to see that no particular section in this country put its color on the program. It is the most democratic provision we could think of.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman indulge me one further question?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; I will.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Before the boy went to the Army he had no board anywhere to tell him anything.

Mr. BARDEN. He certainly did.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Why should he have a board now? If he took care of himself in the fighting through Guadalcanal and anywhere else, he certainly ought to have sense enough to know how to do a thing then, when he gets back.

Mr. BARDEN. I say again the advisory board is not absolutely necessary. But we thought it advisable—we advise with people to write legislation and I think it wise for administrators to advise with people in administering a law of this kind—you are the one who is advocating putting a one-man director over the veteran, to pass on his conduct, his efficiency, and so forth. Not me; I want him to be accountable to the same folks I was accountable to when I went to college, to the officials of the institution. They were the ones who passed on my conduct, grades, and so forth, not an administrator in Washington or his traveling inspectors.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for me to comment on that particular question?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; gladly.

Mr. JUDD. You say under the committee bill the Veterans' Administrator is going to be able personally to inaugurate and set up and handle every detail of this program. He is no expert in education. He has got to go out and set up a board. He will do it under your bill. We have tried to spell out what this board is going to consist of so it will represent all levels of education and training.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. We are leaving that to the schools.

Mr. JUDD. We would like it to be spelled out a little bit more in the legislation as to who the personnel of the particular board is to be and their qualifications, rather than turn it over to one particular man and then have somebody like Mr. Biddle be able to read almost anything into it, or set up any kind of board.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Let me ask the gentleman if he is willing to leave it to the student, to himself, and the school and the State, that is what we are proposing to do.

Mr. JUDD. So the purpose of this provision on page 18 that this advisory council is to advise the Director with respect to matters relating to the effective inauguration and operation of the program of education and training has nothing to do with the curriculum. It helps the Director to set up a program; he has a man from the Army and Navy there and they will merely advise about an educational program which once started is almost certainly a thing which will never operate, maybe it would not operate. If there is that much objection to it, I would agree to striking it out, but it seems to me it would be helpful rather than harmful.

Mr. BARDEN. When the gentleman from Louisiana begins to talk about leaving matters pertaining to this legislation to the student, the school, and the State, he is joining our ranks. Let me say that board was set up because we felt that it was about the wisest kind of a democratic set-up we could think of. We did not give them any authority. We simply give them an advisory capacity and we knew good and well, and the gentleman from Louisiana knows good and well that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is going to follow the same wise policy he has always followed. When he is setting up a program in this country he calls in advisers and we thought that the Congress might not be amiss in charting the kind of advisers we want. For that reason it is not a harmful but a helpful provision. If that is the worst thing you can find against this bill, then it is lily white.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is this reference you make to the setting up of this board the only distinction between the bill you mentioned and the committee report? If it is, why is it not pertinent to this issue to give us the difference between the two bills so that we may have a thorough understanding on this question?

Mr. BARDEN. I was trying to get to that when I became tangled in this series of questions.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In the first place, if this board is so useless and so inutile, why pay $15 a day for them to sit and do nothing?

The second question is, after these men get back, after 3½ to 5 years, they will be fed up with Selective Service and the Army and Navy.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, and let me tell the gentlemen this. God bless them if they fight for 5 years. They will be fighting the dictators of the earth and they will despise everything that even smacks of dictatorship.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is exactly the point I made.

Mr. BARDEN. They will despise everything that even smacks of dictatorship, whether it be a bureaucrat in Washington or anybody engaged in a Government activity. You can take that thought home with you tonight.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is exactly the purpose in giving them their choice.

Mr. BARDEN. I fail to see where S. 1767 gives the veteran any choice; you simply put him under a one-man dictatorship. We do not believe in this streamlined government. That is what Hitler has, and he does not have a Congress either. He says it is in the way and it is too much trouble. He does not want advisers. I do not like governments or government programs ruled and run by one man, and especially is that true when we enter the field of education.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am glad to hear that expression, and has been stated, in view of the things you have mentioned, that is exactly the thing that has motivated the members of the committee in striking out paragraph 7, because we are bound and determined that these agencies in Washington will have just as little power and as little say-so as is humanly possible.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to have the gentleman clear up one or two points.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, now, let us get back to paragraph 7.

Mr. BUSBEY. It is right on this particular subject. After all is said and done, this is a veterans' bill. Your bill has the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Selective Service System, the War Manpower Commission, and all these others in this advisory council. What right have the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and these others to dictate to these men after they have been discharged from the service? They are no longer in the service.

Mr. BARDEN. Now, wait a minute. The gentleman is entirely too intelligent to make a statement like that. I know what the gentleman is trying to do. He is trying to make a wolf out of a lamb. Who said anything about this advisory council being a dictator? Let me tell you this, that every one of these programs has been charted by advisory committees. If there is an advisory committee put in there, this Congress will put it in there, and the gentleman has seen 500 of them operating in Washington that the Congress never put in, never exercised any right to put in. It is I think a safeguard. The gentleman is on the wrong side of the picture if he says he wants to strike out "safeguards." Now, what is the other question?

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not think the first one has been satisfactorily answered. I believe the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] is losing sight of the fact that this is not an education bill, but this is a veteran's bill, dealing purely

with trying to give veterans an education. We are not trying to set up various curricula for these schools and colleges.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

This is a bill which seeks to provide education and training for approximately 1,000,000 men and women who have honorably served their country. Call it what you may, I have not lost sight of the facts involved.

Mr. BARDEN. Now, if you will just bear with me a minute, I want to read the rest of the provisions in paragraph 7. I have just read the provision which enabled the Administrator to build colleges, as far as that concerned, to direct and prescribe, or prescribe and provide, as you want to put it. Then they make paragraph 6 a part of it, and it begins as follows:

The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary in order to promote good conduct and cooperation on the part of persons who are following courses in vocational rehabilitation provided in this part.

And it is made a part of this law by the reference contained in paragraph 7 of S. 1767.

And then it goes on and deals with penalties which are set up in this paragraph, but I do not understand how they are going to apply the penalties.

Then the seventh paragraph is also made a part of this S. 1767:

The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations—

They are strong on rules and regulations—

as may be deemed necessary for the granting of leaves of absence to those following courses of vocational rehabilitation—

And so forth; and then it sets out the length of time, and so forth.

Now, I cannot understand, to save my life, how this bill could have been minutely discussed and dissected without discovering such glaring invasions of the school system of America as that.

In searching for further light, that paragraph 7 looks harmless, and as they intimated, they are going to strike it out. Maybe they will, but I think the best thing to do is to remove the section and I believe the House will reach that conclusion. Some of the committee members have already indicated the need for several amendments to it until it has about reached the point that they should give it the same treatment the farmer gave his Ford car, jack up the radiator cap and run a new car under it.

There is another aspect to this provision of giving the Federal agency authority to prescribe suitable courses. With a million men involved it virtually gives this central agency control over what will be taught in our schools. I do not believe in giving that kind of authority to any Federal agency. It is not democratic.

Mr. SCRIVNER. To what language is the gentleman referring?

Mr. BARDEN. The language of "prescribing and providing," and "making regulations and controlling," and line 4, page 53, "upon satisfactory completion of such course of education." Satisfactory to whom? The Administrator; also lines 20 through 23, page 53 of S. 1767, "That any course of education or training under this part may be discontinued at any time if it is found by the Administrator that the conduct or progress of the veteran is unsatisfactory," and so forth. It is not democratic and would not be respecting the traditional State and local control of education. The institutions are in the best position to pass on the conduct and progress of a student, not some bureau in Washington City. And let me repeat that paragraph 7 is loaded with more dynamite than any paragraph I have ever seen written into a bill, especially with such a harmless appearance.

Something has been said about the veteran having the right to enroll in a school of his choice. I believe their language reads: "A veteran eligible under this part may enroll in any school or nstitution of his choice which will accept him for educational training."

That sounds fair and reasonable. It must be remembered, however, that the veteran is subject to the limitations as to the kind of course he may take. He is further automatically limited to schools which provide a course which the central Federal agency decides will be suitable for him.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield? Excluding paragraph 7, which we are going to strike out, will the gentleman take the balance of the bill and tell us where that language appears?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the gentleman I am still talking about the bill as you have written it. You cannot say to this House whether this paragraph 7 will be stricken out or not or what you will put in its place. Your committee came in here saying it was a good bill as written; now you propose to cut out about three paragraphs of law including the sections referred to. I still cannot understand how it got in for even a short stay; but it is in and tied up with practically every section of the bill, and not only must be considered as a part of the bill, but is a part of it. The gentleman will have to let me proceed.

If the Administrator decides that some course, such as a course in shoemaking or agriculture, is unsuitable, then it goes out of the window, for as the bill is written he has the power to "prescribe and provide" or as is set out in lines 20 to 23, page 53, of S. 1767, the Administrator may decide that the veteran's "conduct or progress" is unsatisfactory and throw him out.

The question of tuition has been discussed. A limit of $500 has been fixed. How that applies I am hardly able to say. The bill refers to "each regular school year." Most of the colleges are now on an accelerated program and probably will be for the duration of the war; but there are some things in that paragraph that are bad. It reads:

The customary cost of tuition, laboratory fees, books, supplies, and equipment, and other necessary expenses exclusive of any charge for maintenance.

I do not know what "supplies and equipment" are. The Committee on Education bill, H. R. 3846, is perfectly clear on that subject. It reads as follows:

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, pursuant to appropriate certifications of facts by the Director, shall also provide for the payment by the United States of such customary tuition, laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees and charges, as may be recommended by the State department of education and approved by the Director, to approved educational or training institutions furnishing education or training to war-service persons, whether on a full-time or part-time basis, so long as such persons maintain regular attendance and are in good standing at such institutions, but in no event shall such payment with respect to any person exceed the rate of $500 per ordinary school year of 36 weeks: *Provided*, That such payments shall not include charges for travel, board, lodging, or other living expenses, and no payments shall be made to business or other establishments furnishing apprentice or other training on the job. If any such institution has no established tuition fee, or if the established tuition fee of any publicly supported institution or private institution exempt from tax under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, shall be found by the Director, after recommendation of the State department of education of the State in which such institution is located, to be inadequate compensation to such institution for furnishing education or training to war-service persons, the Director is authorized to provide for the payment with respect to any such person of such compensation as he may find to be fair and reasonable, but not to exceed the rate of $500 per ordinary school year of 36 weeks.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I greatly fear the language of the bill on page 55, lines 3, 4, and 5, if enacted into law, will discriminate against State colleges and universities who charge no tuition, discriminate against them in favor of other schools that have a definite tuition charge which covers all expenses.

Mr. BARDEN. Of course, that is true. Such detail provisions, those things that will cause so much trouble if left out as they are in S. 1767, are spelled out in the bill presented by the Committee on Education. It provides for the realization of the objective we seek but avoids these pitfalls that the Administrator will find from the time he begins to administer this act. I will read the provision which deals with the tuition. We all know there are publicly supported schools and there are schools maintained by the church; also there are privately endowed institutions. Some of them do not even charge tuition, yet we should not impose this burden upon them without compensation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman's bill exclude those schools or include them?

Mr. BARDEN. It includes them.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Who determines which ones shall go in?

Mr. BARDEN. The States—the States and not an administrator in Washington—the States which for 150 years have been able to give the public appropriate information about their approved, accredited, and qualified schools, are going to make that determination. Certainly they are more interested and know more about it than some far-away Washington administrator. The language in H. R. 3846 is as follows:

(f) The term "approved educational or training institution" includes any institution specified below which has been approved by a State department of education: Private or public elementary, secondary, and other schools furnishing education for adults, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, colleges, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers colleges, normal schools, professional schools, and universities, and including business or other establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job under the supervision of (1) an approved college or university, (2) any State department of education, (3) any State apprenticeship agency, (4) any State board of vocational education, (5) any State apprenticeship council, (6) the Federal Apprentice Training Service established in accordance with Public, No. 308, Seventy-fifth Congress, or (7) any agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such training.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Why then is there set out at the bottom of page 22 rules and regulations which put the State departments of education under the control of a Federal agency?

Mr. BARDEN. We do not put any control of a Federal agency over them except what we have written out and spelled out in this bill, and that is exactly in line with what the armed forces committee on post-war educational opportunities for service personnel recommended to the President who in turn passed the recommendation on to Congress. Therefore such provisions as the following was included in H. R. 3846:

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to appropriate certifications of fact by the Director, shall also provide for the payment by the United States of such customary tuition, laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees and charges as may be recommended by the State departments of education and approved by the Director, to approved educational or training institutions furnishing education or training to war-service persons whether on a full-time or part-time basis, so long as such persons maintain regular attendance and are in good standing at such institutions.

Now, we do not want the Administrator sending inspectors to see whether the student is in good standing, whether he is attending classes, and whether he is behaving himself. The institutions have always been able to do that themselves. We have enough inspectors and inquirers running around as it is without turning loose another batch.

But in no event—

Now, listen to this—

But in no event shall such payment with respect to any person exceed the rate of $500 per ordinary school year of 36 weeks.

H. R. 3846 is specific; it does not leave these things hanging in the air.

Provided—

I want the Members to listen to this—

Provided, That such payment shall not include charges for travel, board, lodging, or other living expenses, and no payments shall be made to business or other establishments furnishing apprentice or other training on the job. If any such institution has no established tuition fee, or if the established tuition fee of any publicly supported institution or private institution exempt from tax under section 101, subsection 6, of the Internal Revenue Code, shall be found by the director, after recommendation of the State department of education of the State in which such institution is located, to be inadequate compensation to such institution for furnishing education or training to war-service persons, the Director is authorized to provide for the payment with respect to any such person of such compensation as he may find to be fair and reasonable, but not to exceed the rate of $500 per ordinary school year of 36 weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I understood the gentleman from North Carolina to say that he was trying to take this away from any Federal bureaucracy, yet in the language he has just read, the power to approve these tuition fees, laboratory fees, and so forth, is given to the Director. The language on page 21 of the gentleman's bill reads:

And approved by the Director.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me read something to the gentleman in that connection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let me first put the other proposition, for it goes right along with the first one. Then when it comes to paying the schools some sum up to $500 the provisions of the gentleman's bill still retain the power of decision back here in Washington as to what is fair and reasonable.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; but it is recommended to them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. But if he is going to adopt the recommendations of the State agency why give him any discretion whatsoever?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me read the gentleman something that comes from the very able committee appointed by the President which made its study and recommendation to the President:

Administrative arrangements. In considering administrative arrangements for the program it proposes your committee has had as its primary objective the provision of arrangements which will get the program carried out with an absolute minimum of administrative overhead. In addition it has been governed by the conviction that in the post-war processes of education for ex-servicemen the traditional State and local control of education should be fully protected and that the Federal Government should not inject itself into these processes beyond the degree—

Now, listen—

beyond the degree necessary to assure that the funds it may make available are providently spent. The committee has always borne in mind, moreover, the fact that the educational institution itself in the final analysis—

Listen—

must be responsible for the most important part of the program, the actual guidance and teaching of the former serviceman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There is no argument on that, but the gentleman has not yet answered the question I asked about the power and discretion of the Director to find what is fair and reasonable.

Mr. BARDEN. If there is no argument over the recommendation just read, the gentleman must be for H. R. 3846, for after all, Mr. Chairman, this is Federal money that is being spent and we cannot take the bridle off altogether.

There must be a controlling hand somewhere in matters of this kind and H. R. 3846 provides for recommendation of the State department of education of the State in which such institution is located. S. 1767 simply leaves them out completely unless they have an established tuition fee. This recommendation comes up from the State as a recommendation to the Director and he has a right to find what is a reasonable tuition. There must be a reasonable tuition. The Administrator, with the recommendation of the State department of education, can find what is a reasonable tuition to pay. How in the world could you restrict it any more? What the gentleman's G. I. bill does is, it just takes the bridle off and puts virtually all power in the administrator, but overlooks all church, State or endowed schools, and apprentice schools unless they have an established or customary tuition fee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Oh, no. I would not do that any more than the gentleman would.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me read you from the President's message. It is a clear-cut statement. This is from the President's message to Congress of October 27:

While the Federal Government should provide the necessary funds and should have the responsibility of seeing that they are spent providently and under generally accepted standards, the control of the educational processes and the certification of trainees and students should reside in the States and the localities.

If that is not sound American doctrine then I do not recognize it when I see it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think we are in accord on what is there.

Mr. BARDEN. Then we are getting closer together, but you cannot sleep

with that bill, S. 1767, tonight if we do see eye to eye.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have been sleeping with it now for six weeks and I expect to stay with it.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan. But before I do let me say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] that he has already declared his intention to abandon a part of his bedfellows, to wit, that powerful paragraph No. 7.

Mr. MICHENER. Much has been said about paragraph 7 that seems to be the nub of the dispute so far as the Barden bill is concerned. As I understand it, the committee has agreed to and will offer an amendment to strike out paragraph 7. Assuming that is correct, will the bill then be opposed by the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Education?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me answer your question.

Mr. MICHENER. A great many Members over here are in sympathy with the gentleman's position and I have been trying and they have been trying to clarify the situation to find out what the position is. If paragraph 7 comes out then does the bill meet the specifications that the gentleman advocates? If it does, then I think talk is water over the dam.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the gentleman that I appreciate how he feels. He may think that probably would correct the situation. They have talked about striking out paragraph 7. If you strike that out you still have this one fundamental principle left, that the whole Committee on Education is solemnly opposed to, and that is in S. 1767 and I think its supporters will agree with me. It set up one Director in Washington and he must of necessity be director of that program, a dictator of that program, so to speak, because he has no one else there to rely on and no one, or no set-up provided to share in the power control or supervision. There is no alternative for him, he must be the dictator, and he is the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. When you remove paragraph 7 you have removed some of the most objectionable features I have ever seen written into a bill; at the same time you have simply taken one link out of the bill which its supporters and the Veterans' Committee thought was necessary to make it a complete bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will conclude. I yield him 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, there is a fundamental difference between the two bills and I am glad to get down to them. Here is the set-up with H. R. 3846. Under the Veterans' Administrator, and below him this Director of Educational Services, there will be approximately, we anticipate, 1,000,000 to 1,250,000 people. It is bound to take the time of a man, whether you call him Director or whatever you call him. All right. We recognize the State department of education in the States to give a list of the approved schools and training institutions, and so forth. We let the veteran deal with the colleges, schools—private and public. The service person enters and attends the college, school, or training institution of his own choice, provided the school finds him qualified and acceptable.

The college or school is responsible for his conduct, it is responsible for his progress, it is responsible for his attendance, whether it be high school, college, or an apprentice school, and we do provide for apprentice schools. They make their report on the student's conduct, progress, and efficiency to the State departments of education, which in turn transmits them to the Director. The duties and powers of the Director are limited and specifically prescribed in H. R. 3846, as well as the duties, authority, and so forth, of all other agencies or persons connected with the program.

In S. 1767 the Administrator in Washington is the one who looks after the man's conduct. He is the judge of whether he is making satisfactory progress; he is the judge of whether or not the veteran is entitled to go to school for another year. He may add schools which the State says are not good. He may put a student out if he is not satisfied. S. 1767 provides that a person shall go to school after the first entrance. The veteran goes as long as he or she has served in the Army, less 3 months and less the training he or she has had under the Army specialized-training program or Navy college-training program or at either of the service schools. Much of the training in the Army training schools was on radar and other things that are absolutely useless to the person in peacetime. If these veterans stay as long as they were in the Army, there would not be a day in the year but what there would be a flock of those boys going out because they had served their time. Some 6 months, some 8 months, some 10 months, some 15 months, some 7 month and 13 days. How on earth the educational institutions will be able to keep up with them, I am unable to say, but that is what S. 1767 prescribes. In H. R. 3846, if they served 6 months or served less than that, if they saw sea duty or oversea duty, and many of them have and will in the future, then they get the first year of 54 weeks. That 54 weeks was thought out because of the way the colleges divide their semesters and their terms. If you made it 52 weeks, you would simply cut off the 2 weeks' examination. If he makes satisfactory progress and the institution thinks that his conduct, his progress, and his work are satisfactory, then he goes for another year. That gives to everybody who passes their first year's work and who conduct themselves properly an additional term, which makes 108 weeks.

We thought in view of the fact the line must be drawn somewhere that that was about the fairest disposition we could make of the matter. That would be a total of 108 weeks, which would give him a 2-year accelerated course, as all of the colleges are now practicing. After this war I am inclined to think every college in the country will be on a straight time year-round schedule until this educational deficit is filled or to some considerable extent caught up. So when you remove paragraph 7 you have not removed the objectionable features of S. 1767 because it is still a one-man program here in Washington. The very theory of the bill is objectionable; you cannot make it anything else because you have not provided for anything but a straight one-man controlled set-up.

It is a one-man directorship and he can make it rather strong. The educational people of the country realize that a million or a million and a quarter men will be coming into their schools, and you give to one man the power to pay and the power to direct and the power to say when a man is behaving himself—the power to say when progress is or is not satisfactory and when he should go out. These powers along with his regulatory powers, and so forth, they simply cannot see anything in that but an invasion of the State's prerogatives and rights, and the orderly conduct of their school systems as they have enjoyed it for 150 years, especially since there will be probably more than a million participating in this program. I know if there is anything fixed in the hearts of the people of this country, it is that we want our school system unmolested from Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman with the understanding he will yield a minute to me.

This is very interesting to me, but the gentleman, I think, forgets that the Administrator today has special men for the insurance claims, special men for the medical section, and special men for vocational education work. That is all under the Director. I have never seen a sick veteran or well veteran, or soldier or sailor who does not prefer to have it administered by the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration knows their problems. They are following the education that they are taking in the Army today. They are keeping up with it. It does not seem to me that that interferes in any way with State rights. It gives the men more opportunity to go to the school, large or small, that they want to go to.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me just say this in reply to that. I think one of the great problems and one of the biggest things we must look forward to is fitting the veteran back into normal society, as a normal human being, and not keep segregating him and making him feel he is a different class of citizen. Let him go to a school just like any other boy, be a part of the school system, and operate.

It is true we do have hospitals for the disabled, institutions for vocational training, and so forth, but this is the first

time that we have taken a general hold of the educational system of this country proposing to take charge of over 1,000,000 students, and that is where this is coming from, I think the gentlewoman from Massachusetts would agree with me. I think we are all interested in the same objective.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Surely.

Mr. BARDEN. This bill—H. R. 3846—will give the boys the training, and the gentlewoman's bill would probably do the same thing if General Hines lives, and I hope he does. But I am inclined to think that while we have a most excellent and delightful Administrator presiding over the Veterans' Administration now, he has no more assurance of life than you or I. We must write a Federal law, and I think it is our responsibility to safeguard our institutions and our educational system against the possible invasion of some man who might not be as discreet and as competent perhaps as General Hines.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say that the Veterans' Administration bill, operated as we wrote it in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, will protect the State rights much more from the Federal Government than does the bill proposed by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I cannot agree with the gentlewoman. There is not one vestige of protection of States' rights or institution rights. They are simply ignored and the Administrator featured, and if paragraph 7 remains in the bill it will be a bureaucratic bill of the very worst type.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. In the gentleman's bill there is provided a list of accredited schools which is submitted by the various States. As I understand it, the other bill also provides for a list submitted by the States, but it provides that the man here in Washington, the head of the Veterans' Administration, can add other schools to it. Does the gentleman have a similar provision in his bill?

Mr. BARDEN. No. Do not confuse the word "accredited" with "approved." H. R. 3846 uses the term "approved."

Mr. WRIGHT. Suppose a veteran wanted to go to a private school, for instance, or possibly some trade school.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman understands that we cover all private, trade, and apprenticeship schools.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; but you leave the designation of those schools entirely up to the State board of education, and if the veteran wanted to go to one of those schools that was not on your list, he could not do it very well, could he?

Mr. BARDEN. The State authorities know more about the reputable schools inside its borders than any administrator in Washington will ever know. I had rather trust my State set-up any day before I will some administrator here in Washington. So will the veterans, the educational folks, and the people in general. Here is a telegram that just came in from the gentleman's very distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania:

> Believe that veteran aid bill should be so amended vesting the selection of educational institutions and other administrative matters in State agencies.

I know there has been a lot of discussion about these things, but that just came in since lunch.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I believe the gentleman has made a splendid contribution to the discussion today, and I believe it would be a splendid thing if the gentleman would extend his remarks and set forth the essential differences between his bill and the bill that the committee reported in order to permit the Members who were not able to be here today to have the opportunity of reading what he had to say in that respect.

Mr. BARDEN. I will say to the gentleman I will try to do that.

The ideas of the two bills are just different in this respect. One is, we build our structure on the State government, and the other, S. 1767, builds from the top down.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Can the gentleman give us the difference in the cost of bill H. R. 3846 and S. 1767? The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I believe, gave some estimated cost of S. 1767.

Mr. BARDEN. I have not been able to get any estimate of the total cost of this program that I regard it as being a safe estimate, because it is all a guess, and my guess is as good as anyone else's. But I do not see one bit of difference.

I do not see where H. R. 3846 should cost a cent more than S. 1767, if as much. In H. R. 3846 the States pay one-half of the administrative cost. In H. R. 3846 the State institutions, the colleges, the high schools, the trade schools, and the private schools are their own truant officers. They do their own investigating. They do their own passing upon the grades, and so forth. In S. 1767 all of those duties are placed on the Administrator, and if he does not have inspectors, he cannot keep up with it, and if he does have them, he should not be sending them into my State. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman from Mississippi arrived at some cost on the other bill, and I wondered if the Bureau of Education could not arrive at some cost on H. R. 3846.

Mr. BARDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I do not know anything about the Bureau of Education. The Bureau of Education did not write this bill. This is a committee bill.

Mr. DURHAM. I did not mean that, of course. The gentleman consulted the Bureau of Education in writing the bill, did he not?

Mr. BARDEN. No; I did not even do that.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman did not?

Mr. BARDEN. No. There is some language from the lips of nearly every member of the committee in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] 40 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I first wish to congratulate the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans' Association, the Order of the Purple Heart, as well as all other organizations and individuals who have spent their time and effort that brought forth and sponsored this bill. I think it was splendid on their part. They showed their patriotism and a recognition of the rights of the men and women who are defending our country for us.

I also wish to congratulate the Congress for considering it, the members of the committee that I have the honor to serve with, particularly our chairman, and our ranking Member the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. Since coming to Congress I have never seen a committee or served on a committee that has worked harder and more conscientiously than this committee. We took this bill as it came to us from the Senate, went over it line by line, paragraph by paragraph, and studied it with one thought in mind: How to bring before you—for your consideration—the best bill for the veteran; a bill that would give him the best when he gets home. There is no pride of opinion on the part of anyone, insofar as the veterans' committee of the House is concerned, in regard to this bill, or any detail of this bill. Your committee in presenting this bill, has done so after 15 full days in executive session, after studying every proposition that has been presented on the floor this afternoon, and accepting it or discarding it.

The result of your committee's effort and the result of its total labors is what is in its opinion the best bill for the veteran, and nothing else.

It happens that the Committee on Education, which is sponsoring the bill H. R. 3846, and which I understand will offer it as a substitute for title II of the committee bill, is seeking exactly the same goal that your committee is seeking. We are all traveling toward the same point, namely, to give the veteran the most satisfactory and the best education we can give him with the least interference with and regulation of the veteran, as well as the least amount of control from the seat of our Government here in Washington, and at the same time give as much control to the States as it is

possible to give and be efficient and effective in the results we are seeking to obtain for the veteran. That is the goal of both committees.

I said a moment ago we have no pride of opinion. If it is brought out here that some other wording will be better than the wording in the committee bill, I am sure the committee will accept that wording. All we want to be sure of is that there will be as little bureaucracy and as little control as possible, and at the same time give the veteran a maximum of education. I am sure I am speaking for each of the 21 members of the committee.

While I am on that subject, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word about the membership of this committee. At least three-fourths of them are veterans of the last war. Some of them have sons in this war. One member of this committee is a past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Four members of this committee are past State commanders of the American Legion. If the Members of this House think for one minute that that committee is anxious to or is trying to get through a bill affecting the educational provisions of this measure that will take away from the States the rights and take away from the veteran freedom in securing his education, then they just do not understand the make-up and the membership of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of good features about this bill that have not yet been touched on. Because I probably shall not have an opportunity to speak twice on the bill, I want to start in at the beginning and take up the bill title by title, speaking briefly on some of them and longer on others, in order to give you a full picture of the bill known as Senate 1767, which has been amended by your committee by striking all after the enacting clause and substituting its own version.

First is the question of the need for the legislation. That has been recognized by the various veterans' organizations that I referred to in the beginning. I wish to say here that these boys and girls, these men and women who are fighting for us, are doing so willingly. They did not have anything to say about the rate of pay. They are not quarreling about the long hours they have to work or that they have to fight. They have nothing to say about where they go. Therefore, your committee in considering this bill took those questions into consideration insofar as they could and amended the bill as it came to us from the Senate to give a greater recognition to the sacrifice and the service that the veterans are performing for us.

Title I of this bill, in sections 100 and 101, provides for hospitalization claims and procedure in securing those claims. Section 101 declares that the Veterans' Administration is an essential war agency, which has never yet been determined by this Congress, and subject only to the Army and the Navy. It has priority over all material necessary for the hospitalization, treatment, and care of the veteran.

The bill further authorizes and directs the Veterans' Administration to complete additional hospital facilities and to make agreements for the use and the transfer of Army and Navy hospitals. General Hines testified before our committee that many of these hospitals, particularly in the States, belonging both to the Army and the Navy, will no longer be needed as much by them as they are now. As the men move out of the United States he wants to be able to enter into negotiations with the heads of the Army and the Navy to take over those hospitals for the benefit of the veterans who are discharged and under the control of the Veterans' Administration.

Sections 104 and 105 deal with claims, waivers, and prosthetic appliances, and education in the use of prosthetic appliances. In regard to claims, when a soldier is discharged, according to the terms of this bill, in the first place he cannot be discharged until his papers are ready and his discharge is ready. Then he can file a claim, if he wishes to, but he is not required to, he is not compelled to. All he needs to do is to state that he does not want at that time to file a claim. Then his rights are preserved for him so that he can file a claim later if it develops that he is entitled to do so.

Your committee, in order to make sure that the veterans of this war will not suffer from the signing of waivers as did the veterans of the last war, wrote into this bill an additional provision. In order to explain that, I want to take you back 25 years. Many of you will recall that when the boys got out of the service in 1918 and 1919 they were asked to sign a statement that they were in good health and good physical condition and, as I recall, that they were in as good condition as when they entered the service. In their anxiety to get home, the boys signed those waivers. They were told that they had to in order to get their discharge. Later some ailment developed that they could trace as service connected, and that waiver stood as a bar to their rights.

Your committee in its hearings found that these statements are being signed by the boys and the girls today when they are discharged. We did not want that. In order to protect them, we added a provision to this bill to the effect that in the event any member of the armed forces shall have signed one of these statements or papers either heretofore or hereafter, it will be null and void and of no force and effect and cannot be used against the soldier or as a bar to his rights at any time.

The provision of the bill dealing with prosthetic appliances has been well explained by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and I shall not enter into it.

I shall not dwell long on title II of the bill. That has to do with the permission primarily of representatives of the veterans' organizations such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the D. A. V., the Order of the Purple Heart, the Red Cross, and other recognized organizations that look after the interests of the veteran. This provision authorizes and directs the Veterans' Administration to make suitable quarters or suitable rooms or conveniences in each veterans' facility throughout the United States available for a representative of these recognized organizations so they can be ready with their representative to aid the veteran either in making application for the education provided for in title II, or the loans provided for in title III, or any other aid provided for in this bill or any legislation in the past or enacted in the future. This assures that these authorized representatives of these organizations will be given recognition in their work for the veteran.

Chapter III deals with a reviewing authority. I have only one thing to say in regard to that. It sets up a reviewing authority for a veteran who has been discharged other than by act of a general court martial.

This bill provides all those who are discharged under other than dishonorable conditions, may benefit under it. However, there are some discharges in the armed forces today taking place that are not the result of a general court martial. Where the discharge is for that reason or where the veteran under the provisions of the bill, such as the conscientious objector, is not entitled to the benefits and has not been dismissed from the service as the result of a general court martial, he may go before the reviewing board and have his discharge reviewed and his rights reinstated if his record shows that he is entitled to it.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. With reference to these boards with reviewing authority will a man who receives his so-called blue discharge come under that category?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. He would. That is a very wise provision, I think, of the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. There is a difference in the language employed in H. R. 1767 in reference to the discharge of veterans and in the language used in H. R. 3846.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Are you dealing with education only now?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I had not talked about that feature yet. I was talking about the previous provisions of titles of the bill which your bill has nothing to do with.

Mr. BARDEN. I thought this term "discharge" was running all the way through.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No; it is only in this one section.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, then I will not ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will say to the gentleman in answer to that that we had quite a bit of discussion, and if there is any member of the Committee on Military Affairs here I would like to have them know and have the benefit of what the committee brought out when representatives of the Army and Navy were up there about the character of the discharges being granted today. There is a white discharge which is an honorable discharge. There is a blue discharge. And then there is a yellow discharge which is dishonorable. But the white discharge, the honorable discharge, has on the back of it a statement of the soldier's record and on the last line is written "character," and we find they are putting on the line after "character" the words "good, bad, fair, satisfactory, or excellent." It is the opinion of your committee that every soldier who is entitled to an honorable discharge is entitled to have an excellent character rating or else it is inconsistent. And the only one who is not entitled to an excellent character rating is the one whom it has been determined is not entitled to it by the findings of a general court martial.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. We dealt with that. The language used in your bill is, "who is discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions," and realizing the distinction they are making and the argument that might arise on that, we employed the language, "who is discharged or relieved of active service and conditions other than dishonorable."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not think there is much difference between the gentleman's bill and the committee bill in that regard.

Mr. BARDEN. They have been giving some different interpretations to it down in the Department and that is the reason why we used that language.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not think there is much difference.

Now, I was hoping to pass the title on education and go to loans. However, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina in regard to his bill, I do want to touch on this title on education.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It is a recognized fact, is it not, that during World War No. 1 there were about 400,000 or approximately one-tenth of the armed forces who made application for what we term "educational rehabilitation."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Out of that 400,000 about 325,000 qualified. Then out of the 325,000, about 285,000 completed their education under the Veterans' Administration supervision. The law now proposed is that the Veterans' Administration will be doing the same thing with the disabled of this war. If the same ratio carries through, that will mean there will be approximately 1,500,000 who will make application for education rehabilitation and about 1,250,000 who will be eligible for it and probably out of that 1,250,000, 1,000,000 will complete the courses. In other words, there will be already set up in the Veterans' Administration an education set-up.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is correct. And no one knows how many veterans will take advantage of the provisions for education. Therefore it is impossible to make any accurate estimate as to what the cost of that title will be. There may be a million or five million or even more than that who will take advantage of the title on education and no one knows, one man's guess is just as good as another's, as to what the cost will be.

Now the gentleman from North Carolina said, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Kansas, that there must be a "controlling hand." I know I am correct in quoting that correctly, because I wrote it down the moment he said it. There is the nucleus of the whole thing in both of these measures. As I said in the beginning, our committee has no pride of opinion. If you can show our committee a better wording which will protect States' rights and give a minimum of Federal control, our committee will accept it. But the bill of the gentleman from North Carolina goes just as far in the other direction. I will show you why. He says there must be "a controlling hand." That is correct. The Government of the United States is going to pay the money to the colleges and universities and the schools. It has to come from Washington. Now to make the absolute irreducible minimum of Federal control that the gentleman from North Carolina thinks he has in his bill, we will have to have a set-up in Washington to send out checks to the colleges when they write in and say, "We are educating John Jones or Bill Smith, who are veterans of the last war and you owe so much money." All they would have to do when they receive that proof or that information is to write the check and send it out there for the veteran. So he is absolutely right when he says there must be a controlling hand. Your committee recognized that in drafting this bill and it left that controlling hand in the Veterans' Administration, or in the head of the Veterans' Administration, because he is the one closest to the veteran, the one who is all the time dealing with the veteran, the one who knows the veteran and the one whom all of the veterans' organizations can get after by going to one place and one point if they find he is not doing right by the veteran. Such an arrangement would not require them to run to a board or agency of 20 on the one hand and 14 or 17 on another. It leaves it in the hands of that one man. But now let us look at the House bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. But that so-called controlling hand does not give the Administrator in Washington any control whatsoever over what the young man takes or where he should take it or whether he should take it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Not at all. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. Now I want to read at the bottom of page 53, paragraph 2, of the committee bill, which reads as follows:

> 2. A veteran eligible under this part may enroll in any school or institution of his choice, which will accept him, for education or training, and may for reason satisfactory to the Administrator, change a course or institution: *Provided*, That any course of education or training under this part may be discontinued at any time if it is found by the Administrator that the conduct or progress of the veteran is unsatisfactory.

I am going to stop right there and say that a member of our committee has been discussing that with a member of the Committee on Education, and I think probably a wording has been agreed upon between them that will make it absolutely certain that the course cannot be changed or his course interrupted or discontinued by the Administrator unless the records of the institution or the college or the university show that they are unsatisfactory and it is not worth while for the boys to continue.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I just want to say a little in amplification of the distinguished gentleman's remarks with reference to this matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield for a question and not for a speech.

Mr. JUDD. I mean, the reason that was taken up, was the question of the word "conduct."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. If the Administrator finds the conduct is unsatisfactory, that might be stretched by some to get to the place of saying whether he voted right or not, and then again he would have over his head the threat that he could be removed if he did not do something that pleases the Administrator or if he did something that did not please the Administrator here in Washington. I hope they do that in case the bill is not substituted and that it will be corrected as suggested.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I said, our committee has no pride of opinion, and if a better wording can be suggested we will be glad to adopt it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. May I make a further observation?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If an occasion should arise, to which the gentleman has alluded, namely, that a veteran might be put out of a school because he had not voted right, I will guarantee that there would be such a storm arise from the veterans' organizations and the Veterans' Administration that the Administrator would probably take to the tall timbers. Not only that, but this committee which has been so closely connected with the Veterans' Administration would take some proper action itself.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Now, I want to read further:

Provided further, That the Administrator shall from time to time, secure from the appropriate agency of each State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, a list of schools, or institutions equipped to supply education or training within such jurisdiction, which schools and institutions, and such additional public or private schools or institutions as may be recognized by the Administrator, shall be deemed qualified to enroll eligible veterans approved for education or training under this part.

In explanation of that, you will notice first that the Administrator "shall." It is not "may." It is "shall secure from the appropriate agency of each State, a list of all the schools or institutions equipped to supply education or training within such jurisdiction"; and "they shall be deemed qualified to enroll eligible veterans."

It is also provided that the Administrator can add to that any others that he wants to put on that are necessary.

The reason for that is this: In my State we have an excellent college. It is an accredited college under the North Central Association of Colleges, or whatever the name is, for the simple and sole reason that it does not have a large enough endowment. Yet it was selected by the Navy for one of the best naval training schools in our entire State. It was good enough for the Navy. It was so good that the Navy wanted it and made it practically No. 1. Yet it is not an accredited school under that association, and under these rules. It has been in existence a long time. My personal experience is that graduates from that school can pass the entrance examinations to West Point and Annapolis much better than from almost any other school in my district. Yet it is not an accredited school.

As I interpret the bill of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], it would leave this matter to a State agency, and in my State that school would be barred, would not come under the provisions of his bill, unless the bureau in Washington, which he says he does not set up, comes in and says that it should.

I am getting now to the differences between the bills. We permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in Washington not to take from, to change, or in any way interfere with what the State agency says the veterans can attend, but if they fail to include the school I just referred to, or if they fail to include a good business college, or if they fail to include some good private institution, which would not be accredited under these rules, or any other educational institution, he can come in and add those, but he cannot take from. He can only add to. Wherein is that setting up a bureaucracy or a dictatorship over State control?

Now, coming to the bill of the gentleman from North Carolina on the same point, they set up an agency in Washington with 17 or 20 members, and they provide for a chairman. And who is the chairman? The same head of the Veterans' Administration.. They have the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, they have the Chairman of the National Board of Education, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Navy, and they go on and on. They would have to come in. Now the only difference is we leave it to the Veterans' Administration. They give it to the Veterans' Administration, but they put up another bureau around him, to be paid $15 a day. Yet they say they are giving State's rights.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. First, let me correct the gentleman's last statement, and then I will come back to where I think he made a slight error.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am not going to yield for a speech. I yield for a question. The gentleman had 1 hour.

Mr. BARDEN. May I ask the gentleman if he was not in error when he made the statement that we set up a bureau here in Washington?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am referring to the bottom of page 15 of the gentleman's bill:

There shall be established in the Veterans' Administration, an agency to be known as the War Service Education and Training Agency. The President, after recommendations by and consultation with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall appoint and prescribe a Director of War Service Education and Training, who shall be the head of the agency.

The President defines the duties. You do not in your bill, but—

The Director, with the approval of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall appoint such other employees as may be necessary in the execution of the functions of the agency.

I called it a bureau. I apologize. It is just an agency, but it puts the power here in Washington.

Mr. BARDEN. Then in subsection (b), going on, we describe the duties of the Director.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. Will the gentleman just let me follow that a moment? You said we set up a bureau.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Oh, but you do on page 17, under "Training." Do you want me to read that?

Mr. BARDEN. Now, let me see if the gentleman had in mind this language:

There shall be established on advisory council.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I did in one part of my statement.

Mr. BARDEN. There is a great deal of difference between an advisory council and a bureau; is there not?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I said I apologized for calling it a bureau. It is an agency. But, a rose is still a rose no matter what you call it.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman knows that an agency usually has authority, and an advisory council has no authority.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman. The bill speaks for itself.

Mr. BARDEN. Now the gentleman has made a very bad error, I think, unintentionally, when he was discussing the fact that the State department of education should give a list of accredited schools.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Under our bill, yes. No; not accredited schools, but a list of schools. Under your bill they give a list of accredited schools.

Mr. BARDEN. No; that is where the gentleman is in error again.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Show me where it is.

Mr. BARDEN. At the top of page 15. The term "approved," as the gentleman knows, is different from "accredited."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But who has the power to determine the approval?

Mr. BARDEN. There is a vast difference between "an approved school" and "an accredited school."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman wants to make a speech, I am not going to yield any further.

Mr. BARDEN. If you do not want me to help untangle it, very well.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No. I am asking you what is the difference between "approved" and "accredited."

Mr. BARDEN. Oh, the gentleman certainly knows the difference.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do know, but who is going to determine?

Mr. BARDEN. Now, the gentleman has asked. Let me tell him.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Who is going to determine "approved" and then I will know whether it is accredited or not?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me answer the first question first. Approved schools are those schools, apprentice schools, business schools, places of work for apprentices who learn trades that have been approved by the department of education. An accredited school or college is one that has been duly accredited, where its grades are acceptable in other colleges as being acceptable toward a degree, or toward some graduation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Under the gentleman's bill a school could only be approved if it were approved by the board of education or a State agency?

Mr. BARDEN. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Now, you are setting up 48 State bureaucrats. An educational bureaucracy can be just as dangerous as any other kind of bureaucracy. That is the point I was coming to in the bill, but you got me ahead of myself. You set up in this bill a possible bureaucrat in each of the 48 States and 2 huge bureaucracies, or you call them agencies, or services, here in Washington.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman does not call the department of education in his State, as it is now set up, a bureaucracy?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It could well be.

Mr. JUDD. We do not set them up. We use the ones that are.

Mr. BARDEN. We use the ones that are there.

The one in my State is a very reputable organization, and I am sure the gentle-

man would say as much for the one in his.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It certainly is.

Mr. BARDEN. We do not set them up in this bill; it was set up in my State a hundred years ago.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We do the same thing, only not quite as much as you. We simply ask them to name the schools and then allow the veteran to make his own choice. There is no more control or not quite as much control as there is in the gentleman's bill. That was the point I was coming to.

Mr. JUDD. The point is, you accept all those State boards of education as being qualified to supply the information, and so forth, but they send a lot of men to Washington to go beyond them and take in extra ones, too.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right, but what do you do?

Mr. JUDD. I trust the State boards of education.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But you do not. I beg your pardon. Let me read from page 16 of the bill:

It shall be the duty of the Director with the assistance of the advisory council to (1) formulate general policies and procedures necessary to assure the effective inauguration and operation of the program of education and training provided for by this part, (2) examine State plans submitted to him for approval.

They are going to approve the plans here in Washington.

Mr. JUDD. That meets the requirements of section 8; and what are the requirements of section 8? We spell them out.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And I am coming to that:

And approve those State plans which meet the requirements of section 8.

In section 8 you go ahead and lay down a lot more rules. You set up an agency in each of the States, and then you set up an agency here in Washington to determine whether or not the State has complied with the rules, regulations, and provisions of your so-called bureau in Washington. You are getting into such a complicated mess that you will never get him out of it and he never will get to college.

Mr. JUDD. May I suggest that the gentleman read subparagraph 3 beginning in line 9 on page 23:

The duty of the agency in approving the plan shall be solely the determination of whether the plan contains such provisions—

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. A while ago I understood the gentleman from North Carolina to say he had not lodged any authority in officials in Washington, but here is a specifically prescribed duty.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman could not have so understood. The gentleman knows I never made a statement of that kind. How could I when it is set up here?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wrote it down.

Mr. JUDD. It states that the plan shall provide six different things and if the plan submitted by the State provides six different things it automatically is approved.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It comes from the States back to Washington to determine whether or not those plans conform.

Mr. JUDD. No.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. You come back here every time to a group of 17 or 20 men where we go to 1 man. We take our 1 man and make him the head of the whole group. The gentleman complains of the large number of bureaus in Washington, yet here he sets up a new one in each of the 48 States.

Mr. JUDD. We say in our bill that if the plan meets these specifications it has to be approved; it does not delegate discretionary power as in your bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman from Minnesota knows who is going to regulate veterans' education under that section of the bill.

Mr. JUDD. The State boards of education are going to do it under our bill; and I would trust them rather than the other.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman from Minnesota has said the State boards would do it under his bill. In the committee bill the young man himself chooses the school. That is the way he did before. Why is it necessary to change it now?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is what we should like to know. Under the committee bill we let him do it.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Why should we have anybody regulate that except the student and the school? Why should we change?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We are all seeking the same end; we just do not agree on the method, that is all.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In the Barden bill we have an advisory committee subject to high pressure from a Government administrator.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Under the Senate bill he was subject to the War Manpower Commission, the Federal Bureau of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Department of the Navy, the Department of War, and some others. We took that out in the committee and put it in one agency instead of setting up the advisory committee they provide in the Barden bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. I thought we understood and agreed a while ago that it was an advisory committee and not an agency.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If I said "agency" I beg the gentleman's pardon. Let us call it agency or bureau; it is just a difference in words.

Mr. BARDEN. What; an advisory board?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What do these bureaucrats down here call themselves if not advisors?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is the one who is defending bureaucrats. We have none in my bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Are these intellectual advisors what they call a brain trust?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I presume so; I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. This may have been brought out before, this may be a repetition, but I think the gentleman will agree with me that when men are discharged from the armed forces they do not want the Army or the Navy to have anything to do with them any more; and, furthermore, they do not want anything else to do with the selective service. That is an agency which should be terminated with the termination of the war.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And the soldiers do not want to be regimented when they come home.

Mr. WRIGHT and Mr. KEARNEY rose.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Just one moment and I will yield to you both. First I want to say the gentleman from North Carolina that he in his bill and we in our bill have exactly the same provision:

No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out the provisions of this part, shall exercise any supervision or control over any State educational agency or State apprenticeship agency or any educational institution in any State—

Why do we need to set up this agency?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Page 24 of the Barden bill provides for the appointment of an advisory committee which shall be broadly representative of the various types of approved educational or training institutions in the State. I thought the agency in Washington would have the duty and the power of determining whether such advisory committee was set up. Does the gentleman understand that the agency here does or does not have the power to pass on the nature of the State advisory committee?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I could not answer that; that is in the Barden bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. What strikes me is that if they do have the power in Washington to pass on that sort of thing with that broad and rather fancy language, that is a good bit of power. If they do not have any such power why have it in the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We do not have it in the committee bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. It strikes me that the committee bill is more simple and probably more easily administered as to these educational provisions than the Barden

bill; also I think it has one other feature which is very important, in that it gives to the veteran more freedom of choice. In spite of what we say it is just as easy to have a veteran regimented by his State government as it is by his National Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. By 48 State agencies.

Mr. WRIGHT. Under 48 different rules. When it comes to choosing the accredited schools and approved schools, this bill gives the veteran the right to go to any school he wants as long as it is approved by the Veterans' Administration in Washington or suggested by the States and as long as the Veterans' Administration is satisfied that it is not a racket proposition trying to fleece the veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Can the gentleman from New York yield me some more time?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What is the pleasure of the gentleman from Mississippi about continuing this afternoon? I should like more time.

Mr. RANKIN. I can let the gentleman have some time tomorrow. If it is satisfactory to the gentleman from New York, suppose the gentleman from Iowa continues tomorrow.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with the objectives and aims of the provisions of this bill. I believe that the educational features of H. R. 3864 might improve the bill. I did not, however, ask for this time to discuss the bill before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time rather to pay tribute to a very great lady. It has been brought to my attention that a very great honor will be conferred on Ella Marie Kelley, the wife of our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], in having been selected as the Catholic mother of 1944.

Mrs. Kelley is the mother of 9 children, 6 sons and 3 daughters. Five sons are serving in the armed service, 2 of them in overseas theaters of operation. Selection of the Catholic mother of the year is completed annually on the day devoted to the Patroness of Christian Mothers and announcement made on the eve of National Family Week, which date coincides with Mother's Day.

Presentation to Mrs. Kelley of the medal of the National Catholic Conference on Family Life will be made at the Shrine of Christian Motherhood in St. Augustine, Fla. At this period of tragic war, it seems to me it is well for us to pause long enough to pay homage not only to Mrs. Kelley but to the mothers of the world, many of whose sons are fighting and dying to maintain and preserve the things we believe to be of supreme importance to the future of our beloved country.

May I at this time offer my tribute and admiration and respect to a wonderful mother, Ella Marie Kelley, the wife of our colleague, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, and the mother of six sons and three daughters, all of whom are great Americans.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I, too, have had the privilege of the acquaintanceship of Mrs. Kelley and know her to be a very charming lady and a fine example of Christian motherhood. The family life of the Kelleys has been an inspiration to all people who have been fortunate enough to come in contact with them.

Mrs. NORTON. I agree with the gentleman and I say to you that their family life has been a very great inspiration to me also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MURDOCK, having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civil life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial by Jay Sheldon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter I have forwarded today to the Attorney General, Hon. Francis Biddle, relative to Reverend Orlemanski and Professor Lange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

FLOOD RELIEF

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to consider, immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, a resolution providing for flood relief, under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long will it take?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I think it will take about 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, owing to the emergency that exists in the flood areas, I am not going to object, but I will say that immediately at the conclusion of consideration of that measure we will resume general debate on the veterans' bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a comparative analysis by General Hines of the pending bill and what is known as the Barden bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the American Labor News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a short article discussing a very vital matter in connection with the disposal of the surplus materials of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENNETT of Missouri and Mr. SHAFER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

BILL OF RIGHTS STILL A FORCE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a very wholesome thing recently happened in Honolulu. The long, strong arms of the Bill of Rights—our constitutional Bill of Rights—reached out to that community to preserve and sustain the rights of a humble dock worker. He is a civilian navy yard worker who, it appears, got into a fight with two marine

sentries. Whether the civilian navy yard worker was at fault, or whether the sentries were at fault, is beside the point of this observation. This civilian navy yard worker was arrested by order of the provost marshal, tried by court martial, and sentenced to 6 months in jail. The man appealed his case on the grounds that a military court martial did not have the authority to try and to sentence a civilian worker in Honolulu. The case was appealed to Federal Judge Delbert E. Metzger. Gen. Robert C. Richardson and Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, in charge of the military and naval defense of Hawaii, appeared before Judge Metzger and claimed that because an invasion of Hawaii was a standing threat, that martial law was in operation. Judge Metzger said, in effect, to these high-ranking officers of the armed forces that they had no right to establish a military government in any part of the United States. The judge ruled that the civil courts are still functioning, and that civil rights are still to be upheld, regardless of any threat of invasion. The judge ruled that the military authorities had no right to withdraw from the civilian population the protection of the civil law and submit the civil population to martial rule and trial by military courts.

Thus, in the person of Federal Judge Metzger, the Constitution of the United States has reached out to protect a humble workingman who got into an altercation with a couple of marine sentries, and even a general and an admiral were not powerful enough, in wartime and on an outpost of defense such as Hawaii, to override the rights of that humble citizen.

We are not interested in this special individual, Lloyd C. Duncan. We are interested in the rights of the individual, whether he be Lloyd C. Duncan, or Bill Smith, or John Brown. We do not know whether or not in this particular case this particular workman violated the prescribed rules of proper behavior. We do not know whether 6 months in jail would be a reasonable punishment for his offense, if he actually committed one.

What we, as citizens of the United States, are interested in is the imporant principle of the sanctity of civil rights involved in the spectacular conflict between a Federal judge and the high military authorities in Honolulu.

In the habeas corpus case, the court ordered freedom for Duncan and canceled his $500 bond. Judge Metzger ruled that the military court "possesses no authority in law to try, find guilty, and sentence the civilian petitioner to imprisonment."

What was actually at stake in the case was the legality of the military government established on the Hawaiian Islands after the attack on Pearl Harbor. The case is remarkable in that Admiral Chester W. Nimitz and Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson appeared in court in defense of the military authorities taking over the governmental functions of the islands including the administration of justice.

General Richardson expressed the opinion that Hawaii "is and has been continuously since December 7, 1941, in imminent and constant danger of attack." Admiral Nimitz added that the present form of martial law is a desirable expedient and necessary in the field of war operations.

Judge Metzger, however, ruled that martial law was—I quote—

> without lawful operation or lawful authority over civilian affairs or persons. I find myself bound by the laws of the land. * * * Civil affairs and the civil government extend in the operation of the law to the battle zone or military camps even in time of war, and for many purposes inside military reservations, particularly where civilians are concerned.

The judge asserted, and both commanders agreed, that actual invasion of Hawaii by enemy troops is now practically impossible. He stated—and I again quote:

> If the present laws do not give the fullest desirable protection against subversive and suspicious Japanese aliens, clearly it is the duty of the Army and Navy to ask for a legislative curb on the procedure instead of insisting upon holding by force of arms an entire population under a form of helpless, unappealable subjugation called martial law or military government. * * * The right to establish martial law * * * ceases and becomes unlawful as soon as the civil government is capable and willing to resume its normal functions. * * * Throughout 1943 the civilian government was sufficiently equipped, capable, and willing to perform all of the functions for which it was created.

The issue at stake and the point which is so consequential that you, my friends, ought to understand what this case is all about, was well expressed by the courageous judge when he, in rendering his opinion, stated that the very purpose of this war allegedly is to protect and perpetuate the American system of government by constitutionally established laws. He noted that some countries have tried dictatorships and commented:

> Many views have been advanced that such is the correct and efficient system for successfully conducting a war, but that system is now on its way out. It is the antithesis to Americanism, and nothing short of riotous conditions and dissolution of lawfully constituted government can justify it in civilian affairs of the land.

The Nation will applaud this Federal judge for pointing out to us that this country is in danger of losing the war, not as a consequence of military defeat, mind you, but by surrendering, though victorious in combat, to the hateful ideals and political methods of our enemies. For, indeed, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" And that question can cover a nation.

This is not the first time Judge Metzger has upheld the rights of the people against the military government sought to be enforced upon the Hawaiian Islands. In a previous action, the judge fined General Richardson for contempt of court, but the general was pardoned by President Roosevelt. This time, also the military authorities have no intention of accepting the ruling of the court. Col. W. R. C. Morrison, the executive officer to General Richardson, has stated that the War Department would immediately appeal the decision of the court and added:

> Pending a decision by the highest court, the office of military governor will function as usual and violations of general orders will continue to be tried in provost courts.

It will be most interesting to note what action the Federal Courts of Appeal will take in this case.

It is most unfortunate that during his prolonged reign in this country, the President apparently has used his powers to appoint to our Federal courts and particularly to the Supreme Court of the United States, men chosen because of their subservience to his political ideas rather than the most competent and most experienced judges of the land. Indeed, many of them have indicated they are not of the same high caliber as Judge Metzger.

We fully grant to our military leaders an obligation to protect the shores of this country and to take any necessary precaution to assure the defense of any part of our American territory. This, however, must be done within the framework of the Constitution and the laws of the land. If these are not adequate to meet war conditions, reasonable requests for additional legislation will certainly not be refused by Congress. But we do not grant to any authority in this Nation the right to set aside the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, or our statutory laws under the mere pretext that it is necessary to do so. Where human rights are involved, the power of the people, as formulated in the Constitution, insists that the rights of a lowly workman are as important as the authority and functions of a commanding general, or anyone else.

In confirmation of this statement and to impress upon the minds of all of us the vital interest each citizen of these United States has in preserving intact the Constitution, may I call to your attention a practice in the Federal courts that is as old as the courts themselves. I do this only because the average citizen little realizes how vitally this practice may affect him.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution are called the Bill of Rights. They are so named because they throw around the individual citizen a mantle of protection which guarantees to him that he shall enjoy free from interference all the rights and the freedom enjoyed by any other citizen or group of citizens, regardless of who they are nor how powerful they may be.

That the freedom of the individual is the very foundation upon which our whole system of government is based, and that this freedom is boundless except as to action which invades the rights and freedom of other citizens, is indicated by the lengths to which the judiciary has always gone in protecting the

constitutional rights of each citizen regardless of his standing in life, or how poor or unfortunate he may be.

The most humble citizen of this country, regardless of the fact that he may have no financial means, when his constitutional rights have been invaded, can reach even into the august presence of the United States Supreme Court itself, if necessary, to preserve those rights.

During the past year there have been not less than 150 such cases in our Federal and State courts in which the constitutional rights of our citizens have been involved, which were brought direct from those courts to the Supreme Court without intervening action.

If the appellant is charged with crime, and in most of such cases this charge is involved, and in the event the appellant appears with no attorney or the means of employing same, the Court itself, under the Constitution, is compelled to ask the appellant if he desires counsel, and if so, the Court thereupon appoints an attorney to protect the citizen's every right. Thus the most humble citizen may be heard in the highest court of the land with little or no expense to himself.

If we remove one little stone from the foundation of a structure, we take the first step toward the total destruction of not only the foundation but of the entire structure itself. We cannot destroy even a small segment of the Constitution and hope to long retain any part of this great protection of human rights. It is because of this that I have repeatedly called attention to the sinister attacks made upon constitutional government by those in high authority and the danger such attacks hold for the liberty and rights of our citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FARM OWNERSHIP IN RELATION TO VETERANS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain tables and letters from departments of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as a preface to the remarks I wish to make today, may I say that I think very few of us realize the problems that confronted the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in many of the sections of this bill. I say that at this time because I have conferred not only with the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], but also with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], a former commander of the American Legion of our State.

I address myself particularly to the section on page 58, section 500, subsection (c), in which provision is made for the veteran to obtain a farm upon his release from the armed forces.

To start with, I wish to say that I do not arrogate to myself knowledge as to exactly what the interest rate should be, but I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Agriculture has had a subcommittee headed by our colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] studying one phase of this farm loan problem for a year. So I do not in any way question the actions of this committee. In the remarks that are to follow I hope I have made some contribution. I have tried to assemble in as purely an informative way as I could what has happened in the past so that it may guide our footsteps in the future.

I feel that this committee, from the conversations I have had with its members, are open to any suggestion in connection with this legislation that will improve this section of the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman approve of the provision that increases the amount of the down payment from $1,000 to $1,500?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I may say to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts that I do not want to inject my personal opinion as to any particular phase of the problem but desire to make a general aprpoach to the problem.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Our committee welcomes it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. This will all come out in the debate. It is a part of the legislation that should be brought out by the committee at the proper time. I feel that the committee will do this. I am not trying to bring out any amendment of my own. I feel that the committee should not be criticized for the provisions as they now appear, for the reason that the Committee on Agriculture has spent a year on studying only a part of this problem. I hope that the committee will present an amendment to this section that will be satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, the G. I. bill now being considered by this House, has a farm-loan feature incorporated in it that requires the attention of each and every Member of Congress. We should approach this section and this program from the viewpoint of the welfare of the veteran and we should also consider this legislation in the light of what has been and is being done to increase farm ownership by nonveterans.

To obtain this picture we must spend a few minutes on a historical background of federally sponsored farm-loan agencies.

The Federal land bank was started in 1916. The rates of interest were mostly 5 to 6 percent, which seemed fair rates at that time. The Federal land bank was supposed to stand on its own feet. When the farmers formed borrowing cooperatives they could and did make individual loans.

Beginning in 1930 large numbers of delinquent farm loans, including the ones held by individuals, banks, and insurance companies, appeared. This was due to many factors, including low farm prices, drought, and a national and world-wide economic upheaval. The selling price of many farms became less than the cost of the buildings.

In 1933 there was an attempt to meet the situation by forming the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation which made direct Government loans, sometimes as first mortgages and sometimes as second mortgages, behind the Federal land-bank loans.

The approach was by Executive order, which is as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER REORGANIZING AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AGENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas sections 401 and 403 of title IV of part II of the Legislative Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1933, as amended by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1933, provide:

"SEC. 401. The Congress hereby declares that a serious emergency exists by reason of the general economic depression; that it is imperative to reduce drastically governmental expenditures; and that such reduction may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding immediately under the provisions of this title.

"Accordingly, the President shall investigate the present organization of all executive and administrative agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"(a) To reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(b) To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

"(c) To group, coordinate, and consolidate executive and administrative agencies of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(d) To reduce the number of such agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and by abolishing such agencies and/or such functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government;

"(e) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

"(f) To segregate regulatory agencies and functions from those of an administrative and executive character."

The real cause of this crisis was the lack of faith in the land and a lack of appreciation of the fact that, after all, the land is pretty much the basis of the value of a country. Any great country has always been one with a large area of rich, productive, and fertile land.

When the magnitude of the undertaking and the rapidity of execution is considered, it is usually agreed that fairly satisfactory results were obtained, even though the politics injected into the picture could have well been eliminated. Many farms were saved temporarily from some insurance company or individual, later to be foreclosed on by the governmental agency itself.

The following table shows the foreclosures each year from 1930 to 1943:

Federal land banks and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation—Number and unpaid principal of mortgage loans, purchase money mortgages, and real-estate sales contracts foreclosed by years from 1930 through 1943

Year ending Dec. 31—	Federal land banks		Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation		Total	
	Number	Unpaid principal	Number	Unpaid principal	Number	Unpaid principal
1930	4,645	$16,866,108.97			4,645	$16,866,108.97
1931	7,386	27,168,645.95			7,386	27,168,645.95
1932	10,039	40,419,840.29			10,039	40,419,840.29
1933	5,557	21,589,659.28			5,557	21,589,659.28
1934	4,014	12,490,125.83	2	$4,800.00	4,016	12,494,925.83
1935	9,955	30,592,349.66	213	361,836.00	10,168	30,954,185.66
1936	11,922	35,274,863.52	2,184	4,012,791.62	14,106	39,287,655.14
1937	7,774	22,591,580.27	3,498	6,647,043.19	11,272	29,238,623.46
1938	5,311	16,941,259.69	5,189	10,530,474.62	10,500	27,471,734.31
1939	7,461	25,512,760.58	5,502	11,538,242.93	12,963	37,051,003.51
1940	3,319	11,502,798.46	2,212	4,833,108.19	5,531	16,335,906.65
1941	2,766	8,836,514.83	1,841	3,795,563.79	4,607	12,632,078.62
1942	2,392	7,641,221.32	2,074	4,313,296.99	4,466	11,954,518.31
1943	861	2,801,861.06	1,074	2,042,634.51	1,935	4,844,495.57

NOTE.—Properties acquired by voluntary deeds from borrowers are included prior to 1933. Foreclosures of purchase-money mortgages and contracts are not included prior to 1936.

It was rather difficult to maintain these farms with droughts and low farm prices prevailing from 1930 to 1940. On January 1, 1944, there were in force:

	Number of loans	Amount of loans
Federal land-bank loans	482,779	$1,357,937,417
Land Bank Commissioner loans	318,282	406,190,206
Total	801,061	1,764,127,623

During 1943, the number of Federal land-bank loans in the United States was reduced from 554,163 to 482,779 or by 71,384. During 1943—the amount of the Federal land-bank loans in force was reduced from $1,602,846,044 to $1,357,937,417 or by $244,909,527.

During 1943 the Land Bank Commissioner loans were reduced from 382,504 to 318,282, or by 64,222. During 1943 the amount of the Land Bank Commissioner loans was reduced from $512,197,416 to $406,190,206 or by $106,007,310. This makes a total of 125,608 loans paid during the past year. Some of these loans were paid up by transferring the obligation to insurance companies. There has been a large increase in the number of farm loans in the United States as a result of new loans by insurance companies, banks, and individuals during the past few years. On January 1, 1940, the farms of the United States, including buildings, had a value of thirty-five billions and this estimated value now is somewhere around forty billions.

THE BANKHEAD-JONES LOANS

In 1935 the Bankhead-Jones bill was passed. This provided for farms at 100 percent value for 40 years at 3 percent. This loan set-up has been heralded as an approach to solving farm tenancy although the facts are that farm ownership has decreased during all these years. I personally believe in any approach to increase farm ownership, but I never could, nor do I now, see the justice of the Bankhead-Jones law.

As I told Marvin Jones once, about all I liked about it was the name of the author. The reason I say this is because while the Bankhead-Jones agency was out finding farms for people who never owned one and spending $250 to $300 of public funds each to find one for them and then giving them a 40-year loan at 3 percent at the very time other Federal agencies were taking farms from people because they could not pay 4-percent and 5-percent loans and when the loans were in many cases only $1,200 to $1,500.

The agriculture appropriation bill now in the other body has a provision for $15,000,000 for these same Bankhead-Jones farm purchases, in the face of the apparent need and desire for veteran's farm ownership.

The Bankhead-Jones loans by States since 1935 are as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Number of farms and amount of money approved for the purchase of farms under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, by States, since inception through Dec. 31, 1943*

State	Total number borrowers approved	Total amount of money approved [1]
United States total	35,146	$201,659,859
Alabama	3,071	12,847,383
Arizona	30	203,242
Arkansas	2,091	9,596,181
California	202	1,957,521
Colorado	164	1,557,631
Connecticut	13	105,701
Delaware	42	257,090
Florida	309	1,257,312
Georgia	3,546	13,758,825
Idaho	102	904,178
Illinois	658	6,596,338
Indiana	442	4,072,145
Iowa	873	7,845,338
Kansas	561	4,796,322
Kentucky	865	6,055,709
Louisiana	1,462	7,584,465
Maine	31	166,677
Maryland	150	1,009,488
Massachusetts	23	131,592
Michigan	335	2,566,037
Minnesota	580	4,998,683
Mississippi	2,799	13,337,739
Missouri	1,160	7,092,667
Montana	78	753,649
Nebraska	451	4,412,716
Nevada	6	33,424
New Hampshire	10	60,574
New Jersey	57	385,195
New Mexico	60	494,386
New York	279	1,608,759
North Carolina	2,495	11,199,963
North Dakota	563	2,393,315
Ohio	617	5,006,010
Oklahoma	1,591	9,588,019
Oregon	100	775,381
Pennsylvania	439	2,533,890
Rhode Island	2	10,297
South Carolina	1,994	8,617,298

TABLE 1.—*Number of farms and amount of money approved for the purchase of farms under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, by States, since inception through Dec. 31, 1943*—Continued

State	Total number borrowers approved	Total amount of money approved
South Dakota	351	$2,603,880
Tennessee	1,520	8,189,480
Texas	2,682	19,852,813
Utah	40	274,321
Vermont	35	188,732
Virginia	777	4,113,008
Washington	125	1,052,289
West Virginia	371	1,740,805
Wisconsin	477	3,197,620
Wyoming	34	270,274
Hawaii	192	1,141,647
Puerto Rico	491	2,463,849

[1] Obligations.

You will note that over 10 percent of these loans are in one State, Georgia.

In addition to the Bankhead-Jones loans we also have the farm development loans that have been made by the Farm Security Administration. These have been made without any foundation of law, but rather by Executive order, I presume. The borrowers by States are as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Number of borrowers and amount of funds advanced for farm development loans since inception through Dec. 31, 1943*

State	Total number borrowers	Total amount advanced
United States total	4,186	$7,868,097
Alabama	7	12,885
Arizona	3	4,600
Arkansas	149	180,365
California	22	19,129
Colorado	31	59,976
Connecticut	0	0
Delaware	2	3,565
Florida	9	9,861
Georgia	21	39,371
Idaho	108	261,588
Illinois	73	123,859
Indiana	67	144,547
Iowa	30	93,662
Kansas	21	58,325
Kentucky	32	55,163
Louisiana	3	1,157
Maine	11	20,722
Maryland	5	16,200
Massachusetts	1	2,500
Michigan	268	486,519
Minnesota	818	1,389,412
Mississippi	75	125,965
Missouri	214	355,306
Montana	125	550,299
Nebraska	5	9,588
Nevada	0	0
New Hampshire	11	28,283
New Jersey	16	7,279
New Mexico	15	39,236
New York	27	61,180
North Carolina	46	92,245
North Dakota	7	18,273
Ohio	56	93,122
Oklahoma	354	322,270
Oregon	172	440,201
Pennsylvania	27	66,072
Rhode Island	0	0
South Carolina	4	5,655
South Dakota	20	50,167
Tennessee	25	63,837
Texas	264	257,486
Utah	36	74,194
Vermont	25	39,285
Virginia	29	59,266
Washington	93	270,040
West Virginia	30	53,334
Wisconsin	737	1,481,970
Wyoming	92	230,138
Hawaii	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0

A letter received from the Office of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, dated May 8, 1944, reads in part as follows:

This is in response to your letters of March 31 and April 4, 1944, for information relative to farm-ownership loans made by this Administration under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and from other sources. The number and amount of farm-ownership loans approved under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act are shown by States on table 1. The number of farm-development loans, also made under the farm-ownership program for necessary improvements to real estate, but from funds other than those authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, are shown together with the amounts advanced on table 2. Those tables do not include those project units which are being sold wherever practicable under terms and procedure established under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. * * *

Furthermore, it may be well to point out that administrative policy of the Farm Security Administration prohibits the purchase of any farms in excess of $12,000 valuation.

There is another appropriation to farmers I wish to call to your attention. It is in the bill that sets up some authority of law for the numerous, about 100, items for which appropriations were being made without any authorization of law.

It is as follows:

SEC. 502. (a) Section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914, is amended by striking out the following words in the second proviso: "at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued:" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "at a rate of 2 percent per annum; interest rates on the unmatured and unpaid balance of any loans made pursuant to this section prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to 2 percent per annum, and the maturity date of any such loans may be readjusted to occur at a date not beyond 35 years from the date of such loan."

(b) Section 5 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), is amended by striking out the following words: "at a rate of interest equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued.", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "at a rate of interest of 2 percent per annum; interest rates on the unmatured and unpaid balance of any loans made pursuant to this section prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to 2 percent per annum."

I am not taking the position that the section 502 should not be passed, but I call your attention to the fact that this section was passed this session of Congress without a dissenting vote.

Another situation that can be included at this time is in connection with the Federal Housing Authority. At this point I wish to read the letter of transmittal from this agency and two memoranda:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY,
Washington, April 24, 1944.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: Confirming information given to you by telephone on April 20, I am glad to enclose herewith two statements covering data which you requested concerning the development cost and annual subsidy on our program under the United States Housing Act, as amended.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES R. LEE,
For HERBERT EMMERICH,
Commissioner.

STATEMENT REGARDING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT (INCLUDING THE WAR HOUSING AMENDMENT THERETO, PUBLIC ACT 671, 76TH CONG.) AS OF APRIL 20, 1944

1. The amount of annual contributions:

a. Paid in fiscal year 1943, $9,882,042.

b. Budget estimate for fiscal year 1945, $10,947,291. (Funds for this purpose consist of $9,500,000 included in the pending independent offices appropriation bill plus unobligated balances of the prior year's appropriations.)

2. The total maximum annual subsidy of the entire program is $28,000,000. (The F. P. H. A. now has outstanding commitments for annual contributions substantially up to the maximum.)

UNIT COST DATA FOR PROJECTS DEVELOPED UNDER THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT (INCLUDING THE WAR HOUSING AMENDMENT THERETO, PUBLIC ACT 671, 76TH CONGRESS), AS OF FEBRUARY 29, 1944

1. Total program:[1]

a. Number of projects, 570.

b. Number of dwelling units, 167,514.

2. Average unit costs:

a. The average total development cost per unit was $4,715.

The total development cost includes all costs, including site improvements and community facilities, as well as dwelling units and, in the case of projects built on slum sites, includes also the cost of slum buildings torn down and the cost of their demolition.

b. The average cost per unit for all items included in the statutory limitation specified in the United States Housing Act (that is, all costs excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities) was $3,390 for projects in cities under 500,000 (statutory limitation $4,000) and $3,605 for projects in cities over 500,000 (statutory limitation $5,000).

c. The highest average total development cost per unit was $6,801.[2] The cost for the items included in the statutory limitation for this project was $3,787.

d. The lowest average total development cost per unit for projects in continental United States was $2,692. This project is located at Miami, Fla., where it was possible to purchase the land, on which the project was developed, at a very low cost. The cost for the items included in the statutory limitation for this project was $2,347.

[1] Thirteen rural projects, including 515 units, with very low costs excluded.

[2] This project is located at San Francisco, Calif., and the high cost per dwelling unit was due to the high cost of the land purchased for the site and the high cost of purchasing and clearing the slum buildings on that site. In fact, these two items, i. e., cost of land and cost of purchase and clearance of slum buildings amounted to approximately 25 percent of the total development cost.

I am not at this time commenting on the merits of this housing legislation, but I do want to call your attention to the appropriation and the subsidy involved.

In addition to the above, legislation was enacted last year to provide overtime payment to Federal employees which was up to $300 per year for the low-income groups, and over twice as much, or $628.32 to be exact, to the employees in the higher salary group. In fact, many of the higher salary groups of government receiving $10,000 to $15,000 per annum and some with the best-paying jobs they ever had in their lives, receive more as overtime than the base pay of the men in the armed forces.

Furthermore we have agencies of government spending millions of dollars for subsidized hay, such as in the political dust bowl of Virginia, and the agency does not even know to whom the free hay was given nor how much it cost. Many of these activities are carried on as aids to the war effort when in fact some of them are detrimental to the war effort.

With this background now let us consider the G. I. bill, S. 1767. On page 58 we find under section 500 the following:

(c) Loans guaranteed by the Administrator under this title shall be payable under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That loans guaranteed by the Administrator shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding 6 percent per annum and shall be payable in full in not more than 20 years. The Administrator is authorized and directed to guarantee loans to veterans subject to the provisions of this title on approved applications made to persons, firms, associations, and corporations and to governmental agencies and corporations, either State or Federal.

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has spent considerable time on this section of the bill. I appeared before the committee but did not have all the information from the departments to present at that time.

There are certain questions that must arise in every Member's mind. One question is this: If any selected group of nonveterans can purchase a farm and have the Government pay 100 percent of the purchase price, and give a 40-year loan at 3 percent interest, should we enact legislation that gives the veteran a less favorable position?

In fairness it should be stated that there is nothing in the Bankhead-Jones law to exclude a veteran. Nor is there anything to give the veteran preference for a loan. In the proposed Cooley bill, not yet out of committee, the veteran would have preference.

Another question is this: Do you not think it advisable to provide the veteran a set-up whereby his interest rate is favorable in comparison to other groups?

The importance of giving deep consideration to this legislation is due to the fact that farming is a young man's profession. A rather small percentage of the rural population attend institutions of higher learning.

The desired legislation should be passed at this time because of the fact that proper consideration for veterans is apt to receive less support when the war is over.

For example, take the attitude of Clarence A. Dykstra, president of the University of Wisconsin, in 1936, where we find the following:

Source: Lip Service or Civil Service, by Clarence Addison Dykstra, Pamphlet No. 6, November 1936, published by Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada (p. 9, par. 2).

By Federal ruling and by State legislation the veteran picture of today is strikingly different. The veteran is much more highly favored than in the old days. The United States Commission reported in 1920 that there were approximately 4,500,000 persons entitled to preference for the service. Large areas of the public service in many jurisdictions now are restricted largely to veteran groups. In the Federal service alone, according to a Federal examiner's report of 1934, 25 percent of all appointments go to veterans, although they are a very small percentage of the population. Such a procedure in appointments seems to come dangerously near to the creation of a privileged office-holding class in America, and moreover a group which, according to examination figures, made substandard records in the tests.

Another suggestion is that the Farm Credit Administration should be included in this legislation so that the veteran will be assured a fair appraisal of any farm he may wish to secure.

To sum this up then we have provided for loans of 100 percent for 40 years to selected groups; we have seen agencies drive 90,000 farm families from their homes as well as their farms because farm prices were low from 1930 to 1940 and because they could not pay a $3,000 to $4,000 loan. We have seen a home-providing program for our city cousins with 167 housing units where some units cost over $6,800 each and the average nearly $5,000 each. We have seen overtime provided for higher bracket Federal employees in excess of the base pay of the men in the armed forces although these men received from $10,000 to $15,000 per year. We have seen and now are seeing millions of dollars provided to groups not asking for it, and to groups that do not need it.

Then we find in S. 1767, "That loans guaranteed by the Administration shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding 6 percent per annum, and shall be payable in full in not more than 20 years."

I have conferred with the gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. JOHN RANKIN, chairman of the Veterans Committee, the gentleman from Iowa, Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM, the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. MARION BENNETT, the gentleman from New York, Hon. BERNARD KEARNEY, and other members of this committee and I am sure that they wish to have this section of the bill amended in such a manner so that the veteran will be provided with the legislative protection he so richly deserves.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JARMAN, until May 20, 1944, on account of official business.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters;

H. R. 3261. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 12, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on S. 1272, to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations, at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, May 12, 1944, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, May 16, 1944, at 10:00 a. m., to consider H. R. 4780, a bill to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, and special delivery service. Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 18, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. (Ship-construction reserve fund.)

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 25, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4486, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the Clerk by letter.

Witnesses are requested to notify the Clerk by letter at least a day in advance of the hearings of their desire to testify in order that a list of witnesses may be prepared. Written statements for the record from persons other than witnesses should be submitted a day in advance. Amendments to be proposed during the hearing should be submitted to the reporter in duplicate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1529. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision in the form of an amendment to the budget for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 584); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1530. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $9,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 585); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1531. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1532. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the sixth report of the Attorney General covering the period from January 8, 1944, through May 6, 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 531. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4421, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1436). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 526. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4710, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1437). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 543. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4184, to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1438). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1645. A bill for the relief of Edward Gillam; with amendment (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By M. FULMER:

H. R. 4792. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By M. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 4793. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4794. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with reference to the transactions in regard to watches containing works of foreign manufacture; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4795. A bill to authorize the undertaking of the initial stage of the comprehensive plan for the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to provide for the carry-back of net operating losses resulting from reimbursement of vendees for unconstitutional processing taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 280. Joint resolution to provide assistance to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1944 in order to enable them to continue farming operations to produce food for the war effort; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4796. A bill granting a pension to Nina G. Givens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4797. A bill to require conveyance of certain lands in the San Joaquin del Rio de Chama grant (in the State of New Mexico), and reserving minerals and other interests therein; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WINTER:

H. R. 4798. A bill granting a pension to Henry A. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5651. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Lillie Nyhus and 34 other citizens of Roshalt, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5652. Also, petition of Mary D. Strickles and 69 other citizens of Cumberland, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibitng the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5653. Also, petition of Rev. J. H. Hour and 82 other citizens of Willits, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5654. Also, petition of V. H. Ward and 58 other citizens of Eckley, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5655. Also, petition of Mrs. William F. Smith and 66 other citizens of Fort Madison, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5656. Also, petition of Benjamin H. Shultz and 60 other citizens of Detroit, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5657. Also, petition of Annie E. Lance and 61 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5658. Also, petition of Rev. T. G. Weaver and 38 other citizens of Mexico, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5659. Also, petition of Lillian Graham and 57 other citizens of Ionia, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5660. Also, petition of M. H. McCullough and 42 other citizens of Hampstead, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5661. Also, petition of Mrs. William Berrell and 51 other citizens of Enid, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5662. Also, petition of Mrs. B. A. Fearrington and 45 other citizens of Greensboro, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5663. Also, petition of Mrs. Warren D. Johnson and 38 other citizens of Nottingham, Pa., and Elkton, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5664. Also, petition of Alexander W. Durfee and 50 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5665. By Mr. GOODWIN: Statement adopted by the Laymen's League Chapter of the Unitarian Church, Somerville, Mass., protesting against the action of the Government in the Montgomery Ward case; to the Committee on Rules.